

UNCONDITIONAL WELL-POSEDNESS FOR SOME NONLINEAR PERIODIC ONE-DIMENSIONAL DISPERSIVE EQUATIONS

LUC MOLINET AND TOMOYUKI TANAKA

ABSTRACT. We consider the Cauchy problem for one-dimensional dispersive equations with a general nonlinearity in the periodic setting. Our main hypotheses are both that the dispersive operator behaves for high frequencies as a Fourier multiplier by $i|\xi|^\alpha \xi$, with $1 \leq \alpha \leq 2$, and that the nonlinear term is of the form $\partial_x f(u)$ where f is the sum of an entire series with infinite radius of convergence. Under these conditions, we prove the unconditional local well-posedness of the Cauchy problem in $H^s(\mathbb{T})$ for $s \geq 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha+1)}$. This leads to some global existence results in the energy space $H^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{T})$, for $\alpha \in [\sqrt{2}, 2]$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Our goal is to establish low regularity well-posedness results for quite general one-dimensional nonlinear dispersive equations of KdV type in the periodic setting. Our class contains in particular the generalized KdV equations with fractional dispersion

$$\partial_t u - \partial_x D_x^\alpha u + \partial_x(f(u)) = 0, \quad (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}, \quad (1.1)$$

$$u(0, x) = u_0(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{T}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$, $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the sum of an entire series, $\alpha \in [1, 2]$ and D_x^α is the Fourier multiplier by $|\xi|^\alpha$.

Famous equations in this class are the generalized Korteweg-de Vries equation (gKdV)

$$\partial_t u + \partial_x^3 u + \partial_x(f(u)) = 0$$

that corresponds to $\alpha = 2$ as well as the generalized Benjamin-Ono equation (gBO)

$$\partial_t u - \mathcal{H} \partial_x^2 u + \partial_x(f(u)) = 0,$$

where \mathcal{H} is the Hilbert transform (Fourier multiplier by $-i \operatorname{sgn}(\xi)$), that corresponds to $\alpha = 1$.

The Cauchy problem for this type of dispersive equations has been extensively studied since more than thirty years starting with the work of Kato [13] (see also

Key words and phrases. Benjamin-Ono equation, dispersion generalized Benjamin-Ono equation, nonlinear dispersive equation, well-posedness, unconditional uniqueness, energy method.

[1]). It is worth noticing that the first methods employed did not make use of the dispersive effects and the local well-posedness was restricted to Sobolev spaces with index $s > 3/2$. At the end of the eighties Kenig, Ponce and Vega succeeded in exploiting dispersive effects of the linear part of these equations in order to lower the required Sobolev regularity on the initial data (see for instance [15], [32]). They obtained in particular the well-posedness of the KdV equation in the energy space and were able in [16] to apply a contraction mapping argument on the integral formulation for some k -generalized KdV equations ($f(x) = x^k$). Then in the early nineties, Bourgain introduced the now so-called Bourgain's spaces that take into account the localization of the space-time Fourier transform of the function and where one can solve by a fixed point argument a wide class of dispersive equations on \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{T} with very rough initial data ([3]). At this stage, let us underline that since the nonlinearity of these equations is in general algebraic, the fixed point argument ensures the real analyticity of the solution-map.

In the early 2000's, Saut, Tzvetkov and the first author [24] noticed that a large class of "weakly" dispersive equations posed on the real line, including in particular (1.1) with $\alpha < 2$ and $f(x) = x^2$, cannot be solved by a fixed point argument for initial data in any Sobolev spaces $H^s(\mathbb{R})$. Since then, except in the case of integrability of the equation where methods linked to this remarkable property have been recently developed (see for instance [12], [6] in the periodic setting), mainly two types of approaches have been developed to solve this class of equation in low regularity Sobolev spaces. The first one consists in applying a gauge transform (see [37] for the Benjamin-Ono equation and [10] for the dispersion generalized KdV equation) to eliminate the worst nonlinear interactions that are some high-low frequency interactions and then to solve the equation after the gauge transform by using dispersive tools as Strichartz's and Bourgain's type estimates. The second one consists in enhancing the energy method (or modified energy method) with a priori estimates that takes the dispersion into account. For this one possibility is to improve the dispersive estimates by localizing a solution in space frequency depending time intervals and then mixing them with classical energy estimates. This type of methods was first introduced by Koch and Tzvetkov [21] (see also [17] for some improvements) in the framework of Strichartz's spaces and then by Koch and Tataru [20] (see also [11]) in the framework of Bourgain's spaces. Another method that does not need to localize in space frequency depending time intervals has been recently introduced in [27]. Note that in [28], [29] it is shown that in some cases this last method can be improved by adding some a priori estimates obtained

by localizing in space frequency depending time intervals. We implement this last approach enhanced with some other tools in this paper.

1.1. Presentation of the main results. In this work we consider roughly the same type of dispersion term as in [7] and [27] but with a much more general nonlinear term. More precisely we consider dispersive equation of the form

$$\partial_t u + L_{\alpha+1} u + \partial_x(f(u)) = 0 \quad (1.3)$$

under the two following hypotheses on $L_{\alpha+1}$ and f .

Hypothesis 1. $L_{\alpha+1}$ is the Fourier multiplier operator by $-ip_{\alpha+1}$ where $p_{\alpha+1} \in C^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap C^2(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$ is a real-valued odd function satisfying, for some $\xi_0 > 0$, $p'_{\alpha+1}(\xi) \sim \xi^\alpha$ and $p''_{\alpha+1}(\xi) \sim \xi^{\alpha-1}$ for all $\xi \geq \xi_0$.

Hypothesis 2. $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the sum of an entire series with infinite radius of convergence.

Remark 1.1. We choose a sign in Hypothesis 1 only to fix in an easy way the defocussing case that leads to a global existence result ((2) of Theorem 1.3 below). Of course for all other results the sign will play no role here.

Remark 1.2. Hypothesis 1 is fulfilled by the purely dispersive operators $L := \partial_x D_x^\alpha$ with $\alpha > 0$, the linear Intermediate Long Wave operator $L := \partial_x D_x \coth(D_x)$ and some perturbations of the Benjamin-Ono equation as the Smith operator $L := \partial_x(D_x^2 + 1)^{1/2}$ (see [35]) for which $\alpha = 1$.

Remark 1.3. The hypothesis on f ensures that f is of class C^∞ and is at each point of \mathbb{R} the sum of its Taylor expansion at the origin, i.e.,

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \frac{f^{(n)}(0)}{n!} x^n, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (1.4)$$

Of course any polynomial function enters in this class but also the exponential functions as e^x , $\sin(x)$, $\cos(x)$ and their products and compositions.

Here we concentrate ourself on the periodic setting. Actually we notice that in the real line case, following [21], one can exploit the classical Strichartz estimates in $L_t^4 L_x^\infty$ to get the following improved Strichartz estimates on smooth solutions to (1.1):

$$\|D_x^{1/2} u\|_{L_T^2 L_x^\infty} \lesssim C(\|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{(1-\alpha/4)+}}).$$

With this estimate in hand, the same method as the one developed in this work but with a clearly more simple decomposition, lead to the unconditional local well-posedness of (1.1) in $H^{(1-\alpha/4)^+}(\mathbb{R})$ (see [31] where the KdV case $\alpha = 2$ is treated with initial data that may be non vanishing at infinity).

Our approach is based on the method introduced in [27] enhanced with some arguments that can be found in [29], [18] and [21]. As noticed in [27], this method is particularly well-adapted to solve the Cauchy problem associated with one-dimensional dispersive wave equations in the Sobolev spaces H^s for $s > 1/2$. It combines classical energy estimates with Bourgain's type estimates that measure the localization of the space-time Fourier transform of the solution around the curve given by the Fourier symbol of the associated linear dispersive equation. In our approach we combine this with improved Strichartz estimates and symmetrization arguments. The main strategy is to use symmetry arguments to distribute the lost derivative to several functions and then to recover it by either improved Strichartz estimates or Bourgain's type estimates depending on whether the nonlinear interactions are resonant. Since the equation for the difference of two solutions enjoys less symmetries, this difference will be estimated in a lower regularity space than the solution itself and we will use the frequency envelope approach to recover the continuity result with respect to initial data.

We emphasize that our work was motivated by [18] where the local well-posedness of the k -gBO equation ($L_2 = \partial_x D_x$ and $f(x) = x^k$, $k \geq 2$) is proven in $H^{3/4}(\mathbb{T})$ by using another method that is short time Fourier transform restriction method combined with modified energy estimates. It is interesting to underline that our local well-posedness result in this case is exactly the same (except that we also get the unconditional uniqueness)¹. Both methods have the advantage to not use a gauge transformation and thus to be more flexible with respect to perturbations of the equation. However we believe that our approach is easier to implement to solve (1.3).

We are not aware of any low regularity results in the literature on the Cauchy problem associated with (1.1) with a general nonlinearity in the periodic setting. However we notice that, in [5], the local well-posedness of the k -gKdV equation was proven to be well-posed in $H^{1/2}(\mathbb{T})$ by a contraction mapping argument in Bourgain's spaces. This suggests that the LWP of the gKdV equation (at least with f satisfying hypothesis 2) should be locally well-posed in $H^{1/2^+}(\mathbb{T})$ whereas we only get the unconditional LWP of the gKdV equation in $H^{2/3}(\mathbb{T})$ in this work. On the

¹To be precise, they also deduced a priori estimate at the regularity $s > 1/2$.

other hand, in the case $\alpha < 2$, we do not know any local well-posedness results for (1.1) with $f(x) = x^k$, $k \geq 2$, in Sobolev spaces with lower regularity than the ones obtained in Theorem 1.1 below. Actually the only results we know are [18], mentioned above, and [26] where Ribaud and the first author proved the local well-posedness of the k -gBO equation in $H^1(\mathbb{T})$ by using gauge transform and Strichartz estimates. We believe that this approach could be adapted to quite general nonlinearity $\partial_x(f(u))$ to get the LWP of the gBO equation in $H^1(\mathbb{T})$. However it is not clear how to adapt such approach for more general dispersive term as it is done here.

Before stating our main result, let us recall our notion of solutions:

Definition 1. Let $s > 1/2$. We will say that $u \in L^\infty([0, T[; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$ is a solution to (1.3) associated with the initial datum $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T})$ if u satisfies (1.3)-(1.2) in the distributional sense, i.e. for any test function $\phi \in C_c^\infty([-T, T] \times \mathbb{T})$, it holds

$$\int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{T}} [(\phi_t + L_{\alpha+1}\phi)u + \phi_x f(u)] dx dt + \int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi(0, \cdot) u_0 dx = 0 \quad (1.5)$$

Remark 1.4. Note that for $u \in L^\infty([0, T[; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$, with $s > 1/2$, $f(u)$ is well-defined and belongs to $L^\infty([0, T[; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$. Moreover, Hypothesis 1 forces

$$L_{\alpha+1}u \in L^\infty([0, T[; H^{s-\alpha-1}(\mathbb{T})).$$

Therefore $u_t \in L^\infty([0, T[; H^{s-\alpha-1}(\mathbb{T}))$ and (1.5) ensures that (1.3) is satisfied in $L^\infty([0, T[; H^{s-\alpha-1}(\mathbb{T}))$. In particular, $u \in C([0, T[; H^{s-\alpha-1}(\mathbb{T}))$ and (1.5) forces the initial condition $u(0) = u_0$. Note that this ensures that $u \in C_w([0, T[; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$ and thus $\|u_0\|_{H^s} \leq \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H^s}$. Finally, we notice that this also ensures that u satisfies the Duhamel formula associated with (1.3).

Finally, let us recall the notion of unconditional well-posedness that was introduced by Kato [14], which is, roughly speaking, the local well-posedness with uniqueness of solutions in $L^\infty([0, T[; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$.

Definition 2. We will say that the Cauchy problem associated with (1.3) is unconditionally locally well-posed in $H^s(\mathbb{T})$ if for any initial data $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T})$ there exists $T = T(\|u_0\|_{H^s}) > 0$ and a solution $u \in C([0, T[; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$ to (1.3) emanating from u_0 . Moreover, u is the unique solution to (1.3) associated with u_0 that belongs to $L^\infty([0, T[; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$. Finally, for any $R > 0$, the solution-map $u_0 \mapsto u$ is continuous from the ball of $H^s(\mathbb{T})$ with radius R centered at the origin into $C([0, T(R)]; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$.

We note that Babin, Ilyin and Titi [2] proved the unconditional uniqueness of the KdV equation in $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ by integration by parts in time. This method, which is

actually a normal form reduction, has been now successfully applied to a variety of dispersive equations (see for instance [8, 19, 22]).

Our main result is the following one:

Theorem 1.1 (Unconditional well-posedness). *Assume that Hypotheses 1-2 are satisfied with $1 \leq \alpha \leq 2$. Then for any $s \geq s(\alpha) = 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha+1)}$ the Cauchy problem associated with (1.3) is unconditionally locally well-posed in $H^s(\mathbb{T})$ with a maximal time of existence $T \geq g(\|u_0\|_{H^s(\alpha)}) > 0$ where g is a smooth increasing function depending only on $L_{\alpha+1}$ and f .*

Remark 1.5. The limitation $s \geq s(\alpha) = 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha+1)}$ in the above theorem is due to the following nonlinear interactions: there are 4 input high frequencies of the same order than the output frequency whereas all other input frequencies are much lower. In this configuration the nonlinear term can be resonant and to recover the lost derivative we put the 4 terms with high frequencies in $L_{t,x}^4$ (whereas the other ones are put in $L_{t,x}^\infty$) and we use the improved Strichartz estimates in Proposition 3.5 to control their norms in this space. This is the lost of derivatives in these Strichartz estimates that leads to the value of $s(\alpha)$. More precisely, in Proposition 3.5, it is proven that any solution $u \in L^\infty([0, T[; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$ to (1.3) satisfies $D_x^{s-\beta(\alpha)}u \in L_T^4 L_x^4$ with $\beta(\alpha) = \frac{1}{4(\alpha+1)}$. Then, in order to recover the lost derivative in this configuration, direct calculations lead to $4(s - \beta(\alpha)) \geq 2s + 1 \Leftrightarrow s \geq 1/2 + 2\beta(\alpha) \Leftrightarrow s \geq s(\alpha)$.

Equation (1.3) enjoys the following conservation laws at the L^2 and at the $H^{\alpha/2}$ -level:

$$M(u) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} u^2 \quad \text{and} \quad E(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}} u \partial_x^{-1} L_{\alpha+1} u + \int_{\mathbb{T}} F(u)$$

where $\partial_x^{-1} L_{\alpha+1}$ is the Fourier multiplier by $\frac{p_{\alpha+1}(k)}{k} \mathbf{1}_{k \neq 0}$ and

$$F(x) := \int_0^x f(y) dy. \tag{1.6}$$

At this stage it is worth noticing that Hypothesis 1 ensures that the restriction of the quadratic part of the energy E to high frequencies behaves as the $H^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{T})$ -norm whereas its restriction to the low frequencies can be controlled by the L^2 -norm. Therefore, gathering these conservation laws with the above local well-posedness result we are able to obtain the two following global existence results:

Theorem 1.2 (Global existence for small initial data). *Assume that Hypotheses 1-2 are satisfied with $\alpha \in [\sqrt{2}, 2]$. Then there exists $A = A(L_{\alpha+1}, f) > 0$ such that for any initial data $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T})$ with $s \geq \alpha/2$ such that $\|u_0\|_{H^{\alpha/2}} \leq A$, the solution*

constructed in Theorem 1.1 can be extended for all times. Moreover its trajectory is bounded in $H^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{T})$.

Theorem 1.3 (Global existence for arbitrary large initial data).

Assume that Hypotheses 1-2 are satisfied with $\alpha \in [\sqrt{2}, 2]$. Then the solution constructed in Theorem 1.1 can be extended for all times if the function F defined in (1.6) satisfies one of the following conditions:

- (1) There exists $C > 0$ such that $|F(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|^{p+1})$ for some $0 < p < 2\alpha + 1$.
- (2) There exists $B > 0$ such that $F(x) \leq B$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Moreover its trajectory is bounded in $H^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{T})$.

Remark 1.6. Typical examples for the case (1) are

- $f(x)$ is a polynomial function of degree strictly less than 2α .
- $f(x)$ is a polynomial function of $\sin(x)$ and $\cos(x)$.

Whereas typical example for the case (2) are

- $f(x)$ is a polynomial function of odd degree with $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x) = -\infty$.
- $f(x) = -\exp(x)$ or $f(x) = -\sinh(x)$.

2. NOTATION, FUNCTION SPACES AND BASIC ESTIMATES

2.1. Notation. Throughout this paper, \mathbb{N} denotes the set of non negative integers. For any positive numbers a and b , we write $a \lesssim b$ when there exists a positive constant C such that $a \leq Cb$. We also write $a \sim b$ when $a \lesssim b$ and $b \lesssim a$ hold. Moreover, we denote $a \ll b$ if the estimate $b \lesssim a$ does not hold. For two non negative numbers a, b , we denote $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$ and $a \wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$. We also write $\langle \cdot \rangle = (1 + |\cdot|^2)^{1/2}$.

For $u = u(t, x)$, $\mathcal{F}u = \tilde{u}$ denotes its space-time Fourier transform, whereas $\mathcal{F}_x u = \hat{u}$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}_t u$) denotes its Fourier transform in space (resp. time). We define the Riesz potentials by $D_x^s g := \mathcal{F}_x^{-1}(|\xi|^s \mathcal{F}_x g)$. We also denote the unitary group associated to the linear part of (1.3) by $U_\alpha(t) = e^{-tL_{\alpha+1}}$, i.e.,

$$U_\alpha(t)u = \mathcal{F}_x^{-1}(e^{itp_{\alpha+1}(\xi)} \mathcal{F}_x u).$$

In the present paper, we fix a smooth cutoff function χ : let $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ satisfy

$$0 \leq \chi \leq 1, \quad \chi|_{[-1,1]} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp } \chi \subset [-2, 2].$$

We set $\phi(\xi) := \chi(\xi) - \chi(2\xi)$. For any $l \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$\phi_{2^l}(\xi) := \phi(2^{-l}\xi), \quad \psi_{2^l}(\tau, \xi) := \phi_{2^l}(\tau - p_{\alpha+1}(\xi)),$$

where $ip_{\alpha+1}(\xi)$ is the Fourier symbol of $L_{\alpha+1}$. By convention, we also denote

$$\phi_0(\xi) = \chi(2\xi) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_0(\tau, \xi) = \chi(2(\tau - p_{\alpha+1}(\xi))).$$

Any summations over capitalized variables such as K, L, M or N are presumed to be dyadic. We work with non-homogeneous dyadic decompositions, i.e., these variables ranges over numbers of the form $\{2^k; k \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{0\}$. We call those numbers *nonhomogeneous dyadic numbers*. It is worth pointing out that $\sum_N \phi_N(\xi) = 1$ for any $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\text{supp}(\phi_N) \subset \{N/2 \leq |\xi| \leq 2N\}, \quad N \geq 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp}(\phi_0) \subset \{|\xi| \leq 1\}.$$

Finally, we define the Littlewood–Paley multipliers P_N and Q_L by

$$P_N u = \mathcal{F}_x^{-1}(\phi_N \mathcal{F}_x u) \quad \text{and} \quad Q_L u = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\psi_L \mathcal{F} u).$$

We also set $P_{\geq N} := \sum_{K \geq N} P_K$, $P_{\leq N} := \sum_{K \leq N} P_K$, $Q_{\geq N} := \sum_{K \geq N} Q_K$ and $Q_{\leq N} := \sum_{K \leq N} Q_K$.

2.2. Function spaces. For $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $L^p(\mathbb{T})$ is the standard Lebesgue space with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^p}$.

In this paper we will use the frequency envelope method (see for instance [37] and [21]) in order to show the continuity result with respect to initial data. To this aim, we have to slightly modulate the classical Sobolev spaces in the following way: for $s \geq 0$ and a dyadic sequence $\{\omega_N\}$, we define $H_\omega^s(\mathbb{T})$ with the norm

$$\|u\|_{H_\omega^s} := \left(\sum_N \omega_N^2 (1 \vee N)^{2s} \|P_N u\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Note that $H_\omega^s(\mathbb{T}) = H^s(\mathbb{T})$ when we choose $\omega_N \equiv 1$. Here, $H^s(\mathbb{T})$ is the usual L^2 -based Sobolev space. If B_x is one of spaces defined above, for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $T > 0$, we define the space–time spaces $L_t^p B_x := L^p(\mathbb{R}; B_x)$ and $L_T^p B_x := L^p([0, T]; B_x)$ equipped with the norms (with obvious modifications for $p = \infty$)

$$\|u\|_{L_t^p B_x} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{B_x}^p dt \right)^{1/p} \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{L_T^p B_x} = \left(\int_0^T \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{B_x}^p dt \right)^{1/p},$$

respectively. For $s, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we introduce the Bourgain spaces $X^{s,b}$ associated to the operator $L_{\alpha+1}$ endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{X^{s,b}} = \left(\sum_{\xi=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle \xi \rangle^{2s} \langle \tau - p_{\alpha+1}(\xi) \rangle^{2b} |\tilde{u}(\tau, \xi)|^2 d\tau \right)^{1/2}.$$

We also use a slightly stronger space $X_\omega^{s,b}$ with the norm

$$\|u\|_{X_\omega^{s,b}} := \left(\sum_N \omega_N^2 (1 \vee N)^{2s} \|P_N u\|_{X_{0,b}}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

We define the function spaces Z^s (resp. Z_ω^s), with $s \in \mathbb{R}$, as $Z^s := L_t^\infty H^s \cap X^{s-1,1}$ (resp. $Z_\omega^s := L_t^\infty H_\omega^s \cap X_\omega^{s-1,1}$), endowed with the natural norm

$$\|u\|_{Z^s} = \|u\|_{L_t^\infty H^s} + \|u\|_{X^{s-1,1}} \quad (\text{resp. } \|u\|_{Z_\omega^s} = \|u\|_{L_t^\infty H_\omega^s} + \|u\|_{X_\omega^{s-1,1}}).$$

We also use the restriction in time versions of these spaces. Let $T > 0$ be a positive time and B be a normed space of space-time functions. The restriction space B_T will be the space of functions $u :]0, T[\times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C} satisfying

$$\|u\|_{B_T} := \inf\{\|\tilde{u}\|_B \mid \tilde{u} : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ or } \mathbb{C}, \tilde{u} = u \text{ on }]0, T[\times \mathbb{T}\} < \infty.$$

Finally, we introduce a bounded linear operator from $X_{\omega,T}^{s-1,1} \cap L_T^\infty H_\omega^s$ into Z_ω^s with a bound which does not depend on s and T . The existence of this operator ensures that actually $Z_{\omega,T}^s = L_T^\infty H_\omega^s \cap X_{\omega,T}^{s-1,1}$. Following [23], we define ρ_T as

$$\rho_T(u)(t) := U_\alpha(t) \chi(t) U_\alpha(-\mu_T(t)) u(\mu_T(t)), \quad (2.1)$$

where μ_T is the continuous piecewise affine function defined by

$$\mu_T(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } t \notin]0, 2T[, \\ t & \text{for } t \in [0, T], \\ 2T - t & \text{for } t \in [T, 2T]. \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\delta \geq 1$, and suppose that the dyadic sequence $\{\omega_N\}$ of positive numbers satisfies $\omega_N \leq \omega_{2N} \leq \delta \omega_N$ for $N \geq 1$. Let $0 < T \leq 1$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_T : X_{\omega,T}^{s-1,1} \cap L_T^\infty H_\omega^s &\rightarrow Z_\omega^s \\ u &\mapsto \rho_T(u) \end{aligned}$$

is a bounded linear operator, i.e.,

$$\|\rho_T(u)\|_{L_t^\infty H_\omega^s} + \|\rho_T(u)\|_{X_\omega^{s-1,1}} \lesssim \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s} + \|u\|_{X_{T,\omega}^{s-1,1}}, \quad (2.3)$$

for all $u \in X_{T,\omega}^{s-1,1} \cap L_T^\infty H_\omega^s$. Moreover, it holds that

$$\|\rho_T(u)\|_{L_t^\infty H_\omega^s} \lesssim \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s} \quad (2.4)$$

for all $u \in L_T^\infty H_\omega^s$. Here, the implicit constants in (2.3) and (2.4) can be chosen independent of $0 < T \leq 1$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. See Lemma 2.4 in [29] for $\omega_N \equiv 1$ but it is obvious that the result does not depend on ω_N . \square

2.3. Basic estimates. In this subsection, we collect some fundamental estimates. Well-known estimates are adapted for our setting $H_\omega^s(\mathbb{T})$ and $f(u)$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $s > 0$. Let $\delta \geq 1$, and suppose that the dyadic sequence $\{\omega_N\}$ of positive numbers satisfies $\omega_N \leq \omega_{2N} \leq \delta \omega_N$ for $N \geq 1$. Then we have the estimate*

$$\|uv\|_{H_\omega^s} \lesssim \|u\|_{H_\omega^s} \|v\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{H_\omega^s}. \quad (2.5)$$

In particular for any fixed real entire function f with $f(0) = 0$, there exists a real entire function $G = G[f]$ that is increasing non negative on \mathbb{R}_+ such that

$$\|f(u)\|_{H_\omega^s} \lesssim G(\|u\|_{L^\infty}) \|u\|_{H_\omega^s}. \quad (2.6)$$

Proof. The proof of (2.5) is identical with that of Lemma A.8 in [38]. For reader's convenience, we provide the proof.

The triangle inequality gives

$$\|uv\|_{H_\omega^s} \lesssim \left(\sum_{N \lesssim 1} \omega_N^2 \|P_N(uv)\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} + \left(\sum_{N \gg 1} \omega_N^2 N^{2s} \|P_N(uv)\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} =: A + B.$$

It is clear that $A \lesssim \|u\|_{H_\omega^s} \|v\|_{L^\infty}$ since $\omega_{2^j} \leq \delta^j \omega_1$. We further split

$$\|P_N(uv)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|P_N((P_{\ll N}u)v)\|_{L^2} + \sum_{M \gtrsim N} \|P_N((P_M u)v)\|_{L^2}.$$

For the first term, by impossible frequency interactions, we see that

$$\|P_N((P_{\ll N}u)v)\|_{L^2} \leq \|(P_{\ll N}u)P_{\sim N}v\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty} \sum_{M \sim N} \|P_M v\|_{L^2}.$$

So, the contribution of this term to B is bounded by $C\|u\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{H_\omega^s}$. For the second term, we simply bound

$$\sum_{M \gtrsim N} \|P_N((P_M u)v)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|v\|_{L^\infty} \sum_{M \gtrsim N} \|P_M u\|_{L^2}$$

and so we see from $2^s \omega_N N^s \leq \omega_{2N} (2N)^s$ and the Young's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{N \gg 1} \left(\sum_{M \gtrsim N} \omega_N N^s \|P_M u\|_{L^2} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} &\lesssim \left(\sum_{k \gg 1} \left(\sum_{j \gtrsim 1} 2^{-sj} \omega_{2^{k+j}} 2^{s(j+k)} \|P_{2^{k+j}} u\|_{L^2} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{H_\omega^s}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $B \lesssim \|u\|_{H_\omega^s} \|v\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{H_\omega^s}$.

Now by Minkowsky and (2.5)

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(u)\|_{H_\omega^s} &\leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{|f^{(k)}(0)|}{k!} \|u^k\|_{H_\omega^s} \leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{|f^{(k)}(0)|}{k!} C^{k-1} \|u\|_{L^\infty}^{k-1} \|u\|_{H_\omega^s} \\ &\leq G(\|u\|_{L^\infty}) \|u\|_{H_\omega^s}, \end{aligned}$$

with $G(x) := \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{|f^{(k)}(0)|}{k!} C^{k-1} x^{k-1}$. \square

Lemma 2.3. *Assume that $s_1 + s_2 \geq 0$, $s_1 \wedge s_2 \geq s_3$, $s_3 < s_1 + s_2 - 1/2$. Then*

$$\|uv\|_{H^{s_3}} \lesssim \|u\|_{H^{s_1}} \|v\|_{H^{s_2}}. \quad (2.7)$$

In particular, for $f, g \in H^s(\mathbb{T})$ with $s > 1/2$ and any fixed real entire function F , there exists a real entire function $G = G[f]$ that is increasing non negative on \mathbb{R}_+ such that

$$\|f(u) - f(v)\|_{H^{s-1}} \leq G(\|u\|_{H^s} + \|v\|_{H^s}) \|u - v\|_{H^{s-1}}. \quad (2.8)$$

Proof. (2.7) can be found in [[9], Lemma 3.4]. To prove (2.8) it suffices to check that for $s > 1/2$, $(s-1) + s = 2s-1 > 0$ and $s-1 < s-1/2 + (s-1)$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(u) - f(v)\|_{H^{s-1}} &\leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{|f^{(k)}(0)|}{k!} \|u^k - v^k\|_{H^{s-1}} \\ &\leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{|f^{(k)}(0)|}{k!} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|u^j v^{k-1-j} (u - v)\|_{H^{s-1}} \\ &\leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{|f^{(k)}(0)|}{k!} C^{k-1} (\|u\|_{H^s} + \|v\|_{H^s})^{k-1} \|u - v\|_{H^{s-1}} \\ &\leq G(\|u\|_{H^s} + \|v\|_{H^s}) \|u - v\|_{H^{s-1}} \end{aligned}$$

with $G(x) := \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{|f^{(k)}(0)|}{k!} C^{k-1} x^{k-1}$. \square

We will frequently use the following lemma, which can be seen as a variant of the integration by parts.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $N \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \cup \{0\}$. Then,*

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}} \Pi(u, v) w dx \right| \lesssim \|u\|_{L_x^2} \|v\|_{L_x^2} \|\partial_x w\|_{L_x^\infty},$$

where

$$\Pi(u, v) := v \partial_x P_N^2 u + u \partial_x P_N^2 v. \quad (2.9)$$

Proof. It suffices to show that

$$\|[\partial_x P_N^2, w]v\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\partial_x w\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{L^2} \quad (2.10)$$

since the integration by parts shows

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \Pi(u, v) w dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}} u \partial_x P_N^2 v w dx - \int_{\mathbb{T}} u \partial_x P_N^2 (vw) dx = - \int_{\mathbb{T}} u [\partial_x P_N^2, w] v dx.$$

The Poisson summation formula and the mean value theorem imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
|([\partial_x P_N^2, w]v)(x)| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mathcal{F}_x^{-1}(\xi \phi_N^2(\xi))(x-y)(w(y) - w(x))v(y)dy \right| \\
&= \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{F}_{x, \mathbb{R}}^{-1}(\xi \phi_N^2(\xi))(x-y+2\pi k)(w(y) - w(x))v(y)dy \right| \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\mathcal{F}_{x, \mathbb{R}}^{-1}(\xi \phi_N^2(\xi))(x-y)(w(y) - w(x))v(y)|dy \\
&\leq \|\partial_x w\|_{L^\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |(x-y)\mathcal{F}_{x, \mathbb{R}}^{-1}(\xi \phi_N^2(\xi))(x-y)v(y)|dy,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{x, \mathbb{R}}^{-1}$ is the inverse Fourier transform on \mathbb{R} . A direct calculation gives

$$\|x\mathcal{F}_{x, \mathbb{R}}^{-1}(\xi \phi_N^2(\xi))(x)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} = \|x\mathcal{F}_{x, \mathbb{R}}^{-1}(\xi \phi^2(\xi))(x)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} < \infty.$$

This and the Minkowski inequality show (2.10), which completes the proof. \square

3. LINEAR AND IMPROVED STRICHARTZ ESTIMATES

In this section, we establish improved Strichartz estimates which play an important role in our estimates. Since we treat the general operator $L_{\alpha+1}$, we first have to restate the standard Strichartz estimate.

Definition 3. For $\alpha \in [1, 2]$, we define

$$\beta(\alpha) := \frac{1}{4(\alpha+1)}, \quad b(\alpha) := \beta(\alpha) + \frac{1}{4} \left(= \frac{\alpha+2}{4(\alpha+1)} \right).$$

We make use of the Strichartz estimate in the Bourgain space, which is originally obtained in [3].

Lemma 3.1. *There exists $C > 0$ such that for any $v \in X^{0, b(\alpha)}$,*

$$\|v\|_{L_{t,x}^4} \leq C\|v\|_{X^{0, b(\alpha)}}.$$

Lemma 3.1 immediately follows from the following lemma (see the Appendix in [25] for similar considerations).

Lemma 3.2. *There exists $C = C(\xi_0) > 0$ such that for any real-valued functions $u, v \in L^2(\mathbb{R}; l^2(\mathbb{Z}))$ and any $N_1, N_2 \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$,*

$$\|(\psi_{N_1} u) *_{\tau, \xi} (\psi_{N_2} v)\|_{L_\tau^2 l_\xi^2} \leq C(N_1 \wedge N_2)^{1/2} (N_1 \vee N_2)^{2\beta(\alpha)} \|\psi_{N_1} u\|_{L_\tau^2 l_\xi^2} \|\psi_{N_2} v\|_{L_\tau^2 l_\xi^2}.$$

For the proof of Lemma 3.2, we use the following:

Lemma 3.3. *Let I and J be two intervals on the real line and $g \in C^1(J; \mathbb{R})$. Then*

$$\#\{x \in J \cap \mathbb{Z}; g(x) \in I\} \leq \frac{|I|}{\inf_{x \in J} |g'(x)|} + 1.$$

Proof. See Lemma 2 in [33]. □

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Following [3], we may assume that $\text{supp}_\xi \psi_{N_1} u, \text{supp}_\xi \psi_{N_2} v \subset \mathbb{N}$ since u and v are real-valued. Following the argument of Lemma 3.1 in [34], the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\psi_N u) *_{\tau, \xi} (\psi_M v)\|_{L_\tau^2 L_\xi^2}^2 \\ &= \sum_{\xi \geq 0} \int_\tau \left| \sum_{\xi \geq \xi_1} \int_{\tau_1} \psi_{N_1}(\tau_1, \xi_1) u(\tau_1, \xi_1) \psi_{N_2}(\tau - \tau_1, \xi - \xi_1) v(\tau - \tau_1, \xi - \xi_1) d\tau_1 \right|^2 d\tau \\ &\lesssim \sup_{(\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{N}} A(\tau, \xi) \|\psi_N u\|_{L_\tau^2 L_\xi^2}^2 \|\psi_M v\|_{L_\tau^2 L_\xi^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A(\tau, \xi) &\lesssim \text{mes}\{(\tau_1, \xi_1) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{N}; \xi - \xi_1 \geq 0, \langle \tau_1 + p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_1) \rangle \sim N_1 \\ &\quad \text{and } \langle \tau - \tau_1 + p_{\alpha+1}(\xi - \xi_1) \rangle \sim N_2\} \\ &\lesssim (N_1 \wedge N_2) \# B(\tau, \xi) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$B(\tau, \xi) = \{\xi_1 \geq 0; \xi - \xi_1 \geq 0 \text{ and } \langle \tau + p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_1) + p_{\alpha+1}(\xi - \xi_1) \rangle \lesssim N_1 \vee N_2\}.$$

For simplicity, we put $L := N_1 \vee N_2$. When $\xi \leq L^{1/(\alpha+1)} + 2\xi_0 + 2$, it is clear that

$$\#B(\tau, \xi) \leq L^{1/(\alpha+1)} + 2\xi_0 + 2 \leq C(\xi_0) L^{1/(\alpha+1)}$$

since $0 \leq \xi_1 \leq \xi$ and $L \geq 1$. On the other hand, when $\xi \geq L^{1/(\alpha+1)} + 2\xi_0 + 2$, putting $g(\xi_1) := \tau + p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_1) + p_{\alpha+1}(\xi - \xi_1)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \#B(\tau, \xi) &\lesssim \#\{\xi_1 \geq 0; \xi \geq 2\xi_1 \text{ and } |g(\xi_1)| \lesssim L\} \\ &\leq [\xi_0] + 1 + \#\{\xi_1 \geq 0; \xi \geq 2\xi_1, \xi_1 \geq \xi_0 \text{ and } |g(\xi_1)| \lesssim L\} \\ &\lesssim \#\{\xi_1 \in [\xi_0, \xi/2]; |\xi - 2\xi_1|^{\alpha+1} \geq L \text{ and } |g(\xi_1)| \lesssim L\} + [\xi_0] + L^{1/(\alpha+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $[a]$ is the integral part of a . Here, we used the symmetry in the first inequality. It is worth noticing that the set in the right hand side is not empty since $(\xi - L^{1/(\alpha+1)})/2 \geq \xi_0$ by the assumption. Lemma 3.3 implies that

$$\#\{\xi_1 \in [\xi_0, \xi/2]; |\xi - 2\xi_1|^{\alpha+1} \geq L \text{ and } |g(\xi_1)| \lesssim L\} \lesssim L^{1/(\alpha+1)}.$$

Indeed, we have

$$|g'(\xi_1)| = \left| \int_{\xi_1}^{\xi - \xi_1} p''_{\alpha+1}(\theta) d\theta \right| \sim (\xi - \xi_1)^\alpha - \xi_1^\alpha \geq (\xi - 2\xi_1)^\alpha \geq L^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)}$$

since for $\theta \geq \xi_1$, $p''_{\alpha+1}$ does not change sign since $|p''_{\alpha+1}(\theta)| \sim |\theta|^{\alpha-1}$ and $p''_{\alpha+1}$ is continuous outside 0. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.1 enables to establish the following Strichartz estimate:

Lemma 3.4. *Let $T > 0$. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $u \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$,*

$$\|U_\alpha(t)u\|_{L^4_{T,x}} \leq CT^{1/2-b(\alpha)} \|u\|_{L^2_x}.$$

Proof. See Lemma 2.1 in [26]. \square

We are now ready to prove our improved Strichartz estimates for solutions to (1.3). We point out that it is crucial to state estimates in $l^4(\mathbb{N})$ -form since we are not allowed to lose any derivatives in order to reach $s = s(\alpha)$. For that purpose, how to choose $c_{j,N}$ plays an important role in the proof below. This type of argument can be found in [Lemma 2.4, [30]] for instance.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $\delta \geq 1$, and suppose that the dyadic sequence $\{\omega_N\}$ of positive numbers satisfies $\omega_N \leq \omega_{2N} \leq \delta\omega_N$ for $N \geq 1$. Let $s \geq s_0 > 1/2$, $\alpha \in [1, 2]$ and $0 < T < 1$. Let $u \in C([0, T]; H^s_\omega(\mathbb{T}))$ satisfy (1.3)–(1.2) with $u_0 \in H^s_\omega(\mathbb{T})$ on $[0, T]$. Then,*

$$\left(\sum_N \omega_N^4 \|D_x^{s-\beta(\alpha)} P_N u\|_{L^4_{T,x}}^4 \right)^{1/4} \lesssim T^{1/4} G(\|u\|_{L^\infty_{T,x}}) \|u\|_{L^\infty_T H^s_\omega} \quad (3.1)$$

and

$$\left(\sum_N \|D_x^{1/3} P_N u\|_{L^3_T L^\infty_x}^3 \right)^{1/3} \lesssim T^{1/3} G(\|u\|_{L^\infty_{T,x}}) \|u\|_{L^\infty_T H^{7/12+\beta(\alpha)}_x}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $G = G[f]$ is an entire function that is increasing and non negative on \mathbb{R}_+ .

Proof. It suffices to consider the case $N \gg 1$. We divide the interval in small intervals of length $\sim N^{-1}$. In other words, we define $\{I_{j,N}\}_{j \in J_N}$ so that $\bigcup_{j \in J_N} I_{j,N} = [0, T]$, $|I_{j,N}| \lesssim N^{-1}$ and $\#J_N \lesssim N$. By the hypothesis, we see that $\|D_x^s P_N u(t)\|_{L^2_x}^4 \in C([0, T])$. For $j \in J_N$, we choose $c_{j,N} \in I_{j,N}$ at which $\|D_x^s P_N u(t)\|_{L^2_x}^4$ attains its minimum on $I_{j,N}$. We see from (1.3)–(1.2) that

$$P_N u(t) = e^{-(t-c_{j,N})L_{\alpha+1}} P_N u(c_{j,N}) + \int_{c_{j,N}}^t e^{-(t-t')L_{\alpha+1}} P_N \partial_x(f(u))(t') dt'$$

for $t \in I_{j,N}$. Lemma 3.4 and the Bernstein inequality show that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_j \omega_N^4 \|D_x^{s-\beta(\alpha)} e^{-(t-c_{j,N})L_{\alpha+1}} P_N u(c_{j,N})\|_{L^4(I_{j,N}; L_x^4)}^4 \right)^{1/4} \\
& \lesssim \left(\sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_j \omega_N^4 |I_{j,N}|^{2-4b(\alpha)} N^{-4\beta(\alpha)} \|D_x^s P_N u(c_{j,N})\|_{L_x^2}^4 \right)^{1/4} \\
& \lesssim \left(\sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_j \omega_N^4 |I_{j,N}| \|D_x^s P_N u(c_{j,N})\|_{L_x^2}^4 \right)^{1/4} \\
& \lesssim \left(\sum_{N \gg 1} \int_0^T \omega_N^4 \|D_x^s P_N u(t)\|_{L_x^2}^4 dt \right)^{1/4} \lesssim T^{1/4} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality, we used the fact $l^2(\mathbb{N}) \hookrightarrow l^4(\mathbb{N})$. Next, we estimate the contribution of the Duhamel term. To simplify the expressions we set $\tilde{f} = f - f(0)$. Lemma 3.4, the Hölder inequality in time and (2.6) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_j \omega_N^4 \left\| \int_{c_{j,N}}^t e^{-(t-t')L_{\alpha+1}} D_x^{s-\beta(\alpha)} P_N \partial_x(\tilde{f}(u))(t') dt' \right\|_{L^4(I_{j,N}; L_x^4)}^4 \right)^{1/4} \\
& \lesssim \left(\sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_j \left(\omega_N |I_{j,N}|^{-3/4} \int_{I_{j,N}} \|D_x^s P_N \tilde{f}(t')\|_{L_x^2}^4 dt' \right)^4 \right)^{1/4} \\
& \lesssim \left(\sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_j \omega_N^4 \int_{I_{j,N}} \|D_x^s P_N \tilde{f}(t')\|_{L_x^2}^4 dt' \right)^{1/4} \\
& \lesssim \left(\int_0^T \sum_{N \gg 1} \omega_N^4 \|D_x^s P_N \tilde{f}(t')\|_{L_x^2}^4 dt' \right)^{1/4} \\
& \lesssim T^{1/4} \|\tilde{f}(u)\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s} \lesssim T^{1/4} G(\|u\|_{L_{T,x}^\infty}) \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

To prove (3.2), the Bernstein inequality in space and the Hölder inequality in time give

$$\|D_x^{1/3} P_N u\|_{L^3(I_{j,N}; L_x^\infty)} \lesssim |I_{j,N}|^{1/12} \|D_x^{7/12} P_N u\|_{L^4(I_{j,N}; L_x^4)} \sim \|D_x^{1/2} P_N u\|_{L^4(I_{j,N}; L_x^4)},$$

where $|I_{j,N}| \sim N^{-1}$ and $\#J \sim N$. This implies that

$$\left(\sum_N \|D_x^{1/3} P_N u\|_{L_T^3 L_x^\infty}^3 \right)^{1/3} \lesssim \left(\sum_N \sum_j \|D_x^{1/2} P_N u\|_{L^4(I_{j,N}; L_x^4)}^3 \right)^{1/3}.$$

We can obtain (3.2) by the same way as (3.1) with $\omega_N = 1$. □

For the estimate for the difference, we shall use the following estimates.

Corollary 3.6. *Assume that $s > 1/2$. Let $\alpha \in [1, 2]$ and $0 < T < 1$. Let $u, v \in C([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$ satisfy (1.3)–(1.2) with $u_0, v_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T})$ on $[0, T]$, respectively. Then,*

$$\left(\sum_N [(1 \vee N)^{s-1-\beta(\alpha)} \|P_N w\|_{L_{T,x}^4}]^4 \right)^{1/4} \lesssim T^{1/4} G(K) \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}} \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$\left(\sum_N [(1 \vee N)^{-5/12} \|P_N w\|_{L_T^3 L_x^4}]^3 \right)^{1/3} \lesssim T^{1/3} G(K) \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{-5/12+\beta(\alpha)}}, \quad (3.4)$$

where $w = u - v$, $K = \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^s} + \|v\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^s}$ and $G = G[f]$ is an entire function that is increasing and non negative on \mathbb{R}_+ .

Proof. The proof is the same as that of Proposition 3.5, but with using (2.8) instead of (2.5). \square

4. A PRIORI ESTIMATE

4.1. Preliminary technical estimates. Let us denote by $\mathbf{1}_T$ the characteristic function of the interval $]0, T[$. As pointed out in [27], $\mathbf{1}_T$ does not commute with Q_L . To avoid this difficulty, following [27], we further decompose $\mathbf{1}_T$ as

$$\mathbf{1}_T = \mathbf{1}_{T,R}^{\text{low}} + \mathbf{1}_{T,R}^{\text{high}}, \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{F}_t(\mathbf{1}_{T,R}^{\text{low}})(\tau) = \chi(\tau/R) \mathcal{F}_t(\mathbf{1}_T)(\tau), \quad (4.1)$$

for some $R > 0$ to be fixed later.

Remark 4.1. In the proofs of Propositions 4.8 and 5.1, since we integrate on an interval of time $]0, t[$ with $0 < t < T$, we will put the cutoff function $\mathbf{1}_t$ on two functions of the integral. Actually, it is enough to put $\mathbf{1}_t$ on one function if one merely seeks the commutativity of Q_L with the low frequency part of $\mathbf{1}_t$ such as in (4.5). The advantage of putting $\mathbf{1}_t$ on two functions is that one can get a positive power of T in the right hand side in (4.8) and (5.1), which enables us to bypass the scaling argument in the proof of the well-posedness. This is particularly comfortable here since (1.3) is in general not scaling invariant.

Lemma 4.1 (Lemma 3.5 in [29]). *Let L be a nonhomogeneous dyadic number. Then the operator $Q_{\leq L}$ is bounded in $L_t^\infty L_x^2$ uniformly in L . In other words,*

$$\|Q_{\leq L} u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \lesssim \|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}, \quad (4.2)$$

for all $u \in L_t^\infty L_x^2$ and the implicit constant appearing in (4.2) does not depend on L .

Lemma 4.2 (Lemma 3.6 in [29]). *For any $R > 0$ and $T > 0$, it holds*

$$\|\mathbf{1}_{T,R}^{high}\|_{L^1} \lesssim T \wedge R^{-1}, \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$\|\mathbf{1}_{T,R}^{high}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\mathbf{1}_{T,R}^{low}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 1. \quad (4.4)$$

Lemma 4.3 (Lemma 3.7 in [29]). *Assume that $T > 0$, $R > 0$, and $L \gg R$. Then, it holds*

$$\|Q_L(\mathbf{1}_{T,R}^{low}u)\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \lesssim \|Q_{\sim L}u\|_{L_{t,x}^2}, \quad (4.5)$$

for all $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}_t \times \mathbb{T}_x)$.

It is well-known that the resonance function (Ω_{k+1} defined as below) with respect to higher order nonlinear terms such as $\partial_x(u^{k+1})$ can be resonant (i.e., very small). In what follows, we clarify non-resonant contributions in which we can recover the derivative loss by using a priori estimates in Bourgain's spaces of solution to (1.3) proved in Lemma 4.7.

Definition 4. Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$. We define $\Omega_j(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{j+1}) : \mathbb{Z}^{j+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\Omega_j(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{j+1}) := \sum_{n=1}^{j+1} p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_j)$$

for $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{j+1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{j+1}$, where $p_{\alpha+1}$ satisfies Hypothesis 1.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $k \geq 1$ and $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{k+2}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{k+2}$ satisfy $\sum_{j=1}^{k+2} \xi_j = 0$. Assume that $|\xi_1| \sim |\xi_2| \gtrsim |\xi_3|$ if $k = 1$ or $|\xi_1| \sim |\xi_2| \gtrsim |\xi_3| \gg k \max_{j \geq 4} |\xi_j|$ if $k \geq 2$. Then,*

$$|\Omega_{k+1}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{k+2})| \gtrsim |\xi_3| |\xi_1|^\alpha$$

for $|\xi_1| \gg (\max_{\xi \in [0, \xi_0]} |p'_{\alpha+1}(\xi)|)^{1/\alpha}$.

Proof. First we consider the case $k \geq 2$. We separate different cases:

Case 1: $|\xi_2| \gg |\xi_3|$. By hypothesis, it follows that $|\xi_2| \gg \xi_0$. The mean value theorem implies that there exists $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\eta| \sim |\xi_2|$ and that

$$|p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_2 + \dots + \xi_{k+2}) - p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_2)| = |\xi_3 + \dots + \xi_{k+2}| |p'_{\alpha+1}(\eta)| \sim |\xi_3| |\xi_1|^\alpha.$$

Here, we used $|\xi_1| \sim |\xi_2|$ and $|\xi_3| \gg k \max_{j \geq 4} |\xi_j|$. Now, if $|\xi_j| \leq \xi_0$ for $j \geq 4$, then

$$|p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_j)| \leq |\xi_j| \max_{\xi \in [0, \xi_0]} |p'_{\alpha+1}(\xi)| \ll \frac{|\xi_3| |\xi_1|^\alpha}{k}$$

since $p_{\alpha+1}(0) = 0$. On the other hand, if $|\xi_j| \geq \xi_0$ for $j \geq 4$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_j)| &\leq |p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_j) - p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_0)| + |p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_0)| \\ &\lesssim |\xi_0| \max_{\xi \in [0, \xi_0]} |p'_{\alpha+1}(\xi)| + |\xi_j|^{\alpha+1} \ll \frac{|\xi_3||\xi_1|^\alpha}{k}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can get $|p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_3)| \ll |\xi_3||\xi_1|^\alpha$. Gathering these estimates leads to $|\Omega_{k+1}| \gtrsim |\xi_3||\xi_1|^\alpha$.

Case 2: $|\xi_2| \sim |\xi_3|$. Then we have $|\xi_3| \gg \xi_0$. By impossible interactions, ξ_1, ξ_2 and ξ_3 do not have the same sign. By the symmetry and $|\xi_1| \sim |\xi_2| \sim |\xi_3|$, it suffices to consider the case $\xi_2, \xi_3 > 0$. We notice that

$$\begin{aligned} -\Omega_{k+1} &= \int_{\xi_0}^{\xi_2} (p'_{\alpha+1}(\theta + \xi_3 + \cdots + \xi_{k+2}) - p'_{\alpha+1}(\theta)) d\theta \\ &\quad + p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_0 + \xi_3 + \cdots + \xi_{k+2}) - p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_3) - p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_0) - \sum_{j=4}^{k+2} p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_j) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$|p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_0 + \xi_3 + \cdots + \xi_{k+2}) - p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_3)| \lesssim (|\xi_0| + k \max_{j \geq 4} |\xi_j|) |\xi_3|^\alpha \ll |\xi_3||\xi_1|^\alpha$$

and

$$p'_{\alpha+1}(\theta + \xi_3 + \cdots + \xi_{k+2}) - p'_{\alpha+1}(\theta) = \int_0^{\xi_3 + \cdots + \xi_{k+2}} p''_{\alpha+1}(\theta + \mu) d\mu.$$

For $\theta \geq \xi_0$, $p''_{\alpha+1}$ does not change sign since $|p''_{\alpha+1}(\theta)| \sim |\theta|^{\alpha-1}$ and $p''_{\alpha+1}$ is continuous outside 0. Therefore, for $\theta \in [\xi_0, \xi_2]$, we get

$$\int_0^{\xi_3 + \cdots + \xi_{k+2}} p''_{\alpha+1}(\theta + \mu) d\mu \sim \int_0^{\xi_3 + \cdots + \xi_{k+2}} (\theta + \mu)^{\alpha-1} d\mu \sim \xi_3^\alpha$$

since $\xi_3 \gg \xi$. Gathering these estimates, we obtain $|\Omega_{k+1}| \gtrsim |\xi_3||\xi_1|^\alpha$.

For the case $k = 1$, we can argue exactly as above. \square

Lemma 4.5. *Let $k \geq 2$ and $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{k+2}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{k+2}$ satisfy $\sum_{j=1}^{k+2} \xi_j = 0$. Assume that $|\xi_1| \sim |\xi_2| \gg |\xi_3| \gtrsim |\xi_4|$ if $k = 2$ or $|\xi_1| \sim |\xi_2| \gg |\xi_3| \gtrsim |\xi_4|$ with $|\xi_3 + \xi_4| \gg k \max_{j \geq 5} |\xi_j|$ if $k \geq 3$. Then,*

$$|\Omega_{k+1}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{k+2})| \gtrsim |\xi_3 + \xi_4||\xi_1|^\alpha$$

for $|\xi_1| \gg (\max_{\xi \in [0, \xi_0]} |p'_{\alpha+1}(\xi)|)^{1/\alpha}$.

Proof. First we consider the case $k \geq 3$. We separate different cases:

Case 1: $|\xi_3| \gg |\xi_4|$. Then we have $|\xi_3| \gg k \max_{j \geq 5} |\xi_j|$ and $|\xi_3| \sim |\xi_3 + \xi_4|$. Therefore, we can argue exactly as in Case 1 of Lemma 4.4 and obtain $|\Omega_{k+1}| \gtrsim |\xi_3||\xi_1|^\alpha \sim |\xi_3 + \xi_4||\xi_1|^\alpha$.

Case 2: $|\xi_3| \sim |\xi_4|$. When $\xi_3\xi_4 \geq 0$, it holds that $|\xi_3 + \xi_4| = |\xi_3| + |\xi_4|$. Then we have $|\xi_3|, |\xi_4| \gg k \max_{j \geq 5} |\xi_j|$. So, we can still argue as in Case 1 of Lemma 4.4 and obtain $|\Omega_{k+1}| \gtrsim |\xi_3||\xi_1|^\alpha \sim |\xi_3 + \xi_4||\xi_1|^\alpha$. When $\xi_3\xi_4 < 0$, by the mean value theorem, there exist $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\eta_1| \sim |\xi_1|$, $|\xi_4| \lesssim |\eta_2| \lesssim |\xi_3|$ and

$$-\Omega_{k+1} = (\xi_3 + \xi_4 + \cdots + \xi_{k+2})p'_{\alpha+1}(\eta_1) - (\xi_3 + \xi_4)p'_{\alpha+1}(\eta_2) - \sum_{j=5}^{k+2} p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_j)$$

since $p_{\alpha+1}(\xi) = -p_{\alpha+1}(-\xi)$ for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that $|p'_{\alpha+1}(\eta_2)| \ll |\xi_1|^\alpha$. Indeed, $|p'_{\alpha+1}(\eta_2)| \leq \max_{\xi \in [0, \xi_0]} |p'_{\alpha+1}(\xi)| \ll |\xi_1|^\alpha$ when $|\eta_2| \leq \xi_0$, and $|p'_{\alpha+1}(\eta_2)| \sim |\eta_2|^\alpha \lesssim |\xi_3|^\alpha \ll |\xi_1|^\alpha$ when $|\eta_2| \geq \xi_0$. As in Case 1 of Lemma 4.4, we also have $k \max_{j \geq 5} |p_{\alpha+1}(\xi_j)| \ll |\xi_3 + \xi_4||\xi_1|^\alpha$. From these estimates, we obtain $|\Omega_{k+1}| \gtrsim |\xi_3 + \xi_4||\xi_1|^\alpha$.

For the case $k = 2$, we can argue exactly as above. \square

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\delta > 1$, and suppose that the dyadic sequence $\{\omega_N\}$ of positive numbers satisfies $\omega_N \leq \omega_{2N} \leq \delta\omega_N$ for $N \geq 1$ and $\omega_N \rightarrow \infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Then, for any $1 < \delta' < \delta$, there exists a dyadic sequence $\{\tilde{\omega}_N\}$ such that $\tilde{\omega}_N \leq \omega_N$, $\tilde{\omega}_N \leq \tilde{\omega}_{2N} \leq \delta'\tilde{\omega}_N$ for $N \geq 1$ and $\tilde{\omega}_N \rightarrow \infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. Let $1 < \delta' < \delta$. Set $\delta_N := \omega_{2N}/\omega_N$ for $N \geq 1$. Define $\{\tilde{\omega}_N\}$ so that $\tilde{\omega}_0 := \omega_0$, $\tilde{\omega}_1 := \omega_1$ and $\tilde{\omega}_{2N} := (\delta_N \wedge \delta')\tilde{\omega}_N$ for $N \geq 1$. Since $\delta_N, \delta' \geq 1$, it is clear that $\tilde{\omega}_N \leq \tilde{\omega}_{2N} \leq \delta'\tilde{\omega}_N$. We can show $\tilde{\omega}_N \leq \omega_N$ by the induction on N . Indeed, $\tilde{\omega}_0 = \omega_0$, $\tilde{\omega}_1 = \omega_1$ and

$$\tilde{\omega}_{2N} = (\delta_N \wedge \delta')\tilde{\omega}_N \leq \delta_N\tilde{\omega}_N \leq \delta_N\omega_N = \omega_{2N}$$

for $N \geq 1$. Now, we show $\tilde{\omega}_N \rightarrow \infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Case 1: $\#\{N; \delta_N > \delta'\} < \infty$. Put $N_0 := 1 \vee \max\{N; \delta_N > \delta'\}$ and $C := \tilde{\omega}_{2N_0}/\omega_{2N_0}$. Then, we can deduce inductively that $\tilde{\omega}_N = C\omega_N$ for $N \geq 2N_0$, which shows $\tilde{\omega}_N \rightarrow \infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ by the hypothesis.

Case 2: $\#\{N; \delta_N > \delta'\} = \infty$. Define an increasing sequence $\{j_n\}_{n \geq 2} \subset \mathbb{N}$ so that $j_n := \#\{m \in \mathbb{N}; 1 \leq m \leq n-1, \delta_{2^m} > \delta'\}$ for $n \geq 2$. Then, we have $j_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Observe that

$$\tilde{\omega}_{2^n} = \prod_{m=0}^{n-1} (\delta_{2^m} \wedge \delta')\tilde{\omega}_1 \geq (\delta')^{j_n}\omega_1 \rightarrow \infty$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ since $\delta' > 1$, which completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.2. For the given dyadic sequence $\{\omega_N\}$ of positive numbers, Lemma 4.6 enables us to assume $\delta \leq 2$, by defining a new dyadic sequence. We use this fact in

the proof of Proposition 4.8. Let N, M be dyadic numbers satisfying $lN \gtrsim M \gtrsim 1$ for some $l \geq 2$. Using $\omega_{2N} \leq \delta\omega_N$, it holds

$$\frac{\omega_M}{\omega_N} \lesssim \delta^{\log_2 l} \lesssim l$$

which is uniformly in δ .

4.2. Estimates on solutions to (1.3).

Lemma 4.7. *Let $1 \leq \delta \leq 2$, and suppose that the dyadic sequence $\{\omega_N\}$ of positive numbers satisfies $\omega_N \leq \omega_{2N} \leq \delta\omega_N$ for $N \geq 1$. Let $0 < T < 1$, $s > 1/2$ and $u \in L_T^\infty H_\omega^s$ be a solution to (1.3) associated with an initial datum $u_0 \in H_\omega^s(\mathbb{T})$. Then $u \in Z_{\omega,T}^s$ and it holds*

$$\|u\|_{Z_{\omega,T}^s} \lesssim \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s} + G(\|u\|_{L_{T,x}^\infty})\|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s}. \quad (4.6)$$

Moreover, for any couple $(u, v) \in (L_T^\infty H^s)^2$ of solutions to (1.3) associated with a couple of initial data $(u_0, v_0) \in (H^s(\mathbb{T}))^2$ it holds

$$\|u - v\|_{Z_T^{s-1}} \lesssim \|u - v\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}} + G(\|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^s} + \|v\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^s})\|u - v\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}. \quad (4.7)$$

Proof. According to the extension Lemma 2.1, it is clear that we only have to estimate the $X_{\omega,T}^{s-1,1}$ -norm of u to prove (4.6). As noticed in Remark 1.4, u satisfies the Duhamel formula of (1.3) and $\|u_0\|_{H_\omega^\theta} \leq \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^\theta}$ for any $\theta \leq s$. Hence, standard linear estimates in Bourgain's spaces lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{X_{\omega,T}^{s-1,1}} &\lesssim \|u_0\|_{H_\omega^{s-1}} + \|\partial_x(f(u))\|_{X_{\omega,T}^{s-1,0}} \\ &\lesssim \|u_0\|_{H_\omega^{s-1}} + \|f(u) - f(0)\|_{L_T^2 H_\omega^s} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^{s-1}} + G(\|u\|_{L_{T,x}^\infty})\|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s}, \end{aligned}$$

by using (2.6).

In the same way, using this times (2.8), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - v\|_{X_T^{s-2,1}} &\lesssim \|u_0 - v_0\|_{H_x^{s-1}} + \|f(u) - f(v)\|_{L_T^2 H_x^{s-1}} \\ &\lesssim \|u - v\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}} + G(\|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^s} + \|v\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^s})\|u - v\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

The following proposition is one of main estimates in the present paper.

Proposition 4.8 (A priori estimate). *Let $\delta \geq 1$, and suppose that the dyadic sequence $\{\omega_N\}$ of positive numbers satisfies $\omega_N \leq \omega_{2N} \leq \delta\omega_N$ for $N \geq 1$. Let $0 < T < 1$, $\alpha \in [1, 2]$ and $2 \geq s \geq s(\alpha) := 1/2 + 2\beta(\alpha)$. Let $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T})$ and*

let $u \in L^\infty(0, T; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$ be a solution to (1.3)–(1.2) on $[0, T]$. Then there exists an entire function $G = G[f]$ that is increasing and non negative on \mathbb{R}_+ such that

$$\|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s}^2 \leq \|u_0\|_{H_\omega^s}^2 + T^{1/4} G(\|u\|_{Z_T^{s(\alpha)}}) \|u\|_{Z_{\omega, T}^s} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s}. \quad (4.8)$$

Proof. First we notice that according to Lemma 4.7 it holds $u \in Z_{\omega, T}^s$. By using (1.3), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|P_N u(t, \cdot)\|_{L_x^2}^2 = -2 \int_{\mathbb{T}} P_N \partial_x (f(u)) P_N u dx.$$

Fixing $t \in]0, T[$, integration in time between 0 and t , multiplication by $\omega_N^2 \langle N \rangle^{2s}$ and summation over N yield

$$\|u(t)\|_{H_\omega^s}^2 \leq \|u_0\|_{H_\omega^s}^2 + 2 \sum_{N \geq 1} \omega_N^2 N^{2s} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} (f(u) - f(0)) P_N^2 \partial_x u dx dt' \right| \quad (4.9)$$

since $P_0 \partial_x u = 0$. Now we rewrite $f(u) - f(0)$ as $\sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{f^{(k)}(0)}{k!} u^k$ and we notice that for any fixed $N \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$,

$$\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} (f(u) - f(0)) P_N^2 \partial_x u dx dt' = \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{f^{(k)}(0)}{k!} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} u^k P_N^2 \partial_x u dx dt'. \quad (4.10)$$

Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{|f^{(k)}(0)|}{k!} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u^k P_N^2 \partial_x u| dx dt' &\lesssim N \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{|f^{(k)}(0)|}{k!} \int_0^t \|u^k\|_{L_x^2} \|u\|_{L_x^2} dt' \\ &\lesssim N \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{|f^{(k)}(0)|}{k!} \int_0^t \|u\|_{L_x^\infty}^{k-1} \|u\|_{L_x^2}^2 dt' \\ &\lesssim NTG(\|u\|_{L_{T,x}^\infty}) \|u\|_{L_T^\infty L_x^2}^2 < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

that proves (4.10) by Fubini-Lebesgue's theorem. (4.10) together with Fubini-Tonelli's theorem then ensure that

$$\sum_{N \geq 1} \omega_N^2 N^{2s} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} (f(u) - f(0)) P_N^2 \partial_x u dx dt' \right| \leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{|f^{(k)}(0)|}{k!} I_k^t \quad (4.11)$$

where

$$I_k^t := \sum_{N \geq 1} \omega_N^2 N^{2s} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} u^k P_N^2 \partial_x u dx dt' \right|.$$

By integration by parts it is easy to check that $I_1^t = 0$. We set

$$C_0 := \|u\|_{Z_T^{s(\alpha)}}.$$

Let us now prove that for any $k \geq 1$ it holds

$$I_{k+1}^t \leq C^k T^{1/4} G(C_0) C_0^k (\|u\|_{X_{\omega, T}^{s-1,1}} + \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s}) \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s}. \quad (4.12)$$

that clearly leads (4.8) by taking (4.9) and (4.11) into account since $\sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{|f^{(k+1)}(0)|}{(k+1)!} C^k C_0^k < \infty$.

In the sequel we fix $k \geq 1$. For simplicity, for any positive numbers a and b , the notation $a \lesssim_k b$ means there exists a positive constant $C > 0$ independent of k such that

$$a \leq C^k b. \quad (4.13)$$

Remark that $a \leq k^m b$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ can be expressed by $a \lesssim_k b$ too since an elementary calculation shows $k^m \leq m!e^k$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Here, e is Napier's constant. The contribution of the sum over $N \lesssim 1$ in I_{k+1}^t is easily estimated by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{N \lesssim 1} \omega_N^2 N^{2s} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} u^{k+1} P_N^2 \partial_x u dx dt' \right| \\ & \leq T \sum_{N \lesssim 1} \|u\|_{L_{T,x}^\infty}^k \|u\|_{L_T^\infty L_x^2} \|P_N^2 u\|_{L_T^\infty L_x^2} \lesssim_k T C_0^k \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

It thus remains to bound the contribution of the sum over $N \gg 1$ in I_{k+1}^t . Putting

$$\begin{aligned} A(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{k+2}) &:= \sum_{j=1}^{k+2} \phi_N^2(\xi_j) \xi_j, \\ A_1(\xi_1, \xi_2) &:= \phi_N^2(\xi_1) \xi_1 + \phi_N^2(\xi_2) \xi_2, \\ A_2(\xi_4, \dots, \xi_{k+2}) &:= \sum_{j=4}^{k+2} \phi_N^2(\xi_j) \xi_j, \end{aligned}$$

we see from the symmetry that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}} u^{k+1} P_N^2 \partial_x u dx &= \frac{i}{k+2} \sum_{\xi_1 + \dots + \xi_{k+2} = 0} A(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{k+2}) \prod_{j=1}^{k+2} \widehat{u}(\xi_j) \\ &= \frac{i}{k+2} \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} \sum_{\xi_1 + \dots + \xi_{k+2} = 0} A(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{k+2}) \prod_{j=1}^{k+2} \phi_{N_j}(\xi_j) \widehat{u}(\xi_j). \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

By symmetry we can assume that $N_1 \geq N_2 \geq N_3$ if $k = 1$, $N_1 \geq N_2 \geq N_3 \geq N_4$ if $k = 2$ and $N_1 \geq N_2 \geq N_3 \geq N_4 \geq N_5 = \max_{j \geq 5} N_j$ if $k \geq 3$. We notice that the cost of this choice is a constant factor less than $(k+2)^4$. It is also worth noticing that the frequency projection operator P_N ensures that the contribution of any $N_1 \leq N/4$ does cancel. We thus can assume that $N_1 \geq N/4$ and that $N_2 \gtrsim N_1/k$ with $N_2 \geq 1$.

First, we consider the contribution of A_2 . Note that we must have $k \geq 2$ since otherwise $A_2 = 0$. Also it suffices to consider the contribution of $(\phi_N(\xi_4))^2 \xi_4$ since

the contributions of $(\phi_N(\xi_j))^2 \xi_j$ for $j \geq 5$ are clearly simplest. Note that $N_4 \sim N$ in this case. By the Bernstein inequality, we have

$$\sum_K \|P_K u\|_{L_{T,x}^\infty} \lesssim \sum_K (1 \vee K^{1/2-s_0}) \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s_0}} \lesssim \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s_0}} \lesssim C_0. \quad (4.16)$$

This together with Hölder's and Young's inequalities and (3.1) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} \omega_N^2 N^{2s} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} (\partial_x P_N^2 P_{N_4} u) \prod_{j=1, j \neq 4}^{k+2} P_{N_j} u dx dt' \right| \\ & \lesssim_k \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s_0}}^{k-2} \sum_{N_1 \geq N_2 \geq N_3 \geq N_4 \gg 1} \omega_{N_4}^2 N_4^{2s+1} \prod_{j=1}^4 \|P_{N_j} u\|_{L_{T,x}^4} \\ & \lesssim_k \sum_{N_1 \geq N_2 \geq N_3 \geq N_4 \gg 1} \prod_{j=1}^2 \left(\frac{N_4}{N_j} \right)^{s-\beta(\alpha)} \omega_{N_j} \|D_x^{s-\beta(\alpha)} P_{N_j} u\|_{L_{T,x}^4} \\ & \quad \times \prod_{j=3}^4 \left(\frac{N_4}{N_j} \right)^{1/2+\beta(\alpha)} \|D_x^{1/2+\beta(\alpha)} P_{N_j} u\|_{L_{T,x}^4} \\ & \lesssim_k \left(\sum_{N_4} \|D_x^{1/2+\beta(\alpha)} P_{N_4} u\|_{L_{T,x}^4}^4 \right)^{1/4} \\ & \quad \times \left(\sum_{N_4} \left(\sum_{N_3 \gtrsim N_4} \left(\frac{N_4}{N_3} \right)^{1/2+\beta(\alpha)} \|D_x^{1/2+\beta(\alpha)} P_{N_3} u\|_{L_{T,x}^4} \right)^4 \right)^{1/4} \\ & \quad \times \left(\sum_{N_4} \left(\sum_{K \gtrsim N_4} \left(\frac{N_4}{K} \right)^{2(s-\beta(\alpha))} \omega_K^2 \|D_x^{s-\beta(\alpha)} P_K u\|_{L_{T,x}^4}^2 \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \lesssim_k TG(C_0) \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we consider the contribution A_1 . We notice that the frequency projector in A_1 ensures that either $N_1 \sim N$ or $N_2 \sim N$ and thus in any case $N \gtrsim N_3$. Moreover we can also assume that $N_3 \geq 1$ since otherwise the contribution of A_1 cancelled by integration by parts.

We divide the contribution A_1 into three cases: 1. $N_2 \lesssim N_3 \lesssim kN_4$, 2. $N_3 \gg kN_4$ or $k = 1$ and 3. $N_2 \gg N_3$. Set

$$J_t := \sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} \omega_N^2 N^{2s} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} \Pi(P_{N_1} u, P_{N_2} u) \prod_{j=3}^{k+2} P_{N_j} u dx dt' \right|,$$

where $\Pi(f, g)$ is defined by (2.9). Note that $N \gg 1$ ensures that $N_1 \gg 1$.

Case 1: $N_2 \lesssim N_3 \lesssim kN_4$. Since $N \lesssim N_1 \lesssim kN_2 \lesssim kN_3 \lesssim k^2N_4$, Hölder's,

Bernstein's and Young's inequalities and (3.1) show that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_t &\lesssim k^{2(2s+1)} \sum_{\substack{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2} \\ N_1 \lesssim k^2 N_4, N_1 \geq N_4, N_2 \geq N_4, N_3 \geq N_4}} \omega_{N_1}^2 N_4^{2s+1} \prod_{j=1}^4 \|P_{N_j} u\|_{L_{T,x}^4} \prod_{j=5}^{k+2} \|P_{N_j} u\|_{L_{T,x}^\infty} \\
&\lesssim_k \sum_{N_1 \geq N_4, N_2 \geq N_4, N_3 \geq N_4} \frac{\omega_{N_1}}{\omega_{N_2}} \omega_{N_1} \omega_{N_2} \left(\frac{N_4}{N_1}\right)^{s-\beta(\alpha)} \left(\frac{N_4}{N_2}\right)^{s-\beta(\alpha)} \left(\frac{N_4}{N_3}\right)^{\beta(\alpha)+1/2} \\
&\quad \times \prod_{j=1}^2 \|D_x^{s-\beta(\alpha)} P_{N_j} u\|_{L_{T,x}^4} \prod_{n=3}^4 \|D_x^{\beta(\alpha)+1/2} P_{N_n} u\|_{L_{T,x}^4} \\
&\lesssim_k \left(\sum_K \omega_K^4 \|D_x^{s-\beta(\alpha)} P_K u\|_{L_{T,x}^4}^4 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_K \|D_x^{\beta(\alpha)+1/2} P_K u\|_{L_{T,x}^4}^4 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\lesssim_k TG(C_0) \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $s \leq 2$ so that $k^{2(2s+1)} \leq k^{10}$ and that since $N_1 \lesssim kN_2$ we have $\frac{\omega_{N_1}}{\omega_{N_2}} \lesssim k$ since $\delta \leq 2$.

Case 2: $N_3 \gg kN_4$ or $k = 1$. By impossible frequency interactions, we must have $N \sim N_1 \sim N_2$. We take the extensions $\tilde{u} = \rho_T(u)$ of u defined in (2.1). For simplicity, we define the following functional:

$$J_\infty^{(2)}(u_1, \dots, u_{k+2}) := \sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} \omega_N^2 N^{2s} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \Pi(u_1, u_2) \prod_{j=3}^{k+2} u_j dx dt' \right|. \quad (4.17)$$

Setting $R = N_1^{1/3} N_3^{4/3}$, we split J_t as

$$\begin{aligned}
J_t &\leq J_\infty^{(2)}(P_{N_1} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{high}} \tilde{u}, P_{N_2} \mathbf{1}_t \tilde{u}, P_{N_3} \tilde{u}, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \tilde{u}) \\
&\quad + J_\infty^{(2)}(P_{N_1} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \tilde{u}, P_{N_2} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{high}} \tilde{u}, P_{N_3} \tilde{u}, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \tilde{u}) \\
&\quad + J_\infty^{(2)}(P_{N_1} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \tilde{u}, P_{N_2} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \tilde{u}, P_{N_3} \tilde{u}, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \tilde{u}) =: J_{\infty,1}^{(2)} + J_{\infty,2}^{(2)} + J_{\infty,3}^{(2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

For $J_{\infty,1}^{(2)}$, we see from (4.3) that $\|\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{high}}\|_{L^1} \lesssim T^{1/4} N_1^{-1/4} N_3^{-1}$, which gives

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{\infty,1}^{(2)} &\lesssim \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} \omega_{N_1}^2 N_1^{2s} N_3 \|\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{high}}\|_{L_t^1} \|P_{N_1} \tilde{u}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|P_{N_2} \tilde{u}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \prod_{j=3}^{k+2} \|P_{N_j} \tilde{u}\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \\
&\lesssim_k T^{1/4} \|\tilde{u}\|_{L_t^\infty H_{x^0}^k}^k \|\tilde{u}\|_{L_t^\infty H_\omega^s}^2 \sum_{N_1} N_1^{-1/4} \lesssim_k T^{1/4} C_0^k \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s}^2
\end{aligned}$$

since $N \sim N_1 \sim N_2$. In the last inequality, we used (2.4). By (4.4), $J_{\infty,2}^{(2)}$ can be estimated by the same bound as above. For $J_{\infty,3}^{(2)}$, we see from Lemma 4.4 that

$|\Omega_{k+1}| \gtrsim N_3 N_1^\alpha \gg R$. Then, defining $L := N_3 N_1^\alpha$, we decompose $J_{\infty,3}^{(2)}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\infty,3}^{(2)} &\leq J_{\infty}^{(2)}(P_{N_1} Q_{\gtrsim L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}), P_{N_2} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}, P_{N_3} \check{u}, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \check{u}) \\ &\quad + J_{\infty}^{(2)}(P_{N_1} Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}), P_{N_2} Q_{\gtrsim L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}), P_{N_3} \check{u}, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \check{u}) \\ &\quad + J_{\infty}^{(2)}(P_{N_1} Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}), P_{N_2} Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}), P_{N_3} Q_{\gtrsim L} \check{u}, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \check{u}) \\ &\quad + \dots + J_{\infty}^{(2)}(P_{N_1} Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}), P_{N_2} Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}), P_{N_3} Q_{\ll L} \check{u}, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} Q_{\gtrsim L} \check{u}) \\ &=: J_{\infty,3,1}^{(2)} + \dots + J_{\infty,3,k+2}^{(2)}. \end{aligned}$$

We also see from (4.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{N_2} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} &\leq \|P_{N_2} \mathbf{1}_t \check{u}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} + \|P_{N_2} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{high}} \check{u}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \\ &\lesssim \|P_{N_2} \mathbf{1}_t \check{u}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} + T^{1/4} R^{-1/4} \|P_{N_2} \check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

For $J_{\infty,3,1}^{(2)}$, Lemmas 2.4 and 2.1, the Hölder inequality, (4.5) and (4.18) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\infty,3,1}^{(2)} &\lesssim \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} \omega_{N_1}^2 N_1^{2s} N_3 \|P_{N_1} Q_{\gtrsim L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u})\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \|P_{N_2} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \prod_{j=3}^{k+2} \|P_{N_j} \check{u}\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \\ &\lesssim_k \|\check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s_0}}^k \sum_{N_1 \gtrsim 1} \omega_{N_1}^2 N_1^{2s-1} \|P_{N_1} \check{u}\|_{X^{0,1}} \|P_{N_1} \mathbf{1}_t \check{u}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \\ &\quad + T^{1/4} \|\check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s_0}}^{k-1} \sum_{N_1 \gtrsim N_3} \omega_{N_1}^2 N_1^{2s-13/12} N_3^{-1/3} \|P_{N_1} \check{u}\|_{X^{0,1}} \|P_{N_1} \check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|P_{N_3} \check{u}\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \\ &\lesssim T^{1/4} \|\check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s_0}}^k \|\check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty H_\omega^s} \|\check{u}\|_{X_\omega^{s-1,1}} \lesssim_k T^{1/4} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s} \|u\|_{Z_{\omega,T}^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we used $N_1^{-\alpha} \leq N_1^{-1}$ since $\alpha \in [1, 2]$. We can evaluate the contribution $J_{\infty,3,2}^{(2)}$ by the same way with (4.18). Next, we consider the contribution $J_{\infty,3,3}^{(2)}$. Lemmas 2.4 and 2.1, the Hölder inequality and (4.2) show

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\infty,3,3}^{(2)} &\lesssim \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} \omega_{N_1}^2 N_1^{2s} N_3 \|P_{N_1} Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u})\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \|P_{N_2} Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u})\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \\ &\quad \times \|P_{N_3} Q_{\gtrsim L} \check{u}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^\infty} \prod_{j=4}^{k+2} \|P_{N_j} \check{u}\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \\ &\lesssim_k T^{1/2} \|\check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s_0}}^{k-1} \sum_{N_1 \gtrsim N_3 \geq 1} \omega_{N_1}^2 N_1^{2s-\alpha} \|P_{N_1} \check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^2 \|D_x^{1/2} P_{N_3} \check{u}\|_{X^{0,1}} \\ &\lesssim T^{1/2} \|\check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s_0}}^{k-1} \sum_{N_1 \gtrsim N_3 \geq 1} N_1^{-\beta(\alpha)} N_3^{-\beta(\alpha)} \omega_{N_1}^2 N_1^{2s} \|P_{N_1} \check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^2 \|P_{N_3} \check{u}\|_{X^{s(\alpha)-1,1}} \\ &\lesssim T^{1/2} \|\check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s_0}}^{k-1} \|\check{u}\|_{X^{s(\alpha)-1,1}} \|\check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty H_\omega^s}^2 \lesssim_k T^{1/2} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s}^2 \end{aligned}$$

since $s(\alpha) - 1 < 0$. In a similar manner, we can evaluate the contribution $J_{\infty,3,j}^{(2)}$ for $j = 4, \dots, k+2$ by the same bound.

Case 3: $N_2 \gg N_3$. In this case, roughly speaking, we compare $|\xi_3 + \xi_4|$ and $k|\xi_5|$ where ξ_i is the i -th largest frequency. If $|\xi_3 + \xi_4| \gg k|\xi_5|$, we have a suitable non resonance relation (Lemma 4.5) whereas otherwise we can share the lost derivative between three functions. We split J_t as

$$\begin{aligned} J_t &\leq \sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} \omega_N^2 N^{2s} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} \Pi(P_{N_1} u, P_{N_2} u) P_{\lesssim k N_5} \left(\prod_{j=3}^{k+2} P_{N_j} u \right) dx dt' \right| \\ &\quad + \sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} \sum_{k N_5 \ll M \lesssim N_3} \omega_N^2 N^{2s} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} \Pi(P_{N_1} u, P_{N_2} u) P_M \left(\prod_{j=3}^{k+2} P_{N_j} u \right) dx dt' \right| \\ &=: I_t^{(3)} + J_t^{(3)}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark that if $k = 2$, then the term $I_t^{(3)}$ does not appear, and it holds that $J_t \leq J_t^{(3)}$ with the summation $\sum_{M \lesssim N_3}$ instead of $\sum_{k N_5 \ll M \lesssim N_3}$. Note also that the contribution in respectively $I_t^{(3)}$ and $J_t^{(3)}$ of respectively $N_5 = 0$ and $N_5 = M = 0$ does vanish by integration by parts. Therefore we can always assume that $N_5 \geq 1$ in $I_t^{(3)}$ and that $M \geq 1$ in $J_t^{(3)}$. For $I_t^{(3)}$, since either $N_1 \sim N$ or $N_2 \sim N$, we see from the Young inequality and the assumption that $\delta \leq 2$ that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{N_1 \geq N_2, k N_2 \gtrsim N_1} (\omega_{N_1}^2 N_1^{2s} + \omega_{N_2}^2 N_2^{2s}) \|P_{N_1} u\|_{L_x^2} \|P_{N_2} u\|_{L_x^2} \\ &\lesssim k^s \sum_{k N_2 \gtrsim N_1} \frac{\omega_{N_1}}{\omega_{N_2}} \omega_{N_1} \omega_{N_2} \left(\frac{N_1}{k N_2} \right)^s \|D_x^s P_{N_1} u\|_{L_x^2} \|D_x^s P_{N_2} u\|_{L_x^2} \\ &\quad + \sum_{N_2 \leq N_1} \frac{\omega_{N_2}}{\omega_{N_1}} \omega_{N_1} \omega_{N_2} \left(\frac{N_2}{N_1} \right)^s \|D_x^s P_{N_1} u\|_{L_x^2} \|D_x^s P_{N_2} u\|_{L_x^2} \lesssim k^3 \|u\|_{H_\omega^s}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This, Lemma 2.4, Hölder's and Young's inequalities and (3.2) show

$$\begin{aligned} I_t^{(3)} &\lesssim \sum_{N_1 \geq N_2, k N_2 \gtrsim N_1} \sum_{N_3, \dots, N_{k+2}} (\omega_{N_1}^2 N_1^{2s} + \omega_{N_2}^2 N_2^{2s}) k N_5 \\ &\quad \times \int_0^t \|P_{N_1} u\|_{L_x^2} \|P_{N_2} u\|_{L_x^2} \prod_{j=3}^{k+2} \|P_{N_j} u\|_{L_x^\infty} dt' \\ &\lesssim_k \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s_0}}^{k-3} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s}^2 \sum_{N_3 \geq N_4 \geq N_5} \prod_{j=3}^5 \left(\frac{N_5}{N_j} \right)^{1/3} \|D_x^{1/3} P_{N_j} u\|_{L_T^3 L_x^\infty} \\ &\lesssim_k \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s_0}}^{k-3} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s}^2 \sum_K \|D_x^{1/3} P_K u\|_{L_T^3 L_x^\infty}^3 \lesssim_k TG(C_0) \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s}^2 \end{aligned}$$

since $s(\alpha) = 1/2 + 2\beta(\alpha) \geq 7/12 + \beta(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in [1, 2]$. For $J_t^{(3)}$, we take the extensions $\tilde{u} = \rho_T(u)$ of u defined in (2.1). Note that we have $N_1 \sim N_2 \sim N$.

We further decompose $J_t^{(3)}$ as in Case 2. In the same sprit as (4.17), we define the functional for the sake of notation:

$$J_\infty^{(3)}(u_1, \dots, u_{k+2}) \\ := \sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} \sum_{kN_5 \ll M \lesssim N_3} \omega_N^2 N^{2s} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \Pi(u_1, u_2) P_M \left(\prod_{j=3}^{k+2} u_j \right) dx dt' \right|.$$

Putting $R = N_1^{1/3} M^{4/3}$, we obtain

$$J_t^{(3)} \leq J_\infty^{(3)}(P_{N_1} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{high}} \check{u}, P_{N_2} \mathbf{1}_t \check{u}, P_{N_3} \check{u}, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \check{u}) \\ + J_\infty^{(3)}(P_{N_1} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}, P_{N_2} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{high}} \check{u}, P_{N_3} \check{u}, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \check{u}) \\ + J_\infty^{(3)}(P_{N_1} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}, P_{N_2} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}, P_{N_3} \check{u}, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \check{u}) =: J_{\infty,1}^{(3)} + J_{\infty,2}^{(3)} + J_{\infty,3}^{(3)}.$$

Obviously, we have for any $\varepsilon > 0$ (for instance, $\varepsilon = \beta(\alpha)/2 \wedge (s_0/2 - 1/4)$)

$$\sum_{M \lesssim N_3} 1 \lesssim N_3^\varepsilon, \quad (4.19)$$

where the implicit constant does not depend on ε . By (4.19), (2.4) and the same argument as that of $J_{\infty,1}^{(2)}$, we obtain

$$J_{\infty,1}^{(3)} + J_{\infty,2}^{(3)} \lesssim_k T^{1/4} \|\check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty H_{x^0}^s}^k \|\check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty H_\omega^s}^2 \lesssim_k T^{1/4} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s}^2.$$

For $J_{\infty,3}^{(3)}$, Lemma 4.5 implies that $|\Omega_{k+1}| \gtrsim MN_1^\alpha \sim |\xi_3 + \xi_4|N_1^\alpha$. So, defining $L := MN_1^\alpha$, we have

$$J_{\infty,3}^{(3)} \leq J_\infty^{(3)}(P_{N_1} Q_{\gtrsim L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}), P_{N_2} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}, P_{N_3} \check{u}, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \check{u}) \\ + J_\infty^{(3)}(P_{N_1} Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}), P_{N_2} Q_{\gtrsim L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}), P_{N_3} \check{u}, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \check{u}) \\ + J_\infty^{(3)}(P_{N_1} Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}), P_{N_2} Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}), P_{N_3} Q_{\gtrsim L} \check{u}, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \check{u}) \\ + \dots + J_\infty^{(3)}(P_{N_1} Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}), P_{N_2} Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}), P_{N_3} Q_{\ll L} \check{u}, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} Q_{\gtrsim L} \check{u}) \\ =: J_{\infty,3,1}^{(3)} + \dots + J_{\infty,3,k+2}^{(3)}.$$

It is worth noting that $R \ll L = MN_1^\alpha$ since $N_1 \gg 1$. For $J_{\infty,3,1}^{(3)}$, we use the argument of $J_{\infty,3,1}^{(2)}$. Lemmas 2.4 and 2.1, the Hölder inequality, (4.5), (4.18) and

(4.19) show

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{\infty,3,1}^{(3)} &\lesssim \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} \sum_{M \lesssim N_3} \omega_{N_1}^2 N_1^{2s} M \|P_{N_1} Q_{\gtrsim L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u})\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \|P_{N_2} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{u}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \prod_{j=3}^{k+2} \|P_{N_j} \check{u}\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \\
&\lesssim_k \sum_{N_1, N_3, \dots, N_{k+2}} \sum_{M \lesssim N_3} \omega_{N_1}^2 N_1^{2s-\alpha} \|P_{N_1} \check{u}\|_{X^{0,1}} \|P_{\sim N_1} \mathbf{1}_t \check{u}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \prod_{j=3}^{k+2} \|P_{N_j} \check{u}\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \\
&\quad + T^{1/4} \sum_{N_1 \geq N_3} \sum_{M \lesssim N_3} \omega_{N_1}^2 N_1^{2s-\alpha-1/12} M^{-1/3} \|P_{N_1} \check{u}\|_{X^{0,1}} \|P_{\sim N_1} \check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \\
&\lesssim_k T^{1/4} \|\check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty H_\omega^s} \|\check{u}\|_{X_\omega^{s-1,1}} \lesssim T^{1/4} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s} \|u\|_{Z_{\omega,T}^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

We can estimate the contribution $J_{\infty,3,2}^{(3)}$ by the same way. For the contribution $J_{\infty,3,3}^{(3)}$, similarly to $J_{\infty,3,3}^{(2)}$, we see from (4.2), (4.19) and Lemma 2.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{\infty,3,3}^{(3)} &\lesssim_k T^{1/2} \|\check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s_0}}^{k-1} \sum_{N_1 \gtrsim N_3 \geq 1} \omega_{N_1}^2 N_1^{2s-\alpha} N_3^{\beta(\alpha)/2} \|P_{N_1} \check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^2 \|D_x^{1/2} P_{N_3} \check{u}\|_{X^{0,1}} \\
&\lesssim T^{1/2} \|\check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s_0}}^{k-1} \|\check{u}\|_{X^{s(\alpha)-1,1}} \|\check{u}\|_{L_t^\infty H_\omega^s}^2 \lesssim_k T^{1/2} \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_\omega^s}^2
\end{aligned}$$

In a similar manner, we can estimate the contribution $J_{\infty,3,j}^{(3)}$ for $j = 4, \dots, k+2$ by the same bound.

Finally, we consider the contribution of $\phi_N^2(\xi_3)\xi_3$. We may assume that $N_3 \gg kN_4$. Otherwise the proof is the same as the contribution of A_2 . When $N_3 \gg kN_4$, we can obtain the desired estimate as in Case 2. This completes the proof. \square

5. ESTIMATE FOR THE DIFFERENCE

We provide the estimate (at the regularity $s-1$) for the difference w of two solutions u, v of (1.3). In this section, we do not use the frequency envelope, so we always argue on the standard Sobolev space $H^s(\mathbb{T})$.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $0 < T < 1$, $\alpha \in [1, 2]$ and $2 \geq s \geq s(\alpha) := 1/2 + 2\beta(\alpha)$. Let u and v be two solutions of (1.3) belonging to Z_T^s and associated with the initial data $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T})$ and $v_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T})$, respectively. Then there exists an entire function $G = G[f]$ that is increasing and non negative on \mathbb{R}_+ such that*

$$\|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}^2 \leq \|u_0 - v_0\|_{H_x^{s-1}}^2 + T^{1/4} G(\|u\|_{Z_T^s} + \|v\|_{Z_T^s}) \|w\|_{Z_T^{s-1}} \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}, \quad (5.1)$$

where we set $w = u - v$.

Proof. According to Lemma 4.7, we notice that $u, v \in Z_T^s$. Observe that w satisfies

$$\partial_t w + L_{\alpha+1} w = -\partial_x(f(u) - f(v)) \quad (5.2)$$

Rewriting $f(u) - f(v)$ as

$$f(u) - f(v) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{f^{(k)}(0)}{k!} (u^k - v^k) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{f^{(k)}(0)}{k!} w \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} u^i v^{k-1-i}$$

and arguing as in the proof of Proposition 4.8, we see from (5.2) that for $t \in [0, T]$

$$\|w(t)\|_{H_x^{s-1}}^2 \leq \|w_0\|_{H_x^{s-1}}^2 + 2 \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{|f^{(k)}(0)|}{(k-1)!} \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}} I_{k,i}^t,$$

where $w_0 = u_0 - v_0$ and

$$I_{k,i}^t := \sum_{N \geq 1} N^{2(s-1)} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} u^i v^{k-1-i} w P_N^2 \partial_x w \, dx dt' \right|.$$

It is clear that $I_{1,i}^t = 0$ by the integration by parts. Therefore we are reduced to estimate the contribution of

$$I_{k+1}^t = \sum_{N \geq 1} N^{2(s-1)} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mathbf{z}^k w P_N^2 \partial_x w \, dx dt' \right| \quad (5.3)$$

where \mathbf{z}^k stands for $u^i v^{k-i}$ for some $i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. We set

$$C_0 := \|u\|_{Z_T^s} + \|v\|_{Z_T^s}.$$

We claim that for any $k \geq 1$ it holds

$$I_{k+1}^t \leq C^k T^{1/4} G(C_0) C_0^k \|w\|_{Z_T^{s-1}} \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}. \quad (5.4)$$

that clearly leads (4.8) by taking (4.9) and (4.11) into account since $\sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{|f^{(k+1)}(0)|}{k!} C^k C_0^k < \infty$.

In the sequel we fix $k \geq 1$ and we estimate I_k^t . We also use the notation $a \lesssim_k b$ defined in (4.13). The contribution of the sum over $N \lesssim 1$ in (5.3) is easily estimated thanks to (2.5) by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{N \lesssim 1} (1 \vee N)^{2(s-1)} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mathbf{z}^k w P_N^2 \partial_x w \, dx dt' \right| \\ & \lesssim T \sum_{N \lesssim 1} \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}} \|\mathbf{z}^k P_N^2 \partial_x w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{1-s}} \lesssim_k T \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

since $s > 1/2$. In the last inequality, we used $1 - s < 1/2$. Therefore, in what follows, we can assume that $N \gg 1$. A similar argument to (4.15) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{N \gg 1} N^{2(s-1)} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mathbf{z}^k w P_N^2 \partial_x w \, dx dt' \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} N^{2(s-1)} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} \Pi(P_{N_1} w, P_{N_2} w) \prod_{j=3}^{k+2} P_{N_j} z_j \, dx dt' \right| =: J_t, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Pi(f, g)$ is defined by (2.9) and $z_i \in \{u, v\}$ for $i \in \{3, \dots, k+2\}$. By symmetry, we may assume that $N_1 \geq N_2$. Moreover, we may assume that $N_3 \geq N_4$ for $k = 2$ and $N_3 \geq N_4 \geq N_5 = \max_{j \geq 5} N_j$ for $k \geq 3$. Note again that the cost of this choice is a constant factor less than $(k+2)^4$. It is also worth noticing that the frequency projectors in $\Pi(\cdot, \cdot)$ ensure that $N_1 \sim N$ or $N_2 \sim N$ and in particular $N_1 \gtrsim N$. We also remark that we can assume that $N_3 \geq 1$ since the contribution of $N_3 = 0$ does vanish by integration by parts. Finally we note that we can also assume that $N_2 \geq 1$ since in the case $N_2 = 0$ we must have $N_3 \gtrsim N_1/k$ and it is easy to check that

$$J_t \lesssim kT \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}} \|z_3\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^s} \|P_0 w\|_{L_{T,x}^\infty} \prod_{j=4}^{k+2} \|z_j\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^s} \lesssim_k T \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}^2.$$

We consider the contribution of J_t , dividing it into three cases:

- $N_1 \lesssim kN_4$ ($k \geq 2$),
- $N_1 \gg kN_4$ and $N_2 \gtrsim N_3$ (or $k = 1$ and $N_2 \gtrsim N_3$),
- $N_1 \gg kN_4$ and $N_2 \ll N_3$ (or $k = 1$ and $N_2 \ll N_3$).

Case 1: $N_1 \lesssim kN_4$ ($k \geq 2$).

Hölder's and Young's inequalities, (4.16), (3.1) and (3.3) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} J_t &\leq \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} (N_1^{2s-1} + N_2^{2s-1}) \prod_{j=1}^2 \|P_{N_j} w\|_{L_{T,x}^4} \prod_{n=3}^4 \|P_{N_n} z_n\|_{L_{T,x}^4} \prod_{j=5}^{k+2} \|P_{N_j} z_j\|_{L_{T,x}^\infty} \\ &\lesssim_k C_0^{k-2} \sum_{N_3 \geq N_4 \gtrsim k^{-1} N_1 \geq k^{-1} N_2} N_1^{2s-1} \|P_{N_1} w\|_{L_{T,x}^4} \|P_{N_2} w\|_{L_{T,x}^4} \|P_{N_3} z_3\|_{L_{T,x}^4} \|P_{N_4} z_4\|_{L_{T,x}^4} \\ &\lesssim_k \sum_{N_3 \geq N_4 \gtrsim k^{-1} N_1 \geq k^{-1} N_2} k^{2s-2\beta(\alpha)} \left(\frac{N_1}{kN_4}\right)^{2s-\beta(\alpha)-1/2} \left(\frac{N_2}{kN_4}\right)^{1/2-\beta(\alpha)} \left(\frac{N_4}{N_3}\right)^{s-\beta(\alpha)} \\ &\quad \times \prod_{j=1}^2 \|D_x^{-1/2+\beta(\alpha)} P_{N_j} w\|_{L_{T,x}^4} \prod_{n=3}^4 \|D_x^{s-\beta(\alpha)} P_{N_n} z_n\|_{L_{T,x}^4} \\ &\lesssim_k TG(C_0) \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s(\alpha)-1}}^2 \end{aligned}$$

since $2s - \beta(\alpha) - 1/2 > 0$ and $s - \beta(\alpha) > 1/2 - \beta(\alpha) > 0$.

Case 2: $N_1 \gg kN_4$ and $N_2 \gtrsim N_3$ (or $k = 1$ and $N_2 \gtrsim N_3$).

In this case, the contribution of J_t in this case can be estimated by the same way as the contribution of A_1 in Proposition 4.8, replacing N^{2s} , $P_{N_1} u$, $P_{N_2} u$, $P_{N_j} u$ for $j = 3, \dots, k+2$ by $N^{2(s-1)}$, $P_{N_1} w$, $P_{N_2} w$, $P_{N_j} z_j$ for $j = 3, \dots, k+2$, respectively.

Case 3: $N_1 \gg kN_4$ and $N_2 \ll N_3$ (or $k = 1$ and $N_2 \ll N_3$).

Note that in this case $N_1 \sim N_3 \sim N \gg N_2 \vee N_4$. We further divide the contribution of J_t into three cases:

- $N_2 \gg kN_4$ or $k = 1$,
- $kN_4 \gtrsim N_2 \gtrsim N_5$ (or $k = 2$ and $N_4 \gtrsim N_2$),
- $N_2 \ll N_5$ ($k \geq 3$).

Subcase 3.1: $N_2 \gg kN_4$ or $k = 1$. Recall that we have $N_2 \geq 1$ and thus this subcase contains the case $N_4 = 0$. We take the extensions $\check{w} = \rho_T(w)$ (resp. $\check{z}_j = \rho_T(z_j)$ for $j \geq 3$) of w (resp. z_j for $j \geq 3$) defined in (2.1). For simplicity, we shall use the following notation:

$$J_\infty^{(3.1)}(u_1, \dots, u_{k+2}) := \sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} N^{2(s-1)} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \Pi(u_1, u_2) \prod_{j=3}^{k+2} u_j dx dt' \right|.$$

Setting $R = N_1^{1/3} N_2^{4/3}$, we divide J_t as

$$\begin{aligned} J_t &\leq J_\infty^{(3.1)}(P_{N_1} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{high}} \check{w}, P_{N_2} \check{w}, P_{N_3} \mathbf{1}_t \check{z}_3, P_{N_4} \check{z}_4, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \check{z}_{k+2}) \\ &\quad + J_\infty^{(3.1)}(P_{N_1} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{w}, P_{N_2} \check{w}, P_{N_3} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{high}} \check{z}_3, P_{N_4} \check{z}_4, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \check{z}_{k+2}) \\ &\quad + J_\infty^{(3.1)}(P_{N_1} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{w}, P_{N_2} \check{w}, P_{N_3} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{z}_3, P_{N_4} \check{z}_4, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \check{z}_{k+2}) \\ &=: J_{\infty,1}^{(3.1)} + J_{\infty,2}^{(3.1)} + J_{\infty,3}^{(3.1)}. \end{aligned}$$

For $J_{\infty,1}^{(3.1)}$, we see from (4.3) that $\|\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{high}}\|_{L^1} \lesssim T^{1/4} N_1^{-1/4} N_2^{-1}$, which gives

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\infty,1}^{(3.1)} &\lesssim \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} N_1^{2s-1} \|\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{high}}\|_{L^1} \|P_{N_1} \check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|P_{N_2} \check{w}\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \|P_{N_3} \check{z}_3\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \prod_{j=4}^{k+2} \|P_{N_j} \check{z}_j\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \\ &\lesssim_k T^{1/4} C_0^{k-1} \sum_{N_1, N_2} N_1^{2s-5/4} N_2^{-1} \|P_{N_1} \check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|P_{N_2} \check{w}\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \|P_{\sim N_1} \check{z}_3\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \\ &\lesssim_k T^{1/4} \|\check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s-1}}^2 \lesssim_k T^{1/4} \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here, in the first inequality, we used $N_2^{2s-1} \leq N_1^{2s-1}$ since $s \geq s(\alpha) > 1/2$. In the last inequality, we also used (2.4). In a similar manner, we can also estimate $J_{\infty,2}^{(3.1)}$ by the same bound as that of $J_{\infty,1}^{(3.1)}$. For $J_{\infty,3}^{(3.1)}$, we note that $|\Omega_{k+1}| \gtrsim N_2 N_1^\alpha =: L$ by Lemma 4.4. This enables us to decompose $J_{\infty,3}^{(3.1)}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\infty,3}^{(3.1)} &\leq J_\infty^{(3.1)}(P_{N_1} Q_{\gtrsim L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{w}), P_{N_2} \check{w}, P_{N_3} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{z}_3, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \check{z}_{k+2}) \\ &\quad + J_\infty^{(3.1)}(P_{N_1} Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{w}), P_{N_2} \check{w}, P_{N_3} Q_{\gtrsim L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{z}_3), \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \check{z}_{k+2}) \\ &\quad + J_\infty^{(3.1)}(P_{N_1} Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{w}), P_{N_2} Q_{\gtrsim L} \check{w}, P_{N_3} Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{z}_3), \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \check{z}_{k+2}) + \dots \\ &\quad + J_\infty^{(3.1)}(P_{N_1} Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{w}), P_{N_2} Q_{\ll L} \check{w}, P_{N_3} Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{z}_3), \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} Q_{\gtrsim L} \check{z}_{k+2}) \\ &=: J_{\infty,3,1}^{(3.1)} + \dots + J_{\infty,3,k+2}^{(3.1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $J_{\infty,3,n}^{(3.1)}$ for $4 \leq n \leq k+2$ corresponds to the term in which $Q_{\gtrsim L}$ lands on $P_{N_n} \check{z}_n$. It is worth noting that $R \ll L$. Then, the Hölder inequality, (4.5), (4.18)

and Lemma 2.1 imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
& J_{\infty,3,1}^{(3.1)} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} N_1^{2s-1} \|P_{N_1} Q_{\gtrsim L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{w})\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \|P_{N_2} \check{w}\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \|P_{N_3} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{z}_3\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \prod_{j=4}^{k+2} \|P_{N_j} \check{z}_j\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \\
& \lesssim_k C_0^{k-1} \sum_{N_1, N_2} N_1^{2s-1-\alpha} \|P_{N_1} \check{w}\|_{X^{0,1}} \|P_{N_2} \check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{-1/2}} \|P_{\sim N_1} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{z}_3\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \\
& \lesssim_k \sum_{N_1, N_2} N_1^{2s-1-\alpha} \|P_{N_1} \check{w}\|_{X^{0,1}} \|P_{N_2} \check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{-1/2}} \|P_{\sim N_1} \mathbf{1}_t \check{z}_3\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \\
& \quad + T^{1/4} \sum_{N_1, N_2} N_1^{2s-13/12-\alpha} N_2^{-1/3} \|P_{N_1} \check{w}\|_{X^{0,1}} \|P_{N_2} \check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{-1/2}} \|P_{\sim N_1} \check{z}_3\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \\
& \lesssim_k T^{1/4} \|\check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s-1}} \|\check{w}\|_{X^{s-2,1}} \lesssim_k T^{1/4} \|w\|_{Z_T^{s-1}} \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the same way, we can obtain

$$J_{\infty,3,2}^{(3.1)} \lesssim_k T^{1/4} C_0^{k-1} \|\check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s-1}}^2 \|\check{z}_3\|_{X^{s-1,1}} \lesssim_k T^{1/4} \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}^2.$$

Next, we consider the contribution of $J_{\infty,3,3}^{(3.1)}$. Lemma 2.1, the Hölder inequality and (4.2) show

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{\infty,3,3}^{(3.1)} & \lesssim \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} N_1^{2s-1} \|P_{N_1} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{w}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \|P_{N_2} Q_{\gtrsim L} \check{w}\|_{L_t^2 L_x^\infty} \|P_{N_3} \check{z}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \prod_{j=4}^{k+2} \|P_{N_j} \check{z}_j\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \\
& \lesssim_k T^{1/2} C_0^{k-1} \sum_{N_1 \geq N_2} N_1^{2s-1-\alpha} N_2^{-1} \|P_{N_1} \check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|D_x^{1/2} P_{N_2} \check{w}\|_{X^{0,1}} \|P_{\sim N_1} \check{z}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \\
& \lesssim_k T^{1/2} \|\check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s-1}} \|\check{z}_3\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^s} \sum_{N_1 \geq N_2} N_1^{-\alpha} N_2^{-1} \|P_{N_2} \check{w}\|_{X^{1/2,1}} \\
& \lesssim_k T^{1/2} \|\check{w}\|_{X^{s-2,1}} \|\check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s-1}} \lesssim T^{1/2} \|w\|_{Z_T^{s-1}} \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}
\end{aligned}$$

since $s \geq s(\alpha) > 1/2$. Similarly, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& J_{\infty,3,4}^{(3.1)} \\
& \lesssim_k C_0^{k-2} \sum_{N_1, N_2, N_4} N_1^{2s-1} \|P_{N_1} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \check{w}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \|P_{N_2} \check{w}\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \|P_{\sim N_1} \check{z}_3\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|P_{N_4} Q_{\gtrsim L} \check{z}_4\|_{L_t^2 L_x^\infty} \\
& \lesssim_k T^{1/2} \sum_{N_1, N_2, N_4} N_1^{2s-\alpha-1} N_2^{-1} \|P_{N_1} \check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|P_{N_2} \check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{1/2}} \|P_{\sim N_1} \check{z}_3\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|P_{N_4} \check{z}_4\|_{X^{1/2,1}} \\
& \lesssim T^{1/2} C_0^{k-2} \|\check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s-1}} \|\check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{-1/2}} \|\check{z}_3\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^s} \sum_{N_1 \geq N_4} N_1^{-\alpha} \|P_{N_4} \check{z}_4\|_{X^{1/2,1}} \\
& \lesssim T^{1/2} C_0^{k-1} \|\check{z}_4\|_{X^{s(\alpha)-1,1}} \|\check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s-1}}^2 \lesssim_k T^{1/2} C_0^k \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We see from the above argument that $J_{\infty,3,j}^{(3,1)}$ for $5 \leq j \leq k+2$ can be estimated by the same bound as that of $J_{\infty,3,4}^{(3,1)}$.

Subcase 3.2: $N_5 \lesssim N_2 \lesssim kN_4$ (or $k=2$ and $N_4 \gtrsim N_2$). Note that the cases $N_2 = 0$ or $N_4 = 0$ have been already treated so that we can assume that $N_2 \geq 1$ and $N_4 \geq 1$. It suffices to consider the case $N_5 \lesssim N_2 \lesssim N_4$ since $k \geq 1$. First we set

$$\begin{aligned} J_t &\leq \sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} N^{2(s-1)} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} \partial_x P_N^2 P_{N_1} w P_{N_2} w \prod_{j=3}^{k+2} P_{N_j} z_j dx dt' \right| \\ &\quad + \sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} N^{2(s-1)} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} P_{N_1} w \partial_x P_N^2 P_{N_2} w \prod_{j=3}^{k+2} P_{N_j} z_j dx dt' \right| \\ &=: I_t^{(3,2)} + J_t^{(3,2)}. \end{aligned}$$

For $I_t^{(3,2)}$, we further divide it as in Case 3 in Proposition 4.8:

$$\begin{aligned} I_t^{(3,2)} &\leq \sum N^{2(s-1)} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} \partial_x P_N^2 P_{N_1} w P_{N_3} z_3 P_{\lesssim kN_5 \vee 1} \left(P_{N_2} w \prod_{j=4}^{k+2} P_{N_j} z_j \right) dx dt' \right| \\ &\quad + \sum_{kN_5 \vee 1 \ll M \lesssim N_4} N^{2(s-1)} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} \partial_x P_N^2 P_{N_1} w P_{N_3} z_3 P_M \left(P_{N_2} w \prod_{j=4}^{k+2} P_{N_j} z_j \right) dx dt' \right| \\ &=: I_{t,1}^{(3,2)} + I_{t,2}^{(3,2)}, \end{aligned}$$

where \sum denotes $\sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}}$ for the sake of simplicity. Remark that if $k=2$, then the term $I_{t,1}^{(3,2)}$ does not appear, and it holds that $I_t^{(3,2)} \leq I_{t,2}^{(3,2)}$ with the summation $\sum_{M \lesssim N_4}$ instead of $\sum_{kN_5 \vee 1 \ll M \lesssim N_4}$. For $I_{t,1}^{(3,2)}$, Hölder's, Bernstein's and Minkowski's inequalities, (3.2) and (3.4) give

$$\begin{aligned} I_{t,1}^{(3,2)} &\lesssim \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} N_1^{2s-1} (k^{3/4} N_5^{3/4} \vee 1) \int_0^t \|P_{N_1} w\|_{L_x^2} \|P_{N_3} z_3\|_{L_x^2} \|P_{N_2} w\|_{L_x^4} \\ &\quad \times \|P_{N_4} z_4\|_{L_x^4} \|P_{N_5} z_5\|_{L_x^4} \prod_{j=6}^{k+2} \|P_{N_j} z_j\|_{L_x^\infty} dt' \\ &\lesssim_k C_0^{k-3} \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}} \|z_3\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^s} \sum_{N_4 \gtrsim N_2 \gtrsim N_5} \left(\frac{N_2}{N_4} \right)^{5/12} \left(\frac{N_5 \vee 1}{N_4} \right)^{1/6} \\ &\quad \times \|D_x^{-5/12} P_{N_2} w\|_{L_T^3 L_x^4} \|D_x^{7/12} P_{N_4} z_4\|_{L_T^3 L_x^4} \|D_x^{7/12} P_{N_5} z_5\|_{L_T^3 L_x^4} \\ &\lesssim_k TG(C_0) \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s(\alpha)-1}} \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}} \prod_{i=4}^5 \|z_i\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s(\alpha)}}^2 \lesssim_k TG(C_0) \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

since $s(\alpha) \geq 7/12 + \beta(\alpha)$. In order to estimate $I_{t,2}^{(3,2)}$, we further decompose it. We take the extensions $\tilde{w} = \rho_T(w)$ (resp. $\tilde{z}_j = \rho_T(z_j)$ for $j \geq 3$) of w (resp. z_j for $j \geq 3$) defined in (2.1). As in Subcase 3.1, we shall use the followig notation:

$$I_{\infty,2}^{(3,2)}(u_1, \dots, u_{k+2}) \\ := \sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} \sum_{kN_5 \vee 1 \ll M \lesssim N_4} N^{2(s-1)} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} (\partial_x P_N^2 u_1) u_3 P_M \left(u_2 \prod_{j=4}^{k+2} u_j \right) dx dt' \right|.$$

Putting $R = N_1^{1/3} M^{4/3}$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{t,2}^{(3,2)} &\leq I_{\infty,2}^{(3,2)}(P_{N_1} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{high}} \tilde{w}, P_{N_2} \tilde{w}, P_{N_3} \mathbf{1}_t \tilde{z}_3, P_{N_4} \tilde{z}_4, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \tilde{z}_{k+2}) \\ &\quad + I_{\infty,2}^{(3,2)}(P_{N_1} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \tilde{w}, P_{N_2} \tilde{w}, P_{N_3} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{high}} \tilde{z}_3, P_{N_4} \tilde{z}_4, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \tilde{z}_{k+2}) \\ &\quad + I_{\infty,2}^{(3,2)}(P_{N_1} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \tilde{w}, P_{N_2} \tilde{w}, P_{N_3} \mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}} \tilde{z}_3, P_{N_4} \tilde{z}_4, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}} \tilde{z}_{k+2}) \\ &=: I_{\infty,2,1}^{(3,2)} + I_{\infty,2,2}^{(3,2)} + I_{\infty,2,3}^{(3,2)}. \end{aligned}$$

For $I_{\infty,2,1}^{(3,2)}$, we see from (4.3) that $\|\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{high}}\|_{L^1} \lesssim T^{1/4} N_1^{-1/4} M^{-1}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\infty,2,1}^{(3,2)} &\lesssim \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} \sum_{kN_5 \vee 1 \ll M \lesssim N_4} N_1^{2s-1} \|\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{high}}\|_{L^1} \|P_{N_1} \tilde{w}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|P_{N_3} \tilde{z}_3\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \\ &\quad \times \left\| P_M \left(P_{N_2} \tilde{w} \prod_{j=4}^{k+2} P_{N_j} \tilde{z}_j \right) \right\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \\ &\lesssim T^{1/4} \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} \sum_{M \lesssim N_4} N_1^{2s-5/4} \|P_{N_1} \tilde{w}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|P_{N_3} \tilde{z}_3\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \\ &\quad \times \left\| P_{N_2} \tilde{w} \prod_{j=4}^{k+2} P_{N_j} \tilde{z}_j \right\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{-1/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that (2.7) leads to

$$\sum_{N_5, \dots, N_{k+2}} \left\| P_{N_2} \tilde{w} \prod_{j=4}^{k+2} P_{N_j} \tilde{z}_j \right\|_{H_x^{-1/2}} \lesssim_k C_0^{k-2} \|P_{N_4} \tilde{z}_4\|_{H^{s_0}} \|P_{N_2} \tilde{w}\|_{H_x^{-1/2}} \quad (5.6)$$

with $1/2 < s_0 < s$. This together with (4.19) and (2.4) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\infty,2,1}^{(3,2)} &\lesssim_k T^{1/4} \|\tilde{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s-1}} \|\tilde{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s-1}} \|\tilde{z}_3\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^s} \|\tilde{z}_4\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^s} \sum_{N_1} N_1^{-1/4} \\ &\lesssim_k T^{1/4} \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $I_{\infty,2,2}^{(3,2)}$ can be estimated by the same bound as above. For $I_{\infty,2,3}^{(3,2)}$, Lemma 4.5 shows $|\Omega_{k+1}| \gtrsim MN_1^\alpha \sim |\xi_2 + \xi_4|N_1^\alpha$. Therefore, setting $L := MN_1^\alpha$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{\infty,2,3}^{(3,2)} &\leq I_{\infty,2}^{(3,2)}(P_{N_1}Q_{\gtrsim L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}}\check{w}), P_{N_2}\check{w}, P_{N_3}\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}}\check{z}_3, \dots, P_{N_{k+2}}\check{z}_{k+2}) \\
&\quad + I_{\infty,2}^{(3,2)}(P_{N_1}Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}}\check{w}), P_{N_2}\check{w}, P_{N_3}Q_{\gtrsim L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}}\check{z}_3), \dots, P_{N_{k+2}}\check{z}_{k+2}) \\
&\quad + I_{\infty,2}^{(3,2)}(P_{N_1}Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}}\check{w}), P_{N_2}Q_{\gtrsim L}\check{w}, P_{N_3}Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}}\check{z}_3), \dots, P_{N_{k+2}}\check{z}_{k+2}) + \dots \\
&\quad + I_{\infty,2}^{(3,2)}(P_{N_1}Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}}\check{w}), P_{N_2}Q_{\ll L}\check{w}, P_{N_3}Q_{\ll L}(\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}}\check{z}_3), \dots, P_{N_{k+2}}Q_{\gtrsim L}\check{z}_{k+2}) \\
&=: I_{\infty,2,3,1}^{(3,2)} + \dots + I_{\infty,2,3,k+2}^{(3,2)},
\end{aligned}$$

where $I_{\infty,2,3,n}^{(3,2)}$ for $4 \leq n \leq k+2$ corresponds to the term in which $Q_{\gtrsim L}$ lands on $P_{N_n}\check{z}_n$. The contribution of $I_{\infty,2,3,1}^{(3,2)}$ is estimated, thanks to Lemma 2.1, (4.16), (4.5), (4.18) and (5.6), by

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{\infty,2,3,1}^{(3,2)} &\lesssim \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} \sum_{1 \vee k N_5 \ll M \lesssim N_4} N_1^{2s-1-\alpha} M^{-1} \|P_{N_1}\check{w}\|_{X^{0,1}} \|P_{N_3}\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}}\check{z}_3\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \\
&\quad \times \left\| P_M \left(P_{N_2}\check{w} \prod_{j=4}^{k+2} P_{N_j}\check{z}_j \right) \right\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \\
&\lesssim \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} \sum_{M \lesssim N_4} N_1^{2s-2} \|P_{N_1}\check{w}\|_{X^{0,1}} \|P_{N_3}\mathbf{1}_{t,R}^{\text{low}}\check{z}_3\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \left\| P_{N_2}\check{w} \prod_{j=4}^{k+2} P_{N_j}\check{z}_j \right\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{-1/2}} \\
&\lesssim_k \|\check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s-1}} \sum_{N_1 \gtrsim N_4} \sum_{M \lesssim N_4} (N_1^{2s-2} \|P_{N_1}\check{w}\|_{X^{0,1}} \|P_{\sim N_1}\mathbf{1}_t\check{z}_3\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \|P_{N_4}\check{z}_4\|_{L_t^\infty H^{s_0}} \\
&\quad + T^{1/4} N_1^{2s-25/12} M^{-1/3} \|P_{N_1}\check{w}\|_{X^{0,1}} \|P_{\sim N_1}\check{z}_3\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|P_{N_4}\check{z}_4\|_{L_t^\infty H^{s_0}}) \\
&\lesssim_k T^{1/4} \|\check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s-1}} \|\check{w}\|_{X^{s-2,1}} \|\check{z}_3\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^s} \|\check{z}_4\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^s} \lesssim_k T^{1/4} \|w\|_{Z_T^{s-1}} \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}
\end{aligned}$$

with $1/2 < s_0 < s$. Here, we used $N_1^{-\alpha} \leq N_1^{-1}$ since $\alpha \geq 1$. Similarly, we can estimate $I_{\infty,2,3,2}^{(3,2)}$ by

$$I_{\infty,2,3,2}^{(3,2)} \lesssim_k T^{1/4} C_0^k \|\check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s-1}}^2 \lesssim_k T^{1/4} \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}^2.$$

Next, for $I_{\infty,2,3,2}^{(3,2)}$, thanks to Lemma 2.1, (4.3), (4.4), (4.2) and (5.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{\infty,2,3,3}^{(3,2)} &\lesssim T^{1/2} \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} \sum_{M \lesssim N_4} N_1^{2s-1} M \|P_{N_1} \check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|P_{N_3} \check{z}_3\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \\
&\quad \times \left\| (P_{N_2} Q_{\gtrsim L} \check{w}) \prod_{j=4}^{k+2} P_{N_j} \check{z}_j \right\|_{L_t^2 H_x^{-1/2}} \\
&\lesssim_k T^{1/2} \|\check{w}\|_{X^{s-2,1}} \sum_{N_1 \gtrsim N_4} \sum_{M \lesssim N_4} N_1^{2s-2} \|P_{N_1} \check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|P_{\sim N_1} \check{z}_3\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|P_{N_4} \check{z}_4\|_{L_t^\infty H^{s_0}} \\
&\lesssim_k T^{1/2} \|\check{z}_3\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^s} \|\check{z}_4\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^s} \|\check{w}\|_{X^{s-2,1}} \|\check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s-1}} \lesssim_k T^{1/2} \|w\|_{Z_T^{s-1}} \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}
\end{aligned}$$

with $1/2 < s_0 < s$. Here, we used $N_1^{-\alpha} \leq N_1^{-1}$. By a similar argument, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{\infty,2,3,4}^{(3,2)} &\lesssim T^{1/2} \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}} \sum_{M \lesssim N_4} N_1^{2s-1} M \|P_{N_1} \check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|P_{N_3} \check{z}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \\
&\quad \times \left\| (P_{N_2} Q_{\ll MN_1^\alpha} \check{w}) (P_{N_4} Q_{\gtrsim MN_1^\alpha} \check{z}_4) \prod_{j=5}^{k+2} P_{N_j} \check{z}_j \right\|_{L_t^2 H_x^{-1/2}} \\
&\lesssim_k T^{1/2} \|\check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s-1}} \sum_{N_1 \gtrsim N_4} \sum_{M \lesssim N_4} N_1^{2s-2} \|P_{N_1} \check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|P_{\sim N_1} \check{z}_3\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|P_{N_4} \check{z}_4\|_{X^{s_0,1}} \\
&\lesssim_k T^{1/2} \|\check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s-1}} \|\check{z}_4\|_{X^{s(\alpha)-1,1}} \sum_{N_1} N_1^{s_0-s(\alpha)} N_1^{2s-1} \|P_{N_1} \check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \|P_{\sim N_1} \check{z}_3\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \\
&\lesssim T^{1/2} \|\check{z}_3\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^s} \|\check{z}_4\|_{X^{s(\alpha)-1,1}} \|\check{w}\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^{s-1}}^2 \lesssim_k T^{1/2} \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we chose $s_0 \in (1/2, s(\alpha))$ and used $N_1^{-\alpha} \leq N_1^{-1}$. Similarly, we can estimate $I_{\infty,2,3,n}^{(3,2)}$ for $5 \leq n \leq k+2$ by the same bound as that of $I_{\infty,2,3,4}^{(3,2)}$, which completes the estimate of the contribution of $I_t^{(3,2)}$. On the other hand, the contribution of $J_t^{(3,2)}$ can be controlled by $I_t^{(3,2)}$ since $s > 1/2$ and $N_2^{2s-1} \leq N_1^{2s-1}$.

Subcase 3.3: $N_2 \ll N_5$ ($k \geq 3$). Recall that we can assume $N_2 \geq 1$ and note that we can also assume that $N_5 \geq 1$ since $N_5 = 0$ is included in Subcase 3.2: $N_2 \gtrsim N_5$. As in Subcase 3.2, we evaluate $I_t^{(3,2)}$ and $J_t^{(3,2)}$. Define L_k for $k \geq 3$ so that $L_3 := N_2$ and $L_k := N_2 \vee kN_6$ for $k \geq 4$. We decompose

$$\begin{aligned}
I_t^{(3,2)} &\leq \sum N^{2(s-1)} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} \partial_x P_N^2 P_{N_1} w P_{N_3} z_3 P_{\lesssim L_k} \left(P_{N_2} w \prod_{j=4}^{k+2} P_{N_j} z_j \right) dx dt' \right| \\
&\quad + \sum_{L_k \ll M \lesssim N_4} \sum N^{2(s-1)} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} \partial_x P_N^2 P_{N_1} w P_{N_3} z_3 P_M \left(P_{N_2} w \prod_{j=4}^{k+2} P_{N_j} z_j \right) dx dt' \right| \\
&=: I_{t,1}^{(3,3)} + I_{t,2}^{(3,3)},
\end{aligned}$$

where \sum denotes $\sum_{N \gg 1} \sum_{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2}}$ for simplicity. In what follows, we may assume that $k \geq 4$ since the case $k = 3$ can be treated by the same way as Subcase 3.2. For

$I_{t,1}^{(3,3)}$, Hölder's, Bernstein's and Minkowski's inequalities, (3.2) and (3.4) give

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{t,1}^{(3,3)} &\lesssim \left(\sum_{\substack{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2} \\ N_2 \geq kN_6}} N_1^{2s-1} N_2^{3/4} + \sum_{\substack{N_1, \dots, N_{k+2} \\ N_2 < kN_6}} N_1^{2s-1} (kN_6)^{3/4} \right) \\
&\quad \times \int_0^t \|P_{N_1} w\|_{L_x^2} \|P_{N_3} z_3\|_{L_x^2} \|P_{N_2} w\|_{L_x^4} \|P_{N_4} z_4\|_{L_x^4} \|P_{N_5} z_5\|_{L_x^4} \prod_{j=6}^{k+2} \|P_{N_j} z_j\|_{L_x^\infty} dt' \\
&\lesssim_k \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}} \sum_{N_4 \geq N_5 \gg N_2} \|D_x^{-5/12} P_{N_2} w\|_{L_T^3 L_x^4} \prod_{i=4}^5 \left(\frac{N_2}{N_i} \right)^{7/12} \|D_x^{7/12} P_{N_i} z_i\|_{L_T^3 L_x^4} \\
&\quad + \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}} \sum_{N_4 \geq N_5 \geq N_2 \vee N_6} \left(\frac{N_2}{N_4} \right)^{5/12} \|D_x^{-5/12} P_{N_2} w\|_{L_T^3 L_x^4} \\
&\quad \times \left(\frac{N_6}{N_4} \right)^{1/6} \|D_x^{7/12} P_{N_4} z_4\|_{L_T^3 L_x^4} \left(\frac{N_6}{N_5} \right)^{7/12} \|D_x^{7/12} P_{N_5} z_5\|_{L_T^3 L_x^4} \|P_{N_6} z_6\|_{L_{T,x}^\infty} \\
&\lesssim_k TG(C_0) \|w\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s-1}}^2
\end{aligned}$$

since $s(\alpha) \geq 7/12 + \beta(\alpha)$. On the other hand, $I_{t,3}^{(3,3)}$ can be estimated by the same way as $I_{t,2}^{(3,2)}$. We also notice that $J_t^{(3,2)}$ is controlled by $I_t^{(3,2)}$. This concludes the proof. \square

6. LOCAL AND GLOBAL-WELL-POSEDNESS

6.1. Unconditional local well-posedness in $H^s(\mathbb{T})$ for $s \geq s(\alpha)$.

6.1.1. Unconditional uniqueness. Let $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T})$ with $s \geq s(\alpha)$ and let u, v be two solutions to the Cauchy problem (1.3)-(1.2) that belong to $L_T^\infty H^s$. According to Lemma 4.7, we know that $u, v \in Z_T^s$ and Proposition 5.1 together with (4.7) ensure that $u \equiv v$ on $[0, T_0]$ with $0 < T_0 \leq T$ that only depends on $\|u\|_{Z_T^{s(\alpha)}} + \|v\|_{Z_T^{s(\alpha)}}$. Therefore $u(T_0) = v(T_0)$ and we can reiterate the same argument on $[T_0, T]$. This proves that $u \equiv v$ on $[0, T]$ after a finite number of iteration.

6.1.2. Local existence. We fix $\alpha \in [1, 2]$. It is well known (see [1]) that the Cauchy problem (1.3)-(1.2), with $L_{\alpha+1}$ satisfying Hypotheses 1, is locally well-posed in $H^s(\mathbb{T})$ for $s > 3/2$ with a minimal time of existence $T = T(\|u_0\|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}+}})$. Indeed, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and any smooth function g the H^s -scalar product $(L_{\alpha+1} g, g)_{H^s}$ vanishes, and the classical energy method (which consists of the parabolic regularization, the Kato–Ponce commutator estimate and the Bona–Smith argument [4]) can be applied. So let $u \in C([0, T_0]; H^\infty(\mathbb{T}))$ be a smooth solution to (1.3) emanating from a smooth

initial data $u_0 \in H^\infty(\mathbb{T})$. According to Lemma 4.7 and Proposition 4.8 with $w_N \equiv 1$, there exists an increasing entire function G non negative on \mathbb{R}_+ such that

$$\|u\|_{L_T^\infty H^s}^2 \leq \|u_0\|_{H^s}^2 + T^{1/4} G(\|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^{s(\alpha)}}) \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H^s}^2. \quad (6.1)$$

for any $0 < T \leq \min(1, T_0)$ and any $2 \geq s \geq s(\alpha)$.

Taking $s = s_0(\alpha)$ in (6.1) and setting $T_1 = G(2\|u_0\|_{H^{s(\alpha)}})^{-4}$, we deduce from a continuity argument that for all $0 < T < \min(T_0, T_1)$ it holds $\|u\|_{L_T^\infty H^{s(\alpha)}}^2 \leq 2\|u_0\|_{H^{s(\alpha)}}^2$. Re-injecting this in (6.1) we obtain that for any $2 \geq s \geq s(\alpha)$ and any $0 < T \leq \min(T_0, T_1)$ it holds $\|u\|_{L_T^\infty H^s}^2 \leq 2\|u_0\|_{H^s}^2$. Therefore the local well-posedness result in $H^s(\mathbb{T})$ for $s > 3/2$ ensures that u does exist on $[0, T_1]$ with $u \in C([0, T_1]; H^\infty(\mathbb{T}))$.

Now let us fix $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T})$ with $2 \geq s \geq s(\alpha)$. Setting $u_{0,n} = P_{\leq n} u_0$, it is clear that the sequence $\{u_{0,n}\}_{n \geq 1}$ belongs to $H^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ and converges to u_0 in $H^s(\mathbb{T})$. We deduce from above that the emanating sequence of solutions $\{u_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ to (1.3) is including in $C([0, T]; H^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$ with $T = G(2\|u_0\|_{H^{s(\alpha)}})^{-4}$ and satisfies $\|u_n\|_{L_T^\infty H^s}^2 \leq 2\|u_0\|_{H^s}^2$. Moreover, we infer from Proposition 5.1 together with (4.7) that $\{u_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $C([0, T]; H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}))$ and thus converges to some function $u \in L^\infty([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$ strongly in $C([0, T]; H^{s'}(\mathbb{T}))$ for any $s' < s$ and in particular in $C([0, T] \times \mathbb{T})$. We can thus pass to the limit on the nonlinear term $f(u_n)$ and u satisfies (1.3)-(1.2) at least in the distributional sense.

6.1.3. Strong continuity in $H^s(\mathbb{T})$. Let u be the solution emanating from $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T})$. It suffices to check that $u(t)$ is continuous in $H^s(\mathbb{T})$ at $t = 0$ thanks to time translation invariance and reversibility in time (invariance by the change of variables $(t, x) \mapsto (-t, -x)$) of (1.3) together with the uniqueness of the solution. Since $u \in C([0, T]; H^{s'}(\mathbb{T})) \cap L^\infty([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$ for $s' < s$, the standard argument (see [Theorem 2.1, [36]] for instance) yields that $u(t)$ is weakly continuous in $H^s(\mathbb{T})$ on $[0, T]$. In particular, it holds that $\|u_0\|_{H^s} \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow 0} \|u(t)\|_{H^s}$. On the other hand, we see from (4.8) with $\omega_N \equiv 1$ that $\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \|u(t)\|_{H^s} \leq \|u_0\|_{H^s}$ since $\|u(t)\|_{H^s} \leq \|u\|_{L_T^\infty H_x^s}$ for any $t \in [0, T]$ (see for instance [Lemma 2.4, [29]]). It thus follows that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \|u(t)\|_{H^s} = \|u_0\|_{H^s}$. This together with the weak continuity shows that $u(t)$ is continuous in $H^s(\mathbb{T})$ at $t = 0$.

6.1.4. Continuity with respect to initial data. Here, we make use of the frequency envelope ω . Following [21], for any sequence $\{u_{0,k}\}_{k \geq 1}$ converging to u_0 in $H^s(\mathbb{T})$ there exists a dyadic sequence $\{\omega_N\}$ of positive numbers satisfies $\omega_N \leq \omega_{2N} \leq \delta \omega_N$

for $N \geq 1$ such that

$$\|u_0\|_{H_\omega^s} < \infty, \quad \sup_{k \geq 1} \|u_{0,k}\|_{H_\omega^s} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_N \nearrow +\infty. \quad (6.2)$$

By Remark 4.2, we may assume that $1 < \delta \leq 2$. Now let $\{u_{0,k}\}_{k \geq 1} \subset H^s(\mathbb{T})$, with $\sup_{k \geq 1} \|u_{0,k}\|_{H^s} \leq 2\|u_0\|_{H^s}$, that converges to u_0 in $H^s(\mathbb{T})$ and let $\{\omega_N\}$ satisfying (6.2). Applying Lemma 4.7 and Proposition 4.8 with $\{\omega_N\}$ we infer that the sequence of solution $\{u_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ emanating from $\{u_{0,k}\}_{k \geq 1}$ is bounded in $L_T^\infty H_\omega^s$ with $T = G(4\|u_0\|_{H^{s(\alpha)}})^{-4}$. This together with the Lipschitz bound (5.1) in $H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T})$ ensures $\{u_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ converges to u in $C([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$.

7. GLOBAL EXISTENCE

(1.3) is Hamiltonian and enjoys at least two conservation laws that correspond to the conservation of the mass and of the energy. The local-wellposedness result ensures that (1.3) is wellposed in the energy space $H^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\alpha \in [\sqrt{2}, 2]$. In this section we take advantage of this to prove some global existence result in this case. Note that since $p_{\alpha+1}$ is odd, $\frac{p_{\alpha+1}(\xi)}{\xi}$ is well-defined on \mathbb{Z} . We denote by $\partial_x^{-1} L_{\alpha+1}$ the Fourier multiplier by $\frac{p_{\alpha+1}(k)}{k}$.

7.1. Conservation laws. Assume that the $u_0 \in H^3(\mathbb{T})$ and let $u \in C([0, T]; H^3(\mathbb{T}))$ be the associated solution to (1.3). Multiplying (1.3) by u and integrating by parts, using that $p_{\alpha+1}$ is odd and u is real valued, we infer that $M(u) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} u^2(x) dx$ is an invariant of the motion. In the same way multiplying (1.3) by $\partial_x^{-1} L_{\alpha+1} u + f(u)$ and integrating by parts we infer that

$$E(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}} u \partial_x^{-1} L_{\alpha+1} u + \int_{\mathbb{T}} F(u)$$

where

$$F(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{f^{(k)}(0)}{(k+1)!} x^{k+1}, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad F(x) = \int_0^x f(y) dy.$$

is conserved along the flow. Now from Hypothesis 1 we infer that

$$p_{\alpha+1}(\xi) \sim \xi^{\alpha+1}, \quad \forall \xi \geq \xi_0. \quad (7.1)$$

Therefore $\frac{p_{\alpha+1}(\xi)}{\xi} > 0$ for $|\xi| \geq \xi_0$ and denoting by $\Lambda_{\alpha/2}$ the Fourier multiplier defined by

$$\widehat{\Lambda_{\alpha/2} u}(k) = \sqrt{\frac{p_{\alpha+1}(k)}{k}} \hat{u}(k) \mathbf{1}_{|k| \geq \xi_0}$$

we may thus rewrite $\int_{\mathbb{T}} u \partial_x^{-1} L_{\alpha+1} u$ as

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} u \partial_x^{-1} L_{\alpha+1} u = \sum_{1 \leq |k| \leq \xi_0} \frac{p_{\alpha+1}(\xi)}{\xi} |\hat{u}(k)|^2 + \int_{\mathbb{T}} |\Lambda_{\alpha/2} P_{\geq \xi_0} u|^2$$

with

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} |\Lambda_{\alpha/2} P_{\geq \xi_0} u|^2 \sim \|P_{\geq \xi_0} u\|_{H^{\alpha/2}}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \sum_{1 \leq |k| \leq \xi_0} \frac{p_{\alpha+1}(\xi)}{\xi} |\hat{u}(k)|^2 \right| \leq K_0 \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (7.2)$$

for some fixed $K_0 > 0$. In particular, $u \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{T}} u \partial_x^{-1} L_{\alpha+1} u$ is continuous from $H^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{T})$ into \mathbb{R} which ensure that these conservation laws remain valid for $u_0 \in H^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{T})$ thanks to the continuity with respect to initial data of the flow-map.

7.2. Arbitrary large initial data. We assume that we are in one of the two following situations:

- Case 1: $|F(x)| \lesssim (1 + |x|^{p+1})$ for some $0 < p < 2\alpha + 1$.
- Case 2: There exists $B > 0$ such that $F(x) \leq B$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$.

In Case 1, it holds

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}} F(u) \right| \lesssim 1 + \|u\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1} \lesssim 1 + \|u\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p+1}}}^{p+1} \lesssim 1 + \|u\|_{L^2}^{p+1-\frac{p-1}{\alpha}} \|u\|_{H^{\alpha/2}}^{\frac{p-1}{\alpha}}.$$

Therefore since $p < 2\alpha + 1$ and thus $\frac{p-1}{\alpha} < 2$, the conservation of the L^2 -norm together with Young's inequality and (7.2) lead to

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}} F(u(t)) \right| \leq C_0 + C_1 (\|u_0\|_{L^2}) \|u(t)\|_{H^{\alpha/2}}^{\frac{p-1}{\alpha}} \leq C_0 + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |\Lambda_{\alpha/2} P_{\geq \xi_0} u|^2 + C_2 (\|u_0\|_{L^2}).$$

The conservation of the energy and (7.2) then ensure that the trajectory of u remains bounded in $H^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{T})$. This, together with the local well-posedness result, leads to the global existence of the solution in $H^s(\mathbb{T})$ for $s \geq \alpha/2$. Typical examples of Case 1 are:

- $f(x)$ is a polynomial function of degree strictly less than 2α .
- $f(x)$ is a polynomial function of $\sin(x)$ and $\cos(x)$.

In Case 2, it holds $\int_{\mathbb{T}} F(u) \leq 2\pi B$ and the conservation of the energy together with (7.2) ensure that for any $t \in [0, T]$

$$\|u(t)\|_{H^{\alpha/2}}^2 \lesssim E(u_0) + M(u_0) + \int_{\mathbb{T}} F(u) \lesssim E(u_0) + M(u_0) + 2\pi B$$

that leads to the global existence result. Typical examples of Case 2 are:

- $f(x)$ is a polynomial function of odd degree with $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x) = -\infty$.
- $f(x) = -\exp(x)$ or $f(x) = -\sinh(x)$.

7.3. Small initial data. We set

$$\tilde{F}(x) = \sum_{k=2}^{+\infty} \frac{f^{(k)}(0)}{(k+1)!} x^{k+1} = F(x) - \frac{f'(0)}{2} x^2 \quad \text{and} \quad G(x) = \sum_{k=2}^{+\infty} \frac{|f^{(k)}(0)|}{(k+1)!} x^{k-2}.$$

Then the conservations of M and E lead to

$$\begin{aligned} E(u) + \left(\frac{K_0 + 1 - f'(0)}{2} \right) M(u) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left((K_0 + 1) |u|^2 + u \partial_x^{-1} L_{\alpha+1} u \right) + \int_{\mathbb{T}} \tilde{F}(u) \\ &= E(u_0) + \left(\frac{K_0 + 1 - f'(0)}{2} \right) M(u_0), \end{aligned} \quad (7.3)$$

where $K_0 > 0$ is the constant interfering in (7.2).

We observe that $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} G(x) = |f'(0)|/6$ and thus there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for $\|u\|_{H^{\alpha/2}} < \delta_0$ it holds $|G(u)| \leq G(\|u\|_{L_x^\infty}) \leq |f'(0)|$. Under this restriction we thus have

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}} \tilde{F}(u) \right| \leq |f'(0)| \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^3 \leq C_0 |f'(0)| \|u\|_{H^{\alpha/2}}^3.$$

Therefore according to (7.2)-(7.3) there exists a positive constant $C_1 > 0$ that depends on $L_{\alpha+1}$ such that

$$C_1 \|u\|_{H^{\alpha/2}}^2 - C_0 |f'(0)| \|u\|_{H^{\alpha/2}}^3 \leq E(u) + \left(K_0 + 1 - \frac{f'(0)}{2} \right) M(u).$$

We set

$$C = \max \left(\frac{C_0 |f'(0)|}{C_1}, \frac{1}{2\delta_0} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad p(x) = C_1(x^2 - Cx^3).$$

It is easy to check that $p(x) \leq C_1 x^2 - C_0 |f'(0)| x^3$ on \mathbb{R}_+ and that $p(\frac{1}{2C}) = \frac{C_1}{8} (\frac{C_1}{C})^2 > 0$.

Let $s \geq \alpha/2$. We infer from above that for any $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T})$ such that

$$E(u_0) + \left(K_0 + 1 - \frac{f'(0)}{2} \right) M(u_0) < \frac{C_1}{8} \left(\frac{C_1}{C} \right)^2 \quad (7.4)$$

the solution $u \in C([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$ emanating from u_0 satisfies

$$p(\|u(t)\|_{H^{\alpha/2}}) < E(u_0) + \left(K_0 + 1 - \frac{f'(0)}{2} \right) M(u_0) < \frac{C_1}{8} \left(\frac{C_1}{C} \right)^2 \quad (7.5)$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$ such that $\|u(t)\|_{H^{\alpha/2}} < \delta_0$. Since $p(1/2C) = \frac{C_1}{8} (\frac{C_1}{C})^2$ and $1/2C \leq \delta_0$, a continuity argument ensures that for $u_0 \in H^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{T})$ satisfying (7.4) with $\|u_0\|_{H^{\alpha/2}} < \delta_0$, the emanating solution u verifies (7.5) for all times and thus can be extended globally in times according to the LWP result. Finally since of course, by the continuity of the energy in $H^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{T})$, (7.4) is satisfied for $\|u_0\|_{H^{\alpha/2}}$ small enough, this leads to the global existence result in $H^s(\mathbb{T})$, $s \geq \alpha/2$, for initial data with $H^{\alpha/2}$ -norm small enough.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The second author was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP20J12750 and JSPS Overseas Challenge Program for Young Researchers. This work was conducted during a visit of the second author at Institut Denis Poisson (IDP) of Université de Tours in France. The second author is deeply grateful to IDP for its kind hospitality.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Abdelouhab, J. L. Bona, M. Felland, and J.-C. Saut, *Nonlocal models for nonlinear, dispersive waves*, Phys. D, **40** (1989), 360–392.
- [2] A. Babin, A. Ilyin and E. Titi, *On the regularization mechanism for the periodic Korteweg-de Vries equation*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **64** (2011), 591–648.
- [3] J. Bourgain, *Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations, part I: Schrödinger equation, part II: The KdV-equation*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **3** (1993), 107–156, 209–262.
- [4] J. L. Bona and R. Smith, *The initial-value problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation*, Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **278** (1975), 555–601.
- [5] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka and T. Tao, *Multilinear estimates for periodic KdV equations, and applications*, J. Funct. Anal. **211** (2004), 173–218.
- [6] P. Gérard, T. Kappeler and P. Topalov, *Sharp well-posedness results of the Benjamin-Ono equation in $H^s(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ and qualitative properties of its solution*, arXiv:2004.04857.
- [7] Z. Guo, *Local well-posedness for dispersion generalized Benjamin-Ono equations in Sobolev spaces*, J. Differential Equations **252** (2012), 2053–2084.
- [8] Z. Guo, S. Kwon and T. Oh, *Poincaré-Dulac normal form reduction for unconditional well-posedness of the periodic cubic NLS*, Comm. Math. Phys. **322** (2013), 19–48.
- [9] Z. Guo, Y. Lin and L. Molinet, *Well-posedness in energy space for the periodic modified Benjamin-Ono equation*, J. Differential Equations **256** (2014), 2778–2806.
- [10] S. Herr, A. D. Ionescu, C. E. Kenig and H. Koch, *A para-differential renormalization technique for nonlinear dispersive equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **35** (2010), 1827–1875.
- [11] A. D. Ionescu, C. E. Kenig and D. Tataru, *Global well-posedness of the initial value problem for the KP-I equation in the energy space*, Invent. Math. **173** (2008), 265–304.
- [12] T. Kappeler and T. Topalov, *Global wellposedness of KdV in $H^{-1}(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$* , Duke Math. J. **135** (2006), 327–360.
- [13] T. Kato, *On the Cauchy problem for the (generalized) Korteweg-de Vries equation*, Stud. Appl. Math. **8** (1983), 93–126.
- [14] T. Kato, *On nonlinear Schrödinger equations. II. H^s -solutions and unconditional well-posedness*, J. Anal. Math. **67** (1995), 281–306. with Correction in J. Anal. Math **68** (1996), 305.

- [15] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega, *Well-posedness of the initial value problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **4** (1991), 323–347.
- [16] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce and L. Vega, *Well-posedness and scattering results for the generalized Korteweg-de Vries equation via the contraction principle*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **46** (1993), 527–620.
- [17] C. Kenig and K. Koenig, *On the local well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono and modified Benjamin-Ono equations*, Math. Res. Letters **10** (2003), 879–895.
- [18] K. Kim and R. Schippa, *Low regularity well-posedness for generalized Benjamin-Ono equations on the circle*, arXiv:2007.15505.
- [19] N. Kishimoto, *Unconditional uniqueness for the periodic modified Benjamin-Ono equation by normal form approach*, arXiv:1912.01363v2.
- [20] H. Koch and D. Tataru, *A priori bounds for the 1D cubic NLS in negative Sobolev spaces*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN, (2007), Art. ID rnm053, 36 pp.
- [21] H. Koch and N. Tzvetkov, *On the local well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$* , Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN, **26** (2003), 1449–1464.
- [22] S. Kwon, T. Oh and H. Yoon, *Normal form approach to unconditional well-posedness of nonlinear dispersive PDEs on the real line*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. **29** (2020), 649–720.
- [23] N. Masmoudi and K. Nakanishi, *Energy convergence for singular limits of Zakharov type systems*, Invent. Math. **172** (2008), 535–583.
- [24] L. Molinet, J.-C. Saut and N. Tzvetkov, *Ill-posedness issues for the Benjamin-Ono and related equations*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., **33** (2001), 982–988.
- [25] L. Molinet, *Global well-posedness in the energy space for the Benjamin-Ono equation on the circle*, Math. Ann. **337** (2007), 353–383.
- [26] L. Molinet and F. Ribaud, *Well-posedness in H^1 for generalized Benjamin-Ono equations on the circle*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **23** (2009), 1295–1311.
- [27] L. Molinet and S. Vento, *Improvement of the energy method for strongly nonresonant dispersive equations and applications*, Anal. PDE **8** (2015), 1455–1495.
- [28] L. Molinet, D. Pilod and S. Vento, *On well-posedness for some dispersive perturbations of Burgers’ equation*, Ann. I. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **35** (2018), 1719–1756.
- [29] L. Molinet, D. Pilod and S. Vento, *On unconditional well-posedness for the periodic modified Korteweg-de Vries equation*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **71** (2019), 147–201.
- [30] M. Nakamura and T. Wada, *Global existence and uniqueness of solutions to the Maxwell-Schrödinger equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **276** (2007), 315–339.
- [31] J. Palacios, *Local well-posedness for the gKdV equation on the background of a bounded function*, arXiv:2104.15126.
- [32] G. Ponce, *On the global well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation*, Diff. Int. Eq. **4** (1991), 527–542.
- [33] J.-C. Saut and N. Tzvetkov, *On periodic KP-I type equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **221** (2001), 451–476.
- [34] R. Schippa, *Local and global well-posedness for dispersion generalized Benjamin-Ono equations on the circle*, Nonlinear Anal. **196** (2020), 111777, 38 pp.

- [35] R. Smith, *Nonlinear Kelvin and continental-shelf waves*, J. Fluid Mech. **57** (1972), 379-391.
- [36] W. A. Strauss, *On continuity of functions with values in various Banach spaces*, Pacific J. Math. **19** (1966), 543-551.
- [37] T. Tao, *Global well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$* , J. Hyperbolic Differ. Equ. **1** (2004), 27-49.
- [38] T. Tao, *Nonlinear Dispersive Equations; Local and Global Analysis*, CBMS, 2006.

(L. Molinet) INSTITUT DENIS POISSON, UNIVERSITÉ DE TOURS, UNIVERSITÉ D'ORLÉANS,
CNRS, PARC GRANDMONT, 37200 TOURS, FRANCE

Email address, L. Molinet: `Luc.Molinet@lmpt.univ-tours.fr`

(T. Tanaka) GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, NAGOYA UNIVERSITY, CHIKUSA-KU,
NAGOYA, 464-8602, JAPAN

Email address, T. Tanaka: `d18003s@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp`