

The non-linear stability of the Schwarzschild family of black holes

Mihalis Dafermos^{‡ §}, Gustav Holzegel^{† *}, Igor Rodnianski[‡], and Martin Taylor[†]

[†]*Imperial College London, Department of Mathematics,
South Kensington Campus, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom*

[‡]*Princeton University, Department of Mathematics,
Fine Hall, Washington Road, Princeton, NJ 08544, United States of America*

[§]*University of Cambridge, Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics,
Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, United Kingdom*

^{*}*Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Mathematisches Institut,
Einsteinstrasse 62 48149 Münster, Bundesrepublik Deutschland*

April 16, 2021

Abstract

We prove the non-linear asymptotic stability of the Schwarzschild family as solutions to the Einstein vacuum equations in the exterior of the black hole region: general vacuum initial data—with no symmetry assumed—sufficiently close to Schwarzschild data evolve to a vacuum spacetime which

- (i) possesses a complete future null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ (whose past $J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$ is moreover bounded by a regular future complete event horizon \mathcal{H}^+),
- (ii) remains close to Schwarzschild in its exterior, and
- (iii) asymptotes back to a member of the Schwarzschild family as an appropriate notion of time goes to infinity,

provided that the data are themselves constrained to lie on a teleologically constructed codimension-3 “submanifold” of moduli space. This is the full nonlinear asymptotic stability of Schwarzschild since solutions not arising from data lying on this submanifold should by dimensional considerations approach a Kerr spacetime with rotation parameter $a \neq 0$, i.e. such solutions cannot satisfy (iii). The statement is effective, providing quantitative bounds from explicit initial data quantities, and the global nearness to Schwarzschild at top order can be measured with respect to the same quantity as initial data, i.e. without loss of derivatives. The proof employs teleologically normalised double null gauges, is expressed entirely in physical space and makes essential use of the analysis in our previous study of the *linear* stability of the Kerr family around Schwarzschild [DHR], as well as techniques developed over the years to control the non-linearities of the Einstein equations, in particular in the difficult radiation zone associated to subtle non-linear effects like Christodoulou memory. The present work, however, is entirely self-contained. In view of the recent [DHR19, TdCSR20], our approach can be applied to the full non-linear asymptotic stability of the subextremal Kerr family.

Contents

Introduction	1
I The main result: the nonlinear asymptotic stability of Schwarzschild	3
I.1 Double null gauge	3
I.2 Schwarzschild, Kerr and residual gauge freedom	4
I.3 First formulation of the main result: Theorem I.3.1	5
I.4 The asymptotically stable “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ and the problem of Kerr	7
II The linear stability of Schwarzschild in double null gauge	8
II.1 The linearised Einstein equations in double null gauge	8
II.2 Statement of the linear stability theorem [DHR]	9
II.3 Proof of linear stability	9
II.4 The Kerr case	12
II.5 Other approaches	12
III Previous results on nonlinear stability	12
III.1 The nonlinear stability of Minkowski space	13
III.2 Nonlinear results under symmetry	15
III.3 Aside: application of Theorem I.3.1 to axisymmetry and the statement of Corollary III.3.1	16
III.4 Some non-linear model problems	16
III.5 A scattering construction of dynamic black holes	17
III.6 Comparison with the case of $\Lambda \neq 0$	18
IV The nonlinear stability of Kerr, extremality and the black hole interior	18
IV.1 Formulation of the problem	18
IV.2 Extremality and the Aretakis instability	19
IV.3 Implications for black hole interiors with $a_{\text{final}} \neq 0$ and strong cosmic censorship	20
IV.4 A conjecture for the $a_{\text{final}} = 0$ case	21
V Brief overview of the proof	21
V.1 The 3-parameter families of data and $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$	22
V.2 The logic of the proof	22
V.3 The bootstrap region and the teleological normalisation of the null gauges	22
V.4 Boundedness of the initial norm and the relation of the gauges	23
V.5 The main estimates: revisiting [DHR]	24
V.6 Estimates near null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ and the null condition	25
V.7 Estimating the non-linear terms near the photon sphere	25
V.8 Other nonlinear issues	26
V.9 Top order elliptic estimates for Ricci coefficients	27
V.10 The $\ell = 0, 1$ modes	27
V.11 Completing the continuity argument	27
V.12 The properties of null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ and the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+	28
VI Outline of the work and guide to the reader	29
Acknowledgments	29

A	Preliminaries	30
1	The vacuum Einstein equations in double null gauge and the Schwarzschild background	32
1.1	Geometric preliminaries	33
1.2	The complete set of equations	36
1.3	The Schwarzschild metric in Eddington–Finkelstein and Kruskal normalised double null coordinates	39
1.4	The $\ell = 0, 1$ modes and the reference linearised Kerr solutions	43
2	The almost gauge-invariant hierarchy and the teleological gauge normalisations	47
2.1	The almost gauge invariant hierarchy: α, ψ, P and $\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\psi}, \underline{P}$	48
2.2	The \mathcal{I}^+ gauge	48
2.3	The \mathcal{H}^+ gauge	51
3	Schematic notation and the Teukolsky and Regge–Wheeler equations	55
3.1	Schematic notation for differences and the commutation operators	56
3.2	Schematic notation for nonlinear error terms	57
3.3	Commutation identities	64
3.4	Derivation of equations satisfied by almost gauge invariant quantities	65
4	Change of double null gauge and the diffeomorphism functions	76
4.1	Local double null gauges in a vacuum spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g)	77
4.2	Change of double null gauge: the diffeomorphism functions f and their derivatives	77
4.3	Transformation laws for geometric quantities under change of gauge	79
4.4	A determination of the sphere diffeomorphism	88
B	The main theorem: setup, statement and logic of the proof	97
5	The local theory	99
5.1	Characteristic initial data generated by seed data \mathcal{S}	100
5.2	The maximal Cauchy development (\mathcal{M}, g)	102
5.3	Identification with Schwarzschild and global existence of the data	103
5.4	The global smallness assumption and the smallness parameter ε_0	106
5.5	Cauchy stability and the initial data gauges	109
5.6	The anchoring conditions	114
5.7	Existence of anchored teleological gauges at time u_f^0	118
5.8	The 3-parameter families of initial data $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}$ and the structure of the moduli space \mathfrak{M}	119
5.9	The homeomorphism $\mathbf{J}_0 : \mathfrak{R}_0 \rightarrow B_{\varepsilon_0/u_f^0}$ and its degree 1 property	121
6	Final formulation of the main result: Theorem 6.1	122
6.1	Energies	123
6.2	The statement of Theorem 6.1	132
	(i) Completeness of null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ and properties of the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+	132
	(ii) Orbital stability	133
	(iii) Asymptotic stability	133
6.3	The stable codimension-3 “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ and other remarks on the statement	134
7	The logic of the proof of Theorem 6.1	135
7.1	The bootstrap set \mathfrak{B}	136
7.2	Non-emptiness of the bootstrap set \mathfrak{B}	137
7.3	Improving the bootstrap assumptions: the statement of Theorem C	138
7.4	The bootstrap set \mathfrak{B} is open and the statements of Theorems 16.1 and 16.2	138
7.5	Higher order estimates: the statement of Theorem 16.3	140
7.6	The bootstrap set \mathfrak{B} is closed	140

7.7	Completing the proof and the statements of Theorems 17.1 and 17.2	142
C	Improving the bootstrap assumptions	146
8	The logic of the proof of Theorem C	148
8.1	Theorem C.1: Sobolev inequalities, elliptic estimates and basic pointwise bounds	149
8.2	Theorem C.2: Estimating diffeomorphisms and relating the gauges	150
8.3	Theorem C.3: Estimating almost gauge invariant quantities: P and \underline{P}	150
8.4	Theorem C.4: Estimating almost gauge invariant quantities: α and $\underline{\alpha}$	151
8.5	Theorem C.5: Estimating geometric quantities in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge	151
8.6	Theorem C.6: Estimating geometric quantities in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge	151
9	Sobolev inequalities, pointwise bounds and elliptic estimates: the proof of Theorem C.1	153
9.1	Sobolev inequalities	154
9.2	Pointwise estimates	155
9.3	Poincaré inequalities and elliptic estimates	155
9.4	Error estimates arising from mode projections	158
10	Estimating diffeomorphisms and relating the gauges: the proof of Theorem C.2	166
10.1	Estimates for the diffeomorphisms functions	167
10.2	Improving the inclusion relations	178
10.3	Cancellations along a timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B}	178
10.4	Cancellations on null hypersurfaces and spacetime regions	184
10.5	Estimates for initial energies of α and $\underline{\alpha}$	186
10.6	Estimates for \mathcal{H}^+ quantities from \mathcal{I}^+ quantities on C_{u_f}	190
11	Tensorial wave equations	194
11.1	Algebraic preliminaries and definitions	195
11.2	The structure of commuted tensorial wave equations	198
11.3	Regions and energies for tensorial wave equation estimates	201
11.4	The energy estimate and basic integrated local energy decay	204
11.5	The redshift estimate	211
11.6	The r^p -weighted hierarchy	211
11.7	Nonlinear error estimates for wave equations	213
11.8	Some auxiliary estimates for commuted energies	220
12	Estimates for P and \underline{P}: the proof of Theorem C.3	223
12.1	Overview	224
12.2	Non-degenerate boundedness and integrated decay	227
12.3	The r^p -weighted estimate	228
12.4	Higher derivative estimates	228
12.5	The hierarchy of weighted decay estimates	237
12.6	Completing the proof of Theorem C.3	238
13	Estimates for α and $\underline{\alpha}$: the proof of Theorem C.4	241
13.1	Overview of the estimates on α	242
13.2	Auxiliary transport estimates at low orders for α	244
13.3	Higher order energy estimates for α	246
13.4	Concluding the main estimates for α	261
13.5	Overview of the estimates on $\underline{\alpha}$	262
13.6	Auxiliary transport estimates at low orders for $\underline{\alpha}$	264
13.7	Higher order energy estimates for $\underline{\alpha}$	265
13.8	Concluding the main estimates for $\underline{\alpha}$	279

13.9	Completing the proof of Theorem C.4	280
14	Estimates in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge: the proof of Theorem C.5	283
14.1	Schematic form of the equations and the quantity Y	284
14.2	Non-linear error estimates	292
14.3	The proof of Theorem C.5: transport and elliptic estimates	300
15	Estimates in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge: the proof of Theorem C.6	346
15.1	General transport estimates for redshifted and blueshifted equations, the quantity X , and other preliminaries	347
15.2	Non-linear error estimates	355
15.3	The proof of Theorem C.6: transport and elliptic estimates	359
D	Finishing the proof of the main theorem	412
16	The construction of the teleological gauges and higher order estimates	414
16.1	Existence of anchored $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised gauges: the proof of Theorem 16.1	414
16.2	Monotonicity properties of $\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$: the proof of Theorem 16.2	485
16.3	Higher order estimates: the proof of Theorem 16.3	488
17	Conclusions	491
17.1	Null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ and the laws of gravitational radiation	491
17.2	The event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ and the characterization of the black hole region $\mathcal{M} \setminus J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$	495
17.3	Proof of Theorems 17.1 and 17.2	496
17.4	Axisymmetric solutions with vanishing angular momentum: the proof of Corollary III.3.1	497
	Index	497
	Bibliography	507

Introduction

The *Schwarzschild metrics*

$$g_M = -(1 - 2M/r)dt^2 + (1 - 2M/r)^{-1}dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2) \quad (1)$$

give rise to a 1-parameter family of spherically symmetric, stationary asymptotically flat Lorentzian 4-manifolds (\mathcal{M}, g_M) , parametrised by mass $M \in \mathbb{R}$, and represent the most well-known explicit solutions of the *Einstein vacuum equations*

$$\text{Ric}[g] = 0, \quad (2)$$

the equations governing general relativity in the absence of matter. The metric (1) was originally discovered in local coordinates by Schwarzschild [Sch16], very soon after Einstein’s formulation [Ein15] of (2), but was only later understood by Lemaître [Lem33] to admit (in the case $M > 0$) a non-trivial regular extension through an *event horizon* \mathcal{H}^+ at $r = 2M$ to what is now known as a *black hole* region (see also the earlier [Edd24]). Whereas freely falling observers may choose to remain in the *exterior* region $r > 2M$ for all proper time (in particular, this region possesses a *complete future null infinity* \mathcal{I}^+), those entering the black hole interior $r < 2M$ encounter a “ferocious singularity” (see [MTW17]) at $r = 0$, where curvature blows up and beyond which the metric cannot be extended—not even merely continuously [Sbi18]. The very notion of black hole implies, however, that the exterior region remains causally unaffected by this singularity, and thus the basic properties of this region can be studied independently of the black hole interior.

The most fundamental question to ask concerning the Schwarzschild metric (1) is that of its *nonlinear stability* in the exterior region as a solution of (2). This will be the subject of the present work.

The nonlinear stability problem is naturally formulated in the context of the *Cauchy problem* [CBG69] for (2), which associates a unique *maximal Cauchy development*, solving (2), to every *vacuum initial data set*. We will give a preliminary statement of our main result, the **full non-linear asymptotic stability of Schwarzschild**, in **Section I** below. This is formulated as **Theorem I.3.1**. Briefly, this theorem says that for vacuum initial data sets—with no symmetry assumed—sufficiently close to appropriate Schwarzschild initial data, the resulting maximal Cauchy development

- (i) possesses a complete future null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ whose past $J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$ is bounded to the future by a regular future complete event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ ,
- (ii) remains globally close to Schwarzschild (1) in its exterior and
- (iii) asymptotes back to a member of the Schwarzschild family as a suitable notion of time goes to infinity,

provided that the initial data set itself lies on a codimension-3 “submanifold” of the moduli space of vacuum initial data. Our restriction on data is a necessary condition for the asymptotic stability statement (iii). For as is well known, the Schwarzschild family (1) is contained as the $a = 0$ subcase of a larger family of stationary solutions, the *Kerr family* $g_{a,M}$ [Ker63], with aM representing angular momentum. Outside our codimension-3 submanifold, one expects solutions to necessarily asymptote to a Kerr solution with $a \neq 0$, since the dimension of *linearised Kerr solutions fixing the mass* is equal to 3 in our parametrisation.

To break the general covariance of (2), our proof relies in an essential way on expressing the equations in *double null gauge*. It is natural then to start the problem from characteristic initial data (cf. [Ren90]) determined by two null hypersurfaces $C_{\text{out}} \cup \underline{C}_{\text{in}}$, with C_{out} extending to \mathcal{I}^+ and $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ entering what will be the black hole region, as it follows from [CK93, KN03] and Cauchy stability that general asymptotically flat initial data posed on a (spacelike) Cauchy hypersurface Σ indeed contain such null hypersurfaces in their Cauchy




Figure 1: Nonlinear asymptotic stability of Schwarzschild: spacetimes satisfying (i)–(iii)

evolution. See Figure 1. Our moduli space will thus consist of the set of general such characteristic initial data, without symmetry assumptions, in a suitable topology. We emphasise that both our asymptotically stable codimension-3 submanifold itself and the double null gauges that we shall employ must be constructed “teleologically”, i.e. on the basis of properties of their future evolution. The same applies to the final mass parameter M of the Schwarzschild solution g_M to which our metric g asymptotically settles down. (Indeed, in general, the only way to identify data for which (iii) holds, and to moreover determine M , is to evolve them towards the future under (2)!) The event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ will represent an asymptotic hypersurface of our double null gauge and in particular is also only determined teleologically. We emphasise that our results give stability up to and including \mathcal{H}^+ , which is moreover shown to be future complete and suitably regular; this then determines the boundary of a non-trivial black hole region.

We note that double null gauges have been successfully employed in recent years for several very different global problems in general relativity [Chr09, LR17, Luk18, DL17], and their use here means that, despite the complication of the present work, its basic equations and the general framework for their analysis will be already familiar to some readers, and many of the difficulties can be readily understood in a far more general context, beyond stability problems. We emphasise however that the present work is completely self-contained and will not require previous familiarity with any of the above papers.

It is worth remarking that the global closeness of statement (ii) can be expressed at the top order energy level with respect to the same quantity that measures a suitable “initial” energy quantity, i.e. without loss of derivatives. In this sense, we have obtained a true orbital stability statement. As is well known, however, the supercriticality of the non-linearities of (2) means that the only path to proving the statements (i) and (ii) is through a full asymptotic stability statement (iii), and thus one does not expect to be able to obtain a statement involving (i)–(ii) alone. See already Section I.4.

The necessary starting point to proving (iii) is a robust approach to *linear stability* around the expected asymptotic state. This was provided by our (purely physical space based) method and framework introduced in [DHR], where we proved the linear stability of the Kerr family around Schwarzschild, in double null gauge. In particular, a corollary of [DHR] is that the Schwarzschild subfamily is itself linearly *asymptotically* stable precisely for data lying on a codimension-3 subspace, which, unlike the nonlinear setting, can be identified explicitly, as can the final linearised mass parameter. We note, however, that the necessity of teleological normalisation of the double null gauge is already a key difficulty of linear theory. We shall review these results in **Section II**. These in turn can be viewed as the culmination of a series of previous work starting from [RW57], using heavily technology developed in the last fifteen years (see [BS06, DR09b, BS05, DR13, Hol10b, DR09a]) for understanding dispersion of waves outside of black holes.

In addition to the linear theory of [DHR], our results depend on many insights developed over the years, starting from the monumental proof of the stability of Minkowski space [CK93], for understanding the *nonlinearities* of (2), in particular, in the most difficult radiation zone towards null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ , where null structure (cf. [Kla86]) is paramount. This full understanding of the null structure elucidated by the geometric gauge used here allows one to understand in our black hole context subtle non-linear effects associated to radiation, for instance, Christodoulou memory [Chr91]. We shall put our work in the context of previous non-linear results for asymptotically flat solutions of (2) in **Section III**. (We shall also compare with the situation when a cosmological constant Λ is added to (2), in which case there are recent non-linear stability results if $\Lambda > 0$ due to Hintz and Vasy [HV18], while in the $\Lambda < 0$ case, all black hole solutions may in fact be unstable (cf. [HS13, Mos18]).)

Much previous work on nonlinear stability has considered various symmetric reductions, starting from

work of Christodoulou on the Einstein-scalar field system in spherical symmetry [Chr87], followed by [DR05, DH06b, Hol10a], and most recently, the impressive work of Klainerman–Szeftel [KS18] for polarised axisymmetric spacetimes, which is a first work beyond $1 + 1$ dimensional systems. Whereas, as remarked above, the full codimension-3 submanifold of moduli space yielding asymptotic stability (iii) of Schwarzschild, in the absence of symmetry, can only be characterized teleologically, in contrast, in the restrictive setting of symmetry, one can easily identify criteria on initial data which guarantee that their only possible end-state within the Kerr family would be Schwarzschild. If these data lead to stable evolution, it follows that they should then be contained on our submanifold. Indeed, we will explicitly show, exploiting the fact that in the vacuum angular momentum cannot radiate to null infinity under axisymmetry, that our submanifold does contain, as an infinite codimension subclass, the set of all axisymmetric data with vanishing Komar angular momentum. This is the statement of **Corollary III.3.1**. Thus in particular, our submanifold contains also the polarised axisymmetric data considered recently in [KS18], which itself is an infinite codimension subfamily of general axisymmetric data.

The first step of the proof of linear stability of Schwarzschild in [DHR] was to prove decay results for the decoupled *Teukolsky equation* [BP73, Teu73], governing the gauge-invariant part of the perturbations, via a physical space reinterpretation and novel use of transformations first introduced by Chandrasekhar [Cha75]. This has recently been generalised to the very slowly rotating Kerr case $|a| \ll M$ in [DHR19] (see also [Ma20b]) and to the full subextremal range $|a| < M$ by Shlapentokh-Rothman and Teixeira da Costa [TdCSR20]. With these more recent developments, the whole approach of this work can in principle be generalised to Kerr, in fact in the full subextremal range of parameters. We shall give a formulation of the full nonlinear stability of Kerr problem in **Section IV**, including a discussion of the extremal case and the relation with the structure of black hole interiors.

We shall finally give an overview of the proof of Theorem I.3.1 in **Section V**. We will conclude this introduction in **Section VI** with an outline of the work.

I The main result: the nonlinear asymptotic stability of Schwarzschild

We attempt here a first rough formulation of our main result, fleshing out the above discussion.

I.1 Double null gauge

Fundamental to our approach will be expressing the Einstein vacuum equations (2) in a *double null gauge*, where the metric takes the form

$$g = -4\Omega^2 du dv + g_{CD}(d\theta^C - b^C dv)(d\theta^D - b^D dv). \quad (\text{I.1.1})$$

The constant- u and v hypersurfaces are thus null, intersecting along 2-surfaces $S_{u,v}$ with local coordinates θ^A and induced metric g_{AB} assumed Riemannian. Associated to the above is a *normalised double null frame*

$$e_1, \quad e_2, \quad e_3 = \Omega^{-1}\partial_u, \quad e_4 = \Omega^{-1}(\partial_v + b^A\partial_{\theta^A}).$$

The equations reduce to a complicated coupled system for the following geometric quantities:

metric coefficients	$\Omega, \quad g, \quad b$
connection coefficients	$\chi = g(\nabla_A e_4, e_B), \quad \underline{\chi} = g(\nabla_A e_3, e_B), \dots$
curvature components	$\alpha_{AB} = R(e_A, e_4, e_B, e_4), \quad \underline{\alpha}_{AB} = R(e_A, e_3, e_B, e_3), \dots$

Some of the resulting equations are displayed below:

transport	$\nabla_4 g = 0, \quad \nabla_4 \hat{\chi} + \text{tr} \chi \hat{\chi} - \hat{\omega} \hat{\chi} = \alpha, \dots$	(I.1.2)
elliptic	$\text{d}\hat{v} \hat{\chi} = \nabla \text{tr} \chi - \beta + \dots, \dots$	
hyperbolic	$\nabla_3 \alpha + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \chi \alpha + 2 \hat{\omega} \alpha = -2 \mathcal{D}_2^* \beta - 3 \hat{\chi} \rho + \dots, \quad \nabla_4 \beta + 2 \text{tr} \chi \beta - \hat{\omega} \beta = \text{d}\hat{v} \alpha + \dots, \dots$	

(In the above, ∇_3 and ∇_4 denote covariant differential operators acting in the e_3 and e_4 directions, whereas ∇ , $\text{d}\hat{v}$, \mathcal{D}_2^* are covariant operators acting tangentially on the spacelike surfaces $S_{u,v}$. The complete equations




Figure 2: The Lemaître manifold $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Lemaître}}$

will be given in Chapter 1.) We note that the metric and connection coefficients satisfy *transport* and *elliptic* equations, whereas the essential *hyperbolicity* of (2) is captured by the Bianchi identities satisfied by the curvature components.

The significance of the double null gauge formulation for our work is two-fold: The form (I.1.2) will allow us to capture important structure associated to the vacuum equations (2), both at the linear level (see Section II) as well as at the level of the quadratic non-linearities (see Section III), necessary to understand non-linear stability.

As mentioned already above, an added benefit of using double null gauge is that the present work can then be seen in a unified context with a host of other recent works in general relativity where double null gauge has been successfully employed [Chr09, KN03, KLR14, LR17, Luk18, DL17, DHR13]. In particular, the above notations and the form of the above equations are familiar from these works.

I.2 Schwarzschild, Kerr and residual gauge freedom

The Schwarzschild family can itself be written in the form (I.1.1) with respect to Eddington–Finkelstein normalised double null coordinates (u, v) , where the exterior is parametrised as $(-\infty, \infty) \times (-\infty, \infty)$ and

$$\Omega^2 = 1 - \frac{2M}{r}, \quad g = r^2 \hat{g}, \quad b^A = 0, \quad (\text{I.2.1})$$

where \hat{g} denotes the standard metric on the unit sphere. The coordinate r of (1) now appears in the above as a function $r(u, v)$. The ideal boundary null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ can be formally parametrised as $(-\infty, \infty) \times \{\infty\} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ and the parameter u represents a canonical Bondi time at infinity. In particular, the unboundedness of the range of u exhibits the “completeness” of null infinity.

The above coordinate system does not cover the *event horizon*. For this, we can define a new coordinate

$$U(u) = -\Omega^2(u, 0) \frac{r(u, 0)}{2M} e^{r(u, 0)/2M} = -e^{-u/2M}. \quad (\text{I.2.2})$$

The transformation (I.2.2) maps the u -range $(-\infty, \infty)$ to the U -range $(-\infty, 0)$. One may easily see that the resulting functions $r(U, v)$ and $\Omega(U, v)$ now extend by analyticity to positive functions on a region $c(v) > U \geq 0$ where $c(v)$ is defined implicitly by the limiting relation $r(c(v), v) = 0$. We have thus produced a solution of (2) defined on this larger domain whose underlying manifold we shall denote as $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Lemaître}}$. The event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ is then given by the hypersurface $U = 0$ and satisfies $r = 2M$. It can be characterized as the boundary in $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Lemaître}}$ of the past of future null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ , $J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$. The region $U > 0$ is then what we shall refer to as the *black hole interior*. See Figure 2.

It is convenient to also transform $V(v) = e^{v/2M}$, mapping the v -range $(-\infty, \infty)$ to the V -range $(0, \infty)$. This transforms the metric coefficient Ω^2 into

$$\Omega_K^2(U, V) = \frac{8M^3}{r} \exp\left(-\frac{r}{2M}\right), \quad (\text{I.2.3})$$

where $r(U, V)$ is implicitly defined by the relation $\left(\frac{r}{2M} - 1\right) \exp\left(\frac{r}{2M}\right) = -UV$. This is the celebrated Kruskal form of the metric. From this form one can see that the metric can in fact be extended to be defined on an even larger manifold corresponding precisely to the region $UV < 1$. See already Section 1.3.2.




Figure 3: Schwarzschild as a Cauchy development of characteristic data

The above discussion already illustrates a fundamental fact: The double null form (I.1.1) is not uniquely determined by the metric as (I.2.1) and (I.2.3) are in particular both representations of the same metric. There is in fact an infinite dimensional family of diffeomorphisms preserving the form (I.1.1). Thus, even after imposing double null gauge, finding a particular normalisation in which the metric coefficients asymptote to (I.2.1) is one of the difficulties of the stability problem, present—as we shall see in Section II—already in the context of linear theory.

As we have discussed previously, the Schwarzschild family appears as a subfamily of the two-parameter Kerr family $g_{a,M}$. These latter solutions are again stationary, but now only axisymmetric, and aM corresponds to their total angular momentum. In Boyer–Lindquist coordinates, the Kerr metric can be written as

$$g_{a,M} = -\frac{\Delta}{\varrho^2}(dt - a \sin^2 \theta d\phi)^2 + \frac{\varrho^2}{\Delta} dr^2 + \varrho^2 d\theta^2 + \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{\varrho^2} (adt - (r^2 + a^2)d\phi)^2, \quad (\text{I.2.4})$$

where

$$\Delta = r^2 - 2Mr + a^2, \quad \varrho^2 = r^2 + a^2 \cos^2 \theta. \quad (\text{I.2.5})$$

The Kerr metrics were first expressed globally in double null gauge (I.1.1) by [PI98]. Note that, given a fixed underlying double null coordinate system (u, v, θ, ϕ) associated to Schwarzschild, it is natural to consider the “standard Kerr metrics” as representing a four-dimensional family. In this parametrisation, there is only one standard Schwarzschild solution for each mass, but a three-dimensional family of fixed mass Kerr solutions corresponding to the group $\text{SO}(3)$ reflecting the freedom in choosing the axisymmetric Killing field ∂_ϕ . The codimension of the Schwarzschild family in the Kerr family is thus 3.

I.3 First formulation of the main result: Theorem I.3.1

To formulate the stability problem, let us first restrict to the region

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{Lemaître}} \cap \{\delta \geq U \geq -1\} \cap \{1 \leq V < \infty\}, \quad (\text{I.3.1})$$

for a $\delta > 0$. See Figure 3.

We may think of the above region (I.3.1) as the unique *maximal future Cauchy development* of Schwarzschild characteristic initial data for (2) posed on the null hypersurfaces

$$C_{\text{out}} = \{-1\} \times [1, \infty) \times \mathbb{S}^2, \quad \underline{C}_{\text{in}} = [-1, \delta] \times \{1\} \times \mathbb{S}^2. \quad (\text{I.3.2})$$

See [FB52, CBG69] for the general notion of maximal Cauchy development and [Ren90] for the characteristic initial value problem. The significance of taking $\delta > 0$ will be clear momentarily. (Note already that $S = \{\delta\} \times \{1\} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ is a *trapped sphere* in Schwarzschild (see [Pen65] for this notion) in view of the inequalities $\partial_U r(\delta, 1) < 0$, $\partial_V r(\delta, 1) < 0$.) It is the above data which we will perturb, i.e. we shall consider characteristic data sets for (I.1.2) defined on the initial hypersurfaces (I.3.2) which are assumed suitably close to Schwarzschild initial data. We shall give a more detailed discussion of initial data in Section 5.1. In particular, for all data considered, the cone C_{out} will be future complete and asymptotically flat, “terminating” at null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ , while the terminal sphere S of $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ will again be trapped.

The first formulation of our main theorem can then be given as follows:

Theorem I.3.1 (The nonlinear asymptotic stability of Schwarzschild in full co-dimension). *For all characteristic initial data prescribed on (I.3.2), assumed sufficiently close to Schwarzschild data with mass M_{init}*

and lying on a codimension-3 “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ of the moduli space \mathfrak{M} of initial data, the maximal Cauchy development \mathcal{M} contains a region \mathcal{R} which can be covered by appropriate (teleologically normalised) global double null gauges (I.1.1) and which

- (i) possesses a complete future null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ such that $\mathcal{R} \subset J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$, and in fact the future boundary of \mathcal{R} in \mathcal{M} is a regular, future affine complete “event horizon” \mathcal{H}^+ . Moreover,
- (ii) the metric remains close to the Schwarzschild metric with mass M_{init} in \mathcal{R} (moreover, measured with respect to an energy at the same order as a suitable “initial” energy), and
- (iii) asymptotes, inverse polynomially, to a Schwarzschild metric with mass $M_{\text{final}} \approx M_{\text{init}}$ as $u \rightarrow \infty$ and $v \rightarrow \infty$, in particular along \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ .

As we have already remarked, it follows from [CK93, KN03] and Cauchy stability arguments that, were initial data to be posed on an arbitrary asymptotically flat spacelike hypersurface, with data assumed globally close (in a suitable sense) to the induced data on a Cauchy hypersurface of Schwarzschild, then their Cauchy evolution would contain null hypersurfaces C_{out} and $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ satisfying the assumptions of our Theorem I.3.1. (See already Remark 5.4.5 for further discussion of this.) Thus, in the sequel, we will always view the stability problem as starting from characteristic initial data.

Note that the celebrated *weak cosmic censorship* conjecture (see [Chr99]) says that for generic asymptotically flat data, the Cauchy evolution possesses a complete future null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ . Thus, statement (i) can be thought of as showing “weak cosmic censorship” in a neighbourhood of Schwarzschild, statement (ii) can be thought of as the *orbital stability* of the Schwarzschild exterior, while statement (iii) represents the *asymptotic stability* of the Schwarzschild family—all restricted to our codimension-3 “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ of data, to be discussed further in Section I.4 below. We note moreover that (ii) as stated is indeed a true orbital stability statement, without loss of derivatives.

We emphasise that stability here is only being proven for the *exterior* region $J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$ of \mathcal{M} , up to and including its future boundary \mathcal{H}^+ , the event horizon. As is well known, however, one cannot identify this region explicitly from initial data since $J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$ (and hence \mathcal{H}^+ itself) is defined “teleologically”. It is for this reason that it is essential that the Schwarzschild data extend slightly beyond the event horizon, i.e. to take $\delta > 0$ in (I.3.2). (Let us note that in view of the fact that the terminal sphere S of $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ remains trapped, we can already say *a priori* that $S \cap J^-(\mathcal{I}^+) = \emptyset$,¹ and thus one expects the past of a complete \mathcal{I}^+ to be indeed contained in the maximal development of the data $C_{\text{out}} \cup \underline{C}_{\text{in}}$, even though $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ is itself future incomplete.) One can in fact extend the region of stability in the interior of the black hole all the way to a spacelike hypersurface, foliated by trapped spheres, complete in one direction. See [DL21a]. The stability issues “deep” in the black hole interior are of an entirely different nature, however, being intimately related to the question of *strong cosmic censorship*. See [DL17] and Section IV for further remarks.

In addition to the region \mathcal{R} being only characterized teleologically, the double null gauge determined by the coordinates (u, v) is itself *normalised* teleologically. In fact, the proof shall construct *two* distinct double null gauges, corresponding to a near and far region, suitably anchored to one another but with different normalisations in each case. See already the discussion in Section V.3. An additional statement in the theorem is that the change of coordinates between these two double null coordinate systems, as well as the change of coordinates connecting both these coordinate systems to the initial data on $C_{\text{out}} \cup \underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ (or rather, to two auxiliary double null gauges associated to the data) are all themselves controlled quantitatively from a geometric norm on initial data. See already the underlined clause in Theorem II.2.1 for the linear version of this statement and Section V.4 for its significance for the nonlinear proof.

We emphasise that it is the two teleologically normalised double null gauges which our proof employs that allows us at the same time to (i) identify the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ and show its regularity and global geometric properties and (ii) give a *Bondi foliation* of null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ (see Chapter 17 of [CK93]). One can thus again formulate the laws of gravitational radiation in our setting, and our results in particular control the total displacement of test particles at infinity, involved in the Christodoulou memory effect [Chr91] (see already Chapter 17 of the present work). We note that the final parameter M_{final} has the additional interpretation of

¹See [Chr09]. Note that if our null initial data on $C_{\text{out}} \cup \underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ arose from an asymptotically flat (spacelike) Cauchy hypersurface Σ , then the presence of S ensures that the maximal Cauchy development of Σ is itself future causally geodesically incomplete, by Penrose’s celebrated incompleteness theorem [Pen65]. The incompleteness of the Cauchy evolution of $C_{\text{out}} \cup \underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ is of course trivial in view of the incompleteness of $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ itself.

final Bondi mass. Just as with the double null gauges themselves, this parameter is again only determined teleologically.

I.4 The asymptotically stable “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ and the problem of Kerr

The necessity of restricting to an asymptotically stable “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ arises from our requiring approach to Schwarzschild in condition (iii) of Theorem I.3.1. For instance, the induced initial data corresponding to the Kerr solutions themselves with fixed mass M in standard double null form evidently do not satisfy (iii) unless one takes $a = 0$. Moreover, from Section I.2, these can be represented as a 3-dimensional subspace of the moduli space of initial data, passing through exact Schwarzschild data. It is thus natural to expect that the statement of our theorem holds if and only if the data lie on a “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ of *codimension* 3. Indeed, this can be understood in the context of the more general conjectural nonlinear stability of the Kerr family (see already Section IV): initial data outside of $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ should necessarily evolve to a Kerr with $a \neq 0$. Thus, lying on $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ would be a necessary condition for (iii).

We note that, given the necessity of our restriction on data, a difficulty of proving Theorem I.3.1 is that there is no way to identify in general which initial data satisfy (iii) other than evolving these data to the future under (2). Thus, the asymptotically stable “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ cannot be identified explicitly in the space of initial data, but must also be constructed teleologically, along with the teleological double null gauges and the parameter M_{final} . This is precisely what we do in the present work. Indeed, given that the fundamental double null gauges already have to be constructed teleologically (in fact, already in linear theory; see Section II), it turns out that the additional problem of constructing $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ does not in practice present a major conceptual difficulty (although it gives rise to a number of interesting technical issues; see Section V). We note moreover that the codimensionality assumption can be understood very concretely, because the moduli space of data can be naturally decomposed as a union of disjoint 3-parameter families (one of which is precisely the one referred to above, i.e. passing through exact Schwarzschild and representing the Kerr family). By construction, $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ will then contain exactly one data set from each 3-parameter family (see already Section V.1). (In view of this convenient description, we shall not be concerned with the regularity of this set as a subset of moduli space, hence our use of quotations around the word “submanifold”).

Though statement (iii) requires our codimensionality assumption, statements (i) and (ii) alone should not. (Indeed, according to weak cosmic censorship, statement (i) is conjecturally true for generic initial data while statement (ii) would in particular follow from the more general stability of Kerr conjecture to be discussed in Section IV.) One might wonder then, why not try and prove (i) and (ii) directly in a neighbourhood of Schwarzschild, i.e. without proving the accompanying condition (iii) and the corresponding difficulty of identifying the “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ that satisfies this condition? It is a fundamental limitation of current technology concerning the analysis of the Einstein vacuum equations (2), however, that one can only hope to infer “global” existence type statements like (i) and orbital stability type statements like (ii) as a corollary of a much stronger asymptotic stability statement like (iii). This limitation originates in the *supercriticality* of equations (2) with respect to natural conserved quantities like the ADM mass (which fail to be coercive in any case). Thus, it is only by identifying the final state to which solutions asymptote as perturbations “radiate away” (to null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ and—in the black hole case—to the horizon \mathcal{H}^+) that one can hope to control the total “backreaction” of perturbations and prove any form of nonlinear stability, even simply orbital stability. Moreover, to integrate this backreaction in time one moreover requires that the decay rate of these perturbations is sufficiently fast. We shall see this difficulty already in our discussion of the non-linear stability of Minkowski space, in Section III.1. (We note in contrast, however, that *under sufficient symmetry*, the presence of a black hole effectively *breaks* the supercriticality of the equations, and one can indeed prove orbital stability directly, without a full asymptotic stability; see some results discussed in Section III.2.)

In view of the above remarks, to study any form of non-linear stability (without symmetry), one requires quantitative decay estimates for the linearisation of (2) *around the final state*. Thus, to show (i) and (ii) in a neighbourhood of Schwarzschild without restriction, one would need to use an asymptotic linear stability analysis around the very slowly rotating Kerr metrics $|a| \ll M$. Carrying this out is indeed in principle now possible (see already the discussion in Section IV). The advantage in constructing the “submanifold” that satisfies (iii), however, is that we only require results concerning linear stability of the Kerr family *around Schwarzschild*, and this is technically slightly easier than the full Kerr problem and moreover already

available from our previous [DHR] in a form readily applicable² to the nonlinear problem. This important technical simplification compensates for the extra difficulty of teleologically constructing $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$. We turn now to a brief review of the linear stability results of [DHR].

II The linear stability of Schwarzschild in double null gauge

The proof of Theorem I.3.1 will be based on our previous self-contained analysis of linear stability in [DHR], carried out entirely in physical space. We review this now.

II.1 The linearised Einstein equations in double null gauge

As with our non-linear Theorem I.3.1, the problem of *linear* stability considered in [DHR] was formulated in double null gauge.

That is to say, one fixes a double null coordinate system (u, v) around Schwarzschild, one embeds the Schwarzschild metric in a 1-parameter family of solutions of (I.1.2) and one derives a set of equations linearising the system (I.1.2). (Note that the linearisation procedure is covariant with respect to change of ambient double null coordinates on Schwarzschild and can be expressed with respect to Eddington–Finkelstein normalised coordinates (u, v) , provided one considers rescaled quantities at the horizon \mathcal{H}^+ so as to be regular.) This results in a closed system for *linearised quantities* $\overset{(1)}{\Omega}, \overset{(1)}{\mathcal{G}}, \overset{(1)}{\chi}$, etc.:

linearised transport	$\Omega \nabla_4 \left(\frac{\sqrt{\overset{(1)}{\mathcal{G}}}}{\sqrt{\overset{(1)}{\mathcal{G}}}} \right) = (\Omega \text{tr} \chi) - \text{d}\overset{(1)}{v} b, \quad \nabla_4 \left(\Omega^{-1} \overset{(1)}{\hat{\chi}} \right) + \Omega^{-1} (\text{tr} \chi) \overset{(1)}{\hat{\chi}} = -\Omega^{-1} \overset{(1)}{\alpha}, \dots$
linearised elliptic	$\text{d}\overset{(1)}{v} \overset{(1)}{\hat{\chi}} = \frac{1}{2} \Omega^{-1} \nabla (\Omega \text{tr} \chi) - \overset{(1)}{\beta} + \dots, \dots$
linearised hyperbolic	$\nabla_3 \overset{(1)}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \chi \overset{(1)}{\alpha} + 2 \underline{\omega} \overset{(1)}{\alpha} = -2 \overset{(1)}{\mathcal{D}}_2^* \overset{(1)}{\beta} - 3 \rho \overset{(1)}{\chi}, \quad \nabla_4 \overset{(1)}{\beta} + 2 \text{tr} \chi \overset{(1)}{\beta} - \hat{\omega} \overset{(1)}{\beta} = \text{d}\overset{(1)}{v} \overset{(1)}{\alpha}$

(II.1.1)

Here $\Omega, \text{tr} \chi$, (without (1) superscripts) etc., denote Schwarzschild background values, computable from (I.2.1). The system (II.1.1) can be shown to be well-posed, where, in accordance with the previous section, initial data for (II.1.1) are prescribed on the Schwarzschild null hypersurfaces

$$C_{\text{out}} := \{0\} \times [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{S}^2, \quad C_{\text{in}} := [0, \infty] \times \{0\} \times \mathbb{S}^2. \quad (\text{II.1.2})$$

(Here, the inclusion of ∞ in the u -range is meant to signify that the data are regular at the horizon when covariantly changed to Kruskal coordinates.) Since the equations are linear, one can immediately infer the existence of a *global* solution on the Schwarzschild exterior $J^+(C_{\text{out}} \cup \underline{C}_{\text{in}}) \cap (J^-(\mathcal{I}^+) \cup \mathcal{H}^+) = \{0 \leq u \leq \infty\} \cap \{0 \leq v < \infty\}$, including the horizon \mathcal{H}^+ .

The diffeomorphisms which preserve the double null form (I.1.1), discussed already in Section I, give rise in linear theory to an infinite dimensional family of solutions of (II.1.1), the so-called (residual) *pure gauge solutions*. An example of such a pure gauge solution is one generated by an arbitrary smooth function $f^{(1)}(v, \theta, \phi)$ as follows:

$$2\Omega^{-1} \overset{(1)}{\Omega} = \Omega^{-2} \partial_v (f \Omega^2), \quad \overset{(1)}{\mathcal{G}} = -4r \overset{(1)}{\mathcal{D}}_2^* \overset{(1)}{\nabla} f, \quad \dots \quad (\text{II.1.3})$$

The 4-dimensional Kerr family itself, as parametrised in our double null gauge, when linearised, gives rise to an additional 4-dimensional family of explicit stationary solutions of the system (II.1.1), the *linearised Kerr solutions*. This subspace can in turn be decomposed into a 1-dimensional linearised Schwarzschild family parametrised by $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$2\Omega^{-1} \overset{(1)}{\Omega} = -\mathbf{m}, \quad \text{tr}_{\overset{(1)}{\mathcal{G}}} \overset{(1)}{\mathcal{G}} = -2\mathbf{m}, \quad \overset{(1)}{\hat{\mathcal{G}}} = 0, \quad \overset{(1)}{b} = 0 \quad (\text{II.1.4})$$

and a 3-dimensional family of *fixed-mass linearised Kerr solutions*, spanned by a basis

$$\Omega^{-1} \overset{(1)}{\Omega} = 0, \quad \text{tr}_{\overset{(1)}{\mathcal{G}}} \overset{(1)}{\mathcal{G}} = 0, \quad \overset{(1)}{\hat{\mathcal{G}}} = 0, \quad \overset{(1)}{b}^A = \frac{4M}{r} \epsilon^{AB} \partial_B Y_m^1, \quad (\text{II.1.5})$$

where Y_m^1 , $m = -1, 0, 1$ denote the three standard $\ell = 1$ spherical harmonics.

²readily applicable because the energy-based linear estimates of [DHR] can be applied directly to the dynamical spacetime itself; see the discussion in Section III.1 in the context of the nonlinear stability of Minkowski space

II.2 Statement of the linear stability theorem [DHR]

We may now state the main result of [DHR].

Theorem II.2.1 (Linear stability of the Kerr family around Schwarzschild [DHR]). *For all characteristic initial data prescribed on (II.1.2), the arising solution of the linearised Einstein equations (II.1.1) around Schwarzschild remains uniformly bounded in the exterior region $\{0 \leq u \leq \infty\} \cap \{0 \leq v < \infty\}$, including the horizon \mathcal{H}^+ , in terms of its initial data. Moreover, after adding a pure gauge solution, which itself is quantitatively controlled by the data, the solution approaches inverse polynomially a standard linearised Kerr metric as $u \rightarrow \infty$ and $v \rightarrow \infty$, in particular along \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ .*

In particular, there is a codimension-3 subspace of initial data for which all solutions approach a linearised Schwarzschild metric (II.1.4).

One may already compare the above with the statement of Theorem I.3.1 in Section I. We note that the boundedness statement in Theorem II.2.1, at top order energy, is again without loss in derivatives. We emphasise that the pure gauge solution, referred to in the statement of Theorem II.2.1, which must be added to ensure asymptotic stability, cannot be determined explicitly from initial data. This fact is the analogue of the teleological nature of the normalisation of the double null gauge of Theorem I.3.1. The underlined statement in Theorem II.2.1 corresponds to the property, mentioned already, that the coordinate representation of the initial data in the future-normalised coordinate systems of Theorem I.3.1 can itself be appropriately bounded. (We will describe already in Section V.4 the significance of the underlined statement above for the proof of non-linear stability.) On the other hand, in contrast to Theorem I.3.1, the “location” of the horizon in Theorem II.2.1, as well as the standard linearised Kerr solution in the span of (II.1.5) referred to in the statement, can be explicitly determined on the basis of initial data. In particular, this allows us to effectively restrict to $\delta = 0$ in the definition (II.1.2) of $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}$, in comparison with (I.3.2), and the codimension-3 subspace of the last line of the statement of Theorem II.2.1 is explicit.

II.3 Proof of linear stability

Let us give a brief overview of the proof of Theorem II.2.1, for we will later have to repeat all these arguments in the more elaborate nonlinear setting.

II.3.1 The gauge invariant quantities and the Chandrasekhar-type transformation

The first advantage of double null gauge at the linear level is that it allows one to apply insights from the Newman–Penrose formalism [NP62]. In particular, it was shown already in [BP73] that the linearised extremal curvature components $\overset{(v)}{\alpha}$ and $\overset{(v)}{\underline{\alpha}}$ decouple from the system (II.1.1) and satisfy wave equations, which in the case of $\overset{(v)}{\alpha}$ is here written in tensorial form:

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \Omega \nabla_3 (r \Omega^2 \overset{(v)}{\alpha}) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \text{d}\dot{v} (r \Omega^2 \overset{(v)}{\alpha}) + \frac{4}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \Omega \nabla_3 (r \Omega^2 \overset{(v)}{\alpha}) + \frac{6M\Omega^2}{r^3} r \Omega^2 \overset{(v)}{\alpha} = 0. \quad (\text{II.3.1})$$

(If $\overset{(v)}{\alpha}$ and $\overset{(v)}{\underline{\alpha}}$ are defined with respect to the algebraically special frame, then an analogous equation can be derived in the Kerr case, as was shown by Teukolsky [Teu73]. We will refer in general to equation (II.3.1) as the *Teukolsky equation*.) Note that $\mathcal{P}_2^* \text{d}\dot{v} = -\frac{1}{2} \underline{\Delta} + K$, and thus the left hand side of (II.3.1) indeed defines a wave operator applied to $\overset{(v)}{\alpha}$, though with unfamiliar first order terms. The quantities $\overset{(v)}{\alpha}$ and $\overset{(v)}{\underline{\alpha}}$ parametrise the *gauge-invariant* part of the solution, in the sense that these quantities vanish in the case of pure gauge solutions like (II.1.3) and standard linearised Kerr solutions like (II.1.5), and conversely, any admissible solution with $\overset{(v)}{\alpha} = \overset{(v)}{\underline{\alpha}} = 0$ identically is in fact the sum of a pure gauge and a standard linearised Kerr solution.

It turns out, however, that the above equation (II.3.1) is difficult to analyse directly in view of its first order terms. The approach taken in [DHR] was to consider the higher order quantities

$$\overset{(v)}{P} = -\frac{1}{2} r^{-3} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (r^2 \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (r \Omega^2 \overset{(v)}{\alpha})), \quad \overset{(v)}{\underline{P}} = -\frac{1}{2} r^{-3} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_4 (r^2 \Omega^{-1} \nabla_4 (r \Omega^2 \overset{(v)}{\underline{\alpha}})). \quad (\text{II.3.2})$$

These quantities satisfy the so-called *Regge–Wheeler equation*, written below (again in tensorial form):

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \Omega \nabla_3 (r^5 \overset{(i)}{P}) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{D} \nabla (r^5 \overset{(i)}{P}) + 2\Omega^2 \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) r^5 \overset{(i)}{P} = 0. \quad (\text{II.3.3})$$

(The Regge–Wheeler equation first appeared in the context of the so-called *metric perturbations* approach due to [RW57], where it governed, however, only “half” of the gauge invariant part of the perturbations. It is remarkable that the very same equation is satisfied by the higher order quantities (II.3.2). The relations (II.3.2) are physical space reformulations of fixed frequency transformations originally discovered by Chandrasekhar [Cha75].)

In contrast to the Teukolsky equation (II.3.1), the Regge–Wheeler equation (II.3.3) can be analysed in much the same way as the scalar wave equation

$$\square_g \psi = 0, \quad (\text{II.3.4})$$

which itself had been the object of much recent work, see [BS06, DR09b] for Schwarzschild and [DRSR16] for the Kerr case in the full subextremal range of parameters $|a| < M$. (For a detailed discussion of (II.3.4) on Schwarzschild and in particular the role of the *red-shift* at the event horizon $r = 2M$ and the trapped null geodesics associated to the *photon sphere* $r = 3M$, see [DR13].) In particular, following previous results for (II.3.4), one can show uniform boundedness and integrated decay results for (II.3.3). (See also the treatments in [BS05, Hol10b].) From this, boundedness and integrated decay for (II.3.1) follow by integrating the relations (II.3.2) *as transport equations*, after suitable multiplication by weighted quantities. (Note that the boundedness statements at the energy level do not lose derivatives.) *Inverse polynomial decay* for all quantities $\overset{(i)}{P}$, $\overset{(i)}{\alpha}$, etc. then follows via the r^p -weighted energy hierarchy of [DR09a].

II.3.2 Fixing the gauge: initial data normalisation and the linearised Kerr modes.

The stability statement of Theorem II.2.1 does not end with showing boundedness and decay for the gauge invariant quantities above. We must still show uniform boundedness and decay to a standard linearised Kerr solution for the remaining (gauge dependent) linearised quantities in (II.1.1).

For this, the first task is to normalise the initial data. In the context of linear theory, this corresponds to adding a pure gauge solution (e.g. (II.1.3)) such that certain quantities are fixed. For instance, one can arrange so as to fix the quantity

$$(\Omega \text{tr} \chi) = 0 \quad (\text{II.3.5})$$

at the initial sphere $(u, v) = (\infty, 0)$ of \mathcal{H}^+ . It turns out that condition (II.3.5) is then preserved along \mathcal{H}^+ by evolution under (II.1.1). This can be thought of as ensuring that the event horizon of the perturbed spacetime coincides with \mathcal{H}^+ , i.e. that of the background Schwarzschild. In this sense, the “location” of the horizon is not teleological in linear theory, but can be explicitly deduced from the data (and thus one can effectively set the parameter δ appearing in Theorem I.3.1 to vanish).

Let us note moreover that in the process of gauge normalisation, the $\ell = 0$ and $\ell = 1$ spherical harmonic modes play an anomalous role. It turns out that solutions supported only on $\ell = 0$ and $\ell = 1$ can be written as the sum of a pure gauge solution (e.g. (II.1.3)) and a standard linearised Kerr solution (e.g. (II.1.4) or (II.1.5)). Thus, by adding a pure gauge solution so as to fix certain quantities at the initial sphere $(u, v) = (\infty, 0)$ of the horizon \mathcal{H}^+ , for instance

$$\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell=0,1} = 0, \quad (\overset{(i)}{\rho} + \mathcal{D} \nabla \overset{(i)}{\eta})_{\ell=1} = 0,$$

we can arrange so as to be left only with a linearised Kerr solution, which will be precisely that appearing in the statement of the Theorem II.2.1. Note that, as with the issue of the location of the horizon discussed above, this means that the final linearised Kerr metric is not teleological in linear theory, but can be *explicitly* deduced from the initial data.

II.3.3 Estimating the gauge dependent quantities: boundedness

Having normalised the gauge by adding an appropriate pure gauge solution, we now turn to the *boundedness* statement of Theorem II.2.1.

The essential point is that one can order the remaining linearised quantities hierarchically, starting from the outgoing and ingoing shears $\hat{\chi}^{(i)}$ and $\hat{\underline{\chi}}^{(i)}$, so that the transport equations (II.1.1) contain only the gauge invariant quantities $\hat{P}^{(i)}$, $\hat{\alpha}^{(i)}$, $\hat{\underline{P}}^{(i)}$, $\hat{\underline{\alpha}}^{(i)}$ estimated already above, or else quantities lower in the hierarchy. Thus the situation resembles the problem of estimating $\hat{\alpha}^{(i)}$, respectively $\hat{\underline{\alpha}}^{(i)}$, from $\hat{P}^{(i)}$, respectively $\hat{\underline{P}}^{(i)}$, by integration of the relations (II.3.2). Unlike the case of the gauge invariant quantities, however, as we shall see below, this procedure will at this stage only lead to boundedness.

We can illustrate the issue already with the first step of the hierarchy. The ingoing shear $\hat{\underline{\chi}}^{(i)}$ satisfies the transport equation

$$\nabla_3(\Omega^{-1}\hat{\underline{\chi}}^{(i)}) + \Omega^{-1}(\text{tr}\hat{\underline{\chi}})\hat{\underline{\chi}}^{(i)} = -\Omega^{-1}\hat{\underline{\alpha}}^{(i)}, \quad (\text{II.3.6})$$

which only contains $\hat{\underline{\alpha}}^{(i)}$ on its right hand side. Already, to obtain boundedness for $\hat{\underline{\chi}}^{(i)}$ upon integration, there is an issue, as the appropriate integrating factor for (II.3.6) would require estimating $r^2\hat{\underline{\chi}}^{(i)}$ initially, which is however generally unbounded along an outgoing cone. To resolve this issue, one introduces an auxiliary renormalised quantity $\hat{Y}^{(i)}$ which is essentially a sum of a second order (elliptic) angular operator applied to $\hat{\underline{\chi}}^{(i)}$ and the (decaying) gauge invariant quantity $\hat{\underline{\psi}}^{(i)} := \frac{1}{2}r^{-1}\Omega^{-2}\nabla_4(r\Omega^2\hat{\underline{\alpha}}^{(i)})$, given by

$$\hat{Y}^{(i)} = r^2\hat{\mathcal{P}}_2^*\text{div}(\Omega^{-1}r\hat{\underline{\chi}}^{(i)}) - \Omega^{-1}r^4\hat{\underline{\psi}}^{(i)}. \quad (\text{II.3.7})$$

The quantity $\hat{Y}^{(i)}$ can be shown to be bounded initially and satisfies a transport equation without integrating factor and with integrable right hand side

$$\nabla_3\hat{Y}^{(i)} = \frac{1}{2}r\text{tr}\hat{\underline{\chi}}\Omega^{-1}r^3\hat{\underline{\psi}}^{(i)} + 3M\Omega^{-1}r\hat{\underline{\alpha}}^{(i)}. \quad (\text{II.3.8})$$

Integration of (II.3.8) from initial data will now indeed give rise to a finite bound for $\hat{Y}^{(i)}$ (and thus for $\hat{\underline{\chi}}^{(i)}$), but, this bound is dominated at large v values by a flux associated to $\hat{\underline{\alpha}}^{(i)}$ which in general will be non-zero. Thus, the quantity $\hat{Y}^{(i)}$, and consequently $\hat{\underline{\chi}}^{(i)}$, *will not in general decay* in our gauge. The solution to the problem described above is to integrate (II.3.7) *backwards*. For this, however, we will need to renormalise the gauge teleologically.

Before turning to teleological normalisation in Section II.3.4 below, let us consider also the outgoing shear $\hat{\chi}^{(i)}$. For this quantity, there is a corresponding issue associated with the horizon \mathcal{H}^+ , as the transport equation for the regular quantity $\Omega\hat{\chi}^{(i)}$

$$\nabla_4(\Omega\hat{\chi}^{(i)}) + (\text{tr}\hat{\chi})(\Omega\hat{\chi}^{(i)}) - 2\hat{\omega}\Omega\hat{\chi}^{(i)} = -\Omega\hat{\alpha}^{(i)} \quad (\text{II.3.9})$$

appears to be “blue-shifted” when trying to integrate it forwards in time near \mathcal{H}^+ , i.e. the third term on the left hand side of (II.3.9) appears to drive exponential growth! Such exponential growth does not actually occur, however. In fact, exactly along the horizon \mathcal{H}^+ , it turns out that $\Omega\hat{\chi}^{(i)}$ is gauge invariant and fortuitously can be controlled as part of a conserved flux. (See [Hol16] for further elaboration of these conservation laws.) Given this, in order to estimate $\hat{\chi}^{(i)}$ in a neighbourhood of \mathcal{H}^+ , it now suffices to remark that the “blue-shift” problem of (II.3.9) is cured upon successive commutation by $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$: Commuting once, one obtains a “no-shifted” quantity, and commuting again, a “red-shifted” quantity. Thus, decay bounds for higher order $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivatives of $\Omega\hat{\chi}^{(i)}$ can be obtained by integrating the commuted version of (II.3.9) forwards in time, and estimates for $\Omega\hat{\chi}^{(i)}$ itself can then be retrieved upon integration along ingoing cones backwards from the horizon \mathcal{H}^+ , given the estimate for $\hat{\chi}^{(i)}$ on \mathcal{H}^+ itself arising from the flux.

II.3.4 Estimating the gauge dependent quantities: future-normalisation and decay

In the context of the linear theory, teleological normalisation amounts to adding a pure gauge solution related to the original solution (i.e. in the “initial data normalised gauge”) by its value *somewhere to the future*, so as to normalise certain quantities to vanish there.

It turns out to be sufficient for our purposes here to require that the linearised metric quantity $\Omega^{-1}\overset{(\circ)}{\Omega}$ vanish identically *along the entire event horizon \mathcal{H}^+* :

$$\Omega^{-1}\overset{(\circ)}{\Omega} = 0. \quad (\text{II.3.10})$$

Relation (II.3.10) can indeed be arranged by adding a pure gauge solution (at the expense of relaxing a previous similar normalisation along the initial cone C_{out}). Let us note that the pure gauge solution that must be added *is itself quantitatively bounded from initial data*. This follows from the boundedness statement just obtained!

One can now revisit the integration of the transport equations (II.1.1) for various gauge-dependent quantities, for instance (II.3.8) for $\overset{(\circ)}{Y}$ (and thus governing $\overset{(\circ)}{\chi}$), by integrating these equations backwards, with the condition (II.3.10) along \mathcal{H}^+ ensuring that the *future* boundary terms are controlled. This allows one to indeed inherit decay properties from those already obtained for the gauge invariant quantities.

Eventually, combining the process again with the r^p -weighted energy hierarchy of [DR09a], this allows one to obtain inverse polynomial decay for all quantities, completing the proof of Theorem II.2.1.

Let us emphasise that the fact that the added pure gauge solution which assured (II.3.10) can itself be quantitatively bounded is fundamental for the nonlinear stability proof to be discussed in Section V.

Finally, let us note that the necessity of future normalisation is not new to the Schwarzschild problem but is a feature of double null gauge, and more generally, geometric gauges governed by transport equations. In particular, as we shall discuss in Section III.1, the issue of future normalisation arises (already at the linear level) in the context of the gauge used in [CK93] for the stability of Minkowski space, where one defined null cones emanating from points on a geodesic. The fundamental difference in the black hole case is that since one cannot normalise from such a geodesic, one must instead also teleologically choose a sphere surrounding the horizon. This is exactly one of the conditions accomplished above at the linearised level by our future-normalised gauge of [DHR]. We note already that the nonlinear versions of these will be characterized by analogous equations and constructed by iteration around the linear construction (see already Section V.3).

II.4 The Kerr case

In the Kerr case, the decoupled Teukolsky equation referred to above can again be shown to govern the gauge-invariant part of the perturbations [Wal78]. To the difficulties of (II.3.1) discussed previously, however, one must now add the phenomenon of *superradiance*, which occurs already for (II.3.4). Thus, even mode stability is highly non-trivial, shown by [Whi89, SR15] in the subextremal and [TdC20] in the extremal case. Recently, the argument of [DHR] showing quantitative boundedness and decay for the Teukolsky equation has indeed been generalised, first to the very slowly rotating case $|a| \ll M$ in [DHR19, Ma20a], and then to the full subextremal range $|a| < M$ in [TdCSR20], implementing the first part of the argument of Section II.3. Here, the boundedness statement at the energy level is proven without loss of derivatives and can in particular be seen to quantify the amplifying strength of superradiance. With these results, the full linear stability of Kerr in analogy to [DHR] can in principle be obtained, in fact, for the entire subextremal range $|a| < M$. We will discuss the full *non-linear* stability of Kerr in Section IV.

II.5 Other approaches

The work [DHR] was the first complete treatment of linear stability of Schwarzschild in a well-posed gauge. Let us note, however, that double null gauge is not the only such gauge in which linear stability can be addressed. In particular, in the recent [Joh19], a version of Theorem II.2.1 has been shown in a “generalised harmonic gauge”. (For more on harmonic gauge, see already the discussion in Section III.1.) See also [Hun18, HKW17] and, for some results on Kerr, see [ABBM19, HHV21]. (Note that for the (Schwarzschild) Kerr-de Sitter cases, linear stability results are contained in [HV18]; see Section III.6 for further discussion.)

III Previous results on nonlinear stability

Before introducing the main ideas of the proof of Theorem I.3.1, we describe briefly previous results relevant to the *non-linear* stability of asymptotically flat solutions of (2).

We begin in Section III.1 with a discussion of the non-linear stability of Minkowski space, followed in Section III.2 by a discussion of stability results for non-trivial solutions, but under the restrictive assumption of various symmetries. We review some relevant non-linear model problems in Section III.4 and finally, we shall discuss in Section III.5 our previous “scattering theoretic” construction of solutions of (2) representing non-trivial dynamical vacuum black holes. (For comparison, we shall comment briefly on results for $\Lambda \neq 0$ in Section III.6.)

III.1 The nonlinear stability of Minkowski space

The study of non-linear stability of solutions of (2) without symmetry was initiated with the monumental proof by Christodoulou and Klainerman [CK93] of the stability of Minkowski space, the trivial solution of (2) (corresponding to (1) in the case $M = 0$). Let us discuss briefly the background of this result.

III.1.1 Harmonic gauge

To understand the main issues, let us begin the discussion from the perspective of the simplest gauge to consider, namely *harmonic gauge*

$$g^{\mu\nu}\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha = 0. \quad (\text{III.1.1})$$

Expressed in the gauge (III.1.1), the vacuum equations (2) reduce to a system of quasilinear wave equations

$$\square_g g^{\mu\nu} = Q^{\mu\nu}(g, \partial g), \quad (\text{III.1.2})$$

where $Q^{\mu\nu}$ is a nonlinear expression quadratic in ∂g , which when linearised around Minkowski space (see already [Ein18]) yield simply the classical wave equation

$$\square \psi = 0 \quad (\text{III.1.3})$$

for each linearised metric component $\psi = g^{\mu\nu}$.

Linear stability of Minkowski space in harmonic gauge follows immediately from classical boundedness and decay results concerning (III.1.3). Nonetheless, proving *non-linear* stability of Minkowski space turned out to be quite difficult! To understand why, recall that we have already remarked in Section I.4 on the supercriticality of (2) and the resulting necessity of showing not just orbital stability but the full *asymptotic stability* of Minkowski space, hoping moreover that the quantitative decay rates back towards the Minkowski metric are indeed sufficiently strong so as to ensure that non-linear terms can be understood as error terms which can be integrated in time.

For dimensions $4+1$ and higher, one can indeed use decay of the linear equation to show relatively easily the nonlinear stability of higher dimensional Minkowski space. The modern way to do this is via the *vector field method* [Kla], where energy estimates are applied *directly* to the nonlinear equation (III.1.2) commuted with weighted commutation vector fields. (Note that one thus does not use the linear theory proper, but a more robust version of linear estimates that can be applied to the non-linear equation itself. This is essential for obtaining a true stability result without loss of derivatives.) Sufficient polynomial pointwise decay for lower order terms can be inferred by weighted Sobolev estimates, so as to indeed absorb via integration the non-linear terms. One uses in a fundamental way that the decay of solutions of (III.1.3) on say \mathbb{R}^{4+1} satisfies $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^4} |\partial \psi(x, t)| \leq C t^{-\frac{3}{2}}$, and the latter decay rate is integrable in t . See [Loi09] where this argument for the non-linear stability of higher dimensional Minkowski space is treated in detail.

In the physical case of $3+1$ spacetime dimensions, however, solutions to (III.1.3) decay along the outgoing null cones only as r^{-1} . This slow decay means that the quadratic nature of the non-linearities on the right hand side of (III.1.2) is insufficient by itself to ensure non-linear stability: one must identify *special structure* in the nonlinear terms. This difficulty is already apparent in comparing the following two model equations:

$$(i) \quad \square \psi = (\partial_t \psi)^2, \quad (ii) \quad \square \psi = -(\partial_t \psi)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^3 (\partial_{x_i} \psi)^2. \quad (\text{III.1.4})$$

John [Joh81] showed that (i) of (III.1.4) exhibits blow up for solutions arising from arbitrary small compactly supported data, while for (ii), a transformation due to Nirenberg (see [Kla80]) immediately yields global existence. The situation was clarified with the formulation of the *null condition* of Klainerman [Kla86], which identifies a wide class of “good” nonlinearities for which global existence holds.

III.1.2 Double null gauge: capturing the null condition for the Einstein equations

Unfortunately, as already discussed in [CB73], what was later understood as the null condition is *not* in fact satisfied by the reduced Einstein equations (III.1.2) in harmonic gauge (III.1.1). The approach taken in [CK93] was to completely abandon harmonic gauge, and introduce an appropriate geometric formulation of the equations (2) in terms of the *structure relations* associated to a foliation by maximal hypersurfaces and outgoing null cones, in which an analogue of the null condition is now captured. The closely related double null gauge formulation used in the present work was subsequently developed in [Chr09, KN03] and also captures this null condition.

The understanding of the null condition uncovered in the above works can be systematised with the help of the following schematic notation: One denotes Ricci coefficients by Γ_p , and curvature components by \mathcal{R}_p , where the p -subscript denotes the r^p weighted bound one expects to propagate. For instance, the Ricci coefficient $\hat{\chi}$ can be denoted as Γ_1 , indicating that $r\hat{\chi}$ is finite on \mathcal{I}^+ while the curvature component $\underline{\alpha}$ can be denoted by \mathcal{R}_1 . For general products of Γ and \mathcal{R} , one can use the O_p notation to denote the total expected r^p weighted bound. When we do not wish to distinguish between Γ and \mathcal{R} , we shall use the symbol Φ or Φ_p .

For instance, the equation for $\hat{\chi}$ in (I.1.2) together with (1.2.8) can be rewritten in the form

$$\nabla_4(r^{2c[\Gamma_p]}\Gamma_p) = r^{2c[\Gamma_p]}O_{p+2}, \quad (\text{III.1.5})$$

$$\nabla_3\Gamma_p = O_p, \quad (\text{III.1.6})$$

for $p := 2$ and $c[\Gamma_p] := 1$. These equations exhibit “null structure” in the sense that the p -decay of the quantities on the right hand side is *consistent* upon integration of (III.1.5) and (III.1.6) as transport equations.

We note that a similar structure occurs for curvature, but now the equations are hyperbolic, and must be estimated using additional integration by parts over spheres. We defer discussion of this to later.

Let us emphasise that the null condition *per se* simply ensures good behaviour *towards* \mathcal{I}^+ , i.e. for u fixed and $v \rightarrow \infty$. (Indeed, the issue of the null condition shows up even in the semi-global problem of existence for the characteristic initial value problem, all the way up to \mathcal{I}^+ , for small retarded time u .) To prove the stability of Minkowski space, however, one requires global decay of the above quantities, for instance, one requires that the right hand side of (III.1.5) *decay* sufficiently in the retarded time u as $u \rightarrow \infty$. Just like in our present work, obtaining decay for all quantities required teleological normalisations. We discuss this briefly below.

III.1.3 The gauge of [CK93] and teleological normalisation

Though we have based the above discussion of the null condition on double null gauge, in the original proof of the stability of Minkowski space [CK93], one in fact used a maximal foliation together with an optical function u defining a family of outgoing null cones.

In this maximal-optical gauge of [CK93], it is the optical function u that must be normalised teleologically. In practice, two distinct optical functions were used in [CK93], one normalised from a timelike geodesic suitable for a “near” region and a second “Bondi” normalised suitable for the radiation zone. The presence of two normalisations is thus similar (though for slightly different reasons—see already Section V.3) to the situation described after Theorem I.3.1.

The first step of the proof of [CK93] was to show that the smallness assumption expressed geometrically with respect to assumptions on initial data corresponded to smallness with respect to energies expressed in a teleologically defined gauge. This can be thought of as the analogue of the underlined clause in the statement of Theorem II.2.1.

Let us emphasise that, just as in our discussion in the context of Section II, the necessity of teleological normalisation is in fact a *linear* issue, and would have been present had a full proof of “linear stability of Minkowski space” in the gauge of [CK93] been carried out explicitly.³ As discussed already in Section II.3.4,

³In the context of linear stability of Minkowski space, the entire system of hyperbolic Bianchi equations for curvature decouple at linear order from the equations governing the spin coefficients and can be studied separately, as opposed to the present setting, where only the Teukolsky equation satisfied by $\overset{(i)}{\alpha}$ and $\overset{(i)}{\underline{\alpha}}$ decouple. Boundedness and decay for this “spin-2 system” was indeed proven [CK90], prior to their [CK93]. A full “linear stability” in the gauge of [CK93] was never written out, but can of course be deduced *a posteriori* from the full non-linear stability proof.

the fundamental difference between the Minkowski and Schwarzschild cases is that in the latter, due to the presence of the black hole, this normalisation cannot be centred upon late points of a timelike geodesic but, rather, upon an appropriate sphere surrounding the horizon.

III.1.4 Elliptic estimates on spheres

Let us discuss one additional fundamental element of the proof of stability of Minkowski space [CK93]: In order for the estimates in [CK93] to close, one needed to make use of elliptic estimates, in addition to the hyperbolic estimates and integration of transport equations discussed already above. We explain this briefly in this section, basing the discussion on the vacuum equations (2) expressed in double null gauge (I.1.2), for which similar issues arise.

The equation

$$\mathfrak{d}\nabla\chi = \nabla\text{tr}\chi - \beta + \dots \quad (\text{III.1.7})$$

is an example of an elliptic equation contained in the system (I.1.2), corresponding to the celebrated Codazzi relation associated to the sphere (thought of as a codimension-1 submanifold of the outgoing null cone). Together with the transport equation

$$\nabla_4\text{tr}\chi = -\frac{1}{2}(\text{tr}\chi)^2 - \hat{\omega}\text{tr}\chi + \dots, \quad (\text{III.1.8})$$

one can use (III.1.7) to estimate the pair $(\hat{\chi}, \text{tr}\chi)$ without loss of derivative, i.e. at one level of differentiability more than curvature. The idea is that elliptic estimates for equation (III.1.7) on spheres improve by one level of differentiability over their right hand side, whereas equation (III.1.8), which does not improve on its right hand side, contains no curvature. Remarkably, the work [CK93] showed how additional quantities can be introduced so as to avoid this loss of derivatives for *all* Ricci coefficients, not just the pair $(\hat{\chi}, \text{tr}\chi)$.

In view of the above structure, the authors of [CK93] obtain a true stability result, where the stability statement as measured in terms of top order energies does not lose derivatives.

Let us note that the remarkable structure described above descends from (2) to the linearised setting (II.1.1) considered in Section II, see for instance the pair of equations

$$\mathfrak{d}\nabla\hat{\chi}^{(i)} = \frac{1}{2}\Omega^{-1}\nabla(\Omega\text{tr}\chi^{(i)}) - \hat{\beta}^{(i)} + \dots, \quad \Omega\nabla_4(\Omega\text{tr}\chi^{(i)}) = (-\Omega\text{tr}\chi + 2\omega)(\Omega\text{tr}\chi^{(i)}) + \dots$$

contained in the linearised system (II.1.1). This structure can be again exploited to indeed estimate all linearised Ricci coefficients at one level of differentiability higher than the linearised curvature. While this was not necessary to close the estimates in the context of Theorem II.2.1, this improvement will be very important in the non-linear problem in order to close the estimates. (See already Section V.9.)

III.1.5 The weak null condition

We emphasise that the above type of gauges are not the only way to capture null structure! It turned out that a weaker form of the null condition can be shown to hold for (III.1.2) under harmonic gauge (III.1.1) by [LR03] and with this, an alternative proof of non-linear stability of Minkowski space was given in [LR05, LR10]. For further developments, see also [Lin17, HV20, LS17, Kei18].

III.2 Nonlinear results under symmetry

The study of nonlinear stability of *non-trivial* asymptotically flat solutions, like (1) with $M > 0$, has up to now been confined to symmetric situations.

By far the simplest case is where enough symmetry is imposed so as for the equations to reduce to a 1+1-dimensional system. The only such symmetry compatible with asymptotic flatness is spherical symmetry, and this requires coupling the Einstein equations to appropriate *matter fields* to evade Birkhoff's theorem [Jeb21], according to which Schwarzschild is the *unique* spherically symmetric solution of the vacuum equations (2). For the case of the *Einstein-scalar field system* under spherical symmetry, the non-linear asymptotic stability of (1) follows from the more general results of [Chr87, DR05].

The vacuum equations (2) in higher space-time dimensions admit other symmetries reducing the equations to $1 + 1$, for instance the triaxial Bianchi symmetry [BCS05]. The non-linear orbital stability of the $4 + 1$ -dimensional analogue of (1) under triaxial Bianchi symmetry was proven in [DH06b] while its full asymptotic stability (in the further restricted biaxial case) was proven in [Hol10a]. We note that under any of the above symmetries, the presence of the black hole together with the reduction to $1 + 1$ breaks the supercriticality of the equations, and thus, in contrast to the situation discussed in Section I.4, orbital stability can be shown *independently of showing asymptotic stability*. In [Hol10a], however, the full strength of orbital stability was not in fact used in the proof, to make clear the relation with the more general strategy of necessarily proving orbital and asymptotic stability at the same time. In particular, the issue of identifying an approximate final mass parameter in a bootstrap context, via the Hawking mass, appears already in the work [Hol10a].

Beyond reductions to $1 + 1$, even the symmetric problem is considerably harder. Non-linear stability of (1) has been given in the case of (2) under polarised axisymmetry (a $2 + 1$ reduction) in an impressive recent work by Klainerman–Szeftel [KS18]. Unlike the $1 + 1$ dimensional problem, one must here face already the supercriticality of the equations and one can no longer exploit the special structure of $1 + 1$ dimensional hyperbolic pde’s. Like the present work, the starting point of [KS18] is the linear theory [DHR] discussed in Section II, though [KS18] opts for a different gauge which is still however governed by transport equations of geometric quantities associated to foliations. Several of the non-linear difficulties discussed above already arise in [KS18] in simplified form and are addressed in that work in a different framework. We refer the reader to [KS18] for more details.

III.3 Aside: application of Theorem I.3.1 to axisymmetry and the statement of Corollary III.3.1

It is well known that under the assumption of axisymmetry, vacuum solutions cannot radiate angular momentum to null infinity. This can be shown using the conservation [Wal84] of the Komar angular momentum $\mathcal{J}(S)$ associated to a 2-surface S . This leads easily to the following corollary of Theorem I.3.1.

Corollary III.3.1 (Nonlinear stability of Schwarzschild under axisymmetric perturbations with vanishing initial angular momentum). *All characteristic initial data prescribed on (I.3.2), assumed sufficiently close to Schwarzschild data with mass M_{init} , which are moreover axisymmetric and have vanishing Komar angular momentum, are contained in the codimension-3 “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ of Theorem I.3.1. Thus, consequences (i), (ii) and (iii) apply to such data.*

Thus, even though the full codimension-3 “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ of Theorem I.3.1 can only be characterized teleologically, the above Corollary identifies a further *infinite*-codimension submanifold which can indeed be explicitly identified examining only initial data, namely axisymmetric solutions with vanishing Komar angular momentum. We note that the polarised axisymmetric solutions of [KS18] in turn themselves form an infinite-codimensional sub-class of the set of axisymmetric data with vanishing Komar angular momentum. See already Section 17.4.

III.4 Some non-linear model problems

We refer briefly here to a series of non-linear model problems which have been studied, in part motivated by certain of the difficulties of the non-linear stability problem for Schwarzschild and Kerr.

The simplest such problem is the semilinear wave equation

$$\square_g \psi = N(\nabla \psi, \nabla \psi) \tag{III.4.1}$$

on Schwarzschild and more generally on a slowly rotating subextremal Kerr, where N is assumed to satisfy Klainerman’s null condition [Kla86]. This problem was originally studied in [Luk13], with a proof based on a weighted conformal Morawetz multiplier together with weighted commutation vector fields. See also [LT18] where the results of [Luk13] are generalised to the case of a background metric g suitably decaying in t towards Schwarzschild and [OS20] for a very general framework of radiating spacetimes.

An interesting model nonlinear problem motivated by the axisymmetric reduction of the Einstein equations has been studied in [IK15].

Finally, most pertinent for the present work, we mention the recent proof of non-linear stability of the trivial solution for the Maxwell–Born–Infeld system on Schwarzschild [Pas19a]. This can be thought of as a quasilinear version of (III.4.1) (but with cubic nonlinearities), which moreover has the additional difficulty that, as with the Einstein vacuum equations (2) themselves, the system admits non-trivial stationary solutions. (Note that this system linearises to the usual Maxwell equations on Schwarzschild, studied previously in [Blu08, ST15, Pas19b].) To extract the necessary decay, the paper [Pas19a] implements an argument based on the so-called “ r^p method” [DR09a, Mos16], exploiting a hierarchy of r^p -weighted estimates in place of the time-weighted multiplier and commutation vector fields used in [Luk13]. The most serious non-linear difficulties can be localised to near null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ and near the photon sphere $r = 3M$. The method of [Pas19a] can be thought of as a precursor to the arguments described in Section V.6 and V.7 below for understanding the nonlinearities in these regions in the context of the present work.

III.5 A scattering construction of dynamic black holes

A final related non-linear result is the “scattering construction” of non-trivial examples of spacetimes satisfying the conclusion of Theorem I.3.1, i.e. dynamically settling down to a Schwarzschild exterior [DHR13]. Here, non-trivial means that these examples are not *identically* Schwarzschild for sufficiently late times. Such non-trivial spacetimes had in fact first been considered in [Hol10b], where, without proving existence, a series of estimates were obtained.

In the construction of [DHR13], which in fact produces more generally spacetimes settling down to Kerr, “scattering data” are posed on what will be the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ and null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ , and an exterior spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) is then proven to exist, with a global double null coordinate system (I.1.1), admitting \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ as appropriate boundaries and indeed attaining the scattering data. Key to the tractability of the problem, however, is requiring that the scattering data decay *exponentially* to Schwarzschild (or more generally Kerr) in advanced time v along \mathcal{H}^+ and retarded time u along \mathcal{I}^+ , at a rate at least as fast as a certain threshold connected to the so-called *surface gravity* of the event horizon. Note, in contrast, that for generic initial data in Theorem I.3.1 (and more generally in Conjecture IV.1 to be discussed in Section IV.1), the solution is expected to approach Schwarzschild (or more generally Kerr) only *inverse polynomially*. In fact, in the context of the linear theory, vanishing of the coefficient of *each* polynomial term in the asymptotic expansion along \mathcal{H}^+ or \mathcal{I}^+ imposes an *additional* constraint on initial data. See for instance [AAG18b, Hin20, AAG21a, AAG21b]. Thus, in view of the strong assumption on scattering data, the solutions constructed in [DHR13] are expected to be *infinite* codimension in the moduli space of initial data.

The significance of the exponential decay assumption on scattering data is that all linear terms in the finite region can be uniformly bounded using nothing other than Gronwall’s inequality. In particular, the construction works independently of the validity of the linear stability of Schwarzschild or Kerr (and indeed, the theorem of [DHR13] was obtained before the linear results described in Section II). On the other hand, in a neighbourhood of null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ , the “null condition”, discussed already in Section III.1, is relevant, and thus the structure embodied in equations (III.1.5)–(III.1.6) must be used already in the proof of [DHR13]. We note that in [DHR13], the equations of type (III.1.5) derived for some of the Γ_p quantities have only the borderline decay O_{p+1} for their right hand side; it is important that these borderline terms can be themselves estimated solely from an equation of type (III.1.6).

It is interesting finally to remark that there is an essential difficulty in trying to parametrise solutions in terms of scattering data on $\mathcal{H}^+ \cup \mathcal{I}^+$ when the decay along \mathcal{H}^+ and along \mathcal{I}^+ is slower than a certain fixed exponential rate. This has to do with the red-shift at the horizon \mathcal{H}^+ , which in the context of backwards evolution acts as a blue-shift. In particular, one can show already at the linear level that the polynomial-decay asymptotics of the scattering data on \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ must be *correlated* to all order for the data to have arisen from sufficiently regular Cauchy data. See again [AAG21a] and [DRSR18]. Thus, parametrising a full open set of the moduli space of vacuum spacetimes around Kerr, or even just the finite codimension $\mathcal{M}_{\text{stable}}$ space of Theorem I.3.1, entirely in terms of free scattering data on $\mathcal{H}^+ \cup \mathcal{I}^+$ appears to be a difficult problem. For linear scattering theory for gravitational perturbations, see the very recent [Mas20] for a complete physical space treatment around Schwarzschild, and [TdC20, TdCSR20] for fixed frequency statements on Kerr, up to and including extremality.

III.6 Comparison with the case of $\Lambda \neq 0$

We compare briefly with the situation when a cosmological constant $\Lambda \neq 0$ is added to the right hand side of the Einstein vacuum equations (2).

In the case of $\Lambda > 0$, the ground state solution analogous to Minkowski space is so-called *de Sitter space*. The (Schwarzschild) Kerr family of black holes also has an analogue, known as (Schwarzschild) Kerr–de Sitter. The analogue of the exterior region considered in the present work is a stationary region bounded by an event and cosmological horizon.

In both the de Sitter and (Schwarzschild) Kerr–de Sitter cases above, stability of the relevant regions reduces to the domain of development of a compact Cauchy surface, and moreover one has exponential decay of linear fields. Thus, the nonlinear aspects of the stability problem are considerably easier than the asymptotically flat case, and in particular do not require any special structure for the non-linearities, like those that were so important in Section III.1. Nonlinear stability of pure de Sitter space had been obtained by [Fri86], and recently, for the very slowly rotating Kerr–de Sitter case by Hintz and Vasy [HV18]. See [HV18] for further discussion.

In the case $\Lambda < 0$, the ground state solution analogous to Minkowski space is known as *anti de Sitter space*. Since null infinity is now timelike, boundary conditions must be imposed there to obtain a well-posed problem, and the most natural type are so-called reflective conditions. Under this assumption, anti de Sitter space has been conjectured [DH06a] to be nonlinearly *unstable* already in vacuum, precisely because of the lack of decay mechanism on such spacetimes. In the case of the Einstein–Vlasov system, this conjecture has recently been proven in [Mos18]. See also [BR11] for numerics and further discussion.

The analogue for $\Lambda < 0$ of the black hole solutions (I.2.4) is the so-called (Schwarzschild) Kerr–anti de Sitter family. On these spacetimes, logarithmic decay rates for solutions of the wave equation have been obtained [HS13], and these have been shown to be sharp in a suitable sense [HS14]. In view of this very slow decay, it remains completely open whether to expect non-linear stability for these spacetimes for reflective boundary conditions at null infinity. See the discussion in [HS13].

IV The nonlinear stability of Kerr, extremality and the black hole interior

We include for completeness a statement of the full non-linear stability of the Kerr exterior (including a discussion of the extremal case for both vacuum and electrovacuum), as well as the implications for the *interior* structure of generic black holes.

IV.1 Formulation of the problem

To compare with our main theorem, we shall again state this problem in double null gauge. (Recall from our discussion above that the paper [PI98] exhibits the Kerr metric itself in precisely such a gauge (for the full subextremal range $|a| < M$).) Fixing parameters, we consider then the subregion of Kerr given as the maximal Cauchy development of the union of two null hypersurfaces $C_{\text{out}} \cup \underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ of the double null gauge, where as before $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ crosses the event horizon, while C_{out} is future complete and terminates at null infinity. Note that if $a \neq 0$, the development is depicted in Figure 4, superimposed on the larger region of Kerr corresponding to the future Cauchy development of a two-ended asymptotically flat spacelike Σ .

In marked contrast to Schwarzschild, the above region of Kerr does not terminate at a strongly singular spacelike boundary corresponding to $r = 0$, but rather, can be further extended beyond a non-trivial null boundary \mathcal{CH}^+ known as a *Cauchy horizon* [Haw67]. These extensions fail to be uniquely determined by initial data, this pathology motivating the so-called *strong cosmic censorship conjecture*, according to which, extendibility across Cauchy horizons should be non-generic. We shall discuss this in Section IV.3 below.

First we give the statement of the stability problem for the exterior region:

Conjecture IV.1 (Nonlinear stability of the Kerr exterior). *For all characteristic data prescribed as above, assumed sufficiently close to Kerr with parameters $|a_{\text{init}}| < M_{\text{init}}$, the maximal Cauchy development \mathcal{M} contains a region \mathcal{R} which can be covered by appropriate global double null foliations (I.1.1) and which (i) possesses a complete future null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ such that $\mathcal{R} \subset J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$, and in fact the future boundary of \mathcal{R} in*




Figure 4: Kerr with $0 < |a| < M$: The Cauchy development of characteristic data superimposed on the Cauchy development of two-ended spacelike data

\mathcal{M} is a regular future affine complete “event horizon” \mathcal{H}^+ . Moreover (ii) the metric remains close to Kerr in \mathcal{R} and (iii) asymptotes, inverse polynomially, to a Kerr metric with parameters $|a_{\text{final}}| < M_{\text{final}}$ where $a_{\text{final}} \approx a_{\text{init}}$, $M_{\text{final}} \approx M_{\text{init}}$, as $u \rightarrow \infty$ and $v \rightarrow \infty$, in particular along \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ .

Moreover, for any given $0 < |a_{\text{final}}| < M_{\text{final}}$, the set of initial data above attaining these final parameters is codimension-2 in the space of all data, the set of initial data attaining $a_{\text{final}} = 0$ for some M_{final} is codimension-3, and the set of initial data attaining $a_{\text{final}} = 0$ and a fixed M_{final} is codimension-4. In particular, for generic initial data, $a_{\text{final}} \neq 0$, while the set of solutions $a_{\text{final}} = 0$ corresponds precisely to the solutions constructed in Theorem I.3.1.

We remark that the difference in dimensionality in the $a_{\text{final}} = 0$ case has to do with the enhanced symmetry of Schwarzschild in comparison to Kerr. Let us also note that, as in Theorem I.3.1, a true stability result should give a top-order orbital stability statement representing (ii) without loss of derivatives.

In view of our discussion and the recent [DHR19, TdCSR20], the path is now open to obtaining Conjecture IV.1 following the approach of the present work, although, at a technical level, the Kerr case introduces several new complications related to the necessity of applying frequency localisation to deal with the issues related to trapping. In this sense, we view one of the appealing features of having a complete, self-contained physical space treatment of the Schwarzschild case as in the present work to be that one may understand the essence of the above conjecture without this additional, largely technical, complication.

IV.2 Extremality and the Aretakis instability

It is non-trivial even to formulate the extremal analogue $|a_{\text{init}}| = M_{\text{init}}$ of Conjecture IV.1.

Here, already at the linear level, the situation is considerably more complicated. In particular, a basic understanding of even the linear scalar wave equation (II.3.4) on an extremal Kerr background (cf. the discussion in Section II.3.1 concerning (II.3.4) in the sub-extremal case) is not yet available. One thing that is known, however, is that all extremal stationary black holes are subject—at the very least—to the Aretakis instability [Are15] along their horizon, according to which, higher order translation invariant derivatives of solutions to the wave equation (II.3.4) generically blow up polynomially. This has been extended to gravitational perturbations in [LR12, LMRT13]. One may view these derivatives as infinitely growing horizon “hair”, whose presence can moreover be inferred indirectly via measurements at \mathcal{I}^+ [AAG18a]. It is an interesting problem to understand whether the most basic geometric features of these black hole spacetimes can still be nonlinearly stable despite this higher order instability phenomenon associated to their horizons, or, rather, whether this growing “hair” leads at the nonlinear level to some worse type of blowup, for instance the formation of so-called “naked singularities”, resulting in a future incomplete \mathcal{I}^+ (i.e. already violating the analogue of statement (i) of Theorem I.3.1). So far, this question has only been probed numerically for toy models under spherical symmetry [MRT13].

In order to disentangle the Aretakis instability from other difficulties associated to extremal Kerr, it is natural to first consider the electrovacuum Reissner–Nordström metrics (see for instance [Wal84]), a spherically symmetric family of solutions to the Einstein–Maxwell system with parameters Q and M . (Note that this family contains the Schwarzschild family as the subfamily $Q = 0$.) One expects that the analogue of

Theorem I.3.1 for the sub-extremal case $0 \leq Q < M$ of Reissner–Nordström is a more or less straightforward adaptation of the results of the present paper, in view of the recent [Gio20], where a linear stability proof is carried out explicitly for the subextremal Reissner–Nordström family, adapting the methods of [DHR]. The interesting case to consider further is thus the extremal case $Q = M$.

To set up the problem, fix null hypersurfaces $\underline{C}_{\text{in}} \cup C_{\text{out}}$ in background extremal Reissner–Nordström with parameters $M_{\text{init}} = Q_{\text{init}}$, analogous to (I.3.2), where the terminal sphere of $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ lies in the black hole interior. (Note that, in contrast to the Schwarzschild case, this terminal sphere is no longer trapped.) Consider now the moduli space \mathfrak{M} of nearby data defined on $\underline{C}_{\text{in}} \cup C_{\text{out}}$, suitably normalised. Note that we may identify the following families of initial data corresponding to explicit solutions: (a) a 1-parameter family corresponding to extremal Reissner–Nordström metrics with charge $Q = M$; (b) a 1-parameter family corresponding to Reissner–Nordström metrics with fixed $M = M_{\text{init}}$, parametrised by Q , (c) a 3-parameter family corresponding to extremal Kerr–Newman metrics (see [MTW17]) with charge Q_{init} . We note that (b) contains both subextremal $Q < M_{\text{init}}$ and superextremal $Q > M_{\text{init}}$ Reissner–Nordström data on $\underline{C}_{\text{in}} \cup C_{\text{out}}$. The latter lead to spacetimes such that $\underline{C}_{\text{in}} \subset J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$, i.e. spacetimes that fail to form black holes.

For the extremal Reissner–Nordström family (a) itself, then, in view of the above, the best one can hope is for the existence of a codimension-4 asymptotically stable “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}} \subset \mathfrak{M}$, where moreover the asymptotic stability statement is suitably relaxed along \mathcal{H}^+ (compared to that of Theorem I.3.1), so as to accommodate the growing horizon “hair” associated to the Aretakis instability. This suggests the following:

Conjecture IV.2 (Asymptotic stability of extremal Reissner–Nordström but with growing horizon “hair”). *For all characteristic initial data for the Einstein–Maxwell system prescribed on (I.3.2), assumed sufficiently close to extremal Reissner–Nordström data with mass M_{init} and $Q_{\text{init}} = M_{\text{init}}$ and lying on a codimension-4 “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ of the moduli space \mathfrak{M} of initial data, the maximal Cauchy development \mathcal{M} contains a region \mathcal{R} which can be covered by appropriate (teleologically normalised) global double null gauges (I.1.1) and where the analogues of (i), (ii) and (iii) of Theorem I.3.1 are satisfied with an extremal Reissner–Nordström metric with parameters $M_{\text{final}} = Q_{\text{final}}$ in the place of Schwarzschild. Along \mathcal{H}^+ , however, one has decay to extremal Reissner–Nordström only in a weaker sense, in particular, for generic data lying on $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$, suitable higher order quantities in the arising solution blow up polynomially along \mathcal{H}^+ (growing horizon “hair”).*

Given a positive resolution of the above, one would moreover expect that the “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ itself lies on a larger codimension-1 submanifold $\mathfrak{M}'_{\text{stable}}$ of \mathfrak{M} consisting of data leading to solutions asymptoting to a very slowly rotating extremal Kerr–Newman, again with growing horizon hair. Moreover, one could hope to prove that this larger submanifold $\mathfrak{M}'_{\text{stable}}$ delimits the boundary signifying a phase transition between two very different open regions of moduli space \mathfrak{M} : (1) the set of data leading to spacetimes failing to collapse (i.e. those for which $C_{\text{in}} \subset J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$) and (2) the set of data leading to a black hole exterior settling down to a very slowly rotating subextremal Kerr–Newman. (Of course, one can already conjecture the analogue of Conjecture IV.2 for extremal Kerr as a family of the Einstein vacuum equations; we emphasise, however, that the dynamics near this phase transition in that case may be considerably more complicated!)

In order to prove Conjecture IV.2, one must confront a fundamental new difficulty compared to the present work: In the extremal case, the stabilising mechanism of the red-shift effect, exploited heavily here, degenerates at \mathcal{H}^+ . Moreover, in view of the expected growing horizon hair, it would seem that in order to control the nonlinearities, one must identify and exploit a suitable “null structure”, not just near null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ as before (cf. Section III.1.2), but now also in the region near the horizon \mathcal{H}^+ . See the recent [AAG20] where this is indeed exploited to show global stability results on a fixed extreme Reissner–Nordström background for a nonlinear scalar wave equation whose nonlinearities satisfy the null condition (cf. equation (ii) of (III.1.4)). We hope that the present work, with its set-up for proving finite-codimensional stability statements and with one of its teleological gauges normalised at the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ , may provide a suitable general framework to try to address Conjecture IV.2.

IV.3 Implications for black hole interiors with $a_{\text{final}} \neq 0$ and strong cosmic censorship

Returning to the subextremal case, Conjecture IV.1 can be applied together with the following theorem to obtain the C^0 stability of the Kerr Cauchy horizon:

Theorem IV.3.1 ([DL17]). *Consider general characteristic initial data for the Einstein vacuum equations on $\mathcal{H}^+ \cup \underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ such that \mathcal{H}^+ is future complete and the data along \mathcal{H}^+ approach that of a sub-extremal rotating Kerr solution (with $0 < |a| < M$) along its event horizon at a suitable inverse polynomial rate. Then restricting to a sufficiently short $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}$, the maximal Cauchy development can be covered by a global double null foliation and can be extended continuously beyond a non-trivial Cauchy horizon \mathcal{CH}^+ .*

In particular, for initial data as in Conjecture IV.1, then as long as $a_{\text{final}} \neq 0$ (which would be true generically!), it would follow from the conjecture and the above paragraph that the maximal Cauchy development is extendible beyond a non-trivial Cauchy horizon located in the black hole interior. In particular, the C^0 -formulation of strong cosmic censorship (see [Chr99]) is false.

In fact, if one considers now two-ended Kerr initial data Σ as depicted in Figure 4, then a further extension of Theorem IV.3.1, see the upcoming [DL21b], implies that the *entire* Kerr Penrose diagram depicted above is stable, in particular, spacetime is globally extendible as a C^0 metric across a *bifurcate* null Cauchy horizon such that *all* future inextendible causal geodesics pass into the extension.

The above result is surprising in view of the presence of a well-known *blue-shift instability* [PD68] associated with the Cauchy horizon, which provided the original evidence for the conjecture of strong cosmic censorship. The theorem is still compatible, however, with the possibility that for generic initial data, the boundary \mathcal{CH}^+ be singular in a weaker sense, specifically, that the metric in particular fails to be H_{loc}^1 in any extension of the maximal Cauchy development. (This is related to the Christodoulou formulation of strong cosmic censorship and has been discussed in [Chr09].) Proving this is in turn related to obtaining a suitable *lower* bound on the rate of approach to Kerr on \mathcal{H}^+ in the statement of Conjecture IV.1 for generic initial data. See the discussion in [DL17] and [Daf05, LO19a, LO19b, VdM18] for results for a spherically symmetric model. We also note that here too, the extremal case is exceptional; see [Gaj17, GL19].

IV.4 A conjecture for the $a_{\text{final}} = 0$ case

Ironically, it is precisely for data lying on the codimension-3 “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ constructed in Theorem I.3.1 satisfying $a_{\text{final}} = 0$ for which there is no general analogue⁴ of the understanding of the black hole interior provided by the above theorem. This case is harder from the perspective of the interior because of the strongly singular nature of the exact Schwarzschild boundary. In the special case of polarised axisymmetry studied in [KS18], for which in particular $a_{\text{final}} = 0$ (cf. the discussion in Sections III.2 and III.3), this spacelike singular boundary has very recently been shown to be globally stable [AF20] in a suitable sense. This result relies heavily on the polarised assumption, however, and the precise results proven are not expected to carry over outside of the symmetry class. The most basic question one can ask is whether $a_{\text{final}} = 0$ necessarily means that, in contrast to the $a_{\text{final}} \neq 0$ case, there can never exist a Cauchy horizon emanating from “timelike infinity”. Thus, it would already be interesting to prove simply:

Conjecture IV.3. *For the initial data of Theorem I.3.1, the maximal Cauchy development (\mathcal{M}, g) will necessarily contain a TIP whose intersection with $C_{\text{out}} \cup \underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ has compact closure.*

For the definition of TIPs, see [GKP72]. A positive resolution of the above would in particular show that the set of vacuum initial data leading to a TIP whose intersection with spacelike initial data has compact closure, if not open in moduli space, is at least a set of finite codimension. (In contrast, the largest class of examples produced so far, namely the symmetric solutions of [AF20] discussed above, as well as previous examples due to [Fou16], produced by a scattering construction, are manifestly of infinite codimension in moduli space.)

V Brief overview of the proof

In very broad outline, the proof of Theorem I.3.1 is an adaptation of the linear analysis of [DHR]—reviewed in Section II—using the insights from previous non-linear results—reviewed in Section III—to estimate the

⁴Note that, as remarked after the statement of Theorem I.3.1, one can still apply [DL21a] in the case $a_{\text{final}} = 0$ to obtain stability up to a suitable spacelike hypersurface foliated by trapped surfaces. In fact, in this case, using translation invariance, the geometry of Schwarzschild and Cauchy stability, one can then deduce relatively easily the statement that the supremum of the Kretschmann curvature (taken over the maximal development of data $C_{\text{out}} \cup \underline{C}_{\text{in}}$) is infinite.

nonlinear terms (most specifically the setup of [DHR13] described in Section III.5). As in Section III, linear analysis is here always understood in the sense of the modern theory of non-linear wave equations, i.e. applied directly to the non-linear equation. This is essential for a true non-linear stability result which does not lose derivatives.

In addition, there are various additional specifically nonlinear aspects of the problem, however, concerning our modulation scheme, small non-linear corrections to the linear teleological determination of the gauge and other issues.

The precise statement of Theorem I.3.1 is given as Theorem 6.1 (see already Section 6). We give a brief overview of the proof in this section.

V.1 The 3-parameter families of data and $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$

We decompose the moduli space of characteristic initial data into disjoint 3-parameter families of initial data

$$\mathcal{L}_{S_0}^{\varepsilon_0} := \{S_0(\lambda) : \lambda \in [-c\varepsilon_0, c\varepsilon_0]^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^3\}, \quad (\text{V.1.1})$$

each determined by some reference data set S_0 . (Here c and ε_0 are constants and $S_0(\lambda)$ denotes initial data derived from S_0 by adding to one of the seed quantities the three independent $\ell = 1$ spherical harmonics weighted by the three coefficients $(\lambda_{-1}, \lambda_0, \lambda_1)$ of λ , and the norm $|\lambda|$ may be thought to be an approximate measure of the norm of the angular momentum of the seed data $S_0(\lambda)$.) As S_0 is varied in a suitable space, these families $\mathcal{L}_{S_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$ cover an entire neighbourhood of the moduli space \mathfrak{M} of initial data around Schwarzschild. (See already Section 5.8 for a discussion of initial data.) We denote by $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ the maximal Cauchy development of initial data $S_0(\lambda)$. (See already Section 5.2 for a general discussion of the maximal Cauchy development.)

The aim is to show that for each S_0 , there exists a $\lambda^{\text{final}} \in [-c\varepsilon_0, c\varepsilon_0]^3$ for which $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda^{\text{final}}), g(\lambda^{\text{final}}))$ asymptotes to a Schwarzschild metric as described in the statement of Theorem 6.1. The collection of all $\{S_0(\lambda^{\text{final}})\}$ as one varies S_0 will then form our codimension-3 asymptotically stable “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}} \subset \mathfrak{M}$.

V.2 The logic of the proof

The logic of the proof (see already Section 7) proceeds by a continuity argument. At each step, governed by a final retarded time u_f , one defines a subset $\mathfrak{R}(u_f) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ of λ -parameter space, and considers, for each $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, a certain subregion of the spacetime $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ together with a set of bootstrap assumptions on this region. The subregion of spacetime will be described in Section V.3 below. We defer further discussion of the role of the set of parameters $\mathfrak{R}(u_f)$ to Section V.11. (Briefly, the set of parameters $\mathfrak{R}(u_f)$ is a closed set in \mathbb{R}^3 such that the “total angular momentum” of solutions is less than or equal to $\varepsilon_0 u_f^{-1}$, with equality holding on the boundary $\partial\mathfrak{R}(u_f)$. This “total angular momentum” is in turn defined as the norm of a vector \mathbf{J} associated to the $\ell = 1$ modes of a suitable Ricci coefficient. The special role of the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes will be discussed in Section V.10.) At each stage of the bootstrap, the solution is compared to a Schwarzschild solution whose mass M_f is chosen on the basis of the $\ell = 0$ mode of a curvature component at time u_f .

As usual in a continuity argument, the statement that the bootstrap assumptions can be improved is the main difficulty of the proof (see already the statement of Theorem C). In Sections V.3–V.9 below, we shall discuss the main difficulties arising in retrieving the bootstrap assumptions (i.e. in the proof of Theorem C). These are addressed in the chapters corresponding to Part C of the work.

We shall discuss issues related to the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes in Section V.10, and then how one completes the continuity argument in Section V.11. Finally, we shall discuss how one obtains the asymptotic gauges and stability statements in Section V.12.

V.3 The bootstrap region and the teleological normalisation of the null gauges

As in [DHR], the gauge must be normalised towards *the future* of the bootstrap region. As discussed already, however, for the nonlinear problem it is necessary to have in fact two separate normalisations corresponding to a region near the horizon (the \mathcal{H}^+ -gauge) and near infinity (the \mathcal{I}^+ -gauge). (See already Chapter 2 for details.)

Given a final retarded time u_f and a $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, the bootstrap region of $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ will be defined as the intersection of the past of a “late” outgoing null cone C_{u_f} and the past of a “late” ingoing null cone \underline{C}_{v_∞} , with $v_\infty \rightarrow \infty$ as $u_f \rightarrow \infty$, intersecting at the sphere S_{u_f, v_∞} . In both gauges, defined by double null coordinates $(u_{\mathcal{H}^+}, v_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ and $(u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ respectively, the final outgoing cone C_{u_f} will be a hypersurface of constant $u_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, respectively $u_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, anchoring the two gauges together.

The \mathcal{H}^+ -gauge will be normalised on the “late” outgoing null cone C_{u_f} and an initial ingoing cone $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ defined by $v_{\mathcal{H}^+} = v_{-1}$. This initial cone does not coincide with the initial data cone $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ but remains within a fixed distance from $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ independently of u_f . In the limit as $u_f \rightarrow \infty$, the cone C_{u_f} will coincide with the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ . The gauge will only be considered in a region $r \leq R_2$, where r is a function of $(u_{\mathcal{H}^+}, v_{\mathcal{H}^+})$.

The \mathcal{I}^+ -gauge will have the cone \underline{C}_{v_∞} as a $v_{\mathcal{I}^+} = v_\infty$ hypersurface, and the geometry of the cones will be normalised on the final ingoing cone \underline{C}_{v_∞} and the “initial” outgoing cone $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ defined by $u_{\mathcal{I}^+} = u_{-1}$. As before, this initial cone does not coincide with the initial data cone C_{out} but remains within a fixed distance from C_{out} independently of u_f . The gauge will only be considered in a region $r \geq R_{-2}$, with $R_{-2} < R_2$, where r is a function of $(u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+})$. The two r -functions are close and the gauges thus have a nontrivial overlap region.

The normalisations are determined by a series of requirements on the spheres $S_{u_f, v_{-1}}$ and $S_{u_f, v(R, u_f)}$, for an $R_{-2} < R < R_2$, and on the cones C_{u_f} , $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in the case of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge and on the sphere S_{u_f, v_∞} and the cones $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, \underline{C}_{v_f} in the case of the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, for instance, in the case of \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, the requirements

$$\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ = 0, \quad \Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ = 0 \quad \text{on } S_{u_f, v_\infty} \quad (\text{V.3.1})$$

and that

$$\mu_{\ell \geq 1} = 0 \quad \text{on } \underline{C}_{v_\infty}. \quad (\text{V.3.2})$$

Here $(\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ$, $(\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ$ denote Schwarzschild background quantities and the Ricci coefficient μ denotes the mass-aspect function. Some of the conditions (e.g. (V.3.2)) distinguish the behaviour of the $\ell = 0$ or $\ell = 1$ modes; see already Section V.10 below. For issues related to *constructing* a gauge satisfying conditions such as (V.3.1) and (V.3.2), see already Section V.11 below. These normalisations ensure that as $(u_f, v_\infty) \rightarrow (\infty, \infty)$, the normalisation of the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge becomes Bondi, and moreover, we have vanishing of the quantity $\Sigma_+ = \lim_{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{v_{\mathcal{I}^+} \rightarrow \infty} r^2 \hat{\chi}(u, v) = 0$ (see already Section V.12 below).

Note that the two gauge normalisations are non-trivial at the linearised level and differ in their overlap already in linear theory. The future-normalised gauge used in Theorem II.2.1 is closely related to the normalisations of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge when it is anchored as above to the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge. Though one could have considered the analogue of the normalisations specific to the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge already in [DHR], we did not need this type of gauge in the proof of Theorem II.2.1. Its essential usefulness here lies in the fact that it allows for better control of the decay towards null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ , important for capturing the null condition necessary for controlling the non-linear terms (see already the discussion in Section V.6 below).

The teleological gauges are “anchored” to initial data via two auxiliary double null gauges, one Kruskal-normalised and the other Eddington–Finkelstein normalised, which cover a fixed region in the vicinity of the initial cones $C_{\text{out}} \cup \underline{C}_{\text{in}}$, which can be constructed by Cauchy stability considerations, together with some local analysis near \mathcal{I}^+ in order to achieve that the latter be Bondi normalised (see already Section 5.5). (Note that local considerations imply that one has good estimates in these auxiliary regions, coming from initial data.) The domains of the four gauges are depicted in Figure 5. Note that this depiction is schematic, as each of the two teleological null gauges and each of the two auxiliary null gauges define different foliations of spacetime by spheres.

V.4 Boundedness of the initial norm and the relation of the gauges

Since the two teleological gauges are normalised to the future, one must first show that suitable energies on the “initial” cones $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ can be controlled from initial data. Here one uses that these “initial” cones lie in the region covered by the two auxiliary double null gauges in which one already has good estimates. To compare, however, one must estimate the diffeomorphism f relating teleological to auxiliary gauge in their overlap region. (See already Chapter 10.) As discussed previously, this is analogous in linear theory to the underlined part of the statement of Theorem II.2.1 (stating that the future normalised pure gauge solution




Figure 5: The two teleological double null gauges and the two auxiliary double null gauges near data

is bounded by the data). To close our estimates, it is important here that the initial energies in question are “almost gauge invariant” (see already Section V.5), and thus the dependence on the diffeomorphisms will be at higher order in the smallness parameter ε_0 . (For comparison, this corresponds in the proof of the nonlinear stability of Minkowski space to the sentence following formula (10.2.4b) on p. 302 of [CK93].)

Similarly, one must show that the two future normalisations of double null gauge are themselves sufficiently close in their mutual overlap region (see the darker shaded region in Figure 5), by estimating the diffeomorphisms f relating these two. (Again, for comparison, this is in some sense analogous to step 2 in the proof of the nonlinear stability of Minkowski space (see p. 301 and Chapter 15 of [CK93]), where the exterior optical function is extended to an interior optical function and appropriate estimates are obtained.)

In general, the idea for estimating the diffeomorphisms connecting the various gauges is to use relations expressing the difference of curvature or Ricci coefficients in the two gauges, in which derivatives of the gauge functions appear. For instance, one can write schematically the relation for difference of the curvature component β expressed in two gauges

$$\beta - \tilde{\beta} = \nabla f + \dots,$$

where non-linear terms are omitted and f here denotes one component of the diffeomorphism connecting the gauges (see already Section 4.3.4). From the above, estimates on curvature components like β and $\tilde{\beta}$, to be discussed below, lead to estimates on f .

V.5 The main estimates: revisiting [DHR]

For the main estimates, the general strategy of the linear stability result [DHR] applies, as described in Section II.

In particular, one first considers the fully non-linear quantities P, \underline{P} , (defined in analogy with (II.3.2) for the linearised $\overset{(i)}{P}$ and $\overset{(i)}{\underline{P}}$) which now satisfy equations analogous to (II.3.3),

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \Omega \nabla_3 (r^5 P) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \text{div}(r^5 P) + 2\Omega^2 \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) r^5 P = \mathcal{E}[P], \quad (\text{V.5.1})$$

but with non-linear error terms $\mathcal{E}[P]$ on their right hand sides, coupling with other quantities. These error terms can be written in schematic form as

$$\mathcal{E}[P] = \Omega^2 \sum_{p_1+p_2 \geq 2} \sum_{\substack{k_1 \leq 3 \\ k_2 \geq 2}} r^{-p_1} \cdot (\mathfrak{D}^{k_1} \Phi_{p_2})^{k_2}, \quad (\text{V.5.2})$$

where Φ_p is a schematic notation (see already Chapter 3) encompassing both Ricci coefficients Γ_p and curvature components \mathcal{R}_p (cf. the discussion in Section III.1.2 above for a discussion of p -weights), but now for *differences* of quantities from their Schwarzschild values (e.g. the expressions appearing in (V.3.1)).

An important new technical difficulty that occurs in estimating (V.5.1) is that quantities P and \underline{P} are now only “almost” gauge invariant, i.e. unlike in [DHR], they now depend on which of the four gauges we are using, i.e. we have in fact $P_{\mathcal{H}+}, P_{\mathcal{I}+}$, etc. This dependence, however, is quadratic in the smallness parameter

ε_0 . Thus, up to quadratic errors quantified already in the bootstrap assumptions, one can control the initial data quantities of P evaluated in the teleological gauge from analogous quantities evaluated in the initial data gauge, and similarly, one can compare a suitable boundary term (on a timelike boundary \mathcal{B} in the overlap of the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges) which arises when simultaneously applying energy estimates to (V.5.1) in the region covered by the two teleological gauges. With this understanding, one can then repeat the energy estimates as in [DHR], to obtain suitable decay estimates for P , given estimates on the right hand side (V.5.2). We emphasise that in accordance with our comments above, we estimate equation (V.5.1) directly, viewing it as a linear equation for P , keeping the left hand side's dependence on the solution itself. This is essential to prevent loss of derivatives at top order.

As we shall see, the hierarchical approach to estimates (described in Section II.3 in the context of the linear theory) can be implemented as before, to estimate all (differences of) curvature components \mathcal{R}_p (e.g. α , $\rho - \rho_0$) and (differences of) Ricci coefficients Γ_p (e.g. $\hat{\chi}$, $\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_0$), starting from control of P and \underline{P} . (Let us add that in addition to the transport estimates connecting α to P , we also use the nonlinear analogue of the Teukolsky equation itself (II.3.1) to control certain derivatives of α which were not explicitly estimated in the linear work [DHR] described in Section II.3.) Here, the gauge normalisations, for instance (V.3.1)–(V.3.2) in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, are essential to indeed obtain decay of all quantities. See Section V.8 for a discussion of some specifically nonlinear issues that arise.

The estimates thus obtained now allow one to absorb the error terms arising from (V.5.2) and from similar error terms arising in the other relations, and close the bootstrap.

Let us discuss in more detail the issue of absorbing the errors arising from (V.5.2). In general, in the context of energy-type estimates, after commutation $N - 3$ times by suitable operators \mathfrak{D} , the $\mathcal{E}[P]$ defined in (V.5.2) produces terms which are cubic and higher, e.g. terms of the form

$$\mathfrak{D}^{N-2}P \cdot \mathfrak{D}^N\Phi \cdot \Phi \tag{V.5.3}$$

in schematic notation, which must be integrated over spacetime with weights. The highest order terms $\mathfrak{D}^{N-2}P$ and $\mathfrak{D}^N\Phi$ (an example of the latter are highest order commuted curvature terms like $\mathfrak{D}^N\alpha$), must typically be estimated in the energy norm, whereas lower order terms Φ in (V.5.3) must be taken in a higher L^p norm, say L^∞ . The most difficult regions for controlling these non-linear terms are near null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ and near the Schwarzschild photon sphere $r = 3M$. For it is in these two regions where it cannot be ensured that the spacetime integral of the highest order terms is controlled by the natural (weighted) “integrated local energy decay estimates”. Thus, in general, to obtain spacetime integrability of the terms (V.5.3) one must exploit some sort of time-decay for the lower order terms.

We turn to a brief discussion of these two regions in Sections V.6 and V.7 respectively.

V.6 Estimates near null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ and the null condition

Near null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ , even local (in u) propagation is non-trivial and requires capturing the so called “null condition”, discussed above in Section III.1. In the present argument, this enters already at the level of equation (II.3.2). The null condition can again be captured by the subscript- p structure in (V.5.2) (cf. the discussion in Section III.1.2), which ensures that all nonlinear terms have the correct r -decay to propagate. We emphasise that to infer this structure, we use in an essential way the Bondi normalisation of the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge.

In practice, equation (II.3.2) is estimated by applying the r^p method [DR09a]. (For previous uses of the r^p method for nonlinear problems, see [Yan13, Pas19a, Kei18].) To globally control the spacetime integral of the terms (V.5.3) arising from (V.5.2), which are now multiplied by r^p weights, one must in general exploit decay (in u) for the lower order terms. This decay must match the type of decay which can be obtained from the r^p method itself. In addition to the null condition, our argument depends on the fortuitous absence of certain quantities in (V.5.2), for which the rate of u -decay which can be obtained is very weak.

V.7 Estimating the non-linear terms near the photon sphere

The region near the Schwarzschild photon sphere $r = 3M$ presents a similar difficulty to null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ because the highest order integrated decay estimates one obtains from (V.5.1) for the quantity P necessarily

degenerate. Thus one again needs to exploit faster decay for the lower order terms in order to control the part of the spacetime integral arising from (V.5.2) which is supported near $r = 3M$.

The “usual” way of doing this (see for instance [Luk13]) is to obtain a pointwise statement

$$|\Phi| \lesssim (u+v)^{-3/2+\delta}, \quad (\text{V.7.1})$$

for some $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$ in the region near $r = 3M$ for the lower order terms Φ appearing in (V.5.2). (Note $u \sim v$ in this region.) Together with the uniform boundedness of the highest order energy fluxes (through null hypersurfaces $u = c$ or $v = c$ as appropriate) associated to $\mathfrak{D}^N \Phi$, this allows control of the spacetime integral of terms of the form (V.5.3), restricted to the region near $r = 3M$. Alternatively, however, instead of the pointwise (V.7.1), it is in fact sufficient to control the spacetime integral of

$$u^{2-\delta} \sup_v |\Phi|^2(u, v, \theta^A) + v^{2-\delta} \sup_u |\Phi|^2(u, v, \theta^A) \quad (\text{V.7.2})$$

for some $\delta > 0$, again restricted to the region near $r = 3M$. It turns out that one can estimate this spacetime integral of (V.7.2) with less assumptions on initial data than would be required to obtain (V.7.1). This leads to important simplifications in the argument. (See already Section 11.7.1.)

Moreover, the error terms (V.5.3) have additional special structure (see already Chapter 3.4). For instance, it is useful that certain terms do not appear on the right hand side of (V.5.2), for instance, the term $\nabla^N \hat{\chi}$ after N commutations.

V.8 Other nonlinear issues

Let us mention some other nonlinear issues that arise in the estimates of transport equations. The reader should refer back to the discussion of the linear theory in Section II.3.3.

To exploit the nonlinear analogue Y of the quantity (II.3.7), necessary to estimate the ingoing shear $r\hat{\chi}$, we require additional refinements over the method of [DHR]: (i) One requires a further renormalisation of the (now non-linear) version of the transport equation (II.3.8) satisfied by Y to improve the regularity and decay of the right hand side (resulting in the quantity B , see already (14.1.54) in Section 14.1). (ii) The nonlinear version (II.3.8) for Y needs in addition to be commuted with $\Omega \nabla_4$: Decay is then shown for $\Omega \nabla_4 Y$, which in turn, by the gauge conditions on $C_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ leads to decay for Y itself. (iii) A careful analysis of the non-linear errors must be done to keep track of the fact that certain anomalous quantities $\alpha, \beta, \omega - \omega_\circ$ do not appear in the worst terms. This is perhaps the most involved part of the estimates for quantities corresponding to the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge in Chapter 14.

Concerning the corresponding issue associated to the ingoing shear $\Omega \hat{\chi}$ and its blue-shifted transport equation near the horizon \mathcal{H}^+ , since the location of the event horizon is not a priori known we may no longer directly exploit the existence of a conserved flux to obtain a priori bounds on the horizon itself as had been done in [DHR]. Instead, we first directly relate $\Omega \hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ to $\Omega \hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ (i.e. the quantities expressed in the two gauges) on the sphere $S_{u_f, v(R, u_f)}$ and estimate $\Omega \hat{\chi}$ backwards on the final cone C_{u_f} (for backwards evolution, the blue-shift is a good sign!). To now estimate $\Omega \hat{\chi}$ is a neighbourhood of C_{u_f} the “blue-shift” problem can be cured, as in [DHR], by successive commutation of the nonlinear analogue of equation (II.3.9) with $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3$. Estimates for $\Omega \hat{\chi}$, and its ∇ derivatives at low orders, are then obtained by integrating backwards from the final cone C_{u_f} , as in [DHR]. More care is required, however, in estimating higher order ∇ derivatives of $\Omega \hat{\chi}$ as the above procedure is “expensive” in that it “costs” two $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3$ derivatives. (Note that in [DHR] this issue was overcome by exploiting a very special property of the linearised equations.) To avoid commuting with $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3$ too many times, at top order we estimate differences in place of actual derivatives. Moreover, rather than estimating $\Omega \hat{\chi}$ directly, the quantity $X = X_1$ (see already (15.1.14) for its definition), is introduced (in complete analogy with the quantity Y discussed above), the right hand side of whose equation has better regularity and decay properties than that of $\Omega \hat{\chi}$. In fact, to obtain an estimate for $\nabla^N \Omega \hat{\chi}$, a further renormalised quantity X_2 (see already (15.1.15) for its definition) is considered (now in analogy with the quantity B discussed above), the right hand side of whose equation has further improved regularity and decay properties. Due to the fact that the equation for the difference quotient of X_2 is only *noshifted*, unlike the estimates for $r\hat{\chi}$ in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, the estimates for $\Omega \hat{\chi}$ in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge grow mildly in v at the highest order. For more details concerning control of quantities associated to the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, see already Chapter 15.

V.9 Top order elliptic estimates for Ricci coefficients

We have discussed in Section III.1 the elliptic structure of some of the equations in (I.1.2) (e.g. equation (III.1.7)) and how this structure can be used to improve the control of the Ricci coefficients from the point of view of differentiability, allowing for top order estimates on these coefficients at one degree of differentiability greater than curvature.

In the context of the linear stability of Theorem II.2.1, such top order control was not necessary for the estimates to close. Thus this control was not part of the statement of the theorem, although it could be obtained a posteriori. For the present work, however, it turns out to indeed be necessary to estimate certain Ricci coefficients at the top order at the intersection of C_{u_f} and $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$. Since the gauge is normalised to the future, this in turn requires a top order estimate for quantities along the whole of C_{u_f} and, in view of the normalisation in the \mathcal{I}^+ -gauge, this then requires control of essentially all Ricci coefficients at top order. As a result, the top order elliptic estimates as described in Section III.1 form an integral part of the argument.

V.10 The $\ell = 0, 1$ modes

Recall from Section II.3 that in the context of the linear stability result of Theorem II.2.1, the projection of a solution to the $\ell = 0$ and $\ell = 1$ modes decouples from the rest of the system and can be written as the sum of a pure gauge solution and a linearised Kerr solution. The linearised Kerr metric to which the solution approached could be read off from the quantities $\overset{(i)}{\rho}_{\ell=0}, \overset{(i)}{\sigma}_{\ell=1,m=-1,0,1}$ which, appropriately scaled, were moreover conserved. At infinity the latter three quantities can be related to $(\text{curl}\beta)_{\ell=1,m=-1,0,1}$.

In the present problem, to identify the λ^{final} such that $\mathcal{S}_0(\lambda^{\text{final}})$ corresponds to a solution which indeed asymptotes to a Schwarzschild metric of some mass M_{final} , the values of

$$-\frac{r^3}{2}\rho_{\ell=0}, \quad r^5(\text{curl}\beta)_{\ell=1,m=-1,0,1} \quad (\text{V.10.1})$$

are monitored at late times at the final sphere S_{u_f, v_∞} for solutions corresponding to general λ . The Schwarzschild mass M_f used for taking differences at the u_f stage of the bootstrap is set equal to $-\frac{r^3}{2}\rho_{\ell=0}(u_f, v_\infty)$, while the vector

$$\mathbf{J}(\lambda, u_f) = r^5(\text{curl}\beta)_{\ell=1,m=-1,0,1}(u_f, v_\infty) \quad (\text{V.10.2})$$

is used to restrict λ to a region $\mathfrak{R}(u_f) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ of parameter space determined by property

$$|\mathbf{J}(\lambda, u_f)| \leq \varepsilon_0 u_f^{-1}. \quad (\text{V.10.3})$$

The quantity (V.10.2) will play a fundamental role in completing the continuity argument discussed in the next section.

We note that the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes above are defined by the projection to the four dimensional kernel space of a natural differential operator. (See already Section 1.4.)

The fact that, at any given time u_f , we are dealing with solutions with potentially non-trivial angular momentum (V.10.2), bound only by the linear constraint (V.10.3), suggests that, for the sharpest estimates, we should in fact subtract a “reference fixed-mass linearised Kerr solution”, with parameters determined by (V.10.2). This turns out to indeed be necessary in order to improve our bootstrap estimates for the projections on our $\ell = 0, 1$ modes. Because these projections no longer exactly decouple, these lead to various error terms. In particular, bounds for the derivatives of these projection operators must be included in our bootstrap assumptions.

V.11 Completing the continuity argument

Once the bootstrap assumptions are improved, one aims to show thus that the set $\mathfrak{B} \subset [u_f^0, \infty)$ of “allowed” final retarded times u_f (i.e. the set \mathfrak{B} of u_f such that the gauges can be constructed as described and such that the bootstrap assumptions indeed hold) is a non-empty, open and closed subset of $[u_f^0, \infty)$, and thus $\mathfrak{B} = [u_f^0, \infty)$.

The standard structure (see already Sections 7.2, 7.4 and 7.6) for such an argument is to appeal to Cauchy stability to obtain that $u_f^0 \in \mathfrak{B}$ and then to the improvement of the bootstrap assumptions, together with

an appropriate local existence theorem, to show that one can extend the bootstrap region. In view of our setup, however, let us note already that there are two additional slightly non-standard features, related to the finite codimensionality nature of the result and the teleological nature of the gauge:

1. Related to the finite codimensionality, we have now also a varying set of parameters $\mathfrak{R}(u_f)$ to contend with. The decay imposed by (V.10.3), together with faster decay estimates for suitable derivatives of (V.10.1), allows us to show the monotonicity statement

$$\mathfrak{R}(u'_f) \subsetneq \mathfrak{R}(u_f) \quad (\text{V.11.1})$$

for $u'_f > u_f$ (see already Section 16.2). (Note that we do not have complete freedom in choosing the decay rate (V.10.3), as the quantities (V.10.1) couple linearly to the other $\ell = 0$ and $\ell = 1$ modes and appear in the nonlinear error terms coupling to the other modes of the system.) On the other hand, we note that by a strengthening of Cauchy stability type arguments, the original region $\mathfrak{R}(u_f^0)$ can be seen to be a closed disc and the map $\mathbf{J}_0 : \mathfrak{R}(u_f^0) \rightarrow B$ defined by $\mathbf{J}_0(\lambda) := (\lambda, u_f^0)$, mapping to an appropriate closed ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, can be seen to have degree 1 on $\partial\mathfrak{R}(u_f^0)$ (see already Section 5.9). A topological argument applied to an appropriately defined map \mathbf{J}_{u_f} associated to (V.10.2) can then be used to show that $\mathfrak{R}(u_f)$ indeed remains non-empty for all $u_f > u_f^0$ (see again already Section 16.2).

2. In view of the teleological normalisation of the gauge (see Section V.3 immediately below), enlarging the bootstrap region requires an appeal to an iteration argument around the analogous linearised construction in order to select the new “final” sphere $S_{u'_f, v_\infty}$ of an enlarged region and achieve the gauge normalisations such as (V.3.1)–(V.3.2) described previously in Section V.3. Here again, estimates comparing different gauges (cf. Section V.4) are used to ensure the regularity of the relevant map.

Once it has been established that $\mathfrak{B} = [u_f^0, \infty)$, one obtains in view of (V.11.1) that there exists $\lambda^{\text{final}} = (\lambda_1^{\text{final}}, \lambda_2^{\text{final}}, \lambda_3^{\text{final}})$, such that $\lambda^{\text{final}} \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$ for all $u_f \geq u_f^0$, and a solution $(\mathcal{M}, g) := (\mathcal{M}(\lambda^{\text{final}}), g(\lambda^{\text{final}}))$ generated by data $\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}_0(\lambda^{\text{final}})$, with an M_f tending to the final Schwarzschild mass M_{final} and with “final total angular momentum” zero. We see thus how it is this collapsing of the 3-parameter family (V.1.1) which leads to the expected codimension-3 statement in the theorem.

V.12 The properties of null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ and the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+

The asymptotic stability statements for (\mathcal{M}, g) defined above and the statements about the properties of null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ as well as the existence and regularity of the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ then follow easily via an Arzela–Ascoli argument by taking the limit of the estimates obtained in the bootstrap regions (see already Section 7.7 and Chapter 17 of Part D).

The finite gauge normalisations and estimates imply that the asymptotic \mathcal{I}^+ gauge is “Bondi-normalised”, meaning that in particular one can associate to it a set \mathcal{I}^+ with coordinates (u, θ) , with $u \in [u_{-1}, \infty)$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$, and asymptotic quantities, defined on \mathcal{I}^+ , familiar from [BvdBM62, Sac62] and [CK93], for instance the Bondi news Ξ , the asymptotic shear Σ , and the rescaled curvature components \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{B} , \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{Q} , satisfying the “laws of gravitational radiation”. Given the normalisation, the fact that u exhausts the range $\in [u_{-1}, \infty)$ corresponds to the (future) completeness of null infinity. Our teleological normalisation of the gauge imposes in particular the condition that, defining $\mathbf{P}^+(\theta) := \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(u, \theta)$, we have

$$\mathbf{P}_{\ell=0}^+ = M_{\text{final}}, \quad \mathbf{P}_{\ell \geq 1}^+ = 0, \quad (\text{V.12.1})$$

while

$$\Sigma^+ := \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma = 0. \quad (\text{V.12.2})$$

The condition (V.12.1) has the interpretation that the final Schwarzschild black hole is at rest with respect to our teleologically normalised frames. The condition (V.12.2), in the language of [NP66], is the condition that the final “cut” of null infinity is asymptotically a “good cut”. Given that our two teleological gauges share a final outgoing cone C_{u_f} , one can think that the normalisation (V.12.2) is a necessary consequence of the requirement to obtain decay for all quantities at constant r .⁵ See already Section 17.1.

⁵This is in distinction with the proof of the stability of Minkowski space [CK93], where the supertranslation symmetry is not broken, corresponding to the fact that the construction of the proof in [CK93] depends on an arbitrary choice of outgoing

The uniform estimates in the asymptotic \mathcal{H}^+ normalised gauge, together with the presence of a trapped surface in the initial data which provides a barrier, allow one to extract a limiting, regular hypersurface \mathcal{H}^+ . Another appeal to local existence of the characteristic initial value problem ensures that \mathcal{H}^+ is indeed in the maximal development (\mathcal{M}, g) (and thus also a neighbourhood of \mathcal{I}^+). It is clear moreover that \mathcal{H}^+ is the future boundary of $J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$, when the latter is interpreted in the obvious way, i.e. \mathcal{H}^+ is indeed the event horizon of the black hole region of (\mathcal{M}, g) . The future completeness of \mathcal{H}^+ , together with decay along \mathcal{H}^+ for various quantities, follows directly from the estimates. See already Section 17.2.

VI Outline of the work and guide to the reader

We end this introduction with an outline of our work and a guide to the reader.

The remainder of the work is divided into four parts. In **Part A**, we shall give various preliminaries concerning double null gauge with a background Schwarzschild metric, the almost gauge invariant hierarchy satisfying the Regge–Wheeler and Teukolsky equations, teleological gauge normalisations, schematic notation, and a formalism for change of double null gauge. Then, in **Part B** we shall introduce the local theory and relevant setup necessary to give a detailed statement of the main theorem (stated as **Theorem 6.1**) and the logic of its proof. The main analytical content of the proof is contained in **Part C** which corresponds to “improving the bootstrap assumptions”. The remaining statements of the theorem including a necessary existence theorem for the gauge and the final conclusions concerning the event horizon and null infinity are obtained in **Part D**. Each part will be prefaced with a more detailed summary of its contents.

Our work has been written so that it may be read linearly. There are various alternative tracks through the work, however, that some readers—particularly the impatient reader!—may wish to pursue. In particular, the reader anxious to understand the large-scale architecture of the statement and proof of the main theorem can skip large parts of Part A after reading Chapter 1, turning directly to Part B and referring back. Part D can then be read independently of Part C. On the other hand, Part C can be understood somewhat independently of the architecture of the proof of the main theorem.

More precise directions for these alternative tracks will be given in the prologues to the various parts and chapters.

As we have noted above, the double null gauge framework used in this work is common to a host of different recent works in general relativity [Chr09, KN03, KLR14, LR17, Luk18, DL17, DHR13], as well as providing the framework for our previous complete treatment of the linear stability problem in [DHR]. Thus, the reader who has studied previously these works will find familiar much of the basic setup in Part A, as well as the architecture of the proof in Part B and the general strategy of estimates in Part C, if not their precise form. We have included helpful comparisons with some of these other works when appropriate. Conversely, we hope that the reader who encounters double null gauge for the first time in the present work will find that the effort necessary to learn this formalism pays off in making the above other works more accessible for future study.

Acknowledgements

During the preparation of this work: MD acknowledges support through NSF grants DMS-2005464, DMS-1709270 and EPSRC grant EP/K00865X/1. GH acknowledges support by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation in the framework of the Alexander von Humboldt Professorship endowed by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research and ERC Consolidator Grant 772249. MT acknowledges support through Royal Society Tata University Research Fellowship URF\R1\191409 and ERC Consolidator Grant 772249. IR acknowledges support through NSF grants DMS-2005464, DMS-1709270 and a Simons Investigator Award.

cone which is a level surface of the exterior optical function. This is still compatible with decay of all quantities for fixed r since the “interior” region was covered by a different optical functions whose null cones were not related to the null cones of the exterior optical function. In the exterior region of [CK93], on the other hand, the r decay is sufficient to compensate for the lack of decay for some fully rescaled quantities in u , so as for all nonlinearities to still be controllable.

Part A

Preliminaries

In this part of the work, we will give various preliminaries concerning the double null gauge, the Schwarzschild background (with various derived concepts), and the almost gauge invariant hierarchy and teleological gauge normalisations.

1	The vacuum Einstein equations in double null gauge and the Schwarzschild background	32
1.1	Geometric preliminaries	33
1.2	The complete set of equations	36
1.3	The Schwarzschild metric in Eddington–Finkelstein and Kruskal normalised double null coordinates	39
1.4	The $\ell = 0, 1$ modes and the reference linearised Kerr solutions	43
2	The almost gauge-invariant hierarchy and the teleological gauge normalisations	47
2.1	The almost gauge invariant hierarchy: α, ψ, P and $\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\psi}, \underline{P}$	48
2.2	The \mathcal{I}^+ gauge	48
2.3	The \mathcal{H}^+ gauge	51
3	Schematic notation and the Teukolsky and Regge–Wheeler equations	55
3.1	Schematic notation for differences and the commutation operators	56
3.2	Schematic notation for nonlinear error terms	57
3.3	Commutation identities	64
3.4	Derivation of equations satisfied by almost gauge invariant quantities	65
4	Change of double null gauge and the diffeomorphism functions	76
4.1	Local double null gauges in a vacuum spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g)	77
4.2	Change of double null gauge: the diffeomorphism functions f and their derivatives	77
4.3	Transformation laws for geometric quantities under change of gauge	79
4.4	A determination of the sphere diffeomorphism	88

We begin in **Chapter 1** with the formulation of the Einstein vacuum equations in double null gauge and the Schwarzschild background.

We shall then present in **Chapter 2** two key concepts which will play an important role in our proof: an almost gauge invariant hierarchy and the teleological gauge normalisations.

In **Chapter 3**, we shall introduce a schematic notation for differences with Schwarzschild background quantities, and derive the Teukolsky and Regge–Wheeler equations, exploiting the schematic notation to organise “error terms”.

Finally, in **Chapter 4**, we shall derive formulas relating change of gauge between two local double null parametrisations, and discuss how to break the diffeomorphism invariance of the sphere.

Chapter 1 is essential for all other chapters in the work and must be read first. The reader impatient to proceed to Part B can skip portions of Chapters 2 and 4 and almost the entirety of Chapter 3, though they will need to refer to these skipped portions to understand the energies appearing in the main theorem. We shall give more precise instructions for such a reader in the preambles of the various chapters.

Chapter 1

The vacuum Einstein equations in double null gauge and the Schwarzschild background

In this chapter we will present the Einstein vacuum equations (2) in double null gauge and associate to such a gauge a Schwarzschild background solution.

Contents

1.1	Geometric preliminaries	33
1.1.1	The plane \mathbb{R}^2 and the sphere \mathbb{S}^2	33
1.1.2	Coordinates, differentiable structure and S -tangent tensors	33
1.1.3	Metric and time orientation	34
1.1.4	Null frames and associated differential operators	34
1.1.5	Ricci coefficients and curvature components	36
1.2	The complete set of equations	36
1.2.1	The null structure equations	37
1.2.2	The Bianchi identities	38
1.2.3	Interchanging the position of the torsion term	39
1.3	The Schwarzschild metric in Eddington–Finkelstein and Kruskal normalised double null coordinates	39
1.3.1	Eddington–Finkelstein normalised double null coordinates	39
1.3.2	Kruskal normalised double null coordinates	40
1.3.3	Penrose-type representations	41
1.3.4	Schwarzschild as a background and diffeomorphisms of the sphere	41
1.3.5	The parameter M_{init} and related fixed parameters	41
1.4	The $\ell = 0, 1$ modes and the reference linearised Kerr solutions	43
1.4.1	Spherical integration and volume form	43
1.4.2	Projection onto $\ell = 0$ and $\ell = 1$ modes and spherical harmonics Y_m^ℓ	43
1.4.3	The reference linearised Kerr solutions	46

We begin in **Section 1.1** with certain geometric preliminaries concerning a manifold represented globally by a double null coordinate system. We shall then give the complete set of structure equations in **Section 1.2** resulting from (2). In **Section 1.3**, we introduce the Schwarzschild metric, expressed in two double null coordinate systems, Eddington–Finkelstein and Kruskal normalised. This will allow us to associate a Schwarzschild background to a given general solution of the vacuum equations in double null gauge. With this, we shall define in **Section 1.4** the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes and the reference linearised Kerr solutions associated to a solution.

The results and notations of this chapter will be used throughout the work. After finishing this chapter, the reader impatient to proceed to Part B may read Chapter 5 up to and including Section 5.3. (We remark in fact that Sections 5.1–5.2 of Chapter 5 only depend on Sections 1.1–1.2 here and thus could be read directly after these if the reader prefers.)

1.1 Geometric preliminaries

In this section, we give certain geometric preliminaries.

We begin in **Section 1.1.1** with some notation concerning the plane and sphere which will allow us to introduce in **Section 1.1.2** the differentiable structure of the ambient manifold associated to what will be a double null gauge. We shall consider then the metric and time orientation in **Section 1.1.3**, interpreting our previously defined coordinates as double null coordinates. We shall define associated null frames and differential operators in **Section 1.1.4**. This will allow us to define all Ricci coefficients and curvature components in **Section 1.1.5**.

The reader may wish to also consult and compare with the references [Chr09, DL17, DHR] for equations and notations very similar to those presented here. (We will point out differences arising from our slightly different conventions wherever appropriate.)

1.1.1 The plane \mathbb{R}^2 and the sphere \mathbb{S}^2

Let us fix some notation concerning the plane \mathbb{R}^2 and the sphere \mathbb{S}^2 which will be related to the domains of double null parametrisations.

We will denote the standard coordinates on \mathbb{R}^2 as (u, v) or (U, V) .

We shall consider \mathbb{S}^2 concretely, say as a subset $\mathbb{S}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3_{(x,y,z)}$. Let us fix the north pole $(0, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{S}^2$ and let (θ, ϕ) denote standard spherical coordinates defined by

$$\theta = \cos^{-1} z, \quad \phi = \tan^{-1}(y/x). \quad (1.1.1)$$

We now let $\dot{\gamma}$ denote the standard metric on \mathbb{S}^2 induced from the inclusion $\mathbb{S}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. In the spherical coordinates defined above, we have

$$\dot{\gamma} = d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2.$$

Whereas we shall always refer to standard coordinates (u, v) on \mathbb{R}^2 , on the sphere \mathbb{S}^2 , we shall often consider *general* local coordinates. We will denote such *general* local coordinates on the sphere by θ^A , where $A = 1, 2$.

We will also sometimes use the notation $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$ to denote a point on the sphere, with no reference to any particular coordinate system.

1.1.2 Coordinates, differentiable structure and S -tangent tensors

We fix some

$$\mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$$

to be a non-empty open subset. (Later, we shall allow more generally \mathcal{W} to be a 2-dimensional submanifold of \mathbb{R}^2 with piecewise smooth boundary.)

We define now

$$\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2 \quad (1.1.2)$$

We note that the standard coordinates (u, v) of \mathbb{R}^2 together with a local coordinate system θ^A , $A = 1, 2$, on \mathbb{S}^2 , as described in Section 1.1.1, define a local coordinate system (u, v, θ^A) on \mathcal{Z} .

We denote

$$S_{u,v} = \{(u, v)\} \times \mathbb{S}^2. \quad (1.1.3)$$

An S -tangent (r, s) tensor (or S -tensor for short) will be defined to be a tensor ϕ which when expressed in the coordinate basis defined by the above coordinates takes the form

$$\phi = \phi_{B_1 \dots B_s}^{A_1 \dots A_r}(u, v, \theta^1, \theta^2) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^{A_1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^{A_r}} \otimes d\theta^{B_1} \otimes \dots \otimes d\theta^{B_s}.$$

In the above, r labels the number of contravariant indices and s the number of covariant indices. We shall refer as usual to S -tangent $(1, 0)$ tensors as S -tangent vector fields, $(0, 1)$ tensors as S -tangent 1-forms, and $(0, s)$ tensors as S -tangent s -covariant tensors. Note that the notion of S -tensor does not depend on the choice of local coordinates θ^A on \mathbb{S}^2 , and defines for each fixed (u, v) a tensor on $S_{u,v}$.

1.1.3 Metric and time orientation

On \mathcal{Z} , let Ω^2 denote a smooth positive function, let b denote a smooth S -tangent 1-form and let \mathcal{g} denote a smooth S -tangent symmetric covariant 2-tensor which is assumed to be positive definite (thought of as a tensor on $S_{u,v}$).

(More generally, we will consider such tensors of suitably high regularity so that the operations to be considered in this Chapter can be defined.)

Under the above assumptions, the expression

$$g = -2\Omega^2(u, v, \theta^A)(du \otimes dv + dv \otimes du) + \mathcal{g}_{CD}(u, v, \theta^A)(d\theta^C - b^C(u, v, \theta^A)dv) \otimes (d\theta^D - b^D(u, v, \theta^A)dv) \quad (1.1.4)$$

defines a smooth Lorentzian metric on \mathcal{Z} . Note that the hypersurfaces

$$C_u := \bigcup_{v:(u,v) \in \mathcal{W}} S_{u,v}, \quad C_v := \bigcup_{u:(u,v) \in \mathcal{W}} S_{u,v}, \quad (1.1.5)$$

of constant u and v respectively, are null with respect to the above metric, while $S_{u,v}$ defined in (1.1.3) satisfies $S_{u,v} = C_u \cap C_v$ and is spacelike with induced (Riemannian) metric \mathcal{g} . We will denote by \mathcal{g}^{AB} the components of the inverse induced metric \mathcal{g}^{-1} on $S_{u,v}$ and we will denote by ϵ_{AB} the components of the volume form of \mathcal{g} .

We may time-orient the above metric (1.1.4) by the timelike vector $\partial_u + \partial_v + b^A \partial_{\theta^A}$. This makes (\mathcal{M}, g) into a 4-dimensional spacetime.

Note finally that given an arbitrary (r, s) tensor field ψ , there is a unique projection to an (r, s) S -tensor $\Pi\psi$ defined by

$$(\Pi\psi)_{B_1 \dots B_s}^{A_1 \dots A_r} = \psi_{B_1 \dots B_s}^{A_1 \dots A_r}, \quad \text{all other components vanish.}$$

This definition is independent of the choice of local coordinates θ^A on \mathbb{S}^2 .

1.1.4 Null frames and associated differential operators

We define globally on \mathcal{Z} the vector fields

$$e_3 = \Omega^{-1} \partial_u, \quad e_4 = \Omega^{-1} (\partial_v + b^A \partial_{\theta^A}). \quad (1.1.6)$$

Note that e_3 and e_4 are future-directed.

Locally, we may complete e_3 and e_4 to a so-called null frame. Let θ^A , $A = 1, 2$ denote local coordinates on \mathbb{S}^2 . Consider the S -tangent vector fields

$$e_A = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^A} \quad (1.1.7)$$

defined in a local neighbourhood on \mathcal{M} . We shall call the collection $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$ a local null frame. Note that we have

$$g(e_3, e_4) = -2, \quad g(e_3, e_A) = 0, \quad g(e_4, e_B) = 0.$$

We emphasise that e_1 and e_2 are coordinate vector fields and thus not in general orthonormal! Recall also that such a frame cannot be defined globally on all of \mathbb{S}^2 .

Note also that for covariant S -tensors ϕ , since e_A are defined to be coordinate vector fields, then the nontrivial tensor components ϕ_{A_1, \dots, A_s} satisfy $\phi_{A_1, \dots, A_s} = \phi(e_{A_1}, \dots, e_{A_s})$.

We will require various differential operators which take S -tensors to S -tensors.

We define the projected Lie derivatives \underline{D} and D to act on an S -tensor ϕ as the S -tensor projection of the Lie derivatives $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega e_3} \phi$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega e_4} \phi$, respectively, i.e.

$$\underline{D}\phi = \Pi(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega e_3} \phi), \quad D\phi = \Pi(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega e_4} \phi). \quad (1.1.8)$$

Note that the above operators map S -tangent (r, s) tensors into S -tangent (r, s) tensors.

The operator ∇ acts on an S -tensor as the induced covariant derivative on $S_{u,v}$. Note that this is well defined and raises the order of a tensor. We use the standard notation $\nabla_C \phi_{A_1, \dots, A_s}^{B_1, \dots, B_r}$ for the components of the tensor $\nabla \phi$.

The operator ∇_3 and ∇_4 acting on S -tensors at $p = (u, v, \theta)$ are the S -tensor projections of the covariant derivatives $\nabla_3 = \nabla_{e_3}$ and $\nabla_4 = \nabla_{e_4}$ respectively, i.e.

$$\nabla_3 \phi = \Pi(\nabla_3 \phi), \quad \nabla_4 \phi = \Pi(\nabla_4 \phi). \quad (1.1.9)$$

Like their projected Lie derivative analogues, the above operators (1.1.9) preserve the order of S -tensors ϕ .

Finally, for totally symmetric covariant S -tensors ϕ of rank $s+1$, we define the covariant rank s S -tensors

$$(\text{div} \phi)_{A_1 \dots A_s} := \nabla^B \nabla_B \phi_{C A_1 \dots A_s}$$

$$(\text{curl} \phi)_{A_1 \dots A_s} := \nabla^B \nabla_B \phi_{C A_1 \dots A_s}.$$

For S -tangent 1-forms ξ we will also require the operator

$$\mathcal{D}_2^* \xi = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\nabla \xi + \nabla^T \xi - \text{div} \xi \right), \quad (1.1.10)$$

where $\nabla^T \xi$ denotes the transpose of $\nabla \xi$,

$$(\nabla^T \xi)_{AB} = \nabla_B \xi_A. \quad (1.1.11)$$

In addition to the above differential operators, we define the following algebraic operations on S -tensors. Let ϑ_{AB} and $\tilde{\vartheta}_{AB}$ be symmetric covariant S -tangent 2-tensors and $\xi_A, \tilde{\xi}_A$ be covariant S -tangent 1-forms. We define

$$\begin{aligned} (\vartheta \times \tilde{\vartheta})_{BC} &:= \nabla^{AD} \vartheta_{AB} \tilde{\vartheta}_{DC} \\ (\vartheta, \tilde{\vartheta}) &:= \nabla^{AC} \nabla^{BD} \vartheta_{AB} \tilde{\vartheta}_{CD} \\ (\xi, \tilde{\xi}) &:= \nabla^{AB} \xi_A \tilde{\xi}_B \\ (\xi \hat{\otimes} \tilde{\xi})_{AB} &:= \xi_A \tilde{\xi}_B + \xi_B \tilde{\xi}_A - \nabla^{CD} \xi_C \tilde{\xi}_D \nabla_{AB} \\ \vartheta \wedge \tilde{\vartheta} &:= \nabla^{AB} \nabla^{CD} \vartheta_{AC} \tilde{\vartheta}_{BD}. \end{aligned}$$

For totally symmetric covariant S -tensors of rank $s+2$ we define

$$(\text{tr} \phi)_{A_1 \dots A_s} := \nabla^{BC} \phi_{BC A_1 \dots A_s}.$$

For S -tangent 1-forms ξ_A and symmetric covariant S -tangent 2-tensors ϑ_{AB} we define the Hodge duals $^* \xi_A$ and $^* \vartheta_{AB}$ by the expressions

$$^* \xi_A := \nabla_{AC} \nabla^{CB} \xi_B, \quad ^* \vartheta_{AB} := \nabla_{BD} \nabla^{DC} \vartheta_{AC}.$$

For a (not necessarily symmetric) 2-covariant S -tensor field ϑ_{AB} and an S -tangent 1-form ξ_A we note the musical operations

$$\vartheta_A^\#{}^C = \vartheta_{AB} \nabla^{BC}, \quad \xi^\#{}^C = \xi_A \nabla^{AC},$$

defining S -tangent $(1, 1)$ and $(1, 0)$ tensors, respectively.

For an S -tensor T , we shall often use the coercive expression

$$|T|_\nabla^2 := \nabla^{A_1 B_1} \dots \nabla^{A_k B_k} T_{A_1 \dots A_k} T_{B_1 \dots B_k}. \quad (1.1.12)$$

1.1.5 Ricci coefficients and curvature components

We have already given examples of Ricci coefficients and curvature components in Section I.1. Here, we give the complete list, expressed in terms of a local null frame e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4 . We use the notation $\nabla_A = \nabla_{e_A}$, where ∇ denotes the covariant derivative of g .

Note that although the definition is given in terms of a local null frame, the definitions below determine the components of globally defined covariant S -tangent tensors, expressed in a local coordinate system θ^A .

The complete list of Ricci coefficients¹ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_{AB} &:= g(\nabla_A e_4, e_B), & \underline{\chi}_{AB} &:= g(\nabla_A e_3, e_B), \\ \eta_A &:= -\frac{1}{2}g(\nabla_3 e_A, e_4), & \underline{\eta}_A &:= -\frac{1}{2}g(\nabla_4 e_A, e_3), \\ \hat{\omega} &:= \frac{1}{2}g(\nabla_4 e_3, e_4), & \hat{\underline{\omega}} &:= \frac{1}{2}g(\nabla_3 e_4, e_3).\end{aligned}$$

We will further decompose χ_{AB} , resp. $\underline{\chi}_{AB}$ into its trace-free part $\hat{\chi}_{AB}$, resp. $\hat{\underline{\chi}}_{AB}$, a symmetric trace-free S -tangent 2-tensor, and its trace $\text{tr}\chi$, resp. $\text{tr}\underline{\chi}$, i.e. we define

$$\hat{\chi}_{AB} := \chi_{AB} - \frac{1}{2}(\text{tr}\chi)\not{g}_{AB}, \quad \hat{\underline{\chi}}_{AB} = \underline{\chi}_{AB} - \frac{1}{2}(\text{tr}\underline{\chi})\not{g}_{AB}.$$

The complete list of curvature components is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_{AB} &:= R(e_A, e_4, e_B, e_4), & \underline{\alpha}_{AB} &:= R(e_A, e_3, e_B, e_3), \\ \beta_A &:= \frac{1}{2}R(e_A, e_4, e_3, e_4), & \underline{\beta}_A &:= \frac{1}{2}R(e_A, e_3, e_4, e_3), \\ \rho &:= \frac{1}{4}R(e_4, e_3, e_4, e_3), & \sigma &:= \frac{1}{4}{}^*R(e_4, e_3, e_4, e_3).\end{aligned}$$

Here, R denotes the Riemann curvature tensor of g , defined as usual by

$$R(W, Z, X, Y) = g(R(X, Y)Z, W) = g(\nabla_X \nabla_Y Z - \nabla_Y \nabla_X Z - [X, Y]Z, W)$$

and $*$ denotes the Hodge star operation. Note moreover that by the symmetries of the curvature tensor, α and $\underline{\alpha}$ are symmetric.

Define also the mass aspect functions²

$$\mu = d\not{v}\eta + \rho - \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\chi}, \hat{\underline{\chi}}), \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\mu} = d\not{v}\underline{\eta} + \rho - \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\underline{\chi}}, \hat{\chi}). \quad (1.1.13)$$

1.2 The complete set of equations

We now assume that the metric g of (1.1.4) satisfies the Einstein vacuum equations

$$\text{Ric}[g] = 0, \quad (1.2.1)$$

where as usual

$$\text{Ric}(X, Y) = \text{tr}(Z \mapsto R(Z, X)Y).$$

The content of (1.2.1) is expressed in the null structure and Bianchi identities satisfied by the Ricci coefficients and curvature components. Let us note already that α and $\underline{\alpha}$ are traceless symmetric S -tangent covariant 2-tensors under the assumption (1.2.1), i.e.

$$\text{tr}\alpha = 0, \quad \text{tr}\underline{\alpha} = 0.$$

We display in **Section 1.2.1** the null structure equations (with the Ricci coefficients on the left hand side) and in **Section 1.2.2** the Bianchi identities (with the curvature components on the left hand side). Finally, in **Section 1.2.3**, we note the different form the equations take if the position of the torsion term in (1.1.4) is interchanged.

¹In comparing formulas with [DL17], note that the $\hat{\omega}$ here corresponds to -2ω of [DL17], and similarly $\hat{\underline{\omega}}$ here corresponds to $-2\underline{\omega}$ of [DL17].

²In comparing formulas with [Chr09], note that the μ here corresponds to $-\mu$ of [Chr09], and similarly $\underline{\mu}$ here corresponds to $-\underline{\mu}$ of [Chr09].

1.2.1 The null structure equations

We give in this section the null structure equations.

We first note the relation of the projected Lie and covariant derivatives. For scalar functions f , we clearly have $Df = \Omega \nabla_4 f$, $\underline{D}f = \Omega \nabla_3 f$. For S -tangent 1-forms, we have

$$D\xi = \Omega(\nabla_4 \xi + \chi^\sharp \cdot \xi), \quad \underline{D}\xi = \Omega(\nabla_3 \xi + \underline{\chi}^\sharp \cdot \xi). \quad (1.2.2)$$

For S -tangent symmetric covariant 2-tensors, we have

$$D\vartheta = \Omega(\nabla_4 \vartheta + \chi \times \vartheta + \vartheta \times \chi), \quad \underline{D}\vartheta = \Omega(\nabla_3 \vartheta + \underline{\chi} \times \vartheta + \vartheta \times \underline{\chi}). \quad (1.2.3)$$

In particular, in the case where ϑ is trace-free, these simplify to

$$D\vartheta = \Omega(\nabla_4 \vartheta + \text{tr}\chi \vartheta), \quad \underline{D}\vartheta = \Omega(\nabla_3 \vartheta + \text{tr}\underline{\chi} \vartheta). \quad (1.2.4)$$

We have the first variational formulae:

$$D\mathcal{G} = 2\Omega\chi = 2\Omega\hat{\chi} + \Omega\text{tr}\chi\mathcal{G} \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{D}\mathcal{G} = 2\Omega\underline{\chi} = 2\Omega\hat{\underline{\chi}} + \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}\mathcal{G}. \quad (1.2.5)$$

These formulae are in fact equivalent to the statement that $\nabla_3 \mathcal{G} = 0 = \nabla_4 \mathcal{G}$.

We then have the following set of transport equations for the so-called shear and expansion:

$$\nabla_3 \hat{\chi} + \text{tr}\underline{\chi} \hat{\chi} - \hat{\omega} \hat{\chi} = -\alpha, \quad \nabla_4 \hat{\chi} + \text{tr}\chi \hat{\chi} - \hat{\omega} \hat{\chi} = -\alpha, \quad (1.2.6)$$

$$\nabla_3 \text{tr}\underline{\chi} + \frac{1}{2}(\text{tr}\underline{\chi})^2 - \hat{\omega} \text{tr}\underline{\chi} = -(\hat{\chi}, \hat{\chi}), \quad \nabla_4 \text{tr}\chi + \frac{1}{2}(\text{tr}\chi)^2 - \hat{\omega} \text{tr}\chi = -(\hat{\chi}, \hat{\chi}). \quad (1.2.7)$$

Note that the last two equations constitute the celebrated Raychaudhuri equations.

The same quantities satisfy an alternative set of transport equations in the conjugate null directions:

$$\nabla_3 \hat{\chi} + \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\underline{\chi} \hat{\chi} + \hat{\omega} \hat{\chi} = -2\mathcal{D}_2^* \eta - \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\chi \hat{\chi} + \eta \hat{\otimes} \eta, \quad (1.2.8)$$

$$\nabla_4 \hat{\chi} + \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\chi \hat{\chi} + \hat{\omega} \hat{\chi} = -2\mathcal{D}_2^* \underline{\eta} - \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\underline{\chi} \hat{\chi} + \underline{\eta} \hat{\otimes} \underline{\eta}, \quad (1.2.9)$$

$$\nabla_3 \text{tr}\chi + \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\underline{\chi} \text{tr}\chi + \hat{\omega} \text{tr}\chi = -(\hat{\chi}, \hat{\chi}) + 2(\eta, \eta) + 2\rho + 2\text{d}\not{v}\eta, \quad (1.2.10)$$

$$\nabla_4 \text{tr}\underline{\chi} + \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\chi \text{tr}\underline{\chi} + \hat{\omega} \text{tr}\underline{\chi} = -(\hat{\chi}, \hat{\chi}) + 2(\underline{\eta}, \underline{\eta}) + 2\rho + 2\text{d}\not{v}\underline{\eta}. \quad (1.2.11)$$

We then have the following remaining transport equations:

$$\nabla_3 \underline{\eta} + \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\underline{\chi} \underline{\eta} = \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\underline{\chi} \eta + \hat{\chi}^\sharp \cdot (\eta - \underline{\eta}) + \underline{\beta}, \quad \nabla_4 \eta + \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\chi \eta = \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\chi \underline{\eta} - \hat{\chi}^\sharp \cdot (\eta - \underline{\eta}) - \beta, \quad (1.2.12)$$

$$\nabla_4 \underline{\eta} + \text{tr}\chi \underline{\eta} = \frac{2}{\Omega} \nabla(\Omega \hat{\omega}) + \beta - 2\hat{\chi} \cdot \underline{\eta}, \quad (1.2.13)$$

$$\nabla_3 \eta + \text{tr}\underline{\chi} \eta = \frac{2}{\Omega} \nabla(\Omega \hat{\omega}) - \underline{\beta} - 2\underline{\chi} \cdot \eta, \quad (1.2.14)$$

$$\Omega^{-1}\nabla_4(\Omega\hat{\omega}) = 2(\eta, \underline{\eta}) - |\eta|^2 - \rho, \quad \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(\Omega\hat{\omega}) = 2(\eta, \underline{\eta}) - |\underline{\eta}|^2 - \rho, \quad (1.2.15)$$

$$\partial_u b^A = 2\Omega^2(\eta^A - \underline{\eta}^A). \quad (1.2.16)$$

Finally we have the following tangential equations on $S_{u,v}$:

$$\text{curl}\eta = -\frac{1}{2}\hat{\chi} \wedge \hat{\chi} + \sigma \quad \text{and} \quad \text{curl}\underline{\eta} = \frac{1}{2}\hat{\chi} \wedge \hat{\chi} - \sigma, \quad (1.2.17)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{div}\hat{\chi} &= -\frac{1}{2}\hat{\chi}^\sharp \cdot (\eta - \underline{\eta}) + \frac{1}{4}\text{tr}\chi(\eta - \underline{\eta}) + \frac{1}{2}\nabla\text{tr}\chi - \beta \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\hat{\chi}^\sharp \cdot (\eta - \underline{\eta}) - \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\chi\underline{\eta} + \frac{1}{2\Omega}\nabla(\Omega\text{tr}\chi) - \beta, \end{aligned} \quad (1.2.18)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{div}\hat{\chi} &= \frac{1}{2}\hat{\chi}^\sharp \cdot (\eta - \underline{\eta}) - \frac{1}{4}\text{tr}\chi(\eta - \underline{\eta}) + \frac{1}{2}\nabla\text{tr}\chi + \underline{\beta} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\hat{\chi}^\sharp \cdot (\eta - \underline{\eta}) - \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\chi\underline{\eta} + \frac{1}{2\Omega}\nabla(\Omega\text{tr}\chi) + \underline{\beta}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.2.19)$$

The latter two equations represent the well-known Codazzi equations.

We finally note the Gauss equation

$$K = -\frac{1}{4}\text{tr}\chi\text{tr}\chi + \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\chi}, \hat{\chi}) - \rho, \quad (1.2.20)$$

where K denotes the Gauss curvature of $S_{u,v}$, and the relations

$$\eta + \underline{\eta} = 2\nabla\log\Omega, \quad \hat{\omega} = \nabla_4\log\Omega, \quad \hat{\omega} = \nabla_3\log\Omega. \quad (1.2.21)$$

1.2.2 The Bianchi identities

To complete our system of equations, we record the *Bianchi identities* satisfied by the curvature components:

$$\nabla_3\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\chi\alpha + 2\hat{\omega}\alpha = -2\mathcal{P}_2^*\beta - 3\hat{\chi}\rho - 3^*\hat{\chi}\sigma + \frac{1}{2}(9\eta - \underline{\eta}) \hat{\otimes}\beta, \quad (1.2.22)$$

$$\nabla_4\beta + 2\text{tr}\chi\beta - \hat{\omega}\beta = \text{div}\alpha + \eta^\sharp \cdot \alpha, \quad (1.2.23)$$

$$\nabla_3\beta + \text{tr}\chi\beta + \hat{\omega}\beta = \nabla\rho + ^*\nabla\sigma + 3\eta\rho + 3^*\eta\sigma + 2\hat{\chi}^\sharp \cdot \underline{\beta}, \quad (1.2.24)$$

$$\nabla_4\rho + \frac{3}{2}\text{tr}\chi\rho = \text{div}\beta + \frac{1}{2}(\eta + 3\underline{\eta}, \beta) - \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\chi}, \alpha), \quad (1.2.25)$$

$$\nabla_4\sigma + \frac{3}{2}\text{tr}\chi\sigma = -\text{curl}\beta - \frac{1}{2}(\eta + 3\underline{\eta}) \wedge \beta + \frac{1}{2}\hat{\chi} \wedge \alpha, \quad (1.2.26)$$

$$\nabla_3\rho + \frac{3}{2}\text{tr}\chi\rho = -\text{div}\underline{\beta} - \frac{1}{2}(3\eta + \underline{\eta}, \underline{\beta}) - \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\chi}, \underline{\alpha}), \quad (1.2.27)$$

$$\nabla_3\sigma + \frac{3}{2}\text{tr}\chi\sigma = -\text{curl}\underline{\beta} - \frac{1}{2}(3\eta + \underline{\eta}) \wedge \underline{\beta} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{\chi} \wedge \underline{\alpha}, \quad (1.2.28)$$

$$\nabla_4\underline{\beta} + \text{tr}\chi\underline{\beta} + \hat{\omega}\underline{\beta} = -\nabla\rho + ^*\nabla\sigma - 3\underline{\eta}\rho + 3^*\underline{\eta}\sigma + 2\hat{\chi}^\sharp \cdot \beta, \quad (1.2.29)$$

$$\nabla_3\underline{\beta} + 2\text{tr}\chi\underline{\beta} - \hat{\omega}\underline{\beta} = -\text{div}\underline{\alpha} - \underline{\eta}^\sharp \cdot \underline{\alpha}, \quad (1.2.30)$$

$$\nabla_4\underline{\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\chi\underline{\alpha} + 2\hat{\omega}\underline{\alpha} = 2\mathcal{P}_2^*\underline{\beta} - 3\underline{\hat{\chi}}\rho + 3^*\underline{\hat{\chi}}\sigma - \frac{1}{2}(9\underline{\eta} - \eta) \hat{\otimes}\underline{\beta}. \quad (1.2.31)$$

1.2.3 Interchanging the position of the torsion term

We shall also consider double null metrics on \mathcal{Z} in the form

$$g = -2\Omega^2(u, v, \theta^A)(du \otimes dv + dv \otimes du) + \not{g}_{CD}(u, v, \theta^A)(d\theta^C - b^C(u, v, \theta^A)du) \otimes (d\theta^D - b^D(u, v, \theta^A)du), \quad (1.2.32)$$

i.e. with the torsion term b multiplying du in place of dv . This just interchanges the role of u and v so that the relevant formulas can immediately be derived from the formulas above. Note that the null pair (1.1.6) is now replaced by

$$e_3 = \Omega^{-1}(\partial_u + b^A \partial_{\theta^A}), \quad e_4 = \Omega^{-1} \partial_v. \quad (1.2.33)$$

Note that there is an asymmetry in the roles of e_3 and e_4 in the definition of β and $\underline{\beta}$. As a result of this, we may repeat all definitions as in Section 1.1 where we replace (1.1.4) with (1.2.32), and all equations in Section 1.2 remain valid in precisely their original form, except for (1.2.16), which becomes

$$\partial_v b^A = -2\Omega^2(\eta^A - \underline{\eta}^A). \quad (1.2.34)$$

1.3 The Schwarzschild metric in Eddington–Finkelstein and Kruskal normalised double null coordinates

In this section, we shall give two concrete realisations of the Schwarzschild metric with mass $M > 0$ expressed in so-called Eddington–Finkelstein and Kruskal normalised double null coordinates. We shall define these coordinates in **Sections 1.3.1** and **1.3.2**, respectively, while in **Section 1.3.3** we shall describe how these coordinate ranges are represented as Penrose diagrams. In **Section 1.3.4**, we shall associate a Schwarzschild background with a double null gauge, describing the ambiguity in choosing the diffeomorphism to the sphere. Finally, in **Section 1.3.5** we shall fix a reference parameter M_{init} and collect a number of parameters depending on M_{init} which will be used later in this work.

1.3.1 Eddington–Finkelstein normalised double null coordinates

In the notation of Section 1.1.2, we let $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}} := \mathbb{R}^2$ with coordinates u, v . We shall refer to the coordinates u and v as retarded and advanced Eddington–Finkelstein null coordinates. Let $\hat{\gamma}$ denote the standard metric on \mathbb{S}^2 as defined in Section 1.1.1.

Let us fix $M > 0$. On the manifold $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{EF}} := \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}} \times \mathbb{S}^2$, we define the metric

$$g_{\circ, M} = -2\Omega_{\circ, M}^2(u, v)(du \otimes dv + dv \otimes du) + r_M^2(u, v)\hat{\gamma}_{AB}d\theta^A \otimes d\theta^B \quad (1.3.1)$$

where the function $r_M(u, v)$ is defined implicitly by the relation

$$\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r_M(u, v)}\right) \frac{r_M(u, v)}{2M} \exp\left(\frac{r_M(u, v)}{2M}\right) = \exp\left(\frac{v - u}{2M}\right), \quad (1.3.2)$$

and

$$\Omega_{\circ, M}^2(u, v) := 1 - \frac{2M}{r_M}. \quad (1.3.3)$$

The expression (1.3.1) describes the Schwarzschild metric with mass M , expressed in Eddington–Finkelstein normalised double null coordinates (see [Edd24, Fin58] for what is essentially the outgoing null coordinate v).

Note that we may view (1.3.1) as being in either the form (1.1.4) or in (1.2.32), with the metric coefficient functions given by (1.3.3), and

$$b_{\circ, M} = 0, \quad \not{g}_{\circ, M} = r_M^2 \hat{\gamma}.$$

We record here the non-vanishing Ricci coefficients and curvature components associated to (1.3.1):

$$\Omega_{\circ, M}^2 = 1 - \frac{2M}{r_M}, \quad (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\circ, M} = \frac{2\Omega_{\circ, M}^2}{r_M}, \quad (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\circ, M} = -\frac{2\Omega_{\circ, M}^2}{r_M}, \quad (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\circ, M} = \frac{M}{r_M^2}, \quad (\Omega \underline{\hat{\omega}})_{\circ, M} = -\frac{M}{r_M^2}, \quad (1.3.4)$$

and

$$\rho_{\circ,M} = -\frac{2M}{r_M^3}, \quad K_{\circ,M} = \frac{1}{r_M^2}. \quad (1.3.5)$$

The value of the mass M will often be clear from the context, in which case M is omitted from the subscript and we write Ω_{\circ}^2 , r , etc.

Let us also introduce the following notation: Given $r' > 2M$, we define

$$v(r', u) := v : r_M(u, v) = r'. \quad (1.3.6)$$

Note that the above v is unique and for fixed r' this defines a smooth increasing function of u .

1.3.2 Kruskal normalised double null coordinates

Now let $\mathbb{R}_{U,V}^2$ denote \mathbb{R}^2 with coordinates U and V and consider $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}} \subset \mathbb{R}_{U,V}^2$ to be the region $UV < 1$. We shall refer to U and V as Kruskal normalised retarded and advanced coordinates. Let γ denote the standard metric on \mathbb{S}^2 as defined in Section 1.1.1.

On the manifold $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{K}} := \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}} \times \mathbb{S}^2$, we define the metric

$$g_{\circ,M,\mathcal{K}} = -2\Omega_{\circ,M,\mathcal{K}}^2(U, V)(dU \otimes dV + dV \otimes dU) + r_{M,\mathcal{K}}^2(U, V)\gamma_{AB}d\theta^A \otimes d\theta^B \quad (1.3.7)$$

where $r_{M,\mathcal{K}}(U, V)$ is defined by the relation

$$\left(\frac{r_{M,\mathcal{K}}(U, V)}{2M} - 1\right) \exp\left(\frac{r_{M,\mathcal{K}}(U, V)}{2M}\right) = -UV \quad (1.3.8)$$

and

$$\Omega_{\circ,M,\mathcal{K}}^2(U, V) = \frac{8M^3}{r_{M,\mathcal{K}}} \exp\left(-\frac{r_{M,\mathcal{K}}}{2M}\right). \quad (1.3.9)$$

Again, we may view (1.3.7) as being in either the form (1.1.4) or in (1.2.32), as $b = 0$.

The non-vanishing Ricci coefficients and curvature components associated to (1.3.7) are

$$\Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ,M,\mathcal{K}} = \frac{2M}{V} \frac{2}{r_{M,\mathcal{K}}} \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r_{M,\mathcal{K}}}\right), \quad \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ,M,\mathcal{K}} = -V \frac{8M^2}{r_{M,\mathcal{K}}^2} \exp\left(-\frac{r_{M,\mathcal{K}}}{2M}\right), \quad \rho_{\circ,M,\mathcal{K}} = -\frac{2M}{r_{M,\mathcal{K}}^3}, \quad (1.3.10)$$

and

$$\Omega \hat{\omega}_{\circ,M,\mathcal{K}} = -\frac{1}{2r_{M,\mathcal{K}}} \left(1 + \frac{2M}{r_{M,\mathcal{K}}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r_{M,\mathcal{K}}}\right), \quad \Omega \hat{\omega}_{\circ,M,\mathcal{K}} = V \frac{M}{r_{M,\mathcal{K}}} \left(1 + \frac{2M}{r_{M,\mathcal{K}}}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{r_{M,\mathcal{K}}}{2M}\right). \quad (1.3.11)$$

As is well known, the expression (1.3.7) again represents the Schwarzschild metric with mass M , but now in Kruskal normalised double null coordinates (see [Kru60]). We may identify the manifold $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Lemaître}}$ discussed in Section I.2 as the subregion $V > 0$. The map

$$\iota_M : \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}} \quad (1.3.12)$$

given by

$$U = -\exp\left(-\frac{u}{2M}\right), \quad V = \exp\left(\frac{v}{2M}\right), \quad (1.3.13)$$

gives rise to an embedding $\iota_M \times id_{\mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2}$ taking $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{EF}} = \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ into $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ with

$$\iota_M(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}) = \{U < 0\} \cap \{V > 0\} \subset \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}},$$

such that

$$g_{\circ,M} = (\iota_M \times id)^* g_{\circ,M,\mathcal{K}},$$

where $g_{\circ,M}$ was defined by (1.3.1), in particular

$$r_M = \iota_M^* r_{M,\mathcal{K}}, \quad (1.3.14)$$

where r_M was defined by (1.3.2).

In what follows, the use of capital letters U and V will be sufficient to distinguish the functions $r_{M,\mathcal{K}}(U, V)$ from $r_M(u, v)$, and thus, in view also of (1.3.14), we will drop the \mathcal{K} subscript from r (as well as the M subscript, as discussed in Section 1.3.2). Similarly, we will often drop the M subscript as from the map (1.3.12), when the choice of M is implicit.




Figure 1.1: Kruskal and Eddington–Finkelstein double null coordinates superimposed on a Penrose diagram

1.3.3 Penrose-type representations

We shall often depict yet another representation of spacetime, which refers to a set of null coordinates which are *globally bounded*. One can obtain such a representation trivially by suitably rescaling U and V . So as to avoid the unnecessary further proliferation of symbols, we shall not attempt here to name such new coordinates but we shall often superimpose Kruskal and Eddington–Finkelstein double null coordinate labels on such a diagram. Refer to Figure 1.1.

1.3.4 Schwarzschild as a background and diffeomorphisms of the sphere

In this work, we shall use the two alternative double null gauges defined in Sections 1.3.1 and 1.3.2 above to define Schwarzschild backgrounds corresponding to a metric as in Section 1.1.3.

That is to say, consider \mathcal{Z} as in Section 1.1.2 given by (1.1.2), with $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$.

Assume that we have a metric g on \mathcal{Z} expressed as (1.1.4) (or alternatively (1.2.32)), satisfying (1.2.1).

Since we have $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}$, by identifying the standard coordinates, we may now consider, in addition to g , also the Schwarzschild metric $g_{\circ, M}$ with mass $M > 0$ defined on the same set \mathcal{Z} by the expression (1.3.1).

We shall call $g_{\circ, M}$ the Eddington–Finkelstein Schwarzschild background defined by our choice of double null gauge.

(We may alternatively, if $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{K}}$, consider on \mathcal{Z} the Schwarzschild metric defined by (1.3.7). If we are to do this, we shall denote the coordinates of \mathcal{Z} with capital U, V .)

Let us remark already that if we consider a diffeomorphism $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{EF}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{EF}}$ of the form

$$\text{id} \times \psi : \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}} \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}} \times \mathbb{S}^2, \quad (1.3.15)$$

where $\psi : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ is a diffeomorphism, then this covariantly induces a new solution $(\text{id} \times \psi)_* g$ of the vacuum equations on \mathcal{Z} , again expressed in the form (1.1.4) (or alternatively (1.2.32)).

Considering Schwarzschild as a background, however, breaks the diffeomorphism invariance, as $(\text{id} \times \psi)_* g - g_{\circ, M} \neq (\text{id} \times \psi)_* (g - g_{\circ, M})$ unless ψ is an isometry of the standard metric $\hat{\gamma}$ on \mathbb{S}^2 . We note already, however, that several of the background functions are invariant to transformation by such a (1.3.15), for instance, the function r and all the quantities (1.3.4) and (1.3.5).

1.3.5 The parameter M_{init} and related fixed parameters

Let us fix now a parameter

$$M_{\text{init}} > 0. \quad (1.3.16)$$

Associated to M_{init} will be a smallness parameter

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_0(M_{\text{init}}), \quad (1.3.17)$$

which will be constrained at various stages within the proof. We shall consider Schwarzschild metrics of various masses M , but we shall always assume

$$|M - M_{\text{init}}| \lesssim \hat{\varepsilon}_0. \quad (1.3.18)$$

Here and in what follows, $A \lesssim B$ for nonnegative A and B denotes $A \leq CB$ where $C > 0$ is a constant depending only on M_{init} .

In our proof we shall require a variety of u , v and r parameters depending on M_{init} .

We first shall require a large value

$$R := R(M_{\text{init}}) > M_{\text{init}}\delta^{-2} \quad (1.3.19)$$

which will moreover be further constrained later in the paper, specifically in (13.3.35) and (13.7.27) and in the proof of Propositions 14.3.25 and 14.3.27, where each time R is constrained in terms of explicitly computable constants depending only on M_{init} . Here

$$\delta := \frac{1}{100}. \quad (1.3.20)$$

For a real number $c \in \mathbb{R}$, let us introduce the notation

$$R_c := R + cM_{\text{init}}.$$

We shall now require a set of u and v values, together with corresponding sets of U and V values defined via $\iota_{M_{\text{init}}}$.

Let us define $u_{-2} := 0$, and the corresponding $U_{-2} := -1$ defined by (1.3.13) with $M = M_{\text{init}}$, and define $v_{-2} := 0$ such that, and correspondingly $V_{-2} := 1$.

We choose seven additional parameters

$$u_4 > u_3 > u_2 > u_f^0 > u_1 > u_0 > u_{-1} > u_{-2} = 0, \quad (1.3.21)$$

and four additional parameters

$$v_3 > v_2 > v_0 > v_{-1} > v_{-2} = 0, \quad (1.3.22)$$

all depending only on M_{init} , such that

$$r_{M_{\text{init}}}(u_{-2}, v_0) = r_{M_{\text{init}}}(u_{-2}, v_{-2}) + M_{\text{init}}, \quad (1.3.23)$$

$$r_{M_{\text{init}}}(u_0, v_2) = R_4, \quad r_{M_{\text{init}}}(u_f^0, v_3) \geq R_5 \quad (1.3.24)$$

$$r_{M_{\text{init}}}(u_1, v_2) = R_3 \quad (1.3.25)$$

and

$$r_{M_{\text{init}}}(u_3, v_3) \leq R_{-2} \quad (1.3.26)$$

and such that u_f^0 is sufficiently large, by a condition to be determined in Section 5 (the condition (5.9.5) from Remark 5.9.3, necessary for the validity of Proposition 5.9.2) together with the condition

$$u_f^0 - 2M_{\text{init}} \geq u_1. \quad (1.3.27)$$

(Note that the above constraints can indeed be satisfied for R and u_f^0 arbitrary large. Thus, we first select R and u_f^0 sufficiently large, and then the remaining parameters.)

Finally, we shall choose

$$U_5 > 0 \quad (1.3.28)$$

such that $r(V_3, U_5) = M_{\text{init}}$, where V_3 corresponds to v_3 by (1.3.13).

The role of these parameters will become clear when we discuss the boundaries of the domains of various gauges in Sections 2.2, 2.3 and 5.5. We note already that we shall introduce in Section 10.3 an additional parameter v_1 satisfying $v_0 < v_1 < v_2$, but this parameter will depend on an actual solution and will thus be variable.

1.4 The $\ell = 0, 1$ modes and the reference linearised Kerr solutions

We will consider a subset \mathcal{Z} as in Section 1.1.2 given by (1.1.2), with $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. We will assume that we have a metric g on \mathcal{Z} expressed as (1.1.4) (or alternatively (1.2.32)), satisfying (1.2.1).

As in Section 1.3.4, we shall now consider, in addition to g , also the Schwarzschild metric $g_{\circ, M}$ with mass $M > 0$ defined on the same set \mathcal{Z} by the expression (1.3.1).

We define in this section the $\ell = 0$ and $\ell = 1$ modes and the reference linearised Kerr solutions. These definitions will all depend on the metric g . We first shall discuss in **Section 1.4.1** integration over spheres. We shall define the projections to $\ell = 0$ and $\ell = 1$ spherical harmonics in **Section 1.4.2**. (This will require an additional assumption of closeness to the spherical metric.) We shall finally define the reference linearised Kerr solutions in **Section 1.4.3**.

1.4.1 Spherical integration and volume form

As usual, let us denote by r the function $r = r_{\circ, M}$ on $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ induced by the background Schwarzschild metric $g_{\circ, M}$.

Integrals over spheres $S_{u, v}$ will typically involve the volume form $r^{-2} \sqrt{\det g} d\theta^1 d\theta^2$ and so, accordingly, define

$$d\theta := r^{-2} \sqrt{\det g} d\theta^1 d\theta^2. \quad (1.4.1)$$

We remark already that this volume form will be comparable to that of the round unit sphere metric.

We note however that the volume form changes covariantly under diffeomorphisms of the form (1.3.15). In particular, the integral

$$\int_{S_{u, v}} f d\theta$$

is well defined and invariant to diffeomorphism of the form (1.3.15). We may also define the L^2 inner product

$$(a, b) = \int_{S_{u, v}} ab d\theta. \quad (1.4.2)$$

1.4.2 Projection onto $\ell = 0$ and $\ell = 1$ modes and spherical harmonics Y_m^ℓ

We define in this section the projection onto “low” spherical harmonics.

1.4.2.1 The operator $\mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla$ and the projections for functions and one-forms

Recall the operator \mathcal{P}_2^* acting on S -tangent 1-forms ξ defined by (1.1.10). Consider now the operator $\mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla$. This operates on scalar functions.

Proposition 1.4.1. *Given $(u, v) \in \mathcal{W}$, suppose g is sufficiently close to the round metric on $S_{u, v}$ in the geometric sense, i.e. there exists a diffeomorphism $\psi : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ such that for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$|r^{-2} g(u, v, \theta) - \psi^* \hat{g}| < \epsilon. \quad (1.4.3)$$

Then, thought of as an operator on $C^\infty(S_{u, v})$, we have

$$\dim \text{Ker}(\mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla) = 4,$$

and the projection $\Pi_{\text{Ker}(\mathcal{P}_2^ \nabla)}$ defines a continuous map $C^\infty(\mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2)$.*

Remark 1.4.2. *We have formulated the assumption (1.4.3) allowing for ψ to highlight its geometric nature. In practice, however, we shall always apply this with ψ as the identity.*

Constant functions on $S_{u,v}$ are evidently elements of $\text{Ker}(\mathcal{D}_2^* \nabla)$.
Under the assumptions of Proposition 1.4.1, we may decompose

$$\dim \text{Ker}(\mathcal{D}_2^* \nabla) = \mathcal{Y}_0 + \mathcal{Y}_1$$

where

$$\mathcal{Y}^0 := \text{span}\{1\}$$

and where

$$\mathcal{Y}^1 := \text{span}\{1\}^\perp \subset \text{Ker}(\mathcal{D}_2^* \nabla),$$

where the orthogonal complement is taken in the space $\text{Ker}(\mathcal{D}_2^* \nabla)$ using the L^2 inner product on the sphere $S_{u,v}$ given by (1.4.2).

For a smooth scalar function $f(u, v, \theta)$, we may now define

$$f_{\ell=0}(u, v, \theta) = \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}^0} f(u, v, \theta), \quad (1.4.4)$$

$$f_{\ell=1}(u, v, \theta) = \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}^1} f(u, v, \theta), \quad (1.4.5)$$

$$f_{\ell \geq 1}(u, v, \theta) = f - f_{\ell=0}, \quad (1.4.6)$$

$$f_{\ell \neq 1}(u, v, \theta) = f - f_{\ell=1}, \quad (1.4.7)$$

$$f_{\ell \geq 2}(u, v, \theta) = f - \Pi_{\text{Ker}(\mathcal{D}_2^* \nabla)} f = f - f_{\ell=0} - f_{\ell=1}, \quad (1.4.8)$$

where Π denotes orthogonal projection with respect to (1.4.2). By Proposition 1.4.1, these functions are again smooth.

To define projections on 1-forms, let us first recall that, for any function $h(u, v, \theta)$, the Hodge dual of the gradient of h is the one form defined by

$$r^* \nabla_A h := \epsilon_{AB} g^{BC} r^* \nabla_C h,$$

where g is the induced metric on the sphere $S_{u,v}$ and ϵ is the induced volume form. Recall the following Hodge decomposition of a 1-form (which follows from standard elliptic theory):

Proposition 1.4.3. *Under the assumption of Proposition 1.4.1, any smooth S -tangent 1-form ξ can be uniquely decomposed as*

$$\xi(u, v, \theta) = r^* \nabla h_{1,\xi}(u, v, \theta) + r^* \nabla h_{2,\xi}(u, v, \theta),$$

where $h_{1,\xi}(u, v, \theta)$, $h_{2,\xi}(u, v, \theta)$ are smooth functions such that $(h_{1,\xi})_{\ell=0} = (h_{2,\xi})_{\ell=0} = 0$.

Thus, under the assumptions of Proposition 1.4.1, given an S -tangent 1-form ξ , define the smooth S -tangent 1-forms

$$\xi_{\ell=1}(u, v, \theta) = r^* \nabla(h_{1,\xi})_{\ell=1}(u, v, \theta) + r^* \nabla(h_{2,\xi})_{\ell=1}(u, v, \theta),$$

and

$$\xi_{\ell \geq 2}(u, v, \theta) = r^* \nabla(h_{1,\xi})_{\ell \geq 2}(u, v, \theta) + r^* \nabla(h_{2,\xi})_{\ell \geq 2}(u, v, \theta),$$

where $h_{1,\xi}$ and $h_{2,\xi}$ are as in Proposition 1.4.3.

Remark 1.4.4. *We remark that if we consider a diffeomorphism of the form (1.3.15), the above definitions are covariant in the sense that $\psi^*(f_{\ell=1}) = (\psi^* f)_{\ell=1}$, etc.*

1.4.2.2 Round spherical harmonics

It will be convenient to introduce actual spherical harmonic functions depending on our metric g . We first will need to recall the round spherical harmonic functions.

Recall the standard spherical coordinates (1.1.1) on \mathbb{S}^2 defined in Section 1.1.1.

We may lift the standard $\ell = 0$ and $\ell = 1$ spherical harmonics expressed with respect to this coordinate system to functions on $\mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2$. Explicitly, we define the *round* $\ell = 0$ *spherical harmonic* to be

$$\mathring{Y}_0^0(u, v, \mathring{\theta}, \mathring{\phi}) := \sqrt{\frac{1}{4\pi}},$$

and we define the *round* $\ell = 1$ *spherical harmonics* \mathring{Y}_m^1 , for $m = -1, 0, 1$, to be

$$\mathring{Y}_{-1}^1(u, v, \mathring{\theta}, \mathring{\phi}) = \sqrt{\frac{3}{4\pi}} \sin \mathring{\theta} \sin \mathring{\phi}, \quad \mathring{Y}_0^1(u, v, \mathring{\theta}, \mathring{\phi}) = \sqrt{\frac{3}{4\pi}} \cos \mathring{\theta}, \quad \mathring{Y}_1^1(u, v, \mathring{\theta}, \mathring{\phi}) = \sqrt{\frac{3}{4\pi}} \sin \mathring{\theta} \cos \mathring{\phi}.$$

Remark 1.4.5. *We note that, in contrast to Remark 1.4.4, the above definitions do not change covariantly by diffeomorphism of the form (1.3.15). That is to say, they depend on our concrete realisation of the sphere!*

1.4.2.3 A basis for the spaces \mathcal{Y}^0 and \mathcal{Y}^1 and the coefficients c_f, c_f^m

We may now proceed to define spherical harmonics depending on our metric g . We will always be under the assumption of Proposition 1.4.1, but now with the additional restriction that $\psi = id$.

Define the $\ell = 0$ spherical harmonic simply to be the function

$$Y_0^0(u, v) := \left(\int_{S^2} r^{-2} \sqrt{\det \mathring{g}} d\theta^1 d\theta^2 \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For each (u, v) , this manifestly spans the space \mathcal{Y}^0 .

Let \check{Y}_m^1 denote the projection of the round $\ell = 1$ spherical harmonics to the space \mathcal{Y} ,

$$\check{Y}_m^1 := \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}^1} \mathring{Y}_m^1, \quad \text{for } m = -1, 0, 1.$$

By Proposition 1.4.1, these are again smooth.

One easily shows the following

Lemma 1.4.6. *Under the assumption (1.4.3), with the additional requirement that $\psi = id$, it follows that \check{Y}_m^1 again form a basis for \mathcal{Y}^1 .*

Define finally the $\ell = 1$ spherical harmonics Y_m^1 , for $m = -1, 0, 1$, to be the result of performing the Gram–Schmidt orthonormalisation process to $\check{Y}_{-1}^1, \check{Y}_0^1, \check{Y}_1^1$.

We have that for each (u, v) ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{span}\{Y_{-1}^1, Y_0^1, Y_1^1\} &= \mathcal{Y}^1, \\ \text{span}\{Y_0^0, Y_{-1}^1, Y_0^1, Y_1^1\} &= \mathcal{Y}^0 + \mathcal{Y}^1 = \text{Ker}(\mathcal{D}_2^* \mathcal{V}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for a given smooth scalar function $f : \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, there exist unique smooth functions $c_f, c_f^{-1}, c_f^0, c_f^1 : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$f_{\ell=0}(u, v) = c_f(u, v) Y_0^0(u, v) = \left(\int_{S_{u,v}} d\theta \right)^{-1} \int_{S_{u,v}} f(u, v, \theta) d\theta,$$

and

$$f_{\ell=1}(u, v, \theta) = \sum_{m=-1}^1 c_f^m(u, v) Y_m^1(u, v, \theta), \quad (1.4.9)$$

where $f_{\ell=0}$ and $f_{\ell=1}$ were defined in (1.4.4) and (1.4.4), respectively.

We have in particular that

$$f(u, v, \theta) = c_f(u, v)Y_0^0(u, v) + \sum_{m=-1}^1 c_f^m(u, v)Y_m^1(u, v, \theta) + f_{\ell \geq 2}(u, v, \theta),$$

where $f_{\ell \geq 2}$ was defined in (1.4.8). Note that $f_{\ell \geq 2}$ satisfies

$$\int_{S^2} f_{\ell \geq 2} Y_m^{\hat{\ell}} r^{-2} \sqrt{\det g} d\theta^1 d\theta^2 = 0,$$

for $\hat{\ell} = 0, 1$, $|m| \leq \hat{\ell}$.

Remark 1.4.7. *In view of Remarks 1.4.4 and 1.4.5, we emphasise that the above definitions of c_f^m (as opposed to the projections $f_{\ell=1}$, etc., themselves) are not preserved by diffeomorphisms of the form (1.3.15).*

1.4.3 The reference linearised Kerr solutions

Finally, we will define in this section a fixed- M linearised Kerr solution on $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ associated to g .

Given a 3-vector $(J^{-1}, J^0, J^1) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\text{Kerr}} &= \sum_{m=-1}^1 J^m \frac{6}{r^4} Y_m^{\ell=1}, & \eta_{\text{Kerr}} &= -\underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}} = \sum_{m=-1}^1 J^m \frac{3}{r^2} {}^* \nabla Y_m^{\ell=1}, & b_{\text{Kerr}} &= \sum_{m=-1}^1 J^m \frac{4}{r} {}^* \nabla Y_m^{\ell=1}, \\ (\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\text{Kerr}} &= - \sum_{m=-1}^1 J^m \frac{3}{r^3} {}^* \nabla Y_m^{\ell=1}, & (\Omega \beta)_{\text{Kerr}} &= \Omega_{\circ}^2 \sum_{m=-1}^1 J^m \frac{3}{r^3} {}^* \nabla Y_m^{\ell=1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we again assume that (1.4.3) holds with $\psi = id$ so the spherical harmonics of Section 1.4.2.3 are indeed well defined on $\mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2$.

The above expressions are motivated from [DHR], where they appeared as solutions to the linearised Einstein vacuum equations (expressed in double null gauge) around Schwarzschild with mass M , corresponding to the fixed- M Kerr family of solutions.

Remark 1.4.8. *In view of Remark 1.4.7, we again emphasise that these definitions are not covariant under diffeomorphisms of the form (1.3.15).*

Chapter 2

The almost gauge-invariant hierarchy and the teleological gauge normalisations

In this chapter we shall introduce two essential concepts for our work, that of the almost gauge-invariant hierarchy and that of teleological gauge normalisations suitable for black holes. Both have their origin in [DHR].

Contents

2.1	The almost gauge invariant hierarchy: α, ψ, P and $\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\psi}, \underline{P}$	48
2.2	The \mathcal{I}^+ gauge	48
2.2.1	The coordinate domain and Schwarzschild background	49
2.2.2	Definition of an \mathcal{I}^+ gauge	49
2.2.3	Associated linearised Kerr solution	50
2.2.4	Aside: The \mathcal{I}^+ gauge in linear theory	51
2.3	The \mathcal{H}^+ gauge	51
2.3.1	The coordinate domain and Schwarzschild background	52
2.3.2	Definition of an \mathcal{H}^+ gauge	52
2.3.3	Associated linearised Kerr solution	53
2.3.4	Associated Kruskalised gauge	54
2.3.5	Aside: The \mathcal{H}^+ gauge in linear theory	54

In **Section 2.1**, we shall introduce the non-linear analogue of the gauge-invariant hierarchy of [DHR]. In the following two sections, we then introduce two possible teleological normalisations of a double null gauge, the so called \mathcal{I}^+ gauge normalisation in **Section 2.2**, followed by the so-called \mathcal{H}^+ gauge normalisation in **Section 2.3**.

The constructions of the present chapter are fundamental for the rest of the paper. In principle, the impatient reader anxious to already continue reading Part B beyond Section 5.3 could for now skip Section 2.1, as the gauge invariant quantities only will appear implicitly in the definition of various norms in Sections 5.5 and 6.1 (for which the notations of Chapter 3 will also be essential; see comments in the prologue to the next chapter). Nonetheless, as this is a short section, and given the centrality of this hierarchy to the spirit of the paper, we do not recommend so doing! The reader may wish to refer to the discussion of [DHR] for more background on both the issue of gauge-invariant quantities and of future gauge normalisation.

2.1 The almost gauge invariant hierarchy: α , ψ , P and $\underline{\alpha}$, $\underline{\psi}$, \underline{P}

We have already remarked in Section V.5 how our approach relies on adapting the gauge-invariant hierarchy of [DHR]. We give the relevant definitions here.

Definition 2.1.1. *We consider subsets \mathcal{Z} , \mathcal{W} as in Section 1.1.2, and we assume that we have a metric g on \mathcal{Z} expressed as (1.1.4) (or alternatively (1.2.32)), satisfying (1.2.1).*

Given $M > 0$, using the inclusion $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}$, we consider as in Section 1.3.4 also the Schwarzschild metric $g_{\circ, M}$ with mass M defined on the same set \mathcal{Z} by the expression (1.3.1). We shall denote $r = r_M$.

*We define the **almost gauge-invariant hierarchy** associated to g to consist of the following quantities:*

$$\alpha, \quad \psi := -\frac{1}{2r\Omega^2} \nabla_3(r\Omega^2\alpha), \quad P := \frac{1}{r^3\Omega} \nabla_3(r^3\Omega\psi), \quad (2.1.1)$$

$$\underline{\alpha}, \quad \underline{\psi} := \frac{1}{2r\Omega^2} \nabla_4(r\Omega^2\underline{\alpha}), \quad \underline{P} := -\frac{1}{r^3\Omega} \nabla_4(r^3\Omega\underline{\psi}). \quad (2.1.2)$$

Moreover, let

$$\tilde{r} := \frac{2\Omega}{\text{tr}\chi}, \quad (2.1.3)$$

and define also the alternative members of the hierarchy:

$$\check{\psi} := \frac{1}{2r\Omega^2} \nabla_4(\tilde{r}\Omega^2\underline{\alpha}), \quad \check{P} := -\frac{1}{r^3\Omega} \nabla_4(r^3\Omega\check{\psi}).$$

In the proof of the main theorem it is useful to consider the quantities $\check{\psi}$ and \check{P} when r is large since the error terms in the wave equations that they satisfy have better r behaviour, compared to the error terms in the $\underline{\psi}$ and \underline{P} equations. The error terms in the wave equations satisfied by $\underline{\psi}$ and \underline{P} , on the other hand, have better behaviour close to the event horizon.

The above definitions should be compared with the gauge-invariant quantities of linear theory, defined in [DHR], and discussed in Section II.3.1. Since the linear theory analogues of (2.1.1) and (2.1.2) were exactly gauge invariant and satisfied decoupled equations, it will turn out that the gauge dependence of (2.1.1) and (2.1.2) and their coupling to the other quantities in the full nonlinear theory, while not trivial, will be at higher order in the smallness parameter ε_0 measuring distance from Schwarzschild. That is to say, if we have two double null parametrisations i and \tilde{i} as in Section 4.2, then the difference between the quantities corresponding to i^*g and \tilde{i}^*g will be higher order in ε_0 .

For the generalisations of the Teukolsky and Regge–Wheeler equations satisfied by the gauge invariant hierarchy, see already Chapter 3.4.

2.2 The \mathcal{I}^+ gauge

We define in this section what it means for a metric to be expressed in \mathcal{I}^+ gauge.

An \mathcal{I}^+ gauge will be a particular type of double null gauge (in the alternative form (1.2.32)), characterised by a specific domain \mathcal{W} , depending on parameters u_f , M_f and v_∞ , and particular gauge normalisations on the boundary of \mathcal{W} . The nomenclature is motivated by the fact that, when applied later to our maximal developments (\mathcal{M}, g) , in the limit where $u_f \rightarrow \infty$ and $v_\infty \rightarrow \infty$, the ingoing future boundary component of \mathcal{W} will tend to what will be null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ , and the normalisations will be such so as to induce Bondi type behaviour.

We first introduce the coordinate domain in **Section 2.2.1**. Refer already to Figure 2.1. The definition of the domain already refers to a Schwarzschild background metric with mass parameter M_f , with which we can define differences, spherical harmonic projections, etc. With this, we give the definition of an \mathcal{I}^+ gauge in **Section 2.2.2**. Finally, we will also define an associated linearised Kerr solution in **Section 2.2.3**.




Figure 2.1: The region $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f)$

2.2.1 The coordinate domain and Schwarzschild background

Given $M_f > 0$ satisfying (1.3.18), let us first recall the Schwarzschild metric $g_{\circ, M}$ with parameter $M := M_f$, given by (1.3.1), defined on the set $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{EF}} = \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}} \times \mathbb{S}^2$. We will denote the resulting background quantities as

$$r = r_{M_f}, \quad \Omega_{\circ}^2 = \Omega_{\circ, M_f}^2, \text{ etc.} \quad (2.2.1)$$

Recall the parameters R and u_{-1} from Section 1.3.5, and more generally the parameters R_c for $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

Given now additional (variable) parameters $u_f \geq u_{-1}$ and v_{∞} satisfying $v_{\infty} \geq v(R_4, u)$ for all $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$ (where $v(R_c, u)$ is defined by (1.3.6), and we note that this definition depends on r given by (2.2.1) and thus on M_f), we may define $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, M_f, v_{\infty})$ to be the subset of \mathbb{R}^2 with coordinates u, v given by

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, M_f, v_{\infty}) = \{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f\} \cap \{v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v \leq v_{\infty}\}. \quad (2.2.2)$$

The domain on which an \mathcal{I}^+ gauge is to be defined will then be

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, M_f, v_{\infty}) := \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, M_f, v_{\infty}) \times \mathbb{S}^2. \quad (2.2.3)$$

We shall typically drop explicit reference to the M_f and v_{∞} dependence in what follows.

In view of the inclusion

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f) \subset \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}},$$

we may now also naturally consider the Schwarzschild metric with parameter M_f as defined on (2.2.3), for which we shall again use the notation (2.2.1).

2.2.2 Definition of an \mathcal{I}^+ gauge

Let us now assume that we have a metric g on the domain $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f)$ defined by (2.2.3) in the form (1.2.32) satisfying the vacuum equations (1.2.1). (Recall the alternative form (1.2.33) of the null frame and the resulting equations, described in Section 1.2.3.)

We may define the spherical harmonic projections as in Section 1.4, referring always also to the above Schwarzschild background quantities (2.2.1). For this we shall require that our metric g satisfies the condition (1.4.3) with $\psi = \text{id}$, i.e. the assumptions of both Proposition 1.4.1 and Lemma 1.4.6. We will need one

additional quantity, a “renormalised mass aspect difference”:

$$\underline{\mu}^\dagger = d\sharp v \underline{\eta} + (\rho - \rho_\circ) - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\chi} \cdot \hat{\underline{\chi}} + \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{2r} \left(\frac{\text{tr} \underline{\chi}}{\Omega} - \frac{(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ}{\Omega_\circ^2} \right). \quad (2.2.4)$$

We are now ready to give the definition of what it means for a metric to be expressed in \mathcal{I}^+ gauge.

Definition 2.2.1. *Given u_f , M_f , v_∞ as above, and defining $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f)$ by (2.2.2) and $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f)$ by (2.2.3), we say that a metric g in the form (1.2.32) defined on $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f)$ and solving the Einstein vacuum equations (1.2.1) is **expressed in \mathcal{I}^+ gauge** if, for all $(u, v) \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f)$, the induced metric on the spheres $S_{u,v}$ satisfies the roundness condition (1.4.3) with $\psi = \text{id}$, i.e. the assumptions of both Proposition 1.4.1 and Lemma 1.4.6 hold, and projections to spherical harmonics are thus defined, and the following relations hold on the boundary of the domain:*

- $\frac{1}{2}(r^3 \rho_{\ell=0})(u_f, v_\infty) = -M_f$;
- $b(u, v_\infty, \theta) = 0$ for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell \neq 1}(u_f, v_\infty, \theta) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $(d\sharp v \Omega \beta)_{\ell=1}(u_f, v_\infty, \theta) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $(\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)(u_f, v_\infty, \theta) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $\mu_{\ell \geq 1}(u, v_\infty, \theta) = 0$ for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $\underline{\mu}_{\ell \geq 1}^\dagger(u_{-1}, v, \theta) = 0$ for all $v \in [v(R_{-2}, u_{-1}), v_\infty]$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $(\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=0}(u, v_\infty) = 0$ for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$;
- $(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}(u_{-1}, v) = F(u_{-1}) \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{r^3}(u_{-1}, v)$ for all $v \in [v(R_{-2}, u_{-1}), v_\infty]$, where

$$F(u) := \frac{1}{2} \int_u^{u_f} \int_{\bar{u}}^{u_f} r^3 (\Omega \hat{\chi}, \underline{\alpha})_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}, v_\infty) d\hat{u} d\bar{u}, \quad (2.2.5)$$

where the Schwarzschild background is as defined above and $\underline{\mu}^\dagger$ is defined in (2.2.4).

Remark 2.2.2. *Let us remark that for all u_f , M_f and v_∞ , the Schwarzschild metric g_{\circ, M_f} defined by (1.3.1), restricted to (2.2.3), is itself expressed in \mathcal{I}^+ gauge.*

Remark 2.2.3. *Note that because the definition of the Schwarzschild scalar quantities and the projection operations transform covariantly under diffeomorphisms of \mathbb{S}^2 (cf. Remarks 3.1.1 and 1.4.4), it follows that an \mathcal{I}^+ gauge remains such if pulled back by the map $\text{id} \times \psi : \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f) \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f) \times \mathbb{S}^2$, where ψ acts as a diffeomorphism on \mathbb{S}^2 . In particular, we do not really need the assumptions of Lemma 1.4.6 to hold to be able to formulate the above definition, but we shall indeed require it in Definition 2.2.5 below.*

Remark 2.2.4. *All conditions in Definition 2.2.1 can be directly motivated already by their linearised versions, except for the final condition (2.2.5), which is used in Section 14.3.4.4. See already Remark 2.2.6.*

2.2.3 Associated linearised Kerr solution

Given an \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, we will also define an associated linearised Kerr solution. Recall the $\ell = 1$ spherical harmonic functions Y_m^1 defined in Section 1.4.2.3 with the help also of the Schwarzschild background g_{\circ, M_f} . By Proposition 1.4.3, the curvature component $\Omega \beta$ of a given \mathcal{I}^+ gauge can be decomposed as

$$\Omega \beta(u, v, \theta) = r \nabla h_{1, \Omega \beta}(u, v, \theta) + r^* \nabla h_{2, \Omega \beta}(u, v, \theta),$$

for two functions $h_{1, \Omega \beta}$, $h_{2, \Omega \beta}$.

Definition 2.2.5. Given g expressed in \mathcal{I}^+ gauge with respect to parameters u_f , M_f and v_∞ , we may define associated Kerr parameters $J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^m$, for $m = -1, 0, 1$, by the relation

$$(r^4 h_{2,\Omega\beta})_{\ell=1}(u_f, v_\infty(u_f), \theta) = 3\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^2(u_f, v_\infty) \sum_{m=-1}^1 J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^m Y_m^1(u_f, v_\infty, \theta).$$

This then gives rise to an associated linearised Kerr solution, which we shall denote by $\sigma_{\text{Kerr}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\eta_{\text{Kerr}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, etc., by the definitions of Section 1.4.3 with $M = M_f$ and $J^m = J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^m$ defined above. We note that in view of Remark 1.4.7, the parameters $J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^m$ in general change under diffeomorphisms of the type considered in Remark 2.2.3 above.

Note that, given an \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, the linearised Kerr solution of Definition 2.2.5 satisfies

$$\text{curl}(\Omega\beta_{\ell=1})(u_f, v_\infty, \theta) = \text{curl}(\Omega\beta_{\text{Kerr}})(u_f, v_\infty, \theta). \quad (2.2.6)$$

The energies defined in Section 6.1 involve the solution minus this corresponding reference linearised Kerr solution and, in the proof of the main theorem, the solution minus the corresponding reference linearised Kerr solution will be shown to satisfy better estimates than the reference linearised Kerr solutions themselves.

2.2.4 Aside: The \mathcal{I}^+ gauge in linear theory

The question of existence of an \mathcal{I}^+ gauge is already nontrivial in linear theory. Understanding this is a pre-requisite for using this gauge in the fully nonlinear theory. We state already a linearised version of this, which the reader may wish to already try and prove on their own, referring to [DHR] for the relevant notation.

Proposition 2.2.6. Consider a smooth solution \mathcal{S} of the linearised Einstein equations in double null gauge as in [DHR] (but with the metric expressed in the alternative double null form (1.2.32)) around Schwarzschild with mass M_f , defined on the domain $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f) \times \mathbb{S}^2$ of the background Schwarzschild solution. Then there exists a pure gauge solution \mathcal{G} and a linearised Schwarzschild solution $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{m},0,0,0}$ (see Section 6 of [DHR] for this notation; note that the family of linearised Schwarzschild solutions is a 1-dimensional subfamily of the linearised Kerr solutions \mathcal{K}) so that $\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{G} + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{m},0,0,0}$ satisfies the linearised version of all requirements of Definition 2.2.1, e.g. $\overset{\circ}{\rho}_{\ell=0}(u_f, v_\infty) = 0$, etc.

Remark 2.2.7. Let us note that the pure gauge solution \mathcal{G} is not unique as any pure gauge solution generated by a 1-parameter family of diffeomorphisms as in Remark 2.2.3 trivially satisfies the (linearised) conditions defining the gauge. Similarly, pure gauge solutions generated by the 1-parameter family generated by the Killing field ∂_t also trivially satisfy these linearised conditions. In essence, in our setting, we shall break these symmetries in Section 5.6 with the help of Proposition 4.4.1 and by anchoring the solution to initial data.

Proof. See Remark 16.1.5 and the remarks referred to there for instructions on how to distill this theorem from our later Theorem 16.1 of Chapter 16. \square

2.3 The \mathcal{H}^+ gauge

We define in this section what it means for a metric to be expressed in \mathcal{H}^+ gauge. Like the notion of \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, defined in Section 2.2, an \mathcal{H}^+ gauge will be a particular type of double null gauge, now however in the form (1.1.4), characterised by a specific domain \mathcal{Z} , again depending on parameters M_f and u_f , and particular gauge normalisations on its boundary. Both the domain and the boundary normalisations will differ from those of the case of an \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, and the nomenclature is now motivated by the fact that, when applied to our maximal Cauchy development (\mathcal{M}, g) , as $u_f \rightarrow \infty$, the outgoing future boundary of \mathcal{W} will tend to what will be the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ , with suitable normalisations there.

We first introduce the coordinate domain in **Section 2.3.1**, which again depends on two parameters u_f and M_f . Refer to Figure 2.2. As with the notion of \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, the definition of the domain already refers to




Figure 2.2: The region $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f)$

a Schwarzschild background metric with mass parameter M_f , with which we can define differences, spherical harmonic projections, etc. With this, we give the definition of an \mathcal{H}^+ gauge in **Section 2.3.2**. Again as in the case of an \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, we will also define an associated linearised Kerr solution in **Section 2.3.3**. Finally, we will define an associated Kruskalised gauge in **Section 2.3.4**.

2.3.1 The coordinate domain and Schwarzschild background

As in Section 2.3.1, given parameter M_f , satisfying (1.3.18), we will consider the Schwarzschild metric $g_{\circ, M}$ with parameter $M := M_f$, given by (1.3.1), defined on the set $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ and use the notation (2.2.1).

Recall the parameters R and u_0, v_{-1} from Section 1.3.5, and more generally R_c for $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

Given an additional parameter $u_f > u_0$, we define the set $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, M_f)$ to be the subset of \mathbb{R}^2 with coordinates u, v given by

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, M_f) = \{u_0 \leq u \leq u_f\} \cap \{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)\}. \quad (2.3.1)$$

where $v(R_2, u)$ is defined by (1.3.6), and where we note again that this definition depends on r defined above and thus on M_f . Again, we shall typically drop explicit reference to the M_f dependence in what follows. We note that by (1.3.18), for $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ sufficiently small, we may assume that indeed $v_{-1} \leq v(R_2, u)$ for all $u \geq u_0$.

The domain on which the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge is to be defined will then be

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f) \times \mathbb{S}^2. \quad (2.3.2)$$

Again, in view of the inclusion

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \subset \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}},$$

we may now also naturally consider the Schwarzschild metric with parameter M_f as defined on (2.2.3), for which we shall again use the notation (2.2.1).

2.3.2 Definition of an \mathcal{H}^+ gauge

In analogy to Section 2.3.2, let us now assume that we have a metric g on the domain (2.3.2), now however in the form (1.1.4), satisfying the vacuum equations (1.2.1).

We may define spherical harmonic projections as in Section 1.4, referring always also to the above Schwarzschild background quantities (2.2.1). For this, we shall again require the roundness condition (1.4.3) with $\psi = \text{id}$, i.e. the assumptions of both Proposition 1.4.1 and Lemma 1.4.6 hold, and projections to spherical harmonics are thus defined.

We will need one additional quantity, namely:

$$\mu^* = \text{d}\nabla\eta + (\rho - \rho_o) - \frac{3}{2r} (\Omega \text{tr}\chi - (\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_o). \quad (2.3.3)$$

We are now ready to give the definition of what it means for a metric to be expressed in \mathcal{H}^+ gauge.

Definition 2.3.1. *Given u_f , M_f as above, and defining $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f)$ by (2.3.1), we say that a metric g in the form (1.1.4) defined on the domain (2.3.2) and solving the Einstein vacuum equations (1.2.1) is **expressed in \mathcal{H}^+ gauge** if the induced metric on the spheres $S_{u,v}$ satisfy the roundness condition (1.4.3) with $\psi = \text{id}$, i.e. the assumptions of both Proposition 1.4.1 and Lemma 1.4.6 hold, and projections to spherical harmonics are thus defined, and the following relations hold on the boundary of the domain:*

- $b(u_f, v, \theta) = 0$ for all $v \in [v_{-1}, v(R_2, u_f)]$ and all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $\mu_{\ell \geq 1}^*(u_f, v(R, u_f), \theta) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $(\Omega \text{tr}\chi - (\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_o)_{\ell=0}(u_f, v(R, u_f)) = 0$;
- $(\Omega \text{tr}\underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr}\underline{\chi})_o)(u_f, v_{-1}, \theta) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $\Omega(u_f, v, \theta) = \Omega_o(u_f, v, \theta)$ for all $v \in [v_{-1}, v(R_2, u_f)]$ and all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $\partial_u (r^3(\text{d}\nabla\eta)_{\ell \geq 1} + r^3\rho_{\ell \geq 1})(u, v_{-1}, \theta) = 0$ for all $u \in [u_0, u_f]$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $\Omega(u, v_{-1})_{\ell=0} = \Omega_o(u, v_{-1})$ for all $u \in [u_0, u_f]$.

where the Schwarzschild background is as defined above and μ^* is defined in (2.3.3).

Remark 2.3.2. *In analogy with Remark 2.2.2, let us remark that for all u_f , M_f , the Schwarzschild metric g_{o, M_f} defined by (1.3.1), restricted to domain (2.3.2), is itself expressed in \mathcal{H}^+ gauge.*

Remark 2.3.3. *In analogy with Remark 2.2.3, we again note that \mathcal{H}^+ gauge remains such if pulled back by the map $\text{id} \times \psi : \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f) \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f) \times \mathbb{S}^2$, where ψ acts as a diffeomorphism on \mathbb{S}^2 .*

2.3.3 Associated linearised Kerr solution

As in the case of an \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, we will also define an associated linearised Kerr solution to a given \mathcal{H}^+ gauge. Recall the $\ell = 1$ spherical harmonic functions Y_m^1 defined in Section 1.4.2.3 with the help also of the Schwarzschild background g_{o, M_f} . Again, by Proposition 1.4.3 the curvature component $\Omega\beta$ of a given \mathcal{H}^+ gauge can be decomposed as

$$\Omega\beta(u, v, \theta) = r\check{\nabla}h_{1, \Omega\beta}(u, v, \theta) + r^*\check{\nabla}h_{2, \Omega\beta}(u, v, \theta),$$

for two functions $h_{1, \Omega\beta}$, $h_{2, \Omega\beta}$.

Definition 2.3.4. *Given g expressed in \mathcal{H}^+ gauge with respect to parameters u_f , M_f , we may define associated Kerr parameters $J_{\mathcal{H}^+}^m$, for $m = -1, 0, 1$, by the relation*

$$(r^4 h_{2, \Omega\beta})_{\ell=1}(u_f, v(R, u_f), \theta) = 3\Omega_{o, M_f}^2(u_f, v(R, u_f)) \sum_{m=-1}^1 J_{\mathcal{H}^+}^m Y_m^{\ell=1}(u_f, v(R, u_f), \theta).$$

This then gives rise to an associated linearised Kerr solution, which we shall denote by $\sigma_{\text{Kerr}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\eta_{\text{Kerr}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, etc., given by the definitions of Section 1.4.3 with $M = M_f$ and $J^m = J_{\mathcal{H}^+}^m$ defined above.

Note again that, given an \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, the linearised Kerr solution of Definition 2.3.4 satisfies

$$\text{curl}(\Omega\beta_{\ell=1})(u_f, v(R, u_f), \theta) = \text{curl}(\Omega\beta_{\text{Kerr}})(u_f, v(R, u_f), \theta).$$

2.3.4 Associated Kruskalised gauge

We define finally the associated Kruskalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge.

Recall the map ι_M given by (1.3.12). Given parameters M_f, u_f , let us define $U_f := U(u_f)$ where U is defined by (1.3.13) with $M := M_f$, and

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(U_f) := \iota_{M_f}^{-1}(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f)).$$

Note that $\iota_{M_f}^{-1}|_{\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(U_f)} : \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(U_f) \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f)$ is well defined.

Definition 2.3.5. Given g expressed in \mathcal{H}^+ gauge with respect to parameters u_f, M_f , we define the associated Kruskalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge to be given by $(\iota_{M_f}^{-1} \times \text{id})^* g$ defined on

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(U_f) \times \mathbb{S}^2. \quad (2.3.4)$$

Remark 2.3.6. In view of Remark 2.3.2 and the considerations of Section 1.3.2, let us remark that for all $U_f < 0$, M_f , the Schwarzschild metric $g_{\circ, M_f, \mathcal{K}}$ defined by (1.3.7), restricted to domain $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(U_f) \times \mathbb{S}^2$, corresponds precisely to the Kruskalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge associated with g_{\circ, M_f} defined on $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(U_f) \times \mathbb{S}^2$.

Remark 2.3.7. Note that the values U_1 and V_{-1} corresponding to the boundary segments of $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(U_f)$ depend in fact on M_f , as opposed to the parameters of Section 1.3.5, which depended only on M_{init} .

2.3.5 Aside: The \mathcal{H}^+ gauge in linear theory

We state a counterpart of Proposition 2.2.6 for the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge:

Proposition 2.3.8. Consider a smooth solution \mathcal{S} of the linearised Einstein equations in double null gauge as in [DHR] around Schwarzschild with mass M_f , defined on the domain $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f) \times \mathbb{S}^2$ of the background Schwarzschild solution. Then there exists a pure gauge solution \mathcal{G} so that $\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{G}$ satisfies the linearised version of all requirements of Definition 2.3.1.

Remark 2.3.9. In comparison to Remark 2.2.7 concerning the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, there is additional non-uniqueness in the statement of Proposition 2.3.8. For here, there are additional pure gauge solutions \mathcal{G} which satisfy the linearised requirements of Definition 2.3.1. In essence, in our setting, we shall break this degeneracy in Section 5.6 by anchoring the gauge to the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge.

Remark 2.3.10. Let us note that, in the limiting case $u_f = \infty$, the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, when anchored appropriately to an \mathcal{I}^+ gauge as in Section 5.6, is closely related to the gauge yielding the so-called “horizon normalised” solutions considered in [DHR].

Proof. See Remark 16.1.22 and the remarks referred to there for instructions on how to distill this theorem from our later Theorem 16.1 of Chapter 16. \square

Chapter 3

Schematic notation and the Teukolsky and Regge–Wheeler equations

In this chapter, we will consider a metric in double null gauge with a background Schwarzschild metric of mass M and we will derive a schematic notation to denote differences. This will allow us to derive in a compact form the equations satisfied by the almost gauge invariant quantities.

Contents

3.1	Schematic notation for differences and the commutation operators	56
3.1.1	Schematic notation for differences \mathcal{R}_p , Γ_p and Φ_p	56
3.1.2	The commutation differential operators \mathfrak{D}	57
3.2	Schematic notation for nonlinear error terms	57
3.2.1	Ordering the schematic differences Φ	57
3.2.2	Admissible coefficient functions and schematic notation for traces of S -tensors . .	57
3.2.3	The nonlinear error notation \mathcal{E}^k	58
3.2.4	The nonlinear error notation \mathcal{E}_p^k	59
3.2.5	The nonlinear error notation \mathcal{E}^{*k} and \mathcal{E}_p^{*k}	60
3.2.6	The nonlinear error notation \mathcal{E}^k and \mathcal{E}_p^k	61
3.2.7	The nonlinear error notation $\mathcal{E}_p^{(4)k}$	61
3.2.8	The nonlinear error notation $\mathcal{E}_p^{(in)k}$ and $\mathcal{E}_p^{(out)k}$	62
3.2.9	The nonlinear error notation $\mathcal{E}^{(Kerr)}$	64
3.3	Commutation identities	64
3.4	Derivation of equations satisfied by almost gauge invariant quantities	65
3.4.1	Elliptic relations	65
3.4.2	Teukolsky equations for α and $\underline{\alpha}$	68
3.4.3	Wave equations for ψ and $\underline{\psi}$	70
3.4.4	Regge–Wheeler equations for P and \underline{P}	71
3.4.5	Wave equations for $\check{r}\Omega^2\underline{\alpha}$, $\underline{\psi}$, $\underline{\dot{P}}$	71

In **Section 3.1**, we will introduce a schematic notation for such differences and a set of commutation operators. This will allow us in **Section 3.2** to introduce a schematic notation for nonlinear expressions in differences which we shall be able to think of as “error terms” in our later estimates. We shall derive some commutation identities in **Section 3.3**. Finally, with the help of the error term notation introduced, we shall derive in **Section 3.4** the nonlinear Teukolsky and Regge–Wheeler equations for the quantities of our gauge invariant hierarchy, in a form which makes clear the relation with the familiar linearised equations from [\[DHR\]](#).

Section 3.1 is fundamental for understanding the norms appearing later and should be read before continuing in Part B beyond Section 5.3. The rest of the chapter may be skipped on a first reading, though it will be necessary for Part C. For related schematic notation, see [DHR13, DL17].

3.1 Schematic notation for differences and the commutation operators

In this section, we will consider throughout a subset \mathcal{Z} as in Section 1.1.2, with $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. We shall assume moreover that we have a metric g on \mathcal{Z} expressed as (1.1.4) (or alternatively (1.2.32)), satisfying (1.2.1). By viewing \mathcal{W} as a subset $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}$, we may define a Schwarzschild background as in Section 1.3.4, i.e. we may define on the same underlying set \mathcal{Z} the Schwarzschild metric $g_{\circ, M}$ with mass $M > 0$ as in (1.3.1), expressed in Eddington–Finkelstein normalised double null coordinates.

3.1.1 Schematic notation for differences \mathcal{R}_p , Γ_p and Φ_p

The notation \mathcal{R}_p will be schematically used for the following curvature components,

$$\mathcal{R}_1 = \{\Omega^{-2}\underline{\alpha}\}, \quad \mathcal{R}_2 = \{\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}\}, \quad \mathcal{R}_3 = \{\rho - \rho_{\circ}, \sigma\}, \quad \mathcal{R}_4 = \{\Omega\beta, \Omega^2\alpha\},$$

and the notation Γ_p will be used for the following Ricci coefficients:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_1 &= \left\{ 1 - \frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_{\circ}^2}, 1 - \frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{\Omega^2}, b, \Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}}, \Omega^{-2}(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ}) \right\}, \\ \Gamma_2 &= \left\{ \Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\circ}, \Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - (\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_{\circ}), \Omega\hat{\chi}, \eta, \underline{\eta} \right\}, \\ \Gamma_{\frac{5}{2}} &= \{\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ}\}. \end{aligned}$$

(The quantities $1 - \frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_{\circ}^2}$ and b are metric components, rather than Ricci coefficients, though it is convenient to include them with the Ricci coefficients nonetheless.)

We may define $\mathcal{R} = \cup_p \mathcal{R}_p$ and $\Gamma = \cup_p \Gamma_p$. In addition to denoting sets, we will often also use the above notation to denote a general element of the respective set, i.e. we may write

$$1 - \frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_{\circ}^2} = \Gamma_1,$$

and say informally that “ $1 - \frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_{\circ}^2}$ is a Γ ”, specifically a Γ_1 , and write expressions like $\sum_{\Gamma} \|\Gamma\|^2$, where $|\cdot|$ is some norm (where one sees together the notation being used for the set and for its elements).

In the above definitions, note that each Γ and \mathcal{R} contains an appropriate Ω weight so that, in the proof of the main theorem, it will correspond to a quantity which is in the limit regular on the event horizon. The p -subscript is used to describe the r weights which appear in certain weighted estimates of each quantity in the proof of the main theorem. See already (11.7.8) and (11.7.9).

Since in the present paper it will often not be necessary to distinguish between curvature components and Ricci coefficients, we will use the schematic notation Φ_p to denote either, i.e.

$$\Phi_p = \mathcal{R}_p \cup \Gamma_p, \quad \Phi = \cup_p \Phi_p. \quad (3.1.1)$$

Remark 3.1.1. Recall from Section 1.3.4 that if we consider a diffeomorphism $\text{id} \times \psi$ of the form (1.3.15), where $\psi : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ is a diffeomorphism, then this covariantly induces a new solution $(\text{id} \times \psi)_* g$ of the vacuum equations, again expressed in the form (1.1.4) (or alternatively (1.2.32)). Because the above quantities \mathcal{R}_p , Γ_p and Φ_p involve differences with Schwarzschild *scalars*, and these are preserved by such diffeomorphisms (e.g. $\psi_* \rho_{\circ} = \rho_{\circ}$), it follows that all these quantities transform covariantly under diffeomorphisms of the above form.

3.1.2 The commutation differential operators \mathfrak{D}

Let M , \mathcal{Z} , g and $g_{\circ,M}$ be as in the beginning of the chapter.

Let \mathfrak{D} denote the collection of differential operators $\mathfrak{D} = \{r\nabla, \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3, r\Omega\nabla_4\}$. Given a triple $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$ for $k_1, k_2, k_3 \geq 0$, define

$$\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} = (r\nabla)^{k_1} (\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2} (r\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_3},$$

so that, in particular,

$$\mathfrak{D}^{(1,0,0)} = r\nabla, \quad \mathfrak{D}^{(0,1,0)} = \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3, \quad \mathfrak{D}^{(0,0,1)} = r\Omega\nabla_4.$$

Given, moreover, a multi-index $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k)$, where $\gamma_i \in \{(1,0,0), (0,1,0), (0,0,1)\}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, k$, and given an S -tensor ξ , define

$$\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \xi := \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \dots \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_k} \xi.$$

For $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k)$, define $|\gamma| = k$.

Note that, for a given triple \underline{k} and S -tensor ξ , in the expression $\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\xi$ the $r\Omega\nabla_4$ derivatives are always applied first to ξ , followed by the $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivatives, followed, finally, by the $r\nabla$ derivatives. On the other hand, the derivatives $r\nabla, \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3, r\Omega\nabla_4$ can appear in any chosen order, given the correct γ , in the expression \mathfrak{D}^γ .

3.2 Schematic notation for nonlinear error terms

In this section, notation is introduced which is used to describe nonlinear error terms throughout the rest of the paper. Throughout, let M , \mathcal{Z} , g and $g_{\circ,M}$ be as in Section 3.1.

3.2.1 Ordering the schematic differences Φ

Recall the schematic notation Φ from (3.1.1). In order to define the nonlinear error notation below, let the above collection of Φ be given a superscript to order them as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^1 &= 1 - \frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_\circ^2}, & \Phi^2 &= 1 - \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2}, & \Phi^3 &= b, & \Phi^4 &= \Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}, & \Phi^5 &= \Omega^{-2}(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ), & \Phi^6 &= \Omega^{-2}\underline{\alpha}, \\ \Phi^7 &= \Omega \text{tr}\chi - (\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_\circ, & \Phi^8 &= \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr}\underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr}\underline{\chi})_\circ), & \Phi^9 &= \Omega\hat{\chi}, & \Phi^{10} &= \eta, & \Phi^{11} &= \underline{\eta}, & \Phi^{12} &= \Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}, \\ \Phi^{13} &= \Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ, & \Phi^{14} &= \rho - \rho_\circ, & \Phi^{15} &= \sigma, & \Phi^{16} &= \Omega\beta, & \Phi^{17} &= \Omega^2\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

3.2.2 Admissible coefficient functions and schematic notation for traces of S -tensors

Functions of the following form will appear in the nonlinear error notation introduced below. Given $N \geq 0$ and a constant C , we say that a smooth function $h : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an *admissible coefficient function* if

$$\sup_{\mathcal{Z}} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma h| \leq C. \quad (3.2.1)$$

The number of derivatives $N \geq 12$ will be fixed later in the paper, and the constant C here is understood to be chosen sufficiently large so that the claimed inequalities later in the paper hold for the h 's that naturally arise. In all such instances, it will be clear that this largeness can be chosen to depend only on the parameter M_{init} of Section 1.3.5.

The following notation, which describes schematically admissible functions multiplying S -tensor fields and traces of S -tensor fields, will be used in defining the schematic notation for nonlinear error terms below.

Consider some $n \geq 0$. The following objects will act on $(0, n)$ S -tensor fields. A *trace set of order 0* is defined simply to be an admissible coefficient function h , satisfying (3.2.1). Given such an h and an S -tangent $(0, n)$ tensor ξ , define $\xi \cdot h$ by pointwise multiplication

$$\xi \cdot h := h\xi.$$

In schematic expressions we will sometimes write $\xi \cdot_{\mathcal{G}} h$ to mean $\xi \cdot h$, even though $\xi \cdot h$ does not involve the metric \mathcal{G} , in order to not have to distinguish between trace sets of order 0 and trace sets of order $l \geq 1$, which are defined below. Suppose now $n \geq 2$. A *trace set of order 1* is a collection $I = \{h_{ij}\}_{1 \leq i < j \leq n}$, where each h_{ij} is an admissible function, satisfying (3.2.1). Given such an I and an S -tangent $(0, n)$ tensor ξ , define $\xi \cdot_{\mathcal{G}} I$ to be the S -tangent $(0, n-2)$ tensor

$$(\xi \cdot_{\mathcal{G}} I)_{A_1 \dots A_{n-2}} = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} h_{ij} \mathcal{G}^{BC} \xi_{A_1 \dots A_{i-1} B A_i \dots A_{j-2} C A_{j-1} \dots A_{n-2}}.$$

For example, recall that

$$(\Omega \hat{\chi} \times \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi})_{A_1 A_2} = \mathcal{G}^{BC} \Omega \hat{\chi}_{B A_1} \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}_{C A_2} = \mathcal{G}^{BC} (\Omega \hat{\chi} \otimes \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi})_{B A_1 C A_2}.$$

The tensor field $\Omega \hat{\chi} \times \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}$ can then be written

$$\Omega \hat{\chi} \times \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi} = (\Omega \hat{\chi} \otimes \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}) \cdot_{\mathcal{G}} I,$$

where $I = \{h_{ij}\}_{1 \leq i < j \leq 4}$, $h_{13} = 1$ and $h_{ij} = 0$ otherwise.

Consider now some $n \geq 2$ and some $1 \leq d \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. A *trace set of order d* is defined to be a collection $I = \{I^m\}_{1 \leq m \leq d}$, where each $I^m = \{h_{ij}^m\}_{1 \leq i < j \leq n}$ is a trace set of order 1. If ξ is an S -tangent $(0, n)$ tensor field and $I = \{I^m\}_{1 \leq m \leq d}$ is a trace set of order $d \geq 1$, define $\xi \cdot_{\mathcal{G}} I$ to be the S -tangent $(0, n-2d)$ tensor

$$\xi \cdot_{\mathcal{G}} I = \xi \cdot I^1 \cdot_{\mathcal{G}} \dots \cdot_{\mathcal{G}} I^d.$$

For example, recall that

$$(\Omega \hat{\chi}, \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}) = \mathcal{G}^{AD} \mathcal{G}^{BC} \Omega \hat{\chi}_{B A} \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}_{C D} = \mathcal{G}^{AD} \mathcal{G}^{BC} (\Omega \hat{\chi} \otimes \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi})_{B A C D}.$$

One can then write

$$(\Omega \hat{\chi}, \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}) = (\Omega \hat{\chi} \otimes \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}) \cdot_{\mathcal{G}} I,$$

where $I = \{I^1, I^2\}$ and $I^1 = \{h_{ij}^1\}_{1 \leq i < j \leq 4}$, $h_{13}^1 = 1$ and $h_{ij}^1 = 0$ otherwise, is as in the previous example, and $I^2 = \{h_{12}^2\}$ where $h_{12}^2 = 1$.

3.2.3 The nonlinear error notation \mathcal{E}^k

The notation \mathcal{E}^k is used to denote a nonlinear error term involving at most k derivatives of Ricci coefficients and curvature components.

Consider some $k \geq 0$. Define $\{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^0 := \{(0, 0, 0)\}$. Given $i \in \{1, \dots, 17\}$ and $\gamma \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^k$, define

$$\mathfrak{D}^k \Phi \cdot (i, \gamma) := \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi^i.$$

As an example, one can write

$$\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 \Omega \hat{\chi} = \mathfrak{D}^1 \Phi \cdot (9, (0, 1, 0)), \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\eta} = \mathfrak{D}^0 \Phi \cdot (11, (0, 0, 0)).$$

Consider now some $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 1$ and some

$$H = \{{}^{j,m} H_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^j, {}^j J_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}\}_{m=0, \dots, l', k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k, l' \geq l, j \geq 1},$$

where

$${}^{j,m} H_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}} \in \{(i, \gamma) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, 17\}, \gamma \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^{k_m}\} \cup \{0\},$$

for all $m = 0, \dots, l'$ and ${}^j J_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}$ is a trace set of some order $d \geq 0$, as in Section 3.2.2, for all $j \geq 1$, $k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k$ and $l' \geq l$. For such $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 1$ and H , define

$$(\mathfrak{D}^k \Phi)^l \cdot H := \sum_{l' \geq l} \sum_{k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k} \sum_{j \geq 1} (\mathfrak{D}^{k_1} \Phi \cdot {}^{j,1} H_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathfrak{D}^{k_{l'}} \Phi \cdot {}^{j,l'} H_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}) \cdot_{\mathcal{G}} {}^j J_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}.$$

Such expressions are only ever considered when sufficiently many of the components of H vanish so that each object appearing in the above summation is an S -tensor of the same type, and so that the allowed ranges of $l' \geq l$ and $j \geq 1$ are finite, and so the summation is indeed well defined.

For example, one can write

$$(r\nabla\eta) \otimes \underline{\eta} + \Omega\beta \otimes \Omega^{-1}\underline{\chi} + \Omega^{-2}\underline{\alpha} \otimes \eta = (\mathfrak{D}^1\Phi)^2 \cdot H,$$

where ${}^{1,1}H_{10} = \{10, (1, 0, 0)\}$, ${}^{1,2}H_{10} = \{11, (0, 0, 0)\}$, ${}^{1,1}H_{00} = \{16, (0, 0, 0)\}$, ${}^{1,2}H_{00} = \{4, (0, 0, 0)\}$, ${}^{2,1}H_{00} = \{6, (0, 0, 0)\}$, ${}^{2,2}H_{00} = \{10, (0, 0, 0)\}$ and ${}^{j,m}H_{k_1\dots k_{l'}} = 0$ otherwise, and ${}^jJ_{k_1\dots k_{l'}} = 0$ are all trace sets of order 0 (i.e. functions satisfying (3.2.1)) with ${}^1J_{10} = {}^1J_{00} = {}^2J_{00} = 1$, and ${}^jJ_{k_1\dots k_{l'}} = 0$ otherwise for all $j, k_1, \dots, k_{l'}$.

For a given $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 2$ and H as above, define

$$\mathcal{E}^k(H) := (\mathfrak{D}^k\Phi)^l \cdot H.$$

Note that $\mathcal{E}^k(H)$ has the property that, for any γ ,

$$\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathcal{E}^k(H) = \mathcal{E}^{k+|\gamma|}(H^\gamma)$$

for some H^γ .

We will often abuse notation and write “ \mathcal{E}^k ” to mean “ $\mathcal{E}^k(H)$ for some H ”, and “ $(\mathfrak{D}^k\Phi)^l$ ” to mean “ $(\mathfrak{D}^k\Phi)^l \cdot H$ for some H ”.

3.2.4 The nonlinear error notation \mathcal{E}_p^k

The notation \mathcal{E}_p^k is used to denote a nonlinear error term involving at most k derivatives of Ricci coefficients and curvature components which moreover decays, according to the p index notation introduced above, like r^{-p} .

Define the sets

$$S_1 = \{1, \dots, 6\}, \quad S_2 = \{7, \dots, 12\}, \quad S_{\frac{5}{2}} = \{13\}, \quad S_3 = \{14, 15\}, \quad S_4 = \{16, 17\}.$$

Consider some $k \geq 0$. Given $i \in \{1, \dots, 17\}$ and $\gamma \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^k$, recall the definition

$$\mathfrak{D}^k\Phi \cdot (i, \gamma) := \mathfrak{D}^\gamma\Phi^i.$$

Given $p \in \{1, 2, \frac{5}{2}, 3, 4\}$, if $i \in S_p$ then we often add a p subscript for emphasis, i.e.

$$\mathfrak{D}^k\Phi_p \cdot (i, \gamma) := \mathfrak{D}^\gamma\Phi^i \quad \text{if } i \in S_p.$$

The p subscript is added to emphasise certain r weights which appear in estimates established for each quantity $\mathfrak{D}^k\Phi_p \cdot (i, \gamma)$ in the proof of the main theorem.

Consider now some $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 1$, $p \geq 0$ and some

$$H = \{ {}^{j,m}H_{k_1\dots k_{l'}}^{p_0\dots p_{l'}}, {}^jJ_{k_1\dots k_{l'}}^{p_0\dots p_{l'}} \}_{m=0,\dots,l', k_1+\dots+k_{l'} \leq k, p_0+\dots+p_{l'} \geq p, l' \geq l, j \geq 1}$$

where

$${}^{j,m}H_{k_1\dots k_{l'}}^{p_0\dots p_{l'}} \in \{(i, \gamma) \mid i \in S_{p_m}, \gamma \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^{k_m}\} \cup \{0\},$$

for all $m = 0, \dots, l'$, and ${}^jJ_{k_1\dots k_{l'}}^{p_0\dots p_{l'}}$ is a trace set of some order $d \geq 0$, as in Section 3.2.2, for all $k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k$, $p_0 + \dots + p_{l'} \geq p$, $j \geq 1$ and $l' \geq l$. For such $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 1$ and H , define

$$(\mathfrak{D}^k\Phi_p)^l \cdot H := \sum_{\substack{l' \geq l \\ p_0 + \dots + p_{l'} \geq p}} \sum_{k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k} \sum_{j \geq 1} r^{-p_0} (\mathfrak{D}^{k_1}\Phi_{p_1} \cdot {}^{j,1}H_{k_1\dots k_{l'}}^{p_0\dots p_{l'}} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathfrak{D}^{k_{l'}}\Phi_{p_{l'}} \cdot {}^{j,l'}H_{k_1\dots k_{l'}}^{p_0\dots p_{l'}}) \cdot {}^jJ_{k_1\dots k_{l'}}^{p_0\dots p_{l'}}.$$

Such expressions are again only ever considered when sufficiently many of the components of H vanish so that each object appearing in the above summation is an S -tensor of the same type, and moreover that the ranges of allowed $l \geq l'$, $j \geq 1$ and $p_0, \dots, p_{l'} \geq p$ are finite, and so the summation is indeed well defined.

For example one can write

$$\frac{2}{r}\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi} \otimes \eta + \frac{1}{r}\Omega^{-2}\underline{\alpha} \otimes \underline{\eta} = (\mathfrak{D}^0\Phi_4)^2 \cdot H,$$

where ${}^{1,1}H_{00}^{112} = \{4, (0, 0, 0)\}$, ${}^{1,2}H_{00}^{112} = \{10, (0, 0, 0)\}$, ${}^{2,1}H_{00}^{112} = \{6, (0, 0, 0)\}$, ${}^{2,2}H_{00}^{112} = \{11, (0, 0, 0)\}$ and ${}^{j,m}H_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}} = 0$ otherwise, each ${}^jJ_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}} = 0$ is a trace set of order 0 with ${}^1J_{00}^{112} = 2$, ${}^2J_{00}^{112} = 1$ and ${}^jJ_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}} = 0$ otherwise for all $k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k$, $p_0 + \dots + p_{l'} \geq p$, $j \geq 1$ and $l' \geq l$.

For a given $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 2$, p and H as above, define

$$\mathcal{E}_p^k(H) := (\mathfrak{D}^k\Phi_p)^l \cdot H.$$

Note that the $\mathcal{E}_p^k(H)$ have the property that, for any γ ,

$$\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathcal{E}_p^k(H) = \mathcal{E}_p^{k+|\gamma|}(H^\gamma)$$

for some H^γ .

We will often abuse notation and write “ \mathcal{E}_p^k ” to mean “ $\mathcal{E}_p^k(H)$ for some H ”, and “ $(\mathfrak{D}^k\Phi_p)^l$ ” to mean “ $(\mathfrak{D}^k\Phi_p)^l \cdot H$ for some H ”.

3.2.5 The nonlinear error notation \mathcal{E}^{*k} and \mathcal{E}_p^{*k}

In some nonlinear error terms it will be important to keep note of the fact that certain anomalous quantities—which, in the proof of Theorem 6.1, will decay at slower rates than other quantities—do not appear. The notation \mathcal{E}^{*k} , therefore, is used to denote a nonlinear error term involving at most k derivatives of Ricci coefficients and curvature components which does not involve the terms

$$(r\nabla)^k \Omega \hat{\chi}, \quad (r\nabla)^k (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ).$$

Similarly, the notation \mathcal{E}_p^{*k} is used for nonlinear errors which do not involve the above terms and which moreover decay, according to the p index notation introduced above, like r^{-p} .

In order to be more precise, consider again some $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 1$. Recall that, in the ordering of Section 3.2.1, $\Phi^7 = \Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ$ and $\Phi^9 = \Omega \hat{\chi}$. Define the set

$$\mathcal{P}_{k,k}^* = \{(i, \gamma) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, 17\}, \gamma \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^k\} \setminus \{(i, \gamma) \mid i \in \{7, 9\}, \gamma \in (1, 0, 0)^k\},$$

and, for $k' < k$, define

$$\mathcal{P}_{k,k'}^* = \{(i, \gamma) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, 17\}, \gamma \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^{k'}\}.$$

Given $l' \geq l$ and $k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k$, consider some

$$H^* = \{{}^{j,m}H_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^*, {}^jJ_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}\}_{m=0, \dots, l', k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k, l' \geq l, j \geq 1},$$

as in Section 3.2.3, where now

$${}^{j,m}H_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^* \in \mathcal{P}_{k,k_m}^* \cup \{0\},$$

for all $m = 0, \dots, l'$, and again ${}^jJ_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}$ is a trace set of some order $d \geq 0$, as in Section 3.2.2, for all $j \geq 1$, $k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k$ and $l' \geq l$. For such $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 1$ and H^* , define, as in Section 3.2.3,

$$(\mathfrak{D}^k\Phi)^l \cdot H^* := \sum_{l' \geq l} \sum_{k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k} \sum_{j \geq 1} (\mathfrak{D}^{k_1}\Phi \cdot {}^{j,1}H_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^* \otimes \dots \otimes \mathfrak{D}^{k_{l'}}\Phi \cdot {}^{j,l'}H_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^*) \cdot {}^jJ_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}.$$

For a given $k \geq 0, l \geq 2$ and H^* as above, define as before

$$\mathcal{E}^{*k}(H^*) := (\mathfrak{D}^k \Phi)^l \cdot H^*.$$

The notation $\mathcal{E}_p^{*k}(H^*)$ is similarly defined in the obvious way. Note that, for any γ ,

$$\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathcal{E}_p^{*k}(H^*) = \mathcal{E}_p^{*,k+|\gamma|}(H_\gamma^*)$$

for some H_γ^* .

Again, we will often abuse notation and write “ \mathcal{E}^{*k} ” to mean “ $\mathcal{E}^{*k}(H^*)$ for some vector H^* of the above form”, and “ \mathcal{E}_p^{*k} ” to mean “ $\mathcal{E}_p^{*k}(H^*)$ for some vector H^* of the above form”.

3.2.6 The nonlinear error notation $\check{\mathcal{E}}^k$ and $\check{\mathcal{E}}_p^k$

Recall \check{r} , defined in Definition 2.1.1. The notation $\check{\mathcal{E}}^k$ is used to denote a nonlinear error term involving at most k derivatives of Ricci coefficients and curvature components, which may also include factors of powers of $r^{-1}\check{r}$, and may also contain bad Ω weights. Such error terms typically arise only in analysis of the quantities $\check{\psi}$ and \check{P} which are used, in the proof of Theorem C, only in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge where such bad Ω weights are irrelevant. Similarly, $\check{\mathcal{E}}_p^k$ is used to denote such a nonlinear error term which moreover decays, according to the p index notation, like r^{-p} .

Consider some $l_1, l_2 \geq 0$ and some $\check{H} = \{H_{m_1 m_2}\}_{m_1=0, \dots, l_1, m_2=0, \dots, l_2}$, where each $H_{m_1 m_2}$ is an array of the form H of Section 3.2.3. Define

$$\check{\mathcal{E}}^k(\check{H}) := \sum_{m_1=0}^{l_1} \sum_{m_2=0}^{l_2} \Omega^{-m_1} \left(\frac{\check{r}}{r}\right)^{m_2} \mathcal{E}^k(H_{m_1 m_2}).$$

Similarly define, for \check{H} as in Section 3.2.4,

$$\check{\mathcal{E}}_p^k(\check{H}) := \sum_{m_1=0}^{l_1} \sum_{m_2=0}^{l_2} \Omega^{-m_1} \left(\frac{\check{r}}{r}\right)^{m_2} \mathcal{E}_p^k(H_{m_1 m_2}).$$

Again, such expressions are only ever considered when sufficiently many of the components of \check{H} vanish so that each object appearing in the above summation is an S tensor of the same type, and that the summation is over only finitely many terms.

Note that, for any γ ,

$$\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \check{\mathcal{E}}_p^k(\check{H}) = \check{\mathcal{E}}_p^{k+|\gamma|}(\check{H}^\gamma)$$

for some \check{H}^γ .

Again, we will typically abuse notation and write “ $\check{\mathcal{E}}^k$ ” to mean “ $\check{\mathcal{E}}^k(\check{H})$ for some vector \check{H} of the above form”, and “ $\check{\mathcal{E}}_p^k$ ” to mean “ $\check{\mathcal{E}}_p^k(\check{H})$ for some vector \check{H} of the above form”.

3.2.7 The nonlinear error notation $\overset{(4)}{\mathcal{E}}_p^k$

In Section 3.4.5, it will be important to keep track of error terms which have a gain in decay, which is better than the expected r^{-1} , when acted on by $\Omega \nabla_4$. To do so, it is convenient to introduce additional error notation. Define

$$\overset{(4)}{\Phi}^1 = \Omega^{-1} \hat{\underline{\chi}}, \quad \overset{(4)}{\Phi}^2 = \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}, \quad \overset{(4)}{\Phi}^3 = \Omega \hat{\underline{\chi}}, \quad \overset{(4)}{\Phi}^4 = \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}, \quad \overset{(4)}{\Phi}^5 = \rho - \rho_\circ, \quad \overset{(4)}{\Phi}^6 = \sigma.$$

Note that each $\overset{(4)}{\Phi}$ satisfies a null structure or Bianchi equation of the form

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r^p \overset{(4)}{\Phi}_p) = \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{k=0}^1 \sum_{\Phi_q} c_{k, \Phi_q} (r \nabla)^k r^q \Phi_q + \mathcal{E}_2^0, \quad (3.2.2)$$

for some admissible functions c_{k,Φ_q} , satisfying (3.2.1).

The notation $\mathcal{E}_p^{(4)k}$ will be used for nonlinear error terms which involve at most k derivatives of geometric quantities, decay in r , according to the p index notation, like r^{-p} and moreover only involve the above Φ so that there is a gain of r^2 decay when ∇_4 acts on the error appropriately (see (3.4.7)).

Unlike in the previous error notation, general admissible functions are not allowed to appear in the $\mathcal{E}_p^{(4)k}$ errors. In order to define these errors one therefore has to consider trace sets, as in Section 3.2.2, which do not include any admissible functions. To be more precise, first define a constant a to be *admissible* if $|a| \leq C$, where C is as in (3.2.1). A *trace set of constants of order 0* is defined simply to be an admissible constant a . Consider now some $n \geq 2$. A *trace set of constants of order 1* is a collection $I = \{a_{ij}\}_{1 \leq i < j \leq n}$, where each a_{ij} is an admissible constant. For $1 \leq d \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, a *trace set of constants of order d* is defined to be a collection $I = \{I^m\}_{1 \leq m \leq d}$, where each $I^m = \{a_{ij}^m\}_{1 \leq i < j \leq n}$ is a trace set of constants of order 1. If ξ is a $(0, n)$ S tensor field and I is a trace set of some order $d \geq 0$, one defines $\xi \cdot_{\mathcal{I}} I$ as in Section 3.2.2.

Define the sets

$$S_1^{(4)} = \{1, 2\}, \quad S_2^{(4)} = \{3, 4\}, \quad S_4^{(4)} = \{5, 6\}.$$

Consider some $k \geq 0$. Given $\gamma \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^k$, $p \in \{1, 2, 4\}$ and $i \in S_p^{(4)}$, define

$$\mathfrak{D}^k \Phi_p^{(4)} \cdot (i, \gamma) := \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi^{(4)i} \quad \text{if } i \in S_p^{(4)}.$$

Consider now some $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 1$, $p \geq 0$ and some

$$H = \{ {}^{j,m} H_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}}, {}^j J_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}} \}_{m=0, \dots, l', k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k, p_0 + \dots + p_{l'} \geq p, j \geq 1, l' \geq l},$$

where

$${}^{j,m} H_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}} \in \{(i, \gamma) \mid i \in S_{p_m}^{(4)}, \gamma \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^{k_m}\} \cup \{0\},$$

for all $m = 0, \dots, l'$, and ${}^j J_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}}$ is a trace set of constants (defined above) of some order $d \geq 0$, for all $k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k$, $p_0 + \dots + p_{l'} \geq p$, $j \geq 1$ and $l' \geq l$. For such $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 1$ and H , define

$$(\mathfrak{D}^k \Phi_p^{(4)})^l \cdot H := \sum_{\substack{l' \geq l \\ p_0 + \dots + p_{l'} \geq p}} \sum_{k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k} \sum_{j \geq 1} r^{-p_0} (\mathfrak{D}^{k_1} \Phi_{p_1}^{(4)} \cdot {}^{j,1} H_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathfrak{D}^{k_{l'}} \Phi_{p_{l'}}^{(4)} \cdot {}^{j,l'} H_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}}) \cdot_{\mathcal{I}} {}^j J_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}}.$$

For a given $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 2$, consider some $l_1, l_2 \geq 0$ and some $\check{H} = \{H_{m_1 m_2}\}_{m_1=0, \dots, l_1, m_2=0, \dots, l_2}$ where each $H_{m_1 m_2}$ is an array of the above form H . Define

$$\mathcal{E}_p^{(4)k}(\check{H}) := \sum_{m_1=0}^{l_1} \sum_{m_2=0}^{l_2} \Omega^{-m_1} \left(\frac{\check{r}}{r} \right)^{m_2} (\mathfrak{D}^k \Phi_p^{(4)})^l \cdot H. \quad (3.2.3)$$

Again, such expressions are only ever considered when sufficiently many of the components of \check{H} vanish so that each object appearing in the above summation is an S tensor of the same type, and that the summation is over only finitely many terms.

Again, we will abuse notation and write “ $\mathcal{E}_p^{(4)k}$ ” to mean “ $\mathcal{E}_p^{(4)k}(\check{H})$ for some vector \check{H} ”. In accordance with (3.2.2), the key property of $\mathcal{E}_p^{(4)k}$ errors is summarised in Lemma 3.4.2.

3.2.8 The nonlinear error notation $\mathcal{E}_p^{(in)k}$ and $\mathcal{E}_p^{(out)k}$

In Chapter 14, we are going to derive, in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, top-order estimates for the Ricci-coefficients, hence we will need to distinguish between Ricci-coefficients and curvature components appearing in the error-terms:

Up to $N + 1$ derivatives of Ricci-coefficients may appear at top order but only N derivatives of curvature. Moreover, we would like to capture the fact that only certain components appear in certain (ingoing or outgoing) transport equations. To achieve this, we introduce the shorthand notation

$$T = \Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ, \quad \underline{T} = \frac{\text{tr} \chi}{\Omega} - \frac{\text{tr} \chi_\circ}{\Omega_\circ}, \quad \omega - \omega_\circ = \Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ, \quad \underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_\circ = \Omega \hat{\underline{\omega}} - (\Omega \hat{\underline{\omega}})_\circ. \quad (3.2.4)$$

and let

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{(in)} &\in \{\eta, \eta, \Omega \hat{\chi}, \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}, T, \underline{T}, 1 - \frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_\circ^2}, 1 - \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2}, \Omega^{-2} (\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_\circ)\} \\ \Phi^{(in)} &\in \{\eta, \eta, \Omega \hat{\chi}, \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}, T, \underline{T}, 1 - \frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_\circ^2}, 1 - \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2}, \Omega^{-2} (\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_\circ)\} \cup \{\Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}, \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}, \rho - \rho_\circ, \sigma\} \\ \Gamma^{(out)} &\in \{\eta, \eta, \Omega \hat{\chi}, \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}, T, \underline{T}, 1 - \frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_\circ^2}, 1 - \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2}, \omega - \omega_\circ, b\} \\ \Phi^{(out)} &\in \{\eta, \eta, \Omega \hat{\chi}, \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}, T, \underline{T}, 1 - \frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_\circ^2}, 1 - \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2}, \omega - \omega_\circ, b\} \cup \{\Omega^2 \alpha, \Omega \beta, \rho - \rho_\circ, \sigma\}. \end{aligned}$$

We also denote by $\Gamma_p^{(in)}$ a $\Gamma^{(in)}$ from the collection Γ_p and by $\Phi_p^{(in)}$ a $\Phi^{(in)}$ from the collection Φ_p . The notation $\mathcal{E}_p^{(in),k}$ will be introduced to denote a nonlinear error term involving at most k angular derivatives of Ricci coefficients from $\Gamma^{(in)}$ and at most $k - 1$ derivatives of the $\Phi^{(in)}$ and which decays, according to the p index notation introduced above, like r^{-p} . The analogous definition will be made for $\mathcal{E}_p^{(out),k}$.

Formal definitions can be given using the notation of Section 3.2.4. We define for $i \in \{1, \dots, 17\}$ the notation $[r\nabla]^k \Phi_p \cdot (i) := [r\nabla]^k \Phi^i$. In analogy with Section 3.2.4, given $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 1$ and $p \geq 0$, we let

$$\mathbb{H} = \left(j, m \mathbb{H}_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{(in), p_0 \dots p_{l'}}, j \mathbb{H}_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}}, j, m \mathbb{H}_{top}^{(in), \tilde{p}_0 \tilde{p}_1 \tilde{p}_2}, j \mathbb{H}_{top}^{\tilde{p}_0 \tilde{p}_1 \tilde{p}_2} \right) \quad (3.2.5)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} j, m \mathbb{H}_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{(in), p_0 \dots p_{l'}} &\in \{i \leq 15 \mid i \in S_{p_m} \text{ and } i \notin \{3, 13\}\} \cup \{0\}, \\ j, m \mathbb{H}_{top}^{(in), \tilde{p}_0 \tilde{p}_1 \tilde{p}_2} &\in \{i \leq 11 \mid i \in S_{p_m} \text{ and } i \notin \{3, 6\}\} \cup \{0\}, \end{aligned}$$

and $j \mathbb{H}_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}}$ and $j \mathbb{H}_{top}^{\tilde{p}_0 \tilde{p}_1 \tilde{p}_2}$ trace sets of some order $d, d_{top} \geq 0$, all these being defined for all $l' \geq l, m = 0, \dots, \ell'$, $k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k$ and $p_0 + \dots + p_{l'} \geq p, \tilde{p}_0 + \tilde{p}_1 + \tilde{p}_2 \geq p$. We finally define

$$\begin{aligned} \left([r\nabla]^k \Phi_p^{(in)} \right)^l \cdot \mathbb{H} &:= \sum_{\tilde{p}_0 + \tilde{p}_1 + \tilde{p}_2 \geq p} \sum_{j \geq 1} r^{-p_0} ([r\nabla]^k \Phi_{p_1} \cdot j, 1 \mathbb{H}_{top}^{(in), p_0 p_1 p_2} \otimes \Phi_{p_2} \cdot j, 2 \mathbb{H}_{top}^{(in), \tilde{p}_0 \tilde{p}_1 \tilde{p}_2}) \cdot j \mathbb{H}_{top}^{\tilde{p}_0 \tilde{p}_1 \tilde{p}_2} \\ &+ \sum_{l' \geq l} \sum_{\substack{k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k \\ k_i \leq k-1 \\ p_0 + \dots + p_{l'} \geq p}} \sum_{j \geq 1} r^{-p_0} ([r\nabla]^{k_1} \Phi_{p_1} \cdot j, 1 \mathbb{H}_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{(in), p_0 \dots p_{l'}} \otimes \dots \otimes [r\nabla]^{k_{l'}} \Phi_{p_{l'}} \cdot j, l' \mathbb{H}_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{(in), p_0 \dots p_{l'}}) \cdot j \mathbb{H}_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2.6)$$

In other words, top order (i.e. equal to k) derivatives, can only involve Christoffel symbols from $\Gamma^{(in)}$, not curvature and the terms are necessarily quadratic. Moreover, as is clear from the above notation, in general only angular derivatives can appear. Note that for $k = 0$ only the first sum survives and the right hand side equals a sum of products of Christoffel symbols from $\Gamma^{(in)}$ where each product can also be multiplied with a bounded function.

The same definition is made replacing all superscripts (in) by (out) and setting

$${}^{j,m} \overset{(out)}{\#} \overset{p_0 \dots p_{l'}}{k_1 \dots k_{l'}} \in \{i \mid i \in S_{p_m} \text{ and } i \notin \{5, 6, 12\}\} \cup \{0\},$$

$${}^{j,m} \overset{(out)}{\#} \overset{p_0 p_1 p_2}{top} \in \{i \leq 13 \mid i \in S_{p_m} \text{ and } i \notin \{5, 6, 12\}\} \cup \{0\}.$$

Finally, for a given $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 2$, $p \geq 0$ and given $\#$ as above, we define

$$\overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_p^k(\#) := \left([r\nabla]^k \overset{(in)}{\Phi}_p \right)^l \cdot \#.$$
(3.2.7)

The notation $\overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}}_p^k(\#)$ is defined replacing (in) by (out). We will often abuse notation and write “ $\overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_p^k$ ” to mean “ $\overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_p^k(\#)$ for some $\#$ ” etc. We will also freely use the easily verified schematic identities

$$[r\nabla]^l \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_p^k = \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_p^{k+l} \quad \text{and} \quad [r\nabla]^l \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}}_p^k = \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}}_p^{k+l}.$$
(3.2.8)

3.2.9 The nonlinear error notation $\overset{(Kerr)}{\mathcal{E}}$

We finally introduce a schematic notation for errors arising from the subtraction of Kerr reference solutions in the Bianchi and null structure equations. This will become relevant only in Section 14.1. We define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_m^1 &= (r^2 \Delta + 2) Y_m^{\ell=1}, \quad \mathcal{Z}_m^2 = (r^2 \Delta + 2 \frac{\Omega_o^2}{\Omega^2}) Y_m^{\ell=1}, \quad \mathcal{Z}_m^3 = \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 Y_m^{\ell=1}, \quad \Omega \nabla_4 Y_m^{\ell=1}, \\ \mathcal{Z}_m^5 &= \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (r \cdot \nabla Y_m^{\ell=1}), \quad \mathcal{Z}_m^6 = \Omega \nabla_4 (r \cdot \nabla Y_m^{\ell=1}), \end{aligned}$$

where we recall the definition of the spherical harmonics (cf. Section 1.4.2.3) and observe that $\mathcal{Z}_m^i = 0$ holds for Schwarzschild with the standard spherical harmonics. For a given collection of admissible coefficient functions (see (3.2.1)) h_j ($j \in \{1, \dots, 17\}$) and $h_{j,m}$ ($j \in \{1, \dots, 6\}$, $m \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$), denoted collectively by H , we define the error

$$\overset{(Kerr)}{\mathcal{E}}(H) = \sum_{m=-1}^1 \sum_{j=1}^6 h_{j,m} \cdot a_{\mathcal{I}^+}^m \cdot \mathcal{Z}_m^j + \sum_{i \in \{3, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16\}} h_i \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_o^2}{\Omega^2} \right) r^{p_i} (\Phi^i)_{Kerr},$$
(3.2.9)

where $p_3 = 1$, $p_{10} = p_{11} = p_{12} = 2$, $p_{15} = 3$ and $p_{16} = 4$. Such expressions are only ever considered when sufficiently many of the components of H vanish so that each object appearing in the above summation is

an S tensor of the same type. Finally, we will often abuse notation and write “ $\overset{(Kerr)}{\mathcal{E}}$ ” to mean “ $\overset{(Kerr)}{\mathcal{E}}(H)$ for some H ”.

3.3 Commutation identities

Throughout, let M , \mathcal{Z} , g and $g_{\circ, M}$ be as in Section 3.1. The following lemma describes the error terms generated by commuting the various differential operators.

Lemma 3.3.1 (Commutation identities). *For any S -tangent $(0, k)$ tensor ξ ,*

$$[\Omega \nabla_4, r \nabla_B] \xi_{A_1 \dots A_k} = F_{4BA_1 \dots A_k}[\xi], \quad [\Omega \nabla_3, r \nabla_B] \xi_{A_1 \dots A_k} = \Omega^2 F_{3BA_1 \dots A_k}[\xi],$$

and

$$[\Omega \nabla_3, \Omega \nabla_4] \xi_{A_1 \dots A_k} = \Omega^2 F_{34A_1 \dots A_k}[\xi],$$

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{4BA_1\dots A_k}[\xi] &= \frac{1}{2} ((\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_\circ - \Omega \text{tr}\chi) r\nabla_B \xi_{A_1\dots A_k} - \Omega \hat{\chi}_B{}^C r\nabla_C \xi_{A_1\dots A_k} \\
&\quad + r\Omega \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\chi_{A_i B} \underline{\eta}^C - \chi_B{}^C \underline{\eta}_{A_i} + {}^*\beta_B \not\! \epsilon_{A_i}{}^C \right) \xi_{A_1\dots A_{i-1} C A_{i+1}\dots A_k}, \\
F_{3BA_1\dots A_k}[\xi] &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\Omega^2} ((\Omega \text{tr}\underline{\chi})_\circ - \Omega \text{tr}\underline{\chi}) r\nabla_B \xi_{A_1\dots A_k} - \Omega^{-1} \hat{\underline{\chi}}_B{}^C r\nabla_C \xi_{A_1\dots A_k} \\
&\quad + r\Omega^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\underline{\chi}_{A_i B} \eta^C - \underline{\chi}_B{}^C \eta_{A_i} + {}^*\underline{\beta}_B \not\! \epsilon_{A_i}{}^C \right) \xi_{A_1\dots A_{i-1} C A_{i+1}\dots A_k}, \\
F_{34A_1\dots A_k}[\xi] &= (\eta^B - \underline{\eta}^B) \nabla_B \xi_{A_1\dots A_k} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\underline{\eta}_{A_i} \eta^C - \eta_{A_i} \underline{\eta}^C + \sigma \not\! \epsilon_{A_i}{}^C \right) \xi_{A_1\dots A_{i-1} C A_{i+1}\dots A_k}.
\end{aligned}$$
$$[\nabla_A, \nabla_B]\xi_{C_1 \dots C_k} = K \sum_{i=1}^k \not\partial_{AC_i} \xi_{C_1 \dots C_{i-1} B C_{i+1} \dots C_k} - \not\partial_{BC_i} \xi_{C_1 \dots C_{i-1} A C_{i+1} \dots C_k}, \quad (3.3.1)$$

Proof. The proof is standard. See, for example, Lemma 7.3.3 of [CK93] (note however the difference with the present notation). \square

Consider some Ricci coefficient or curvature component Φ_p and some multi index γ . In the notation of Section 3.2.3, the commutation errors take the form

$$F_3[\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p] = \mathcal{E}_{p+1}^{|\gamma|+1}, \quad (3.3.3)$$

$$F_{34}[\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p] = \mathcal{E}_{n+3}^{|\gamma|+1}. \quad (3.3.4)$$

Throughout, let M , \mathcal{Z} , g and $g_{o,M}$ be as in Section 3.1. In this section, we will derive the equations satisfied by α , $\underline{\alpha}$, ψ , $\underline{\psi}$, P , \underline{P} , $\underline{\psi}$, and \underline{P} (see Definition 2.1.1). In particular, we shall exhibit the special structure of the nonlinear terms appearing in these equations. Throughout this section, the error notation introduced in Section 3.2 is utilised.

$$\mathcal{D}_2^* \xi = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\nabla \xi + \nabla^T \xi - \operatorname{div} \xi \not{g} \right),$$

The following proposition gives expressions for ψ , $\underline{\psi}$, P , \underline{P} in terms of certain elliptic operators applied to certain Ricci coefficients and curvature components. It is important to isolate the anomalous error term $\frac{1}{r}(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ}) \cdot \underline{\alpha}$ in (3.4.3).

Proposition 3.4.1 (Elliptic relations for ψ , $\underline{\psi}$, P , \underline{P}). *With M , \mathcal{Z} , g and $g_{\circ,M}$ as in Section 3.1, the quantities ψ and $\underline{\psi}$ satisfy*

$$\psi = \mathcal{P}_2^* \beta - \frac{3M}{r^3} \hat{\chi} + \mathcal{E}_5^0, \quad \underline{\psi} = \mathcal{P}_2^* \underline{\beta} + \frac{3M}{r^3} \hat{\underline{\chi}} + \mathcal{E}_3^0, \quad (3.4.1)$$

and the quantities P and \underline{P} satisfy

$$P = \mathcal{P}_2^* (\nabla \rho + {}^* \nabla \sigma) + \frac{3M\Omega}{r^4} (\hat{\underline{\chi}} - \hat{\chi}) + \mathcal{E}_5^1, \quad (3.4.2)$$

$$\underline{P} = \mathcal{P}_2^* (\nabla \rho - {}^* \nabla \sigma) + \frac{3M\Omega}{r^4} (\hat{\underline{\chi}} - \hat{\chi}) + \frac{1}{r} (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\circ}) \cdot \underline{\alpha} + \mathcal{E}_5^1. \quad (3.4.3)$$

Proof. The expressions for ψ and $\underline{\psi}$ follow immediately from the Bianchi equations (1.2.22), (1.2.31). The expression for ψ implies that

$$P = \frac{1}{r^3 \Omega} \nabla_3 (r^3 \Omega \psi) = \frac{1}{r^3 \Omega} \nabla_3 (r^3 \Omega \mathcal{P}_2^* \beta) - \frac{3M}{r^3 \Omega} \nabla_3 (\Omega \hat{\chi}) + \frac{1}{r^3 \Omega} \nabla_3 (r^3 \Omega \mathcal{E}_5^0).$$

The identity (3.4.2) for P then follows from the commuted Bianchi equation (1.2.24) and the equation (1.2.8). The expression for \underline{P} is obtained similarly after noting that, in fact,

$$\underline{\psi} = \mathcal{P}_2^* \underline{\beta} + \frac{3M}{r^3} \hat{\underline{\chi}} - \frac{1}{4\Omega} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ}) \cdot \underline{\alpha} + \mathcal{E}_4^0,$$

and that

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ}) \cdot r \underline{\alpha}) = 4\Omega_{\circ}^2 r^2 (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_{\circ}) \cdot \underline{\alpha} + \mathcal{E}_2^1,$$

which follows from the Raychaudhuri equation, (1.2.7), which can be rewritten

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ})) = 2M (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ}) + 4r \Omega_{\circ}^2 (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_{\circ}) + \mathcal{E}_2^0. \quad (3.4.4)$$

□

Recall the definition of \check{r}

$$\check{r} := \frac{2\Omega}{\text{tr} \chi},$$

and the definitions of $\check{\psi}$ and $\check{\underline{P}}$

$$\check{\psi} := \frac{1}{2r\Omega^2} \nabla_4 (\check{r} \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}), \quad \check{\underline{P}} := -\frac{1}{r^3 \Omega} \nabla_4 (r^3 \Omega \check{\psi})$$

introduced in Definition 2.1.1. It follows from the Raychaudhuri equation (1.2.7) that \check{r} satisfies

$$\partial_v \check{r} = \frac{\check{r}}{2} \Omega \text{tr} \chi + \frac{\check{r}^2}{2\Omega^2} |\Omega \hat{\chi}|^2. \quad (3.4.5)$$

In particular,

$$\partial_v (r^{-1} \check{r}) = \frac{\check{r}}{2r} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ}) + \frac{\check{r}^2}{2r\Omega^2} |\Omega \hat{\chi}|^2. \quad (3.4.6)$$

At various points in this section it is important to keep track of weaker decaying error terms which, in fact, have a gain in decay, which is better than the expected r^{-1} , when acted on by $\Omega \nabla_4$. To do so, it is convenient to use error notation of Section 3.2.7 and the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4.2 (∇_4 derivative of error terms). *Each error term of the form $\mathcal{E}_p^{(4)k}$ satisfies*

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r^p \mathcal{E}_p^{(4)k}) = \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^{k+1}. \quad (3.4.7)$$

Proof. The proof is an easy consequence of the property (3.2.2) of the $\overset{(4)}{\Phi}$ geometric quantities, equation (3.4.6) and equation (1.2.21). \square

The following proposition in particular uses the above expression for $\partial_v \check{r}$.

Proposition 3.4.3 (Elliptic relations for $\check{\underline{\psi}}, \check{\underline{P}}$). *With M, \mathcal{Z}, g and $g_{o,M}$ as in Section 3.1, the quantities $\check{\underline{\psi}}$ and $\check{\underline{P}}$ satisfy*

$$\frac{r}{\check{r}} \check{\underline{\psi}} = \mathcal{P}_2^* \underline{\beta} + \frac{3M}{r^3} \hat{\underline{\chi}} + \mathcal{E}_4^0, \quad \frac{r}{\check{r}} \check{\underline{P}} = \mathcal{P}_2^* (\nabla \rho - {}^* \nabla \sigma) + \frac{3M\Omega}{r^4} (\hat{\underline{\chi}} - \hat{\chi}) + \mathcal{E}_5^1.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 3.4.1, now taking into account (3.4.5), which in particular implies that

$$\check{\underline{\psi}} = \frac{\check{r}}{r} \left(\mathcal{P}_2^* \underline{\beta} + \frac{3M}{r^3} \hat{\underline{\chi}} \right) + \frac{1}{4} \frac{\check{r}^2}{\Omega^3 r^2} |\Omega \hat{\chi}|^2 \cdot r \underline{\alpha} + \frac{\check{r}}{r} \left(-\frac{3}{2} (\rho - \rho_o) \hat{\underline{\chi}} + \frac{3}{2} \sigma^* \hat{\underline{\chi}} - \frac{1}{4} (9\underline{\eta} - \eta) \hat{\otimes} \underline{\beta} \right).$$

The equation for $\check{\underline{\psi}}$ then follows. Using the definition of $\check{\underline{P}}$ from Definition 2.1.1 we deduce

$$\check{\underline{P}} = \frac{\check{r}}{r} \left(\mathcal{P}_2^* (\nabla \rho - {}^* \nabla \sigma) + \frac{3M\Omega}{r^4} (\hat{\underline{\chi}} - \hat{\chi}) \right) + \frac{\check{r}}{r} \left(\mathcal{E}_5^1 + k_1 \nabla \hat{\omega} \hat{\otimes} \underline{\beta} + k_2 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o) \mathcal{P}_2^* \underline{\beta} + \frac{k_3}{r} \underline{\eta} \hat{\otimes} \underline{\beta} \right) + \mathcal{E}_6^1, \quad (3.4.8)$$

for some constants k_1, k_2, k_3 , which implies the result. The refined statement (3.4.8) will be used in Proposition 3.4.4 below. \square

Note that, in the proof of Theorem 6.1, $\check{\underline{\psi}}$ and $\check{\underline{P}}$ will only be considered in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, where $\check{r}r^{-1}, \Omega^{-1} \sim 1$, and so the presence of the error terms $\check{\mathcal{E}}$, rather than the regular error terms \mathcal{E} , in Proposition 3.4.3 is irrelevant.

The following proposition similarly gives expressions for $\check{\nabla}_4(r^5 P), \check{\nabla}_4(r^5 \check{\underline{P}})$ in terms of certain elliptic operators applied to certain Ricci coefficients and curvature components. It is important to isolate the anomalous nonlinear error terms involving $\check{\nabla}(\Omega \hat{\omega}) \hat{\otimes} \underline{\beta}, \check{\nabla}_4 r \check{\nabla}(\Omega \hat{\omega}) \hat{\otimes} \underline{\beta}$ and $r^4(\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_o) \mathcal{P}_2^* \underline{\beta}$ in (3.4.10).

Proposition 3.4.4 (Elliptic relations for $\check{\nabla}_4(r^5 P), \check{\nabla}_4(r^5 \check{\underline{P}})$). *With M, \mathcal{Z}, g and $g_{o,M}$ as in Section 3.1, the quantities P and $\check{\underline{P}}$ satisfy*

$$\check{\nabla}_4(r^5 P) = r^5 \mathcal{P}_2^* \check{\nabla} \text{div} \beta - r^5 \mathcal{P}_2^* \check{\nabla} \text{curl} \beta - 6M\Omega r \mathcal{P}_2^* \underline{\eta} + 6M \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) \hat{\chi} + \frac{3M}{\Omega} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \check{\nabla} \Omega \text{tr} \chi + 3Mr \Omega \alpha + \Omega^{-1} \mathcal{E}_2^2, \quad (3.4.9)$$

$$\frac{r}{\check{r}} \check{\nabla}_4(r^5 \check{\underline{P}}) = r^5 \mathcal{P}_2^* \check{\nabla} \text{div} \beta + r^5 \mathcal{P}_2^* \check{\nabla} \text{curl} \beta - 6M\Omega r \mathcal{P}_2^* \underline{\eta} + 6M \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) \hat{\chi} + \frac{3M}{\Omega} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \check{\nabla} \Omega \text{tr} \chi + 3Mr \Omega \alpha + \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^2 + a_1 r^4 \check{\nabla}(\Omega \hat{\omega}) \hat{\otimes} \underline{\beta} + a_2 r^4 \check{\nabla}_4 r \check{\nabla}(\Omega \hat{\omega}) \hat{\otimes} \underline{\beta} + a_3 r^4 (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_o) \mathcal{P}_2^* \underline{\beta}, \quad (3.4.10)$$

for some admissible coefficient functions $a_i = a_i(r)$ satisfying (3.2.1). Moreover (3.4.10) is also satisfied with $\check{\nabla}_4(\frac{r}{\check{r}} r^5 \check{\underline{P}})$ in place of $\frac{r}{\check{r}} \check{\nabla}_4(r^5 \check{\underline{P}})$ (with a different nonlinear error term $\check{\mathcal{E}}_2^2$ with the same schematic form).

Proof. Consider first (3.4.9). Revisiting Proposition 3.4.1, note that in fact

$$P = \mathcal{P}_2^* (\nabla \rho + {}^* \nabla \sigma) + \frac{3M\Omega}{r^4} (\hat{\underline{\chi}} - \hat{\chi}) + \frac{3}{2r^3 \Omega} \nabla_3 (r^3 \Omega ((\rho - \rho_o) \hat{\chi} + \sigma^* \hat{\chi})) + 2\mathcal{P}_2^* (\hat{\chi} \cdot \underline{\beta}) + \mathcal{E}_6^1.$$

Now equations (1.2.25) and (1.2.26) imply that

$$\check{\nabla}_4(r^5 \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla \rho) = r^5 \mathcal{P}_2^* \check{\nabla} \text{div} \beta + \frac{3M}{\Omega} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \check{\nabla} \Omega \text{tr} \chi + \Omega^{-1} \mathcal{E}_2^2, \quad \check{\nabla}_4(r^5 \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla \sigma) = -r^5 \mathcal{P}_2^* \check{\nabla} \text{curl} \beta + \Omega^{-1} \mathcal{E}_2^2.$$

Equations (1.2.9) and (1.2.6) imply that

$$\nabla_4 (r\Omega\hat{\chi}) = -2r\Omega\mathcal{P}_2^*\eta + \Omega_\circ^2\hat{\chi} + \Omega\mathcal{E}_2^0, \quad \nabla_4 (r\Omega\hat{\chi}) = -\Omega_\circ^2\hat{\chi} + \frac{2M}{r}\hat{\chi} - r\Omega\alpha + \Omega^{-1}\mathcal{E}_3^0.$$

Similarly, using also Lemma 3.3.1,

$$\Omega\nabla_4 \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega} \nabla_3 (r^3\Omega(\rho - \rho_\circ)\hat{\chi}) \right) = \mathcal{E}_2^2, \quad \Omega\nabla_4 \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega} \nabla_3 (r^3\Omega\sigma^*\hat{\chi}) \right) = \mathcal{E}_2^2, \quad \Omega\nabla_4 (r^5\mathcal{P}_2^*(\hat{\chi} \cdot \underline{\beta})) = \mathcal{E}_2^2.$$

The expression (3.4.9) then follows from the fact that $\Omega\nabla_4(r^5\mathcal{E}_6^1) = \mathcal{E}_2^2$.

The expression (3.4.10) is obtained similarly, using now equation (3.4.8), equation (3.4.6), the form (3.4.4) of the Raychaudhuri equation and Lemma 3.4.2. The statement concerning $\nabla_4(\frac{r}{r}r^5\check{P})$ follows easily from (3.4.10) and equation (3.4.6). \square

3.4.2 Teukolsky equations for α and $\underline{\alpha}$

In this section, the nonlinear wave equations satisfied by α and $\underline{\alpha}$ are derived. To linear order, both satisfy the *Teukolsky* equation. See the discussion in Section II.3. We will refer to the nonlinear analogues below also as Teukolsky equations.

Recall the $\hat{\otimes}$ product for S -tangent 1-forms ξ and ξ' ,

$$\xi \hat{\otimes} \xi' = \xi \otimes \xi' + \xi' \otimes \xi - (\xi \cdot \xi')\not{g},$$

defined previously in Section 1.1.4. The following product rule for the operator \mathcal{P}_2^* is easily checked.

Lemma 3.4.5 (Product rule for symmetric traceless gradient). *For any S -tangent 1-form ξ and any function f ,*

$$\mathcal{P}_2^*(f\xi) = f\mathcal{P}_2^*\xi - 2\nabla f \hat{\otimes} \xi.$$

The fact that

$$\Omega\nabla_4 \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \right) = -\frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(\frac{1}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) - (\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ) \right) \quad (3.4.11)$$

and

$$\Omega\nabla_3 \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \right) = \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(\frac{1}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) + (\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ) \right) \quad (3.4.12)$$

will be used often in what follows.

Proposition 3.4.6 (Wave equation for α). *With M , \mathcal{Z} , g and $g_{\circ,M}$ as in Section 3.1, α satisfies the Teukolsky equation*

$$\Omega\nabla_4\Omega\nabla_3(r\Omega^2\alpha) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2}r^2\mathcal{P}_2^*\text{div}(r\Omega^2\alpha) = -\frac{4}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) \Omega\nabla_3(r\Omega^2\alpha) - \frac{6M\Omega^2}{r^3}r\Omega^2\alpha + \Omega^2\mathcal{E}_6^1. \quad (3.4.13)$$

Proof. The Bianchi equation (1.2.22) can be rewritten

$$\Omega\nabla_3(r\Omega^2\alpha) = -2\frac{\Omega^4}{r^4}r\mathcal{P}_2^*(r^4\Omega^{-1}\beta) + \frac{6M\Omega^2}{r^2}\Omega\hat{\chi} + E_1,$$

where

$$E_1 = \Omega^2r \left(-3(\rho - \rho_\circ)\Omega\hat{\chi} - 3\sigma\Omega^*\hat{\chi} + 2(\eta + \underline{\eta})\hat{\otimes}(\Omega\beta) + \frac{1}{2}(9\eta - \underline{\eta})\hat{\otimes}(\Omega\beta) - \frac{1}{2\Omega^2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)\Omega^2\alpha \right),$$

is a nonlinear error term. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega\nabla_4 \left(\frac{r^4}{\Omega^4} \Omega\nabla_3(r\Omega^2\alpha) \right) &= -2r\mathcal{P}_2^*\Omega\nabla_4(r^4\Omega^{-1}\beta) - 6Mr^2\alpha + \Omega\nabla_4 \left(\frac{r^4}{\Omega^4} E_1 \right) \\ &\quad + 6Mr^2\Omega^{-2}((\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ - \Omega\text{tr}\chi)\Omega\hat{\chi} - 2[\Omega\nabla_4, r\mathcal{P}_2^*](r^4\Omega^{-1}\beta), \end{aligned}$$

by equation (1.2.6). The Bianchi equation (1.2.23) can be rewritten

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r^4 \Omega^{-1} \beta) = r^4 \mathring{d} \mathring{v} \alpha + E_2,$$

where

$$E_2 = \frac{r^4}{\Omega^2} (\eta \cdot \Omega^2 \alpha - 2(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) \Omega \beta).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_4 \left(\frac{r^4}{\Omega^4} \Omega \nabla_3 (r \Omega^2 \alpha) \right) &= -2r^5 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathring{d} \mathring{v} \alpha - 6Mr^2 \alpha - 2r \mathcal{P}_2^* E_2 + \Omega \nabla_4 \left(\frac{r^4}{\Omega^4} E_1 \right) \\ &\quad + 6Mr^2 \Omega^{-2} ((\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ - \Omega \text{tr} \chi) \Omega \hat{\chi} - 2[\Omega \nabla_4, r \mathcal{P}_2^*](r^4 \Omega^{-1} \beta), \end{aligned}$$

which can be rearranged to give

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_4 \Omega \nabla_3 (r \Omega^2 \alpha) + 2 \frac{\Omega^4}{r} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathring{d} \mathring{v} \alpha &= -\frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \Omega \nabla_4 \left(\frac{r^4}{\Omega^4} \right) \Omega \nabla_3 (r \Omega^2 \alpha) - 6M \frac{\Omega^4}{r^2} \alpha \\ &\quad + \frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \left[-2r \mathcal{P}_2^* E_2 + \Omega \nabla_4 \left(\frac{r^4}{\Omega^4} E_1 \right) + 6Mr^2 \Omega^{-2} ((\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ - \Omega \text{tr} \chi) \Omega \hat{\chi} - 2[\Omega \nabla_4, r \mathcal{P}_2^*](r^4 \Omega^{-1} \beta) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The proof follows after noting that, by (3.4.11),

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \left(\frac{r^4}{\Omega^4} \right) = -2 \frac{r^6}{\Omega^6} \Omega \nabla_4 \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \right) = -2 \frac{r^4}{\Omega^4} \left(-\frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) + 2(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ) \right)$$

and, by Lemma 3.4.5,

$$2 \frac{\Omega^4}{r} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathring{d} \mathring{v} \alpha = \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathring{d} \mathring{v} (r \Omega^2 \alpha) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(2r^3 (\eta + \underline{\eta}) \hat{\otimes} \mathring{d} \mathring{v} \alpha - r^3 \mathcal{P}_2^* ((\eta + \underline{\eta}) \cdot \alpha) \right),$$

and checking by inspection that all of the nonlinear error terms have the correct form, using Lemma 3.3.1 and the schematic expression (3.3.2). The nontrivial error terms to check are $4(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ) \Omega \nabla_3 (r \Omega^2 \alpha)$, for which the Bianchi equation (1.2.22) is used, and the term $-3\Omega \nabla_4 (r^5 \Omega^{-2} (\rho - \rho_\circ) \Omega \hat{\chi})$ in $\Omega \nabla_4 (r^4 \Omega^{-4} E_1)$, which is rewritten as

$$-3\Omega \nabla_4 (r^5 \Omega^{-2} (\rho - \rho_\circ) \Omega \hat{\chi}) = -3\Omega \nabla_4 (r^3 (\rho - \rho_\circ)) \cdot r^2 \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi} - 3r^3 (\rho - \rho_\circ) \Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}),$$

and evaluated using equations (1.2.25) and (1.2.6). Similarly for the term $-3\Omega \nabla_4 (r^5 \Omega^{-2} \sigma \Omega^* \hat{\chi})$ in the error $\Omega \nabla_4 (r^4 \Omega^{-4} E_1)$. \square

In the proof of the main theorem, the following wave equation for $\underline{\alpha}$ will be used only for the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge and therefore the r behaviour of the error terms are not considered. For the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, the equation (3.4.18) for $\check{r} \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}$ will be used. The reason for considering the wave equation for $\check{r} \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}$ in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge is the absence of an error term with bad r behaviour of the form

$$(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) \Omega \nabla_3 (r \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha})$$

in equation (3.4.18), which is present in the following equation for $r \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}$.

Proposition 3.4.7 (Wave equation for $\underline{\alpha}$). *With M , \mathcal{Z} , g and $g_{\circ, M}$ as in Section 3.1, $\underline{\alpha}$ satisfies the Teukolsky equation*

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \Omega \nabla_4 (r \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathring{d} \mathring{v} (r \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}) = \frac{4}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) \Omega \nabla_4 (r \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}) - \frac{6M\Omega^2}{r^3} r \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha} + \Omega^6 \mathcal{E}^{*1}. \quad (3.4.14)$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 3.4.6, using now the Bianchi equations (1.2.30), (1.2.31), but is much simpler since the precise r behaviour of the error terms is not recorded. One sees easily by inspection that the terms $r \nabla \Omega \hat{\chi}$ and $r \nabla \Omega \text{tr} \chi$ do not appear. \square

3.4.3 Wave equations for ψ and $\underline{\psi}$

In this section, the wave equations satisfied by

$$\psi := -\frac{1}{2r\Omega^2} \nabla_3(r\Omega^2\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\psi} := \frac{1}{2r\Omega^2} \nabla_4(r\Omega^2\underline{\alpha})$$

are derived. The fact that, for any p, k and $\gamma \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}$,

$$\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathcal{E}_p^k = \mathcal{E}_p^{k+1}, \quad (3.4.15)$$

will be used.

Proposition 3.4.8 (Wave equation for ψ). *With M, \mathcal{Z}, g and $g_{\circ, M}$ as in Section 3.1, ψ satisfies the wave equation*

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_4 \Omega \nabla_3(r^3 \Omega \psi) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{I}v(r^3 \Omega \psi) \\ = -\frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \Omega \nabla_3(r^3 \Omega \psi) - \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) r^3 \Omega \psi + \frac{3M\Omega^2}{r^2} r\Omega^2 \alpha + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_4^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4.16)$$

Proof. The Teukolsky equation (3.4.13) can be rewritten

$$-2\Omega \nabla_4 \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r^3 \Omega \psi \right) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{I}v(r\Omega\alpha) = \frac{8}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r^3 \Omega \psi - 6M \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} r\Omega^2 \alpha + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_6^1.$$

The expression (3.4.11) then implies

$$\Omega \nabla_4(r^3 \Omega \psi) = r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{I}v(r\Omega^2 \alpha) - \frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) r^3 \Omega \psi + \frac{3M}{r} r\Omega^2 \alpha - \frac{r^2}{2\Omega^2} \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_6^1 - 2(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ) r^3 \Omega \psi,$$

and applying $\Omega \nabla_3$ then gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_4 \Omega \nabla_3(r^3 \Omega \psi) &= -2\mathcal{P}_2^* \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{I}v \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r^3 \Omega \psi \right) - \frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \Omega \nabla_3(r^3 \Omega \psi) - \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) r^3 \Omega \psi \\ &+ \frac{3M\Omega^2}{r^2} r\Omega^2 \alpha - \Omega \nabla_3 \left(\frac{r^2}{2\Omega^2} \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_6^1 - 2(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ) r^3 \Omega \psi \right) - [\Omega \nabla_3, \Omega \nabla_4](r^3 \Omega \psi) + [\Omega \nabla_3, r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{I}v](r\Omega^2 \alpha) \\ &- \frac{2}{r^2} (\Omega_\circ^2 - \Omega^2) \left(1 - \frac{6M}{r}\right) r^3 \Omega \psi + \frac{3M}{r^2} (\Omega_\circ^2 - \Omega^2) r\Omega^2 \alpha, \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \left(\frac{3M}{r} \right) = \frac{3M}{r^2} \Omega_\circ^2, \quad \text{and} \quad -\Omega \nabla_3 \left(\frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \right) = -\frac{2\Omega_\circ^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{6M}{r}\right).$$

The proof then follows from checking by inspection that the nonlinear error terms have the correct form. The expression (3.4.1) is used, along with (3.3.3), (3.3.4) and (3.4.15). \square

Proposition 3.4.9 (Wave equation for $\underline{\psi}$). *With M, \mathcal{Z}, g and $g_{\circ, M}$ as in Section 3.1, $\underline{\psi}$ satisfies the wave equation,*

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 \Omega \nabla_4(r^3 \Omega \underline{\psi}) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{I}v(r^3 \Omega \underline{\psi}) \\ = \frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \Omega \nabla_4(r^3 \Omega \underline{\psi}) - \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) r^3 \Omega \underline{\psi} + \frac{3M\Omega^2}{r^2} r\Omega^2 \underline{\alpha} + \Omega^4 \mathcal{E}^{*2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4.17)$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 3.4.8, using now the Teukolsky equation (3.4.14) and (3.4.12) instead of (3.4.11). One again easily sees, by inspecting the principal terms, that the terms $(r\nabla)^2 \Omega \hat{\chi}$ and $(r\nabla)^2 \Omega \text{tr} \chi$ do not appear. \square

3.4.4 Regge–Wheeler equations for P and \underline{P}

In this section, the wave equations satisfied by

$$P := \frac{1}{r^3\Omega} \nabla_3(r^3\Omega\psi), \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{P} := -\frac{1}{r^3\Omega} \nabla_4(r^3\Omega\underline{\psi}),$$

are derived. To linear order, both satisfy the *Regge–Wheeler* equation. See Section II.3. We will refer to the nonlinear analogues below also as Regge–Wheeler equations.

Proposition 3.4.10 (Wave equation for P). *With M , \mathcal{Z} , g and $g_{\circ,M}$ as in Section 3.1, P satisfies the Regge–Wheeler equation,*

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \Omega \nabla_3(r^5 P) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \mathcal{D}_2^* \text{div}(r^5 P) = -\frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) r^5 P + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_2^{*3}.$$

Proof. Equation (3.4.16) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_4(\Omega^2 r^3 P) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \mathcal{D}_2^* \text{div}(r^3 \Omega \psi) \\ = -\frac{2\Omega^2}{r} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) r^5 P - \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) r^3 \Omega \psi + \frac{3M\Omega^2}{r^2} r \Omega^2 \alpha + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_4^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.4.11), as in the proof of Proposition 3.4.8, this gives

$$\Omega \nabla_4(r^5 P) + 2r^2 \mathcal{D}_2^* \text{div}(r^3 \Omega \psi) = -2 \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) r^3 \Omega \psi + 3Mr \Omega^2 \alpha + \frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_4^2 - 2(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\circ}) r^5 P.$$

Note the cancellation which occurs this time. Applying $\Omega \nabla_3$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_4 \Omega \nabla_3(r^5 P) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \mathcal{D}_2^* \text{div}(r^5 P) = -2\Omega^2 \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) r^5 P \\ + \frac{6M}{r^2} (\Omega_{\circ}^2 - \Omega^2) r^3 \Omega \psi - 2[\Omega \nabla_3, r^2 \mathcal{D}_2^* \text{div}](r^3 \Omega \psi) + \Omega \nabla_3 \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_4^2 - 2(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\circ}) r^5 P \right) \end{aligned}$$

since

$$-\Omega \nabla_3 \left(2 - \frac{6M}{r}\right) = \frac{6M\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r^2}.$$

Again, note the cancellation. The proof again follows by checking that the nonlinear error terms have the correct form. The fact that the nonlinear error is of the form $\Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_2^{*3}$, rather than merely of the form $\Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_2^3$, is easily seen from the fact that the principal terms all arise from applying ∇_3 and ∇_4 derivatives to the nonlinear terms in the Bianchi equations (1.2.22) and (1.2.23). \square

Proposition 3.4.11 (Wave equation for \underline{P}). *With M , \mathcal{Z} , g and $g_{\circ,M}$ as in Section 3.1, \underline{P} satisfies the Regge–Wheeler equation,*

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \Omega \nabla_3(r^5 \underline{P}) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \mathcal{D}_2^* \text{div}(r^5 \underline{P}) = -\frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) r^5 \underline{P} + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}^{*3}.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 3.4.10, using now (3.4.12) and equation (3.4.17). \square

3.4.5 Wave equations for $\check{r}\Omega^2\alpha$, $\check{\psi}$, $\check{\underline{P}}$

Recall \check{r} , $\check{\psi}$ and $\check{\underline{P}}$ from Definition 2.1.1. In this section, the wave equations satisfied by $\check{r}\alpha$, $\check{\psi}$ and $\check{\underline{P}}$ are derived. Since $\check{\psi}$ and $\check{\underline{P}}$ are only considered, in the proof of Theorem 6.1, for the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, where it will be shown that $\Omega \sim 1$, it is not necessary to keep track of the Ω behaviour of error terms in the equations for $\check{\psi}$ and $\check{\underline{P}}$, and so only the error notation of Section 3.2.6 will be used.

In deriving the wave equation satisfied by $\check{r}\underline{\alpha}$, it is important to keep track of weaker decaying error terms which, in fact, have a gain in decay, which is better than the expected r^{-1} , when acted on by $\Omega\check{\nabla}_4$. To do so, it is convenient to use error notation of Section 3.2.7.

In the following proposition it is convenient to isolate the slowest decaying nonlinear error terms. Moreover, the term $r\check{\mathcal{P}}_2^*(r\check{\nabla}\Omega\text{tr}\chi \cdot \underline{\alpha})$ involves too many derivatives to be incorporated into the error $\check{\mathcal{E}}_3^1$ and it is important to isolate it as it is, in an appropriate sense, better than the typical error of the form $\check{\mathcal{E}}_3^2$.

Proposition 3.4.12 (Wave equation for $\check{r}\Omega^2\underline{\alpha}$). *With M , \mathcal{Z} , g and $g_{\circ,M}$ as in Section 3.1, $\underline{\alpha}$ satisfies the Teukolsky equation*

$$\Omega\check{\nabla}_3\Omega\check{\nabla}_4(\check{r}\Omega^2\underline{\alpha}) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2}r^2\check{\mathcal{P}}_2^*\text{d}\check{v}(\check{r}\Omega^2\underline{\alpha}) = \frac{4}{r}\left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right)\Omega\check{\nabla}_4(\check{r}\Omega^2\underline{\alpha}) - \frac{6M\Omega^2}{r^3}\check{r}\Omega^2\underline{\alpha} + \check{\mathcal{E}}[\underline{\alpha}], \quad (3.4.18)$$

where the nonlinear error $\check{\mathcal{E}}[\underline{\alpha}]$ has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\mathcal{E}}[\underline{\alpha}] &= \check{\mathcal{E}}_4^1 + \check{\mathcal{E}}_3^1 + k_1 r \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^*(r\check{\nabla}\Omega\text{tr}\chi \cdot \underline{\alpha}) + k_2 r \eta \hat{\otimes} \text{d}\check{v}\underline{\alpha} + k_3 r \eta \hat{\otimes} \text{d}\check{v}\underline{\alpha} + k_4 r \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^*(\eta \cdot \underline{\alpha}) + k_5 r \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^*(\eta \cdot \underline{\alpha}) \\ &\quad + k_6 r^2 \check{\nabla}\Omega\text{tr}\chi \hat{\otimes} \text{d}\check{v}\underline{\alpha} + k_7 (\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ}) r \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^*(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}) + k_8 r \check{\nabla}(\Omega\hat{\omega}) \hat{\otimes} (\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}) \\ &= \check{\mathcal{E}}_3^1 + k_1 r \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^*(r\check{\nabla}\Omega\text{tr}\chi \cdot \underline{\alpha}), \end{aligned}$$

for functions $k_i = k_i(r^{-1}\check{r})$, $i = 1, \dots, 8$, which each either take the form $k_i = \tilde{k}_i \frac{\check{r}}{r}$ or $k_i = \tilde{k}_i \frac{\check{r}^2}{r^2}$, for some constants $\tilde{k}_1, \dots, \tilde{k}_8$.

Proof. The Bianchi equation (1.2.31) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{r^4}{\Omega^4}\Omega\check{\nabla}_4(\check{r}\Omega^2\underline{\alpha}) = 2\frac{\check{r}}{r} \cdot r\check{\mathcal{P}}_2^*\left(\frac{r^4}{\Omega}\underline{\beta}\right) + 6M\frac{\check{r}}{r}\Omega^{-1}r^2\hat{\chi} + \underline{E}_1,$$

where

$$\underline{E}_1 = \frac{\check{r}}{r} \left(-3r\Omega^{-1}r\hat{\chi}r^3(\rho - \rho_{\circ}) - 3r\Omega^{-1}r^*\hat{\chi}r^3\sigma - \frac{1}{2}r(13\underline{\eta} + 3\eta)\hat{\otimes}r^4\underline{\beta}\Omega^{-1} \right) + 2r^4\Omega^{-4}|\Omega\hat{\chi}|^2\check{r}^2\underline{\alpha}.$$

Rewriting the Bianchi equation (1.2.30)

$$\Omega\check{\nabla}_3\left(\frac{r^4}{\Omega}\underline{\beta}\right) = -r^4\text{d}\check{v}\underline{\alpha} + \underline{E}_2, \quad \underline{E}_2 = -\Omega^2r^4(\underline{\eta} \cdot \Omega^{-2}\underline{\alpha} + \Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - (\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_{\circ})\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}),$$

and the equations (1.2.6), (1.2.10) as

$$\Omega\check{\nabla}_3\left(\frac{r\check{r}}{\Omega}\hat{\chi}\right) = -r\check{r}\underline{\alpha} + \underline{E}_3, \quad (3.4.19)$$

with

$$\underline{E}_3 = \frac{r}{\Omega}\hat{\chi}\left[\frac{\check{r}}{2}((\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_{\circ} - \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}) + 2\check{r}(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ}) + \frac{2M(\check{r} - r)}{r^3} - \frac{\check{r}^2}{2}(-(\hat{\chi}, \hat{\chi}) + 2|\eta|^2 + 2(\rho - \rho_{\circ}) + 2\text{d}\check{v}\eta)\right]$$

it follows that

$$\Omega\check{\nabla}_3\left(\frac{r^4}{\Omega^4}\Omega\check{\nabla}_4(\check{r}\Omega^2\underline{\alpha})\right) = -2r^4\check{r}\check{\mathcal{P}}_2^*\text{d}\check{v}\underline{\alpha} - 6Mr\check{r}\underline{\alpha} + \Omega\check{\nabla}_3(\underline{E}_1) + 2\check{r}\check{\mathcal{P}}_2^*\underline{E}_2 + \underline{E}_3 + 2[\Omega\check{\nabla}_3, \check{r}\check{\mathcal{P}}_2^*](r^4\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}).$$

After rearranging, using (3.4.12) and the fact that

$$\check{r}\Omega^2\check{\mathcal{P}}_2^*\text{d}\check{v}\underline{\alpha} = \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^*\text{d}\check{v}(\check{r}\Omega^2\underline{\alpha}) + 2\check{\nabla}(\check{r}\Omega^2)\hat{\otimes}\text{d}\check{v}\underline{\alpha} - \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^*(\check{\nabla}(\check{r}\Omega^2) \cdot \underline{\alpha}),$$

this gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 \Omega \nabla_4 (\check{r} \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathfrak{d}\check{v}(\check{r} \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}) &= \frac{4}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \Omega \nabla_4 (\check{r} \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}) - \frac{6M\Omega^4}{r^3} \check{r} \underline{\alpha} \\ &\quad - 4\Omega^4 \nabla (\check{r} \Omega^2) \hat{\otimes} \mathfrak{d}\check{v} \underline{\alpha} + 2\Omega^4 \mathcal{P}_2^* (\nabla (\check{r} \Omega^2) \cdot \underline{\alpha}) + 4(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ) \Omega \nabla_4 (\check{r} \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \Omega \nabla_3 (\underline{E}_1) + \frac{2\Omega^4}{r^4} \check{r} \mathcal{P}_2^* \underline{E}_2 + \frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \underline{E}_3 + \frac{2\Omega^4}{r^4} [\Omega \nabla_3, \check{r} \mathcal{P}_2^*] (r^4 \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}). \end{aligned}$$

The proof then follows by inspecting each of the error terms and using the fact that

$$\nabla (\check{r} \Omega^2) = 2\check{r} \Omega^2 (\eta + \underline{\eta}) - \frac{\check{r}^2}{2} \nabla (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ).$$

As in Lemma 3.3.1, using equation (1.2.10),

$$\frac{2\Omega^4}{r^4} [\Omega \nabla_3, \check{r} \mathcal{P}_2^*] (r^4 \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}) = 4\Omega^4 (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ) \check{r} \mathcal{P}_2^* (\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}) + \check{\mathcal{E}}_4^1 + \mathcal{E}_3^1. \quad (4)$$

The most nontrivial terms to check are those in $\frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \Omega \nabla_3 (\underline{E}_1)$. Equations (1.2.27) and (3.4.19) are used for the first term after writing

$$-3 \frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \Omega \nabla_3 (r^4 \check{r} (\rho - \rho_\circ) \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}) = -3 \frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \Omega \nabla_3 (r^3 (\rho - \rho_\circ)) r \check{r} \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi} + -3 \frac{\Omega^4}{r} (\rho - \rho_\circ) \Omega \nabla_3 (r \check{r} \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}) = \check{\mathcal{E}}_4^1 + \mathcal{E}_3^1. \quad (4)$$

Similarly

$$-3 \frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \Omega \nabla_3 (r^4 \check{r} \sigma \Omega^{-1*} \hat{\chi}) = \check{\mathcal{E}}_4^1 + \mathcal{E}_3^1. \quad (4)$$

Equations (1.2.14) and (1.2.30) are used to show

$$-\frac{3}{2} \frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \Omega \nabla_3 (r^4 \check{r} \eta \hat{\otimes} \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}) = -3 \frac{\check{r}}{r} \frac{\Omega^4}{r} \nabla (\Omega \hat{\omega}) \hat{\otimes} (r^2 \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}) + \frac{3}{2} \frac{\check{r}}{r} \Omega^4 r \eta \hat{\otimes} \mathfrak{d}\check{v} \underline{\alpha} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_4^1 + \mathcal{E}_3^1, \quad (4)$$

and equations (1.2.12) and (1.2.30) to show

$$-\frac{13}{2} \frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \Omega \nabla_3 (r^4 \check{r} \eta \hat{\otimes} \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}) = \frac{13}{2} r \Omega^4 \eta \hat{\otimes} \mathfrak{d}\check{v} \underline{\alpha} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_4^1 + \mathcal{E}_3^1. \quad (4)$$

For the final term in $\frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \Omega \nabla_3 (\underline{E}_1)$ note that,

$$\frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \Omega \nabla_3 \left(\frac{r^4}{\Omega^4} \frac{1}{\Omega \text{tr} \chi} |\Omega \hat{\chi}|^2 \check{r} \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha} \right) = \frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \Omega \nabla_3 \left(\frac{r^4 \check{r}}{2\Omega^2} |\Omega \hat{\chi}|^2 \check{r} \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha} \right) = \check{\mathcal{E}}_4^1 + \mathcal{E}_3^1. \quad (4)$$

□

Again, it is important to isolate the slowest decaying nonlinear error terms in the following proposition. The additional structure in the error, namely the fact that each term contains at least one factor which is not equal to $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 \alpha$, $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega \beta$ or $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_\circ)$, is used in Chapter 14 to show that the error in equation (14.1.60) also has this additional structure, as shown in Proposition 14.2.14.

Proposition 3.4.13 (Wave equation for $\check{\psi}$). *With M , \mathcal{Z} , g and $g_{\circ, M}$ as in Section 3.1, $\check{\psi}$ satisfies the wave equation,*

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 \Omega \nabla_4 (r^3 \Omega \check{\psi}) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathfrak{d}\check{v} (r^3 \Omega \check{\psi}) \\ = \frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \Omega \nabla_4 (r^3 \Omega \check{\psi}) - \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) r^3 \Omega \check{\psi} + \frac{3M\Omega^2}{r^2} \check{r} \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha} + \mathcal{E}[\check{\psi}], \end{aligned} \quad (3.4.20)$$

where the nonlinear error $\mathcal{E}[\check{\psi}]$ has the schematic form,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}[\check{\psi}] &= \check{\mathcal{E}}_3^2 + \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^2 + k_1 \eta \hat{\otimes} r^2 \mathfrak{d}\check{\mathbf{v}}\underline{\alpha} + k_2 r \mathcal{P}_2^*(r\eta \cdot \underline{\alpha}) + k_3 r \nabla \Omega \hat{\omega} \hat{\otimes} r^2 \mathfrak{d}\check{\mathbf{v}}\underline{\alpha} + k_4 r \mathcal{P}_2^*(r \nabla \Omega \hat{\omega} \cdot r \underline{\alpha}) \\ &\quad + k_5 r \nabla \Omega \text{tr} \chi \hat{\otimes} r^2 \mathfrak{d}\check{\mathbf{v}}\underline{\alpha} + k_6 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o) r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathfrak{d}\check{\mathbf{v}}(r \underline{\alpha}) \\ &= \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^2,\end{aligned}\tag{3.4.21}$$

for functions $k_i = k_i(r^{-1}\check{r})$, for $i = 1, \dots, 6$, which each take either the form $k_i = \tilde{k}_i \frac{\check{r}}{r}$ or $k_i = \tilde{k}_i \frac{\check{r}^2}{r^2}$, for some constants $\tilde{k}_1, \dots, \tilde{k}_6$. Moreover, each term in the nonlinear error $\mathcal{E}[\check{\psi}]$ contains at least one factor which is not equal to $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 \alpha$, $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega \beta$ or $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_o)$.

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 3.4.8, the Teukolsky equation (3.4.18) and (3.4.12) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega \nabla_3 \Omega \nabla_4 (r^3 \Omega \check{\psi}) &= -2r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathfrak{d}\check{\mathbf{v}} \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r^3 \Omega \check{\psi} \right) + \frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) \Omega \nabla_4 (r^3 \Omega \check{\psi}) - \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) r^3 \Omega \check{\psi} \\ &\quad + \frac{3M\Omega^2}{r^2} \check{r} \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha} + \frac{3M}{r^2} (\Omega_o^2 - \Omega^2) \check{r} \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha} - \frac{2}{r^2} (\Omega_o^2 - \Omega^2) \left(1 - \frac{6M}{r} \right) r^3 \Omega \check{\psi} - [\Omega \nabla_4, \Omega \nabla_3] (r^3 \Omega \check{\psi}) \\ &\quad - [\Omega \nabla_4, r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathfrak{d}\check{\mathbf{v}}] (\check{r} \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}) - 2\Omega \nabla_4 ((\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o) r^3 \Omega \check{\psi}) - \frac{1}{2} \Omega \nabla_4 \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \mathcal{E}[\check{\alpha}] \right).\end{aligned}$$

It remains to check the form of the error. It is straightforward to check by inspection, using also Proposition 3.4.3, that most of the terms have the correct form. For the penultimate term one also uses the fact that equation (1.2.15) gives

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o) = \Omega^2 [(\eta, \underline{\eta}) - |\eta|^2 - (\rho - \rho_o)] + \rho_o (\Omega_o^2 - \Omega^2),$$

so that

$$\Omega \nabla_4 ((\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o) r^3 \Omega \check{\psi}) = \Omega \nabla_4 ((\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o)) r^3 \Omega \check{\psi} + (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o) \Omega \nabla_4 (r^3 \Omega \check{\psi}) = \check{\mathcal{E}}_3^2.$$

For the third from last term, Lemma 3.3.1 implies that

$$2[\Omega \nabla_4, r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathfrak{d}\check{\mathbf{v}}] (\check{r} \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}) = r \mathcal{P}_2^* [((\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o - \Omega \text{tr} \chi) r \mathfrak{d}\check{\mathbf{v}} (\check{r} \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha})] + ((\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o - \Omega \text{tr} \chi) r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathfrak{d}\check{\mathbf{v}} (\check{r} \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}) + \check{\mathcal{E}}_3^1 + \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^1.\tag{4}$$

The remaining nontrivial terms to check are those in $\Omega \nabla_4 \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \check{\mathcal{E}}[\check{\alpha}] \right)$, which can be done so in a similar straightforward way by using the relevant null structure and Bianchi equations. As an example, the first anomalous term in $\check{\mathcal{E}}[\check{\alpha}]$ gives the contribution

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r \eta \hat{\otimes} r^2 \mathfrak{d}\check{\mathbf{v}} \underline{\alpha}) = \Omega_o^2 \eta \hat{\otimes} r^2 \mathfrak{d}\check{\mathbf{v}} \underline{\alpha} + \mathcal{E}_3^2.$$

Lemma 3.4.2 is used for the terms arising from the $\check{\mathcal{E}}_3^1$ error in $\check{\mathcal{E}}[\check{\alpha}]$ to give $\Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 \check{\mathcal{E}}_3^1) = \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^2 + \check{\mathcal{E}}_3^2$.

One easily sees that each term in the nonlinear error $\mathcal{E}[\check{\psi}]$ contains at least one factor which is not equal to $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 \alpha$, $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega \beta$ or $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_o)$ by noting the form of the terms in $\check{\mathcal{E}}[\check{\alpha}]$ in Proposition 3.4.12 and the terms in Lemma 3.3.1. \square

Finally, the wave equation satisfied by \check{P} can be derived. It is convenient to isolate certain anomalous nonlinear error terms. Accordingly, define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{\text{anom}}[\check{P}] &= 2k_1 r^4 \nabla (\Omega \hat{\omega}) \hat{\otimes} \mathfrak{d}\check{\mathbf{v}} \underline{\alpha} + 2k_2 r^4 \mathcal{P}_2^* (\nabla (\Omega \hat{\omega}) \cdot \underline{\alpha}) + k_3 r^5 \nabla \Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega \hat{\omega}) \hat{\otimes} \mathfrak{d}\check{\mathbf{v}} \underline{\alpha} \\ &\quad + k_4 r^5 \mathcal{P}_2^* (\nabla \Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega \hat{\omega}) \cdot \underline{\alpha}) + 4k_5 r^4 \nabla (\Omega \hat{\omega}) \hat{\otimes} \mathfrak{d}\check{\mathbf{v}} \underline{\alpha} + 4k_6 r^5 (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_o) \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathfrak{d}\check{\mathbf{v}} \underline{\alpha},\end{aligned}\tag{3.4.22}$$

and $k_i = k_i(r^{-1}\check{r})$, for $i = 1, \dots, 6$, are as in Proposition 3.4.13.

Proposition 3.4.14 (Wave equation for $\check{\underline{P}}$). *With M , \mathcal{Z} , g and $g_{\circ,M}$ as in Section 3.1, $\check{\underline{P}}$ satisfies the Regge–Wheeler equation,*

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \Omega \nabla_3 (r^5 \check{\underline{P}}) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \text{div} (r^5 \check{\underline{P}}) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) r^5 \check{\underline{P}} = \mathcal{E}[\check{\underline{P}}], \quad (3.4.23)$$

where the nonlinear error $\mathcal{E}[\check{\underline{P}}]$ has the schematic form

$$\mathcal{E}[\check{\underline{P}}] = \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^3 + \mathcal{E}_{\text{anom}}[\check{\underline{P}}] = \check{\mathcal{E}}_{\frac{3}{2}}^3,$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{\text{anom}}[\check{\underline{P}}]$ is defined in (3.4.22).

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 3.4.10, using now (3.4.12), equation (3.4.20) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 \Omega \nabla_4 (r^5 \check{\underline{P}}) &= -2r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \text{div} \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r^5 \check{\underline{P}} \right) - \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) r^5 \check{\underline{P}} + \frac{6M}{r^2} (\Omega_{\circ}^2 - \Omega^2) r^3 \Omega \check{\underline{\psi}} \\ &\quad - \Omega \nabla_4 \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \mathcal{E}[\check{\underline{\psi}}] + 2(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\circ}) r^5 \check{\underline{P}} \right) - [\Omega \nabla_4, \Omega \nabla_3] (r^5 \check{\underline{P}}) + 2[\Omega \nabla_4, r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \text{div}] (r^3 \Omega \check{\underline{\psi}}). \end{aligned}$$

Note the cancellations. It remains to check the structure of the error terms, which is done by inspection. The most nontrivial terms to check are those in $\Omega \nabla_4 \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \mathcal{E}[\check{\underline{\psi}}] \right)$ for which the equations (1.2.7), (1.2.13), (1.2.31) are used, together with Lemma 3.4.2. \square

Chapter 4

Change of double null gauge and the diffeomorphism functions

The vacuum Lorentzian manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) of interest in this paper will not be covered by a single double null coordinate system. We will thus consider locally defined double null parametrisations, and being able to understand (and estimate) the diffeomorphisms relating two such parametrisations will be paramount. This is the goal of the present chapter.

Contents

4.1	Local double null gauges in a vacuum spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g)	77
4.2	Change of double null gauge: the diffeomorphism functions f and their derivatives	77
4.2.1	The diffeomorphism functions f	78
4.2.2	First order derivatives of the diffeomorphism functions	78
4.2.3	Beyond S -tensors: higher order derivatives of the diffeomorphism functions . . .	78
4.3	Transformation laws for geometric quantities under change of gauge	79
4.3.1	Basic setup: two double null gauges and two Schwarzschild backgrounds with masses M and \tilde{M}	79
4.3.2	Basic identities	80
4.3.3	The nonlinear error notation $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{df},p}^{1,k}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{df},p}^{2,k}$	82
4.3.4	The change of gauge relations	85
4.3.5	Norms and derivatives of projections of S -tensors	87
4.3.6	\tilde{S} -tangential operators acting on S -tensors	88
4.4	A determination of the sphere diffeomorphism	88
4.4.1	Preliminaries on the sphere \mathbb{S}^2	90
4.4.2	Two geodesic polar charts on (S, h)	91
4.4.3	Two isothermal charts on (S, h)	92
4.4.4	Estimates for the metric in isothermal charts	94
4.4.5	The modified chart on the southern hemisphere and the completion of the construction	95
4.4.6	Equivariance	96
4.4.7	Estimates for differences in canonical coordinates	96
4.4.8	Proof of canonicity, smooth dependence and estimates for the diffeomorphisms $\psi \circ \tilde{\psi}^{-1}$	96

We shall set the notation in **Section 4.1** for a local double null parametrisations covering a region of a vacuum spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) . We shall then consider change of double null gauge in **Section 4.2**, introducing a formalism for estimating the diffeomorphism functions f to arbitrary order. We shall then give formulas for how geometric quantities transform under such change of gauge in **Section 4.3**. Finally, in **Section 4.4**, we shall give a canonical choice for breaking the diffeomorphism invariance of the sphere.

The basic notation of Section 4.1 is fundamental for all of Part B beyond Section 5.3. Section 4.2 will also be necessary wherever the f notation appears (e.g. already in Section 5.6), and the operations defining derivatives of f appear in the energies of Section 6.1. Section 4.3 may be skipped on a first reading, though it will be necessary for Part C. The statement of the main proposition of Section 4.4 is referred to in Section 5.6.3; the proof may also be safely skipped on a first reading. (We remark here that Section 4.4 is in fact independent of the rest of the paper with the exception of the notation of Section 1.1.1.)

4.1 Local double null gauges in a vacuum spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g)

Let (\mathcal{M}, g) be a smooth time-oriented 4-dimensional Lorentzian manifold satisfying the Einstein vacuum equations (1.2.1). Consider a subset as before

$$\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^2$$

and a local parameterisation

$$i : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}, g) \tag{4.1.1}$$

where i^*g satisfies the assumptions of Section 1.1. We will assume that the time-orientation defined in Section 1.1.3 coincides with that induced from (\mathcal{M}, g) . We will call such a parametrisation a (locally defined) double null gauge in (\mathcal{M}, g) . In the context of restricting domains, we will may also consider $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^2$ to be an arbitrary 4-dimensional submanifold with piecewise smooth boundary.

When working in a single such parametrisation, we will usually not differentiate our notation between g and i^*g , and, as is standard, we may think of u, v, θ^A as coordinate functions on \mathcal{M} , i.e. we may identify these with $u \circ i^{-1}$, etc. Similarly, we shall use the notations $C_u, C_v, S_{u,v}$ etc., to denote subsets of \mathcal{M} , i.e. they correspond to $i(C_u), i(C_v)$, etc., defined previously.

Remark 4.1.1. *We note that although our underlying manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) will be smooth, as it will be a maximal Cauchy development of smooth data, some gauges which will be defined via normalisations on null infinity will only have limited regularity. Thus, we shall sometimes refer also to parametrisations (4.1.1) which are only C^k for some sufficiently high k , in which case the corresponding geometric quantities will only have finite regularity. We note already that the fundamental parametrisations of our work, however, i.e. those corresponding to our \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauge normalised at finite u_f time, will indeed be smooth.*

4.2 Change of double null gauge: the diffeomorphism functions f and their derivatives

We shall often cover the same region of \mathcal{M} by multiple local parameterisations of the form (4.1.1). For instance, in Chapter 5, we shall consider the two initial data gauges (5.6.1) and (5.6.2) (defined in Section 5.5) and the two teleologically normalised \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges (5.6.5) and (5.6.6) (defined in Section 5.6.3), and the ranges of these parametrisations will indeed overlap. It will be of fundamental importance to understand how quantities transform, and in particular, to estimate the diffeomorphisms relating two such parametrisations.

With (\mathcal{M}, g) and (4.1.1) as in Section 4.1, let us consider then, in addition to a parametrisation (4.1.1), a second parametrisation

$$\tilde{i} : \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}, \tag{4.2.1}$$

where \tilde{i}^*g again satisfies the assumptions of Section 1.1. We may define transition functions

$$F := i^{-1} \circ \tilde{i} : \tilde{i}^{-1}(i(\mathcal{Z})) \rightarrow i^{-1}(\tilde{i}(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}})). \tag{4.2.2}$$

When considering coordinates in two such gauges, it is convenient to introduce labels on the coordinates so as to distinguish them. Thus, we may denote by u, v, θ^A local coordinates defined by a parametrisation (4.1.1) and $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}^A$ local coordinates defined by a second parametrisation (4.2.1). With this notational convention we may consider both C_u , etc., and $C_{\tilde{u}}$, etc., as subsets of \mathcal{M} , where the different labelling of the coordinates is sufficient to distinguish these.

4.2.1 The diffeomorphism functions f

In coordinates, we may write $F = (F^1, F^2, F^3, F^4)$ in the form

$$F^A(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}) = \tilde{\theta}^A + f^A(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}), \quad F^3(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}) = \tilde{u} + f^3(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}), \quad F^4(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}) = \tilde{v} + f^4(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}), \quad (4.2.3)$$

where the above expressions define f^A , f^3 and f^4 . One may think of f^3 and f^4 as scalar valued functions on $\tilde{i}^{-1}(i(\mathcal{Z}))$. Their definition does not depend on the choice of local angular coordinates. The decomposition of $F^A = \tilde{\theta}^A + f^A$, on the other hand, is somewhat unnatural, because the linear structure is heavily dependent on the choice of local coordinates θ^A and $\tilde{\theta}^A$. Nonetheless, we use this notation to facilitate comparison with [DHR]. In the subsections below, we will define tensorial derivatives of F , which we will later use to estimate the diffeomorphisms.

4.2.2 First order derivatives of the diffeomorphism functions

Consider the set $\tilde{S}_{\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ and some point $p \in \tilde{S}_{\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}}$. The image $F(p)$ lies on a unique $S_{u,v} \subset \mathcal{Z}$. The restriction of the differential dF_p to $T_p \tilde{S}_{\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}}$ can be projected to $T_{F(p)} S_{u,v}$ to give a map which we shall denote

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p : T_p \tilde{S}_{\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}} \rightarrow T_{F(p)} S_{u,v}, \quad (4.2.4)$$

defined by $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p(X) = \Pi_{T_{F(p)} S_{u,v}}(dF_p X)$, for $X \in T_p \tilde{S}_{\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}}$. We emphasise that the definition of this map is independent of the choice of local angular coordinates θ^A and $\tilde{\theta}^A$.

In components,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\partial_{\tilde{\theta}^A}, d\theta^B) = \frac{\partial F^B}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^A} = \delta_A^B + \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^A}. \quad (4.2.5)$$

We note that the two summands on the right hand side of above do not have a natural tensorial meaning individually.

Similarly, define $\partial_{\tilde{u}} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p \in T_{F(p)} S_{u,v}$ and $\partial_{\tilde{v}} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p \in T_{F(p)} S_{u,v}$ by

$$\partial_{\tilde{u}} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p = \Pi_{T_{F(p)} S_{u,v}}(dF_p \partial_{\tilde{u}}), \quad \partial_{\tilde{v}} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p = \Pi_{T_{F(p)} S_{u,v}}(dF_p \partial_{\tilde{v}}). \quad (4.2.6)$$

In components,

$$\partial_{\tilde{u}} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(d\theta^A) = \frac{\partial F^A}{\partial \tilde{u}} = \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial \tilde{u}}, \quad \partial_{\tilde{v}} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(d\theta^A) = \frac{\partial F^A}{\partial \tilde{v}} = \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial \tilde{v}}.$$

Define now

$$\partial_{\tilde{u}} f := \partial_{\tilde{u}} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \quad \partial_{\tilde{v}} f := \partial_{\tilde{v}} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}.$$

4.2.3 Beyond S -tensors: higher order derivatives of the diffeomorphism functions

So as to not overload the notation with restrictions of domain, let us assume without loss of generality that the transition map F of (4.2.2) is in fact a global diffeomorphism $F : \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$. (Note here that in this case, we will not assume that $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ and \mathcal{Z} in general factor as products, so it is important to allow these to be general 4-dimensional submanifolds of $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^2$ with boundary, as noted in Section 4.1.)

Thought of as defined on \mathcal{Z} , then $\partial_{\tilde{u}} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\partial_{\tilde{v}} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ are simply S -vector fields. On the other hand, $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is a new kind of tensorial object which cannot be thought of either as an S -tensor or as a \tilde{S} -tensor. Thus, we cannot follow the calculus of Section 1.1.4 to define higher order derivatives.

We would like to view both (4.2.5) and (4.2.6) as tensors on $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ and to differentiate them with respect to operators which are connected to the double null structure of $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$. The purpose of this section is to provide such a calculus.

We first introduce certain vector bundles over $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ and note that the objects $\partial_{\tilde{u}} f$, $\partial_{\tilde{v}} f$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, introduced in the previous section, are indeed sections of these vector bundles.

Let $TS \subset TZ$ denote the sub-bundle of vectors tangential to the spheres $S_{u,v}$, i.e. $TS = \bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{Z}} \{p\} \times T_p S_{u(p),v(p)}$, with the obvious topology and smooth structure. Let $F^*(TS)$ denote the pull back bundle over $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$,

$$F^*(TS) = \bigcup_{p \in \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}} \{p\} \times T_{F(p)}S,$$

where $T_{F(p)}S$ is the fibre of TS over $F(p)$. Similarly let $T^*\tilde{S} \subset T^*\mathcal{M}$ denote the sub-bundle of $\tilde{S}_{\tilde{u},\tilde{v}}$ one forms, $T^*\tilde{S} = \bigcup_{p \in M} \{p\} \times T_p^* \tilde{S}_{\tilde{u}(p),\tilde{v}(p)}$.

Now $\partial_{\tilde{u}}f, \partial_{\tilde{v}}f \in \Gamma(F^*(TS))$ and $\tilde{d}\tilde{F} \in \Gamma(T^*\tilde{S} \otimes F^*(TS))$ and so, in order to apply the operators $\tilde{\nabla}, \tilde{\nabla}_3$ and $\tilde{\nabla}_4$ to $\partial_{\tilde{u}}f, \partial_{\tilde{v}}f$, and $\tilde{d}\tilde{F}$, we define the operators $\tilde{\nabla}, \tilde{\nabla}_3$ and $\tilde{\nabla}_4$ applied to general sections of these vector bundles.

First consider a one form $\xi \in \Gamma(T^*S)$. Define $\tilde{\nabla}_X \xi$ to be the restriction of the spacetime one form $\nabla_{F_*X} \xi$ to $S_{u,v}$ vectors. Define moreover $\tilde{\nabla}_3 \xi$ and $\tilde{\nabla}_4 \xi$ to be the restriction of $\nabla_{F_*\tilde{e}_3} \xi$ and $\nabla_{F_*\tilde{e}_4} \xi$ to $S_{u,v}$ vectors.

Given now a tensor field $T \in \Gamma((T^*\tilde{S})^s \otimes F^*(TS))$, define $\tilde{\nabla}T \in \Gamma((T^*\tilde{S})^{s+1} \otimes F^*(TS))$ by

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\nabla}_X T)(Y_1, \dots, Y_s, \xi) &= X(T(Y_1, \dots, Y_s, \xi)) - T(\tilde{\nabla}_X Y_1, \dots, Y_s, \xi) - \dots - T(Y_1, \dots, \tilde{\nabla}_X Y_s, \xi) \\ &\quad + T(Y_1, \dots, Y_s, \tilde{\nabla}_X \xi), \end{aligned}$$

for $X, Y_1, \dots, Y_s \in \Gamma(T\tilde{S})$ and $\xi \in \Gamma(T^*S)$. Similarly define

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\nabla}_3 T)(Y_1, \dots, Y_s, \xi) &= \tilde{e}_3(T(Y_1, \dots, Y_s, \xi)) - T(\tilde{\nabla}_3 Y_1, \dots, Y_s, \xi) - \dots - T(Y_1, \dots, \tilde{\nabla}_3 Y_s, \xi) \\ &\quad + T(Y_1, \dots, Y_s, \tilde{\nabla}_3 \xi), \\ (\tilde{\nabla}_4 T)(Y_1, \dots, Y_s, \xi) &= \tilde{e}_4(T(Y_1, \dots, Y_s, \xi)) - T(\tilde{\nabla}_4 Y_1, \dots, Y_s, \xi) - \dots - T(Y_1, \dots, \tilde{\nabla}_4 Y_s, \xi) \\ &\quad + T(Y_1, \dots, Y_s, \tilde{\nabla}_4 \xi). \end{aligned}$$

Setting, for example, $T = \partial_{\tilde{u}}f$, the above defines the derivative $\tilde{\nabla}\partial_{\tilde{u}}f \in \Gamma(T^*\tilde{S} \otimes F^*(TS))$. Higher order $\tilde{\nabla}$ derivatives are then inductively defined, for $k \geq 2$, by setting $T = \tilde{\nabla}^k \partial_{\tilde{u}}f \in \Gamma((T^*\tilde{S})^k \otimes F^*(TS))$ in the above and defining

$$\tilde{\nabla}^{k+1} \partial_{\tilde{u}}f := \tilde{\nabla} \tilde{\nabla}^k \partial_{\tilde{u}}f \in \Gamma((T^*\tilde{S})^{k+1} \otimes F^*(TS)).$$

One similarly defines general combinations of $\tilde{\nabla}, \tilde{\nabla}_3$ and $\tilde{\nabla}_4$ derivatives of $\partial_{\tilde{u}}f$, and also of $\partial_{\tilde{v}}f$ and $\tilde{d}\tilde{F}$.

For $T \in \Gamma((T^*\tilde{S})^s \otimes F^*(TS))$ and $p \in \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{U}$, we note that the expression

$$|T|^2 := \tilde{g}^{\tilde{A}_1 \tilde{B}_1}(p) \dots \tilde{g}^{\tilde{A}_s \tilde{B}_s}(p) \tilde{g}_{CD}(F(p)) T_{\tilde{A}_1 \dots \tilde{A}_s}^C(p) T_{\tilde{B}_1 \dots \tilde{B}_s}^D(p) \quad (4.2.7)$$

provides a coercive expression.

4.3 Transformation laws for geometric quantities under change of gauge

In this section, identities are derived for how certain geometric quantities change under a change of gauge relations. See Proposition 4.3.1, Proposition 4.3.2 and Proposition 4.3.3.

4.3.1 Basic setup: two double null gauges and two Schwarzschild backgrounds with masses M and \tilde{M}

Throughout, (\mathcal{M}, g) and parametrisations (4.1.1) and (4.2.1) are as in Section 4.2. As in Section 4.2.3, without loss of generality we may assume that the diffeomorphism F of (4.2.2) is in fact a global diffeomorphism $F : \tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$. We may suppress F from the notation, writing (4.2.3) as

$$u = \tilde{u} + f^3(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}^1, \tilde{\theta}^2), \quad v = \tilde{v} + f^4(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}^1, \tilde{\theta}^2), \quad \theta^A = \tilde{\theta}^A + f^A(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}^1, \tilde{\theta}^2). \quad (4.3.1)$$

We may consider (4.3.1) as relations on $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ (or alternatively on the spacetime region $\tilde{i}(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}})$) with the usual identifications.

We will typically be interested in the case where parametrisation (4.1.1) is in the form (1.1.4) whereas parametrisation (4.2.1) is in the form (1.2.32). In this case, we have the associated null frames

$$e_A = \partial_{\theta^A}, \quad e_3 = \frac{1}{\Omega} \partial_u, \quad e_4 = \frac{1}{\Omega} (\partial_v + b), \quad (4.3.2)$$

and

$$\tilde{e}_A = \partial_{\tilde{\theta}^A}, \quad \tilde{e}_3 = \frac{1}{\tilde{\Omega}} (\partial_{\tilde{u}} + \tilde{b}), \quad \tilde{e}_4 = \frac{1}{\tilde{\Omega}} \partial_{\tilde{v}}. \quad (4.3.3)$$

Both (4.3.2) and (4.3.3) may be considered as (local) frames on $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ with the usual identifications, i.e. where e_A is identified with $(F_*)^{-1}(e_A)$, etc.

We shall write down identities in Section 4.3.2 corresponding to the above case. We shall less frequently consider also the case where (4.2.1) is of the form (1.1.4); the resulting identities change in the obvious way.

For given masses $M > 0$, $\tilde{M} > 0$, we may now associate also Schwarzschild backgrounds to i^*g and \tilde{i}^*g as in Section 1.3.4. We will denote the Schwarzschild background corresponding to \tilde{i}^*g with \sim 's and the Schwarzschild background corresponding to i^*g without. We consider the Schwarzschild scalar quantities defined in both gauges, denoting the ones corresponding to \tilde{i}^*g with a \sim . Thus, we distinguish $\tilde{r}_{\tilde{M}}$ from r_M . We will in what follows drop the M and \tilde{M} subscripts.

We will similarly distinguish the operators associated with \tilde{i}^*g and i^*g by putting \sim on the former.

Again, using the diffeomorphism F of (4.2.2), we may consider all such quantities as defined on $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$.

4.3.2 Basic identities

With the setup of Section 4.3.1 and the above conventions, we compute the relations

$$du = \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{u}}\right) d\tilde{u} + \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{v}} d\tilde{v} + \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^A} d\tilde{\theta}^A \quad (4.3.4)$$

$$dv = \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{v}}\right) d\tilde{v} + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{u}} d\tilde{u} + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^A} d\tilde{\theta}^A \quad (4.3.5)$$

$$d\theta^A = \left(\delta_B^A + \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^B}\right) d\tilde{\theta}^B + \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial \tilde{u}} d\tilde{u} + \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial \tilde{v}} d\tilde{v}, \quad (4.3.6)$$

and

$$\partial_{\tilde{u}} = \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{u}}\right) \partial_u + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{u}} \partial_v + \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial \tilde{u}} \partial_{\theta^A} \quad (4.3.7)$$

$$\partial_{\tilde{v}} = \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{v}}\right) \partial_v + \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{v}} \partial_u + \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial \tilde{v}} \partial_{\theta^A} \quad (4.3.8)$$

$$\partial_{\tilde{\theta}^A} = \left(\delta_A^B + \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^A}\right) \partial_{\theta^B} + \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^A} \partial_u + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^A} \partial_v. \quad (4.3.9)$$

It then follows that the frames (4.3.2) and (4.3.3) are related by

$$\tilde{e}_A = \left(\delta_A^B + \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^A}\right) e_B + \Omega \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^A} e_3 + \Omega \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^A} e_4 - \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^A} b, \quad (4.3.10)$$

$$\tilde{e}_3 = \frac{\Omega}{\tilde{\Omega}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{u}}\right) e_3 + \frac{\Omega}{\tilde{\Omega}} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{u}} e_4 + \frac{1}{\tilde{\Omega}} \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial \tilde{u}} e_A + \frac{1}{\tilde{\Omega}} \tilde{b} - \frac{1}{\tilde{\Omega}} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{u}} b, \quad (4.3.11)$$

$$\tilde{e}_4 = \frac{\Omega}{\tilde{\Omega}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{v}}\right) e_4 + \frac{\Omega}{\tilde{\Omega}} \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{v}} e_3 + \frac{1}{\tilde{\Omega}} \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial \tilde{v}} e_A - \frac{1}{\tilde{\Omega}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{v}}\right) b. \quad (4.3.12)$$

Note that

$$\nabla_{e_A} e_B = \tilde{\Gamma}_{AB}^C e_C + \frac{1}{2} \chi_{AB} e_3 + \frac{1}{2} \chi_{AB} e_4, \quad (4.3.13)$$

$$\nabla_{e_A} e_3 = \underline{\chi}_A{}^B e_B + \frac{1}{2}(\eta_A - \underline{\eta}_A) e_3, \quad \nabla_{e_A} e_4 = \chi_A{}^B e_B + \frac{1}{2}(\underline{\eta}_A - \eta_A) e_4, \quad (4.3.14)$$

$$\nabla_{e_3} e_A = \underline{\chi}_A{}^B e_B + \eta_A e_3, \quad \nabla_{e_4} e_A = [\chi_A{}^B - e_A(b^B)] e_B + \underline{\eta}_A e_4, \quad (4.3.15)$$

$$\nabla_{e_3} e_4 = -\hat{\omega} e_4 + 2\eta^A e_A, \quad \nabla_{e_4} e_3 = -\hat{\omega} e_3 + 2\underline{\eta}^B e_B, \quad (4.3.16)$$

$$\nabla_{e_3} e_3 = \hat{\omega} e_3, \quad \nabla_{e_4} e_4 = \hat{\omega} e_4. \quad (4.3.17)$$

Similar formulas hold for $\{\tilde{e}_\mu\}$, with the exception of equations (4.3.15) which take the form

$$\nabla_{\tilde{e}_3} \tilde{e}_A = [\tilde{\chi}_A{}^B - \tilde{e}_A(\tilde{b}^B)] \tilde{e}_B + \tilde{\eta}_A \tilde{e}_3, \quad \nabla_{\tilde{e}_4} \tilde{e}_A = \tilde{\chi}_A{}^B \tilde{e}_B + \tilde{\eta}_A \tilde{e}_4.$$

The null components of the Riemann curvature tensor satisfy

$$R(e_A, e_4, e_B, e_4) = \alpha(e_A, e_B), \quad R(e_A, e_3, e_B, e_3) = \underline{\alpha}(e_A, e_B), \quad (4.3.18)$$

$$R(e_A, e_4, e_3, e_4) = 2\beta(e_A), \quad R(e_A, e_3, e_3, e_4) = 2\underline{\beta}(e_A), \quad (4.3.19)$$

$$R(e_A, e_4, e_B, e_C) = -^*\beta(e_A)\not\epsilon(e_B, e_C), \quad R(e_A, e_3, e_B, e_C) = ^*\underline{\beta}(e_A)\not\epsilon(e_B, e_C), \quad (4.3.20)$$

$$R(e_A, e_3, e_B, e_4) = -\rho\not\epsilon(e_A, e_B) + \sigma\not\epsilon(e_A, e_B), \quad R(e_A, e_B, e_C, e_D) = \rho\not\epsilon(e_A, e_B)\not\epsilon(e_C, e_D), \quad (4.3.21)$$

$$R(e_3, e_4, e_3, e_4) = 4\rho, \quad R(e_A, e_B, e_3, e_4) = 2\sigma\not\epsilon(e_A, e_B). \quad (4.3.22)$$

Similar formulas hold for $\{\tilde{e}_\mu\}$.

Suppose that the metric g takes the following expressions in each of the two double null coordinate systems

$$\begin{aligned} g|_{\tilde{x}=x_0} &= -4\Omega^2 du dv + |b|^2 dv dv - 2\not\phi_{AB} b^A dv d\theta^B + \not\phi_{AB} d\theta^A d\theta^B \Big|_{x=x_0+f(x_0)} \\ &= -4\tilde{\Omega}^2 d\tilde{u} d\tilde{v} + |\tilde{b}|^2 d\tilde{u} d\tilde{u} - 2\tilde{\not\phi}_{AB} \tilde{b}^A d\tilde{u} d\tilde{\theta}^B + \tilde{\not\phi}_{AB} d\tilde{\theta}^A d\tilde{\theta}^B \Big|_{\tilde{x}=x_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Note the asymmetry between the two expressions in the location of the torsion term b .¹ Expanding the first line, using the relations (4.3.4)–(4.3.6), and equating with the second line gives the following system of equations for f . The equated coefficients of $d\tilde{u}d\tilde{v}$ give

$$\begin{aligned} -4\tilde{\Omega}^2 &= -4\Omega^2 \left[\left(1 + \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{u}}\right) \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{v}}\right) + \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{v}} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{u}} \right] + 2|b|^2 \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{v}}\right) \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{u}} \\ &\quad - 2\not\phi_{AB} b^A \left[\left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{v}}\right) \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{u}} + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{u}} \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{u}} \right] + 2\not\phi_{AB} \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial \tilde{v}} \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{u}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3.23)$$

The equated coefficients of $d\tilde{u}d\tilde{u}$ give

$$|\tilde{b}|^2 = -4\Omega^2 \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{u}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{u}}\right) + |b|^2 \left(\frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{u}}\right)^2 - 2\not\phi_{AB} b^A \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{u}} \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{u}} + \not\phi_{AB} \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial \tilde{u}} \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{u}}. \quad (4.3.24)$$

The equated coefficients of $d\tilde{v}d\tilde{v}$ give

$$0 = -4\Omega^2 \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{v}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{v}}\right) + |b|^2 \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{v}}\right)^2 - 2\not\phi_{AB} b^A \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{v}}\right) \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{v}} + \not\phi_{AB} \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial \tilde{v}} \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{v}}. \quad (4.3.25)$$

The equated coefficients of $d\tilde{\theta}^C d\tilde{u}$ give

$$\begin{aligned} -2\tilde{\not\phi}_{AC} \tilde{b}^A &= -4\Omega^2 \left[\left(1 + \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{u}}\right) \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^C} + \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^C} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{u}} \right] + 2|b|^2 \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{u}} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^C} \\ &\quad - 2\not\phi_{AB} b^A \left[\left(\delta_C^B + \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^C}\right) \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{u}} + \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{u}} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^C} \right] + 2\not\phi_{AB} \left(\delta_C^A + \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^C}\right) \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{u}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3.26)$$

¹The following relations will most commonly be used with the present location of the torsion terms. Similar relations hold, and will also be used, with alternative locations of the torsion terms. The following relations all hold with obvious modification, e.g. in equations (4.3.26) and (4.3.27).

The equated coefficients of $d\tilde{\theta}^C d\tilde{v}$ give

$$0 = -4\Omega^2 \left[\left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{v}}\right) \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^C} + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^C} \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{v}} \right] + 2|b|^2 \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{v}}\right) \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^A} \\ - 2\phi_{AB} b^A \left[\left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{v}}\right) \left(\delta_C^B + \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^C}\right) + \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{v}} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^C} \right] + 2\phi_{AB} \left(\delta_C^A + \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^C}\right) \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{v}}. \quad (4.3.27)$$

The equated coefficients of $d\tilde{\theta}^C d\tilde{\theta}^D$ give

$$\tilde{g}_{CD} = -2\Omega^2 \left(\frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^C} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^D} + \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^D} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^C} \right) + |b|^2 \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^C} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^D} \\ - \phi_{AB} b^A \left[\frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^C} \left(\delta_D^B + \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^D} \right) + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^D} \left(\delta_C^B + \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^C} \right) \right] + \phi_{AB} \left(\delta_C^A + \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^C} \right) \left(\delta_D^B + \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^D} \right). \quad (4.3.28)$$

Given a $(0, k)$ S -tensor ξ , the projection $\Pi_{\tilde{S}}\xi$ is defined to be the restriction of ξ to \tilde{S} vectors. The relation (4.3.9) implies that, in components,

$$\Pi_{\tilde{S}}\xi(\tilde{e}_{A_1}, \dots, \tilde{e}_{A_k}) = \xi\left(\left(\delta_{A_1}^{B_1} + \frac{\partial f^{B_1}}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^{A_1}}\right)e_{B_1}, \dots, \left(\delta_{A_k}^{B_k} + \frac{\partial f^{B_k}}{\partial \tilde{\theta}^{A_k}}\right)e_{B_k}\right). \quad (4.3.29)$$

4.3.3 The nonlinear error notation $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{f}}, p}^{1, k}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{f}}, p}^{2, k}$

In this section, we introduce a notation for nonlinear error terms which involve the diffeomorphisms which relate two gauges. We will assume throughout that we have the setup of Section 4.3.1.

The notation $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_p$, for $p = -1, 0, 1$, is used to schematically denote the following first order derivatives

$$\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{-1} = r\tilde{\nabla}f^4, \widetilde{r\Omega\nabla_4 f^4}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_0 = \tilde{\Omega}^{-2}\partial_{\tilde{u}}f, \tilde{r}\partial_{\tilde{v}}f, r\tilde{\nabla}f^3, \widetilde{\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 f^3}, \widetilde{\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 f^4}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_1 = r\widetilde{\Omega\nabla_4 f^3}.$$

The notation $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{f}}, p}^{1, k}$ will be used to denote a quadratic error term which involves at most k derivatives of $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}$ and Φ , each term involves at least one $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}$ factor, and which decays, according to the p index notation, like \tilde{r}^{-p} . Similarly, the notation $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{f}}, p}^{2, k}$ will be used to denote a quadratic error term which involves at most k derivatives of $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}$, $\sum_{|\gamma|=1} \tilde{\mathbf{f}}^\gamma \tilde{\mathbf{f}}$ and Φ , each term involves at least one $\sum_{|\gamma|\leq 1} \tilde{\mathbf{f}}^\gamma \tilde{\mathbf{f}}$ factor, and which decays, according to the p index notation, like \tilde{r}^{-p} .

We remark that in the above expressions, the derivatives of f are taken with respect to the operators of the gauge (4.2.1), while the Ricci coefficients and curvature components Φ are those of the gauge (4.1.1). These are the type of terms that will naturally appear later in the paper.

4.3.3.1 Ordering the schematic diffeomorphism components $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}$

In order to define the error notation more precisely, let the collection $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}$ be ordered as follows

$$\tilde{\mathbf{f}}^1 = r\tilde{\nabla}f^4, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{f}}^2 = r\widetilde{\Omega\nabla_4 f^4}, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{f}}^3 = \tilde{\Omega}^{-2}\partial_{\tilde{u}}f, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{f}}^4 = \tilde{r}\partial_{\tilde{v}}f, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{f}}^5 = r\tilde{\nabla}f^3, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{f}}^6 = \widetilde{\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 f^3}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{f}}^7 = \widetilde{\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 f^4}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{f}}^8 = r\widetilde{\Omega\nabla_4 f^3}.$$

4.3.3.2 The notation $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}^{k+1}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}^{k+1}_p$

Consider some $k \geq 0$. Define $\{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^0 := \{(0, 0, 0)\}$. Given $i \in \{1, \dots, 8\}$ and $\gamma \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^k$, define

$$\tilde{\mathbf{f}}^{k+1} \cdot (i, \gamma) := \tilde{\mathbf{f}}^\gamma \tilde{\mathbf{f}}^i. \quad (4.3.30)$$

As an example, one can write

$$\widetilde{\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 r\widetilde{\Omega\nabla_4 f^3}} = \tilde{\mathbf{f}}^2 \cdot (8, (0, 1, 0)), \quad \text{and} \quad r\tilde{\nabla}f^4 = \tilde{\mathbf{f}}^1 \cdot (1, (0, 0, 0)).$$

Define now the sets

$$Q_{-1} = \{1, 2\}, \quad Q_0 = \{3, \dots, 7\}, \quad Q_1 = \{8\}.$$

Consider some $k \geq 0$. Given $p \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ and $\gamma \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^k$, if $i \in Q_p$ then we often add a p subscript in (4.3.30) for emphasis, i.e.

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{k+1} \mathbf{f}_p \cdot (i, \gamma) := \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^\gamma \tilde{\mathfrak{D}} \mathbf{f}^i \quad \text{if } i \in Q_p.$$

4.3.3.3 The notation $(\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{k+1} \mathbf{f})^l$

Consider now some $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 1$ and some

$$G = \{ {}^{j,m} G_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}} , {}^j L_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}} \}_{m=0, \dots, l', k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k, l' \geq l, j \geq 1},$$

where

$${}^{j,m} G_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}} \in \{ (i, \gamma) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, 8\}, \gamma \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^{k_m} \} \cup \{0\},$$

for all $m = 0, \dots, l'$ and ${}^j L_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}$ is a trace set of some order $d \geq 0$, as in Section 3.2.2, for all $j \geq 1$, $k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k$ and $l' \geq l$. For such $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 1$ and G , define

$$\left(\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{k+1} \mathbf{f} \right)^l \cdot G := \sum_{l' \geq l} \sum_{k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k} \sum_{j \geq 1} \left(\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{k_1+1} \mathbf{f} \cdot {}^{j,1} G_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}} \otimes \dots \otimes \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{k_{l'}+1} \mathbf{f} \cdot {}^{j,l'} G_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}} \right) \cdot \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^j L_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}.$$

Such expressions are only ever considered when sufficiently many of the components of G and L vanish so that each object appearing in the above summation is a tensor field of the same type, and so that the allowed ranges of l_1, l_2, p_1, p_2 and $j \geq 1$ are finite, and so the summation is indeed well defined.

Note that the operation $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^j L_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}$ involves multiplying with admissible functions on $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ or taking traces over the \sim indices. Note also that

$$\left(\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{k+1} \mathbf{f} \right)^l \cdot G \in \Gamma((T^* \tilde{S})^s \otimes F^*(TS)^r),$$

for some r and s .

4.3.3.4 The notation $(\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{k+1} \mathbf{f}_p)^l$

Consider now some $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 1$, $p \geq 0$ and some

$$G = \{ {}^{j,m} G_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}}, {}^j L_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}} \}_{m=0, \dots, l', k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k, p_0 + \dots + p_{l'} \geq p, l' \geq l, j \geq 1},$$

where

$${}^{j,m} G_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}} \in \{ (i, \gamma) \mid i \in Q_{p_m}, \gamma \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^{k_m} \} \cup \{0\},$$

for all $m = 0, \dots, l'$, and ${}^j L_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}}$ is a trace set of some order $d \geq 0$, as in Section 3.2.2, for all $k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k$, $p_0 + \dots + p_{l'} \geq p$, $j \geq 1$ and $l' \geq l$. For such $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 1$ and G , define

$$\left(\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{k+1} \mathbf{f}_p \right)^l \cdot G := \sum_{l' \geq l} \sum_{k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k} \sum_{\substack{j \geq 1 \\ p_0 + \dots + p_{l'} \geq p}} \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{-p_0} \left(\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{k_1+1} \mathbf{f}_{p_1} \cdot {}^{j,1} G_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}} \otimes \dots \otimes \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{k_{l'}+1} \mathbf{f}_{p_{l'}} \cdot {}^{j,l'} G_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}} \right) \cdot \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^j L_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}^{p_0 \dots p_{l'}}.$$

Again, such expressions will only ever be considered when sufficiently many components of G and L vanish so that the summation is well defined.

4.3.3.5 The notation $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}}^{1,k}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},p}^{1,k}$

Given appropriate $H = \{^j H_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2}\}$ and $G = \{^j G_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2}\}$, where each $^j H_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2}$ is as in Section 3.2.3 and each $^j G_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2}$ is as above, and $K = \{^j K_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2}\}$, where each $^j K_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2}$ is a trace set of some order $d \geq 0$, as in Section 3.2.2, define the \tilde{S} tensor

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}}^{1,k}(H, G, K) = \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2 \leq k \\ l_1+l_2 \geq 2, l_2 \geq 1}} \sum_{j \geq 1} \left((\mathfrak{D}^{k_1} \Phi)^{l_1} \cdot ^j H_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2} \otimes (\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{k_2+1} \mathbf{f})^{l_2} \cdot ^j G_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2} \right) \cdot \cdot ^j K_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2},$$

where $\Pi_{\tilde{S}}$ denotes the projection to the \tilde{S} spheres (see (4.3.29)). Note that $l_2 \geq 1$ in the summation, so that each term in the nonlinear error $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}}^{1,k}(H, G, K)$ involves at least one factor involving (derivatives of) a diffeomorphism component $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}\mathbf{f}$.

Similarly, for given k, p , and for appropriate $H = \{^j H_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2}\}_{p_1 p_2}$, $G = \{^j G_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2}\}_{p_1 p_2}$ and $K = \{^j K_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2}\}_{p_1 p_2}$, define

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},p}^{1,k}(H, G, K) = \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2 \leq k \\ l_1+l_2 \geq 2, l_2 \geq 1 \\ p_1+p_2 \geq p}} \sum_{j \geq 1} \left((\mathfrak{D}^{k_1} \Phi_{p_1})^{l_1} \cdot ^j H_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2} \otimes (\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{k_2+1} \mathbf{f}_{p_2})^{l_2} \cdot ^j G_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2} \right) \cdot \cdot ^j K_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2}.$$

Such expressions are only ever considered when sufficiently many of the components of H, G and K vanish so that each object appearing in the above summations is a tensor field of the same type, and so that the allowed ranges of l_1, l_2, p_1, p_2 and $j \geq 1$ are finite, and so each summation is indeed well defined.

Note that, for any γ ,

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^\gamma \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},p}^{1,k}(H, G, K) = \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},p}^{1,k+|\gamma|}(H^\gamma, G^\gamma, K^\gamma)$$

for some $H^\gamma, G^\gamma, K^\gamma$.

We will typically abuse notation and write “ $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},p}^{1,k}$ ” to mean “ $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},p}^{1,k}(H, G, K)$ for some H, G, K ”, etc.

4.3.3.6 The notation $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}}^{2,k}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},p}^{2,k}$

The nonlinear error notation $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}}^{2,k}(H, G, K)$ is defined, for appropriate H, G, K , by

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}}^{2,k}(H, G, K) = \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2 \leq k+1, k_1 \leq k \\ l_1+l_2 \geq 2, l_2 \geq 1}} \sum_{j \geq 1} \left((\mathfrak{D}^{k_1} \Phi)^{l_1} \cdot ^j H_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2} \otimes (\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{k_2+1} \mathbf{f})^{l_2} \cdot ^j G_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2} \right) \cdot \cdot ^j K_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2},$$

so that each term in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}}^{2,k}(H, G, K)$ involves a total of at most $k+1$ derivatives of $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}\mathbf{f}$ and Φ , but at most k derivatives of Φ . Similarly, for appropriate H, G, K , define

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},p}^{2,k}(H, G, K) = \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2 \leq k+1, k_1 \leq k \\ l_1+l_2 \geq 2, l_2 \geq 1 \\ p_1+p_2 \geq p}} \sum_{j \geq 1} \left((\mathfrak{D}^{k_1} \Phi_{p_1})^{l_1} \cdot ^j H_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2} \otimes (\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{k_2+1} \mathbf{f}_{p_2})^{l_2} \cdot ^j G_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2} \right) \cdot \cdot ^j K_{k_1 k_2}^{l_1 l_2}.$$

Here $\Pi_{\tilde{S}}$ again denotes the projection to the \tilde{S} spheres (see (4.3.29)).

Again, such expressions are only ever considered when sufficiently many of the components of H, G and K vanish so that each object appearing in the above summations is a tensor field of the same type, and so that the allowed ranges of l_1, l_2, p_1, p_2 and $j \geq 1$ are finite, and so each summation is indeed well defined.

Note that, for any γ ,

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^\gamma \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},p}^{2,k}(H, G, K) = \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},p}^{2,k+|\gamma|}(H^\gamma, G^\gamma, K^\gamma)$$

for some $H^\gamma, G^\gamma, K^\gamma$.

Again, we will typically abuse notation and write “ $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},p}^{2,k}$ ” to mean “ $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},p}^{2,k}(H, G, K)$ for some H, G, K ”, etc.

4.3.4 The change of gauge relations

Recall the nonlinear error notation $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},p}^{1,k}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},p}^{2,k}$ from Section 4.3.3.

The relations (4.3.23)–(4.3.28) between the metric coefficients can be written in the following schematic form. Recall the notation $\partial_{\tilde{u}}f, \partial_{\tilde{v}}f$ from Section 4.1. Since $\partial_{\tilde{u}}f$ and $\partial_{\tilde{v}}f$ are S -vectors one can also define their \flat with respect to \not{g} ,

$$\partial_{\tilde{u}}f^\flat(\partial_{\theta^A}) := \not{g}_{AB}\partial_{\tilde{u}}f^B, \quad \partial_{\tilde{v}}f^\flat(\partial_{\theta^A}) := \not{g}_{AB}\partial_{\tilde{v}}f^B.$$

Recall also the operator $\Pi_{\tilde{S}}$, which projects S -tensor fields to \tilde{S} -tensor fields (see (4.3.29)). The relations of Propositions 4.3.1, 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 are relations between \tilde{S} tensor fields.

Proposition 4.3.1 (Change of gauge relations for metric components). *With the setup of Section 4.3.1, the metric coefficients of the two gauges, viewed as spacetime tensors, satisfy the relations*

$$\Omega^2\partial_{\tilde{u}}f^4 = \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},0}^{1,0}; \quad (4.3.31)$$

$$\Omega^2(1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}}f^4)\partial_{\tilde{v}}f^3 = \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},2}^{1,0}; \quad (4.3.32)$$

$$2\Omega^2\tilde{\nabla}f^4 = \Pi_{\tilde{S}}\partial_{\tilde{u}}f^\flat + \tilde{b}^\flat + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},0}^{1,0}; \quad (4.3.33)$$

$$2\Omega^2\tilde{\nabla}f^3 = \Pi_{\tilde{S}}\partial_{\tilde{v}}f^\flat - \Pi_{\tilde{S}}b^\flat + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},1}^{1,0}; \quad (4.3.34)$$

$$\Pi_{\tilde{S}}r^2\gamma - \widetilde{r^2\gamma} = (\tilde{g} - \widetilde{r^2\gamma}) - \Pi_{\tilde{S}}(g - r^2\gamma) + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},1}^{1,0}; \quad (4.3.35)$$

$$\Omega^2(\partial_{\tilde{u}}f^3 + \partial_{\tilde{v}}f^4) + \Omega_{\circ,M}^2 - \tilde{\Omega}_{\circ,\tilde{M}}^2 = (\tilde{\Omega}^2 - \tilde{\Omega}_{\circ,\tilde{M}}^2) - (\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ,M}^2) + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},0}^{1,0}. \quad (4.3.36)$$

Proof. The identities (4.3.31), (4.3.32) and (4.3.36) are simply the relations (4.3.24), (4.3.25), and (4.3.23) respectively written using the nonlinear error notation of Section 4.3.3. For (4.3.33), one notes that the relation (4.3.26) can be written as

$$2\Omega^2\frac{\partial f^4}{\partial\tilde{\theta}^C} = \tilde{g}_{AC}\tilde{b}^A + \not{g}_{AB}\left(\delta_C^A + \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial\tilde{\theta}^C}\right)\frac{\partial f^B}{\partial\tilde{u}} + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},0}^{1,0}(\tilde{e}_C),$$

from which (4.3.33) follows. The relations (4.3.34) and (4.3.35) follow similarly from (4.3.27) and (4.3.36) respectively. \square

Relations between the Ricci coefficients of the two gauges can similarly be obtained. Note that certain nonlinear error terms have worse r behaviour than the typical terms (such as the term $\partial_{\tilde{v}}f^4\tilde{\nabla}\partial_{\tilde{u}}f^3$ in the relation (4.3.39)), according to the p index notation of Section 4.3.3, and so are stated explicitly.

Proposition 4.3.2 (Change of gauge relations for Ricci coefficients). *With the setup of Section 4.3.1, the Ricci coefficients of the two gauges, viewed as spacetime tensors, satisfy the relations*

$$\widetilde{\Omega}\hat{\chi} - \Pi_{\tilde{S}}\Omega\hat{\chi} = -2\Omega^2\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_2^*\tilde{\nabla}f^3 + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},2}^{2,0}; \quad (4.3.37)$$

$$\widetilde{\Omega}\hat{\underline{\chi}} - \Pi_{\tilde{S}}\Omega\hat{\underline{\chi}} = -2\Omega^2\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_2^*\tilde{\nabla}f^4 + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},1}^{2,0}; \quad (4.3.38)$$

$$\tilde{\eta} - \Pi_{\tilde{S}}\eta = \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial\tilde{v}}\right)\tilde{\nabla}\frac{\partial f^3}{\partial\tilde{u}} + (2\Omega\hat{\omega} - \frac{1}{2}\Omega\text{tr}\chi)\tilde{\nabla}f^3 + \frac{1}{2}\Omega\text{tr}\chi\tilde{\nabla}f^4 + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},2}^{2,0}; \quad (4.3.39)$$

$$\tilde{\underline{\eta}} - \Pi_{\tilde{S}}\underline{\eta} = \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial\tilde{u}}\right)\tilde{\nabla}\frac{\partial f^4}{\partial\tilde{v}} + (2\Omega\hat{\omega} - \frac{1}{2}\Omega\text{tr}\chi)\tilde{\nabla}f^4 + \frac{1}{2}\Omega\text{tr}\chi\tilde{\nabla}f^3 + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},2}^{2,0}; \quad (4.3.40)$$

$$\left(\widetilde{\Omega\hat{\omega}} - \widetilde{(\Omega\hat{\omega})}_{\circ,\tilde{M}}\right) - (\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ,M}) = (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ,M} - \widetilde{(\Omega\hat{\omega})}_{\circ,\tilde{M}} + \Omega\hat{\omega}\frac{\partial f^4}{\partial\tilde{v}} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 f^4}{\partial\tilde{v}^2} + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},1}^{2,0}; \quad (4.3.41)$$

$$\left(\widetilde{\Omega\hat{\underline{\omega}}} - \widetilde{(\Omega\hat{\underline{\omega}})_{\circ,\tilde{M}}}\right) - (\Omega\hat{\underline{\omega}} - (\Omega\hat{\underline{\omega}})_{\circ,M}) = (\Omega\hat{\underline{\omega}})_{\circ,M} - \widetilde{(\Omega\hat{\underline{\omega}})_{\circ,\tilde{M}}} + \Omega\hat{\underline{\omega}}\frac{\partial f^3}{\partial\tilde{u}} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 f^3}{\partial\tilde{u}^2} + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},0}^{2,0}; \quad (4.3.42)$$

and $\Omega \text{tr} \chi$ and $\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}$ satisfy

$$\left(\widetilde{\Omega \text{tr} \chi} - \widetilde{(\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\circ, \widetilde{M}}} \right) - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\circ, M}) = (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\circ, M} - \widetilde{(\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\circ, \widetilde{M}}} + 2\Omega^2 \widetilde{\Delta} f^3 + \Omega \text{tr} \chi \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \widetilde{v}} + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{F}, 2}^{2,0}; \quad (4.3.43)$$

$$\left(\widetilde{\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}} - \widetilde{(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\circ, \widetilde{M}}} \right) - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\circ, M}) = (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\circ, M} - \widetilde{(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\circ, \widetilde{M}}} + 2\Omega^2 \widetilde{\Delta} f^4 + \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \widetilde{u}} + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{F}, 1}^{2,0}. \quad (4.3.44)$$

Proof. Consider first (4.3.37) and (4.3.43). Writing

$$\widetilde{\Omega \chi}(\widetilde{e}_A, \widetilde{e}_B) = g(\nabla_{\widetilde{e}_A} \widetilde{\Omega} \widetilde{e}_4, \widetilde{e}_B),$$

expanding $\widetilde{e}_A, \widetilde{e}_B, \widetilde{\Omega} \widetilde{e}_4$ using the relations (4.3.10) and (4.3.12), and using the metric relation (4.3.34), it follows that

$$\widetilde{\Omega \chi}(\widetilde{e}_A, \widetilde{e}_B) = (1 + \partial_{\widetilde{v}} f^4) \Omega \chi(H_A^C e_C, H_B^D e_D) + 2\Omega^2 \widetilde{\nabla}_{\partial_{\widetilde{e}_A}, \partial_{\widetilde{e}_B}}^2 f^3 + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{F}, 2}^{2,0}(\widetilde{e}_A, \widetilde{e}_B),$$

where $H_A^C = \delta_A^C + \partial_{\widetilde{\theta}^A} f^C$, and so

$$\widetilde{\Omega \chi} = (1 + \partial_{\widetilde{v}} f^4) \Pi_{\widetilde{S}} \Omega \chi + 2\Omega^2 \widetilde{\nabla}^2 f^3 + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{F}, 2}^{2,0}.$$

The proof of (4.3.37) and (4.3.43) then follow from decomposing into trace and trace free parts, with respect to \widetilde{g} , and using the relation (4.3.35). The proof of the other relations is similar. \square

The following proposition similarly gives relations between the curvature components of the two gauges.

Proposition 4.3.3 (Change of gauge relations for curvature components). *With the setup of Section 4.3.1, the curvature components of the two gauges, viewed as spacetime tensors, satisfy the relations*

$$\widetilde{\Omega^2 \alpha} - \Pi_{\widetilde{S}} \Omega^2 \alpha = \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{F}, 4}^{1,0}; \quad (4.3.45)$$

$$\widetilde{\Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}} - \Pi_{\widetilde{S}} \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha} = \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{F}, 1}^{1,0}; \quad (4.3.46)$$

$$\widetilde{\Omega \beta} - \Pi_{\widetilde{S}} \Omega \beta = 3\Omega^2 \rho \widetilde{\nabla} f^3 + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{F}, 4}^{1,0}; \quad (4.3.47)$$

$$\widetilde{\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}} - \Pi_{\widetilde{S}} \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta} = -3\rho \widetilde{\nabla} f^4 + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{F}, 2}^{1,0}; \quad (4.3.48)$$

$$(\widetilde{\rho} - \widetilde{\rho}_{\circ, \widetilde{M}}) - (\rho - \rho_{\circ, M}) = \rho_{\circ, M} - \widetilde{\rho}_{\circ, \widetilde{M}} + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{F}, 3}^{1,0}; \quad (4.3.49)$$

$$\widetilde{\sigma} - \sigma = \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{F}, 3}^{1,0}. \quad (4.3.50)$$

Proof. Consider first (4.3.45). Using (4.3.18),

$$\widetilde{\Omega^2 \alpha_{AB}} = R(\widetilde{e}_A, \widetilde{\Omega} \widetilde{e}_4, \widetilde{e}_B, \widetilde{\Omega} \widetilde{e}_4).$$

Expanding $\widetilde{e}_1, \widetilde{e}_2$ and \widetilde{e}_4 in terms of e_1, \dots, e_4 using the relations (4.3.10)–(4.3.12), evaluating the resulting curvature components using the relations (4.3.18)–(4.3.22), and checking each of the resulting terms has the correct form, one sees that

$$\widetilde{\Omega^2 \alpha_{AB}} = (\delta_A^C + \partial_{\widetilde{\theta}^A} f^C)(\delta_B^D + \partial_{\widetilde{\theta}^B} f^D) R(e_C, \Omega e_4, e_D, \Omega e_4) + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{F}, 4}^{1,0}(\widetilde{e}_A, \widetilde{e}_B),$$

and (4.3.45) follows.

The identities (4.3.46)–(4.3.50) follow similarly. Note that the term $\frac{1}{\Omega} \left(\partial_{\widetilde{u}} f^A e_A + \widetilde{b} \right)$ in \widetilde{e}_3 (see (4.3.11)) can be replaced by $2\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega} \widetilde{\nabla} f^4$, plus nonlinear terms, using the relation (4.3.33). \square

4.3.5 Norms and derivatives of projections of S -tensors

Recall the setup of Section 4.3.1 and recall the definition (1.1.12) of the norm of an S -tensor. In this section the \tilde{S} norms and derivatives of projections of S -tensors are related to the corresponding S norms and derivatives.

Proposition 4.3.4 relates the \mathcal{G} norm of an S -tensor field to the $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ norm of its projection to \tilde{S} . Proposition 4.3.5 relates the $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ derivative of the projection of an S -tensor field to an \tilde{S} -tensor field, to the projection of the corresponding \mathcal{D} derivative of the tensor field.

Proposition 4.3.4 ($\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ norm of projection to \tilde{S} of an S -tensor field). *With the setup of Section 4.3.1, assuming that the map (4.2.4) is a vector space isomorphism, for any multi index γ and any S -geometric quantity Φ ,*

$$|\mathcal{D}^\gamma \Phi_p|_{\mathcal{G}} = |\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \mathcal{D}^\gamma \Phi_p|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} + \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{f},p}^{1,|\gamma|}.$$

Proof. Let G_A^B denote the components of the inverse of $(\delta_A^B + \frac{\partial f^B}{\partial \theta^A})$, so that

$$G_A^B \left(\delta_B^C + \frac{\partial f^C}{\partial \theta^B} \right) = \delta_A^C.$$

If ξ and ξ' are two $(0, k)$ S -tensors, one can define

$$(\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \mathcal{G})(\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \xi, \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \xi') = (\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \mathcal{G})^{A_1 B_1} \dots (\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \mathcal{G})^{A_k B_k} (\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \xi)_{A_1 \dots A_k} (\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \xi')_{B_1 \dots B_k}, \quad |\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \xi|_{\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \mathcal{G}}^2 = (\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \mathcal{G})(\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \xi, \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \xi),$$

where

$$(\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \mathcal{G})^{AB} = G_C^A G_D^B \mathcal{G}^{CD},$$

is the projection of \mathcal{G}^{-1} to \tilde{S} .

One easily computes

$$(\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \mathcal{G})(\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \xi, \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \xi') = \mathcal{G}(\xi, \xi'), \quad |\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \xi|_{\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \mathcal{G}} = |\xi|_{\mathcal{G}}.$$

Indeed, if $k = 1$,

$$(\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \mathcal{G})(\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \xi, \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \xi') = \mathcal{G}^{-1}(G_A^B d\theta^A, G_C^D d\theta^C) \xi \left(\left(\delta_B^E + \frac{\partial f^E}{\partial \theta^B} \right) e_E \right) \xi' \left(\left(\delta_D^F + \frac{\partial f^F}{\partial \theta^D} \right) e_F \right) = \mathcal{G}^{AC} \xi_A \xi'_C = \mathcal{G}(\xi, \xi').$$

Similarly for $k \geq 2$. The proof then follows from the relation (4.3.35). \square

Proposition 4.3.5 ($\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ derivatives of projection to \tilde{S} of an S -tensor field). *With the setup of Section 4.3.1, for any multi index γ and any of the S -geometric quantities Φ ,*

$$\tilde{\nabla} \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \mathcal{D}^\gamma \Phi_p = \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \tilde{\nabla} \mathcal{D}^\gamma \Phi_p + \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{f},p+1}^{1,|\gamma|+1}, \quad (4.3.51)$$

$$\tilde{\Omega} \tilde{\nabla}_3 \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \mathcal{D}^\gamma \Phi_p = \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \Omega \tilde{\nabla}_3 \mathcal{D}^\gamma \Phi_p + \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{f},p}^{1,|\gamma|+1}, \quad (4.3.52)$$

$$\tilde{\Omega} \tilde{\nabla}_4 \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \mathcal{D}^\gamma \Phi_p = \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \Omega \tilde{\nabla}_4 \mathcal{D}^\gamma \Phi_p + \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{f},p+1}^{1,|\gamma|+1}. \quad (4.3.53)$$

Proof. The relation (4.3.10) implies that, for any S -tensor ξ ,

$$\nabla_{\tilde{e}_B} \xi = \left(\delta_B^C + \frac{\partial f^C}{\partial \theta^B} \right) \nabla_{e_C} \xi + \Omega \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \theta^B} \nabla_{e_3} \xi + \Omega \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \theta^B} \nabla_{e_4} \xi - \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \theta^B} b^C \nabla_{e_C} \xi.$$

If ξ is an S -tangent 1-form, the relation (4.3.6) implies that,

$$\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \xi = \left(\delta_B^A + \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial \theta^B} \right) \xi_A d\tilde{\theta}^A = \xi_A (d\theta^A - \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^A d\tilde{u} - \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^A d\tilde{v}) = \xi - \xi \cdot \partial_{\tilde{u}} f d\tilde{u} - \xi \cdot \partial_{\tilde{v}} f d\tilde{v},$$

and so

$$\tilde{\nabla} \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \xi = \Pi_{\tilde{S}} (\nabla \xi) - \xi \cdot \partial_{\tilde{u}} f \tilde{\nabla} d\tilde{u} - \xi \cdot \partial_{\tilde{v}} f \tilde{\nabla} d\tilde{v}.$$

It follows that

$$\tilde{\nabla} \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \xi = \Pi_{\tilde{S}}(\tilde{\nabla} \xi) + \tilde{\nabla} f^3 \otimes \Pi_{\tilde{S}}(\Omega \nabla_{e_3} \xi) + \tilde{\nabla} f^4 \otimes \Pi_{\tilde{S}}(\Omega \nabla_{e_4} \xi) - \tilde{\nabla} f^4 \otimes \Pi_{\tilde{S}}(b \cdot \tilde{\nabla} \xi) - \frac{1}{2} \xi \cdot \partial_{\tilde{u}} f \tilde{\Omega}^{-1} \tilde{\chi}^\# - \frac{1}{2} \xi \cdot \partial_{\tilde{v}} f \tilde{\Omega}^{-1} \tilde{\chi}^\#.$$

The proof of (4.3.51) then follows if $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi$ is a one form. If $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi$ is a higher order tensor the proof of (4.3.51) is similar, using now the fact that, for any $(0, k)$ S -tensor ξ ,

$$\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \xi = \xi_{A_1} \dots \xi_{A_k} (d\theta^{A_1} - \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^{A_1} d\tilde{u} - \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^{A_1} d\tilde{v}) \dots (d\theta^{A_k} - \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^{A_k} d\tilde{u} - \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^{A_k} d\tilde{v}).$$

The proofs of (4.3.52) and (4.3.53) are similar, using now the relations (4.3.11) and (4.3.12) respectively. \square

4.3.6 \tilde{S} -tangential operators acting on S -tensors

Recall the setup of Section 4.3.1.

It is convenient to define the action of the differential operators $\tilde{\nabla}$, $\tilde{\nabla}_3$, $\tilde{\nabla}_4$ associated to the \tilde{S} double null foliation on S -tensors. Recall, for any S -tangent 1-form ξ , the $\tilde{\nabla}$ derivative $\tilde{\nabla} \xi \in \Gamma((F^{-1})^* T^* \tilde{S} \otimes T^* S)$ defined in Section 4.2.3, with F defined by (4.2.2). Similarly, if $\xi \in \Gamma((T^* S)^k)$ is an S -tangent $(0, k)$ tensor, for any $X \in \Gamma((F^{-1})^* T^* \tilde{S})$ define $\tilde{\nabla}_X \xi$ to be the restriction of $\nabla_{F_* X} \xi$ to S -vectors, so that $\tilde{\nabla} \xi \in \Gamma((F^{-1})^* T^* \tilde{S} \otimes (T^* S)^k)$. In view of the relation (4.3.10),

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X \xi = \tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{a}^\# X} \xi + \tilde{\nabla}_X f^3 \Omega \tilde{\nabla}_3 \xi + \tilde{\nabla}_X f^4 \Omega \tilde{\nabla}_4 \xi - \tilde{\nabla}_X f^4 \tilde{\nabla}_b \xi. \quad (4.3.54)$$

Similarly, define $\tilde{\nabla}_3 \xi$ and $\tilde{\nabla}_4 \xi$ to be the restriction of $\nabla_{F_* \tilde{e}_3} \xi$ and $\nabla_{F_* \tilde{e}_4} \xi$ to S -vectors respectively. In view of the relations (4.3.11), (4.3.12),

$$\tilde{\nabla}_3 \xi = \frac{\Omega}{\tilde{\Omega}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{u}} \right) \tilde{\nabla}_3 \xi + \frac{\Omega}{\tilde{\Omega}} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{u}} \tilde{\nabla}_4 \xi + \frac{1}{\tilde{\Omega}} \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial \tilde{u}} \tilde{\nabla}_A \xi - \frac{1}{\tilde{\Omega}} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{u}} \tilde{\nabla}_b \xi \quad (4.3.55)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & + \frac{1}{\tilde{\Omega}} \tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{a}^\# \tilde{b}} \xi + \Omega \tilde{b}(f^3) \tilde{\nabla}_3 \xi + \Omega \tilde{b}(f^4) \tilde{\nabla}_4 \xi - \tilde{b}(f^4) \tilde{\nabla}_b \xi, \\ \tilde{\nabla}_4 \xi &= \frac{\Omega}{\tilde{\Omega}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{v}} \right) \tilde{\nabla}_4 \xi + \frac{\Omega}{\tilde{\Omega}} \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial \tilde{v}} \tilde{\nabla}_3 \xi + \frac{1}{\tilde{\Omega}} \frac{\partial f^A}{\partial \tilde{v}} \tilde{\nabla}_A \xi - \frac{1}{\tilde{\Omega}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \tilde{v}} \right) \tilde{\nabla}_b \xi. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3.56)$$

Define the coercive expression

$$|\tilde{\nabla} \xi|^2 := \tilde{\mathcal{G}}^{\tilde{C} \tilde{D}} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}^{A_1 B_1} \dots \tilde{\mathcal{G}}^{A_k B_k} \tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{C}} \xi_{A_1 \dots A_k} \tilde{\nabla}_{\tilde{D}} \xi_{B_1 \dots B_k}. \quad (4.3.57)$$

Note that $\tilde{\nabla}_3 \xi, \tilde{\nabla}_4 \xi \in \Gamma((T^* S)^k)$ are S -tangent $(0, k)$ tensors and so $|\tilde{\nabla}_3 \xi|$ and $|\tilde{\nabla}_4 \xi|$ are defined as usual by (1.1.12).

4.4 A determination of the sphere diffeomorphism

We have already discussed how some definitions of Section 1.4 are sensitive to diffeomorphisms ψ of the form (1.3.15) (cf. Remarks 1.4.5, 1.4.7 and 1.4.8). Thus, it is important to have a canonical way of choosing the correct such identification with the standard \mathbb{S}^2 of Section 1.1.1. In this respect, the following proposition will be of use later in the paper.

Proposition 4.4.1. *Let (S, h) be a compact oriented Riemannian 2-manifold such that*

$$|K - 1| \leq \epsilon, \quad |\nabla_h K| \leq \epsilon, \quad (4.4.1)$$

where K here denotes the Gauss curvature of h . Then for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, it follows that S is diffeomorphic to the standard sphere \mathbb{S}^2 of Section 1.1.1, and given $p \in S$, $v \in T_p S$ with $h(v, v) = 1$, we can associate to the triple $((S, h), p, v)$ a “canonical” diffeomorphism

$$\psi : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow S \quad (4.4.2)$$

such that $\psi(1, 0, 0) = p$, and $\psi_*(0, 1, 0) = v$, where we consider $(0, 1, 0)$ as a vector $(0, 1, 0) \in T_{(1,0,0)}\mathbb{S}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$.

This association is canonical in the following sense: If $\xi : \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$ is a diffeomorphism then $\tilde{\psi}$ associated to the triple $(\xi^*h, \xi^{-1}(p), (\xi_*)^{-1}(v))$ satisfies

$$\psi = \xi \circ \tilde{\psi}. \quad (4.4.3)$$

Moreover, the association is equivariant in the following sense: If (S, h) admits a non-trivial Killing field X such that $X(p) = 0$, then $\partial_{\tilde{\phi}}$ is a Killing field of ψ^*h , where $\partial_{\tilde{\phi}}$ is the coordinate vector field on \mathbb{S}^2 defined with respect to the canonical coordinates (1.1.1).

The association depends smoothly on h , p and v in the following sense: Let us fix the manifold S and suppose h_t , p_t , v_t depend smoothly on a parameter t . Then the resulting map ψ_t given by our association depends smoothly on t .

Moreover, for all integers $k \geq 3$, with ψ as above, we have the following estimates

$$\sum_{\tilde{k}=0}^{k+2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla_{\psi^*h}^{\tilde{k}}(\psi^*h - \dot{\gamma})|_{\psi^*h}^2 d\text{Vol}_{\psi^*h} \leq C_k \sum_{\tilde{k}=0}^k \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla_{\psi^*h}^{\tilde{k}} \psi^*(K - 1)|_{\psi^*h}^2 d\text{Vol}_{\psi^*h}. \quad (4.4.4)$$

Finally, if (S, h) and (\hat{S}, \hat{h}) are two manifolds, with distinguished points and vectors p, \hat{p} and v, \hat{v} , with Gauss curvature K and \hat{K} and with corresponding canonical diffeomorphisms ψ and $\hat{\psi}$, we have the estimate

$$\sum_{\tilde{k}=0}^{k+2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla_{\psi^*h}^{\tilde{k}}(\psi^*h - \hat{\psi}^*\hat{h})|_{\psi^*h}^2 d\text{Vol}_{\psi^*h} \leq C_k \sum_{\tilde{k}=0}^k \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla_{\psi^*h}^{\tilde{k}}(\psi^*K - \hat{\psi}^*\hat{K})|_{\psi^*h}^2 d\text{Vol}_{\psi^*h}. \quad (4.4.5)$$

If $S = \hat{S}$, $p = \hat{p}$ and $v = \lambda \hat{v}$ for some positive multiple λ , we moreover have the following zeroth and first order pointwise estimates on the diffeomorphisms $\psi \circ \hat{\psi}^{-1}$, which can be expressed geometrically as the statement

$$\sup_{x \in S} d_{(S,h)}^2(\psi \circ \hat{\psi}^{-1}(x), x) \leq C \sum_{\tilde{k}=0}^2 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla_{\psi^*h}^{\tilde{k}} \psi^*(h - \hat{h})|_{\psi^*h}^2 d\text{Vol}_{\psi^*h}, \quad (4.4.6)$$

$$\sup_{x \in S} d_{(S,h)}^2(d(\psi \circ \hat{\psi}^{-1})|_x, d(\text{Id})|_x) \leq C \sum_{\tilde{k}=0}^2 \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla_{\psi^*h}^{\tilde{k}} \psi^*(h - \hat{h})|_{\psi^*h}^2 d\text{Vol}_{\psi^*h}. \quad (4.4.7)$$

Moreover $\psi \circ \hat{\psi}^{-1}$ satisfies the higher order estimates

$$\sum_{\tilde{k}=0}^k \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla_{\psi^*h}^{\tilde{k}+1} d(\psi \circ \hat{\psi}^{-1})|_{\psi^*h}^2 d\text{Vol}_{\psi^*h} \leq C \sum_{\tilde{k}=0}^{k+1} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla_{\psi^*h}^{\tilde{k}} \psi^*(h - \hat{h})|_{\psi^*h}^2 d\text{Vol}_{\psi^*h}. \quad (4.4.8)$$

In (4.4.6), $d_{(S,h)}$ may be taken to be the Riemannian distance, while in (4.4.7), $d_{(S,h)}$ simply denotes any appropriate geometric notion of distance between maps $T_x S \rightarrow T_{\psi \circ \hat{\psi}^{-1}(x)} S$ and $T_x S \rightarrow T_x S$, defined so as to be comparable to the differences of the components of the differential maps expressed in a fixed chart. In formulas (4.4.6)–(4.4.8), the constant C depends on

$$\sum_{\tilde{k}=0}^{k+1} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla_{\psi^*h}^{\tilde{k}} \psi^*h|_{\psi^*h}^2 d\text{Vol}_{\psi^*h}.$$

Remark 4.4.2. By Gauss–Bonnet, the statement that S is diffeomorphic to the sphere already follows from the first inequality of (4.4.1) as soon as $\epsilon < 1$.

Remark 4.4.3. Note that in the case where $(S, h) = (\mathbb{S}^2, \dot{\gamma})$ defined in Section 1.1.1, and $p = (1, 0, 0)$, $v = (0, 1, 0) \in T_{(1,0,0)}S \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, then our ψ as defined below will in fact be the identity map. By (4.4.3), it then follows that for the same choice $(S, h) = (\mathbb{S}^2, \dot{\gamma})$ but for a different choice of point \tilde{p} and vector $\tilde{v} \in T_{\tilde{p}}S$, then the resulting $\tilde{\psi} : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow S = \mathbb{S}^2$ is the unique Euclidean rotation of \mathbb{S}^2 which brings $(1, 0, 0)$ to \tilde{p} and $(0, 1, 0)$ to \tilde{v} .

Remark 4.4.4. Estimate (4.4.5) is the statement that the metrics of h and \tilde{h} in their respective canonical coordinates are close if their curvatures are close as measured in canonical coordinates. Estimates (4.4.6) and (4.4.7) correspond to the statement that the canonical diffeomorphisms are suitably close to each other, if the metrics, considered as defined on the same S are sufficiently close, when the anchoring point and vector is taken to be the same. In practice, estimates (4.4.6) and (4.4.7) will in fact be applied to metrics h and $\xi^*\hat{h}$ on S where $\xi : S \rightarrow \hat{S}$ is a diffeomorphism and \hat{p}, \hat{v} are distinguished points and vectors on \hat{S} such that $\xi^{-1}(\hat{p}) = p, \xi_*^{-1}\hat{v} = v$.

Remark 4.4.5. The equivariance statement is only relevant for the proof of Corollary III.3.1 in Section 4.4.6. This will be discussed in Section 4.4.6.

Proof. We begin the proof with some additional constructions related to \mathbb{S}^2 .

4.4.1 Preliminaries on the sphere \mathbb{S}^2

Recall the standard sphere \mathbb{S}^2 as described in Section 1.1.1. In addition to the coordinates $\hat{\theta}, \hat{\phi}$ defined by (1.1.1), we may define a standard isothermal coordinate system \hat{x}, \hat{y} defined by

$$\hat{x} := \frac{1 - \cos \hat{\theta}}{\sin \hat{\theta}} \cos \hat{\phi}, \quad \hat{y} := \frac{1 - \cos \hat{\theta}}{\sin \hat{\theta}} \sin \hat{\phi}. \quad (4.4.9)$$

Note also the identity

$$\sqrt{\hat{x}^2 + \hat{y}^2} = \left| \frac{1 - \cos \hat{\theta}}{\sin \hat{\theta}} \right| = \tan(\hat{\theta}/2). \quad (4.4.10)$$

The above coordinates satisfy $\Delta_{\hat{\gamma}} \hat{x} = 0, \Delta_{\hat{\gamma}} \hat{y} = 0$, and \hat{y} is a harmonic conjugate of \hat{x} with respect to the standard metric on the sphere, i.e.

$$d\hat{y} = \star d\hat{x}. \quad (4.4.11)$$

Note that \hat{y} is uniquely determined from \hat{x} and equation (4.4.11) together with the additional requirement that \hat{y} vanish at the “north pole” $(0, 0, 1)$. Let us note that the standard metric $\hat{\gamma}$ in these coordinates takes the form

$$\hat{\gamma} = e^{\hat{\lambda}(\hat{x}, \hat{y})} (d\hat{x}^2 + d\hat{y}^2) \quad (4.4.12)$$

where

$$\hat{\lambda}(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) := \log \frac{4}{(1 + \hat{x}^2 + \hat{y}^2)^2}. \quad (4.4.13)$$

We may consider an auxiliary set of coordinates associated to the “south pole” $(0, 0, -1)$. We denote these as $\hat{\theta}', \hat{\phi}'$. These are related to $\hat{\theta}, \hat{\phi}$ by the relations

$$\hat{\theta}' = \pi - \hat{\theta}, \quad \hat{\phi}' = \hat{\phi}. \quad (4.4.14)$$

Finally, we may also define an isothermal coordinate system \hat{x}', \hat{y}' by replacing $\hat{\theta}$ by $\hat{\theta}'$ and $\hat{\phi}$ by $\hat{\phi}'$ in (4.4.9).

The two isothermal coordinate systems are themselves related by the transformation law:

$$\hat{x}' = \frac{\hat{x}}{\hat{x}^2 + \hat{y}^2}, \quad \hat{y}' = -\frac{\hat{y}}{\hat{x}^2 + \hat{y}^2}. \quad (4.4.15)$$

To define now a diffeomorphism $\psi : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow S$, it suffices to define open sets $\mathcal{U} \subset S$, and $\mathcal{U}' \subset S$ with $\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{U}' = S$ and to define diffeomorphisms

$$\varphi : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \varphi' : \mathcal{U}' \rightarrow \mathcal{V}' \subset \mathbb{R}^2$$

such that the transition map

$$\varphi' \circ \varphi^{-1} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}' \quad (4.4.16)$$

is given by (4.4.15) when we view $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{R}_{\hat{x}, \hat{y}}^2$ and $\mathcal{V}' \subset \mathbb{R}_{\hat{x}', \hat{y}'}^2$. (For then ψ can be defined consistently in local coordinates (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) by φ^{-1} and in local coordinates (\hat{x}', \hat{y}') by φ'^{-1} .) This is what we shall proceed to do.

4.4.2 Two geodesic polar charts on (S, h)

We begin with the point $p \in S$ and $v \in T_p S$. By a well known result of Klingenberg [Kli59], if ϵ in (4.4.1) is sufficiently small, there exists a geodesic polar neighbourhood $S_{p, \frac{7}{8}\pi} \subset S$ around p of, say, radius $\frac{7}{8}\pi$. Let us denote the chart by the diffeomorphism

$$\varphi_{p, \frac{7}{8}\pi} : S_{p, \frac{7}{8}\pi} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_{\frac{7}{8}\pi}.$$

Associated to this chart are geodesic polar coordinates which we shall denote as (θ, ϕ) . These are uniquely determined by declaring that $\phi = 0$ corresponds to the direction ∂_v and the frame $\partial_\theta, \partial_\phi$ is compatible with the orientation where defined.

Let $\gamma(s)$ denote the geodesic in S with initial condition $\gamma(0) = p$, $\gamma'(0) = v$. This is parametrised by arc length. We will define an “antipode” q as follows:

Note that by the assumption on curvature, for ϵ sufficiently small, γ will have a unique conjugate point in the interval $(99\pi/100, 101\pi/100)$. Let t_0 correspond to this value and define $q = \gamma(t_0)$.

Similarly, there exists a geodesic polar neighbourhood $S_{q, \frac{7}{8}\pi}$ around q of radius $\frac{7}{8}\pi$. Let us denote the chart by

$$\varphi_{q, \frac{7}{8}\pi} : S_{q, \frac{7}{8}\pi} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_{\frac{7}{8}\pi}.$$

Again, associated to this chart are geodesic polar coordinates which we shall denote as (θ', ϕ') . These are selected so that $\phi = 0$ corresponds to the direction $\gamma(t_0 - s)$ and the frame $\partial_{\theta'}, -\partial_{\phi'}$ is compatible with the orientation where defined.

Let us introduce some auxiliary notation: For any $0 < \alpha < \frac{7}{8}\pi$, we define the sets

$$S_{p, \alpha} := \{x \in S : \text{dist}(x, p) < \alpha\},$$

$$S_{q, \alpha} := \{x \in S : \text{dist}(x, q) < \alpha\},$$

$$\mathcal{T}_\alpha = S_{p, \alpha} \cap S_{q, \alpha},$$

$$C_{p, \alpha} = \{x \in S : \text{dist}(x, p) = \alpha\},$$

$$C_{q, \alpha} = \{x \in S : \text{dist}(x, q) = \alpha\}.$$

Note that $S_{p, \alpha} \subset S_{p, \frac{7}{8}\pi}$ and is itself a geodesic polar neighbourhood. Similarly, for $S_{q, \alpha}$. The sets $C_{p, \alpha}$ and $C_{q, \alpha}$ are geodesic circles that generalise the “lines of constant latitude”.

We recall that in the patches $S_{p, \frac{7}{8}\pi}$ and $S_{q, \frac{7}{8}\pi}$, the metric h takes the form

$$h = d\theta^2 + G(\theta, \phi)d\phi^2, \quad h = d\theta'^2 + G'(\theta', \phi')d\phi'^2, \quad (4.4.17)$$

respectively, where G and G' satisfy the differential equations

$$\sqrt{G}_{\theta\theta} + K\sqrt{G} = 0, \quad \sqrt{G'}_{\theta\theta} + K\sqrt{G'} = 0 \quad (4.4.18)$$

with the initial conditions

$$\sqrt{G}(\theta, 0) = 0, \sqrt{G}_\theta(\theta, 0) = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt{G'}(\theta', 0) = 0, \sqrt{G'}_{\theta'}(\theta', 0) = 1, \quad (4.4.19)$$

respectively.

Note (as is well known) that if $K = 1$ identically, it follows that $G = \sin^2 \theta$, $G' = \sin^2 \theta'$. In view of the assumptions on K , we may quantify the closeness of G and G' to these values with the following

Lemma 4.4.6. *The metric functions G and G' satisfy the following estimates:*

$$\sup_{\mathbb{D}_{7/8\pi}} \left\| \frac{\sqrt{G} - \sin \theta}{\sin^3 \theta} \right\| + \sup_{\mathbb{D}_{7/8\pi}} \left\| \frac{\partial_\theta(\sqrt{G} - \sin \theta)}{\sin^2 \theta} \right\| + \sup_{\mathbb{D}_{7/8\pi}} \left\| \frac{\partial_\phi(\sqrt{G} - \sin \theta)}{\sin^3 \theta} \right\| \leq C\|K - 1\|_{C^1(S)} \quad (4.4.20)$$

$$\sup_{\mathbb{D}_{7/8\pi}} \left\| \frac{\sqrt{G'} - \sin \theta'}{\sin^3 \theta'} \right\| + \sup_{\mathbb{D}_{7/8\pi}} \left\| \frac{\partial_{\theta'}(\sqrt{G'} - \sin \theta')}{\sin^2 \theta'} \right\| + \sup_{\mathbb{D}_{7/8\pi}} \left\| \frac{\partial_{\phi'}(\sqrt{G'} - \sin \theta')}{\sin^3 \theta'} \right\| \leq C\|K - 1\|_{C^1(S)}. \quad (4.4.21)$$

Proof. From (4.4.18) and (4.4.19) we derive the ordinary differential equation

$$(\sqrt{G} - \sin \theta)_{\theta\theta} + (\sqrt{G} - \sin \theta) = -(K - 1) \sin \theta - (K - 1)(\sqrt{G} - \sin \theta),$$

with initial condition $(\sqrt{G} - \sin \theta)(0, 0) = 0$ and $\partial_\theta(\sqrt{G} - \sin \theta)(0, 0) = 0$. The solution satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{G} - \sin \theta = & -\sin \theta \int_0^\theta d\tilde{\theta} \cos \tilde{\theta} (\sin \tilde{\theta} + \sqrt{G} - \sin \tilde{\theta})(K - 1)(\tilde{\theta}, \varphi) \\ & + \cos \theta \int_0^\theta d\tilde{\theta} \sin \tilde{\theta} (\sin \tilde{\theta} + \sqrt{G} - \sin \tilde{\theta})(K - 1)(\tilde{\theta}, \varphi), \end{aligned}$$

from which the estimates follow. The computation in the south chart is of course analogous. \square

Let us note that the overlap region $\mathcal{T}_{\frac{7}{8}\pi}$ is nonempty. We have the following estimate for the difference of the coordinates.

Lemma 4.4.7. *We have in the overlap region $\mathcal{T}_{\frac{7}{8}\pi}$ the zeroth order estimate*

$$\|\theta - (\pi - \theta')\|_{C^0(\mathcal{T}_{\frac{7}{8}\pi})} + \|\varphi - \varphi'\|_{C^0(\mathcal{T}_{\frac{7}{8}\pi})} \leq C\|K - 1\|_{C^1(S)}. \quad (4.4.22)$$

Proof. This follows easily from the estimates of Lemma 4.4.6. \square

In particular, it follows from the above lemma that $\partial S_{p, \frac{7}{8}\pi} \subset S_{q, \frac{7}{8}\pi}$ and $\partial S_{q, \frac{7}{8}\pi} \subset S_{p, \frac{7}{8}\pi}$. In particular, $S_{p, \frac{7}{8}\pi} \cup S_{q, \frac{7}{8}\pi}$ is both open and closed and by connectivity we have

$$S = S_{p, \frac{7}{8}\pi} \cup S_{q, \frac{7}{8}\pi}.$$

More generally, given any $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}\pi$, this argument yields

$$S = S_{p, \alpha} \cup S_{q, \alpha} \quad (4.4.23)$$

for sufficiently small ϵ .

4.4.3 Two isothermal charts on (S, h)

Associated to each of the two geodesic polar neighbourhoods defined above, we may define isothermal charts in the subregions $S_{p, \frac{3}{4}\pi}$ and $S_{q, \frac{3}{4}\pi}$ with the following properties:

Lemma 4.4.8. *Let (S, h) , p, v be as above. We may associate two isothermal coordinate systems (x, y) and (x', y') , defined in $S_{p, \frac{3}{4}\pi}$ and $S_{q, \frac{3}{4}\pi}$, respectively, such that*

$$\Delta_h x = 0, \Delta_h y = 0, \quad \Delta_h x' = 0, \Delta_h y' = 0, \quad (4.4.24)$$

$$dy = \star dx, \quad dy' = \star dx', \quad (4.4.25)$$

$$x(p) = 0, y(p) = 0, \quad (4.4.26)$$

$$\left\| x - \frac{1 - \cos \theta}{\sin \theta} \cos \phi \right\|_{H^2(S_{p, \frac{3}{4}\pi})} \leq C\|K - 1\|_{C^1(S)}, \quad (4.4.27)$$

$$\left\| y - \frac{1 - \cos \theta}{\sin \theta} \sin \phi \right\|_{H^2(S_{p, \frac{3}{4}\pi})} \leq C\|K - 1\|_{C^1(S)}, \quad (4.4.28)$$

$$\left\| x' - \frac{1 - \cos \theta'}{\sin \theta'} \cos \phi' \right\|_{H^2(S_{q, \frac{3}{4}\pi})} \leq C\|K - 1\|_{C^1(S)}, \quad (4.4.29)$$

$$\left\| y' - \frac{1 - \cos \theta'}{\sin \theta'} \sin \phi' \right\|_{H^2(S_{q, \frac{3}{4}\pi})} \leq C\|K - 1\|_{C^1(S)}. \quad (4.4.30)$$

The choice is canonical and, if $(S, h) = (\mathbb{S}^2, \hat{\gamma})$ with $p = (1, 0, 0)$ and $v = (0, 1, 0)$, then $(x, y) = (\hat{x}, \hat{y})$ and $(x', y') = (\hat{x}', \hat{y}')$.

Proof. Let us first define x_{prelim} to be unique solution of the Dirichlet problem for

$$\Delta_h x_{\text{prelim}} = 0$$

with the boundary condition

$$x_{\text{prelim}} = \frac{1 - \cos(\frac{3}{4}\pi)}{\sin(\frac{3}{4}\pi)} \cos \phi$$

on $C_{p, \frac{3}{4}\pi}$.

In view of the estimates of Lemma 4.4.6, it follows that

$$\left\| x_{\text{prelim}} - \frac{1 - \cos \theta}{\sin \theta} \cos \phi \right\|_{H^2(S_{p, \frac{3}{4}\pi})} \leq C \|K - 1\|_{C^1(S)}.$$

In particular, $|x_{\text{prelim}}(p)| \leq C \|K - 1\|_{C^1(S)}$, and defining $x = x_{\text{prelim}} - x_{\text{prelim}}(p)$, we have that x satisfies again $\Delta_h x = 0$ and the estimate (4.4.27).

We define y to be the harmonic conjugate of x

$$dy := \star dx,$$

where \star is the Hodge-star operator associated to the metric h , with the additional condition that $y = 0$ at p . Note that this uniquely determines y . The pair x, y clearly satisfy the relations of (4.4.24), (4.4.25) and (4.4.26).

We note that y can also be easily seen to satisfy (4.4.28).

In the case where $(S, h) = (\mathbb{S}^2, \hat{\gamma})$ and $p = (1, 0, 0)$, $v = (0, 1, 0)$, then $x = \hat{x}$, $y = \hat{y}$ defined in Section 4.4.1 above.

In an entirely analogous fashion, we may define isothermal coordinates x' and y' and they clearly satisfy the estimates (4.4.29) and (4.4.30). □

Let us denote the diffeomorphisms defined by the above coordinates as

$$\varphi_{\text{isoth}} : S_{p, \frac{3}{4}\pi} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_p \subset \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \varphi'_{\text{isoth}} : S_{q, \frac{3}{4}\pi} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'_q \subset \mathbb{R}^2.$$

These are indeed diffeomorphisms and $\mathcal{V}_p, \mathcal{V}_q$ are bounded open subsets of \mathbb{R}^2 .

We may write the metric h in the coordinates x, y , as

$$h = e^{\lambda(x,y)}(dx^2 + dy^2) \tag{4.4.31}$$

for a smooth function $\lambda : \mathcal{V}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Similarly, we have

$$h = e^{\lambda'(x',y')}(dx'^2 + dy'^2) \tag{4.4.32}$$

for a smooth function $\lambda' : \mathcal{V}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 4.4.9. *We have the following estimates for the transition functions on the overlap region $\mathcal{T}_{\frac{3}{4}\pi}$:*

$$\left\| x' - \frac{x}{x^2 + y^2} \right\|_{C^0(\mathcal{T}_{\frac{3}{4}\pi})} + \left\| y' + \frac{y}{x^2 + y^2} \right\|_{C^0(\mathcal{T}_{\frac{3}{4}\pi})} \leq C \|K - 1\|_{C^1(S)}. \tag{4.4.33}$$

Proof. This follows from the exact relation (4.4.15) in the case of the transition functions connecting standard isothermal coordinates on the standard sphere, and the estimates of Lemma 4.4.7 and 4.4.8. □

Note the following corollary:

Corollary 4.4.10.

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{m+n \leq N} \sup_{\varphi_{\text{isoth}}(\mathcal{T}_{\frac{11}{16}\pi})} \left\| (\partial_x)^m (\partial_y)^n \left(x'(x, y) - \frac{x}{x^2 + y^2} \right) \right\| \\ & + \max_{m+n \leq N} \sup_{\varphi_{\text{isoth}}(\mathcal{T}_{\frac{11}{16}\pi})} \left\| (\partial_x)^m (\partial_y)^n \left(y'(x, y) + \frac{y}{x^2 + y^2} \right) \right\| \leq C_N \|K - 1\|_{C^1(S)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4.34)$$

Proof. The case $N = 0$ follows from Lemma 4.4.9. The higher order estimates for $N \geq 1$ now follow by elliptic estimates in view of the identities:

$$\left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \right] \left(x'(x, y) - \frac{x}{x^2 + y^2} \right) = 0, \quad \left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \right] \left(y'(x, y) + \frac{y}{x^2 + y^2} \right) = 0.$$

Note that the identities above follow since $\Delta_h x = 0$, $\Delta_h y = 0$, the functions $\frac{x}{x^2 + y^2}$ and $\frac{y}{x^2 + y^2}$ are harmonic as functions of (x, y) , and the fact that the coordinates x and y are isothermal. \square

4.4.4 Estimates for the metric in isothermal charts

In this section we prove the following estimates:

Lemma 4.4.11. *Let $\hat{\gamma}$ denote the metric on subsets of \mathbb{R}^2 given by the expression (4.4.12). For $N \geq 4$, we have the estimate:*

$$\|(\varphi_{\text{isoth}}^{-1})^* h - \hat{\gamma}\|_{H^{N+1}(\varphi_{\text{isoth}}(S_p, \frac{11}{16}\pi), (\varphi_{\text{isoth}}^{-1})^* h)} \leq C_N \|K - 1\|_{H^{N-1}(S)}, \quad (4.4.35)$$

$$\|(\varphi'_{\text{isoth}})^{-1} h - \hat{\gamma}\|_{H^{N+1}(\varphi'_{\text{isoth}}(S_q, \frac{11}{16}\pi), (\varphi'_{\text{isoth}})^{-1} h)} \leq C_N \|K - 1\|_{H^{N-1}(S)}. \quad (4.4.36)$$

Here H^s is the geometrically defined Sobolev norm for tensors (defined using covariant derivatives).

Proof. Let us define

$$\lambda_0(x, y) = \log \frac{4}{(1 + x^2 + y^2)^2}, \quad \lambda'_0 = \log \frac{4}{(1 + x'^2 + y'^2)^2}.$$

In view of (4.4.31), (4.4.32) and (4.4.12), it clearly suffices to estimate

$$\|\lambda - \lambda_0\|_{H^{k+2}(\varphi_{\text{isoth}}(S_p, \frac{11}{16}\pi))} \leq C_k \|K - 1\|_{H^k(S)} + C_k \|K - 1\|_{C^1(S)}, \quad (4.4.37)$$

$$\|\lambda' - \lambda'_0\|_{H^{k+2}(\varphi'_{\text{isoth}}(S_q, \frac{11}{16}\pi))} \leq C_k \|K - 1\|_{H^k(S)} + C_k \|K - 1\|_{C^1(S)}, \quad (4.4.38)$$

in view of the fact that for $k \geq 3$ the second term can evidently be dropped on the right hand side of (4.4.37) and (4.4.38) can evidently be dropped by a Sobolev inequality (note that a geometric Sobolev inequality with bounded constant holds for metrics satisfying (4.4.1)). The norm on the left hand side of (4.4.37) can (4.4.38) can be understood either as the Euclidean Sobolev norm or as the norm with respect $(\varphi_{\text{isoth}}^{-1})^* h$ or $(\varphi'_{\text{isoth}})^{-1} h$ respectively, since in view of the estimates on the Christoffel symbols, these norms are equivalent.

From the change of variable formula relating h in the form (4.4.17) and (4.4.31), we obtain that

$$\left| \frac{\partial x}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{\partial y}{\partial \theta} \right|^2 = e^{-\lambda(x, y) + \lambda_0(x, y)} e^{-\lambda_0(x, y)}. \quad (4.4.39)$$

Defining $\sigma_x := x - \frac{1 - \cos \theta}{\sin \theta} \cos \varphi$ and $\sigma_y := y - \frac{1 - \cos \theta}{\sin \theta} \sin \varphi$, the left hand side of (4.4.39) can be reexpressed as

$$\frac{1}{4 \cos^4(\theta/2)} + \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \sigma_x \right|^2 + 2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \sigma_x \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left(\frac{1 - \cos \theta}{\sin \theta} \cos \phi \right) + \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \sigma_y \right|^2 + 2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \sigma_y \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left(\frac{1 - \cos \theta}{\sin \theta} \sin \phi \right).$$

We also compute the second factor on the right hand side of (4.4.39)

$$e^{-\lambda_0(x,y)} = \frac{(1+x^2+y^2)^2}{4} = \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{\cos^2(\theta/2)} + 2\sigma_x \left(\frac{1-\cos\theta}{\sin\theta} \cos\phi \right) + \sigma_x^2 + 2\sigma_y \left(\frac{1-\cos\theta}{\sin\theta} \sin\phi \right) + \sigma_y^2 \right)^2.$$

We conclude using formulas (4.4.27), (4.4.28) of Lemma 4.4.8 and formula (4.4.33) of Lemma 4.4.9 that

$$\|e^{\lambda-\lambda_0-1}\|_{L^2(\phi_{\text{isoth}}(S_{p,\frac{3}{4}\pi}))} \leq C\|K-1\|_{C^1(S)}. \quad (4.4.40)$$

To obtain (4.4.37) as desired we must upgrade (4.4.40) to higher order. For this, we note that we have in $\phi_{\text{isoth}}(S_{p,\frac{3}{4}\pi})$ the relation

$$\left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \right] \lambda + 2Ke^\lambda = 0.$$

Recalling that λ_0 satisfies the above relation with $K=1$ we obtain

$$\left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \right] (\lambda - \lambda_0) + 2(e^\lambda - e^{\lambda_0}) = -2(K-1)e^\lambda. \quad (4.4.41)$$

Thus, noting the restriction of the domain, inequality (4.4.37) indeed follows from (4.4.40) by applying standard Euclidean interior elliptic estimates to (4.4.41).

The case of (4.4.38) is of course completely analogous. \square

4.4.5 The modified chart on the southern hemisphere and the completion of the construction

To define our desired map to the standard sphere \mathbb{S}^2 , it suffices to interpolate between $\left(\frac{x}{x^2+y^2}, \frac{-y}{x^2+y^2} \right)$ and (x', y') via a partition of unity.

Lemma 4.4.12. *One can canonically define a third set of coordinates (\tilde{x}', \tilde{y}') defining a regular chart*

$$\tilde{\varphi}' : S_{q,\frac{11}{16}\pi} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_q \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \quad (4.4.42)$$

such that the identities

$$\tilde{x}' = \frac{x}{x^2+y^2}, \quad \tilde{y}' = \frac{y}{x^2+y^2} \quad (4.4.43)$$

hold in $\mathcal{T}_{\frac{17}{32}\pi}$, and such that the estimate (4.4.36) holds with $\tilde{\varphi}'$ replacing φ_{isoth} .

Proof. Let us fix a smooth cutoff function $\chi(\varrho)$ such that $\chi(\varrho) = 1$ for $\varrho \geq \tan \frac{7}{16}\pi$ and $\chi(\varrho) = 0$ for $\varrho \leq \tan \frac{3}{8}\pi$. We define coordinates

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}' &= \frac{x}{x^2+y^2} \chi(\sqrt{(x')^2 + (y')^2}) + (1 - \chi(\sqrt{(x')^2 + (y')^2}))x', \\ \tilde{y}' &= \frac{-y}{x^2+y^2} \chi(\sqrt{(x')^2 + (y')^2}) + (1 - \chi(\sqrt{(x')^2 + (y')^2}))y'. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the (x, y) coordinates are indeed defined in the region where $\chi(\sqrt{(x')^2 + (y')^2}) \neq 0$. Using the estimate (4.4.34) of Corollary 4.4.10, we easily see that this is indeed a smooth change of coordinates in $S_{q,\frac{11}{16}\pi}$, provided ϵ in (4.4.1) is sufficiently small.

Let (4.4.42) denote the diffeomorphism defined by these coordinates. In view of the identity (4.4.10) and again using the estimate (4.4.34), it follows that for ϵ in (4.4.1) sufficiently small, $\sqrt{(x')^2 + (y')^2} \geq \tan \frac{7}{16}\pi$ in $\mathcal{T}_{\frac{17}{32}\pi}$, and thus relation (4.4.43) holds on that region.

Finally, we note that using (4.4.29) and (4.4.30) it is easy to see now that the estimate (4.4.36) holds for $\tilde{\varphi}'$ replacing φ . \square

In view of the remarks at the end of Section 4.4.1, then denoting $\varphi := \varphi_{\text{isoth}}|_{S_{p, \frac{17}{32}\pi}}$, and requiring that ϵ in (4.4.1) be sufficiently small so that (4.4.23) holds with $\alpha = \frac{17}{32}\pi$, it follows that the charts

$$\varphi : S_{p, \frac{17}{32}\pi} \rightarrow \varphi(S_{p, \frac{17}{32}\pi}), \quad \tilde{\varphi}' : S_{p, \frac{17}{32}\pi} \rightarrow \tilde{\varphi}'(S_{p, \frac{17}{32}\pi})$$

indeed determine a well-defined map $\psi : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow S$ in view in particular of the property (4.4.43) (which corresponds to the transition maps (4.4.16) satisfying (4.4.15)). The statement (4.4.4) now follows from (4.4.35) and the analogue of (4.4.36) for \tilde{x}' and \tilde{y}' asserted in Lemma 4.4.12.

4.4.6 Equivariance

We note that, in the presence of a Killing field, the construction is indeed equivariant as claimed in the statement of Proposition 4.4.1. For let us assume that (S, h) admits a nontrivial Killing field X which vanishes at p . Note that the geodesics emanating from p are taken to one another under the 1-parameter group of diffeomorphisms generated by X . It follows that if two such geodesics intersect at another point \tilde{q} , then X must vanish at \tilde{q} . Now let γ , t_0 and $q = \gamma(t_0)$ be as in Section 4.4.2. It is clear that for $\gamma(t_0)$ to be conjugate to p , it must be that all arc-length parameterised geodesics $\tilde{\gamma}$ emanating from p satisfy $\tilde{\gamma}(t_0) = q$ and thus $X(q) = 0$. The antipode q is in fact the unique other point of S with this vanishing property. One clearly sees now that the G and G' of geodesic polar coordinates in both hemispheres are manifestly ϕ , respectively ϕ' , independent. All subsequent constructions respect this symmetry and thus the equivariance claim follows.

4.4.7 Estimates for differences in canonical coordinates

To obtain the geometric estimate (4.4.5) for differences of two metrics expressed in canonical coordinates, let us now assume we have two metrics h and \hat{h} on S as in statement. We essentially repeat the steps of the previous proof, starting from the remark that, considering G and \hat{G} as functions on $\mathbb{D}_{\frac{7}{8}\pi}$, we have

$$|\sqrt{G} - \sqrt{\hat{G}}| \leq C \|K - \tilde{K}\|_{C^1(\mathbb{D}_{\frac{7}{8}\pi})},$$

and similarly in the southern hemisphere.

4.4.8 Proof of canonicity, smooth dependence and estimates for the diffeomorphisms $\psi \circ \tilde{\psi}^{-1}$

We note that the canonicity relation (4.4.3) follows immediately from the construction as all coordinate systems are defined geometrically. It is also clear that all constructions depend smoothly on the metric in the sense described.

To obtain the more quantitative statements (4.4.6)–(4.4.8) estimating the diffeomorphisms $\psi \circ \hat{\psi}^{-1}$, then denoting x, y the final coordinates on the northern hemisphere corresponding to ψ and \hat{x}, \hat{y} the corresponding coordinates on the northern hemisphere corresponding to $\hat{\psi}$, then viewing $\hat{x}'(x, y)$ and $\hat{y}'(x, y)$ on a suitable smaller overlap domain, statement (4.4.6) is equivalent to C^0 bounds for $\hat{x}(x, y) - x$ and $\hat{y}(x, y) - y$, (together with corresponding bounds on $\hat{x}'(\tilde{x}', \tilde{y}') - \hat{x}$ and $\hat{y}'(\tilde{x}', \tilde{y}') - \hat{y}$ covering the southern hemisphere), statement (4.4.7) is equivalent to C^1 bounds for these functions, while (4.4.8) is equivalent to H^{k+2} bounds.

Note that because these diffeomorphisms are based on isothermal coordinates, this easily reduces in coordinates to showing $k + 2$ order interior estimates for differences of appropriate solutions of the Laplace equation with respect to the metrics h and \tilde{h} , which can easily be seen to be bounded by the quantity on the right hand side of (4.4.8)

Note finally that the statement of Remark 4.4.3 follows from the various remarks in the lemmas concerning the case $(S, h) = (\mathbb{S}^2, \hat{g})$.

□

Part B

**The main theorem: setup, statement
and logic of the proof**

In this part of the work, we will give the setup of the main theorem, including its detailed statement and the complete logic of the proof.

5	The local theory	99
5.1	Characteristic initial data generated by seed data \mathcal{S}	100
5.2	The maximal Cauchy development (\mathcal{M}, g)	102
5.3	Identification with Schwarzschild and global existence of the data	103
5.4	The global smallness assumption and the smallness parameter ε_0	106
5.5	Cauchy stability and the initial data gauges	109
5.6	The anchoring conditions	114
5.7	Existence of anchored teleological gauges at time u_f^0	118
5.8	The 3-parameter families of initial data \mathcal{L}_{S_0} and the structure of the moduli space \mathfrak{M}	119
5.9	The homeomorphism $\mathbf{J}_0 : \mathfrak{R}_0 \rightarrow B_{\varepsilon_0/u_f^0}$ and its degree 1 property	121
6	Final formulation of the main result: Theorem 6.1	122
6.1	Energies	123
6.2	The statement of Theorem 6.1	132
6.3	The stable codimension-3 “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ and other remarks on the statement	134
7	The logic of the proof of Theorem 6.1	135
7.1	The bootstrap set \mathfrak{B}	136
7.2	Non-emptiness of the bootstrap set \mathfrak{B}	137
7.3	Improving the bootstrap assumptions: the statement of Theorem C	138
7.4	The bootstrap set \mathfrak{B} is open and the statements of Theorems 16.1 and 16.2	138
7.5	Higher order estimates: the statement of Theorem 16.3	140
7.6	The bootstrap set \mathfrak{B} is closed	140
7.7	Completing the proof and the statements of Theorems 17.1 and 17.2	142

First, in **Chapter 5**, we shall consider the local theory for our problem, giving a well-posedness statement for the characteristic initial value problem which we shall study, a Cauchy stability type statement which will allow us to infer the existence of a sufficiently large region of spacetime covered by initial data gauges, a decomposition of the set of initial data into 3-parameter families, and the anchoring conditions linking teleological normalised gauges to initial data gauges. This will finally allow us to assert the existence of anchored teleologically normalised gauges at time u_f^0 .

In **Chapter 6**, after introducing a variety of energies, we shall be able to give a complete statement of our main theorem, stated as **Theorem 6.1**.

Finally, in **Chapter 7** we shall give the logic of the proof of Theorem 6.1. The main analytical content will be deferred to subtheorems whose proofs will appear in Part C while some of the other statements necessary to complete the proof will be deferred to subtheorems whose proofs appear in Part D.

In general, the chapters of this part will use definitions from Part A, but, as discussed previously, portions can be read independently. The notations and theorems of Chapter 5 will be fundamental for the rest of the work, though the proofs may be skipped at a first reading. The reader who is primarily interested in understanding the large-scale architecture of the proof can skip some of the detailed definitions of energies in Chapter 6. On the other hand, the reader more interested in the statement and proof of the bootstrap theorem forming the analytic heart of the argument can in principle skip the later parts of Chapter 7. More detailed instructions to the reader will be provided in the preambles of each chapter.

Chapter 5

The local theory

In the present chapter we will develop the local theory associated to the characteristic initial value problem to be studied in this work. This will also involve introducing some of the basic setup which will be central to the proof of our main theorem, including a description of “seed” data, a basic well-posedness statement, the existence of teleological gauges, anchored to suitable initial data gauges, and a discussion of the structure of the moduli space \mathfrak{M} of initial data.

Contents

5.1	Characteristic initial data generated by seed data \mathcal{S}	100
5.2	The maximal Cauchy development (\mathcal{M}, g)	102
5.3	Identification with Schwarzschild and global existence of the data	103
5.3.1	The initial hypersurfaces and additional normalisations	103
5.3.2	Associated Eddington–Finkelstein data and covariance	103
5.3.3	Global existence of the full initial data	104
5.3.4	Kerr parameters of the data	104
5.3.5	Associated linearised data and linearised solution	105
5.4	The global smallness assumption and the smallness parameter ε_0	106
5.5	Cauchy stability and the initial data gauges	109
5.5.1	The initial Kruskal gauge	109
5.5.2	The initial Eddington–Finkelstein gauge	111
5.6	The anchoring conditions	114
5.6.1	The basic setup: four local double null parametrisations in (\mathcal{M}, g)	114
5.6.2	Notation for coordinates and diffeomorphism functions	115
5.6.3	Definition of anchored gauges	116
5.7	Existence of anchored teleological gauges at time u_f^0	118
5.8	The 3-parameter families of initial data $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}$ and the structure of the moduli space \mathfrak{M} . .	119
5.9	The homeomorphism $\mathbf{J}_0 : \mathfrak{R}_0 \rightarrow B_{\varepsilon_0/u_f^0}$ and its degree 1 property	121

In **Section 5.1** we shall define the characteristic initial data considered, as generated by “seed data” \mathcal{S} . Next, in **Section 5.2** we shall give the existence of a maximal future Cauchy development (Theorem 5.2.1). We note that these two sections depend only on Sections 1.1–1.2.

In **Section 5.3**, we shall identify the initial characteristic hypersurfaces with analogous hypersurfaces in Schwarzschild, and give a smallness condition on seed data guaranteeing that initial data themselves exist globally on the characteristic hypersurfaces. We shall then introduce in **Section 5.4** the norm on initial data which will define the global smallness condition fundamental for our work, determined by a parameter ε_0 . In **Section 5.5**, we shall state two theorems (**Theorems 5.5.1** and **5.5.2**) giving that, for data with small norm, the resulting solution exists for a sufficiently long interval so as to contain regions covered by what we shall term “the initial data gauges”. This can be thought of as a more quantitative version of Cauchy

stability (using already the null structure exhibited by the equations!), allowing existence all the way up to a “piece” of null infinity.

In **Section 5.6**, we shall give the anchoring conditions connecting two teleologically normalised \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges with the initial data gauges. We shall address the question of existence of anchored gauges corresponding to some fixed retarded time parameter u_f^0 in **Section 5.7**.

In **Section 5.8**, we shall discuss the structure of the moduli space of initial data, foliating it by 3-parameter families $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}$ labelled by some choice of seed data $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}$ and parametrised by $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^3$. This will be essential for the statement of the main theorem in Section 6. Finally, in **Section 5.9**, appealing to the existence of the anchored gauges corresponding to time u_f^0 asserted in Section 5.7, we shall define the map

$$\mathbf{J}_0 : \mathfrak{R}_0 \rightarrow B_{\varepsilon_0/u_f^0},$$

defined using the associated Kerr angular momentum parameters of the solution in \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, where $\mathfrak{R}_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a subset of the λ -parameter space, which will be key to our topological argument in the proof of the main theorem.

This chapter is fundamental for understanding the detailed statement of the main theorem of this work, Theorem 6.1 stated in Chapter 6, as well as for the large-scale architecture of the proof as outlined in Chapter 7 and for the statement of the main “bootstrap” theorem, Theorem C stated in Section 7.3, in particular. On a first reading, however, the reader may wish to skip some of the details and refer back as necessary. The work [Chr09] provides a useful reference for setting up data for the characteristic initial value problem.

5.1 Characteristic initial data generated by seed data \mathcal{S}

In this and the following section, we will set up the characteristic initial value problem for the Einstein equations in double null gauge and state a well-posedness theorem. The results here make no reference to a Schwarzschild background and only depend on Sections 1.1–1.2.

Consider arbitrary parameters $\mathbf{U}_{-2} < \mathbf{U}_5$, \mathbf{V}_{-2} . Let us define

$$\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{in}} = [\mathbf{U}_{-2}, \mathbf{U}_5] \times \{\mathbf{V}_{-2}\} \times \mathbb{S}^2, \quad \mathcal{C}_{\text{out}} = \{\mathbf{U}_{-2}\} \times [\mathbf{V}_{-2}, \infty) \times \mathbb{S}^2$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{U}_{-2}, \mathbf{V}_{-2}} = \{\mathbf{U}_{-2}\} \times \{\mathbf{V}_{-2}\} \times \mathbb{S}^2.$$

Note that we can naturally define the notion of S -tangent tensor on $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{in}} \cup \mathcal{C}_{\text{out}}$.

We define initial data on $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{in}} \cup \mathcal{C}_{\text{out}}$ as follows.

We prescribe smooth functions $\text{tr}\chi(\theta)$, $\text{tr}\chi(\theta)$ and a 1-form $\eta_A(\theta)$ on $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{U}_{-2}, \mathbf{V}_{-2}}$.

We further prescribe smooth positive functions $\Omega^{\text{in}}(\mathbf{U}, \theta)$ and $\Omega^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{V}, \theta)$ on $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{in}}$ and \mathcal{C}_{out} respectively, with

$$\Omega^{\text{in}}(\mathbf{U}_{-2}, \theta) = \Omega^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{V}_{-2}, \theta),$$

and a smooth S -tangent vector field $\mathbf{b}_{\text{out}}^A(\mathbf{V}, \theta)$ on \mathcal{C}_{out} .

We may now define the vector fields

$$e_3 = (\Omega^{\text{in}})^{-1} \partial_{\mathbf{U}}, \quad e_4 = (\Omega^{\text{out}})^{-1} (\partial_{\mathbf{V}} + \mathbf{b}_{\text{out}}^A \partial_A)$$

on $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{in}}$, \mathcal{C}_{out} respectively. Note that the operations \underline{D} and D can be defined for covariant S -tensors on $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{in}}$ and \mathcal{C}_{out} respectively, since the relevant projection does not require the metric.

Finally we prescribe smooth symmetric positive definite S -tangent covariant 2-tensors in the angular coordinates $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{AB}^{\text{in}}(\mathbf{U}, \theta)$ and $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{AB}^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{V}, \theta)$ on $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{in}}$ and \mathcal{C}_{out} respectively, with the property that

$$\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{AB}^{\text{in}}(\mathbf{U}_{-2}, \theta) = \hat{\mathcal{G}}_{AB}^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{V}_{-2}, \theta)$$

and that

$$(\underline{D}\hat{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{in}})_{AB} = 0, \quad (D\hat{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{out}})_{AB} = 0 \tag{5.1.1}$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{in}}$, $\hat{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{out}}$ denote the area element of $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{AB}^{\text{in}}$, $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{AB}^{\text{out}}$, respectively.

We refer to this information as the *seed data* and denote this collectively by the symbol \mathcal{S} .

Proposition 5.1.1 (Existence of the initial data set). *Consider seed data*

$$\mathcal{S} = \{\text{tr}\chi, \text{tr}\underline{\chi}, \eta, \Omega^{\text{in}}, \Omega^{\text{out}}, \mathbf{b}_{\text{out}}^A, \hat{\mathbf{g}}_{AB}^{\text{in}}, \hat{\mathbf{g}}_{AB}^{\text{out}}\} \quad (5.1.2)$$

as defined above. Then there exists a \mathbf{U}'_5 satisfying $\mathbf{U}_{-2} < \mathbf{U}'_5 \leq \mathbf{U}_5$ and a \mathbf{V}'_0 satisfying $\mathbf{V}_{-2} < \mathbf{V}'_0 \leq \infty$ and unique smooth vector field \mathbf{b}_{in}^A defined on $\underline{\mathcal{C}}'_{\text{in}} = \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{in}} \cap \{\mathbf{U} \leq \mathbf{U}'_5\}$ and a smooth $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{AB}$ defined on $\underline{\mathcal{C}}'_{\text{in}} \cup \mathcal{C}'_{\text{out}}$ where $\mathcal{C}'_{\text{out}} = \mathcal{C}_{\text{out}} \cap \{\mathbf{V} \leq \mathbf{V}'_0\}$, generated by the prescribed data. Moreover, on $\underline{\mathcal{C}}'_{\text{in}} \cup \mathcal{C}'_{\text{out}}$ we may define the operation ∇ , we may define ∇_3 on $\underline{\mathcal{C}}'_{\text{in}}$ and ∇_4 on $\mathcal{C}'_{\text{out}}$, and we may determine $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \vartheta$ applied to each of the quantities ϑ defined in Section 1.2 for all $|\gamma| \geq 0$, yielding definitions for quantities $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \vartheta$ on $\underline{\mathcal{C}}'_{\text{in}} \cup \mathcal{C}'_{\text{out}}$ such that the equations of Section 1.2, and the equations that arise after commutation by \mathfrak{D}^γ , are satisfied. We may in fact define α on all of \mathcal{C}_{out} and $\underline{\alpha}$ on all of $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{in}}$.

Proof. Refer to [Chr09].

Let us set

$$\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{AB}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}_{-2}, \theta) := \phi^{\text{in}}(\mathbf{U}, \theta) \hat{\mathbf{g}}_{AB}^{\text{in}}(\mathbf{U}, \theta) \quad (5.1.3)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{AB}(\mathbf{U}_{-2}, \mathbf{V}, \theta) := \phi^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{V}, \theta) \hat{\mathbf{g}}_{AB}^{\text{in}}(\mathbf{V}, \theta) \quad (5.1.4)$$

for a $\phi^{\text{in}}, \phi^{\text{out}}$ to be determined. Using (5.1.1), we derive from the relations of Section 1.2 the ordinary differential equations

$$\underline{D}\underline{D}\phi^{\text{in}} + e^{\text{in}}\phi^{\text{in}} = 0, \quad \underline{D}\underline{D}\phi^{\text{out}} + e^{\text{out}}\phi^{\text{out}} = 0 \quad (5.1.5)$$

where

$$e^{\text{in}} := \frac{1}{8}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}^{\text{in}-1})^{AC}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}^{\text{in}-1})^{BD}\underline{D}\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{AB}^{\text{in}}\underline{D}\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{CD}^{\text{in}}, \quad e^{\text{out}} := \frac{1}{8}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}^{\text{out}-1})^{AC}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}^{\text{out}-1})^{BD}\underline{D}\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{AB}^{\text{out}}\underline{D}\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{CD}^{\text{out}}.$$

Let us define now $\phi^{\text{in}}, \phi^{\text{out}}$ to be the unique solutions of the (5.1.5) with initial condition

$$\phi^{\text{in}}(\mathbf{U}_{-2}, \theta) = 1, \quad \underline{D}\phi^{\text{in}}(\mathbf{U}_{-2}) = \frac{1}{2}\Omega^{\text{in}}\text{tr}\chi, \quad \text{and} \quad \phi^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{V}_{-2}, \theta) = 1, \quad \underline{D}\phi^{\text{out}}(\mathbf{V}_{-2}) = \frac{1}{2}\Omega^{\text{in}}\text{tr}\underline{\chi},$$

respectively. These are globally defined on $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{in}}$ and \mathcal{C}_{out} respectively, but may not be positive. Thus, we do not know yet that the definitions (5.1.3)–(5.1.4) define metrics.

Nonetheless, motivated by the relations of Section 1.2, we may already define $\hat{\chi}$ on $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{in}}$ and $\hat{\underline{\chi}}$ on \mathcal{C}_{out} by the expressions

$$\Omega^{\text{in}}\hat{\chi}_{AB} := \frac{1}{2}(\phi^{\text{in}})^2\underline{D}\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{AB}, \quad \Omega^{\text{out}}\hat{\underline{\chi}}_{AB} := \frac{1}{2}(\phi^{\text{out}})^2\underline{D}\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{AB}.$$

Note that since we may rewrite (1.2.6) as $D(\Omega\hat{\chi}) = -\Omega\alpha$, $\underline{D}(\Omega\hat{\underline{\chi}}) = -\underline{\alpha}$, we may now already define $\underline{\alpha}$ along $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{in}}$ and α along \mathcal{C}_{out} as

$$\Omega^{\text{in}}\underline{\alpha} := \underline{D}\left(\frac{1}{2}(\phi^{\text{in}})^2\underline{D}\hat{\mathbf{g}}\right), \quad \Omega^{\text{out}}\alpha := \underline{D}\left(\frac{1}{2}(\phi^{\text{out}})^2\underline{D}\hat{\mathbf{g}}\right). \quad (5.1.6)$$

To define the remaining quantities, we shall require restricting the initial data cones such that ϕ^{in} and ϕ^{out} are indeed safely positive. Let us fix thus a $\mathbf{U}'_5, \mathbf{V}'_0$ such that say $\phi^{\text{in}} \geq \frac{1}{2}$, $\phi^{\text{out}} \geq \frac{1}{2}$ for $\mathbf{U}_{-2} \leq \mathbf{U} \leq \mathbf{U}'_5$ and $\mathbf{V}_{-2} \leq \mathbf{V} \leq \mathbf{V}'_0$. This defines the restricted cones $\underline{\mathcal{C}}'_{\text{in}}$ and $\mathcal{C}'_{\text{out}}$.

We may define now $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{AB}$ from (5.1.3), (5.1.4) and these are non-degenerate (Riemannian) metrics on the spheres of constant \mathbf{U} or \mathbf{V} respectively. Thus, we may now define the covariant derivative ∇ with respect to $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$, the algebraic relations on S -tensors as well as the S -tangential differential operators d/v , etc.

Motivated by the relations of Section 1.2, we may also now define $\text{tr}\chi$, on $\underline{\mathcal{C}}'_{\text{in}}$ and $\text{tr}\underline{\chi}$ on $\mathcal{C}'_{\text{out}}$ by the expressions

$$\Omega^{\text{in}}\text{tr}\chi = 2(\phi^{\text{in}})^{-1}\underline{D}\phi^{\text{in}} \quad \Omega^{\text{out}}\text{tr}\chi = 2(\phi^{\text{out}})^{-1}\underline{D}\phi^{\text{out}}.$$

We may now define $\chi = \hat{\chi} + \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\chi\hat{\mathbf{g}}$, $\underline{\chi} = \hat{\underline{\chi}} + \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\underline{\chi}\hat{\mathbf{g}}$.

Note at this point it follows from the relations (1.2.2)–(1.2.3) that the covariant operators ∇_3, ∇_4 can now be defined along $\underline{\mathcal{C}}'_{\text{in}}$ and $\mathcal{C}'_{\text{out}}$, respectively.

We note first that we may define $\hat{\omega}$ and $\hat{\underline{\omega}}$ along \mathbf{C}_{out} , $\underline{\mathbf{C}}_{\text{in}}$ respectively, by the second two relations of (1.2.21). To define $\underline{\eta}$ and $\underline{\eta}$, note that the first relation of (1.2.21) allows one to determine $\eta + \underline{\eta}$ on $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} \cup \mathbf{C}'_{\text{in}}$. In particular, we may use this to define $\underline{\eta}(\mathbf{U}_{-2}, \mathbf{V}_{-2}, \theta)$ from $\underline{\eta}(\mathbf{U}_{-2}, \mathbf{V}_{-2}, \theta)$.

Considering now equations (1.2.12), we may substitute the β , respectively $\underline{\beta}$, term on the right hand side from (1.2.18), respectively from (1.2.19). Finally, we may substitute the $\underline{\eta}$, respectively η , term by $(\eta + \underline{\eta}) - \underline{\eta}$, respectively $(\eta + \underline{\eta}) - \eta$. This allows us to integrate (1.2.12) as a linear propagation relation for η along \mathbf{C}_{out} and $\underline{\eta}$ along $\underline{\mathbf{C}}_{\text{in}}$ with known coefficients and known initial data at $\mathbf{C}_{\text{in}} \cap \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}$. This integration defines our $\underline{\eta}$, η on $\underline{\mathbf{C}}'_{\text{in}}$ and \mathbf{C}'_{out} . We may similarly now integrate (1.2.13) and (1.2.14) to obtain these quantities on \mathbf{C}'_{out} and $\underline{\mathbf{C}}'_{\text{in}}$. Thus, we have defined both $\underline{\eta}$ and η on all of $\mathbf{C}'_{\text{out}} \cup \underline{\mathbf{C}}'_{\text{in}}$. Finally, we may define β as it has been determined.

From (1.2.16) we may now determine b^A along $\underline{\mathbf{C}}'_{\text{in}}$, thus we define

$$b_{\text{in}}^A(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}_{-2}, \theta) := b_{\text{out}}^A(\mathbf{U}_{-2}, \mathbf{V}_{-2}, \theta) + \int_{\mathbf{U}_{-2}}^{\mathbf{U}} 2(\Omega^{\text{in}})^2(\eta^A - \underline{\eta}^A).$$

Note that we may define \mathbf{K} on $\mathbf{C}_{\text{out}} \cup \underline{\mathbf{C}}'_{\text{in}}$ by the usual expression for Gauss curvature of the metric \mathbf{g} . Using this we may rewrite the transport equations (1.2.10) and (1.2.11) for $\text{tr}\chi$ and $\text{tr}\underline{\chi}$ in the 3 and 4 directions in terms of known quantities. We may now integrate the transport equations (1.2.8) and (1.2.9) for $\hat{\chi}$ and $\hat{\underline{\chi}}$. This allows us to complete the definition of both χ and $\underline{\chi}$ to all of $\underline{\mathbf{C}}'_{\text{in}} \cup \mathbf{C}'_{\text{out}}$. Moreover, this now determines ρ from the Gauss equation (1.2.20), whereas σ is determined by (1.2.17). We thus define ρ and σ according to these determinations.

Continuing as above, we may inductively determine $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \vartheta$ for any of the quantities of Section 1.2 and for any order $|\gamma|$, so that all equations of Section 1.2, commuted by \mathfrak{D}^γ , are satisfied along $\underline{\mathbf{C}}'_{\text{in}} \cup \mathbf{C}'_{\text{out}}$. \square

Remark 5.1.2. We remark already that considering a diffeomorphism $\psi : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$, associated to any seed data set we may define a new data set by replacing all quantities by their pullback under ψ^* .

Remark 5.1.3. We note that the initial data may not exist globally, in particular, the quantities $\mathfrak{g}_{AB}^{\text{in}}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{AB}^{\text{out}}$, since if ϕ is negative, these no longer define metrics. Global existence of the data on the full $\underline{\mathbf{C}}_{\text{in}} \cup \mathbf{C}_{\text{out}}$ will require conditions on the seed data to be discussed in Section 5.3. It is useful, however, that α and $\underline{\alpha}$ are defined on \mathbf{C}_{out} and $\underline{\mathbf{C}}_{\text{in}}$ by (5.1.6), because this way we may phrase the conditions for global existence of data in terms of these quantities.

5.2 The maximal Cauchy development (\mathcal{M}, g)

In the meantime, let us state a general well posedness theorem for the above characteristic initial value problem.

Theorem 5.2.1 (Existence of the maximal Cauchy evolution [Ren90, Luk12, Sbi16]). *Consider seed data as in Proposition 5.1.1 and $\underline{\mathbf{C}}'_{\text{in}} \cup \mathbf{C}'_{\text{out}}$ such that the full set of initial data exist, as in the statement of the proposition. Then there exists a unique smooth maximal globally hyperbolic future Cauchy evolution (\mathcal{M}, g) , with past boundary diffeomorphic to $\underline{\mathbf{C}}'_{\text{in}} \cup \mathbf{C}'_{\text{out}}$, satisfying (2) and obtaining the data, in the sense that there exists a globally hyperbolic subset $\mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^2$ with past boundary $\underline{\mathbf{C}}'_{\text{in}} \cup \mathbf{C}'_{\text{out}}$, and an embedding*

$$i : \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{M} \tag{5.2.1}$$

such that $i^(g)$ is of the form (1.1.4) (and thus satisfies the equations (1.2.5)–(1.2.31)) and obtains the prescribed quantities on $\underline{\mathbf{C}}'_{\text{in}} \cup \mathbf{C}'_{\text{out}}$, and $i|_{\underline{\mathbf{C}}'_{\text{in}} \cup \mathbf{C}'_{\text{out}}}$ is a diffeomorphism of $\underline{\mathbf{C}}'_{\text{in}} \cup \mathbf{C}'_{\text{out}}$ onto the past boundary of (\mathcal{M}, g) .*

The spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) is maximal in the sense that, given any other globally hyperbolic C^k Lorentzian manifold $(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}, \tilde{g})$, for sufficiently high k , satisfying (2) admitting the data in the sense of the existence of (5.2.1) as above for some map $\tilde{i} : \tilde{\mathcal{W}} \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$, then $(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}, \tilde{g})$ admits a smooth atlas with respect to which \tilde{g} is in fact smooth, and there exists an isometric embedding $j : \tilde{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ such that $\tilde{i} \circ j = i$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{W}} \cap \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2$.

In particular, the following uniqueness statement holds for i in (5.2.1): If \mathcal{W}_1 and \mathcal{W}_2 are two open sets satisfying the above in place of \mathcal{W} , with embeddings i_1, i_2 , then $i_1^(g) = i_2^*(g)$ on $(\mathcal{W}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2) \times \mathbb{S}^2$.*

Remark 5.2.1. *We emphasise here that it is already nontrivial that the maximal future Cauchy evolution exists in a full neighbourhood of $\underline{C}'_{\text{in}} \cup C'_{\text{out}}$, as stated in the above theorem. This depends in an essential way on the null condition and follows from the work of [Luk12].*

5.3 Identification with Schwarzschild and global existence of the data

We recall the parameter $M_{\text{init}} > 0$ fixed in (1.3.16). Recall the Kruskal manifold $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ with the Schwarzschild metric (1.3.7) with mass $M = M_{\text{init}}$.

5.3.1 The initial hypersurfaces and additional normalisations

We now recall the parameters defined in Section 1.3.5 associated to $M = M_{\text{init}}$. Let us now identify the \mathbf{U} with U and \mathbf{V} with V , and thus \mathbf{U}_{-2} , etc., with our chosen parameters U_{-2} , etc.

For definiteness, in this context we denote the identified $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ as $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}^{\mathcal{K}}$ and C_{out} as $C_{\text{out}}^{\mathcal{K}}$. We have

$$\underline{C}_{\text{in}}^{\mathcal{K}} := [U_{-2}, U_5] \times \{V_{-2}\} \times \mathbb{S}^2, \quad C_{\text{out}}^{\mathcal{K}} := \{U_{-2}\} \times [V_{-2}, \infty) \times \mathbb{S}^2$$

We thus have that $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}^{\mathcal{K}} \cup C_{\text{out}}^{\mathcal{K}} \subset \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}} \times \mathbb{S}^2$, by our choices of U_{-2} , V_{-2} , U_5 . Let us also define

$$C_{\text{out}}^{\mathcal{EF}} := (\iota_M \times \text{id})^{-1}(C_{\text{out}}) = [v_{-2}, \infty) \times \mathbb{S}^2 \subset \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}} \times \mathbb{S}^2 \quad (5.3.1)$$

and, for any $\underline{C}'_{\text{in}} \subset \underline{C}_{\text{in}}^{\mathcal{K}} \cap \{U < 0\}$,

$$\underline{C}'_{\text{in}}{}^{\mathcal{EF}} := (\iota_M \times \text{id})^{-1}(\underline{C}'_{\text{in}}) \subset \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}} \quad (5.3.2)$$

where $\iota = \iota_M$ is the map (1.3.12).

We consider now seed data $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{K}}$ as in Proposition 5.1.1, with the following additional normalisations:

$$b_{\text{out}}^A = 0, \quad \Omega^{\text{in}} = \Omega_{\circ}^{\mathcal{K}}, \quad \Omega^{\text{out}} = \Omega_{\circ}^{\mathcal{K}}. \quad (5.3.3)$$

We recall from Proposition 5.1.1 that we may define $\alpha_{\text{out}}^{\mathcal{K}}$ globally on $C_{\text{out}}^{\mathcal{K}}$ and $\underline{\alpha}_{\text{in}}^{\mathcal{K}}$ on $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}^{\mathcal{K}}$ by (5.1.6).

5.3.2 Associated Eddington–Finkelstein data and covariance

On (5.3.1) and any choice of (5.3.2), we may define an associated Eddington–Finkelstein realisation $\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{EF}}$ of the seed data. The Eddington–Finkelstein realisation of the data is defined by first setting

$$b_{\text{out}}^A = 0, \quad \Omega^{\text{in}} = \Omega_{\circ}^{\mathcal{EF}}, \quad \Omega^{\text{out}} = \Omega_{\circ}^{\mathcal{EF}}. \quad (5.3.4)$$

We notice that under this choice $\iota_*(e_3^{\mathcal{K}}) = \frac{\partial U}{\partial u} e_3^{\mathcal{EF}}$, $\iota_*(e_4^{\mathcal{K}}) = \frac{\partial V}{\partial v} e_4^{\mathcal{EF}}$. We now define, $\text{tr}\chi_{\mathcal{EF}}$ and $\eta_{\mathcal{EF}}$

$$\text{tr}\chi^{\mathcal{EF}}(u_{-2}, v_{-2}, \theta) = \text{tr}\chi_{\mathcal{K}}(U_{-2}, V_{-2}, \theta) \frac{\partial v}{\partial V}(U_{-2}, V_{-2}), \quad \text{tr}\chi^{\mathcal{EF}}(u_{-2}, v_{-2}, \theta) = \text{tr}\chi^{\mathcal{K}}(U_{-2}, V_{-2}, \theta) \frac{\partial u}{\partial U}(U_{-2}, V_{-2}),$$

$$\eta_A^{\mathcal{EF}} = \eta_A^{\mathcal{K}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial U}(U_{-2}, V_{-2}).$$

Finally, we define $\hat{g}_{\mathcal{EF}}^{\text{in}}(u, \theta) = \hat{g}_{\mathcal{K}}^{\text{in}}(U(u), \theta)$ and $\hat{g}_{\mathcal{EF}}^{\text{out}}(u, \theta) = \hat{g}_{\mathcal{K}}^{\text{in}}(U(u), \theta)$. Note that the resulting $\alpha_{\text{out}}^{\mathcal{EF}}$ will satisfy

$$\alpha_{\text{out}}^{\mathcal{EF}}(v, \theta) = \alpha_{\text{out}}^{\mathcal{K}} \left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial V} \right)^2 (V(v), \theta).$$

Finally, we note that the Gaussian curvature $K = K^{\mathcal{EF}} = K^{\mathcal{K}}$ on $\underline{C}_{\text{in}} \cap C_{\text{out}}$ is determined by the seed data.

The uniqueness statement in Theorem 5.2.1 gives us the following

Proposition 5.3.1. Fix $M = M_{\text{init}}$, consider the seed data $\mathcal{S}^\mathcal{K}$ defined on $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}^\mathcal{K} \cup C_{\text{out}}^\mathcal{K}$ satisfying (5.3.3), and let $\underline{C}'_{\text{in}} \cup C'_{\text{out}}^\mathcal{K}$, \mathcal{W} , i , (\mathcal{M}, g) be as in the statement of Theorem 5.2.1. Then, provided $\underline{C}'_{\text{in}}^\mathcal{K}$ is chosen $\underline{C}'_{\text{in}}^\mathcal{K} \subset \{U < 0\}$, defining $\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{EF}}$ as above, and with $\tilde{i} : \widetilde{\mathcal{W}} \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow (\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \tilde{g})$ as in the statement of Theorem 5.2.1 but for data $\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{EF}}$, then $\iota_M^* i^* g = \tilde{i}^* \tilde{g}$ on $\iota_M^{-1}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$.

In view of the above, we may indeed consider the initial data sets induced by seed data $\mathcal{S}^\mathcal{K}$ and corresponding seed data $\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{EF}}$ as geometrically the same initial data. In discussing norms, it will be natural to use the $\mathcal{S}^\mathcal{K}$ quantities on $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ while using $\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{EF}}$ quantities on C_{out} in order to parameterise initial data.

5.3.3 Global existence of the full initial data

We now formulate a smallness assumption guaranteeing the existence of the full initial data on all of $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}^\mathcal{K} \cup C_{\text{out}}^\mathcal{K}$.

Proposition 5.3.2. Fix $M = M_{\text{init}}$, consider seed data $\mathcal{S}^\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{S}$ defined on $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}^\mathcal{K} \cup C_{\text{out}}^\mathcal{K}$ satisfying (5.3.3), and define the corresponding $\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{EF}}$ as above on $C_{\text{out}}^\mathcal{K}$. Assume in addition the following smallness assumption is satisfied:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \leq k \leq 3} \int_{U_{-2}}^{U_5} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |(r\nabla_\circ)^k \underline{\alpha}_{\text{in}}^\mathcal{K}|_{\mathcal{G}_\circ}^2 dU d\theta + \int_{v_{-2}}^\infty \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} r^7 |(r\nabla_\circ)^k \alpha_{\text{out}}^{\mathcal{EF}}|_{\mathcal{G}_\circ}^2 dv d\theta \\ & + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |(r\nabla_\circ)^k (\text{tr}\chi_{\mathcal{EF}} - \text{tr}\chi_{\circ, M_{\text{init}}, \mathcal{EF}})|_{\mathcal{G}_\circ}^2 + |(r\nabla_\circ)^k (\text{tr}\chi_{\mathcal{EF}} - \text{tr}\chi_{\circ, M_{\text{init}}, \mathcal{EF}})|_{\mathcal{G}_\circ}^2 \\ & + |(r\nabla_\circ)^k \hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{EF}}|_{\mathcal{G}_\circ}^2 + |(r\nabla_\circ)^k \hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{EF}}|_{\mathcal{G}_\circ}^2 + |(r\nabla_\circ)^k \eta_{\mathcal{EF}}|_{\mathcal{G}_\circ}^2 + |(r\nabla_\circ)^k (K - r^{-2})|_{\mathcal{G}_\circ}^2 (u_{-2}, v_{-2}) d\theta \leq \varepsilon_1. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(M_{\text{init}})$, we may take $U'_5 = U_5$, $V'_0 = \infty$ in Proposition 5.1.1, i.e. the full initial data exists globally on $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}^\mathcal{K} \cup C_{\text{out}}^\mathcal{K}$.

Moreover, $\{U_5\} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ is a trapped surface in the sense that $\text{tr}\chi(U_5, \theta) < 0$, $\text{tr}\chi(U_5, \theta) < 0$.

Proof. Note that the ∇_\circ and the norms are taken with respect to the Schwarzschild metric as one cannot define globally the metric \mathcal{G} before we know that the data exist globally. Essentially one simply requires that ϕ^{in} and ϕ^{out} from Proposition 5.1.1 satisfy globally $\phi^{\text{in}} \geq \frac{1}{2}$, $\phi^{\text{out}} \geq \frac{1}{2}$. The smallness condition can easily seen to be sufficient for sufficiently small ε_1 as it ensures weighted pointwise estimates on the quantities e^{in} and e^{out} . The statement concerning the trapped surface follows easily from examining the first equation of (1.2.7) and equation (1.2.10). \square

5.3.4 Kerr parameters of the data

We may associate Kerr parameters to an initial data set (cf. Section 2.2.3).

We first remark that on the sphere $S_{u_{-2}, v_{-2}}$ we may define the $\ell = 1$ spherical harmonic functions Y_m^1 as in Section 1.4.2.3 with the help also of the Schwarzschild background $g_{\circ, M_{\text{init}}}$. By Proposition 1.4.3 the curvature component $\Omega\beta$ computed from the seed data can be decomposed as

$$\Omega\beta(u_{-2}, v_{-2}, \theta) = r\nabla h_{1, \Omega\beta}(u_{-2}, v_{-2}, \theta) + r^* \nabla h_{2, \Omega\beta}(u_{-2}, v_{-2}, \theta),$$

where $*$ here is defined with respect $\mathcal{G}(u_{-2}, v_{-2})$.

Definition 5.3.3. Given seed initial data as above, we may define associated Kerr parameters J_{seed}^m , for $m = -1, 0, 1$, by the relation

$$(r^4 h_{2, \Omega\beta})_{\ell=1}(u_{-2}, v_{-2}, \theta) = 3\Omega_{\circ, M_{\text{init}}}^2(u_{-2}, v_{-2}) \sum_{m=-1}^1 J_{\text{seed}}^m Y_m^1(u_{-2}, v_{-2}, \theta).$$

We note that in view of Remark 1.4.7, the parameters J_{seed}^m in general change under diffeomorphisms of the type considered in Remark 2.2.3 above.

Remark 5.3.4. We note that the Kerr parameters can be computed from the seed data quantity η by using the Codazzi equation (1.2.18) on the sphere $S_{u_{-2}, v_{-2}}$ which yields the relation

$$\text{cyl}(\Omega\beta) = \frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r} \text{cyl} \eta - \text{cyl} d\text{iv}(\Omega\hat{\chi}) + \text{cyl} \left(-\frac{1}{2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ})) \underline{\eta} + \Omega \hat{\chi}^{\sharp} \underline{\eta} \right).$$

After projection to $\ell = 1$ one obtains the relation $2(h_{2, \Omega\beta})_{\ell=1} \approx \Omega_{\circ}^2 (\text{cyl} \eta)_{\ell=1}$ up to nonlinear terms, and hence $J_{\text{seed}}^m = \frac{1}{6} r^4 (\text{cyl} \eta)_{\ell=1, m}(u_{-2}, v_{-2}) + O(\varepsilon_1^2)$.

5.3.5 Associated linearised data and linearised solution

Given seed data as in Proposition 5.3.2, we may define an associated linearised seed data set. This gives rise to an associated linearised solution, which we may furthermore renormalise at \mathcal{I}^+ . We summarise this in the following:

Proposition 5.3.5. *Given general seed data as in Proposition 5.3.2, we may define associated seed data for the linearised Einstein equations in double null gauge around Schwarzschild with mass M_{init} , restricted to the exterior, as follows: All the linearised seed functions are defined by assigning the linearised quantities their full nonlinear values (in Eddington–Finkelstein representation) minus the Schwarzschild values, e.g. $\hat{\eta} := \eta_{\mathcal{EF}}$, $\Omega^{-1}\hat{\Omega} = 0$, etc., except for $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{\text{in}}^{(i)}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{\text{out}}^{(i)}$ which must be constrained to be symmetric traceless S -tangent 2-tensors with respect to the Schwarzschild metric, but which we can again choose so that $|\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{\text{in}}^{(i)} - \hat{\mathcal{G}}_{\text{in}}| \lesssim \varepsilon_1^2$, $|\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{\text{out}}^{(i)} - \hat{\mathcal{G}}_{\text{out}}| \lesssim \varepsilon_1^2$ with respect to a suitable norm. This gives rise to a full data set for the linearised Einstein equations on $[u_{-2}, \infty) \times \{v_{-2}\} \times \mathbb{S}^2 \cup \{u_{-2}\} \times [v_{-2}, \infty) \times \mathbb{S}^2$.*

The following hold:

(a) **Preliminary normalised solution.** We may associate to this data set a smooth “linearised metric”

$$\begin{aligned} g(u, v, \theta) = & -2\hat{\Omega}^2(u, v, \theta)(du \otimes dv + dv \otimes du) + \hat{\mathcal{G}}_{CD}^{(i)}(u, v, \theta)(d\theta^C \otimes d\theta^D) \\ & - \hat{\mathcal{G}}_{\circ, CD}^{(i)}(\hat{b}^C(u, v, \theta)du \otimes d\theta^D - \hat{b}^D(u, v, \theta)du \otimes d\theta^C) \end{aligned} \quad (5.3.5)$$

defined globally in $[u_{-2}, \infty) \times [v_{-2}, \infty) \times \mathbb{S}^2$ attaining the data and solving the linearised Einstein equations in double null gauge. We call this the preliminary normalised linearised solution and we may define associated linearised quantities $\hat{\chi}^{(i)}$, etc., as in [DHR].

(b) **Null-infinity renormalised solution.** We may now define a pure gauge solution \mathcal{G} so that, upon adding this solution to (5.3.5), we have that the new associated linearised quantities satisfy:

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} r^{-2} \hat{\mathcal{G}}(u, v, \theta) = 0, \quad \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} r^{-2} \hat{K}(u, v, \theta) = 0, \quad \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\Omega}(u, v, \theta) = 0. \quad (5.3.6)$$

We call this the null infinity renormalised linearised solution.

For both these linearised solutions (a) and (b), we have the following (cf. Section 1.4.3):

$$\text{cyl} \eta_{\ell=1}^{(i)} = \sum_{m=-1}^1 J_{\text{seed}}^m \frac{6}{r^4} \hat{Y}_m^{\ell=1}, \quad \text{cyl}(\Omega_{\circ} \hat{\beta}) = \Omega_{\circ}^2 \sum_{m=-1}^1 J_{\text{seed}}^m \frac{6}{r^5} \hat{Y}_m^{\ell=1}, \quad (5.3.7)$$

where we recall that \hat{Y} denote the round spherical harmonics and the operators above are defined with respect to the Schwarzschild metric with mass M_{init} .

Proof. Statement (a) follows directly from the well-posedness statement Theorem 8.1 of [DHR]. (Note that, to apply here [DHR], one must trivially rewrite the equations [DHR] with the torsion \hat{b} term corresponding to the form (1.2.32) in place of (1.1.4).) For (b), note that the so-called initial data normalisation of

Theorem 9.1 of [DHR] already accomplishes the first two relations of (5.3.6), while an additional explicit and easily computed pure gauge solution generated by $f_3^{(i)}(u, \theta)$ can be seen to accomplish $\hat{\Omega}^{(i)}(u, v, \theta) = 0$ along null infinity. The statement (5.3.7) now follows from Remark 5.3.4, the definition of the linearised seed data in the statement of the proposition and the properties of the propagation of $\ell = 1$ modes in linearised theory (see Theorem 9.2 of [DHR]). \square

Remark 5.3.6. *Let us note that the above pure gauge solution \mathcal{G} will not in general be smooth, although, under our assumption on data, it will be such that all geometric quantities are only C^k for finite k . This is because, even though our data and thus the resulting (5.3.5) are smooth, the linearised diffeomorphisms realising (5.3.6) (for instance $f_3^{(i)}(u, \theta)$) depend on the asymptotic behaviour at null infinity. Smoothness of this would require weighted estimates to all order, whereas our only assumption here is that of Proposition 5.3.2. See also Remark 5.5.8.*

5.4 The global smallness assumption and the smallness parameter ε_0

With a criterion ensuring the global existence of initial data, we now give the smallness assumption on initial data which will appear in the main theorem of this work.

Set $M = M_{\text{init}}$ with M_{init} fixed in (1.3.16) and consider initial data on $\underline{C}_{\text{in}} \cup C_{\text{out}}$ generated by seed data $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{K}}$. Let $\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{EF}}$ again denote the corresponding seed data on C_{out} . For general k , we define the following energy quantity

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\text{seed}}^{k+10}[\mathcal{S}] := & \sum_{i+j=0}^{k+10} \int_{U_{-2}}^{U_5} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |(r\hat{\nabla}_o)^i (\underline{D}^{\mathcal{K}})^j \underline{\alpha}_{\text{in}}^{\mathcal{K}}|_{\hat{\mathcal{G}}_o}^2 dU d\theta + \sum_{i+j=0}^{k+10} \int_{v_{-2}}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} r^8 |(r\hat{\nabla}_o)^i (rD^{\mathcal{EF}})^j \alpha_{\text{out}}^{\mathcal{EF}}|_{\hat{\mathcal{G}}_o}^2 dv d\theta \quad (5.4.1) \\ & + \sum_{i=0}^{k+10} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \left\{ |(r\hat{\nabla}_o)^i (\text{tr}\chi_{\mathcal{EF}} - \text{tr}\chi_{o, M_{\text{init}}, \mathcal{EF}})|_{\hat{\mathcal{G}}_o}^2 + |(r\hat{\nabla}_o)^i (\text{tr}\underline{\chi}_{\mathcal{EF}} - \text{tr}\underline{\chi}_{o, M_{\text{init}}, \mathcal{EF}})|_{\hat{\mathcal{G}}_o}^2 + |(r\hat{\nabla}_o)^i \hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{EF}}|_{\hat{\mathcal{G}}_o}^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + |(r\hat{\nabla}_o)^i \hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{EF}}|_{\hat{\mathcal{G}}_o}^2 + |(r\hat{\nabla}_o)^i \eta_{\mathcal{EF}}|_{\hat{\mathcal{G}}_o}^2 + |(r\hat{\nabla}_o)^i (K - r^{-2})|_{\hat{\mathcal{G}}_o}^2 + |(r\hat{\nabla}_o)^i (\hat{\mathcal{G}} - r^2 \hat{\gamma})|^2 \right\} (u_{-2}, v_{-2}) d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for all $k \geq 0$, this quantity is stronger than that appearing in Proposition 5.1.1 both in terms of its regularity and its r weights.

Let us fix the parameter

$$N = 12.$$

This will define the order of differentiability of our smallness assumption. Consider seed data satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}_{\text{seed}}^{N+10}[\mathcal{S}] \leq \varepsilon_0^2, \quad (5.4.2)$$

and a $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0(M_{\text{init}})$, where $\hat{\varepsilon}_0(M_{\text{init}})$ is to be constrained to be sufficiently small at various points in the work. *The inequality (5.4.2) will be our fundamental global smallness assumption which we shall require of all \mathcal{S} whose evolution we shall attempt to estimate.*

More generally, we may set $N \geq 12$, but in this case our constant $\hat{\varepsilon}$ must be taken to depend in addition on N , i.e. $\hat{\varepsilon}(M_{\text{init}}, N)$.

It follows in particular from (5.4.2) that if

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_0 \leq \varepsilon_1, \quad (5.4.3)$$

then the assumptions of Proposition 5.1.1 hold and the full data exist globally. For convenience, let us always assume (5.4.3) in what follows.

Recall by Proposition 5.1.1 that the operators $\hat{\nabla}$, $\hat{\nabla}_4$, $\hat{\nabla}_3$, and more generally $\hat{\mathfrak{D}}$ to all order, are defined acting on all the quantities of Section 1.2. Let us use the convention that these will represent operators on $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}^{\mathcal{K}}$ and on $C_{\text{out}}^{\mathcal{EF}}$ as we will express the norm in terms of \mathcal{K} quantities and \mathcal{EF} quantities, respectively, on these two initial hypersurfaces. For quantities defined on their sphere of intersection, we will use the \mathcal{EF} quantities.

With this understanding, under the assumption (5.4.2), we may define, for $k \geq 12$, the following initial data energy,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_0^k[\mathcal{S}] := & \sum_{|l| \leq k} \int_{v_{-2}}^{\infty} \int_{S_{u_{-2}, v}} \left| \mathfrak{D}^l(r^4 \alpha, r^3 \beta, r^2(\rho - \rho_{\circ}), r^2 \sigma, r \underline{\beta}) \right|^2 d\theta dv(u_{-2}) \\
& + \sum_{|l| \leq k} \int_{U_{-2}}^{U_5} \int_{S_{U, V_{-2}}} \left| \mathfrak{D}^l(\beta^{\mathcal{K}}, \rho^{\mathcal{K}} - \rho_{\circ}^{\mathcal{K}}, \sigma^{\mathcal{K}}, \underline{\beta}^{\mathcal{K}}, \underline{\alpha}^{\mathcal{K}}) \right|^2 d\theta dU(V_{-2}) \\
& + \sum_{|l| \leq k+1} \sup_{U \in [U_{-2}, U_5]} \int_{S_{U, V_{-2}}} \left| \mathfrak{D}^l(\hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{K}}, \hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{K}}, tr\chi^{\mathcal{K}} - tr\chi_{\circ}^{\mathcal{K}}, tr\underline{\chi}^{\mathcal{K}} - tr\underline{\chi}_{\circ}^{\mathcal{K}}, \eta^{\mathcal{K}}, \underline{\eta}^{\mathcal{K}}, \hat{\omega}^{\mathcal{K}} - \hat{\omega}_{\circ}^{\mathcal{K}}) \right|^2 d\theta \\
& + \sum_{|l| \leq k+1} \sup_{v \in [v_{-2}, \infty]} \int_{S_{u_{-2}, v}} \left\{ \left| \mathfrak{D}^l(r^2 \hat{\chi}, r \hat{\chi}, r^2(\Omega tr\chi - \Omega tr\chi_{\circ}), r(\Omega tr\underline{\chi} - \Omega tr\underline{\chi}_{\circ}), r\eta, r^2 \underline{\eta}, \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. r^3(\hat{\omega} - \hat{\omega}_{\circ}), 1 - \frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{\Omega^2} \right) \right|^2 \right\} d\theta + \sum_{j=0}^k \int_{S_{u_{-2}, v_{-2}}} \left| \nabla^j (\not{g} - r^2 \not{\gamma}) \right|^2 d\theta,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.4.4}$$

which in general may be infinite. In the above, we note that we have dropped the \mathcal{EF} labels from the \mathcal{EF} quantities, but have retained them on the \mathcal{K} quantities.

Proposition 5.4.1. *Under the assumption (5.4.2), with the above definitions, it follows that the full initial data satisfy the estimate*

$$\mathbb{E}_0^N[\mathcal{S}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2. \tag{5.4.5}$$

More generally, for $k \geq 12$, we have the estimate

$$\mathbb{E}_0^k[\mathcal{S}] \leq C_k \mathbb{E}_{\text{seed}}^{k+10}[\mathcal{S}],$$

for a constant C_k depending only on M_{init} and k (provided the right hand side is finite).

Proof. See the appendix of [DHR] where this construction is carried out explicitly in the linearised setting (the familiar derivative loss being due to the integration of transport equations along the characteristic hypersurfaces). \square

Note that for Schwarzschild data of mass M_{init} in its usual form we have $\mathbb{E}_0^k[\mathcal{S}] = \mathbb{E}_{\text{seed}}^{k+10}[\mathcal{S}] = 0$.

Remark 5.4.2. *Due to the specific normalisation (5.3.3), (5.3.4) here, the zeroth order bounds on $\hat{\omega} - \hat{\omega}_{\circ}$, $1 - \frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{\Omega^2}$ and $\hat{\omega}^{\mathcal{K}} - \hat{\omega}_{\circ}^{\mathcal{K}}$ are in fact trivial and, in view of $\eta + \underline{\eta} = 0$, the zeroth order bound on $r\eta$ may be replaced by one on $r^2 \underline{\eta}$. We have included the quantities because the normalisation (5.3.3), (5.3.4) is not strictly necessary to construct data satisfying (5.4.2).*

Remark 5.4.3. *From the point of view of regularity, the norm (5.4.4) is slightly stronger than what we will need to keep track of: For convenience we have included bounds on $k+1$ derivatives of all Ricci coefficients, although such bounds are only required (and propagated) for some of them. Finally, note that L^2 bounds on k derivatives (not all of them in the 4-direction) of $\alpha^{\mathcal{K}}$ on the ingoing cone $\underline{C}_{\text{in}}$ follow from the Bianchi equations and (5.4.2). Similarly, weighted L^2 bounds on k derivatives (not all of them in the 3-direction) of $\underline{\alpha}$ follow on the outgoing cone C_{out} .*

Remark 5.4.4. *Note that the bounds on $(\Omega tr\underline{\chi} - \Omega tr\underline{\chi}_{\circ})$ and η imposed by (5.4.2) are weaker than suggested by the Φ_p notation. Indeed, it is only when the corresponding solution is renormalised with respect to null infinity that these quantities will exhibit r^{-2} -decay along outgoing cones.*

Remark 5.4.5. *The boundedness (5.4.2), together with standard Sobolev inequalities, imposes the pointwise bound $|r^{9/2}\alpha| \lesssim \varepsilon_0$ and, through the Bianchi identity (1.2.23) connecting β and α , the bound $|r^4\beta| \lesssim \varepsilon_0$. We see thus that (5.4.2) is a stronger assumption than that arising from the most general asymptotically flat initial data considered in [CK93]. We emphasise however that one may still recover (5.4.2) from suitable*

assumptions on asymptotically flat spacelike initial data (see for instance [KN03]). We note that this slightly stronger decay, effectively imposed by the r^4 power of α in (5.4.1), is not essential to our method but is convenient for our modulation theory used in constructing $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$. See already Remarks 16.2.1 and 17.4.1.

Remark 5.4.6. Consider seed data $\mathcal{S}^\mathcal{K}$ satisfying (5.4.2) for some ε_0 , but where $\mathbb{E}_{\text{seed}}^N[\mathcal{S}]$ is defined without the last term in (5.4.1). Then, by Proposition 4.4.1 and Remark 5.1.2, we may define a new seed data set related to the original one by pulling back the quantities via a diffeomorphism $\psi : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$, such that (5.4.2) is satisfied with $C\varepsilon_0$ in place of ε_0 , for some C depending only on M_{init} , provided of course that $C\varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$.

Let us introduce also the notation $\mathbb{E}_{0,v_\infty}^k[\mathcal{S}]$ for (5.4.4) where we replace $v = \infty$ in the limit of integration with $v = 2v_\infty$ for a given parameter v_∞ . For smooth initial data, we have trivially by compactness that

$$\mathbb{E}_{0,v_\infty}^k[\mathcal{S}] \leq C(k, v_\infty) \quad (5.4.6)$$

for some constant depending on the seed data, k and v_∞ . This will be useful for considering the propagation of higher regularity (see already the statement of Theorem 16.3).

Remark 5.4.7. Let us note that given an embedding (5.2.1) for a $\mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ with past boundary $C_{\text{out}}^\mathcal{K} \cup \underline{C}_{\text{in}}^\mathcal{K} \cap \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ where (\mathcal{M}, g) is globally hyperbolic (with past boundary diffeomorphic to $C_{\text{out}}^\mathcal{K} \cup \underline{C}_{\text{in}}^\mathcal{K} \cap \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2$) and satisfies the (1.2.1) and where i^*g is expressed in double null form (1.1.4), then if moreover

$$\Omega^2(i^*g)|_{C_{\text{out}}^\mathcal{K} \cup \underline{C}_{\text{in}}^\mathcal{K} \cap \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2} = \Omega_{\circ, M, \mathcal{K}}^2, \quad b^A(i^*g)|_{C_{\text{out}}^\mathcal{K} \cap \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2} = 0, \quad (5.4.7)$$

it follows that defining the seed data by the quantities corresponding to i^*g on $C_{\text{out}}^\mathcal{K} \cup \underline{C}_{\text{in}}^\mathcal{K} \cap \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2$, then (\mathcal{M}, g) is a Cauchy evolution corresponding to this seed data.

Remark 5.4.8. We have already remarked that for Schwarzschild data of mass $M := M_{\text{init}}$ induced from (1.3.7), we have that $\mathbb{E}_0^k[\mathcal{S}] = \mathbb{E}_{\text{seed}}^k[\mathcal{S}] = 0$ and thus the smallness condition (5.4.2) is trivially satisfied.

Let us also note the following additional “trivial” examples of initial data satisfying the smallness condition, which will all be induced from the Schwarzschild (or more generally Kerr) family itself via Remark 5.4.7.

1. Consider a diffeomorphism $\psi : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ sufficiently close to the identity and consider the initial data induced as in Remark 5.4.7 by $i^*g_{\circ, M, \mathcal{K}}$ where $i = \text{id} \times \psi : \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}_{\text{Kruskal}}, g_{\circ, M, \mathcal{K}})$ and $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{K} \cap [U_{-2}, U_5] \times [V_{-2}, \infty)$. This satisfies the smallness condition (5.4.2) but fails to satisfy $\mathbb{E}_0^k = 0$ only on account of the final term in the last integral of (5.4.4).
2. Consider a sphere $S \subset (\mathcal{M}_{\text{Kruskal}}, g_{\circ, M, \mathcal{K}})$ in the Schwarzschild solution sufficiently near $S_{U_{-2}, V_{-2}}$, and consider smooth future directed null vector fields e_3, e_4 defined along S such that $g(e_3, e_4) = -2$, and $e_3 \perp TS$, $e_4 \perp TS$, and such that e_3 and e_4 are sufficiently close to the Kruskal vectors $e_3^\mathcal{K}$ and $e_4^\mathcal{K}$, resp., defined previously. Assume in particular that S is such that the map $S \hookrightarrow \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{K} \times \mathbb{S}^2 \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathbb{S}^2$ is a diffeomorphism $S \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$. For a suitable \mathcal{W} as in Remark 5.4.7, we may now define uniquely a local double null gauge $\mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2 \xrightarrow{i} (\mathcal{M}_{\text{Kruskal}}, g_{\circ, M, \mathcal{K}})$ with the property that the metric $i^*g_{\circ, M, \mathcal{K}}$ takes the double null form (1.1.4), $\pi \circ i|_{(U_{-2}, V_{-2}) \times \mathbb{S}^2} = \text{id}$, such that (5.4.7) are satisfied and such that the vector fields $(i_*)^{-1}(e_3)$ and $(i_*)^{-1}(e_4)$ correspond to (1.1.6) on $i^{-1}(S) = S_{U_{-2}, V_{-2}}$. This gives rise to initial data via Remark 5.4.7 satisfying the smallness condition (5.4.2).
3. Given $\tilde{M} \neq M$, for a suitable \mathcal{W} as in Remark 5.4.7, consider the map $i : \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}_{\text{Kruskal}}, g_{\circ, \tilde{M}, \mathcal{K}})$ uniquely determined by the conditions $i_{M, \tilde{M}} \circ \pi_{\mathbb{S}^2} = \pi_{\mathbb{S}^2} \circ i$, $i(U_{-2}, V_{-2}, \cdot) = (U_{-2}, V_{-2}, \cdot)$, $i(U_5, V_{-2}, \cdot) = (U_5, V_{-2}, \cdot)$ and $i^*g_{\circ, \tilde{M}, \mathcal{K}}$ is in double null form (1.1.4) with

$$\Omega^2(i^*g_{\circ, \tilde{M}, \mathcal{K}})(U_{-2}, \cdot, \cdot) = \Omega_{\circ, M, \mathcal{K}}^2(U_{-2}, \cdot, \cdot), \quad \Omega^2(i^*g_{\circ, \tilde{M}, \mathcal{K}})(\cdot, V_{-2}, \cdot) = \Omega_{\circ, M, \mathcal{K}}^2(\cdot, V_{-2}, \cdot).$$

Note under these assumptions all normalisations (5.4.7) are in fact satisfied. Then, if $|\tilde{M} - M|$ is sufficiently small, it follows that the data induced by $i^*g_{\circ, \tilde{M}, \mathcal{K}}$ satisfy the smallness condition (5.4.2).

4. Consider (the analogue of the Lemaitre region of) a slowly rotating Kerr solution $(\mathcal{M}_{\text{Kerr}}, g_{a, M})$ (see (I.2.4) for the form of the metric in local coordinates on the exterior), again with $M := M_{\text{init}}$ and

with some $a \neq 0$. We claim that, for a suitable \mathcal{W} , there exists an embedding $i : \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}, g_{a,M})$ satisfying the assumptions of Remark 5.4.7. (One can deduce this again via purely geometric considerations starting from a sphere S and a null frame e_3, e_4 as in example 2 above. Alternatively, one can deduce an explicit form for i starting from the Kerr metric in double null gauge given in equation (A.43) of [DL17], regularising the coordinate across the event horizon, and rescaling so that the normalisations (5.4.7) hold.) Moreover, if $|a| \ll M$, this choice can be made so that the induced data from $i^*g_{a,M}$ moreover satisfy the smallness condition (5.4.2).

We can in fact combine 1–4 to construct more complicated examples all connected to the explicit Schwarzschild/Kerr family.

5.5 Cauchy stability and the initial data gauges

In this section we shall state two results giving that, for data with small norm, the maximal Cauchy development contains sufficiently “large” regions covered by what we shall term “the initial data gauges”. The initial Kruskal gauge result is given by Theorem 5.5.1 in **Section 5.5.1** while the initial Eddington–Finkelstein gauge is given by Theorem 5.5.2 in **Section 5.5.2**. The former result is essentially just standard Cauchy stability, while the latter can be thought of as a more quantitative version, allowing existence all the way up to a piece of null infinity. (In particular, the latter already depends on the good “null structure” satisfied by our equations (cf. Section III.1.2).)

5.5.1 The initial Kruskal gauge

The following statement follows from a standard Cauchy stability argument.

Theorem 5.5.1 (Cauchy stability and the initial Kruskal gauge). *Set $M = M_{\text{init}}$, consider initial data as in Proposition 5.3.2 and let (\mathcal{M}, g) denote the maximal Cauchy development given by Theorem 5.2.1.*

Recall the parameter $V_3 > V_{-2}$ from Section 1.3.5 associated to v_3 . Then for sufficiently small $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$, if the initial data satisfy the global smallness assumption (5.4.2) with $\varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$, then, defining $C'_{\text{out}} = C_{\text{out}} \cap \{V \leq V_3\}$, then the domain \mathcal{W} of Theorem 5.2.1 can be chosen to be

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}}(V_3) := [U_{-2}, U_5] \times [V_{-2}, V_3].$$

Refer to Figure 5.1.

We will denote the map (5.2.1) by $i_{\mathcal{K}}$ and the image

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}}(V_3) := i_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}}(V_3) \times \mathbb{S}^2) \subset \mathcal{M}. \quad (5.5.1)$$

Moreover, the metric g expressed in the above gauge is ε_0 -close to the Schwarzschild metric (1.3.7) expressed in the Kruskal gauge by making ε_0 sufficiently small, in the following sense: Noting $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}}(V_3) \subset \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}}$, then we may define $g_{\circ, M}$ on $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}}(V_3)$ by (1.3.7), and the statement is that $i_{\mathcal{K}}^*g - g_{\circ, M}$ is appropriately controlled by ε_0 , and in particular the quantities Φ defined in Section 3.1.1, satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}_0^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{K}, d}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2, \quad (5.5.2)$$

where the energy $\mathbb{E}_0^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{K}, d}]$ is described in Definition 5.5.1 immediately below.

Definition 5.5.1. We will describe here geometrically an energy $\mathbb{E}_0^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{EF}, d}]$ for which (5.5.2) holds.

Consider any diffeomorphism sphere $\tilde{S} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}}(V_3)$ which is C^1 close to a $S_{U', V'}$ sphere of the gauge $i_{\mathcal{K}}$, i.e. such that $\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2}|_{\tilde{S}} : \tilde{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ is a C^1 diffeomorphism and such that there exist $(U', V') \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}}$ with

$$\sup_{x \in \tilde{S}} |\pi_{\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}}}|_{\tilde{S}} - (U', V')| \lesssim \varepsilon_0, \quad \sup_{x \in \tilde{S}} |\overset{\circ}{\nabla} \pi_{\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}}}|_{\tilde{S}} \lesssim \varepsilon_0 \quad (5.5.3)$$

where the $|\cdot|$ in the first formula of (5.5.3) is in the usual sense of distance in \mathbb{R}^2 , while in the second we think of $\pi_{\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}}}|_{\tilde{S}}$ as a pair of scalar functions and $\overset{\circ}{\nabla}$ denotes the operator on \tilde{S} defined with respect to the pull




Figure 5.1: The region $\mathcal{W}_K(V_3)$ as a subset of the Kruskal domain of Schwarzschild with $M = M_{\text{init}}$

back of the usual round covariant derivative under $\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2}|_{\tilde{S}} : \tilde{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ and we interpret finally $|\cdot|$ as the norm on pairs of vectors again defined from the round metric on \mathbb{S}^2 .

We consider the past ingoing and outgoing cones $\tilde{C}_{\text{in}} \subset \mathcal{D}^K(V_3)$, $\tilde{C}_{\text{out}} \subset \mathcal{D}^K(V_3)$ emanating from \tilde{S} . (It follows from (5.5.3) that these are again C^1 close to $U = U'$ and $V = V'$ hypersurfaces of the gauge i_K in the sense of the analogue of (5.5.3).)

We define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0^N[\Phi_{K,d}] = \sup_{\tilde{S} \subset \mathcal{D}^K(V_3)} \Bigg\{ & \sum_{\Phi, |\gamma| \leq N-1} \|(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi)_{K,d}\|_{L^2(\tilde{S})}^2 \\ & + \sum_{\mathcal{R} \setminus \{\Omega^{-2}\alpha\}, |\gamma| \leq N} \|(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathcal{R})_{K,d}\|_{\tilde{C}_{\text{out}}}^2 + \sum_{\mathcal{R} \setminus \{\Omega^2\alpha\}, |\gamma| \leq N} \|(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathcal{R})_{K,d}\|_{\tilde{C}_{\text{in}}}^2 \\ & + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} \|(\widetilde{r\mathfrak{V}})(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega^2\alpha))_{K,d}\|_{\tilde{C}_{\text{in}}}^2 + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} \|(\widetilde{\mathfrak{V}_3})(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega^2\alpha))_{K,d}\|_{\tilde{C}_{\text{in}}}^2 \\ & + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} \|(\widetilde{r\mathfrak{V}})(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega^{-2}\alpha))_{K,d}\|_{\tilde{C}_{\text{out}}}^2 + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} \|(\widetilde{\mathfrak{V}_4})(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega^{-2}\alpha))_{K,d}\|_{\tilde{C}_{\text{out}}}^2 \Bigg\}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.5.4)$$

where the supremum is taken over all \tilde{S} satisfying (5.5.3), and the \tilde{C}_{in} and \tilde{C}_{out} are the corresponding null cones defined above.

In the above, the operators $\widetilde{r\mathfrak{V}}$, $\widetilde{r\mathfrak{V}_3}$, $\widetilde{r\mathfrak{V}_4}$ are appropriate tangential operators to the cones \tilde{C}_{in} , \tilde{C}_{out} (defined in analogy to Section 4.3.6) and the volume elements are appropriately defined (see Remark 5.5.2).

Remark 5.5.2. In practice, it is only in Propositions 10.1.13 and 10.5.1 where we shall apply the estimate (5.5.2) for the quantity (5.5.4). We shall need specifically the control of the expression in brackets in (5.5.4) corresponding to a particular \tilde{S} taken to be a sphere of our teleological \mathcal{H}^+ gauge anchored to the gauge i_K by the conditions described in Section 5.6. In this case, we may represent explicitly the quantities appearing in (5.5.4) using diffeomorphism functions relating our teleological \mathcal{H}^+ gauge to the gauge i_K and the pull back measures and “mixed tensors” defined in Section 4.2.3. For Proposition 10.1.13, the estimate (5.5.2) will be used to control an initial energy controlling the above diffeomorphism functions. For

Proposition 10.5.1, the important point will be that the norm (5.5.4) directly controls through the natural energy fluxes for the quantities of the almost gauge invariant hierarchy (α, ψ, P) and $(\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\psi}, \underline{P})$. Thus, the estimate (5.5.2) will appear in this work only through the estimates (10.1.38) of Proposition 10.1.13 and estimates (10.5.1) and (10.5.2) of Proposition 10.5.1.

Remark 5.5.3. *When we must distinguish between different double null gauges (cf. the discussion in Section 4.2), we shall denote the coordinates on $\mathcal{D}^K(V_3)$ as $(U_{data}, V_{data}, \theta_{data}^K)$ and refer to these coordinates as the “initial Kruskal system”.*

Proof. This is essentially a standard Cauchy stability argument applied to the equations of Section 1.2. The reader unfamiliar with local energy estimates for this system may wish to return to this theorem after reading the main estimates of this work, which are strictly harder, so as to understand how the expressions in (5.5.4) naturally appear. \square

5.5.2 The initial Eddington–Finkelstein gauge

The construction of the initial Eddington–Finkelstein gauge is slightly more involved.

First of all, we need a more quantitative theorem than Cauchy stability as we would like the gauge to exist up until a fixed retarded time u_3 for all values of $v > v_0$, i.e. we would like to define a “piece of null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ ”.

Moreover, for this gauge to properly exhibit the asymptotic flatness of the solution (roundness of spheres and Bondi normalisation) we will need to re-normalise the gauge “at” null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ , cf. the conditions (5.3.6) for the null infinity normalised linearised solution.

Thus, we will obtain the gauge in two stages. We first (a) obtain a preliminary gauge which admits the initial data and exists in a large enough region, and then (b) we renormalise it along the initial outgoing null cone and along null infinity so as to have roundness of the spheres and Bondi normalisation.

All these statements are summarised in the following theorem:

Theorem 5.5.2 (Existence of the initial Eddington–Finkelstein gauge). *Set $M = M_{\text{init}}$, consider initial data as in Proposition 5.3.2 and let (M, g) denote the maximal Cauchy development given by Theorem 5.2.1.*

(a) The preliminary gauge. *Recall the parameter $u_4 > u_{-2}$ from Section 1.3.5. Then for sufficiently small $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$, if the initial data satisfy the global smallness assumption (5.4.2) with $\varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$, then the following is true:*

Defining $\underline{C}'_{\text{in}}{}^{\mathcal{EF}} = \iota_M^{-1}(C_{\text{in}}^K \cap \{U \leq U_4\})$, then the domain \mathcal{W} of Theorem 5.2.1 applied to $\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{EF}}$ restricted to $\underline{C}'_{\text{in}}{}^{\mathcal{EF}} \cup C_{\text{out}}^{\mathcal{EF}}$ can be chosen to be

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}^0(u_4) = [u_{-2}, u_4] \times [v_{-2}, \infty).$$

We will denote the map (5.2.1) by $i_{\mathcal{EF}}^0$ and its image by $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{EF}}^0(u_4)$.

In the region $\iota_M(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}^0(u_4)) \cap \mathcal{W}_K(V_3)$ we have

$$i_{\mathcal{K}}^* g = (\iota_M^{-1})^* i_{\mathcal{EF}}^{0*} g. \quad (5.5.5)$$

Moreover, the metric g expressed in the above gauge is ε_0 -close to the Schwarzschild metric (1.3.1) expressed in the Eddington–Finkelstein double null gauge: Noting $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}^0(u_4) \subset \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}$, then we may define $g_{\circ, M}$ on $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}^0(u_4)$ by (1.3.1), and the statement is that $i_{\mathcal{EF}}^{0} g - g_{\circ, M}$ is controlled in a suitable norm by ε_0 .*

In fact, $i_{\mathcal{EF}}^{0} g - g_{\circ, M} - \overset{(i)}{g}$ is controllable in a suitable norm by ε_0^2 , where $\overset{(i)}{g}$ denotes the initial data normalised linearised solution of Proposition 5.3.5.*

(b) The renormalised gauge at \mathcal{I}^+ . *Now, recalling also the parameters u_3 and v_0 from Section 1.3.5 and defining*

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}(v_0, u_3) = [u_{-2}, u_3] \times [v_0, \infty),$$

we may define, for sufficiently small ε_0 , a new parameterisation

$$i_{\mathcal{EF}} : \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}(v_0, u_3) \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{M} \quad (5.5.6)$$




Figure 5.2: The region $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3)$ as a subset of the Kruskal domain of Schwarzschild with $M = M_{\text{init}}$

such that the following normalisations hold:

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} r^{-2} g(u, v, \theta) = \dot{\gamma}(\theta), \quad \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} r^2 K(u, v, \theta) = 1, \quad \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \Omega^2(u, v, \theta) = 1 \quad (5.5.7)$$

$$\Omega^2(u_{-2}, v, \theta) = \Omega_{\circ, M, \mathcal{EF}}^2 \quad (5.5.8)$$

and such that

$$\begin{aligned} i_{\mathcal{EF}}(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}(v_0, u_3) \times \mathbb{S}^2) &\subset i_{\mathcal{EF}}^0(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}^0(u_4) \times \mathbb{S}^2) = \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{EF}}^0(u_4), \\ i_{\mathcal{EF}}(\{u_{-2}\} \times [v_0, \infty) \times \mathbb{S}^2) &\subset i_{\mathcal{EF}}^0(C_{\text{out}}). \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2} \circ (i_{\mathcal{EF}}^0)^{-1} \circ i_{\mathcal{EF}}(\{u_{-2}\} \times [v_0, \infty) \times \{(0, 0, 1)\}) = (0, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{S}^2 \quad (5.5.9)$$

$$d(\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2} \circ (i_{\mathcal{EF}}^0)^{-1} \circ i_{\mathcal{EF}})|_{(\{u_{-2}\} \times [v_0, \infty) \times \{(0, 0, 1)\})}(0, 1, 0) = (0, 1 + \xi, 0) \in T_{(0, 0, 1)} \mathbb{S}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \quad (5.5.10)$$

for some real number $|\xi| \lesssim \varepsilon_0$. Refer to Figure 5.2.

We will denote the image

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3) := i_{\mathcal{EF}}(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3) \times \mathbb{S}^2) \subset \mathcal{M}. \quad (5.5.11)$$

This parametrisation is close to the parametrisation $i_{\mathcal{EF}}^0$, in particular, in the sense that

$$|\pi|_{\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}^0(u_3)} \circ (i_{\mathcal{EF}}^0)^{-1} \circ i^{\mathcal{EF}}(u, v, \theta) - (u, v)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 r_M(u, v). \quad (5.5.12)$$

(Note, however, the growth in r on the right hand side of (5.5.12).)

As with $i_{\mathcal{EF}}^0 g$, we have that $i_{\mathcal{EF}}^* g - g_{\circ, M}$ is controlled by ε_0 , specifically the quantities Φ defined in Section 3.1.1 satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}_0^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{EF}, d}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2, \quad (5.5.13)$$

where the energy $\mathbb{E}_0^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{EF}, d}]$ is described in Definition 5.5.4 immediately below.

Moreover, $i_{\mathcal{EF}}^* g - g_{\circ, M} - \overset{(i)}{g}$ is in fact controlled by ε_0^2 , where $\overset{(i)}{g}$ now denotes the null infinity normalised linearised solution of Proposition 5.3.5, in particular

$$|r^5 c/r \Omega \beta_{\ell=1}(u, v, \theta) - \Omega^2 \sum_{m=-1}^1 J_{\text{seed}}^m \frac{6}{r^5} Y_m^{\ell=1}(u, v, \theta)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2, \quad (5.5.14)$$

where $Y_m^{\ell=1}$ denote the spherical harmonics associated to the parameterisation (5.3.6) as defined in Section 1.4.2.3 and J_{seed}^m are defined by Definition 5.3.3.

Definition 5.5.4. We will describe here geometrically an energy $\mathbb{E}_0^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{EF},d}]$ for which (5.5.13) holds. Compare with Definition 5.5.1.

Consider any diffeomorphism sphere $\tilde{S} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3)$ which is C^1 close to a $S_{u',v'}$ sphere of the gauge (5.5.6), i.e. such that $\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2}|_{\tilde{S}} : \tilde{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ is a C^1 diffeomorphism and such that there exist $(u', v') \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}$ with

$$\sup_{x \in \tilde{S}} |v|_{\tilde{S}} - (u', v')| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 r, \quad \sup_{x \in \tilde{S}} |u|_{\tilde{S}} - (u', v')| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 \quad \sup_{x \in \tilde{S}} |\overset{\circ}{\nabla} \pi_{\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}}|_{\tilde{S}} \lesssim \varepsilon_0 \quad (5.5.15)$$

interpreted as in (5.5.3). (Note the factor of r allowed in the first inequality of (5.5.15).)

We consider the past ingoing and outgoing cones $\tilde{C}_{\text{in}} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3)$, $\tilde{C}_{\text{out}} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3)$ emanating from \tilde{S} . (It follows from (5.5.15) that these are again C^1 close to $u = u'$ and $v = v'$ hypersurfaces of the gauge (5.5.6) in the sense of the analogue of (5.5.15).)

We define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{EF},d}] := \sup_{\tilde{S} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3)} \Bigg\{ & \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} \|(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma r^p \Phi_p)_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{L^2(\tilde{S})}^2 \\ & + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N} \|r^{-1}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(r^5 \alpha, r^4 \beta, r^3 \rho + 2M, r^3 \sigma, r^2 \underline{\beta}))_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{\tilde{C}_{\text{out}}}^2 \\ & + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(r^4 \beta, r^3 \rho + 2M, r^3 \sigma, r^2 \underline{\beta}, r \underline{\alpha})_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{\tilde{C}_{\text{in}}}^2 \\ & + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} \|\widetilde{(r \nabla)}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma r^4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{\tilde{C}_{\text{in}}}^2 + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} \|\widetilde{(\nabla_3)}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma r^5 \alpha)_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{\tilde{C}_{\text{in}}}^2 \\ & + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} \left[\|r^{-1} \widetilde{(r \nabla)}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma r \underline{\alpha})_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{\tilde{C}_{\text{out}}}^2 + \|\widetilde{(r \nabla_4)}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \check{r} \underline{\alpha})_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{\tilde{C}_{\text{out}}}^2 \right] \Bigg\}, \quad (5.5.16) \end{aligned}$$

where the supremum is taken over all \tilde{S} satisfying (5.5.15), and the \tilde{C}_{in} and \tilde{C}_{out} are the corresponding null cones defined above.

In the above, the operators $\widetilde{r \nabla}$, $\widetilde{r \nabla_3}$, $\widetilde{r \nabla_4}$ are appropriate tangential operators to the cones \tilde{C}_{in} , \tilde{C}_{out} (defined in analogy to Section 4.3.6) and the volume elements are appropriately defined (see Remark 5.5.5).

Remark 5.5.5. Analogously with Remark 5.5.2, it is only in Propositions 10.1.10 and 10.5.1 where we shall apply the estimate (5.5.13) for the quantity (5.5.16). We shall need specifically the control of the expression in brackets in (5.5.16) corresponding to a particular \tilde{S} taken to be a sphere of our teleological \mathcal{I}^+ gauge anchored to the gauge (5.5.6) by the conditions described in Section 5.6. In this case, we may represent explicitly the quantities appearing in (5.5.16) using diffeomorphism functions relating our teleological \mathcal{I}^+ gauge to (5.5.6) and the pull back measures and “mixed tensors” defined in Section 4.2.3. For Proposition 10.1.10, the estimate (5.5.13) will be used to control an initial energy controlling the above diffeomorphism functions. For Proposition 10.5.1, the important point will be that the norm (5.5.16) directly controls through the Bianchi equations energy fluxes for the quantities of the almost gauge invariant hierarchy (α, ψ, P) and $(\underline{\alpha}, \check{\psi}, \check{P})$. Thus, the estimate (5.5.13) will appear in this work only through the estimates (10.1.21) of Proposition 10.1.10 and estimates (10.5.1) and (10.5.2) of Proposition 10.5.1.

Remark 5.5.6. When we must distinguish between different double null gauges (cf. the discussion in Section 4.2), we will denote the coordinates on $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3)$ as $(u_{\text{data}}, v_{\text{data}}, \theta_{\text{data}}^{\mathcal{EF}})$ and refer to these coordinates as the “initial Eddington–Finkelstein system”.

Remark 5.5.7. We remark that from the Raychaudhuri equation (1.2.7) and the first limiting statement of (5.5.7), it follows that $\text{tr} \chi > 0$ in the domain of (5.3.6).

Remark 5.5.8. We note that while the preliminary gauge $i_{\mathcal{EF}}^0$ is smooth, the renormalised gauge (5.5.6), due to its normalisation on null infinity, has in general only the finite regularity given from (5.5.16) which

follows from the smallness of (5.4.1) for $k = N$. (See Remark 5.3.6 for the analogous statement concerning linear theory.) For $i_{\mathcal{EF}}^0$ to be smooth, one must require the finiteness (though not smallness!) of (5.4.1) for all k . Because it will be convenient to appeal to smoothness in the closedness argument, we shall circumvent this issue by appealing directly to the preliminary gauge $i_{\mathcal{EF}}^0$ in place of (5.5.16). See already Theorems 16.3 and 7.6.1. (These are the only points in this work where the preliminary gauge $i_{\mathcal{EF}}^0$ will reappear.)

Remark 5.5.9. Conditions (5.5.9) and (5.5.10) are necessary so as to anchor the poles and standard meridian of the sphere of the two gauges. Without these conditions, relation (5.5.14) would only be true after a rotation of the vector \mathbf{J}_{seed} .

Proof. Compare with the corresponding linear statement, Proposition 5.3.5. In contrast to Theorem 5.5.1, the proof of Theorem 5.5.2, already for (a), requires something slightly more quantitative than Cauchy stability, as one must show that r -weighted estimates propagate. These estimates are now quite standard and have appeared often in the literature. For instance, one can infer a proof of (a) directly from [Tay17]. For (b), one must moreover show the possibility of achieving (5.5.7) (cf. the linearised version (5.3.6)) and the improved r -decay (see Remark 5.4.4) which this leads to, which is itself incorporated by the decay inherent in the p -notation in the energy of (5.5.16) of Definition 5.5.4. The estimates required for this appear implicitly in a more complicated form as part of the construction of Chapter 16. We encourage the reader unfamiliar with how to accomplish these estimates to provide a detailed proof after reading Chapter 16. \square

5.6 The anchoring conditions

In this section we shall define conditions which will “anchor” future normalised \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges, as defined in Sections 2.2 and 2.3, to the maximal Cauchy development (\mathcal{M}, g) with its two initial data gauges defined in Section 5.5. This will uniquely fix the freedom in choosing these gauges and will determine the setup used in the proof of the main theorem.

We give the basic setup in **Section 5.6.1** of the four local double null parametrisations. We shall then review some notational conventions for dealing with multiple double null parametrisations in **Section 5.6.2**. Finally, we shall give the precise anchoring conditions in **Section 5.6.3**.

5.6.1 The basic setup: four local double null parametrisations in (\mathcal{M}, g)

In this section (\mathcal{M}, g) will denote the maximal Cauchy development of data given by Theorem 5.2.1 applied to data as in Proposition 5.3.2 satisfying the global smallness assumption (5.4.2).

In particular, we have the two double null parametrisations

$$i_{\mathcal{K}} : \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}}(V_3) \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}}(V_3) \subset \mathcal{M} \quad (5.6.1)$$

$$i_{\mathcal{EF}} : \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3) \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3) \subset \mathcal{M}, \quad (5.6.2)$$

from Theorems 5.5.1 and 5.5.2, respectively. (Recall that the parameters involved in the definition of the above sets, including u_3 and V_3 , are those determined in Section 1.3.5.)

We now also assume that we are given additional parameters $u_f \geq u_{-1}$ and M_f satisfying (1.3.18). We define

$$v_{\infty}(\varepsilon_0, u_f) := \varepsilon_0^{-2}(u_f)^{\frac{1}{\delta}}, \quad (5.6.3)$$

where $\delta > 0$ is as fixed in Section 1.3.5. The role of the parameter (5.6.3) will become clear in Section 14.2.2. For convenience, we shall require that $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ is sufficiently small so that for any $M = M_f$ satisfying (1.3.18) and $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$, we have

$$v(R_4, u) + M_{\text{init}} \leq \varepsilon_0^{-2} u^{1/\delta} \quad (5.6.4)$$

for all $u \geq u_{-1}$, where $v(R_4, u)$ is defined with respect to M_f . Note that by (5.6.4) and the fact that $R_{-2} < R_4$, it follows that the v -range in (2.2.2) is non-empty for all $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$.

Associated to the above parameters, we assume that we have two additional parametrisations:

$$i_{\mathcal{I}^+} : \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, M_f, v_{\infty}) \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \subset \mathcal{M} \quad (5.6.5)$$

$$i_{\mathcal{H}^+} : \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, M_f) \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \subset \mathcal{M}, \quad (5.6.6)$$

such that $i_{\mathcal{I}^+}^* g$ is \mathcal{I}^+ normalised and $i_{\mathcal{H}^+}^* g$ is \mathcal{H}^+ normalised, both with respect to u_f and M_f .

Finally, we note that we may consider a fifth local parametrisation, directly associated to (5.6.6), namely

$$i_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{K}} : \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(U_f, M_f) \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \subset \mathcal{M}, \quad (5.6.7)$$

where $i_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{K}} = (\iota_{M_f}^{-1} \times \text{id}) \circ i_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, and thus $i_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{K}}^* g$ is the metric of the associated Kruskalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge to $i_{\mathcal{H}^+}^* g$.

5.6.2 Notation for coordinates and diffeomorphism functions

As discussed in Section 4.1, we may interpret the coordinates of the domains of the above parametrisations (5.6.1)–(5.6.6) as functions on the images of (5.6.1)–(5.6.6), i.e. as functions on subsets of \mathcal{M} . When doing so, however, we shall give the coordinates distinctive labels.

5.6.2.1 Coordinate labels

As we have already remarked above (see Remarks 5.5.3 and 5.5.6) we shall refer to the coordinates of (5.6.1) and (5.6.2) as

$$(U_{data}, V_{data}, \theta_{data}^{\mathcal{K}}), \quad (u_{data}, v_{data}, \theta_{data}^{\mathcal{EF}}),$$

respectively. We shall refer to the coordinates of (5.6.5) and (5.6.6) as

$$(u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}), \quad (u_{\mathcal{H}^+}, v_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}),$$

respectively. Finally, we shall refer to the coordinates of (5.6.7) as

$$(U_{\mathcal{H}^+}, V_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}).$$

The use of the same symbol $\theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge and its associated Kruskalised gauge will not be confusing as these indeed coincide.

5.6.2.2 Labels on cones and spheres

In order to distinguish the cones and spheres of intersection in both gauges, we shall typically put the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ labels on the C and S themselves, i.e. we denote

$$\begin{aligned} C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+} &:= \{u_{\mathcal{H}^+} = u\} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}, & \underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+} &:= \{v_{\mathcal{H}^+} = v\} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}, \\ C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+} &:= \{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} = u\} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}, & \underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+} &:= \{v_{\mathcal{I}^+} = v\} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+} := C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}, \quad S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+} := C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}.$$

5.6.2.3 Diffeomorphism functions

When considering transition diffeomorphisms between our patches we shall follow the f notation of Section 4.2. We summarise this here explicitly in the context of the specific diffeomorphism functions we shall typically be interested in.

The first pair of such coordinate systems we shall consider is the initial data Kruskal gauge (5.6.1) and a Kruskalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge (5.6.7). For this, we shall use the notation:

$$\begin{aligned} U_{data} &= U_{\mathcal{H}^+} + f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}^3(U_{\mathcal{H}^+}, V_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}^1, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2), & V_{data} &= V_{\mathcal{H}^+} + f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}^4(U_{\mathcal{H}^+}, V_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}^1, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2), \\ \theta_{data}^1 &= \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}^1 + f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}^1(U_{\mathcal{H}^+}, V_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}^1, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2), & \theta_{data}^2 &= \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2 + f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}^2(U_{\mathcal{H}^+}, V_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}^1, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2). \end{aligned}$$

The second pair we shall consider will be the initial Eddington–Finkelstein gauge (5.6.1) and an \mathcal{I}^+ gauge (5.6.5). For this, we shall use the notation:

$$u_{data} = u_{\mathcal{I}^+} + f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}^3(u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^1, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2), \quad v_{data} = v_{\mathcal{I}^+} + f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}^4(u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^1, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2),$$

$$\theta_{data}^1 = \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^1 + f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+}^1(u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^1, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2), \quad \theta_{data}^2 = \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2 + f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+}^2(u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^1, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2).$$

Finally, the third pair we shall consider will be an \mathcal{H}^+ gauge (5.6.6) and an \mathcal{I}^+ gauge (5.6.5). For this, we shall use the notation

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\mathcal{H}^+} &= u_{\mathcal{I}^+} + f_{\mathcal{H}^+,\mathcal{I}^+}^3(u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^1, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2), & v_{\mathcal{H}^+} &= v_{\mathcal{I}^+} + f_{\mathcal{H}^+,\mathcal{I}^+}^4(u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^1, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2), \\ \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}^1 &= \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^1 + f_{\mathcal{H}^+,\mathcal{I}^+}^1(u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^1, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2), & \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2 &= \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2 + f_{\mathcal{H}^+,\mathcal{I}^+}^2(u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^1, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, these diffeomorphism functions will already appear in Section 5.6.3 below, where we discuss the anchoring conditions between our gauges.

5.6.3 Definition of anchored gauges

We may now give a definition of what it means for gauges (5.6.5) and (5.6.6) to be anchored in the maximal development (\mathcal{M}, g) of initial data considered in Theorem 5.2.1.

Let us first introduce some additional notation that will be useful. Recalling the function $r := r_{M_f}$ on $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}$ defined by (1.3.2), we may consider this as a function on $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$. We shall denote the resulting functions $r_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $r_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ respectively, i.e.

$$r_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r_{M_f} \circ i_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{-1}, \quad r_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r_{M_f} \circ i_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{-1}.$$

We also recall the parameter R defined in Section 1.3.5.

In addition to dropping the explicit dependence on M_f , we will often drop the u_f from the notation, i.e. we shall write $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ instead of $\mathcal{D}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ instead of $\mathcal{D}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, etc. This will allow us to insert additional labels without the proliferation of symbols. With this understanding, given $\tilde{s} > s > 0$, we may now define the sets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{r \leq s}^{\mathcal{H}^+} &:= \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \{r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq s\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{r \geq s}^{\mathcal{I}^+} &:= \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \{r_{\mathcal{I}^+} \geq s\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_{s \leq r \leq \tilde{s}}^{\mathcal{I}^+} := \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \{s \leq r_{\mathcal{I}^+} \leq \tilde{s}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Refer to Figure 5.3.

Definition 5.6.1. Let (\mathcal{M}, g) be the maximal development of initial data given by Theorem 5.2.1 applied to data as in Proposition 5.3.2, satisfying the global smallness assumption (5.4.2) with $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$ for sufficiently small $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ and let (5.6.1) and (5.6.2) be the initial data gauges of Theorems 5.5.1 and 5.5.2.

Let us be given parameters u_f and M_f , and smooth parametrisations (5.6.5) and (5.6.6) as in Section 5.6.1, i.e. such that $i_{\mathcal{I}^+}^* g$ and $i_{\mathcal{H}^+}^* g$ are expressed in \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, respectively, with respect to the parameters u_f and M_f . We say that the gauges are **anchored** in (\mathcal{M}, g) with respect to the parameters u_f , $v_\infty = v_\infty(u_f, \varepsilon_0)$ and M_f if the following hold:

- **Overlap of $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$.** We have that the following inclusions hold

$$\mathcal{D}_{r \geq R_{-1}}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}_{R_{-2} \leq r \leq R_2}^{\mathcal{I}^+}, \quad (5.6.8)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{R_{-2} \leq r \leq R_1}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap J^+(S_{u_0, v_{-1}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}) \subset \mathcal{D}_{r \leq R_2}^{\mathcal{H}^+}; \quad (5.6.9)$$

- **Common future null cone.** The final outgoing cones coincide in their common domain, i.e. we assume moreover that

$$C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+} = C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}; \quad (5.6.10)$$

note that this implies the statement

$$f_{\mathcal{H}^+,\mathcal{I}^+}^3(u_f, v(R, u_f, \theta), \theta) = 0$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$, where $f_{\mathcal{H}^+,\mathcal{I}^+}^\mu$ is as defined in Section 5.6.2.




Figure 5.3: The region \mathcal{D} partitioned into the overlapping regions $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$: Beware of reading off incidence relations!

- **Overlap with initial data gauges.** The “initial hypersurfaces” defined by the u_f -normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge and u_f -normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge are contained in appropriate regions covered by the initial data gauge, i.e. they satisfy the inclusions

$$\bigcup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v_2} \underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}}(V_3), \quad (5.6.11)$$

$$\bigcup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2} C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3); \quad (5.6.12)$$

let us assume here in addition that the restriction map

$$\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2}^{\mathcal{EF}}|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_{\infty}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} S_{u_{-1}, v_{\infty}}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2 \quad (5.6.13)$$

is a C^1 -diffeomorphism, where $\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2}^{\mathcal{EF}} : \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ denotes $\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2} \circ (i^{\mathcal{EF}})^{-1}$;

- **Relating u_f with distance from initial data.** The following diffeomorphism component vanishes:

$$f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}^3(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}, \cdot)_{\ell=0} = 0; \quad (5.6.14)$$

- **Affixing the sphere diffeomorphism of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge to that of the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge.** We have the equality of maps

$$\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2} \circ i_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{-1}|_{S_{u, v(R, u)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} = \pi_{\mathbb{S}^2} \circ i_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{-1}|_{S_{u, v(R, u)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \quad (5.6.15)$$

as maps $S_{u, v(R, u)}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$, where $\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2}$ denotes the natural projection to \mathbb{S}^2 ; note that in the notation of Section 5.6.2.3, this can be written as the statement that the following diffeomorphism component vanishes:

$$f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^i(u_f, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, v_{\mathcal{H}^+}(R, u_{\mathcal{H}^+}), \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}), \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, v_{\mathcal{H}^+}(R, u_{\mathcal{H}^+}), \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+})) = 0,$$

for $i = 1, 2$, and all $\theta_{\mathcal{H}^+} \in \mathbb{S}^2$;

- **Determining the sphere diffeomorphism of the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge and affixing it to initial data.** Let us note first that we can distinguish a point p on $S_{u_f, v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and a vector $v \in T_p S_{u_f, v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ as follows:

Noting the natural null flow diffeomorphism $j : S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \rightarrow S_{u_f, v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ associated to the double null gauge, then in view of (5.6.13) we may distinguish

$$p = j \circ (\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2}^{\mathcal{EF}}|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}})^{-1}(1, 0, 0), \quad w = d\left(j \circ (\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2}^{\mathcal{EF}}|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}})^{-1}\right)|_{(1, 0, 0)}(0, 1, 0), \quad (5.6.16)$$

where we consider here $(1, 0, 0) \in \mathbb{S}^2$ and $(0, 1, 0) \in T_{(1, 0, 0)}\mathbb{S}^2$.

Our final condition is thus that the map:

$$i_{\mathcal{I}^+}|_{(u_f, v_\infty) \times \mathbb{S}^2} : (u_f, v_\infty) \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow S_{u_f, v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \subset \mathcal{M},$$

thought of as a map $\mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow S_{u_f, v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, be the unique map determined by Proposition 4.4.1, with $h = r^{-2}\not{g}$, and with $p \in S_{u_f, v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $v := r^2 g(w, w)^{-1/2} w \in T_p S_{u_f, v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ given by (5.6.16).

We note finally that (5.6.16) can be expressed as the following statement. If (θ^1, θ^2) denote local coordinates on \mathbb{S}^2 such that (θ_0^1, θ_0^2) corresponds to the point $(1, 0, 0)$ and the vector $\partial_{\theta^1}(\theta_0^1, \theta_0^2)$ corresponds to the vector $(0, 1, 0)$, then in the notation of the diffeomorphism functions of Section 5.6.2.3, we have

$$f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}^i(u_{-1}, v_\infty, \theta_0^1, \theta_0^2) = 0 = \frac{\partial f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}^i}{\partial \theta^1}(u_{-1}, v_\infty, \theta_0^1, \theta_0^2), \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (5.6.17)$$

Remark 5.6.2. As we shall see later, the above anchoring conditions make the choice of teleological gauges rigid. Let us note that since (5.6.5) and (5.6.6) will be smooth, but the parameterisation (5.6.2) is not in general, the diffeomorphism (5.6.13) is in general only of finite regularity. (In this context, we also note that, since the $\ell = 0$ mode is constant on spheres, the mild condition (5.6.14) does not impose the finite regularity of (5.6.2) onto (5.6.5).)

We define

$$\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \subset \mathcal{M},$$

$$C_{u_f} = C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cup C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}.$$

We note finally the following easy proposition:

Proposition 5.6.3. Consider anchored gauges as in Definition 5.6.1. Then the set

$$\mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}}$$

is globally hyperbolic and admits $i_{\mathcal{K}}(\underline{C}_{\text{in}}^{\mathcal{K}}) \cup i_{\mathcal{EF}}(C_{\text{out}}^{\mathcal{EF}})$ as a (bifurcate null) past Cauchy surface.

5.7 Existence of anchored teleological gauges at time u_f^0

Let us already state the following existence theorem.

Theorem 5.7.1. Let (\mathcal{M}, g) be the maximal development of initial data given by Theorem 5.2.1 applied to data as in Proposition 5.3.2, satisfying the global smallness assumption (5.4.2) with $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$ for sufficiently small $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ and let (5.6.1) and (5.6.2) be the initial data gauges of Theorems 5.5.1 and 5.5.2.

Then, for u_f^0 defined in Section 1.3.5, it follows that there exists an M_f^0 satisfying

$$|M_f^0 - M_{\text{init}}| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 \quad (5.7.1)$$

and anchored gauges (5.6.5) and (5.6.6) with respect to parameters u_f^0 and M_f^0 , in the sense of Definition 5.6.1.

We have moreover the inclusions

$$\mathcal{D}_{u_f^0}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}}(V_3), \quad \mathcal{D}_{u_f^0}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3) \quad (5.7.2)$$

and the associated Kerr angular momentum parameters given by Definitions 2.2.5 and 5.3.3 satisfy

$$|J_{\text{seed}}^m - J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^m| \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2. \quad (5.7.3)$$

Moreover, the almost gauge invariant quantities of Section 2.1, the difference quantities of Section 3.1.1, and the diffeomorphisms of Section 5.6.2 connecting the gauges are all controlled in certain energies (in particular (7.1.4) and (7.1.5) hold for $u_f := u_f^0$ and with $\lesssim \varepsilon_0^2$ replacing $\leq \varepsilon^2$).

Finally, with the understanding that $\varepsilon_0 = \sqrt{\varepsilon_0^2}$, we may replace ε_0^2 on the right hand side of (5.7.1), (5.7.3) and all the estimates for the energies claimed above by the quantity

$$\mathcal{E}_0^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{K},d}] + \mathbb{E}_0^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{EF},d}]. \quad (5.7.4)$$

Remark 5.7.1. The linear version of the existence part of Theorem 5.7.1 is already given by Proposition 2.2.6 and 2.3.8. The linear analogue of the boundedness statement of Theorem 5.7.1 is the statement that the pure gauge solution \mathcal{G} and linearised Kerr solutions \mathcal{K} are unique and themselves bounded with respect to the solution \mathcal{S} expressed in the “initial data normalisation”. See again [DHR].

Proof. This proof of the existence of the anchored gauges can be thought of as an easier version of Theorem 16.1, proven later in this work (see Chapter 16) as part of the continuity argument of the bootstrap. See Remark 16.1.6 for precise instructions on how to distill this. (Briefly, one first constructs the \mathcal{I}^+ normalised gauge (cf. Section 16.1.2) and then the \mathcal{H}^+ normalised gauge (cf. Section 16.1.3). In view of the expected inclusions (5.7.2) we can apply our Cauchy stability statements from Theorems 5.5.1 and 5.5.2. The construction proceeds by similar iterations to Sections 16.1.2 and 16.1.3, using the fact that by Proposition 2.2.6, the linearised version of the gauge conditions can be readily satisfied.) The estimate (5.7.3) follows from (5.5.14) and the fact that the linearised change of gauge does not alter the quantities (5.3.7). Note that to obtain (5.7.3) we are using here also the anchoring condition (5.6.16) determining the sphere diffeomorphism. (The fact that we may replace ε_0 with (5.7.4) is clear, because it is from control of the norm (5.7.4) that one constructs the gauges, and ε_0^2 only entered in the first place through its appearance in equations (5.5.2) and (5.5.13) of Theorems 5.5.1 and 5.5.2.) \square

Remark 5.7.2. Implicit in our proof of the above Theorem is a rigidity statement giving the uniqueness of the above gauges (see again Remark 16.1.6). Let us note in particular that this implies that were we to consider initial data given by any of the examples 1–3 of Remark 5.4.8, then $M_f = M, M, \tilde{M}$, respectively, and our two teleological gauges would give the standard Eddington–Finkelstein representation (1.3.1) of the Schwarzschild metric with mass M_f , restricted to (2.2.3) or (2.3.2) (cf. Remarks 2.2.2 and 2.3.2). In particular these gauges can be defined for all $u_f \geq u_f^0$, and the gauge corresponding to u_f' with $u_f^0 < u_f' < u_f$ is simply the restriction of the gauge corresponding to u_f . (This latter property will not be true for general initial data!) In the case of example 4 of the same remark, it is already not easy to obtain an explicit form of this gauge, nor is it clear that the gauge can be defined for all sufficiently large u_f . It will turn out that this latter example of initial data is excluded from corresponding to the final (\mathcal{M}, g) of our main theorem by the codimensionality assumption.

5.8 The 3-parameter families of initial data $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}$ and the structure of the moduli space \mathfrak{M}

Given $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$, we shall denote by $\mathfrak{M}(M_{\text{init}}, \varepsilon_0)$ the set of all characteristic initial data as in Proposition 5.3.2 which moreover satisfy the smallness assumption (5.4.2). We can think of $\mathfrak{M}(M_{\text{init}}, \varepsilon_0)$ as the *moduli space* of characteristic initial data ε_0 -close to the Schwarzschild metric of mass M_{init} . When there is no danger of confusion, we will sometimes simply write $\mathfrak{M} := \mathfrak{M}(M_{\text{init}}, \varepsilon_0)$. Since characteristic initial data are determined by seed data, we will often refer to an element of $\mathfrak{M}(M_{\text{init}}, \varepsilon_0)$ by its seed initial data $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{K}}$ representing (5.1.2), i.e. we may write $\mathcal{S} \in \mathfrak{M}(M_{\text{init}}, \varepsilon_0)$.

Given thus $\mathcal{S} \in \mathfrak{M}(M_{\text{init}}, \varepsilon_0)$, recall that we denote by $\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{EF}}$ the associated realisation of the seed data on C_{out} , and with \mathcal{EF} subscripts the quantities associated to this realisation. Recall from Section 5.3.4 that the $\ell = 1$ spherical harmonics $Y_{-1}^{\ell=1}$, $Y_0^{\ell=1}$, $Y_1^{\ell=1}$ and the corresponding projection to the $\ell = 1$ space can be defined on the sphere $S_{u_{-2}, v_{-2}}$ with the help of $g_{o, M_{\text{init}}}(u_{-2}, v_{-2})$ according to Section 1.4.2.3. Using this, we may identify a subset

$$\mathfrak{M}_0(M_{\text{init}}, \varepsilon_0) \subset \mathfrak{M}(M_{\text{init}}, \varepsilon_0)$$

consisting of all seed data of all seed data $\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{K}} \in \mathfrak{M}(M_{\text{init}}, \varepsilon_0)$ such that

$$(\text{curl } \eta_{\mathcal{EF}})_{\ell=1} = 0 = (\text{curl } \eta_{\mathcal{K}})_{\ell=1}$$

on the sphere $S_{u_{-2}, v_{-2}}$. We shall in general denote seed data contained in \mathfrak{M}_0 with a 0 subscript, i.e. as $\mathcal{S}_0 = \mathcal{S}_0^{\mathcal{K}}$. In view of Definition 5.3.3 and Remark 5.3.4, we note that such data satisfy $|J_{\text{seed}}^m| \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2$.

Given such seed data $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathfrak{M}_0(M_{\text{init}}, \varepsilon_0)$, and real parameters $\lambda_{-1}, \lambda_0, \lambda_1$, then, setting

$$\lambda := (\lambda_{-1}, \lambda_0, \lambda_1) \in \mathbb{R}^3,$$

let us denote by $\mathcal{S}_0(\lambda)$ the seed data (5.1.2) arising from

$$\eta_{\mathcal{EF}}(\lambda) := \eta_{\mathcal{EF}} + \frac{3}{r^2(u_{-2}, v_{-2})} (\lambda_{-1} * \nabla Y_{-1}^{\ell=1} + \lambda_0 * \nabla Y_0^{\ell=1} + \lambda_1 * \nabla Y_1^{\ell=1}), \quad (5.8.1)$$

in place of the $\eta_{\mathcal{EF}}$ of \mathcal{S}_0 , and all other seed data quantities (5.1.2) the same as \mathcal{S}_0 . We note here that by Remark 5.3.4,

$$|\lambda_m - J_{\text{seed}}^m[\mathcal{S}_0(\lambda)]| \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2.$$

Given seed data $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathfrak{M}_0(M_{\text{init}}, \varepsilon_0)$, let us denote by $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$ the 3-parameter family of initial data

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0} = \{\mathcal{S}_0(\lambda) : \lambda \in [-c\varepsilon_0, c\varepsilon_0]^3\} \quad (5.8.2)$$

where $c = c(M_{\text{init}}) > 0$ is a constant referred to in Proposition 5.8.1. Note that for $\mathcal{S}_0 \neq \mathcal{S}'_0$, then

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}'_0}^{\varepsilon_0} \cap \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0} = \emptyset.$$

We have the following:

Proposition 5.8.1. *For ε_0 sufficiently small, there exists a constant $c = c(M_{\text{init}}) > 0$ such that the following is true. Let $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$. Then*

$$\mathfrak{M}(M_{\text{init}}, c^2\varepsilon_0) \subset \bigcup_{\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathfrak{M}_0(M_{\text{init}}, c^2\varepsilon_0)} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0} \subset \mathfrak{M}(M_{\text{init}}, \varepsilon_0). \quad (5.8.3)$$

In particular, the statement of Theorem 5.7.1 holds for all initial data sets parameterised by $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$.

Proof. Note that the second inclusion follows simply from the triangle inequality, in view of the smoothness of the new term on the right hand side of (5.4.1), the restriction of λ to $[-c\varepsilon_0, c\varepsilon_0]^3$ and the fact that the energy (5.4.1) is expressed directly in terms of seed data. \square

Remark 5.8.2. *The above Proposition covers $\mathfrak{M}(M_{\text{init}}, c^2\varepsilon_0)$ by disjoint 3-parameter families, which are themselves contained in a $\mathfrak{M}(M_{\text{init}}, \varepsilon_0)$. Moreover, \mathfrak{M}_0 is evidently a codimension-3 submanifold of \mathfrak{M} in a natural sense. One should think of \mathfrak{M}_0 as a non-teleological approximation to our actual asymptotically stable “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$. In our main theorem, we will show that global asymptotic stability holds for one member of every leaf $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$ of this foliation, corresponding to a $\lambda^{\text{final}}(\mathcal{S}_0)$. Our actual asymptotically stable “submanifold” will then be defined as union*

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}} = \bigcup_{\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathfrak{M}_0} \mathcal{S}_0(\lambda^{\text{final}})$$

for some λ^{final} which itself depends on \mathcal{S}_0 . It is in this sense that our “submanifold” can be naturally viewed as codimension 3. See Remark 6.3.1.

5.9 The homeomorphism $\mathbf{J}_0 : \mathfrak{R}_0 \rightarrow B_{\varepsilon_0/u_f^0}$ and its degree 1 property

In this section, we shall define a map

$$\mathbf{J}_0 : \mathfrak{R}_0 \rightarrow B_{\varepsilon_0/u_f^0}$$

associated to u_f^0 . Here $B_{\varepsilon_0/u_f^0} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ denotes the closed ball of radius ε_0/u_f^0 in \mathbb{R}^3 .

The topological properties of the extension of this map to later times $u_f \geq u_f^0$ in the context of the proof of our main theorem will be essential to obtaining our codimension-3 stability result.

Definition 5.9.1. For $\hat{\varepsilon}_0(M_{\text{init}})$ chosen sufficiently small (so that in particular Theorem 5.7.1 applies) and $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$, let us fix a leaf $\mathcal{L}_{S_0^0}^{\varepsilon_0}$ as in Proposition 5.8.1. For $\lambda \in [-c\varepsilon_0, c\varepsilon_0]^3$, define

$$\mathbf{J}_0(\lambda) := (J_{T^+}^{-1}, J_{T^+}^0, J_{T^+}^1) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \quad (5.9.1)$$

where $J_{T^+}^m$ are the associated Kerr parameters defined in Definition 2.2.5 corresponding to the anchored \mathcal{I}^+ gauge with respect to parameters u_f^0 and $M_f^0(\lambda)$ given by Theorem 5.7.1 applied to $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$. We define the set

$$\mathfrak{R}_0 = \left\{ \lambda \in [-c\varepsilon_0, c\varepsilon_0]^3 : |\mathbf{J}_0(\lambda)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{u_f^0} \right\}. \quad (5.9.2)$$

Proposition 5.9.2. For sufficiently small $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ and for $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$, let $\mathcal{L}_{S_0^0}^{\varepsilon_0}$ be as in Definition 5.9.1. Then the set \mathfrak{R}_0 defined by (5.9.2) is homeomorphic (in fact diffeomorphic) to a closed 3-ball under the map (5.9.1), i.e. the map

$$\mathbf{J}_0 : \mathfrak{R}_0 \rightarrow B_{\varepsilon_0/u_f^0} \quad (5.9.3)$$

is a diffeomorphism, so, in particular, the restriction

$$\mathbf{J}_0|_{\partial\mathfrak{R}_0} : \partial\mathfrak{R}_0 \rightarrow \partial B_{\varepsilon_0/u_f^0} \quad (5.9.4)$$

is of degree 1.

Remark 5.9.3. In view of (5.3.7) of Proposition 5.3.5, it follows that the linear analogue of the map \mathbf{J}_0 is simply the identity map

$$\lambda \mapsto \lambda.$$

Thus, in linear theory, provided that say

$$u_f^0 > 2c^{-1} \quad (5.9.5)$$

where c is the constant above, then $B_{\varepsilon_0/u_f^0} \subset (-c\varepsilon_0, c\varepsilon)^3$ and thus $\mathfrak{R}_0 = B_{\varepsilon_0/u_f^0}$, whence the analogue of $\mathbf{J}_0 : \mathfrak{R}_0 \rightarrow B_{\varepsilon_0/u_f^0}$ is (trivially) a diffeomorphism. The condition (5.9.5) thus defines our additional restriction on u_f^0 announced in Section 1.3.5.

Remark 5.9.4. Note that it is the weaker statement that the map (5.9.4) is degree-1 which we shall propagate in our bootstrap as a property of a u_f -dependent map \mathbf{J}_{u_f} (see already Definition 7.1.1), rather than the stronger statement that (5.9.3) is in fact a diffeomorphism. In fact, we shall propagate this property by simply ensuring that our map \mathbf{J}_{u_f} coincides with \mathbf{J}_0 on $\partial\mathfrak{R}_0$.

Proof. In view of Remark 5.9.3, the result is simply an improvement on the statement (5.7.3) and follows again from Cauchy stability type arguments. \square

Chapter 6

Final formulation of the main result: Theorem 6.1

Using the local theory and associated structures defined in the previous chapter, we may now record in this chapter the final formulation of our main theorem.

Contents

6.1	Energies	123
6.1.1	Some auxiliary notation	123
6.1.2	Norms on spheres, cones and spacetime regions	123
6.1.3	Conventions for the volume form in integrals	124
6.1.4	Energies of P and \underline{P}	124
6.1.5	Energies of α and $\underline{\alpha}$	125
6.1.6	Energies of $\Phi^{\mathcal{I}^+}$	126
6.1.7	Energies of $\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}$	129
6.1.8	Pointwise norms of $\Phi^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}$	130
6.1.9	Energies of diffeomorphisms	131
6.1.10	Pointwise norms of diffeomorphism functions	131
6.2	The statement of Theorem 6.1	132
(i)	Completeness of null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ and properties of the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+	132
(ii)	Orbital stability	133
(iii)	Asymptotic stability	133
6.3	The stable codimension-3 “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ and other remarks on the statement	134

We first will define in **Section 6.1** a collection of energies controlling our various quantities, which are combined into a set of master energies, which will then appear explicitly in the statement of the theorem. The final formulation of our theorem will appear as **Theorem 6.1** in **Section 6.2**. Finally, in **Section 6.3**, we shall interpret our theorem as defining a codimension-3 asymptotically stable “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ and conclude with some technical remarks.

The detailed definitions of the various energies in Section 6.1 can be skipped on a first reading. We note that the reliance of this chapter on many of the notations from Part A (e.g. the gauge invariant hierarchy of Section 2.1, the calculus of diffeomorphism functions of Chapter 4.1, etc.) is only through their presence in the energies of Section 6.1; thus the present chapter may in fact be read independently of much of Part A, provided that the reader takes these energies as a black box.

6.1 Energies

In this section, we shall fix parameters u_f and M_f and assume we have a spacetime as in Definition 5.6.1, i.e. the maximal Cauchy development (\mathcal{M}, g) , satisfying the Einstein vacuum equations (1.2.1), equipped with the four gauges (5.6.1)–(5.6.6) defined in Section 5.6.1. We will proceed to define a variety of energies controlling our basic quantities in both teleological gauges as well as the diffeomorphism functions. These energies will be combined to form the master energies appearing explicitly in the statement of Theorem 6.1.

Many of the estimates shown in the proof of Theorem 6.1 amount to stronger statements than the boundedness, stated in Theorem 6.1, of the following energies. The reader is referred to Part C for the sharpest statements.

6.1.1 Some auxiliary notation

In this section, we introduce various auxiliary notations concerning anchored gauges which will appear in the definition of energies.

We will often typically drop the u_f dependence from the notation.

Recall the definitions of $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ from Section 5.6.2. Define also

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{\mathcal{I}^+} = \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}.$$

For given u, v , we will find useful the notations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v) &:= \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \{v_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq v\}, & \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) &:= \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} \geq u\}, \\ \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u, v) &:= \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \{u_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq u\} \cap \{v_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq v\}, & \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u, v) &:= \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} \geq u\} \cap \{v_{\mathcal{I}^+} \geq v\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) &= \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v) &:= C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \{v_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq v\}, & \underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u) &:= \underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \{u_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq u\}, \\ C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}(v) &:= C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \{v_{\mathcal{I}^+} \geq v\}, & \underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) &:= \underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} \geq u\}. \end{aligned}$$

6.1.2 Norms on spheres, cones and spacetime regions

We define the norms on the spheres, for any $S^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ -tensor or $S^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ -tensor ξ by

$$\|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 := \int_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} |\xi|^2 d\theta, \quad \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 := \int_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} |\xi|^2 d\theta,$$

respectively. Recall that the notation $d\theta$ is defined in (1.4.1). (In particular, the true induced volume form is $r^2 d\theta$, and, thus, the above integrands are r^{-2} weighted with respect to the true induced volume form.)

Define the norms on the \mathcal{I}^+ null hypersurfaces, for any $S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ tensor ξ ,

$$\|\xi\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}(v)}^2 := \int_v^{v_\infty} \int_{S_{u,v'}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} |\xi|^2 d\theta dv', \quad \|\xi\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)}^2 := \int_u^{\min\{u_f, u(R_{-2}, v)\}} \int_{S_{u',v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} |\xi|^2 \Omega_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2 d\theta du',$$

and

$$\|\xi\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 := \|\xi\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}(v(R_{-2}, u))}^2, \quad \|\xi\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 := \|\xi\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_{-1})}^2.$$

Similarly define the norms on the \mathcal{H}^+ null hypersurfaces, for any $S^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ -tensor ξ ,

$$\|\xi\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 := \int_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \{v_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq v\}} |\xi|^2 d\theta dv', \quad \|\xi\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u)}^2 := \int_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \{u_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq u\}} |\xi|^2 \Omega_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2 d\theta du',$$

and

$$\|\xi\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 := \|\xi\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v_{-1})}^2, \quad \|\xi\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 := \|\xi\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\max\{u_{-1}, u(R_2, v)\})}^2.$$

For the spacetime regions define, for $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$ and $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$,

$$\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 := \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} |\xi|^2 \Omega_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2 d\theta du dv', \quad \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)}^2 := \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)} |\xi|^2 \Omega_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2 d\theta du' dv,$$

and

$$\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 := \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v_{-1})}^2, \quad \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 := \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_{-1})}^2,$$

and finally

$$\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u)} := \|\xi \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}.$$

Finally, for any of the above norms $\|\cdot\|$ we define for any $S_{u,v}$ tensors ξ_1, \dots, ξ_k and any \mathfrak{D}^γ ,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)\| := \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \xi_1\| + \dots + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \xi_k\|.$$

6.1.3 Conventions for the volume form in integrals

In what follows, we shall use the following convention for integrals, recalling again the notation $d\theta$ defined in (1.4.1):

If the measure is not spelled out explicitly, integration over an ingoing cone \underline{C}_v will always be with respect to $du d\theta$, over an outgoing cone C_u will always be with respect to $dv d\theta$ and over a spacetime region will always be with respect to $du dv d\theta$.

Note that with this convention all Ω^2 -weights near (what will be) the horizon and all r -weights near infinity will appear explicitly in the integrand.

6.1.4 Energies of P and \underline{P}

Recall the quantities P , \underline{P} and \check{P} appearing in the almost gauge invariant hierarchy of Section 2.1, expressed now with respect to the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges.

We first define the following rescaled quantities:

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^5 P_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \quad \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 P_{\mathcal{I}^+} \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^5 \underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \quad \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 \check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}. \quad (6.1.1)$$

We recall the fixed parameters $N \geq 12$ from Section 5.4 and $\delta = \frac{1}{100}$ from Section 1.3.5.

We define for $1 \leq K \leq N - 2$, the energies for $v \geq v_{-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^K[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) &:= \sup_{\tilde{v} \geq v} \int_{\underline{C}_{\tilde{v}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq K}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \sup_{u \leq u_f} \int_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_1 \neq K}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \\ &+ \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \Omega^2 \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r}\right)^2 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |R^* \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.1.2)$$

where we have already used the convention of Section 6.1.3 for the volume form, and for $p \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, $1 \leq K \leq N - 3$ and $\tau \geq u_{-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{K,p}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) &:= \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \int_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} r^p |\Omega \nabla_4 \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} |r \nabla \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\ &+ \sup_{v \leq v_\infty} \int_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} |\Omega \nabla_3 \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{r^p}{r^2} |r \nabla \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\ &+ \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} |\Omega \nabla_3 \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + r^{p-1-\delta} |\Omega \nabla_4 \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{r^p}{r^{3+\delta} \delta^2} |r \nabla \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.1.3)$$

Furthermore, we define $\mathbb{E}^K [P_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v)$ replacing $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ by $\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ on the right hand side of (6.1.2) and $\mathbb{E}^{K,p} [\check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau)$ replacing $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ by $\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ on the right hand side of (6.1.3).

We finally define the master energies (now making the dependence on u_f manifest in the notation)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2} [P_{\mathcal{H}^+}, P_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &:= \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{u_{-1} \leq \tau \leq u_f} \tau^s \cdot \mathbb{E}^{N-2-s, 2-s} [P_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) + \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v} v^s \cdot \mathbb{E}^{N-2-s} [P_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v), \\ \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2} [\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &:= \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{u_{-1} \leq \tau \leq u_f} \tau^s \cdot \mathbb{E}^{N-2-s, 2-s} [\check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) + \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v} v^s \cdot \mathbb{E}^{N-2-s} [\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v).\end{aligned}\tag{6.1.4}$$

6.1.5 Energies of α and $\underline{\alpha}$

Recall the curvature components α and $\underline{\alpha}$ appearing in the almost gauge invariant hierarchy of Section 2.1, expressed now with respect to the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges.

6.1.5.1 Energies of α

We first define the following rescaled quantities:

$$A_{\mathcal{H}^+} = \Omega^2 r \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \quad A_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \Omega^2 r \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \quad \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = \Omega r^3 \psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \quad \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \Omega r^3 \psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}\tag{6.1.5}$$

For $1 \leq K \leq N$, we define the energies for $v \geq v_{-1}$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}^K [\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v) &:= \sup_{\tilde{v} \geq v} \int_{\underline{C}_{\tilde{v}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq K}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \sup_{u \leq u_f} \int_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \Omega^2 \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r}\right)^2 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |R^* \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \right\}\end{aligned}\tag{6.1.6}$$

and for $p \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, $1 \leq K \leq N$ and $\tau \geq u_{-1}$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}^{K,p} [\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) &:= \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \int_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1}^K r^{4+p} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} r^2 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \sup_{v \leq v_{\infty}} \int_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1, k_3 \neq K}^K r^{4+p} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} r^{2+p} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-2} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1}^K r^{3+p-\delta} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} r^{1+p-\delta} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-2} r^{-1-\delta} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\}.\end{aligned}\tag{6.1.7}$$

Now, restoring the dependence on u_f , we define the master energy

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N [\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] := \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{u_{-1} \leq \tau \leq u_f} \tau^s \cdot \mathbb{E}^{N-s, 2-s} [\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) + \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v} v^s \cdot \mathbb{E}^{N-s} [\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v).\tag{6.1.8}$$

6.1.5.2 Energies of $\underline{\alpha}$

We define the following rescaled quantities:

$$\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = \Omega^2 r \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \quad \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \Omega^2 \check{r} \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \quad \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = \Omega r^3 \underline{\psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \quad \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \Omega r^3 \check{\underline{\psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}.\tag{6.1.9}$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}^K [\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v) &:= \sup_{\tilde{v} \geq v} \int_{\underline{C}_{\tilde{v}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 + \sup_{u \leq u_f} \int_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq K}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \Omega^2 \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r}\right)^2 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 + |R^* \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 \right\}\end{aligned}\tag{6.1.10}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^K [\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) := & \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \int_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \frac{1}{r^2} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq K}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-2} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\
& + \sup_{v \leq v_\infty} \int_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\
& + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-2} |(R^*)^k \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \quad (6.1.11)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, restoring the dependence on u_f , we define the master energy

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N [\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] := \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{u_{-1} \leq \tau \leq u_f} \tau^s \cdot \mathbb{E}^{N-s} [\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) + \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v} v^s \cdot \mathbb{E}^{N-s} [\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v) \quad (6.1.12)$$

6.1.6 Energies of $\Phi^{\mathcal{I}^+}$

Recall the schematic notation from Section 3.1 and the shorthands (3.2.4). For the energies below we define the following weights which affect the quantities $\omega - \omega_\circ$ and β only.

For the Ricci coefficients we let $w_s(\Gamma_p) = 1 = \tilde{w}_s(\Gamma_p) = 1$ for all $\Gamma_p \setminus \{\omega - \omega_\circ\}$ and $s = 0, 1, 2$ while $w_s(\omega - \omega_\circ) = r^{1-s}$ and $\tilde{w}_s(\omega - \omega_\circ) = r^{-s}$.

For the curvature components, we let $w_s(\mathcal{R}_p) = \tilde{w}(\mathcal{R}_p) = 1$ for all $\mathcal{R}_p \setminus \{\Omega^2 \alpha, \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}, \Omega \beta\}$ and $s = 0, 1, 2$ while for β we set $w_s(\Omega \beta) = r^{-s}$ and $\tilde{w}(\Omega \beta) = r^{-1}$.

Finally, we recall from Section 1.4.3 the Kerr reference solutions. Below we will denote by $(\Gamma_p)_{\text{Kerr}}$ and $(\mathcal{R}_p)_{\text{Kerr}}$ the value of the Kerr reference solution of the relevant quantity Γ_p or \mathcal{R}_p . In particular, $(\Gamma_p)_{\text{Kerr}} = 0$ unless $\Gamma_p \in \{\eta, \underline{\eta}, b\}$ and $(\mathcal{R}_p)_{\text{Kerr}} = 0$ unless $\mathcal{R}_p \in \{\Omega \beta, \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}, \sigma\}$.

6.1.6.1 Energies on $\underline{C}_{v=v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$

We define the following (angular) energies for the Ricci coefficients and curvature on $\underline{C}_{v=v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{v_\infty}^N [\Gamma] := & \sum_{\Gamma_p \setminus \{\omega - \omega_\circ\}} \sum_{s=0}^2 \sum_{k=0}^{N-s} \sup_{u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]} u^s \cdot \|(r\check{\nabla})^k (r^p \Gamma_p - r^p (\Gamma_p)_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}^2}^2 \\
& + \sum_{\Gamma_p \setminus \{\omega - \omega_\circ\}} \sum_{s=0}^2 \sum_{k=0}^{N-s} \sup_{u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]} u^s \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \cdot \|(r\check{\nabla})^k (r^p \Gamma_p - r^p (\Gamma_p)_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}^2}^2 \\
& + \int_{u_{-1}}^{u_f} d\bar{u} \cdot \|(r\check{\nabla})^{N+1} \left(r^2 \eta - r^2 \eta_{\text{Kerr}}, r^2 \underline{\eta} - r^2 \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}}, r^2 \hat{\chi}, r \hat{\underline{\chi}}, \underline{\omega} r \right)\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}^2}^2 \\
& + \sup_{u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]} \|(r\check{\nabla})^{N+1} \left(r^{5/2} T, r^2 \underline{T} \right)\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}^2}^2 + \sum_{i=0}^N \sup_{u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]} \|(r\check{\nabla})^i (r^3 T)\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}^2}^2, \quad (6.1.13)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{v_\infty}^N [\mathcal{R}] := & \sum_{\mathcal{R}_p \setminus \{\Omega^2 \alpha, \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}\}} \sum_{s=0}^2 \sum_{k=0}^{N-1-s} \sup_{u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]} u^{\min(\frac{1}{2}+s, 2)} \cdot \tilde{w}(\mathcal{R}_p) \cdot \|(r\check{\nabla})^k (r^p \mathcal{R}_p - r^p (\mathcal{R}_p)_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}^2}^2 \\
& + \sum_{s=0}^2 \sum_{k=0}^{N-1-s} \sup_{u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]} u^{\frac{s}{2}} \|(r\check{\nabla})^k (r^4 \Omega \beta - r^4 (\Omega \beta)_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}^2}^2 \\
& + \sum_{\mathcal{R}_p \setminus \{\Omega^2 \alpha, \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}\}} \sum_{s=0}^2 \sum_{k=0}^{N-s} \sup_{u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]} u^s \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \cdot w_s(\mathcal{R}_p) \cdot \|(r\check{\nabla})^k (r^p \mathcal{R}_p - r^p (\mathcal{R}_p)_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

6.1.6.2 Energies on $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$

We define the (angular) energies for the Ricci coefficients and curvature on $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{u_{-1}}^N [\Gamma] := & \sum_{\Gamma_p \setminus \{\Omega^{-2}(\Omega_{\hat{\omega}} - (\Omega_{\hat{\omega}_o}))\}} \sum_{k=0}^N \sup_{v \in [v(u_{-1}, R_{-2}), v_\infty]} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k (r^p \Gamma_p - r^p(\Gamma_p)_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}^2}^2 \\ & + \int_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^{N+1} \left(r^2 \underline{\eta} - r^2 \eta_{\text{Kerr}}, r^2 \underline{\eta} - r^2 \eta_{\text{Kerr}}, r^2 \hat{\chi}, r \hat{\chi}, \omega r^3 \right)\|_{S_{u_{-1}, \bar{v}}^2}^2 \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^N \sup_{v \in [v(u_{-1}, R_{-2}), v_\infty]} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k \left(r\hat{\nabla} r^{5/2} T, r\hat{\nabla} r^2 \underline{T}, r^3 T, r^3(\omega - \omega_o) \right)\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (6.1.14)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{u_{-1}}^N [\mathcal{R}] := & \sum_{\mathcal{R}_p \setminus \{\Omega^2 \alpha, \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}\}} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sup_{v \in [v(u_{-1}, R_{-2}), v_\infty]} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k (r^p \mathcal{R}_p - r^p(\mathcal{R}_p)_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}^2}^2 \\ & + \sum_{\mathcal{R}_p \setminus \{\Omega^2 \alpha, \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}\}} \sum_{k=0}^N \int_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k (r^p \mathcal{R}_p - r^p(\mathcal{R}_p)_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u_{-1}, \bar{v}}^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

6.1.6.3 Energies in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$

We define:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^N [\Gamma] := & \sum_{\Gamma_p} \sum_{s=0}^2 \sum_{\substack{|\underline{k}| \leq N-s \\ \underline{k}_{\hat{\omega}} \neq (0, N, 0) \\ \underline{k}_{\hat{\omega}} \neq (0, 0, N)}} \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} u^s \cdot w_s(\Gamma_p) \cdot \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(r^p \Gamma_p - r^p(\Gamma_p)_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u, v}^2}^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}| \leq N} \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(r^3 T)\|_{S_{u, v}^2}^2 \\ & + \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^{N+1} (r^2 T, r^2 \underline{T}, \sqrt{r} b)\|_{S_{u, v}^2}^2 + \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} u^{4-2\delta} \|r^2 T_{\ell=0}, r^2 \underline{T}_{\ell=0}, r(\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u, v}^2}^2 \\ & + \sum_{\Gamma_p} \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{|\underline{k}| \leq N-s} \sup_{u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]} u^s \cdot \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)} \frac{d\bar{u} dv}{r^{1+\delta}} \tilde{w}_s(\Gamma_p) \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(r^p \Gamma_p - r^p(\Gamma_p)_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{\bar{u}, v}^2}^2 \\ & + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} d\bar{u} dv \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^{N+1} \left(r^2 T, r^2 \hat{\chi}, r^2(\underline{\eta} - \eta_{\text{Kerr}}), r^2(\eta - \eta_{\text{Kerr}}), r(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o) \right)\|_{S_{u, v}^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (6.1.15)$$

where the restriction $\underline{k}_\omega \neq (0, N, 0)$ indicates that the term $[\Omega \nabla_3]^N (r\omega - r\omega_o)$ is excluded from the sum and similarly $\underline{k}_\omega \neq (0, 0, N)$ indicates that the term $[\Omega \nabla_4]^N (r^{\frac{5}{2}}\omega - r^{\frac{5}{2}}\omega_o)$ is excluded,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}}^N [\mathcal{R}] := & \sum_{\mathcal{R}_p \setminus \{\Omega^2 \alpha, \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}\}} \sum_{s=0}^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}| \leq N-1-s} \sup_{u \in \mathcal{D}^{I^+}} u^{\min(\frac{1}{2}+s, 2)} \cdot \tilde{w}(\mathcal{R}_p) \cdot \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(r^p \mathcal{R}_p - r^p(\mathcal{R}_p)_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u,v}^2}^2 \\
& + \sum_{s=0}^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}| \leq N-1-s} \sup_{u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]} u^{\frac{s}{2}} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(r^4 \Omega \beta - r^4(\Omega \beta)_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u,v}^2}^2 \\
& + \sum_{\mathcal{R}_p \setminus \{\Omega^2 \alpha, \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}\}} \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{|\underline{k}| \leq N-s} \sup_{u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]} u^s \cdot \int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(u)} \frac{d\bar{u} dv}{r^{1+\delta}} w_s(\mathcal{R}_p) \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(r^p \mathcal{R}_p - r^p(\mathcal{R}_p)_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u,v}^2}^2 \\
& + \sum_{\mathcal{R}_p \setminus \{\Omega^2 \alpha, \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}\}} \sum_{s=0}^2 \sum_{n=0}^{N-s} \sup_{u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]} u^s \int_{\underline{C}_v(u)} d\bar{u} \cdot w_s(\mathcal{R}_p) \|(r \nabla)^n (r^p \mathcal{R}_p - r^p(\mathcal{R}_p)_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u,v}^2}^2 \\
& + \sum_{\mathcal{R}_p \setminus \{\Omega^2 \alpha, \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}\}} \sum_{s=0}^2 \sum_{n=0}^{N-s} \sup_{u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]} u^s \cdot \int_{C_u} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \|(r \nabla)^n (r^p \mathcal{R}_p - r^p(\mathcal{R}_p)_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u,v}^2}^2 \\
& + \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}} u^{4-2\delta} \|r^3 \rho_{\ell=0} + 2M_f\|_{S_{u,v}^2}^2 + \sup_v u^{4-2\delta} \|r^5 (d\sharp v \Omega \beta)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f,v}^2}^2. \tag{6.1.16}
\end{aligned}$$

We also define the energies $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}}^N [\Gamma]$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}}^N [\mathcal{R}]$ to be as above but with the multi-indices \underline{k} restricted to those of the form $\underline{k} = (n, 0, 0)$, i.e. only angular derivatives are employed.

We finally define the angular master energy

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N := & \mathbb{E}_{u_{-1}}^N [\Gamma] + \mathbb{E}_{u_{-1}}^N [\mathcal{R}] + \mathbb{E}_{v_\infty}^N [\Gamma] + \mathbb{E}_{v_\infty}^N [\mathcal{R}] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}}^N [\Gamma] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}}^N [\mathcal{R}] \\
& + \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}} \sum_{s=0}^2 u^s \sum_{k=0}^{N+1-s} \|[r \nabla]^n (r(\not{g} - r^2 \gamma))\|_{S_{u,v}^2}^2 + \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}} \sum_{s=0}^2 u^s \sum_{k=0}^{N+2-s} \sum_{m=-1}^1 \|(r \nabla)^k (Y_m^1 - \hat{Y}_m^1)^{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{S_{u,v}^2}^2
\end{aligned} \tag{6.1.17}$$

and the (total) master energy

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N := \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}}^N [\Gamma] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}}^N [\mathcal{R}] + \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}} \sum_{s=0}^2 u^s \sum_{|\underline{k}| \leq N-s} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(r(\not{g} - r^2 \gamma))\|_{S_{u,v}^2}^2. \tag{6.1.18}$$

6.1.6.4 An auxiliary energy for $\omega - \omega_o$ and $\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o$

We finally define two auxiliary energies on $\omega - \omega_o$ and $\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o$ respectively. The motivation is that controlling (1) these auxiliary energies (2) the *angular* master energy $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N$ and (3) the energy $\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$ will control the full master energy $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N$ by exploiting the form of the null structure and Bianchi equations.¹ See already Theorem 14.3.3. The definitions are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^{N, aux} [\underline{\omega}] = & \sum_{s=0}^1 \sup_{u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]} \left\{ u^s \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_3 \leq N-s \\ k_1+k_3 \leq N+1-s, k_1 \geq 2}} \int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(u)} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} \|(\Omega \nabla_3)^{k_3} (r \nabla)^{k_1} (r(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o))\|_{S_{u,v}^2}^2 \right\} \\
& + \sum_{s=0}^2 \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}} \left\{ u^s \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_3 \leq N-s \\ k_1 \neq N-s}} \|(\Omega \nabla_3)^{k_1} (r \nabla)^{k_3} (r(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o))\|_{S_{u,v}^2}^2 \right\} \\
& + \sum_{s=0}^2 u^s \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_3 \leq N-s \\ k_1+k_3 \leq N+1-s, k_1 \geq 1}} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \|(\Omega \nabla_3)^{k_3} (r \nabla)^{k_1} (r(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o))\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}^2}^2, \tag{6.1.19}
\end{aligned}$$

¹The point is that ω and $\underline{\omega}$ are the only connection coefficients not satisfying an equation in both the 3 and the 4-direction and α and $\underline{\alpha}$ are the only curvature components not satisfying an equation in both the 3 and the 4-direction.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}}^{N, aux} [\omega] &= \sum_{s=0}^1 \sup_{u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]} \left\{ u^s \sum_{k_4 + k_1 \leq N-s} \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta+s}} \|(r\Omega \nabla_4)^{k_4} (r \nabla)^{k_1} (r^{5/2}(\omega - \omega_o))\|_{S_{u,v}^2}^2 \right\} \\
&+ \sum_{s=0}^2 \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left\{ u^s \sum_{\substack{k_4 + k_1 \leq N-s \\ k_4 \neq N-s}} \|(r\Omega \nabla_4)^{k_4} (r \nabla)^{k_3} (r^{3-s/2}(\omega - \omega_o))\|_{S_{u,v}^2}^2 \right\} \\
&+ \int_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \|\left[\Omega \nabla_4\right]^N (r^3(\omega - \omega_o))\|_{S_{u_{-1}, \bar{v}}^2}^2. \tag{6.1.20}
\end{aligned}$$

6.1.7 Energies of $\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}$

Recall the \mathcal{H}^+ linearised Kerr solution of Definition 2.3.4. Define

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}} = \{(\Omega\beta - \Omega\beta_{\text{Kerr}})^{\mathcal{H}^+}, (\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta} - \Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}_{\text{Kerr}})^{\mathcal{H}^+}, (\rho - \rho_o)^{\mathcal{H}^+}, (\sigma - \sigma_{\text{Kerr}})^{\mathcal{H}^+}\},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_{\Gamma} &= \{(\Omega_o^{-2}\Omega^2 - 1)^{\mathcal{H}^+}, \Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{H}^+}, \Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_o)^{\mathcal{H}^+}, (\eta - \eta_{\text{Kerr}})^{\mathcal{H}^+}, (\underline{\eta} - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}})^{\mathcal{H}^+}, \\
&\quad (\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_o)^{\mathcal{H}^+}, \Omega^{-2}(\Omega\underline{\hat{\omega}} - \Omega\underline{\hat{\omega}}_o)^{\mathcal{H}^+}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Elements of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}}$ and \mathcal{A}_{Γ} are denoted $\check{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\check{\Gamma}$ respectively, with a $\check{}$ added to emphasise the fact that the linearised Kerr values have been subtracted. The Ricci coefficients $\Omega\hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_o)^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfy weaker estimates than the remaining Ricci coefficients. Accordingly, define

$$\mathcal{A}_{\chi} = \{\Omega\hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{H}^+}, (\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_o)^{\mathcal{H}^+}\}.$$

Define the spacetime energy

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] &:= \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)} \sum_{s=0,1,2} v^s \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \sum_{\check{\mathcal{R}} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}}} \|(1 - 3M_f/r)\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}\check{\mathcal{R}}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1-s} \sum_{\check{\mathcal{R}} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}}} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}\check{\mathcal{R}}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \sum_{\check{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma}} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}\check{\Gamma}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and the null cone energies

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^N[\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] &:= \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)} \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} v^s \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f} \sum_{\check{\Phi} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma}} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}\check{\Phi}\|_{\mathcal{C}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2, \\
\mathbb{E}^N[\underline{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] &:= \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)} \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} v^s \sum_{\check{\Phi} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma}} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}\check{\Phi}\|_{\underline{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

along with the energy on spheres

$$\mathbb{E}^N[\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] := \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \sum_{s=0,1,2} v^s \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1-s} \sum_{\check{\mathcal{R}} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}}} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}\check{\mathcal{R}}\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \sum_{\check{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma}} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}\check{\Gamma}\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \right),$$

and the energy of $N+1$ derivatives of certain Ricci coefficients on the final hypersurface

$$\mathbb{E}^{N+1}[\mathcal{C}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] := \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)} \sum_{s=0,1,2} v^s \sum_{k=0}^{N+1-s} \|(r\nabla)^k (\Omega\hat{\chi}, \Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_o, \eta - \eta_{\text{Kerr}})^{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{\mathcal{C}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2.$$

For the metric components, \not{g} , b and the mode difference, $Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^N[g^{\mathcal{H}^+}] := & \sup_{\substack{u_0 \leq u \leq u_f \\ v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)}} \left(v \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\not{g} - r^2\gamma)\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + v \sum_{k=0}^{N+1} \sum_{m=-1}^1 \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k(Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1)\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \right. \\ & + \sum_{s=0,1,2} v^s \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} (\|\Omega^{-2}\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(b - b_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(b - b_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 \\ & \left. + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(b - b_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(b - b_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the quantities $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ and $\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_o$ recall that, for $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$, $\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} = (r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2}(r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^{k_3}$ and define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^N[\chi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] := & \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{A}_\chi} \left[\sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} v^{-\delta} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^N \Gamma\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sum_{\substack{|\underline{k}| \leq N-s \\ k_1 \neq N-s}} \left(\sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} v^s \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Gamma\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)} v^s \left(\sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Gamma\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Gamma\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Gamma\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \right) \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N := & \mathbb{E}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}^N[C^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}^N[\underline{C}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}^N[S^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}^N[\chi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}^{N+1}[C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}^N[g^{\mathcal{H}^+}] \\ & + (u_f)^4 \sum_{m=-1}^1 |J_{\mathcal{H}^+}^m - J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^m|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.1.21)$$

where $J_{\mathcal{H}^+}^m$ are the associated Kerr angular momentum parameters of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge (see Definition 2.3.4).

6.1.8 Pointwise norms of $\Phi^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}$

Define the pointwise norm of the geometric quantities in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{N-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{I}^+}] = & \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-5} \left(|r^{\frac{9}{2}}\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\alpha| + |u^{\frac{1}{2}}r^4\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\beta| + |r^3\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_o)| + |r^3\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_o)| \right. \\ & + u(|r^{\frac{7}{2}}\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\alpha| + |r\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\underline{\alpha}| + |r^{\frac{7}{2}}\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\beta| + |r^2\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\underline{\beta}| + |r^3\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\rho - \rho_o)| + |r^3\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\sigma| \\ & + |r\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega_o^{-2}\Omega^2 - 1)| + |r^2\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_o)| + |r^2\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}_o)| + |r^2\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\hat{\chi}| + |r\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\hat{\chi}| \\ & \left. + |r^2\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\eta| + |r^2\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\underline{\eta}| + |r^2\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_o)| + |r\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_o)| + |r\mathfrak{D}^\gamma b| + |r\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\not{g} - r^2\gamma)| \right), \end{aligned} \quad (6.1.22)$$

and of the geometric quantities in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{N-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] = & \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} v \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-5} (|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\Omega^2\alpha| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\Omega^{-2}\underline{\alpha}| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\Omega\beta| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\rho - \rho_o)| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\sigma| \\ & + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega_o^{-2}\Omega^2 - 1)| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_o)| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}_o)| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\eta| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\underline{\eta}| \\ & + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\Omega\hat{\chi}| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_o)| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_o)| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\Omega^{-2}b| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\not{g} - r^2\gamma)|). \end{aligned} \quad (6.1.23)$$

6.1.9 Energies of diffeomorphisms

Define the energy of the $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ diffeomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N+2}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] = & \sup_{\substack{u_1 \leq u \leq u_f \\ v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v \leq v(R_3, u)}} \left(\sum_{k \leq N-5} u^2 \left[\sum_{\substack{|\gamma| \leq 2 \\ k+|\gamma| \geq 1}} \left(\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^3 \mathbb{1}\|_{S_{u,v}^{I^+}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^4 \mathbb{1}\|_{S_{u,v}^{I^+}}^2 \right) \right. \right. \\ & + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 1} \left(\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_u f \mathbb{1}\|_{S_{u,v}^{I^+}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_v f \mathbb{1}\|_{S_{u,v}^{I^+}}^2 \right) \Big] \\ & + u^2 |(f^3 - f^4)_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}|^2 + u^2 \|(f^3 - f^4)_{\ell=0}\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{I^+}(u)}^2 + u |(f^3 + f^4)_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}|^2 \Big) \\ & + \sum_{s=0}^2 \sum_{k=0}^{N-s} (u_f)^s \left[\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} \left(\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^4 \tilde{\mathbb{1}}\|_{C_{u_f}^{I^+}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^3 \tilde{\mathbb{1}}\|_{C_{u_f}^{I^+}}^2 \right) + \sum_{|\gamma|=0,1} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_u f \tilde{\mathbb{1}}\|_{C_{u_f}^{I^+}}^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (6.1.24)$$

where $f = f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$, $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \mathcal{D}^{I^+}}$, and $\tilde{\mathbb{1}} = \mathbb{1}_{R_{-1} \leq r \leq R_1}$ so that, for any tensor ξ ,

$$\|\xi \mathbb{1}\|_{C_{u_f}^{I^+}}^2 = \int_{v(R_{-1}, u_f)}^{v(R_1, u_f)} \int_{S^2} |\xi(u_f, v, \theta)|^2 d\theta dv.$$

Note that the higher order derivatives of $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ in the final line of (6.1.24) are only considered on the final hypersurface $u = u_f$.

Define the energy of the f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+} diffeomorphisms as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}] := & \sup_{\substack{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2 \\ v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v < v_\infty}} \sum_{k \leq 2} \left[\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} \left(\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^3\|_{S_{u,v}^{I^+}}^2 + r^{-2} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^4\|_{S_{u,v}^{I^+}}^2 \right) \right. \\ & + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 1} \left(r^2 \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma r \mathring{\nabla}_4 f^3\|_{S_{u,v}^{I^+}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathring{\nabla}_3 f^4\|_{S_{u,v}^{I^+}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_u f\|_{S_{u,v}^{I^+}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_v f\|_{S_{u,v}^{I^+}}^2 \right) \Big], \end{aligned} \quad (6.1.25)$$

where $f = f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}$.

Finally, define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}] := & \sup_{\substack{U_0 \leq U \leq U_f \\ V_{-1} \leq V \leq V_2 \wedge V(R_2, U)}} \sum_{k \leq 2} \left[\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} \left(\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^3\|_{S_{U,V}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^4\|_{S_{U,V}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \right) \right. \\ & + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 1} \left(\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_U f\|_{S_{U,V}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_V f\|_{S_{U,V}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \right) \Big], \end{aligned} \quad (6.1.26)$$

where $f = f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}$, $V_2 \wedge V(R_2, U) = \min\{V_2, V(R_2, U)\}$, and $U_0 := U(u_0)$, where U is defined by (1.3.13) with $M := M_f$.

6.1.10 Pointwise norms of diffeomorphism functions

Define the pointwise norm of the diffeomorphism functions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{N-7}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] = & \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \mathcal{D}^{I^+}(u_1)} \left(u |(f^3 - f^4)_{\ell=0}| + u^{\frac{1}{2}} |(f^3 + f^4)_{\ell=0}| \right. \\ & + \sum_{k \leq N-7} u \left[\sum_{\substack{|\gamma| \leq 2 \\ k+|\gamma| \geq 1}} \left(|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^3| + |(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^4| \right) + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 1} \left(|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_u f| + |(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_v f| \right) \right] \Big), \end{aligned} \quad (6.1.27)$$

where $f = f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}] := \sup_{\substack{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2 \\ v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v < v_\infty}} \left[\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} (|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^3| + r^{-1} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^4|) + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 1} (r |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma r \nabla_4 f^3| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \nabla_3 f^4| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_u f| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_v f|) \right], \quad (6.1.28)$$

where $f = f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}$, and

$$\mathbb{P}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}] := \sup_{\substack{U_0 \leq U \leq U_f \\ V_{-1} \leq V \leq V_2 \wedge V(R_2, U)}} \left[\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} (|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^3| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^4|) + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 1} (|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_U f| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_V f|) \right], \quad (6.1.29)$$

where $f = f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}$, $V_2 \wedge V(R_2, U) = \min\{V_2, V(R_2, U)\}$, and $U_0 := U(u_0)$, where U is defined by (1.3.13) with $M = M_f$.

6.2 The statement of Theorem 6.1

Below is the detailed statement of the main theorem (corresponding to Theorem I.3.1 of the introduction):

Theorem 6.1 (Full finite-codimension nonlinear asymptotic stability of Schwarzschild). *Let $M_{\text{init}} > 0$ and associated parameters be fixed as in Section 1.3.5, with $\hat{\varepsilon}_0(M_{\text{init}})$ sufficiently small.*

Given $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$, let $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathfrak{M}(M_{\text{init}}, c^2 \varepsilon_0)$ be initial data as in Proposition 5.8.1. Then the 3-parameter family $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$ contains an initial data set

$$\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}(\lambda^{\text{final}}) \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$$

such that the following is true.

Let (\mathcal{M}, g) denote the maximal Cauchy development of the initial data \mathcal{S} as given by Theorem 5.2.1. Recall that Proposition 5.3.2 applies, and moreover (\mathcal{M}, g) admits the Kruskal and Eddington–Finkelstein initial data gauges as in Theorems 5.5.1 and 5.5.2, and Theorem 5.7.1 applies, so we have in addition anchored (in the sense of Definition 5.6.1) teleologically normalised \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges (5.6.5) and (5.6.6) corresponding to u_f^0 and some parameter M_f^0 .

Then (\mathcal{M}, g) satisfies the following global stability properties:

(i) Completeness of null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ and properties of the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+

For all $u_f \geq u_f^0$, there exists an $M_f = M_f(u_f)$ such that (\mathcal{M}, g) admit \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ normalised gauges (5.6.5) and (5.6.6) anchored in (\mathcal{M}, g) in the sense of Definition 5.6.1.

Moreover, the \mathcal{I}^+ normalised and \mathcal{H}^+ normalised gauges induce two limiting double null gauges corresponding to $u_f = \infty$, i.e. C^k embeddings for a $k \geq 3$

$$i_{\mathcal{I}^+, \infty} : \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\infty, M_{\text{final}}) \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{I}^+} \subset \mathcal{M} \quad (6.2.1)$$

$$i_{\mathcal{H}^+, \infty} : \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\infty, M_{\text{final}}) \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{H}^+} \subset \mathcal{M} \quad (6.2.2)$$

where the sets $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\infty, M_{\text{final}})$ and $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\infty, M_{\text{final}})$, are defined as in (2.2.2) and (2.3.1) with $< \infty$ replacing $\leq u_f$ and $\leq v_\infty$, and where all statements of Definition 2.2.1 and 2.3.1 hold which do not correspond to evaluation at $u = u_f$ or $v = v_\infty$, where the background Schwarzschild metric is defined with respect to

$$M_{\text{final}} := \lim_{u_f \rightarrow \infty} M_f(u_f). \quad (6.2.3)$$

Moreover, null infinity is complete in the sense of [Chr99], and the domain of outer communications

$$\mathcal{M} \cap J^-(\mathcal{I}^+) = \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}} \cup \mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cup \mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap J^-(\mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{I}^+})$$

is bounded to the future in \mathcal{M} by a C^k null hypersurface \mathcal{H}^+ , for a $k \geq 3$, to be called the event horizon, whose null generators are future complete and which can be identified with the limiting hypersurface $\{u_{\mathcal{H}^+} = \infty\}$ of the limiting \mathcal{H}^+ normalised gauge (6.2.2).

Null infinity can be realised as an ideal boundary corresponding to the limiting $v_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \infty$ hypersurface of the limiting \mathcal{I}^+ gauge (6.2.1) and the “laws of gravitational radiation” hold on \mathcal{I}^+ as relations linking the asymptotic behaviour of various rescaled quantities [CK93], and the limiting \mathcal{I}^+ gauge satisfies the normalisations

$$\Sigma_+ = 0, \quad \mathbf{P}_{\ell=1}^+ = 0 \quad (6.2.4)$$

which express that $u_f = \infty$ is asymptotically a “good cut” of \mathcal{I}^+ and in centre-of-mass frame.

Given the finiteness of higher order weighted norms on initial data, arbitrary high smoothness of the asymptotic gauges (6.2.1) and (6.2.2), and thus of the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ itself, follows and also of the rescaled quantities at \mathcal{I}^+ . In particular, if (5.4.4) is finite for all k , then \mathcal{H}^+ is a smooth hypersurface.

(ii) Orbital stability

For all $u_f \geq u_f^0$ above, the masses $M_f(u_f)$ referred to in (i) remain uniformly close to the initial Schwarzschild mass M_{init} in the sense that

$$|M_f(u_f) - M_{\text{init}}| \lesssim \varepsilon_0, \quad (6.2.5)$$

the two future normalised gauges corresponding to time u_f remain uniformly close to the initial data gauges in the sense that

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d,\mathcal{H}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2, \quad \mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2, \quad (6.2.6)$$

and the solution in both the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ normalised gauges satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f,\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{u_f,\mathcal{I}^+}^N \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 \quad (6.2.7)$$

and the lower order pointwise estimates

$$\mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{N-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{N-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0. \quad (6.2.8)$$

Moreover, we may replace ε_0^2 on the right hand side of the above estimates (as well as all estimates appearing below) with the quantity

$$\mathbb{E}_0^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{K},d}] + \mathbb{E}_0^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{EF},d}] \quad (6.2.9)$$

from (5.5.4) and (5.5.16). In view of the top order boundedness statement included in the estimates (6.2.7), the spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) remains uniformly close to the Schwarzschild metric with mass M_{init} in terms of energies at the same level of differentiability as the “initial” energy fluxes (6.2.9). (It is this aspect of (6.2.7) which strictly speaking represents orbital stability.)

(iii) Asymptotic stability

For all $u_f \geq u_f^0$ above, the energy and pointwise decay estimates for the Ricci coefficients and curvature components included in (6.2.7) and (6.2.8) can already be considered as a statement of asymptotic stability.

An analogous energy statement

$$\mathbb{E}_{\infty,\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\infty,\mathcal{I}^+}^N \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 \quad (6.2.10)$$

holds for the asymptotically normalised gauges (where the above norms in (6.2.10) are defined by applying the norms of (6.2.7) to the asymptotically normalised gauges (6.2.1) and (6.2.2), replacing $\leq u_f, \leq v_f$ with $< \infty$, and including all quantities which are not evaluated at $u = u_f$ or $v = v_\infty$).

Similarly, an analogous lower order pointwise statement

$$\mathbb{P}_\infty^{N-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{P}_\infty^{N-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0 \quad (6.2.11)$$

holds, where $\mathcal{D}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ are replaced by $\mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in formulas (6.1.22) and (6.1.23), respectively, and the quantities are taken with respect to the asymptotic gauges (6.2.1) and (6.2.2).

In this sense, the spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) , expressed in the asymptotic \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges, asymptotically settles down to the Schwarzschild metric (1.3.1) of mass M_{final} given by (6.2.3) in the domain of outer communications. (Note that by (6.2.5), M_{final} satisfies $|M_{\text{final}} - M_{\text{init}}| \lesssim \varepsilon_0$.)

Moreover, we have a number of inverse polynomial decay bounds along \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ for instance the pointwise estimate on \mathcal{H}^+

$$|\Omega^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\infty, v, \cdot)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 v^{-1}, \quad (6.2.12)$$

where $\Omega^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\infty, v, \cdot)$ is defined as the $u \rightarrow \infty$ limit of $\Omega^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ defined with respect to the asymptotic \mathcal{H}^+ gauge (6.2.2), and the estimates

$$0 \leq M(u) - M_{\text{final}} \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 u^{-2}, \quad |\Sigma(u, \cdot)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 u^{-1}, \quad |\Xi(u, \cdot)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 u^{-1}, \quad |\mathbf{A}(u, \cdot)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 u^{-1}, \quad (6.2.13)$$

where $M(u)$ denotes the Bondi mass and Ξ , Σ and \mathbf{A} are defined in Section 17.1.3.

6.3 The stable codimension-3 “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$ and other remarks on the statement

We note a number of remarks:

Remark 6.3.1. The above statement should be compared directly to the rough statement given in Theorem 1.3.1. Note that by Remark 5.8.2, defining

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}} := \bigcup_{S_0 \in \mathfrak{M}_0} \mathcal{S}_0(\lambda^{\text{final}}) \subset \mathfrak{M}(\varepsilon_0, M_{\text{init}})$$

to be union of all data $S(\lambda^{\text{final}})$ whose existence follows from Theorem 6.1, this can indeed be viewed as defining a “submanifold” $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}} \subset \mathfrak{M}(\varepsilon_0, M_{\text{init}})$ of codimension 3. (Here we are primarily interested in the size of the set of allowed initial data and not its regularity as a true submanifold of moduli space. For removing the quotes, see Remark 6.3.3 below.) Statements (i), (ii) and (iii) above are elaborations of the corresponding statements in Theorem 1.3.1.

Remark 6.3.2. With extra work, one can show that there is in fact a unique $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{L}_{S_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$ satisfying (i), (ii), and (iii). In essence, this follows from our understanding of the linearised Kerr modes in linear theory [DHR]. Note that this is a weaker statement than the purely teleological statement that, for small ε_0 , $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{L}_{S_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$ is the unique data set in the family that eventually evolves to Schwarzschild. The latter would of course follow from a positive resolution to Conjecture IV.1 for small $|a| \ll M$.

Remark 6.3.3. In addition to uniqueness (cf. Remark 6.3.2), with more work one can indeed show that $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}} \subset \mathfrak{M}$ indeed forms a regular submanifold of codimension exactly 3.

Remark 6.3.4. The inequalities (6.2.13) imply that M_{final} can also be identified as the final Bondi mass, and the total flux of energy radiated to \mathcal{I}^+ is bounded (and quadratic in the smallness parameter ε_0), as measured from retarded time corresponding to $u_f = u_0$ in the asymptotically defined \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, whereas the total infinitesimal displacement of far-away test masses given by $|\Sigma_+(\cdot) - \Sigma(u_{-1}, \cdot)| = |\Sigma(u_{-1}, \cdot)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0$ is also bounded. One can show similarly the flux of linear momentum to \mathcal{I}^+ to be finite and quadratic in ε_0 (see already 17.1.17). Let us note finally that had we started from asymptotically flat spacelike initial data, then we could define our asymptotic \mathcal{I}^+ gauge for all $u \in (-\infty, \infty)$, and defining \mathbf{P}_- , Σ_- , etc. as the limit $u \rightarrow -\infty$, we would obtain the relations of [Chr91] concerning $\Sigma_+ - \Sigma_-$. In particular, note that in this case $|\Sigma_+ - \Sigma_-| \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2$.

Remark 6.3.5. We remark finally that although one immediately has only the bound $|\lambda^{\text{final}}| \lesssim \varepsilon_0$, one may show relatively easily that one has in fact $|\lambda^{\text{final}}| \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2$.

Chapter 7

The logic of the proof of Theorem 6.1

In the present section, we shall give the logic of the proof of Theorem 6.1, i.e. the skeletal form of the proof, broken into various subtheorems. The analytical difficulty of the skeleton will then be fleshed out by the proofs of the subtheorems to be given over Parts C and D of the remainder of this work.

Contents

7.1	The bootstrap set \mathfrak{B}	136
7.2	Non-emptiness of the bootstrap set \mathfrak{B}	137
7.3	Improving the bootstrap assumptions: the statement of Theorem C	138
7.4	The bootstrap set \mathfrak{B} is open and the statements of Theorems 16.1 and 16.2	138
7.4.1	Existence of anchored $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised gauges: The statement of Theorem 16.1	139
7.4.2	Properties of $\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and $\mathbf{J}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}$: The statement of Theorem 16.2	139
7.5	Higher order estimates: the statement of Theorem 16.3	140
7.6	The bootstrap set \mathfrak{B} is closed	140
7.7	Completing the proof and the statements of Theorems 17.1 and 17.2	142
7.7.1	Proof of (i) and the statement of Theorem 17.1	142
7.7.2	Proof of (ii)	144
7.7.3	Proof of (iii) and the statement of Theorem 17.2	145

The logic of the proof follows a bootstrap and the first order of business is to define the bootstrap set \mathfrak{B} in **Section 7.1**. The main part of the proof then consists of showing that \mathfrak{B} is nonempty, open and closed.

We give the nonemptiness statement in **Section 7.2**.

The main part of showing openness consists of “improving the bootstrap assumptions”. The statement of this bootstrap theorem (**Theorem C**) will be given in **Section 7.3**. (It is precisely this theorem whose proof will form Part C.)

The openness statement itself is then given in **Section 7.4** (depending on an existence theorem for the teleologically normalised gauges which is deferred to Part D).

Higher order estimates are given in **Section 7.5** (whose proof is also deferred to Part D) followed by the closedness statement in **Section 7.6**.

The remaining assertions of Theorem 6.1 are deduced in **Section 7.7**. (Some of these will depend on subtheorems whose proof is again deferred to Part D.)

The reader primarily interested in the large-scale architecture of the proof may read this chapter without having read Section 6.1, provided they are happy to treat the energies defined there as black boxes or refer back as necessary for the notation. The reader primarily interested in Theorem C may read up to Section 7.3 and immediately turn to Part C. On the other hand, the reader willing to take Theorem C on faith may turn immediately to Part D after reading this chapter.

7.1 The bootstrap set \mathfrak{B}

Let $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathfrak{M}_0(M_{\text{init}}, c^2 \varepsilon_0)$ be as in the statement of Theorem 6.1 and let $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$ be the three parameter family defined in (5.8.2), parametrised by $\lambda \in [-c\varepsilon_0, c\varepsilon_0]^3$.

Let $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ denote the maximal Cauchy development corresponding to $\mathcal{S}_0(\lambda)$ as given by Theorem 5.2.1. Recall (cf. the statement of Theorem 6.1) that Proposition 5.3.2 applies, and moreover $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ admit the Kruskal and Eddington–Finkelstein initial data gauges as in Theorems 5.5.1 and 5.5.2. Recall also from the statement that Theorem 5.7.1 applies, so we have in addition anchored (in the sense of Definition 5.6.1) teleologically normalised \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges (5.6.5) and (5.6.6) corresponding to u_f^0 and some parameter M_f^0 . Recall finally the set \mathfrak{R}_0 defined in Section 5.9, and the map

$$\mathbf{J}_0 : \mathfrak{R}_0 \rightarrow B(\varepsilon_0/u_f^0),$$

given by (5.9.1), which, by Proposition 5.9.2 is a diffeomorphism, and thus in particular restricts on its boundary to a degree-1 map to a 2-sphere.

Consider the quantity

$$\varepsilon := v\varepsilon_0, \tag{7.1.1}$$

where v denotes a large constant which will be fixed later.

Definition 7.1.1. *Let \mathfrak{B} denote the set of $\hat{u}_f \in [u_f^0, \infty)$ such that*

- **The λ -parameter range sets $\mathfrak{R}(u_f)$ and their topology and monotonicity.** *For all $u_f \in (u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$, there exists a nonempty closed subset $\mathfrak{R}(u_f) \subset [-c\varepsilon_0, c\varepsilon_0]^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with*

$$\mathfrak{R}(u_f'') \subset \mathfrak{R}(u_f'), \quad \partial \mathfrak{R}(u_f') \cap \mathfrak{R}(u_f'') = \emptyset \tag{7.1.2}$$

for $u_f'' > u_f'$, and such that $\mathfrak{R}(u_f^0)$ is homeomorphic to a closed ball;

- **The M_f parameter and the existence of anchored teleologically normalised \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges.** *There exists a function $M_f : \cup_{u_f \in [u_0, \hat{u}_f]} \{u_f\} \times \mathfrak{R}(u_f) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying for all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$, $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$*

$$|M_f(u_f, \lambda) - M_{\text{init}}| \leq \varepsilon, \tag{7.1.3}$$

and, anchored (in the sense of Definition 5.6.1) teleologically normalised \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges (5.6.5) and (5.6.6) corresponding to parameters u_f and $M_f = M_f(u_f, \lambda)$ in $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$;

- **Continuous dependence of the anchored teleologically normalised gauges on u_f .** *The function $M_f(u_f, \lambda)$ is continuous, and for fixed $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_k)$, the two teleologically normalised gauges depend continuously on u_f , in the sense that their domains and all geometric quantities depend continuously on u_f .*
- **Energy estimates for geometric quantities in both teleological gauges.** *For all $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ as above, all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$, and with the above gauges, the estimate*

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \underline{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N \leq \varepsilon^2 \tag{7.1.4}$$

holds, where the above energies are defined in Section 6.1.4, by (6.1.8) and (6.1.12) in Section 6.1.5, by (6.1.21) in Section 6.1.7 and by (6.1.18) in Section 6.1.6.3;

- **Energy estimates for the diffeomorphism functions connecting the teleological gauges to each other and to initial data.** *For all $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ as above, all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$, and with the above gauges, the estimate*

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N+2}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}] \leq \varepsilon^2 \tag{7.1.5}$$

holds, where the above energies are defined by (6.1.24), (6.1.26) and (6.1.25) in Section 6.1.9;

- **Zeroth order metric estimates.** For all $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ as above, all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$, and with the above gauges, the estimate

$$\sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \left(|r^{-2} \not{g}^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \not{\gamma}|_{\not{\gamma}} + |\Omega_o^{-2} \Omega_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2 - 1| \right) + \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left(|r^{-2} \not{g}^{\mathcal{I}^+} - \not{\gamma}|_{\not{\gamma}} + |r(\Omega_o^{-2} \Omega_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2 - 1)| \right) \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon} \quad (7.1.6)$$

holds;

- **Estimate for the angular momentum.** For all $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ as above, all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$, and with the above gauges, recalling the definition (1.4.9), and defining

$$\mathbf{J}(u_f, \lambda) = (J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{-1}, J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^0, J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^1) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \quad (7.1.7)$$

where $J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^m$ are the associated Kerr parameters defined in Definition 2.2.5 corresponding to the anchored \mathcal{I}^+ gauge in $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ with parameters u_f and M_f as above, then $\mathbf{J} : \cup_{u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]} \{u_f\} \times \mathfrak{R}(u_f) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is a continuous map and the following estimate holds:

$$|\mathbf{J}(u_f, \lambda)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{u_f}; \quad (7.1.8)$$

- **Norm of angular momentum on the boundary of the parameter range.** For all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$ and $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ corresponding to $\lambda \in \partial \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, then

$$|\mathbf{J}(u_f, \lambda)| = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{u_f}; \quad (7.1.9)$$

- **Degree properties of the map \mathbf{J}_{u_f} .** Defining the map

$$\mathbf{J}_{u_f} : \mathfrak{R}(u_f^0) \rightarrow B_{\varepsilon_0/u_f^0} \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \quad (7.1.10)$$

by

$$\mathbf{J}_{u_f}(\lambda) = \mathbf{J}(u'_f(u_f, \lambda), \lambda) \quad (7.1.11)$$

where

$$u'_f(u_f, \lambda) := \sup\{u_f^0 \leq u'_f \leq u_f : \lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u'_f)\}$$

then \mathbf{J}_{u_f} is continuous and its restriction satisfies

$$\mathbf{J}_{u_f}|_{\partial \mathfrak{R}(u_f^0)} = \mathbf{J}_{u_f^0}|_{\partial \mathfrak{R}(u_f^0)} : \partial \mathfrak{R}(u_f^0) \rightarrow \partial B_{\varepsilon_0/u_f^0} \quad (7.1.12)$$

and is thus a degree-1 map.

The essential part of the proof of Theorem 6.1 will follow from showing that $\mathfrak{B} \neq \emptyset$ and that \mathfrak{B} is open and closed.

7.2 Non-emptiness of the bootstrap set \mathfrak{B}

The first step in the proof of Theorem 6.1 is to show that $\mathfrak{B} \neq \emptyset$. This follows from Theorem 5.7.1 and Proposition 5.9.2.

Theorem 7.2.1 (Non-emptiness of the bootstrap set). *Let $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$, $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$, $M_f^0(\lambda)$, \mathfrak{R}_0 and the map \mathbf{J}_0 defined by (5.9.1), considered as a map (5.9.3), be as in the beginning of Section 7.1.*

Then defining $\mathfrak{R}(u_f^0) := \mathfrak{R}_0$, defining $M_f : \{u_f^0\} \times \mathfrak{R}(u_f^0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $M_f(u_f^0, \lambda) := M_f^0(\lambda)$, it follows that, for sufficiently large v in (7.1.1), all conditions of Definition 7.1.1 are satisfied by u_f^0 with these choices, i.e. $u_f^0 \in \mathfrak{B}$ and thus $\mathfrak{B} \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. We note that $\mathbf{J}(\lambda, u_f^0)$ defined by (7.1.7) satisfies $\mathbf{J}(\lambda, u_f^0) = \mathbf{J}_0$, and thus \mathbf{J}_{u_f} defined by (7.1.10) also satisfies $\mathbf{J}_{u_f} = \mathbf{J}_0$. Thus, (7.1.8) holds by definition while (7.1.9), the continuity statements in λ and the statement that (7.1.10) is of degree 1 follow from Proposition 5.9.2. The monotonicity property (7.1.2) is vacuous, while (7.1.4) follows from the statement of Theorem 5.7.1. The continuous dependence on u_f is also vacuous. Inequalities (7.1.4), (7.1.5) have already been asserted in the statement of Theorem 5.7.1. \square

7.3 Improving the bootstrap assumptions: the statement of Theorem C

The main analytical content of this work can be expressed as a theorem stating that given a $\hat{u}_f \in \mathfrak{B}$, then all quantitative estimates in Definition 7.1.1 can in fact be improved, i.e.

Theorem C (Improving the bootstrap assumptions). *There exists an $v = v(M_{\text{init}})$ sufficiently large such that for $\hat{\varepsilon}_0(M_{\text{init}})$ sufficiently small, and all $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$, the following is true with $\varepsilon = v\varepsilon_0$ defined by (7.1.1).*

Let $\mathcal{S}_0 \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$, $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ be as in the beginning of Section 7.1, and let \mathfrak{B} be the set defined by Definition 7.1.1.

Let $\hat{u}_f \in \mathfrak{B}$. Then for all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$ and all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, we have the following improved estimates for the solution $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$:

$$\sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \left(|r^{-2} \not{g}^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \dot{\gamma}|_{\dot{\gamma}} + |\Omega_{\circ}^{-2} \Omega_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2 - 1| \right) + \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left(r|r^{-2} \not{g}^{\mathcal{I}^+} - \dot{\gamma}|_{\dot{\gamma}} + |r(\Omega_{\circ}^{-2} \Omega_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2 - 1)| \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\varepsilon}, \quad (7.3.1)$$

$$|M_f(u_f, \lambda) - M_{\text{init}}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon, \quad (7.3.2)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \underline{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N \leq \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2, \quad (7.3.3)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N+2}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}] \leq \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \quad (7.3.4)$$

and the following improved inclusions:

$$\mathcal{D}_{r \geq R_{-1}}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}_{r \geq R_{-\frac{3}{2}}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}, \quad (7.3.5)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{r \leq R_1}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap J^+(S_{u_0, v_0}^{\mathcal{H}^+}) \subset \mathcal{D}_{r \leq R_{\frac{3}{2}}}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \quad (7.3.6)$$

and

$$\bigcup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v_2} \underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}}(V_3) \cap \{V_{-1} - C\varepsilon \leq V_{\text{data}} \leq V_2 + C\varepsilon\} \cap \{U_0 - C\varepsilon \leq U_{\text{data}} \leq C\varepsilon\}, \quad (7.3.7)$$

$$\bigcup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2} C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3) \cap \{u_{-1} - C\varepsilon \leq u_{\text{data}} \leq u_2 + C\varepsilon\}, \quad (7.3.8)$$

for some constant C depending only on M_{init} .

Remark 7.3.1. Here we recall that the energies appearing in (7.3.3) are defined in Section 6.1.4, by (6.1.8) and (6.1.12) in Section 6.1.5, by (6.1.21) in Section 6.1.7 and by (6.1.18) in Sections 6.1.6.3 while the energies appearing in (7.3.4) are defined by (6.1.24), (6.1.26) and (6.1.25) in Section 6.1.9.

Inequality (7.3.2) improves (7.1.3), inequality (7.3.3) improves (7.1.4), inequality (7.3.4) improves (7.1.5) and inequality (7.3.1) improves (7.1.6).

The inclusion relations (7.3.5)–(7.3.6) improve (5.6.8)–(5.6.9) while the inclusion relations (7.3.7)–(7.3.8) improve (5.6.11)–(5.6.12), provided that $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ is chosen sufficiently small.

Proof. The proof of the above theorem will be the content of Part C. See Chapter 8. \square

7.4 The bootstrap set \mathfrak{B} is open and the statements of Theorems 16.1 and 16.2

Having improved the bootstrap assumptions in Theorem C, we now turn to proving that the bootstrap set is open:

Theorem 7.4.1 (The bootstrap set \mathfrak{B} is open). *For $\hat{\varepsilon}_0(M_{\text{init}})$ sufficiently small, let $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$, $\mathcal{S}_0 \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$, $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ be as in the beginning of Section 7.1, and let \mathfrak{B} be the set defined by Definition 7.1.1.*

Then if $\hat{u}_f \in \mathfrak{B}$, then for sufficiently small δ_0 , it follows that $\hat{u}_f + \delta_0 \in \mathfrak{B}$.

Proof. The first step (**Section 7.4.1**) is to show that for sufficiently small δ , the spacetimes $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ admit anchored \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges with respect to $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ and a suitable $M_f(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$, continuously depending on δ , which, in view of Theorem C, inherit by continuity the bootstrap estimates (7.1.4), (7.1.5) and (7.1.6). This will be the statement of **Theorem 16.1**, whose proof is deferred to Section 16.1. Finally (**Section 7.4.2**), it is shown that $\hat{u}_f + \delta_0$ satisfies the remaining assumptions of Definition 7.1.1, after appropriately defining $\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ for all $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$. This will be the statement of **Theorem 16.2**, a statement whose proof is deferred to Section 16.2. It follows that indeed, $\hat{u}_f + \delta_0$ together with the definition of $\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ for $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$ satisfy all the conditions of Definition 7.1.1. Thus we have indeed $\hat{u}_f + \delta_0 \in \mathfrak{B}$. This completes now the proof of Theorem 7.4.1. \square

7.4.1 Existence of anchored $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised gauges: The statement of Theorem 16.1

The following theorem gives that for sufficiently small $\delta_0 > 0$, there exist anchored $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised teleological gauges, for all $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$, which inherit the improved bootstrap estimates.

Theorem 16.1 (Existence of anchored $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised gauges). *For $\hat{\varepsilon}_0(M_{\text{init}})$ sufficiently small, let $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$, $\mathcal{S}_0 \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$, $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ be as in the beginning of Section 7.1, and let \mathfrak{B} be the set defined by Definition 7.1.1.*

Let $\hat{u}_f \in \mathfrak{B}$. Then there exists a $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\delta \in [0, \delta_0]$, and all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f)$, with the gauges as defined above, we have the following:

There exists a function

$$M_f : [\hat{u}_f, \hat{u}_f + \delta_0] \times \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad (7.4.1)$$

satisfying (7.1.3), and anchored \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ normalised gauges with respect to $\hat{u}_f + \delta$, $v_\infty = v_\infty(\varepsilon_0, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and $M_f(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$ given by (7.4.1), defined as in Definition 5.6.1, satisfying (7.1.4), (7.1.5) and (7.1.6), with $u_f := \hat{u}_f + \delta$.

The function M_f defined by (7.4.1) is continuous and coincides with the previously defined M_f at $\delta = 0$. Finally, one may define the map $\mathbf{J}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$ by (7.1.7) as a map

$$\mathbf{J} : [\hat{u}_f, \hat{u}_f + \delta_0] \times \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \quad (7.4.2)$$

and (7.4.2) is a continuous map (i.e. continuous in both λ and δ) and coincides with the previously defined map for $\delta = 0$.

Proof. See Section 16.1. \square

7.4.2 Properties of $\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and $\mathbf{J}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}$: The statement of Theorem 16.2

Finally, we deduce the existence of $\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ for all $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$ and infer that $\hat{u}_f + \delta_0$ satisfies the remaining hypotheses of Definition 7.1.1.

Theorem 16.2 (Definition, non-emptiness and monotonicity properties of $\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and properties of the map $\mathbf{J}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}$). *Let δ_0 , the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ gauges, (7.4.1) and (7.4.2) be as in Theorem 16.1, for $0 \leq \delta < \delta_0$.*

Defining the closed set

$$\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta) := \left\{ \lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f) : |\mathbf{J}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{\hat{u}_f + \delta} \right\}, \quad (7.4.3)$$

then, after possibly redefining $\delta_0 > 0$, we have for all $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$ that

$$\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta) \neq \emptyset, \quad (7.4.4)$$

and if $0 \leq \delta' < \delta \leq \delta_0$, then

$$\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta) \subset \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta'), \quad \partial\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta') \cap \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta) = \emptyset. \quad (7.4.5)$$

Moreover, the inequality (7.1.8) trivially holds on $\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ while (7.1.9) holds on $\partial\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and the map $\mathbf{J}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}$ defined by (7.1.11) is continuous and satisfies (7.1.12), thus its restriction to the boundary is in particular degree 1.

Proof. See Section 16.2. □

7.5 Higher order estimates: the statement of Theorem 16.3

Given the estimates we have obtained in the bootstrap region as part of the proof of Theorem C for small data, we can obtain higher order estimates. In particular, for smooth data, this will imply pointwise estimates to arbitrary order, depending only on the order and the supremum of u_f . These will be useful for showing closedness in Section 7.6.

Theorem 16.3 (Higher order estimates). *For $\hat{\varepsilon}_0(M_{\text{init}})$ sufficiently small, let $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$, $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$, $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ be as in the beginning of Section 7.1, and let \mathfrak{B} be the set defined by Definition 7.1.1.*

Let $u_f \in \mathfrak{B}$ and let $\mathfrak{R}(u_f)$ be as in the statement of Definition 7.1.1.

Then, for all $k \geq N$ there exist constants C_k such that for all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, we have the following higher order estimates for the solution $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^k[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^k[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^k + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^k + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{k+2}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{k-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{k-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ & \leq C_k \mathbb{E}_0^k[\mathcal{S}(\lambda)]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.5.1)$$

Moreover, we have in addition the localised estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^k[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^k[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^k + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^k + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{k+2}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{k-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{k-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ & \lesssim \mathbb{E}_0^N[\mathcal{S}(\lambda)] + C_k(u_f) \mathbb{E}_{0, v_\infty}^k[\mathcal{S}(\lambda)], \end{aligned} \quad (7.5.2)$$

where $v_\infty = v_\infty(u_f)$, the energy $\mathbb{E}_{0, v_\infty}^k[\mathcal{S}(\lambda)]$ is defined in Section 5.4 (appearing in particular in equation (5.4.6)) and where $C_k(u_f)$ is a constant which depends in addition on u_f .

Proof. See Section 16.3. □

Remark 7.5.1. We will use (7.5.2) to show closedness. We note that (7.5.2) does not follow immediately from (7.5.1) and the domain of dependence property because the fact that the initial Eddington–Finkelstein gauge is normalised at null infinity means that the choice of the teleologically normalised gauges at time u_f depend on the full initial data along C_{out} , even if the solution itself geometrically can be shown not to. One expects that (7.5.2) is true without the additional u_f -dependence, but due to our crude use of the preliminary initial Eddington–Finkelstein gauge $i_{\mathcal{E}\mathcal{F}}^0$ in the proof of Theorem 7.5.2 in Section 16.3 (with bad r -dependence of estimates), we shall not track this.

Corollary 7.5.2. *Fix an arbitrary constant $u_{\text{max}} < \infty$, and let u_f be as in Theorem 16.3 satisfying $u_f \leq u_{\text{max}}$. Then, in view of (5.4.6) and statement (7.5.2) above, it follows that for all k , there exists a constant $D(k, u_{\text{max}})$, depending only on k and u_{max} , such that the C^k norms of Ω , the tensor \not{g}_{CD} and the vector field b^D in both teleologically normalised gauges are bounded by $D(k, u_{\text{max}})$. In particular, with a different labelling of k , all geometric quantities are uniformly bounded, depending only on their order and u_{max} .*

7.6 The bootstrap set \mathfrak{B} is closed

Using the higher order estimates of Theorem 16.3 and a soft local existence theorem for the characteristic initial value problem (in the smooth category), the bootstrap set \mathfrak{B} can readily be seen to be closed. For this it will suffice to show the following.

Theorem 7.6.1 (The bootstrap set \mathfrak{B} is closed). *For $\hat{\varepsilon}_0(M_{\text{init}})$ sufficiently small, let $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$, $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$, $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ be as in the beginning of Section 7.1, and let \mathfrak{B} be the set defined by Definition 7.1.1.*

Let $u_{f_j} \in \mathfrak{B}$ such that $u_{f_j} \rightarrow u_f$ monotonically increasingly. Then $u_f \in \mathfrak{B}$.

Proof. Define first

$$\mathfrak{R}(u_f) := \bigcap_{u_{f_j}} \mathfrak{R}(u_{f_j}). \quad (7.6.1)$$

By compactness, we have that $\mathfrak{R}(u_f) \neq \emptyset$.

Consider now $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$ and consider $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$. Clearly, $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_{f_j})$ for all u_{f_j} . Since $u_{f_j} \leq u_f$, by Corollary 7.5.2, one has C^{k+1} estimates for all quantities in both u_{f_j} -normalised teleological gauges, independent of j . Thus, one can extract a subsequence converging in all C^k to limiting \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ normalised metrics $g_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\lambda)$ and $g_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\lambda)$ defined in domains

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f) \times \mathbb{S}^2, \quad \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f) \times \mathbb{S}^2, \quad (7.6.2)$$

with respect to

$$M_f(u_f, \lambda) := \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} M_f(u_{f_j}, \lambda), \quad (7.6.3)$$

where the existence of this limit is again assured by Arzela–Ascoli.

At this point we have produced normalised metrics satisfying the assumptions of Sections 2.2 and 2.3, and which can be smoothly attached to another (by applying the limit of the transition functions of the u_{f_j} normalised gauges), but, we do not yet know that they are contained in our spacetime $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$, i.e. we do not yet know of the existence of the embeddings (5.6.5) and (5.6.6) defined on the domains (7.6.2).

To argue for this, we first note that, again by continuity, we may indeed obtain smooth isometric embeddings on the restricted domains

$$\hat{i}_{\mathcal{I}^+} : (\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\infty) \times \mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{u < u_f\} \cap \{v < v_\infty(u_f)\}, g_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\lambda)) \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda)) \quad (7.6.4)$$

$$\hat{i}_{\mathcal{H}^+} : (\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\infty) \times \mathbb{S}^2 \cap \{u < u_f\}, g_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\lambda)) \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda)), \quad (7.6.5)$$

by considering the limit of the embeddings corresponding to u_{f_j} . Let us consider the union in $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ of the images of $\hat{i}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\hat{i}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and let us construct a new spacetime with boundary $(\mathcal{M}_0^{\text{new}}(\lambda), g_0^{\text{new}}(\lambda))$ by attaching a future boundary defined from (the mutually compatible in view of our above comments) extensions of $g_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $g_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ to $u = u_f$ and $v = v_\infty(u_f)$, along with parts of the initial data regions $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{EF}}^0$ (where we have here used the preliminary Eddington–Finkelstein gauge so as for our solution to be smooth; cf. Remark 5.5.8). Refer to Figure 7.1. We may now solve in the smooth category the obvious characteristic initial value problems [Ren90, Luk12] for the Einstein vacuum equations (1.2.1), in succession, given by the data on the null future boundary of $\mathcal{M}_0^{\text{new}}(\lambda)$ and attach the maximal solution to $\mathcal{M}_0^{\text{new}}$ to form a spacetime $(\mathcal{M}^{\text{new}}(\lambda), g^{\text{new}}(\lambda))$. In particular, applying [Luk12], \mathcal{M}^{new} contains a full neighbourhood of the data including the terminal sphere. We thus have obtained a smooth vacuum spacetime \mathcal{M}^{new} which is easily seen to be a development of the original initial data $\mathcal{S}(\lambda)$. It follows then that this new spacetime is contained in $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ by the uniqueness of the maximal Cauchy development as stated in Theorem 5.2.1.

Finally it follows that the embeddings (7.6.4) and (7.6.5) can be extended to embeddings on the entire domains (7.6.2) into $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$. It is clear again by continuity that these embeddings correspond to anchored gauges $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ in the sense of Definition 5.6.1, with respect to u_f and $M_f(u_f, \lambda)$ is defined by (7.6.3).

The estimates and relations (7.1.3)–(7.1.5) follow by continuity for u_f . The newly defined $\mathfrak{R}(u_f)$ from (7.6.1) manifestly inherits the monotonicity properties (7.1.2) with any $u_0 \leq u'_f < u_f$, whereas, $\mathbf{J}(u_f, \lambda)$ defined by (7.1.7) manifestly extends continuously the previously defined \mathbf{J} , and by continuity manifestly inherits the properties (7.1.8) for all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$ and (7.1.9) for all $\lambda \in \partial \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$.

Finally, defining \mathbf{J}_{u_f} by (7.1.10), by continuous dependence, this map is again continuous as a map $\mathfrak{R}(u_f^0) \rightarrow B_{\varepsilon_0/u_f^0}$ and inherits the property (7.1.12) on its boundary restriction.

Thus indeed $u_f \in \mathfrak{B}$. □

Remark 7.6.1. *It follows now immediately from Theorem 7.2.1, Theorem 7.4.1 and Theorem 7.6.1 that $\mathfrak{B} = [u_f^0, \infty)$.*

We remark that we can already deduce from this fact the statement that null infinity is future complete in the sense of Christodoulou [Chr99]. This is because the generators of the final ingoing cones \underline{C}_{v_∞} of the u_f -normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge have affine length $\sim u_f$ (as measured with respect to that gauge), with the constants in \sim independent of u_f . But in view of the estimates on the diffeomorphisms to the initial data gauge (Theorem 10.1.1), then it follows easily that the affine length of the generators of \underline{C}_{v_∞} is again $\sim u_f$ as measured and normalised from some fixed outgoing cone contained in the region covered by the Eddington–Finkelstein normalised initial data gauge. Thus, completeness in the sense of [Chr99] follows already since we may take $u_f \rightarrow \infty$.

The existence of the induced asymptotic \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges is given by the following

Theorem 7.7.1. *Let λ^{final} , $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda^{\text{final}}), g(\lambda^{\text{final}}))$ be as above. There exist limiting \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges, i.e. C^k embeddings (6.2.1) and (6.2.2), for a $k \geq 3$, where*

- *the sets $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\infty, M_{\text{final}})$ and $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\infty, M_{\text{final}})$ are defined as in (2.2.2) and (2.3.1) with $< \infty$ replacing $\leq u_f$ and $\leq v_\infty$,*
- *all statements of Definition 2.2.1 and 2.3.1 hold which do not correspond to evaluation at $u = u_f$ or $v = v_\infty$, where the background Schwarzschild metric is defined with respect to M_{final} given by (6.2.3).*

The union $\mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cup \mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}}$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cup \mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}} = \bigcup_{u_f \geq u_f^0} \mathcal{D}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cup \mathcal{D}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}} \quad (7.7.2)$$

and is a globally hyperbolic subset of $\mathcal{M}(\lambda^{\text{final}})$.

Given the finiteness of the higher order weighted norm (5.4.4) on initial data, arbitrary high smoothness of the asymptotic gauges can be achieved. In particular, if (5.4.4) is finite for all k , then the embeddings (6.2.1) and (6.2.2) are in fact C^∞ .

Proof. Let λ^{final} be as given and $(u_f)_i \rightarrow \infty$ be a sequence, and denote $(M_f)_i := M_f((u_f)_i)$.

Consider first the anchored \mathcal{I}^+ gauges with parameters $(u_f)_i, (M_f)_i$. These are defined on sets

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}((u_f)_i, (M_f)_i) \times \mathbb{S}^2. \quad (7.7.3)$$

These sets “converge” to $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\infty, M_{\text{final}}) \times \mathbb{S}^2$ in the sense that for all compact subsets

$$\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\infty, M_{\text{final}}) \times \mathbb{S}^2, \quad (7.7.4)$$

then $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}((u_f)_i, (M_f)_i) \times \mathbb{S}^2$ for all i sufficiently large.

On any compact \mathcal{X} as in (7.7.4), we have uniform C^{k+1} estimates for a $k \geq 3$ for the metric coefficients Ω^2, g, b with respect to all $(u_f)_i, (M_f)_i$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauges containing \mathcal{X} .

By exhausting $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\infty, M_{\text{final}}) \times \mathbb{S}^2$ by a sequence of compact subsets \mathcal{X}_j , it follows by Arzela–Ascoli that there exists a subsequence, which we again denote as $(u_f)_i$, such that on *all* compact subsets (7.7.4), the metric coefficients Ω_i^2, g_i, b_i with respect to the $(u_f)_i, (M_f)_i$ normalised gauges converge in C^k to globally defined metric coefficients Ω^2, g, b on (7.7.3). This defines a metric expressed in double null gauge which satisfies the Einstein vacuum equations (1.2.1) pointwise, i.e. we have obtained a vacuum solution to the system on the domain (7.7.3). Note that by continuity this metric indeed satisfies all normalisations in Definition 2.2.1 which do not correspond to evaluation at $u = u_f$ or $v = v_\infty$, where the background Schwarzschild metric is defined with respect to M_{final} given by (6.2.3).

We now consider the \mathcal{H}^+ normalised gauges and similarly extract via a subsequence a solution to the system on $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\infty, M_{\text{final}}) \times \mathbb{S}^2$. Again, by continuity this metric indeed satisfies all normalisations in Definition 2.3.1 which do not correspond to evaluation at $u = u_f$, where as before, the background Schwarzschild metric is defined with respect to M_{final} given by (6.2.3).

For convenience, we may require that both limiting gauges are in fact limits of a common subsequence. It follows that there is also a sequence of diffeomorphisms f_i which connect the gauges, with uniform estimates. Thus, we may also assume that these diffeomorphisms converge to a limiting diffeomorphism. Thus, the two limiting gauges are related by a C^k diffeomorphism.

Finally, we also have the diffeomorphisms between the gauges and the initial data. As we have uniform estimates C^{k+1} on these, we may finally assume that these also converge to limiting C^k diffeomorphisms.

The transition functions defined by these diffeomorphisms are all compatible as they inherit this from the compatibility relations at finite $(u_f)_i$. It follows that we may define an abstract spacetime by gluing together the limiting teleological metrics on their domains and the metrics corresponding to the initial data regions $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{E}\mathcal{F}}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}}$ on their domains via these limiting diffeomorphisms. This is easily seen (see also below) to yield a globally hyperbolic Lorentzian C^k 4-manifold $(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \widetilde{g})$, which admits the initial $\underline{C}_{\text{in}} \cup C_{\text{out}}$ with induced data corresponding to parameter λ^{final} as a past bifurcate null Cauchy hypersurface.

It follows from the uniqueness statement as stated in Theorem 5.2.1 (in the category of C^k Lorentzian manifolds) that $(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \widetilde{g})$ indeed embeds into the maximal Cauchy development $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda^{\text{final}}), g(\lambda^{\text{final}}))$.

Finally, we may define (6.2.1) and (6.2.2) to be the restriction of the above embedding to the domains $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\infty, M_{\text{final}}) \times \mathbb{S}^2$ and $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\infty, M_{\text{final}}) \times \mathbb{S}^2$. Note that the restriction of the embedding to any \mathcal{X} as in (7.7.4) is easily then seen to be limit of the embeddings corresponding to the sequence $(u_f)_i, (M_f)_i$. We have then that the image of $(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \widetilde{g})$ in (\mathcal{M}, g) under the aforementioned embedding is precisely the set on the left hand side of (7.7.2) and the relation (7.7.2) easily follows. Note that since by Proposition 5.6.3, each set in the big union on the right hand side of (7.7.2) is globally hyperbolic with a common Cauchy hypersurface, this yields (a posteriori) the global hyperbolicity of the left hand side of (7.7.2). (We could have thus inferred the global hyperbolicity of $(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \widetilde{g})$, as needed previously, by interpreting this relation in the abstract manifold before applying the embedding.)

Finally, we note that under the assumption that (5.4.4) is finite for sufficient high k , we may show using (7.5.1) of Theorem 16.3 that the manifold $(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}, \widetilde{g})$ above is a C^k Lorentzian manifold where $\tilde{k} \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and thus the embeddings (6.2.1) and (6.2.2) are in fact C^k . It follows that if (5.4.4) is finite for all k , then the embeddings (6.2.1) and (6.2.2) are in fact C^∞ . \square

The two limiting gauges allow us to define null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ and the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ . We summarise the additional properties we can obtain concerning these asymptotic gauges which are relevant to statement (i).

Theorem 17.1 (Properties of \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 7.7.1, null infinity can be realised as the asymptotic null hypersurface $v = \infty$ of the gauge (6.2.1), denoted now simply as \mathcal{I}^+ , which is future complete in the sense that the coordinate u along \mathcal{I}^+ is Bondi normalised and $u \rightarrow \infty$ along \mathcal{I}^+ towards the future. The ‘laws of gravitational radiation’ can be formulated along \mathcal{I}^+ , and \mathcal{I}^+ can be endowed with a frame on which the final asymptotic shear $\Sigma_+ = 0$ and final centre of mass normalisation $\mathbf{P}_{\ell=1}^+ = 0$, i.e. satisfying (6.2.4).*

We may characterise the domain

$$\mathcal{D}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{E}\mathcal{F}} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}} \cap J^-(\mathcal{D}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}) \quad (7.7.5)$$

as the domain of outer communications of \mathcal{M} , and we may write:

$$J^-(\mathcal{I}^+) \cap \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{D}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{E}\mathcal{F}} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}} \cap J^-(\mathcal{D}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}).$$

On the other hand, the future boundary of (7.7.5) in \mathcal{M} is a future affine complete regular null hypersurface \mathcal{H}^+ . If (5.4.4) is finite for a certain k , then \mathcal{H}^+ is a $C^{\tilde{k}}$ hypersurface, where $\tilde{k} \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, if (5.4.4) is finite for all k , then \mathcal{H}^+ is a smooth hypersurface.

The above theorem, with more detailed properties, will be proven in Chapter 17. We note that with the above theorem, all statements in (i) have now been obtained.

7.7.2 Proof of (ii)

The energy estimates of (ii) follow from the fact that $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda^{\text{final}}), g(\lambda^{\text{final}}))$ satisfies the properties of Definition 7.1.1 for all $u_f^0 \leq u_f < \infty$, i.e. (6.2.5) follows from (7.1.3), (6.2.6) follows from (7.1.5) and (6.2.7) follows from (7.1.4). Finally, the pointwise estimate (6.2.8) follows from (8.1.2) of Theorem C.1.

Note that the statement concerning replacing ε_0^2 on the right hand side of the estimates by the quantity (6.2.9) follows immediately (cf. the analogous statement concerning (5.7.4) in Theorem 5.7.1), since for the solution corresponding to λ^{final} , ε_0^2 only arises in the first place in the context of bounding (6.2.9).

7.7.3 Proof of (iii) and the statement of Theorem 17.2

The decay estimates (6.2.10) for energies in the asymptotic teleological gauges follow immediately from (6.2.7) and the way these gauges are defined. Similarly, the pointwise estimates (6.2.11) from (6.2.8).

The polynomial decay estimates (6.2.12) and (6.2.13) at \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ , respectively, follow from

Theorem 17.2 (Polynomial decay along \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 7.7.1, we have inverse polynomial decay along \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ , for instance the pointwise estimates*

$$|\Omega^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\infty, v, \cdot)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 v^{-1}, \quad (7.7.6)$$

where $\Omega^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\infty, v, \cdot)$ is defined as the $u \rightarrow \infty$ limit of $\Omega^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ defined with respect to the asymptotic \mathcal{H}^+ gauge (6.2.2), and

$$0 \leq M(u) - M_{\text{final}} \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 u^{-2}, \quad |\Sigma(u, \cdot)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 u^{-1}, \quad |\Xi(u, \cdot)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 u^{-1}, \quad |\mathbf{A}(u, \cdot)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 u^{-1}, \quad (7.7.7)$$

where $M(u)$ denotes the Bondi mass and Ξ , Σ and \mathbf{A} are defined in Section 17.1.3.

As with Theorem 17.1, the above Theorem, together with more detailed properties, will be proven in Chapter 17. We note already, however, that given the way \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ are constructed in Theorem 17.1, the result of Theorem 17.2 becomes essentially a direct consequence of the estimates (6.2.11).

Part C

Improving the bootstrap assumptions

In this part, we shall give the proof of Theorem C. This constitutes the bulk of the analysis of the present work.

8	The logic of the proof of Theorem C	148
9	Sobolev inequalities, pointwise bounds and elliptic estimates: the proof of Theorem C.1	153
10	Estimating diffeomorphisms and relating the gauges: the proof of Theorem C.2	166
11	Tensorial wave equations	194
12	Estimates for P and \underline{P}: the proof of Theorem C.3	223
13	Estimates for α and $\underline{\alpha}$: the proof of Theorem C.4	241
14	Estimates in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge: the proof of Theorem C.5	283
15	Estimates in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge: the proof of Theorem C.6	346

We begin in **Chapter 8** with the logic of the proof of Theorem C. This will depend on several subtheorems to be proven in the remaining chapters that constitute this part. These chapters will be outlined in Chapter 8.

This part depends on essentially all of the notation introduced in Part A. This part can be understood, however, independently of some of the large-scale architecture of the proof of Theorem 6.1; in particular, this part is independent of Chapter 7 beyond Section 7.3.

Chapter 8

The logic of the proof of Theorem C

In this chapter we shall give the logic of the proof of Theorem C, first stated in Section 7.3. The proof will depend on six subtheorems, which will be proven in the chapters that follow.

For the convenience of the reader, let us first restate the theorem below:

Theorem C (Improving the bootstrap assumptions). *There exists an $v = v(M_{\text{init}})$ sufficiently large such that for $\hat{\varepsilon}_0(M_{\text{init}})$ sufficiently small, and all $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$, the following is true with $\varepsilon = v\varepsilon_0$ defined by (7.1.1).*

Let $\mathcal{S}_0 \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$, $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ be as in the beginning of Section 7.1, and let \mathfrak{B} be the set defined by Definition 7.1.1.

Let $\hat{u}_f \in \mathfrak{B}$. Then for all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$ and all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, we have the following improved estimates for the solution $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$:

$$\sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \left(|r^{-2} \not{g}^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \not{g}|_{\dot{\gamma}} + |\Omega_{\text{o}}^{-2} \Omega_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2 - 1| \right) + \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left(|r| r^{-2} \not{g}^{\mathcal{I}^+} - \not{g}|_{\dot{\gamma}} + |r(\Omega_{\text{o}}^{-2} \Omega_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2 - 1)| \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\varepsilon}, \quad (7.3.1)$$

$$|M_f(u_f, \lambda) - M_{\text{init}}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon, \quad (7.3.2)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \underline{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N \leq \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2, \quad (7.3.3)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N+2}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}] \leq \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \quad (7.3.4)$$

and the following improved inclusions:

$$\mathcal{D}_{r \geq R_{-1}}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}_{r \geq R_{-\frac{3}{2}}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}, \quad (7.3.5)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{r \leq R_1}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap J^+(S_{u_0, v_0}^{\mathcal{H}^+}) \subset \mathcal{D}_{r \leq R_{\frac{3}{2}}}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \quad (7.3.6)$$

and

$$\bigcup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v_2} \underline{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}}(V_3) \cap \{V_{-1} - C\varepsilon \leq V_{\text{data}} \leq V_2 + C\varepsilon\} \cap \{U_0 - C\varepsilon \leq U_{\text{data}} \leq C\varepsilon\}, \quad (7.3.7)$$

$$\bigcup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2} \mathcal{C}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3) \cap \{u_{-1} - C\varepsilon \leq u_{\text{data}} \leq u_2 + C\varepsilon\}, \quad (7.3.8)$$

for some constant C depending only on M_{init} .

Proof. Below, we consider $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$, with $\hat{u}_f \in \mathfrak{B}$, the spacetimes $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ for all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, and we shall refer to the anchored \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges, corresponding to parameters u_f , $M_f(u_f, \lambda)$, whose existence is ensured by Definition 7.1.1.

We shall break up the main part of the proof of Theorem C into a collection of subtheorems, given as Theorems C.1–C.6.

Theorem	Purpose	Proof
Theorem C.1	Sobolev inequalities, elliptic estimates and basic pointwise bounds	Chapter 9
Theorem C.2	Estimating diffeomorphisms and relating the gauges	Chapter 10
Theorem C.3	Estimating almost gauge invariant quantities: P and \underline{P}	Chapter 12
Theorem C.4	Estimating almost gauge invariant quantities: α and $\underline{\alpha}$	Chapter 13
Theorem C.5	Estimating geometric quantities in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge	Chapter 14
Theorem C.6	Estimating geometric quantities in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge	Chapter 15

Theorems C.3 and C.4 will rely on a general framework for estimating inhomogeneous tensorial wave equations, left to **Chapter 11**.

We proceed to discuss briefly these theorems, giving in particular their statements, and show how they allow us to complete the proof of Theorem C.

The remainder of this chapter is essential reading for Part C. The theorems stated below are proven in their logical order in the subsequent chapters, with each chapter depending on the the previous. One can, however, read various chapters independently. Theorems C.1 and C.2 of Chapters 9 and 10 are used in all remaining chapters of Part C, but the reader can simply refer back to the statements if they want to focus on other aspects of the argument. In particular, Chapters 11–13, concerning estimates for almost gauge invariant quantities, constitute a cohesive unit, proving Theorems C.3 and C.4 while the later Chapters 14 and 15 can in turn be largely understood independently of this unit, though they appeal to the statements of Theorems C.3 and C.4. The order of the estimates follows closely the situation in linear theory, and thus we recommend the reader refer also back to [DHR]. We note finally that many aspects of the large-scalar architecture of the theorem is familiar from other works in double null gauge, see for instance [Chr09, DL17].

8.1 Theorem C.1: Sobolev inequalities, elliptic estimates and basic pointwise bounds

The first step of the proof of Theorem C will be to obtain basic Sobolev inequalities and elliptic estimates. These will then allow us to show pointwise bounds which, as well as being part of the statement of our main theorem, will be important later for controlling error terms.

Theorem C.1 (Sobolev inequalities, elliptic estimates and basic pointwise bounds). *Under the assumptions of Theorem C, then for all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$ and all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, with the gauges as defined above, we have the Sobolev inequality*

$$\sup_{\theta \in S_{u,v}} |\xi(u, v, \theta)| \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^2 \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}, \quad (8.1.1)$$

for ξ an S -tensor field in either the \mathcal{H}^+ or \mathcal{I}^+ gauges, and the pointwise estimates

$$\mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{N-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{N-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon, \quad (8.1.2)$$

in particular the zeroth order estimate

$$\sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \left(|r^{-2} \not{g}^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \hat{\gamma}|_{\hat{\gamma}} + |\Omega_o^{-2} \Omega_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2 - 1| \right) + \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left(|r^{-2} \not{g}^{\mathcal{I}^+} - \hat{\gamma}|_{\hat{\gamma}} + |r(\Omega_o^{-2} \Omega_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2 - 1)| \right) \lesssim \varepsilon. \quad (8.1.3)$$

In addition, we have the Sobolev inequalities on cones given by Propositions 9.1.2 and 9.1.4, the Poincaré estimates of Proposition 9.3.2 and the elliptic estimates of Propositions 9.3.3 and 9.3.4 and the estimates for nonlinear errors associated to mode projection given by Propositions 9.4.1, 9.4.2, 9.4.3, 9.4.4, 9.4.5 and 9.4.6.

Remark 8.1.1. We note that estimate (8.1.3) already yields the improved (7.3.1) of Theorem C, for $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ sufficiently small.

8.2 Theorem C.2: Estimating diffeomorphisms and relating the gauges

The next step of the proof of Theorem C will be to show that the bootstrap assumptions (7.1.4) lead to estimates relating the various gauges.

Included in the statement below will be estimates for the diffeomorphisms relating the gauges, estimates for the initial data themselves in the teleological gauge (recall Section V.4 for a discussion of both of these issues) as well as estimates for the cancellation of terms arising from different gauges on various domains, including a timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B} (recall Section V.5 for a discussion of the relevance of this issue for the main energy estimates).

Theorem C.2 (Estimating diffeomorphisms and relating the gauges). *Under the assumptions of Theorem C, then for all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$ and all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, with the gauges as defined above, the diffeomorphism functions of Section 5.6.2.3 satisfy the estimates*

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N+2}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4, \quad (8.2.1)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4, \quad (8.2.2)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4, \quad (8.2.3)$$

and the mass parameter satisfies the estimate

$$|M_f(u_f, \lambda) - M_{\text{init}}|^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4, \quad (8.2.4)$$

the improved inclusions (7.3.5)–(7.3.6) and (7.3.7)–(7.3.8) are satisfied, the “initial” energies in the teleological gauges are controlled by ε_0^2 according to the statement of Propositions 10.5.1, the differences of corresponding quantities in the two teleological gauges satisfy the statements of Propositions 10.3.2 and 10.4.1, and certain \mathcal{H}^+ quantities can be directly estimated from \mathcal{I}^+ quantities according to the statement of Proposition 10.6.1.

Remark 8.2.1. We recall here that the energies on the left hand side of (8.2.1), (8.2.2) and (8.2.3) above are defined by (6.1.24), (6.1.26) and (6.1.25), respectively, in Section 6.1.9 and are the same ones appearing in formula (7.3.4) of the statement of Theorem C. Thus, the above theorem will be key to obtaining the improved statement (7.3.4). On the other hand, the right hand side of (8.2.1), (8.2.2) and (8.2.3) still contains additional energies which must be estimated at later stages of the argument.

Remark 8.2.2. We note explicitly that the above statement already contains the improved inclusions (7.3.5)–(7.3.6) and (7.3.7)–(7.3.8) of Theorem C concerning the domains.

8.3 Theorem C.3: Estimating almost gauge invariant quantities: P and \underline{P}

We have arrived at what can be viewed as the main estimates of the proof (cf. the discussion in Section V.5): improving the estimates on the almost gauge invariant quantities, starting with the quantities P and \underline{P} , which are the key to unraveling the almost gauge invariant hierarchy of Section 2.1.

Recall from Section 3.4 that the quantities P and \underline{P} satisfy Regge–Wheeler equations. Wave equation-type estimates lead to the following:

Theorem C.3 (Estimates for P and \underline{P}). *Under the assumptions of Theorem C, then for all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$ and all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, with the gauges as defined above, then the following holds:*

The quantities $P_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $P_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\underline{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfy the estimates

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}, P_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2}[\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. See Chapter 12. □

Remark 8.3.1. We recall that the energies appearing in the statement of the theorem are defined in Section 6.1.4. We remark that this theorem depends on some of the cancellation properties included in Theorem C.2. We recall in particular the discussions of Section V.6 and V.7 concerning the special difficulties near \mathcal{I}^+ and near the photon sphere.

8.4 Theorem C.4: Estimating almost gauge invariant quantities: α and $\underline{\alpha}$

Having obtained improved estimates on P and \underline{P} , we proceed to unlock the rest of the almost gauge invariant hierarchy of Section 2.1, obtaining in the end estimates for α and $\underline{\alpha}$.

This is the content of:

Theorem C.4 (Estimates for α and $\underline{\alpha}$). *Under the assumptions of Theorem C, then for all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$ and all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, with the gauges as defined above, then the quantities $\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfy the estimates*

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. See Chapter 13. □

Remark 8.4.1. We recall that the energy appearing in the above theorem are defined by (6.1.8) and (6.1.12). The quantities α and $\underline{\alpha}$ are controlled directly from P and \underline{P} (just estimated in Theorem C.3) using transport estimates as well as by direct use of wave equation estimates for the Teukolsky equations they satisfy. We will need again to appeal to Theorem C.2 for cancellations on an appropriate boundary.

8.5 Theorem C.5: Estimating geometric quantities in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge

Having improved the estimates on the almost gauge invariant quantities, the next step in the proof of Theorem C is to improve the estimates on the remaining quantities. We first consider the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge.

From α , $\underline{\alpha}$, the gauge conditions and the estimate (7.1.8), the geometric quantities in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge can be controlled.

Theorem C.5 (Estimates for geometric quantities in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge). *Under the assumptions of Theorem C, then for all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$ and all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, with the gauges as defined above, it follows that the geometric quantities in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge satisfy the estimates*

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. See Chapter 14. □

Remark 8.5.1. We recall that the energy appearing in the above theorem is defined by (6.1.18) in Sections 6.1.6.3. As described in Section V.5, we shall estimate these via transport equations, following the method of [DHR], using the estimates obtained for the almost gauge invariant quantities in Theorems C.3 and C.4 above, together with elliptic estimates, in particular to control top order energies of the Ricci coefficients (cf. Section V.9). The reader may wish to refer back to some of the specific nonlinear difficulties discussed in Section V.8.

8.6 Theorem C.6: Estimating geometric quantities in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge

Having improved the estimates for the geometric quantities in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, the next step of the proof of Theorem C is to improve the estimates for the geometric quantities in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge.

The geometric quantities in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge can be controlled using the estimates on α , $\underline{\alpha}$ (from Theorem C.4), the gauge conditions, and the estimates on the geometric quantities in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge (from Theorem C.5).

Theorem C.6 (Estimates for geometric quantities in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge). *Under the assumptions of Theorem C, then for all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$ and all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, with the gauges as defined above, it follows that the geometric quantities in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge satisfy the estimates*

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. See Chapter 15. □

Remark 8.6.1. *We recall that the energy in the above theorem is defined by (6.1.21) in Section 6.1.7. As with Theorem C.5, we shall estimate these via transport equations, following the method of [DHR], together with elliptic estimates. Note that to start the argument, we shall appeal also to Theorem C.2 to directly relate some of the \mathcal{I}^+ quantities estimated before to some \mathcal{H}^+ quantities on C_{u_f} . Again, the reader may wish to refer back to some of the specific nonlinear difficulties discussed in Section V.8.*

Completing the proof of Theorem C

Recall (7.1.1). Theorems C.3, C.4, C.5 and C.6 in particular imply that

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}, P_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2}[\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \check{\underline{P}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N \leq C(\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3),$$

for some constant C , independent of v . It follows that, if v is chosen so that $v^2 \geq 4C$ and if ε_0 is sufficiently small so that $\varepsilon_0 \leq (4vC)^{-1}$, the estimate (7.1.4) in fact holds with constant $\frac{1}{2}$, i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \check{\underline{P}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2. \quad (8.6.1)$$

Theorems C.5 and C.6, together with Theorem C.2, similarly imply that, provided v is sufficiently large and ε_0 is sufficiently small,

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N+2}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}] \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 \quad (8.6.2)$$

and

$$|M_f(u_f, \lambda) - M_{\text{init}}| \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2.$$

With this, in view also of Remarks 8.1.1 and 8.2.2, the proof of Theorem C is now complete. □

Chapter 9

Sobolev inequalities, pointwise bounds and elliptic estimates: the proof of Theorem C.1

This section will prove Theorem C.1, which yields our basic pointwise estimates, after showing appropriate Sobolev and Poincaré inequalities. The theorem also collects a variety of additional elliptic estimates and estimates for mode projection errors. We restate the theorem here.

Theorem C.1 (Sobolev inequalities, elliptic estimates and basic pointwise bounds). *Under the assumptions of Theorem C, then for all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$ and all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, with the gauges as defined above, we have the Sobolev inequality*

$$\sup_{\theta \in S_{u,v}} |\xi(u, v, \theta)| \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^2 \|(r\nabla)^k \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}, \quad (8.1.1)$$

for ξ an S -tensor field in either the \mathcal{H}^+ or \mathcal{I}^+ gauges, and the pointwise estimates

$$\mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{N-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{N-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon, \quad (8.1.2)$$

in particular the zeroth order estimate

$$\sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \left(|r^{-2} \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \hat{\gamma}|_{\hat{\gamma}} + |\Omega_o^{-2} \Omega_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2 - 1| \right) + \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left(r |r^{-2} \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{I}^+} - \hat{\gamma}|_{\hat{\gamma}} + |r(\Omega_o^{-2} \Omega_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2 - 1)| \right) \lesssim \varepsilon. \quad (8.1.3)$$

In addition, we have the Sobolev inequalities on cones given by Propositions 9.1.2 and 9.1.4, the Poincaré estimates of Proposition 9.3.2 and the elliptic estimates of Propositions 9.3.3 and 9.3.4 and the estimates for nonlinear errors associated to mode projection given by Propositions 9.4.1, 9.4.2, 9.4.3, 9.4.4, 9.4.5 and 9.4.6.

Contents

9.1	Sobolev inequalities	154
9.2	Pointwise estimates	155
9.3	Poincaré inequalities and elliptic estimates	155
9.3.1	Poincaré inequalities	156
9.3.2	Elliptic estimates	156
9.4	Error estimates arising from mode projections	158
9.4.1	Estimates for spherical harmonic functions and their eigenvalues	158
9.4.2	Commuting mode projections with derivative operators	161
9.4.3	$\ell = 1$ modes of Gauss curvature	164

We shall first prove in **Section 9.1** the fundamental Sobolev inequality (8.1.1) on spheres and the propositions giving Sobolev inequalities on cones, using only our most basic zeroth order bootstrap assumption (7.1.6). We shall then immediately infer the pointwise bounds (8.1.2) in **Section 9.2**, already improving in particular (7.1.6) with (8.1.3). We shall then prove the propositions providing Poincaré inequalities and elliptic estimates in **Section 9.3**. Finally, we shall prove the propositions giving error estimates arising from mode projections in **Section 9.4**.

We shall assume throughout the assumptions of Theorem C. Let us fix an arbitrary $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$, with $\hat{u}_f \in \mathfrak{B}$, and fix some $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$. All propositions below shall always refer to the anchored \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges in the spacetime $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$, corresponding to parameters u_f , $M_f(u_f, \lambda)$, whose existence is ensured by Definition 7.1.1.

The estimates here will be used throughout the remaining sections of Part C. The reader may wish also to refer to [Chr09]. The reader may wish to skip Section 9.4 on a first reading and refer back as necessary.

9.1 Sobolev inequalities

We begin with the most basic Sobolev inequality (8.1.1).

Proposition 9.1.1 (Sobolev inequality on spheres). *In both the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges, for any sphere $S_{u,v}$ and any $S_{u,v}$ tensor field ξ ,*

$$\sup_{\theta \in S_{u,v}} |\xi(u, v, \theta)| \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^2 \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}.$$

Proof. The proof is standard given the closeness to the round sphere provided by the bootstrap assumption (7.1.6). See, for example, Chapter 5 of [Chr09]. \square

Again, using only (7.1.6), we can also infer the following additional Sobolev inequalities on null cones.

Proposition 9.1.2 (Sobolev inequality on incoming cones). *In the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, for any S -tensor field ξ*

$$\sup_{\theta \in S_{u,v}} |\xi(u, v, \theta)| \lesssim \sum_{\substack{0 \leq k_1 + k_2 \leq 2 \\ 0 \leq k_2 \leq 1}} \left(\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1} (\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2} \xi\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u)} + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1} (\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2} \xi\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f - M_{\text{init}})} \right),$$

for all $(u, v) \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, M_f)$ such that $(u_f - M_{\text{init}}, v) \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, M_f)$. In the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, for any S -tensor field ξ ,

$$\sup_{\theta \in S_{u,v}} |\xi(u, v, \theta)| \lesssim \sum_{\substack{0 \leq k_1 + k_2 \leq 2 \\ 0 \leq k_2 \leq 1}} \left(\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1} (\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2} \xi\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)} + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1} (\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2} \xi\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f - M_{\text{init}} \wedge u(R_{-1}, v))} \right),$$

for all $(u, v) \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, v_\infty(u_f), M_f)$ such that $(u_f - M_{\text{init}} \wedge u(R_{-1}, v), v) \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, M_f)$, where $u_f - M_{\text{init}} \wedge u(R_{-1}, v) := \min\{u_f - M_{\text{init}}, u(R_{-1}, v)\}$.

Proof. The proof is again standard given (7.1.6). See, for example, Chapter 10 of [Chr09]. Note that it is necessary to include the terms involving the norms $\|\cdot\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f - M_{\text{init}})}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f - M_{\text{init}} \wedge u(R_{-1}, v))}$ in case $u_f - M_{\text{init}} \leq u \leq u_f$ and $u(R_{-1}, v) \leq u \leq u(R_{-2}, v)$ respectively. Note that, by (1.3.27), we have $u_f - M_{\text{init}} \geq u_{-1}$. \square

Remark 9.1.3. *Note that the domains of the teleological gauges do not contain sufficiently long incoming cones too close to $u_{\mathcal{H}^+} = u_f$, $v_{\mathcal{H}^+} = v(R_2, u_f)$ and $u_{\mathcal{I}^+} = u_{-1}$, $v_{\mathcal{I}^+} = v(R_{-2}, u_{-1})$ respectively, and so such values of (u, v) have been excluded in the statement above.*

Proposition 9.1.4 (Sobolev inequality on outgoing cones). *In the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, for any S -tensor field ξ and all $(u, v) \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, M_f)$,*

$$\sup_{\theta \in S_{u,v}} |\xi(u, v, \theta)| \lesssim \sum_{\substack{0 \leq k_1 + k_2 \leq 2 \\ 0 \leq k_2 \leq 1}} \left(\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1} (r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^{k_2} \xi\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1} (r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^{k_2} \xi\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(R, u))} \right).$$

In the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, for any function S -tensor field ξ and all $(u, v) \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, v_\infty(u_f), M_f)$,

$$\sup_{\theta \in S_{u,v}} |\xi(u, v, \theta)| \lesssim \sum_{\substack{0 \leq k_1 + k_2 \leq 2 \\ 0 \leq k_2 \leq 1}} \left(\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1} (r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^{k_2} \xi\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}(v)} + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1} (r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^{k_2} \xi\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}(v_\infty - M_{\text{init}})} \right).$$

Proof. Again see, for example, Chapter 10 of [Chr09]. It is again necessary to include the terms involving the norms $\|\cdot\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(R, u))}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}(v_\infty - M_{\text{init}})}$ in case $v(R, u) \leq v \leq v(R_1, u)$ and $v_\infty - M_{\text{init}} \leq v \leq v_{\text{init}}$ respectively. Note that by (5.6.4), we have in particular that $(u, v_\infty - M_{\text{init}}) \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, v_\infty(u_f), M_f)$ under our assumptions. \square

9.2 Pointwise estimates

We now prove the estimates (8.1.2).

Proposition 9.2.1. *The pointwise estimates*

$$\mathbb{P}^{N-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{P}^{N-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon \quad (9.2.1)$$

hold, in particular, the improved zeroth order bounds

$$\sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \left(|r^{-2}\mathring{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \mathring{\gamma}|_{\dot{\gamma}} + |\Omega_\circ^{-2}\Omega_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2 - 1| \right) + \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left(|r^{-2}\mathring{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathcal{I}^+} - \mathring{\gamma}|_{\dot{\gamma}} + |r(\Omega_\circ^{-2}\Omega_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2 - 1)| \right) \lesssim \varepsilon$$

and the higher order tangential pointwise bounds

$$\sum_{k \leq N-5} |(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (r^{-2}\mathring{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \mathring{\gamma})|_{\dot{\gamma}} \lesssim \varepsilon, \quad \sum_{k \leq N-5} |(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (r^{-2}\mathring{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathcal{I}^+} - \mathring{\gamma})|_{\dot{\gamma}} \lesssim \varepsilon. \quad (9.2.2)$$

Proof. This is a direct consequence of the Sobolev inequalities and the bootstrap assumption (7.1.4), on examination of the relation between the integrands of the energies and the expressions in (6.1.22) and (6.1.23). \square

9.3 Poincaré inequalities and elliptic estimates

This section concerns Poincaré inequalities and L^2 elliptic estimates for certain operators on the spheres $S_{u,v}$ of the \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges.

We will use here the pointwise bounds (9.2.2) as well as the bounds

$$\sum_{k=0}^N \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (\mathring{\mathcal{G}} - r^2\mathring{\gamma})\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^2, \quad \sum_{k=0}^{N+1} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1)\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \quad (9.3.1)$$

which follow in either of the \mathcal{H}^+ or \mathcal{I}^+ gauges, from the bootstrap estimates $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N \leq \varepsilon^2$, $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N \leq \varepsilon^2$ contained in (7.1.4), in view of the definitions of Section 6.1.6 and 6.1.7.

We also note the following stronger bound on curvature

Lemma 9.3.1. *We have, in either of the \mathcal{H}^+ or \mathcal{I}^+ gauges, the bound*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k K\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \quad (9.3.2)$$

Proof. We apply the operator $r\mathring{\nabla}$ to the Gauss equation (1.2.20) $N-1$ times, using the estimates $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N \leq \varepsilon^2$ (respectively, $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N \leq \varepsilon^2$) and the pointwise bound (9.2.1) to estimate the resulting terms. \square

9.3.1 Poincaré inequalities

Proposition 9.3.2 (Poincaré inequalities). *In both the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges, for any sphere $S_{u,v}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{2-\delta}\|f_{\ell \geq 1}\|_{S_{u,v}} &\leq \|r\mathring{\nabla} f\|_{S_{u,v}} \quad \text{for any function } f \text{ on } S_{u,v}, \\ \sqrt{1-\delta}\|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}} &\leq \|r\mathring{\nabla} \xi\|_{S_{u,v}} \quad \text{for any 1-form } \xi \text{ on } S_{u,v}, \\ \sqrt{2-\delta}\|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}} &\leq \|r\mathring{\nabla} \xi\|_{S_{u,v}} \quad \text{for any symmetric traceless tensor } \xi \text{ on } S_{u,v}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Note first that

$$f_{\ell=0}(u,v) = \left(\int_{S_{u,v}} \sqrt{\det g} d\theta \right)^{-1} \int_{S_{u,v}} f(u,v,\theta) \sqrt{\det g} d\theta,$$

and so $f_{\ell \geq 1}$ is equal to f minus its average with respect to the sphere $(S_{u,v}, g)$. The first inequality is then standard given the control on the induced metric g in each of the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges implied by (9.2.2) and the fact that (by a classical result of Lichnerowicz) the lowest positive eigenvalue of $(S_{u,v}, g)$ is bounded below by twice the minimum of its Gaussian curvature (whose difference from 1 is of course bounded by (9.2.2)). The second and third inequalities are proven most easily by establishing them first for the case of the round metric, where they hold with $\delta = 0$. See for instance Proposition 4.4.4 of [DHR] for an explicit treatment of the case of symmetric traceless tensors. In a second step one then uses the closeness assumptions (9.2.2) of the induced metric g to estimate (say for symmetric traceless tensors)

$$\|r\mathring{\nabla} \xi\|_{S_{u,v}, \mathring{g}} \geq (1 - C\varepsilon) \|r\mathring{\nabla} \xi\|_{S_{u,v}, \mathring{g}} - C\varepsilon \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}, \mathring{g}} \geq \sqrt{2(1 - C\varepsilon)} \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}, \mathring{g}} \geq \sqrt{2(1 - C\varepsilon)} \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}, g},$$

where a ring denotes reference to the round metric and the constant C may be different in each occurrence. \square

9.3.2 Elliptic estimates

The first proposition concerns the operator \mathcal{P}_2^* .

Proposition 9.3.3 (Elliptic estimates for symmetric traceless gradient). *Suppose ε_0 is sufficiently small. In both the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges, for any sphere $S_{u,v}$, any function h , and any $2 \leq l \leq N+1$,*

$$\sum_{k=0}^l \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k h_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{l-2} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathring{\nabla} h\|_{S_{u,v}}. \quad (9.3.3)$$

Moreover, for any $S_{u,v}$ one form ξ and any $1 \leq l \leq N+1$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^l \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \xi_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k r \mathcal{P}_2^* \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}. \quad (9.3.4)$$

Proof. Let $\mathring{\nabla}$ denote the Levi-Civita connection of the round metric $r^2 \mathring{\gamma}$, and let $\mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^*$ denote the corresponding symmetric traceless gradient operator. Moreover given a function h , let $h_{\ell=0}$, $h_{\ell=1}$, $h_{\ell \geq 2}$ denote the projection of h to its $\ell = 0$, $\ell = 1$ and $\ell \geq 2$ modes respectively, as defined by the round sphere. Explicitly, in the notation of Section 1.4.2,

$$h_{\ell=0} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi}} \int h d\theta, \quad h_{\ell=1} = \sum_{m=-1}^1 \int h Y_m^1 d\theta, \quad h_{\ell \geq 2} = h - h_{\ell=0} - h_{\ell=1},$$

where $d\theta = \sqrt{\det \gamma} d\theta^1 d\theta^2$. Consider first (9.3.3) for $l = 2$. Recall that, using properties of the round spherical harmonics (see, for example, Proposition 4.4.2 of [DHR]), for any smooth function h ,

$$\sum_{k=0}^2 \int_{S_{u,v}} |(r\mathring{\nabla})^k h_{\ell \geq 2}|^2 d\theta \lesssim \int_{S_{u,v}} |r^2 \mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla} h|^2 d\theta.$$

Now

$$-2(\mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla - \mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla})h = (\nabla - \mathring{\nabla})\mathring{d}h + (\nabla^T - \mathring{\nabla}^T)\mathring{d}h - (\mathring{d}\mathring{v} - \mathring{d}\mathring{v})\mathring{d}hr^2\mathring{\gamma} - \mathring{\Delta}h(\mathring{g} - r^2\mathring{\gamma}),$$

where \mathring{d} is the exterior derivative of the sphere. Since $((\nabla - \mathring{\nabla})\mathring{d}h)_{AB} = (\mathring{Y}_{AB}^C - \mathring{Y}_{AB}^C)\mathring{d}_C h$, and $|\mathring{Y} - \mathring{Y}| \lesssim \varepsilon r^{-2}$, it follows that

$$|r^2(\mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla - \mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla})h| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{r} \sum_{k=0}^2 |(r\mathring{\nabla})^k h|.$$

Similarly $\sum_{k=0}^2 |(r\mathring{\nabla})^k h| \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^2 |(r\mathring{\nabla})^k h|$. Let now h be a function with $h_{\ell=0} = h_{\ell=1} = 0$. It follows that,

$$\sum_{k=0}^2 \int_{S_{u,v}} |(r\mathring{\nabla})^k h_{\ell \geq 2}|^2 d\theta \lesssim \int_{S_{u,v}} |r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla h|^2 d\theta + \frac{\varepsilon}{r} \sum_{k=0}^2 \int_{S_{u,v}} |(r\mathring{\nabla})^k h|^2 d\theta.$$

Hence, if ε_0 is sufficiently small,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^2 \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k h\|_{S_{u,v}} &\lesssim \|r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla h\|_{S_{u,v}} + \sum_{k=0}^2 \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (h_{\ell \geq 2} - h_{\ell \geq 2}^{\circ})\|_{S_{u,v}} \\ &\lesssim \|r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla h\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|h\|_{S_{u,v}} \left(\sum_{k=0}^2 \sum_{m=-1}^1 \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1)\|_{S_{u,v}} + r^{-2} \|\mathring{g} - r^2 \mathring{\gamma}\|_{S_{u,v}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

since $h_{\ell \geq 2} - h_{\ell \geq 2}^{\circ} = h_{\ell=1}^{\circ} - h_{\ell=1} + h_{\ell=0}^{\circ} - h_{\ell=0}$. The estimate (9.3.3), for $l = 2$, then follows, using the bound (9.3.1) for $\mathring{g} - r^2 \mathring{\gamma}$ and $Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1$, if ε_0 is sufficiently small since, for any function h , $\mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla h_{\ell \geq 2} = \mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla} h$. For $l \geq 3$ the proof of (9.3.3) follows similarly using now the fact that, that, for any smooth function h ,

$$\sum_{k=0}^l \int_{S_{u,v}} |(r\mathring{\nabla})^k h_{\ell \geq 2}|^2 d\theta \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{l-2} \int_{S_{u,v}} |(r\mathring{\nabla})^k r^2 \mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla} h|^2 d\theta.$$

The proof of (9.3.4) follows similarly using the decomposition of Proposition 1.4.3. \square

The next proposition concerns L^2 elliptic estimates for div-curl-trace systems.

Proposition 9.3.4 (Elliptic estimates for div-curl-trace systems). *In either the \mathcal{H}^+ or the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, let ξ be an S -tangent totally symmetric $(0, j+1)$ tensor satisfying*

$$r\mathring{d}\mathring{v}\xi = a, \quad r\mathring{c}\mathring{v}\mathring{r}\mathring{l}\xi = b, \quad \text{tr}\xi = c,$$

where $\text{tr}\xi := 0$ if $j = 0$. Then, for any $1 \leq l \leq N+1$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^l \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \xi\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} (\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k a\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k b\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k c\|_{S_{u,v}}). \quad (9.3.5)$$

If ξ is an S -tangent symmetric traceless $(0, 2)$ tensor such that

$$r\mathring{d}\mathring{v}\xi = a,$$

then

$$\sum_{k=0}^l \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \xi\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k a\|_{S_{u,v}}. \quad (9.3.6)$$

Finally, if ξ is an S -tangent symmetric traceless $(0, 2)$ tensor such that

$$r^2 \mathring{d}\mathring{v}\mathring{d}\mathring{v}\xi = a, \quad r^2 \mathring{c}\mathring{v}\mathring{r}\mathring{l}\mathring{d}\mathring{v}\xi = b,$$

then, for any $2 \leq l \leq N+1$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^l \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \xi\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{l-2} (\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k a\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k b\|_{S_{u,v}}). \quad (9.3.7)$$

Proof. The proof, given the bounds (9.3.1) and (9.3.2) on $\not{g} - r^2\hat{\gamma}$, is standard and so is only sketched. For more details see, for example, Section 7.3 of [Chr09].

Consider first (9.3.5) and note the identity

$$\int_{S_{u,v}} |r\nabla\xi|^2 + (j+1)r^2K|\xi|^2 d\theta = \int_{S_{u,v}} |a|^2 + |b|^2 + jr^2K|c|^2 d\theta.$$

This immediately yields (9.3.5) for $l = 1$. For $l \geq 2$, the proof follows inductively by relating the higher order symmetrised gradients of ξ ,

$$\nabla^s \xi_{BA_1 \dots A_{j+1}} := \frac{1}{j+2} \left(\nabla_B \xi_{A_1 \dots A_{j+1}} + \sum_{i=1}^{j+1} \nabla_{A_i} \xi_{A_1 \dots A_{i-1} B A_{i+1} \dots A_{j+1}} \right),$$

to symmetrised gradients of a , b and c , and using the estimate (9.3.2) on derivatives of the Gauss curvature.

The estimate (9.3.6) follows from (9.3.5) and the fact that

$$\text{curl} \xi = {}^* \text{div} \xi,$$

if ξ is an S -tangent symmetric traceless $(0,2)$ tensor.

Finally, to show (9.3.7), first note that it follows from (9.3.5) that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{l-1} \|(r\nabla)^k r \text{div} \xi\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{l-2} (\|(r\nabla)^k a\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|(r\nabla)^k b\|_{S_{u,v}}).$$

The proof then follows from (9.3.6). □

9.4 Error estimates arising from mode projections

In this section, we shall give estimates for various nonlinear error terms which arise from different ways of applying mode projections.

In contrast to Section 9.3 where we only used tangential bounds (9.2.2), (9.3.1) and (9.3.2) on spheres $S_{u,v}$, in the present section, we will appeal to additional bounds following from the main bootstrap estimate (7.1.4), including order bounds on other Ricci coefficients like the expansion $\Omega \text{tr} \chi$ and the shear $\hat{\chi}$.

9.4.1 Estimates for spherical harmonic functions and their eigenvalues

First, estimates are given for the differences $Y_m^1 - \hat{Y}_m^1$ of the $\ell = 1$ spherical harmonics with their round counterparts.

Recall the definitions of Section 1.4.2. Note that there is a discrepancy between the number of derivatives estimated in the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges in the following proposition. This discrepancy is due to the fact that, in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, the estimates for $(r\nabla)^N \Omega \hat{\chi}$ and $(r\nabla)^N \Omega \text{tr} \chi$ grow in v . Though a more optimal statement, in terms of number of derivatives of $\partial_u Y_m^1$ and $\partial_u \hat{Y}_m^1$ estimated, can be made in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, such a statement is not used anywhere and so only non-optimal estimates are stated for simplicity.

Proposition 9.4.1 (Estimates for $Y_m^1 - \hat{Y}_m^1$). *In the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, for all $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$, the differences $Y_m^1 - \hat{Y}_m^1$, for $m = -1, 0, 1$, for any $l \leq N$,*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{l+1} \|(r\nabla)^k (Y_m^1 - \hat{Y}_m^1)\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^l \|(r\nabla)^k (\not{g} - r^2\hat{\gamma})\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}. \quad (9.4.1)$$

and the derivatives $\partial_u Y_m^1$ and $\partial_v Y_m^1$, for $m = -1, 0, 1$, satisfy, for $|\gamma| \leq N - 1 - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$, and $k = 0, 1$,

$$\|(r\nabla)^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_u Y_m^1\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} + \|(r\nabla)^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_v Y_m^1\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{v^{\frac{s}{2}}}. \quad (9.4.2)$$

In the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, for all $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$, $v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v \leq v_\infty$, the differences $Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1$, for $m = -1, 0, 1$, satisfy, for any $l \leq N + 1$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{l+1} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k(Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1)\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^l \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k(\not{g} - r^2\mathring{\gamma})\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}. \quad (9.4.3)$$

and the derivatives $\partial_u Y_m^1$ and $\partial_v Y_m^1$, for $m = -1, 0, 1$, satisfy, for $|\gamma| \leq N - 1 - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$, and $k = 0, 1, 2$,

$$r\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_u Y_m^1\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} + r^2\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_v Y_m^1\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u^{\frac{s}{2}}}. \quad (9.4.4)$$

Proof. Consider first (9.4.1) and (9.4.3) for $l = 0$. First note that, for $m = -1, 0, 1$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^2 \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k(\mathring{Y}_m^1)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \|r(\mathring{\mathcal{F}} - \mathring{\mathcal{F}})\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|\not{g} - r^2\mathring{\gamma}\|_{S_{u,v}}. \quad (9.4.5)$$

Indeed,

$$-\mathcal{P}_2^* \mathring{\nabla} \mathring{Y}_m^1 = \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathring{\nabla} (Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1) = (\mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla} - \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathring{\nabla}) \mathring{Y}_m^1, \quad (9.4.6)$$

where $\mathring{\nabla}$ denotes the Levi-Civita connection of the round metric $r^2\mathring{\gamma}$, and $\mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^*$ denotes the corresponding symmetric traceless gradient operator. As in the proof of Proposition 9.3.3, it follows that

$$|r^2(\mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla} - \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathring{\nabla}) \mathring{Y}_m^1| \lesssim r|\mathring{\mathcal{F}} - \mathring{\mathcal{F}}| + |\not{g} - r^2\mathring{\gamma}|,$$

and so (9.4.5) follows from Proposition 9.3.3. Similarly, the fact that $\int Y_m^1 \sqrt{\det \gamma} d\theta^1 d\theta^2 = 0$ implies that

$$|(\mathring{Y}_m^1)_{\ell=0}| \lesssim \|\not{g} - r^2\mathring{\gamma}\|_{S_{u,v}}.$$

Recall now the notation of Section 1.4.2. Since $\check{Y}_m^1 := \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}^1} \mathring{Y}_m^1$ it follows that $(\check{Y}_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1)_{\ell=1} = 0$ for $m = -1, 0, 1$. Moreover,

$$|\|\mathring{Y}_m^1\|_{S_{u,v}} - 1| \lesssim \|\not{g} - r^2\mathring{\gamma}\|_{S_{u,v}}, \quad (9.4.7)$$

and, since $\|\mathring{Y}_m^1\|_{S_{u,v}} = \|(\mathring{Y}_m^1)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|(\mathring{Y}_m^1)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|(\mathring{Y}_m^1)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v}}$ and $\|\check{Y}_m^1\|_{S_{u,v}} = \|(\check{Y}_m^1)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}}$, it follows from (9.4.5) and (9.4.7) that

$$|\|\check{Y}_m^1\|_{S_{u,v}} - 1| \lesssim \|r(\mathring{\mathcal{F}} - \mathring{\mathcal{F}})\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|\not{g} - r^2\mathring{\gamma}\|_{S_{u,v}}.$$

Now $Y_{-1}^1 = \|\check{Y}_{-1}^1\|_{S_{u,v}}^{-1} \check{Y}_{-1}^1$ and so

$$\sum_{k=0}^2 \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k(Y_{-1}^1 - \mathring{Y}_{-1}^1)\|_{S_{u,v}} \leq \sum_{k=0}^2 \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k(\check{Y}_{-1}^1 - \mathring{Y}_{-1}^1)\|_{S_{u,v}} + |\|\check{Y}_{-1}^1\|_{S_{u,v}}^{-1} - 1| \sum_{k=0}^2 \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \check{Y}_{-1}^1\|_{S_{u,v}}.$$

The estimates (9.4.1) and (9.4.3) for $m = -1$ then follow. Similarly for Y_0^1 and Y_1^1 . The proof of (9.4.1) for $1 \leq l \leq N - 1 - s$ and the proof of (9.4.3) for $1 \leq l \leq N - s$ are similar.

The main difficulty in the estimates (9.4.2) and (9.4.4) are in the $\ell \geq 2$ modes of $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_v Y_m^1$ and $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_u Y_m^1$. For the $\ell = 0$ modes, for example, one uses the fact that $(Y_m^1)_{\ell=0} = 0$ and so, in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge for example,

$$0 = \partial_v((Y_m^1)_{\ell=0}) = (\partial_v Y_m^1)_{\ell=0} + \left(\int_{S_{u,v}} d\theta \right)^{-1} \int_{S_{u,v}} Y_m^1 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o)_{\ell \geq 1} d\theta,$$

to which one can apply \mathfrak{D}^γ . Similarly for the $\ell = 1$ modes, using again the fact that $(\check{Y}_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1)_{\ell=1} = 0$. Consider, therefore, the estimates (9.4.2) and (9.4.4) for the $\ell \geq 2$ modes. For the $\partial_v Y_m^1$ estimate of (9.4.2), consider first the case that $|\gamma| = 0$. First note that (9.4.6) implies that

$$r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathring{\nabla} \partial_v Y_m^1 = [r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathring{\nabla}, \Omega \mathring{\nabla}_4](Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1) + \Omega \mathring{\nabla}_4 \left(r^2 (\mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla} - \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathring{\nabla}) \mathring{Y}_m^1 \right).$$

As in the proof of Proposition 9.3.3,

$$-2r^2(\mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^*\mathring{\nabla} - \mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^*\mathring{\nabla})\mathring{Y}_m^1 = 2r(\mathring{\mathcal{F}} - \mathring{\mathcal{F}}) \cdot r\mathring{\nabla}\mathring{Y}_m^1 - r^2(\mathring{\Delta} - \mathring{\Delta})\mathring{Y}_m^1 \cdot \mathring{g} + 2(\mathring{g} - r^2\mathring{\gamma})\mathring{Y}_m^1,$$

and moreover

$$\begin{aligned} \mathring{\nabla}_4(r(\mathring{\mathcal{F}} - \mathring{\mathcal{F}}))_{AB}^C &= r\mathring{\nabla}_A(\Omega\chi)_B^C + r\mathring{\nabla}_B(\Omega\chi)_A^C - r\mathring{\nabla}^C(\Omega\chi)_{AB} \\ &\quad - \Omega\hat{\chi}_A^D r(\mathring{\mathcal{F}} - \mathring{\mathcal{F}})_{DB}^C - \Omega\hat{\chi}_B^D r(\mathring{\mathcal{F}} - \mathring{\mathcal{F}})_{AD}^C + \Omega\hat{\chi}_D^C r(\mathring{\mathcal{F}} - \mathring{\mathcal{F}})_{AB}^D, \end{aligned} \quad (9.4.8)$$

and

$$\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4(\mathring{g} - r^2\mathring{\gamma})_{AB} = (\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_\circ)r^2\mathring{\gamma}_{AB} + \Omega\hat{\chi}_A^C r^2\mathring{\gamma}_{CB} + \Omega\hat{\chi}_B^C r^2\mathring{\gamma}_{AC}.$$

The proof of the $\partial_v Y_m^1$ estimate of (9.4.2) then follows from Lemma 3.3.1, the estimate (9.4.1), Proposition 9.3.3 and the bootstrap assumption (7.1.4) on the Ricci coefficients and curvature components. Consider now the $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_v Y_m^1$ estimate of (9.4.2) for $|\gamma| \neq 0$, and first the case that $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = (r\mathring{\nabla})^k$, for some $k \leq N-1-s$. Note that the principal terms above are the $\mathring{\nabla}(\Omega\chi)$ terms in (9.4.8). If $k \leq 2$ then proof is as above. For $3 \leq k \leq N-1-s$ the proof follows similarly by commuting (9.4.6) with $(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k-2}\partial_v$ and using the fact that

$$\sum_{l \leq N-1-s} (\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^l \Omega\hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^l (\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_\circ)\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{v^{\frac{s}{2}}}.$$

For general \mathfrak{D}^γ with $|\gamma| \leq N-1-s$, which contains at least one $\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3$ or $r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4$ derivative, the proof is similar (one even controls $\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^2 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_v Y_m^1\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}$, commuting (9.4.6) with \mathfrak{D}^γ and using the fact that, from (7.1.4), we have from (7.1.4) the estimate

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} \Omega\hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} (\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_\circ)\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{v^{\frac{s}{2}}},$$

for all $|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq N-s$ provided $\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}}$ contains at least one $\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3$ or $r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4$ derivative.

The proof of the $\partial_u Y_m^1$ estimate of (9.4.2) is similar, and is in fact slightly easier since one has better estimates for $\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}$ than for $\Omega\hat{\chi}$, using now the fact that

$$r^2 \mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla} \partial_u Y_m^1 = [r^2 \mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla}, \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3](Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1) + \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3 \left(r^2 (\mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla} - \mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla}) \mathring{Y}_m^1 \right),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathring{\nabla}_3(r(\mathring{\mathcal{F}} - \mathring{\mathcal{F}}))_{AB}^C &= r\mathring{\nabla}_A(\Omega\chi)_B^C + r\mathring{\nabla}_B(\Omega\chi)_A^C - r\mathring{\nabla}^C(\Omega\chi)_{AB} \\ &\quad - \Omega\hat{\chi}_A^D r(\mathring{\mathcal{F}} - \mathring{\mathcal{F}})_{DB}^C - \Omega\hat{\chi}_B^D r(\mathring{\mathcal{F}} - \mathring{\mathcal{F}})_{AD}^C + \Omega\hat{\chi}_D^C r(\mathring{\mathcal{F}} - \mathring{\mathcal{F}})_{AB}^D, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3(\mathring{g} - r^2\mathring{\gamma})_{AB} = (\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_\circ)r^2\mathring{\gamma}_{AB} + \Omega\hat{\chi}_A^C r^2\mathring{\gamma}_{CB} + \Omega\hat{\chi}_B^C r^2\mathring{\gamma}_{AC}.$$

The proof of (9.4.4) is similar, and is again slightly easier due to the better estimates for $\hat{\chi}$ in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge. One simply commutes (9.4.6) with $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_u$ and $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_v$ and uses the estimates

$$r\|\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} \Omega\hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} + r^2\|\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} (\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_\circ)\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} + r^2\|\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} \Omega\hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} + r^2\|\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} (\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_\circ)\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u^{\frac{s}{2}}},$$

for any $|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq N-s$, contained in (7.1.4). Note the better behaviour in r of the commutator $[r^2 \mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla}, \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4]$, and of $\mathring{\nabla}_4(r(\mathring{\mathcal{F}} - \mathring{\mathcal{F}}))$ and $\mathring{\nabla}_4(\mathring{g} - r^2\mathring{\gamma})$, compared to $[r^2 \mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla}, \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3]$, $\mathring{\nabla}_3(r(\mathring{\mathcal{F}} - \mathring{\mathcal{F}}))$ and $\mathring{\nabla}_3(\mathring{g} - r^2\mathring{\gamma})$. \square

Recall that the round $\ell = 1$ modes, \mathring{Y}_m^1 , are eigenvalues of the round spherical Laplacian, $r^2\mathring{\Delta}$, with eigenvalue -2 . The following proposition shows that the $\ell = 1$ modes Y_m^1 are almost eigenvalues of $r^2\Delta$ with eigenvalue -2 .

Proposition 9.4.2 (Y_m^1 are almost eigenvalues of $\mathring{\Delta}$). *In the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, for all $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$, the $\ell = 1$ modes Y_m^1 , for $m = -1, 0, 1$, satisfy, for any $|\gamma| \leq N - 1 - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(r^2\mathring{\Delta} + 2)Y_m^1\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{v^{\frac{s}{2}}}.$$

In the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, for all $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$, $v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v \leq v_\infty$, the $\ell = 1$ modes Y_m^1 , for $m = -1, 0, 1$, satisfy, for any $|\gamma| \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(r^2\mathring{\Delta} + 2)Y_m^1\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{ru^{\frac{s}{2}}}.$$

Proof. Proposition 9.4.1 in particular implies that

$$\sum_{k \leq 2} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1-s} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(r\mathring{\nabla})^k(Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1)^{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{v^{\frac{s}{2}}}, \quad \sum_{k \leq 2} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(r\mathring{\nabla})^k(Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1)^{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{ru^{\frac{s}{2}}},$$

in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge and \mathcal{I}^+ gauge respectively. Since $r^2\mathring{\Delta}\mathring{Y}_m^1 = -2\mathring{Y}_m^1$, it follows that,

$$(r^2\mathring{\Delta} + 2)Y_m^1 = r^2\mathring{\Delta}(Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1) + r^2(\mathring{\Delta} - \mathring{\Delta})\mathring{Y}_m^1 + 2(Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1),$$

and, after applying \mathfrak{D}^γ , it follows, as in the proof of Proposition 9.4.1, that

$$|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(r^2\mathring{\Delta} + 2)Y_m^1| \lesssim \sum_{k \leq 2} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(r\mathring{\nabla})^k(Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1)| + r|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\mathring{\nabla} - \mathring{\nabla})| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\mathring{g} - r^2\mathring{\gamma})|,$$

and the proof follows from Proposition 9.4.1 and the bootstrap assumptions on $\mathring{g} - r^2\mathring{\gamma}$ contained in (7.1.4) in the two gauges. \square

9.4.2 Commuting mode projections with derivative operators

In this section, estimates are given for the nonlinear error terms which arise when projections of functions and S -tangent 1-forms to their $\ell = 0$, $\ell = 1$ and $\ell \geq 2$ modes are commuted with certain derivative operators. See Proposition 9.4.3, Proposition 9.4.4 and Proposition 9.4.5 below.

The following proposition gives estimates for the nonlinear error terms generated by commuting projections of a function to its $\ell = 0$, $\ell = 1$ and $\ell \geq 2$ modes with the operators $\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3$ and $\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4$.

Proposition 9.4.3 (Estimates for commutator of mode projections with $\mathring{\nabla}_3$ and $\mathring{\nabla}_4$ derivatives). *If f is a function in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge then, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$ and any $|\gamma| \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3 f)_{\ell=0} - \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3(f_{\ell=0}))\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3 f)_{\ell=1} - \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3(f_{\ell=1}))\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \\ & + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3 f)_{\ell \geq 2} - \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3(f_{\ell \geq 2}))\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{v^{\frac{s}{2}}} \sum_{|\gamma_1| \leq |\gamma|} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (9.4.9)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 f)_{\ell=0} - \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4(f_{\ell=0}))\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 f)_{\ell=1} - \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4(f_{\ell=1}))\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \\ & + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 f)_{\ell \geq 2} - \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4(f_{\ell \geq 2}))\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{v^{\frac{s}{2}}} \sum_{|\gamma_1| \leq |\gamma|} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}. \end{aligned} \quad (9.4.10)$$

Similarly, if f is a function in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge then, for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$, $v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v \leq v_\infty$ and any $|\gamma| \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3 f)_{\ell=0} - \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3(f_{\ell=0}))\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3 f)_{\ell=1} - \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3(f_{\ell=1}))\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \\ & + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3 f)_{\ell \geq 2} - \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3(f_{\ell \geq 2}))\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{ru^{\frac{s}{2}}} \sum_{|\gamma_1| \leq |\gamma|} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}, \end{aligned} \quad (9.4.11)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \left((\Omega \nabla_4 f)_{\ell=0} - \Omega \nabla_4 (f_{\ell=0}) \right) \right\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} + \left\| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \left((\Omega \nabla_4 f)_{\ell=1} - \Omega \nabla_4 (f_{\ell=1}) \right) \right\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \\ & + \left\| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \left((\Omega \nabla_4 f)_{\ell \geq 2} - \Omega \nabla_4 (f_{\ell \geq 2}) \right) \right\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{r^2 u^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}} \sum_{|\gamma_1| \leq |\gamma|} \left\| \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f \right\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}. \end{aligned} \quad (9.4.12)$$

Proof. Consider first (9.4.12), and recall that, in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, the double null frame takes the form

$$e_1 = \partial_{\theta^1}, \quad e_2 = \partial_{\theta^2}, \quad e_3 = \frac{1}{\Omega} \partial_u, \quad e_4 = \frac{1}{\Omega} (\partial_v + b^A \partial_{\theta^A}).$$

In what follows $\partial_v f_{\ell=0} = \partial_v (f_{\ell=0})$ etc.

First,

$$\partial_v f_{\ell=0} = \partial_v \left(\left(\int_{S_{u,v}} d\theta \right)^{-1} \int_{S_{u,v}} f d\theta \right) = (\partial_v f)_{\ell=0} + \left(\int_{S_{u,v}} d\theta \right)^{-1} \int_{S_{u,v}} f (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)_{\ell \geq 1} d\theta,$$

as $\partial_v (r^{-2} \sqrt{\det g}) = (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ) r^{-2} \sqrt{\det g}$, and so

$$\left| (\Omega \nabla_4 f)_{\ell=0} - \Omega \nabla_4 (f_{\ell=0}) \right| \lesssim \|f\|_{S_{u,v}} \|\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ\|_{S_{u,v}}.$$

Similarly, for any multi index γ ,

$$\left| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \left((\Omega \nabla_4 f)_{\ell=0} - \Omega \nabla_4 (f_{\ell=0}) \right) \right| \lesssim \sum_{k_2+k_3+l_2+l_3 \leq |\gamma|} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} f\|_{S_{u,v}} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{l}} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)\|_{S_{u,v}}$$

where $\underline{k} = (0, k_2, k_3)$, $\underline{l} = (0, l_2, l_3)$ and $\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} = (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{k_2} (r \Omega \nabla_4)^{k_3}$, $\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{l}} = (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{l_2} (r \Omega \nabla_4)^{l_3}$, so that, in particular, no angular derivatives of $\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ$ appear.

For $f_{\ell=1}$, note first that,

$$\partial_v f_{\ell=1} = \sum_{m=-1}^1 \partial_v \left(\int_{S_{u,v}} f Y_m^1 d\theta Y_m^1 \right),$$

and so

$$\partial_v f_{\ell=1} = (\partial_v f)_{\ell=1} + \sum_{m=-1}^1 \left[\int_{S_{u,v}} f \partial_v Y_m^1 + f Y_m^1 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ) d\theta Y_m^1 + \int_{S_{u,v}} f Y_m^1 d\theta \partial_v Y_m^1 \right],$$

so that

$$\left| \Omega \nabla_4 f_{\ell=1} - (\Omega \nabla_4 f)_{\ell=1} \right| \lesssim \|f\|_{S_{u,v}} \left(\|\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ\|_{S_{u,v}} + \sum_{m=-1}^1 (\|\partial_v Y_m^1\|_{S_{u,v}} + |\partial_v Y_m^1|) \right).$$

Similarly, for any multi index γ , by Proposition 9.4.1,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \left(\Omega \nabla_4 f_{\ell=1} - (\Omega \nabla_4 f)_{\ell=1} \right) \right\|_{S_{u,v}} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\gamma_1|+|\gamma_2| \leq |\gamma|} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f\|_{S_{u,v}} \left(\sum_{l_2+l_3 \leq |\gamma_2|} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{l}} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)\|_{S_{u,v}} + \sum_{m=-1}^1 \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \partial_v Y_m^1\|_{S_{u,v}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\underline{l} = (0, l_2, l_3)$ and $\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{l}} = (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{l_2} (r \Omega \nabla_4)^{l_3}$, so that no angular derivatives of $\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ$ appear. The estimate (9.4.12) then follows from the fact that

$$\Omega \nabla_4 f_{\ell \geq 2} - (\Omega \nabla_4 f)_{\ell \geq 2} = (\Omega \nabla_4 f)_{\ell=1} - \Omega \nabla_4 f_{\ell=1} + (\Omega \nabla_4 f)_{\ell=0} - \Omega \nabla_4 f_{\ell=0},$$

the estimate for $\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ$ provided directly by the bootstrap estimate (7.1.4) and Proposition 9.4.1. The proof of (9.4.11), and (9.4.9) and (9.4.10), are similar. \square

The next proposition similarly gives estimates for the nonlinear error terms generated by commuting projections of an S -tangent 1-form to its $\ell = 1$ and $\ell \geq 2$ modes with the operators $\Omega \nabla_3$ and $\Omega \nabla_4$.

Proposition 9.4.4 (Estimates for commutator of mode projections with ∇_3 and ∇_4 derivatives for S -tangent 1-forms). *If ξ is an S -tangent 1-form in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge then, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$ and any $|\gamma| \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\Omega \nabla_3 \xi)_{\ell=1} - \Omega \nabla_3(\xi_{\ell=1}))\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\Omega \nabla_3 \xi)_{\ell \geq 2} - \Omega \nabla_3(\xi_{\ell \geq 2}))\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{v^{\frac{s}{2}}} \sum_{|\gamma_1| \leq |\gamma|} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \xi\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}, \quad (9.4.13)$$

and

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\Omega \nabla_4 \xi)_{\ell=1} - \Omega \nabla_4(\xi_{\ell=1}))\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\Omega \nabla_4 \xi)_{\ell \geq 2} - \Omega \nabla_4(\xi_{\ell \geq 2}))\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{v^{\frac{s}{2}}} \sum_{|\gamma_1| \leq |\gamma|} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \xi\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}. \quad (9.4.14)$$

Similarly, if ξ is an S -tangent 1-form in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge then, for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$, $v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v \leq v_\infty$ and any $|\gamma| \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\Omega \nabla_3 \xi)_{\ell=1} - \Omega \nabla_3(\xi_{\ell=1}))\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\Omega \nabla_3 \xi)_{\ell \geq 2} - \Omega \nabla_3(\xi_{\ell \geq 2}))\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{ru^{\frac{s}{2}}} \sum_{|\gamma_1| \leq |\gamma|} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \xi\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}, \quad (9.4.15)$$

and

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\Omega \nabla_4 \xi)_{\ell=1} - \Omega \nabla_4(\xi_{\ell=1}))\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\Omega \nabla_4 \xi)_{\ell \geq 2} - \Omega \nabla_4(\xi_{\ell \geq 2}))\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{r^2 u^{\frac{s}{2}}} \sum_{|\gamma_1| \leq |\gamma|} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \xi\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}. \quad (9.4.16)$$

Proof. Consider first (9.4.15) with $|\gamma| = 0$. Recall the notation of Proposition 1.4.3 and note that

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \xi = \Omega \nabla_3 (r \nabla h_{1,\xi} + r^* \nabla h_{2,\xi}) = r \nabla \Omega \nabla_3 h_{1,\xi} + r^* \nabla \Omega \nabla_3 h_{2,\xi} + [\Omega \nabla_3, r \nabla] h_{1,\xi} + [\Omega \nabla_3, r^* \nabla] h_{2,\xi},$$

and so

$$|(\Omega \nabla_3 \xi)_{\ell=1} - (r \nabla(\Omega \nabla_3 h_{1,\xi})_{\ell=1} + r^* \nabla(\Omega \nabla_3 h_{2,\xi})_{\ell=1})| \lesssim |[\Omega \nabla_3, r \nabla] h_{1,\xi} + [\Omega \nabla_3, r^* \nabla] h_{2,\xi}|.$$

Proposition 9.4.3 implies that

$$\|r \nabla \Omega \nabla_3 (h_{1,\xi})_{\ell=1} + r^* \nabla \Omega \nabla_3 (h_{2,\xi})_{\ell=1} - (r \nabla(\Omega \nabla_3 h_{1,\xi})_{\ell=1} + r^* \nabla(\Omega \nabla_3 h_{2,\xi})_{\ell=1})\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{ru} \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}},$$

using the Poincaré inequality, Proposition 9.3.2, and the fact that $\|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 = \|r \nabla h_{1,\xi}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|r^* \nabla h_{2,\xi}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2$. Since $\Omega \nabla_3(\xi_{\ell=1}) = \Omega \nabla_3 r \nabla (h_{1,\xi})_{\ell=1} + \Omega \nabla_3 r^* \nabla (h_{2,\xi})_{\ell=1}$, it therefore follows that

$$\|(\Omega \nabla_3 \xi)_{\ell=1} - \Omega \nabla_3(\xi_{\ell=1})\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \|[\Omega \nabla_3, r \nabla] h_{1,\xi}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|[\Omega \nabla_3, r^* \nabla] h_{2,\xi}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{ru} \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}},$$

and the proof follows from Lemma 3.3.1.

The proof when $|\gamma| \neq 0$ and the proofs of (9.4.13), (9.4.14) and (9.4.16) are similar. \square

The final proposition of this section gives estimates for the nonlinear error terms generated by commuting projections of an S -tangent 1-form to its $\ell = 1$ and $\ell \geq 2$ modes with the operators $\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{I}v$ and $\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{I}r\mathfrak{l}$.

Proposition 9.4.5 (Estimates for commutator of mode projections with $\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{I}v$ and $\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{I}r\mathfrak{l}$). *If ξ is an S -tangent 1-form in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge then, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$ and any $|\gamma| \leq N - 1 - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((r \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{I}v \xi)_{\ell=1} - r \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{I}v(\xi_{\ell=1}))\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((r \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{I}v \xi)_{\ell \geq 2} - r \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{I}v(\xi_{\ell \geq 2}))\|_{S_{u,v}} \\ & + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((r \mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{I}r\mathfrak{l} \xi)_{\ell=1} - r \mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{I}r\mathfrak{l}(\xi_{\ell=1}))\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((r \mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{I}r\mathfrak{l} \xi)_{\ell \geq 2} - r \mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{I}r\mathfrak{l}(\xi_{\ell \geq 2}))\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{v^{\frac{s}{2}}} \sum_{|\gamma_1| \leq |\gamma|} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if ξ is an S -tangent 1-form in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge then, for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$, $v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v \leq v_\infty$ and any $|\gamma| \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\text{rd}\mathfrak{I}v\xi)_{\ell=1} - \text{rd}\mathfrak{I}v(\xi_{\ell=1}))\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\text{rd}\mathfrak{I}v\xi)_{\ell \geq 2} - \text{rd}\mathfrak{I}v(\xi_{\ell \geq 2}))\|_{S_{u,v}} \\ & + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\text{rcurl}\xi)_{\ell=1} - \text{rcurl}(\xi_{\ell=1}))\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma((\text{rcurl}\xi)_{\ell \geq 2} - \text{rcurl}(\xi_{\ell \geq 2}))\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{ru^{\frac{s}{2}}} \sum_{|\gamma_1| \leq |\gamma|} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Recall the decomposition $\xi = r\mathring{\nabla}h_{1,\xi} + r^*\mathring{\nabla}h_{2,\xi}$ and note that, in both the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges,

$$(\text{rd}\mathfrak{I}v\xi)_{\ell=1} = (r^2\mathring{\Delta}h_{1,\xi})_{\ell=1} = \sum_{m=-1}^1 \int_{S_{u,v}} r^2\mathring{\Delta}h_{1,\xi} \cdot Y_m^1 d\theta Y_m^1 = \sum_{m=-1}^1 \int_{S_{u,v}} h_{1,\xi} \cdot r^2\mathring{\Delta}Y_m^1 d\theta Y_m^1,$$

and

$$\text{rd}\mathfrak{I}v(\xi_{\ell=1}) = r^2\mathring{\Delta}((h_{1,\xi})_{\ell=1}) = \sum_{m=-1}^1 \int_{S_{u,v}} h_{1,\xi} \cdot Y_m^1 d\theta r^2\mathring{\Delta}Y_m^1.$$

It follows that

$$(\text{rd}\mathfrak{I}v\xi)_{\ell=1} - \text{rd}\mathfrak{I}v(\xi_{\ell=1}) = \sum_{m=-1}^1 \left(\int_{S_{u,v}} h_{1,\xi} \cdot (r^2\mathring{\Delta} + 2)Y_m^1 d\theta Y_m^1 - \int_{S_{u,v}} h_{1,\xi} \cdot Y_m^1 d\theta (r^2\mathring{\Delta} + 2)Y_m^1 \right),$$

and Proposition 9.4.2 implies, for example in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge,

$$\|(\text{rd}\mathfrak{I}v\xi)_{\ell=1} - \text{rd}\mathfrak{I}v(\xi_{\ell=1})\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \|h_{1,\xi}\|_{S_{u,v}} \|(r^2\mathring{\Delta} + 2)Y_m^1\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{ru} \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}},$$

by the Poincaré inequality, Proposition 9.3.2, and the fact that $\|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 = \|r\mathring{\nabla}h_{1,\xi}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|r^*\mathring{\nabla}h_{2,\xi}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2$. The proof of the first part of the two estimates then follows for the case that $|\gamma| = 0$. The remainder of the proof is similar after noting that $(\text{d}\mathfrak{I}v\xi)_{\ell \geq 2} - \text{d}\mathfrak{I}v(\xi_{\ell \geq 2}) = \text{d}\mathfrak{I}v(\xi_{\ell=1}) - (\text{d}\mathfrak{I}v\xi)_{\ell=1}$ and $\text{rcurl}\xi = -r^2\mathring{\Delta}h_{2,\xi}$. \square

9.4.3 $\ell = 1$ modes of Gauss curvature

The following proposition shows that, in each of the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges, the $\ell = 1$ modes of the Gauss curvature K vanish to linear order.

Proposition 9.4.6 ($\ell = 1$ modes of the Gauss curvature vanish to linear order). *The $\ell = 1$ modes of the Gauss curvature, in the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges, satisfy the estimates*

$$|(r^2K^{\mathcal{I}^+})_{\ell=1}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^2u} \quad \text{and} \quad |(r^2K^{\mathcal{H}^+})_{\ell=1}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v},$$

in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ respectively.

Proof. Expanding the Gauss curvature K of the metric g in terms of $g - r^2\hat{\gamma}$ we obtain the formula

$$r^2K - 1 = -\frac{1}{4} (r^2\mathring{\Delta} + 2) \text{tr}_g (g - r^2\hat{\gamma}) + \frac{1}{2} r^2 \text{d}\mathfrak{I}v \text{d}\mathfrak{I}v (\widehat{g - r^2\hat{\gamma}}) + (r^2K)_{NL}, \quad (9.4.17)$$

where the non-linear error $(r^2K)_{NL}$ is a finite sum of terms, each of them at least quadratic in $(g - r^2\hat{\gamma})$ and involving two angular derivatives. Equation (9.4.17) is valid both the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge and the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge.

In the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, the aforementioned structure of the non-linear error $(r^2K)_{NL}$ implies that we have for $n = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ the estimate¹

$$\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^n (r^2K)_{NL}^{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^2u}. \quad (9.4.18)$$

¹Only $n = 0$ is relevant for the current proof but the estimate for higher n will be used later.

Recalling the definition (6.1.18), this is a direct consequence of the L^2 bounds for the metric components given by the estimate $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N \lesssim \varepsilon$ (in turn following from the bootstrap assumption (7.1.4)), together with the pointwise bounds (9.2.2).

In the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge we have similarly for $n = 0, 1, \dots, N-2$ the estimate

$$\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^n(r^2K)_{NL}^+\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v}. \quad (9.4.19)$$

We now multiply (9.4.17) by the $Y_m^{\ell=1}$ for $m = -1, 0, 1$ respectively and integrate over $S_{u,v}$. Integrating the angular derivative operators in the linear terms by parts, we see that the term involving $d\mathring{v}d\mathring{v}$ vanishes (this is because for $m = -1, 0, 1$ the $Y_m^{\ell=1}$ are in the kernel of $\mathcal{D}_2^*\mathring{\nabla}$, which is the adjoint of $d\mathring{v}d\mathring{v}$) while for the term involving $r^2\mathring{\Delta} + 2$ we can apply Proposition 9.4.2 to include it in the decay term appearing on the right hand side of the estimate. The proof is complete. \square

Chapter 10

Estimating diffeomorphisms and relating the gauges: the proof of Theorem C.2

This section will prove Theorem C.2, which estimates the diffeomorphisms relating the two teleological gauges to themselves and initial data, and gives some additional controls of differences of quantities in the two gauges, as well as direct estimates for some \mathcal{H}^+ quantities in terms of \mathcal{I}^+ quantities. We restate the theorem here.

Theorem C.2 (Estimating diffeomorphisms and relating the gauges). *Under the assumptions of Theorem C, then for all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$ and all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, with the gauges as defined above, the diffeomorphism functions of Section 5.6.2.3 satisfy the estimates*

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N+2}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4, \quad (8.2.1)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4, \quad (8.2.2)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4, \quad (8.2.3)$$

and the mass parameter satisfies the estimate

$$|M_f(u_f, \lambda) - M_{\text{init}}|^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4, \quad (8.2.4)$$

the improved inclusions (7.3.5)–(7.3.6) and (7.3.7)–(7.3.8) are satisfied, the “initial” energies in the teleological gauges are controlled by ε_0^2 according to the statement of Propositions 10.5.1, the differences of corresponding quantities in the two teleological gauges satisfy the statements of Propositions 10.3.2 and 10.4.1, and certain \mathcal{H}^+ quantities can be directly estimated from \mathcal{I}^+ quantities according to the statement of Proposition 10.6.1.

Contents

10.1	Estimates for the diffeomorphisms functions	167
10.1.1	Estimates for $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$	167
10.1.2	Estimates for f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}	173
10.1.3	Estimates for f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}	176
10.2	Improving the inclusion relations	178
10.3	Cancellations along a timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B}	178
10.3.1	The timelike hypersurface $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{R}}$	178
10.3.2	Cancellation between almost gauge invariant quantities on the timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B}	180
10.4	Cancellations on null hypersurfaces and spacetime regions	184

10.5	Estimates for initial energies of α and $\underline{\alpha}$	186
10.6	Estimates for \mathcal{H}^+ quantities from \mathcal{I}^+ quantities on C_{u_f}	190
10.6.1	Estimate for $\hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ from $\hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$	191
10.6.2	Estimates for $\ell = 0, 1$ modes of \mathcal{H}^+ quantities from \mathcal{I}^+ quantities	193
10.6.3	Estimate for $(\not{g} - r^2 \hat{\gamma})^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ from $(\not{g} - r^2 \hat{\gamma})^{\mathcal{I}^+}$	193

We will first prove the estimates (8.2.1)–(8.2.3) in **Section 10.1**. In **Section 10.2**, we shall obtain the improved inclusions (7.3.5)–(7.3.6) and (7.3.7)–(7.3.8) for the regions. In **Section 10.3**, we shall prove Proposition 10.3.2, which concerns cancellations between corresponding quantities in the two teleological gauges on a well-chosen timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B} . In **Section 10.4**, we shall prove Proposition 10.4.1, which concerns such cancellations when suitably integrated on null hypersurfaces and spacetime regions. In **Section 10.5**, we shall prove Proposition 10.5.1, controlling “initial” energies expressed in the teleological gauges in terms of ε_0 . Finally, in **Section 10.6**, we shall prove Proposition 10.6.1, which allows for the direct estimate of certain \mathcal{H}^+ quantities from \mathcal{I}^+ quantities.

We shall assume throughout the assumptions of Theorem C. Let us fix an arbitrary $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$, with $\hat{u}_f \in \mathfrak{B}$, and fix some $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$. All propositions below shall always refer to the anchored \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges in the spacetime $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$, corresponding to parameters $u_f, M_f(u_f, \lambda)$, whose existence is ensured by Definition 7.1.1.

The results of the present chapter depend on those of Chapter 9. The results of Section 10.3–10.5 will be used in Chapters 11–13 while the results of Section 10.6 will be used in Chapter 15. The reader can, however, skip any of the proofs here on a first reading and refer back to the statements as necessary.

10.1 Estimates for the diffeomorphisms functions

In this section we shall prove the following proposition, which gives the first part of Theorem C.2 concerning the estimates for the energies relating to the diffeomorphism functions.

Proposition 10.1.1 (Estimates for the diffeomorphisms). *The diffeomorphism functions of Section 5.6.2.3 satisfy the estimates*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N+2}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4, \\ \mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}] &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4, \\ \mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}] &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4,\end{aligned}$$

and $M_f = M_f(u_f, \lambda)$ satisfies

$$|M_f - M_{\text{init}}|^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4.$$

Remark 10.1.2. *Let us remark already that the estimates for higher order derivatives of $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ are easier to obtain on the final hypersurface C_{u_f} than they are elsewhere. These higher order estimates are used in controlling derivatives of $\hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in terms of derivatives of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ (see Proposition 10.6.1 below). It is only on C_{u_f} that any Ricci coefficients in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge are estimated in terms of Ricci coefficients in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge (and no Ricci coefficients in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge are estimated in terms of Ricci coefficients in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge). Elsewhere it is only the almost gauge invariant quantities in the two different gauges which are compared, for which the lower order estimates of (7.1.5), along with estimates on the Ricci coefficients, suffice.*

Proposition 10.1.1 follows from Proposition 10.1.6, Proposition 10.1.7, Proposition 10.1.10, and Proposition 10.1.13 below. The diffeomorphisms $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ are first estimated, followed by f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+} , and finally f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+} .

10.1.1 Estimates for $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$

Recall the pointwise norm $\mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{N-7}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}]$ of the $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ diffeomorphism functions, defined in (6.1.27).

Proposition 10.1.3. *The diffeomorphism functions $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfy the pointwise estimate*

$$\mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{N-7}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon. \quad (10.1.1)$$

Proof. The proof is an immediate consequence of the Sobolev inequality, Proposition 9.1.1, and the bootstrap assumption (7.1.5) for the energy $\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N+2}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}]$, defined in (6.1.24). \square

Note that the anchoring conditions of Definition 5.6.1 (in particular the conditions (5.6.10) and (5.6.15)) imply that

$$f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^1(u_f, v, \theta) = f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^2(u_f, v, \theta) = f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^3(u_f, v, \theta) = 0, \quad (10.1.2)$$

for all $v(R_{-2}, u_f) \leq v \leq v(R_3, u_f)$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$ such that the above diffeomorphism functions are defined.

Recall the nonlinear error notation introduced in Section 4.3.3, and recall the spacetime region $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) = \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)$ and the norm

$$\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)} := \|\xi \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}.$$

The error terms in the estimates for $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ are controlled as follows.

Lemma 10.1.4 (Estimates for $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ nonlinear error terms). *For any $u_1 \leq u \leq u_f$ and $v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v \leq v(R_3, v)$,*

$$\sum_{k \leq N-4} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}}^{1,0} \mathbf{1}\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}}^{1,0}\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)}^2 + \sum_{k \leq N-5} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}}^{2,0} \mathbf{1}\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}}^{2,0}\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^4},$$

where $\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)}$.

Proof. The proof is an immediate consequence of the pointwise estimate (10.1.1) and the fact that, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and $v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v \leq v(R_3, v)$, we have from the bootstrap assumption (7.1.5) the estimates:

$$\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f} \mathbf{1}\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2} \quad \text{for } k \leq N-5, \quad |\gamma| \leq 1,$$

and

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+} \mathbf{1}\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2} \quad \text{for } |\gamma| \leq N-3.$$

\square

Lemma 10.1.5 (Estimates for $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ nonlinear error terms on the final hypersurface). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$,*

$$\sum_{s=0,1,2} (u_f)^{s+2} \sum_{k=0}^{N-s} \int_{v(R_{-1}, u_f)}^{v(R_1, u_f)} \|\mathring{\nabla}^k \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}}^{2,0}\|_{S_{u_f, v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 dv \lesssim \varepsilon^4.$$

Proof. The proof is again a straightforward consequence of the pointwise estimate (10.1.1) and the fact that from the bootstrap assumption (7.1.5) we have

$$\sum_{s=0,1,2} (u_f)^s \left(\sum_{k=0}^{N-s} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} \int_{v(R_{-1}, u_f)}^{v(R_1, u_f)} \|\mathring{\nabla}^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}\|_{S_{u_f, v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 dv + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \int_{v(R_{-1}, u_f)}^{v(R_1, u_f)} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{S_{u_f, v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 dv \right) \lesssim \varepsilon^2.$$

\square

It is possible to estimate more derivatives of $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ than are controlled in the following proposition, though such estimates are not required and, for simplicity, are omitted.

Recall the energy $\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N+2}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}]$ from Section 6.1.9 and note that the following two propositions in particular imply that

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N+2}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4,$$

and thus complete the first part of the proof of Proposition 10.1.1.

Proposition 10.1.6 (Estimates for $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ diffeomorphisms). *The diffeomorphisms $f = f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfy the estimates, for $k \leq N - 5$ and for any $u_1 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v \leq v(R_3, u)$,*

$$\sum_{\substack{|\gamma| \leq 2 \\ k+|\gamma| \geq 1}} \left(\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^3 \mathbb{1}\|_{S_{u,v}^{x+}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^4 \mathbb{1}\|_{S_{u,v}^{x+}}^2 \right) \lesssim \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4}{u^2}, \quad (10.1.3)$$

and

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 1} \left(\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_u f \mathbb{1}\|_{S_{u,v}^{x+}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_v f \mathbb{1}\|_{S_{u,v}^{x+}}^2 \right) \lesssim \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4}{u^2}, \quad (10.1.4)$$

The $\ell = 0$ modes of f^3 and f^4 satisfy,

$$|(f^3 - f^4)_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}|^2 + \|(f^3 - f^4)_{\ell=0}\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{x+}(u)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4}{u^2}, \quad |(f^3 + f^4)_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4}{u}. \quad (10.1.5)$$

Proof. Consider first u, v satisfying $u_1 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v \leq v(R_1, u)$. For such u, v the diffeomorphism functions $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}(u, v, \cdot)$ are defined on the whole sphere \mathbb{S}^2 in view of the inclusion (5.6.9). The proof for such u, v follows from Propositions 4.3.1, 4.3.2 and 4.3.3, with $(u, v, \theta) = (u_{\mathcal{H}^+}, v_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ and $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}) = (u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ and $M = \tilde{M} = M_f$, using Lemma 10.1.4 to control the nonlinear error terms. In what follows $f = f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$. The subscript is omitted for brevity.

Derivatives of the relations in Propositions 4.3.1, 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 will be taken, and so Proposition 4.3.5, along with Proposition 4.3.4, will be used throughout the proof. The different components of the diffeomorphisms are estimated separately in a reductive manner. Lemma 10.1.4 is used throughout to estimate nonlinear error terms.

Estimate for $f_{\ell \geq 1}^3$: To begin, $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k f_{\ell \geq 1}^3$ is estimated, for $1 \leq k \leq N - 3$, by applying $(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k-1}$ to (4.3.47) and using Proposition 4.3.5 to obtain

$$3\Omega_o \rho_o (\mathring{\nabla}^{x+})^k f^3 = (\mathring{\nabla}^{k-1} \Omega \beta)^{x+} - \Pi_{S^{x+}} (\mathring{\nabla}^{k-1} \Omega \beta)^{\mathcal{H}^+} + (\mathring{\nabla}^{x+})^{k-1} \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{Df}}^{1,0}.$$

Proposition 4.3.4 then implies that

$$|(\mathring{\nabla}^{x+})^k f^3|_{\mathfrak{g}_{x+}} \lesssim |(\mathring{\nabla}^{k-1} \Omega \beta)^{x+}|_{\mathfrak{g}_{x+}} + |(\mathring{\nabla}^{k-1} \Omega \beta)^{\mathcal{H}^+}|_{\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{H}^+}} + |(\mathring{\nabla}^{x+})^{k-1} \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{Df}}^{1,0}|_{\mathfrak{g}_{x+}},$$

from which it follows that, for $k \leq N - 3$,

$$\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k f_{\ell \geq 1}^3\|_{S_{u,v}^{x+}}^2 \lesssim u^{-2} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4), \quad (10.1.6)$$

where the estimate for $f_{\ell \geq 1}^3$ itself follows from the Poincaré inequality, Proposition 9.3.2.

Estimate for $f_{\ell \geq 1}^4$: The quantity $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k f_{\ell \geq 1}^4$ is similarly estimated, for $k \leq N - 3$, by applying $(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k-1}$ to (4.3.48) (and using the Poincaré inequality, Proposition 9.3.2, for $k = 0$) from which it follows that, for $k \leq N - 3$,

$$\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k f_{\ell \geq 1}^4\|_{S_{u,v}^{x+}}^2 \lesssim u^{-2} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4). \quad (10.1.7)$$

Estimate for $\mathring{\nabla}_3 f_{\ell \geq 1}^3$: Next, $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathring{\nabla}_3 f_{\ell \geq 1}^3$ is estimated, for $k \leq N - s$, by applying $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k$ to the relation (4.3.39) (or using the Poincaré inequality, Proposition 9.3.2, for $k = 0$) and using the estimates (10.1.6) and (10.1.7) to obtain, for $k \leq N - 4$,

$$\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathring{\nabla}_3 f_{\ell \geq 1}^3\|_{S_{u,v}^{x+}}^2 \lesssim u^{-2} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4). \quad (10.1.8)$$

Estimate for $\nabla_4 f_{\ell \geq 1}^4$: In a similar way, $(r\nabla)^k \nabla_4 f_{\ell \geq 1}^4$ is estimated, for $k \leq N-4$, using the relation (4.3.40) to obtain

$$\|(r\nabla)^k \nabla_4 f_{\ell \geq 1}^4\|_{S_{u,v}^{I^+}}^2 \lesssim u^{-2}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4). \quad (10.1.9)$$

(Note that r weights play no role in the present region and so the term $\frac{\partial f^3}{\partial u} \tilde{\nabla} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial v}$ in (4.3.40) can be estimated exactly as the other nonlinear error terms.)

Estimates for $\nabla_3 f^4$, $(\nabla_3)^2 f^4$ and $\nabla_4 \nabla_3 f^4$: Next, $(r\nabla)^k \nabla_3 f^4$ is estimated, for $k \leq N-4$ by applying $(r\nabla)^k$ to the metric relation (4.3.31) to obtain

$$\|(r\nabla)^k \nabla_3 f^4\|_{S_{u,v}^{I^+}}^2 \lesssim u^{-2}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4). \quad (10.1.10)$$

Similarly for $(r\nabla)^k (\nabla_3)^2 f^4$ and $(r\nabla)^k \nabla_4 \nabla_3 f^4$ for $k \leq N-5$.

Estimate for $\nabla_4 f^3$, $(\nabla_4)^2 f^3$ and $\nabla_3 \nabla_4 f^3$: Similarly, $(r\nabla)^k \nabla_4 f^3$ is estimated, for $k \leq N-4$ by applying $(r\nabla)^k$ the metric relation (4.3.32) to obtain

$$\|(r\nabla)^k \nabla_4 f^3\|_{S_{u,v}^{I^+}}^2 \lesssim u^{-2}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4). \quad (10.1.11)$$

Similarly for $(r\nabla)^k (\nabla_4)^2 f^3$ and $(r\nabla)^k \nabla_3 \nabla_4 f^3$ for $k \leq N-5$.

Estimates for $\partial_u f$ and $\nabla_3 \partial_u f$: The components $(r\nabla)^k \partial_u f$, for $k \leq N-4$, are estimated by applying $(r\nabla)^k$ to the metric relation (4.3.33). The bounds (10.1.6) then give

$$\|(r\nabla)^k \partial_u f\|_{S_{u,v}^{I^+}}^2 \lesssim u^{-2}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4). \quad (10.1.12)$$

Similarly, $(r\nabla)^k \nabla_3 \partial_u f$, for $k \leq N-5$, is estimated by applying $(r\nabla)^k \nabla_3$ to (4.3.33).

Estimates for $\partial_v f$, $\nabla_3 \partial_v f$ and $\nabla_4 \partial_v f$: The components $(r\nabla)^k \partial_v f$, for $k \leq N-4$, are estimated by applying $(r\nabla)^k$ to the metric relation (4.3.34). The bounds (10.1.7) then give

$$\|(r\nabla)^k \partial_v f\|_{S_{u,v}^{I^+}}^2 \lesssim u^{-2}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4). \quad (10.1.13)$$

Similarly for $(r\nabla)^k \nabla_3 \partial_v f$ and $(r\nabla)^k \nabla_4 \partial_v f$ for $k \leq N-5$.

Estimate for $(f^3 - f^4)_{\ell=0}$: The component $(f^3 - f^4)_{\ell=0}$ is estimated, by considering the relation (4.3.49). From the fact that,

$$|r(x + f(x)) - r(x) + \Omega_o(x)^2(f^3(x) - f^4(x))| \lesssim |f^3 - f^4|^2, \quad (10.1.14)$$

the first estimate of (10.1.5) then follows.

Estimate for $(f^3 + f^4)_{\ell=0}$: For the second estimate of (10.1.5), for $(f^3 + f^4)_{\ell=0}$, first note that the first estimate of (10.1.5) together with the fact that $f^3 = 0$ on $\{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} = u_f\} = \{u_{\mathcal{H}^+} = u_f\}$ (see (10.1.2)) implies that

$$|(f^3 + f^4)_{\ell=0}(u_f, v)|^2 \lesssim \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^2}{u_f^2},$$

for all $v(R_{-2}, u_f) \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$. The second estimate of (10.1.5) then follows from summing the relations (4.3.31), (4.3.32), (4.3.43) and (4.3.44) to obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} |(\partial_u + \partial_v)(f^3 + f^4)_{\ell=0}| &\lesssim |(f^3 - f^4)_{\ell=0}| + \left|(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o)_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{H}^+}\right| + \left|(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o)_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{I}^+}\right| \\ &\quad + \left|(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_o)_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{H}^+}\right| + \left|(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_o)_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{I}^+}\right| + |\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}}^{2,0}|, \end{aligned}$$

and integrating backwards from $\{u = u_f\}$ along the constant $r_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ curves, using the first estimate of (10.1.5), the fact that

$$\left|(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{I}^+}\right| + \left|(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_\circ)_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{I}^+}\right| \lesssim u^{-\frac{3}{2}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N,$$

and

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)^{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{\mathcal{D}_{R_{-1} \leq r \leq R_1}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u)}^2 \lesssim u^{-2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N,$$

so that

$$\int_u^{u_f} |(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u', u')| du' \lesssim u^{-\frac{\delta}{2}} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|(u')^{\frac{1+\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)^{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{\mathcal{D}_{R_{-1} \leq r \leq R_1}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u)} \lesssim u^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N.$$

(See Lemma 11.7.2.) Similarly for $(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_\circ)_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$.

Estimates for $\nabla_3 f_{\ell=0}^3$ and $\nabla_4 f_{\ell=0}^4$: The relations (4.3.43) and (4.3.44), together with the first estimate of (10.1.5), imply that,

$$|\nabla_3 f_{\ell=0}^3|^2 + |\nabla_4 f_{\ell=0}^4|^2 \lesssim u^{-2} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4). \quad (10.1.15)$$

Estimates for $(\nabla_3)^2 f^3$ and $(\nabla_4)^2 f^4$: Finally, it follows from the relations (4.3.41) and (4.3.42), together with the above estimates, that, for $k \leq N - 5$,

$$\|(r\nabla)^k (\nabla_3)^2 f^3\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|(r\nabla)^k (\nabla_4)^2 f^4\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \lesssim u^{-2} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4). \quad (10.1.16)$$

Estimates close to $r_{\mathcal{H}^+} = R_2$: The above completes the estimates for $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ in the region $R_{-2} \leq r_{\mathcal{I}^+} \leq R_1$. Consider now the region $R_{-1} \leq r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq R_2$. Since the diffeomorphism functions $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ are not defined on whole spheres close to the boundary of the overlap region, $r_{\mathcal{H}^+} = R_2$, and they are estimated via elliptic estimates, it is more convenient in this region to first estimate the diffeomorphism functions $f_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}$, defined by (4.2.3) with $F = F_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+} = i_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{-1} \circ i_{\mathcal{H}^+}$. Indeed, repeating the above estimates with $f_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}$ in place of $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ and $R_{-1} \leq r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq R_2$ in place of $R_{-2} \leq r_{\mathcal{I}^+} \leq R_1$ (modifying the relations (4.3.33), (4.3.34) appropriately in view of the fact that the position of the torsion terms $b_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $b_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ in the respective coordinate expressions of the metric is interchanged), it follows that the estimates (10.1.3)–(10.1.5) hold for $f = f_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}$ in the region $R_{-1} \leq r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq R_2$. Now, for appropriate (u, v, θ) , by definition

$$u = u + f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^3(u, v, \theta) + f_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}^3(u + f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^3(u, v, \theta), v + f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^4(u, v, \theta), \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}(u, v, \theta)),$$

and so

$$f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^3(u, v, \theta) = -f_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}^3(u + f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^3(u, v, \theta), v + f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^4(u, v, \theta), \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}(u, v, \theta)). \quad (10.1.17)$$

Similarly,

$$f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^4(u, v, \theta) = -f_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}^4(u + f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^3(u, v, \theta), v + f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^4(u, v, \theta), \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}(u, v, \theta)), \quad (10.1.18)$$

and

$$\theta^A = \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}^A(u + f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^3(u, v, \theta), v + f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^4(u, v, \theta), \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}(u, v, \theta)). \quad (10.1.19)$$

Applying $\nabla^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ to (10.1.17) it follows that

$$\nabla f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^3 = -\partial_u f_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}^3 \nabla f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^3 - \partial_v f_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}^3 \nabla f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^4 - \nabla f_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}^3 \cdot \nabla \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+},$$

where $\nabla f_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}^3 \cdot \nabla \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}(\partial_{\theta^A}) = \partial_{\theta^B} f_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}^3 \partial_{\theta^A} \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^B$. It then follows from Proposition 4.3.4 that

$$|\nabla f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^3|_{\mathcal{H}^+} = |\partial_u f_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}^3| |\nabla f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^3|_{\mathcal{H}^+} + |\partial_v f_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}^3| |\nabla f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^4|_{\mathcal{H}^+} + |\nabla f_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}^3|_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \varepsilon^2.$$

Similarly for ∇_3 and ∇_4 derivatives, for higher order derivatives, and for $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^4$, $\partial_u f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\partial_v f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ using the relations (10.1.18) and (10.1.19). \square

On the final hypersurface, $u = u_f$, it is important to control extra derivatives of $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$. Since $f^3 \equiv 0$ and $f^4 \equiv 0$ on $\{u = u_f\}$ (see (10.1.2)) their derivatives tangential to $\{u = u_f\}$ also all vanish (and, in particular, $\partial_v f$ vanishes on $\{u = u_f\}$). In the following proposition $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{R_{-1} \leq r \leq R_1}$ so that, for any tensor ξ ,

$$\|\xi \mathbb{1}\|_{C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 = \int_{v(R_{-1}, u_f)}^{v(R_1, u_f)} \int_{S^2} |\xi(u_f, v, \theta)|^2 d\theta dv.$$

Proposition 10.1.7 (Estimates for extra derivatives of $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ on $\{u = u_f\}$). *On the final hypersurface $\{u = u_f\}$, the diffeomorphisms $f = f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfy the higher order estimates, for $k \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} (\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathring{\mathcal{D}}^\gamma f^4 \mathbb{1}\|_{C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathring{\mathcal{D}}^\gamma f^3 \mathbb{1}\|_{C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2) + \sum_{|\gamma| = 0, 1} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathring{\mathcal{D}}^\gamma \partial_u f \mathbb{1}\|_{C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \lesssim (u_f)^{-s} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4),$$

where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{R_{-1} \leq r \leq R_1}$.

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 10.1.6, derivatives of the relations (4.3.31)–(4.3.50) will be taken and Proposition 4.3.4 and Proposition 4.3.5 used. Consider $s = 0, 1, 2$. Note that, by (10.1.2), derivatives of f^3 tangential to $\{u = u_f\}$ all vanish. Lemma 10.1.5 is used to estimate the nonlinear error terms.

Estimate for $f_{\ell \geq 1}^4$: First, $\mathring{\nabla}^k f_{\ell \geq 2}^4$ is estimated, for $k \leq N + 2 - s$, using equation (4.3.38), the elliptic estimate of Proposition 9.3.3, and the fact that

$$(u_f)^s \sum_{k=0}^{N-s} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \mathbb{1}\|_{C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N,$$

and similarly for $\hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, together with Lemma 10.1.5 to control the nonlinear error terms. The $\ell = 1$ modes of f^4 are controlled using the relation (4.3.48), as in the proof of Proposition 10.1.6.

Estimate for $\partial_v f^4$: Next, $\mathring{\nabla}^k \partial_v f^4$ is estimated, for $1 \leq k \leq N + 1 - s$, by applying $\mathring{\nabla}^{k-1}$ to the relation (4.3.40), using the above estimate for $\mathring{\nabla}^k f^4$ together with the fact that $f^3 \equiv 0$ on $u = u_f$, and controlling the error terms again using Lemma 10.1.5. The Poincaré inequality, Proposition 9.3.2, then gives control of $\partial_v f_{\ell \geq 1}^4$.

Estimates for $\partial_u f^4$, $\partial_u^2 f^4$ and $\partial_u \partial_v f^4$: The quantity $\mathring{\nabla}^k \partial_u f^4$ is estimated, for $0 \leq k \leq N + 1 - s$, by applying $\mathring{\nabla}^k$ to the metric relation (4.3.31). The quantities $\mathring{\nabla}^k \partial_u^2 f^4$ and $\mathring{\nabla}^k \partial_u \partial_v f^4$ are similarly estimated, for $0 \leq k \leq N - s$.

Estimates for $\partial_u f_{\ell \geq 1}^3$ and $\partial_v f_{\ell \geq 1}^4$: Next, $\mathring{\nabla}^k \partial_u f_{\ell \geq 1}^3$ is estimated, for $0 \leq k \leq N + 1 - s$, exactly as $\mathring{\nabla}^k \partial_v f_{\ell \geq 1}^4$ is controlled above, using now (4.3.39) instead of (4.3.40).

Estimates for $\partial_u f$, $\mathring{\nabla}_3 \partial_u f$, and $\mathring{\nabla}_4 \partial_u f$: The quantity $\mathring{\nabla}^k \partial_u f$ is then controlled, for $0 \leq k \leq N + 1 - s$, by applying $\mathring{\nabla}^k$ to the metric relation (4.3.33) and using the above estimate for $\mathring{\nabla}^{k+1} f^4$ and the fact that

$$(u_f)^s \sum_{k=0}^{N+1-s} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k b^{\mathcal{I}^+} \mathbb{1}\|_{C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N.$$

Similarly for $\mathring{\nabla}_3 \partial_u f$ and $\mathring{\nabla}_4 \partial_u f$.

Estimates for $f_{\ell=0}^4$, $\partial_u f_{\ell=0}^3$ and $\partial_v f_{\ell=0}^4$: Now $f_{\ell=0}^4$ is estimated from the relation (4.3.49), $\partial_u f_{\ell=0}^3$ is estimated from (4.3.44), and $\partial_v f_{\ell=0}^4$ from (4.3.43), using again (10.1.14) and the fact that $f^3 \equiv 0$ on $u = u_f$.

Estimates for $\partial_v^2 f^4$ and $\partial_u^2 f^3$: Finally, $\mathring{\nabla}^k \partial_v^2 f^4$ and $\mathring{\nabla}^k \partial_u^2 f^3$ are estimated, for $0 \leq k \leq N - s$, using the above estimates and the relations (4.3.41) and (4.3.42) respectively. \square

10.1.2 Estimates for f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+}

The diffeomorphisms f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+} are estimated in a similar way as $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ in the previous section, though it is now necessary to keep track of the r behaviour of the different terms. First recall the pointwise norm $\mathbb{P}_{u_f}[f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+}]$ of the f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+} diffeomorphism functions, defined in (6.1.28).

Proposition 10.1.8. *The diffeomorphism functions f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+} satisfy the pointwise estimate*

$$\mathbb{P}_{u_f}[f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon. \quad (10.1.20)$$

Proof. The proof is an immediate consequence of the Sobolev inequality, Proposition 9.1.1, and the bootstrap assumption (7.1.5) for the energy $\mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+}]$, defined in (6.1.25). \square

The following lemma provides estimates for nonlinear error terms which arise in the proof of Proposition 10.1.10 below.

Lemma 10.1.9 (Estimates for f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+} nonlinear error terms). *For any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2$ and $v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v \leq v_\infty$,*

$$\sum_{k \leq 2} \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 1} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{f},p}^{1,0}\|_{S_{u,v}^{+,+}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{f},p}^{2,0}\|_{S_{u,v}^{+,+}}^2 \right) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{r^{2p}}.$$

Proof. The proof is an immediate consequence of the fact that, for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2$ and $v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v \leq v_\infty$,

$$\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathfrak{f}_p\|_{S_{u,v}^{+,+}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^{2p}} \quad \text{for } k \leq 2, \quad |\gamma| \leq 1,$$

and the geometric quantities of the initial gauge satisfy,

$$|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p^d|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^{2p}} \quad \text{for } |\gamma| \leq 4.$$

\square

The diffeomorphisms f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+} can now be estimated using the change of gauge relations of Chapter 4 and the estimate (5.5.13). Recall the definition (6.1.25) of the energy $\mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+}]$. It is also possible to estimate higher order derivatives of f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+} , but such estimates are not required and so are not obtained.

Proposition 10.1.10 (Estimates for f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+} diffeomorphisms and mass difference $M_f - M_{\text{init}}$). *The diffeomorphisms f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+} satisfy the estimates,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4, \quad (10.1.21)$$

and moreover the mass M_f satisfies,

$$|M_f - M_{\text{init}}|^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4.$$

Proof. The proof follows from Propositions 4.3.1, 4.3.2 and 4.3.3, with $(u, v, \theta) = (u_{\text{data}}, v_{\text{data}}, \theta_{\text{data}})$ and $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}) = (u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+})$, $M = M_{\text{init}}$ and $\tilde{M} = M_f$. Derivatives of the relations in Propositions 4.3.1, 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 will be taken, as in the proof of Proposition 10.1.6, and Proposition 4.3.4 and Proposition 4.3.5 used. In what follows $f = f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+}$. The subscript is omitted for brevity. Lemma 10.1.9 will be used throughout to estimate the nonlinear error terms which arise, and the estimate (5.5.13) will be used to estimate terms in the initial \mathcal{EF} gauge.

Consider some $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2$ and $v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v \leq v_\infty$.

Estimate for $f_{\ell \geq 1}^3$: To begin, $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k f_{\ell \geq 1}^3$ is estimated for $k \leq 4$, using (4.3.47) (along with $(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k-1}$ applied to (4.3.47)) which implies

$$|r\mathring{\nabla} f^3|_{g^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \lesssim |r^4(\Omega\beta)_{\text{data}}|_{g^{\text{data}}} + |r^4(\Omega\beta)_{\mathcal{I}^+}|_{g^{\mathcal{I}^+}} + |\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{f},0}^{1,0}|_{g^{\mathcal{I}^+}}$$

Similarly for $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k f^3$ for $k = 2, 3, 4$. The Poincaré inequality, Proposition 9.3.2 then implies

$$\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k f_{\ell \geq 1}^3\|_{S_{u,v}^{x+}}^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4. \quad (10.1.22)$$

Estimate for $f_{\ell \geq 1}^4$: Next, $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k f_{\ell \geq 1}^4$ is estimated for $k \leq 4$. First, to estimate $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k f_{\ell \geq 2}^4$, the relation (4.3.40) implies that

$$|r^2 \mathring{\mathcal{D}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla} f^4|_{\mathcal{G}^{x+}} \lesssim |r^2 \hat{\chi}_{data}|_{\mathcal{G}^{data}} + |r^2 \hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|_{\mathcal{G}^{x+}} + |\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},-1}^{2,0}|_{\mathcal{G}^{x+}}$$

and similarly after commuting with $r\mathring{\nabla}$. The elliptic estimate, Proposition 9.3.3 then implies that

$$\sum_{k \leq 4} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k f_{\ell \geq 2}^4\|_{S_{u,v}^{x+}}^2 \lesssim r^2 (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4).$$

Now the relation (4.3.49) implies that

$$(\rho - \rho_{\circ, M_f})^{\mathcal{I}^+} = (\rho - \rho_{\circ, M_{\text{init}}})^d + 2M_f \left(\frac{1}{r_d^3} - \frac{1}{r_{\mathcal{I}^+}^3} \right) + 2 \frac{M_{\text{init}} - M_f}{r_d^3} + |\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f},3}^{1,0}|. \quad (10.1.23)$$

Projecting to $\ell \geq 1$, using the above estimate (10.1.22), and the fact that

$$\left| \frac{1}{r_d^3} - \frac{1}{r_{\mathcal{I}^+}^3} - \frac{3\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r_d^4} (f^3 - f^4) - \frac{3(r_{M_f} - r_{M_{\text{init}}})}{r_d^4} \right| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r_d^3}, \quad (10.1.24)$$

and

$$\left| \frac{r_{M_f} - r_{M_{\text{init}}}}{r_d^4} - \left(\frac{M_f}{M_{\text{init}}} - 1 \right) \frac{r_{M_{\text{init}}} - (v_d - u_d)\Omega_{\circ, M_{\text{init}}}^2}{r_d^4} \right| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r_d^4} \quad (10.1.25)$$

it follows that

$$\sum_{k \leq 4} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k f_{\ell \geq 1}^4\|_{S_{u,v}^{x+}}^2 \lesssim r^2 (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4). \quad (10.1.26)$$

Estimate for $\mathring{\nabla}_3 f_{\ell \geq 1}^3$: The quantity $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathring{\nabla}_3 f_{\ell \geq 1}^3$ can now be estimated, for $k \leq 3$. Indeed, it follows from the relation (4.3.39) and the estimates (10.1.22) and (10.1.26) that

$$\sum_{k \leq 3} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathring{\nabla}_3 f_{\ell \geq 1}^3\|_{S_{u,v}^{x+}}^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4. \quad (10.1.27)$$

Estimate for $r\mathring{\nabla}_4 f_{\ell \geq 1}^4$: Now $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (r\mathring{\nabla}_4) f_{\ell \geq 1}^4$ can now be estimated, for $k \leq 3$, since the relation (4.3.40) and the estimates (10.1.22) and (10.1.26) imply that

$$\sum_{k \leq 3} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (r\mathring{\nabla}_4) f_{\ell \geq 1}^4\|_{S_{u,v}^{x+}}^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4. \quad (10.1.28)$$

Estimates for $\mathring{\nabla}_3 f^4$, $(\mathring{\nabla}_3)^2 f^4$ and $r\mathring{\nabla}_4 \mathring{\nabla}_3 f^4$: Next, $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathring{\nabla}_3 f^4$ is estimated, for $k \leq 3$ from the metric relation (4.3.31):

$$\sum_{k \leq 3} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathring{\nabla}_3 f^4\|_{S_{u,v}^{x+}}^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4. \quad (10.1.29)$$

Similarly for $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (\mathring{\nabla}_3)^2 f^4$ and $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (r\mathring{\nabla}_4) \mathring{\nabla}_3 f^4$ for $k \leq 2$.

Estimates for $r\mathring{\nabla}_4 f^3$ and $(r\mathring{\nabla}_4)^2 f^3$: Similarly, $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (r\mathring{\nabla}_4) f^3$ is estimated, for $k \leq 3$ from the metric relation (4.3.32):

$$\sum_{k \leq 3} r^2 \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (r\mathring{\nabla}_4) f^3\|_{S_{u,v}^{x+}}^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4. \quad (10.1.30)$$

Similarly for $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k(r\mathring{\nabla}_4)^2f^3$ for $k \leq 2$.

Estimates for $\partial_u f$, $\mathring{\nabla}_3 \partial_u f$, and $r\mathring{\nabla}_4 \partial_u f$: The components $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \partial_u f$, for $k \leq 3$, are estimated from the metric relation (4.3.33), using the bounds (10.1.26):

$$\sum_{k \leq 3} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \partial_u f\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4. \quad (10.1.31)$$

Similarly for $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathring{\nabla}_3 \partial_u f$, and $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (r\mathring{\nabla}_4) \partial_u f$ for $k \leq 2$.

Estimates for $r\partial_v f$, $\mathring{\nabla}_3(r\partial_v f)$, and $r\mathring{\nabla}_4(r\partial_v f)$: The components $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k(r\partial_v f)$, for $k \leq 3$, are estimated from the metric relation (4.3.34), using the bounds (10.1.6):

$$\sum_{k \leq 3} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k(r\partial_v f)\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4. \quad (10.1.32)$$

Similarly for $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \mathring{\nabla}_3(r\partial_v f)$ and $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (r\mathring{\nabla}_4)(r\partial_v f)$ for $k \leq 2$.

Estimates for $M_f - M_{\text{init}}$, $(\partial_v f^4)_{\ell=0}$, $(\partial_u f^3)_{\ell=0}$, $f_{\ell=0}^3$, $f_{\ell=0}^4$: It remains to estimate certain $\ell = 0$ modes, along with the difference $M_f - M_{\text{init}}$. Equation (4.3.36) implies that

$$\Omega_{\circ}^2 (\partial_u f^3 + \partial_v f^4) + 2M_f \left(\frac{1}{r_{\mathcal{I}^+}} - \frac{1}{r_d} \right) + 2 \frac{M_f - M_{\text{init}}}{r_d} = \left(\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ, M_f}^2 \right)^{\mathcal{I}^+} - \left(\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ, M_{\text{init}}}^2 \right)^d + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{f},0}^{1,0}, \quad (10.1.33)$$

equation (4.3.43) implies,

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \frac{r_{\mathcal{I}^+} - r_d}{r_{\mathcal{I}^+} r_d} \left(1 - \frac{4M_f}{r_d} \right) + 4 \frac{M_f - M_{\text{init}}}{r_d^2} + 2\Omega_{\circ}^2 \Delta f^3 + \frac{2\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r_d} \partial_v f^4 \\ = \left(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M_f} \right)^{\mathcal{I}^+} - \left(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M_{\text{init}}} \right)^d + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{f},2}^{2,0}, \end{aligned} \quad (10.1.34)$$

and equation (4.3.44) implies,

$$\begin{aligned} -2 \frac{r_{\mathcal{I}^+} - r_d}{r_{\mathcal{I}^+} r_d} \left(1 - \frac{4M_f}{r_d} \right) - 4 \frac{M_f - M_{\text{init}}}{r_d^2} + 2\Omega_{\circ}^2 \Delta f^4 - \frac{2\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r_d} \partial_u f^3 \\ = \left(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ, M_f} \right)^{\mathcal{I}^+} - \left(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ, M_{\text{init}}} \right)^d + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{f},1}^{2,0}, \end{aligned} \quad (10.1.35)$$

with $\Omega_{\circ}^2 = (\Omega_{\circ, M_{\text{init}}}^2)^d$. Considering $-\frac{2}{3} \frac{r_d^2}{M_f} \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r_d} \right)$ times equation (10.1.23) minus $2/r_d$ times equation (10.1.33) plus equation (10.1.34) minus equation (10.1.35) and projecting to $\ell = 0$, it follows that,

$$|M_f - M_{\text{init}}|^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4.$$

Now equation (10.1.23) and (10.1.24) imply that

$$|f_{\ell=0}^3 - f_{\ell=0}^4|^2 \lesssim r_d^2 (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4). \quad (10.1.36)$$

Equations (10.1.34) and (10.1.35) then respectively imply

$$|(\partial_v f^4)_{\ell=0}|^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4, \quad |(\partial_u f^3)_{\ell=0}|^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4.$$

Finally, the estimate (10.1.30) implies that $|\partial_v f_{\ell=0}^3|^2 \lesssim r_d^{-4} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^K + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3)$. The estimate for $f_{\ell=0}^3$ is estimated by integrating backwards from $u_{\mathcal{I}^+} = u_0$, $v_{\mathcal{I}^+} = v_{\infty}$, using the fact that $f_{\ell=0}^3(u_0, v_{\infty}) = 0$, to obtain,

$$|f_{\ell=0}^3|^2 \lesssim r_d^{-2} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4), \quad |f_{\ell=0}^4|^2 \lesssim r_d^2 (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4),$$

where the latter follows from the former and (10.1.36).

Estimates for $(\nabla_3)^2 f^3$ and $(\nabla_4)^2 f^4$: Finally, the relations (4.3.41) and (4.3.42), together with the above estimates, then imply that, for $k \leq 2$,

$$\|(r\nabla)^k (\nabla_3)^2 f^3\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + r^{-2} \|(r\nabla)^k (r\nabla_4)^2 f^4\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4.$$

□

10.1.3 Estimates for f_{d,\mathcal{H}^+}

Recall the initial Kruskal gauge of Section 5.5.1, the Kruskalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge of Section 2.3.4 (see also (5.6.7)), whose coordinates are denoted $(U_{\mathcal{H}^+}, V_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+})$, and the diffeomorphisms $f_{d,\mathcal{H}^+}^1, \dots, f_{d,\mathcal{H}^+}^4$. Let $\Phi^{\mathcal{K},\mathcal{H}^+}$ denote the geometric quantities of the Kruskalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge of Section 2.3.4.

The estimates on the geometric quantities of the Eddington–Finkelstein \mathcal{H}^+ gauge immediately give estimates for the above geometric quantities of the Kruskalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge. The quantities in the Kruskalised gauge can, of course, be estimated up to order N in the entire \mathcal{H}^+ region, though the following estimate is all that is used in estimating the diffeomorphisms f_{d,\mathcal{H}^+} in Proposition 10.1.13 below.

Recall U_f from Section 2.3.4, and $U_0 := U(u_0)$, where U is defined by (1.3.13) with $M := M_f$.

Proposition 10.1.11 (Estimates for \mathcal{H}^+ quantities in Kruskalised gauge). *For any $U_0 \leq U \leq U_f$ and any $V_{-1} \leq V \leq \min\{V_2, V(R_2, U)\}$, each Ricci coefficient and curvature component of the Kruskalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge (see (5.6.7)) satisfies*

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi^{\mathcal{K},\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{S_{U,V}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4.$$

Proof. Note that

$$\Omega_{\circ,\mathcal{EF}}^{-2} \partial_u = \frac{2M_f}{V} \Omega_{\circ,\mathcal{K}}^{-2} \partial_U, \quad \partial_v = \frac{V}{2M_f} \partial_V.$$

Consider, for example, $\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}$. It follows that

$$(\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi})_{\mathcal{EF}} = (\Omega_{\circ}^{-1} \hat{\chi})_{\mathcal{EF}} + ((1 - \Omega_{\circ}^{-1} \Omega) \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi})_{\mathcal{EF}} = \frac{2M_f}{V} (\Omega_{\circ}^{-1} \hat{\chi})_{\mathcal{K}} + ((1 - \Omega_{\circ}^{-1} \Omega) \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi})_{\mathcal{EF}},$$

and so

$$\|(\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi})_{\mathcal{K}}\|_{S_{U,V}}^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4.$$

Similarly for derivatives and for the other geometric quantities. □

Recall the pointwise norm $\mathbb{P}_{u_f}[f_{d,\mathcal{H}^+}]$ of the f_{d,\mathcal{H}^+} diffeomorphism functions, defined in (6.1.29).

Proposition 10.1.12. *The diffeomorphism functions f_{d,\mathcal{H}^+} satisfy the pointwise estimate*

$$\mathbb{P}_{u_f}[f_{d,\mathcal{H}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon. \tag{10.1.37}$$

Proof. The proof is an immediate consequence of the Sobolev inequality, Proposition 9.1.1, and the bootstrap assumption (7.1.5) for the energy $\mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d,\mathcal{H}^+}]$, defined in (6.1.26). □

The diffeomorphisms f_{d,\mathcal{H}^+} can now be estimated using the change of gauge relations of Chapter 4, Proposition 10.1.11, and the estimates (5.5.2). Recall the definition (6.1.26) of the energy $\mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d,\mathcal{H}^+}]$.

Proposition 10.1.13 (Estimates for f_{d,\mathcal{H}^+} diffeomorphisms). *The diffeomorphisms f_{d,\mathcal{H}^+} satisfy the estimates,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d,\mathcal{H}^+}] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \tag{10.1.38}$$

Proof. In what follows $f = f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}$. The subscript is omitted for brevity.

Consider the relations (4.3.31)–(4.3.50) with $(u, v, \theta) = (U_{data}, V_{data}, \theta_{data})$ and $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}) = (U_{\mathcal{H}^+}, V_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ and $M = M_f$, $\tilde{M} = M_{\text{init}}$ (modifying the relations (4.3.33), (4.3.34) appropriately in view of the position of the torsion terms $b_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and b_{data} in the respective coordinate expressions of the metric), now with the Schwarzschild background quantities referring to those of the Kruskal Schwarzschild gauge (see (1.3.9)–(1.3.11)).

The estimates for $(r\tilde{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{\ell \geq 1}^3$ and $(r\tilde{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{\ell \geq 1}^4$, for $k = 0, 1, 2$, $|\gamma| \leq 2$, and $(r\tilde{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_U f$ and $(r\tilde{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_V f$, for $k = 0, 1, 2$, $|\gamma| \leq 1$, follow as in the proof of Proposition 10.1.6, using now the estimate (5.5.2).

The estimates for the $\ell = 0$ modes are slightly different to the $\ell = 0$ mode estimates of Proposition 10.1.6 due to the fact that the Kruskal Schwarzschild values differ from the Eddington–Finkelstein Schwarzschild values. Recall that $|M_{\text{init}} - M_f|^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3$ (see Proposition 10.1.10). The metric relations (4.3.31) and (4.3.32) immediately imply

$$|\partial_V f_{\ell=0}^3| + |\partial_U f_{\ell=0}^4| \lesssim \varepsilon^2. \quad (10.1.39)$$

Using the expressions (1.3.9)–(1.3.11) for the Schwarzschild values one easily shows

$$\left| (\Omega_{\circ}^2)_{\mathcal{H}^+} - (\Omega_{\circ}^2)_{data} - (r_d - r_{\mathcal{H}^+}) \frac{4M_f}{r} \left(1 + \frac{2M_f}{r} \right) e^{-\frac{r}{2M_f}} \right| \lesssim \varepsilon^2, \quad (10.1.40)$$

$$\left| (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ})_{\mathcal{H}^+} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ})_{data} - \left[2M_f f^4 + (r_{\mathcal{H}^+} - r_d) V \left(1 + \frac{4M_f}{r} \right) \right] \frac{4M_f}{r^2} e^{-\frac{r}{2M_f}} \right| \lesssim \varepsilon^2, \quad (10.1.41)$$

$$\left| \rho_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \rho_{data} - (r_{\mathcal{H}^+} - r_d) \frac{6M_f}{r^4} \right| \lesssim \varepsilon^2. \quad (10.1.42)$$

The estimates for $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ and f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+} of Proposition 10.1.6 and Proposition 10.1.10, along with the estimate (5.5.12) and the relation (5.5.5), imply that

$$|f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}^3(U_0, V(R, U_0), \theta)|^2 + |f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}^4(U_0, V(R, U_0), \theta)|^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (10.1.43)$$

The relation (4.3.49), together with (10.1.42), implies that

$$|r_{\mathcal{H}^+} - r_{data}|^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \quad (10.1.44)$$

for $U_0 \leq U \leq U_f$, $V_{-1} \leq V \leq \min\{V_2, V(R_2, U)\}$. Similarly, the relations (4.3.36) and (4.3.44), together with (10.1.40) and (10.1.41), then imply that

$$|\partial_U f_{\ell=0}^3 + \partial_V f_{\ell=0}^4|^2 + |2M_f f_{\ell=0}^4 + \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ, \mathcal{K}}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \partial_U f_{\ell=0}^3|^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \quad (10.1.45)$$

for $U_0 \leq U \leq U_f$, $V_{-1} \leq V \leq \min\{V_2, V(R_2, U)\}$. In particular,

$$|2M_f f_{\ell=0}^4 - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ, \mathcal{K}}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \partial_V f_{\ell=0}^4|^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \quad (10.1.46)$$

for $U_0 \leq U \leq U_f$, $V_{-1} \leq V \leq \min\{V_2, V(R_2, U)\}$. The estimate (10.1.43) is then used to estimate $f_{\ell=0}^4$ on C_{U_0} , and the estimate (10.1.39) is then used to give

$$|f_{\ell=0}^4|^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \quad (10.1.47)$$

for $U_0 \leq U \leq U_f$, $V_{-1} \leq V \leq \min\{V_2, V(R_2, U)\}$. Note that, for $r = r_{M_f, \mathcal{K}}$,

$$\partial_U r = -V \frac{4M_f^2}{r} e^{-\frac{r}{2M_f}}, \quad \partial_V r = \frac{2M_f}{V} \left(1 - \frac{2M_f}{r} \right),$$

and so

$$\left| r(U + f^3, V + f^4) - r(U, V) - \left(\frac{2M_f}{V} (1 - 2M_f/r) f^4 - V \frac{4M_f^2}{r} e^{-\frac{r}{2M_f}} f^3 \right) \right| \lesssim \varepsilon^2.$$

Equations (10.1.44)–(10.1.47) then combine to give

$$|f_{\ell=0}^3|^2 + |\partial_U f_{\ell=0}^3|^2 + |\partial_V f_{\ell=0}^4|^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3,$$

for $U_0 \leq U \leq U_f$, $V_{-1} \leq V \leq \min\{V_2, V(R_2, U)\}$, which completes the proof. \square

10.2 Improving the inclusion relations

An immediate consequence of Propositions 10.1.6, 10.1.10 and 10.1.13 is that, if $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ is sufficiently small, the inclusions (5.6.8), (5.6.9), (5.6.11), (5.6.12) can indeed be strengthened to (7.3.5)–(7.3.6) and (7.3.7)–(7.3.8).

(These improved inclusions will ensure that the inclusions (5.6.8), (5.6.9), (5.6.11), (5.6.12), still hold in the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ gauges, defined in the context of the proof of Theorem 16.1.)

10.3 Cancellations along a timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B}

We first define in **Section 10.3.1** a timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B} which we will use as a common boundary for energy estimates in Chapters 12 and 13 for almost gauge invariant quantities. Because these quantities are not exactly gauge invariant, there will be an error term associated to the difference of the quantities in the two gauges along this \mathcal{B} . Controlling this error will be the statement of Proposition 10.3.2, given in **Section 10.3.2**. This proposition in turn forms part of the statement of Theorem C.2.

10.3.1 The timelike hypersurface $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{R}}$

Recall that we fixed in Section 1.3.5 a u_1 satisfying

$$u_2 > u_1 > u_0. \quad (10.3.1)$$

For $u_f \geq u \geq u_1$, $v \geq v(R_{-1}, u_1)$, we may define the surfaces

$$\hat{S}_{u,v} := \{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} = u\} \cap \{v_{\mathcal{H}^+} = v\}.$$

Note that these surfaces are in general not spheres of either the \mathcal{H}^+ or the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge.

Now, for all $s \in [R_{-1}, R_1]$, $u_f \geq u \geq u_1$, it follows from the pointwise estimate (10.1.1) that $\hat{S}_{u,v(s,u)}$ is a diffeomorphism sphere, and $(\theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^1, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2)$ define coordinates on all $\hat{S}_{u,v}$.

Finally, for all $s \in [R_{-1}, R_1]$ we may define:

$$\mathcal{B}_s := \bigcup_{u=u_1}^{u_f} \hat{S}_{u,v(s,u)}.$$

Let us note that by the pointwise estimate (10.1.1) for the $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ diffeomorphism functions it follows that for fixed s , \mathcal{B}_s is a connected timelike hypersurface with boundary $\hat{S}_{u_1, v(s, u_1)} \cup \hat{S}_{u_f, v(s, u_f)}$ and $u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^1, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2$ provide coordinates on \mathcal{B} .

We finally note that by the the pointwise estimate (10.1.1) we have in addition:

$$\bigcup_{s \in (R_{-1}, R_1)} \mathcal{B}_s \subset \left\{ R_{-\frac{3}{2}} \leq r(u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}) \leq R_{\frac{3}{2}} \right\}. \quad (10.3.2)$$

Let \mathcal{A}_Γ denote the following collection of Ricci coefficients, with their linearised Kerr values subtracted

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_\Gamma = \left\{ 1 - \frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_\circ^2}, \quad b - b_{\text{Kerr}}, \quad \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}, \quad \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ), \quad \Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ, \right. \\ \left. \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ), \quad \Omega \hat{\chi}, \quad \eta - \eta_{\text{Kerr}}, \quad \underline{\eta} - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}}, \quad \Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and let $\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{R}$ denote the curvature components $\Omega \beta$, $\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}$, $\rho - \rho_\circ$, σ , minus their linearised Kerr values,

$$\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{R} = \left\{ \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta} - \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}_{\text{Kerr}}, \quad \rho - \rho_\circ, \quad \sigma, \quad \Omega \beta - \Omega \beta_{\text{Kerr}} \right\}.$$

Elements of $\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{R}$ and \mathcal{A}_Γ are denoted $\check{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\check{\Gamma}$ respectively, with a $\check{}$ added to emphasise the fact that the linearised Kerr values have been subtracted. Set

$$\kappa(0) = 0, \quad \kappa(1) = 1 - \delta, \quad \kappa(2) = 2 - \delta, \quad (10.3.3)$$




Figure 10.1: The hypersurface \mathcal{B}

and define

$$e_{\delta,N} := \sum_{s=0}^1 u^{\kappa(s)} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \sum_{\check{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma}} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma} \check{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{s=0}^2 u^{\kappa(s)} \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1-s} \sum_{\check{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma}} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma} \check{\Gamma}^{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \left(\sum_{\check{\mathcal{R}} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}}} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma} \check{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma} \check{\alpha}^{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma} \check{\alpha}^{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma} \check{\alpha}^{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma} \check{\alpha}^{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right) \right).$$

By the mean value theorem (cf. [DR09a]) there exists a parameter $\tilde{R} = \tilde{R}(u_f, \lambda)$ with the property that $R_{-1} \leq \tilde{R} \leq R_1$ and

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{R}}} e_{\delta,N} d\theta du \leq \int_{R_{-1}}^{R_1} \left(\int_{\mathcal{B}_s} e_{\delta,N} d\theta du \right) ds. \quad (10.3.4)$$

Note that the integral on the left hand side of (10.3.4) is an integral over the timelike hypersurface $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{R}}$ and the integral on the right hand side is an integral over a spacetime region around $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{R}}$.

As it is precisely this hypersurface $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{R}}$ which we shall use, we shall from now on omit the subscript \tilde{R} , i.e. we define

$$\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{R}}.$$

Given $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$, define

$$\mathcal{B}(\tau) := \mathcal{B} \cap \{u \geq \tau\} = \bigcup_{u=\tau}^{u_f} \hat{S}_{u,v(\tilde{R},u)}.$$

We define finally v_1 by

$$v_1 = v(\tilde{R}, u_1). \quad (10.3.5)$$

Refer to Figure 10.1. By (1.3.23), (1.3.25) and the pointwise estimate (10.1.1), we have that

$$v_0 < v_1 < v_2.$$

Remark 10.3.1. Note that v_1 , as opposed to our other parameters, depends on u_f and λ .

Define the L^2 norm of a $(0, k)$ tensor ξ on \mathcal{B} ,

$$\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{B}(\tau)}^2 := \int_{\tau}^{u_f} \int_{\hat{S}_{\tau', v(\bar{R}, \tau')}} |\xi|^2 d\text{Vol}_{\mathcal{B}},$$

where $d\text{Vol}_{\mathcal{B}} = \Omega^2 d\theta \wedge du \wedge dv(n_{\mathcal{B}})$ and $n_{\mathcal{B}}$ is the appropriately oriented unit normal to \mathcal{B} . Define also

$$\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{B}} := \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{B}(u_1)}.$$

10.3.2 Cancellation between almost gauge invariant quantities on the timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B}

We may now state the result concerning cancellation on \mathcal{B} . If ξ and ξ' are two S -tangent $(0, k)$ tensors, their inner product is defined by

$$(\xi, \xi')_{\mathcal{B}} := \not{g}^{A_1 B_1} \dots \not{g}^{A_k B_k} \xi_{A_1} \dots \xi_{A_k} \xi'_{B_1} \dots \xi'_{B_k}.$$

Proposition 10.3.2 (Cancellations between almost gauge invariant quantities on a timelike hypersurface). *Recall the hypersurface \mathcal{B} defined in Section 10.3.1. Given $s = 0, 1, 2$, a smooth admissible coefficient function h as in Section 3.2.2, and multi-indices γ_1, γ_2 such that $|\gamma_1| \leq N - s$, $|\gamma_2| \leq N - s$ and such that $\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \alpha$ and $\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \alpha$ are tensor fields of the same order, then,*

$$\sup_{u_1 \leq u \leq u_f} u^s \int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} \left| \left(h(r) (\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \alpha, \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \alpha)_{\not{g}} \right)^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \left(h(r) (\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \alpha, \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \alpha)_{\not{g}} \right)^{\mathcal{I}^+} \right| \lesssim \varepsilon^3, \quad (10.3.6)$$

and

$$\sup_{u_1 \leq u \leq u_f} u^s \int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} \left| \left(h(r) (\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} (r\underline{\alpha}), \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} (r\underline{\alpha}))_{\not{g}} \right)^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \left(h(r) (\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} (\check{r}\underline{\alpha}), \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} (\check{r}\underline{\alpha}))_{\not{g}} \right)^{\mathcal{I}^+} \right| \lesssim \varepsilon^3. \quad (10.3.7)$$

Note that Proposition 10.3.2 in particular also implies that a cancellation occurs between appropriate derivatives of $P^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $P^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, and also $\underline{P}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\underline{P}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, on the timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B} .

The following three lemmas will be used to estimate nonlinear error terms arising in the proof of Proposition 10.3.2. First note that, recalling the definition of \mathcal{B} in Section 10.3.1 and the bootstrap assumption (7.1.4), it follows (see the argument of Lemma 11.7.2) that, for $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $|\gamma| \leq N - s$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}} u^{\kappa(s)} (|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma} \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma} \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2) \lesssim \int_{\mathcal{D}_{R_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \leq r \leq R_1} u^{\kappa(s)} (|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma} \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma} \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2) \lesssim \varepsilon^2,$$

with κ defined by (10.3.3). It then follows that, for all $u_1 \leq u \leq u_f$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} (|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma} \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma} \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{\kappa(s)}}.$$

Similarly, the inequalities (in the notation of Section 10.3.1)

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}_{R_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \leq r \leq R_1} \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma} \check{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1-s} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma} \check{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \right) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^s}, \quad \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} \int_{\mathcal{D}_{R_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \leq r \leq R_1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma} \check{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u},$$

contained in the bootstrap assumption (7.1.4) imply in particular that

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma} (\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_{\circ})_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{\kappa(s)}} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u_f}, \quad \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1-s} \int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma} (\Gamma - \Gamma_{\circ})|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{\kappa(s)}},$$

for each $\Gamma - \Gamma_{\circ} = (\Gamma - \Gamma_{\circ})_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $(\Gamma - \Gamma_{\circ})_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, where κ is defined by (10.3.3).

Lemma 10.3.3 (Cancellation between $r_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $r_{\mathcal{I}^+}$). *Given a smooth admissible coefficient function $h(r)$, for any $|\gamma| \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} |h(r_{\mathcal{H}^+}) - h(r_{\mathcal{I}^+})| |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{u^{1+\kappa(s)}},$$

for any $u_1 \leq u \leq u_f$, with κ defined by (10.3.3). Similarly for $\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ respectively in place of $\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$.

Proof. Note that,

$$(r_{\mathcal{H}^+} - r_{\mathcal{I}^+})|_{(u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+})=(u, v, \theta)} = r_{M_f}(u + f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^3, v + f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^4) - r_{M_f}(u, v),$$

and so,

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} |h(r_{\mathcal{H}^+}) - h(r_{\mathcal{I}^+})| |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \lesssim \int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} |f^3 - f^4| |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u} \int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{u^{1+\kappa(s)}}.$$

□

Lemma 10.3.4 (Cancellation between $r_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\check{r}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$). *For any $|\gamma_1| + |\gamma_2| \leq N - s$, $|\gamma_3| \leq N - s$ for $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(r_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \check{r}_{\mathcal{I}^+})| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_3} \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{u^s},$$

for any $u_1 \leq u \leq u_f$. Similarly for $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ in place of $\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$.

Proof. At most one of $|\gamma_1|$ and $|\gamma_2|$ can be greater than $N - 5$. Suppose first that $|\gamma_1| > N - 5$. Then $|\gamma_2| \leq N - 5$ and the pointwise estimate (8.1.2) implies that

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(r_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \check{r}_{\mathcal{I}^+})| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_3} \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(r_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \check{r}_{\mathcal{I}^+})\|_{\mathcal{B}(u)} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{\mathcal{B}(u)}.$$

The proof follows the proof of Lemma 10.3.3 after noting that

$$\check{r} = r + \frac{2\Omega^2}{\Omega \text{tr} \chi} - \frac{2\Omega_o^2}{\Omega \text{tr} \chi_o},$$

and that the definition of \mathcal{B} and the bootstrap assumption (7.1.4) imply that

$$\sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} \left(|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o)|^2 + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega_o^{-2} \Omega^2 - 1)|^2 \right) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{\kappa(s)}},$$

where κ defined by (10.3.3). The proof when $|\gamma_1| \leq N - 5$ is similar. □

Before proceeding further, it is convenient to introduce additional nonlinear error notation. Recall the notation of Section 3.2.3. Note that if $i \in \{6, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17\}$ and $\gamma \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^k$, then $\mathfrak{D}^k \Phi \cdot (i, \gamma)$ is equal to \mathfrak{D}^γ applied to a *curvature component* (and not a Ricci coefficient). Accordingly, given $k \geq 0$, $l \geq 1$ and some

$$H = \{^j, ^m H_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}\}, \quad ^j J_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}}\}_{m=0, \dots, l', k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k, l' \geq l, j \geq 1}, \quad (10.3.8)$$

as in Section 3.2.3, if

$$^j, ^m H_{k_1 \dots k_{l'}} \in \{(i, \gamma) \mid i \in \{6, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17\}, \gamma \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^{k_m}\} \cup \{0\}, \quad (10.3.9)$$

for all $m = 0, \dots, l'$, $k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k$, $l' \geq l$, $j \geq 1$, then we denote

$$(\mathfrak{D}^k(\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_o))^l \cdot H := (\mathfrak{D}^k \Phi)^l \cdot H.$$

Similarly, if H is such that

$${}^{j,m}H_{k_1\dots k_{l'}} \in \{(i, \gamma) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, 5, 7, \dots, 11, 13\}, \gamma \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^{k_m}\} \cup \{0\}, \quad (10.3.10)$$

for all $m = 0, \dots, l', k_1 + \dots + k_{l'} \leq k, l' \geq l, j \geq 1$, then $(\mathfrak{D}^k \Phi)^l \cdot H$ involves only *Ricci coefficients* (and no curvature components) and we denote

$$(\mathfrak{D}^k(\Gamma - \Gamma_o))^l \cdot H := (\mathfrak{D}^k \Phi)^l \cdot H.$$

Given $k_1, k_2, k_3 \geq 0$ and $l_1, l_2, l_3, l_4 \geq 0$, define $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$, $\underline{l} = (l_1, l_2, l_3, l_4)$ and

$$|\underline{k}| = k_1 + k_2 + k_3, \quad |\underline{l}| = l_1 + l_2 + l_3 + l_4.$$

Consider some $k \geq 0$, $G = \{{}^j G_{\underline{l}}^k\}$ where each ${}^j G_{\underline{l}}^k$ is as in Section 4.3.3.3, $H = \{{}^j H_{\underline{l}}^k\}$ where each ${}^j H_{\underline{l}}^k$ is of the form (10.3.8), (10.3.9), $K = \{{}^j K_{\underline{l}}^k\}$ and $L = \{{}^j L_{\underline{l}}^k\}$ where each ${}^j K_{\underline{l}}^k$ and ${}^j L_{\underline{l}}^k$ is of the form (10.3.8), (10.3.10), and $I = \{{}^j I_{\underline{l}}^k\}$ and $J = \{{}^j J_{\underline{l}}^k\}$ where each ${}^j I_{\underline{l}}^k$ and ${}^j J_{\underline{l}}^k$ is a trace index set of some order $d \geq 0$ as in Section 3.2.2. Define $\mathcal{F}^k(G, H, K, L, I, J)$ by,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^k(G, H, K, L, I, J) = & \Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \sum_{\substack{|\underline{l}| \geq 2 \\ l_1 \geq 1}} \sum_{\substack{|\underline{k}| \leq k \\ k_2 + k_3 \leq k-1 \vee 0}} \sum_{j \geq 1} \left((\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f})^{l_1} \cdot {}^j G_{\underline{l}}^k \otimes (\mathfrak{D}^{k_1}(\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_o)_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{l_2} \cdot {}^j H_{\underline{l}}^k \right. \\ & \left. \otimes (\mathfrak{D}^{k_2}(\Gamma - \Gamma_o)_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{l_3} \cdot {}^j K_{\underline{l}}^k \otimes (\mathfrak{D}^{k_3}(\Gamma - \Gamma_o)_{\mathcal{I}^+})^{l_4} \cdot {}^j L_{\underline{l}}^k \right) \cdot {}^j I_{\underline{l}}^k \cdot {}^j J_{\underline{l}}^k, \quad (10.3.11) \end{aligned}$$

where $\Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}}$ denotes projection to the $S^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ spheres (see (4.3.29)), $\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f} = \mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ and $k-1 \vee 0 = \max\{k-1, 0\}$. As usual, such expressions are only ever considered when sufficiently many of the elements of G, H, K, L, I, J vanish so that every term in the summation is a tensor of the same type, and so that there are only finitely many terms, so that the summation is well defined. We typically abuse notation and write “ \mathcal{F}^k ” for “ $\mathcal{F}^k(G, H, K, L, I, J)$ for some G, H, K, L, I, J ”.

Note that \mathcal{F}^k is nonlinear, each term involves at least one $\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}$ factor, and each term involves at most $k-1$ derivatives of $(\Gamma - \Gamma_o)_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $(\Gamma - \Gamma_o)_{\mathcal{I}^+}$.

Lemma 10.3.5 (Error estimate on timelike hypersurface). *For any $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $k \leq N - s$, $|\gamma| \leq N - s$, for any $u_1 \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} |\mathcal{F}^k|_{\mathcal{H}^+} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{u^{\kappa(s) + \frac{1}{2}}},$$

for $\alpha = \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, where $\kappa(0) = 0$, $\kappa(1) = 1 - \delta$ and $\kappa(2) = 2 - \delta$.

Proof. Recall, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for $\alpha = \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ or $\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and for each $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$,

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{\kappa(s)}}, \quad \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_o)_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{\kappa(s)}} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u_f}.$$

Each $(\Gamma - \Gamma_o) = (\Gamma - \Gamma_o)_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $(\Gamma - \Gamma_o)_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfies,

$$\sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1-s} \int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Gamma - \Gamma_o)|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{\kappa(s)}}.$$

Recall also that the diffeomorphisms satisfy

$$|\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u}.$$

See (10.1.1). The proof follows (using Proposition 4.3.4) from noting that, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, $|\gamma_1| \leq N - s$, $|\gamma_2| \leq N - s$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} |\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_o)_{\mathcal{H}^+}| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \alpha| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u} \left(\int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_o)_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \alpha|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{u^{1 + \frac{\kappa(s)}{2}}} \left(\frac{1}{u^{\kappa(s)}} + \frac{1}{u_f} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, $|\gamma_1| \leq N - 1 - s$, $|\gamma_2| \leq N - s$

$$\int_{B(u)} |\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Gamma - \Gamma_\circ)| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2}\alpha| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u} \left(\int_{B(u)} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Gamma - \Gamma_\circ)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{B(u)} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2}\alpha|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{u^{1 + \frac{\kappa(s) + \kappa(\min\{s, 1\})}{2}}},$$

for $\Gamma - \Gamma_\circ = (\Gamma - \Gamma_\circ)_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $(\Gamma - \Gamma_\circ)_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, and for $\alpha = \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}$. \square

The proof of Proposition 10.3.2 can now be given.

Proof of Proposition 10.3.2. Consider first the estimate (10.3.6) for α and the case $s = 2$.

First, suppose $|\gamma_1| = |\gamma_2| = 0$. Recall the projection $\Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}}$ to the $S^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ spheres (see (4.3.29)) and note that the bootstrap assumption (7.1.5) implies that $\Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \mathfrak{g}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ is a metric on the $S^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ spheres. It follows (see the proof of Proposition 4.3.4) that

$$|\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}|_{\mathfrak{g}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 = |\Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}|_{\Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \mathfrak{g}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2,$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} h(r_{\mathcal{H}^+}) |\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}|_{\mathfrak{g}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 - h(r_{\mathcal{I}^+}) |\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}|_{\mathfrak{g}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 &= (h(r_{\mathcal{H}^+}) - h(r_{\mathcal{I}^+})) |\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}|_{\mathfrak{g}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \\ &\quad + h(r_{\mathcal{I}^+}) (|\Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}|_{\Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \mathfrak{g}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 - |\Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}|_{\mathfrak{g}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2) + h(r_{\mathcal{I}^+}) (\Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+})_{\mathfrak{g}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the relation (4.3.45) implies

$$\Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}}^{1,0}.$$

The proof then follows from Lemma 10.3.3 and Lemma 10.3.5.

The proof for $|\gamma_1| = |\gamma_2| \geq 1$ is similar. It is helpful to first consider the case $|\gamma_1| = |\gamma_2| = 1$. Suppose, for example, that $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = (0, 0, 1)$. Again,

$$\begin{aligned} h(r_{\mathcal{H}^+}) |(r\Omega \nabla_4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{H}^+}|_{\mathfrak{g}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 - h(r_{\mathcal{I}^+}) |(r\Omega \nabla_4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{I}^+}|_{\mathfrak{g}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \\ = (h(r_{\mathcal{H}^+}) - h(r_{\mathcal{I}^+})) |(r\Omega \nabla_4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{H}^+}|_{\mathfrak{g}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + h(r_{\mathcal{I}^+}) (|\Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}} (r\Omega \nabla_4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{H}^+}|_{\Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \mathfrak{g}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 - |\Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}} (r\Omega \nabla_4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{H}^+}|_{\mathfrak{g}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2) \\ + h(r_{\mathcal{I}^+}) (\Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}} (r\Omega \nabla_4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{H}^+} + (r\Omega \nabla_4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}} (r\Omega \nabla_4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{H}^+} - (r\Omega \nabla_4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{I}^+})_{\mathfrak{g}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}. \end{aligned} \quad (10.3.12)$$

Note that, in both the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges,

$$\nabla_4 \alpha_{AB} = (\nabla_{e_4} R)(e_A, e_4, e_B, e_4) - R(e_A, \nabla_{e_4} e_4, e_B, e_4) - R(e_A, e_4, e_B, \nabla_{e_4} e_4),$$

and so,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}} (\Omega \nabla_4 \alpha_{AB})^{\mathcal{H}^+} - (\Omega \nabla_4 \alpha_{AB})^{\mathcal{I}^+} &= (\nabla_{\Omega e_4^{\mathcal{H}^+}} R)(H_A^C e_C^{\mathcal{H}^+}, e_4^{\mathcal{H}^+}, H_B^D e_D^{\mathcal{H}^+}, e_4^{\mathcal{H}^+}) - (\nabla_{\Omega e_4^{\mathcal{I}^+}} R)(e_A^{\mathcal{I}^+}, e_4^{\mathcal{I}^+}, e_B^{\mathcal{I}^+}, e_4^{\mathcal{I}^+}) \\ &\quad + 2(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ)^{\mathcal{I}^+} R(e_A^{\mathcal{I}^+}, e_4^{\mathcal{I}^+}, e_B^{\mathcal{I}^+}, e_4^{\mathcal{I}^+}) - 2(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ)^{\mathcal{H}^+} R(H_A^C e_C^{\mathcal{H}^+}, e_4^{\mathcal{H}^+}, H_B^D e_D^{\mathcal{H}^+}, e_4^{\mathcal{H}^+}) \\ &\quad + \frac{2M_f}{r_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2} R(e_A^{\mathcal{I}^+}, e_4^{\mathcal{I}^+}, e_B^{\mathcal{I}^+}, e_4^{\mathcal{I}^+}) - \frac{2M_f}{r_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2} R(H_A^C e_C^{\mathcal{H}^+}, e_4^{\mathcal{H}^+}, H_B^D e_D^{\mathcal{H}^+}, e_4^{\mathcal{H}^+}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$H_A^C = \delta_A^C + \frac{\partial f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^C}{\partial \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^A}.$$

As in the proof of Proposition 4.3.3,

$$(\nabla_{\Omega e_4^{\mathcal{H}^+}} R)(H_A^C e_C^{\mathcal{H}^+}, e_4^{\mathcal{H}^+}, H_B^D e_D^{\mathcal{H}^+}, e_4^{\mathcal{H}^+}) - (\nabla_{\Omega e_4^{\mathcal{I}^+}} R)(e_A^{\mathcal{I}^+}, e_4^{\mathcal{I}^+}, e_B^{\mathcal{I}^+}, e_4^{\mathcal{I}^+}) = \mathcal{F}^1,$$

and so it follows from Lemma 10.3.5 that

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(u)} |(r\Omega \nabla_4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{H}^+}| |((r\Omega \nabla_4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{H}^+} - (r\Omega \nabla_4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{I}^+})| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{u^2}.$$

The remaining terms in (10.3.12) are estimated similarly.

At higher orders, defining,

$$\nabla_{C_1, \dots, C_{l_1}}^{(l_1, l_2, l_3)} := \nabla_{e_{C_1}} \dots \nabla_{e_{C_{l_1}}} (\nabla_{e_3})^{l_2} (\nabla_{e_4})^{l_3},$$

it follows that, in both the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges,

$$\nabla_{C_1} \dots \nabla_{C_{k_1}} (\nabla_3)^{k_2} (\nabla_4)^{k_3} \alpha_{AB} = \sum_{\substack{l_1+m_1+n_1=k_1 \\ l_2+m_2+n_2=k_2 \\ l_3+m_3+n_3=k_3}} M_{l_1 \dots n_3} (\nabla_{C_1, \dots, C_{l_1}}^{(l_1, l_2, l_3)} R)(e_A, \nabla_{C_1, \dots, C_{m_1}}^{(m_1, m_2, m_3)} e_4, e_B, \nabla_{C_1, \dots, C_{n_1}}^{(n_1, n_2, n_3)} e_4),$$

for some constants $M_{l_1 \dots n_3}$. The proof then follows similarly from Lemma 10.3.5 since, schematically, for $m_1 + m_2 + m_3 \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{C_1, \dots, C_{m_1}}^{(m_1, m_2, m_3)} e_4 &= \sum_{\substack{j_1+j_2+j_3 \\ \leq m_1+m_2+m_3-1 \\ l \geq 1}} \left((\nabla^{j_1} \nabla_3^{j_2} \nabla_4^{j_3} \Gamma)^l (e_{C_1} \dots e_{C_{j_1}}) \right)^A e_A \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{j_1+j_2+j_3 \\ \leq m_1+m_2+m_3-1 \\ l \geq 1}} (\nabla^{j_1} \nabla_3^{j_2} \nabla_4^{j_3} \Gamma)^l (e_{C_1} \dots e_{C_{j_1}}) e_3 + \sum_{\substack{j_1+j_2+j_3 \\ \leq m_1+m_2+m_3-1 \\ l \geq 1}} (\nabla^{j_1} \nabla_3^{j_2} \nabla_4^{j_3} \Gamma)^l (e_{C_1} \dots e_{C_{j_1}}) e_4, \end{aligned}$$

so that, for any multi-index γ , schematically,

$$\Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \mathcal{F}^{|\gamma|}. \quad (10.3.13)$$

The cases $s = 0, 1$ are similar, as are the estimates (10.3.7) for $\underline{\alpha}$ where Lemma 10.3.4 is also used. \square

10.4 Cancellations on null hypersurfaces and spacetime regions

We will also exploit some additional cancellations in our later estimates that arise from replacing almost gauge invariant quantities in the \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges. These are contained in the following proposition, which forms part of the statement of Theorem C.2.

If ξ is an $S^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ -tangent $(0, k)$ tensor field, recall the definitions of $\nabla^{\mathcal{H}^+} \xi$, $\nabla_3^{\mathcal{H}^+} \xi$ and $\nabla_4^{\mathcal{H}^+} \xi$ from Section 4.3.6, along with the definitions of $|\nabla^{\mathcal{H}^+} \xi|$, $|\nabla_3^{\mathcal{H}^+} \xi|$ and $|\nabla_4^{\mathcal{H}^+} \xi|$.

Proposition 10.4.1 (Cancellations between almost gauge invariant quantities on null hypersurfaces and spacetime regions). *Given $s = 0, 1, 2$, $W \in \{\alpha, \underline{\alpha}\}$ and a multi-index $|\gamma| \leq N - 1 - s$, for all $u_1 \leq u \leq u_f$, the following estimates on null hypersurfaces hold*

$$\|\mathbb{1}(r\nabla)_{\mathcal{H}^+} ((\mathfrak{D}^\gamma W)_{\mathcal{I}^+} - \Pi(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma W)_{\mathcal{H}^+})\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(r\Omega \nabla_4)_{\mathcal{H}^+} ((\mathfrak{D}^\gamma W)_{\mathcal{I}^+} - \Pi(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma W)_{\mathcal{H}^+})\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{s+2}}, \quad (10.4.1)$$

$$\|\mathbb{1}(r\nabla)_{\mathcal{H}^+} ((\mathfrak{D}^\gamma W)_{\mathcal{I}^+} - \Pi(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma W)_{\mathcal{H}^+})\|_{C_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)_{\mathcal{H}^+} ((\mathfrak{D}^\gamma W)_{\mathcal{I}^+} - \Pi(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma W)_{\mathcal{H}^+})\|_{C_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{s+2}}, \quad (10.4.2)$$

for all $v(R_{-3}, u_1) \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{\{r_{\mathcal{I}^+} \geq R_{-2}\}}$, and

$$\|\mathbb{1}(r\nabla)_{\mathcal{I}^+} ((\mathfrak{D}^\gamma W)_{\mathcal{I}^+} - \Pi(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma W)_{\mathcal{H}^+})\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(r\Omega \nabla_4)_{\mathcal{I}^+} ((\mathfrak{D}^\gamma W)_{\mathcal{I}^+} - \Pi(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma W)_{\mathcal{H}^+})\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{s+2}}, \quad (10.4.3)$$

$$\|\mathbb{1}(r\check{\nabla})_{\mathcal{I}^+}((\mathfrak{D}^\gamma W)_{\mathcal{I}^+} - \Pi(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma W)_{\mathcal{H}^+})\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(\Omega^{-1}\check{\nabla}_3)_{\mathcal{I}^+}((\mathfrak{D}^\gamma W)_{\mathcal{I}^+} - \Pi(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma W)_{\mathcal{H}^+})\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{s+2}}, \quad (10.4.4)$$

for all $v(R_{-2}, u_1) \leq v \leq v(R_3, u_f)$, where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq R_2}$ and $\Pi = \Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}}$.

Moreover, given $s = 0, 1, 2$, $W \in \{\alpha, \underline{\alpha}\}$ and a multi-index $|\gamma| \leq N - s$, for all $u_1 \leq u \leq u_f$, the following spacetime estimate holds

$$\|(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma W)_{\mathcal{I}^+} - \Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma W)_{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{s+1}}. \quad (10.4.5)$$

The following two lemmas will be used to estimate nonlinear error terms in the proof of Proposition 10.4.1. Recall the nonlinear error notation (10.3.11).

Lemma 10.4.2 (Spacetime nonlinear error estimate). *For any $s = 0, 1$, and $k \leq N - s$, for any $u_1 \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|\mathcal{F}^k\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{s+2}}.$$

Proof. The proof follows as in the proof of Lemma 10.3.5, now using the fact that each $\Phi = \Phi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ or $\Phi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and each $\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}$ satisfies

$$\sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^s}, \quad |\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u},$$

from which it follows that

$$\|\mathcal{F}^k\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2} \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq k} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)}^2 + \sum_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}} \|\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)}^2 \right) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{s+2}}.$$

□

Lemma 10.4.3 (Error estimates on null hypersurfaces). *For any $s = 0, 1, 2$, and $k \leq N - 1 - s$, and for any $u_1 \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|\mathbb{1}(r\check{\nabla})_{\mathcal{H}^+} \mathcal{F}^k\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(r\Omega\check{\nabla}_4)_{\mathcal{H}^+} \mathcal{F}^k\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(r\check{\nabla})_{\mathcal{H}^+} \mathcal{F}^k\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(\Omega^{-1}\check{\nabla}_3)_{\mathcal{H}^+} \mathcal{F}^k\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{s+2}},$$

for all $v(R_{-3}, u) \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$, where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r_{\mathcal{I}^+} \geq R_{-2}}$, and

$$\|\mathbb{1}(r\check{\nabla})_{\mathcal{I}^+} \mathcal{F}^k\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(r\Omega\check{\nabla}_4)_{\mathcal{I}^+} \mathcal{F}^k\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(r\check{\nabla})_{\mathcal{I}^+} \mathcal{F}^k\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(\Omega^{-1}\check{\nabla}_3)_{\mathcal{I}^+} \mathcal{F}^k\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{s+2}},$$

for all $v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v \leq v(R_3, u)$, where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq R_2}$.

Proof. Given an operator $\mathfrak{D}^* \in \{\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^\gamma, \mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^\gamma \mid |\gamma| = 1\}$, note that

$$|\mathfrak{D}^* \mathcal{F}^k| \lesssim \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 1} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}| \cdot \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq k} |\mathfrak{D}^* \mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_o)_{\mathcal{H}^+}| + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq k} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{\mathcal{H}^+}| + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq k} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{\mathcal{I}^+}| + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 1} \sum_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}| \right).$$

The proof then follows, as in the proof of Lemma 10.4.2, from the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1-s} \left(\|\mathbb{1}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi)_{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(r\check{\nabla} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_o))_{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(r\Omega\check{\nabla}_4 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_o))_{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\mathbb{1}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi)_{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(r\check{\nabla} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_o))_{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(\Omega^{-1}\check{\nabla}_3 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_o))_{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \right) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^s}, \end{aligned}$$

for $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r_{\mathcal{I}^+} \geq R_{-2}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1-s} \left(\|\mathbb{1}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi)_{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(r\check{\nabla})^{\mathcal{I}^+} (\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_o))_{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(r\Omega\check{\nabla}_4)^{\mathcal{I}^+} (\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_o))_{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\mathbb{1}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi)_{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(r\check{\nabla})^{\mathcal{I}^+} (\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_o))_{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(\Omega^{-1}\check{\nabla}_3)^{\mathcal{I}^+} (\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_o))_{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \right) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^s}, \end{aligned}$$

for $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq R_2}$, and

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 1} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathfrak{D}\mathbf{f}| + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-6} (|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{\mathcal{H}^+}| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u}.$$

Moreover, the geometric quantities of both the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges can easily be shown to satisfy the following estimates on the cones of the other gauge at the expense of one derivative

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1-s} (\|\mathbb{1}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi)_{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi)_{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^s},$$

for $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r_{\mathcal{I}^+} \geq R_2}$, and

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1-s} (\|\mathbb{1}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi)_{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi)_{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^s},$$

for $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq R_2}$. \square

The proof of Proposition 10.4.1 can now be given.

Proof of Proposition 10.4.1. Consider first the estimates on null hypersurfaces. As in the proof of Proposition 10.3.2, schematically

$$(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha)_{\mathcal{I}^+} - \Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha)_{\mathcal{H}^+} = \mathcal{F}^{|\gamma|}.$$

Similarly for $\underline{\alpha}$. The proof of (10.4.1)–(10.4.4) are then an immediate consequence of Lemma 10.4.3.

The proof of the spacetime estimate (10.4.5) is similar, using now Lemma 10.4.2. \square

10.5 Estimates for initial energies of α and $\underline{\alpha}$

As discussed already in the introduction in Section V.4, one aspect of working with teleological normalisations is that it is non-trivial to estimate “initial” energy quantities when expressed in the \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges. The next part of the statement of Theorem C.2 corresponds to a bound of the initial energy fluxes of α and $\underline{\alpha}$ expressed in the \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges in terms of ε_0 .

Recall that, for $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$, $\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} = (r\check{\nabla})^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\check{\nabla}_3)^{k_2}(r\Omega\check{\nabla}_4)^{k_3}$. Define the following energies of α and $\underline{\alpha}$, in the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges. For the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}] &:= \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v_2} \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq N}^N \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+})\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \sup_{u_0 \leq u \leq u_f} \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^N \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+})\mathbb{1}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2, \\ \mathbb{E}_0^N[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] &:= \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v_2} \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^N \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+})\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \sup_{u_0 \leq u \leq u_f} \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq N}^N \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+})\mathbb{1}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{v_{-1} \leq v_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq v_3}$, and for the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &:= \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2} \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^N \|r^4 \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \sup_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2}) \leq v \leq v_\infty} \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq N}^N \|r^4 \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+} \mathbb{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2, \\ \mathbb{E}_0^N[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &:= \sup_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2}) \leq v \leq v_\infty} \left(\sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^N \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\check{r} \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+})\mathbb{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{N-1} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(r^3 \check{\psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+})\mathbb{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \right) \\ &+ \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2} \left(\sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq N}^N \|r^{-1} \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\check{r} \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+})\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{N-1} \|r^{-1} \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(r^3 \check{\psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+})\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{N-2} \|r^{-1} \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(r^5 \check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+})\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2}$. These energies should be compared with the energies of Section 6.1.5. Define also the following energies for P and \underline{P} :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_0^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}] &:= \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v_2} \sum_{|k|=0}^{N-2} \|\mathfrak{D}^k(r^5 P_{\mathcal{H}^+})\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \sup_{u_0 \leq u \leq u_f} \sum_{|k|=0}^{N-2} \|\mathfrak{D}^k(r^5 P_{\mathcal{H}^+})\mathbf{1}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2, \\ \mathbb{E}_0^{N-2}[\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] &:= \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v_2} \sum_{|k|=0}^{N-2} \|\mathfrak{D}^k(r^5 \underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+})\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \sup_{u_0 \leq u \leq u_f} \sum_{|k|=0}^{N-2} \|\mathfrak{D}^k(r^5 \underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+})\mathbf{1}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2,\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}_{v_{-1} \leq v_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq v_2}$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_0^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &:= \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2} \sum_{|k|=0}^{N-3} \left(\|r\mathfrak{V}_4 \mathfrak{D}^k(r^5 P_{\mathcal{I}^+})\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|r^{-1}(r\mathfrak{V})\mathfrak{D}^k(r^5 P_{\mathcal{I}^+})\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \sup_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2}) \leq v \leq v_\infty} \sum_{|k|=0}^{N-3} \left(\|\mathfrak{V}_3 \mathfrak{D}^k(r^5 P_{\mathcal{I}^+})\mathbf{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|r\mathfrak{V} \mathfrak{D}^k(r^5 P_{\mathcal{I}^+})\mathbf{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \right), \\ \mathbb{E}_0^{N-2}[\check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &:= \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2} \sum_{|k|=0}^{N-3} \left(\|r\mathfrak{V}_4 \mathfrak{D}^k(r^5 \check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+})\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|r^{-1}(r\mathfrak{V})\mathfrak{D}^k(r^5 \check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+})\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \sup_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2}) \leq v \leq v_\infty} \sum_{|k|=0}^{N-3} \left(\|\mathfrak{V}_3 \mathfrak{D}^k(r^5 \check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+})\mathbf{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|r\mathfrak{V} \mathfrak{D}^k(r^5 \check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+})\mathbf{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2}$. These energies involve integrals over regions which are covered by the initial Kruskal and Eddington-Finkelstein gauges of Theorem 5.5.1 and Theorem 5.5.2 respectively, and can therefore be controlled by comparing $\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and their derivatives to the geometric quantities in the initial gauges, and using the fact that the estimates (5.5.2) and (5.5.13) yield appropriate estimates for the geometric quantities in the initial gauges on the relevant \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ null hypersurfaces.

Proposition 10.5.1 (Estimates for initial energies of α and $\underline{\alpha}$). *The above initial energies of α and $\underline{\alpha}$ satisfy*

$$\mathbb{E}_0^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_0^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_0^N[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_0^N[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4, \quad (10.5.1)$$

and the above initial energies of P and \underline{P} satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}_0^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_0^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_0^{N-2}[\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_0^{N-2}[\check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4. \quad (10.5.2)$$

Proof. The proof is an immediate consequence of the following estimates for $\alpha = \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\underline{\alpha} = \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$,

$$\sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v_2} \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} (\|\Omega^{-1} \mathfrak{V}_3 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 \alpha\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|r\mathfrak{V} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 \alpha\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2) \right) \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4, \quad (10.5.3)$$

$$\sup_{u_0 \leq u \leq u_f} \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 \alpha \mathbf{1}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} (\|r\Omega \mathfrak{V}_4 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha} \mathbf{1}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|r\mathfrak{V} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha} \mathbf{1}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2) \right) \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4, \quad (10.5.4)$$

where $\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}_{v_{-1} \leq v_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq v_2}$, and, for $\alpha = \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $P = P_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\underline{\alpha} = \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\check{\psi} = \check{\psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, and $\check{P} = \check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$,

$$\sup_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2}) \leq v \leq v_\infty} \sum_{|k|=0, k_3 \neq N}^N \|\mathfrak{D}^k \alpha \mathbf{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4, \quad (10.5.5)$$

$$\sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2} \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N} \|r^4 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-2} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma r \mathfrak{V}_4 r^5 P\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \right) \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4, \quad (10.5.6)$$

$$\sup_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2}) \leq v \leq v_\infty} \left(\sum_{|k|=0}^N \|r \mathfrak{D}^k \underline{\alpha} \mathbf{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \sum_{|k|=0}^{N-1} \|r^3 \mathfrak{D}^k \check{\psi} \mathbf{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \right) \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4, \quad (10.5.7)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2} \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} (\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\alpha}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|(r\check{\nabla})\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\alpha}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2) + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma r^2 \check{\psi}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-2} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma r^4 \check{\underline{P}}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma r \check{\nabla}_4(r^5 \check{\underline{P}})\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \right) \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4, \quad (10.5.8) \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2}$. The proof of the estimates (10.5.3)–(10.5.8) proceeds by relating $\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and their derivatives to the corresponding quantities in the initial Kruskal and Eddington–Finkelstein gauges of Theorem 5.5.1 and Theorem 5.5.2 respectively, and using the fact that the estimates (5.5.2) and (5.5.13) yield appropriate estimates for the geometric quantities in the initial gauges on the relevant \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ null hypersurfaces.

Define the following energy of the geometric quantities of the initial Kruskal gauge of Theorem 5.5.1 on the spheres and null cones of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{0, i_{\mathcal{H}^+}}^N [\Phi_{\mathcal{K}, d}] := \sup_{\substack{u_0 \leq u \leq u_f \\ v_{-1} \leq v \leq v_2}} \left(\sum_{\Phi, |\gamma| \leq N-1} \|(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi)_{\mathcal{K}, d}\|_{S_{u, v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \right. \\ + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N} \left(\|(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\alpha, \beta, \rho - \rho_o, \sigma, \underline{\beta}))_{\mathcal{K}, d} \mathbb{1}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\beta, \rho - \rho_o, \sigma, \underline{\beta}, \underline{\alpha})_{\mathcal{K}, d}\|_{C_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \right) \\ + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} \left(\|(r\check{\nabla})^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha)_{\mathcal{K}, d}\|_{C_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1} \check{\nabla}_3)^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha)_{\mathcal{K}, d}\|_{C_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \right) \\ \left. + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} \left(\|(r\check{\nabla})^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\alpha})_{\mathcal{K}, d} \mathbb{1}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|(\Omega \check{\nabla}_4)^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\alpha})_{\mathcal{K}, d} \mathbb{1}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{v_{-1} \leq v_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq v_2}$, along with the following energy of the geometric quantities of the initial Eddington–Finkelstein gauge of Theorem 5.5.2 on the spheres and null cones of the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{0, i_{\mathcal{I}^+}}^N [\Phi_{\mathcal{EF}, d}] := \sup_{\substack{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2 \\ v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v \leq v_\infty}} \left(\sum_{\Phi, |\gamma| \leq N-1} \|(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma r^p \Phi_p)_{\mathcal{EF}, d}\|_{S_{u, v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \right. \\ + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N} \|r^{-1}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(r^5 \alpha, r^4 \beta, r^3(\rho - \rho_o), r^3 \sigma, r^2 \underline{\beta}))_{\mathcal{EF}, d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \\ + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(r^4 \beta, r^3(\rho - \rho_o), r^3 \sigma, r^2 \underline{\beta}, r \underline{\alpha})_{\mathcal{EF}, d} \mathbb{1}\|_{C_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \\ + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} \left(\|(r\check{\nabla})^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma r^4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{EF}, d} \mathbb{1}\|_{C_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1} \check{\nabla}_3)^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma r^5 \alpha)_{\mathcal{EF}, d} \mathbb{1}\|_{C_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \right) \\ \left. + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} \left(\|(r\check{\nabla})^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\alpha})_{\mathcal{EF}, d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|(r\Omega \check{\nabla}_4)^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \check{r} \underline{\alpha})_{\mathcal{EF}, d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2}$. Here $(r\check{\nabla})^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha)_{\mathcal{K}, d}$ is defined as in Section 4.3.6, and

$$\|(r\check{\nabla})^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha)_{\mathcal{K}, d}\|_{C_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 = \int_{C_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}} |(r\check{\nabla})^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha)_{\mathcal{K}, d}|^2 \Omega_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2 d\theta du,$$

with $|(r\check{\nabla})^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha)_{\mathcal{K}, d}|$ defined as in (4.3.57). Similarly for the other terms involving α and $\underline{\alpha}$ in $\mathbb{E}_{0, i_{\mathcal{I}^+}}^N [\Phi_{\mathcal{K}, d}]$ and $\mathbb{E}_{0, i_{\mathcal{I}^+}}^N [\Phi_{\mathcal{EF}, d}]$. Note that the pointwise control on the f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+} diffeomorphisms in (10.1.37) guarantees that (5.5.3) is satisfied by $\tilde{S} = S_{u, v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $U' = -\exp(-\frac{u}{2M_f})$, $V' = \exp(\frac{v}{2M_f})$, for all $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v_2$ and so the fluxes appearing in $\mathbb{E}_{0, i_{\mathcal{H}^+}}^N [\Phi_{\mathcal{K}, d}]$ are allowed fluxes in the energy $\mathbb{E}_0^N [\Phi_{\mathcal{K}, d}]$, defined in (5.5.4). Thus

$$\mathbb{E}_{0, i_{\mathcal{H}^+}}^N [\Phi_{\mathcal{K}, d}] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_0^N [\Phi_{\mathcal{K}, d}]. \quad (10.5.9)$$

Similarly, the pointwise control on the f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+} diffeomorphisms in (10.1.20) guarantees that (5.5.15) is satisfied by $\tilde{S} = S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $u' = u$, $v' = v$ for all $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2$, $v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v \leq v_\infty$ and thus the fluxes appearing in $\mathbb{E}_{0,i_{\mathcal{I}^+}}^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{EF},d}]$ are allowed fluxes in the energy $\mathbb{E}_0^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{EF},d}]$, defined in (5.5.16). Hence

$$\mathbb{E}_{0,i_{\mathcal{I}^+}}^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{EF},d}] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_0^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{EF},d}]. \quad (10.5.10)$$

Consider first the estimate for $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, for $|\gamma| \leq N$, on the incoming cones $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ of (10.5.3). It suffices to estimate $\underline{\alpha}$ and its derivatives in the Kruskalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge (see (5.6.7) and Section 2.3.4) since, following Proposition 10.1.11, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v_3$,

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N} \|(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha})_{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \lesssim \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N} \|(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\alpha})_{\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H}^+}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \varepsilon^4.$$

It follows, after relating $(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\alpha})_{\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H}^+}$ to covariant derivatives of the Riemann curvature tensor, as in the proof of Proposition 10.3.2 (in fact, the present proof is easier since there is no decay to be captured), that

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N} \|(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\alpha})_{\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H}^+}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \lesssim \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N} \|(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\alpha})_{\mathcal{K}, d}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + (\mathbb{E}_{0,i_{\mathcal{H}^+}}^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{K}, d}])^2 + (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N)^2 + (\mathbb{P}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}])^4.$$

Moreover

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N} \|(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\alpha})_{\mathcal{K}, d}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{0,i_{\mathcal{H}^+}}^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{K}, d}],$$

and so, in view of (10.5.9), it then follows from (5.5.2), the estimate for $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N$ in the bootstrap assumption (7.1.4), and the pointwise estimate (10.1.20) that

$$\|(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\alpha})_{\mathcal{K}, d}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4,$$

thus completing the estimate for $\Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$. For $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 \alpha$ one similarly obtains, by relating to covariant derivatives of the Riemann curvature tensor as in the proof of Proposition 10.3.2, that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 \alpha)_{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{\mathcal{H}^+} (\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha)_{\mathcal{K}, d}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + (\mathbb{E}_{0,i_{\mathcal{H}^+}}^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{K}, d}])^2 + (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N)^2 + (\mathbb{P}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}])^4 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4, \end{aligned}$$

in view again of (10.5.9), the estimate (5.5.2), the estimate for $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^N$ in the bootstrap assumption (7.1.4), and the pointwise estimate (10.1.20). The proof of the remaining estimates of (10.5.3) and (10.5.4) are similar.

The estimates (10.5.5)–(10.5.8) require slightly more care due to the presence of the r weights. Consider first the estimate for $r^4 \alpha$ on the cone $C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, for some $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2$. Revisiting the proof of the relation (4.3.45), one sees that, in fact,

$$\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+} = (1 + \partial_v f^4)^2 \Pi_{S^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \alpha_{\mathcal{EF}, d} + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{Df}, 5}^{1,0}, \quad (10.5.11)$$

where $f^4 = f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}^4$, and so, as in the proof of Proposition 4.3.4, for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2$,

$$\|(r^4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \lesssim \|(r^4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{EF}, d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + (\mathbb{E}_{0,i_{\mathcal{I}^+}}^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{EF}, d}])^2 + (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N)^2 + (\mathbb{P}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}])^4.$$

Since

$$\|(r^4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{EF}, d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{0,i_{\mathcal{I}^+}}^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{EF}, d}],$$

the estimate (5.5.13), in view of (10.5.10), the estimate for $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N$ in the bootstrap assumption (7.1.4), and the pointwise control on the f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+} diffeomorphisms in (10.1.20) then give

$$\|(r^4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4,$$

thus yielding the estimate for the first term in (10.5.6) when $|\gamma| = 0$. Estimates for $\|(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma r^4 \alpha)_{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2$, for $|\gamma| \leq N$, are obtained similarly, following the process of the proof of Proposition 10.3.2 (see the relation (10.3.13)). The estimate (10.5.5) is similar.

Consider now the second term in (10.5.6). For $r\check{\nabla}_4(r^5 P)$, Proposition 3.4.4 and the Codazzi equation (1.2.18) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} r\check{\nabla}_4(r^5 P) &= r^6 \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \check{\nabla} \text{div} \beta - r^6 \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \check{\nabla} \text{curl} \beta + 6M_f r \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r}\right) \hat{\chi} \\ &\quad + 3M_f r^3 \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \text{div} \hat{\chi} + 3M_f r^3 \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \beta + 3M_f r^2 \Omega \alpha + \Omega^{-1} \mathcal{E}_1^2. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from the change of gauge relations (4.3.47), (4.3.37), (10.5.11) and Proposition 4.3.5, after noting that the no linear terms in the diffeomorphism functions appear when the above expression is related to the corresponding expression in the initial \mathcal{EF} gauge, that, for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(r\check{\nabla}_4(r^5 P))_{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 &\lesssim \sum_{k \leq 3} \|r^3((r\check{\nabla})^k \beta)_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \sum_{k \leq 2} \|r((r\check{\nabla})^k \hat{\chi})_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|r^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \\ &\quad + (\mathbb{E}_{0,i_{\mathcal{I}^+}}^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{EF},d}])^2 + (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N)^2 + (\mathbb{P}_{u_f}[f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+}])^4, \end{aligned}$$

and the estimate for $\|(r\check{\nabla}_4(r^5 P))_{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2$ again follows from (5.5.13), in view of (10.5.10), since

$$\sum_{k \leq 3} \|r^3((r\check{\nabla})^k \beta)_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \sum_{k \leq 2} \|r((r\check{\nabla})^k \hat{\chi})_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|r^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{0,i_{\mathcal{I}^+}}^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{EF},d}].$$

Similarly for the higher order derivatives.

The estimates (10.5.7) and (10.5.8) follow similarly, using now Proposition 3.4.3 and Proposition 3.4.4. For example, for the final estimate of (10.5.8), Proposition 3.4.4 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{r^2}{\check{r}} \check{\nabla}_4(r^5 \check{P}) &= r^6 \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \check{\nabla} \text{div} \beta + r^6 \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \check{\nabla} \text{curl} \beta - 6M_f \Omega r^2 \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \underline{\eta} + 6M_f r \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r}\right) \hat{\chi} + \frac{3M_f}{\Omega} r^3 \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \check{\nabla} \Omega \text{tr} \chi \\ &\quad + 3M_f r^2 \Omega \alpha + a_1 r^5 \check{\nabla}(\Omega \hat{\omega}) \hat{\otimes} \underline{\beta} + a_2 r^5 \check{\nabla}_4 r \check{\nabla}(\Omega \hat{\omega}) \hat{\otimes} \underline{\beta} + a_3 r^5 \Omega \hat{\omega} \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \underline{\beta} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^2, \end{aligned}$$

and so the relations (4.3.47), (4.3.37), (4.3.39), (4.3.43), (10.5.11), and Proposition 4.3.5 imply that, for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|r\check{\nabla}_4(r^5 \check{P})_{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 &\lesssim \left\| \frac{r^2}{\check{r}} \check{\nabla}_4(r^5 \check{P})_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \lesssim \sum_{k \leq 3} \|r^3((r\check{\nabla})^k \beta)_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|r(r\check{\nabla} \eta)_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|r\hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \\ &\quad + \|r((r\check{\nabla})^2 \Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|r^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \mathbb{E}_{0,i_{\mathcal{I}^+}}^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{EF},d}]^2 + (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^N)^2 + \mathbb{P}_{u_f}[f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+}]^4 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^4, \end{aligned}$$

by (5.5.13) since

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \leq 3} \|r^3((r\check{\nabla})^k \beta)_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|r(r\check{\nabla} \eta)_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|r\hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|r((r\check{\nabla})^2 \Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 + \|r^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{EF},d}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2 \\ \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{0,i_{\mathcal{I}^+}}^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{EF},d}]. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly for higher order derivatives of $r\check{\nabla}_4(r^5 \check{P})$. \square

10.6 Estimates for \mathcal{H}^+ quantities from \mathcal{I}^+ quantities on C_{u_f}

There is one final statement which we have to show to complete the proof of Theorem C.2.

Recall that the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges share a common final outgoing cone C_{u_f} . Exploiting this fact and our estimates on the diffeomorphisms $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$, we obtain the following estimates on $\hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\beta_{\ell=1}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and a new quantity $\Upsilon_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in terms of geometric quantities in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge.

Proposition 10.6.1 (Estimating \mathcal{H}^+ quantities from \mathcal{I}^+ quantities on C_{u_f}). *The quantity $\Omega \hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfies*

$$\sum_{s=0,1,2} (u_f)^s \sum_{k=0}^{N+1-s} \int_{v(R_{-1}, u_f)}^{v(R_1, u_f)} \int_{S^2} |(r\hat{\nabla})^k \Omega \hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 d\theta dv'(u_f) \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4, \quad (10.6.1)$$

and the quantities $\mathrm{div} \beta_{\ell=1}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\Upsilon_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfy

$$\left| \mathrm{div} \beta_{\ell=1}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, v(R, u_f)) \right|^2 + \left| \Upsilon_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, v(R, u_f)) \right|^2 \lesssim (u_f)^{-4+2\delta} (\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4),$$

where

$$\Upsilon = \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r}\right) (\rho - \rho_\circ) + \frac{3M_f}{2r^2} (\Omega \mathrm{tr} \chi - (\Omega \mathrm{tr} \chi)_\circ) - \frac{3M_f \Omega_\circ^2}{2r^2} \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \mathrm{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \mathrm{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ).$$

Moreover the metric $(g - r^2 \hat{\gamma})^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfies, for $s = 0, 1$,

$$\sum_{k \leq N-s} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k (g - r^2 \hat{\gamma})^{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{S_{u_f, v(R, u_f)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v(R, u_f)^{s+1}} + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N + \sum_{k \leq N-s-2} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k \hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{S_{u_f, v(R, u_f)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + |(\rho - \rho_\circ)^{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2. \quad (10.6.2)$$

Remark 10.6.2. We remark that Proposition 10.6.1 will be used in the proof of Theorem C.6 in Chapter 15, after $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N$ has been estimated in Theorem C.5. The estimate (10.6.2) will be used in the proof of Theorem C.6 after $\hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $(\rho - \rho_\circ)^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ have been estimated (see Proposition 15.3.119).

In this section the diffeomorphisms $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ relating the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges are denoted f , without the subscript.

In obtaining the estimate (10.6.2) one first shows that

$$\sum_{k \leq N-s} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k (g - r^2 \gamma)^{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{S_{u_f, v(R, u_f)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v(R, u_f)^{s+1}} + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N + \sum_{k \leq N-s} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k f^4\|_{S_{u_f, v(R, u_f)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2. \quad (10.6.3)$$

(See the proof of Proposition 10.6.6 below.) It is more convenient to state the estimate, as in (10.6.2), after the final term, involving f^4 , has been estimated by quantities in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge.

Proof of Proposition 10.6.1. The proof will be accomplished in the Sections 10.6.1–10.6.3 below.

10.6.1 Estimate for $\hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ from $\hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$

When $\hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ is estimated from $\hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ on the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, the following simplification of the identity (4.3.37) is used, which exploits the vanishing of f^3 and f^1, f^2 on $u = u_f$.

Lemma 10.6.3 (Change of gauge identity for $\hat{\chi}$ on C_{u_f}). *The gauge condition $f^3(u_f, v(R, u_f), \cdot) = 0$ implies that, on $\{u_{\mathcal{H}^+} = u_f\} \cap \{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} = u_f\}$,*

$$(\Omega \hat{\chi})^{\mathcal{I}^+} = \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial v_{\mathcal{I}^+}}\right) (\Omega \hat{\chi})^{\mathcal{H}^+}. \quad (10.6.4)$$

Proof. Recall (10.1.2).

The equalities (4.3.8) and (4.3.9), together with the fact that $b^{\mathcal{H}^+} = 0$ on $\{u = u_f\}$ (and $\Omega^{\mathcal{I}^+} e_4^{\mathcal{I}^+} = \partial_{v_{\mathcal{I}^+}}$ everywhere) give

$$e_4^{\mathcal{I}^+} = \frac{\Omega^{\mathcal{H}^+}}{\Omega^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial v_{\mathcal{I}^+}}\right) e_4^{\mathcal{H}^+}, \quad e_A^{\mathcal{I}^+} = \partial_{\theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^A} = \partial_{\theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}^A} + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^A} \partial_v = e_A^{\mathcal{H}^+} + \Omega^{\mathcal{H}^+} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^A} e_4^{\mathcal{H}^+},$$

on $\{u_{\mathcal{H}^+} = u_f\} \cap \{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} = u_f\}$. Hence, on $\{u_{\mathcal{H}^+} = u_f\} \cap \{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} = u_f\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_{AB}^{\mathcal{I}^+} &= g(\nabla_{e_A^{\mathcal{I}^+}} e_4^{\mathcal{I}^+}, e_B^{\mathcal{I}^+}) = e_A^{\mathcal{I}^+} \left(\frac{\Omega^{\mathcal{H}^+}}{\Omega^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial v_{\mathcal{I}^+}} \right) \right) g(e_4, e_B^{\mathcal{I}^+}) + \frac{\Omega^{\mathcal{H}^+}}{\Omega^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial v_{\mathcal{I}^+}} \right) g(\nabla_{e_A^{\mathcal{I}^+}} e_4, e_B^{\mathcal{I}^+}) \\
&= \frac{\Omega^{\mathcal{H}^+}}{\Omega^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial v_{\mathcal{I}^+}} \right) g \left(\nabla_{e_A + \Omega \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \theta^A} e_4} e_4, e_B + \Omega_{\mathcal{H}^+} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^A} e_4 \right) \\
&= \frac{\Omega^{\mathcal{H}^+}}{\Omega^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial v_{\mathcal{I}^+}} \right) \left[g(\nabla_{e_A} e_4, e_B) + \Omega^{\mathcal{H}^+} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \theta^A} g(\nabla_{e_4} e_4, e_B) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \Omega^{\mathcal{H}^+} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \theta^B} g(\nabla_{e_A} e_4, e_4) + \Omega_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2 \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \theta^A} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \theta^B} g(\nabla_{e_4} e_4, e_4) \right] \\
&= \frac{\Omega^{\mathcal{H}^+}}{\Omega^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial v_{\mathcal{I}^+}} \right) \chi_{AB}^{\mathcal{H}^+},
\end{aligned}$$

where $e_A = e_A^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $e_4 = e_4^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, and the fact that

$$\nabla_{e_A} e_4 = \chi_A^B e_C + \underline{\eta}_A e_4, \quad \nabla_{e_4} e_4 = \hat{\omega} e_4,$$

has been used. Now,

$$\not{g}_{AB}^{\mathcal{I}^+} = g(e_A^{\mathcal{I}^+}, e_B^{\mathcal{I}^+}) = g \left(e_A^{\mathcal{H}^+} + \Omega^{\mathcal{H}^+} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^A} e_4^{\mathcal{H}^+}, e_B^{\mathcal{H}^+} + \Omega^{\mathcal{H}^+} \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}^B} e_4^{\mathcal{H}^+} \right) = g(e_A^{\mathcal{H}^+}, e_B^{\mathcal{H}^+}) = \not{g}_{AB}^{\mathcal{H}^+},$$

implies that

$$(\text{tr} \chi)^{\mathcal{I}^+} = \not{g}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{AB} \chi_{AB}^{\mathcal{I}^+} = \frac{\Omega^{\mathcal{H}^+}}{\Omega^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial v_{\mathcal{I}^+}} \right) \not{g}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{AB} \chi_{AB}^{\mathcal{H}^+} = \frac{\Omega^{\mathcal{H}^+}}{\Omega^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial v_{\mathcal{I}^+}} \right) \text{tr} \chi^{\mathcal{H}^+},$$

and hence

$$\hat{\chi}_{AB}^{\mathcal{I}^+} = \chi_{AB}^{\mathcal{I}^+} - \frac{1}{2} (\text{tr} \chi)^{\mathcal{I}^+} \not{g}_{AB}^{\mathcal{I}^+} = \frac{\Omega^{\mathcal{H}^+}}{\Omega^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial v_{\mathcal{I}^+}} \right) \left(\chi_{AB}^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \chi^{\mathcal{H}^+} \not{g}_{AB}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \right) = \frac{\Omega^{\mathcal{H}^+}}{\Omega^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left(1 + \frac{\partial f^4}{\partial v_{\mathcal{I}^+}} \right) \hat{\chi}_{AB}^{\mathcal{H}^+}.$$

□

The estimate (10.6.1) is now obtained by exploiting Lemma 10.6.3.

Proposition 10.6.4 (Estimate for $\Omega \hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, $\Omega \hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfies*

$$\sum_{s=0,1,2} (u_f)^s \sum_{k=0}^{N+1-s} \int_{v(R_{-1}, u_f)}^{v(R_1, u_f)} \int_{S^2} |(r \nabla)^k \Omega \hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 d\theta dv'(u_f) \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4.$$

Proof. Recall that, for any $S^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ -tangent $(0, k)$ tensor ξ , on $u = u_f$,

$$\nabla^{\mathcal{I}^+} \xi = \nabla^{\mathcal{H}^+} \xi + \nabla f^4 (\Omega \nabla_4)^{\mathcal{H}^+} \xi,$$

and so, for example, the equality (10.6.4) implies that

$$(\nabla \Omega \hat{\chi})^{\mathcal{I}^+} = (1 + \partial_v f^4) \cdot (\nabla \Omega \hat{\chi})^{\mathcal{H}^+} + (1 + \partial_v f^4) \cdot \nabla f^4 \cdot (\Omega \nabla_4 \Omega \hat{\chi})^{\mathcal{H}^+} + \nabla \partial_v f^4 \cdot (\Omega \hat{\chi})^{\mathcal{H}^+}.$$

Given $s = 0, 1, 2$, applying ∇^k to the equality (10.6.4), for any $k \leq N + 1 - s$, it follows that, in the error notation of Section 3.2,

$$|(\nabla^k \Omega \hat{\chi})^{\mathcal{H}^+} - (\nabla^k \Omega \hat{\chi})^{\mathcal{I}^+}| \lesssim \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2+|\gamma| \leq k \\ l_1+l_2+l_3 \geq 2}} |(\nabla^{k_1} f^4)^{l_1} \cdot (\nabla^{k_2} \partial_v f^4)^{l_2} \cdot (\nabla^\gamma \hat{\chi})_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{l_3}|.$$

The proof then follows after controlling the nonlinear terms appropriately. □

10.6.2 Estimates for $\ell = 0, 1$ modes of \mathcal{H}^+ quantities from \mathcal{I}^+ quantities

The following estimate for $\beta_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ exploits the fact that $f^3 = 0$ on $\{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} = u_f\} \cap \{u_{\mathcal{H}^+} = u_f\}$. The estimate for

$$\Upsilon^{\mathcal{H}^+} = \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r}\right) (\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \frac{3M_f}{2r^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \frac{3M_f \Omega_\circ^2}{2r^2} \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\mathcal{H}^+},$$

exploits the fact that this quantity, plus a suitable multiple of $(\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, when projected to $\ell = 0$ is almost gauge invariant.

Proposition 10.6.5 (Estimates for $\text{div} \beta_{\ell=1}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\Upsilon_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ on C_{u_f}). *The $\ell = 1$ modes of β and the $\ell = 0$ mode of Υ in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge satisfy*

$$\left| \text{div} \beta_{\ell=1}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, v(R, u_f)) \right|^2 + \left| \Upsilon_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, v(R, u_f)) \right|^2 \lesssim (u_f)^{-4+2\delta} (\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N + \varepsilon^4).$$

Proof. The estimate for $\text{div} \beta$ follows from applying div to the relation (4.3.47) and using the fact that $f^3 \equiv 0$ on $\{u_{\mathcal{H}^+} = u_f\} = \{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} = u_f\}$.

The estimate for $\Upsilon_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ follows from the fact that,

$$\Upsilon_{\ell=0} - \frac{3M_f}{r^3} (\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=0},$$

is almost gauge invariant. Indeed, the relations (4.3.36), (4.3.43), (4.3.44) and (4.3.49) imply that

$$\left| \left(\Upsilon - \frac{3M_f}{r^3} (\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2) \right)^{\mathcal{I}^+} - \left(\Upsilon - \frac{3M_f}{r^3} (\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2) \right)^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \frac{3M_f \Omega_\circ^2}{r^2} \Delta(f^3 - f^4) \right| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2}.$$

The proof then follows from the fact that $\left(\frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2} - 1 \right)^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ vanishes on $u_{\mathcal{H}^+} = u_f$. □

10.6.3 Estimate for $(\not{g} - r^2 \not{\gamma})^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ from $(\not{g} - r^2 \not{\gamma})^{\mathcal{I}^+}$

Finally the estimate (10.6.2) is obtained.

Proposition 10.6.6 (Estimates for $(\not{g} - r^2 \not{\gamma})^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, $(\not{g} - r^2 \not{\gamma})^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfies, for $s = 0, 1$,*

$$\sum_{k \leq N-s} \|(r \not{\nabla})^k (\not{g} - r^2 \not{\gamma})^{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{S_{u_f, v(R, u_f)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v(R, u_f)^{s+1}} + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N + \sum_{k \leq N-s-2} \|(r \not{\nabla})^k \hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{S_{u_f, v(R, u_f)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + |(\rho - \rho_\circ)^{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2.$$

Proof. Recall that, on the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, $f^1 = f^2 = f^3 = 0$. Using the relation (4.3.35) restricted to $\{u = u_f\}$, the fact that

$$\left| r_{\mathcal{H}^+} - r_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \Omega_\circ^2 (f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^3 - f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^4) \right| \lesssim |f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^3 - f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^4|^2,$$

and the fact that, for any $S^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ -tangent $(0, k)$ tensor ξ , on $u = u_f$,

$$\not{\nabla}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \xi = \not{\nabla}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \xi + \not{\nabla} f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^4 (\Omega \not{\nabla}_4)^{\mathcal{H}^+} \xi,$$

one easily arrives at the estimate (10.6.3). The proof then follows from the relation (4.3.49) restricted to $\{u = u_f\}$ and Lemma 10.6.3. □

This now completes the proof of Proposition 10.6.1, and thus also of Theorem C.2. □

Chapter 11

Tensorial wave equations

The goal of this chapter is to provide a unified framework for estimating classes of non-linear S -tensorial wave equations which will encompass the wave equations of Section 3.4 satisfied by the members of the gauge invariant hierarchy of Definition 2.1.1 and their higher order commutations. Specifically, we shall be able to represent these equations in the form

$$\frac{1}{2} (\Omega \nabla_4 \Omega \nabla_3 + \Omega \nabla_3 \Omega \nabla_4) W + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} (-\Delta + V) W = \mathcal{F}^{lin}[W] + \mathcal{F}^{nlin}[W], \quad (11.0.1)$$

for V some (non-negative) potential, $\mathcal{F}^{lin}[W]$ a “linear error” term and $\mathcal{F}^{nlin}[W]$ a “non-linear error” term. Depending on the potential, this will be called an S -tensorial wave equation of Type 1 or 2. We shall then derive a set of Propositions giving estimates for equations of the form (11.0.1) with general right hand side. These will then be applied in the subsequent two chapters in the course of the proof of Theorems C.3 and C.4.

Contents

11.1	Algebraic preliminaries and definitions	195
11.2	The structure of commuted tensorial wave equations	198
11.3	Regions and energies for tensorial wave equation estimates	201
11.3.1	The truncated regions	202
11.3.2	Energies associated to the region $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$	202
11.3.3	Energies associated to the region $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$	203
11.4	The energy estimate and basic integrated local energy decay	204
11.5	The redshift estimate	211
11.6	The r^p -weighted hierarchy	211
11.7	Nonlinear error estimates for wave equations	213
11.7.1	Error terms in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge	214
11.7.2	Main error terms in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge	217
11.7.3	Anomalous error terms in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge	218
11.8	Some auxiliary estimates for commuted energies	220

The first part of this chapter is purely algebraic. In **Section 11.1**, we shall introduce the general formalism for equations of the type (11.0.1), specifying in particular the V , $\mathcal{F}^{lin}[W]$, $\mathcal{F}^{nlin}[W]$ for the equations satisfied by (weighted versions of) the quantities α , $\underline{\alpha}$, ψ , $\underline{\psi}$, P and \underline{P} , each in their respective gauges. The most important algebraic insight, following from [DHR] (cf. (II.3.3) in Section II.3.1), is that $\mathcal{F}^{lin}[r^5 P] = \mathcal{F}^{lin}[\underline{r^5 P}] = 0$, in both regions. We then specify the V , $\mathcal{F}^{lin}[W]$ and $\mathcal{F}^{nlin}[W]$ arising from commuting tensorial wave equations of various types in **Section 11.2**.

The remainder of the chapter concerns the analysis of the above tensorial wave equations and will depend on the assumptions of Theorem C.

In **Section 11.3**, we define various energies (fluxes on null hypersurfaces, integrated decay energies) that will be relevant for the analysis. **Section 11.4** then proves general estimates (energy and integrated decay)

for an appropriate pair $(W_{\mathcal{H}^+}, W_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ satisfying S -tensorial wave equations of type (11.0.1). These estimates arise from summing general multiplier identities applied in the region $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ (for $W_{\mathcal{H}^+}$) and $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ (for $W_{\mathcal{I}^+}$) respectively. Characteristic of all statements is the appearance of a boundary term on the common boundary hypersurface \mathcal{B} that vanishes in linear theory (the contributions from $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ cancelling exactly) and will be estimated later (from Proposition 10.3.2) when specific equations are being considered. Furthermore, the inhomogeneous terms arising from \mathcal{F}^{lin} are kept abstractly in the statements of the propositions. These will again be estimated later when specific W 's and equations are considered.

Finally, **Section 11.5** proves redshift multiplier estimates for $W_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ above and **Section 11.6** proves r^p -weighted multiplier estimates for an $W_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ above.

As remarked above, Sections 11.1–11.2 lie outside of the proof of Theorem C and can in fact be read immediately after Chapter 3. Starting from Sections 11.3, we will assume the assumptions of Theorem C. The results of Sections 11.3–11.6 will depend on Theorems C.1 and C.2 and will in turn be used in the proofs of Theorem C.3 and C.4 of Chapters 12 and 13. Thus, the present chapter together with the following two form a coherent unit. The estimates of Sections 11.4, 11.5 and 11.6 build on previous techniques which originate in the study of the scalar wave equation on Schwarzschild and more generally Kerr spacetimes, mentioned already in Section II.3.1. The reader can refer to the discussion in Section 2.3 of [DHR] for more context, as well as the lecture notes [DR13] and some of the original papers [BS05, DR09b, DR09a, DRSR16].

11.1 Algebraic preliminaries and definitions

Associated to a general double null gauge of the form (1.1.4) or (1.2.32), endowed with a Schwarzschild background with mass M as in Section 1.3.4, we may define the following operator acting on S -tensors:

$$\square := \frac{1}{2} (\Omega \nabla_4 \Omega \nabla_3 + \Omega \nabla_3 \Omega \nabla_4) + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 (-\Delta) = \nabla_T^2 - \nabla_{R^*}^2 - \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \Delta, \quad (11.1.1)$$

where

$$T = \frac{1}{2} (\Omega e_3 + \Omega e_4), \quad R^* = \frac{1}{2} (-\Omega e_3 + \Omega e_4). \quad (11.1.2)$$

Define also the potentials

$$V_I = \frac{4\Omega^2}{r^2} - 6M \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} \quad \text{and} \quad V_{II} = \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} + 6M \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3}. \quad (11.1.3)$$

Remark 11.1.1. *Note that the principal part of $-\square$ agrees with that of the spacetime wave operator \square_g .*

Definition 11.1.2 (Types of tensorial wave equations). *Consider a double null gauge of the form (1.1.4) or (1.2.32), endowed with a Schwarzschild background with mass M as in Section 1.3.4.*

We say that an S -tensor¹ W satisfies a tensorial wave equation of Type 1 with given expressions $\mathcal{F}_1^{lin}[W]$ (“linear errors”) and $\mathcal{F}_1^{nlin}[W]$ (“non-linear errors”), if

$$\square W + V_I W = \mathcal{F}_1^{lin}[W] + \mathcal{F}_1^{nlin}[W], \quad (11.1.4)$$

a tensorial wave equation of Type 2 with given expressions $\mathcal{F}_2^{lin}[W]$ and $\mathcal{F}_2^{nlin}[W]$, if

$$\square W + V_{II} W = \mathcal{F}_2^{lin}[W] + \mathcal{F}_2^{nlin}[W], \quad (11.1.5)$$

a tensorial wave equation of Type 3_k with given expressions $\mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{lin}[W]$ and $\mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{nlin}[W]$, if

$$\square W + 2k \frac{M}{r^2} \Omega \nabla_3 W = \mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{lin}[W] + \mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{nlin}[W] \quad (11.1.6)$$

and a tensorial wave equation of Type 4_{k,l} with given expressions $\mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{lin}[W]$ and $\mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{nlin}[W]$, if

$$\square W + \frac{2k}{r} \Omega_\circ^2 \Omega \nabla_4 W + 2l \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} W = \mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{lin}[W] + \mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{nlin}[W]. \quad (11.1.7)$$

¹In all applications W will either be a symmetric traceless S -tangent 2-tensor or an S -tangent 1-form.

Remark 11.1.3. We remark already that while we shall consider Type 1 and 2 equations for quantities of both the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge and the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, we shall consider Type 3_k equations only for the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge and Type $4_{k,l}$ equations only for the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge.

The following propositions reveal the tensorial wave equations satisfied by the quantities in the gauge invariant hierarchy of Definition 2.1.1. In each case, the relevant double null gauge is that indicated by the subscript on the quantity, i.e. $\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ refers to the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, etc.

Proposition 11.1.4 (Quantities satisfying tensorial wave equation of Type 1 and 2). *The following quantities satisfy tensorial wave equations of Type 1 or 2, with given linear and nonlinear error terms:*

- The pairs $(A_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r\Omega^2\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, A_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r\Omega^2\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ and $(\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r\Omega^2\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \check{A}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \check{r}\Omega^2\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ satisfy equations of Type 2 with linear errors given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_2^{lin}[A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] &= \frac{8}{r} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \quad , \quad \mathcal{F}_2^{lin}[A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \frac{8}{r} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \\ \mathcal{F}_2^{lin}[\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] &= \frac{8}{r} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \quad , \quad \mathcal{F}_2^{lin}[\check{A}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \frac{8}{r} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}\end{aligned}\tag{11.1.8}$$

and non-linear errors given by (see Proposition 3.4.12 for the definition of k_1 below):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_2^{nlin}[A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] &= \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}^1 \quad , \quad \mathcal{F}_2^{nlin}[A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \mathcal{E}_6^1 \quad , \\ \mathcal{F}_2^{nlin}[\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] &= \Omega^6 (\mathcal{E}^*)^1 \quad , \quad \mathcal{F}_2^{nlin}[\check{A}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \check{\mathcal{E}}_3^1 + k_1 r \mathcal{D}_2^* (r \nabla \Omega \text{tr} \chi \cdot \underline{\alpha}) \quad .\end{aligned}$$

- The pairs $(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^3 \Omega \psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^3 \Omega \psi_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ and $(\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^3 \Omega \underline{\psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^3 \Omega \check{\psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ satisfy equations of Type 1 with linear error terms given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_1^{lin}[\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] &= \frac{3M}{r^2} \Omega^2 A_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \frac{2}{r} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \\ \mathcal{F}_1^{lin}[\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] &= \frac{3M}{r^2} \Omega^2 \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \frac{2}{r} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}\end{aligned}\tag{11.1.9}$$

and the same relations replacing all subscripts \mathcal{H}^+ by \mathcal{I}^+ and putting a check superscript on the underlined-quantities) and non-linear errors given by

$$\mathcal{F}_1^{nlin}[\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}^2 \quad , \quad \mathcal{F}_1^{nlin}[\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \mathcal{E}_4^2 \quad , \quad \mathcal{F}_1^{nlin}[\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \Omega^4 (\mathcal{E}^*)^2 \quad , \quad \mathcal{F}_1^{nlin}[\check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^2 \quad .\tag{11.1.10}$$

- The pairs $(\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ and $(\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ satisfy equations of Type 1 with linear errors given by

$$\mathcal{F}_1^{lin}[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \mathcal{F}_1^{lin}[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \mathcal{F}_1^{lin}[\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \mathcal{F}_1^{lin}[\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = 0 \quad .\tag{11.1.11}$$

and non-linear errors given by (see Proposition 3.4.14 and in particular (3.4.22))

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_1^{nlin}[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] &= \Omega^2 (\mathcal{E}^*)_2^3 \quad , \quad \mathcal{F}_1^{nlin}[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \mathcal{E}_2^3 \\ \mathcal{F}_1^{nlin}[\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] &= \Omega^2 (\mathcal{E}^*)_2^3 \quad , \quad \mathcal{F}_1^{nlin}[\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^3 + \mathcal{E}_{\text{anom}}[\check{P}]\end{aligned}\tag{11.1.12}$$

Proof. This is a rewriting of the equations derived in Chapter 3.4. □

Remark 11.1.5. One may easily check that also $\mathcal{F}_2^{nlin}[A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \Omega^2 (\mathcal{E}^*)^1$ and $\mathcal{F}_1^{nlin}[\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \Omega^2 (\mathcal{E}^*)^2$ but we will not need to exploit this additional structure of the error below. We will however exploit $\mathcal{F}_1^{nlin}[\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \Omega^4 (\mathcal{E}^*)^2$ and $\mathcal{F}_2^{nlin}[\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \Omega^6 (\mathcal{E}^*)^1$ in Section 13.7.6. (Recall Section 3.2.5 for the \mathcal{E}^* notation.)

Proposition 11.1.6 (Quantities satisfying tensorial wave equations of Type 3_k). *The following quantities satisfy tensorial wave equations of Type 3_k with given linear and non-linear error terms:*

- The weighted tensor $\Omega^{-4}\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfies an equation of Type 3₂ with

$$\mathcal{F}_{3_2}^{lin} [\Omega^{-4}\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \frac{8}{r} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} (\Omega^{-2}\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) - \frac{8M}{r^3} \Omega^2 (\Omega^{-4}\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}), \quad (11.1.13)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{3_2}^{nlin} [\Omega^{-4}\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}^1. \quad (11.1.14)$$

- The weighted tensor $\Omega^{-2}\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfies an equation of Type 3₁ with

$$\mathcal{F}_{3_1}^{lin} [\Omega^{-2}\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \frac{3M}{r^2} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \frac{2}{r} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} - 2 \frac{2M}{r^3} \Omega^2 \cdot (\Omega^{-2}\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}), \quad (11.1.15)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{3_1}^{nlin} [\Omega^{-2}\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}^2. \quad (11.1.16)$$

- The tensors $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfy an equation of Type 3₀ with

$$\mathcal{F}_{3_0}^{lin} [\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = -\frac{4\Omega^2}{r^2} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} + 6M \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \quad \mathcal{F}_{3_0}^{lin} [\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = -\frac{4\Omega^2}{r^2} \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} + 6M \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \quad (11.1.17)$$

and the non-linear error as in (11.1.12).

Remark 11.1.7. The reason for considering $\Omega^{-4}\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\Omega^{-2}\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ is that these quantities are expected to remain uniformly bounded all the way to the event horizon.

Proof. The $\Psi, \underline{\Psi}$ case is just a rewriting of the equation of Type 1 from Proposition 11.1.4, equation (11.1.11). Now for $W = \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $k = 1$ as well as for $W = \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $k = 2$ we note the identity:

$$\square(\Omega^{-2k}W) = \Omega^{-2k} (\square W - k (\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \Omega^2) \Omega \nabla_4 W) - 2k\omega \Omega \nabla_3 (\Omega^{-2k}W) - 2k \frac{2M}{r^3} \Omega^2 \cdot \Omega^{-2k}W + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}^{3-k},$$

which in turn follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 \Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^{-2k}W) &= \Omega \nabla_3 (-k\Omega^{-2k}2\omega W + \Omega^{-2k}\Omega \nabla_4 W) \\ &= -2k\omega \Omega \nabla_3 (\Omega^{-2k}W) - 2k \frac{2M}{r^3} \Omega^2 \cdot \Omega^{-2k}W - k (\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \Omega^2) \Omega^{-2k}\Omega \nabla_4 W \\ &\quad + \left(-2 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \nabla_2^* dv (\Omega^{-2k}W) + \Omega^{-2k} \square W \right) + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}^{3-k}. \end{aligned} \quad (11.1.18)$$

We now apply the above with $k = 1$ and $W = \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ as well as with $k = 2$ and $W = \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$. After inserting the relevant equation of Proposition 11.1.4 for $\square \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\square \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ we obtain the desired form. \square

Proposition 11.1.8 (Quantities satisfying tensorial wave equations of Type 4_{k,l}). *The following quantities satisfy tensorial wave equations of Type 4_{k,l} with given linear and non-linear error terms:*

- The tensors $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfy equations of Type 4_{k,l} with $k = 0, \ell = 2$ and with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{4_{0,2}}^{lin} [\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &= 6M \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \quad \mathcal{F}_{4_{0,2}}^{lin} [\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = 6M \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{4_{0,2}}^{nlin} [\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &= \mathcal{E}_2^3, \quad \mathcal{F}_{4_{0,2}}^{nlin} [\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^3 + \mathcal{E}_{\text{anom}}[\check{P}]. \end{aligned}$$

- The tensor $r^2 \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfies an equation of Type 4_{k,l} with $k = 1, \ell = 1$ and with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{4_{1,1}}^{lin} [r^2 \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &= 2M \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \frac{3M\Omega^2}{r^4} (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}) + 6M \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} (r^2 \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}), \\ \mathcal{F}_{4_{1,1}}^{nlin} [r^2 \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &= \mathcal{E}_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (11.1.19)$$

- The tensor $r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfies an equation of Type $4_{k,l}$ with $k = 2$, $\ell = -1$ and with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{4_{2,-1}}^{lin} [r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &= -8M\Omega^2 \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} - 22M \frac{\Omega_o^2}{r^3} (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}), \\ \mathcal{F}_{4_{2,-1}}^{nlin} [r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &= \mathcal{E}_2^1.\end{aligned}\tag{11.1.20}$$

Proof. For $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, this is a rewriting of the equation of Type 1 from Proposition 11.1.4, equation (11.1.11). For $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, note (dropping subscripts temporarily)

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega \nabla_3 \Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 \Pi) &= \Omega \nabla_3 (r^2 \Omega \nabla_4 \Pi + 2r \Omega_o^2 \Pi) \\ &= r^2 \left(-2 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \not\partial_2^* \not\partial v \Pi - 2 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \Pi + 6M \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} A - \frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) \Omega \nabla_3 \Pi + \frac{3M}{r^2} \Omega^2 A + \mathcal{E}_4^2 \right) \\ &\quad + 2r \Omega_o^2 \Omega \nabla_3 \Pi - \frac{2}{r} \Omega_o^2 \Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 \Pi) + 4\Omega_o^4 \Pi - 2\Omega_o^2 \Pi\end{aligned}$$

and collect terms. For A , note

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega \nabla_3 \Omega \nabla_4 (r^4 A) &= \Omega \nabla_3 (r^4 \Omega \nabla_4 A + 4r^3 \Omega_o^2 A) \\ &= r^4 \left(+ \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \not\Delta A - 2 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} A - 6M \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} A - \frac{4}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) \Omega \nabla_3 A + \mathcal{E}[\alpha] + F_{34}[A] \right) \\ &\quad + 4r^3 \Omega_o^2 \Omega \nabla_3 A - \frac{4}{r} \Omega_o^2 \Omega \nabla_4 (r^4 A) + 16r^2 \Omega_o^4 A + (-12r^2 + 16Mr) \Omega_o^2 A\end{aligned}$$

and collect terms. \square

11.2 The structure of commuted tensorial wave equations

The next three propositions capture what structure of the tensorial wave equations is preserved under commutation by the operators ∇_T , $r \not\partial v$, $r^2 \not\Delta$ and ∇_{R^*} .

Before stating them we need to define an additional bit of notation to capture the errors arising from the commutation of an abstract tensorial wave equation. Recall first from Section 3.2.4 that given $k_1, p_1 \geq 0$, the notation $(\mathfrak{D}^{k_1} \Phi_{p_1})^1 \cdot H$ denotes a term involving a sum of terms (linear, quadratic, cubic, ...) in the Φ_p containing at most k_1 derivatives in total and that the array H encodes the information on exactly what terms appear in the sum. Let W be a symmetric traceless tensor. Define for $p \geq 0$, $k \geq 2$ the array

$$\mathcal{H} = \left\{ {}^j \mathbf{H}_{k_1 k_2}^{p_1}, {}^j \tilde{H}_{k_1 k_2}^{p_1}, {}^j J_{k_1 k_2}^{p_1} \right\}_{k_1 + k_2 \leq k, k_1 \leq k-1, p_1 \geq p, j \geq 1}$$

where ${}^j \mathbf{H}_{k_1 k_2}^{p_1}$ is a collection of H as above, ${}^j \tilde{H}_{k_1 k_2}^{p_1} \in \{\gamma \mid \gamma \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^{k_2}\} \cup \{0\}$ and ${}^j J_{k_1 k_2}^{p_1}$ is a trace set of some order $d \geq 0$. Set $\mathfrak{D}^{k_2} W \cdot (\gamma) := \mathfrak{D}^\gamma W$ for $\gamma \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\}^{k_2}$. We finally define

$$\mathfrak{D}^k [\Phi_p, W] \cdot \mathcal{H} = \sum_{\substack{p_1 \geq p \\ k_1 + k_2 \leq k \\ k_1 \leq k-1}} \sum_{j \geq 1} \left((\mathfrak{D}^{k_1} \Phi_{p_1})^1 \cdot {}^j \mathbf{H}_{k_1 k_2}^{p_1} \otimes \mathfrak{D}^{k_2} W \cdot {}^j \tilde{H}_{k_1 k_2}^{p_1} \right) \cdot {}^j J_{k_1 k_2}^{p_1}.\tag{11.2.1}$$

As usual, such expressions are only ever considered when sufficiently many of the components of \mathcal{H} vanish so that each object appearing in the above summation is an S -tensor of the same type and moreover that the range of p and j is finite so that the summation is indeed well-defined. Finally, we note that once W is specified (it will typically be a derivative operator applied to an almost gauge invariant quantity) the above expression can be captured by the familiar $\mathcal{E}_p^{k'}$. For instance $\mathfrak{D}^k [\Phi_p, [r \Omega \nabla_4]^m (r^5 P)] \cdot \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{E}_p^{k+m+2}$.

Proposition 11.2.1. *Consider a double null gauge of the form (1.1.4) or (1.2.32), endowed with a Schwarzschild background with mass M as in Section 1.3.4. Let W be a symmetric traceless S -tensor satisfying a tensorial wave equation of Type 1 or 2. Then²*

²We suppress the subscript 1 or 2 in \mathcal{F}^{lin} below. It is 1 or 2 depending on the type.

- The commuted quantity $\nabla_T W$ satisfies a tensorial wave equation of the same type with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}^{lin} [\nabla_T W] &= \nabla_T (\mathcal{F}^{lin} [W]) , \\ \mathcal{F}^{nlin} [\nabla_T W] &= \nabla_T (\mathcal{F}^{nlin} [W]) + \mathfrak{D}^2[\Phi_3, W] \cdot \mathcal{H} .\end{aligned}\tag{11.2.2}$$

- The commuted quantity $rd\!\!\!\!/\,vW$ (which is an S -tangent 1-form) satisfies a tensorial wave equation of the same type with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}^{lin} [rd\!\!\!\!/\,vW] &= rd\!\!\!\!/\,v\mathcal{F}^{lin} [W] + 3\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2}rd\!\!\!\!/\,vW , \\ \mathcal{F}^{nlin} [rd\!\!\!\!/\,vW] &= rd\!\!\!\!/\,v\mathcal{F}^{nlin} [W] + \mathfrak{D}^2[\Phi_2, W] \cdot \mathcal{H} .\end{aligned}\tag{11.2.3}$$

- The commuted quantity $r^2\Delta W$ satisfies a tensorial wave equation of the same type with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}^{lin} [r^2\Delta W] &= r^2\Delta\mathcal{F}^{lin} [W] , \\ \mathcal{F}^{nlin} [r^2\Delta W] &= r^2\Delta\mathcal{F}^{nlin} [W] + \mathfrak{D}^3[\Phi_2, W] \cdot \mathcal{H} .\end{aligned}\tag{11.2.4}$$

- The commuted quantity $\nabla_{R^*} W$ satisfies a tensorial wave equation of the same type with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}^{lin} [\nabla_{R^*} W] &= \nabla_{R^*} (\mathcal{F}^{lin} [W]) - \frac{2}{r}\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2}\left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right)r^2\Delta W + h_0\frac{1}{r}\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2}W , \\ \mathcal{F}^{nlin} [\nabla_{R^*} W] &= \nabla_{R^*} (\mathcal{F}^{nlin} [W]) + \mathfrak{D}^2[\Phi_3, W] \cdot \mathcal{H} .\end{aligned}\tag{11.2.5}$$

Proof. The ∇_T commutation is straightforward using Lemma 3.3.1. For the angular commutation we note

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{D}_2\Delta\xi &= \mathfrak{D}_2\left(-2\mathfrak{D}_2^*\mathfrak{D}_2 + 2K\right)\xi = -2\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta - \frac{1}{2}K\right)\mathfrak{D}_2\xi + 2K\mathfrak{D}_2\xi + 2\nabla K\hat{\otimes}\xi \\ &= \Delta\mathfrak{D}_2\xi + 3K\mathfrak{D}_2\xi + 2\nabla K\hat{\otimes}\xi ,\end{aligned}\tag{11.2.6}$$

which yields the result. The ∇_{R^*} commutation is again a straightforward commutation using the formulae (3.4.11), (3.4.12) and Lemma 3.3.1. \square

Proposition 11.2.2. *Consider a double null gauge of the form (1.1.4) or (1.2.32), endowed with a Schwarzschild background with mass M as in Section 1.3.4. Let W be a symmetric traceless S -tensor satisfying a tensorial wave equation of Type 3_k . Then*

- The commuted quantity $\nabla_T W$ satisfies a tensorial wave equation of type 3_k with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{lin} [\nabla_T W] &= \nabla_T (\mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{lin} [W]) , \\ \mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{nlin} [\nabla_T W] &= \nabla_T (\mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{nlin} [W]) + \mathfrak{D}^2[\Phi_3, W] \cdot \mathcal{H} .\end{aligned}\tag{11.2.7}$$

- The commuted quantity $rd\!\!\!\!/\,vW_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ (which is an S -tangent 1-form) satisfies a tensorial wave equation of type 3_k with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{lin} [rd\!\!\!\!/\,vW] &= rd\!\!\!\!/\,v\mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{lin} [W] + 3\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2}rd\!\!\!\!/\,vW , \\ \mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{nlin} [rd\!\!\!\!/\,vW] &= rd\!\!\!\!/\,v\mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{nlin} [W] + \mathfrak{D}^2[\Phi_2, W] \cdot \mathcal{H} .\end{aligned}\tag{11.2.8}$$

- The commuted quantity $r^2\Delta W$ satisfies a tensorial wave equation of type 3_k with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{lin} [r^2\Delta W] &= r^2\Delta\mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{lin} [W] , \\ \mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{nlin} [r^2\Delta W] &= r^2\Delta\mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{nlin} [W] + \mathfrak{D}^3[\Phi_2, W] \cdot \mathcal{H} .\end{aligned}\tag{11.2.9}$$

- The commuted quantity $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 W$ satisfies a tensorial wave equation of type $3_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{lin} [\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 W] &= \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{lin} [W] + h_3 \Omega^2 \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 W + h_3 \Omega^2 \Delta W, \\ \mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{nlin} [\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 W] &= \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{nlin} [W] + \mathfrak{D}^2[\Phi_3, W] \cdot \mathcal{H}.\end{aligned}\quad (11.2.10)$$

Remark 11.2.3. The fact that commutation with $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ leads to a stronger redshift factor $(k + \frac{1}{2})$ is the familiar amplified commuted redshift effect for the wave equation. See [DR13].

Remark 11.2.4. Since these equations are only ever going to be considered in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, one does not need to keep track of the r -weights. We have included them here to unify notation for the error terms.

Proof. The ∇_T , $rd\nabla v$ and $r^2\Delta$ commutations are analogous to the proof of Proposition 11.2.1. For $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$, write (cf. Lemma 3.3.1)

$$\frac{1}{\Omega^2} \square = \frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3 \Omega \nabla_4 - \frac{1}{r^2} r^2 \Delta - \frac{1}{2} \Omega^{-2} F_{34}[\cdot]$$

and commute the operator $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ through, resulting in the commutator

$$[\square, \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3] W \equiv -\frac{2M}{r^2} \Omega^2 [\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3]^2 W - \frac{4M}{r^3} \Omega^2 \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 W - \frac{4}{r^3} \Omega^2 \Phi_2^* d\nabla v W \quad (11.2.11)$$

with \equiv ignoring non-linear errors which are easily seen (using Lemma 3.3.1) to be of the form appearing in (11.2.10). \square

Proposition 11.2.5. Consider a double null gauge of the form (1.1.4) or (1.2.32), endowed with a Schwarzschild background with mass M as in Section 1.3.4. Let W be a symmetric traceless S -tensor satisfying a tensorial wave equation of Type $4_{k,l}$. Then

- The commuted quantity $\nabla_T W$ satisfies a tensorial wave equation of type $4_{k,l}$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{lin} [\nabla_T W] &= \nabla_T \left(\mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{lin} [W] \right), \\ \mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{nlin} [\nabla_T W] &= \nabla_T \left(\mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{nlin} [W] \right) + \mathfrak{D}^2[\Phi_3, W] \cdot \mathcal{H}.\end{aligned}\quad (11.2.12)$$

- The commuted quantity $rd\nabla v W_{T^+}$ (which is an S -tangent 1-form) satisfies a tensorial wave equation of type $4_{k,l-\frac{3}{2}}$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{lin} [rd\nabla v W] &= rd\nabla v \mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{lin} [W], \\ \mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{nlin} [rd\nabla v W] &= rd\nabla v \mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{nlin} [W] + \mathfrak{D}^2[\Phi_2, W] \cdot \mathcal{H}.\end{aligned}\quad (11.2.13)$$

- The commuted quantity $r^2\Delta W$ satisfies a tensorial wave equation of type $4_{k,l}$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{lin} [r^2\Delta W] &= r^2\Delta \mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{lin} [W], \\ \mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{nlin} [r^2\Delta W] &= r^2\Delta \mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{nlin} [W] + \mathfrak{D}^3[\Phi_2, W] \cdot \mathcal{H}.\end{aligned}\quad (11.2.14)$$

- The commuted quantity $r\Omega\nabla_4 W$ satisfies a tensorial wave equation of type $4_{k+\frac{1}{2}, l-k-1/2}$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{lin} [r\Omega\nabla_4 W] &= (r\Omega\nabla_4 - \Omega_\circ^2) \mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{lin} [W] + h_2 r^2 \Delta W + h_3 r\Omega\nabla_4 W + h_2 W, \\ \mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{nlin} [r\Omega\nabla_4 W] &= (r\Omega\nabla_4 - \Omega_\circ^2) \mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{nlin} [W] + \mathfrak{D}^2[\Phi_2, W] \cdot \mathcal{H}.\end{aligned}\quad (11.2.15)$$

Proof. The ∇_T , $rd\nabla v$ and $r^2\Delta$ commutations are analogous to the proof of Proposition 11.2.1. For $r\Omega\nabla_4$ we first note

$$\begin{aligned}r\Omega\nabla_4 \left(\mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{lin} [W] + \mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{nlin} [W] \right) &= r\Omega\nabla_4 \left(\square + \frac{2k}{r} \Omega_\circ^2 \Omega \nabla_4 W + 2l \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} W \right) \\ &= \square (r\Omega\nabla_4 W) + \frac{2k}{r} \Omega_\circ^2 \Omega \nabla_4 (r\Omega\nabla_4 W) + 2l \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} (r\Omega\nabla_4 W) \\ &\quad + [r\Omega\nabla_4, \square] W + \left[r\Omega\nabla_4, \frac{2k}{r} \Omega_\circ^2 \Omega \nabla_4 \right] - 4l \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) W + \frac{1}{r} \Phi_{5/2} W.\end{aligned}$$

To compute the commutator $[r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4, \mathring{\nabla}]$ we observe (with \equiv ignoring non-linear terms, which are easily seen to be of the form claimed)

$$\begin{aligned}
r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 \left(\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 - \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2}r^2\mathring{\Delta} + F_{34}[\cdot] \right) &\equiv r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3 (\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4) - \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2}r^2\mathring{\Delta}r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 + 2\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) r^2\mathring{\Delta} \\
&\equiv \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3 (r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4) + \Omega_{\circ}^2\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 - \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2}r^2\mathring{\Delta}r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 + 2\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) r^2\mathring{\Delta} \\
&\equiv \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3 (\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4(r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4) - \Omega_{\circ}^2\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4) + \frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r}\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4(r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4) - \frac{\Omega_{\circ}^4}{r}\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 - \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2}r^2\mathring{\Delta}r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 + 2\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) r^2\mathring{\Delta} \\
&\equiv \mathring{\nabla} (r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4) + \frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r}\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4(r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4) + \left(-1 + \frac{4M}{r} \right) \frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r^2}r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 - \Omega_{\circ}^2\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 + 2\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) r^2\mathring{\Delta} \\
&\equiv \mathring{\nabla} (r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4) + \frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r}\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4(r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4) + (-1 + 2k) \frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r^2}r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 \\
&\quad + h_2r^2\mathring{\Delta} + h_2 + h_3r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 - \Omega_{\circ}^2 \left(\mathcal{F}_{4k,l}^{lin}[\cdot] + \mathcal{F}_{4k,l}^{nlin}[\cdot] \right).
\end{aligned}$$

To compute the other commutator we note

$$r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 \left(\frac{2k}{r}\Omega_{\circ}^2\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4W \right) = r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 \left(\frac{2k}{r^2}\Omega_{\circ}^2r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4W \right) = \frac{2k}{r}\Omega_{\circ}^2\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 (r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4W) - \frac{4k}{r^2}\Omega_{\circ}^2 \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4W$$

Collecting terms now yields the claim. \square

11.3 Regions and energies for tensorial wave equation estimates

We introduce in this section some auxiliary notations for regions convenient for applying energy type estimates for tensorial wave equations in our setup, as well as notation for energy fluxes and spacetime integral quantities that naturally appear in such estimates.

As in Chapters 9 and 10, in the remainder of this chapter we shall assume throughout the assumptions of Theorem C. Let us fix an arbitrary $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$, with $\hat{u}_f \in \mathfrak{B}$, and fix some $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$. All propositions below shall always refer to the anchored \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges in the spacetime $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$, corresponding to parameters $u_f, M_f(u_f, \lambda)$, whose existence is ensured by Definition 7.1.1. We shall denote $M = M_f$ throughout the remainder of this chapter.

The following summary will help the reader familiarise with the notation.

- Fluxes are generally denoted \mathbb{F} (outgoing cones) and \mathbb{F} (ingoing cones), integrated decay energies by \mathbb{I} .
- A check superscript (i.e. $\check{\mathbb{I}}$) is used when the cones or spacetimes integrals in the respective spacetime regions are truncated at the timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B} defined in Section 10.3.
- A superscript \diamond in the horizon energies denotes an energy that is non-optimal in terms of Ω^2 -weights (to be thought of as the horizon-degenerate energy generated by the ultimately Killing field T).
- A superscript “deg” in the horizon energies denotes an energy that degenerates near $r = 3M$.
- A superscript number in the infinity energies denotes an r -weight near null infinity.
- A superscript \star in the horizon region denotes that the energies are restricted to $r \geq 9M_{\text{init}}/4$.
A superscript \star in the infinity region denotes that the energies are restricted to $r \leq 2R$.




Figure 11.1: The regions $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$

11.3.1 The truncated regions

Recall the hypersurface \mathcal{B} and the values u_1, v_1 defined in Section 10.3.1. The timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B} partitions the globally hyperbolic domain

$$J^+(\underline{C}_{v_1}^{\mathcal{H}^+}) \cap J^-(C_{u_f})$$

into two connected components whose closures we shall denote by $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, characterised by

$$\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}, \quad \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}, \quad \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+} = \mathcal{B}, \quad \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+} = J^+(\underline{C}_{v_1}^{\mathcal{H}^+}) \cap J^-(C_{u_f}). \quad (11.3.1)$$

Refer to Figure 11.1.

More generally we will find useful also the notations, for given $u \geq u_1, v \geq v_1$

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v) &:= \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \{v_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq v\}, & \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) &:= \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} \geq u\}, \\ \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u, v) &:= \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \{u_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq u\} \cap \{v_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq v\}, & \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u, v) &:= \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} \geq u\} \cap \{v_{\mathcal{I}^+} \geq v\}. \end{aligned}$$

We may now define the truncated cones: For given $u \geq u_1, v \geq v_1$, define the null hypersurfaces of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge truncated at the timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B} ,

$$\check{C}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v) := C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v) \cap \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}, \quad \check{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u) := \underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u) \cap \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+},$$

and similarly define the truncated null hypersurfaces in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge

$$\check{C}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}(v) := C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}(v) \cap \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}, \quad \check{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) := \underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) \cap \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}.$$

Finally, given a $\tau \geq u_1$ we denote by $v(\tau)$ the number such that $\check{C}_{v(\tau)}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap C_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+} \subset \mathcal{B}$.

11.3.2 Energies associated to the region $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$

Recall our conventions from Section 6.1.3 concerning volume forms.

We define the energy fluxes for the truncated cones in $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ (ending at \mathcal{B} , indicated by a check superscript)

$$\check{\mathbb{F}}_u^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) = \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} |\Omega \check{\nabla}_4 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2, \quad (11.3.2)$$

$$\check{\mathbb{F}}_u[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) = \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} |\Omega \check{\nabla}_4 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} |r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} |W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2,$$

$$\check{\mathbb{E}}_v^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}} |\Omega \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2, \quad (11.3.3)$$

$$\check{\mathbb{E}}_v[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^{-2} |\Omega \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2.$$

Note the improvement near the horizon when the \diamond superscript is dropped.

Finally, we define the following auxiliary energy, which contains a \star to indicate it is restricted to the region $r \geq 9M_{\text{init}}/4$ (i.e. away from what will be the event horizon):

$$\check{\mathbb{F}}_v^\star[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \{r \geq 9M_{\text{init}}/4\}} |\Omega \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2. \quad (11.3.4)$$

We furthermore define non-degenerate and degenerate spacetime energies

$$\check{\mathbb{I}}^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) = \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1)) \setminus \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_2))} \frac{|\Omega \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2}{r^{1+\delta}} + \frac{|\Omega \check{\nabla}_4 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2}{r^{1+\delta}} + \frac{|r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2}{r^3} + \frac{|W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2}{r^3}, \quad (11.3.5)$$

$$\check{\mathbb{I}}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) = \check{\mathbb{I}}^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) + \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1)) \setminus \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_2))} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} |\Omega^{-1} \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2, \quad (11.3.6)$$

$$\check{\mathbb{I}}^{\diamond, \text{deg}}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) = \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1)) \setminus \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_2))} \frac{|\check{\nabla}_{R^\star} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2}{r^{1+\delta}} + \frac{|W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2}{r^3} + \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right)^2 \left(\frac{|\check{\nabla}_T W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2}{r^{1+\delta}} + \frac{|r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2}{r^3} \right),$$

$$\check{\mathbb{I}}^{\text{deg}}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) = \check{\mathbb{I}}^{\diamond, \text{deg}}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) + \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1)) \setminus \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_2))} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} |\Omega^{-1} \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2. \quad (11.3.7)$$

We also define the auxiliary energy (restricted to $r \geq 9M_{\text{init}}/4$)

$$\check{\mathbb{I}}^{\star, \text{deg}}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) = \int \frac{|\check{\nabla}_{R^\star} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2}{r^{1+\delta}} + \frac{|W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2}{r^3} + \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right)^2 \left(\frac{|\check{\nabla}_T W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2}{r^{1+\delta}} + \frac{|r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2}{r^3} \right),$$

where the integration is over $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1)) \setminus \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_2)) \cap \{r \geq 9M_{\text{init}}/4\}$. For all of the spacetime energies above we agree on the convention that replacing (τ_1, τ_2) by just (τ_1) results in all integrations being over $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1))$ instead of $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1)) \setminus \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_2))$.

Finally, we define the flux through the timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B} in the horizon region as

$$\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{B}}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau) := \int_{\mathcal{B}(\tau)} |\Omega \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |\Omega \check{\nabla}_4 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2. \quad (11.3.8)$$

11.3.3 Energies associated to the region $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$

We define the following energy fluxes on null cones

$$\check{\mathbb{F}}_u[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} |\Omega \check{\nabla}_4 W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} |r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} |W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2, \quad (11.3.9)$$

$$\check{\mathbb{E}}_v[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](u) = \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)} |\Omega \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} |r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} |W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2,$$

$$\check{\mathbb{F}}_u^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} r^p |\Omega \check{\nabla}_4 W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \check{\mathbb{F}}_u^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} r^{p-2} |r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2, \quad (11.3.10)$$

$$\check{\mathbb{F}}_v^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](u) = \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)} r^{p-2} |r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2.$$

We also define weighted spacetime energies

$$\check{\mathbb{I}}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) = \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1) \setminus \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_2)} \frac{|\Omega \check{\nabla}_4 W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^{1+\delta}} + \frac{|\Omega \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^{1+\delta}} + \frac{|r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^3} + \frac{|W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^3}, \quad (11.3.11)$$

$$\check{\mathbb{I}}^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) = \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1) \setminus \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_2)} \left(\frac{|\Omega \check{\nabla}_4 W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^{1+\delta_0^p}} + \frac{|r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^{3+\delta_2^p \delta}} + \frac{|W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^{3+\delta_2^p \delta}} \right) r^p, \quad (11.3.12)$$

for $p \leq 2$ where δ_b^a is the Kronecker delta symbol, and

$$\check{\mathbb{I}}^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) = \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1) \setminus \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_2)} r^{p-3} |r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2. \quad (11.3.13)$$

Furthermore, the following auxiliary energies will also be useful. They contain a \star which indicates that these energies are restricted to the region $r \leq 2R$. Specifically

$$\check{\mathbb{F}}_u^\star[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \{r \leq 2R\}} \left(r^p |\Omega \check{\nabla}_4 W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} |r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} |W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right), \quad (11.3.14)$$

$$\check{\mathbb{I}}^\star[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) = \int_{(\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1) \setminus \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_2)) \cap \{r \leq 2R\}} \frac{|\Omega \check{\nabla}_4 W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^{1+\delta}} + \frac{|\Omega \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^{1+\delta}} + \frac{|r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^{3+\delta}} + \frac{|W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^{3+\delta}}.$$

As before, we agree on the convention that replacing (τ_1, τ_2) by just (τ_1) in the spacetime energies results in all integrations being over $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1)$ instead of $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1) \setminus \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_2)$.

Finally, we define the flux through the timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B} in the infinity region:

$$\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{B}}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) := \int_{\mathcal{B}(\tau)} |\Omega \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |\Omega \check{\nabla}_4 W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2. \quad (11.3.15)$$

11.4 The energy estimate and basic integrated local energy decay

The next propositions establish good approximate energy conservation and integrated local energy decay estimates for tensorial wave equations in the region $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cup \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in terms of the energy on the cones $\mathcal{C}_{u_1}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{v(u_1)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$. In the derivation, we will only use the pointwise estimates

$$|r^p \Phi_p| + |\mathfrak{D}(r^p \Phi_p)| \lesssim \varepsilon, \quad (11.4.1)$$

valid for the quantities of both gauges, in regions $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ respectively, following easily from our general pointwise estimates (8.1.2).

Proposition 11.4.1. *Let $(W_{\mathcal{H}^+}, W_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ be either a pair of symmetric traceless S -tensors or of S -tangent 1-forms defined in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ respectively. Then, if $(W_{\mathcal{H}^+}, W_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ satisfy tensorial wave equations of Type 1 or Type 2 one has the following estimates:*

1. *T-Boundedness (non-optimal near horizon):* For any $u_1 \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq u_f$,

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_2)}^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{\tau_2}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f}^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau_1)) + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau_1) &\lesssim \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_1)}^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{\tau_1}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^3 \left| \mathcal{B}_i[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) - \mathcal{B}_i[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) \right| + \sum_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{G}_i[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) + \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{H}_i[W](\tau_1, \tau_2). \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.2)$$

2. *Basic integrated decay (non-optimal near horizon):* For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\mathbb{I}}^{\diamond, \text{deg}}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \check{\mathbb{I}}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) &\lesssim \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)}^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^3 \left| \mathcal{B}_i[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau, u_f) - \mathcal{B}_i[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau, u_f) \right| + \sum_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{G}_i[W](\tau, u_f) + \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{H}_i[W](\tau, u_f). \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.3)$$

Here, with $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2)) := \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1)) \setminus \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_2))$ and $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2) := \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1) \setminus \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_2)$, we define

$$\mathcal{G}_1[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) = \left| \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))} \mathcal{F}^{\text{lin}}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \nabla_T W_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} \mathcal{F}^{\text{lin}}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \nabla_T W_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right|, \quad (11.4.4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_2[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) &= \left| \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))} \mathcal{F}^{\text{lin}}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \nabla_{R^*} W_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} \mathcal{F}^{\text{lin}}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \nabla_{R^*} W_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right| \\ &+ \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))} |\mathcal{F}^{\text{lin}}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]| |W_{\mathcal{H}^+}| r^{-1-\delta} + \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} |\mathcal{F}^{\text{lin}}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]| |W_{\mathcal{I}^+}| r^{-1-\delta} \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.5)$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}_1[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) = \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))} |\mathcal{F}^{\text{lin}}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]| |\nabla_T W_{\mathcal{H}^+}| + \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} |\mathcal{F}^{\text{lin}}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]| |\nabla_T W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|, \quad (11.4.6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_2[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) &= \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))} |\mathcal{F}^{\text{lin}}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]| |\nabla_{R^*} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}| + \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} |\mathcal{F}^{\text{lin}}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]| |\nabla_{R^*} W_{\mathcal{I}^+}| \\ &+ \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))} |\mathcal{F}^{\text{lin}}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]| |W_{\mathcal{H}^+}| r^{-1-\delta} + \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} |\mathcal{F}^{\text{lin}}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]| |W_{\mathcal{I}^+}| r^{-1-\delta}, \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.7)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_3[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) = \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2)) \cap \{5M_{\text{init}}/2 \leq r \leq 7M_{\text{init}}/2\}} (|\mathfrak{D}\Phi_p| + |\Phi_p|) (|\nabla_T W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |\nabla W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2) \quad (11.4.8)$$

and $\mathcal{B}_i[W]$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ are defined in the proof, see (11.4.25), (11.4.27) and (11.4.30).

Remark 11.4.2. To guide the reader's intuition, we briefly discuss the later application of the above estimate to the almost gauge invariant quantities satisfying tensorial wave equations of Type 1 and 2. The errors $\mathcal{H}_i[W]$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ are non-linear error terms and will be handled schematically using Section 11.7. The error terms $\mathcal{B}_i[W]$ are boundary terms on the hypersurface \mathcal{B} . They cancel in linear theory and are hence at least cubic. They will be estimated schematically by relating the quantities in the different gauges; see Proposition 10.3.2. No special structure is required. The “linear” error terms $\mathcal{G}_1[W]$ and $\mathcal{G}_2[W]$, on the other hand, will be estimated explicitly (which also explains the position of the absolute value bars allowing further integration by parts). Their treatment will depend on a hierarchical structure in the system of tensorial wave equations that we estimate. Note in particular that in the case of Ψ , $\underline{\Psi}$, it follows that the $\mathcal{G}_i[W]$ actually vanish identically.

Remark 11.4.3. The terminology and notations: *T*-boundedness, *T*-identity, Morawetz *X*-identity, Lagrangian *h*-identity that will appear below are used to facilitate comparison with standard notation for the analogous constructions for the scalar wave equation (see e.g. [DR13]), where these identities are generated by currents associated to the Lagrangian contracted with vector fields T , X , ... and auxiliary functions h , etc. Note that in the present work, although we use X as a label, we shall not actually define a vector field X !

Proof of Proposition 11.4.1. Below V denotes either $V_I = 2\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} - \frac{6M\Omega^2}{r^3}$ (Type 1) or $V_{II} = \frac{6M\Omega^2}{r^3}$ (Type 2). Note $V_I \geq \frac{\Omega^2}{2r^2}$ for $r \geq 2M$.

Step 1: Derivation of multiplier identities. Before we start the proof proper we derive the following multiplier identities.³ Contracting the tensorial wave equation with $\nabla_T W$ produces identities in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ respectively of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_T \left(\mathfrak{f}_T^T [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \right) + \nabla_{R^*} \left(\mathfrak{f}_{R^*}^T [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \right) + \nabla^A \mathfrak{f}_A^T [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] &= \mathfrak{F}^T [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathcal{F}^{lin} [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \nabla_T W_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \mathcal{F}^{nlin} [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \nabla_T W_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \\ \nabla_T \left(\mathfrak{f}_T^T [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \right) + \nabla_{R^*} \left(\mathfrak{f}_{R^*}^T [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \right) + \nabla^A \mathfrak{f}_A^T [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &= \mathfrak{F}^T [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathcal{F}^{lin} [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \nabla_T W_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \mathcal{F}^{nlin} [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \nabla_T W_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{f}_T^T [W] &= \frac{1}{2} \left(|\nabla_T W|^2 + |\nabla_{R^*} W|^2 + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} (r^2 |\nabla W|^2) + V |W|^2 \right), \\ \mathfrak{f}_{R^*}^T [W] &= -\nabla_{R^*} W \nabla_T W, \\ \mathfrak{f}_A^T [W] &= -\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \nabla_A W_{BC} \nabla_T W^{BC}, \\ \mathfrak{F}^T [W] &= +\nabla_{R^*} W \frac{1}{2} F_{34} [W] + (K \cdot T (\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2) + \Omega^2 T (K - K_o)) |W|^2 + \frac{1}{2} (T (V - V_o)) |W|^2, \\ &\quad - \Omega^2 (\eta + \underline{\eta})^A \nabla_A W_{BC} \nabla_T W^{BC} + \frac{1}{2} (T (\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)) |\nabla W|^2 + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r \nabla W [r \nabla, \nabla_T] W, \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.9)$$

which we shall collectively refer to as the **T -identity**.

Contracting the tensorial wave equations with $f \nabla_{R^*} W + \frac{1}{2} f' W$ where f is a bounded function of r (i.e. $r = r_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $r = r_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$) and a prime denoting a derivative with respect to R^* produces identities with

$$\begin{aligned} &\nabla_T (\mathfrak{f}_T^X [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]) + \nabla_{R^*} (\mathfrak{f}_{R^*}^X [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]) + \nabla^A \mathfrak{f}_A^X [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathfrak{f}_{bulk}^X [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \\ &= \mathfrak{F}^X [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathcal{F}^{lin} [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \left(f \nabla_{R^*} W_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \frac{1}{2} f' W_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right) + \mathcal{F}^{nlin} [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \left(f \nabla_{R^*} W_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \frac{1}{2} f' W_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}, \\ &\nabla_T (\mathfrak{f}_T^X [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]) + \nabla_{R^*} (\mathfrak{f}_{R^*}^X [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]) + \nabla^A \mathfrak{f}_A^X [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathfrak{f}_{bulk}^X [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ &= \mathfrak{F}^X [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathcal{F}^{lin} [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \left(f \nabla_{R^*} W_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \frac{1}{2} f' W_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right) + \mathcal{F}^{nlin} [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \left(f \nabla_{R^*} W_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \frac{1}{2} f' W_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{f}_T^X [W] &= f \nabla_T W \cdot \nabla_{R^*} W + \frac{1}{2} f' \nabla_T W \cdot W, \\ \mathfrak{f}_{R^*}^X [W] &= -\frac{1}{2} f \left(|\nabla_T W|^2 + |\nabla_{R^*} W|^2 - \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |r \nabla W|^2 \right) + 2 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} f |W|^2 + \frac{1}{2} f V |W|^2 - \frac{1}{2} f' \nabla_{R^*} W \cdot W + \frac{1}{4} f'' |W|^2, \\ \mathfrak{f}_A^X [W] &= -\Omega^2 \nabla_A W f \nabla_{R^*} W - \frac{1}{2} \Omega^2 f' \nabla_A W_{BC} W^{BC}, \\ \mathfrak{f}_{bulk}^X [W] &= f' |\nabla_{R^*} W|^2 + r^2 |\nabla W|^2 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) f + |W|^2 \left(-f R^* \left(\frac{V}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{4} f''' \right), \\ \mathfrak{F}^X [W] &= -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r \nabla W [r \nabla, \nabla_{R^*}] W - \Omega^2 (\eta + \underline{\eta})^A f \nabla_A W_{BC} \nabla_{R^*} W^{BC} - 2 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} (r^2 K - 1) f W \nabla_{R^*} W \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (T f') W \cdot \nabla_T W - \frac{1}{2} \Omega^2 (\eta + \underline{\eta}) f' \nabla W \cdot W - \frac{1}{2} \Omega^2 \nabla W \nabla f' \cdot W \\ &\quad + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} f r^2 |\nabla W|^2 (\omega - \omega_o + \underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o) + |W|^2 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} f' (K r^2 - 1), \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.10)$$

³The contraction of indices is written below for the case of symmetric traceless tensors. The case of 1-forms requires trivial modifications and is not spelled out explicitly. Finally, we only explicitly write down the indices involved in the contraction (to a scalar) in case there is ambiguity, e.g. we write $\nabla_T W \nabla_{R^*} W$ to denote $(\nabla_T W)_{AB} (\nabla_{R^*} W)^{AB}$.

which we shall collectively refer to as the **Morawetz X -identity**.

Finally, contracting the tensorial wave equations with $\frac{1}{2}hW$ produces identities of the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \nabla_T (\mathfrak{f}_T^h [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]) + \nabla_{R^*} (\mathfrak{f}_{R^*}^h [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]) + \nabla^A \mathfrak{f}_A^h [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathfrak{f}_{bulk}^h [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \\ &= \mathfrak{F}^h [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathcal{F}^{lin} [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \frac{1}{2}hW_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \mathcal{F}^{nlin} [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \frac{1}{2}hW_{\mathcal{H}^+} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}, \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \nabla_T (\mathfrak{f}_T^h [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]) + \nabla_{R^*} (\mathfrak{f}_{R^*}^h [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]) + \nabla^A \mathfrak{f}_A^h [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathfrak{f}_{bulk}^h [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ &= \mathfrak{F}^h [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathcal{F}^{lin} [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \frac{1}{2}hW_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \mathcal{F}^{nlin} [W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \frac{1}{2}hW_{\mathcal{I}^+} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}, \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.12)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{f}_T^h [W] &= \frac{1}{2}h\nabla_T W \cdot W, \\ \mathfrak{f}_{R^*}^h [W] &= -\frac{1}{2}h\nabla_{R^*} W \cdot W + \Omega^2 K h |W|^2 + \frac{1}{4}h' |W|^2, \\ \mathfrak{f}_A^h [W] &= -\frac{1}{2}\Omega^2 h \nabla_A W_{BC} \cdot W^{BC}, \\ \mathfrak{f}_{bulk}^h [W] &= \frac{1}{2}h|\nabla_{R^*} W|^2 - \frac{1}{2}h|\nabla_T W|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2}hr^2|\nabla W|^2 - \frac{1}{4}h''|W|^2 + \frac{1}{2}Vh|W|^2, \\ \mathfrak{F}^h [W] &= \frac{1}{2}(Th)W \cdot \nabla_T W - \frac{1}{2}\Omega^2(\eta + \underline{\eta})h\nabla W \cdot W - \frac{1}{2}\Omega^2\nabla W \nabla h \cdot W, \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.13)$$

which we shall collectively refer to as the **Lagrangian h -identity**.

Step 2. General strategy and converting projected covariant derivatives into spacetime divergences to apply Stokes' theorem. With $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ fixed, we will apply for arbitrary $\tau < u \leq u_f$ successively

- The T -identity,
- The Morawetz X -identity with $f = (1 - \frac{3M}{r})(1 + \frac{M}{r})$,
- The Lagrangian h -identity with $h = -(1 - \frac{3M}{r})^2 \frac{1}{r^2}$
- The Morawetz X -identity with $f = (1 - r^{-\delta})\xi$ where ξ is a smooth cut-off function equal to 1 for $r \geq 2R$ and vanishing for $r \leq 2R_{-1}$
- The Lagrangian h -identity with $h = r^{-1-\delta}\xi$ where ξ is a smooth cut-off function equal to 1 for $r \geq 2R$ and vanishing for $r \leq 2R_{-1}$.

By this we mean multiplying each identity with $\frac{\sqrt{g}}{r^2}$ (recall $r = r_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ in $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $r = r_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in the region inside $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$) and integrating

- the relevant identity for $W_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ in the region $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1) \setminus \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_2)$
- the relevant identity for $W_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ identity in the region $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2)) = \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1)) \setminus \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_2))$

and finally *summing* the two identities.

We then apply Stokes' theorem after using the following Lemma, which converts the projected covariant derivatives appearing in the identities into spacetime divergences.

Lemma 11.4.4. *For \mathfrak{f} a spacetime function and \mathfrak{f} an S -vectorfield we have in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ the formulae*

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \mathfrak{f} = \Omega^2 r^2 \nabla_a \left(\frac{1}{\Omega^2 r^2} (\Omega e_3)^a \mathfrak{f} \right) - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) \mathfrak{f}, \quad (11.4.14)$$

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \mathfrak{f} = \Omega^2 r^2 \nabla_a \left(\frac{1}{\Omega^2 r^2} (\Omega e_4)^a \mathfrak{f} \right) - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ - b^A \partial_A \log \sqrt{\mathfrak{g}}) \mathfrak{f}, \quad (11.4.15)$$

$$\nabla_A \mathfrak{f}^A = \Omega^2 r^2 \nabla_a \left(\frac{\mathfrak{f}^A}{\Omega^2 r^2} (e_A)^a \right). \quad (11.4.16)$$

Similarly, in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ (where we recall the metric is of the form (1.2.32) and hence (1.2.33) holds)

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \mathfrak{f} = \Omega^2 r^2 \nabla_a \left(\frac{1}{\Omega^2 r^2} (\Omega e_4)^a \mathfrak{f} \right) - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) \mathfrak{f}, \quad (11.4.17)$$

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \mathfrak{f} = \Omega^2 r^2 \nabla_a \left(\frac{1}{\Omega^2 r^2} (\Omega e_3)^a \mathfrak{f} \right) - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ - b^A \partial_A \log \sqrt{\mathfrak{g}}) \mathfrak{f}, \quad (11.4.18)$$

$$\nabla_A \mathfrak{f}^A = \Omega^2 r^2 \nabla_a \left(\frac{\mathfrak{f}^A}{\Omega^2 r^2} (e_A)^a \right). \quad (11.4.19)$$

Proof. We carry out the proof for the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, the one for the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge being entirely analogous.

We note ($\sqrt{g} = 2\Omega^2 \sqrt{\mathfrak{g}}$ being the spacetime volume form)

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \mathfrak{f} = \sqrt{g} \nabla_a \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} (\Omega e_3)^a \mathfrak{f} \right) \quad (11.4.20)$$

and stick in a $\frac{\sqrt{\mathfrak{g}}}{r^2}$ in the bracket. Analogously for the 4-direction where we start from

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \mathfrak{f} = \sqrt{g} \nabla_a \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} (\Omega e_4)^a \mathfrak{f} \right) - \mathfrak{f} \partial_A b^A = \sqrt{g} \nabla_a \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} (\Omega e_4)^a \mathfrak{f} \right) - \mathfrak{f} \not\partial b + \mathfrak{f} b^A \partial_A \log \sqrt{\mathfrak{g}} \quad (11.4.21)$$

and repeat the computation sticking in a $\frac{\sqrt{\mathfrak{g}}}{r^2}$ in the bracket. For the last part we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_a \left(\mathfrak{f}^A (e_A)^a \right) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \partial_a \left(\sqrt{g} \mathfrak{f}^A (e_A)^a \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{g}} \Omega^2} \partial_a \left(\sqrt{\mathfrak{g}} \Omega^2 \mathfrak{f}^A (e_A)^a \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{g}} \Omega^2} \partial_B \left(\sqrt{\mathfrak{g}} \Omega^2 \mathfrak{f}^B \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{g}}} \partial_A \left(\sqrt{\mathfrak{g}} \mathfrak{f}^A \right) + \Omega^2 (\eta + \underline{\eta})_B \mathfrak{f}^B = \nabla_A \mathfrak{f}^A + \Omega^2 (\eta + \underline{\eta})_B \mathfrak{f}^B. \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.22)$$

□

Note that indeed Stokes' theorem can be applied to each of the first terms on the right in the Lemma after multiplication by $\frac{\sqrt{\mathfrak{g}}}{r^2}$ and integration with respect to the volume for $dudvd\theta^1 d\theta^2$. Moreover, note that the second term on the right produces a cubic error term if \mathfrak{f} is quadratic. In summary this produces identities relating various bulk and flux terms as well as a term on the common boundary \mathcal{B} .

Step 3: General error estimates. We already note the following estimate for the non-linear error terms arising from the various \mathfrak{F} (recall the definition (1.4.1)):

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))} dudvd\theta \left(|\mathfrak{F}^T[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]| + |\mathfrak{F}^X[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]| + |\mathfrak{F}^h[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]| \right) \\ & + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} dudvd\theta \left(|\mathfrak{F}^T[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]| + |\mathfrak{F}^X[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]| + |\mathfrak{F}^h[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]| \right) \\ & \lesssim \mathcal{H}_3[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) + \varepsilon \left(\mathbb{I}^{\circ, deg}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2)) + \mathbb{I}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.23)$$

which follows easily from inserting the pointwise bounds (11.4.1) on the Ricci coefficients (use Lemma 3.3.1 for the commutator terms before inserting the L^∞ -bounds). The non-linear spacetime terms arising after integration from applying the formulae of Lemma 11.4.4 are also easily seen to be controlled by the right hand side of (11.4.23).

Step 4: Applying the T -identity. Recall $u_1 \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq u_f$ has been fixed. Integrating the T identity as described above in the V -shaped region produces (after summing) the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{\tau_2}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_2)}^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f}^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau_1)) + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau_1) &\lesssim \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_1)}^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \lesssim \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ + \mathcal{G}_1[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) + \mathcal{H}_1[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) + \mathcal{H}_3[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) + |\mathcal{B}_1[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) - \mathcal{B}_1[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2)| \\ + \varepsilon \left(\mathbb{I}^{\diamond, deg}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2)) + \mathbb{I}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.24)$$

provided we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_1[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) &:= \int_{\mathcal{B}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} \left(\mathfrak{f}_T^T[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]g(T^{\mathcal{I}^+}, n) + \mathfrak{f}_{R^*}^T[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]g(R^{\star \mathcal{I}^+}, n) + \mathfrak{f}_A^T[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]g(e_A^{\mathcal{I}^+}, n) \right) \\ \mathcal{B}_1[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) &:= \int_{\mathcal{B}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} \left(\mathfrak{f}_T^T[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]g(T^{\mathcal{H}^+}, n) + \mathfrak{f}_{R^*}^T[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]g(R^{\star \mathcal{H}^+}, n) + \mathfrak{f}_A^T[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]g(e_A^{\mathcal{H}^+}, n) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.25)$$

The estimate (11.4.24) arises from the respective boundary terms induced on the hypersurface \mathcal{B} , where the integration is with respect to the measure induced on \mathcal{B} .

Below we will often add a large multiple (depending only on M_{init}) of the estimate (11.4.24).

Step 5: Applying the Morawetz X -identity. We claim that choosing $f = (1 - \frac{3M}{r})(1 + \frac{M}{r})$ in the Morawetz multiplier identity produces

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))} \left(\frac{1}{r^2} |\nabla_{R^*} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{(1 - \frac{3M}{r})^2}{r^3} |\nabla W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^3} |W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \right) \\ &+ \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} \left(\frac{1}{r^2} |\nabla_{R^*} W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^3} |\nabla W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^3} |W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right) \lesssim \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_1)}^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{\tau_1}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ &+ \mathcal{G}_1[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) + \mathcal{G}_2[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) + \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{H}_i[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) + \left| \sum_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{B}_i[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) - \mathcal{B}_i[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.26)$$

provided we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_2[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &:= \int_{\mathcal{B}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} \left(\mathfrak{f}_T^X[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]g(T^{\mathcal{I}^+}, n) + \mathfrak{f}_{R^*}^X[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]g(R^{\star \mathcal{I}^+}, n) + \mathfrak{f}_A^X[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]g(e_A^{\mathcal{I}^+}, n) \right) \\ \mathcal{B}_2[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] &:= \int_{\mathcal{B}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} \left(\mathfrak{f}_T^X[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]g(T^{\mathcal{H}^+}, n) + \mathfrak{f}_{R^*}^X[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]g(R^{\star \mathcal{H}^+}, n) + \mathfrak{f}_A^X[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]g(e_A^{\mathcal{H}^+}, n) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.27)$$

which arises from the contribution of the boundary terms on the hypersurface \mathcal{B} . Here we have used that

- we can control all boundary terms that appear on null hypersurfaces by adding a large multiple of the estimate (11.4.24).
- in the region $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ we can use that we have

$$-f \left(\frac{V}{2} \right)' - \frac{1}{4} f''' \geq \frac{1 - \frac{2M}{r}}{r^3}$$

for both $V = V_I$ and $V = V_{II}$.

- in the region $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))$ we have for V_{II}

$$-f \left(\frac{V_{II}}{2} \right)' - \frac{1}{4} f''' \geq \frac{1 - \frac{2M}{r}}{r^3},$$

while for V_I we have the above inequality only in $r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq 6M_{\text{init}}$. However, for $r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq 6M_{\text{init}}$ we can use in addition the Poincaré inequality⁴ of Proposition 9.3.2 for a symmetric traceless S -tensor W ,

$$\int dudvd\theta r^2 |\nabla W|^2 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) f \geq \frac{3}{4} \int dudvd\theta \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right)^2 \left(1 + \frac{M}{r} \right) |W|^2, \quad (11.4.28)$$

where the integration is over $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2)) \cap \{r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq 6M_{\text{init}}\}$ on both sides, and the fact that

$$-f \left(\frac{V_I}{2} \right)' - \frac{1}{4} f''' + \frac{3}{4} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right)^2 \left(1 + \frac{M}{r} \right) \geq \frac{1}{64} \frac{1 - \frac{2M}{r}}{r^3}$$

holds in $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2)) \cap \{r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq 6M_{\text{init}}\}$.

Step 6: Applying the Lagrangian h -identity. To obtain the missing ∇_T derivatives in (11.4.26) we apply the Lagrangian identity with $h = -\left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right)^2 \frac{1}{r^2}$ and use that we can add a large multiple of the identity (11.4.26) and (11.4.24) to produce the identity

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))} \left(\frac{1}{r^2} |\nabla_{R^*} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{(1 - \frac{3M}{r})^2}{r^3} |\nabla W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{(1 - \frac{3M}{r})^2}{r^2} |\nabla_T W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^3} |W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \right) \\ & + \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} \left(\frac{1}{r^2} |\nabla_{R^*} W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} |\nabla_T W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^3} |\nabla W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^3} |W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right) \lesssim \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_1)}^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{\tau_1}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{G}_i[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) + \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{H}_i[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) + \left| \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{B}_i[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) - \mathcal{B}_i[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.29)$$

provided we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_3[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) &:= \int_{\mathcal{B}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} \left(\mathfrak{f}_T^h[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]g(T^{\mathcal{I}^+}, n) + \mathfrak{f}_{R^*}^h[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]g(R^{\mathcal{I}^+}, n) + \mathfrak{f}_A^h[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]g(e_A^{\mathcal{I}^+}, n) \right), \\ \mathcal{B}_3[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) &:= \int_{\mathcal{B}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} \left(\mathfrak{f}_T^h[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]g(T^{\mathcal{H}^+}, n) + \mathfrak{f}_{R^*}^h[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]g(R^{\mathcal{H}^+}, n) + \mathfrak{f}_A^h[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]g(e_A^{\mathcal{H}^+}, n) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.30)$$

Step 7: Optimising the r -weights. Except for the r -weights at infinity this is already the desired estimate (12.2.4). To finally optimise the r -weights we apply again the Morawetz X -identity, this time with $f = (1 - \frac{1}{r^\delta})\xi$ where ξ is a smooth cut-off function vanishing for $r \leq 2R_{-1}$ and equal to 1 for $r \geq 2R$ (in particular, no boundary term on \mathcal{B}). It is easy to see that

$$\mathfrak{f}_{bulk}^X[W] \geq \frac{1}{2} \delta r^{-1-\delta} |\nabla_{R^*} W|^2 + \frac{1}{r^3} |W|^2$$

holds for all $r \geq \tilde{R}$ for some \tilde{R} sufficiently large.

Since we already control (11.4.29) and since all boundary terms in the identity remain controlled by the T -identity we have obtained the correct r -weight for $\nabla_{R^*} W$ appearing in $\check{\mathbb{I}}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$. To obtain the optimal r -weight for the $\nabla_T W$ term we apply the Lagrangian h -identity with $h = -r^{-1-\delta}\xi$. This finally yields (11.4.3) as stated. Coupling (11.4.3) to (11.4.24) yields (11.4.2). \square

⁴The reason we apply the Poincaré inequality only in $r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq 6M_{\text{init}}$ is to avoid truncated spheres near the hypersurface \mathcal{B} .

11.5 The redshift estimate

We now exploit the redshift (see [DR09b, DR13]) to obtain Proposition 11.4.1 without the diamond superscripts, i.e. with the improved weights near the horizon in all energies.

Proposition 11.5.1. *Let $W_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ be a symmetric traceless S -tensor or an S -tangent 1-form satisfying a tensorial wave equation of Type 3_k with $k \geq 0$. Then, for any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ the following estimate holds*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} |\Omega^{-1} \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v(u)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} |\Omega^{-1} \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau)) \cap \{r \leq 9M_{\text{init}}/4\}} |\check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \\ & \lesssim \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v(\tau)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} |\Omega^{-1} \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{E}}_{v(u)}^{\star} [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{I}^{\star, \text{deg}} [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) + \mathcal{G}_4 [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (\tau, u_f) + \mathcal{H}_4 [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (\tau, u_f). \end{aligned} \quad (11.5.1)$$

Here

$$\mathcal{G}_4 [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (\tau, u_f) = \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau)) \cap \{r \leq 5M_{\text{init}}/2\}} |\mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{\text{lin}} [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \cdot \Omega^{-1} \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|, \quad (11.5.2)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_4 [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (\tau, u_f) = \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau)) \cap \{r \leq 5M_{\text{init}}/2\}} \left| \left(\mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{\text{lin}} [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] - \frac{1}{2} F_{34} [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \right) \Omega^{-1} \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right|. \quad (11.5.3)$$

Remark 11.5.2. *The terms involving a \star on the right hand side are energies supported away from what will be the horizon and controlled from the basic energy and Morawetz estimate, i.e. Proposition 11.4.1.*

Proof. Let ξ be a radial cut-off function with $\xi = 1$ for $r \leq 9M_{\text{init}}/4$ and vanishing for $r \geq 5M_{\text{init}}/2$. Note that

$$2Mr + 3r^2\Omega_{\circ}^2 \geq 2M^2 \quad \text{for } r \leq 9M_{\text{init}}/4.$$

Contract now the equation of Type 3_k by $\frac{r^3}{\Omega^2} \xi \Omega \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ to generate the multiplier identity

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \Omega \check{\nabla}_4 \left(\xi \frac{r^3}{\Omega^2} |\Omega \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\Omega^2} |\Omega \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \left(\xi (2M(k+1)r + r^2(\omega - \omega_{\circ}) - 3r^2\Omega_{\circ}^2) - \partial_r \xi r^3 \Omega_{\circ}^2 \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \Omega \check{\nabla}_3 (\xi r |r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2) + \frac{1}{2} |r \check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 (\Omega_{\circ}^2 \xi + \partial_r \xi \Omega_{\circ}^2 r) - \check{\nabla}^A (r^3 \xi \check{\nabla}_A W_{\mathcal{H}^+} \Omega \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}) \\ & = \mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{\text{lin}} [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \cdot \xi r^3 \Omega^{-1} \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \mathcal{F}_{3_k}^{\text{lin}} [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \cdot \xi r^3 \Omega^{-1} \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \frac{1}{2} F_{34} [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \xi r^3 \Omega^{-1} \check{\nabla}_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}. \end{aligned}$$

Multiply this by $\frac{\sqrt{g}}{r^2}$ and integrate over the region $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))$ with respect to $dudv d\theta^1 d\theta^2$ using Lemma 11.4.4 and Stokes' theorem. Note that the last term in the second line vanishes and that all spacetime (and boundary) terms have good signs in $r \leq 9M_{\text{init}}/4$. \square

Revisiting the above proof now integrating the multiplier identity over $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau)) \cap J^- \left(\check{\mathcal{C}}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau)) \right)$ we easily see

Corollary 11.5.3. *The estimate (11.5.1) also holds replacing $\int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau)) \cap \{r \leq 9/4 M_{\text{init}}\}} |\check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2$ on the left by $\sup_u \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau)) \cap \{r \leq 9M_{\text{init}}/4\}} |\check{\nabla} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2$.*

11.6 The r^p -weighted hierarchy

In this section we shall derive r^p weighted estimates for tensors $W_{\mathcal{I}^+}$. For the wave equation, these estimates originate in [DR09a].

Since the following Proposition will in particular be used later in the paper to derive largeness constraints on the constant R , we will explicitly denote the additional R -dependence in constants in Proposition 11.6.1 with the notation C_R , while the \lesssim notation in Proposition 11.6.1 will indicate that the constant can be chosen to depend only on M_{init} independently of the choice of R . We shall return to our usual conventions regarding \lesssim in Section 11.7.

Proposition 11.6.1. *Let $W_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ be a symmetric traceless S -tensor or an S -tangent 1-form satisfying a tensorial wave equation of Type $4_{k,l}$. Then, for any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ and $p \in [1 - 4k, 2 - \delta] \cup \{2\}$, the following estimate holds*

$$\begin{aligned} & \check{\mathbb{I}}^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau, u_f) + \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty}^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) \\ & \lesssim \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + C_R \left[\sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u^*[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{I}}^*[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau, u_f) \right] \\ & \quad + \boxed{\int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} r^{p-3} |W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2} + \mathcal{G}_{5,p}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau, u_f) + \mathcal{H}_{5,p}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau, u_f) \end{aligned} \quad (11.6.1)$$

where the boxed term can be dropped if $l \geq 0$ and also if $\frac{2l^2}{p+4k-1/2} \leq \frac{3}{8}(2-p)$.⁵ Here

$$\mathcal{G}_{5,p}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau, u_f) = \left| \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq 3R/2\}} \mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{lin}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \cdot (r^p + r^{2-\delta} \delta_p^2) \Omega \nabla_4 W_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right|, \quad (11.6.2)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{5,p}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau, u_f) = \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq 3R/2\}} \left| \left(\mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{lin}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + F_{34}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \right) \cdot r^p |\Omega \nabla_4 W_{\mathcal{I}^+}| \right|, \quad (11.6.3)$$

and C_R is a constant depending on R .

Remark 11.6.2. *The terms in the square bracket are energies supported away from infinity and will be controlled from an energy and Morawetz estimate, i.e. Proposition 11.4.1. The boxed term will be controlled inductively (and shown not to appear at the lowest order).*

Proof. Let ξ be a radial cut-off function equal to 1 for $r \geq 2R$ and equal to zero for $r \leq 3R/2$ and denote the weight $w = 1 + \frac{6M}{r}$. Multiply now the equation of type $4_{k,l}$ by $\xi r^p w \Omega \nabla_4 W_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ to generate the following multiplier identity:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \Omega \nabla_3 (\xi r^p w |\Omega \nabla_4(W_{\mathcal{I}^+})|^2) + \frac{1}{2} \Omega \nabla_4 \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r^p \xi w |r \nabla(W_{\mathcal{I}^+})|^2 \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} (\xi ((p+4k)r^{p-1}w - 6Mr^{p-2}) \Omega_\circ^2 + \partial_r \xi r^p w) |\Omega \nabla_4(W_{\mathcal{I}^+})|^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{2} (\xi r^{p-3} \Omega^2 ((2-p) + (12-4p)Mr^{-1} + M^2 r^{-2}(-48+12p)) - \partial_r \xi w \Omega^2 r^{p-2}) |r \nabla W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \\ & \boxed{+ 2l \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \xi w r^p W_{\mathcal{I}^+} \Omega \nabla_4 W_{\mathcal{I}^+}} - d\sharp v \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 \nabla W_{\mathcal{I}^+} \xi r^p w \Omega \nabla_4 W_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right) = \mathcal{E}_{r^p}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}], \end{aligned} \quad (11.6.4)$$

where the (at least quadratic) error is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{r^p}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &= (\mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{lin}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathcal{F}_{4_{k,l}}^{nlin}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \frac{1}{2} F_{34}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]) \xi r^p \Omega \nabla_4(W_{\mathcal{I}^+}) - 2\xi r^{p-2} w (\omega - \omega_\circ) |r \nabla W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \\ & - \xi \Omega^2 r^{p-2} (r \nabla(W_{\mathcal{I}^+})) [\Omega \nabla_4, r \nabla] W_{\mathcal{I}^+} - (\eta + \underline{\eta}) \xi r^{p-1} (r \nabla(W_{\mathcal{I}^+})) \Omega \nabla_4(W_{\mathcal{I}^+}). \end{aligned} \quad (11.6.5)$$

We multiply this identity by $\frac{\sqrt{g}}{r^2}$ and integrate first over $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)$ with respect to $du dv d\theta^1 d\theta^2$ using Lemma 11.4.4 and Stokes' theorem. Note that the last term on the left then vanishes identically. Ignoring the boxed cross-term for the moment we see that upon integration the first line of (11.6.4) will produce positive future boundary terms as claimed in the proposition. In the second line and third line, the terms involving $\partial_r \xi$ are supported for $r \leq 2R$ only and hence controlled by $\mathbb{I}^*[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$. For the other terms in these lines it is not hard to see that the constraint $\frac{M}{R} < \delta$ implies that the following holds in $r \geq 2R$ for all p with $1 - 4k \leq p \leq 2 - \delta$:

$$(p+4k)r^{p-1}w - 6Mr^{p-2} \geq \frac{1}{2}r^{p-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{6}(2-p) + (12-4p)Mr^{-1} + M^2 r^{-2}(-48+12p) \geq \frac{\delta}{12},$$

⁵The latter condition will be exploited in Lemma 13.3.8 for the equation satisfied by $r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$.

while for $p = 2$ the lower bound in the second estimate changes to $\frac{2M}{r}$. Therefore, we manifestly control the spacetime energy $\check{\mathbb{I}}^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau, u_f)$ in the Proposition, at least if $1 - 4k \leq p \leq 2 - \delta$. For $p = 2$, we get a weaker estimate in view of the spacetime term containing angular derivatives degenerating for $p = 2$. However, we can add to the weaker $p = 2$ estimate also the estimate for $p = 2 - \delta$ to provide control of the angular derivatives as claimed. Turning to the non-linear terms (11.6.5), we see that the first three terms are those appearing in the final estimate while the remaining ones can easily be absorbed on the left using the L^∞ estimates (11.4.1) on the Ricci coefficients (use Lemma 3.3.1 for the commutator terms).

We finally deal with the boxed term. For $l \geq 0$ we use

$$2l \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \xi w r^p W_{\mathcal{I}^+} \Omega \nabla_4 W_{\mathcal{I}^+} = l \Omega \nabla_4 \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \xi r^p w \right) + (\xi r^{p-3} \Omega^2 ((2-p) + (12-4p)Mr^{-1} + Mr^{-2}(-48+12p))) - \partial_r \xi w \Omega^2 r^{p-2} |W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2$$

producing a positive (up to terms supported in $r \leq 2R$ and controlled by $\mathbb{I}^*[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$) spacetime term in $r \geq 2R$ and a positive boundary term on $v = v_\infty$.

For $l \leq 0$ we use Cauchy-Schwarz to estimate

$$\left| 2l \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \xi w r^p W_{\mathcal{I}^+} \Omega \nabla_4 W_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right| = \frac{1}{2} (p + 4k - 1/2) r^{p-1} \Omega_\circ^2 w \xi |\Omega \nabla_4 W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{2l^2}{p + 4k - 1/2} \frac{\Omega^4}{\Omega_\circ^2} r^{p-3} w \xi |W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2.$$

The first term can be absorbed by the positive term in (11.6.4). The second term is the one appearing on the left hand side. If $\frac{2l^2}{p+4k-1/2} \leq \frac{3}{8}(2-p)$ holds we can estimate further

$$\frac{2l^2}{p + 4k - 1/2} \frac{\Omega^4}{\Omega_\circ^2} r^{p-3} w \xi |W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \leq \frac{3}{8} (2-p) \Omega^2 r^{p-3} \xi \frac{16}{15} |r \nabla W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 = \frac{2}{5} (2-p) \Omega^2 r^{p-3} |r \nabla W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2, \quad (11.6.6)$$

where the Poincaré inequality of Proposition 9.3.2 (for symmetric traceless S -tensors and S -tangent 1-forms) has been used. The expression on the right can finally be absorbed by the positive term in (11.6.4).

This produces (11.6.1) except that $\sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$ is replaced by $\check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f}^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$ on the left. To finally obtain the boundary term on any constant u hypersurface one repeats the proof integrating now over $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} \leq u\}$ and using the estimate already obtained. \square

Revisiting the above proof now integrating the multiplier identity over the region $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap J^-(\check{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau))$ we easily see

Corollary 11.6.3. *The estimate (11.6.1) remains true replacing $\check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty}^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau)$ on the left hand side by $\sup_v \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq 2R\}} r^{p-2} |r \nabla W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2$.*

11.7 Nonlinear error estimates for wave equations

We recall the non-linear errors $\mathcal{H}_i[W](\tau, u_f)$ ($i=1,2,3,4$) and $\mathcal{H}_{5,p}[W](\tau, u_f)$ appearing in the energy estimates of Propositions 11.4.1, 11.5.1, 11.6.1. In this section, we prove estimates allowing us to control the resulting nonlinear error terms for the wave equations in Chapters 12 and 13.

Recall that $2M < r_0 < r_1 < 3M < R$, and recall the nonlinear error notation \mathcal{E}_p^k and \mathcal{E}_p^{*k} defined in Section 3.2.3 and Section 3.2.5 respectively. Recall also the following pointwise estimates for the geometric quantities in the \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ gauges of Proposition 9.2.1,

$$\mathbb{P}^{N-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{P}^{N-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon. \quad (11.7.1)$$

The error terms are estimated separately in different regions.

11.7.1 Error terms in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge

The easiest region in which to estimate error terms is the region near the event horizon, $r(u_{\mathcal{H}^+}, v_{\mathcal{H}^+}) \leq r_1$. Recall the set of anomalous quantities

$$\mathcal{A}_s = \{(r\mathring{\nabla})^{N-s}\Omega\hat{\chi}, (r\mathring{\nabla})^{N-s}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_o)\}, \quad (11.7.2)$$

for $s = 0, 1, 2$.

Proposition 11.7.1 (Spacetime nonlinear error estimate in the region $r(u_{\mathcal{H}^+}, v_{\mathcal{H}^+}) \leq r_1$ of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$, $0 \leq k \leq N - s$, $0 \leq |\gamma| \leq N - s$ and $\tau \geq v_{-1}$, for any nonlinear error of the form $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{*k}$ and for any $\Phi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ such that $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \notin \mathcal{A}_s$,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}) \cdot \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{*k}| \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq r_1\}} \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\frac{1}{2}+s}}.$$

Proof. A given term in the nonlinear error $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{*k}$ takes the form $\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi' \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi''$ for appropriate geometric quantities Φ' and Φ'' , where $|\gamma_1| + |\gamma_2| \leq N - s$. Suppose, without loss of generality, $|\gamma_1| \geq |\gamma_2|$. Then $\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi' \notin \mathcal{A}_s$ and, since $N \geq 12$, it follows that $|\gamma_2| \leq N - 6$ and so the estimate for $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N$ in the bootstrap assumption (7.1.4) and the pointwise estimate (11.7.1) imply that

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Phi' - \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}})|^2 \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq r_1\}} \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\tau^s}, \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi''| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{v},$$

respectively. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Phi - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}) \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi' \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi''| \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq r_1\}} \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \\ & \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{\tau} \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Phi - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}})| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Phi' - \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}}) + \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}}| \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq r_1\}} \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \\ & \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{\tau} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Phi - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}) \mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} \left(\|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Phi' - \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}}) \mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}} \mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} \right) \\ & \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{\tau} \frac{\varepsilon}{\tau^{\frac{s}{2}}} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\tau^{\frac{s}{2}}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{(u_f)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

since $\|\Phi_{\text{Kerr}}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^2(u_f)^{-1}$ for any Φ . The proof follows. \square

The estimates for the error terms in the region $r_1 \leq r(u_{\mathcal{H}^+}, v_{\mathcal{H}^+}) \leq R_2$ are more involved than the proof of Proposition 11.7.1 due to the degeneration of the integrated decay estimates in (7.1.4) at $r = 3M_f$.

Note that the estimate for $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N$ in bootstrap assumption (7.1.4) implies that each $\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfies, for all $v \geq v_{-1}$, and for $s = 0, 1, 2$,

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1-s} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{\mathcal{H}^+})\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^s}, \quad (11.7.3)$$

and at least one of the two estimates,

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{\mathcal{H}^+})\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^s}, \quad \text{and/or} \quad \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{\mathcal{H}^+})\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^s}, \quad (11.7.4)$$

for all $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$. Note also that, for each $\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, the pointwise estimate (11.7.1) and the estimate (7.1.8) for the linearised Kerr parameters imply that

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-6} |\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{v}, \quad \text{and} \quad |\Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u_f}.$$

The following lemma is exploited when estimating nonlinear error terms in the region $r_1 \leq r(u_{\mathcal{H}^+}, v_{\mathcal{H}^+}) \leq R_2$ in Proposition 11.7.3.

Lemma 11.7.2. For all $\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and all $|\gamma| \leq N - 4$, $\tau \geq v_{-1}$,

$$\|v^{1-\delta} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{\mathcal{H}^+})\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} \lesssim \varepsilon \tau^{-\delta}. \quad (11.7.5)$$

Proof. The bootstrap assumption (7.1.4) in particular implies that

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} \left| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}) \right|^2 \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\tau^2}, \quad (11.7.6)$$

since $k \leq N - 4$. To see that (11.7.5) indeed holds, let $\{\tau_n\}$ be a dyadic sequence (so that $\tau_{n+1} = 2\tau_n$, $\tau_0 = v_0$). The estimate (11.7.6) gives, for any n ,

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau_n) \setminus \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau_{n+1})} \left| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}) \right|^2 \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(\tau_n)^2}.$$

Multiplying by $\tau_{n+1}^{2-2\delta}$ and using the fact that τ_{n+1} and v are comparable, for any $\tau_n \leq v \leq \tau_{n+1}$, gives

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau_n) \setminus \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau_{n+1})} v^{2-2\delta} \left| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}) \right|^2 \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(\tau_n)^{2\delta}}.$$

Summing over $n \geq l$, and using the fact that $\sum_{n \geq l} \tau_n^{-2\delta} = \tau_l^{-2\delta} \sum_{n \geq l} 2^{-\delta(n-l)} \lesssim \tau_l^{-2\delta}$ gives

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau_n)} v^{2-2\delta} \left| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}) \right|^2 \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(\tau_n)^{2\delta}},$$

for any l , from which (11.7.5) follows. \square

Recall again the anomalous quantities (11.7.2).

Proposition 11.7.3 (Spacetime nonlinear error estimate in the region $r(u_{\mathcal{H}^+}, v_{\mathcal{H}^+}) \geq r_1$ of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge). For $s = 0, 1, 2$, $0 \leq k \leq N - s$, $0 \leq |\gamma| \leq N - s$ and $\tau \geq v_{-1}$, for any nonlinear error of the form $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{*k}$ and for any $\Phi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ such that $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \notin \mathcal{A}_s$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}) \cdot \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{*k}| \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq r_1\}} \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{\tau^s}.$$

Proof. A given term in the nonlinear error \mathcal{E}^{*k} takes the form $\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi' \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi''$, for appropriate geometric quantities Φ' and Φ'' , where $|\gamma_1| + |\gamma_2| \leq N - s$. Suppose, without loss of generality, $|\gamma_1| \geq |\gamma_2|$. Then $\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi' \notin \mathcal{A}_s$ and so the bootstrap assumption (7.1.4) implies that $\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Phi' - \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}})$ satisfies at least one of the two estimates (11.7.4). Similarly for $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Phi - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}})$. Moreover, since $N \geq 12$, it follows that $|\gamma_2| \leq N - 6$ and so $\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}}(\Phi - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}})$ satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 11.7.2 for all $|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq |\gamma_2| + 2$.

Now

$$|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Phi - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}) \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi' \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi''| \lesssim |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi''| (|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Phi - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}})|^2 + |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi'|^2).$$

Consider the second term (the first term is simpler to estimate). Clearly

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi''| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi'|^2 &\lesssim |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2}(\Phi'' - \Phi''_{\text{Kerr}})| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Phi' - \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}})|^2 + |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi''_{\text{Kerr}}| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Phi' - \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}})|^2 \\ &\quad + |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2}(\Phi'' - \Phi''_{\text{Kerr}})| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}}|^2 + |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi''_{\text{Kerr}}| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}}|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (11.7.7)$$

Consider the first term and suppose first that the former of (11.7.4) holds. By the Sobolev inequality, Proposition 9.1.2, and the fact that $\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} \Omega^2 d\theta dudv = \int_\tau^{v(R_2, u_f)} \int_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 d\theta dudv$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2}(\Phi'' - \Phi''_{\text{Kerr}})| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Phi' - \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}})|^2 \\ \lesssim \sum_{|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq |\gamma_2| + 2} \int_\tau^{v(R_2, u_f)} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}}(\Phi'' - \Phi''_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Phi' - \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 dv. \end{aligned}$$

For any $|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq |\gamma_2| + 2$ then, by Cauchy–Schwarz,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\tau}^{v(R_2, u_f)} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}}(\Phi'' - \Phi''_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Phi' - \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 dv \\ & \lesssim \|v^{1-\delta} \mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}}(\Phi'' - \Phi''_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} \left(\int_{\tau}^{v(R_2, u_f)} v^{-2+2\delta} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Phi' - \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^4 dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{\tau^{\delta}} \left(\int_{\tau}^{v(R_2, u_f)} v^{-2+2\delta} \varepsilon^4 v^{-2s} dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{\tau^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}, \end{aligned}$$

where (11.7.3), Lemma 11.7.2 and the first of (11.7.4) have been used. Suppose now that only the latter of (11.7.4) holds. Then, similarly, the Sobolev inequality of Proposition 9.1.4 implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2}(\Phi'' - \Phi''_{\text{Kerr}})| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Phi' - \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}})|^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq r_1\}} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq |\gamma_2| + 2} \int_{u(R_2, \tau)}^{u_f} \|v^{1-\delta} \mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}}(\Phi'' - \Phi''_{\text{Kerr}})\Omega\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} \|v^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Phi' - \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(r_0, u))}^2 du \\ & \quad + \int_{u(R_2, \tau)}^{u_f} \|v^{1-\delta} \mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}}(\Phi'' - \Phi''_{\text{Kerr}})\Omega\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(R, u))} \|v^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Phi' - \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(r_0, u))}^2 du. \end{aligned}$$

Again, for any $|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq |\gamma_2| + 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{u(R_2, \tau)}^{u_f} \|v^{1-\delta} \mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}}(\Phi'' - \Phi''_{\text{Kerr}})\Omega\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} \|v^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Phi' - \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(r_0, u))}^2 du \\ & \lesssim \|v^{1-\delta} \mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}}(\Phi'' - \Phi''_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} \left(\int_{u(R_2, \tau)}^{u_f} v(r_0, u)^{-2+2\delta} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Phi' - \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(r_0, u))}^4 du \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{\tau^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

The second term on the right hand side of (11.7.7) can be controlled using the fact that

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} |\Phi''_{\text{Kerr}}| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Phi' - \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}})|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u_f} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Phi' - \Phi'_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{\tau^s},$$

using either of (11.7.4) when $s = 0$, or the integrated decay estimate (11.7.3) when $s = 1$ or 2 . The third term on the right hand side of (11.7.7) is estimated similarly. For the final term one simply uses the fact that

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} |\Phi''_{\text{Kerr}}| |\Phi'_{\text{Kerr}}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{(u_f)^3} \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} \Omega^2 d\theta du dv \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{(u_f)^2}.$$

□

We also note the following estimate whose proof is much easier than that of the previous propositions and hence left to the reader.

Proposition 11.7.4 (Spacetime nonlinear error estimate in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$, $0 \leq k \leq N - s$ and $\tau \geq v_{-1}$, for any nonlinear error of the form $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{*k}$ we have*

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} |\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{*k}|^2 \Omega^2 d\theta du dv \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{\tau^{1+s}},$$

where for $s = 1, 2$ the estimate also holds for $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^k$ replacing $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{*k}$.

We conclude with an estimate on cones that will be used frequently:

Proposition 11.7.5 (Nonlinear error estimate on null hypersurfaces in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$, $0 \leq k \leq N - 1 - s$ and $\tau \geq v_{-1}$, for any nonlinear error of the form $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^k$ we have*

$$\int_{\underline{C}_\tau^{\mathcal{H}^+}} |\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^k|^2 \Omega^2 d\theta du + \int_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)} |\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^k|^2 d\theta dv \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{\tau^{1+s}}.$$

Proof. A given term in the nonlinear error $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^k$ takes the form $\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi'$ where $|\gamma_1| + |\gamma_2| \leq N - 1 - s$. Suppose, without loss of generality, $|\gamma_1| \geq |\gamma_2|$. The proof follows from the fact that $|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi'| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{v}$ and $\|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{v^{s/2}}$. \square

11.7.2 Main error terms in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge

By the pointwise estimate (11.7.1), each $\Phi_p^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfies the pointwise estimates

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-6} |r^p \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p^{\mathcal{I}^+}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{u}}, \quad \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-6} |r^{p-\frac{1}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p^{\mathcal{I}^+}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u}, \quad (11.7.8)$$

and, by the estimate for $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N$ in the bootstrap assumption (7.1.4), the integrated decay estimates

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N} \|r^{p-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p^{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^2, \quad \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1} \|r^{p-1-\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p^{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(u)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u}. \quad (11.7.9)$$

Recall the $\check{\mathcal{E}}_p^k$ nonlinear error notation introduced in Section 3.2.6.

Proposition 11.7.6 (Spacetime nonlinear error estimate in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge). *For $s = 0, 1$, $0 \leq k \leq N - s$, $0 \leq |\gamma| \leq N - s$ and $\tau \geq u_{-1}$, for any nonlinear error of the form \mathcal{E}_2^k and for any $\Phi_p^{\mathcal{I}^+}$,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} r^{-s} |r^p \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p| |\mathcal{E}_2^k| \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{\tau^{1+s}}.$$

Moreover, the same estimate holds replacing \mathcal{E}_2^k by $\check{\mathcal{E}}_2^k$.

Proof. Recall that each term in the error \mathcal{E}_2^k takes the form $r^{-2} r^{p_1} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi'_{p_1} \cdot r^{p_2} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi''_{p_2}$, for appropriate geometric quantities Φ'_{p_1} and Φ''_{p_2} , where $|\gamma_1| + |\gamma_2| \leq N - s$. Suppose, without loss of generality, $|\gamma_1| \geq |\gamma_2|$.

Consider first the case $s = 0$. Then, since $N \geq 12$ it follows that $|\gamma_2| \leq N - 6$ and so

$$|r^{p_2-\frac{1}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi''_{p_2}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|r^{p_1-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi'_{p_1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}} + \|r^{p-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}} \lesssim \varepsilon. \quad (11.7.10)$$

It follows that

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} r^{-2} |r^p \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p| |r^{p_1} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi'_{p_1}| |r^{p_2} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi''_{p_2}| \lesssim \varepsilon \|r^{p-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} \|r^{p_1-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi'_{p_1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{\tau}.$$

Consider now the case $s = 1$. Since $N \geq 12$, it again follows that $|\gamma_2| \leq N - 6$ and so,

$$|r^{p_2-\frac{1}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi''_{p_2}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|r^{p_1-1-\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi'_{p_1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)}^2 + \|r^{p-1-\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\tau}.$$

It follows that

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} r^{-3} |r^p \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p| |r^{p_1} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi'_{p_1}| |r^{p_2} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi''_{p_2}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{\tau} \|r^{p-1-\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} \|r^{p_1-1-\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi'_{p_1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{\tau^2}.$$

Finally, the estimate replacing \mathcal{E}_2^k by $\check{\mathcal{E}}_2^k$ follows in exactly the same fashion using in addition that $|\check{r}r^{-1}| \leq 2$ and $|\Omega^{-2l}| \leq C_l$. \square

Proposition 11.7.7 (Spacetime nonlinear error estimate in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge). *For $0 \leq k \leq N$ and $\tau \geq u_{-1}$ we have, for $t \in \{0, 1\}$,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left(r^{\frac{3}{2}+t} |\mathcal{E}_2^k|^2 + r^{\frac{3}{2}+t} |\check{\mathcal{E}}_2^k|^2 \right) \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{\tau^{2-t}}.$$

Proof. The proof follows immediately from (11.7.10) following the proof of the previous proposition. \square

Proposition 11.7.8 (Spacetime nonlinear error estimate in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge). *For $s = 0, 1$, $0 \leq k \leq N - s$, and $\tau \geq u_{-1}$, for any nonlinear error of the form \mathcal{E}_2^k and for any S -tensor W ,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} |W| |\mathcal{E}_2^k| \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\tau^{1+\frac{s}{2}(1-2\delta)}} \|r^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} W\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)}.$$

Moreover, the same estimate holds replacing \mathcal{E}_2^k by $\check{\mathcal{E}}_2^k$.

Proof. Recall that each term in the error \mathcal{E}_2^k takes the form $r^{-2} r^{p_1} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi_{p_1} \cdot r^{p_2} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi_{p_2}$ where $|\gamma_1| + |\gamma_2| \leq N - s$. Suppose, without loss of generality, $|\gamma_1| \geq |\gamma_2|$. Then, since $N \geq 12$ it follows that $|\gamma_2| \leq N - 6$ and so

$$|r^{p_2-\frac{1}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi_{p_2}^{\mathcal{I}^+}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|r^{p_1-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}-\frac{s}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi_{p_1}^{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\tau^s}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} r^{-2} |W| |r^{p_1} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi_{p_1}| |r^{p_2} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi_{p_2}| \\ & \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{\tau} \|r^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} W\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \|r^{p_1-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}-\frac{1-2\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi_{p_1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{\tau^{1+\frac{s}{2}(1-2\delta)}} \|r^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} W\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

We conclude with an estimate on cones which will be used frequently:

Proposition 11.7.9 (Nonlinear error estimate on null hypersurfaces in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge). *For $0 \leq k \leq N - 1$ and $\tau \geq u_{-1}$ we have for $t \in \{0, 1\}$:*

$$\int_{C_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left(r^{-\frac{1}{2}+t} |\mathcal{E}_1^k|^2 + r^{-\frac{1}{2}+t} |\check{\mathcal{E}}_1^k|^2 \right) dv d\theta + \int_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left(r^{-\frac{1}{2}+t} |\mathcal{E}_1^k|^2 + r^{-\frac{1}{2}+t} |\check{\mathcal{E}}_1^k|^2 \right) dud\theta \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{\tau^{2-t}}.$$

Proof. The proof follows immediately from (11.7.10) and $\|\mathfrak{D}^{N-1} r^p \Phi_p\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \varepsilon$ together with the fact that $r^{-3/2}$ is integrable both in u and v . \square

11.7.3 Anomalous error terms in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge

In the equations satisfied by \check{P} (see Proposition 3.4.4 and Proposition 3.4.23) there are several anomalous error terms which are estimated separately from the others. Accordingly, given l, k_1, k_2, k_3 , define

$$\mathcal{F}^{k_1 k_2 k_3} = r^2 (r \nabla)^{k_1} (r \Omega \nabla_4)^{k_2} (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_o) \otimes (r \nabla)^{k_3} \underline{\alpha}, \quad \mathcal{G}^l = r^3 \underline{\beta} \otimes (r \Omega \nabla_4)^l r \nabla (\Omega \hat{\omega}), \quad \check{\mathcal{G}} = r^4 (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_o) \mathcal{P}_2^* \underline{\beta}.$$

Proposition 11.7.10 (Anomalous error estimate in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$, $0 \leq |\gamma| \leq N - 3 - s$, $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 \leq 3$, $k_3 \leq 2$ and $\tau \geq u_{-1}$, and for any S -tensor W ,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} |W| |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathcal{F}^{k_1 k_2 k_3}| \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\tau^{\frac{s}{2}}} \|r^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} W\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)}.$$

Proof. Clearly

$$|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathcal{F}^{k_1 k_2 k_3}| \lesssim r^2 \sum_{\substack{|\gamma_1|+|\gamma_2| \leq N-s \\ |\gamma_2| \leq N-1-s}} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_o)| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \underline{\alpha}|.$$

Now consider γ_1, γ_2 such that $|\gamma_1| \leq N - s$, $|\gamma_2| \leq N - 1 - s$ and $|\gamma_1| + |\gamma_2| \leq N - s$. Using the fact that the estimate for $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N$ in the bootstrap assumption (7.1.4) and the pointwise estimate (11.7.1) imply that

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N} \|r^3 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_o)\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \varepsilon, \quad \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-5} |r^3 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_o)| \lesssim \varepsilon,$$

respectively, it follows that

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} |W| r^2 |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_o)| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \underline{\alpha}| \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \lesssim \varepsilon \sum_{|\gamma_3| \leq N-1-s} \|r^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} W\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} \|r^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_3} \underline{\alpha}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)}.$$

The claim now follows from the fact that $\|r^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_3} \underline{\alpha}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} \lesssim \varepsilon \tau^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}$ for $|\gamma_3| \leq N - s$ by the estimate for $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N$ in the bootstrap assumption (7.1.4). \square

Proposition 11.7.11 (Anomalous error estimate in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge). *For $s = 0, 1$, $0 \leq |\gamma_1| \leq N - s$, $0 \leq |\gamma_2| \leq N - 3 - s$, $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 \leq 3$, $k_1, k_3 \leq 2$, $k_2 \leq 1$ and $\tau \geq u_{-1}$, and for any $\Phi_p^{\mathcal{I}^+}$,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} |r^p \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi_p^{\mathcal{I}^+}| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \mathcal{F}^{k_1 k_2 k_3}| \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{\tau^s}.$$

Proof. Repeating the proof of Proposition 11.7.10, we again have

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} |r^p \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi_p| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \mathcal{F}^{k_1 k_2 k_3}| \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \lesssim \varepsilon \sum_{|\gamma_3| \leq N-1-s} \|r^{p-\frac{3}{2}+\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi_p\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} \|r^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_3} \underline{\alpha}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)}.$$

The claim follows from the fact that $\|r^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_3} \underline{\alpha}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} \lesssim \varepsilon \tau^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}$ and $\|r^{p-1-\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi_p\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} \lesssim \varepsilon \tau^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}$. \square

Proposition 11.7.12 (Anomalous error estimate in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge). *For $s = 0, 1$, $0 \leq |\gamma| \leq N - 3 - s$, $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 \leq 3$, $k_1, k_3 \leq 2$, $k_2 \leq 1$, $l = 0, 1$, and $\tau \geq u_{-1}$,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} r^2 |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathcal{G}^l| |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathcal{F}^{k_1 k_2 k_3}| \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{\tau^s}.$$

The same estimate holds replacing \mathcal{G}^l by $\mathring{\mathcal{G}}$.

Proof. Clearly

$$|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathcal{F}^{k_1 k_2 k_3}| \lesssim r^2 \sum_{\substack{|\gamma_1|+|\gamma_2| \leq N-s \\ |\gamma_2| \leq N-1-s}} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_o)| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \underline{\alpha}|, \quad |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathcal{G}^l| \lesssim r^2 \sum_{\substack{|\gamma_3|+|\gamma_4| \leq N-1-s \\ |\gamma_4| \leq N-3-s}} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_3} (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_o)| |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_4} \underline{\beta}|,$$

and so, using that fact that $\|r^3 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_o)\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \varepsilon$ for all $|\gamma| \leq N$, together with the pointwise estimate (11.7.1), it follows that,

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} r^2 |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathcal{G}^l| |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathcal{F}^{k_1 k_2 k_3}| \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \sum_{|\gamma_1| \leq N-1-s} \|r^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \underline{\alpha}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} \sum_{|\gamma_2| \leq N-3-s} \|r^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \underline{\beta}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)},$$

and the claim follows from the fact that $\|r^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \underline{\alpha}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} + \|r^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \underline{\beta}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} \lesssim \varepsilon \tau^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}$ for $|\gamma| \leq N - s$.

The claim about $\mathring{\mathcal{G}}$ follows easily by repeating the above proof. \square

Proposition 11.7.13 (Anomalous error estimate in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge). *For $s = 0, 1$, $0 \leq k \leq N - s$, $0 \leq |\gamma| \leq N - 3 - s$, $l = 0, 1$ and $\tau \geq u_{-1}$, for any nonlinear error of the form \mathcal{E}_2^k ,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} r^{2-s} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathcal{G}^l| |\mathcal{E}_2^k| \Omega^2 d\theta dudv + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} r^{2-s} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathring{\mathcal{G}}| |\mathcal{E}_2^k| \Omega^2 d\theta dudv \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{\tau^{1+s}}.$$

Moreover, the same estimate holds replacing \mathcal{E}_2^k by $\mathring{\mathcal{E}}_2^k$.

Proof. The proof follows from respectively applying Proposition 11.7.8 with $W = r^{1-\frac{s}{2}} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathcal{G}^l$ and $W = r^{1-s/2} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathring{\mathcal{G}}$ and noting that pointwise estimate (11.7.1) implies

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} r^{-1-\delta} r^{-1-s} r^3 |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathcal{G}^l|^2 \Omega^2 d\theta du dv + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} r^{-1-\delta} r^{-1-s} r^3 |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \mathring{\mathcal{G}}|^2 \Omega^2 d\theta du dv \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \frac{1}{\tau^2}.$$

□

11.8 Some auxiliary estimates for commuted energies

When commuting tensorial wave equations for symmetric traceless S -tensors we will (as is already clear from Section 11.2) typically commute with the following modified set of commutation operators:

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} = \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3)} := \begin{cases} (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{k_2} (r \Omega \nabla_4)^{k_3} (r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2} & \text{if } k_1 \text{ even} \\ (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{k_2} (r \Omega \nabla_4)^{k_3} (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} r d\nabla & \text{if } k_1 \text{ odd} \end{cases} \quad (11.8.1)$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{\underline{k}} = \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3)} = \begin{cases} (\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3} (r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} & \text{if } k_1 \text{ even} \\ (\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3} (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} r d\nabla (\nabla_T)^{k_2} & \text{if } k_1 \text{ odd,} \end{cases} \quad (11.8.2)$$

where as usual $|\underline{k}| := k_1 + k_2 + k_3$ is the length.

Note the difference with $\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}$ is that the angular derivatives are $d\nabla$ and Δ (both of which are elliptic operators on the spheres of the double null foliation acting on symmetric traceless tensors) and that derivatives are taken in a slightly different order.

The next proposition asserts that controlling the energy of $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} W$ is equivalent to controlling that of $\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} W$. Similarly, in a region of $r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq 9M_{\text{init}}/4$ and $r_{\mathcal{I}^+} \leq 2R$ respectively, controlling $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} W$ is equivalent to controlling $\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} W$.

Proposition 11.8.1. *Let W denote a symmetric traceless tensor in the \mathcal{I}^+ -gauge. We have for $1 \leq K \leq N$ and $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ the estimates*

$$\sum_{|\underline{k}|=0, k_2 \neq K}^K \int_{\check{C}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} W|^2 \lesssim \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0, k_2 \neq K}^K \int_{\check{C}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} W|^2, \quad (11.8.3)$$

$$\sum_{|\underline{k}|=0, k_3 \neq K}^K \int_{\check{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} W|^2 \lesssim \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0, k_3 \neq K}^K \int_{\check{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} W|^2, \quad (11.8.4)$$

$$\sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} W|^2 \lesssim \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} W|^2, \quad (11.8.5)$$

where $\check{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)$ is any truncated ingoing cone such that also $\check{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau, \tau + M) \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$.

In addition, for each estimate we can replace $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}$ by $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{\underline{k}}$ on the right provided we restrict the region of integration to $r_{\mathcal{I}^+} \leq 2R$ in the integrals on the left.

Remark 11.8.2. *The condition on the ingoing cone is a technical condition that ensures that the truncated cone is long enough to be bounded by two proper spheres in order to perform the elliptic estimates in the proof. In practise one can always extend an arbitrary ingoing cone in $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ slightly to the past if necessary before applying the Proposition.*

One similarly has for the horizon region:

Proposition 11.8.3. *Let W denote a symmetric traceless tensor in the \mathcal{H}^+ -gauge. We have for $1 \leq K \leq N$ and $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ the estimates*

$$\sum_{|\underline{k}|=0, k_2 \neq K}^K \int_{\check{C}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} W|^2 \lesssim \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0, k_2 \neq K}^K \int_{\check{C}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} W|^2, \quad (11.8.6)$$

$$\sum_{|\underline{k}|=0, k_3 \neq K}^K \int_{\check{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} W|^2 \lesssim \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0, k_3 \neq K}^K \int_{\check{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} W|^2, \quad (11.8.7)$$

$$\sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} W|^2 \lesssim \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} W|^2, \quad (11.8.8)$$

where $\check{C}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))$ is any outgoing cone which is such that $\check{C}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau), v(\tau) + M) \subset \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$.

In addition, for each estimate we can replace $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}$ by $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{\underline{k}}$ on the right provided we restrict the region of integration to $r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq 9M_{\text{init}}/4$ in the integrals on the left.

Proof. These estimates are standard, the only complication being the fact that the cones are truncated and hence do not necessarily end in a sphere of the double null foliation. We sketch the proof of (11.8.3). One proves the statement successively for $K = 1, \dots, N$. For fixed K , one proves the estimate successively for the tuples $\underline{k} = (1, k_2, k_3)$ with $k_2 + k_3 = K - 1$, $\underline{k} = (2, k_2, k_3)$ with $k_2 + k_3 = K - 2$, until we reach the tuple $\underline{k} = (K, 0, 0)$. For instance, for the tuple $\underline{k} = (1, k_2, k_3)$ with $k_2 + k_3 = K - 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\check{C}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}} |r \nabla (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{k_2} (r \Omega \nabla_4)^{k_3} W|^2 &\lesssim \int_{\check{C}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}} |r dv (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{k_2} (r \Omega \nabla_4)^{k_3} W|^2 \\ &\quad + C\varepsilon \int_{\check{C}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \{r \leq R_2\}} |(\Omega \nabla_4) (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{k_2} (r \Omega \nabla_4)^{k_3} W|^2 \\ &\lesssim \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0, k_2 \neq K}^K \int_{\check{C}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}(v(\tau))} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} W|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (11.8.9)$$

with the last step following easily from commuting the angular derivative through and using the pointwise bootstrap assumptions ((11.4.1) is sufficient) on the commutator terms.

To see the first inequality it is sufficient to consider $k_2 = k_3 = 0$. Note first that if the cones were not truncated at a sphere which is (in general) not part of the double null foliation, the first inequality would be true without the ε -term by standard elliptic estimates on the spheres of the cone.

To reduce the case at hand to standard elliptic estimates on spheres, one re-foliates $\check{C}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ by spheres such that the spheres $\mathcal{B} \cap \check{C}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and the spheres $S_{\tau, v}$ for $v \geq v(\tau, R_2)$ are now part of the new foliation. From $v(s, \theta') = v' + f(v', \theta' = \theta)$ one computes from the old frame $(\Omega^{-1} e_3, \Omega e_4 = \partial_v, e_A = \partial_{\theta^A})$ new frame on $\check{C}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \{r \leq R_2\}$ (see also Proposition 16.1.10)

$$e'_A = e_A + \nabla_A f \cdot \Omega e_4 \quad , \quad e'_4 = (1 + \partial_{v'} f) \Omega e_4 \quad , \quad e'_3 = \frac{1}{1 + \partial_{v'} f} \left(\Omega^{-1} e_3 + |\nabla f|^2 \Omega e_4 + 2 \nabla^A f e_A \right)$$

with e'_1, e'_2 tangent to the new spheres and with $\|f\|_{C^2(\check{C}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+})} \lesssim \varepsilon$ by the bootstrap assumptions. Note $\mathcal{G}'_{AB} = g(e'_A, e'_B) = g(e_A, e_B) = \mathcal{G}_{AB}$. From the symmetric traceless $S_{u, v}$ -tensor W we construct a symmetric traceless $S_{u, v'}$ -tensor W' through the definition (\otimes_S denoting the symmetric tensor product)

$$W' = W - \frac{1}{(1 + \partial_{v'} f)^2} g(e'_4, \cdot) \otimes g(e'_4, \cdot) [W(e_A, e_B) \nabla^A f \nabla^B f] + \frac{1}{1 + \partial_{v'} f} g(e'_4, \cdot) \otimes_S \mathcal{G}^{AC} g(e'_A, \cdot) [W(e_C, e_B) \nabla^B f].$$

Indeed, W' is symmetric and once checks $W'(e'_A, e'_B) = W(e_A, e_B)$ and $W'(e'_3, \cdot) = W'(e'_4, \cdot) = 0$. Now let $\overset{\circ}{\nabla}$ (acting on $S_{u, v'}$ -tensors) denote the projection of the covariant derivative to the $S_{u, v'}$ -spheres. We have

the relation

$$\begin{aligned}
\overset{\cdot}{\nabla}_{e'_C} W'(e'_A, e'_B) &= e'_C (W'(e'_A, e'_B)) - W' \left(\overset{\cdot}{\nabla}_{e'_C} e'_A, e'_B \right) - W' \left(e'_A, \overset{\cdot}{\nabla}_{e'_C} e'_B \right) \\
&= [e_C + \nabla_C f \cdot \Omega e_4] (W(e_A, e_B)) - W' \left(\overset{\cdot}{\nabla}_{e'_C} e'_A, e'_B \right) - W' \left(e'_A, \overset{\cdot}{\nabla}_{e'_C} e'_B \right) \\
&= \nabla_{e_C} W(e_A, e_B) + \varepsilon \cdot \mathcal{O}(W) + \varepsilon \cdot \mathcal{O}(\Omega \nabla_4 W) ,
\end{aligned} \tag{11.8.10}$$

in particular

$$\overset{\cdot}{d}\overset{\cdot}{\nabla} v W'(e'_A) = d\overset{\cdot}{\nabla} v W(e_A) + \varepsilon \cdot \mathcal{O}(W) + \varepsilon \cdot \mathcal{O}(\nabla_{e_4} W) . \tag{11.8.11}$$

Using these relations we show

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\check{C}_\tau^{I^+} \cap \{r \leq R_2\}} |r d\overset{\cdot}{\nabla} v W|^2 &\gtrsim \int_{\check{C}_\tau^{I^+} \cap \{r \leq R_2\}} |r d\overset{\cdot}{\nabla} v W'|^2 - \varepsilon |\Omega \nabla_4 W|^2 - \varepsilon |W|^2 \\
&\gtrsim \int_{\check{C}_\tau^{I^+} \cap \{r \leq R_2\}} |r \overset{\cdot}{\nabla} W'|^2 - \varepsilon |\Omega \nabla_4 W|^2 \gtrsim \int_{\check{C}_\tau^{I^+} \cap \{r \leq R_2\}} |r \nabla W|^2 - \varepsilon |\Omega \nabla_4 W|^2 .
\end{aligned} \tag{11.8.12}$$

Here the first and the third inequality follow from (11.8.11) and (11.8.10), while the second one is the standard elliptic estimate on the new spheres. \square

Chapter 12

Estimates for P and \underline{P} : the proof of Theorem C.3

In this section, we prove Theorem C.3, which we restate here:

Theorem C.3 (Estimates for P and \underline{P}). *Under the assumptions of Theorem C, then for all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$ and all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, with the gauges as defined above, then the following holds:*

The quantities $P_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $P_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\underline{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfy the estimates

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}, P_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2}[\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Contents

12.1	Overview	224
12.1.1	Estimates in regions I+II	224
12.1.2	A preliminary weaker set of estimates in region III	225
12.1.3	Completing the proof of Theorem C.3	226
12.2	Non-degenerate boundedness and integrated decay	227
12.3	The r^p -weighted estimate	228
12.4	Higher derivative estimates	228
12.4.1	Basic boundedness and integrated decay for higher derivatives	228
12.4.2	The r^p weighted hierarchy for higher derivatives	235
12.5	The hierarchy of weighted decay estimates	237
12.6	Completing the proof of Theorem C.3	238
12.6.1	Integrated decay	238
12.6.2	Estimates on truncated ingoing cones $\check{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}$	239
12.6.3	Estimates on truncated outgoing cones $\check{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}$	240
12.6.4	Estimates on the full cones $C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}$	240

We will give a complete overview of the chapter in **Section 12.1** below, which will contain the skeleton of the proof, divided into a main subtheorem and various propositions. The subsequent sections of the chapter will flesh out this skeleton with the proof of these results. We defer a detailed summary of the contents of the remaining sections till then.

As in the previous chapters of Part C, we shall assume throughout the assumptions of Theorem C. Let us fix an arbitrary $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$, with $\hat{u}_f \in \mathfrak{B}$, and fix some $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$. All propositions below shall always refer to the anchored \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges in the spacetime $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$, corresponding to parameters u_f , $M_f(u_f, \lambda)$, whose existence is ensured by Definition 7.1.1. We shall denote $M = M_f$ throughout this chapter.




Figure 12.1: The regions I, II and III

In addition to the statements of Theorems C.1 and C.2, this chapter depends on the propositions of Chapter 11. The reader who is content to understand the basic structure of the proof of Theorem C.3 may wish to read only Section 12.1. For the linear version of Theorem C.3, the reader may compare with Theorem 1 in Section 10 of [DHR].

12.1 Overview

The quantities P and \underline{P} are the primal quantities of our almost gauge invariant hierarchy, and we recall from Proposition 11.1.4, that in their various manifestations $P_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $P_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\underline{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, the quantities satisfy a homogeneous up to non-linear error-terms tensorial wave equation of Type 1.

We define the three regions depicted in Figure 12.1:

- I. $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap (\{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} \leq u_1\} \cup \{v_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq v_1\}) \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3)$, the near (Eddington Finkelstein) data region
- II. $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap (\{v_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq v_1\} \cup \{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} \leq u_1\}) \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}}(V_4)$, the near (Kruskal) initial data region
- III. $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_1) \cup \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v_1 = v(u_1))$, the main region.

Let us note that we may prove Theorem C.3 by obtaining the improved estimate separately in the above regions, i.e. examining the fluxes and spacetime integrals in

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}, P_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2}[\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}], \quad (12.1.1)$$

showing that their restrictions to both the regions I+II and III are estimated by $\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3$.

In the “main” region III, we shall estimate these quantities using the wave-equation estimates of Chapter 11. We must first however dispense with regions I+II.

12.1.1 Estimates in regions I+II

Obtaining the estimates in regions I+II follows directly from comparison with the respective initial data gauges, in view of the almost gauge invariant property of the quantities and the bootstrap assumption.

We have already accomplished this! In particular, from Proposition 10.5.1 we have

$$\mathbb{E}_0^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_0^{N-2}[\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_0^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_0^{N-2}[\check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (12.1.2)$$

Hence, examining the fluxes present in (12.1.1), we see that all ingoing and outgoing fluxes restricted to regions I+II are included in the left hand side of (12.1.2) and thus are indeed estimated by $\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3$ as required.

From this one easily concludes that also all the restrictions to regions I+II of the spacetime integrals present in (12.1.1) are similarly estimated by $\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3$.

12.1.2 A preliminary weaker set of estimates in region III

In view of Section 12.1.1, we have reduced Theorem C.3 to proving estimates for the fluxes and spacetime integrals present in (12.1.1) *restricted to region III*, i.e. in $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_1) \cup \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v_1)$, bounding these by $\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3$.

In that regard we will first prove the following weaker set of estimates:

Theorem 12.1.1. *The quantities $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^5 P_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 P_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^5 \underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 \underline{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfy the estimates*

$$\sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f} \tau^s \cdot \check{\mathbb{E}}_{out}^{N-2-s,2-s}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) + \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{v(u_1) \leq v} v^s \cdot \check{\mathbb{E}}_{in}^{N-2-s}[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \quad (12.1.3)$$

$$\sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f} \tau^s \cdot \check{\mathbb{E}}_{out}^{N-2-s,2-s}[\check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) + \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{v(u_1) \leq v} v^s \cdot \check{\mathbb{E}}_{in}^{N-2-s}[\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \quad (12.1.4)$$

where for $1 \leq K \leq N-2$

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\mathbb{E}}_{in}^K[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) &:= \sup_{\check{v} \geq v} \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{\check{v}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq K}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \Omega^2 \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r}\right)^2 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |R^* \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (12.1.5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\mathbb{E}}_{out}^{K,p}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) &:= \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} r^p |\Omega \nabla_4 \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} |r \nabla \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} |\Omega \nabla_3 \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + r^{p-1-\delta} \delta_0^p |\Omega \nabla_4 \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{r^p}{r^{3+\delta} \delta_2^p} |r \nabla \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (12.1.6)$$

and the same definitions replacing $P_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ by $\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $P_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ by $\check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$.

Comparing the energies $\check{\mathbb{E}}_{in}^K[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v)$, $\check{\mathbb{E}}_{out}^{K,p}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau)$ defined in Theorem 12.1.1 with the energies defined in (6.1.2), (6.1.3) we see that:

- For $P_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ (and $\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$), the energies are restricted to the truncated (at \mathcal{B}) ingoing cones $\check{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and integrated decay estimates on truncated regions $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(\tau)$. However, they do not contain fluxes on outgoing cones in $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$.
- For $P_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ (and $\check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$), the energies are restricted to the truncated (at \mathcal{B}) outgoing cones $\check{\mathcal{C}}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ in $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and integrated decay estimates on truncated regions $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)$. However, they do not contain fluxes on ingoing cones in $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$.

Note already (see Section 12.1.3) that Theorem C.3 will follow from Theorem 12.1.1 if we can replace the energies $\check{\mathbb{E}}_{in}^K[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v)$, $\check{\mathbb{E}}_{out}^{K,p}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau)$ by $\mathbb{E}^K[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v)$, $\mathbb{E}^{K,p}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau)$ (and similarly for the underlined quantities) respectively in the estimate of Theorem 12.1.1.

The proof of Theorem 12.1.1 proceeds by controlling the left hand side by the “initial” energies on the cones $\check{C}_{u_1}^{I^+}$ and $\check{C}_{v_1}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, namely

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\check{C}_{u_1}^{I^+}} \sum_{|k|=0}^{N-3} \left\{ r^2 |\Omega \nabla_4 \mathfrak{D}^k \Psi_{I^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} |r \nabla \mathfrak{D}^k \Psi_{I^+}|^2 + r^2 |\Omega \nabla_4 \mathfrak{D}^k \check{\Psi}_{I^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} |r \nabla \mathfrak{D}^k \check{\Psi}_{I^+}|^2 \right\} \\ & + \int_{\check{C}_{v_1}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|k|=0; k_3 \neq N-2}^{N-2} \left\{ |\mathfrak{D}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |\mathfrak{D}^k \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \right\} \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \end{aligned} \quad (12.1.7)$$

the inequality being an immediate consequence of (12.1.2). We apply the estimates proven in Chapter 11.1 for general tensorial wave equations to obtain boundedness and integrated decay estimates for Ψ_{I^+} and $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ (and $\check{\Psi}_{I^+}$ and $\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$), as well as r -weighted estimates for Ψ_{I^+} (and $\check{\Psi}_{I^+}$) in the infinity region. This is the content of **Sections 12.2** and **12.3**. Here we will use that

1. the boundary terms on \mathcal{B} appearing in these estimates cancel up to non-linear terms which can in turn be controlled by the bootstrap assumptions (see Proposition 10.3.2 included as part of the statement of Theorem C.2), and
2. the non-linear errors are controlled by the bootstrap assumptions (see Section 11.7).

In **Section 12.4** we prove higher derivatives estimates. This is based on applying the estimates of Sections 12.2 and 12.3 to suitably commuted equations. The scheme is as follows:

1. We first commute the equation for Ψ with the operator ∇_T as well as the angular operators $rd\cancel{v}$ and $r^2\Delta$ only. These operators commute up to non-linear terms and (in the case of $rd\cancel{v}$) a lower order linear term which can be controlled inductively. We then commute by the operator ∇_{R^*} whose commutator can be controlled by the previous estimates.¹ We exploit here that the commutator of \square with ∇_{R^*} behaves nicely near trapping (the top order term degenerates linearly at $r = 3M$, see the last part of Proposition 11.2.1). With this, *all* derivatives of Ψ are controlled but with non-optimal weights near the horizon for $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and near null infinity for Ψ_{I^+} .
2. We improve the weights near the horizon for $\Omega \nabla_3$ -derivatives of $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ by commuting the equation for $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ with a (suitably cut-off) redshift operator $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3$ and applying Proposition 11.5.1.
3. We improve the weights near null infinity for $\Omega \nabla_4$ -derivatives of Ψ_{I^+} by commuting the equation for Ψ_{I^+} with the (suitably cut-off) operator $r \Omega \nabla_4$ and applying Proposition 11.6.1.

In **Section 12.5**, we run a pigeonhole argument in the style of [DR09a], providing inverse polynomial decay estimates for higher derivatives. We finally obtain Proposition 12.5.1 from which Theorem 12.1.1 is easily deduced.

12.1.3 Completing the proof of Theorem C.3

Once Theorem 12.1.1 has been obtained we use, in **Section 12.6**, the estimates of Theorem 12.1.1 and the estimates on the diffeomorphisms relating $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and Ψ_{I^+} to deduce the estimates on the restriction to region III of the full fluxes and spacetime integrals contained in the definition of the energies 12.1.1, required to obtain Theorem C.3:

We first show that Theorem 12.1.1 continues to hold replacing $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+}$ by $\mathcal{D}^{I^+} \cap \left(\check{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+}(u_1) \cup \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v_1) \right)$ and $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ by $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \left(\check{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+}(u_1) \cup \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v_1) \right)$, and adding the flux

$$\sup_{u \leq u_f} \int_{\check{C}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \sum_{|k|=0; k_1 \neq K}^K |\mathfrak{D}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2$$

¹Alternatively, one could recover the R^* -derivatives directly from the equation. However, since non-degenerate control near $r = 3M$ is required, a further integration by parts argument (near $3M$) would be necessary when deriving the estimates.

to $\check{\mathbb{E}}_{in}^K[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v)$ and the flux

$$\sup_{v \leq v_\infty} \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left\{ \sum_{|k|=0}^{K-1} |\Omega \nabla_3 \mathfrak{D}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{r^p}{r^2} |r \nabla \mathfrak{D}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\}$$

to $\check{\mathbb{E}}_{out}^{K,p}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau)$. We finally show that truncated cones can be replaced by non-truncated ones.

(For the last step, some localised energy estimates in regions of bounded r (involving null cones that are not part of the respective null-foliation) have to be applied, however, these require no special structure.)

12.2 Non-degenerate boundedness and integrated decay

Proposition 12.2.1. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$, the pair $(\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 P_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^5 P_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ satisfies*

1. *degenerate boundedness:*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{E}}_{v(u)}^\diamond[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f}^\diamond[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) \\ \lesssim \check{\mathbb{E}}_{v(\tau)}^\diamond[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (12.2.1)$$

2. *boundedness:*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{E}}_{v(u)}[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f}[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \check{\mathbb{E}}_{v_\infty}[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) \\ \lesssim \check{\mathbb{E}}_{v(\tau)}[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (12.2.2)$$

3. *integrated decay:*

$$\check{\mathbb{I}}^{\diamond,deg}[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \check{\mathbb{I}}[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) \lesssim \check{\mathbb{E}}_{v(\tau)}^\diamond[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^2}, \quad (12.2.3)$$

$$\check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg}[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \check{\mathbb{I}}[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) \lesssim \check{\mathbb{E}}_{v(\tau)}[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^2}. \quad (12.2.4)$$

Moreover, the pair $(\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 \check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^5 \check{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ satisfies the same estimates.

Proof. We first prove (12.2.1) and (12.2.3). We note that both pairs $(\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ and $(\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ satisfy a tensorial wave equation of Type 1 by Proposition 11.1.4.² We can hence apply Proposition 11.4.1. We have $\mathcal{G}_i[\Psi](\tau_1, \tau_2) = 0$. In view of $\mathcal{F}_1^{nlin}[\Psi] = \mathcal{E}_2^3$ we have from Proposition 10.3.2 as well as Propositions 11.7.1, 11.7.3, 11.7.8 the estimate

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 \left| \mathcal{B}_i[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) - \mathcal{B}_i[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2) \right| + \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{H}_i[\Psi](\tau, u_f) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^2}.$$

For $\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, we have to use in addition Proposition 11.7.10 in view of the anomalous error term appearing in $\mathcal{F}_1^{nlin}[\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$; see Proposition 11.1.4 and in particular (3.4.22). This proves (12.2.1) and (12.2.3).

To obtain (12.2.2) and (12.2.4), we observe first that $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfies a tensorial wave equation of type 3₀ by Proposition 11.1.6. Apply now Proposition 11.5.1. Note that the energies carrying a \star in (11.5.1) can be controlled by (12.2.1) and (12.2.3). The linear error $\mathcal{G}_4[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$ can be estimated

$$\mathcal{G}_4[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau) \lesssim \eta \check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg}[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau) + C_\eta \check{\mathbb{I}}^{\diamond,deg}[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau)$$

for any $\eta > 0$. The first term on the right can be absorbed on the left of (11.5.1) and the second is controlled by (12.2.3). Finally, by Propositions 11.7.1, 11.7.3 we have $\mathcal{H}_4[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^2}$ for the non-linear error. Combining the resulting estimate with (12.2.1) and (12.2.3) we deduce (12.2.2) and (12.2.4). \square

²We focus on the proof for the $(\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ pair, the underlined pair being entirely analogous.

12.3 The r^p -weighted estimate

We also have a p -weighted estimate near infinity:

Proposition 12.3.1. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ and $1 \leq p \leq 2$, the pair $(\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 P_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^5 P_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u^p[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty}^p[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) \\ & \quad + \check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg}[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \check{\mathbb{I}}[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) + \check{\mathbb{I}}^p[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) \\ & \lesssim \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)}[\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau^p[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau}. \end{aligned} \quad (12.3.1)$$

Moreover, the pair $(\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 \check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^5 \check{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ satisfies the same estimate.

Proof. Note that $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ (and $\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$) satisfies tensorial wave equation of type $4_{0,2}$ by Proposition 11.1.8. Hence we can apply Proposition 11.6.1. Note there is no boxed term and the term in the square brackets of (11.6.1) can be controlled from Proposition 12.2.1. To control the term $\mathcal{G}_{5,p}[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$ in (11.6.1) we use Cauchy-Schwarz

$$\left| \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq 3/2R\}} \frac{6M\Omega^2}{r^3} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \cdot (r^p + r^{2-\delta} \delta_p^2) \Omega \nabla_4 \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right| \lesssim \eta \check{\mathbb{I}}^p[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau, u_f) + C_\eta \check{\mathbb{I}}[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau, u_f)$$

for any $\eta > 0$ and $1 \leq p \leq 2$. The second term on the right is controlled by (12.2.4) and the first can, for sufficiently small η , be absorbed on the left of (11.6.1). Of course the analogous estimate holds for $\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$. Finally, we turn to the non-linear error term for $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ (see Proposition 11.1.4):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{5,p}[\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau, u_f) &= \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq 3R/2\}} \left| \left(\mathcal{F}_{4k,l}^{nlin}[\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + F_{34}[[\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}]] \right) \right| r^p |\Omega \nabla_4 \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}| \\ &= \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq 3R/2\}} \left| \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^3 + \mathcal{E}_{\text{anom}}[\check{P}] \right| r^p |\Omega \nabla_4 \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting the expression for $\nabla_4 \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ from Proposition 3.4.4 we conclude that $\mathcal{H}_{5,p}[\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau}$ after applying the estimates of Propositions 11.7.6, 11.7.11, 11.7.12 and 11.7.13. The error for $\mathcal{H}_{5,p}[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$ is treated entirely analogously but is strictly easier as no anomalous term appears in $\mathcal{F}_{4k,l}^{nlin}[\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$. \square

12.4 Higher derivative estimates

We now state and prove the main decay estimate for higher derivatives, these being the analogues of Propositions 12.2.1 and 12.3.1. We recall the definition \mathfrak{D}^k from Section 3.1.2 and the definitions of $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^k$ from Section 11.8.

12.4.1 Basic boundedness and integrated decay for higher derivatives

Proposition 12.4.1. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ and any $1 \leq K \leq N-3$, the pair $(\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 P_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^5 P_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|k| \leq K} \left[\sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) \right] \\ & + \sum_{|k| \leq K} \check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \sum_{|k| \leq K-1} \check{\mathbb{I}}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \sum_{|k| \leq K} \check{\mathbb{I}}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|k| \leq K} \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sum_{|k| \leq K} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau \min(N-3-K, 2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (12.4.1)$$

Moreover, the pair $(\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 \check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^5 \check{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ satisfies the same estimate.

Remark 12.4.2. For $W_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ an S -tensor one has of course for any $1 \leq K' \leq K$

$$\sum_{|\underline{k}| \leq K'-1} \mathbb{I} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] (v(\tau)) \lesssim \sum_{|\underline{k}| \leq K'} \mathbb{I}^{deg} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] (v(\tau)) . \quad (12.4.2)$$

We have included the non-degenerate term explicitly on the left hand side but in view of the above it suffices to prove the estimate without this term.

Proof. The proof will proceed in steps. We first give an overview.

Overview. Note that for $K = 0$ we have already proven the above estimate in Proposition 12.2.1. The proof is an induction on K . The general strategy is to commute the tensorial wave equations by appropriate derivative operators and observe that they still satisfy the tensorial wave equation up to non-linear errors and a few explicit linear terms (cf. Section 11.2). While the non-linear errors can be dealt with schematically (leading to the last term in (12.4.1)), we will deal with the linear error terms explicitly exploiting a hierarchy in the way one performs the commutation. Finally, in any energy estimate, as before, the boundary terms appearing on \mathcal{B} will always be a non-linear error that can be estimated schematically. The overview is as follows:

1. Structure of commuted equations and estimating the non-linear errors (Step 0).
2. Prove the estimate (12.4.1) with $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{\underline{k}}$ instead of $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}$ (Steps 1 and 2)
 - (a) Prove it for tuples $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$ with k_1 even.
 - (b) Prove it for tuples $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$ with k_1 odd.

In proving (2a) and (2b), we will first prove (12.4.1) for the (weaker horizon) energies containing an additional diamond and then improve using the redshift estimate.

3. Prove the full estimate (12.4.1) for all horizon energies on the left (Step 3).
4. Prove the full estimate (12.4.1) for all infinity energies on the left (Step 4).

Step 0. Structure of commuted equations and non-linear errors. By Proposition 11.1.4, the quantities $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfy an equation of Type 1. Commuting the equations with $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{\underline{k}}$ will according to Proposition 11.2.1 result in a tensorial wave equation of Type 1 with non-linear error given by

$$\mathcal{F}^{nlin} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] = \Omega^2 (\mathcal{E}^*)^{3+|\underline{k}|} , \quad (12.4.3)$$

$$\mathcal{F}^{nlin} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{\underline{k}} \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] = \Omega^2 (\mathcal{E}^*)^{3+|\underline{k}|} , \quad (12.4.4)$$

$$\mathcal{F}^{nlin} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] = \mathcal{E}_2^{3+|\underline{k}|} , \quad (12.4.5)$$

$$\mathcal{F}^{nlin} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{\underline{k}} \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] = \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^{3+|\underline{k}|} + \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{\underline{k}} \mathcal{E}_{anom} [\check{\underline{P}}] . \quad (12.4.6)$$

Similarly, by Proposition 11.1.6, $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfy an equation of Type 3_0 . Therefore, commuting with $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{\underline{k}}$ (defined below in (12.4.20)) will according to Proposition 11.2.2 result in an equation of Type 3_0 with non-linear error given by

$$\mathcal{F}^{nlin} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] = \Omega^2 (\mathcal{E}^*)^{3+|\underline{k}|} , \quad (12.4.7)$$

$$\mathcal{F}^{nlin} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{\underline{k}} \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] = \Omega^2 (\mathcal{E}^*)^{3+|\underline{k}|} . \quad (12.4.8)$$

Finally, by Proposition 11.1.8, $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfy an equation of Type $4_{0,2}$. Therefore, commuting with $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{\underline{k}}$ (defined below in (12.4.21)) will according to Proposition 11.2.5 result in an equation of Type $4_{1/2k_3,l}$

(for some l) with non-linear error given by

$$\mathcal{F}^{lin} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] = \mathcal{E}_2^{3+|k|}, \quad (12.4.9)$$

$$\mathcal{F}^{lin} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] = \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^{3+|k|} + \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \mathcal{E}_{\text{anom}}[\check{P}]. \quad (12.4.10)$$

We now recall the errors (11.4.6), (11.4.7), (11.4.8), (11.5.3), (11.6.3) arising in the various energy estimates. We also recall that by the bootstrap assumptions (7.1.4) we have for $s = 0, 1, 2$

$$\|r^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} \nabla_{R^*} \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} + \|r^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}} \nabla_T \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} + \|r^{-\frac{3}{2}} \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{\tau^{\min(1, (N-3-|k|)/2)}}$$

and the same estimate replacing $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k$ by $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^k$ and by $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k$.

Using Propositions 11.7.1, 11.7.3 for the errors in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and Propositions 11.7.8, 11.7.10 for the errors in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, we conclude³

$$\sum_{|k| \leq K} \left[\sum_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{H}_i \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^k \Psi \right] (\tau, u_f) + \mathcal{H}_4 \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^k \Psi \right] (\tau, u_f) + \mathcal{H}_4 \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^k \Psi \right] (\tau, u_f) + \mathcal{H}_{5,0} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \Psi \right] (\tau, u_f) \right] \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(N-3-K, 2)}}.$$

Using Proposition 10.3.2, we also conclude

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{|k| \leq K} \left| \mathcal{B}_i \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] (\tau, u_f) - \mathcal{B}_i \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau, u_f) \right| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(N-3-K, 2)}} \quad (12.4.11)$$

and the same estimate for the $(\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ pair.

Step 1. Angular and T derivatives. We first prove a restricted version of (12.4.1)

- replacing everywhere $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k$ by $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^k$
- restricting all tuples k that appear in the sums to those with $k_3 = 0$, i.e. we restrict to derivatives of the form

- $(r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2} (\nabla_T)^{k_2}, \quad k_1 + k_2 \leq K; \quad k_1 \text{ even},$
- $(r \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} (rd\ell v) (\nabla_T)^{k_2}, \quad k_1 + k_2 \leq K; \quad k_1 \text{ odd}.$

For k_1 even, the restricted (12.4.1) then follows directly: By Proposition 11.2.1, both ∇_T and $r^2 \Delta$ commute with the tensorial wave equation up to non-linear terms discussed in Step 0. The commuted equations therefore again satisfy a tensorial wave equation of Type 1 up to non-linear terms and hence repeating the proof of Proposition 12.2.1 (i.e. applying successively Propositions 11.4.1 and 11.5.1) we establish the restricted (12.4.1) using the non-linear estimates from Step 0.

For k_1 odd, by Proposition 11.2.1 the commuted quantity again satisfies a tensorial wave equation of Type 1 up to non-linear terms as above but now with an additional *linear* error term arising from the (angular part of the) commutation. According to Proposition 11.2.1 it has the form

$$\mathcal{F}_1^{lin} \left[W = (r \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} (rd\ell v) (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi \right] = 3 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} (r \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} (rd\ell v) (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi. \quad (12.4.12)$$

We now repeat the proof of Proposition 12.2.1, i.e. we apply successively Propositions 11.4.1, 11.5.1. When applying Proposition 11.4.1 we now need to control in addition the linear error terms ($u_1 \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq u_f$)

$$\mathcal{G}_1[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) = \left| \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))} 3 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} W_{\mathcal{H}^+} \cdot \nabla_T W_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} 3 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} W_{\mathcal{I}^+} \cdot \nabla_T W_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right|$$

³Note in particular that the integrand in $\mathcal{H}_3 \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^k \Psi \right] (\tau, u_f)$, (11.4.8), can be rewritten in a form such that Proposition 11.7.3 directly applies.

and (see (11.4.5))

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_2[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) = & \left| \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))} 3 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} W_{\mathcal{H}^+} \cdot \nabla_{R^*} W_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} 3 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} W_{\mathcal{I}^+} \nabla_{R^*} W_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right| \\ & + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))} 3 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^{3+\delta}} |W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} 3 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^{3+\delta}} |W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we have denoted and will denote for the rest of this step $W_{\mathcal{H}^+} = (r\Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} (rd\psi) (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $W_{\mathcal{I}^+} = (r\Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} (rd\psi) (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$. Integrating by parts the T derivative it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_1[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) \lesssim & \sum_{\substack{k'_1+k'_2 \leq K-1 \\ k'_3=0, k'_1 \text{ even}}} \left\{ \sup_{\tau_1 \leq u \leq \tau_2} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{k'} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sup_{\tau_1 \leq u \leq \tau_2} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{k'} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \right. \\ & \left. + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{k'} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau_1)) + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{k'} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau_1) \right\} + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{(\tau_1)^{\min(N-3-K, 2)}} \end{aligned}$$

with the last term arising from the boundary term induced on \mathcal{B} (see Proposition 10.3.2) as well as the non-linear error. Here we used that $|(r\Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} (rd\psi) (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi|^2 \lesssim \sum_{i=0}^{(k_1-1)/2} |r\nabla (r\Delta)^{(k_1-1-2i)/2} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi|^2$ holds up to non-linear errors that can be incorporated into the decay term. Note that the right hand side has already been controlled since we have estimated tuples with k'_1 even.

Similarly, integrating the R^* derivative by parts⁴ we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_2[W](\tau_1, \tau_2) \lesssim & \sum_{\substack{k'_1+k'_2 \leq K-1 \\ k'_3=0, k'_1 \text{ even}}} \left\{ \sup_{\tau_1 \leq u \leq \tau_2} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{k'} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sup_{\tau_1 \leq u \leq \tau_2} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{k'} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{k'} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau_1)) \right. \\ & \left. + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{k'} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau_1) \right\} + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} |W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} |W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{(\tau_1)^{\min(N-3-K, 2)}}. \end{aligned}$$

For the spacetime integrals we recall the easily established calculus inequality

$$\int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))} |W|^2 \lesssim \gamma \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))} |\nabla_{R^*} W|^2 + C_\gamma \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right)^2 |W|^2, \quad (12.4.13)$$

valid for any $\gamma > 0$, which allows us to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} |W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} |W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \\ & \lesssim \gamma \cdot \check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg} [W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2)) + C_\gamma \sum_{\substack{k'_1+k'_2 \leq K-1 \\ k'_3=0, k'_1 \text{ even}}} \check{\mathbb{I}}^{s, deg} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{k'} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2)) + \check{\mathbb{I}} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{k'} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau_1, \tau_2). \end{aligned} \quad (12.4.14)$$

Since the term multiplying γ in the estimate (12.4.14) can be absorbed on the left hand side of (11.4.3) for sufficiently small γ and the second term has already been estimated when we dealt with k'_1 even, we have established the restricted estimate also for k_1 odd, however, with all energies appearing carrying an additional diamond superscript (i.e. the energies being non-optimal near the horizon). To remove that restriction we finally apply Proposition 11.5.1 to the commuted equation for $W_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, which can also be viewed as a tensorial wave equation of type 3₀. The additional linear error term $\mathcal{G}_4[W](\tau, u_f)$ is easily controlled using Cauchy–Schwarz in conjunction with the degenerate estimate already established (note the linear error is supported away from trapping). We have proven the restricted version of (12.4.1) defined at the beginning of Step 1.

⁴This is necessary only because of the radial decay of this error term. E.g. in the case $k_1 = 1$, to control $\int \frac{1}{r^2} rd\psi \Psi \nabla_{R^*} d\psi \Psi$ one cannot apply Cauchy–Schwarz directly in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$. In $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, one could apply Cauchy–Schwarz with γ and (12.4.13). However, conceptually (and to avoid constants depending on R) it is easiest to integrate ∇_{R^*} by parts in both regions and estimate the non-linear error (boundary) term on \mathcal{B} as usual.

Step 2. Including R^* -derivatives. We next show the desired estimate replacing everywhere $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k$ by $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^k$ but lifting the restriction $k_3 = 0$. Note that the case $k_3 = 0$ has been dealt with in Step 1 and that we can again proceed inductively.

Let $k_3 > 0$ and $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 \leq K$. If k_1 is even, the commuted quantity satisfies a tensorial wave equation of Type 1 with a linear error term \mathcal{F}_1^{lin} determined inductively by Proposition 11.2.1. Hence we can apply Proposition 11.4.1, which requires us to control the errors \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 generated by the linear error term \mathcal{F}_1^{lin} . From (11.2.5) and a simple induction we conclude (denoting $W = (\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3} (r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi$ for the rest of this step)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \left| \mathcal{F}_1^{lin} [W] \right|^2 &\lesssim \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right)^2 |(\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3-1} (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1+2)/2} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi|^2 + |(\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3-1} (r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi|^2 \right\} \\ &+ \sum_{i=2}^{k_3} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} \left(|(\nabla_{R^*})^{i-2} (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1+2)/2} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi|^2 + |(\nabla_{R^*})^{i-2} (r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi|^2 \right) + |\mathcal{E}_3^{k_1+k_2+k_3+2}|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the $|\mathcal{E}_3^{k_1+k_2+k_3+2}|^2$ arise from commutation of derivatives. Commuting derivatives further we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \left| \mathcal{F}_1^{lin} [W] \right|^2 &\lesssim \sum_{\tilde{k}_1 \leq k_1 \text{ even}} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} \left[\left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right)^2 |r \nabla (\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3-1} (r^2 \Delta)^{\tilde{k}_1/2} r d\sharp v (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |r \nabla (\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3-1} (r^2 \Delta)^{(\tilde{k}_1-2)/2} r d\sharp v (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi|^2 \right] \\ &+ \sum_{i=2}^{k_3} \sum_{\tilde{k}_1 \leq k_1 \text{ even}} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} |r \nabla (\nabla_{R^*})^{i-2} (r^2 \Delta)^{\tilde{k}_1/2} d\sharp v (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi|^2 + |\mathcal{E}_3^{k_1+k_2+k_3+2}|^2. \quad (12.4.15) \end{aligned}$$

Since we also have the inequality

$$|\nabla_T (\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3} (r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi|^2 \lesssim |\nabla_{R^*} (\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3-1} (r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2} (\nabla_T)^{k_2+1} \Psi|^2 + |\mathcal{E}_2^{k_1+k_2+k_3+2}|^2,$$

it follows from applying Cauchy–Schwarz to the product $\mathcal{F}_1^{lin} [W] \cdot \nabla_T W$ appearing in $\mathcal{G}_1 [W] (\tau_1, \tau_2)$ that

$$\mathcal{G}_1 [W] (\tau_1, \tau_2) \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|\underline{k}'| \leq k_1+k_2+k_3 \\ k'_3 \leq k_3-1}} \check{\mathbb{I}}^{\diamond, deg} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{\underline{k}'} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] (v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2)) + \check{\mathbb{I}} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{\underline{k}'} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau_1, \tau_2) + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{(\tau_1)^{\min(N-3-K, 2)}},$$

thereby completing the induction step for \mathcal{G}_1 . Note that we have used Propositions 11.7.4 and 11.7.7 for the non-linear error and that the first term on the right controls also $\sum_{\substack{|\underline{k}'| \leq k_1+k_2+k_3-1 \\ k'_3 \leq k_3-2}} \check{\mathbb{I}} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{\underline{k}'} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] (v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2))$

by Remark 12.4.2 (the latter term appearing in the application of Cauchy–Schwarz).

For \mathcal{G}_2 we obtain similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_2 [W] (\tau_1, \tau_2) &\lesssim C_\gamma \sum_{\substack{|\underline{k}'| \leq k_1+k_2+k_3 \\ k'_3 \leq k_3-1}} \check{\mathbb{I}}^{\diamond, deg} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{\underline{k}'} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] (v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2)) + \check{\mathbb{I}} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{\underline{k}'} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau_1, \tau_2) \\ &+ \gamma \left\{ \check{\mathbb{I}}^{\diamond, deg} \left[(\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3} (r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] (v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \check{\mathbb{I}} \left[(\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3} (r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau_1, \tau_2) \right\} + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{(\tau_1)^{\min(N-3-K, 2)}}. \quad (12.4.16) \end{aligned}$$

For γ sufficiently small we can absorb the term in the second line by the left hand side of (11.4.3). In summary, we have shown that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f}^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) + \check{\mathbb{I}}^{\diamond,deg}[W](v(\tau)) + \check{\mathbb{I}}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) \\
& \lesssim \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)}^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{\substack{|\underline{k}'| \leq k_1+k_2+k_3 \\ k'_3 \leq k_3-1}} \left\{ \check{\mathbb{I}}^{\diamond,deg} \left[\check{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{k'} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] (v(\tau), v(u_f)) + \check{\mathbb{I}} \left[\check{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{k'} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau, u_f) \right\} \\
& + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(N-3-K,2)}}
\end{aligned} \tag{12.4.17}$$

and hence completed the induction step for k_1 even. This establishes the desired estimate for k_1 even, however, with diamond superscripts on the horizon energies. To remove the latter we finally observe that $W_{\mathcal{H}^+} = (\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3} (r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfies a tensorial wave equation of type 3_0 with

$$\mathcal{F}_{3_0}^{lin}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = -\frac{4\Omega^2}{r^2} W_{\mathcal{H}^+} + 6M \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} W_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \mathcal{F}_1^{lin}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}].$$

We apply Proposition 11.5.1. The terms with a \star are easily seen to be controlled by (12.4.17) and the linear error $\mathcal{G}_4[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$ is controlled using Cauchy–Schwarz in conjunction with (12.4.17) noting that the linear error is supported away from $r = 3M$. In summary, the estimate (12.4.1) has now been established replacing everywhere $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k$ by $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^k$ and restricting to tuples (k_1, k_2, k_3) with k_1 even on the left hand side.

Let now $k_3 > 0$ and $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 \leq K$ and k_1 **odd**. We leave the general induction step to the reader but treat here explicitly the key case $k_3 = 1$. The linear error has the structure (separately for $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}^{lin} \left[(\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3=1} (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} rd\!\not{v} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi \right] &= h_0 \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1+1)/2} rd\!\not{v} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi \\
&+ h_0 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} rd\!\not{v} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi \\
&+ 3 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} (\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3=1} (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} rd\!\not{v} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi, \tag{12.4.18}
\end{aligned}$$

generating three terms in \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 respectively. When applying Proposition 11.4.1, the first two can be handled exactly as in the k_1 even case using Cauchy–Schwarz and noting also the general inequality for a symmetric traceless S -tensor ξ ,

$$|r^2 \Delta rd\!\not{v} \xi|^2 \lesssim |rd\!\not{v} r^2 \Delta \xi|^2 + |rd\!\not{v} \xi|^2 \lesssim |r \nabla r^2 \Delta \xi|^2 + |r \nabla \xi|^2. \tag{12.4.19}$$

The term in the third line of (12.4.18) generates an integrand in \mathcal{G}_1 of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
& 3 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} (\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3=1} (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} rd\!\not{v} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi \cdot \nabla_T (\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3=1} (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} rd\!\not{v} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi \\
& \lesssim C_\gamma \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |\nabla_{R^*} (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} rd\!\not{v} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi|^2 + \gamma \cdot \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |\nabla_T (\nabla_{R^*}) (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} rd\!\not{v} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi|^2 \\
& \lesssim C_\gamma \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |\nabla_{R^*} (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} rd\!\not{v} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi|^2 + \gamma \cdot \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |\nabla_{R^*} (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} rd\!\not{v} (\nabla_T)^{k_2+1} \Psi|^2 + |\mathcal{E}_2^{k_1+k_2}|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term is controlled (non-degenerately at $r = 3M$) entirely by Step 1 and the second can be absorbed on the left of (11.4.3) for γ sufficiently small. The same estimate works for the term \mathcal{G}_2 arising from the term in the third line of (12.4.18).

We finally summarise the estimate one obtains for general $k_3 \geq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{G}_1 \left[(\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3} (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} r d\!/\!v (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi \right] (\tau_1, \tau_2) + \mathcal{G}_2 \left[(\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3} (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} r d\!/\!v (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi \right] (\tau_1, \tau_2) \\
& \lesssim C_\gamma \sum_{\substack{|\underline{k}'| \leq k_1 + k_2 + k_3 \\ k'_3 \leq k_3 - 1}} \mathbb{I}^{\diamond, deg} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{k'} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] (v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2)) + \mathbb{I} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{k'} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau_1, \tau_2) + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{(\tau_1)^{\min(N-3-K, 2)}} \\
& + \gamma \mathbb{I}^{\diamond, deg} \left[(\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3} (r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2} r d\!/\!v (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] (v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2)) \\
& + \gamma \mathbb{I} \left[(\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3} (r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2} r d\!/\!v (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau_1, \tau_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking into account these estimates for the linear errors we easily deduce the analogue of (12.4.17) now for $W = (\nabla_{R^*})^{k_3} (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} r d\!/\!v (\nabla_T)^{k_2} \Psi$, k_1 odd on the left. Coupling in the redshift via Proposition 11.5.1 proceeds entirely analogously to the k_1 even case. This finally produces the desired (12.4.1) except that $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k$ is replaced by $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^k$ everywhere.

Note that Propositions 11.8.1 and 11.8.3 now imply in particular the estimate (12.4.1) if one restricts

- all fluxes and spacetime integrals for $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ on the left to $r \geq 9M_{\text{init}}/4$
- all fluxes and spacetime integrals for $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ on the left to $r \leq 2R$.

Therefore, to complete the proof, we only need to improve the estimates for $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ (or more precisely $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3$ derivatives applied to it) in $r \leq 9M_{\text{init}}/4$ (Step 3 below) and the estimates for $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ (or more precisely $r\Omega \nabla_4$ derivatives applied to it) in the region $r \geq 2R$ (Step 4 below).

Step 3. Improved control near the horizon for $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$. We introduce another auxiliary set of derivative operators in the horizon region:

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^k = \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3)} := \begin{cases} (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{k_3} (r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} & \text{if } k_1 \text{ even} \\ (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{k_3} (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} r d\!/\!v (\nabla_T)^{k_2} & \text{if } k_1 \text{ odd.} \end{cases} \quad (12.4.20)$$

It is easy to see that if we can establish the estimate (12.4.1) for $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ instead of $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, then we have established it for $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ (replace $2\nabla_T = \Omega \nabla_3 + \Omega \nabla_4$, commute, and estimate the non-linear errors via Propositions 11.7.4 and 11.7.5). Moreover, we only need to obtain improved estimates for $r \leq 9M_{\text{init}}/4$ by the considerations at the end of Step 2. Finally, note that for $k_3 = 0$ we have already proven the desired estimate in Step 1.

To establish the estimate (12.4.1) for $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, we recall that $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfies a tensorial wave equation of Type 3₀ with (zeroth order) linear error-term given by (11.1.17). Commuting with $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^k$ for $k_3 = 1$ produces a tensorial wave equation of Type 3_{1/2} whose non-linear error was controlled in Step 0. Applying Proposition 11.5.1 with $W_{\mathcal{H}^+} = \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ ($k_3 = 1$) and estimating the linear error by Cauchy–Schwarz (and the estimates from Steps 1 and 2) yields the desired estimate for $k_3 = 1$ (and k_1, k_2 arbitrary). Now inductively continue to $k_3 = K$.

Step 4. Improved control near infinity for $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ We introduce another auxiliary set of derivative operators near infinity:

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k = \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3)} := \begin{cases} (r\Omega \nabla_4)^{k_3} (r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2} (\nabla_T)^{k_2} & \text{if } k_1 \text{ even} \\ (r\Omega \nabla_4)^{k_3} (r^2 \Delta)^{(k_1-1)/2} r d\!/\!v (\nabla_T)^{k_2} & \text{if } k_1 \text{ odd.} \end{cases} \quad (12.4.21)$$

It is easy to see that if we can establish the estimate (12.4.1) for $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ instead of $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ then we have established it for $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ (replace $2\nabla_T = \Omega \nabla_3 + \Omega \nabla_4$, commute, and estimate the non-linear errors via Propositions 11.7.7, 11.7.9). Note also that for $k_3 = 0$ we have already proven the desired estimate in Step 1.

To establish the estimate (12.4.1) for $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ we proceed inductively, starting with $k_3 = 1$, i.e. we prove the desired estimate with the sum on the left restricted to $\sum_{|\underline{k}| \leq K, k_3=1}$. By Proposition 11.1.8, $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$

satisfies a tensorial wave equation of type $4_{0,2}$. Proposition 11.2.5 therefore implies that the tensorial wave equations for $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=1)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ are of Type $4_{1/2,0}$ (k_1 odd) or $4_{1/2,3/2}$ (k_1 even). We apply the estimate of Proposition 11.6.1 for these $W_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=1)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ with $p = 0$ and note that the boxed term is absent in view of the values of k and l . This leads to the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k_1+k_2 \leq K-1} \left(\check{\mathbb{I}}^0[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=1)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau, u_f) + \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u^0[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=1)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty}^0[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=1)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) \right) \\ & \lesssim \text{RHS of (12.4.1)} + \sum_{k_1+k_2 \leq K-1} \left| \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{\tau \geq 3/2R\}} \mathcal{F}_{4_{1/2,l}}^{lin}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=1)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \cdot \Omega \nabla_4 \left(\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=1)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

We next observe that the left hand side of the above controls the left hand side of (12.4.1) with the sum restricted to all tuples with $k_3 = 1$ in view of the estimates

$$\sum_{k_1+k_2 \leq K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=1)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \sum_{k_1+k_2 \leq K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u^0[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=1)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sum_{k_1+k_2 \leq K} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{aux}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=0)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \quad (12.4.22)$$

and a similar estimate for $\mathbb{I}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=1)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$. The last term in (12.4.22) is already controlled from Step 1.

Finally, for the term involving $\mathcal{F}_{4_{1/2,l}}^{lin}$, we note that an application of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality estimates it for any $\gamma > 0$ by

$$\gamma \sum_{k_1+k_2 \leq K-1} \check{\mathbb{I}}^0[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=1)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau, u_f) + C_\gamma \sum_{k_1+k_2 \leq K} \check{\mathbb{I}}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=0)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau, u_f).$$

For γ sufficiently small, the first term can be absorbed on the left and the second term is controlled by Step 1. This proves the desired estimate for $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ with k having $k_3 = 1$.

It is easy to see we can induct all the way up to $k_3 = K$. We leave the details to the reader and note here only the key point. The tensorial wave equations for $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3 \geq 2)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ are of type $4_{k_3/2,l}$ for l some (half) integer number depending only on K . The exact value of l is irrelevant here because we can now allow for the boxed term to appear in the estimate Proposition 11.6.1. This is because this term is clearly controlled by $\check{\mathbb{I}}_u^0[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3-1)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$ (i.e. the previous step of the induction). The treatment of the inhomogeneous term involving $\mathcal{F}_{4_{k_3/2,l}}^{lin}$ and the non-linear term proceeds completely analogously.

This concludes the proof for $(\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+})$. It is clear that the same steps can be followed for the pair $(\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ thereby establishing the last claim of the proposition. \square

12.4.2 The r^p weighted hierarchy for higher derivatives

Proposition 12.4.3. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$, any $0 \leq K \leq N-3$ and $p \in \{1, 2-\delta, 2\}$, the pair $(\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 P, \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^5 P)$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|k| \leq K} \left[\sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u^p[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \right] \\ & \sum_{|k| \leq K} \left[\check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty}^p[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) \right] \\ & + \sum_{|k| \leq K} \check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \sum_{|k| \leq K-1} \check{\mathbb{I}}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) \\ & + \sum_{|k| \leq K} \check{\mathbb{I}}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) + \sum_{|k| \leq K} \check{\mathbb{I}}^p[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|k| \leq K} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{|k| \leq K} \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sum_{|k| \leq K} \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau^p[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(N-3-K, 1)}}. \quad (12.4.23) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the pair $(\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 \check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^5 \underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ satisfies the same estimates.

Proof. Note first that the estimate claimed is an improvement over Proposition 12.4.1 only in that the weights near infinity for $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ are improved here. The proof is similar to that of Step 4 of Proposition 12.4.1 and hence only outlined here. The main idea is to add to the estimate (12.4.1) the r^p weighted estimate from Proposition 11.6.1 for the relevant p . Note that we already proved the estimate for $K = 0$ in Proposition 12.3.1.

Step 0. Non-linear errors. We first establish the non-linear error estimate

$$\sum_{|k| \leq K} \mathcal{H}_{5,p} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] + \sum_{|k| \leq K} \mathcal{H}_{5,p} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(N-3-K, 1)}}. \quad (12.4.24)$$

Focussing on the $\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ term (the $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ term being strictly easier as there are no anomalous error terms) we estimate the term

$$\mathcal{H}_{5,p} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau, u_f) = \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq 3R/2\}} \left| \left(\mathcal{F}_{4k,l}^{nlin} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] + F_{34} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] \right) \cdot r^p |\Omega \nabla_4 \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}| \right|$$

as follows. Wlog $p = 2$. We commute the $\Omega \nabla_4$ through on $\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and insert the expression from Proposition 3.4.4. Note that errors from commutators (Lemma 3.3.1) either strictly improve regularity of the integrand or its r -decay (by at least two powers of r) or both. We further note that $\mathcal{F}_{4k,l}^{nlin} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right]$ is of the same form as $\mathcal{F}^{nlin} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right]$ considered in (12.4.10). Inserting the schematic forms for these terms the error is of the form controlled by Propositions 11.7.6, 11.7.11 and Propositions 11.7.12, 11.7.13.

Step 1. Angular and T derivatives. We first prove (12.4.23) for any fixed $K \in \{1, 2, \dots, N-3\}$ and all $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ with $(k_1, k_2, k_3 = 0)$, $k_1 + k_2 = K$. Since such $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfy a tensorial wave equation of type $4_{0,1/2}$ or $4_{0,2}$ respectively (depending on k_2 even or odd) with $\mathcal{F}^{lin} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] = 6M \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, we can apply Proposition 11.6.1 (no boxed term in view of $l \geq 0$) for $p \in \{1, 2 - \delta, 2\}$ and estimate the term $\mathcal{G}_{5,p}$ arising from \mathcal{F}^{lin} using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and Proposition 12.4.1 (just as in the proof of Proposition 12.3.1).

Step 2. Including $r\nabla_4$ -derivatives. We now prove (12.4.23) for any fixed $K \in \{1, 2, \dots, N-3\}$ and all $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ with $k = (k_1, k_2, k_3 = 1)$, $k_1 + k_2 = K - 1$ and then induct all the way to $k_3 = K$. Since the main step is going to $k_3 = 1$, we focus on this. We note that by Proposition 11.2.5 such $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfy a tensorial wave equation of type $4_{1/2,l}$ (precise half-integer value of l irrelevant) with linear inhomogeneous term of the form $(h_0$ denoting an admissible coefficient function that can be different in each occurrence)

$$\mathcal{F}_{4_{1/2,l}}^{lin} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] = \frac{h_0}{r^3} \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \frac{h_0}{r^2} r^2 \Delta \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=0)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \frac{h_0}{r^2} \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=0)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}. \quad (12.4.25)$$

We apply Proposition 11.6.1 for this $W_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$. The boxed term on the right hand side of (11.6.1) is controlled for any $p \in [1, 2]$ by

$$\int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} r^{p-3} |r \Omega \nabla_4 \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=0)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \lesssim \mathbb{I} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=0)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau, u_f) + \mathbb{I}^p \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=0)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau, u_f),$$

with the right hand side being controlled by Step 1. The terms supported in $r \leq 2R$ on the right hand side of (11.6.1) are controlled already by the estimate (12.4.1). The non-linear term is controlled by (12.4.24). The term

$$\mathcal{G}_{5,p} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=1)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] = \left| \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq 3/2R\}} \mathcal{F}_{4_{1/2,l}}^{lin} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] \cdot (r^p + r^{2-\delta} \delta_p^2) \Omega \nabla_4 \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right| \quad (12.4.26)$$

arising from (12.4.25) on the right hand side of (11.6.1) is the most difficult. For $p = 1$ and $p = 2 - \delta$ it is again easily seen from the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality that we have for any $\eta > 0$

$$\mathcal{G}_{5,p} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=1)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] \leq \gamma \mathbb{I}^p \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=1)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau, u_f) + C_\gamma \mathbb{I}^p \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2+1, k_3=0)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau, u_f) + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau},$$

with the non-linear errors arising from commutations of derivatives. The first term can be absorbed on the left for sufficiently small γ and the second term is controlled by Step 1 above.

For $p = 2$, this argument still works for the first term appearing in (12.4.25) but not for the last two terms. Here we need to control the expression

$$\int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq 3R/2\}} h_0 r^2 \tilde{\Delta} \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=0)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \cdot \Omega \nabla_4 \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=1)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}. \quad (12.4.27)$$

Inserting $1 = (\chi(r) + (1 - \chi(r)))$ into the integrand where $\chi(r)$ is a radial cut-off equal to 1 for $r \geq 2R$ and zero near $r = 3R/2$, we control the integral involving $(1 - \chi(r))$, which is supported for $r \leq 2R$, directly from Proposition 12.4.1. For the term involving $\chi(r)$ we integrate by parts the angular derivative and the 4 derivative (using $[r\nabla, \Omega\nabla_4]$ is non-linear by Lemma 3.3.1) resulting in the following estimate. For any $\gamma > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} (12.4.27) \lesssim & C_\gamma \sum_{k'_1 \leq k_1+1} \left\{ \check{\mathbb{I}}^{p=2} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k'_1, k_2, k_3=0)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau, u_f) + \check{\mathbb{I}}_{v_\infty}^{p=2} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k'_1, k_2, k_3=0)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau) \right\} \\ & + \gamma \check{\mathbb{I}}_{v_\infty}^{p=2} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3=1)} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau) + \sum_{|k| \leq K} \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sum_{|k| \leq K} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(N-3-K, 1)}}. \end{aligned}$$

The γ -term is absorbed on the left of (11.6.1) and the first line is controlled by the previous estimate from Step 1. The last term in (12.4.25) is treated entirely analogously.

Using further commutations it is clear how to induct all the way to $k_3 = K$ and the proposition is proven for the pair $(\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+})$. It is clear that the same steps can be followed for the pair $(\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ thereby establishing the last claim of the proposition. \square

12.5 The hierarchy of weighted decay estimates

In this section we complete the proof of Theorem 12.1.1. It is easy to check that the estimates of the following proposition imply the estimates of Theorem 12.1.1.

Proposition 12.5.1. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$, the pair $(\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 P, \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^5 P)$ satisfies the estimates*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|k| \leq N-3} \left[\sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u^2 [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \right] \\ & \sum_{|k| \leq N-3} \left[\check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty}^2 [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) \right] \\ & + \sum_{|k| \leq N-3} \check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) + \sum_{|k| \leq N-4} \check{\mathbb{I}} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) \\ & + \sum_{|k| \leq N-3} \check{\mathbb{I}} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) + \sum_{|k| \leq N-3} \check{\mathbb{I}}^2 [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \end{aligned} \quad (12.5.1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|k| \leq N-4} \left[\sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u^1 [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \right] \\ & \sum_{|k| \leq N-4} \left[\check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty}^1 [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) \right] \\ & + \sum_{|k| \leq N-4} \check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) + \sum_{|k| \leq N-5} \check{\mathbb{I}} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) \\ & + \sum_{|k| \leq N-4} \check{\mathbb{I}} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) + \sum_{|k| \leq N-4} \check{\mathbb{I}}^1 [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau}, \end{aligned} \quad (12.5.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{|k| \leq N-5} \left[\sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \right] \\
& + \sum_{|k| \leq N-5} \left[\check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) \right] + \sum_{|k| \leq N-5} \check{\mathbb{I}}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) \\
& + \sum_{|k| \leq N-5} \check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \sum_{|k| \leq N-6} \check{\mathbb{I}}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^2}. \tag{12.5.3}
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the pair $(\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 \check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^5 \underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ satisfies the same estimates.

Finally, all estimates hold replacing $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k$ by \mathfrak{D}^k .

Proof. Apply the estimate of Proposition 12.4.3 with $\tau = u_1$, $K = N - 3$ and $p = 2$. This produces (12.5.1) after using the estimate (12.1.7) for the initial energies. Using the non-degenerate spacetime terms of (12.5.1) we find a dyadic sequence τ_i such that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N-4} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_i)}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{N-4} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{\tau_i}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{N-4} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{\tau_i}^1[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau_i}. \tag{12.5.4}$$

Applying the estimate of Proposition 12.4.3 with $\tau = \tau_i$, $K = N - 4$ and $p = 1$ establishes the estimate (12.5.2) now for any τ .

From the estimate (12.5.2) we find another dyadic sequence, also denoted τ_i along which

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N-5} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_i)}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{N-5} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{\tau_i}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau_i^2}. \tag{12.5.5}$$

Applying now the estimate of Proposition 12.4.1 with $\tau = \tau_i$, $K = N - 5$ we obtain the estimate (12.5.3) for any τ . The estimates for $(\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 \check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^5 \underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ are proven in exactly the same fashion. Finally, the claim regarding $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}$ follows from Propositions 11.8.1 and 11.8.3. \square

12.6 Completing the proof of Theorem C.3

Having proven Theorem 12.1.1, we complete in this section the proof Theorem C.3.

We recall once more the master energies (6.1.4) and focus on the quantities $P_{\mathcal{H}^+}, P_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ (the $\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ case being treated entirely analogously). Since, by the considerations of Section 12.1.1, we have reduced the problem to region III, it suffices to prove estimates for:

	$P_{\mathcal{I}^+}$	$P_{\mathcal{H}^+}$
outgoing cones	$\underline{C}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ for $u \geq u_1$	$\underline{C}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)$ for $v \geq v_1$
ingoing cones	$\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)$ for $u \geq u_1$	$\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ for $v \geq v_1$
integrated decay regions	$\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) \cap \{v_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq v_1\}$ for $u \geq u_1$	$\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v) \cap \{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} \geq u_1\}$ for $v \geq v_1$

Note also that in view of Theorem 12.1.1, we have already proved the required estimates for $P_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ on the truncated cones $\check{C}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ as well as the regions $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)$ for $u \geq u_1$, and the estimates for $P_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ on the truncated cones $\check{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ as well as the regions $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)$ for $v \geq v_1$.

12.6.1 Integrated decay

We first focus on the integrated decay. We recall the energies (11.3.7) and (11.3.6) and define the analogous “unchecked” energies

$$\mathbb{I}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) = \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v) \cap \{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} \geq u_1\}} |\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |\Omega \nabla_4 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |r \nabla W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2, \tag{12.6.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{I}^{\circ,deg}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) &= \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v) \cap \{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} \geq u_1\}} |\nabla_{R^*} W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right)^2 (|\nabla_T W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |r\nabla W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2), \\ \mathbb{I}^{deg}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) &= \mathbb{I}^{\circ,deg}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v) \cap \{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} \geq u_1\}} |\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 W_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2.\end{aligned}\quad (12.6.2)$$

Similarly, in analogy with (11.3.11) and (11.3.12), we define

$$\mathbb{I}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) = \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{v_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq v_1\}} \frac{|\Omega \nabla_4 W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^{1+\delta}} + \frac{|\Omega \nabla_3 W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^{1+\delta}} + \frac{|r\nabla W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^3} + \frac{|W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^3}, \quad (12.6.3)$$

$$\mathbb{I}^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) = \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{v_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq v_1\}} \left(\frac{|\Omega \nabla_4 W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^{1+\delta_0^p}} + \frac{|r\nabla W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^{3+\delta_2^p\delta}} + \frac{|W_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^{3+\delta_2^p\delta}} \right) r^p. \quad (12.6.4)$$

Proposition 12.6.1. *The pair $(\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 P, \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^5 \tilde{P})$ satisfies the following estimates*

$$\sum_{s=0}^2 \sup_{u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f} \tau^s \left\{ \sum_{|k| \leq N-3-s} \mathbb{I}[\mathfrak{D}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) + \sum_{|k| \leq N-3-s} \mathbb{I}^{2-s}[\mathfrak{D}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) \right\} \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \quad (12.6.5)$$

$$\sum_{s=0}^2 \sup_{v \geq v_1} v^s \left\{ \sum_{|k| \leq N-3-s} \mathbb{I}^{deg}[\mathfrak{D}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) + \sum_{|k| \leq N-4-s} \mathbb{I}[\mathfrak{D}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) \right\} \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (12.6.6)$$

Moreover, the quantity $\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ in the pair $(\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 \tilde{P}, \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^5 \tilde{P})$ satisfies the same estimates.

Proof. Note that we have proven these estimates already for the \mathbb{I} energies in Theorem 12.1.1. For $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, it therefore suffices to restrict the integrals in the energies (12.6.3) and (12.6.4) appearing in (12.6.5) to the region $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau)) \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)$, which contains $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{v_{\mathcal{H}^+} \geq v_1\} \setminus \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)$ and is located far away from $r = 3M$. The (non-degenerate) estimates for $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ will then follow if we can replace $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ by $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in these integrals over $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau)) \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)$. Indeed, we have $v(\tau) \sim \tau$ and the desired estimates hold for $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))$ by Theorem 12.1.1. To finally replace $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ by $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, we apply Proposition 10.4.1, which controls the difference in the region $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau)) \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)$ by a decaying error term implicit in (12.6.5).

The proof for $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ is analogous using again Proposition 10.4.1 in the overlap region. \square

From the definition of the timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B} in Section 10.3.1 we conclude (see (11.3.15)):

Corollary 12.6.2. *We have in addition the following bounds on the timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B} :*

$$\sup_{u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f} \sum_{s=0}^2 \tau^s \left\{ \sum_{|k| \leq N-3-s} \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{B}(\tau)}[\mathfrak{D}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{|k| \leq N-3-s} \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{B}(\tau)}[\mathfrak{D}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \right\} \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (12.6.7)$$

12.6.2 Estimates on truncated ingoing cones $\check{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}$

With the improved estimates on the timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B} of Corollary 12.6.2, we can obtain estimates on arbitrary *truncated* ingoing cones of the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge.

Indeed, pick such a cone $\check{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)$ with $\tau \geq u_1$ and consider the spacetime region enclosed by $\check{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)$, \mathcal{B} , $\check{\mathcal{C}}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and (potentially) $\check{\mathcal{C}}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$. Apply the energy estimate and the r^p weighted estimates in this region using the bounds on the cone $\check{\mathcal{C}}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ established in Proposition 12.5.1 and the bounds on the hypersurface \mathcal{B} established in Corollary 12.6.2. This proves in particular the statement of Theorem 12.1.1 for $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ with the flux $\sup_{v \leq v_\infty} \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left\{ \sum_{|k|=0}^{K-1} |\Omega \nabla_3 \mathfrak{D}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{r^p}{r^2} |r\nabla \mathfrak{D}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\}$ added to $\check{\mathbb{E}}_{out}^{K,p}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau)$. Also, the check superscript can be removed for the integrated decay terms in the energies of Theorem 12.1.1 in view of Proposition 12.6.1.

12.6.3 Estimates on truncated outgoing cones $\check{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}$

In order to obtain estimates on arbitrary *truncated* outgoing cones of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, we proceed similarly to Section 12.6.2 above.

Consider an outgoing cone $\check{C}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)$ with $v \geq v_1$ and the region enclosed by $\check{C}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)$, $\check{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and \mathcal{B} . Apply the energy estimate and the redshift estimate in this region using the estimates on the cone $\check{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ from Proposition 12.5.1 and the bounds on the hypersurface \mathcal{B} established in Corollary 12.6.2. This proves in particular the statement of Theorem 12.1.1 for $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ with the outgoing (truncated) flux $\sup_{u \leq u_f} \int_{\check{C}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \sum_{|k|=0; k_1 \neq K}^K |\mathfrak{D}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2$ added to $\check{\mathbb{E}}_{in}^K[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v)$. Also, the check superscript can be removed for the integrated decay terms in the energies of Theorem 12.1.1 in view of Proposition 12.6.1.

12.6.4 Estimates on the full cones $C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}$

To complete the proof of Theorem C.3 for $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, i.e. to obtain the statement of Theorem 12.1.1 for $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ with the check superscripts and the “in” subscript removed from the energies, it now suffices, in view of the previous estimates, to obtain estimate for the flux on truncated outgoing cones $C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ for $u \geq u_1$ and the truncated ingoing ones $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) \cap \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ for $u \geq u_1$. This is because the part of the flux on $C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ to the exterior of \mathcal{B} (which is the flux on $\check{C}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$) has already been estimated, and similarly for $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)$.

Step 1: Outgoing cones $C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$. Given a null cone $C_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ with $\tau \geq u_1 + 4M_{\text{init}}$ (the “near data” case $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_1 + 4M_{\text{init}}$ requiring trivial modifications of the following argument), we consider its past extension into the horizon region, say (for definiteness) up to the timelike hypersurface $r_{\mathcal{H}^+} = R_{-4} = R - 4M_{\text{init}}$ and denote the resulting cone by \check{C}_τ . Note this cone in general does not overlap with an outgoing cone of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, but agrees of course with a null cone of the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge for $r_{\mathcal{I}^+} \geq R_{-2} = R - 2M_{\text{init}}$. We observe that the v coordinate at the intersection sphere satisfies $|v_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \tau + R_{-4}| \leq \frac{1}{10}M_{\text{init}}$, which follows from closeness to Schwarzschild and $v - u \approx r$ in view of R satisfying (1.3.19).

Next we consider the spacetime region enclosed by the ingoing cone $\underline{C}_{v=\tau+R-3M_{\text{init}}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, the hypersurface \mathcal{B} and the hypersurface \check{C}_τ . Note that in this region $R_{-4} \leq r_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq R_1$ and in particular r -weights and Ω^2 -weights can be absorbed into constants in this region. Since it is also a finite time region, it suffices to apply a standard energy estimate (e.g. arising from the vectorfield T) to the equation satisfied by $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in this region. The boundary term on \mathcal{B} can be controlled by Proposition 12.6.2. The term on $\underline{C}_{v=\tau+R-3M_{\text{init}}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ is controlled by Proposition 12.5.1. The estimate therefore produces in particular control of all *tangential* derivatives of $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ on $C_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$. With the tangential derivatives of $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ controlled on the null hypersurface $C_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ we can translate $\nabla_{e_4^+} \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\check{\nabla}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ to $\nabla_{e_4^+} \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\check{\nabla}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ using the estimates of Proposition 10.4.1 in the overlap region producing the desired flux. [Note that it is important that in the way we carried out the argument, one of the derivatives of $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ is already the “correct” tangential derivative on the cone and does not need to be converted. The expression $\nabla_{e_4^+} \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ would generally not be controlled at top order on $C_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ because it involves derivatives transversal to the cone!]

Step 2: Ingoing cones $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}$. Consider an arbitrary ingoing cone $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) \cap \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ of the infinity gauge. It intersects $\{r_{\mathcal{I}^+} = R_{-2}\} \cup \{u = u_f\}$ in a sphere of the infinity foliation. The outgoing cone C emanating from that sphere intersects \mathcal{B} and we can hence consider the region enclosed by C , the cone $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) \cap \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and \mathcal{B} . Doing a backwards energy estimate using the control on C from Step 1 and the estimates of Proposition 12.6.2 for the term on \mathcal{B} one obtains the desired estimates.

The argument for estimating $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ on the cones $C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ is now completely analogous.

In view of our comments at the beginning of Section 12.6, this now completes the proof of Theorem C.3.

Chapter 13

Estimates for α and $\underline{\alpha}$: the proof of Theorem C.4

In this chapter we shall prove Theorem C.4, which we restate here:

Theorem C.4 (Estimates for α and $\underline{\alpha}$). *Under the assumptions of Theorem C, then for all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$ and all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, with the gauges as defined above, then the quantities $\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfy the estimates*

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Contents

13.1	Overview of the estimates on α	242
13.2	Auxiliary transport estimates at low orders for α	244
13.3	Higher order energy estimates for α	246
13.3.1	Basic estimates for Π and $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi$	246
13.3.2	Basic estimates for A and $(\nabla_{R^*})^k A$	248
13.3.3	Integrated local energy decay for all derivatives of Π and A	249
13.3.4	Basic fluxes for all derivatives of Π and A	250
13.3.5	The weighted r^p estimates for $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$	253
13.3.6	Decay estimates for Π and A : the proof of Theorem 13.1.2	259
13.4	Concluding the main estimates for α	261
13.5	Overview of the estimates on $\underline{\alpha}$	262
13.6	Auxiliary transport estimates at low orders for $\underline{\alpha}$	264
13.7	Higher order energy estimates for $\underline{\alpha}$	265
13.7.1	Basic estimates for $\underline{\Pi}$ and $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}$	265
13.7.2	Basic estimates for \underline{A} and $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{A}$	268
13.7.3	Integrated local energy decay for all derivatives of $\underline{\Pi}$ and \underline{A}	269
13.7.4	Basic fluxes for all derivatives of $\underline{\Pi}$ and \underline{A}	270
13.7.5	Improving the weights near infinity	270
13.7.6	The redshift estimates for $\underline{\Pi}$ and \underline{A}	274
13.7.7	Decay estimates for $\underline{\Pi}$ and \underline{A} : the proof of Theorem 13.5.2	278
13.8	Concluding the main estimates for $\underline{\alpha}$	279
13.9	Completing the proof of Theorem C.4	280
13.9.1	Missing transversal fluxes for $\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$	280
13.9.2	Missing transversal fluxes for $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$	280
13.9.3	Two corollaries of the proof	281

We shall first prove separate (and slightly weaker) estimates for α and then for $\underline{\alpha}$. These will be the contents of theorems to be stated in **Section 13.1** and **13.5**, respectively, which will be proven in the four and three sections, respectively immediately following each of them. We defer further discussion of the contents of these to Sections 13.1 and 13.5, respectively. On the basis of these estimates, the proof of Theorem C.4 will be completed in **Section 13.9**.

As in the previous chapters of Part C, we shall assume throughout the assumptions of Theorem C. Let us fix an arbitrary $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$, with $\hat{u}_f \in \mathfrak{B}$, and fix some $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$. All propositions below shall always refer to the anchored \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges in the spacetime $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$, corresponding to parameters u_f , $M_f(u_f, \lambda)$, whose existence is ensured by Definition 7.1.1. We shall denote $M = M_f$ throughout this chapter.

This chapter will depend on all previous chapters of Part C, and will in particular use the propositions of Chapter 11 as well as the statements of Theorems C.1–C.3. As with Chapter 12, the reader who wishes to understand the structure of the proof without reading the detailed estimates may wish to simply read the overview Sections 13.1 and 13.5 together with Section 13.9. For the linear version of Theorem C.4, the reader may compare with Theorem 2 in Section 11 of [DHR].

13.1 Overview of the estimates on α

To prove the estimates on $\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ implicit in Theorem C.4 we will first prove the following statement:

Theorem 13.1.1. *We have the estimates*

$$\sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{u_{-1} \leq \tau \leq u_f} \tau^s \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\square}^{N-s, 2-s}[\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) + \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v} v^s \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\square}^{N-s}[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3$$

for the restricted energies (recall $A_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r\Omega^2\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $A_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r\Omega^2\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^3\Omega\psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5P_{\mathcal{I}^+}$)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\square}^K[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) &:= \sup_{\tilde{v} \geq v} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{v}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq K}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \sup_{u \leq u_f} \int_{\mathcal{C}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; \boxed{k_2 \neq K}}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \Omega^2 \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right)^2 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |R^* \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \right\}, \\ \mathbb{E}_{\square}^{K,p}[\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) &:= \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \int_{\mathcal{C}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1; \boxed{k_2 \neq K}}^K r^{4+p} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; \boxed{k_2 \neq K-1}}^{K-1} r^2 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \sup_{v \leq v_{\infty}} \int_{\mathcal{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1, k_3 \neq K}^K r^{4+p} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} r^{2+p} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-2} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1}^K r^{3+p-\delta} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} r^{1+p-\delta} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-2} r^{-1-\delta} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\}. \quad (13.1.1) \end{aligned}$$

Note that the above restricted energies differ from the actual energies defined in (6.1.6) and (6.1.7) only by the boxed restrictions in the sum. We will finally remove these restrictions in Section 13.9 (after having proved estimates also on $\underline{\alpha}$), using the Teukolsky–Starobinski identities to deduce control over the missing fluxes concluding the $\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3$ part in Theorem C.4. Observe already at this point that the estimate of Theorem 13.1.1 strengthens in particular some of the estimates (r -weights) for the derived quantity $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 P_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ in Theorem C.3.

Remark 13.1.1. Note that we can equivalently replace the restrictions $k_3 \neq K$, $k_2 \neq K$ and $k_2 \neq K-1$ by $\underline{k}_3 \neq \underline{k}$, $\underline{k}_2 \neq \underline{k}$ and $\underline{k}_2 \neq \underline{k}$ in the sums above. This follows by a simple elliptic estimate along cones.

To prove Theorem 13.1.1 we first recall the three regions introduced at the beginning of Section 12.1. Just as for P and \underline{P} , in view of Proposition 10.5.1 it suffices to prove decay estimates for cones and regions contained in the region III, namely $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_1) \cup \tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v_1 = v(u_1))$, in terms of the weighted energy

$$\int_{\underline{C}_{v_1}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq |\underline{k}|}^N |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \int_{C_{u_1}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^N r^6 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^{N-1} r^2 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \quad (13.1.2)$$

on $C_{u_1}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cup \underline{C}_{v_1=v(u_1)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, which is in turn controlled by $\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3$ from Proposition 10.5.1.

In order to achieve this, we first prove (just as for P and \underline{P} in Chapter 12) a weaker version of Theorem 13.1.1 which involves only arbitrary truncated (at \mathcal{B}) outgoing cones in the infinity region and arbitrary truncated (at \mathcal{B}) ingoing cones in the horizon region. More precisely, we will prove (recalling Remark 13.1.1):

Theorem 13.1.2. *We have the estimates*

$$\sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f} \tau^s \cdot \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^{N-s, 2-s}[\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) + \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{v \geq v_1} v^s \cdot \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^{N-s}[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3$$

for the restricted energies (recall $A_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r\Omega^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $A_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r\Omega^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^3 \Omega \psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 P_{\mathcal{I}^+}$)

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^K[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) &:= \sup_{\tilde{v} \geq v} \int_{\underline{\tilde{C}}_{\tilde{v}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq |\underline{k}|}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \int_{\tilde{C}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \Omega^2 \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right)^2 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |R^* \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \right\}, \\ \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^{K,p}[\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) &:= \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \int_{\tilde{C}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^K r^{4+p} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^{K-1} r^2 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \int_{\underline{\tilde{C}}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1; k_3 \neq |\underline{k}|}^K r^{4+p} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} r^{2+p} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-2} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1}^K r^{3+p-\delta} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} r^{1+p-\delta} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-2} r^{-1-\delta} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (13.1.3)$$

The proof of Theorem 13.1.2 will extend over **Sections 13.2–13.3** and is the main step in proving Theorem 13.1.1. The full statement of Theorem 13.1.1 is then obtained from Theorem 13.1.2 in **Section 13.4**. The latter step (i.e. removing the check-superscripts, i.e. adding general ingoing cones in the infinity gauge and general outgoing cones in the horizon gauge as well as considering the non-truncated cones) is straightforward and follows exactly as for P , \underline{P} by doing localised energy estimates.

We end this overview by outlining the proof of Theorem 13.1.2. We first recall the defining relations

$$\Omega \nabla_3 A_{\mathcal{H}^+} = (-2) \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \quad , \quad \Omega \nabla_3 A_{\mathcal{I}^+} = (-2) \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \quad , \quad (13.1.4)$$

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \quad , \quad \Omega \nabla_3 \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \quad , \quad (13.1.5)$$

as well as the non-linear wave equations (written in “elliptic” form)

$$r^2 \mathfrak{D}_2^* d\not{v} A_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \frac{3M}{r} A_{\mathcal{H}^+} = \Omega \nabla_4 \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \mathcal{E}^1, \quad (13.1.6)$$

$$r^2 \mathfrak{D}_2^* d\not{v} A_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \frac{3M}{r} A_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \Omega \nabla_4 \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \mathcal{E}_4^1 \quad (13.1.7)$$

and

$$2r^2\mathcal{P}_2^\star d\psi\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} + 2\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \frac{6M}{r}\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = -\Omega\mathcal{V}_4\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} + 3MA_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \mathcal{E}_2^2, \quad (13.1.8)$$

$$2r^2\mathcal{P}_2^\star d\psi\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + 2\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} - \frac{6M}{r}\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = -\Omega\mathcal{V}_4\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + 3MA_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \mathcal{E}_2^2. \quad (13.1.9)$$

Note that we can always replace $r^2\mathcal{P}_2^\star d\psi$ by $-\frac{1}{2}r^2\Delta + 1$ since the term involving the difference of the Gauss curvature with the round metric can be incorporated into the non-linear error.

The logic in obtaining the required estimates is then as follows:

1. Interpreting the defining relations (13.1.4), (13.1.5) as *transport equations* we derive estimates on $(\mathcal{V}_{R^\star})^k\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $(\mathcal{V}_{R^\star})^kA_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ as well as $(\mathcal{V}_{R^\star})^k\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $(\mathcal{V}_{R^\star})^kA_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ for $0 \leq k \leq N-2$, i.e. with a loss of derivatives. These will be useful to control lower order terms. This is the content of Section 13.2. We remark that from (13.1.4), (13.1.5) we could, by appropriate commutations, derive estimates for *all* derivatives up to order $N-2$, however, we prefer a different argument below.
2. In Section 13.3 we consider the *wave equations* satisfied by $(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ and $(A_{\mathcal{H}^+}, A_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ and prove inductively boundedness and integrated decay estimates for $((\mathcal{V}_{R^\star})^k\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}, (\mathcal{V}_{R^\star})^k\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ with $0 \leq k \leq N-1$ and $((\mathcal{V}_{R^\star})^kA_{\mathcal{H}^+}, (\mathcal{V}_{R^\star})^kA_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ with $0 \leq k \leq N$. These estimates do not lose derivatives and do not degenerate near $3M$ for $k \geq 1$, see Propositions 13.3.1 and 13.3.3. With this established we control—with good weights near the horizon but non-optimal weights near infinity—*all* derivatives of $(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ both in integrated decay (Section 13.3.3) and fluxes (Section 13.3.4). The basic idea here is simple: Angular derivatives are controlled from the relations (13.1.6)–(13.1.9) and previous estimates. For $\Omega\mathcal{V}_3$ derivatives one can use (13.1.5) and the fact that estimates on $(\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ have already been established in Theorem C.3. Finally $\Omega\mathcal{V}_4 = \Omega\mathcal{V}_3 + 2R^\star$ can be used to reduce $\Omega\mathcal{V}_4$ derivatives to R^\star derivatives, which Propositions 13.3.1 and 13.3.3 provide control on.

It remains to optimise the r -weights for $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$. This is done in Section 13.3.5 using estimates for the relevant Bianchi pairs. This finally provides a hierarchy of r -weighted estimates, see Proposition 13.3.7. We summarise our weighted estimates concisely in Proposition 13.3.10. This is also a form to which the pigeonhole principle argument of [DR09a] can then be applied to yield an inverse polynomial decay hierarchy for the weighted energies which provides all of the estimates in Theorem 13.1.2. This is the content of Section 13.3.6.

13.2 Auxiliary transport estimates at low orders for α

Exploiting the transport relations we can deduce lower order estimates for $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ as well as $A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $A_{\mathcal{H}^+}$.

Proposition 13.2.1. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ and $1 \leq K \leq N-2$ the quantities $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^3\Omega\psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $A_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r\Omega^2\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfy the estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} r^{-1-\delta} |\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + r^{1-\delta} |A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + r^{1-\delta} (|(\mathcal{V}_{R^\star})^k\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |(\mathcal{V}_{R^\star})^kA_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2) \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\mathcal{B}(\tau)} |\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |(\mathcal{V}_{R^\star})^k\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |(\mathcal{V}_{R^\star})^kA_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^K \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}} r^2 |(\Omega\mathcal{V}_4)^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |(r\Omega\mathcal{V}_4)^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}} \end{aligned} \quad (13.2.1)$$

and the quantities $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^3\Omega\psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $A_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r\Omega^2\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^K \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} |(\mathcal{V}_{R^\star})^k\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |(\mathcal{V}_{R^\star})^kA_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^K \int_{\mathcal{B}(\tau)} |(\mathcal{V}_{R^\star})^k\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |(\mathcal{V}_{R^\star})^kA_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^K \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}} r^2 |(\Omega\mathcal{V}_4)^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |(r\Omega\mathcal{V}_4)^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (13.2.2)$$

Note the right hand side in the two estimates is identical.

Proof. The proof proceeds in several steps.

Step 0. We first show the following auxiliary lemma which implies that it suffices to prove the above estimates with the right hand side replaced by the left hand side of (13.2.3).

Lemma 13.2.2. *We have, for any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ and $1 \leq K \leq N - 2$, the estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\tilde{C}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}} r^{-\delta} |\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + r^{2-\delta} (|A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^K \int_{\tilde{C}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}} r^2 |(\Omega \nabla_4)^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |(r \Omega \nabla_4)^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (13.2.3)$$

Proof. Use the definition $2R^* = -\Omega \nabla_3 + \Omega \nabla_4$ and the defining relations (13.1.4) and (13.1.5) in conjunction with the estimates on $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ of Theorem C.3.¹ \square

Step 1. Proof of the first estimate without the $(\nabla_{R^*})^k$ terms. For technical reasons, namely to avoid elliptic estimates on truncated cones, we will first prove the estimate with the regions replaced by $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq R_2\}$, the hypersurface \mathcal{B} replaced by the hypersurface $\{r = r_{\mathcal{I}^+} = R_2\} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and the cones truncated at the sphere $r = R_2$. From (13.1.9) we have

$$\int \frac{|\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^{1+\delta}} \leq \int \frac{|r^2 \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_2^* d\nu \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^{1+\delta}} \leq \int \frac{|A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2}{r^{1+\delta}} + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}}, \quad (13.2.4)$$

where the integration is over $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq R_2\}$ with measure $dudv d\theta$ and we have used the fact that $M_{\text{init}} R^{-1} < \delta$ by (1.3.19) in the second inequality. From (13.1.4) we derive

$$\frac{1}{2} \Omega \nabla_3 (r^s |A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2) + \frac{1}{2} s \cdot r^{s-1} \Omega_0^2 |A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 = \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} r^s A_{\mathcal{I}^+}. \quad (13.2.5)$$

Applying this with $s = 2 - \delta$ and integrating over $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq R_2\}$ with respect to $dudv d\theta$ (cf. Lemma 11.4.4) we obtain (after using Cauchy–Schwarz on the right and inserting (13.2.4) using (1.3.19)) the desired estimates for $A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ on the region $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq R_2\}$ and the hypersurface $r = R_2$ (instead of \mathcal{B}). Revisiting (13.2.4), the estimate for $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq R_2\}$ also follows. The missing estimate for $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ on $r = R_2$ (instead of \mathcal{B}) is now a consequence of the transport relation (an immediate consequence of (13.1.5))

$$\frac{1}{2} \Omega \nabla_3 (r^s |\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2) + \frac{1}{2} s \cdot r^{s-1} \Omega_0^2 |\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 = \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} r^s \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \quad (13.2.6)$$

applied with $s = -\delta$ and inserting the previous estimates on $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, (13.2.4), to control the wrong-signed spacetime term on the left. This proves all of the desired estimates for $r \geq R_2$. We can now easily extend them all the way up to \mathcal{B} by integrating (13.2.6) with $s = +\delta$ over the region $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \leq R_2\}$. The boundary term on $r = R_2$ is controlled by the previous step and on the right hand side we can estimate (since we are now in a region with $R_{-2} \leq r \leq R_2$)

$$\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} r^\delta \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \leq \frac{C}{\delta} R^\delta \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} |\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{4} \delta \cdot r^{\delta-1} \Omega_0^2 |\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}}. \quad (13.2.7)$$

The first term can be incorporated in the decay term and the second term absorbed on the left. We therefore immediately obtain the desired estimate for $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$. Integrating now (13.2.5) with $r = 2 - \delta$ over $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \leq R_2\}$ and applying Cauchy–Schwarz on the right (using the previous estimate for $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$) now yields the desired estimate also for $A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$.²

¹Note that at most the flux of $N - 1$ transversal derivatives of $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ can appear.

²The reason for the two-step argument we applied now becomes clear: We cannot apply (13.2.6) with $s = \delta$ in $r \geq R_2$ without using an r^p -weighted norm for $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ with $p \geq \delta$.

Step 2. Proof of the first estimate including the $(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k$ -terms. We now turn to the commuted versions of the transport equations (13.1.4), (13.1.5):

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega \check{\nabla}_3 (\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} &= \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} (\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \Omega^2 (f_{-3})_i (\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^i \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \mathcal{E}_3^{k+2}, \\ \Omega \check{\nabla}_3 (\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+} &= \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} (\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \Omega^2 (f_{-3})_i (\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^i \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \mathcal{E}_5^{k+1}.\end{aligned}$$

Contracting the first by $(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} r^{2-\delta}$ and the second by $(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+} r^{2-\delta}$ (stronger weights could be applied for $A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$) yields the desired estimates after integration over $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)$ and applying Cauchy–Schwarz on the right.³ The estimate for $(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ now follows from the (commuted) transport equation for $A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$.

Step 3. Proof of the second estimate. This is easier as r -weights can be absorbed into the constants. The estimates on \mathcal{B} follow directly from expressing the expression on \mathcal{B} of the first estimate in terms of the horizon frame and using Proposition 10.3.2. The estimates on $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ are then a direct consequence of applying the transport relations (13.2.5) with $s > 0$ and (13.2.6), which hold verbatim for $A_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$. Note again that in this region r -weights can be absorbed into the constant implicit in \lesssim . \square

13.3 Higher order energy estimates for α

In this section, we turn to higher order estimates for α .

13.3.1 Basic estimates for Π and $(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Pi$

We begin with a basic estimate arising from commuting the Π equations only with R^* derivatives:

Proposition 13.3.1. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ and $1 \leq K \leq N-2$ the pair $(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^3 \Omega \psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^3 \Omega \psi_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}& \sum_{k=0}^K \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)} [(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^K \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u [(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f} [(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty} [(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{I}} [(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{I}} [(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau [(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^K \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}} r^2 |(\Omega \check{\nabla}_4)^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |(r \Omega \check{\nabla}_4)^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}}.\end{aligned}\tag{13.3.1}$$

Remark 13.3.2. *Note that we are asserting non-degenerate control near $r = 3M$ as soon as one commutes at least once with $\check{\nabla}_{R^*}$. In fact, the proof will establish the estimate also for $K = 0$ provided one replaces $\check{\mathbb{I}}[\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau))$ by $\check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg}[\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau))$ on the left hand side.*

Proof. Recall from Proposition 11.1.4 that $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfy a tensorial wave equation of Type 1 with

$$\mathcal{F}^{lin}[\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \frac{3M}{r^2} \Omega^2 A_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \frac{2}{r} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \quad \mathcal{F}^{lin}[\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \frac{3M}{r^2} \Omega^2 A_{\mathcal{I}^+} - \frac{2}{r} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}.$$

³The non-linear error satisfies $\int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} r^{3-\delta} |\mathcal{E}_3^{K+2}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}}$ for all $1 \leq K \leq N-2$ by Proposition 11.7.7.

By a simple induction using Proposition 11.2.1 it is easy to see that $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfy a tensorial wave equation of Type 1 and that the linear error term after K commutations will have the form $(h_0, h_0^k$ and $h_0^{k,i}$ denoting admissible coefficients functions of r which can be different in different places)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &= \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} (h_0 (\nabla_{R^*})^K \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + h_0 \Omega \nabla_4 (\nabla_{R^*})^{K-1} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{h_0^k}{r^2} \Omega^2 (\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \sum_{i=0}^1 \sum_{k=i}^{K-1} \frac{h_0^{k,i}}{r^3} \Omega^2 (\Omega \nabla_4)^i (\nabla_{R^*})^{k-i} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{h_0^k}{r^3} (\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \end{aligned} \quad (13.3.2)$$

and with the same schematic form for $\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$. From Propositions 11.1.4 and 11.2.1 one sees that the non-linear error-term is of the form

$$\mathcal{F}^{nlin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_4^{2+K} \quad , \quad \mathcal{F}^{nlin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \Omega^2 (\mathcal{E}^*)^{K+2} .$$

Step 1. We claim that applying the T -boundedness estimate and the Morawetz X -estimate of Proposition 11.4.1 to the wave equations for $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ already yields (13.3.1) for all $0 \leq K \leq N-2$ (0 included), however,

- with the horizon fluxes carrying an additional diamond superscript (i.e. weaker energies on the horizon) and
- with $\check{\mathbb{I}} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau))$ replaced by $\check{\mathbb{I}}^{\diamond, deg} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau))$ on the left.

To verify this claim, we observe that using $T = \Omega \nabla_3 + R^*$ the linear error $\mathcal{G}_1 [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi] (\tau, u_f)$ appearing in Proposition 11.4.1 can be estimated further by

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} |\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}]| |\nabla_T (\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}| + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} |\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}]| |\nabla_T (\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}| \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} |\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}]| |(\nabla_{R^*})^{K+1} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} + (\nabla_{R^*})^K \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right) + \Omega^2 (\mathcal{E}^*)^{K+1}| \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} |\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}]| |(\nabla_{R^*})^{K+1} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + (\nabla_{R^*})^K \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right) + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_4^{K+1}| \\ &\lesssim \gamma \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |(\nabla_{R^*})^{K+1} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |(\nabla_{R^*})^{K+1} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + C_\gamma \text{ (RHS of (13.3.1))} \end{aligned}$$

for any $\gamma > 0$. Here we have used: (1) the error estimates of Propositions 11.7.1, 11.7.3 for the terms involving $(\mathcal{E}^*)^{K+1}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and Proposition 11.7.8 for the analogous error in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and (2) Cauchy-Schwarz in the last step, together with the fact that (2a) the lower order terms in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ (appearing in $|\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi]|^2$) from (13.3.2) can be controlled from Proposition 13.2.1 and (2b) the terms involving $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ or $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ are controlled from Theorem C.3.

For the terms $\mathcal{G}_2 [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi] (\tau, u_f)$ and $\mathcal{G}_3 [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi] (\tau, u_f)$, we note similarly that for any $\gamma > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} |\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}]| \nabla_{R^*} (\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} |\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}]| \nabla_{R^*} (\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \\ &+ \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} |\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}]| \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} (\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} |\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}]| \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} (\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \\ &\lesssim \gamma \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |(\nabla_{R^*})^{K+1} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |(\nabla_{R^*})^{K+1} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + C_\gamma \text{ (RHS of (13.3.1))} . \end{aligned}$$

Choosing γ sufficiently small (depending only on M_{init}) we absorb the first terms on the right hand side of (11.4.3) and the desired estimate (with the aforementioned restrictions) is proven provided we can control

the non-linear errors arising from \mathcal{H}_i . For these, we note that, using Propositions 11.7.1, 11.7.3 for the errors in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and Proposition 11.7.8 for the errors in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^4 \sum_{k \leq K} \mathcal{H}_i [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi] \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}} \quad (13.3.3)$$

and that, using Proposition 10.3.2, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{|k| \leq K} \left| \mathcal{B}_i [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi] (\tau, u_f) - \mathcal{B}_i [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi] (\tau, u_f) \right| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}}. \quad (13.3.4)$$

Step 2. To remove the diamond superscripts, we apply the redshift estimate of Proposition 11.5.1 to the tensorial wave equation satisfied by $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$. The linear errors are easily seen to be controlled by Cauchy–Schwarz and the estimate from Step 1 and the non-linear error is again controlled by (13.3.3).

Step 3. We have proved (13.3.1) except that $\sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau))$ appears on the left hand side instead of $\sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{I}} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau))$. To obtain the non-degenerate control we proceed successively for $K = 1, \dots, N-2$. For $K = 1$ we consider the tensorial wave equation for $\nabla_{R^*} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and integrate over $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ the Lagrangian identity (11.4.11) with h a radial cut-off function equal to 1 in $[3M - \frac{1}{4}M_{\text{init}}, 3M + \frac{1}{4}M_{\text{init}}]$ and vanishing for $r \leq \frac{5}{2}M_{\text{init}}$ and $r \geq \frac{7}{2}M_{\text{init}}$. Boundary terms and the term arising from $\mathfrak{F}^h [\nabla_{R^*} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$ are easily seen to be controlled by the estimate already established. Also, the lower order terms in $\mathfrak{f}_{bulk}^h [(\nabla_{R^*}) \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$ are all directly controlled from $\sum_{k=0}^1 \check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau))$. The angular derivative term has a good sign and for the wrong signed term involving $\nabla_T (\nabla_{R^*}) \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ we observe

$$\nabla_T \nabla_{R^*} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = (\nabla_{R^*} + \Omega \nabla_3) \nabla_{R^*} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = (\nabla_{R^*})^2 \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \nabla_{R^*} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} - 2 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \Omega^2 (\mathcal{E}^*)^2$$

with all linear terms on the right already controlled *non-degenerately* near $r = 3M$. This gives non-degenerate (near $r = 3M$) control on all first derivatives of $\nabla_{R^*} \Pi$ and hence control on $\check{\mathbb{I}} [(\nabla_{R^*} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+})] (v(\tau))$. By a simple interpolation one also has $\check{\mathbb{I}} [\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) \lesssim \check{\mathbb{I}} [(\nabla_{R^*} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+})] (v(\tau)) + \check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg} [\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau))$. This finishes the proof for $K = 1$. For $K = 2, 3, \dots, N-2$ we apply successively the same argument, at each order using the Lagrangian multiplier for the wave equation satisfied by $(\nabla_{R^*})^K \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$. \square

13.3.2 Basic estimates for A and $(\nabla_{R^*})^k A$

Completely analogously we prove the above estimate for $A_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$:

Proposition 13.3.3. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ and $1 \leq K \leq N-1$ the pair $(A_{\mathcal{H}^+}, A_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^K \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^K \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u [(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{I}} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{I}} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau [(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^{\max(1, K-1)} \int_{\check{C}_{\tau^+}} r^2 |(\Omega \nabla_4)^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |(r \Omega \nabla_4)^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (13.3.5)$$

Proof. Note that $A_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfy a tensorial wave equation of Type 2 with

$$\mathcal{F}^{lin}[A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = +\frac{8}{r}\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2}\left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right)\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \quad , \quad \mathcal{F}^{lin}[A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = +\frac{8}{r}\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2}\left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right)\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} . \quad (13.3.6)$$

Repeating the proof of Proposition 13.3.1, this linear error term and its R^* commuted analogues are easily controlled using Cauchy-Schwarz and the estimates from Proposition 13.3.1. Note in particular that we obtain $K - 1$ in the sums involving Π on the right hand side.⁴ \square

13.3.3 Integrated local energy decay for all derivatives of Π and A

We next conclude that Propositions 13.3.1 and 13.3.3 already provide control over *all* derivatives of $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, however *with non-optimal weights near infinity* (note the \star in the energies below). On the other hand, the weights near the horizon do not have to be improved.

Proposition 13.3.4. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ and $1 \leq K \leq N - 2$ the pair $(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^3\Omega\psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^3\Omega\psi_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|k| \leq K+1} \check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] (v(\tau)) + \sum_{|k| \leq K+1} \check{\mathbb{I}}^* \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{K+1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{K+1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{\tau} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{\tau} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^K \int_{\check{C}_{\tau}^{I^+}} r^2 |(\Omega \nabla_4)^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + | (r\Omega \nabla_4)^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}} . \end{aligned} \quad (13.3.7)$$

Proof. We only treat the $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ here since the region $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+}(\tau, u_f) \cap \{r \leq 2R\}$ is treated entirely analogously (but is much easier as there is no potential degeneration near $r = 3M$ and weights in r and Ω are irrelevant). We first prove for $1 \leq K \leq N - 2$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|k| \leq K} \check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] (v(\tau)) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k \leq K} \check{\mathbb{I}} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) + \sum_{k \leq K-1} \check{\mathbb{I}} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}} , \end{aligned} \quad (13.3.8)$$

whose right hand side we can estimate by the right hand side of (13.3.7) by applying Propositions 13.3.1 and 13.3.3. Fixing $K \geq 1$ we look at

$$\nabla_{R^*} \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3)} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \quad \text{for } k_1 + k_2 + k_3 = K , \quad (13.3.9)$$

which we have to control *non-degenerately* near $r = 3M$. We first commute the $(\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3)^{k_1}$ through on the $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and use (13.1.5) in conjunction with the estimates of Theorem C.3 for the terms involving $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ (as well as Proposition 11.7.4 for the non-linear errors arising from commutation) to obtain

$$\int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} \Omega^2 |\nabla_{R^*} \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3)} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \lesssim \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} \Omega^2 |\nabla_{R^*} \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{(k_1, 0, k_3)} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}} .$$

Similarly, using the relation $\Omega \nabla_4 = \Omega \nabla_3 + 2R^*$ and commuting the 4-derivative through we find

$$\int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} \Omega^2 |\nabla_{R^*} \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3)} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{k_3+1} \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} \Omega^2 |(\nabla_{R^*})^i \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{(k_1, 0, 0)} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}} .$$

⁴Indeed, for $K = 2$ (commuting twice), say, we need to control *two* derivatives of Π in the linear error which follow from (the spacetime terms of) $K = 1$ in Proposition 13.3.1. Similarly for higher K .

Now if $k_1 = 1$ the desired estimate follows directly from Proposition 13.3.1. If $k_1 \geq 2$, we commute all $r^2 \Delta$ operators through on $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ using repeatedly the relations (13.1.6) and (13.1.8) in the form

$$r^2 \Delta \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = \Omega \nabla_4 \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} + 4 \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \frac{6M}{r} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} - 3M A_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \mathcal{E}^2, \quad (13.3.10)$$

$$r^2 \Delta A_{\mathcal{H}^+} = +2 \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \frac{6M}{r} A_{\mathcal{H}^+} + -2 \Omega \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} - 2 \nabla_{R^*} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right) - \frac{4}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \mathcal{E}^1,$$

to conclude (using again Proposition 11.7.4 for the non-linear errors)

$$\int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} \Omega^2 |\nabla_{R^*} \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3)} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \lesssim \text{RHS of (13.3.8)}. \quad (13.3.11)$$

The same argument works for general derivatives (which only need to be controlled *degenerately* near $r = 3M$) in particular one easily establishes for $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 = K + 1$

$$\int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} \Omega^2 \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right)^2 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3)} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \lesssim \text{RHS of (13.3.8)}. \quad (13.3.12)$$

The point is that without the ∇_{R^*} derivative only the degenerate estimates on $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ can be used when inserting relations like (13.1.5) and (13.3.10). This proves (13.3.8). Next we show

$$\sum_{|k| \leq K+1} \check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] (v(\tau)) \lesssim \sum_{k \leq K} \check{\mathbb{I}} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) + \sum_{k \leq K+1} \check{\mathbb{I}} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}}.$$

The proof of this is entirely analogous to the proof of (13.3.8) (in fact easier now that (13.3.8) has already been established) and is therefore left to the reader. \square

The mean value theorem immediately produces the following corollary.

Corollary 13.3.5. *There exists $R_1 \leq \tilde{R} \leq R_2$ such that the right hand side of the Proposition 13.3.4 controls in particular $\sum_{|k| \leq K+1} \int_{\{r=\tilde{R}\} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2$.*

13.3.4 Basic fluxes for all derivatives of Π and A

Proposition 13.3.6. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ and $1 \leq K \leq N-2$ the pair $(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^3 \Omega \psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^3 \Omega \psi_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|k| \leq K+1} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{|k| \leq K+1} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u^* [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sum_{|k| \leq K+1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{K+1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{K+1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{\tau} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{\tau} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^K \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} r^2 |(\Omega \nabla_4)^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |(r \Omega \nabla_4)^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (13.3.13)$$

Proof. We prove the estimate for the **ingoing boundary term in horizon region**. The proof for the other terms is similar (but easier) and outlined below. We claim that for any $1 \leq K \leq N-2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|k| \leq K} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{|k| \leq K+1} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)} [\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^K \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{K+1} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (13.3.14)$$

whose right hand side we can estimate by the right hand side of (13.3.13) by applying Propositions 13.3.1 and 13.3.3.⁵ To establish this estimate, we will prove for $1 \leq K \leq N - 2$ and any *fixed* $l = 0, 1, \dots, K - 1$ the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\underline{k}|=K-l} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\nabla_{R^*})^l \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\underline{k}|=K-l-1} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\nabla_{R^*})^{l+1} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{\substack{|\underline{k}| \leq K-l-1 \\ i \leq l}} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\nabla_{R^*})^i \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \\ & \quad + \sum_{|\underline{k}| \leq K-l-1} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\nabla_{R^*})^l A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (13.3.15)$$

and for $1 \leq K \leq N - 1$ and any *fixed* $l = 0, 1, \dots, K - 1$ the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\underline{k}|=K-l} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\nabla_{R^*})^l A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\underline{k}|=K-l-1} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\nabla_{R^*})^{l+1} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{\substack{|\underline{k}| \leq K-l-1 \\ i \leq l}} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\nabla_{R^*})^i A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \\ & \quad + \sum_{|\underline{k}| \leq K-l-1} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\nabla_{R^*})^l \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{|\underline{k}| \leq K-l-2} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\nabla_{R^*})^{l+1} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-1-K)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (13.3.16)$$

Combining (13.3.15) and (13.3.16) the estimate (13.3.14) follows by a simple induction, which is left to the reader.

Step 1. We first prove (13.3.15) for fixed $1 \leq K \leq N - 2$ and $l \in \{0, \dots, K - 1\}$. Since $K - l \geq 1$, at least one of the inequalities $k_1 > 0$, $k_2 > 0$, $k_3 > 0$ must hold for $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$ in each summand on the left. We prove the inequality for each summand.

If $k_2 > 0$, we can commute one $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3$ through⁶ the expression $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\nabla_{R^*})^l \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ (cf. Lemma 3.3.1) and insert the relation (13.1.5), $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^{-2} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, to obtain (13.3.15) with the decay term coming from the non-linear commutation errors and applying Theorem C.3 to the terms involving $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$.

If $k_3 > 0$ we can assume $k_2 = 0$ and we write (for k_1 even; k_1 odd being completely analogous)

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\nabla_{R^*})^l \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = (r \Omega \nabla_4)^{k_3-1} (r \Omega \nabla_3 + 2r \nabla_{R^*}) \left((r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2} \right) (\nabla_{R^*})^l \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}.$$

Commuting through the $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3$ as before as well as commuting the ∇_{R^*} through yields (13.3.15).

Finally, if $k_1 > 0$, we can assume in view of the previous that $k_2 = 0$ and $k_3 = 0$. We distinguish between $k_1 = 1$ and $k_1 \geq 2$. If $k_1 \geq 2$ even, we see from (13.1.8) that

$$(r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2} (\nabla_{R^*})^l \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = (r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2-1} (\nabla_{R^*})^l \left(\Omega \nabla_4 \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} + 4 \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \frac{6M}{r} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} - 3M A_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right) + \mathcal{E}^{k_1+l}$$

and similarly for $k_1 \geq 2$ odd (there is an additional term coming from commuting $r^2 \Delta$ and $rd\nabla v$)

$$(r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2-1/2} rd\nabla v (\nabla_{R^*})^l \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = (r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2-3/2} rd\nabla v (\nabla_{R^*})^l \left(\Omega \nabla_4 \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} + (4-3) \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \frac{6M}{r} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} - 3M A_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right) + \mathcal{E}^{k_1+l}.$$

In both cases we easily check that (13.3.15) holds (using also the error estimates of Proposition 11.7.5 on

⁵Note that the first term in (13.3.14) is actually redundant since it is manifestly controlled by the second term on the left up to decaying non-linear errors. We have kept it to make the proof more transparent.

⁶Observe that up to what will become non-linear terms we have $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (\nabla_{R^*})^l = (\nabla_{R^*})^l \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 + \sum_{i=1}^l f_2^i (\nabla_{R^*})^i \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3$.

cones). In case that $k_1 = 1$ we need observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\underline{\tilde{C}}_{v(u)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 |r \nabla \not{D} v (\nabla_{R^*})^l \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \int_{\underline{\tilde{C}}_{v(u)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 |\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 r \not{D} v (\nabla_{R^*})^l \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \\
& \leq \int_{\underline{\tilde{C}}_{v(u)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 |r^2 \not{D}_2^* \not{D} v (\nabla_{R^*})^l \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \int_{\underline{\tilde{C}}_{v(u)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 |\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 \not{D} v (\nabla_{R^*})^l \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \\
& \lesssim \int_{\underline{\tilde{C}}_{v(u)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 |r^2 \not{D}_2^* \not{D} v (\nabla_{R^*})^l \frac{r^2}{\Omega} \nabla_3 A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}[(\nabla_{R^*})^l \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-l-2)}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{13.3.17}$$

Here we have used an elliptic estimate along truncated cones in the first step and commuted the ∇_3 derivative through in the second term as well as inserted the definition (13.1.4) for the first term. We now commute the $r^2 \not{D}_2^* \not{D} v$ derivative through on $A_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in the first term and insert the Teukolsky equation (13.1.6) where we replace $\Omega \nabla_4 \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = 2 \nabla_{R^*} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ on its right hand side.

Step 2. We now prove (13.3.16) for fixed $1 \leq K \leq N-1$ and $l \in \{0, \dots, K-1\}$. Since $K-l \geq 1$, at least one of the inequalities $k_1 > 0$, $k_2 > 0$, $k_3 > 0$ must hold for each summand.

If $k_2 > 0$, we can commute one $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3$ through the expression $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k (\nabla_{R^*})^l A_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and insert the relation $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 A_{\mathcal{H}^+} = -2r^{-2} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ to obtain (13.3.16) with the decay term coming from the non-linear commutation errors. (Actually, only the second, third and fifth term on the right hand side of (13.3.16) are needed.)

If $k_3 > 0$ we can assume $k_2 = 0$ and write (for k_1 even; k_1 odd being completely analogous)

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k (\nabla_{R^*})^l A_{\mathcal{H}^+} = (r \Omega \nabla_4)^{k_3-1} (r \Omega \nabla_3 + 2r \nabla_{R^*}) \left((r^2 \Delta)^{k_1/2} \right) (\nabla_{R^*})^l A_{\mathcal{H}^+}.$$

Commuting through the $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3$ as before as well as commuting the (R^*) through yields (13.3.16).

Finally, if $k_1 > 0$, we can assume in view of the previous that $k_2 = 0$ and $k_3 = 0$. We distinguish between $k_1 = 1$ and $k_1 \geq 2$. If $k_1 \geq 2$ even, we see after inserting (13.1.6) that

$$(r^2 \Delta)^{\frac{k_1}{2}} (\nabla_{R^*})^l A_{\mathcal{H}^+} = (r^2 \Delta)^{\frac{k_1}{2}-1} (\nabla_{R^*})^l \left(2 \nabla_{R^*} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \frac{3M}{r} A_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right) + \mathcal{E}_4^{k_1-1+l}$$

and similarly for $k_1 \geq 2$ odd. In both cases we easily see that (13.3.16) indeed holds. In case that $k_1 = 1$ we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\underline{\tilde{C}}_{v(u)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 |r \nabla \not{D} v (\nabla_{R^*})^l A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \int_{\underline{\tilde{C}}_{v(u)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 |\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 r \not{D} v (\nabla_{R^*})^l A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \\
& \leq \int_{\underline{\tilde{C}}_{v(u)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 |r^2 \not{D}_2^* \not{D} v (\nabla_{R^*})^l A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \int_{\underline{\tilde{C}}_{v(u)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 |\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 \not{D} v (\nabla_{R^*})^l A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \\
& \lesssim \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}[(\nabla_{R^*})^{l+1} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}[(\nabla_{R^*})^l A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}[(\nabla_{R^*})^l \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-l-2)}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{13.3.18}$$

Here we have used an elliptic estimate along truncated cones in the first step. We then commuted the ∇_3 derivative through for the second term while for the first term we inserted (13.1.6) in the form

$$r^2 \not{D}_2^* \not{D} v A_{\mathcal{H}^+} = -\frac{3M}{r} A_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \Omega \nabla_3 \left(-2 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \nabla_{R^*} A_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right) + \mathcal{E}_4^1.$$

This finishes the proof for the ingoing flux in the horizon region. We briefly outline the proof for **the outgoing flux in the infinity region**. Completely analogously to Step 1 (using now the estimates of Proposition 11.7.9 for the non-linear errors) we prove that for any $K \leq N-2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{|k| \leq K} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u^*[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sum_{|k| \leq K+1} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u^*[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\
& \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^K \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u^*[(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^K \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u^*[(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{13.3.19}$$

Note carefully that all energies are restricted to $r \leq 2R$ so r -weights can be absorbed into constants. To the right hand side of (13.3.19) we apply Propositions 13.3.1 and 13.3.3. The proof of (13.3.19) is in fact a little easier as now we can directly insert (13.1.7) and (13.1.9) (when reaching the analogues of (13.3.17), (13.3.18)) since these relations produce ∇_4 -derivatives which are the ones naturally appearing in the fluxes. Similarly the ingoing flux in the horizon region follows from proving

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\underline{k}| \leq K} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \sum_{|\underline{k}| \leq K+1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f}[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f}[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \sum_{k=0}^{K+1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f}[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-2-K)}} \end{aligned} \quad (13.3.20)$$

and applying Propositions 13.3.1 and 13.3.3 to the right hand side. \square

13.3.5 The weighted r^p estimates for $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$

In this subsection only we use the following notation (for which we recall (12.4.21)):

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^{\underline{k}} = \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(0, k_2, k_3)} = \begin{cases} (r\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_3} (r^2\check{\Delta})^{k_2/2} & \text{if } k_2 \text{ even} \\ (r\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_3} (r^2\check{\Delta})^{(k_2-1)/2} r d\check{v} & \text{if } k_2 \text{ odd.} \end{cases} \quad (13.3.21)$$

Proposition 13.3.7. *We have, for $3 \leq K \leq N$ and any $u_1 \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq u_f$, the following estimates:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1}^K \int_{\check{C}_{\tau_2}^{I^+}} r^6 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} \int_{\check{C}_{v_\infty}^{I^+}(\tau_1)} r^4 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \\ & + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+}(\tau_1)} r^5 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+}(\tau_1)} r^{3-\delta} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1}^K \int_{\check{C}_{\tau_1}^{I^+}} r^6 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} \int_{\check{C}_{\tau_1}^{I^+}} r^2 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_1)}[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_1)}[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3 \end{aligned} \quad (13.3.22)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1}^K \int_{\check{C}_{\tau_2}^{I^+}} r^5 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} \int_{\check{C}_{v_\infty}^{I^+}(\tau_1)} r^3 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \\ & + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1}^K \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+}(\tau_1)} r^4 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+}(\tau_1)} r^2 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1}^K \int_{\check{C}_{\tau_1}^{I^+}} r^5 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} \int_{\check{C}_{\tau_1}^{I^+}} r^2 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_1)}[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_1)}[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{(\tau_1)^{1-\delta_N^K}}, \end{aligned} \quad (13.3.23)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{|k|=1}^K \int_{\tilde{C}_{\tau_2}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} r^4 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|k|=0}^{K-1} \int_{\tilde{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1)} r^2 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \\
& + \sum_{|k|=1}^K \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1)} r^3 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|k|=0}^{K-1} \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1)} r^1 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \\
& \lesssim \sum_{|k|=1}^K \int_{\tilde{C}_{\tau_1}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} r^4 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|k|=0}^{K-1} \int_{\tilde{C}_{\tau_1}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} r^2 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \\
& + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_1)}[(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_1)}[(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{(\tau_1)^{\min(2, N-K)}}. \tag{13.3.24}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Using the relation $R^* = \frac{1}{2}(\Omega \nabla_3 + \Omega \nabla_4)$ and inserting (13.1.4), (13.1.5) one first checks that for fixed $3 \leq \tilde{K} \leq N$, the right hand side of (13.3.22)–(13.3.24) controls the right hand side of the estimates of Proposition 13.3.4 and 13.3.6 applied with $K = \tilde{K} - 2$. Hence we are free to use the estimates of Propositions 13.3.4 and 13.3.6 in proving the above. In particular, it suffices to prove the estimates with all integrals on the left hand sides restricted to $r \geq R_2$ since in the remaining region, the desired estimates already hold by Propositions 13.3.4 and 13.3.6.

Key to the proof are the Bianchi pairs

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega \nabla_3(r d\nabla v A_{\mathcal{I}^+}) &= -\frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r d\nabla v \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \mathcal{E}_4^1, \\
\Omega \nabla_4 \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \left(\frac{2}{r} - \frac{2M}{r^2}\right) \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} &= r^2 \mathfrak{D}_2^* d\nabla v A_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \frac{3M}{r} A_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \mathcal{E}_4^1, \tag{13.3.25}
\end{aligned}$$

which after commutation using the definition

$$W_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)} = \begin{cases} \left(r d\nabla v r \mathfrak{D}_2^*\right)^{k/2-1/2} r d\nabla v W_{\mathcal{I}^+} & \text{if } k \text{ odd} \\ \left(r \mathfrak{D}_2^* r d\nabla v\right)^{k/2} W_{\mathcal{I}^+} & \text{if } k \text{ even} \end{cases} \tag{13.3.26}$$

for a symmetric traceless tensor $W_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, read, for $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega \nabla_3(A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}) &= -\frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r d\nabla v \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)} + \mathcal{E}_4^{k+1}, \\
\Omega \nabla_4(\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)}) + \left(\frac{2}{r} - \frac{2M}{r^2}\right) \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)} &= r \mathfrak{D}_2^* A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)} + \frac{3M}{r} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)} + \mathcal{E}_4^{k+1}, \tag{13.3.27}
\end{aligned}$$

if k is odd, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega \nabla_3(A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}) &= -\frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r \mathfrak{D}_2^* \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)} + \mathcal{E}_4^{k+1}, \\
\Omega \nabla_4(\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)}) + \left(\frac{2}{r} - \frac{2M}{r^2}\right) \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)} &= r d\nabla v A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)} + \frac{3M}{r} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)} + \mathcal{E}_4^{k+1}, \tag{13.3.28}
\end{aligned}$$

if k is even.

Step 1. We first prove the desired estimates for angular derivatives, i.e. replacing $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ by $A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(|k|)}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ by $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(|k|)}$ everywhere. The proof is by induction on $K \geq 1$.⁷ Contract the first equation (of the pairs (13.3.27), (13.3.28) respectively) by $r^{4+p} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)} \left(1 - \frac{\delta_2^p}{r^2}\right)$ and add the second contracted with

⁷We will prove the estimates also for $K = 1$ and $K = 2$ with the term $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_1)}[(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_1)}[(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$ on the right replaced by $\sum_{k=0}^2 \tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_1)}[(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^1 \tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_1)}[(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$.

$2r^{2+p}\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)}\left(1 - \frac{\delta_2^p}{r^\delta}\right)$ with $p = 2, 1, 0$.⁸ Then sum over all $k = 1, \dots, K$ and integrate over $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}\}$, where \tilde{R} is the one from Corollary 13.3.5. The following observations will then yield the desired (angular restricted) estimate:

- The terms from the left of (13.3.27) and (13.3.28) produce the desired terms on the left hand side of the estimate after an integration by parts except for the boundary term on $r = \tilde{R}$ which is controlled by Corollary 13.3.5.
- The first term on the right hand side of each of the equations in (13.3.25) cancels after an integration by parts up to a cubic error, which for fixed k is of the form (integration being over $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}\}$ with volume form $dudvd\theta$)

$$\left| \int (\eta + \underline{\eta}) (1 + r^{-\delta}) r^{3+p} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)} \cdot \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)} \right| \lesssim \varepsilon \int \left(r^{3+p} |A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}|^2 + r^{1+p} |\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)}|^2 \right),$$

which can be absorbed on the left hand side. Here we have used $\|r^2(\eta + \underline{\eta})\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \varepsilon$ following from (8.1.2).

- The lower order linear terms can be estimated for fixed k by

$$\int \frac{3M}{r} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)} \cdot 2r^{2+p} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)} \left(1 - \frac{\delta_2^p}{r^\delta}\right) \leq \frac{3M}{R} \int \left(r^{3+p} |A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)}|^2 + r^{1+p} |\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)}|^2 \right).$$

The $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)}$ term can be directly absorbed on the left hand side using (1.3.19). The $A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)}$ can be absorbed by the term $A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}$ on the left by a standard elliptic estimate.

- The non-linear error-term is estimated from Proposition 11.7.7 which implies that

$$\int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} r^6 u^{1+\delta} |\mathcal{E}_4^N|^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3 \quad (\text{used for } p = 2), \quad (13.3.29)$$

$$\int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} r^6 |\mathcal{E}_4^{N-1}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau} \quad (\text{used for } p = 1), \quad (13.3.30)$$

$$\int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} r^5 |\mathcal{E}_4^{N-1}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^2} \quad (\text{used for } p = 0). \quad (13.3.31)$$

Note that using standard elliptic estimates on spheres we have obtained the desired estimates for $\mathfrak{D}_{\nearrow}^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ with \underline{k} of the form $(k, 0, 0)$.

Step 2. We now commute the pairs (13.3.27), (13.3.28) for fixed k with $(r\Omega\nabla_4)^l$ and $l = 1, \dots, K - k$ and show the result by an induction on l . The commuted equations read, for k odd

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega\nabla_3((r\Omega\nabla_4)^l A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}) + (2l-1)\frac{\Omega_0^2}{r}((r\Omega\nabla_4)^l A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}) &= -\frac{2\Omega_0^2}{r^2} r d\sharp v((r\Omega\nabla_4)^l \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)}) + \mathcal{F}_{lin}^{k,l}[A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathcal{E}_4^{k+l+1}, \\ \Omega\nabla_4((r\Omega\nabla_4)^l \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)}) + \frac{2}{r}((r\Omega\nabla_4)^l \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)}) &= r\mathcal{D}_2^*((r\Omega\nabla_4)^l A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}) + \mathcal{F}_{lin}^{k,l}[\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathcal{E}_4^{k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

with (h_0^m) denoting admissible coefficient functions that can be different in different places)

$$\mathcal{F}_{lin}^{k,l}[A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \sum_{m=0}^{l-1} \frac{1}{r} h_0^m ((r\Omega\nabla_4)^m A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}) + \frac{1}{r^2} h_0^m ((r\Omega\nabla_4)^m \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}),$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{lin}^{k,l}[\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \sum_{m=0}^{l-1} h_0^m ((r\Omega\nabla_4)^m A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k+1)}) + \frac{1}{r} h_0^m ((r\Omega\nabla_4)^m \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)}) + \sum_{m=0}^l \frac{1}{r} h_0^m ((r\Omega\nabla_4)^m A_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)}).$$

⁸For $p = 2$ the spacetime term for $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}$ cancels to first order which is the reason for including the $r^{-\delta}$ term in this case.

For k even, we interchange $rd\psi$ in the first with $r\mathring{\mathcal{D}}_2^*$ in the second equation. From the structure of the commuted equations it is clear that we can simply repeat the proof of Step 1 (with the same weights). The linear terms can be dealt with using Cauchy–Schwarz and the estimates from Step 1 (base case) or the previous step of the induction.

Note that with this we have obtained the desired estimates for $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ with k of the form $(k, 0, l)$ with $k \geq 1$ and all of the desired $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$. Therefore, it only remains to prove the estimates for $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ being $(r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^{|k|} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$. This we turn to in Step 3.

Step 3. To estimate $(r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^{|k|} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, we apply the r^p -hierarchy for the Teukolsky equation:

Lemma 13.3.8. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq u_f$ and any $1 \leq K \leq N$ we have for $p \in \{2, 1, 0\}$ the estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \int_{\tilde{C}_{\tau_2}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} r^{p-2} |\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 (r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^k (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+})|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \int_{\tilde{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1)} r^{p-4} |r\mathring{\nabla} (r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^k (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+})|^2 \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1)} r^{p-3} |\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 (r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^k (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+})|^2 + r^{p-5} |r\mathring{\nabla} (r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^k (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+})|^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^K \int_{\tilde{C}_{\tau_1}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} r^{p+4} |(r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\tilde{C}_{\tau_1}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} r^2 |(r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^{k-1} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{(\tau_1)^{\kappa_p}} \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_1)}[(\mathring{\nabla}_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{\max(0, K-2)} \tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_1)}[(\mathring{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \end{aligned} \quad (13.3.32)$$

where $\kappa_2 = 0$, $\kappa_1 = 1 - \delta_N^K$ and $\kappa_0 = \min(2, N - K)$.

Proof of Lemma. This will again be proven inductively. We observe from Propositions 11.1.8 and 11.2.5 that $(r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^k (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ satisfies a tensorial wave equation of type $4_{2+k/2, l}$, the precise value of the (half-integer) l being irrelevant, except for $k = 0$ where we know by Proposition 11.1.8 that $r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfies a tensorial wave equation of type $4_{2, -1}$. We then apply successively for $K = 1, 2, \dots, N$ Proposition 11.6.1 with $p\text{Proposition 11.6.1} = p\text{Lemma 13.3.8} - 2$.

Non-linear errors. We first estimate for all $k \leq N - 1$ the non-linear error appearing in Proposition 11.6.1, $\mathcal{H}_{5,p} \left[(r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^k (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}) \right] (\tau_1, u_f)$. From the schematic notation of Proposition 11.2.5 we deduce

$$\mathcal{F}^{nlin} [(r\mathring{\nabla}_4)^k (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+})] = \mathcal{E}_2^{k+1} + \mathcal{E}_1^{k+1} \text{ (each summand contains } \alpha) = \mathcal{E}_1^{k+1}. \quad (13.3.33)$$

For $p \in \{0, 1\}$ we have applying spacetime Cauchy–Schwarz the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{5,p} \left[(r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^k (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}) \right] (\tau_1, u_f) & \leq C_\gamma \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1)} r^{p-1} \left(|\mathcal{F}^{nlin} [(r\mathring{\nabla}_4)^k (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+})]|^2 + F_{34} [(r\mathring{\nabla}_4)^k (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+})]^2 \right) \\ & + \gamma \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1)} r^{p-3} |\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 (r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^k (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+})|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (13.3.34)$$

The second line will be absorbed on the left for sufficiently small γ while the first line is estimated by $\frac{\varepsilon^4}{\tau^{2-p}}$ using Lemma 3.3.1 and Proposition 11.7.7. For $p = 2$ the same argument works for the term involving F_{34} in (11.6.3) while for the term involving \mathcal{F}^{nlin} we estimate using Cauchy–Schwarz on the cones $C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$

$$\int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1)} |\mathcal{F}^{nlin} [(r\mathring{\nabla}_4)^k (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+})]| |\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 (r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^k (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+})| \lesssim \varepsilon \sqrt{\int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau_1)} u^{1+\delta} |\mathcal{E}_1^{k+1}|^2} \lesssim \varepsilon^3.$$

Here the last step is a direct consequence of (11.7.8) and (11.7.9).

The case $K = 1$. This follows directly from the fact that $r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfies a tensorial wave equation of type $4_{2, -1}$ and applying Proposition 11.6.1. Indeed, we conclude the estimate after

- Observing that the boxed term in Proposition 11.6.1 vanishes for $K = 1$ since $\frac{2}{p+\frac{15}{2}} \leq \frac{3}{4}$ for $p \in [-2, 0]$.
- Inserting the estimates of Proposition 13.3.4 for the terms in the square bracket in Proposition 11.6.1 and realising that the fluxes appearing on the right hand side of these estimates can be estimated by the right hand side of (13.3.32).
- Treating the integrand of the linear error term $\mathcal{G}_{5,p} [r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau_1, \tau_2)$ as follows. We have for any $\gamma > 0$

$$\mathcal{F}^{lin} [r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] r^{p-2} \Omega \nabla_4 (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}) \leq \gamma r^{p-3} |\Omega \nabla_4 (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+})|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} |\mathcal{F}^{lin} [r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}]|^2 r^{p-1}.$$

Let C denote the implicit constant in front of $\mathcal{G}_{5,p} [r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau_1, \tau_2)$ in (11.6.1). Recall from the discussion in Section 11.6 that this constant can be chosen to depend only on M_{init} *independently of the choice of R* . Choosing now $\gamma = \frac{1}{4C}$ we can absorb the first term above on the left hand side of (11.6.1). Furthermore, from Proposition 11.1.8 we compute

$$\frac{1}{\gamma} |\mathcal{F}^{lin} [r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}]|^2 r^{p-1} \leq \frac{64}{\gamma} \frac{M^2}{R^2} |r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 r^{p-5} + \frac{500}{\gamma} \frac{M^{2-\delta}}{R^{2-\delta}} |r^2 \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 r^{p-3-\delta}.$$

The first term can again be absorbed on the left of (11.6.1) provided R satisfies

$$\frac{512C^2 M_{\text{init}}^2}{R^2} < 1 \quad (13.3.35)$$

with C as above. (Recall that (13.3.35) was indeed one of the constraints announced in Section 1.3.5 for the choice of R .) The second term is already controlled from Steps 1 and 2.

- Treating the non-linear error $\mathcal{H}_{5,p} [r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$ as above.

The case $K > 1$. From Propositions 11.1.8 and 11.2.5 we conclude that $(\Omega \nabla_4)^k (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ satisfies a tensorial wave equation of type $4_{2+k/2,l}$, the precise value of the (half-integer) l being irrelevant. We hence again apply Proposition 11.6.1. The boxed term might no longer vanish but will now be controlled by the estimate proven in the previous step of the induction. For the term $\mathcal{G}_{5,p} [(r \nabla_4)^{k-1} (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+})]$ note (after doing a simple induction using Propositions 11.1.8 and 11.2.5) that for $2 \leq k \leq K$

$$\mathcal{F}_{2+\frac{k-1}{2},l}^{lin} [(r \nabla_4)^{k-1} (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+})] = \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} h_0 \Omega \nabla_4 (r \Omega \nabla_4)^l \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \frac{h_0}{r^2} \Omega (r \nabla_4)^l (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+}) + \frac{h_0}{r^2} r^2 \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \frac{h_0}{r} \nabla_4 \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}.$$

In particular, for $k = 2$

$$|\mathcal{F}_{2+\frac{k-1}{2},l}^{lin} [r \nabla_4 (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+})]|^2 r^{p-1} \lesssim r^{p-1} |\nabla_4 \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + r^{p-3} |\nabla_4 (r^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+})|^2 + r^{p-5} |r^2 \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + r^{p-3} |\nabla_4 \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2$$

and similarly for the higher k . The first and third term on the right can be controlled by the estimates proven in Steps 1 and 2, the second term from the estimate for $K = 1$ and the last term by Theorem C.3 for $p \leq 2$. The argument for $k > 2$ is analogous and the proof is complete. \square

Combining the estimate of the Lemma with Steps 1 and 2 yields the estimates of the proposition after using standard elliptic estimates on cones. \square

We can similarly prove

Proposition 13.3.9. *We have, for $2 \leq K \leq N$ and any $u_1 \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq u_f$, the following estimate:*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{|k|=1}^{K-1} \int_{\tilde{C}_{\tau_2}^{I^+}} r^2 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^k \Pi_{I^+}|^2 + \sum_{|k|=0}^{K-2} \int_{\tilde{C}_{v_\infty}^{I^+}(\tau_1)} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^k \Psi_{I^+}|^2 \\
& + \sum_{|k|=1}^{K-1} \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+}(\tau_1)} r |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^k \Pi_{I^+}|^2 + \sum_{|k|=0}^{K-2} \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+}(\tau_1)} r^{-1-\delta} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^k \Psi_{I^+}|^2 \\
& \lesssim \sum_{|k|=1}^{K-1} \int_{\tilde{C}_{\tau_1}^{I^+}} r^2 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^k \Pi_{I^+}|^2 + \sum_{|k|=1}^K \int_{\tilde{C}_{\tau_1}^{I^+}} r^4 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^k A_{I^+}|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{(\tau_1)^{\min(2, N-K)}} \\
& + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_1)}[(\nabla_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau_1)}[(\nabla_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}]. \tag{13.3.36}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is very similar to that of the previous proposition and we shall use terminology from its proof. At the heart of the proof are now the Bianchi pairs

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega \nabla_3 (r^2 d\nabla v \Pi_{I^+}) + \frac{\Omega_o^2}{r} (r^2 d\nabla v \Pi_{I^+}) &= \frac{\Omega^2}{r} r d\nabla v \Psi_{I^+} + \boxed{-\Omega^{-1} r \underline{\hat{\chi}} \cdot r d\nabla v \Pi_{I^+} + r^2 \Omega^{-1*} \underline{\beta}^* \cdot \Pi_{I^+}} + \mathcal{E}_3^2, \\
\Omega \nabla_4 \Psi_{I^+} &= -\frac{2}{r} r \mathcal{P}_2^* (r^2 d\nabla v \Pi_{I^+}) - 2\Pi_{I^+} + \frac{6M}{r} \Pi_{I^+} + 3MA_{I^+} + \mathcal{E}_2^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{13.3.37}$$

where we have boxed the anomalous error (which would only be \mathcal{E}_2^2 in schematic notation).

Step 1. As in the previous proposition, we first prove the estimate for angular derivatives. Hence we look at the angular commuted equations (recall (13.3.26)) which for $k \geq 1$ read

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega \nabla_3 (r \Pi_{I^+}^{(k)}) + \frac{\Omega_o^2}{r} (r \Pi_{I^+}^{(k)}) &= \frac{\Omega^2}{r} r d\nabla v \Psi_{I^+}^{(k-1)} + \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{(k-1,0,0)} \boxed{-\Omega^{-1} r \underline{\hat{\chi}} \cdot r d\nabla v \Pi_{I^+} + r^2 \Omega^{-1*} \underline{\beta}^* \cdot \Pi_{I^+}} + \mathcal{E}_3^{k+1}, \\
\Omega \nabla_4 (\Psi_{I^+}^{(k-1)}) &= -\frac{2}{r} r \mathcal{P}_2^* (r \Pi_{I^+}^{(k)}) - 2\Pi_{I^+}^{(k-1)} + \frac{6M}{r} \Pi_{I^+}^{(k-1)} + 3MA_{I^+}^{(k-1)} + \mathcal{E}_2^{k+1},
\end{aligned} \tag{13.3.38}$$

if k is odd and with $r d\nabla v$ and $r \mathcal{P}_2^*$ interchanged in the two equations if k is even. To produce the estimate, we contract the first of (13.3.38) by $2r(1+r^{-\delta})r\Pi_{I^+}^{(k)}$ and add the second contracted with $\Omega^2(1+r^{-\delta})\Psi_{I^+}^{(k-1)}$. We then sum over all k up to K and integrate over $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}\}$. This produces the desired estimate after observing

- The terms on the left produce the desired terms after an integration by parts.
- The first term on the right hand side of each of (13.3.38) cancels after an integration by parts up to a cubic error

$$(\eta + \underline{\eta})(1+r^{-\delta})r\Pi_{I^+}^{(k)} \cdot \Psi_{I^+}^{(k-1)} \lesssim \varepsilon \frac{1}{r^2} \left(|r\Pi_{I^+}^{(k)}|^2 + |\Psi_{I^+}^{(k-1)}|^2 \right),$$

which can be absorbed on the left hand side. Here we have used $\|r^2(\eta + \underline{\eta})\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+})} \lesssim \varepsilon$ following from (8.1.2).

- All other linear terms on the right hand side, except for the term $-2\Pi_{I^+}^{(k-1)}$, can be easily controlled using the third estimate of Proposition 13.3.7.
- For the term $-2\Pi_{I^+}^{(k-1)}$, we integrate the relevant term by parts: After using (13.1.5) we obtain

$$\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} d\bar{u} \int_{\tilde{C}_{\bar{u}}^{I^+}} -2\Pi_{I^+}^{(k-1)} r^2 (1+r^{-\delta}) \Omega \nabla_3 \Pi_{I^+}^{(k-1)} \leq - \int_{\tilde{C}_{\bar{u}}^{I^+}} r^2 (1+r^{-\delta}) |\Pi_{I^+}^{(k-1)}|^2 \Big|_{\bar{u}=\tau_1}^{\bar{u}=\tau_2} \tag{13.3.39}$$

noting that both the spacetime term and the term induced on $r = \tilde{R}$ have favourable (negative) signs. The boundary term on τ_2 also has a good sign and the one on τ_1 is controlled by the right hand side of the desired estimate.

- For the non-linear term it suffices to observe (after applying Cauchy–Schwarz) that by Proposition 11.7.7 we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau_1)} r^{1+\delta} |\mathcal{E}_2^K|^2 + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau_1)} r^2 |\mathcal{E}_3^K|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{(\tau_1)^2} \quad (13.3.40)$$

and for the anomalous term

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau_1)} r^2 \left| \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{(K-2,0,0)}(r\hat{\chi} \cdot r d\nu \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}) \right|^2 + r^2 \left| \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{(K-2,0,0)} \left(r^{2*} \underline{\beta}^* \cdot \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right) \right|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{(\tau_1)^{\min(2, N-K)}}. \quad (13.3.41)$$

Step 2. Proceeds entirely analogously to Step 2 in Proposition 13.3.7: Commute the Bianchi pairs (13.3.38) with $(r\Omega\tilde{\nabla}_4)^l$ and repeat the proof of Step 1. Lower order terms and angular derivative terms can be controlled by the estimates obtained in Step 1.

Step 3. Instead of carrying out the analogue of the proof of Proposition 13.3.7 (which is also possible), we can directly employ the second equation of (13.3.25) and the third estimate of Proposition 13.3.7 to control the missing flux of $(\Omega\tilde{\nabla}_4)^{K-1}\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ on $\check{C}^{I^+}(\tau_2)$. \square

13.3.6 Decay estimates for Π and A : the proof of Theorem 13.1.2

We first summarise our weighted estimates in the following proposition recalling the energies defined in Theorem 13.1.2.

Proposition 13.3.10. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ and $p \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, we have, for $1 \leq K \leq N$, the estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^{K,p}[\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) + \check{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^K[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) &\lesssim \int_{\check{C}_{v(\tau)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq |\underline{k}|}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\kappa_p}} \\ &+ \int_{\check{C}_{\tau}^{I^+}} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^K r^{4+p} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^{K-1} r^2 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (13.3.42)$$

with $\kappa_2 = 0$, $\kappa_1 = 1 - \delta_N^K$ and $\kappa_0 = \min(2, N - K)$.

Proof. Using Propositions 11.8.1 and 11.8.3 one sees that it suffices to prove (13.3.42) with \mathfrak{D} replaced by $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}$ everywhere in the energies appearing on the left and this is what we will show.

We first note the easily verified estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)}[(\tilde{\nabla}_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)}[(\tilde{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}] &\lesssim \int_{\check{C}_{v(\tau)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1, k_3 \neq |\underline{k}|}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K)}}, \\ \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{\tau}[(\tilde{\nabla}_{R^*})^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{\tau}[(\tilde{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &\lesssim \int_{\check{C}_{\tau}^{I^+}} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^K r^{4+0} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^{K-1} r^2 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\ &+ \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Together they imply that the right hand side of (13.3.42) controls the right hand side (hence the left hand side) of the estimates of Propositions 13.3.4 and 13.3.6. These estimates in turn already imply that (13.3.42) holds for $\check{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^K[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau))$. They also imply (13.3.42) for $\check{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^{K,p}[\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau)$ provided one restricts all integrals appearing in the definition of that energy $r \leq 2R$. We now remove that restriction to complete the proof.

We observe that the right hand side of (13.3.42) also controls the right hand side of Proposition 13.3.9 and Proposition 13.3.7. We next claim that the estimate of Proposition 13.3.9 in fact implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^{K-1} \int_{\tilde{C}_u^{I^+}} r^2 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{I^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-2} \int_{\tilde{C}_{v_\infty}^{I^+}(\tau)} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{I^+}|^2 \\ & + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1}^{K-1} \int_{\tilde{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} r^{1-\delta} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{I^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-2} \int_{\tilde{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} r^{-1-\delta} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{I^+}|^2 \lesssim \text{RHS of (13.3.42) for } p=0, \end{aligned} \quad (13.3.43)$$

that is that the estimate of Proposition 13.3.9 remains true replacing everywhere $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^{\underline{k}}$ by $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}$, provided one accepts an $r^{-\delta}$ in the integrated decay statement for Π_{I^+} and avoids the top-order transversal flux on the cone ($k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|$). For the terms involving Ψ_{I^+} , the claim follows from Theorem C.3. For the terms involving Π_{I^+} the claim is readily verified (inductively) by commuting through the $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ of $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}$ on Π_{I^+} and inserting the relation (13.1.5).⁹ By a completely analogous argument (commuting through $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ and using (13.1.4)), one sees that the estimates of Proposition 13.3.7 continue to hold replacing $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}_{\nearrow}^{\underline{k}}$ by $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}$ everywhere on the left, provided one allows an $r^{-\delta}$ loss in the integrated decay statement for Π_{I^+} (and omits the top order transversal flux on the cone) in (13.3.24).

Combining these facts one sees that we have shown the desired (13.3.42) except for the term

$$\int_{\tilde{C}_{v_\infty}^{I^+}(\tau)} \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1, k_3 \neq |\underline{k}|}^K r^{4+p} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} A_{I^+}|^2$$

appearing in $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^{K,p}[\alpha_{I^+}](\tau)$. Therefore, it suffices to control this term using the estimate (13.3.42) with this term in $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^{K,p}[\alpha_{I^+}](\tau)$ removed. Now, if one of the derivatives in $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}$ is a 3-derivative, we can commute it through, insert (13.1.4) and the flux of Π_{I^+} on $v = v_\infty$ appearing in $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}^{K,p}[A](\tau)$. If one of the derivatives is angular and the remaining ones are 4-derivatives, the term is already contained in the estimate of Lemma 13.3.8. Finally, if there are two angular derivatives in \underline{k} , one can use (13.1.7) and elliptic estimates together with the flux bounds for Π_{I^+} on $v = v_\infty$ appearing in $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^{K,p}[A](\tau)$. \square

The following decay estimates are easily seen to imply the statement of Theorem 13.1.2.

Proposition 13.3.11. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ we have the estimates*

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^{N,2}[\alpha_{I^+}](\tau) + \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \quad (13.3.44)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^{N-1,1}[\alpha_{I^+}](\tau) + \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^{N-1}[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau}, \quad (13.3.45)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^{N-2,0}[\alpha_{I^+}](\tau) + \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^{N-2}[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^2}. \quad (13.3.46)$$

Proof. Applying Proposition 13.3.10 for $K = N$, $p = 2$ and $\tau = u_1$ yields (13.3.44) after using that the initial flux (13.1.2) is controlled by $\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3$ from Proposition 10.5.1. From (13.3.44) we extract a dyadic sequence of times τ_i such that for $\tau \in \{\tau_i\}$ we have

$$\sum_{|\underline{k}|=1; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^{N-1} \int_{\tilde{C}_\tau^{I^+}} r^5 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{I^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^{N-2} \int_{\tilde{C}_\tau^{I^+}} r^2 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{I^+}|^2 + \int_{\tilde{C}_{v(\tau_2)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1, k_3 \neq |\underline{k}|}^{N-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau}. \quad (13.3.47)$$

Applying Proposition 13.3.10 with $K = N - 1$ and $p = 1$ from the slices τ_i to an arbitrary τ yields (13.3.45). From this we extract a (different) dyadic sequence of times τ_i such that for $\tau \in \{\tau_i\}$ we have

$$\sum_{|\underline{k}|=1; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^{N-2} \int_{\tilde{C}_\tau^{I^+}} r^4 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{I^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^{N-3} \int_{\tilde{C}_\tau^{I^+}} r^2 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{I^+}|^2 + \int_{\tilde{C}_{v(\tau_2)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1, k_3 \neq |\underline{k}|}^{N-2} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^2}.$$

⁹Note the $r^{-\delta}$ loss is necessary here because we do not have τ^{-2} decay for $\int_{\tilde{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} r^{-1} |\Omega \nabla_4 \Psi_{I^+}|^2$; see Proposition 12.5.1.

Applying Proposition 13.3.10 with $K = N - 2$ and $p = 0$ from the slices τ_i to an arbitrary τ yields the estimate (13.3.46). \square

Remark 13.3.12. We note that this iteration has in particular provided a decay estimate for the flux of $\int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty}^+(\tau_1)} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2$ which is much stronger than what we obtained from the r^p method for the tensorial wave equation for $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ itself, where we could only show boundedness.

13.4 Concluding the main estimates for α

In this section we prove Theorem 13.1.1 from Theorem 13.1.2. To achieve this, we only need to extend all of our integrated decay estimates and flux estimates to the non-truncated regions and cones. The proof is very similar to that for P and \underline{P} seen in Section 12.6 of the previous chapter.

Step 1. We observe that the estimates of Theorem 13.1.2 continue to hold if we drop all check superscripts in the *spacetime integrals*. This follows easily from the relations for $A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $A_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in the overlap region, i.e. by applying Proposition 10.4.1. As an immediate corollary using the definition of the timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B} we obtain:

Corollary 13.4.1. For all $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ we have the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|\underline{k}| \leq N} \int_{\mathcal{B}(u_1)} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 &\lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \\ \sum_{|\underline{k}| \leq N-1} \int_{\mathcal{B}(\tau)} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 &\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau}, \\ \sum_{|\underline{k}| \leq N-2} \int_{\mathcal{B}(\tau)} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 &\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (13.4.1)$$

Step 2a. We observe that the estimates of Theorem 13.1.2 continue to hold if we replace the flux

$$\int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty}^+(\tau)} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=1, k_3 \neq |\underline{k}|}^K r^{4+p} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} r^{2+p} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-2} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\}$$

by the flux over an arbitrary ingoing truncated cone in $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, i.e. integrating over $\int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_v^+(\tau)}$ for any cone with $v \leq v_\infty$. Indeed, picking such a cone $\check{\mathcal{C}}_v^+(\tau)$ we can consider the spacetime region enclosed by $\check{\mathcal{C}}_v^+(\tau)$, \mathcal{B} , $\check{\mathcal{C}}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and (potentially) $\check{\mathcal{C}}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$. We reapply the estimates of Propositions 13.3.7 and 13.3.9 using now the bounds on the cone $\check{\mathcal{C}}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ established in 13.1.2 and the bounds on the hypersurface \mathcal{B} established in Corollary 13.4.1.

Step 2b. We observe that the estimates of Theorem 13.1.2 continue to hold if we replace the flux

$$\int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2$$

by the flux over an arbitrary outgoing truncated cone in $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, i.e. integrating over $\check{\mathcal{C}}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)$ for any $u \leq u_f$. Indeed picking such a cone $\check{\mathcal{C}}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)$ we can consider the region enclosed by $\check{\mathcal{C}}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)$, $\check{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and \mathcal{B} . We repeat the proof of Propositions 13.3.1 and 13.3.3 in this region using now the estimates of Theorem 13.1.2 on the cone $\check{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and the bounds on the hypersurface \mathcal{B} established in Corollary 13.4.1. One then obtains control over the fluxes $\mathbb{F}_u[\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v)$ from that of $\mathbb{F}_u[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^{\underline{k}} A_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v)$ and $\mathbb{F}_u[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^{\underline{k}} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v)$ as in the proof of Proposition 13.3.4.

Step 3. We observe that the estimates of Theorem 13.1.2 continue to hold if we replace truncated by non-truncated cones in $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cup \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$. This proceeds by doing localised energy estimates (in regions where neither the r -weights nor Ω -weights play a role) for the non-linear Teukolsky equation entirely analogously to the case of P and \underline{P} seen in Section 12.6 of the previous chapter. We omit the standard details. Taking into account the remarks at the beginning of Section 13.1.2 about the “near initial data region” we see that we have proven the estimate of Theorem 13.1.1.

13.5 Overview of the estimates on $\underline{\alpha}$

We now turn to the task of obtaining the estimates for $\underline{\alpha}$ in Theorem C.4. This section is closely modelled on Section 13.1.

In complete analogy to the estimate on α we will first prove the following restricted version of the estimates for $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ before concluding the full estimate implied by Theorem C.4.

Theorem 13.5.1. *We have the estimates*

$$\sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{u_{-1} \leq \tau \leq u_f} \tau^s \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\square}^{N-s} [\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) + \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v} v^s \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\square}^{N-s} [\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v) \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3$$

for the restricted energies (recall $\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \check{r}\Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r\Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^3 \Omega \check{\underline{\psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 \check{\underline{P}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\square}^K [\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v) &:= \sup_{\tilde{v} \geq v} \int_{\underline{C}_{\tilde{v}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; \boxed{k_3 \neq K}}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 + \sup_{u \leq u_f} \int_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq K}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \Omega^2 \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r}\right)^2 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 + |R^* \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 \right\}, \\ \mathbb{E}_{\square}^K [\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) &:= \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \int_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \frac{1}{r^2} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq K}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-2} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \sup_{v \leq v_{\infty}} \int_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; \boxed{k_3 \neq K}}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; \boxed{k_3 \neq K-1}}^{K-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-2} |(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (13.5.1)$$

Note that the above restricted energies differ from the actual energies defined in (6.1.10) and (6.1.11) only by the boxed restrictions in the sum. We will finally remove these restrictions in Section 13.9, using the Teukolsky–Starobinsky identities (in conjunction with the estimates already proven on α) to deduce control over the missing fluxes thereby proving Theorem C.4.

To prove Theorem 13.5.1 we again recall the three regions introduced at the beginning of Section 12.1. Just as for P and \underline{P} , in view of Proposition 10.5.1 it suffices to prove decay estimates for cones and regions contained in the region $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_1) \cup \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v_1 = v(u_1))$ in terms of the weighted energy

$$\int_{\underline{C}_{v_1}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq N}^N |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 + \int_{C_{u_1}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq N}^N |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{N-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{N-2} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\}$$

on $C_{u_1}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cup \underline{C}_{v_1=v(u_1)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, which is in turn controlled by $\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3$ from Proposition 10.5.1.

As for P and \underline{P} , and for α discussed in Section 13.1, we first prove a weaker version of Theorem 13.5.1 which involves only arbitrary truncated (at \mathcal{B}) outgoing cones in the infinity region and arbitrary truncated (at \mathcal{B}) ingoing cones in the horizon region. More precisely, we will prove (recall again Remark 13.1.1):

Theorem 13.5.2. *We have the estimates*

$$\sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f} \tau^s \cdot \check{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^{N-s} [\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) + \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sup_{v \geq v_1} v^s \cdot \check{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^{N-s} [\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v) \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3$$

for the restricted energies (recall $\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \tilde{r} \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^3 \Omega \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5 \underline{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$)

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^K [\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v) &:= \sup_{\tilde{v} \geq v} \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{\tilde{v}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq |\underline{k}|}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 + \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \Omega^2 \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r}\right)^2 |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 + |R^* \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 \right\}, \\ \check{\mathbb{E}}_{\square}^K [\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) &:= \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \frac{1}{r^2} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-2} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq |\underline{k}|}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq |\underline{k}|}^{K-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{|\underline{k}|} \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-2} |(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (13.5.2)$$

The proof of Theorem 13.5.2 will extend over **Sections 13.6–13.7** and is the main step in proving Theorem 13.5.1. The full statement of Theorem 13.5.1 is then obtained from Theorem 13.5.2 in **Section 13.8**. The latter step (i.e. removing the check superscripts from the cones and regions, adding general ingoing cones in the infinity gauge and general outgoing cones in the horizon gauge as well as considering the non-truncated cones) is straightforward and follows exactly as for P , \underline{P} , and for α discussed in Section 13.1, by doing localised energy estimates.

We end this overview by outlining the proof of Theorem 13.5.2. We first recall the defining relations

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) + 4\hat{\omega}(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) = 2r^2 \Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \quad , \quad \Omega \nabla_4 \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = 2 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \quad (13.5.3)$$

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) + 2\hat{\omega}(\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) = -\frac{1}{r^2} \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \quad , \quad \Omega \nabla_4 \check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = -\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \quad (13.5.4)$$

as well as the non-linear wave equations (written in “elliptic” form) from Proposition 11.1.4

$$r^4 \mathcal{P}_2^* d\sharp v (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) = -\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3 \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right) - 3Mr (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) + (\mathcal{E}^*)^1, \quad (13.5.5)$$

$$r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* d\sharp v \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \frac{3M}{r} \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = -\Omega \nabla_3 \check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^1 + \frac{k_1}{r} r \mathcal{P}_2^* (r \nabla r^2 \Omega \text{tr} \chi \cdot r \underline{\alpha}), \quad (13.5.6)$$

where we explicitly note the anomalous term in the $\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ equation and

$$2r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* d\sharp v (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) + 2\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \frac{6M}{r} (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) = +\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3 \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} + 3M \Omega^{-2} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} + (\mathcal{E}^*)^2, \quad (13.5.7)$$

$$2r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* d\sharp v \check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} + 2\check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} - \frac{6M}{r} \check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = +\Omega \nabla_3 \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} + 3M \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^2. \quad (13.5.8)$$

Note that we can always replace $r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* d\sharp v$ by $-\frac{1}{2} r^2 \Delta + 1$ since the term involving the difference of the Gauss curvature with the round metric can be incorporated into the non-linear error.

The logic in obtaining the required estimates is then as follows:

1. Interpreting the defining relations (13.5.3), (13.5.4) as *transport equations* we derive estimates on $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ as well as $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ for $0 \leq k \leq N-2$, i.e. with a loss of derivatives. These will be useful to control lower order terms. This is the content of Section 13.6. We remark that from (13.5.3), (13.5.4) we could derive, by suitable commutation, estimates for *all* derivatives up to order $N-2$, however, we prefer a different argument below.
2. In Section 13.7, we consider the *wave equations* satisfied by $(\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ and $(\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ and prove inductively boundedness and integrated decay estimates for $((\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, (\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ with $0 \leq k \leq N-1$ and $((\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, (\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ with $0 \leq k \leq N$. These estimates do not lose derivatives and do not degenerate near $3M$ for $k \geq 1$, see Propositions 13.7.1 and 13.7.3. With this established we control – with non-optimal weights near the horizon and infinity – *all* derivatives of $(\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ and $(\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ both in integrated decay (Section 13.7.3) and for fluxes (Section 13.7.4). The basic idea here is simple: Angular derivatives are controlled from the elliptic relations (13.5.5)–(13.5.8) and previous estimates. For $\Omega \nabla_4$ derivatives one can use (13.5.4) and the fact that estimates on $(\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ have already been established in Theorem C.3. Finally $\Omega \nabla_3 = \Omega \nabla_4 - 2\nabla_{R^*}$ can be used to reduce $\Omega \nabla_3$ derivatives to R^* derivatives, which Proposition 13.7.1 provides control on.

It remains to optimise the weights near infinity for $\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and near (what will be) the horizon for $\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$. This is done in Sections 13.7.5 and 13.7.6 respectively, using estimates for the relevant Bianchi pairs. The pigeonhole principle argument of [DR09a] can then be applied to yield an inverse polynomial decay hierarchy for the weighted energies which provides all of the estimates of Theorem 13.5.2. This is the content of Section 13.7.7.

13.6 Auxiliary transport estimates at low orders for $\underline{\alpha}$

The reader should compare this section with Section 13.2.

Exploiting the transport relations we can deduce lower order estimates for $\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ as well as $\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$.

Proposition 13.6.1. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ and $1 \leq K \leq N-2$ the quantities $\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^3 \Omega \check{\underline{\psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \check{r} \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfy the estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} (|\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2) \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\mathcal{B}(\tau)} |\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})] + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K-2)}}, \end{aligned}$$

and the quantities $\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^3 \Omega \underline{\psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^K \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} \Omega^2 (|(\nabla_{R^*})^k (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 + |(\nabla_{R^*})^k (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2) \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^K \int_{\mathcal{B}(\tau)} |(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})] + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K-2)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We note that it suffices to prove the estimates with the right hand side being

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v(\tau)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 [|\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + |(\nabla_{R^*})^k (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 + |(\nabla_{R^*})^k (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K-2)}}.$$

Indeed, it is easy to see (replacing $\Omega\check{\nabla}_3 = -2\check{\nabla}_{R^*} + \Omega\check{\nabla}_4$ and using (13.5.3), (13.5.4)) that the right hand sides appearing in the proposition control the above expression.

We first prove the second estimate, and this first without the $(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k$ terms. From (13.5.4) we derive

$$\frac{1}{2}\Omega\check{\nabla}_4(\Omega^{-2}|\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2) + \Omega\hat{\omega}\Omega^{-2}|\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 = -\frac{1}{r^2}\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq \frac{M}{2r^2}\Omega^{-2}|\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{2\Omega^2}{Mr^2}|\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2, \quad (13.6.1)$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\Omega\check{\nabla}_4(\Omega^{-6}|\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2) + \Omega\hat{\omega}\Omega^{-6}|\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 = -\frac{\Omega^{-4}}{r^2}\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq \frac{M}{2r^2}\Omega^{-6}|\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \frac{2\Omega^{-2}}{Mr^2}|\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2. \quad (13.6.2)$$

We now integrate (13.6.1) over $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))$ (absorbing the first term on the right by the left using $|\Omega\hat{\omega} - Mr^{-2}| \lesssim \varepsilon$) and estimate the term involving $\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ by Theorem C.3. Similarly we integrate (13.6.2) over $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))$ (absorbing the first term on the right by the left) and estimate the term involving $\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ by the estimate just obtained. This provides the second estimate of the proposition without the $(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k$ -terms. To prove the estimate for the $(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k$ -commuted terms one commutes (13.5.3) and (13.5.4) by $\check{\nabla}_{R^*}$ and an entirely straightforward induction using the commuted analogues of (13.6.1) and (13.6.2) finishes the proof of the second estimate of the proposition.

To prove the first estimate (note that in this infinity region weights in Ω do not play any role), we first convert the estimate for the horizon quantities to the estimate for the infinity quantities on the hypersurface \mathcal{B} using Proposition 10.3.2. This immediately provides control on the terms in the second line of the first estimate. Next we first prove the estimate for the terms appearing in the first line without the $(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k$ terms. To do this we note the easily derived (from (13.5.3) and (13.5.4)) identities for $s > 0$

$$\frac{1}{2}\Omega\check{\nabla}_4(r^{-s}|\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2) + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{s}{r^{s+1}}\Omega_{\circ}^2|\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 = -\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2}\check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}r^{-s}\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \lesssim \frac{1}{4} \frac{s}{r^{1+s}}\Omega_{\circ}^2|\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{4}{s \cdot r^{3+s}}|\check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2, \quad (13.6.3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\Omega\check{\nabla}_4((1+r^{-s})|\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2) + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{s}{r^{s+1}}\Omega_{\circ}^2|\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 &= -\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2}\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(1+r^{-s})\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{4} \frac{s}{r^{1+s}}\Omega_{\circ}^2|\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{16}{s \cdot r^{3-s}}|\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (13.6.4)$$

We now integrate (13.6.3) for $s = \delta$ over the region $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)$ absorbing the first term on the right by the left hand side and using the estimates of Theorem C.3. We then integrate (13.6.4) for $s = \delta$ over the region $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)$ absorbing the first term on the right by the left hand side and the second term by the estimate just shown on $\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$. This yields the desired estimate. Of course the same argument works for the $(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k$ commuted analogue of (13.6.3) arising from commuting (13.5.3) and (13.5.4). \square

An easy corollary of the proof (noting that it also produces favourable boundary terms on $v = v_{\infty}$) is

Corollary 13.6.2. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ the quantities $\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^3\Omega\check{\underline{\psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \check{r}\Omega^2\check{\underline{\alpha}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfy the estimate*

$$\int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v_{\infty}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} |\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{1}{r^{\delta}}|\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |\Omega\check{\nabla}_3\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \lesssim \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)}[(\Omega^{-2}\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})] + \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)}[(\Omega^{-4}\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^2}. \quad (13.6.5)$$

13.7 Higher order energy estimates for $\underline{\alpha}$

The reader should compare this section with Section 13.2.

13.7.1 Basic estimates for $\underline{\Pi}$ and $(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k\underline{\Pi}$

We begin with a basic estimate arising from commuting the $\underline{\Pi}$ equations only with R^* derivatives:

Proposition 13.7.1. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ and $1 \leq K \leq N - 2$ the pair $(\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^3 \Omega \underline{\psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^3 \Omega \check{\underline{\psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=0}^K \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^K \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\
& + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) \\
& + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{I}} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau)) + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{I}} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau) \\
& \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\
& + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})] + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K-2)}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{13.7.1}$$

Remark 13.7.2. *Note that we are asserting non-degenerate control near $r = 3M$ as soon as one commutes at least once with ∇_{R^*} . In fact, the proof will establish the above estimate also for $K = 0$ provided one replaces $\check{\mathbb{I}} [\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau))$ by $\check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg} [\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau))$ on the left hand side.*

Proof. Recall from Proposition 11.1.4 that $\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfy a tensorial wave equation of Type 1 with

$$\mathcal{F}^{lin} [\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \frac{3M}{r^2} \Omega^2 \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \frac{2}{r} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \quad \mathcal{F}^{lin} [\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \frac{3M}{r^2} \Omega^2 \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} - \frac{2}{r} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}.$$

By a simple induction using Proposition 11.2.1 it is easy to see that $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfy a tensorial wave equation of Type 1 and that the linear error term after K commutations will have the form (cf. (13.3.2) for notation)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &= \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} (h_0 (\nabla_{R^*})^K \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} + h_0 \Omega \nabla_3 (\nabla_{R^*})^{K-1} \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}) \\
&+ \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{h_0^k}{r^2} \Omega^2 (\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \sum_{i=0}^1 \sum_{k=i}^{K-1} \frac{h_0^{k,i}}{r^3} \Omega^2 (\Omega \nabla_3)^i (\nabla_{R^*})^{k-i} \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{h_0^k}{r^3} (\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}
\end{aligned} \tag{13.7.2}$$

and with the same schematic form for $\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$. From Propositions 11.1.4 and 11.2.1 one sees that the non-linear error-term is of the form

$$\mathcal{F}^{nlin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^{2+K}, \quad \mathcal{F}^{nlin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \Omega^4 (\mathcal{E}^*)^{K+2}.$$

Step 1. We claim that applying the T -boundedness estimate and the Morawetz X -estimate of Proposition 11.4.1 to the wave equations for $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ already yields the desired estimate for all $0 \leq K \leq N - 2$, however,

- with the horizon fluxes carrying an additional diamond superscript (i.e. weaker energies on the horizon) and
- with $\check{\mathbb{I}} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau))$ replaced by $\check{\mathbb{I}}^{\diamond, deg} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau))$ on the left.

To verify this claim, we observe that using $T = \Omega \nabla_4 - R^*$ the linear error $\mathcal{G}_1 [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \underline{\Pi}] (\tau, u_f)$ can be

estimated further by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} |\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}]| |\nabla_T (\nabla_{R^*})^K \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}| + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} |\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}]| |\nabla_T (\nabla_{R^*})^K \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}| \\
& \lesssim \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} \left| \mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] \right| \left| (\nabla_{R^*})^{K+1} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} + (\nabla_{R^*})^K \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right) \right| \\
& \quad + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left| \mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \right| \left| (\nabla_{R^*})^{K+1} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} + (\nabla_{R^*})^K \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right) \right| + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K-2)}} \\
& \lesssim \gamma \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |(\nabla_{R^*})^{K+1} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \gamma \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |(\nabla_{R^*})^{K+1} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + C_\gamma (\text{RHS of (13.7.1)})
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\gamma > 0$, which is obtained in complete analogy to Step 1 below (13.3.2). In particular, we have used Cauchy–Schwarz and the fact that the lower order terms in $\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ (appearing in $|\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \underline{\Pi}]|^2$) from (13.7.2) can be controlled from Proposition 13.6.1.

For the terms $\mathcal{G}_2 [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \underline{\Pi}] (\tau, u_f)$ and $\mathcal{G}_3 [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \underline{\Pi}] (\tau, u_f)$ we note similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} |\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}]| R^* (\nabla_{R^*})^K \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}| + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} |\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}]| R^* (\nabla_{R^*})^K \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}| \\
& + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} |\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}]| \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} |(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}| + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} |\mathcal{F}^{lin} [(\nabla_{R^*})^K \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}]| \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} |(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}| \\
& \lesssim \gamma \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |(\nabla_{R^*})^{K+1} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \gamma \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} |(\nabla_{R^*})^{K+1} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + C_\gamma (\text{RHS of (13.7.1)}) .
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing γ sufficiently small (depending only on M_{init}) we absorb the first terms on the right hand side of (11.4.3) and the desired estimate (with the aforementioned restrictions) is proven provided we can control the non-linear errors arising from \mathcal{H}_i . For these we note that using Propositions 11.7.1, 11.7.3 for the errors in the horizon region and Proposition 11.7.8 for the errors in the infinity region we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^4 \sum_{k \leq K} \mathcal{H}_i [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}] \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K-2)}} \quad (13.7.3)$$

and that using Proposition 10.3.2 we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{|k| \leq K} \left| \mathcal{B}_i [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (\tau, u_f) - \mathcal{B}_i [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] (\tau, u_f) \right| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K-2)}} . \quad (13.7.4)$$

Step 2. To remove the diamond superscripts, we apply the redshift estimate of Proposition 11.5.1 to the tensorial wave equation satisfied by $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$. The linear errors are easily seen to be controlled by Cauchy–Schwarz and the estimate from Step 1 and the non-linear error is controlled by (13.7.3).

Step 3. We have proved (13.7.1) except that $\sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau))$ appears on the left hand side instead of $\sum_{k=0}^K \mathbb{I} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau))$. To obtain the non-degenerate control we proceed successively for $K = 1, 2, \dots, N-2$. For $K = 1$ we consider the tensorial wave equation for $\nabla_{R^*} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and integrate over $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ the Lagrangian identity (11.4.11) with h a radial cut-off function equal to 1 in $[3M - \frac{1}{4}M_{\text{init}}, 3M + \frac{1}{4}M_{\text{init}}]$ and vanishing for $r \leq \frac{5}{2}M_{\text{init}}$ and $r \geq \frac{7}{2}M_{\text{init}}$. Boundary terms and the term arising from $\mathfrak{F}^h [\nabla_{R^*} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$ are easily seen to be controlled by the estimate already established. Also, the lower order terms in $\mathfrak{f}_{bulk}^h [\nabla_{R^*} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$ are all directly controlled from $\sum_{k=0}^1 \check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg} [(\nabla_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] (v(\tau))$. The angular derivative term has a good sign and for the wrong signed term involving $\nabla_T (\nabla_{R^*}) \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ we observe

$$\nabla_T \nabla_{R^*} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = (-\nabla_{R^*} + \Omega \nabla_4) (\nabla_{R^*}) \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = -\nabla_{R^*} \nabla_{R^*} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} - \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} (\nabla_{R^*}) \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} h_0 (\nabla_{R^*}) \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \Omega^4 (\mathcal{E}^*)^2$$

with all terms on the right already controlled *non-degenerately* near $r = 3M$. This gives non-degenerate (near $r = 3M$) control on all first derivatives of $\check{\nabla}_{R^*}\underline{\Pi}$ and hence control on $\check{\mathbb{I}}[\check{\nabla}_{R^*}\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau))$. By a simple interpolation one also has $\check{\mathbb{I}}[\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) \lesssim \check{\mathbb{I}}[\check{\nabla}_{R^*}\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg}[\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau))$. This finishes the proof for $K = 1$. For $K = 2, 3, \dots, N - 2$ we apply successively the same argument at each K using the Lagrangian multiplier for the wave equation satisfied by $(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^K \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$. \square

13.7.2 Basic estimates for \underline{A} and $(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \underline{A}$

Completely analogously we prove the above estimate for $\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$:

Proposition 13.7.3. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ and $1 \leq K \leq N - 1$ the pair $(\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^K \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^K \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{u_f}[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v_\infty}[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{I}}[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{I}}[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)}[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)}[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^{\max(0, K-2)} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)}[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})] + \sum_{k=0}^{\max(0, K-2)} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)}[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})] + \frac{C(\epsilon_0)^2 + C^2 \epsilon^4}{\tau^{\kappa(N-K-2)}} \end{aligned} \quad (13.7.5)$$

Proof. Recall from Proposition 11.1.4 that $\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfy a tensorial wave equation of Type 2 with

$$\mathcal{F}^{lin}[\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] = +\frac{8}{r} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \quad , \quad \mathcal{F}^{lin}[\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] = +\frac{8}{r} \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} . \quad (13.7.6)$$

Repeating the proof of Proposition 13.7.1, this linear error term and its R^* commuted analogues are easily controlled using Cauchy-Schwarz and the estimates from Proposition 13.7.1.¹⁰ The only additional difficulty is concerned with the anomalous non-linear error-term appearing in the Teukolsky equation for $\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, see Proposition 11.1.4 or (13.5.6). This corresponds to an additional error term in $\sum_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{H}_i[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \underline{A}]$ of the form:

$$\int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left| (\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \left(\frac{1}{r^3} r \mathcal{P}_2^* (r \check{\nabla} (r^2 \Omega \text{tr} \chi) \cdot r \underline{\alpha}) \right) \right| \left(|\check{\nabla}_T (\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}| + |(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^{k+1} \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}| + \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} |(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}| \right)$$

for $k = 0, \dots, N - 1$. We can now apply Cauchy-Schwarz (borrowing from the term $\check{\mathbb{I}}[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau)$ on the left) reducing the problem to establish the estimate

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} r^2 \left| (\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \left(\frac{1}{r^3} r \mathcal{P}_2^* (r \check{\nabla} (r^2 \Omega \text{tr} \chi) \cdot r \underline{\alpha}) \right) \right|^2 \lesssim \frac{\epsilon_0^2 + \epsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K-2)}} . \quad (13.7.7)$$

Writing $2\check{\nabla}_{R^*} = -\Omega\check{\nabla}_3 + \Omega\check{\nabla}_4$ and commuting the derivatives through using the null structure equations for $\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_0$ provides the desired estimate except for the term involving $[\Omega\check{\nabla}_3]^{N-1} \mathcal{P}_2^* (r \check{\nabla} r^2 \Omega \text{tr} \chi)$ which, ignoring terms involving only N derivatives which are easily controlled, requires controlling the term $\frac{1}{r^3} r \underline{\alpha} [\Omega\check{\nabla}_3]^{N-3} r^4 \mathcal{P}_2^* \check{\nabla} \not{d} v \check{\nabla} r (\omega - \omega_0)$. However using the bootstrap assumption on the energy defined in (6.1.19) and $|r \underline{\alpha}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\epsilon^2}{\tau^2}$ the estimate also follows for this term. \square

¹⁰Note in particular that we obtain $K - 1$ in the sums involving $\underline{\Pi}$ on the right hand side. Indeed, for $K = 2$ (commuting twice), say, we need to control *two* derivatives of $\underline{\Pi}$ in the linear error which follow from (the spacetime terms of) $K = 1$ in Proposition 13.7.1. Similarly for higher K .

13.7.3 Integrated local energy decay for all derivatives of $\underline{\Pi}$ and \underline{A}

We next conclude that Propositions 13.7.1 and 13.7.3 already provide control over *all* derivatives of $\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ away from the horizon and infinity (note the \star in the energies below). We start with the integrated decay energies.

Proposition 13.7.4. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ and $1 \leq K \leq N-2$, the pair $(\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^3 \Omega \psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^3 \Omega \check{\psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|k| \leq K+1} \check{\mathbb{I}}^{\star, deg} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] (v(\tau)) + \sum_{|k| \leq K+1} \check{\mathbb{I}}^{\star} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau) + \sum_{|k| \leq K} \check{\mathbb{I}}^{\star} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{K+1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\check{\nabla}_{R^\star})^k \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{K+1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{\tau} [(\check{\nabla}_{R^\star})^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\check{\nabla}_{R^\star})^k \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{\tau} [(\check{\nabla}_{R^\star})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\check{\nabla}_{R^\star})^k (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})] + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\check{\nabla}_{R^\star})^k (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K-2)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (13.7.8)$$

Proof. We first prove

$$\sum_{|k| \leq K} \check{\mathbb{I}}^{\star} \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (v(\tau)) \lesssim \sum_{k \leq K} \check{\mathbb{I}} \left[(\check{\nabla}_{R^\star})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (v(\tau)) + \sum_{k \leq K-1} \check{\mathbb{I}} \left[(\check{\nabla}_{R^\star})^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (v(\tau)) + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K-2)}}, \quad (13.7.9)$$

whose right hand side we can estimate by the right hand side of (13.7.8) by applying Propositions 13.7.1 and 13.7.3. Fixing $K \geq 1$ we look at

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3)} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \quad \text{for } k_1 + k_2 + k_3 = K + 1. \quad (13.7.10)$$

We first use (13.5.4) for the $(r\Omega\check{\nabla}_4)^{k_3} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ part in conjunction with the estimates of Theorem C.3 for the terms involving $\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ to obtain

$$\int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \leq 2R\}} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3)} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \lesssim \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \leq 2R\}} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{(k_1, k_2, 0)} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K-2)}}.$$

Similarly, using the relation $\Omega\check{\nabla}_3 = \Omega\check{\nabla}_4 - 2\check{\nabla}_{R^\star}$ and commuting the 3-derivative through we find

$$\int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \leq 2R\}} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3)} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \lesssim \sum_{i=0}^{k_2} \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \leq 2R\}} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{(k_1, 0, 0)} (\check{\nabla}_{R^\star})^i \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K-2)}}.$$

Now if $k_1 = 1$ the desired estimate follows directly from Proposition 13.7.1. If $k_1 \geq 2$ we commute all $r^2 \Delta$ operators through on $\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ using repeatedly the relations (13.5.6) and (13.5.8) in the form¹¹

$$r^2 \Delta \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = -\Omega \check{\nabla}_3 \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} + 4\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} - \frac{6M}{r} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} - 3M \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^2 \quad (13.7.11)$$

$$r^2 \Delta \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = +2\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \frac{6M}{r} \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \left(-\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} + 2\check{\nabla}_{R^\star} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right) - \frac{4}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^2 \quad (13.7.12)$$

to conclude (using Proposition 11.7.7 for the non-linear errors)

$$\int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \leq 2R\}} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3)} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \lesssim \text{RHS of (13.7.9)}. \quad (13.7.13)$$

¹¹Note we have replaced $\check{\mathcal{E}}_1^1 + \frac{k_1}{r} r \check{\mathcal{D}}_2^* (r \check{\nabla} r^2 \Omega \text{tr} \chi \cdot r \underline{\alpha}) = \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^2$ as we do not need to keep track of the anomalous term when inserting elliptic relations.

This proves (13.7.9). Next we show

$$\sum_{|k| \leq K+1} \check{\mathbb{I}}^* \left[\check{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau) \lesssim \sum_{k \leq K} \check{\mathbb{I}} \left[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau) + \sum_{k \leq K+1} \check{\mathbb{I}} \left[(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \right] (\tau) + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K-2)}}.$$

The proof of this is entirely analogous to the proof of (13.7.9) (note that we can freely use (13.7.9) now) and is therefore left to the reader. Finally, the estimate in $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ is carried out entirely analogously (see the proof of Proposition 13.3.4 where it is done explicitly). \square

The following corollaries easily follow from the mean value theorem:

Corollary 13.7.5. *There exists $R_1 \leq \check{R}' \leq R_2$ such that the right hand side of Proposition 13.7.4 controls in particular $\sum_{|k| \leq K+1} \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \check{R}'\}} |\check{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2$.*

Corollary 13.7.6. *Suppose $r_{\mathcal{H}}(u_f, v(u_1)) \leq 9M_{\text{init}}/4$. Then there exists a $9M_{\text{init}}/4 < \check{R} < 5M_{\text{init}}/2$ such that the right hand side of Proposition 13.7.4 controls in particular $\sum_{|k| \leq K+1} \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau)) \cap \{r_{\mathcal{H}^+} = \check{R}\}} |\check{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2$.*

13.7.4 Basic fluxes for all derivatives of $\underline{\Pi}$ and \underline{A}

We now turn to estimating general fluxes.

Proposition 13.7.7. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ and $1 \leq K \leq N-2$ the pair $(\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = r^3 \Omega \psi_{\underline{\mathcal{H}^+}}, \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^3 \Omega \check{\psi}_{\underline{\mathcal{I}^+}})$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|k| \leq K+1} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(u)}^* [\check{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{|k| \leq K} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u^* [\check{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sum_{|k| \leq K+1} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \check{\mathbb{F}}_u^* [\check{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{K+1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^{K+1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau [(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \sum_{k=0}^K \check{\mathbb{F}}_\tau [(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k (\Omega^{-2} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{H}^+})] + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \check{\mathbb{F}}_{v(\tau)} [(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k (\Omega^{-4} \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{H}^+})] + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K-2)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (13.7.14)$$

Remark 13.7.8. *We omit the proof as it is entirely analogous (but easier) than that of Proposition 13.3.4. It is easier because here we are restricting the energies to be both away from (what will be) the horizon and from $r \geq 2R$. Hence r -weights and Ω -weights are irrelevant in all regions under consideration.*

13.7.5 Improving the weights near infinity

We now obtain r -weighted fluxes and integrated decay estimates in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$.

Proposition 13.7.9. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ and $1 \leq K \leq N-2$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|k|=0}^{K+1} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \{r \geq R+2\}} \frac{1}{r^2} |\check{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|k|=0}^K \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \{r \geq R+2\}} \frac{1}{r^2} |\check{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \\ & + \sum_{|k|=0; k_3 \neq |k|}^{K+2} \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} |\check{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|k|=0; k_3 \neq |k|}^{K+1} \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} |\check{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \\ & + \sum_{|k|=0}^{K+1} \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} |\check{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|k|=0}^{K+2} \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} |\check{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \\ & \lesssim \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \frac{1}{r^2} \left\{ \sum_{|k|=0; k_2 \neq |k|}^{K+2} |\check{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|k|=0}^{K+1} |\check{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^K |(\check{\nabla}_{R^*})^k \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\ & + \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v(\tau)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|k|=0; k_3 \neq |k|}^{K+2} |\check{\mathfrak{D}}^k (\Omega^{-4} \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K-2)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (13.7.15)$$

Moreover, the restriction $k_3 \neq |k|$ can be changed to $k_3 \neq K + 2$ in the third sum and to $k_3 \neq K + 1$ in the fourth sum.

Proof. Observe that the statement of the restriction in the sums is a simple a posteriori consequence of (13.7.15) and elliptic estimates along the cones using that the tangential derivatives are always included.

Step 0. Simplifying what is to show. The right hand side of (13.7.15) does control the right hand side of Propositions 13.7.4 and 13.7.7, hence we are free to use these estimates and Corollary 13.7.5. We also note that it suffices to prove the estimate restricting all sums on the left to tuples $(k_1, k_2, 0)$. Indeed this is clear for the term involving $\check{\Psi}_{I^+}$ from Theorem C.3. Next, for the expressions involving $\check{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{\Pi}_{I^+}$, note that if (k_1, k_2, k_3) with $k_3 \neq 0$ then we can insert the relation (13.5.4) which turns the flux into a flux for $\check{\Psi}_{I^+}$ that has already been controlled in Theorem C.3 by the right hand side of (13.7.15). Finally, for the expressions involving $\check{\mathfrak{D}}^k \check{A}_{I^+}$ note that if (k_1, k_2, k_3) with $k_3 \neq 0$, then we can insert the relation (13.5.3) and the flux turns into a flux for $\check{\Pi}_{I^+}$ that has just been controlled.

Step 1. Collecting the commuted equations. Key to the proof will be the Bianchi pair (13.5.6) and (13.5.3)

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \check{\Pi}_{I^+} = -r^2 \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^* d\check{v} \check{A}_{I^+} - \frac{3M}{r} \check{A}_{I^+} + \frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) \check{\Pi}_{I^+} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^1 + \frac{k_1}{r} r \check{\nabla}_2^* (r \check{\nabla} r^2 \Omega \text{tr} \chi \cdot r \underline{\alpha}) , \quad (13.7.16)$$

$$\Omega \nabla_4 r d\check{v} \check{A}_{I^+} = 2 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r d\check{v} \check{\Pi}_{I^+} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^1 , \quad (13.7.17)$$

as well as the pair (13.5.8) and (13.5.4)

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \check{\Psi}_{I^+} = 2r^2 \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^* d\check{v} \check{\Pi}_{I^+} + 2\check{\Pi}_{I^+} - \frac{6M}{r} \check{\Pi}_{I^+} - 3M \check{A}_{I^+} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^2 , \quad (13.7.18)$$

$$\Omega \nabla_4 r d\check{v} \check{\Pi}_{I^+} = -\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r d\check{v} \check{\Psi}_{I^+} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^2 . \quad (13.7.19)$$

We first derive commuted versions of these equations, for which we recall the notation (13.3.26). For the first pair we have for $k \geq 1$ and odd, $l \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 (\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{\Pi}_{I^+}^{(k-1)} &= -r \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^* (\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{A}_{I^+}^{(k)} + \sum_{i=0}^l \frac{h_0^i}{r} (\Omega \nabla_3)^i \check{A}_{I^+}^{(k-1)} + \sum_{i=0}^l \frac{h_0^i}{r} (\Omega \nabla_3)^i \check{\Pi}_{I^+}^{(k-1)} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{k+l} \\ &\quad + (\Omega \nabla_3)^l \left(r^2 \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^* d\check{v} \right)^{\frac{k-1}{2}} \frac{h_0}{r} r \check{\nabla}_2^* (r \check{\nabla} r^2 \Omega \text{tr} \chi \cdot r \underline{\alpha}) , \end{aligned} \quad (13.7.20)$$

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \left((\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{A}_{I^+}^{(k)} \right) = 2 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r d\check{v} (\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{\Pi}_{I^+}^{(k-1)} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^{k+l} ,$$

while for $k \geq 1$ and even, $l \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 (\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{\Pi}_{I^+}^{(k-1)} &= -r d\check{v} (\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{A}_{I^+}^{(k)} + \sum_{i=0}^l \frac{h_0^i}{r} (\Omega \nabla_3)^i \check{A}_{I^+}^{(k-1)} + \sum_{i=0}^l \frac{h_0^i}{r} (\Omega \nabla_3)^i \check{\Pi}_{I^+}^{(k-1)} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{k+l} \\ &\quad + (\Omega \nabla_3)^l \left(r^2 d\check{v} \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \right)^{\frac{k}{2}} \frac{h_0}{r} (r \check{\nabla} r^2 \Omega \text{tr} \chi \cdot r \underline{\alpha}) , \end{aligned} \quad (13.7.21)$$

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \left((\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{A}_{I^+}^{(k)} \right) = 2 \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^* (\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{\Pi}_{I^+}^{(k-1)} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^{k+l} . \quad (13.7.22)$$

For the second pair we have for $k \geq 1$ and k odd, $l \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 (\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{\Psi}_{I^+}^{(k-1)} &= 2r \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^* (\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{\Pi}_{I^+}^{(k)} + 2(\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{\Pi}_{I^+}^{(k-1)} + \sum_{i=0}^l h_1^i (\Omega \nabla_3)^i \check{\Pi}_{I^+}^{(k-1)} - 3M (\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{A}_{I^+}^{(k-1)} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{k+1} , \\ \Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{\Pi}_{I^+}^{(k)} &= -\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r d\check{v} (\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{\Psi}_{I^+}^{(k-1)} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^{k+1} , \end{aligned} \quad (13.7.23)$$

while for $k \geq 1$ and even, $l \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega \nabla_3(\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)} &= 2r d\sharp v(\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)} + 2(\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)} + \sum_{i=0}^l h_1^i(\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)} - 3M(\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{k+1}, \\ \Omega \nabla_4(\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)} &= -\frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} r \mathcal{P}_2^*(\Omega \nabla_3)^l \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^{k+1}.\end{aligned}\quad (13.7.24)$$

Step 2. Deriving the estimates for $l = 0$. We first set $l = 0$ above to prove the estimate (13.7.15) with the restriction that only angular derivatives can appear in $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^k$. We proceed inductively in k . We contract the first equation of (13.7.20) (and (13.7.21) respectively) with $\frac{2}{r^2} (1 + M^\delta r^{-\delta}) \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)}$ and the second equation of (13.7.20) with $(1 + M^\delta r^{-\delta}) \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)}$. We then add the relevant equations and integrate over $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \setminus \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}$ for arbitrary $\tau \leq u \leq u_f$ with \tilde{R}' the one of Corollary 13.7.5 to control boundary terms arising at $r = \tilde{R}'$ in the standard integration by parts. This produces (for $K = -1, 0, \dots, N-2$)

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{k=0}^{K+1} |\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}|^2 + \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \sum_{k=1}^{K+2} |\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}|^2 + \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} \frac{M^\delta}{r^{1+\delta}} \sum_{k=1}^{K+2} |\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}|^2 \\ &\leq \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} \frac{1}{r^3} \left\{ C_1 \sum_{k=0}^{K+1} |\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}|^2 + C_2 \sum_{k=1}^{K+2} |\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}|^2 \right\} + \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} \frac{C_3}{r^2} \sum_{k=0}^{K+1} |\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}|^2 + C_R (\text{RHS of (13.7.8)}) \\ &+ C_4 \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} \sum_{k=0}^{K+1} r^{-2} |\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}| \left(|\check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{k+1}| + r^{-1} |\mathcal{A}^{[k]} r \mathcal{P}_2^*(r \nabla r^2 \Omega \text{tr} \chi \cdot r \underline{\alpha}) \right) + C_5 \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} \sum_{k=1}^{K+2} |\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}| |\check{\mathcal{E}}_2^k|\end{aligned}\quad (13.7.25)$$

where for $k \geq 0$ we define $\mathcal{A}^{[k]} = \left(r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* d\sharp v \right)^{\frac{k}{2}}$ if k is even and $\mathcal{A}^{[k]} = r d\sharp v \mathcal{A}^{[k-1]}$ if k is odd. Importantly, the constants C_1, \dots, C_5 above can be chosen *independently* of R , i.e. they only depend on M_{init} .

Similarly, we contract the first equation of (13.7.23) (and (13.7.24) respectively) with $\frac{1}{r^2} (1 + M^\delta r^{-\delta}) \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)}$ and the second with $2(1 + M^\delta r^{-\delta}) \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}$. We then add the relevant equations and integrate over $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \setminus \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}$ for arbitrary $\tau \leq u \leq u_f$ with \tilde{R}' the one of Corollary 13.7.5. After an integration by parts this produces (for $K = 0, \dots, N-2$)

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{k=0}^K |\check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}|^2 + \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \sum_{k=1}^{K+1} |\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}|^2 + \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} \frac{M^\delta}{r^{1+\delta}} \sum_{k=1}^{K+1} |\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}|^2 \\ &\leq C_6 \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} \frac{1}{r^{3+\delta}} \sum_{k=0}^K |\check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}|^2 + \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} \left\{ \frac{C_7}{r^2} \sum_{k=0}^{K+1} |\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}|^2 + C_8 \frac{M^\delta}{r^{1+\delta}} \sum_{k=0}^K |\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}|^2 \right\} \\ &+ C_9 \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{k=0}^K |\check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}|^2 + C_{10} \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} \sum_{k=0}^K |\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}|^2 + C_R (\text{RHS of (13.7.8)}) \\ &+ C_{11} \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} \sum_{k=0}^K r^{-2} |\check{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}| |\check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{k+2}| + C_{12} \int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} \sum_{k=1}^{K+1} |\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}| |\check{\mathcal{E}}_2^{k+2}|\end{aligned}\quad (13.7.26)$$

where again, importantly, the constants C_6, \dots, C_{12} can be chosen independently of R . Note that the sums for $\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k)}$ on the left could be extended to $k = 0$ by a standard elliptic estimate. We now restrict R to satisfy

$$\frac{C_1}{M^\delta R^{2-\delta}} + \frac{C_2}{M^\delta R^{2-\delta}} + \frac{C_7}{M^\delta R^{1-\delta}} < \frac{1}{4} \quad (13.7.27)$$

with the C_i as above. (Recall that (13.7.27) was indeed of the constraints announced in Section 1.3.5 for the choice of R .)

Deriving (13.7.25) and (13.7.26) is straightforward, we only discuss here the terms in the derivation of (13.7.26) that require special attention. For the terms

$$+ \sum_{k=0}^K \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+}(\tau, u) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} 2\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{I^+}^{(k)} \frac{1}{r^2} (1 + r^{-\delta}) \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{I^+}^{(k)} \quad (13.7.28)$$

one may easily treat the term involving $r^{-\delta}$ with Cauchy–Schwarz and borrowing from the left hand side while for the remaining term one inserts that $\check{\underline{\Psi}}_{I^+}^{(k)} = -\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \Omega \check{\nabla}_4 \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{I^+}^{(k)} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_0^{1+k}$ and integrates by parts. The spacetime term is then controlled by a term appearing on the right hand side, the boundary term on $v = v_\infty$ has a good sign and the one on $r = \tilde{R}'$ is controlled by Corollary 13.7.5.

For the terms

$$+ \sum_{k=0}^K \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+}(\tau, u) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} \left(-3M \check{\underline{A}}_{I^+}^{(k)} \right) \frac{1}{r^2} (1 + r^{-\delta}) \check{\underline{\Psi}}_{I^+}^{(k)} \quad (13.7.29)$$

one may easily treat the term involving $r^{-\delta}$ with Cauchy–Schwarz. For the remaining term, one inserts that $\check{\underline{\Psi}}_{I^+}^{(k)} = -\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \Omega \check{\nabla}_4 \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{I^+}^{(k-1)} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_0^{2+k}$ and integrates by parts. The spacetime term is controlled by terms appearing on the right of (13.7.26), the boundary term on $r = \tilde{R}'$ is controlled by Corollary 13.7.5, while for the boundary term on $v = v_\infty$, we can now estimate for any $\gamma > 0$

$$\int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty}^{I^+}(\tau)} \sum_{k=1}^K |\check{\underline{A}}_{I^+}^{(k)}| |\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{I^+}^{(k)}| \leq \gamma \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty}^{I^+}(\tau)} |\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{I^+}^{(k)}|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty}^{I^+}(\tau)} |\check{\underline{A}}_{I^+}^{(k)}|^2.$$

Choosing γ sufficiently small we can absorb the first term on the left.

We next claim that adding (13.7.25) and (13.7.26) successively for $K = 0, \dots, N-2$ leads immediately to (13.7.15), provided all sums on the left of (13.7.15) are restricted to tuples of the form $(|\underline{k}|, 0, 0)$. This indeed follows after observing that

- Theorem C.3 controls all terms involving $\check{\underline{\Psi}}_{I^+}$. All other spacetime terms appearing on the right hand side of (13.7.25), (13.7.26) can be directly absorbed on the left using (13.7.27) except the non-linear errors in the last line and the term involving $\frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} \sum_{k=0}^K |\check{\underline{A}}_{I^+}^{(k)}|^2$ on the left of (13.7.26).
- for $K = 0$, the term $\int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty}^{I^+}(\tau)} |\check{\underline{A}}_{I^+}^{(0)}|^2$ on the right hand side of (13.7.26) is controlled by Corollary 13.6.2, while for higher K it is controlled inductively since (13.7.25) produces for $K = 0$ in particular the term $\int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty}^{I^+}(\tau)} |\check{\underline{A}}_{I^+}^{(1)}|^2$. Similarly, for $K = 0$ the term $\int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} |\check{\underline{A}}_{I^+}^{(0)}|^2$ on the right hand side of (13.7.26) is controlled by Proposition 13.6.1, while for higher K it is controlled inductively since (13.7.25) produces for $K = 0$ in particular the term $\int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} |\check{\underline{A}}_{I^+}^{(1)}|^2$ on the left hand side.
- The non-linear errors can be treated using Cauchy–Schwarz and the estimates for $s = 0, 1, 2$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}(\tau)} r^{1+\delta} |\check{\mathcal{E}}_2^{N-s}|^2 + r^{-1+\delta} |\check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{N-s}|^2 + r^{-3+\delta} |\check{\mathcal{A}}^{[N-1-s]} r \check{\mathcal{P}}_2^* (r \check{\nabla} r^2 \Omega \text{tr} \chi \cdot r \underline{\alpha}_{I^+})|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{\tau^s}. \quad (13.7.30)$$

This follows directly from Proposition 11.7.7 for the first two terms and is easily established for the third using that the bootstrap assumptions imply $\|r^{-1} [r \check{\nabla}]^{N+1} (r^2 \Omega \text{tr} \chi)\|_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}} \lesssim \varepsilon$ and $|r \underline{\alpha}| \lesssim \varepsilon \tau^{-1}$.

Step 3. Deriving the estimates for $l = 1, 2, \dots, N-2$. We first note that the right hand side of (13.7.15) controls also the following expressions

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty}^{I^+}(\tau)} |(\Omega \check{\nabla}_3)^{K+2} \check{\underline{A}}_{I^+}^{(0)}|^2 + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+}(\tau)} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} |(\Omega \check{\nabla}_3)^{K+2} \check{\underline{A}}_{I^+}^{(0)}|^2 \\ & + \int_{\check{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty}^{I^+}(\tau)} |(\Omega \check{\nabla}_3)^{K+1} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{I^+}^{(0)}|^2 + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+}(\tau)} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} |(\Omega \check{\nabla}_3)^{K+1} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{I^+}^{(0)}|^2 \lesssim \text{right hand side of (13.7.15)}. \end{aligned} \quad (13.7.31)$$

This follows immediately from the fluxes and integrated decay estimates of Propositions 13.7.1 and 13.7.3 after inserting the relation $\Omega\check{\nabla}_3 = -2R^* + \Omega\check{\nabla}_4$ and the relations (13.5.3) and (13.5.4) together with Theorem C.3.

We now repeat the proof of Step 2 for the commuted equations (13.7.20), (13.7.23) (and (13.7.21), (13.7.24) respectively) and fixed $l = 1, 2, \dots, N - 2$.¹² The proof is entirely analogous to Step 2 and therefore left to the reader. We only remark the following important points:

- Note that this time the boundary term $\int_{\check{C}_{v_\infty}^{I^+}(\tau)} |(\Omega\check{\nabla}_3)^l \check{\underline{A}}_{I^+}^{(0)}|^2$ appears for $K = 0$ (recall that control on this term corresponded to the “base case” of the induction in Step 2 and was deduced from Corollary 13.6.2) and $l = 1, \dots, N - 2$. Now this term is controlled by (13.7.31). Similarly, the spacetime term $\int_{\check{\mathcal{D}}^{I^+}(\tau) \cap \{r \geq \tilde{R}'\}} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} |(\Omega\check{\nabla}_3)^l \check{\underline{A}}_{I^+}^{(0)}|^2$ appearing for $K = 0$ is also controlled by (13.7.31).
- For the non-linear terms we now need in addition for $k + l \leq N$ and $k \geq 1$ the estimate

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}(\tau)} r^{-3} |[\Omega\check{\nabla}_3]^l \check{\mathcal{A}}^{[k]}(r\check{\nabla}r^2 \Omega \text{tr}\chi \cdot r\underline{\alpha})|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^s} \quad \text{for } s = 0, 1, 2.$$

This in turn follows as in the discussion below (13.7.7). For the top order term (all derivatives falling on $\Omega \text{tr}\chi$) we use the null structure equations until it becomes manifest that we can control the term using the bootstrap assumption on the energy defined in (6.1.19) and $|r\underline{\alpha}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\tau^2}$.

Having repeated the argument for $l = 1, 2, \dots, N - 2$, we have now established (13.7.15) except that the sums for $\check{\underline{A}}_{I^+}$ (over $|\underline{k}| \leq K + 2$) are restricted to tuples with $(k_1, k_2, 0)$ with $k_2 \leq K$ (i.e. at least two derivatives have to be angular) and the sums for $\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{I^+}$ (over $|\underline{k}| \leq K + 1$) are restricted to tuples with $(k_1, k_2, 0)$ with $k_2 \leq K$ (i.e. at least one derivative has to be angular). For $\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{I^+}$ the tuple $(K + 1, 0, 0)$ is controlled directly from (13.7.15) both on $\check{C}_{v_\infty}^{I^+}$ and in integrated decay, while for the term

$$\int_{\check{C}^{I^+}(u)} \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{l=0}^{K+1} |(\Omega\check{\nabla}_3)^l \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{I^+}|^2$$

one can insert (13.7.16) and reduce it to a flux already controlled. For $\check{\underline{A}}_{I^+}$ one applies the $(\Omega\check{\nabla}_3)^l$ -commuted analogue of (13.7.25) with $K = -1$. The wrong-signed term on the right hand side involving $|(\Omega\check{\nabla}_3)^l \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{I^+}^{(k)}|^2$ has now already been controlled and (13.7.15) is also shown for $\check{\mathfrak{D}}^{(1, K+1, 0)} \check{\underline{A}}_{I^+}$. Finally, for the tuple $\check{\mathfrak{D}}^{(0, K+2, 0)} \check{\underline{A}}_{I^+}$ the estimate (13.7.15) follows from (13.7.31). \square

Corollary 13.7.10. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ and $1 \leq K \leq N - 2$, we also have*

$$\sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^{K+2} \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \int_{\check{C}_u^{I^+} \cap \{r \geq R+2\}} \frac{1}{r^2} |\check{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{A}}_{I^+}|^2 \lesssim \text{right hand side of (13.7.15)}. \quad (13.7.32)$$

Proof. We can reduce to tuples with $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, 0)$ since otherwise using (13.5.3) reduces the expression to a flux involving $\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{I^+}$ appearing on the left of (13.7.15). If two or more derivatives are angular, we can insert (13.7.16) and again reduce the expression to a flux involving $\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{I^+}$ appearing on the left of (13.7.15). If one derivative is angular we can replace $\Omega\check{\nabla}_3 = -2R^* + \Omega\check{\nabla}_4$ and the flux is controlled by the flux on $\check{\underline{A}}$ appearing in Proposition 13.7.3 and a flux involving $\check{\underline{\Pi}}_{I^+}$ appearing on the left of (13.7.15). \square

13.7.6 The redshift estimates for $\underline{\Pi}$ and \underline{A}

We now improve the estimates (more specifically the Ω -weights) in $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(u_1)) \cap \{r \leq 9M_{\text{init}}/4\}$. We can assume wlog that $r_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, v = v(u_1)) < \frac{17}{8}M_{\text{init}}$ as otherwise we have a uniform lower bound on Ω^2 in all of $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$. Hence Ω^2 weights can be absorbed into constants and the statement below would follow directly from Propositions 13.7.4 and 13.7.7.

¹²More precisely, for each fixed l we repeat the proof for $K = 0, 1, \dots, N - 2 - l$.

Proposition 13.7.11. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau < u_f$ and $1 \leq K \leq N - 2$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0, k_3=0}^{K+2} \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v(\tau)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0, k_3=0}^{K+1} \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1))} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 \\
& + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K+2} \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1))} \Omega^2 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K+1} \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1))} \Omega^2 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 \\
& \lesssim \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \frac{1}{r^2} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq |k|}^{K+2} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K+1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^K |(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\
& + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v(\tau)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq |k|}^{K+2} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K-2)}}. \tag{13.7.33}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof will proceed in steps.

Step 0. Simplifying what is to show. The right hand side of the estimate claimed controls the right hand side of Propositions 13.7.4 and 13.7.7 hence we are free to use these estimates and Corollary 13.7.6. In particular, we only need to prove (13.7.33) with all integrals on the left restricted to the region $r \leq \check{R}$ because if we restrict all integrals to $r \geq \check{R}$, the corresponding estimates already hold by Propositions 13.7.4 and 13.7.7. This is what we will do. We also note in advance that it suffices to establish the estimate restricting to tuples $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, 0)$ also for the integrated decay terms. Indeed, one can use the relations (13.5.4) and (13.5.3) and Theorem C.3 to a posteriori treat all tuples $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$.

Step 1. Collecting the commuted equations. Key to the argument is the Bianchi pair

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) + \frac{2}{r} \Omega^2 (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) = -\Omega^2 r^2 \mathcal{D}_2^* d\ell v (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) - \frac{3M}{r} \Omega^2 (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) + \Omega^2 (\mathcal{E}^*)^1, \tag{13.7.34}$$

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (rd\ell v \Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) + \frac{4M}{r^2} (rd\ell v \Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) = \frac{2}{r^2} rd\ell v (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) + (\mathcal{E}^*)^1, \tag{13.7.35}$$

which after commutation with angular derivatives using the definition (13.3.26) reads for $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega \nabla_3 (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} + \frac{2}{r} \Omega^2 (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} &= -\Omega^2 r \mathcal{D}_2^* (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)} - \frac{3M}{r} \Omega^2 (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} + \Omega^2 (\mathcal{E}^*)^k, \\
\Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)} + \frac{4M}{r^2} (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)} &= \frac{2}{r^2} rd\ell v (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} + (\mathcal{E}^*)^k, \tag{13.7.36}
\end{aligned}$$

if k is odd and

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega \nabla_3 (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} + \frac{2}{r} \Omega^2 (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} &= -\Omega^2 rd\ell v (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)} - \frac{3M}{r} \Omega^2 (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} + \Omega^2 (\mathcal{E}^*)^k, \\
\Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)} + \frac{4M}{r^2} (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)} &= \frac{2}{r^2} r \mathcal{D}_2^* (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} + (\mathcal{E}^*)^k, \tag{13.7.37}
\end{aligned}$$

if k is even.

Step 2. Proving the estimate for tuples $\underline{k} = (k, 0, 0)$. We first prove (13.7.33) (with all integrals on the left restricted to $r \geq \check{R}$ as mentioned) for angular derivatives, i.e. with all sums on the left restricted to tuples with $\underline{k} = (|\underline{k}|, 0, 0)$. For each $k = 1, \dots, K+2$ we are going to generate an estimate as follows (and then add all of them). We contract the first equation with $2 (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)}$ and sum it with the second contracted with $r^2 \Omega^2 (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)}$. We then integrate over $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau)) \cap \{r \leq \check{R}\}$ if $v(\tau) < v(\check{R}, u_f)$ where \check{R} is defined in Corollary 13.7.6. This yields the desired estimate after observing that

- The terms on the left hand side produce the good boundary terms and spacetime terms appearing in the proposition noting that $\check{R} \leq 5M_{\text{init}}/2$. The boundary term on $r = \check{R}$ is controlled by Corollary 13.7.6.

- The angular-derivative terms on the left hand side cancel (after an integration by parts of the angular derivative) up to a nonlinear error error-term which is easily controlled.
- The non-linear terms are easily controlled by Cauchy–Schwarz and that for $s = 0, 1$ and any $k \leq N - s$ we have by Proposition 11.7.4

$$\int_{D(v(\tau))} \Omega^2 |(\mathcal{E}^\star)^k|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{\tau^{1+s}}. \quad (13.7.38)$$

- For the linear “error”, we note

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2)) \cap \{r \leq \hat{R}\}} \frac{6M}{r} \Omega^2 (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} \\ & \leq \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2)) \cap \{r \leq \hat{R}\}} \Omega^2 \left(\frac{3}{r} |(\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)}|^2 + \frac{3M^2}{r} |(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)}|^2 \right) \\ & \leq \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau_2)) \cap \{r \leq \hat{R}\}} \Omega^2 \left(\frac{3}{r} |(\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)}|^2 + 3M |(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)}|^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (13.7.39)$$

where we have used that $\frac{M}{r} \leq \frac{3}{4}$ and the elliptic estimate $\int_{S_{u,v}} |(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)}|^2 \leq \frac{4}{3} \int_{S_{u,v}} |\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)}|^2$. The right hand side can now be absorbed by the good terms on the left hand side (where they appear with 4 instead of 3).

Step 3. Proving the estimate for tuples $(k_1, k_2, 0)$ with $k_1 \geq 1$. We next commute (13.7.36) and (13.7.37) respectively with the redshift vectorfield $(\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3)^l$.¹³ The resulting equations read (restricting to k odd, the even case is treated analogously)

$$\begin{aligned} & \Omega \nabla_3 \left[\left(\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3 \right)^l (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} \right] + \frac{2}{r} \Omega^2 \left[\left(\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3 \right)^l (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} \right] = -\Omega^2 r \mathcal{D}_2^\star \left[\left(\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3 \right)^l (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)} \right] \\ & - \frac{3M}{r} \Omega^2 \left(\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3 \right)^l (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) + \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} h^i \left(\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3 \right)^i (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} + \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} h^i \left(\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3 \right)^i (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} + \Omega^2 (\mathcal{E}^\star)^{k+l} \\ & \Omega \nabla_4 \left[\left(\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3 \right)^l (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)} \right] + \frac{(4+2l)M}{r^2} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3 \right)^l (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)} \right] = \frac{2}{r^2} r d \not{v} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3 \right)^l (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} \right] \\ & + \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} h^i \left(\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3 \right)^i (\Omega^{-2} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)} + \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} h^i \left(\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3 \right)^i (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)} + (\mathcal{E}^\star)^{k+l} \end{aligned}$$

with h^i an admissible coefficient function of r (which may be different in different places). Since for $l = 0$, all estimates have been proven (for all k), it is clear that we can repeat the analysis of Step 1 and we proceed inductively in l to obtain (13.7.33) with the sums involving $\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ on the right hand side restricted to tuples of the form $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, 0)$ and $k_1 \geq 1$).

Step 4. Proving the estimate for tuples $(0, |\underline{k}|, 0)$ with $k_1 \geq 1$. The only missing bit in the proof of the estimate (13.7.33) is to control $\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ for tuples of the form $\underline{k} = (0, |\underline{k}|, 0)$, i.e. all derivatives being 3-derivatives. For this we apply the redshift estimates to the Teukolsky equation directly. We recall from Proposition 11.1.6 that $\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfies a tensorial wave equation of type 3_2 and that by Proposition 11.2.2,

¹³Computationally it is much easier to first divide the first of (13.7.36) by Ω^{-2} and then commute with $(\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3)^l$ before in the end multiplying by Ω^{-2} again.

$(\frac{1}{\Omega}\nabla_3)^l \Omega^{-4}\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ satisfies a tensorial wave equation of type $3_{2+l/2}$ with inhomogeneous term of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{3_{2+l/2}}^{lin} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\Omega}\nabla_3 \right)^l \Omega^{-4}\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] &= \sum_{i=0}^l h^i \left(\frac{1}{\Omega}\nabla_3 \right)^i (\Omega^{-2}\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) + \sum_{i=0}^l h^i \left(\frac{1}{\Omega}\nabla_3 \right)^i (\Omega^{-4}\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} h^i \left(\frac{1}{\Omega}\nabla_3 \right)^i \Delta (\Omega^{-4}\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) \end{aligned} \quad (13.7.40)$$

and non-linear error $\mathcal{F}_{3_{2+l/2}}^{nlin} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\Omega}\nabla_3 \right)^l \Omega^{-4}\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right] = \Omega^2(\mathcal{E}^*)^{1+l}$. We can hence apply Proposition 11.5.1. The non-linear error is easily estimated by the last term on the right hand side of (13.7.33). For the linear error we apply Cauchy-Schwarz and use the estimates already obtained to control $|\mathcal{F}_{3_{2+l/2}}^{lin}|^2$. This is obvious for the first and the third term on the right hand side of (13.7.40). For the second term, note that it involves only l derivatives but that we are estimating $l+1$ derivatives of $\Omega^{-4}\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$. The term can therefore be controlled by an elliptic estimate using that we already proved an estimate for $(\frac{1}{\Omega}\nabla_3)^l r d\!\!\!/\, v \Omega^{-4}\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in terms of the right hand side in (13.7.33). This proves that

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \int_{\underline{C}_{v(u)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \left| \left(\frac{1}{\Omega}\nabla_3 \right)^{l+1} \Omega^{-4}\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right|^2 + \int_{\dot{C}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau)) \cap \{r \leq 9M_{\text{init}}/4\}} \left| r \nabla \left(\frac{1}{\Omega}\nabla_3 \right)^l \Omega^{-4}\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right|^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{\dot{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} \left| \left(\frac{1}{\Omega}\nabla_3 \right)^{l+1} \Omega^{-4}\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \right|^2 \lesssim \text{right hand side of (13.7.33)}, \end{aligned} \quad (13.7.41)$$

thereby completing the proof. \square

Completely analogously we prove

Proposition 13.7.12. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau < u_f$ and $1 \leq K \leq N-2$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{|\underline{k}|=0, k_3=0}^{K+1} \int_{\underline{C}_{v(\tau)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} \Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^K \int_{\dot{C}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \\ &\lesssim \int_{\dot{C}_{\tau}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \frac{1}{r^2} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^{K+2} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K+1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^K |(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \int_{\underline{C}_{v(\tau)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq |\underline{k}|}^{K+2} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} (\Omega^{-4}\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K-2)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (13.7.42)$$

Proof. Key to the proof is the Bianchi pair

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} &= 2\Omega^2 r^2 \mathfrak{D}_2^* d\!\!\!/\, v (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) + \left(2\Omega^2 - \frac{6M}{r} \right) \Omega^2 \Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} - 3M\Omega^4 \Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \Omega^2 (\mathcal{E}^*)^2, \\ \Omega \nabla_4 (r d\!\!\!/\, v \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \Omega^{-2}) &+ \frac{2M}{r^2} (r d\!\!\!/\, v \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+} \Omega^{-2}) = -\frac{1}{r^2} r d\!\!\!/\, v \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} + (\mathcal{E}^*)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (13.7.43)$$

which after commutation with angular derivatives using the definition (13.3.26) reads for $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{(k-1)} &= 2\Omega^2 r \mathfrak{D}_2^* (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)} + \left(2 - \frac{6M}{r} \right) \Omega^2 (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} - 3M\Omega^4 (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} + \Omega^2 (\mathcal{E}^*)^{k+1}, \\ \Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)} &+ \frac{2M}{r^2} (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)} = -\frac{1}{r^2} r d\!\!\!/\, v \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)} + (\mathcal{E}^*)^{k+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (13.7.44)$$

if k is odd and

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}^{(k-1)} &= 2\Omega^2 r d\!\!\!/\, v (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)} + \left(2 - \frac{6M}{r} \right) \Omega^2 (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} - 3M\Omega^4 (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)} + \Omega^2 (\mathcal{E}^*)^{k+1}, \\ \Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)} &+ \frac{2M}{r^2} (\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)} = -\frac{1}{r^2} r \mathfrak{D}_2^* \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{(k-1)} + (\mathcal{E}^*)^{k+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (13.7.45)$$

if k is even. Contracting the first equation with $(\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k-1)}$ and summing it with the second contracted with $2r^2\Omega^2(\Omega^{-2}\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})^{(k)}$ yields after integration over $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau_1), v(\tau)) \cap \{r \leq \mathring{R}\}$ if $v(\tau) < v(\mathring{R}, u_f)$ (where \mathring{R} is defined in Corollary 13.7.6) the result for the sums restricted to tuples involving only angular derivatives. Now, if (at least) one of the derivatives of $\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}$ in the first sum of (13.7.42) is a $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivative, we can use (13.5.5) and the fluxes of Proposition 13.7.11 on $\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ to control all fluxes for $\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$. Similarly, if (at least) one of the $\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}$ in the second sum of (13.7.42) is a $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivative, we can use (13.5.7) and the fluxes of Proposition 13.7.11 (as well as the fluxes on $\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ just established) to control the associated flux. \square

13.7.7 Decay estimates for $\underline{\Pi}$ and \underline{A} : the proof of Theorem 13.5.2

We now recall the energies defined in Theorem 13.5.2 allowing us to concisely summarise the weighted estimates we have proven:

Proposition 13.7.13. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$, we have, for $3 \leq K \leq N$, the estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\square}^K[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \mathbb{E}_{\square}^K[\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) &\lesssim \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \frac{1}{r^2} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq |k|}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-2} |(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v(\tau)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq |k|}^K |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (13.7.46)$$

Proof. By Propositions 11.8.1 and 11.8.3 it suffices to prove the estimate replacing $\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}$ by $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}$ everywhere in the energies on the left hand side and this is what we will do.

For $\mathbb{E}_{\square}^K[\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau)$ this follows immediately from combining the estimates of Theorem C.3, Propositions 13.7.4 and 13.7.7 and Proposition 13.7.9 together with Corollary 13.7.10. Note in particular that we have, in view of Theorem C.3 the estimate

$$\int_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-2} |\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \lesssim \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{k=1}^{K-2} |(\nabla_{R^*})^k \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^{\min(2, N-K-2)}}. \quad (13.7.47)$$

For $\mathbb{E}_{\square}^K[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau))$, the integrated decay terms are already completely included in Proposition 13.7.11. For the fluxes on $v = v(\tau)$ we first note

$$\sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v(u)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq |k|}^{K-1} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 \lesssim \text{right hand side of (13.7.46)}. \quad (13.7.48)$$

Indeed, if $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, 0)$ the result is the statement of Proposition 13.7.12. If $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$ with $k_3 \geq 1$ (but $k_3 \neq |\underline{k}|!$) we insert the relation (13.5.4) and turn it into a flux involving $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ that is controlled by Theorem C.3. We next claim

$$\sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v(u)}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq |k|}^K |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 \lesssim \text{right hand side of (13.7.46)}. \quad (13.7.49)$$

Indeed, if $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, 0)$ the result is the statement of Proposition 13.7.11. If $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$ with $k_3 \geq 1$ (but $k_3 \neq |\underline{k}|!$) we insert the relation (13.5.3) and turn it into a flux controlled by (13.7.48).

Finally, we look at the fluxes on $u = u_f$ appearing in $\mathbb{E}_{\square}^K[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau))$. We first claim

$$\sum_{|\underline{k}|=0}^{K-1} \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-2} \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 \lesssim \text{right hand side of (13.7.46)}. \quad (13.7.50)$$

Indeed, if $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, 0)$ the result is the statement of Proposition 13.7.11. If $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$ with $k_3 \geq 1$ (but $k_3 \neq |\underline{k}|!$) we insert the relation (13.5.4) and turn it into a flux involving $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ that is controlled by

Proposition 13.7.12 and Theorem C.3. With (13.7.50) established, we next claim

$$\sum_{|\underline{k}|=0, k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^K \int_{\check{C}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau))} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 \lesssim \text{right hand side of (13.7.46)}. \quad (13.7.51)$$

It suffices to prove this estimate with the sum starting from $|\underline{k}| = 1$ in view of a simple elliptic estimate. If $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$ with $k_3 \neq 0$ we can use the relation (13.5.3) to turn the flux into a flux for $\check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ controlled by (13.7.50). Hence we can restrict to $k_3 = 0$. If one of the derivatives is angular (and hence the rest $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3$ derivatives) the flux is controlled by (13.7.41). If two derivatives are angular we can insert (13.7.34) and turn it into a flux controlled by (13.7.50). \square

The following proposition is easily seen to imply the statement of Theorem 13.5.2.

Proposition 13.7.14. *For any $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ we have for $s = 0, 1, 2$ the estimates*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\square}^{N-s} [\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v(\tau)) + \mathbb{E}_{\square}^{N-s} [\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^s} \quad (13.7.52)$$

Proof. This follows from applying the pigeonhole argument of [DR09a] to the left hand side of (13.7.46). \square

13.8 Concluding the main estimates for $\underline{\alpha}$

In this section we prove Theorem 13.5.1 from Theorem 13.5.2. To achieve this, we only need to extend all of our integrated decay estimates and flux estimates to the non-truncated regions and cones. The proof is almost identical to that for α seen previously in Section 13.4.

Step 1. We observe that the estimates of Theorem 13.5.2 continue to hold if we drop all check superscripts in the *spacetime integrals*. This follows easily from the relations for $\check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in the overlap region, i.e. by applying Proposition 10.4.1. As an immediate corollary using the definition of the timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B} we obtain:

Corollary 13.8.1. *For all $u_1 \leq \tau \leq u_f$ we have for $s = 0, 1, 2$ the estimate*

$$\sum_{|\underline{k}| \leq N-s} \int_{\mathcal{B}(\tau)} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^s}. \quad (13.8.1)$$

Step 2a. We observe that the estimates of Theorem 13.5.2 continue to hold if we replace the flux

$$\int_{\check{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left\{ \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0, k_3 \neq |\underline{k}|}^K |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_3 \neq |\underline{k}|}^{K-1} |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} \check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\}$$

by the flux over an arbitrary ingoing truncated cone in $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, i.e. integrating over $\int_{\check{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)}$ for any cone with $v \leq v_\infty$. Indeed, picking such a cone $\check{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)$ we can consider the spacetime region enclosed by $\check{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)$, \mathcal{B} , $\check{C}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and (potentially) $\check{C}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$. We reapply the estimates of Proposition 13.7.9 (integrating now over $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap J^-(\check{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau))$) using now the bounds on the cone $\check{C}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ established in Theorem 13.5.2 and the bounds on the hypersurface \mathcal{B} established in Corollary 13.8.1.

Step 2b. We observe that the estimates of Theorem 13.5.2 continue to hold if we replace the flux

$$\int_{\check{C}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \sum_{|\underline{k}|=0; k_2 \neq |\underline{k}|}^K |\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\underline{k}} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2$$

by the flux over an arbitrary outgoing truncated cone in $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, i.e. integrating over $\check{C}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)$ for any $u \leq u_f$. Indeed picking such a cone $\check{C}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)$ we can consider the region enclosed by $\check{C}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)$, $\check{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and \mathcal{B} . We repeat the proof of Proposition 13.7.11 (integrating now over $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v(\tau)) \cap J^-(\check{C}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v))$) using the estimates of Theorem 13.5.2 on the cone $\check{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and the bounds on the hypersurface \mathcal{B} established in Corollary 13.8.1. Using also the reasoning following (13.7.50) we deduce control of the fluxes on arbitrary truncated outgoing cones.

Step 3. We observe that the estimates of Theorem 13.5.2 continue to hold if we replace truncated by non-truncated cones in $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cup \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$. This proceeds by doing localised energy estimates (in regions where neither the r -weights nor Ω -weights play a role) for the non-linear Teukolsky equation entirely analogously to the case of P and \underline{P} seen in Chapter 12. We omit the standard details.

13.9 Completing the proof of Theorem C.4

To prove Theorem C.4 from Theorems 13.1.1 and 13.5.1, we only need to remove the “boxed” restrictions in the sums appearing in Theorems 13.1.1 and 13.5.1, i.e. to obtain control on the top-order fluxes of certain transversal derivatives. This is a direct consequence of certain relations between the gauge invariant hierarchies (α, ψ, P) and $(\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\psi}, \underline{P})$, known in linear theory (at the mode decomposed level in the physics literature) as the Teukolsky–Starobinsky identities.

13.9.1 Missing transversal fluxes for $\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$

Starting from Proposition 3.4.1 we derive the identities

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \Omega \check{\nabla}_3 \right)^2 \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} &= \frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \Omega \check{\nabla}_3 \right)^4 A_{\mathcal{H}^+} = 2r^4 \check{\mathcal{D}}_2^* \check{\mathcal{D}}_1^* \check{\mathcal{D}}_1 \check{\mathcal{D}}_2 A_{\mathcal{H}^+} + 6M(\Omega \check{\nabla}_3 + \Omega \check{\nabla}_4) A_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \mathcal{E}^3 \\ , -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \Omega \check{\nabla}_3 \right)^2 \Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+} &= \frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \Omega \check{\nabla}_3 \right)^4 A_{\mathcal{I}^+} = 2r^4 \check{\mathcal{D}}_2^* \check{\mathcal{D}}_1^* \check{\mathcal{D}}_1 \check{\mathcal{D}}_2 (r \check{r}^{-1} \check{A}_{\mathcal{I}^+}) + 6M(\Omega \check{\nabla}_3 + \Omega \check{\nabla}_4) \check{A}_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_0^3. \end{aligned}$$

To obtain the missing fluxes in Theorem 13.1.1, it suffices to prove for $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $\tau \geq u_1$:

$$\sup_{u \leq u_f} \int_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \sum_{k=0}^{N-s} |[\Omega^{-1} \check{\nabla}_3]^k A_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}, \quad (13.9.1)$$

$$\sup_{\tau \leq u \leq u_f} \int_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{N-s} r^{6-s} |[\Omega^{-1} \check{\nabla}_3]^k A_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1-s} r^2 |[\Omega^{-1} \check{\nabla}_3]^k \Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^s}. \quad (13.9.2)$$

We can split the sums into a sum for $k < 4$ and a sum $k \geq 4$. For the former we can (exploiting that the transversal fluxes are indeed included if we accept the loss of a derivative) estimate these fluxes (for fixed s) by $\mathbb{E}_{\square}^{4,2-s}[\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) + \mathbb{E}_{\square}^4[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau)$. For the latter we insert the above identities. For (13.9.2) it is then easy to see that for fixed s the flux is now controlled by $\mathbb{E}_{\square}^{N-s}[\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) + \mathbb{E}_{\square}^{N-s,2-s}[\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^s}$, which is in turn controlled by $\frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^s}$ from Theorems 13.1.1 and 13.5.1. Similarly, for the $(k \geq 4)$ -part of the sum of (13.9.1) inserting the first identity (note r -weights can be absorbed into constants in this region) shows that the flux can be controlled by $\mathbb{E}_{\square}^{N-s}[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) + \mathbb{E}_{\square}^{N-s,2-s}[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}$, which is in turn controlled by $\frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}$ from Theorems 13.1.1 and 13.5.1.

13.9.2 Missing transversal fluxes for $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$

Starting from Proposition 3.4.4 we derive the identities

$$-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \Omega \check{\nabla}_4 \right)^2 \Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+} = \frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \Omega \check{\nabla}_4 \right)^4 \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = 2r^4 \check{\mathcal{D}}_2^* \check{\mathcal{D}}_1^* \check{\mathcal{D}}_1 \check{\mathcal{D}}_2 \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} - 6M(\Omega \check{\nabla}_3 + \Omega \check{\nabla}_4) \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \mathcal{E}^3,$$

$$-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \Omega \nabla_4 \right)^2 \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \Omega \nabla_4 \right)^4 \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = 2r^4 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^* \mathcal{P}_1 \mathcal{P}_2 A_{\mathcal{I}^+} - 6M(\Omega \nabla_3 + \Omega \nabla_4) A_{\mathcal{I}^+} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_{7/2}^3.$$

Note that both sides of the first identity are regular at $u = u_f$ in view of the schematic identity (h_i a bounded function of r in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$)

$$\frac{\Omega^4}{r^4} \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \Omega \nabla_4 \right)^4 \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+} = \frac{1}{r^4} (r^2 \Omega \nabla_4)^4 (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) + \sum_{i=0}^3 h_i (\Omega \nabla_4)^i (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}) \quad (13.9.3)$$

To obtain the missing fluxes in Theorem 13.5.1, it suffices to prove for $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $\tau \geq u_1$:

$$\sup_{\check{v} \geq v_1} \int_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \Omega^2 \sum_{k=0}^{N-s} |(r \Omega \nabla_4)^k (\Omega^{-4} \underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+})|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s} \quad (13.9.4)$$

$$\sup_{v \leq v_\infty} \int_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{N-s} |(r \Omega \nabla_4)^k \check{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1-s} |(r \Omega \nabla_4)^k \check{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \right\} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^s} \quad (13.9.5)$$

For (13.9.5), using the splitting of sums argument of the previous section we reduce (after inserting (13.5.4)) the problem to establishing the estimate $\sup_{v \leq v_\infty} \int_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau)} \sum_{k=2}^{N-2-s} \frac{1}{r^2} |(r \Omega \nabla_4)^k \check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^s}$. This is easily proven by inserting the second estimate above which yields

$$(13.9.5) \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\square}^{N-s, 2-s} [\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) + \mathbb{E}_{\square}^{N-s} [\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau) + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^s} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^s},$$

with the last step following by applying Theorems 13.1.1 and 13.5.1. To establish (13.9.4) one proceeds analogously obtaining

$$(13.9.4) \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\square}^{N-s} [\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) + \mathbb{E}_{\square}^{N-s} [\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v) + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

with the last step following again by applying Theorems 13.1.1 and 13.5.1.

As mentioned above, Theorems 13.1.1 and 13.5.1 and the estimates (13.9.1), (13.9.2), (13.9.4), (13.9.5) prove Theorem C.4.

13.9.3 Two corollaries of the proof

We first record explicitly the following statement, which estimates the horizon quantities on the cones of the infinity gauge. It was actually already obtained in the process of the proof of Step 3 in Sections 13.4 and 13.8 respectively.

Corollary 13.9.1. *We have for $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $\tau \geq u_{-1}$ the estimates*

$$\sum_{|k|=0}^{N-1-s} \int_{\check{C}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} |\mathfrak{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^k \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|k|=0}^{N-1-s} \int_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} |\mathfrak{D}_{\check{\mathcal{K}}}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^k \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^s}, \quad (13.9.6)$$

$$\sum_{|k|=0}^{N-1-s} \int_{\check{C}_\tau^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} |\mathfrak{D}_{\check{\mathcal{K}}}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^k \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 + \sum_{|k|=0}^{N-1-s} \int_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(\tau) \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} |\mathfrak{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^k \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{\tau^s}. \quad (13.9.7)$$

Proof. Localised energy estimates in the horizon gauge on the infinity null cones produce these estimates with $\mathfrak{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ replaced by $\mathfrak{D}_{\check{\mathcal{K}}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ in the first, and $\mathfrak{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ replaced by $\mathfrak{D}_{\check{\mathcal{K}}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ in the second estimate. The additional transversal derivatives can be recovered a posteriori as stated using the Teukolsky–Starobinski identities as in Section 13.9. \square

The second corollary illustrates the following fact: While working with the weight \check{r} instead of r for the underlined quantities was essential to improve the error in the wave equation for $\underline{\check{P}}$ (as compared to \underline{P}) in order to derive optimal estimates, a posteriori, the estimates for the energies (6.1.11), (6.1.12) hold verbatim with the “usual” weight r . [We do note in this context, however, that the highest r -weighted estimates proven for $\Omega\nabla_4(r^5\underline{\check{P}}_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ may not hold verbatim for $\Omega\nabla_4(r^5\underline{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+})$, related to the fact that (13.9.9) below may fail for $i \leq 3$. This fact is irrelevant for future applications.] This conversion is important when one wants to estimate curvature components with the usual r -weights from the (\check{r} -weighted) almost gauge invariant quantities in Chapter 14. See for instance the identities of Proposition 3.4.3.

Corollary 13.9.2. *The estimates of Theorem C.4 remain true if one replaces*

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\check{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} &= \check{r}\Omega^2\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+} & \text{by} & & \underline{A}_{\mathcal{I}^+} &= r\Omega^2\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \\ \underline{\check{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} &= r^3\Omega\underline{\check{\psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} & \text{by} & & \underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} &= \frac{r}{\check{r}}\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \\ \underline{\check{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} &= r^5\underline{\check{P}}_{\mathcal{I}^+} & \text{by} & & \underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} &= \frac{r}{\check{r}}\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} \end{aligned} \tag{13.9.8}$$

in the definition of the energies (6.1.11), (6.1.12).

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of the definitions of these quantities, the estimate

$$\sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \sum_{|\underline{k}|+i \leq N; i \leq 2} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(r^2\Omega\nabla_4)^i \left(\frac{\check{r}}{r} - 1 \right)\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \varepsilon \tag{13.9.9}$$

following easily from (3.4.6) and the bootstrap assumptions. □

Chapter 14

Estimates in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge: the proof of Theorem C.5

In this chapter we shall prove Theorem C.5, which we restate here:

Theorem C.5 (Estimates for geometric quantities in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge). *Under the assumptions of Theorem C, then for all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$ and all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, with the gauges as defined above, it follows that the geometric quantities in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge satisfy the estimates*

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Contents

14.1	Schematic form of the equations and the quantity Y	284
14.1.1	Recalling the gauge conditions	284
14.1.2	Equations in the 3-direction	285
14.1.3	Equations in the 4-direction	287
14.1.4	Elliptic relations	289
14.1.5	Commutation principle	290
14.1.6	The auxiliary quantities Y and B	290
14.2	Non-linear error estimates	292
14.2.1	Preliminaries	292
14.2.2	Error estimates on $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$	294
14.2.3	Error estimates on $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$	295
14.2.4	Error estimates in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$	296
14.2.5	The error term in the evolution equation of B	297
14.3	The proof of Theorem C.5: transport and elliptic estimates	300
14.3.1	Overview of the proof of Theorem C.5	300
14.3.2	The basic elliptic estimates	301
14.3.3	The basic transport estimates	303
14.3.4	Estimates for the angular master energy for quantities on $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$	303
14.3.5	Estimates for the angular master energy for quantities on $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$	313
14.3.6	Estimates for the angular master energy for quantities in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$	318
14.3.7	Estimates for the angular master energy for the metric components	338
14.3.8	Estimates for the auxiliary energies for ω and $\underline{\omega}$	339
14.3.9	Estimates the full master energy	344

In **Section 14.1** we derive, after recalling the gauge conditions, a schematic form of the non-linear null structure and Bianchi equations in the infinity gauge, including a commutation principle governing the behaviour of these equations under angular commutation. It is also in this section where the renormalised auxiliary quantity Y is introduced (which, as mentioned in the introduction, will be instrumental in estimating the quantity $\hat{\chi}$) and its propagation equation is being derived.

Non-linear error estimates are collected in **Section 14.2**.

Finally, Theorem C.5 is proven in **Section 14.3** via transport and elliptic estimates.

As in the previous chapters of Part C, we shall assume throughout the assumptions of Theorem C. Let us fix an arbitrary $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$, with $\hat{u}_f \in \mathfrak{B}$, and fix some $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$. In this chapter, all propositions below shall always refer to the anchored \mathcal{I}^+ gauge in the spacetime $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$, corresponding to parameters $u_f, M_f(u_f, \lambda)$, whose existence is ensured by Definition 7.1.1. Thus, we drop the \mathcal{I}^+ superscripts for geometric quantities without risk of confusion, writing $\alpha = \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $C_u = C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, etc. We shall denote $M = M_f$ throughout this chapter.

From Part C, this chapter will only depend on Chapter 9, 12 and 13. Moreover, Chapters 9 and 13 are only appealed to through the estimate in the statement of Theorems C.3 and C.4. Thus, the chapter can be read independently of Chapter 10 but also of the entire gauge-invariant unit Chapters 11–13.

We note that the additional schematic notation of Section 14.1 will only be used in the present chapter. (We note, however, that as Section 14.1 is exclusively algebraic, it in fact lies outside of the proof of Theorem C and may be read immediately after Section 3.)

The reader may wish to compare with the proofs of both Theorems 3 and 4 of [DHR] in Sections 13 and 14, respectively, for linear analogues of results proven here, in particular for the role of linearised version $\overset{(i)}{Y}$ of quantity Y .

14.1 Schematic form of the equations and the quantity Y

In this section, we provide the schematic form of the null structure and Bianchi equations in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge.

We begin in **Section 14.1.1** by recalling the gauge conditions that hold in the infinity gauge as these provide some intuition about writing the equations in the particular form given later.

We then spell out the schematic form of the equations in the 3- and 4-directions, in **Section 14.1.2** and **Section 14.1.3** respectively, followed by the elliptic relations on the spheres of the double null foliation in **Section 14.1.4**. This makes use of the schematic error notation from Sections 3.2.8 and 3.2.9.

A commutation principle for angular commutation is stated in **Section 14.1.5**. Finally, in **Section 14.1.6**, the important auxiliary quantity Y (and the related quantity B), discussed already in the introduction Section V.8, is introduced and its propagation equation is derived.

14.1.1 Recalling the gauge conditions

We recall from Definition 2.2.1 that the solution in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ satisfies:

- (1) $r^2 T_{\ell \neq 1} = r^2 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell \neq 1} = 0$ on S_{u_f, v_∞} on S_{u_f, v_∞} ,
- (2) $r^5 (d\text{tr} \Omega \beta)_{\ell=1} = 0$ on S_{u_f, v_∞} ,
- (3) $r^2 \underline{T} = r^2 \left(\frac{\text{tr} \chi}{\Omega} - \frac{\text{tr} \chi_\circ}{\Omega_\circ} \right) = 0$ on S_{u_f, v_∞} ,
- (4) $\mu_{\ell \geq 1} = 0$ on $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ (recall (1.1.13) for the definition of μ),
- (5) $(\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=0} = 0$ on $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$,
- (6) $(\underline{\mu}^\dagger)_{\ell \geq 1} = 0$ on $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ (see (14.1.1) below),

- (7) $(\omega - \omega_o)_{\ell=0}(u_{-1}, v) = F(u_0) \frac{\Omega_o^2}{r^3}$ on $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, where $F(u) := \frac{1}{2} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{\bar{u}}^{u_f} d\hat{u} r^3 (\Omega \hat{\chi} \underline{\alpha})_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}, v_\infty)$,
(8) $b = 0$ on $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$.

We recall also from (2.2.4) that

$$\underline{\mu}^\dagger = \rho + 2Mr^{-3} + d\#v\eta - \frac{1}{2}\hat{\chi}\hat{\chi} + \frac{1}{2r}\Omega_o^2 T, \quad (14.1.1)$$

and from Definition 2.2.1 and (7.1.8), (2.2.6) respectively

$$(\rho r^3)_{\ell=0} =: -2M \quad \text{and} \quad r^5(c\#rl\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1, m=0, \pm 1} \in \left[-\frac{\varepsilon_0}{u_f}, \frac{\varepsilon_0}{u_f} \right] \quad \text{at } S_{u_f, v_\infty}. \quad (14.1.2)$$

Finally from (5.6.3) we recall our definition of $v_\infty = \varepsilon_0^{-2}(u_f)^{\frac{1}{8}}$.

14.1.2 Equations in the 3-direction

The reader might wish to recall the schematic notation for non-linear error terms defined in Sections 3.2.8 and 3.2.9 before reading the next proposition.

Proposition 14.1.1 (Null structure equations in the 3-direction).

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (r^2 T) = -2 (\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2) - r^2 |\hat{\chi}|^2 + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_1^{(in)} \quad (14.1.3)$$

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (Tr) = -\Omega_o^4 T + \frac{2}{r} \Omega_o^2 (\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2) + \boxed{2\Omega^2 r (\mu - \rho_o)} - \frac{4M}{r^2} (\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2) + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_3^{(in)} \quad (14.1.4)$$

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (r^2 \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}) = -\Omega r^2 + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_0^{(in)} \quad (14.1.5)$$

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (r^2 \Omega \hat{\chi}) = \frac{\Omega_o^2}{r} (r^2 \Omega \hat{\chi}) - 2r^2 \Omega^2 \mathcal{P}_2^\star \eta - \Omega_o^4 (r \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}) + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_1^{(in)} \quad (14.1.6)$$

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (r \eta) = -\Omega^2 \eta + \Omega r \beta + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_2^{(in)} \quad (14.1.7)$$

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (r^2 \eta) = 2r^2 \nabla (\omega - \omega_o) - \Omega r^2 \beta + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_1^{(in)} \quad (14.1.8)$$

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (\omega - \omega_o) = -\Omega^2 \left((\rho - \rho_o) - \frac{2M}{r^3} \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_o^2}{\Omega^2} \right) \right) + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_4^{(out)} \quad (14.1.9)$$

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_o^2}{\Omega^2} \right) = 2(\omega - \omega_o) - (\omega - \omega_o) \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_o^2}{\Omega^2} \right) \quad (14.1.10)$$

Moreover, for the error-term in (14.1.9) we could also replace the superscript (out) by (in).

We finally collect the equation for the renormalised conjugate mass aspect (14.1.1):

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (r^2 \underline{\mu}^\dagger) = \frac{2\Omega_o^2}{r^2} (r^3 (\rho - \rho_o)) + \frac{\Omega_o^2}{r^2} \left(1 + \frac{2M}{r} \right) r^2 T - \frac{1 + \frac{4M}{r}}{r^2} r (\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2) - \boxed{\Omega_o^2 r (\mu - \rho_o)} + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_2^{(in)}. \quad (14.1.11)$$

Proof. Follows from the equations of Section 1.2.1 and the definitions for the non-linear errors. \square

Corollary 14.1.2. All Γ_p except $\Omega^{-2}(\omega - \omega_o)$ and b satisfy a schematic equation of the form

$$\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3 (r^p \Gamma_p) = \sum_{\Phi_{p'}} h_{\Phi_{p'}}^{(in)} \cdot r^{p'} \Phi_{p'}^{(in)} + \sum_{\Gamma_{p'} \in \{\eta, \Omega^{-2}(\omega - \omega_o)\}} h_{\Gamma_{p'}} \cdot r \nabla (r^{p'} \Gamma_{p'}) + \mathcal{E}_0^0, \quad (14.1.12)$$

with the first sum ranging over all $\Phi_{p'}^{(in)}$ (of the same tensorial type as the Γ_p appearing on the left) and $h_{\Phi_{p'}^{(in)}}$ and $h_{\Gamma_{p'}}$ being admissible coefficient functions of r (see (3.2.1)). For the same Γ_p we also have the following alternative form arising from subtracting the Kerr reference solutions:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3(r^p(\Gamma_p - (\Gamma_p)_{\text{Kerr}})) &= \sum_{\Phi_{p'}^{(in)}} h_{\Phi_{p'}^{(in)}} \cdot r^{p'} (\Phi_{p'}^{(in)} - (\Phi_{p'}^{(in)})_{\text{Kerr}}) \\ &+ \sum_{\Gamma_{p'} \in \{\eta, \Omega^{-2}(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o)\}} h_{\Gamma_{p'}} \cdot r \nabla(r^{p'}(\Gamma_{p'} - (\Gamma_{p'})_{\text{Kerr}})) + \mathcal{E}_0^{(in)} + \mathcal{E}^{(Kerr)}. \end{aligned} \quad (14.1.13)$$

Remark 14.1.3. The point here is that derivatives of curvature do not appear on the right hand side. The only (potential) terms containing first order derivatives are linear terms involving $\eta, \Omega^{-2}(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o)$. Our notation also captures that applying a 3-derivative to Γ_p preserves (or improves) the overall decay in r .

Proof. Direct inspection of the equations in Proposition 14.1.1. For the second schematic form we subtract the Kerr reference solutions. We give one example. For (14.1.7) we observe

$$\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3(r \eta_{\text{Kerr}}) = \frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3(-\frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{m=-1}^1 a^m r^* \nabla Y_m^{\ell=1}) = -2 \frac{\Omega_o^2}{\Omega^2} \eta_{\text{Kerr}} - \frac{1}{r} \sum_{m=-1}^1 a^m \frac{1}{\Omega^2} (\Omega \nabla_3 r^* \nabla Y_m^{\ell=1})$$

and

$$-\eta_{\text{Kerr}} + r(\beta \Omega^{-1})_{\text{Kerr}} = -2\eta_{\text{Kerr}}$$

which means we can write

$$\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3(r \eta - r \eta_{\text{Kerr}}) = -\eta + \eta_{\text{Kerr}} + r((\Omega^{-1} \beta) - (\Omega^{-1} \beta)_{\text{Kerr}}) + \mathcal{E}_2^{(in)} + \frac{1}{r} \mathcal{E}^{(Kerr)}$$

which after putting in an additional factor of r in the bracket on the left is of the desired form. \square

Proposition 14.1.4 (Bianchi equations in the 3-direction).

$$\Omega \nabla_3(\rho r^3 + 2M) = -r \Omega^2 d\sharp v(\Omega^{-1} r^2 \underline{\beta}) + 3M \hat{\underline{T}} + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_0^0 \quad (14.1.14)$$

$$\Omega \nabla_3(\sigma r^3) = -\Omega^2 r c \sharp l(\Omega^{-1} r^2 \underline{\beta}) - \frac{1}{2} \Omega r^3 \hat{\chi} \wedge \underline{\alpha} + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_1^0 \quad (14.1.15)$$

$$\Omega \nabla_3(r^2 \Omega \underline{\beta}) = \Omega^2 r^2 \nabla \rho + \Omega^2 r^2 \nabla \sigma + 3\eta r^2 \rho_o \Omega^2 + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_2^0 \quad (14.1.16)$$

$$\Omega \nabla_3(r^4 \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}) = -\Omega^2 r^3 d\sharp v(\Omega^{-2} r \underline{\alpha}) + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_{-1}^0 \quad (14.1.17)$$

where $\hat{\underline{T}} = \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_o$ and we note the relation $\hat{\underline{T}} = \Omega^2 \underline{T} - \frac{2}{r} (\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)$.

Proof. Follows from the equations of Section 1.2.2 and the definitions for the non-linear errors. \square

Corollary 14.1.5. All curvature components $\mathcal{R}_p \in \{\Omega \beta, \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}, \rho, \sigma\}$ satisfy a schematic equation of the form

$$\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3(r^p \mathcal{R}_p) = \sum_{i=0}^1 \sum_{i, \Phi_{p'}^{(in)}} h_{i, \Phi_{p'}^{(in)}} \cdot [r \nabla]^i \left(r^{p'} \Phi_{p'}^{(in)} \right) + \mathcal{E}_0^0, \quad (14.1.18)$$

with the first sum ranging over all $\Phi_{p'}^{(in)}$ and the $h_{i, \Phi_{p'}^{(in)}}$ admissible coefficient functions of r (see (3.2.1)). Alternatively, we can write

$$\frac{1}{\Omega} \nabla_3(r^p(\mathcal{R}_p - (\mathcal{R}_p)_{\text{Kerr}})) = \sum_{i=0}^1 \sum_{i, \Phi_{p'}^{(in)}} h_{i, \Phi_{p'}^{(in)}} \cdot [r \nabla]^i \left(r^{p'} \left(\Phi_{p'}^{(in)} - (\Phi_{p'}^{(in)})_{\text{Kerr}} \right) \right) + \mathcal{E}_0^0 + \mathcal{E}^{(Kerr)}. \quad (14.1.19)$$

Proof. The first form can be read off directly from the equations of Proposition 14.1.4. To obtain the second form we subtract the Kerr reference solutions. We again give one example leaving the remaining straightforward computations to the reader. For σ we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(r^3\sigma_{\text{Kerr}}) &= \frac{3M}{r^2} \sum_{m=-1}^1 a^m \cdot 2Y_m^{\ell=1} + \frac{6M}{r} \sum_{m=-1}^1 a^m \Omega \nabla_4 Y_m^{\ell=1} \\ rclrl(r^2(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\text{Kerr}}) &= \frac{3M}{r^2} \sum_{m=-1}^1 a^m r^2 \Delta Y_m^{\ell=1}\end{aligned}\tag{14.1.20}$$

Adding the two equation we see that the error on the right hand side can be incorporated into $\overset{(Kerr)}{\mathcal{E}}$. \square

14.1.3 Equations in the 4-direction

Proposition 14.1.6 (Null structure equations in the 4-direction).

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 T \Omega^{-2}) = 4r (\omega - \omega_o) - |\hat{\chi}|^2 r^2 - \frac{1}{2} T^2 \Omega^{-2} = 4r (\omega - \omega_o) + \Omega^{-2} \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}}_2^0 \tag{14.1.21}$$

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^2 \underline{T} r) = +\Omega_o^2 T + 4\Omega^2 (\omega - \omega_o) + 2\Omega^2 r (\underline{\mu} - \rho_o) + \Omega^2 \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}}_3^0 \tag{14.1.22}$$

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^2 \underline{T} r^2) = +\Omega_o^2 r T + 4r \Omega^2 (\omega - \omega_o) + \boxed{2\Omega^2 r^2 \underline{\mu}^\dagger} + \Omega^2 \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}}_2^0 \tag{14.1.23}$$

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}) = -\alpha r^2 + \Omega^{-2} \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}}_2^0 \tag{14.1.24}$$

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r \Omega \hat{\chi}) = -2\Omega^2 r \Phi_2^* \underline{\eta} + \Omega^2 \hat{\chi} \Omega + \Omega^2 \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}}_3^0. \tag{14.1.25}$$

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r \underline{\eta}) = \Omega^2 \underline{\eta} - \Omega r \beta + \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}}_3^0 \tag{14.1.26}$$

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r \underline{\eta}) = 2r \nabla \omega + \Omega r \beta + \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}}_2^0 \tag{14.1.27}$$

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o) = -\Omega^2 \left((\rho - \rho_o) - \frac{2M}{r^3} \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_o^2}{\Omega^2} \right) \right) + \Omega^2 \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_4^0 \tag{14.1.28}$$

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_o^2}{\Omega^2} \right) = 2(\omega - \omega_o) - (\omega - \omega_o) \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_o^2}{\Omega^2} \right). \tag{14.1.29}$$

Moreover, for the error term in (14.1.28) we could also replace the superscript (in) by (out).

We finally collect the evolution equation of the (linearised) mass aspect (cf. (1.1.13)):

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 (\rho - \rho_o + d\text{v}\eta)) = -2\Omega_o^2 r (\rho - \rho_o) + \frac{3M}{r} T - \frac{1}{2} \Omega_o^4 \underline{T} + \boxed{\Omega_o^2 r \underline{\mu}^\dagger} + \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}}_2^1. \tag{14.1.30}$$

Proof. Follows from the equations of Section 1.2.1 and the definitions for the non-linear errors. \square

Corollary 14.1.7. All Γ_p except $(\omega - \omega_o)$ and b satisfy a schematic equation of the form

$$r \Omega \nabla_4 (r^p \Gamma_p) = \sum_{\Phi_{p'}'} h_{\Phi_{p'}'} \cdot r^{p'} \overset{(out)}{\Phi_{p'}} + \sum_{\Gamma_{p'}' \in \{\underline{\eta}, \omega - \omega_o\}} h_{\Gamma_{p'}'} \cdot r \nabla (r^{p'} \Gamma_{p'}') + \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}}_1^0, \tag{14.1.31}$$

with the first sum ranging over all $\overset{(out)}{\Phi'_{p'}}$ (of the same tensorial type as Γ_p on the left) and $h_{\overset{(out)}{\Phi'_{p'}}}$ and $h_{\Gamma'_{p'}}$ being admissible coefficient functions of r (see (3.2.1)). Alternatively, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} r\Omega\nabla_4(r^p\Gamma_p - r^p(\Gamma_p)_{Kerr}) &= \sum h_{\overset{(out)}{\Phi'_{p'}}} \left(r^{p'} \overset{(out)}{\Phi'_{p'}} - r^{p'} (\overset{(out)}{\Phi'_{p'}})_{Kerr} \right) \\ &+ \sum_{\Gamma'_{p'} \in \{\underline{\eta}, \omega - \omega_o\}} h_{\Gamma'_{p'}} \cdot r\nabla \left(r^{p'} \Gamma'_{p'} - r^{p'} (\Gamma'_{p'})_{Kerr} \right) + \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}}_1^0 + \overset{(Kerr)}{\mathcal{E}}, \end{aligned} \quad (14.1.32)$$

and also, a bit more refined,

$$\begin{aligned} r\Omega\nabla_4(r^p\Gamma_p - r^p(\Gamma_p)_{Kerr}) &= \sum h_{\overset{(in)}{\Phi'_{p'}}} \left(r^{p'} \overset{(in)}{\Phi'_{p'}} - r^{p'} (\overset{(in)}{\Phi'_{p'}})_{Kerr} \right) + h_{\underline{\eta}} \cdot [r\nabla] \left(\underline{\eta} - \underline{\eta}_{Kerr} \right) r^2 + \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}}_1^0 + \overset{(Kerr)}{\mathcal{E}} \\ &+ \frac{h_\beta}{r} (r^4\beta - r^4\beta_{Kerr}) + \frac{h_\alpha}{r} (r^4\alpha) + \sum_{i=0}^1 \frac{h_{i,\omega}}{\sqrt{r}} [r\nabla]^i ((\omega - \omega_o) r^{\frac{5}{2}}) \end{aligned} \quad (14.1.33)$$

for admissible coefficient functions $h_{\underline{\eta}}, h_\alpha, h_\beta, h_{i,\omega}$ depending only on r .

Remark 14.1.8. The form (14.1.33) makes manifest that the “anomalous” quantities α, β and $\omega - \omega_o$ can only enter on the right hand side with an additional gain of at least a power of $r^{-1/2}$ (in fact, a full gain of r^{-1} if α or β enter). This will ensure that the right hand side decays like u^{-1} at the low orders, which cannot be deduced from the form (14.1.32).

Proof. Analogous to the 3-direction. \square

Proposition 14.1.9 (Bianchi equations in the 4-direction).

$$\Omega\nabla_4(\rho r^3 + 2M) = +r^3 d\nabla\Omega\beta + 3MT + \mathcal{E}_2^0 \quad (14.1.34)$$

$$\Omega\nabla_4(\sigma r^3 + \sigma_{Kerr} r^3) = -r^3 c\nabla l(\Omega\beta - (\Omega\beta)_{Kerr}) + \mathcal{E}_2^0 + \Omega\nabla_4(\sigma_{Kerr} r^3) - r^3 c\nabla l(\Omega\beta)_{Kerr} \quad (14.1.35)$$

$$\Omega\nabla_4(r^4\Omega^{-1}\beta) = r^4 d\nabla\alpha + \Omega^{-2}\mathcal{E}_2^0 \quad (14.1.36)$$

$$\Omega\nabla_4(r^2\Omega\underline{\beta}) = -\Omega^2 r^2 \nabla\rho + \Omega^2 r^2 \nabla\sigma - 3\underline{\eta} r^2 \rho_o \Omega^2 + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_2^0. \quad (14.1.37)$$

Proof. Follows from the equations of Section 1.2.2 and the definitions for the non-linear errors. \square

Corollary 14.1.10. All curvature components $\mathcal{R}_p \in \{\Omega\beta, \Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}, \rho, \sigma\}$ satisfy a schematic equation of the form

$$r\Omega\nabla_4(r^p\mathcal{R}_p) = \sum_{i=0}^1 \sum h_{\overset{(out)}{i, \Phi'_{p'}}} \cdot [r\nabla]^i \left(r^{p'} \overset{(out)}{\Phi'_{p'}} \right) + \mathcal{E}_1^0, \quad (14.1.38)$$

with the first sum ranging over all $\overset{(out)}{\Phi'_{p'}}$ and the $h_{\overset{(out)}{i, \Phi'_{p'}}}$ admissible coefficient functions of r (see (3.2.1)). Alternatively we can write

$$r\Omega\nabla_4(r^p\mathcal{R}_p - r^p(\mathcal{R}_p)_{Kerr}) = \sum_{i=0}^1 \sum h_{\overset{(out)}{i, \Phi'_{p'}}} \cdot [r\nabla]^i \left(r^{p'} \overset{(out)}{\Phi'_{p'}} - r^{p'} (\overset{(out)}{\Phi'_{p'}})_{Kerr} \right) + \mathcal{E}_1^0 + r \cdot \overset{(Kerr)}{\mathcal{E}}, \quad (14.1.39)$$

where also $r \cdot \overset{(Kerr)}{\mathcal{E}}$ can be replaced by $\overset{(Kerr)}{\mathcal{E}}$ unless $\mathcal{R}_p = \Omega\beta$.

Finally, for the $\mathcal{R}_p \in \{\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}, \rho, \sigma\}$, i.e. the curvature components in $\overset{(in)}{\Phi}$, we can also write

$$\begin{aligned} r\Omega\overset{\nabla}{\nabla}_4(r^p\mathcal{R}_p - r^p(\mathcal{R}_p)_{\text{Kerr}}) &= \sum_{i=0}^1 \sum_{i, \Phi'_{p'}} h_{i, \Phi'_{p'}}^{(in)} \cdot [r\overset{\nabla}{\nabla}]^i \left(r^{p'} \overset{(in)}{\Phi'}_{p'} - r^{p'} (\overset{(in)}{\Phi'}_{p'})_{\text{Kerr}} \right) + \overset{(Kerr)}{\mathcal{E}}_1^0 + \overset{(Kerr)}{\mathcal{E}} \\ &\quad + \frac{h_\beta}{r} [r\overset{\nabla}{\nabla}] (r^4\beta r^4 - r^4\beta_{\text{Kerr}}). \end{aligned} \quad (14.1.40)$$

Remark 14.1.11. The form (14.1.40) makes manifest that if an $r\Omega\overset{\nabla}{\nabla}_4$ derivatives falls on a non-anomalous curvature component, then an anomalous component can only appear on the right hand side with an additional gain of r^{-1} . See Remark 14.1.8.

Proof. Analogous to the 3-direction. \square

14.1.4 Elliptic relations

Proposition 14.1.12. We have the following elliptic relations:

$$r^3 c\psi r l \eta = -r^3 c\psi r l \underline{\eta} = r^3 \sigma - \frac{1}{2} r^3 \hat{\chi} \wedge \hat{\underline{\chi}} \quad (14.1.41)$$

$$r^3 d\psi v \eta = \boxed{r^3 \mu + 2M_f} - r^3 \rho - 2M_f + \frac{1}{2} r^3 \hat{\chi} \hat{\underline{\chi}} \quad (14.1.42)$$

$$r^3 d\psi v \underline{\eta} = \boxed{r^3 \underline{\mu}^\dagger} - r^3 \rho - 2M_f + \frac{1}{2} r^3 \hat{\chi} \hat{\underline{\chi}} - \frac{1}{2} \Omega_o^2 r^2 \underline{T} \quad (14.1.43)$$

$$2(r^2 \underline{\Delta} + \Omega_o^2) (\omega - \omega_o) = \boxed{\Omega \overset{\nabla}{\nabla}_4(r^2 \underline{\mu}^\dagger)} - 2r^2 d\psi v (\Omega \beta) + (Tr^3) \left(-\frac{\Omega_o^2}{2r^3} - \frac{3M}{r^4} \right) + \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}}_3^1 \quad (14.1.44)$$

$$2r^2 \underline{\Delta} \omega = \boxed{\frac{1}{r} \Omega \overset{\nabla}{\nabla}_3(r^3 \mu)} + 2r^2 \Omega^2 d\psi v (\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}) - (\hat{T} r^2) \left(\frac{3M}{r^3} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Omega_o^2}{r} r^2 |\hat{\underline{\chi}}|^2 + \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_2^1 \quad (14.1.45)$$

and

$$\left[r^2 \overset{\star}{\mathcal{P}}_2^* d\psi v + \frac{3M}{r} \right] r^2 \Omega \hat{\chi} = -r^4 \Omega \psi - \Omega_o^2 r^3 \overset{\star}{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \underline{\eta} + \frac{1}{2} r^2 \overset{\star}{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \overset{\nabla}{\nabla} (r^2 T) + \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}}_1^1 \quad (14.1.46)$$

$$\left[r^2 \overset{\star}{\mathcal{P}}_2^* d\psi v + \frac{3M}{r} \right] r \Omega^{-1} \hat{\underline{\chi}} = r^3 \Omega^{-1} \frac{r}{\hat{r}} \hat{\underline{\psi}} + \frac{1}{r} r^3 \overset{\star}{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \eta + \frac{1}{2r} r^2 \overset{\star}{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \overset{\nabla}{\nabla} (r^2 \underline{T}) + \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_1^1 + \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_1^0. \quad (14.1.47)$$

Finally, the Gauss equation

$$K - K_o = -\rho + \rho_o + \frac{1}{2} \hat{\chi} \hat{\underline{\chi}} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Omega_o^2}{r} \underline{T} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{r} T - \frac{1}{4} T \underline{T} = \boxed{-\mu + \rho_o} + d\psi v \eta - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Omega_o^2}{r} \underline{T} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{r} T - \frac{1}{4} T \underline{T}. \quad (14.1.48)$$

Proof. Direct computation from the Bianchi and null structure equations. For (14.1.47) recall Proposition 3.4.3, whose proof also gives that $\overset{\star}{\mathcal{E}}_1^0$ does not contain the components α, β, ω . \square

Remark 14.1.13. The linear terms in boxes will vanish (after projection of the equation to $\ell \geq 1$ or equivalently angular commutation) up to non-linear terms along one of the hypersurfaces defining the gauge, as seen from the gauge conditions (6) and (4).

Remark 14.1.14. Note already that after projection to $\ell \geq 1$ the right hand side of (14.1.11) decays as r^{-2} suggesting that the quantity $(r^3 \underline{\mu}^\dagger)_{\ell \geq 1}$ is conserved along null-infinity. This is the main reason for introducing the renormalised mass aspect (14.1.1). See Proposition 14.3.9.

14.1.5 Commutation principle

We finally note the following commutation principle, which is tailored to be applied to the schematic transport equations in the previous subsection (and we will do so frequently). The main point here is that the error from commuting the transport operator with angular derivatives can be incorporated into the non-linear error with the correct r -weight by Lemma 3.3.1.

Lemma 14.1.15. *The transport equations (14.1.3)–(14.1.11) and (14.1.21)–(14.1.30) are schematically of the form*

$$\Omega \nabla_3(A) = B + \mathcal{E}_p^{(in)k} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega \nabla_4(A') = B' + \mathcal{E}_{p'}^{(out)k'}$$

respectively, with the obvious identifications for A, B and A', B' . Under angular commutation, these equations can be expressed in the following schematic form ($l \geq 0$)

$$\Omega \nabla_3([r\nabla]^l(A)) = [r\nabla]^l B + \mathcal{E}_p^{(in)k+l} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega \nabla_4([r\nabla]^l(A')) = [r\nabla]^l B' + \mathcal{E}_{p'}^{(out)k'+l},$$

with the exception of (14.1.9) and (14.1.28) for which one has

$$\Omega \nabla_3([r\nabla]^l(\omega - \omega_o)) = [r\nabla]^l B + \mathcal{E}_4^{(out)l} + \mathcal{E}_p^{l-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega \nabla_4([r\nabla]^l(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o)) = [r\nabla]^l B' + \mathcal{E}_{p'}^{(in)l} + \mathcal{E}_{p'}^{l-1}.$$

Proof. Follows directly from the definition of the error, (3.2.8), and applying inductively Lemma 3.3.1 for the commutators. The exceptional cases follow from the fact that they involve the 3-derivative of a quantity not in $\Gamma^{(in)}$ and the 4-derivative of a quantity not in $\Gamma^{(out)}$. Note that by Lemma 3.3.1 the commutator of a 4-derivative and an angular derivative produces only terms from $\Gamma^{(in)}$ except for a lower order curvature term involving β which is incorporated into \mathcal{E}_p^{l-1} in the second formula. \square

One similarly has for the Bianchi equations:

Lemma 14.1.16. *The Bianchi equations (14.1.14)–(14.1.17) and (14.1.34)–(14.1.37) are schematically of the form*

$$\Omega \nabla_3(A) = B + \mathcal{E}_p^k \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega \nabla_4(A') = B' + \mathcal{E}_{p'}^k$$

respectively, with the obvious identifications for A, B and A', B' . Under angular commutation, these equations can be expressed in the following schematic form ($l \geq 0$)

$$\Omega \nabla_3([r\nabla]^l(A)) = [r\nabla]^l B + \mathcal{E}_p^{k+l} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega \nabla_4([r\nabla]^l(A')) = [r\nabla]^l B' + \mathcal{E}_{p'}^{k+l}.$$

14.1.6 The auxiliary quantities Y and B

For this subsection we recall the definitions of the almost gauge invariant quantities $\check{A}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = \check{r}\Omega^2\check{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\check{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^3\Omega\check{\psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = r^5\check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, which according to our convention at the beginning of the chapter appear without the \mathcal{I}^+ subscript here. We define the quantity

$$Y := -3Mr\check{\chi}\Omega^{-1} - r^3\mathcal{P}_2^*\eta + \frac{1}{2}r^2\mathcal{P}_2^*\nabla(r^2\underline{T}). \quad (14.1.49)$$

The point of this quantity is that it can be used to prove estimates on $\hat{\chi}$ using the following relation.

Lemma 14.1.17. *We have the relation*

$$r^2\mathcal{D}_2^*dv(\hat{\chi}r\Omega^{-1}) = \frac{Y}{r} + \frac{r}{\check{r}}\check{\Pi}\Omega^{-2} + \mathcal{E}_1^{(in)1} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^0. \quad (14.1.50)$$

Proof. This is a rewriting of (14.1.47). \square

Using the null structure equations, we next derive a propagation equation for Y .

Lemma 14.1.18. *The quantity Y defined in (14.1.49) satisfies the propagation equation*

$$\Omega \nabla_3 Y = -\frac{r}{\tilde{r}} \check{\Pi} + 3M \frac{r}{\tilde{r}} \Omega^{-2} \check{A} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{(in)} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^0 + \mathcal{E}_{anom}, \quad (14.1.51)$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}_{anom} = -\frac{1}{2} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla (r^2 |\hat{\chi}|^2) + \frac{1}{2} \left[\Omega \nabla_3, r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla \right] (r^2 \underline{T}) \quad (14.1.52)$$

and $\check{\mathcal{E}}_1^0$ does not contain the components α, β, ω .

Proof. Direct computation starting from (14.1.49) using Lemma 3.3.1 and (14.1.7), (14.1.5), (14.1.3) as well as Proposition 3.4.3. \square

Remark 14.1.19. *Note that compared with $\check{\mathcal{E}}_1^1 + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^0$ the isolated anomalous non-linear error \mathcal{E}_{anom} contains both terms with higher derivatives and with less r -decay.*

To improve the regularity of the right hand side of (14.1.51) we first commute the equation with the operator $\mathcal{A}^{[2]} + 1$ and renormalise. We use here and below the following definition for $k \geq 0$ of the (elliptic) angular operators acting on symmetric traceless S -tensors:

$$\mathcal{A}^{[k]} := \left(r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* d\check{v} \right)^{\frac{k}{2}} \text{ if } k \text{ is even} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}^{[k]} := r d\check{v} \mathcal{A}^{[k-1]} \text{ if } k \text{ is odd.} \quad (14.1.53)$$

Note that these operators already appeared in the proof of Proposition 13.7.9.

More specifically we define the quantity

$$B := \mathcal{A}^{[2]} Y + Y + \frac{1}{2} \frac{r}{\tilde{r}} \check{\Psi} + 3M \frac{r}{\tilde{r}} \check{\Pi} \Omega^{-2}, \quad (14.1.54)$$

for which we can derive the following evolution equation:

Lemma 14.1.20. *The quantity B defined in (14.1.54) satisfies for $i \geq 0$ the evolution equation*

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \left(\mathcal{A}^{[i]} B \right) = \frac{1}{r} \frac{r}{\tilde{r}} h \cdot \mathcal{A}^{[i]} \check{\Pi} + \frac{r}{\tilde{r}} \tilde{h} \cdot \mathcal{A}^{[i]} \check{A} + \mathcal{E} \left[\mathcal{A}^{[i]} B \right] \quad (14.1.55)$$

with h and \tilde{h} admissible coefficient functions of r (see (3.2.1)) and the non-linear error is given by

$$\mathcal{E} \left[\mathcal{A}^{[i]} B \right] = \mathcal{A}^{[i]} \frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \mathcal{E}[\check{\psi}] + \left(\mathcal{A}^{[i+2]} + \mathcal{A}^{[i]} \right) \mathcal{E}_{anom} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{(in)} + \frac{\tilde{r}}{r} \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{(in)} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{2+i}, \quad (14.1.56)$$

where moreover the components α, β, ω do not appear in the $\check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{2+i}$. See (3.4.21) for the definition of $\mathcal{E}[\check{\psi}]$ and (14.1.52) for that of \mathcal{E}_{anom} .

Proof. We prove the identity for $i = 0$. The case $i > 0$ will then follow by straightforward commutation. We first recall from Propositions 3.4.12 and 3.4.13 the wave equations for the almost gauge invariant quantities

$$\left(\mathcal{A}^{[2]} + 1 \right) \check{\Pi} = +\frac{1}{2} \Omega \nabla_3 \check{\Psi} + \frac{3M}{r} \check{\Pi} + \frac{3M}{2} \check{A} + \frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \mathcal{E}[\check{\psi}] - 2(\omega - \omega_o) \check{\Psi}, \quad (14.1.57)$$

$$\left(\mathcal{A}^{[2]} + 1 \right) \check{A} = -\Omega \nabla_3 \check{\Pi} + \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r} \right) \left(\frac{2}{r} \check{\Pi} + \check{A} \right) + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^2, \quad (14.1.58)$$

where the components α, β, ω do not appear in the $\check{\mathcal{E}}_1^2$.

Commuting the equation for Y , equation (14.1.51), with the angular operator $\mathcal{A}^{[2]} + 1$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 \left(\left(\mathcal{A}^{[2]} + 1 \right) Y \right) &= - \left(\mathcal{A}^{[2]} + 1 \right) \frac{r}{\tilde{r}} \check{\Pi} + 3M \left(\mathcal{A}^{[2]} + 1 \right) \frac{r}{\tilde{r}} (\Omega^{-2} \check{\underline{A}}) \\ &\quad + \left(\mathcal{A}^{[2]} + 1 \right) \left(\overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_1^1 + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^0 + \mathcal{E}_{anom} \right) + \left[\Omega \nabla_3, \mathcal{A}^{[2]} \right] Y. \end{aligned}$$

Commuting the $\mathcal{A}^{[2]}$ past the $\frac{r}{\tilde{r}}$ and inserting the wave equations for $\check{\underline{A}}$ and $\check{\Pi}$ produces

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \left(\mathcal{A}^{[2]} Y + Y + \frac{1}{2} \frac{r}{\tilde{r}} \check{\Psi} + 3M \frac{r}{\tilde{r}} \Omega^{-2} \check{\Pi} \right) = \frac{1}{r} h \cdot \check{\Pi} + \tilde{h} \cdot \check{\underline{A}} + \mathcal{E}[B], \quad (14.1.59)$$

from which the result is immediate for $i = 0$. Note that the commutator term $[\Omega \nabla_3, \mathcal{A}^{[2]}] Y$ can indeed be incorporated into the schematic terms after inserting (14.1.49) for Y . To establish the identity for $i > 0$ commute the $i = 0$ equation with $\mathcal{A}^{[i]}$ and observe that the commutator term $[\Omega \nabla_3, \mathcal{A}^{[i]}] B$ can be incorporated into the schematic error terms after inserting (14.1.54) and (14.1.49). \square

We finally commute the equation (14.1.55) with $\Omega \nabla_4$.

Lemma 14.1.21. *The quantity $\Omega \nabla_4 B$ satisfies for $i \geq 0$ the evolution equation*

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \left(\Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[i]} B \right) = \frac{h_1}{r^3} \mathcal{A}^{[i]} \check{\Psi} + \frac{h_2}{r^2} \mathcal{A}^{[i]} \check{\Pi} + \frac{h_3}{r^2} \mathcal{A}^{[i]} \check{\underline{A}} + \mathcal{E} \left[\Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[i]} B \right] \quad (14.1.60)$$

with h_1, h_2, h_3 admissible coefficient functions of r (see (3.2.1)) and the non-linear error

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} \left[\Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[i]} B \right] &= -(\eta - \underline{\eta})^C \check{\nabla}_C \mathcal{A}^{[i]} B + \Omega \nabla_4 \left(\mathcal{A}^{[i+2]} + \mathcal{A}^{[i]} \right) \mathcal{E}_{anom} + \Omega \nabla_4 \left(\mathcal{A}^{[i]} \frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \mathcal{E}[\check{\psi}] \right) \\ &\quad + \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^{4+i} (no \ \alpha, \ \beta, \ \omega - \omega_o) + \check{\mathcal{E}}_{5/2}^{4+i} (no \ \alpha, \ \beta) + \check{\mathcal{E}}_3^{4+i}, \end{aligned} \quad (14.1.61)$$

where we recall the definitions (3.4.21) and (14.1.52).

Remark 14.1.22. *Note that the first three terms in (14.1.60) are linear and that the non-linear error involves $i + 1$ angular derivatives of B .*

Proof. We commute (14.1.55) by $\Omega \nabla_4$. Note that the first term in the error arises from the commutator $[\Omega \nabla_3, \Omega \nabla_4] B$ (cf. Lemma 3.3.1) and that the lower order parts of this commutator can be incorporated

into the schematic terms. Note also that $\Omega \nabla_4 \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_1^{3+i}$ and $\Omega \nabla_4 \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{2+i}$ (with $\check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{2+i}$ not containing $\alpha, \beta, \omega - \omega_o$) can be incorporated into the last line: Indeed α, β or $\omega - \omega_o$ can only enter through a 4-equation for $\Phi \setminus \{\alpha, \beta, \omega - \omega_o\}$ with an improvement of r -decay by two powers if α and β enter, and a gain of $r^{-3/2}$ if $\omega - \omega_o$ enters (cf. Remarks 14.1.8 and 14.1.11). \square

14.2 Non-linear error estimates

In this section we collect various error estimates that will be crucial when obtaining estimates from the schematic equations of Section 14.1.

14.2.1 Preliminaries

14.2.1.1 Bootstrap assumptions for quantities without reference Kerr solution subtracted

We first note the following important consequence of the bootstrap assumption $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^K \lesssim \varepsilon^2$.

Lemma 14.2.1. *The bootstrap assumption $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^K \lesssim \varepsilon^2$ holds verbatim if in all energies that constitute $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^K$ (cf. (6.1.13)–(6.1.18)), the Kerr part is not subtracted from the quantities that appear.*

Proof. This follows from checking that the Kerr parts individually satisfy all of the bootstrap assumptions, which in turn is a consequence of the definitions of Section 1.4.3 and the estimate $|J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^m| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u_f}$ for $m = -1, 0, 1$. \square

The point to make here is that while the bootstrap assumptions hold without the reference Kerr solutions subtracted, we will only be able to *improve* the assumptions *with* the Kerr modes subtracted.

14.2.1.2 Basic estimates on spheres for errors $\mathcal{E}_p^{(in)}$ and $\mathcal{E}_p^{(out)}$

We next note the following basic estimates for the non-linear errors involving only angular derivatives:

Lemma 14.2.2. *We have for $n = 0, 1, \dots, N+1$ and any sphere $S_{u,v}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ the following estimates:*

$$\begin{aligned} \|r^p \mathcal{E}_p^{(in)}\|_{S_{u,v}} &\lesssim \left[\sum_{\Gamma} \sum_{i=0}^n \| [r\mathcal{V}]^i r^{p_1} \Gamma_{p_1}^{(in)} \|_{S_{u,v}} + \sum_{\Phi} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \| [r\mathcal{V}]^i r^{p_2} \Phi_{p_2}^{(in)} \|_{S_{u,v}} \right] \sum_{\Phi} \sum_{j=0}^{N-6} \| [r\mathcal{V}]^j r^{p_3} \Phi_{p_3}^{(in)} \|_{S_{u,v}}, \\ \|r^p \mathcal{E}_p^{(out)}\|_{S_{u,v}} &\lesssim \left[\sum_{\Gamma} \sum_{i=0}^n \| [r\mathcal{V}]^i r^{p_1} \Gamma_{p_1}^{(out)} \|_{S_{u,v}} + \sum_{\Phi} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \| [r\mathcal{V}]^i r^{p_2} \Phi_{p_2}^{(out)} \|_{S_{u,v}} \right] \sum_{\Phi} \sum_{j=0}^{N-6} \| [r\mathcal{V}]^j r^{p_3} \Phi_{p_3}^{(out)} \|_{S_{u,v}}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the bootstrap assumption $\mathbb{P}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N \lesssim \varepsilon^2$ implies for $s \in \{0, 1\}$ the estimates

$$\sum_{\Phi} \sum_{j=0}^{N-6} \| [r\mathcal{V}]^j r^{p_3} \Phi_{p_3}^{(in)} \|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\Phi} \sum_{j=0}^{N-6} \frac{1}{r^{\frac{s}{2}}} \| [r\mathcal{V}]^j r^{p_3} \Phi_{p_3}^{(out)} \|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{s}{2}}}. \quad (14.2.1)$$

Proof. Recall from (3.2.6) and (3.2.7) that $\mathcal{E}_p^{(in)}$ denotes a sum of terms which are products of (angular derivatives of) the Φ . For *quadratic* terms, the estimate follows directly from Cauchy-Schwarz on $S_{u,v}$. For cubic and higher order errors, additional L^∞ -Sobolev embedding on $S_{u,v}$ leads to the same estimate (with additional ε powers) after inserting the bootstrap assumptions. The proof of the second estimate is identical. The third estimate follows directly from the bootstrap assumptions. \square

The next lemma looks at 3- and 4-derivatives applied to the schematic error.

Lemma 14.2.3. *For $n \geq 0$, $m \geq 1$ and $m+n \leq N+1$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\Omega^{-1} \mathcal{V}_3)^m \mathcal{E}_p^{(in)}\|_{S_{u,v}} &\lesssim \frac{1}{r^p} \left[\sum_{\Phi} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq m+n-1} \| \mathcal{D}^\gamma r^{p_2} \Phi_{p_2}^{(in)} \|_{S_{u,v}} \right] \sum_{\Phi} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-6} \| \mathcal{D}^\gamma r^{p_3} \Phi_{p_3}^{(in)} \|_{S_{u,v}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{r^p} \left[\sum_{i=0}^m \| [\Omega^{-1} \mathcal{V}_3]^i [r\mathcal{V}]^{n+i} (r\Omega^{-2}(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o)) \|_{S_{u,v}} \right] \sum_{\Gamma} \| r^p \Gamma_p^{(in)} \|_{S_{u,v}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{r^p} \left[\sum_{\Gamma \in \{\eta, \underline{\eta}\}} \| [r\mathcal{V}]^{m+n} (r^2 \Gamma) \|_{S_{u,v}} \right] \sum_{\Gamma} \| r^p \Gamma_p^{(in)} \|_{S_{u,v}}. \end{aligned} \quad (14.2.2)$$

The expressions outside the square brackets are $\lesssim \varepsilon r^{-p} u^{-1}$ by the bootstrap assumptions. In addition

$$\begin{aligned} \|(r\Omega \mathcal{V}_4)^m \mathcal{E}_p^{(out)}\|_{S_{u,v}} &\lesssim \frac{1}{r^p} \left[\sum_{\Phi} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq m+n-1} \| \mathcal{D}^\gamma r^{p_2} \Phi_{p_2}^{(out)} \|_{S_{u,v}} \right] \sum_{\Phi} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-6} \| \mathcal{D}^\gamma r^{p_3} \Phi_{p_3}^{(out)} \|_{S_{u,v}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{r^p} \left[\sum_{i=0}^m \| [\Omega^{-1} \mathcal{V}_4]^i [r\mathcal{V}]^{n+i} (r^{\frac{5}{2}}(\omega - \omega_o)) \|_{S_{u,v}} \right] \sum_{\Gamma} \| r^p \Gamma_p^{(out)} \|_{S_{u,v}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{r^p} \left[\sum_{\Gamma \in \{\eta, \underline{\eta}\}} \| [r\mathcal{V}]^{m+n} (r^2 \Gamma) \|_{S_{u,v}} \right] \sum_{\Gamma} \| r^p \Gamma_p^{(out)} \|_{S_{u,v}}. \end{aligned} \quad (14.2.3)$$

The expressions outside the square brackets are $\lesssim \varepsilon r^{-p} u^{-1/2}$ by the bootstrap assumptions.

Proof. Recall from (3.2.6) and (3.2.7) that $\mathcal{E}_p^{(in)n}$ denotes a sum of terms which are products of (angular derivatives of) the $\Phi^{(in)}$. Applying $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)$ to the second term on the right of (3.2.6) we see that at most $m+n-1$ derivatives appear and hence the resulting expression can be estimated by first term on the right of (14.2.2). For the top order term in the first line of (3.2.6) (involving $k_1 = n$ derivatives) we commute the $\Omega\nabla_3$ through the angular derivatives (the commutator being lower order and controlled by the first term on the right of (14.2.2)) use the schematic null structure equations (14.1.12) which show that at the top order only $\eta, \underline{\eta}$ and $\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o$ can appear with the derivatives as stated in (14.2.2). Note that only top-order *angular* derivatives appear for η and $\underline{\eta}$ as there is a schematic equation (14.1.12) available. The claim about the bootstrap assumption is immediate.

The second estimate is proven entirely analogously, now using the schematic equations (14.1.31). \square

14.2.1.3 Basic estimates on spheres for errors \mathcal{E}_p^n and $\mathcal{E}_p^{(4)n}$

We also recall the error notation \mathcal{E}_p^n , which we recall is essentially a sum of products of the Φ (involving at most n derivatives from \mathfrak{D}) which has total decay r^{-p} . We also recall the definition (3.2.3) of $\mathcal{E}_p^{(4)n}$.

Following the proof of the previous lemma we obtain

Lemma 14.2.4. *We have for $n = 0, 1, \dots, N$ and any sphere $S_{u,v}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ the following estimates:*

$$\|r^p \mathcal{E}_p^{(4)n}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \left[\sum_{\Phi} \sum_{|k| \leq n} \|\mathfrak{D}^k r^{p_2} \Phi_{p_2}^{(4)}\|_{S_{u,v}} \right] \sum_{\Phi} \sum_{|j| \leq N-6} \|\mathfrak{D}^j r^{p_3} \Phi_{p_3}^{(4)}\|_{S_{u,v}}. \quad (14.2.4)$$

$$\|r^p \mathcal{E}_p^n\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \left[\sum_{\Phi} \sum_{|k| \leq n} \|\mathfrak{D}^k r^{p_2} \Phi_{p_2}\|_{S_{u,v}} \right] \sum_{\Phi} \sum_{|j| \leq N-6} \|\mathfrak{D}^j r^{p_3} \Phi_{p_3}\|_{S_{u,v}}. \quad (14.2.5)$$

Moreover, the bootstrap assumption $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N \lesssim \varepsilon^2$ imply for $s \in \{0, 1\}$ the estimates

$$\sum_{\Phi} \sum_{|j| \leq N-6} \|\mathfrak{D}^j r^{p_3} \Phi_{p_3}^{(4)}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\Phi} \sum_{|j| \leq N-6} \frac{1}{r^{\frac{s}{2}}} \|\mathfrak{D}^j r^{p_3} \Phi_{p_3}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{s}{2}}}. \quad (14.2.6)$$

14.2.2 Error estimates on $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$

The main idea in proving estimates on $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ is that any decay in r can be translated into very strong decay in u using our definition $v_\infty = \varepsilon_0^{-2}(u_f)^{\frac{1}{\delta}} \geq \varepsilon^{-2} u^{\frac{1}{\delta}}$, which implies in particular

$$\sup_{\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \frac{1}{r(u,v)} \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0^2}{(u_f)^8} \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^8}. \quad (14.2.7)$$

We begin with an estimate for *linear* error terms (which are still called error terms because they exhibit additional decay in r , which by the above remark can be translated into strong u -decay).

Proposition 14.2.5. *For $\Gamma_p \in \Gamma^{(in)} = \{\hat{\chi}, \hat{\underline{\chi}}, T, \underline{T}, \eta, \underline{\eta}, \Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2, \underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o\}$ we have for $n = 0, \dots, N+1$ and $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$:*

$$\left(\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} \| [r\nabla] ^n \Gamma_p r^p \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} \right)^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^4} \quad , \quad \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \frac{1}{r} \| [r\nabla] ^n \Gamma_p r^p \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^4}. \quad (14.2.8)$$

For $\mathcal{R}_p \in \{\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\beta}, \rho - \rho_\circ, \sigma\}$ we have for $n = 0, \dots, N$:

$$\left(\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} \| [r\mathbb{V}]^n \mathcal{R}_p r^p \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} \right)^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^4} \quad , \quad \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \frac{1}{r} \| [r\mathbb{V}]^n \mathcal{R}_p r^p \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^4}. \quad (14.2.9)$$

Proof. Note that the bootstrap assumptions imply for the Γ_p and \mathcal{R}_p as above the flux estimates¹

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N+1} \int_{u-1}^{u_f} d\bar{u} \| [r\mathbb{V}]^n \Gamma_p r^p \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2 + \sum_{n=0}^N \int_{u-1}^{u_f} d\bar{u} \| [r\mathbb{V}]^n \mathcal{R}_p r^p \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^2. \quad (14.2.10)$$

The desired estimates then follow easily from applying Cauchy–Schwarz and using (14.2.7). \square

We next provide estimates for *non-linear* error terms on $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ to be used in the sequel.

Proposition 14.2.6. *For all $n = 0, \dots, N+1$ we have for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$*

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} \| r^p \mathfrak{E}_p^{(in)n} \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} + \sqrt{\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \frac{1}{r} \| r^p \mathfrak{E}_p^{(in)n} \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2} \quad (14.2.11)$$

and

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \| r^p \mathfrak{E}_p^{(in)n} \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u}. \quad (14.2.12)$$

We also have for $n = 0, \dots, N-2$ the improved estimate

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \| r^p \mathfrak{E}_p^{(in)n} \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2}. \quad (14.2.13)$$

Proof. For the bound (14.2.12) we insert the estimate of Lemma 14.2.2 and apply Cauchy–Schwarz to produce fluxes. Using that the bootstrap assumptions control the flux of up to $N-6$ derivatives of $\Phi^{(in)}$ by $\frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2}$ (cf. Lemma 14.2.1) and the top-order flux bounds for the quantities appearing in $\Phi^{(in)}$ and $\Gamma^{(in)}$, we deduce the result.² The improved bound (14.2.13) follows using that both fluxes now decay like $\frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2}$. \square

14.2.3 Error estimates on $\underline{C}_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$

Proposition 14.2.7. *For all $n = 0, \dots, N$ and $p \geq 3/2$, we have, for any $v \geq v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})$, the estimate*

$$\int_v^\infty d\bar{v} \| \mathfrak{E}_p^{(out)n} \|_{S_{u_{-1}, \bar{v}}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^{p-1}(u_{-1}, v)}. \quad (14.2.14)$$

Also, at the top order³, we have, for $p \geq 2$ and any $v \geq v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})$, the estimate

$$\int_v^\infty d\bar{v} \| \mathfrak{E}_p^{(out)N+1} \|_{S_{u_{-1}, \bar{v}}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^{p-3/2}(u_{-1}, v)}. \quad (14.2.15)$$

Finally, for all $n = 0, \dots, N-1$ and $p \geq 0$ we have, for all $v \geq v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})$, the estimate

$$\| \mathfrak{E}_p^{(out)n} \|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} + \| \mathfrak{E}_p^{(in)n} \|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^p(u_{-1}, v)}. \quad (14.2.16)$$

Proof. Follows from structure of the error, Sobolev embedding on spheres and the bootstrap assumptions. \square

¹The bootstrap assumptions are formulated for these quantities with their reference Kerr values subtracted but by Lemma 14.2.1 they also hold without the subtraction.

²Note that the key here is that all geometric quantities appearing in $\mathfrak{E}_p^{(in)n}$ satisfy a flux estimate on $v = v_\infty$.

³One loses $3/2$ here if N derivatives of curvature appear because the r -weights appearing in the energy flux that has to be used are non-optimal.

14.2.4 Error estimates in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$

14.2.4.1 Estimates on $\mathcal{E}_p^{(in)n}$ and $\mathcal{E}_p^{(out)n}$

Proposition 14.2.8. *For $s = 0, \dots, N$, we have the estimate*

$$\|r^p \mathcal{E}_p^{(in)N-s}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{\min(4, 2+s)}}. \quad (14.2.17)$$

For $s = 0, 1, \dots, N$, we have the estimate

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} \|r^p \mathcal{E}_p^{(in)N-s}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{\min(3, 2+s)}}. \quad (14.2.18)$$

Also, for the outgoing non-linear error terms we have for $t \in \{0, 1\}$ and $s = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N$, we have

$$\|r^p \mathcal{E}_p^{(out)N-s}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{\min(2, 1+\frac{s}{2})}} \quad , \quad \frac{1}{r^{1+t}} \|r^p \mathcal{E}_p^{(out)N-s}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{\min(3+t, 2+\frac{s}{2})}}. \quad (14.2.19)$$

For $s = 0, 1, \dots, N$ and $t \in \{0, 1\}$, we have the estimate

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} \frac{1}{r^t} \|r^p \mathcal{E}_p^{(out)N-s}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{1+t}}. \quad (14.2.20)$$

For $s = 2, 3, \dots, N$ and $t \in \{0, 1\}$, we have the estimate

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} \frac{1}{r^2} \|r^p \mathcal{E}_p^{(out)N-s}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^3}. \quad (14.2.21)$$

Proof. The bounds on spheres follow directly from the estimates of Lemma 14.2.2 and inserting the bootstrap assumptions. For the integrated decay bounds use again the estimates of Lemma 14.2.2 and in addition the bootstrap assumptions on the remaining spacetime integrals. \square

14.2.4.2 Estimates on $\mathcal{E}_p^n, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_p^n$

Proposition 14.2.9. *For $s = 0, \dots, N-1$ and $t \in \{0, 1\}$, we have*

$$\|r^{p-\frac{t}{2}} \mathcal{E}_p^{N-1-s}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{\min(2+t, 1+t+\frac{s}{2})}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|r^{p-1} \mathcal{E}_p^{N-1-s}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{\min(4, 5/2+s)}}. \quad (14.2.22)$$

Moreover, assuming that each summand in \mathcal{E}_p^{N-1-s} contains at least one $\Phi^{(in)}$, we have for $s = 0, \dots, N-2$

$$\|r^p \mathcal{E}_p^{N-2-s}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{\min(3, 5/2+s)}}. \quad (14.2.23)$$

Finally, assuming that none of the summands in \mathcal{E}_p^{N-1-s} contains factors from $\{\alpha, \beta, \omega - \omega_\circ\}$, we have for $s = 0, \dots, N-1$

$$\|r^p \mathcal{E}_p^{N-1-s}(\text{no } \alpha, \beta, \omega - \omega_\circ)\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|r^{p-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{E}_p^{N-1-s}(\text{no } \alpha, \beta)\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{\min(3, 5/2+s)}}. \quad (14.2.24)$$

Finally (and more generally), all statements hold verbatim with \mathcal{E} replaced by $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$.

Proof. Follows directly from (14.2.5) and the bootstrap assumptions. Note in particular that we have

$$\sum_{|k| \leq N-1-s} \|\mathfrak{D}^k(r^p \Phi_p)\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{u^{\min(1/4+s/2, 1)}} \quad \text{for all } \Phi_p \setminus \{\Omega^2 \alpha, \Omega \beta, \omega - \omega_\circ\} \quad (14.2.25)$$

for $s = 0, 1, 2$ by the bootstrap assumptions. \square

In terms of integrated decay estimates we have (see also Section 11.7.2):

Proposition 14.2.10. *For $s = 0, 1, \dots, N$ and $t \in \{0, 1\}$*

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} \frac{1}{r^t} \|r^p \check{\mathcal{E}}_p^{N-s}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{1+t}}, \quad (14.2.26)$$

and for $s = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ and $t \in \{0, 1\}$

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} \frac{1}{r^{t+1}} \|r^p \check{\mathcal{E}}_p^{N-1-s}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{2+t}}. \quad (14.2.27)$$

Proof. Follows directly from (14.2.5) and the bootstrap assumptions. \square

14.2.4.3 Estimates on $\overset{(Kerr)}{\mathcal{E}}$

We note the following estimate, which is an immediate consequence of the bootstrap assumptions. Both stronger rates and higher regularity can be proven but the one stated is sufficient for our future applications.

Proposition 14.2.11. *We have, for any $|\gamma| \leq N-1$, the estimate*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \overset{(Kerr)}{\mathcal{E}}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r \cdot u}. \quad (14.2.28)$$

14.2.5 The error term in the evolution equation of B

In this subsection, we estimate the right hand sides of the propagation equations for the quantities B and $\Omega \nabla_4 B$, see Section 14.1.6.

Before doing this, we collect a straightforward consequence of the bootstrap assumption $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N \leq \varepsilon^2$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, which provides top-order fluxes for the shear on arbitrary outgoing and ingoing cones.

Lemma 14.2.12. *For fixed $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$, we have on any ingoing cone $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)$ for $s = 0, 1, 2$ the flux estimates*

$$\int_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)} d\bar{u} \| [r \nabla]^{N+1} r \hat{\chi} \Omega^{-1} \|_{S_{\bar{u},v}}^2 + u^s \int_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)} d\bar{u} \| [r \nabla]^{N-s} r \hat{\chi} \Omega^{-1} \|_{S_{\bar{u},v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \quad (14.2.29)$$

and on any outgoing cone $C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ the top-order estimate

$$\int_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \| [r \nabla]^{N+1} r^2 \hat{\chi} \Omega \|_{S_{u,\bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \quad (14.2.30)$$

Proof. Write the Codazzi equation (1.2.19) in the form

$$\begin{aligned} r^2 d\!/\!v(\hat{\chi} \Omega^{-1}) &= r^2 (\underline{\beta} \Omega^{-1} - (\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\text{Kerr}}) - \frac{1}{r} r^2 (\underline{\eta} - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}}) + \frac{1}{2r} r \nabla r^2 \underline{T} - \frac{1}{r} \Omega^{-1} r^2 \underline{\eta} r \hat{\chi} + \frac{1}{2r^2} r^2 \underline{T} r^2 \underline{\eta} \\ &= r^2 (\underline{\beta} \Omega^{-1} - (\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\text{Kerr}}) - \frac{1}{r} r^2 (\underline{\eta} - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}}) - \frac{1}{r} r^2 (\underline{\eta} - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}}) + \frac{1}{2r} r \nabla r^2 \underline{T} + \frac{1}{r} \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_0^0. \end{aligned}$$

Apply $N-s$ angular derivatives and use the bootstrap assumptions on the flux on $\underline{\beta}$ and the assumptions on spheres for the Ricci coefficients T and η . The non-linear error is easily controlled using Proposition 14.2.8. The second estimate follows similarly from the other Codazzi equation (1.2.18). \square

Proposition 14.2.13. *For $i = 0, \dots, N-3$ and any fixed ingoing cone $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, we have*

$$\int_{u_0}^u d\bar{u} \left\| \mathcal{E} \left[\mathcal{A}^{[i]} B \right] \right\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2. \quad (14.2.31)$$

Proof. We use the defining expression (14.1.56),

$$\mathcal{E} \left[\mathcal{A}^{[i]} B \right] = \mathcal{A}^{[i]} \frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \mathcal{E}[\check{\psi}] + \left(\mathcal{A}^{[i+2]} + \mathcal{A}^{[i]} \right) \mathcal{E}_{anom} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{(in)3+i} + \frac{\check{r}}{r} \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{(in)3+i} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{2+i}, \quad (14.2.32)$$

for which we recall also (3.4.21). We handle the error terms term by term:

1. We have for all $i \leq N - 3$ the estimate $\|\check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{(in)3+i}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r\sqrt{u}}$ (see Proposition 14.2.8) and similarly $\|\check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{2+i}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r\sqrt{u}}$. Since the right hand side in these estimates is integrable in u , the estimate follows for the last three terms of the error.
2. For the term involving \mathcal{E}_{anom} we recall the definition (14.1.52). Using the commutator formula of Lemma 3.3.1 twice we see that besides a number of terms that can be incorporated into the error $\check{\mathcal{E}}_1^{(in)3+i}$ the desired estimate would follow if products of the form $[r\check{\nabla}]^{k_1} r\hat{\chi} [r\check{\nabla}]^{k_2} r\hat{\chi}, [r\check{\nabla}]^{k_1} r\check{T} [r\check{\nabla}]^{k_2} r\hat{\chi}$ and $[r\check{\nabla}]^{k_1} r\check{T} [r\check{\nabla}]^{k_2} r\check{T}$ are integrable along ingoing cones for $k_1 + k_2 \leq N + 1$. This in turn is an immediate consequence of applying Cauchy-Schwarz and the fact that the bootstrap assumptions and Lemma 14.2.12 imply a flux estimate for up to $N + 1$ angular derivatives of $r\hat{\chi}$ and $r\check{T}$.
3. Turning to the term $r^2 \mathcal{E}[\check{\psi}]$ in (14.1.56) and the definition (3.4.21) we first note that the term involving $[r\check{\nabla}]^i r^2 \check{\mathcal{E}}_3^2$ can be handled as in 1. Next we have $\|[r\check{\nabla}]^i r^2 \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^2\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{5/4}}$ which is also integrable. Finally, we have for $i \leq N - 3$

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| [r\check{\nabla}]^i \left(k_1 \underline{\eta} \cdot r^4 d\check{v} \underline{\alpha} + k_2 r^3 \check{\mathcal{D}}_2^* (r\underline{\eta} \cdot \underline{\alpha}) + k_3 r^3 \check{\nabla} \Omega \hat{\omega} \cdot r^2 d\check{v} \underline{\alpha} \right) \right\|_{S_{u,v}} &\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{\frac{3}{2}}}, \\ \left\| [r\check{\nabla}]^i \left(k_4 r^3 \check{\mathcal{D}}_2^* (r\check{\nabla} \Omega \hat{\omega} \cdot r\underline{\alpha}) + k_5 r^3 \check{\nabla} \Omega \text{tr} \chi \cdot r^2 d\check{v} \underline{\alpha} \right) \right\|_{S_{u,v}} &\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{\frac{3}{2}}}, \end{aligned}$$

as follows easily from Cauchy-Schwarz on $S_{u,v}$ and the bootstrap assumptions on spheres for the quantities involved. □

For the next proposition, we recall the non-linear error (14.1.61).

Proposition 14.2.14. *For $i = 0, \dots, N - 5$ and any fixed ingoing cone $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ we have*

$$\int_{u_{-1}}^u d\bar{u} \left\| \mathcal{E} \left[\Omega \check{\nabla}_4 \mathcal{A}^{[i]} B \right] \right\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^2} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^{5/4} u}. \quad (14.2.33)$$

Finally, for $i = 0, \dots, N - 4$ we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} d\bar{u} d\bar{v} r^{3-\delta} \cdot u \left\| \mathcal{E} \left[\Omega \check{\nabla}_4 \mathcal{A}^{[i]} B \right] \right\|_{S_{\bar{u},\bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^4. \quad (14.2.34)$$

Proof. The first estimate. Recalling the definition (14.1.61), we obtain the first estimate term by term. We have for $i \leq N - 5$

$$\|(\eta + \underline{\eta}) \check{\nabla} \mathcal{A}^{[i]} B\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{1}{r} \|(\eta + \underline{\eta})\|_{S_{u,v}} \|r\check{\nabla} \mathcal{A}^{[i]} B\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{r^3 u} \|r\check{\nabla} \mathcal{A}^{[i]} B\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^3 u}, \quad (14.2.35)$$

which is easily seen to integrate to the desired bound. Here the last estimate follows from inserting the definition of B in terms of Y , the definition of Y (14.1.49) and then using the bootstrap assumptions on $S_{u,v}$.

For the second term in (14.1.61) we recall from the proof of Proposition 14.2.13 that $(\mathcal{A}^{[i+2]} + \mathcal{A}^{[i]}) \mathcal{E}_{anom}$ is given by terms that can be incorporated into $\overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_1^{3+i}$ plus a sum of products of the form $[r\mathcal{V}]^{k_1} r\hat{\chi} [r\mathcal{V}]^{k_2} r\hat{\chi}$, $[r\mathcal{V}]^{k_1} r\mathcal{T} [r\mathcal{V}]^{k_2} r\hat{\chi}$ and $[r\mathcal{V}]^{k_1} r\mathcal{T} [r\mathcal{V}]^{k_2} r\mathcal{T}$ with appropriate contractions and $k_1 + k_2 \leq i + 4$. Since $\Omega\mathcal{V}_4 \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_1^{3+i} = \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^{4+i} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_{5/2}^{4+i}$ it is clear from the propagation equations for $r^2\mathcal{T}$ and $r\hat{\chi}$ that it suffices to estimate

$$\int_{u-1}^u d\bar{u} \frac{1}{r^2} \left(\|r\hat{\chi}\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}} + \frac{1}{r} \|r^2\mathcal{T}\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}} \right) \| [r\mathcal{V}]^{5+i} (\eta r^2) \|_{S_{\bar{u},v}}. \quad (14.2.36)$$

We focus on the term involving $\hat{\chi}$, the term involving \mathcal{T} being much simpler as there is an additional power of r^{-1} . We let $\tilde{u} = \min(u, \frac{1}{2}r(u, v))$ and integrate first

$$\int_{u-1}^{\tilde{u}} d\bar{u} \frac{1}{r^2} \|r\hat{\chi}\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}} \| [r\mathcal{V}]^{5+i} (\eta r^2) \|_{S_{\bar{u},v}} \lesssim \frac{1}{r^2} \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{x^+}} \| [r\mathcal{V}]^{5+i} (\eta r^2) \|_{S_{u,v}} \sqrt{\int_{u-1}^{\tilde{u}} d\bar{u} \|r\hat{\chi}\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}}^2 \bar{u}^{3/2}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^2}$$

and in case that $u > \tilde{u}$ also

$$\int_{\tilde{u}}^u d\bar{u} \frac{1}{r^2} \|r\hat{\chi}\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}} \| [r\mathcal{V}]^{5+i} (\eta r^2) \|_{S_{\bar{u},v}} \lesssim \sqrt{\int_{\tilde{u}}^u d\bar{u} \frac{1}{r^4(\bar{u}, v)} \| [r\mathcal{V}]^{5+i} (\eta r^2) \|_{S_{\bar{u},v}}^2} \sqrt{\int_{\tilde{u}}^u d\bar{u} \|r\hat{\chi}\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}}^2} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^{\frac{3}{2}}u}.$$

Combining the two integrals yields the desired bound for this term.

We turn to the expression $\check{\mathcal{E}}_2^{4+i}(\text{no } \alpha, \beta, \omega - \omega_o) + \check{\mathcal{E}}_{5/2}^{4+i}(\text{no } \alpha, \beta) + \check{\mathcal{E}}_3^{4+i}$. As a direct consequence of Proposition 14.2.9, for $i \leq N - 5$

$$\|\check{\mathcal{E}}_2^{4+i}(\text{no } \alpha, \beta, \omega - \omega_o)\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|\check{\mathcal{E}}_{5/2}^{4+i}(\text{no } \alpha, \beta)\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|\check{\mathcal{E}}_3^{4+i}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^2 u^{\frac{5}{4}}}, \quad (14.2.37)$$

which integrates to the desired bound. Finally, we recall definition (3.4.21) according to which we have

$$\Omega\mathcal{V}_4 \left(\mathcal{A}^{[i]} \frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} \mathcal{E}[\psi] \right) = \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^{3+i} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_{\frac{3}{2}}^{3+i} + \Omega\mathcal{V}_4 \overset{(4)}{\mathcal{E}}_0^{2+i} + \mathfrak{Y} = \check{\mathcal{E}}_2^{3+i} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_{\frac{3}{2}}^{3+i} + \mathfrak{Y} \quad (14.2.38)$$

where each summand in $\check{\mathcal{E}}_2^{3+i}$ contains at least one factor of $\overset{(in)}{\Phi}$ and where

$$\mathfrak{Y} = \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2+k_3 \leq 3+i \\ k_1 \leq 2+i, k_2 \leq 1, k_3 \leq 1+i}} H_{k_1 k_2 k_3} r(r\mathcal{V})^{k_1} (r\Omega\mathcal{V}_4)^{k_2} (\omega - \omega_o) \cdot (r\mathcal{V})^{k_3} \underline{\alpha} r \quad (14.2.39)$$

is the anomalous term. Note that the second equality is a consequence of (3.4.7). We note that by Proposition 14.2.9 we have for $i \leq N - 5$ the bounds

$$\|\check{\mathcal{E}}_2^{3+i}(\text{each summand has a factor of } \overset{(in)}{\Phi})\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|\check{\mathcal{E}}_{\frac{3}{2}}^{3+i}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^2 u^{5/4}}, \quad (14.2.40)$$

which integrates to the desired bound. For the anomalous term, we integrate first with $i \leq N - 5$

$$\int_{u-1}^{\tilde{u}} d\bar{u} \|\mathfrak{Y}\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}} \lesssim \frac{1}{r^2} \sum_{j \leq N-4} \sum_{|k| \leq N-2} \left(\sup_{\mathcal{D}^{x^+}} \|\mathfrak{D}^k r^3(\omega - \omega_o)\|_{S_{u,v}} \right) \sqrt{\int_{u-1}^{\tilde{u}} d\bar{u} \| [r\mathcal{V}]^j r\alpha \|_{S_{\bar{u},v}}^2 \bar{u}^{3/2}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^2}$$

where we have used Theorem C.4 (and Corollary 13.9.2) and in case that $u > \tilde{u}$ also

$$\int_{\tilde{u}}^u d\bar{u} \|\mathfrak{Y}\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}} \lesssim \sum_{j \leq N-4} \sum_{|k| \leq N-2} \sqrt{\int_{\tilde{u}}^u d\bar{u} \frac{1}{r^4(\bar{u}, v)} \|\mathfrak{D}^k r^3(\omega - \omega_o)\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}}^2} \sqrt{\int_{u-1}^{\tilde{u}} d\bar{u} \| [r\mathcal{V}]^j r\alpha \|_{S_{\bar{u},v}}^2} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^{\frac{3}{2}}u}.$$

establishing the bound for the anomalous term.

The second estimate. This is much easier. We will only estimate the anomalous term leaving the details of the remaining terms to the reader. We have for $i \leq N - 4$

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} d\bar{u}d\bar{v} r^{3-\delta} \cdot u \|\mathfrak{Y}\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \sum_{|k| \leq N-1} \sum_{j \leq N-3} \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \|\mathfrak{D}^k r^3 (\omega - \omega_o)\|_{S_{u,v}} \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} d\bar{u}d\bar{v} \frac{\bar{u}}{r^{1+\delta}} \| [r\mathfrak{V}]^j \underline{\alpha} r \|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^4.$$

□

14.3 The proof of Theorem C.5: transport and elliptic estimates

14.3.1 Overview of the proof of Theorem C.5

We recall that we have already proven Theorem C.4, i.e. we have obtained improved estimates on the almost gauge invariant quantities α and $\underline{\alpha}$ (note also Corollary 13.9.2). The general strategy to obtain the estimates of Theorem C.5 is to estimate connection coefficients and curvature components in the region $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ using the estimates of Theorem C.4 and the gauge conditions on the solution imposed on the null hypersurfaces $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, which have been recalled in Section 14.1.1.

Our estimates will follow from elliptic estimates on spheres and transport estimates along cones. We first state the general form of these estimates which we shall use in **Sections 14.3.2** and **Section 14.3.3**, respectively.

The actual proof of Theorem C.5 is divided into proving the following three theorems, for which we recall the energies defined in Section 6.1.6:

Theorem 14.3.1 (Improving the angular master energy). *We have the estimate*

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.1)$$

Theorem 14.3.2 (Improving the auxiliary energies on ω and $\underline{\omega}$). *We have the estimate*

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}}^{N, aux} [\underline{\omega}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}}^{N, aux} [\omega] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.2)$$

Theorem 14.3.3 (Improving the full master energy). *We have the estimate*

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}}^{N, aux} [\underline{\omega}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}}^{N, aux} [\omega] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N [\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N [\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}]. \quad (14.3.3)$$

In view of the fact that we have already proven Theorem C.4, it is clear that Theorems 14.3.1–14.3.3 prove Theorem C.5. At the heart of the matter is the proof of Theorem 14.3.1.

14.3.1.1 Improving the angular master energy: Proof of Theorem 14.3.1

The proof of Theorem 14.3.1 is contained in Sections 14.3.4, 14.3.5 and 14.3.6–14.3.7 where we estimate all quantities on $v = v_\infty$, on $u = u_{-1}$ and in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, respectively. In particular (recall the angular master energy (6.1.17)):

(1) In **Section 14.3.4**, we will improve the bootstrap assumptions on $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, i.e. we shall prove

$$\mathbb{E}_{v_\infty}^N [\Gamma] + \mathbb{E}_{v_\infty}^N [\mathcal{R}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.4)$$

(2) In **Section 14.3.5**, we will improve the bootstrap assumptions on $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, i.e. we shall prove

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_{-1}}^N [\Gamma] + \mathbb{E}_{u_{-1}}^N [\mathcal{R}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.5)$$

(3) In **Section 14.3.6**, we will improve the bootstrap assumptions in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, i.e. we shall prove

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^N [\Gamma] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^N [\mathcal{R}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.6)$$

(4) In **Section 14.3.7**, we will improve the bootstrap assumptions on the metric, i.e. we shall prove

$$\sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \sum_{s=0}^2 u^s \sum_{k=0}^{N+1-s} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (r(\mathring{g} - r^2\gamma))\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \quad (14.3.7)$$

which by Proposition 9.4.1 implies

$$\sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \sum_{s=0}^2 u^s \sum_{k=0}^{N+2-s} \sum_{m=-1}^1 \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1)^{\mathcal{I}^+}\|_{S_{u,v}^+}^2. \quad (14.3.8)$$

This will complete the proof of Theorem 14.3.1.

The proof will generally proceed by obtaining the estimates (14.3.4)–(14.3.7) separately for each Γ and \mathcal{R} appearing in the relevant energies. We emphasise the important role of the quantity Y introduced in Section 14.1.6 below in estimating the Ricci coefficient $\hat{\chi}$ as already discussed in Section V.8 of the introduction.

14.3.1.2 Improving the auxiliary energies on ω and $\underline{\omega}$: Proof of Theorem 14.3.2

The proof of Theorem 14.3.2 will be carried out in **Section 14.3.8**.

This proof is quite straightforward once Theorem 14.3.1 has been established. The main idea, for $\underline{\omega}$ say, is to first estimate *all* derivatives of $\underline{\omega}$ elliptically on $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ (using the gauge condition of constant mass aspect) and then in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ by commuting the transport equation $\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4\underline{\omega}$ with $[r\mathring{\nabla}]^i [\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3]^j$ -derivatives exploiting that on the right hand side we can insert the Bianchi or null structure equations to convert $\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3$ derivatives into (a) angular derivatives (b) lower order terms and (c) $\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3$ -derivatives of $\underline{\alpha}$, all of which have already been estimated.

The argument for ω is completely analogous exchanging the cones $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and the 3-direction by the 4-direction.

14.3.1.3 Improving the full master energy: Proof of Theorem 14.3.3

The proof of Theorem 14.3.3 will be carried out in **Section 14.3.9**.

For all quantities in the master energy except the terms involving the metric quantity b and $\mathring{g} - \mathring{g}_o$, this follows easily by inductively exploiting the schematic structure of the Bianchi and null structure equations established in Section 14.1. For b and \mathring{g} a simple transport argument can be invoked commuting (14.3.231) and (14.3.242) with \mathfrak{D}^γ to produce the missing estimates on in the master energy.

14.3.2 The basic elliptic estimates

The arguments employed in the proof of Theorem 14.3.1 will make use of the following three key propositions which are manifestations of the following general principle:

General Principle: To estimate the angular derivatives of a quantity, it suffices to estimate the $\ell = 0$ and $\ell = 1$ modes and a suitable *top order* angular derivative operator (whose kernel consists of the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes) applied to it.

We recall $\mathcal{A}^{[i]} = [r^2\mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^*d\mathring{t}v]^{i/2}$ if i is even and $\mathcal{A}^{[i]} = rd\mathring{t}v [r^2\mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^*d\mathring{t}v]^{(i-1)/2}$ if i is odd.

Proposition 14.3.1. *For ξ a symmetric traceless S -tensor we have for $1 \leq n \leq N+1$ the estimate*

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \|[r\mathring{\nabla}]^i \xi\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \|\mathcal{A}^{[n]} \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}. \quad (14.3.9)$$

Proposition 14.3.2. *Let (f, g) be a pair of smooth functions and $f_{\text{Kerr}}, g_{\text{Kerr}}$ be functions each supported on $\ell = 1$ only. Then we have for $2 \leq n \leq N + 1$*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^n \|[r\nabla]^i(f - f_{\text{Kerr}}, g - g_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u,v}} &\lesssim \|f_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|f_{\ell=1} - f_{\text{Kerr}}\|_{S_{u,v}} \\ &\quad + \|g_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|g_{\ell=1} - g_{\text{Kerr}}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|\mathcal{A}^{[n-2]}r^2\mathcal{D}_2^*\mathcal{D}_1^*(f, g)\|_{S_{u,v}}, \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.10)$$

where the left hand side denotes the sum $\sum_{i=0}^n \|[r\nabla]^i(f - f_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u,v}} + \sum_{i=0}^n \|[r\nabla]^i(g - g_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u,v}}$.

Proposition 14.3.3. *Let ξ be an S -tangent 1-form and ξ_{Kerr} be a divergence-free S -tangent 1-form supported on $\ell = 1$ only. Then we have for $1 \leq n \leq N + 1$*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^n \|[r\nabla]^i(\xi - \xi_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u,v}} &\lesssim \|(rd\lrcorner \xi)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|\mathcal{A}^{[n-1]}r^3\mathcal{D}_2^*\mathcal{D}_1^*\xi\|_{S_{u,v}} \\ &\quad + \|(rc\lrcorner \xi)_{\ell=1} - rc\lrcorner \xi_{\text{Kerr}}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \boxed{\|rc\lrcorner \xi_{\text{Kerr}} - (rc\lrcorner \xi_{\text{Kerr}})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.11)$$

and for $3 \leq n \leq N + 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^n \|[r\nabla]^i(\xi - \xi_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u,v}} &\lesssim \|(rd\lrcorner \xi)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|\mathcal{A}^{[n-3]}r^3\mathcal{D}_2^*\mathcal{D}_1^*\xi\|_{S_{u,v}} \\ &\quad + \|(rc\lrcorner \xi)_{\ell=1} - rc\lrcorner \xi_{\text{Kerr}}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \boxed{\|rc\lrcorner \xi_{\text{Kerr}} - (rc\lrcorner \xi_{\text{Kerr}})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.12)$$

Finally, for the boxed term we have the following estimates (important in applications)

$$\|rc\lrcorner \eta_{\text{Kerr}} - (rc\lrcorner \eta_{\text{Kerr}})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|rc\lrcorner \eta_{\text{Kerr}} - (rc\lrcorner \eta_{\text{Kerr}})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^3 u^2},$$

$$\|rc\lrcorner (\Omega\beta)_{\text{Kerr}} - (rc\lrcorner (\Omega\beta)_{\text{Kerr}})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|rc\lrcorner (\Omega^{-1}\beta)_{\text{Kerr}} - (rc\lrcorner (\Omega^{-1}\beta)_{\text{Kerr}})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^4 u^2}.$$

Remark 14.3.4. *The restriction $n \leq N + 1$ in the above propositions arises from the fact that the proof will require control on up to $N - 1$ angular derivatives of the Gauss curvature.*

Proof of Proposition 14.3.1. We first note

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \|[r\nabla]^i \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \|\mathcal{A}^{[n]} \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \|[r\nabla]^i \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2. \quad (14.3.13)$$

This follows from first diligently integrating by parts the covariant derivatives on the left to create Laplacians (at the cost of lower order errors involving up to $N - 1$ angular derivatives of Gauss curvature, which by (14.1.48) and the bootstrap assumptions are controlled in $L^2(S_{u,v})$) and then use the relation $r^2\Delta = -2\mathcal{A}^{[2]} + 2r^2K$. Secondly, using $r^2\Delta = -2\mathcal{A}^{[2]} + 2r^2K$ we can also show that for a symmetric traceless tensor we have both

$$\|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \|\mathcal{A}^{[1]}\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathcal{A}^{[1]}\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \|\mathcal{A}^{[2]}\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2. \quad (14.3.14)$$

The desired estimate now follows by a simple induction. \square

Proof of Proposition 14.3.2. To prove (14.3.10), we first prove that the estimate holds for $n = 2$. To achieve this, we observe that it suffices to prove the estimate for $S_{u,v}$ equipped with the round metric $r^2\hat{\gamma}$ and the projections defined with respect to the honest spherical harmonics. Indeed, all errors arising from this replacement are controlled by the bootstrap assumptions on the metric and the estimates for the difference of the $Y_m^{\ell=1}$ with the spherical harmonics. For the round metric the estimate follows as in Section 4.4.2

of [DHR]: Indeed defining $\tilde{f} = f - f_{\ell=1} - (f_{\text{Kerr}})_{\ell=1} - (f)_{\ell=0}$ and $\tilde{g} = g - g_{\ell=1} - (g_{\text{Kerr}})_{\ell=1} - (g)_{\ell=0}$ we can write (in the next formula all operators and volume elements are defined with respect to the round metric)

$$\|r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^*(f, g)\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 = \|r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^*(\tilde{f}, \tilde{g})\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 = \int_{S_{u,v}} \frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{f} \cdot r^2 \Delta \tilde{f} + \tilde{f} \cdot r^2 \Delta \tilde{g} + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{g} \cdot r^2 \Delta \tilde{g} + \tilde{g} \cdot r^2 \Delta \tilde{f}.$$

Expanding into spherical harmonics of the round sphere and using that \tilde{f}, \tilde{g} are supported on $\ell \geq 2$ as well as the orthogonality properties of the spherical harmonics now leads to the desired bound for $n = 2$.

The proof of $n > 2$ proceeds in analogy to the proof of Proposition 14.3.1. We use that for any pair of functions (f, g) and $n \geq 3$

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \|[r\nabla]^i(f, g)\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \|\mathcal{A}^{[n-2]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^*(f, g)\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \|[r\nabla]^i(f, g)\|_{S_{u,v}}^2, \quad (14.3.15)$$

which follows once more by diligently integrating by parts using in particular the relation $2\mathcal{P}_1\mathcal{P}_2\mathcal{P}_2^*\mathcal{P}_1^* = \Delta\Delta - 2\mathcal{P}_1(K\mathcal{P}_1^*)$. Invoking also (14.3.14) and the fact that the estimate has been shown for $n = 2$, we conclude the proof of (14.3.10). \square

Proof of Proposition 14.3.3. We turn to the proof of (14.3.11). We claim we can reduce the proof to the case of functions using that there is a unique pair of functions (f, g) , each with vanishing spherical mean, such that $\xi - \xi_{\text{Kerr}} = \mathcal{P}_1^*(f, g)$ holds. The estimate (14.3.10) applied with $f_{\text{Kerr}} = g_{\text{Kerr}} = 0$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^n \|[r\nabla]^i((f, g))\|_{S_{u,v}} &\lesssim \|f_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|g_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|\mathcal{A}^{[n-2]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^*(f, g)\|_{S_{u,v}} \\ &\lesssim \|(r^2 \Delta f)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|(r^2 \Delta g)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|\mathcal{A}^{[n-2]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^*(f, g)\|_{S_{u,v}} \\ &\lesssim \|(rd\psi\xi)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|(rc\psi l(\xi - \xi_{\text{Kerr}}))_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|\mathcal{A}^{[n-2]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^*(f, g)\|_{S_{u,v}}, \end{aligned}$$

from which the estimate (14.3.11) follows. The estimate (14.3.12) can be reduced to (14.3.11) after noting the relation

$$r^3 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^* \mathcal{P}_1 \xi = 2\mathcal{A}^{[2]} r \mathcal{P}_2^* \xi + 2\mathcal{P}_2^*(K\xi). \quad (14.3.16)$$

Finally, the bounds on the boxed term follows readily from the definition of the reference Kerr solution and the fact that the angular momentum parameter satisfies $|J_{T^+}^m| \lesssim \varepsilon$. \square

14.3.3 The basic transport estimates

We rely on the following basic transport estimates.

Lemma 14.3.5. *Let Q be an S -tensor and $\Omega\nabla_3 Q = \xi$ hold along $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}$. Let $u_+ \geq u_-$ such that $\{u_{\pm}\} \times S_{u_{\pm}, v} \subset \underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}$. Then*

$$\|Q\|_{S_{u_{\pm}, v}} \lesssim \|Q\|_{S_{u_{\mp}, v}} + \int_{u_-}^{u_+} d\bar{u} \|\xi\|_{S_{\bar{u}, v}}. \quad (14.3.17)$$

Similarly, let Q be an S -tensor and $\Omega\nabla_4 Q = \xi$ hold along $C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$. Let $v_+ \geq v_-$ such that $\{v_{\pm}\} \times S_{u, v_{\pm}} \subset C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$. Then

$$\|Q\|_{S_{u, v_{\pm}}} \lesssim \|Q\|_{S_{u, v_{\mp}}} + \int_{v_-}^{v_+} d\bar{v} \|\xi\|_{S_{u, \bar{v}}}. \quad (14.3.18)$$

14.3.4 Estimates for the angular master energy for quantities on $\underline{C}_{v_{\infty}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$

The objective of this section is to prove the estimate (14.3.4).

14.3.4.1 Estimating $\hat{\chi}$ and $\underline{\beta}$

Proposition 14.3.6. *On $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ we have for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ and $s = 0, 1, 2$*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N+1-s} \int_u^{u_f} du \| [r\check{\nabla}]^i (r\hat{\chi}\Omega^{-1}) \|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.19)$$

On the spheres we have for $s = 0, 1, 2$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-s} \| [r\check{\nabla}]^i (r\hat{\chi}\Omega^{-1}) \|_{S_{u,\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^{\min(\frac{1}{2}+s, 2)}}. \quad (14.3.20)$$

Proof. The flux estimate follows directly from the relation (14.1.47) together with the bounds on the flux of $\check{\underline{\Pi}} = r^3 \check{\psi} \Omega$ in Theorem C.4 and Proposition 14.2.5 for the linear lower order (in r) terms, as well as Propositions 14.2.6 and 14.2.9 for the non-linear errors (which have additional decay in r).

For the bound on spheres recall the null structure equation (14.1.5), which after invoking the flux estimates on $\underline{\alpha}$ of Theorem C.4 (see also Corollary 13.9.2) leads to the bound

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-s} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \| \Omega \check{\nabla}_3 [r\check{\nabla}]^i (r\hat{\chi}\Omega^{-1}) \|_{S_{\bar{u},v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s} \quad (14.3.21)$$

for $s = 0, 1, 2$. Now from (14.3.19) we easily extract a dyadic sequence of spheres S_{u_i, v_∞} on which (14.3.20) already holds. The bound can then be extended to any sphere S_{u, v_∞} using the fundamental theorem of calculus in conjunction with the flux bounds (14.3.21) and (14.3.19). \square

Corollary 14.3.7. *On $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ we have for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ and $s = 0, 1, 2$*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-s} \int_u^{u_f} du \| [r\check{\nabla}]^i (r^2 \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta} - r^2 (\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\text{Kerr}}) \|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.22)$$

On the spheres we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-1-s} \| [r\check{\nabla}]^i (r^2 \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta} - r^2 (\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\text{Kerr}}) \|_{S_{u,\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^{\min(\frac{1}{2}+s, 2)}}. \quad (14.3.23)$$

Moreover, the same estimates hold without subtracting the Kerr reference solution.

Proof. The last claim is immediate from $r^2 (\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\text{Kerr}} \sim r^{-2}$ manifestly satisfying the above estimates in view of (14.2.7). It hence suffices to show the estimate without the Kerr reference solutions subtracted and this follows directly from the Codazzi equation (1.2.19) using that $\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta} = d\check{v}(\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi})$ holds up to terms of order $\frac{1}{r}$, see Propositions 14.2.5 and 14.2.6. \square

14.3.4.2 Estimating \underline{T}

Proposition 14.3.8. *We have for $\underline{T} = \frac{\text{tr}\chi}{\Omega} - \frac{\text{tr}\chi_\circ}{\Omega_\circ}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ and $s = 0, 1, 2$*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N+1-s} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \| [r\check{\nabla}]^i r^2 \underline{T} \|_{S_{\bar{u},v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{s+1}} \quad (14.3.24)$$

and

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N+1-s} \| [r\check{\nabla}]^i r^2 \underline{T} \|_{S_{u,\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^{s+2}}. \quad (14.3.25)$$

Proof. One first proves (14.3.25) by integrating the (angular commuted) Raychaudhuri equation (14.1.3) from the sphere S_{u_f, v_∞} where $\underline{T} = 0$ by the gauge condition (3). For the right hand side one uses the flux estimates of Proposition 14.3.6 for the $[r\hat{\nabla}]^n |\hat{\chi}|^2$ term on the right hand side, the error estimate of Proposition 14.2.6 for the other non-linear terms and that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \| [r\hat{\nabla}]^i (\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2) \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^2},$$

the latter exploiting that this term is lower order in r and hence Proposition 14.2.5 applies. This proves (14.3.25) and the flux estimate (14.3.24) then follows directly by integration. \square

14.3.4.3 Estimating $\underline{\mu}^\dagger$

Proposition 14.3.9. *On $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ we have for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$*

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \| [r\hat{\nabla}]^n (r^3 \underline{\mu}^\dagger) \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^4}, \quad (14.3.26)$$

Proof. Commute equation (14.1.11) with n angular derivatives. By the commutation principle (Section 14.1.5), the error from n commutations can be incorporated into $\overset{(in)}{\mathfrak{E}}_2^{n+1}$ and we have $\hat{\nabla} \mu = 0$ on the right hand side by gauge condition (4). We then integrate the resulting equation from the sphere S_{u_{-1}, v_∞} where $\hat{\nabla} \mu^\dagger = 0$ holds by gauge condition (6) and estimate the right hand side using Propositions 14.2.6 and 14.2.5. Since we can pull out an overall factor of $r^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ on the right we obtain the first estimate after using (14.2.7). \square

14.3.4.4 Estimating the $\ell = 1$ and $\ell = 0$ modes

We turn to estimating the $\ell = 0$ and $\ell = 1$ modes of all quantities. We prove

Proposition 14.3.10. *On $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ we have for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ the following estimates for the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes of the Ricci coefficients:*

$$\| r\omega_{\ell=0} - r\omega_\circ \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^4}, \quad (14.3.27)$$

$$\| r^4 (c\rlap{/}{r}l\eta)_{\ell=1} - r^4 c\rlap{/}{r}l\eta_{\text{Kerr}} \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + \| r^4 (c\rlap{/}{r}l\eta)_{\ell=1} - r^4 c\rlap{/}{r}l\eta_{\text{Kerr}} \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{3/2}} \quad (14.3.28)$$

$$\| r^4 (d\rlap{/}{v}\eta)_{\ell=1} \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \quad (14.3.29)$$

$$\| r^3 (d\rlap{/}{v}\eta)_{\ell=1} \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2} \quad (14.3.30)$$

$$\| r^2 \underline{T}_{\ell=1} \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} + \| r^2 \underline{T}_{\ell=0} \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2} \quad (14.3.31)$$

$$\| r^3 T_{\ell=1} \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} + \| r^3 T_{\ell=0} \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2. \quad (14.3.32)$$

Moreover, on $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ we have for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ the following estimates for the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes of the curvature components:

$$\| r^3 (d\rlap{/}{v}\beta\Omega^{-1})_{\ell=1} \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + \| r^3 (c\rlap{/}{r}l\beta\Omega^{-1})_{\ell=1} - r^3 c\rlap{/}{r}l(\beta\Omega^{-1})_{\text{Kerr}} \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^4}, \quad (14.3.33)$$

$$\| r^3 \rho_{\ell=1} \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} + \| r^3 \sigma_{\ell=1} - r^3 \sigma_{\text{Kerr}} \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2}, \quad (14.3.34)$$

$$\| r^3 \rho_{\ell=0} + 2M \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + \| r^3 \sigma_{\ell=0} \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2} \quad (14.3.35)$$

$$\| r^5 (c\rlap{/}{r}l\beta\Omega)_{\ell=1} - r^5 c\rlap{/}{r}l(\Omega\beta)_{\text{Kerr}} \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{3/2}} \quad (14.3.36)$$

$$\| r^5 (d\rlap{/}{v}\beta\Omega)_{\ell=1} \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u}. \quad (14.3.37)$$

Finally, on the sphere S_{u_f, v_∞} the estimates (14.3.28) and (14.3.36) hold with the improved rate $\frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2}$ on the right hand side.

Remark 14.3.11. Note that by our choice of v_∞ we have

$$\|r^3 \text{curl}(\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\text{Kerr}}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + \|r^3 \sigma_{\text{Kerr}}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^4}$$

so the above estimates for $\underline{\beta}$ and σ hold verbatim without their Kerr modes subtracted.

Remark 14.3.12. Estimates on $\underline{\omega}_{\ell=1}$ will be obtained in the context of estimating all $\ell \geq 1$ modes of $\underline{\omega}$ in Section 14.3.4.9.

Proof. Step 1: Preliminary estimates. Note the estimate (14.3.31) is already implied by Proposition 14.3.8. We first recall that from Proposition 9.4.6 we have for $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$

$$\|r^4 (K - K_\circ)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u} \quad \text{and by (14.2.7) in particular} \quad \|r^3 (K - K_\circ)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2}. \quad (14.3.38)$$

Invoking the Gauss equation (14.1.48) on S_{u, v_∞} together with the improved estimate (14.3.25) for \underline{T} and the bootstrap assumption $\|Tr^3\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \leq \varepsilon$ (which using (14.2.7) implies $\|Tr^2\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2 u^{-2}$) we conclude

$$\|r^3 (\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2} \quad (14.3.39)$$

for $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$, which is already the first part of (14.3.34). Using Proposition 14.3.9 and $\mu_{\ell=1} = 0$ on $v = v_\infty$ as well as the improved estimate (14.3.25) for \underline{T} we deduce

$$\|r^3 (d\!/\!v (\eta + \underline{\eta}))_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2} \quad \text{and hence} \quad \|r (\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2} \quad (14.3.40)$$

for $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$. Here the last step follows from (1.2.21) and applying Proposition 9.4.2. We finally revisit (14.1.11) projected to $\ell = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 \left(r^2 \underline{\mu}_{\ell=1}^\dagger \right) &= \frac{2\Omega_\circ^2}{r^2} (r^3 (\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=1}) + \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{r^2} \left(1 + \frac{2M}{r} \right) r^2 \underline{T}_{\ell=1} - \frac{1 + \frac{4M}{r}}{r^2} r (\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=1} \\ &\quad + \left(\Omega^2 \underline{\mathcal{E}}_2^{(in)} \right)_{\ell=1} + \Omega \nabla_3 \left(r^2 \underline{\mu}_{\ell=1}^\dagger \right) - (\Omega \nabla_3 (r^2 \underline{\mu}^\dagger))_{\ell=1}, \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.41)$$

from which we conclude after integration for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ using Proposition 9.4.3 the estimate

$$\|r^4 \underline{\mu}_{\ell=1}^\dagger\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2. \quad (14.3.42)$$

Step 2: Estimates on S_{u_f, v_∞} . Note that $\underline{T} = 0$ on this sphere. From the Gauss equation and the definition of $\underline{\mu}_{\ell=1}^\dagger$ we conclude after using (14.3.38)

$$\|r^4 (d\!/\!v \underline{\eta})_{\ell=1} + \frac{1}{2} r^3 T_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v_\infty}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2.$$

From the Gauss equation and the definition of $\mu_{\ell=1}$ (which vanishes on $v = v_\infty$) we conclude after using (14.3.38)

$$\|r^4 (d\!/\!v \eta)_{\ell=1} + \frac{1}{2} r^3 T_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v_\infty}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2.$$

From the Codazzi equation (1.2.18) evaluated on the sphere S_{u_f, v_∞} we obtain using the gauge condition (2)

$$\|r^4 (d\!/\!v \underline{\eta})_{\ell=1} + r^3 T_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v_\infty}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2.$$

From the previous three estimates we conclude

$$\|r^4 (d\!v\eta)\|_{\ell=1} \|_{S_{u_f, v_\infty}} + \|r^4 (d\!v\eta)\|_{\ell=1} \|_{S_{u_f, v_\infty}} + \|r^3 T_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v_\infty}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2. \quad (14.3.43)$$

Using the Codazzi equation (1.2.19) projected to $\ell = 1$ on the sphere S_{u_f, v_∞} ,

$$r^4 (d\!v\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1} = \frac{1}{2}(\Omega^{-1}tr\chi)_{\circ} r^4 (d\!v\eta)_{\ell=1} + (\mathfrak{E}_0^1)^{(in)}_{\ell=1},$$

we conclude after using (14.2.17) for the error

$$\|r^4 (d\!v\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2} \quad \text{and hence} \quad \|r^3 (d\!v\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^4}. \quad (14.3.44)$$

From the $c\!u\!r\!l$ -part of the Codazzi equation (1.2.18) we have

$$\|r^5 (c\!u\!r\!l(\beta\Omega))_{\ell=1} + r^4 \Omega_{\circ}^2 (c\!u\!r\!l\eta)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2} \quad (14.3.45)$$

and hence in particular using the triangle inequality and the definition of the Kerr modes

$$\|r^4 (c\!u\!r\!l\eta)_{\ell=1} - r^4 c\!u\!r\!l\eta_{\text{Kerr}}\|_{S_{u_f, v_\infty}} + \|r^4 (c\!u\!r\!l\eta)_{\ell=1} - r^4 c\!u\!r\!l\eta_{\text{Kerr}}\|_{S_{u_f, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2}, \quad (14.3.46)$$

where the bound on η follows from $c\!u\!r\!l\eta = -c\!u\!r\!l\underline{\eta}$. We conclude from (1.2.17) also

$$\|r^3(\sigma_{\ell=1} - \sigma_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u_f, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2} \quad \text{as well as} \quad \|r^4(c\!u\!r\!l\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2}, \quad (14.3.47)$$

with the second bound following from applying $c\!u\!r\!l$ to the Codazzi equation (1.2.19) and projecting to $\ell = 1$. This already proves the last statement of the proposition regarding the improved decay on the sphere S_{u_f, v_∞} .

Step 3: Estimates for $\ell = 0$ on $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^+$. The projected ∇_3 -propagation equation for $(\rho^3 + 2M)_{\ell=0}$ can be written

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (r^3 \rho_{\ell=0} + 2M + f(u)) = \frac{3M\Omega^2}{r^2} r^2 T_{\ell=0} + (\mathfrak{E}_1^1)^{(in)}_{\ell=0} + \Omega \nabla_3 (r^3 \rho_{\ell=0} + 2M) - (\Omega \nabla_3 (r^3 \rho + 2M))_{\ell=0} \quad (14.3.48)$$

where we defined (recall gauge condition (7))

$$f(u) := F'(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_u^{u_f} d\hat{u} r^3 (\Omega \hat{\chi} \underline{\alpha})_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}, v_\infty). \quad (14.3.49)$$

We integrate (14.3.48) from S_{u_f, v_∞} where the quantity in brackets on the left is zero. For the error we observe using the fact that $1 \leq \frac{r(u, v_\infty)}{r(u_f, v_\infty)} \lesssim 1$ and (14.2.13) the estimate

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \|(\mathfrak{E}_1^1)^{(in)}\|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{1}{r} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \|r(\mathfrak{E}_1^1)^{(in)}\|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{ru^2}.$$

The same estimate holds for the commutator of the derivative and projection in (14.3.48) in view of $|(\Omega \nabla_3 (\rho^3 + 2M))_{\ell=0} - \Omega \nabla_3 ((\rho^3 + 2M)_{\ell=0})| \lesssim \|(\rho^3 + 2M)_{S_{u, v}}\| \|\Omega \text{tr}\chi - \Omega \text{tr}\chi_{\circ}\|_{S_{u, v}}$.⁴ Combining these facts we are lead to the estimate

$$\|(r^3 \rho + 2M)_{\ell=0} + f(u)\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{ru^2} \quad \text{for all } u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]. \quad (14.3.50)$$

⁴Applying the weaker statement (9.4.11) produces (14.3.50) with u^{-1} instead of u^{-2} which is sufficient in applications.

From this one easily deduces (using the bootstrap assumptions on the fluxes for $\hat{\chi}$ and the estimates on $\underline{\alpha}$) the estimate for ρ of (14.3.35). From the equation $c\psi l\eta = -\frac{1}{2}\hat{\chi} \wedge \underline{\hat{\chi}} + \sigma$ projected to $\ell = 0$ one deduces the σ part of (14.3.35).

We next estimate $T_{\ell=0}$. For this we derive the projected propagation equation

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (T_{\ell=0} r) = -\Omega_{\circ}^4 T_{\ell=0} - (\Omega^2 r \hat{\chi} \underline{\hat{\chi}})_{\ell=0} + (\Omega^2 \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_3^0)_{\ell=0}.$$

We conclude the $\ell = 0$ part of (14.3.32) after integration from $S_{u_f, v_{\infty}}$ (where $T_{\ell=0} = 0$ vanishes by the gauge condition (1)) using Proposition 14.3.8. The $\ell = 0$ part of (14.3.31) then immediately follows using (14.2.7). We finally turn to $(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_{\circ})_{\ell=0}$. We project the equation (14.1.10) to $\ell = 0$ and use the gauge condition (5) to deduce

$$2(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_{\circ})_{\ell=0} = \frac{1}{\Omega_{\circ}^2} \left[(\Omega \nabla_3 (\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2))_{\ell=0} - \Omega \nabla_3 (\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2)_{\ell=0} \right] - \frac{2}{\Omega_{\circ}^2} ((\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2)(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_{\circ}))_{\ell=0}. \quad (14.3.51)$$

We conclude from (9.4.11) and the bootstrap assumptions that

$$\|(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_{\circ})_{\ell=0}\| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^2 u}. \quad (14.3.52)$$

The $\ell = 0$ part of the estimate (14.3.27) follows immediately using (14.2.7). We close this step noting that from the definition of $\underline{\mu}^{\dagger}$ and the estimates established on the $\ell = 0$ modes we easily deduce

$$|r^3 (\underline{\mu}^{\dagger})_{\ell=0}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2}. \quad (14.3.53)$$

Step 4: Estimates for $\ell = 1$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{\infty}}^{T^+}$. We start from the commuted and projected Bianchi equation

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (r^5 (d\psi v \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}) = r \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_0^1 + [\Omega \nabla_3 (r^5 (d\psi v \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}) - (\Omega \nabla_3 (r^5 (d\psi v \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})))_{\ell=1}], \quad (14.3.54)$$

where we observe that the right hand side grows linearly in r and has the additional structure (Proposition 9.4.3, (1.2.30) and Lemma 3.3.1) that the non-linearity contains at least one factor of $\underline{\beta}$ or $\underline{\alpha}$, both of which are integrable in u using the flux bounds on these quantities. Integrating (14.3.54) using (14.3.44) for the initial term we can hence deduce $\|r^4 (d\psi v \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u, v_{\infty}}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2$, and similarly, from the propagation for the $c\psi l\eta$ -part using (14.3.47) we find the estimate $\|r^4 (c\psi l\eta \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u, v_{\infty}}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2$. Noting also $\|r^4 c\psi l\eta (\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\text{Kerr}}(u_f, v_{\infty}, \theta)\|_{S_{u, v_{\infty}}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^4}$ we obtain (14.3.33) using (14.2.7).

Turning to (ρ, σ) we recall that the ρ -part was already obtained in Step 1. For $\sigma_{\ell=1}$ we derive

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (r^3 \sigma_{\ell=1}) = r^3 \Omega^2 (c\psi l\eta \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\ell=1} - \frac{1}{2} (\Omega^2 r^2 \Omega \hat{\chi} \wedge r \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha})_{\ell=1} + (\overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_1^0)_{\ell=1} + \Omega \nabla_3 (r^3 \sigma_{\ell=1}) - (\Omega \nabla_3 (r^3 \sigma))_{\ell=1}.$$

Using Proposition 9.4.3 we conclude the σ -part of the estimate (14.3.34) using the estimates just shown on $\underline{\beta}$ and (14.2.13). Note that one needs to use the flux estimates for $\hat{\chi}$ and $\underline{\alpha}$ to obtain the rate of u^{-2} claimed.

From $\mu_{\ell=1} = 0$ and the definition of μ (cf. (1.1.13)) we deduce (14.3.30) using (14.3.39).

We turn to $\underline{\eta}$:

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (r^3 \underline{\eta}) = -2\Omega_{\circ}^2 (\eta + \underline{\eta}) r^2 + \Omega_{\circ} r^3 d\psi v \hat{\chi} - \frac{1}{2} \Omega^2 r \nabla (T r^2) + \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_0^0, \quad (14.3.55)$$

where $\overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_0^0$ satisfies $\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \|\overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_0^0\|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_{\infty}}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2}$ from (14.2.13). Commuting and projecting to $\ell = 1$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 (r^4 (c\psi l\eta)_{\ell=1} - r^4 c\psi l\eta_{\text{Kerr}}) &= \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_0^1 + [\Omega \nabla_3 (r^4 (c\psi l\eta)_{\ell=1}) - (\Omega \nabla_3 (r^4 c\psi l\eta))_{\ell=1}] \\ &\quad - 3M \sum_{m=-1}^1 a_{T^+}^m \Omega \nabla_3 r^2 \Delta Y_n^{\ell=1}, \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.56)$$

where \mathcal{E}_0^1 satisfies $\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \|\mathcal{E}_0^1\|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2}$ from (14.2.13). The commutator term in square brackets satisfies the same estimate with $\frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{3/2}}$ (use (9.4.11) and the flux estimate for $c\psi r l \eta$).⁵ The last term in (14.3.56) is order $\varepsilon^2 u_f^{-1} r^{-1}$ by Proposition 9.4.1 and hence easily integrated using (14.2.7). We conclude using (14.3.45) for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ the estimate (14.3.28), first for $\underline{\eta}$ and in view of $c\psi r l \eta = -c\psi r l \underline{\eta}$ also for η . Commuting now (14.3.55) with $r d\psi v$ and projecting to $\ell = 1$, the right hand side is integrable using and the estimates of Proposition 14.3.8 for $\underline{\eta}$ and (14.3.40) for $d\psi v (\eta + \underline{\eta})$ and we deduce (14.3.29).

We turn to estimating β . From the Codazzi equation (1.2.18) we deduce

$$r^5 c\psi r l d\psi v \Omega \hat{\chi} = -\Omega_\circ^2 r^4 c\psi r l \underline{\eta} - r^5 c\psi r l (\beta \Omega) + \mathcal{E}_0^1, \quad (14.3.57)$$

which after projection to $\ell = 1$ allows one to conclude (using (14.2.17) for the non-linear term)

$$\|r^4 \Omega_\circ^2 (c\psi r l \underline{\eta})_{\ell=1} + r^5 (c\psi r l \beta \Omega)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2}. \quad (14.3.58)$$

Note that (14.3.58) actually holds for any sphere $S_{u, v}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$. Using the estimate (14.3.28), the triangle inequality and the definition of the Kerr modes we conclude (14.3.36). Turning to the propagation equation

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 (r^5 (d\psi v \beta \Omega)_{\ell=1}) &= \Omega_\circ^2 r^5 \Delta \rho_{\ell=1} + 3\rho_0 \Omega_\circ^2 r^5 (d\psi v \eta)_{\ell=1} + (\mathcal{E}_0^1)_{\ell=0} + (\mathcal{E}_1^1)_{\ell=0} \\ &\quad + \Omega \nabla_3 (r^5 (d\psi v \beta \Omega)_{\ell=1}) - (\Omega \nabla_3 (r^5 (d\psi v \beta \Omega)))_{\ell=1} - \Omega_\circ^2 r^5 \Delta \rho_{\ell=1} + \Omega_\circ^2 r^5 (\Delta \rho)_{\ell=1}, \end{aligned}$$

we easily derive using Propositions 14.2.6 as well as 9.4.3 and 9.4.2, the estimate (14.3.37).

Finally, we estimate the $\ell = 1$ modes of T . Using the Codazzi equation

$$r^5 d\psi v d\psi v \Omega \hat{\chi} = -\Omega_\circ^2 r^4 d\psi v \underline{\eta} - r^5 d\psi v (\beta \Omega) + \frac{1}{2} r^5 \Delta T + \mathcal{E}_0^1 \quad (14.3.59)$$

projected to $\ell = 1$ we conclude the $\ell = 1$ part of (14.3.32). The $\ell = 1$ part of the bound (14.3.31) then immediately follows using (14.2.7). \square

From the proof we explicitly note the following corollary:

Corollary 14.3.13. *With $f(u)$ defined in (14.3.49) we also have the estimate (14.3.50) for $\rho_{\ell=0}$.*

14.3.4.5 Estimating ρ and σ

Proposition 14.3.14. *On $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ we have for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ and $s = 0, 1, 2$*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-s} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \| [r \nabla]^i (r^3 \rho + 2M_f, r^3 \sigma) \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.60)$$

We also have on spheres

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-1-s} \| [r \nabla]^i (r^3 \rho + 2M_f, r^3 \sigma) \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^{\min(s+\frac{1}{2}, 2)}}. \quad (14.3.61)$$

Proof. We first note that it suffices to prove the above estimates with the sums starting from $i = 2$ and replacing $[r \nabla]^i$ by $\mathcal{A}^{[i-2]} r^2 \mathcal{D}_2^* \mathcal{D}_1^*$. This follows from Proposition 14.3.2 after noting that the projections $(r^3 \rho + 2M, r^3 \sigma)_{\ell=1}$ and $(r^3 \rho + 2M, r^3 \sigma)_{\ell=0}$ already manifestly satisfy the above estimates from the results of the previous section; see (14.3.34), (14.3.35).

⁵This could be improved to u^{-2} by improving the estimate (9.4.11) to a flux estimate but we will not require or use this. This is the origin of the small loss in decay in the $c\psi r l$ estimates.

To prove the latter, we recall that we have the following (already improved) flux estimates for $\Psi = r^5 P$:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-2-s} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \|\mathcal{A}^{[i]} \Psi\|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s} \quad (14.3.62)$$

and

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-3-s} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \|\nabla_3 \mathcal{A}^{[i]} \Psi\|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.63)$$

The first estimate of the proposition now follows from the flux estimate on $\Psi = r^5 P$ of Proposition 13.3.11, the relations of Proposition 3.4.1 and (14.3.19). To obtain the estimates on spheres we will first deduce

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-3-s} \|\mathcal{A}^{[i]} \Psi\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^{\max(s+\frac{1}{2}, 2)}}, \quad (14.3.64)$$

after which the desired estimates follows immediately from the relations of Proposition 3.4.1 and (14.3.20). To establish (14.3.64) we extract from (14.3.62) a dyadic sequence of good spheres with additional decay and integrate from these spheres using Cauchy–Schwarz and the flux bounds for the 3-derivatives (14.3.63). \square

14.3.4.6 Estimating $\underline{\eta}$ and η

We finally exploit Proposition 14.3.9 regarding the modified mass aspect function $\underline{\mu}^\dagger$ which allows us to deduce decay estimates on $\underline{\eta}$.

Proposition 14.3.15. *On $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{T^+}$ we have for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ and $s = 0, 1, 2$*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N+1-s} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \|[r\nabla]^i r^2(\underline{\eta} - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.65)$$

On spheres we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-s} \|[r\nabla]^i r^2(\underline{\eta} - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.66)$$

Finally, (14.3.65) and (14.3.66) also hold if one replaces $(\underline{\eta} - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}})$ by $\underline{\eta}$ itself.

Proof. In view of Proposition 14.3.3 and the estimates on the $\ell = 1$ modes of $\underline{\eta}$ in Proposition 14.3.10 it suffices to prove these estimate for the sums starting from $i = 3$ and with $[r\nabla]^i r^3(\underline{\eta} - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}})$ replaced by $\mathcal{A}^{[i-3]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^*(r^3 \underline{\eta})$. Now, from the estimate of Proposition 14.3.9 and equation (14.1.41) we have

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \|\mathcal{A}^{[i-2]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^* \left(r^3 d\bar{v} \underline{\eta} + r^3 \rho + 2M_f + \frac{1}{2} r^3 \hat{\chi} \hat{\underline{\chi}} + r^2 \underline{T}, r^3 c\bar{u} r l \underline{\eta} + r^3 \sigma - \frac{1}{2} r^3 \hat{\chi} \wedge \hat{\underline{\chi}} \right)\|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^3}.$$

We now use Proposition 14.3.14 to control the flux on $(r^3 \rho + 2M_f, \sigma)$ and Proposition 14.3.8 to control the flux on \underline{T} . It is easy to see that the bootstrap assumptions and Sobolev embedding implies for $n \leq N$

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \|\mathcal{A}^{[n-2]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^*(r^3 \hat{\chi} \hat{\underline{\chi}})\|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^2}, \quad (14.3.67)$$

and similarly for the product $\hat{\chi} \wedge \hat{\underline{\chi}}$. This establishes (14.3.65). The estimate on the spheres is similar. Here we “lose a derivative” because at the level of N derivatives we only have the *flux* of ρ at our disposal. For the final claim note that $\underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}}$ itself satisfies the estimate in view of $\underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}} \sim r^{-3}$ and (14.2.7). \square

Proposition 14.3.16. *Proposition 14.3.15 holds verbatim replacing $\underline{\eta}$ by η .*

Proof. The proof is identical to that of Proposition 14.3.15 now starting from the fact that by gauge condition (4) and (14.1.41) we have $\|\mathcal{A}^{[i-2]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^*(r^3 \mu, r^3 c\bar{u} r l \eta - r^3 \sigma + \frac{1}{2} r^3 \hat{\chi} \wedge \hat{\underline{\chi}})\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}^2 = 0$ along $v = v_\infty$. \square

14.3.4.7 Estimating $\hat{\chi}$ and β

Before we estimate $\hat{\chi}$, we deduce the following estimates:

Proposition 14.3.17. *On $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ we have for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ the following bounds. For $1 \leq n \leq N$*

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \|\mathcal{A}^{[n-1]} r \mathcal{P}_2^* (r^2 \underline{\eta} - r^3 d\!\!\!/ v \Omega \hat{\chi})\|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^4}, \quad (14.3.68)$$

and for $2 \leq n \leq N$

$$\|\mathcal{A}^{[n-2]} r \mathcal{P}_2^* (r^2 \underline{\eta} - r^3 d\!\!\!/ v \Omega \hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{u^4}. \quad (14.3.69)$$

Proof. This is a direct consequence of the Codazzi equation (14.1.47) evaluated on $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ using Propositions 14.2.6 and 14.2.5 and recalling (14.2.7). \square

From (14.3.68) and (14.3.69) and Proposition 14.3.15 we can now deduce applying Proposition 14.3.1 the following corollary.

Corollary 14.3.18. *On $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ we have for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ and $s = 0, 1$*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N+1-s} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \|[r\mathcal{V}]^i (r^3 \Omega \hat{\chi})\|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^{1+s}}. \quad (14.3.70)$$

On spheres, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^N \|[r\mathcal{V}]^i (r^3 \Omega \hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u} \quad (14.3.71)$$

and

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-2} \|[r\mathcal{V}]^i (r^3 \Omega \hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^2}. \quad (14.3.72)$$

From the relation of Proposition 3.4.1 and the estimates on ψ of Theorem C.4 we deduce:

Corollary 14.3.19. *On $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ we have for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$*

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \|[r\mathcal{V}]^i r^4 (\Omega \beta - (\Omega \beta)_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim (\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.73)$$

On spheres we have for $s = 0, 1, 2$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N-s-1} \|[r\mathcal{V}]^i r^4 (\Omega \beta - (\Omega \beta)_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^{\frac{s}{2}}}. \quad (14.3.74)$$

Finally, by (14.2.7) both estimates hold with $\frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^4}$ on the right provided we replace r^4 by $r^{7/2}$ on the left.

Proof. In view of Proposition 14.3.3 and the estimates on the $\ell = 1$ modes of $\Omega \beta$ in Proposition 14.3.10, it suffices to prove these estimates replacing $\|[r\mathcal{V}]^i r^{4-s/2} (\Omega \beta - (\Omega \beta)_{\text{Kerr}})\|$ by $\|\mathcal{A}^{[i-1]} r^{4-s/2} r \mathcal{P}_2^* \Omega \beta\|$.

For the latter, we first note that the estimates of Theorem C.4 imply that for $s = 0, 1, 2$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \|\mathcal{A}^{[i]} r^5 \psi \Omega\|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim (\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N-s-1} \|\mathcal{A}^{[i]} r^5 \psi \Omega\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^{\frac{s}{2}}}.$$

From the relation of Proposition 3.4.1 and the estimates of Corollary 14.3.18 and Proposition 14.2.9, the desired estimates now follow. \square

14.3.4.8 Estimating $T = \Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ$

Proposition 14.3.20. *On $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{T^+}$ we have for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \| [r\mathring{\nabla}]^i r^{5/2} T \|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{u^4}. \quad (14.3.75)$$

For $n \leq N$ we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^N \| [r\mathring{\nabla}]^i r^3 T \|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \quad (14.3.76)$$

hence in particular

$$\sum_{i=0}^N \| [r\mathring{\nabla}]^i r^2 T \|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^4}. \quad (14.3.77)$$

Proof. In view of Proposition 14.3.2 and the estimates on the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes of T in Proposition 14.3.10 it suffices to prove these estimates with the sums starting from $i = 2$ and with $[r\mathring{\nabla}]^i$ replaced by $\mathcal{A}^{[i-2]} r^2 \mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla}$.

The estimate (14.3.75) then follows by commuting the equation (14.1.4) with $\mathcal{A}^{[i-2]} r^2 \mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla}$ (using that the boxed term then vanishes by the gauge condition (4), $\mu_{\ell \geq 1} = 0$, and integrating. To show (14.3.76) we proceed as before but now observe that for all $2 \leq i \leq N$ we have

$$\int_{u_{-1}}^{u_f} |\mathcal{A}^{[i-2]} r^2 \mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla} T|^2 u^{1+\delta} du + \int_{u_{-1}}^{u_f} r^4 |\mathcal{A}^{[i-2]} r \mathring{\mathcal{P}}_2^* (\eta + \underline{\eta})|^2 u^{1+\delta} du \lesssim \varepsilon^4$$

following from Propositions 14.3.15 and 14.3.16 as well as the estimate (14.3.25) with $s = 1$. The last estimate is immediate from (14.2.7). \square

14.3.4.9 Estimating $\underline{\omega}$

Proposition 14.3.21. *On $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{T^+}$ we have for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ and $s = 0, 1, 2$*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N+1-s} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \| [r\mathring{\nabla}]^i (r\underline{\omega} - r\underline{\omega}_\circ) \|_{S_{\bar{u},v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.78)$$

We also have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-s} \| [r\mathring{\nabla}]^i (r\underline{\omega} - r\underline{\omega}_\circ) \|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.79)$$

Proof. Note that by Proposition 14.3.10 the $\ell = 0$ modes of $\underline{\omega}$ already manifestly satisfy the estimates claimed. Projecting (14.1.45) to $\ell \geq 1$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2r^2 \mathring{\Delta} \underline{\omega}_{\ell \geq 1} = & + 2r^2 \Omega_\circ^2 (d \not{v} (\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}))_{\ell \geq 1} + \Omega_\circ^2 (T r^2)_{\ell \geq 1} \left(\frac{3M_f}{r^3} \right) + \frac{1}{2r} r^2 (|r\hat{\chi}|^2)_{\ell \geq 1} + \left(\mathring{\mathcal{E}}_2^{(in)} \right)_{\ell \geq 1} \\ & + \frac{1}{r} \left[(\Omega \mathring{\nabla}_3 (r^3 \mu + 2M))_{\ell \geq 1} - \Omega \mathring{\nabla}_3 (r^3 \mu + 2M)_{\ell \geq 1} \right] + 2r^2 \left[\mathring{\Delta} \underline{\omega}_{\ell \geq 1} - (\mathring{\Delta} \underline{\omega})_{\ell \geq 1} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.80)$$

The estimates now follow from (angular commutation and) Corollary 14.3.7 and Proposition 14.3.8 as well as Proposition 9.4.5 (with $\xi = \mathring{\nabla}_A \underline{\omega}$) and (9.4.11) in conjunction with Proposition 14.2.6. \square

14.3.4.10 Conclusions

We now combine all our estimates to establish that we have shown (14.3.4). We recall the energies $\mathbb{E}_{v_\infty}^N[\Gamma]$ and $\mathbb{E}_{v_\infty}^N[\mathcal{R}]$. They contain sums over all Ricci-coefficients Γ_p and curvature components \mathcal{R}_p . The following list shows where the estimate is established for each individual quantity:

1. Corollary 14.3.7 shows it for $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}$. Proposition 14.3.14 shows it for ρ, σ .
Corollary 14.3.19 shows it for $\Omega\beta$.
2. Proposition 14.3.6 shows it for $\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}$.
3. Proposition 14.3.8 shows it for \underline{T} .
4. Propositions 14.3.15 and 14.3.16 show it for $\underline{\eta}$ and $\underline{\eta}$.
5. Corollary 14.3.18 shows it for $\Omega\hat{\chi}$.
6. Proposition 14.3.20 shows it for T .
7. Proposition 14.3.21 shows it for $\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o$ and it is easy to see the estimates hold verbatim for $\Omega^{-2}(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o)$.
8. The estimate on $(r(\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2))$ is easily obtained from the gauge condition $(r(\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2))_{\ell=0} = 0$ on $C_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, the relation $\nabla(\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2) = \Omega^2(\underline{\eta} + \underline{\eta})$ and the estimates on $\underline{\eta}$ and $\underline{\eta}$ in Propositions 14.3.15 and 14.3.16.

14.3.4.11 Estimating the quantity Y

We finally deduce an estimate on the quantity Y (both flux and estimates on spheres) which follows directly from the definition (14.1.49) and the previous bounds on $\underline{\eta}$, $\hat{\chi}$ and \underline{T} .

Corollary 14.3.22. *On $C_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ we have for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ and $s = 0, 1, 2$*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-s} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \| [r\nabla]^i Y \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^{s+1}} \quad (14.3.81)$$

while on spheres

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-1-s} \| [r\nabla]^i Y \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.82)$$

14.3.5 Estimates for the angular master energy for quantities on $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$

The objective of this section is to prove the estimate (14.3.5).

14.3.5.1 The $\ell = 0$ and $\ell = 1$ modes

Proposition 14.3.23. *For the Ricci coefficients along $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ we have for all $v \in [v(u_{-1}, R_{-2}), v_\infty]$*

$$\|r^3\omega_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} + \|r^3\omega_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} + \|r^2(\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} + \|r^2(\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2, \quad (14.3.83)$$

$$\|r^2\underline{T}_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} + \|r^2\underline{T}_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} + \|r^3T_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} + \|r^3T_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2, \quad (14.3.84)$$

$$\|r^3(d\nabla v\eta)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} + \|(r^4(c\nabla r l\eta)_{\ell=1} - r^4 c\nabla r l\eta_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2, \quad (14.3.85)$$

$$\|r^3(d\nabla v\underline{\eta})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} + \|(r^4(c\nabla r l\underline{\eta})_{\ell=1} - r^4 c\nabla r l\underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2. \quad (14.3.86)$$

For the curvature components along $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ we have for all $v \in [v(u_{-1}, R_{-2}), v_\infty]$

$$\|r^5(d\nabla v\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} + \|(r^5(c\nabla r l\beta\Omega)_{\ell=1} - r^5(c\nabla r l(\beta\Omega)_{\text{Kerr}}))\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2, \quad (14.3.87)$$

$$\|r^3\rho_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} + \|r^3\rho_{\ell=0} + 2M\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} + \|r^3\sigma_{\ell=1} - r^3\sigma_{\text{Kerr}}\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} + \|r^3\sigma_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2, \quad (14.3.88)$$

$$\|r^3(d\nabla v\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} + \|r^3(c\nabla r l(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}))_{\ell=1} + r^3 c\nabla r l(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\text{Kerr}}\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2. \quad (14.3.89)$$

Proof. Step 1. We first prove all the estimates for $\ell = 0$. The estimate for $\omega_{\ell=0}$ is immediate from gauge condition (7). The one on $(\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2)_{\ell=0}$ follows from projecting the equation

$$2(\omega - \omega_{\circ}) + 2 \left(\frac{\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2}{\Omega_{\circ}^2} \right) (\omega - \omega_{\circ}) = \Omega \nabla_4 \left(\frac{\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2}{\Omega_{\circ}^2} \right)$$

to $\ell = 0$ and integrating from $S_{u_{-1}, v_{\infty}}$ (where $(\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2)_{\ell=0} = 0$ by gauge condition (5)). Note here the estimate for the commutator

$$\left| (\Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2))_{\ell=0} - \Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2)_{\ell=0} \right| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^3}$$

following directly from (9.4.12). Projecting (14.1.21) to $\ell = 0$ and integrating from $S_{u_{-1}, v_{\infty}}$ we obtain after using the estimate on $(\omega - \omega_{\circ})_{\ell=0}$ and the estimates on the non-linear terms (including (9.4.12) to deal with the commutator term from the projection) the estimate for $T_{\ell=0}$. Projecting the ρ -equation to $\ell = 0$ we obtain

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (\rho r^3 + 2M)_{\ell=0} = +3MT_{\ell=0} + (\overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}_2^0})_{\ell=0} - [(\Omega \nabla_4 (\rho r^3 + 2M))_{\ell=0} - \Omega \nabla_4 (\rho r^3 + 2M)_{\ell=0}]$$

which we integrate from $S_{u_{-1}, v_{\infty}}$. Using Proposition 14.3.10 for the initial term and the previous estimates as well as (9.4.12), we obtain the desired estimate for $\rho_{\ell=0}$. For $\sigma_{\ell=0}$ we can directly project (14.1.41) to $\ell = 0$. Finally, for $\underline{T}_{\ell=0}$ we similarly project (14.1.22) to $\ell = 0$ and use previous estimate on the right hand side including the fact that $|r^3 \underline{\mu}_{\ell=0}| \lesssim \varepsilon^2$ by the previous estimate on $\rho_{\ell=0}$.

Step 2. We now prove all the estimates for $\ell = 1$. Commuting the Bianchi equation for $r^4 \beta$ with $r \mathcal{D}_1$ and projecting to $\ell = 1$, we derive

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r^5 (d\sharp v \Omega^{-1} \beta)_{\ell=1}) = (\overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}_2^1})_{\ell=1} - [(\Omega \nabla_4 (r^5 d\sharp v (\Omega^{-1} \beta)))_{\ell=1} - \Omega \nabla_4 (r^5 d\sharp v (\Omega^{-1} \beta))_{\ell=1}] , \quad (14.3.90)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_4 (r^5 (c\sharp r l \Omega^{-1} \beta)_{\ell=1} - r^5 \Omega_{\circ}^{-2} (c\sharp r l (\Omega \beta)_{\text{Kerr}})) &= +3M \sum_{m=-1}^1 a_{T^+}^m \Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 \Delta Y_m^{\ell=1}) + (\overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}_2^1})_{\ell=1} \\ &\quad - [(\Omega \nabla_4 (r^5 c\sharp r l (\Omega^{-1} \beta)))_{\ell=1} - \Omega \nabla_4 (r^5 c\sharp r l (\Omega^{-1} \beta))_{\ell=1}] . \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.91)$$

We note that the right hand sides are integrable and order ε^2 . We integrate and using the global estimate

$$\|r^5 (c\sharp r l \Omega^{-1} \beta)_{\ell=1} - r^5 \Omega_{\circ}^{-2} (c\sharp r l (\Omega \beta)_{\ell=1})\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2$$

as well as the estimates of Proposition 14.3.10 for the initial term on $S_{u_{-1}, v_{\infty}}$, we deduce the estimate (14.3.87).

We now turn to estimate $T_{\ell=1}$ and $\omega_{\ell=1}$ which will have to be proven simultaneously. We first compute from (14.1.44)

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \left(r^2 \Delta + 1 - \frac{2M}{r} \right) \omega_{\ell=1} &= -2r^2 (d\sharp v (\Omega \beta))_{\ell=1} + T_{\ell=1} \left(-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2M}{r} \right) + (\overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}_3^1})_{\ell=1} \\ &\quad + \left[(\Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 \underline{\mu}^{\dagger}))_{\ell=1} - \Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 \underline{\mu}^{\dagger})_{\ell=1} \right] + 2r^2 [\Delta \omega_{\ell=1} - (\Delta \omega)_{\ell=1}] . \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.92)$$

For future reference we note that (14.3.92) holds verbatim replacing $\ell = 1$ by $\ell \geq 1$. With the estimate on $(d\sharp v (\Omega \beta))_{\ell=1}$ already shown we deduce using Proposition 9.4.2

$$\left\| 4\omega_{\ell=1} - \frac{1 + \frac{4M}{r}}{1 + \frac{2M}{r}} (Tr)_{\ell=1} \frac{1}{r} \right\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^3} . \quad (14.3.93)$$

Projecting (14.1.21) to $\ell = 1$ one obtains after inserting (14.3.93) an ODE for the quantity $(T_{\ell=1} \Omega_{\circ}^{-2} r)$ whose right hand side is order $\varepsilon^2 r^{-3}$. The desired estimate on $r^3 T_{\ell=1}$ follows by integrating this ODE and using the estimate of Proposition 14.3.10 for the initial term. The estimate on $r^3 \omega_{\ell=1}$ now follows from (14.3.93).

Projecting the Bianchi equation (14.1.34) to $\ell = 1$ one obtains the estimate for $\rho_{\ell=1}$ by the usual integration. Similarly, projecting (14.1.35) to $\ell = 1$ and integrating one obtains the estimate on $\sigma_{\ell=1}$. Projecting (14.1.23) to $\ell = 1$ using that $(\underline{\mu}^\dagger)_{\ell=1} = 0$ one obtains the desired estimate for $\underline{T}_{\ell=1}$.

Estimates on the $\ell = 1$ modes of $d\sharp v\eta$ and $c\sharp rl\eta$ now follow from $(\underline{\mu}^\dagger)_{\ell=1} = 0$ and the elliptic equation $-(c\sharp rl\eta)_{\ell=1} - c\sharp rl\eta_{\text{Kerr}} = \sigma - \sigma_{\text{Kerr}} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{\chi} \wedge \hat{\underline{\chi}} - (c\sharp rl\eta_{\text{Kerr}} - \sigma_{\text{Kerr}})$ respectively.

For the bounds on $(d\sharp v\eta)_{\ell=1}$ we recall $\Omega\sharp_4(r d\sharp v\eta) = +\Omega_o^2 r d\sharp v\eta - r^2 d\sharp v\Omega\beta + \mathcal{E}_2^1$ and project to $\ell = 1$. Integrating then provides the estimates on $(d\sharp v\eta)_{\ell=1}$. The relation $c\sharp rl\eta = -c\sharp rl\eta$ the analogous estimate for the curl.

Finally, from the Codazzi equation (1.2.19) commuted with $r d\sharp v$ and $r c\sharp rl$ respectively we obtain after projection to $\ell = 1$ and inserting previous bounds on \underline{T} and $\underline{\eta}$ the bound (14.3.89). \square

14.3.5.2 Estimating β

We note the following auxiliary estimate

$$\sup_v \| [r\sharp]{}^N r^2 \Omega \hat{\chi} \|_{S_{u_{-1},v}} \lesssim \varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (14.3.94)$$

which follows easily from (14.1.24), the estimates on α from Theorem 13.1.1 and the estimates on the error from Proposition 14.2.7. From the relation of Proposition 3.4.1 and the estimates on ψ of Theorem C.4 as well as (14.3.94):

$$\int_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \| \mathcal{A}^{[N-1]} r \mathcal{P}_2^\star(r^4 \beta \Omega) \|_{S_{u_{-1},\bar{v}}}^2 + \sup_v \| \mathcal{A}^{[N-1]} r \mathcal{P}_2^\star(r^4 \beta \Omega) \|_{S_{u_{-1},v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.95)$$

Note that in view of the estimate (14.3.87) and Proposition 14.3.3 **we have shown the estimate (14.3.5) for all terms containing β .**

14.3.5.3 Estimating T and $\omega - \omega_o$

Next we look at the coupled system of transport and elliptic equations (14.1.21) and (14.1.44) for T and $\omega - \omega_o$. We first claim that the structure of these equations implies that if we can show the lowest order estimate⁶

$$\sup_v \| r^3 T_{\ell \geq 2} \|_{S_{u_{-1},v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3 \quad (14.3.96)$$

for $r^3 T$, then it follows that

$$\sup_v \| [r\sharp]{}^N (r^3 T) \|_{S_{u_{-1},v}}^2 + \sup_v \| [r\sharp]{}^N (r^3 (\omega - \omega_o)) \|_{S_{u_{-1},v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3 \quad (14.3.97)$$

and

$$\sup_v \| [r\sharp]{}^{N+1} (r^{5/2} T) \|_{S_{u_{-1},v}}^2 + \int_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \| [r\sharp]{}^{N+1} (r^3 (\omega - \omega_o)) \|_{S_{u_{-1},\bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.98)$$

To see this, note that (14.3.96) immediately implies—using the standard elliptic estimate for (14.1.44) (use the $\ell \geq 1$ version of (14.3.92))—control of two angular derivatives of $r^3(\omega - \omega_o)$. This means that we can commute (14.1.21) twice with angular derivatives and upgrade (14.3.96) to two angular derivatives of $r^3 T$. This can be iterated: Commuting now (14.1.44) (or better the $\ell \geq 1$ version of (14.3.92)) with $r^2 \Delta$ we estimate four angular derivatives of $r^3(\omega - \omega_o)$ allowing to estimate four angular derivatives of $r^3 T$ etc. For the top derivatives of $\omega - \omega_o$ we only control the flux as it relies on the top order flux of β improved in (14.3.95) and this leads to a loss in r -power for T because one needs to use the flux estimate for $\omega - \omega_o$ when integrating the $N + 1$ -angular commuted transport equation (14.1.21).

⁶Note we already proved this estimate for $\ell = 1$ and $\ell = 0$ in Proposition 14.3.23.

To finally establish (14.3.96) we first note that by comparison with the round sphere and the properties of spherical harmonics

$$\begin{aligned} 6\|(\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{(S_{u_{-1},v},\dot{\mathcal{G}})}^2 &\leq 6\|(\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{(S_{u_{-1},v},\dot{\mathcal{G}})}^2 + \varepsilon^4 \leq \| -(\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell \geq 2} \dot{\Delta} (\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell \geq 2} \|_{(S_{u_{-1},v},\dot{\mathcal{G}})} + \varepsilon^4 \\ &\leq \| -(\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell \geq 2} \dot{\Delta} (\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell \geq 2} \|_{(S_{u_{-1},v},\dot{\mathcal{G}})} + \varepsilon^4, \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.99)$$

which follows easily from the bootstrap assumptions on the closeness of the metric and the spherical harmonics to their round analogues.

This implies that the projection of (14.1.44) to $\ell \geq 2$ leads to the estimate

$$\|r^3(\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u_{-1},v}} \leq \frac{1}{5} \sup_v \|r^3 T_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u_{-1},v}} + \varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (14.3.100)$$

Projecting now the transport equation (14.1.21) to $\ell \geq 2$ and integrating yields (14.3.96) after inserting the estimate (14.3.100) on the right hand side (and exploiting that $r \geq R_{-2}$ is large in the region under consideration, see (1.3.19)). With this (14.3.97) and (14.3.98) are proven and **we have shown the estimate (14.3.5) for all terms containing T and $\omega - \omega_\circ$.**

14.3.5.4 Estimating \underline{T}

Commuting (14.1.23) with angular derivatives we see (using that $\underline{\mu}_{\ell \geq 2}^\dagger = 0$ on $\underline{C}_{u_{-1}}^+$) that

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \left(\mathcal{A}^{[N-1]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla \Omega^2 \underline{T} r^2 \right) = \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{r^2} (\mathcal{A}^{[N-1]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla r^3 T) + \frac{4\Omega_\circ^2}{r^2} \mathcal{A}^{[N-1]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla r^3 (\omega - \omega_\circ) + \mathcal{E}_2^{(out)N+1}.$$

We integrate and use the estimates (14.3.97) and (14.3.98) on the right hand side. Finally, we conclude using Proposition 14.3.2 with the fact that the estimate has already been shown for the $\ell = 0$ and $\ell = 1$ projections by Proposition 14.3.23 the estimate

$$\sup_v \| [r \nabla]^{N+1} (r^2 \underline{T}) \|_{S_{u_{-1},v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.101)$$

With this **we have shown the estimate (14.3.5) for all terms containing \underline{T} .**

14.3.5.5 Estimating ρ , σ and $\underline{\eta}$

Integrating the Bianchi equations for ρ and σ as transport equations we find

$$\sup_v \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-3]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^* (r^3 \rho + 2M, \sigma)\|_{S_{u_{-1},v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.102)$$

From the elliptic equations (14.1.43) and (14.1.41) we have using the gauge condition $(\underline{\mu}^\dagger)_{\ell \geq 1} = 0$,

$$r^5 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^* (d \nabla \eta, c \nabla \eta) = r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^* \left(-r^3 \rho - 2M_f + \frac{1}{2} r^3 \hat{\chi} \hat{\chi} - \frac{1}{2} \Omega_\circ^2 r^2 \underline{T}, r^3 \sigma - \frac{1}{2} r^3 \hat{\chi} \wedge \hat{\chi} \right),$$

from which we easily deduce using (14.3.102) and (14.3.101)

$$\sup_v \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-3]} \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^* \eta r^2\|_{S_{u_{-1},v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.103)$$

Commuting the equation (14.1.25) we first deduce the lower order estimate

$$\sup_v \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1]} r \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u_{-1},v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.104)$$

Using this and (14.3.94) we obtain immediately from the flux estimates on $\Psi = r^5 P$ of Proposition 13.3.11 and the relations of Proposition 3.4.1 the top order flux estimate

$$\int_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^* (r^3 \rho + 2M_f, r^3 \sigma)\|_{S_{u_{-1},\bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3 \quad (14.3.105)$$

and revisiting the elliptic relation for $\underline{\eta}$ above also the flux estimate

$$\int_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} r^3 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^* \mathcal{P}_1 \underline{\eta} r^2\|_{S_{u_{-1}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.106)$$

In view of Propositions 14.3.2, 14.3.3 and the estimates on the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes in Proposition 14.3.23 now **we have shown the estimate (14.3.5) for all terms containing $\rho - \rho_\circ, \sigma, \underline{\eta}$.**

14.3.5.6 Estimating η

Commuting (14.1.30) with $\mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla$ and using the gauge condition (6) on the right hand side (which makes the $\underline{\mu}^\dagger$ -term vanish) and the fact that $\mu_{\ell \geq 1} = 0$ on S_{u_f, v_∞} we deduce after integration bounds on N derivatives of the linearised mass aspect, which easily translate (using also the commuted (14.1.41)) into the following bounds:

$$\sup_v \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-3]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^* (rd\bar{v} \eta r^2, 0)\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3 \quad (14.3.107)$$

and

$$\int_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^* (rd\bar{v} \eta r^2, 0)\|_{S_{u_{-1}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.108)$$

We now note that the estimates remain valid if we replace 0 by $r^3 c\bar{u}rl\eta$. In view of Proposition 14.3.3 and the estimates on the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes in Proposition 14.3.23 now **we have shown the estimate (14.3.5) for all terms containing η .**

14.3.5.7 Estimating $\underline{\beta}$, $\underline{\hat{\chi}}$ and $\hat{\chi}$

From the estimates for $\underline{\psi}$ we deduce

$$\sup_v \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} r \mathcal{P}_2^* (\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta} r^2)\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3 \quad (14.3.109)$$

and

$$\int_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1]} r \mathcal{P}_2^* (\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta} r^2)\|_{S_{u_{-1}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.110)$$

The Codazzi equation (14.1.47) (cf. (1.2.18)) and previous estimates now lead to

$$\sup_v \|\mathcal{A}^{[N]} (\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi} r)\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}}^2 + \int_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N+1]} (\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi} r)\|_{S_{u_{-1}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.111)$$

Similarly, the Codazzi equation (14.1.46) (cf. (1.2.19)) and previous estimates lead to

$$\sup_v \|\mathcal{A}^{[N]} (\Omega \hat{\chi} r^2)\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}}^2 + \int_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N+1]} (\Omega \hat{\chi} r^2)\|_{S_{u_{-1}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.112)$$

With this, after invoking Proposition 14.3.1, **we have shown the estimate (14.3.5) for all terms containing $\underline{\beta}$, $\underline{\hat{\chi}}$ and $\hat{\chi}$.**

This completes the proof of (14.3.5).

14.3.5.8 Estimating Y

We collect some estimates concerning the quantity Y introduced in (14.1.49).

Corollary 14.3.24. *The following estimates hold on $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$.*

$$\sup_{v \geq v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1]} Y\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \quad (14.3.113)$$

$$\sup_{v \geq v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} r^2 \Omega \nabla_4 Y\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \quad (14.3.114)$$

$$\int_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} \|r^{3-\delta} \mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} \nabla_4 Y\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}}^2 dv \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.115)$$

Proof. The first estimate is a direct consequence of the expression (14.1.49) and the estimates already proven. For the second estimate one computes $\Omega \nabla_4 Y$ from the definition (14.1.49) using the relevant null structure equations for $\hat{\chi}$, $\underline{\eta}$ and \underline{T} after commuting $\Omega \nabla_4$ through. Note that when inserting (14.1.23) one does not produce linear terms with $N+1$ derivatives because gauge condition (6) implies $\mathcal{D}_2^* \nabla \underline{\mu}^\dagger = 0$. All linear terms involve only $N-1$ derivatives of curvature and N derivatives of Ricci-coefficients. The only non-linear term with $N+1$ derivatives involves $N+1$ derivatives of \underline{T} , which we control on spheres. Therefore, one deduces the second estimate invoking the bounds proven *on spheres*. The third estimate follows from integrating the second. \square

14.3.6 Estimates for the angular master energy for quantities in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$

The purpose of this Section is to prove (14.3.6). We begin by estimating the $\ell = 0$ and $\ell = 1$ modes of all quantities in Sections 14.3.6.1 and 14.3.6.2.

14.3.6.1 The $\ell = 0$ modes

For the $\ell = 0$ modes we prove a strong decay estimate.

Proposition 14.3.25. *We have for any $(u, v, \theta) \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ the following estimates*

$$|r^2 T_{\ell=0}| + |r^2(\omega - \omega_o)_{\ell=0}| + |r(\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)_{\ell=0}| + |r^3 \rho_{\ell=0} + 2M_f| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{2-\delta}} \quad (14.3.116)$$

and

$$|r^2 \underline{T}_{\ell=0}| + |r(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o)_{\ell=0}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{2-\delta}}. \quad (14.3.117)$$

In addition,

$$|r^3(\omega - \omega_o)_{\ell=0}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{1-\delta}}. \quad (14.3.118)$$

Proof. The proof exploits that $R \gg M_f$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and will put an explicit constraint on R depending only on M_f . Hence for the duration of the proof, we will denote dependences on R explicitly, while the implicit constants in the notation \lesssim can here be chosen independently of the choice of R .

Step 1. We first establish the above estimates in the region $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \{r \geq \frac{1}{2}u\}$. By our choice of parameters $R_{-2} > \frac{1}{2}u_{-1}$ so that the hypersurface $r = \frac{1}{2}u$ does not intersect $u = u_{-1}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$.

For the proof, we let for fixed $(u, v) \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f) \cap \{r \geq \frac{1}{2}u\}$

$$\mathcal{A}^*(u, v) := \{(\bar{u}, \bar{v}, \theta) \in \mathcal{A} \text{ with } \bar{u} \leq u \text{ and } \bar{v} \geq v\}$$

and note that $\sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u, v)} \frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{r(u, v)}$.

Integrating the projected Bianchi equation for ρ ,

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r^3(\rho - \rho_o)_{\ell=0} + f(u)) = 3M_f T_{\ell=0} + (\overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}_2^1})_{\ell=0} + \Omega \nabla_4 (r^3(\rho - \rho_o)_{\ell=0}) - (\Omega \nabla_4 (r^3(\rho - \rho_o)))_{\ell=0} \quad (14.3.119)$$

backwards from $v = v_\infty$, we have for any $(u, v, \theta) \in \mathcal{A}$

$$|r^3(\rho - \rho_o)_{\ell=0}(u, v) + f(u)| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{ru} + \frac{3M_f}{ru^{2-\delta}} \sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)} |T_{\ell=0} r^2 u^{2-\delta}|, \quad (14.3.120)$$

with the $\frac{\varepsilon^2}{ru}$ term on the right arising from $|\overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}_2^1}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^2 u}$ (cf. Proposition 14.2.8), Proposition 9.4.3 and (14.3.50) for the term on $v = v_\infty$.

We now integrate the projected $\nabla_3 \omega$ equation forwards from (u_{-1}, v, θ) to $(u, v, \theta) \in \mathcal{A}$. From

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 \left((\omega - \omega_o)_{\ell=0} - \frac{\Omega_o^2}{r^3} F(u) \right) &= -\frac{\Omega_o^2}{r^3} (r^3(\rho - \rho_o)_{\ell=0} + f(u)) + \frac{2M_f}{r^3} (\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)_{\ell=0} - \frac{\Omega_o^2}{r^4} \left(3 - \frac{4M_f}{r} \right) F(u) \\ &\quad + (\overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}_4^0})_{\ell=0} + \Omega \nabla_3 (\omega - \omega_o)_{\ell=0} - (\Omega \nabla_3 (\omega - \omega_o))_{\ell=0} \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.121)$$

we derive

$$\left| (\omega - \omega_o)_{\ell=0}(u, v) - \frac{\Omega_o^2}{r^3} F(u) \right| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^{4-\delta}} + \frac{\sup_{\mathcal{A}^*} |r(\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)_{\ell=0}|}{r^3} + \frac{\sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)} |T_{\ell=0} r^2 u^{2-\delta}|}{r^4} \quad (14.3.122)$$

for all $(u, v, \theta) \in \mathcal{A}$, where we have used

- that the quantity in brackets on the left of (14.3.121) vanishes on $u = u_{-1}$ by the gauge condition (7),
- (14.3.120) and $|\overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}_4^0}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^4 u}$ (cf. Proposition 14.2.8) as well as $F(u) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u}$.
- Proposition 9.4.3 which implies that $|\Omega \nabla_3 (\omega - \omega_o)_{\ell=0} - (\Omega \nabla_3 (\omega - \omega_o))_{\ell=0}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^4 u}$.

Integrating backwards from $v = v_\infty$ the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)_{\ell=0} &= 2\Omega_o^2 (\omega - \omega_o)_{\ell=0} - \frac{2M_f}{r^3} (\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)_{\ell=0} \\ &\quad + 2[(\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)(\omega - \omega_o)]_{\ell=0} + \Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)_{\ell=0} - (\Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2))_{\ell=0}, \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.123)$$

we deduce after inserting (14.3.122) and using Proposition 9.4.3 and the fact that the initial term on $v = v_\infty$ vanishes by the gauge condition (5), that we have

$$\left| (\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)_{\ell=0}(u, v) \right| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^2 u^{1-\delta}} + \frac{1}{r^2} \sup_{\mathcal{A}^*} |r(\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)_{\ell=0}| + \frac{1}{r^3} \sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)} |T_{\ell=0} r^2 u^{2-\delta}| \quad (14.3.124)$$

and hence in particular

$$\sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)} \left| r(\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)_{\ell=0}(u, v) \right| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{ru^{1-\delta}} + \frac{1}{r^2} \sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)} |T_{\ell=0} r^2 u^{2-\delta}|, \quad (14.3.125)$$

which allows to simplify (14.3.122) to

$$\left| (\omega - \omega_o)_{\ell=0}(u, v) - \frac{\Omega_o^2}{r^3} F(u) \right| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^{4-\delta}} + \frac{1}{r^4} \sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)} |T_{\ell=0} r^2 u^{2-\delta}| \quad (14.3.126)$$

and

$$|(\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell=0}(u, v)| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^{3-\delta}u} + \frac{1}{r^4} \sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)} |T_{\ell=0} r^2 u^{2-\delta}|. \quad (14.3.127)$$

Note that since we are in the region \mathcal{A} , we could replace $r^{3-\delta}$ by $v^{3-\delta}$, something that will be convenient to do below. We finally project (14.1.21) to $\ell = 0$,

$$\Omega \nabla_4((\Omega^{-2} r^2 T)_{\ell=0}) = r(\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell=0} + (\overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}_2^0})_{\ell=0} + \Omega \nabla_4((\Omega^{-2} r^2 T)_{\ell=0}) - (\Omega \nabla_4((\Omega^{-2} r^2 T))_{\ell=0}), \quad (14.3.128)$$

and integrate backwards from $v = v_\infty$. Inserting the previous estimates and using (9.4.12) we conclude

$$|r^2 T_{\ell=0}(u, v)| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^{1-\delta}u} + \frac{1}{r^2} \sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)} |T_{\ell=0} r^2 u^{2-\delta}| \quad (14.3.129)$$

for all $(u, v, \theta) \in \mathcal{A}$. Multiplying by $u^{2-\delta}$ and using that $|ur^{-1}| \leq 2$ in \mathcal{A} , we finally conclude

$$\sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)} |r^2 T_{\ell=0} u^{2-\delta}| \lesssim \varepsilon^2, \quad (14.3.130)$$

provided $R^{-\delta}C < \frac{1}{2}$ where C is the constant implicit in (14.3.129), which can easily be computed explicitly. Since (u, v) was arbitrary we have this estimate in all of \mathcal{A} . The estimates (14.3.116) now follow in \mathcal{A} by revisiting (14.3.125), (14.3.127) and (14.3.120). The estimate (14.3.118) follows from (14.3.126). To show (14.3.117) in \mathcal{A} we integrate

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_4((\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_\circ)_{\ell=0}) &= -\Omega_\circ^2(\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0} + \frac{2M_f}{r^3}(\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=0} \\ &\quad + (\overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}_4^0}) + \Omega \nabla_4(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_\circ)_{\ell=0} - (\Omega \nabla_4(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_\circ))_{\ell=0} \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.131)$$

from $v = v_\infty$ (where we have $|(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_\circ)_{\ell=0}| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^2 u}$ by (14.3.52)) to conclude the bound claimed. For \underline{T} we integrate the projected equation (14.1.22),

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_4(\Omega^2 \underline{T} r)_{\ell=0} &= \Omega_\circ^2 T_{\ell=0} + 4\Omega_\circ^2(\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell=0} + \frac{2\Omega_\circ^2}{r^2} \left(r^3(\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0} - \frac{1}{2}(r^3 \hat{\chi} \hat{\chi})_{\ell=0} \right) + (\overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}_3^0})_{\ell=0} \\ &\quad + \Omega \nabla_4(\Omega^2 \underline{T} r)_{\ell=0} - (\Omega \nabla_4(\Omega^2 \underline{T} r))_{\ell=0}, \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.132)$$

to obtain

$$(\Omega^2 \underline{T} r)_{\ell=0}(u, v) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r u^{2-\delta}},$$

from which the estimate claimed for \underline{T} follows easily.

Step 2. We now establish the estimates in the region $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap \{r \leq \frac{1}{2}u\}$.

Note that in \mathcal{B} we have $u \leq v \leq 2u$. Note also that from $R_{-2} > \frac{1}{2}u_{-1}$, the past ingoing cone through any sphere in \mathcal{B} intersects $\{r = \frac{1}{2}u\}$ (and so does the future outgoing cone). For the proof, it is useful to define for $(u, v) \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f) \cap \{r \leq \frac{1}{2}u\}$ the set

$$\mathcal{B}^*(u, v) := \{(\bar{u}, \bar{v}, \theta) \in \mathcal{B} \text{ with } \bar{u} \leq u \text{ and } \bar{v} \geq v\}.$$

Note that $\inf_{(u', v') \in \mathcal{B}^*(u, v)} u' \geq \frac{1}{3}u$ so the u value in $\mathcal{B}^*(u, v)$ is everywhere comparable to u itself.

Integrating (14.3.119) (now dropping the $f(u)$ on the left) from $r = \frac{1}{2}u$ (where $r \sim u \sim v$) yields

$$|r^3 \rho_{\ell=0}(u, v) + 2M| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{2-\delta}} + \frac{1}{R} \sup_{\mathcal{B}^*(u, v)} |T_{\ell=0} r^2| \quad \text{for all } (u, v, \theta) \in \mathcal{B},$$

where we have used $|\overset{(out)}{\mathcal{Z}}_2^1| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{2-\delta}r^{1+\delta}}$ from Proposition 14.2.8. Integrating the $\omega - \omega_\circ$ equation (14.3.121) (again with all terms involving $F(u)$ and $f(u)$ removed on both sides) forwards from $\{r = \frac{1}{2}u\}$ yields

$$|(\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell=0}(u, v)| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^{3-\delta}u} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^2u^2} + \frac{1}{r^3} \sup_{\mathcal{B}^*(u,v)} \left| r(\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=0} \right| + \frac{1}{r^2R} \sup_{\mathcal{B}^*(u,v)} |T_{\ell=0}r^2|,$$

where we have used $|\overset{(in)}{\mathcal{Z}}_4^0 + \Omega \nabla_3(\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell=0} - (\Omega \nabla_3(\omega - \omega_\circ))_{\ell=0}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^2u^2}$ and the first term arises from the initial term on $r = \frac{1}{2}u$.⁷ Integrating (14.3.123) we find

$$\sup_{\mathcal{B}^*(u,v)} \left| r(\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=0}(u, v) \right| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{2-\delta}} + \frac{1}{R} \sup_{\mathcal{B}^*(u,v)} |T_{\ell=0}r^2|, \quad (14.3.133)$$

and hence

$$|(\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell=0}(u, v)| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^{3-\delta}u} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^2u^2} + \frac{1}{r^2R} \sup_{\mathcal{B}^*(u,v)} |T_{\ell=0}r^2|.$$

Integrating backwards (14.3.128) from $r = \frac{1}{2}u$ we deduce

$$|r^2T_{\ell=0}(u, v)| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{2-\delta}} + \frac{1}{r} \sup_{\mathcal{B}^*(u,v)} |T_{\ell=0}r^2| \quad \text{for all } (u, v, \theta) \in \mathcal{B}, \quad (14.3.134)$$

and hence, provided $R^{-1}C < \frac{1}{2}$ with C the constant implicit in (14.3.134),

$$\sup_{\mathcal{B}^*(u,v)} |r^2T_{\ell=0}(u, v)| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{2-\delta}}. \quad (14.3.135)$$

Since (u, v) was arbitrary, we have shown the estimate in all of \mathcal{B} and hence in all of $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$. The estimates for $(\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell=0}$, $(\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ)_{\ell=0}$ and $r^3\rho_{\ell=0} + 2M$ now follow as before by revisiting the conditional estimates of Step 2. Integrating (14.3.131) and (14.3.132) from $r = \frac{1}{2}u$ using the previous estimates establishes also the bounds for \underline{T} and $\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_\circ$. This ends the proof. \square

14.3.6.2 The $\ell = 1$ modes

We now turn to the $\ell = 1$ modes. Key is an improved estimate for $(c\psi r l \eta)_{\ell=1}$. For all other (independent) quantities we confine ourselves with the standard u^{-1} decay, see Proposition 14.3.27 below.

Proposition 14.3.26. *We have for any $(u, v, \theta) \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ the estimates*

$$\|r^5 c\psi r l ((\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1} - (\Omega\beta)_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|r^3 c\psi r l ((\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1} - (\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{3/2}} \quad (14.3.136)$$

$$\|r^3(\sigma_{\ell=1} - \sigma_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2} \quad (14.3.137)$$

and

$$\|r^3 c\psi r l (\eta_{\ell=1} - \eta_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|r^3 c\psi r l (\underline{\eta}_{\ell=1} - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{3/2}}. \quad (14.3.138)$$

Finally, on $u = u_f$ all estimates hold with the improved rate $\varepsilon^2(u_f)^{-2}$.

⁷Note that when integrating $u^{-\gamma}$ along the constant v hypersurface in \mathcal{B} we call pull out $u^{-\gamma}$ from the integral because in \mathcal{B} , the infimum and the supremum of u along that hypersurface are comparable. Moreover, note that r is decreasing towards the future along that hypersurface.

Proof. We recall from (14.3.90) the projected equations

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r^5 (d\!/\!v \Omega^{-1} \beta)_{\ell=1}) = (\overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}_2^1})_{\ell=1} - [(\Omega \nabla_4 (r^5 d\!/\!v (\Omega^{-1} \beta)))_{\ell=1} - \Omega \nabla_4 (r^5 d\!/\!v (\Omega^{-1} \beta))_{\ell=1}] , \quad (14.3.139)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_4 (r^5 (c\!/\!r l \Omega^{-1} \beta)_{\ell=1} - r^5 \Omega_{\circ}^{-2} (c\!/\!r l (\Omega \beta)_{\text{Kerr}})) &= +3M_f \sum_{m=-1}^1 a_{T^+}^m \Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 \Delta Y_m^{\ell=1}) + (\overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}_2^1})_{\ell=1} \\ &\quad - [(\Omega \nabla_4 (r^5 c\!/\!r l (\Omega^{-1} \beta)))_{\ell=1} - \Omega \nabla_4 (r^5 c\!/\!r l (\Omega^{-1} \beta))_{\ell=1}] . \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.140)$$

In fact, we need to be slightly more precise about the terms appearing in $\overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}_2^1}$. It is easy to check that the terms in $\overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}_2^1}$ are either actually $\overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}_{5/2}^1}$ or each summand in the remaining terms will contain at least one factor from $\overset{(in)}{\Phi_p}$. This special structure leads to the estimate $\| \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}_2^1} \|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2 r^{-3/2} u^{-2}$ (while without it only $\| \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}_2^1} \|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2 r^{-3/2} u^{-3/2}$ would hold). Using also the estimate of Proposition 9.4.3 we conclude that the entire right hand sides of the above two equations satisfy $\|RHS\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2 r^{-3/2} u^{-2}$. In view of the estimates on $v = v_{\infty}$ for the initial term (14.3.36), (14.3.37) we therefore conclude the estimates

$$\|r^5 (d\!/\!v \Omega \beta)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u} \quad \text{and} \quad \|r^5 (c\!/\!r l \Omega \beta)_{\ell=1} - r^5 c\!/\!r l (\Omega \beta)_{\text{Kerr}}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^{3/2}} , \quad (14.3.141)$$

with an improvement to $\frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2}$ on $u = u_f$ for the latter estimate, in view of the improvement of the estimate for the initial term (14.3.36) in Proposition 14.3.10. The $c\!/\!r l$ -part of the Codazzi equation (1.2.18) projected to $\ell = 1$ as well as $c\!/\!r l (\eta + \underline{\eta}) = 0$ now provide the bounds claimed on $c\!/\!r l \eta$ and $c\!/\!r l \underline{\eta}$. The equation $\sigma = c\!/\!r l \eta + \frac{1}{2} \hat{\chi} \wedge \underline{\hat{\chi}}$ provides the bound on σ and the other Codazzi equation the bound on $c\!/\!r l \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}$. \square

Proposition 14.3.27. *We have for any $(u, v, \theta) \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ the following estimates*

$$\begin{aligned} \|r^2 T_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|r^2 (\omega - \omega_{\circ})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|r (\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} \\ + \|r^3 \rho_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|r^5 (d\!/\!v \Omega \beta)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u} \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.142)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|r^2 \underline{T}_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|r (\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_{\circ})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} \\ + \|r^3 (d\!/\!v \eta)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|r^3 (d\!/\!v \underline{\eta})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|r^3 (d\!/\!v \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u} . \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.143)$$

In addition,

$$\|r^3 (\omega - \omega_{\circ})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2 . \quad (14.3.144)$$

Proof. Note the bound on β was already obtained in (14.3.141). The proof proceeds very similarly to Proposition 14.3.25. We use the notation of the regions etc. from that proof (in particular \lesssim does not involve constants that depend on R) and streamline the argument, which is easier here as we are not aiming for improved decay.

Step 1. Estimates in \mathcal{A} . The analogue of the (now to $\ell = 1$) projected propagation equation contains an additional term $r^3 (d\!/\!v \Omega \beta)_{\ell=1}$ on the right hand side, for which we have just proven the estimate (14.3.141). Therefore, we have

$$\|r^3 (\rho - \rho_{\circ})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2} + \frac{1}{ru} \sup_{(u', v') \in \mathcal{A}^*(u, v)} \|T_{\ell=1} r^2 u\|_{S_{u', v'}} , \quad (14.3.145)$$

for all $(u, v, \theta) \in \mathcal{A}$. Integrating the projected $\Omega \nabla_3 (\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell=1}$ equation yields or all $(u, v, \theta) \in \mathcal{A}$

$$\|(\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^3} + \frac{\sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)} \|u \cdot r (\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u',v'}}}{r^{4-\delta}} + \frac{\sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)} \|T_{\ell=1} r^2 u\|_{S_{u',v'}}}{r^{4-\delta}}, \quad (14.3.146)$$

where we write shorthand $\sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)}$ for $\sup_{(u',v') \in \mathcal{A}^*(u,v)}$. Integrating $(\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=1}$ backwards using (14.3.40) for the initial term gives

$$\|(\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u',v'}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{ru} + \frac{1}{r^{3-\delta}} \sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)} \|u \cdot r (\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u',v'}} + \frac{1}{r^{3-\delta}} \sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)} \|T_{\ell=1} r^2 u\|_{S_{u',v'}}$$

and hence in particular

$$\sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)} \|u \cdot r (\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u',v'}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2 + \frac{1}{r^{1-\delta}} \sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)} \|T_{\ell=0} r^2 u\|_{S_{u',v'}}, \quad (14.3.147)$$

and

$$\|(\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^3} + \frac{1}{r^{4-\delta}} \sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)} \|T_{\ell=1} r^2 u\|_{S_{u',v'}} \quad (14.3.148)$$

holds in \mathcal{A} . Integrating backwards the $\ell = 1$ analogue of (14.3.128) yields (using (14.3.32) for the initial term)

$$\|r^2 T_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r} + \frac{1}{r^{2-\delta}} \sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)} \|T_{\ell=1} r^2 u\|_{S_{u',v'}} \quad (14.3.149)$$

for all $(u, v, \theta) \in \mathcal{A}$. Multiplying by u and using that $|ur^{-1}| \leq 2$ in \mathcal{A} we conclude

$$\sup_{\mathcal{A}^*(u,v)} \|r^2 T_{\ell=1} u\|_{S_{u',v'}} \lesssim \varepsilon^2, \quad (14.3.150)$$

provided $R^{-2+\delta} C < \frac{1}{2}$ where C is the constant implicit in (14.3.149). Since (u, v) was arbitrary we have this estimate in all of \mathcal{A} . Revisiting the estimates shows (14.3.142) and (14.3.144) in \mathcal{A} . Applying $r^4 d\!\!\!\!/\,v$ to the Codazzi equation (1.2.18) and projecting to $\ell = 1$ immediately establishes the estimate for $r^3 d\!\!\!\!/\,v \eta_{\ell=1}$ after using that $\|r^4 \Delta T_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u}$ by (14.3.130) and Proposition 9.4.2. We next integrate

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 (d\!\!\!\!/\,v \eta)_{\ell=1}) = \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{r^2} r^3 (d\!\!\!\!/\,v \eta)_{\ell=1} - r^2 (d\!\!\!\!/\,v \Omega \beta)_{\ell=1} + (\mathcal{E}_3^{(out)})_{\ell=0} + \Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 (d\!\!\!\!/\,v \eta)_{\ell=1}) - (\Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 d\!\!\!\!/\,v \eta))_{\ell=1} \quad (14.3.151)$$

from infinity (using (14.3.30)) to establish $\|(r^3 d\!\!\!\!/\,v \eta)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u}$. The estimates for the $\ell = 1$ part of \underline{T} , $\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_\circ$ and $d\!\!\!\!/\,v \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}$ easily follow from their projected propagation equations in the 4-direction and the estimates already shown.

Step 2. Estimates in \mathcal{B} .

Integrating the $\ell = 1$ analogue of (14.3.119) from $r = \frac{1}{2}u$ (where $r \sim u \sim v$) and using (14.3.145) for the initial term yields

$$\|r^3 \rho_{\ell=1}(u, v)\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{ru} + \frac{1}{R} \sup_{\mathcal{B}^*(u,v)} \|T_{\ell=1} r^2\|_{S_{u',v'}} \quad \text{for all } (u, v, \theta) \in \mathcal{B}.$$

Integrating the projected $\Omega \nabla_3 (\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell=1}$ equation forwards from $\{r = \frac{1}{2}u\}$ yields

$$\|(\omega - \omega_\circ)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^3} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^3 u} + \frac{1}{r^3} \sup_{\mathcal{B}^*(u,v)} \|r (\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u',v'}} + \frac{1}{r^2 R} \sup_{\mathcal{B}^*(u,v)} \|T_{\ell=1} r^2\|_{S_{u',v'}}.$$

Integrating the $\ell = 1$ analogue of (14.3.123) we find

$$\sup_{\mathcal{B}^*(u,v)} \|r (\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u',v'}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u} + \frac{1}{R} \sup_{\mathcal{B}^*(u,v)} \|T_{\ell=1} r^2\|_{S_{u',v'}}, \quad (14.3.152)$$

and hence

$$\|(\omega - \omega_o)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^3} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^3 u} + \frac{1}{r^2 R} \sup_{\mathcal{B}^*(u,v)} \|T_{\ell=1} r^2\|_{S_{u',v'}}.$$

Integrating backwards the $\ell = 1$ analogue of (14.3.128) from $r = \frac{1}{2}u$ we deduce

$$\|r^2 T_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u} + \frac{1}{r} \sup_{\mathcal{B}^*(u,v)} \|T_{\ell=1} r^2\|_{S_{u',v'}} \quad \text{for all } (u, v, \theta) \in \mathcal{B}, \quad (14.3.153)$$

and hence, provided $R^{-1}C < \frac{1}{2}$ with C the constant implicit in (14.3.153),

$$\sup_{\mathcal{B}^*(u,v)} \|r^2 T_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u',v'}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u}. \quad (14.3.154)$$

Since (u, v) was arbitrary, we have shown the estimate in all of \mathcal{B} and hence in all of $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$. The estimates for $(\omega - \omega_o)_{\ell=1}$, $(\Omega^2 - \Omega_o)_{\ell=1}$ and $r^3 \rho_{\ell=1} + 2M$ now follow as before by revisiting the conditional estimates of Step 2. The estimate for $(d\nu\eta)_{\ell=1}$ again follows from Codazzi and the one for $(d\nu\eta)_{\ell=1}$ again straight from the propagation equation (14.3.151).

Integrating the $\ell = 1$ analogue of (14.3.131) and (14.3.132) from $r = \frac{1}{2}u$ using the previous estimates establishes also the bounds for \underline{T} and $\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o$. The estimate for $d\nu\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}$ easily follows again from their propagation equations in the 4-direction. This ends the proof. \square

From Proposition 14.3.25 and (14.3.141) we conclude in particular (referring back to the terms in the second line of the energy (6.1.15) and in the last line of the energy (6.1.16)):

The estimate (14.3.6) has been shown for all terms containing explicitly the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes.

14.3.6.3 Estimating $\hat{\chi}$

Proposition 14.3.28. *For any $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ we have for $s = 0, 1$ the integrated decay estimates*

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N+1-s]} \hat{\chi} \Omega r^2\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.155)$$

Along any ingoing cone $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ we have for $s = 0, 1$

$$\int_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)} d\bar{u} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N+1-s]} \hat{\chi} \Omega r^2\|_{S_{\bar{u}, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.156)$$

On spheres we have for $s = 0, 1, 2$

$$\|\mathcal{A}^{[N-s]} \hat{\chi} \Omega r^2\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^{\min(\frac{1}{2}+s, 2)}}. \quad (14.3.157)$$

Along any outgoing cone we have the flux estimate

$$\int_{v(u, R_{-2})}^\infty d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N+1]} \hat{\chi} \Omega r^2\|_{S_{u, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim (\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.158)$$

In particular, in view of Proposition 14.3.1

The estimate (14.3.6) has been shown for all terms containing $\hat{\chi}$.

Remark 14.3.29. As the proof will reveal, the estimates (14.3.155) and (14.3.156) also hold for $s = 2$ provided the decay rate on the right is changed to $2 - 2\delta$.

Proof. We first note that it suffices to establish all estimates with $\frac{\hat{\chi}}{\Omega}$ in place of $\hat{\chi}\Omega$. This follows easily from the estimates on the non-linear errors caused by the difference of these quantities, cf. Proposition 14.2.8.

Step 1: Renormalised quantity and propagation equation. We introduce the renormalised quantity

$$Z := -\frac{3M}{r}r^2\hat{\chi}\Omega^{-1} - r^3\mathcal{P}_2^*\underline{\eta} + \frac{1}{2}r^2\mathcal{P}_2^*\nabla(\Omega^{-2}r^2T) = r^2\mathcal{P}_2^*d\psi(\hat{\chi}r^2\Omega^{-1}) + r\Omega^{-2}\Pi + \Omega^{-2}\mathcal{E}_1^{(out)} \quad (14.3.159)$$

with the second equality following from (14.1.46) recalling $\Pi = r^3\Omega\psi$. Clearly, in view of the second equality, estimates on Z will translate into estimates on $\hat{\chi}$ using estimates on the almost gauge invariant quantity Π . We compute (using the null structure equations and noting that the linear term in $\omega - \omega_o$ appearing from (14.1.21) and (1.2.13) cancels) the schematic propagation equation

$$\Omega\nabla_4 Z = -\Pi + 3MA\Omega^{-2} + \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2 \leq 2 \\ \Phi_{p_1}, \Phi_{p_2} \in \{\hat{\chi}, T\}}} h_{k_1, k_2, \Phi_{p_1}, \Phi_{p_2}} \Omega^{-2}r^2[r\nabla]^{k_1}\Phi_{p_1}[r\nabla]^{k_2}\Phi_{p_2} + \Omega^{-2}\mathcal{E}_2^{(out)}. \quad (14.3.160)$$

Here implicit in the sum involving the admissible coefficient functions $h_{k_1, k_2, \Phi_{p_1}, \Phi_{p_2}}$ are various contractions with the metric g (to produce a symmetric traceless tensor) that we do not keep track of. Commuting yields

$$\Omega\nabla_4 \left(\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}Z \right) = -\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}\Pi + \frac{3M}{\Omega^2}\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}A + \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2 \leq N+1-s \\ \Phi_{p_1}, \Phi_{p_2} \in \{\hat{\chi}, T\}}} \Omega^{-2}r^2[r\nabla]^{k_1}\Phi_{p_1}[r\nabla]^{k_2}\Phi_{p_2} + \Omega^{-2}\mathcal{E}_2^{(out)}, \quad (14.3.161)$$

where we recall $A = r\Omega^2\alpha$ and we have further abused notation and suppressed the admissible coefficient functions multiplying each term in the sum.

Step 2: Estimates for the right hand side and boundary terms

(1) (Error estimates) Denoting the last two terms in (14.3.161) momentarily by “ NL_s ” we have for any s

$$\int_v^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \|NL_s\|_{S_{u, \bar{v}}}^2 r^{1+\delta} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{u^{2-\delta_0^s}}, \quad \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{1+\delta} \|NL_s\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{u^2}. \quad (14.3.162)$$

This follows easily from the error estimates of Proposition 14.2.8 and the flux estimate of Lemma 14.2.12 for the top order derivative term in the sum. For the spacetime integral one uses in addition the bootstrap assumption on $N+1$ angular derivatives of $\hat{\chi}$ and T .

(2) (Almost gauge invariant quantities) From Theorem C.4, we have, for any $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ and $s = 0, 1, 2$, the flux estimates

$$\int_v^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-s]}A\|_{S_{u, \bar{v}}}^2 r^{1+\delta} \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^4}{u^s}, \quad \int_v^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}\Pi\|_{S_{u, \bar{v}}}^2 r^{1+\delta} \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}$$

as well as the spacetime estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{1+\delta} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-s]}A\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 &\lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s} \quad \text{for } s = 0, 1, 2, \\ \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{1+\delta} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}\Pi\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 &\lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s} \quad \text{for } s = 0, 1, \\ \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{1+\delta} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-3]}\Pi\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 &\lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^{2-2\delta}}. \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.163)$$

(3) (boundary terms on $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$) From estimates of Propositions 14.3.6, 14.3.8 and 14.3.15, we have on $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ the estimates

$$\|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}Z\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}, \quad \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}Z\|_{S_{\bar{u},v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.164)$$

Step 3: Completing the proof. Using (1)–(3) above, the desired estimates follow: We contract (14.3.161) with $(1-r^{-\delta})\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}Z$ and integrate successively over the following regions

1. $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)$ (to obtain the spacetime integral)
2. $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) \cap J^+(\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u))$ (to produce the boundary term on the ingoing cone $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)$) .

After an integration by parts with the boundary term controlled by (3) we produce a spacetime term with a favourable sign on the left of the form

$$\delta \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}Z\|_{S_{\bar{u},\bar{v}}}^2.$$

Applying Cauchy–Schwarz to the terms borrowing from this spacetime term and using the estimates from (1) and (2) above yields for $s = 0, 1$ the estimate

$$\int_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)} d\bar{u} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}Z\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}}^2 + \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}Z\|_{S_{\bar{u},\bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.165)$$

The estimate also holds for $s = 2$ provided the decay rate is changed to $2 - 2\delta$.

Following the same argument but integrating now only over a fixed cone $C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ we also obtain for $s = 0, 1, 2$

$$\|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}Z\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \int_{v(u, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}Z\|_{S_{u,\bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.166)$$

Using the relation (14.3.159), the above estimates on Z readily translate into estimates for $r^2\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}$ using the estimates on the almost gauge invariant quantity Π from Theorem C.4. \square

We conclude with an L^1 -estimate for $\hat{\chi}$ along the outgoing cones $C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ which will be useful when estimating the metric components later.

Corollary 14.3.30. *For any $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ and $v > v(u, R_{-2})$ we have for $s = 0, 1, 2$ the estimate*

$$\int_v^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \| [r\hat{\nabla}]^{N+1-s}(\Omega\hat{\chi}) \|_{S_{u,\bar{v}}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{r \cdot u^{s/2}}. \quad (14.3.167)$$

Proof. Note that we have

$$\int_v^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}r^2\mathcal{P}_2^*d\hat{v}(\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u,\bar{v}}} = \int_v^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}\frac{1}{r^2}(\Omega^2Z - r\Pi - \overset{(out)}{\mathfrak{E}_1^1})\|_{S_{u,\bar{v}}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{r \cdot u^{s/2}},$$

where the equality follows from (14.3.159) and the estimate from Proposition 14.2.8 on the non-linear error, the estimate (14.3.166) on Z and using Cauchy–Schwarz on the term involving Π so that its flux appearing in Theorem C.4 can be exploited. Applying Proposition 14.3.1 to the left hand side the result follows. \square

14.3.6.4 Estimating β

Using that the bootstrap estimates have been improved for $\hat{\chi}$ we can improve them for β using the control of the $\ell = 1$ modes from Propositions 14.3.26 and 14.3.27 and the almost gauge invariant quantity ψ .

Proposition 14.3.31.

The estimate (14.3.6) has been shown for all terms containing β .

Proof. Note that using the estimates of Propositions 14.3.26 and 14.3.27 on the $\ell = 1$ mode of β it suffices in view of Proposition 14.3.3 to obtain estimates for $\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}\mathcal{P}_2^*\beta$. To obtain the latter we recall from the proof of Proposition 3.4.6 the relation

$$\mathcal{P}_2^*\Omega\beta = \Pi r^{-3} + \frac{3M}{r^3}\Omega\hat{\chi} + \frac{1}{2}(-3(\rho - \rho_\circ)\Omega\hat{\chi} - 3\sigma\Omega^*\hat{\chi}) + \mathcal{E}_6^0.$$

We commute this with $\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}$ and use the estimates of Proposition 14.3.28 on $\hat{\chi}$ and the estimates on the almost gauge invariant quantity Π from Theorem C.4 for the linear terms. The non-linear term \mathcal{E}_6^0 is controlled using Propositions 14.2.9 and 14.2.10. For the other non-linear terms note in particular that we have ingoing flux estimates for ρ and σ from the bootstrap assumptions and also such estimates for $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ from (14.3.156). \square

14.3.6.5 Estimating $\hat{\chi}$

The quantity $\hat{\chi}$ will be estimated from the quantity B which in turn will be estimated from its propagation equation in the 3-direction (14.1.55).

Proposition 14.3.32. *We have in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ the estimates*

$$\|\mathcal{A}^{[N-3]}B\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1]}Y\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (14.3.168)$$

Proof. The estimate for B follows directly from (14.1.55) noting the non-linear error estimate (14.2.31). For the most difficult linear error term on the right hand side of (14.1.55) note that by Cauchy–Schwarz

$$\int_{u_{-1}}^u d\bar{u} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-3]}\check{A}\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}} \lesssim \sqrt{\int_{u_{-1}}^u d\bar{u} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-3]}\check{A}\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}}^2} \bar{u}^{1+\delta} \lesssim \varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (14.3.169)$$

with the last estimate following from Theorem C.4. Once the estimate holds for B , the relation (14.1.54) implies it for Y using the estimates on $\check{\Psi}$ and $\check{\psi}$ from Theorem C.4 and Corollary 13.9.2. \square

Corollary 14.3.33. *We have in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ the estimates*

$$\sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N]}r\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u,v}} + \sqrt{\int_{u_{-1}}^{u_f} d\bar{u} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N+1]}r\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}}^2} \lesssim \varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (14.3.170)$$

Proof. This follows directly the relation (14.1.50), and estimates on $\check{\psi}$ of Theorem C.4. For the flux estimate start from the fact that we control $\int d\bar{u} \frac{1}{r^2} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1]}Y\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}}^2$ from (14.3.168) and (14.1.50). \square

For $\Omega\check{\nabla}_4 B$ we have estimates on spheres

Proposition 14.3.34. *We have in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ the estimates*

$$\|\Omega\check{\nabla}_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-5]}B\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{v^2} + \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{r^{5/4}u}. \quad (14.3.171)$$

The same estimate holds for any order of the derivatives $\Omega\check{\nabla}_4$ and $\mathcal{A}^{[N-5]}$ in the above.

Proof. Note first that on $u = u_{-1}$ we have by (14.3.114) the bound

$$\|\Omega\check{\nabla}_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-5]}B\|_{S_{u_{-1},v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{v^2}.$$

Integrating (14.1.60) along a hypersurface of fixed constant v , we use that by Theorem C.4 for $i = 1, \dots, N-5$

$$\int_{u_{-1}}^u d\bar{u} \frac{1}{r^3} \|\mathcal{A}^{[i]}\check{\Psi}\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}} + \frac{1}{r^2} \|\mathcal{A}^{[i]}\check{\Pi}\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}} + \frac{1}{r^2} \|\check{A}^{[i]}\check{A}\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{v^2} + \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{r^{5/4}u}. \quad (14.3.172)$$

Combining this with (14.2.33) the estimate follows. For the interchange of derivatives, note that the commutator terms that arise can be controlled by (14.3.168) and the u -decay of the lower order terms arising in the commutator formula of Lemma 3.3.1. \square

Corollary 14.3.35. *We have*

$$\|\mathcal{A}^{[N-5]}B\|_{S_{u,v}} + \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-3]}Y\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u} \quad (14.3.173)$$

and for $s = 0, 1$

$$\|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}r\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u^{\frac{s+1}{2}}}. \quad (14.3.174)$$

Proof. For the bound on B we first observe that it holds for $\|\mathcal{A}^{[N-5]}B\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}$ by Corollary 14.3.22, the relation (14.1.54) and Theorem C.4 (Theorem C.3 is also sufficient, the estimate on spheres is easily obtained from Sobolev embedding and the control of the fluxes on $v = v_\infty$). We then integrate backwards along constant u using the estimate (14.3.171) to finish the proof.

To obtain the bound on Y , we first prove it for Y replaced by $\frac{Y}{r}$. In this case, the bound follows directly from the relation (14.1.54) and use Theorem C.4.⁸ With this weaker bound, the bound on $r\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}$ already follows from (14.1.50). Finally, to get the estimate claimed for Y , note that by Propositions 3.4.1 and 3.4.3 we have $\|\mathcal{A}^{[N-5]}r\frac{\check{\Psi}}{r}\| \lesssim \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-5]}\Psi\| + \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-5]}r\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}\| + \frac{1}{r}\|\mathcal{A}^{[N-5]}r^2\Omega\hat{\chi}\| + \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u}$, the last inequality following in view of what we have already proven (in particular on $r\hat{\chi}$). Now revisit the relation (14.1.54) with the improved estimate on $\|\mathcal{A}^{[N-5]}r\frac{\check{\Psi}}{r}\|$ to deduce the estimate for Y . \square

We next prove an integrated decay estimate for $\nabla_4 B$ which will then produce an integrated decay estimate for B via a Hardy inequality, see Corollary 14.3.37.

Proposition 14.3.36. *We have the top-order estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]} \int_{v(u, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \, r^{2+\delta} \|\Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-4]}B\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \\ & \int_{u_{-1}}^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \, r^{1+\delta} \|\Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-4]}B\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3 \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.175)$$

and the lower order integrated decay estimate

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \, r^{1-\delta} \|\Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-5]}B\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u} \quad (14.3.176)$$

Finally, both estimates hold interchanging the order of $\Omega \nabla_4$ and the angular operator $\mathcal{A}^{[N-4]}$ (and $\mathcal{A}^{[N-5]}$ respectively) in the above.

Proof. The second estimate is a direct consequence of (14.3.171) using that $v > u$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$.

For the first estimate we derive from (14.1.60) upon contraction with $r^{2+\delta}\Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-4]}B$ and integration over $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)$ the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{[u_{-1}, u_f]} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \, r^{2+\delta} \|\Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-4]}B\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \\ & + \int_{u_{-1}}^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \, r^{1+\delta} \|\Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-4]}B\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.177)$$

⁸The reason we can a priori only establish the weaker estimate is that only know $\frac{1}{r}\|\check{\Psi}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u}$ from Theorems C.3 and C.4. After having proven the estimate for $r\hat{\chi}$, we also have $\|\check{\Psi}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u}$ and hence the stronger estimate for Y .

where we have ignored the favourable boundary term on $r = R_{-2}$. To prove (14.3.177), we first note the estimates for the error-term (for any $\gamma > 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+} \cap \{r \geq \frac{1}{2}u\}} dudvd\theta \mathcal{E} \left[\Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-4]} B \right] r^{2+\delta} \Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-4]} B \\ & \lesssim C_\gamma \int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+} \cap \{r \geq \frac{1}{2}u\}} dudvd\theta u^{1+\delta} r^{2+\delta} |\mathcal{E} \left[\Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-4]} B \right]|^2 + \gamma \sup_{[u_{-1}, u]} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{2+\delta} \|\Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-4]} B\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+} \cap \{r \leq \frac{1}{2}u\}} dudvd\theta \mathcal{E} \left[\Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-4]} B \right] r^{2+\delta} \Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-4]} B \\ & \lesssim C_\gamma \int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+} \cap \{r \leq \frac{1}{2}u\}} dudvd\theta r^{3+\delta} |\mathcal{E} \left[\Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-4]} B \right]|^2 + \gamma \int_{u_{-1}}^u d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{1+\delta} \|\Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-4]} B\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The first term in both estimates is easily controlled by (14.2.34) while the second one is absorbed on the left for sufficiently small γ . The “linear” terms

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}^{I^+}} dudvd\theta \left(h_3 \mathcal{A}^{[N-4]} \underline{\Psi} + h_2 \mathcal{A}^{[N-4]} \underline{\Pi} + h_2 \mathcal{A}^{[N-4]} \underline{\check{A}} \right) r^{2+\delta} \Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-4]} B \quad (14.3.178)$$

can be handled similarly using again Cauchy-Schwarz and the estimates of Theorem C.4 for the almost gauge invariant quantities. For the term on the data $u = u_{-1}$ we use the estimate (14.3.115) in conjunction with (14.1.54) and Theorem C.4. This proves the desired estimate. The claim about the interchange of derivatives follows easily from the commutator formula, the lower order bootstrap assumptions on spheres and Proposition 14.3.32. \square

Corollary 14.3.37. *We have for $s = 0, 1$*

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-4-s]} B\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}, \quad (14.3.179)$$

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-2-s]} Y\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.180)$$

Proof. Note that for $s = 1$ both estimates follow directly from Corollary 14.3.35. For B and $s = 0$ the result follows from the following Hardy inequality: Let f be a smooth symmetric traceless tensor on $S_{u,v}$. Then we have for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$ and any fixed $R_{-2} \leq \hat{R} \leq R$ the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, \hat{R})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} d\theta \frac{1}{r^{1+\delta}} \|f\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 + \int_u^{u_f} dud\theta \|f\|_{S_{u, v(u, \hat{R})}}^2 \\ & \lesssim \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, \hat{R})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} d\theta r^{1+\delta} \|\Omega \nabla_4 f\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 + \int_u^{u_f} \int_S d\bar{u} d\theta \|f\|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.181)$$

Applying the inequality with $f = \mathcal{A}^{[N-4]} B$ and using that the last term on $v = v_\infty$ is controlled by Corollary 14.3.22, the relation (14.1.54) and Theorem C.4, the result follows. For the estimate on Y use (14.1.54) and the estimates of Theorem C.4. \square

Corollary 14.3.38. *We have for $s = 0, 1$ the integrated decay estimate*

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \Omega^2 \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-s]} r \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.182)$$

Proof. Use (14.1.50) in conjunction with the estimate on Y from Corollary 14.3.37 and the estimates for $\underline{\Pi}$ from Theorem C.4. \square

Corollary 14.3.39. *We have for $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ along any cone $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)$ the flux estimate*

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1]}(r\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}})\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^2}. \quad (14.3.183)$$

Proof. From Corollary 14.3.35 we have

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \frac{1}{r^2} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-3]}Y\|_{S_{\bar{u},v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^2}.$$

Now use (14.1.50) as well as the flux bound on $\check{\Pi}$ from Theorem C.4 to establish the desired flux estimate. \square

Corollary 14.3.40. *We have for $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ along any cone $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u) \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)$ the flux estimate*

$$\int_u^{u_f} du \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-5]}\check{\Psi}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^2}. \quad (14.3.184)$$

and the integrated decay estimate

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-4]}\check{\Psi}\|_{S_{\bar{u},\bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u} \quad (14.3.185)$$

Proof. Use that $\|\mathcal{A}^{[N-5]}\frac{r}{\bar{r}}\check{\Psi}\| \lesssim \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-5]}\Psi\| + \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-5]}r\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}}\| + \frac{1}{r}\|\mathcal{A}^{[N-5]}r^2\Omega\hat{\chi}\| + \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u}$ as in the proof of Corollary 14.3.35 \square

We finally estimate also the *ingoing* flux of $N+1$ derivatives of $\underline{\hat{\chi}}$:

Corollary 14.3.41. *We have for any $C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$*

$$\int_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N+1]}(r\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}})\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.186)$$

Proof. Use (14.3.168), which implies $\int_{C_v} \frac{1}{r^2} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1]}Y\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3$. Convert back using (14.1.50) and the estimates on $\check{\Pi}$ from Theorem C.4 and Corollary 13.9.2. \square

Collecting the estimates of Corollaries 14.3.33, 14.3.35, 14.3.38 and 14.3.39, 14.3.41 we conclude applying Proposition 14.3.1:

The estimate (14.3.6) has been shown for all terms containing $\underline{\hat{\chi}}$.

14.3.6.6 Estimating $\underline{\beta}$

Proposition 14.3.42.

The estimate (14.3.6) has been shown for all terms containing $\underline{\beta}$.

Proof. With the bootstrap estimates having been improved for $\underline{\hat{\chi}}$ the proof is entirely analogous to that of Proposition 14.3.31. In particular, control of the $\ell = 1$ modes for $\underline{\beta}$ from Propositions 14.3.26 and 14.3.27 implies (by Proposition 14.3.3) that it suffices to obtain estimates for $\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}\mathcal{P}_2^*\underline{\beta}$. These are obtained using the relation of Proposition 3.4.3 and the estimates on the almost gauge invariant quantity $\check{\Pi} = r^3\Omega\check{\psi}$ from Theorem C.4 (and Corollary 13.9.2). Propositions 14.2.9 and 14.2.10 for the non-linear error term yields the result. \square

14.3.6.7 Estimating ρ, σ

Proposition 14.3.43.

The estimate (14.3.6) has been shown for all terms containing $(\rho - \rho_o, \sigma)$.

Proof. We control of the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes for $\rho - \rho_o$ and $\sigma - \sigma_{\text{Kerr}}$ from Propositions 14.3.26 and 14.3.27, which implies by Proposition 14.3.2 that it suffices to obtain estimates for $\mathcal{A}^{[N-2-s]} \mathcal{P}_2^* (\nabla \rho + {}^* \nabla \sigma)$. The latter are obtained from the relation

$$P = \mathcal{P}_2^* (\nabla \rho + {}^* \nabla \sigma) + \frac{3M\Omega}{r^4} (\hat{\chi} - \hat{\chi}) + \frac{3}{2r^3\Omega} \nabla_3 (r^3\Omega((\rho - \rho_o)\hat{\chi} + \sigma^* \hat{\chi})) + 2\mathcal{P}_2^* (\hat{\chi} \cdot \underline{\beta}) + \mathcal{E}_6^1. \quad (14.3.187)$$

using previous estimates and Propositions 14.2.9 and 14.2.10 for the non-linear error terms. For the most difficult ingoing flux note that all non-linear terms are either \mathcal{E}_6^1 or involve a product of quantities from the collection $\hat{\chi}, \underline{\hat{\chi}}, \rho, \sigma, \underline{\beta}$ for each of which we have ingoing flux estimates available \square

14.3.6.8 Estimating $r^2\Omega\nabla_4(r\hat{\chi})$

Returning now to Proposition 14.3.36 we convert our estimates for $\Omega\nabla_4 B$ into estimate for $\Omega\nabla_4 Y$ and eventually $\Omega\nabla_4(r\hat{\chi})$ using the definitions of B and Y . Key in all proofs is the relation

$$r^2\Omega\nabla_4 \left(r^2\mathcal{P}_2^* d\iota v(r\hat{\chi}\Omega^{-1}) \right) = r\Omega\nabla_4 Y - \Omega_o^2 Y + h \frac{r}{\tilde{r}} \underline{\Psi} + \tilde{h} \frac{r}{\tilde{r}} \underline{\Psi} + \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}_0^2} + \check{\mathcal{E}}_0^1, \quad (14.3.188)$$

with h, \tilde{h} admissible coefficient functions. This follows from Lemma 14.1.17 and (3.4.6). Note that using the Bianchi and null structure equations we have that $r^2\Omega\nabla_4 \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_1^1 = \overset{(out)}{\mathcal{E}}_0^2 + \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_0^1$ holds for the $\overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}}_1^1$ appearing in Lemma 14.1.17.

We begin with a Lemma estimating $\Omega\nabla_4 Y$ for $\Omega\nabla_4 B$ on spheres:

Lemma 14.3.44. *We have*

$$\|r\Omega\nabla_4 [r\nabla]^{N-2} Y\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} \quad (14.3.189)$$

and for $s = 0, 1$

$$\|r\Omega\nabla_4 [r\nabla]^{N-3-s} Y\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u^{\frac{1+s}{2}}} \quad (14.3.190)$$

$$\int_v^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \|r\Omega\nabla_4 [r\nabla]^{N-3} Y\|_{S_{u,\bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^2} \quad (14.3.191)$$

Proof. This follows from the estimate (14.3.171), the definition of B (14.1.54) and the estimates on $\check{\psi}$ and $\check{\Psi}$ on spheres following from Theorem C.4, in particular that for $s = 0, 1$

$$\|\mathcal{A}^{[N-5-s]} r\nabla_4 \left(\frac{r}{\tilde{r}} \check{\Psi} \right)\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u^{\frac{1+s}{2}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-4]} r\nabla_4 \left(\frac{r}{\tilde{r}} \check{\Psi} \right)\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (14.3.192)$$

To prove (14.3.192) recall that it holds for Ψ in place of $\underline{\Psi}$ by Proposition 13.3.11. Then use Proposition 3.4.4 to derive the relation

$$r\Omega\nabla_4 \left(\frac{r}{\tilde{r}} \underline{\Psi} \right) = r\Omega\nabla_4 \Psi + \Omega r^6 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^* (0, clrl\beta) + \check{\mathcal{E}}_{\frac{1}{2}}^2.$$

The claim (14.3.192) now follows after angular commutation and using that the bootstrap assumptions for β have been improved in Section 14.3.6.4 already. \square

Proposition 14.3.45. *We have the following estimates on spheres for $s = 0, 1, 2$*

$$\|r^2 \Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}(r \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u^{\min(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{s}{2}, 1)}}. \quad (14.3.193)$$

Proof. The estimate follows from the identity (14.3.188) using (14.3.190) and the estimates of Corollary 14.3.35, in particular the improved bound $\|\mathcal{A}^{[N-5]} \check{\Psi}\| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^2}{u}$ established in the proof of Corollary 14.3.35. \square

Proposition 14.3.46. *We have for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$ the estimates*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{u_{-1}}^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \|r^2 \Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N]}(r \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi})\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 &\lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \\ \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \|r^2 \Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-2]}(r \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi})\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 &\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u}. \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.194)$$

We also have the flux estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\bar{u} \in [u, u_f]} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-2} \|r^2 \Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N]}(r \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi})\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 &\lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \\ \sup_{\bar{u} \in [u, u_f]} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-2} \|r^2 \Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-2]}(r \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi})\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 &\lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u}. \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.195)$$

Proof. From Proposition 14.3.36 and the relation (14.1.54) we have (using the estimates on $\Omega \nabla_4 \check{\Psi}$ from Theorem C.4 which lead to the small loss in r -decay)

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\bar{u} \in [u, u_f]} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^2 \|\Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} Y\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \\ + \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^1 \|\Omega \nabla_4 \mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} Y\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 &\lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.196)$$

Using (14.3.196), (14.3.188) and Corollary 14.3.37 as well as the estimates on $\check{\psi}$, $\check{\Psi}$ from Theorem C.4 we conclude the first and third estimate. For the second we consider the spacetime integral of the identity (14.3.188) and use the estimate (14.3.190) for $s = 1$ on spheres as well as the decay estimate for Y of Corollary 14.3.37. The fourth estimate is already immediate from Proposition 14.3.45. \square

14.3.6.9 Estimating η

Proposition 14.3.47. *We have for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$ the integrated decay estimates*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N]} r \mathcal{P}_2^*(r^2 \underline{\eta})\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 &\lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \\ \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} r \mathcal{P}_2^*(r^2 \underline{\eta})\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 &\lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u}. \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.197)$$

We also have the flux estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\bar{u} \in [u, u_f]} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-2} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N]} r \mathcal{P}_2^*(r^2 \underline{\eta})\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 &\lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \\ \sup_{\bar{u} \in [u, u_f]} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-2} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} r \mathcal{P}_2^*(r^2 \underline{\eta})\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 &\lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u}. \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.198)$$

On spheres we have for $s = 0, 1, 2$

$$\|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]} r \mathcal{P}_2^*(r^2 \underline{\eta})\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u^{\min(\frac{s}{2} + \frac{1}{4}, 1)}} \quad (14.3.199)$$

Proof. Follows directly from the angular commuted propagation equation (1.2.9) for $\nabla_4(r\hat{\chi})$ combining the estimates of Proposition 14.3.28 with Proposition 14.3.46 (in the spacetime case) and the estimates (14.3.157) and Proposition 14.3.45 (in the case of spheres). \square

Applying as usual Proposition 14.3.3 in conjunction with the estimates on the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes from Propositions 14.3.26 and 14.3.27 we conclude

The estimate (14.3.6) has been shown for all terms containing $\underline{\eta}$.

14.3.6.10 Estimating η

Proposition 14.3.48. *We have for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$ the integrated decay estimates*

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N]} r \mathcal{P}_2^*(r^2 \eta)\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \quad (14.3.200)$$

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} r \mathcal{P}_2^*(r^2 \eta)\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u} \quad (14.3.201)$$

On spheres we have for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$ and $s = 0, 1, 2$

$$\|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]} r \mathcal{P}_2^*(r^2 \eta)\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^{\min(s+\frac{1}{2}, 2)}}. \quad (14.3.202)$$

In particular,

The estimate (14.3.6) has been shown for all terms containing η .

Finally, for the outgoing fluxes we also have the top order estimate

$$\int_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \left\| [r \nabla]^{N+1} (r^2 (\eta - \eta_{\text{Kerr}})) \right\|_{S_{u, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.203)$$

Proof. To estimate η , we derive from (14.1.26) its commuted version

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (\mathcal{A}^{[n]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \eta) = \Omega_{\circ}^2 \mathcal{A}^{[n]} r \mathcal{P}_2^* \underline{\eta} - \Omega r^2 \mathcal{A}^{[n]} \mathcal{P}_2^* \Omega \beta + \mathcal{E}_3^{(out) n+1}. \quad (14.3.204)$$

Contracting with $r^{2-\delta} \mathcal{A}^{[n]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \eta$ for appropriate n and integrating either over $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)$, or $C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ yields after applying Cauchy-Schwarz on the right hand side using the improved estimates for $\underline{\eta}$ and β the second and third estimate. For the top order estimate (14.3.203) we derive

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \left(\frac{r^3 \rho + 2M}{r} + r^2 d\bar{v} \eta \right) = + \frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r^2} \left(r^3 d\bar{v} \underline{\eta} - (r^3 \rho + 2M) - \frac{1}{2} r^3 \hat{\chi} \hat{\chi} \right) + \mathcal{E}_3^{(out) 1}, \quad (14.3.205)$$

and note that the only top order (=first) derivatives that can appear in the non-linear error-term are angular derivatives of η , $\underline{\eta}$ and T and $\Omega \hat{\chi}$. For $\underline{\eta}$, T and $\Omega \hat{\chi}$ we already have an outgoing flux bound for $N+1$ derivatives: For T and $\hat{\chi}$ from the bootstrap assumptions and Lemma 14.2.12 respectively, for $\underline{\eta}$ from Proposition 14.3.47 (and Proposition 14.3.3). For (14.3.205) we also note that quantity in brackets on the left is equal to $\frac{1}{r}(\mu + \frac{1}{2} r^3 \hat{\chi} \hat{\chi})$ which on $v = v_\infty$ for $\ell \geq 1$ reduces to $\frac{1}{2r} r^3 (\hat{\chi} \hat{\chi})_{\ell \geq 1}$.

Therefore, commuting (14.3.205) with $\mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla$ and integrating along a cone $C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ from the sphere S_{u, v_∞} (where clearly $\|\frac{1}{2r} \mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla r^3 \hat{\chi} \hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r \cdot u}$ by the bootstrap assumptions) we obtain using the flux estimate for $\underline{\eta}$ of Proposition 14.3.47 and the flux estimate for ρ of Proposition 14.3.43

$$\sup_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left\| \mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla (r^3 \rho + 2M + r^3 d\bar{v} \eta) \right\|_{S_{u, v}} \lesssim \varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} + \varepsilon \sqrt{\int_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \frac{1}{r^2} \left\| [r \nabla]^{N+1} (\eta - \eta_{\text{Kerr}}) \right\|^2}, \quad (14.3.206)$$

where the last term arises from the non-linear error-term involving $N + 1$ derivatives of η .⁹

We also have directly from (14.1.41) and the bootstrap assumptions

$$\sup_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \left\| \mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla (r^3 \sigma - r^3 c \not{r} l \eta) \right\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (14.3.207)$$

Using the top order fluxes on ρ and σ from Proposition 14.3.43 we deduce

$$\int_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \frac{1}{r^2} \left\| \mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} r^3 \mathcal{P}_2^* \mathcal{P}_1^* \mathcal{P}_1 \eta \right\|^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3 + \varepsilon^2 \int_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}} \frac{1}{r^2} \left\| [r \nabla]^{N+1} (\eta - \eta_{\text{Kerr}}) \right\|^2. \quad (14.3.208)$$

Using Proposition 14.3.3 on the term on the left (and the estimates on the $\ell = 1$ modes of η from Propositions 14.3.26 and 14.3.27) we can absorb the last term on the right and deduce the desired (14.3.203).

Finally, for the top order integrated decay estimate we commute (14.3.205) with $\mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla$ contract with $r^{2-\delta} \mathcal{A}^{[N-2]} r^2 \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla (r^3 \rho + 2M + r^3 d \not{v} \eta)$ and integrate over $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_{-1})$. \square

14.3.6.11 Estimating $\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2$

Using the estimates for the $\ell = 0$ and $\ell = 1$ modes from Proposition 14.3.25 and 14.3.27 respectively, we conclude using Proposition 14.3.2 together with the relation $\Omega^2(\eta + \underline{\eta}) = \nabla(\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2)$ from (1.2.21) and the estimates on $\underline{\eta}$ and η obtained in the previous sections:

The estimate (14.3.6) has been shown for all terms containing $\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2$.

14.3.6.12 Estimating ω

Proposition 14.3.49. *We have on spheres for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$ and $s = 0, 1, 2$*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-s} \left\| [r \nabla]^i r^{3-\frac{s}{2}} (\omega - \omega_{\circ}) \right\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u^{\frac{s}{2}}}. \quad (14.3.209)$$

We also have the integrated decay estimates

$$\sum_{i=0}^N \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_{\infty}} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \left\| [r \nabla]^i r^{5/2} (\omega - \omega_{\circ}) \right\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \quad (14.3.210)$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_{\infty}} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \left\| [r \nabla]^i r^2 (\omega - \omega_{\circ}) \right\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u} \quad (14.3.211)$$

and the flux estimate

$$\sum_{i=0}^N \sup_{\bar{u} \in [u, u_f]} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_{\infty}} d\bar{v} r^{-\delta} \left\| [r \nabla]^i (\omega - \omega_{\circ}) r^2 \right\|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.212)$$

Proof. For the proof observe that for a function f and $N + 1 \geq n \geq 2$ we have the elliptic estimate

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \left\| [r \nabla]^i f \right\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \left\| [r \nabla]^i r^2 \Delta f \right\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|f_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2. \quad (14.3.213)$$

We will first prove that for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$ and $s = 0, 1$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-2-s} \left\| [r \nabla]^i r^{3-s} (r^2 \Delta \omega + r^2 d \not{v} (\beta \Omega)) \right\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.214)$$

⁹Note that we can write $\eta = \eta - \eta_{\text{Kerr}} + \eta_{\text{Kerr}}$ in the non-linear error-term and estimate the term involving $\eta_{\text{Kerr}} \sim \frac{\varepsilon}{r^3 u_f}$ (see Section 1.4.3) separately exploiting that we can estimate $N + 2$ derivatives of the $Y_m^{\ell=1}$ from Proposition 9.4.1.

From this, the desired estimates on spheres follow using that the bootstrap estimates on β have already been improved in Section 14.3.6.4 and that the $\ell = 0$ mode of $\omega - \omega_{\ell=0}$ is controlled from Proposition 14.3.25. To prove (14.3.214), we first derive for h_0 an admissible coefficient function (different in different places)

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (r^2 \Delta \omega + r^2 d\!/\!v(\beta\Omega)) = h_0 r d\!/\!v \beta \Omega + h_0 \frac{1}{r} d\!/\!v \eta - h_0 \frac{1}{r} d\!/\!v \underline{\eta} + \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}_4^2} + [\Omega \nabla_3, r^2 \Delta] (\omega - \omega_\circ). \quad (14.3.215)$$

Commute (14.3.215) with $[r \nabla]^i$. Integrating the resulting transport equation it is easy to see that we have for all $i \leq N - 2$ the estimate¹⁰

$$\| [r \nabla]^i (r^2 \Delta \omega + r^2 d\!/\!v(\beta\Omega)) \|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{r^3}, \quad (14.3.216)$$

which already proves the desired estimate for $s = 0$ and also for $s = 1$ in the subregion $\mathcal{D} \cap \{r \geq \frac{1}{2}u\}$. For $s = 1$ and the region $\mathcal{D} \cap \{r \leq \frac{1}{2}u\}$ we integrate from $r = \frac{1}{2}u$ where the estimate already holds to prove

$$\| [r \nabla]^i (r^2 \Delta \omega + r^2 d\!/\!v(\beta\Omega)) \|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{r^2 u} + \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{r^3 u} \quad (14.3.217)$$

for all $i \leq N - 3$. Here we have used the (improved in Section 14.3.6.4) flux estimates for the β term and the (already improved) estimates on spheres for the η and $\underline{\eta}$ term as well as estimating the non-linear error on spheres by $\frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^4 u}$.

The second integrated decay and the flux estimate now follows directly from integrating (14.3.214) and converting back to ω using that the bootstrap assumptions on β have already been improved. For the first integrated decay estimate we return to (14.3.215), commute with $[r \nabla]^{N-2}$ and contract with $r^{5-\delta} [r \nabla]^{N-2} (r^2 \Delta \omega + r^2 d\!/\!v(\beta\Omega))$. Integration over \mathcal{D}^{I+} will then produce the desired integrated decay estimate (and the boundary term) for $(r^2 \Delta \omega + r^2 d\!/\!v(\beta\Omega))$. This is easily converted to $\omega - \omega_\circ$ using the improved estimates on β and the estimates on the $\ell = 0$ modes of $\omega - \omega_\circ$ from Proposition 14.3.27. \square

The estimate (14.3.6) has been shown for all terms containing $\omega - \omega_\circ$.

14.3.6.13 Estimating ω

For ω we need to prove an integrated decay estimate for $N + 1$ derivatives, the reason being its appearance in the anomalous error-term of the top order commuted Teukolsky equation for $\underline{\alpha}$.

Proposition 14.3.50. *For $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$ we have for $s = 0, 1, 2$*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-s} \| [r \nabla]^i (r \Omega^{-2} (\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_\circ)) \|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u^{\frac{s}{2}}}. \quad (14.3.218)$$

Also, for $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$ we have for $s = 0, 1, 2$ the integrated decay estimates

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N+1-s} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \| (r \Omega^{-2} (\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_\circ)) \|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^{\min(1, S-s)}}. \quad (14.3.219)$$

Proof. It clearly suffices to prove the estimates without the factor of Ω^{-2} . For the proof, recall (14.3.213). Recalling Lemma 14.1.15 we derive the propagation equation

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 \Delta (\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_\circ) - \Omega^2 r d\!/\!v (r \beta \Omega^{-1})) = \Omega_\circ^4 r d\!/\!v (\beta \Omega^{-1}) - \frac{4M}{r} \Omega_\circ^2 d\!/\!v \underline{\eta} + \frac{2M}{r} \Omega_\circ^2 d\!/\!v \eta + \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}_3^2} + \mathcal{E}_1^1. \quad (14.3.220)$$

We observe in particular that $\overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}_3^2}$ in (14.3.220) does not contain second (angular) derivatives of $\hat{\chi}$, \underline{T} or $\omega - \omega_\circ$. To prove (14.3.218), commute (14.3.220) with $[r \nabla]^i$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, N - 2$. We then integrate from the sphere S_{u, v_∞} along the outgoing cone C_u^{I+} and use:

¹⁰We could in fact estimate $N + 1$ derivatives.

- The fact that (14.3.4) has already been established to control the boundary term on the sphere S_{u,v_∞} .
- Cauchy-Schwarz and Proposition 14.2.8 for the non-linear error on the right hand side
- The already improved estimates for $d\!\!\!/v\beta\Omega^{-1}$ (Section 14.3.6.6, note $d\!\!\!/v(\beta\Omega^{-1})_{\text{Kerr}} = 0$), $d\!\!\!/v\eta$ (Section 14.3.6.9) and $d\!\!\!/v\eta$ (Section 14.3.6.10) *on spheres* on the right hand side.

Finally, use once more the improved estimates on $d\!\!\!/v\beta$ on spheres (Section 14.3.6.6) to convert the resulting estimate into the desired estimates for $\underline{\omega}$ itself.

For (14.3.219) we commute (14.3.220) with $[r\mathring{\nabla}]^i$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$, contract the resulting equation with $r^{2-\delta} [r\mathring{\nabla}]^i (r^2 \underline{\Delta}\omega - \Omega^2 r d\!\!\!/v(r\beta\Omega^{-1}))$ and integrate over $\mathcal{D}^{T^+}(u)$. Use Corollary 14.3.7 and the estimate (14.3.78) for the flux term appearing on the hypersurface $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{T^+}$. Use Cauchy-Schwarz on the right hand side, the already improved integrated decay estimates for $d\!\!\!/v\beta\Omega^{-1}$, $d\!\!\!/v\eta$ and $d\!\!\!/v\eta$. For the non-linear error use the fact that $\mathring{\mathcal{E}}_3^{N+1}$ is equal to $\mathring{\mathcal{E}}_3^N$ (controlled by Proposition 14.2.8) except for terms involving $N+1$ angular derivatives of connections coefficients for which we do have an integrated decay estimate available. Finally, use once more the integrated decay estimate on $d\!\!\!/v\beta\Omega^{-1}$ to convert the resulting estimate into an estimate for $\underline{\omega}$ itself. \square

We conclude

The estimate (14.3.6) has been shown for all terms containing $\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o$.

14.3.6.14 Estimating T

We recall now (14.3.159) written in the form

$$\frac{1}{2}r^2\mathring{\mathcal{D}}_2^*\mathring{\nabla}(\Omega^{-2}r^2T) = Z + \frac{3M}{r}r^2\hat{\chi}\Omega^{-1} + \Omega r^3\mathring{\mathcal{D}}_2^*\eta. \quad (14.3.221)$$

Proposition 14.3.51. *We have for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$ and $s = 0, 1$ the estimates*

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]} r^2 \mathring{\mathcal{D}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla}(r^2 T)\|_{S_{u,\bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}, \quad (14.3.222)$$

On spheres we have for $s = 0, 1, 2$

$$\|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]} r^2 \mathring{\mathcal{D}}_2^* \mathring{\nabla} r^2 T\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u^{\frac{s}{2}}} \quad (14.3.223)$$

and

$$\sum_{i=0}^N \| [r\mathring{\nabla}]^i (r^3 T) \|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (14.3.224)$$

Proof. Commuting (14.3.221) by $\mathcal{A}^{[n]}$ for appropriate n we obtain the first two estimates using the previous estimates of Propositions 14.3.47, 14.3.47, 14.3.28 and the estimates (14.3.165) and (14.3.166) on Z . For the estimate (14.3.224) we integrate the $[r\mathring{\nabla}]^i$ -commuted (14.1.21) backwards from $v = v_\infty$ and use (14.3.76) for the term on $v = v_\infty$ and the estimate (14.3.209) on the right hand side of (14.1.21). \square

We conclude after applying Proposition 14.3.2 with the estimates on the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes from Propositions 14.3.25, 14.3.27:

The estimate (14.3.6) has been shown for all terms containing T .

14.3.6.15 Estimating \underline{T}

We recall (14.1.49), now written in the form

$$\frac{1}{2}r^2\mathcal{P}_2^\star\mathcal{V}r^2\underline{T} = Y + 3Mr\underline{\chi}\Omega^{-1} + r^3\mathcal{P}_2^\star\underline{\eta}. \quad (14.3.225)$$

Using the estimates for the quantities on the right hand side (see Section 14.3.6.5 as well as Propositions 14.3.47) we easily deduce the following two propositions.

Proposition 14.3.52. *We have for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$ and $s = 0, 1$ the estimates*

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \|\mathcal{A}^{[N-2-s]}r^2\mathcal{P}_2^\star\mathcal{V}(r^2\underline{T})\|_{S_{u,\bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.226)$$

On spheres we have

$$\|\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}r^2\mathcal{P}_2^\star\mathcal{V}r^2\underline{T}\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u^{\frac{s}{2}}}. \quad (14.3.227)$$

Proof. For the estimate on spheres commute (14.3.225) by $\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}$ and use previous estimates. For the integrated decay estimate commute by $\mathcal{A}^{[N-1-s]}$ and use previous integrated decay estimates. \square

We conclude after applying Proposition 14.3.2 with the estimates on the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes from Propositions 14.3.25, 14.3.27:

The estimate (14.3.6) has been shown for all terms containing \underline{T} .

14.3.6.16 Estimating b

Proposition 14.3.53. *We have for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$ and $s = 0, 1, 2$*

$$\| [r\mathcal{V}]^{N+1} (b - b_{\text{Kerr}}) \sqrt{r} \|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (14.3.228)$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-s} \| [r\mathcal{V}]^i (b - b_{\text{Kerr}}) r \|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u^{\min(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{s}{2}, 1)}}. \quad (14.3.229)$$

In addition, we have for $s = 0, 1$ the integrated decay estimate

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-s} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(\bar{u}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \| [r\mathcal{V}]^i (b - b_{\text{Kerr}}) r \|_{S_{\bar{u},\bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}, \quad (14.3.230)$$

Proof. We have the transport equation

$$\Omega\mathcal{V}_4 \left(\frac{1}{r} (b - b_{\text{Kerr}}) \right) = 2 \frac{\Omega_o^2}{r} \left((\eta - \eta_{\text{Kerr}}) - (\underline{\eta} - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}}) \right) + \mathcal{E}_4^{(out)}, \quad (14.3.231)$$

where one easily sees that the only connection coefficients appearing in $\mathcal{E}_4^{(out)}$ are $\eta, \underline{\eta}, \hat{\chi}, T, b$.

To obtain the second estimate we first commute (14.3.231) with $[r\mathcal{V}]^i$ for $i = 0, \dots, N-s$ and the integrate the resulting equation along the cone $C_u^{Z^+}$. For the linear terms on the right hand side we can use the estimates for η and $\underline{\eta}$ implicit in (14.3.6) which have already been improved at the end of Sections 14.3.6.9 and 14.3.6.10 respectively.

To obtain the first estimate we commute with $[r\mathcal{V}]^{N+1}$ and integrate using again the estimates for η and $\underline{\eta}$ implicit in (14.3.6) which have already been improved at the end of Sections 14.3.6.9 and 14.3.6.10

respectively. For the non-linear term we now note that for $N + 1$ angular derivatives of $\eta, \underline{\eta}, \hat{\chi}, T, b$ we have an outgoing flux estimate or an estimate on spheres available¹¹, which allow one to show using Lemma 14.2.2

$$\int_v^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \int_{S_{u, \bar{v}}} \| [r\bar{\nabla}]^{N+1} \mathcal{E}_4^{(out)} \|_{S_{u, \bar{v}}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^2 u} \quad \text{for the particular } \mathcal{E}_4^{(out)} \text{ appearing in (14.3.231).}$$

Since the error arising from the (iteration of) commutators on the left can contain at most $N + 1$ angular derivatives of $(b - b_{\text{Kerr}})$, the first estimate follows. Note the loss in r -weight for the top-order estimate arising from having to use (weaker) outgoing flux estimates for $\eta, \underline{\eta}$ instead of estimates on spheres, which are not available at top order.

To obtain (14.3.230) one commutes (14.3.231) with $[r\bar{\nabla}]^i$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, N - s$ and contracts the resulting equation with $r^{3-\delta} \frac{1}{r} [r\bar{\nabla}]^i (b - b_{\text{Kerr}})$ and integrates over $\mathcal{D}^+(u)$. After standard integration by parts the boundary term on $v = v_\infty$ is always controlled from the gauge condition (8) and the fact that $\| [r\bar{\nabla}]^i b_{\text{Kerr}} \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{a}{r^2} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^3}{ru^4}$ in view of (14.2.7). Finally, on the right hand side, we apply Cauchy–Schwarz and invoke the (improved) integrated decay estimates on η and $\underline{\eta}$ implicit in (14.3.6), which have already been established at the end of Sections 14.3.6.9 and 14.3.6.10 respectively. The non-linear error-term is controlled using the integrated decay estimates of Proposition 14.2.8. \square

This finishes the proof of Theorem 14.3.1.

14.3.7 Estimates for the angular master energy for the metric components

The objective of this section is to prove (14.3.7).

From the Gauss equation (14.1.48) we first deduce in view of the previous estimates (more precisely the estimate (14.3.4) from Theorem 14.3.1) the following estimate on the Gauss curvature:

$$\| [r\bar{\nabla}]^{N-1-s} r(r^2 K - 1) \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u^{\min(1, \frac{s}{2} + \frac{1}{4})}} \quad \text{for } s = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1. \quad (14.3.232)$$

14.3.7.1 Proof of (14.3.7) on the final sphere S_{u_f, v_∞}

Restricting now to the final sphere S_{u_f, v_∞} we recall the estimate (4.4.4) which implies the following estimate on the metric components in their respective charts:

$$\| [r\bar{\nabla}]^{N+1-s} (r(\not{g} - r^2 \hat{\gamma})) \|_{S_{u_f, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{(u_f)^{\min(1, \frac{s}{2} + \frac{1}{4})}} \quad \text{for } s = 0, 1, \dots, N + 1. \quad (14.3.233)$$

This establishes (14.3.7) on the final sphere.

14.3.7.2 Proof of (14.3.7) on the final ingoing cone

To estimate the metric components along the cone $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^+$ we first derive the following renormalised (tensorial) transport equation.¹²

$$\Omega \bar{\nabla}_3 (\not{g} - r^2 \hat{\gamma}) = r^2 \hat{\gamma} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ) + 2\Omega \hat{\chi} - (\Omega \hat{\chi} \times (\not{g} - r^2 \hat{\gamma})) - ((\not{g} - r^2 \hat{\gamma}) \times \Omega \hat{\chi}). \quad (14.3.234)$$

We could integrate this directly but this would lead to a loss in the estimates because $\hat{\chi}$ decays only like $r^{-1}u^{-1}$. Therefore we first deduce an equation for the trace:

$$\Omega \bar{\nabla}_3 \left(\text{tr}_{\not{g}} (\not{g} - r^2 \hat{\gamma}) \right) = 2\hat{\underline{T}} - \left(\hat{\underline{T}} \text{ or } \Omega \hat{\chi} \right) (\not{g} - r^2 \hat{\gamma}), \quad (14.3.235)$$

¹¹For b and T by the bootstrap assumptions on spheres, for η by (14.3.203), for $\underline{\eta}$ by (14.3.198) and for $\hat{\chi}$ by (14.3.158)).

¹²The general equation has an additional term $\bar{\nabla}_A b_B + \bar{\nabla}_B b_A$ on the right hand side which vanishes by the gauge condition (8) on the cone.

where the last (non-linear) term denotes a finite sum of arbitrary contractions between the tensors involved. Note that the right hand side of the equation for the trace decays like $r^{-2}u^{-1}$. Integrating (14.3.235) using Lemma 14.3.5 we therefore deduce¹³ using the (now improved) estimates on $\underline{\hat{T}}$ the estimate

$$\| [r\nabla]^{N+1-s} \left(r \cdot \text{tr}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{G} - r^2 \hat{\gamma}) \right) \|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u^{\min(1, \frac{s}{2} + \frac{1}{4})}} \quad \text{for } s = 0, 1, \dots, N+1. \quad (14.3.236)$$

Using this estimate on the trace we can revisit the relation (9.4.17) and using also the estimate (9.4.18) deduce

$$\| [r\nabla]^{N-1-s} \left(r \cdot r^2 \text{curl} \text{div}(\widehat{\mathcal{G} - r^2 \hat{\gamma}}) \right) \|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u^{\min(1, \frac{s}{2} + \frac{1}{4})}} \quad \text{for } s = 0, 1, \dots, N-1. \quad (14.3.237)$$

To estimate the $\text{curl} \text{div}(\widehat{\mathcal{G} - r^2 \hat{\gamma}})$ -part we note the propagation equation equation for the trace-free part,

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \left(\widehat{\mathcal{G} - r^2 \hat{\gamma}} \right) = 2\Omega \underline{\hat{\chi}} - \left(\underline{\hat{T}} \text{ or } \Omega \underline{\hat{\chi}} \right) (\mathcal{G} - r^2 \hat{\gamma}). \quad (14.3.238)$$

From this we can derive an improved equation for the renormalised quantity

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 \left(r^2 \text{curl} \text{div}(\widehat{\mathcal{G} - r^2 \hat{\gamma}}) + 2r^2 \sigma \right) &= + \frac{\Omega_o^2}{r^2} \sigma r^3 + \frac{\Omega_o^2}{r^2} r \text{curl}(\eta r^2) - \frac{1}{r} \Omega \hat{\chi} \wedge \underline{\alpha} + \mathcal{E}_2^1 \\ &\quad - r^2 \text{curl} \text{div} \left(\left(\underline{\hat{T}} \text{ or } \Omega \underline{\hat{\chi}} \right) (\mathcal{G} - r^2 \hat{\gamma}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.239)$$

Integrating and using the estimates (14.3.4) from Theorem 14.3.1 for the right hand side we deduce

$$\| [r\nabla]^{N-1-s} \left(r \cdot r^2 \text{curl} \text{div}(\widehat{\mathcal{G} - r^2 \hat{\gamma}}) \right) \|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u^{\min(1, \frac{s}{2} + \frac{1}{4})}} \quad \text{for } s = 0, 1, \dots, N-1. \quad (14.3.240)$$

Combining (14.3.237), (14.3.238) and (14.3.240) we have established

$$\| [r\nabla]^{N+1-s} (r(\mathcal{G} - r^2 \hat{\gamma})) \|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u^{\min(1, \frac{s}{2} + \frac{1}{4})}} \quad \text{for } s = 0, 1, \dots, N+1 \quad (14.3.241)$$

and hence (a stronger version of) the estimate (14.3.7) along the cone $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^+$.

14.3.7.3 Proof of (14.3.7) in all of \mathcal{D}^+

Note first the propagation equation along each outgoing cone C_u^+ with $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$,

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (\mathcal{G} - r^2 \hat{\gamma}) = r^2 \hat{\gamma} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o) + 2\Omega \hat{\chi} - (\Omega \hat{\chi} \times (\mathcal{G} - r^2 \hat{\gamma})) - ((\mathcal{G} - r^2 \hat{\gamma}) \times \Omega \hat{\chi}). \quad (14.3.242)$$

We commute with up to $N+1$ angular derivatives and integrate backwards from S_{u,v_∞} . Using (14.3.241) for the initial data term and the estimate (14.3.223) for $T = \Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o$ and the estimate (14.3.167) on $\hat{\chi}$ we finally deduce (14.3.7) as desired.

14.3.8 Estimates for the auxiliary energies for ω and $\underline{\omega}$

The objective of this section is to prove Theorem 14.3.2. In this regard, we prove (14.3.248) in Section 14.3.8.1 and (14.3.252) in Section 14.3.8.2.

¹³Recall again $1 \leq \frac{r(u, v_\infty)}{r(u_f, v)} \lesssim \frac{v_\infty - u}{v_\infty - u_f} \lesssim 1$ in view of our definition of v_∞ .

14.3.8.1 Estimates on all derivatives of $\underline{\omega}$

We first estimate $[r\nabla]^i [\nabla_3]^j (r\underline{\omega} - r\underline{\omega}_o)$ derivatives on $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$.

Proposition 14.3.54. *On $\underline{C}_{v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ we have for all $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$ and $s = 0, 1, 2$*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i+j=0; i \geq 1}^{N+1-s} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \| [r\nabla]^i [\Omega \nabla_3]^j (r\Omega^{-2}(\underline{\omega} - r\underline{\omega}_o)) \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2 \\ & + \sum_{i+j=0}^{N-s} \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \| [r\nabla]^i [\Omega \nabla_3]^j (r\Omega^{-2}(\underline{\omega} - r\underline{\omega}_o)) \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.243)$$

On spheres we have for $s = 0, 1, 2$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i+j=0; i \geq 1}^{N-s} \| [r\nabla]^i [\Omega \nabla_3]^j (r\Omega^{-2}(\underline{\omega} - r\underline{\omega}_o)) \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}^2 \\ & + \sum_{i+j=0}^{N-1-s} \| [r\nabla]^i [\Omega \nabla_3]^j (r\Omega^{-2}(\underline{\omega} - r\underline{\omega}_o)) \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^{\min(\frac{1}{2}+s, 2)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.244)$$

Remark 14.3.55. *Note that the above proposition already establishes the required estimate in Theorem 14.3.2 for the term on $v = v_\infty$ appearing in $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}}^{N, aux}[\underline{\omega}]$ (see (6.1.19)) as well as the estimates on spheres restricted to $v = v_\infty$.*

Proof. Note these estimates have already been shown for $j = 0$ in Proposition 14.3.21. Note also that we can equivalently prove the estimates without the Ω^{-2} factor, which is what we are going to do.

We will prove the estimates separately for $(r\underline{\omega} - r\underline{\omega}_o)_{\ell=0}$ and $(r\underline{\omega} - r\underline{\omega}_o)_{\ell \geq 1}$. For the former, we recall the projected equation (14.3.51) and deduce in view of our definition of v_∞ , using the estimates of Proposition 9.4.3 for derivatives of the commutator of projections and $\Omega \nabla_3$ the following estimates for the $\ell = 0$ mode. For $u \in [u_{-1}, u_f]$, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \| [\Omega \nabla_3]^i (r\underline{\omega} - r\underline{\omega}_o)_{\ell=0} \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \| [\Omega \nabla_3]^N (r\underline{\omega} - r\underline{\omega}_o)_{\ell=0} \|_{S_{\bar{u}, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^4}. \quad (14.3.245)$$

The estimates (14.3.245) already imply that the estimates claimed in the proposition hold for $(r\underline{\omega} - r\underline{\omega}_o)_{\ell=0}$ (instead of the full $(r\underline{\omega} - r\underline{\omega}_o)$). From this we conclude that it suffices to prove both estimates for the respective *first* sum appearing in (14.3.243) and (14.3.244). This is trivial for $i \geq 1$ and follows for $i = 0$ from the Poincaré inequality after noting that $\| ((\Omega \nabla_3)^k \underline{\omega}_{\ell \geq 1})_{\ell=0} \|_{S_{u, v}}$ is non-linear and estimated by Proposition 9.4.3.

We turn to estimating the respective first sums in (14.3.243) and (14.3.244), restricting first further to $i \geq 2$ in these sums. In this case we commute (14.3.80) with $[r\nabla]^i [\Omega \nabla_3]^j$ (with $i + j \leq N - 2$ for the top order estimate) and induct on j . More precisely, we can commute the $\Omega \nabla_3$ derivatives with the $\ell \geq 1$ projections (estimating the commutator terms repeatedly by Proposition 9.4.3 and insert the Bianchi and null structure equation in the 3-direction for all *linear* terms on the right hand side converting 3-derivatives into angular derivatives which have already been controlled in Theorem 14.3.1. The only quantities for which there exists no equation converting a 3-derivative to an angular derivative are $\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o$ and $\underline{\alpha}$. However, the latter has been controlled in Theorem C.4 while the former is easily controlled inductively as it is necessarily lower order in terms of derivatives (and decays stronger in r).

We now treat the case $i = 1$. We define unique functions b_1, b_2 with vanishing mean satisfying $\underline{\beta} = r\nabla b_1 + r^* \nabla b_2$. We can then write (derive the formula first for $j = 0$ where the commutator term in the last

line vanishes)

$$2r^2 \Delta [\Omega \nabla_3]^j (\underline{\omega} - b_1 \cdot r)_{\ell \geq 1} = [\Omega \nabla_3]^j \left\{ (\mathcal{T}r^2)_{\ell \geq 1} \left(\frac{3M}{r^3} \right) + \frac{1}{2r} r^2 (|\hat{\chi}|^2)_{\ell \geq 1} + (\mathcal{E}_2^{(in)})_{\ell \geq 1} \right\} \quad (14.3.246)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ [\Omega \nabla_3]^j \left\{ \frac{1}{r} \left[(\Omega \nabla_3 (r^3 \mu + 2M))_{\ell \geq 1} - \Omega \nabla_3 (r^3 \mu + 2M)_{\ell \geq 1} \right] \right\} \\ &+ [\Omega \nabla_3]^j \left\{ 2r^2 \left[\Delta (\underline{\omega} - b_1 \cdot r)_{\ell \geq 1} - (\Delta (\underline{\omega} - b_1 \cdot r))_{\ell \geq 1} \right] \right\} \\ &+ 2 \left[r^2 \Delta, [\Omega \nabla_3]^j \right] (\underline{\omega} - b_1 \cdot r)_{\ell \geq 1}. \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.247)$$

Denoting the entire right hand side momentarily by \mathcal{F}^j we have by the standard elliptic estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|r \nabla [\Omega \nabla_3]^j \underline{\omega}_{\ell \geq 1}\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} &\lesssim \|r \nabla [\Omega \nabla_3]^j (r(b_1)_{\ell \geq 1})\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} + \|r \mathcal{F}^j\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} \\ &\lesssim \|[\Omega \nabla_3]^j r^2 \beta\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} + r \|\mathcal{F}^j\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used that the commutator is lower order in r and the definition of v_∞ to exploit decay in the non-linear term.

To estimate \mathcal{F}^j we can again commute $\Omega \nabla_3$ -derivative with the $l \geq 1$ projections on the right hand side (estimating the errors by Propositions 9.4.3 and 9.4.5) and insert the $\Omega \nabla_3$ -Bianchi and null structure equations for all terms (to convert $\Omega \nabla_3$ -derivatives into angular derivatives and lower order terms controlled by Theorem 14.3.1) and treat the lower order linear terms in $[\Omega \nabla_3]^j (\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o)$ that appear (and for which there is no equation to insert) inductively. Note that for $j = 0$ no linear terms in $\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o$ are present. We conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{F}^{j-1}\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} &\lesssim \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \|[\Omega \nabla_3]^i \underline{\omega}_{\ell \geq 1}\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} + \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u \cdot (r(u,v))} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq N, \\ \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} r^2 \|\mathcal{F}^j\|_{S_{\bar{u},v_\infty}}^2 &\lesssim \int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \|[\Omega \nabla_3]^i \underline{\omega}_{\ell \geq 1}\|_{S_{\bar{u},v_\infty}}^2 + \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^2} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq j \leq N. \end{aligned}$$

The first term is always controlled by the previous step of the induction. Combining the estimates, the estimates for the first sum in (14.3.243) and (14.3.244) respectively now follow. \square

We now turn to proving

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}}^{N, aux} [\underline{\omega}] \lesssim (\varepsilon_o)^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.248)$$

where we recall (6.1.19) and Remark 14.3.55. We first prove the estimate for the energy $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}}^{N, aux} [\underline{\omega}]$ defined in (6.1.19) with the sum $\sum_{k_1+k_3 \leq N+1-s \wedge k_3 \geq 2}^{k_1+k_3 \leq N-s}$ replaced by $\sum_{k_1+k_3 \leq N-s}$ (we refer to this as *the restricted* (14.3.248) below). For this it suffices to recall the propagation equation (14.1.28) and commute it (using Lemma 14.1.15), repeatedly inserting the Bianchi and null structure equations on the right hand side. This yields the following schematic form

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_4 \left([\Omega \nabla_3]^{k_3} [r \nabla]^{k_1} (\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o) \right) &= \sum_{\Phi_p} \sum_{k \leq k_1+k_3} \frac{1}{r^3} h_0 [r \nabla]^k (r^p (\Phi_p - (\Phi_p)_{\text{Kerr}})) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{j_1 \leq k_1 \\ j_3 < k_3}} \frac{1}{r^3} h_0 [\Omega \nabla_3]^{j_3} [r \nabla]^{j_1} (\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{j_1+j_3 \leq k_1+k_3 \\ j_3 < k_3-1}} \frac{1}{r^3} h_0 [r \nabla]^{j_1} [\Omega \nabla_3]^{j_3} (\underline{\alpha} r) + [\Omega \nabla_3]^{k_3} \mathcal{E}_3^{(in)} k_1 + [\Omega \nabla_3]^{k_3} \mathcal{E}_3^{k_1-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.249)$$

A simple induction on k_3 (and the usual procedure to derive integrated decay estimates and estimates on spheres) now proves (14.3.248) with the aforementioned restriction on the sums appearing on the left. Indeed, we can use that

- The first term on the right of (14.3.249) is controlled by the estimate of Theorem 14.3.1. Use the flux for the curvature components and estimates on spheres for connection coefficients.
- The second term on the right of (14.3.249) is controlled inductively.
- The third term on the right of (14.3.249) is controlled by Theorem C.4.
- The non-linear error term $[\Omega \nabla_3]^{k_3} \mathfrak{E}_3^{(in)k_1} + [\Omega \nabla_3]^{k_3} \mathfrak{E}_3^{k_1-1}$ involves only up to N derivatives of the connection coefficients and $N-1$ derivatives of curvature components and is hence controlled by the bootstrap assumptions on spheres and Lemma 14.2.3.

To obtain (14.3.248) also without the restriction on the sum on the left, we need to derive integrated decay estimates for $N+1-s$ derivatives with two of them being angular. For this we commute (14.3.220) with $[\Omega \nabla_3]^{k_3} [r \nabla]^{k_1}$ for $k_1+k_3 \leq N-1-s$ and (as before) repeatedly insert null-structure and Bianchi equations on the right hand side to convert the 3-derivatives into angular ones.¹⁴ Then one contracts the resulting equation with $r^{2-\delta} [\Omega \nabla_3]^{k_3} [r \nabla]^{k_1} (r^2 \Delta(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o) - r \Omega^2 d\!/\!v(r \beta \Omega^{-1}))$, applies Cauchy-Schwarz on the right and invokes the estimates of Theorem 14.3.1 as well as the restricted (14.3.248) for the linear terms and the estimates of Lemma 14.2.3 and Proposition 14.2.10 for the non-linear error-terms. In the end, one converts the resulting integrated decay estimate for $[\Omega \nabla_3]^{k_3} [r \nabla]^{k_1} (r^2 \Delta(\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o) - r \Omega^2 d\!/\!v(r \beta \Omega^{-1}))$ where $k_1+k_3 \leq N-1-s$ into one for $[\Omega \nabla_3]^{k_3} [r \nabla]^{k_1+2} (\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o)$ itself (by inserting again the Bianchi equation for $[\Omega \nabla_3]^{k_3} (r d\!/\!v(r \beta \Omega^{-1}))$ and using the estimates of Theorem 14.3.1 as well as the restricted (14.3.248) proven before.

14.3.8.2 Estimates on ω

We begin by estimating $[\nabla_4]^j (\omega - \omega_o)$ derivatives on $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$:

Proposition 14.3.56. *On $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i+j=0; i \geq 1}^{N+1} \int_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \| [r \nabla]^i [\Omega \nabla_4]^j (r^3 \omega - r^3 \omega_o) \|_{S_{u_{-1}, \bar{v}}}^2 \\ & + \sum_{i+j=0}^N \int_{v(u_{-1}, R_{-2})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} \frac{1}{r^2} \| [r \nabla]^i [\Omega \nabla_4]^j (r^3 \omega - r^3 \omega_o) \|_{S_{u_{-1}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim (\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3. \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.250)$$

On spheres we have for all $v \in [v(u_{-1}, R_{-2}), v_\infty]$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i+j=0; i \geq 1}^N \| [r \nabla]^i [\Omega \nabla_4]^j (r^3 \omega - r^3 \omega_o) \|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}}^2 \\ & + \sum_{i+j=0}^{N-1} \| [r \nabla]^i [\Omega \nabla_4]^j (r^3 \omega - r^3 \omega_o) \|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}}^2 \lesssim (\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3. \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.251)$$

Proof. Analogous to Proposition 14.3.54 hence omitted: For the $\ell = 0$ modes the estimate is immediate from gauge condition (7). For $\ell \geq 1$ one uses the relation (14.3.92) which holds verbatim replacing $\ell = 1$ by $\ell \geq 1$ and proceeds as in Proposition 14.3.54. \square

We finally prove

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}}^{N, aux} [\omega] \lesssim (\varepsilon_o)^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.252)$$

¹⁴Note that the order the derivatives are taken in is irrelevant as the commutator is always non-linear with improved decay and regularity.

In this case, the global estimates are a little more involved than for $\omega - \omega_\circ$ as we have to integrate forwards. On the other hand, we do not have to show an integrated decay estimate for $N + 1$ derivatives (although we could).

The previous proposition in conjunction with following proposition easily imply (14.3.252).

Proposition 14.3.57. *We have on spheres for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$ and $s = 0, 1, 2$, $k_4 + k_1 \leq N - s$, $k_4 \neq N$*

$$\| [\Omega \nabla_4]^{k_4} [r \nabla]^{k_1} r^{3-\frac{s}{2}} (\omega - \omega_\circ) \|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{(\varepsilon_0)^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.253)$$

We also have the integrated decay estimates for $k_4 + k_1 \leq N$

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(R_{-2}, \bar{u})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \| [r \Omega \nabla_4]^{k_4} [r \nabla]^{k_1} r^{5/2} (\omega - \omega_\circ) \|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \quad (14.3.254)$$

and for $k_4 + k_1 \leq N - 1$

$$\int_u^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(R_{-2}, \bar{u})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \| [r \Omega \nabla_4]^{k_4} [r \nabla]^{k_1} r^2 (\omega - \omega_\circ) \|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u}. \quad (14.3.255)$$

Proof. The proof is very similar to that of Proposition 14.3.49. In particular, for $k_4 = 0$, Proposition 14.3.49 already established the desired bounds.

Step 1. We establish (14.3.253) for $k_4 = 1$. Commuting (14.3.215) by $[r \nabla]^{N-3-s} [\Omega \nabla_4]$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 \left([r \nabla]^{N-3-s} [\Omega \nabla_4] (r^2 \Delta \omega + r^2 d\!v(\beta \Omega)) \right) &= \left[\Omega \nabla_3, [r \nabla]^{N-3-s} [\Omega \nabla_4] \right] (r^2 \Delta \omega + r^2 d\!v(\beta \Omega)) \\ &\quad + [r \nabla]^{N-3-s} [\Omega \nabla_4] \left(h_0 r d\!v \beta \Omega + h_0 \frac{1}{r} d\!v \eta - h_0 \frac{1}{r} d\!v \underline{\eta} + \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}_4^2} + [\Omega \nabla_3, r^2 \Delta] (\omega - \omega_\circ) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We now insert all the (available) null structure and Bianchi equations in the 4-direction on the right hand side gaining (at least) a power of $\frac{1}{r}$ in decay. With this, all (linear) terms on the right hand side can then either be controlled by Theorem 14.3.1 or Theorem C.4. The non-linear terms are easily seen to be handled by the bootstrap assumptions. Proceeding as in the proof of Proposition 14.3.49 therefore yields

$$\| r^{3-\frac{s}{2}} [r \nabla]^{N-3-s} [r \Omega \nabla_4] (r^2 \Delta \omega + r^2 d\!v(\beta \Omega)) \|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u^s}. \quad (14.3.256)$$

Using the fact that

$$\| r^{3-s} [r \nabla]^{N-3-s} [r \Omega \nabla_4] r^2 d\!v(\beta \Omega) \|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{u^{\min(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{s}{2}, 1)}}$$

is easily seen to hold after inserting the Bianchi equation for β and using Theorem 14.3.1 and Theorem C.4, the result for $\omega - \omega_\circ$ on spheres follows for $k_4 = 1$.

Step 2. We next establish (14.3.253) for the case $k_4 \geq 2$. Commuting the propagation equation

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (\omega - \omega_\circ) = -\Omega^2 (\rho - \rho_\circ) + \frac{2M}{r^3} (\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2) + 2\Omega^2 (\eta, \underline{\eta}) - \Omega^2 |\underline{\eta}|^2$$

with $[r \nabla]^{k_1} [\Omega \nabla_4]^{k_4}$ we first find for $k_4 \geq 1$, $k_1 \leq N - k_4 - s$ schematically

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_3 \left([r \nabla]^{k_1} [\Omega \nabla_4]^{k_4} (\omega - \omega_\circ) \right) &= + \frac{h_0}{r^{3+k_4}} \left([r \nabla]^{k_1} (\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2) + [r \nabla]^{k_1} (\rho - \rho_\circ) r^3 \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{h_0}{r^3} [r \nabla]^{k_1} [\Omega \nabla_4]^{k_4-1} (\omega - \omega_\circ) + \frac{h_0}{r^{4+k_4}} [r \nabla]^{k_1+1} r^3 (\Omega \beta - (\Omega \beta)_{\text{Kerr}}) \\ &\quad + \frac{h_0}{r^{5+k_4-2}} [r \nabla]^{k_1+2} [r \Omega \nabla_4]^{k_4-2} r^3 \alpha \\ &\quad + [r \nabla]^{k_1} [\Omega \nabla_4]^{k_4} \overset{(in)}{\mathcal{E}_4^0} + \left[\Omega \nabla_3, [r \nabla]^{k_1} [\Omega \nabla_4]^{k_4} \right] (\omega - \omega_\circ). \end{aligned} \quad (14.3.257)$$

Assuming $k_4 \geq 2$ and integrating we use

- the estimates of Proposition 14.3.56 for the data term on $u = u_{-1}$ (this is where $k_4 \neq N$ is used)
- the estimates of Theorem C.4 for the term involving α
- the estimates of Theorem 14.3.1 for the linear terms (this is the only place $k_4 = 2$ is used¹⁵)
- the bootstrap assumptions on the non-linear terms (note they can involve at most $N - s$ derivatives of Ricci coefficients or $N - 1$ derivatives of curvature and decay strongly in r)

yields after a simple induction on k_4 (using the estimate for $k_4 = 1$ from Step 1) for $k_4 + k_1 \leq N - s$ and $k_4 \geq 2$ the estimate

$$\|r^{-1} \cdot r^{3-\frac{s}{2}} [r\check{\nabla}]^{k_1} [r\Omega\check{\nabla}_4]^{k_4} (\omega - \omega_o)\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^2}{u^{s/2}}, \quad (14.3.258)$$

which is the desired estimate on spheres.

Step 3. We now prove the integrated decay estimate, which can be done inductively in k_4 without distinguishing the case $k_4 = 1$. We integrate (14.3.257) contracted with $r^{2k_4+5-\delta} [r\check{\nabla}]^{k_1} [\Omega\check{\nabla}_4]^{k_4} (\omega - \omega_o)$ over spacetime to obtain (inducting on k_4 using that for $k_4 = 0$ the estimate has already been proven) the boundedness estimate

$$\sum_{k_4+k_1 \leq N} \int_{u_{-1}}^{u_f} d\bar{u} \int_{v(R_{-2}, \bar{u})}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-1-\delta} \| [r\Omega\check{\nabla}_4]^{k_4} [r\check{\nabla}]^{k_1} r^{5/2} (\omega - \omega_o) \|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \quad (14.3.259)$$

One may now extract a dyadic sequence of constant u hypersurfaces such that

$$\sum_{k_4+k_1 \leq N} \int_{v(R_{-2}, u_i)}^{v_\infty} d\bar{v} r^{-\delta} \| [r\Omega\check{\nabla}_4]^{k_4} [r\check{\nabla}]^{k_1} r^2 (\omega - \omega_o) \|_{S_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{u_i}. \quad (14.3.260)$$

For $k_4 + k_1 \leq N - 1$, therefore, integrating (14.3.257) now contracted with $r^{2k_4+4-\delta} [r\check{\nabla}]^{k_1} [\Omega\check{\nabla}_4]^{k_4} (\omega - \omega_o)$ over $\mathcal{D}^+(u_i, u_f)$, i.e. now starting from a “good slice”, yields also the last estimate of the proposition. \square

14.3.9 Estimates the full master energy

We now prove the estimate of Theorem 14.3.3. Inspecting the master energies in Section 6.1.6.3, we see that our task is to estimate up to N arbitrary derivatives of Ricci coefficients and curvature (both in integrated decay and on spheres). Note that we can assume that not all derivatives are angular, as these have already been estimated.

Step 1. We show the estimate of Theorem 14.3.3 excluding the metric quantities b and $\not{g} - \not{g}_o$ in the energy on the left hand side and excluding the estimate for $\sum_{|k| \leq N} \sup_{\mathcal{D}^+} \|\mathfrak{D}^k(r^3 T)\|_{S_{u,v}}^2$. This follows from repeatedly applying the schematic equations collected in (14.1.13), (14.1.32) and (14.1.19), (14.1.39), as these will provide expressions for $1 \leq n \leq N$ derivatives of any Ricci coefficient $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(r^p \Gamma_p - r^p (\Gamma_p)_{\text{Kerr}})$ (except $\omega - \omega_o$ and $\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o$, which however have already been estimated in Theorem 14.3.8), where $1 \leq |\gamma| \leq n$ (and $\gamma \neq (0, 0, n)$, i.e. not all derivatives angular), in terms of

- up to n angular derivatives of Ricci-coefficients
- up to n derivatives of ω and $\underline{\omega}$ (at least one of them angular if N derivatives appear)
- up to $n - 1$ angular derivatives of curvature
- non-linear errors involving at most n derivatives of Γ 's and $n - 1$ derivatives of \mathcal{R} 's.

¹⁵Note that the improved ingoing curvature flux bound $\int_{u_0}^u d\bar{u} \bar{u}^{2-\delta} \| [r\check{\nabla}]^{N-2} (\rho - \rho_o) \|^2$ is crucial here to recover the full r -decay. This is also why the argument does not work directly for $k_4 = 1$: The estimate does not hold for $N - 1$ derivatives.

Moreover, if α , $\Omega\beta - (\Omega\beta)_{\text{Kerr}}$ or $\omega - \omega_o$ appears on the right hand side, then it does so with an additional weight of at least $r^{-1/2}$, cf. Remarks 14.1.8 and 14.1.11.

Similarly, (14.1.13), (14.1.32) and (14.1.19), (14.1.39) imply expressions for n derivatives of any curvature component (except α and $\underline{\alpha}$ itself, which however have already been estimated), i.e. $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(r^p\mathcal{R}_p - r^p(\mathcal{R}_p)_{\text{Kerr}})$, where $1 \leq |\gamma| \leq n$ (and $\gamma \neq (0, 0, n)$, i.e. not all derivatives angular) in terms of

- up to n angular derivatives of Ricci coefficients and curvature components
- up to n derivatives of ω and $\underline{\omega}$ (at least one of them angular if n derivatives appear)
- non-linear errors involving at most n derivatives of the Γ 's and n derivatives of the \mathcal{R} 's.

Moreover, if α , $\Omega\beta - (\Omega\beta)_{\text{Kerr}}$ or $\omega - \omega_o$ appears on the right hand side, then it does so with an additional weight of at least $r^{-1/2}$, cf. Remarks 14.1.8 and 14.1.11.

The integrated decay estimates and the estimates on spheres follow for all $\Gamma \setminus \{b, \omega - \omega_o, \underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o\}$ and all $\mathcal{R} \setminus \{\alpha, \underline{\alpha}\}$ directly from these observations.

Step 2. The estimate

$$\sum_{|k| \leq N} \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{x^+}} \|\mathfrak{D}^k(r^3 T)\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}$$

now follows by differentiating equations (14.1.21) and (14.1.4). (Reall again that we have proven the estimate for $\underline{k} = (|k|, 0, 0)$ in the angular master energy already.)

Step 3. We prove the estimate of Theorem 14.3.3 for the terms involving b in the energy on the left. This follows from commuting the transport equation (14.3.231) with derivatives of the form $[\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3]^i [r\nabla]^j$ for $1 \leq i+j = n \leq N$.¹⁶ The non-linear error on the right involves at most n derivatives of the Ricci-coefficients and the linear term involve up to $n \leq N$ derivatives of $\eta - \eta_{\text{Kerr}}$ and $\underline{\eta} - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}}$ which have been estimated in Step 1. Integrating the commuted transport equation therefore yields the desired estimates.

Step 4. We prove the estimate of Theorem 14.3.3 for the terms involving the metric difference $\mathfrak{g} - \mathfrak{g}_o$. This follows from the transport equation (14.3.242) and repeating the argument of Step 3.

¹⁶Note that a tuple of derivatives involving one $\Omega\nabla_4$ can of course be estimated directly from the equation.

Chapter 15

Estimates in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge: the proof of Theorem C.6

In this chapter we shall prove Theorem C.6, which we restate here:

Theorem C.6 (Estimates for geometric quantities in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge). *Under the assumptions of Theorem C, then for all $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$ and all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, with the gauges as defined above, it follows that the geometric quantities in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge satisfy the estimates*

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Contents

15.1	General transport estimates for redshifted and blueshifted equations, the quantity X , and other preliminaries	347
15.1.1	General transport estimates	347
15.1.2	Equations for commuted and renormalised quantities	352
15.2	Non-linear error estimates	355
15.2.1	Spacetime error estimates	355
15.2.2	Error estimates on spheres	356
15.2.3	Error estimates on null hypersurfaces	356
15.2.4	Difference quotient nonlinear error estimates for $\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ$	358
15.3	The proof of Theorem C.6: transport and elliptic estimates	359
15.3.1	Outline of the proof of Theorem C.6	359
15.3.2	Estimates for almost gauge invariant quantities in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$	361
15.3.3	Estimates for quantities on C_{u_f} and $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$: the $\ell \geq 2$ modes	362
15.3.4	Estimates for quantities in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$: the $\ell \geq 2$ modes	375
15.3.5	Estimates for quantities on C_{u_f} and $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$: the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes	389
15.3.6	Estimates for quantities in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$: the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes	399
15.3.7	Estimates for metric components in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$	409

Section **Section 15.1** concerns certain preliminaries, including estimates for general *redshifted* and *blueshifted* transport equations and the derivation of an equation satisfied by the quantity X , which is later used to estimate $\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}$ in what is perhaps the most involved part of the proof of Theorem C.6. See already the discussion in Section V.8. Section **Section 15.2** involves estimates for certain nonlinear error terms. These preliminaries and error estimates are used in **Section 15.3**, which concerns transport and elliptic estimates for the geometric quantities in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge and constitutes the main part of the proof of Theorem C.6.

As in the previous chapters of Part C, we shall assume throughout the assumptions of Theorem C. Let us fix an arbitrary $u_f \in [u_f^0, \hat{u}_f]$, with $\hat{u}_f \in \mathfrak{B}$, and fix some $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$. In this chapter, unless explicitly stated otherwise, all propositions below shall always refer to the anchored \mathcal{H}^+ gauge in the spacetime $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$, corresponding to parameters $u_f, M_f(u_f, \lambda)$, whose existence is ensured by Definition 7.1.1. Thus, we drop the \mathcal{H}^+ superscripts for geometric quantities without risk of confusion, writing $\alpha = \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, $C_u = C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, etc. We shall denote $M = M_f$ throughout this chapter.

This Chapter will depend on results from all previous chapters of Part C. Note, however, that from Theorem C.2 of Chapter 10, this chapter will only use the statement of Proposition 10.6.1. Chapters 9 and 13 are only appealed to through the estimate in the statement of Theorems C.3 and C.4, and Chapter 14 only through the statement of Theorem C.5. Thus, if the reader is willing to refer back for these statements, the chapter can be read independently of the rest of Part C.

As with the previous chapter, the reader may again wish to compare with the proofs of both Theorems 3 and 4 of [DHR] in Sections 13 and 14, respectively, for linear analogues of results proven here.

15.1 General transport estimates for redshifted and blueshifted equations, the quantity X , and other preliminaries

This section contains some preliminaries which will be used in Section 15.3 to estimate the Ricci coefficients and curvature components. **Section 15.1.1** concerns some basic transport estimates for S -tensors, including estimates for *redshifted* and *blueshifted* transport equations in the outgoing null direction, which will be used in Section 15.3 along with the elliptic estimates of Section 9.3. **Section 15.1.2** involves the derivation of equations satisfied by certain renormalised quantities, including the quantity X discussed in Section V.8.

15.1.1 General transport estimates

The general transport estimates of this section are used in Section 15.3 in order to estimate the Ricci coefficients and curvature components.

15.1.1.1 L^2 transport estimates in the ∇_4 direction

A transport equation in the ∇_4 direction for an S tensor ξ of the form

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \xi + a(\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ \xi = F, \quad (15.1.1)$$

for some inhomogeneous term F and some $a \in \mathbb{R}$, is referred to as *redshifted*, *noshifted* or *blueshifted* according to whether the sign of a is positive, zero or negative respectively.

The following lemma provides an estimate for quantities which satisfy a blueshifted transport equation.

Lemma 15.1.1 (Estimates for blueshifted transport equation). *Consider some $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, u)$. Let ξ be an S -tensor field such that*

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \xi - l(\Omega \hat{\omega}) \xi = F,$$

for some tensor field F and some $l \geq 2$. Then,

$$\|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\xi\|_{C_u(v)}^2 \lesssim \Omega(u, v)^l \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v(R,u)}}^2 + \|F\|_{C_u(v)}^2 \lesssim \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v(R,u)}}^2 + \|F\|_{C_u(v)}^2.$$

Proof. Since $\partial_v \log \Omega = \Omega \hat{\omega}$, it follows that

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^{-\frac{l}{2}} \xi) - \frac{l}{2} (\Omega \hat{\omega}) \Omega^{-\frac{l}{2}} \xi = \Omega^{-\frac{l}{2}} F.$$

The proof follows from contracting with $\Omega^{\frac{l}{2}} \xi$ to give

$$\partial_v (\Omega^{-l} |\xi|^2) - \frac{l}{2} \Omega \hat{\omega}_\circ \Omega^{-l} |\xi|^2 = 2 \Omega^{-l} \xi \cdot F.$$

Integrating over $S_{u,v'}$ and from v to $v(R, u)$ one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Omega^{-\frac{l}{2}}\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\Omega^{-\frac{l}{2}}\xi\|_{C_u(v)}^2 &\lesssim \|\Omega^{-\frac{l}{2}}\xi\|_{S_{u,v(R,u)}}^2 + \int_v^{v(R,u)} \int_{S_{u,v'}} \Omega^{-l} |\xi \cdot F| dv' \\ &\lesssim \|\Omega^{-\frac{l}{2}}\xi\|_{S_{u,v(R,u)}}^2 + \lambda \|\Omega^{-\frac{l}{2}}\xi\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \lambda^{-1} \|\Omega^{-\frac{l}{2}}F\|_{C_u(v)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

for any $\lambda > 0$. The proof follows from taking λ suitably small and multiplying by $\Omega(u, v)^l$. \square

The next lemma provides an estimate for quantities which satisfy a redshifted transport equation.

Lemma 15.1.2 (Estimates for redshifted transport equation). *Let ξ be an S -tensor field such that*

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \xi + l(\Omega \hat{\omega}) \xi = F, \quad (15.1.2)$$

for some $l \geq 2$ and some tensor field F . Then, for any $\kappa \geq 0$, and any $2M_f < r_ \leq R_2$,*

$$\|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\xi \mathbb{1}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{v^\kappa} \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v-1}}^2 + \|F \mathbb{1}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v-1 \vee v/2)}^2, \quad (15.1.3)$$

and

$$\|\xi \mathbb{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|\xi \mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{v^\kappa} \|\xi \mathbb{1}\|_{\underline{C}_{v-1}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|F \mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v-1 \vee v/2)}^2, \quad (15.1.4)$$

for all $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_, u)$, where $v_{-1} \vee v/2 := \max\{v_{-1}, v/2\}$ and $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r \leq r_*}$.*

Proof. After contracting (15.1.2) with ξ and integrating between any $v_{-1} \leq v_1 < v_2 \leq v(r_*, u)$, it follows that,

$$\|\xi\|_{S_{u,v_2}}^2 + \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 dv \lesssim \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v_1}}^2 + \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|F\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 dv. \quad (15.1.5)$$

Let $\{\tilde{v}_n\}$ be an appropriate dyadic sequence. By the pigeonhole principle, for each n there exists $v_n \in [\tilde{v}_n, \tilde{v}_{n+1})$ such that

$$\|\xi\|_{S_{u,v_n}}^2 = \frac{1}{\tilde{v}_{n+1} - \tilde{v}_n} \int_{\tilde{v}_n}^{\tilde{v}_{n+1}} \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 dv \lesssim \frac{1}{v_n} \left(\|\xi\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \int_{\tilde{v}_n}^{v(r_*, u)} \|F\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 dv \right),$$

where the inequality follows from (15.1.5). Returning to (15.1.5), it follows that

$$\|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \int_v^{v(r_*, u)} \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 dv \lesssim \frac{1}{v} \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \int_{\lambda v}^{v(r_*, u)} \|F\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 dv,$$

for some appropriate $\lambda < 1$ (depending on exactly how the original dyadic sequence was chosen). The estimate (15.1.3) follows by iterating the above argument $\lfloor \kappa - 1 \rfloor$ more times. The estimate (15.1.4) follows from replacing ξ with $\Omega \xi$ in (15.1.3) and integrating from u to u_f . \square

15.1.1.2 L^2 transport estimates in the ∇_3 direction

The following lemma provides an estimate for quantities which satisfy transport equations in the ∇_3 direction.

Lemma 15.1.3 (Estimates for transport equation in ∇_3 direction). *Let ξ be an S -tangent tensor field satisfying*

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \xi = \Omega^2 F, \quad (15.1.6)$$

for some tensor field F . Then, for all $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$

$$\|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\xi\|_{\underline{C}_v(u)}^2 \lesssim \|\xi\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 + \|F\|_{\underline{C}_v(u)}^2, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\xi\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \|\xi\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 + \|F\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2.$$

Proof. Renormalising (15.1.6) with r^{-1} and contracting with ξ gives,

$$\partial_u (|r^{-1}\xi|^2) - 2r^{-1}\Omega_0^2 |r^{-1}\xi|^2 = 2r^{-2}\Omega^2 \xi \cdot F,$$

and so, integrating over the cone $\underline{C}_v(u)$ gives

$$\|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\xi\|_{\underline{C}_v(u)}^2 \leq \|\xi\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 + \|F\|_{\underline{C}_v(u)}^2.$$

The second estimate follows similarly by integrating over the spacetime region $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)$. \square

15.1.1.3 L^2 transport estimates for difference quotients

Recall that any S -tangent $(0, k)$ tensor field ξ can be uniquely decomposed as

$$\xi = \xi_{A_1 \dots A_k} d\theta^{A_1} \otimes \dots \otimes d\theta^{A_k}.$$

For such ξ define the difference

$$\xi(u, v, \theta) - \xi(u_f, v, \theta) := (\xi(u, v, \theta)_{A_1 \dots A_k} - \xi(u_f, v, \theta)_{A_1 \dots A_k}) d\theta^{A_1} \otimes \dots \otimes d\theta^{A_k},$$

(note that this definition is independent of the choice of local coordinates θ^A on \mathbb{S}^2) and define the difference quotient

$$D_{u_f} \xi(u, v, \theta) := \frac{\xi(u, v, \theta) - \xi(u_f, v, \theta)}{\Omega_o(u, v, \theta)^2}.$$

This section contains transport estimates concerning the above difference quotients of $S_{u,v}$ tensor fields. The following lemma gives an estimate for the difference quotient of a noshifted equation (recall the nomenclature of Section 15.1.1.1).

Lemma 15.1.4 (Difference quotient estimate for noshifted transport equation). *If ξ is an S -tangent $(0, k)$ tensor which satisfies*

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \xi = F, \tag{15.1.7}$$

then, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$, and any $\kappa \geq 0$,

$$\|D_{u_f} \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|D_{u_f} \xi\|_{C_u^+(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{v^\kappa} \|D_{u_f} \xi\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|D_{u_f} F\|_{C_u^+(v_{-1} \vee v/2)}^2,$$

and

$$\|D_{u_f} \xi\|_{C_v^+}^2 + \|D_{u_f} \xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^+(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{v^\kappa} \|D_{u_f} \xi\|_{C_{v_{-1}}^+}^2 + \|D_{u_f} F\|_{\mathcal{D}^+(v_{-1} \vee v/2)}^2,$$

where $v_{-1} \vee v/2 := \max\{v_{-1}, v/2\}$.

Proof. The equation (15.1.7) implies that

$$\Omega \nabla_4 D_{u_f} \xi + 2(\Omega \hat{\omega})_o D_{u_f} \xi = D_{u_f} F.$$

The proof then follows from Lemma 15.1.2. □

The next lemma in particular shows that the difference quotient $D_{u_f} \xi$ can be appropriately controlled by the derivative $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 \xi$.

Lemma 15.1.5 (Estimate for difference by ∇_3 derivative). *Consider some $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$ and an S -tangent tensor field ξ . Then*

$$|\xi(u, v, \theta) - \xi(u_f, v, \theta)| \lesssim \int_u^{u_f} (|\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 \xi| + |\xi|)(u', v, \theta) \Omega^2 du'. \tag{15.1.8}$$

In particular, it follows that

$$\|D_{u_f} \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \leq \sup_{u \leq u' \leq u_f} (\|\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 \xi\|_{S_{u',v}}^2 + \|\xi\|_{S_{u',v}}^2). \tag{15.1.9}$$

Proof. For simplicity, suppose ξ is an S -tangent 1-form. Write

$$\xi(u, v, \theta) - \xi(u_f, v, \theta) = (\xi(u, v, \theta)_A - \xi(u_f, v, \theta)_A) d\theta^A = \int_u^{u_f} \partial_u (\xi(u', v, \theta)_A) du' d\theta^A.$$

The inequality (15.1.8) follows from the fact that

$$\partial_u (\xi_A) = \Omega \nabla_3 \xi_A + \Omega \chi_A^B \xi_B.$$

The inequality (15.1.9) is then immediate from the fact that $\Omega_o(u, v)^{-2} \int_u^{u_f} \Omega^2 du' \lesssim 1$. The proof for more general S -tangent tensor fields is similar. □

The next lemma concerns particular blueshifted transport equations which become noshifted after one commutation with $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$.

Lemma 15.1.6 (Estimates for blueshifted transport equations which are noshifted after one commutation).
Let ξ be an S -tangent tensor field satisfying

$$\Omega\nabla_4\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3\xi = h(r)\xi + F,$$

for some S -tangent tensor field F and some smooth function h . For any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$ and any $\kappa \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{l=0,1} \left(\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^l \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^l \xi\|_{C_u(v)}^2 \right) \\ & \lesssim v^{-\kappa} \|D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|D_{u_f} F\|_{C_u(v_{-1} \vee \frac{v}{2})}^2 + \sum_{l=0,1} \left(\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^l \xi\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^l \xi\|_{C_{u_f}(v_{-1} \vee \frac{v}{2})}^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (15.1.10)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{l=0,1} \left(\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^l \xi\|_{\underline{C}_v(u)}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^l \xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\kappa^+}(v)}^2 \right) \\ & \lesssim v^{-\kappa} \|D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 + \|D_{u_f} F\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\kappa^+}(v_{-1} \vee \frac{v}{2})}^2 + \sum_{l=0,1} \left(\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^l \xi\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^l \xi\|_{C_{u_f}(v_{-1} \vee \frac{v}{2})}^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (15.1.11)$$

where $v_{-1} \vee v/2 := \max\{v_{-1}, v/2\}$.

Proof. The difference quotient $D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi$ satisfies

$$\Omega\nabla_4 D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi + 2(\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi = h(r) D_{u_f} \xi + \xi(u_f, v) D_{u_f} h + D_{u_f} F. \quad (15.1.12)$$

Given $v_{-1} \leq v_1 < v_2 \leq v(R_2, u)$, after contracting (15.1.12) with $D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi$ and integrating it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi\|_{S_{u,v_2}}^2 + \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 dv & \lesssim \|D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi\|_{S_{u,v_1}}^2 \\ & + \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|\xi\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 + \|D_{u_f} F\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|D_{u_f} \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 dv. \end{aligned}$$

Now, by Lemma 15.1.5

$$|D_{u_f} \xi(u, v)| \leq \Omega_\circ(u, v)^{-2} \int_u^{u_f} (|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi(u', v)| + |\xi(u', v)|) \Omega^2 du',$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|D_{u_f} \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 dv & \lesssim \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \int_u^{u_f} (\|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi\|_{S_{u',v}}^2 + \|\xi\|_{S_{u',v}}^2) \Omega_\circ^2 du' \Omega_\circ(u, v)^{-4} \int_u^{u_f} \Omega(u', v)^2 du' dv \\ & \lesssim \int_u^{u_f} \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi\|_{S_{u',v}}^2 + \|\xi\|_{S_{u',v}}^2 dv \frac{\Omega_\circ(u', v_2)^2}{\Omega_\circ(u, v_2)^2} du'. \end{aligned}$$

Now since,

$$\|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 + \|D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2$$

and

$$\|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \|\xi\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 + \int_u^{u_f} \|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi\|_{S_{u',v}}^2 \Omega^2 du',$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 dv \lesssim \|\xi\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 + \|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 \\ & + \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|\xi\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 + \|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 dv + \int_u^{u_f} (\|D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi\|_{S_{u',v_2}}^2 + \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \xi\|_{S_{u',v}}^2 dv) \Omega^2 du', \end{aligned}$$

and the Grönwall inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|D_{u_f}\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 dv \\ \lesssim \|D_{u_f}\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3\xi\|_{S_{u,v_1}}^2 + \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|\xi\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 + \|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3\xi\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 + \|D_{u_f}F\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 dv \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v_2}}^2 + \|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3\xi\|_{S_{u,v_2}}^2 + \|D_{u_f}\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3\xi\|_{S_{u,v_2}}^2 \\ \lesssim \|D_{u_f}\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3\xi\|_{S_{u,v_1}}^2 + \|\xi\|_{S_{u_f,v_2}}^2 + \|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3\xi\|_{S_{u_f,v_2}}^2 + \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|\xi\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 + \|D_{u_f}F\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 dv. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of (15.1.10) then follows from a pigeonhole argument, as in the proof of Lemma 15.1.2. The proof of (15.1.11), this time using the fact that the difference quotient satisfies

$$\Omega\nabla_4\Omega_\circ D_{u_f}\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3\xi + (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ\Omega_\circ D_{u_f}\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3\xi = h(r)\Omega_\circ D_{u_f}\xi + \Omega_\circ\xi(u_f, v)D_{u_f}h + \Omega_\circ D_{u_f}F.$$

□

The next lemma similarly concerns particular blueshifted transport equations which become noshifted after one commutation with $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$. Unlike Lemma 15.1.6, the following lemma involves commuting with D_{u_f} , rather than commuting with $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$.

Lemma 15.1.7 (Estimates for difference quotient for blueshifted transport equations which are noshifted after one commutation). *If ξ is an S -tangent $(0, k)$ tensor which satisfies*

$$\Omega\nabla_4\xi - 2(\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ\xi = F, \quad (15.1.13)$$

then, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,

$$\|D_{u_f}\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \|D_{u_f}\xi\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \int_{v_{-1}}^v (v')^{1+\frac{\delta}{2}} \|\xi\|_{S_{u_f,v'}}^2 dv' + \int_{v_{-1}}^v (v')^{1+\frac{\delta}{2}} \|D_{u_f}F\|_{S_{u,v'}}^2 dv'.$$

Proof. The equation (15.1.13) implies that

$$\Omega\nabla_4 D_{u_f}\xi = \hat{F}, \quad \text{where,} \quad \hat{F}(u, v) = 2\xi(u_f, v)D_{u_f}(\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ(u, v) + D_{u_f}F(u, v),$$

Hence

$$\partial_v \|D_{u_f}\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 = 2 \int_{S^2} D_{u_f}\xi \cdot \hat{F} d\theta,$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_{u_f}\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 &\leq \|D_{u_f}\xi\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + 2 \int_{v_{-1}}^v \|D_{u_f}\xi\|_{S_{u,v'}} \|\hat{F}\|_{S_{u,v'}} dv' \\ &\leq \|D_{u_f}\xi\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + 2 \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v' \leq v} \|D_{u_f}\xi\|_{S_{u,v'}} \left(\int_{v_{-1}}^v (v')^{-1-\frac{\delta}{2}} dv' \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{v_{-1}}^v (v')^{1+\frac{\delta}{2}} \|\hat{F}\|_{S_{u,v'}}^2 dv' \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dv'. \end{aligned}$$

The result then follows after dividing by $\sup_{v_{-1} \leq v' \leq v} \|D_{u_f}\xi\|_{S_{u,v'}}$, taking the supremum over $v_{-1} \leq v' \leq v$ and noting that

$$\frac{r(u, v) - r(u_f, v)}{\Omega_\circ(u, v)^2} = \frac{r(u, v) - r(u_f, v)}{\frac{2M(r(u, v) - r(u_f, v))}{r(u_f, v)r(u, v)} + \Omega_\circ(u_f, v)^2} \leq \frac{r(u_f, v)r(u, v)}{2M_f},$$

and so

$$\frac{(\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ(u, v) - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ(u_f, v)}{\Omega_\circ(u, v)^2} \lesssim 1.$$

□

15.1.2 Equations for commuted and renormalised quantities

In this section several equations, which are used in the later sections, are collected.

When estimating $\hat{\chi}$ it is convenient to consider the renormalised quantity

$$X = X_1 = r\mathcal{P}_2^* r d\mathfrak{I}v(r^2\Omega\hat{\chi}) - \frac{r^3}{2}\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3(r\Omega^2\alpha), \quad (15.1.14)$$

for which, unlike $\hat{\chi}$, α does not appear as a top order quantity on the right hand side of its evolution equation in the outgoing direction.

Recall the error notation of Section 3.2.3.

Proposition 15.1.8 (Equation for X_1). *The quantity X_1 satisfies*

$$\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 X_1 - 2(\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ X_1 = \mathcal{L}[X_1] + \mathcal{E}[X_1],$$

where the linear term $\mathcal{L}[X_1]$ takes the form

$$\mathcal{L}[X_1] = \frac{r^2\Omega_\circ^2}{2}\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3(r\Omega^2\alpha) + 3M_f r\Omega^2\alpha,$$

and the nonlinear error $\mathcal{E}[X_1]$ has the schematic form,

$$\mathcal{E}[X_1] = \mathcal{E}^1 + (H^1 \cdot \Phi) \cdot (r\mathring{\nabla})^2 \Omega\hat{\chi} + (H^2 \cdot \Phi) \cdot (r\mathring{\nabla})^2 \Omega\hat{\omega}.$$

for some vectors of admissible coefficient functions (see (3.2.1)) $H^j = \{H_i^j\}_{i=1,\dots,17}$, $j = 1, 2$ and $H^{k_1 k_2} = \{H_i^{k_1 k_2}\}_{i=1,\dots,17}$.

Proof. Equation (1.2.6) can be written

$$\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4(r^2\Omega\hat{\chi}) - 2(\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ r^2\Omega\hat{\chi} = -r^2\Omega^2\alpha + E_4[r^2\Omega\hat{\chi}], \quad E_4[r^2\Omega\hat{\chi}] = 2(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ)r^2\Omega\hat{\chi} - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)r^2\Omega\hat{\chi}.$$

Equation (1.2.6) and equation (3.4.13) then imply that,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 X_1 &= r^2\mathcal{P}_2^* r d\mathfrak{I}v(2(\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ r^2\Omega\hat{\chi} - r^2\Omega^2\alpha) - \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 \left(\frac{r^3}{2\Omega^2} \right) \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3(r\Omega^2\alpha) - \frac{r^3}{2\Omega^2} \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3(r\Omega^2\alpha) \\ &\quad + [\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4, r^2\mathcal{P}_2^* r d\mathfrak{I}v](r^2\Omega\hat{\chi}) + r^2\mathcal{P}_2^* r d\mathfrak{I}v E_4[r^2\Omega\hat{\chi}] \\ &= 2(\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ X_1 + \left[2(\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ \frac{r^3}{2\Omega^2} - \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 \left(\frac{r^3}{2\Omega^2} \right) + \frac{2r^2}{\Omega^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r} \right) \right] \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3(r\Omega^2\alpha) + 3M_f r\Omega^2\alpha \\ &\quad - \frac{r^3}{2} \mathcal{E}^1 + [\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4, r^2\mathcal{P}_2^* r d\mathfrak{I}v](r^2\Omega\hat{\chi}) + r^2\mathcal{P}_2^* r d\mathfrak{I}v E_4[r^2\Omega\hat{\chi}]. \end{aligned}$$

The proof follows from the fact that

$$\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 \left(\frac{r^3}{2\Omega^2} \right) = \frac{3r^2}{2\Omega^2} \left(1 - \frac{2M_f}{r} \right) - \frac{M_f r}{\Omega^2} - \frac{r^3}{\Omega^2} (\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ),$$

and so

$$2(\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ \frac{r^3}{2\Omega^2} - \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 \left(\frac{r^3}{2\Omega^2} \right) + \frac{2r^2}{\Omega^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r} \right) = \frac{r^2}{2} \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2} + \frac{r^3}{\Omega^2} (\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ).$$

It follows from inspecting the form of the error (using also Lemma 3.3.1) that the only second order terms involve two angular derivatives of $\Omega\hat{\chi}$, $\Omega\hat{\omega}$ or $\Omega\text{tr}\chi$. The terms involving $\mathring{\nabla}\Omega\text{tr}\chi$ can be replaced by terms involving $d\mathfrak{I}v\Omega\hat{\chi}$, plus zeroth order terms, using the Codazzi equation (1.2.18). \square

Proposition 15.1.8 shows that X_1 satisfies a transport equation which contains linear terms involving only one derivative of α on the right hand side (instead of the “expected” two derivatives). Define

$$X_2 = r\mathcal{P}_2^* r d\mathfrak{I}v X_1 + \frac{r^4\Omega^2}{4} (\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^2 (r\Omega^2\alpha). \quad (15.1.15)$$

The following proposition shows that X_2 satisfies a transport equation such that the linear terms on the right hand side involve only two derivatives of α , instead of the “expected” four derivatives. This “gap” of two derivatives will be exploited when estimating $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ in Section 15.3.4.

Proposition 15.1.9 (Equation for X_2). *The quantity X_2 satisfies*

$$\Omega \nabla_4 X_2 - 2(\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ X_2 = \mathcal{L}[X_2] + \mathcal{E}[X_2],$$

where the linear term $\mathcal{L}[X_2]$ takes the form

$$\mathcal{L}[X_2] = \sum_{k_1+k_2 \leq 2} H^{k_1 k_2} \cdot (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{k_1} (r \nabla)^{k_2} (r \Omega^2 \alpha)$$

and the nonlinear error $\mathcal{E}[X_2]$ has the schematic form

$$\mathcal{E}[X_2] = \mathcal{E}^3 + (H^1 \cdot \Phi) \cdot (r \nabla)^4 \Omega \hat{\chi} + (H^2 \cdot \Phi) \cdot (r \nabla)^4 \Omega \hat{\omega},$$

for some vectors of admissible coefficient functions (see (3.2.1)) $H^j = \{H_i^j\}_{i=1, \dots, 17}$, $j = 1, 2$ and $H^{k_1 k_2} = \{H_i^{k_1 k_2}\}_{i=1, \dots, 17}$.

Proof. The proof is a direct computation using Proposition 15.1.8, Proposition 3.4.6 and the commutation formulae of Lemma 3.3.1. Explicitly one obtains,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_4 X_2 - 2(\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ X_2 = & -\frac{r^2 \Omega^2}{2} (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^2 (r \Omega^2 \alpha) + (3M_f - r^2 \Omega^2) r^2 \nabla_2^* \text{div} (r \Omega^2 \alpha) \\ & - r^4 \Omega \nabla_3 \left(\frac{1}{r} \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r} \right) \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (r \Omega^2 \alpha) \right) - \frac{r^4}{2} \Omega \nabla_3 \left(\frac{3M_f}{r^3} r \Omega^2 \alpha \right) \\ & + r^3 \Omega^2 \Omega \nabla_3 \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (r \Omega^2 \alpha) - \frac{r^4}{2} \Omega \nabla_3 \left(\frac{M_f}{r^2} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (r \Omega^2 \alpha) \right) + \mathcal{E}[X_2], \end{aligned}$$

where the error $\mathcal{E}[X_2]$ has the above schematic form. \square

Define

$$\underline{X}_1 = r^2 \nabla_2^* \text{div} (r^2 \Omega \hat{\chi}) - \frac{r^3}{2\Omega^2} \Omega \nabla_4 (r \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}). \quad (15.1.16)$$

Similar to the ∇_4 equation satisfied by X_1 , \underline{X}_1 satisfies a transport equation in the ∇_3 direction such that the linear terms on the right hand side involve only first order derivatives of $\underline{\alpha}$.

Proposition 15.1.10 (Equation for \underline{X}_1). *The quantity \underline{X}_1 satisfies*

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (\Omega^{-2} \underline{X}_1) = -\frac{r^2}{2\Omega^2} \Omega \nabla_4 (r \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}) + 3M_f r \underline{\alpha} + \mathcal{E}^2.$$

Proof. The proof is a direct computation and is similar to the proof of Proposition 15.1.8, using now equations (1.2.6) and (3.4.14). \square

Recall the quantity $\mu^* = \text{div} \eta + (\rho - \rho_\circ) - \frac{3}{2r} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)$, which satisfies the following equation which is *noshifted*, but has only nonlinear terms on the right hand side.

Proposition 15.1.11 (Equation for μ^*). *On the final hypersurface $\{u = u_f\}$, the quantity μ^* satisfies*

$$\partial_v (r^3 \mu^*) = \mathcal{E}[r^3 \mu^*].$$

and the nonlinear error $\mathcal{E}[r^3 \mu^*]$ has the schematic form

$$\mathcal{E}[r^3 \mu^*] = \mathcal{E}^0 + (H^1 \cdot \Phi) \cdot r \nabla \Omega \hat{\chi} + (H^2 \cdot \Phi) \cdot r \nabla \eta$$

for some vectors of admissible coefficient functions (see (3.2.1)) $H^j = \{H_i^j\}_{i=1, \dots, 17}$, $j = 1, 2$.

Proof. First note that the equations (1.2.12), (1.2.25), together with (15.3.27), imply that, on $\{u = u_f\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_v(r^3 \mathring{d}\mathring{v}\eta) &= -r^3 \mathring{d}\mathring{v}(\Omega\beta) + [\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4, r\mathring{d}\mathring{v}]r^2\eta - 2r^3 \mathring{d}\mathring{v}(\Omega\hat{\chi} \cdot \eta) + \mathcal{E}^0, \\ \partial_v(r^3\rho) &= -\frac{3r^3}{2}\rho_\circ(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ) + r^3\Omega\mathring{d}\mathring{v}\beta + \mathcal{E}^0\end{aligned}$$

and the Raychaudhuri equation (1.2.7) can be written in renormalised form as

$$\partial_v(r^2(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)) = 2r^2(\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ) + \mathcal{E}^0,$$

on $\{u = u_f\}$. The result then follows after noting the cancellations in the linear terms. \square

The following proposition contains the commuted form of equation (1.2.6). Note that, in the language of Section 15.1.1.1, the equation is *blueshifted*, *noshifted* or *redshifted* depending on whether it is commuted with zero, one, or two or more $\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3$ derivatives respectively.

Proposition 15.1.12 (Commutated equation for $\Omega\hat{\chi}$). *For any k_1, k_2 , $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ satisfies the commuted equation*

$$\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4((r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2}r^2\Omega\hat{\chi}) + 2(k_2 - 1)\Omega\hat{\omega}(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2}r^2\Omega\hat{\chi} = \mathcal{L}_{k_1 k_2}[\Omega\hat{\chi}] + \mathcal{E}^{k_1+k_2},$$

where

$$|\mathcal{L}_{k_1 k_2}[\Omega\hat{\chi}]| \lesssim \sum_{l_1+l_2=0}^{k_1-1} |(r\mathring{\nabla})^{l_1}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{l_2}\Omega\hat{\chi}| + \sum_{l_1+l_2=0}^{k_1+k_2} |(r\mathring{\nabla})^{l_1}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{l_2}\Omega^2\alpha|.$$

If $k_2 \geq k_1 + 1$ then the one can replace $\mathcal{E}^{k_1+k_2}$ with $\mathcal{E}^{*k_1+k_2}$.

Proof. The proof follows by commuting equation (1.2.6), using Lemma 3.3.1. \square

Finally, the following proposition collects equations which will be used to estimate σ .

Lemma 15.1.13 (Equations satisfied by σ). *The following schematic equations are satisfied by σ ,*

$$\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4(r^2\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4(r^3\sigma)) = -r^5\text{c}\mathring{v}\mathring{r}\mathring{d}\mathring{v}(\Omega^2\alpha) + 2\Omega\hat{\omega}r^2\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4(r^3\sigma) + \mathcal{E}^1, \quad (15.1.17)$$

and,

$$\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3(r^2\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3(r^3\sigma)) = r^5\text{c}\mathring{v}\mathring{r}\mathring{d}\mathring{v}(\Omega^{-2}\underline{\alpha}) + \mathcal{E}^1. \quad (15.1.18)$$

Proof. The Bianchi equation (1.2.26) implies that

$$\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4(r^3\sigma) = -r^3\text{c}\mathring{v}\mathring{r}\mathring{l}(\Omega\beta) + E_4[r^3\sigma],$$

where

$$E_4[r^3\sigma] = \frac{r^3}{2}^*(\eta + \underline{\eta}) \cdot \Omega\beta - \frac{r^3}{2}(\eta + 3\underline{\eta}) \wedge \Omega\beta + \frac{r^3}{2}\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi} \wedge \Omega^2\alpha.$$

Similarly, the Bianchi equation (1.2.23) implies

$$\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4\left(\frac{r^4}{\Omega}\beta\right) = r^4\mathring{d}\mathring{v}\alpha + E_4\left[\frac{r^4}{\Omega}\beta\right], \quad E_4\left[\frac{r^4}{\Omega}\beta\right] = \Omega^{-2}r^4(\eta^\sharp \cdot \alpha - 2(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)\Omega\beta),$$

which then gives,

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4(r^5\text{c}\mathring{v}\mathring{r}\mathring{l}\Omega\beta) &= \Omega^2r^5\text{c}\mathring{v}\mathring{r}\mathring{d}\mathring{v}\alpha - 2\Omega\hat{\omega}r^2\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4(r^3\sigma) + 2\Omega\hat{\omega}r^2E_4[r^3\sigma] + \Omega^2\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4\left(\frac{r^5}{\Omega^2}^*(\eta + \underline{\eta}) \cdot \Omega\beta\right) \\ &\quad + \Omega^2r\text{c}\mathring{v}\mathring{r}\mathring{l}E_4\left[\frac{r^4}{\Omega}\beta\right] - \Omega^2[r\text{c}\mathring{v}\mathring{r}\mathring{l}, \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4]\left(\frac{r^4}{\Omega}\beta\right).\end{aligned}$$

Equation (15.1.17) then follows. Equation (15.1.18) follows similarly, now using equations (1.2.28) and (1.2.30). \square

15.2 Non-linear error estimates

The results of this section will be used to control the nonlinear error terms which arise when estimating the geometric quantities in Section 15.3. Recall again the pointwise estimates for the geometric quantities in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge of Proposition 9.2.1, which take the form

$$\mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{N-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon$$

with the pointwise norm $\mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{N-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$ defined in (6.1.23). Recall also the estimate for the energy $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N$, defined in (6.1.21), in the bootstrap assumption (7.1.4), which takes the form

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N \lesssim \varepsilon^2.$$

These estimates will be used throughout this section.

15.2.1 Spacetime error estimates

The first nonlinear error estimate concerns nonlinear errors estimated in the spacetime L^2 norm.

Proposition 15.2.1 (Spacetime nonlinear error estimate). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$, if $k \leq N - s$, then, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\|\mathcal{E}^k\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{\kappa(s)}},$$

where $\kappa(0) = 1 - \delta$, $\kappa(1) = 2$ and $\kappa(2) = 3$.

Proof. Consider a nonlinear term of the form $\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi^{(1)} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi^{(2)}$ for some $|\gamma_1| + |\gamma_2| \leq N - s$ (the cubic and higher order terms are easier to estimate). Without loss of generality assume $|\gamma_2| \geq |\gamma_1|$. Suppose first that $\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi^{(2)} \neq (r\mathring{\nabla})^{N-s} \Omega \hat{\chi}$ and $\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi^{(2)} \neq (r\mathring{\nabla})^{N-s} \Omega \text{tr} \chi$. Then

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2}(\Phi^{(2)} - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{(2)})\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^s}.$$

Now, since $|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi^{(1)}| \lesssim \varepsilon v^{-1}$,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi^{(1)} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi^{(2)}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^2} \left(\|\Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{(2)}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2}(\Phi^{(2)} - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{(2)})\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \right),$$

and the result follows from the fact that $\|\Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{(2)}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^2 v^{-1}$.

Suppose now that $\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi^{(2)} = (r\mathring{\nabla})^{N-s} \Omega \hat{\chi}$ or $(r\mathring{\nabla})^{N-s} \Omega \text{tr} \chi$. Consider first the case that $s = 0$. Then

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi^{(2)}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^2 v^\delta,$$

and

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi^{(1)} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi^{(2)}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \int_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)} \varepsilon^4 (v')^{\delta-2} \Omega_\circ^2 du dv \lesssim \varepsilon^4 v^{\delta-1}.$$

The cases $s = 1$ and $s = 2$ are similar, using the fact that

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi^{(2)}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^2, \text{ if } s = 1, \quad \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi^{(2)}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^2 v^{-1}, \text{ if } s = 2.$$

□

15.2.2 Error estimates on spheres

In this section nonlinear error terms are estimate on spheres.

Proposition 15.2.2 (Nonlinear error estimate on spheres). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$, if $k \leq N - 1 - s$ then, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,*

$$\|\mathcal{E}^k\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{2+s}}.$$

Proof. The proof is an immediate consequence of the fact that each Φ satisfies, for $s = 0, 1, 2$,

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1-s} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^s}.$$

□

An extra derivative can be controlled if the nonlinear error involves only Ricci coefficients, and no curvature components.

Proposition 15.2.3 (Nonlinear error estimate on spheres). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$, if $|\gamma| \leq N - s$ then, for any Γ and $\tilde{\Gamma}$ and any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Gamma \cdot \tilde{\Gamma})\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{1+\kappa(s)}},$$

where $\kappa(0) = 1 - \delta$, $\kappa(1) = 2$ and $\kappa(2) = 3$.

Proof. The proof is an immediate consequence of the fact that, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for each Γ ,

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Gamma\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^{\kappa(s)-1}}.$$

□

15.2.3 Error estimates on null hypersurfaces

In this section, nonlinear error terms are estimated in L^2 on null hypersurfaces. The first proposition concerns outgoing null hypersurfaces.

Proposition 15.2.4 (Nonlinear error estimate on outgoing null hypersurfaces). *Given $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $k \leq N - s$, let \mathcal{E}^k be a nonlinear error which does not involve the top order quantity $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k \Omega^{-2}\underline{\alpha}$. Then, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,*

$$\|\mathcal{E}^k\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{\kappa(s)}},$$

where $\kappa(0) = 1 - \delta$, $\kappa(1) = 2$ and $\kappa(2) = 3$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 15.2.1 since, for all $|\gamma| \leq N - s$ and $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi \neq (\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{N-s} \Omega^{-2}\underline{\alpha}$, $(r\nabla)^{N-s} \Omega \hat{\chi}$ or $(r\nabla)^{N-s} \Omega \text{tr}\chi$,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Phi - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^s}.$$

Terms of the form $\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} \Phi^{(1)} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi^{(2)}$ for $\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi^{(2)} = (r\nabla)^{N-s} \Omega \hat{\chi}$ or $(r\nabla)^{N-s} \Omega \text{tr}\chi$ are again estimated separately, exactly as in the proof of Proposition 15.2.1. □

The next proposition concerns nonlinear error terms on incoming null hypersurfaces.

Proposition 15.2.5 (Nonlinear error estimate on incoming null hypersurfaces). *Given $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $k \leq N - s$, let \mathcal{E}^k be a nonlinear error which does not involve the top order quantity $(r\Omega\hat{\nabla}_4)^k\Omega^2\alpha$. Then, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\|\mathcal{E}^k\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{\kappa(s)}},$$

where $\kappa(0) = 1 - \delta$, $\kappa(1) = 2$ and $\kappa(2) = 3$.

Proof. The proof is again similar to that of Proposition 15.2.1 since, for all $|\gamma| \leq N - s$ and $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\Phi \neq (\Omega^{-1}\hat{\nabla}_3)^{N-s}\Omega^{-2}\underline{\alpha}$, $(r\hat{\nabla})^{N-s}\Omega\hat{\chi}$ or $(r\hat{\nabla})^{N-s}\Omega\text{tr}\chi$,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Phi - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^s}.$$

Terms of the form $\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}\Phi^{(1)} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2}\Phi^{(2)}$ for $\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2}\Phi^{(2)} = (r\hat{\nabla})^{N-s}\Omega\hat{\chi}$ or $(r\hat{\nabla})^{N-s}\Omega\text{tr}\chi$ are again estimated separately, exactly as in the proof of Proposition 15.2.1. \square

On the final hypersurface $\{u_{\mathcal{H}^+} = u_f\}$, nonlinear error terms involving even higher order derivatives of certain Ricci coefficients can be controlled. Such estimates are used in Section 15.3.3.1.

Proposition 15.2.6 (Nonlinear error estimate on the final outgoing hypersurfaces). *On the final hypersurface $\{u = u_f\}$, for $s = 0, 1$, for any Φ , any $\xi = \Omega\hat{\chi}$, $\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_o$, $\eta - \eta_{\text{Kerr}}$, any $k \leq N + 1 - s$, and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\left(\int_{C_u(v)} |\Phi \cdot (r\hat{\nabla})^k \xi| d\theta dv' \right)^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{2+s}}.$$

Proof. The proof is an immediate consequence of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the fact that $|\Phi| \lesssim \varepsilon v^{-1}$ for all Φ , and

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N+1-s} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k \xi\|_{C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^s},$$

for $\xi = \Omega\hat{\chi}$, $\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_o$, $\eta - \eta_{\text{Kerr}}$ and $s = 0, 1, 2$. \square

The following proposition exploits the fact that nonlinear error terms have faster decay if they do not contain quadratic terms for which both factors are non-vanishing in the reference linearised Kerr solution. Note that such terms for which one of the factors is $\Omega\beta$ are allowed in the following proposition since, in the reference linearised Kerr solution, $\Omega\beta_{\text{Kerr}}$ behaves like Ω^2 .

Proposition 15.2.7 (Nonlinear error estimate on outgoing null hypersurfaces). *Given $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $k \leq N - 1 - s$, let \mathcal{E}^k be a nonlinear error which moreover does not contain any quadratic terms of the form*

$$\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}\Phi^{(1)} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2}\Phi^{(2)}, \quad \Phi^{(1)}, \Phi^{(2)} \in \{\eta, \underline{\eta}, \sigma, \Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}\}.$$

Then, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,

$$\left(\int_{C_u(v)} |\mathcal{E}^k| d\theta dv' \right)^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{1+s}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathcal{E}^k\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{2+s}}. \quad (15.2.1)$$

Proof. Consider a quadratic term $\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}\Phi^{(1)} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2}\Phi^{(2)}$ and suppose that $\Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{(1)} = 0$. Then

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}\Phi^{(1)}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^2 v^{-s}, \quad \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2}(\Phi^{(2)} - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{(2)})\|_{C_u(v)}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^2 v^{-s},$$

for $|\gamma_1| \leq N - 1 - s$ and $|\gamma_2| \leq N - 1 - s$ respectively. Hence, by Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{C_u(v)} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}\Phi^{(1)} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2}\Phi^{(2)}| d\theta dv' \right)^2 &\lesssim \left(\int_{C_u(v)} \frac{\varepsilon}{u_f} |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}\Phi^{(1)}| + |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}\Phi^{(1)} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2}(\Phi^{(2)} - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{(2)})| d\theta dv' \right)^2 \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{u_f} + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2}(\Phi^{(2)} - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{(2)})\|_{C_u(v)}^2 \right) \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}\Phi^{(1)}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{s+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

For the remaining case, when $\Phi^{(1)} = \Omega\beta$, one estimates the term arising from $\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1}(\Phi^{(1)} - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{(1)})$ exactly as above. Now $|\Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{(1)}| \lesssim \Omega_{\circ}^2 \varepsilon (u_f)^{-1}$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{C_u(v)} |\Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{(1)} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} \Phi^{(2)}| d\theta dv' \right)^2 &\lesssim \left(\int_{C_u(v)} \frac{\varepsilon \Omega_{\circ}^2}{u_f} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{u_f} + |\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2}(\Phi^{(2)} - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{(2)})| \right) d\theta dv' \right)^2 \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{u_f^2} + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2}(\Phi^{(2)} - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}^{(2)})\|_{C_u(v)}^2 \right) \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(u_f)^2} \|\Omega_{\circ}^2\|_{C_u(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{s+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

The first of (15.2.1) then follows. The proof of the second is similar. \square

15.2.4 Difference quotient nonlinear error estimates for $\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ}$

The term $\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ}$ appears at top order as an error in the $\nabla_4 X_2$ equation (see Section 15.1.2) and so the following will be used in estimating the difference quotient $D_{u_f} X_2$.

Proposition 15.2.8 (Difference quotient nonlinear error estimates for $\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ}$). *For any $k \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, and for any Φ , the difference quotient $D_{u_f}(\Phi \cdot (r\nabla)^k(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ}))$ satisfies, for all $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,*

$$\|D_{u_f}(\Phi \cdot (r\nabla)^k(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ}))\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|D_{u_f}(\Phi \cdot (r\nabla)^k(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ}))\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{2+s}}.$$

Proof. Note first that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{u_f}(\Phi \cdot (r\nabla)^k(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ}))(u, v) \\ = D_{u_f}\Phi(u, v) \cdot (r\nabla)^k(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ})(u_f, v) + D_{u_f}(r\nabla)^k(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ})(u, v) \cdot \Phi(u, v). \end{aligned}$$

Equation (1.2.15) and Lemma 3.3.1 imply that

$$\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(r\nabla)^k(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ}) = (r\nabla)^k(\rho - \rho_{\circ}) + \mathcal{E}^{*k},$$

and so it follows from Proposition 15.1.5 that

$$\|D_{u_f}(\Phi \cdot (r\nabla)^k(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ}))\|_{C_u(v)}^2 \lesssim \sup_{u \leq u' \leq u_f} \int_v^{v(R_2, u)} \int_{S_{u', v'}} |\mathcal{E}^{*k}|^2 d\theta dv' \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{2+s}}.$$

The estimate on $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)$ is similar, using now the fact that the estimate (15.1.8) implies that, denoting

$$W_k = (r\nabla)^k(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi \cdot D_{u_f} W_k\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 &\lesssim \int_u^{u_f} \int_v^{v(R_2, u')} \int_{S_{u', v'}} |\Phi|^2 \Omega^{-4} \left(\int_{u'}^{u_f} (|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 W_k| + |W_k|) \Omega^2 du'' \right)^2 \Omega^2 d\theta dv' du' \\ &\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^2} \int_u^{u_f} \int_v^{v(R_2, u')} \int_{S_{u', v'}} \int_{u'}^{u_f} (|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 W_k|^2 + |W_k|^2) \Omega^2 du'' d\theta dv' du' \\ &\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^2} \sup_{u \leq u' \leq u_f} (\|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 W_k\|_{C_{u'}(v)}^2 + \|W_k\|_{C_{u'}(v)}^2), \end{aligned}$$

where the fact that

$$\int_u^{u_f} \int_{u'}^{u_f} \Omega(u'', v')^2 du'' du' \lesssim 1,$$

for all v' has been used. The term $D_{u_f}\Phi \cdot (r\nabla)^k(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ})$ is estimated similarly. \square

15.3 The proof of Theorem C.6: transport and elliptic estimates

This section concerns the main part of the proof of Theorem C.6. In Section 15.3.1 the proof of Theorem C.6 is outlined and reduced to the main statements of the following sections. Some of the geometric quantities are *almost gauge invariant* and so can be estimated directly, using only elliptic estimates, without directly exploiting any of the defining properties of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, from Theorem C.4. These quantities are estimated in Section 15.3.2. The most involved part of the proof of Theorem C.6 concerns the estimates for the $\ell \geq 2$ modes of the geometric quantities. The $\ell \geq 2$ modes are first estimated, via transport and elliptic estimates, on the hypersurfaces C_{u_f} and $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$ in Section 15.3.3, and then in the spacetime region $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in Section 15.3.4. The $\ell = 0, 1$ modes of the geometric quantities are then estimated on the hypersurfaces C_{u_f} and $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$ in Section 15.3.5, and then in the spacetime region $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ in Section 15.3.6. Section 15.3.7 concerns estimates for the metric components.

15.3.1 Outline of the proof of Theorem C.6

In this section the proof of Theorem C.6 is reduced to Theorems 15.3.1, 15.3.2, 15.3.3, 15.3.4, and 15.3.5, whose proofs are given in Sections 15.3.2–15.3.7.

Recall the energy $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N$ from Section 6.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N &:= \mathbb{E}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}^N[C^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}^N[\underline{C}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}^N[S^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}^N[\chi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}^{N+1}[C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}^N[g^{\mathcal{H}^+}] \\ &\quad + (u_f)^4 \sum_{m=-1}^1 |J_{\mathcal{H}^+}^m - J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^m|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The $\ell \geq 2$, $\ell = 1$ and $\ell = 0$ modes of the geometric quantities are estimated separately. Accordingly, recall

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}} = \{(\Omega\beta - \Omega\beta_{\text{Kerr}})^{\mathcal{H}^+}, (\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta} - \Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}_{\text{Kerr}})^{\mathcal{H}^+}, (\rho - \rho_o)^{\mathcal{H}^+}, (\sigma - \sigma_{\text{Kerr}})^{\mathcal{H}^+}\},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma} = \{(\Omega_o^{-2}\Omega^2 - 1)^{\mathcal{H}^+}, \Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{H}^+}, \Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}_o)^{\mathcal{H}^+}, (\eta - \eta_{\text{Kerr}})^{\mathcal{H}^+}, (\underline{\eta} - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}})^{\mathcal{H}^+}, \\ (\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_o)^{\mathcal{H}^+}, \Omega^{-2}(\Omega\underline{\omega} - \Omega\underline{\omega})^{\mathcal{H}^+}\}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{\chi} = \{\Omega\hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{H}^+}, (\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_o)^{\mathcal{H}^+}\},$$

and recall that elements of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}}$ and \mathcal{A}_{Γ} are denoted $\check{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\check{\Gamma}$ respectively, with a $\check{}$ added to emphasise the fact that the linearised Kerr values have been subtracted. Define the spacetime energies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] := \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)} \sum_{s=0,1,2} v^s \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \sum_{\check{\mathcal{R}} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}}} \|(1 - 3M_f/r)\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}\check{\mathcal{R}}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \right. \quad (15.3.1)$$

$$\left. + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1-s} \sum_{\check{\mathcal{R}} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}}} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}\check{\mathcal{R}}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \sum_{\check{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma}} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}\check{\Gamma}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \right),$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell=1}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] := \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)} \sum_{s=0,1,2} v^s \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \sum_{\check{\Phi} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\chi}} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}\check{\Phi}_{\ell=1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \quad (15.3.2)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell=0}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] := \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)} \sum_{s=0,1,2} v^s \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \sum_{\check{\Phi} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\chi}} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}\check{\Phi}_{\ell=0}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2, \quad (15.3.3)$$

and the null cone energies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^N[C^{\mathcal{H}^+}] := \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)} \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} v^s \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f} \sum_{\check{\Phi} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma}} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}\check{\Phi}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2, \quad (15.3.4)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell=1}^N[C^{\mathcal{H}^+}] := \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)} \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} v^s \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f} \sum_{\check{\Phi} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\chi}} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}\check{\Phi}_{\ell=1}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2, \quad (15.3.5)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell=0}^N[C^{\mathcal{H}^+}] := \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)} \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} v^s \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f} \sum_{\check{\Phi} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\chi}} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}\check{\Phi}_{\ell=0}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2, \quad (15.3.6)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^N[\underline{C}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] := \sup_{v-1 \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)} \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} v^s \sum_{\check{\Phi} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma}} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \check{\Phi}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2, \quad (15.3.7)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell=1}^N[\underline{C}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] := \sup_{v-1 \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)} \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} v^s \sum_{\check{\Phi} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma}} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \check{\Phi}_{\ell=1}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2, \quad (15.3.8)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell=0}^N[\underline{C}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] := \sup_{v-1 \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)} \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} v^s \sum_{\check{\Phi} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma}} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \check{\Phi}_{\ell=0}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2, \quad (15.3.9)$$

the energies on spheres

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^N[S^{\mathcal{H}^+}] := \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \sum_{s=0,1,2} v^s \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-1-s} \sum_{\check{\mathcal{R}} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}}} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \check{\mathcal{R}}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \sum_{\check{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma}} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \check{\Gamma}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \right), \quad (15.3.10)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell=1}^N[S^{\mathcal{H}^+}] := \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \sum_{s=0,1,2} v^s \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \sum_{\check{\Phi} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\chi}} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \check{\Phi}_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2, \quad (15.3.11)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell=0}^N[S^{\mathcal{H}^+}] := \sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} \sum_{s=0,1,2} v^s \sum_{|\gamma| \leq N-s} \sum_{\check{\Phi} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\chi}} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \check{\Phi}_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2, \quad (15.3.12)$$

and the energy of $N+1$ derivatives of certain Ricci coefficients through the final hypersurface

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^{N+1}[C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] := \sup_{v-1 \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)} \sum_{s=0,1,2} v^s \sum_{k=0}^{N+1-s} \|(r\check{\nabla})^k (\Omega \hat{\chi}_{\ell \geq 2}, (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o)_{\ell \geq 2}, (\eta - \eta_{\text{Kerr}})_{\ell \geq 2})^{\mathcal{H}^+}\|_{C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2. \quad (15.3.13)$$

For the quantities $\Omega \hat{\chi}$ and $\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o$ recall again that, for $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$, $\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} = (r\check{\nabla})^{k_1} (\Omega^{-1} \check{\nabla}_3)^{k_2} (r\Omega \check{\nabla}_4)^{k_3}$ and define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^N[\chi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] &:= \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{A}_{\chi}} \left[\sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} v^{-\delta} \|(r\check{\nabla})^N \Gamma_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \sum_{s=0,1,2} \sum_{\substack{|\underline{k}| \leq N-s \\ k_1 \neq N-s}} \left(\sup_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} v^s \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Gamma_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \sup_{v-1 \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)} v^s \left(\sup_{u-1 \leq u \leq u_f} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Gamma_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Gamma_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Gamma_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \right) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (15.3.14)$$

Here $\xi_{\ell=1} = \xi_{\ell=0} = 0$ if ξ is a symmetric trace free $(0, 2)$ S tensor.

Proof of Theorem C.6. The estimates for $\mathbb{E}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, $\mathbb{E}^N[C^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, $\mathbb{E}^N[\underline{C}^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, $\mathbb{E}^N[S^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, follow from Theorems 15.3.2, 15.3.3 and 15.3.4 (for the $\ell \geq 2$, $\ell = 1$ and $\ell = 0$ modes respectively) and the fact that

$$\mathbb{E}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell=1}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell=0}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}],$$

etc. The estimate for $\mathbb{E}^{N+1}[C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$ then follows from the estimate for $\mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^{N+1}[C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$ of Theorem 15.3.1 and the fact that

$$\mathbb{E}^{N+1}[C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^{N+1}[C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell=1}^{N+1}[C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell=0}^{N+1}[C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}],$$

and the estimate for $\mathbb{E}^N[\chi^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$ follows from the estimate for $\mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^N[\chi^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$ of Theorem 15.3.2 and the fact that

$$\mathbb{E}^N[\chi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^N[\chi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell=0,1}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell=0,1}^N[C^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell=0,1}^N[\underline{C}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell=0,1}^N[S^{\mathcal{H}^+}],$$

where

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell=0,1}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] = \mathbb{E}_{\ell=0}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell=1}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}],$$

etc. The estimate for $\mathbb{E}^N[g^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$ follows from Theorem 15.3.5 and the estimate for the Kerr parameters $J_{\mathcal{H}^+}^m - J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^m$ follows from Theorem 15.3.1. \square

15.3.2 Estimates for almost gauge invariant quantities in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$

The quantities $\sigma_{\ell \geq 2}$, $\text{curl} \eta_{\ell \geq 2}$, $\text{curl} \underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}$, $\text{curl} \beta_{\ell \geq 2}$, $\text{curl} \underline{\beta}_{\ell \geq 2}$, $\text{curl} d\hat{v} \hat{\chi}$, $\text{curl} d\hat{v} \hat{\underline{\chi}}$ are all almost gauge invariant and so can be directly estimated in terms of α , $\underline{\alpha}$ and higher order derivatives, without directly exploiting the defining conditions of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge. The estimates of this section will be used in Section 15.3.3 and Section 15.3.4.

Given an $S_{u,v}$ tensor ξ and $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$, define the norm

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 &:= \|R^* \xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 + \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 + \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \\ &+ \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 1} \left(\|(1 - 3M_f/r) \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \xi\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \xi\|_{C_u(v)}^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (15.3.15)$$

where $R^* = \Omega \nabla_4 - \Omega \nabla_3$. Note that the norm $\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}$ involves first order derivatives of ξ .

Proposition 15.3.1 (Estimate for $\sigma_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v \geq v_{-1}$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$ and for $0 \leq |\gamma| \leq N - 1 - s$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \sigma_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

where the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}$ is defined in (15.3.15).

Proof. Consider first the case that $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = \mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}}(r \nabla)^k$ for some $|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq N - 4 - s$ and $k \leq 3$. Proposition 3.4.1 implies that

$$\mathcal{P}_2^{**} \nabla \sigma = \frac{1}{2}(P - \underline{P}) + \mathcal{E}^1,$$

and the result then follows from Proposition 9.3.3 and Theorem C.3, using Propositions 15.2.1, 15.2.2, 15.2.4, 15.2.5 to control the error terms.

If, now, $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = \mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}}(r \Omega \nabla_4)^k$ for some $|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq N - 3 - s$ and $k \leq 2$ then the proof follows inductively from Lemma 15.1.13 and Theorem C.4, again using Propositions 15.2.1, 15.2.2, 15.2.4, 15.2.5 to control the error terms (it is readily checked that the error terms have the correct form). Similarly if $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = \mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}}(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^k$ for some $|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq N - 3 - s$ and $k \leq 2$. The remaining cases follow easily from commuting the previous cases. \square

Proposition 15.3.2 (Estimates for $\text{curl} \eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\text{curl} \underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v \geq v_{-1}$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$ and for $0 \leq |\gamma| \leq N - 1 - s$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \text{curl} \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \text{curl} \underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

where the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}$ is defined in (15.3.15).

Proof. The proof follows from the equations (1.2.17) and Proposition 15.3.1, using Propositions 15.2.1, 15.2.2, 15.2.4, 15.2.5 to control the nonlinear error terms. \square

Proposition 15.3.3 (Estimates for $\text{curl} \Omega \beta_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\text{curl} \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v \geq v_{-1}$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$ and for $0 \leq |\gamma| \leq N - 2 - s$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \text{curl} \Omega \beta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \text{curl} \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

where the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}$ is defined in (15.3.15).

Proof. Since $\text{curl} \eta = -\text{curl} \underline{\eta}$, equation (1.2.12) implies that

$$r^3 \text{curl}(\Omega \beta) = \Omega \nabla_4(r^3 \text{curl} \eta) + \mathcal{E}^1.$$

The proof for $\text{curl} \beta$ then follows from Proposition 15.3.2 and Propositions 15.2.1, 15.2.2, 15.2.4, 15.2.5 (after noting that α and $\underline{\alpha}$ do not appear as top order terms in the error). The proof for $\text{curl} \underline{\beta}$ is similar, using now

$$r^3 \text{curl}(\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}) = \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r^3 \text{curl} \underline{\eta}) + \mathcal{E}^1.$$

\square

Proposition 15.3.4 (Estimates for $\text{curl} \nabla \Omega \hat{\chi}$ and $\text{curl} \nabla \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}$ in \mathcal{H}^+). *For any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v \geq v_{-1}$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$ and for $0 \leq |\gamma| \leq N - 2 - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \text{curl} \nabla \Omega \hat{\chi}\|_{\mathcal{H}^+(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \text{curl} \nabla \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}\|_{\mathcal{H}^+(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

where the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^+(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}$ is defined in (15.3.15).

Proof. Applying curl to the Codazzi equation (1.2.18) gives

$$\text{curl} \nabla (\Omega \hat{\chi}) = -\text{curl} \Omega \beta - \frac{1}{2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ \text{curl} \underline{\eta} + \mathcal{E}^1.$$

The proof then follows from Proposition 15.3.2, Proposition 15.3.3, using Propositions 15.2.1, 15.2.2, 15.2.4, 15.2.5 (after noting that α and $\underline{\alpha}$ do not appear as top order terms in the error) to control the nonlinear error terms. The proof for $\text{curl} \nabla \hat{\chi}$ follows similarly, using now the Codazzi equation (1.2.19). \square

15.3.3 Estimates for quantities on C_{u_f} and $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$: the $\ell \geq 2$ modes

In this section the defining conditions of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge (see Definition 2.3.1 or (15.3.19)–(15.3.26) below) are exploited, together with the estimates on $\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ of Theorem C.4 and the estimates on $\hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ of Theorem C.5, in order to control the $\ell \geq 2$ modes of the geometric quantities of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, first on the final outgoing hypersurface $u_{\mathcal{H}^+} = u_f$ (see Section 15.3.3.1), and then on the initial incoming hypersurface $v_{\mathcal{H}^+} = v_{-1}$ (see Section 15.3.3.2). The main goal of this section is to obtain results which will be exploited in the proof of Theorem 15.3.2 in Section 15.3.4. As a consequence, the following is also shown. Recall the energy (15.3.13).

Theorem 15.3.1 (Improving bootstrap assumptions for $\mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^{N+1}[C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$ and angular momentum parameters). *The energy $\mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^{N+1}[C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$ satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^{N+1}[C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \quad (15.3.16)$$

and the Kerr angular momentum parameters satisfy the estimate, for $m = -1, 0, 1$,

$$|J_{\mathcal{H}^+}^m - J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^m| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(u_f)^2}. \quad (15.3.17)$$

Proof. The proof of (15.3.16) is a direct consequence of Propositions 15.3.8, 15.3.17 and 15.3.18 below. The proof of (15.3.17) follows from Proposition 15.3.5. \square

Recall the quantity μ^* ,

$$\mu^* = \text{div} \eta + \rho - \rho_\circ - \frac{3}{2r} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ).$$

Recall that the geometric quantities in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge satisfy

$$b(u_f, v, \theta) = 0 \quad \text{on } C_{u_f} \quad (15.3.18)$$

$$\Omega(u_f, v, \theta) = \Omega_\circ(u_f, v) \quad \text{on } C_{u_f} \quad (15.3.19)$$

$$\partial_u (r^3 (\text{div} \eta)_{\ell \geq 1} + r^3 \rho_{\ell \geq 1})(u, v_{-1}, \theta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } u_0 \leq u \leq u_f, \theta \in S^2; \quad (15.3.20)$$

$$\Omega_{\ell=0}(u, v_{-1}) = \Omega_\circ(u, v_{-1}) \quad \text{for all } u_0 \leq u \leq u_f; \quad (15.3.21)$$

$$f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^3(u_f, v(R, u_f), \theta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in S^2; \quad (15.3.22)$$

$$\mu_{\ell \geq 1}^*(u_f, v(R, u_f), \theta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in S^2; \quad (15.3.23)$$

$$(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}(u_f, v(R, u_f), \theta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in S^2; \quad (15.3.24)$$

$$\text{div} \text{div} \hat{\chi}(u_f, v_{-1}, \theta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in S^2; \quad (15.3.25)$$

$$(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0,1}(u_f, v_{-1}, \theta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in S^2. \quad (15.3.26)$$

The gauge condition (15.3.19) involving Ω in particular implies that

$$\Omega\hat{\omega} = (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ} \quad \text{on } C_{u_f},$$

and

$$\eta = -\underline{\eta} \quad \text{on } C_{u_f}. \quad (15.3.27)$$

Recall that $2M_f < r_0 < 3M_f < R$, and r_0 will be chosen so that $r_0 - 2M_f$ is suitably small.

15.3.3.1 Estimates for quantities on the final hypersurface C_{u_f}

Recall that a transport equation in the ∇_4 direction of the form (15.1.1) is referred to as *redshifted*, *noshifted* or *blueshifted* according to whether the sign of a in (15.1.1) is positive, zero or negative respectively. Recall also, see Proposition 15.1.12, that $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ satisfies a blueshifted transport equation, $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3\Omega\hat{\chi}$ satisfies a noshifted transport equation, and higher order $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivatives of $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ satisfy redshifted transport equations.

One can view the main goal of this section as estimating $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ and its derivatives on the final hypersurface C_{u_f} . The estimates are accordingly obtained differently depending whether they involve zero, one, or two or more $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivatives and hence the three cases are considered separately. See Propositions 15.3.8, 15.3.21 and 15.3.25 respectively. Estimates for other Ricci coefficients and curvature components are also obtained in the process.

Estimates for Kerr parameters

First, however, the following estimate is obtained on the difference between the Kerr parameters $J_{\mathcal{H}^+}^m - J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^m$ (recall Definition 2.2.5 and Definition 2.3.4).

Proposition 15.3.5 (Estimate for \mathcal{H}^+ Kerr parameters). *The Kerr angular momentum parameters satisfy the estimate, for $m = -1, 0, 1$,*

$$|J_{\mathcal{H}^+}^m - J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^m| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(u_f)^2}.$$

Proof. Setting $x = x_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\tilde{x} = x_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ in (4.3.47) and applying $\text{curl}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, it follows from Lemma 10.1.5 that, on $\{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} = u_f\}$,

$$|(\text{curl}\Omega\beta)^{\mathcal{I}^+} - (\text{curl}\Omega\beta)^{\mathcal{H}^+}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(u_f)^2}.$$

The proof then follows from Proposition 14.3.26, which in particular implies that, on $\{u_{\mathcal{I}^+} = u_f\}$,

$$|(r^5 \text{curl}\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1}^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, v) - r^5 \text{curl}\Omega\beta_{\text{Kerr}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(u_f)^2}.$$

□

Estimates for $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ and $\Omega\beta$

First the *blueshifted* quantities $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ and $\Omega\beta$ are estimated on C_{u_f} .

To begin, the gauge condition (15.3.22) is exploited (in the form of Proposition 10.6.1) along with the estimates on $\hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ obtained in Theorem C.5 to give the following estimate for $\Omega\hat{\chi}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ on C_{u_f} around $S_{u_f, v(R, u_f)}$.

Proposition 15.3.6 (Estimate for $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ around $S_{u_f, v(R, u_f)}$). *For $k \leq N + 1 - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\int_{v(R_{-1}, u_f)}^{v(R_2, u_f)} \int_{S^2} |(r\nabla)^k \hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}|^2 d\theta dv(u_f) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v(R, u_f)^s}.$$

Proof. The proof is an immediate consequence of Proposition 10.6.1 and Theorem C.5. □

In order to estimate $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ on the entire hypersurface C_{u_f} , it is convenient to first consider the renormalised quantity X_1 (see Section 15.1.2).

Proposition 15.3.7 (Estimate for X_1 on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for $k \leq N - 1 - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\sum_{k \leq N-2-s} \|(r\nabla)^k X_1\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \sum_{k \leq N-1-s} \|(r\nabla)^k X_1\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. Let ϕ be a smooth cut off function such that $\phi(v(R_2, u_f)) = 0$, and $\phi(v) = 1$ for all $v \leq v(R_{-1}, u_f)$. It follows from Proposition 15.1.8 that $(r\nabla)^k X_1$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \Omega \nabla_4 (\phi(r\nabla)^k X_1) - \frac{2M_f}{r} \phi(r\nabla)^k X_1 \right| \\ & \lesssim |\phi' \cdot (r\nabla)^k X_1| + \sum_{\substack{k_1 \leq k \\ l \leq 1}} |\phi \cdot (r\nabla)^{k_1} (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^l \Omega^2 \alpha| + \sum_{k_1 \leq k} |\phi \cdot \mathcal{E}^1| + \phi |(r\nabla)^{k+2} \Omega \hat{\chi}| \sum |\Phi|. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows from Lemma 15.1.1 (with $v_2 = v(R_2, u_f)$) using the vanishing of $\phi(v(R_2, u_f))$, the fact that ϕ' is supported in $v(R_{-1}, u_f) \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, Proposition 15.3.6 and Theorem C.4, using Propositions 15.2.2, 15.2.4, and 15.2.6 to control the nonlinear error terms. \square

Proposition 15.3.7 yields the following estimate for $\Omega \hat{\chi}$.

Proposition 15.3.8 (Estimate for $\Omega \hat{\chi}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\sum_{k \leq N-s} \|(r\nabla)^k (\Omega \hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}, \quad \sum_{k \leq N+1-s} \|(r\nabla)^k (\Omega \hat{\chi})\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The proof follows from Proposition 15.3.7, Propositions 9.3.3 and 9.3.4, and Theorem C.4. \square

The following estimate for $\Omega \beta$ follows easily from Proposition 15.3.8.

Proposition 15.3.9 (Estimate for $\Omega \beta_{\ell \geq 2}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\sum_{k \leq N-1-s} \|(r\nabla)^k (\Omega \beta_{\ell \geq 2})\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}, \quad \sum_{k \leq N-s} \|(r\nabla)^k (\Omega \beta_{\ell \geq 2})\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The Bianchi equation (1.2.22) can be rewritten,

$$\mathcal{D}_2^* \Omega \beta = -\frac{1}{2r\Omega} \nabla_3 (r\Omega^2 \alpha) + \frac{3M}{r^3} \Omega \hat{\chi} + \mathcal{E}^0.$$

The result then follows from Proposition 9.3.3, Theorem C.4 and Proposition 15.3.8, using also Propositions 15.2.2 and 15.2.4 to control the nonlinear error terms. \square

Estimates for $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 \Omega \hat{\chi}$, η , $\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_0$ and $\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}$

The outgoing propagation equation for the quantity $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 \Omega \hat{\chi}$ is *noshifted* and so it is convenient to first consider the quantity μ^* which is also *noshifted*, but its outgoing propagation equation contains only nonlinear terms on the right hand side. See Proposition 15.1.11.

Proposition 15.3.10 (Estimate for $\mu_{\ell \geq 1}^*$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for $k \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\|(r\nabla)^k \mu_{\ell \geq 1}^*\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{s+1}}, \quad \|(r\nabla)^k \mu_{\ell \geq 1}^*\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^s}. \quad (15.3.28)$$

Proof. By Proposition 15.1.11 and Lemma 3.3.1, for $k \leq N - s$, it follows that each nonlinear term in the equation for $\Omega \nabla_4 (r \nabla)^k \mu^*$ involves at least one Φ for which $\Phi_{\text{Kerr}} = 0$. Hence, by Proposition 9.4.3,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Omega \nabla_4 (r \nabla)^k \mu_{\ell \geq 1}^*\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 &\lesssim \sum_{k_1 + k_2 \leq k} \|(r \nabla)^{k_1} \Phi \cdot (r \nabla)^{k_2} (\Phi - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{\Phi, \xi} \|\Phi \cdot (r \nabla)^{k+1} \xi\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^s} \sum_{l \leq k} \|(r \nabla)^l \mu^*\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (15.3.29)$$

for $\xi = \Omega \hat{\chi}, \Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o, \eta - \eta_{\text{Kerr}}$. Consider $k_1 + k_2 \leq k$. Since $|\Phi_{\text{Kerr}}| \lesssim \varepsilon(u_f)^{-1}$ for all Φ ,

$$\left(\int_v^{v(R_2, u_f)} \int_{S_{u_f, v'}} |\Phi_{\text{Kerr}} \cdot (r \nabla)^{k_2} (\Phi - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}})| d\theta dv' \right)^2 \lesssim \int_v^{v(R_2, u_f)} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(u_f)^2} dv' \|(r \nabla)^{k_2} (\Phi - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{s+1}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\int_v^{v(R_2, u_f)} \int_{S_{u_f, v'}} |(r \nabla)^{k_1} (\Phi - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}}) \cdot (r \nabla)^{k_2} (\Phi - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}})| d\theta dv' \right)^2 \\ &\lesssim \|(r \nabla)^{k_1} (\Phi - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \|(r \nabla)^{k_2} (\Phi - \Phi_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{s+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The second term on the right hand side of (15.3.29) is estimated in Proposition 15.2.6, and an estimate for the third term follows immediately from the bootstrap assumption (7.1.4). The first of (15.3.28) then follows from the fact that $|(r \nabla)^k \mu_{\ell \geq 1}^*(v)| \leq |(r \nabla)^k \mu_{\ell \geq 1}^*(v(R, u_f))| + \int_v^{v(R, u_f)} |\Omega \nabla_4 (r \nabla)^k \mu_{\ell \geq 1}^*(v')| dv'$ and the gauge condition (15.3.23). The second of (15.3.28) follows from integrating the first. \square

Recall that $r_0 > 2M_f$ will be chosen to be close to $2M_f$ later. The following provides control over $\Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\ell \geq 2}$ in terms of Ω_o^2 times η . The Ω_o^2 factor will be later be used as a smallness factor in the region $r \leq r_0$.

In what follows, if $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, then $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$.

Proposition 15.3.11 (Preliminary estimate for $\Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\ell \geq 2}$ on $C_{u_f} \cap \{r \leq r_0\}$). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, for $0 \leq k \leq N + 1 - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|(r \nabla)^k (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 &\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s} + \|\Omega_o^2 (r \nabla)^{(k-1) \vee 0} \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2, \\ \|\mathbb{1} (r \nabla)^k (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 &\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s} + \|\mathbb{1} \Omega_o^2 (r \nabla)^{(k-1) \vee 0} \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r \leq r_0}$.

Proof. The Codazzi equation (1.2.18) implies that

$$\mathcal{D}_2^* \nabla (\Omega \text{tr} \chi) = 2\mathcal{D}_2^* (\text{div}(\Omega \hat{\chi}) + \Omega \beta + \frac{1}{2} \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o \underline{\eta} + \mathcal{E}^0) = 2X_1 + \frac{2\Omega_o^2}{r} \mathcal{D}_2^* \underline{\eta} + \mathcal{E}^1,$$

by the Bianchi equation (1.2.22). The proof then follows from the elliptic estimate of Proposition 9.3.3, using the estimates of Proposition 15.3.7 and Propositions 15.2.3 and 15.2.4 to control the nonlinear error terms, after recalling that $\eta = -\underline{\eta}$ on $\{u = u_f\}$. \square

The following two propositions similarly control ρ and η in terms of Ω_o^2 times $\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}$. Again, the Ω_o^2 factor will be used as a smallness factor in the region $r \leq r_0$.

Proposition 15.3.12 (Preliminary estimate for $\rho_{\ell \geq 2}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for $0 \leq k \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_0, u_f)$,*

$$\|\mathbb{1} (r \nabla)^k \rho_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s} + \|\mathbb{1} \Omega_o^2 (r \nabla)^{(k-2) \vee 0} (\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi})\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2,$$

where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r \leq r_0}$, and, for $0 \leq k \leq N - 1 - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,

$$\|(r \nabla)^k \rho_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s} + \|\Omega_o^2 ((r \nabla)^{(k-2) \vee 0} (\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}))\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2.$$

Proof. The proof follows from the equality (3.4.2), together with the elliptic estimate Proposition 9.3.3, Theorem C.3 and Propositions 15.3.1 and 15.3.8, using Propositions 15.2.2 and 15.2.4 to control the nonlinear error terms. \square

Proposition 15.3.13 (Preliminary estimate for $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, if $r_0 - 2M_f$ is sufficiently small then, for $0 \leq k \leq N + 1 - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_0, u_f)$,*

$$\|(r\nabla)^k \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s} + \|\Omega_\circ^2((r\nabla)^{(k-3)\vee 0}(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}}))\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2,$$

and, for $0 \leq k \leq N + 1 - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, with $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r \leq r_0}$,

$$\|\mathbb{1}(r\nabla)^k \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s} + \|\mathbb{1}\Omega_\circ^2(r\nabla)^{(k-3)\vee 0}(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}})\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2.$$

Proof. Recall that

$$d\!v\eta = \mu^* - (\rho - \rho_\circ) + \frac{3}{2r}(\Omega \text{tr}\chi - (\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_\circ).$$

The proof follows immediately from Propositions 15.3.10, 15.3.11, 15.3.12, along with Proposition 15.3.2 and the elliptic estimate of Proposition 9.3.4, using also Proposition 9.4.5, provided $r_0 - 2M_f$, and hence Ω_\circ , is sufficiently small. \square

The next propositions exploit the factors of Ω_\circ^2 in the above to control $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}}$, $\rho_{\ell \geq 2}$, $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\Omega \text{tr}\chi_{\ell \geq 2}$.

Proposition 15.3.14 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}}$ on $C_{u_f} \cap \{r \leq r_0\}$). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, provided $r_0 - 2M$ is sufficiently small, for $k \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_0, u_f)$, with $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r \leq r_0}$,*

$$\|(r\nabla)^k(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}})\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(r\nabla)^k(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}})\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The gauge condition (15.3.25), Proposition 15.3.4 and Proposition 9.3.4 imply that,

$$\|(r\nabla)^k(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}})\|_{S_{u_f, v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

The equation (1.2.9) and Lemma 3.3.1 imply that, for any $k \geq 0$, on $\{u = u_f\}$,

$$\Omega \nabla_4((r\nabla)^k r \Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}}) + \frac{2M_f}{r^2}(r\nabla)^k(r \Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}}) = -2r(r\nabla)^k \Phi_2^* \underline{\eta} + (r\nabla)^k(\Omega \hat{\chi}) + (r\nabla)^k \mathcal{E}^0.$$

The proof then follows that of Lemma 15.1.2. Proposition 15.3.8 and Proposition 15.3.13, together with (15.3.27), are used to control the linear error terms and Proposition 15.2.4 to control the nonlinear error terms. The $\int_v^{v(r_0, u_f)} \Omega_\circ^2 \int_{S^2} |(r\nabla)^{(k-2)\vee 0}(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}})|^2 d\theta dv'(u_f)$ term arising from Proposition 15.3.13 is absorbed on the left by taking $r_0 - 2M$ (and hence Ω_\circ in $r \geq r_0$) sufficiently small. \square

Proposition 15.3.15 (Estimate for $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\sum_{k \leq N-s} \left(\|(r\nabla)^k \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \|(r\nabla)^k \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \right) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. Proposition 15.3.13 and Proposition 15.3.14 imply that, for $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_0, u_f)$,

$$\sum_{k \leq N-s} \left(\|(r\nabla)^k \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}(r\nabla)^k \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \right) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r \leq r_0}$. For $v(r_0, u_f) \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, the equation (1.2.12) can be renormalised with a bad Ω weight to introduce a *redshift term*

$$\Omega \nabla_4(\Omega^{-2} r^2 \eta) + 2\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ r^2 \eta = -\Omega^{-2}(2r^2 \Omega \beta - 2r^2 \Omega \hat{\chi} \cdot \eta - r^2(\Omega \text{tr}\chi - (\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_\circ)\eta),$$

where (15.3.27) has also been used. The proof then follows from Lemma 15.1.2, Proposition 15.3.9, and Proposition 9.4.4, using Proposition 15.2.4 to control the error terms, since $\Omega \sim 1$ in the region $r \geq r_0$. \square

Proposition 15.3.16 (Estimate for $\rho_{\ell \geq 2}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\sum_{k \leq N-1-s} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \rho_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \sum_{k \leq N-s} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \rho_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. First note that

$$\sum_{k \leq N-1-s} \left(\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \right) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}. \quad (15.3.30)$$

Indeed, for $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_0, u_f)$ (15.3.30) follows from Proposition 15.3.14. For $v \geq v(r_0, u_f)$, the proof follows by integrating the equation (1.2.9) forwards, using Lemma 15.1.2. Proposition 15.3.8 and Proposition 15.3.15 are used to control the linear error terms. The nonlinear error terms are controlled by Propositions 15.2.4.

The proof of the Proposition then follows from the relation (3.4.2), Theorem C.3, Proposition 15.3.1 and the elliptic estimate of Proposition 9.3.3. \square

The sharper part of the following estimate will be used in the proof of Proposition 15.3.119.

Proposition 15.3.17 (Estimate for $\Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\ell \geq 2}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\sum_{k \leq N+1-s} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \Omega(u_f, v)^2 \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v(R, u_f)^s} + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^{s+2}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. Consider first the cruder estimate. It follows from Proposition 15.3.11 and Proposition 15.3.15 that

$$\sum_{k \leq N+1-s} \left(\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \|\mathbb{1} (r\mathring{\nabla})^k (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \right) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r \leq r_0}$. For $v(r_0, u_f) \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, the equation

$$\partial_v (r^2 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o)) - 2\Omega \hat{\omega}_o r^2 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o) = -\frac{1}{2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o)^2 - |\Omega \hat{\chi}|^2, \quad (15.3.31)$$

can be renormalised with a bad Ω weight to introduce a *redshift term* and $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o)$ can be estimated as $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ is estimated in the proof of Proposition 15.3.15, using now the fact that

$$\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o)^2\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k |\Omega \hat{\chi}|^2\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{s+2}}, \quad (15.3.32)$$

for $k \leq N+1-s$.

For the sharper estimate note that, on C_{u_f} , the equation (15.3.31) for $\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o$ is *blueshifted*, and only has nonlinear terms on the right hand side. The proof then follows from Proposition 15.1.1, together with (15.3.32), where the cruder estimate, which has already been established, is used to control $\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u_f, v_{-1}}}^2$. \square

An additional derivative of $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ can now be estimated on C_{u_f} .

Proposition 15.3.18 (Estimate for $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\sum_{k \leq N-s} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \sum_{k \leq N+1-s} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. Recall that

$$d\eta = \mu^* - (\rho - \rho_0) + \frac{3}{2r} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_0).$$

The proof then follows from the elliptic estimate of Proposition 9.3.4 along with Propositions 15.3.2, 15.3.10, 15.3.16 and 15.3.17. \square

Proposition 15.3.19 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for $k \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\|(r\nabla)^k(\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 + \|(r\nabla)^k(\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi})\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. For $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_0, u_f)$ the statement reduces to Proposition 15.3.14. For $v \geq v(r_0, u_f)$, the proof follows by integrating the equation (1.2.9) forwards, using Lemma 15.1.2. Proposition 15.3.8 and Proposition 15.3.18 are used to control the linear error terms. The nonlinear error terms are controlled by Propositions 15.2.4. \square

Proposition 15.3.20 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\|(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_1}(r\nabla)^{k_2}(\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 + \|(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_1}(r\nabla)^{k_2}(\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi})\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. When $k_1 = 0$ the proposition reduces to Proposition 15.3.19. When $k_1 = 1$ the proof follows, by equation (1.2.9) and (15.3.27), from Proposition 15.3.18, Proposition 15.3.8 and Proposition 15.2.4. For $k_1 \geq 2$ the proof follows inductively, using again equation (1.2.6) and also equations (1.2.12), (1.2.23) and the $\nabla_4\hat{\chi}$ equation from (1.2.6), along with Theorem C.4, Proposition 15.3.9 and Propositions 15.2.2 and 15.2.4. \square

One $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivative of $\hat{\chi}$ can now be controlled on C_{u_f} using the equation (1.2.8).

Proposition 15.3.21 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(\Omega\hat{\chi})$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for $k \leq N - 1 - s$, for $s = 0, 1$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\|(r\nabla)^k\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 + \|(r\nabla)^k\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The proof follows from equation (1.2.8), which implies that

$$\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(r\Omega\hat{\chi}) = -2r\mathcal{D}_2^*\eta - \Omega\hat{\chi} + \mathcal{E}^0,$$

along with Proposition 15.3.18 and Proposition 15.3.19, using Propositions 15.2.2 and 15.2.4 to control the nonlinear error terms. \square

Estimates for higher order $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivatives of $\Omega\hat{\chi}$

In order to control higher order $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivatives of $\hat{\chi}$ on $\{u = u_f\}$, it is first necessary to exploit the gauge condition (15.3.20) to control them on the sphere $S_{u_f, v_{-1}}$.

Proposition 15.3.22 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivatives of $\rho_{\ell \geq 2}$ on $S_{u_f, v_{-1}}$). *On the sphere $S_{u_f, v_{-1}}$, for $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - 1$,*

$$\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(r\nabla)^{k_2}\rho_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u_f, v_{-1}}} \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3 + \sum_{l_1 + l_2 \leq k_1 + k_2} \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{l_1}(r\nabla)^{l_2}(\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u_f, v_{-1}}}.$$

Proof. The proof follows from the relation (3.4.2), along with Theorem C.3, Proposition 15.3.1, Proposition 15.3.19, the equation (1.2.6) and Theorem C.4. The nonlinear error terms are controlled using Proposition 15.2.2. \square

Proposition 15.3.23 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivatives of $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ on $S_{u_f, v_{-1}}$). *On the sphere $S_{u_f, v_{-1}}$, for $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - 1$,*

$$\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(r\nabla)^{k_2+1}\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u_f, v_{-1}}} \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3 + \sum_{l_1+l_2 \leq k_1+k_2} \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{l_1}(r\nabla)^{l_2}(\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u_f, v_{-1}}}.$$

Proof. If $k_1 = 0$ then the proof follows from Proposition 15.3.18. The proof, for $k_1 \geq 1$, follows from the gauge condition (15.3.20) along with Proposition 15.3.22 and Proposition 15.3.2, using Proposition 9.3.4 and Proposition 9.4.5. \square

Proposition 15.3.24 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivatives of $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ on $S_{u_f, v_{-1}}$). *On the sphere $S_{u_f, v_{-1}}$, for $k_1 + k_2 \leq N$,*

$$\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(r\nabla)^{k_2}(\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u_f, v_{-1}}} \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. The result for $k_1 = 0$ and $k_1 = 1$ follows from Proposition 15.3.8 and Proposition 15.3.21. Applying $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ to the appropriately normalised equation (1.2.8) gives, schematically,

$$(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^2(r\Omega\hat{\chi}) = -2\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(r\mathcal{D}_2^*\eta) - \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(\Omega^2 \cdot \Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}) + \mathcal{E}^1,$$

and so the result for $k_1 = 2$ follows from Proposition 15.3.21, Proposition 15.3.23, the equation (1.2.6), Theorem C.4 and Proposition 15.2.2. A straightforward inductive argument on k_1 completes the proof. \square

With this control of higher order $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivatives of $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ on the initial sphere, $S_{u_f, v_{-1}}$, the *redshifted* equations satisfied by these higher order derivatives can now be integrated forwards to control them on the entire final hypersurface $\{u = u_f\}$.

Proposition 15.3.25 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivatives of $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(r\nabla)^{k_2}(\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(r\nabla)^{k_2}(\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. For $k_1 = 0$ and $k_1 = 1$ the proposition reduces to Proposition 15.3.8 and Proposition 15.3.21 respectively. For $k_1 \geq 2$ the proof uses the fact that the twice (and higher order) $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ commuted equation (1.2.6) is redshifted. See Proposition 15.1.12. The proof then follows from Lemma 15.1.2, Proposition 15.3.24, Theorem C.4 and Propositions 15.2.4. \square

The following estimate on $\Omega\nabla_4$ derivatives of $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ will be used in the proof of Proposition 15.3.59.

Proposition 15.3.26 (Estimate for $\Omega\nabla_4$ derivatives of $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for $k \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\|(\Omega\nabla_4)^k\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \|(\Omega\nabla_4)^k\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The case that $k = 0$ follows from Proposition 15.3.18. Equation (1.2.13) on $u = u_f$ takes the schematic form,

$$\Omega\nabla_4(r^2\eta) = r^2\Omega\beta + \mathcal{E}^0.$$

The proof, for $k \geq 1$, then follows from applying $(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k-1}$, using equation (1.2.23) and Theorem C.4. \square

Finally, for Proposition 15.3.37 below, it is convenient to control, for $k \leq N$, $(r\nabla)^k\Omega\text{tr}\chi_{\ell \geq 2}$ at the sphere $S_{u_f, v_{-1}}$.

Proposition 15.3.27 (Estimate for $\Omega\text{tr}\chi_{\ell \geq 2}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for $k \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\|(r\nabla)^k\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \|(r\nabla)^k\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The Codazzi equation (1.2.19) can be rewritten schematically as

$$\frac{1}{2}\nabla\left(\Omega^{-2}\left(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}-\left(\Omega\text{tr}\chi\right)_o\right)\right)=-\text{div}\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}}-\frac{1}{r}\eta+\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}+\mathcal{E}^0.$$

The proof then follows after applying $(r\nabla)^{k-1}$. The resulting term involving $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}}$ is controlled using Proposition 15.3.19, the term involving η is controlled using Proposition 15.3.18 and the term involving $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}$ is controlled using the relation (3.4.1), Theorem C.4 and Proposition 15.3.19. The nonlinear terms are controlled using Propositions 15.2.2 and 15.2.4. \square

15.3.3.2 Estimates for quantities on the initial incoming hypersurface $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$

In this section the curvature components and Ricci coefficients are estimated on the incoming null hypersurface $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$.

Estimates for $\Omega\hat{\chi}$, $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}}$, $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}_{\ell\geq 2}$, $\eta_{\ell\geq 2}$, $\underline{\eta}_{\ell\geq 2}$

To begin, the quantities $\Omega\hat{\chi}$, $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}}$, $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}_{\ell\geq 2}$, $\eta_{\ell\geq 2}$, $\underline{\eta}_{\ell\geq 2}$ are estimated on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$. First, the gauge condition (15.3.20) is exploited to estimate $(\text{div}\eta+\rho)_{\ell\geq 2}$.

Proposition 15.3.28 (Estimate for $(\text{div}\eta+\rho)_{\ell\geq 2}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for $k \leq N$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|(r\nabla)^k(\text{div}\eta+\rho)_{\ell\geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2+\|(r\nabla)^k(\text{div}\eta+\rho)_{\ell\geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2\lesssim\varepsilon_0^2+\varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. The gauge condition (15.3.20) gives

$$\Omega\nabla_3\left(r^3\rho_{\ell\geq 2}+r^3\text{div}\eta_{\ell\geq 2}\right)=0$$

on $\{v = v_{-1}\}$. The proof then follows from Lemma 15.1.3, after inductively commuting with $(r\nabla)^k$, using Lemma 3.3.1, and Proposition 15.3.10, Proposition 15.3.11 and Proposition 15.3.18 to control the initial condition, and Proposition 15.2.5 to control the nonlinear error terms resulting from commutation. \square

The equation (1.2.6) can be immediately used, along with the estimates on $\Omega^{-2}\underline{\alpha}$ of Theorem C.4, to estimate $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}}$.

Proposition 15.3.29 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for $k \leq N$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|(r\nabla)^k(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}})\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2+\|(r\nabla)^k(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}})\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2\lesssim\varepsilon_0^2+\varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. The proof follows from Lemma 15.1.3 and the equation (1.2.6), using Theorem C.4, Lemma 3.3.1 and Proposition 15.3.19 to control the initial condition, and Proposition 15.2.5 to control the nonlinear error terms. \square

The $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivatives of $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}}$ can be similarly estimated.

Proposition 15.3.30 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivatives of $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for $k_1 + k_2 \leq N$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(r\nabla)^{k_2}(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}})\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2+\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(r\nabla)^{k_2}(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\hat{\chi}})\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2\lesssim\varepsilon_0^2+\varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. When $k_1 = 0$ the proposition reduces to Proposition 15.3.29. For $k_1 \geq 1$ the proof follows inductively from equation (1.2.6), Lemma 3.3.1, using Theorem C.4 to control the linear error terms involving $\underline{\alpha}$ and Proposition 15.2.2 and 15.2.5 to control the nonlinear error terms. \square

Proposition 15.3.28 and Proposition 15.3.29 can now be used to give the following estimates for $\Omega\hat{\chi}$.

Proposition 15.3.31 (Estimate for $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for $k \leq N$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|(r\nabla)^k(\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{\underline{S}_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(r\nabla)^k(\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. Lemma 15.1.3, Proposition 15.3.8, equation (1.2.8) and Proposition 15.3.29 imply that,

$$\|(r\nabla)^k(\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{\underline{S}_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(r\nabla)^k(\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \|(r\nabla)^{k+1}\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3 \lesssim \|(r\nabla)^k\rho_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3,$$

where the second inequality follows from Proposition 15.3.28 and Proposition 15.3.2. Equation (3.4.2), Theorem C.3, Proposition 15.3.1 and Proposition 15.3.29 imply that, for $k \geq 2$,

$$\|(r\nabla)^k\rho_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \|(r\nabla)^{(k-2) \vee 0}\hat{\chi}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3,$$

where $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$. The proof then follows from the Grönwall inequality. \square

Proposition 15.3.31 yields the following estimates for $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}_{\ell \geq 2}$.

Proposition 15.3.32 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivatives of $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}_{\ell \geq 2}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for $k_1 + k_2 \leq N$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(r\nabla)^{k_2}(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. If $k_1 = 0$ then the proof follows from equation (3.4.1), Lemma 9.3.3, Theorem C.4, Proposition 15.3.30 and Proposition 15.2.5, after recalling that $2r\Omega^2\underline{\psi} = \nabla_4(r\Omega^2\underline{\alpha})$. If $k_1 \geq 1$ then the proof follows from equation (1.2.30), Theorem C.4 and Proposition 15.2.5. \square

The following estimates for $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}$ can now be obtained.

Proposition 15.3.33 (Estimates for $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivatives of $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for $k_1 + k_2 \leq N$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|(r\nabla)^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2}\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{S}_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(r\nabla)^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2}\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 &\lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \\ \|(r\nabla)^{k_1+1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2}\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 &\lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. If $k_2 = 0$ then, by Proposition 9.3.4,

$$\|(r\nabla)^{k_1}\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{S}_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \|(r\nabla)^{k_1-1}r\mathrm{d}\hat{v}\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{S}_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(r\nabla)^{k_1-1}r\mathrm{c}\hat{u}\hat{r}\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{S}_{u,v_{-1}}}^2,$$

where $k_1 - 1$ can be replaced by 0 if $k_1 = 0$, and the proof follows from Proposition 15.3.2 for the $\mathrm{c}\hat{u}\hat{r}$ part, and Proposition 15.3.28, equation (3.4.2), Theorem C.3, Proposition 15.3.1, Proposition 15.3.31 and Proposition 15.3.29 for the $\mathrm{d}\hat{v}$ part, using Propositions 15.2.2 and 15.2.5 to control nonlinear error terms.

If $k_2 \geq 1$, by Proposition 9.3.4 and Lemma 3.3.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(r\nabla)^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2}\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{S}_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 &\lesssim \|(r\nabla)^{k_1-1}r\mathrm{d}\hat{v}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2}\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{S}_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(r\nabla)^{k_1-1}r\mathrm{c}\hat{u}\hat{r}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2}\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{S}_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|(r\nabla)^{k_1-1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2}r\mathrm{d}\hat{v}\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{S}_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(r\nabla)^{k_1-1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2}r\mathrm{c}\hat{u}\hat{r}\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{S}_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 d\theta + \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \end{aligned}$$

where $k_1 - 1$ can be replaced by 0 if $k_1 = 0$. Now,

$$(r\nabla)^{k_1-1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2}r\mathrm{d}\hat{v}\eta = (r\nabla)^{k_1-1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2-1}\Omega^{-2}\partial_u(r\mathrm{d}\hat{v}\eta),$$

and

$$\partial_u(r\mathrm{d}\hat{v}\eta) = -\frac{1}{r^2}\partial_u(r^3\rho) + \partial_u\left(\frac{1}{r^2}\right)r^3\mathrm{d}\hat{v}\eta = r\Omega\mathrm{d}\hat{v}\underline{\beta} - \frac{3M_f}{r^2}(\Omega\mathrm{tr}\underline{\chi} - \Omega\mathrm{tr}\underline{\chi}_o) + 2\Omega^2\mathrm{d}\hat{v}\eta + \Omega^2\mathcal{E}^0,$$

by equation (1.2.27). Similarly,

$$(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1-1}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2}rc\mathring{\nabla}rl\eta = (r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1-1}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2-1}\Omega^{-2}\partial_u(rc\mathring{\nabla}rl\eta),$$

and,

$$\partial_u(rc\mathring{\nabla}rl\eta) = -\frac{1}{r^2}\partial_u\left(r^3\sigma - \frac{r^3}{2}\hat{\chi} \wedge \hat{\chi}\right) + \partial_u\left(\frac{1}{r^2}\right)r^3c\mathring{\nabla}rl\eta = r\Omega c\mathring{\nabla}rl\beta + 2\Omega^2c\mathring{\nabla}rl\eta + \Omega^2\mathcal{E}^1,$$

by equation (1.2.17) and equation (1.2.28). The proof then follows from Proposition 15.3.30 and the Codazzi equation (1.2.19), Proposition 15.3.32, Proposition 15.2.2, Proposition 15.2.5 and an induction argument. \square

Finally, the following estimates for $\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3$ derivatives of $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ are obtained.

Proposition 15.3.34 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3$ derivatives of $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for $k_1 + k_2 \leq N$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2}(\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2}(\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. When $k_2 = 0$ the proposition reduces to Proposition 15.3.31. For $k_2 \geq 1$, the proof follows inductively from Proposition 15.3.30 and Proposition 15.3.33 after applying $(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2-1}$ to equation (1.2.8), which can be schematically rewritten as,

$$\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3(\Omega\hat{\chi}) = -2\mathring{\Phi}_2^*\eta - \frac{\Omega^2}{r}\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi} + \frac{1}{r}\Omega\hat{\chi} + \mathcal{E}^0.$$

\square

Estimates for difference quotients

Recall the quantity X_2 from Section 15.1.2. It is necessary to control the difference quotients

$$D_{u_f}X_2(u, v_{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad D_{u_f}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3(\Omega\hat{\chi}))(u, v_{-1}),$$

along with their higher order angular derivatives, on the initial incoming hypersurface. See Section 15.1.1.3 for the definition of $D_{u_f}\xi$ for any S -tangent $(0, k)$ tensor ξ . The main results of this Section are Proposition 15.3.39 and Proposition 15.3.41. Other Ricci coefficients and difference quotients are estimated on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$ in the process.

To estimate $D_{u_f}X_2$, it is convenient to first control the corresponding difference quotient for $(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell \geq 2}$. In order to use the propagation equation for $(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell \geq 2}$ in the $\mathring{\nabla}_3$ direction, it is first necessary to control the $(\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\ell \geq 2}$ term which appears linearly on its right hand side.

Proposition 15.3.35 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\ell \geq 2}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for $k \leq N$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. The proof is a direct consequence of equation (1.2.14), Proposition 15.3.32 and Proposition 15.3.33, using Propositions 15.2.2 and 15.2.5 to control the nonlinear error terms. \square

The following estimates for $\Omega_o^{-2}\Omega_{\ell \geq 2}^2$ are similarly obtained.

Proposition 15.3.36 (Estimate for $\Omega_o^{-2}\Omega_{\ell \geq 2}^2$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for $k \leq N$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\left\| (r\mathring{\nabla})^k \left(1 - \frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_o^2} \right)_{\ell \geq 2} \right\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \left\| (r\mathring{\nabla})^k \left(1 - \frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_o^2} \right)_{\ell \geq 2} \right\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. Equation (1.2.21) implies

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \log \left(\frac{\Omega}{\Omega_o} \right) = \Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o.$$

Lemma 3.3.1, Lemma 15.1.3, Proposition 15.3.35 and Proposition 9.4.3 then imply that, using the gauge condition (15.3.19),

$$\left\| (r \nabla)^k \log \left(\frac{\Omega}{\Omega_o} \right)_{\ell \geq 2} \right\|_{S_{u, v_{-1}}}^2 + \left\| (r \nabla)^k \log \left(\frac{\Omega}{\Omega_o} \right)_{\ell \geq 2} \right\|_{C_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

where Proposition 15.2.5 is used to control the error terms arising from commutation, from which the proof follows. \square

Proposition 15.3.35 is now used to give the following estimates on $\Omega_o^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}$.

Proposition 15.3.37 (Estimate for $\Omega_o^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for $k \leq N$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\left\| (r \nabla)^k \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2} \right\|_{S_{u, v_{-1}}}^2 + \left\| (r \nabla)^k \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2} \right\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. The equation (1.2.7) can be rewritten schematically as

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o) \right) = \Omega^2 \left[-4r \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o) + \mathcal{E}^0 \right].$$

The proof then follows from Proposition 9.4.3, Lemma 15.1.3, Proposition 15.3.27 and Proposition 15.3.35. The nonlinear terms are controlled using Proposition 15.2.5. \square

Recall again, given an $S_{u, v}$ tensor ξ , the difference quotient $D_{u_f} \xi$ is defined by

$$(D_{u_f} \xi)(u, v, \theta) := \frac{\xi(u, v, \theta) - \xi(u_f, v, \theta)}{\Omega_o(u, v)^2}.$$

(See Section 15.1.1.3 for the definition of the difference $\xi(u, v, \theta) - \xi(u_f, v, \theta)$.) The difference quotient $D_{u_f}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}$ can now be estimated.

Proposition 15.3.38 (Estimate for $D_{u_f}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for $k \leq N$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, the difference quotient satisfies*

$$\left\| D_{u_f}((r \nabla)^k (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}) \right\|_{S_{u, v_{-1}}}^2 + \left\| D_{u_f}((r \nabla)^k (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}) \right\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. Equation (1.2.10) can be schematically rewritten as

$$\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (r (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o)) = 2r (d^* v \eta + (\rho - \rho_o)) - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o) - \frac{4M}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_o^2}{\Omega^2} \right) + \mathcal{E}^0,$$

(see equation (15.3.46)). The result then follows from Proposition 9.4.3, Lemma 15.1.5, together with Proposition 15.3.28, Proposition 15.3.36 and Proposition 15.3.37. The nonlinear error terms are controlled using Proposition 15.2.5. \square

The difference quotient $D_{u_f}(X_2)_{\ell \geq 2}$ can now be similarly estimated.

Proposition 15.3.39 (Estimate for $D_{u_f}(X_2)_{\ell \geq 2}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for $k \leq N - 4$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, the difference quotient satisfies*

$$\left\| D_{u_f}((r \nabla)^k X_2) \right\|_{S_{u, v_{-1}}}^2 + \left\| D_{u_f}((r \nabla)^k X_2) \right\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. Equation (1.2.22) and the Codazzi equation (1.2.18) imply that,

$$\begin{aligned} X_2 &= r^3 \mathcal{P}_2^* \text{div} \mathcal{P}_2^* (r^3 \text{div} \Omega \hat{\chi} + r^3 \Omega \beta - 3M_f r \Omega \hat{\chi} + \mathcal{E}^0) + \frac{1}{2} (3r^3 M_f - 2r^2 M_f^2 - r^4) (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^2 (r \Omega^2 \alpha) \\ &= r^3 \mathcal{P}_2^* \text{div} \mathcal{P}_2^* \left(\frac{r^3}{2} \nabla (\Omega \text{tr} \chi) - \Omega^2 r^2 \underline{\eta} - 3M_f r \Omega \hat{\chi} + \mathcal{E}^0 \right) + \frac{1}{2} (3r^3 M_f - 2r^2 M_f^2 - r^4) (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^2 (r \Omega^2 \alpha). \end{aligned}$$

The proof follows from Proposition 15.3.38 by applying $(r \nabla)^k$, subtracting $(r \nabla)^k X_2(u_f, v_{-1})$ and dividing by $\Omega_o(u, v_{-1})^2$. The differences of the other linear terms can be estimated as in the proof of Proposition 15.3.38, now using equations (1.2.22), (1.2.8), (1.2.12) and the above estimates. The differences of the nonlinear error terms are controlled by Lemma 15.1.5 and Proposition 15.2.5. \square

The difference quotient $D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}$ is estimated using equation (1.2.10).

Proposition 15.3.40 (Estimate for $D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for $k \leq N$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, the difference quotient satisfies*

$$\|D_{u_f} (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (r \nabla)^k (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2})\|_{S_{u, v_{-1}}}^2 + \|D_{u_f} (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (r \nabla)^k (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2})\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. Recall again equation (1.2.10),

$$\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (r (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o)) = 2r (\text{div} \eta + (\rho - \rho_o)) - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o) - \frac{4M_f}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_o^2}{\Omega^2} \right) + \mathcal{E}^0.$$

The proof again follows by commuting with $(r \nabla)^k$, projecting to the $\ell \geq 2$ modes, subtracting the value at $S_{u_f, v_{-1}}$, $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (r \nabla)^k (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}(u_f, v_{-1})$, and dividing by $\Omega_o(u', v_{-1})^2$. The differences of the linear terms are controlled, as in the proof of Proposition 15.3.38, using now the gauge condition (15.3.20), equation (1.2.7) and (1.2.21). The differences of the nonlinear error terms are again controlled using Lemma 15.1.5 and Proposition 15.2.5. \square

Finally, the difference quotient $D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 X_2$ is estimated.

Proposition 15.3.41 (Estimate for $D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 X_2$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for $k \leq N - 5$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, the difference quotient satisfies*

$$\|D_{u_f} (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (r \nabla)^k X_2)\|_{S_{u, v_{-1}}}^2 + \|D_{u_f} (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (r \nabla)^k X_2)\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 15.3.39, the proof follows from the Codazzi equation

$$X_2 = r^3 \mathcal{P}_2^* \text{div} \mathcal{P}_2^* \left(\frac{r^3}{2} \nabla (\Omega \text{tr} \chi) - \Omega^2 r^2 \underline{\eta} - 3M_f r \Omega \hat{\chi} + \mathcal{E}^0 \right) + \frac{1}{2} (3r^3 M_f - 2r^2 M_f^2 - r^4) (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^2 (r \Omega^2 \alpha),$$

after applying $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (r \nabla)^k$ and using now Proposition 15.3.40. \square

Estimate for $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3$ derivatives of $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o)_{\ell \geq 2}$

In this section $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3$ derivatives of $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o)_{\ell \geq 2}$ are estimated.

First, the estimates of the following proposition, for $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3$ derivatives of $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$, will be used in the proof of Proposition 15.3.53.

Proposition 15.3.42 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3$ derivatives of $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for $k \leq N + 1$,*

$$\|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^k \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. First note that the result for $k \leq N$ follows from Proposition 15.3.33.

Now, equation (1.2.14) and Propositions 15.3.33 and 15.3.32 imply that, for any $l = 0, 1$, $k \leq N - 1$,

$$\|(r \nabla)^l (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^k \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_o)\|_{S_{u, v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3,$$

and hence the Raychaudhuri equation (1.2.7) implies that, for any $k \leq N$,

$$\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_o)\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Revisiting the proof of Proposition 15.3.33, note that η satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \|r \text{div} \left((\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{N+1} r^2 \eta_{\ell \geq 2} - (\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^N r^2 \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}_{\ell \geq 2} \right)\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 \\ & \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{N+1} \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \varepsilon^2 \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^N (r \nabla) \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^N \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_o)\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 \\ & \quad + \|\mathcal{E}^N\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3 + \varepsilon^2 \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{N+1} \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

by Proposition 15.3.33 and the above, and similarly,

$$\|r \text{curl} \left((\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{N+1} r^2 \eta_{\ell \geq 2} + (\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^N r^2 \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}_{\ell \geq 2} \right)\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3 + \varepsilon^2 \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{N+1} \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2.$$

Writing

$$(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{N+1} r^2 \eta_{\ell \geq 2} = r \nabla h_1 + r^* \nabla h_2, \quad (\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^N r^2 \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}_{\ell \geq 2} = r \nabla g_1 + r^* \nabla g_2,$$

for some functions h_1, h_2, g_1, g_2 , it follows from standard elliptic theory that

$$\sum_{l=0,1,2} \|(r \nabla)^l (h_1 - g_1)\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(r \nabla)^l (h_2 + g_2)\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3 + \varepsilon^2 \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{N+1} \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2,$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{N+1} r^2 \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 = \|r \nabla h_1\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|r \nabla h_2\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3 + \varepsilon^2 \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{N+1} \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 \\ & + \|r \nabla g_1\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|r \nabla g_2\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 = \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3 + \varepsilon^2 \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{N+1} \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^N r^2 \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The proof then follows from Proposition 15.3.32 after integrating in u and taking ε sufficiently small. \square

Finally, the following proposition, on estimates for $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivatives of $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o)_{\ell \geq 2}$, will be used in the proof of Proposition 15.3.62.

Proposition 15.3.43 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ derivatives of $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o)_{\ell \geq 2}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for $k \leq N$, $l = 0, 1$,*

$$\|(r \nabla)^l (\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k (\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o))_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. The proof follows from projecting equation (1.2.14) to $\ell \geq 2$ and commuting with $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k$ and using Proposition 15.3.32, Proposition 9.4.4 and Proposition 15.3.42, and the Poincaré inequality, Proposition 9.3.2. The nonlinear error terms are controlled using Proposition 15.2.5. \square

15.3.4 Estimates for quantities in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$: the $\ell \geq 2$ modes

The goal of this section is to estimate the $\ell \geq 2$ modes of the geometric quantities of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge using the estimates for the corresponding quantities on C_{u_f} and $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$ obtained in the previous section. The main result of this section is the following proposition. Recall the energies (15.3.1), (15.3.4), (15.3.7), (15.3.10), (15.3.14).

Theorem 15.3.2 (Improving bootstrap assumptions for energies of $\ell \geq 2$ modes). *The energies defined in (15.3.1), (15.3.4), (15.3.7), (15.3.10), (15.3.14) satisfy,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^{N+1}[C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^N[\underline{C}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^N[S^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell \geq 2}^N[\chi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. The proof is a direct consequence of the estimate for $\sigma_{\ell \geq 2}$ of Proposition 15.3.1, the estimates for $\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}$ of Propositions 15.3.44 and 15.3.45, the estimates for $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ of Propositions 15.3.47 and 15.3.49, the estimates for $\rho_{\ell \geq 2}$ of Proposition 15.3.52, the estimate for $\Omega\beta_{\ell \geq 2}$ of Proposition 15.3.56, the estimate for $\Omega^{-1}\beta_{\ell \geq 2}$ of Proposition 15.3.57, the estimate for $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ of Proposition 15.3.58, the estimate for $\underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}$ of Proposition 15.3.59, the estimate for $\Omega_{\ell \geq 2}$ of Proposition 15.3.60, the estimate for $\Omega\hat{\omega}_{\ell \geq 2}$ of Proposition 15.3.61, the estimate for $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\ell \geq 2}$ of Proposition 15.3.62, the estimates for $\Omega\text{tr}\chi_{\ell \geq 2}$ of Propositions 15.3.66 and 15.3.64, and the estimate for $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell \geq 2}$ of Proposition 15.3.65. \square

The remainder of this section involves the proof of the propositions which constitute the proof of Proposition 15.3.2. First $\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}$ is estimated in Section 15.3.4.1. The main difficulties are in estimating $\Omega\hat{\chi}$. Such estimates are obtained in Section 15.3.4.2. In Section 15.3.4.3 the curvature components $\Omega\beta_{\ell \geq 2}$, $\Omega^{-1}\beta_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\rho_{\ell \geq 2}$ are estimated. The quantities $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}$ are estimated in Section 15.3.4.4, $\Omega_o^{-2}\Omega_{\ell \geq 2}^2$ is estimated in Section 15.3.4.5, $(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_o)_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_o)_{\ell \geq 2}$ are estimated in Section 15.3.4.6, and $(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_o)_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_o)_{\ell \geq 2}$ are estimated in Section 15.3.4.7.

15.3.4.1 Estimates for $\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}$

To begin, $\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}$ can immediately be estimated by integrating backwards from the final hypersurface $\{u = u_f\}$.

Proposition 15.3.44 (Estimates for $\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}$ on C_u and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $|\gamma| \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi})\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi})\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. Recall the quantity \underline{X}_1 (see equation (15.1.16)) and the ∇_3 equation it satisfies (see Proposition 15.1.10). Since $\Omega^{-2}\underline{\alpha}$ only appears at lower orders on the right hand side of the equation (and so the estimates of Theorem C.4 do not degenerate at $r = 3M_f$), Lemma 15.1.3 and Theorem C.4 imply that

$$\sum_{k \leq N-2-s} \|(r\nabla)^k(\Omega^{-2}\underline{X}_1)\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|(r\nabla)^k(\Omega^{-2}\underline{X}_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

where Proposition 15.2.1 is used to control the nonlinear error terms. It follows from Theorem C.4 and Proposition 9.3.3 that the result holds in the case that $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = (r\nabla)^k$.

Consider now the case that $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = (\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(r\nabla)^{k_2}$, for some $k_1 + k_2 = |\gamma|$. The equation (1.2.6) can schematically be written

$$\Omega\nabla_3(\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}) - \frac{2\Omega^2}{r}\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi} = -\Omega^2 \cdot \Omega^{-2}\underline{\alpha} + \Omega^2\mathcal{E}^0. \quad (15.3.33)$$

Given $l_1 + l_2 \leq N - 1$, it follows from commuting the equation (15.3.33) that

$$|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{l_1+1}(r\nabla)^{l_2}\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}| \lesssim \sum_{k_1+k_2 \leq l_1+l_2} (|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{l_1}(r\nabla)^{l_2}\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}| + |(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{l_1}(r\nabla)^{l_2}\Omega^{-2}\underline{\alpha}|) + |\mathcal{E}^{l_1+l_2}|,$$

and the result in the case that $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = (\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(r\nabla)^{k_2}$ follows by a straightforward induction argument by integrating the above inequality and using Theorem C.4.

Consider now \mathfrak{D}^γ of the form $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = (r\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2}(r\nabla)^{k_3}$, for some $k_1 + k_2 \leq N$ with $k_1 \geq 1$. Given such k_1, k_2 , define

$$\xi := (\Omega\nabla_4 - \Omega\nabla_3)(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_1-1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2}(r\nabla)^{k_3}\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}.$$

By Lemma 3.3.1 and equation (15.3.33) it follows that that,

$$|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3\xi - \frac{2}{r}\xi| \lesssim |(\Omega\nabla_4 - \Omega\nabla_3)(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_1-1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2}(r\nabla)^{k_3}\Omega^{-2}\underline{\alpha}| + |\mathcal{E}^{k_1+k_2+k_3}|,$$

and Lemma 15.1.3, Proposition 15.3.20 and Theorem C.4 then imply that

$$\|\xi\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

since the integrated decay estimate for $(\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 - \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3)\Omega^{-2}\underline{\alpha}$ does not degenerate at $r = 3M_f$. The result then inductively follows for the case that $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = (r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2}(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_3}$ by combining with the previous estimates. The result for general \mathfrak{D}^γ then follows from Lemma 3.3.1. \square

The following estimates for $\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}$ on $S_{u,v}$ and \underline{C}_v are obtained similarly.

Proposition 15.3.45 (Estimates for $\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}$ on $S_{u,v}$ and \underline{C}_v). *For $k \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^k(\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^k(\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi})\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 15.3.44, though is much simpler since the degeneration of the estimates at $r = 3M_f$ is not an issue, using now Lemma 15.1.3. \square

15.3.4.2 Estimates for $\Omega\hat{\chi}$

Recall that a transport equation in the $\mathring{\nabla}_4$ direction of the form (15.1.1) is referred to as *redshifted*, *noshifted* or *blueshifted* according to whether the sign of a in (15.1.1) is positive, zero or negative respectively. Recall also, see Proposition 15.1.12, that $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ satisfies a blueshifted transport equation, $\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3\Omega\hat{\chi}$ satisfies a noshifted transport equation, and higher order $\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3$ derivatives of $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ satisfy redshifted transport equations. In Section 15.3.3.1, the derivatives of $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ were accordingly estimated on the final hypersurface C_{u_f} differently depending whether they involve zero, one, or two or more $\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3$ derivatives. In this section the derivatives of $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ are similarly estimated in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ differently depending whether they involve zero, one, or two or more $\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3$ derivatives.

Estimates for $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ and angular derivatives up to order N

To estimate angular derivatives of $\Omega\hat{\chi}$, $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k\Omega\hat{\chi}$ for $k \leq N$, rather than using the equation (1.2.6) directly, which is blueshifted, it is convenient to first estimate the difference quotient

$$D_{u_f}((r\mathring{\nabla})^k\Omega\hat{\chi}),$$

(recall the definition from Section 15.1.1.3). Further, it is convenient to consider the renormalised quantities X_1 and X_2 , introduced in Section 15.1.2, which take the form

$$X_1 = r\mathring{\nabla}_2^* r d\mathring{\nabla} v (r^2\Omega\hat{\chi}) - \frac{r^3}{2}\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3(r\Omega^2\alpha), \quad X_2 = r\mathring{\nabla}_2^* r d\mathring{\nabla} v X_1 + \frac{r^4\Omega^2}{4}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^2(r\Omega^2\alpha). \quad (15.3.34)$$

Note that term involving α on the right hand side of the equation in the $\mathring{\nabla}_4$ direction satisfied by X_2 (see Proposition 15.1.9), involves only two derivatives, in contrast to the commuted equation (1.2.6) for $(r\mathring{\nabla})^4\Omega\hat{\chi}$ which involves four derivatives of $\Omega^2\alpha$.

The estimates of Proposition 15.3.47 are most relevant for the top order quantity $(r\mathring{\nabla})^N\Omega\hat{\chi}$. A better estimate for lower order derivatives will be obtained in Proposition 15.3.48. First, estimates for the difference quotient $D_{u_f}(\Omega\hat{\chi})$ are obtained.

Proposition 15.3.46 (Estimate for $D_{u_f}(\Omega\hat{\chi})$ on $S_{u,v}$). *For $k \leq N$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|D_{u_f}((r\mathring{\nabla})^k\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim v^\delta(\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3) + \sum_{\substack{l_1+l_2 \leq k-1 \\ l_2 \leq 2}} \|D_{u_f}((r\mathring{\nabla})^{l_1}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{l_2}(\Omega^2\alpha))\|_{S_{u,v}}^2.$$

Proof. The proof proceeds by considering the quantity X_2 . See equation (15.3.34) above. Suppose $k \geq 4$ (the case $k \leq 4$ will follow from Propositions 9.3.3 and 9.3.4). By Proposition 15.1.9 and Lemma 3.3.1,

$$\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k-4}X_2 - 2(\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k-4}X_2 = \mathcal{L}[(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k-4}X_2] + \mathcal{E}[(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k-4}X_2],$$

where the linear term $\mathcal{L}[(r\dot{\nabla})^{k-4}X_2]$ takes the form

$$\mathcal{L}[(r\dot{\nabla})^{k-4}X_2] = \sum_{\substack{l_1+l_2 \leq k-2 \\ l_2 \leq 2}} H^{l_1 l_2} \cdot (r\dot{\nabla})^{l_1} (\Omega^{-1}\dot{\nabla}_3)^{l_2} (r\Omega^2\alpha)$$

and the nonlinear error $\mathcal{E}[(r\dot{\nabla})^{k-4}X_2]$ has the schematic form,

$$\mathcal{E}[(r\dot{\nabla})^{k-4}X_2] = \mathcal{E}^{k-1} + (H^{k,1} \cdot \Phi) \cdot (r\dot{\nabla})^k (\Omega\hat{\chi}) + (H^{k,2} \cdot \Phi) \cdot (r\dot{\nabla})^k \Omega\hat{\omega},$$

for some vectors of admissible coefficient functions (see (3.2.1)) $H^{l_1 l_2}$, $H^{k,1}$, $H^{k,2}$.

The proof will follow from Lemma 15.1.7. First note that the initial condition, at $v = v_{-1}$, is controlled by Proposition 15.3.39. Now, to control the term on $\{u = u_f\}$ arising from applying Lemma 15.1.7, Proposition 15.3.7 gives

$$\|(r\dot{\nabla})^{k-2}X_1\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v},$$

for all $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$ and so, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,

$$\int_{v_{-1}}^v (v')^{1-\frac{\delta}{2}} \|(r\dot{\nabla})^{k-2}X_1\|_{S_{u_f, v'}}^2 dv' \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3, \quad \text{hence,} \quad \int_{v_{-1}}^v (v')^{1+\frac{\delta}{2}} \|(r\dot{\nabla})^{k-2}X_1\|_{S_{u_f, v'}}^2 dv' \lesssim v^\delta (\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3).$$

Theorem C.4 then implies that,

$$\int_{v_{-1}}^v (v')^{1+\frac{\delta}{2}} \|(r\dot{\nabla})^{k-4}X_2\|_{S_{u_f, v'}}^2 dv' \lesssim v^\delta (\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3).$$

For the remaining terms arising from applying Lemma 15.1.7 first note that Lemma 15.1.5 implies that, for $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = (r\dot{\nabla})^{l_1} (\Omega^{-1}\dot{\nabla}_3)^{l_2}$ for some $l_1 + l_2 \leq k-2$,

$$\int_{v_{-1}}^v (v')^{1+\frac{\delta}{2}} \|D_{u_f} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha\|_{S_{u, v'}}^2 dv' \lesssim \sup_{u \leq u' \leq u_f} \int_{v_{-1}}^v (v')^{1+\frac{\delta}{2}} (\|\Omega^{-1}\dot{\nabla}_3 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha\|_{S_{u, v'}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \alpha\|_{S_{u, v'}}^2) dv' \lesssim v^\delta (\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3),$$

by Theorem C.4.

The nonlinear error terms arising from the first collection of nonlinear terms in $\mathcal{E}[(r\dot{\nabla})^{k-4}X_2]$ are estimated using Lemma 15.1.5 and Proposition 15.2.1.

For the second collection of nonlinear terms in $\mathcal{E}[(r\dot{\nabla})^{k-4}X_2]$, write

$$D_{u_f} (\Phi \cdot (r\dot{\nabla})^k (\Omega\hat{\chi})) (u, v) = D_{u_f} \Phi(u, v) \cdot (r\dot{\nabla})^k (\Omega\hat{\chi})(u_f, v) + D_{u_f} (r\dot{\nabla})^k (\Omega\hat{\chi})(u, v) \cdot \Phi(u, v).$$

The first resulting term can be estimated exactly as the first collection of nonlinear terms are above. For the second,

$$\int_{v_{-1}}^v (v')^{1+\frac{\delta}{2}} \int_{S^2} |D_{u_f} ((r\dot{\nabla})^k \Omega\hat{\chi})|^2 |\Phi|^2 d\theta dv' \lesssim \sum_{k \leq 2} \int_{v_{-1}}^v (v')^{1+\frac{\delta}{2}} \int_{S^2} |(r\dot{\nabla})^k \Phi|^2 d\theta \int_{S^2} |D_{u_f} ((r\dot{\nabla})^k \Omega\hat{\chi})|^2 d\theta dv',$$

by the Sobolev inequality, Proposition 9.1.1. The nonlinear error terms arising from the third collection of nonlinear terms in $\mathcal{E}[(r\dot{\nabla})^{k-4}X_2]$ are estimated in Proposition 15.2.8.

Lemma 15.1.7 then implies that

$$\|D_{u_f} ((r\dot{\nabla})^{k-4}X_2)\|_{S_{u, v}}^2 \lesssim v^\delta (\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3) + \sum_{\Phi, k \leq 2} \int_{v_{-1}}^v (v')^{1+\frac{\delta}{2}} \int_{S^2} |(r\dot{\nabla})^k \Phi|^2 d\theta \int_{S^2} |D_{u_f} ((r\dot{\nabla})^k (\Omega\hat{\chi}))|^2 d\theta dv'.$$

Using the definition of X_2 (see equation (15.3.34)), it follows that,

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_{u_f} ((r\dot{\nabla})^{k-4} (r^2 \dot{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \dot{\mathcal{P}}_2^* (r^2 \Omega\hat{\chi})))\|_{S_{u, v}}^2 &\lesssim v^\delta (\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3) + \sum_{\substack{l_1+l_2 \leq k-1 \\ l_2 \leq 2}} \|D_{u_f} ((r\dot{\nabla})^{l_1} (\Omega^{-1}\dot{\nabla}_3)^{l_2} (\Omega^2\alpha))\|_{S_{u, v}}^2 \\ &+ \sum_{\Phi, k \leq 2} \int_{v_{-1}}^v (v')^{1+\frac{\delta}{2}} \int_{S^2} |(r\dot{\nabla})^k \Phi|^2 d\theta \int_{S^2} |D_{u_f} ((r\dot{\nabla})^k (\Omega\hat{\chi}))|^2 d\theta dv'. \end{aligned}$$

The result then follows from the Grönwall inequality and Propositions 9.3.3 and 9.3.4 since

$$\int_{v-1}^v (v')^{1+\frac{\delta}{2}} \int_{S^2} |(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \Phi|^2 d\theta dv' \lesssim \varepsilon^2$$

for all Φ and $k \leq 2$. \square

The following proposition provides weak control over $(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \Omega \hat{\chi}$ for $k \leq N$. Better estimates for lower order angular derivatives of $\Omega \hat{\chi}$ are obtained in Proposition 15.3.48 and Proposition 15.3.49 below.

Proposition 15.3.47 (Estimate for $\Omega \hat{\chi}$ on $S_{u,v}$ and \underline{C}_v). *For $k \leq N$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k(\Omega \hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k(\Omega \hat{\chi})\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 \lesssim v^\delta (\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3).$$

Proof. From Proposition 15.3.46 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k(\Omega \hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 &\leq \Omega_\circ(u, v)^2 \|D_{u_f}((r\mathring{\nabla})^k(\Omega \hat{\chi}))\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k(\Omega \hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 \\ &\lesssim v^\delta (\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3) + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq k-1} \Omega_\circ(u, v)^2 \|D_{u_f}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega^2 \alpha))\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k(\Omega \hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u_f,v}}^2 \lesssim v^\delta (\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3), \end{aligned}$$

by Theorem C.4 and Proposition 15.3.25. \square

Estimates for $\Omega \hat{\chi}$, $\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3(\Omega \hat{\chi})$ and angular derivatives up to order $N-1$

The $\mathring{\nabla}_4$ equation for $\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3(\Omega \hat{\chi})$ is *noshifted* (see the $k_1 = 1$ case of Proposition 15.1.12) and so, in order to obtain the best estimates for $\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3(\Omega \hat{\chi})$ and its angular derivatives up to order $N-1$, it is again convenient to consider the difference quotient $D_{u_f}(\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3(\Omega \hat{\chi}))$. As in the proof of Proposition 15.3.46, the renormalised quantity X_2 is again considered.

Proposition 15.3.48 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3(\Omega \hat{\chi})$). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $k_1 = 0, 1$, $k_2 \leq N-1-s$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$, if ε is sufficiently small,*

$$\|(\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_1} (r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_2}(\Omega \hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_1} (r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_2}(\Omega \hat{\chi})\|_{C_u(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

and

$$\|(\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_1} (r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_2}(\Omega \hat{\chi})\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_1} (r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_2}(\Omega \hat{\chi})\|_{\mathcal{D}^{N+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. Consider some $l \leq N-5-s$. Proposition 15.1.9 and Lemma 3.3.1 imply that $\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3(r\mathring{\nabla})^l X_2$ satisfies the *noshifted* equation

$$\Omega \mathring{\nabla}_4 \Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3(r\mathring{\nabla})^l X_2 = -2\rho_\circ(r\mathring{\nabla})^l X_2 + \mathcal{L}[\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3(r\mathring{\nabla})^l X_2] + \mathcal{E}[\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3(r\mathring{\nabla})^l X_2],$$

where the linear term $\mathcal{L}[\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3(r\mathring{\nabla})^l X_2]$ takes the form

$$\mathcal{L}[\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3(r\mathring{\nabla})^l X_2] = \sum_{\substack{l_1+l_2 \leq l+3 \\ l_2 \leq 3}} H^{l_1 l_2} \cdot (r\mathring{\nabla})^{l_1} (\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3)^{l_2} (r\Omega^2 \alpha)$$

and the nonlinear error $\mathcal{E}[\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3(r\mathring{\nabla})^l X_2]$ has the schematic form,

$$\mathcal{E}[\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3(r\mathring{\nabla})^l X_2] = \mathcal{E}^{l+4} + (H^{k,1} \cdot \Phi) \cdot (r\mathring{\nabla})^{l+5}(\Omega \hat{\chi}) + (H^{k,1} \cdot \Phi) \cdot \Omega^{-1} \mathring{\nabla}_3(r\mathring{\nabla})^{l+4}(\Omega \hat{\chi}) + (H^{k,3} \cdot \Phi) \cdot (r\mathring{\nabla})^{l+5} \Omega \hat{\omega},$$

for some vectors of admissible coefficient functions (see (3.2.1)) $H^{l_1 l_2}$, $H^{k,1}$, $H^{k,2}$, $H^{k,3}$, where the second equation of (1.2.15) has been used.

The proof then follows that of Lemma 15.1.6. Since, for any Φ ,

$$\begin{aligned} D_{u_f}(\Phi \cdot \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r \nabla)^{l+4}(\Omega \hat{\chi}))(u, v) \\ = D_{u_f} \Phi(u, v) \cdot \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r \nabla)^{l+4}(\Omega \hat{\chi})(u_f, v) + D_{u_f}(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r \nabla)^{l+4}(\Omega \hat{\chi}))(u, v) \cdot \Phi(u_f, v), \end{aligned}$$

it follows that, for any $v_{-1} \leq v_1 < v_2 \leq v(R_2, u)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r \nabla)^l X_2\|_{S_{u, v_2}}^2 + \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r \nabla)^l X_2\|_{S_{u, v}}^2 dv \lesssim \|D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r \nabla)^l X_2\|_{S_{u, v_1}}^2 \\ & + \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|(r \nabla)^l X_2\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \|D_{u_f}(r \nabla)^l X_2\|_{S_{u, v}}^2 + \|D_{u_f} \mathcal{L}\|_{S_{u, v}}^2 + \|\hat{\mathcal{E}}\|_{S_{u, v}}^2 + \varepsilon^2 \|D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r \nabla)^{l+4} \Omega \hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u, v}}^2 dv, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}[\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r \nabla)^l X_2]$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{E}}(u, v) &= D_{u_f} \mathcal{E}^{l+4}(u, v) + D_{u_f} \left((H^{k,1} \cdot \Phi) \cdot (r \nabla)^{l+5}(\Omega \hat{\chi}) + (H^{k,3} \cdot \Phi) \cdot (r \nabla)^{l+5} \Omega \hat{\omega} \right)(u, v) \\ &+ (D_{u_f}(H^{k,1} \cdot \Phi))(u, v) \cdot \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r \nabla)^{l+4}(\Omega \hat{\chi})(u_f, v). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the term $D_{u_f}(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r \nabla)^{l+4}(\Omega \hat{\chi}))(u, v) \cdot \Phi(u_f, v)$ in $D_{u_f} \mathcal{E}[\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r \nabla)^l X_2]$ is considered separately. Now, since

$$D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r^2 \mathcal{D}_2^* d\mathbf{v})^2 (r \nabla)^l \Omega \hat{\chi} = (r^2 \mathcal{D}_2^* d\mathbf{v})^2 D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r \nabla)^l \Omega \hat{\chi} + D_{u_f} [\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3, (r^2 \mathcal{D}_2^* d\mathbf{v})^2] (r \nabla)^l \Omega \hat{\chi},$$

it follows from Proposition 9.3.3 and Proposition 9.3.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l' \leq l+4} \|D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r \nabla)^{l'} \Omega \hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u, v}}^2 &\lesssim \|D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r^2 \mathcal{D}_2^* d\mathbf{v})^2 (r \nabla)^l \Omega \hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u, v}}^2 \\ &+ \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^2} \sum_{\substack{l_1+l_2 \leq l+2 \\ l_1 \leq 1}} \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{l_1} (r \nabla)^{l_2} \Omega \hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u, v}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

and hence, by Theorem C.4, if ε is sufficiently small, for $l \leq l' \leq l+4$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l' \leq l+4} \|D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r \nabla)^{l'} \Omega \hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u, v_2}}^2 + \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r \nabla)^{l'} \Omega \hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u, v}}^2 dv &\lesssim \sum_{l' \leq l+4} \|D_{u_f} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3(r \nabla)^{l'} \Omega \hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u, v_1}}^2 \\ &+ \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \sum_{l' \leq l} \left(\|(r \nabla)^{l'} X_2\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \|D_{u_f}(r \nabla)^{l'} \Omega \hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u, v}}^2 \right) + \|D_{u_f} \mathcal{L}\|_{S_{u, v}}^2 + \|\hat{\mathcal{E}}\|_{S_{u, v}}^2 dv + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v_1^s}. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows, as in the proof of Lemma 15.1.6, using Propositions 15.3.25 and 15.3.41, that, for $l' \leq l+4$ and $i = 0, 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^i (r \nabla)^{l'} \Omega \hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u, v}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^i (r \nabla)^{l'} \Omega \hat{\chi}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^i (r \nabla)^{l'} \Omega \hat{\chi}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 \\ & + \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^i (r \nabla)^{l'} \Omega \hat{\chi}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s} + \|D_{u_f} \mathcal{L}\|_{C_u(v_{-1} \vee v/2)}^2 + \|\hat{\mathcal{E}}\|_{C_u(v_{-1} \vee v/2)}^2 + \|D_{u_f} \mathcal{L}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v_{-1} \vee v/2)}^2 + \|\hat{\mathcal{E}}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v_{-1} \vee v/2)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $v_{-1} \vee v/2 := \max\{v_{-1}, v/2\}$. To control the first $D_{u_f} \mathcal{L}$ term note that, by Lemma 15.1.5, for $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = (r \nabla)^{l_1} (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{l_2}$ with $l_1 + l_2 \leq l-2$,

$$\|D_{u_f}(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega^2 \alpha))\|_{C_u(v_{-1} \vee v/2)}^2 \lesssim \sup_{u \leq u' \leq u_f} \sum_{k=0,1} \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^k \mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega^2 \alpha)\|_{C_{u'}(v_{-1} \vee v/2)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

by Theorem C.4. The term $\|D_{u_f} \mathcal{L}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v_{-1} \vee v/2)}^2$ is controlled similarly. For the first nonlinear term in $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$, Lemma 15.1.5 and Proposition 15.2.1 imply that

$$\|D_{u_f} \mathcal{E}^{l+4}\|_{C_u(v_{-1} \vee v/2)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^s}.$$

The nonlinear term in $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ arising from the nonlinear term involving $(r\nabla)^{l+5}(\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_o)$ in \mathcal{E} is controlled by Proposition 15.2.8. For the nonlinear terms involving $\Omega\hat{\chi}$, for any Φ write

$$D_{u_f}(\Phi \cdot (r\nabla)^{l+5}(\Omega\hat{\chi}))(u, v) = D_{u_f}\Phi(u, v) \cdot (r\nabla)^{l+5}(\Omega\hat{\chi})(u, v) + D_{u_f}((r\nabla)^{l+5}(\Omega\hat{\chi}))(u, v) \cdot \Phi(u, v).$$

For the first term it follows exactly as above, using Lemma 15.1.5 and Proposition 15.2.1, that

$$\|(r\nabla)^{l+5}(\Omega\hat{\chi}) \cdot D_{u_f}\Phi\|_{C_u(v_{-1} \vee v/2)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^s}.$$

If $l \leq N - 6$ then the second term can be estimated similarly. For the remaining case, Proposition 15.3.46 implies that,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi \cdot D_{u_f}((r\nabla)^N(\Omega\hat{\chi}))\|_{C_u(v_{-1} \vee \frac{v}{2})}^2 &\lesssim \int_{v_{-1} \vee v/2}^{v(R_2, u)} \frac{\varepsilon^4}{(v')^{2-\delta}} dv' \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{l_1+l_2 \leq N-1 \\ l_2 \leq 2}} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^2} \|D_{u_f}((r\nabla)^{l_1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{l_2}(\Omega^2\alpha))\|_{C_u(v_{-1} \vee \frac{v}{2})}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{1-\delta}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 15.1.5 and Theorem C.4. The remaining nonlinear term in $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ is estimated similarly, and the Proposition follows. \square

All remaining derivatives of $\Omega\hat{\chi}$

In this section the remaining derivatives of $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ are estimated. The top order angular derivatives of $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ only satisfy the weaker estimates of Propositions 15.3.47 above and hence are excluded from the results of this section.

Recall that, given $k_1, k_2, k_3 \geq 0$, $\mathfrak{D}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3)} = (r\nabla)^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2}(r\nabla\nabla_4)^{k_3}$.

Proposition 15.3.49 (Estimate for remaining derivatives of $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 \leq N - s$, $k_1 \leq N - 1 - s$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega\hat{\chi})\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

where $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$.

Proof. Consider first the region $2M_f \leq r \leq r_0$, and suppose first that $k_3 = 0$. The proof proceeds by induction on k_2 . Note that, when $k_2 = 0$ and $k_2 = 1$, the proposition reduces to Proposition 15.3.48. Suppose then that the result holds for some $1 \leq k_2 \leq N - 1 - s$. Proposition 15.1.12 and Lemma 15.1.2 then imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(r\nabla)^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2+1}\Omega\hat{\chi}\mathbb{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|(r\nabla)^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2+1}\Omega\hat{\chi}\mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 &\lesssim \frac{1}{v^s} \|(r\nabla)^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2+1}\Omega\hat{\chi}\mathbb{1}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 \\ &+ \sum_{l_1+l_2=0}^{k_2} \|(r\nabla)^{l_1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{l_2}\Omega\hat{\chi}\mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v_{-1} \vee v/2)}^2 + \sum_{l_1+l_2=0}^{k_1+k_2+1} \|(r\nabla)^{l_1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{l_2}\Omega^2\alpha\mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v_{-1} \vee v/2)}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^s}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r \leq r_0}$ and the nonlinear terms are controlled using Propositions 15.2.1 and 15.2.4. It then follows from Proposition 15.3.34, Theorem C.4 and the inductive hypothesis that

$$\|(r\nabla)^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2+1}\Omega\hat{\chi}\mathbb{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|(r\nabla)^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2+1}\Omega\hat{\chi}\mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Similarly for $\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2+1}\Omega\hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2$ and $\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2+1}\Omega\hat{\chi}\mathbb{1}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2$. For the case that $k_3 \geq 1$ it then inductively follows from applying $(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2}(\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^{k_3-1}$ to (the appropriately normalised) equation (1.2.6) that

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\Omega\hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\Omega\hat{\chi}\mathbb{1}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\Omega\hat{\chi}\mathbb{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\Omega\hat{\chi}\mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

with $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$.

The region $r \geq r_0$ is simpler since $\Omega \sim 1$ and hence the redshift effect plays no role. One does, however, have to take care with the degeneration of the integrated decay estimates for α at $r = 3M_f$. Consider again first the case that $k_3 = 0$. Note again that, when $k_2 = 0$ and $k_2 = 1$, the proposition reduces to Proposition 15.3.48. Let τ be a smooth cut off function such that $\tau(u, v) = 1$ for $r(u, v) \geq r_0$ and $\tau(u, v) = 0$ for $r(u, v) \leq \frac{r_0 - 2M_f}{2}$. Given $k_2 \geq 1$, from equation (1.2.6) it follows, by Lemma 3.3.1, that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4(\Omega^{-4}\tau \cdot R^*(\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2-1}(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}\Omega\hat{\chi}) + 2\Omega\hat{\omega}\Omega^{-4}\tau \cdot R^*(\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2-1}(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}\Omega\hat{\chi}| \\ & \lesssim |\partial_v\tau \cdot R^*(\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2-1}(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}\Omega\hat{\chi}| + |\tau \cdot R^*(\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2-1}(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}\Omega^2\alpha| + |\mathcal{E}^{*k_1+k_2}|, \end{aligned}$$

where $R^* = \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 - \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3$. Lemma 15.1.2 (now with $r_* = R_2$), Theorem C.4 and the above estimates in $r \leq r_0$ then imply that

$$\|R^*(\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2-1}(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}\Omega\hat{\chi}\|_{\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2 + \|R^*(\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2-1}(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}\Omega\hat{\chi}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

where Proposition 15.2.1 is used to control the nonlinear error terms. Similarly for $\|R^*(\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2-1}(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}\Omega\hat{\chi}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2$ and $\|R^*(\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2-1}(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}\Omega\hat{\chi}\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2$. The estimates then hold for $(\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2}(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}\Omega\hat{\chi}$ after inserting equation (1.2.6). Combining with the above estimates in $r \leq r_0$ then gives the proposition in the case that $k_3 = 0$. The case $k_3 \geq 1$ then again follows inductively by applying $(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2}(\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^{k_3-1}$ to equation (1.2.6). \square

15.3.4.3 Estimates for curvature components

In this section most of the remaining curvature components are estimated (though there are some derivatives of $\Omega\beta_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}_{\ell \geq 2}$ which are estimated in Section 15.3.4.4 after $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}$ are estimated).

Recall, for an S -tensor ξ and $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $v \geq v_{-1}$, the norm

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 &:= \|R^*\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 + \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 + \|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \\ &+ \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 1} \left(\|(1 - 3M_f/r)\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \xi\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \xi\|_{C_u(v)}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $R^* = \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4 - \Omega\mathring{\nabla}_3$. Note that the norm $\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2$ involves first order derivatives of ξ .

Estimates for $\Omega\beta_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}_{\ell \geq 2}$

The following two propositions control most derivatives of β and $\underline{\beta}$. The exceptions are $(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^N(\Omega\beta)$ and $(\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^N(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})$, which will be controlled in Section 15.3.4.4 below after all derivatives of $\rho_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}$ have been controlled. Recall again that, given $k_1, k_2, k_3 \geq 0$, $\mathfrak{D}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3)} = (r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\mathring{\nabla}_3)^{k_2}(r\Omega\mathring{\nabla}_4)^{k_3}$.

Proposition 15.3.50 (Estimate for $\Omega\beta_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$ with $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 \leq N - 1 - s$, $k_2 \leq N - 2 - s$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega\beta)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. Consider a multi index \underline{k} such that $|\underline{k}| \leq N - 2 - s$. Equation (1.2.22) takes the schematic form

$$-2\mathcal{P}_2^* \Omega \beta = \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (r \Omega^2 \alpha) - \frac{6M_f}{r^3} \Omega \hat{\chi} + \mathcal{E}^0,$$

and so it follows from Lemma 9.3.3, Theorem C.4 and Proposition 15.3.49 that

$$\sum_{l=0,1} \|(r \nabla)^l \mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega \beta)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

using Propositions 15.2.1, 15.2.2, 15.2.4 and 15.2.5 to control the nonlinear error terms. Similarly, it follows from equation (1.2.23) that

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} r \Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega \beta)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

□

Proposition 15.3.51 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$ with $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 \leq N - 1 - s$, $k_3 \leq N - 2 - s$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 15.3.50, using now equation (1.2.31) and equation (1.2.30). □

Estimates for $\rho_{\ell \geq 2}$

The following proposition provides control over all derivatives of ρ up to order N .

Proposition 15.3.52 (Estimate for $\rho_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $|\gamma| \leq N - 1 - s$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \rho_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. Consider first the case $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = (r \nabla)^k$ for some $k \leq N - 1 - s$. After commuting the equality (3.4.2) by $(r \nabla)^{k-2}$ (or not commuting if $k \leq 1$) and using Theorem C.3 and Propositions 15.3.1, 15.3.44, 15.3.45 and 15.3.49 to control the linear terms, and Propositions 15.2.1, 15.2.2, 15.2.4 and 15.2.5 to control the nonlinear error terms, it follows from Proposition 9.3.3 that

$$\sum_{l \leq k} \|(r \nabla)^l \rho_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Moreover, for $|\gamma| \leq N - 2 - s$, the estimates

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega \nabla_4 \rho_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 \rho_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

follow from applying \mathfrak{D}^γ to equations (1.2.25) and (1.2.27) respectively. The proposition then follows. □

15.3.4.4 Estimates for $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}$

In this section $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}$ are estimated.

Estimates for $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$

Most of the derivatives of η can be estimated directly using the equation (1.2.8), which can be rewritten schematically as,

$$\mathcal{D}_2^* \eta = -\frac{1}{2} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (\Omega \hat{\chi}) + \frac{1}{2r} \Omega \hat{\chi} - \frac{\Omega_o^2}{2r} \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi} + \mathcal{E}^0. \quad (15.3.35)$$

Proposition 15.3.53 (Estimate for $\nabla \eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $|\gamma| \leq N-1-s$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,*

$$\sum_{l=0,1} \|(r \nabla)^l \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\dot{S}_{u,v}}^2 + \|(r \nabla)^l \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\dot{C}_u(v)}^2 + \|(r \nabla)^l \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\dot{C}_v}^2 + \|(r \nabla)^l \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. After commuting equation (15.3.35) with \mathfrak{D}^γ , the proof follows from Proposition 9.3.3, Propositions 15.3.44, 15.3.45 and 15.3.49, and using Propositions 15.2.1, 15.2.2, 15.2.4 and 15.2.5 to control the nonlinear error terms. \square

The remaining derivatives of η are estimated using the equation (1.2.12) and so it is first necessary to estimate $\underline{\eta}$ and the remaining derivatives of $\Omega \beta$.

Estimates for $\underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}$

Derivatives of $\nabla \underline{\eta}$ will be controlled using the equation (1.2.9), which can be written schematically as,

$$\mathcal{D}_2^* \underline{\eta} = -\frac{1}{2} \Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}) - \left(\frac{1}{4} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o + (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o \right) \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi} + \frac{1}{2r} \Omega \hat{\chi} + \mathcal{E}^0. \quad (15.3.36)$$

Proposition 15.3.54 (Estimate for $\nabla \underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $|\gamma| \leq N-1-s$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,*

$$\sum_{l=0,1} \|(r \nabla)^l \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\dot{S}_{u,v}}^2 + \|(r \nabla)^l \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\dot{C}_u(v)}^2 + \|(r \nabla)^l \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\dot{C}_v}^2 + \|(r \nabla)^l \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The proof again follows from Proposition 9.3.3, Propositions 15.3.44, 15.3.45 and 15.3.49, now commuting equation (15.3.36) with \mathfrak{D}^γ . \square

The remaining derivatives of $\underline{\eta}$ are estimated using the equation (1.2.12). The case when one of the derivatives is $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3$ can be estimated already.

Proposition 15.3.55 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 \underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $|\gamma| \leq N-1-s$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 \underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\dot{S}_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 \underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\dot{C}_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 \underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\dot{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 \underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The proof follows from projecting (1.2.12) to $\ell \geq 2$, applying $(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{N-1}$ and using Proposition 9.4.4. The linear terms involving β can be estimated using Proposition 15.3.50. The linear terms involving η can be estimated using Proposition 15.3.53. \square

Remaining derivatives of $\Omega \beta_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\Omega^{-1} \beta_{\ell \geq 2}$

Before estimating the remaining derivatives of η , it is first necessary (in particular for the $(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^N$ derivative) to control the remaining $(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{N-s}$ derivatives of $\Omega \beta$, which it is now possible to do using Proposition 15.3.53 and the estimates for ρ and σ .

Proposition 15.3.56 (Estimate for $\Omega\beta_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $|\gamma| \leq N - 1 - s$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega\beta)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. In the case that $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = (\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k$, for some $1 \leq k \leq N - 1 - s$, the proof follows from projecting equation (1.2.24), which can be schematically rewritten as

$$\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(\Omega\beta) = \frac{2}{r}\Omega\beta + \nabla\rho + *\nabla\sigma - \frac{6M_f}{r^3}\eta + \mathcal{E}^0,$$

to $\ell \geq 2$, applying $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k-1}$ and using Proposition 9.4.4, and using Propositions 15.3.50, 15.3.52, 15.3.1 and 15.3.53 to control the linear terms. The nonlinear terms are controlled using Propositions 15.2.1, 15.2.2, 15.2.4 and 15.2.5. In the remaining cases the proposition reduces to Proposition 15.3.50. \square

In order to estimate the remaining derivatives of $\underline{\eta}$, it is similarly necessary to control the $(\Omega\nabla_4)^{N-s}$ derivatives of $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}$, which it is now possible to do using Proposition 15.3.54.

Proposition 15.3.57 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $|\gamma| \leq N - 1 - s$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v), \underline{C}_v, C_u(v), S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 15.3.56, using now equation (1.2.29), which can be schematically written

$$\Omega\nabla_4(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}) = -((\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ + 2(\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ)\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta} - \nabla\rho + *\nabla\sigma + \frac{6M_f}{r^3}\underline{\eta} + \mathcal{E}^0.$$

\square

Remaining derivatives of $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}$

The remaining derivatives of η are estimated using the equation (1.2.12), which can schematically be written,

$$\Omega\nabla_4(r\eta) = \Omega^2\underline{\eta} - r\Omega\beta + \mathcal{E}^0. \quad (15.3.37)$$

Proposition 15.3.58 (Estimate for $\eta_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $|\gamma| \leq N - s$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma\eta_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. First, the case that $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = \mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}}r\Omega\nabla_4$, for some $|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq |\gamma| - 1$ follows from projecting equation (15.3.37) to $\ell \geq 2$, applying $\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}}$ and using Proposition 9.4.4, Proposition 15.3.54 and Proposition 15.3.56.

Consider now the case that $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = (\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k$ for some $k \leq N - s$. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 15.3.49 in which $\Omega\hat{\chi}$ is estimated. The equation (15.3.37) is first projected to $\ell \geq 2$, commuted with $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k$ and (noting that the resulting equation is redshifted) Lemma 15.1.2 is used, along with Propositions 15.3.55 and 15.3.56 and Proposition 15.3.42 to control the term on $v = v_{-1}$, to estimate $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k\eta$ in the region $r \leq r_0$, where the integrated decay estimate for β does not degenerate. The equation (15.3.37) is then commuted with $R^*(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k-1}$ and Lemma 15.1.2 is again used, along with the fact that the integrated decay estimate for $R^*\Omega\beta$ of Proposition 15.3.56 does not degenerate at $r = 3M_f$, to estimate $R^*(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k-1}\eta$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$.

The remaining cases follow from Proposition 15.3.53. \square

The remaining derivatives of $\underline{\eta}$ are estimated by commuting the equation (1.2.12).

Proposition 15.3.59 (Estimate for $\underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $|\gamma| \leq N - s$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \underline{\eta}_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. Suppose $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = (r\Omega \nabla_4)^k$ for some $1 \leq k \leq N - s$. The proof follows from considering (1.2.12), which can be schematically written

$$\Omega \nabla_3(r\eta) = -\Omega^2 \eta + \Omega^2 r \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta} + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}^0,$$

projecting to $\ell \geq 2$ and commuting with $(\Omega \nabla_4)^{k-1} R^*$, and using Lemma 15.1.3 and Proposition 9.4.4. The term at $u = u_f$ is controlled by Proposition 15.3.26, and the linear terms are controlled by Proposition 15.3.57 and Proposition 15.3.58. The result then follows from Proposition 15.3.55. The remaining cases follow from Proposition 15.3.54 and Proposition 15.3.55. \square

15.3.4.5 Estimates for $\Omega_\circ^{-2} \Omega_{\ell \geq 2}^2$

Estimates for Ω^2 can easily be obtained from the estimates for η and $\underline{\eta}$ using the equation

$$\nabla \log \Omega^2 = \eta + \underline{\eta}. \quad (15.3.38)$$

Proposition 15.3.60 (Estimate for $\Omega_\circ^{-2} \Omega_{\ell \geq 2}^2$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $|\gamma| \leq N - s$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,

$$\left\| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega_\circ^{-2} \Omega_{\ell \geq 2}^2) \right\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \left\| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega_\circ^{-2} \Omega_{\ell \geq 2}^2) \right\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \left\| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega_\circ^{-2} \Omega_{\ell \geq 2}^2) \right\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \left\| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega_\circ^{-2} \Omega_{\ell \geq 2}^2) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The equation (15.3.38) implies that

$$\nabla \log \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_\circ^2} \right) = \eta + \underline{\eta}. \quad (15.3.39)$$

The proof follows from Proposition 15.3.53 and Proposition 15.3.54 and the Poincaré inequality, Proposition 9.3.2, after projecting to $\ell \geq 2$ and commuting with \mathfrak{D}^γ . \square

Since Ω^2 is a metric component, it is also possible to estimate more than N of its derivatives. Such estimates will not be obtained here.

15.3.4.6 Estimates for $(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell \geq 2}$

The propagation equation (1.2.15) for $\Omega \hat{\omega}$ can be schematically rewritten as,

$$\partial_u (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ) = -\Omega^2 (\rho - \rho_\circ) + \frac{2M_f}{r^3} (\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2) + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}^0, \quad (15.3.40)$$

and equation (1.2.13) can be schematically rewritten

$$2\nabla(\Omega \hat{\omega}) = \Omega \nabla_4 \underline{\eta} + 2 \frac{\Omega^2}{r} \underline{\eta} - \Omega \beta + \mathcal{E}^0. \quad (15.3.41)$$

Proposition 15.3.61 (Estimate for $(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $|\gamma| \leq N - s$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. Consider first the case that $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = \mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} r \nabla$ for some $|\tilde{\gamma}| = |\gamma| - 1$. The proof follows from projecting equation (15.3.41) to $\ell \geq 2$, applying $\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}}$, using Proposition 15.3.56 and Proposition 15.3.59 to control the linear terms, and Propositions 15.2.1, 15.2.2, 15.2.4 and 15.2.5 to control the nonlinear terms. Next, if $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = \mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3$ for some $|\tilde{\gamma}| = |\gamma| - 1$, the proof follows from dividing equation (15.3.40) by Ω^2 , projecting to $\ell \geq 2$ and using Proposition 9.4.3, applying $\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}}$ and using Proposition 15.3.52 and Proposition 15.3.60. Finally, suppose $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = (r \Omega \nabla_4)^k$ for some $1 \leq k \leq N - s$. The proof then follows from projecting (15.3.40) to $\ell \geq 2$, commuting with $R^*(\Omega \nabla_4)^{k-1}$ and using Lemma 15.1.3 and Proposition 9.4.3. The linear terms are controlled using Proposition 15.3.52 and Proposition 15.3.60. The proof then follows from the previous cases. \square

The propagation equation (1.2.15) for $\hat{\omega}$ can be rewritten as,

$$\partial_v (\Omega^{-2} (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ)) + 2\Omega \hat{\omega} \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ) = -(\rho - \rho_\circ) + \frac{2M_f}{r^3} \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2}\right) + \mathcal{E}^0. \quad (15.3.42)$$

Equation (1.2.14) can be schematically written,

$$2\nabla(\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_\circ)) = \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 \eta - \frac{2}{r} \eta + \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta} + \mathcal{E}^0. \quad (15.3.43)$$

In the following, $(\hat{\omega})_{*,\ell \geq 2}$ will denote the quantity

$$(\hat{\omega})_{*,\ell \geq 2} := (\Omega^{-2} (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_\circ))_{\ell \geq 2}.$$

Proposition 15.3.62 (Estimate for $(\Omega^{-2} (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_\circ))_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $|\gamma| \leq N - s$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\hat{\omega})_{*,\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\hat{\omega})_{*,\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\hat{\omega})_{*,\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\hat{\omega})_{*,\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. In the cases that $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = \mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} r \nabla$ and $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = \mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} r \Omega \nabla_4$ for some $|\tilde{\gamma}| = |\gamma| - 1$ the proof follows from respectively projecting (15.3.43) and (15.3.42) to $\ell \geq 2$ and applying $\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}}$, using Propositions 9.4.3, 15.3.52, 15.3.56, 15.3.58, and 15.3.60. In the case that $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^k$ for some $1 \leq k \leq N - s$ the proof follows the approach of Proposition 15.3.49. First equation (15.3.42) is inductively commuted with $(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^k$ for all $1 \leq k \leq N - s$, and Lemma 15.1.2 is used with $r_* = r_0$ to control $(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^k (\hat{\omega})_{*,\ell \geq 2}$ in the region $r \leq r_0$. Then equation (15.3.42) is commuted with $R^*(\Omega \nabla_3)^{k-1}$ and Lemma 15.1.2 is used again to control $(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^k (\hat{\omega})_{*,\ell \geq 2}$ in the region $r_0 \leq r \leq R_2$. Proposition 15.3.52 and Proposition 15.3.60 are used to control the linear error terms, and Propositions 15.2.1 and 15.2.4 to control the nonlinear terms. The terms on the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$ are controlled by Proposition 15.3.43. \square

15.3.4.7 Estimates for $(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $(\Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_\circ))_{\ell \geq 2}$

In this section, the quantities $(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)_{\ell \geq 2}$ and $(\Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_\circ))_{\ell \geq 2}$ are estimated.

Equations

The equations satisfied by $\text{tr} \chi$ and $\text{tr} \underline{\chi}$ are more convenient in the following renormalised forms. The Codazzi equation (1.2.18) can be rewritten,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) &= 2\text{d}\nabla(\Omega \hat{\chi}) + (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ \underline{\eta} + 2\Omega \beta + 2\Omega \hat{\chi} \cdot \eta + (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) \underline{\eta} \\ &= 2\text{d}\nabla(\Omega \hat{\chi}) + (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ \underline{\eta} + 2\Omega \beta + \mathcal{E}^0. \end{aligned} \quad (15.3.44)$$

The Raychaudhuri equation for $\text{tr} \chi$, (1.2.7), can be rewritten

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) &= -((\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ - 2(\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ) (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) + \frac{4\Omega_\circ^2}{r} (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)^2 + 2(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ) (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) - |\Omega \hat{\chi}|^2 \\ &= -((\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ - 2(\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ) (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) + \frac{4\Omega_\circ^2}{r} (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ) + \mathcal{E}^0. \end{aligned} \quad (15.3.45)$$

The equation (1.2.10) can be rewritten,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) &= 2d\text{iv} \eta + \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{r\Omega^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) - \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{r\Omega^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ) + 2\frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2} (\rho - \rho_\circ) \\
&\quad - \frac{4M_f}{r^3} \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2}\right) - \frac{1}{2\Omega^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ) (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) \\
&\quad + 2 \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2}\right) (\rho - \rho_\circ) - (\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}) \cdot (\Omega \hat{\chi}) + 2\eta \cdot \eta \\
&= 2d\text{iv} \eta + \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{r\Omega^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) - \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{r\Omega^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ) + 2\frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2} (\rho - \rho_\circ) \\
&\quad - \frac{4M_f}{r^3} \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2}\right) + \mathcal{E}^0.
\end{aligned} \tag{15.3.46}$$

The Codazzi equation (1.2.19) can be rewritten,

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla (\Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)) &= 2d\text{iv}(\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}) - \frac{2}{r} \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2} \eta - 2\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta} + 2\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi} \cdot (\eta + 2\underline{\eta}) - \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ) \underline{\eta} \\
&= 2d\text{iv}(\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}) - \frac{2}{r} \eta - 2\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta} + \mathcal{E}^0.
\end{aligned} \tag{15.3.47}$$

The Raychaudhuri equation for $\text{tr} \underline{\chi}$, (1.2.7), can be rewritten

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (\Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)) &= \frac{2}{r} \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2} \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ) - \frac{4}{r} \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2} \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} (\Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ))^2 - |\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}|^2 \\
&= \frac{2}{r} \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ) - \frac{4}{r} \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ) + \mathcal{E}^0.
\end{aligned} \tag{15.3.48}$$

The equation (1.2.11) can be rewritten,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)) &= 2d\text{iv} \underline{\eta} - \left(2(\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ + \frac{1}{2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ\right) \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ) \\
&\quad + \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{r\Omega^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) + 2\frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2} (\rho - \rho_\circ) - \frac{4M_f}{r^3} \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2}\right) - (\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}) \cdot (\Omega \hat{\chi}) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2\Omega^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ) (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) + 2 \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2}\right) (\rho - \rho_\circ) + 2\underline{\eta} \cdot \underline{\eta} \\
&= 2d\text{iv} \underline{\eta} - \left(2(\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ + \frac{1}{2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ\right) \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ) + \frac{1}{r} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) \\
&\quad + 2(\rho - \rho_\circ) - \frac{4M_f}{r^3} \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2}\right) + \mathcal{E}^0.
\end{aligned} \tag{15.3.49}$$

Estimates for $\Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\ell \geq 2}$

Most of the derivatives of $(\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}$ can immediately be estimated. The quantity $(r \nabla)^N (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}$ only satisfies the weaker estimate of Proposition 15.3.64 below. The quantity $(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^N (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}$ is estimated in Proposition 15.3.66, after derivatives of $(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\ell \geq 2}$ have been estimated.

Recall again that $\mathfrak{D}^{(k_1, k_2, k_3)} = (r \nabla)^{k_1} (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{k_2} (r \Omega \nabla_4)^{k_3}$.

Proposition 15.3.63 (Estimate for $\Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 \leq N - s$, $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - 1 - s$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

where $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$.

Proof. Suppose first that $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 \leq N - 1 - s$. The proof follows from projecting equation (15.3.44) to $\ell \geq 2$, commuting with $(r\tilde{\nabla})^{k_1-1}(\Omega^{-1}\tilde{\nabla}_3)^{k_2}(r\Omega\tilde{\nabla}_4)^{k_3}$ (or with $(\Omega^{-1}\tilde{\nabla}_3)^{k_2}(r\Omega\tilde{\nabla}_4)^{k_3}$ if $k_1 = 0$) and using Propositions 15.3.49, 15.3.56 and 15.3.59, and Propositions 15.2.1, 15.2.2, 15.2.4 and 15.2.5 to control the nonlinear terms. The case that $\mathfrak{D}^k = (r\Omega\tilde{\nabla}_4)^{k_3}$ for some $1 \leq k_3 \leq N - s$ follows inductively from applying $(\Omega\tilde{\nabla}_4)^{k_3-1}$ to equation (15.3.45) (after projecting to $\ell \geq 2$ and using Proposition 9.4.3) and using Proposition 15.3.61. \square

The top order quantity $(r\tilde{\nabla})^N(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell \geq 2}$ satisfies the following weaker estimate.

Proposition 15.3.64 (Estimate for $(r\tilde{\nabla})^N(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For any $k \leq N$, $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,*

$$\|(r\tilde{\nabla})^k(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|(r\tilde{\nabla})^k(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 \lesssim v^\delta(\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3).$$

Proof. The proof follows from Propositions 15.3.47, 15.3.56 and 15.3.59 after applying $(r\tilde{\nabla})^{k-1}$ to equation (15.3.44). \square

Estimates for $(\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ))_{\ell \geq 2}$

In the following, $(\text{tr}\chi)_{*,\ell \geq 2}$ will denote the quantity

$$(\text{tr}\chi)_{*,\ell \geq 2} := (\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ))_{\ell \geq 2}.$$

Proposition 15.3.65 (Estimate for $(\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ))_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $|\gamma| \leq N - s$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\text{tr}\chi)_{*,\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\text{tr}\chi)_{*,\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\text{tr}\chi)_{*,\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(\text{tr}\chi)_{*,\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The proof for $\gamma = 0$ follows from equation (15.3.47), the Poincaré inequality, Proposition 9.3.2, and Propositions 15.3.44, 15.3.45, 15.3.57 and 15.3.58. The proof for $|\gamma| \geq 1$ follows from inductively considering some $\tilde{\gamma}$ with $|\tilde{\gamma}| = |\gamma| - 1$ and applying $\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}}$ to either equation (15.3.47), (15.3.48) or (15.3.49) and using Propositions 15.3.44, 15.3.45, 15.3.52, 15.3.57, 15.3.58, 15.3.59, 15.3.60, 15.3.62 and 15.3.63. \square

Estimates for remaining derivatives of $(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell \geq 2}$

The remaining derivatives of $(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell \geq 2}$ can now be estimated.

Proposition 15.3.66 (Estimate for $\Omega\text{tr}\chi_{\ell \geq 2}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 \leq N - s$, $k_1 \leq N - 1 - s$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^k(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^k(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^k(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^k(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

where $\underline{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3)$.

Proof. By Proposition 15.3.63 the only remaining case to show is when $\mathfrak{D}^k = (\Omega^{-1}\tilde{\nabla}_3)^{k_2}$ for some $1 \leq k_2 \leq N - s$. The proof then follows from Propositions 15.3.52, 15.3.58, 15.3.60, 15.3.63 and 15.3.65 after projecting equation (15.3.46) to $\ell \geq 2$, applying $(\Omega^{-1}\tilde{\nabla}_3)^{k_2-1}$ and using Proposition 9.4.3. \square

15.3.5 Estimates for quantities on C_{u_f} and $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$: the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes

In this section, the defining conditions of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge are exploited to estimate the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes of the geometric quantities on C_{u_f} and $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$. Recall that, restricted to their $\ell = 0, 1$ modes, the geometric

quantities in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge satisfy the gauge conditions

$$b_{\ell=0,1}(u_f, v, \theta) = 0 \quad \text{on } C_{u_f}; \quad (15.3.50)$$

$$(\Omega(u_f, v, \theta) - \Omega_o(u_f, v))_{\ell=0,1} = 0 \quad \text{on } C_{u_f}; \quad (15.3.51)$$

$$\partial_u (r^3(\text{div}\eta)_{\ell=1} + r^3\rho_{\ell=1})(u, v_{-1}, \theta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } u_0 \leq u \leq u_f, \theta \in S^2; \quad (15.3.52)$$

$$(\Omega(u, v_{-1}) - \Omega_o(u, v_{-1}))_{\ell=0} = 0 \quad \text{for all } u_0 \leq u \leq u_f; \quad (15.3.53)$$

$$(f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}^3)_{\ell=0,1}(u_f, v(R, u_f), \theta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in S^2; \quad (15.3.54)$$

$$\mu_{\ell=1}^*(u_f, v(R, u_f), \theta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in S^2; \quad (15.3.55)$$

$$(\Omega \text{tr}\chi - (\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_o)_{\ell=0}(u_f, v(R, u_f), \theta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in S^2; \quad (15.3.56)$$

$$(\Omega \text{tr}\underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr}\underline{\chi})_o)_{\ell=0,1}(u_f, v_{-1}, \theta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in S^2; \quad (15.3.57)$$

where

$$\mu^* = \text{div}\eta + (\rho - \rho_o) - \frac{3}{2r}(\Omega \text{tr}\chi - (\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_o).$$

Recall the reference linearised Kerr solution from Section 1.4.3 and Section 2.3.3. The estimates of the following sections will be shown to hold for the solution minus this reference linearised Kerr solution, as the linearised Kerr solution itself does not satisfy the estimates.

The fact that, if ξ is an S -tangent symmetric trace free $(0, 2)$ tensor,

$$(\text{div}\text{div}\xi)_{\ell=0,1} = (\text{curl}\text{div}\xi)_{\ell=0,1} = 0$$

will be used throughout this section.

15.3.5.1 Estimates for $\ell = 1$ modes of quantities on the final hypersurface C_{u_f}

In this section the $\ell = 1$ modes are estimated on C_{u_f} . Note that the gauge condition (15.3.54) implies, by Theorem 10.6.1 and Theorem C.5, that $\text{div}(\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1}$ satisfies the estimate

$$|\text{div}(\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1}(u_f, v(R, u_f))|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v(R, u_f)^{4-2\delta}}, \quad (15.3.58)$$

and moreover, by the definition of the \mathcal{H}^+ linearised Kerr solution,

$$\text{curl}((\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1} - \Omega\beta_{\text{Kerr}})(u_f, v(R, u_f), \theta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in S_{u_f, v(R, u_f)}. \quad (15.3.59)$$

Proposition 15.3.67 (Estimate for $(\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1} - \Omega\beta_{\text{Kerr}}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, for $k \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\|(\Omega\nabla_4)^k(\Omega\beta - \Omega\beta_{\text{Kerr}})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \|(\Omega\nabla_4)^k(\Omega\beta - \Omega\beta_{\text{Kerr}})_{\ell=1}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^{2-2\delta+s}}.$$

Moreover, for $k \leq N - 1 - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,

$$\|(\Omega\nabla_4)^k(\text{div}\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \|(\Omega\nabla_4)^k(\text{div}\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^{2-2\delta+s}}.$$

Proof. The Bianchi equation (1.2.23) implies

$$\Omega\nabla_4(r^4(\Omega\beta - \Omega\beta_{\text{Kerr}}))_{\ell=1} - 2(\Omega\hat{\omega})_o r^4((\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1} - \Omega\beta_{\text{Kerr}}) = \mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^0, \quad (15.3.60)$$

where the error term has the correct structure to use Proposition 15.2.7. The proof of the first estimate, for $k = 0$, then follows from Lemma 15.1.1, the “final condition” (15.3.58) and (15.3.59), and Proposition 15.2.7, using also Proposition 9.4.3. For $k \geq 1$ the proof follows inductively from applying $(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k-1}$ to (15.3.60). The second estimate, for $(\text{div}\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1}$, is similar. \square

Proposition 15.3.68 (Equations for $\text{curl}\eta_{\ell=1}$). *The quantity $\text{curl}\eta_{\ell=1}$ satisfies the equations*

$$\Omega \nabla_3(r^4 \text{curl}\eta_{\ell=1}) = \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}^1, \quad \Omega \nabla_4(r^4 \text{curl}\eta_{\ell=1}) = \mathcal{E}^1, \quad (15.3.61)$$

where the nonlinear errors contain no quadratic terms which are both non-vanishing in the reference linearised Kerr solution, i.e. no terms of the form

$$\mathfrak{D}^{l_1} \Phi^{(1)} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{l_2} \Phi^{(2)}, \quad \Phi^{(1)}, \Phi^{(2)} \in \{\eta, \underline{\eta}, \sigma, \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}, \Omega \beta\}.$$

Proof. From equation (1.2.13) it follows that

$$\Omega \nabla_4(r^3 \text{curl}\eta) = r^3 \text{curl}(\Omega \beta) + \mathcal{E}^1.$$

The Codazzi equation (1.2.18) implies that

$$\frac{(\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_\circ}{2} \text{curl}\eta_{\ell=1} = -\text{curl}(\Omega \beta)_{\ell=1} + \mathcal{E}^1,$$

and the equation for $\Omega \nabla_4(r^4 \text{curl}\eta_{\ell=1})$ follows after noting that $\text{curl}\eta = -\text{curl}\underline{\eta}$. The $\Omega \nabla_3$ equation is obtained similarly. \square

Proposition 15.3.69 (Estimate for $\text{curl}\eta_{\ell=1} - \text{curl}\eta_{\text{Kerr}}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, for $k \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\|(\Omega \nabla_4)^k (\text{curl}\eta_{\ell=1} - \text{curl}\eta_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^{2-2\delta+s}}.$$

Proof. Consider first the case $k = 0$. The Codazzi equation (1.2.18) projected to $\ell = 1$ together with (15.3.59) implies that, on C_{u_f} .

$$|\text{curl}\eta_{\ell=1} - \text{curl}\eta_{\text{Kerr}}|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^{4-2\delta}}.$$

For $k \geq 1$ the proof follows from Proposition 15.3.67 after applying $(\Omega \nabla_4)^{k-1}$ to the latter of (15.3.61) and using the error estimate of Proposition 15.2.2. \square

Proposition 15.3.70 (Estimate for $\sigma_{\ell=1} - \sigma_{\text{Kerr}}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, for $k \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\|(\Omega \nabla_4)^k (\sigma_{\ell=1} - \sigma_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^{2-2\delta+s}}.$$

Proof. The proof follows from Proposition 15.3.69 and equation (1.2.17). \square

Recall that $\mu_{\ell=1}^*$ was estimated on C_{u_f} in Proposition 15.3.10.

Proposition 15.3.71 (Estimate for $\mu_{\ell=1}^*$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, for $k \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\|(\Omega \nabla_4)^k \mu_{\ell=1}^*\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{s+1}}.$$

Proof. See Proposition 15.3.10. \square

Proposition 15.3.72 (Preliminary estimate for $(\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\|(\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^{4-2\delta}} + \Omega_\circ^2 \|(\text{div}\eta)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2,$$

and, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_0, u_f)$,

$$\int_v^{v(r_0, u_f)} \int_{S^2} |(\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}|^2 d\theta dv(u_f) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^{4-2\delta}} + \int_v^{v(r_0, u_f)} \Omega_\circ^2 \int_{S^2} |(\text{div}\eta)_{\ell=1}|^2 d\theta dv'(u_f).$$

Proof. The Codazzi equation (1.2.18) implies

$$(\Delta \Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell=1} = 2(\text{div} \Omega \beta)_{\ell=1} + \frac{2\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r}(\text{div} \eta)_{\ell=1} + \mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^1.$$

Proposition 9.4.5 implies that

$$|(\Delta \Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell=1} - \Delta(\Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\ell=1})| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^2}$$

The proof then follows from Proposition 15.3.67, Proposition 15.2.7 and the fact that $\eta = -\underline{\eta}$ on C_{u_f} . \square

Proposition 15.3.73 (Preliminary estimate for $\rho_{\ell=1}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\|\rho_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^{4-2\delta}} + \Omega_{\circ}^2 \left(\|(\text{div} \eta)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \|\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \right),$$

and, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_0, u_f)$,

$$\int_v^{v(r_0, u_f)} \int_{S^2} |\rho_{\ell=1}|^2 d\theta dv(u_f) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^{4-2\delta}} + \int_v^{v(r_0, u_f)} \Omega_{\circ}^2 \int_{S^2} |(\text{div} \eta)_{\ell=1}|^2 + |\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\ell=1}|^2 d\theta dv'(u_f).$$

Proof. The Gauss equation (1.2.20) can be schematically written,

$$\rho - \rho_{\circ} = \frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r^2} \left(\frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{\Omega^2} - 1 \right) + \frac{1}{2r} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\circ}) - \frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{2r} \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\circ}) - (K - K_{\circ}) + \mathcal{E}^0,$$

and so Proposition 9.4.6 implies that,

$$\rho_{\ell=1} = \frac{1}{2r} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\circ})_{\ell=1} - \frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{2r} \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\circ})_{\ell=1} + \mathcal{E}^0,$$

since $\Omega = \Omega_{\circ}$ on $\{u = u_f\}$. The proof then follows from Proposition 15.3.72. \square

Proposition 15.3.74 (Preliminary estimate for $(\text{div} \eta)_{\ell=1}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, if r_0 is sufficiently small then, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_0, u_f)$,*

$$\|(\text{div} \eta)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^3} + \Omega_{\circ}^2 \|\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2.$$

Proof. The proof follows from Propositions 15.3.71, 15.3.72 and 15.3.73 after taking r_0 , and hence Ω_{\circ} in $r \leq r_0$, sufficiently small. \square

In what follows the equation (1.2.29) for $\underline{\beta}$ will be used, which can be schematically written,

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}) + 2r^2 \Omega \hat{\omega} \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta} = -r^2 \nabla \rho + r^{2*} \nabla \sigma + \frac{6M_f}{r} \underline{\eta} + \mathcal{E}^0. \quad (15.3.62)$$

Proposition 15.3.75 (Preliminary estimate for $(\text{div} \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$ for $r \leq r_0$, i.e. for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_0, u_f)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S^2} |(\text{div} \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}|^2 d\theta(u_f, v) + \int_v^{v(r_0, u_f)} \int_{S^2} |(\text{div} \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}|^2 d\theta dv'(u_f) \\ \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^3} + \int_v^{v(r_0, u_f)} \Omega_{\circ}^2 \int_{S^2} |\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\ell=1}|^2 d\theta dv'(u_f). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First note that, by the Codazzi equation,

$$(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{v}\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1} = -\frac{1}{r}(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{v}\eta)_{\ell=1} - \mathbb{A}(\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}_\circ))_{\ell=1} + \mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^1,$$

on $\{u = u_f\}$ and Proposition 15.3.74 and the gauge condition (15.3.57), it follows that, on the sphere $S_{u_f, v_{-1}}$,

$$\|(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{v}\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

The equation (15.3.62) implies,

$$\Omega\nabla_4(r^3(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{v}\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}) + 2r^3\Omega\hat{\omega}_\circ(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{v}\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1} = -r^3(\mathbb{A}\rho)_{\ell=1} + 6M_f(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{v}\eta)_{\ell=1} + \mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^1.$$

The result then follows from Lemma 15.1.2, Proposition 9.4.5 and Propositions 15.3.73, 15.3.74. \square

Proposition 15.3.76 (Preliminary estimate for $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_{\ell=1}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$ for $r \leq r_0$, i.e. for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_0, u_f)$,*

$$\int_{S^2} |\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_{\ell=1}|^2 d\theta(u_f, v) + \int_v^{v(r_0, u_f)} \int_{S^2} |\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_{\ell=1}|^2 d\theta dv'(u_f) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^3}.$$

Proof. The Codazzi equation (1.2.19) implies that

$$(\mathbb{A}\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}))_{\ell=1} = -\frac{2}{r}(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{v}\eta)_{\ell=1} - 2(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{v}\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1} + \mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^1.$$

Proposition 9.4.5 implies that

$$|(\mathbb{A}\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}))_{\ell=1} - \mathbb{A}\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_{\ell=1}| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{v^2},$$

and so the result follows from Propositions 15.3.74 and 15.3.75 after taking $r_0 - 2M_f$, and hence Ω_\circ^2 in $\{r \leq r_0\}$, sufficiently small. \square

Proposition 15.3.77 (Estimate for $\Omega\text{tr}\chi_{\ell=1}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, for $k \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\|(\Omega\nabla_4)^k(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \|(\Omega\nabla_4)^k(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^{s+1}}.$$

Proof. First consider the case $k = 0$. By Propositions 15.3.72, 15.3.74 and 15.3.76 it suffices to consider the case $v \geq v(r_0, u_f)$. For such v , the redshift plays no role and the Raychaudhuri equation (1.2.7) can be normalised with a bad Ω weight to give

$$\Omega\nabla_4(r^2\Omega^{-4}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)) + 2r^2(\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ\Omega^{-4}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi) = \Omega^{-4}\mathcal{E}^0, \quad (15.3.63)$$

since $\Omega\hat{\omega} = (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ$ on $\{u = u_f\}$. The result then follows from Lemma 15.1.2 after projecting to $\ell = 1$ and using Proposition 9.4.3. For $k \geq 1$ the proof follows inductively from applying $(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k-1}$ to (15.3.63), again after projecting to $\ell = 1$ and using Proposition 9.4.3. \square

Proposition 15.3.78 (Estimate for $\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{v}\eta_{\ell=1}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, for $k \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\|(\Omega\nabla_4)^k(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{v}\eta)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^{s+1}}, \quad \|(\Omega\nabla_4)^k(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{v}\eta)_{\ell=1}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. First suppose $k = 0$. Again, by Propositions 15.3.74 and 15.3.76 it suffices to assume $v \geq v(r_0, u_f)$. Equation (1.2.12) implies that,

$$\Omega\nabla_4(\Omega^{-2}r^3\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{v}\eta) + 2\Omega\hat{\omega}\Omega^{-2}r^3\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{v}\eta = -\Omega^{-2}r^3\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{v}\Omega\beta + \Omega^{-2}\mathcal{E}^1, \quad (15.3.64)$$

since $\eta = -\underline{\eta}$ on $\{u = u_f\}$. The proof then follows from Lemma 15.1.2 and Proposition 15.3.67, since the Ω weights are irrelevant in the region $r_0 \leq r \leq R_2$, after projecting to $\ell = 1$ and using Proposition 9.4.3. For $k \geq 1$ the proof follows inductively from Proposition 15.3.67 after applying $(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k-1}$ to the equation (15.3.64). \square

Proposition 15.3.79 (Estimate for $\eta_{\ell=1} - \eta_{\text{Kerr}}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, for $k \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\|(\Omega \nabla_4)^k (\eta_{\ell=1} - \eta_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^{s+1}}, \quad \|(\Omega \nabla_4)^k (\eta_{\ell=1} - \eta_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The result for $k = 0$ follows from Proposition 9.3.4 and Propositions 15.3.69 and 15.3.78. For $k \geq 1$ the proof follows inductively from Proposition 15.3.67 after applying $(\Omega \nabla_4)^{k-1}$ to equation (1.2.12) which can be schematically rewritten,

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 \eta)_{\ell=1} = -r^2 (\Omega \beta)_{\ell=1} + \mathcal{E}^0,$$

and using Proposition 9.4.4. \square

Proposition 15.3.80 (Estimate for $\rho_{\ell=1}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, for $k \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\|(\Omega \nabla_4)^k \rho_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^{s+1}}, \quad \|(\Omega \nabla_4)^k \rho_{\ell=1}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The proof follows from Propositions 15.3.71, 15.3.77 and 15.3.78. \square

Proposition 15.3.81 (Estimate for $(\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\ell=1} - \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}_{\text{Kerr}}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, for $k \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\left\| (\Omega \nabla_4)^k \left((\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\ell=1} - \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}_{\text{Kerr}} \right) \right\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \left\| (\Omega \nabla_4)^k \left((\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\ell=1} - \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}_{\text{Kerr}} \right) \right\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. First suppose $k = 0$. The Codazzi equation (1.2.19) gives

$$(\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\ell=1} = -\frac{1}{r} \eta_{\ell=1} - \nabla \left(\Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\circ})_{\ell=1} \right) + \mathcal{E}^0,$$

and hence, on the initial sphere $S_{u_f, v_{-1}}$,

$$\|(\Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\ell=1} - \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta}_{\text{Kerr}}\|_{S_{u_f, v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3$$

by Proposition 15.3.79 and the gauge condition (15.3.57). The proof then follows from Lemma 15.1.2 and Propositions 15.3.70, 15.3.79 and 15.3.80, using the equation (15.3.62) projected to $\ell = 1$. For $k \geq 1$ the proof follows inductively from applying $(\Omega \nabla_4)^{k-1}$ directly to the equation (15.3.62) projected to $\ell = 1$ and using Proposition 9.4.4. \square

Proposition 15.3.82 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (\Omega \beta - \Omega \beta_{\text{Kerr}})_{\ell=1}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\|\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (\Omega \beta - \Omega \beta_{\text{Kerr}})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^{s+1}}, \quad \|\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (\Omega \beta - \Omega \beta_{\text{Kerr}})_{\ell=1}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The proof follows from the Bianchi equation (1.2.24), which can be schematically written,

$$\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (r^2 (\Omega \beta - \Omega \beta_{\text{Kerr}}))_{\ell=1} = r^2 \nabla \rho_{\ell=1} + r^{2*} \nabla (\sigma_{\ell=1} - \sigma_{\text{Kerr}}) - \frac{6M_f}{r} (\eta_{\ell=1} - \eta_{\text{Kerr}}) + \mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^0,$$

and Propositions 15.3.70, 15.3.79 and 15.3.80. \square

15.3.5.2 Estimates for $\ell = 1$ modes of quantities on the initial hypersurface $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$

In this section the $\ell = 1$ modes of quantities on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$ are estimated. Since the estimates of this section do not involve *decay*, it is not necessary to subtract the \mathcal{H}^+ linearised Kerr solution in this section.

Proposition 15.3.83 (Estimate for $(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, for $k \leq N$,*

$$\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. By equation (1.2.30),

$$\Omega\nabla_3(r^4(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}))_{\ell=1} = \Omega^2\mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^0. \quad (15.3.65)$$

The proof for $k = 0$ then follows from Lemma 15.1.3 and Proposition 9.4.4, using Proposition 15.3.81 to control the final condition. For $k \geq 1$ the proof follows inductively by applying $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k-1}$ to (15.3.65). \square

Proposition 15.3.84 (Estimate for $\sigma_{\ell=1}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, for $k \leq N$,*

$$\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k\sigma_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k\sigma_{\ell=1}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. Equations (1.2.28), (1.2.17) and (1.2.19) imply that

$$\Omega\nabla_3(r^4\sigma)_{\ell=1} = \Omega^2\mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^1.$$

The proof when $k = 0$ then follows from Lemma 15.1.3 and Proposition 9.4.4, using Proposition 15.3.70 to control the final condition. For $k \geq 1$, the proof follows inductively from Proposition 15.3.83 by applying $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k-1}$ to (1.2.28), which can be written,

$$\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(r^3\sigma)_{\ell=1} = -r^3(\text{curl}\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1} + \mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^0.$$

\square

Proposition 15.3.85 (Estimate for $\eta_{\ell=1}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, for $k \leq N$,*

$$\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k\eta_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k\eta_{\ell=1}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. Since $\nabla(\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\ell=1} = 0$ on $\{v = v_{-1}\}$, equation (1.2.14) implies

$$\Omega\nabla_3(r^2\eta)_{\ell=1} = -\Omega^2r^2(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1} + \Omega^2\mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^0. \quad (15.3.66)$$

The proof when $k = 0$ then follows from Lemma 15.1.3, Proposition 9.4.4 and Proposition 15.3.83, using Proposition 15.3.79 to control the final condition. When $k \geq 1$, the proof follows inductively from Proposition 15.3.83 by dividing (15.3.66) by Ω^2 and applying $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k-1}$. \square

Proposition 15.3.86 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_{\ell=1}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, for $k \leq N$,*

$$\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_{\ell=1}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. By the Raychaudhuri equation (1.2.7) and the gauge condition (15.3.53),

$$\Omega\nabla_3(r^2\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}))_{\ell=1} = \Omega^2\mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^0, \quad (15.3.67)$$

and the proof, when $k = 0$, follows from Lemma 15.1.3 and the gauge condition (15.3.57). For $k \geq 1$ the proof follows from applying $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k-1}$ to (15.3.67) and using Proposition 9.4.3. \square

Proposition 15.3.87 (Estimate for $\rho_{\ell=1}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, for $k \leq N$,*

$$\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k \rho_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k \rho_{\ell=1}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. The equation (1.2.27) gives,

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (r^3 \rho)_{\ell=1} = 3M\Omega^2\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1} - \Omega^2 r^3 (\text{d}\nabla \Omega^{-1}\beta)_{\ell=1} + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^1,$$

and the result follows from Lemma 15.1.3, Proposition 9.4.3, and Propositions 15.3.83 and 15.3.86. \square

Proposition 15.3.88 (Estimate for $(\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, for $k \leq N$,*

$$\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k (\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k (\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. Equation (1.2.24) implies

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (r^3 (\text{d}\nabla \Omega\beta))_{\ell=1} = \Omega^2 r^3 (\Delta\rho)_{\ell=1} - 6M\Omega^2 (\text{d}\nabla \eta)_{\ell=1} + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^0,$$

and the proof then follows from Lemma 15.1.3, Proposition 9.4.3, and Propositions 15.3.85 and 15.3.87. \square

15.3.5.3 Estimates for $\ell = 0$ modes of quantities on the final hypersurface C_{u_f}

This section concerns estimates for the $\ell = 0$ modes of the Ricci coefficients and curvature components on C_{u_f} .

Recall the quantity

$$\Upsilon = \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r}\right) (\rho - \rho_o) + \frac{3M_f}{2r^2} (\Omega \text{tr}\chi - (\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_o) - \frac{3M_f \Omega_o^2}{2r^2} \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr}\chi - (\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_o).$$

Proposition 10.6.1 and Theorem C.5 imply that, at $S_{u_f, v(R, u_f)}$,

$$|\Upsilon_{\ell=0}(u_f, v(R, u_f))|^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v(R, u_f)^{4-2\delta}}. \quad (15.3.68)$$

Proposition 15.3.89 (Estimate for $(\Omega \text{tr}\chi - (\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_o)_{\ell=0}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, for $k \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\|(\Omega \nabla_4)^k (\Omega \text{tr}\chi - (\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_o)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \|(\Omega \nabla_4)^k (\Omega \text{tr}\chi - (\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_o)_{\ell=0}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^{2+s}}.$$

Proof. The gauge condition (15.3.51) and the equation (1.2.7) (see (15.3.45)) imply that $(\Omega \text{tr}\chi - (\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_o)_{\ell=0}$ satisfies the blueshifted equation

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (r^2 (\Omega \text{tr}\chi - (\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_o))_{\ell=0} - 2(\Omega \hat{\omega})_o r^2 (\Omega \text{tr}\chi - (\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_o)_{\ell=0} = \mathcal{E}_{\ell=0}^0. \quad (15.3.69)$$

The proof for $k = 0$ follows from Lemma 15.1.1 and Proposition 9.4.3, using the gauge condition (15.3.56). The nonlinear error terms are controlled by Proposition 15.2.4. For $k \geq 1$ the proof follows inductively from applying $(\Omega \nabla_4)^{k-1}$ directly to the equation (15.3.69). \square

Proposition 15.3.90 (Estimate for $\Upsilon_{\ell=0}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, for $k \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\|(\Omega \nabla_4)^k \Upsilon_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^{s+1}}.$$

Proof. The equations (15.3.45), (15.3.49) and (1.2.25), along with the gauge condition (15.3.51), imply that $\Upsilon_{\ell=0}$ on $\{u = u_f\}$ satisfies the noshifted equation

$$\partial_v(r^3\Upsilon)_{\ell=0} = \mathcal{E}_{\ell=0}^0 - 3M_f r \Omega_\circ^2 |\underline{\eta}|^2,$$

where the nonlinear error \mathcal{E}^0 has the correct structure to apply Proposition 15.2.7. The proof then follows as in Proposition 15.3.10, using also the fact that

$$\left(\int_{C_{u(v)}} \Omega_\circ^2 |\underline{\eta}|^2 d\theta dv' \right)^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^4}{v^4}.$$

□

Proposition 15.3.91 (Preliminary estimate for $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$ for $r \leq r_0$, i.e. for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_0, u_f)$, if $r_0 - 2M_f$ is sufficiently small,*

$$\left\| \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0} \right\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \int_v^{v(r_0, u_f)} \left\| \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0} \right\|_{S_{u_f, v'}}^2 dv' \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^2}.$$

Proof. On $u = u_f$, $\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\ell=0}$ satisfies the redshifted equation

$$\Omega \nabla_4 \left(\frac{r}{\Omega^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ) \right)_{\ell=0} + 2(\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ \frac{r}{\Omega^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0} = (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0} + 2(\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0} + \mathcal{E}_{\ell=0}^0. \quad (15.3.70)$$

The proof then follows, after taking $r_0 - 2M_f$, and hence Ω_\circ^2 in $r \leq r_0$, sufficiently small, from Lemma 15.1.2, Proposition 9.4.3 and Propositions 15.3.89 and 15.3.90 after noting that, in $r \leq r_0$,

$$|(\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0}| \lesssim |(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}| + |\Upsilon_{\ell=0}| + \Omega_\circ^2 |\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0}|.$$

□

Proposition 15.3.92 (Estimate for $(\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, for $k \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\left\| (\Omega \nabla_4)^k (\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0} \right\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \left\| (\Omega \nabla_4)^k (\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0} \right\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. Suppose first that $k = 0$. In the region $r \leq r_0$ the proof follows from Propositions 15.3.89, 15.3.90 and 15.3.91, and the fact that, in $r \leq r_0$,

$$|(\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0}| \lesssim |(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}| + |\Upsilon_{\ell=0}| + \Omega_\circ^2 |\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0}|.$$

In the region $r_0 \leq r \leq R_2$, the redshift plays no role and so the Bianchi equation (1.2.25) can be normalised with a bad Ω weight to give

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^{-2} r^3 (\rho - \rho_\circ))_{\ell=0} + 2(\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ \Omega^{-2} r^3 (\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0} = 3M_f \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ) + \Omega^{-2} \mathcal{E}_{\ell=0}^0.$$

The proof then follows from Lemma 15.1.2, Proposition 9.4.3 and Proposition 15.3.89. For $k \geq 1$ the proof follows from Proposition 15.3.89 after applying $(\Omega \nabla_4)^{k-1}$ to (1.2.25). □

Proposition 15.3.93 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, for $k \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$,*

$$\left\| (\Omega \nabla_4)^k \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0} \right\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \left\| (\Omega \nabla_4)^k \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0} \right\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. For $k = 0$, the proof follows as in Proposition 15.3.91, using now Proposition 15.3.92. For $k \geq 1$ the proof follows from applying $(\Omega \nabla_4)^{k-1}$ to equation (15.3.70), and using Proposition 15.3.89 and Proposition 15.3.92. □

Proposition 15.3.94 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}$ on C_{u_f}). *On the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$,*

$$\|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \|\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{C_{u_f}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^2}.$$

Proof. The proof follows directly from Propositions 15.3.89, 15.3.92 and 15.3.93 using equation (1.2.10) which, after projecting to $\ell = 0$, on $u = u_f$ takes the form

$$\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0} = r^{-1}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0} - r^{-1}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - (\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0} + 2(\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0} + \mathcal{E}_{\ell=0}^0.$$

□

15.3.5.4 Estimates for $\ell = 0$ modes of quantities on the initial hypersurface $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$

This section concerns estimates for the $\ell = 0$ modes of the Ricci coefficients and curvature components on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$.

Proposition 15.3.95 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - (\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, for $k \leq N$,*

$$\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k \Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - (\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u, v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k \Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - (\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. The gauge condition (15.3.53) and the equation (1.2.7) (see (15.3.48)) imply that, on $\{v = v_{-1}\}$, $(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - (\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0}$ satisfies

$$\Omega\nabla_3(r^2\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - (\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_\circ))_{\ell=0} = \Omega^2\mathcal{E}_{\ell=0}^0. \quad (15.3.71)$$

The proof for $k = 0$ follows from Lemma 15.1.3, Proposition 9.4.3 and the gauge condition (15.3.57). For $k \geq 1$ the proof follows inductively after dividing the equation (15.3.71) by Ω^2 and applying $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k-1}$. □

Proposition 15.3.96 (Estimate for $(\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, for $k \leq N$,*

$$\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k(\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u, v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k(\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. The equation (1.2.27) implies

$$\Omega\nabla_3(r^3(\rho - \rho_\circ))_{\ell=0} = -\frac{3}{2}\Omega^2\rho_\circ\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - (\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0} + \Omega^2\mathcal{E}_{\ell=0}^0, \quad (15.3.72)$$

and the proof for $k = 0$ follows from Lemma 15.1.3, Proposition 9.4.3, Proposition 15.3.95 and Proposition 15.3.92. For $k \geq 1$ the proof follows inductively after dividing the equation (15.3.72) by Ω^2 and applying $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k-1}$. □

Proposition 15.3.97 (Estimate for $(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}$ on $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$). *On the initial hypersurface $v = v_{-1}$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, for $k \leq N$,*

$$\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u, v_{-1}}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. Equation (1.2.10) (see also (15.3.46)) implies

$$\Omega\nabla_3(r(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ))_{\ell=0} = -\Omega^2(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - (\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0} + 2\Omega^2r(\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0} + \Omega^2\mathcal{E}_{\ell=0}^0, \quad (15.3.73)$$

and the proof for $k = 0$ follows from Lemma 15.1.3, Proposition 9.4.3, Proposition 15.3.95, Proposition 15.3.96 and Proposition 15.3.89. For $k \geq 1$ the proof follows inductively after dividing the equation (15.3.73) by Ω^2 and applying $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k-1}$. □

15.3.6 Estimates for quantities in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$: the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes

In this section the estimates for the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes of the geometric quantities on C_{u_f} and $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}$ obtained in Section 15.3.5 are exploited to estimate the $\ell = 0, 1$ modes of the geometric quantities in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$. The main results of this section are Proposition 15.3.3 and Proposition 15.3.4.

15.3.6.1 Estimates for $\ell = 1$ modes in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$

The main result of this section is the following proposition.

Theorem 15.3.3 (Improving bootstrap assumptions for energies of $\ell = 1$ modes). *The energies defined in (15.3.2), (15.3.5), (15.3.8), (15.3.11) satisfy,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell=1}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell=1}^N[C^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell=1}^N[\underline{C}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell=1}^N[S^{\mathcal{H}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. The proof is a direct consequence of the estimate for $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}_{\ell=1}$ of Proposition 15.3.98, the estimate for $\Omega\underline{\beta}_{\ell=1}$ of Proposition 15.3.99, the estimate for $\sigma_{\ell=1}$ of Proposition 15.3.100, the estimate for $\rho_{\ell=1}$ of Proposition 15.3.106, the estimate for $\Omega_{\ell=1}$ of Proposition 15.3.107, the estimates for $(\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\ell=1}$ and $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\ell=1}$ of Proposition 15.3.108, the estimates for $\eta_{\ell=1}$ and $\underline{\eta}_{\ell=1}$ of Proposition 15.3.109, and the estimates for $(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}$ and $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}$ of Proposition 15.3.110. \square

Recall that, for $k_1, k_2 \geq 0$, $\mathfrak{D}^{(0,k_1,k_2)} = (\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(r\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_2}$.

Estimates for $(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}$

To begin, $\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}$ can immediately be estimated by integrating the Bianchi equation (1.2.30) backwards from $u = u_f$. Compare with Proposition 15.3.44 and Proposition 15.3.45.

Proposition 15.3.98 (Estimate for $(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *Define $\underline{B} = (\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta})_{\ell=1} - \Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}_{\text{Kerr}}$. For $\underline{k} = (0, k_1, k_2)$, with $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\underline{B}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\underline{B}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\underline{B}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\underline{B}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The equation (1.2.29), after projecting to $\ell = 1$, can schematically be written

$$\Omega\nabla_3(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta} - \Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}_{\text{Kerr}})_{\ell=1} - \frac{4\Omega^2}{r}(\Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta} - \Omega^{-1}\underline{\beta}_{\text{Kerr}})_{\ell=1} = \Omega^2\mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^0.$$

The proof then inductively follows, after commuting the equation, from Lemma 15.1.3 and Proposition 15.3.81, using Proposition 9.4.3 and Propositions 15.2.1 and 15.2.5 to control the nonlinear error terms. \square

Estimates for $(\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1}$

In order to estimate $\Omega\beta$, since the Bianchi equation (1.2.23) is blueshifted (recall the nomenclature of Section 15.1.1.1) it is first commuted twice with $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ so that the resulting equation satisfied by $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^2\Omega\beta$ is redshifted.

By Lemma 3.3.1, for any $k \geq 0$, $(\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1}$ satisfies the commuted equation

$$\Omega\nabla_4((\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k r^4 \Omega\beta)_{\ell=1} + 2(k-1)\Omega\hat{\omega}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k r^4 (\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1} = \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} H_l \cdot (\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^l (\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1} + \mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^k. \quad (15.3.74)$$

for some admissible coefficient functions (see (3.2.1)) H_1, \dots, H_{k-1} .

Compare the following proposition with Proposition 15.3.48.

Proposition 15.3.99 (Estimate for $(\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). Define $B = (\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1} - \Omega\beta_{\text{Kerr}}$. For $\underline{k} = (0, k_1, k_2)$, with $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}B\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}B\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}B\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}B\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. Consider first the case $k_2 = 0$. The proof, for $k_1 = 0, 1$ follows from equation (15.3.74) and Lemma 15.1.6, using Lemma 15.1.5 and Proposition 15.2.4 to control the nonlinear error term

$$\|D_{u_f}\mathcal{E}^1\|_{C_u(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^2},$$

and Propositions 15.3.81, 15.3.82 and 15.3.88. For $k_1 \geq 2$ the proof proceeds by induction, using Lemma 15.1.2 and the fact that equation (15.3.74) is redshifted, using Propositions 15.2.1 and 15.2.4 to control the nonlinear error terms. For $k_2 \geq 1$ the proof proceeds inductively by applying $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_2-1}$ to equation (15.3.74). \square

Estimates for $\sigma_{\ell=1}$

The Bianchi equation (1.2.28), the curl of the Codazzi equation (1.2.19) projected to $\ell = 1$ and (1.2.17) imply that $\sigma_{\ell=1}$ satisfies

$$\Omega\nabla_3(\sigma - \sigma_{\text{Kerr}})_{\ell=1} - 4\frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r}(\sigma_{\ell=1} - \sigma_{\text{Kerr}}) = \Omega^2\mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^1. \quad (15.3.75)$$

Similarly, equations (1.2.26) and (1.2.18) imply that

$$\Omega\nabla_4(\sigma - \sigma_{\text{Kerr}})_{\ell=1} + 4\frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r}(\sigma_{\ell=1} - \sigma_{\text{Kerr}}) = \mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^1. \quad (15.3.76)$$

These equations are used to obtain the following estimates for $\sigma_{\ell=1}$.

Proposition 15.3.100 (Estimate for $\sigma_{\ell=1}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). Define $S = \sigma_{\ell=1} - \sigma_{\text{Kerr}}$. For $\underline{k} = (0, k_1, k_2)$, with $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}S\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}S\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}S\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}S\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. Consider first the case that $k_2 = 0$. The result for $k_1 = 0$ follows, using equation (15.3.75) from Lemma 15.1.3, Proposition 9.4.3, Proposition 15.3.70 and Propositions 15.2.1 and 15.2.5. For $k_1 \geq 1$ the proof follows from dividing (15.3.75) by Ω^2 and applying $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1-1}$. For $k_2 \geq 1$ the proof follows from applying $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_2}$ to (15.3.76). \square

Estimates for $\eta_{\ell=1}$ and $\underline{\eta}_{\ell=1}$

The quantities $\eta_{\ell=1}$ and $\underline{\eta}_{\ell=1}$ and most of their derivatives can now be estimated. Define

$$E = \eta_{\ell=1} - \eta_{\text{Kerr}}, \quad \underline{E} = \underline{\eta}_{\ell=1} - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}}.$$

First a preliminary estimate for the difference $\eta_{\ell=1} - \underline{\eta}_{\ell=1}$ is obtained.

Proposition 15.3.101 (Estimate for $\eta_{\ell=1} - \underline{\eta}_{\ell=1}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). For $\underline{k} = (0, k_1, k_2)$, with $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - 1 - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(E - \underline{E})\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(E - \underline{E})\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(E - \underline{E})\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(E - \underline{E})\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. Adding together equations (1.2.24) and (1.2.29) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{6M_f}{r}(\eta - \eta_{\text{Kerr}} - \underline{\eta} + \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}}) &= 2r^{2*}\nabla(\sigma - \sigma_{\text{Kerr}}) - \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(r^2(\Omega\beta - \Omega\beta_{\text{Kerr}})) \\ &\quad - \Omega\nabla_4(r^2(\Omega^{-1}\beta - \Omega^{-1}\beta_{\text{Kerr}})) - 2r^2\Omega\hat{\omega}(\Omega^{-1}\beta - \Omega^{-1}\beta_{\text{Kerr}}) + \mathcal{E}^0. \end{aligned}$$

The proof follows from Propositions 15.3.98, 15.3.99 and 15.3.100 after projecting to $\ell = 1$ and applying $(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2}$. \square

Most of the derivatives of $\underline{\eta}_{\ell=1}$ can now be estimated.

Proposition 15.3.102 (Estimate for $\underline{\eta}_{\ell=1}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $\underline{k} = (0, k_1, k_2)$, with $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - s$, $k_2 \leq N - 1 - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\underline{E}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\underline{E}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\underline{E}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\underline{E}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. Equation (1.2.12) implies,

$$\Omega\nabla_3(r^{-1}(\underline{\eta} - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}})) - \frac{\Omega^2}{r}r^{-1}(\underline{\eta} - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}}) = \frac{\Omega^2}{r} \left(r^{-1}(\underline{\eta} - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}} - \eta + \eta_{\text{Kerr}}) + \Omega^{-1}\beta - \Omega^{-1}\beta_{\text{Kerr}} + \mathcal{E}^0 \right).$$

Consider first the case that $k_2 = 0$. The proof follows inductively, after projecting the above equation to $\ell = 1$ and using Proposition 9.4.4, from Lemma 15.1.3 and Propositions 15.3.79, 15.3.98, 15.3.101 after commuting with $(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_1}$. For $k_2 \geq 1$, the proof follows inductively from Propositions 15.3.98 and 15.3.101 after projecting the above equation to $\ell = 1$, dividing by Ω^2 , and applying $(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_1}(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_2-1}$. \square

Most of the derivatives of $\eta_{\ell=1}$ are now estimated. The remaining derivatives of $\eta_{\ell=1}$ and $\underline{\eta}_{\ell=1}$ are estimated in Proposition 15.3.109 below.

Proposition 15.3.103 (Estimate for $\eta_{\ell=1}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $\underline{k} = (0, k_1, k_2)$, with $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - 1 - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}E\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}E\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}E\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}E\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The proof is an immediate consequence of Proposition 15.3.101 and Proposition 15.3.102. \square

Estimates for $(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}$ and $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}$

The Codazzi equations now yield the following estimates for $(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}$ and $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}$.

Proposition 15.3.104 (Estimate for $(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $\underline{k} = (0, k_1, k_2)$, with $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - 1 - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The proof follows from the Codazzi equation (1.2.18) projected to $\ell = 1$ and Propositions 15.3.99 and 15.3.103. \square

Proposition 15.3.105 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $\underline{k} = (0, k_1, k_2)$, with $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - 1 - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1})\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1})\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1})\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 \\ + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1})\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof follows from the Codazzi equation (1.2.19) projected to $\ell = 1$ and Propositions 15.3.98 and 15.3.102. \square

Estimates for $\rho_{\ell=1}$

Using the Bianchi equations (1.2.25) and (1.2.27), $\rho_{\ell=1}$ can now be estimated.

Proposition 15.3.106 (Estimate for $\rho_{\ell=1}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $\underline{k} = (0, k_1, k_2)$, with $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\rho_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\rho_{\ell=1}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\rho_{\ell=1}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\rho_{\ell=1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The equation (1.2.27) gives,

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (r^3 \rho)_{\ell=1} = 3M_f (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell=1} - r^3 \Omega^2 (\text{div} \Omega^{-1} \underline{\beta})_{\ell=1} + \mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^0,$$

and the result for $k_1 = k_2 = 0$ follows from Lemma 15.1.3, Proposition 9.4.3, Proposition 15.3.80 and Propositions 15.3.98 and 15.3.105. The result for $k_1 \geq 1, k_2 = 0$ follows inductively from dividing the above equation by Ω^2 and applying $(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{k_1-1}$. For $k_2 \geq 0$ the proof follows similarly from applying $(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^{k_1} (\Omega \nabla_4)^{k_2-1}$ to the projection of equation (1.2.25) and using Propositions 15.3.99 and 15.3.104. \square

Estimates for $(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell=1}$ and $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell=1}$

The quantities $(\Omega_{\circ}^{-2} \Omega^2)_{\ell=1}$, $(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell=1}$ and $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell=1}$ can now be estimated.

Proposition 15.3.107 (Estimate for $(\Omega_{\circ}^{-2} \Omega^2)_{\ell=1}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|(\Omega_{\circ}^{-2} \Omega^2)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|(\Omega_{\circ}^{-2} \Omega^2)_{\ell=1}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|(\Omega_{\circ}^{-2} \Omega^2)_{\ell=1}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|(\Omega_{\circ}^{-2} \Omega^2)_{\ell=1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. The proof follows from Propositions 15.3.102 and 15.3.103, Proposition 9.3.2 and the fact that

$$\nabla \log \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_{\circ}^2} \right) = \eta + \underline{\eta}.$$

\square

Proposition 15.3.108 (Estimates for $(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell=1}$ and $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell=1}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $\underline{k} = (0, k_1, k_2)$, with $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell=1}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell=1}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell=1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}, \quad (15.3.77)$$

and

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell=1}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell=1}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell=1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}. \quad (15.3.78)$$

Proof. Consider first the estimate (15.3.77) in the case that $k_1 = k_2 = 0$. Equation (1.2.15) implies that,

$$\Omega \nabla_3 (r^{-1}(\Omega \hat{\omega}))_{\ell=1} - \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2}(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell=1} = \frac{\Omega^2}{r} (-\rho_{\circ}(\Omega_{\circ}^{-2} \Omega^2)_{\ell=1} - \rho_{\ell=1} + \mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^0),$$

and the proof follows from Lemma 15.1.3, Proposition 9.4.3, and Propositions 15.3.106 and 15.3.107 after recalling that $(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell=1} = 0$ on $\{u = u_f\}$. Consider now the estimate (15.3.78) in the case that $k_1 = k_2 = 0$. Equation (1.2.15) implies,

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega}))_{\ell=1} + 2(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\circ} \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell=1} = -\rho_{\circ}(\Omega_{\circ}^{-2} \Omega^2)_{\ell=1} - \rho_{\ell=1} + \mathcal{E}_{\ell=1}^0,$$

and the proof follows from Lemma 15.1.2, Proposition 9.4.3, and Propositions 15.3.106 and 15.3.107, after recalling that $(\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell=1} = 0$ on $\{v = v_{-1}\}$.

For $k_1 + k_2 \geq 1$, the proofs follow inductively by commuting the equations with either $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_2-1}$ or $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1-1}(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_2}$ and using the fact that

$$\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(\Omega^{-2}\Omega^2) = 2\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ) + 2(\Omega^{-2}\Omega^2 - 1)\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ),$$

and

$$\Omega\nabla_4(\Omega^{-2}\Omega^2) = 2(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ) + 2(\Omega^{-2}\Omega^2 - 1)(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ).$$

□

Estimates for top order derivatives of $\eta_{\ell=1}$, $\underline{\eta}_{\ell=1}$, $(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}$ and $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}$

The following proposition gives estimates for all $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ and $\Omega\nabla_4$ derivatives of $\eta_{\ell=1}$ and $\underline{\eta}_{\ell=1}$ up to order N , meaning that the estimates of Proposition 15.3.102 and Proposition 15.3.103 in fact hold for all $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$.

Proposition 15.3.109 (Estimates for $\eta_{\ell=1}$ and $\underline{\eta}_{\ell=1}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $\underline{k} = (0, k_1, k_2)$, with $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\underline{E}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\underline{E}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\underline{E}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}\underline{E}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

and

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}E\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}E\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}E\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}E\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

where $E = \eta_{\ell=1} - \eta_{\text{Kerr}}$ and $\underline{E} = \underline{\eta}_{\ell=1} - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}}$.

Proof. When $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - 1 - s$ the proposition reduces to Proposition 15.3.102 and Proposition 15.3.103. For the remaining cases the proofs follow from commuting equations (1.2.12), (1.2.13), (1.2.14) with either $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_2-1}$ or $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1-1}(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_2}$ and using Propositions 15.3.98, 15.3.99 and 15.3.108. □

The following proposition gives estimates for all $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ and $\Omega\nabla_4$ derivatives of $(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}$ and $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}$ up to order N , meaning that the estimates of Proposition 15.3.104 and Proposition 15.3.105 in fact hold for all $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - s$, $s = 0, 1, 2$.

Proposition 15.3.110 (Estimate for $(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}$ and $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $\underline{k} = (0, k_1, k_2)$, with $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - s$, for $s = 0, 1, 2$, for any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u_f)$, and any $\max\{u_0, u(R_2, v)\} \leq u \leq u_f$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1})\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1})\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1})\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 \\ + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}}(\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{\ell=1})\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. When $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - 1 - s$ the proposition reduces to Proposition 15.3.104 and Proposition 15.3.105. For the remaining cases the proofs follow from commuting equations (1.2.7), (1.2.10), (1.2.11) with either $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_2-1}$ or $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1-1}(\Omega\nabla_4)^{k_2}$ and using Propositions 15.3.106, 15.3.109 and 15.3.108. □

15.3.6.2 Estimates for $\ell = 0$ modes in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$

This section concerns estimates for the $\ell = 0$ modes of the Ricci coefficients and curvature components on $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$. The main result is the following Proposition.

Theorem 15.3.4 (Improving bootstrap assumptions for energies of $\ell = 0$ modes). *The energies defined in (15.3.3), (15.3.6), (15.3.9), (15.3.12) satisfy,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\ell=0}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell=0}^N[\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell=0}^N[\underline{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\ell=0}^N[S^{\mathcal{H}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. The proof is a direct consequence of Proposition 15.3.117 below. \square

The quantities are estimated separately in the region $r \leq r_0$, where the smallness of Ω_\circ^2 can be exploited, and the region $r_0 \leq r \leq R_2$, where a softer argument is sufficient.

Estimates for $\ell = 0$ modes in the region $r \leq r_0$

The goal of this section is to estimate the $\ell = 0$ modes of the geometric quantities in the region $r \leq r_0$ by exploiting the smallness of r_0 . The main difficulty is in estimating the lower order derivatives. See Propositions 15.3.111–15.3.115. Once the lower order derivatives have been estimated the higher order derivatives are estimated in Proposition 15.3.116.

By Lemma 3.3.1 and the Raychaudhuri equation (1.2.7) (see also (15.3.45)), for any $k \geq 1$, $(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}$ satisfies the commuted equation

$$\begin{aligned} & \Omega \nabla_4 \left((\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^k r^2 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0} + 2(k-1) \Omega \hat{\omega} (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^k r^2 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0} \right. \\ & \quad \left. = \Omega_\circ^2 \sum_{l=0}^k H_l^1 \cdot (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^l (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0} + \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} H_l^2 \cdot (\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^l (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0} + \mathcal{E}^{*k}, \right. \end{aligned} \quad (15.3.79)$$

for some admissible coefficient functions (see (3.2.1)) $H_0^1, \dots, H_k^1, H_0^2, \dots, H_{k-1}^2$. Note that the terms involving $(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}$ in (15.3.79) involve a smallness factor of Ω_\circ^2 .

Define

$$\begin{aligned} F_2[(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}](v) &:= (r_0 - 2M_f) \sup_{u(r_0, v) \leq u \leq u_f} \sum_{l=0}^2 \left(\frac{1}{v^2} \int_{v-1}^{v(r_0, u)} \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^l (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u, v'}}^2 dv' \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{v} \int_{\frac{v}{4} \vee v-1}^{v(r_0, u)} \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^l (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u, v'}}^2 dv' + \int_v^{v(r_0, u)} \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^l (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u, v'}}^2 dv' \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\frac{v}{4} \vee v-1 = \max\{v-1, v/4\}$. Note the smallness factor of $r_0 - 2M_f$. This quantity arises in Propositions 15.3.111 and 15.3.112 below, before $(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}$ itself is estimated. The quantity is then eventually, in Proposition 15.3.113, absorbed by exploiting the smallness factor. Similarly define

$$\begin{aligned} F_1[\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}](v) &:= (r_0 - 2M_f) \sup_{u(r_0, v) \leq u \leq u_f} \sum_{l=0}^1 \left(\frac{1}{v^2} \int_{v-1}^{v(r_0, u)} \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^l \underline{T}_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u, v'}}^2 dv' \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{v} \int_{\frac{v}{4} \vee v-1}^{v(r_0, u)} \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^l \underline{T}_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u, v'}}^2 dv' + \int_v^{v(r_0, u)} \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^l \underline{T}_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u, v'}}^2 dv' \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\underline{T}_{\ell=0} = \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}$.

Proposition 15.3.111 (Estimate for $(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}$ for $r \leq r_0$). *For any $u(r_0, v_{-1}) \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_0, u)$, for $k = 0, 1, 2$, provided r_0 is sufficiently small,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^k T_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u, v}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^k T_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^k T_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^k T_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^2} + F_2[(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}](v), \end{aligned}$$

where $T = \Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ$ and $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r \leq r_0}$.

Proof. Consider some $v_{-1} \leq v_1 < v_2 \leq v(r_0, u)$. Integrating backwards from $u = u_f$, Propositions 15.3.89 and 15.3.94 imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u, v}}^2 + \|\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u, v}}^2 dv \\ & \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v_1^2} + (r_0 - 2M_f)^2 \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|(\Omega^{-1} \nabla_3)^2 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 dv. \end{aligned}$$

Now by equation (15.3.79) (with $k = 2$) it follows, from Proposition 9.4.3 and Proposition 15.3.97 that,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^2(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u,v_1}}^2 + \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^2(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 dv \\ & \lesssim \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^2(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u,v_2}}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v_1^2} \\ & \quad + \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \sum_{l=0}^1 \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^l(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \sum_{l=0}^2 \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^l(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}\mathbb{1}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 dv, \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^2 \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u,v_1}}^2 + \sum_{k=0}^2 \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 dv \\ & \lesssim \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^2(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u,v_2}}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v_1^2} + \sum_{l=0}^2 \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^l(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 dv. \end{aligned}$$

The proof then follows as in that of Lemma 15.1.2. \square

Proposition 15.3.112 (Estimate for $(\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0}$ for $r \leq r_0$). *For any $u(r_0, v_{-1}) \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_0, u)$, for $k = 0, 1, 2$, provided r_0 is sufficiently small,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k(\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k(\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0}\mathbb{1}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k(\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0}\mathbb{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 \\ & \quad + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k(\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0}\mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^2} + F_2[(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}](v), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r \leq r_0}$.

Proof. The proof follows, as in the proof of Proposition 15.3.111, using now equation (1.2.25), which implies,

$$\Omega\nabla_4(r^3(\rho - \rho_\circ)) = r^3 d\text{iv}\beta + 3M_f(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ) + \mathcal{E}^0,$$

after projecting to $\ell = 0$, using Proposition 9.4.3 and the fact that $(d\text{iv}\beta)_{\ell=0}$, by Proposition 15.3.111 and Proposition 15.3.96. \square

Equations (1.2.10) (see also (15.3.46)) and (1.2.15) imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \Omega\nabla_3\left((\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ) + (\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ)\right)_{\ell=0} \\ & = \frac{\Omega^2}{r}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0} - \frac{\Omega^4}{r}\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0} + \Omega^2\mathcal{E}_{\ell=0}^0. \end{aligned} \quad (15.3.80)$$

Note the smallness factor of Ω^2 accompanying the $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}$ term.

Proposition 15.3.113 (Estimate for $(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}$ for $r \leq r_0$). *For any $u(r_0, v_{-1}) \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_0, u)$, for $k = 0, 1, 2$, provided r_0 is sufficiently small,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}\mathbb{1}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}\mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^2} + (r_0 - 2M_f) \sum_{l=0}^1 \sup_{u_0 \leq u \leq u_f} \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^l\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}\mathbb{1}\|_{C_u(v)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (15.3.81)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}\mathbb{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^2} + (r_0 - 2M_f) \sum_{l=0}^1 \sup_{u_0 \leq u' \leq u_f} \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^l\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}\mathbb{1}\|_{S_{u',v}}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (15.3.82)$$

where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r \leq r_0}$.

Proof. Setting

$$\xi = (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o)_{\ell=0} + (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o)_{\ell=0},$$

it follows as in Lemma 15.1.3, using equation (15.3.80) (or rather the corresponding equation for $r^{-1}\xi$) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi \mathbb{1}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\xi \mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 &\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^2} + F_2[(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o)_{\ell=0}](v) \\ &\quad + (r_0 - 2M_f) \sup_{u_0 \leq u \leq u_f} \|\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o)_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}\|_{C_u(v)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

by Proposition 15.3.89, Proposition 15.3.111 and the fact that $(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o)_{\ell=0} = 0$ on $u = u_f$. It moreover follows from the equation (15.3.80) directly, and from applying $\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3$ to (15.3.80) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^2 \left(\|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k \xi \mathbb{1}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k \xi \mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \right) &\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^2} + F_2[(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o)_{\ell=0}](v) \\ &\quad + (r_0 - 2M_f) \sum_{l=0}^1 \sup_{u_0 \leq u \leq u_f} \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^l \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o)_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}\|_{C_u(v)}^2, \quad (15.3.83) \end{aligned}$$

and, by Proposition 15.3.111, the estimate (15.3.83) holds with $(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o)_{\ell=0}$ in place of ξ . The proof of (15.3.81) then follows by taking r_0 sufficiently small and exploiting the Ω_o^2 smallness factor in $F_2[(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o)_{\ell=0}]$. The proof of (15.3.82) follows similarly. \square

Now $(\Omega_o^{-2}\Omega^2 - 1)_{\ell=0}$ can be estimated in the region $r \leq r_0$.

Proposition 15.3.114 (Estimate for $(\Omega_o^{-2}\Omega^2 - 1)_{\ell=0}$ for $r \leq r_0$). *For any $u(r_0, v_{-1}) \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_0, u)$, for $k = 0, 1$, provided r_0 is sufficiently small,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_o^2} - 1 \right)_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_o^2} - 1 \right)_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_o^2} - 1 \right)_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 \\ + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_o^2} - 1 \right)_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^2} + F_1[\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o)_{\ell=0}](v), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r \leq r_0}$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 15.3.111, using now Proposition 15.3.113 and equation (1.2.21), which implies that,

$$\Omega \nabla_4 (\Omega_o^{-2}\Omega^2 - 1)_{\ell=0} = 2(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o)_{\ell=0} + \mathcal{E}_{\ell=0}^0,$$

along with the gauge conditions (15.3.51) and (15.3.53). \square

Similarly, $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o)_{\ell=0}$ can be estimated for $r \leq r_0$.

Proposition 15.3.115 (Estimate for $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o)_{\ell=0}$ for $r \leq r_0$). *For any $u(r_0, v_{-1}) \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_0, u)$, for $k = 0, 1$, provided r_0 is sufficiently small,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o)_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o)_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 \\ + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o)_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o)_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r \leq r_0}$.

Proof. Equation (1.2.7) (see also equation (15.3.48)) implies

$$\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3 \left(\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o)_{\ell=0} \right) - \frac{2}{r} \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o)_{\ell=0} = -\frac{4}{r} \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_o)_{\ell=0} + \mathcal{E}^0. \quad (15.3.84)$$

Using Lemma 15.1.3 and Proposition 15.3.93 for $k = 0$, and the equation (15.3.84) directly for $k = 1$, it follows from Proposition 15.3.114 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\circ})_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 \\ & + \|(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^k \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\circ})_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^2} + F_1[\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\circ})_{\ell=0}](v), \end{aligned}$$

since

$$2\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\circ})_{\ell=0} = \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(\Omega_{\circ}^{-2}\Omega^2 - 1)_{\ell=0} + \mathcal{E}^0.$$

The estimate for the $\|\cdot\|_{C_u(v)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}$ norms follow after taking r_0 sufficiently small. The estimate for the $\|\cdot\|_{\underline{C}_v}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{S_{u,v}}$ norms are similar. \square

Estimates for the higher order derivatives of the $\ell = 0$ modes of the quantities now easily follow.

Proposition 15.3.116 (Estimate for higher order derivatives in $r \leq r_0$). *For*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\ell=0} &= (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\circ})_{\ell=0}, \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\circ})_{\ell=0}, \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_{\circ}^2} - 1\right)_{\ell=0}, (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\circ})_{\ell=0}, \\ & \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\circ})_{\ell=0}, (\rho - \rho_{\circ})_{\ell=0}, \sigma_{\ell=0}, \end{aligned}$$

for any $u(r_0, v_{-1}) \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(r_0, u)$, for $\underline{k} = (0, k_1, k_2)$ with $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - s$ and $s = 0, 1, 2$,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Phi_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Phi_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Phi_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Phi_{\ell=0} \mathbb{1}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

where $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_{r \leq r_0}$.

Proof. For $\Phi_{\ell=0} = \sigma_{\ell=0}$, the equation (1.2.17) projected to $\ell = 0$ takes the schematic form

$$\sigma_{\ell=0} = \mathcal{E}_{\ell=0}^0,$$

and proof follows from applying $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(\Omega \nabla_4)^{k_2}$.

For the remaining quantities, consider first the case that $k_2 = 0$. The proof for $\Phi_{\ell=0} = (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\circ})_{\ell=0}, (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\circ})_{\ell=0}, (\rho - \rho_{\circ})_{\ell=0}$ for $k_1 \leq 2, k_2 = 0$ follows from Propositions 15.3.111–15.3.115, as does the proof for $\Phi_{\ell=0} = \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\circ})_{\ell=0}, \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_{\circ}^2} - 1\right)_{\ell=0}$ for $k_1 \leq 1, k_2 = 0$. For $k_1 = 0$, the proof for $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\circ})_{\ell=0}$ follows from Proposition 15.3.114 and the fact that

$$2\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\circ})_{\ell=0} = \Omega^{-1}\nabla_3(\Omega_{\circ}^{-2}\Omega^2 - 1)_{\ell=0} + \mathcal{E}_{\ell=0}^0.$$

The proof then follows inductively after applying $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1-1}$ to equations (1.2.7), (1.2.10), (1.2.15), (1.2.27) projected to $\ell = 0$, and commuting equation (1.2.15), which takes the schematic form

$$\partial_v(\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\circ}))_{\ell=0} + 2\Omega \hat{\omega} \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\circ})_{\ell=0} = -(\rho - \rho_{\circ})_{\ell=0} + \frac{2M_f}{r^3} \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{\Omega^2}\right)_{\ell=0} + \mathcal{E}_{\ell=0}^0,$$

with $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}$ and using Lemma 15.1.2.

For $k_2 \geq 1$, the proof again follows inductively from applying $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(\Omega \nabla_4)^{k_2-1}$ to the equations (1.2.7), (1.2.11), (1.2.15), (1.2.25) projected to $\ell = 0$ and commuting equation (1.2.15) with $(\Omega^{-1}\nabla_3)^{k_1}(\Omega \nabla_4)^{k_2}$ and using Lemma 15.1.3. \square

Estimates for $\ell = 0$ modes in the region $r_0 \leq r \leq R_2$

The results of the previous section, namely Proposition 15.3.116, can be extended to the region $r_0 \leq r \leq R_2$. The smallness of Ω_{\circ}^2 can no longer be exploited, however the proof of Proposition 15.3.117 below is much simpler than that of Proposition 15.3.116 since, for each u , the difference $v(R_2, u) - v(r_0, u)$ is uniformly bounded independently of u .

Proposition 15.3.117 (Estimates for $\ell = 0$ modes in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\ell=0} &= (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}, \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0}, \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_\circ^2} - 1 \right)_{\ell=0}, (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}, \\ &\quad \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}, (\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0}, \sigma_{\ell=0}, \end{aligned}$$

for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $\max\{v_{-1}, v(r_0, u)\} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$, for $\underline{k} = (0, k_1, k_2)$ with $k_1 + k_2 \leq N - s$ and $s = 0, 1, 2$,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Phi_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Phi_{\ell=0}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Phi_{\ell=0}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\underline{k}} \Phi_{\ell=0}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. Define

$$\overset{(3)}{\Phi}_{\ell=0} = (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}, \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0}, \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_\circ^2} - 1 \right)_{\ell=0}, (\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}, (\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0}, \sigma_{\ell=0},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \overset{(4)}{\Phi}_{\ell=0} &= (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}, \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0}, \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_\circ^2} - 1 \right)_{\ell=0}, \\ &\quad \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}, (\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0}, \sigma_{\ell=0}. \end{aligned}$$

For each $\overset{(3)}{\Phi}_{\ell=0}$ and $\overset{(4)}{\Phi}_{\ell=0}$, by the equations (1.2.7), (1.2.11), (1.2.10), (1.2.15), (1.2.21), (1.2.25), (1.2.26), (1.2.27), (1.2.28) there is some function $h_{\overset{(3)}{\Phi}}(r)$ and $h_{\overset{(4)}{\Phi}}(r)$ respectively, both comparable to 1 in the region $r_0 \leq r \leq R_2$, such that

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \left(h_{\overset{(3)}{\Phi}}(r) \overset{(3)}{\Phi}_{\ell=0} \right) = \sum_{\overset{(4)}{\Phi}} h \cdot \overset{(4)}{\Phi}_{\ell=0} + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}^0, \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega \nabla_4 \left(h_{\overset{(4)}{\Phi}}(r) \overset{(4)}{\Phi}_{\ell=0} \right) = \sum_{\overset{(3)}{\Phi}} h \cdot \overset{(3)}{\Phi}_{\ell=0} + \mathcal{E}^0.$$

Consider first the case that $k_1 = k_2 = 0$. For any $\lambda > 0$, the first equations can be renormalised to give

$$\Omega \nabla_3 \left(r^{-\lambda} h_{\overset{(3)}{\Phi}}(r) \overset{(3)}{\Phi}_{\ell=0} \right) - \frac{\lambda \Omega_\circ^2}{r} r^{-\lambda} h_{\overset{(3)}{\Phi}}(r) \overset{(3)}{\Phi}_{\ell=0} = r^{-\lambda} \sum_{\overset{(4)}{\Phi}} h \cdot \overset{(4)}{\Phi}_{\ell=0},$$

and so, after contracting with $r^{-\lambda} h_{\overset{(3)}{\Phi}}(r) \overset{(3)}{\Phi}_{\ell=0}$,

$$\left| \partial_u \left(\left| r^{-\lambda} h_{\overset{(3)}{\Phi}}(r) \overset{(3)}{\Phi}_{\ell=0} \right|^2 \right) - \frac{\lambda \Omega_\circ^2}{r} \left| r^{-\lambda} h_{\overset{(3)}{\Phi}}(r) \overset{(3)}{\Phi}_{\ell=0} \right|^2 \right| \lesssim \sum_{\overset{(4)}{\Phi}} \left| r^{-\lambda} \overset{(4)}{\Phi}_{\ell=0} \right|^2 + |\mathcal{E}^0|^2, \quad (15.3.85)$$

and similarly,

$$\left| \partial_v \left(\left| r^{-\lambda} h_{\overset{(4)}{\Phi}}(r) \overset{(4)}{\Phi}_{\ell=0} \right|^2 \right) + \frac{\lambda \Omega_\circ^2}{r} \left| r^{-\lambda} h_{\overset{(4)}{\Phi}}(r) \overset{(4)}{\Phi}_{\ell=0} \right|^2 \right| \lesssim \sum_{\overset{(3)}{\Phi}} \left| r^{-\lambda} \overset{(3)}{\Phi}_{\ell=0} \right|^2 + |\mathcal{E}^0|^2, \quad (15.3.86)$$

where the constant implicit in \lesssim is independent of λ . Integrating over the spacetime region $u \leq u' \leq u_f$ and any $v \leq v' \leq v(R_2, u)$ and summing, Propositions 15.3.89–15.3.97 give

$$\lambda \sum_{\overset{(4)}{\Phi}} \|r^{-\lambda} \Phi_{\ell=0}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 + \sum_{\overset{(4)}{\Phi}} \|r^{-\lambda} \Phi_{\ell=0}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \sum_{\overset{(3)}{\Phi}} \|r^{-\lambda} \Phi_{\ell=0}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 \lesssim C_\lambda \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^2} + \sum_{\overset{(3)}{\Phi}} \|r^{-\lambda} \Phi_{\ell=0}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2,$$

where Proposition 15.3.116 is used, after averaging, to estimate the boundary terms on $r = r_0$. After taking λ sufficiently large, it follows that,

$$\sum_{\Phi} \|\Phi_{\ell=0}\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 + \sum_{\substack{(4) \\ \Phi}} \|\Phi_{\ell=0}\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 + \sum_{\substack{(3) \\ \Phi}} \|\Phi_{\ell=0}\|_{C_u(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^2},$$

Integrating the estimates (15.3.85) over $u \leq u' \leq u_f$ and integrating (15.3.86) over $v_{-1} \leq v' \leq v$ it follows that, for each $\Phi_{\ell=0}^{(3)}$ and $\Phi_{\ell=0}^{(4)}$ respectively,

$$\|\Phi_{\ell=0}^{(3)}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\Phi_{\ell=0}^{(4)}\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^2},$$

which completes the proof for $k_1 = k_2 = 0$ (note that, for each $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$, $|v(R_2, u) - v(r_0, u)| \lesssim 1$ and so the estimates on the outgoing null hypersurfaces follow from the estimates on spheres). For $k_1 + k_2 \geq 1$ the proof follows inductively from commuting equations (1.2.15) to control $\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ}$ and $\Omega^{-2}(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ})$, and using the equations directly to control the remaining quantities, as in the proof of Proposition 15.3.116. \square

15.3.7 Estimates for metric components in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$

The main result of this section is the following estimate for the metric components.

Theorem 15.3.5 (Improving bootstrap assumptions for energy of metric components). *The energy for the metric components, defined in Section 6.1.7, satisfies,*

$$\mathbb{E}^N[g^{\mathcal{H}^+}] \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Proof. The proof is a direct consequence of the estimates for b of Proposition 15.3.118, the estimates for $\not{g} - r^2\hat{\gamma}$ of Proposition 15.3.119, and the estimates for the mode differences $Y_m^1 - \check{Y}_m^1$ of Proposition 15.3.120. \square

First, the metric component b is estimated.

Proposition 15.3.118 (Estimate for $b - b_{\text{Kerr}}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For $s = 0, 1, 2$ and $|\gamma| \leq N - s$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,*

$$\|\Omega^{-2}\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}(b - b_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}(b - b_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s},$$

and

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}(b - b_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{C_u(v)}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}(b - b_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

Proof. Equation (1.2.16) implies that

$$\partial_u(b^A - b_{\text{Kerr}}^A) = 2\Omega^2(\eta^A - \underline{\eta}^A) - 2\Omega_{\circ}^2(\eta_{\text{Kerr}}^A - \underline{\eta}_{\text{Kerr}}^A)$$

The proof then follows from Lemma 15.1.3, Propositions 15.3.58, 15.3.59 and 15.3.109, and the fact that $b \equiv 0$ on $u = u_f$. The Ω^{-2} factor in the first estimate can indeed be included by using the fact that, for example,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}(\eta - \eta_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{\underline{C}_v(u)}^2 \lesssim \sup_{u \leq u' \leq u_f} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}(\eta - \eta_{\text{Kerr}})\|_{S_{u',v}}^2 \int_u^{u_f} \Omega(u', v)^2 du' \lesssim \Omega(u, v)^2 \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^s}.$$

\square

Next, the difference between the induced metric on $S_{u,v}$ and the round metric, $\not{g} - r^2\hat{\gamma}$, is estimated.

Proposition 15.3.119 (Estimate for $\not{g} - r^2\hat{\gamma}$ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$). *For any $|\gamma| \leq N$, for any $u_0 \leq u \leq u_f$ and any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}(\not{g} - r^2\hat{\gamma})\|_{S_{u,v}}^2 + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma}(\not{g} - r^2\hat{\gamma})\|_{\underline{C}_v}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v}.$$

Proof. Proposition 10.6.1, Theorem C.5 and Propositions 15.3.49, 15.3.52, 15.3.106, 15.3.117 imply that, on the sphere $S_{u_f, v(R, u_f)}$, for $k \leq N$,

$$\|(r\nabla)^k(\mathfrak{g} - r^2\dot{\gamma})\|_{S_{u_f, v(R, u_f)}}^2 \lesssim v(R, u_f)^{-1}(\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3).$$

Now, on $u = u_f$,

$$\Omega\nabla_4(\mathfrak{g} - r^2\dot{\gamma}) = (\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_\circ)r^2\dot{\gamma} + \Omega\hat{\chi} \times r^2\dot{\gamma} + r^2\dot{\gamma} \times \Omega\hat{\chi},$$

(recalling the notation of Section 1.1.4) and so, in the notation of Lemma 3.3.1,

$$\Omega\nabla_4(\text{tr}(\mathfrak{g} - r^2\dot{\gamma})) = 2(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_\circ) + \text{tr}\left((\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_\circ)(r^2\dot{\gamma} - \mathfrak{g}) + \Omega\hat{\chi} \times (r^2\dot{\gamma} - \mathfrak{g}) + (r^2\dot{\gamma} - \mathfrak{g}) \times \Omega\hat{\chi}\right),$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega\nabla_4(r^2\text{divdiv}(\mathfrak{g} - r^2\dot{\gamma}) + 2r^2\rho) &= r^2\text{divdiv}\left((\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_\circ)r^2\dot{\gamma} - \Omega\hat{\chi} \times (\mathfrak{g} - r^2\dot{\gamma}) + (\mathfrak{g} - r^2\dot{\gamma}) \times \Omega\hat{\chi}\right) \\ &\quad - 2r\Omega_\circ^2\text{div}\underline{\eta} + r^2\Delta\Omega\text{tr}\chi - r^2\Omega\text{tr}\chi\rho + \mathcal{E}^1 + \text{tr}F_4[r\text{div}(\mathfrak{g} - r^2\dot{\gamma})] + r\text{divtr}F_4[\mathfrak{g} - r^2\dot{\gamma}], \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega\nabla_4(r^2\text{curldiv}(\mathfrak{g} - r^2\dot{\gamma}) - 2r^2\sigma) &= r^2\text{curldiv}\left((\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_\circ)r^2\dot{\gamma} - \Omega\hat{\chi} \times (\mathfrak{g} - r^2\dot{\gamma}) + (\mathfrak{g} - r^2\dot{\gamma}) \times \Omega\hat{\chi}\right) \\ &\quad - 2r\Omega_\circ^2\text{curl}\underline{\eta} + r^2\Omega\text{tr}\chi\sigma + \mathcal{E}^1 + \text{tr}F_4[r\text{curl}(\mathfrak{g} - r^2\dot{\gamma})] + r\text{curltr}F_4[\mathfrak{g} - r^2\dot{\gamma}]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, for any ξ ,

$$\|\xi\|_{L^1(S_{u_f, v})} \lesssim \|\xi\|_{L^1(S_{u_f, v(R, u_f)})} + \int_v^{v(R_2, u_f)} \|\Omega\nabla_4\xi\|_{L^1(S_{u_f, v'})} dv'.$$

Proposition 15.3.77, Proposition 15.3.89 and the sharper estimate of Proposition 15.3.17 imply that,

$$\sum_{k \leq N} \left(\int_v^{v(R_2, u_f)} \|(r\nabla)^k(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_\circ)\|_{L^1(S_{u_f, v'})} dv' \right)^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v(R, u_f)} \left(\int_v^{v(R_2, u_f)} \Omega dv' \right)^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v},$$

and so it follows that

$$\sum_{k \leq N} \|(r\nabla)^k \text{tr}(\mathfrak{g} - r^2\dot{\gamma})\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v}.$$

Note now that, for any ξ and any $\delta > 0$,

$$\|\xi\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \|\xi\|_{S_{u_f, v(R, u_f)}}^2 + v^{-\delta} \int_v^{v(R_2, u_f)} (v')^{1+\delta} \|\Omega\nabla_4\xi\|_{S_{u_f, v'}}^2 dv'.$$

Propositions 15.3.18, 15.3.79, 15.3.1, 15.3.100, 15.3.16, 15.3.80 and 15.3.117 imply that

$$\int_v^{v(R_2, u_f)} (v')^{1+\delta} \left(\sum_{k \leq N-1} \|(r\nabla)^k \underline{\eta}\|_{S_{u_f, v'}}^2 + \sum_{k \leq N-2} (\|(r\nabla)^k \rho\|_{S_{u_f, v'}}^2 + \|(r\nabla)^k \sigma\|_{S_{u_f, v'}}^2) \right) dv' \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v^{1-\delta}},$$

and so

$$\sum_{k \leq N-2} \left(\|(r\nabla)^k(r^2\text{divdiv}(\mathfrak{g} - r^2\dot{\gamma}) + 2r^2\rho)\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 + \|(r\nabla)^k(r^2\text{curldiv}(\mathfrak{g} - r^2\dot{\gamma}) - 2r^2\sigma)\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \right) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v}.$$

It then follows from Propositions 9.3.3 and 9.3.4, and Propositions 15.3.1, 15.3.100, 15.3.16, 15.3.80 and 15.3.117 that, on C_{u_f} ,

$$\sum_{k \leq N} \|(r\nabla)^k(\mathfrak{g} - r^2\dot{\gamma})\|_{S_{u_f, v}}^2 \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v}.$$

The proof, when $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma = (r\mathfrak{V})^k$, then follows from commuting the equation

$$\Omega\mathfrak{V}_3(\mathfrak{g} - r^2\mathring{\gamma}) = (\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}_o)r^2\mathring{\gamma} + \Omega\hat{\chi} \times r^2\mathring{\gamma} + r^2\mathring{\gamma} \times \Omega\hat{\chi}, \quad (15.3.87)$$

and integrating backwards from C_{u_f} , using Lemma 15.1.3 and Propositions 15.3.45, 15.3.65, 15.3.110 and 15.3.117. The proof for \mathfrak{D}^γ otherwise follows from directly using the equations (15.3.87) and

$$\Omega\mathfrak{V}_4(\mathfrak{g} - r^2\mathring{\gamma})_{AB} = (\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_o)r^2\mathring{\gamma}_{AB} + \Omega\hat{\chi}_A{}^C \cdot r^2\mathring{\gamma}_{CB} + \Omega\hat{\chi}_B{}^C \cdot r^2\mathring{\gamma}_{CA} - e_A(b^C)r^2\mathring{\gamma}_{CB} - e_B(b^C)r^2\mathring{\gamma}_{AC}.$$

□

Proposition 15.3.119 and Proposition 9.4.1 immediately yield the following estimate on $Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1$.

Proposition 15.3.120 (Estimates for $Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1$). *For all $u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_f$, $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, u)$, the differences $Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1$ satisfy, for $m = -1, 0, 1$,*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N+1} \|(r\mathfrak{V})^k(Y_m^1 - \mathring{Y}_m^1)\|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2 + \varepsilon^3}{v}.$$

Proposition 15.3.120 completes the proof of Proposition 15.3.5 and hence of Theorem C.6.

Part D

Finishing the proof of the main theorem

In this final part of the paper, we shall obtain the final subtheorems necessary to complete the proof of Theorem 6.1.

16 The construction of the teleological gauges and higher order estimates	414
16.1 Existence of anchored $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised gauges: the proof of Theorem 16.1	414
16.2 Monotonicity properties of $\Re(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$: the proof of Theorem 16.2	485
16.3 Higher order estimates: the proof of Theorem 16.3	488
17 Conclusions	491
17.1 Null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ and the laws of gravitational radiation	491
17.2 The event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ and the characterization of the black hole region $\mathcal{M} \setminus J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$	495
17.3 Proof of Theorems 17.1 and 17.2	496
17.4 Axisymmetric solutions with vanishing angular momentum: the proof of Corollary III.3.1	497
Index	497
Bibliography	507

In **Chapter 16**, we shall at last address the issue of the existence of the teleological gauges necessary to complete the openness argument. In **Chapter 17**, we shall obtain the final subtheorems of the proof of Theorem 6.1, concerning the existence of the limiting gauges, and the properties of the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ and future null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ .

This part may in principle be read independently of Part C, though some of the proofs will refer back to arguments from there. Chapters 16 and 17 may be read completely independently of one another.

Chapter 16

The construction of the teleological gauges and higher order estimates

This chapter is concerned with the proofs of Theorem 16.1, Theorem 16.2 and Theorem 16.3, first stated in Sections 7.4 and 7.5.

Contents

16.1	Existence of anchored $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised gauges: the proof of Theorem 16.1	414
16.1.1	Extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauges	415
16.1.2	Existence of $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge	417
16.1.2.1	Foliations of null hypersurfaces	419
16.1.2.2	Existence of a new good sphere and mass: the proof of Theorem 16.1.2	435
16.1.3	Existence of $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge	458
16.1.3.1	Foliations of null hypersurfaces	458
16.1.3.2	Existence of a new good sphere: the proof of Theorem 16.1.3	468
16.2	Monotonicity properties of $\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$: the proof of Theorem 16.2	485
16.3	Higher order estimates: the proof of Theorem 16.3	488

In **Section 16.1**, we give the proof of Theorem 16.1, on the existence of $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised gauges. We then give in **Section 16.2** the proof of Theorem 16.2, concerning the monotonicity properties of the set $\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$. Finally, in **Section 16.3**, we give the proof of Theorem 16.3, concerning estimates for higher order derivatives.

The three sections of this chapter may be read independently, although Section 16.2 will refer to some estimates from Section 16.1. For the construction of Section 16.1, the reader should compare with the construction of the future normalised pure gauge solutions in [DHR] through solving of elliptic equations on spheres and transport equations. Here, a very analogous linear analysis must be supplemented with a nonlinear iteration. For the convenience of the reader, we will explicitly distill the analogous purely linear statements in the language of [DHR] in Remarks 16.1.5 and 16.1.22. These will in particular prove Propositions 2.2.6 and 2.3.8 from Chapter 2. We will also explain how to distill the proof of Theorem 5.7.1 of Chapter 5 in Remarks 16.1.6 and 16.1.23.

16.1 Existence of anchored $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised gauges: the proof of Theorem 16.1

The main result of this section is Theorem 16.1, on the existence of the teleological gauges, which we restate here.

Theorem 16.1 (Existence of anchored $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised gauges). *For $\hat{\varepsilon}_0(M_{\text{init}})$ sufficiently small, let $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$, $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$, $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ be as in the beginning of Section 7.1, and let \mathfrak{B} be the set defined by Definition 7.1.1.*

Let $\hat{u}_f \in \mathfrak{B}$. Then there exists a $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\delta \in [0, \delta_0]$, and all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f)$, with the gauges as defined above, we have the following:

There exists a function

$$M_f : [\hat{u}_f, \hat{u}_f + \delta_0] \times \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad (7.4.1)$$

satisfying (7.1.3), and anchored \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ normalised gauges with respect to $\hat{u}_f + \delta$, $v_\infty = v_\infty(\varepsilon_0, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and $M_f(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$ given by (7.4.1), defined as in Definition 5.6.1, satisfying (7.1.4), (7.1.5) and (7.1.6), with $u_f := \hat{u}_f + \delta$.

The function M_f defined by (7.4.1) is continuous and coincides with the previously defined M_f at $\delta = 0$.

Finally, one may define the map $\mathbf{J}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$ by (7.1.7) as a map

$$\mathbf{J} : [\hat{u}_f, \hat{u}_f + \delta_0] \times \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \quad (7.4.2)$$

and (7.4.2) is a continuous map (i.e. continuous in both λ and δ) and coincides with the previously defined map for $\delta = 0$.

The proof relies first on, for any given \hat{u}_f in the bootstrap set \mathfrak{B} , extending the \hat{u}_f -normalised \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges. In **Section 16.1.1** the definition of such extended gauges is given, and a theorem on the existence of such extensions is stated. In **Section 16.1.2**, the part of the proof of Theorem 16.1 concerning the existence of $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauges is given, along with the properties of the functions M_f and \mathbf{J} . In **Section 16.1.3** the proof of the existence of $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauges is given, thus completing the proof of Theorem 16.1. (Note that δ will here be used as a variable and thus in this section δ no longer denotes (1.3.20).)

16.1.1 Extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauges

This section is concerned with Theorem 16.1.1, stated below, which guarantees that the \hat{u}_f -normalised \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges can be extended for some small time. First, definitions of appropriate extensions of the \hat{u}_f -normalised \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges are stated.

Recall the definition of the set $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ from Chapter 2 (see (2.2.2)). For general \tilde{u}_f and ε_0 , let us define $v_\infty(\tilde{u}_f, \varepsilon_0) = \varepsilon_0^{-2}(\tilde{u}_f)^{100}$. Given u_f, ε_0 , and M_f , for $\delta_1 \geq 0$, define

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, \delta_1) = \{u_{-1} - \delta_1 \leq u \leq u_f + \delta_1\} \cap \{v(R_{-2}, u) \leq v \leq v_\infty(u_f + \delta_1)\}, \quad (16.1.1)$$

and define the corresponding domain

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, \delta_1) := \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, \delta_1) \times \mathbb{S}^2. \quad (16.1.2)$$

(Here $v(R_{-2}, u)$ is defined with respect to M_f . These sets depend in addition on our choice of M_f and ε_0 but we suppress this from the notation.) Note that $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, 0) = \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f)$ and $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, 0) = \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f)$. The following definition extends Definition 2.2.1 of a u_f -normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge to allow for a larger domain $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, \delta_1)$ with $\delta_1 > 0$.

Definition 16.1.1. *Given u_f, M_f, ε_0 and $\delta_1 \geq 0$, let $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, \delta_1)$ and $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, \delta_1)$ be defined by (16.1.1) and (16.1.2) respectively. We say that a metric g in the form (1.2.32) defined on the domain $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, \delta_1)$ and solving the Einstein vacuum equations (1.2.1) is **expressed in δ_1 extended u_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge** if for all $(u, v) \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, \delta_1)$, the induced metric on the spheres $S_{u,v}$, satisfies the roundness condition (1.4.3) with $\psi = \text{id}$, i.e. the assumptions of both Proposition 1.4.1 and Lemma 1.4.6 hold, and projections to spherical harmonics are thus defined, and the following relations hold:*

- $\frac{1}{2}(r^3 \rho_{\ell=0})(u_f, v_\infty(u_f)) = -M_f$;
- $b(u, v_\infty, \theta) = 0$ for all $u \in [u_{-1} - \delta_1, u_f + \delta_1]$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell \neq 1}(u_f, v_\infty(u_f), \theta) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;

- $(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{v}\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1}(u_f, v_\infty(u_f), \theta) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $(\Omega^{-1}\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - (\Omega^{-1}\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_\circ)(u_f, v_\infty(u_f), \theta) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $\mu_{\ell \geq 1}(u, v_\infty(u_f), \theta) = 0$ for all $u \in [u_{-1} - \delta_1, u_f + \delta_1]$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $\underline{\mu}_{\ell \geq 1}^\dagger(u_{-1}, v, \theta) = 0$ for all $v \in [v(R_{-2}, u_{-1}), v_\infty(u_f + \delta_1)]$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $(\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=0}(u, v_\infty(u_f)) = 0$ for all $u \in [u_{-1} - \delta_1, u_f + \delta_1]$;
- $(\Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ)_{\ell=0}(u_{-1}, v) = F(u_{-1})\frac{\Omega^2}{r^3}(u_{-1}, v)$ for all $v \in [v(R_{-2}, u_{-1}), v_\infty(u_f + \delta_1)]$, where

$$F(u) := \frac{1}{2} \int_u^{u_f} \int_{\bar{u}}^{u_f} r^3(\Omega\hat{\chi}, \underline{\alpha})_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}, v_\infty(u_f)) d\hat{u} d\bar{u},$$

where $\underline{\mu}^\dagger$ is defined in (2.2.4).

Note that Definition 16.1.1 coincides with Definition 2.2.1 if $\delta_1 = 0$.

The following definition similarly extends Definition 2.3.1 of a u_f -normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge to allow for a larger domain. Recall the definition of $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ from Chapter 2 (see (2.3.1)). Given u_f, M_f , for $\delta_1 \geq 0$ define

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, \delta_1) = \{u_0 \leq u \leq u_f + \delta_1\} \cap \{v_{-1} - \delta_1 \leq v \leq v(R_2 + \delta_1, u)\}, \quad (16.1.3)$$

and the corresponding domain

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, \delta_1) = \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, \delta_1) \times \mathbb{S}^2. \quad (16.1.4)$$

Again, these domains depend also on M_f to define $v(R_2 + \delta_1, u)$ but we omit this dependence from the notation.

Definition 16.1.2. Given u_f, M_f and $\delta_1 \geq 0$, let $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, \delta_1)$ and $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, \delta_1)$ be defined by (16.1.3) and (16.1.4) respectively. We say that a metric g in the form (1.1.4) defined on the domain $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, \delta_1)$ and solving the Einstein vacuum equations (1.2.1) is **expressed in δ_1 extended u_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge** if for all $(u, v) \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, \delta_1)$, the induced metric on the spheres $S_{u,v}$, satisfies the roundness condition (1.4.3) with $\psi = \text{id}$, i.e. the assumptions of both Proposition 1.4.1 and Lemma 1.4.6 hold, and projections to spherical harmonics are thus defined, and the following relations hold:

- $b(u_f, v, \theta) = 0$ for all $v \in [v_{-1} - \delta_1, v(R_2, u_f + \delta_1)]$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $\mu_{\ell \geq 1}^*(u_f, v(R, u_f), \theta) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}(u_f, v(R, u_f)) = 0$;
- $(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - (\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_\circ)(u_f, v_{-1}, \theta) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $\Omega(u_f, v, \theta) = \Omega_\circ(u_f, v, \theta)$ for all $v \in [v_{-1} - \delta_1, v(R_2, u_f + \delta_1)]$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $\partial_u(r^3(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{v}\eta)_{\ell \geq 1} + r^3\rho_{\ell \geq 1})(u, v_{-1}, \theta) = 0$ for all $u \in [u_0, u_f + \delta_1]$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$;
- $\Omega(u, v_{-1})_{\ell=0} = \Omega_\circ(u, v_{-1})$ for all $u \in [u_0, u_f + \delta_1]$,

where μ^* is defined in (2.3.3).

The following theorem guarantees that the \hat{u}_f -normalised \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges can be indeed extended for some small time δ_1 .

Theorem 16.1.1 (Extension of the \hat{u}_f normalised gauges). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 7.4.1, for all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f)$, the following holds:*

There exists some small $\delta_1 > 0$ and δ_1 extensions of the \hat{u}_f -normalised \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges, in the sense of Definition 16.1.1 and Definition 16.1.2 respectively, with ε_0 as in the statement of Theorem 7.4.1 and $M_f = M_f(\hat{u}_f, \lambda)$ given by Definition 7.1.1, satisfying the anchoring conditions of Definition 5.6.1, where,

in place of the inclusions (5.6.8) and (5.6.9), the domains $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+} = \mathcal{D}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta_1}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+} = \mathcal{D}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta_1}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ of the δ_1 extensions of the \hat{u}_f -normalised \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges satisfy the inclusions,

$$\mathcal{D}_{r \geq R_{-1}}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}_{r \geq R_{-\frac{7}{4}}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}, \quad (16.1.5)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{r \leq R_1}^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cap J^+(S_{u_0, v_0}^{\mathcal{H}^+}) \subset \mathcal{D}_{r \leq R_{\frac{7}{4}}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}. \quad (16.1.6)$$

Moreover, the null cones of the δ_1 extensions of the \hat{u}_f -normalised \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+ gauges satisfy

$$\bigcup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v_2} \underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}}(V_3) \cap \{V_{-1} - 2C\varepsilon \leq V_{data} \leq V_{-1} + 2C\varepsilon\} \cap \{U_0 - 2C\varepsilon \leq U_{data} \leq 2C\varepsilon\}, \quad (16.1.7)$$

$$\bigcup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2} C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3) \cap \{u_{-1} - 2C\varepsilon \leq u_{data} \leq u_2 + 2C\varepsilon\}, \quad (16.1.8)$$

where the constant C is as in Theorem C, and the geometric quantities of the \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge and the \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge satisfy

$$\sup_{\mathcal{D}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta_1}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} |r^{-2} \mathring{g}^{\mathcal{H}^+} - \mathring{\gamma}|_{\mathring{\gamma}} + \sup_{\mathcal{D}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta_1}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} r |r^{-2} \mathring{g}^{\mathcal{I}^+} - \mathring{\gamma}|_{\mathring{\gamma}} + \sup_{\mathcal{D}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta_1}^{\mathcal{H}^+}} |\Omega_o^{-2} \Omega_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2 - 1| + \sup_{\mathcal{D}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta_1}^{\mathcal{I}^+}} |r(\Omega_o^{-2} \Omega_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2 - 1)| \leq \frac{3}{4} \sqrt{\varepsilon}, \quad (16.1.9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta_1}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta_1}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \underline{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta_1}^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta_1}^N[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta_1, \mathcal{H}^+}^N + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta_1, \mathcal{I}^+}^N \leq \frac{3}{4} \varepsilon^2, \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.10)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta_1}^{N+2}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta_1}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta_1}[f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}] \leq 2\varepsilon^2. \quad (16.1.11)$$

Note that the inclusions (16.1.5)–(16.1.8) guarantee that all of the diffeomorphism functions in (16.1.11) are indeed well defined.

Proof. The estimates (7.3.3), (7.3.4) guarantee that the cones $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\underline{C}_{v_{\infty}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $C_{\hat{u}_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, and $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ can be extended as regular cones for some small time δ_1 and, following Propositions 16.1.9, 16.1.11, 16.1.28, 16.1.26 below, the relevant gauge conditions concerning the foliations of these cones by spheres can be extended. By compactness of the domains $W_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f, \delta_1)$ and $W_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f, \delta_1)$ these extended foliations of the extended cones $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $\underline{C}_{v_{\infty}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, $C_{\hat{u}_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, and $\underline{C}_{v_{-1}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ define regular extensions of the spacetime double null parametrisations $i_{\mathcal{I}^+}: W_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f, \delta_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ and $i_{\mathcal{H}^+}: W_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f, \delta_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$. The definitions (1.3.21), (1.3.22) and (1.3.28) of u_3 , V_3 and U_5 guarantee that the initial data regions $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3)$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}}(V_3)$ are large enough so that the improved inclusions (7.3.7)–(7.3.8) imply that the inclusions (16.1.7)–(16.1.8) hold. The inclusions (16.1.5), (16.1.6) similarly follow from the improved inclusions (7.3.5), (7.3.6). The inequalities (16.1.9), (16.1.10) and (16.1.11) follow from the compactness of the domains $W_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f)$ and $W_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f)$, Theorem C, and the fact that the norms depend continuously on δ_1 . \square

16.1.2 Existence of $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge

In this section, and in Section 16.1.3, the proof of Theorem 16.1 is given. This section concerns the following theorem on the existence of $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauges.

Theorem 16.1.2 (Existence of $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge). *There exists $\delta_0 > 0$ and a function*

$$M_f: [\hat{u}_f, \hat{u}_f + \delta_0] \times \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

satisfying (7.1.3) such that, if ε_0 is sufficiently small, for all $\delta \in [0, \delta_0]$ and all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f)$, there exists a smooth $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge with respect to $M_f(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$

$$i_\delta: \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta) \rightarrow \mathcal{M},$$

where $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ is defined in (2.2.3), satisfying the anchoring conditions (5.6.14) and (5.6.17) and the overlap relation (5.6.12), and such that the map

$$i_\delta|_{(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty) \times \mathbb{S}^2} : (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty) \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty} \subset \mathcal{M}, \quad (16.1.12)$$

thought of as a map $\mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}$, is the unique map determined by Proposition 4.4.1 with $h = r^{-2}\not{g}$ (and $p \in S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}$ and $v \in T_p S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}$ chosen so that (5.6.17) holds). The energies $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, \mathcal{I}^+}^N$ of the geometric quantities of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge with respect to $M_f(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$, and the associated diffeomorphism energies $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}[f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}]$, depend continuously on δ . The function M_f satisfies

$$|M_f(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda) - M_f(\hat{u}_f, \lambda)| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{\hat{u}_f}. \quad (16.1.13)$$

If δ_1 is sufficiently small, then each $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge can be extended to a smooth δ_1 extended $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge

$$i_\delta : \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \delta_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{M},$$

in the sense of Definition 16.1.1. For any $0 \leq \delta' < \delta \leq \delta_0$, define

$$F_{\delta', \delta} = i_{\delta'}^{-1} \circ i_\delta : \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta) \rightarrow i_{\delta'}^{-1}(i_\delta(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', \delta_1))),$$

and define $f_{\delta', \delta}^3$, $f_{\delta', \delta}^4$, $\partial_u f_{\delta', \delta}$, $\partial_v f_{\delta', \delta}$ in terms of $F_{\delta', \delta}$ by (4.2.3). These diffeomorphism functions satisfy, for all $u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta$, the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 4} \left(\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_u f_{\delta', \delta}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_v f_{\delta', \delta}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_u f_{\delta', \delta}^4\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + r \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_v f_{\delta', \delta}^3\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \right) \\ + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \left(\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{\delta', \delta}^3\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + r^{-1} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{\delta', \delta}^4\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \right) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon(\delta - \delta')}{\hat{u}_f + \delta'}, \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.14)$$

and, for all $\hat{u}_f + \delta' \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta$,

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} \text{dist}_\gamma(\theta, \not{F}_{\delta', \delta}(u, v_\infty, \theta)) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon(\delta - \delta')}{\hat{u}_f + \delta'}, \quad (16.1.15)$$

where $v_\infty = v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and $\not{F}_{\delta', \delta}(u, v_\infty, \theta) = \pi_{\mathbb{S}^2} \circ F_{\delta', \delta}(u, v_\infty, \theta)$, where $\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2}$ is the projection to the \mathbb{S}^2 argument.

Finally, one may extend the map $\mathbf{J}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$ defined by (7.1.7) as a map

$$\mathbf{J} : [\hat{u}_f, \hat{u}_f + \delta_0] \times \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3. \quad (16.1.16)$$

The map (16.1.16) is continuous in both λ and δ and coincides with the previously defined map for $\delta = 0$.

Remark 16.1.3. It is manifest from the proof of Theorem 16.1.2 that, for fixed $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f)$ and fixed $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$, the mass $M_f(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$ and the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge with respect to $M_f(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$ are unique amongst all such nearby masses and gauges, satisfying the anchoring conditions (5.6.14) and (5.6.17), such that the map (16.1.12), thought of as a map $\mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}$, is the unique map determined by Proposition 4.4.1 with $h = r^{-2}\not{g}$ (and p and v chosen so that (5.6.17) holds).

Remark 16.1.4. For $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$ the proof of Theorem 16.1.2 involves proving suitable a priori estimates for the diffeomorphism functions $f_{0, \delta}$. Weaker estimates than (16.1.14) and (16.1.15) suffice for the proof, where the δ factor provides sufficient smallness and the decay factor of $(\hat{u}_f)^{-1}$ is not necessary. The stronger estimates, with the decay factor of $(\hat{u}_f)^{-1}$, and the more general estimates for $\delta' \neq 0$, are used in the proof of Theorem 16.2.

Remark 16.1.5. For any u_f , the existence of the analogue of a u_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge in linear theory, namely the proof of Proposition 2.2.6, can be inferred from (a considerable simplification of) the proof of Theorem 16.1.2. We will explicitly distill this proof in Remarks 16.1.12 and 16.1.17 below.

Remark 16.1.6. Recall the double null parametrisation (5.5.6) of Theorem 5.5.2, and let u_f^0 be as defined in Section 1.3.5. The proof of Theorem 16.1.2 can readily be adapted to give the existence of a mass $M_f(u_f^0, \lambda)$ and a u_f^0 normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge with respect to $M_f(u_f^0, \lambda)$, satisfying the anchoring conditions (5.6.14) and (5.6.17), and such that the map (16.1.12), thought of as a map $\mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}$, is the unique map determined by Proposition 4.4.1 with $h = r^{-2}\not{g}$ (and p and v chosen so that (5.6.17) holds) (cf. the proof of Theorem 5.7.1) by replacing the role of the δ_1 extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge of Theorem 16.1.1 with the double null parametrisation (5.5.6) of Theorem 5.5.2, and replacing any invocation of the smallness of δ_0 with the smallness of $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$. In fact, the existence of u_f^0 normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge is much simpler than the proof of Theorem 16.1.2 in view of the fact that $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ can be chosen to be small with respect to u_f^0 . Moreover, it is implicit from the construction that this mass and gauge are unique amongst all such nearby masses and gauges (cf. Remark 16.1.3). See Remarks 16.1.13 and 16.1.18 below for further discussion.

The proof of Theorem 16.1.2 is divided into two parts. For a fixed $\delta \in [0, \delta_0]$, the first part of the proof involves showing that, for any sphere suitably close to the sphere $S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge and for any mass M suitably close to M_f , there exist certain foliations of the corresponding null hypersurfaces defined by the sphere. The foliations attain a subset of the defining conditions of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge with mass M . The existence of such foliations is addressed in **Section 16.1.2.1**. See Proposition 16.1.7. The second part of the proof of Theorem 16.1.2 involves finding an appropriate sphere and mass such that, in the double null foliation arising from the foliations of the resulting cones of Proposition 16.1.7, the remaining defining conditions of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge are attained. The existence of such a sphere and mass is addressed in **Section 16.1.2.2**, along with the properties of the map (16.1.16) and the diffeomorphisms $F_{\delta', \delta}$.

16.1.2.1 Foliation of null hypersurfaces

Throughout this section $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f)$ is fixed and the dependence of quantities on λ is suppressed. Recall that the boundary components of the causal future and causal past of any spacelike 2-sphere are null hypersurfaces. Suppose S is any sphere suitably close to $S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ denote the incoming component of the boundary of the causal past of S . Suppose a foliation of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ by spheres is given, described by the level hypersurfaces of a function \tilde{u} . This foliation defines a sphere \tilde{S} , the sphere of the foliation at parameter time u_{-1} . Let $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{u_{-1}}$ denote the outgoing component of the boundary of the causal past of \tilde{S} . Any foliation of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{u_{-1}}$ by spheres then defines a spacetime double null foliation by considering the outgoing components of the boundaries of the causal past of the spheres of the foliation of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$, and the incoming components of the boundaries of the causal future of the spheres of the foliation of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{u_{-1}}$. Under suitable smallness conditions, this spacetime double null foliation will be regular in the image of the domain of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, $i_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f, \delta_1))$. The first step in the proof of Theorem 16.1.2 is the following proposition which states that, given any such sphere suitably close to $S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$, and any mass M suitably close to $M_f = M_f(\hat{u}_f)$, there exist foliations of the two corresponding null hypersurfaces defined by this sphere such that, in the corresponding spacetime double null foliation, a subset of the defining properties of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge are satisfied with mass M . Recall that

$$\underline{\mu}_M^\dagger = d\mathcal{I}v\eta + \rho - \rho_{\circ, M} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{\chi} \cdot \hat{\chi} + \frac{\Omega_{\circ, M}^2}{2r_M} \left(\frac{\text{tr}\chi}{\Omega} - \frac{(\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_{\circ, M}}{\Omega_{\circ, M}^2} \right).$$

Proposition 16.1.7 (Foliation of cones corresponding to any sphere close to $S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$). *Let S be a sphere defined, in the $(u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ coordinate system of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, by smooth functions $s^3, s^4: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,*

$$S = \{i_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta + s^3(\theta), v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta) + s^4(\theta), \theta) \mid \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2\}.$$

Suppose that s^3 and s^4 satisfy

$$\sum_{k \leq 5} (\|(r\nabla)^k s^3\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} + \|(r\nabla)^k s^4\|_{\mathbb{S}^2}) \leq \tau,$$

for some τ sufficiently small, so that S is appropriately close to the sphere $S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f+\delta)}$. Let also $M > 0$ denote any mass which is close to the mass $M_f = M_f(\hat{u}_f)$ in the sense that

$$|M - M_f| \leq \tau.$$

Then, if δ_0 and τ are sufficiently small with respect to \hat{u}_f and $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ is sufficiently small (independent of \hat{u}_f), there exists a smooth foliation of the past incoming cone, $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f+\delta)}$, of S and a smooth foliation of the past outgoing cone, $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$, of the sphere $\tilde{S}_{u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f+\delta)}$ (defined to be the sphere at parameter time $u_{-1} - (\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ in the past of S along $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f+\delta)}$) such that the geometric quantities of the associated spacetime double null foliation satisfy

$$\mu_{\ell \geq 1}(u, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } u \in [u_{-1}, \hat{u}_f + \delta], \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2; \quad (16.1.17)$$

$$\underline{\mu}_{\ell \geq 1}^\dagger(u_{-1}, v, \theta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } v \in [v(R_{-2}, u_{-1}), v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)], \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2; \quad (16.1.18)$$

$$(\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ, M}^2)_{\ell=0}(u, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)) = 0 \quad \text{for all } u \in [u_{-1}, \hat{u}_f + \delta]; \quad (16.1.19)$$

$$(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\circ, M})_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2; \quad (16.1.20)$$

and

$$(\Omega \hat{\omega} - (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\circ, M})_{\ell=0}(u_{-1}, v) = F(u_{-1}) \frac{\Omega_{\circ, M}^2}{r^3}(u_{-1}, v) \quad \text{for all } v \in [v(R_{-2}, u_{-1}), v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)], \quad (16.1.21)$$

where

$$F(u) := \frac{1}{2} \int_u^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} \int_{\bar{u}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} r^3 (\Omega \hat{\chi}, \underline{\alpha})_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}, v_\infty) d\hat{u} d\bar{u}.$$

Instead of showing Proposition 16.1.7 directly, it will first be shown that, for any sphere close to $S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ (rather than the sphere $S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$), the desired foliations of its corresponding cones can be found. It will then afterwards be shown that any sphere close to $S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ can be attained by an appropriate choice of sphere close to $S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$. It will therefore be supposed that \tilde{S} is a sphere defined, in the $(u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ coordinate system, by smooth functions j^3, j^4 ,

$$\tilde{S} = \{i_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_{-1} + j^3(\theta), v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta) + j^4(\theta), \theta) \mid \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2\}. \quad (16.1.22)$$

The functions j^3 and j^4 will be assumed to satisfy

$$\sum_{k \leq 5} (\|(r \nabla)^k j^3\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} + \|(r \nabla)^k j^4\|_{\mathbb{S}^2}) \leq \tau,$$

so that \tilde{S} is appropriately close to the sphere $S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$. For such an \tilde{S} , let $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ be the incoming component of the causal future of \tilde{S} and let $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$ be the outgoing component of the causal past of \tilde{S} . Note that, provided τ is suitably small, the sphere \tilde{S} is contained in the image of the domain of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, $\tilde{S} \subset i_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f, \delta_1))$, and the cones $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ and $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$ are arbitrarily close to the cones $\underline{C}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ and $C_{u_{-1}}$ respectively of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge. In particular, $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ and $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$, when restricted to $i_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f, \delta_1))$, are regular null hypersurfaces. The cones $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ and $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$ will each be foliated in such a way that the relevant regions of the cones also live in the region $i_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f, \delta_1))$ covered by the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge.

Foliations of the incoming null hypersurface $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$

Consider an incoming null hypersurface \underline{C} in (\mathcal{M}, g) foliated by spheres described by the level hypersurfaces of a function $u : \underline{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Consider the null generator \underline{L} of \underline{C} satisfying $\underline{L}(u) = 1$. There exists a unique conjugate null vector field L' on \underline{C} satisfying

$$g(\underline{L}, L') = -2.$$

If \underline{C} is an incoming null hypersurface of a given spacetime double null foliation, and its foliation by spheres coincides with that obtained by intersecting \underline{C} with the outgoing null hypersurfaces of the spacetime double null foliation, then the vectors of the double null frame e_3, e_4 are related to \underline{L}, L' by

$$\underline{L} = \Omega e_3, \quad L' = \Omega^{-1} e_4.$$

It follows that many of the Ricci coefficients and curvature components of the spacetime double null foliation can be expressed entirely in terms of \underline{L} and L' . For example, if X is a vector field tangent to the level hypersurfaces of u ,

$$\eta(X) = -\frac{1}{2}g(\nabla_{\underline{L}}X, L'), \quad \rho = \frac{1}{4}R(L', \underline{L}, L', \underline{L}). \quad (16.1.23)$$

Though the same is not true of Ricci coefficients such as $\underline{\hat{\omega}}$ and $\hat{\chi}$, certain Ω rescaled quantities can also be expressed entirely in terms of \underline{L} and L' . For example, if X and Y are tangential to the level hypersurfaces of u ,

$$\Omega \underline{\hat{\omega}} = \frac{1}{4}g(\nabla_{\underline{L}}L', \underline{L}), \quad \Omega^{-1}\chi(X, Y) = g(\nabla_X L', Y), \quad \Omega \underline{\chi}(X, Y) = g(\nabla_X \underline{L}, Y), \quad (16.1.24)$$

$$\Omega^{-1}\hat{\chi}(X, Y) = \Omega^{-1}\chi(X, Y) - \Omega^{-1}\text{tr}\chi g(X, Y), \quad \Omega \hat{\underline{\chi}}(X, Y) = \Omega \underline{\chi}(X, Y) - \Omega \text{tr}\chi g(X, Y), \quad (16.1.25)$$

and

$$\Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}(X, Y) = R(X, \underline{L}, Y, \underline{L}), \quad (16.1.26)$$

The following proposition relates certain geometric quantities associated to two different foliations of the incoming null hypersurface $\underline{C}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f+\delta)}$.

Proposition 16.1.8 (Change of foliation relations on incoming cones). *For a given sphere \tilde{S} as in (16.1.22), let u denote the restriction to $\underline{C}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f+\delta)}$ of the u coordinate of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge. Consider another foliation of $\underline{C}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f+\delta)}$ by spheres, described by the level hypersurfaces of a function \tilde{u} . Suppose u and \tilde{u} are related by*

$$u = \tilde{u} + f^3(\tilde{u}, \theta), \quad (16.1.27)$$

for some function $f^3 : [u_{-1}, \hat{u}_f + \delta_1] \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then the corresponding geometric quantities μ and $\Omega \underline{\hat{\omega}}$ are related by

$$\tilde{\Delta} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3(\tilde{u}, \theta)) = \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{u}, \theta) - \mu(\tilde{u} + f^3, \theta) + F_\mu(\tilde{\nabla} f^3, \tilde{\nabla}^2 f^3, \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3, \tilde{\nabla} \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3),$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial_{\tilde{u}} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3)(\tilde{u}, \theta) = \tilde{\Omega} \underline{\hat{\omega}}(\tilde{u}, \theta) - (1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3(\tilde{u}, \theta)) \Omega \underline{\hat{\omega}}(\tilde{u} + f^3, \theta).$$

Here $\tilde{\nabla}$ denotes the Levi-Civita connection of the induced metric on the level hypersurfaces of \tilde{u} , and F_μ is a function which satisfies

$$r^2 |F_\mu(\tilde{\nabla} f^3, \tilde{\nabla}^2 f^3, \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3, \tilde{\nabla} \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3)| \lesssim (|r \tilde{\nabla} f^3| + |(r \tilde{\nabla})^2 f^3| + |\partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3| + |r \tilde{\nabla} \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3| + \frac{1}{r}) |r \tilde{\nabla} f^3| + |(r \tilde{\nabla})^2 f^3|. \quad (16.1.28)$$

In particular, if $|r \tilde{\nabla} f^3| + |(r \tilde{\nabla})^2 f^3| + |\partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3| + |r \tilde{\nabla} \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3| \lesssim 1$, then F_μ satisfies

$$r^2 |F_\mu(\tilde{\nabla} f^3, \tilde{\nabla}^2 f^3, \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3, \tilde{\nabla} \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3)| \lesssim |r \tilde{\nabla} f^3| + |(r \tilde{\nabla})^2 f^3|.$$

Proof. Let \underline{L} and $\tilde{\underline{L}}$ denote the null generators of $\underline{C}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f+\delta)}$ which satisfy

$$\underline{L}(u) = 1, \quad \tilde{\underline{L}}(\tilde{u}) = 1,$$

respectively. Clearly $\tilde{\underline{L}} = a \underline{L}$ for some a and, by applying to the relation (16.1.27), it follows that

$$\tilde{\underline{L}} = (1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3) \underline{L}.$$

Now defining $e_A = \partial_{\theta^A}$ in the (u, θ) coordinate system for $\tilde{C}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$, and $\tilde{e}_A = \tilde{\partial}_{\theta^A}$ in the (\tilde{u}, θ) coordinate system, it follows again from (16.1.27) that

$$\tilde{e}_A = e_A + \partial_{\theta^A} f^3 \underline{L}.$$

In particular, $\tilde{g}_{AB} = g(\tilde{e}_A, \tilde{e}_B) = g(e_A, e_B) = g_{AB}$. If now L' and \tilde{L}' denote the conjugate null vectors to \underline{L} and $\tilde{\underline{L}}$ respectively, satisfying $g(L', \underline{L}) = g(\tilde{L}', \tilde{\underline{L}}) = -2$, it follows, after writing $\tilde{L}' = aL' + b\underline{L} + c^A e_A$ and using the fact that $g(\tilde{L}', \tilde{L}') = 0$, $g(\tilde{L}', \tilde{\underline{L}}) = -2$ and $g(\tilde{L}', \tilde{e}_A) = 0$ to compute a , b and c^A , that

$$\tilde{L}' = (1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3)^{-1} [L' + |\tilde{\nabla} f^3|^2 \underline{L} + 2\tilde{g}^{AB} \partial_{\theta^A} f^3 e_B],$$

where $|\tilde{\nabla} f^3|^2 = \tilde{g}^{AB} \partial_{\theta^A} f^3 \partial_{\theta^B} f^3$.

From the above relations, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} -2\tilde{\eta}(\tilde{e}_A) &= g(\nabla_{\tilde{\underline{L}}} \tilde{e}_A, \tilde{L}') \\ &= (1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3)^{-1} \partial_{\tilde{u}} \partial_{\theta^A} f^3 g(\underline{L}, L') + g(\nabla_{\underline{L}} e_A + \partial_{\theta^A} f^3 \nabla_{\underline{L}} \underline{L}, L') + |\tilde{\nabla} f^3|^2 \underline{L} + 2\tilde{g}^{BC} \partial_{\theta^B} f^3 e_C \\ &= -2(1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3)^{-1} \partial_{\tilde{u}} \partial_{\theta^A} f^3 - 2\eta(e_A) + \Omega \chi_A{}^B \partial_{\theta^B} f^3 - 4\Omega \hat{\omega} \partial_{\theta^A} f^3. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\tilde{\rho} - \rho = \tilde{\nabla} f^3 \otimes \tilde{\nabla} f^3 \cdot \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha} - 2\tilde{\nabla} f^3 \cdot \Omega \underline{\beta},$$

where

$$\tilde{\nabla} f^3 \otimes \tilde{\nabla} f^3 \cdot \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha} = \tilde{g}^{AB} \tilde{g}^{CD} \partial_{\theta^A} f^3 \partial_{\theta^C} f^3 \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}_{BD}, \quad \tilde{\nabla} f^3 \cdot \Omega \underline{\beta} = \tilde{g}^{AB} \partial_{\theta^A} f^3 \Omega \underline{\beta}_B.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\Omega \chi}(\tilde{e}_A, \tilde{e}_B) &= (1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3) \Omega \chi(e_A, e_B), \\ \widetilde{\Omega^{-1} \chi}(\tilde{e}_A, \tilde{e}_B) &= (1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3)^{-1} [2\tilde{\nabla}_{A,B}^2 f^3 + \Omega^{-1} \chi(e_A, e_B) + 2(\eta_A \partial_{\theta^B} f^3 + \eta_B \partial_{\theta^A} f^3) + 4\Omega \hat{\omega} \partial_{\theta^A} f^3 \partial_{\theta^B} f^3 \\ &\quad + |\tilde{\nabla} f^3|^2 \Omega \chi_{AB} - 2\partial_{\theta^C} f^3 (\Omega \chi_A{}^C \partial_{\theta^B} f^3 + \Omega \chi_A{}^C \partial_{\theta^B} f^3) - 2(\partial_{\theta^A} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3) \partial_{\theta^B} f^3 + \partial_{\theta^B} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3) \partial_{\theta^A} f^3)]. \end{aligned}$$

After recalling that $\mu = d\iota v \eta + \rho - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\chi} \cdot \hat{\chi}$, these relations combine to give the expression for $\tilde{\mu} - \mu$. The expression involving $\widetilde{\Omega \hat{\omega}}$ can be computed similarly, using the fact that

$$\Omega \hat{\omega} = \frac{1}{4} g(\nabla_{\underline{L}} L', \underline{L}).$$

We finally note also that

$$\widetilde{\Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}}(\tilde{e}_A, \tilde{e}_B) = (1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3)^2 \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}(e_A, e_B).$$

□

Rather than foliate the incoming cone $\tilde{C}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ directly by the condition that $(\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=0} = 0$, which is not a condition which can be expressed entirely in terms of the vectors \underline{L} and L' , it is first shown that the incoming cone can be foliated by certain conditions which involve only the above quantities $\Omega \hat{\omega}$ and $\Omega \text{tr} \chi$, which can be expressed entirely in terms of \underline{L} and L' (see (16.1.24) and (16.1.25)). The foliation achieving the condition $(\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=0} = 0$ will be shown to exist simultaneously with the foliation of $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$ achieving the conditions (16.1.18) and (16.1.21) in the proof of Proposition 16.1.7 below.

In order to motivate the foliations constructed in Proposition 16.1.9 below, note first that, in a given spacetime double null foliation,

$$\partial_u (\Omega_\circ^{-1} \Omega_{\ell=0} - 1) = \Omega \hat{\omega}_{\ell=0} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_\circ - \underline{\mathcal{F}}, \quad (16.1.29)$$

where

$$\underline{\mathcal{F}} = -(\Omega_\circ^{-1} \Omega_{\ell=0} - 1)(\Omega \hat{\omega}_{\ell=0} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_\circ) - (\Omega_\circ^{-1} \Omega_{\ell \geq 1} (\Omega \hat{\omega})_{\ell \geq 1})_{\ell=0} - (\Omega_\circ^{-1} \Omega (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell \geq 1})_{\ell=0}.$$

Equation (1.2.21) implies that,

$$\Omega_o^{-1}\Omega(u, v_\infty, \theta) = \Omega_o^{-1}\Omega(u_{-1}, v_\infty, \theta) e^{\int_{u_{-1}}^u (\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_o)(u', v_\infty, \theta) du'}, \quad (16.1.30)$$

and so $\underline{\mathcal{F}}$ can be viewed as a function of u , for any given $\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_o$, $\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}_o$, and $\Omega_o^{-1}\Omega(u_{-1}, v_\infty, \cdot)$, i.e., abusing notation,

$$\underline{\mathcal{F}} = \underline{\mathcal{F}}(\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_o, \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}_o, \Omega_o^{-1}\Omega(u_{-1}, v_\infty, \cdot)) : [u_{-1}, \hat{u}_f + \delta] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

Proposition 16.1.9 (Foliations of the incoming cone $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$). *Let \tilde{S} be a sphere defined, in the coordinate system of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, by smooth functions j^3, j^4 ,*

$$\tilde{S} = \{i_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_{-1} + j^3(\theta), v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta) + j^4(\theta), \theta) \mid \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2\}.$$

such that j^3 and j^4 satisfy

$$\sum_{k \leq 5} (\|(r\nabla)^k j^3\|_{\tilde{S}} + \|(r\nabla)^k j^4\|_{\tilde{S}}) \leq \tau.$$

Consider also a mass M satisfying the smallness assumption of Proposition 16.1.7, a constant $A \in \mathbb{R}$, and a smooth function $q : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$|A| + \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} |q(\theta)| \leq \tau.$$

Then, provided τ and δ_0 are sufficiently small, there exists a smooth foliation of the incoming cone, $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$, of \tilde{S} such that, on $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$, the geometric quantities μ and $\Omega\hat{\omega}$ of this foliation satisfy

$$\mu_{\ell \geq 1}(\tilde{u}, \theta) = 0, \quad (\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_{o,M})_{\ell=0}(\tilde{u}) = \underline{\mathcal{F}}[\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_{o,M}, \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}_{o,M}, q](\tilde{u}),$$

for all $\tilde{u} \in [u_{-1}, \hat{u}_f + \delta]$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$, and,

$$\partial_{\tilde{u}} f_{\ell=0}^3(u_{-1}) = A,$$

where f^3 is the diffeomorphism which relates this foliation of $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ to the foliation of $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ obtained by intersecting with the outgoing cones C_u , for $u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta_1$, of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge, so that $u = \tilde{u} + f^3(\tilde{u}, \theta)$.

Proof. Let $\mu, \Omega\hat{\omega}, \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}$ denote the geometric quantities of the foliation of $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ obtained by intersecting $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ with the outgoing hypersurfaces of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge. Note that, by continuity and compactness, these quantities are sufficiently close to their values in the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge if τ and δ are sufficiently small. By Proposition 16.1.8, the goal is to construct a function $f^3 : [u_{-1}, \hat{u}_f + \delta] \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\tilde{\Delta} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3(\tilde{u}, \theta)) = \left[-\mu(\tilde{u} + f^3, \theta) + F_\mu(\tilde{\nabla} f^3, \tilde{\nabla}^2 f^3, \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3, \tilde{\nabla} \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3) \right]_{\ell \geq 1},$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} [\partial_{\tilde{u}} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3)(\tilde{u}, \cdot)]_{\ell=0} = \hat{\underline{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{u}) + [\Omega\hat{\omega}_{o,M}(\tilde{u}) - (1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3(\tilde{u}, \cdot))\Omega\hat{\omega}(\tilde{u} + f^3(\tilde{u}, \cdot), \cdot)]_{\ell=0},$$

along with the initial conditions,

$$f^3(u_{-1}, \cdot) = j^3, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}} f_{\ell=0}^3(u_{-1}) = A,$$

where

$$\hat{\underline{\mathcal{F}}} = \underline{\mathcal{F}}(\Omega\hat{\omega}_{o,M} + \frac{1}{2} \partial_{\tilde{u}} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3) + (1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3)\Omega\hat{\omega}_{f^3}, \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}_{o,M} + (1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3)\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}_{f^3}, q),$$

and

$$\Omega\hat{\omega}_{f^3}(\tilde{u}, \theta) = \Omega\hat{\omega}(\tilde{u} + f^3(\tilde{u}, \theta), \theta), \quad \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}_{f^3}(\tilde{u}, \theta) = \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}(\tilde{u} + f^3(\tilde{u}, \theta), \theta).$$

Here $\widetilde{\ell \geq 1}$ and $\widetilde{\ell = 0}$ denote the mode projections with respect to the spheres defined as the level hypersurfaces of \tilde{u} , where $u = \tilde{u} + f^3(\tilde{u}, \theta)$. Define, therefore, $f_{[0]} = 0$ and, for $n \geq 1$, iterates $f_{[n]}$ as solutions of

$$\Delta_{[n-1]} \log(1 + \partial_u f_{[n]}^3(u, \theta)) = \left[-\mu(u + f_{[n-1]}^3, \theta) + F_\mu(\nabla f_{[n-1]}^3, \nabla^2 f_{[n-1]}^3, \partial_u f_{[n-1]}^3, \nabla \partial_u f_{[n-1]}^3) \right]_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}}, \quad (16.1.31)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} [\partial_u \log(1 + \partial_u f_{[n]}^3)(u, \cdot)]_{(\ell=0)_{[n-1]}} = \mathcal{F}_{[n-1]}(u) + [\Omega \hat{\omega}_{\circ, M} - (1 + \partial_u f_{[n-1]}^3(u, \cdot)) \Omega \hat{\omega}(u + f_{[n-1]}^3(u, \cdot), \cdot)]_{(\ell=0)_{[n-1]}}, \quad (16.1.32)$$

along with the initial conditions,

$$f_{[n]}^3(u_{-1}, \cdot) = j^3, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}}(f_{[n]}^3)_{(\ell=0)_{[n-1]}}(u_{-1}) = A,$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_{[n-1]} = \mathcal{F}(\Omega \hat{\omega}_{\circ, M} + \frac{1}{2} \partial_u \log(1 + \partial_u f_{[n-1]}^3) + (1 + \partial_u f_{[n-1]}^3) \Omega \hat{\omega}_{f_{[n-1]}^3}, \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M} + (1 + \partial_u f_{[n-1]}^3) \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{f_{[n-1]}^3}, q),$$

where $(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}$ and $(\ell = 0)_{[n-1]}$ denote the mode projections with respect to the spheres defined as the level hypersurfaces of $u_{[n-1]}$, where $u_{[n-1]}$ is defined implicitly by $u = u_{[n-1]} + f_{[n-1]}^3(u_{[n-1]}, \theta)$.

Define

$$g_{[n]} = \log(1 + \partial_u f_{[n]}^3),$$

so that

$$f_{[n]}^3(u, \theta) = j^3(\theta) + \int_{u_{-1}}^u e^{g_{[n]}(u', \theta)} - 1 du'.$$

Consider some $U > u_{-1}$. It follows, by induction, that, provided $U - u_{-1}$ is sufficiently small,

$$\sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r \nabla)^k f_{[n]}^3\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \leq 2\tau, \quad \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r \nabla)^k \partial_u f_{[n]}^3\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \leq C_1 \tau, \quad (16.1.33)$$

for all n , for some constant C_1 to be chosen. Indeed, suppose that (16.1.33) holds for some $n \geq 1$. A standard elliptic estimate for (16.1.31) and transport estimate for (16.1.32) gives, for all $u_{-1} \leq u \leq U$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r \nabla)^k g_{[n+1]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} &\lesssim \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r \nabla)^k f_{[n]}^3\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + (U - u_{-1}) \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 4} \|(r \nabla)^k \partial_u f_{[n]}^3\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \\ &\quad + |M - M_f| + |\log(1 + A)| + (U - u_{-1}) \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} |q(\theta)|. \end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r \nabla)^k \partial_u f_{[n+1]}^3\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r \nabla)^k g_{[n+1]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}},$$

and

$$\sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r \nabla)^k f_{[n+1]}^3\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \leq \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r \nabla)^k j^3\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}} + C(U - u_{-1}) \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r \nabla)^k g_{[n+1]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}},$$

and hence (16.1.33) holds with $n + 1$ in place of n if $U - u_{-1}$ is sufficiently small, and C_1 is chosen to be sufficiently large.

Similarly, considering now the differences of the systems (16.1.31) and (16.1.32) for $n + 1$ and n respectively, and using the estimates (16.1.33), it follows from (16.1.33) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r \nabla)^k (g_{[n+1]} - g_{[n]})\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} &\lesssim \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r \nabla)^k (f_{[n]}^3 - f_{[n-1]}^3)\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \\ &\quad + (\tau + (U - u_{-1})) \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 4} \|(r \nabla)^k (\partial_u f_{[n]}^3 - \partial_u f_{[n-1]}^3)\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (\partial_u f_{[n+1]}^3 - \partial_u f_{[n]}^3)\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} &\lesssim \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (f_{[n]}^3 - f_{[n-1]}^3)\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} \\ &\quad + (\tau + (U - u_{-1})) \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 4} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (\partial_u f_{[n]}^3 - \partial_u f_{[n-1]}^3)\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (f_{[n+1]}^3 - f_{[n]}^3)\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} &\lesssim (U - u_{-1}) \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (f_{[n]}^3 - f_{[n-1]}^3)\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} \\ &\quad + (U - u_{-1})(\tau + (U - u_{-1})) \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 4} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (\partial_u f_{[n]}^3 - \partial_u f_{[n-1]}^3)\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}, \end{aligned}$$

from which it follows that

$$\sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (f_{[n+1]}^3 - f_{[n]}^3)\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} \lesssim (U - u_{-1}) \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq U} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (f_{[n]}^3 - f_{[n-1]}^3)\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}.$$

Hence, if $U - u_{-1}$ is sufficiently small, the map which takes $f_{[n]}^3$ to $f_{[n+1]}^3$ is a contraction and the sequence $\{f_{[n]}^3\}$ converges to a limit f^3 on $[u_{-1}, U]$ satisfying the estimate (16.1.33).

The proof then follows from dividing the interval $[u_{-1}, \hat{u}_f + \delta]$ into subintervals of size $U - u_{-1}$ and repeating the proof, using now the estimate (16.1.33) for f^3 in place of the assumptions on j^3 and A . The desired smallness holds if τ is sufficiently small with respect to $\hat{u}_f + \delta$. The smoothness of the foliation follows from the smoothness of the ambient spacetime, the smoothness of the \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, the smoothness of the functions j^3, j^4 and q , and thus the smoothness of f^3 . \square

Foliations of the outgoing null hypersurface $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$

Consider now an outgoing null hypersurface C in (\mathcal{M}, g) foliated by spheres described by the level hypersurfaces of a function $v : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Consider the null generator L of C satisfying $L(v) = 1$. There exists a unique *conjugate* null vector field \underline{L}' on C satisfying

$$g(L, \underline{L}') = -2.$$

If C is an outgoing null hypersurface of a given spacetime double null foliation, and its foliation by spheres coincides with that obtained by intersecting C with the incoming null hypersurfaces of the spacetime double null foliation, then the vectors of the double null frame e_3, e_4 are related to L, \underline{L}' by

$$\underline{L}' = \Omega^{-1}e_3, \quad L = \Omega e_4.$$

Again, many of the Ricci coefficients and curvature components of the spacetime double null foliation can be expressed entirely in terms of L and \underline{L}' . For example, if X is a vector field tangent to the level hypersurfaces of v ,

$$\underline{\eta}(X) = -\frac{1}{2}g(\nabla_L X, \underline{L}'), \quad \rho = \frac{1}{4}R(L, \underline{L}', L, \underline{L}').$$

Moreover, certain Ω rescaled quantities can again also be expressed entirely in terms of L and \underline{L}' . For example, if X and Y are tangential to the level hypersurfaces of v ,

$$\Omega\hat{\omega} = \frac{1}{4}g(\nabla_L \underline{L}', L), \quad \Omega\chi(X, Y) = g(\nabla_X L, Y), \quad \Omega^{-1}\underline{\chi}(X, Y) = g(\nabla_X \underline{L}', Y),$$

and

$$\Omega\hat{\chi}(X, Y) = \Omega\chi(X, Y) - \Omega\text{tr}_\chi g(X, Y), \quad \Omega^{-1}\hat{\underline{\chi}}(X, Y) = \Omega^{-1}\underline{\chi}(X, Y) - \Omega^{-1}\text{tr}_{\underline{\chi}} g(X, Y).$$

The following proposition relates certain geometric quantities associated to two different foliations of the outgoing null hypersurface $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$.

Proposition 16.1.10 (Change of foliation relations on outgoing cones). *For a given sphere \tilde{S} as in (16.1.22), let v denote the restriction to $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$ of the v coordinate of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge. Consider another foliation of $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$ by spheres, described by the level hypersurfaces of a function \tilde{v} , and a mass M . Suppose v and \tilde{v} are related by*

$$v = \tilde{v} + f^4(\tilde{v}, \theta),$$

for some function $f^4 : [v(R_{-2}, u_{-1}), v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)] \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then the corresponding geometric quantities $\underline{\mu}^\dagger$ and $\Omega\hat{\omega}$ are related by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Delta} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4(\tilde{v}, \theta)) &= \tilde{\underline{\mu}}_M^\dagger(\tilde{v}, \theta) - \underline{\mu}_{M_f}^\dagger(\tilde{v} + f^4, \theta) + \frac{\Omega_o^2}{2r} \Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \chi(\tilde{v} + f^4, \theta) ((1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4(\tilde{v}, \theta))^{-1} - 1) \\ &\quad + F_{\underline{\mu}^\dagger}(f^4, \tilde{\nabla} f^4, \tilde{\nabla}^2 f^4, \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4, \tilde{\nabla} \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4, M), \end{aligned}$$

for a function $F_{\underline{\mu}^\dagger}$ which, provided $|f^4| + |r\tilde{\nabla} f^4| + |(r\tilde{\nabla})^2 f^4| + |\partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4| + |r\tilde{\nabla} \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4| \lesssim 1$, satisfies

$$r^2 |F_{\underline{\mu}^\dagger}(f^4, \tilde{\nabla} f^4, \tilde{\nabla}^2 f^4, \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4, \tilde{\nabla} \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4)| \lesssim |f^4| + |r\tilde{\nabla} f^4| + |(r\tilde{\nabla})^2 f^4| + |M - M_f|,$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial_{\tilde{v}} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4)(\tilde{v}, \theta) = \tilde{\Omega}\hat{\omega}(\tilde{v}, \theta) - (1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4) \Omega\hat{\omega}(\tilde{v} + f^4, \theta).$$

Here $\tilde{\nabla}$ denotes the Levi-Civita connection of the induced metric on the level hypersurfaces of \tilde{v} .

Proof. Let L and \underline{L} denote the null generators of C which satisfy

$$L(v) = 1, \quad \tilde{L}(\tilde{v}) = 1,$$

respectively, and let \underline{L}' and \tilde{L}' denote the conjugate null vectors to L and \tilde{L} respectively, satisfying $g(L, \underline{L}') = g(\tilde{L}, \tilde{L}') = -2$. Let $e_A = \partial_{\theta^A}$ in the (v, θ) coordinate system for C , and $\tilde{e}_A = \tilde{\partial}_{\theta^A}$ in the (\tilde{v}, θ) coordinate system. It follows, as in the proof of Proposition 16.1.8, that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L} &= (1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4) L, \\ \tilde{L}' &= (1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4)^{-1} [\underline{L}' + |\tilde{\nabla} f^4|^2 L + 2g^{AB} \partial_{\theta^A} f^4 e_B], \\ \tilde{e}_A &= e_A + \partial_{\theta^A} f^4 L, \end{aligned}$$

where $|\tilde{\nabla} f^4|^2 = g^{AB} \partial_{\theta^A} f^4 \partial_{\theta^B} f^4$.

As in the proof of Proposition 16.1.8 one computes

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\eta}(\tilde{e}_A) &= (1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4)^{-1} \partial_{\tilde{v}} \partial_{\theta^A} f^4 + \underline{\eta}(e_A) - \frac{1}{2} \Omega \chi_A{}^B \partial_{\theta^B} f^4 + 2\Omega\hat{\omega} \partial_{\theta^A} f^4, \\ \tilde{\rho} &= \rho + \tilde{\nabla} f^4 \otimes \tilde{\nabla} f^4 \cdot \Omega^2 \alpha - 2\tilde{\nabla} f^4 \cdot \Omega\beta, \\ \tilde{\Omega}\chi(\tilde{e}_A, \tilde{e}_B) &= (1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4) \Omega\chi(e_A, e_B), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\Omega^{-1}\chi}(\tilde{e}_A, \tilde{e}_B) &= (1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4)^{-1} [2\tilde{\nabla}_{A,B}^2 f^4 + \Omega^{-1} \chi(e_A, e_B) + 2(\underline{\eta}_A \partial_{\theta^B} f^4 + \underline{\eta}_B \partial_{\theta^A} f^4) + 4\Omega\hat{\omega} \partial_{\theta^A} f^4 \partial_{\theta^B} f^4 \\ &\quad + |\tilde{\nabla} f^4|^2 \Omega\chi_{AB} - 2\partial_{\theta^C} f^4 (\Omega\chi_A^C \partial_{\theta^B} f^4 + \Omega\chi_B^C \partial_{\theta^A} f^4) - 2(\partial_{\theta^A} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4) \partial_{\theta^B} f^4 + \partial_{\theta^B} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4) \partial_{\theta^A} f^4)]. \end{aligned}$$

The latter in particular implies that

$$\widetilde{\Omega^{-1}\text{tr}\chi} = (1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4)^{-1} [\Omega^{-1} \text{tr}\chi + 2\tilde{\Delta} f^4 + 4\underline{\eta} \cdot \tilde{\nabla} f^4 + (4\Omega\hat{\omega} + \Omega \text{tr}\chi) |\tilde{\nabla} f^4|^2 - 4\Omega\chi \cdot \tilde{\nabla} f^4 \otimes \tilde{\nabla} f^4 - 4\tilde{\nabla} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4) \cdot \tilde{\nabla} f^4].$$

The expression involving $\tilde{\Omega}\hat{\omega}$ can be computed similarly, using the fact that,

$$\Omega\hat{\omega} = \frac{1}{4} g(\nabla_L \underline{L}', L).$$

The proof then follows from the fact that

$$\underline{\mu}_M^\dagger = d\underline{v}\eta + \rho - \rho_{\circ,M} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{\chi} \cdot \hat{\chi} + \frac{\Omega_{\circ,M}^2}{2r_M} \left(\frac{\text{tr}\underline{\chi}}{\Omega} - \frac{(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_{\circ,M}}{\Omega_{\circ,M}^2} \right).$$

and

$$|\rho_{\circ,M}(\tilde{v}, \theta) - \rho_{\circ,M_f}(\tilde{v} + f^4, \theta)| + \left| \frac{1}{r_M} (\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_{\circ,M}(\tilde{v}, \theta) - \frac{1}{r_{M_f}} (\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_{\circ,M_f}(\tilde{v} + f^4, \theta) \right| \lesssim \frac{|M - M_f| + |f^4|}{r_{M_f}^2}.$$

□

The following proposition shows that certain foliations of the cone $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$ can be attained.

Proposition 16.1.11 (Foliations of the outgoing cone $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$). *Let \tilde{S} be a sphere defined, in the $(u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ coordinate system, by smooth functions j^3, j^4 ,*

$$\tilde{S} = \{i_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_{-1} + j^3(\theta), v_{\infty}(\hat{u}_f + \delta) + j^4(\theta), \theta) \mid \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2\}.$$

such that j^3 and j^4 satisfy

$$\sum_{k \leq 5} (\|(r\nabla)^k j^3\|_{\tilde{S}} + \|(r\nabla)^k j^4\|_{\tilde{S}}) \leq \tau.$$

Consider also a mass M satisfying the smallness assumption of Proposition 16.1.7, a constant $B \in \mathbb{R}$, and a smooth function $\mathcal{F} : [v(R_{-2}, u_{-1}), v_{\infty}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$|B| + \sup_{v(R_{-2}, u_{-1}) \leq v \leq v_{\infty}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)} |\mathcal{F}(v)| \leq \tau.$$

Then, provided τ and δ_0 are sufficiently small, there exists a smooth foliation of the past outgoing cone, $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$, of \tilde{S} such that, on $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$,

$$\underline{\mu}_{\ell \geq 1}^\dagger(\tilde{v}, \theta) = 0, \quad (\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_{\circ,M})_{\ell=0}(\tilde{v}) = \mathcal{F}(\tilde{v}),$$

for all $\tilde{v} \in [v(R_{-2}, u_{-1}), v_{\infty}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)]$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$. Moreover,

$$\partial_{\tilde{v}} f_{\ell=0}^4(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)) = B,$$

where f^4 is the diffeomorphism which relates this foliation of $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$ to the foliation of $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$ obtained by intersecting with the incoming cones \underline{C}_v , for $v(R_{-2}, u_{-1}) \leq v \leq v_{\infty}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$, of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge, so that $v = \tilde{v} + f^3(\tilde{v}, \theta)$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 16.1.9. By Proposition 16.1.10, the goal is to construct a function $f^4 : [v(R_{-2}, u_{-1}), v_{\infty}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)] \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\left[\tilde{\Delta} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4(\tilde{v}, \theta)) + \frac{1}{r^2} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4(\tilde{v}, \theta)) \right]_{\ell \geq 1} = \left[-\underline{\mu}^\dagger(\tilde{v} + f^4, \theta) + F'_{\underline{\mu}^\dagger}(f^4, \tilde{\nabla} f^4, \tilde{\nabla}^2 f^4, \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4, \tilde{\nabla} \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4) \right]_{\ell \geq 1},$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} [\partial_{\tilde{v}} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4(\tilde{v}, \cdot))]_{\ell=0} = \mathcal{F}(\tilde{v}) + [\Omega\hat{\omega}_{\circ}(\tilde{v}) - (1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4(\tilde{v}, \cdot))\Omega\hat{\omega}(\tilde{v} + f^4(\tilde{v}, \cdot), \cdot)]_{\ell=0},$$

along with the final conditions,

$$f^4(v_{\infty}(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \cdot) = j^4, \quad \partial_{\tilde{v}} f_{\ell=0}^4(v_{\infty}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)) = B,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F'_{\underline{\mu}^\dagger}(f^4, \tilde{\nabla} f^4, \tilde{\nabla}^2 f^4, \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4, \tilde{\nabla} \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4) &= F_{\underline{\mu}^\dagger}(f^4, \tilde{\nabla} f^4, \tilde{\nabla}^2 f^4, \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4, \tilde{\nabla} \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4) \\ &\quad + \frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{2r} \Omega^{-1} \text{tr}\underline{\chi}(\tilde{v} + f^4, \theta) ((1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4(\tilde{v}, \theta))^{-1} - 1) + \frac{1}{r^2} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f^4(\tilde{v}, \theta)), \end{aligned}$$

and $\underline{\mu}^\dagger$ and $\Omega\hat{\omega}$ denote the quantities of the gauge obtained by intersecting $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$ with the incoming hypersurfaces of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge (which, again, are arbitrarily close to their values of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge provided τ and δ are sufficiently small). Define, therefore, $f_{[0]} = 0$ and, for $n \geq 1$, iterates $f_{[n]}$ as solutions of

$$\left[\Delta_{[n-1]} \log(1 + \partial_v f_{[n]}^4(v, \theta)) + \frac{1}{r^2} \log(1 + \partial_v f_{[n]}^4(v, \theta)) \right]_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}} = \left[-\underline{\mu}^\dagger(v + f_{[n-1]}^4, \theta) + F'_{\underline{\mu}^\dagger}(f_{[n-1]}^4, \nabla f_{[n-1]}^4, \nabla^2 f_{[n-1]}^4, \partial_v f_{[n-1]}^4, \nabla \partial_v f_{[n-1]}^4) \right]_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}}, \quad (16.1.34)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} [\partial_v \log(1 + \partial_v f_{[n]}^4)(v, \cdot)]_{(\ell=0)_{[n-1]}} = \mathcal{F}(v) + [\Omega\hat{\omega}_o(v) - (1 + \partial_v f_{[n-1]}^4(v, \cdot))\Omega\hat{\omega}(v + f_{[n-1]}^4(v, \cdot), \cdot)]_{(\ell=0)_{[n-1]}}, \quad (16.1.35)$$

along with the initial conditions,

$$f_{[n]}^4(v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \cdot) = j^4, \quad \partial_{\tilde{v}}(f_{[n]}^4)_{(\ell=0)_{[n-1]}}(v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)) = B,$$

where $(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}$ and $(\ell = 0)_{[n-1]}$ denote the mode projections with respect to the spheres defined as the level hypersurfaces of $v_{[n-1]}$, where $v_{[n-1]}$ is defined implicitly by $v = v_{[n-1]} + f_{[n-1]}^4(v_{[n-1]}, \theta)$.

Consider some $V < v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$. As in the proof of Proposition 16.1.9 it follows by induction, using an elliptic estimate for (16.1.34) and transport estimate for (16.1.35), that, provided $v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta) - V$ is sufficiently small,

$$\sup_{V \leq v \leq v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r\nabla)^k f_{[n]}^4\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} \lesssim \tau, \quad \sup_{V \leq v \leq v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r\nabla)^k \partial_v f_{[n]}^4\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} \lesssim \tau, \quad (16.1.36)$$

for all n , provided τ , $v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta) - V$ and ε are sufficiently small, and moreover,

$$\sup_{V \leq v \leq v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r\nabla)^k (f_{[n+1]}^4 - f_{[n]}^4)\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}} \lesssim (v_\infty - V) \sup_{V \leq v \leq v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r\nabla)^k (f_{[n]}^4 - f_{[n-1]}^4)\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v}}.$$

Hence, if $v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta) - V$ is sufficiently small, the map which takes $f_{[n]}^4$ to $f_{[n+1]}^4$ is a contraction and the sequence $\{f_{[n]}^4\}$ converges to a limit f^4 on $[V, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)]$ satisfying the estimate (16.1.36).

As in the proof of Proposition 16.1.9, the proof follows from dividing the interval $[v(R_{-2}, u_{-1}), v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)]$ into subintervals of size $v_\infty - V$ and repeating the proof, using now the estimate (16.1.36) for f^4 in place of the assumptions on j^4 and B . The desired smallness holds if τ is sufficiently small with respect to $\hat{u}_f + \delta$. \square

The proof of Proposition 16.1.7: foliation of cones of any sphere close to $S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$

The proof of Proposition 16.1.7 can now be given.

Proof of Proposition 16.1.7. Overview: It will first be shown that, for any sphere close to $S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ (rather than the sphere $S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$), the desired foliations of its corresponding cones can be found. Suppose therefore that \tilde{S} is a sphere defined, in the $(u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ coordinate system, by smooth functions j^3, j^4 ,

$$\tilde{S} = \{i_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_{-1} + j^3(\theta), v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta) + j^4(\theta), \theta) \mid \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2\}, \quad (16.1.37)$$

where j^3 and j^4 satisfy

$$\sum_{k \leq 5} (\|(r\nabla)^k j^3\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}} + \|(r\nabla)^k j^4\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}}) \leq \tau, \quad (16.1.38)$$

so that \tilde{S} is appropriately close to the sphere $S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$.

Let $\tilde{C}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ denote the incoming null hypersurface of the sphere \tilde{S} and let $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$ denote the outgoing null hypersurface of \tilde{S} . Let \tilde{S} be identified with the standard sphere so that the \mathbb{S}^2 part of the diffeomorphisms

relating the new double null foliation to the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge satisfy $f^1 = f^2 = 0$ on \tilde{S} . It then follows that

$$f^4(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) = j^4(\theta), \quad f^3(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) = j^3(\theta),$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$.

Throughout the proof $v_\infty = v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$.

The goal is to choose A , B , \mathcal{F} , q appropriately so that the corresponding foliations of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{u_{-1}}$ of Proposition 16.1.9 and Proposition 16.1.11 give rise to a resulting spacetime double null foliation with the desired properties. The constants A and B will be chosen to achieve, in the resulting spacetime double null foliation,

$$(\Omega_{\circ, M}^{-2} \Omega^2 - 1)_{\ell=0}(u_{-1}, v_\infty) = 0, \quad (16.1.39)$$

and

$$(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M})_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty) = 0. \quad (16.1.40)$$

The function q will be chosen so that, in the resulting spacetime double null foliation, the function $\underline{\mathcal{F}}$ of Proposition 16.1.9 satisfies

$$\underline{\mathcal{F}} = \partial_u((\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ, M}^2)_{\ell=0}) - (\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_{\circ, M})_{\ell=0}. \quad (16.1.41)$$

The conditions (16.1.39) and (16.1.41) will then imply that

$$(\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ, M}^2)_{\ell=0}(u, v_\infty) = 0,$$

for all $u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta$ (see equation (16.1.29)). Finally, \mathcal{F} will be chosen so that, in the resulting spacetime double null foliation,

$$\mathcal{F}(v) = \frac{\Omega_{\circ, M}^2}{r^3}(u_{-1}, v) \frac{1}{2} \int_{u_{-1}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} \int_{\bar{u}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} r^3 (\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}, \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha})_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}, v_\infty) d\hat{u} d\bar{u}, \quad (16.1.42)$$

as desired.

The desired A and B will be obtained as solutions of two nonlinear equations. The change of spacetime gauge relations (4.3.31)–(4.3.36) give a nonlinear equation for A and B , involving j^3 , j^4 and quantities in the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge, which guarantees that the condition (16.1.39) will be achieved in the resulting spacetime double null foliation. The corresponding relation required to achieve (16.1.40) is more complicated, however, due to the fact that (16.1.40) is a condition at $(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty)$, rather than at (u_{-1}, v_∞) . To arrive at such an equation then, consider some given spacetime double null foliation. Equation (1.2.10) can be used to relate $(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ})_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty)$ to $(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ})_{\ell=0}(u_{-1}, v_\infty)$. The right hand side of the equation involves quantities such as $\rho - \rho_{\circ}$, $\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}$, etc., which can be related, by Proposition 16.1.8, to the corresponding quantities in the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge, f^3 , $\partial_u f^3$, and also the quantity $\Omega_{\circ}^{-1} \Omega$. This latter quantity can be re-expressed, using equation (1.2.21), in terms of $\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_{\circ}$, which can again be expressed in terms of f^3 by Proposition 16.1.8, and $\Omega_{\circ}^{-1} \Omega(u_{-1}, v_\infty)$ (see equation (16.1.30)). Using again the change of spacetime gauge relations (4.3.31)–(4.3.36), $\Omega_{\circ}^{-1} \Omega(u_{-1}, v_\infty)$ can then be expressed in terms of A , B , j^3 , j^4 and quantities in the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge.

Similarly, in order to achieve the condition (16.1.41) the fact that $\Omega_{\circ}^{-1} \Omega(u_{-1}, v_\infty)$ can be expressed in terms of A , B , j^3 , j^4 and quantities in the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge is used to define q appropriately.

The result is a closed system for A and B which involves the $f^3(u)$ and $\partial_u f^3(u)$, for all $u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta$, arising from the foliation of Proposition 16.1.9. Sequences of iterates $\{A_{[n]}\}$ and $\{B_{[n]}\}$ are defined and are shown to be bounded, uniformly in n , from which it follows that there exist convergent subsequences. One then considers the foliation of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ defined by the limits and Proposition 16.1.9. Given this foliation of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$, the quantities in (16.1.42) are all defined and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{u_{-1}}$ can be foliated, according to Proposition 16.1.11, with this \mathcal{F} .

Equations: Suppose that, for some given A , q , the cone $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$ is foliated according to Proposition 16.1.9 and, for some given B , \mathcal{F} , the outgoing hypersurface $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{u_{-1}}$ is foliated according to Proposition 16.1.11. Suppose that these foliations are described as the level hypersurfaces of functions \tilde{u} and \tilde{v} respectively. The resulting spacetime double null foliation, obtained by considering the outgoing null cones associated to the

spheres of constant \tilde{u} in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f+\delta)}$ and the incoming null cones associated to the spheres of constant \tilde{v} in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{u_{-1}}$, is related to the extended \hat{u}_f normalised double null foliation by functions f^3, f^4 satisfying

$$u = \tilde{u} + f^3(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}), \quad v = \tilde{v} + f^4(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}), \quad \theta^A = \tilde{\theta}^A + f^A(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}), \quad (16.1.43)$$

where $f^3(\cdot, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \cdot)$ agrees with f^3 of Proposition 16.1.9, $f^4(u_{-1}, \cdot, \cdot)$ agrees with f^4 of Proposition 16.1.11, and f^1, f^2 are defined so that

$$f^A(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \cdot) \equiv 0, \quad A = 1, 2,$$

and the spacetime metric takes the standard double null form. In particular,

$$f^3(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \cdot) = j^3, \quad f^4(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \cdot) = j^4.$$

The change of spacetime gauge relations (4.3.36) and (4.3.43) then imply that

$$\begin{aligned} (\Omega \tilde{\text{tr}} \chi - \Omega \tilde{\text{tr}} \chi_{\circ, M})_{\ell=0}(u_{-1}, v_\infty) - \frac{2}{r}(\tilde{\Omega}^2 - \tilde{\Omega}_{\circ, M}^2)_{\ell=0}(u_{-1}, v_\infty) &= -\frac{2\Omega^2}{r}A + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2}(j^3 - j^4)_{\ell=0} \\ &+ (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M})(u_{-1} + j^3, v_\infty + j^4)_{\ell=0} - \frac{2}{r}(\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ, M}^2)(u_{-1} + j^3, v_\infty + j^4)_{\ell=0} + \mathfrak{E}^1, \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.44)$$

and

$$(\tilde{\Omega}_{\circ, M}^{-2} \tilde{\Omega}^2 - 1)_{\ell=0}(u_{-1}, v_\infty) = A + B - \frac{2M}{r^2}(j^3 - j^4)_{\ell=0} + (\Omega_{\circ, M}^{-2} \Omega^2 - 1)(u_{-1} + j^3, v_\infty + j^4)_{\ell=0} + \mathfrak{E}^2, \quad (16.1.45)$$

where $v_\infty = v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and $\mathfrak{E}^1, \mathfrak{E}^2$ are nonlinearities, as determined by the relations of Proposition 4.3.1 and Proposition 4.3.2, which both take the schematic form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{E}^1 &= \left(\sum_{\substack{k \leq 1 \\ |\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2| \leq 1}} \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \Phi \cdot (r \tilde{\nabla})^k \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\gamma_1} f(x_{-1}) + \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\gamma_1} f \cdot (r \tilde{\nabla})^k \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\gamma_2} f(x_{-1}) \right)_{\ell=0}, \\ \mathfrak{E}^2 &= \left(\sum_{|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2| \leq 1} \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \Phi \cdot \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\gamma_1} f(x_{-1}) + \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\gamma_1} f \cdot \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\gamma_2} f(x_{-1}) \right)_{\ell=0}, \end{aligned}$$

with $x_{-1} = (u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \cdot)$, and $\tilde{\Omega}$ and $\Omega \tilde{\text{tr}} \chi$ denote the values of Ω and $\Omega \text{tr} \chi$ in the resulting spacetime double null foliation.

Note that equation (1.2.10) can be rewritten

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^{-1} \nabla_3 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) &= 2 \text{d}\nabla \eta + \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{r \Omega^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) - \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{r \Omega^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ) + 2 \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2} (\rho - \rho_\circ) \\ &- \frac{4M}{r^3} \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2} \right) - \frac{1}{2\Omega^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ) (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) \\ &+ 2 \left(1 - \frac{\Omega_\circ^2}{\Omega^2} \right) (\rho - \rho_\circ) - (\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}) \cdot (\Omega \hat{\chi}) + 2\eta \cdot \eta, \end{aligned}$$

and so,

$$(\Omega \tilde{\text{tr}} \chi - \Omega \tilde{\text{tr}} \chi_\circ)(u_{-1}, v_\infty) = (\Omega \tilde{\text{tr}} \chi - \Omega \tilde{\text{tr}} \chi_\circ)(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty) + \mathcal{G}_0(\tilde{\Omega}_\circ^{-1} \tilde{\Omega}, \Omega \tilde{\text{tr}} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \tilde{\text{tr}} \underline{\chi}_\circ, \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}, \Omega \hat{\chi}, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\eta}),$$

for an appropriate function \mathcal{G}_0 , which depends on the values of $\tilde{\Omega}_\circ^{-1} \tilde{\Omega}(u, v_\infty)$, $(\Omega \tilde{\text{tr}} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \tilde{\text{tr}} \underline{\chi}_\circ)(u, v_\infty)$, etc. for all $u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta$. Recall equation (16.1.30) and note that, by Proposition 16.1.8, the quantities $\tilde{\Omega} \hat{\omega} - \tilde{\Omega} \hat{\omega}_\circ$, $\Omega \tilde{\text{tr}} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \tilde{\text{tr}} \underline{\chi}_\circ$, $\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}$, $\Omega \hat{\chi}$, $\tilde{\rho}$, $\tilde{\eta}$ can be related to the corresponding quantities in the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge and f^3 and its derivatives. It follows then that

$$\begin{aligned} (\Omega \tilde{\text{tr}} \chi - \Omega \tilde{\text{tr}} \chi_{\circ, M})(u_{-1}, v_\infty) &= (\Omega \tilde{\text{tr}} \chi - \Omega \tilde{\text{tr}} \chi_{\circ, M})(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty) \\ &+ \mathcal{G}(\tilde{\Omega}_{\circ, M}^{-1} \tilde{\Omega}(u_{-1}, v_\infty), f^3, \nabla f^3, \nabla^2 f^3, \partial_u f^3, \nabla \partial_u f^3, \nabla^2 \partial_u f^3, M), \end{aligned}$$

for some appropriate \mathcal{G} , which depends on $\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_o$, $\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_o$, etc. in the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge, and satisfies

$$v_\infty^2 |\mathcal{G}| \lesssim \frac{\hat{u}_f}{v_\infty} \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{k \leq 2} (|(r\hat{\nabla})^k f^3| + |(r\hat{\nabla})^k \partial_u f^3|) + \hat{u}_f \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{k \leq 2} (|(r\hat{\nabla})^k f^3|^2 + |(r\hat{\nabla})^k \partial_u f^3|^2) \\ + \frac{\hat{u}_f}{v_\infty} |\tilde{\Omega}_o^{-1} \tilde{\Omega}(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| + \frac{\hat{u}_f}{v_\infty} |M - M_f| + \frac{\hat{u}_f \varepsilon}{v_\infty}. \quad (16.1.46)$$

Moreover, the change of spacetime gauge relation (4.3.36) implies that

$$|\tilde{\Omega}_{o,M}^{-1} \tilde{\Omega}(u_{-1}, v_\infty) - 1| \lesssim \sum_{k \leq 1} (|(r\hat{\nabla})^k j^3| + |(r\hat{\nabla})^k j^4|) + |\partial_u f^3(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| + |\partial_v f^3(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| \\ + |\partial_v f^4(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| + |\partial_u f^4(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| + |M - M_f| + \varepsilon. \quad (16.1.47)$$

The relations (4.3.31)–(4.3.36) moreover imply that, if τ and δ_0 are sufficiently small,

$$\sum_{k \leq 4} (\|(r\hat{\nabla})^k \partial_u f^3\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}} + \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k \partial_v f^3\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}} + \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k \partial_u f^4\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}} + \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k \partial_v f^4\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}}) \\ \lesssim \sum_{k \leq 5} (\|(r\hat{\nabla})^k j^3\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}} + \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k j^4\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}}) + |A| + |B|, \quad (16.1.48)$$

since $f^A(u_{-1}, v_\infty, \cdot) = 0$ and $\tilde{b}(u_{-1}, v_\infty, \cdot) = 0$.

The goal then is to find A and B such that

$$\mathcal{G}(\tilde{\Omega}_{o,M}^{-1} \tilde{\Omega}(u_{-1}, v_\infty), f^3, \hat{\nabla} f^3, \hat{\nabla}^2 f^3, \partial_u f^3, \hat{\nabla} \partial_u f^3, \hat{\nabla}^2 \partial_u f^3, M) = -\frac{2\Omega^2}{r} A + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} (j^3 - j^4)_{\ell=0} \\ + (\Omega\text{tr}\chi - \Omega\text{tr}\chi_{o,M})(u_{-1} + j^3, v_\infty + j^4)_{\ell=0} - \frac{2}{r} (\Omega^2 - \Omega_{o,M}^2)(u_{-1} + j^3, v_\infty + j^4)_{\ell=0} + \mathfrak{E}^1,$$

and

$$0 = A + B - \frac{2M}{r^2} (j^3 - j^4)_{\ell=0} + (\Omega_{o,M}^{-2} \Omega^2 - 1)(u_{-1} + j^3, v_\infty + j^4)_{\ell=0} + \mathfrak{E}^2,$$

where f^3 denotes the change of foliation of the cone arising from Proposition 16.1.9 with $\partial_u f_{\ell=0}^3(u_{-1}, v_\infty) = A$ and

$$q = \tilde{\Omega}_{o,M}^{-1} \tilde{\Omega}(u_{-1}, v_\infty),$$

where $\tilde{\Omega}_{o,M}^{-1} \tilde{\Omega}(u_{-1}, v_\infty)$ can be computed from A , B , j^3 , j^4 from the relations (4.3.31)–(4.3.36).

Definition of iterates: In order to begin the iteration, define first

$$A_{[1]} = q = 0.$$

Consider the foliation of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty}$ arising from Proposition 16.1.9 with $A = A_{[1]} = 0$ and $q = q_{[1]} = 0$. This foliation of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty}$, described by the level hypersurfaces of a function $u_{[1]}$, is related to u by a function $f_{[1]}^3$ by

$$u = u_{[1]} + f_{[1]}^3(u_{[1]}, \theta).$$

The corresponding geometric quantities of this foliation of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v_\infty}$, defined by (16.1.23)–(16.1.26), are denoted $\eta_{[1]}$, $\Omega\hat{\omega}_{[1]}$ etc.

Define also

$$B_{[1]} = 0, \quad \mathcal{F}_{[1]}(v) = \frac{\Omega_{o,M}^2}{r^3} (u_{-1}, v) F_{[1]}(u_{-1}), \\ F_{[1]}(u_{-1}) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{u_{-1}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} \int_{\bar{u}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} r^3 (\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}_{[1]}, \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}_{[1]})_{\ell=0} (\hat{u}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)) d\hat{u} d\bar{u},$$

and consider the foliation of $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$ arising from Proposition 16.1.11 with $B = B_{[1]} = 0$ and $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{[1]}$. This foliation of $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$, described by the level hypersurfaces of a function $v_{[1]}$, is related to v by a function $f_{[1]}^4$ by

$$v = v_{[1]} + f_{[1]}^4(v_{[1]}, \theta).$$

Similarly, for $n \geq 2$, inductively define $\mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^1$ and $\mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^2$ by replacing f with $f_{[n-1]}$ in the definition of \mathfrak{E}^1 and \mathfrak{E}^2 respectively. Schematically,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^1 &= \left(\sum_{\substack{k \leq 1 \\ |\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2| \leq 1}} \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \Phi \cdot ((r\tilde{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f)_{[n-1]}(x_{-1}) + (\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f)_{[n-1]} \cdot ((r\tilde{\nabla})^k \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} f)_{[n-1]}(x_{-1}) \right)_{\ell=0}. \\ \mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^2 &= \left(\sum_{|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2| \leq 1} \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \Phi \cdot (\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f)_{[n-1]}(x_{-1}) + (\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f)_{[n-1]} \cdot (\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} f)_{[n-1]}(x_{-1}) \right)_{\ell=0}.\end{aligned}$$

Define moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{F}^1 &= \frac{1}{r}(j^3 - j^4)_{\ell=0} + \frac{r}{2\Omega_{\circ, M}^2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M})(u_{-1} + j^3, v_{\infty} + j^4)_{\ell=0} - (\Omega_{\circ, M}^{-2} \Omega^2 - 1)(u_{-1} + j^3, v_{\infty} + j^4)_{\ell=0}, \\ \mathfrak{F}^2 &= \frac{2M}{r^2}(j^3 - j^4)_{\ell=0} - (\Omega_{\circ, M}^{-2} \Omega^2 - 1)(u_{-1} + j^3, v_{\infty} + j^4)_{\ell=0}, \\ A_{[n]} &= \mathfrak{F}^1 + \frac{r}{2\Omega_{\circ, M}^2}(\mathcal{G}_{[n-1]} + \mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^1), \quad q_{[n]} = \Omega_{\circ, M}^{-1} \Omega_{[n-1]}(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{G}_{[n-1]} = \mathcal{G}(\Omega_{\circ, M}^{-1} \Omega_{[n-1]}(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}), f_{[n-1]}^3, \tilde{\nabla} f_{[n-1]}^3, \tilde{\nabla}^2 f_{[n-1]}^3, \partial_u f_{[n-1]}^3, \tilde{\nabla} \partial_u f_{[n-1]}^3, \tilde{\nabla}^2 \partial_u f_{[n-1]}^3, M).$$

Consider the foliation of $\tilde{C}_{v_{\infty}}$ arising from Proposition 16.1.9 with $A = A_{[n]}$ and $q = q_{[n]}$. This foliation of $\tilde{C}_{v_{\infty}}$, described by the level hypersurfaces of a function $u_{[n]}$, is related to u by a function $f_{[n]}^3$ by

$$u = u_{[n]} + f_{[n]}^3(u_{[n]}, \theta).$$

The corresponding geometric quantities of this foliation of $\tilde{C}_{v_{\infty}}$, defined by (16.1.23)–(16.1.26), are denoted $\eta_{[n]}$, $\Omega \hat{\omega}_{[n]}$ etc.

Define now

$$\begin{aligned}B_{[n]} &= \mathfrak{F}^2 - \mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^2 - A_{[n]}, \quad \mathcal{F}_{[n]}(v) = \frac{\Omega_{\circ, M}^2}{r^3}(u_{-1}, v)F_{[n]}(u_{-1}), \\ F_{[n]}(u_{-1}) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{u_{-1}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} \int_{\bar{u}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} r^3(\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}_{[n]}, \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha}_{[n]})_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}, v_{\infty}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)) d\hat{u} d\bar{u}.\end{aligned}$$

Consider the foliation of $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$ arising from Proposition 16.1.11 with $B = B_{[n]}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{[n]}$. This foliation of $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$, described by the level hypersurfaces of a function $v_{[n]}$, is related to v by a function $f_{[n]}^4$ by

$$v = v_{[n]} + f_{[n]}^4(v_{[n]}, \theta).$$

Estimates and existence of limits: It will be shown, by induction, that

$$r^2 |\mathcal{G}_{[n]}| \leq \tau + \varepsilon, \quad r^2 |\mathfrak{E}_{[n]}^1| + r |\mathfrak{E}_{[n]}^2| \leq \tau + \frac{\varepsilon}{v_{\infty}},$$

for all n . The estimate trivially holds for $n = 0$. Assume the estimate is true for some $n - 1$.

By definition,

$$|A_{[n]}| \lesssim |\mathfrak{F}^1| + \frac{r}{2\Omega_{\circ}^2}(|\mathcal{G}_{[n-1]}| + |\mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^1|), \quad |B_{[n]}| \lesssim |\mathfrak{F}^2| + |\mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^2| + |\mathfrak{F}^1| + \frac{r}{2\Omega_{\circ}^2}(|\mathcal{G}_{[n-1]}| + |\mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^1|),$$

and so it follows, from the inductive hypothesis, that

$$r|A_{[n]}| + r|B_{[n]}| \lesssim \tau + \frac{\varepsilon}{v_\infty}. \quad (16.1.49)$$

Proposition 16.1.8 implies that,

$$\Delta_{[n]} \log(1 + \partial_u f_{[n]}^3(u, \theta)) = \left[-\mu(u + f_{[n]}^3, \theta) + F_\mu(\nabla f_{[n]}^3, \nabla^2 f_{[n]}^3, \partial_u f_{[n]}^3, \nabla \partial_u f_{[n]}^3) \right]_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n]}}, \quad (16.1.50)$$

where F_μ is as in Proposition 16.1.8, and

$$\frac{1}{2} [\partial_{\hat{u}} \log(1 + \partial_u f_{[n]}^3)]_{(\ell=0)_{[n]}}(u) = \mathcal{F}_{[n-1]}(u) + \Omega_{\hat{\omega}_o, M}(u) - [(1 + \partial_u f_{[n]}^3(u, \cdot)) \Omega_{\hat{\omega}}(u + f_{[n]}^3(u, \cdot), \cdot)]_{(\ell=0)_{[n]}}, \quad (16.1.51)$$

where $\Delta_{[n]}$ denotes the Laplacian, $(\ell \geq 1)_{[n]}$ and $(\ell = 0)_{[n]}$ denote the appropriate mode projections, of the spheres defined by the level hypersurfaces of $u_{[n]}$ in $\tilde{C}_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}$, and

$$\mathcal{F}_{[n-1]} = \mathcal{F}((\Omega_{\hat{\omega}} - \Omega_{\hat{\omega}_o, M})_{[n]}, (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{o, M})_{[n]}, \Omega_{o, M}^{-1} \Omega_{[n-1]}(u_{-1}, v_\infty, \cdot)).$$

The estimate (16.1.48) implies that, if τ is sufficiently small,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \leq 4} (\|(r \nabla)^k \partial_u f_{[n]}^3\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}} + \|(r \nabla)^k \partial_v f_{[n]}^3\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}} + \|(r \nabla)^k \partial_u f_{[n]}^4\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}} + \|(r \nabla)^k \partial_v f_{[n]}^4\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}}) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k \leq 5} (\|(r \nabla)^k j^3\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}} + \|(r \nabla)^k j^4\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}}) + |A_{[n]}| + |B_{[n]}|, \end{aligned}$$

from which it follows, using also (16.1.49), that

$$|\mathfrak{E}_{[n]}^1| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{r^2}(\tau + \varepsilon v_\infty^{-1}) + \tau^2, \quad |\mathfrak{E}_{[n]}^2| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{r}(\tau + \varepsilon v_\infty^{-1}) + \tau^2.$$

Recalling (16.1.28), an estimate for the system (16.1.50)–(16.1.51) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{k \leq 4} (\|(r \nabla)^k f_{[n]}^3\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + \|(r \nabla)^k f_{[n]}^4\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k \leq 5} (\|(r \nabla)^k j^3\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}} + \|(r \nabla)^k j^4\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}}) + |A_{[n]}| + |B_{[n]}| + |M - M_f|. \end{aligned}$$

The estimates (16.1.46) and (16.1.47) then combine to give, provided $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ and τ are sufficiently small,

$$v_\infty^2 |\mathcal{G}_{[n]}| \lesssim \frac{\hat{u}_f}{v_\infty} \left(\sum_{k \leq 5} (\|(r \nabla)^k j^3\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}} + \|(r \nabla)^k j^4\|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}}) + |A_{[n]}| + |B_{[n]}| + |M - M_f| + \varepsilon \right).$$

The induction is completed after inserting (16.1.49) and taking τ to be suitably small.

From (16.1.49) it follows that there exists a subsequences of $\{A_{[n]}\}$ and $\{B_{[n]}\}$ which converge to limits A and B respectively, from which the desired foliations are constructed.

Achieving any final sphere: It remains to show that, for any *final* sphere S defined, in the extended \hat{u}_f normalised coordinate system, by functions s^3, s^4 ,

$$S = \{i_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta + s^3(\theta), v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta) + s^4(\theta), \theta) \mid \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2\},$$

which satisfy

$$\sum_{k \leq 5} (\|(r \nabla)^k s^3\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} + \|(r \nabla)^k s^4\|_{\mathbb{S}^2}) \leq \tau,$$

the desired foliations of the corresponding null hypersurfaces exist. This fact is established by showing that any such functions s^3, s^4 are attained by suitable functions j^3, j^4 as above. More precisely, this fact is

established by showing that, for any such functions s^3, s^4 , there exist functions j^3, j^4 such that, in the above double foliation corresponding to the initial sphere (16.1.37) described by j^3, j^4 satisfying (16.1.38), the functions f^3 and f^4 which relate this new double null foliation to the extended \hat{u}_f normalised double null foliation, (16.1.43), satisfy

$$f^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) = s^3(\theta), \quad f^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) = s^4(\theta).$$

Indeed, for any such j^3, j^4 as above, one writes, with $v_\infty = v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$,

$$f^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta) = j^3(\theta) + \int_{u_{-1}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} \partial_u f^3(u, v_\infty, \theta) du, \quad f^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta) = j^4(\theta) + \int_{u_{-1}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} \partial_u f^4(u, v_\infty, \theta) du.$$

The result then follows, after taking τ and $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ suitably small, from defining suitable iterates $j_{[n]}^3$ and $j_{[n]}^4$ and using the fact that if $j_{[n]}^3$ and $j_{[n]}^4$ satisfy (16.1.38) then the corresponding diffeomorphism functions $f_{[n]}^3$ and $f_{[n]}^4$ satisfy,

$$\int_{u_{-1}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} |\partial_u f_{[n]}^3(u, v_\infty)| du + \int_{u_{-1}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} |\partial_u f_{[n]}^4(u, v_\infty)| du \lesssim \hat{u}_f \left(\frac{\tau}{v_\infty} + \tau^2 \right).$$

□

Remark 16.1.12. In the linear setting of Proposition 2.2.6, one can distill from the proof of Proposition 16.1.7 an analogous linear statement, namely that, for any solution $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ of the linearised equations around Schwarzschild of mass M_f , there exist functions $f^3(u, \theta), f^4(v, \theta)$, with $f^3(u_f, \cdot) = 0, f^4(v_\infty, \cdot) = 0$, which generate a pure gauge solution (see Section 6 of [DHR]), denoted $\mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}}$, such that the solution $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}}$ of the linearised equations satisfies the linearised analogues of (16.1.17)–(16.1.21). Indeed, in the notation of [DHR], by the linearised analogues of the relations of Proposition 16.1.8, Proposition 16.1.10 and the relations (4.3.36) and (4.3.43), it suffices to find $f^3(u, \theta)$ satisfying the equations

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \partial_u f_{\ell \geq 1}^3 + \frac{1}{r} \left(1 - \frac{4M_f}{r} \right) \Delta f_{\ell \geq 1}^3 - \frac{6M_f \Omega^2}{r^4} f_{\ell \geq 1}^3 &= -(\text{div}^{(\tilde{\mathcal{S}})} \eta + \rho^{(\tilde{\mathcal{S}})})_{\ell \geq 1}(\cdot, v_\infty, \cdot), \\ \frac{1}{2} \partial_u^2 f_{\ell=0}^3 - \frac{M_f}{r^2} \partial_u f_{\ell=0}^3 - \frac{2M_f \Omega^2}{r^3} f_{\ell=0}^3 &= -\underline{\omega}_{\ell=0}^{(\tilde{\mathcal{S}})}(\cdot, v_\infty), \end{aligned}$$

and $f^4(v, \theta)$ satisfying the equations

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \partial_v f_{\ell \geq 1}^4 + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} \partial_v f_{\ell \geq 1}^4 + \frac{2M_f}{r^2} \Delta f_{\ell \geq 1}^4 + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^3} \left(1 + \frac{4M_f}{r} \right) f_{\ell \geq 1}^4 \\ = -(\text{div}^{(\tilde{\mathcal{S}})} \underline{\eta} + \rho^{(\tilde{\mathcal{S}})} + \frac{1}{2r} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) + \frac{\Omega^2}{r^2} 2\Omega^{-1} \underline{\Omega})_{\ell \geq 1}^{(\tilde{\mathcal{S}})}(u_f, \cdot, \cdot), \end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial_v^2 f_{\ell=0}^4 + \frac{M_f}{r^2} \partial_v f_{\ell=0}^4 - \frac{2M_f \Omega^2}{r^3} f_{\ell=0}^4 = -\underline{\omega}_{\ell=0}^{(\tilde{\mathcal{S}})}(u_f, \cdot),$$

along with the final conditions

$$\begin{aligned} f^3(u_f, \cdot) = f^4(v_\infty, \cdot) &= 0, \\ \partial_u f_{\ell=0}^3(u_f) + \partial_v f_{\ell=0}^4(v_\infty) &= -2\Omega^{-1} \underline{\Omega}_{\ell=0}^{(\tilde{\mathcal{S}})}(u_f, v_\infty), \\ \partial_u f_{\ell=0}^3(u_f) &= \left(\frac{r}{2\Omega^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi) - 2\Omega^{-1} \underline{\Omega} \right)_{\ell=0}^{(\tilde{\mathcal{S}})}(u_f, v_\infty), \end{aligned}$$

(the latter two being the linear analogues of (16.1.44) and (16.1.45)) where $r = r_{M_f}$ is defined by (1.3.2), Δ now denotes the Laplacian of the round sphere of radius r , and $\ell \geq 1$ now denote projections with respect to the spherical harmonics of the round sphere, etc. In this simplified linear setting, the proofs of Propositions 16.1.9, 16.1.11, and 16.1.7 reduce to showing the existence of functions $f^3(u, \theta)$ and $f^4(v, \theta)$ satisfying these linear equations.

Remark 16.1.13. Recall the double null parametrisation (5.5.6) of Theorem 5.5.2, and let u_f^0 be as defined in Section 1.3.5. The proof of Proposition 16.1.7 can easily be adapted to yield the statement that, for any sphere,

$$S = \{i_{\mathcal{EF}}(u_f^0 + s^3(\theta), v_\infty(u_f^0) + s^4(\theta), \theta) \mid \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2\}, \quad (16.1.52)$$

defined by smooth functions $s^3, s^4: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and any mass $M > 0$, satisfying

$$\sum_{k \leq 5} (\|(r\nabla)^k s^3\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} + \|(r\nabla)^k s^4\|_{\mathbb{S}^2}) + |M - M_{\text{init}}| \leq \tau,$$

for some τ sufficiently small, then, if $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ is sufficiently small, there exists a smooth foliation of the past incoming cone, $\underline{\tilde{C}}_{v_\infty(u_f^0)}$, of S and a smooth foliation of the past outgoing cone, $\tilde{C}_{u_{-1}}$, of the sphere $\tilde{S}_{u_{-1}, v_\infty(u_f^0)}$ (defined to be the sphere at parameter time $u_{-1} - u_f^0$ in the past of S along $\underline{\tilde{C}}_{v_\infty(u_f^0)}$) such that the geometric quantities of the associated spacetime double null foliation satisfy (16.1.17)–(16.1.21) with u_f^0 in place of $\hat{u}_f + \delta$. Indeed, the proof is adapted by replacing the role of the δ_1 extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge of Theorem 16.1.1 with the double null parametrisation (5.5.6) of Theorem 5.5.2, and exploiting only the smallness of $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ (which may depend on u_f^0) in place of the smallness of δ_0 .

16.1.2.2 Existence of a new good sphere and mass: the proof of Theorem 16.1.2

The remaining defining conditions of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, namely,

$$\left(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\circ, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}} \right)_{\ell \geq 2} (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) = 0 \text{ for all } \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2; \quad (16.1.53)$$

$$(d\text{tr} \Omega \beta)_{\ell=1} (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) = 0 \text{ for all } \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2; \quad (16.1.54)$$

$$\left(\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\circ, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}} \right) (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) = 0 \text{ for all } \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2; \quad (16.1.55)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} (r^3 \rho_{\ell=0}) (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)) = -M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}; \quad (16.1.56)$$

$$b(u, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) = 0 \text{ for all } u \in [u_{-1}, \hat{u}_f + \delta], \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2, \quad (16.1.57)$$

for some $M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta} = M_f(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$, along with the anchoring conditions of Definition 5.6.1 (using the notation of Definition 5.6.1)

$$f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}^3(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta))_{\ell=0} = 0, \quad (16.1.58)$$

$$f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}^A(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta_0^1, \theta_0^2) = 0, \quad A = 1, 2, \quad (16.1.59)$$

$$\frac{\partial f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}^A}{\partial \theta^1}(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta_0^1, \theta_0^2) = 0, \quad A = 1, 2, \quad (16.1.60)$$

will be achieved by iteratively solving for a suitable sphere \mathring{S} and considering the resulting spacetime double null foliation generated by Proposition 16.1.7.

Note that the inclusion (5.6.12) is trivially satisfied, provided δ_0 is sufficiently small, by continuity and the improved bootstrap assumptions of Theorem C.

Proof of Theorem 16.1.2. Let $\lambda \in \mathfrak{A}(\hat{u}_f)$ be fixed. Note that any two smooth functions $h^3, h^4: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a diffeomorphism $\# : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ define a *new final sphere* given (in the coordinate system of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge) by

$$\mathring{S} = \{i_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta + h^3(\theta), v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta) + h^4(\theta), \#(\theta)) \mid \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2\}. \quad (16.1.61)$$

Recall the domain (2.2.3). Any such sphere \mathring{S} (provided $h^3 \circ \#^{-1}$ and $h^4 \circ \#^{-1}$ are sufficiently small) defines, by Proposition 16.1.7 (with $s^3 = h^3 \circ \#^{-1}$, $s^4 = h^4 \circ \#^{-1}$), a unique double null parametrisation

$$\tilde{i}: \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta) \rightarrow \mathcal{M},$$

such that the associated geometric quantities satisfy the gauge conditions of Proposition 16.1.7, (16.1.57) holds, the image of \mathbb{S}^2 under $\tilde{i}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \cdot)$ is the sphere \mathring{S} , and

$$\tilde{i}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \cdot) = \psi^{-1},$$

where $\psi: \mathring{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ is the canonical diffeomorphism of Proposition 4.4.1 arising from the normalised induced metric $r^{-2}g|_{\mathring{S}}$ and $p \in \mathring{S}$, $v \in T_p \mathring{S}$ chosen so that the diffeomorphisms relating this double null parametrisation to the initial Eddington–Finkelstein gauge (5.6.2) satisfies (16.1.59), (16.1.60). Note that, if δ , $h^3 \circ \#^{-1}$ and $h^4 \circ \#^{-1}$ are sufficiently small then $\tilde{i}(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)) \subset i(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f, \delta_1))$ (recalling (16.1.2) and Theorem 16.1.1) where i (see (4.1.1)) is the local parametrisation of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, and, by the compactness of the domain $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$, the parametrisation \tilde{i} can be made arbitrarily close to the parametrisation i . It follows that the inclusion (16.1.8) implies that the cones $\tilde{C}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ of the parametrisation \tilde{i} satisfy

$$\bigcup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq u_2} \tilde{C}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3) \cap \{u_{-1} - 3C\varepsilon \leq u_{data} \leq u_2 + 3C\varepsilon\},$$

and in particular the diffeomorphism functions appearing in (16.1.57), (16.1.59), (16.1.60) are well defined. The goal is to find appropriate $h^3, h^4, \#$ so that this double null foliation satisfies (16.1.53)–(16.1.56) and (16.1.58).

Using the expressions (4.3.37), (4.3.38), (4.3.39), (4.3.40), (4.3.43), (4.3.44), (4.3.49) for how geometric quantities change under a change of gauge, along with the gauge conditions (16.1.17), (16.1.18), (16.1.19) of Proposition 16.1.7 (with $M = M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}$), it follows that the goal is to find $M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}$ and functions $h^3, h^4: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a diffeomorphism $\#: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ such that

$$\left[2\tilde{\Delta}\tilde{\Delta}h^3(\theta) + \frac{2}{r^2} \left(3 - \frac{8M_f}{r} \right) \tilde{\Delta}h^3(\theta) - \frac{2\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^2}{r^2} \tilde{\Delta}h^4(\theta) + \mathfrak{a}^1(M_f, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}, r, \tilde{r}) \right]_{\ell \geq 2} \quad (16.1.62)$$

$$= \left[-\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^{-2} \tilde{\Delta} \Omega \text{tr} \chi(x_\delta + f(x_\delta)) - r^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M_f})(x_\delta + f(x_\delta)) - 2r^{-1} \mathfrak{m} + \mathfrak{E}^1 \right]_{\ell \geq 2},$$

$$\left[\frac{6M_f}{r^3} \left(1 - \frac{2M_f}{r} \right) \tilde{\Delta}h^3(\theta) \right]_{\ell=1} = \left[\text{div} \Omega \beta(x_\delta + f(x_\delta)) + \mathfrak{E}^2 \right]_{\ell=1}, \quad (16.1.63)$$

$$\left[2\tilde{\Delta}\tilde{\Delta}h^4(\theta) + \frac{4}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r} \right) \tilde{\Delta}h^4(\theta) + \mathfrak{a}^3(M_f, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}, r, \tilde{r}) \right]_{\ell \geq 1} \quad (16.1.64)$$

$$= \left[-\tilde{\Delta} \Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \chi(x_\delta + f(x_\delta)) - \frac{2}{r} \mathfrak{m} - \frac{\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^2}{r^2} (\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \chi - \Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M_f})(x_\delta + f(x_\delta)) + \mathfrak{E}^3 \right]_{\ell \geq 1},$$

$$\left[\mathfrak{a}^4(M_f, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}, r, \tilde{r}) \right]_{\ell=0} \quad (16.1.65)$$

$$= \left[-(\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \chi - \Omega_{\circ, M_f}^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\circ, M_f})(x_\delta + f(x_\delta)) + \Omega_{\circ, M_f}^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M_f})(x_\delta + f(x_\delta)) + \mathfrak{E}^4 \right]_{\ell=0},$$

$$h_{\ell=0}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)) = \int_{u_{-1}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} \partial_u (f_{\ell=0}^3)(u, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)) du, \quad (16.1.66)$$

$$\frac{1}{2}(\tilde{r}^3 \tilde{\rho}_{\ell=0})(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)) = -M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}, \quad (16.1.67)$$

where $\tilde{\Delta}$ is the Laplacian of the new sphere \mathring{S} , and the mode projections refer to the modes of the new sphere \mathring{S} , and such that, if $\psi: \mathring{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ denotes the canonical diffeomorphism of Proposition 4.4.1 arising from the sphere defined by (16.1.61) with the normalised induced metric $r^{-2}g|_{\mathring{S}}$ and $p \in \mathring{S}$, $v \in T_p \mathring{S}$ chosen so that (16.1.59), (16.1.60) are satisfied, then

$$\psi \circ i(\hat{u}_f + \delta + h^3(\theta), v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta) + h^4(\theta), \#(\theta)) = \theta, \quad (16.1.68)$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$, where i (see (4.1.1)) is the local parametrisation of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge. Here $x_\delta = x_\delta(\theta)$ denotes the point $x_\delta = (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta)$,

$$x_\delta + f(x_\delta) = (\hat{u}_f + \delta + f^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta), v_\infty + f^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta), \#(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta)),$$

where $v_\infty = v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$, and $\mathfrak{E}^1, \mathfrak{E}^2, \mathfrak{E}^3$ are nonlinearities determined by the appropriate nonlinearities in the relations (4.3.37), (4.3.38), (4.3.39), (4.3.40), (4.3.43), (4.3.44), (4.3.49). The functions f^1, f^2, f^3, f^4 denote the diffeomorphisms relating the new double null foliation defined by the sphere \tilde{S} (whose double null coordinates are denoted $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta})$), to the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ double null foliation, so that

$$u = \tilde{u} + f^3(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}), \quad v = \tilde{v} + f^4(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}), \quad \theta^A = \tilde{\theta}^A + f^A(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}). \quad (16.1.69)$$

Note that the condition (16.1.68) guarantees that

$$h^3(\theta) = f^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta), \quad h^4(\theta) = f^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta), \quad \mathbb{H}(\theta) = \tilde{\mathbb{H}}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta),$$

with $v_\infty = v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$. The quantity \mathfrak{m} is defined by

$$\mathfrak{m} = \tilde{\Delta} \partial_v f^4 + \frac{\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^2}{r^2} \partial_v f^4 + \frac{2M_f}{r^2} \tilde{\Delta} h^4 - \frac{\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^2}{r} \tilde{\Delta} h^3 + \mathfrak{a}(M_f, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}, r, \tilde{r}),$$

where \mathfrak{a} is a smooth function, determined from the relations (4.3.37), (4.3.38), (4.3.40), (4.3.44) and (4.3.49), such that

$$|\mathfrak{a}(M_f, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}, r, \tilde{r}) + \frac{\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^2}{r^3} \left(1 + \frac{4M_f}{r}\right) (h^3 - h^4)| \lesssim |h|^2 + |M_f - M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}|^2.$$

Note that $\underline{\mu}^\dagger(x_\delta) = \underline{\mu}^\dagger(x_\delta + f(x_\delta)) + \mathfrak{m}(x_\delta) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$. The functions \mathfrak{a}^i are smooth for each i and satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{a}^1(M_f, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}, r, \tilde{r}) - \frac{4\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^2}{r^4} (h^3(\theta) - h^4(\theta))| &\lesssim |h|^2 + |M_f - M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}|^2, \\ |\mathfrak{a}^3(M_f, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}, r, \tilde{r}) - \frac{12M_f\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^2}{r^5} (h^3(\theta) - h^4(\theta))| &\lesssim |h|^2 + |M_f - M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}|^2, \\ |\mathfrak{a}^4(M_f, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}, r, \tilde{r}) + \frac{4}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r}\right) (h^3(\theta) - h^4(\theta))| &\lesssim |h|^2 + |M_f - M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}|. \end{aligned}$$

The function \tilde{r} is the r_M (see (1.3.2)) associated to the \tilde{i} double null parametrisation and mass $M = M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}$, and r is the r_M associated to the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ double null gauge, with mass $M = M_f$. In particular, in the coordinates associated to the \tilde{i} double null parametrisation,

$$\tilde{r}(u, v, \theta) = r_{M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}}(u, v), \quad r(u, v, \theta) = r_{M_f}(u + f^3(u, v, \theta), v + f^4(u, v, \theta)).$$

Schematically, the nonlinear terms take the form, for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$,

$$\mathfrak{E}^i(\theta) = \sum_{|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2| \leq 4} \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \Phi_{M_f} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f(x_\delta) + \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} f(x_\delta). \quad (16.1.70)$$

The quantities $\tilde{\Delta} \Omega \text{tr} \chi$, $\underline{\mu}^\dagger$, Φ etc. refer to the quantities in the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge.

Indeed, given a solution to the system (16.1.62)–(16.1.67), it follows from the expressions (4.3.31)–(4.3.50) for how geometric quantities change under a change of gauge, together with the fact that the gauge conditions (16.1.17), (16.1.18), (16.1.19) of Proposition 16.1.7 already hold, that the gauge conditions (16.1.53)–(16.1.56) hold in the spacetime double null foliation obtained from Proposition 16.1.7 using the new sphere defined by the functions $s^3 = h^3 \circ \mathbb{H}^{-1}$, $s^4 = h^4 \circ \mathbb{H}^{-1}$.

Consider the following sequence of iterates. Let $h_{[0]} = \mathbb{H}_{[0]} = f_{[0]} = 0$, $\rho_{[0]} = \rho$. For $n \geq 1$, $M_{[n]}$, $h_{[n]}$ and $f_{[n]}$ are defined inductively as follows. Given $\rho_{[n-1]}$, let

$$M_{[n-1]} := -\frac{1}{2}(r^3 \rho_{\ell=0})_{[n-1]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)),$$

and, given $h_{[n-1]}$ and $f_{[n-1]}$, consider the equations,

$$\left[2\Delta_{[n-1]}\Delta_{[n-1]}h_{[n]}^3(\theta) + \frac{2}{r_{[n-1]}^2} \left(3 - \frac{8M_f}{r_{[n-1]}} \right) \Delta_{[n-1]}h_{[n]}^3(\theta) - \frac{2}{r_{[n-1]}^2} \left(1 - \frac{2M_f}{r_{[n-1]}} \right) \Delta_{[n-1]}h_{[n]}^4(\theta) + \frac{4}{r_{[n-1]}^4} \left(1 - \frac{2M_f}{r_{[n-1]}} \right) (h_{[n]}^3(\theta) - h_{[n]}^4(\theta)) \right]_{(\ell \geq 2)_{[n-1]}} = \left[\mathcal{G}_{[n-1]}^1 + \mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^1 + A_{[n-1]}^1 \right]_{(\ell \geq 2)_{[n-1]}}, \quad (16.1.71)$$

$$\left[\frac{6M_f}{r_{[n-1]}^3} \left(1 - \frac{2M_f}{r_{[n-1]}} \right) \Delta_{[n-1]}h_{[n]}^3(\theta) \right]_{(\ell=1)_{[n-1]}} = \left[\mathcal{G}_{[n-1]}^2 + \mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^2 + A_{[n-1]}^2 \right]_{(\ell=1)_{[n-1]}}, \quad (16.1.72)$$

$$2\Delta_{[n-1]}\Delta_{[n-1]}h_{[n]}^4(\theta) + \frac{4}{r_{[n-1]}^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r_{[n-1]}} \right) \Delta_{[n-1]}h_{[n]}^4(\theta) + \frac{12M_f}{r_{[n-1]}^5} \left(1 - \frac{2M_f}{r_{[n-1]}} \right) (h_{[n]}^3(\theta) - h_{[n]}^4(\theta)) = \left[\mathcal{G}_{[n-1]}^3 + \mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^3 + A_{[n-1]}^3 \right]_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}}, \quad (16.1.73)$$

$$- \frac{4}{r_{[n-1]}^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r_{[n-1]}} \right) (h_{[n]}^3(\theta) - h_{[n]}^4(\theta)) = \left[\mathcal{G}_{[n-1]}^4 + \mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^4 + A_{[n-1]}^4 \right]_{(\ell=0)_{[n-1]}}, \quad (16.1.74)$$

$$(h_{\ell=0}^3)_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)) = \int_{u_{-1}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} \partial_u (f_{\ell=0}^3)_{[n]}(u, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)) du, \quad (16.1.75)$$

where, $\Delta = \Delta_{[n-1]}$ is the Laplacian of the sphere defined by $h_{[n-1]}$ (see (16.1.77) below), the notation $(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}$ is used for the projection to $\ell \geq 1$ associated the spheres of the double foliation defined by $h_{[n-1]}$, and, schematically,

$$\mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^i(\theta) = \sum_{|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2| \leq 4} \Pi_{S_{[n-1]}} \Phi_{M_f} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n-1]}(x_\delta) + \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n-1]} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} f_{[n-1]}(x_\delta).$$

Again,

$$x_\delta + f_{[n-1]}(x_\delta) = (\hat{u}_f + \delta + f_{[n-1]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta), v_\infty + f_{[n-1]}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta), \#_{[n-1]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta)), \quad (16.1.76)$$

where $v_\infty = v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$. The functions $\mathcal{G}_{[n-1]}^i$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{[n-1]}^1 &= -\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^{-2} \Delta \Omega \text{tr} \chi(x_\delta + f_{[n-1]}(x_\delta)) - r^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)(x_\delta + f_{[n-1]}(x_\delta)) - 2r^{-1} \mathfrak{m}_{[n-1]}(x_\delta), \\ \mathcal{G}_{[n-1]}^2 &= \text{div} \Omega \beta(x_\delta + f_{[n-1]}(x_\delta)), \\ \mathcal{G}_{[n-1]}^3 &= -\Delta \Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi}(x_\delta + f_{[n-1]}(x_\delta)) - \Omega_{\circ, M_f}^2 r^{-2} (\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ, M_f})(x_\delta + f_{[n-1]}(x_\delta)) - 2r^{-1} \mathfrak{m}_{[n-1]}(x_\delta), \\ \mathcal{G}_{[n-1]}^4 &= -(\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega_{\circ, M_f}^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\circ, M_f})(x_\delta + f_{[n-1]}(x_\delta)) + \Omega_{\circ, M_f}^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M_f})(x_\delta + f_{[n-1]}(x_\delta)), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{m}_{[n-1]} = \Delta_{[n-1]} \partial_v f_{[n-1]}^4 + \frac{\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^2}{r^2} \partial_v f_{[n-1]}^4 + \frac{2M_f}{r^2} \Delta_{[n-1]} h_{[n-1]}^4 - \frac{\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^2}{r} \Delta_{[n-1]} h_{[n-1]}^3 + \mathfrak{a}(M_f, M_{[n-1]}, r, r_{[n-1]}),$$

and the functions $A_{[n-1]}^i$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{[n-1]}^1 &= \left[\frac{2}{r_{[n-1]}^2} \left(3 - \frac{8M_f}{r_{[n-1]}} \right) - \frac{2}{r^2} \left(3 - \frac{8M_f}{r} \right) \right] \Delta_{[n-1]} h_{[n-1]}^3(\theta) + \frac{4}{r_{[n-1]}^4} \left(1 - \frac{2M_f}{r_{[n-1]}} \right) (h_{[n-1]}^3(\theta) - h_{[n-1]}^4(\theta)) \\
&\quad - \left[\frac{2}{r_{[n-1]}^2} \left(1 - \frac{2M_f}{r_{[n-1]}} \right) - \frac{2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{2M_f}{r} \right) \right] \Delta_{[n-1]} h_{[n-1]}^4(\theta) - \mathfrak{a}^1(M_f, M_{[n-1]}, r, r_{[n-1]}), \\
A_{[n-1]}^2 &= \left[\frac{6M_f}{r_{[n-1]}^3} \left(1 - \frac{2M_f}{r_{[n-1]}} \right) - \frac{6M_f}{r^3} \left(1 - \frac{2M_f}{r} \right) \right] \Delta_{[n-1]} h_{[n-1]}^3(\theta), \\
A_{[n-1]}^3 &= \left[\frac{4}{r_{[n-1]}^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r_{[n-1]}} \right) - \frac{4}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r} \right) \right] \Delta_{[n-1]} h_{[n-1]}^4(\theta) \\
&\quad + \frac{12M_f}{r_{[n-1]}^5} \left(1 - \frac{2M_f}{r_{[n-1]}} \right) (h_{[n-1]}^3(\theta) - h_{[n-1]}^4(\theta)) - \mathfrak{a}^3(M_f, M_{[n-1]}, r, r_{[n-1]}), \\
A_{[n-1]}^4 &= -\mathfrak{a}^4(M_f, M_{[n-1]}, r, r_{[n-1]}) + \frac{4}{r_{[n-1]}^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r_{[n-1]}} \right) (h_{[n-1]}^3(\theta) - h_{[n-1]}^4(\theta)),
\end{aligned}$$

$r_{[n-1]}$ is the r_M (see (1.3.2)) associated to the $i_{[n-1]}$ double null parametrisation and mass $M = M_{[n-1]}$, and r is the r_M associated to the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ double null gauge, with mass $M = M_f$, so that, in the coordinates associated to the $i_{[n-1]}$ double null parametrisation,

$$\begin{aligned}
r_{[n-1]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta) &= r_{M_{[n-1]}}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty), \\
r(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta) &= r_{M_f}(\hat{u}_f + \delta + f_{[n-1]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta), v + f_{[n-1]}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta)),
\end{aligned}$$

with $v_\infty = v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$.

It follows from standard elliptic theory that there exist unique solutions $h_{[n]}^3, h_{[n]}^4$ of the linear elliptic system (16.1.71), (16.1.72), (16.1.73) which are supported on $(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}$. Moreover the unique solutions $h_{[n]}^3, h_{[n]}^4$ of (16.1.74), (16.1.75) are supported on $(\ell = 0)_{[n-1]}$. Define, therefore

$$h_{[n]}^3 = (h_{[n]}^3)_{(\ell=0)_{[n-1]}} + (h_{[n]}^3)_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}}, \quad h_{[n]}^4 = (h_{[n]}^4)_{(\ell=0)_{[n-1]}} + (h_{[n]}^4)_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}},$$

where the functions $(h_{[n]}^3)_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}}$, $(h_{[n]}^4)_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}}$ are the unique solutions of the system (16.1.71), (16.1.72), (16.1.73) and the functions $(h_{[n]}^3)_{(\ell=0)_{[n-1]}}$, $(h_{[n]}^4)_{(\ell=0)_{[n-1]}}$ are the unique solutions of (16.1.74), (16.1.75).

Such solutions $h_{[n]}^3, h_{[n]}^4$, together with the “previous” spherical diffeomorphism $\#_{[n-1]}$, define an “ n -th” sphere $S_{[n]}$, expressed in the $(u_{\mathcal{I}^+}, v_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{I}^+})$ coordinate system of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge by

$$S_{[n]} = \{i_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta + h_{[n]}^3(\theta), v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta) + h_{[n]}^4(\theta), \#_{[n-1]}(\theta)) \mid \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2\}. \quad (16.1.77)$$

Each such sphere $S_{[n]}$ defines (provided $h_{[n]}^3 \circ \#_{[n-1]}^{-1}$ and $h_{[n]}^4 \circ \#_{[n-1]}^{-1}$ are sufficiently small), by Proposition 16.1.7 (with $s^3 = h_{[n]}^3 \circ \#_{[n-1]}^{-1}$, $s^4 = h_{[n]}^4 \circ \#_{[n-1]}^{-1}$), a unique double null parametrisation

$$i_{[n]}: \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta) \rightarrow \mathcal{M},$$

such that the associated geometric quantities satisfy the gauge conditions of Proposition 16.1.7, (16.1.57) holds, the image of \mathbb{S}^2 under $i_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \cdot)$ is the sphere $S_{[n]}$, and

$$i_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \cdot) = \psi_{[n]}^{-1},$$

where $\psi_{[n]}: S_{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ is the canonical diffeomorphism of Proposition 4.4.1 arising from the normalised induced metric $r_{[n]}^{-2}g|_{S_{[n]}}$ and $p \in S_{[n]}$, $v \in T_p S_{[n]}$ chosen so that the diffeomorphisms relating this double null parametrisation to the initial Eddington–Finkelstein gauge (5.6.2) satisfies, using the notation of Definition 5.6.1,

$$(f_{[n]})_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}^A(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta_0^1, \theta_0^2) = \partial_{\theta^1}(f_{[n]})_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}^A(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta_0^1, \theta_0^2) = 0, \quad A = 1, 2.$$

Let $(u_{[n]}, v_{[n]}, \theta_{[n]})$ denote the coordinates of the local representation which define this n -th double null foliation, and define $f_{[n]}$ to be the diffeomorphism functions which relate this “ n -th” double null foliation to the extended \hat{u}_f normalised double null foliation,

$$u = u_{[n]} + f_{[n]}^3(u_{[n]}, v_{[n]}, \theta_{[n]}), \quad v = v_{[n]} + f_{[n]}^4(u_{[n]}, v_{[n]}, \theta_{[n]}),$$

$$\theta^A = \#_{[n]}^A(u_{[n]}, v_{[n]}, \theta_{[n]}) = \theta_{[n]}^A + f_{[n]}^A(u_{[n]}, v_{[n]}, \theta_{[n]}),$$

and define $\rho_{[n]}$ etc. to be the geometric quantities of this “ n -th” double null foliation (schematically denoted $\Phi_{[n]}$). Define also the diffeomorphism $F_{[n]}$ by

$$(u, v, \theta) = F_{[n]}(u_{[n]}, v_{[n]}, \theta_{[n]}).$$

Let $\#_{[n]}$ be defined by the relation

$$\psi_{[n]} \circ i(\hat{u}_f + \delta + h_{[n]}^3(\theta), v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta) + h_{[n]}^4(\theta), \#_{[n-1]}(\theta)) = \#_{[n]}^{-1} \circ \#_{[n-1]}(\theta),$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$, where i (see (4.1.1)) is the local parametrisation of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge. It follows that

$$(i_{[n]})^{-1} \circ i(\hat{u}_f + \delta + h_{[n]}^3(\theta), v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta) + h_{[n]}^4(\theta), \#_{[n-1]}(\theta)) = (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \#_{[n]}^{-1} \circ \#_{[n-1]}(\theta)),$$

hence

$$f_{[n]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta) = h_{[n]}^3 \circ \#_{[n-1]}^{-1} \circ \#_{[n]}(\theta), \quad f_{[n]}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta) = h_{[n]}^4 \circ \#_{[n-1]}^{-1} \circ \#_{[n]}(\theta), \quad (16.1.78)$$

and

$$\#_{[n]}(\theta) = \#_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta),$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$, with $v_\infty = v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$.

In order to show that the sequence $\{h_{[n]}\}$ converges it is first necessary to estimate the iterates $f_{[n]}$ and their derivatives.

In what follows x will be used to denote a value $x = (u, v, \theta)$. For fixed (u, v) the geometric quantities $\Phi(u, v)$ and $\Phi_{[n]}(u, v)$ can be viewed, via the identifications (4.1.1) and (4.2.1), as tensor fields on the sphere \mathbb{S}^2 . When the quantities Φ and $\Phi_{[n]}$ are compared, they will be sometimes be identified using the values of their respective coordinate functions, i.e. $\Phi(u, v)$ and $\Phi_{[n]}(u, v)$ will be identified, in this way, as tensor fields on \mathbb{S}^2 , in which case we write $\Phi(x) - \Phi_{[n]}(x)$. They will also be considered at the same spacetime point, as in the relations of Propositions 4.3.1, 4.3.2 and 4.3.3, in which case we write $\Pi_{S_{[n]}}\Phi - \Phi_{[n]}$, where the projection $\Pi_{S_{[n]}}$ is as in (4.3.29). For example, for $\Phi = \rho$, the difference $(\Pi_{S_{[n]}}\rho - \rho_{[n]})$ at the spacetime point $(u_{[n]}, v_{[n]}, \theta_{[n]}) = (u, v, \theta)$ takes the form

$$(\Pi_{S_{[n]}}\rho - \rho_{[n]})(u, v, \theta) = \rho(F_{[n]}(u, v, \theta)) - \rho_{[n]}(u, v, \theta) = \rho(x + f_{[n]}(x)) - \rho_{[n]}(x),$$

and for $\Phi = \alpha$, the difference takes the form

$$(\Pi_{S_{[n]}}\alpha - \alpha_{[n]})(u, v, \theta) = \left(\alpha(F_{[n]}(u, v, \theta))_{CD} \partial_{\theta_{[n]}^A} F_{[n]}^C \partial_{\theta_{[n]}^B} F_{[n]}^D - \alpha_{[n]}(u, v, \theta)_{AB} \right) d\theta_{[n]}^A d\theta_{[n]}^B.$$

The difference $\alpha(u, v, \theta) - \alpha_{[n]}(u, v, \theta)$, on the other hand, takes the form

$$\alpha(u, v, \theta) - \alpha_{[n]}(u, v, \theta) = \left(\alpha(u, v, \theta)_{AB} - \alpha_{[n]}(u, v, \theta)_{AB} \right) d\theta_{[n]}^A d\theta_{[n]}^B.$$

Similarly, for fixed (u, v) , α and $\Pi_{S_{[n]}}\alpha$ can be identified as tensor fields on \mathbb{S}^2 and we write $\alpha(u, v, \theta) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}}\alpha(u, v, \theta)$ to mean

$$\alpha(u, v, \theta) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}}\alpha(u, v, \theta) = \left(\alpha(u, v, \theta)_{AB} - \alpha(F_{[n]}(u, v, \theta))_{CD} \partial_{\theta_{[n]}^A} F_{[n]}^C \partial_{\theta_{[n]}^B} F_{[n]}^D \right) d\theta_{[n]}^A d\theta_{[n]}^B. \quad (16.1.79)$$

For some given $u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta$ and $k \geq 1$, define the norm on diffeomorphisms f ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq k} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} &= \sum_{|\gamma| \leq k} \left(\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^3\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} + r^{-1} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^4\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} \right) \\ &+ \sum_{|\gamma| \leq k-1} \left(\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_u f\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_v f\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_u f^4\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} + r \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_v f^3\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.80)$$

with, for example,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^3\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^3(u, v_\infty, \theta)|_{r^2 \gamma}^2 \sqrt{\det \gamma(\theta)} d\theta.$$

Define also $\sum_{|\gamma| \leq k} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{\ell \geq 1}\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}$ by replacing f^3 and f^4 with $f_{\ell \geq 1}^3$ and $f_{\ell \geq 1}^4$ respectively in (16.1.80).

The following will be used in the proof of Lemma 16.1.15.

Lemma 16.1.14 (Estimates for differences between S tensors with pullback by $\sharp_{[n]}$). *Let $v_\infty = v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$, and recall the norm (16.1.80). Suppose that, in each coordinate chart $U \subset \mathbb{S}^2$, with associated coordinates (θ^1, θ^2) ,*

$$\sum_{k_1+k_2 \leq 5} \sum_{A=1,2} \|\partial_{\theta^1}^{k_1} \partial_{\theta^2}^{k_2} (\sharp_{[n]}^A(\theta) - \theta^A) \mathbf{1}_U\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} + \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} \lesssim 1.$$

Then, for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta$,

$$|h(u, v_\infty, \theta) - h(u, v_\infty, \sharp_{[n]}(u, v_\infty, \theta))| \lesssim \sup_{S_{u,v_\infty}} |r \nabla h|_{\sharp_{[n]}} \left(\frac{\varepsilon \delta}{r} + \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} \right), \quad (16.1.81)$$

for all functions h , and

$$\left| (\omega - (\sharp_{[n]}(u, v_\infty, \cdot))^* \omega)(u, v_\infty, \theta) \right|_{\sharp_{[n]}} \lesssim \sup_{S_{u,v_\infty}} (|\omega|_{\sharp_{[n]}} + |r \nabla \omega|_{\sharp_{[n]}}) \left(\frac{\varepsilon \delta}{r} + \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} \right). \quad (16.1.82)$$

for any S -tangent $(0, k)$ tensor ω . Moreover,

$$\sum_{k \leq 3} \|(r \nabla)^{k+2} \sharp_{[n]}\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{r} + \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}. \quad (16.1.83)$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} &|h(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \sharp_{[n+1]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta)) - h(u, v_\infty, \sharp_{[n]}(u, v_\infty, \theta))| \\ &\lesssim \sup_{S_{u,v_\infty}} |r \nabla h|_{\sharp_{[n]}} \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]} - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}, \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.84)$$

for all functions h , and

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| ((\sharp_{[n+1]}(u, v_\infty, \cdot))^* \omega - (\sharp_{[n]}(u, v_\infty, \cdot))^* \omega)(u, v_\infty, \theta) \right|_{\sharp_{[n]}} \\ &\lesssim \sup_{S_{u,v_\infty}} (|\omega|_{\sharp_{[n]}} + |r \nabla \omega|_{\sharp_{[n]}}) \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]} - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}. \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.85)$$

for any S -tangent $(0, k)$ tensor ω . Finally,

$$\sum_{k \leq 3} \|(r \nabla)^{k+2} \sharp_{[n]}^{-1} \circ \sharp_{[n+1]}\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} \lesssim \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]} - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}. \quad (16.1.86)$$

Proof. Let (θ^1, θ^2) be the local coordinates of some coordinate chart on \mathbb{S}^2 , and let i denote the parametrisation of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge. In what follows the identification

$$\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2} \circ i^{-1}: S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2, \quad (16.1.87)$$

$$i(\hat{u}_f + \delta + h_{[n]}^3 \circ \#_{[n-1]}^{-1}(\theta), v_\infty + h_{[n]}^4 \circ \#_{[n-1]}^{-1}(\theta), \theta) \mapsto \theta \quad (16.1.88)$$

will be used, where $\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2}$ denotes the projection onto the \mathbb{S}^2 argument. Consider Proposition 4.4.1, in particular equations (4.4.6), (4.4.7) and (4.4.8), with $S = \mathbb{S}^2$, $p = (1, 0, 0)$, $v = (0, 1, 0) \in T_p \mathbb{S}^2$, $h = i^*(r^{-2}\mathcal{J})(\hat{u}_f, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f), \cdot)$ and $\hat{h} = R^*\mathfrak{g}$ where

$$\mathfrak{g} = r_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty)^{-2}(i^*g)(\hat{u}_f + \delta + h_{[n]}^3 \circ \#_{[n-1]}^{-1}(\cdot), v_\infty + h_{[n]}^4 \circ \#_{[n-1]}^{-1}(\cdot), \cdot),$$

is the $(r_{[n]}^{-2})$ normalised induced metric on the sphere $S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}^{[n]}$ in the parametrisation of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge (i.e. viewed as a metric on \mathbb{S}^2 via the identification (16.1.87), (16.1.88)), $v_\infty = v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and $R: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ is the unique rotation which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} R(1, 0, 0) &= \pi_{\mathbb{S}^2} \circ i^{-1} \circ j_{[n]} \circ (\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2}^{\mathcal{EF}}|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}^{[n]}})^{-1}(1, 0, 0), \\ R_*(0, 1, 0) &= (\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2})_* \circ (i^{-1})_* \circ (j_{[n]})_* \circ (\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2}^{\mathcal{EF}}|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}^{[n]}})^{-1}_*(0, 1, 0), \end{aligned}$$

where $j_{[n]}: S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}^{[n]} \rightarrow S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}^{[n]}$ is the natural null flow diffeomorphism of the n -th double null foliation (see (5.6.16)) and

$$L = |(\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2})_* \circ (i^{-1})_* \circ (j_{[n]})_* \circ (\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2}^{\mathcal{EF}}|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}^{[n]}})^{-1}_*(0, 1, 0)|_{\tilde{\gamma}}.$$

Now, in order to estimate the right hand sides of equations (4.4.6), (4.4.7) and (4.4.8), for $k = 0, 1, 2$, in view of the \mathbb{S}^2 identification of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ double null parametrisation,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{\psi^*h}^k \psi^*(h - \hat{h})\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} &= \|(r\mathcal{V})^k(r^{-2}\mathcal{J}(\hat{u}_f, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f), \cdot) - R^*\mathfrak{g})\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} \\ &\lesssim \|(r\mathcal{V})^k(r^{-2}\mathcal{J}(\hat{u}_f, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f), \cdot) - R^*(r^{-2}\mathcal{J})(\hat{u}_f, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f), \cdot))\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} + \|(r\mathcal{V})^k(R^*(r^{-2}\mathcal{J})(\hat{u}_f, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f), \cdot) - R^*\mathfrak{g})\|_{\mathbb{S}^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.89)$$

It follows from the relation (4.3.28) that

$$\|(r\mathcal{V})^k(r^{-2}\mathcal{J}(\hat{u}_f, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f), \cdot) - \mathfrak{g})\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon\delta}{r} + r^{-1} \sum_{\tilde{k} \leq k+1} (\|(r\mathcal{V})^{\tilde{k}}(h_{[n]}^3 \circ \#_{[n-1]}^{-1})\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} + \|(r\mathcal{V})^{\tilde{k}}(h_{[n]}^4 \circ \#_{[n-1]}^{-1})\|_{\mathbb{S}^2}). \quad (16.1.90)$$

Now, for any $(0, k)$ tensor field ω on \mathbb{S}^2 ,

$$\sum_{l \leq k} \|\tilde{\nabla}^l(\omega - R^*\omega)\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} \lesssim \sum_{l \leq k+1} \|\tilde{\nabla}^l \omega\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} \sum_{A=1,2} (|R(x_{[n]})^A - x_{[n]}^A| + |(R_*\partial_{\theta^1}|_{R(x_{[n]})})^A - (\partial_{\theta^1}|_{x_{[n]}})^A|), \quad (16.1.91)$$

where

$$x_{[n]} = (\hat{u}_f + \delta + f_{[n]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \#_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta_0)), v_\infty + f_{[n]}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \#_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta_0)), \theta_0),$$

which, recall, is identified with the point $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{S}^2$ via (16.1.87), (16.1.88). Before proceeding to estimate the terms on the right hand side of (16.1.91), first note that the diffeomorphism $j_{[n]}$ has the property that, for a point $q = i_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u(q), v(q), \theta(q)) \in S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}^{[n]}$, its image under $j_{[n]}$ takes the form $j_{[n]}(q) = i_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u(j_{[n]}q), v(j_{[n]}q), \theta(j_{[n]}q)) \in S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}^{[n]}$ with coordinates satisfying

$$|u(j_{[n]}q) - (\hat{u}_f + \delta) - u(q) + u_{-1}| \lesssim \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} (|f_{[n]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta)| + |f_{[n]}^3(u_{-1}, v_\infty, \theta)|), \quad (16.1.92)$$

$$|v(j_{[n]}q) - v(q)| \lesssim \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} (|f_{[n]}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta)| + |f_{[n]}^4(u_{-1}, v_\infty, \theta)|), \quad (16.1.93)$$

$$\sum_{A=1,2} |\theta^A(j_{[n]}q) - \theta^A(q)| \lesssim \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} \int_{u_{-1}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} r^{-1} |\partial_u f_{[n]}(u, v_\infty)| du. \quad (16.1.94)$$

Moreover, if a vector $w \in T_q S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}^{[n]}$ takes the form $w = w^A \partial_{\theta^A} + w^u \partial_u + w^v \partial_v$ with respect to the coordinate frame of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, then its image $(j_{[n]})_* w \in T_{j_{[n]}(q)} S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}^{[n]}$ takes the form

$(j_{[n]})_* w = ((j_{[n]})_* w)^A \partial_{\theta^A} + ((j_{[n]})_* w)^u \partial_u + ((j_{[n]})_* w)^v \partial_v$, where the components satisfy

$$|((j_{[n]})_* w)^u - w^u| \lesssim \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} (|w^A \partial_{\theta^A} (\mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1})^B(\theta) \partial_{\theta^B} f_{[n]}^3(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}, \theta)| + |w^A \partial_{\theta^A} (\mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1})^B(\theta) \partial_{\theta^B} f_{[n]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{\infty}, \theta)|) \quad (16.1.95)$$

$$|((j_{[n]})_* w)^v - w^v| \lesssim \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} (|w^A \partial_{\theta^A} (\mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1})^B(\theta) \partial_{\theta^B} f_{[n]}^4(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}, \theta)| + |w^A \partial_{\theta^A} (\mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1})^B(\theta) \partial_{\theta^B} f_{[n]}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{\infty}, \theta)|) \quad (16.1.96)$$

$$|((j_{[n]})_* w)^A - w^A| \lesssim |w^B \partial_{\theta^B} (\mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1})^C(\theta)| \int_{u_{-1}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} |\partial_{\theta^C} \partial_u f_{[n]}^A(u, v_{\infty})| du. \quad (16.1.97)$$

Indeed, (16.1.92)–(16.1.94) follow from the fact that any such q takes the form

$$q = i_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_{-1} + f_{[n]}^3(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta)), v_{\infty} + f_{[n]}^4(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta)), \mathbb{F}_{[n]}(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta)),$$

for some $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$ and then

$$\begin{aligned} j_{[n]} \circ i_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_{-1} + f_{[n]}^3(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta)), v_{\infty} + f_{[n]}^4(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta)), \mathbb{F}_{[n]}(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta))) \\ = i_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta + f_{[n]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{\infty}, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta)), v_{\infty} + f_{[n]}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{\infty}, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta)), \theta), \end{aligned}$$

along with the fact that

$$|\mathbb{F}_{[n]}^A(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta)) - \theta^A| \lesssim \int_{u_{-1}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} |\partial_u f_{[n]}^A(u, v_{\infty}, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta))| du,$$

and

$$|\partial_u f_{[n]}^A| \lesssim |\partial_u f_{[n]}| |d\theta^A|_{\mathcal{F}} \lesssim r^{-1} |\partial_u f_{[n]}|.$$

Similarly, (16.1.95) and (16.1.96) follow from the fact that any $w \in T_q S_{u_{-1}, v_{\infty}}^{[n]}$ can be written

$$\begin{aligned} w = w^A \Big(\partial_{\theta^B} f_{[n]}^3(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta)) \partial_{\theta^A} (\mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1})^B(\theta) \partial_u + \partial_{\theta^B} f_{[n]}^4(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta)) \partial_{\theta^A} (\mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1})^B(\theta) \partial_v \\ + \partial_{\theta^B} \mathbb{F}_{[n]}^C(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta)) \partial_{\theta^A} (\mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1})^B(\theta) \partial_{\theta^C} \Big), \end{aligned}$$

and so $(j_{[n]})_* w$ takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} (j_{[n]})_* w = w^A \Big(\partial_{\theta^B} f_{[n]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{\infty}, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta)) \partial_{\theta^A} (\mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1})^B(\theta) \partial_u \\ + \partial_{\theta^B} f_{[n]}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{\infty}, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta)) \partial_{\theta^A} (\mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1})^B(\theta) \partial_v + \partial_{\theta^A} \Big). \end{aligned}$$

The terms on the right hand side of (16.1.91) are estimated as follows. The rotation R has the property that (recalling the identification (16.1.87), (16.1.88) of $S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{\infty}}^{[n]}$ with \mathbb{S}^2)

$$R(\hat{u}_f + \delta + f_{[n]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{\infty}, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta_0)), v_{\infty} + f_{[n]}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{\infty}, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta_0)), \theta_0) = j_{[n]}(u_*, v_*, \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}(u_*, v_*, \theta_0)),$$

and

$$R_* \partial_{\theta^1} = L^{-1} (j_{[n]})_* (\Pi_{S_{u_{-1}, v_{\infty}}^{[n]}} \partial_{\theta_{\mathcal{F}}^1})$$

for some u_*, v_* satisfying

$$u_* = u_{-1} + f_{[n]}^3(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}, \theta_*), \quad v_* = v_{\infty} + f_{[n]}^4(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}, \theta_*), \quad (16.1.98)$$

and θ_* satisfying

$$\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}(u_*, v_*, \theta_0) = \mathbb{F}_{[n]}(u_{-1}, v_{\infty}, \theta_*),$$

so that indeed

$$i(u_*, v_*, \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}(u_*, v_*, \theta_0)) \in S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}^{[n]},$$

where $\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{I}^+, d} = \pi_{\mathbb{S}^2} \circ i_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{-1} \circ i_{\mathcal{EF}}$ and $i_{\mathcal{EF}}$ is the initial Eddington–Finkelstein parametrisation (5.6.2), $i_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ is the parametrisation of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, and $\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2}$ denotes the projection onto the \mathbb{S}^2 argument. To estimate $|R(x_{[n]})^A - x_{[n]}^A|$, note that (16.1.94) implies that

$$|(R(x_{[n]})^A - x_{[n]}^A) - (\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}(u_*, v_*, \theta_0)^A - \theta_0^A)| \lesssim \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} \int_{u_{-1}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} r^{-1} |\partial_u f_{[n]}(u, v_\infty)| du.$$

Recall now that $\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f), \theta_0) = \theta_0$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}(u_*, v_*, \theta_0)^A - \theta_0^A| &\lesssim \int_{u_{-1}}^{u_*} |\partial_u f_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}^A(u, v_*, \theta_0)| du + \int_{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f)}^{v_*} |\partial_v f_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}^A(u_{-1}, v, \theta_0)| dv \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{r} (\varepsilon \delta + \varepsilon \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} (|f_{[n]}^3(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta)| + |f_{[n]}^4(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta)|)), \end{aligned}$$

by (16.1.98), since $|v_\infty(\hat{u}_f) - v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)| \lesssim \delta$. Hence, for $A = 1, 2$,

$$|R(x_{[n]})^A - x_{[n]}^A| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{r} + r^{-1} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} (|f_{[n]}^3(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta))| + |f_{[n]}^4(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta))| + \int_{u_{-1}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} |\partial_u f_{[n]}(u, v_\infty)| du). \quad (16.1.99)$$

Note now that

$$\Pi_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}^{[n]}} \partial_{\theta^1_{\mathcal{EF}}} = \partial_{\theta^1_{\mathcal{EF}}} + \frac{1}{2} g(\partial_{\theta^1_{\mathcal{EF}}}, e_4^{[n]}) e_3^{[n]} + \frac{1}{2} g(\partial_{\theta^1_{\mathcal{EF}}}, e_3^{[n]}) e_4^{[n]}.$$

With respect to the double null frame of the extended \mathcal{I}^+ gauge,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\theta^1_{\mathcal{EF}}} &= \partial_{\theta^1} F_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}^A e_A + \Omega \partial_{\theta^1} f_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}^3 e_3 + \Omega \partial_{\theta^1} f_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}^4 e_4 - \partial_{\theta^1} f_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}^3 b, \\ e_3^{[n]} &= \Omega \left(1 + \partial_u f_{[n]}^3 \right) e_3 + \Omega \partial_u f_{[n]}^4 e_4 + \partial_u f_{[n]}^A e_A - \left(1 + \partial_u f_{[n]}^3 \right) b, \\ e_4^{[n]} &= \Omega \left(1 + \partial_v f_{[n]}^4 \right) e_4 + \Omega \partial_v f_{[n]}^3 e_3 + \partial_v f_{[n]}^A e_A - \partial_v f_{[n]}^3 b, \end{aligned}$$

since $b_{[n]} \equiv 0$ and $\Omega_{[n]} \equiv 1$ on $S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}^{[n]}$, and so it follows that

$$\Pi_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}^{[n]}} \partial_{\theta^1_{\mathcal{EF}}} = \mathcal{U}^A \partial_{\theta^A} + \mathcal{U}^u \partial_u + \mathcal{U}^v \partial_v,$$

where the components satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{A=1,2} |\mathcal{U}^A(x_0) - \partial_{\theta^1} \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}^A(u_*, v_*, \theta_0)| + |\mathcal{U}^u(x_0) - \not{g}_{AB}(x_0) \partial_v \mathbb{F}_{[n]}^A(u_{-1}, v_\infty, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta)) \partial_{\theta^1} \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}^B(u_*, v_*, \theta_0)| \\ &\quad + |\mathcal{U}^v(x_0) - \not{g}_{AB}(x_0) \partial_u \mathbb{F}_{[n]}^A(u_{-1}, v_\infty, \mathbb{H}_{[n]}^{-1}(\theta)) \partial_{\theta^1} \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}^B(u_*, v_*, \theta_0)| \\ &\lesssim \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} (|\partial_u f_{[n]}(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| + |\partial_v f_{[n]}(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| + |\partial_u f_{[n]}^3(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| + |\partial_v f_{[n]}^3(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| + |\partial_u f_{[n]}^4(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| \\ &\quad + |\partial_v f_{[n]}^4(u_{-1}, v_\infty)|), \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.100)$$

using the relation (4.3.23) and the estimates (16.1.11), which easily yield appropriate estimates for the $f_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}$ diffeomorphism functions, where

$$x_0 = (u_*, v_*, \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}(u_*, v_*, \theta_0)).$$

It follows from (16.1.97) and (16.1.100) that, for $A = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} &|((R_* \partial_{\theta^1} |R(x_{[n]})|^A) - (\partial_{\theta^1} |x_{[n]}|^A) - (\partial_{\theta^1} \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}^A(u_*, v_*, \theta_0) - \delta_1^A))| \\ &\lesssim \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} \left(\int_{u_{-1}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} r^{-1} |r \nabla \partial_u f_{[n]}(u, v_\infty)| du + |\partial_u f_{[n]}(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| + |\partial_v f_{[n]}(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| + |\partial_u f_{[n]}^3(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\partial_v f_{[n]}^3(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| + |\partial_u f_{[n]}^4(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| + |\partial_v f_{[n]}^4(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now recall that

$$\partial_{\theta^1} \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}^A(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f), \theta_0) = \delta_1^A,$$

and so

$$|\partial_{\theta^1} \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{I}^+, d}^A(u_*, v_*, \theta_0) - \delta_1^A| \lesssim \frac{1}{r} (\varepsilon \delta + \varepsilon \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} (|f_{[n]}^3(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta)| + |f_{[n]}^4(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta)|)).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |(R_* \partial_{\theta^1} |_{R(x_{[n]})})^A - (\partial_{\theta^1} |_{x_{[n]}})^A| &\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{r} + \varepsilon \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} (r^{-1} (|f_{[n]}^3(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta)| + |f_{[n]}^4(u_{-1}, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta)|) \\ &\quad + \int_{u_{-1}}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} r^{-1} |r \nabla \partial_u f_{[n]}(u, v_\infty)| + |\partial_u f_{[n]}(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| + |\partial_v f_{[n]}(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| + |\partial_u f_{[n]}^3(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| \\ &\quad + |\partial_v f_{[n]}^3(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| + |\partial_u f_{[n]}^4(u_{-1}, v_\infty)| + |\partial_v f_{[n]}^4(u_{-1}, v_\infty)|). \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.101)$$

The estimates (16.1.89), (16.1.90), (16.1.91), (16.1.99), (16.1.101), together with the Sobolev inequality (Proposition 9.1.1) and the fact that $\hat{u}_f r(\hat{u}_f, v_\infty)^{-1} \leq 1$, then imply that, for any $2 \leq k \leq 4$,

$$\sum_{l \leq k} \|\nabla_{\psi^* h}^l \psi^*(h - \hat{h})\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{r} + \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq k+1} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}. \quad (16.1.102)$$

Equation (4.4.6) and the estimate (16.1.102) imply that

$$|\mathbb{F}_{[n]}^A(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta) - \theta^A| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{r} + \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}, \quad (16.1.103)$$

for $A = 1, 2$. Hence, for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta$,

$$|\mathbb{F}_{[n]}^A(u, v_\infty, \theta) - \theta^A| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{r} + \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + \int_u^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} |\partial_u f_{[n]}^A(u', v_\infty, \theta)| du'.$$

Now (16.1.81) follows from the fact that

$$|h(u, v_\infty, \theta) - h(u, v_\infty, \mathbb{F}_{[n]}(u, v_\infty, \theta))| \lesssim \left(\sup_{S_{u, v_\infty}} |r \nabla h|_{\mathfrak{g}_{[n]}} \right) \sum_{A=1}^2 |\mathbb{F}_{[n]}^A(u, v_\infty, \theta) - \theta^A|,$$

and

$$|\partial_u f_{[n]}^A| \lesssim |\partial_u f_{[n]}| |d\theta^A|_{\mathfrak{g}} \lesssim r^{-1} |\partial_u f_{[n]}|.$$

For (16.1.82) note that, in the (θ^1, θ^2) coordinate chart,

$$\begin{aligned} (\omega - (\mathbb{F}_{[n]}(u, v_\infty, \cdot))^* \omega)(u, v_\infty, \theta) \\ = \left(\omega_{A_1 \dots A_k}(u, v_\infty, \theta) - \omega_{B_1 \dots B_k}(u, v_\infty, \mathbb{F}_{[n]}(u, v, \theta)) \partial_{\theta_{[n]}^{A_1}} \mathbb{F}_{[n]}^{B_1} \dots \partial_{\theta_{[n]}^{A_k}} \mathbb{F}_{[n]}^{B_k} \right) d\theta_{[n]}^{A_1} \dots d\theta_{[n]}^{A_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.4.1, in particular equation (4.4.7), and the estimate (16.1.102) imply that

$$|\partial_{\theta^B} \mathbb{F}_{[n]}^A(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta) - \delta_B^A| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{r} + \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}},$$

for $A, B = 1, 2$. Hence, for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta$,

$$|\partial_{\theta^B} \mathbb{F}_{[n]}^A(u, v_\infty, \theta) - \delta_B^A| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{r} + \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + \int_u^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} |\partial_{\theta^B} \partial_u f_{[n]}^A(u', v_\infty, \theta)| du'.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| (\omega_{A_1 \dots A_k}(u, v_\infty, \theta) - \omega_{A_1 \dots A_k}(u, v_\infty, \#_{[n]}(u, v, \theta))) d\theta_{[n]}^{A_1} \dots d\theta_{[n]}^{A_k} \right| \\
& \lesssim r^k \left(\sup_{S_{u, v_\infty}} |r \nabla \omega|_{\mathfrak{g}_{[n]}} \right) \sum_{A=1}^2 |\#_{[n]}^A(u, v_\infty, \theta) - \theta^A| |d\theta_{[n]}^{A_1}|_{\mathfrak{g}_{[n]}} \dots |d\theta_{[n]}^{A_k}|_{\mathfrak{g}_{[n]}} \\
& \lesssim \left(\sup_{S_{u, v_\infty}} |r \nabla \omega|_{\mathfrak{g}_{[n]}} \right) \sum_{A=1}^2 |\#_{[n]}^A(u, v_\infty, \theta) - \theta^A|.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
|(\omega - (\#_{[n]}(u, v_\infty, \cdot))^* \omega)(u, v_\infty, \theta)| & \lesssim \int_u^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{A, B=1}^2 |\partial_{\theta^B} \partial_u f_{[n]}^A(u', v_\infty, \theta)| du' \\
& + \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{r} + \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of (16.1.82) then follows from the fact that

$$|\partial_{\theta^B} \partial_u f_{[n]}^A| \lesssim |\nabla \partial_u f_{[n]}|.$$

The estimate (16.1.83) similarly follows from (4.4.8) and (16.1.102).

For the estimates (16.1.84), (16.1.85) and (16.1.86), consider Proposition 4.4.1, in particular equations (4.4.6), (4.4.7) and (4.4.8), with $S = \mathbb{S}^2$, $p = (1, 0, 0)$, $v = (0, 1, 0) \in T_p \mathbb{S}^2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
h &= r_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty)^{-2} (i^* g)(\hat{u}_f + \delta + h_{[n]}^3 \circ \#_{[n-1]}^{-1} \circ \#_{[n]}(\cdot), v_\infty + h_{[n]}^4 \circ \#_{[n-1]}^{-1} \circ \#_{[n]}(\cdot), \#_{[n]}(\cdot)) \\
\hat{h} &= r_{[n+1]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty)^{-2} (R_{[n+1]}^* i^* g)(\hat{u}_f + \delta + h_{[n+1]}^3 \circ \#_{[n]}^{-1}(\cdot), v_\infty + h_{[n+1]}^4 \circ \#_{[n]}^{-1}(\cdot), \cdot),
\end{aligned}$$

where $R_{[n+1]}: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ is the unique rotations which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{[n+1]}(1, 0, 0) &= \pi_{\mathbb{S}^2} \circ i_{[n]}^{-1} \circ j_{[n+1]} \circ (\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2}^{\mathcal{EF}}|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}^+})^{-1}(1, 0, 0), \\
(R_{[n+1]})_*(0, 1, 0) &= (\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2})_* \circ (i_{[n]}^{-1})_* \circ (j_{[n+1]})_* \circ (\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2}^{\mathcal{EF}}|_{S_{u_{-1}, v_\infty}^+})_*^{-1}(0, 1, 0).
\end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of (16.1.102), it follows that, for any $2 \leq k \leq 4$,

$$\sum_{l \leq k} \|\nabla_{\psi^* h}^l \psi^*(h - \hat{h})\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} \lesssim \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq k+1} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]} - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}. \quad (16.1.104)$$

For (16.1.84), Proposition 4.4.1, in particular equation (4.4.6), and (16.1.104) imply that

$$|\#_{[n+1]}^A(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta) - \#_{[n]}^A(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta)| \lesssim \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]} - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}, \quad (16.1.105)$$

for $A = 1, 2$. The estimate (16.1.84) then follows as in the proof of (16.1.81), using now the fact that

$$|h(u, v_\infty, \#_{[n+1]}(u, v_\infty, \theta)) - h(u, v_\infty, \#_{[n]}(u, v_\infty, \theta))| \lesssim \left(\sup_{S_{u, v_\infty}} |r \nabla h|_{\mathfrak{g}_{[n]}} \right) \sum_{A=1}^2 |\#_{[n+1]}^A(u, v_\infty, \theta) - \#_{[n]}^A(u, v_\infty, \theta)|.$$

Similarly for (16.1.85), using the fact that Proposition 4.4.1, in particular equation (4.4.7), implies that

$$|\partial_{\theta^B} \#_{[n+1]}^A(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta) - \partial_{\theta^B} \#_{[n]}^A(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta)| \lesssim \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]} - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}, \quad (16.1.106)$$

for $A, B = 1, 2$. The estimate (16.1.86) follows similarly from (4.4.8). \square

Estimates for the iterates $f_{[n]}$ can now be given.

Lemma 16.1.15 (Estimates for iterates). *Provided $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ is sufficiently small (independent of \hat{u}_f) and δ_0 is sufficiently small (with respect to \hat{u}_f), for all $n \geq 1$ the diffeomorphisms $f_{[n]}$ satisfy, for all $u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta$, the estimates*

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + |M_{[n]} - M_f| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{\hat{u}_f},$$

where $v_\infty = v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and the norm $\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}$ is defined in (16.1.80).

Proof. The diffeomorphisms $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}$ are estimated inductively. Suppose $n \geq 1$ is such that

$$\sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n-1]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + |M_{[n-1]} - M_f| \leq \frac{C_1 \varepsilon \delta}{\hat{u}_f},$$

for some appropriate C_1 , to be chosen, where the norm $\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n-1]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}$ is defined in (16.1.80). Under this assumption, the estimates for $f_{[n]}$ and $M_{[n]}$ are divided into several steps.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{[n]} = & \sum_{k=3} \left[r^2 \left\| \left[(r\mathfrak{V})^k (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M_{[n]}})_{\ell \neq 1}^{[n]} - (r\mathfrak{V})^k (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M_f})_{\ell \neq 1} \right] (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty) \right\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}} \right. \\ & + r^2 \left\| \left[(r\mathfrak{V})^k (\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ, M_{[n]}})_{[n]} - (r\mathfrak{V})^k (\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ, M_f}) \right] (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty) \right\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}} \Big] \\ & + r^5 \left\| \left[(d\mathfrak{V} \Omega \beta)_{\ell=1}^{[n]} - (d\mathfrak{V} \Omega \beta)_{\ell=1} \right] (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty) \right\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}} \end{aligned}$$

to be the sum of the difference between the values of $(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M_{[n]}})_{\ell \neq 1}^{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty)$ and $(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M_f})_{\ell \neq 1}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty)$, and $(\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ, M_{[n]}})_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty)$ and $(\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ, M_f})(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty)$, along with the differences of their angular derivatives up to order 3, and the difference between the $\ell = 1$ modes $(d\mathfrak{V} \Omega \beta)_{\ell=1}^{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty)$ and $(d\mathfrak{V} \Omega \beta)_{\ell=1}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty)$.

Estimates for Ricci coefficients of iterates $\Phi_{[n]}$: The first step is to obtain the following estimates for the Ricci coefficients of the n -th gauge, schematically denoted $\Phi_{[n]}$, along with non-sharp estimates for the diffeomorphisms $f_{[n]}$ and their derivatives, and the mass difference $M_{[n]} - M_f$:

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 4} \|r^p \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p^{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}} + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 6} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}} + |M_{[n]} - M_f| \lesssim \varepsilon, \quad (16.1.107)$$

for all $n \geq 1$. Since this is similar to, but less involved than, the main part of the proof, the estimates are only sketched. The estimates for $f_{[n]}$ and $M_{[n]} - M_f$ are non-sharp, and much easier to obtain than the sharp estimates, as they do not exploit the fact that the differences $\Phi_{[n]}(x) - \Phi(x)$ can be estimated by δ , but only that $\Phi_{[n]}(x)$ and $\Phi(x)$ can individually be estimated by ε .

First one estimates $\alpha_{[n]}(u, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta))$ and $\underline{\alpha}_{[n]}(u, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta))$ and their derivatives up to order 4, for $u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta$. The estimates are obtained, as in the proof of Proposition 10.5.1, in terms of nonlinearities involving Φ and the diffeomorphisms $f_{[n]}$, and linear terms involving $\Pi_{S_{[n]}} \alpha$ and $\Pi_{S_{[n]}} \underline{\alpha}$ and their derivatives up to order 4 (see, for example, equation (4.3.46)). One then uses, for example, the fact that

$$\sum_{k \leq 4} r \|\Pi_{S_{[n]}} (r\mathfrak{V})^k \underline{\alpha}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \varepsilon \left(1 + \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \right),$$

using the estimates on $\underline{\alpha}$ and its derivatives up to order 6 (see the expression (16.1.79)) and Lemma 16.1.14.

Next one estimates, as in the proof of Proposition 10.1.10, the diffeomorphisms $f_{[n]}(u, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta))$ and their derivatives, along with $M_{[n]} - M_f$, in terms of $\Phi_{[n]}$, Φ and their derivatives. One then revisits the estimates of Chapter 14 (or rather the part of Chapter 14 involving the estimates on the hypersurface $v = v_\infty$) and estimates $\Phi_{[n]}(u, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta))$ and their derivatives up to order 4 in terms of $\alpha_{[n]}(u, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta))$, $\underline{\alpha}_{[n]}(u, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta))$, and their derivatives, and

$$\sum_{k \leq 4} r^2 \left\| (r\mathfrak{V})^k (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M_{[n]}})_{[n]} \right\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}} + r^2 \left\| (r\mathfrak{V})^k (\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ, M_{[n]}})_{[n]} \right\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}}.$$

A simple induction argument, using the change of gauge relations (4.3.37), (4.3.38), (4.3.39), (4.3.40), (4.3.43), (4.3.44), (4.3.49) and the equations (16.1.71)–(16.1.75), then completes the proof of the estimate (16.1.107).

Estimates for differences of Ricci coefficients $\Phi_{[n]} - \Phi$: Now the differences between the n -th Ricci coefficients and curvature components and those of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, $\Phi_{[n]}(x) - \Phi(x)$, identified by the values of their respective coordinate functions, are estimated.

Considering the equations for the differences $\Phi_{[n]}(x) - \Phi(x)$, revisiting the estimates of Chapter 14, and using the estimates (16.1.107) for $\Phi_{[n]}$, it follows that, if v_∞ is sufficiently large, for any $u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} r^p \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p^{[n]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p(x)\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + \|(r^p \Phi_p^{[n]})_{\ell=0}(x) - (r^p \Phi_p)_{\ell=0}(x)\|_{L^1(\underline{C}_{v_\infty})} \lesssim \mathcal{S}_{[n]} + \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{\hat{u}_f} + \varepsilon \frac{\hat{u}_f}{v_\infty} |M_{[n]} - M_f| \\ & + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} \|r^5 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \nabla_3 \alpha_{[n]}(x) - r^5 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \nabla_3 \alpha(x)\|_{S, \underline{C}_{v_\infty}} + \sum_{\substack{|\gamma| + k \leq 3 \\ k \leq 2}} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (r^2 \nabla_4)^k r \underline{\alpha}_{[n]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma (r^2 \nabla_4)^k r \underline{\alpha}(x)\|_{S, \underline{C}_{v_\infty}}, \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.108)$$

where

$$\|F\|_{L^1(\underline{C}_{v_\infty})} = \int_{u_{-1}}^{\hat{u}_f} \int_{S_{u, v_\infty}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)} |F| d\theta du, \quad \|F\|_{S, \underline{C}_{v_\infty}} = \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \|F\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)} + \|F\|_{\underline{C}_{v_\infty}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)}.$$

Clearly also, by the Gauss equation (1.2.20) and the estimates for K ,

$$\|(r^2 K)(\hat{u}_f, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f), \cdot) - (r^2 K)_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \cdot)\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} \lesssim \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} r^p \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p^{[n]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}} + \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{\hat{u}_f}. \quad (16.1.109)$$

The difference between the metrics, $\mathfrak{g}(x) - \mathfrak{g}_{[n]}(x)$, are similarly be estimated. The estimate (4.4.5) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |r^{-2} \mathfrak{g}(\hat{u}_f, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f), \theta) - (r^{-2} \mathfrak{g})_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta)|_\gamma & \lesssim \|r^2 K(\hat{u}_f, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f), \cdot) - (r^2 K)_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \cdot)\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} \\ & \lesssim \|r^2 K(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \cdot) - (r^2 K)_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \cdot)\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} + \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{\hat{u}_f}, \end{aligned}$$

from which it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{g}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta) - \mathfrak{g}_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta)|_\mathfrak{g} & \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{r \hat{u}_f} + \frac{|f_{[n]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta)| + |f_{[n]}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta)|}{r} \\ & + |M_{[n]} - M_f| + r \|K(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \cdot) - K_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \cdot)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}}, \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.110)$$

with $v_\infty = v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$. The difference $\mathfrak{g}(x) - \mathfrak{g}_{[n]}(x)$ is then estimated as in Chapter 14, using this estimate in place of where the estimate (4.4.4) is used (see Section 14.3.7.1).

Estimates for differences $\alpha_{[n]} - \alpha$ and $\underline{\alpha}_{[n]} - \underline{\alpha}$: Next, the differences $\alpha_{[n]}(x) - \alpha(x)$ and $\underline{\alpha}_{[n]}(x) - \underline{\alpha}(x)$ are estimated. The relation (4.3.46) implies that, schematically,

$$r(\underline{\alpha}_{[n]} - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \underline{\alpha}) = \Pi_{S_{[n]}} r^p \Phi_p \cdot \mathfrak{D} f_{[n]} + (\mathfrak{D} f_{[n]})^2,$$

and so by the Sobolev inequality,

$$\|r \underline{\alpha}_{[n]} - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} r \underline{\alpha}\|_{S, \underline{C}_{v_\infty}} \lesssim \varepsilon \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 1} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 1} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S, \underline{C}_{v_\infty}} \right)^2.$$

where the norm $\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 1} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}$ is defined in (16.1.80), and the norm $\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 1} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S, \underline{C}_{v_\infty}}$ is similarly defined, in the obvious way. Moreover (recall (16.1.79)),

$$\|\Pi_{S_{[n]}} r \underline{\alpha}(x) - r \underline{\alpha}(x)\|_{S, \underline{C}_{v_\infty}} \lesssim \varepsilon \left(\frac{\delta}{r} + \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \right),$$

where Lemma 16.1.14 has been used. Similarly for higher order derivatives and for α (note that the estimates for derivatives with better r weights, e.g. for $r^2 \nabla_4 r \underline{\alpha}_{[n]} - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} r^2 \nabla_4 r \underline{\alpha}$, follow as in the proof of Proposition 10.5.1). It therefore follows, using (16.1.109), that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} \|r^5 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \nabla_3 \alpha_{[n]}(x) - r^5 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \nabla_3 \alpha(x)\|_{S, \underline{C}_{v_\infty}} + \sum_{\substack{|\gamma|+k \leq 3 \\ k \leq 2}} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (r^2 \nabla_4)^k (r \underline{\alpha}_{[n]})(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma (r^2 \nabla_4)^k (r \underline{\alpha})(x)\|_{S, \underline{C}_{v_\infty}} \\ & \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2 \delta}{\hat{u}_f} + \varepsilon \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} r^p \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p^{[n]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p(x)\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + \varepsilon \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 4} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S, \underline{C}_{v_\infty}} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.111)$$

Estimates for diffeomorphisms of iterates $f_{[n]}$: Consider now the entire system (4.3.31)–(4.3.50), each equation of which takes the schematic form

$$\mathfrak{D}^2 f_{[n]} = \Phi_{[n]} - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Phi + \sum_{1 \leq |\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2| \leq 2} (\Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n]} + \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n]} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} f_{[n]}). \quad (16.1.112)$$

Exploiting the reductive structure of the left hand sides, as in the proof of Proposition 10.1.10, and using the fact that, for each Φ ,

$$r^p \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p(x)\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \sum_{|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq |\gamma|+1} \sup_{S_{u, v_\infty}} |\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} \Phi_p| \left(\frac{\varepsilon \delta}{r} + \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \right),$$

by Lemma 16.1.14, it follows that the $\ell \geq 1$ modes of $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}$ satisfy, for $|\gamma| \leq 5$,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{\ell \geq 1}^{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \lesssim \sum_{|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq |\gamma|-2} r^p \|\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} \Phi_p^{[n]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} \Phi_p(x)\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + \varepsilon \sum_{|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq |\gamma|} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + \frac{\varepsilon^2 \delta}{\hat{u}_f}, \quad (16.1.113)$$

where (16.1.109) has been used. For the $\ell = 0$ modes, a similar argument to that of Proposition 10.1.10 gives

$$\begin{aligned} |(f_{[n]}^3 - f_{[n]}^4)_{\ell=0}| + \sum_{1 \leq |\gamma| \leq 2} |(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]})_{\ell=0}| & \lesssim r^p |(\Phi_p^{[n]}(x) - \Phi_p(x))_{\ell=0}| \\ & + r^p |\Phi_p| \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}| + \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}| \right)^2 + \frac{\varepsilon^2 \delta}{\hat{u}_f}, \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.114)$$

and, using the analogue of (10.1.23), (10.1.24), (10.1.25) for r and $r_{[n]}$, along with the fact that $M_{[n]} + \frac{1}{2}(r^3 \rho_{\ell=0})(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta))_{[n]} = 0$ and $|M_f + \frac{1}{2}(r^3 \rho_{\ell=0})(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta))| \lesssim \varepsilon \delta (\hat{u}_f)^{-1}$,

$$|M_{[n]} - M_f| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{\hat{u}_f} + \frac{1}{r} r^p |(\Phi_p^{[n]}(x) - \Phi_p(x))_{\ell=0}| + r^p |\Phi_p| \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}| + \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}| \right)^2, \quad (16.1.115)$$

and moreover, equation (16.1.75) implies

$$\begin{aligned} |(f_{\ell=0}^3)_{[n]}(u, v_\infty)| & \leq \int_{u_{-1}}^u |\partial_u (f_{\ell=0}^3)_{[n]}(u', v_\infty)| du' \\ & \lesssim \int_{u_{-1}}^u r^p |(\Phi_p^{[n]}(x) - \Phi_p(x))_{\ell=0}| + r^p |\Phi_p| \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}| + \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}| \right)^2 du' + \frac{\varepsilon^2 \delta}{\hat{u}_f}. \end{aligned}$$

Estimate for $\mathcal{S}_{[n]}$: Consider now $\mathcal{S}_{[n]}$. The change of gauge relations (4.3.37), (4.3.38), (4.3.40), (4.3.43),

(4.3.44), (4.3.49), the expressions (16.1.78), and equation (16.1.71) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^{-2} \Delta \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{[n]}(x_\delta) + r^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)_{[n]}(x_\delta) \right]_{(\ell \geq 2)_{[n-1]}} = \left[\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^{-2} \Delta \Omega \text{tr} \chi(x_{f_{[n]}}) + r^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)(x_{f_{[n]}}) \right. \\
& \quad + 2 \Delta \Delta (h_{[n]}^3(\theta_{[n]})) + \frac{2}{r^2} \left(3 - \frac{8M_f}{r} \right) \Delta (h_{[n]}^3(\theta_{[n]})) - \frac{2\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^2}{r^2} \Delta (h_{[n]}^4(\theta_{[n]})) \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{4\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^2}{r^4} (h_{[n]}^3(\theta_{[n]}) - h_{[n]}^4(\theta_{[n]})) + \frac{2}{r} (\underline{\mu}_{[n]}^\dagger(x) - \underline{\mu}^\dagger(x_{f_{[n]}})) - \mathfrak{E}_{[n]}^1(\theta) - A_{[n]}^1(\theta) \right]_{(\ell \geq 2)_{[n-1]}} \\
& = \left[\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^{-2} \Delta \Omega \text{tr} \chi(x_{f_{[n]}}) + r^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)(x_{f_{[n]}}) - \Omega_{\circ, M_f}^{-2} \Delta \Omega \text{tr} \chi(x_{[n-1]}) - r^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)(x_{[n-1]}) \right. \\
& \quad + \frac{2}{r} (\underline{\mu}_{[n]}^\dagger(x) - \underline{\mu}^\dagger(x_{f_{[n]}})) - \frac{2}{r} (\underline{\mu}_{[n-1]}^\dagger(x) - \underline{\mu}^\dagger(x_{[n-1]})) - \mathfrak{E}_{[n]}^1(\theta) + \mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^1(\theta_{[n]}) \\
& \quad \left. - A_{[n]}^1(\theta) + A_{[n-1]}^1(\theta_{[n]}) + \mathfrak{H}_{[n]}(\theta) \right]_{(\ell \geq 2)_{[n-1]}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $x_\delta = x_\delta(\theta) = (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta)$,

$$\theta_{[n]} = \mathbb{H}_{[n-1]}^{-1} \circ \mathbb{H}_{[n]}(\theta),$$

$x_{f_{[n]}} = x_\delta + f_{[n]}(x_\delta)$ is as defined in (16.1.76), and

$x_{[n-1]} = (\hat{u}_f + \delta + f_{[n-1]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \mathbb{H}_{[n-1]}^{-1} \circ \mathbb{H}_{[n]}(\theta)), v_\infty + f_{[n-1]}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \mathbb{H}_{[n-1]}^{-1} \circ \mathbb{H}_{[n]}(\theta)), \mathbb{H}_{[n]}(\theta))$, and $\mathfrak{H}_{[n]}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{H}_{[n]}(\theta) &= 2 \Delta \Delta (h_{[n]}^3(\theta_{[n]})) - 2 (\Delta \Delta h_{[n]}^3)(\theta_{[n]}) + \frac{2}{r^2} \left(3 - \frac{8M_f}{r} \right) (\Delta (h_{[n]}^3(\theta_{[n]})) - (\Delta h_{[n]}^3)(\theta_{[n]})) \\
&\quad - \frac{2\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^2}{r^2} (\Delta (h_{[n]}^4(\theta_{[n]})) - (\Delta h_{[n]}^4)(\theta_{[n]})).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\sum_{k=0}^1 \|(r\mathbb{V})^k r^4 \mathfrak{H}_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}} \lesssim \varepsilon \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]} - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n-1]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}},$$

by Lemma 16.1.14 (in particular the estimates (16.1.86), (16.1.105) and (16.1.106)). An elliptic estimate, together with the fact that

$$r^3 \|\underline{\mu}_{[n]}^\dagger(x) - \underline{\mu}^\dagger(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}} \lesssim \hat{u}_f v_\infty^{-1} \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} r^p \|\Phi_p^{[n]}(x) - \Phi_p(x)\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}},$$

then gives, for $k \leq 3$,

$$\begin{aligned}
r^2 \|(r\mathbb{V})^k (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M_f})_{\ell \geq 2}^{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}} &\lesssim \varepsilon \delta \hat{u}_f^{-1} + |M_{[n-1]} - M_f|^2 \\
&\quad + \sum_{l=n-1}^n \left[\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \varepsilon \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[l]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}} + \varepsilon \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} r^p \|\Phi_p^{[l]}(x) - \Phi_p(x)\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that this estimate exploits the fact that each term of the form $\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f$ appearing in \mathfrak{E}^1 , see (16.1.70), has the property that

$$r^4 \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}} \lesssim \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} r^p \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}},$$

where the norm of $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f$ is defined in (16.1.80). Equation (16.1.73) gives a similar estimate for $(\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ, M_f})_{\ell \geq 1}^{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty)$, and equation (16.1.74) similarly gives

$$\begin{aligned}
r^2 |(\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ, M_f})_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty)| &\lesssim \varepsilon \delta \hat{u}_f^{-1} + |M_{[n-1]} - M_f| \\
&\quad + \sum_{l=n-1}^n \left[\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \varepsilon \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[l]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}} + \varepsilon \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} r^p \|\Phi_p^{[l]}(x) - \Phi_p(x)\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

and equation (16.1.72) gives

$$\begin{aligned} r^5 \|(\mathrm{d}\mathbf{f}\mathbf{v}\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1}^{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \cdot)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v_\infty}} &\lesssim \varepsilon \delta \hat{u}_f^{-1} + |M_{[n-1]} - M_f|^2 \\ &+ \sum_{l=n-1}^n \left[\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \varepsilon \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[l]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v_\infty}} + \varepsilon \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f+\delta} r^p \|\Phi_p^{[l]}(x) - \Phi_p(x)\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

exploiting similar structure in the terms of the form $\Pi_{\tilde{S}}\Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f$ appearing in \mathfrak{E}^2 , \mathfrak{E}^3 and \mathfrak{E}^4 respectively. The estimates for $(\Omega^{-1}\mathrm{tr}\underline{\chi} - \Omega^{-1}\mathrm{tr}\underline{\chi}_{\circ, M_f})_{\ell=0}^{[n]}$ rely on the fact that the change of gauge relation (cf. Proposition 4.3.2) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\widetilde{(\Omega^{-1}\mathrm{tr}\underline{\chi})} - \widetilde{(\Omega^{-1}\mathrm{tr}\underline{\chi})}_{\circ, \widetilde{M}} \right) - (\Omega^{-1}\mathrm{tr}\underline{\chi} - (\Omega^{-1}\mathrm{tr}\underline{\chi})_{\circ, M}) \\ &= (\Omega^{-1}\mathrm{tr}\underline{\chi})_{\circ, M} - (\widetilde{(\Omega^{-1}\mathrm{tr}\underline{\chi})}_{\circ, \widetilde{M}} + 2\widetilde{\mathfrak{A}}f^4 - \Omega^{-1}\mathrm{tr}\underline{\chi}\partial_{\widetilde{v}}f^4 - 2\widetilde{\mathfrak{V}}\partial_{\widetilde{u}}f^3 \cdot \widetilde{\mathfrak{V}}f^4 + \Omega^{-1}\mathrm{tr}\underline{\chi}\partial_{\widetilde{u}}f^3\partial_{\widetilde{v}}f^4 + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{Df}, 2}^{2,0}), \end{aligned}$$

so that all of the nonlinear terms which have the worst r behaviour are nonlinear in the diffeomorphism functions. Since $(\Omega\mathrm{tr}\chi - \Omega\mathrm{tr}\chi_{\circ, M_f})_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k \leq 3} \left[r^2 \|(r\mathfrak{V})^k (\Omega\mathrm{tr}\chi - \Omega\mathrm{tr}\chi_{\circ, M_f})_{\ell \neq 1}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v_\infty}} + r^2 \|(r\mathfrak{V})^k (\Omega^{-1}\mathrm{tr}\underline{\chi} - \Omega^{-1}\mathrm{tr}\underline{\chi}_{\circ, M_f})\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v_\infty}} \right] \\ &+ r^5 \|(\mathrm{d}\mathbf{f}\mathbf{v}\Omega\beta)_{\ell=1}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v_\infty}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{\hat{u}_f}, \end{aligned}$$

it then follows that

$$\mathcal{S}_{[n]} \lesssim \varepsilon \delta \hat{u}_f^{-1} + |M_{[n-1]} - M_f| + \sum_{l=n-1}^n \left[\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \varepsilon \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[l]}\|_S + \varepsilon \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f+\delta} r^p \|\Phi_p^{[l]}(x) - \Phi_p(x)\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \right]. \quad (16.1.116)$$

The completion of the proof: Provided C_1 is chosen to be sufficiently large, the estimates (16.1.108), (16.1.111), (16.1.113), (16.1.114), (16.1.115), (16.1.116) now combine to give

$$\sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f+\delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + |M_{[n]} - M_f| \leq \frac{C_1 \varepsilon \delta}{\hat{u}_f},$$

provided δ_0 and $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ are sufficiently small, thus completing the induction. \square

The next part of the proof involves showing that the map which takes the n -th sphere to $n+1$ -th sphere is a contraction.

Lemma 16.1.16 (Estimates for differences of iterates). *Provided $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ is sufficiently small (independent of \hat{u}_f) and δ_0 is sufficiently small (with respect to \hat{u}_f), the diffeomorphisms $f_{[n]}$ and masses $M_{[n]}$ satisfy, for all $n \geq 1$ and all $u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta$, the estimates*

$$|M_{[n+1]} - M_{[n]}| + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]} - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \leq 2^{-n},$$

where $v_\infty = v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and the norm $\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]} - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}$ is as in (16.1.80). In particular, $h_{[n]}^3, h_{[n]}^4$ satisfy

$$\sum_{k \leq 5} (\|(r\mathfrak{V})^k h_{[n+1]}^3 - (r\mathfrak{V})^k h_{[n]}^3\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + \|(r\mathfrak{V})^k h_{[n+1]}^4 - (r\mathfrak{V})^k h_{[n]}^4\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}) \leq 2^{-n}.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 16.1.15. The proof is divided into several steps, which follow closely the corresponding steps of Lemma 16.1.15. Define now, for $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{s}_{[n]} = & \sum_{k \leq 3} \left[r^2 \| [(r\nabla)^k (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M_{[n]}})_{[n]} - (r\nabla)^k (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M_{[n-1]}})_{[n-1]}] (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty) \|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}} \right. \\ & + r^2 \| [(r\nabla)^k (\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ, M_{[n]}})_{[n]} - (r\nabla)^k (\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ, M_{[n-1]}})_{[n-1]}] (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty) \|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}} \\ & \left. + r^5 \| [(d\text{iv} \Omega \beta)_{[n]} - (d\text{iv} \Omega \beta)_{[n-1]}] (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty) \|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Estimates for differences of Ricci coefficients $\Phi_{[n+1]} - \Phi_{[n]}$: Considering the equations satisfied by the differences $\Phi_{[n+1]}(x) - \Phi_{[n]}(x)$ and revisiting the estimates of Chapter 14, it follows from Lemma 16.1.15 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} r^p \| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p^{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p^{[n]}(x) \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} + \| (r^p \Phi_p^{[n+1]})_{\ell=0}(x) - (r^p \Phi_p^{[n]})_{\ell=0}(x) \|_{L^1(\underline{C}_{v_\infty})} \quad (16.1.117) \\ & \lesssim \mathfrak{s}_{[n+1]} + \varepsilon \frac{\hat{u}_f}{v_\infty} |M_{[n+1]} - M_{[n]}| + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} \| r^5 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \nabla_3 \alpha_{[n+1]}(x) - r^5 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \nabla_3 \alpha_{[n]}(x) \|_{S, \underline{C}_{v_\infty}} \\ & + \sum_{\substack{|\gamma| + k \leq 3 \\ k \leq 2}} \| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma (r^2 \nabla_4)^k r \underline{\alpha}_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma (r^2 \nabla_4)^k r \underline{\alpha}_{[n]}(x) \|_{S, \underline{C}_{v_\infty}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the norms $\| \cdot \|_{L^1(\underline{C}_{v_\infty})}$ and $\| \cdot \|_{S, \underline{C}_{v_\infty}}$ are as in the proof of Lemma 16.1.15. The Gauss equation (1.2.20) implies that,

$$\| (r^2 K)_{[n+1]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \cdot) - (r^2 K)_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \cdot) \|_{\mathbb{S}^2} \lesssim \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} r^p \| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p^{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p^{[n]}(x) \|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}}. \quad (16.1.118)$$

The difference between the metrics, $\mathfrak{g}(x) - \mathfrak{g}_{[n]}(x)$, are similarly be estimated. The estimate (4.4.5) implies that

$$|(r^{-2} \mathfrak{g})_{[n+1]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta) - (r^{-2} \mathfrak{g})_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta)|_\gamma \lesssim \| (r^2 K)_{[n+1]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \cdot) - (r^2 K)_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \cdot) \|_{\mathbb{S}^2},$$

from which it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{g}_{[n+1]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) - \mathfrak{g}_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta)|_\mathfrak{g} & \lesssim |M_{[n+1]} - M_{[n]}| \\ & + r \| K_{[n+1]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \cdot) - K_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \cdot) \|_{\mathbb{S}^2}, \end{aligned}$$

with $v_\infty = v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$. The difference $\mathfrak{g}_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{g}_{[n]}(x)$ is then estimated as in Chapter 14, using this estimate in place of where the estimate (4.4.4) is used (see Section 14.3.7.1).

Estimates for differences $\alpha_{[n+1]} - \alpha_{[n]}$ and $\underline{\alpha}_{[n+1]} - \underline{\alpha}_{[n]}$: Consider now the differences $\alpha_{[n+1]}(x) - \alpha_{[n]}(x)$ and $\underline{\alpha}_{[n+1]}(x) - \underline{\alpha}_{[n]}(x)$. The relation (4.3.45) implies that, schematically,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{[n+1]}(x) - \alpha_{[n]}(x) & = \Pi_{S_{[n+1]}} \underline{\alpha}(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \underline{\alpha}(x) \\ & + \Pi_{S_{[n+1]}} \Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D} f_{[n+1]}(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D} f_{[n]}(x) + \mathfrak{D} f_{[n+1]} \cdot \mathfrak{D} f_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D} f_{[n]} \cdot \mathfrak{D} f_{[n]}(x). \end{aligned}$$

For each Φ , using Lemma 16.1.14 (in particular (16.1.85)),

$$|\Pi_{S_{[n+1]}} \Phi(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Phi(x)| \lesssim \sup_{\theta} (|\Phi| + |\mathfrak{D} \Phi|) \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]} - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]} \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}},$$

and so it follows that

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma r \underline{\alpha}_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma r \underline{\alpha}_{[n]}(x) \|_{S, \underline{C}_{v_\infty}} \lesssim \varepsilon \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \| \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}(x) \|_{S_{u, v_\infty}},$$

where the norm $\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]} - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}$ is as in (16.1.80). Similarly for $(r^2 \nabla_4)^k r_{\underline{\alpha}_{[n+1]}}(x) - (r^2 \nabla_4)^k r_{\underline{\alpha}_{[n]}}(x)$, for $k = 1, 2$, and for $\alpha_{[n+1]}(x) - \alpha_{[n]}(x)$, as in the proof of Lemma 16.1.15, and so

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} \|r^5 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \nabla_3 \alpha_{[n+1]}(x) - r^5 \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \nabla_3 \alpha_{[n]}(x)\|_{S_{\underline{C}_{v_\infty}}} + \sum_{\substack{|\gamma|+k \leq 3 \\ k \leq 2}} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (r^2 \nabla_4)^k (r_{\underline{\alpha}})_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma (r^2 \nabla_4)^k (r_{\underline{\alpha}})_{[n]}(x)\|_{S_{\underline{C}_{v_\infty}}} \\ & \lesssim \varepsilon \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}(x)\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}. \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.119)$$

Estimates for differences of diffeomorphisms $f_{[n+1]}(x) - f_{[n]}(x)$: The next step involves estimating the differences $\mathfrak{D}^k f_{[n+1]} - \mathfrak{D}^k f_{[n]}$. Considering the system (4.3.31)–(4.3.50) which, recall, takes the schematic form (16.1.112), it follows that, schematically,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{D}^2 f_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^2 f_{[n]}(x) &= \Phi_{[n+1]}(x) - \Phi_{[n]}(x) + \Pi_{S_{[n+1]}} \Phi(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Phi(x) \\ &+ \sum_{1 \leq |\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2| \leq 2} (\Pi_{S_{[n+1]}} \Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n+1]}(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n]}(x) \\ &+ \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n+1]} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} f_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n]} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} f_{[n]}(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Each Φ_p satisfies,

$$\begin{aligned} & r^p \|\Pi_{S_{[n+1]}} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p(x)\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq |\gamma|+1} \sup_{S_{u,v_\infty}} |\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} \Phi_p| \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]} - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}, \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 16.1.14 and so, again using the reductive structure of Proposition 10.1.10, if ε is sufficiently small, for $u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}(x))_{\ell \geq 1}\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} \lesssim \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} r^p \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p^{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p^{[n]}(x)\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} \\ & + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} (r^p \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]}\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}) \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}(x)\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}}, \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.120)$$

where the norms are again as in (16.1.80) and (16.1.118) has been used. Similarly, as in the proof of Lemma 16.1.15,

$$\begin{aligned} & |(f_{[n+1]}^3 - f_{[n+1]}^4 - f_{[n]}^3 + f_{[n]}^4)_{\ell=0}| + \sum_{1 \leq |\gamma| \leq 2} |(\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]} - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]})_{\ell=0}| \lesssim r^p |(\Phi_p^{[n+1]}(x) - \Phi_p^{[n]}(x))_{\ell=0}| \\ & + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} (r^p |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]}| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}|) \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}(x)|, \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.121)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & |M_{[n+1]} - M_{[n]}| \lesssim \frac{1}{r} r^p |(\Phi_p^{[n+1]}(x) - \Phi_p^{[n]}(x))_{\ell=0}| \\ & + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} (r^p |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_p| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]}| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}|) \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}(x)|, \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.122)$$

and moreover, equation (16.1.75) implies

$$|(f_{[n+1]}^3 - f_{[n]}^3)_{\ell=0}(u, v_\infty)| \leq \int_{u_{-1}}^u |(\partial_u (f_{\ell=0}^3)_{[n+1]} - \partial_u (f_{\ell=0}^3)_{[n]})(u', v_\infty)| du'. \quad (16.1.123)$$

Estimate for $\mathfrak{s}_{[n+1]}$: As in the proof of Lemma 16.1.15, using now the fact that

$$r^3 \|\underline{\mu}_{[n+1]}^\dagger(x) - \underline{\mu}_{[n]}^\dagger(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}} \lesssim \hat{u}_f v_\infty^{-1} \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} r^p \|\Phi_p^{[n+1]}(x) - \Phi_p^{[n]}(x)\|_{S_{u,v_\infty}},$$

it follows that,

$$\mathfrak{s}_{[n+1]} \lesssim |M_{[n]} - M_{[n-1]}| + \sum_{l=n-1}^n \left[\varepsilon \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[l+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[l]}(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty}} + \varepsilon \sup_{u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta} r^p \|\Phi_p^{[l+1]}(x) - \Phi_p^{[l]}(x)\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}} \right]. \quad (16.1.124)$$

The completion of the proof: The result then follows from the estimates (16.1.117)–(16.1.124) if ε_0 is sufficiently small (independent of \hat{u}_f). \square

It follows from Lemma 16.1.16 that the sequences $\{h_{[n]}^3\}$ and $\{h_{[n]}^4\}$ converges to limits h^3 and h^4 respectively, sequence of masses $\{M_{[n]}\}$ converges to some limit $M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}$, and, moreover, the diffeomorphisms $\{\#_{[n]}\}$ converge (for example, in given coordinate charts for \mathbb{S}^2) to a limiting diffeomorphism $\#$ (see (16.1.105) and Lemma 16.1.16). The limit is the unique solution of the system (16.1.62)–(16.1.67). The expressions (4.3.37), (4.3.38), (4.3.39), (4.3.40), (4.3.43), (4.3.44), (4.3.49) then imply that the spacetime double null foliation defined by the sphere (16.1.61) and Proposition 16.1.7 (with $s^3 = h^3 \circ \#^{-1}$, $s^4 = h^4 \circ \#^{-1}$) is the desired gauge. The smoothness of the gauge follows from the smoothness of the ambient spacetime, the smoothness of the \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge and thus the smoothness of h^3 , h^4 and $\#$ solving (16.1.62)–(16.1.67).

The functions

$$M_f: [\hat{u}_f, \hat{u}_f + \delta_0] \times \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \mathbf{J}: [\hat{u}_f, \hat{u}_f + \delta_0] \times \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3,$$

are defined by fixing $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f)$ as above and setting, for $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$,

$$M_f(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda) := M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}, \quad \mathbf{J}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda) := (J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^{-1}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda), J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^0(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda), J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^1(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)),$$

where one recalls (see Proposition 1.4.3) that $\Omega\beta$ can be decomposed as

$$\Omega\beta(u, v, \theta) = r \check{\nabla} h_{1, \Omega\beta}(u, v, \theta) + r^* \check{\nabla} h_{2, \Omega\beta}(u, v, \theta),$$

for two functions $h_{1, \Omega\beta}$, $h_{2, \Omega\beta}$, and $J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^m(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$ are defined, for $m = -1, 0, 1$, by the relation

$$(r^3 h_{2, \Omega\beta})_{\ell=1}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) = 3\Omega_{\circ, M_f}^2(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta)) \sum_{m=-1}^1 J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^m(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda) Y_m^1(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta).$$

The continuity of M_f and \mathbf{J} , in both δ and λ , follows softly from Cauchy stability for the system (16.1.62)–(16.1.67). Similarly for the continuity in δ of the energies $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, \mathcal{I}^+}^N$ of the geometric quantities of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge with respect to $M_f(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$, and the associated diffeomorphism energies $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}[f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}]$. The estimate (16.1.13) follows from Lemma 16.1.15. The estimate (7.1.3) follows from the improved estimate (7.3.2) and continuity, provided δ_0 is sufficiently small.

The fact that each $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge can be extended to a $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge

$$i_\delta: \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \delta_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{M},$$

in the sense of Definition 16.1.1, follows as in the proof of Theorem 16.1.1 if δ_1 is sufficiently small. The estimates (16.1.14), (16.1.15) for the diffeomorphisms when $\delta' = 0$ follow from Lemma 16.1.15 (for (16.1.15) see (16.1.103)). For $\delta' > 0$ the estimates are obtained similarly, following the proof of Lemma 16.1.15 and considering now the differences of the geometric quantities in the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge with those of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta'$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge. \square

Remark 16.1.17. From the proof of Theorem 16.1.2, one can again distill arguments to the linear setting (where matters simplify considerably) so as to complete the proof of Proposition 2.2.6 as follows. Recall again the notation of [DHR].

Recall that the linearised Schwarzschild solution satisfies

$$\overset{(\iota)}{\rho} \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{m},0,0,0} = -\frac{2M_f}{r^3} \cdot \mathbf{m}, \quad 2\Omega^{-1} \overset{(\iota)}{\Omega} \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{m},0,0,0} = -\mathbf{m}, \quad (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) \overset{(\iota)}{\mathcal{K}}_{\mathbf{m},0,0,0} = (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) \overset{(\iota)}{\mathcal{K}}_{\mathbf{m},0,0,0} = 0.$$

Now, any two functions $h^3, h^4: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ give rise to functions $f^3(u, \theta) = h^3(\theta)$ for all u and $f^4(v, \theta) = h^4(\theta)$ for all v , which generate a pure gauge solution, denoted $\mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}}$. In view of the linearised analogues of the relations (4.3.36), (4.3.40), (4.3.43), (4.3.44), (4.3.47), (4.3.49), and in anticipation of the linearised analogues of the gauge normalisations, in order to realise the linearised analogues of the gauge normalisations (16.1.53)–(16.1.56) one considers the solution $\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{m},0,0,0} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}}$ arising from h^3, h^4, \mathbf{m} which satisfy the linearised analogues of equations (16.1.62)–(16.1.65), (16.1.67), namely the elliptic system

$$\begin{aligned} 2\Delta \Delta h_{\ell \geq 2}^3 + \frac{2}{r^2} \left(3 - \frac{8M_f}{r} \right) \Delta h_{\ell \geq 2}^3 - \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} \Delta h_{\ell \geq 2}^4 + \frac{4\Omega^2}{r^4} (h_{\ell \geq 2}^3 - h_{\ell \geq 2}^4) \\ = -(\Omega^{-2} \Delta (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) + r^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) + \frac{2}{r} \text{div} \underline{\eta} + \frac{2}{r} \overset{(\iota)}{\rho} + \frac{1}{r^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^3} 2\Omega^{-1} \overset{(\iota)}{\Omega})_{\ell \geq 2}^{\mathcal{S}} (u_f, v_\infty, \cdot), \\ \frac{6M_f}{r^3} \left(1 - \frac{2M_f}{r} \right) \Delta h_{\ell=1}^3 = (\text{div} \Omega \beta)_{\ell=1}^{\mathcal{S}} (u_f, v_\infty, \cdot), \\ 2\Delta \Delta h_{\ell \geq 1}^4 + \frac{4}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r} \right) \Delta h_{\ell \geq 1}^4 + \frac{12M_f \Omega^2}{r^5} (h_{\ell \geq 1}^3 - h_{\ell \geq 1}^4) \\ = -(\Omega^{-2} \Delta (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) + \frac{2}{r} \Delta 2\Omega^{-1} \overset{(\iota)}{\Omega} + \frac{2}{r} \text{div} \underline{\eta} + \frac{2}{r} \overset{(\iota)}{\rho} + \frac{2}{r^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) + \frac{4\Omega^2}{r^3} 2\Omega^{-1} \overset{(\iota)}{\Omega})_{\ell \geq 1}^{\mathcal{S}} (u_f, v_\infty, \cdot), \\ -\frac{4}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r} \right) (h_{\ell=0}^3 - h_{\ell=0}^4) - \frac{2\mathbf{m}}{r} = -(\Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) + \frac{2}{r} 2\Omega^{-1} \overset{(\iota)}{\Omega} - \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}))_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{S}} (u_f, v_\infty), \\ \frac{2M_f}{r^3} \mathbf{m} + \frac{6M_f \Omega^2}{r^4} (h_{\ell=0}^3 - h_{\ell=0}^4) = \overset{(\iota)}{\rho}_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{S}} (u_f, v_\infty). \end{aligned}$$

(Note that the linearised analogue of the condition $(\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega^{-1} \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ) (u_f, v_\infty, \cdot) = 0$ is the condition $(\Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) + \frac{2}{r} 2\Omega^{-1} \overset{(\iota)}{\Omega}) (u_f, v_\infty, \cdot) = 0$.) The proof of Theorem 16.1.2 in this linearised setting reduces to showing the existence of h^3, h^4, \mathbf{m} satisfying this elliptic system. Note that the solution is not unique in view of the fact that, for any solution h^3, h^4, \mathbf{m} , the functions $h^3 + \lambda, h^4 + \lambda$ together with \mathbf{m} are also a solution for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ (this non-uniqueness could be broken by imposing a linearised analogue of the anchoring condition (5.6.14), cf. equation (16.1.66)). Given such a solution h^3, h^4, \mathbf{m} , the solution $\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{m},0,0,0} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}}$ of the linearised equations satisfies

$$(\Omega^{-2} \Delta (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) + r^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) + \frac{2}{r} \text{div} \underline{\eta} + \frac{2}{r} \overset{(\iota)}{\rho} + \frac{1}{r^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^3} 2\Omega^{-1} \overset{(\iota)}{\Omega})_{\ell \geq 2}^{\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{m},0,0,0} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}}} (u_f, v_\infty, \cdot) = 0, \quad (16.1.125)$$

$$(\Omega^{-2} \Delta (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) + \frac{2}{r} \Delta 2\Omega^{-1} \overset{(\iota)}{\Omega} + \frac{2}{r} \text{div} \underline{\eta} + \frac{2}{r} \overset{(\iota)}{\rho} + \frac{2}{r^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) + \frac{4\Omega^2}{r^3} 2\Omega^{-1} \overset{(\iota)}{\Omega})_{\ell \geq 1}^{\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{m},0,0,0} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}}} (u_f, v_\infty, \cdot) = 0, \quad (16.1.126)$$

and

$$(\text{div} \Omega \beta)_{\ell=1}^{\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{m},0,0,0} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}}} (u_f, v_\infty, \cdot) = 0, \quad (16.1.127)$$

$$(\Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) + \frac{2}{r} 2\Omega^{-1} \overset{(\iota)}{\Omega} - \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}))_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{m},0,0,0} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}}} (u_f, v_\infty) = 0, \quad (16.1.128)$$

$$\overset{(\iota)}{\rho}_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{m},0,0,0} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}}} (u_f, v_\infty) = 0. \quad (16.1.129)$$

Recall now Remark 16.1.12. Adding the pure gauge solution $\mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}}$ arising from $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S} + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{m},0,0,0} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}}$, the solution $\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{m},0,0,0} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}}$ then, in view of the fact that $f^3(u_f, \cdot) = f^4(v_\infty, \cdot) = 0$ for the functions generating this pure gauge solution, still satisfies the relations (16.1.125)–(16.1.129) and, in view of the fact that this solution satisfies the linearised analogues of (16.1.17)–(16.1.21), thus moreover achieves the linearised analogues of the gauge normalisations (16.1.53)–(16.1.56) (the linear analogue of (16.1.56) being the condition $\overset{(\iota)}{\rho}_{\ell=0} (u_f, v_\infty) = 0$).

Finally, the linearised analogue of the gauge condition (16.1.57) can be achieved by adding an appropriate pure gauge solution $\mathcal{G}_{\text{theta}}$ generated by functions $q_1(u, \theta)$ and $q_2(u, \theta)$ (see Lemma 6.1.3 of [DHR] and note that the difference in the position of the torsion means that here q_1 and q_2 are indeed functions of (u, θ) , rather than (v, θ) as in [DHR]) satisfying

$$-r^2 \nabla \partial_u q_1(u, \theta) + r^{2*} \nabla \partial_u q_2(u, \theta) = -b^{\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{m}, 0, 0, 0} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}}}(u, v_\infty, \theta),$$

for all u and $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$ (along with $f^3 \equiv 0$, $f^4 \equiv 0$). The solution

$$\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{m}, 0, 0, 0} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{theta}},$$

is then normalised as desired.

Note again that $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{theta}}$ is not the unique pure gauge solution which achieves these normalisations in view of the absence of any linearised analogues of the anchoring condition (5.6.14) and the anchoring condition of Definition 5.6.1 concerning the sphere diffeomorphism of the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge in Proposition 2.2.6.

Remark 16.1.18. Recall the double null parametrisation (5.5.6) of Theorem 5.5.2, and let u_f^0 be as defined in Section 1.3.5. The proof of Theorem 16.1.2 given in this section can easily be adapted to give a proof of the existence of a u_f^0 normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge satisfying the anchoring condition (5.6.14) and the anchoring condition of Definition 5.6.1 concerning the sphere diffeomorphism of the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge (cf. Theorem 5.7.1). Indeed, the existence of such a gauge reduces to finding smooth functions $h^3, h^4: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a diffeomorphism $\mathbb{H}: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ and a mass M_f satisfying the system (16.1.62)–(16.1.67) with $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ replaced by u_f^0 , the geometric quantities of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge replaced by the corresponding geometric quantities of the $i_{\mathcal{EF}}$ gauge of Theorem 5.5.2, and the diffeomorphism functions f replaced by the diffeomorphism functions relating the new double null foliation arising from Remark 16.1.13 with the sphere (16.1.52) defined by $s^3 = h^3 \circ \mathbb{H}^{-1}$, $s^4 = h^4 \circ \mathbb{H}^{-1}$, together with the condition that

$$\psi \circ i_{\mathcal{EF}}(u_f^0 + h^3(\theta), v_\infty(u_f^0) + h^4(\theta), \mathbb{H}(\theta)) = \theta,$$

where ψ is the canonical diffeomorphism of Proposition 4.4.1 and p, v chosen so that (16.1.59) and (16.1.60) hold. The existence of such h^3, h^4, \mathbb{H} and M_f can easily be established by defining a suitable sequence of iterates and following the proof of Theorem 16.1.2.

This section is ended with the following estimate for the differences between the $\ell = 1$ modes of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, which will be used in the proof of Theorem 16.2 in Section 16.2 below.

Proposition 16.1.19 (Estimate for difference between $\ell = 1$ modes of $\hat{u}_f + \delta'$ and $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauges). *Let $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f)$ be fixed and consider some $0 \leq \delta' < \delta \leq \delta_0$. Let $(Y_m^1)^\delta$ and $(Y_m^1)^{\delta'}$ denote the $\ell = 1$ modes of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ and $\hat{u}_f + \delta'$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauges of Theorem 16.1.2 respectively. One can view $(Y_m^1)^\delta(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta'), \cdot)$ and $(Y_m^1)^{\delta'}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta'), \cdot)$ as functions on \mathbb{S}^2 via the identifications i_δ and $i_{\delta'}$ respectively. The differences satisfy, for $m = -1, 0, 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \| (Y_m^1)^\delta(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta'), \cdot) - (Y_m^1)^{\delta'}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta'), \cdot) \|_{S_{u,v}} \\ & + \| (r^2 \Delta Y_m^1)^\delta(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta'), \cdot) - (r^2 \Delta Y_m^1)^{\delta'}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta'), \cdot) \|_{S_{u,v}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon(\delta - \delta')}{\hat{u}_f + \delta'}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Consider first the case that $\delta' = 0$. Define $Y_m^1 := (Y_m^1)^0$ and $\tilde{Y}_m^1 := (Y_m^1)^{\delta'}$, and similarly let \mathcal{g} and $\tilde{\mathcal{g}}$ denote the induced metrics of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge and the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge respectively. Via the identifications i_0 and i_δ , one can view $\mathcal{g}(\hat{u}_f, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f), \cdot)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{g}}(\hat{u}_f, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f), \cdot)$ as two metrics on the sphere \mathbb{S}^2 . Given a function h on \mathbb{S}^2 , let $h_{\ell=0}$, $h_{\ell=1}$ and $h_{\ell \geq 2}$ denote the mode projections with respect to the metric \mathcal{g} , and let $\widetilde{h_{\ell=0}}$, $\widetilde{h_{\ell=1}}$ and $\widetilde{h_{\ell \geq 2}}$ denote the mode projections with respect to the metric $\tilde{\mathcal{g}}$. Let also $\| \cdot \|_{S_{u,v}}$ and $\| \cdot \|_{\tilde{S}_{u,v}}$ denote the L^2 norms on \mathbb{S}^2 with respect to $\mathcal{g}(u, v)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{g}}(u, v)$ respectively.

Recall now that, for $m = -1, 0, 1$, Y_m^1 is defined in terms of $\check{Y}_m^1 = \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}^1} \check{\check{Y}}_m^1$ (see Section 1.4.2.3). It follows that $\check{Y}_m^1 = (\check{\check{Y}}_m^1)_{\ell=1}$, and similarly $\check{\check{Y}}_m^1 = (\check{\check{Y}}_m^1)_{\ell=1}$, and so

$$(\check{\check{Y}}_m^1)_{\ell=1} - (\check{\check{Y}}_m^1)_{\ell=1} = ((\check{\check{Y}}_m^1 - \check{\check{Y}}_m^1)_{\ell=1})_{\ell=1} = 0.$$

Hence, for $\check{Y}_m^1 = \check{Y}_m^1(u, v, \theta)$ and $\check{\check{Y}}_m^1 = \check{\check{Y}}_m^1(u, v, \theta)$,

$$\check{Y}_m^1 - \check{\check{Y}}_m^1 = (\check{\check{Y}}_m^1)_{\ell=0} + (\check{\check{Y}}_m^1)_{\ell \geq 2} - (\check{\check{Y}}_m^1)_{\ell=0} - (\check{\check{Y}}_m^1)_{\ell \geq 2}.$$

Now

$$(\check{\check{Y}}_m^1)_{\ell=0}(u, v) = \left(\int \sqrt{\det \tilde{g}(u, v, \theta)} d\theta^1 d\theta^2 \right)^{-1} \int \check{\check{Y}}_m^1(u, v, \theta) \sqrt{\det \tilde{g}(u, v, \theta)} d\theta^1 d\theta^2,$$

and

$$\int \check{\check{Y}}_m^1(u, v, \theta) \sqrt{\det \tilde{g}(u, v, \theta)} d\theta^1 d\theta^2 = 0,$$

hence

$$|(\check{\check{Y}}_m^1)_{\ell=0}(u, v)| \lesssim \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} |\tilde{g}(u, v, \theta) - g(u, v, \theta)|.$$

Moreover, by Proposition 9.3.3,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^2 \|\tilde{\nabla}^k (\check{\check{Y}}_m^1)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\tilde{S}_{u,v}} &\lesssim \|\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \tilde{\nabla} \check{\check{Y}}_m^1\|_{\tilde{S}_{u,v}} = \|(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \tilde{\nabla} - \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla) \check{\check{Y}}_m^1\|_{\tilde{S}_{u,v}} \\ &\lesssim \|g(u, v, \cdot) - \tilde{g}(u, v, \cdot)\|_{\tilde{S}_{u,v}} + \|\check{Y}(u, v, \cdot) - \check{\check{Y}}(u, v, \cdot)\|_{\tilde{S}_{u,v}}, \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.130)$$

since

$$(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_2^* \tilde{\nabla} - \mathcal{P}_2^* \nabla) \check{\check{Y}}_m^1 = (\check{Y} - \check{\check{Y}}) \cdot \check{\check{Y}}_m^1 + \frac{1}{2} (\check{\Delta} - \tilde{\Delta}) \check{\check{Y}}_m^1 \cdot \tilde{g} + \frac{1}{2} (g - \tilde{g}) \check{\Delta} \check{\check{Y}}_m^1.$$

The terms $\|(\check{\check{Y}}_m^1)_{\ell=0}\|_{\tilde{S}_{u,v}}$ and $\|(\check{\check{Y}}_m^1)_{\ell \geq 2}\|_{\tilde{S}_{u,v}}$ can be estimated similarly. Hence

$$\|\check{\check{Y}}_m^1 - \check{\check{Y}}_m^1\|_{\tilde{S}_{u,v}} \lesssim \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} |\tilde{g}(u, v, \theta) - g(u, v, \theta)| + \|\check{Y}(u, v, \cdot) - \check{\check{Y}}(u, v, \cdot)\|_{\tilde{S}_{u,v}}.$$

Now,

$$Y_{-1}^1 = \|\check{Y}_{-1}^1\|_{\check{S}}^{-1} \check{Y}_{-1}^1, \quad \check{\check{Y}}_{-1}^1 = \|\check{\check{Y}}_{-1}^1\|_{\check{\check{S}}}^{-1} \check{\check{Y}}_{-1}^1,$$

and so

$$\|\check{\check{Y}}_{-1}^1(u, v, \cdot) - \check{Y}_{-1}^1(u, v, \cdot)\|_{\tilde{S}_{u,v}} \lesssim \|\check{Y}_{-1}^1 - \check{\check{Y}}_{-1}^1\|_{\tilde{S}_{u,v}}.$$

Similarly for $Y_0^1 - \check{\check{Y}}_0^1$ and $Y_1^1 - \check{\check{Y}}_1^1$. The proof of the estimate for $\check{\check{Y}}_m^1 - Y_m^1$ then follows from estimates for $g(u, v, \theta) - \tilde{g}(u, v, \theta)$ and $\check{Y}(u, v, \theta) - \check{\check{Y}}(u, v, \theta)$ which arise from Lemma 16.1.15 (see, for example (16.1.110)).

The estimate for $\check{\Delta} Y_m^1 - \check{\check{\Delta}} \check{\check{Y}}_m^1$ follows from the fact that

$$\check{\Delta} Y_m^1 - \check{\check{\Delta}} \check{\check{Y}}_m^1 = (\check{\Delta} - \check{\check{\Delta}}) Y_m^1 + \check{\check{\Delta}} ((Y_m^1 - \check{\check{Y}}_m^1)_{\ell=1} + (Y_m^1)_{\ell \geq 2}),$$

and so

$$\|\check{\Delta} Y_m^1 - \check{\check{\Delta}} \check{\check{Y}}_m^1\|_{\tilde{S}_{u,v}} \lesssim \|g - \tilde{g}\|_{\tilde{S}_{u,v}} + \|\check{Y} - \check{\check{Y}}\|_{\tilde{S}_{u,v}} + \|Y_m^1 - \check{\check{Y}}_m^1\|_{\tilde{S}_{u,v}},$$

by (16.1.130).

The proof when $\delta' > 0$ is similar. Defining g^δ and $g^{\delta'}$ to be the induced metrics of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ and $\hat{u}_f + \delta'$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauges respectively, one uses now appropriate estimates for $g^\delta(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty, \theta) - g^{\delta'}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty, \theta)$, which follow as in the proof of Lemma 16.1.15 by considering now the differences of the geometric quantities in the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge with those of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta'$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge. \square

16.1.3 Existence of $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge

This section concerns the proof of the following theorem, which establishes the existence of $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauges. Recall the function $M_f: [\hat{u}_f, \hat{u}_f + \delta_0] \times \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ from Theorem 16.1.2.

Theorem 16.1.3 (Existence of $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge). *There exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that, for all $\delta \in [0, \delta_0]$ and all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f)$, if ε_0 is sufficiently small, there exists a smooth $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge with respect to $M_f(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$ satisfying the anchoring conditions of Definition 5.6.1 with the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge of Theorem 16.1.2. Moreover the energies $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, \mathcal{H}^+}^N$ of the geometric quantities of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge with respect to $M_f(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$, and the associated diffeomorphism energies $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}^{N+2}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}]$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}]$, depend continuously on δ .*

The fact that the energies of the geometric quantities and the relevant diffeomorphism functions of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised gauges all depend continuously on δ , as stated in Theorem 16.1.2 and Theorem 16.1.3, ensures that, provided δ_0 is suitably small, the estimates (7.1.4), (7.1.5) and (7.1.6) hold with $u_f := \hat{u}_f + \delta$. Theorem 16.1.2 and Theorem 16.1.3 thus complete the proof of Theorem 16.1.

Remark 16.1.20. *It is again manifest from the proof of Theorem 16.1.3 that, for fixed $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f)$ and fixed $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$, the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge with respect to $M_f(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$ is unique amongst all such nearby gauges which satisfy the anchoring conditions (5.6.10) and (5.6.15).*

Remark 16.1.21. *For each $0 \leq \delta' < \delta \leq \delta_0$, the diffeomorphisms relating the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised and the (appropriately extended) $\hat{u}_f + \delta'$ normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauges satisfy appropriate estimates, similar to the estimates (16.1.14) and (16.1.15) relating the different \mathcal{I}^+ gauges. Since such estimates are not used later (unlike (16.1.14) and (16.1.15)) they are not stated explicitly as part of Theorem 16.1.3.*

Remark 16.1.22. *For any u_f , the existence of the analogue of a u_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge in linear theory, namely the proof of Proposition 2.3.8, can again be inferred from (a considerable simplification of) the proof of Theorem 16.1.3. We will explicitly distill such a proof in Remarks 16.1.29 and 16.1.37 below.*

Remark 16.1.23. *Recall the double null parametrisation $i_{\mathcal{K}}$ of Theorem 5.2.1 and Theorem 5.5.1, and let u_f^0 be as defined in Section 1.3.5. The proof of Theorem 16.1.3 can readily be adapted to give the existence of a u_f^0 normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge (cf. the proof of Theorem 5.7.1), anchored (in the sense of Definition 5.6.1) with the u_f^0 normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge discussed in Remark 16.1.6, by replacing the role of the δ_1 extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge of Theorem 16.1.1 with the double null parametrisation $i_{\mathcal{K}}$, and replacing any invocation of the smallness of δ_0 with the smallness of ε_0 . Again, the existence of u_f^0 normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge is much simpler than the proof of Theorem 16.1.3 in view of the fact that ε_0 can be chosen to be small with respect to u_f^0 . It is again implicit from the construction that this gauge is unique amongst all such nearby gauges. See also the discussion in Remarks 16.1.13 and 16.1.18 concerning the u_f^0 normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge.*

Throughout this section $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f)$ is considered fixed, and hence the dependence of quantities on λ is suppressed, and

$$M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta} = M_f(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda).$$

The proof of Theorem 16.1.3 is divided into two parts. The first part involves showing that, for any sphere suitably close to the sphere $S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}$ of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, there exist certain foliations of the corresponding null hypersurfaces defined by the sphere. The foliations attain a subset of the defining conditions of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge with mass $M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}$. The existence of such foliations is addressed in **Section 16.1.3.1**. See Proposition 16.1.24. The second part of the proof of Theorem 16.1.3 involves finding an appropriate sphere with the property that, in the double null foliation arising from the foliations of the resulting cones of Proposition 16.1.24, the remaining defining conditions of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge are attained. The existence of such a sphere is addressed in **Section 16.1.3.2**.

16.1.3.1 Foliations of null hypersurfaces

Throughout this section $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f)$ is fixed and the dependence of quantities on λ is again suppressed. Suppose \hat{S} is any sphere suitably close to $S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}$. Let $\tilde{C}_{v_{-1}}$ denote the incoming component of the

boundary of the causal past of \mathring{S} , and let $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$ denote the outgoing component of the boundary of the causal future of \mathring{S} . Any foliations of $\tilde{C}_{v_{-1}}$ and $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$ by spheres define a spacetime double null foliation by considering the outgoing components of the boundaries of the causal future of the spheres of the foliation of $\tilde{C}_{v_{-1}}$, and the incoming components of the boundaries of the causal past of the spheres of the foliation of $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$. Under suitable smallness conditions, this spacetime double null foliation will be regular in the image of the domain of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, $i_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f, \delta_1))$.

Following the proof of Theorem 16.1.2, the first step in the proof of Theorem 16.1.3 is to show that, given any such sphere suitably close to $S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v_{-1}}$, there exist foliations of the two corresponding null hypersurfaces defined by this sphere such that, in the corresponding spacetime double null foliation, a subset of the defining properties of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge are satisfied. This statement is the content of Proposition 16.1.24. Recall the quantity

$$\mu^* = \text{div}\eta + (\rho - \rho_o) - \frac{3}{2r} (\Omega \text{tr}\chi - (\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_o)$$

Proposition 16.1.24 (Foliation of cones corresponding to any sphere close to $S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v_{-1}}$). *Let \mathring{S} be a sphere defined, in the $(u_{\mathcal{H}^+}, v_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ coordinate system of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, by smooth functions s^3, s^4 ,*

$$\mathring{S} = \{i_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta + s^3(\theta), v_{-1} + s^4(\theta), \theta) \mid \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2\}. \quad (16.1.131)$$

Suppose that s^3 and s^4 satisfy

$$\sum_{k \leq 5} (\|(r\nabla)^k s^3\|_{\mathring{S}} + \|(r\nabla)^k s^4\|_{\mathring{S}}) \leq \tau,$$

for some τ sufficiently small, so that \mathring{S} is appropriately close to the sphere $S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v_{-1}}$. Then, provided τ and δ_0 are suitably small, there exists a smooth foliation of the outgoing cone, $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$, of \mathring{S} and a smooth foliation of the incoming cone, $\tilde{C}_{v_{-1}}$, of the sphere \mathring{S} such that the geometric quantities of the associated spacetime double null foliation satisfy,

$$\Omega^2 - \Omega_{o, M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}}^2 = 0 \quad \text{on } \tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cap \{r_{\mathcal{I}^+} \leq R_2\}; \quad (16.1.132)$$

$$\partial_u (r^3 (\text{div}\eta)_{\ell \geq 1} + r^3 \rho_{\ell \geq 1})(u, v_0, \theta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } u_0 \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f, \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2; \quad (16.1.133)$$

$$\Omega(u, v_0)_{\ell=0}^2 - \Omega_{o, M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}}(u, v_0)^2 = 0 \quad \text{for all } u_0 \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f; \quad (16.1.134)$$

$$\mu_{\ell \geq 1}^*(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2; \quad (16.1.135)$$

$$(\Omega \text{tr}\chi - (\Omega \text{tr}\chi)_o, M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta})_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}) = 0. \quad (16.1.136)$$

Given a sphere \mathring{S} as in (16.1.131), let $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$ denote the outgoing component of the boundary of the causal future of \mathring{S} , and let $\tilde{C}_{v_{-1}}$ denote the incoming component of the boundary of the causal past of \mathring{S} . If τ is suitably small, the sphere \mathring{S} is contained in the region covered by the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, $\mathring{S} \subset i_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f, \delta_1))$, and $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$ and $\tilde{C}_{v_{-1}}$ are regular null hypersurfaces in $i_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f, \delta_1))$. The cones $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$ and $\tilde{C}_{v_{-1}}$ will each be foliated in such a way that the relevant regions of the cones also live in the region $i_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f, \delta_1))$ covered by the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge.

Foliations of the outgoing null hypersurface $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$

The following proposition relates certain geometric quantities associated to two different foliations of the outgoing null hypersurface $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$.

Proposition 16.1.25 (Change of foliation relations on outgoing cones). *For any sphere \mathring{S} as in (16.1.131), let v denote the restriction to $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$ of the v coordinate of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge. Consider another foliation of $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$ by spheres, described by the level hypersurfaces of a function \tilde{v} . Suppose v and \tilde{v} are related by*

$$v = \tilde{v} + f^4(\tilde{v}, \theta^1, \theta^2),$$

for some function f^4 . Then the corresponding $\Omega\hat{\omega}$ are related by

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_{\tilde{v}}\log(1+\partial_{\tilde{v}}f^4)(\tilde{v},\theta) = \widetilde{\Omega\hat{\omega}}(\tilde{v},\theta) - (1+\partial_{\tilde{v}}f^4)\Omega\hat{\omega}(\tilde{v}+f^4,\theta).$$

Proof. The proof follows exactly as that of Proposition 16.1.10. \square

As in Section 16.1.2.1, rather than foliate the outgoing cone $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$ directly by the condition that $(\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2) = 0$, it is first shown that the incoming cone can be foliated by certain conditions which involve only $\Omega\hat{\omega}$.

In order to motivate the foliations constructed in Proposition 16.1.26 below, note first that, in a given spacetime double null foliation, equation (1.2.21) implies that,

$$\Omega_{\circ}^{-1}\Omega(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta) = \Omega_{\circ}^{-1}\Omega(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \theta)e^{\int_{v_{-1}}^v (\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_{\circ})(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v', \theta) dv'}.$$

Proposition 16.1.26 (Foliations of outgoing cones). *Let \mathring{S} be a sphere defined, in the $(u_{\mathcal{H}^+}, v_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ coordinate system of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge, by smooth functions s^3, s^4 ,*

$$\mathring{S} = \{i_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta + s^3(\theta), v_{-1} + s^4(\theta), \theta) \mid \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2\}.$$

such that s^3 and s^4 satisfy

$$\sum_{k \leq 5} (\|(r\tilde{\nabla})^k s^3\|_{\mathring{S}} + \|(r\tilde{\nabla})^k s^4\|_{\mathring{S}}) \leq \tau.$$

Consider also a smooth function $p^4 : \mathring{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} |p^4(\theta)| \leq \tau.$$

Then, provided τ and δ_0 are sufficiently small, there exists a smooth foliation of the outgoing cone, $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$, of \mathring{S} such that, on $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$,

$$(\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_{\circ, M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}})(\tilde{v}, \theta) = 0,$$

for all $\tilde{v} \in [v_{-1}, v(R_2, \hat{u}_f + \delta)]$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$, and,

$$\partial_{\tilde{v}}f^4(v_{-1}, \theta) = p^4(\theta),$$

where f^4 is the diffeomorphism which relates this foliation of $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$ to the foliation of $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$ obtained by intersecting with the incoming cones \underline{C}_v , for $v_{-1} \leq u \leq v(R_2, \hat{u}_f + \delta_1)$, of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 16.1.11. By Proposition 16.1.25, the goal is to construct a function f^4 such that

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_{\tilde{v}}\log(1+\partial_{\tilde{v}}f^4)(\tilde{v},\theta) = \Omega\hat{\omega}_{\circ, M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}}(\tilde{v},\theta) - (1+\partial_{\tilde{v}}f^4)\Omega\hat{\omega}(\tilde{v}+f^4,\theta),$$

along with the initial conditions

$$f^4(v_{-1}, \cdot) = s^4, \quad \partial_{\tilde{v}}f^4(v_{-1}, \cdot) = p^4,$$

where $\Omega\hat{\omega}$ denotes the quantity of the foliation of $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$ obtained by intersecting with the incoming hypersurfaces of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge. Again, by continuity and compactness, this quantity is sufficiently close to its value in the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge if τ and δ are sufficiently small. Define therefore the iterates $f_{[0]}^4 = 0$ and, for $n \geq 1$, define $f_{[n]}^4$ to be the unique solution of the linear equation

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_{\tilde{v}}\log(1+\partial_{\tilde{v}}f_{[n]}^4)(\tilde{v},\theta) = \Omega\hat{\omega}_{\circ, M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}}(\tilde{v},\theta) - (1+\partial_{\tilde{v}}f_{[n-1]}^4)\Omega\hat{\omega}(\tilde{v}+f_{[n-1]}^4,\theta), \quad (16.1.137)$$

with the initial conditions

$$f^4(v_{-1}, \cdot) = s^4, \quad \partial_v f^4(v_{-1}, \cdot) = p^4.$$

As in the proof of Proposition 16.1.11 it follows inductively that each $f_{[n]}^4$ satisfies the estimates

$$\sum_{k \leq 2} \sup_{v \in [v_{-1}, V], \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} |\partial_v^k f_{[n]}^4(v, \theta)| \lesssim \tau,$$

on the interval $[v_{-1}, V]$, provided $V - v_{-1}$ is sufficiently small. It moreover follows that,

$$\sum_{k \leq 2} \sup_{v \in [v_{-1}, V], \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} |\partial_v^k (f_{[n+1]}^4 - f_{[n]}^4)(v, \theta)| \lesssim |V - v_{-1}| \sum_{k \leq 2} \sup_{v \in [v_{-1}, V], \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} |\partial_v^k (f_{[n]}^4 - f_{[n-1]}^4)(v, \theta)|,$$

and so, provided $V - v_{-1}$ is sufficiently small the sequence $\{f_{[n]}^4\}$ converges to a limit f^4 on the interval $[v_{-1}, V]$, which satisfies the equation (16.1.137). As in the proof of Proposition 16.1.11, the proof follows from dividing the interval $[v_{-1}, v(R_2, \hat{u}_f + \delta)]$ into sub-intervals of size $V - v_{-1}$ and repeating the proof. \square

Foliations of the incoming null hypersurface $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_{-1}}$

The following proposition relates certain geometric quantities associated to two different foliations of the incoming null hypersurface $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_{-1}}$.

Proposition 16.1.27 (Change of foliation relations on incoming cones). *Let u denote the restriction to $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_{-1}}$ of the u coordinate of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge. Consider another foliation of $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_{-1}}$ by spheres, described by the level hypersurfaces of a function \tilde{u} . Suppose u and \tilde{u} are related by*

$$u = \tilde{u} + f^3(\tilde{u}, \theta^1, \theta^2), \quad (16.1.138)$$

for some function f^3 . Then the corresponding geometric quantities $\partial_u(r^3 \text{d}\hat{v}\eta + r^3 \rho)$, $\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}$ and $\Omega \hat{\omega}$ are related by

$$\tilde{r}^3 \partial_{\tilde{u}} \tilde{\Delta} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3) = \partial_{\tilde{u}}(\tilde{r}^3 \widetilde{\text{d}\hat{v}\eta} + \tilde{r}^3 \tilde{\rho})(\tilde{u}, \theta) - \partial_u(r^3 \text{d}\hat{v}\eta + r^3 \rho)(\tilde{u} + f^3, \theta) + F(\tilde{\nabla} f^3, \tilde{\nabla}^2 f^3, \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3, \tilde{\nabla} \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3),$$

for a function F which, provided $|r \tilde{\nabla} f^3| + |(r \tilde{\nabla})^2 f^3| + |\partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3| + |r \tilde{\nabla} \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3| \lesssim 1$, satisfies

$$|F(\tilde{\nabla} f^3, \tilde{\nabla}^2 f^3, \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3, \tilde{\nabla} \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3)| \lesssim |r \tilde{\nabla} f^3| + |(r \tilde{\nabla})^2 f^3| + |\partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3| + |\tilde{\nabla} \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3|,$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial_{\tilde{u}} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3)(\tilde{u}, \theta) = \widetilde{\Omega \hat{\omega}}(\tilde{u}, \theta) - (1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3(\tilde{u}, \theta)) \Omega \hat{\omega}(\tilde{u} + f^3, \theta).$$

Proof. The proof follows exactly as that of Proposition 16.1.8, using now the fact that

$$\partial_{\tilde{u}} \widetilde{\text{d}\hat{v}\eta} - \partial_u \text{d}\hat{v}\eta = \partial_{\tilde{u}} \tilde{\Delta} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3) + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3 \text{d}\hat{v}\eta + \partial_{\tilde{u}} \left(\tilde{\nabla} f^3 \cdot \Omega \tilde{\nabla}_3 \eta - \frac{1}{2} \text{d}\hat{v}(\Omega \underline{\chi} \cdot \tilde{\nabla} f^3) + 2 \text{d}\hat{v}(\Omega \hat{\omega} \tilde{\nabla} f^3) \right),$$

and,

$$\partial_{\tilde{u}} \tilde{\rho} - \partial_u \rho = \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3 \rho + \partial_{\tilde{u}} \left(\tilde{\nabla} f^3 \otimes \tilde{\nabla} f^3 \cdot \Omega^2 \underline{\alpha} - 2 \tilde{\nabla} f^3 \cdot \Omega \underline{\beta} \right),$$

and the fact that $\partial_u(r^3 \rho_o) = \partial_{\tilde{u}}(\tilde{r}^3 \tilde{\rho}_o) = 0$. \square

Again, rather than foliate the incoming cone $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_{-1}}$ directly by the condition that $(\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)_{\ell=0} = 0$, it is first shown that the incoming cone can be foliated by certain conditions which involve only the above quantities $\Omega \hat{\omega}$ and $\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}$.

Recall that, in a given spacetime double null foliation,

$$\partial_u(\Omega_o^{-1} \Omega_{\ell=0} - 1) = \Omega \hat{\omega}_{\ell=0} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_o - \underline{\mathcal{F}},$$

where

$$\underline{\mathcal{F}} = -(\Omega_o^{-1}\Omega_{\ell=0} - 1)(\Omega\hat{\omega}_{\ell=0} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_o) - (\Omega_o^{-1}\Omega_{\ell\geq 1}(\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\ell\geq 1})_{\ell=0} - (\Omega_o^{-1}\Omega(\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi})_{\ell\geq 1})_{\ell=0},$$

and, since

$$\Omega_o^{-1}\Omega(u, v_{-1}, \theta) = -\Omega_o^{-1}\Omega(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \theta)e^{\int_{\hat{u}_f}^{\hat{u}_f + \delta} (\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_o)(u', v_{-1}, \theta) du'},$$

$\underline{\mathcal{F}}$ can be viewed as a function of u , for any given $\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_o$, $\Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}_o$, and $\Omega_o^{-1}\Omega(u_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}, v_{-1}, \cdot)$, i.e., abusing notation,

$$\underline{\mathcal{F}} = \underline{\mathcal{F}}(\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_o, \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}_o, \Omega_o^{-1}\Omega(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \cdot)) : [u_{-1}, \hat{u}_f + \delta] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

In Proposition 16.1.24 a gauge will be constructed in which $\Omega_o^{-1}\Omega(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \cdot) \equiv 1$, and so the following proposition uses this value of 1 for $\Omega_o^{-1}\Omega(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \cdot)$.

Proposition 16.1.28 (Foliations of incoming cones). *Let \mathring{S} be a sphere defined, in the $(u_{\mathcal{H}^+}, v_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ coordinate system of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, by smooth functions s^3, s^4 ,*

$$\mathring{S} = \{i_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta + s^3(\theta), v_{-1} + s^4(\theta), \theta) \mid \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2\}.$$

such that s^3 and s^4 satisfy

$$\sum_{k \leq 5} (\|(r\nabla)^k s^3\|_{\mathring{S}} + \|(r\nabla)^k s^4\|_{\mathring{S}}) \leq \tau.$$

Consider also a smooth function $p^3 : \mathring{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} |p^3(\theta)| \leq \tau.$$

Then, provided τ and δ_0 are sufficiently small, there exists a smooth foliation of the incoming cone, $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v_{-1}}$, of \mathring{S} such that, on $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v_{-1}}$,

$$\partial_u(r^3 \text{d}\text{v}\eta_{\ell \geq 1} + r^3 \rho_{\ell \geq 1})(\tilde{u}, \theta) = 0, \quad (\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_{o, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}})_{\ell=0}(\tilde{u}) = \underline{\mathcal{F}}[\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_{o, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}}, \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - \Omega\text{tr}\underline{\chi}_{o, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}}, 1](\tilde{u}),$$

for all $\tilde{u} \in [u_{-1}, \hat{u}_f + \delta]$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$, and,

$$\partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \theta) = p^3(\theta),$$

where f^3 is the diffeomorphism which relates this foliation of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v_{-1}}$ to the foliation of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{v_{-1}}$ obtained by intersecting with the outgoing cones C_u , for $u_{-1} \leq u \leq \hat{u}_f + \delta_1$, of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge.

Proof. The proof is again similar to that of Propositions 16.1.9, 16.1.11 and 16.1.26. By Proposition 16.1.27, the goal is to construct a function $f^3 : [u_{-1}, \hat{u}_f + \delta] \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\left[\tilde{r}^3 \partial_{\tilde{u}} \tilde{\Delta} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3) \right]_{\ell \geq 1} = \left[-\partial_u(r^3 \text{d}\text{v}\eta + r^3 \rho)(\tilde{u} + f^3, \theta) + F' \right]_{\ell \geq 1}, \quad (16.1.139)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} [\partial_{\tilde{u}} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3)(\tilde{u}, \cdot)]_{\ell=0} = \underline{\mathcal{F}}(\tilde{u}) + [\Omega\hat{\omega}_o(\tilde{u}) - (1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3(\tilde{u}, \cdot))\Omega\hat{\omega}(\tilde{u} + f^3(\tilde{u}, \cdot), \cdot)]_{\ell=0}, \quad (16.1.140)$$

along with the final conditions,

$$f^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \cdot) = s^3, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \cdot) = p^3, \quad (16.1.141)$$

where

$$F' := F(\tilde{\nabla} f^3, \tilde{\nabla}^2 f^3, \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3, \tilde{\nabla} \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3) + (\partial_{\tilde{u}}(\tilde{r}^3 \text{d}\text{v}\eta + \tilde{r}^3 \tilde{\rho}))_{\ell \geq 1} - \partial_{\tilde{u}}(\tilde{r}^3 \text{d}\text{v}\eta + \tilde{r}^3 \tilde{\rho})_{\ell \geq 1},$$

and F is as in Proposition 16.1.27. Note that, by Proposition 9.4.1 and Proposition 9.4.3, for any function h ,

$$|(\partial_{\tilde{u}} h)_{\ell \geq 1} - \partial_{\tilde{u}}(h_{\ell \geq 1})| \lesssim \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} |h| \cdot (|\widetilde{\Omega\beta}| + |\tilde{\eta}| + \sum_{k \leq 1} (|(r\widetilde{\nabla})^k \widetilde{\Omega\chi}| + |(r\widetilde{\nabla})^k (\widetilde{\Omega\text{tr}\chi} - \widetilde{\Omega\text{tr}\chi_o})|)),$$

and so

$$|(\partial_{\tilde{u}}(\tilde{r}^3 \widetilde{\text{d}\tilde{v}\eta} + \tilde{r}^3 \tilde{\rho}))_{\ell \geq 1} - \partial_{\tilde{u}}(\tilde{r}^3 \widetilde{\text{d}\tilde{v}\eta} + \tilde{r}^3 \tilde{\rho}))_{\ell \geq 1}| \lesssim \varepsilon (|\widetilde{\nabla} f^3| + |(r\widetilde{\nabla})^2 f^3| + |\partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3| + |\widetilde{\nabla} \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3|),$$

by relating $\widetilde{\Omega\beta}$ etc. to their values in the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge (see Proposition 16.1.8 and Proposition 16.1.27). As in the proofs of Propositions 16.1.9, 16.1.11 and 16.1.26, the proof proceeds by considering the iterates $f_{[0]}^3 = 0$, and inductively defining $f_{[n]}^3$ to be the solution of the linear system

$$\left[r_{[n-1]}^3 \partial_{\tilde{u}} \Delta_{[n-1]} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f_{[n]}^3) \right]_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}} = \left[-\partial_u(r^3 \text{d}\tilde{v}\eta + r^3 \rho)(\tilde{u} + f_{[n-1]}^3, \theta) + F'_{[n-1]} \right]_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}},$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} [\partial_{\tilde{u}} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f_{[n]}^3)(\tilde{u}, \cdot)]_{(\ell=0)_{[n-1]}} = \mathcal{F}_{[n-1]}(\tilde{u}) + [\Omega\hat{\omega}_o(\tilde{u}) - (1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f_{[n-1]}^3)(\tilde{u}, \cdot)) \Omega\hat{\omega}(\tilde{u} + f_{[n-1]}^3)(\tilde{u}, \cdot, \cdot)]_{(\ell=0)_{[n-1]}},$$

along with the final conditions,

$$f^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \cdot) = s^3, \quad \partial_{\tilde{u}} f^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \cdot) = p^3,$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_{[n-1]} = \mathcal{F}(\Omega\hat{\omega}_o + \frac{1}{2} \partial_u \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f_{[n-1]}^3) + (1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f_{[n-1]}^3) \Omega\hat{\omega}_{f_{[n-1]}^3}, \Omega\text{tr}\chi_o + (1 + \partial_{\tilde{u}} f_{[n-1]}^3) \Omega\text{tr}\chi_{f_{[n-1]}^3}, q),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} F'_{[n-1]} &= F(\nabla f_{[n-1]}^3, \nabla^2 f_{[n-1]}^3, \partial_u f_{[n-1]}^3, \nabla \partial_u f_{[n-1]}^3) \\ &\quad + (\partial_u((r^3 \text{d}\tilde{v}\eta + r^3 \rho)_{[n-1]}))_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}} - \partial_u(((r^3 \text{d}\tilde{v}\eta + r^3 \rho)_{[n-1]}))_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}}. \end{aligned}$$

As in the proofs of Propositions 16.1.9, 16.1.11 and 16.1.26, one then shows that the sequence of iterates $\{f_{[n]}^3\}$ converges to a limit f^3 which solves (16.1.139)–(16.1.141) as desired. \square

The proof of Proposition 16.1.24: foliations of cones of any sphere close to $S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}$

The proof of Proposition 16.1.24 can now be given.

*Proof of Proposition 16.1.24. **Equations:*** The goal is to choose functions p^3, p^4 appropriately so that, in the spacetime double null foliation arising from the foliations of $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}$ and $\tilde{C}_{v_{-1}}$ of Propositions 16.1.26 and 16.1.28 respectively,

$$\Omega(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \cdot)^2 - \Omega_{o, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1})^2 = 0, \quad (16.1.142)$$

$$\mu_{\ell \geq 1}^*(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \cdot) = 0, \quad (16.1.143)$$

$$(\Omega\text{tr}\chi - (\Omega\text{tr}\chi)_{o, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}})_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}) = 0. \quad (16.1.144)$$

The function q will then be chosen so that, in the resulting spacetime double null foliation, the function \mathcal{F} of Proposition 16.1.28 satisfies

$$\mathcal{F} = \partial_u ((\Omega^2 - \Omega_{o, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}}^2)_{\ell=0}) - (\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_{o, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}})_{\ell=0}.$$

Suppose that, for some given p^4 , the cone $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}$ is foliated according to Proposition 16.1.26 and, for some given p^3, q , the cone $\tilde{C}_{v_{-1}}$ is foliated according to Proposition 16.1.28. Suppose that these foliations are described as the level hypersurfaces of functions \tilde{v} and \tilde{u} respectively. The resulting spacetime double

null foliation, obtained by considering the outgoing null cones associated to the spheres of constant \tilde{u} in $\tilde{C}_{v_{-1}}$ and the incoming null cones associated to the spheres of constant \tilde{v} in $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$, is related to the extended \hat{u}_f normalised double null foliation by functions f^3, f^4 satisfying

$$u = \tilde{u} + f^3(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}), \quad v = \tilde{v} + f^4(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}), \quad \theta^A = \tilde{\theta}^A + f^A(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}),$$

where $f^3(\cdot, v_{-1}, \cdot)$ agrees with f^3 of Proposition 16.1.28, $f^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \cdot, \cdot)$ agrees with f^4 of Proposition 16.1.26, and f^1, f^2 are defined so that

$$f^A(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \cdot) \equiv 0, \quad A = 1, 2,$$

and the spacetime metric takes the standard double null form with $\tilde{b} \equiv 0$ on the cone $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$. In particular,

$$f^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \cdot) = s^3, \quad f^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \cdot) = s^4.$$

The change of spacetime gauge relations (4.3.36), (4.3.39), (4.3.43), (4.3.44), (4.3.49) then imply that

$$(\tilde{\Omega}_{o,M}^{-2} \tilde{\Omega}^2 - 1)(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}) = (\Omega_{o,M}^{-1} \Omega^2 - 1)(\hat{u}_f + \delta + s^3, v_{-1} + s^4) + p^3 + p^4 - \frac{2M}{r^2}(s^3 - s^4) + \mathfrak{E}^1,$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu^* + 3\tilde{\Omega}^2 \tilde{r}^{-2}(\tilde{\Omega}_{o,M}^{-2} \tilde{\Omega}^2 - 1))_{\ell \geq 1}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}) &= (\mu^* + 3\Omega^2 r^{-2}(\Omega_{o,M}^{-2} \Omega^2 - 1))(\hat{u}_f + \delta + s^3, v_{-1} + s^4)_{\ell \geq 1} \\ &\quad + \Delta p_{\ell \geq 1}^3 + \frac{3\Omega^2}{r^2} p_{\ell \geq 1}^3 - \frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{M}{r}\right) \Delta s_{\ell \geq 1}^3 + \frac{\Omega^2}{r} \Delta s_{\ell \geq 1}^4 - \frac{3\Omega^2}{r^3}(s^3 - s^4)_{\ell \geq 1} + \mathfrak{E}^2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Omega}_{o,M}^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{o,M})_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}) &= \Omega_{o,M}^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{o,M})(\hat{u}_f + \delta + s^3, v_{-1} + s^4)_{\ell=0} \\ &\quad - \frac{2}{r} p_{\ell=0}^3 - \frac{2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{4M}{r}\right) (s^3 - s^4)_{\ell=0} + \mathfrak{E}^3, \end{aligned}$$

where $M = M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$ and $\mathfrak{E}^1, \mathfrak{E}^2, \mathfrak{E}^3$ are nonlinearities, as determined by the relations of Proposition 4.3.1 and Proposition 4.3.2, which take the schematic form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{E}^1 &= \sum_{|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2| \leq 1} \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \Phi \cdot \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\gamma_1} f(x_{-1}) + \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\gamma_1} f \cdot \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\gamma_2} f(x_{-1}), \\ \mathfrak{E}^2 &= \sum_{k \leq 2} \sum_{|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2| \leq 1} \left(\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \Phi \cdot (r \tilde{\nabla})^k \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\gamma_1} f(x_{-1}) + \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\gamma_1} f \cdot (r \tilde{\nabla})^k \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\gamma_2} f(x_{-1}) \right)_{\ell \geq 1}, \\ \mathfrak{E}^3 &= \sum_{k \leq 1} \sum_{|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2| \leq 1} \left(\Pi_{\tilde{S}} \Phi \cdot (r \tilde{\nabla})^k \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\gamma_1} f(x_{-1}) + \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\gamma_1} f \cdot (r \tilde{\nabla})^k \tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{\gamma_2} f(x_{-1}) \right)_{\ell=0}, \end{aligned}$$

with $x_{-1} = (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \cdot)$, and $\tilde{\Omega}$ and $\Omega \text{tr} \chi$ denote the values of Ω and $\Omega \text{tr} \chi$ in the resulting spacetime double null foliation.

Under the assumption that the gauge condition (16.1.142) is satisfied, Proposition 15.1.11 in particular implies that, after relating (see Proposition 16.1.10 or Proposition 16.1.25) the quantities $\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o$, $\Omega \tilde{\chi}$, η , $\Omega^{-1} \tilde{\chi}$, $\tilde{\rho}$, $\Omega \tilde{\beta}$, $\Omega^2 \alpha$ to the corresponding quantities in the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge and f^4 and its derivatives,

$$\mu_{\ell \geq 1}^*(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}) = \mu_{\ell \geq 1}^*(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)) + \mathcal{G}(f^4, \nabla f^4, \nabla^2 f^4, \partial_v f^4, \nabla \partial_v f^4, \nabla^2 \partial_v f^4),$$

for some appropriate \mathcal{G} , which depends on $\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o$, η , $\Omega^2 \alpha$, etc. in the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge, and satisfies

$$\|\mathcal{G}\|_S \lesssim \varepsilon^2 + \hat{u}_f \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)} \sum_{k \leq 2} (\|(r \tilde{\nabla})^k f^4\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}}^2 + \|(r \tilde{\nabla})^k \partial_v f^4\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}}^2).$$

The goal then is to find p^3 and p^4 such that

$$0 = (\Omega_{\circ}^{-1}\Omega^2 - 1)(\hat{u}_f + \delta + s^3, v_{-1} + s^4) + p^3 + p^4 - \frac{2M}{r^2}(s^3 - s^4) + \mathfrak{E}^1, \quad (16.1.145)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(f^4, \nabla f^4, \nabla^2 f^4, \partial_v f^4, \nabla \partial_v f^4, \nabla^2 \partial_v f^4) &= (\mu^* + 3r^{-2}(\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2))(\hat{u}_f + \delta + s^3, v_{-1} + s^4)_{\ell \geq 1} \\ &+ \Delta p_{\ell \geq 1}^3 + \frac{3\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r^2} p_{\ell \geq 1}^3 - \frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{M}{r}\right) \Delta s_{\ell \geq 1}^3 + \frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r} \Delta s_{\ell \geq 1}^4 - \frac{3\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r^3} (s^3 - s^4)_{\ell \geq 1} + \mathfrak{E}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.146)$$

and

$$0 = \Omega_{\circ}^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ})(\hat{u}_f + \delta + s^3, v_{-1} + s^4)_{\ell=0} - \frac{2}{r} p_{\ell=0}^3 - \frac{2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{4M}{r}\right) (s^3 - s^4)_{\ell=0} + \mathfrak{E}^3, \quad (16.1.147)$$

where f^4 denotes the change of foliation of the cone arising from Proposition 16.1.26 with $\partial_v f^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}) = p^4$ and f^3 denotes the change of foliation of the cone arising from Proposition 16.1.28 with $\partial_u f^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}) = p^3$.

Definition of iterates: Define first

$$p_{[1]}^3 = p_{[1]}^4 = 0,$$

and, for $n \geq 2$ inductively define $p_{[n]}^3$ and $p_{[n]}^4$ as solutions of the system

$$\begin{aligned} [\Delta_{[n-1]} p_{[n]}^3 + 3\Omega_{\circ}^2 r^{-2} p_{[n]}^3]_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}} &= [\mathcal{G}_{[n-1]} - (\mu^* + 3r^{-2}(\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2))(\hat{u}_f + \delta + s^3, v_{-1} + s^4) \\ &+ \frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{M}{r}\right) \Delta s^3 - \frac{\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r} \Delta s^4 + \frac{3\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r^3} (s^3 - s^4) - \mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^2]_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}} \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.148)$$

$$[2r^{-1} p_{[n]}^3]_{(\ell=0)_{[n-1]}} = [\Omega_{\circ}^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ})(\hat{u}_f + \delta + s^3, v_{-1} + s^4) - \frac{2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{4M}{r}\right) (s^3 - s^4) + \mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^3]_{(\ell=0)_{[n-1]}}, \quad (16.1.149)$$

and

$$p_{[n]}^4 = -p_{[n]}^3 - (\Omega_{\circ}^{-1}\Omega^2 - 1)(\hat{u}_f + \delta + s^3, v_{-1} + s^4) + \frac{2M}{r^2}(s^3 - s^4) - \mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^1, \quad (16.1.150)$$

where

$$\mathcal{G}_{[n-1]} = \mathcal{G}(f_{[n-1]}^4, \nabla f_{[n-1]}^4, \nabla^2 f_{[n-1]}^4, \partial_v f_{[n-1]}^4, \nabla \partial_v f_{[n-1]}^4, \nabla^2 \partial_v f_{[n-1]}^4),$$

and the errors $\mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^1$, $\mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^2$ and $\mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^3$ are defined by replacing f with $f_{[n-1]}$ in the definition of \mathfrak{E}^1 , \mathfrak{E}^2 and \mathfrak{E}^3 respectively. Schematically,

$$\mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^1 = \sum_{|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2| \leq 1} \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n-1]}(x_{-1}) + \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n-1]} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} f_{[n-1]}(x_{-1}),$$

and similarly for $\mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^2$ and $\mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}^3$. The diffeomorphisms $f_{[n]}^3$ and $f_{[n]}^4$ are inductively defined as follows. Suppose n is such that $p_{[n]}^3$ and $p_{[n]}^4$ are defined. Consider the foliation of $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_{\infty}}$ arising from Proposition 16.1.28 with $p^3 = p_{[n]}^3$. This foliation of $\tilde{\underline{C}}_{v_{\infty}}$, described by the level hypersurfaces of a function $u_{[n]}$, is related to u by a function $f_{[n]}^3$ by

$$u = u_{[n]} + f_{[n]}^3(u_{[n]}, \theta).$$

Consider the foliation of $C_{u_{-1}}$ arising from Proposition 16.1.26 with $p^4 = p_{[n]}^4$. This foliation of $C_{u_{-1}}$, described by the level hypersurfaces of a function $v_{[n]}$, is related to v by a function $f_{[n]}^4$ by

$$v = v_{[n]} + f_{[n]}^4(v_{[n]}, \theta).$$

Estimates and existence of limits: It follows from Proposition 16.1.25 that

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial_{\tilde{v}} \log(1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f_{[n]}^4)(\tilde{v}, \theta) = \Omega \hat{\omega}_{\circ, M_{\hat{a}_f + \delta}}(\tilde{v}) - (1 + \partial_{\tilde{v}} f_{[n]}^4) \Omega \hat{\omega}(\tilde{v} + f_{[n]}^4, \theta),$$

for all n , and so

$$\sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)} \sum_{k_1 \leq 4} \sum_{k_2 \leq 3} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^{k_1} \partial_v^{k_2} f_{[n]}^4\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \lesssim C(\hat{u}_f)(\delta + \tau + \sum_{k \leq 4} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k p_{[n]}^4\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}}),$$

for a constant $C(\hat{u}_f)$ which depends on \hat{u}_f . The relations (4.3.31)–(4.3.36) moreover imply that, if τ and δ_0 are sufficiently small,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \leq 4} (\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \partial_u f_{[n]}^3\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}} + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \partial_v f_{[n]}^3\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}} + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \partial_u f_{[n]}^4\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}} + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \partial_v f_{[n]}^4\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}}) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k \leq 5} (\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k s^3\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}} + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k s^4\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}}) + \sum_{k \leq 4} (\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k p_{[n]}^3\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}} + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k p_{[n]}^4\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}}), \end{aligned}$$

since $f_{[n]}^A(u_{-1}, v_\infty, \cdot) = 0$ and $b_{[n]}(u_{-1}, v_\infty, \cdot) = 0$.

It then follows, using a simple induction argument and an elliptic estimate for the system (16.1.148)–(16.1.150), that, if δ and τ are sufficiently small,

$$\sum_{k \leq 4} (\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k p_{[n]}^3\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}} + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k p_{[n]}^4\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}}) \lesssim \tau + \delta + \varepsilon,$$

for all n . Similarly, by considering differences of the system (16.1.148)–(16.1.150), if τ , ε and δ are sufficiently small,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \leq 4} (\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (p_{[n+1]}^3 - p_{[n]}^3)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}} + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (p_{[n+1]}^4 - p_{[n]}^4)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}}) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \leq 4} (\|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (p_{[n]}^3 - p_{[n-1]}^3)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}} + \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (p_{[n]}^4 - p_{[n-1]}^4)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}}). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the sequences $\{p_{[n]}^3\}$, $\{p_{[n]}^4\}$ converge to limits p^3 , p^4 respectively which solve the system (16.1.145)–(16.1.147) as desired. \square

Remark 16.1.29. Note again (cf. Remark 16.1.12 concerning the linearised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge) that in the linear setting of Proposition 2.3.8, one can distill from the proof of Proposition 16.1.24 the analogous linear statement, namely that, for any solution $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ of the linearised equations around Schwarzschild of mass M_f , there exist functions $f^3(u, \theta)$, $f^4(v, \theta)$, with $f^3(u_f, \cdot) = 0$, $f^4(v_\infty, \cdot) = 0$, which generate a pure gauge solution $\mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}}$, such that the solution $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}}$ of the linearised equations satisfies the linearised analogues of (16.1.132)–(16.1.136). Indeed, in the notation of [DHR], by the linearised analogues of the relations of Proposition 16.1.25, Proposition 16.1.27 and the relations (4.3.36), (4.3.39), (4.3.43), and (4.3.49), it suffices to find $f^3(u, \theta)$ satisfying the equations

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_u \left(r^3 \Delta \partial_u f_{\ell \geq 1}^3 + \left(1 - \frac{4M_f}{r}\right) r^2 \Delta f_{\ell \geq 1}^3 + r^2 \Omega^2 \Delta f_{\ell \geq 1}^4 - \frac{6M_f \Omega^2}{r} (f_{\ell \geq 1}^3 - f_{\ell \geq 1}^4) \right) &= -(\partial_u(r^3 \mathring{d} \mathring{v} \mathring{\eta} + r^3 \mathring{\rho}))_{\ell \geq 1}^{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}(\cdot, v_{-1}, \cdot), \\ \frac{1}{2} \partial_u^2 f_{\ell=0}^3 - \frac{M_f}{r^2} \partial_u f_{\ell=0}^3 - \frac{2M_f \Omega_{\text{c}}^2}{r^3} f_{\ell=0}^3 &= -\mathring{\omega}_{\ell=0}^{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}(\cdot, v_{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

and $f^4(v, \theta)$ satisfying the equation

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial_v^2 f^4 + \frac{M_f}{r^2} \partial_v f^4 - \frac{2M_f \Omega_{\text{c}}^2}{r^3} f^4 = -\mathring{\omega}^{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}(u_f, \cdot, \cdot),$$

along with the final conditions

$$\begin{aligned} f^3(u_f, \cdot) &= f^4(v_{-1}, \cdot) = 0, \\ \partial_u f^3(u_f, \cdot) + \partial_v f^4(v_{-1}, \cdot) &= -2\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\Omega}^{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}(u_f, v_{-1}, \cdot), \\ \Delta \partial_u f_{\ell \geq 1}^3(u_f, \cdot) + \frac{3\Omega^2}{r^2} \partial_u f_{\ell \geq 1}^3(u_f, \cdot) &= -(\mathring{d} \mathring{v} \mathring{\eta} + \mathring{\rho} - \frac{3}{2r} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi) + \frac{3\Omega^2}{r^2} 2\Omega^{-1} \mathring{\Omega})_{\ell \geq 1}^{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}(u_f, v_\infty, \cdot), \\ \partial_u f_{\ell=0}^3(u_f) &= \frac{r}{2\Omega^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\ell=0}^{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}(u_f, v_\infty), \end{aligned}$$

where the latter three are the linear analogues of (16.1.145), (16.1.146) and (16.1.147). In this simplified linear setting, the proofs of Propositions 16.1.28, 16.1.26, and 16.1.24 reduce to showing the existence of functions $f^3(u, \theta)$ and $f^4(v, \theta)$ satisfying these linear equations.

Recall the quantity

$$\Upsilon = \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r}\right) (\rho - \rho_\circ) + \frac{3M_f}{2r^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ) - \frac{3M_f \Omega_\circ^2}{2r^2} \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ).$$

The following lemma expresses $(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}$ in terms of $(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0}$, $\Upsilon_{\ell=0}$ and nonlinear terms for any sphere as in Proposition 16.1.24, in the double null foliation of Proposition 16.1.24. This expression will be used in the proof of Theorem 16.1.3.

Lemma 16.1.30 (Expression for $\text{tr} \chi$ in gauge of Proposition 16.1.24). *Given any sphere, as in Proposition 16.1.24, in the double null foliation of Proposition 16.1.24,*

$$(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)) = A(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)) + B\Upsilon_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)) + \mathfrak{E}, \quad (16.1.151)$$

for some constants A, B (where $A \neq 0$ and $A \neq 1$) where $v(R) = v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and \mathfrak{E} is a nonlinear error which satisfies

$$|\mathfrak{E}| \lesssim \sum_{\Phi} \int_{v_{-1}}^{v(R)} |\Phi(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v)|^2 dv.$$

Moreover, in the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge,

$$(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)) = A(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)) + B\Upsilon_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)) + \mathfrak{F}, \quad (16.1.152)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{F}| \lesssim & |(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1})| + \int_{v_{-1}}^{v(R)} \Omega^2 (|(1 - \Omega^{-2} \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=0}| + |(\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_\circ)_{\ell=0}|) (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v) dv \\ & + \sum_{\Phi} \int_{v_{-1}}^{v(R)} |\Phi(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v)|^2 dv. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Consider first (16.1.151). Note that, on $u = \hat{u}_f + \delta$,

$$\partial_v \left(\frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0} \right) = \Omega^{-2} \mathcal{E}, \quad \partial_v (r^3 \mu_{\ell=0}^*) = \mathcal{E},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_v \left(r (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0} \right) &= 4\Omega^2 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0} + 2\Omega^2 r \mu_{\ell=0}^* + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E} \\ &= \frac{4\Omega^4}{r^2} \frac{r^2}{\Omega^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0} + \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} r^3 \mu_{\ell=0}^* + \Omega^2 \mathcal{E}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0}(v_{-1}) = 0$, it follows that

$$(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ)_{\ell=0}(v(R)) = \int_{v_{-1}}^{v(R)} \frac{4\Omega^4}{r^2} dv \frac{R}{\Omega^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ)_{\ell=0}(v(R)) + \int_{v_{-1}}^{v(R)} \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} dv R^2 \mu_{\ell=0}^*(v(R)) + \mathcal{E}.$$

The proof then follows from rewriting $\mu_{\ell=0}^*(v(R))$ in terms of $\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_\circ$, $\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_\circ$ and Υ . The constants A, B take the explicit form,

$$\begin{aligned} A &= C^{-1} R \left(\Omega(v(R))^{-2} I_1 - \frac{3}{2} \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{R} \right)^{-1} I_2 \right), \quad B = C^{-1} R^2 \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{R} \right)^{-1} I_2, \\ C &= 1 - \frac{3M_f}{2} \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{R} \right)^{-1} I_2, \quad I_1 = \int_{v_{-1}}^{v(R)} \frac{4\Omega^4}{r^2} dv, \quad I_2 = \int_{v_{-1}}^{v(R)} \frac{2\Omega^2}{r^2} dv, \end{aligned}$$

where $v(R) = v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$.

The equality (16.1.152) follows similarly. The fact that the defining conditions of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge hold for $u = \hat{u}_f$, rather than $\hat{u}_f + \delta$, means there are extra contributions to the error \mathfrak{F} . \square

16.1.3.2 Existence of a new good sphere: the proof of Theorem 16.1.3

The remaining defining conditions of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, namely,

$$\left(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_{\circ, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}} \right)_{\ell \geq 1} (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}) = 0 \text{ for all } \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2; \quad (16.1.153)$$

$$\left(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\circ, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}} \right)_{\ell=0} (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)) = 0; \quad (16.1.154)$$

$$b(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta) = 0 \text{ for all } v \geq v_{-1}, \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2; \quad (16.1.155)$$

will be achieved by iteratively solving for a suitable sphere \hat{S} and considering the resulting spacetime double null foliation generated by Proposition 16.1.24. Moreover, letting $\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}$ denote the diffeomorphism functions which relate the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge to the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_{\mathcal{I}^+} &= \tilde{u}_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \tilde{f}_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}^3(\tilde{u}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \tilde{v}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \tilde{\theta}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^1, \tilde{\theta}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2), & \tilde{v}_{\mathcal{I}^+} &= \tilde{v}_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \tilde{f}_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}^4(\tilde{u}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \tilde{v}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \tilde{\theta}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^1, \tilde{\theta}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2), \\ \tilde{\theta}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^1 &= \tilde{\theta}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^1 + \tilde{f}_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}^1(\tilde{u}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \tilde{v}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \tilde{\theta}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^1, \tilde{\theta}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2), & \tilde{\theta}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^2 &= \tilde{\theta}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2 + \tilde{f}_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}^2(\tilde{u}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \tilde{v}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \tilde{\theta}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^1, \tilde{\theta}_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2), \end{aligned}$$

the anchoring conditions

$$\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) = 0 \text{ for all } \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2; \quad (16.1.156)$$

$$\tilde{f}_{\mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{H}^+}^A(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) = 0 \text{ for all } \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2, \quad A = 1, 2, \quad (16.1.157)$$

will also be achieved. The remaining relevant anchoring conditions of Definition 5.6.1 (in particular the inclusion (5.6.11)) are trivially satisfied, provided δ_0 is sufficiently small, by continuity and the improved bootstrap assumptions of Theorem C.

Define \hat{f} to be the diffeomorphism functions which relate the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge to the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge,

$$\tilde{u}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = u_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \hat{f}^3(u_{\mathcal{H}^+}, v_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}), \quad \tilde{v}_{\mathcal{I}^+} = v_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \hat{f}^4(u_{\mathcal{H}^+}, v_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}), \quad (16.1.158)$$

$$\tilde{\theta}_{\mathcal{I}^+}^A = \hat{f}^A(u_{\mathcal{H}^+}, v_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}) = \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}^A + \hat{f}^A(u_{\mathcal{H}^+}, v_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}), \quad A = 1, 2, \quad (16.1.159)$$

defined on an appropriate subset of $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^2$. The \mathbb{S}^2 part of this diffeomorphism in particular has the property that

$$|h(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta) - h(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \hat{f}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta))| \leq C(\hat{u}_f) \delta \sup_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} |r \nabla h|_{\mathcal{G}_{[n]}}, \quad (16.1.160)$$

for all functions h ,

$$\left| (\omega - (\hat{f}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \cdot))^* \omega)(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) \right|_{\mathcal{G}} \leq C(\hat{u}_f) \delta \sup_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} (|\omega|_{\mathcal{G}} + |r \nabla \omega|_{\mathcal{G}}), \quad (16.1.161)$$

for any $(0, k)$ S tensor ω , and

$$\sum_{k \leq 3} \|(r \nabla)^{k+2} \hat{f}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \cdot)\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} \leq C(\hat{u}_f) \delta, \quad (16.1.162)$$

for some constant $C(\hat{u}_f)$ which depends on \hat{u}_f . The estimates (16.1.160) and (16.1.161) can be viewed as appropriate estimates for $\hat{f}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \cdot)$ and $\nabla \hat{f}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \cdot)$.

Let $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ denote the continuation of the cone $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$ of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised gauge of Theorem 16.1.2. By continuity, $\tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ is a regular cone if δ is sufficiently small and, moreover, in the $(u_{\mathcal{H}^+}, v_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ coordinates of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge,

$$\{i_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta + K(v, \theta), v, \theta) \mid (v, \theta) \in [v_{-1}, v(R_2, \hat{u}_f + \delta)] \times \mathbb{S}^2\} \subset \tilde{C}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}^{\mathcal{H}^+},$$

for some smooth function $K: [v_{-1}, v(R_2, \hat{u}_f + \delta)] \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, \hat{u}_f + \delta)} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k K(v, \cdot)\|_{\mathbb{S}^2} \leq C(\hat{u}_f)\delta, \quad (16.1.163)$$

for some constant $C(\hat{u}_f)$ which depends on \hat{u}_f .

Recall the domain (2.3.1). Given a smooth function $h^4: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a diffeomorphism $\# : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$, provided $K \circ \#^{-1}$ and $h^4 \circ \#^{-1}$ are sufficiently small, the sphere

$$\tilde{S} = \{i_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta + K(v_{-1}, \#(\theta)), v_{-1} + h^4(\theta), \#(\theta)) \mid \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2\},$$

defines, by Proposition 16.1.24 (with $s^3 = K$, $s^4 = h^4 \circ \#^{-1}$), a unique smooth double null parametrisation

$$\tilde{i}: \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta) \rightarrow \mathcal{M},$$

such that the metric takes the double null form (1.1.4) in the associated coordinates, the associated geometric quantities satisfy the gauge conditions of Proposition 16.1.24, (16.1.155) holds, the image of \mathbb{S}^2 under $\tilde{i}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \cdot)$ is the sphere \tilde{S} , and

$$\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2} \circ i^{-1} \circ \tilde{i}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \theta) = \#(\theta),$$

where i is the parametrisation of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge and $\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2}: \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ is the projection onto the \mathbb{S}^2 argument. Note that, if δ , K and $h^4 \circ \#^{-1}$ are sufficiently small then $\tilde{i}(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)) \subset i(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f, \delta_1))$ (recalling (16.1.4) and Theorem 16.1.1) where i (see (4.1.1)) is the local parametrisation of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, and the parametrisation \tilde{i} can be made arbitrarily close to the parametrisation i . It follows that the inclusion (16.1.7) implies that the cones $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ of the parametrisation \tilde{i} satisfy

$$\bigcup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v_2} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+} \subset \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}}(V_3) \cap \{V_{-1} - 3C\varepsilon \leq V_{data} \leq V_{-1} + 3C\varepsilon\} \cap \{U_0 - 3C\varepsilon \leq U_{data} \leq 3C\varepsilon\},$$

In particular, U_5 is large enough so that the region covered by the initial data gauge $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}}(V_3)$ is not exhausted and there is room to extend in u . Moreover the inclusions (16.1.5), (16.1.6) guarantee that the diffeomorphism functions appearing in (16.1.156), (16.1.157) are well defined.

In the proof of Theorem 16.1.3 below, equations will be solved for $f_{\ell=0}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta))$ and $f_{\ell \geq 1}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \cdot)$. The following lemma guarantees that there indeed exists a double null parametrisation corresponding to such a prescription.

Lemma 16.1.31 (Existence of a double null parametrisation defined by $f_{\ell=0}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta))$ and $f_{\ell \geq 1}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \cdot)$). *Consider $\tau > 0$. Let $h^4: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function and let j^4 be a constant such that*

$$\sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k h^4\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}} + |j^4| \leq \tau. \quad (16.1.164)$$

If τ , $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ and δ_0 are sufficiently small, there exists a constant λ satisfying

$$|\lambda| \lesssim C(\hat{u}_f)\delta + \tau,$$

and a diffeomorphism $\# : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ such that, in the above double null parametrisation arising from Proposition 16.1.24 and the sphere, in the $(u_{\mathcal{H}^+}, v_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \theta_{\mathcal{H}^+})$ coordinates of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge,

$$\tilde{S} = \{i_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta + K(v_{-1}, \#(\theta)), v_{-1} + h^4(\theta) + \lambda, \#(\theta)) \mid \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2\}, \quad (16.1.165)$$

the diffeomorphisms which relate the above double null parametrisation to the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge satisfy

$$f_{\ell=0}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)) = j^4, \quad \hat{\mathcal{F}}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) = \hat{\mathcal{F}}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta), \quad (16.1.166)$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$, where $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$ is defined in (16.1.158), (16.1.159).

Proof. First note that any constant $\lambda_{[n]}$ and diffeomorphism $\#_{[n-1]}: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ define a sphere, in the coordinates of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge,

$$S_{[n]} = \{i_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta + K(v_{-1}, \#_{[n-1]}(\theta)), v_{-1} + h^4(\theta) + \lambda_{[n]}, \#_{[n-1]}(\theta)) \mid \theta \in \mathbb{S}^2\}. \quad (16.1.167)$$

Provided K , $h^4 \circ \#_{[n-1]}^{-1}$, and $\lambda_{[n]}$ are suitably small, Proposition 16.1.24 defines a unique double null parametrisation

$$i_{[n]}: \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta) \rightarrow \mathcal{M},$$

such that the metric in the associated coordinates takes the double null form (1.1.4), the associated double null foliation is that of Proposition 16.1.24, the condition (16.1.155) holds, and

$$\pi_{\mathbb{S}^2} \circ i^{-1} \circ i_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) = \hat{\mathcal{F}}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta),$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$, where i is the parametrisation of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge. Let $f_{[n]}$ denote the diffeomorphism functions which relate this double null parametrisation to the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ double null parametrisation, so that

$$u_{\mathcal{H}^+} = u_{[n]} + f_{[n]}^3(u_{[n]}, v_{[n]}, \theta_{[n]}), \quad v_{\mathcal{H}^+} = v_{[n]} + f_{[n]}^4(u_{[n]}, v_{[n]}, \theta_{[n]}),$$

$$\theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}^A = \#_{[n]}^A(u_{[n]}, v_{[n]}, \theta_{[n]}) = \theta_{[n]}^A + f_{[n]}^A(u_{[n]}, v_{[n]}, \theta_{[n]}), \quad A = 1, 2,$$

and let $\Phi_{[n]}$ denote the appropriate geometric quantities of the this double null parametrisation. Note that

$$f_{[n]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta) = K(v, \#_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)), \quad \#_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R), \theta) = \hat{\mathcal{F}}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R), \theta),$$

for all $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$, where $v(R) = v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$. In such a double null parametrisation, $(f_{[n]}^4)_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R))$ and $(f_{[n]}^4)_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1})$ are related as follows. It follows from the relations (4.3.36), (4.3.44), and (4.3.49) that, on $u_{[n]} = \hat{u}_f + \delta$, using the gauge condition (16.1.132),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{r} \partial_v (f_{[n]}^4)_{\ell=0}(x) &= \Omega_{[n]}^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_o)_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x) - \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_o)_{\ell=0}(x + f_{[n]}(x)) \\ &\quad - \frac{2}{r} \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_o^2} - 1 \right)_{\ell=0}(x + f_{[n]}(x)) - \frac{r^2}{3M_f} (\rho - \rho_o)_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x) + \frac{r^2}{3M_f} (\rho - \rho_o)_{\ell=0}(x + f(x)) + \mathcal{X}_0[f_{[n]}](x), \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.168)$$

where $\mathcal{X}_0[f_{[n]}]$ is an error satisfying $|\mathcal{X}_0[f_{[n]}]| \lesssim \mathcal{X}[f_{[n]}]$, and

$$\mathcal{X}[f_{[n]}] = (|M_f - M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}| + \sum_{\Phi} |\Phi|) \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}| + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}|^2,$$

where, for any k ,

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq k} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}| := \sum_{|\gamma| \leq k} \left(|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 f_{[n]}^3| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}^4| \right) + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq k-1} \left(|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_u f_{[n]}| + |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_v f_{[n]}| \right).$$

Now, as in the proof of Lemma 16.1.30,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{v_{-1}}^{v(R)} \frac{r}{2} \Omega_{[n]}^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_o)_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v) - \frac{r^3}{6M_f} (\rho - \rho_o)_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v) dv \\ = \tilde{c}_1 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o)_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)) + \tilde{c}_2 \Upsilon_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)) + \mathcal{E}, \end{aligned}$$

for an appropriate nonlinearity \mathcal{E} and constants \tilde{c}_1 , \tilde{c}_2 , where the gauge conditions (16.1.132), (16.1.136) have been used. It then follows, from the change of gauge formula (4.3.43) for $(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o)_{\ell=0}$, together

with the gauge condition $(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f, v(R)) = 0$, that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{v_{-1}}^{v(R)} \frac{r}{2} \Omega_{[n]}^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x) - \frac{r}{2} \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)_{\ell=0}(x + f_{[n]}(x)) - \frac{r^3}{6M_f} (\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x) \\ & + \frac{r^2}{3M_f} (\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0}(x + f_{[n]}(x)) dv \\ & = c_1 (f_{[n]}^4)_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)) - c_1 K(v(R), \#_{[n]}(\cdot))_{\ell=0} + c_2 (\Upsilon_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)) - \Upsilon_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R))) + \mathcal{E}_{[n]}, \end{aligned}$$

for some constants c_1, c_2 with $c_1 \neq 1$, where $x = (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v)$ and $\mathcal{E}_{[n]}$ is a nonlinear error which takes the schematic form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{[n]} &= \int_{v_{-1}}^{v(R)} \Phi_{[n]} \cdot \Phi_{[n]}(x) - \Phi \cdot \Phi(x + f_{[n]}(x)) dv' + \int_{v_{-1}}^{v(R)} (\Omega_\circ^{-2} \Omega^2(x + f_{[n]}(x)) - 1)_{\ell=0} dv' \\ &+ \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}(v(R)) + \sum_{|\gamma_1| + |\gamma_2| \leq 2} \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n]} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} f_{[n]}(v(R)). \end{aligned}$$

From (16.1.168) it then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & (f_{[n]}^4)_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)) - (f_{[n]}^4)_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}) = c_1 (f_{[n]}^4)_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)) - c_1 K(v(R), \#_{[n]}(\cdot))_{\ell=0} \\ & + c_2 (\Upsilon_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)) - \Upsilon_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R))) + \mathcal{E}_{[n]} + \int_{v_{-1}}^{v(R)} \mathcal{X}_0[f_{[n]}] - \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_\circ^2} - 1\right)_{\ell=0}(x + f_{[n]}(x)) dv, \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} (h^4 + \lambda_{[n]})_{\ell=0} &= (1 - c_1) (f_{[n]}^4)_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)) + \int_{v_{-1}}^{v(R)} \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_\circ^2} - 1\right)_{\ell=0}(x + f_{[n]}(x)) - \mathcal{X}_0[f_{[n]}] dv \\ &+ c_1 K(v(R), \#_{[n]}(\cdot))_{\ell=0} - c_2 (\Upsilon_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)) - \Upsilon_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R))) - \mathcal{E}_{[n]}. \end{aligned}$$

Define therefore $\lambda_{[0]} = 0$, $\#_{[0]} = Id$ and, for $n \geq 1$, define $\lambda_{[n]}$ inductively by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{[n]} &= (1 - c_1) j^4 - h_{\ell=0}^4 + \int_{v_{-1}}^{v(R)} \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_\circ^2} - 1\right)_{\ell=0}(x + f_{[n-1]}(x)) - \mathcal{X}_0[f_{[n-1]}](x) dv \\ &+ c_1 K(v(R), \#_{[n-1]}(\cdot))_{\ell=0} - c_2 (\Upsilon_{\ell=0}^{[n-1]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)) - \Upsilon_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R))) - \mathcal{E}_{[n-1]}, \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.169)$$

where $x = (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v)$. Recall that, provided $h^4 \circ \#_{[n-1]}^{-1}$ and $\lambda_{[n]}$ are suitably small, $\lambda_{[n]}$ and $\#_{[n-1]}$ define a sphere (16.1.167) and hence a double null parametrisation. Define $\#_{[n]}$ in terms of the diffeomorphisms relating this double null parametrisation to the extended \hat{u}_f normalised double null parametrisation by

$$\#_{[n]}(\theta) = \#_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \theta).$$

The proof will follow from showing that the sequences $\{\lambda_{[n]}\}$ and $\{\#_{[n]}\}$ converge to appropriate limits. Many of the steps are very similar to those of the proof of Theorem 16.1.3 below and so are only sketched. Following the proof of Lemma 16.1.35 below, one sees that, if ε and δ are sufficiently small,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)} \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R)} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{[n]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \right) \\ & \lesssim C(\hat{u}_f) \delta + \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r \nabla)^k h^4\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}} + |(f_{[n]}^4)_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R))|, \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.170)$$

where the norm of the diffeomorphism functions is defined below in (16.1.182), for some constant $C(\hat{u}_f)$ which depends on \hat{u}_f .

Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{[n]} = & (1 - c_1)(f_{[n]}^4)_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)) - h_{\ell=0}^4 + \int_{v_{-1}}^{v(R)} \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_o^2} - 1 \right)_{\ell=0} (x + f_{[n]}(x)) - \mathcal{X}_0[f_{[n]}](x) dv \\ & + c_1 K(v(R), \mathbb{H}_{[n]}(\cdot))_{\ell=0} - c_2 (\Upsilon_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)) - \Upsilon_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R))) - \mathcal{E}_{[n]}, \end{aligned}$$

and so, subtracting from the definition (16.1.169), it follows, using the fact that, for all $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$,

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega_o^{-2} \Omega^2 - 1)(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)| \lesssim \delta,$$

the assumption (16.1.164), and the estimate (16.1.170), that, if δ is sufficiently small,

$$|(f_{[n]}^4)_{\ell=0}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R))| \lesssim C(\hat{u}_f) \delta + \tau.$$

It then follows from the definition (16.1.169) of $\lambda_{[n]}$ and the estimate (16.1.170) that the sequence $\{\lambda_{[n]}\}$ is uniformly bounded. It follows that there exists a subsequence converging to a limit λ , which one easily checks is as desired. Moreover, in any given coordinate chart for \mathbb{S}^2 , for any $k \leq 4$, $A_1, \dots, A_k = 1, 2$,

$$|\partial_{A_1} \dots \partial_{A_k} f_{[n]}^B(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)| \lesssim C(\hat{u}_f) \delta + \int_v^{v(R)} |\partial_{A_1} \dots \partial_{A_k} \partial_v f_{[n]}^B(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v', \theta)| dv' \lesssim C(\hat{u}_f) \delta + \tau,$$

by the estimates (16.1.160)–(16.1.162) for $\hat{\mathbb{F}}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R), \cdot)$, and so one similarly sees that the diffeomorphisms $\mathbb{H}_{[n]}$ converge to a limiting diffeomorphism $\mathbb{H}: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$, which is as desired. \square

Note that, for any h^4 and j^4 as in Lemma 16.1.31, the double null parametrisation of Lemma 16.1.31 clearly satisfies the anchoring condition (16.1.156). The latter of (16.1.166) moreover implies that the anchoring condition (16.1.157) also holds.

The proof of Theorem 16.1.3 can now be given.

Proof of Theorem 16.1.3. Let $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f)$ be fixed. The goal is to find an appropriate function $h^4: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a constant j^4 so that double null parametrisation of Lemma 16.1.31, which, recall, satisfies the gauge conditions of Proposition 16.1.24 and the anchoring conditions (16.1.156), (16.1.157), moreover satisfies (16.1.153) and (16.1.154).

Recall the quantity

$$\Upsilon = \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r} \right) (\rho - \rho_o) + \frac{3M_f}{2r^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_o) - \frac{3M_f \Omega_o^2}{2r^2} \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})_o).$$

Using the expressions (4.3.36), (4.3.43), (4.3.44), (4.3.49), for how geometric quantities change under a change of gauge, along with Lemma 16.1.30, it follows that the goal is to find a function $h^4(\theta)$ and a constant j^4 such that

$$\left[2\tilde{\Delta} \tilde{\Delta} h^4(\theta) + \frac{2}{r^2} \left(5 - \frac{12M}{r} \right) \tilde{\Delta} h^4(\theta) + \mathfrak{a}^1(r, \tilde{r})(x_{-1}) \right]_{\ell \geq 1} \quad (16.1.171)$$

$$\begin{aligned} = & \left[\frac{6\Omega_o^2}{r^2} \tilde{\Delta} h^3(\theta) - \Delta(\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_o))(x_{-1} + f(x_{-1})) - \frac{3}{r^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_o)(x_{-1} + f(x_{-1})) \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{6}{r^3} (\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)(x_{-1} + f(x_{-1})) + \frac{2}{r} \mathfrak{m}(x_{-1}) + \mathcal{E}^1(x_{-1}) \right]_{\ell \geq 1}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathfrak{a}^2(r, \tilde{r})(x_R)_{\ell=0} = \left[(1 - A^{-1}) \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o)(x_R + f(x_R)) \right. \quad (16.1.172)$$

$$\left. - BA^{-1} \Omega^{-2} \tilde{\Upsilon}(x_R) + BA^{-1} \Omega^{-2} \Upsilon(x_R + f(x_R)) - \frac{2}{r \Omega_o^2} (\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)(x_R + f(x_R)) + \mathcal{E}^2(x_R) \right]_{\ell=0},$$

$$j^4 = f_{\ell=0}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)), \quad (16.1.173)$$

where $x_{-1} = x_{-1}(\theta) = (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \theta)$, $x_R = x_R(\theta) = (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta)$. Here the functions f^1 , f^2 , f^3 , f^4 denote the diffeomorphisms relating the double null foliation arising from h^4 , j^4 and Lemma

16.1.31 (whose double null coordinates are denoted $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta})$), to the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ double null parametrisation, so that

$$u = \tilde{u} + f^3(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}), \quad v = \tilde{v} + f^4(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}), \quad \theta^A = \tilde{\theta}^A(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}) = \tilde{\theta}^A + f^A(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\theta}).$$

The Laplacian $\tilde{\Delta}$ is the Laplacian of the new sphere $\tilde{S}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v_{-1}} = \{\tilde{u} = \hat{u}_f + \delta\} \cap \{\tilde{v} = v_{-1}\}$ (or, equivalently, the sphere (16.1.165) arising from Lemma 16.1.31), the mode projection in (16.1.171) is that associated to the new sphere $\tilde{S}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v_{-1}}$ and the mode projection in (16.1.172) is that of the sphere $\tilde{S}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v(R)} = \{\tilde{u} = \hat{u}_f + \delta\} \cap \{\tilde{v} = v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)\}$. The nonlinear error \mathcal{E}^1 has the schematic form

$$\mathcal{E}^1(x_{-1}) = \sum_{|\gamma_1|+|\gamma_2|\leq 4} \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f(x_{-1}) + \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} f(x_{-1}),$$

and \mathcal{E}^2 takes the form,

$$\mathcal{E}^2(x_R) = \sum_{|\gamma_1|+|\gamma_2|\leq 2} \Pi_{\tilde{S}} \Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f(x_R) + \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} f(x_R) + A^{-1} \Omega^{-2} \mathfrak{F} - A^{-1} \Omega_{\circ}^{-2} \mathfrak{E},$$

where A , B , \mathfrak{E} and \mathfrak{F} are as in Lemma 16.1.30. For each $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$, $x_{-1} + f(x_{-1})$ and $x_R + f(x_R)$ denote the points, in the coordinate system of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge,

$$x_{-1} + f(x_{-1}) = (\hat{u}_f + \delta + f^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \theta), v_{-1} + f^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \theta), \tilde{\theta}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \theta)), \quad (16.1.174)$$

$$x_R + f(x_R) = (\hat{u}_f + \delta + f^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R), \theta), v(R) + f^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R), \theta), \tilde{\theta}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R), \theta)), \quad (16.1.175)$$

with $v(R) = v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$. The function \mathfrak{m} is defined by

$$\mathfrak{m} = \tilde{\Delta} \partial_u f^3 - \frac{3\Omega^2}{r^2} \partial_v f^4 - \frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{M_f}{r}\right) \tilde{\Delta} h^3 + \frac{\Omega^2}{r} \tilde{\Delta} h^4 + \mathfrak{a}(r, \tilde{r}),$$

and $\mathfrak{a}^1, \mathfrak{a}^2, \mathfrak{a}$ are smooth functions, determined from the relations (4.3.36), (4.3.43), (4.3.44), (4.3.49), which satisfy $\mathfrak{a}(r, r) = \mathfrak{a}^i(r, r) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{a}^1(r, \tilde{r})(x_{-1}) - \frac{12\Omega_{\circ}^4}{r^4} (f^4(x_{-1}) - f^3(x_{-1}))| &\lesssim |f^3(x_{-1})|^2 + |f^4(x_{-1})|^2 + |M_f - M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}|^2, \\ |\mathfrak{a}^2(r, \tilde{r})(x_R) - \frac{4}{R^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{R}\right) (f^4(x_R) - f^3(x_R))| &\lesssim |f^3(x_R)|^2 + |f^4(x_R)|^2 + |M_f - M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}|^2, \\ |\mathfrak{a}(r, \tilde{r})(x_{-1}) + \frac{3\Omega^4}{r^3} (f^4(x_{-1}) - f^3(x_{-1}))| &\lesssim |f^3(x_{-1})|^2 + |f^4(x_{-1})|^2 + |M_f - M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The dependence of \mathfrak{a}^i on M_f and $M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$ is suppressed since both M_f and $M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$ are now considered fixed. Recall that, by Theorem 16.1.2,

$$|M_f - M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}| \lesssim \delta.$$

Note that $\tilde{\mu}^*(x) = \mu^*(x + f(x)) + \mathfrak{m}(x) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$. The function \tilde{r} is the r_M (see (1.3.2)) associated to the \tilde{i} double null parametrisation and mass $M = M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$, and r is the r_M associated to the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ double null gauge, with mass $M = M_f$. In particular, in the coordinates associated to the \tilde{i} double null parametrisation,

$$\tilde{r}(u, v, \theta) = r_{M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}}(u, v), \quad r(u, v, \theta) = r_{M_f}(u + f^3(u, v, \theta), v + f^4(u, v, \theta)).$$

The quantities $\tilde{\Delta} \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ})$, μ^* , Φ etc. refer to the quantities in the extended \hat{u}_f normalised gauge.

Note that, for such h^4, j^4 , the diffeomorphism functions satisfy

$$f_{\ell \geq 1}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \theta) = h_{\ell \geq 1}^4(\theta), \quad f_{\ell=0}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)) = j^4,$$

and

$$f^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta) = K(v, \tilde{\theta}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)),$$

for all $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$.

Equation (16.1.172) arises from Lemma 16.1.30 and the fact that the diffeomorphisms relating two given double null gauges satisfy (see the relations (4.3.31), (4.3.43), (4.3.44))

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{4\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{r}\right) (f^3 - f^4)_{\ell=0} &= (\widetilde{\Omega \text{tr} \chi} - \widetilde{\Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ})_{\ell=0} - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)_{\ell=0} \\ &\quad - [(\widetilde{\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}} - \widetilde{\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_\circ})_{\ell=0} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_\circ)_{\ell=0}] - \frac{2}{r} [(\tilde{\Omega}^2 - \tilde{\Omega}_\circ^2)_{\ell=0} - (\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)_{\ell=0}] + \mathcal{E}. \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.176)$$

The reader is also referred to Remark 16.1.37, concerning the proof of Proposition 2.3.8 on the existence of a linearised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge.

Given a solution h^4, j^4 of (16.1.171), (16.1.172), the double null parametrisation arising from Lemma 16.1.31 will then be as desired.

The solution h^4, j^4 of (16.1.171), (16.1.172) will be constructed as a limit of a sequence of iterates. Given suitably small iterates $h_{[n]}^4$ and $j_{[n]}^4$, consider the double null parametrisation

$$i_{[n]}: \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\hat{u}_f + \delta) \rightarrow \mathcal{M},$$

arising from Lemma 16.1.31, whose coordinates are denoted $(u_{[n]}, v_{[n]}, \theta_{[n]})$. Let $F_{[n]} := i^{-1} \circ i_{[n]}$, where i is the parametrisation of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ double null gauge, so that

$$(u, v, \theta) = F_{[n]}(u_{[n]}, v_{[n]}, \theta_{[n]}),$$

and let $f_{[n]}$ denote the corresponding diffeomorphism functions,

$$u = u_{[n]} + f_{[n]}^3(u_{[n]}, v_{[n]}, \theta_{[n]}), \quad v = v_{[n]} + f_{[n]}^4(u_{[n]}, v_{[n]}, \theta_{[n]}),$$

$$\theta^A = \#_{[n]}^A(u_{[n]}, v_{[n]}, \theta_{[n]}) = \theta_{[n]}^A + f_{[n]}^A(u_{[n]}, v_{[n]}, \theta_{[n]}).$$

Define $\rho_{[n]}$ etc. to be the geometric quantities of this “ n -th” double null foliation (schematically denoted $\Phi_{[n]}$).

Define now $h_{[0]}^4 = 0, j_{[0]}^4 = 0$ and, for $n \geq 1$, define $h_{[n]}^4: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the constant $j_{[n]}^4$ inductively as the solutions of

$$2\Delta_{[n-1]}\Delta_{[n-1]}h_{[n]}^4(\theta) + \frac{2}{r_{[n-1]}^2} \left(5 - \frac{12M_f}{r_{[n-1]}}\right) \Delta_{[n-1]}h_{[n]}^4(\theta) + \frac{12\Omega_{\circ,[n-1]}^4}{r_{[n-1]}^4} h_{[n]}^4(\theta) \quad (16.1.177)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \left[\frac{6\Omega_{\circ,[n-1]}^2}{r_{[n-1]}^2} (\Delta_{[n-1]}h_{[n-1]}^3(\theta) + \frac{2\Omega_{\circ,[n-1]}^2}{r_{[n-1]}^2} h_{[n-1]}^3(\theta)) + \mathcal{G}_{[n-1]}^1 + A_{[n-1]}^1 + \mathcal{E}_{[n-1]}^1 \right]_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}}, \\ \frac{4}{R^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{R}\right) j_{[n]}^4 &= \left[\frac{4}{R^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{R}\right) j^3 + \mathcal{G}_{[n-1]}^1 + A_{[n-1]}^2 + \mathcal{E}_{[n-1]}^2 \right]_{(\ell=0)_{[n-1]}}, \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.178)$$

where

$$h_{[n-1]}^3(\theta) = K(v_{-1}, \#_{[n-1]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \theta)), \quad j^3(\theta) = K(v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \hat{\#}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta)),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{[n-1]}^1 &= -\Delta(\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_\circ))(x + f_{[n-1]}(x)) - \frac{3}{r^2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_\circ)(x + f_{[n-1]}(x)) \\ &\quad - \frac{6}{r^3}(\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)(x + f_{[n-1]}(x)) + \frac{2}{r}\mathbf{m}_{[n-1]}, \\ \mathcal{G}_{[n-1]}^2 &= (1 - A^{-1})\Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ)(x_R + f_{[n-1]}(x_R)) - BA^{-1}\Omega^{-2}\Upsilon_{[n-1]}(x_R) \\ &\quad + BA^{-1}\Omega^{-2}\Upsilon(x_R + f_{[n-1]}(x_R)) - \frac{2}{r\Omega_\circ^2}(\Omega^2 - \Omega_\circ^2)(x_R + f_{[n-1]}(x_R)), \end{aligned}$$

$$A_{[n-1]}^1 = a^1(r, r_{[n-1]}) - \frac{12\Omega_{\circ}^4}{r^4}(h_{[n-1]}^4 - h_{[n-1]}^3), \quad A_{[n-1]}^2 = a^2(r, r_{[n-1]}) - \frac{4}{R^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M}{R}\right) (j_{[n-1]}^4 - j_{[n-1]}^3),$$

$$\mathfrak{m}_{[n-1]} = \mathbb{A}_{[n-1]} \partial_u f_{[n-1]}^3 - \frac{3\Omega^2}{r^2} \partial_v f_{[n-1]}^4 - \frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{M_f}{r}\right) \mathbb{A}_{[n-1]} h_{[n-1]}^3 + \frac{\Omega^2}{r} \mathbb{A}_{[n-1]} h_{[n-1]}^4 + a(r, r_{[n-1]}),$$

and the errors $\mathcal{E}_{[n-1]}^1$ and $\mathcal{E}_{[n-1]}^2$ are defined by replacing f with $f_{[n-1]}$ in \mathcal{E}^1 and \mathcal{E}^2 . Schematically,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{[n-1]}^1 &= \sum_{|\gamma_1|+|\gamma_2|\leq 4} \Pi_{S_{[n-1]}} \Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n-1]}(x_{-1}) + \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n-1]} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} f_{[n-1]}(x_{-1}), \\ \mathcal{E}_{[n-1]}^2 &= \sum_{|\gamma_1|+|\gamma_2|\leq 2} \Pi_{S_{[n-1]}} \Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n-1]}(x_R) + \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n-1]} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} f_{[n-1]}(x_R) + A^{-1} \Omega^{-2} \mathfrak{F} - A^{-1} \Omega_{\circ}^{-2} \mathfrak{E}_{[n-1]}. \end{aligned}$$

The Laplacian $\mathbb{A}_{[n-1]}$ is defined to be Laplacian associated to the sphere $S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v_{-1}}^{[n-1]} = \{u_{[n-1]} = \hat{u}_f + \delta\} \cap \{v_{[n-1]} = v_{-1}\}$ (or, equivalently, the sphere (16.1.165) arising from Lemma 16.1.31 with $h_{[n-1]}^4$ and $j_{[n-1]}^4$). The mode projection in (16.1.177) is that of the associated to the new sphere $S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v_{-1}}^{[n-1]}$ and the mode projection in (16.1.178) is that of the sphere $S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v(R)}^{[n-1]} = \{u_{[n-1]} = \hat{u}_f + \delta\} \cap \{v_{[n-1]} = v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)\}$. Finally, $r_{[n-1]}$ is the r_M (see (1.3.2)) associated to the $i_{[n-1]}$ double null parametrisation and mass $M = M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}$, and r is the r_M associated to the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ double null gauge, with mass $M = M_f$, so that, in the coordinates associated to the $i_{[n-1]}$ double null parametrisation,

$$\begin{aligned} r_{[n-1]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta) &= r_{M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v), \\ r(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta) &= r_{M_f}(\hat{u}_f + \delta + f_{[n-1]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta), v + f_{[n-1]}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Omega_{\circ, [n-1]}^2 = 1 - \frac{2M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}}{r_{[n-1]}}.$$

Note that the unique solution $h_{[n]}^4$ of (16.1.177) is supported on $(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}$, and the unique solution $j_{[n]}^4$ of (16.1.178) is supported on $(\ell = 0)_{[n-1]}$, and that

$$h_{[n]}^4(\theta) = (f_{[n]}^4)_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \theta), \quad j_{[n]}^4 = (f_{[n]}^4)_{(\ell = 0)_{[n-1]}}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)), \quad (16.1.179)$$

and

$$f_{[n]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta) = K(v, \mathbb{F}_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)), \quad (16.1.180)$$

$$\mathbb{F}_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) = \hat{\mathbb{F}}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta), \quad (16.1.181)$$

for all $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R_2, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$.

In order to show that the sequences $\{h_{[n]}^4\}$ and $\{j_{[n]}^4\}$ converge it is first necessary to estimate the iterates $f_{[n]}$ and their derivatives.

In what follows x will be used to denote a value $x = (u, v, \theta)$. As in the proof of Theorem 16.1.2, for fixed (u, v) the geometric quantities $\Phi(u, v)$ and $\Phi_{[n]}(u, v)$ can be viewed, via the identifications (4.1.1) and (4.2.1), as tensor fields on the sphere \mathbb{S}^2 . When the quantities Φ and $\Phi_{[n]}$ are identified using the values of their respective coordinate functions in this way, we write $\Phi(x) - \Phi_{[n]}(x)$. When they are considered at the same spacetime point, as in the relations of Propositions 4.3.1, 4.3.2 and 4.3.3, we write $\Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Phi - \Phi_{[n]}$, where the projection $\Pi_{S_{[n]}}$ is as in (4.3.29). For example, as in the proof of Theorem 16.1.2,

$$\begin{aligned} (\Pi_{S_{[n]}} \rho - \rho_{[n]})(u, v, \theta) &= \rho(F_{[n]}(u, v, \theta)) - \rho_{[n]}(u, v, \theta) = \rho(x + f_{[n]}(x)) - \rho_{[n]}(x), \\ (\Pi_{S_{[n]}} \alpha - \alpha_{[n]})(u, v, \theta) &= \left(\alpha(F_{[n]}(u, v, \theta))_{CD} \partial_{\theta_{[n]}^A} F_{[n]}^C \partial_{\theta_{[n]}^B} F_{[n]}^D - \alpha_{[n]}(u, v, \theta)_{AB} \right) d\theta_{[n]}^A d\theta_{[n]}^B, \\ \alpha(u, v, \theta) - \alpha_{[n]}(u, v, \theta) &= \left(\alpha(u, v, \theta)_{AB} - \alpha_{[n]}(u, v, \theta)_{AB} \right) d\theta_{[n]}^A d\theta_{[n]}^B, \\ \alpha(u, v, \theta) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \alpha(u, v, \theta) &= \left(\alpha(u, v, \theta)_{AB} - \alpha(F_{[n]}(u, v, \theta))_{CD} \partial_{\theta_{[n]}^A} F_{[n]}^C \partial_{\theta_{[n]}^B} F_{[n]}^D \right) d\theta_{[n]}^A d\theta_{[n]}^B. \end{aligned}$$

For some given $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and $k \geq 1$, define the norm on diffeomorphisms f ,

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq k} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} = \sum_{|\gamma| \leq k} \left(\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 f^3\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f^4\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \right) + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq k-1} \left(\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_u f\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \partial_v f\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \right), \quad (16.1.182)$$

with, for example,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 f^3\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (\Omega^2 f^3)(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)|_{r^2 \gamma}^2 \sqrt{\det \gamma(\theta)} d\theta.$$

Define also $\sum_{|\gamma| \leq k} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{\ell \geq 1}\|_{S_{u, v_\infty}}$ by replacing f^3 and f^4 with $f_{\ell \geq 1}^3$ and $f_{\ell \geq 1}^4$ respectively in (16.1.80), and

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq k} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} = \sum_{|\gamma| \leq k} \left(\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 f_{\ell=0}^3\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{\ell=0}^4\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \right). \quad (16.1.183)$$

The following lemma will be used in the proof of Lemma 16.1.35.

Lemma 16.1.32 (Estimates for differences between S tensors with pullback by $\mathcal{F}_{[n]}$). *For any $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$,*

$$|h(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta) - h(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \mathcal{F}_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta))| \lesssim \sup_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} |r \nabla h|_{\mathcal{G}_{[n]}} \left(C(\hat{u}_f) \delta + \int_v^{v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)} |\partial_v f_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v', \theta)| dv' \right),$$

for all functions h , and

$$\begin{aligned} & |(\omega - (\mathcal{F}_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \cdot))^* \omega)(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)|_{\mathcal{G}_{[n]}} \\ & \lesssim \sup_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} (|\omega|_{\mathcal{G}_{[n]}} + |r \nabla \omega|_{\mathcal{G}_{[n]}}) \left(C(\hat{u}_f) \delta + \sum_{k=0}^1 \int_v^{v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)} |(r \nabla)^k \partial_v f_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v', \theta)| dv' \right). \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.184)$$

for any $(0, k)$ S tensor ω . Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} & |h(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \mathcal{F}_{[n+1]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty, \theta)) - h(u, v_\infty, \mathcal{F}_{[n]}(u, v_\infty, \theta))| \\ & \lesssim \sup_{S_{u, v_\infty}} |r \nabla h|_{\mathcal{G}_{[n]}} \int_v^{v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)} |(\partial_v f_{[n+1]} - \partial_v f_{[n]})(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v', \theta)| dv', \end{aligned}$$

for all functions h , and

$$\begin{aligned} & |((\mathcal{F}_{[n+1]}(u, v_\infty, \cdot))^* \omega - (\mathcal{F}_{[n]}(u, v_\infty, \cdot))^* \omega)(u, v_\infty, \theta)|_{\mathcal{G}_{[n]}} \\ & \lesssim \sup_{S_{u, v_\infty}} (|\omega|_{\mathcal{G}_{[n]}} + |r \nabla \omega|_{\mathcal{G}_{[n]}}) \sum_{k=0}^1 \int_v^{v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)} |(r \nabla)^k (\partial_v f_{[n+1]} - \partial_v f_{[n]})(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v', \theta)| dv'. \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.185)$$

for any $(0, k)$ S tensor ω .

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 16.1.14, using now the estimates (16.1.160), (16.1.161) in place of Proposition 4.4.1. \square

The following estimate for the diffeomorphisms in terms of the differences $\Phi_{[n]}(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Phi(x)$ will be also used in Lemma 16.1.35.

Lemma 16.1.33 (Estimates for diffeomorphisms by differences of geometric quantities). *The diffeomorphism functions $f_{[n]}$ satisfy the estimates*

$$\sup_{v-1 \leq v \leq v(R)} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(f_{[n]})_{\ell \geq 1}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \lesssim \sup_{v-1 \leq v \leq v(R)} \left[\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{[n]}(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r\mathfrak{V})^k \Omega^2 f_{[n]}^3\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}}^2 \right],$$

and

$$\sup_{v-1 \leq v \leq v(R)} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma(f_{[n]})_{\ell=0}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \lesssim \sum_{\substack{|\gamma| \leq 3 \\ |\tilde{\gamma}| \leq 5}} \left[\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{\ell=0}(x)\|_{L^1(C_{\hat{u}_f + \delta})} \right. \\ \left. + \sup_{v-1 \leq v \leq v(R)} (\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{[n]}(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} + \|\Omega^2 f_{[n]}^3\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} + v(R)(|M_f - M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}| + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} f_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}}^2)) \right],$$

where $v(R) = v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and the norms of the diffeomorphism functions are defined in (16.1.182) and (16.1.183), provided ε is sufficiently small (independent of \hat{u}_f).

Proof. Throughout this proof $f = f_{[n]}$. The subscript is omitted for brevity. Define

$$\mathcal{X} = (|M_f - M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}| + \sum_{\Phi} |\Phi|) \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f| + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f|^2,$$

where $\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} |\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f|$ is defined as in (16.1.182).

Consider any $v-1 \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and the sphere $S = S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}$. First note that equations (4.3.38) and (4.3.48) imply that

$$\|(r\mathfrak{V})^2 f_{\ell \geq 2}^4\|_S \lesssim \|\Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}_{\leq [n]}(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Omega^{-1} \hat{\chi}(x)\|_S + \|\mathcal{X}\|_S, \quad |f_{\ell=1}^4| \lesssim |\Omega^{-1} \beta_{\ell=1}^{[n]}(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Omega^{-1} \beta_{\ell=1}(x)| + \mathcal{X}.$$

The relation (4.3.39) implies that

$$\|r\mathfrak{V} \Omega^{-2} \partial_u (\Omega^2 f^3)_{\ell \geq 1}\|_S \lesssim \|\eta_{[n]}(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \eta(x)\|_S + \|r\mathfrak{V} \Omega^2 f^3\|_S + \|r\mathfrak{V} f^4\|_S + \|\mathcal{X}\|_S.$$

The relation (4.3.40) implies that

$$\|r\mathfrak{V} \partial_v f_{\ell \geq 1}^4\|_S \lesssim \|\underline{\eta}_{[n]}(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \underline{\eta}(x)\|_S + \|r\mathfrak{V} \Omega^2 f^3\|_S + \|r\mathfrak{V} f^4\|_S + \|\mathcal{X}\|_S.$$

The metric relations (4.3.31) and (4.3.32) give

$$\|\Omega^{-2} \partial_u f^4\|_S + \|\partial_v (\Omega^2 f^3)\|_S \lesssim \|\mathcal{X}\|_S.$$

The metric relations (4.3.33) and (4.3.34) give

$$\|\Omega^{-2} \partial_{\bar{u}} f^b\|_S \lesssim \|r\mathfrak{V} f^4\|_S + \|\mathcal{X}\|_S, \quad \|\partial_v f^b\|_S \lesssim \|r\mathfrak{V} \Omega^2 f^3\|_S + \|\mathcal{X}\|_S.$$

For the $\ell = 0$ modes, first note that

$$\frac{2}{r} \partial_v f_{\ell=0}^4 = \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_o)_{\ell=0}^{[n]} - \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_o)_{\ell=0} \\ + \frac{2}{r} \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_o^2} - 1 \right)_{\ell=0}^{[n]} - \frac{2}{r} \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_o^2} - 1 \right)_{\ell=0} - \frac{r^2}{3M_f} (\rho - \rho_o)_{\ell=0}^{[n]} + \frac{r^2}{3M_f} (\rho - \rho_o)_{\ell=0} + \mathcal{X}_0,$$

where \mathcal{X}_0 is an error satisfying $|\mathcal{X}_0| \lesssim \mathcal{X}$, and so

$$|\partial_v f_{\ell=0}^4| \lesssim |\Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_o)_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x) - \Omega^{-2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_o)_{\ell=0}(x + f(x))| \\ + \left| \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_o^2} - 1 \right)_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x) - \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_o^2} - 1 \right)_{\ell=0}(x + f(x)) \right| + |(\rho - \rho_o)_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x) - (\rho - \rho_o)_{\ell=0}(x + f(x))| + \mathcal{X}.$$

Integrating backwards from $r = R$ gives an estimate for $f_{\ell=0}^4$

$$\begin{aligned} |f_{\ell=0}^4(v)| &\lesssim \int_v^{v(R)} |\partial_v f_{\ell=0}^4| dv' + |f_{\ell=0}^4(v(R))| + \mathcal{X} \\ &\lesssim \int_v^{v(R)} |\partial_v f_{\ell=0}^4| dv' + |f_{\ell=0}^3(v(R))| + |(\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(v(R)) - (\rho - \rho_\circ)_{\ell=0}(v(R) + f)| + \mathcal{X}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, note that

$$\Omega^{-2} \partial_u (\Omega^2 f^3) + \partial_v f^4 + \frac{2M_f}{r^2} f^4 = \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_\circ^2} - 1 \right)_{[n]} - \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_\circ^2} - 1 \right) + \mathcal{X}_0,$$

where \mathcal{X}_0 is an error satisfying $|\mathcal{X}_0| \lesssim \mathcal{X}$, and so

$$|\Omega^{-2} \partial_u (\Omega^2 f^3)_{\ell=0}| \lesssim \left| \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_\circ^2} - 1 \right)_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x) - \left(\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega_\circ^2} - 1 \right)_{\ell=0}(x + f(x)) \right| + |\partial_v f_{\ell=0}^4| + |f_{\ell=0}^4| + \mathcal{X}.$$

Finally, the relations (4.3.41), (4.3.42) give appropriate estimates for $(\Omega^{-2} \partial_u)^2 \Omega^2 f^3$ and $\partial_v^2 f^4$. Estimates for higher order derivatives follow similarly. The proof then follows after inserting the estimates for Φ and taking ε sufficiently small (independent of \hat{u}_f). \square

The following Lemma gives estimates for the diffeomorphism functions $f_{[n]}^3$, which take the form (16.1.180), using the estimates (16.1.160)–(16.1.162) and (16.1.163).

Lemma 16.1.34 (Estimates for $f_{[n]}^3$). *For each n , the diffeomorphism function $f_{[n]}^3$ satisfies the estimates, for all $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$,*

$$\sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k f_{[n]}^3\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \lesssim C(\hat{u}_f) \delta \left(1 + \int_v^{v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k \partial_v f_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v'}} dv' \right), \quad (16.1.186)$$

where $C(\hat{u}_f)$ is as constant which depends on \hat{u}_f . Moreover,

$$\sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k (f_{[n+1]}^3 - f_{[n]}^3)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \lesssim C(\hat{u}_f) \delta \int_v^{v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k (\partial_v f_{[n+1]} - \partial_v f_{[n]})\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v'}} dv'. \quad (16.1.187)$$

Proof. Consider some coordinate chart (θ^1, θ^2) of \mathbb{S}^2 . Recall (see (16.1.180)) that,

$$f_{[n]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta^A) = K(v, \theta^A + f_{[n]}^A(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)),$$

and so

$$\partial_{\theta^B} f_{[n]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta^A) = (\partial_{\theta^C} K)(v, \theta^A + f_{[n]}^A(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)) \frac{\partial f_{[n]}^C}{\partial \theta^B}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta).$$

The estimate (16.1.186) for $f_{[n]}^3$ is clear. The estimate (16.1.186) for $r\hat{\nabla} f_{[n]}^3$ follows from the fact that

$$\frac{\partial f_{[n]}^C}{\partial \theta^B}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta) = \frac{\partial f_{[n]}^C}{\partial \theta^B}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R), \theta) - \int_v^{v(R)} \frac{\partial^2 f_{[n]}^C}{\partial \theta^B \partial v}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v', \theta) dv',$$

together with (16.1.181), the estimate (16.1.161), which in particular implies that

$$\left| \frac{\partial f_{[n]}^C}{\partial \theta^B}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R), \theta) \right| \lesssim C(\hat{u}_f) \delta,$$

and (16.1.163). Similarly for $(r\hat{\nabla})^k f_{[n]}^3$ for $k = 2, 3, 4, 5$, using now (16.1.162). The estimate (16.1.187) follows similarly. \square

The iterates, $f_{[n]}$, can now be estimated.

Lemma 16.1.35 (Estimates for diffeomorphisms). *Provided ε_0 is sufficiently small (independent of \hat{u}_f), and δ_0 is sufficiently small (with respect to \hat{u}_f), for all $n \geq 1$ the diffeomorphisms $f_{[n]}$ satisfy, for all $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$, the estimates*

$$\sum_{k \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^k f_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \leq C(\hat{u}_f)\delta,$$

where the norm is defined in (16.1.182) and $C(\hat{u}_f)$ is a constant which depends on \hat{u}_f .

Proof. The proof follows that of Lemma 16.1.15. The diffeomorphisms and their derivatives, $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}$, are estimated inductively. Suppose $n \geq 1$ is such that

$$\sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n-1]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \leq C_1(\hat{u}_f)\delta,$$

for some appropriate $C_1(\hat{u}_f)$, to be chosen, with the norm defined in (16.1.182). Under this assumption, the estimates for $f_{[n]}$ are divided into several steps.

Throughout this proof the notation $\underline{S} := \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}})$, $T := \Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}}$ is used. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{[n]} = & \sum_{k \leq 3} \|(r\mathfrak{V})^k \Omega \hat{\chi}_{[n]}(x_R) - (r\mathfrak{V})^k \Omega \hat{\chi}(x_R)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)}} + |(\text{div} \Omega \beta_{[n]} - \text{div} \Omega \beta)_{\ell=1}(x_R)| \\ & + |(\Upsilon_{[n]} - \Upsilon)_{\ell=0}(x_R)| + \sum_{k \leq 3} \|(r\mathfrak{V})^k \underline{S}_{[n]} - (r\mathfrak{V})^k \underline{S}\|_{\ell \geq 1}(x_{-1}) + |(T_{[n]} - T)_{\ell=0}(x_R)|, \end{aligned}$$

to be the sum of the differences between $\Omega \hat{\chi}_{[n]}(x_R)$ and $\Omega \hat{\chi}(x_R)$, and $\text{div} \Omega \beta_{\ell=1}^{[n]}(x_R)$ and $\text{div} \Omega \beta_{\ell=1}(x_R)$ etc., where $x_R = x_R(\theta) = (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta)$ and $x_{-1} = x_{-1}(\theta) = (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \theta)$. Throughout this proof $v(R) = v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$.

Estimates for Ricci coefficients of iterates $\Phi_{[n]}$: The first step is to obtain the following estimates for the Ricci coefficients of the n -th gauge, schematically denoted $\Phi_{[n]}$, along with non-sharp estimates for the diffeomorphisms $f_{[n]}$ and their derivatives:

$$\sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)} \left(\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 4} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 6} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \right) \lesssim \varepsilon, \quad (16.1.188)$$

for all $n \geq 1$, where the norm of the diffeomorphism functions is defined in (16.1.182). Since this is similar to, but less involved than, the main part of the proof, the estimates are only sketched. The estimates for $f_{[n]}$ are non-sharp, and much easier to obtain than the sharp estimates, as they do not exploit the fact that the differences $\Phi_{[n]}(x) - \Phi(x)$ can be estimated by δ , but only that $\Phi_{[n]}(x)$ and $\Phi(x)$ can individually be estimated by ε .

First one estimates $\Omega^2 \alpha_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v)$ and $\Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v)$ and their derivatives up to order 6, for $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$. The estimates are obtained, as in the proof of Proposition 10.5.1, in terms of nonlinearities involving Φ and the diffeomorphisms $f_{[n]}$, and linear terms involving $\Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Omega^2 \alpha$ and $\Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}$ and their derivatives up to order 6 (see for example equations (4.3.45) and (4.3.46)). One then uses the fact that, for example,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \leq 4} \|\Pi_{S_{[n]}} (r\mathfrak{V})^k \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \\ & \lesssim \varepsilon \left(1 + \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} (|f_{[n]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)| + |f_{[n]}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)|) + \sum_{k=0}^1 |(r\mathfrak{V})^k \partial_v f_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)| \right), \end{aligned}$$

using the estimates on $\underline{\alpha}$ and its derivatives up to order 6 and Lemma 16.1.32.

Next one estimates, see Lemma 16.1.33 and Lemma 16.1.34, the diffeomorphisms $f_{[n]}(u, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta))$ and their derivatives in terms of $\Phi_{[n]}$, Φ and their derivatives. One then revisits the estimates of Chapter

15 (or rather the part of Chapter 15 involving the estimates on the hypersurface $u = u_f$) and estimates $\Phi_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v)$ and their derivatives up to order 4 in terms of $\Omega^2 \alpha_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v)$, $\Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v)$, and their derivatives, and

$$\sum_{k \leq 4} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k \Omega \hat{\chi}_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)}} + \sum_{k \leq 6} \|(r\hat{\nabla})^k \underline{S}_{\ell \geq 1}^{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}} + |\mathrm{div} \Omega \beta_{\ell=1}^{[n]}(x_R)| + |\Upsilon_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x_R)| + |T_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x_R)|.$$

A simple induction argument, using the change of gauge relations (4.3.36), (4.3.37), (4.3.39), (4.3.43), (4.3.44), (4.3.47), (4.3.49), the equations (16.1.177), (16.1.178), the estimates (16.1.160)–(16.1.162), (16.1.163), and the relations (16.1.166), (16.1.180) then completes the proof of the (16.1.188) after taking δ sufficiently small.

Estimates for differences of Ricci coefficients $\Phi_{[n]} - \Phi$: The differences between the n -th Ricci coefficients and curvature components and those of the extended \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, $\Phi_{[n]}(x) - \Phi(x)$, identified by the values of their respective coordinate functions, are estimated. Revisiting the estimates of Chapter 15, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R)} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{[n]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{\ell=0}(x)\|_{L^1(C_{\hat{u}_f + \delta})} \lesssim \mathcal{S}_{[n]} + \varepsilon \delta \\ & + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \left[\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 \alpha_{[n]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 \alpha(x)\|_{S, C_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}_{[n]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}(x)\|_{S, C_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.189)$$

where

$$\|F\|_{L^1(C_{\hat{u}_f + \delta})} = \int_{v_{-1}}^{v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)} \int_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} |F| d\theta dv, \quad \|F\|_{S, C_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}} := \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)} \|F\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} + \|F\|_{C_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}}.$$

The difference between the metrics, $\mathfrak{g}(x) - \mathfrak{g}_{[n]}(x)$, are similarly be estimated. The change of gauge relation (4.3.28), Lemma 16.1.32, the estimates (16.1.160), (16.1.161), (16.1.163), and the relations (16.1.180), (16.1.181), imply that

$$|\mathfrak{g}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R), \theta) - \mathfrak{g}_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R), \theta)|_{\mathfrak{g}} \lesssim C(\hat{u}_f) \delta + \sum_{k \leq 1} |(r\hat{\nabla})^k f_{[n]}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R), \theta)|.$$

The difference $\mathfrak{g}(x) - \mathfrak{g}_{[n]}(x)$ is then estimated in terms of $\Phi(x) - \Phi_{[n]}(x)$ as in Proposition 15.3.119.

Estimates for differences $\Omega^2 \alpha_{[n]} - \Omega^2 \alpha$ and $\Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}_{[n]} - \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}$: Next, the difference $\Omega^2 \alpha_{[n]}(x) - \Omega^2 \alpha(x)$ is estimated. The relation (4.3.45) implies that, schematically,

$$\Omega^2 \alpha_{[n]}(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Omega^2 \alpha(x) = \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D} f_{[n]}(x) + (\mathfrak{D} f_{[n]}(x))^2,$$

and so

$$\|\Omega^2 \alpha_{[n]}(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Omega^2 \alpha(x)\|_{S, C_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}} \lesssim \varepsilon \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R)} \|\mathfrak{D} f_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} + \|(\mathfrak{D} f_{[n]})^2\|_{S, C_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}}.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 16.1.32 (in particular (16.1.184)),

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Omega^2 \alpha(x) - \Omega^2 \alpha(x)\|_{S, C_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}} \lesssim C(\hat{u}_f) \delta \\ & + \varepsilon \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} (|f_{[n]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)| + |f_{[n]}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)|) + \sum_{k=0}^1 |(r\hat{\nabla})^k \partial_v f_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)|. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly for higher order derivatives, and for $\Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}$. It therefore follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \left[\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 \alpha_{[n]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 \alpha(x)\|_{S, C_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}_{[n]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}(x)\|_{S, C_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}} \right] \\ & \lesssim C(\hat{u}_f) \delta + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \left[\varepsilon \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R)} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S, C_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}}^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (16.1.190)$$

Estimates for diffeomorphisms of iterates $f_{[n]}$: By Lemma 16.1.33, using also the fact that, for each Φ and $|\gamma| \leq 3$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \lesssim C(\hat{u}_f) \delta \\ & + \varepsilon \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2} (|f_{[n]}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)| + |f_{[n]}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)| + \sum_{k=0}^1 |(r\nabla)^k \partial_v f_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v, \theta)|), \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 16.1.32, it follows that, for $|\gamma| \leq 5$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, u)} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} & \lesssim C(\hat{u}_f) \delta + \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)} \left[\sum_{|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} \Phi_{[n]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} \Phi(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} \Phi_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} \Phi_{\ell=0}(x)\|_{L^1(C_{\hat{u}_f + \delta})} + C(\hat{u}_f) \sum_{|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} f_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}}^2 \right], \quad (16.1.191) \end{aligned}$$

Estimate for $S_{[n]}$: Consider now $S_{[n]}$. The change of gauge relations (4.3.36), (4.3.39), (4.3.43), (4.3.44), (4.3.49), the relations (16.1.179) and (16.1.180), and equation (16.1.177) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\underline{\Delta} S_{[n]}(x_{-1}) + \frac{3}{r^2} \Omega^2 \underline{S}_{[n]}(x_{-1}) \right]_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}} = \left[\underline{\Delta} S(x_{-1} + f_{[n]}(x_{-1})) + \frac{3}{r^2} \Omega^2 \underline{S}(x_{f_{[n]}}) \right. \\ & + 2 \underline{\Delta} \underline{\Delta} h_{[n]}^4(\theta) + \frac{2}{r^2} \left(5 - \frac{12M_f}{r} \right) \underline{\Delta} h_{[n]}^4(\theta) + \frac{12\Omega_{\circ}^4}{r^4} h_{[n]}^4(\theta) - \mathfrak{K}_{[n]}(\theta) \\ & \left. + \frac{6}{r^3} (\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2)(x_{f_{[n]}}) - \frac{2}{r} (\mu_{[n]}^*(x_{-1}) - \mu^*(x_{f_{[n]}})) - A_{[n]}^1(x_{-1}) - \mathcal{E}_{[n]}^1(x_{-1}) \right]_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}} \\ & = \left[\underline{\Delta} S(x_{f_{[n]}}) - \underline{\Delta} S(x_{f_{[n-1]}}) + \frac{3}{r^2} \Omega^2 \underline{S}(x_{f_{[n]}}) - \frac{3}{r^2} \Omega^2 \underline{S}(x_{f_{[n-1]}}) - \mathfrak{K}_{[n]}(\theta) + \mathfrak{K}_{[n-1]}(\theta) \right. \\ & + \frac{6}{r^3} (\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2)(x_{f_{[n]}}) - \frac{6}{r^3} (\Omega^2 - \Omega_{\circ}^2)(x_{f_{[n-1]}}) + A_{[n-1]}^1(x_{-1}) - A_{[n]}^1(x_{-1}) \\ & \left. + \frac{2}{r} (\mu_{[n-1]}^*(x_{-1}) - \mu^*(x_{f_{[n-1]}})) - \frac{2}{r} (\mu_{[n]}^*(x_{-1}) - \mu^*(x_{f_{[n]}})) + \mathcal{E}_{[n-1]}^1(x_{-1}) - \mathcal{E}_{[n]}^1(x_{-1}) \right]_{(\ell \geq 1)_{[n-1]}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $x_{-1} = (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}, \theta)$, $x_{f_{[n]}} = x_{-1} + f_{[n]}(x_{-1})$ is as in (16.1.174), and

$$\mathfrak{K}_{[n]}(\theta) = \frac{12\Omega_{\circ}^4}{r^4} K(v_{-1}, \#_{[n]}(x_{-1})) + \frac{6\Omega_{\circ}^2}{r^2} \underline{\Delta}(K(v_{-1}, \#_{[n]}(x_{-1}))).$$

Note that Lemma 16.1.33 and Lemma 16.1.34 imply that $\mathfrak{K}_{[n]}$, $A_{[n]}^1$ and $\mathcal{E}_{[n]}^1$ satisfy, if δ is sufficiently small,

$$\|\mathfrak{K}_{[n]} - \mathfrak{K}_{[n-1]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}} + \|A_{[n]}^1 - A_{[n-1]}^1\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}} + \|\mathcal{E}_{[n]}^1 - \mathcal{E}_{[n-1]}^1\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}} \lesssim \varepsilon \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma (f_{[n]} - f_{[n-1]})\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}}.$$

An elliptic estimate, together with the fact that

$$\|\mu_{[n]}^*(x) - \underline{\mu}^*(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}} \lesssim \varepsilon \delta + \varepsilon \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R)} \|\Phi_{[n]}(x) - \Phi(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}},$$

then gives, for $k \leq 3$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(r\nabla)^k \underline{S}_{\ell \geq 1}^{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1})\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}} & \lesssim \varepsilon \delta + \sum_{l=n-1}^n \left[\varepsilon \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R)} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{[l]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} (\varepsilon \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[l]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[l]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_{-1}}}^2) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly for $T_{\ell=0}^{[n]}$, Lemma 16.1.30 and equation (16.1.178) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 - A^{-1})\Omega^{-2}T_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x_R) &= (1 - A^{-1})\Omega^{-2}T_{\ell=0}(x_R + f_{[n]}(x_R)) - \frac{2}{r\Omega_o^2}(\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)_{\ell=0}(x_R + f_{[n]}(x_R)) \\
&\quad - BA^{-1}\left(\Omega^{-2}\Upsilon_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x_R) - \Omega^{-2}\Upsilon_{\ell=0}(x_R + f_{[n]}(x_R))\right) + \frac{4}{R^2}\left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{R}\right)(j^3 - j_{[n]}^4)_{\ell=0} + A_{[n]}^2 + \mathcal{E}_{[n]}^2 \\
&= \mathcal{E}_{[n]}^2 - \mathcal{E}_{[n-1]}^2 + A_{[n]}^2 - A_{[n-1]}^2 + (1 - A^{-1})(\Omega^{-2}T_{\ell=0}(x_R + f_{[n]}(x_R)) - \Omega^{-2}T_{\ell=0}(x_R + f_{[n-1]}(x_R))) \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{2}{r\Omega_o^2}(\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)_{\ell=0}(x_R + f_{[n]}(x_R)) - \frac{2}{r\Omega_o^2}(\Omega^2 - \Omega_o^2)_{\ell=0}(x_R + f_{[n-1]}(x_R))\right) \\
&\quad - \frac{B}{A}\left(\Omega^{-2}\Upsilon_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x_R) - \Omega^{-2}\Upsilon_{\ell=0}^{[n-1]}(x_R) - \Omega^{-2}\Upsilon_{\ell=0}(x_R + f_{[n]}(x_R)) + \Omega^{-2}\Upsilon_{\ell=0}(x_R + f_{[n-1]}(x_R))\right),
\end{aligned}$$

and so it similarly follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
|T_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x_R)| &\lesssim \sum_{l=n-1}^n |\Upsilon_{\ell=0}^{[l]}(x_R) - \Upsilon_{\ell=0}(x_R + f_{[l]}(x_R))| \\
&+ \sum_{l=n-1}^n \left[\varepsilon \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \sup_{v-1 \leq v \leq v(R)} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{[l]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)}} + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2} (\varepsilon \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[l]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[l]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)}}^2) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Consider now the remaining terms in $\mathcal{S}_{[n]}$. First, the relation (4.3.37) implies that, schematically,

$$\Omega \hat{\chi}_{[n]}(x_R) = \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Omega \hat{\chi}(x_R) - 2\Omega^2 \mathcal{D}_2^* \nabla f_{[n]}^3(x_R) + \sum_{1 \leq |\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2| \leq 2} \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n]}(x_R) + \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n]} \cdot \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} f_{[n]}(x_R),$$

and so it follows from Lemma 16.1.32 and Lemma 16.1.34, if δ is sufficiently small, that

$$\sum_{k \leq 3} \|(r\nabla)^k \Omega \hat{\chi}_{[n]}(x_R) - (r\nabla)^k \Omega \hat{\chi}(x_R)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)}} \lesssim C(\hat{u}_f)\delta + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} (\varepsilon \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R)}}^2).$$

Similarly for $\mathfrak{d}^k v_{\ell=1}$ and $\Upsilon_{\ell=0}$.

It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}_{[n]} &\lesssim C(\hat{u}_f)\delta + \sup_{v-1 \leq v \leq v(R)} \sum_{l=n-1}^n \left[\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} (\varepsilon \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[l]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[l]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}}^2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \varepsilon \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{[l]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \right]. \quad (16.1.192)
\end{aligned}$$

The completion of the proof: The estimates (16.1.189), (16.1.190), (16.1.191), (16.1.192) now combine to give

$$\sup_{v-1 \leq v \leq v(R)} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^k f_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \lesssim C(\hat{u}_f)\delta + \varepsilon \sup_{v-1 \leq v \leq v(R)} \sum_{k \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^k f_{[n-1]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}},$$

provided ε is sufficiently small (independent of \hat{u}_f) and δ is sufficiently small with respect to \hat{u}_f . The proof then follows if $C_1(\hat{u}_f)$ is chosen to be sufficiently large. \square

The next part of the proof involves showing that the map which takes the n -th sphere to $n+1$ -th sphere is a contraction.

Lemma 16.1.36 (Estimates for differences of iterates). *Provided $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ is sufficiently small (independent of \hat{u}_f), and δ_0 is sufficiently small (with respect to \hat{u}_f), the diffeomorphisms $f_{[n]}$ satisfy, for all $n \geq 1$ and all $v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$, the estimates*

$$\sum_{k \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^k f_{[n+1]} - \mathfrak{D}^k f_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta, v}} \leq 2^{-n},$$

where the norm is as in (16.1.182), and, in particular, $h_{[n]}^4$ and $j_{[n]}^4$ satisfy

$$|j_{[n+1]}^4 - j_{[n]}^4| + \sum_{k \leq 5} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (h_{[n+1]}^4 - h_{[n]}^4)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v}} \leq 2^{-n}.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 16.1.35 and is divided into several steps, which follow closely the corresponding steps of Lemma 16.1.35. See also Lemma 16.1.16. Again, throughout this proof the notation $\underline{S} := \Omega^{-2}(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_{\circ, M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}})$, $T := \Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_{\circ, M_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}}$ is used. Define now, for $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{s}_{[n]} = & \sum_{k \leq 3} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \Omega \hat{\chi}_{[n]}(x_R) - (r\mathring{\nabla})^k \Omega \hat{\chi}_{[n-1]}(x_R)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v(R)}} + |(\text{div} \Omega \beta_{[n]} - \text{div} \Omega \beta_{[n-1]})_{\ell=1}(x_R)| \\ & + |(\Upsilon_{[n]} - \Upsilon_{[n-1]})_{\ell=0}(x_R)| + \sum_{k \leq 3} \|(r\mathring{\nabla})^k \underline{S}_{[n]} - (r\mathring{\nabla})^k \underline{S}_{[n-1]}\|_{\ell \geq 1}(x_{-1})\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v_{-1}}} + |(T_{[n]} - T_{[n-1]})_{\ell=0}(x_R)|, \end{aligned}$$

(where quantities are identified by the values of their respective coordinates) where again $x_R = (\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta)$ and $v(R) = v(R, \hat{u}_f + \delta)$.

Estimates for differences of Ricci coefficients $\Phi_{[n+1]} - \Phi_{[n]}$: Considering the equations satisfied by the differences $\Phi_{[n+1]}(x) - \Phi_{[n]}(x)$ and revisiting the estimates of Chapter 15, it follows from Lemma 16.1.35 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \left[\sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R)} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{[n]}(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{\ell=0}^{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x)\|_{L^1(C_{\hat{u}_f+\delta})} \right] \quad (16.1.193) \\ & \lesssim \mathfrak{s}_{[n+1]} + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \left[\|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 \alpha_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 \alpha_{[n]}(x)\|_{S, C_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}_{[n]}(x)\|_{S, C_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the norms $\|\cdot\|_{L^1(C_{\hat{u}_f+\delta})}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{S, C_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}}$ are as in the proof of Lemma 16.1.35. The metric differences $\mathfrak{g}_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{g}_{[n]}(x)$ are similarly be estimated, as in Proposition 15.3.119, using now the fact that

$$|\mathfrak{g}_{[n+1]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R), \theta) - \mathfrak{g}_{[n]}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R), \theta)|_{\mathfrak{g}} \lesssim \sum_{k \leq 1} |(r\mathring{\nabla})^k (f_{[n+1]}^4 - f_{[n]}^4)(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v(R), \theta)|,$$

which follows from the change of gauge relation (4.3.28), Lemma 16.1.32, the estimate (16.1.163), and the relations (16.1.180), (16.1.181).

Estimates for differences $\alpha_{[n+1]} - \alpha_{[n]}$ and $\underline{\alpha}_{[n+1]} - \underline{\alpha}_{[n]}$: Consider now the differences $\Omega^2 \alpha_{[n+1]}(x) - \Omega^2 \alpha_{[n]}(x)$ and $\Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}_{[n+1]}(x) - \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}_{[n]}(x)$. The relation (4.3.45) implies that, schematically,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^2 \alpha_{[n+1]}(x) - \Omega^2 \alpha_{[n]}(x) = & \Pi_{S_{[n+1]}} \Omega^2 \alpha(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Omega^2 \alpha(x) \\ & + \Pi_{S_{[n+1]}} \Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D}^2 f_{[n+1]}(x) - \Pi_{S_{[n]}} \Phi \cdot \mathfrak{D}^2 f_{[n]}(x) + (\mathfrak{D}^2 f_{[n+1]}(x))^2 - (\mathfrak{D}^2 f_{[n]}(x))^2, \end{aligned}$$

and so, using Lemma 16.1.32 (in particular (16.1.185)),

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 \alpha_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Omega^2 \alpha_{[n]}(x)\|_{S, C_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}} \lesssim \varepsilon \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R, \hat{u}_f+\delta)} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v}}. \quad (16.1.194)$$

Similarly for $\Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}_{[n+1]}(x) - \Omega^{-2} \underline{\alpha}_{[n]}(x)$.

Estimates for differences of diffeomorphisms $f_{[n+1]}(x) - f_{[n]}(x)$: The next step involves estimating the differences $\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]} - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}$. Considering differences of the system (4.3.31)–(4.3.50) for $f_{[n+1]}$ and $f_{[n]}$ and following again Lemma 16.1.33, it follows that, for $|\gamma| \leq 5$, if ε is sufficiently small,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R)} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[n]}(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v}} \\ & \lesssim \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R)} \left[\sum_{|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} \Phi_{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} \Phi_{[n]}(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v}} + \sum_{|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq 3} \|\mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} \Phi_{\ell=0}^{[n+1]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^{\tilde{\gamma}} \Phi_{\ell=0}^{[n]}(x)\|_{L^1(C_{\hat{u}_f+\delta})} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + C(\hat{u}_f) \sum_{|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2| \leq 5} (\|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n+1]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v}} + \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_1} f_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v}}) \|\mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} f_{[n+1]} - \mathfrak{D}^{\gamma_2} f_{[n]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where Lemma 16.1.32 (in particular (16.1.185)) has again been used.

Estimate for $\mathfrak{s}_{[n+1]}$: As in the proof of Lemma 16.1.35, using now the fact that

$$\|\mu_{[n+1]}^*(x_{-1}) - \mu_{[n]}^*(x_{-1})\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v_{-1}}} \lesssim \varepsilon \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R)} \|\Phi_{[n+1]}(x) - \Phi_{[n]}(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v}},$$

it follows that, if δ is sufficiently small,

$$\mathfrak{s}_{[n+1]} \lesssim \varepsilon \sum_{l=n-1}^n \left[\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 3} \sup_{v_{-1} \leq v \leq v(R)} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{[l]}(x) - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma \Phi_{[l-1]}(x)\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v}} + \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \|\mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[l]} - \mathfrak{D}^\gamma f_{[l-1]}\|_{S_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, v}} \right]. \quad (16.1.195)$$

The completion of the proof: The result then follows from the estimates (16.1.193)–(16.1.195) if $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$ is sufficiently small (independent of \hat{u}_f) and δ_0 is sufficiently small with respect to \hat{u}_f . \square

It follows from Lemma 16.1.36 that the sequences $\{h_{[n]}^4\}$ and $\{j_{[n]}^4\}$ converge to limits h^4 and j^4 respectively with $h_{\ell=0}^4 = j_{\ell \geq 1}^4 = 0$. Moreover, the limits h^4 and j^4 are the unique solution of the system (16.1.171)–(16.1.172). The function h^4 is smooth in view of the smoothness of the ambient spacetime, the smoothness of the \hat{u}_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, and the fact that h^4 solves (16.1.171)–(16.1.172). The expressions (4.3.36), (4.3.43), (4.3.44), (4.3.49) then imply that the spacetime double null foliation defined by the sphere arising from Lemma 16.1.31 and Proposition 16.1.24 is the desired gauge. The continuity in δ of the energies $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta, \mathcal{H}^+}^N$ of the geometric quantities of the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge with respect to $M_f(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$, and the associated diffeomorphism energies $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}^{N+2}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}]$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{u}_f+\delta}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}]$, follows softly from continuity. \square

Remark 16.1.37. Again, the proof of Theorem 16.1.3 can be adapted to the linearised setting of Proposition 2.3.8, where it simplifies considerably, to complete the proof of Proposition 2.3.8 as follows. Recall again the notation of [DHR]. Define

$$\overset{(\cdot)}{\Upsilon} = \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r}\right) \overset{(\cdot)}{\rho} + \frac{3M_f}{2r^2} ((\Omega \text{tr} \chi) - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})) - \frac{3M_f \Omega^2}{r^3} 2\Omega^{-1} \overset{(\cdot)}{\Omega},$$

and recall A and B from Lemma 16.1.30. Any function $h^4: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ gives rise to a function $f^4(v, \theta) = h^4(\theta)$ for all v , which generates a pure gauge solution (together with $f^3 \equiv 0$), denoted $\mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}}$. In view of the linearised analogues of the relations (4.3.36), (4.3.39), (4.3.43), (4.3.44), (4.3.49), and in anticipation of the linearised analogues of the gauge normalisations (16.1.132)–(16.1.136), to achieve the linearised analogues of the gauge normalisations (16.1.153)–(16.1.154) one considers the solution $\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}}$ arising from h^4 satisfying the linearised analogues of equations (16.1.171)–(16.1.173), namely the elliptic equations

$$\begin{aligned} 2\Delta \Delta h_{\ell \geq 1}^4 + \frac{2}{r^2} \left(5 - \frac{12M_f}{r}\right) \Delta h_{\ell \geq 1}^4 + \frac{12\Omega^4}{r^4} h_{\ell \geq 1}^4 \\ = -(\Omega^{-2} \Delta (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) + \frac{3}{r^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) + \frac{6\Omega^2}{r^3} 2\Omega^{-1} \overset{(\cdot)}{\Omega} + \frac{2}{r} \text{div} \overset{(\cdot)}{\eta} + \frac{2}{r} \overset{(\cdot)}{\rho} - \frac{3}{r^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi))_{\ell \geq 1}^{\mathcal{S}}(u_f, v_{-1}, \cdot), \\ \frac{4\Omega^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{3M_f}{r}\right) h_{\ell=0}^4 = -((\Omega \text{tr} \chi) - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) - \frac{2\Omega^2}{r} 2\Omega^{-1} \overset{(\cdot)}{\Omega} - \frac{B}{A} \overset{(\cdot)}{\Upsilon})_{\ell=0}^{\mathcal{S}}(u_f, v(R, u_f)). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Theorem 16.1.3 in this linearised setting reduces to showing the existence of a function h^4 solving these equations. Indeed, given such a function h^4 , it follows from the linearised analogues of the relations (4.3.36), (4.3.39), (4.3.43), (4.3.44), (4.3.49) that

$$(\Omega^{-2} \Delta (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) + \frac{3}{r^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}) + \frac{6\Omega^2}{r^3} 2\Omega^{-1} \overset{(\cdot)}{\Omega} + \frac{2}{r} \text{div} \overset{(\cdot)}{\eta} + \frac{2}{r} \overset{(\cdot)}{\rho} - \frac{3}{r^2} (\Omega \text{tr} \chi))_{\ell \geq 1}^{\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}}}(u_f, v_{-1}, \cdot) = 0, \quad (16.1.196)$$

and (recalling that $A \neq 0$)

$$\left((\Omega \text{tr} \chi)^{(i)} - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})^{(i)} - \frac{2\Omega^2}{r} 2\Omega^{-1} \Omega^{(i)} - \frac{B}{A} \Upsilon^{(i)}_{\ell=0}\right)^{\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}}}(u_f, v(R, u_f)) = 0, \quad (16.1.197)$$

(see also the transformation law (16.1.176) and note that $\Upsilon^{(i)}_{\ell=0}$ is gauge invariant).

Recall now Remark 16.1.29. Adding the pure gauge solution $\mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}}$ arising from $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}}$, the solution $\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}}$ then achieves the linearised analogues of the gauge normalisations (16.1.132)–(16.1.136) and, in view of the fact that $f^3(u_f, \cdot) = f^4(v_{-1}, \cdot) = 0$ for the functions generating this pure gauge solution, (16.1.196) and (16.1.197) are still satisfied. Moreover, in this gauge the relation (see Lemma 16.1.30)

$$\left((\Omega \text{tr} \chi)^{(i)} - A(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})^{(i)} - B\Upsilon^{(i)}_{\ell=0}\right)^{\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}}}(u_f, v(R, u_f)) = 0$$

holds, and so it follows from (16.1.197), together with the fact that $\Omega^{-1} \Omega^{\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}}}(u_f, \cdot, \cdot) = 0$, that

$$(1 - A^{-1})(\Omega \text{tr} \chi)^{\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}}}_{\ell=0}(u_f, v(R, u_f)) = 0.$$

It similarly follows from the relation (16.1.196) that

$$(\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi})^{\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}}}_{\ell \geq 1}(u_f, v_{-1}, \cdot) = 0.$$

Hence (recalling that $A \neq 1$) the linearised analogues of (16.1.153)–(16.1.154) are also satisfied by $\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}}$.

Finally, the linearised analogue of the gauge condition (16.1.155) can be achieved by adding an appropriate pure gauge solution $\mathcal{G}_{\text{theta}}$ generated by functions $q_1(v, \theta)$ and $q_2(v, \theta)$ (see Lemma 6.1.3 of [DHR]) satisfying

$$-r^2 \nabla \partial_u q_1(v, \theta) + r^2 \nabla \partial_u q_2(v, \theta) = -b^{\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{sphere}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}}}(u_f, v, \theta),$$

for all v and $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^2$ (along with $f^3 \equiv 0$, $f^4 \equiv 0$). The solution

$$\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{spheres}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{theta}},$$

is then normalised as desired.

Again, note that $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{spheres}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{foliations}} + \mathcal{G}_{\text{theta}}$ is not the unique pure gauge solution which achieves these normalisations in view of the absence of any linearised analogues of the anchoring conditions (5.6.10) and (5.6.15) in Proposition 2.3.8.

16.2 Monotonicity properties of $\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$: the proof of Theorem 16.2

We restate Theorem 16.2.

Theorem 16.2 (Definition, non-emptiness and monotonicity properties of $\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and properties of the map $\mathbf{J}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}$). *Let δ_0 , the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ gauges, (7.4.1) and (7.4.2) be as in Theorem 16.1, for $0 \leq \delta < \delta_0$.*

Defining the closed set

$$\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta) := \left\{ \lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f) : |\mathbf{J}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{\hat{u}_f + \delta} \right\}, \quad (7.4.3)$$

then, after possibly redefining $\delta_0 > 0$, we have for all $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$ that

$$\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta) \neq \emptyset, \quad (7.4.4)$$

and if $0 \leq \delta' < \delta \leq \delta_0$, then

$$\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta) \subset \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta'), \quad \partial \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta') \cap \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta) = \emptyset. \quad (7.4.5)$$

Moreover, the inequality (7.1.8) trivially holds on $\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ while (7.1.9) holds on $\partial \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ and the map $\mathbf{J}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}$ defined by (7.1.11) is continuous and satisfies (7.1.12), thus its restriction to the boundary is in particular degree 1.

Proof. Since $\hat{u}_f \in \mathcal{B}$, the map (7.1.12) is degree 1 for $\delta = 0$. It follows that there exists a $\lambda^0 \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f^0)$ such that $\mathbf{J}_{\hat{u}_f}(\lambda^0) = 0$. (See for instance Theorem 1.1.1 of [Nir74].) But now this can only happen if $u'_f(\hat{u}_f, \lambda^0) = \hat{u}_f$, because if $u'_f(\hat{u}_f, \lambda^0) < \hat{u}_f$, by continuity of the map $\mathbf{J}(u'_f, \lambda)$ in u'_f it would follow that $|\mathbf{J}(u'_f, \lambda^0)| \geq \varepsilon_0/u'_f(\hat{u}_f, \lambda^0) \neq 0$. Thus, we have that for the λ^0 above, $\lambda^0 \in \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f)$ and $\mathbf{J}(\lambda^0, \hat{u}_f) = 0$.

By continuity of $\mathbf{J}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$ in λ and δ , it follows that for sufficiently small $\delta_0 > 0$ and $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$, $\lambda^0 \in \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$, and thus, in particular, the set $\mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f + \delta)$ is indeed nonempty, i.e. (7.4.4) holds.

To infer the inclusions (7.4.5) we show that, for $0 \leq \delta' < \delta \leq \delta_0$,

$$|\mathbf{J}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', \lambda)| \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{\hat{u}_f + \delta'} \quad \text{implies} \quad |\mathbf{J}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)| > \frac{\varepsilon_0}{\hat{u}_f + \delta}. \quad (16.2.1)$$

Let $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(\hat{u}_f)$ be fixed. For each $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$, geometric quantities in the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge with respect to $M_f(\hat{u}_f, \lambda)$ are denoted with a δ superscript. Recall the definition (7.1.7) of the angular momentum parameters

$$\mathbf{J}(u_f, \lambda) = (J^{-1}(u_f, \lambda), J^0(u_f, \lambda), J^1(u_f, \lambda)).$$

where $J^m(u_f, \lambda)$ is defined in Definition 2.2.5. Equations (1.2.23), (1.2.24), (1.2.17), (1.2.18) imply that $\text{curl}\Omega^{-1}\beta$ satisfies,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_u(r^5 \text{curl}\Omega^{-1}\beta) &= -r^6 \left(\underline{\Delta} + \frac{2}{r^2} \right) \text{curl}\Omega^{-1}\beta - r^6 \Omega_o^{-2} (\underline{\Delta} - 3\rho_o) \text{curl}\Omega \hat{\chi} + \mathcal{E}_{\partial_u} \\ \partial_v(r^5 \text{curl}\Omega^{-1}\beta) &= r^5 \text{curl}\Omega \hat{\chi} + \mathcal{E}_{\partial_v}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\partial_u} &= -\frac{r^5}{2} \underline{\Delta}(\hat{\chi} \wedge \hat{\chi}) + 2r^5 \text{curl}(\hat{\chi}^\# \cdot \underline{\beta}) \\ &\quad + r^5 \text{curl} \left(3(\rho - \rho_o)\eta + 3^* \eta \sigma - (\Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi} - \Omega \text{tr} \underline{\chi}_o) \Omega^{-1} \beta - 2(\Omega \hat{\omega} - \Omega \hat{\omega}_o) \Omega^{-1} \beta \right) + [\Omega \nabla_3, r \text{curl}] r^4 \Omega^{-1} \beta \\ &\quad + r^6 (\underline{\Delta} - 3\rho_o) \left((1 - \Omega_o^{-2} \Omega^2) \text{curl}(\Omega^{-1} \beta) - (*\eta + *\underline{\eta}) \cdot \Omega \beta + \Omega_o^{-2} \text{curl}(\Omega \hat{\chi}^\# \cdot \underline{\eta} - \frac{1}{2}(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o) \underline{\eta}) \right), \\ \mathcal{E}_{\partial_v} &= [\Omega \nabla_4, r \text{curl}] r^4 \Omega^{-1} \beta + r^5 \text{curl}(\eta^\# \cdot \alpha - 2(\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_o) \Omega^{-1} \beta). \end{aligned} \quad (16.2.2)$$

For each $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$, after recalling that the geometric quantities in the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge with respect to $M_f(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$ satisfy the bootstrap estimate (7.1.4) with $u_f = \hat{u}_f + \delta$ (see Theorem 16.1), Proposition 9.4.2 and Proposition 9.4.3, together with the fact that $\text{curl}\Omega \hat{\chi}_{\ell=1} = \text{curl}\Omega \hat{\chi}_{\ell=1} = 0$, imply that,

$$|\partial_u(r^5 \text{curl}\Omega^{-1} \beta_{\ell=1}^\delta)| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{u^2}, \quad |\partial_v(r^5 \text{curl}\Omega^{-1} \beta_{\ell=1}^\delta)| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^2}, \quad (16.2.3)$$

using also Proposition 9.4.5.

Fix now some $0 \leq \delta' < \delta \leq \delta_0$. It follows, recalling Definition 2.2.5, that

$$\left| 3 \sum_{m=-1}^1 J^m(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda) (r^2 \underline{\Delta} Y_m^1)^\delta(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) + r^5 \text{curl}\Omega^{-1} \beta_{\ell=1}^\delta(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta'), \theta) \right| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2(\delta - \delta')}{(\hat{u}_f + \delta')^2}.$$

It moreover follows from Proposition 9.4.1 that

$$|(r^2 \underline{\Delta} Y_m^1)^\delta(\hat{u}_f + \delta, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta), \theta) - (r^2 \underline{\Delta} Y_m^1)^\delta(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta'), \theta)| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon(\delta - \delta')}{v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta') \hat{u}_f + \delta'},$$

and so

$$\left| 3 \sum_{m=-1}^1 J^m(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda) (r^2 \underline{\Delta} Y_m^1)^\delta(\hat{u}_f, v_\infty(\hat{u}_f), \theta) + r^5 \text{curl}\Omega^{-1} \beta_{\ell=1}^\delta(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta'), \theta) \right| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2(\delta - \delta')}{(\hat{u}_f + \delta')^2}. \quad (16.2.4)$$

Revisiting the proof of (4.3.47), one sees that, in fact,

$$\Omega\beta^\delta - \Pi_{S^\delta}\Omega\beta^{\delta'} = 3(\Omega^2\rho)^\delta \nabla f_{\delta',\delta}^3 + \frac{1}{2}(1 + \partial_{\bar{v}}f_{\delta',\delta}^4)^2 \Pi_{S^\delta}(\partial_{\bar{u}}f_{\delta',\delta} \cdot \alpha^{\delta'}) + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{Df},4}^{1,0} + \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{Df},5}^{1,0}, \quad (16.2.5)$$

where $f_{\delta',\delta}$ denote the diffeomorphism functions relating the $\hat{u}_f + \delta$ and $\hat{u}_f + \delta'$ gauges (see Theorem 16.1.2) and the term $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{Df},4}^{1,0}$ does not involve α , β or $\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_o$. Since $|\alpha| \lesssim \varepsilon r^{-\frac{9}{2}}$, $r^p|\Phi_p| \lesssim \varepsilon u^{-1}$ for all $\Phi_p \neq \alpha$, β or $\Omega\hat{\omega} - \Omega\hat{\omega}_o$, it follows from the estimate (16.1.14) and the fact that $u_f^2 \leq v_\infty(u_f)$ that

$$|((r^5 \text{curl} \Omega^{-1} \beta_{\ell=1})^\delta - \Pi_{S^\delta}(r^5 \text{curl} \Omega^{-1} \beta_{\ell=1})^{\delta'}) (\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta'), \theta)| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2(\delta - \delta')}{(\hat{u}_f + \delta')^2},$$

where, for any function h ,

$$\Pi_{S^\delta} h(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty, \theta) = h(\hat{u}_f + \delta' + f_{\delta',\delta}^3(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty, \theta), v_\infty + f_{\delta',\delta}^4(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty, \theta), \#_{\delta',\delta}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty, \theta)).$$

The estimates (16.1.14), (16.1.15) for $f_{\delta',\delta}^3$, $f_{\delta',\delta}^4$ and $\#_{\delta',\delta}$ then imply that

$$|(r^5 \text{curl} \Omega^{-1} \beta_{\ell=1})^\delta(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta'), \theta) - (r^5 \text{curl} \Omega^{-1} \beta_{\ell=1})^{\delta'}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta'), \theta)| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2(\delta - \delta')}{(\hat{u}_f + \delta')^2}. \quad (16.2.6)$$

Now, for any $J = (J^{-1}, J^0, J^1)$, $\tilde{J} = (\tilde{J}^{-1}, \tilde{J}^0, \tilde{J}^1) \in \mathbb{R}^3$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m=-1}^1 \left(J^m(r^2 \Delta Y_m^1)^\delta(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty, \theta) - \tilde{J}^m(r^2 \Delta Y_m^1)^{\delta'}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty, \theta) \right) \\ &= \sum_{m=-1}^1 \left(-2(J^m - \tilde{J}^m)(Y_m^1)^{\delta'}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty, \theta) + 2(J^m - \tilde{J}^m)((Y_m^1)^{\delta'}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty, \theta) - (Y_m^1)^\delta(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty, \theta)) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (J^m - \tilde{J}^m)(r^2 \Delta Y_m^1 + 2Y_m^1)^\delta(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty, \theta) - \tilde{J}^m((r^2 \Delta Y_m^1)^{\delta'}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty, \theta) - (r^2 \Delta Y_m^1)^\delta(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty, \theta)) \right), \end{aligned}$$

for $v_\infty = v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta')$. Setting $J = \mathbf{J}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)$, $\tilde{J} = \mathbf{J}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', \lambda)$ and using the fact that $(Y_m^1)^{\delta'}$ are orthonormal, for $m = -1, 0, 1$, it follows from Proposition 9.4.2 and Proposition 16.1.19 that, if ε_0 is sufficiently small,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{J}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda) - \mathbf{J}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', \lambda)| &\lesssim |\mathbf{J}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', \lambda)| \sum_{m=-1}^1 \|(r^2 \Delta Y_m^1)^{\delta'}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty, \cdot) - (r^2 \Delta Y_m^1)^\delta(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty, \cdot)\|_{S^{\delta'}} \\ &\quad + \left\| \sum_{m=-1}^1 \left(J^m(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)(r^2 \Delta Y_m^1)^\delta(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty, \cdot) - J^m(\hat{u}_f + \delta', \lambda)(r^2 \Delta Y_m^1)^{\delta'}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty, \cdot) \right) \right\|_{S^{\delta'}}, \end{aligned}$$

with $S^{\delta'} = S_{\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta')}'$. Since

$$(r^5 \text{curl} \Omega^{-1} \beta_{\ell=1})^{\delta'}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta'), \theta) = -3 \sum_{m=-1}^1 J^m(\hat{u}_f + \delta', \lambda)(r^2 \Delta Y_m^1)^{\delta'}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', v_\infty(\hat{u}_f + \delta'), \theta),$$

the estimates (16.2.4) and (16.2.6), along with Proposition 16.1.19 then imply that

$$|\mathbf{J}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda) - \mathbf{J}(\hat{u}_f + \delta', \lambda)| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^2(\delta - \delta')}{(\hat{u}_f + \delta')^2}. \quad (16.2.7)$$

Suppose now that $|\mathbf{J}(\hat{u}_f, \lambda)| \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{\hat{u}_f}$. The estimate (16.2.7) implies that, for some constant C ,

$$|\mathbf{J}(\hat{u}_f + \delta, \lambda)| \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{\hat{u}_f + \delta'} - \frac{C\varepsilon_0^2(\delta - \delta')}{(\hat{u}_f + \delta')^2} > \frac{\varepsilon_0}{\hat{u}_f + \delta},$$

where the latter inequality holds if ε_0 is sufficiently small. This concludes the proof of (16.2.1).

Remark 16.2.1. The strong $r^{-\frac{9}{2}}$ decay for α and appropriate derivatives imposed by (5.4.2) (see Remark 5.4.5) was convenient in obtaining (16.2.7), as it allowed us to avoid capturing decay in u faster than u^{-1} for any of the geometric quantities of the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge. Indeed, this is one of the main places where this assumption on data is used. See the first two terms in the error (16.2.2) and the second term on the right hand side of the change of gauge relation (16.2.5).

The continuity of the map $\mathbf{J}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}$ follows from the continuity of (7.4.2) in λ and the continuity of the original map $\mathbf{J}_{\hat{u}_f}$ as follows:

Since

$$\mathbf{J}_{u_f}(\lambda) = \mathbf{J}(u'_f(\lambda, u_f), \lambda)$$

where

$$u'_f(\lambda, u_f) := \sup\{u_f^0 \leq u'_f \leq u_f : \lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u'_f)\}, \quad (16.2.8)$$

it suffices to note that the map $u'_f(u_f, \lambda)$ defined by (16.2.8) is continuous, for fixed $u_f = \hat{u}_f + \delta$, in λ as a map on $\mathfrak{R}(u^0)$.

For this, fix $u_f = \hat{u}_f + \delta$, and consider a sequence $\lambda_i \rightarrow \lambda_0$ with $\lambda_i \in \mathfrak{R}(u^0)$.

If $u''_f < u'_f(u_f, \lambda_0)$, then by the monotonicity properties (7.1.2) of $\mathfrak{R}(u''_f)$, it follows that $\lambda_0 \in \text{int}(\mathfrak{R}(u''_f))$. But since $\text{int}(\mathfrak{R}(u''_f))$ is open, it follows that $\lambda_i \in \mathfrak{R}(u''_f)$ for sufficiently large i , and thus, for such i , $u'_f(\lambda_i, u_f) \geq u''_f$. It follows that that

$$\liminf u'_f(u_f, \lambda_i) \geq u'_f(u_f, \lambda_0). \quad (16.2.9)$$

On the other hand, suppose that

$$\limsup u'_f(u_f, \lambda_i) > u'_f(u_f, \lambda_0). \quad (16.2.10)$$

It follows again by the first monotonicity property (7.1.2) of $\mathfrak{R}(u''_f)$ that there exists $u''_f > u'_f(u_f, \lambda_0)$ and a sequence of $i_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\lambda_{i_k} \in \mathfrak{R}(u''_f)$ for all i . But since $\mathfrak{R}(u''_f)$ is closed, it follows that $\lambda_0 \in \mathfrak{R}(u''_f)$ but this contradicts the fact that $u''_f > u'_f(u_f, \lambda_0)$. Thus, we have in fact

$$\limsup u'_f(u_f, \lambda_i) \leq u'_f(u_f, \lambda_0), \quad (16.2.11)$$

and inequalities (16.2.9) and (16.2.11) together give continuity of the map (16.2.8) at λ_0 , as desired.

We note that the identity (7.1.12) continues to hold for $\mathbf{J}_{\hat{u}_f + \delta}$ and thus the statement about its degree. \square

16.3 Higher order estimates: the proof of Theorem 16.3

We restate Theorem 16.3:

Theorem 16.3 (Higher order estimates). *For $\hat{\varepsilon}_0(M_{\text{init}})$ sufficiently small, let $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_0$, $\mathcal{S}_0 \subset \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$, $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$ be as in the beginning of Section 7.1, and let \mathfrak{B} be the set defined by Definition 7.1.1.*

Let $u_f \in \mathfrak{B}$ and let $\mathfrak{R}(u_f)$ be as in the statement of Definition 7.1.1.

Then, for all $k \geq N$ there exist constants C_k such that for all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, we have the following higher order estimates for the solution $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^k[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^k[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^k + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^k + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{k+2}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{k-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{k-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ & \leq C_k \mathbb{E}_0^k[\mathcal{S}(\lambda)]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.5.1)$$

Moreover, we have in addition the localised estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^k[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^k[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^k + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^k + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{k+2}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{k-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{k-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{I}^+}] \\ & \lesssim \mathbb{E}_0^N[\mathcal{S}(\lambda)] + C_k(u_f) \mathbb{E}_{0, v_\infty}^k[\mathcal{S}(\lambda)], \end{aligned} \quad (7.5.2)$$

where $v_\infty = v_\infty(u_f)$, the energy $\mathbb{E}_{0, v_\infty}^k[\mathcal{S}(\lambda)]$ is defined in Section 5.4 (appearing in particular in equation (5.4.6)) and where $C_k(u_f)$ is a constant which depends in addition on u_f .

Proof. Typically, higher order estimates like the above, without additional smallness at higher order, follow since the equations are linear after sufficient differentiation. This is similar here although slightly complicated by the teleological normalisation of our gauges. For the reader's convenience, we provide some of the details.

We begin with the proof of (7.5.1). The proof is an induction on k . We have already proven the above estimate for $k = N = 12$ (base case). Assume now the estimate holds for some fixed $k \geq N$. The estimate at order $k + 1$ is now obtained through a sequence of four steps:

Step 1. We first consider the wave equations for the quantities of the almost gauge invariant hierarchy, i.e. (α, ψ, P) and $(\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\psi}, \underline{P})$ and repeat the analysis of Chapters 12 and 13 for the higher commuted equations.

The key observation is that upon commutation with k derivatives for α ($k - 1$ for ψ and $k - 2$ for P) the (finite) number of top order non-linear error terms on the right hand side (i.e. those involving $k + 1$ derivatives of curvature or Ricci coefficients and one exceptional term involving $k + 2$ derivatives of $\Omega \text{tr} \chi - \Omega \text{tr} \chi_\circ$ in the $\underline{\alpha}$ equation, see (3.4.18)) is independent of k and moreover each of the finite terms has the structure¹ $h \Phi \mathfrak{D}^k \Phi'$, where h is a bounded function and both h and the Φ, Φ' that appear are independent of k . This observation provides the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{k+1}[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{k+1}[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &\lesssim C\varepsilon \left(\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^{k+1} + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^{k+1} \right) \\ &\quad + C_k \varepsilon \left(\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^k + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^k + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^k[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^k[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \right) \\ &\quad + C_k \varepsilon \left(\mathbb{E}^{k-6}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}] \right) + C_k \mathbb{E}_0^{k+1}[\mathcal{S}(\lambda)], \end{aligned} \quad (16.3.1)$$

where the constant C_k may depend on k but the constant C does not. Indeed, the first two lines on the right hand side follow directly from the observation. The last line follows from the fact that we need to compare the top order energies on the timelike hypersurface and estimate the initial energies in the horizon and the infinity gauge from the data. However, all these estimates involve only lower order energies of the diffeomorphisms and – again for a finite k -independent number of terms – the top order energy of the Ricci coefficients. Recall Sections 10.3–10.5 for the precise statements.

Step 2. We next repeat the analysis of Chapters 14 and 15 to estimate the Ricci-coefficients in their individual gauges after $k + 1$ commutations. Again the equations are linear at top order leading to the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^{k+1} &\lesssim C \left(\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{k+1}[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{k+1}[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \right) + C_k \left(\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^k[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^k[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \right), \\ \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^{k+1} &\lesssim C \left(\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{k+1}[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{k+1}[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \right) + C_k \left(\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^k[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^k[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \right) \\ &\quad + C\varepsilon \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{k+1}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] + C_k \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^k[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}]. \end{aligned} \quad (16.3.2)$$

Note that in the horizon gauge there are extra terms involving the higher order energies of the diffeomorphisms because on the final hypersurface $u = u_f$, some horizon quantities are obtained from the infinity quantities and the estimates on the diffeomorphisms; see Section 10.6.

Step 3. Finally, the higher order diffeomorphisms are estimated from the Ricci coefficients as in Chapter 10. Once more, we observe that the number of top order terms is k -independent and we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{k+1}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] \lesssim C \left(\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^{k+1} + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^{k+1} \right) + C_k \left(\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^k + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^k \right). \quad (16.3.4)$$

Step 4. Coupling all the estimates together yields in view of $C\varepsilon \sim \varepsilon$ the estimate

$$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{k+1}[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{k+1}[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^{k+1} + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^{k+1} + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{k+3}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] \leq C_k \mathbb{E}_0^{k+1}[\mathcal{S}(\lambda)].$$

¹We do not keep track of the r -weights here as it is clear that they don't provide any additional difficulty in closing the higher order estimates compared with closing them at lower order.

One finally observes that the left hand side controls also $\mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{k-4}[\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{k-4}[\Phi^{\mathcal{I}^+}]$ as in Section 9.2. This is the estimate (7.5.1) at order $k+1$ and hence the induction is complete.

We next turn to the proof of (7.5.2). Here we can follow exactly the same steps as above, except that the estimate (16.3.1) is now replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{k+1}[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{k+1}[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] &\lesssim C\varepsilon \left(\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^{k+1} + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^{k+1} \right) \\ &+ C_k \varepsilon \left(\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^k + \mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^k + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^k[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}^k[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}] \right) \\ &+ C_k \varepsilon \left(\mathbb{E}^{k-6}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}] + \mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}] \right) \\ &+ \mathbb{E}_0^N[\mathcal{S}(\lambda)] + C_k(u_f) \mathbb{E}_{0, v_\infty}^{k+1}[\mathcal{S}(\lambda)], \end{aligned} \tag{16.3.5}$$

the only difference being that the energy in the last line is now localised at the expense of a constant depending on u_f . This is because we proceed slightly differently when estimating the initial energies of (α, ψ, P) and $(\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\psi}, \underline{P})$ in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge. Specifically, we now obtain estimates for these initial energies by comparing the almost gauge invariant quantities in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge directly with those in the preliminary gauge $i_{\mathcal{EF}}^0$ of part (a) of Theorem 5.5.2 (as opposed to the renormalised gauge (5.5.6) of part (b)). Appealing to the gauge $i_{\mathcal{EF}}^0$ allows us to exploit the domain of dependence property and localise the region where one does the comparison of energies.² However, this comes at the expense of constants potentially growing in u_f since the estimates obtainable for the diffeomorphisms relating the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge and the preliminary gauge $i_{\mathcal{EF}}^0$ exhibit worse behaviour in r . The domain of dependence property and the compactness of the region under consideration, however, allows one to absorb this behaviour into the constant $C(u_f)$. This establishes (16.3.5), and repeating the steps above now yields (7.5.2). \square

²Note that we cannot do this for the renormalised initial data gauge (5.5.6) in view of its “teleological” normalisations (5.5.7) at \mathcal{I}^+ : The quantities expressed in this gauge in a compact region depend on the full seed energy $\mathbb{E}_0^{k+1}[\mathcal{S}(\lambda)]$.

Chapter 17

Conclusions

In this last Chapter, we deduce properties of the limiting foliations and complete the proof of the statement of Theorem 6.1. We also prove Corollary III.3.1.

Contents

17.1	Null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ and the laws of gravitational radiation	491
17.1.1	Null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ as a set and Bondi normalisation	492
17.1.2	The completeness of \mathcal{I}^+	492
17.1.3	Definition of the rescaled quantities	492
17.1.4	The laws of gravitational radiation	493
17.1.5	BMS symmetry and the normalisation of the asymptotic \mathcal{I}^+ gauge	493
17.1.6	Decay along null infinity \mathcal{I}^+	494
17.2	The event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ and the characterization of the black hole region $\mathcal{M} \setminus J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$. .	495
17.2.1	Definition of \mathcal{H}^+ , regularity and completeness	495
17.2.2	Polynomial decay along \mathcal{H}^+	495
17.2.3	The black hole region as $\mathcal{M} \setminus J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$	495
17.2.4	Higher order regularity of \mathcal{H}^+	496
17.3	Proof of Theorems 17.1 and 17.2	496
17.4	Axisymmetric solutions with vanishing angular momentum: the proof of Corollary III.3.1	497

We first interpret in **Section 17.1** the “laws of gravitational radiation” as identities on null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ and then in **Section 17.2**, we shall understand the regularity and properties of the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ . In **Section 17.3**, we shall explicitly recap all statements appearing in the statement of Theorems 17.1 and 17.2, completing thus the proof of Theorem 6.1. Finally, in **Section 17.4** we give a proof of Corollary III.3.1 concerning axisymmetric initial data with vanishing angular momentum.

Section 17.4 is independent of Sections 17.1–17.3. The reader may wish to refer also to Chapter 17 of [CK93] and to [Chr91] for background.

17.1 Null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ and the laws of gravitational radiation

In this section we shall present the laws of gravitational radiation as a set of relations of limiting quantities defined on null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ .

We first define null infinity as a set \mathcal{I}^+ in **Section 17.1.1** and discuss in what sense it is Bondi normalised. We remark on the completeness of null infinity in **Section 17.1.2**. We shall then define the rescaled quantities in **Section 17.1.3** and formulate the “laws of gravitational radiation” in **Section 17.1.4**, following [CK93]. We shall discuss in **Section 17.1.5** how the BMS group acts on asymptotic quantities and how our construction has broken BMS symmetry in normalising uniquely the asymptotic gauge. Finally, we shall give decay statements for the asymptotic quantities in **Section 17.1.6**.

17.1.1 Null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ as a set and Bondi normalisation

We have remarked in Section 7.7.1 that the existence of a u_f -normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge for all $u_f \geq u_f^0$ already yields the completeness of null infinity, in the sense of Christodoulou [Chr99].

We can describe this completeness in another way by introducing \mathcal{I}^+ as an actual set. We define

$$\mathcal{I}^+ := [u_{-1}, \infty) \times \mathbb{S}^2.$$

If desired, one may naturally attach \mathcal{I}^+ to the spacetime (\mathcal{M}, g) by extending the embedding (6.2.1), identifying \mathcal{I}^+ with the image of a limiting $\{\infty\} \times [u_0, \infty) \times \mathbb{S}^2$ hypersurface which can be naturally attached to the domain $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\infty, M_{\text{final}}) \times \mathbb{S}^2$ of (6.2.1).

With respect to the limiting \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, we note that our bounds (6.2.11) in particular immediately yield

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \Omega^2(u, v, \theta) = 1. \quad (17.1.1)$$

One could rescale the metric to obtain a conformal compactification, but we shall refrain from doing so here. Let it suffice here to note that (6.2.11) similarly imply

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} r \text{tr} \chi(u, v, \theta) = 2 \quad (17.1.2)$$

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} r \text{tr} \underline{\chi}(u, v, \theta) = -2 \quad (17.1.3)$$

and, defining $\hat{\gamma}$ to be the standard metric on the \mathbb{S}^2 , then we have that

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} r^{-2} \not{g}_{AB}(u, v, \theta) = \hat{\gamma}_{AB}(u, \theta). \quad (17.1.4)$$

Note that

$$|r^{-2} \text{Area}(u, v) - 4\pi| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0}{r} \quad (17.1.5)$$

so in all the above (17.1.2)–(17.1.4) we could replace r with the geometric area-radius function.

We interpret (17.1.1) and (17.1.4) to be the statement that our limiting \mathcal{I}^+ normalised gauge is in an appropriate sense *Bondi normalised*.

17.1.2 The completeness of \mathcal{I}^+

Given the above concrete realisation of null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ as a set, we can view the “completeness of null infinity” as a relation on \mathcal{I}^+ itself. Indeed, since the range of the asymptotic u coordinate is $[u_{-1}, \infty)$ and the normalisation (17.1.1) yield

$$\int_{u_{-1}}^{\infty} \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \Omega^2(u, v, \theta^1, \theta^2) du = \int_{u_{-1}}^{\infty} 1 du = \infty. \quad (17.1.6)$$

The relation (17.1.6) is then another manifestation of the “completeness of null infinity”.

17.1.3 Definition of the rescaled quantities

We note that the following quantities, thought of as tensors on null infinity \mathcal{I}^+ , may now be defined by the following pointwise limits in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge

$$\Xi_{AB}(u, \theta) := \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} r^{-1} \hat{\chi}_{AB}(u, v, \theta),$$

$$\Sigma_{AB}(u, \theta) := \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\chi}_{AB}(u, v, \theta),$$

$$H(u, \theta) := \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} r^2 (\Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\circ})(u, v, \theta),$$

$$\underline{N}(u, \theta) := \left(\frac{1}{2} r^3 d \not{v} (\eta - \underline{\eta}) + \frac{1}{2} r^3 \hat{\chi} \cdot \hat{\chi} - r^3 \rho \right) (u, v, \theta),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_A(u, \theta) &:= \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} r \left(\eta_A - \underline{\eta}_A \right) (u, v, \theta), \\
\mathbf{A}_{AB}(u, \theta) &:= \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} r^{-1} \underline{\alpha}_{AB}(u, v, \theta), \\
\mathbf{B}_A(u, \theta) &:= \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} r \underline{\beta}_A(u, v, \theta), \\
\mathbf{P}(u, \theta) &:= \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} r^3 \rho(u, v, \theta), \\
\mathbf{Q}(u, \theta) &:= \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} r^3 \sigma(u, v, \theta).
\end{aligned}$$

We define also the limit of the Hawking mass:

$$M(u) = \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{\frac{\text{Area}(S_{u,v})}{16\pi}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{16\pi} \int_{S_{u,v}} \text{tr} \chi \text{tr} \underline{\chi} dA \right). \quad (17.1.7)$$

This is indeed the *Bondi mass*, due to (17.1.4). We note that in view of (17.1.5), we may replace $\text{Area}(S_{u,v})$ with $4\pi r^2$ in (17.1.7).

The reader can easily check that the above pointwise limits are indeed well defined in view of our estimates (6.2.11).

We will also make use of the “final” values of the quantities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma^+(\theta) &:= \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma(u, \theta) \\
\mathbf{P}^+(\theta) &= \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(u, \theta), \quad \mathbf{Q}^+(\theta) = \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{Q}(u, \theta).
\end{aligned}$$

We will see in Section 17.1.5 that these limits are well defined and particularly simple in our gauge.

17.1.4 The laws of gravitational radiation

The laws of gravitational radiation (cf. Chapter 17 of [CK93]) hold, in particular, the *Bondi mass loss* formula

$$\frac{d}{du} M(u) = -\frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2(u)} |\Xi(u, \theta)|^2 d\mu_{\dot{\gamma}} \quad (17.1.8)$$

and the relations

$$\frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial u} = -\Xi, \quad \frac{\partial \Xi}{\partial u} = -\frac{1}{4} \mathbf{A}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial u}(u, \theta) = 0.$$

Again, the validity of these pointwise limiting identities is an easy consequence of (6.2.10) and (6.2.11).

17.1.5 BMS symmetry and the normalisation of the asymptotic \mathcal{I}^+ gauge

To understand the limiting behaviour of the quantities of Section 17.1.3, it is useful, for greater context, to introduce the notion of a *Bondi normalised double null gauge*. This is any double null gauge covering the region $[u_{-1}, \infty) \times [v_0, \infty)$ of the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge such that the asymptotic relations of Section 17.1.3 are satisfied.

We may construct other such gauges starting from our \mathcal{I}^+ normalised gauge by applying a diffeomorphism satisfying appropriate bounds on f^3 , f^4 and f^A . Given such a gauge, we may again define the asymptotic quantities of Section 17.1.3. Their transformation properties only depend on the $r \rightarrow \infty$ limits of f^A and f^3 and the part of f^4 growing linearly in r (which is itself determined by its $\ell = 1$ mode, f^3 and f^A .) We note that given two Bondi normalised double null gauges, the quantities Σ , Ξ , \mathbf{P} , \mathbf{Q} , \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{B} transform by the action of the well-known BMS group [PR84].

Our asymptotic normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge induces a Bondi frame uniquely by the conditions

$$\mathbf{P}_{\ell=1}^+ = 0 \quad (17.1.9)$$

and

$$\Sigma_+ = 0. \quad (17.1.10)$$

The condition (17.1.9) says that our gauge is normalised so as to be a centre of mass frame for the final black hole that arises while the condition (17.1.10) chooses the cuts of null infinity.

Our gauge satisfies the following additional relations:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\text{final}} &= \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} M(u) = \inf_u M(u), \\ \mathbf{P}_{\ell=0}^+ &= -2M_{\text{final}}, \\ \mathbf{P}_{\ell \geq 2}^+ &= 0, \\ \underline{N}_{\ell=0}^+ &= \frac{1}{4\pi} M_{\text{final}}, \quad \underline{N}_{\ell \geq 1}^+ = 0, \quad Z^+ = 0, \\ \mathbf{Q}^+ &= 0, \\ H &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (17.1.11)$$

The relation (17.1.11) can be interpreted as the statement that the final Bondi mass measured at infinity coincides with the final Schwarzschild parameter of the metric to which the spacetime converges at finite points.

17.1.6 Decay along null infinity \mathcal{I}^+

We infer from the Bondi mass law formula (17.1.8) and the boundedness of the (second line of the) energy expression (6.1.13) (computed in the asymptotic \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, i.e. as it appears in the energy (6.2.10)) the following decay bound for the Bondi mass:

$$M(u) - M_{\text{final}} \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 u^{-2}. \quad (17.1.12)$$

In particular we have the orbital stability statement

$$|M(u) - M(u_{-1})| \lesssim \varepsilon^2.$$

Finally, we infer immediately from (6.2.11) the following pointwise decay bounds along \mathcal{I}^+ :

$$|\Sigma(u, \theta)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 u^{-1}, \quad (17.1.13)$$

$$|\Xi(u, \theta)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 u^{-1}, \quad (17.1.14)$$

$$|\mathbf{A}(u, \theta)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 u^{-1}, \quad (17.1.15)$$

$$|\mathbf{B}(u, \theta)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 u^{-1},$$

$$|\mathbf{P}(u, \theta) + 2M_{\text{final}}| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 u^{-1},$$

$$|\mathbf{Q}(u, \theta)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 u^{-1}.$$

These can all be viewed as asymptotic stability statements at \mathcal{I}^+ .

The tensor

$$\Sigma^+(\theta) - \Sigma(u_{-1}, \theta)$$

is related to the infinitesimal total displacement of test masses in gravitational wave experiments [Chr91]. Its boundedness

$$|\Sigma^+ - \Sigma(u_{-1}, \cdot)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 \quad (17.1.16)$$

follows thus from the above estimates, and can be viewed as an additional (orbital) stability statement.

Defining

$$F(\theta) := \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{u_{-1}}^{\infty} |\Xi(\theta)|^2 du$$

we have in particular, that

$$|F_{\ell=1}| \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 \quad (17.1.17)$$

which is the statement that the *linear momentum radiated* to infinity is bounded.

A similar statement can be made for the angular momentum, modulo the well-known ambiguities in its general definition along null infinity. This is related to the bound on λ^{final} . See Remark 6.3.5.

17.2 The event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ and the characterization of the black hole region $\mathcal{M} \setminus J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$

In this section, we shall define the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ and infer its basic regularity and completeness properties, characterizing it moreover as the past boundary of the black hole region $\mathcal{M} \setminus J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$.

The definition of \mathcal{H}^+ , with its basic regularity and completeness properties, will be given in **Section 17.2.1**. We shall infer polynomial decay statements along \mathcal{H}^+ in **Section 17.2.2**. We characterize the horizon \mathcal{H}^+ as the past boundary of $\mathcal{M} \setminus J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$ in **Section 17.2.3**, connecting with the usual notion of black hole event horizon. Finally, we infer higher order regularity of \mathcal{H}^+ , under suitable additional assumptions on initial data, in **Section 17.2.4**.

17.2.1 Definition of \mathcal{H}^+ , regularity and completeness

To define the event horizon, let us first note that $J^-(\mathcal{D}_\infty^+) \cap \mathcal{D}^\mathcal{K}$ has a non-empty future boundary $B \subset \mathcal{D}^\mathcal{K}$. Considering the sets $\{v_{\mathcal{H}^+} = v_{-1}\} \cap \{u_{\mathcal{H}^+} = u_n\} \subset \mathcal{D}_\infty^+$, then since these are also contained in $\mathcal{D}^\mathcal{K}$, one easily sees that $\{v_{\mathcal{H}^+} = v_{-1}\} \cap \{u_{\mathcal{H}^+} = u_n\}$ all lie in a fixed compact subset of $\mathcal{D}^\mathcal{K}$. By examining the transition functions from \mathcal{D}_∞^+ to $\mathcal{D}^\mathcal{K}$, one easily sees that the Kruskalised frame satisfies uniform C^k bounds with respect to the frame corresponding to $\mathcal{D}^\mathcal{K}$ for a $k \geq 3$. On the other hand, with respect to this frame, we have uniform C^k bounds of all geometric quantities associated to $\{v_{\mathcal{H}^+} = v_{-1}\} \cap \{u_{\mathcal{H}^+} = u_n\}$. Since these are all contained in a compact subset of $\mathcal{D}^\mathcal{K}$, we have that a subsequence converges in C^{k-1} to some C^k sphere $S \subset B$.

Now let us define the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ as the future boundary of the set $J^-(\mathcal{D}_\infty^+)$ in \mathcal{M} . Note that $S \subset \mathcal{H}^+$. General Lorentzian geometry, our bounds on S and Cauchy stability now tell us that $\mathcal{H}^+ \cap \mathcal{D}^\mathcal{K}$ is a regular C^k null hypersurface admitting S as a spatial section.

Now given any v_n , we similarly have uniform bounds on the geometry of the sequence of hypersurfaces $\{v_{-1} \leq v_{\mathcal{H}^+} \leq v_n\} \cap \{u_{\mathcal{H}^+} = u_n\}$ in the Kruskalised frame. As in the proof of the closedness, we may extract a convergent limit which is a C^k null hypersurface, denote $\mathcal{H}_{v_n, \text{new}}^+$, attach this to spacetime, noting that it will be consistent with the geometry of \mathcal{H}^+ . We may now solve a characteristic initial value problem (now we have to lose derivatives) to obtain an extension spacetime. By the C^k uniqueness statement of Theorem 5.2.1, it follows that this extension embeds into \mathcal{M} in the first place. It follows that $\mathcal{H}_{v_n, \text{new}}^+ \subset \mathcal{H}^+$ for all n , under the obvious identification and thus that $\mathcal{H}^+ = \cup_n \mathcal{H}_{v_n, \text{new}}^+ \cup (\mathcal{H}^+ \cap \mathcal{D}^\mathcal{K})$. It follows that \mathcal{H}^+ is a C^k null hypersurface.

The future completeness of \mathcal{H}^+ follows easily from our estimates on $\Omega_{\mathcal{H}^+}^2$ when Kruskalised and the range of the $v_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ coordinates.

17.2.2 Polynomial decay along \mathcal{H}^+

The limiting hypersurface \mathcal{H}^+ inherits the estimates of the asymptotically normalised \mathcal{H}^+ gauge (6.2.2). Thus, from (6.2.11), we easily see the estimate that

$$|\Omega^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\infty, v, \cdot)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 v^{-1}, \quad (17.2.1)$$

where $\Omega^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ is defined as the $u \rightarrow \infty$ limit of $\Omega^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u, v, \theta)$ defined with respect to the gauge (6.2.2). Note that $\Omega^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ is generically a nonvanishing quantity as can be seen by passing to the Kruskalised gauge.

17.2.3 The black hole region as $\mathcal{M} \setminus J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$

It is traditional to attach \mathcal{I}^+ as a “conformal boundary” of spacetime by introducing a conformally rescaled metric, and using this, ascribe meaning to $J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$. We prefer to define $J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$ directly as the set

$$J^-(\mathcal{I}^+) := \{p \in \mathcal{M} : \gamma : [0, 1) \rightarrow \mathcal{M} \text{ future directed causal, } \gamma(0) = p, \lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \gamma(t) \in \mathcal{I}^+\}$$

where by $\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \gamma(t) \in \mathcal{I}^+$ we mean that γ is eventually in the range \mathcal{D}_∞^+ of the \mathcal{I}^+ asymptotic gauge and, writing γ as $(u(t), v(t), \theta(t))$, then $v(t) \rightarrow \infty$ while $u(t), \theta(t)$ have finite limits.

Under this definition, we manifestly see that $J^-(\mathcal{I}^+) \subset J^-(\mathcal{D}_\infty^+)$, and in fact

$$J^-(\mathcal{I}^+) = J^-(\mathcal{D}_\infty^+) = \mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cup \mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cup (\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}} \cap J^-(\mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{I}^+})).$$

17.2.4 Higher order regularity of \mathcal{H}^+

In view of our construction of \mathcal{H}^+ , the higher order regularity statement of Theorem 17.1 follows directly from the statement in Theorem 7.7.1 on higher regularity of the embedding (6.2.1). In particular, if (5.4.4) is finite for all k , then the event horizon \mathcal{H}^+ is a C^∞ hypersurface in \mathcal{M} .

17.3 Proof of Theorems 17.1 and 17.2

Let us explicitly note that we have indeed obtained all statements in Theorems 17.1 and 17.2.

We restate first Theorem 17.1.

Theorem 17.1 (Properties of \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 7.7.1, null infinity can be realised as the asymptotic null hypersurface $v = \infty$ of the gauge (6.2.1), denoted now simply as \mathcal{I}^+ , which is future complete in the sense that the coordinate u along \mathcal{I}^+ is Bondi normalised and $u \rightarrow \infty$ along \mathcal{I}^+ towards the future. The ‘laws of gravitational radiation’ can be formulated along \mathcal{I}^+ , and \mathcal{I}^+ can be endowed with a frame on which the final asymptotic shear $\Sigma_+ = 0$ and final centre of mass normalisation $\mathbf{P}_{\ell=1}^+ = 0$, i.e. satisfying (6.2.4).*

We may characterise the domain

$$\mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cup \mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}} \cap J^-(\mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{I}^+}) \quad (7.7.5)$$

as the domain of outer communications of \mathcal{M} , and we may write:

$$J^-(\mathcal{I}^+) \cap \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{H}^+} \cup \mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{I}^+} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}} \cup \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}} \cap J^-(\mathcal{D}_\infty^{\mathcal{I}^+}).$$

On the other hand, the future boundary of (7.7.5) in \mathcal{M} is a future affine complete regular null hypersurface \mathcal{H}^+ . If (5.4.4) is finite for a certain k , then \mathcal{H}^+ is a $C^{\tilde{k}}$ hypersurface, where $\tilde{k} \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, if (5.4.4) is finite for all k , then \mathcal{H}^+ is a smooth hypersurface.

Proof. The statement concerning $J^-(\mathcal{I}^+)$ has been obtained in Section 17.2.3, whereas the completeness of null infinity was obtained as (17.1.6) in Section 17.1.6. The laws of gravitational radiation are formulated in Section 17.1.4, and the statements on the final shear and centre of mass, i.e. (6.2.4), were obtained in (17.1.10) and (17.1.9) above. The statement regarding the completeness and basic regularity properties of the horizon \mathcal{H}^+ were obtained in Section 17.2.1 whereas the higher order regularity statement is given in Section 17.2.4. \square

We now restate Theorem 17.2.

Theorem 17.2 (Polynomial decay along \mathcal{I}^+ and \mathcal{H}^+). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 7.7.1, we have inverse polynomial decay along \mathcal{H}^+ and \mathcal{I}^+ , for instance the pointwise estimates*

$$|\Omega^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\infty, v, \cdot)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 v^{-1}, \quad (7.7.6)$$

where $\Omega^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\infty, v, \cdot)$ is defined as the $u \rightarrow \infty$ limit of $\Omega^2 \alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$ defined with respect to the asymptotic \mathcal{H}^+ gauge (6.2.2), and

$$0 \leq M(u) - M_{\text{final}} \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 u^{-2}, \quad |\Sigma(u, \cdot)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 u^{-1}, \quad |\Xi(u, \cdot)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 u^{-1}, \quad |\mathbf{A}(u, \cdot)| \lesssim \varepsilon_0 u^{-1}, \quad (7.7.7)$$

where $M(u)$ denotes the Bondi mass and Ξ , Σ and \mathbf{A} are defined in Section 17.1.3.

Proof. The decay properties on \mathcal{H}^+ were obtained in Section 17.2, specifically, in (17.2.1), while the decay properties on \mathcal{I}^+ were obtained in Section 17.1.6, specifically, in (17.1.12), (17.1.13), (17.1.14) and (17.1.15). \square

17.4 Axisymmetric solutions with vanishing angular momentum: the proof of Corollary III.3.1

In the notation of Section 5.8, let us consider an initial data set $\mathcal{S} \in \mathfrak{M}(M_{\text{init}}, c^2 \varepsilon_0)$ which is moreover assumed to be axisymmetric and represented such that the initial axisymmetric vector field is $\partial_{\dot{\phi}}$, where $(\dot{\theta}, \dot{\phi})$ represent the standard spherical coordinates (1.1.1) of the initial data cones.

It follows that the maximal Cauchy development (\mathcal{M}, g) corresponding to \mathcal{S} inherits a globally defined Killing field \tilde{Z} .

We now remark that the renormalised initial Eddington–Finkelstein gauge (5.5.6) of part (b) of Theorem 5.5.2, in view of its geometric characterization and its anchoring (5.5.9) to the (manifestly symmetric) preliminary gauge (a), also inherits the axisymmetry and in fact $\partial_{\dot{\phi}} = h\tilde{Z}$ for h some constant with $|h - 1| \lesssim \varepsilon_0$, where now $(\dot{\theta}, \dot{\phi})$ represent the standard spherical coordinates (1.1.1) of the parametrisation (5.5.6). It is natural in fact to define “the” axisymmetric Killing field as the extension of $Z := \partial_{\dot{\phi}}$ to \mathcal{M} , as this is the correctly normalised vector at infinity.

Let us assume moreover that the initial angular momentum vanishes. This is the statement that the so-called Komar integral [Kom59, Wal84]

$$\mathcal{J}(S) = -\frac{1}{16\pi} \int_S \nabla^\mu Z^\nu \epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} \quad (17.4.1)$$

vanishes when computed for instance on any standard section of the initial cones. (We note that if the data are polarised, then in particular the angular momentum indeed vanishes in the above sense.)

By the well known conservation relation for the Komar integral [Wal84], it follows that (17.4.1) vanishes when computed on any spacelike surface S in (\mathcal{M}, g) homologous to a standard section of the initial cones.

Note that \mathcal{S} as above might not satisfy $(\eta_{\mathcal{EF}})_{\ell=1} = 0$. It will satisfy, however, $|(\eta_{\mathcal{EF}})_{\ell=1}| \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2$. We may thus write $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_0(\lambda_0)$ for some $|\lambda_0| \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2$ and some $\mathcal{S}_0 \in \mathfrak{M}_0(M_{\text{init}}, c^2 \varepsilon_0)$. Note that it follows that $\lambda_0 \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f^0)$.

For all $u_f \geq u_f^0$, consider the sets $\mathfrak{R}(u_f)$ given in the proof of Theorem 6.1. For all $u_f \geq u_f^0$ such that $\lambda_0 \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, consider the u_f, M_f normalised \mathcal{I}^+ gauge (5.6.5) in (\mathcal{M}, g) corresponding to $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(\lambda_0)$. Since this gauge is itself again geometrically defined and anchored only to the initial Eddington–Finkelstein gauge through (5.6.16), it follows, in view also of the equivariance of the construction of Proposition 4.4.1 (cf. Remark 4.4.5), that $Z = h_{u_f} \partial_{\dot{\phi}}$ for some constant $|h_{u_f} - 1| \lesssim \varepsilon_0$, where $(\dot{\theta}, \dot{\phi})$ are now the standard spherical coordinates corresponding to the \mathbb{S}^2 appearing in (5.6.5).

An easy computation (see [GM14] for the analogous computation in the Newman–Penrose formalism and Bondi framework) shows that, in view of our estimates in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge and the relation between u_f and v_∞ , we have the relation:

$$||\mathcal{J}(S_{u_f, v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+})| - |\mathbf{J}(u_f, \lambda_0)|| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2}{u_f}. \quad (17.4.2)$$

Since $\mathcal{J}(S_{u_f, v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}) = 0$ for this solution, it follows then that for no u_f can $\mathbf{J}(u_f, \lambda_0)$ saturate the bound (7.1.8), i.e. for no u_f can we have $|\mathbf{J}(u_f, \lambda_0)| = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{u_f}$. From the construction of the sets $\mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, it then follows that in fact we have $\lambda_0 \in \mathfrak{R}(u_f)$ for all $u_f \geq u_f^0$. We may thus take $\lambda^{\text{final}} = \lambda_0$, and the corollary follows.

Remark 17.4.1. *An alternative proof of Corollary III.3.1 would of course be to dispense completely with the 3-parameter family $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}$ and simply use (17.4.2) directly on the solution corresponding to the axisymmetric solution $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(\lambda_0)$ as an a priori estimate for $|\mathbf{J}(u_f, \lambda_0)|$, namely $|\mathbf{J}(u_f, \lambda_0)| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_0^2}{u_f}$, since for this solution we have $|\mathcal{J}(S_{u_f, v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+})| = 0$. Given this estimate, one may remove all references to $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}$ and $\mathfrak{R}(u_f)$ from the setup of Theorem 6.1, as the modulation was only necessary to bound $|\mathbf{J}(u_f, \lambda)|$. This leads to a number of important simplifications throughout, for instance one does not require the monotonicity properties of Section 16.2, which were the main reason for our precise assumptions on data (cf. Remark 16.2.1). Thus, in this case, one can see relatively easily that the decay assumptions on the data can indeed be further relaxed (cf. Remark 5.4.5), to allow for instance for $\beta \sim r^{-4} \log |r|$ as in [Chr02].*

Index

almost gauge invariant hierarchy

P , quantity satisfying Regge–Wheeler type equation, 24, 48

\underline{P} , quantity satisfying Regge–Wheeler type equation, 24, 48

α , 48

$\underline{\alpha}$, 48

$\underline{\underline{P}}$, alternative to \underline{P} , 48

$\underline{\psi}$, alternative to ψ , 48

$\underline{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, rescaled version of $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 125

$\underline{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, rescaled version of $\underline{\psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 125

$\underline{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, rescaled version of $\underline{\underline{P}}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 124

ψ , 48

$\underline{\psi}$, 48

$\underline{\underline{A}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, rescaled version of $\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 125

$\underline{\underline{\Pi}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, rescaled version of $\underline{\psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 125

$\underline{\underline{\Psi}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, rescaled version of $\underline{\underline{P}}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 124

$A_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, rescaled version of $\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 125

$A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, rescaled version of $\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 125

$\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, rescaled version of $\psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 125

$\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, rescaled version of $\psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 125

$\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, rescaled version of $P_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 124

$\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, rescaled version of $P_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 124

angular momentum

(J^{-1}, J^0, J^1) , angular momentum vector associated to a linearised Kerr solution, 46

$(J_{\text{seed}}^{-1}, J_{\text{seed}}^0, J_{\text{seed}}^1)$, angular momentum vector associated to data, 104

$\lambda = (\lambda_{-1}, \lambda_0, \lambda_1)$, modulation parameters related to angular momentum of data, 22, 120

$\mathcal{J}(S)$, Komar angular momentum associated to S , 16, 496

aM , angular momentum of the Kerr metric $g_{a,M}$, 1, 5

$\mathbf{J}(\lambda, u_f)$, vector measuring angular momentum at time u_f , 27, 137

bootstrap

energies

$\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^K$, 136

$\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^K$, 136

$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{K-2}[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, P_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \underline{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, 136

$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^K[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, 136

$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}]$, 136

$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}]$, 136

$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}]$, 136

maps

$\mathbf{J}_{u_f} : \mathfrak{R}(u_f^0) \rightarrow B_{\varepsilon_0/u_f^0}$, 137

parameters

$M_f(u_f, \lambda)$, 136

\hat{u}_f , 136

u_f^0 , “initial” final retarded time associated to bootstrap, 42, 118, 136

u_f , final retarded time associated to bootstrap, 136

$\mathbf{J}(\lambda, u_f)$, vector measuring angular momentum, 27

u_f , final retarded time associated to bootstrap, 22

sets

B_{ε_0/u_f^0} , closed ball of radius ε_0/u_f^0 in \mathbb{R}^3 , 121

\mathfrak{B} , set of allowed final retarded times u_f , 27

$\mathfrak{R}(u_f)$, subset of λ -parameter space depending on u_f , 22, 136

constants

Λ , cosmological constant, 18

double null gauge

algebraic operations

$(\text{tr}\phi)_{A_1 \dots A_s}$, 35

$(\vartheta, \vartheta)_i$, 35

$(\vartheta \times \vartheta)_{BC}$, 35

$(\xi, \tilde{\xi})$, 35

$(\xi \hat{\otimes} \xi)_{AB}$, 35

$\vartheta \wedge \vartheta$, 35

$\vartheta^{\sharp C}$, 35

$\xi^{\sharp C}$, 35

$^*\vartheta_{AB}$, Hodge dual, 35

$^*\xi_A$, Hodge dual, 35

change of gauge

F , notation for functions describing diffeomorphisms, 77

$F_{\delta', \delta}$, 417

$(\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{k+1} \mathbf{f})^l \cdot G$, schematic notation for products of higher order derivatives of f , 83

$(\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{k+1} \mathbf{f}_p)^l \cdot G$, schematic notation for products of higher order derivatives of f with p

- dependence, 83
- $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{f},p}^{1,k}(H, G, K)$, nonlinear error notation associated to f with p dependence, 84
- $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{f}}^{1,k}(H, G, K)$, nonlinear error notation associated to f , 84
- $\partial_u f$, notation for first derivative of diffeomorphism map, 78
- $\partial_v f$, notation for first derivative of diffeomorphism map, 78
- $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_{\mathbf{f},p}$, schematic notation for first order derivatives of f , 82
- $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{k+1}\mathbf{f} \cdot (i, \gamma)$, schematic notation for higher order derivatives of f , 82
- $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{k+1}\mathbf{f}_p \cdot (i, \gamma)$, schematic notation for higher order derivatives of f showing p dependence, 83
- $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathbf{f},p}$, angular part of first derivatives of diffeomorphism maps, 78
- f , notation for functions describing diffeomorphisms, 23, 78
- $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$, 116
- f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+} , 115
- f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+} , 115
- connection coefficients
 - B , quantity used only in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, 26, 291
 - K , Gauss curvature of $S_{u,v}$, 38
 - X_1 , quantity used only in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, 26, 351
 - X_2 , quantity used only in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, 26, 351
 - Y , quantity used only in the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, 26, 290
 - Υ , quantity used only in the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, 191, 395
 - \tilde{r} , area radius defined from $\text{tr}\chi$, 48
 - χ , 3, 36
 - $\underline{\chi}$, 3, 36
 - η , 36
 - $\underline{\eta}$, 36
 - $\hat{\chi}$, 36
 - $\underline{\hat{\chi}}$, 36
 - $\hat{\omega}$, 3, 36
 - $\hat{\chi}$, 3
 - μ , mass aspect function, 23, 36
 - μ^* , renormalised mass aspect difference, 53
 - $\underline{\mu}$, mass aspect function, 36
 - $\underline{\hat{\omega}}$, 3, 36
 - $\text{tr}\chi$, 36
 - $\text{tr}\underline{\chi}$, 36
 - $\underline{\mu}$, renormalised mass aspect difference, 50
- coordinates
 - u , retarded null coordinate, 3, 33
 - v , advanced null coordinate, 3, 33
- curvature components
 - α , 36
 - $\underline{\alpha}$, 3, 36
 - β , 3, 36
 - $\underline{\beta}$, 36
 - ρ , 3, 36
 - σ , 36
- differential operators
 - D , projected Lie derivative in the e_4 direction, 34
 - $R^* = \frac{1}{2}(-\Omega e_3 + \Omega e_4)$, 195
 - $T = \frac{1}{2}(\Omega e_3 + \Omega e_4)$, 195
 - \mathcal{D}_2^* , covariant operator acting tangentially on $S_{u,v}$, 3, 35
 - curl , covariant operator acting tangentially on $S_{u,v}$, 35
 - div , covariant operator acting tangentially on $S_{u,v}$, 3, 35
 - \mathcal{D} , 25, 57
 - $\mathcal{A}^{[k]}$, angular operators acting on symmetric traceless S -tensors, 272, 291
 - ∇_3 , covariant differential operator acting in e_3 direction, 3, 35
 - ∇_4 , covariant differential operator acting in e_4 direction, 3, 35
 - \square , 195
 - $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^k$, modified commutation operator, 220
 - $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^k_{\nearrow}$, commutators used for $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$ and $A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 253
 - $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^k_{aux}$, auxiliary modified commutation operator, 220
 - \underline{D} , projected Lie derivative in the e_3 direction, 34
- frames
 - $e_i, i = 1, \dots, 4$, normalised double null frame, 3, 34, 39
- functions
 - V_I , potential appearing in Type 1 wave tensorial wave equations, 195
 - V_{II} , potential appearing in Type 2 wave tensorial wave equations, 195
- metric coefficients
 - Ω^2 , conformal metric coefficient, 3
 - \mathcal{G}_{CD} , angular metric coefficient, 3, 34
 - b^C , torsion metric coefficient, 3, 34
 - Ω^2 , conformal metric coefficient, 34
- projection
 - $\Pi\phi$, 34
- sets
 - C , outgoing null hypersurface, 5
 - C_u , ingoing null hypersurface, 34
 - C_v , outgoing null hypersurface, 34
 - $S_{u,v}$, intersections of constant- u and constant- v hypersurfaces, 3, 33
 - \mathcal{W} , subset of \mathbb{R}^2 , 33
 - \mathcal{Z} , domain of parametrisation, 33, 77

\underline{C} , ingoing null hypersurface, 5
time orientation
 $\partial_u + \partial_v + b^A \partial_{\theta^A}$, 34

energies

energies for α and $\underline{\alpha}$
 $\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, 125
 $\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, 126
 $\mathbb{E}^{K,p}[\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau)$, 125
 $\mathbb{E}^K[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v)$, 125
 $\mathbb{E}^K[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau)$, 125
 $\mathbb{E}^K[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v)$, 125
energies for $\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}$
 $\mathbb{E}^N[C^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, null cone energy in $C^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 129
 $\mathbb{E}^N[S^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, energy on $S^{\mathcal{H}^+}$ spheres, 129
 $\mathbb{E}^N[\underline{C}^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, null cone energy in $\underline{C}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 129
 $\mathbb{E}^N[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, spacetime energy in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 129
 $\mathbb{E}^N[\chi^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, energy for $\chi^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 130
 $\mathbb{E}^N[g^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, energy for metric components, 130
 $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{H}^+}^N$, master energy, 130
 $\mathbb{E}^{N+1}[C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, top-order null cone energy on final cone $C_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 129

energies for $\Phi^{\mathcal{I}^+}$

$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^N[\Gamma]$, energy for Γ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 127
 $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^N[\mathcal{R}]$, energy for \mathcal{R} in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 128
 $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N$, total master energy in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 128
 $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^{N, aux}[\underline{\omega}]$, energy for $\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_o$, 128
 $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^{N, aux}[\omega]$, energy for $\omega - \omega_o$, 128
 $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^N[\Gamma]$, angular energy for Γ in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 128
 $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^N[\mathcal{R}]$, angular energy for \mathcal{R} in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 128
 $\mathbb{E}_{u_f, \mathcal{I}^+}^N$, master angular energy in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 128
 $\mathbb{E}_{u_{-1}}^N[\Gamma]$, angular energy for Γ on cones $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 127
 $\mathbb{E}_{u_{-1}}^N[\mathcal{R}]$, angular energy for \mathcal{R} on cones $C_{u_{-1}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 127
 $\mathbb{E}_{v_\infty}^N[\Gamma]$, angular energy for Γ on cones $\underline{C}_{v=v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 126
 $\mathbb{E}_{v_\infty}^N[\mathcal{R}]$, angular energy for \mathcal{R} on cones $\underline{C}_{v=v_\infty}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 126

energies for P and \underline{P}

$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2}[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}, P_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, 125
 $\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^{N-2}[\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}, \underline{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, 125
 $\mathbb{E}^{K,p}[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau)$, 124
 $\mathbb{E}^K[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v)$, 124

energies of diffeomorphisms

$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}]$, energy associated to f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+} diffeomorphisms, 131
 $\mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}]$, energy associated to f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+} diffeomorphisms, 131

$\mathbb{E}_{u_f}^N[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}]$, energy associated to $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$ diffeomorphisms, 131

fluxes

$\check{\mathbb{F}}_u^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, horizon-degenerate energy flux on truncated outgoing null cone, 203
 $\check{\mathbb{F}}_u^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, p -weighted energy flux on truncated outgoing null cone, 203
 $\check{\mathbb{F}}_u[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, energy flux on truncated outgoing null cone, 203
 $\check{\mathbb{F}}_u^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, p -weighted angular energy flux on truncated outgoing null cone, 203
 $\check{\mathbb{F}}_v^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, horizon-degenerate energy flux on truncated ingoing null cone, 203
 $\check{\mathbb{F}}_v^*[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, energy flux on restricted ingoing null cone, 203
 $\check{\mathbb{F}}_v[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](u)$, energy flux on truncated ingoing null cone, 203
 $\check{\mathbb{F}}_v^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, p -weighted angular energy flux on truncated ingoing null cone, 203
 $\check{\mathbb{F}}_v[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, energy flux on truncated ingoing null cone, 203
 $\check{\mathbb{F}}_u[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](v)$, energy flux on truncated outgoing null cone, 203
 $\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{B}}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau)$, flux through the timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B} , 203
 $\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{B}}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau)$, flux through the timelike hypersurface \mathcal{B} , 204

initial energies

$\mathbb{E}_0^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{EF}, d}]$, initial energy associated to the initial Eddington–Finkelstein gauge, 113
 $\mathbb{E}_0^N[\Phi_{\mathcal{K}, d}]$, initial energy associated to the initial Kruskal gauge, 110
 $\mathbb{E}_0^k[\mathcal{S}]$, energy associated to full initial data set, 107
 $\mathbb{E}_{0, v_\infty}^k[\mathcal{S}]$, energy of truncated initial data, 108
 $\mathbb{E}_{\text{seed}}^{k+10}[\mathcal{S}]$, initial energy associated to seed data, 106
 $\mathbb{E}_0^N[P_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, initial energy for P in the teleological \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, 187
 $\mathbb{E}_0^N[P_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, initial energy for P in the teleological \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, 187
 $\mathbb{E}_0^N[\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, initial energy for \underline{P} in the teleological \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, 187
 $\mathbb{E}_0^N[\underline{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, initial energy for \underline{P} in the teleological \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, 187
 $\mathbb{E}_0^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, initial energy for α in the teleological \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, 186
 $\mathbb{E}_0^N[\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, initial energy for α in the teleological \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, 186
 $\mathbb{E}_0^N[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, initial energy for $\underline{\alpha}$ in the teleological \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, 186
 $\mathbb{E}_0^N[\underline{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, initial energy for $\underline{\alpha}$ in the teleological \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, 186

- norms on cones
 - $\|\xi\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)}^2$, 123
 - $\|\xi\|_{C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}(v)}^2$, 123
 - $\|\xi\|_{C_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u)}^2$, 123
 - $\|\xi\|_{C_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)}^2$, 123
- norms on spheres
 - $\|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}}^2$, 123
 - $\|\xi\|_{S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}}^2$, 123
- norms on timelike hypersurfaces
 - $\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{B}}$, 180
 - $\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{B}(\tau)}$, 180
- pointwise norms
 - $\mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{N-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{H}^+}]$, pointwise norm of geometric quantities in \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, 130
 - $\mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{N-5}[\Phi^{\mathcal{I}^+}]$, pointwise norm of geometric quantities in \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, 130
 - $\mathbb{P}_{u_f}^{N-7}[f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}]$, pointwise norm of diffeomorphisms $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$, 131
 - $\mathbb{P}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+}]$, pointwise norm of diffeomorphisms f_{d, \mathcal{H}^+} , 132
 - $\mathbb{P}_{u_f}[f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+}]$, pointwise norm of diffeomorphisms f_{d, \mathcal{I}^+} , 132
- spacetime energies
 - $\check{\mathbb{I}}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2)$, non-degenerate spacetime integral, 203
 - $\check{\mathbb{I}}[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2)$, spacetime integral, 204
 - $\check{\mathbb{I}}^\diamond[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2)$, horizon-degenerate spacetime integral, 203
 - $\check{\mathbb{I}}^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2)$, r^p weighted angular spacetime integral, 204
 - $\check{\mathbb{I}}^p[W_{\mathcal{I}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2)$, r^p weighted spacetime integral, 204
 - $\check{\mathbb{I}}^{\diamond, deg}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2)$, horizon and trapping-degenerate spacetime integral, 203
 - $\check{\mathbb{I}}^{deg}[W_{\mathcal{H}^+}](\tau_1, \tau_2)$, trapping-degenerate spacetime integral, 203
- initial data
 - derived data
 - K , 103
 - $\alpha_{\text{in}}^{\mathcal{K}}$, 103
 - $\alpha_{\text{out}}^{\mathcal{EF}}$, 103
 - $\alpha_{\text{out}}^{\mathcal{K}}$, 103
 - α , 101
 - $\underline{\alpha}$, 101
 - \not{g}_{AB} , 101
 - \mathbf{b}_{in}^A , 101
 - $\eta_{\mathcal{EF}}$, 103
 - ϕ^{in} , 101
 - ϕ^{out} , 101
 - $\text{tr}\chi_{\mathcal{EF}}$, 103
 - $\text{tr}\underline{\chi}_{\mathcal{EF}}$, 103
 - e^{in} , 101
 - e^{out} , 101
 - derived quantities
 - $\mathfrak{D}\gamma\theta$, 101
 - differential operators
 - ∇ , 101
 - ∇_3 , 101
 - ∇_4 , 101
 - energies
 - $\mathbb{E}_0^k[\mathcal{S}]$, energy associated to full initial data set, 107
 - $\mathbb{E}_{0, v_\infty}^k[\mathcal{S}]$, energy of truncated initial data, 108
 - $\mathbb{E}_{\text{seed}}^{k+10}[\mathcal{S}]$, initial energy associated to seed data, 106
 - initial hypersurfaces
 - $S_{\mathbf{U}_{-2}, \mathbf{V}_{-2}}$, 100
 - initial surfaces
 - $C_{\text{out}}^{\mathcal{EF}}$, 103
 - $C_{\text{out}}^{\mathcal{K}}$, 103
 - \mathcal{C}_{out} , 100
 - $\mathcal{C}'_{\text{out}}$, shorter hypersurface on which data exist, 101
 - $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{in}}$, 100
 - $\underline{\mathcal{C}}'_{\text{in}}$, shorter hypersurface on which data exist, 101
 - $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{in}}^{\mathcal{K}}$, 103
 - maps
 - $\mathbf{J}_0 : \mathfrak{R}_0 \rightarrow B_{\varepsilon_0/u_f^0}$, 121
 - moduli space
 - $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}_0}^{\varepsilon_0}$, 3-parameter family of initial data indexed by a reference data set \mathcal{S}_0 , 22, 120
 - $\mathfrak{M} = \mathfrak{M}(M_{\text{init}}, \varepsilon_0)$, moduli space of data, 119
 - $\mathfrak{M}_0(M_{\text{init}}, \varepsilon_0)$, set of initial data with $J_{\text{seed}}^m = 0$, 120
 - $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{stable}}$, asymptotically stable codimension-3 “submanifold” of \mathfrak{M} , 6, 7, 120, 134
 - parameters
 - J_{seed}^m , $m = -1, 0, 1$, associated Kerr parameters, 104
 - M_{init} , initial Schwarzschild parameter, 41, 103
 - N , parameter measuring regularity required on data, 106
 - $\hat{\varepsilon}_0$, smallness parameter depending on M_{init} , 41
 - $\lambda = (\lambda_{-1}, \lambda_0, \lambda_1)$, modulation vector parameter, 22
 - λ_m , $m = -1, 0, 1$, modulation parameters, 120
 - ε_0 , smallness parameter appearing in the main theorem, 25, 106
 - ε_1 , smallness parameter ensuring global existence of the data, 104
 - $\mathbf{J}_0(\lambda)$, angular momentum vector at time u_0^f , 121
 - \mathbf{U}'_5 , 101

- U_{-2} , 100
- U_5 , 100
- V'_0 , 101
- V_{-2} , 100
- seed data
 - Ω^{in} , 100
 - Ω^{out} , 100
 - η , 100
 - \hat{g}^{in} , 100
 - \hat{g}^{out} , 100
 - \mathcal{S} , complete set of seed data quantities, 100
 - $\text{tr}\chi$, 100
 - $\text{tr}\chi$, 100
 - b_{out}^A , 100
 - $\mathcal{S}_0(\lambda)$, initial data derived from \mathcal{S}_0 associated with parameter λ , 120
 - $\mathcal{S}_0(\lambda)$, initial data set derived from \mathcal{S}_0 associated with parameter λ , 22
- sets
 - B_{ε_0/u_f^0} , closed ball of radius ε_0/u_f^0 in \mathbb{R}^3 , 121
 - \mathfrak{R}_0 , subset of λ -parameter space at time u_f^0 , 121
- initial Eddington–Finkelstein gauge
 - change of gauge
 - f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+} , change from teleological \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, 115
 - coordinates
 - $\theta_{\text{data}}^{\mathcal{EF}}$, 113, 115
 - u_{data} , 113, 115
 - v_{data} , 113, 115
 - double null parametrisation
 - $i_{\mathcal{EF}}^0$, preliminary gauge, 111
 - $i_{\mathcal{EF}}$, renormalised gauge, 111
 - parameters
 - u_4 , 42, 111
 - u_{-2} , 42
 - u_3 , 42, 111
 - v_0 , 42, 111
 - sets
 - $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{EF}}(u_2)$, spacetime domain, 112
 - $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{EF}}^0(u_f)$, spacetime domain of the preliminary gauge, 111
 - $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}(u_3)$, renormalised coordinate domain, 111
 - $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}^0(u_3)$, preliminary coordinate domain, 111
- initial Kruskal gauge
 - change of gauge
 - f_{d,\mathcal{H}^+} , change from teleological \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, 115
 - coordinates
 - U_{data} , 111, 115
 - V_{data} , 111, 115
 - $\theta_{\text{data}}^{\mathcal{K}}$, 115
 - $\theta_{\text{data}}^{\mathcal{K}}$, 111
 - double null parametrisation
 - $i_{\mathcal{K}}$, 109
- parameters
 - U_{-2} , 42
 - V_3 , 109
 - V_{-2} , 42
- sets
 - $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{K}}(V_3)$, spacetime domain, 109
 - $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}}(V_3)$, coordinate domain, 109
- Kerr metric
 - M_{final} , final mass parameter, 19
 - M_{init} , mass parameter associated to initial data, 19
 - Δ , function appearing in Kerr metric, 5
 - ϱ , function appearing in Kerr metric, 5
 - a , Kerr parameter, 1
 - a_{final} , final rotation parameter, 19
 - a_{init} , rotation parameter associated to initial data, 19
 - $g_{a,M}$, 1
 - reference linearised Kerr solution
 - $(\Omega\beta)_{\text{Kerr}}$, 46
 - $(\Omega^{-1}\beta)_{\text{Kerr}}$, 46
 - η_{Kerr} , 46
 - σ_{Kerr} , 46
 - b_{Kerr} , 46
- linearised theory
 - complete solution
 - \mathcal{S} , smooth solution of linearised Einstein equations in double null gauge, 51
 - connection coefficients
 - $\overset{(1)}{\eta}$, 10
 - $(\overset{(1)}{\Omega}\text{tr}\chi)$, 8
 - $(\overset{(1)}{\Omega}\text{tr}\chi)$, 10
 - $\overset{(1)}{\rho}$, 10
 - $\overset{(1)}{\chi}$, 11
 - $\overset{(1)}{\chi}$, 8
 - curvature components
 - $\overset{(1)}{\underline{\alpha}}$, 9
 - $\overset{(1)}{\alpha}$, 8
 - $\overset{(1)}{\beta}$, 8
 - gauge invariant hierarchy
 - $\overset{(1)}{P}$, higher order gauge invariant quantity satisfying Regge–Wheeler equation, 9
 - $\overset{(1)}{P}$, higher order gauge invariant quantity satisfying Regge–Wheeler equation, 9
 - linearised Kerr solutions
 - \mathcal{K} , linearised Kerr solution, 51
 - metric coefficients
 - $\overset{(1)}{\Omega}$, 8
 - $\overset{(1)}{g}$, 8
 - $\overset{(1)}{\chi}$, 8
 - parameters

- \mathbf{m} , linearised Schwarzschild parameter, 8
- pure gauge solutions
 - $f^{(i)}(v, \theta, \phi)$, smooth function generating pure gauge solution in linear theory, 8
 - \mathcal{G} , residual smooth pure gauge solution, 51
- main theorem
 - coordinate domains
 - $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(\infty, M_{\text{final}})$, 132
 - $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\infty, M_{\text{final}})$, 132
 - energies
 - $\mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d,\mathcal{H}^+}]$, energy measuring diffeomorphisms, 131, 133
 - $\mathbb{E}_{u_f}[f_{d,\mathcal{I}^+}]$, energy measuring diffeomorphisms, 131, 133
 - initial data
 - \mathcal{S} , 132
 - parameters
 - $M_f(u_f)$, 132
 - M_{final} , 132
 - M_{init} , 132
 - ε_0 , 132
 - u_f , 132
 - quantities
 - $M(u)$, Bondi mass, 134
 - Σ , 134
 - Σ_+ , 133
 - Ξ , 134
 - \mathbf{A} , 134
 - $\mathbf{P}_{\ell=1}^+$, 133
 - spacetime sets
 - (\mathcal{M}, g) , 132
 - \mathcal{H}^+ , the event horizon of (\mathcal{M}, g) , 133
 - \mathcal{I}^+ , null infinity of (\mathcal{M}, g) , defined as an asymptotic boundary, 133
- multiplier currents
 - T -identity
 - $\mathfrak{F}^T[W]$, 206
 - $\mathfrak{f}_A^T[W]$, 206
 - $\mathfrak{f}_T^T[W]$, 206
 - $\mathfrak{f}_{R^*}^T[W]$, 206
 - Lagrangian identity
 - $\mathfrak{F}_T^h[W]$, 207
 - $\mathfrak{f}_A^h[W]$, 207
 - $\mathfrak{f}_T^h[W]$, 207
 - $\mathfrak{f}_{R^*}^h[W]$, 207
 - $\mathfrak{f}_{bulk}^h[W]$, 207
 - Morawetz identity
 - $\mathfrak{F}^X[W]$, 206
 - $\mathfrak{f}_A^X[W]$, 206
 - $\mathfrak{f}_T^X[W]$, 206
 - $\mathfrak{f}_{R^*}^X[W]$, 206
 - $\mathfrak{f}_{bulk}^X[W]$, 206
- null infinity
 - Σ_+ , final asymptotic shear, 23, 493
 - Ξ , Bondi news, 28, 491
 - Σ , asymptotic shear, 28, 491
 - \underline{N} , rescaled quantity at null infinity, 491
 - $F(\theta)$, total radiation flux to null infinity per unit solid angle, 493
 - H , rescaled quantity at null infinity, 491
 - $M(u)$, Bondi mass, 492
 - Z , rescaled quantity at null infinity, 491
 - \mathbf{A} , rescaled curvature component $\underline{\alpha}$, 28, 491
 - \mathbf{B} , rescaled curvature component $\underline{\beta}$, 28, 491
 - \mathbf{P} , rescaled curvature component $\underline{\rho}$, 28, 491
 - \mathbf{P}^+ , final value of \mathbf{P} (related to centre of mass), 28, 492
 - \mathbf{Q} , rescaled curvature component σ , 28, 491
 - \mathbf{Q}^+ , final value of \mathbf{Q} , 492
- parameters
 - λ^{final} , the parameter value for which convergence to Schwarzschild is proven, 22
- schematic notation
 - I , trace set, 58
 - $T = \Omega \text{tr} \chi - (\Omega \text{tr} \chi)_{\circ}$, 63
 - Γ_p , schematic notation for Ricci coefficients, 14, 56
 - Φ_p , schematic notation denoting either a Ricci coefficient or curvature component, 14, 56
 - $\check{\mathcal{E}}^k(\check{H})$, nonlinear error notation with possible bad metric weights, 61
 - $\check{\mathcal{E}}_p^k(\check{H})$, nonlinear error notation with possible bad metric weights, 61
 - $(\check{\mathfrak{D}}^{k+1}\mathbf{f})^l \cdot G$, schematic notation for products of higher order derivatives of f , 83
 - $(\check{\mathfrak{D}}^{k+1}\mathbf{f}_p)^l \cdot G$, schematic notation for products of higher order derivatives of f with p dependence, 83
 - \mathcal{A}_{R} , differences with linearised Kerr in \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, 129
 - \mathcal{A}_{χ} , differences in \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, 129
 - $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}}$, differences with linearised Kerr in \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, 129
 - $\mathcal{E}^k(H)$, nonlinear error notation for quantities of up to k 'th order, 59
 - $\mathcal{E}_p^k(H)$, nonlinear error notation keeping track of r^p decay, 60
 - $\mathcal{E}^{*k}(H^*)$, nonlinear error notation for components not involving certain terms, 61
 - $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{Df},p}^{1,k}(H, G, K)$, nonlinear error notation associated to f with p dependence, 84
 - $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{Df}}^{1,k}(H, G, K)$, nonlinear error notation associated to f , 84

- $\mathcal{E}_p^{k*}(H^*)$, nonlinear error notation for components not involving certain terms, 61
- $\mathcal{F}^k(G, H, K, L, I, J)$, non-linear error term notation associated to f and geometric quantities of the two teleological gauges, 182
- $\mathcal{F}_1^{lin}[W]$, linear error term associated to tensorial wave equations of Type 1, 195
- $\mathcal{F}_2^{lin}[W]$, linear error term associated to tensorial wave equations of Type 2, 195
- $\mathcal{F}_{3k}^{lin}[W]$, linear error term associated to tensorial wave equations of Type 3, 195
- $\mathcal{F}_{4k,l}^{lin}[W]$, linear error term associated to tensorial wave equations of Type 4, 195
- $\mathcal{F}_1^{nlin}[W]$, non-linear error term associated to tensorial wave equations of Type 1, 195
- $\mathcal{F}_2^{nlin}[W]$, non-linear error term associated to tensorial wave equations of Type 2, 195
- $\mathcal{F}_{3k}^{nlin}[W]$, non-linear error term associated to tensorial wave equations of Type 3, 195
- $\mathcal{F}_{4k,l}^{nlin}[W]$, non-linear error term associated to tensorial wave equations of Type 4, 195
- \mathcal{R}_p , schematic notation for curvature components, 14, 56
- $\omega - \omega_\circ = \Omega\hat{\omega} - (\Omega\hat{\omega})_\circ$, 63
- $\underline{T} = \frac{tr\chi}{\Omega} - \frac{tr\chi_\circ}{\Omega_\circ}$, 63
- $\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}_\circ = \Omega\underline{\hat{\omega}} - (\Omega\underline{\hat{\omega}})_\circ$, 63
- $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}\mathbf{f}_p$, schematic notation for first order derivatives of f , 82
- $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{k+1}\mathbf{f} \cdot (i, \gamma)$, schematic notation for higher order derivatives of f , 82
- $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{k+1}\mathbf{f}_p \cdot (i, \gamma)$, schematic notation for higher order derivatives of f showing p dependence, 83
- h , admissible coefficient function, 57
- p , subscript related to r^p weights, 14, 56
- w_s , r -weight, 126
- Schwarzschild background
 - change of coordinates
 - ι_M , map from Eddington–Finkelstein to Kruskal, 40
 - $v(r', u)$, 40
 - connection coefficients
 - $(\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ,M}$, 39
 - $(\Omega\hat{\omega})_{\circ,M}$, 39
 - $(\Omega tr\chi)_{\circ,M}$, 39
 - $(\Omega tr\chi)_{\circ,M}$, 39
 - $(\Omega tr\chi)_\circ$, 23
 - $(\Omega^{-1} tr\chi)_\circ$, 23
 - coordinates
 - U , retarded Kruskal null coordinate, 4, 40
 - V , advanced Kruskal null coordinate, 4, 40
 - u , retarded Eddington–Finkelstein coordinate, 39
 - v , advanced Eddington–Finkelstein coordinate, 39
 - curvature components
 - $K_{\circ,M}$, 40
 - $\rho_{\circ,M}$, 40
 - metric
 - $\Omega_{\circ,M,\mathcal{K}}^2$, metric component in Kruskal coordinates, 40
 - $\Omega_{\circ,M}^2$, metric component, 39
 - $\Omega_{\mathcal{K}}^2$, metric component in Kruskal coordinates, 4
 - \check{r} , not a Schwarzschild background quantity, 48
 - g_M , Schwarzschild metric, 1
 - $g_{\circ,M,\mathcal{K}}$, Schwarzschild metric in Kruskal coordinates, 40
 - $g_{\circ,M}$, Schwarzschild metric, 39
 - r , area radius function, 1
 - r_M , area radius function, 39
 - $r_{M,\mathcal{K}}$, area radius function of Kruskal coordinates, 40
 - parameters
 - M , mass parameter, 1, 39
 - M_{final} , final mass parameter, 6
 - M_{init} , mass parameter associated to initial data, 6
 - sets
 - \mathcal{H}^+ , the event horizon, 1
 - \mathcal{I}^+ , future null infinity, 1
 - $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Lemaître}}$, the Lemaître manifold, 4
 - $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{EF}}$, domain of Eddington–Finkelstein double null coordinates, 39
 - $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{K}}$, domain of Kruskal normalised double null coordinates, 40
 - $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{EF}}$, underlying Eddington–Finkelstein manifold, 39
 - $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{K}}$, underlying Kruskal manifold, 40
 - spacetime subsets
 - $(\mathcal{M}(\lambda), g(\lambda))$, the maximal Cauchy development of initial data $\mathcal{S}_0(\lambda)$, 22
 - C_{u_f} , 118
 - \mathcal{B} , timelike boundary for energy estimates, 25
 - \mathcal{D} , 118
 - \mathcal{M} , maximal Cauchy development manifold, 6
 - \mathcal{R} , subregion of \mathcal{M} for which stability holds, 6
 - sphere
 - \hat{g} , standard metric on \mathbb{S}^2 , 33
 - coordinates
 - \hat{x} , standard isothermal coordinate, 90
 - \hat{y} , standard isothermal coordinate, 90
 - $\hat{\phi}$, standard spherical coordinate, 33
 - $\hat{\theta}$, standard spherical coordinate, 33
 - θ^A , general local coordinates, 33
 - \tilde{x}' , southern canonical coordinate, 95

- \tilde{y}' , southern canonical coordinate, 95
- x , canonical coordinate, 92
- y , canonical coordinate, 92
- \tilde{x} , standard southern isothermal coordinate, 90
- \tilde{y}' , standard southern isothermal coordinate, 90
- $\tilde{\phi}'$, standard southern spherical coordinate, 90
- $\tilde{\theta}'$, standard southern spherical coordinate, 90
- manifold
 - S , manifold diffeomorphic to \mathbb{S}^2 , 88
 - \mathbb{S}^2 , standard sphere in \mathbb{R}^3 , 33
- metric
 - G , metric function in geodesic polar coordinates, 91
 - G' , metric function in southern geodesic polar coordinates, 91
 - K , Gauss curvature of h , 88
 - λ , conformal factor in standard isothermal coordinates, 90
 - γ , standard metric on \mathbb{S}^2 , 4
 - h , metric close to standard spherical metric, 88
- norms
 - (a, b) , L^2 inner product used, 43
 - $d\theta$, volume form used in integration, 43
- spherical harmonics
 - Y_0^0 , $\ell = 0$ spherical harmonic, 45
 - Y_m^1 , $m = -1, 0, 1$, $\ell = 1$ spherical harmonics, 8, 45
 - \mathcal{Y}_0 , space of $\ell = 0$ spherical harmonics, 44
 - \mathcal{Y}_1 , space of $\ell = 1$ spherical harmonics, 44
 - \tilde{Y}_m^ℓ , round spherical harmonics, 45
 - $\xi_{\ell=1}$, projection to $\ell = 1$ for S 1-forms, 44
 - $\xi_{\ell \geq 2}$, projection to $\ell \geq 2$ for S 1-forms, 44
 - c_f , $\ell = 0$ coefficient of f in spherical harmonic expansion, 45
 - c_f^m , $m = -1, 0, 1$, $\ell = 1$ coefficients of f in spherical harmonic expansion, 45
 - $f_{\ell=0}$, projection to $\ell = 0$, 44
 - $f_{\ell=1}$, projection to $\ell = 1$, 44
 - $f_{\ell \geq 2}$, projection to $\ell \geq 2$, 44
- teleological \mathcal{H}^+ gauge
 - change of gauge
 - $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$, change from teleological \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, 116
 - coordinates
 - $U_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, Kruskalised retarded null coordinate of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, 115
 - $V_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, Kruskalised advanced null coordinate of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, 115
 - $\theta_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 115
 - $u_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, retarded null coordinate of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, 23, 115
 - $v_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, advanced null coordinate of the \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, 23, 115
 - double null parametrisation
 - $i_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{K}}$, Kruskalised double null parametrisation, 115
 - $i_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 114
 - functions
 - $r_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 116
 - parameters
 - $J_{\mathcal{H}^+}^m$, $m = -1, 0, 1$, associated Kerr parameters, 53
 - M_f reference Schwarzschild parameter, 52
 - M_f^0 , 118
 - R , 52
 - U_f , 54
 - u_0 , 42, 52
 - u_f , final retarded time parameter, 52
 - u_f^0 , 118
 - v_{-1} , 42, 52
 - $v_1 = v_1(u_f, \lambda)$, 42, 179
 - v_3 , 42
 - rescaled quantities
 - $\underline{A}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, rescaled version of $\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 125
 - $\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, rescaled version of $\psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 125
 - $\underline{\Psi}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, rescaled version of $\underline{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 124
 - $A_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, rescaled version of $\alpha_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 125
 - $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, rescaled version of $\psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 125
 - $\Psi_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, rescaled version of $P_{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 124
 - sets
 - $C_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 115
 - $S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 115
 - $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 115
 - $\check{\underline{C}}_v^{\mathcal{H}^+}(u)$, truncated ingoing null cone for energy estimates, 202
 - $\check{C}_u^{\mathcal{H}^+}(v)$, truncated outgoing null cone for energy estimates, 202
 - $\mathcal{D}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, spacetime domain, 114
 - $\mathcal{D}_{r \leq s}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, 116
 - $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{H}^+}$, truncated domain for energy estimates, 202
 - $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(U_f)$, Kruskalised coordinate domain, 54
 - $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, M_f)$, coordinate domain, 52
 - $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, \delta_1)$, extended coordinates domain, 415
 - $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{H}^+}(u_f, \delta_1)$, extended coordinates domain, 415
- teleological \mathcal{I}^+ gauge
 - change of gauge
 - $f_{\mathcal{H}^+, \mathcal{I}^+}$, change to teleological \mathcal{H}^+ gauge, 116
 - coordinates
 - $\theta_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 115
 - $u_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, retarded null coordinate of the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, 23, 115

- $v_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, advanced null coordinate of the \mathcal{I}^+ gauge, 23, 115
- double null parametrisation
 - $i_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 114
- functions
 - $r_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 116
- parameters
 - $J_{\mathcal{I}^+}^m$, $m = -1, 0, 1$, associated Kerr parameters, 51
 - M_f , reference Schwarzschild parameter, 48
 - M_f^0 , 118
 - δ , 114
 - ϵ , 114
 - u_f , final retarded time parameter, 48
 - u_f^0 , 118
 - u_{-1} , 42
 - u_1 , 42, 178
 - u_2 , 42
 - v_∞ , final advanced time parameter, 114
- rescaled quantities
 - $\underline{A}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, rescaled version of $\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 125
 - $\underline{\Pi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, rescaled version of $\psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 125
 - $\check{\Psi}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, rescaled version of $\check{P}_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 124
 - $A_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, rescaled version of $\alpha_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 125
 - $\Pi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, rescaled version of $\psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 125
 - $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, rescaled version of $P_{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 124
- sets
 - $C_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 115
 - $S_{u,v}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 115
 - $\underline{C}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 115
 - $\check{\underline{C}}_v^{\mathcal{I}^+}(u)$, truncated ingoing null cone for energy estimates, 202
 - $\check{\underline{C}}_u^{\mathcal{I}^+}(v)$, truncated outgoing null cone for energy estimates, 202
 - $\mathcal{D}_{u_f}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, spacetime domain, 114
 - $\mathcal{D}_{r \geq s}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 116
 - $\mathcal{D}_{s \leq r \leq \bar{s}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, 116
 - $\check{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{I}^+}$, truncated domain for energy estimates, 202
 - $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, M_f, v_\infty)$, coordinate domain, 49
 - $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, \delta_1)$, extended coordinates domain, 414
 - $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f)$, domain of parametrisation, 49
 - $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(u_f, \delta_1)$, extended domain of parametrisation, 414

Bibliography

- [AAG18a] Y. Angelopoulos, S. Aretakis, and D. Gajic. Horizon hair of extremal black holes and measurements at null infinity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 121:131102, Sep 2018.
- [AAG18b] Y. Angelopoulos, S. Aretakis, and D. Gajic. Late-time asymptotics for the wave equation on spherically symmetric, stationary spacetimes. *Adv. Math.*, 323:529–621, 2018.
- [AAG20] Y. Angelopoulos, S. Aretakis, and D. Gajic. Nonlinear scalar perturbations of extremal Reissner–Nordström spacetimes. *Ann. PDE*, 6(2):Paper No. 12, 124, 2020.
- [AAG21a] Y. Angelopoulos, S. Aretakis, and D. Gajic. Late-time tails and mode coupling of linear waves on Kerr spacetimes. *arXiv:2102.11884*, preprint, 2021.
- [AAG21b] Y. Angelopoulos, S. Aretakis, and D. Gajic. Price’s law and precise late-time asymptotics for subextremal Reissner–Nordström black holes. *arXiv:2102.11888*, preprint, 2021.
- [ABBM19] L. Andersson, T. Baeckdahl, P. Blue, and S. Ma. Stability for linearized gravity on the Kerr spacetime. *arXiv:1903.03859*, preprint, 2019.
- [AF20] S. Alexakis and G. Fournodavlos. Stable space-like singularity formation for axi-symmetric and polarized near-Schwarzschild black hole interiors. *arXiv:2004.00692*, preprint, 2020.
- [Are15] S. Aretakis. Horizon instability of extremal black holes. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 19(3):507–530, 2015.
- [BCS05] P. Bizoń, T. Chmaj, and B. G. Schmidt. Critical behavior in vacuum gravitational collapse in $4 + 1$ dimensions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 95:071102, Aug 2005.
- [Blu08] P. Blue. Decay of the Maxwell field on the Schwarzschild manifold. *J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ.*, 5(4):807–856, 2008.
- [BP73] J. M. Bardeen and W. H. Press. Radiation fields in the Schwarzschild background. *J. Math. Phys.*, 14(1):7–19, 1973.
- [BR11] P. Bizoń and A. Rostworowski. Weakly turbulent instability of anti-de Sitter spacetime. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 107(3):031102, 2011.
- [BS05] P. Blue and A. Soffer. The wave equation on the Schwarzschild metric. II: Local decay for the spin 2 Regge Wheeler equation. *J. Math. Phys.*, 46:012502, 2005. [Erratum: arXiv:gr-qc/0608073].
- [BS06] P. Blue and J. Sterbenz. Uniform decay of local energy and the semi-linear wave equation on Schwarzschild space. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 268 (2):481–504, 2006.
- [BvdBM62] H. Bondi, M. G. J. van der Burg, and A. W. K. Metzner. Gravitational waves in general relativity. VII. Waves from axi-symmetric isolated systems. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A*, 269:21–52, 1962.
- [CB73] Y. Choquet-Bruhat. Un théorème d’instabilité pour certaines équations hyperboliques non linéaires. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, 276:A281–A284, 1973.

- [CBG69] Y. Choquet-Bruhat and R. P. Geroch. Global aspects of the Cauchy problem in General Relativity. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 14:329–335, 1969.
- [Cha75] S. Chandrasekhar. On the equations governing the perturbations of the Schwarzschild black hole. *Proc. Roy. Soc. A*, 343(1634):289–298, 1975.
- [Chr87] D. Christodoulou. A mathematical theory of gravitational collapse. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 109(4):613–647, 1987.
- [Chr91] D. Christodoulou. Nonlinear nature of gravitation and gravitational-wave experiments. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 67:1486–1489, Sep 1991.
- [Chr99] D. Christodoulou. On the global initial value problem and the issue of singularities. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 16:A23–A35, 1999.
- [Chr02] D. Christodoulou. *The global initial value problem in general relativity*, pages 44–54. World Scientific Publishing Company, 2002.
- [Chr09] D. Christodoulou. *The formation of black holes in general relativity*. EMS Monographs in Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2009.
- [CK90] D. Christodoulou and S. Klainerman. Asymptotic properties of linear field equations in Minkowski space. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 43(2):137–199, 1990.
- [CK93] D. Christodoulou and S. Klainerman. *The global nonlinear stability of the Minkowski space*, volume 41 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993.
- [Daf05] M. Dafermos. The interior of charged black holes and the problem of uniqueness in general relativity. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 58(4):445–504, 2005.
- [DH06a] M. Dafermos and G. Holzegel. Dynamic instability of solitons in $4 + 1$ -dimensional gravity with negative cosmological constant. (*unpublished*), 2006. See <https://www.dpmms.cam.ac.uk/~md384/ADSinstability.pdf>.
- [DH06b] M. Dafermos and G. Holzegel. On the nonlinear stability of higher dimensional triaxial Bianchi-IX black holes. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 10(4):503–523, 2006.
- [DHR19] M. Dafermos, G. Holzegel, and I. Rodnianski. Boundedness and decay for the Teukolsky equation on Kerr spacetimes I: The case $|a| \ll M$. *Ann. PDE*, 5(1):Paper No. 2, 118, 2019.
- [DHR13] M. Dafermos, G. Holzegel, and I. Rodnianski. A scattering theory construction of dynamical vacuum black holes. *arXiv:1306.5364*, preprint, 2013. to appear in J. Diff. Geom.
- [DHR] M. Dafermos, G. Holzegel, and I. Rodnianski. The linear stability of the Schwarzschild solution to gravitational perturbations. *Acta Math.*, 222(1):1–214, 2019.
- [DL17] M. Dafermos and J. Luk. The interior of dynamical vacuum black holes I: The C^0 -stability of the Kerr Cauchy horizon. *arXiv:1710.01722*, preprint, 2017.
- [DL21a] M. Dafermos and J. Luk. The interior of dynamical vacuum black holes II: event horizon data and the stability of the red-shift region. *in preparation*, 2021.
- [DL21b] M. Dafermos and J. Luk. The interior of dynamical vacuum black holes III: The C^0 -stability of the bifurcation sphere of the Kerr Cauchy horizon. *in preparation*, 2021.
- [DR05] M. Dafermos and I. Rodnianski. A proof of Price’s law for the collapse of self-gravitating scalar field. *Invent. Math.*, 162:381–457, 2005.
- [DR09a] M. Dafermos and I. Rodnianski. A new physical-space approach to decay for the wave equation with applications to black hole spacetimes. In P. Exner, editor, *XVIIth International Congress on Mathematical Physics*, pages 421–433. World Scientific, London, 2009.

- [DR09b] M. Dafermos and I. Rodnianski. The red-shift effect and radiation decay on black hole spacetimes. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 62:859–919, 2009.
- [DR13] M. Dafermos and I. Rodnianski. Lectures on black holes and linear waves. In *Evolution equations, Clay Mathematics Proceedings, Vol. 17*, pages 97–205. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2013.
- [DRSR16] M. Dafermos, I. Rodnianski, and Y. Shlapentokh-Rothman. Decay for solutions of the wave equation on Kerr exterior spacetimes III: The full subextremal case $|a| < M$. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 183(3):787–913, 2016.
- [DRSR18] M. Dafermos, I. Rodnianski, and Y. Shlapentokh-Rothman. A scattering theory for the wave equation on Kerr black hole exteriors. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 51(2):371–486, 2018.
- [Edd24] A. S. Eddington. A Comparison of Whitehead’s and Einstein’s Formulæ. *Nature*, 113:192, February 1924.
- [Ein15] A. Einstein. Die Feldgleichungen der Gravitation. *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin)*, Seite 844–847., 1915.
- [Ein18] A. Einstein. Über Gravitationswellen. *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin)*, Seite 154–167., 1918.
- [FB52] Y. Fourès-Bruhat. Théorème d’existence pour certains systèmes d’équations aux dérivées partielles non linéaires. *Acta Math.*, 88:141–225, 1952.
- [Fin58] D. Finkelstein. Past-future asymmetry of the gravitational field of a point particle. *Phys. Rev.*, 110:965–967, May 1958.
- [Fou16] G. Fournodavlos. On the backward stability of the Schwarzschild black hole singularity. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 345(3):923–971, 2016.
- [Fri86] H. Friedrich. On the existence of n -geodesically complete or future complete solutions of Einstein’s field equations with smooth asymptotic structure. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 107(4):587–609, 1986.
- [Gaj17] D. Gajic. Linear waves in the interior of extremal black holes I. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 353(2):717–770, 2017.
- [Gio20] E. Giorgi. The linear stability of Reissner-Nordström spacetime: the full subextremal range $|Q| < M$. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 380(3):1313–1360, 2020.
- [GKP72] R. Geroch, E. H. Kronheimer, and R. Penrose. Ideal points in space-time. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A.*, 327(1571):545–567, 1972.
- [GL19] D. Gajic and J. Luk. The interior of dynamical extremal black holes in spherical symmetry. *Pure Appl. Anal.*, 1(2):263–326, 2019.
- [GM14] E. Gallo and O. M. Moreschi. Intrinsic angular momentum for radiating spacetimes which agrees with the Komar integral in the axisymmetric case. *Phys. Rev. D*, 89:084009, Apr 2014.
- [Haw67] S. Hawking. The occurrence of singularities in cosmology. III. Causality and singularities. *Proc. Royal Soc. A*, 300(1461):187–201, 1967.
- [HHV21] D. Häfner, P. Hintz, and A. Vasy. Linear stability of slowly rotating Kerr black holes. *Invent. Math.*, 223(3):1227–1406, 2021.
- [Hin20] P. Hintz. A sharp version of Price’s law for wave decay on asymptotically flat spacetimes. *arXiv:2004.01664, preprint*, 2020.
- [HKW17] P.-K. Hung, J. Keller, and M.-T. Wang. Linear Stability of Schwarzschild Spacetime: The Cauchy Problem of Metric Coefficients. *arXiv:1702.02843, preprint*, 2017.

- [Hol10a] G. Holzegel. Stability and decay rates for the five-dimensional Schwarzschild metric under biaxial perturbations. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 14(5):1245–1372, 2010.
- [Hol10b] G. Holzegel. Ultimately Schwarzschild spacetimes and the black hole stability problem. *arXiv:1010.3216, preprint*, 2010.
- [Hol16] G. Holzegel. Conservation laws and flux bounds for gravitational perturbations of the Schwarzschild metric. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 33(20):205004, 2016.
- [HS13] G. Holzegel and J. Smulevici. Decay properties of Klein–Gordon fields on Kerr–AdS spacetimes. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 66(11):1751–1802, 2013.
- [HS14] G. Holzegel and J. Smulevici. Quasimodes and a lower bound on the uniform energy decay rate for Kerr–AdS spacetimes. *Anal. PDE*, 7(5):1057–1090, 2014.
- [Hun18] P.-K. Hung. The linear stability of the Schwarzschild spacetime in the harmonic gauge: odd part. *arXiv:1803.03881, preprint*, 2018.
- [HV18] P. Hintz and A. Vasy. The global non-linear stability of the Kerr–de Sitter family of black holes. *Acta Math.*, 220(1):1–206, 2018.
- [HV20] P. Hintz and A. Vasy. Stability of Minkowski space and polyhomogeneity of the metric. *Ann. PDE*, 6(1):Paper No. 2, 146, 2020.
- [IK15] A. D. Ionescu and S. Klainerman. On the global stability of the wave-map equation in Kerr spaces with small angular momentum. *Annals of PDE*, 1(1):1, Sep 2015.
- [Jeb21] J. T. Jebsen. Über die allgemeinen kugelsymmetrischen Lösungen der Einsteinschen Gravitationsgleichungen im Vakuum. *Ark. Mat. Astr. Fys.*, 15:1–9, 1921.
- [Joh81] F. John. Blow-up for quasilinear wave equations in three space dimensions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 34(1):29–51, 1981.
- [Joh19] T. W. Johnson. The linear stability of the Schwarzschild solution to gravitational perturbations in the generalised wave gauge. *Ann. PDE*, 5(2):Paper No. 13, 92, 2019.
- [Kei18] J. Keir. The weak null condition and global existence using the p-weighted energy method. *arXiv:1808.09982, preprint*, 2018.
- [Ker63] R. Kerr. Gravitational field of a spinning mass as an example of algebraically special metrics. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 11 (5):237–238, 1963.
- [Kla] S. Klainerman. Brief history of the vector field method. <https://web.math.princeton.edu/~seri/homepage/papers/John2010.pdf>.
- [Kla80] S. Klainerman. Global existence for nonlinear wave equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 33(1):43–101, 1980.
- [Kla86] S. 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.
- [Kli59] W. Klingenberg. Contributions to riemannian geometry in the large. *Ann. of Math*, 69(3):654–666, 1959.
- [KLR14] S. Klainerman, J. Luk, and I. Rodnianski. A fully anisotropic mechanism for formation of trapped surfaces in vacuum. *Invent. Math.*, 198(1):1–26, 2014.
- [KN03] S. Klainerman and F. Nicolò. *The evolution problem in general relativity*, volume 25 of *Progress in Mathematical Physics*. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2003.

- [Kom59] A. Komar. Covariant conservation laws in general relativity. *Phys. Rev.*, 113:934–936, Feb 1959.
- [Kru60] M. D. Kruskal. Maximal extension of Schwarzschild metric. *Phys. Rev. (2)*, 119:1743–1745, 1960.
- [KS18] S. Klainerman and J. Szeftel. Global nonlinear stability of Schwarzschild spacetime under polarized perturbations. *arXiv:1711.07597v2, preprint*, 2018.
- [Lem33] G. Lemaître. L’Univers en expansion. *Annales de la Société Scientifique de Bruxelles*, 53, 1933.
- [Lin17] H. Lindblad. On the asymptotic behavior of solutions to the Einstein vacuum equations in wave coordinates. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 353(1):135–184, 2017.
- [LMRT13] J. Lucietti, K. Murata, H. S. Reall, and N. Tanahashi. On the horizon instability of an extreme Reissner-Nordström black hole. *J. High Energy Phys.*, (3):035, front matter+43, 2013.
- [LO19a] J. Luk and S.-J. Oh. Strong cosmic censorship in spherical symmetry for two-ended asymptotically flat initial data I. The interior of the black hole region. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 190(1):1–111, 2019.
- [LO19b] J. Luk and S.-J. Oh. Strong cosmic censorship in spherical symmetry for two-ended asymptotically flat initial data II: the exterior of the black hole region. *Ann. PDE*, 5(1):Paper No. 6, 194, 2019.
- [Loi09] J. Loizelet. Solutions globales des équations d’Einstein-Maxwell. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6)*, 18(3):565–610, 2009.
- [LR03] H. Lindblad and I. Rodnianski. The weak null condition for Einstein’s equations. *C. R. Math.*, 336(11):901–906, 2003.
- [LR05] H. Lindblad and I. Rodnianski. Global existence for the Einstein vacuum equations in wave coordinates. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 256(1):43–110, 2005.
- [LR10] H. Lindblad and I. Rodnianski. The global stability of Minkowski space-time in harmonic gauge. *Ann. of Math.*, 171(3):1401–1477, 2010.
- [LR12] J. Lucietti and H. S. Reall. Gravitational instability of an extreme kerr black hole. *Phys. Rev. D*, 86:104030, Nov 2012.
- [LR17] J. Luk and I. Rodnianski. Nonlinear interaction of impulsive gravitational waves for the vacuum Einstein equations. *Camb. J. Math.*, 5(4):435–570, 2017.
- [LS17] H. Lindblad and V. Schlue. Scattering from infinity for semilinear models of Einstein’s equations satisfying the weak null condition. *arXiv:1711.00822, preprint*, November 2017.
- [LT18] H. Lindblad and M. Tohaneanu. Global existence for quasilinear wave equations close to Schwarzschild. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 43(6):893–944, 2018.
- [Luk12] J. Luk. On the local existence for the characteristic initial value problem in general relativity. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (20):4625–4678, 2012.
- [Luk13] J. Luk. The null condition and global existence for nonlinear wave equations on slowly rotating Kerr spacetimes. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 15(5):1629–1700, 2013.
- [Luk18] J. Luk. Weak null singularities in general relativity. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 31(1):1–63, 2018.
- [Ma20a] S. Ma. Uniform energy bound and Morawetz estimate for extreme components of spin fields in the exterior of a slowly rotating Kerr black hole I: Maxwell field. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 21(3):815–863, 2020.

- [Ma20b] S. Ma. Uniform energy bound and Morawetz estimate for extreme components of spin fields in the exterior of a slowly rotating Kerr black hole II: Linearized gravity. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 377(3):2489–2551, 2020.
- [Mas20] H. Masaoood. A scattering theory for linearised gravity on the exterior of the Schwarzschild black hole I: The Teukolsky equations. *arXiv:2007.13658, preprint*, 2020.
- [Mos16] G. Moschidis. The r^p -weighted energy method of Dafermos and Rodnianski in general asymptotically flat spacetimes and applications. *Annals of PDE*, 2(1):6, May 2016.
- [Mos18] G. Moschidis. A proof of the instability of AdS for the Einstein–massless Vlasov system. *arXiv:1812.04268, preprint*, 2018.
- [MRT13] K. Murata, H. S. Reall, and N. Tanahashi. What happens at the horizon(s) of an extreme black hole? *Classical Quantum Gravity*, 30(23):235007, 36, 2013.
- [MTW17] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler. *Gravitation*. Princeton University Press, 2017.
- [Nir74] L. Nirenberg. *Topics in nonlinear functional analysis*. Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, New York, 1974. With a chapter by E. Zehnder, Notes by R. A. Artino, Lecture Notes, 1973–1974.
- [NP62] E. Newman and R. Penrose. An approach to gravitational radiation by a method of spin coefficients. *J. Math. Phys.*, 3(3):566–578, 1962.
- [NP66] E. T. Newman and R. Penrose. Note on the bondi-metzner-sachs group. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 7(5):863–870, 1966.
- [OS20] J. Oliver and J. Sterbenz. A vector field method for radiating black hole spacetimes. *Anal. PDE*, 13(1):29–92, 2020.
- [Pas19a] F. Pasqualotto. Nonlinear stability for the Maxwell-Born-Infeld system on a Schwarzschild background. *Ann. PDE*, 5(2):Paper No. 19, 172, 2019.
- [Pas19b] F. Pasqualotto. The spin ± 1 Teukolsky equations and the Maxwell system on Schwarzschild. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 20(4):1263–1323, 2019.
- [PD68] R. Penrose and C. DeWitt. Battelle rencontres. *New York*, page 222, 1968.
- [Pen65] R. Penrose. Gravitational collapse and space-time singularities. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 14:57–59, Jan 1965.
- [PI98] F. Pretorius and W. Israel. Quasispherical light cones of the Kerr geometry. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 15:2289–2301, 1998.
- [PR84] R. Penrose and W. Rindler. *Spinors and space-time: Volume 2, Spinor and twistor methods in space-time geometry*, volume 2. Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- [Ren90] A. D. Rendall. Reduction of the characteristic initial value problem to the Cauchy problem and its applications to the Einstein equations. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A*, 427(1872):221–239, 1990.
- [RW57] T. Regge and J. A. Wheeler. Stability of a Schwarzschild Singularity. *Phys. Rev.*, 108:1063–1069, 1957.
- [Sac62] R. Sachs. Asymptotic symmetries in gravitational theory. *Phys. Rev.*, 128:2851–2864, Dec 1962.
- [Sbi16] J. Sbierski. On the existence of a maximal Cauchy development for the Einstein equations: a deznification. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 17(2):301–329, 2016.
- [Sbi18] J. Sbierski. The C_0 -inextendibility of the Schwarzschild spacetime and the spacelike diameter in Lorentzian geometry. *J. Differential Geom.*, 108(2):319–378, 02 2018.

- [Sch16] K. Schwarzschild. Über das Gravitationsfeld eines Massenpunktes nach der Einsteinschen Theorie. *Sitzungsber. K. Preuss. Akad. Wiss.*, 1:189–196, 1916.
- [SR15] Y. Shlapentokh-Rothman. Quantitative mode stability for the wave equation on the Kerr space-time. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 16(1):289–345, Jan 2015.
- [ST15] J. Sterbenz and D. Tataru. Local energy decay for Maxwell fields Part I: Spherically symmetric black-hole backgrounds. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, (11):3298–3342, 2015.
- [Tay17] M. Taylor. The global nonlinear stability of Minkowski space for the massless Einstein–Vlasov system. *Ann. PDE*, 3(1):Paper No. 9, 177, 2017.
- [TdC20] R. Teixeira da Costa. Mode Stability for the Teukolsky Equation on Extremal and Subextremal Kerr Spacetimes. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 378(1):705–781, 2020.
- [TdCSR20] R. Teixeira da Costa and Y. Shlapentokh-Rothman. Boundedness and decay for the Teukolsky equation on Kerr in the full subextremal range $|a| < M$: frequency space analysis. *arXiv:2007.07211, preprint*, 2020.
- [Teu73] S. A. Teukolsky. Perturbations of a rotating black hole. I. Fundamental equations for gravitational, electromagnetic, and neutrino-field perturbations. *Astrophysical J.*, 185:635–648, 1973.
- [VdM18] M. Van de Moortel. Stability and instability of the sub-extremal Reissner-Nordström black hole interior for the Einstein-Maxwell-Klein-Gordon equations in spherical symmetry. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 360(1):103–168, 2018.
- [Wal78] R. M. Wald. Construction of solutions of gravitational, electromagnetic, or other perturbation equations from solutions of decoupled equations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 41(4):203, 1978.
- [Wal84] R. M. Wald. *General Relativity*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1984.
- [Whi89] B. F. Whiting. Mode Stability of the Kerr black hole. *J. Math. Phys.*, 30:1301–1306, 1989.
- [Yan13] S. Yang. Global solutions of nonlinear wave equations in time dependent inhomogeneous media. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 209(2):683–728, Aug 2013.