

L^p -ESTIMATE OF SCHRÖDINGER MAXIMAL FUNCTION IN HIGHER DIMENSIONS

ZHENBIN CAO, CHANGXING MIAO AND MENG WANG

ABSTRACT. Almost everywhere convergence on the solution of Schrödinger equation is an important problem raised by Carleson in harmonic analysis. In recent years, this problem was essentially solved by building the sharp L^p -estimate of Schrödinger maximal function. Du-Guth-Li in [7] proved the sharp L^p -estimates for all $p \geq 2$ in \mathbb{R}^{2+1} . Du-Zhang in [12] proved the sharp L^2 -estimate in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} with $n \geq 3$, but for $p > 2$ the sharp L^p -estimate of Schrödinger maximal function is still unknown. In this paper, we obtain partial results on this problem by using polynomial partitioning and refined Strichartz estimates.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the free Schrödinger equation:

$$\begin{cases} iu_t - \Delta u = 0, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}, \\ u(x, 0) = f(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Its solution is given by

$$e^{it\Delta} f(x) = (2\pi)^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{i(x \cdot \xi + t|\xi|^2)} \widehat{f}(\xi) d\xi,$$

where \widehat{f} denotes the Fourier transform of the function f .

One of the fundamental problems in this setting is that of determining the optimal s such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} e^{it\Delta} f(x) = f(x), \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad (1.2)$$

for all $f \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$. In 1979, Carleson [4] first purposed this problem and proved that the almost everywhere convergence (1.2) holds for any $f \in H^{1/4}(\mathbb{R})$ by making use of the stationary phase method. A year later, Dahberg and Kenig in [9] were able to prove the condition $s \geq \frac{1}{4}$ given by Carleson is sharp, showing that the existence of functions in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ with $s < \frac{1}{4}$ for which the convergence fails. For the situation in higher dimensions, many authors such as Carbery in [3] and Cowling in [5] studied this problem, and in 1987 Sjölin in [21] and Vega in [25] proved independently that (1.2) holds if $s > \frac{1}{2}$ no matter the dimension. After that some important positive results in higher dimensions have been obtained by many authors [1, 6, 8, 18, 19, 20]. More recently, Bourgain in [2]

Date: February 2, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 42B25, 35B41.

Key words and phrases. Schrödinger maximal function, k -Broad norm, polynomial partitioning, refined Strichartz estimate.

gave counterexamples showing that (1.2) can fail if $s < \frac{n}{2(n+1)}$. Du-Guth-Li in [7] and Du-Zhang in [12] improved the sufficient condition to the almost sharp range $s > \frac{n}{2(n+1)}$ when $n = 2$ and $n \geq 3$, respectively. Hence, the Carleson problem was essentially solved except the endpoint.

Now, we recall the main ideas in [7, 12]. Suppose that f satisfies $\text{supp} \widehat{f} \subset B^n(0, 1)$. When $n = 2$, Du-Guth-Li in [7] proved the sharp L^3 -estimate of Schrödinger maximal function:

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t \leq R} |e^{it\Delta} f| \right\|_{L^3(B^2(0, R))} \lesssim R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}, \quad \forall \epsilon > 0. \quad (1.3)$$

By Littlewood-Paley decomposition and parabolic rescaling, they applied (1.3) to derive that (1.2) holds for $s > 1/3$. On the other hand, using Hölder inequality, one immediately obtains whole sharp L^p -estimates:

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t \leq R} |e^{it\Delta} f| \right\|_{L^p(B^2(0, R))} \lesssim \begin{cases} R^{\frac{2}{p} - \frac{2}{3} + \epsilon} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}, & 2 \leq p < 3, \\ R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}, & p \geq 3. \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

This fact means that $p = 3$ is the minimal number such that

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t \leq R} |e^{it\Delta} f| \right\|_{L^p(B^2(0, R))} \lesssim R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}, \quad \forall \epsilon > 0. \quad (1.5)$$

When $n \geq 3$, Du-Zhang in [12] showed (1.2) holds for $s > \frac{n}{2(n+1)}$ by establishing the sharp L^2 -estimate

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t \leq R} |e^{it\Delta} f| \right\|_{L^2(B^n(0, R))} \lesssim R^{\frac{n}{2(n+1)} + \epsilon} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \quad \forall \epsilon > 0. \quad (1.6)$$

We observe that (1.6) can recover the case of $p = 2$ in (1.4) when $n = 2$. The sharp L^p -estimate of Schrödinger maximal function implies the sharp L^2 -estimate by Hölder inequality, but the reverse is invalid. So Du-Zhang in [12] further raised the problem of identifying the sharp exponent p such that

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t \leq R} |e^{it\Delta} f| \right\|_{L^p(B^n(0, R))} \lesssim R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \quad \forall \epsilon > 0. \quad (1.7)$$

From (1.3), we see that

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t \leq R} |e^{it\Delta} f| \right\|_{L^{\frac{2(n+1)}{n}}(B^n(0, R))} \lesssim R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \quad \forall \epsilon > 0 \quad (1.8)$$

holds when $n = 1, 2$, see [7, 17]. It would be an amazing result if (1.8) holds for higher dimensions, since $p = 2(n+1)/n$ corresponds to the endpoint exponent of $(n+1)$ -dimensional restriction conjecture. Unfortunately, Du-Kim-Wang-Zhang in [10] proved (1.8) fails when $n \geq 3$. More precisely, by searching Bourgain's counterexample in every intermediate dimension in [2], they proved that (1.7) fails if

$$p < p_0 := \max_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{Z} \\ 1 \leq m \leq n}} 2 + \frac{4}{n-1+m+\frac{n}{m}}. \quad (1.9)$$

In particular, (1.8) fails for $n \geq 3$ due to $\frac{2(n+1)}{n} < p_0$. Very recently, Wu in [24] proved that (1.7) holds for

$$p \geq 2 + \frac{4}{n+2-\frac{1}{n}}. \quad (1.10)$$

Our main result in this paper is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $n \geq 2$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \leq k \leq n$. Define*

$$p(k) := \begin{cases} 2 + \frac{4}{n+k+1-\frac{k}{n}}, & 1 \leq k < k_0(n), \\ 2 + \frac{4}{n+\frac{n+2}{k}}, & k_0(n) \leq k < \frac{n+2}{2}, \\ 2 + \frac{4}{n-2+\frac{2n}{k-1}}, & \frac{n+2}{2} \leq k \leq n, \end{cases} \quad (1.11)$$

where $k_0(n)$ denotes the positive root of the equation

$$(n-1)k^2 + kn - (n^2 + 2n) = 0.$$

If p satisfies

$$p \geq \min_{1 \leq k \leq n} p(k), \quad (1.12)$$

then (1.7) holds.

Theorem 1.1 can be reduced to the following result.

Theorem 1.2. *Let p satisfy (1.12). For any $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, there exists a constant C_ϵ such that*

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t \leq R} |e^{it\Delta} f| \right\|_{L^p(B^n(0,R))} \leq C_\epsilon M^{-\epsilon^2} R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2}, \quad \forall M \geq 1 \quad (1.13)$$

for all $R \geq 1$, any $\xi_0 \in B^n(0,1)$, and all f with $\text{supp} \widehat{f} \subset B^n(\xi_0, 1/M)$.

Remark 1.3. *If we choose $\xi_0 = 0$ and $M = 1$, then Theorem 1.2 implies Theorem 1.1. This slight variation of Theorem 1.2 makes scale induction work, for details one can refer to Section 2.*

We firstly recall the k -broad norm $BL_{k,A}^p$ initially defined by Guth in [14]. $BL_{k,A}^p$ -norm has two advantages compared with the classical L^p -norm. The first is that $BL_{k,A}^p$ -norm can lead to the k -linear reduction. Secondly, $\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL_{k,A}^p(B_R)}$ is negligible whenever most of the mass of $e^{it\Delta} f$ is concentrated on an algebraic surface with the dimension less than k , named vanishing property. Guth applied these properties to improve the bound of restriction conjecture in higher dimensions. Motivated by Guth's idea, Du-Li in [11] extended $BL_{k,A}^p$ -norm to a mixed version $BL_{k,A}^{p,\infty}$ -norm for studying L^p -estimate of Schrödinger maximal function. $BL_{k,A}^{p,\infty}$ -norm can also lead to the k -linear reduction. In this paper, we mainly introduce $BL_{2,A}^{p,\infty}$ -norm, since the bilinear reduction is enough to complete our goals. We use $BL_A^{p,\infty}$ to represent $BL_{2,A}^{p,\infty}$ in the whole paper. For more properties one can refer to Section 3.

Let f satisfy $\text{supp}\widehat{f} \subset B^n(\xi_0, 1/M)$, where $\xi_0 \in B^n(0, 1)$ and $M \geq 1$. Decomposing $B^n(\xi_0, 1/M)$ into balls τ of radius $(KM)^{-1}$, where K is a large constant, we have $f = \sum_{\tau} f_{\tau}$ such that each f_{τ} is Fourier supported on τ . Denote

$$G(\tau) = \{G(\xi) \mid \xi \in \tau\}, \quad \text{where } G(\xi) = \frac{(-2\xi, 1)}{|(-2\xi, 1)|}.$$

If $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ is a subspace, we use $\angle(G(\tau), V)$ to be the smallest angle between any non-zero vectors $v \in V$ and $v' \in G(\tau)$.

Next we decompose $B^n(0, R)$ into balls B_K of radius K , and again decompose $[0, R]$ into intervals I_K of length K . For a given positive integer A , we define

$$\mu_{e^{it\Delta}f}(B_K \times I_K) := \min_{V_1, \dots, V_A} \left(\max_{\tau \notin V_a \text{ for all } a} \int_{B_K \times I_K} |e^{it\Delta} f_{\tau}(x)|^p dx dt \right), \quad (1.14)$$

where V_1, \dots, V_A are lines of \mathbb{R}^{n+1} , and $\tau \notin V_a$ means that $\angle(G(\tau), V_a) > (KM)^{-1}$. For any subset $U \subset B_R^* := B^n(0, R) \times [0, R]$, define

$$\|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{BL_A^{p,\infty}(U)}^p := \sum_{B_K \subset B(0,R)} \max_{I_K \subset [0,R]} \frac{|U \cap (B_K \times I_K)|}{|B_K \times I_K|} \mu_{e^{it\Delta}f}(B_K \times I_K). \quad (1.15)$$

We reduce Theorem 1.2 to the following Theorem 1.4, and we will explain how Theorem 1.4 implies Theorem 1.2 in Section 2.

Theorem 1.4. *Let p satisfy (1.12). For any $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, there exist a positive integer A and a constant $C(\epsilon, K)$ such that*

$$\|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{BL_A^{p,\infty}(B_R^*)} \leq C(\epsilon, K) M^{-\epsilon^2} R^{\epsilon} \|f\|_{L^2}, \quad \forall M \geq 1 \quad (1.16)$$

for all $R \geq 1$, any $\xi_0 \in B^n(0, 1)$, and all f with $\text{supp}\widehat{f} \subset B^n(\xi_0, 1/M)$.

Since $BL_A^{p,\infty}$ -norm is not continuous, it is not convenient to use polynomial partitioning's argument. For this purpose, we substitute $BL_A^{p,\infty}$ -norm with $BL_A^{p,q}$ -norm, defined as

$$\|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{BL_A^{p,q}(U)}^p := \sum_{B_K \subset B(0,R)} \left[\sum_{I_K \subset [0,R]} \left(\frac{|U \cap (B_K \times I_K)|}{|B_K \times I_K|} \mu_{e^{it\Delta}f}(B_K \times I_K) \right)^{\frac{q}{p}} \right]^{\frac{p}{q}}, \quad \text{for } q < \infty. \quad (1.17)$$

Since

$$\|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{BL_A^{p,\infty}(B_R^*)} = \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{BL_A^{p,q}(B_R^*)},$$

it suffices to show the following result.

Theorem 1.5. *Let p satisfy (1.12). For any $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, let $0 < \delta \ll \epsilon$, there exist a positive integer A and a constant $C(\epsilon, K)$ such that for any $q > 1/\delta$,*

$$\|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{BL_A^{p,q}(B_R^*)} \leq C(\epsilon, K) M^{-\epsilon^2} R^{\epsilon} \|f\|_{L^2}, \quad \forall M \geq 1 \quad (1.18)$$

for all $R \geq 1$, any $\xi_0 \in B^n(0, 1)$, and all f with $\text{supp}\widehat{f} \subset B^n(\xi_0, 1/M)$.

Now we illustrate our result by contrasting with (1.9) and (1.10). Considering the necessary condition for (1.7)

$$p \geq p_{\text{ness}} := \max_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{Z} \\ 1 \leq m \leq n}} 2 + \frac{4}{n-1+m+\frac{n}{m}},$$

one easily verifies p_{ness} reaches the maximum value at $m = [\sqrt{n}]$ or $m = [\sqrt{n}] + 1$. Then we can rewrite it as

$$p_{\text{ness}} = 2 + \frac{4}{n+2\sqrt{n}+c_n}, \quad |c_n| < 1 \quad \text{when } n \geq 2. \quad (1.19)$$

Let

$$p_{\text{wu}} := 2 + \frac{4}{n+2-\frac{1}{n}}. \quad (1.20)$$

Wu in [24] has proved that (1.7) holds for $p \geq p_{\text{wu}}$. Comparing (1.19) and (1.20), there are still some room between p_{wu} and p_{ness} .

Next, we discuss the result of Theorem 1.1. We rewrite (1.11) as

$$p(k) := \begin{cases} p_1(k) = 2 + \frac{4}{n+k+1-\frac{k}{n}}, & 1 \leq k < k_0(n), \\ p_2(k) = 2 + \frac{4}{n+\frac{n+2}{k}}, & k_0(n) \leq k < \frac{n+2}{2}, \\ p_3(k) = 2 + \frac{4}{n-2+\frac{2n}{k-1}}, & \frac{n+2}{2} \leq k \leq n. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 1.1 says that if $p \geq \min_{1 \leq k \leq n} p(k) := p_{\text{main}}$, then (1.7) holds. According to monotonicity, $p_1(k)$ and $p_2(k)$ can reach the minimum value at $k = [k_0(n)] - 1$, $k = [k_0(n)]$ or $k = [k_0(n)] + 1$. Using Taylor formula,

$$k_0(n) = \frac{\sqrt{4n^3+5n^2-8n}-n}{2(n-1)} = \sqrt{n} + \frac{\tilde{c}_n}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad |\tilde{c}_n| < 1 \quad \text{when } n \geq 2.$$

And so we have

$$\min_{1 \leq k < k_0(n)} p_1(k) \sim \min_{k_0(n) \leq k < \frac{n+2}{2}} p_2(k) = 2 + \frac{4}{n+\sqrt{n}+c'_n}, \quad |c'_n| < 2 \quad \text{when } n \geq 2. \quad (1.21)$$

On the other hand, $p_3(k)$ can reach the minimum value at $k = [\frac{n+2}{2}]$ or $k = [\frac{n+2}{2}] + 1$, this fact implies that

$$\min_{\frac{n+2}{2} \leq k \leq n} p_3(k) = 2 + \frac{4}{n+c''_n}, \quad |c''_n| \leq 2 \quad \text{when } n \geq 2. \quad (1.22)$$

In most cases, the estimate (1.21) is better than (1.22). In fact, when $n \geq 3$, $p_1(k)$ and $p_2(k)$ will reach p_{main} alternately. When $n = 2$, one has

$$p_{\text{main}} = p_3(2) = 3,$$

which recovers the sharp result of Du-Guth-Li in [7]. So our result can be regarded as a higher dimensional generalization of [7]. On the other hand, our result is better than

Wu's in all dimensions. However, for $n \geq 3$, our result can't still reach p_{ness} (see Table 1).

$n=$	p_{ness}	p_{wu}	$\min_{1 \leq k < k_0(n)} p_1(k)$	$\min_{k_0(n) \leq k < \frac{n+2}{2}} p_2(k)$	$\min_{\frac{k+2}{2} \leq k \leq n} p_3(k)$
2	$2 + 1$	$2 + \frac{8}{7}$	$2 + \frac{8}{7}$	-	$2 + 1$
3	$2 + \frac{8}{11}$	$2 + \frac{6}{7}$	$2 + \frac{3}{4}$	-	$2 + 1$
4	$2 + \frac{4}{7}$	$2 + \frac{16}{23}$	$2 + \frac{8}{13}$	-	$2 + \frac{2}{3}$
5	$2 + \frac{8}{17}$	$2 + \frac{10}{17}$	$2 + \frac{10}{19}$	$2 + \frac{6}{11}$	$2 + \frac{12}{19}$
6	$2 + \frac{2}{5}$	$2 + \frac{24}{47}$	$2 + \frac{6}{13}$	$2 + \frac{6}{13}$	$2 + \frac{1}{2}$
7	$2 + \frac{6}{17}$	$2 + \frac{14}{31}$	$2 + \frac{7}{17}$	$2 + \frac{2}{5}$	$2 + \frac{8}{17}$
8	$2 + \frac{6}{19}$	$2 + \frac{32}{79}$	$2 + \frac{16}{43}$	$2 + \frac{6}{17}$	$2 + \frac{2}{5}$
9	$2 + \frac{2}{7}$	$2 + \frac{18}{49}$	$2 + \frac{18}{53}$	$2 + \frac{6}{19}$	$2 + \frac{20}{53}$
10	$2 + \frac{6}{23}$	$2 + \frac{40}{119}$	$2 + \frac{40}{137}$	$2 + \frac{4}{13}$	$2 + \frac{1}{3}$
11	$2 + \frac{6}{25}$	$2 + \frac{22}{71}$	$2 + \frac{22}{81}$	$2 + \frac{16}{57}$	$2 + \frac{6}{19}$
12	$2 + \frac{2}{9}$	$2 + \frac{48}{167}$	$2 + \frac{16}{63}$	$2 + \frac{8}{31}$	$2 + \frac{2}{7}$
13	$2 + \frac{16}{77}$	$2 + \frac{26}{97}$	$2 + \frac{26}{109}$	$2 + \frac{16}{67}$	$2 + \frac{28}{103}$
14	$2 + \frac{8}{41}$	$2 + \frac{56}{223}$	$2 + \frac{56}{249}$	$2 + \frac{2}{9}$	$2 + \frac{1}{4}$
15	$2 + \frac{16}{87}$	$2 + \frac{30}{127}$	$2 + \frac{10}{47}$	$2 + \frac{16}{77}$	$2 + \frac{16}{67}$
16	$2 + \frac{4}{23}$	$2 + \frac{64}{287}$	$2 + \frac{64}{317}$	$2 + \frac{8}{41}$	$2 + \frac{2}{9}$

TABLE 1. Comparison between p_{ness} , p_{wu} and p_{main} for $2 \leq n \leq 16$. The red numbers denote our aims. The blue numbers denote best results yet.

Let us say a few words on the proof scheme of Theorem 1.5. The basic tool is polynomial partitioning introduced by Guth in [14], which helps us to make the dimensional reduction. We will adopt the algorithm, repeated application of polynomial partitioning, which has similar spirit as Hickman-Rogers in [16]. Hickman-Rogers built the algorithm to estimate $\|Ef\|_{BL_{k,A}^p(B_R)}$, where Ef represents the extension operator associated with restriction problem. By building polynomial partitioning on $BL_A^{p,q}$ -norm, we show the algorithm also works to estimate $\|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{BL_A^{p,q}(B_R^*)}$. But $BL_A^{p,q}$ -norm has no vanishing property as the k -broad norm $BL_{k,A}^p$. So we will revise Hickman-Rogers' algorithm by adding one stopping condition. For handling the case if the algorithm ends with the additional stopping condition, we need one class of refined Strichartz estimates which is an important tool to research L^p -estimate of Schrödinger maximal function as in [7, 8, 12]. By making use of the arguments as in [7, 8], we establish bilinear L^p -estimate of Schrödinger maximal function in lower dimensions.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we explain how Theorem 1.4 implies Theorem 1.2. In Section 3, we introduce some notations and standard results. The proof

of Theorem 1.5 is in Section 4 and Section 5. In Section 6, we prove bilinear maximal L^p -estimate in lower dimensions, which are the supplements of Section 5.

To end up this section, we will outline some notations used throughout the paper. If X is a finite set, we use $|X|$ to denote its cardinality. If X is a measurable set, we use $|X|$ to denote its Lebesgue measure. If the function f has compact support, we use $\text{supp} f$ to denote the support of f . C_ϵ denotes a constant which depends on ϵ . Write $A \lesssim B$ or $A = O(B)$ to mean that there exists a constant C such that $A \leq CB$. We write $A \lesssim_\epsilon B$ to denote $A \lesssim_\epsilon R^\epsilon B$. Let $[a]$ mean the largest integer that be not more than a .

2. HOW MAXIMAL BROAD L^p -NORM IMPLIES MAXIMAL L^p -NORM

In this section, we prove that Theorem 1.4 implies Theorem 1.2 by making use of induction on M . If $M \geq R^{10}$, we have

$$|e^{it\Delta} f| \leq M^{-\frac{n}{2}} \|f\|_{L^2},$$

then

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t \leq R} |e^{it\Delta} f| \right\|_{L^p(B_R)} \leq M^{-\frac{n}{2}} R^{\frac{n}{p}} \|f\|_{L^2} \lesssim M^{-\epsilon^2} R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2}$$

for $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$. Now we assume Theorem 1.2 holds for physical radius R and frequency radius less than $\frac{1}{2M}$. Using the decomposition of $B(0, R) \times [0, R]$ as in (1.14), we obtain

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t \leq R} |e^{it\Delta} f| \right\|_{L^p(B_R)}^p = \sum_{B_K \subset B(0, R)} \int_{B_K} \max_{I_K \subset [0, R]} \sup_{t \in I_K} |e^{it\Delta} f(x)|^p dx.$$

For each $B_K \times I_K$, we choose lines V_1, \dots, V_A to achieve the minimum of $\mu_{e^{it\Delta} f}(B_K \times I_K)$. Using the decomposition $f = \sum_\tau f_\tau$, we have

$$|e^{it\Delta} f(x)|^p \lesssim K^{O(1)} \max_{\tau \notin V_a \text{ for all } a} |e^{it\Delta} f_\tau(x)|^p + C \sum_{a=1}^A \left| \sum_{\tau \in V_a} e^{it\Delta} f_\tau(x) \right|^p, \quad (x, t) \in B_K \times I_K,$$

and so $\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{L^p L^\infty(B_R^*)}^p$ can be divided into two parts. The first part is

$$K^{O(1)} \sum_{B_K \subset B(0, R)} \max_{I_K \subset [0, R]} \max_{\tau \notin V_a \text{ for all } a} \int_{B_K \times I_K} |e^{it\Delta} f_\tau(x)|^p dx dt,$$

where we use the fact that each $|e^{it\Delta} f_\tau|$ is essentially constant on $B_K \times I_K$ (see Lemma 3.1). By Theorem 1.4, the first part is bounded by

$$K^{O(1)} \left[C(\epsilon, K) M^{-\epsilon^2} R^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2} \right]^p. \quad (2.1)$$

Next, we handle the second part, which can be rewritten as

$$C \sum_{a=1}^A \int_{B_R} \sup_{t \in [0, R]} \left| \sum_{\tau \in V_a} e^{it\Delta} f_\tau(x) \right|^p dx.$$

Since the number of $\tau \in V_a$ is $O(1)$, and we choose A satisfying $A \ll K$, the second part is controlled by

$$\lesssim \sum_{\tau} \int_{B_R} \sup_{t \in [0, R]} |e^{it\Delta} f_{\tau}(x)|^p dx.$$

Using the induction on frequency radius $\frac{1}{KM}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\tau} \int_{B_R} \sup_{t \in [0, R]} |e^{it\Delta} f_{\tau}(x)|^p dx &\leq C \sum_{\tau} \left[C_{\epsilon}(KM)^{-\epsilon^2} R^{\epsilon} \|f_{\tau}\|_{L^2} \right]^p \\ &\leq CK^{-p\epsilon^2} \left(C_{\epsilon} M^{-\epsilon^2} R^{\epsilon} \|f\|_{L^2} \right)^p. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

We choose K sufficiently large such that $CK^{-p\epsilon^2} \leq 1$, then the second part is proved by scale induction. Combining the estimates (2.1) with (2.2), we have proved Theorem 1.2 based on Theorem 1.4.

3. SOME PREPARATIONS

The main ingredient of the proof of Theorem 1.5 is the algorithm which leads to different scales r satisfying $1 \ll r \leq R$, not just the scale R . In this section, we introduce some notations and standard results with respect to the general scale r .

1. Locally constant property

Locally constant property says that if a function f has compact Fourier support Θ , then we can view $|f|$ essentially as constant on dual Θ^* .

Lemma 3.1. [15, Lemma 6.1] *Let Θ be a compact symmetric convex set centered at $C_{\Theta} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. If \widehat{g}_{Θ} is supported in Θ and T_{Θ} is the dual convex $\Theta^* := \{y \mid |y \cdot x - C_{\Theta}| \leq 1, \forall x \in \Theta\}$, then there exists a positive function $\eta_{T_{\Theta}}$ satisfying the following properties:*

- (a) $\eta_{T_{\Theta}}$ is essentially supported on $10T_{\Theta}$ and rapidly decaying away from it: for any integer $N > 0$, there exists a constant C_N such that $\eta_{T_{\Theta}}(x) \leq C_N(1+n(x, 10T_{\Theta}))^{-N}$ where $n(x, 10T_{\Theta})$ is the smallest positive integer n such that $x \in 10nT_{\Theta}$,
- (b) $\|\eta_{T_{\Theta}}\|_{L^1} \lesssim 1$,
- (c)

$$|g_{\Theta}| \leq \sum_{T // T_{\Theta}} c_T \chi_T \leq |g_{\Theta}| * \eta_{T_{\Theta}}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $c_T := \max_{x \in T} |g_{\Theta}|(x)$ and the sum $\sum_{T // T_{\Theta}}$ is over a finitely overlapping cover $\{T\}$ of \mathbb{R}^n with each $T // T_{\Theta}$. Here $T // T_{\Theta}$ means that T is a translated copy of T_{Θ} .

In particular, for each ball τ of radius K^{-1} , note $e^{it\Delta} f_{\tau}$ is Fourier supported on $\{(w, |w|^2) \mid w \in \tau\}$ in a distributional sense, which is contained in a rectangular box of radius K^{-1} and thickness K^{-2} . Therefore $e^{it\Delta} f_{\tau}$ is locally constant on each tube of radius K and length K^2 .

2. Wave packet decomposition on scale r

Let φ be a Schwartz function satisfying $\text{supp}\widehat{\varphi} \subset B(0, 3/2)$, and

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \widehat{\varphi}(\xi - k) = 1, \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Define

$$\begin{cases} \widehat{\varphi}_\theta(\xi) := r^{\frac{n}{2}} \widehat{\varphi}\left(r^{\frac{1}{2}}(\xi - c(\theta))\right), & \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,\nu}(\xi) := e^{-ic(\nu)\cdot\xi} \widehat{\varphi}_\theta(\xi), \\ c(\theta) \in r^{-1/2}\mathbb{Z}^n, & c(\nu) \in r^{1/2}\mathbb{Z}^n, \end{cases}$$

where θ denote $r^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ -balls in frequency space and ν denote $r^{\frac{1}{2}}$ -balls in physical space.

For each Schwartz function f with $\text{supp}\widehat{f} \subset B^n(0, 1)$, we have the following decomposition

$$f = \sum_{\theta,\nu} c_{\theta,\nu} \varphi_{\theta,\nu}, \quad \theta \cap B^n(0, 1) \neq \emptyset, \quad (3.2)$$

where each $\varphi_{\theta,\nu}$ is Fourier supported in θ and has physical support essentially in ν . A basic property is the functions $\varphi_{\theta,\nu}$ are approximately orthogonal, i.e.

$$\sum_{\theta,\nu} |c_{\theta,\nu}|^2 \sim \|f\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (3.3)$$

Next we consider the decomposition on $e^{it\Delta}f$ associated with (3.2)

$$e^{it\Delta}f = \sum_{\theta,\nu} c_{\theta,\nu} e^{it\Delta} \varphi_{\theta,\nu}. \quad (3.4)$$

By the stationary phase method, we obtain

$$|e^{it\Delta} \varphi_{\theta,\nu}(x)| \leq r^{-\frac{n}{4}} \chi_{T_{\theta,\nu}}(x, t) + O(r^{-N}), \quad \forall N > 0. \quad (3.5)$$

Here $T_{\theta,\nu}$ is defined by

$$T_{\theta,\nu} := \left\{ (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \mid 0 \leq t \leq r, \ |x + 2tc(\theta) - c(\nu)| \leq r^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta} \right\},$$

where δ is a small positive parameter satisfying $\delta \ll \epsilon$. $T_{\theta,\nu}$ is a tube of length r , of radius $r^{1/2+\delta}$ and in the direction $(-2c(\theta), 1)$. For each ν , $e^{it\Delta} \varphi_{\theta,\nu}$ is Fourier supported in $\xi(\theta) = \{(\xi, \xi^2) \mid \xi \in \theta\}$ in a distributional sense. For detailed proofs of wave packet decomposition one can see [7, 22].

3. The properties of $BL_A^{p,q}$

Firstly, we recall the basic properties of $BL_A^{p,q}$.

Proposition 3.2 ([11, 14]). *Let $p \leq q$. The following properties hold:*

(a) (Finite subadditivity) *Let $A \geq 1$, $U_1, U_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, then*

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL_A^{p,q}(U_1 \cup U_2)}^p \leq \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL_A^{p,q}(U_1)}^p + \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL_A^{p,q}(U_2)}^p.$$

(b) (Triangle inequality) *Let $A \geq 2$, $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, then*

$$\|e^{it\Delta}(f + g)\|_{BL_A^{p,q}(U)}^p \lesssim \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL_{A/2}^{p,q}(U)}^p + \|e^{it\Delta} g\|_{BL_{A/2}^{p,q}(U)}^p.$$

- (c) (Logarithmic convexity) Let $A \geq 2$, $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Suppose that $1 \leq p, p_1, p_2 < \infty$ and $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ obey

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1-\alpha}{p_1} + \frac{\alpha}{p_2},$$

then

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL_A^{p,q}(U)} \leq \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL_{A/2}^{p_1,q}(U)}^{1-\alpha} \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL_{A/2}^{p_2,q}(U)}^\alpha.$$

The proof of Proposition 3.2 is elementary, one can refer to [11, 14]. If $A = 1$, we can't use (b) and (c) in Proposition 3.2 since $BL_A^{p,q}$ -norm only makes sense for the positive integer A . But if we start with a large A , and use (b) and (c) only $O_\epsilon(1)$ times, then the choice of A won't influence our argument, see [16, 23]. On the other hand, we always choose the parameter A satisfying $A \ll K$, which is an unimportant parameter. From now on, we write $BL^{p,q}$ to represent $BL_A^{p,q}$.

Now we consider the relationship between $BL^{p,\infty}$ -norm and maximal L^p -norm, bilinear maximal L^p -norm.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $p \geq 2$. Suppose that f has Fourier support in $B(\xi_0, 1/M)$ for some $\xi_0 \in B(0, 1)$ and $M \geq 1$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, if*

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t \leq r} |e^{it\Delta} f| \right\|_{L^p(B_r)} \lesssim M^{-\epsilon^2} r^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2},$$

then

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,\infty}(B_r^*)} \lesssim K^{O(1)} M^{-\epsilon^2} r^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Proof. By the definition of $BL^{p,\infty}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,\infty}(B_r^*)} &= \left(\sum_{B_K \subset B(0,r)} \max_{I_K \subset [0,r]} \mu_{e^{it\Delta} f}(B_K \times I_K) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \left[\sum_{B_K \subset B(0,r)} \max_{I_K \subset [0,r]} \left(\sum_{\tau} \|e^{it\Delta} f_\tau\|_{L^p(B_K \times I_K)}^p \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{\tau} \sum_{B_K \subset B(0,r)} \max_{I_K \subset [0,r]} \|e^{it\Delta} f_\tau\|_{L^p(B_K \times I_K)}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\lesssim K^{O(1)} \left(\sum_{\tau} \|e^{it\Delta} f_\tau\|_{L_x^p L_t^\infty(B_r^*)}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\lesssim K^{O(1)} M^{-\epsilon^2} r^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 3.4. *Let $p \geq 2$. Suppose that f has Fourier support in $B(\xi_0, 1/M)$ for some $\xi_0 \in B(0, 1)$ and $M \geq 1$. Let $f = \sum_{\tau} f_\tau$, where each f_τ is Fourier supported on τ . For any $\epsilon > 0$, if*

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t \leq r} \left| e^{it\Delta} f_{\tau_1} e^{it\Delta} f_{\tau_2} \right|^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^p(B_r)} \lesssim M^{-\epsilon^2} r^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2}$$

holds for all τ_1, τ_2 satisfying that the Fourier supports of f_{τ_1} and f_{τ_2} are separated by at least $\frac{1}{KM}$, then

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^p, \infty(B_r^*)} \lesssim K^{O(1)} M^{-\epsilon^2} r^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Proof. We recall the definition of $\mu_{e^{it\Delta} f}$:

$$\mu_{e^{it\Delta} f}(B_K \times I_K) = \min_{V_1, \dots, V_A} \left(\max_{\tau \notin V_a} \int_{B_K \times I_K} |e^{it\Delta} f_\tau|^p dx dt \right).$$

For each τ , by Lemma 3.1, there exists a positive function η_K which is essentially supported on $B_K \times I_K$ satisfying $\|\eta_K\|_{L^1} \lesssim 1$ and

$$|e^{it\Delta} f_\tau| \leq |e^{it\Delta} f_\tau| * \eta_K.$$

Fix $B_K \times I_K$, then there exists a τ_0 such that

$$\max_{\tau} \int_{B_K \times I_K} |e^{it\Delta} f_\tau|^p = \int_{B_K \times I_K} |e^{it\Delta} f_{\tau_0}|^p dx dt.$$

We choose V'_1, \dots, V'_A such that $\tau_0 \in V'_a$ for some $a \in \{1, 2, \dots, A\}$, then by (3.1) and Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{e^{it\Delta} f}(B_K \times I_K) &\leq \max_{\tau \notin V'_a} \int_{B_K \times I_K} |e^{it\Delta} f_\tau|^p \\ &\leq \max_{\tau \notin V'_a} \left(\int_{B_K \times I_K} |e^{it\Delta} f_\tau|^p \int_{B_K \times I_K} |e^{it\Delta} f_{\tau_0}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \max_{\tau \notin V'_a} \int_{B_K \times I_K} (|e^{it\Delta} f_\tau| * \eta_K)^{\frac{p}{2}} (|e^{it\Delta} f_{\tau_0}| * \eta_K)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \max_{\tau \notin V'_a} \int_{B_K \times I_K} \left(|e^{it\Delta} f_\tau|^{\frac{p}{2}} * \eta_K \right) \left(|e^{it\Delta} f_{\tau_0}|^{\frac{p}{2}} * \eta_K \right) \\ &= \max_{\tau \notin V'_a} \int \left(\int_{B_K \times I_K} |e^{i(t-t_1)\Delta} f_\tau(x-x_1) e^{i(t-t_2)\Delta} f_{\tau_0}(x-x_2)|^{\frac{p}{2}} dx dt \right) \\ &\quad \eta_K(x_1, t_1) \eta_K(x_2, t_2) dx_1 dx_2 dt_1 dt_2 \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{\tau_1, \tau_2 \\ d(\tau_1, \tau_2) \geq (KM)^{-1}}} \int \left(\int_{B_K \times I_K} |e^{i(t-t_1)\Delta} f_{\tau_1}(x-x_1) e^{i(t-t_2)\Delta} f_{\tau_2}(x-x_2)|^{\frac{p}{2}} dx dt \right) \\ &\quad \eta_K(x_1, t_1) \eta_K(x_2, t_2) dx_1 dx_2 dt_1 dt_2. \end{aligned}$$

Define f_{τ_j, x_j, t_j} by

$$\widehat{f_{\tau_j, x_j, t_j}} = e^{-i(t_j|\xi|^2 + x_j \cdot \xi)} \widehat{f_{\tau_j}},$$

then

$$e^{it\Delta} f_{\tau_j, x_j, t_j} = e^{i(t-t_j)\Delta} f_{\tau_j}(x-x_j). \quad j = 1, 2.$$

We repeat the argument as in the proof of Proposition 3.3 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,\infty}(B_r^*)} = \left(\sum_{B_K \subset B(0,r)} \max_{I_K \subset [0,r]} \mu_{e^{it\Delta} f}(B_K \times I_K) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
& \leq \left[\sum_{B_K \subset B(0,r)} \max_{I_K \subset [0,r]} \left(\sum_{\substack{\tau_1, \tau_2 \\ d(\tau_1, \tau_2) \geq (KM)^{-1}}} \int \left\| e^{it\Delta} f_{\tau_1, x_1, t_1} e^{it\Delta} f_{\tau_2, x_2, t_2} \right\|_{L^p(B_K \times I_K)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^p \right. \\
& \quad \left. \eta_K(x_1, t_1) \eta_K(x_2, t_2) dx_1 dx_2 dt_1 dt_2 \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
& \leq \left[\sum_{\substack{\tau_1, \tau_2 \\ d(\tau_1, \tau_2) \geq (KM)^{-1}}} \int \left(\sum_{B_K \subset B(0,r)} \max_{I_K \subset [0,r]} \left\| e^{it\Delta} f_{\tau_1, x_1, t_1} e^{it\Delta} f_{\tau_2, x_2, t_2} \right\|_{L^p(B_K \times I_K)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^p \right. \\
& \quad \left. \eta_K(x_1, t_1) \eta_K(x_2, t_2) dx_1 dx_2 dt_1 dt_2 \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
& \lesssim K^{O(1)} \left(\sum_{\substack{\tau_1, \tau_2 \\ d(\tau_1, \tau_2) \geq (KM)^{-1}}} \int \left\| e^{it\Delta} f_{\tau_1, x_1, t_1} e^{it\Delta} f_{\tau_2, x_2, t_2} \right\|_{L_x^p L_t^\infty(B_r^*)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^p \\
& \quad \eta_K(x_1, t_1) \eta_K(x_2, t_2) dx_1 dx_2 dt_1 dt_2 \Big)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
& \lesssim K^{O(1)} M^{-\epsilon^2} r^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 3.5. For $q > 1/\delta$, we have

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{L_x^p L_t^q(B_r^*)} \lesssim r^\delta \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{L_x^p L_t^\infty(B_r^*)}$$

and

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,q}(B_r^*)} \lesssim r^\delta \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,\infty}(B_r^*)}.$$

So Proposition 3.3 and 3.4 still hold if we replace $BL^{p,\infty}$ with $BL^{p,q}$.

4. Polynomial partitioning

Polynomial partitioning was firstly introduced by Guth [13, 14] to improve the bound of restriction conjecture in three dimension. The main idea of polynomial partitioning is using a polynomial to cut the whole space to several parts, and each part has the same contribution.

Theorem 3.6. [13, Theorem 1.4] *Suppose that F is a non-negative L^1 function on \mathbb{R}^n . For each degree d , there exists a nontrivial polynomial P of degree at most d such that $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus Z(P)$ is a union of $\sim_n d^n$ pairwise disjoint open sets O'_i (cells) and for each i we have*

$$\int_{O'_i} F(x) dx \sim_n d^{-n} \int F(x) dx.$$

Let $Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n+1-m})$ be the set of common zeros of polynomials P_1, \dots, P_{n+1-m} . We call the variety $Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n+1-m})$ to be a transverse complete intersection if

$$\nabla P_1(x) \wedge \dots \wedge \nabla P_{n+1-m}(x) \neq 0, \quad \text{for all } x \in Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n+1-m}).$$

If $Z = Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n+1-m})$ satisfies $\deg P_i \leq d$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, n+1-m$, we say the degree of Z is at most d . Du-Li in [11] gave the following polynomial partitioning theorem on broad norm version.

Theorem 3.7. [11, Theorem 4.5] *Suppose that f is a function with $\text{supp } \widehat{f} \subset B(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, U is a subset of B_R^* , and $1 \leq p, \lambda < \infty$. Then for each d , there exists a nontrivial polynomial P of degree at most $O(d)$ such that $(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}) \setminus Z(P)$ is a union of $\sim d^{n+1}$ disjoint open sets O'_i and for each i we have*

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,\lambda}(U)}^p \leq C_n d^{n+1} \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,\lambda}(U \cap O'_i)}^p.$$

Moreover, $Z(P)$ is a finite union of transverse complete intersections.

Theorem 3.7 induces one spatial decomposition $B_R^* = (\cup_i O'_i) \cup Z(P)$. If we consider wave packet decomposition of f on scale R : $f = \sum_{\theta,\nu} c_{\theta,\nu} \varphi_{\theta,\nu}$, then most of the mass of each $e^{it\Delta} \varphi_{\theta,\nu}$ is concentrated on $T_{\theta,\nu}$ in physical space. An example of f says that there exists a related tube $T_{\theta,\nu}$ such that it can enter into all cells O'_i , which is not convenient to carry on this divide and conquer approach. Roughly speaking, this bad situation can happen because the diameter of each cell O'_i is too large. So we shrunk the scale of cells O'_i to make that each tube can only enter into a small part of the shrunken cells.

Using Theorem 3.7 with $\lambda = q$, we conclude that there exists a nontrivial polynomial P of degree at most $O(d)$ such that $(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}) \setminus Z(P)$ is a union of $\sim d^{n+1}$ disjoint open sets O'_i and for each i we have

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,q}(B_R^*)}^p \leq C_n d^{n+1} \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,q}(O'_i)}^p. \quad (3.6)$$

Now we define

$$W := N_{R^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta}} Z(P) \cap B_R^*, \quad O_i := [O'_i \cap B_R^*] \setminus W, \quad (3.7)$$

where $N_{R^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta}} Z(P)$ denotes the $R^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta}$ -neighborhood of the variety Z . By Proposition 3.2, one obtains

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,q}(B_R^*)}^p \leq \sum_i \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,q}(O_i)}^p + \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,q}(W)}^p. \quad (3.8)$$

By the pigeonhole principle, we have at least one of the following cases holds:

Cellular case: there exist $O(d^{n+1})$ many cells O_i such that for each i ,

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,q}(B_R^*)}^p \lesssim d^{n+1} \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,q}(O_i)}^p.$$

Algebraic case:

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,q}(B_R^*)}^p \lesssim \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,q}(W)}^p.$$

Therefore we can attribute the contribution on the whole region to cellular contribution and algebraic contribution. Hickman-Rogers [16] also introduced the polynomial partitioning theorem in lower dimensions. To build the algorithm on $BL^{p,q}$ -norm in the next section, we prove relevant theorem on the version of $BL^{p,q}$ -norm.

We firstly recall the definition of tangential tube introduced by Guth in [13, 14].

Definition 3.8. Suppose that $Z = Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n+1-m})$ is a transverse complete intersection in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$. We say that $T_{\theta, \nu}$ is concentrated on scale r wave packets which are $r^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta_m}$ -tangent to Z in B_r if the following two conditions hold:

(i) **Distance condition:**

$$T_{\theta, \nu} \subset N_{r^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta_m}} Z \cap B_r.$$

(ii) **Angle condition:** for any $x \in T_{\theta, \nu}$ and $z \in Z \cap B_r$ with $|z - x| \lesssim r^{1/2+\delta_m}$, one has

$$\angle(G(\theta), T_z Z) \lesssim r^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta_m}.$$

Let

$$\mathbb{T}_Z[r] := \left\{ (\theta, \nu) \mid T_{\theta, \nu} \text{ is concentrated on scale } r \text{ wave packets} \right. \\ \left. \text{which are } r^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta_m} \text{ tangent to } Z \right\}.$$

We say that f is concentrated in wave packets from $\mathbb{T}_Z[r]$ if

$$\sum_{(\theta, \nu) \notin \mathbb{T}_Z[r]} \|f_{\theta, \nu}\|_{L^2} \leq O(r^{-N}) \|f\|_{L^2}, \quad \forall N > 0.$$

Theorem 3.9. Fix $r \gg 1$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq p, \lambda < \infty$. Suppose that Z is an m -dimensional transverse complete intersection of degree at most d . Suppose that f satisfies $\text{supp } \widehat{f} \subset B(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, and f is concentrated in wave packets from $\mathbb{T}_Z[r]$. Then there exists a constant $D = D_Z = D(\epsilon, d)$ such that at least one of the following cases holds:

Cellular case: there exist $O(D^m)$ shrunken cells O_i in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ such that for each i ,

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p, \lambda}(B_r)}^p \lesssim D^m \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p, \lambda}(O_i)}^p.$$

Algebraic case: there exists an $(m-1)$ -dimensional transverse complete intersection Y of degree at most $O(D)$ such that

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p, \lambda}(B_r \cap N_{r^{1/2+\delta_m}} Z)}^p \lesssim \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p, \lambda}(B_r \cap N_{r^{1/2+\delta_m}} Y)}^p.$$

Proof. Suppose that the algebraic case does not occur. We say that a ball $B = B(x_0, r^{1/2+\delta_m}) \subset N_{r^{1/2+\delta_m}} Z \cap B_r$ is regular if, on each connected component of $Z \cap B(x_0, r^{1/2+\delta_m})$, the tangent space TZ is constant up to angle $1/100$. By the hypothesis and Guth's argument such as in [14, Section 8], we have the regular balls contain most of the mass of $e^{it\Delta} f$, i.e.

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p, \lambda}(B_r)} \lesssim \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p, \lambda}(\cup_{\text{regular } B} B)}.$$

For each regular ball B , we pick a point $z \in Z \cap B_{r^{1/2+\delta_m}}$ and define V_B to be the m -dimensional tangent plane $T_z Z$. For each m -dimensional tangent plane V , we use \mathfrak{B}_V to denote the set of regular balls so that $\angle(V_B, V) \leq 1/100$. By the pigeonhole principle, there exists a plane V such that

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p, \lambda}(B_r)} \lesssim \|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p, \lambda}(\cup_{B \in \mathfrak{B}_V} B)}.$$

Set $N_1 = \cup_{B \in \mathfrak{B}_V} B$. Therefore, it suffices to consider the contribution on N_1 .

Since all wave packets of $e^{it\Delta}f$ on scale r are contained in the $\approx r^{1/2}$ -neighborhood of V , $|e^{it\Delta}f(x)|$ is essentially constant along a certain direction which is roughly normal to V . Let $P_V : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote a polynomial defined on V , and $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow V$ be the orthogonal projection. Then we can extend V to a polynomial P on \mathbb{R}^{n+1} by setting $P(x) := P_V(\pi(x))$. We denote the collection of such polynomials by \mathbb{P}_V . Repeating the proof of Theorem 4.5 in [11], we can find a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{P}_V$ of degree at most $D = D(\epsilon, d)$ such that $N_1 = (\cup_i O'_i) \cup Z(P)$ satisfying $\#O'_i \sim D^m$, and for each i ,

$$\|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{BL^{p,\lambda}(B_r)}^p \sim \|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{BL^{p,\lambda}(N_1)}^p \lesssim D^m \|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{BL^{p,\lambda}(O'_i)}^p. \quad (3.9)$$

Define

$$W := N_{r^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta_m}} Z(P) \cap B_r, \quad O_i := [O'_i \cap B_r] \setminus W.$$

By Proposition 3.2, we obtain

$$\|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{BL^{p,\lambda}(B_r)}^p \leq \sum_i \|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{BL^{p,\lambda}(O_i)}^p + \|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{BL^{p,\lambda}(W)}^p.$$

Since the algebraic case does not occur, the contribution from W is negligible. By the pigeonhole principle and (3.9), there exist $O(D^m)$ cells O_i such that for each i ,

$$\|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{BL^{p,\lambda}(B_r)}^p \lesssim D^m \|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{BL^{p,\lambda}(O_i)}^p.$$

□

4. TWO ALGORITHMS

From this section, we start to prove Theorem 1.5. We firstly consider a simple situation. If $M > R^{\frac{1}{2}-O(\delta)}$, all associated directions of wave packets of f are very few. In fact, let $f = \sum_{(\theta,\nu) \in \mathbb{T}} c_{\theta,\nu} \varphi_{\theta,\nu}$ be wave packet decomposition of f on scale R , where \mathbb{T} is a set of pairs (θ, ν) , then

$$\#\{\theta \mid \exists \nu \text{ s.t. } (\theta, \nu) \in \mathbb{T}\} \lesssim R^{O(\delta)}.$$

Hence, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{L_x^p L_t^\infty(B_R^*)} &= \left\| \sum_{\theta,\nu} c_{\theta,\nu} e^{it\Delta} \varphi_{\theta,\nu} \right\|_{L_x^p L_t^\infty(B_R^*)} = \left\| \left| \sum_{\theta,\nu} c_{\theta,\nu} e^{it\Delta} \varphi_{\theta,\nu} \right|^2 \right\|_{L_x^{\frac{p}{2}} L_t^\infty(B_R^*)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim R^{O(\delta)} \left\| \sum_{\theta,\nu} |c_{\theta,\nu} e^{it\Delta} \varphi_{\theta,\nu}|^2 \right\|_{L_x^{\frac{p}{2}} L_t^\infty(B_R^*)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq R^{O(\delta)} R^{-\frac{n}{4}} \left\| \sum_{\theta,\nu} |c_{\theta,\nu}|^2 \chi_{T_{\theta,\nu}} \right\|_{L_x^{\frac{p}{2}} L_t^\infty(B_R^*)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq R^{O(\delta)} R^{-\frac{n}{4}} \left(\sum_{\theta,\nu} |c_{\theta,\nu}|^2 \|\chi_{T_{\theta,\nu}}\|_{L_x^{\frac{p}{2}} L_t^\infty(B_R^*)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim R^{\frac{n+1}{2p} - \frac{n}{4} + O(\delta)} \left(\sum_{\theta,\nu} |c_{\theta,\nu}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\sim R^{\frac{n+1}{2p} - \frac{n}{4} + O(\delta)} \|f\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Proposition 3.3 and Remark 3.5, we have

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,q}(B_R^*)} \lesssim R^{\frac{n+1}{2p} - \frac{n}{4} + O(\delta)} \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

This inequality shows that when $M > R^{\frac{1}{2} - O(\delta)}$, Theorem 1.5 holds for $p > \frac{2(n+1)}{n}$, and (1.12) satisfies this condition obviously. From now on, we always assume $M \ll R^{1/2}$.

We will adopt two algorithms introduced by Hickman-Rogers in [16] to continue the proof of Theorem 1.5. The method developed by Guth [14] in the study of restriction conjecture relies on polynomial partitioning and scale induction. Hickman-Rogers used the algorithm instead of scale induction to give a new proof of Guth's result. The main advantage of the algorithm is to lead to a more detailed geometry analysis on different scales.

Now we introduce the first algorithm. It is a dimensional reduction, essentially passing from an m -dimensional to an $(m-1)$ -dimensional situation. More precisely, we start with a function f which is concentrated in wave packets from $\mathbb{T}_Z[r]$, and Z is an m -dimensional transverse complete intersection. Using Theorem 3.9, we can divide $\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,q}(B_r)}$ into the cellular and algebraic case. The algebraic case can further separate into the transverse and tangential case according to the angle condition. If it's the tangential case, we already pass from an m -dimensional to an $(m-1)$ -dimensional situation, then the algorithm closes. Otherwise, we repeat the above steps to each cells produced by the cellular and transverse cases.

[Alg-1]-The first algorithm: Let $p \geq 2$, $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, and $\delta, \delta_n, \dots, \delta_1, \delta_0$ satisfy

$$\epsilon^C \leq \delta \ll \delta_n \ll \delta_{n-1} \ll \dots \ll \delta_1 \ll \delta_0 \ll \epsilon$$

for some constant C .

Input.

- A ball $B_r \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with radius $r \gg 1$.
- A transverse complete intersection Z of dimension $m \geq 2$.
- A function f satisfying $\text{supp } \widehat{f} \subset B^n(0, 1)$, and f is concentrated on scale r wave packets which are $r^{-1/2 + \delta_m}$ -tangent to Z in B_r .

Output. The j -th step of recursion will produce:

- A word \mathcal{E}_j of length j in the alphabet $\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}\}$. Here \mathbf{a} is an abbreviation of ‘‘algebraic’’ and \mathbf{c} ‘‘cellular’’. The algorithm is realized by repeated application of Theorem 3.9. More precisely, suppose that the algorithm has run through $(j-1)$ steps, and produced a word \mathcal{E}_{j-1} of length $j-1$ and a family of subsets \mathcal{O}_{j-1} (see its definition below), then we again use Theorem 3.9 on each $O_{j-1} \in \mathcal{O}_{j-1}$. If more than $1/2$ fraction of the \mathcal{O}_{j-1} belong to the cellular case, then we define \mathcal{E}_j as a word of length j , where the first $(j-1)$ letters are the same as \mathcal{E}_{j-1} and the j -th letter is \mathbf{c} . Otherwise, we defined the j -th letter of \mathcal{E}_j to be \mathbf{a} .

- A spatial scale $\rho_j \geq 1$. Let $\tilde{\delta}_{m-1}$ satisfy

$$(1 - \tilde{\delta}_{m-1})\left(\frac{1}{2} + \delta_{m-1}\right) = \frac{1}{2} + \delta_m,$$

and $\sigma_k : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfy

$$\sigma_k(\rho) := \begin{cases} \frac{\rho}{2}, & \text{if the } k\text{-th letter of } \mathcal{E}_j \text{ is } \mathbf{c}, \\ \rho^{1-\tilde{\delta}_{m-1}}, & \text{if the } k\text{-th letter of } \mathcal{E}_j \text{ is } \mathbf{a}, \end{cases}$$

for each $1 \leq k \leq j$. With these definitions, take

$$\rho_j := \sigma_j \circ \dots \circ \sigma_1(r).$$

Then ρ_j satisfies:

$$\rho_j \leq r^{(1-\tilde{\delta}_{m-1})\#\mathbf{a}(j)} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_j \leq \frac{r}{2^{\#\mathbf{c}(j)}},$$

where $\#\mathbf{a}(j)$ and $\#\mathbf{c}(j)$ denote the number of occurrences of \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{c} in the \mathcal{E}_j .

- A family of subsets \mathcal{O}_j of \mathbb{R}^{n+1} which will be referred to as cells. Each cell $O_j \in \mathcal{O}_j$ has diameter at most ρ_j .
- A collection of functions $(f_{O_j})_{O_j \in \mathcal{O}_j}$. Each f_{O_j} is concentrated on scale ρ_j wave packets which are $\rho_j^{-1/2+\delta_m}$ -tangent to some translation of Z on (a ball of radius ρ_j containing) O_j .
- A large integer $d \in \mathbb{N}$ which depends only on the admissible parameters and $\deg Z$.

Then the following properties hold:

Property I. Most of the mass of $\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,q}(B_r)}^p$ is concentrated on the $O_j \in \mathcal{O}_j$:

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,q}(B_r)}^p \leq C_{j,\delta}^I(d, r) \sum_{O_j \in \mathcal{O}_j} \|e^{it\Delta} f_{O_j}\|_{BL^{p,q}(O_j)}^p + O(r^{-N})\|f\|_{L^2}^p. \quad (4.1)$$

Property II. The functions f_{O_j} satisfy

$$\sum_{O_j \in \mathcal{O}_j} \|f_{O_j}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_{j,\delta}^{II}(d, r) d^{\#\mathbf{c}(j)} \|f\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (4.2)$$

Property III. Each f_{O_j} satisfies

$$\|f_{O_j}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_{j,\delta}^{III}(d, r) \left(\frac{r}{\rho_j}\right)^{-\frac{n+1-m}{2}} d^{-\#\mathbf{c}(j)(m-1)} \|f\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (4.3)$$

Here

$$\begin{cases} C_{j,\delta}^I(d, r) := d^{\#\mathbf{c}(j)\delta} (\log r)^{2\#\mathbf{a}(j)(1+\delta)}, \\ C_{j,\delta}^{II}(d, r) := d^{\#\mathbf{c}(j)\delta} \text{Poly}(d)^{\#\mathbf{a}(j)(1+\delta)}, \\ C_{j,\delta}^{III}(d, r) := d^{j\delta} r^{\overline{C}\#\mathbf{a}(j)\delta_m}, \end{cases}$$

where $\text{Poly}(d) := d^{n+1}$ and \overline{C} is some suitably chosen large constant. One easily verifies that

$$C_{j,\delta}^I(d, r), \quad C_{j,\delta}^{II}(d, r), \quad C_{j,\delta}^{III}(d, r) \lesssim_{d,\delta} r^{\delta_0} d^{\#\mathbf{c}(j)\delta}. \quad (4.4)$$

The first step. The algorithm shall start by taking:

- $\mathcal{E}_0 := \emptyset$ to be the empty word;
- $\rho_0 := r$;
- $\mathcal{O}_0 := \{O_0\}$, where $O_0 := N_{r^{1/2+\delta_m}}Z \cap B_r$;
- $f_{O_0} := f$.
- A large integer $d \in \mathbb{N}$ to be determined later.

Under this setting, one easily verifies the validity of **Property I**, **II**, and **III**. In fact, **Property I** holds due to the hypothesis of f . **Property II** and **III** hold trivially.

The $(j+1)$ -th step. Let $j \geq 1$. We assume that the recursive algorithm has run through j steps. Since each function f_{O_j} is concentrated on scale ρ_j wave packets which are $\rho_j^{-1/2+\delta_m}$ -tangent to some translation of Z in B_{ρ_j} , we again apply Theorem 3.9 to bound $\|e^{it\Delta}f_{O_j}\|_{BL^{p,q}(O_j)}^p$ for each $O_j \in \mathcal{O}_j$. One of two things can happen: either **[Alg-1]** terminates if the diameter of each cell is very small or it terminates if most of the mass of $\|e^{it\Delta}f_{O_j}\|_{BL^{p,q}(O_j)}^p$ is concentrated on some $(m-1)$ -dimensional transverse complete intersections. We give the exact stopping conditions as follows.

Stopping conditions. The algorithm will be stopped if one of both conditions occurs:

[tiny] The algorithm terminates if $\rho_j \leq r^{\tilde{\delta}_{m-1}}$.

[tang] The algorithm terminates if

$$\sum_{O_j \in \mathcal{O}_j} \|e^{it\Delta}f_{O_j}\|_{BL^{p,q}(O_j)}^p \leq C_{\text{tang}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \|e^{it\Delta}f_S\|_{BL^{p,q}(B_{\tilde{\rho}})}^p \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \|f_S\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_{\text{tang}} r^{(n+1)\tilde{\delta}_{m-1}} \sum_{O_j \in \mathcal{O}_j} \|f_{O_j}\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (4.6)$$

hold for $\tilde{\rho} := \rho_j^{1-\tilde{\delta}_{m-1}}$ and for some constant C_{tang} . Here \mathcal{S} is a collection of $(m-1)$ -dimensional transverse complete intersections in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} all of degree $O(d)$, and f_S is a function to each $S \in \mathcal{S}$ which is $\tilde{\rho}^{-1/2+\delta_{m-1}}$ -tangent to S on $B_{\tilde{\rho}}$.

Remark 4.1. (a) *We can use Theorem 3.9 and scale induction to reformulate this algorithm. For details one can refer to Hickman-Rogers [16, Section 9].*

(b) *There exists a additional local estimate in **Property III** in **[Alg-1]** of Hickman-Rogers. The main effect of such estimate is to establish L^∞ -estimate from L^2 -estimate at the smallest possible cost due to the hypothesis of restriction conjecture. In this paper, we always assure $f \in L^2$, so the local estimate is not essential in our argument though it also holds in this case.*

Next we introduce the second algorithm. It consists of repeated application of the first algorithm to reduce to an appropriate dimensional case.

[Alg-2]-The second algorithm: Let $\{p_\ell\}_{\ell=k}^{n+1}$ denote Lebesgue exponents such that

$$p_k \geq p_{k+1} \geq \dots \geq p_{n+1} := p \geq 2.$$

Let $0 \leq \alpha_\ell, \beta_\ell \leq 1$ be the numbers defined in terms of p_ℓ by

$$\frac{1}{p_\ell} := \frac{1 - \alpha_{\ell-1}}{2} + \frac{\alpha_{\ell-1}}{p_{\ell-1}}, \quad \beta_\ell := \prod_{i=\ell}^n \alpha_i \quad \text{for } k+1 \leq \ell \leq n,$$

and $\alpha_{n+1} := \beta_{n+1} := 1$.

Input. Fix $R \gg 1$. Let f satisfy $\text{supp} \widehat{f} \subset B^n(0, 1)$ and the non-degeneracy hypothesis

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,q}(B_R^*)} \geq CR^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Output. The $(n+2-\ell)$ -th step of the recursion will produce:

- Scales $\vec{r}_\ell = (r_{n+1}, \dots, r_\ell)$, satisfying $R = r_{n+1} > r_n > \dots > r_\ell$. Large and non-admissible parameters $\vec{D}_\ell = (D_{n+1}, \dots, D_\ell)$. Here $D_i, \ell \leq i \leq n+1$, are defined by the upper bound of (4.4).
- A family transverse complete intersections \mathcal{S}_ℓ . Each $S_i \in \mathcal{S}_i, \ell \leq i \leq n+1$, satisfies $\text{deg } S_i = i$.
- A function f_{S_ℓ} associated with each $S_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_\ell$ is concentrated on scale r_ℓ wave packets which are $r_\ell^{-1/2+\delta_\ell}$ -tangent to S_ℓ in B_{r_ℓ} .

Then the following properties hold:

Property 1.

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,q}(B_R^*)} \lesssim M(\vec{r}_\ell, \vec{D}_\ell) \|f\|_{L^2}^{1-\beta_\ell} \left(\sum_{S_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_\ell}\|_{BL^{p_\ell,q}(B_{r_\ell})}^{p_\ell} \right)^{\frac{\beta_\ell}{p_\ell}}, \quad (4.7)$$

where

$$M(\vec{r}_\ell, \vec{D}_\ell) := \left(\prod_{i=\ell}^n D_i \right)^{(n+1-\ell)\delta} \left(\prod_{i=\ell}^n r_i^{\frac{n}{2(n+1)}(\beta_{i+1}-\beta_i)} D_i^{\frac{1}{2}(\beta_{i+1}-\beta_\ell)} \right).$$

Property 2. For $\ell \leq n$,

$$\sum_{S_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \|f_{S_\ell}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim D_\ell^{1+\delta} \sum_{S_{\ell+1} \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell+1}} \|f_{S_{\ell+1}}\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (4.8)$$

Property 3. For $\ell \leq n$,

$$\max_{S_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \|f_{S_\ell}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \left(\frac{r_{\ell+1}}{r_\ell} \right)^{-\frac{n-\ell}{2}} D_\ell^{-\ell+\delta} \max_{S_{\ell+1} \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell+1}} \|f_{S_{\ell+1}}\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (4.9)$$

The first step. The algorithm shall start by taking:

- $r_{n+1} := R$ and $D_{n+1} := 1$;
- $\mathcal{S}_{n+1} := \{S_{n+1}\}$, where $S_{n+1} := \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$;
- $\mathcal{O}_0 := \{O_0\}$, where $O_0 := N_{r,1/2+\delta_m} Z \cap B_r$;
- $f_{S_{n+1}} := f$ is a function satisfying the non-degeneracy hypothesis, and f is concentrated on scale R wave packets which are $R^{-1/2+\delta_{n+1}}$ -tangent to the $(n+1)$ -dimensional variety \mathbb{R}^{n+1} in B_R^* .

With these definitions, **Property 1, 2** and **3** hold trivially.

The $(n + 3 - \ell)$ -th step. Let $\ell \geq 1$. We assume that the algorithm has run through $(n + 2 - \ell)$ steps. Since each function f_{S_ℓ} is concentrated on scale r_ℓ wave packets which are $r_\ell^{-1/2+\delta_\ell}$ -tangent to S_ℓ in B_{r_ℓ} , we repeat to apply [**Alg-1**] to bound $\|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_\ell}\|_{BL^{p_\ell, q}(B_{r_\ell})}^{p_\ell}$ for each $S_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_\ell$. One of two things can happen: either [**Alg-2**] terminates if most of $S_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_\ell$ ended with the stopping condition [**tiny**] after using [**Alg-1**] or it terminates when $\ell = k$, where k is a positive integer to be determined later. We give the exact stopping conditions as follows.

Stopping conditions. The algorithm will be stopped if one of both conditions occurs:

[**tiny-dom**] Suppose that the inequality

$$\sum_{S_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_\ell}\|_{BL^{p_\ell, q}(B_{r_\ell})}^{p_\ell} \leq 2 \sum_{S_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell, \text{tiny}}} \|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_\ell}\|_{BL^{p_\ell, q}(B_{r_\ell})}^{p_\ell} \quad (4.10)$$

holds, where the right-hand summation is restricted to those $S_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_\ell$ for which [**Alg-1**] terminates owing to the stopping condition [**tiny**]. Then [**Alg-2**] terminates.

[**k-dim**] Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq k \leq n$. If [**Alg-2**] carries out until $\ell = k$, then [**Alg-2**] terminates.

We add another stopping condition [**k-dim**] in [**Alg-2**], which is difference from that in [16]. This stopping condition is necessary in our argument. The target that Hickman-Rogers studied in [16] is $\|Ef\|_{BL_{k,A}^p(B_R)}$, where Ef is the extension operator associated with restriction problem. The vanishing property of the k -broad norm says that: if a function f is concentrated in wave packet from $\mathbb{T}_Z[R]$, where the dimension of Z is less than k , then

$$\|Ef\|_{BL_{k,A}^p(B_R)} = O(R^{-N})\|f\|_{L^2}, \quad \forall N > 0.$$

This estimate implies that [**Alg-2**] must stop when $\ell = k$, otherwise it contradicts the non-degeneracy hypothesis of f . Unfortunately, $BL^{p,q}$ -norm does not possess such property. It shows that [**Alg-2**] may carry out until $\ell = 1$ in the absence of the stopping condition [**k-dim**]. So we add the extra stopping condition [**k-dim**], which requires us to estimate each contribution of the tangential items if [**Alg-2**] terminates at the stopping condition [**k-dim**]. To overcome such difficulty, we will use refined Strichartz estimate to build bilinear L^p -estimate of Schrödinger maximal function in lower dimensions in the last section.

Property 2 and **3** of [**Alg-2**] can be obtained by repeated applications of **Property II** and **III** in [**Alg-1**]. We give the proof of **Property 1**, which relies on the sharp L^2 -estimate of Schrödinger maximal function proved by Du-Zhang in [12].

Theorem 4.2. [12, Theorem 1.3] *For any f with $\text{supp } \widehat{f} \subset B^n(0, 1)$, we have*

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t \leq R} |e^{it\Delta} f| \right\|_{L^2(B^n(0, R))} \lesssim R^{\frac{n}{2(n+1)}} \|f\|_{L^2} \quad (4.11)$$

for all $R \geq 1$.

The proof of Property 1. If the stopping condition **[tiny-dom]** not happened, then

$$\sum_{S_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_\ell}\|_{BL^{p_\ell, q}(B_{r_\ell})}^{p_\ell} \leq 2 \sum_{S_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell, \text{tang}}} \|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_\ell}\|_{BL^{p_\ell, q}(B_{r_\ell})}^{p_\ell} \quad (4.12)$$

holds, where the right-hand summation is restricted to those $S_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_\ell$ for which **[Alg-1]** terminates owing to the stopping condition **[tang]**. For each $S_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell, \text{tang}}$, let $\mathcal{S}_{\ell-1}[S_\ell]$ denote a collection of transverse complete intersections in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} of dimension $\ell - 1$ which is produced by the stopping condition **[tang]** in **[Alg-1]** on $\|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_\ell}\|_{BL^{p_\ell, q}(B_{r_\ell})}^{p_\ell}$, then by **Proposition I** in **[Alg-1]**,

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_\ell}\|_{BL^{p_\ell, q}(B_{r_\ell})}^{p_\ell} \lesssim D_{\ell-1}^\delta \sum_{S_{\ell-1} \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell-1}[S_\ell]} \|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_{\ell-1}}\|_{BL^{p_{\ell-1}, q}(B_{r_{\ell-1}})}^{p_{\ell-1}}.$$

Define

$$\mathcal{S}_{\ell-1} := \{S_{\ell-1} \mid S_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell, \text{tang}} \text{ and } S_{\ell-1} \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell-1}[S_\ell]\}.$$

By induction on ℓ , we have

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p, q}(B_R^*)} \lesssim D_{\ell-1}^\delta M(\vec{r}_\ell, \vec{D}_\ell) \|f\|_{L^2}^{1-\beta_\ell} \left(\sum_{S_{\ell-1} \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell-1}} \|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_{\ell-1}}\|_{BL^{p_{\ell-1}, q}(B_{r_{\ell-1}})}^{p_{\ell-1}} \right)^{\frac{\beta_\ell}{p_\ell}}.$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 3.2 and Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{S_{\ell-1} \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell-1}} \|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_{\ell-1}}\|_{BL^{p_{\ell-1}, q}(B_{r_{\ell-1}})}^{p_{\ell-1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p_\ell}} = \left\| \|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_{\ell-1}}\|_{BL^{p_{\ell-1}, q}(B_{r_{\ell-1}})} \right\|_{l^{p_\ell}(\mathcal{S}_{\ell-1})} \\ & \leq \left\| \|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_{\ell-1}}\|_{BL^{2, q}(B_{r_{\ell-1}})}^{1-\alpha_{\ell-1}} \|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_{\ell-1}}\|_{BL^{p_{\ell-1}, q}(B_{r_{\ell-1}})}^{\alpha_{\ell-1}} \right\|_{l^{p_\ell}(\mathcal{S}_{\ell-1})} \\ & \leq \left\| \|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_{\ell-1}}\|_{BL^{2, q}(B_{r_{\ell-1}})} \right\|_{l^2(\mathcal{S}_{\ell-1})}^{1-\alpha_{\ell-1}} \left\| \|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_{\ell-1}}\|_{BL^{p_{\ell-1}, q}(B_{r_{\ell-1}})} \right\|_{l^{p_{\ell-1}}(\mathcal{S}_{\ell-1})}^{\alpha_{\ell-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

From Theorem 4.2 it follows

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_{\ell-1}}\|_{L_x^2 L_t^\infty(B_{r_{\ell-1}})} \lesssim r_{\ell-1}^{\frac{n}{2(n+1)}} \|f_{S_{\ell-1}}\|_{L^2},$$

and so we have by Proposition 3.3 and Remark 3.5

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_{\ell-1}}\|_{BL^{2, q}(B_{r_{\ell-1}})} \lesssim \|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_{\ell-1}}\|_{BL^{2, \infty}(B_{r_{\ell-1}})} \lesssim r_{\ell-1}^{\frac{n}{2(n+1)}} \|f_{S_{\ell-1}}\|_{L^2}.$$

This inequality implies

$$\left\| \|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_{\ell-1}}\|_{BL^{2, q}(B_{r_{\ell-1}})} \right\|_{l^2(\mathcal{S}_{\ell-1})} \lesssim r_{\ell-1}^{\frac{n}{2(n+1)}} \left(\prod_{i=\ell-1}^n D_i^{1+\delta} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Combining all estimates, one concludes

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p, q}(B_R^*)} \lesssim M(\vec{r}_{\ell-1}, \vec{D}_{\ell-1}) \|f\|_{L^2}^{1-\beta_{\ell-1}} \left(\sum_{S_{\ell-1} \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell-1}} \|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_{\ell-1}}\|_{BL^{p_{\ell-1}, q}(B_{r_{\ell-1}})}^{p_{\ell-1}} \right)^{\frac{\beta_{\ell-1}}{p_{\ell-1}}}.$$

□

5. THE FINAL STAGE

In this section, we apply the algorithms in the previous section to prove Theorem 1.5. Firstly, suppose that **[Alg-2]** terminates at the stopping condition **[tiny-dom]**, i.e.

$$\sum_{S_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_\ell}\|_{BL^{p_\ell, q}(B_{r_\ell})}^{p_\ell} \leq 2 \sum_{S_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell, \text{tiny}}} \|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_\ell}\|_{BL^{p_\ell, q}(B_{r_\ell})}^{p_\ell}. \quad (5.1)$$

Since the stopping condition **[k-dim]** does not happen, if the recursive process terminates the step m , then $m \geq k + 1$. For each $S_m \in \mathcal{S}_{m, \text{tiny}}$, let $\mathcal{O}[S_m]$ denote the final collection of cells output by **[Alg-1]**. By **Properties I, II** and **III** of **[Alg-1]**, we obtain

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_m}\|_{BL^{p_m, q}(B_{r_m})}^{p_m} \lesssim D_{m-1}^\delta \sum_{O \in \mathcal{O}[S_m]} \|e^{it\Delta} f_O\|_{BL^{p_m, q}(O)}^{p_m}, \quad (5.2)$$

where the functions f_O satisfy

$$\sum_{O \in \mathcal{O}[S_m]} \|f_O\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim D_{m-1}^{1+\delta} \|f_{S_m}\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (5.3)$$

and

$$\max_{O \in \mathcal{O}[S_m]} \|f_O\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \left(\frac{r_m}{r_{m-1}}\right)^{-\frac{n+1-m}{2}} D_{m-1}^{-(m-1)+\delta} \|f_{S_m}\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (5.4)$$

Let \mathcal{O} denote the union of the $\mathcal{O}[S_m]$ over all $S_m \in \mathcal{S}_{m, \text{tiny}}$. Combining **Property 1** of **[Alg-2]**, (5.1) and (5.2), one concludes

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p, q}(B_R^*)} \lesssim D_{m-1}^\delta M(\vec{r}_m, \vec{D}_m) \|f\|_{L^2}^{1-\beta_m} \left(\sum_{O \in \mathcal{O}} \|e^{it\Delta} f_O\|_{BL^{p_m, q}(O)}^{p_m} \right)^{\frac{\beta_m}{p_m}}. \quad (5.5)$$

Since each $O \in \mathcal{O}$ has diameter at most R^{δ_0} by the stopping condition **[tiny]**, one has

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f_O\|_{BL^{p_m, q}(O)} \lesssim \|f_O\|_{L^2}.$$

Hence (5.5) becomes

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p, q}(B_R^*)} \lesssim D_{m-1}^\delta M(\vec{r}_m, \vec{D}_m) \|f\|_{L^2}^{1-\beta_m} \left(\sum_{O \in \mathcal{O}} \|f_O\|_{L^2}^{p_m} \right)^{\frac{\beta_m}{p_m}}. \quad (5.6)$$

The definition of β_m leads to

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_m}\right)\beta_m = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_{n+1}},$$

and so we obtain

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p, q}(B_R^*)} \lesssim D_{m-1}^\delta M(\vec{r}_m, \vec{D}_m) \|f\|_{L^2}^{1-\beta_m} \left(\sum_{O \in \mathcal{O}} \|f_O\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{\frac{\beta_m}{p_m}} \max_{O \in \mathcal{O}} \|f_O\|_{L^2}^{1-\frac{2}{p_{n+1}}}. \quad (5.7)$$

On the other hand, using (5.3) and **Property 2** from **[Alg-2]**, one has

$$\sum_{O \in \mathcal{O}} \|f_O\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \left(\prod_{i=m-1}^n D_i^{1+\delta} \right) \|f\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (5.8)$$

By (5.4) and repeated application of **Property 3** from [Alg 2], it implies that

$$\max_{O \in \mathcal{O}} \|f_O\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \prod_{i=m-1}^n r_i^{-\frac{1}{2}} D_i^{-i+\delta} \|f\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (5.9)$$

where $r_{m-1} := 1$. Combining (5.7), (5.8) and (5.9), one concludes

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p,q}(B_R^*)} \lesssim \prod_{i=m-1}^n r_i^{X_i} D_i^{Y_i+O(\delta)} \|f\|_{L^2},$$

where

$$\begin{cases} X_i := \frac{n}{2(n+1)}(\beta_{i+1} - \beta_i) - \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_{n+1}}\right), \\ Y_i := \frac{\beta_{i+1}}{2} - (i+1)\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_{n+1}}\right). \end{cases} \quad (5.10)$$

In order to prove Theorem 1.5, we need to verify

$$X_i \leq 0, \quad m \leq i \leq n \quad \text{and} \quad Y_i \leq 0, \quad m-1 \leq i \leq n.$$

One easily verifies that

$$X_i \leq 0 \iff \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_{i+1}}\right)^{-1} - \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_i}\right)^{-1} \leq \frac{n+1}{n} \quad (5.11)$$

and

$$Y_{i-1} \leq 0 \iff \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_i}\right)^{-1} - 2i \leq 0. \quad (5.12)$$

We firstly choose $p_m = \frac{2m}{m-1}$, then

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_m}\right)^{-1} = 2m.$$

Let $i = m$ in (5.11) and $i = m+1$ in (5.12), then

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_{m+1}}\right)^{-1} \leq \min\left\{2(m+1), 2m + \frac{n+1}{n}\right\} = 2m + \frac{n+1}{n}.$$

We choose p_{m+1} such that

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_{m+1}}\right)^{-1} = 2m + \frac{n+1}{n}.$$

Repeating the above argument, we obtain the following formula

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_i}\right)^{-1} = 2m + (i-m)\frac{n+1}{n}, \quad i \geq m.$$

In particular, let $i = n+1$,

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_{n+1}}\right)^{-1} = 2m + (n+1-m)\frac{n+1}{n},$$

and so we have

$$p_{n+1} = 2 + \frac{4}{n+m+\frac{1}{n}-\frac{m}{n}}.$$

The worst case happens when $m = k+1$, i.e.

$$p_{n+1} := p_{\text{tiny}} = 2 + \frac{4}{n+k+1-\frac{k}{n}}.$$

Suppose that **[Alg-2]** terminates at the stopping condition **[k-dim]**, i.e.

$$\|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{BL^{p,q}(B_R^*)} \lesssim M(\vec{r}_k, \vec{D}_k) \|f\|_{L^2}^{1-\beta_k} \left(\sum_{S_k \in \mathcal{S}_k} \|e^{it\Delta}f_{S_k}\|_{BL^{p_k,q}(B_{r_k})}^{p_k} \right)^{\frac{\beta_k}{p_k}}. \quad (5.13)$$

Fix $S_k \in \mathcal{S}_k$, we consider $\|e^{it\Delta}f_{S_k}\|_{BL^{p_k,q}(B_{r_k})}$, here f_{S_k} is concentrated on scale r_k wave packets which are $r_k^{-1/2+\delta_k}$ -tangent to S_k in B_{r_k} .

Case 1: $k \geq \frac{n+2}{2}$. We have the following **key estimate**:

$$\|e^{it\Delta}f_{S_k}\|_{BL^{p_k,q}(B_{r_k})} \lesssim \|f_{S_k}\|_{L^2}, \quad p_k = \frac{2(k+1)n}{kn+n+2-2k}. \quad (5.14)$$

In fact, it can be obtained by Theorem 6.5, Proposition 3.4 and Remark 3.5. We leave the proof of Theorem 6.5 in Section 6. Then (5.13) becomes

$$\|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{BL^{p,q}(B_R^*)} \lesssim M(\vec{r}_k, \vec{D}_k) \|f\|_{L^2}^{1-\beta_k} \left(\sum_{S_k \in \mathcal{S}_k} \|f_{S_k}\|_{L^2}^{p_k} \right)^{\frac{\beta_k}{p_k}}. \quad (5.15)$$

On the other hand, repeated applications of **Properties 1, 2** in **[Alg 2]**, one obtains

$$\sum_{S_k \in \mathcal{S}_k} \|f_{S_k}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \left(\prod_{i=k}^n D_i^{1+\delta} \right) \|f\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (5.16)$$

and

$$\max_{S_k \in \mathcal{S}_k} \|f_{S_k}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim r_k^{\frac{n-k+1}{2}} \prod_{i=k}^n r_i^{-\frac{1}{2}} D_i^{-i+\delta} \|f\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (5.17)$$

Combining (5.15), (5.16) and (5.17), we have

$$\|e^{it\Delta}f\|_{BL^{p,q}(B_R^*)} \lesssim r_k^{\frac{n-k+1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p_{n+1}})} \prod_{i=k}^n r_i^{X_i} D_i^{Y_i+O(\delta)} \|f\|_{L^2}, \quad (5.18)$$

where X_i and Y_i are defined as in (5.10).

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.5 in this case, one needs to verify

$$X_k + \frac{n-k+1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_{n+1}} \right) \leq 0, \quad (5.19)$$

and

$$X_i \leq 0, \quad k+1 \leq i \leq n \quad \text{and} \quad Y_i \leq 0, \quad k \leq i \leq n.$$

Since

$$p_k = \frac{2(k+1)n}{kn+n+2-2k},$$

then

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_k} \right)^{-1} = \frac{(k+1)n}{k-1}.$$

By (5.19) and $Y_k \leq 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_{k+1}}\right)^{-1} &\leq \min \left\{ 2(k+1), \frac{(k+1)n}{k-1} - \frac{(n-k)(n+1)}{n} \right\} \\ &= \frac{(k+1)n}{k-1} - \frac{(n-k)(n+1)}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the hypothesis $k \geq \frac{n+2}{2}$. Choosing p_{k+1} such that

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_{k+1}}\right)^{-1} = \frac{(k+1)n}{k-1} - \frac{(n-k)(n+1)}{n},$$

and repeating the above argument, we obtain the following formula

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_i}\right)^{-1} = \frac{(k+1)n}{k-1} - \frac{(n-k)(n+1)}{n} + (i-k-1)\frac{n+1}{n}, \quad i \geq k+1.$$

In particular, let $i = n+1$,

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_{n+1}}\right)^{-1} = \frac{(k+1)n}{k-1},$$

and so we have

$$p_{n+1} = 2 + \frac{4}{n-2 + \frac{2n}{k-1}}.$$

Case 2: $2 \leq k < \frac{n+2}{2}$. Using Theorem 6.5 and Proposition 3.4 again, we have the following **key estimate**:

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_k}\|_{BL^{p_k, q}(B_{r_k})} \lesssim \|f_{S_k}\|_{L^2}, \quad p_k = \frac{2(k+1)(n+2)}{kn+n+2}. \quad (5.20)$$

In this setting, (5.13) becomes

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p, q}(B_R^*)} \lesssim M(\vec{r}_k, \vec{D}_k) \|f\|_{L^2}^{1-\beta_k} \left(\sum_{S_k \in \mathcal{S}_k} \|f_{S_k}\|_{L^2}^{p_k} \right)^{\frac{\beta_k}{p_k}}. \quad (5.21)$$

Repeating the above argument as in the case $k \geq \frac{n+2}{2}$, one concludes

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{BL^{p, q}(B_R^*)} \lesssim r_k^{\frac{n-k+1}{2}(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_{n+1}})} \prod_{i=k}^n r_i^{X_i} D_i^{Y_i+O(\delta)} \|f\|_{L^2}, \quad (5.22)$$

where X_i and Y_i are defined as in (5.10).

To prove Theorem 1.5 in this case, it suffices to verify

$$X_k + \frac{n-k+1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_{n+1}}\right) \leq 0, \quad (5.23)$$

and

$$X_i \leq 0, \quad k+1 \leq i \leq n \quad \text{and} \quad Y_i \leq 0, \quad k \leq i \leq n.$$

Since

$$p_k = \frac{2(k+1)(n+2)}{kn+n+2},$$

then

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_k}\right)^{-1} = \frac{(k+1)(n+2)}{k}.$$

By (5.23) and $Y_k \leq 0$, we obtain

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_{k+1}}\right)^{-1} \leq \min \left\{ 2(k+1), \frac{(k+1)(n+2)}{k} - \frac{(n-k)(n+1)}{n} \right\}.$$

Let $k_0(n)$ denote the positive root of the equation

$$(n-1)k^2 + kn - (n^2 + 2n) = 0. \quad (5.24)$$

If $k_0(n) \leq k < \frac{n+2}{2}$, we choose p_{k+1} such that

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_{k+1}}\right)^{-1} = \frac{(k+1)(n+2)}{k} - \frac{(n-k)(n+1)}{n},$$

and repeat the above step to obtain

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_i}\right)^{-1} = \frac{(k+1)(n+2)}{k} - \frac{(n-k)(n+1)}{n} + (i-k-1)\frac{n+1}{n}, \quad i \geq k+1.$$

In particular, let $i = n+1$,

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_{n+1}}\right)^{-1} = \frac{(k+1)(n+2)}{k},$$

and so we have

$$p_{n+1} = 2 + \frac{4}{n + \frac{n+2}{k}}.$$

If $2 \leq k < k_0(n)$, we choose p_{k+1} such that

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_{k+1}}\right)^{-1} = 2(k+1),$$

and repeat the above step to get

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_i}\right)^{-1} = 2(k+1) + (i-k-1)\frac{n+1}{n}, \quad i \geq k+1.$$

In particular, let $i = n+1$,

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_{n+1}}\right)^{-1} = 2(k+1) + (n-k)\frac{n+1}{n}.$$

Therefore

$$p_{n+1} = 2 + \frac{4}{n + k + 1 - \frac{k}{n}}.$$

Case 3: $k = 1$. We claim:

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f_{S_1}\|_{BL^{p,q}(B_{r_1})} \lesssim \begin{cases} r_1^{\frac{n+1}{2p} - \frac{n}{4} + \epsilon} \|f_{S_1}\|_{L^2}, & KM \geq r_1^{1/2 - O(\delta_0)}, \\ O(r_1^{-N}) \|f_{S_1}\|_{L^2}, & KM < r_1^{1/2 - O(\delta_0)}, \end{cases}$$

for any $N > 0$. In fact, if $KM \geq r_1^{1/2 - O(\delta_0)}$, the estimate can be derived by the same argument of Section 4. If $KM < r_1^{1/2 - O(\delta_0)}$, we consider wave packet decomposition of f on scale r_1 : $f = \sum_{\theta, \nu} c_{\theta, \nu} \varphi_{\theta, \nu}$. Since f is concentrated in wave packets from $\mathbb{T}_{S_1}[r_1]$, it suffices to consider $(\theta, \nu) \in \mathbb{T}_{S_1}[r_1]$. For each $(\theta, \nu) \in \mathbb{T}_{S_1}[r_1]$, we can choose $z_0 \in S_1 \cap B_{r_1} \cap N_{O(r_1^{1/2 + \delta_1})} T_{\theta, \nu}$ such that

$$\angle(G(\theta), T_{z_0} S_1) \lesssim r_1^{-\frac{1}{2} + \delta_1}.$$

This fact implies for any $\tau \supset \theta$,

$$\angle(G(\tau), T_{z_0}S_1) \leq (KM)^{-1}.$$

Since $T_{z_0}S_1$ is a 1-subspace, such τ 's do not contribute to $\mu_{e^{it\Delta}f}(B_K \times I_K)$. Hence we have

$$\|e^{it\Delta}f_{S_1}\|_{BL^{p,q}(B_{r_1})} = O(r_1^{-N})\|f_{S_1}\|_{L^2}, \quad \forall N > 0.$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\|e^{it\Delta}f_{S_1}\|_{BL^{p_1,q}(B_{r_1})} \lesssim \|f_{S_1}\|_{L^2}, \quad p_1 = \frac{2(n+1)}{n}.$$

Parallel discussion as $2 \leq k < \frac{n+2}{2}$ leads to

$$p_{n+1} = 2 + \frac{4}{n + 2 - \frac{1}{n}}.$$

Collecting all restrictions of p in the stopping condition **[k-dim]**, we have

$$p_{\text{tang}} := \begin{cases} 2 + \frac{4}{n + k + 1 - \frac{k}{n}}, & 1 \leq k < k_0(n), \\ 2 + \frac{4}{n + \frac{n+2}{k}}, & k_0(n) \leq k < \frac{n+2}{2}, \\ 2 + \frac{4}{n - 2 + \frac{2n}{k-1}}, & \frac{n+2}{2} \leq k \leq n. \end{cases}$$

Finally, we can choose

$$p \geq \min_{1 \leq k \leq n} \max\{p_{\text{tiny}}, p_{\text{tang}}\} = \min_{1 \leq k \leq n} p_{\text{tang}},$$

which shows that Theorem 1.5 holds.

Remark 5.1. *The main effect of polynomial partitioning is passing from original $(n+1)$ -dimensional case to k -dimensional case for $1 \leq k \leq n+1$. It seems impossible to achieve such reduction without any loss. If we have already passed from the original setting to k -dimensional case, then $p \geq p_1(k)$ is restricted accordingly. Therefore $p \geq p_{\text{tiny}}$ is the basic restriction in polynomial partitioning's argument. On the other hand, we also have the limitation $p \geq p_{\text{tang}}$ due to the additional stopping condition **[k-dim]** in **[Alg-2]**. One can show that the limitation condition $p \geq p_{\text{tang}}$ is necessary. Otherwise, if Theorem 1.5 holds for*

$$p \geq p_{\text{conj}} := \min_{1 \leq k \leq n} p_{\text{tiny}} = 2 + \frac{4}{2n - 1 + \frac{1}{n}},$$

then for sufficiently large n , we have

$$p_{\text{conj}} = 2 + \frac{4}{2n + O(1)} < 2 + \frac{4}{n + 2\sqrt{n} + O(1)} = p_{\text{ness}}.$$

This inequality contradicts with the necessary condition $p \geq p_{\text{ness}}$.

6. BILINEAR MAXIMAL L^p -ESTIMATE IN LOWER DIMENSIONS

In this section, we will use so called refined Strichartz estimates established by Du-Guth-Li-Zhang in [8] to prove the **key estimates** (5.14) and (5.20).

Theorem 6.1 (Linear refined Strichartz for k -variety in dimension $n + 1$, [8]). *Let k be a dimension in the range $2 \leq k \leq n + 1$. Assume that the following conditions hold:*

- (i) $Z = Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n+1-k})$ is a transverse complete intersection where $\deg(P_i) \leq D_Z = R^{\delta_{deg}}$, where δ_{deg} is a small parameter.
- (ii) $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is of Fourier supported in $B^n(0, 1)$, and concentrated on scale r wave packets which are $r^{-1/2+\delta_k}$ -tangent to Z in B_r .
- (iii) Q_1, Q_2, \dots are lattice $r^{1/2}$ -cubes in B_r^{n+1} such that

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{L^{\frac{2(k+1)}{k-1}}(Q_j)} \text{ is essentially constant in } j.$$

- (iv) These cubes are arranged in horizontal slabs of the form $\mathbb{R} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R} \times \{t_0, t_0 + r^{1/2}\}$, and each such slab contains $\sim \sigma$ cubes Q_j .

Let $Y = \cup_j Q_j$, then

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f\|_{L^{\frac{2(k+1)}{k-1}}(Y)} \lesssim r^{-\frac{n+1-k}{2(k+1)}} \sigma^{-\frac{1}{k+1}} \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Theorem 6.2 (Bilinear refined Strichartz for k -variety in dimension $n + 1$, [8]). *Let k be a dimension in the range $2 \leq k \leq n + 1$. Assume that the following conditions hold:*

- (i) $Z = Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n+1-k})$ is a transverse complete intersection such that $\deg(P_i) \leq D_Z = R^{\delta_{deg}}$, where δ_{deg} is a small parameter.
- (ii) $f_i, i = 1, 2$, have Fourier supports in $B^n(0, 1)$, and the Fourier supports of f_i are separated by at least 1. Each f_i is concentrated on scale r wave packets which are $r^{-1/2+\delta_k}$ -tangent to Z in B_r .
- (iii) Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_N are lattice $r^{1/2}$ -cubes in B_r^{n+1} , so that

$$\|e^{it\Delta} f_i\|_{L^{\frac{2(k+1)}{k-1}}(Q_j)} \text{ is essentially constant in } j, \text{ for each } i=1, 2.$$

Let $Y = \cup_{j=1}^N Q_j$, then

$$\left\| |e^{it\Delta} f_1 e^{it\Delta} f_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{2(k+1)}{k-1}}(Y)} \lesssim r^{-\frac{n+1-k}{2(k+1)}} N^{-\frac{1}{2(k+1)}} \|f_1\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f_2\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The following lemma is the extension version for $n = k = 2$ as in [7, Proposition 8.2]. In fact, for general n and $2 \leq k \leq n + 1$, we can prove it by the same argument by making use of parabolic rescaling.

Lemma 6.3. *Let k be a dimension in the range $2 \leq k \leq n + 1$. Suppose that $f_i, i = 1, 2$, have Fourier supports in $B(\xi_0, 1/M)$, and the Fourier supports of f_i are separated by at least $\frac{1}{KM}$. If each f_i is concentrated on scale r wave packets which are $r^{-1/2+\delta_k}$ -tangent to Z in B_r , where $Z = Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n+1-k})$ is a transverse complete intersection. Suppose that Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_N are lattice $r^{1/2}$ -cubes in B_r^{n+1} , so that*

$$\left\| |e^{it\Delta} f_1 e^{it\Delta} f_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{2(k+1)}{k-1}}(Q_j)} \text{ is essentially constant in } j.$$

Let $Y = \cup_{j=1}^N Q_j$, then

$$\left\| |e^{it\Delta} f_1 e^{it\Delta} f_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{2(k+1)}{k-1}}(Y)} \lesssim M^{\frac{1}{2(k+1)}} r^{-\frac{n+1-k}{2(k+1)}} N^{-\frac{1}{2(k+1)}} \|f_1\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f_2\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Theorem 6.1 and Lemma 6.3 imply the following corollary immediately.

Corollary 6.4. *Let k be a dimension in the range $2 \leq k \leq n+1$. Suppose that f_1 and f_2 are under the hypotheses of Lemma 6.3. Suppose that Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_N are lattice $r^{1/2}$ -cubes in B_r^{n+1} , so that*

$$\left\| |e^{it\Delta} f_1 e^{it\Delta} f_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{2(k+1)}{k-1}}(Q_j)} \text{ is essentially constant in } j.$$

Suppose these cubes are arranged in horizontal slabs of the form $\mathbb{R} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R} \times \{t_0, t_0 + r^{1/2}\}$, and each such slab contains $\sim \sigma$ cubes Q_j . Let $Y = \cup_{j=1}^N Q_j$, then

$$\left\| |e^{it\Delta} f_1 e^{it\Delta} f_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{2(k+1)}{k-1}}(Y)} \lesssim M^{\frac{1}{2(k+1)}} r^{-\frac{n+1-k}{2(k+1)}} [\max(\sigma, N^{1/2})]^{-\frac{1}{k+1}} \|f_1\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f_2\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Now we prove the following bilinear L^p -estimate of Schrödinger maximal function in lower dimensions.

Theorem 6.5. *Let k be a positive integer in the range $2 \leq k \leq n+1$ and*

$$p_k \geq \begin{cases} \frac{2(k+1)(n+2)}{kn+n+2}, & 2 \leq k < \frac{n+2}{2}, \\ \frac{2(k+1)n}{kn+n+2-2k}, & \frac{n+2}{2} \leq k \leq n+1. \end{cases}$$

Suppose that f_1, f_2 have Fourier supports in $B(\xi_0, \frac{1}{M})$, and $d(\text{supp } \hat{f}_1, \text{supp } \hat{f}_2) \geq \frac{1}{KM}$. Suppose that f_1 and f_2 are concentrated on scale r wave packets which are $r^{-1/2+\delta_k}$ -tangent to Z on B_r , where $Z = Z(P_1, \dots, P_{n+1-k})$ is a transverse complete intersection. Then

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t \leq r} |e^{it\Delta} f_1 e^{it\Delta} f_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{p_k}(B_r)} \lesssim \|f_1\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f_2\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. We may assume that $M \ll r^{1/2}$. Otherwise, one can prove this theorem by the same argument as in Section 4.

Since f_i is concentrated on scale r wave packets which are $r^{-1/2+\delta_k}$ -tangent to Z on B_r , we decompose $N_{r^{1/2+\delta_k}} Z$ into balls Q of radius $r^{1/2}$. Fix Q , there exists a non-singular point $z_0 \in Z \cap N_{r^{1/2+\delta_k}} Q$. For each wave packet $T_{\theta, \nu}$ that intersects Q , we have $z_0 \in Z \cap N_{2r^{1/2+\delta_k}}(T_{\theta, \nu})$. By Definition 3.8, we obtain

$$\angle(G(\theta), T_{z_0} Z) \leq r^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta_k}. \tag{6.1}$$

Since $T_{z_0} Z$ is a k -dimensional hyperplane, we can assume that $T_{z_0} Z$ is given by

$$\begin{cases} a_{11}x_1 + a_{12}x_2 + \dots + a_{1n}x_n + b_1t = 0, \\ \dots \\ a_{n+1-k,1}x_1 + a_{n+1-k,2}x_2 + \dots + a_{n+1-k,n}x_n + b_{n+1-k}t = 0, \end{cases}$$

with

$$a_{i1}^2 + a_{i2}^2 + \dots + a_{in}^2 + b_i^2 = 1, \quad \text{for each } i = 1, 2, \dots, n+k-1.$$

Then the above angle condition implies that

$$|-2a_i \cdot c(\theta) + b_i| \lesssim r^{-\frac{1}{2} + \delta_k}, \quad \text{for each } i = 1, 2, \dots, n+k-1. \quad (6.2)$$

So $T_{\theta, \nu}$ makes an angle $\gtrsim 1$ with the plane $t = 0$ due to $\theta \in B(0, 1)$. By (6.1), we know that $T_{z_0}Z$ makes an angle $\gtrsim 1$ with the plane $t = 0$, which implies that $|a_i| \gtrsim 1$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, n+k-1$. Also, we know $T_{z_0}Z|_{t=0}$ is given by

$$\begin{cases} a_{11}x_1 + a_{12}x_2 + \dots + a_{1n}x_n = 0, \\ \dots \\ a_{n+1-k,1}x_1 + a_{n+1-k,2}x_2 + \dots + a_{n+1-k,n}x_n = 0. \end{cases}$$

Since $T_{z_0}Z$ makes an angle $\gtrsim 1$ with the plane $t = 0$, so the dimension of $T_{z_0}Z|_{t=0}$ is $k-1$. Noting that the number of equations of $T_{z_0}Z|_{t=0}$ is $n+1-k$, we conclude that $(a_{i1}, a_{i2}, \dots, a_{in})$, $i = 1, \dots, n+1-k$, are linearly independent to each other. These conditions imply that $\theta \in S$, where S is a strip in $B(0, 1)$ of dimensions

$$\underbrace{r^{-1/2+\delta_k} \times \dots \times r^{-1/2+\delta_k}}_{n+1-k} \times \underbrace{M^{-1} \times \dots \times M^{-1}}_{k-1}.$$

Let η_Q be a smooth bump function approximating χ_Q , then the Fourier transform of each function $\eta_Q e^{it\Delta} f_i$ is supported on

$$S^* := \{(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n+1}) \mid (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in S, |\xi_{n+1} - \xi_1^2 - \dots - \xi_n^2| \lesssim r^{-\frac{1}{2}}\}.$$

Therefore S^* is contained in a rectangular box of dimensions

$$\underbrace{r^{-1/2+\delta_k} \times \dots \times r^{-1/2+\delta_k}}_{n+1-k} \times \underbrace{M^{-1} \times \dots \times M^{-1} \times M^{-1}}_k.$$

By Lemma 3.1, we can view $|\eta_Q e^{it\Delta} f_1 e^{it\Delta} f_2|$ essentially as constant on each rectangular box of dimensions

$$\underbrace{r^{1/2-\delta_k} \times \dots \times r^{1/2-\delta_k}}_{n+1-k} \times \underbrace{M \times \dots \times M \times M}_k,$$

which is denoted by $A_\ell(Q)$. More precisely, there exists a positive function ψ which is essentially supported on $A_\ell(Q)$ satisfying $\|\psi\|_{L^1} \lesssim 1$, so that

$$|\eta_Q e^{it\Delta} f_1 e^{it\Delta} f_2| \leq |\eta_Q e^{it\Delta} f_1 e^{it\Delta} f_2| * \psi. \quad (6.3)$$

Suppose that $\sup_{0 < t \leq r} |e^{it\Delta} f_1 e^{it\Delta} f_2|^{1/2} \sim H$ on $A_H \subset B_r^n$. Without loss of generality we assume that $\|f\|_{L^2} = 1$. A trivial estimate implies $H \lesssim 1$. On the other hand, we can assume that $r^{-100n} < H$, since the contributions from those A_H with $H \leq r^{-100n}$ are negligible. Therefore there are only $\sim \log r$ many relevant H . By the dyadic pigeonhole principle, there exists a dyadic number H such that

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t \leq r} |e^{it\Delta} f_1 e^{it\Delta} f_2|^{1/2} \right\|_{L^{p_k}(B_r)} \lesssim H |A_H|^{\frac{1}{p_k}}. \quad (6.4)$$

Now we consider these $A_\ell(Q_j)$ that intersect $N_{r^{1/2+\delta_k}}Z$. One can choose a collection of rectangles $A_\ell(Q_j)$ satisfying:

- The projection of each $A_\ell(Q_j)$ is almost disjoint;
- The projections of all $A_\ell(Q_j)$ cover A_H ;
-

$$\sup_{(x,t) \in A_\ell(Q_j)} |e^{it\Delta} f_1(x) e^{it\Delta} f_2(x)|^{1/2} \gtrsim H.$$

Let X denote the union of these rectangles. By the above conditions, we have

$$|A_H| \lesssim M^{-1}|X|, \tag{6.5}$$

and for each cube Q ,

$$|X \cap Q| \lesssim r^{\frac{n}{2}} M.$$

Now we consider the $r^{1/2}$ -cubes Q_j in B_r^* that intersect X . Let $\mathcal{Y}_{\gamma,\sigma}$ denote the collection of those Q_j so that

-

$$\left\| |e^{it\Delta} f_1 e^{it\Delta} f_2|^{1/2} \right\|_{L^{\frac{2(k+1)}{k-1}}(Q_j)} \sim \gamma;$$

- The horizontal $r^{1/2}$ -slab containing Q_j contains $\sim \sigma$ many $r^{1/2}$ -cubes satisfying the above condition.

Let $Y_{\gamma,\sigma} := \cup_{Q_j \in \mathcal{Y}_{\gamma,\sigma}} Q_j$. Similarly as for the argument of H , we can assume $r^{-C} \leq \gamma \leq r^C$ for some large constant C . Also note $1 \leq \sigma \leq r^{n/2}$. Therefore there are only $\sim O(\log r)^2$ many relevant dyadic (γ, σ) . Using the dyadic pigeonhole principle, we can choose a set of $r^{1/2}$ -cubes Q_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$, so that

$$|X| \lesssim |X \cap Y|, \tag{6.6}$$

where $Y = Y_{\gamma,\sigma}$ for some (γ, σ) . Let $Y := \cup_{j=1}^N Q_j$. One easily shows that

$$|X| \lesssim |X \cap Y| \lesssim Nr^{\frac{n}{2}} M. \tag{6.7}$$

On the other hand, by (6.3), we see that

$$\sup_{(x,t) \in A_\ell(Q_j)} |e^{it\Delta} f_1(x) e^{it\Delta} f_2(x)| \lesssim r^{O(\delta)} \frac{\int_{r^\delta A_\ell(Q_j)} |e^{it\Delta} f_1 e^{it\Delta} f_2|}{|A_\ell(Q_j)|} + r^{-100n} \|f_1\|_{L^2} \|f_2\|_{L^2}.$$

We have already assumed $H > r^{-100n}$, so the term $r^{-100n} \|f_1\|_{L^2} \|f_2\|_{L^2}$ can be omitted. Then by Hölder inequality, for each $A_\ell(Q_j) \subset X \cap Y$, we have

$$H|A_\ell(Q_j)|^{\frac{k-1}{2(k+1)}} \lesssim \left\| |e^{it\Delta} f_1 e^{it\Delta} f_2|^{1/2} \right\|_{L^{\frac{2(k+1)}{k-1}}(A_\ell(Q_j))},$$

which implies that

$$H|X \cap Y|^{\frac{k-1}{2(k+1)}} \lesssim \left\| |e^{it\Delta} f_1 e^{it\Delta} f_2|^{1/2} \right\|_{L^{\frac{2(k+1)}{k-1}}(Y)}. \tag{6.8}$$

Finally, combining (6.4), (6.5), (6.6), (6.7), (6.8) and Corollary 6.4, one concludes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \sup_{0 < t \leq r} |e^{it\Delta} f_1 e^{it\Delta} f_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{p_k}(B_r)} \lesssim H |A_H|^{\frac{1}{p_k}} \\
& \lesssim H M^{-\frac{1}{p_k}} |X|^{\frac{1}{p_k}} \lesssim H M^{-\frac{1}{p_k}} |X \cap Y|^{\frac{1}{p_k}} \\
& = M^{-\frac{1}{p_k}} H |X \cap Y|^{\frac{k-1}{2(k+1)}} |X \cap Y|^{\frac{1}{p_k} - \frac{k-1}{2(k+1)}} \\
& \lesssim M^{-\frac{1}{p_k}} \left\| |e^{it\Delta} f_1 e^{it\Delta} f_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{2(k+1)}{k-1}}(Y)} (Nr^{\frac{n}{2}} M)^{\frac{1}{p_k} - \frac{k-1}{2(k+1)}} \\
& \leq M^{-\frac{k-2}{2(k+1)}} r^{\frac{n}{2p_k} - \frac{kn+n+2-2k}{4(k+1)}} [\max(\sigma, N^{1/2})]^{-\frac{1}{k+1}} N^{\frac{1}{p_k} - \frac{k-1}{2(k+1)}} \|f_1\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f_2\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq r^{\frac{n}{2p_k} - \frac{kn+n+2-2k}{4(k+1)}} [\max(\sigma, N^{1/2})]^{-\frac{1}{k+1}} N^{\frac{1}{p_k} - \frac{k-1}{2(k+1)}} \|f_1\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f_2\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $\frac{n+2}{2} \leq k \leq n+1$, by $N \geq 1$, this yields $p_k \geq \frac{2(k+1)n}{kn+n+2-2k}$. Then we consider the case for $2 \leq k < \frac{n+2}{2}$. When $\sigma \leq N^{1/2}$, it follows from $N \lesssim \sigma r^{1/2}$ that $N \lesssim r$, which yields $p_k \geq \frac{2(k+1)(n+2)}{kn+n+2}$. When $\sigma > N^{1/2}$, again by $N \lesssim \sigma r^{1/2}$, the worst case happens when $\sigma = N^{1/2}$, which also yields $p_k \geq \frac{2(k+1)(n+2)}{kn+n+2}$. \square

Remark 6.6. *We note that bilinear reduction and bilinear maximal L^p -estimate help us recover the sharp result of Du-Guth-Li [7]. In other words, if one could build appropriate multilinear reduction by some methods, the result of Theorem 1.1 can be further improved. This paper mainly introduces how the polynomial method is applied to such problem. Moreover, by introducing the broad norm, we have successfully realized bilinear reduction. However, it seems difficult to realize general multilinear reduction by the same steps.*

Acknowledgements. We thank the anonymous referee and the associated editor for their invaluable comments which helped to improve the paper. We are grateful for professor Xiaochun Li warm comments and suggestions. This work is supported in part by the National Key research and development program of China (No.2020YFAO712903), NSFC Grants 11771388 and NSFC Grants 11831004.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bourgain, On the Schrödinger maximal function in higher dimension, Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics, 2013, 280(1):46-60.
- [2] J. Bourgain, A note on the Schrödinger maximal function, Journal d'Analyse Mathématique, 2016, 130(1):393-396.
- [3] A. Carbery, Radial Fourier multipliers and associated maximal functions, In Recent Progress In Fourier Analysis, Vol.111 of North-Holland Math. Stud, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1985, 111:49-56.
- [4] L. Carleson, Some analytic problems related to statistical mechanics, In Euclidean Harmonic Analysis, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1979, 779:5-45.
- [5] M. Cowling, Pointwise behavior of solutions to Schrödinger equations, In Harmonic Analysis, Vol.992 of Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1983, 992:83-90.

- [6] C. Demeter, S. Guo, Schrödinger maximal function estimates via the pseudoconformal transformation, 2016, arXiv:1608.07640.
- [7] X. Du, L. Guth, X. Li, A sharp Schrödinger maximal estimate in \mathbb{R}^2 , Annals of Mathematics, 2017, 186(2):607-640.
- [8] X. Du, L. Guth, X. Li, R. Zhang, Pointwise convergence of Schrödinger solutions and multilinear refined Strichartz estimate, Forum Math. Sigma, 2018, e14, 18 pp.
- [9] B. E. J. Dahlberg, C. E. Kenig, A note on the almost everywhere behavior of solutions to the Schrödinger equation, Harmonic Analysis, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1981, 908:205-209.
- [10] X. Du, J. Kim, H. Wang, R. Zhang, Lower bounds for estimates of the Schrödinger maximal function, 2019, arXiv:1902.01430.
- [11] X. Du, X. Li, Pointwise convergence of the solutions to Schrödinger equation in \mathbb{R}^2 , Mathematics, 2016, arXiv:1508.05437.
- [12] X. Du, R. Zhang, Sharp L^2 estimate of Schrödinger maximal function in higher dimensions, Annals of Mathematics, 2018, 189(3):837-861.
- [13] L. Guth, A restriction estimate using polynomial partitioning, Journal of the American Mathematical Society, 2016, 29(2):371-413.
- [14] L. Guth, Restriction estimates using polynomial partitioning II, Acta Mathematica, 2018, 221(1):81-142.
- [15] L. Guth, H. Wang, R. Zhang, A sharp square function estimate for the cone in \mathbb{R}^3 , Annals of Mathematics, 2020, 192(2):551-581.
- [16] J. Hickman, M. Rogers, Improved Fourier restriction estimates in higher dimensions, Cambridge Journal of Mathematics, 2019, 7(3):219-282.
- [17] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce and L. Vega, Oscillatory integrals and regularity of dispersive equations, Indiana Univ. Math. J, 1991, 40(1):33-69.
- [18] S. Lee, On pointwise convergence of the solutions to Schrödinger equations in \mathbb{R}^2 , International Mathematics Research Notices, 2006, Art. ID 32597, 21 pp.
- [19] R. Lucà, K. Rogers, An improved necessary condition for the Schrödinger maximal estimate, 2015, arXiv:1506.05325.
- [20] A. Moyua, A. Vargas, L. Vega, Schrödinger maximal function and restriction properties of the Fourier transform, International Mathematics Research Notices, 1996, 1996(16):793-815.
- [21] P. Sjölin, Regularity of solutions to the Schrödinger equation, Duke Math. J., 1987, 55(3):699-715.
- [22] T. Tao, A sharp bilinear restriction estimate for paraboloids, Geometric and Functional Analysis GAFA, 2003, 13(6):1359-1384.
- [23] H. Wang, A restriction estimate in \mathbb{R}^3 using brooms, 2018, arXiv:1802.04312.
- [24] S. Wu, On the refined Strichartz estimates and maximal extension operator, 2020, arXiv:2003.01258.
- [25] L. Vega, Schrödinger equations, pointwise convergence to the initial data, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 1988, 102(4):874-878.

LABORATORY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPLEX SYSTEMS (MINISTRY OF EDUCATION), SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, BEIJING NORMAL UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100875, CHINA

Email address: 11735002@zju.edu.cn

INSTITUTE OF APPLIED PHYSICS AND COMPUTATIONAL MATHEMATICS, BEIJING 100088, CHINA

Email address: miao_changxing@iapcm.ac.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE, ZHEJIANG UNIVERSITY, HANGZHOU 310058, CHINA

Email address: mathdreamcn@zju.edu.cn