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Abstract. We consider the low regularity well-posedness problem for the Maxwell-Dirac system in 3+1 dimensions:

\[ \partial^\mu F_{\mu\nu} = -\langle \psi, \alpha_\nu \psi \rangle \]
\[ -i\alpha^\mu \partial_\mu \psi = A_\mu \alpha^\mu \psi, \]

where \( F_{\mu\nu} = \partial^\mu A_\nu - \partial^\nu A_\mu \), and \( \alpha^\mu \) are the 4x4 Dirac matrices. We assume the temporal gauge \( A_0 = 0 \) and make use of the fact that some of the nonlinearities fulfill a null condition. Because we work in the temporal gauge we also apply a method, which was used by Tao for the Yang-Mills system.

1. Introduction and the main theorem

The Maxwell–Dirac system describes the interaction of an electron with its self-induced electromagnetic field. In Minkowski space \( \mathbb{R}^{1+3} = \mathbb{R}_t \times \mathbb{R}^3 \) it is given by

\[ \partial^\mu F_{\mu\nu} = -\langle \psi, \alpha_\nu \psi \rangle \]
\[ -i\alpha^\mu \partial_\mu \psi = A_\mu \alpha^\mu \psi, \]

where \( F_{\mu\nu} = \partial^\mu A_\nu - \partial^\nu A_\mu \).

\( \alpha^\mu \) are the (4x4) Dirac matrices given by

\[ \alpha^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha^j = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma^j \\ \sigma^j & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \]

where \( \sigma^j \) are the Pauli matrices

\[ \sigma^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \]

\( \alpha^\mu \) are hermitian matrices with \( (\alpha^\mu)^2 = I_{4x4} \), \( \alpha^i \alpha^k + \alpha^k \alpha^i = 0 \) for \( j \neq k \).

The functions \( A_\mu : \mathbb{R}^{1+3} \to \mathbb{R} \) are the potentials, \( \psi : \mathbb{R}^{1+3} \to \mathbb{C}^4 \) is the spinor and \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) is the \( \mathbb{C}^4 \) inner product.

We omit a mass term \( m\psi \) in the Dirac equation just for convenience.

Our aim is to obtain a well-posedness result for the Cauchy problem under minimal regularity assumptions on the data. As is well-known we have gauge freedom for this system.

From now on we assume the temporal gauge \( A_0 = 0 \).
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In this case equation (11) reduces to
\[
\partial_t \text{div} A = -\langle \psi, \psi \rangle ,
\]
(3)
\[
\Box A_j - \partial^j (\text{div} A) = -\langle \psi, \alpha_j \psi \rangle .
\]
(4)

We apply the well-known Hodge decomposition \( A = A^d + A^c \) , where the divergence-free part is given by
\[
\Pi^d = -\text{div} \left( P A \right)
\]
By the definition of \( A \) where we define \( R \) which we assume from now on. These data transform as follows:
from (4) :
\[
\Box A^d_j = -P(\psi, \alpha_j \psi) .
\]
(5)

By the definition of \( A^c \) the equation (3) can be rewritten as
\[
\partial_t A^c_j = -|\nabla|^{-2} \nabla \langle \psi, \psi \rangle .
\]
(6)

We reformulate (4) as a first order system
\[
(-i\partial_t \pm \langle \nabla \rangle) A_{j, \pm} = \mp 2^{-1} \langle \nabla \rangle^{-1} P(\psi, \alpha_j \psi) - A_j ,
\]
(7)

where we define \( A_{j, \pm} = \pm \frac{1}{2}(A^d_j \pm (i\nabla)^{-1}(\partial_j A^c_j)) \), so that \( A_{j, \pm} = A^d_{j, \pm} + A^c_{j, \pm} \)
\[
\partial_t A_{j, \pm} = i\langle \nabla \rangle (A^d_{j, \pm} - A^c_{j, \pm}) .
\]

Following [2] and [5] in order to rewrite the Dirac equation we define the projections
\[
\Pi(\xi) := \frac{1}{2}(I_{4\times 4} + \frac{\xi \alpha^j}{|\xi|})
\]
and \( \Pi_\pm(\xi) := \Pi(\pm \xi) \), so that \( \Pi_\pm(\xi)^2 = \Pi_\pm(\xi) \), \( \Pi_+(\xi)\Pi_-(\xi) = 0 \), \( \Pi_+(\xi) + \Pi_-(\xi) = I_{4\times 4} \), \( \Pi_\pm(\xi) = \Pi_\mp(-\xi) \). We obtain
\[
\alpha^j \Pi(\xi) = \Pi(-\xi) \alpha^j + \frac{\xi^j}{|\xi|} I_{4\times 4} .
\]
(8)

Using the notation \( \Pi_\pm = \Pi_\pm(\nabla \cdot) \) we obtain
\[
- i\alpha^j \partial_j = |\nabla| \Pi_+ - |\nabla| \Pi_-, \quad |\nabla| \text{ has symbol } |\xi| .
\]
(9)

Moreover defining the modified Riesz transform by
\[
R_\pm^j = \mp \frac{\partial_j}{|\nabla|} \quad \text{ with symbol } \mp \frac{\xi^j}{|\xi|},
\]
the identity (8) implies
\[
\alpha^j \Pi_\pm = (\alpha^j \Pi_\pm) \Pi_\pm = \Pi_\mp \alpha^j \Pi_\pm - R_\pm^j \Pi_\pm .
\]
(10)

If we define \( \psi_\pm = \Pi_\pm \psi \) we obtain by applying the projection \( \Pi_\pm \) and (11) the Dirac type equation in the form
\[
(i\partial_t \pm |\nabla|) \psi_\pm = \Pi_\pm (A^d_j \alpha^j \psi + A^c_j \alpha^j \psi) .
\]
(11)

We want to solve the Cauchy problem for the system (7),(8) and (11). This system is certainly equivalent to the original system (11),(2) in temporal gauge \( A_0 = 0 \).

We consider initial data for \( A_j \) and \( \psi \) at \( t = 0 \):
\[
A_j(0) = a_j, \quad (\partial_t A_j)(0) = b_j, \quad \psi(0) = \psi_0 .
\]
(12)

Equation (3) requires the compatibility condition
\[
\partial^j b_j = -|\psi_0|^2 ,
\]
(13)

which we assume from now on. These data transform as follows:
\[
a_{j, \pm}(0) = \frac{1}{2}(a_j \pm (i\nabla)^{-1} b_j) , \quad \psi_\pm^0 = \psi_\pm(0) = \Pi_\pm \psi_0 .
\]

Our main theorem reads as follows:
**Theorem 1.1.** Let \( n = 3 \) and assume that \( s, r \) and \( l \) satisfy the following conditions:

\[
\begin{align*}
  &s > \frac{1}{4}, \quad r > \frac{5}{8}, \quad l > 1 \\
  &r \geq s \geq r - 1, \ l \geq s \geq l - 1, \\
  &2s - r > -\frac{1}{8}, \ 3s - 2r > -1, \ 2r - s > 1, \ s - l > -\frac{3}{4}.
\end{align*}
\]

Given initial data \( a_j = a_j^{df} + a_j^{cf} \) with \( a_j^{df} \in H^r \), \( a_j^{cf} \in H^1 \), and \( b_j \in H^{r - 1} \), \( \psi_0 \in H^s \), which fulfill the Cauchy problem for the Maxwell-Dirac system in three space dimensions. Bournaveas [4] considered many other systems of mathematical physics. In this paper we are interested in the Maxwell-Dirac system in three space dimensions. Gordon equation (and the Yang-Mills equation) a null structure for the nonlinear terms plays a crucial role. This was first detected by Klainerman and Machedon [7], who proved global well-posedness in the case of three space dimensions in Coulomb gauge for finite energy data. These null condition also plays a decisive role for many other systems of mathematical physics. In this paper we are interested in the Maxwell-Dirac system in three space dimensions. Bournaveas [4] considered...
this system in Coulomb gauge and proved local well-posedness for \( A_j(0) \in H^2 \), 
\( (\partial_t A_j)(0) \in H^1 \) and \( \psi(0) \in H^1 \). Moreover in Lorenz gauge he only assumed 
\( A_\mu(0) \in H^{1+\epsilon} \), \( (\partial_t A_\mu)(0) \in H^s \) and \( \psi(0) \in H^{1+\epsilon} \) with \( \epsilon > 0 \). This result was 
improved by Masmoudi-Nakanishi \[10\] in Coulomb gauge who proved local well-
posedness for finite energy data in the classical solution space \( A \in C^0([0,T], \dot{H}^1) \cap \dot{C}^1([0,T], L^2) \), \( \psi \in C^0([0,T], L^2) \). These authors also studied the nonrelativistic 
limit of this system as well as the Maxwell-Klein-Gordon system as \( c \to \infty \) (cf. \[9\]). An almost optimal local well-posedness result in Lorenz gauge , namely for 
data \( \psi(0) \in H^s \) and \( F_{\mu\nu}(0) \in H^{s-1/2} \) for \( s > 0 \) was obtained by d’Ancona, Foschi 
and Selberg \[2\] who detected a new null structure of the system as a whole. All 
these results are given in 3+1 dimensions.

In 2+1 dimensions the fundamental global well-posedness result for data 
\( \psi(0) \in L^2 \) and (essentially) \( F_{\mu\nu}(0) \in H^{1/2} \) was proven by d’Ancona and Selberg \[3\].

An ill-posedness result in dimensions \( n \leq 3 \) for the case \( s < 0 \) was recently 
obtained by Selberg and Tesfahun \[12\], which means that the results in \[3\] and \[2\] are 
optimal and almost optimal in 2+1 and 3+1 dimensions, respectively.

Important for the present paper are the methods developed by Tao \[14\] for 
a small data local well-posedness result for the Yang-Mills equations. We also rely 
on the methods used by Huh-Oh \[5\] for the Chern-Simons-Dirac equation.

In the present paper we consider the coupled Maxwell-Dirac equation in 
temporal gauge for the space dimension \( n = 3 \). To the best of our knowledge 
we obtain the first local well-posedness result for the temporal gauge. Our aim is 
to minimize the regularity of the Cauchy data. By a Picard iteration we obtain a 
solution of the Cauchy problem with 
\( A^{df} \in C^0([0,T], H^s) \cap \dot{C}^1([0,T], H^{-1}) \), \( A^{cf} \in C^0([0,T], H^l) \), \( \psi \in C^0([0,T], H^s) \), 
provided \( s > \frac{1}{2} \), \( r > \frac{5}{8} \), \( l > 1 \). Here \( A^{df} \) and \( A^{cf} \) denote the divergence-free part 
and the curl-free part respectively. Uniqueness holds in spaces of \( X^{s,b} \)-type, which 
are the spaces where the fixed point argument works. The null conditions detected 
by Klainerman, Machedon, Selberg, Huh, Oh and others are of course fundamental 
for the necessary bilinear estimates. As mentioned before Tao’s methods for the 
Yang-Mills equation are fundamental as well as the convenient atlas of bilinear 
estimates in wave-Sobolev spaces by \[11\] and \[11\].

2. Reduction to multilinear estimates

It is well known that the linear initial value problem 
\( (i\partial_t \pm (\nabla))u = G \in X^{s,b-1+\epsilon}_{x,T} \), \( u(0) = u_0 \in H^s \), 
for any \( s \in \mathbb{R} \), \( b > \frac{1}{2} \), \( 0 < \epsilon \ll 1 \), has a unique solution satisfying 
\( \|u\|_{X^{s,b}_{x,[0,T]}} \leq C \left( \|u_0\|_{H^s} + T^\epsilon \|G\|_{X^{s,b-1+\epsilon}_{x,[0,T]}} \right) \)  
for \( 0 < T < 1 \).

A similar result holds for the equation \( \partial_t u = G \) and the space \( X^{s,b}_{x,T=0} \).

This implies that in order to prove Theorem \[14\] by an iteration argument it suffice 
to prove the following bilinear estimates:
Proposition 2.1. Let $b = \frac{7}{8}^+$. 

\[
\|P(\psi_{\pm, 1}, \alpha^j \psi_{\pm, 2})\|_{X^{r-1, b+1} \pm} \lesssim \|\psi_{\pm, 1}\|_{X_{x}^{r, b+1}} \|\psi_{\pm, 2}\|_{X_{x}^{r, b+1}},
\]
\[
\|\nabla^{-1}(\psi_{\pm, 1}, \psi_{\pm, 2})\|_{X^{r-\frac{1}{2}+} \pm} \lesssim \|\psi_{\pm, 1}\|_{X_{x}^{r, b+1}} \|\psi_{\pm, 2}\|_{X_{x}^{r, b+1}},
\]
\[
\|\Pi \pm (A_{j, \pm}^f \alpha^j \psi)\|_{X^{r-\frac{1}{2}+} \pm} \lesssim \|A^f\|_{X_{x}^{r, b+1}} \|\psi\|_{X_{x}^{r, b+1}},
\]
\[
\|\Pi \pm (A_{j, \pm}^f \alpha^j \psi_{\pm, 2})\|_{X^{r-\frac{1}{2}+} \pm} \lesssim \|A_{j, \pm}^f\|_{X_{x}^{r, b+1}} \|\psi_{\pm, 2}\|_{X_{x}^{r, b+1}},
\]

where $\pm$, $\pm_1$, and $\pm_2$ denote independent signs.

The following product estimates for wave-Sobolev spaces were proven in [1].

Proposition 2.2. For $s_0, s_1, s_2, b_0, b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u, v \in S(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ the estimate

\[
\|uv\|_{H^{-s_0, -b_0}} \lesssim \|u\|_{H^{s_1, b_1}} \|v\|_{H^{s_2, b_2}}
\]

holds, provided the following conditions are satisfied:

\[
b_0 + b_1 + b_2 > \frac{1}{2}, \quad b_0 + b_1 \geq 0, \quad b_0 + b_2 \geq 0, \quad b_1 + b_2 \geq 0
\]

\[
s_0 + s_1 + s_2 > 2 - (b_0 + b_1 + b_2)
\]
\[
\frac{s_0 + s_1 + s_2}{2} > \min(b_0 + b_1, b_0 + b_2, b_1 + b_2)
\]
\[
\frac{s_0 + s_1 + s_2}{2} = 1 - \min(b_0, b_1, b_2)
\]
\[
\frac{s_0 + s_1 + s_2}{2} > 1
\]
\[
(s_0 + b_0) + 2s_1 + 2s_2 > \frac{3}{2}
\]
\[
2s_0 + (s_1 + b_1) + 2s_2 > \frac{3}{2}
\]
\[
2s_0 + 2s_1 + (s_2 + b_2) > \frac{3}{2}
\]

\[
s_1 + s_2 \geq \max(0, -b_0), \quad s_0 + s_2 \geq \max(0, -b_1), \quad s_0 + s_1 \geq \max(0, -b_2)
\]

A consequence of this result this the following analogue for null forms.

Proposition 2.3 (Null form estimates, [11]). Let $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u, v \in S(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. Assume that

\[
0 \leq \beta_0 < \frac{1}{2} < \beta_1, \beta_2 < 1,
\]
\[
\sum \sigma_i + \beta_0 > \frac{3}{2} - (\beta_0 + \sigma_1 + \sigma_2),
\]
\[
\sum \sigma_i > \frac{3}{2} - (\sigma_0 + \beta_1 + \sigma_2),
\]
\[
\sum \sigma_i > \frac{3}{2} - (\sigma_0 + \sigma_1 + \beta_2),
\]
\[
\sum \sigma_i + \beta_0 \geq 1,
\]
\[
\min(\sigma_0 + \sigma_1, \sigma_0 + \sigma_2, \beta_0 + \sigma_1 + \sigma_2) \geq 0,
\]

and that the last two inequalities are not both equalities. Let

\[
F(B_{k, \pm}^f (\psi_{1, \pm, 1}, \psi_{2, \pm, 2}))(\tau_0, \xi_0)
\]
\[
:= \int_{\tau_1 + \tau_2 = \tau_0, \xi_1 + \xi_2 = \xi_0} |\mathcal{L}(\pm_1 \xi_1, \pm_2 \xi_2) (\psi_{1, \pm, 1}, \xi_1) (\psi_{2, \pm, 2}, \xi_2) d\tau_1 d\xi_1,
\]

(19)
where \( \angle(\xi_1, \xi_2) \) denotes the angle between \( \xi_1 \) and \( \xi_2 \). Then we have the null form estimate
\[
\| B(\pm \xi_1, \pm \xi_2) (u, v) \|_{H^{-\sigma_0 - \rho_0}} \lesssim \| u \|_{X_{\rho_1}^{\sigma_1}} \| v \|_{X_{\rho_2}^{\sigma_2}} .
\]

The following estimate was used by [14] for the Yang-Mills equation in temporal gauge.

**Proposition 2.4.** The following estimates hold
\[
\| u \|_{L^p_t L^4_x} \lesssim \| u \|_{X_{\rho_1}^{\sigma_1}} \quad \text{for } 4 \leq p < \infty , \tag{20}
\]
\[
\| u \|_{L^p_t L^6_x} \lesssim \| u \|_{X_{\rho_1}^{\sigma_1}} \quad \text{for } 4 \leq p < \infty , \tag{21}
\]
\[
\| u \|_{L^p_t L^{\infty}_{x_+}} \lesssim \| u \|_{X_{\rho_1}^{\sigma_1}} \quad \text{for } 4 \leq p < \infty . \tag{22}
\]

**Proof.** (20) for the case \( p = 4 \) was proven by [14], Prop. 4.1. Alternatively we may use [6] (appendix by D. Tataru) Thm. B2:
\[
\| \mathcal{F}_t u \|_{L^p_t L^4_x} \lesssim \| u_0 \|_{H^1_x},
\]
if \( u = e^{it|\nabla|} u_0 \), and \( \mathcal{F}_t \) denotes the Fourier transform with respect to time. This implies by Plancherel, Minkowski’s inequality and Sobolev’s embedding theorem
\[
\| u \|_{L^p_t L^4_x} = \| \mathcal{F}_t u \|_{L^p_t L^4_x} \lesssim \| \mathcal{F}_t u \|_{L^{\infty}_t L^4_x} \lesssim \| u \|_{X_{\rho_1}^{\sigma_1}} \quad \text{and interpolate this with } (20) \text{ for } p = 4, \text{ which implies } (22) \text{ in the case } p = 4 , \text{ namely } \| u \|_{L^p_t L^{\infty}_{x_+}} \lesssim \| u \|_{H^{\frac{4}{p} + \frac{1}{4} +} . \text{ Interpolating of } (21) \text{ with the Sobolev type estimate } \| u \|_{L^{\infty}_t L^6_x} \lesssim \| u \|_{X_{\rho_1}^{\sigma_1}} \text{ implies } (22) \text{ in the case } p = \infty . \text{ Interpolating (22) for } p = 4 \text{ and } p = \infty \text{ implies the general case } 4 \leq p \leq \infty .
\]

3. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.4

**Proof of (22):** We obtain with the Riesz transform \( R_\pm (i|\nabla|^{-1} \partial_k) : |

\| \nabla^{-1} (\nabla \times (\psi_1, \alpha^j \psi_2)) \|_{X_{\rho_1}^{\sigma_1}} \lesssim \| \epsilon_{i k j} \sum_{\pm_1, \pm_2} R_\pm^k \langle \psi_{1, \pm_1}, \alpha^j \psi_{2, \pm_2} \rangle \|_{X_{\rho_1}^{\sigma_1}} \|

\lesssim \| \psi_{1, \pm_1} \|_{X_{\rho_1}^{\sigma_1}} \| \psi_{2, \pm_2} \|_{X_{\rho_1}^{\sigma_1}} .
\]

We now use the identity (10), which implies
\[
\epsilon_{i k j} R_\pm^k \langle \psi_{1, \pm_1}, \alpha^j \psi_{2, \pm_2} \rangle = \epsilon_{i k j} R_\pm^k \langle \psi_{1, \pm_1}, \Pi_{\mp_2} (\alpha^j \psi_{2, \pm_2}) \rangle

- \epsilon_{i k j} R_\pm^k \langle \psi_{1, \pm_1}, R^j \Pi_{\mp_2} \psi_{2, \pm_2} \rangle = I + II
\]

Using that \( \Pi_{\mp_1} \) is a projector we obtain
\[
I = \epsilon_{i k j} R_\pm^k \langle \psi_{1, \pm_1}, \Pi_{\pm_2} (\alpha^j \psi_{2, \pm_2}) \rangle .
\]

The crucial point now is that by [1], Lemma 2
\[
\| \Pi(\xi_1) \Pi(-\xi_2) z \| \lesssim |z| \angle(\xi_1, \xi_2) ,
\]
(23)
so that $I$ is a null form. This implies that we may ignore the factor $\epsilon_{jk}R^k_\pm$ and it suffices to prove
\[
\|B_{\pm,1,2}(\psi_{1,1}, \psi_{2,1})\|_{X^{s-1,-1}_{\pm}} \lesssim \|\psi_{1,1}\|_{X^{s,1}_{\pm}} \|\psi_{2,1}\|_{X^{s,1}_{\pm}}. \tag{24}
\]
Concerning $II$ we have to prove by duality
\[
\int \epsilon_{jk} \langle \psi_{1,1}, R^j_{\pm,2} \psi_{2,1} \rangle \overline{R^k_\pm \phi_\pm} \, dx \, dt \lesssim \|\psi_{1,1}\|_{X^{s,1}_{\pm}} \|\psi_{2,1}\|_{X^{s,1}_{\pm}} \|\phi_\pm\|_{X^{1,-r-1-1}_{\pm}}. \tag{25}
\]
We observe a null form of $Q^{jk}_{\pm,2}$-type on the left hand side between the factors $\psi_{2,1}$ and $\phi_\pm$. It is well-known (cf. [11] or [5], Lemma 2.6) that the bilinear form $Q^{jk}_{\pm,2}$ defined by
\[
Q^{jk}_{\pm,2}(\phi_{2,2}, \phi_{0,0}) := R^j_{\pm,2} \phi_{2,2} R^k_{\pm,0} \phi_{0,0} - R^k_{\pm,2} \phi_{2,2} R^j_{\pm,0} \phi_{0,0},
\]
similarly to the standard null form $Q_{\pm,2}$ defined by replacing the modified Riesz transforms $R^k_\pm$ by $\partial^k$, fulfills the following estimate:
\[
Q^{jk}_{\pm,2}(\phi_{2,2}, \phi_{0,0}) \lesssim B_{\pm,2,0}(\psi_{2,2}, \psi_{0,0}),
\]
where $B_{\pm,2,0}(\psi_{2,2}, \psi_{0,0})$ is defined in (10).
Thus we have to prove:
\[
\|B_{\pm,1,2}(\psi_{1,1}, \psi_{2,1})\|_{X^{s-1,-1}_{\pm}} \lesssim \|\psi_{2,1}\|_{X^{s,1}_{\pm}} \|\phi_\pm\|_{X^{1-r-1-1}_{\pm}}. \tag{26}
\]

The estimates (24) and (25) are proven by Prop. 2.3. We choose $b = \frac{r}{8}+$.

For (24) we use the parameters Prop. 2.3 as follows: $\sigma_0 = 1 - r$, $\beta_0 = 1 - b = -\frac{1}{8}$, $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = s$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \frac{r}{8}+$. We require $s \geq r - 1$ and $\sigma_0 + \sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + \beta_0 = 1 - r + \frac{1}{8} + 2s - r > 1 \Leftrightarrow 2s - r > -\frac{1}{8}$, one or our assumptions. Moreover we need $4s - r > \frac{1}{4}$, which immediately follows for $s > \frac{1}{4}$, and $3s - 2r > -1$, which we also assumed.

For (25) we choose $\sigma_0 = s$, $\beta_0 = \frac{r}{8}+$, $\sigma_1 = s$, $\beta_1 = \frac{r}{8}$, $\sigma_2 = 1 - r$, $\beta_2 = 1 - b = -\frac{1}{8}$. We require $2s - r > -\frac{3}{4}$, $3s - 2r > -\frac{3}{8}$, $3s - 2r > -1$, which are satisfied, and $4s - r > \frac{1}{8}$, which follows from the assumption $2s - r > -\frac{1}{8}$ and $s > \frac{1}{2}$.

**Proof of (18):** We start with (10) which implies
\[
\Pi_\pm(A^j_{j,\pm,1} \alpha^j \psi_{2,1}) = \Pi_\pm(A^j_{j,\pm,1} \Pi_{\pm} \alpha^j \psi_{2,1}) - \Pi_{\pm}(A^j_{j,\pm,1} R^j_{\pm,2} \psi_{2,1}) = I + II.
\]
The desired estimate for $I$ reduces by duality to
\[
\left| \int A^j_{j,\pm,1} \langle \psi_{0,0}, \Pi_{\pm} \alpha^j \psi_{2,1} \rangle \, dt \right| dx \lesssim \|\psi_{0,0}\|_{X^{s-1,-\frac{1}{2}}_{\pm}} \|\psi_{2,1}\|_{X^{s,1}_{\pm}} \|A^j_{j,\pm,1}\|_{X^{1}_{\pm}}. \tag{27}
\]
The left hand side equals
\[
\left| \int A^j_{j,\pm,1} \langle \Pi_{\pm} \Pi_{\pm} \psi_{0,0}, \Pi_{\pm} \alpha^j \psi_{2,1} \rangle \, dt \right| dx,
\]
which contains a null form between $\psi_{0,0}$ and $\psi_{2,1}$ by (28), so that it remains to prove
\[
\|B_{\pm,0,2}(\psi_{0,0}, \psi_{2,1})\|_{X^{s-1,-1}_{\pm}} \lesssim \|\psi_{0,0}\|_{X^{s-\frac{1}{2}}_{\pm}} \|\psi_{2,1}\|_{X^{s,1}_{\pm}}. \tag{29}
\]
In order to prove that II contains also a null form, we use the well-known identity (by [1] or [13]):

\[ A_j^d R_{\pm 1}^i \psi_{\pm 1} = -\epsilon^{ijkl} \partial_k w_l R_{\pm 1}^j \psi_{\pm 1} = (\nabla w_i \times \nabla | \psi_{\pm 1} |)^j , \]

where

\[ w = |\nabla|^{-2} \nabla \times A = |\nabla|^{-2} \nabla \times A^d + |\nabla|^{-2} \nabla \times A^f . \]

The last summand results in a term of the type \( A^f \psi \), if we ignore its special structure, which is possible for our purposes. We postpone its estimate to the proof of (17) below, where a similar estimate is proven.

The first summand results in a \( Q^4 \)-type null form, which is essentially of the type \( Q^4(A^d, \psi_{\pm 1}) \). This implies (cf. [11] or [5], Lemma 2.6) that it remains to prove for this part the following estimate:

\[ \| B_{\pm 2, \pm 2}(A_{j, \pm 2}^d, \psi_{\pm 1}) \|_{X^s_{\tau, \pm 2} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \mp} \lesssim \| A_{j, \pm 2}^d \|_{X^s_{\tau, 1}} \| \psi_{\pm 1} \|_{X^s_{\tau, 1/2} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \mp}. \quad (27) \]

We now prove (26) and (27) by Prop. 2.3. For (26) we choose the parameters in this proposition as follows: \( \sigma_0 = r \), \( \sigma_1 = -s \), \( \sigma_2 = s \), \( \beta_0 = b = \frac{7}{8} + \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \frac{1}{2} + \) and \( r > \frac{1}{2} \). We require \( r \geq s > 0 \) and \( r \geq s \geq 0 \), which holds for \( r > \frac{1}{2} \) and \( s > \frac{1}{2} \), and \( 2r - s > 1 \) as assumed. Next, for (27) we have to choose \( \sigma_0 = -s \), \( \sigma_1 = r \), \( \sigma_2 = s \), \( \beta_0 = \beta_2 = \frac{1}{2} + \beta_1 = b = \frac{7}{8} + \) and \( r > \frac{1}{2} \). This requires \( r > \frac{1}{2} \), \( 2r - s > \frac{1}{2} \), and \( 2r - s < 0 \), which is satisfied. Moreover we need \( r > \frac{1}{2} \) \( - (s + b + s) \) \( \Leftrightarrow r > \frac{3}{2} - b = \frac{5}{8} - s > 0 \), which holds by our assumptions.

**Proof of (17):** We even prove the estimate with \( X_{\tau, \pm 1}^s \cdot \frac{1}{2} \mp \) replaced by \( X_{\tau, 0}^0 \) on the left hand side. Moreover we remark that the matrices \( \alpha_j \) are completely irrelevant for the estimate. This also implies that the estimate for the term of type \( A^f \psi \) in the proof of (13), which we postponed, is also proven here.

We may reduce to

\[ \int \tilde{\alpha}_1(\tau_1, \xi_1) \tilde{\alpha}_2(\tau_2, \xi_2) \frac{\xi_3(\tau_3, \xi_3)}{\xi_2^s} \xi_2^s \frac{d\tau_3}{\tau_2^s} \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{3} \| u_i \|_{L^2_{\tau, i}} , \]

where * denotes integration over \( \xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \), \( \tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3) \) with \( \xi_1 + \xi_2 + \xi_3 = 0 \) and \( \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3 = 0 \). We assume here and in the following without loss of generality that the Fourier transforms are nonnegative.

Case 1: \( |\xi_1| \geq |\xi_2| \Rightarrow (\xi_3)^* \lesssim (\xi_1)^* \).

The estimate reduces to

\[ \int \tilde{\alpha}_1(\tau_1, \xi_1) \tilde{\alpha}_2(\tau_2, \xi_2) \frac{d\tau_3}{\tau_2^s} \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{3} \| u_i \|_{L^2_{\tau, i}} . \]

This follows under the assumption \( l > 1 \) from the estimate

\[ \int v_1 v_2 v_3 d\tau d\xi \lesssim \| v_1 \|_{L^\infty_{\tau, l} L^2_{\tau, l} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \mp} \| v_2 \|_{L^\infty_{\tau, l} L^2_{\tau, l} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \mp} \| v_3 \|_{L^\infty_{\tau, l} L^2_{\tau, l} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \mp} \lesssim \| v_1 \|_{X^0_{\tau, \cdot} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \mp} \| v_2 \|_{X^0_{\tau, \cdot} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \mp} \| v_3 \|_{X^0_{\tau, \cdot} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \mp} , \quad (28) \]

where we used (21) for the second factor.

Case 2: \( |\xi_2| \geq |\xi_1| \Rightarrow (\xi_3)^* \lesssim (\xi_2)^* \).

In this case the desired estimate follows from

\[ \int m(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3) \tilde{\alpha}_1(\tau_1, \xi_1) \tilde{\alpha}_2(\tau_2, \xi_2) \tilde{\alpha}_3(\tau_3, \xi_3) d\tau d\xi \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{3} \| u_i \|_{L^2_{\tau, i}} , \quad (29) \]
It suffices to prove

\[m = \frac{1}{\left(\|\tau_2 - |\xi_2|\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle \xi_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}}.\]

We imitate Tao’s proof [14] for a similar estimate.

By two applications of the averaging principle ([15], Prop. 5.1) we may replace

\[m' = \frac{\chi(\|\tau_2 - |\xi_2|\| - 1)\chi(\tau_1 \sim 1)}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}}.\]

Let now \(\tau_2\) be restricted to the region \(\tau_2 = T + O(1)\) for some integer \(T\). Then \(\tau_3\) is restricted to \(\tau_3 = -T + O(1)\), because \(\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3 = 0\), and \(\xi_2\) is restricted to \(|\xi_2| = |T| + O(1)\). The \(\tau_3\)-regions are essentially disjoint for \(T \in \mathbb{Z}\) and similarly the \(\tau_2\)-regions. Thus by Schur’s test ([15], Lemma 3.11) we only have to show

\[
\sup_{T \in \mathbb{Z}} \int \frac{X_{\tau_3 = -T + O(1)}X_{\tau_2 = T + O(1)}X_{|\tau_1| \sim 1}X_{|\xi_2| = |T| + O(1)}}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}} \cdot \hat{u}_1(\tau_1, \xi_1)\hat{u}_2(\tau_2, \xi_2)\hat{u}_3(\xi_3) d\xi d\tau \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^{3} \|u_i\|_{L^2_{\xi_{\tau_1}}}.
\]

The \(\tau\)-behaviour of the integral is now trivial, thus we reduce to

\[
\sup_{T \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\sum_{i=1}^{2} (\xi_i, \tau_i = 0)} \frac{X_{|\xi| = T + O(1)} \langle \xi \rangle^{-2L} \langle \xi \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}} \prod_{i=1}^{3} \|f_i\|_{L^2_{\xi}} \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^{3} \|f_i\|_{L^2_{\xi}}.
\]  

(30)

The last estimate follows by an elementary calculation for \(l > 1\), which completes the proof.

**Proof of (16):** We remark that for our purpose it is admissible to replace the singular operator \(|\nabla|^{-1}\) by \((\nabla)^{-1}\) in three space dimensions, where we use [15], Cor. 8.2.

We may reduce to

\[
\int \frac{\hat{u}_1(\tau_1, \xi_1)}{(\xi_1)^{s}(\tau_1 - |\xi_1|)^{\frac{1}{2}} + (\xi_1)^{s}(\tau_2 - |\xi_2|)^{\frac{1}{2}} + (\xi_3)^{s}(\tau_3 - |\xi_3|)^{\frac{1}{2}}} d\xi d\tau \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^{3} \|u_i\|_{L^2_{\xi_{\tau_1}}}.
\]

We assume without loss of generality \(|\xi_1| \leq |\xi_2|\), so that \(|\xi_3| \lesssim |\xi_2|\).

Case 1: \(|\tau_2| \ll |\xi_2|\). It suffices to prove

\[
\int \frac{\hat{u}_1(\tau_1, \xi_1)}{(\xi_1)^{s}(\tau_1 - |\xi_1|)^{\frac{1}{2}} + (\xi_2)^{s}(\tau_2 - |\xi_2|)^{\frac{1}{2}} + (\xi_3)^{s}(\tau_3 - |\xi_3|)^{\frac{1}{2}}} d\xi d\tau \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^{3} \|u_i\|_{L^2_{\xi_{\tau_1}}},
\]

which is implied under our assumption \(s - l \geq -\frac{1}{4}\) by

\[
|\int v_1 v_2 v_3 dx dt| \lesssim \|v_1\|_{L^2_{\xi t}} \|v_2\|_{L^2_{\xi t}} \|v_3\|_{L^2_{\xi t}}.
\]

where we used (22) in the case \(p = 4\) for the first factor and Sobolev’s embedding theorem for the others.

Case 2: \(|\tau_2| \gg |\xi_2|\). In this case we use \(\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3 = 0\) to estimate

\[
1 \lesssim \frac{(\tau_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(\xi_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \frac{(\tau_1)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(\xi_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{(\tau_3)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(\xi_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}. 
\]
2.2.2: If the first term on the right hand side is dominant we have to show, using also \( \langle \xi_3 \rangle^{l-1} \lesssim \langle \xi_2 \rangle^{l-1} \):

\[
\int \frac{\hat{\tilde{u}}_1(\tau_1, \xi_1)}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^s} \frac{\hat{\tilde{u}}_2(\tau_2, \xi_2)}{\langle \xi_2 \rangle^{s-l+\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\hat{\tilde{u}}_3(\tau_3, \xi_3)}{\langle \xi_3 \rangle^{s-l+\frac{1}{2}}} d\xi_1 d\tau_1 \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^3 \|u_i\|_{L^2_{\tau_i}},
\]

which means nothing but \( \|uv\|_{L^2_{\tau}} \lesssim \|u\|_{X^{\frac{s}{2} + \frac{l}{2} + \frac{1}{2}}} \|v\|_{X^{s-l + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}}} \). This follows from Prop. 2.3 provided \( 2s-l > -\frac{1}{2} \) and \( 4s-2l > -\frac{1}{2} \). Both conditions are weaker than our assumptions \( s-l > -\frac{1}{2} \) and \( s > \frac{1}{2} \).

2.2: If the first term on the right hand side is dominant we consider two subcases.

2.2.1: \(|\tau_1| \lesssim |\xi_1|\). We reduce to

\[
\int \frac{\hat{\tilde{u}}_1(\tau_1, \xi_1)}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^s} \frac{\hat{\tilde{u}}_2(\tau_2, \xi_2)}{\langle \xi_2 \rangle^{s-l+\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\hat{\tilde{u}}_3(\tau_3, \xi_3)}{\langle \xi_3 \rangle^{s-l+\frac{1}{2}}} d\xi_1 d\tau_1 \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^3 \|u_i\|_{L^2_{\tau_i}}.
\]

Using \( |\xi_2| \geq |\xi_1| \) it suffices to show

\[
\int \frac{\hat{\tilde{u}}_1(\tau_1, \xi_1)}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^s} \frac{\hat{\tilde{u}}_2(\tau_2, \xi_2)}{\langle \xi_2 \rangle^{s-l+\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\hat{\tilde{u}}_3(\tau_3, \xi_3)}{\langle \xi_3 \rangle^{s-l+\frac{1}{2}}} d\xi_1 d\tau_1 \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^3 \|u_i\|_{L^2_{\tau_i}}.
\]

But now we obtain by (22) for the case \( p = 4 \) the estimate

\[
\left| \int v_1 v_2 v_3 dx dt \right| \lesssim \|v_1\|_{L^1_{\tau} L^2} \|v_2\|_{L^1_{\tau} L^2} \|v_3\|_{L^\infty_{\tau}} \lesssim \|v_1\|_{X^{\frac{s}{2} + \frac{l}{2} + \frac{1}{2}}} \|v_2\|_{X^{s-l + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}}} \|v_3\|_{X^{\frac{s}{2} + \frac{1}{2}}}.
\]

This obviously gives the desired estimate, if \( s > \frac{1}{2} \) and \( s-l > -\frac{1}{2} \), which we assumed.

2.2.2: \(|\tau_1| \gg |\xi_1| \Rightarrow \langle |\tau_1| - |\xi_1| \rangle^{\frac{s}{2} - s} \sim \langle \tau_1 \rangle^{\frac{s}{2} - s} \). We have to show using \( \langle \xi_3 \rangle \lesssim |\xi_2| \):

\[
\int \frac{\hat{\tilde{u}}_1(\tau_1, \xi_1)}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^s} \frac{\hat{\tilde{u}}_2(\tau_2, \xi_2)}{\langle \xi_2 \rangle^{s-l+\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\hat{\tilde{u}}_3(\tau_3, \xi_3)}{\langle \xi_3 \rangle^{s-l+\frac{1}{2}}} d\xi_1 d\tau_1 \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^3 \|u_i\|_{L^2_{\tau_i}}.
\]

Using our assumptions \( s > \frac{1}{2} \) and \( s-l > -\frac{1}{2} \) again this follows from

\[
\left| \int v_1 v_2 v_3 dx dt \right| \lesssim \|v_1\|_{L^\infty_{\tau} L^2} \|v_2\|_{L^1_{\tau} L^2} \|v_3\|_{L^\infty_{\tau}} \lesssim \|v_1\|_{X^{\frac{s}{2} + \frac{1}{2}}} \|v_2\|_{X^{\frac{s}{2} + \frac{1}{2}}} \|v_3\|_{X^{\frac{s}{2} + \frac{1}{2}}}.
\]

Here we applied the Sobolev embedding \( H^\frac{s}{2} \hookrightarrow L^\frac{1+s}{2} \) and (22) for the case \( p = 12 \). This completes the proof of (21). \(\square\)
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