

LONG TIME DECAY AND ASYMPTOTICS FOR THE COMPLEX MKDV EQUATION

GAVIN STEWART

ABSTRACT. We study the asymptotics of the complex modified Korteweg-de Vries equation

$$\partial_t u + \partial_x^3 u = \pm |u|^2 \partial_x u$$

In the real valued case, it is known that solutions with small, localized initial data exhibit modified scattering for $|x| \geq t^{1/3}$, and behave self-similarly for $|x| \leq t^{1/3}$. We prove that the same asymptotics hold for complex mKdV. The major difficulty in the complex case is that the nonlinearity cannot be expressed as a derivative, which makes the low-frequency dynamics harder to control. To overcome this difficulty, we introduce the decomposition $u = S + w$, where S is a self-similar solution with the same mean as u and w is a remainder that has better decay. By using the explicit expression for S , we are able to get better low-frequency behavior for u than we could from dispersive estimates alone.

1. INTRODUCTION

We study the complex modified Korteweg-de Vries (mKdV) equation

$$\partial_t u + \partial_x^3 u = \pm |u|^2 \partial_x u \tag{1}$$

This equation appears as a model in nonlinear optics, where it models higher order corrections for waves travelling in a nonlinear medium [2, 32, 49]. It also describes higher order effects in vortex filament evolution [14]. The complex mKdV equation is completely integrable, and has infinitely many conserved quantities, the first few of which are the momentum, angular twist, and energy [1]:

$$\mathcal{P}(u) = \int |u|^2 dx, \quad \mathcal{W}(u) = \int |u|^2 \arg(u)_x dx \quad \mathcal{E}(u) = \int \frac{1}{2} |\partial_x u|^2 \mp \frac{1}{4} |u|^4 dx$$

1.1. Known results. The smoothing and maximal function estimates developed by Kenig, Ponce, and Vega in [41, 42] can be used to show that (1) is locally wellposed in H^s , $s \geq \frac{1}{4}$. For real initial data, Colliander, Keel, Staffilani, Takaoka, and Tao show in [7] that for $s > 1/4$ solution exist globally, and global wellposedness for real initial data at the $s = 1/4$ endpoint was shown independently by Kishimoto in [44] and by Guo in [23]. If we require uniformly continuous dependence on the initial data, then the $s = 1/4$ endpoint is sharp, see [43] for the focusing case and [5] for the defocusing case. Local wellposedness has also been show in the weighted Sobolev spaces $H^s \cap |x|^{-m} L^2$ for $s \geq \max(2m, 1/4)$, in [13, 40]. For the equation set on the torus, wellposedness was shown by Chapouto in a range of Fourier-Lebesgue spaces [3, 4]. Relaxing the requirement of uniformly continuous dependence on the initial data, Harrop-Griffiths, Killip, and Visan used the complete integrability of the equation to prove a weaker form of wellposedness in H^s for $s > -1/2$ in [28]. They also show that for $s \leq -1/2$, the equation exhibits instantaneous norm inflation, so no wellposedness result is possible. Outside the scale of H^s spaces, Grünrock proved in [21] that the equation is locally wellposed for real-valued initial data in the spaces \widehat{H}_r^s defined by the norms $\|u\|_{\widehat{H}_r^s} := \|\langle \xi \rangle \hat{u}\|_{L^{r'}}$ for the parameter range $\frac{4}{3} < r \leq 2$, $s \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2r}$. The parameter range was later improved by Grünrock and Herr in [22] to $1 < r \leq 2$,

$s \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2r}$, which has the scaling-critical space $\widehat{H}_1^0 = \mathcal{FL}^\infty$ as the (excluded) endpoint. By using an approximation argument, Correia, Côte, and Vega were able to show a form of wellposedness in a critical space contained in \mathcal{FL}^∞ in [10].

The long time asymptotics of the real-valued mKdV equation have received a great deal of study. The first complete results were given in [11], where Deift and Zhou used the complete integrability of the equations to obtain asymptotic formulas using the inverse scattering transform. The first results not depending on complete integrability were derived by Hayashi and Naumkin in [30, 31], where it was shown that solutions starting with small, localized data decay at the linear rate and exhibit Painlevé asymptotics in the self-similar region $|x| \leq t^{1/3}$. These results were extended to proving modified scattering in the region $x \leq -t^{-1/3}$ and more rapid decay in the region $x \geq t^{-1/3}$ by Harrop-Griffiths in [27] using the method of testing with wave packets developed by Ifrim and Tataru in [35, 36]. These results were also proved independently by Germain, Pusateri, and Rousset in [20] using the method of space time resonances, and it was further shown that solitons are stable under small, localized perturbations, and that for long times the perturbation has the same asymptotics as in the small data case. More recently, Correia, Côte, and Vega extended these results in [10] by allowing the solution to have a jump discontinuity at 0 in Fourier space, which corresponds to studying the dynamics of vortex filaments with corners, see [48]. For the complex equation with nonlinearity $\partial_x(|u|^2u)$, asymptotic results in the region $x/t < 0$ were given in [53] using the Deift-Zhou steepest descent method. Results for the Sasa-Satsuma mKdV equation (nonlinearity $2|u|^2\partial_x u + u\partial_x|u|^2$) are given for $x/t > 0$ in [46] and in the self-similar region $|x| \leq t^{-1/3}$ in [33]. Except for the results in the region $x/t < 0$ given in [34] using steepest descent, the asymptotics of the complex mKdV equation (1) do not appear to have been studied.

Asymptotic results for the mKdV equation hinge on the decay properties of solutions to the linear equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + \partial_x^3 u = 0 \\ u(t=0) = u_0 \end{cases}$$

The fundamental solution is given in terms of the Airy function by

$$F(x, t) = (3t)^{-1/3} \text{Ai}((3t)^{-1/3}x)$$

If u_0 is localized and regular, then for $t \geq 1$ we have

$$|u(x, t)| \lesssim t^{-1/3} \langle x/t^{1/3} \rangle^{-1/4}, \quad |\partial_x u(x, t)| \lesssim t^{-2/3} \langle x/t^{1/3} \rangle^{1/4} \quad (2)$$

In particular, $|u||\partial_x u| \lesssim t^{-1}$, which suggests the problem (1) (like its real-valued counterpart), should be critical with respect to scattering.

1.2. Main results. We will consider the equation with data prescribed at $t = 1$:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + \partial_x^3 u = \pm |u|^2 \partial_x u \\ u(t=1) = e^{-\partial_x^3} u_* \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

We will prove the following result:

Theorem 1. *There exists an $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that if $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$, and $u_* \in H^2$ satisfies*

$$\|\hat{u}_*\|_{L^\infty} + \|xu_*\|_{L^2} \leq \epsilon \quad (4)$$

then the solution u to (3) exists on $[1, \infty)$ and has the following asymptotics:

For $x \geq t^{1/3}$, we have rapid decay of the form

$$|u(x, t)| \lesssim \epsilon t^{-1/3} (xt^{-1/3})^{-3/4} \quad (5)$$

For $x \leq -t^{-1/3}$, we have modified scattering

$$u(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{12t\xi_0}} \sum_{\nu \in \{1, -1\}} \exp \left(-2\nu it \xi_0^3 + \nu i \frac{\pi}{4} \pm i\nu \int_1^t \frac{|\hat{f}(\nu \xi_0, s)|^2}{s} ds \right) \hat{f}_\infty(\nu \xi_0) + O(\epsilon t^{-1/3} (xt^{-1/3})^{-9/28}) \quad (6)$$

where $\xi_0 = \sqrt{\frac{-x}{3t}}$ and f_∞ a bounded function of ξ .

For $|x| \leq t^{1/3+4\beta}$, we have self-similar behavior

$$u(x, t) = S(x, t; \alpha) + O(\epsilon t^{-1/3-\beta}) \quad (7)$$

where α is some complex number with $|\alpha| \lesssim \epsilon$, $\beta = \frac{1}{6} - C\epsilon^2$ for some constant C , and S is a self-similar solution; that is, $S(x, t; \alpha) = t^{-1/3} \sigma(x/t^{1/3}; \alpha)$, where σ is a bounded solution of

$$\begin{cases} \sigma'' - \frac{1}{3}x\sigma = \pm \frac{1}{3}|\sigma|^2\sigma \\ \hat{\sigma}(0) = \alpha \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Remark 1. Equation (8) is nothing more than a complex, phase-rotation invariant version of the Painlevé II equation,

$$\begin{cases} \tau'' - x\tau = \pm \tau^3 \\ \hat{\tau}(0) = \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

It is known (see [9, 12, 29]) that (9) has a unique bounded solution for $|\alpha| < 1$, and this fact will be used in Section 4 to prove that (8) has a unique, bounded solution.

Remark 2. Note that the assumption that $u_* \in H^2$ is only used to give local wellposedness for the equation (using the $H^2 \cap x^{-1}L^2$ theory from [40]). In particular, it plays no role in the a priori estimates which give us the asymptotics, and we do not need any smallness assumption on the H^2 norm of u_* .

If we could prove local wellposedness for (3) with $u_* \in \mathcal{FL}^\infty \cap x^{-1}L^2$, then we could drop the requirement that $u_* \in H^2$ entirely, since our arguments would then imply that the local solution can be extended to a global one. However, proving local wellposedness in this space is not straightforward: the quasilinear behavior of the problem appears to preclude the use of a fixed-point argument, and smooth functions are not dense in \mathcal{FL}^∞ , which makes compactness arguments more complicated. It is possible that local existence could be proved by arguing along the lines of [10]; however, nontrivial modifications outside the scope of this paper would be needed to account for the different algebraic structure of the nonlinearity in the complex case.

It might appear somewhat unnatural to prescribe initial data in this form. However, by combining Theorem 1 with the weighted local wellposedness result in [40] we obtain a result with initial conditions given at $t = 0$:

Corollary 2. Let u solve

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u + \partial_x^3 u = \pm |u|^2 \partial_x u \\ u(t = 0) = u_0 \end{cases}$$

Then, there exists an $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$, if

$$\|xu_0\|_{L^2} + \|u_0\|_{H^2} \leq \epsilon$$

then the solution u has the same asymptotics as in Theorem 1.

Proof. By [40, Theorem 8.1], for ϵ small enough there exists a local solution $u \in C([0, 1], H^2 \cap |x|^{-1}L^2)$ with $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \|u(t)\|_{H^2} + \|xu(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \epsilon$. Now, let $u_* = e^{\partial_x^3} u(1)$. Since the linear propagator is unitary on L^2 Sobolev spaces, $u_* \in H^2$. Moreover, by using the identity $xe^{t\partial_x^3} = e^{t\partial_x^3}(x - 3t\partial_x^2)$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle x \rangle u_*\|_{L^2} &\leq \|u_*\|_{L^2} + \|xe^{t\partial_x^3} u(1)\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|u(1)\|_{L^2} + \|(x - 3\partial_x^2)u(1)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

This controls (4) by the Sobolev-Morrey embedding, so Theorem 1 gives the result. \square

Remark 3. *As discussed in Remark 2, the role of the H^2 hypothesis in Corollary 2 is largely to allow us to use the weighted local wellposedness theory of [40]. In this case, however, it is much less clear that we could obtain a wellposedness theorem in the scaling critical space $\mathcal{FL}^\infty \cap x^{-1}L^2$ because the dispersive decay estimates degenerate at $t = 0$. Even in the real-valued case, very little is known about wellposedness on $[0, 1]$ with initial data in $\mathcal{FL}^\infty \cap x^{-1}L^2$: see [10].*

Remark 4. *Although the arguments in this paper are given for the nonlinear $\pm|u|^2\partial_x u$, with slight modifications they can apply to nonlinearities of the form $a|u|^2\partial_x u + bu^2\partial_x \bar{u}$ for a, b real. If $a = 3b$, we have the Sasa-Satsuma equation whose asymptotics were studied in [33, 47].*

1.3. Main difficulties. The main difficulty for complex mKdV over real valued mKdV is the unfavorable location of the derivative in the nonlinearity, which creates significant obstacles for the proof.

The first difficulty comes when we try to control u in weighted spaces. Our argument requires us to control Lu in L^2 , where

$$L = e^{-t\partial_x^3} x e^{t\partial_x^3} = x - 3t\partial_x^2$$

Prior works for real mKdV estimate Lu by relating it to the scaling transform of u :

$$\Lambda u = (1 + x\partial_x + 3t\partial_t)u$$

via the identity

$$Lu = \partial_x^{-1} \Lambda u \mp 3tu^3$$

which holds for solutions of real mKdV. Since the nonlinearity for real mKdV can be written as a derivative, we can integrate the equation for Λu and perform an energy estimate to get control of $\partial_x^{-1} \Lambda u$. This strategy fails completely for complex mKdV: the relationship between Lu and Λu now reads

$$Lu = \partial_x^{-1} \Lambda u \mp 3t\partial_x^{-1}(|u|^2\partial_x u)$$

and the last term cannot be bounded in L^2 . Thus, we must use a different approach.

Our argument, very roughly speaking, amounts to performing an energy estimate on Lu directly. The fact that we have a derivative in the nonlinearity means we must exploit some cancellation (via integration by parts) to avoid having to estimate terms containing a $\partial_x Lu$ factor. This is analogous to the situation for the H^k energy estimates for mKdV: see [52, Chapter 4].

The other (and more major) problem appears when we try to establish bounds on \hat{u} at low frequencies. Writing $f = e^{t\partial_x^3} u$ for the linear profile of u , we see that

$$\partial_t \hat{f}(\xi, t) = \pm \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_1^t \int e^{it\phi} \hat{f}(\eta, t) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma, t)} (\xi - \eta - \sigma) \hat{f}(\xi - \eta - \sigma, t) d\eta d\sigma$$

for $\phi(\xi, \eta, \sigma) = \xi^3 - (\xi - \eta - \sigma)^3 - \eta^3 - \sigma^3 = 3(\eta + \sigma)(\xi - \eta)(\xi - \sigma)$. When $|\xi| \geq t^{-1/3}$, we can perform a stationary phase estimate on the nonlinear term to find that $\partial_t \hat{f}$ satisfies a perturbed Hamiltonian ODE, which we can integrate to get bounds for \hat{f} . However, the stationary phase estimate degenerates at low frequencies, which prevents us from applying this argument for $|\xi| < t^{-1/3}$. In the real-valued

case, the failure of the stationary phase estimates is compensated by the favorable position of the derivative, allowing us to obtain global bounds using only dispersive estimates. In the complex valued case, the derivative structure is less favorable, and the dispersive estimates for u are only strong enough to prove $|\partial_t \hat{f}| \lesssim \epsilon^3 t^{-1}$, which is insufficient to prove global bounds.

To overcome this second difficulty, we perform a modulation argument. We write $u = S + w$, where S is a self-similar solution to (1) satisfying $\hat{S}(0) = \hat{u}(0)$ and w is a remainder. This decomposition is advantageous: the fact that S is self-similar implies that $|S|^2 \partial_x S$ is a derivative, giving additional cancellation at low frequencies. Moreover, the Fourier space estimates of Correia, Côte, and Vega in [9] can be combined with our estimates on the linear propagator to show that S obeys the same decay estimates as u . In particular, S and u have matched asymptotics for $|x| \leq t^{1/3}$ (which corresponds to $|\xi| \leq t^{-1/3}$ in frequency space), so low-frequency projections of w obey stronger decay bounds than either u or S . By writing

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \hat{f}(0, t) &= \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int |u|^2 \partial_x u \, dx \\ &= \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int |u|^2 \partial_x u - |S|^2 \partial_x S \, dx \\ &= \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int |u|^2 \partial_x w + 2\Re(u\bar{w}) \partial_x S \, dx \end{aligned}$$

and using this improved decay, we can prove that $\partial_t \hat{f}(0, t)$ decays at an integrable rate, which allows us to show that $\hat{f}(\xi, t)$ is bounded for $|\xi| \lesssim t^{-1/3}$. As a bonus, we immediately get the asymptotics $u \approx S$ for $|x| \lesssim t^{1/3}$.

This argument has some similarities with the one used by Hayashi and Naumkin in [30]: indeed, the estimates we find for w are largely identical to theirs. However, our argument differs from theirs in three key regards. First, we cannot estimate Lw using the scaling vector field Λ , so we instead must use the method of space-time resonances to perform an energy estimate on Lw directly. Second, since the mean $\hat{u}(0, t)$ varies in time, we must modulate in time rather than subtracting a fixed self-similar solution. Finally, our argument is different in terms of how the estimates on w fit into the proof. In [30], the estimates on w are performed after the solution has been shown to decay at the linear rate for all time, and are only necessary to obtain the asymptotics in the self-similar region. In our work, on the other hand, the estimates on w are necessary in order to prove that the solution u decays at the linear rate globally in time.

1.4. Plan of the proof.

1.4.1. Overview of the space-time resonance method. To prove Theorem 1, we will work within the framework of the method of space-time resonances. This method, first developed by Germain, Shatah, and Masmoudi in [18] and independently by Gustafson, Nakanishi, and Tsai in [24], has been used to derive improved time of existence and asymptotics for a variety of equations with dispersive character; see [8, 16–19, 25, 37–39]. The method begins by rewriting the nonlinear equation for u in terms of the profile $f(t) = e^{t\partial_x^3} u(t)$:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f = \pm e^{t\partial_x^3} \left(\left| e^{-t\partial_x^3} f \right|^2 \partial_x e^{-t\partial_x^3} f \right) \\ f(t=1) = u_* \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Which can be re-written in mild form as

$$\hat{f}(\xi, t) = \hat{u}_* \pm \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_1^t \int e^{is\phi} \hat{f}(\eta, t) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma, t)} (\xi - \eta - \sigma) \hat{f}(\xi - \eta - \sigma, t) \, d\eta d\sigma \, ds \quad (11)$$

where ϕ is the phase associated with the four wave mixing by the cubic nonlinearity:

$$\phi(\xi, \eta, \sigma) = \xi^3 - (\xi - \eta - \sigma)^3 - \eta^3 - \sigma^3 = 3(\eta + \sigma)(\xi - \eta)(\xi - \sigma) \quad (12)$$

Roughly speaking, we would like to show that the change in f (given by the integral in (11)) is small in some norm that gives us the required decay estimates for u . Heuristically, if we imagine that \hat{f} is a smooth bump function, then the integral term in (11) will be dominated by the stationary points of the phase where $\nabla_{s, \eta, \sigma}(s\phi(\xi, \eta, \sigma)) = 0$. The points where $\phi = 0$ corresponds to a resonance (in the classical sense of the term) in the nonlinear interaction between plane waves of frequencies $\xi - \eta - \sigma$, η and $-\sigma$.

For dispersive PDEs, it is more natural to think in terms of *wave packets* instead of plane waves. A wave packet at frequency ξ is a bump function which travels at the group velocity, which for complex mKdV is $v_\xi = -3\xi^2$. Clearly, wave packets can interact over large timescales only if they have the same group velocity, and the condition $\nabla_{\eta, \sigma}\phi = 0$ is precisely what is required for three wave-packets at frequencies $\xi - \eta - \sigma$, η , and $-\sigma$ to have the same group velocities. See [15] for an expository overview of the method.

In our application, we will see in Section 3 the decay we want in Theorem 1 follows from the estimate $\sup_{t \geq 1} \|f\|_X \lesssim \epsilon$, where the X norm is defined by

$$\|f\|_X = \|\hat{f}(t)\|_{L^\infty} + t^{-1/6} \|xf(t)\|_{L^2} \quad (13)$$

Note that this norm is scale invariant. In our argument, we use a bootstrap argument to show that this norm is small for all time.

1.4.2. Step 1: Stationary phase estimate for high frequencies. Let us first consider the L^∞ bound for $\hat{f}(\xi, t)$. Since this amounts to a pointwise bound, it is natural to consider ξ fixed. The stationary points $\nabla_{\eta, \sigma}\phi = 0$ are then given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\eta_1, \sigma_1) &= (\xi, \xi) \\ (\eta_1, \sigma_1) &= (\xi, -\xi) \\ (\eta_1, \sigma_1) &= (-\xi, \xi) \\ (\eta_4, \sigma_4) &= (\xi/3, \xi/3) \end{aligned}$$

A formal stationary phase calculation then shows that

$$\partial_t \hat{f}(\xi, t) = \pm \frac{i \operatorname{sgn} \xi}{6t} |\hat{f}(\xi, t)|^2 \hat{f}(\xi, t) + ce^{it8/9\xi^3} \frac{\operatorname{sgn} \xi}{t} |\hat{f}(\xi/3, t)|^2 \hat{f}(\xi/3, t) + \{\text{error}\}$$

where c is some constant whose exact value is unimportant. Since the second term has a highly oscillatory phase, we expect that it will not be relevant on timescales $t \geq |\xi|^{-3}$. Similarly, we expect that the error term will be higher order in t , and hence will not contribute significantly to the asymptotics. After discarding the oscillatory term and the error term, we are left with a Hamiltonian ODE, which we can integrate explicitly to find that

$$\hat{f}(\xi, t) \approx \exp \left(\pm \frac{i}{6} \int_1^t \frac{|\hat{f}(\xi, s)|^2}{s} ds \right) f_\infty(\xi)$$

for some bounded function f_∞ .

1.4.3. *Step 2: Modulation analysis in the self-similar region.* The above argument only applies for frequencies $|\xi| \geq t^{-1/3}$. For smaller frequencies, there is not enough oscillation to neglect the oscillating term, and the error term in the stationary phase expansion becomes unacceptably large due to the coalescence of the stationary points (η_i, σ_i) as $\xi \rightarrow 0$. Using the embedding $\dot{H}^1 \rightarrow C^{0,1/2}$ and making the bootstrap assumption that $\|\partial_\xi \hat{f}\|_{L^2} = \|xf\|_{L^2} \lesssim \epsilon t^{1/6}$, we see that the problem of controlling low frequencies reduces to understanding the behavior of the zero Fourier mode. In the real-valued case, $\hat{f}(0, t)$ is conserved by the flow (and hence the low frequency bounds are immediate), but in the complex valued case,

$$\partial_t \hat{f}(0, t) = \partial_t \hat{u}(0, t) = \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int |u|^2 \partial_x u \, dx$$

which is not zero in general.

The main difficulty for $|\xi| \leq t^{-1/3}$ is that the low-frequency component of u evolves in a genuinely nonlinear manner. By analogy with the real-valued problem, we expect u to exhibit self-similar asymptotics for $|x| \leq t^{1/3}$, which corresponds to the low frequency range $|\xi| \leq t^{-1/3}$. Thus, we will attempt to show the behavior of u at low frequencies is approximately self-similar. If $S(x, t) = t^{-1/3} \sigma(xt^{-1/3})$ is a self-similar solution of (1), then σ satisfies the third order ODE

$$\partial_x^3 \sigma - \frac{1}{3} \partial_x (x\sigma) = |\sigma|^2 \sigma_x \quad (14)$$

In order for S to be compatible with the asymptotics given in Theorem 1, we need σ to be bounded and lie in a certain weighted L^2 space. In particular, this means σ must solve the Painlevé-type equation by (8). Since the mean of u changes in time, we will also need to modulate the mean of the self-similar solution. This leads us to impose the condition $\hat{\sigma}(0) = p$, which by [9] is enough to determine σ . By examining (14) and recalling that S is obtained by applying the self-similar scaling to σ , we see that $|S|^2 \partial_x S$ is the derivative of a function. Thus, $|S|^2 \partial_x S$ has mean zero. If we choose S such that $\hat{S}(0, t) = \hat{\sigma}(0) = \hat{f}(0, t)$, then this implies that

$$\partial_t \hat{f}(0, t) = \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int |u|^2 \partial_x u - |S|^2 \partial_x S \, dx = \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int |u|^2 \partial_x w + (w\bar{w} + w\bar{u}) \partial_x S \, dx$$

where $w = u - S$.

1.4.4. *Step 3: Weighted bounds for w .* We now consider the difference w in more detail. By definition, w has mean zero, and so does $g = e^{t\partial_x^3} w$. We will show that $\|xg\|_{L^2} \lesssim \epsilon t^{1/6-\beta}$ for β as in Theorem 1. (This is similar to [30], where it is shown that Lw obeys better L^2 bounds than Lu). Using this estimate, we find that w has better dispersive decay than u , which allows us to prove a bound

$$|\partial_t \hat{f}(0, t)| \lesssim \epsilon^3 t^{-1-\beta}$$

Integrating in time gives the boundedness for low frequencies, and shows that $u(x, t) \approx S(x, t; \alpha)$ for $|x| \lesssim t^{1/3}$ and t large, where $\alpha = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \hat{f}(0, t)$. Moreover, using the self-similar scaling and (8), it can be seen that S satisfies $\|LS\|_{L^2} \sim \epsilon^3 t^{1/6}$. Thus,

$$\|xf\|_{L^2} \leq \|LS\|_{L^2} + \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

so the bound $\|xf\|_{L^2} \lesssim \epsilon t^{1/6}$ also follows from the improved L^2 bound for xg . Thus, the proof is complete if we can obtain the weighted L^2 bound for g .

In the real-valued case, it is possible to use the scaling vector field to control Lw in L^2 , but the non-divergence form of the nonlinearity in (1) precludes this argument. Instead, we will use a more

direct argument. Since $\mathcal{F}(xg) = -i\partial_\xi \hat{g}$, by Plancherel's theorem it suffices to prove bounds on $\partial_\xi g$ in L^2 . We find that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \partial_\xi \hat{g} &= \mp \frac{s}{2\pi} \int \partial_\xi \phi e^{is\phi} \hat{f}(\eta)(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \hat{g}(-\xi + \eta + \sigma) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma)} d\eta d\sigma \\ &\quad \mp \frac{i}{2\pi} \int e^{is\phi} \hat{f}(\eta)(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \partial_\xi \hat{g}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma)} d\eta d\sigma \\ &\quad + \{\text{easier terms}\} \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

The second term appears concerning, since our estimates do not allow us to control derivatives of Lw . However, by writing it as $\pm e^{-t\partial_x^3} (|u|^2 \partial_x Lw)$ in physical space and performing an energy estimate, we see that this term is actually harmless:

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial_t \|xg\|_{L^2}^2 = \pm \int |u|^2 \partial_x |Lw|^2 dx + \dots = \mp \int \partial_x |u|^2 |Lw|^2 dx + \dots$$

and $\int \partial_x |u|^2 |Lw|^2 dx \lesssim \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2}^2$, which is consistent with the slow growth of xg in L^2 . Thus, it only remains to control the first term in (15). We do this by considering the space-time resonance structure of ϕ , together with cancellations coming from the $\partial_\xi \phi$ multiplier. The derivatives of ϕ are

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\xi \phi &= 3(\eta + \sigma)(2\xi - \eta - \sigma) \\ \partial_\eta \phi &= 3(\xi - \sigma)(\xi - 2\eta - \sigma) \\ \partial_\sigma \phi &= 3(\xi - \eta)(\xi - \eta - 2\sigma) \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Based on (12) and (16), We introduce the space-time resonant sets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} &= \{\xi = \eta\} \cup \{\xi = \sigma\} \\ \mathcal{S} &= \{\eta = \sigma = \xi/3\} \\ \mathcal{R} &= \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{T} \\ &= \{(0, 0, 0)\} \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{T} is the set of time resonances (where ϕ vanishes to higher order than $\partial_\xi \phi$), \mathcal{S} is the set of space resonances (where $\nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi$ vanishes to higher order than $\partial_\xi \phi$), and the set of space-time resonances is given by $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{S}$.

Away from the set \mathcal{T} of time resonances the quotient $\frac{\partial_\xi \phi}{\phi}$ is bounded and we may integrate by parts in the time variable. This is akin to the normal form transformation method introduced by Shatah in [51]. In particular, it transforms the cubic nonlinearity into a quintic nonlinearity, which gives us more decay and leads to better bounds.

On the other hand, outside of the set \mathcal{S} of space resonances, $\frac{\partial_\xi \phi}{|\nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi|}$ is bounded, and we can integrate by parts using the relation $\frac{\nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi}{is|\nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi|^2} \cdot \nabla_{\eta, \sigma} e^{is\phi} = e^{is\phi}$ to gain a power of s^{-1} . This is similar in spirit to the vector field method developed by Klainerman in [45]. In principle, this integration could result in a loss of derivatives when the space weight and the derivative fall on the same term. In practice, however, we only need to apply this integration by parts in a small neighborhood of \mathcal{T} , where it can be seen that $|\xi - \eta - \sigma| \lesssim \max(|\eta|, |\sigma|)$, where we can move the derivative from the term with an L weight to an unweighted term.

Finally, in a small (time-dependent) neighborhood of the space-time resonant set \mathcal{R} , we can integrate crudely using the volume bounds in Fourier space and the Hölder bound $|\hat{g}(\xi)| \lesssim \epsilon t^{1/6-\beta} |\xi|^{1/2}$ together with the L^∞ bound for \hat{f} to bound the contribution from \mathcal{R} .

1.4.5. *Organization of the paper.* The plan of the rest of the paper is as follows: In Section 2, we present some notation that will be used throughout the paper, and give some conventions and results about pseudoproduct operators. In Section 3, we will give decay estimates for the linear equation, and show how these estimates allow us to control bi- and trilinear terms. In Section 4, we will consider the self-similar solution S , and derive estimates which will be necessary for the later analysis. In Section 5, we will show that Theorem 1 follows if we prove that \hat{f} evolves by logarithmic phase rotation, and that $\|xg\|_{L^2}$, $\|\hat{f}\|_{L^\infty}$ and $|\partial_t \hat{f}(0, t)|$ satisfy certain bootstrap estimates. In Section 6, we prove that under the bootstrap assumptions, $\|xg\|_{L^2} \lesssim \epsilon t^{1/6-\beta}$ using space-time resonances and a Grönwall argument. We then verify that $|\partial_t \hat{u}|$ obeys the required decay (and hence that \hat{f} is bounded for low frequencies) and by show that at high frequencies \hat{f} is bounded and undergoes the required logarithmic phase rotation in Section 7.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank P. Germain for many helpful discussions. The author would also like to thank P. Deift and R. Côte for discussions about the self-similar solution.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. **Notation and basic inequalities.** We will make use of the Japanese bracket notation

$$\langle x \rangle := \sqrt{1 + x^2}$$

When discussing constants, we will write C to denote a (positive) absolute constant, the exact value of which can change from line to line. We also write c_j and $c_{j,k}$ to denote sequences which are ℓ^2 summable to some arbitrary absolute constant:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_j c_j^2 \right)^{1/2} &= C \\ \left(\sum_{j,k} c_{j,k}^2 \right)^{1/2} &= C \end{aligned}$$

If X and Y are two quantities which we wish to compare, but we want to suppress constant factors, we will write

- $X \lesssim Y$ if $X \leq CY$ for some $C > 0$,
- $X \sim Y$ if $X \lesssim Y$ and $Y \lesssim X$,
- $X \ll Y$ if $X \leq cY$, where c is a small constant, the exact value of which depends on the context.

If we want to allow the implicit constant to depend on some parameters P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n , then we will write $X \lesssim_{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n} Y$, $X \sim_{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n} Y$, or $X \ll_{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n} Y$, respectively.

We use the Fourier transform convention

$$\mathcal{F}f(\xi) = \hat{f}(\xi) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int f(x) e^{-ix\xi} dx$$

with the inverse transformation

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\xi) = \check{f}(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int f(x) e^{ix\xi} dx$$

Under this convention, multiplication and convolution are linked by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}(fg)(\xi) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \hat{f} * \hat{g}(x) \\ \mathcal{F}(f * g)(\xi) &= \sqrt{2\pi} \hat{f}(\xi) \hat{g}(\xi)\end{aligned}$$

where

$$f * g(x) = \int f(x-y)g(y) dy = \int f(y)g(x-y) dy$$

Using the Fourier transform, we can generalize the notion of differential operators to define Fourier multiplication operators. A Fourier multiplication operator with symbol $m : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is given by

$$m(D)f(x) := \mathcal{F}^{-1}(m(\xi)\hat{f}(\xi))(x)$$

The Littlewood-Paley projection operators are an especially important family of Fourier multiplication operators. Let $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be a function supported on $B_2(0)$ which is identically zero on $B_{1/2}(0)$ satisfying

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \psi(2^j \xi) = 1$$

for all $\xi \neq 0$. Then, we define the Littlewood-Paley projectors as

$$P_j = \psi_j(D) = \psi\left(\frac{D}{2^j}\right)$$

and define P_j^+ and P_j^- to be the projectors to positive and negative frequencies, respectively:

$$P_j^+ = \psi_j(D) \mathbb{1}_{D>0}, \quad P_j^- = \psi_j(D) \mathbb{1}_{D<0},$$

We write

$$P_{\leq j} = \sum_{k \leq j} P_k, \quad P_{\geq j} = \sum_{k \geq j} P_k, \quad P_{[j_1, j_2]} = \sum_{j_1 \leq k \leq j_2} P_k$$

with $P_{< j}$ and $P_{> j}$ being defined similarly. We also define

$$P_{\lesssim j} = \sum_{k \leq j+10} P_k, \quad P_{\ll j} = \sum_{k < j+10} P_k, \quad P_{\sim j} = \sum_{j-10 \leq k \leq j+10} P_k$$

All of the Littlewood-Paley projectors are bounded from $L^p(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^p(\mathbb{R})$, and moreover we have the Plancherel-type identity

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \|P_j f\|_{L^2}^2 \sim \|f\|_{L^2}^2$$

Furthermore, if f has mean 0 (i.e. $\hat{f}(0) = 0$), then taking Fourier transforms and applying Hardy's inequality (see [26]), we find that

$$\|f\|_{H^{-1}}^2 := \sum_{2^j} 2^{-2j} \|P_j f\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|xf\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (17)$$

When discussing the complex mKdV equation, we will find it convenient to use the (time-dependent) frequency projectors given by

$$Q_j = \begin{cases} P_j & 2^j > t^{-1/3} \\ P_{\leq j} & 2^{j-1} < t^{-1/3} \leq 2^j \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Clearly, these projectors obey the same $L^p \rightarrow L^p$ bounds as the usual Littlewood-Paley projectors uniformly in time. The decision not to distinguish between frequencies $\lesssim t^{-1/3}$ is motivated our desire

to have the frequency localization of \hat{f} determine the spatial localization of $u = e^{-t\partial_x^3}f$ through the group velocity relation. For frequencies $\gtrsim t^{-1/3}$, this is possible (see Section 3), but the uncertainty principle implies this spatial localization deteriorates when we project to frequencies $\ll t^{-1/3}$. To denote the projector to the low frequencies, we will sometimes write

$$Q_{\leq \log t^{-1/3}} = \psi_{\leq \log t^{-1/3}}(D) := P_{\leq j}$$

where $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ is such that $2^{j-1} < t^{-1/3} \leq 2^j$, so

$$\text{Id} = Q_{\leq \log t^{-1/3}} + \sum_{2^j > t^{-1/3}} Q_j$$

As with the projectors P_j , we define

$$Q_{\leq j} = \sum_{k \leq j} Q_k, \quad Q_{\geq j} = \sum_{k \geq j} Q_k, \quad Q_{[j_1, j_2]} = \sum_{j_1 \leq k \leq j_2} Q_k$$

with $Q_{< j}$ and $Q_{> j}$ being defined analogously, and

$$Q_{\lesssim j} = Q_{\leq j+10}, \quad Q_{\sim j} = Q_{[j-10, j+10]}, \quad Q_{\ll j} = \chi_{< j-10}$$

We will often indicate the frequency localization of a function through a subscript, so

$$f_j = Q_j f$$

$$f_{[j_1, j_2]} = Q_{[j_1, j_2]} f$$

and similarly for $f_{< j}$, $f_{\sim j}$, etc.

To complement the Q_j , it will be useful to consider time-dependent functions χ_j with the property that if f is a bump function localized in space near 0, then $e^{-t\partial_x^3}Q_j f$ will be localized near the support of χ_j (up to more rapidly decaying tails). To do this, we define

$$\chi_j(x; t) = \begin{cases} \chi(x/(t2^{2j})) & 2^j > t^{-1/3} \\ \sum_{2^k \leq t^{-1/3}} \chi(x/(t2^{2k})) & 2^j \leq t^{-1/3} < 2^{j+1} \\ 0 & 2^{j+1} \leq t^{-1/3} \end{cases}$$

where χ is a non-negative bump function localized in the region $|x| \approx 1$ chosen so that $\sum_j \chi_j(x, t) = 1$ for all $x \neq 0$. As with the Fourier projectors, we define

$$\chi_{\leq j} = \sum_{k \leq j} \chi_k, \quad \chi_{< j} = \sum_{k < j} \chi_k, \quad \chi_{[j_1, j_2]} = \sum_{j_1 \leq k \leq j_2} \chi_k$$

with $\chi_{> j}$ and $\chi_{\geq j}$ defined in analogously, and

$$\chi_{\lesssim j} = \chi_{\leq j+10}, \quad \chi_{\ll j} = \chi_{< j-10}, \quad \chi_{\sim j} = \chi_{[j-10, j+10]}$$

and similarly for $\chi_{\gtrsim j}$ and $\chi_{\gg j}$.

Note that for $f \in L^2$, each of the families $\{\chi_k f\}$, $\{Q_j f\}$ and $\{\chi_k Q_j f\}$ is almost orthogonal, which implies that

$$\|f\|_{L^2}^2 \sim \sum_{2^k \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} \|\chi_k f\|_{L^2}^2 \sim \sum_{2^j \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} \|Q_j f\|_{L^2}^2 \sim \sum_{2^j, 2^k \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} \|\chi_k Q_j f\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (18)$$

We also recall the following bound (which expresses the pseudolocality of the projectors Q_j): For $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$,

$$\|(Q_{\leq j} f) g\|_{L^p} \lesssim_N \langle 2^j d(\text{supp}(f), \text{supp}(g)) \rangle^{-N} \|f\|_{L^{p_1}} \|g\|_{L^{p_2}} \quad (19)$$

which can be obtained by writing $Q_{\leq j}f = \check{Q}_{\leq j} * f$ and noting that $\check{Q}_{\leq j}$ is a rapidly decreasing function. In particular, if the supports of f and g are separated by a distance much larger than 2^{-j} , the term on the right in (19) will be small.

Remark 5. *The notion of pseudolocality holds in a much greater generality for pseudodifferential operators $a(x, hD)$, see [54]. In equation (19), 2^{-j} plays the role of the small parameter h .*

Remark 6. *We will often apply the estimate (19) as follows: Taking $g = \chi_j$, we find that*

$$\|\chi_j Q_{\leq j}((1 - \chi_{\sim j})F)\|_{L^p} \lesssim_N (t2^{3j})^{-N} \|F\|_{L^p} \quad (20)$$

so

$$\|\chi_j Q_{\leq j}F\|_{L^p} \lesssim_N \|\chi_{\sim j}F\|_{L^p} + (t2^{3j})^{-N} \|F\|_{L^p}$$

In our applications, $\chi_j F$ and $\chi_{\sim j}F$ will generally obey the same sorts of bounds, so we can essentially commute the frequency localization of $Q_{\leq j}$ and the spatial localization of χ_j up to an error which is summable in j .

Remark 7. *By writing $Q_j = Q_{\leq j} - Q_{\leq j-1}$, we see that the same bounds hold true if $Q_{\leq j}$ is replaced by Q_j*

2.2. Multilinear harmonic analysis. For a symbol $m : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we define the trilinear pseudo-product operator T_m by

$$\mathcal{F}T_m(f, g, h)(\xi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int m(\xi, \eta, \sigma) \hat{f}(\eta) \hat{g}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \hat{h}(\sigma) d\eta d\sigma$$

In particular, $T_1(f, g, h)(x) = (fgh)(x)$, so T_m can be thought of as a generalized product. If the symbol m is sufficiently well-behaved, we can show that the pseudoproduct $T_m(f, g, h)$ obeys Hölder-type bounds (see also [6]):

Theorem 3. *Suppose m is a symbol with $\check{m} \in L^1$, and $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} = \frac{1}{p_3} = \frac{1}{p}$. Then,*

$$\|T_m(f, g, h)\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|\check{m}\|_{L^1} \|f\|_{L^{p_1}} \|g\|_{L^{p_2}} \|h\|_{L^{p_3}} \quad (21)$$

Proof. By inverting the Fourier transform, we find

$$T_m(f, g, h)(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{3/2}} \int \check{m}(y, z, w) f(x - y - z) g(x - y) h(x - y - w) dy dz dw$$

which yields the result by Young's inequality. \square

Remark 8. *In our analysis, we will often consider symbols m which are supported on a region of volume $O(2^{3j})$ and satisfy the symbol bounds*

$$|\partial_{\xi, \eta, \sigma}^\alpha m(\xi, \eta, \sigma)| \lesssim_\alpha 2^{-|\alpha|j}$$

For such symbols,

$$|\check{m}(y, z, w)| \lesssim_N \frac{2^j}{(1 + |2^j y|)^N} \frac{2^j}{(1 + |2^j z|)^N} \frac{2^j}{(1 + |2^j w|)^N}$$

which shows that m satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 3.

We also need a pseudolocality property for pseudoproduct operators given in the following lemma:

Lemma 4. Suppose that f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4 are functions, and suppose that $\text{supp } f_i$ and $\text{supp } f_k$ are separated by a distance R for some $i \neq k$. Let m be a symbol supported on $|\xi| + |\eta| + |\sigma| \leq 2^{j+5}$ and satisfying the symbol bounds

$$|\partial_{\xi, \eta, \sigma}^\alpha m_j(\xi, \eta, \sigma)| \lesssim_\alpha 2^{-j|\alpha|}$$

Then, for $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{p_3} + \frac{1}{p_4} = \frac{1}{p}$, we have

$$\|f_4 T_{m_j}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^p} \lesssim_N \langle 2^j R \rangle^{-N} \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \|f_3\|_{L^{p_3}} \|f_4\|_{L^{p_4}} \quad (22)$$

Proof. We will assume $i = 1, k = 2$, since the other cases are similar. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 3 and using the hypothesis on the supports of f_1 and f_2 , we have that

$$f_4 T_{m_j}(f_1, f_2, f_3) = \int_{|z| \geq} \tilde{m}_j(y, z, w) f_1(x - y - z) f_2(x - y) f_3(x - y - w) f_4(x) dy dz dw$$

Using Minkowski's and Hölder's inequalities, we see that (22) reduces to showing that

$$\int_{|z| \geq R} |\tilde{m}_j(y, z, w)| dy dz dw \lesssim_N \langle 2^j R \rangle^{-N}$$

Since m_j is smooth and supported on a region of size $O(2^{3j})$, the same reasoning as in Remark 8 gives us the bound

$$|\tilde{m}_j(y, z, w)| \lesssim_N 2^{3j} \langle 2^j y, 2^j z, 2^j w \rangle^{-N-10}$$

which gives the required bound. \square

3. LINEAR AND MULTILINEAR ESTIMATES

3.1. The linear estimate. We now turn our attention to the linear part of (1). We begin by proving a linear estimate for the Airy propagator. Define the spaces X_j for $2^j \gtrsim t^{-1/3}$ by the norm

$$\|f\|_{X_j} := \|\widehat{Q_{\sim j} f}\|_{L^\infty} + t^{-1/6} \|x Q_{\sim j} f\|_{L^2} \quad (23)$$

and note that $\|f\|_{X_j}^2 \lesssim \|f\|_X^2$, where X is the norm defined in (13).

Lemma 5. Let $u(x, t) = e^{-t\partial_x^3} f(x, t)$. For $2^j > t^{-1/3}$, we have the pointwise estimate

$$\begin{aligned} P_j^\pm u(x, t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{12t\xi_0}} e^{\mp 2it\xi_0^3 \pm i\frac{\pi}{4}} \widehat{P_j^\pm f}(\pm \xi_0) \mathbf{1}_{x < 0} \\ &\quad + O\left(t^{-1/3} \left(2^j t^{1/3}\right)^{-9/14}\right) \mathbf{1}_{x < 0} \chi_{\sim j}(x, t) \|f\|_{X_j} \\ &\quad + O\left(t^{-1/3} \left((2^j + 2^{-j/3} |\xi_0|^{4/3}) t^{1/3}\right)^{-3/2}\right) \|f\|_{X_j} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where $\xi_0 = \sqrt{|\frac{x}{3t}|}$. Moreover, we have the estimate

$$|Q_{\leq \log t^{-1/3}} u(x, t)| \lesssim t^{-1/3} (1 + t^{2/3} \xi_0^2)^{-1} \|f\|_{X_{\leq \log t^{-1/3}}} \quad (25)$$

so for $p \in [4, \infty]$,

$$\|Q_j u\|_{L^p} \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p}} 2^{\left(\frac{2}{p} - \frac{1}{2}\right)j} \|f\|_{X_j} \quad (26)$$

In particular, if $p > 4$,

$$\|u\|_{L^p} \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3p}} \|f\|_X \quad (27)$$

Proof. The estimate (26) follows directly from (24) and (25), and (27) follows from (25) and (26) since

$$\|u\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|Q_{\leq \log t^{-1/3}} u\|_{L^p} + \sum_{2^j > t^{-1/3}} \|Q_j u\|_{L^p}$$

so it only remains to prove (24) and (25).

To prove the low frequency estimate (25), it suffices to show that

$$|Q_{\leq \log t^{-1/3}} u| \lesssim \min(t^{-1/3}, t^{-1} \xi_0^{-2}) \|f\|_{X_{\leq \log t^{-1/3}}}$$

The bound $|Q_{\leq \log t^{-1/3}} u| \lesssim t^{-1/3} \|f\|_{X_{\leq \log t^{-1/3}}}$ follows immediately from the Hausdorff-Young inequality, so it suffices to consider the case $|\xi_0| \gg t^{-1/3}$. In this case, writing

$$Q_{\leq \log t^{-1/3}} u(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi_{\leq \log t^{-1/3}}(\xi) e^{it\phi_{\text{lin}}(\xi)} \hat{f}(\xi) d\xi$$

for $\phi_{\text{lin}}(\xi) = \frac{x}{t}\xi + \xi^3 = \xi^3 - 3\xi_0^2\xi$, the assumption $|\xi_0| \gg t^{-1/3}$ implies that $|\partial_\xi \phi_{\text{lin}}| \sim |\xi_0|^2$ on the support of $\psi_{\leq \log t^{-1/3}} \hat{f}$, so integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_{\leq \log t^{-1/3}} u(x, t)| &\lesssim \frac{1}{t} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \partial_\xi \left(\frac{1}{\partial_\xi \phi_{\text{lin}}} \right) \right| |\psi_{\leq \log t^{-1/3}} \hat{f}(\xi)| d\xi \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{t} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \frac{1}{\partial_\xi \phi_{\text{lin}}} \right| |\partial_\xi (\psi_{\leq \log t^{-1/3}} \hat{f}(\xi))| d\xi \\ &\lesssim t^{-1} |\xi_0|^{-2} \left(t^{-1/3} \xi_0^{-1} \|\widehat{Q}_{\leq \log t^{-1/3}} \hat{f}\|_{L^\infty} + t^{-1/6} \|x Q_{\leq \log t^{-1/3}} f\|_{L^2} \right) \\ &\lesssim t^{-1} |\xi_0|^{-2} \|f\|_{X_{\leq t^{-1/3}}} \end{aligned}$$

as required.

We now turn to the estimate (24). We consider the estimate for $P_j^+ u$: the estimate for $P_j^- u$ is similar. As before, we write

$$P_j^+ u(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_0^\infty \psi_j^+(\xi) e^{it\phi_{\text{lin}}(\xi)} \hat{f}(\xi) d\xi$$

We distinguish between three cases depending on the relative sizes of 2^j and $|\xi_0|$ and the sign of x .

Case $|\xi_0| < 2^{j-10}$. In this case, $|\partial_\xi \phi_{\text{lin}}| \sim 2^{2j}$, and integration by parts gives

$$|P_j^+ u(x, t)| \lesssim \frac{1}{t} \int_0^\infty \left| \partial_\xi \left(\frac{\psi_j^+(\xi)}{\partial_\xi \phi_{\text{lin}}} \right) \right| |\psi_{\sim j}^+(\xi) \hat{f}(\xi)| d\xi \quad (28a)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{t} \int_0^\infty \left| \psi_j^+(\xi) \frac{1}{\partial_\xi \phi_{\text{lin}}} \right| |\psi_{\sim j}^+(\xi) \partial_\xi \hat{f}(\xi)| d\xi \quad (28b)$$

For (28a), we observe that $\partial_\xi \frac{\psi_j^+(\xi)}{\partial_\xi \phi_{\text{lin}}}$ has size $O(2^{-3j})$ and is supported on a region of size $O(2^j)$, so using Hardy's inequality (17) yields

$$\begin{aligned} (28a) &\lesssim t^{-1} 2^{-5/2j} \|\widehat{Q_{\sim j} f}\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim t^{-1/3} \left(t^{1/3} 2^j \right)^{-3/2} \|f\|_{X_j} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $\frac{\psi_j^+(\xi)}{\partial_\xi \phi_{\text{lin}}}$ has size $O(2^{-2j})$ and is supported on a region of size $O(2^j)$, so

$$(28b) \lesssim t^{-1} 2^{-3/2j} \|Q_{\sim j} x f\|_{L^2} \\ \lesssim t^{-1/3} \left(2^j t^{1/3}\right)^{-3/2} \|f\|_{X_j}$$

as required.

Case $|\xi_0| > 2^{j+10}$. In this case, $|\partial_\xi \phi_{\text{lin}}| \sim \xi_0^2$, and a quick calculation gives that

$$\left\| \partial_\xi \frac{\psi_j^+(\xi)}{\partial_\xi \phi_{\text{lin}}(\xi)} \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{\xi_0^2 2^{j/2}} \\ \left\| \frac{\psi_j^+(\xi)}{\partial_\xi \phi_{\text{lin}}(\xi)} \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{2^{j/2}}{\xi_0^2} \quad (29)$$

Integrating by parts, we find that

$$|P_j^\pm u(x, t)| \lesssim \frac{1}{t} \int_0^\infty \left| \partial_\xi \frac{\psi_j^+(\xi)}{\partial_\xi \phi_{\text{lin}}(\xi)} \right| |\psi_{\sim j}^+ \hat{f}(\xi)| d\xi \quad (30a)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{t} \int_0^\infty \left| \frac{\psi_j^+(\xi)}{\partial_\xi \phi_{\text{lin}}(\xi)} \right| |\psi_{\sim j}^+ \partial_\xi \hat{f}(\xi)| d\xi \quad (30b)$$

Using the bounds (29) and arguing as in the case $|\xi_0| < 2^{j-10}$, we find that

$$(30a) \lesssim t^{-1} \xi_0^{-2} 2^{-j/2} \|\widehat{Q_{\sim j} f}\|_{L^2} \\ \lesssim t^{-1/3} \left(t^{1/3} 2^{-j/3} \xi_0^{-4/3}\right)^{-3/2} \|f\|_{X_j}$$

and

$$(30b) \lesssim t^{-1} \xi_0^{-2} 2^{j/2} \|\widehat{Q_{\sim j} \partial_\xi f}\|_{L^2} \\ \lesssim t^{-1/3} \left(t^{1/3} 2^{-j/3} \xi_0^{-4/3}\right)^{-3/2} \|f\|_{X_j}$$

which yields the desired bound for $P_j^+ u(x, t)$.

Case $x > 0$, $2^{j-10} \leq |\xi_0| \leq 2^{j+10}$. Here, $|\partial_\xi \phi_{\text{lin}}| \sim \xi_0^{-2}$, and the estimate is identical to the previous case.

Case $x < 0$, $2^{j-10} \leq |\xi_0| \leq 2^{j+10}$. Since $\partial_\xi \phi_{\text{lin}}$ vanishes at $\xi = \xi_0$, we employ the method of stationary phase. Let us write

$$P_j^+ u(x, t) = \sum_{\ell=\ell_0}^{j+10} I_{j,\ell}$$

where

$$I_{j,\ell} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_0^\infty \psi_j^+(\xi) \psi_\ell(\xi - \xi_0) e^{it\phi_{\text{lin}}(\xi)} \widehat{Q_{\sim j} f}(\xi) d\xi, \quad \ell > \ell_0 \\ I_{j,\ell_0} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_0^\infty \psi_j^+(\xi) \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\xi - \xi_0) e^{it\phi_{\text{lin}}(\xi)} \widehat{Q_{\sim j} f}(\xi) d\xi$$

and ℓ_0 is chosen such that $2^{\ell_0} \sim t^{-1/3} (2^j t^{1/3})^{-3/7}$.

For the $I_{j,\ell}$ factors with $\ell > \ell_0$, we have that $|\partial_\xi \phi_{\text{lin}}| \sim 2^\ell 2^j$. Integrating by parts, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{j,\ell}| &\lesssim \frac{1}{t} \int_0^\infty \left| \partial_\xi \frac{\psi_j^+(\xi) \psi_\ell(\xi - \xi_0)}{\partial_\xi \phi_{\text{lin}}} \right| |\psi_{\sim j}(\xi) \hat{f}(\xi)| d\xi \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{t} \int_0^\infty \left| \frac{\psi_j^+(\xi) \psi_\ell(\xi - \xi_0)}{\partial_\xi \phi_{\text{lin}}} \right| |\psi_{\sim j}(\xi) \partial_\xi \hat{f}(\xi)| d\xi \\ &\lesssim t^{-1} \left(2^{-j} 2^{-\ell} \|\widehat{Q_{\sim j} f}\|_{L^\infty} + 2^{-j} 2^{-\ell/2} \|\partial_\xi \widehat{Q_{\sim j} f}\|_{L^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

summing over $\ell > \ell_0$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell > \ell_0} |I_{j,\ell}| &\lesssim t^{-1} \left(2^{-j} 2^{-\ell_0} \|\widehat{Q_{\sim k} f}\|_{L^\infty} + 2^{-j} 2^{-\ell_0/2} \|\partial_\xi \widehat{Q_{\sim j} f}\|_{L^2} \right) \\ &\lesssim \left(t^{-1} 2^{-j} 2^{-\ell_0} + t^{-5/6} 2^{-j} 2^{-\ell_0/2} \right) \|f\|_{X_j} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

For the I_{j,ℓ_0} term, we write

$$I_{j,\ell_0} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_0^\infty \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\xi - \xi_0) e^{it\phi_{\text{lin}}(\xi)} \left(\psi_j^+(\xi) \widehat{Q_{\sim j} f}(\xi) - \psi_j^+(\xi_0) \widehat{Q_{\sim j} f}(\xi_0) \right) d\xi \quad (32a)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \psi_j^+(\xi_0) \hat{f}(\xi_0) \int_0^\infty \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\xi - \xi_0) \left(e^{it\phi_{\text{lin}}(\xi)} - e^{6it\xi_0(\xi - \xi_0)^2 - 2it\xi_0^3} \right) d\xi \quad (32b)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \psi_j^+(\xi_0) \hat{f}(\xi_0) e^{-2it\xi_0^3} \int_0^\infty \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\xi - \xi_0) e^{6it\xi_0\xi^2} d\xi \quad (32c)$$

For the first term, we note that

$$\left| \psi_j^+(\xi) \widehat{Q_{\sim j} f}(\xi) - \psi_j^+(\xi_0) \widehat{Q_{\sim j} f}(\xi_0) \right| \lesssim (2^{-j} |\xi - \xi_0| + t^{1/6} |\xi - \xi_0|^{1/2}) \|f\|_{X_j}$$

by the Sobolev-Morrey embedding $\dot{H}^1 \rightarrow C^{0,1/2}$. Using this bound, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} |(32a)| &\lesssim \int_0^\infty \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\xi - \xi_0) \left(|\xi - \xi_0| 2^{-j} + t^{1/6} |\xi - \xi_0|^{1/2} \right) \|f\|_{X_j} d\xi \\ &\lesssim \left(2^{3/2\ell_0} t^{1/6} + 2^{-j} 2^{2\ell_0} \right) \|f\|_{X_j} \end{aligned}$$

For the second term, we observe that

$$\phi_{\text{lin}}(\xi) = -2\xi_0^3 + 6\xi_0(\xi - \xi_0)^2 + (\xi - \xi_0)^3$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} |(32b)| &\lesssim \|\psi_j^+(\xi) \hat{f}(\xi)\|_{L^\infty} \int_0^\infty \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\xi - \xi_0) \left| e^{it(\xi - \xi_0)^3} - 1 \right| d\xi \\ &\lesssim t 2^{4\ell_0} \|f\|_{X_k} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, rescaling and using the classical stationary phase estimate gives

$$\begin{aligned} (32c) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \psi_j^+(\xi_0) \hat{f}(\xi_0) e^{-2it\xi_0^3} \int_0^\infty \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\xi - \xi_0) e^{6it\xi_0(\xi - \xi_0)^2} d\xi \\ &= \frac{2^{\ell_0}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \psi_j^+(\xi_0) \hat{f}(\xi_0) e^{-2it\xi_0^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi_{\leq 0}(\xi) e^{6it\xi_0 2^{2\ell_0} \xi^2} d\xi \\ &= \frac{\psi_j^+(\xi_0) \hat{f}(\xi_0)}{\sqrt{12t\xi_0}} e^{-2it\xi_0^3 + i\frac{\pi}{4}} + O\left(t^{-3/2} 2^{-2\ell_0} 2^{-3/2j} \|\widehat{Q_{\sim j} f}\|_{L^\infty}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Collecting the terms (31) and (32a)–(32c) and recalling the definition of ℓ_0 , we find that

$$u(t, x) = \frac{\psi_j^+(\xi_0)\hat{f}(\xi_0)}{\sqrt{12t\xi_0}} e^{-2it\xi_0^3 + i\frac{\pi}{4}} + O\left(t^{-1/3}(2^j t^{1/3})^{-9/14} \|f\|_{X_j}\right) \quad \square$$

As a corollary of the above estimate, we obtain an improved bilinear decay estimate:

Corollary 6. *If $f, g \in X$, then*

$$|e^{-t\partial_x^3} f e^{-t\partial_x^3} \partial_x g| \lesssim t^{-1} \|f\|_X \|g\|_X$$

Proof. We will prove that

$$|\chi_k e^{-t\partial_x^3} f e^{-t\partial_x^3} \partial_x g| \lesssim t^{-1} \|f\|_X \|g\|_X$$

which gives the desired result. Using Lemma 5, we find that

$$|\chi_{\sim k} Q_j e^{-t\partial_x^3} f| \lesssim \begin{cases} t^{-5/6} 2^{-3/2j} \|f\|_{X_j} & k < j - 20 \\ t^{-1/2} 2^{-k/2} \|f\|_{X_j} & |j - k| \leq 20 \\ t^{-5/6} 2^{j/2-2k} \|f\|_{X_j} & k > j + 20 \end{cases}$$

Thus, summing in j , we find that

$$|\chi_{\sim k} e^{-t\partial_x^3} f| \lesssim t^{-1/2} 2^{-k/2} \|f\|_X$$

Now, $\|\partial_x g\|_{X_j} \sim 2^j \|g\|_{X_j}$, so a similar calculation shows that

$$|\chi_{\sim k} e^{-t\partial_x^3} \partial_x g| \lesssim t^{-1/2} 2^{k/2} \|g\|_X$$

which gives the result. \square

Remark 9. *Although Corollary 6 does not apply directly to pseudoproducts, we will see in Section 6 that Lemma 5 can be used together with the pseudolocality of pseudoproducts given in Lemma 4 to give bounds of the same type for pseudoproducts involving a $\partial_x u$ term.*

From the proof of Corollary 6, we also get a decay bound on $\chi_{\geq k} u$:

Corollary 7. *If $f \in X$ and $u = e^{-t\partial_x^3} f$,*

$$\|\chi_{\geq k} u\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim t^{-1/2} 2^{-k/2} \|f\|_X$$

It will also be important later to have decay estimates for $e^{-t\partial_x^3} g$ when $\hat{g}(0) = 0$. We record them here:

Corollary 8. *Suppose $\hat{g}(0) = 0$ and $xg \in L^2$. Then, if $w = e^{-t\partial_x^3} g$, we have the bounds*

$$|Q_j w| \lesssim \left(t^{-1/2} \chi_{\sim j} + t^{-5/6} 2^{j/2} \left(2^j + 2^{-j/3} |\xi_0|^{4/3} \right)^{-3/2} \right) \|xg\|_{L^2} c_j \quad (33)$$

and

$$\|\chi_k w\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim t^{-1/2} \|xg\|_{L^2} c_k \quad (34)$$

Proof. By the Morrey-Sobolev embedding $\dot{H}^1 \rightarrow C^{1/2}$, we have that for $2^j \gtrsim t^{-1/3}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|g\|_{X_j} &= \|\mathcal{F}(Q_{[j-10, j+10]} g)\|_{L^\infty} + t^{-1/6} \|xQ_{[j-10, j+10]} g\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim (1 + t^{-1/6} 2^{-j/2}) \|\mathcal{F}(Q_{[j-20, j+20]} g)\|_{L^\infty} + t^{-1/6} \|Q_{[j-20, j+20]}(xg)\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim 2^{j/2} \|Q_{[j-30, j+30]}(xg)\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

so applying Lemma 5 gives (33). To prove the localized bound (34), we note that (33) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\chi_k w\|_{L^\infty} &\leq \|\chi_k Q_{\sim k} w\|_{L^\infty} + \|\chi_k Q_{\ll k} w\|_{L^\infty} + \|\chi_k Q_{\gg k} w\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\lesssim \sum_{|k-\ell|\leq 10} \|Q_\ell w\|_{L^\infty} + t^{-5/6} \sum_{\ell < k-10} \|\chi_k Q_\ell w\|_{L^\infty} + \sum_{\ell > k+10} \|\chi_k Q_\ell w\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\lesssim \sum_{|k-\ell|\leq 10} t^{-1/2} \|xg\|_{L^2 C_\ell} + t^{-5/6} \sum_{\ell < k-10} 2^{\ell-2k} \|xg\|_{L^2} + \sum_{\ell > k+10} 2^{-\ell} \|xg\|_{L^2} \\
&\lesssim t^{-1/2} \|xg\|_{L^2 C_k} + t^{-5/6} 2^{-k} \|xg\|_{L^2}
\end{aligned}$$

which can be seen to satisfy the required ℓ_k^2 summability condition. \square

3.2. Bounds for cubic terms. Since the complex mKdV equation has a cubic nonlinearity, we will naturally find ourselves dealing with frequency-localized terms of the form $Q_j(|u|^2 \partial_x u)$ and the like. In this section, we collect some basic bounds for these terms for later reference. Let $u_i = e^{-t\partial_x^3} f_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $f_i \in X$. We begin by considering $\chi_{\geq j-10} Q_{\sim j}(u_1 u_2 u_3)$. Using (20) to control the error in commuting the physical and Fourier localization operators, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\chi_{\geq j-10} Q_{\sim j}(u_1 u_2 u_3)\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \|\chi_{\geq j-10} Q_{\sim j}(\chi_{\geq j-20} u_1 u_2 u_3)\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\quad + \|\chi_{\geq j-10} Q_{\sim j}(\chi_{< j-20} u_1 u_2 u_3)\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\lesssim \|\chi_{\geq j-30} u_1\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{\geq j-30} u_2\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{\geq j-30} u_3\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\quad + (t^{3j})^{-1} \|u_1\|_{L^\infty} \|u_2\|_{L^\infty} \|u_3\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\lesssim t^{-3/2} 2^{-3/2j} \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_X
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Arguing in the same manner, we find that

$$\|\chi_{\geq j-10} Q_{\lesssim j}(u_1 u_2 u_3)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim t^{-3/2} 2^{-3/2j} \|f_1\|_X \|f_2\|_X \|f_3\|_X \tag{36}$$

Moreover, by using the bilinear decay estimate given in Corollary 6, we can obtain analogous bounds for terms containing a derivative:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\chi_{\geq j-10} Q_{\sim j}(u_1 \partial_x u_2 u_3)\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim t^{-3/2} 2^{-j/2} \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_X \\
\|\chi_{\geq j-10} Q_{\lesssim j}(u_1 \partial_x u_2 u_3)\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim t^{-3/2} 2^{-j/2} \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_X
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

In the bounds (35)–(37), the frequency localization in some sense plays no role, in that the bounds would remain true if we removed the frequency projection operator. The situation changes when we consider the cubic $Q_{\sim j}(u_1 u_2 u_3)$ in the region $|x| \ll t2^{2j}$, since the frequency localization eliminates

the worst contribution in this region. A straightforward paraproduct decomposition yields

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\sim j}(u_1 u_2 u_3) = & Q_{\sim j} \left(u_{1, < j-20} u_{2, < j-20} u_{3, j-20} + u_{1, [j-20, j+20]} u_{2, < j-20} u_{3, < j-20} \right. \\ & + \sum_{\ell \geq j-20} u_{1, \ell} u_{2, [\ell-20, \ell+20]} u_{3, < \ell-20} \\ & + \sum_{\ell \geq j-20} u_{1, \ell} u_{2, [\ell-20, \ell+20]} u_{3, [\ell-20, \ell+20]} \left. \right) \\ & + \{\text{similar terms}\} \end{aligned}$$

Note that the term $Q_{\sim j}(u_{1, < j-20} u_{2, < j-20} u_{3, j-20})$ vanishes. If $k < j - 30$, then we can use (20) to commute the physical- and frequency-space localizations and apply Lemma 5 to find that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \chi_k Q_{\sim j}(u_{1, [j-20, j+20]} u_{2, < j-20} u_{3, < j-20}) \right\|_{L^\infty} & \lesssim t^{-11/6} 2^{-3/2j-k} \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_X \\ \left\| \chi_k Q_{\sim j}(u_{1, \ell} u_{2, [\ell-20, \ell+20]} u_{3, < \ell-20}) \right\|_{L^\infty} & \lesssim \left(t^{-13/6} 2^{-3\ell-k/2} + t^{-7/3} 2^{-j-2k-\ell} \right) \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_X \\ \left\| \chi_k Q_{\sim j}(u_{1, \ell} u_{2, [\ell-20, \ell+20]} u_{3, [\ell-20, \ell+20]}) \right\|_{L^\infty} & \lesssim \left(t^{-5/2} 2^{-9/2\ell} + t^{-5/2} 2^{-j-2k-3/2\ell} \right) \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_X \end{aligned}$$

Summing in ℓ , we find that

$$\left\| \chi_k Q_{\sim j}(u_1 u_2 u_3) \right\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim t^{-11/6} 2^{-3/2j} \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_X \quad (38)$$

Summing over $k < j - 30$ and combining the result with (35), we obtain the bound

$$\left\| Q_{\sim j}(u_1 u_2 u_3) \right\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim t^{-3/2} 2^{-3/2j} \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_X \quad (39)$$

By a similar argument, we find that for $k < j - 30$,

$$\left\| \chi_k Q_{\sim j}(u_1 \partial_x u_2 u_3) \right\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim t^{-11/6} 2^{-j/2} 2^{-k} \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_X \quad (40)$$

so

$$\left\| Q_{\sim j}(u_1 \partial_x u_2 u_3) \right\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim t^{-3/2} 2^{-j/2} \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_X \quad (41)$$

It will also be important to bound the mean of terms like $|u|^2 \partial_x u$, since these terms will arise naturally when we consider $\partial_t \hat{u}(0, t)$.

Theorem 9. *Suppose $u_i = e^{-t\partial_x^3} f_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then,*

$$\int u_1 \overline{u_2} \partial_x u_3 \, dx \lesssim t^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_X \quad (42)$$

If instead $\hat{f}_k(0, t) = 0$, then

$$\int u_1 \overline{u_2} \partial_x u_3 dx \lesssim t^{-7/6} \|Lu_k\|_{L^2} \prod_{i \in \{1, 2, 3\} \setminus \{k\}} \|f_i\|_X \quad (43)$$

Proof. Let us write

$$\int u_1 \overline{u_2} \partial_x u_3 dx = I_j + \tilde{I}_j$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_j &= \int u_{1,j} \overline{u_{2,\leq j}} \partial_x u_3 dx \\ \tilde{I}_j &= \int u_{1,<j} \overline{u_{2,j}} \partial_x u_3 dx \end{aligned}$$

We will show how to bound the I_j : the bounds for \tilde{I}_j are analogous.

For $2^j \sim t^{-1/3}$, we note that we can replace the u_3 factor in the definition with $u_{3,\leq j}$, so

$$\begin{aligned} I_j &\lesssim \|u_{1,j}\|_{L^\infty} \|u_{2,\leq j}\|_{L^2} \|\partial_x u_{3,\leq j}\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim t^{-1/3} 2^{2j} \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_X \\ &\lesssim t^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_X \end{aligned}$$

which is acceptable, so it only remains to consider the case $2^j \gg t^{-1/3}$. There, we can write

$$I_j = - \int e^{it\phi(0,\eta,\sigma)} (\eta + \sigma) \psi_j(\eta) \psi_{\leq j}(-\sigma) \hat{f}_1(\eta) \overline{\hat{f}_2(-\sigma)} \hat{f}_3(-\eta - \sigma) d\eta d\sigma$$

where ϕ is the four-wave mixing function given in (12). Since $\nabla_{\eta,\sigma} \phi(0, \eta, \sigma)$ vanishes only at $\eta = \sigma = 0$, we can integrate by parts using the identity

$$e^{it\phi(0,\eta,\sigma)} = \frac{\nabla_{\eta,\sigma} \phi(0, \eta, \sigma)}{it |\nabla_{\eta,\sigma} \phi(0, \eta, \sigma)|^2} \cdot e^{it\phi(0,\eta,\sigma)}$$

to find that

$$I_j = - \frac{i}{t} \int \nabla_{\eta,\sigma} \cdot m_j(\eta, \sigma) \hat{f}_1(\eta) \overline{\hat{f}_2(-\sigma)} \hat{f}_3(-\eta - \sigma) d\eta d\sigma \quad (44a)$$

$$- \frac{i}{t} \int m_j^\eta \partial_\eta \hat{f}_1(\eta) \overline{\hat{f}_2(-\sigma)} \hat{f}_3(-\eta - \sigma) d\eta d\sigma \quad (44b)$$

$$- \frac{i}{t} \int m_j^\sigma \hat{f}_1(\eta) \partial_\sigma \overline{\hat{f}_2(-\sigma)} \hat{f}_3(-\eta - \sigma) d\eta d\sigma \quad (44c)$$

$$+ \frac{i}{t} \int (m_j^\eta + m_j^\sigma) \hat{f}_1(\eta) \overline{\hat{f}_2(-\sigma)} \partial_\eta \hat{f}_3(-\eta - \sigma) d\eta d\sigma \quad (44d)$$

where m_j is the (vector-valued) symbol

$$m_j(\eta, \sigma) = \frac{(\eta + \sigma) \psi_j(\eta) \psi_{\leq j}(-\sigma) \nabla_{\eta,\sigma} \phi(0, \eta, \sigma)}{|\nabla_{\eta,\sigma} \phi(0, \eta, \sigma)|^2}$$

with components m_j^η and m_j^σ . Let us first consider (44a). We can rewrite this term as the Fourier transform of a pseudoproduct

$$(44a) = 2\pi it^{-1} 2^{-2j} \hat{T}_{m_j^1}(u_{1,\sim j}, \overline{u_{2,\lesssim j}}, u_{3,\lesssim j})(0)$$

with symbol

$$m_j^1 = 2^{2j} \psi_j(\xi) \nabla_{\eta,\sigma} \cdot m_j$$

Now, m_j^1 obeys the symbol bounds

$$|\partial_{\xi,\eta,\sigma}^\alpha m_j^1| \lesssim 2^{-|\alpha|j}, \quad |\text{supp } m_j^1| \lesssim 2^{3j}$$

so by Remark 8 the pseudoproduct $T_{m_j^1}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ satisfies Hölder-type bounds uniformly in j . Thus, the Hausdorff-Young inequality gives us the bound

$$\begin{aligned} |(44a)| &\lesssim t^{-1} 2^{-2j} \|T_{m_j^1}(u_{1,\sim j}, \overline{u_{2,\lesssim j}}, u_{3,\lesssim j})\|_{L^1} \\ &\lesssim t^{-1} 2^{-2j} \|u_{1,\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|u_{2,\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} \|u_{3,\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim t^{-3/2} 2^{-3/2j} \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_X \end{aligned}$$

Turning to (44b), we write

$$(44b) = 2\pi it^{-1} 2^{-j} \hat{T}_{m_j^2}(Lu_1, \overline{u_{2,\lesssim j}}, u_{3,\sim j})(0) + 2\pi it^{-1} 2^{-j} \hat{T}_{m_j^3}(Lu_1, \overline{u_{2,\lesssim j}}, u_{3,\sim j})(0)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} m_j^2 &= 2^j \psi_j(\xi) m_j^\eta \\ m_j^3 &= 2^j \psi_j(\xi) m_j^\eta \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that m_j^2 and m_j^3 satisfy the symbol bounds from Remark 8 uniformly in j , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} |(44b)| &\lesssim t^{-1} 2^{-j} \|T_{m_j^2}(Lu_1, \overline{u_{2,\lesssim j}}, u_{3,\sim j})\|_{L^1} + t^{-1} 2^{-j} \|T_{m_j^3}(Lu_1, \overline{u_{2,\lesssim j}}, u_{3,\sim j})\|_{L^1} \\ &\lesssim t^{-1} 2^{-j} \|Lu_1\|_{L^2} (\|u_{2,\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|u_{3,\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} + \|u_{2,\ll j}\|_{L^2} \|u_{3,\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}) \\ &\lesssim t^{-4/3} 2^{-j} \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_X \end{aligned}$$

The estimates for (44c) and (44d) are analogous. Thus,

$$\sum_{2j \gg t^{-1/3}} I_j \lesssim t^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_X$$

which completes the proof of (42).

To prove (43), we observe that the only place we used the assumption $f_k \in X$ was to obtain bounds of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \|Lu_k\|_{L^2} &\lesssim t^{1/6} \|f_k\|_X \\ \|u_{k,\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} &\lesssim 2^{j/2} \|f_k\|_X \\ \|u_{k,\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim t^{-1/2} 2^{-j/2} \|f_k\|_X \end{aligned}$$

If we instead estimate these quantities in terms of $\|Lu_k\|_{L^2}$, we gain a factor of $t^{1/6}$ when estimating terms containing Lu_k . For the other terms, we see from Corollary 8 that

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_{k,\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} &\lesssim 2^j \|Lu_k\|_{L^2} \\ \|u_{k,\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim t^{-1/2} \|Lu_k\|_{L^2}\end{aligned}$$

so we gain a factor of $2^{j/2}$ in this case. Modifying the estimates in light of this, we obtain (43). \square

4. BOUNDS FOR THE SELF-SIMILAR TERM

As discussed in the introduction, we are interested in the self-similar solutions S given by

$$S(x, t; p) = t^{-1/3} \sigma(t^{-1/3} x; p)$$

where σ solves the third order ODE

$$\partial_y^3 \sigma(y; p) - \frac{1}{3} y \partial_y \sigma(y; p) - \frac{1}{3} \sigma(y; p) = \pm |\sigma(y; p)|^2 \partial_y \sigma(y; p) \quad (45)$$

subject to the (nonlocal) boundary condition $\hat{\sigma}(0; p) = p$. We will see that this condition uniquely specifies σ once we restrict to the class of solutions which are compatible with the asymptotics of u .

Since the solutions u we are considering to (1) are bounded, we would like our self-similar solutions σ to be bounded. This boundedness assumption allows us to treat the nonlinearity in (45) perturbatively as $y \rightarrow \infty$, giving us the asymptotics

$$\sigma(y; p) \sim c_1(p) \text{Ai}(3^{-1/2} y) + c_2(p) \text{Bi}(3^{-1/2} y) + c_3(p) \text{Gi}(3^{-1/2} y) \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow \infty$$

where Ai and Bi are the Airy functions of the first and second kind, Gi is Scorer's function [50], and the $c_j(p)$'s are constants. Since $\text{Bi}(y) \rightarrow \infty$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$, we immediately conclude that $c_2(p) = 0$. Our functional framework also requires that Lu remain in L^2 , so we must also impose the condition $LS \in L^2$. This condition translates to the requirement that $(\partial_y^2 - \frac{1}{3}y)\sigma(y; p) \in L_y^2$, and since $(\partial_y^2 - \frac{1}{3}y) \text{Gi}(3^{-1/2} y) = -\frac{1}{3\pi} \neq 0$, we see that $c_3(p) = 0$. Thus, we are seeking self-similar solutions to complex mKdV which are asymptotic to some multiple of $\text{Ai}(3^{-1/2} y)$ at infinity. This problem has received a good deal of study, see [9, 12, 29]. In particular, from [9] we know that σ is the solution to the Painlevé II equation:

$$\begin{cases} \sigma''(y; p) = \frac{1}{3} y \sigma(y; p) \pm |\sigma(y; p)|^2 \sigma(y; p) \\ \hat{\sigma}(0; p) = p \\ \hat{\sigma}(\cdot; p) \text{ is continuous at } 0 \end{cases} \quad (46)$$

We note that (46) is phase rotation invariant, so $\sigma(y; p e^{i\theta}) = e^{i\theta} \sigma(y; p)$ when r and θ are real.

We derived (46) under the relatively weak assumptions that S was bounded and $LS \in L^2$. However, we can say much more about the pointwise behavior of S and LS using (46). Let $\Phi = e^{-\partial_x^3} \sigma$. Then, by [9, Theorem 1], we have that

$$\|\hat{\Phi}\|_{L^\infty} + \|x\Phi\|_{L^2} \lesssim |p|$$

It follows that $h(x, t; p) := e^{t\partial_x^3} S(x, t; p) = t^{-1/3} \Phi(t^{-1/3} x; p)$ satisfies $\|h\|_X \lesssim p$, so the pointwise behavior of S is given by Lemma 5 (cf. [12, 29]). Turning to LS , we note that (46) implies that

$$LS = \mp 3t |S|^2 S \quad (47)$$

In particular, this gives us the weighted L^2 bound $\|LS\|_{L^2} \lesssim t \|S\|_{L^6}^3 \lesssim |p|^3 t^{1/6}$. Similarly, we can use (45) to find that

$$\partial_x LS = \mp 3 |S|^2 \partial_x S \quad (48)$$

Since our argument involves modulating around S , we need σ to have some smoothness in the p parameter. The nonlinearity of (46) is not analytic, so we cannot expect σ to be complex differentiable in p . However, $\sigma(x+iy; p)$ is differentiable as a function of x and y , which is sufficient for our purposes. In particular, for $p : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ differentiable, we have that

$$\partial_s \sigma(x; p(s)) = [\partial_{\Re p} \sigma] \Re p'(s) + [\partial_{\Im p} \sigma] \Im p'(s) =: D_p \sigma p'(s) \quad (49)$$

where we have abused notation slightly by interpreting $D_p \sigma$ as the derivative of a function from $\mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and p as a function from $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$. Changing to polar coordinates $p = re^{i\theta}$ and exploiting the phase rotation invariance of the equation, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_r \sigma(y; re^{i\theta}) &= e^{i\theta} \partial_r \sigma(y; r) \\ \partial_\theta \sigma(y; re^{i\theta}) &= ie^{i\theta} \sigma(y; r) = i\sigma(x, re^{i\theta}) \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Recall that by [9, Theorem 1] the profile Φ satisfies

$$\hat{\Phi}(\xi; r) = \chi(\xi) e^{ia \ln |\xi|} \left(A + B e^{2ia \ln |\xi|} \frac{e^{-i\frac{8}{9}\xi^3}}{\xi^3} \right) + z(\xi; r)$$

where χ is a cut-off function supported on $|\xi| \geq 1$, A, B , and a are real-valued and have a Lipschitz dependence on r (at least for r sufficiently small), and z is some function which has a Lipschitz dependence on r with respect to the norm

$$\|z\|_Z := \|z(\xi) \langle \xi \rangle^k\|_{L^\infty} + \|z'(\xi) \langle \xi \rangle^{k+1}\|_{L^\infty}$$

for $k \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{4}{7})$. From this, we can see that the worst term in $\partial_r \hat{\Phi}$ occurs when the derivative hits the logarithmically oscillating phase, so

$$|\partial_r \hat{\Phi}(\xi; r)| \lesssim \ln(2 + |\xi|)$$

Similarly, differentiating in ξ , we find that

$$|\partial_\xi \partial_r \hat{\Phi}(\xi)| \lesssim \frac{\ln 2 + |\xi|}{\langle \xi \rangle} + O(\langle \xi \rangle^{-3/2})$$

so $\partial_r h(x, t; p) = t^{-1/3} \partial_r \Phi(t^{-1/3} x; p)$ satisfies the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_r h\|_{X_j} &= \|\widehat{Q_{\sim j} \partial_r h}\|_{L^\infty} + t^{-1/6} \|x(Q_{\sim j} \partial_r h)\|_{L^2} \\ &= \|\widehat{Q_{\sim j} \partial_r \Phi}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_\xi \widehat{Q_{\sim j} \partial_r \Phi}\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \ln(2 + t^{1/3} 2^j) \end{aligned}$$

In particular, applying Lemma 5, we find that

$$|Q_{\sim j} \partial_r S| \lesssim t^{-1/2} 2^{-j/2} \ln(2 + t^{-1/3} 2^j) \chi_{\sim j} + t^{-5/6} \ln(2 + t^{-1/3} 2^j) \left(2^j + 2^{-j/3} |\xi_0(x)|^{4/3} \right)^{-3/2}$$

where $\xi_0 = \xi_0(x)$ is as in Lemma 5. Since $\partial_\theta S = iS$ satisfies better estimates, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_{\sim j} D_p S\|_{L^\infty} &= \frac{1}{|p|} \|Q_{\sim j} \partial_\theta S\|_{L^\infty} + \|Q_{\sim j} \partial_r S\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim t^{-1/2} 2^{-j/2} \ln(2 + t^{1/3} 2^j) \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

and, for $4 < q < \infty$

$$\|Q_{\sim j} D_p S\|_{L^q} \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{q}} 2^{(-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{q})j} \ln(2 + t^{1/3} 2^j) \quad (52)$$

which can be summed to give

$$\|D_p S\|_{L^q} \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3p}} \quad (53)$$

To perform the weighted L^2 estimates, we also need a bound on $LD_p S$ in L^2 . As above, we have

$$\|LD_p S\|_{L^2} = t^{1/6} \|LD_p \sigma\|_{L^2} \lesssim t^{1/6} \frac{1}{|p|} \|(3\partial_y^2 - y)\partial_\theta \sigma\|_{L^2} + t^{1/6} \|(3\partial_y^2 - y)\partial_r \sigma\|_{L^2}$$

Since $\partial_\theta \sigma = i\sigma$, we have from (46) that

$$\frac{1}{p} \|L\partial_\theta \sigma\|_{L^2} = \frac{1}{|p|} \|(3\partial_y^2 - y)\sigma\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{|p|} \|\sigma\|_{L^6}^3 \lesssim |p|^2$$

and the problem reduces to finding bounds on $(3\partial_y^2 - y)\partial_r \sigma(y; r)$ for r real. Differentiating (46) shows that $\partial_r \sigma(y; r)$ satisfies $(3\partial_y^2 - y)\partial_r \sigma = \pm 3\sigma^2 \partial_r \sigma$. Using the L^6 estimates for σ and $\partial_r \sigma$ (which follow immediately from the estimates for S and $\partial_r S$ given above), we obtain the bound

$$\|(\partial_x^2 - x)\partial_r \sigma\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\sigma\|_{L^6}^2 \|\partial_r \sigma\|_{L^6} \lesssim |p|^2$$

and so

$$\|LD_p S\|_{L^2} \lesssim t^{1/6} |p|^2 \quad (54)$$

5. REDUCTION OF THE MAIN THEOREM

5.1. Reduction of the main theorem to profile estimates. Let

$$w(x, t) = u(x, t) - S(x, t; \hat{u}(0, t))$$

and define $g = e^{t\partial_x^3} w$. The remainder of the paper will be devoted to proving the nonlinear bounds on f and g given in the following theorem:

Theorem 10. *There exists an $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that if $u_* \in H^2$ and $\|\hat{u}_*\|_{L^\infty} + \|xu_*\|_{L^2} \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, then the solution u to (3) is global, and the following bounds hold for all $t \in [1, \infty)$*

$$\|xg(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \epsilon t^{1/6-\beta} \quad (55)$$

$$\|\hat{f}(t)\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \epsilon \quad (56)$$

where $\beta = \beta(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{6} - C\epsilon^2$ for some constant C . Moreover,

$$|\partial_t \hat{u}(0, t)| \lesssim \epsilon^3 t^{-1-\beta} \quad (57)$$

and there exists a bounded function $f_\infty(\xi)$ such that

$$\hat{f}(\xi, t) = \exp\left(\pm \frac{i}{6} \int_1^t \frac{|\hat{f}(\xi, s)|^2}{s} ds\right) f_\infty(\xi) + O(\epsilon^3 (t^{-1/3} |\xi|)^{-1/14}) \quad (58)$$

Assuming Theorem 10, we can prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. We first show that u satisfies the linear estimates from Lemma 5. By (56), $|\hat{u}(0, t)| = |\hat{f}(0, t)| \lesssim \epsilon$, so $\|LS\|_{L^2} \lesssim \epsilon^3 t^{1/6}$ by (47). Combining this with the bound for xg , we see that

$$\|xf\|_{L^2} \leq \|xg\|_{L^2} + \|LS\|_{L^2} \lesssim \epsilon t^{1/6}$$

Recalling the \mathcal{FL}^∞ bound given in (56), we see that $\|f\|_X \lesssim \epsilon$, which is enough to give the asymptotics (5) for $x > t^{1/3}$ using Lemma 5. By using the more precise expression for \hat{f} given in (58), we see that u has the modified scattering asymptotics given by (6) in the region $x < -t^{-1/3}$.

It only remains to verify that the asymptotics for $|x| \lesssim t^{1/3+4\beta}$ are given by (7). By Corollary 8 and the hypothesis (55), $\|w\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \epsilon t^{-1/3-\beta}$, so in the region $|x| \lesssim t^{1/3+4\beta}$

$$u(x, t) = S(x, t; \hat{u}(0, t)) + O(\epsilon t^{-1/3-\beta}) \quad (59)$$

Moreover, since $t^{-1-\beta}$ is integrable over $[1, \infty)$, (57) implies that $\alpha = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \hat{u}(0, t)$ has size $O(\epsilon)$ and satisfies $|\hat{u}(0, t) - \alpha| = O(\epsilon^3 t^{-\beta})$. Using (51) to bound the terms $\|Q_j D_p S\|_{L^\infty}$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|S(x, t; \hat{u}(0, t)) - S(x, t; \alpha)\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \sum_{2^j \geq t^{-1/3}} \|Q_j D_p S\|_{L^\infty} |\hat{u}(0, t) - \alpha| \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^3 t^{-1/3-\beta} \end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (59), gives the self-similar asymptotics (7). \square

5.2. Plan of the proof of Theorem 10. We will use a bootstrap argument to prove Theorem 10. We begin with some qualitative observations about the local wellposedness of (3). By [40], (3) has a local solution on $[1, 1 + \delta]$ for some $\delta > 0$ such that $u(t)$ is continuous in H_x^2 and $xu(t)$ is continuous in L_x^2 . It follows that $f(t)$ is continuous in X over $[1, 1 + \delta]$. Theorem 9 then implies that

$$\partial_t \hat{u}(0, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int |u|^2 \partial_x u \, dx \in C(1, 1 + \delta)$$

with

$$|\partial_t \hat{u}(0, 0)| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left| \int |u_*|^2 \partial_x u_* \, dx \right| \lesssim \epsilon^3$$

Thus, for $T \leq 1 + \delta$ sufficiently close to 1, the following bootstrap hypotheses hold:

$$\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \left(\|\hat{f}(t)\|_{L^\infty} + t^{-1/6} \|xf(t)\|_{L^2} \right) \leq M\epsilon, \quad \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} |\partial_t \hat{u}(0, t)| \leq M^3 \epsilon^3 t^{-1-\beta} \quad (\text{BH})$$

where $M \gg 1$ is a large constant independent of u_* , the value of which we will specify later. Let us fix an $\epsilon_0 \ll M^{-3/2}$ independent of u_* , and suppose that $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$. Using (BH), we prove in Section 6 that $\|xg\|_{L^2} \leq C\epsilon t^{1/6-\beta}$ for some C independent of M . Then, by using this bound on xg in addition to the bootstrap hypotheses, we verify that $|\partial_t \hat{u}(0, t)| \leq CM^2 \epsilon^3 t^{-1-\beta}$ and that $\|\hat{f}(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\epsilon$ in Section 7, where again the constants C do not depend on M . These results imply that in fact we have the improved bounds

$$\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \left(\|\hat{f}(t)\|_{L^\infty} + t^{-1/6} \|xf(t)\|_{L^2} \right) \leq C\epsilon, \quad \sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} |\partial_t \hat{u}(0, t)| \leq CM^2 \epsilon^3 t^{-1-\beta} \quad (\text{BH}+)$$

In particular, since we are free to choose M , we may choose $M > C$, so that (BH+) are stronger than the original bootstrap hypotheses in (BH). Moreover, a simple energy estimate shows that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\partial_x^2 u\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \|u \partial_x u\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x^2 u\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|\partial_x^2 u\|_{L^2}^2$$

so, by Grönwall's inequality, $\|\partial_x^2 u\|_{L^2}$ grows at most at a polynomial rate in time. By using the L^∞ bound on \hat{f} to control the low frequencies, we see that $\|u\|_{H^2}$ does not blow up at time T . Since the results of [40] imply that the solution u can be continued until $\|xu\|_{L^2} + \|u\|_{H^2}$ blows up, we can extend to a solution to a longer time interval $[1, T']$ such that the bootstrap bounds (BH) hold up to time T' . By a standard continuity argument, this shows that the estimates (BH+) hold for all time. Moreover, in the course of proving the \mathcal{FL}^∞ bound in Section 7, we obtain (58), which proves Theorem 10 (and hence Theorem 1, as well).

5.3. Basic consequences of the bootstrap estimates. We close this section by listing some basic estimates that follow from the bootstrap assumptions (BH) and the material in Section 3.

We begin by discussing estimates for u . By the first bootstrap assumption, for $t \in [1, T]$,

$$\|f(t)\|_X \lesssim M\epsilon$$

Thus, Lemma 5 gives us the following bounds:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_j\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim M\epsilon t^{-1/2} 2^{-j/2} \\ \|\chi_{\geq k} u\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim M\epsilon t^{-1/2} 2^{-k/2} \\ \|\chi_{\geq j} u_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim M\epsilon t^{-5/6} 2^{-3/2j} \\ \|(1 - \chi_{\sim j})u_j\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim M\epsilon t^{-5/6} 2^{-3/2j} \\ \|u_j\|_{L^4} + \|\chi_j u\|_{L^4} &\lesssim M\epsilon s^{-1/4} \\ \|(1 - \chi_{\sim j})u_j\|_{L^4} &\lesssim M\epsilon s^{-7/12} 2^{-j} \\ \|\chi_{> j} u_{\ll j}\|_{L^4} &\lesssim M\epsilon s^{-7/12} 2^{-j} \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

We now consider the bounds for the self-similar solution $S = S(x, t; \hat{u}(0, t))$. From the bootstrap assumptions and the fact that $\epsilon \ll M^{-3/2}$, we find that

$$\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} |\hat{u}(0, t)| \leq \epsilon + \int_1^\infty M^3 \epsilon^3 s^{-1-\beta} ds \lesssim \epsilon$$

It follows from the work in Section 4 that S obeys all of the estimates in (60) but without the bootstrap factor M . In addition, by combining the identity (47) with the cubic estimates from Section 3.2, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(LS)_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \epsilon^3 t^{-1/2} 2^{-j/2} \\ \|\chi_k (LS)_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \epsilon^3 t^{-5/6} 2^{-3/2j} 2^{-k} \quad k < j - 30 \\ \|\chi_k (LS)_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \epsilon^3 t^{-1/2} 2^{-3/2k} \\ \|\chi_{\geq k} \partial_x (LS)_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \epsilon^3 t^{-1/2} 2^{-3/2k} \\ \|\partial_x (LS)_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \epsilon^3 t^{-1/2} 2^{-j/2} \\ \|\partial_x LS\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \epsilon^3 t^{-1/3} \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

All but the last equation are straightforward consequences of the cubic bounds (35)–(38), (40) and (41), and the last inequality follows from the second-to-last after summing in j .

Finally, we turn to the linear estimates for w . By Corollary 8, these estimates can be given in terms of $\|xg\|_{L^2}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_j\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim t^{-1/2} \|xg\|_{L^2} c_j \\ \|\chi_k w\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim t^{-1/2} \|xg\|_{L^2} c_k \\ \|\chi_k \partial_x w\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim t^{-1/2} 2^k \|xg\|_{L^2} c_k \\ \|\chi_k \partial_x w_j\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim t^{-5/6} \|xg\|_{L^2} c_j \quad k < j - 30 \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

The first two equations are simple restatements of Corollary 8, while the last two follow from applying Corollary 8 to $\partial_x g$. We will also often make use of L^2 estimates for w , so we record some below

for future reference:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|w_{\leq j}\|_{L^2} &\lesssim 2^j \|xg\|_{L^2} \\
\|w_j\|_{L^2} &\lesssim 2^j \|xg\|_{L^2} c_j \\
\|\partial_x w_{\leq j}\|_{L^2} &\lesssim 2^{2j} \|xg\|_{L^2} \\
\|\partial_x w_j\|_{L^2} &\lesssim 2^{2j} \|xg\|_{L^2} c_j \\
\|\chi_k w\|_{L^2} &\lesssim 2^k \|xg\|_{L^2} c_k \\
\|\chi_k \partial_x w\|_{L^2} &\lesssim 2^{2k} \|xg\|_{L^2} c_k \\
\|\chi_k \partial_x w_j\|_{L^2} &\lesssim t^{-1/3} 2^k \|xg\|_{L^2} c_j \quad k < j - 30
\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

The first four estimates follow from Hardy's inequality, and the other inequalities are direct consequences of the L^∞ estimates (62) and the estimate $\|\chi_{\sim k}\|_{L^2} \lesssim t^{1/2} 2^k$.

Remark 10. Observe that all of the above bounds are based estimates on the linear propagator. Since the linear propagator is well-behaved under the Littlewood-Paley projectors, all of the above estimates continue to hold if we replace u , S , or w with their Littlewood-Paley projections. For instance, we get the bound $\|\chi_k u_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim M\epsilon t^{-1/2} 2^{-k/2}$ from the second bound in (60).

6. THE WEIGHTED ENERGY ESTIMATE

In this section, we will show that $\|xg\|_{L^2} \lesssim \epsilon t^{1/6-\beta}$, where β is as in Theorem 10. To establish this bound, we show that the bootstrap hypotheses imply

$$\|xg(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \epsilon^2 + \int_1^t \left[M^2 \epsilon^2 s^{-1} \|xg(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + M^2 \epsilon^3 s^{-5/6-\beta} \|xg(s)\|_{L^2} \right] ds \tag{64}$$

for all $t \leq T$. By adding a factor of $\epsilon^2 t^{1/3-2\beta}$, (64) implies that

$$\|xg(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \epsilon^2 t^{1/3-2\beta} \lesssim \epsilon^2 + \int_1^t M^2 \epsilon^2 s^{-1} \left(\|xg(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \epsilon^2 s^{1/3-2\beta} \right) ds$$

(recall that by the definition of β , $\frac{1}{6} - \beta = O(M^2 \epsilon^2)$). Applying Grönwall's inequality, we obtain the desired bound for $\|xg(t)\|_{L^2}$. To prove (64), we write the inequality in differential form using the expansion

$$\begin{aligned}
x\partial_t g &= x e^{t\partial_x^3} (\partial_t + \partial_x^3)(u - S) \\
&= \pm x e^{t\partial_x^3} (|u|^2 \partial_x u - |S|^2 \partial_x S - D_p S \partial_t \hat{u}(0, t)) \\
&= \pm x e^{t\partial_x^3} (|u|^2 \partial_x w + (w\bar{u} + u\bar{w}) \partial_x S) - x e^{t\partial_x^3} D_p S \partial_t \hat{u}(0, t) \\
&= \mp \mathcal{F}^{-1} \frac{1}{2\pi} \partial_\xi \int e^{it\phi}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \left(\hat{f}(\eta) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma)} \hat{g}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left(\hat{f}(\eta) \overline{\hat{g}(-\sigma)} + \hat{g}(\eta) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma)} \right) \hat{h}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \right) d\eta d\sigma \\
&\quad \mp e^{t\partial_x} L D_p S \partial_t \hat{u}(0, t) \\
&= \mp it (T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{it\phi}}(f, \partial_x g, \bar{f}) + T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{it\phi}}(f, \partial_x h, \bar{g}) + T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{it\phi}}(g, \partial_x h, \bar{f})) \\
&\quad \mp e^{t\partial_x^3} (|u|^2 w + (u\bar{w} + \bar{u}w)S) \mp e^{t\partial_x^3} (|u|^2 \partial_x e^{-t\partial_x^3}(xg) + (u\bar{w} + \bar{u}w) \partial_x e^{-t\partial_x^3}(xh)) \\
&\quad \mp e^{t\partial_x} L D_p S \partial_t \hat{u}(0, t)
\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

where $h = e^{t\partial_x^3} S$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \partial_t \|xg\|_{L^2}^2 &= \Re \langle xg, \partial_t xg \rangle \\ &= \pm t \Im \langle xg, T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{it\phi}}(f, \partial_x g, \bar{f}) + T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{it\phi}}(f, \partial_x h, \bar{g}) + T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{it\phi}}(g, \partial_x h, \bar{f}) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (66a)$$

$$\mp \Re \langle e^{-t\partial_x^3} xg, |u|^2 w + (u\bar{w} + \bar{u}w)S \rangle \quad (66b)$$

$$\mp \Re \langle e^{-t\partial_x^3} xg, |u|^2 \partial_x e^{-t\partial_x^3} (xg) \rangle \quad (66c)$$

$$\mp \Re \langle e^{-t\partial_x^3} xg, (u\bar{w} + \bar{u}w) \partial_x LS \rangle \quad (66d)$$

$$\mp \Re \langle e^{-t\partial_x^3} xg, LD_p S \partial_t \hat{u}(0, t) \rangle \quad (66e)$$

Since

$$\|xg(x, 1)\|_{L^2} \leq \|xu_*\|_{L^2} + \|LS(x, 1; \hat{u}_*(0))\|_{L^2} \lesssim \epsilon \quad (67)$$

the desired inequality for $\partial_t \|xg\|_{L^2}^2$ will follow if we can show that (66a)–(66e) satisfy bounds compatible with (64). We will first show that the terms (66b)–(66d) decay in time like $M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2}$, which is compatible with (64) after integrating in time. For (66b), we use the bounds from (60) and (63) together with almost orthogonality in space to find that

$$\begin{aligned} |(66b)| &\lesssim \|xg\|_{L^2} \left(\sum_{2^k \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} \|\chi_k(|u|^2 w)\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} + \{\text{similar terms}\} \\ &\lesssim \|xg\|_{L^2} \left(\sum_{2^k \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} (\|\chi_{\sim k} u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\chi_{\sim k} w\|_{L^2}^2) \right)^{1/2} + \{\text{similar terms}\} \\ &\lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2}^2 \end{aligned}$$

For (66c), we integrate by parts and use Corollary 6 to find that

$$\begin{aligned} |(66c)| &= \left| \int \Re(e^{-t\partial_x^3} xg \partial_x \overline{e^{-t\partial_x^3} xg}) |u|^2 dx \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left| \int \partial_x(|u|^2) |e^{s\partial_x^3} xg|^2 dx \right| \\ &\lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2}^2 \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for (66d), we use equation (48) to write $\partial_x LS = \mp 3t|S|^2 \partial_x S$. Then, since $h \in X$, we can use the bilinear bound given in Corollary 6 and an arguments similar to the one for (66b) give us the bound

$$\begin{aligned} |(66d)| &\lesssim t \|xg\|_{L^2} \|uw|S|^2 \partial_x S\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^2 \|xg\|_{L^2} \left(\sum_{2^k \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} \|\chi_k(uwS)\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^2 \|xg\|_{L^2} \left(\sum_{2^k \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} (\|\chi_{\sim k} u\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{\sim k} S\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{\sim k} w\|_{L^2})^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim M \epsilon^4 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2}^2 \end{aligned}$$

which is better than required.

We now turn to the term (66e). By (BH) and (54)

$$\|LD_p S \hat{u}(0, t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim M^5 \epsilon^5 t^{-5/6-\beta} \quad (68)$$

from which it easily follows that

$$|(66e)| \lesssim M^5 \epsilon^5 t^{-5/6-\beta} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

which is better than the bound required by (64) since $\epsilon \ll M^{-3/2}$.

It only remains to control (66a). We will re-write this term to exploit the space-time resonance structure of the phase ϕ . Recall that the space-time resonances are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} &= \{\eta = \sigma = \xi/3\} \\ \mathcal{T} &= \{\xi = \eta\} \cup \{\xi = \sigma\} \\ \mathcal{R} &= \{(0, 0, 0)\} \end{aligned}$$

Let $\chi^{\mathcal{S}}, \chi^{\mathcal{T}}, \chi^{\mathcal{R}}$ be a smooth partition of unity such that:

- $\chi^{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\chi^{\mathcal{T}}$ are supported away from the sets \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} , respectively,
- $\chi^{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\chi^{\mathcal{T}}$ are 0-homogeneous outside a ball of radius 2 and vanish within a ball of radius 1,
- $\chi^{\mathcal{R}}$ is supported inside the ball of radius 2, and
- the support of $\chi^{\mathcal{S}}$ is contained in the set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}} = \left\{ (\xi, \eta, \sigma) : \frac{\xi}{\eta} \in [1-c, 1+c] \text{ or } \frac{\xi}{\sigma} \in [1-c, 1+c] \right\}$$

where $c \ll 1$ is a small constant. (Note that $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} \cap \mathcal{S}$ is empty for small c so this is possible), and $\chi^{\mathcal{T}}$ is supported away from \mathcal{T} .

Define $\chi_t^\bullet = \chi^\bullet(t^{1/3})$ for $\bullet = \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{R}$. If we write

$$T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{is\phi}} = T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{is\phi} \chi_t^{\mathcal{T}}} + T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{is\phi} \chi_t^{\mathcal{S}}} + T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{is\phi} \chi_t^{\mathcal{R}}} \quad (69)$$

then we can naturally write (66a) as

$$(66a) = \pm t \Im \langle xg, T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{it\phi} \chi_t^{\mathcal{R}}} (f, \partial_x g, \bar{f}) + T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{it\phi} \chi_t^{\mathcal{R}}} (f, \partial_x h, \bar{g}) + T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{it\phi} \chi_t^{\mathcal{R}}} (g, \partial_x h, \bar{f}) \rangle \quad (70a)$$

$$\pm t \Im \langle xg, T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{it\phi} \chi_t^{\mathcal{S}}} (f, \partial_x g, \bar{f}) + T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{it\phi} \chi_t^{\mathcal{S}}} (f, \partial_x h, \bar{g}) + T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{it\phi} \chi_t^{\mathcal{S}}} (g, \partial_x h, \bar{f}) \rangle \quad (70b)$$

$$\pm t \Im \langle xg, T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{it\phi} \chi_t^{\mathcal{T}}} (f, \partial_x g, \bar{f}) + T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{it\phi} \chi_t^{\mathcal{T}}} (f, \partial_x h, \bar{g}) + T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{it\phi} \chi_t^{\mathcal{T}}} (g, \partial_x h, \bar{f}) \rangle \quad (70c)$$

In the following sections, we will show that the space-time resonant and space non-resonant terms satisfy the estimate

$$|(70a)|, |(70b)| \lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 \|xg\|_{L^2}^2 t^{-1}$$

pointwise in time, and that

$$\left| \int_1^t (70c) ds \right| \lesssim \epsilon^2 + M^2 \epsilon^2 \|xg\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_1^t \left[M^2 \epsilon^2 s^{-1} \|xg(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + M^2 \epsilon^3 t^{-5/6-\beta} \|xg\|_{L^2} \right] ds$$

which is enough to prove (64).

6.1. The space-time resonant multiplier. Since the space-time resonant set is a single point, we can control its contribution using the L^∞ bounds on \hat{g} , \hat{f} and \hat{S} . Define

$$m_t^{\mathcal{R}} = i(\xi - \eta - \sigma)\chi_s^{\mathcal{R}}\partial_\xi\phi e^{it\phi}$$

Then, $m_t^{\mathcal{R}}$ is of size $O(t^{-1})$ and is supported within the region $|\xi| + |\eta| + |\sigma| \lesssim t^{-1/3}$, so

$$\begin{aligned} |(70a)| &\leq t\|xg\|_{L^2} \left\| \hat{T}_{m_t^{\mathcal{R}}}(f, g, \bar{f}) \right\|_{L_\xi^2} + \{\text{similar terms}\} \\ &\leq t\|xg\|_{L^2} \left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} m_t^{\mathcal{R}} \hat{g}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \hat{f}(\eta) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma)} d\eta d\sigma \right\|_{L_\xi^2} + \{\text{similar terms}\} \\ &\leq \|xg\|_{L^2} \|\hat{g}\|_{C^{1/2}} \|\hat{f}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \left\| \int_{|\xi|+|\eta|+|\sigma| \lesssim t^{-1/3}} |\xi|^{1/2} d\eta d\sigma \right\|_{L_\xi^2} + \{\text{similar terms}\} \\ &\lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2}^2 \end{aligned}$$

as required.

6.2. The space non-resonant multiplier. We will handle the terms supported away from the space resonant set in frequency space using integration by parts in η and σ . To ease notation, let us write

$$\mathcal{N}^S(f, g, h) = tT_{\partial_\xi\phi e^{it\phi}\chi_t^S}(f, \partial_x g, \bar{f}) + tT_{\partial_\xi\phi e^{it\phi}\chi_t^S}(f, \partial_x h, \bar{g}) + tT_{\partial_\xi\phi e^{it\phi}\chi_t^S}(g, \partial_x h, \bar{f})$$

Then, the desired bound for (70b) follows from showing that

$$\|\mathcal{N}^S(f, g, h)\|_{L^2} \lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2} \quad (71)$$

Let us first consider the term $tT_{\partial_\xi\phi e^{it\phi}\chi_t^S}(f, \partial_x g, \bar{f})$. Integrating by parts in frequency gives

$$\begin{aligned} t\hat{T}_{\partial_\xi\phi e^{it\phi}\chi_t^S}(f, \partial_x g, \bar{f}) &= i \int t\partial_\xi\phi\chi_t^S e^{it\phi}(\xi - \eta - \sigma)\hat{g}(\xi - \eta - \sigma)\hat{f}(\eta)\overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma)} d\eta d\sigma \\ &= - \int e^{it\phi} \nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \cdot \left((\xi - \eta - \sigma) m_s^S \hat{g}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \hat{f}(\eta) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma)} \right) d\eta d\sigma \\ &= -e^{-it\xi^3} \hat{T}_{\nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \cdot m_t^S(\xi - \eta - \sigma)}(u, w, \bar{u}) \\ &\quad - e^{-it\xi^3} \hat{T}_{m_t^{S, \sigma}}(u, \partial_x w, \bar{L}u) \\ &\quad - e^{-it\xi^3} \hat{T}_{m_t^{S, \sigma}}(u, w, \bar{u}) \\ &\quad + e^{-it\xi^3} \hat{T}_{m_t^{S, \sigma}}(u, \partial_x Lw, \bar{u}) \\ &\quad + \{\text{similar terms}\} \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

where m_s^S is the vector-valued symbol $m^c S_s = \frac{\partial_\xi \phi}{|\nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi|^2} \nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi \chi_s^S$, and $m_s^{S, \eta}, m_s^{S, \sigma}$ are its components. Because Lu obeys worse estimates than LS and Lw , we rewrite the term containing the Lu factor using

$$T_{m_t^{S, \sigma}}(u, \partial_x w, \bar{L}u) = T_{m_t^{S, \sigma}}(u, \partial_x w, \bar{LS}) + T_{m_t^{S, \sigma}}(u, \partial_x u, \bar{L}w) - T_{m_t^{S, \sigma}}(u, \partial_x S, \bar{L}w)$$

Similar expressions hold for the other terms in \mathcal{N}^S . Note that each symbol m occurring after the last equality in (72) satisfies Coifman-Meyer type bounds

$$\left| (|\xi| + |\eta| + |\sigma|)^{|\alpha|} \partial_{\xi, \eta, \sigma}^\alpha m \right| \lesssim_\alpha 1$$

and is supported on $\{\xi \sim \eta \gtrsim t^{-1/3}\} \cup \{\xi \sim \sigma \gtrsim t^{-1/3}\}$. Thus, by dividing dyadically in frequency, we can write

$$\mathcal{N}^S(f, g, h) = \sum_{2^j \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} T_{m_j^S}(u, w, \bar{u}) \quad (73a)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(u, \partial_x Lw, \bar{u}) \quad (73b)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(u, \partial_x w, \overline{LS}) \quad (73c)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(u, S, \bar{w}) \quad (73d)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(u, \partial_x LS, \bar{w}) \quad (73e)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(u, \partial_x u, \overline{Lw}) \quad (73f)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(LS, \partial_x u, \bar{w}) \quad (73g)$$

+ {similar or easier terms}

where m_j^S denotes a generic symbol supported in the region

$$\{|\xi| + |\eta| + |\sigma| \sim 2^j, |\xi - \eta| \ll 2^j\} \cup \{|\xi| + |\eta| + |\sigma| \sim 2^j, |\xi - \sigma| \ll 2^j\}$$

and satisfying

$$|\partial_{\xi, \eta, \sigma}^\alpha m_j^S| \lesssim 2^{-|\alpha|j}$$

Above and going forward, we allow the precise symbol represented by m_j^S to change from line to line. We now turn to the task of deriving estimates for (73a)–(73g). Using the support condition on m_j^S , we can decompose any pseudoproduct $T_{m_j^S}$ as

$$T_{m_j^S}(p, q, r) = T_{m_j^S}(p_{\ll j}, q_{\lesssim j}, r_{\sim j}) + T_{m_j^S}(p_{\sim j}, q_{\lesssim j}, r_{\ll j}) + Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^S}(p_{\sim j}, q_{\sim j}, r_{\sim j}) \quad (74)$$

The term $T_{m_j^S}(p_{\sim j}, q_{\ll j}, r_{\sim j})$ does not appear in the expansion because of the support assumption on m_j^S . In particular, we always have $|\xi - \eta - \sigma| \lesssim \max\{|\eta|, |\sigma|\}$, which helps us control the derivative. We now consider each term (73a)–(73g) in turn and use the division (74) and the decay estimates to obtain the bound (71).

6.2.1. *The bound for (73a):* From (74), we can write

$$T_{m_j^S}(u, w, \bar{u}) = T_{m_j^S}(u_{\ll j}, w_{\lesssim j}, \bar{u}_{\sim j}) \quad (75a)$$

$$+ Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^S}(u_{\sim j}, w_{\sim j}, \bar{u}_{\sim j}) \quad (75b)$$

+ {similar terms}

The hypotheses on the symbols m_j^S imply that they satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 3 uniformly in j . Thus, using the L^2 bound for $w_{\sim j}$ from (63) and the dispersive decay of $u_{\sim j}$ given in (60), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{2^j \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^S}(u_{\sim j}, w_{\sim j}, \bar{u}_{\sim j}) \right\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^4 \|w_{\sim j}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

as required. For (75a), we introduce a further dyadic decomposition in space to write

$$T_{m_j^S}(u_{\ll j}, w_{\lesssim j}, \bar{u}_{\sim j}) = T_{m_j^S}(u_{\ll j}, w_{\lesssim j}, (1 - \chi_{[j-20, j+20]})\bar{u}_{\sim j}) \quad (76a)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(u_{\ll j}, w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{[j-20, j+20]}\bar{u}_{\sim j}) \quad (76b)$$

The first term is straightforward to bound using (60) and the L^2 estimates for w from (63):

$$\begin{aligned} \|(76a)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|u_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|(1 - \chi_{[j-20, j+20]})\bar{u}_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-7/6} 2^{-j/2} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

which is sufficient. Turning to the second term (76b), we write

$$(76b) = \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{[j-30, j+30]} u_{\ll j}, \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{[j-20, j+20]} \bar{u}_{\sim j}) \quad (77a)$$

$$+ (1 - \chi_{[j-30, j+30]}) T_{m_j^S}(u_{\ll j}, w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{[j-20, j+20]} \bar{u}_{\sim j}) \quad (77b)$$

$$+ \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} T_{m_j^S}((1 - \chi_{[j-30, j+30]}) u_{\ll j}, w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{[j-20, j+20]} \bar{u}_{\sim j}) \quad (77c)$$

$$+ \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{[j-30, j+30]} u_{\ll j}, (1 - \chi_{[j-30, j+30]}) w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{[j-20, j+20]} \bar{u}_{\sim j}) \quad (77d)$$

The subterms (77b)–(77d) are non-pseudolocal in the sense of Lemma 4, so they satisfy the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|(77b)\|_{L^2} + \|(77c)\|_{L^2} + \|(77d)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim (t^{2^{3j}})^{-1} \|u_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} \|\bar{u}_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-11/6} 2^{-5/2j} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

which gives the required bound after summing in j . To bound the leading order term (77a), we use almost orthogonality and find that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_j (77a) \right\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \geq t^{-1/3}} (\|\chi_{[j-30, j+30]} u_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{[j-30, j+30]} w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} \|\bar{u}_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty})^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

Collecting the bounds for (75a) and (75b), we find

$$\sum_{2^j \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} \|(73a)\|_{L^2} \lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

as required.

6.2.2. The bound for (73b). The estimates for (73b) are analogous to those for (73a) once we use the bounds

$$\|\partial_x(Lw)_j\|_{L^2} \sim 2^j \|xg\|_{L^2} c_j$$

and

$$\|\partial_x(Lw)_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^j \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

in place of the Hardy-type bounds on w .

6.2.3. *The bound for (73c).* Applying (74), we find

$$T_{m_j^s}(u, \partial_x w, \overline{LS}) = T_{m_j^s}(u_{\ll j}, \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, (\overline{LS})_{\sim j}) \quad (78a)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^s}(u_{\sim j}, \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, (\overline{LS})_{\ll j}) \quad (78b)$$

$$+ Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^s}(u_{\sim j}, \partial_x w_{\sim j}, (\overline{LS})_{\sim j}) \quad (78c)$$

We first consider (78c). Using almost orthogonality and the estimates for LS from (61), we find that

$$\left\| \sum_j (78c) \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\partial_x w_{\sim j}\|_{L^2}^2 \| (LS)_{\sim j} \|_{L^\infty}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ \lesssim M \epsilon^4 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

where we have used the L^2 bounds for $\partial_x w_j$ from (63). For (78a), we divide dyadically in space to obtain

$$T_{m_j^s}(u_{\ll j}, \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, (\overline{LS})_{\sim j}) = T_{m_j^s}(\chi_{>j} u_{\ll j}, \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, (\overline{LS})_{\sim j}) \quad (79a)$$

$$+ \sum_{k < j-40} T_{m_j^s}(\chi_k u_{\ll j}, \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, (\overline{LS})_{\sim j}) \quad (79b)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^s}(\chi_{[j-40, j]} u_{\ll j}, \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, (\overline{LS})_{\sim j}) \quad (79c)$$

For the first term, we have that

$$\|(79a)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\chi_{>j} u_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} \| (LS)_{\sim j} \|_{L^\infty} \\ \lesssim M \epsilon^4 t^{-4/3} 2^{-j} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

which gives a better than required bound after summing in j . For the second term, we perform the further division

$$(79b) = \sum_{k < j-40} T_{m_j^s}(\chi_k u_{\ll j}, \chi_{\sim k} \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{\sim k} (\overline{LS})_{\sim j}) \quad (80a)$$

$$+ \sum_{k < j-40} T_{m_j^s}(\chi_k u_{\ll j}, (1 - \chi_{\sim k}) \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, (\overline{LS})_{\sim j}) \quad (80b)$$

$$+ \sum_{k < j-40} T_{m_j^s}(\chi_k u_{\ll j}, \chi_{\sim k} \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, (1 - \chi_{\sim k}) (\overline{LS})_{\sim j}) \quad (80c)$$

Lemma 4 applies to the pseudoproducts in the terms (80b) and (80c), yielding the bound

$$\|(80b)\|_{L^2} + \|(80c)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \sum_{t^{-1/3} \leq 2^k < 2^{j-40}} (t^{2^{k+j}})^{-1} \|u_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} \| (LS)_{\sim j} \|_{L^\infty} \\ \lesssim M \epsilon^4 t^{-7/6} 2^{-j/2} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

which is sufficient. To bound the remaining term (80a), we use the bounds for the localized terms $\chi_{\sim k} \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}$ and $\chi_{\sim k} (LS)_{\sim j}$ from (63) and (61) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|(80a)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \sum_{t^{-1/3} \leq 2^k \leq 2^{j-40}} \|\chi_k u_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{\sim k} \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} \|\chi_{\sim k} (LS)_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim M \epsilon^4 t^{-4/3} \sum_{t^{-1/3} \leq 2^k \leq 2^{j-40}} 2^{k/2-3/2j} \|xg\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim M \epsilon^4 t^{-4/3} 2^{-j} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

To bound (79c), we write

$$(79c) = \chi_{[j-50, j+10]} T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{[j-40, j]} S_{\ll j}, \chi_{[j-50, j+10]} \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, (\overline{LS})_{\sim j}) \quad (81a)$$

$$+ (1 - \chi_{[j-50, j+10]}) T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{[j-40, j]} S_{\ll j}, \chi_{[j-50, j+10]} \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, (\overline{LS})_{\sim j}) \quad (81b)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{[j-40, j]} S_{\ll j}, (1 - \chi_{[j-50, j+10]}) \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, (\overline{LS})_{\sim j}) \quad (81c)$$

The terms (81b) and (81c) can be handled using Lemma 4 in the same manner as (80b) and (80c). The terms in (81a) are almost orthogonal in physical space, so we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_j (81a) \right\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} \|\chi_{[j-40, j]} u_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\chi_{[j-50, j+10]} \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2}^2 \|(\overline{LS})_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim M \epsilon^4 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

Combining the estimates for (79a)–(79c) shows that the bound for (78a) holds.

We now turn to (78b). Dividing dyadically in space, we can write

$$(78b) = \sum_{k < j-30} T_{m_j^S}(u_{\sim j}, \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_k (\overline{LS})_{\ll j}) \quad (82a)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(u_{\sim j}, \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} (\overline{LS})_{\ll j}) \quad (82b)$$

$$+ \sum_{k > j+30} T_{m_j^S}(u_{\sim j}, \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_k (\overline{LS})_{\ll j}) \quad (82c)$$

For (82a), we have

$$(82a) = \sum_{k < j-30} T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{\sim k} u_{\sim j}, \chi_{\sim k} \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_k (\overline{LS})_{\ll j}) \quad (83a)$$

$$+ \sum_{k < j-30} T_{m_j^S}((1 - \chi_{\sim k}) u_{\sim j}, \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_k (\overline{LS})_{\ll j}) \quad (83b)$$

$$+ \sum_{k < j-30} T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{\sim k} u_{\sim j}, (1 - \chi_{\sim k}) \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_k (\overline{LS})_{\ll j}) \quad (83c)$$

The bounds for (83b) and (83c) immediately follow from Lemma 4:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(83b)\|_{L^2} + \|(83c)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \sum_{k < j-30} (t 2^{2k+j})^{-2} \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|(LS)_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim M \epsilon^2 t^{-5/2} \sum_{2^k \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} 2^{-j/2-4k} \|xg\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim M \epsilon^2 t^{-7/6} 2^{-j/2} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

which is sufficient. Turning to (83a), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(83a)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \sum_{k < j-30} \|\chi_{\sim k} u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{\sim k} \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} \|\chi_k(LS)_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim M\epsilon^4 t^{-4/3} 2^{-j} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

which is acceptable, completing the argument for (82a). Turning to (82b), we can write

$$(82b) = \chi_{[j-40, j+40]} T_{m_j^S}(u_{\sim j}, \chi_{[j-40, j+40]} \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{[j-30, j+30]}(\overline{LS})_{\ll j}) \quad (84a)$$

$$+ (1 - \chi_{[j-40, j+40]}) T_{m_j^S}(u_{\sim j}, \chi_{[j-40, j+40]} \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{[j-30, j+30]}(\overline{LS})_{\ll j}) \quad (84b)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(u_{\sim j}, (1 - \chi_{[j-40, j+40]}) \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{[j-30, j+30]}(\overline{LS})_{\ll j}) \quad (84c)$$

The terms (84b) and (84c) can be controlled using Lemma 4:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(84b)\|_{L^2} + \|(84c)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim (t^{2^{3j}})^{-1} \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} \|(\overline{LS})_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim M\epsilon^4 t^{-3/2} 2^{-3/2j} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

which is acceptable. For (84a), we use almost orthogonality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_j (84a) \right\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\chi_{[j-40, j+40]} \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2}^2 \|\chi_{[j-30, j+30]}(LS)_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim M\epsilon^4 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

as required.

Finally, for (82c), we have

$$(82c) = T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{>j+20} u_{\sim j}, \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{>j+30}(\overline{LS})_{\ll j}) \quad (85a)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{\leq j-20} u_{\sim j}, \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{>j+30}(\overline{LS})_{\ll j}) \quad (85b)$$

The second term is easily controlled using Lemma 4:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(85b)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim (t^{2^{3j}})^{-1} \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} \|(\overline{LS})_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim M\epsilon^4 t^{-3/2} 2^{-3/2j} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

and for the main term (85a) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(85a)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\chi_{>j+20} u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} \|\chi_{>j+30}(\overline{LS})_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 t^{-4/3} 2^{-j} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

which is sufficient to bound (82c), completing the estimate for (73c).

Remark 11. In estimating (73a)–(73c), we frequently encountered terms of the form

$$T_{m_j^S}(p, q, \chi_k r) = \chi_{\sim k} T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{\sim k} p, \chi_{\sim k} q, \chi_k r) + \{\text{non-pseudolocal terms}\}$$

where $\{\text{non-pseudolocal terms}\}$ denotes terms which can be estimated using Lemma 4. The estimates for the non-pseudolocal remainder terms are routine: they do not require any refined linear or cubic estimates and are insensitive to the precise frequency localization of p , q , and r . Thus, in the interest of the exposition, we will not estimate these non-pseudolocal remainders or even write them explicitly in the following sections.

6.2.4. *The bound for (73d).* Here, we have

$$T_{m_j^S}(u, S, \bar{w}) = Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^S}(u_{\ll j}, S_{\ll j}, \bar{w}_{\sim j}) \quad (86a)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(u_{\sim j}, S_{\sim j}, \bar{w}_{\ll j}) \quad (86b)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(u_{\ll j}, S_{\sim j}, \bar{w}_{\sim j}) \quad (86c)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(u_{\sim j}, S_{\ll j}, \bar{w}_{\ll j}) \quad (86d)$$

$$+ Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^S}(u_{\sim j}, S_{\sim j}, \bar{w}_{\sim j}) \quad (86e)$$

Notice that the terms (86c) and (86d) can be controlled in the same way as (75a), and that the term (86e) can be controlled in the same way as (75b). Thus, it only remains to consider the contribution from the first two terms. For (86a), we write

$$(86a) = Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{<j-30} u_{\ll j}, \chi_{<j-20} S_{\ll j}, \chi_{<j-20} \bar{w}_{\sim j}) \quad (87a)$$

$$+ Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{\geq j-30} u_{\ll j}, \chi_{\geq j-40} S_{\ll j}, \bar{w}_{\sim j}) \quad (87b)$$

$$+ \{\text{non-pseudolocal terms}\}$$

The non-pseudolocal terms are easily handled (see Remark 11). For (87a), we use the bound for $\chi_{\leq j-30} w_{\sim j}$ from (63) together with the fact that the terms in (87a) are almost orthogonal to find that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_j (87a) \right\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} \|u_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|S_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\chi_{\leq j-30} w_{\sim j}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim M \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

as required. For (87b), the improved decay of $\chi_{\geq j-30} u_{\ll j}$ and $\chi_{\geq j-40} S_{\ll j}$ given by (60) gives us the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_j (87b) &\lesssim \sum_{2^j \geq t^{-1/3}} \|\chi_{\geq j-30} u_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{\geq j-40} S_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|w_{\sim j}\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim M \epsilon^2 t^{-5/3} 2^{-2j} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

which is sufficient after summing in j .

Turning to (86b), we write

$$(86b) = T_{m_j^S}((1 - \chi_{[j-20, j+20]}) u_{\sim j}, S_{\sim j}, \bar{w}_{\ll j}) \quad (88a)$$

$$+ \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{[j-20, j+20]} u_{\sim j}, S_{\sim j}, \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} \bar{w}_{\ll j}) \quad (88b)$$

$$+ \{\text{non-pseudolocal terms}\}$$

The first term is easily bounded using the linear estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(88a)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|(1 - \chi_{[j-20, j+20]}) u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|S_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|w_{\ll j}\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim M \epsilon^2 t^{-4/3} 2^{-j} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

which gives the desired result after summing in j . For (88b), we use almost orthogonality to write

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_j (88b) \right\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \geq t^{-1/3}} \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|S_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\chi_{[j-30, j+30]} \bar{w}_{\ll j}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

The bound for (73d) now follows.

6.2.5. *The bound for (73e).* Here, we decompose the pseudoproduct as

$$T_{m_j^S}(u, \partial_x LS, \bar{w}) = T_{m_j^S}(u_{\ll j}, \partial_x (LS)_{\sim j}, \bar{w}_{\sim j}) \quad (89a)$$

$$+ Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^S}(u_{\ll j}, \partial_x (LS)_{\ll j}, \bar{w}_{\sim j}) \quad (89b)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(u_{\sim j}, \partial_x (LS)_{\lesssim j}, \bar{w}_{\ll j}) \quad (89c)$$

$$+ Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^S}(u_{\sim j}, \partial_x (LS)_{\sim j}, \bar{w}_{\sim j}) \quad (89d)$$

For (89a), we have

$$(89a) = T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{>j} u_{\ll j}, \partial_x (LS)_{\sim j}, \bar{w}_{\sim j}) \quad (90a)$$

$$+ \chi_{[j-50, j+10]} T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{[j-40, j]} u_{\ll j}, \partial_x (LS)_{\sim j}, \bar{w}_{\sim j}) \quad (90b)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{<j-40} u_{\ll j}, \partial_x (LS)_{\sim j}, \chi_{<j-30} \bar{w}_{\sim j}) \quad (90c)$$

$$+ \{\text{non-pseudolocal terms}\}$$

The first and third terms are straightforward to bound:

$$\|(90a)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\chi_{>j} u_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x (LS)_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|w_{\sim j}\|_{L^2}$$

$$\lesssim M \epsilon^4 t^{-4/3} 2^{-j} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

$$\|(90c)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|u_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x (LS)_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{<j-30} w_{\sim j}\|_{L^2}$$

$$\lesssim M \epsilon^4 t^{-7/6} 2^{-j/2} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

For the second term, almost orthogonality implies that

$$\left\| \sum_j (90b) \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \geq t^{-1/3}} \|\chi_{[j-40, j]} u_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\partial_x (LS)_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|w_{\sim j}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

$$\lesssim M \epsilon^4 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

which gives the required bound for (89a).

Turning to (89b), we have

$$(89b) = Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^S}(u_{\ll j}, \partial_x (LS)_{\ll j}, \chi_{<j-30} \bar{w}_{\sim j}) \quad (91a)$$

$$+ Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{\geq j-40} u_{\ll j}, \chi_{\geq j-40} \partial_x (LS)_{\ll j}, \chi_{\geq j-30} \bar{w}_{\sim j}) \quad (91b)$$

$$+ \{\text{non-pseudolocal terms}\}$$

For (91a), we have that

$$\left\| \sum_j (91a) \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \geq t^{-1/3}} \|u_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x (LS)_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{<j-30} w_{\sim j}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

$$\lesssim M \epsilon^4 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

while for (91b), we have the bound

$$\|(91b)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\chi_{\geq j-40} u_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{\geq j-40} \partial_x (LS)_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|w_{\sim j}\|_{L^2}$$

$$\lesssim M \epsilon^4 t^{-4/3} 2^{-j} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

which gives the bound for (89b).

For (89c), we have

$$(89c) = T_{m_j^S}((1 - \chi_{[j-20, j+20]})u_{\sim j}, \partial_x(LS)_{\lesssim j}, \overline{w}_{\ll j}) \quad (92a)$$

$$+ \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{[j-20, j+20]} u_{\sim j}, \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} \partial_x(LS)_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} \overline{w}_{\ll j}) \quad (92b)$$

$$+ \{\text{non-pseudolocal terms}\}$$

For the first term,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(92a)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\chi_{[j-20, j+20]} u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x(LS)_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|w_{\ll j}\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim M \epsilon^4 t^{-7/6} 2^{-j/2} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

which is sufficient. Turning to (92b), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_j (92b) \right\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \geq t^{-1/3}} \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\chi_{[j-30, j+30]} \partial_x(LS)_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\chi_{[j-30, j+30]} w_{\ll j}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim M \epsilon^4 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

which completes the bound for (89c).

Finally, for (89d), we use almost orthogonality and (37) to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_j (89d) \right\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \geq t^{-1/3}} \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x(LS)_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|w_{\sim j}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim M \epsilon^4 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

completing the bound for (73e).

6.2.6. *The bound for (73f).* Using the support condition for m_j^S , we can decompose each summand as

$$T_{m_j^S}(u, \partial_x u, \overline{Lw}) = T_{m_j^S}(u_{\sim j}, \partial_x u_{\lesssim j}, \overline{Lw}) \quad (93a)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(u_{\ll j}, \partial_x u_{\sim j}, (\overline{Lw})_{\sim j}) \quad (93b)$$

$$+ Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^S}(u_{\ll j}, \partial_x u_{\ll j}, (\overline{Lw})_{\sim j}) \quad (93c)$$

For (93a), we introduce the further decomposition

$$(93a) = \chi_{[j-40, j+40]} T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{[j-30, j+30]} u_{\sim j}, \partial_x u_{\ll j}, \chi_{[j-40, j+40]} \overline{Lw}) \quad (94a)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}((1 - \chi_{[j-30, j+30]})u_{\sim j}, \partial_x u_{\ll j}, \overline{Lw}) \quad (94b)$$

$$+ \{\text{non-pseudolocal terms}\}$$

For the first term, we use almost orthogonality to obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_j (94a) \right\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \geq t^{-1/3}} \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\partial_x u_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\chi_{[j-40, j+40]} Lw\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

For the second term, a direct application of the decay estimates yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|(94b)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|(1 - \chi_{[j-30, j+30]})u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x u_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|Lw\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-4/3} 2^{-j} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

which is acceptable, completing the argument for (93a). The bound for (93b) follows from similar reasoning. For the final term (93c), we see immediately that

$$\left\| \sum_j (93c) \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \geq t^{-1/3}} \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\partial_x u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|(Lw)_{\sim j}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

which completes the argument for (73f).

6.2.7. *The bound for (73g).* It only remains to consider (73g). We can use the support restrictions on the m_j^S to write

$$T_{m_j^S}(LS, \partial_x S, \bar{w}) = Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^S}(\partial_x(LS)_{\sim j}, S_{\sim j}, \bar{w}_{\sim j}) \quad (95a)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(\partial_x(LS)_{\sim j}, \partial_x S_{\sim j}, \bar{w}_{\ll j}) \quad (95b)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}((LS)_{\ll j}, \partial_x S_{\sim j}, \partial_x \bar{w}_{\lesssim j}) \quad (95c)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^S}(\partial_x(LS)_{\sim j}, S_{\ll j}, \bar{w}_{\ll j}) \quad (95d)$$

$$+ Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^S}((LS)_{\ll j}, S_{\ll j}, \partial_x \bar{w}_{\sim j}) \quad (95e)$$

Ignoring complex conjugation and permuting the arguments of the pseudoproducts, we see that the terms (95a), (95b), and (95c) are essentially identical to (78c), (89c), and (78b), respectively. Therefore, we will focus on the last two terms. For (95d), we write

$$(95d) = T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{>j+20} \partial_x(LS)_{\sim j}, \chi_{>j+10} S_{\ll j}, \bar{w}_{\ll j}) \quad (96a)$$

$$+ \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{[j+20, j-20]} \partial_x(LS)_{\sim j}, \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} S_{\ll j}, \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} \bar{w}_{\ll j}) \quad (96b)$$

$$+ \sum_{k < j-20} T_{m_j^S}(\chi_k \partial_x(LS)_{\sim j}, \chi_{\sim k} S_{\ll j}, \chi_{\sim k} \bar{w}_{\ll j}) \quad (96c)$$

$$+ \{\text{non-pseudolocal terms}\}$$

The first and last terms can be handled using decay estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(96a)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\chi_{>j+20} \partial_x(LS)_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{>j+10} S_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\bar{w}_{\ll j}\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^4 t^{-4/3} 2^{-j} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|(96c)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \sum_{k < j-30} \|\partial_x(LS)_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{\sim k} S_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{\sim k} \bar{w}_{\ll j}\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^2 t^{-4/3} \|xg\|_{L^2} \sum_{2^k \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} 2^{-j/2-k/2} \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^2 t^{-7/6} 2^{-j/2} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

For the second term, we use almost orthogonality to get the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_j (96b) \right\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \geq t^{-1/3}} \|\partial_x(LS)_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\chi_{[j-30, j+30]} S_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\chi_{[j-30, j+30]} \bar{w}_{\ll j}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^4 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

Turning to (95e), we introduce the decomposition

$$(95e) = Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{>j+30}(LS)_{\ll j}, \chi_{>j+20} S_{\ll j}, \partial_x w_{\sim j}) \quad (97a)$$

$$+ Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^S}(\chi_{[j-30, j+30]}(LS)_{\ll j}, \chi_{[j-40, j+40]} S_{\ll j}, \partial_x w_{\sim j}) \quad (97b)$$

$$+ \sum_{k < j-30} Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^S}(\chi_k(LS)_{\ll j}, \chi_{\sim k} S_{\ll j}, \chi_{\sim k} \partial_x w_{\sim j}) \quad (97c)$$

The first term is easily handled:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(97a)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\chi_{>j+30}(LS)_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{>j+20} S_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\partial_x w_{\sim j}\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^4 t^{-4/3} 2^{-j} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

For the remaining terms, we take advantage of the almost orthogonality coming from the frequency projection to obtain the bounds

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_j (97b) \right\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} \|\chi_{[j-30, j+30]}(LS)_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\chi_{[j-40, j+40]} S_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\partial_x w_{\sim j}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^4 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_j (97b) \right\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} \left(\sum_{k < j-30} \|\chi_k(LS)_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{\sim k} S_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{\sim k} \partial_x w_{\sim j}\|_{L^2} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^4 t^{-4/3} \|xg\|_{L^2} \left(\sum_{2^j \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} \left(\sum_{2^k \gtrsim t^{-1/3}} 2^{-k} c_j \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^4 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

which completes the estimate for (73g).

6.3. The time non-resonant multiplier. We control the term (70c) by integrating by parts in s .

Defining $m_s = \frac{i(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \partial_\xi \phi \chi_s^\tau}{\phi}$, we can integrate by parts to obtain

$$\int_1^t (70c) ds = \mp s \Re \langle e^{-s \partial_x^3} xg, T(s) \rangle \Big|_{s=1}^{s=t} \quad (98a)$$

$$\pm \Re \int_1^t \langle e^{-s \partial_x^3} xg, T(s) \rangle ds \quad (98b)$$

$$\pm \Re \int_1^t s \langle e^{-s \partial_x^3} xg, \tilde{T}(s) \rangle ds \quad (98c)$$

$$\pm \Re \int_1^t s \langle e^{-s \partial_x^3} xg, \dot{T}(s) \rangle ds \quad (98d)$$

$$\pm \Re \int_1^t s \langle e^{-s \partial_x^3} x \partial_s g, T(s) \rangle ds \quad (98e)$$

where, to ease notation, we have written

$$\begin{aligned} T(s) &= T_{m_s}(u, w, \bar{u}) + T_{m_s}(u, S, \bar{w}) + T_{m_s}(w, S, \bar{u}) \\ \tilde{T}(s) &= T_{\partial_s m_s}(u, w, \bar{u}) + T_{\partial_s m_s}(u, S, \bar{w}) + T_{\partial_s m_s}(w, S, \bar{u}) \\ \mathring{T}(s) &= T_{m_s}(e^{-s\partial_x^3}\partial_s f, w, \bar{u}) + T_{m_s}(u, e^{-s\partial_x^3}\partial_s g, \bar{u}) + T_{m_s}(u, w, \overline{e^{-s\partial_x^3}\partial_s f}) \\ &\quad + T_{m_s}(e^{-s\partial_x^3}\partial_s f, S, \bar{w}) + T_{m_s}(u, e^{-s\partial_x^3}\partial_s h, \bar{w}) + T_{m_s}(u, S, \overline{e^{-s\partial_x^3}\partial_s g}) \\ &\quad + T_{m_s}(e^{-s\partial_x^3}\partial_s g, S, \bar{u}) + T_{m_s}(w, e^{-s\partial_x^3}\partial_s h, \bar{u}) + T_{m_s}(w, S, \overline{e^{-s\partial_x^3}\partial_s f}) \end{aligned}$$

Note that the m_t satisfy Coifman-Meyer type bounds uniformly in time:

$$|(\xi^2 + \eta^2 + \sigma^2)|^{|\alpha|/2} \partial_{\xi, \eta, \sigma}^\alpha m_t| \lesssim_\alpha 1 \quad (99)$$

Thus, by dividing dyadically in frequency, we can decompose pseudoproducts involving m_t as

$$T_{m_t}(p, q, r) = \sum_{2^j \geq t^{-1/3}} T_{m_j^\mathcal{T}}(p_{\lesssim j}, q_{\lesssim j}, r_{\lesssim j}) \quad (100)$$

where $m_j^\mathcal{T}$ stands for a generic symbol localized to $|\xi| + |\eta| + |\sigma| \sim 2^j$ and satisfying $|\partial_{\xi, \eta, \sigma}^\alpha m_j^\mathcal{T}| \lesssim_\alpha 2^{-|\alpha|j}$. By Remark 8, all of the pseudoproducts on the right obey Hölder type bounds.

6.3.1. The bound for (98a). We will first give the argument for the boundary $s = t$. Since none of the frequencies η , σ and $\xi - \eta - \sigma$ play a distinguished role, and since S and u obey the same decay estimates, it suffices to prove to obtain bounds for $T_{m_s}(u, w, \bar{u})$. Using (100), we find that

$$T_{m_t}(u, w, \bar{u}) = \sum_{2^j \geq t^{-1/3}} T_{m_j^\mathcal{T}}(u_{\sim j}, w_{\lesssim j}, \bar{u}_{\sim j}) \quad (101a)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^\mathcal{T}}(u_{\sim j}, w_{\lesssim j}, \bar{u}_{\ll j}) \quad (101b)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^\mathcal{T}}(u_{\ll j}, w_{\lesssim j}, \bar{u}_{\sim j}) \quad (101c)$$

$$+ Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^\mathcal{T}}(u_{\ll j}, w_{\sim j}, \bar{u}_{\ll j}) \quad (101d)$$

The terms (101b) and (101c) are controlled using the same arguments as for (75a):

$$\|(101c)\|_{L^2} + \|(101b)\|_{L^2} \lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

Similarly, using the same argument as for (86a), we find that

$$\|(101d)\|_{L^2} \lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

It only remains to bound (101a). Here, we have that

$$(101a) = \sum_{2^j \geq t^{-1/3}} \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} T_{m_j^\mathcal{T}}(\chi_{[j-20, j+20]} u_{\sim j}, \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} w_{\lesssim j}, \bar{u}_{\sim j}) \quad (102a)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^\mathcal{T}}((1 - \chi_{[j-20, j+20]}) u_{\sim j}, w_{\lesssim j}, \bar{u}_{\sim j}) \quad (102b)$$

$$+ \{\text{non-pseudolocal terms}\}$$

Both terms can be estimated using the same types of arguments we have employed previously, yielding the bounds

$$\begin{aligned} \|(102a)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \geq t^{-1/3}} \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^4 \|\chi_{[j-30, j+30]} w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|(102b)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \sum_{2^j \geq t^{-1/3}} \|(1 - \chi_{[j-20, j+20]})u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

Combining these estimates, we see that

$$\|T(t)\|_{L^2} \lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2} \quad (103)$$

so, using Cauchy-Schwarz, we see that

$$|t \langle e^{-t\partial_x^3} xg, T(t) \rangle| \lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 \|xg\|_{L^2}^2$$

Repeating the above arguments at $s = 1$ and recalling (67), we see that

$$|\langle xg(x, 1), T(1) \rangle| \lesssim \epsilon^4$$

so we conclude that

$$|(98a)| \lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 \|xg\|_{L^2}^2 + \epsilon^4$$

Since $M^2 \epsilon^2 \ll 1$, the first term can be absorbed into the left-hand side of (64), and the second term is better than required.

6.3.2. *The bound for (98b).* By using the bound for $\|T(s)\|_{L^2}$ derived above, we have at once that

$$|(98b)| \lesssim \int_1^t M^2 \epsilon^2 s^{-1} \|xg(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds$$

which is acceptable.

6.3.3. *The bound for (98c).* A simple computation shows that $s\partial_s m_s$ also obeys symbols bounds of the form (99), so $\tilde{T}(s)$ obeys the same estimates as $T(s)$, giving us the bound for (98c).

6.3.4. *The bound for (98d).* By differentiating f , g , and h in time, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-s\partial_x^3} \partial_s f &= |u|^2 \partial_x u \\ e^{-s\partial_x^3} \partial_s h &= |S|^2 \partial_x S + D_p S \partial_t \hat{u}(0, t) \\ e^{-s\partial_x^3} \partial_s g &= |u|^2 \partial_x w + (w\bar{u} + u\bar{w}) \partial_x S - D_p S \partial_t \hat{u}(0, t) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can write

$$\dot{T}(s) = \sum_j T_{m_j^T}(|u|^2 \partial_x u, w, \bar{u}) \quad (104a)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^T}(u, D_p S \hat{u}(0, t), \bar{u}) \quad (104b)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^T}(u, |u|^2 \partial_x w, \bar{u}) \quad (104c)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^T}(u, u \partial_x S \bar{w}, \bar{u}) \quad (104d)$$

+ {similar terms}

The desired bound on (98d) will follow once we show that

$$\|\dot{T}(s)\|_{L^2} \lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 s^{-2} \|xg\|_{L^2} + M^2 \epsilon^3 s^{-5/6-\beta}$$

so it suffices to bound the quantities (104a)–(104d) in L^2 . For (104a), we can write

$$T_{m_j^T}(|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\lesssim j}, w_{\lesssim j}, \bar{u}_{\lesssim j} = Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^T}(|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\ll j}, w_{\sim j}, \bar{u}_{\ll j} \quad (105a)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^T}(|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\lesssim j}, w_{\sim j}, \bar{u}_{\sim j} \quad (105b)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^T}(|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\lesssim j}, w_{\ll j}, \bar{u}_{\sim j} \quad (105c)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^T}(|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\sim j}, w_{\lesssim j}, \bar{u}_{\ll j} \quad (105d)$$

The term (105a) is similar to (86a): we write

$$(105a) = Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^T}(\chi_{< j-30}(|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\ll j}, \chi_{< j-20} w_{\sim j}, \bar{u}_{\ll j}) \quad (106a)$$

$$+ Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^T}(\chi_{\geq j-30}(|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\ll j}, w_{\sim j}, \chi_{\geq j-40} \bar{u}_{\ll j}) \quad (106b)$$

$$+ \{\text{non-pseudolocal terms}\}$$

Using (37) to control the cubic $(|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\ll j}$, we find that

$$\left\| \sum_j (106a) \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \gtrsim s^{-1/3}} \|(|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\chi_{< j-20} w_{\sim j}\|_{L^2}^2 \|\bar{u}_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ \lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-2} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

as required. Similar reasoning also gives us the bound

$$\left\| \sum_j (106b) \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \gtrsim s^{-1/3}} \|\chi_{\geq j-30}(|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|w_{\sim j}\|_{L^2}^2 \|\chi_{\geq j-40} \bar{u}_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ \lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-2} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

which gives us the required bound for (105a). Turning to (105b), we find that

$$(105b) = T_{m_j^T}(|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\lesssim j}, w_{\sim j}, (1 - \chi_{[j-30, j+30]}) \bar{u}_{\sim j} \quad (107a)$$

$$+ \chi_{[j-40, j+40]} T_{m_j^T}(\chi_{[j-40, j+40]}(|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\lesssim j}, w_{\sim j}, \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} \bar{u}_{\sim j}) \quad (107b)$$

$$+ \{\text{non-pseudolocal terms}\}$$

For (107a), the linear and cubic dispersive estimates give us the bounds

$$\|(107a)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|(|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|w_{\sim j}\|_{L^2} \|(1 - \chi_{[j-30, j+30]}) \bar{u}_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \\ \lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-13/6} 2^{-j/2} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

which gives the required bound after summing in j . For the second term, we have

$$\left\| \sum_j (107b) \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \gtrsim s^{-1/3}} \|\chi_{[j-40, j+40]}(|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|w_{\sim j}\|_{L^2}^2 \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ \lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-2} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

which is sufficient, completing the bound for (105b). Similarly, for (105c), we have that

$$(105c) = T_{m_j} \left((|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\lesssim j}, w_{\ll j}, (1 - \chi_{[j-30, j+30]}) \bar{u}_{\sim j} \right) \quad (108a)$$

$$+ \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} T_{m_j} \left(\chi_{[j-40, j+40]} (|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{[j-40, j+40]} w_{\ll j}, \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} \bar{u}_{\sim j} \right) \quad (108b)$$

$$+ \{\text{non-pseudolocal terms}\}$$

The estimate for (108a) is analogous to the one for (107a). For (108b), we find that

$$\left\| \sum_j (108b) \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \left(\sum_j \|\chi_{[j-40, j+40]} (|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\chi_{[j-40, j+40]} w_{\ll j}\|_{L^2}^2 \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

$$\lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-2} \|xg\|_{L^2}^2$$

completing the bound for (105c). Finally, for (105d) we find that

$$(105d) = \sum_{k < j-30} \chi_{\sim k} T_{m_j} \left(\chi_k (|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\sim j}, \chi_{\sim k} w_{\sim j}, \chi_{\sim k} \bar{u}_{\ll j} \right) \quad (109a)$$

$$+ \chi_{[j-40, j+40]} T_{m_j} \left(\chi_{[j-30, j+30]} (|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\sim j}, \chi_{[j-40, j+40]} w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{[j-40, j+40]} \bar{u}_{\ll j} \right) \quad (109b)$$

$$+ T_{m_j} \left(\chi_{> j+30} (|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\sim j}, w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{> j+20} \bar{u}_{\ll j} \right) \quad (109c)$$

$$+ \{\text{non-pseudolocal terms}\}$$

The estimate for (109b) is essentially the same as the one for (108b), and the term (109c) can be bounded in essentially the same manner as (108a) and (107a), so it only remains to bound (109a). For this term, the refined cubic estimate (40) gives us the bound

$$\|\chi_k (|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3 s^{-11/6} 2^{-j/2} 2^{-k}$$

from which we deduce that

$$\|(109a)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \sum_{k < j-30} \|\chi_k (|u|^2 \partial_x u)_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{\sim k} w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} \|\chi_{\sim k} \bar{u}_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty}$$

$$\lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-13/6} 2^{-j/2} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

which is sufficient, completing the estimate for (104a).

The term (104b) can be controlled using the L^p estimates for $D_p S$. Let us write

$$T_{m_j} \left(u_{\lesssim j}, Q_{\lesssim j} D_p S \partial_t \hat{u}(0, t), \bar{u}_{\lesssim j} \right) = T_{m_j} \left(u, Q_{\sim j} D_p S \partial_t \hat{u}(0, t), \bar{u} \right) \quad (110a)$$

$$+ T_{m_j} \left(u_{\sim j}, Q_{\ll j} D_p S \partial_t \hat{u}(0, t), \bar{u} \right) \quad (110b)$$

$$+ T_{m_j} \left(u_{\ll j}, Q_{\ll j} D_p S \partial_t \hat{u}(0, t), \bar{u}_{\sim j} \right) \quad (110c)$$

For (110a), we use the L^6 estimates for u and $Q_{\sim j}(D_p S)$ (equations (27) and (52), respectively) to obtain the bound

$$\left\| \sum_j (110a) \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \sum_{2^j \gtrsim s^{-1/3}} \|u\|_{L^6}^2 \|Q_{\sim j} D_p S\|_{L^6} |\partial_s \hat{u}(0, s)|$$

$$\lesssim M^5 \epsilon^5 s^{-17/9-\beta} \sum_{2^j \gtrsim s^{-1/3}} \ln(2 + t^{-1/3} 2^j) 2^{-j/6}$$

$$\lesssim M^5 \epsilon^5 s^{-11/6-\beta}$$

which is better than required, since $\epsilon \ll M^{-3/2}$. For (110b) and (110c), similar reasoning using the L^6 bounds for $u_{\sim j}$ and $Q_{\ll j} D_p S$ (given in (26) and (53)) yields

$$\left\| \sum_j ((110b) + (110c)) \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim M^5 \epsilon^5 s^{-11/6-\beta}$$

completing the argument for (104b).

Let us now consider the term (104c). The estimates here require us to obtain bounds for cubic expressions of the form $|u|^2 \partial_x w$. Since $g \notin X$, these bounds do not immediately follow from the work in Section 3.2, so we instead argue directly. By combining estimates from (60) and (63), we see that

$$\|\chi_k |u|^2 \partial_x w\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 s^{-3/2} \|xg\|_{L^2 C_k} \quad (111)$$

which immediately implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \| |u|^2 \partial_x w \|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim \sup_k \|\chi_k |u|^2 \partial_x w\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-3/2} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned} \quad (112)$$

since the supports of the χ_k have only finite overlap. We will also need refined estimates in the spirit of (38) for $\chi_k(|u|^2 \partial_x w)_{\sim j}$ when $k < j - 30$. To obtain these bounds, we perform a Littlewood-Paley decomposition to write

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_k(|u|^2 \partial_x w)_{\sim j} &= \chi_k Q_{\sim j} \chi_{\sim k} (|u_{< j-20}|^2 \partial_x w_{[j-20, j+20]} + 2\Re(u_{< j-20} \bar{u}_{[j-20, j+20]}) \partial_x w_{< j-20}) \\ &\quad + \{\text{better}\} \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\{\text{better}\}$ denotes more rapidly decaying terms which can be neglected. The leading order terms we estimate as

$$\|\chi_{\sim k} |u_{< j-20}|^2 \partial_x w_{[j-20, j+20]}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 s^{-11/6} 2^{-k} \|xg\|_{L^2 C_j}$$

and

$$\|\chi_{\sim k} u_{< j-20} \bar{u}_{[j-20, j+20]} \partial_x w_{< j-20}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 s^{-11/6} 2^{k/2-3/2j} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

so

$$\|\chi_k(|u|^2 \partial_x w)_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 s^{-11/6} 2^{-k} \|xg\|_{L^2 C_j} \quad (113)$$

where we have used the fact that $2^{3/2(k-j)}$ is ℓ^2 summable in j if $k < j - 30$. Now, let us write

$$T_{m_j^\mathcal{T}}(u, |u|^2 \partial_x w, \bar{u}) = T_{m_j^\mathcal{T}}(u_{\sim j}, |u|^2 \partial_x w, \bar{u}_{\lesssim j}) \quad (114a)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^\mathcal{T}}(u_{\ll j}, |u|^2 \partial_x w, \bar{u}_{\sim j}) \quad (114b)$$

$$+ Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^\mathcal{T}}(u_{\ll j}, (|u|^2 \partial_x w)_{\sim j}, \bar{u}_{\ll j}) \quad (114c)$$

For the term (114a), we write

$$(114a) = \chi_{[j-40, j+40]} T_{m_j^\mathcal{T}}(u_{\sim j}, \chi_{[j-40, j+40]} |u|^2 \partial_x w, \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} \bar{u}_{\lesssim j}) \quad (115a)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^\mathcal{T}}((1 - \chi_{[j-20, j+20]}) u_{\sim j}, |u|^2 \partial_x w, (1 - \chi_{[j-30, j+30]}) \bar{u}_{\lesssim j}) \quad (115b)$$

$$+ \{\text{non-pseudolocal terms}\}$$

For the subterm (115b), the L^4 estimates from (60) together with (112) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|(115b)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|(1 - \chi_{[j-20, j+20]}) u_{\sim j}\|_{L^4} \| |u|^2 \partial_x w \|_{L^\infty} \|(1 - \chi_{[j-30, j+30]}) \bar{u}_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^4} \\ &\lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-13/6} 2^{-j/2} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

which is acceptable. Turning to the subterm (115a), we use (111) to find that

$$\left\| \sum_j (115a) \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \gtrsim s^{-1/3}} \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^4}^2 \|\chi_{[j-40, j+40]} |u|^2 \partial_x w\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\chi_{[j-30, j+30]} u_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^4}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ \lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-2} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

which completes the bound for (114a). The bound for (114b) is identical, since none of the estimates change if we replace $u_{\lesssim j}$ with $u_{\ll j}$ and permute the arguments of the pseudoproduct. For (114c), we have

$$(114c) = Q_{\sim j} \sum_{k < j-30} T_{m_j^T}(\chi_{\sim k} u_{\ll j}, \chi_k (|u|^2 \partial_x w)_{\sim j}, \chi_{\sim k} \bar{u}_{\ll j}) \quad (116a)$$

$$+ Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^T}(\chi_{[j-40, j+40]} u_{\ll j}, \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} (|u|^2 \partial_x w)_{\sim j}, \chi_{[j-40, j+40]} \bar{u}_{\ll j}) \quad (116b)$$

$$+ Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^T}(\chi_{> j+20} u_{\ll j}, \chi_{> j+30} (|u|^2 \partial_x w)_{\sim j}, \chi_{> j+20} \bar{u}_{\ll j}) \quad (116c)$$

$$+ \{\text{non-pseudolocal terms}\}$$

For the first subterm, we use the refined cubic bound (113) to conclude that

$$\left\| \sum_j (116a) \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \left(\sum_j \left(\sum_{k < j-30} \|\chi_{\sim k} u_{\ll j}\|_{L^4}^2 \|\chi_k (|u|^2 \partial_x w)_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ \lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-7/3} \left(\sum_j \left(\sum_{\substack{2^k \gtrsim s^{-1/3} \\ k < j-30}} 2^{-k} c_j \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ \lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-2} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

as required. For the second term, we use the bound (111) to control $\chi_{[j-30, j+30]} |u|^2 \partial_x w$, yielding

$$\left\| \sum_j (116b) \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \left(\sum_{2^j \gtrsim s^{-1/3}} \|\chi_{[j-40, j+40]} u_{\ll j}\|_{L^4}^4 \|\chi_{[j-30, j+30]} (|u|^2 \partial_x w)_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ \lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-2} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

Finally, for the last term, we use the refined L^4 bounds for $\chi_{> j+20} u_{\ll j}$ given in (60) to conclude that

$$\|(116a)\| \lesssim \|\chi_{> j+20} u_{\ll j}\|_{L^4}^2 \| |u|^2 \partial_x w \|_{L^\infty} \\ \lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-8/3} 2^{-2j} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

which is sufficient, completing the bound for (104c).

The argument for (104d) is quite similar. We have that

$$T_{m_j^T}(u, u \partial_x S \bar{w}, \bar{u}) = T_{m_j^T}(u_{\sim j}, u \partial_x S \bar{w}, \bar{u}_{\lesssim j}) \quad (117a)$$

$$+ T_{m_j^T}(u_{\ll j}, u \partial_x S \bar{w}, \bar{u}_{\sim j}) \quad (117b)$$

$$+ Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^T}(u_{\ll j}, (u \partial_x S \bar{w})_{\sim j}, \bar{u}_{\ll j}) \quad (117c)$$

Now, the decay estimates given in Lemma 5 and Corollary 8 immediately imply that

$$\|\chi_k u \partial_x S \bar{w}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim M \epsilon^2 s^{-3/2} \|xg\|_{L^2 c_k}$$

and

$$\|u \partial_x S \bar{w}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim M \epsilon^2 s^{-3/2} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

which are analogous to the estimates (111) and (112). Thus, we can control (117a) and (117b) by the same arguments used for (114a) and (114b), respectively. Moreover, we see that for $k < j - 30$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_k (u \partial_x S \bar{w})_{\sim j} &= \chi_k Q_{\sim j} \chi_{\sim k} (u_{< j-20} \partial_x S_{< j-20} w_{[j-20, j+20]}) + \\ &\quad + \chi_k Q_{\sim j} \chi_{\sim k} ((u_{< j-20} \partial_x S_{[j-20, j+20]} + u_{[j-20, j+20]} \partial_x S_{< j-20}) w_{< j-20}) \\ &\quad + \{\text{better}\} \end{aligned}$$

where $\{\text{better}\}$ denotes terms which decay faster on the support of χ_k . For the first term, the decay estimates from (60) and (62) give the bound

$$\|\chi_k u_{< j-20} \partial_x S_{< j-20} w_{[j-20, j+20]}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim M \epsilon^2 s^{-11/6} 2^{-j} \|xg\|_{L^2 c_j}$$

and similarly,

$$\|\chi_k u_{< j-20} \partial_x S_{[j-20, j+20]} w_{< j-20}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim M \epsilon^2 s^{-\frac{11}{6}} 2^{-\frac{j+k}{2}} \|xg\|_{L^2 c_k}$$

with an identical estimate holding for $u_{[j-20, j+20]} \partial_x S_{< j-20} w_{< j-20}$. Thus, after noting that the restriction $k < j - 30$ lets us write $2^{-\frac{j+k}{2}} = 2^{-j} c_j$ uniformly in k , we find that

$$\|\chi_k (u \partial_x S \bar{w})_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim M \epsilon^2 s^{-\frac{11}{6}} \|xg\|_{L^2} 2^{-j} c_j$$

which is better than (113), since $k < j - 30$. Thus, the term (117c) can be controlled in the same manner as (114c), which completes the argument for (104d). Combining all these bounds, we find that

$$\|\hat{T}(s)\|_{L^2} \lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-2} \|xg\|_{L^2} + M^5 \epsilon^5 t^{-11/6-\beta}$$

which is better than required, since $\epsilon \ll M^{-3/2}$.

6.3.5. *The bound for (98e).* The only remaining term is (98e). Expanding $x \partial_s g$ using (65) gives

$$\begin{aligned} (98e) &= \pm \Im \int_1^t s^2 \left\langle T_{\partial_\xi \phi}(u, \partial_x w, \bar{u}) + T_{\partial_\xi \phi}(u, \partial_x S, \bar{w}) + T_{\partial_\xi \phi}(w, \partial_x S, \bar{u}), T(s) \right\rangle ds \\ &\quad \mp \Re \int_1^t s \left\langle |u|^2 \partial_x L w, T(s) \right\rangle ds \\ &\quad \mp \Re \int_1^t s \left\langle |u|^2 w + 2\Re(u \bar{w}) S + \Re(u \bar{w}) \partial_x L S, T(s) \right\rangle ds \\ &\quad \mp \Re \int_1^t s \left\langle L D_p S \partial_s \hat{u}(0, s), T(s) \right\rangle ds \end{aligned}$$

If we expand the $T_{\partial_\xi \phi}$ pseudoproducts using (69) and observe that

$$i(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \partial_\xi \phi \chi_s^\mathcal{T} = \phi m_s$$

then we can write

$$(98e) = \pm \Im \int_1^t s^2 \left\langle T_{\phi m_s}(u, w, \bar{u}) + T_{\phi m_s}(u, S, \bar{w}) + T_{\phi m_s}(w, S, \bar{u}), T(s) \right\rangle ds \quad (118a)$$

$$\mp \Re \int_1^t s \left\langle |u|^2 \partial_x Lw, T(s) \right\rangle ds \quad (118b)$$

$$\mp \Re \int_1^t s \left\langle H(s), T(s) \right\rangle ds \quad (118c)$$

$$\mp \Re \int_1^t s \left\langle LD_p S \partial_s \hat{u}(0, s), T(s) \right\rangle ds \quad (118d)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H(s) = & e^{-s\partial_x^3} (T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{is\phi} \chi_s^{\mathcal{R}}}(f, \partial_x g, \bar{f}) + T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{is\phi} \chi_s^{\mathcal{R}}}(f, \partial_x h, \bar{g}) + T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{is\phi} \chi_s^{\mathcal{R}}}(g, \partial_x h, \bar{f})) \\ & + e^{-s\partial_x^3} (T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{is\phi} \chi_s^{\mathcal{S}}}(f, \partial_x g, \bar{f}) + T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{is\phi} \chi_s^{\mathcal{S}}}(f, \partial_x h, \bar{g}) + T_{\partial_\xi \phi e^{is\phi} \chi_s^{\mathcal{S}}}(g, \partial_x h, \bar{f})) \\ & + |u|^2 w + 2\Re(u\bar{w})S + 2\Re(u\bar{w})LS \end{aligned}$$

We first consider the term (118c). The arguments from the previous subsections let us conclude that

$$\|H(s)\|_{L^2} \lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 s^{-1} \|xg(s)\|_{L^2}$$

Thus, using the bound (103) for $T(s)$, we immediately have that

$$|(118c)| \lesssim \int_1^t M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-1} \|xg(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds$$

which is better than required. Similar reasoning using (68) shows that

$$|(118d)| \lesssim \int_1^t M^7 \epsilon^7 s^{-5/6-\beta} \|xg(s)\|_{L^2} ds$$

which is again better than required. Turning to the term (118b), we note that

$$\langle |u|^2 \partial_x Lw, T(s) \rangle = - \langle Lw, \partial_x (|u|^2 T(s)) \rangle$$

so the desired bound will follow immediately if we can show that

$$\|\partial_x (|u|^2 (T(s)))\|_{L^2} \lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-2} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

Using Corollary 6 and the estimates in Section 6.3.1, we see that

$$\|(\partial_x |u|^2) T(s)\|_{L^2} \lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-2} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

so it suffices to prove that

$$\||u|^2 \partial_x T(s)\|_{L^2} \lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-2} \|xg\|_{L^2}$$

We will show how to obtain the bound for $|u|^2 \partial_x T_{m_s}(u, w, \bar{u})$: the bounds for the other terms are similar. Recalling that $m_s = \frac{i(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \partial_\xi \phi \chi_s^\tau}{\phi}$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} |u|^2 \partial_x T_{m_s}(u, w, \bar{u}) &= \sum_{2^j \gtrsim s^{-1/3}} |u|^2 T_{m_j^\tau}(u, \partial_x w, \bar{u}) \\ &= \sum_{2^j \gtrsim s^{-1/3}} |u|^2 T_{m_j^\tau}(u_{\sim j}, \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, \bar{u}) \end{aligned} \quad (119a)$$

$$+ |u|^2 T_{m_j^\tau}(u_{\ll j}, \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, \bar{u}_{\sim j}) \quad (119b)$$

$$+ |u|^2 Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^\tau}(u_{\ll j}, \partial_x w_{\sim j}, \bar{u}_{\ll j}) \quad (119c)$$

For (119a), we perform a further division in physical space

$$|u|^2 T_{m_j^\tau}(u_{\sim j}, \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, \bar{u}) = \sum_{k < j-30} \chi_k |u|^2 T_{m_j^\tau}(\chi_{\sim k} u_{\sim j}, \chi_{\sim k} \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{\sim k} \bar{u}) \quad (120a)$$

$$+ \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} |u|^2 T_{m_j^\tau}(u_{\sim j}, \chi_{[j-40, j+40]} \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{[j-40, j+40]} \bar{u}) \quad (120b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \chi_{> j+30} |u|^2 T_{m_j^\tau}(\chi_{> j+20} u_{\sim j}, \chi_{> j+20} \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}, \chi_{> j+20} \bar{u}) \\ &+ \{\text{non-pseudolocal terms}\} \end{aligned} \quad (120c)$$

For the first sub-term, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(120a)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \sum_{k < j-30} \|\chi_{\sim k} u\|_{L^\infty}^3 \|\chi_{\sim k} u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{\sim k} \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-7/3} \sum_{k < j-30} 2^{k/2-3/2j} \|xg\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-7/3} 2^{-j} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

which is sufficient. For the second sub-term, we use almost orthogonality to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_j (120b) \right\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \left(\sum_j \|\chi_{[j-40, j+40]} u\|_{L^\infty}^6 \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\chi_{[j-40, j+40]} \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-2} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

as required. For the final sub-term, we use the L^∞ estimates from (62) to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(120c)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\chi_{> j-20} u\|_{L^6} \|\chi_{> j-20} u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{> j-20} \partial_x w_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-8/3} 2^{-2j} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

which can be summed over $2^j \gtrsim s^{-1/3}$ to give the desired result. Collecting the bounds now gives the bound for (119a). Since $u_{\ll j}$ satisfies better decay estimates than u , we can bound (119b) in the same

way. For (119c), we write

$$|u|^2 T_{m_j^T}(u_{\ll j}, \partial_x w_{\sim j}, \bar{u}_{\ll j}) = \sum_{k < j-30} \chi_k |u|^2 Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^T}(\chi_{\sim k} u_{\ll j}, \chi_{\sim k} \partial_x w_{\sim j}, \chi_{\sim k} \bar{u}_{\ll j}) \quad (121a)$$

$$+ \chi_{[j-30, j+30]} |u|^2 T_{m_j^T}(\chi_{[j-40, j+40]} u_{\ll j}, \partial_x w_{\sim j}, \chi_{[j-40, j+40]} \bar{u}_{\ll j}) \quad (121b)$$

$$+ \chi_{> j+30} |u|^2 T_{m_j^T}(\chi_{> j+20} u_{\ll j}, \chi_{> j-20} \partial_x w_{\sim j}, \chi_{> j+20} \bar{u}_{\ll j}) \quad (121c)$$

$$+ \{\text{non-pseudolocal terms}\}$$

For the first term, we note that we can interchange the order of summation to obtain

$$\left\| \sum_j (121a) \right\|_{L^2} = \left\| \sum_k \chi_k |u|^2 \sum_{j > k+30} Q_{\sim j} T_{m_j^T}(\chi_{\sim k} u_{\ll j}, \chi_{\sim k} \partial_x w_{\sim j}, \chi_{\sim k} \bar{u}_{\ll j}) \right\|_{L^2}$$

Thus, using the almost orthogonality in j , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_j (121a) \right\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \sum_k \|\chi_{\sim k} u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \left(\sum_{j > k+30} \|\chi_{\sim k} u_{\ll j}\|_{L^4}^4 \|\chi_{\sim k} \partial_x w_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-7/6} \|xg\|_{L^2} \sum_k 2^{-k/2} \left(\sum_{j > k+30} c_j^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-2} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

Turning to the next sub-term, we again use almost orthogonality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_j (121b) \right\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \left(\sum_j \|\chi_{[j-40, j+40]} u\|_{L^\infty}^4 \|\chi_{[j-40, j+40]} u_{\ll j}\|_{L^\infty}^4 \|\partial_x w_{\sim j}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-2} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

For the final sub-term, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(121c)\|_{L^2} &\lesssim \|\chi_{> j-20} u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\chi_{> j-20} u_{\ll j}\|_{L^4}^2 \|\chi_{> j-20} \partial_x w_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-3} 2^{-3j} \|xg\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

which gives the desired bound after summing. This completes the argument for (119c).

It only remains to bound the contribution from (118a). Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \partial_s \|T(s)\|_{L^2}^2 &= \Re \langle \partial_s T(s), T(s) \rangle \\ &= \Re \left\langle e^{-s\partial_x^3} \partial_s e^{s\partial_x^3} T(s), T(s) \right\rangle - \Re \left\langle e^{-s\partial_x^3} \partial_x^3 e^{s\partial_x^3} T(s), T(s) \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

The second term on the last line vanishes because ∂_x^3 is a skew-adjoint operator. Noting that

$$e^{s\partial_x^3} T(s) = T_{m_s e^{is\phi}}(f, g, \bar{f}) + T_{m_s e^{is\phi}}(f, h, \bar{g}) + T_{m_s e^{is\phi}}(g, h, \bar{f})$$

we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \partial_s \|T(s)\|_{L^2}^2 &= \Re \langle T_{m_s e^{is\phi}}(f, g, \bar{f}) + T_{m_s e^{is\phi}}(f, h, \bar{g}) + T_{m_s e^{is\phi}}(g, h, \bar{f}), T(s) \rangle \\ &\quad + \Re \langle \tilde{T}(s) + \mathring{T}(s), T(s) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (122)$$

Now,

$$i\partial_\xi \phi(\xi - \eta - \sigma)e^{is\phi}\chi_s^T = \phi m_s e^{is\phi} = -im_s \partial_s e^{is\phi}$$

so we can use (122) to write

$$\begin{aligned} (118a) &= \mp \Re \int_1^t \langle T_{m_s \partial_s e^{is\phi}}(f, g, \bar{f}) + T_{m_s \partial_s e^{is\phi}}(f, h, \bar{g}) + T_{m_s \partial_s e^{is\phi}}(g, h, \bar{f}), T(s) \rangle ds \\ &= \mp \frac{1}{2} \int_1^t s^2 \partial_s \|T(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \end{aligned} \quad (123a)$$

$$\pm \Re \int_1^t s^2 \langle \tilde{T}(s) + \dot{T}(s), T(s) \rangle ds \quad (123b)$$

The bounds for $T(s)$, $\tilde{T}(s)$, and $\dot{T}(s)$ imply that

$$\begin{aligned} |(123a)| &\lesssim \int_1^t s^2 \|F(s)\|_{L^2} \|T(s)\|_{L^2} ds \\ &\lesssim \int_1^t M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-1} \|xg\|_{L^2}^2 + M^4 \epsilon^5 s^{-5/6-\beta} \|xg\|_{L^2} ds \end{aligned}$$

as required. Turning to (123a), integration by parts shows that

$$\begin{aligned} |(123a)| &= \left| -\frac{1}{2} s^2 \|T(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \Big|_{s=1}^{s=t} + \int_1^t s \|T(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right| \\ &\lesssim M^4 \epsilon^4 \|xg\|_{L^2}^2 + \epsilon^6 + \int_1^t M^4 \epsilon^4 s^{-1} \|xg(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \end{aligned}$$

which is better than required, completing the bound for (98e).

7. THE POINTWISE BOUNDS IN FOURIER SPACE

In this section, we will show how to control $\hat{f}(\xi, t)$ and $\partial_t \hat{u}(0, t)$. For $|\xi| < t^{-1/3}$, the Hölder continuity of \hat{f} in ξ reduces to the problem to estimating $\hat{f}(0, t)$, which in turn reduces to showing that (57) holds for $\partial_t \hat{u}(0, t)$. We show this improved decay by taking advantage of the self-similar structure at low frequencies. On the other hand, when $|\xi| \geq t^{-1/3}$, we show that $\hat{f}(\xi, t)$ essentially has ODE dynamics, which produce a logarithmic phase correction given by (58).

7.1. The low-frequency bounds. We first prove the bound (57) on $|\partial_t \hat{u}(0, t)|$. Note that $\partial_t \hat{u}(0, t)$ satisfies

$$\partial_t \hat{u}(0, t) = \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int |u|^2 \partial_x u dx$$

Recalling that $S(x, t) = t^{-1/3} \sigma(t^{-1/3} x)$ and using the self-similar equation (45), we see that $|S|^2 \partial_x S$ is the derivative of an L^2 function. Thus, $\int |S|^2 \partial_x S dx = 0$, and we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \hat{u}(0, t) &= \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int |u|^2 \partial_x u - |S|^2 \partial_x S dx \\ &= \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int |u|^2 \partial_x w + (u\bar{w} + w\bar{u}) \partial_x S dx \end{aligned}$$

But, all of these terms can be controlled using Theorem 9, giving us the bound

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_t \hat{u}(0, t)| &\lesssim M^2 \epsilon^2 t^{-7/6} \|xg\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim M^2 \epsilon^3 t^{-1-\beta} \end{aligned}$$

as required.

We now turn to the task of bounding $\hat{f}(\xi, t)$ in the low frequency region $|\xi| < t^{-1/3}$. Note that $\partial_t \hat{u}(0, t) = \partial_t \hat{f}(0, t)$, so integrating the above bound and recalling that $M^2 \epsilon^2 \ll 1$ gives us the bound

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{f}(0, t)| &\lesssim |\hat{f}(0, 1)| + \int_1^t |\partial_t \hat{u}(0, t)| dt \\ &\lesssim \epsilon + M^4 \epsilon^5 \\ &\lesssim \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

as required. For the other frequencies, we note that by the Sobolev-Morrey embedding, for $|\xi| < t^{-1/3}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{f}(\xi, t) - \hat{f}(0, t)| &\lesssim |\xi|^{1/2} \|xf\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim (\|xg\|_{L^2} + \|LS\|_{L^2}) t^{-1/6} \\ &\lesssim \epsilon t^{-\beta} + M^3 \epsilon^3 \\ &\lesssim \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

allowing us to conclude that \hat{f} is bounded in the region $|\xi| < t^{-1/3}$.

7.2. The perturbed Hamiltonian dynamics. In this section, we show that $\hat{f}(\xi, t)$ satisfies a perturbed Hamiltonian ODE for each $\xi \geq t^{-1/3}$, and as a consequence $\|\hat{f}\|_{L^\infty}$ is uniformly bounded in time. In particular, we will show that for $|\xi| \geq t^{-1/3}$, $\hat{f}(\xi, t)$ satisfies

$$\partial_t \hat{f}(\xi, t) = \pm \frac{i \operatorname{sgn} \xi}{6t} |\hat{f}(\xi, t)|^2 \hat{f}(\xi, t) + ce^{it8/9\xi^3} \frac{\operatorname{sgn} \xi}{t} |\hat{f}(\xi/3, t)|^2 \hat{f}(\xi/3, t) + R(\xi, t) \quad (124)$$

for some constant c , where $|R(\xi, t)| \lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3 t^{-1} (|\xi| t^{1/3})^{-1/14}$. From this, it will follow that if we define

$$B(t, \xi) := \pm \frac{\operatorname{sgn}(\xi)}{6} \int_1^t \frac{|\hat{f}(\xi, s)|^2}{s} ds$$

then $v(t, \xi) = e^{iB(t, \xi)} \hat{f}(t, \xi)$ satisfies

$$\partial_t v = ce^{it8/9\xi^3} e^{iB(t, \xi)} \frac{\operatorname{sgn} \xi}{t} |\hat{f}(\xi/3, t)|^2 \hat{f}(\xi/3, t) + R(\xi, t)$$

Let us consider $|v(t_1) - v(t_2)|$ for $\max(1, |\xi|^{-3}) \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq T$, where T is the time given in the bootstrap argument. Integrating by parts, we find (omitting the ξ factors in the argument):

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{is8/9\xi^3} e^{iB(s)} \frac{\operatorname{sgn} \xi}{s} |\hat{f}(s)|^2 \hat{f}(s) ds \right| &\lesssim \frac{1}{s|\xi|^3} |\hat{f}(s)|^3 \Big|_{s=t_1}^{s=t_2} + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\hat{f}(s)|^3 \frac{ds}{s^2|\xi|^3} \\ &\quad + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\partial_s B(s)| |\hat{f}(s)|^3 \frac{ds}{s|\xi|^3} \\ &\quad + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\partial_s \hat{f}(s)| |\hat{f}(s)|^2 \frac{ds}{s|\xi|^3} \\ &=: \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III} + \text{IV} \end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of B and the bound on \hat{f} , we see that

$$|\text{I}| + |\text{II}| + |\text{III}| \lesssim (M^3\epsilon^3 + M^5\epsilon^5)t_1^{-1}|\xi|^{-3} \quad (125)$$

Moreover, substituting the expression given in (124) for $\partial_s f(s)$, we find that

$$|\text{IV}| \lesssim \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{M^2\epsilon^2}{s|\xi|^3} \left(\frac{M^3\epsilon^3}{s} + R(\xi, s) \right) ds \lesssim M^5\epsilon^5 t_1^{-1} |\xi|^{-3} \quad (126)$$

Taking $t_1 = \max(1, |\xi|^{-3})$ and recalling from Section 7.1 that $|v(\xi, t_1)| = |\hat{f}(\xi, t_1)| \lesssim \epsilon$, we see that for $t \in (t_1, T)$,

$$|\hat{f}(\xi, t)| = |v(\xi, t)| \lesssim \epsilon + M^3\epsilon^3 t_1^{-1} |\xi|^{-3} \lesssim \epsilon$$

since $\epsilon \ll M^{-3/2}$. In particular, this closes the bootstrap for the \mathcal{FL}^∞ component of the X norm. Moreover, we have shown that $v(\xi, t)$ is Cauchy as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for $\xi \neq 0$, so $v(\xi, t)$ converges as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for each fixed nonzero ξ . If we write $f_\infty(\xi) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} v(\xi, t)$, then

$$\hat{f}(\xi, t) = \exp \left(\pm \frac{i}{6} \int_1^t \frac{|\hat{f}(\xi, s)|^2}{s} ds \right) f_\infty(\xi) + O(M^3\epsilon^3(t^{-1/3}|\xi|)^{-1/14})$$

so (58) holds. Thus, the proof of the main theorem will be complete once we verify (124).

7.3. The stationary phase estimate. We now prove (124). Note that we can write $\partial_t \hat{f}(\xi, t)$ as

$$\partial_t \hat{f}(\xi, t) = \pm \frac{i}{2\pi} \int e^{-it\phi}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \hat{f}(\eta) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma)} \hat{f}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) d\eta d\sigma \quad (127)$$

The stationary points for the phase ϕ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\eta_1, \sigma_1) &= (\xi, \xi) \\ (\eta_1, \sigma_1) &= (-\xi, \xi) \\ (\eta_1, \sigma_1) &= (\xi, -\xi) \\ (\eta_4, \sigma_4) &= (\xi/3, \xi/3) \end{aligned} \quad (128)$$

We will now divide the integral dyadically in η and σ , and use stationary phase to estimate each piece. Defining j to be the integer with $2^{j-1} < |\xi| \leq 2^j$, let us write

$$\partial_t \hat{f}(\xi, t) = \text{I}_{\text{lo}} + \text{I}_{\text{stat}} + \sum_{\ell > j+10} (\text{I}_\ell + \tilde{\text{I}}_\ell)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I}_{\text{lo}} &= \pm \frac{i}{2\pi} \int e^{-it\phi} \psi_{\ll j}(\eta) \psi_{\ll j}(\sigma) (\xi - \eta - \sigma) \hat{f}(\eta) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma)} \hat{f}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) d\eta d\sigma \\ \text{I}_{\text{stat}} &= \pm \frac{i}{2\pi} \int e^{-it\phi} \psi_j^{\text{med}}(\eta, \sigma) (\xi - \eta - \sigma) \hat{f}(\eta) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma)} \hat{f}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) d\eta d\sigma \\ \text{I}_\ell &= \pm \frac{i}{4\pi} \int e^{-it\phi} (\xi - \eta - \sigma) \psi_\ell(\eta) \psi_{\leq \ell}(\sigma) \hat{f}(\eta) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma)} \hat{f}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) d\eta d\sigma \\ \tilde{\text{I}}_\ell &= \pm \frac{i}{4\pi} \int e^{-it\phi} (\xi - \eta - \sigma) \psi_{< \ell}(\eta) \psi_\ell(\sigma) \hat{f}(\eta) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma)} \hat{f}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) d\eta d\sigma \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\psi_j^{\text{med}}(\eta, \sigma) = \psi_{\lesssim j}(\eta) \psi_{\lesssim j}(\sigma) - \psi_{\ll j}(\eta) \psi_{\ll j}(\sigma)$$

We will show how to estimate the terms I_{lo} , I_{stat} and I_ℓ : the estimate for the $\tilde{\text{I}}_\ell$ terms follows from similar reasoning.

7.3.1. *The estimate for I_{10} .* Over the support of the integrand, $|\partial_\eta \phi| \sim 2^{2j}$, so we can integrate by parts with respect to η to obtain

$$I_{10} = \mp \frac{i}{2\pi t} \int e^{it\phi} \frac{\xi - \eta - \sigma}{\partial_\eta \phi} \psi_{\ll j}(\eta) \psi_{\ll j}(\sigma) \partial_\eta \hat{f}(\eta) \hat{f}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma)} d\eta d\sigma \quad (129a)$$

$$\mp \frac{1}{4\pi t} \int e^{it\phi} \partial_\eta \left(\frac{(\xi - \eta - \sigma)}{\partial_\eta \phi} \psi_{\ll j}(\eta) \psi_{\ll j}(\sigma) \right) \hat{f}(\eta) \hat{f}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma)} d\eta d\sigma \quad (129b)$$

$$+ \{\text{similar terms}\}$$

For the first term, we note that $m_j^1 = 2^j \frac{\xi - \eta - \sigma}{\partial_\eta \phi} \psi_{\ll j}(\eta) \psi_{\ll j}(\sigma) \psi_{\sim k}(\xi)$ is a smooth symbol supported on $|\xi|, |\eta|, |\sigma| \lesssim 2^j$ and satisfies the Coifman-Meyer type symbol bounds

$$|\partial_{\xi, \eta, \sigma}^\alpha m_j^1| \lesssim_\alpha 2^{-j|\alpha|}$$

Thus, arguing as in Remark 8 and using the Hausdorff-Young inequality, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} |(129a)| &= t^{-1} 2^{-j} \left| \hat{T}_{m_j^1}(Lu_{\lesssim j}, u_{\lesssim j}, \bar{u}_{\lesssim j}) \right| \\ &\lesssim t^{-1} 2^{-j} \left\| T_{m_j^1}(Lu_{\lesssim j}, u_{\lesssim j}, \bar{u}_{\lesssim j}) \right\|_{L^1} \\ &\lesssim t^{-1} 2^{-j} \|xf\|_{L^2} \|P_{\lesssim j} f\|_{L^2} \|u_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3 t^{-7/6} 2^{-j/2} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, defining the symbol $m_j^2 = 2^{2j} \partial_\eta \left(\frac{\xi - \eta - \sigma}{\partial_\eta \phi} \psi_{\ll j}(\eta) \psi_{\ll j}(\sigma) \right) \psi_{\sim j}(\xi)$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} |(129b)| &= t^{-1} 2^{-2j} \left| \hat{T}_{m_j^2}(u_{\lesssim j}, u_{\lesssim j}, \bar{u}_{\lesssim j}) \right| \\ &\lesssim t^{-1} 2^{-2j} \left\| T_{m_j^2}(u_{\lesssim j}, u_{\lesssim j}, \bar{u}_{\lesssim j}) \right\|_{L^1} \\ &\lesssim t^{-1} 2^{-2j} \|P_{\lesssim j} f\|_{L^2}^2 \|u_{\lesssim j}\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3 t^{-4/3} 2^{-j} \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$|I_{10}| \lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3 t^{-1} \left(t^{1/3} 2^j \right)^{-1/2}$$

which is consistent with the estimate for the remainder term in (124).

7.3.2. *The estimate for I_ℓ .* For these terms, $|\nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi| \sim 2^{2\ell}$. Integrating by parts using the identity $\frac{1}{it|\nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi|^2} \nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi \cdot \nabla_{\eta, \sigma} e^{it\phi} = e^{it\phi}$, we find that

$$I_\ell = \mp \frac{1}{2\pi t} \int e^{it\phi} \frac{(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \partial_\eta \phi}{|\nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi|^2} \psi_\ell(\eta) \psi_{\leq \ell}(\sigma) \partial_\eta \hat{f}(\eta) \hat{f}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma)} d\eta d\sigma \quad (130a)$$

$$\mp \frac{1}{4\pi t} \int e^{it\phi} \nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \cdot \left(\frac{(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \psi_\ell(\eta) \psi_{\leq \ell}(\sigma) \nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi}{|\nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi|^2} \right) \hat{f}(\eta) \hat{f}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma)} d\eta d\sigma \quad (130b)$$

$$+ \{\text{similar terms}\}$$

The argument is now similar to the one for (129a) and (129b). Writing

$$\begin{aligned} m_\ell^1 &= 2^\ell \frac{(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \partial_\eta \phi}{|\nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi|^2} \psi_\ell(\eta) \psi_{\leq \ell}(\sigma) \psi_{\sim \ell}(\xi - \xi_0) \\ m_\ell^2 &= 2^{2\ell} \nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \cdot \left(\frac{(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \partial_\eta \phi}{|\nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi|^2} \psi_\ell(\eta) \psi_{\leq \ell}(\sigma) \right) \psi_{\sim \ell}(\xi - \xi_0) \end{aligned}$$

for some ξ_0 within distance $O(2^\ell)$ of ξ and observing that m_ℓ^1, m_ℓ^2 satisfy the conditions given in Remark 8 uniformly in ℓ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} |(130a)| &\lesssim t^{-1} 2^{-\ell} \|T_{m_\ell^1}(Lu, P_{\lesssim \ell}^{\xi_0} u, \bar{u}_{\lesssim \ell})\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim t^{-1} 2^{-\ell} \|Lu\|_{L^2} \|P_{\lesssim \ell}^{\xi_0} f\|_{L^2} \|u\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3 t^{-7/6} 2^{-\ell/2} \\ |(130b)| &\lesssim t^{-1} 2^{-2\ell} \|T_{m_\ell^1}(u_{\lesssim \ell}, P_{\lesssim \ell}^{\xi_0} u, \bar{u}_{\lesssim \ell})\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim t^{-1} 2^{-2\ell} \|P_{\lesssim \ell}^{\xi_0} f\|_{L^2}^2 \|u\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3 t^{-4/3} 2^{-\ell} \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{P}_{\lesssim \ell}^\zeta = \psi_{\lesssim \ell}(D - \zeta)$ for $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$. An analogous argument holds for \tilde{I}_ℓ , so summing over $\ell > k + 10$, we find that

$$\left| \sum_{\ell > k+10} I_\ell + \tilde{I}_\ell \right| \lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3 t^{-1} \left(t^{1/3} 2^k \right)^{-1/2}$$

which allows us to treat these terms as remainders in (124).

7.3.3. The estimate for I_{stat} . The integral here contains the four stationary points given in (128). Note that each of the stationary points are at a distance $\sim 2^j$ from each other. Using this, we can write

$$I_{\text{stat}} = \sum_{r=1}^4 \sum_{2^\ell \ll 2^j} \left(J_\ell^{(r)} + \tilde{J}_\ell^{(r)} \right) + \{\text{remainder}\}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_\ell^{(r)} &= \pm \frac{i}{2\pi} \int e^{-it\phi} \psi_\ell^{[\ell_0]}(\eta - \eta_r) \psi_{\leq \ell}^{[\ell_0]}(\sigma - \sigma_r) (\xi - \eta - \sigma) \hat{f}(\eta) \hat{f}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma)} d\eta d\sigma \\ \tilde{J}_\ell^{(r)} &= \pm \frac{i}{2\pi} \int e^{-it\phi} \psi_\ell^{[\ell_0]}(\eta - \eta_r) \psi_\ell^{[\ell_0]}(\sigma - \sigma_r) (\xi - \eta - \sigma) \hat{f}(\eta) \hat{f}(\xi - \eta - \sigma) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma)} d\eta d\sigma \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\psi_\ell^{[\ell_0]} = \begin{cases} \psi_\ell & \ell > \ell_0 \\ \psi_{\leq \ell} & \ell = \ell_0 \\ 0 & \ell < \ell_0 \end{cases}$$

for a parameter ℓ_0 defined such that $2^{\ell_0} \sim t^{-1/3} (t^{1/3} 2^k)^{-\gamma}$, where $\gamma > 0$ is a constant which will be specified later. The contribution from the remainder can be controlled using an argument similar to the one for I_ℓ , so we will focus on controlling the contribution from the $J_\ell^{(r)}$ terms. There are two cases to consider: either $\ell = \ell_0$ or $\ell > \ell_0$.

Case $\ell > \ell_0$. We first consider the bound for $J_\ell^{(r)}$. Integrating by parts gives

$$J_\ell^{(r)} = t^{-1} 2^{-\ell} e^{it\xi^3} \hat{T}_{m_\ell^1}(Lu, \tilde{P}_{\lesssim \ell}^{\xi_0 - \eta_r - \sigma_r} u, \overline{u}_{\sim j}) \quad (131a)$$

$$+ t^{-1} 2^{-2\ell} e^{it\xi^3} T_{m_\ell^2}(\tilde{P}_{\lesssim \ell}^{\eta_r} u, \tilde{P}_{\lesssim \ell}^{\xi_0 - \eta_r + \sigma_r} u, \overline{u}_{\sim j}) \\ + \{\text{similar terms}\} \quad (131b)$$

where ξ_0 is any point at a distance $\ll 2^\ell$ from ξ , and the symbols m_ℓ^1 and m_ℓ^2 are given by

$$m_\ell^1 = \pm 2^\ell (\xi - \eta - \sigma) \frac{\partial_\eta \phi}{|\nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi|^2} \psi_\ell(\eta - \eta_r) \psi_{\leq \ell}(\sigma - \sigma_r) \psi_{\leq \ell}(\xi - \xi_0) \\ m_\ell^2 = \pm 2^{2\ell} \nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \cdot \left((\xi - \eta - \sigma) \frac{\nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi}{|\nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi|^2} \right) \psi_{\leq \ell}(\xi - \xi_0)$$

It is clear that these symbols are supported on a region of volume $\sim 2^{3\ell}$. Moreover, over the support of the integral we have that

$$|\xi - \eta - \sigma| \lesssim 2^j, \quad |\nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi| \sim 2^{j+\ell}, \quad |\partial_{\xi, \eta, \sigma}^\alpha \nabla_{\eta, \sigma} \phi| \lesssim 2^{(2-|\alpha|)\ell} \quad |\alpha| \geq 2$$

where for the last inequality we have used the fact that $2^\ell \ll 2^j$. Thus, we see that m_ℓ^1 and m_ℓ^2 obey the Coifman-Meyer type bounds

$$|\partial_{\xi, \eta, \sigma}^\alpha m_\ell^1| + |\partial_{\xi, \eta, \sigma}^\alpha m_\ell^2| \lesssim_\alpha 2^{-|\alpha|\ell}$$

Thus, we have the bounds

$$|(131a)| \leq t^{-1} 2^{-\ell} \left\| \hat{T}_{m_\ell^1}(Lu, \tilde{P}_{\lesssim \ell}^{\xi - \eta_r - \sigma_r} u, \overline{u}_{\sim j}) \right\|_{L^1} \\ \lesssim t^{-1} 2^{-\ell} \|xf\|_{L^2} \|\tilde{P}_{\lesssim \ell}^{\xi - \eta_r - \sigma_r} f\|_{L^2} \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \\ \lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3 t^{-4/3} 2^{-j/2} 2^{-\ell/2}$$

and

$$|(131b)| \leq t^{-1} 2^{-2\ell} \left\| \hat{T}_{m_\ell^2}(\tilde{P}_{\lesssim \ell}^{\eta_r} u, \tilde{P}_{\lesssim \ell}^{\xi - \eta_r - \sigma_r} u, \overline{u}_{\sim j}) \right\|_{L^1} \\ \lesssim t^{-1} 2^{-2\ell} \|\tilde{P}_{\lesssim \ell}^{\eta_r} f\|_{L^2} \|\tilde{P}_{\lesssim \ell}^{\xi - \eta_r - \sigma_r} f\|_{L^2} \|u_{\sim j}\|_{L^\infty} \\ \lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3 t^{-3/2} 2^{-j/2} 2^{-\ell}$$

Summing over $\ell > \ell_0$ yields

$$\left| \sum_{\ell > \ell_0} J_\ell^{(r)} \right| \lesssim t^{-1} (t^{1/3} 2^j)^{-1/2+\gamma} \quad (132)$$

A similar argument gives an identical bound for the $\tilde{J}_\ell^{(r)}$.

Case $\ell = \ell_0$. By performing the linear change of variables $\eta \rightarrow \eta + \eta_r$, $\sigma \rightarrow \sigma + \sigma_r$, we obtain

$$J_{\ell_0}^{(r)} = \pm \frac{i}{2\pi} \int e^{-it\phi} \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\eta) \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\sigma) (\xi - \eta_r - \sigma_r - \eta - \sigma) F_r(\xi, \eta, \sigma) d\eta d\sigma \\ \tilde{J}_{\ell_0}^{(r)} = 0$$

where

$$F_r(\xi, \eta, \sigma) = \hat{f}(\eta + \eta_r) \hat{f}(\xi - \eta - \eta_r - \sigma - \sigma_r) \overline{\hat{f}(-\sigma - \sigma_r)}$$

We can re-write this as

$$J_{\ell_0}^{(r)} = \pm \frac{i}{2\pi} \int e^{-it\phi} \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\eta) \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\sigma) (\xi - \eta_r - \sigma_r - \eta - \sigma) (F_r(\xi, \eta, \sigma) - F_r(\xi, 0, 0)) d\eta d\sigma \quad (133a)$$

$$\mp \frac{i}{2\pi} F_r(\xi, 0, 0) \int e^{-it\phi} \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\eta) \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\sigma) (\eta + \sigma) d\eta d\sigma \quad (133b)$$

$$\pm \frac{i}{2\pi} F_r(\xi, 0, 0) (\xi - \eta_r - \sigma_r) \int e^{-it\phi} \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\eta) \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\sigma) d\eta d\sigma \quad (133c)$$

For (133a), we recall that the L^2 bound on xf implies that \hat{f} is $1/2$ -Hölder, so

$$|F_r(\xi, \eta, \sigma) - F_r(\xi, 0, 0)| \lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3 t^{1/6} (|\eta| + |\sigma|)^{1/2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |(133a)| &\lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3 t^{1/6} \int \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\eta) \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\sigma) (\eta + \sigma + \eta_r + \sigma_r) (|\eta| + |\sigma|)^{1/2} d\eta d\sigma \\ &\lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3 2^j t^{1/6} 2^{5/2\ell_0} \\ &\lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3 t^{-1} \left(t^{1/3} 2^j \right)^{1-5/2\gamma} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the L^∞ bound on \hat{f} from (BH) shows that $|F_r(\xi, 0, 0)| \lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3$, so

$$\begin{aligned} |(133b)| &\lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3 2^{3\ell_0} \\ &\lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3 t^{-1} \left(t^{1/3} 2^j \right)^{-3\gamma} \end{aligned}$$

The term (133c) contains the leading order contribution to (124). We will extract this contribution using the method of stationary phase. By direct calculation, we find

$$\phi(\xi, \eta + \eta_r, \sigma + \sigma_r) = \phi_r + Q_r(\eta, \sigma) + O(|\eta|^3 + |\sigma|^3)$$

where $\phi_r = \phi(\xi, \eta_r, \sigma_r)$ and Q_r is the quadratic form associated to the Hessian matrix $\text{Hess}_{\eta, \sigma} \phi(\xi, \eta_r, \sigma_r)$. Thus, $|e^{-it\phi} - e^{-it(\phi_r + Q_r(\eta, \sigma))}| \lesssim t(|\eta|^3 + |\sigma|^3)$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \left| (\xi - \eta_r - \sigma_r) F_r(\xi, 0, 0) \int \left(e^{-it\phi} - e^{-it(\phi_r + Q_r(\eta, \sigma))} \right) \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\eta) \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\sigma) d\eta d\sigma \right| &\lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3 2^j t^{5\ell_0} \\ &\lesssim M^3 \epsilon^3 (t^{1/3} 2^j)^{1-5\gamma} \end{aligned}$$

By rescaling and using stationary phase, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \int e^{-itQ_r(\eta, \sigma)} \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\eta) \psi_{\leq \ell_0}(\sigma) d\eta d\sigma &= 2^{2\ell_0} \int e^{-it2^{2\ell_0} Q_r(\eta, \sigma)} \psi_{\leq 0}(\eta) \psi_{\leq 0}(\sigma) d\eta d\sigma \\ &= \frac{2\pi e^{i\frac{\pi}{4} \text{sign Hess}_{\eta, \sigma} \phi(\xi, \eta_r, \sigma_r)}}{t \sqrt{|\det \text{Hess}_{\eta, \sigma} \phi(\xi, \eta_r, \sigma_r)|}} \\ &\quad + O(t^{-2} 2^{-2\ell_0} 2^{-2j}) \end{aligned}$$

where on the last line we have used the fact that $|\det \text{Hess}_{\eta, \sigma} \phi(\xi, \eta_r, \sigma_r)| \sim 2^{2j}$ to obtain the error term. Collecting all these calculations, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} (133c) &= \pm i F_r(\xi, 0, 0) \frac{(\xi - \eta_r - \sigma_r) e^{-it\phi_r + i\frac{\pi}{4} \text{sign } Q_r}}{t \sqrt{|\det Q_r|}} \\ &\quad + O\left(M^3 \epsilon^3 t^{-1} \left[\left(t^{1/3} 2^j \right)^{1-5\gamma} + \left(t^{1/3} 2^j \right)^{-1-2\gamma} \right] \right) \end{aligned}$$

Collecting the results for (133a)–(133c) and simplifying using the definition of ℓ_0 , we find that

$$J_{\ell_0}^{(r)} = \pm i F_r(\xi, 0, 0) \frac{(\xi - \eta_r - \sigma_r) e^{-it\phi_r + i\frac{\pi}{4} \text{sign } Q_r}}{t \sqrt{|\det Q_r|}} + O\left(M^3 \epsilon^3 t^{-1} \left[\left(t^{1/3} 2^j\right)^{1-5/2\gamma} + \left(t^{1/3} 2^j\right)^{-3\gamma} + \left(t^{1/3} 2^j\right)^{-1-2\gamma} \right]\right) \quad (134)$$

A quick calculation shows that for $r = 1, 2, 3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_r &= 0, & \det Q_r &= -36\xi^2, & \text{sign } Q_r &= 0 \\ \phi_4 &= 8/9\xi^3, & \det Q_4 &= 12\xi^2, & \text{sign } Q_4 &= -2 \text{sgn } \xi \end{aligned}$$

Thus, combining (134) with (132) and taking $\gamma = 3/7$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{r=1}^4 J^{(r)} &= \pm \frac{i \text{sgn } \xi}{6t} |\hat{f}(\xi, t)|^2 \hat{f}(\xi, t) \pm e^{it8/9\xi^3} \frac{\text{sgn } \xi e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2} \text{sgn } \xi}}{3\sqrt{12t}} |\hat{f}(\xi/3, t)|^2 \hat{f}(\xi/3, t) \\ &\quad + O(M^3 \epsilon^3 t^{-1} (t^{1/3} 2^j)^{-1/14}) \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof of (124) and gives Theorem 10.

REFERENCES

- [1] Stephen C. Anco, Mohammad Mohiuddin, and Thomas Wolf. Traveling waves and conservation laws for complex mKdV-type equations. *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 219(2):679–698, October 2012.
- [2] Anjan Biswas and Saima Arshed. Optical solitons in presence of higher order dispersions and absence of self-phase modulation. *Optik*, 174:452–459, December 2018.
- [3] Andreia Chapouto. A Refined Well-Posedness Result for the Modified KdV Equation in the Fourier-Lebesgue Spaces. *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, July 2021.
- [4] Andreia Chapouto. A remark on the well-posedness of the modified KdV equation in the Fourier-Lebesgue spaces. *Discrete. Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 41(8):3915, 2021.
- [5] Francis Michael Christ, James E. Colliander, and Terrence Tao. Asymptotics, Frequency modulation, and low regularity ill-posedness for Canonical defocusing equations. *Amer. J. Math.*, 125(6):1235–1293, 2003.
- [6] Ronald R Coifman and Yves Meyer. Au dela des opérateurs pseudo-différentiels. *Asterisque*, 57:202, 1978.
- [7] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka, and T. Tao. Sharp global well-posedness for KdV and modified KdV on \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{T} . *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 16(3):705–749, 2003.
- [8] Diego Córdoba, Javier Gómez-Serrano, and Alexandru D. Ionescu. Global Solutions for the Generalized SQG Patch Equation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 233(3):1211–1251, September 2019.
- [9] Simão Correia, Raphaël Côte, and Luis Vega. Asymptotics in Fourier space of self-similar solutions to the modified Korteweg-de Vries equation. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 137:101–142, May 2020.
- [10] Simão Correia, Raphaël Côte, and Luis Vega. Self-Similar Dynamics for the Modified Korteweg-de Vries Equation. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, 2021(rnz383), January 2020.
- [11] Percy Deift and Xin Zhou. A Steepest Descent Method for Oscillatory Riemann–Hilbert Problems. Asymptotics for the MKdV Equation. *Ann. Math.*, 137(2):295–368, March 1993.
- [12] Percy Deift and Xin Zhou. Asymptotics for the painlevé II equation. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 48(3):277–337, 1995.
- [13] German Fonseca, Felipe Linares, and Gustavo Ponce. On persistence properties in fractional weighted spaces. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 143(12):5353–5367, 2015.
- [14] Yasuhide Fukumoto and Takeshi Miyazaki. Three-dimensional distortions of a vortex filament with axial velocity. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 222:369–416, January 1991.
- [15] Pierre Germain. Space-time resonances. *Journ. Équ. dériv. partielles*, pages 1–10, 2010.
- [16] Pierre Germain. Global existence for coupled Klein-Gordon equations with different speeds. *Ann. Inst. Fourier*, 61(6):2463–2506, 2011.
- [17] Pierre Germain and Nader Masmoudi. Global existence for the Euler-Maxwell system. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.*, 47(3):469–503, 2014.

- [18] Pierre Germain, Nader Masmoudi, and Jalal Shatah. Global Solutions for 3D Quadratic Schrödinger Equations. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, December 2008.
- [19] Pierre Germain, Nader Masmoudi, and Jalal Shatah. Global solution for 2D quadratic Schrödinger equations. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 97(5):505–543, May 2012.
- [20] Pierre Germain, Fabio Pusateri, and Frédéric Rousset. Asymptotic stability of solitons for mKdV. *Adv. Math.*, 299:272–330, August 2016.
- [21] Axel Grünrock. An improved local well-posedness result for the modified KdV equation. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, 2004(61):3287–3308, January 2004.
- [22] Axel Grünrock and Luis Vega. Local well-posedness for the modified KdV equation in almost critical \widehat{H}_r^s -spaces. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 361(11):5681–5694, 2009.
- [23] Zihua Guo. Global well-posedness of Korteweg–de Vries equation in $h^{-3/4}(\mathbb{R})$. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 91(6):583–597, June 2009.
- [24] Stephen Gustafson, Kenji Nakanishi, and Tai-Peng Tsai. Scattering theory for the gross–pitaevskii equation in three dimensions. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 11(04):657–707, August 2009.
- [25] Zaher Hani, Fabio Pusateri, and Jalal Shatah. Scattering for the Zakharov System in 3 Dimensions. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 322(3):731–753, September 2013.
- [26] Godfrey H. Hardy, John E. Littlewood, and George Pólya. *Inequalities*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2nd ed. edition, 1959.
- [27] Benjamin Harrop-Griffiths. Long time behavior of solutions to the mKdV. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 41(2):282–317, February 2016.
- [28] Benjamin Harrop-Griffiths, Rowan Killip, and Monica Visan. Sharp well-posedness for the cubic NLS and mKdV in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$. *arXiv*, March 2020.
- [29] S.P. Hastings and J.B. McLeod. A boundary value problem associated with the second painlevé transcendent and the Korteweg-de Vries equation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 73(1):31–51, 1980.
- [30] Nakao Hayashi and Pavel Naumkin. On the Modified Korteweg–De Vries Equation. *Math. Phys. Anal. Geom.*, 4(3):197–227, September 2001.
- [31] Nakao Hayashi and Pavel I. Naumkin. Large time behavior of solutions for the modified Korteweg-de Vries equation. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, 1999(8):395–418, January 1999.
- [32] Jingsong He, Lihong Wang, Linjing Li, K. Porsezian, and R. Erdélyi. Few-cycle optical rogue waves: Complex modified Korteweg–de Vries equation. *Phys. Rev. E*, 89(6):062917, June 2014.
- [33] Lin Huang and Jonatan Lenells. Asymptotics for the Sasa–Satsuma equation in terms of a modified painlevé II transcendent. *J. Differ. Equations*, 268(12):7480–7504, 2020.
- [34] Lin Huang, Jian Xu, and En-gui Fan. Long-time asymptotic for the Hirota equation via nonlinear steepest descent method. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.*, 26:229–262, December 2015.
- [35] Mihaela Ifrim and Daniel Tataru. Global bounds for the cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation (NLS) in one space dimension. *Nonlinearity*, 28(8):2661–2675, August 2015.
- [36] Mihaela Ifrim and Daniel Tataru. Two dimensional water waves in holomorphic coordinates II: Global solutions. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 144(2):369–394, 2016.
- [37] Alexandru D. Ionescu and Benoit Pausader. The Einstein-Klein-Gordon coupled system: Global stability of the Minkowski solution. *arXiv*, February 2020.
- [38] Alexandru D. Ionescu and Fabio Pusateri. Global Regularity for 2d Water Waves with Surface Tension. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 256(1227), November 2018.
- [39] Jun Kato and Fabio Pusateri. A new proof of long-range scattering for critical nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Differ. Integr. Equ.*, 24(9-10):923–940, 2011.
- [40] Tosio Kato. On the Cauchy problem for the (generalized) Korteweg-de Vries equation. In *Studies in Applied Mathematics*, volume 8 of *Advances in Mathematics*, pages 93–128. Academic Press, New York, NY, 1983.
- [41] Carlos E. Kenig, Gustavo Ponce, and Luis Vega. On the (generalized) Korteweg-de Vries equation. *Duke Math. J.*, 59(3):585–610, December 1989.
- [42] Carlos E. Kenig, Gustavo Ponce, and Luis Vega. Well-posedness and scattering results for the generalized korteweg-de vries equation via the contraction principle. *Comm. Pure and Appl. Math.*, 46(4):527–620, 1993.
- [43] Carlos E. Kenig, Gustavo Ponce, and Luis Vega. On the ill-posedness of some canonical dispersive equations. *Duke Math. J.*, 106(3):617–633, February 2001.
- [44] Nobu Kishimoto. Well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation at the critical regularity. *Differential Integral Equations*, 22(5/6):447–464, May 2009.

- [45] Sergiu Klainerman. The null condition and global existence to nonlinear wave equations. In *Nonlinear Systems of Partial Differential Equations in Applied Mathematics*, volume 1 of *Lectures in Applied Mathematics*, pages 293–326. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I, 1986.
- [46] Nan Liu and Boling Guo. Long-time asymptotics for the Sasa–Satsuma equation via nonlinear steepest descent method. *J. Math. Phys.*, 60(1):011504, January 2019.
- [47] Nan Liu and Boling Guo. Long-time asymptotics for the sasa–satsuma equation via nonlinear steepest descent method. *J. Math. Phys.*, 60(1):011504, 2019.
- [48] G. Perelman and L. Vega. Self-similar planar curves related to modified Korteweg–de Vries equation. *J. Differential Equations*, 235(1):56–73, April 2007.
- [49] R. F. Rodríguez, J. A. Reyes, A. Espinosa-Cerón, J. Fujioka, and B. A. Malomed. Standard and embedded solitons in nematic optical fibers. *Phys. Rev. E*, 68(3):036606, September 2003.
- [50] R. S. Scorer. Numerical evaluation of integrals of the form $I = \int_{x_1}^{x_2} f(x)e^{i\phi(x)}dx$ and the tabulation of the function $\text{Gi}(z) = (1/\pi) \int_0^\infty \sin(uz + \frac{1}{3}u^3)du$. *Q J Mech Appl Math*, 3(1):107–112, January 1950.
- [51] Jalal Shatah. Normal forms and quadratic nonlinear Klein-Gordon equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 38(5):685–696, 1985.
- [52] Terence Tao. *Nonlinear Dispersive Equations: Local and Global Analysis*. Number no. 106 in Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences Regional Conference Series in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I, 2006.
- [53] Hong-Yi Zhang and Yu-Feng Zhang. Spectral analysis and long-time asymptotics of complex mKdV equation. *J. Math. Phys.*, 63(2):021509, February 2022.
- [54] Maciej Zworski. *Semiclassical Analysis*, volume 138 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, July 2012.

COURANT INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, 251 MERCER ST., NEW YORK, NY 10012, USA

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, 110 FRELINGHUYSEN RD., PISCATAWAY, NJ, 08854, USA
 Email address: gavin.stewart@rutgers.edu