

# PROPAGATION OF SINGULARITIES WITH NORMALLY HYPERBOLIC TRAPPING

QIUYE JIA

**ABSTRACT.** We prove a new microlocal estimate with normally hyperbolic trapping, which can be applied to Kerr and Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetimes. We use a new type of symbol class, and corresponding operator class, which is constructed by blowing up the intersection of the unstable manifold and the fiber infinity. The extra loss of the microlocal estimates compared with the standard propagation of singularities without trapping is arbitrarily small.

## CONTENTS

<b>Introduction</b>	2
1.1 Background	2
1.2 The main result	3
1.3 Previous works	6
1.4 Structure of this paper	6
<b>Microlocal Analysis</b>	7
2.1 The new symbol class	7
2.2 Sobolev spaces and operator classes	12
2.3 The principal symbol	13
2.4 Wavefront Sets and Ellipticity	14
2.5 Mapping properties	15
2.6 Gårding's inequality	16
<b>Statement of the Theorem</b>	17
3.1 Assumptions near the trapped set	17
3.2 Improve orders of operators	19
3.3 The microlocal estimate	20
<b>Positive commutator argument</b>	21
4.1 Propagation near the fiber infinity side of the corner	21
4.2 Propagation near the $\Gamma^u$ side of the corner	27
4.3 Propagation to the trapped set	29
4.4 Propagation using $H_p$ -flow	33
4.5 Combining Estimates	35
4.6 Regularization	37
<b>Application to Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetimes and its perturbations</b>	38
5.1 Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetime and its perturbations	38
5.2 Defining functions of the unstable and stable manifolds	39

5.3	Construction of the symplectomorphism	42
5.4	Quantize $\text{Sp}$	46
5.5	Properties of the conjugated operator	49

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Background.

The Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetime (before compactifying at time infinity) is a manifold  $M^\circ$  equipped with a Lorentzian metric  $g$  such that

$$(1.1) \quad M^\circ = \mathbb{R}_t \times X, \quad X = (r_e, r_c) \times \mathbb{S}^2,$$

For detailed definitions of  $r_e, r_c, g$ , please refer to Section 1.2 and 5.1.  $(M^\circ, g)$  is describing a rotating black hole. It is determined by two parameters: the angular momentum  $\mathfrak{a}$  and the mass  $\mathfrak{m}$ . Our paper concerns the regularity of solutions to wave equations on Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetimes by proving propagation of singularities type estimates. Propagation of singularities builds connection between the regularities of a solution to a partial differential equation at different locations on bicharacteristics, which are integral curves of the Hamilton vector field associated to that equation. The propagation with finite time, i.e. the parameter of bicharacteristics, was considered by Hörmander [18] and his work joint with Duistermaat [8]. The propagation with infinite time bifurcates into radial point estimates and trapping estimates. The general form of the former is proven by Vasy [31]. The trapping estimates, in particular with the normally hyperbolic trapping, is developed by a series of works.

In [36], Wunsch and Zworski proved that for polynomially weighted  $L^2$  function spaces on stationary spacetimes, the loss of Sobolev regularity of the propagation estimates with normally hyperbolic trapping compared with the standard non-trapping propagation estimates is one logarithmic order. Hintz [14] proved propagation estimates with one extra Sobolev order loss (extra compared with non-trapping estimates) for exponentially weighted Sobolev spaces on Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetimes and its time-dependent perturbations, which is an important motivation of our work.

In this paper we prove propagation estimates with arbitrarily small extra loss compared with the classical non-trapping propagation estimates. One major application of estimates of this type is to linearized Einstein equations on the Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetimes. The novelty of this paper is that we associate different orders to different boundary faces in the blown-up compactified cotangent bundle. This further decomposes the positive commutator argument in [14].

### 1.2. The main result.

The metric  $g$  on the Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetime  $M^\circ$  with angular momentum  $\mathfrak{a}$  and mass  $\mathfrak{m}$  is given by

$$(1.2) \quad g_{\mathfrak{m},\mathfrak{a}} = (r^2 + \mathfrak{a}^2 \cos^2 \theta) \left( \frac{dr^2}{\Delta(r)} + \frac{d\theta^2}{\Delta_\theta} \right) - \frac{\Delta_\theta \sin^2 \theta}{\Delta_0^2 (r^2 + \mathfrak{a}^2 \cos^2 \theta)} (\mathfrak{a} dt - (r^2 + \mathfrak{a}^2) d\varphi)^2 \\ + \frac{\Delta(r)}{\Delta_0^2 (r^2 + \mathfrak{a}^2 \cos^2 \theta)} (dt - \mathfrak{a} \sin^2 \theta d\varphi)^2,$$

where  $\Lambda$  is the cosmological constant and

$$(1.3) \quad \Delta(r) = (r^2 + \mathfrak{a}^2) \left( 1 - \frac{\Lambda r^2}{3} \right) - 2\mathfrak{m}r, \quad \Delta_\theta = 1 + \frac{\Lambda \mathfrak{a}^2}{3} \cos^2 \theta, \\ \Delta_0 = 1 + \frac{\Lambda \mathfrak{a}^2}{3}, \quad \Lambda \geq 0.$$

Specifically, the case  $\Lambda > 0$  is called the Kerr-de Sitter spacetime, while the case  $\Lambda = 0$  is called the Kerr spacetime.

The wave operator  $\square_g$  on  $(M^\circ, g)$  is a second order differential operator and its principal symbol is the dual metric function  $G(z, \zeta) := |\zeta|_{g^{-1}(z)}^2$ , where  $\zeta \in T_z^* M^\circ$ . The characteristic set  $\Sigma$  is defined to be

$$\Sigma := \{(z, \zeta) \in T^* M^\circ \setminus o : G(z, \zeta) = 0\},$$

where  $o$  is the zero section in  $T^* M$ . Denote momentum variables dual to  $t, r, \varphi, \theta$  by  $\xi_t, \xi_r, \xi_\varphi, \xi_\theta$  respectively, then  $\Sigma$  has two components

$$\Sigma_\pm := \Sigma \cap \{\pm \xi_t > 0\}.$$

We focus on  $\Sigma_+$ , the ‘future’ part of  $\Sigma$  in our discussion. Since all objects concerned here are homogeneous with respect to the dilation of fiber variables, we can pass our discussion to cosphere bundle which is obtained by identifying orbits of the  $\mathbb{R}^+$  action given by dilation on fibers:  $S^* M^\circ = (T^* M^\circ \setminus o) / \mathbb{R}^+$ . We still use  $\Sigma, \Sigma_\pm$  to denote their images in  $S^* M^\circ$ . The rescaled vector field  $\mathbf{H}_G := (g^{-1}(\zeta, dt))^{-1} H_G$  is a homogeneous (with respect to the fiber dilation) vector field of degree 0, and thus can be viewed as a vector field on  $S^* M^\circ$ . The main feature we use is that the  $\mathbf{H}_G$  in  $\Sigma_+$  is  $r$ -normally hyperbolic trapping for every  $r$  in the sense of [36]. See Section 5 for more discussion. The trapped set is given by

$$\Gamma_+ := \{(z, \zeta) \in \Sigma_+ : \xi_r = r - r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi} = G = 0\}.$$

The definition of  $r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}$  is given in Proposition 5.3. Null-geodesics starting from  $\Gamma_+$  never escape out of the event horizon  $\{r = r_e\}$  or to the ‘spatial’ infinity. Instead, when projected to  $X$ , they stay in the compact set  $\{r = r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}\}$ . In addition, this trapped set is of the form  $\Gamma_+ = \Gamma_+^u \cap \Gamma_+^s$ .  $\Gamma_+^{u/s}$  are future components of unstable/stable manifolds respectively, consisting of

$(z, \zeta) \in \Sigma_+$  such that the backward/forward integral curve starting at  $(z, \zeta)$  tends to  $\Gamma$ . Both  $\Gamma^{u/s}$  are conic codimension 1 submanifolds of  $\Sigma_+$  given by

$$(1.4) \quad \Gamma_+^{u/s} := \{\varphi^{u/s} = 0\} \cap \Sigma_+,$$

where  $\varphi^{u/s} := \xi_r \mp \text{sgn}(r - r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi})(1 + \hat{\alpha})\sqrt{\frac{F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) - F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi})}{\Delta(r)}}$ ,  $r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}$  is defined in Proposition 5.3,  $F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) := \frac{1}{\Delta(r)}((r^2 + \mathfrak{a}^2)\xi_t + \mathfrak{a}\xi_\varphi)^2$ ,  $\Delta(r)$  is defined in (1.3), and  $\hat{\alpha} = \frac{\Lambda \mathfrak{a}^2}{3}$ .

Our key analytic tool is the cusp pseudodifferential algebra, which we recall below. We recommend [14][22][32] as further references on this topic. Our construction is on Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetimes, but the same construction applies to other manifolds with boundary. First we compactify  $M^\circ$  to be  $M = (M^\circ \sqcup ([0, \infty)_\tau \times X))/\sim$ , where  $\sim$  is identifying  $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_t \times X$  and  $(\tau = t^{-1}, x)$  for  $0 < t < \infty$ . The cusp vector fields are

$$\mathcal{V}_{\text{cu}}(M) := \{V \in \mathcal{V}(M) : V\tau \in \tau^2 \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)\}.$$

Away from  $\{\tau = 0\}$ ,  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{cu}}(M)$  is the same as  $\mathcal{V}(M)$ . Let  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$  be coordinates on  $X$ , then near  $\{\tau = 0\}$ ,  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{cu}}(M)$  is locally spanned by

$$(1.5) \quad \tau^2 \partial_\tau, \partial_{x_1}, \partial_{x_2}, \dots, \partial_{x_{n-1}}$$

as a  $\mathcal{C}^\infty(M)$ -module. And vector fields in  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{cu}}(M)$  can be viewed as smooth sections of a vector bundle  ${}^{\text{cu}}TM$  called the cusp tangent bundle. (1.5) also represents a local frame of  ${}^{\text{cu}}TM$ . The class of  $m$ -th order cusp differential operators  $\text{Diff}_{\text{cu}}^m(M)$  then consists of products of up to  $m$  cusp vector fields. As an element of  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{cu}}(M)$ ,  $\tau^2 \partial_\tau$  is non-vanishing even down to  $\tau = 0$ , which is similar to  $\tau \partial_\tau$  in Melrose's b-calculus.

The cusp cotangent bundle  ${}^{\text{cu}}T^*M$  is the dual bundle of  ${}^{\text{cu}}TM$ . Locally it is spanned by

$$(1.6) \quad \frac{d\tau}{\tau^2}, dx^1, dx^2, \dots, dx^{n-1}.$$

Writing covectors in  ${}^{\text{cu}}T^*M$  as

$$-\sigma \frac{d\tau}{\tau^2} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \xi_i dx^i = \sigma dt + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \xi_i dx^i,$$

then to a differential operator

$$P = \sum_{j+|\alpha|} a_{j\alpha}(\tau, x)(-\tau^2 D_\tau)^j D_x^\alpha \in \text{Diff}_{\text{cu}}^m(M), \quad a_{j\alpha} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(M),$$

we associate a function called its principal symbol:

$$\sigma_{\text{cu}}^m(P) := \sum_{j+|\alpha|=m} a_{j\alpha} \sigma^j \xi^\alpha.$$

We write  $\sigma(P)$  when there is no confusion about the order and in which pseudodifferential algebra we are discussing this operator. More importantly,

$\text{Diff}_{\text{cu}}^m(M)$  can be generalized by allowing symbols to be more general functions other than polynomials in fiber variables. The class of  $m$ -th order symbols  $S_{\text{cu}}^m(M)$  consists of functions  $a \in \mathcal{C}^\infty({}^{\text{cu}}T^*M)$  such that

$$(1.7) \quad |\partial_\tau^j \partial_x^\alpha \partial_\sigma^k \partial_\xi^\beta a(\tau, x, \sigma, \xi)| \leq C_{j\alpha k\beta} (1 + |\sigma| + |\xi|)^{m-k-|\beta|}$$

in terms of local coordinates.  $a$  is said to be a symbol of order  $m$  on a cone if  $a$  satisfies this estimate on this cone.  $a$  is said to be of order  $-\infty$  if it satisfies this estimate for any fixed  $m$ . Away from  $\{\tau = 0\}$ , since  $\tau^2 \partial_\tau = -\partial_t$ , this condition remains the same when we replace  $\partial_\tau$  by  $\partial_t$ , which is how we define the standard symbol class. The quantization  $\text{Op}(a)$  of  $a \in S_{\text{cu}}^m(M)$  is a pseudodifferential operator acting on smooth functions  $u \in \dot{\mathcal{C}}(M)$  supported in a single coordinate patch near  $\{\tau = 0\}$  by

$$\text{Op}(a)u(t, x) = (2\pi)^{-n} \int e^{i((t-t')\sigma + (x-x')\xi)} a(\tau, x, \sigma, \xi) u(t', x') dt' dx' d\sigma d\xi.$$

For general  $u$ , we define this action using a partition of unity. We denote the collection of all such  $\text{Op}(a)$  by  $\Psi_{\text{cu}}^m(M)$ . Then we define the cusp wave front set  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu}}(A)$  of an operator  $A = \text{Op}(a)$  by defining its complement.

**Definition 1.1.** *For  $\mathfrak{z} \in {}^{\text{cu}}T^*M$ , we say that  $\mathfrak{z} \notin \text{WF}'_{\text{cu}}(A)$  when there exists a cone containing  $\mathfrak{z}$  on which  $a$  is of order  $-\infty$  (satisfy (1.7) for all  $m \in \mathbb{R}$ ).*

This is a conic set and we identify it with its image in the quotient space  ${}^{\text{cu}}S^*M$ . Next we define cusp  $L^2$ -spaces and Sobolev spaces. The cusp cotangent bundle is locally spanned by  $\frac{d\tau}{\tau^2}, dx_1, dx_2, \dots, dx_{n-1}$ , whose wedge product gives the cusp density  $\nu_{\text{cu}}$ .  $L_{\text{cu}}^2(M)$  consists of functions that are square integrable with respect to density  $\nu_{\text{cu}}$ , and it is equipped with the norm  $\|u\|_{L_{\text{cu}}^2(M)} := (\int_M |u|^2 d\nu_{\text{cu}})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ .  $L_{\text{cu}}^2(M)$  is unaffected by the blowing up near the fiber infinity. For  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ , the  $r$ -weighted cusp  $L^2$ -space is defined by

$$L_{\text{cu}}^{2,r}(M) := \{u \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(M) : \tau^{-r}u \in L_{\text{cu}}^2(M)\},$$

where  $L_{\text{loc}}^2(M)$  is the space of locally  $L^2$ -integrable function class on  $M$ . We use the notation  $\langle \cdot \rangle = (1 + |\cdot|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . For a non-negative integer  $s$ , we define the weighted cusp Sobolev space as

$$H_{\text{cu}}^{s,r}(M) := \{u \in L_{\text{cu}}^{2,r} : Au \in L_{\text{cu}}^{2,r} \text{ for all } A \in \text{Diff}_{\text{cu}}^s(M)\}.$$

For general  $s > 0$ ,  $H_{\text{cu}}^{s,r}(M)$  is defined by interpolation. For  $s < 0$ ,  $H_{\text{cu}}^{s,r}(M)$  is defined to be the dual space of  $H_{\text{cu}}^{-s,-r}(M)$ .

The operator of our major concern is  $P \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^2(M)$  with real principal symbol  $p = \sigma_{\text{cu}}^2(P)$  and characteristic set  $\Sigma := p^{-1}(0) \subset {}^{\text{cu}}T^*M \setminus o$ , where  $o$  is the zero section of  ${}^{\text{cu}}T^*M$ . The order 2 can be replaced by other numbers, and we make this choice in our statement of the theorem because of its most important application: the linearized Einstein equations, which is the case with differential order 2. The key property we need  $P$  to satisfy is that the

trapping of  $H_p$ -flow is *normally hyperbolic trapping* in the sense of Section 3.1. Our main result, the propagation of singularities is as follows.

**Theorem 1.2.** *For  $0 < \alpha < 1$  and  $\lambda$  satisfying (3.8), suppose  $v \in H^{-N,\mu}(M)$ ,  $Pv = f$  and  $\text{WF}^{s+1-\lambda\alpha,\mu}(v) \cap \Gamma^s = \emptyset$ ,  $\text{WF}_{\text{cu}}^{s+1-\lambda\alpha,\mu}(v) \cap (\bar{\Gamma}^s \setminus \Gamma) = \emptyset$ ; and  $\text{WF}_{\text{cu}}^{s-\alpha,\mu}(f) \cap \Gamma = \emptyset$ . Then  $\text{WF}_{\text{cu}}^{s,\mu}(v) \cap \Gamma = \emptyset$ .*

### 1.3. Previous works.

The study of Kerr and Kerr-de Sitter spacetimes has been a vast literature, from which we only list a few as examples.

The close connection between the normally hyperbolic trapping and Kerr black holes is observed in [36]. Then this property is extended to the range  $\{|\mathfrak{a}| < \mathfrak{m}\}$  by Dyatlov [9]. Kerr-de Sitter case with small angular momentum is discussed by Vasy [31].

Nonnenmacher and Zworski [23] extended results in [36] with weaker conditions. Before Hintz's estimates in [14], Dyatlov [10] obtained the width of the resonance free strip of the modified Laplacian under the same dynamical assumptions. Hintz's work can be viewed as a quantitative version of it. Vasy [31] gave a systematic microlocal treatment of Kerr-de Sitter spacetimes with small angular momentum  $\mathfrak{a}$  and obtained an expansion of solutions to wave equations on Kerr-de Sitter spacetimes with terms corresponding to quasinormal modes. For the Kerr case ( $\Lambda = 0$ ), it is known that results for small  $|\mathfrak{a}|$  apply to the full subextremal range. See [35][5][26] and references therein.

Regarding the stability aspect, the stability of the Schwarzschild black holes was considered as early as in [34]. The linear stability of slowly rotating Kerr black holes was considered in [13]. While the non-linear stability of various families of black holes was considered in [4][15][37]. The mode stability was also investigated in [3][26].

Local energy and decay estimates in the Schwarzschild case are proved in [25]. For the Kerr case, see [29][28], in which the author proved  $t^{-3}$  local uniform decay rate for linear waves. See also [2][6] for sharp decay estimates. The existence of solutions to semilinear equations with small initial conditions and an extra null condition was considered in [21].

The method of blowing-up the compactified cotangent bundle and the construction of our pseudodifferential algebra in this paper borrow the idea of the second microlocalization from [20][33][30]. The method of treating Schwartz kernels as paired Lagrangian distributions in [7] also inspired us.

### 1.4. Structure of this paper.

In Section 2, we recall some basic notations of microlocal analysis, and introduce our new symbol classes, operator classes and Sobolev spaces. Then we prove basic facts about them, including mapping properties, composition laws, elliptic estimates and Gårding's inequality. In Section 3, we state assumptions needed for the proof of the main result and a microlocal quantitative version of Theorem 1.2. Section 4 is our main analytic part, which

is a multistage positive commutator argument. Finally, in Section 5, we apply the microlocal framework that we constructed to the Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetimes.

## 2. MICROLOCAL ANALYSIS

In this section, we are going to develop basic facts about microlocal analysis for the symbol class we construct for our purpose. We assume that all functions are supported in the region  $\{\tau \leq 1\}$  (or equivalently,  $\{t \geq 1\}$ ) throughout our argument, including latter sections.  $S_{\text{cu}}^m(M)$ ,  $\Psi_{\text{cu}}^m(M)$  denote the cusp symbol class and pseudodifferential operator class respectively.

### 2.1. The new symbol class.

The spacetime we consider is  $M^\circ = \mathbb{R}_t \times X$ , where  $X$  is an  $n-1$  dimensional closed manifold.  $n = 4$  in our application to Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetimes. We recall the basic set up of the cusp calculus in the introduction.  $M$  is obtained by compactifying  $M^\circ$  on the  $t$ -direction.

$$(2.1) \quad M := (M^\circ \sqcup ([0, \infty)_\tau \times X)) / \sim,$$

where  $\sim$  is the identification:  $(t, x) \sim (\tau = t^{-1}, x)$ ,  $x \in X, t \in (0, \infty)$ . Use  $\mathcal{V}(M)$  to denote smooth vector fields on  $M$ . To facilitate our analysis, we introduce the cusp vector fields:

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{V}_{\text{cu}}(M) := \{V \in \mathcal{V}(M) : V\tau \in \tau^2 C^\infty(M)\}.$$

Suppose  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-1}$  are local coordinates of  $X$ , then  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{cu}}(M)$  is locally spanned by

$$(2.3) \quad \tau^2 \partial_\tau, \partial_{x_1}, \partial_{x_2}, \dots, \partial_{x_{n-1}}.$$

${}^{\text{cu}}TM$  is the vector bundle with local frame consists of vectors in (2.3). We point out that, as a cusp vector field,  $\tau^2 \partial_\tau$  is nonvanishing down to  $\tau = 0$ . And its dual bundle the cusp cotangent bundle  ${}^{\text{cu}}T^*M$  is locally spanned by

$$(2.4) \quad \frac{d\tau}{\tau^2}, dx_1, dx_2, \dots, dx_{n-1}.$$

We denote the defining function of the fiber infinity by  $\hat{\rho}$ , and the radial compactification of  ${}^{\text{cu}}TM, {}^{\text{cu}}T^*M$  by  ${}^{\text{cu}}\bar{T}M, {}^{\text{cu}}\bar{T}^*M$ . Concretely, let  $\bar{\mathbb{R}}^n$  denote the radial compactification of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and in coordinate patches that trivialize  ${}^{\text{cu}}T^*M$ , we replace the  $\mathbb{R}^n$  playing the role of fiber part by  $\bar{\mathbb{R}}^n$ . Concretely, suppose  $\mathcal{U}$  is an open set in  $M$  on which  $T^*M$  is trivialized, we define:

$${}^{\text{cu}}\bar{T}_{\mathcal{U}}^*M := \mathcal{U} \times \bar{\mathbb{R}}^n.$$

We further identify the fiber infinity of  ${}^{\text{cu}}\bar{T}^*M$  with the sphere bundle  ${}^{\text{cu}}S^*M$ . Next we consider a submanifold  $Y$  of  ${}^{\text{cu}}\bar{T}^*M$ , locally defined by  $\varphi_Y$ . Set  $\bar{Y} := Y \cap {}^{\text{cu}}\bar{T}_{\partial M}^*M$ , and  $Y_0 := [0, \infty)_\tau \times \bar{Y}$  is the stationary extension of  $\bar{Y}$ . The defining function of  $\bar{Y}$  in  ${}^{\text{cu}}\bar{T}_{\partial M}^*M$  is  $\bar{\varphi}_Y := \varphi_Y|_{\bar{T}_{\partial M}^*M}$ . And  $\varphi_{Y_0}$ , the defining function of  $Y_0$ , is the stationary extension of  $\bar{\varphi}_Y$ .

Next we define our new symbol class  $S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m}}(M,Y)$ . In our setting,  $M = (M^\circ \sqcup ([0, \infty)_\tau \times X))/\sim$  is the base manifold before blowing up. Let  $Z$  be the manifold with corner obtained by blowing up the boundary of  $Y_0$ , where  $Y_0$  and the fiber infinity intersect each other. For convenience, we define

$$\rho := |\hat{\rho}|^\alpha, \tilde{\rho} := (\varphi_{Y_0}^2 + \hat{\rho}^{2\alpha})^{1/2},$$

where  $\alpha$  is ‘the order of the blow up’ to be determined later.  $\tilde{\rho}$  is the defining function of the front face introduced by the blow up. We emphasize that  $Z$  is obtained by introducing  $\frac{\hat{\rho}^\alpha}{\varphi_{Y_0}}$  and its reciprocal as the coordinate on the front face. This is different from the ‘ordinary’ blow up, which use  $\frac{\hat{\rho}}{\varphi_{Y_0}}$  and its reciprocal.

**Definition 2.1.**  $S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m}}(M,Y)$  consists of functions on  $Z$  satisfying:

$$(2.5) \quad |W_1 \dots W_k a| \leq C_{k,m,r} \hat{\rho}^{-m} \tilde{\rho}^{-\frac{\tilde{m}-m}{\alpha}},$$

where  $W_i$  are lifts of smooth vector fields on  ${}^{\text{cu}}T^*M$  to  $Z$  which are homogeneous of degree 1 in the fiber part, tangent to the front face introduced by the blow up.

In the construction of  $Z$  and the definition of  $S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m}}(M,Y)$ , we used  $Y_0$  instead of  $Y$ . But  $\bar{Y}$  and consequently  $Y_0$  is uniquely determined by  $Y$ . Thus  $S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m}}(M,Y)$  is well defined.

Next we give a description of  $S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m}}(M,Y)$  in terms of the local coordinate patch.

**Lemma 2.2.** Suppose the defining functions of  $\bar{Y}$  and the fiber infinity are  $x_1$  and  $\hat{\rho}$ , then  $S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m}}(M,Y)$  consists of smooth functions on  $Z$ , in terms of coordinates on  $M$ , satisfying:

$$(2.6) \quad |\partial_\tau^f \partial_{x_1}^l \partial_{\hat{x}_1}^\beta \partial_{\tilde{\xi}}^{\tilde{\gamma}} a(\tau, x_1, \hat{x}_1, \xi_t, \xi)| \leq C \hat{\rho}^{-m+|\tilde{\gamma}|} \tilde{\rho}^{-\frac{\tilde{m}-m}{\alpha}-|l|},$$

where  $\hat{x}_1$  means all  $x_i$  other than  $x_1$ ,  $\tilde{\gamma} = (\gamma_\tau, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n-1})$ ,  $\tilde{\xi} = (\xi_t, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1})$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we assume that  $\xi_{n-1}$  is large relative to other  $\xi_i$ , thus we take  $\hat{\rho} = |\xi_{n-1}|^{-1}$ . We still write  $a \in S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m}}(M,Y)$  as a function of  $\tau, x_i, \xi_t, \xi_i$ , but the smoothness near the front face means smoothness on  $Z$ . Concretely, they are smooth with respect to  $\frac{x_1}{|\xi_{n-1}|^{-\alpha}}$  or its reciprocal instead of  $x_1, \xi_{n-1}$  individually. Let  $\xi_t$  be the variable dual to  $\tau$  and  $\xi_i$  be the variable dual to  $x_i$ .

First, we show that only the case  $f = 0$  need to be considered. In (2.5), write each  $W_i$  as

$$(2.7) \quad W_i = c_{i\tau} \partial_\tau + \bar{W}_i,$$

where  $c_{i\tau} \in C^\infty(Z)$  and  $\bar{W}_i \tau = 0$ . Smoothness on the compactified space implies  $c_{i\tau}$  and all of its derivatives are bounded. Consequently, we substitute (2.7) into the left hand side of (2.5) and expand. The final expression

is a sum of terms of the form  $\partial_\tau^{\mathfrak{f}'} \bar{W}_{i1} \bar{W}_{i2} \dots a$  with a bounded function coefficient in front of it (possibly with different  $\mathfrak{f}'$  for different terms). Since the right hand side of both (2.6) and (2.5) are independent of  $\tau$ , and all  $\partial_\tau$  can be commuted to the front, hence in the proof of their equivalence, we can consider the  $\mathfrak{f} = 0$  case first and then add  $\partial_\tau$  to (2.6) or each term of the expanded (2.5). In the proof below, we assume  $\mathfrak{f} = 0$ .

To show that (2.5) is equivalent to (2.6). We show that (2.6) implies (2.5) first, and then the reverse. Consider the region  $x_1 \leq C\rho = C\hat{\rho}^\alpha$ , on which the local coordinates are:

$$\tau, \sigma := \frac{x_1}{|\xi_{n-1}|^{-\alpha}}, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_{n-1}, \frac{\xi_t}{\xi_{n-1}}, \frac{\xi_1}{\xi_{n-1}}, \frac{\xi_2}{\xi_{n-1}}, \dots, \rho := \hat{\rho}^\alpha.$$

We use the notation  $\hat{\xi}_j := \frac{\xi_j}{\xi_{n-1}}, 1 \leq j \leq n-1$  or  $j = \tau$ . Recall that  $\hat{\rho} = |\xi_{n-1}|^{-1}$ , we know (assuming  $\xi_{n-1} > 0$ , the case where  $\xi_{n-1} < 0$  is treated in the same manner)  $\xi_{n-1} \partial_{\xi_{n-1}} = -\hat{\rho} \partial_{\hat{\rho}}$ , together with  $x_1 = \hat{\rho} \sigma, \hat{\rho} = \rho^{1/\alpha}$ , we write b-vectors involving  $\sigma$  and  $\rho$  as:

$$(2.8) \quad V_1 := \partial_\sigma = \rho \partial_{x_1} = |\xi_{n-1}|^{-\alpha} \partial_{x_1},$$

$$(2.9) \quad V_2 := \rho \partial_\rho = \rho \sigma \partial_{x_1} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \rho^{1/\alpha} \partial_{\hat{\rho}} = x_1 \partial_{x_1} - \frac{1}{\alpha} |\xi_{n-1}| \partial_{\xi_{n-1}}.$$

We first show that symbol class defined by (2.6) is invariant under application of  $W_i$  defined after (2.5). We only need to verify this for  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  since invariance under other  $W_i$  is clear from (2.6) and standard facts in microlocal analysis. For  $V_1$ , we need to show that

$$|\partial_{x_1}^{\mathfrak{l}} \partial_{\hat{x}_1}^\beta \partial_{\hat{\xi}}^{\tilde{\gamma}} (|\xi_{n-1}|^{-\alpha} \partial_{x_1} a(\tau, x_1, \hat{x}_1, \xi_t, \xi))| \leq C \hat{\rho}^{-m+|\tilde{\gamma}|} \tilde{\rho}^{-\frac{\tilde{m}-m}{\alpha}-|\mathfrak{l}|}.$$

Applying  $\partial_{\xi_{n-1}}^{\gamma_{n-1}}$ , it produces  $\partial_{\xi_{n-1}}^{\gamma_{n-1}} (|\xi_{n-1}|^{-\alpha} \partial_{x_1} a(\tau, x_1, \hat{x}_1, \xi_t, \xi)) = \sum_{k=0}^{\gamma_{n-1}} \binom{\gamma_{n-1}}{k} \partial_{\xi_{n-1}}^k (|\xi_{n-1}|^{-\alpha}) \partial_{\xi_{n-1}}^{\gamma_{n-1}-k} a$ . The  $k$ -th term is  $C |\xi_{n-1}|^{-\alpha-k} \partial_{\xi_{n-1}}^{\gamma_{n-1}-k} a$ . Applying triangle inequality we reduce the proof to the case of a single term, and notice that any power of  $|\xi_{n-1}|$  will commute with  $\partial_{x_i}$  in the front, so the inequality is equivalent to:

$$|\hat{\rho}^{\alpha+k} \partial_{x_1}^{\mathfrak{l}+1} \partial_{\hat{x}_1}^\beta \partial_{\hat{\xi}}^{\tilde{\gamma}-(0,\dots,0,k)} a(\tau, x_1, \hat{x}_1, \xi_t, \xi)| \leq C \hat{\rho}^{-m+|\tilde{\gamma}|} \tilde{\rho}^{-\frac{\tilde{m}-m}{\alpha}-|\mathfrak{l}|}.$$

Move  $\hat{\rho}$  to the right hand side, and since  $\hat{\rho}$  is equivalent to  $\tilde{\rho}$  on this patch, we have:

$$(2.10) \quad |\partial_{x_1}^{\mathfrak{l}+1} \partial_{\hat{x}_1}^\beta \partial_{\hat{\xi}}^{\tilde{\gamma}-(0,\dots,0,k)} a(\tau, x_1, \hat{x}_1, \xi_t, \xi)| \leq C \hat{\rho}^{-m+|\tilde{\gamma}|-k} \tilde{\rho}^{-\frac{\tilde{m}-m}{\alpha}-|\mathfrak{l}|+1},$$

which is (2.6), with  $\tilde{\gamma}, \mathfrak{l}$  replaced by  $\tilde{\gamma} - (0, \dots, 0, k), \mathfrak{l} + 1$ . For  $V_2$ , we consider  $x_1 \partial_{x_1}$  and  $\xi_{n-1} \partial_{\xi_{n-1}}$  respectively. We prove:

$$(2.11) \quad |\partial_{x_1}^{\mathfrak{l}} \partial_{\hat{x}_1}^\beta \partial_{\hat{\xi}}^{\tilde{\gamma}} (x_1 \partial_{x_1} a(\tau, x_1, \hat{x}_1, \xi_t, \xi))| \leq C \hat{\rho}^{-m+|\tilde{\gamma}|} \tilde{\rho}^{-\frac{\tilde{m}-m}{\alpha}-|\mathfrak{l}|}$$

and

$$(2.12) \quad |\partial_{x_1}^{\mathfrak{l}} \partial_{\hat{x}_1}^\beta \partial_{\hat{\xi}}^{\tilde{\gamma}} (\xi_{n-1} \partial_{\xi_{n-1}} a(\tau, x_1, \hat{x}_1, \xi_t, \xi))| \leq C \hat{\rho}^{-m+|\tilde{\gamma}|} \tilde{\rho}^{-\frac{\tilde{m}-m}{\alpha}-|\mathfrak{l}|}.$$

The proof is the same as  $V_1$  case (even simpler, we only have 2 terms when we expand the derivative), just notice we need to use  $x_1 \leq C|\xi_{n-1}|^{-\alpha}$  to bound the extra  $x_1$  factor in (2.11). Thus we know that the function class defined by (2.6) is invariant under the application of  $W_i$ , and in order to show (2.5) holds, we only need to consider the case with a single vector. When this vector is one of  $\partial_{x_i}, \xi_i \partial_{\xi_j}$ ,  $2 \leq i, j \leq n$ , the inequality is straight forward from (2.6) with one of  $|\tilde{\gamma}|$  or  $|\beta|$  equal to one, and  $\mathfrak{l}$  and the other being 0. When this vector is  $V_1$ , bound (2.5) follows from the case  $\mathfrak{l} = 1$  and  $\beta = \tilde{\gamma} = 0$ . When this vector is  $V_2$ , we show the bound for two terms respectively. For the first term, we use  $x_1 \leq C\rho$  and apply the result proved for  $V_1$ . For the second term, the bound follows from the case  $\mathfrak{l} = \beta = 0$ ,  $\tilde{\gamma} = (0, 0, \dots, 0, 1)$  case. Combining all cases we know (2.5) holds.

Conversely, we take (2.5) as the assumption to prove (2.6). We apply induction on  $|\mathfrak{l}| + |\beta| + |\tilde{\gamma}|$ . We consider the case  $\mathfrak{l}, \beta$  or  $\tilde{\gamma}_i$  increases by 1 respectively.

When  $\tilde{\gamma}_i$  increases, we multiply  $\xi_{n-1}$  on both sides of (2.6), and notice that:

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{n-1} \partial_{\xi_{n-1}}^{\gamma_{n-1}+1} a &= \partial_{\xi_{n-1}}^{\gamma_{n-1}} (\xi_{n-1} \partial_{\xi_{n-1}} a) - \partial_{\xi_{n-1}}^{\gamma_{n-1}} a \\ \xi_{n-1} \partial_{\xi_i}^{\tilde{\gamma}_i+1} a &= \partial_{\xi_i}^{\tilde{\gamma}_i} (\xi_{n-1} \partial_{\xi_i} a).\end{aligned}$$

The symbol class defined by (2.5) is invariant under  $\xi_{n-1} \partial_{\xi_i}$ , so these two equations complete the induction step for the case  $\tilde{\gamma}_i$  increases (other  $x$ -derivatives are not written here since they commute with everything here and do not affect the result. When  $\mathfrak{l}$  increases, we rewrite  $\partial_{x_1}^{\mathfrak{l}+1} = \rho^{-1} \rho \partial_{x_1}^{\mathfrak{l}+1}$ , factor out  $\rho^{-1} \approx \tilde{\rho}^{-1}$  ( $\approx$  means quantities on each side can bound each other up to a constant factor) and apply the induction hypothesis to the rest part. Precisely, if  $\gamma_{n-1} = 0$ , then  $\rho$  commutes with all differential operators appear:  $\rho \partial_{x_1}^{\mathfrak{l}+1} \partial_{\hat{x}_1}^{\beta} \partial_{\xi}^{\tilde{\gamma}} a(\tau, x_1, \hat{x}_1, \xi_t, \xi) = \partial_{x_1}^{\mathfrak{l}} \partial_{\hat{x}_1}^{\beta} \partial_{\xi}^{\tilde{\gamma}} (\rho \partial_{x_1} a(x_1, \hat{x}_1, \xi))$ . And then use the fact that  $\rho \partial_{x_1} a$  is in the same symbol class. For  $\gamma_{n-1} \geq 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\rho \partial_{x_1}^{\mathfrak{l}+1} \partial_{\hat{x}_1}^{\beta} \partial_{\xi_{n-1}}^{\gamma_{n-1}} a &= \partial_{x_1}^{\mathfrak{l}} \partial_{\hat{x}_1}^{\beta} \rho \partial_{\xi_{n-1}}^{\gamma_{n-1}} \partial_{x_1} a \\ &= \partial_{x_1}^{\mathfrak{l}} \partial_{\hat{x}_1}^{\beta} |\xi_{n-1}|^{-\alpha} \partial_{\xi_{n-1}}^{\gamma_{n-1}} \partial_{x_1} a \\ &= \partial_{x_1}^{\mathfrak{l}} \partial_{\hat{x}_1}^{\beta} (\partial_{\xi_{n-1}}^{\gamma_{n-1}} (|\xi_{n-1}|^{-\alpha} \partial_{x_1} a)) - \\ &\quad \sum_{k=1}^{\gamma_{n-1}} [-\alpha]_k |\xi_{n-1}|^{-\alpha-k} \binom{\gamma_{n-1}}{k} \partial_{\xi_{n-1}}^{\gamma_{n-1}-k} \partial_{x_1} a,\end{aligned}$$

where  $[-\alpha]_k = (-\alpha)(-\alpha-1)\dots(-\alpha-k+1)$ . Since  $S_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{m, \tilde{m}}(M, Y)$  is invariant under  $|\xi_{n-1}|^{-\alpha} \partial_{x_1}$ , using the induction hypothesis, each term satisfies (2.6), which completes the induction step. When  $\beta$  increases, we simply notice that  $\partial_{x_j}, 2 \leq j \leq n$  are  $b$ -vectors, hence the result is straightforward by (2.5), we finishes the proof in the patch  $x_1 \leq C\rho$ .

Next we consider the other patch  $\rho \leq Cx_1$ . The coordinate system is

$$\tau, \sigma' := \frac{|\xi_{n-1}|^{-\alpha}}{x_1}, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_{n-1}, \frac{\xi_t}{\xi_{n-1}}, \frac{\xi_1}{\xi_{n-1}}, \frac{\xi_2}{\xi_{n-1}}, \dots, \rho := \hat{\rho}^\alpha.$$

$b$ -vectors involving  $\sigma', \rho$  are

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &= \sigma' \partial_{\sigma'} = -x_1 \partial_{x_1}, \\ K_2 &= \rho \partial_\rho = x_1 \partial_{x_1} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \hat{\rho} \partial_{\hat{\rho}} = x_1 \partial_{x_1} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \xi_{n-1} \partial_{\xi_{n-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

The argument is the same as in the first patch. We first verify that the symbol defined by (2.6) is invariant under  $K_1, K_2$ . For  $K_1$ , the proof is the same as  $V_1$  in the first patch, just notice that now  $Cx_1 \geq \rho$ , so  $\tilde{\rho}$  is equivalent to  $x_1$  now. For example:  $|x_1 \partial_{x_1} a| \leq \hat{\rho}^{-m} \tilde{\rho}^{-\frac{\tilde{m}-m}{\alpha}}$  is equivalent to  $|\partial_{x_1} a| \leq \hat{\rho}^{-m} \tilde{\rho}^{-\frac{\tilde{m}-m}{\alpha}-1}$ . For  $K_2$ , the proof is similar to  $V_2$  case in the other patch, both terms are treated similarly. The difference is that, we use  $x_1 \leq \tilde{\rho}$  to bound  $x_1$  in the front.

On the other hand, suppose (2.5) holds on this patch. In order to verify (2.6), we again use induction, the case in which  $\beta$  or  $\tilde{\gamma}$  increase is the same as before. When  $l$  increases, we use  $\partial_{x_1} = (x_1)^{-1} (x_1 \partial_{x_1})$ , since now  $(x_1)^{-1} \approx \tilde{\rho}^{-1}$ , and then use:

$$x_1 \partial_{x_1}^{l+1} \partial_{\hat{x}_1}^\beta \partial_{\xi}^{\tilde{\gamma}} a = \partial_{x_1}^l \partial_{\hat{x}_1}^\beta \partial_{\xi}^{\tilde{\gamma}} (x_1 \partial_{x_1} a) - \partial_{x_1}^l \partial_{\hat{x}_1}^\beta \partial_{\xi}^{\tilde{\gamma}} a.$$

We have deduced that  $x_1 \partial_{x_1} a$  is in the same symbol class, hence we can apply induction hypothesis to the right hand side and use  $x_1 \approx \tilde{\rho}$ , we know:

$$|\partial_{x_1}^{l+1} \partial_{\hat{x}_1}^\beta \partial_{\xi}^{\tilde{\gamma}} a| \leq C \hat{\rho}^{-m+|\tilde{\gamma}|} \tilde{\rho}^{-\frac{\tilde{m}-m}{\alpha}-|l|-1},$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

Recall that the usual cusp symbol class  $S_{\text{cu}}^m(M)$  consists of smooth functions on  $\bar{T}^*M$  satisfying:

$$(2.13) \quad |\partial_\tau^l \partial_{x_1}^l \partial_{\hat{x}_1}^\beta \partial_{\xi}^{\tilde{\gamma}} a(\tau, x_1, \hat{x}_1, \xi_t, \xi)| \leq C \hat{\rho}^{-m+|\tilde{\gamma}|},$$

Since smooth functions on  $\bar{T}^*M$  lifts to smooth functions on  $Z$ , comparing with (2.6), we have the inclusion:

**Corollary 2.3.** *For  $m, \tilde{m} \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\tilde{m} \geq m$ ,  $M, Y$  as above, we have inclusion relationship between symbol classes:*

$$(2.14) \quad S_{\text{cu}}^m(M) \subset S_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{m, \tilde{m}}(M, Y).$$

Next we discuss the quantization procedure. Let  $\dot{\mathcal{C}}^\infty(M)$  be the class of smooth function on  $M$  vanish to infinite order at  $\partial M$ . For  $u \in \dot{\mathcal{C}}^\infty(M)$  supported in a coordinate chart near  $\{\tau = 0\}$ , the action of  $\text{Op}(a)$ , the left quantization (in short, we use ‘quantization’ below) of  $a$  is defined by:

$$(2.15) \quad \text{Op}(a)u(t, x) := (2\pi)^{-n} \int e^{i((t-t')\xi_t + (x-x') \cdot \xi)} a(t^{-1}, x, \xi_t, \xi) u(t', x') dt' dx' d\xi_t d\xi,$$

where  $\xi_t$  is the variable dual to  $t$ . Since we use  $\frac{d\tau}{\tau^2}$  in the frame of  ${}^{\text{cu}}\bar{T}^*M$  and:

$$(2.16) \quad \xi_t dt + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \xi_i dx_i = -\xi_t \frac{d\tau}{\tau^2} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \xi_i dx_i,$$

$\xi_t$  is also dual to  $\tau$  up to a sign.

For general functions that are not necessarily supported in a coordinate patch, we use a partition of unity to reduce to the case discussed above. We use  $\Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m}}(M, Y)$  to denote the operator class obtained by quantizing symbols in  $S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m}}(M, Y)$ . The symbol class defined by (2.5) is globally defined, hence by the equivalence shown by Lemma 2.2, (2.6) also defines a symbol class on the manifold  $Z$ . Next we verify that this class is closed under composition:

**Proposition 2.4.** *For  $A \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_1,\tilde{m}_1}(M, Y)$ ,  $B \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_2,\tilde{m}_2}(M, Y)$  with symbols  $a \in S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_1,\tilde{m}_1}(M, Y)$ ,  $b \in S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_2,\tilde{m}_2}(M, Y)$ ,  $A \circ B \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_1+m_2,\tilde{m}_1+\tilde{m}_2}(M, Y)$ , and its symbol  $a \circ b \in S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_1+m_2,\tilde{m}_1+\tilde{m}_2}(M, Y)$ . In addition,  $a \circ b$  has asymptotic expansion*

$$(2.17) \quad a \circ b(x, \eta) = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{N}^n} \frac{(-i)^{|l|}}{l!} \partial_\eta^l a \partial_x^l b,$$

where the term with  $l = (l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$  as derivative index belongs to  $S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_1+m_2-|l|,\tilde{m}_1+\tilde{m}_2-l(1-\alpha)}(M, Y)$ .

*Proof.* Using the same method as in the cusp calculus, we know that the left symbol of  $A \circ B$  is given by (2.17). Assuming that both of  $a$  and  $b$  satisfy (2.6), we verify that (2.17) still satisfy (2.6). We only need to consider the term  $\alpha = 0$ . Because the only source of potential growth (as  $\tilde{\rho} \rightarrow 0$ ) comes from  $\partial_{x_1}^{l_1} b$ , which gives  $\tilde{\rho}^{-l_1}$  growth (compared with  $\hat{\rho}^{-m} \tilde{\rho}^{-\frac{\tilde{m}-m}{\alpha}}$ ). On the other hand, this term is multiplied by  $\partial_{\xi_1}^{l_1} a$ , which gives  $\hat{\rho}^{l_1}$  decay. Concretely, the  $l$ -term has at least  $|l|, |l|(1-\alpha)$  extra decay order in the first and second indices respectively compared with the typical bound for  $S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_1+m_2,\tilde{m}_1+\tilde{m}_2}(M, Y)$ , i.e.  $\hat{\rho}^{-(m_1+m_2)} \tilde{\rho}^{-\frac{\tilde{m}_1+\tilde{m}_2-m_1-m_2}{\alpha}}$ .

In order to verify the symbolic property of  $a \circ b$ , we can apply Leibniz's rule. Each partial derivative will fall on exactly one of  $\partial_\xi^l a$  and  $\partial_x^l b$ . The bound on the right hand side of (2.6) with  $(m, r)$  being either one of  $(m_1 - |l|, \tilde{m}_1)$  and  $(m_2, \tilde{m}_2 + \alpha l_1)$  changes in the same manner under each differentiation. Notice that  $l_1 \leq |l|$ , hence their product satisfy (2.6), but with  $(m_1 + m_2 - |l|, \tilde{m}_1 + \tilde{m}_2 - |l|(1-\alpha))$  as the symbol class order.  $\square$

## 2.2. Sobolev spaces and operator classes.

Recall (2.4), the cusp cotangent bundle is locally spanned by  $\frac{d\tau}{\tau^2}, dx_1, dx_2, \dots, dx_{n-1}$ , whose wedge product gives the cusp density  $\nu_{\text{cu}}$ .  $L_{\text{cu}}^2(M)$  consists of functions that are square integrable with respect to density  $\nu_{\text{cu}}$  equipped

with norm  $\|u\|_{L_{\text{cu}}^2(M)} := (\int_M |u|^2 d\nu_{\text{cu}})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ .  $L_{\text{cu}}^2(M)$  is unaffected by the blowing up near the fiber infinity. Recall that for  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ , the  $r$ -weighted cusp  $L^2$ -space is defined by

$$L_{\text{cu}}^{2,r}(M) := \{u \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(M) : \tau^{-r}u \in L_{\text{cu}}^2(M)\},$$

where  $L_{\text{loc}}^2(M)$  is the space of locally  $L^2$ -integrable function class on  $M$ . We use the notation  $\langle \cdot \rangle = (1 + |\cdot|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Define

$$\begin{aligned} D &:= \text{Op}(\hat{\rho}^{-1}), \quad \langle D \rangle := \text{Op}(\langle \hat{\rho}^{-1} \rangle), \\ \tilde{D} &:= \text{Op}(\tilde{\rho}^{-1}), \quad \langle \tilde{D} \rangle := \text{Op}(\langle \tilde{\rho}^{-1} \rangle), \\ D_{m,\tilde{m}} &:= \text{Op}(\langle \hat{\rho}^{-1} \rangle^m \langle \tilde{\rho}^{-1} \rangle^{\frac{\tilde{m}-m}{\alpha}}). \end{aligned}$$

For  $s, \tilde{s} \geq 0$ , the weighted Sobolev space can be characterized as

$$(2.18) \quad H_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{s,\tilde{s},r}(M,Y) = \{u \in L_{\text{cu}}^{2,r}(M) : D_{s,\tilde{s}}u \in L_{\text{cu}}^{2,r}(M)\}.$$

For  $s, \tilde{s} < 0$ ,  $H_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{s,\tilde{s},r}(M,Y)$  is defined to be the dual space of  $H_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{-s,-\tilde{s},r}(M,Y)$ , which has been defined above. For  $s > 0, \tilde{s} < 0$ , notice that  $s = \frac{s}{s+|\tilde{s}|}(s+|\tilde{s}|) + \frac{|\tilde{s}|}{s+|\tilde{s}|} \times 0$ ,  $\tilde{s} = \frac{s}{s+|\tilde{s}|} \times 0 + \frac{|\tilde{s}|}{s+|\tilde{s}|}(-s-|\tilde{s}|)$ , we know  $H_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{s,\tilde{s},r}(M,Y)$  can be defined by interpolating  $H_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{s+|\tilde{s}|,0,r}(M,Y)$  and  $H_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,-s-|\tilde{s}|,r}(M,Y)$ . Similarly for the case  $s < 0, \tilde{s} > 0$ . We equip these Sobolev spaces with norm

$$(2.19) \quad \|u\|_{s,\tilde{s},r} := \|\tau^{-r}D_{s,\tilde{s}}u\|_{L_{\text{cu}}^2(M)}.$$

The  $\tau$ -weighted version of  $S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m}}(M,Y)$ ,  $\Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m}}(M,Y)$  are defined by

$$(2.20) \quad \begin{aligned} S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m},r}(M,Y) &:= \tau^{-r}S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m}}(M,Y) = \{\tau^{-r}a : a \in S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m}}(M,Y)\}, \\ \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m},r}(M,Y) &:= \tau^{-r}\Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m}}(M,Y) = \{\tau^{-r}A : A \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m}}(M,Y)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The weighted generalization of Proposition 2.4 holds:

**Proposition 2.5.** *If  $A \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_1,\tilde{m}_1,r_1}(M,Y)$ ,  $B \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_2,\tilde{m}_2,r_2}(M,Y)$ , then  $A \circ B \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_1+m_2,\tilde{m}_1+\tilde{m}_2,r_1+r_2}(M,Y)$ .*

### 2.3. The principal symbol.

**Definition 2.6.** *The principal symbol of  $A = q_{\text{cu},L}(a) \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m},r}(M,Y)$ , denoted by  $\sigma_{m,\tilde{m},r}(A)$  is the equivalent class  $[a]$  of  $a$  in  $S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m},r}/S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m-1,\tilde{m}-(1-\alpha),r}$ .*

In later arguments, we also call  $a$  the principal symbol of  $A$  if  $a$  is a representative of  $A$ 's principal symbol. We emphasize that the principal part is only  $(1-\alpha)$ -order higher than other parts in the second index, and the decay order remains the same. An important result we need is the following proposition about the principal symbol of commutators.

**Proposition 2.7.** *If  $A \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m},r}(M,Y)$ ,  $B \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m',\tilde{m}',r'}(M,Y)$ , then  $[A,B] \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m+m'-1,\tilde{m}+\tilde{m}'-(1-\alpha),r+r'}(M,Y)$ , with principal symbol*

$$(2.21) \quad \sigma_{m+m'-1,\tilde{m}+\tilde{m}'-(1-\alpha),r+r'}([A,B]) = -iH_a b,$$

where  $[a] = \sigma_{m,\tilde{m},r}(a)$ ,  $[b] = \sigma_{m',\tilde{m}',r'}(B)$ .

*Proof.* This follows from the symbolic expansion given in the proof of Proposition 2.4. The principal symbol of  $AB$  and  $BA$  coincide, and going one order further gives (2.21).  $\square$

#### 2.4. Wavefront Sets and Ellipticity.

Symbol classes with infinite indices are defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{\infty,\infty,r}(M,Y) &:= \cup_{l_1,l_2 \in \mathbb{Z}} S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{l_1,l_2,r}(M,Y), \\ S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{\infty,l_2,r}(M,Y) &:= \cup_{l_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{l_1,l_2,r}(M,Y), \\ S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{l_1,\infty,r}(M,Y) &:= \cup_{l_2 \in \mathbb{Z}} S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{l_1,l_2,r}(M,Y). \end{aligned}$$

And replace union by intersection when we replace  $\infty$  by  $-\infty$ :

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{-\infty,-\infty,r}(M,Y) &:= \cap_{l_1,l_2 \in \mathbb{Z}} S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{l_1,l_2,r}(M,Y), \\ S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{-\infty,l_2,r}(M,Y) &:= \cap_{l_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{l_1,l_2,r}(M,Y), \\ S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{l_1,-\infty,r}(M,Y) &:= \cap_{l_2 \in \mathbb{Z}} S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{l_1,l_2,r}(M,Y). \end{aligned}$$

Similar notations apply to operator classes with  $S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{\cdot,\cdot,\cdot}(M,Y)$  replaced by  $\Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{\cdot,\cdot,\cdot}(M,Y)$ , while for Sobolev spaces with  $S$  replaced by  $H$  and  $\pm\infty$  exchanged. When we use  $-\infty$  as an order of the Sobolev norm, we mean this estimate holds for  $-N$  with large  $N \in \mathbb{R}^+$ .

For  $a \in S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m},r}(M,Y)$ , we define its essential support  $\text{ess supp}(a)$  by defining its complement:

**Definition 2.8.** For  $\mathfrak{z} \in Z$ , we say  $\mathfrak{z} \notin \text{ess supp}(a)$  if there exist  $\chi_{\mathfrak{z}} \in C_c^\infty(Z)$  being identically 1 near  $\mathfrak{z}$  such that  $\chi_{\mathfrak{z}}a \in S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{-\infty,-\infty,r}(M,Y)$ .

For  $A = \text{Op}(a)$ , we define its (cusp) wave front set by  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(A) := \text{ess supp}(a)$ .

Next we define the ellipticity of  $S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m},r}(M,Y)$  and  $\Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m},r}(M,Y)$  and give the parametrix construction. Then we prove elliptic estimates after showing the boundedness between Sobolev spaces.

**Definition 2.9.** For  $a \in S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m},r}(M,Y)$ , we say that  $a$  is elliptic at  $\mathfrak{z} \in \partial Z$  if there is a neighborhood of  $\mathfrak{z}$  in  $Z$  on which  $a$  satisfies

$$(2.22) \quad |a| \geq C\tau^r \hat{\rho}^{-m} \tilde{\rho}^{-\frac{\tilde{m}-m}{\alpha}}.$$

$a$  is said to be elliptic on  $\mathcal{U}$  if it is elliptic on each point of  $\mathcal{U}$ .  $A = \text{Op}(a)$  is said to be elliptic at a point or on an open set if and only if  $a$  is elliptic at that point or on that open set. The elliptic set of  $A$  (resp.  $a$ ) is denoted by  $\text{Ell}(A)$  (resp.  $\text{Ell}(a)$ ).

The wave front set of a distribution is defined as

**Definition 2.10.** For  $u \in H_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{-\infty,-\infty,r}(M,Y)$ , we say  $\mathfrak{z} \notin \text{WF}_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{s,\tilde{s},r}(u)$  if and only if there exists  $A \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{s,\tilde{s},r}(M,Y)$  which is elliptic at  $\mathfrak{z}$  such that  $Au \in L_{\text{cu}}^2(M)$

The parametrix construction using a Neumann series in the classical microlocal analysis generalizes to our situation directly.

**Proposition 2.11.** *Suppose  $A \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m},r}(M,Y)$  is elliptic at  $\mathfrak{z} \in \partial Z$ , then there exist  $B \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{-m,-\tilde{m},-r}(M,Y)$ ,  $E \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,0}(M,Y)$  such that  $\mathfrak{z} \notin \text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(E)$ , and following identity holds:*

$$(2.23) \quad B \circ A = \text{Id} + E.$$

*In particular, when  $A$  is elliptic everywhere, then  $E \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{-\infty,-\infty,r}(M,Y)$*

### 2.5. Mapping properties.

Next we state mapping properties of our operator class, which is analogous to that in previous calculi. We first give a square root construction and reduce the general boundedness to the  $L_{\text{cu}}^2$  boundedness, and then prove  $L_{\text{cu}}^2$  boundedness using this square root construction.

**Lemma 2.12.** *Suppose  $A \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,0}(M,Y)$  is a self-adjoint elliptic operator whose principal symbol has a representative  $a \in S_{\text{cu}}^{0,0,0}(M,Y)$  which is lower bounded by a positive constant, i.e.  $a \geq c > 0$ , then there exists a self-adjoint  $B \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,0}(M,Y)$  such that  $A = B^2 + E$ ,  $E \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{-\infty,-\infty,0}(M,Y)$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is the same as Lemma 5.7 of [32]. The only difference is that the gain of the error term in each inductive is 1 and  $1 - \alpha$  on the first and second indices now. But this does not essentially change the proof as long as we have positive gain in first two indices in each step.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.13.** *Suppose  $A \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{s,\tilde{s},r'}(M,Y)$ , then for  $m, \tilde{m}, r' \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $A$  is a bounded linear operator from  $H_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m},r}(M,Y)$  to  $H_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m-s,\tilde{m}-\tilde{s},r-r'}(M,Y)$ .*

*Proof.* According to (2.19),  $D_{s,\tilde{s},r} := D_{s,\tilde{s}}\tau^{-r}$  is an isometry mapping  $H_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{s,\tilde{s},r}(M,Y)$  to  $L_{\text{cu}}^2(M)$  with right inverse  $D'_{-s,-\tilde{s},r} := \tau^r \langle \tilde{D} \rangle^{-\tilde{s}} \langle D \rangle^{-s}$ , which is an isometry as well. So the claim  $A \in \mathcal{L}(H_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m},r}(M,Y), H_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m-s,\tilde{m}-\tilde{s},r-r'}(M,Y))$  can be reduced to the claim that  $\tilde{A} := D_{m-s,\tilde{m}-\tilde{s},-(r-r')} A D'_{-m,-\tilde{m},r} \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,0}(M,Y)$  is a bounded map from  $L_{\text{cu}}^2(M)$  to  $L_{\text{cu}}^2(M)$ . To be more concrete, we write  $A$  as

$$(2.24) \quad A = D'_{-(m-s),-(\tilde{m}-\tilde{s}),-(r-r')} (D_{m-s,\tilde{m}-\tilde{s},(r-r')} A D'_{-m,-\tilde{m},r}) D_{m,\tilde{m},r},$$

where two operators outside the bracket are isometries between weighted Sobolev spaces with appropriate indices. The graphic illustration of this conjugation process is given below.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m,\tilde{m},r}(M,Y) & \xrightarrow{A} & H_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m-s,\tilde{m}-\tilde{s},r-r'}(M,Y) \\ \uparrow D'_{-m,-\tilde{m},-r} & & \downarrow D_{m-s,\tilde{m}-\tilde{s},(r-r')} \\ L_{\text{cu}}^2(M) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{A}} & L_{\text{cu}}^2(M) \end{array}$$

So we only need to show that for any  $\tilde{A} = q_{\text{cu},L}(\tilde{a}) \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,0}(M,Y)$ , we have  $\tilde{A} \in \mathcal{L}(L_{\text{cu}}^2(M,Y), L_{\text{cu}}^2(M,Y))$ . We apply the proof of Proposition 5.9 of [32] to reduce to the proof of the  $L_{\text{cu}}^2(M) \rightarrow L_{\text{cu}}^2(M)$  boundedness of  $E = q_{\text{cu},L}(e) \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{-\infty,-\infty,0}(M,Y)$ . The modification needed is replacing  $S_{\infty,\delta}^{0,0}, \Psi_{\infty,\delta}^{0,0}, S_{\infty,\delta}^{-1+2\delta,0}$  there by  $S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,0}, \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,0}, S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{-1,-(1-\alpha),0}$  respectively. For a complete statement of the classical Schur's lemma, we refer readers to the Lemma in [11, Appendix A.1]. Our final task is to verify the condition needed for applying Schur's lemma. Let  $K_E(z, z')$  be the Schwartz kernel of  $E$ , where  $z = (t, x), z' = (t', x')$ . Then we need to show

$$(2.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup_z \int |K_E(z, z')| d\nu_{\text{cu}}(z') &< \infty, \\ \sup_{z'} \int |K_E(z, z')| d\nu_{\text{cu}}(z) &< \infty. \end{aligned}$$

By (2.15), we have

$$K_E(z, z') = \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\eta}}^{-1}(e(z, \tilde{\eta}))(z, z - z').$$

Use (2.6) with large (in absolute value) negative  $m, \tilde{m}$  large (in each component) positive  $\tilde{\gamma}$ , we know that we can find  $N_E > n$ , constant  $C_{N_E}$  such that

$$|K_E(z, z')| \leq C_{N_E} \langle z - z' \rangle^{-N_E},$$

which is sufficient for (2.25).  $\square$

Recall (2.23), and the boundedness of  $B$  there as a map from  $H_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_1-m, \tilde{m}_1-\tilde{m}, r-r'}(M, Y)$  to  $H_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_1, \tilde{m}_1, r}(M, Y)$ , we obtain the elliptic estimate:

**Proposition 2.14.** *Suppose  $A \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m, \tilde{m}, r'}(M, Y)$  is elliptic, then  $\forall N \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have*

$$(2.26) \quad \|u\|_{s, \tilde{s}, r} \lesssim \|Au\|_{s-m, \tilde{s}-\tilde{m}, r-r'} + \|u\|_{-N, -N, r}$$

When  $A$  is not globally elliptic, for  $B \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,0}(M, Y)$  such that  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B) \subset \text{Ell}(A)$ , then (2.26) keeps to hold with the left hand side replaced by  $\|Bu\|_{s, \tilde{s}, r}$ .

## 2.6. Gårding's inequality.

Next we prove Gårding's inequality, which exploits bounds on symbols, for our symbols and operator classes.

**Lemma 2.15.** *Let  $B, B' \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{s, \tilde{s}, r}(M, Y)$  with  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B') \subset \text{Ell}(B)$ , and suppose that their rescaled symbols  $b = \hat{\rho}^s \tilde{\rho}^{\frac{\tilde{s}-s}{\alpha}} \sigma(B), b' = \hat{\rho}^s \tilde{\rho}^{\frac{\tilde{s}-s}{\alpha}} \sigma(B')$  satisfy:  $|b'| \leq b$  on  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B')$ , then for any  $\delta > 0$ , there exists a constant  $C$  such that:*

$$\|B'u\|_{s, \tilde{s}, r} \leq (1 + \delta) \|Bu\|_{s, \tilde{s}, r} + C \|u\|_{s-\frac{1}{2}, \tilde{s}-\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, r}.$$

*Proof.* We only need to prove the case  $r = 0$ , since we can replace  $u$  by  $\tau^{-r}u$ . Consider  $(1+\delta)^2 B^*B - (B')^*B' \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{2s,2\tilde{s},2r}(M,Y)$ , whose principal symbol is always strictly positive near  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B')$ , hence it has a smooth real square root  $e \in S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{s,\tilde{s},r}(M,Y)$ . (Away from  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B')$ , we just set it to be  $(1+\delta)\sigma(B)$ ). Then  $K := (1+\delta)^2 B^*B - (B')^*B' - E^*E \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{2s-1,2\tilde{s}-(1-\alpha),2r}(X)$ . Apply  $K$  to  $u$  and pair with  $u$  gives the desired inequality.  $\square$

### 3. STATEMENT OF THE THEOREM

In this section, we state assumptions that we need for our microlocal estimates. For more detailed background, please refer to [16] and [36]. The definitions of the space model  $X$  and the spacetime  $M$  are the same as in Section 2.

#### 3.1. Assumptions near the trapped set.

The operator we consider is  $P \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^m(M)$  with real principal symbol  $p = \sigma_{\text{cu}}^m(P)$  and characteristic set  $\Sigma := p^{-1}(0) \subset {}^{\text{cu}}T^*M \setminus o$ , where  $o$  is the zero section of  ${}^{\text{cu}}T^*M$ . We use  $p_0 := p|_{\tau=0}$  to denote its ‘boundary principal symbol’. We also use  $p_0$  to denote the stationary extension of  $p_0$  itself:  $p_0(t, x, \xi_t, \xi) := p_0(x, \xi_t, \xi)$ .

We make following assumptions (c.f. assumption (P.1)-(P.6) of [14], all ‘assumptions’ with indices mentioned in latter sections are assumptions listed here) near the trapped set  $\Gamma \subset \Sigma \cap {}^{\text{cu}}S_{\partial M}^*M$ :

- (1)  $dp_0 \neq 0$  on  $\Sigma$  near  $\Gamma$ .
- (2) The defining function of fiber infinity  $\hat{\rho}$  is homogeneous of degree -1 and  $H_{p_0}\hat{\rho} = 0$  near  $\Gamma$ .
- (3) The rescaled Hamilton vector field is  $\mathbf{H}_{p_0} := \hat{\rho}^{m-1}H_{p_0} \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{cu}}({}^{\text{cu}}S^*M)$ . It is tangent to  $\Gamma$ , and satisfies:

$$\inf_{\Gamma} \mathbf{H}_{p_0} t > 0.$$

- (4) Stable and unstable manifold at time infinity  $\bar{\Gamma}^{u/s}$  are smooth orientable codimension 1 submanifolds of  $\Sigma \cap {}^{\text{cu}}S_{\partial M}^*M$  near  $\Gamma$ . They intersect transversally at  $\Gamma$ .  $\mathbf{H}_{p_0}$  is tangent to  $\Sigma \cap {}^{\text{cu}}S_{\partial M}^*M$ .
- (5) There exists local defining functions  $\bar{\phi}^{u/s} \in C^\infty({}^{\text{cu}}S_{\partial M}^*M)$  of  $\bar{\Gamma}^{u/s}$  in a neighborhood of  $\Gamma$  in  $\Sigma$  as submanifolds of  $\Sigma \cap {}^{\text{cu}}S_{\partial M}^*M$  such that,

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbf{H}_{p_0}\bar{\phi}^u = -\bar{w}^u\bar{\phi}^u, \quad \mathbf{H}_{p_0}\bar{\phi}^s = -\bar{w}^s\bar{\phi}^s,$$

$$(3.2) \quad \hat{\rho}^{-1}H_{\bar{\phi}^u}\bar{\phi}^s = \hat{\rho}^{-1}\{\bar{\phi}^u, \bar{\phi}^s\} > 0,$$

where  $\bar{\phi}^{u/s}$  are also considered as functions on  ${}^{\text{cu}}\bar{T}^*M \setminus$  by stationary homogeneous degree 0 extension. And we assume that

$$(3.3) \quad \nu_{\min} := \min\left\{\inf_{\Gamma} \bar{w}^i, \inf_{\Gamma} \bar{w}^s\right\} > 0.$$

- (6) There exists smooth submanifolds  $\Gamma^{u/s}$  of  $\Sigma$  such that  $\Gamma^{u/s} \cap {}^{\text{cu}}S_{\partial M}^*M = \bar{\Gamma}^{u/s}$  and  $\mathbf{H}_p := \hat{\rho}^{m-1}H_p$  is tangent to  $\Gamma^{u/s}$ . There exists defining functions  $\phi^{u/s} \in C^\infty({}^{\text{cu}}S^*M)$  of  $\Gamma^{u/s}$  in  $\Sigma$  such that

$$(3.4) \quad \phi^{u/s} - \bar{\phi}^{u/s} \in \tau C^\infty({}^{\text{cu}}S^*M).$$

These assumptions encodes the nature of the normally hyperbolic trapping in our application to the Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetime. In particular, assumption (5) and (6) imply that the defining function in (6) satisfies:

$$(3.5) \quad \mathbf{H}_p \phi^u = -w^u \phi^u, \quad \mathbf{H}_p \phi^s = w^s \phi^s \text{ on } \Sigma,$$

where  $w^u - \bar{w}^u \in C^\infty({}^{\text{cu}}S^*M)$ .

We use  $\tilde{w}^{u/s} := \frac{(\phi^{u/s})^2}{(\phi^{u/s})^2 + |\hat{\rho}|^{2\alpha}} w^{u/s}$  to denote the counterpart of  $w^{u/s}$  for  $\tilde{\rho}$ , which satisfies

$$\mathbf{H}_p \tilde{\rho} = -\tilde{w}^u \tilde{\rho} + \alpha \frac{|\hat{\rho}|^{2\alpha}}{\tilde{\rho}} \hat{\rho}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_p \hat{\rho},$$

and similar equation for  $\tilde{w}^s$  but without the negative sign. The normalized subprincipal symbol of  $P$  is:

$$(3.6) \quad \mathbf{p}_1 := \hat{\rho}^{m-1} \sigma\left(\frac{1}{2i}(P - P^*)\right)$$

We apply the construction in Section 2 to our current setting. We take  $Y = \Gamma^u$ , and all other notations play the same role as in Section 2. In addition, we introduce following regions on  $Z$  to facilitate our discussion:

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_\epsilon &:= \{\tau, |\phi^u|, |\phi^s|, |\mathbf{p}| < \epsilon\}, \bar{\mathcal{U}}_\epsilon = \mathcal{U}_\epsilon \cap \{\tau = 0\}, \\ \hat{\mathcal{U}}_\epsilon &:= \{\tau, |\phi^u|, \left|\frac{\phi^u}{\rho}\right|, |\phi^s|, |\mathbf{p}| < \epsilon\}, M_{c_1, c_2} := \{c_1 \leq \left|\frac{\rho}{\phi^u}\right| \leq c_2\}. \\ \mathcal{R}_\eta &:= \{\tilde{\rho} \leq \eta\}, \bar{\mathcal{R}}_\eta := \mathcal{R}_\eta \cap \{\tau = 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{p} := \hat{\rho}^m p$  is the normalized symbol of  $p$  and we still use  $\Gamma^{u/s}, \Gamma$  to denote their lifts to  $Z$ .

We introduce notations for bounds of  $w^u, w^s$ , and  $\mathbf{p}_1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{\max} &= \sup_{\Gamma} w^u, \nu_{\min} = \inf_{\Gamma} w^u, \nu_{\max, \eta_1, c_1, c_2} = \sup_{M_{c_1, c_2} \cap \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{\eta_1}} w^u, \\ \nu_{\min, \eta_1, c_1, c_2} &= \inf_{M_{c_1, c_2} \cap \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{\eta_1}} w^u, s_{1, \eta_1, c_1, c_2} = \sup_{M_{c_1, c_2} \cap \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{\eta_1}} \mathbf{p}_1. \end{aligned}$$

For purposes that will be clear in our positive commutator argument, we fix  $c, C_1 > 0$  and require following inequality for  $\lambda$  to hold:

$$-\mathbf{p}'_1 - c - \lambda \tilde{w}^u > 0 \text{ near } M_{0, 2C_1} \cap \bar{\mathcal{U}}_{2\eta_1},$$

where  $\mathbf{p}'_1 = \mathbf{p}_1 - w^u$ . Since  $0 \leq \tilde{w}^u \leq w^u$ , we only need

$$\inf_{M_{0, 2C_1} \cap \bar{\mathcal{U}}_{2\eta_1}} (-\mathbf{p}_1 + (1 - \lambda)w^u) - c > 0,$$

which holds if

$$-s_{1,2\eta_1,0,2C_1} + (1 - \lambda)\nu_{\min,2\eta_1,0,2C_1} - c > 0,$$

or equivalently:

$$(3.8) \quad \lambda < 1 - \frac{s_{1,2\eta_1,0,2C_1} + c}{\nu_{\min,0,2C_1}}.$$

### 3.2. Improve orders of operators.

Using assumptions above, we show that if we choose the coordinate system as in Section 2, that is, choose  $\phi^u = x_1$  to be the first ‘spatial’ coordinate (possibly after a rescaling to make it to be homogeneous degree 1 with respect to fiber dilation), then the symbolic expansion of commutators we use in fact have lower order than the order we can count from the general property of the symbol class we constructed in Section 2. Consider  $P \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^{m_1, r_1}(M)$ ,  $A \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{m_2, \tilde{m}_2, r_2}(M, \Gamma^u)$ , and view  $P$  as an operator lifted to  $\Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{m_1, 0, r_1}(M, \Gamma^u)$ . Recalling Proposition 2.4, the full symbolic expansion of  $[P, A]$  is:

$$(3.9) \quad \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} \frac{(-i)^{|\alpha|}}{\alpha!} (\partial_\zeta^\alpha \mathbf{p} D_x^\alpha a - D_x^\alpha \mathbf{p} \partial_\zeta^\alpha a),$$

where terms with  $|\alpha| = k$  lies in  $S_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{m_1+m_2-k, \tilde{m}_2-k(1-\alpha), r_1+r_2}$ . But in fact the proof of Proposition 2.4 gave us more concrete characterization of orders of terms. Since  $P$  is a cusp operator lifted to be the operator of  $\Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{m_1, 0, r_1}(M, \Gamma^u)$ , the orders of its derivatives are the same as that of cusp symbols. The only loss in (3.9) making orders of terms higher than that of classical results (e.g. the symbolic expansion for cusp pseudodifferential algebra) is the  $x_1$ -derivatives of  $a$ . Writing the local coordinates as  $(x, \zeta)$ , consider a typical term  $\partial_{\zeta_1}^k D_1 p \partial_{x_1}^k D_2 a$ , where  $D_1$  is an operator differentiating with respect to other momentum variables other than  $\zeta_1$ , while  $D_2$  is differentiating with respect to spatial variables corresponding to momentum variables in  $D_1$ . This term is in  $S_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{m_1+m_2-k-k', \tilde{m}_2-k(1-\alpha)-k', r_1+r_2}(M, \Gamma^u)$ , where  $k'$  is the differential order of  $D_2$  (and  $D_1$  as well).

Suppose  $D_1, D_2$  are not vacuum, which means  $k' \geq 1$ , then the term is in  $S_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{m_1+m_2-k-1, \tilde{m}_2-k(1-\alpha)-1, r_1+r_2}(M, \Gamma^u)$ , which is contained in  $S_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{m_1+m_2-2, \tilde{m}_2-2+\alpha, r_1+r_2}(M, \Gamma^u)$ . Then we consider the case where  $D_1, D_2$  are vacuum, i.e.,  $k' = 0$ . On the other hand, by the property of normally hyperbolic trapping, we have

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_{\zeta_1}^k p &= \partial_{\zeta_1}^k p \\ &= -\partial_{\zeta_1}^{k-1} H_{x_1} p \\ &= \partial_{\zeta_1}^{k-1} H_p x_1 \\ &= \partial_{\zeta_1}^{k-1} \hat{\rho}^{-(m_1-1)} \mathbf{H}_p x_1 \\ &= \partial_{\zeta_1}^{k-1} (-\hat{\rho}^{-(m_1-1)} w^u x_1 + r^u \hat{\rho} p). \end{aligned}$$

When  $k = 1$ , we finish. When  $k \geq 2$ , we repeat this process for  $\partial_{\zeta_1}^{k-1}(\hat{\rho}^{-(m_1-1)}r^up)$ . Whenever  $\partial_{\zeta_1}$  hits  $p$ , an  $x_1$ -factor is produced. The only term that remain without  $x_1$ -factor is the one that all derivatives fall on other factors, hence it has a  $p$ -factor. The sum of all those terms, multiplied by  $\partial_{x_1}^k a$ , has the form

$$(3.11) \quad x_1 a_1 + a_2 p,$$

where  $a_1 \in S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_1+m_2-k, m_1+m_2-k(1-\alpha), r_1+r_2}(M, \Gamma^u)$ ,  $a_2 \in S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_2-k, m_2-k(1-\alpha), r_2}(M, \Gamma^u)$ . Since  $x_1 \in S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,-\alpha,0}$ , the first term  $x_1 a_1$  in fact is in  $S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_1+m_2-k, \tilde{m}_2-k(1-\alpha)-\alpha, r_1+r_2}(M, \Gamma^u)$ . In particular, when  $k = 1$ , this means that the principal part of the commutator  $[P, A]$ , given by  $H_p a$  is in  $S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_1+m_2-1, \tilde{m}_1+\tilde{m}_2-1, r_1+r_2}(M, \Gamma^u)$ , up to an error term  $a_2 p$ . Any terms in the further expansion part in (3.9) has strictly lower differential order since

$$(3.12) \quad -k(1-\alpha) - \alpha < -1 \text{ for } k \geq 2,$$

which is equivalent to  $\alpha < 1$ . We summarize discussion above as following lemma, Let  $\tilde{a}_1$  be  $x_1$  times the sum of  $a_1$  above, and  $\tilde{a}_2$  be the sum of  $a_2$  above, all of which rescaled by a power of  $-i$  as in (3.9).

**Lemma 3.1.** *Suppose  $P \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^{m_1, r_1}(M)$ ,  $A \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_2, \tilde{m}_2, r_2}(M, \Gamma^u)$ , and  $P$  satisfies assumptions listed in Section 3.1, then the full left symbol of  $[P, A]$  is given by*

$$(3.13) \quad -i H_p a + \tilde{a}_1 + \tilde{a}_2 p,$$

where  $a_1 \in S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_1+m_2-2, m_1+m_2-(2-\alpha), r_1+r_2}(M, \Gamma^u)$ ,  $a_2 \in S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m_2-1, m_2-(1-\alpha), r_2}(M, \Gamma^u)$ .

**Remark 3.2.** *Without the discussion in this section and this Lemma, the main result will hold only for  $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$ . This condition comes from the requirement that the sub-principal part of commutators, which comes from the sub-sub-principal part in the asymptotic expansion of the full symbol of products  $PA, AP$ , should have orders lower than that of the principal part of the commutator.*

### 3.3. The microlocal estimate.

**Theorem 3.3.** *There exists  $B \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$  which is elliptic on  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\epsilon_0}$  and the front face, in particular on  $\Gamma$ .  $B_1, G_0 \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$  and  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B_1) \cap \Gamma^u = \emptyset$ ,  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(G_0) \cap \Gamma^u = \emptyset$ , and  $\lambda, c$  satisfy (3.8), such that for  $s, N \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $0 < \alpha < 1$ , we have:*

$$(3.14) \quad \|Bv\|_{s,s,0} \lesssim \|B_1 v\|_{s+1-\lambda\alpha, s, 0} + c^{-1} \|G_0 P v\|_{s-m+2-\lambda\alpha, s-m+2-\alpha, 0} + \|v\|_{-N, -N, 0}.$$

**Remark 3.4.**  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  is the relative order on the front face, introduced when we construct the commutator. In a typical situation  $\mathbf{p}_1 = 0$ , hence  $s_1 = 0$ . We take  $c$  small and expect  $\lambda$  to be close to 1. Since the orders that capture the main feature of this estimate are: the second order of  $B_0 v$

and the first order of  $B_1 v$ , hence making  $\lambda$  close to 1 will make the loss of propagation  $1 - \lambda\alpha$  smaller.

#### 4. POSITIVE COMMUTATOR ARGUMENT

We start our positive commutator argument. In proofs below, we first assume that the priori  $-N$  order regularity of  $v$  is high enough to justify integration by parts and pairing in our proof. Specifically,  $-N = s - \frac{1}{2}$  is sufficient. And we apply the regularization technique to justify the general  $N$  case.

In the first step, we use the energy away from the front face to control the energy on the front face. The second step is divided into three parts: Section 4.2 to Section 4.4. In Section 4.2, we an estimate near the front face. In the second part, we consider the dynamics of  $\tilde{\phi}^u := \phi^u / |\hat{\rho}|^\alpha$ . In Section 4.3, we control the energy on  $\Gamma$  by the energy on the region away from  $\Gamma^s$ . In Section 4.4, we obtain a ‘reversed’ version of (4.36), using the propagation estimate of  $H_p$  again. In Section 4.5, we combine estimates in previous steps and obtain the estimate in Theorem 3.3. Lastly, in Section 4.6, we use the regularization to remove the priori regularity assumption on  $v$ .

##### 4.1. Propagation near the fiber infinity side of the corner.

In this step, we use the energy on the region away from the front face ( $B_1$ -term below) to control the energy on the front face ( $B_0$ -term below). We first consider a simple estimate .

Since  $\mathbf{H}_p \hat{\rho} = o(\hat{\rho})$  by assumption 2. Terms involving it are negligible. By (3.5), we can find  $\mathbf{r}^u \in C^\infty(\text{cu} S^* M)$  such that

$$\mathbf{H}_p \phi^u = -w^u \phi^u + \mathbf{r}^u \mathbf{p},$$

with  $\mathbf{H}_p = \hat{\rho}^{m-1} H_p$ . For  $[P, \Phi^u]$ , we assume

$$(4.1) \quad [P, \Phi^u] = iW^u \Phi^u + R_1 P + R_2,$$

$$(4.2) \quad R_1 \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{-1, -1, 0}(M, \Gamma^u), R_2 \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{m-2, m-2, 0}(M, \Gamma^u),$$

where  $W^u \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{m-1, m-1, 0}(M, \Gamma^u)$  is the quantization of  $\hat{\rho}^{-(m-1)} w^u$ . Although generally for operators in this operator algebra, the subprincipal part is  $1 - \alpha$  order lower on the front face. But now all those operators are lifted from the unblown up manifold, the asymptotic expansions of their compositions behave the same as in the cusp calculus. Hence the subprincipal symbols are 1 order lower on both boundary faces, instead of 1 on fiber infinity and  $1 - \alpha$  order lower on the front face, it should be 1 order lower on both of them, which explains the orders of  $R_1, R_2$  above.

Applying both sides of (4.1) to  $v$ , and notice that  $Pv = f$ , we have

$$P' v' = f',$$

where

$$P' := P - iW^u, v' = \Phi^u v, f' = (\Phi^u + R_1)Pv + R_2 v.$$

Using (4.2) and mapping properties of pseudodifferential operators, we have:

**Proposition 4.1.** *With  $\Phi^u, P, R_1, R_2$  defined as above, then for  $G, \tilde{G} \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$  with  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(G) \subset \text{Ell}(\tilde{G})$ , we have:*

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|Gf'\|_{s-m+2, s-m+2+\lambda\alpha, 0} \\
 (4.3) \quad & \lesssim \|\tilde{G}(\Phi^u + R_1)Pv\|_{s-m+2, s-m+2+\lambda\alpha} + \|\tilde{G}R_2v\|_{s-m+2, s-m+2+\lambda\alpha, 0} + \\
 & \|v\|_{s-1, s+\lambda-(1-\alpha), r} \\
 & \lesssim \|\tilde{G}Pv\|_{s-m+2, s-m+2+\lambda\alpha-\alpha, 0} + \|\tilde{G}v\|_{s, s+\lambda\alpha, 0} + \|v\|_{s-1, s+\lambda-(1-\alpha), r}.
 \end{aligned}$$

There is no restriction on  $\lambda$  here, but in latter steps it needs to satisfy (3.8). Next we state the main estimate of this step:

**Proposition 4.2.** *There exist operators  $B_0, \tilde{G} \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ ,  $B_1 \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,-\infty,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ ,  $B^{ff} \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{-\infty,0,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$  and constants  $C_1, \epsilon_1, \eta_1 > 0$ , with  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(\tilde{G}), \text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B_0), \text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B_1)$  contained in a fixed neighborhood of  $\Gamma$ ,  $B_0$  being elliptic on  $M_{0,C_1} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\eta_1} = \{0 \leq |\frac{\rho}{\phi^u}| \leq C_1\} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\eta_1}$ ,  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B_1)$  being disjoint from both the lift of  $\Gamma^u$  and the front face, such that for  $s, N \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $0 < \alpha < 1$ ,  $\lambda, c$  satisfying (3.8), we have:*

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|B_0v\|_{-N, s-(1-\lambda)\alpha, 0} + \|B^{ff}v\|_{-N, s+\lambda\alpha-\alpha, 0} \\
 (4.4) \quad & \lesssim \|B_1v\|_{s, -N} + c^{-1} \|\tilde{G}Pv\|_{s-m+1, s-m+1+\lambda\alpha-\alpha, 0} + \|\tilde{G}v\|_{s-1, s-1+\lambda\alpha, 0} \\
 & + \|v\|_{s-\frac{3}{2}, s-\frac{3}{2}+\lambda\alpha+\alpha, r}.
 \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we can take  $-N = s$ .

**Remark 4.3.** Recall (3.8), the restriction on  $\lambda$ . In order to diminish the loss in this estimate by making  $\lambda$  close to 1, we should take  $c$  small. This comes with the cost that the constant in front of the forcing term becoming large. Concretely, the constant is proportional to  $c^{-1}$  because the  $\|\dot{A}P'v'\|_{-\frac{m-1}{2}, -\frac{m-1}{2}, 0}$ -term in the proof below, which we try to bound in the proof below, has a coefficient  $\frac{1}{2c}$ .

*Proof.* The normalized subprincipal part of  $P'$  is

$$(4.5) \quad \mathbf{p}'_1 := \hat{\rho}^{m-1} \sigma \left( \frac{1}{2i} (P' - (P')^*) \right) = \mathbf{p}_1 - w^u.$$

Our commutant is

$$\tilde{a} = \tau^{-r} \hat{\rho}^{-\lambda} \hat{\rho}^{-s-1+\frac{m-1}{2}} \chi^{ff} \left( \frac{\rho}{\phi^u} \right) \chi^{\inf}(\hat{\rho}\tilde{\rho}) \chi^u((\phi^u)^2) \chi^s((\phi^s)^2) \chi_T(\tau) \chi_\Sigma(\mathbf{p}),$$

where  $\chi^{\inf}, \chi^u, \chi^s, \chi_T, \chi_\Sigma$  are chosen to be identically 1 on  $[-\frac{\eta_1}{2}, \eta_1]$ , decreasing on  $[0, \infty)$ , supported on  $[-\eta_1, 2\eta_1]$ .  $\chi^{ff}$  is identically 1 on  $[0, C_1]$ , decreasing on  $[0, \infty)$ , supported on  $[-C_1, 2C_1]$ . Since  $W^u \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{m-1, m-1, 0}(M, \Gamma^u)$ , the

principal symbols and corresponding Hamilton vector fields of  $P'$  and  $P$  are the same. We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} H_p\left(\frac{\hat{\rho}^\alpha}{\phi^u}\right) &= (\phi^u)^{-1} \alpha \hat{\rho}^{\alpha-1} H_p \hat{\rho} - \hat{\rho}^\alpha \frac{-w^u \phi^u \hat{\rho}^{-(m-1)} + \hat{\rho}^{-(m-1)} \mathbf{r}^u \mathbf{p}}{(\phi^u)^2} \\ &= \frac{\hat{\rho}^\alpha}{\phi^u} (\alpha \hat{\rho}^{-1} H_p \hat{\rho} + w^u \hat{\rho}^{-(m-1)} + \hat{\rho}^{-(m-1)} \frac{\mathbf{r}^u}{\phi^u} \mathbf{p}). \end{aligned}$$

Now take  $c > 0$  to be determined later, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (4.6) \quad \check{a} H_p \check{a} + \hat{\rho}^{-(m-1)} \mathbf{p}'_1 \check{a}^2 &= -c \hat{\rho}^{-(m-1)} \check{a}^2 - (\hat{\rho}^{-s-1} \tilde{\rho}^{-\lambda} b_0)^2 - (\hat{\rho}^{-s-1} \tilde{\rho}^{-\lambda} b^s)^2 \\ &\quad + (\hat{\rho}^{-s-1} \tilde{\rho}^{-\lambda} b^u)^2 + (\hat{\rho}^{-s-1} \tilde{\rho}^{-\lambda} b_T)^2 + h p + e^{\text{inf}} \\ &\quad - (\hat{\rho}^{-s-1} \tilde{\rho}^{-\lambda} b^{ff})^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\chi = \chi^{ff} \chi^{\text{inf}} \chi^u \chi^s \chi_T \chi_\Sigma$ , and  $\hat{\chi}^i$  means the product without  $\chi^i, i = ff, \text{inf}, u, s, T, \Sigma$ .  $e^{\text{inf}}, b^{ff}$  are terms introduced by taking derivative with respect to  $\chi^{\text{inf}}, \chi^{ff}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\text{inf}} &= \tau^{-2r} \tilde{\rho}^{-2\lambda} \hat{\rho}^{-2s-2} (\hat{\chi}^{\text{inf}})^2 \chi^{\text{inf}} (\chi^{\text{inf}})' (\hat{\rho} \mathbf{H}_p \tilde{\rho} + \tilde{\rho} \mathbf{H}_p \hat{\rho}), \\ b^{ff} &= \tau^{-r} \hat{\chi}^{ff} (-\chi^{ff} (\chi^{ff})' (\frac{\hat{\rho}^\alpha}{\phi^u}) (\alpha \hat{\rho}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_p \hat{\rho} + w^u))^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $w^u > 0$  near  $\Gamma^u$  and  $(\chi^{ff})' < 0$ , we can choose  $\chi^{ff}$  so that the square root in  $b^{ff}$  is well-defined and smooth. Recall that  $\tilde{w}^{u/s} = \frac{(\phi^{u/s})^2}{(\phi^{u/s})^2 + |\tilde{\rho}|^{2\alpha}} w^{u/s}$  and  $\tilde{\rho}$  satisfies

$$(4.7) \quad \tilde{\rho}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_p \tilde{\rho} = -\tilde{w}^u + \alpha \frac{|\tilde{\rho}|^{2\alpha}}{\tilde{\rho}^2} \hat{\rho}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_p \hat{\rho}.$$

$b_0, b^{u/s}$  are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} (4.8) \quad b_0 &= \tau^{-r} \chi (-\mathbf{p}'_1 - c + r\tau(\tau^{-2} \mathbf{H}_p \tau) + (s+1 - \frac{m-1}{2})(\hat{\rho}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_p \hat{\rho}) \\ &\quad + \lambda \tilde{\rho}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_p \tilde{\rho})^{1/2} \\ &= \tau^{-r} \chi (-\mathbf{p}'_1 - c + r\tau(\tau^{-2} \mathbf{H}_p \tau) + (s+1 - \frac{m-1}{2} + \lambda \alpha (\frac{\rho}{\tilde{\rho}})^2)(\hat{\rho}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_p \hat{\rho}) \\ &\quad - \lambda \tilde{w}^u)^{1/2}, \\ b^{u/s} &= \tau^{-r} \hat{\chi}^{u/s} \phi^{u/s} \sqrt{-2w^{u/s} \chi^{u/s} (\chi^{u/s})'} \\ b_T &= \tau^{-r} \hat{\chi}_T \sqrt{\tau \chi_T \chi'_T (\tau^{-2} \mathbf{H}_p \tau)}, \\ h &= 2\tau^{-2r} \tilde{\rho}^{-2\lambda} \hat{\rho}^{-2s-2+m} \chi (\hat{\chi}^u (\chi^u)' \phi^u \mathbf{r}^u + \hat{\chi}^s (\chi^s)' \phi^s \mathbf{r}^s + m \hat{\chi}_\Sigma \chi'_\Sigma (\hat{\rho}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_p \hat{\rho})) \\ &\quad + 2\tau^{-2r} \tilde{\rho}^{-2\lambda} \hat{\rho}^{-2s-2+m-\alpha} \chi \hat{\chi}^{ff} (\chi^{ff})' (\frac{\hat{\rho}^\alpha}{\phi^u})^2 \mathbf{r}^u. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that  $\tau^{-2}\mathbf{H}_p\tau = -\mathbf{H}_p t < 0$ , and it will be bounded if we localize to the region where  $\tau$  is small and near  $\Gamma$ , since  $\Gamma$  is compact. So  $r\tau(\tau^{-2}\mathbf{H}_p\tau) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\tau \rightarrow 0$ . Combining (4.7) and the fact that  $\hat{\rho}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_p\hat{\rho} = o(1)$  as  $\tau \rightarrow 0$ , we know that all square roots above are well-defined and smooth if we choose  $\chi_T$  to be supported near  $\tau = 0$ .

Quantize both sides of (4.6), and apply it to  $v'$ , then pair it with  $v'$ . We use  $T_j$  to denote the quantization of  $\hat{\rho}^{-j}$  and  $F_j$  to denote the quantization of  $\hat{\rho}^{-j}$ , and for other parts we just use upper case letters to denote the quantization of the corresponding symbol represented by lower case letters.

We get, with  $A := \check{A}^*\check{A}$ ,  $\check{A} \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{s+1-\frac{m-1}{2}, s+1-\frac{m-1}{2}+\lambda\alpha, r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ :

(4.9)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im}\langle f', Av' \rangle &= \langle (\frac{1}{2}i[P', A] + \frac{P' - (P')^*}{2i}A)v', v' \rangle \\ &= \langle (-c\langle (T_{(m-1)/2}\check{A})^*(T_{(m-1)/2}\check{A}) - (T_{s+1}F_\lambda B_0)^*(T_{s+1}F_\lambda B_0) \\ &\quad + (T_{s+1}F_\lambda B^u)^*(T_{s+1}F_\lambda B^u) + (T_{s+1}F_\lambda B_T)^*(T_{s+1}F_\lambda B_T) + H^*P' \\ &\quad + E + E^{\text{inf}} - (T_{s+1}F_\lambda B^{ff})^*(T_{s+1}F_\lambda B^{ff}))v', v' \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where  $E \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{2s+1, 2s+2\lambda\alpha+1+\alpha, 2r}(M, \Gamma^u)$  is the error term introduced because (4.6) concerns only principal symbols. And  $B_0, B^u, B_T, B^{ff} \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ ,  $H \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{2s+2-m+\alpha, 2s+2-m+\alpha+2\lambda\alpha, 2r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ . Next we investigate properties of operators above through analyzing their symbols.  $B_0$  is elliptic on  $\mathcal{U}_{\eta_1}$ . We can choose  $\chi^u$  so that  $(\chi^u)'$  vanishes identically on  $[0, \eta_1]$  to ensure that  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B^u) \cap \mathcal{U}_{\eta_1} = \emptyset$ . Because of the  $\chi'_T$  factor, which vanishes identically near  $\{\tau = 0\}$ , we know  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B_T) \cap \{\tau = 0\} = \emptyset$ . By the support condition of  $\chi^{ff}$  and its derivative, we know:  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B^{ff}) \subset \{C_1 \leq \frac{\rho}{\phi^u} \leq 2C_1\} \cap \mathcal{U}_{2\eta_1}$ . On the other hand, for the left hand side of (4.9) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im}\langle f', Av' \rangle &\leq |\langle f', Av' \rangle| = |\langle P'v', \check{A}^*\check{A}v' \rangle| = |\langle \check{A}P'v', \check{A}v' \rangle| \\ (4.10) \quad &\leq c\|\check{A}v'\|_{\frac{m-1}{2}, \frac{m-1}{2}, 0}^2 + \frac{1}{2c}\|\check{A}P'v'\|_{-\frac{m-1}{2}, -\frac{m-1}{2}, 0}^2 \end{aligned}$$

Combining boundedness of  $\hat{\rho}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_p\hat{\rho}$  and (4.7), we know that  $\tilde{\rho}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_p\tilde{\rho}$  is also bounded. Consequently  $\hat{\rho}\mathbf{H}_p\tilde{\rho} + \tilde{\rho}\mathbf{H}_p\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}\tilde{\rho}(\tilde{\rho}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_p\tilde{\rho} + \hat{\rho}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_p\hat{\rho}) \in S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{-1, -1-\alpha, 0}(M, \Gamma^u)$ . So we have  $E^{\text{inf}} \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{2s+1, 2s+1+2\lambda\alpha-\alpha, 2r}(M, \Gamma^u)$  and it

can be absorbed into  $E$ -term. Combining these inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.11) \quad & c \|\check{A}v'\|_{\frac{m-1}{2}, \frac{m-1}{2}, 0}^2 + \|B_0v'\|_{s+1, s+1+\lambda\alpha, 0}^2 + \|B^s v'\|_{s+1, s+1+\lambda\alpha, 0}^2 \\
& + \|B^{ff}v'\|_{s+1, s+1+\lambda\alpha, 0}^2 \\
& \leq \|B^u v'\|_{s+1, s+1+\lambda\alpha, 0}^2 + \|B_T v'\|_{s+1, s+1+\lambda\alpha, 0}^2 + |\langle P'v', Hv' \rangle| \\
& + (\|G'_1 v'\|_{s+\frac{1}{2}, s+\lambda\alpha+\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 0}^2 + C\|v'\|_{s-\frac{1}{2}, s+\lambda\alpha-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{3}{2}\alpha, r}^2) + c\|\check{A}v'\|_{\frac{m-1}{2}, \frac{m-1}{2}, 0}^2 + \\
& \frac{1}{2c}\|\check{A}P'v'\|_{-\frac{m-1}{2}, -\frac{m-1}{2}, 0} + \langle E^{\text{inf}}v', v' \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

The terms in the bracket comes from the fact that (4.6) only concerns principal symbols. They collect terms of order lower than the principal part in (4.6). They are generated from full symbol expansion of composition of  $P'A, AP', (P')^*A$ , hence the highest order term among them is 2 order lower in the first index and  $2 - \alpha$  order lower (applying Lemma 3.1, where the  $a_2$ -term is absorbed into the  $h$ -term (and  $H$ -term after quantization) in (4.8)) in the second index compared with the product  $P'A$ . Here the order refers to the sum of the orders of two operators in a pairing. Use Cauchy-Schwartz inequality to control  $|\langle P'v', Hv' \rangle|$ . Because of the  $\chi$  factor in  $h$ ,  $Hv'$  is microlocalized near the support of  $\check{a}$  as well, using  $G'_1$  as the microlocalizer again and enlarge is wavefront set if necessary, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.12) \quad & |\langle P'v', Hv' \rangle| \lesssim \|G'_1 P'v'\|_{s-m+2, s-m+2+\lambda\alpha, 0}^2 + \|Hv'\|_{-(s-m+2), -(s-m+2+\lambda\alpha), 0}^2 \\
& + \|v'\|_{-N, -N, r}^2 \\
& \lesssim \|G'_1 P'v'\|_{s-m+2, s-m+2+\lambda\alpha, 0}^2 + \|G'_1 v'\|_{s+\alpha, s+\alpha+\lambda\alpha, 0}^2 \\
& + \|v'\|_{-N, -N, r}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall the discussion following (4.9), we obtain  $(\text{WF}'_{\text{cu}, \alpha}(B^u) \cup \text{WF}'_{\text{cu}, \alpha}(B_T)) \cap \bar{\mathcal{U}}_{\eta_1}^u = \emptyset$ . Combine the first two terms on the right hand side of (4.11) and control them by  $B_1 \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{0, 0, r}(M, \Gamma^u)$  microlocalized in a neighborhood of  $\Gamma$  but away from  $\Gamma$  itself. They satisfy  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu}, \alpha}(B^u) \cup \text{WF}'_{\text{cu}, \alpha}(B_T) \subset \text{Ell}(B_1)$  and  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu}, \alpha}(B_1) \cap \bar{\mathcal{U}}_{\eta_1} = \emptyset$ . In particular,  $B_1 \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{0, -\infty, r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ . Since we can choose  $G'_1$  to be elliptic on  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu}, \alpha}(A)$ ,  $\|\check{A}P'v'\|_{-\frac{m-1}{2}, -\frac{m-1}{2}, 0}$  is controlled by the norm  $\|G'_1 P'v'\|_{s-m+2, s-m+2+\lambda\alpha, 0} = \|G'_1 f'\|_{s-m+2, s-m+2+\lambda\alpha, 0}$  using the mapping property of  $\check{A}$  and the elliptic estimate. Since  $0 < \alpha < 1$ , combining  $\|G'_1 v'\|_{s+\frac{1}{2}, s+\lambda\alpha+\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 0}$  and  $\|G'_1 v'\|_{s+\alpha, s+\alpha+\lambda\alpha, 0}$  to be  $\|G'_1 v'\|_{s+\bar{\alpha}, s+\lambda\alpha+\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 0}$ ,

where  $\bar{\alpha} := \max\{\alpha, \frac{1}{2}\}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.13) \quad & \|B_0 \Phi^u v\|_{s+1, s+1+\lambda\alpha, 0} + \|B^{ff} \Phi^u v\|_{s+1, s+1+\lambda\alpha, 0} \\
& \leq \|B_1 \Phi^u v\|_{s+1, s+1+\lambda\alpha, 0} + \|G'_1 \Phi^u v\|_{s+\bar{\alpha}, s+\lambda\alpha+\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 0} \\
& \quad + \|\Phi^u v\|_{s-\frac{1}{2}, s+\lambda\alpha-\frac{1}{2}+2\alpha, r} + c^{-1} \|G'_1 f'\|_{s-m+2, s-m+2+\lambda\alpha, 0},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $G'_1 \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{0,0,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$  is microlocalized near  $\text{supp } \check{a}$ . Since the support conditions of  $B_0$  and  $G'_1$  are the same (possibly with different bounds on  $\frac{\phi^u}{\rho}$ ), we can iterate this estimate to control the  $\|G'_1 v'\|_{s+\bar{\alpha}, s+\lambda\alpha+\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 0}$  term at the cost of enlarging the wavefront set of  $G'_1$ . In each iteration we can improve the first index by  $1 - \bar{\alpha}$  and the second index by  $\frac{1-\alpha}{2}$ . So after finite iterations, we can absorb this term into the  $\Phi^u v$ -term. We denote the new operator playing the role of  $G'_1$  in the last iteration by  $\tilde{G}$ . Then we apply Proposition 4.1 to control  $\|\tilde{G} f'\|_{s-m+2, s-m+2+\lambda\alpha, 0}$  and use the mapping property of  $\Phi^u \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{0,-\alpha,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$  to control norms of  $\Phi^u v$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.14) \quad & \|B_0 \Phi^u v\|_{s+1, s+1+\lambda\alpha, 0} + \|B^{ff} \Phi^u v\|_{s+1, s+1+\lambda\alpha, 0} \\
& \leq \|B_1 \Phi^u v\|_{s+1, s+1+\lambda\alpha, 0} + c^{-1} \|\tilde{G} P v\|_{s-m+2, s-m+2+\lambda\alpha-\alpha} \\
& \quad + \|\tilde{G} v\|_{s, s+\lambda\alpha, 0} + \|v\|_{s-\frac{1}{2}, s+\lambda\alpha-\frac{1}{2}+\alpha, r},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda, c$  satisfies (3.8), and  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu}, \alpha}(G'_1) \subset \text{Ell}(\tilde{G})$ . In particular, we can require  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu}, \alpha}(\tilde{G}) \subset \{\frac{\rho}{\phi^u} \leq 3C_1\} \cap \mathcal{U}_{3\eta_1}$ . (4.14) will be the same as (4.4) if we can replace  $\Phi^u v$  by  $v$ , which we proceed to achieve next. Recall that  $B_1 \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{0,-\infty,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ , hence the second order of the  $B_1$ -term can be taken to be any real number.

Recall that  $\phi^u \geq C_1 \rho$  on the wave front set of  $B_0$ , hence  $\Phi^u$  is elliptic near  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu}, \alpha}(B_0)$  as an operator in  $\Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{-\alpha, -\alpha, 0}(M, \Gamma^u)$ , and we can write  $B_0 \Phi^u = \Phi^u B_0 + [B_0, \Phi^u]$  with the commutator term having lower order, hence conclude from above estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|B_0 v\|_{s+1, s+1+\lambda\alpha-\alpha, 0} + \|B^{ff} v\|_{s+1, s+1+\lambda\alpha-\alpha, 0} \\
& \lesssim \|B_1 v\|_{s+1, s+1+\lambda\alpha-\alpha, 0} + \|\tilde{G} P v\|_{s-m+2, s-m+2+\lambda\alpha-\alpha, 0} \\
& \quad + \|\tilde{G} v\|_{s, s+\lambda\alpha, 0} + \|v\|_{s-\frac{1}{2}, s+\lambda\alpha-\frac{1}{2}+\alpha, r},
\end{aligned}$$

This implies, if we replace  $s+1$  by  $s$ , and recall that  $B_1 \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{0,-\infty,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.15) \quad & \|B_0 v\|_{s, s+\lambda\alpha-\alpha, 0} + \|B^{ff} v\|_{s, s+\lambda\alpha-\alpha, 0} \\
& \lesssim \|B_1 v\|_{s, -N_1, 0} + \|\tilde{G} P v\|_{s-m+1, s-m+1+\lambda\alpha-\alpha, 0} \\
& \quad + \|\tilde{G} v\|_{s-1, s-1+\lambda\alpha, 0} + \|v\|_{s-\frac{3}{2}, s-\frac{3}{2}+\lambda\alpha+\alpha, r},
\end{aligned}$$

for any  $N_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ . The constant implicitly included in ' $\lesssim$ ' depends on  $N_1$  as well. The effect of  $B^{ff}$  term here is that we can extend the region where we have control to the area near the boundary of  $\text{supp}(\chi^{ff})$ , where  $(\chi^{ff})'$  has a lower bound but  $\chi^{ff}$  is almost vanishing.  $\square$

**Remark 4.4.** *The constant in (4.4) depends on how close the wave front set of  $B_0$  is to the lift of  $\Gamma^u$ . We consider  $B_0$ -term first. What affects the constant in the estimate is, as we approach the lift of  $\Gamma^u$ , the ellipticity of  $\Phi^u$  is becoming weaker and weaker and we do not have a uniform lower bound of its principal symbol. The constant in the elliptic estimate is proportional to the reciprocal of the lower bound of the symbol. Recall that  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B^0) \subset \{\phi^u \geq C_1^{-1}\rho\}$ , hence the way that we can ‘push’ the estimate near  $\Gamma^u$  is letting  $C_1 \rightarrow \infty$  and the constant is proportional to  $C_1$ . The term  $\|B^{ff}v'\|_{s+1,s+1+\lambda\alpha,0}$  is treated in a similar manner. And a more accurate version of (4.15) is*

$$(4.16) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|B_0v\|_{s,s+\lambda\alpha-\alpha,0} + \|B^{ff}v\|_{s,s+\lambda\alpha-\alpha,0} \\ & \lesssim C_1(\|B_1v\|_{s,-N,0} + \|\tilde{G}Pv\|_{s-m+1,s-m+1+\lambda\alpha-\alpha,0} \\ & \quad + \|\tilde{G}v\|_{s-1,s-1+\lambda\alpha,0} + \|v\|_{s-\frac{3}{2},s-\frac{3}{2}+\lambda\alpha+\alpha,r}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_1$  comes from  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B^0) \subset \{\phi^u \geq C_1^{-1}\rho\}$ .

#### 4.2. Propagation near the $\Gamma^u$ side of the corner.

In this step, our positive commutator argument gives an estimate near the front face.

**Proposition 4.5.** *There exist operators  $\tilde{B}_0, \tilde{G}_1 \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ ,  $\tilde{B}_1 \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,-\infty,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$  and a small constant  $\epsilon_0 > 0$ , with  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(\tilde{B}_0), \text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(\tilde{G}_1), \text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(\tilde{B}_1)$  contained in a fixed neighborhood of  $\Gamma$ ,  $\tilde{B}_0$  being elliptic on  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_{2\epsilon_0}$  defined in (3.7),  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(\tilde{B}_1) \cap \{\frac{|\phi^u|}{|\hat{\rho}|^\alpha} < \epsilon_0, \tau = 0\} = \emptyset$ , we have:*

$$(4.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\tilde{B}_0\Phi^u v\|_{s+1,s+1,0} & \lesssim \|\tilde{B}_1\Phi^u v\|_{s+1,s+1,0} + \|\tilde{G}_1Pv\|_{s-m+2,s-m+2,0} \\ & \quad + \|\tilde{G}_1v\|_{s,s,0} + \|v\|_{s-\frac{1}{2},s-\frac{1}{2}+2\alpha,r}, \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We choose the commutant

$$a = \tilde{a}^2, \tilde{a} = \tau^{-r} \hat{\rho}^{-s-1+(m-1)/2} \chi_1^u\left(\frac{\phi^u}{|\hat{\rho}|^\alpha}\right) \chi_1^s((\phi^s)^2) \chi_1^T(\tau) \chi_1^\Sigma(\mathbf{p}),$$

where  $\mathbf{p} = \hat{\rho}^m p$ ,  $\chi_1^i(s) = 1, i = u, s, T, \Sigma$  for  $s \in [-2\epsilon_0, 2\epsilon_0]$ , monotonically decrease to 0 when  $s$  grow from  $2\epsilon_0$  to  $3\epsilon_0$  and extended to  $\mathbb{R}$  in an even manner. Then we consider the pairing

$$\text{Im}\langle f', Av' \rangle = \langle (\frac{1}{2}i[P', A] + \frac{P' - (P')^*}{2i}A)v', v' \rangle.$$

The principal symbol of the operator on the right hand side is

$$(4.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{a}H_p\tilde{a} + \hat{\rho}^{-m+1}\mathbf{p}'_1\tilde{a}^2 & = -c\hat{\rho}^{-m+1}\tilde{a}^2 - (\hat{\rho}^{-s-1}\tilde{b}_0)^2 - (\hat{\rho}^{-s-1}\tilde{b}^s)^2 \\ & \quad + (\hat{\rho}^{-s-1}\tilde{b}^u)^2 + (\hat{\rho}^{-s-1}\tilde{b}_T) + hp. \end{aligned}$$

Defining  $\chi_1 := \chi_1^u \chi_1^s \chi_1^T \chi_1^\Sigma$  and defining  $\hat{\chi}_1^i$  to be the product without  $\chi_1^i$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{b}_0 &= \tau^{-r} \chi_1 (-\mathbf{p}'_1 - c + r\tau(\tau^{-2} \mathbf{H}_p \tau) + (s+1 - \frac{m-1}{2}) \hat{\rho}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_p \hat{\rho})^{1/2} \\ \tilde{b}^s &= \tau^{-r} \hat{\chi}_1^s \phi^s \sqrt{-2w^s \chi^s (\chi^s)'}.\end{aligned}$$

We can arrange that terms in the bracket in  $\tilde{b}_0$  all together is positive when we use  $\chi_T$  to localize to the region on which  $\tau$  is small and use the fact  $\hat{\rho}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_p \hat{\rho} = o(1)$  as  $\tau \rightarrow 0$ . We compute the derivative of  $\phi^u / |\hat{\rho}|^\alpha$ :

$$\mathbf{H}_p(\phi^u / |\hat{\rho}|^\alpha) = -(w^u \phi^u + \mathbf{r}^u \mathbf{p}) |\hat{\rho}|^{-\alpha} - \alpha \phi^u |\hat{\rho}|^{-\alpha-1} \mathbf{H}_p \hat{\rho}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{b}^u &= \tau^{-r} \hat{\chi}_1^u ((-w^u \phi^u |\hat{\rho}|^{-\alpha} - \alpha(\phi^u |\hat{\rho}|^{-\alpha}) \hat{\rho}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_p \hat{\rho}) \chi^u (\chi^u)')^{1/2} \\ \tilde{b}_T &= \tau^{-r} \hat{\chi}_1^T (\tau \chi_1^T (\chi_1^T)' (\tau^{-2} \mathbf{H}_p \tau))^{1/2} \\ h &= 2\tau^{-2r} \hat{\rho}^{-2s-2+m} \chi_1 (\hat{\chi}_1^u (\chi_1^u)' \mathbf{r}^u \hat{\rho}^{-\alpha} + \hat{\chi}_1^s (\chi_1^s)' \mathbf{r}^s + m \hat{\chi}_1^\Sigma (\chi_1^\Sigma)' (\hat{\rho}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_p \hat{\rho}))\end{aligned}$$

We can choose  $\chi_1^u$  so that  $\phi^u \hat{\rho}^{-\alpha}$  is small enough on  $\text{supp} \tilde{a}$ , and notice that  $|\tilde{\rho}^{-1} \phi^u| \leq 1$ ,  $|\tilde{\rho}^{-1} \hat{\rho}| \leq 1$ , and  $\mathbf{H}_p \hat{\rho} = o(\hat{\rho})$  as  $\tau \rightarrow 0$ . Evaluating  $\text{Im} \langle f', Av' \rangle$  and use (4.18), we know

(4.19)

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Im} \langle f', Av' \rangle &= \langle (\frac{1}{2} i [P', A] + \frac{P' - (P')^*}{2i} A) v', v' \rangle \\ &= \langle (-c \langle (T_{(m-1)/2} \tilde{A})^* (T_{(m-1)/2} \tilde{A}) - (T_{s+1} \tilde{B}_0)^* (T_{s+1} \tilde{B}_0) \\ &\quad + (T_{s+1} \tilde{B}^u)^* (T_{s+1} \tilde{B}^u) + (T_{s+1} \tilde{B}_T)^* (T_{s+1} \tilde{B}_T) + H^* P' + E) v', v' \rangle,\end{aligned}$$

with  $\tilde{A} \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{s+1-(m-1)/2, s+1-(m-1)/2, r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ ,  $\tilde{B}_0, \tilde{B}^u, \tilde{B}_T \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{0,0,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ ,  $H^* \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{2s+2-m+\alpha, 2s+2-m+\alpha, 2r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ ,  $E \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{2s+1, 2s+1+\alpha, 2r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ .  $E$  is the error term introduced because (4.18) concerns only principal symbols and apply Lemma 3.1 when we count orders and the  $a_2$ -part in that Lemma is absorbed in  $h$ . We estimate the left hand side by

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Im} \langle f', Av' \rangle &\leq |\langle f', Av' \rangle| = |\langle P' v', \tilde{A}^* \tilde{A} v' \rangle| = |\langle \tilde{A} P' v', \tilde{A} v' \rangle| \\ &\leq c \|\tilde{A} v'\|_{\frac{m-1}{2}, \frac{m-1}{2}, 0}^2 + \frac{1}{2c} \|\tilde{A} P' v'\|_{-\frac{m-1}{2}, -\frac{m-1}{2}, 0}^2.\end{aligned}$$

Combining above equations and inequalities, the estimate we obtain is

(4.20)

$$\begin{aligned}&c \|\tilde{A} v'\|_{(m-1)/2, (m-1)/2, 0}^2 + \|\tilde{B}_0 v'\|_{s+1, s+1}^2 + \|\tilde{B}^s v'\|_{s+1, s+1, 0}^2 \\ &\leq \|\tilde{B}^u v'\|_{s+1, s+1, 0}^2 + \|\tilde{B}_T v'\|_{s+1, s+1, 0}^2 + |\langle P' v', H v' \rangle| + (\|G'_1 v'\|_{s+\frac{1}{2}, s+\lambda\alpha+\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 0}^2 \\ &\quad + C \|v'\|_{s-\frac{1}{2}, s+\lambda\alpha-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{3}{2}\alpha, r}^2) + c \|\tilde{A} v'\|_{(m-1)/2, (m-1)/2, 0}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2c} \|\tilde{A} P' v'\|_{-(m-1)/2, -(m-1)/2, 0}^2.\end{aligned}$$

Terms in the bracket are similar to terms in the bracket in (4.11). The Sobolev order of the leading part of terms in the bracket is 2 order lower in the first index and  $2(1 - \alpha)$  order lower in the second index compared with the product  $P'A$ . Applying Cauchy-Schwartz inequality to  $|\langle P'v', Hv' \rangle|$ , since  $\text{supp} h \subset \text{supp} \check{a}$ , we can add a microlocalizer at the cost of introducing a lower order error term:

$$|\langle P'v', Hv' \rangle| \lesssim \|\tilde{G}_1 P'v'\|_{s-m+2, s-m+2, 0}^2 + \|Hv'\|_{-(s-m+2), -(s-m+2), -r}^2 + \|v\|_{s+\alpha-\frac{1}{2}, s+\alpha-\frac{1}{2}, r}.$$

Since  $H \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{2s+2-m+\alpha, 2s+2-m+\alpha, 2r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ , we know

$$\|Hv'\|_{-(s-m+2), -(s-m+2), -r} \leq \|\tilde{G}_1 v'\|_{s+\alpha, s+\alpha, 0}$$

for  $\tilde{G}_1 \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{0,0,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$  that is elliptic on  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu}, \alpha}(H)$ . The terms  $c\|\check{A}v'\|_{(m-1)/2, (m-1)/2, 0}^2$  on both sides of (4.20) cancel out. Dropping the  $\tilde{B}^s$ -term on the left hand side of (4.20), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{B}_0 \Phi^u v\|_{s+1, s+1, 0} &\leq \|\tilde{B}_1 \Phi^u v\|_{s+1, s+1, 0} + \|\tilde{G}_1 f'\|_{s-m+2, s-m+2, 0} \\ &\quad + \|\tilde{G}_1 \Phi^u v\|_{s+\frac{1}{2}, s+\frac{1}{2}+\alpha, 0} + C\|\Phi^u v\|_{s-\frac{1}{2}, s-\frac{1}{2}+2\alpha, r}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{B}_1 \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{0,0,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$  is elliptic on  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu}, \alpha}(B^u) \cup \text{WF}'_{\text{cu}, \alpha}(B_T)$ . We iterate this estimate to control  $\|\tilde{G}_1 \Phi^u v\|_{s+\frac{1}{2}, s+\frac{1}{2}+\alpha, 0}$ . Then apply Proposition 4.1 to estimate  $\tilde{G}_1 f'$ -term:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{B}_0 \Phi^u v\|_{s+1, s+1, 0} &\lesssim \|\tilde{B}_1 \Phi^u v\|_{s+1, s+1, 0} + \|\tilde{G}_1 P v\|_{s-m+2, s-m+2, 0} \\ &\quad + \|\tilde{G}_1 v\|_{s, s, 0} + \|v\|_{s-\frac{1}{2}, s-\frac{1}{2}+2\alpha, r}, \end{aligned}$$

where the wavefront set of  $\tilde{G}_1$  is enlarged when we iterate the estimate. Our operators satisfy:  $\tilde{B}_0$  is elliptic on  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_{2\epsilon_0}$ ,  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu}, \alpha}(\tilde{B}_1) \cap \{|\phi^u|/|\hat{\rho}|^\alpha < \epsilon_0, \tau = 0\} = \emptyset$ .  $\square$

### 4.3. Propagation to the trapped set.

In this step we consider the dynamics of  $\tilde{\phi}^u := \phi^u/|\hat{\rho}|^\alpha$ , and denote its quantization by  $\tilde{\Phi}^u \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{\alpha, 0, 0}(M, \Gamma^u)$ . The estimate we obtain in this step is to control the energy on  $\Gamma$  (i.e., the  $B_\delta$ -term) by the energy on the region away from  $\Gamma^s$  (i.e., the  $E_\delta$ -term). The regions of microlocalization depend on a parameter  $\delta \in (0, \frac{\alpha}{3})$  to be specified later.

**Proposition 4.6.** *There exist  $B_\delta, E_\delta, B_2, \tilde{G}_2 \in \Psi^{0,0,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$  with  $B_\delta$  being elliptic on  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\epsilon_0} \cap \{|\phi^s| \leq 3\delta\}$ ,  $E_\delta$  satisfying (4.35) below,  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu}, \alpha}(B_2) \cap \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\epsilon_0} = \emptyset$ , and constants  $C, \tilde{C}$  such that*

$$(4.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \|B_\delta v\|_{s, s, 0} &\leq C(\delta^{1/2} \|E_\delta v\|_{s, s, 0} + \|B_2 v\|_{s+1-\alpha, s+1-\alpha, 0} \\ &\quad + \|\tilde{G}_2 P v\|_{s-\alpha-m+2, s-\alpha-m+2, 0} + \tilde{C}\|v\|_{s-\frac{1}{2}, s-\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, r}). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We use a new commutant

$$(4.22) \quad a = \check{a}^2, \quad \check{a} = \tau^{-r} \hat{\rho}^{-s-1/2} \psi_2(\phi^s) \chi_2^u(\phi^u/|\hat{\rho}|^\alpha) \chi_2^T(\tau) \chi_2^\Sigma(\mathbf{p}),$$

where  $\chi_2^u, \chi_2^T, \chi_2^\Sigma$  are identically 1 on  $[-\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0]$  and supported in  $[-2\epsilon_0, 2\epsilon_0]$ . Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\phi^u/|\hat{\rho}|^\alpha} &= \phi^u H_{|\hat{\rho}|^{-\alpha}} + |\hat{\rho}|^{-\alpha} H_{\phi^u} \\ &= -\alpha \phi^u |\hat{\rho}|^{-\alpha-1} H_{\hat{\rho}} + |\hat{\rho}|^{-\alpha} H_{\phi^u}, \end{aligned}$$

we compute the principal symbol of  $\frac{i}{2}[\tilde{\Phi}^u, A]$  as two parts corresponding to two terms above:

$$(4.23) \quad \check{a} H_{\check{\phi}^u} \check{a} = -\alpha \tilde{\phi}^u \check{a} \hat{\rho}^{-1} H_{\hat{\rho}} \check{a} + \hat{\rho}^{-\alpha} \check{a} H_{\phi^u} \check{a}.$$

Recall our assumptions on  $\phi^{u/s}$ , we can choose  $C_\phi > 1$  such that

$$(4.24) \quad C_\phi^{-1} \leq \mathbf{H}_{\phi^u} \phi^s \leq C_\phi \quad \text{on} \quad \mathcal{U}_{3\epsilon_0},$$

where  $\mathbf{H}_{\phi^u} := \hat{\rho}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{\phi^u}$  is the normalized Hamilton vector field associated with  $\phi^u$ . We recall the construction of the cutoff with respect to  $\phi^s$  in step 2 of the proof of Theorem 3.9 of [14], i.e. we choose smooth  $\psi_2$  such that:  $\text{supp} \psi_2 \subset [-4\delta, 2\epsilon_0]$ ,  $0 \leq \psi_2 \leq 1$ ,  $\psi_2' \geq 0$  on  $(-\infty, 0]$ ,  $\psi_2(-3\delta) \geq \frac{1}{4}$ ,  $\psi_2' \geq \frac{1}{12\delta}$  on  $[-3\delta, 3\delta]$ ,  $\psi_2' \geq -\frac{1}{\epsilon_0}$  on  $[0, \infty)$ ,  $\psi_2 \leq 12\delta \psi_2'$  on  $[-4\delta, 3\delta]$ . The last inequality automatically holds on  $[-3\delta, 3\delta]$  by constant bounds on each side respectively, and we can choose appropriate  $\psi_2$  to extend it to  $[-4\delta, 3\delta]$ . The construction of  $\psi_2$  is elementary. Then decompose  $\psi_2$  as

$$\psi_2^2 = \psi_{2-}^2 + \psi_{2+}^2,$$

where  $\psi_{2-} = \psi_2$  on  $(-\infty, 3\delta]$  and  $\text{supp} \psi_{2-} \subset [-4\delta, 4\delta]$ , and  $\text{supp} \psi_{2+} \subset (3\delta, 2\epsilon_0]$ . Define  $a_\pm$  to be symbols obtained from  $a$  by replacing  $\psi_2$  by  $\psi_{2+}$  and  $\psi_{2-}$  respectively. Hence we have  $\check{a}^2 = \check{a}_+^2 + \check{a}_-^2$ , and  $e_3 = -\alpha \tilde{\phi}^u \hat{\rho}^{-1} H_{\hat{\rho}} \check{a}^2 = -\frac{1}{2} \alpha \tilde{\phi}^u \hat{\rho}^{-1} H_{\hat{\rho}} (\check{a}_+^2 + \check{a}_-^2)$ . Consequently we have

$$(4.25) \quad \psi_2 \psi_2' = \frac{1}{24\delta} \psi_{2-}^2 + \frac{1}{24\delta} \tilde{b}_\delta^2 - \tilde{e},$$

where  $\text{supp} \tilde{e} \subset (3\delta, 2\epsilon_0]$ ,  $|\tilde{e}| \leq \epsilon_0^{-1}$ ,  $\tilde{b}_\delta \geq 0$ ,  $\text{supp} \tilde{b}_\delta \subset [-4\delta, 4\delta]$  and

$$(4.26) \quad \tilde{b}_\delta \geq \frac{1}{4} \quad \text{on} \quad [-3\delta, 3\delta].$$

We consider two terms in (4.23) separately. For the second term we have:

$$(4.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \check{a} H_{\phi^u} \check{a} &= \frac{1}{48C_\phi \delta} \hat{\rho} \check{a}^2 + (\hat{\rho}^{-s} \tilde{b}_-)^2 + \frac{1}{24C_\phi \delta} (\hat{\rho}^{-s} b_\delta)^2 \\ &\quad + \hat{\rho}^{-2s} e_1 - \hat{\rho}^{-2s} e_2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} b_- &= \tau^{-r} \psi_{2-} \chi_2^u \chi_2^T \chi_2^\Sigma \left( \frac{1}{24\delta} (\mathbf{H}_{\phi^u} \phi^s - \frac{1}{2} C_\phi^{-1}) - r\tau(\tau^{-2} \mathbf{H}_{\phi^u} \tau) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (s+1/2)(\hat{\rho}^{-1} H_{\phi^u} \hat{\rho}) \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
b_\delta &= \tau^{-r} \chi_2^u \chi_2^T \chi_2^{\Sigma} \tilde{b}_\delta \sqrt{C_\phi \mathbf{H}_{\phi^u} \phi^s}, \\
e_1 &= \tau^{-2r} \psi_2^2 (\tau^2 (\chi_2^u)^2 \chi_2^T (\chi_2^T)' (\chi_2^\Sigma)^2 \tau^{-2} \mathbf{H}_{\phi^u} \tau + \tau^{-2r} (\chi^u)^2 \chi_T^2 \chi_\Sigma (\chi_2^\Sigma)' (\mathbf{H}_{\phi^u} \mathbf{p})) \\
&\quad + \tau^{-2r} (\chi_2^T)^2 (\chi_2^\Sigma)^2 \chi_2^u (\chi_2^u)' (\phi^u / |\hat{\rho}|^\alpha) \hat{\rho}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{\phi^u} \hat{\rho}, \\
e_2 &= \tau^{-2r} (\chi_2^u)^2 (\chi_2^T)^2 \chi_\Sigma^2 ((\mathbf{H}_{\phi^u} \phi^s) \tilde{e} + \tau^{-2r} \psi_{2+}^2 (r \tau (\tau^{-2} \mathbf{H}_{\phi^u} \tau) + (s + \frac{1}{2}) (\hat{\rho}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{\phi^u} \hat{\rho}))),
\end{aligned}$$

where the term introduced by differentiating  $\chi^u$  is included in  $e_1$ . Combining properties of  $\tilde{e}, \psi_{2+}$ , we know that  $e_1, e_2$  satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.28) \quad & \text{supp } e_1 \cap \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\epsilon_0} = \emptyset, \\
& \text{supp } e_2 \subset \{\phi^s > 3\delta\}, \quad |e_2| \leq C_\phi \epsilon_0^{-1} + C,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  is independent of  $\delta$ .  $b_\delta$  satisfies

$$(4.29) \quad \tau^r b_\delta \geq \frac{1}{4} \quad \text{on} \quad \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\epsilon_0} \cap \{|\phi^s| \leq 3\delta\}$$

by (4.24) and (4.26).

Although  $\tilde{\phi}^u \in S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{\alpha,0,0}(M, \Gamma^u)$ ,  $\chi_2^u$  is supported on the region where  $\frac{\phi^u}{\rho}$  is bounded, so  $\chi_2^u \tilde{\phi}^u \in S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,0}(M, \Gamma^u)$ . Consequently  $e_1 \in S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,2r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ .

Next we consider the first term in (4.23). Define  $e_3 := -\alpha \tilde{\phi}^u \tilde{a} \hat{\rho}^{-1} H_{\hat{\rho}} \tilde{a}$ . Recall the definition of  $\tilde{a}$  in (4.22), factors of terms in  $e_3$  involving differentiation are:  $\hat{\rho}^{-1} H_{\hat{\rho}} \phi^s$ ,  $\hat{\rho}^{-1} H_{\hat{\rho}} \phi^s$ ,  $\hat{\rho}^{-1} H_{\hat{\rho}} \tau$ ,  $\hat{\rho}^{-1} H_{\hat{\rho}} p$ , all of which are all bounded quantities. In addition, because of the  $\chi^u$  factor in  $\tilde{a}$ ,  $\tilde{\phi}^u$  is bounded on  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(E_3)$ , so  $e_3$  quantizes to be  $E_3 \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{2s,2s,2r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ , which introduces another term  $|\langle E_3 v, v \rangle|$ . We define

$$e_{31} = \frac{1}{2} \hat{\rho}^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} H_{\hat{\rho}} \tilde{a}, \quad e_{32} = \tilde{a} \hat{\rho}^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{2}},$$

and we have  $e_3 = e_{31} e_{32} \tilde{\phi}^u$ . And define the version truncated by  $\psi_{2\pm}$  as:

$$e_{31\pm} = \frac{1}{2} \hat{\rho}^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} H_{\hat{\rho}} \tilde{a}_\pm, \quad e_{32\pm} = \tilde{a}_\pm \hat{\rho}^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}.$$

We define  $E_{31}, E_{32}, E_{31\pm}, E_{32\pm}$  to be operators with principal symbols denoted by corresponding lower-case letters. In addition, we require them to be self-adjoint (if not, replace  $E_{ij}$  by  $\frac{1}{2}(E_{ij} + E_{ij}^*)$ ). Thus  $E_{31\pm} \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{s-1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, s-1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ ,  $E_{32\pm} \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{s+1-\frac{\alpha}{2}, s+1-\frac{\alpha}{2}, r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ . Hence we have  $E_3 = (E_{31+}^* E_{32+} + E_{31-}^* E_{32-}) \tilde{\Phi}^u$  and:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle E_3 v, v \rangle| &= |\langle (E_{31+}^* E_{32+} + E_{31-}^* E_{32-}) \tilde{\Phi}^u v, v \rangle| \\
&\leq |\langle E_{32+} \tilde{\Phi}^u v, E_{31+} v \rangle| + |\langle E_{32-} \tilde{\Phi}^u v, E_{31-} v \rangle| \\
&\leq \|E_{32+} \tilde{\Phi}^u v\|_{0,0,0}^2 + \|E_{31+} v\|_{0,0,0}^2 + \|E_{32-} \tilde{\Phi}^u v\|_{0,0,0}^2 + \|E_{31-} v\|_{0,0,0}^2
\end{aligned}$$

We can control  $E_{31\pm}$ -term up to a constant by  $\|v\|_{s-1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, s-1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, r}$ , and control  $E_{32\pm}$ -term by  $\|\tilde{A} \tilde{\Phi}^u v\|_{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, \frac{1-\alpha}{2}, 0}$  by mapping properties and counting

the order of operators, where we have used the fact that  $e_{32\pm} = \check{a}_{\pm} \hat{\rho}^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}$ , hence they are just order-shifted version of each other, i.e.  $\|E_{32\pm} \tilde{\Phi}^u v\|_{L_{\text{cu}}^2}$  is equivalent to  $\|\check{A} \tilde{\Phi}^u v\|_{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, \frac{1-\alpha}{2}, 0}$ . To summarize, we have

(4.30)

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle E_3 v, v \rangle| &\leq \|E_{32+} \tilde{\Phi}^u v\|_{0,0,0}^2 + \|E_{31+} v\|_{0,0,0}^2 + \|E_{32-} \tilde{\Phi}^u v\|_{0,0,0}^2 + \|E_{31-} v\|_{0,0,0}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|\check{A}_+ \tilde{\Phi}^u v\|_{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, \frac{1-\alpha}{2}, 0}^2 + \|\check{A}_- \tilde{\Phi}^u v\|_{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, \frac{1-\alpha}{2}, 0}^2 + \|v\|_{s-1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, s-1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, r}^2 \end{aligned}$$

Now we evaluate the pairing  $\text{Im} \langle \tilde{\Phi}^u v, A v \rangle = \langle \frac{i}{2} [\tilde{\Phi}^u, A] v, v \rangle$ . First we quantize both sides of (4.23) and then apply it to  $v$  and pair with  $v$ . We have  $\check{A}, \check{A}_{\pm} \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{s+1/2, s+1/2, r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ ,  $B_-, B_{\delta} \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{0,0,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ ,  $E_1, E_2 \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{0,0,2r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ . Setting  $\tilde{v} := \tilde{\Phi}^u v$  to simplify notations, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{48C_{\phi}\delta} \|\check{A}_- v\|_{\frac{-1+\alpha}{2}, \frac{-1+\alpha}{2}, 0}^2 + \|B_- v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha}{2}, s+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 0}^2 + \frac{1}{24C_{\phi}\delta} \|B_{\delta} v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha}{2}, s+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 0}^2 \\ &\leq |\langle E_1 v, v \rangle| + |\langle E_2 v, v \rangle| + |\langle \check{A}_- \tilde{v}, \check{A}_- v \rangle| + |\langle \check{A}_+ \tilde{v}, \check{A}_+ v \rangle| \\ &\quad + \tilde{C} \|v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha-1}{2}, s+\frac{\alpha}{2}-\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, r}^2 + |\langle E_3 v, v \rangle| \\ &\leq |\langle E_1 v, v \rangle| + |\langle E_2 v, v \rangle| + |\langle E_3 v, v \rangle| + \frac{1}{48C_{\phi}\delta} \|\check{A}_- v\|_{\frac{-1+\alpha}{2}, \frac{-1+\alpha}{2}, 0}^2 \\ &\quad + 24C_{\phi}\delta \|\check{A}_- \tilde{v}\|_{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, \frac{1-\alpha}{2}, 0}^2 + \epsilon_0 \|\check{A}_+ \tilde{\Phi}^u v\|_{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, \frac{1-\alpha}{2}, 0}^2 + \frac{1}{2\epsilon_0} \|\check{A}_+ v\|_{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}, \frac{\alpha-1}{2}, 0}^2 \\ &\quad + \tilde{C} \|v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha-1}{2}, s+\frac{\alpha}{2}-\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, r}^2 \\ &\lesssim |\langle E_1 v, v \rangle| + |\langle E_2 v, v \rangle| + \frac{1}{48C_{\phi}\delta} \|\check{A}_- v\|_{\frac{-1+\alpha}{2}, \frac{-1+\alpha}{2}, 0}^2 + 24C_{\phi}\delta \|\check{A}_- \tilde{v}\|_{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, \frac{1-\alpha}{2}, 0}^2 \\ &\quad + \epsilon_0 \|\check{A}_+ \tilde{\Phi}^u v\|_{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, \frac{1-\alpha}{2}, 0}^2 + \frac{1}{2\epsilon_0} \|\check{A}_+ v\|_{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}, \frac{\alpha-1}{2}, 0}^2 + \tilde{C} \|v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha-1}{2}, s+\frac{\alpha}{2}-\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, r}^2. \end{aligned}$$

$\tilde{C} \|v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha-1}{2}, s+\frac{\alpha}{2}-\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, r} = \tilde{C} \|v\|_{s-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\alpha}{2}, s-\frac{1}{2}+\alpha, r}$  arises because (4.23) concerns only principal symbols. In the last step, we used (4.30). Multiply  $24C_{\phi}\delta$  on both sides and then taking square root, applying Lemma 2.15, we obtain:

(4.31)

$$\begin{aligned} \|B_{\delta} v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha}{2}, s+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 0} &\leq C(\sqrt{\delta/\epsilon_0} \|\tilde{E}_{\delta} v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha}{2}, s+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 0} + \|B_2 v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha}{2}, s+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 0} + (\delta + \sqrt{\delta\epsilon_0}) \\ &\quad \|\tilde{G}_2 \tilde{\Phi}^u v\|_{s+1-\frac{\alpha}{2}, s+1-\frac{\alpha}{2}, 0} + \tilde{C} \|v\|_{s-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\alpha}{2}, s-\frac{1}{2}+\alpha, r}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{G}_2$  is microlocalized near  $\text{supp} \check{a}$ , which contains  $\Gamma$ . The term  $\delta \|\tilde{G}_2 \tilde{\Phi}^u v\|_{s+1-\frac{\alpha}{2}, s+1-\frac{\alpha}{2}, 0}$  controls  $24C_{\phi}\delta \|\check{A}_- \tilde{v}\|_{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, \frac{1-\alpha}{2}, 0}$  and the term  $\sqrt{\epsilon_0\delta} \|\tilde{G}_2 \tilde{\Phi} v\|_{s+1-\frac{\alpha}{2}, s+1-\frac{\alpha}{2}, 0}$  controls  $\epsilon_0 \|\check{A}_+ \tilde{\Phi}^u v\|_{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, \frac{1-\alpha}{2}, 0}$ .  $\tilde{E}_{\delta} \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{0,0,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$  controls  $E_2 v$ -term and  $\check{A}_+ v$ -term. Its principal symbol  $\tilde{e}_{\delta}$  satisfies

$$(4.32) \quad |\tau^r \tilde{e}_{\delta}| \leq 1 \text{ and } \text{WF}'_{\text{cu}}(E_{\delta}) \subset \{\phi^s > 3\delta\}.$$

$B_2$  is chosen to control  $|\langle E_1 v, v \rangle|$ .  $B_2$  satisfies

$$(4.33) \quad \text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B_2) \cap \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\epsilon_0} = \emptyset,$$

which is possible by (4.28).

Next we estimate  $(\delta + \sqrt{\delta\epsilon_0})\|\tilde{G}_2\tilde{\Phi}^u v\|_{s+1-\frac{\alpha}{2},s+1-\frac{\alpha}{2},0}$ , which is equivalent to  $(\delta + \sqrt{\delta\epsilon_0})\|\tilde{G}_2\Phi^u v\|_{s+1+\frac{\alpha}{2},s+1+\frac{\alpha}{2},0}$ . We control this term using (4.17). Enlarging the wavefront set of  $\tilde{G}_2$  if necessary, this results in an error term  $(\delta + \sqrt{\delta\epsilon_0})\|\tilde{G}_2 v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha}{2},s+\frac{\alpha}{2},0}$ . By Lemma 2.15 and (4.29), we know

$$(4.34) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\tilde{G}_2 v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha}{2},s+\frac{\alpha}{2},0} &\leq 2\|B_\delta v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha}{2},s+\frac{\alpha}{2},0} + 2\|E_\delta v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha}{2},s+\frac{\alpha}{2},0} + \tilde{C}\|B_2 v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha}{2},s+\frac{\alpha}{2},0} \\ &\quad + \tilde{C}\|v\|_{s-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\alpha}{2},s-\frac{1}{2}+\alpha,0} \\ &= 2\|B_\delta v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha}{2},s+\frac{\alpha}{2},0} + 2\|E_\delta v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha}{2},s+\frac{\alpha}{2},0} + \tilde{C}\|B_2 v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha}{2},s+\frac{\alpha}{2},0} \\ &\quad + \tilde{C}\|v\|_{s-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\alpha}{2},s-\frac{1}{2}+\alpha,r}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $E_\delta$  satisfies

$$(4.35) \quad \begin{aligned} |\tau^r \sigma(E_\delta)| &\leq 1, \quad \tau^r \sigma(E_\delta) = 1 \text{ on } \{3\delta \leq \phi^s \leq 4\epsilon_0, |\tau| \leq \epsilon_0, |\tilde{\phi}^u| \leq \epsilon_0, |\mathbf{p}| \leq \epsilon_0\}, \\ \text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(E_\delta) &\subset \{\frac{5}{2}\delta \leq \phi^s \leq 5\epsilon_0, |\tau| \leq 2\epsilon_0, |\tilde{\phi}^u| \leq 2\epsilon_0, |\mathbf{p}| \leq 2\epsilon_0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Substitute (4.34) in (4.31), and choose  $\delta$  small enough so that the  $B_\delta$ -term on the right hand side can be absorbed by the  $B_\delta$ -term on the left hand side and fix  $\epsilon_0$ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \|B_\delta v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha}{2},s+\frac{\alpha}{2},0} &\leq C(\delta^{1/2}\|E_\delta v\|_{s+\frac{\alpha}{2},s+\frac{\alpha}{2},0} + \|B_2 v\|_{s+1-\frac{\alpha}{2},s+1-\frac{\alpha}{2},0} \\ &\quad + \|\tilde{G}_2 P v\|_{s-\frac{\alpha}{2}-m+2,s-\frac{\alpha}{2}-m+2,0} + \tilde{C}\|v\|_{s-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\alpha}{2},s-\frac{1}{2}+\alpha,r}) \end{aligned}$$

After an overall  $\frac{\alpha}{2}$  shift of differential orders, we can rewrite this as:

$$(4.36) \quad \begin{aligned} \|B_\delta v\|_{s,s,0} &\leq C(\delta^{1/2}\|E_\delta v\|_{s,s,0} + \|B_2 v\|_{s+1-\alpha,s+1-\alpha,0} \\ &\quad + \|\tilde{G}_2 P v\|_{s-\alpha-m+2,s-\alpha-m+2,0} + \tilde{C}\|v\|_{s-\frac{1}{2},s-\frac{1-\alpha}{2},r}) \end{aligned}$$

□

#### 4.4. Propagation using $H_p$ -flow.

The goal of this part is to control  $\|E_\delta v\|_{s,s,0}$  by  $\|B_\delta v\|_{s,s,0}$  and get a ‘reversed’ version of (4.36), using the propagation estimate of  $H_p$  again.

**Proposition 4.7.** *There exist  $\tilde{B}_1, \tilde{G}_3 \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$  with  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(\tilde{B}_1) \subset \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{7\epsilon_0} \setminus \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\frac{\epsilon_0}{4}}, \tilde{G}_3$  microlocalized near  $\Gamma$ , such that*

$$(4.37) \quad \begin{aligned} \|E_\delta v\|_{s,s,0} &\leq C(\delta^{-\beta}(\|B_\delta v\|_{s,s,0} + \|\tilde{B}_1 v\|_{s,s,0} + \|v\|_{s-1/2,s-(1-\alpha)/2,r}) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\tilde{C}}(\|\tilde{G}_3 P v\|_{s-m+1,s-m+1,0} + \|v\|_{s-1/2,s-(1-\alpha)/2,r})), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  is independent of  $\delta$ , and  $\delta\tilde{C}$  is bounded,  $E_\delta, B_\delta$  are the same as in Proposition 4.6.

*Proof.* Consider the commutant

$$a = \check{a}^2, \quad \check{a} = \tau^{-r} \hat{\rho}^{-s+(m-1)/2} |\phi^s|^{-\beta} \psi_3(\log |\phi^s/\delta|) \chi_3^u(\phi^u/|\hat{\rho}|^\alpha) \chi_3^T(\tau) \chi_3^\Sigma(\mathbf{p}),$$

where  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  is typically a small parameter. The same as in the previous step, whenever companied with  $\chi_3^u$  or  $(\chi_3^u)'$ ,  $\frac{\phi^u}{\hat{\rho}^\alpha}$  is effectively a symbol in  $S_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ . For the cut-off  $\psi_3$ , we can arrange

$$\psi_3 \psi_3' = -\tilde{b}_l^2 + \tilde{e},$$

where  $\tilde{e}$  is supported in  $\{\delta \leq |\phi^s| \leq \frac{9}{4}\delta\}$  and it satisfies  $|\tilde{e}| \leq 1$ .  $\tilde{b}_l \geq 0$ , and it is supported in  $\{\frac{3}{2}\delta \leq |\phi^s| < 6\epsilon_0\delta^{-1}\}$ . And according to the support of  $\tilde{b}_l$  and  $\tilde{e}$ , we use a partition  $\psi_3^2 = (\psi_{3-})^2 + (\psi_{3+})^2$ , where  $\psi_{3+} = \psi_3$  on  $\{\frac{9}{4}\delta \leq |\phi^s| < 6\epsilon_0\delta^{-1}\}$ ,  $\text{supp}\psi_{3-} \subset [0, \log \frac{9}{4})$ ,  $0 \leq \psi_{3\pm} \leq 1$ . Next we consider the pairing

$$\text{Im}\langle Pv, Av \rangle = \langle (\frac{i}{2}[P, A] + \frac{P - P^*}{2i}A)v, v \rangle.$$

For the left hand side, we have

$$\text{Im}\langle Pv, Av \rangle \leq |\text{Im}\langle Pv, Av \rangle| \leq |\langle Pv, Av \rangle|.$$

For the right hand side, its principal symbol is

$$(4.38) \quad \check{a}H_p\check{a} + \hat{\rho}^{-m+1}\mathbf{p}_1\check{a}^2 = -c\hat{\rho}^{-m+1}\check{a}^2 - (\hat{\rho}^{-s}b_{l,-})^2 - (\hat{\rho}^{-s}b_{l,+})^2 + f_1 + f_2 + hp,$$

where

$$(4.39) \quad \begin{aligned} b_{l,\pm} &= \tau^{-r} |\phi^s|^{-\beta} \psi_3^\pm \chi_3^u \chi_3^T \chi_3^\Sigma (\beta w^s - \mathbf{p}_1 - c + r\tau(\tau^{-2}\mathbf{H}_p\tau) \\ &\quad + \tau^{-r}(s - (m-1)/2)(\hat{\rho}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_p\hat{\rho}) + w^s \tilde{b}_l^2)^{1/2} \\ f_2 &= \tau^{-2r} \hat{\rho}^{-2s} |\phi^s|^{-2\beta} w^s \tilde{e} (\chi_3^u)^2 (\chi_3^T)^2 (\chi_3^\Sigma)^2, \\ h &= \tau^{-2r} \hat{\rho}^{-2s+m} |\phi^s|^{-2\beta} \psi_3^2 (\chi_3^u)^2 (\chi_3^T)^2 (-\beta \mathbf{r}^s + \frac{\psi_3' \mathbf{r}^s}{\psi_3 \phi^s} + m(\hat{\rho}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_p\hat{\rho} \chi_3^\Sigma (\chi_3^\Sigma)')). \\ f_1 &= \tau^{-2r} \hat{\rho}^{-2s} |\phi^s|^{-2\beta} \psi_3^2 (\chi_3^\Sigma)^2 ((-(w^u \phi^u + r^u \mathbf{p})|\hat{\rho}|^{-\alpha} - \alpha \phi^u |\hat{\rho}|^{-\alpha-1} \mathbf{H}_p \hat{\rho}) \\ &\quad (\chi_3^u)' \chi_3^u (\chi_3^T)^2 + (\tau^{-2}\mathbf{H}_p\tau) \tau^2 (\chi_3^u)^2 \chi_3^T (\chi_3^T)'). \end{aligned}$$

In the calculation of  $f_1$ , we used

$$\mathbf{H}_p(\phi^u/|\hat{\rho}|^\alpha) = -(w^u \phi^u + r^u \mathbf{p})|\hat{\rho}|^{-\alpha} - \alpha \phi^u |\hat{\rho}|^{-\alpha-1} \mathbf{H}_p \hat{\rho}.$$

$b_{l,+}$  is the main term, giving control over the region away from  $\Gamma^s$ .  $f_i$  are 'error terms'. On the support of  $f_1$ , which is away from  $\bar{\Gamma}^u$ , we have a priori control (because when  $\tau$  and  $\phi^u/|\hat{\rho}|^\alpha$  are close enough to 0,  $(\chi^u)'$  and  $\chi_T'$  will vanish, hence  $f_1$  is supported away from these regions). Recall that

$\text{supp} \tilde{e}(\cdot) \subset [0, \log(\frac{9}{4}))$ , hence  $\text{supp} f_2 \subset \{\delta \leq |\phi^s| \leq \frac{9}{4}\delta\}$ .  $b_{l,+}$  and  $f_2$  satisfy bounds:

$$(4.40) \quad \begin{aligned} \tau^r b_{l,+} &\geq c' \quad \text{on} \quad \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{3\epsilon_0} \cap \{\frac{9}{4}\delta \leq |\phi|^s \leq 5\epsilon_0\}, \\ |f_2| &\lesssim \tau^{-2r} \hat{\rho}^{-2s} \delta^{-2\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Quantize both sides of (4.38), and apply them to  $v$  and pairing with  $v$ , we have:

$$(4.41) \quad \begin{aligned} &c \|\check{A}v\|_{(m-1)/2, (m-1)/2, 0}^2 + \|B_{l,+}v\|_{s,s,0}^2 + \|B_{l,-}\|_{s,s,0}^2 \\ &\leq |\langle F_1 v, v \rangle| + |\langle F_2 v, v \rangle| + |\langle Pv, Hv \rangle| + |\langle \check{A}Pv, \check{A}v \rangle| + \tilde{C} \|v\|_{s-1/2, s-\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, r} \\ &\leq |\langle F_1 v, v \rangle| + |\langle F_2 v, v \rangle| + \|\tilde{G}_3 Pv\|_{s-m+1, s-m+1, 0}^2 + \tilde{C} \|\tilde{G}_3 v\|_{s-1, s-1, 0}^2 \\ &\quad + c \|\check{A}v\|_{(m-1)/2, (m-1)/2, 0}^2 + \frac{1}{2c} \|\check{A}Pv\|_{-(m-1)/2, -(m-1)/2, 0}^2 \\ &\quad + \tilde{C} \|v\|_{s-1/2, s-\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, r}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{G}_3 \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{0,0,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$  is the microlocalizer.  $\tilde{G}_3$  is elliptic near  $\text{supp} \check{a}$  with  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu}, \alpha}(\tilde{G}_3)$  contained in a neighborhood of  $\text{supp} \check{a}$ .  $\tilde{C} \|v\|_{s-1/2, s-\frac{1-\alpha}{2}, r}$  arise because (4.38) concerns only principal symbols and apply Lemma 3.1 when we count orders and the  $a_2$ -term in that Lemma is absorbed into  $f_1$ -term (and  $F_1$ -term after quantization) here. Due to the  $\psi_3$  factor,  $|\phi^s|^{-\beta} \lesssim \delta^{-\beta}$  on  $\text{supp} \check{a}$  and this estimate gives an upper bound of  $\check{a}$  as well. Consequently, for each set of fixed parameters other than  $\delta$ ,  $\delta^{2\beta} \tilde{C}$  is bounded. Since  $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$  and we only concern  $\delta$  small,  $\delta \tilde{C}$  is bounded.

The  $\check{A}v$ -terms on both sides cancel each other. The  $\tilde{G}_3 v$ -term and  $\tilde{G}_3 Pv$ -term are introduced to control  $|\langle Pv, Hv \rangle|$ . Use  $\tilde{B}_1 \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{0,0,r}(M, \Gamma^u)$  which is elliptic on  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_{6\epsilon_0} \setminus \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}}$  and  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu}, \alpha}(\tilde{B}_1) \subset \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{7\epsilon_0} \setminus \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\frac{\epsilon_0}{4}}$  to control the errors slightly away from  $\bar{\Gamma}^u$ . As we have mentioned, the main term being controlled is  $B_{l,+}$ -term, which is elliptic on a region that is near  $\bar{\Gamma}^u$  but away from  $\Gamma^s$ . By our construction,  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu}, \alpha}(E_\delta) \subset \text{Ell}(B_\delta)$ . For  $F_2$ -term, since  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\epsilon_0} \cap \{|\phi|^s \leq 3\delta\} \subset \text{Ell}(B_\delta)$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_{6\epsilon_0} \setminus \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}} \subset \text{Ell}(\tilde{B}_1)$ , we know  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu}, \alpha}(F_2) \subset \text{Ell}(B_\delta) \cup \text{Ell}(\tilde{B}_1)$ . Consequently, we can control  $|\langle F_2 v, v \rangle|$  by  $\delta^{-2\beta} (\|B_\delta v\|_{s,s,0}^2 + \|\tilde{B}_1 v\|_{s,s,0}^2 + \|v\|_{s-1/2, s-(1-\alpha)/2, r}^2)$ . Substitute this into (4.41) and take square root on both sides, and we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|E_\delta v\|_{s,s,0} &\leq C(\delta^{-\beta} (\|B_\delta v\|_{s,s,0} + \|\tilde{B}_1 v\|_{s,s,0} + \|v\|_{s-1/2, s-(1-\alpha)/2, r}) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\tilde{C}} (\|\tilde{G}_3 Pv\|_{s-m+1, s-m+1, 0} + \|v\|_{s-1/2, s-(1-\alpha)/2, r})), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  is independent of  $\delta$ , and  $\delta \tilde{C}$  is bounded.  $\square$

#### 4.5. Combining Estimates.

Combine (4.37) with (4.36), we obtain an estimate with leading term

$\delta^{1/2-\beta} \|B_\delta v\|_{s,s}$ . By choosing  $\delta$  small enough, we can absorb this term into the left hand side and get:

$$(4.42) \quad \|B_\delta v\|_{s,s,0} \lesssim \|\tilde{B}_1 v\|_{s+1-\alpha, s+1-\alpha, 0} + \|\tilde{G}_2 P v\|_{s-m+2-\alpha, s-m+2-\alpha, 0} \\ + \|v\|_{s-1/2, s-(1-\alpha)/2, r},$$

with following properties:  $B_\delta$  is elliptic on (the lift of)  $\Gamma$ ,  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(\tilde{B}_1) \subset \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{7\epsilon_0} \setminus \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\frac{\epsilon_0}{4}}$ . In addition, we enlarge  $\text{Ell}(\tilde{G}_2)$  and  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(\tilde{G}_2)$  to absorb the  $\tilde{G}_3$ -term. Now combine (4.4) and (4.42), and let  $\tilde{B}_1$  in (4.42) play the role of  $B_0$  in (4.4). Since the order now is  $s+1-\alpha$  instead of  $s+\lambda\alpha-\alpha$ , so the order need to be shifted by  $1-\lambda\alpha$ . For  $\tilde{B}_1$ -term, we localize inside the front face by inserting another cutoff, i.e., we use

$$\|\tilde{B}_1 v\|_{s+1-\lambda\alpha, s+1-\alpha, 0} \lesssim \|B_1 v\|_{s+1-\lambda\alpha, -\infty, 0} + \|\tilde{G} P v\|_{s-m+2-\lambda\alpha, s-m+2-\alpha, 0} \\ + \|\tilde{G} v\|_{s-\lambda\alpha, s, 0} + \|v\|_{s-\frac{1}{2}-\lambda\alpha, s-\frac{1}{2}+\alpha, r},$$

where these operators satisfy:  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_{6\epsilon_0} \setminus \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\epsilon_0/2} \subset \text{Ell}(\tilde{B}_1) \subset \text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(\tilde{B}_1) \subset \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{7\epsilon_0} \setminus \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\epsilon_0/4}$ ,  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(\tilde{G}) \subset \{|\frac{\rho}{\phi^u}| \leq 3C_1\} \cap \mathcal{U}_{3\eta_1} = \{|\frac{\phi^u}{\rho}| \geq (3C_1)^{-1}\} \cap \mathcal{U}_{3\eta_1}$ , and  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B_1) \cap \bar{\mathcal{U}}_{\eta_1} = \emptyset$ . In particular, if we choose  $C_1, \eta_1, \epsilon_0$  so that  $(3C_1)^{-1} > \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}, 3\eta_1 < 6\epsilon_0$ , then  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(\tilde{G}) \subset \text{Ell}(\tilde{B}_1)$  and we can iterate to improve this error term. Concretely, apply the same estimate to  $\tilde{G}v$  with  $s$  replaced by  $s-1$ , and then repeat. The only cost this iteration might cause is the microlocal error introduced when we apply elliptic estimate to  $\tilde{B}_1$ , the microlocal error and  $\tilde{G}v$ -term with one order lower norm can both be absorbed into the last error term  $\|v\|_{s-\frac{1}{2}-\lambda\alpha, s-\frac{1}{2}+\alpha, r}$ :

$$\|\tilde{B}_1 v\|_{s+1-\lambda\alpha, s+1-\alpha, 0} \lesssim \|B_1 v\|_{s+1-\lambda\alpha, -\infty, 0} + \|\tilde{G} P v\|_{s-m+2-\lambda\alpha, s-m+2-\alpha, 0} \\ + \|v\|_{s-\frac{1}{2}-\lambda\alpha, s-\frac{1}{2}+\alpha, r}.$$

Substitute this estimate into (4.42) and we get

$$\|B_\delta v\|_{s,s,0} \lesssim \|B_1 v\|_{s+1-\lambda\alpha, -\infty, 0} + \|\tilde{G} P v\|_{s-m+2-\lambda\alpha, s-m+2-\alpha, 0} \\ + \|\tilde{G}_3 P v\|_{s-m+2-\alpha, s-m+2-\alpha, 0} + \|v\|_{s-\frac{1}{2}, s-\frac{1}{2}+\alpha, r}.$$

$\tilde{G}_3$  is microlocalized in a neighborhood of  $\Gamma$  but  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(\tilde{G}_3) \cap \Gamma^s = \emptyset$ .  $\tilde{G}_3 P v$  and  $\tilde{G} P v$ -terms can be combined together using a  $G_0$  obtained by enlarging their wavefront set. And then we iterate to improve the last error term to obtain

$$\|B_\delta v\|_{s,s,0} \lesssim \|B_1 v\|_{s+1-\lambda\alpha, s, 0} + \|G_0 P v\|_{s-m+2-\lambda\alpha, s-m+2-\alpha, 0} + \|v\|_{-N, -N, r},$$

where  $B_\delta$  is elliptic on  $\Gamma$ , and  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B_1) \cap \bar{\Gamma}^u = \emptyset$ , and  $\lambda$  satisfies (3.8). In the special case where  $P$  is self-adjoint, it becomes

$$\lambda < 1 - \frac{c}{\nu_{\max}}.$$

We recall that we can take  $c \rightarrow 0$ , at the cost of making the constant in the estimate  $O(c^{-1})$  large. Finally, notice that the estimate keeps to hold when we add intermediate terms in the proof to the left hand side. Concretely, in terms of notations in this chapter,  $\|\hat{B}_1 v\|_{s+1-\lambda\alpha, s+1-\alpha, 0}$ ,  $\|B_1 v\|_{s+1-\lambda\alpha, s, 0}$  etc. Equivalently we have

$$(4.43) \quad \|Bv\|_{s, s, 0} \lesssim \|B_1 v\|_{s+1-\lambda\alpha, s, 0} + \|G_0 P v\|_{s-m+2-\lambda\alpha, s-m+2-\alpha, 0} + \|v\|_{-N, -N, r},$$

where  $B \in \Psi_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{0, 0, r}(M, \Gamma^u)$  is elliptic on both  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\epsilon_0}$  and the front face.

#### 4.6. Regularization.

Only assuming that the right hand side of (3.14) is finite is not sufficient to guarantee that each pairing in our positive commutator is finite and integrations by parts are legal. Potentially some terms in equations (e.g., (4.9) and (4.10)) are not finite with only  $(-N, -N)$  order priori control of  $v$ . In this section we justify pairing and integration by parts in our positive commutator argument by a regularization argument for  $-N = s - \frac{1}{2}$  first and then for general  $N$  by induction. Starting with Proposition 4.2, we replace  $\check{a}$  by:

$$(4.44) \quad \check{a}_{\eta_r} := \mathfrak{t}_{\eta_r}^2 \check{a},$$

where  $\mathfrak{t}_{\eta_r} = (1 + \eta_r \hat{\rho}^{-1})^{-1}$ ,  $\eta_r > 0$ . In (4.6), this new  $\mathfrak{t}_{\eta_r}^2$  factor introduces an extra term given by the  $H_p$ -derivative falling on  $\mathfrak{t}_{\eta_r}$ . Direct computation shows

$$H_p(\mathfrak{t}_{\eta_r}^4) = 4\mathfrak{t}_{\eta_r}^3 H_p \mathfrak{t}_{\eta_r} = 4 \frac{\eta_r}{\eta_r + \hat{\rho}} \mathfrak{t}_{\eta_r}^4 (\hat{\rho}^{-1} H_p \hat{\rho}).$$

Now since  $|\frac{\eta_r}{\eta_r + \hat{\rho}}| \leq 1$ ,  $\hat{\rho}^{-1} H_p \hat{\rho} \rightarrow 0$  as  $\tau \rightarrow 0$ , hence this term can be made small when we localize near  $\tau = 0$ . Consequently, this term can be absorbed into the  $b_0$ - term (notice that all terms have an extra  $\mathfrak{t}_{\eta_r}^4$ -factor now). For  $\eta_r > 0$ , we know that  $a_{\eta_r} = \check{a}_{\eta_r}^2$  is a symbol of 4 order less in both the indices associated with the fiber infinity and the front face compared with  $a = \check{a}^2$ . To be concrete,  $a \in S_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{2s+2-(m-1), 2s+2-(m-1)+2\lambda\alpha, 2r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ ,  $a_{\eta_r} \in S_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{2s-m-1, 2s-m-1+2\lambda\alpha, 2r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ . Thus assuming  $-N = s - \frac{1}{2}$  regularity of  $v$  in a priori, all pairing and integration by parts are justified and we obtain an estimate similar to (4.15), but with  $B_0, B^{ff}, \dots$  replaced by  $B_{0, \eta_r}, B_{\eta_r}^{ff}, \dots$ , which are obtained by quantizing the symbol of the same lowercase letter (without  $\eta_r$ ) with an extra  $\mathfrak{t}_{\eta_r}$  factor. Finally we let  $\eta_r \rightarrow 0$  and apply the weak-\* compactness argument, see for example Section 5.4.4 of [32], we obtain the estimate above (4.15) without  $\eta_r$  and  $B_0 v \in H_{\text{cu}, \alpha}^{s+1, s+1+\lambda\alpha-\alpha, r}(M, \Gamma^u)$ . The regularization arguments for step 2.1-2.3 are similar. We conduct the argument for step 2.1 individually, but regularize step 2.2, step 2.3 and step 3 together to obtain (4.43) by taking the regularization parameter to 0. And then we prove the general

$N$  case by induction. For  $N$  less than our initial case, the estimate holds automatically by our initial case.

## 5. APPLICATION TO KERR(-DE SITTER) SPACETIMES AND ITS PERTURBATIONS

### 5.1. Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetime and its perturbations.

In this section, we consider Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetimes parameterized by the black hole mass  $\mathfrak{m}$  and the angular momentum  $\mathfrak{a} \in \mathbb{R}$  and its perturbations. We assume the black hole is subextremal in the sense that

$$\Delta(r) = (r^2 + \mathfrak{a}^2)\left(1 - \frac{\Lambda r^2}{3}\right) - 2\mathfrak{m}r$$

has four distinct real roots

$$r_- < r_C < r_e < r_c.$$

We point out here that some authors use the condition  $|\mathfrak{a}| < \mathfrak{m}$  to define the subextremal property, which is slightly stronger than the distinct root condition. See [1] for more details.

Recall that in the Boyer-Lindquist coordinates, the Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetime is given by (1.1). We use  $\varphi \in \mathbb{S}^1, \theta \in [0, \pi]$  as spherical coordinates on  $\mathbb{S}^2$ . And  $M^\circ$  is equipped with the metric  $g_{\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{a}}$  given by (1.2).

As discussed after (2.1), we use  $M = (M^\circ \sqcup ([0, \infty)_\tau \times X)) / \sim$  to denote the spacetime that is compactified at the time infinity. Since (1.2) is independent of  $t$ , it naturally extends to a metric on  $M$ . In order to distinguish with our model  $\tilde{M}$  in following sections, variables on  $T^*M$  are denoted as  $(x_M, \xi_M)$ . The singularity of (1.2) at horizons  $\{r = r_e, r_c\}$  can be resolved by a change of coordinates, see [1] for more detailed discussion. In our coordinate system, the dual metric is given by

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{a}} &= G_r + G_\theta, \\ (5.1) \quad (r^2 + \mathfrak{a}^2 \cos^2 \theta) G_r &= \Delta(r) \xi_r^2 - \frac{(1 + \frac{\Lambda \mathfrak{a}^2}{3})^2}{\Delta(r)} ((r^2 + \mathfrak{a}^2) \xi_t + \mathfrak{a} \xi_\varphi)^2 \\ (r^2 + \mathfrak{a}^2 \cos^2 \theta) G_\theta &= \Delta_\theta \xi_\theta^2 + \frac{(1 + \frac{\Lambda \mathfrak{a}^2}{3})^2}{\Delta_\theta \sin^2 \theta} (\mathfrak{a} \sin^2 \theta \xi_t + \xi_\varphi)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The singularities of  $g$  and  $G$  at  $\{\theta = 0, \pi\}$  can be resolved by coordinate change, we refer to [9, Section 3.1] for more detailed discussion. Applying the analytic framework we developed, we take

$$(5.2) \quad p_{\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{a}} = (r^2 + \mathfrak{a}^2 \cos^2 \theta) G_{\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{a}}.$$

And other notations in propagation estimates are inherited as well.

Next we consider perturbations of the Kerr(-de Sitter) metric in the sense of [14, Section 4].

**Definition 5.1.** *The cusp-conormal functions consists of functions remains bounded under iterated application of cusp vector fields:*

$$(5.3) \quad \mathcal{A}_{\text{cu}} = \{u \in L^\infty(M) : Au \in L^\infty(M), \forall A \in \text{Diff}_{\text{cu}}(M)\},$$

where  $\text{Diff}_{\text{cu}}(M) = \cup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Diff}_{\text{cu}}^m(M)$ . And also its weighted version:

$$(5.4) \quad \mathcal{A}_{\text{cu}}^\alpha(M) := \tau^\alpha \mathcal{A}_{\text{cu}}(M).$$

We will only consider the case  $\alpha > 0$ .

**Definition 5.2.** *A metric  $g$  is called an  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{cu}}^\alpha$ -asymptotic Kerr(-de Sitter) metric if*

$$(5.5) \quad g = g_{\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{a}} + \tilde{g},$$

where  $g_{\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{a}}$  is given by (1.2) and  $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{cu}}^\alpha(M) \otimes S^{2, \text{cu}} T^*M$ . And we denote its dual metric function by  $G$ . We say  $g$  is subextremal if  $g_{\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{a}}$  is so. This is well-defined since  $g_{\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{a}}$  in (5.5) is unique when  $\alpha > 0$ .

In this case we denote

$$(5.6) \quad p = (r^2 + \mathfrak{a}^2 \cos^2 \theta)G$$

and consider  $P \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^2(M)$  with principal symbol  $p$ . In particular,  $(r^2 + \mathfrak{a}^2 \cos^2 \theta)\square_g$ , which is a smooth (and uniformly lower and upper bounded) multiple of  $\square_g$  satisfies this.

## 5.2. Defining functions of the unstable and stable manifolds.

In this section, we characterize the trapping phenomena in exact Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetimes using the combination of [24, Theorem 3.2] (for Kerr-de Sitter case) and [9, Proposition 3.5] (for Kerr case) restated as Proposition 5.3.

**Proposition 5.3.** *For  $(\xi_t, \xi_\varphi) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ , define:*

$$F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) := \frac{1}{\Delta(r)}((r^2 + \mathfrak{a}^2)\xi_t + \mathfrak{a}\xi_\varphi)^2.$$

(1) *Then either:*

- $F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}$  vanishes at  $r_e$  or  $r_c$  and has no critical point in  $(r_e, r_c)$ .
- $F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}$  has exactly one critical point  $r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi} \in (r_e, r_c)$  and  $F''_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}) > 0$ .

(2)  $F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi} > 0$  on  $\Sigma$ .

(3) *The trapped set in  $M$  is:*

$$(5.7) \quad \Gamma := \cup_{(\xi_t, \xi_\varphi) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}} \Gamma_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi},$$

where  $\Gamma_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi} := \{\xi_r = r - r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi} = p_{\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{a}} = 0\}$ .

(4)  $\Gamma$  is a smooth connected 5-dimensional submanifold of  $T^*M$  with defining function  $\xi_r, r - r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}, p_{\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{a}}$ .

- (5) The trapping of the flow of  $\frac{1}{H_{p_{m,a}}}H_{p_{m,a}}$  in any subextremal Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetime is eventually absolutely  $r$ -normally hyperbolic for every  $r$  in the sense of [36]. The unstable( $u$ ) and stable( $s$ ) manifolds are smooth manifold given by:

$$(5.8) \quad \Gamma^{u/s} := \{\varphi^{u/s} = 0\} \cap \Sigma,$$

$$\text{where } \varphi^{u/s} = \xi_r \mp \text{sgn}(r - r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi})(1 + \hat{\alpha})\sqrt{\frac{F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) - F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi})}{\Delta(r)}} \text{ and } \hat{\alpha} = \frac{\Lambda a^2}{3}.$$

**Remark 5.4.** Coupling with  $\text{sgn}(r - r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi})$ , the square root function in the definition of  $\Gamma^{u/s}$  is smooth because at  $r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}$ ,  $F'_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) = 0$  and  $F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) - F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi})$  vanishes quadratically at  $r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}$ .

Next we verify that the rescaled version of  $\varphi^{u/s}$  above are exactly the defining functions that characterize the normally hyperbolic trapping properties, i.e. they satisfy (3.5). Define

$$(5.9) \quad \hat{\varphi}^u := \xi_t^{-1}\varphi^u, \quad \hat{\varphi}^s := \varphi^s.$$

**Proposition 5.5.**  $\hat{\varphi}^{u/s}$  defined in (5.9) satisfy (3.5) with  $\phi^{u/s}$  replaced by  $\hat{\varphi}^{u/s}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbf{H}_{p_{m,a}}\xi_t = 0$ , thus any factor as a function of  $\xi_t$  commute with  $\mathbf{H}_p$  and we consider  $\varphi^{u/s}$  instead, i.e., ignore the  $\xi_t$  power in front of  $\varphi^u$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} p_{m,a}(x, \xi) &= (r^2 + a^2 \cos^2 \theta)G_{m,a}(x, \xi) \\ &= \Delta(r)\xi_r^2 + (1 + \hat{\alpha} \cos^2 \theta)\xi_\theta^2 + \frac{(1 + \hat{\alpha})^2}{(1 + \hat{\alpha} \cos^2 \theta) \sin^2 \theta} (a\xi_t \sin^2 \theta + \xi_\varphi)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{(1 + \hat{\alpha})^2}{\Delta(r)} ((r^2 + a^2)\xi_t + a\xi_\varphi)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} H_{p_{m,a}}\xi_t &= H_{p_{m,a}}\xi_\varphi = H_{p_{m,a}}r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi} = 0, \\ H_{p_{m,a}}\varphi^{u/s} &= H_{p_{m,a}}\xi_r \mp \text{sgn}(r - r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi})(1 + \hat{\alpha})H_{p_{m,a}}\left(\sqrt{\frac{F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) - F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi})}{\Delta(r)}}\right), \\ H_{p_{m,a}}r &= -H_r p_{m,a} = \partial_{\xi_r} p_{m,a} = 2\Delta(r)\xi_r, \\ H_{p_{m,a}}\xi_r &= -H_{\xi_r} p_{m,a} = -\partial_r p_{m,a} = -\Delta'(r)\xi_r^2 + (1 + \hat{\alpha})^2 F'_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r), \\ H_{p_{m,a}}\left(\sqrt{\frac{F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) - F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi})}{\Delta(r)}}\right) &= \frac{1}{2}(F'_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r)((F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) - F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}))\Delta(r))^{-1/2} \end{aligned}$$

$$- (F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) - F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}))^{1/2} \Delta(r)^{-3/2} \Delta'(r)) H_{p_m, a} r,$$

$$\begin{aligned} H_{p_m, a} \varphi^{u/s} &= H_{p_m, a} \xi_r \mp \operatorname{sgn}(r - r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}) (1 + \hat{\alpha}) H_{p_m, a} \left( \sqrt{\frac{F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) - F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi})}{\Delta(r)}} \right). \\ &= -\Delta'(r) \xi_r^2 + (1 + \hat{\alpha})^2 F'_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) \mp \operatorname{sgn}(r - r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}) (1 + \hat{\alpha}) \\ &\quad \times \frac{1}{2} (F'_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) ((F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) - F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi})) \Delta(r))^{-1/2} \\ &\quad - (F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) - F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}))^{1/2} \Delta(r)^{-3/2} \Delta'(r)) H_{p_m, a} r \\ &= -\Delta'(r) \xi_r^2 + (1 + \hat{\alpha})^2 F'_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) \mp \operatorname{sgn}(r - r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}) (1 + \hat{\alpha}) \\ &\quad \times (F'_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) ((F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) - F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi})) \Delta(r))^{-1/2} \\ &\quad - (F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) - F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}))^{1/2} \Delta(r)^{-3/2} \Delta'(r)) \Delta(r) \xi_r \\ &= -\Delta'(r) \xi_r^2 + (1 + \hat{\alpha})^2 F'_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) \mp \operatorname{sgn}(r - r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}) (1 + \hat{\alpha}) \\ &\quad (F'_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) (F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) - F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}))^{-1/2} \Delta^{1/2}(r) \\ &\quad - (F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) - F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}))^{1/2} \Delta(r)^{-1/2} \Delta'(r)) \xi_r \\ &= (\xi_r \mp (1 + \hat{\alpha}) S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r)) \times (-\Delta'(r) \xi_r \mp \frac{(1 + \hat{\alpha}) F'_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r)}{S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r)}). \end{aligned}$$

where

$$S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) = \operatorname{sgn}(r - r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}) \sqrt{\frac{F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) - F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi})}{\Delta(r)}},$$

which is a monotonically increasing smooth function with inverse function  $S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}^{-1}$  when we restrict  $r$  close enough to  $r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}$ . Next we show that

$$\frac{(1 + \hat{\alpha}) F'_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r)}{S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r)}$$

is lower bounded. By the characterization of  $F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}$  in Proposition 5.3, we can set

$$F'_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) = (r - r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}) f_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r),$$

where  $c_f(\xi_t^2 + \xi_\varphi^2) \leq f_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) \leq C_f(\xi_t^2 + \xi_\varphi^2)$  with  $c_f, C_f > 0$  when  $r$  is close to  $r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}$ . The upper bound follows from the smoothness of  $F'_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}$ . On the other hand,  $c_f$  is obtained by considering the homogeneous degree of  $F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}$  and hence we can restrict  $(\xi_t, \xi_\varphi)$  to a sphere, which is compact. If such  $c_f$  does not exist, then by compactness argument we can find  $(\xi_t, \xi_\varphi) \in \mathbb{S}^2$  such that  $f_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}) = 0$ , contradicting the simplicity of this critical point. Similarly for the argument about  $\tilde{f}_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}$  below. Since  $r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}$  is a critical point of  $F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}$  with  $F''_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) > 0$ , then we can assume

$$F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) - F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}) = (r - r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi})^2 \tilde{f}_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r),$$

with  $c_{\tilde{f}}(\xi_t^2 + \xi_\varphi^2) \leq \tilde{f}_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) \leq C_{\tilde{f}}(\xi_t^2 + \xi_\varphi^2)$  near  $r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}$ . Consequently

$$(5.10) \quad S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) = (r - r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}) \tilde{f}_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}^{1/2}(r) \Delta(r)^{-1/2}.$$

Thus

$$\frac{(1 + \hat{\alpha}) F'_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r)}{S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r)} = (1 + \hat{\alpha}) f_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) \tilde{f}_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}^{-1/2}(r) \Delta(r)^{1/2}$$

is lower bounded by a positive constant multiple of  $(\xi_t^2 + \xi_\varphi^2)^{1/2}$  near  $r = r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}$ . In particular, using the characterization of  $\Gamma$  in Proposition 5.3, we can choose a neighborhood of  $\Gamma$  on which  $\xi_r$  is small. Thus the sign of  $(-\Delta'(r)\xi_r \mp \frac{(1+\hat{\alpha})F'_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r)}{S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r)})$  is  $\mp$  for  $\varphi^{u/s}$  respectively and  $(-\Delta'(r)\xi_r \mp \frac{(1+\hat{\alpha})F'_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r)}{S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r)})$  is a multiple of  $(\xi_t^2 + \xi_\varphi^2)^{1/2}$  bounded away from 0, which verifies (3.5) after rescaling by  $(\xi_t^2 + \xi_\varphi^2)^{-1/2}$ .  $\square$

### 5.3. Construction of the symplectomorphism.

The pseudodifferential algebra we constructed exploits the fact that the defining functions of the stationary extension of the unstable manifold is ‘ $x_1$ ’. In this section we construct a symplectomorphism to reduce estimates on Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetimes to the model case satisfying this property. Define our ‘model manifold’ to be

$$(5.11) \quad \tilde{M}^\circ := \mathbb{R}_{x_1} \times \mathbb{S}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{x_4}.$$

Set  $\tilde{X} := \mathbb{R}_{x_1} \times \mathbb{S}^2$  and use  $x_2 \in [0, \pi], x_3 \in \mathbb{S}^1$  as spherecal coordinates. Similar to how we obtain  $M$  from  $M^\circ$ , we define  $\tilde{M}$  to be  $\tilde{M}^\circ$  compactified by attaching the hypersurface  $\{x_4 = \infty\}$ . Formally, using  $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$  as coordinates on  $\tilde{M}^\circ$ , we set

$$\tilde{M} := (\tilde{M}^\circ \sqcup (\tilde{X} \times [0, \infty)_{\tilde{\tau}})) / \sim,$$

where  $\sim$  is the identification:  $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \sim (x_1, x_2, x_3, \tilde{\tau} = x_4^{-1})$ . And  ${}^{\text{cu}}T^*M$  is equipped with the natural symplectic structure, extending the one on  $T^*M^\circ$ .

We prove that there exists a homogeneous symplectomorphism  $\text{Sp}$  mapping  $\mathcal{U}$ , a conic neighborhood of  $\Gamma$  to a conic set in  ${}^{\text{cu}}T^*\tilde{M}$ . In particular,  $\text{Sp}$  sends  $\Gamma^u$  to  $\{x_1 = 0\}$ . We begin by stating our result.

**Theorem 5.6.** *There exists a homogeneous symplectomorphism  $\text{Sp}$  from  $\mathcal{U}$  to  ${}^{\text{cu}}T^*\tilde{M}$ , such that  $\text{Sp}(\Gamma^u \cap \mathcal{U}) = \{x_1 = 0\} \cap \text{Sp}(\mathcal{U})$ ,  $\text{Sp}(\Gamma^s \cap \mathcal{U}) = \{\xi_1 = 0\} \cap \text{Sp}(\mathcal{U})$ . In addition,  $\text{Sp}$  preserves the time infinity in the sense that  $\text{Sp}(\{\tau = 0\}) \subset \{\tilde{\tau} = 0\}$ .*

*Proof.* We define  $\text{Sp}$  on the coordinate patch  $\mathbb{R}_t \times X$  and then show that  $|t - x_4|$  is bounded, so that  $t$ -infinity and  $x_4$ -infinity coincide and taking  $t \rightarrow \infty$  gives the extension of  $\text{Sp}$  down to  $\{\tau = 0\} \subset {}^{\text{cu}}T^*M$ . For  $z_0 = (\tau = t^{-1}, r, \varphi, \theta) \in \mathcal{U}$ , we define  $\text{Sp}(z_0)$  by defining its components

$(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \xi_4)$ .  $\text{Sp}$  is a homogeneous symplectomorphism if and only if

$$(5.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \{\text{Sp}^*(x_i), \text{Sp}^*(x_i)\} &= \delta_{ij}, \quad \{\text{Sp}^*(\xi_i), \text{Sp}^*(\xi_j)\} = \delta_{ij}, \\ \{\text{Sp}^*(x_i), \text{Sp}^*(\xi_j)\} &= 0, \quad \tilde{G}_{t_d} \circ \text{Sp} = \text{Sp} \circ G_{t_d}, \end{aligned}$$

where the Poisson brackets are with respect to the natural symplectic structure on  ${}^{\text{cu}}T^*M$ .  $G_{t_d}$ , resp.  $\tilde{G}_{t_d}$  are dilating fiber parts by  $t_d \in \mathbb{R}$  on  ${}^{\text{cu}}T^*M$ , resp.  ${}^{\text{cu}}T^*\tilde{M}$ . In discussion below, we use  $x_i, \xi_j$  to denote their pull-back by  $\text{Sp}$  when there is no confusion. Define  $x_1$  by

$$x_1 := \hat{\varphi}^u = \xi_t^{-1}(\xi_r - \text{sgn}(r - r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi})(1 + \hat{\alpha})\sqrt{\frac{F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) - F_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi})}{\Delta(r)}}),$$

which is the normalized defining function of  $\Gamma^u$ .

Since  $H_{\hat{\varphi}^u}\hat{\varphi}^s > 0$  in a neighborhood  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $\Gamma$ , we know that starting from each point  $p = (t, r, \theta, \varphi, \xi_t, \xi_r, \xi_\theta, \xi_\varphi)$  in  $\mathcal{U}$ , the  $H_{\hat{\varphi}^u}$ -flow has exactly one intersection with  $\Gamma^s$  and denote it by  $p_0 = (t_0, r_0, \theta, \varphi_0, \xi_t, \xi_{r_0}, \xi_\theta, \xi_\varphi)$ , where we used the fact that  $\xi_t, \xi_\theta, \xi_\varphi, \theta$  are constants along  $H_{\hat{\varphi}^u}$ -flow. Define  $\xi_1$  to be the time need for traveling from  $p$  to  $p_0$  along the  $H_{\hat{\varphi}^u}$ -flow:

$$\xi_1 := T^s(p) = \frac{r - r_0}{H_{\hat{\varphi}^u}r} = \xi_t(r - r_0).$$

Since  $\xi_1$  is defined as travel time to  $\Gamma^s$ , hence  $\Gamma^s$  is sent to  $\{\xi_1 = 0\}$ . Since  $\hat{\varphi}^u$  is preserved by  $H_{\hat{\varphi}^u}$ -flow, we know

$$(5.13) \quad \xi_{r_0} - \xi_r = (1 + \hat{\alpha})S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_0) - (1 + \hat{\alpha})S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r),$$

Since  $p_0 \in \Gamma^s$ , we know

$$\xi_{r_0} = -(1 + \hat{\alpha})S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_0).$$

Thus

$$(5.14) \quad 2\xi_{r_0} = \xi_r - (1 + \hat{\alpha})S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) = \varphi^u(p).$$

Combining (5.13) and (5.14), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r_0) &= \frac{\xi_{r_0} - \xi_r}{1 + \hat{\alpha}} + S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) \\ &= \frac{\xi_r - (1 + \hat{\alpha})S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r)}{2(1 + \hat{\alpha})} - \frac{\xi_r}{1 + \hat{\alpha}} + S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r) \\ &= -\frac{\xi_r - (1 + \hat{\alpha})S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}(r)}{2(1 + \hat{\alpha})}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$(5.15) \quad r_0 = S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}^{-1}\left(-\frac{\varphi^u(p)}{2(1 + \hat{\alpha})}\right).$$

Consequently

$$(5.16) \quad T^s(p) = \xi_t\left(r - S_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}^{-1}\left(-\frac{\varphi^u(p)}{2(1 + \hat{\alpha})}\right)\right).$$

By considering dependence of  $x_1 = \hat{\varphi}^u$  and  $\xi_1 = T^s(p)$ , we can choose

$$x_2 = \theta, \xi_2 = \xi_\theta, \xi_3 = \xi_\varphi, \xi_4 = \xi_t.$$

So  $\theta = 0, \pi$  are sent to  $x_2 = 0, \pi$  respectively. Those  $\mathbb{S}_\varphi^1$  degenerate to a single point in  $M$  correspond to those  $\mathbb{S}_{x_3}^1$  degenerate to a single point in  $\tilde{M}$ , thus  $\text{Sp}$  is smooth and well defined on  $M$ . Next we try to find  $X_3$  so that

$$x_3 = \varphi + X_3(x, \xi)$$

satisfies (5.12), where we are interpreting  $\mathbb{S}_\varphi^1$  as  $\mathbb{R}_\varphi/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$  and  $x_3$  is also parametrizing  $\mathbb{S}_{x_3}^1$ , i.e.  $\mathbb{R}_{x_3}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ . If two points have the same  $x_3$ -coordinates, but with different  $\varphi, X_3$  respectively, then their  $x_1 = \hat{\varphi}^u, \xi_1 = T^s$  coordinates are different as well because of (5.17) below. On the other hand, when we choose two different representatives of  $\varphi$  for the same point, the  $x_3$  components of their image, which is given by  $\varphi + X_3$ , differ by a multiple of  $2\pi$ , hence correspond to the same point in  $\mathbb{R}_{x_3}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ . Thus this map is well-defined and injective. Using (5.12),  $\{\xi_\theta, X_3\} = \{\theta, X_3\} = \{\xi_t, X_3\} = 0$  implies that  $X_3$  is independent of  $\theta, \xi_\theta, t$ .  $\{\xi_\varphi, \varphi + X_3\} = 1$  implies  $\{\xi_\varphi, X_3\}$ , i.e.  $X_3$  is independent of  $\varphi$ . By remaining equations:  $\{\hat{\varphi}^u, \varphi + X_3\} = 0, \{T^s, \varphi + X_3\} = 0$ , the ODE system that  $X_3$  satisfies is

$$(5.17) \quad \begin{cases} H_{T^s} X_3 = -\partial_{\xi_\varphi} T^s(p) \\ H_{\hat{\varphi}^u} X_3 = -\partial_{\xi_\varphi}(\hat{\varphi}^u) \\ V_D X_3 = 0, \end{cases}$$

where  $V_D = \xi_r \partial_{\xi_r} + \xi_\varphi \partial_{\xi_\varphi} + \xi_t \partial_{\xi_t}$ , in which we neglected  $\xi_\theta \partial_{\xi_\theta}$  component since it is not involved in the defining function of  $\Gamma^{u/s}$  and hence not involved in our discussion.

Next we apply Corollary C.1.2 of [19]. Applying equation (21.1.6)''' of [19], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} [H_{\hat{\varphi}^u}, V_D] &= H_{\hat{\varphi}^u}, \\ [H_{T^s}, V_D] &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Combining with the fact that  $H_\theta, H_{\xi_\theta}, H_{\hat{\varphi}^u}, H_{T^s}, H_{\xi_\varphi}$  commute with each other, the condition (C.1.2) is satisfied. Next we verify (C.1.4) there:

$$H_{T^s}(\partial_{\xi_\varphi} \hat{\varphi}^u) - H_{\hat{\varphi}^u}(\partial_{\xi_\varphi} T^s) = 0,$$

which is equivalent to, using  $H_\varphi = -\partial_{\xi_\varphi}$ ,

$$\partial_{\xi_\varphi} H_{T^s} \hat{\varphi}^u + [H_{T^s}, -H_\varphi] \hat{\varphi}^u = \partial_{\xi_\varphi} H_{\hat{\varphi}^u} T^s + [H_{\hat{\varphi}^u}, -H_\varphi] T^s.$$

Since  $H_{\hat{\varphi}^u} T^s = 1$  by the definition of  $T^s$ , the first terms on both sides vanish, and this is equivalent to

$$H_{\{T^s, \varphi\}} \hat{\varphi}^u + H_{\{\varphi, \hat{\varphi}^u\}} T^s = 0.$$

Using Poisson brackets, this is

$$\{\{T^s, \varphi\}, \hat{\varphi}^u\} + \{\{\varphi, \hat{\varphi}^u\}, T^s\} = 0.$$

Since  $\{\{\hat{\varphi}^u, T^s\}, \varphi\} = \{1, \varphi\} = 0$ , above equation holds by Jacobi's identity. Equations in (C.1.4) involving  $V_D$  are

$$\begin{aligned} H_{T^s} 0 - V_D(-\partial_{\xi_\varphi} T^s) &= 0, \\ H_{\hat{\varphi}^u} 0 - V_D(-\partial_{\xi_\varphi} \hat{\varphi}^u) &= -\partial_{\xi_\varphi} \hat{\varphi}^u, \end{aligned}$$

both of which follow from the fact that  $\partial_{\xi_\varphi} T^s$  and  $\partial_{\xi_\varphi} \varphi$  are homogeneous function of degree 0 and -1 respectively and Euler's Theorem on homogeneous functions. Thus we can solve the ODE of  $X_3$  with prescribed initial condition on  $\Theta_1 := \mathcal{U} \cap \{T^s = \hat{\varphi}^u = 0, t = t_1, \theta = \theta_1, \varphi = \varphi_1, \xi_\theta = \xi_{\theta 1}, |\xi| = 1\}$ , where  $t_1, \xi_{\theta 1}, \varphi_1, \theta_1$  are fixed constants and  $|\xi_{\theta 1}| < 1$ . By Proposition 5.3,  $T^s = \hat{\varphi}^u = 0$  is equivalent to  $r = r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}, \xi_r = 0$ , thus  $\Theta_1$  is parametrized by  $\xi_\varphi$ . We set  $X_3 = 0$  on this codimension 7 smooth submanifold.

Using the same method, we construct  $X_4$  in  $x_4 = t + X_4$  such that

$$\begin{cases} H_{T^s} X_4 = -\partial_{\xi_t} T^s(p) \\ H_{\hat{\varphi}^u} X_4 = -\partial_{\xi_t} (\hat{\varphi}^u) \\ H_{x_3} X_4 = -\partial_{\xi_t} x_3, \\ V_D X_4 = 0, \end{cases}$$

where other commutation relations are already satisfied. Condition (C.1.2) and (C.1.4) in [19] are verified in the same manner. We take the first and the third equations as examples. We need to verify

$$H_{x_3} \partial_{\xi_t} T^s(p) - H_{T^s} \partial_{\xi_t} x_3 = 0.$$

This is equivalent to

$$\{\{T^s, t\}, x_3\} + \{\{t, x_3\}, T^s\} = 0,$$

which follows from  $\{\{x_3, T^s\}, t\} = \{0, T^s\} = 0$  and Jacobi's identity. The rest conditions involving  $V_D$  are verified in the same manner as when we solve  $X_3$ . And we can assign initial value of  $X_4$  at  $\Theta_2 := \mathcal{U} \cap \{\xi_r = 0, r = r_{\xi_t, \xi_\varphi}, t = t_1, \theta = \theta_1, \varphi = \varphi_1, \xi_\theta = \xi_{\theta 1}, \xi_\varphi = \xi_{\varphi 1}, |\xi| = 1\}$  with  $|\xi_{\varphi 1}|^2 + |\xi_{\theta 1}|^2 < 1$ , which is a single point. We set  $X_4 = 0$  at  $\Theta_2$ . Finally we show that  $X_4 = x_4 - t$  is bounded. Since  $X_4$  is homogeneous of degree 0, we consider its value on the unit sphere bundle. Then the variables in the ODE from which we obtain  $X_4$  are varying over a bounded region and the right hand sides of those ODEs are bounded as well, thus  $X_4$  is bounded.  $\square$

By [14, Theorem 2.3, 2.6, 4.3], we know that the properties we stated in Section 3.1 holds not only for the  $H_{p_{m,a}}$ -flow, but also for the  $H_p$ -flow. Let  $\Gamma_g^{u/s}$  be the unstable and stable manifolds defined for  $p$  in (5.6), then their intersection with time infinity  $\{\tau = 0\}$  are the same as  $\bar{\Gamma}^{u/s} = \Gamma^{u/s} \cap \{\tau = 0\}$ . Since  $\varphi^{u/s}$  are time-independent,  $\Gamma^{u/s}$  in fact is the stationary extension of  $\bar{\Gamma}^{u/s}$ , and hence the stationary extension of  $\Gamma_g^{u/s} \cap \{\tau = 0\}$ .  $\Gamma_g^{u/s}$  approach  $\Gamma^{u/s}$  in the  $\mathcal{A}_{cu}^\alpha$ -sense (i.e., it is a graph of a  $\mathcal{A}_{cu}^\alpha$ -function over  $\Gamma^{u/s}$  near

$\bar{\Gamma}^{u/s}$ . Thus  $\text{Sp}^*(x_1)$  is still the defining function of the stationary extension of  $\Gamma_g^{u/s} \cap \{\tau = 0\}$ . Summarizing the discussion, we have

**Corollary 5.7.** *The homogeneous symplectomorphism  $\text{Sp}$  constructed in Theorem 5.6 sends the stationary extension of  $\Gamma_g^u \cap \{\tau = 0\}$  to  $\{x_1 = 0\}$ , and the stationary extension of  $\Gamma_g^s \cap \{\tau = 0\}$  to  $\{\xi_1 = 0\}$ .*

#### 5.4. Quantize $\text{Sp}$ .

Next we apply the Egorov's theorem of conjugating pseudodifferential operators by multi-valued Fourier integral operators to reduce our estimates to the model case. The key observation is that, although the Fourier integral operator  $T$  itself, which is locally defined, has an obstruction to be glued to be a global Fourier integral operator, but this obstruction is a transition factor of the form  $e^{i\alpha_{ij}}$ , and hence always cancels out if we conjugate by  $T$ , i.e., multiplying  $T, T^*$  simultaneously. We use a finite open cover  $\{\mathcal{U}_j\}_{j \in J}$  of  $\mathcal{U}$  so that  $\mathcal{U}_i \cap \mathcal{U}_j$  is contractible for  $i, j \in J$  and  $\{(\pi_M(\mathcal{U}_j), \varphi_j)\}$  is an atlas of  $M$ . We use  $J = \{1, 2\}$ , which is possible for our  $M$ . Here we allow half spaces in the model of charts, so that the compactified  $\mathbb{R}_t$  only need one chart to cover and the 2 charts are needed for the  $\mathbb{S}^2$  component.

We denote the coordinates on  $\mathcal{U}_j$  by  $(y, \eta) = (t_y, r_y, \varphi_y, \theta_y, \eta_t, \eta_r, \eta_\varphi, \eta_\theta)$  and the coordinates on  $\text{Sp}(\mathcal{U}_j)$  by  $(x, \zeta) = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 = \tilde{\tau}^{-1}, \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3, \zeta_4)$ , which is valid down to  $\tau = 0$  when we consider oscillatory integral expression of  $T_j$ . We apply [12, Theorem 10.1]. The original proof given is valid for conjugating classical pseudodifferential operators, we will verify that it is valid for cusp calculus in our setting as well after verifying the condition needed to quantize  $\text{Sp}|_{\mathcal{U}_j}$  in that theorem.

**Proposition 5.8.** *Let  $\{\chi_j\}_{j \in J}$  be a partition of unity subordinate to  $\{\pi_M(\mathcal{U}_j)\}_{j \in J}$ , shrinking  $\mathcal{U}_j$  if necessary, we can choose a family of Fourier integral operators  $T_j$  associated to  $\text{Sp}|_{\mathcal{U}_j}$  such that*

- (1)  $T_j^* T_j - \text{Id}_M \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^{-\infty, 0}(M)$  microlocally on  $\mathcal{U}_j$ ,  $T_j T_j^* - \text{Id}_{\tilde{M}} \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^{-\infty, 0}(\tilde{M})$  microlocally on  $\text{Sp}(\mathcal{U}_j)$ .  $T_j$  is elliptic on  $\mathcal{U}_j$ .
- (2) For  $\mathbf{A} \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^{m, r}(M)$  with principal symbol  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\text{WF}(\mathbf{a}) \subset \mathcal{U}_j$ ,  $\mathbf{B} := T_j \mathbf{A} T_j^* \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^{m, r}(\tilde{M})$  has principal symbol

$$(5.18) \quad \mathbf{b} = (\text{Sp}^{-1})^*(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{a} \circ (\text{Sp}^{-1}).$$

- (3)  $T_k^* T_j - c_{kj} e^{i\alpha_{kj}} \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^{-\infty, 0}(M)$  on  $\mathcal{U}_j \cap \mathcal{U}_k$ , where  $c_{kj} > 0, \alpha_{kj} \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Define the global Fourier integral operator  $T$  by

$$Tu = T_1 \chi_1 u + c_{21} e^{i\alpha_{21}} T_2 \chi_2 u, \quad u \in D'(M).$$

Then for the glued conjugated  $P$ :

$$(5.19) \quad \tilde{P} := \sum_{j \in J} T_j (\chi_j P) T_j^*,$$

we have

$$(5.20) \quad \tilde{P}T = TP + R,$$

where  $R$  is a smoothing operator.

*Proof.* The condition we need to verify in order to apply [12, Theorem 10.1] is that  $G(\text{Sp}) \subset^{\text{cu}} T^*M \times^{\text{cu}} T^*\tilde{M}$ , the graph of  $\text{Sp}$ , has a generating function in the sense of [12], which means there exists  $\varphi(z, \eta)$  such that  $\text{Sp}$  has the form

$$(5.21) \quad (\varphi'_\eta(x, \eta), \eta) \mapsto (x, \varphi'_x(x, \eta)).$$

By [12, Theorem 5.3], we need to verify that, the projection  $\pi_{\text{Sp}}$  from  $G(\text{Sp})$  to  $M \times \mathbb{R}^4$ , i.e., the  $(\tau, r, \theta, \varphi, \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3, \zeta_4)$  part is a diffeomorphism. Although the result of Theorem 5.3 there is local, but the proof only relies on the fact that closed differential forms are locally exact, which is true on any contractible region, thus its proof gives a generating function that is ‘global’ on  $\mathcal{U} \times^{\text{cu}} T^*\tilde{M}$ . Since  $\zeta_2 = \zeta_\theta, \zeta_3 = \zeta_\varphi, \zeta_4 = \zeta_t = -\zeta_r$ , and the projection from  $G(\text{Sp})$  to  $^{\text{cu}}T^*M$ , i.e., the  $(\tau, r, \theta, \varphi, \zeta_t, \zeta_r, \zeta_\theta, \zeta_\varphi)$  part is a diffeomorphism, we need to verify

$$\frac{\partial \zeta_1}{\partial \zeta_r} \neq 0,$$

which is sufficient for  $\pi_{\text{Sp}}$  to have full rank. This is straight forward by  $\zeta_1 = \zeta_t(r - S_{\zeta_t, \zeta_\varphi}^{-1}(-\frac{\varphi^u(p)}{2(1+\tilde{\alpha})}))$ ,  $\varphi^u = \zeta_r - S_{\zeta_t, \zeta_\varphi}(r)$  and  $(S_{\zeta_t, \zeta_\varphi}^{-1})' \neq 0$ , where the last condition holds because by (5.10), when  $r$  is close to  $r_{\zeta_t, \zeta_\varphi}$ ,  $S'_{\zeta_t, \zeta_\varphi}(r)$  is continuous and positive, thus  $(S_{\zeta_t, \zeta_\varphi}^{-1})'$  is continuous and positive by the inverse function theorem.

Consequently, we can apply [12, Theorem 10.1] (assuming that it holds for the cusp calculus for the moment), which is stated for a small conic region, but its proof goes through on the region where the generating function is valid, hence on  $G(\text{Sp}) \subset \mathcal{U} \times^{\text{cu}} T^*\tilde{M}$ . We obtain a Fourier integral operator  $T_j : D'(\pi_M(\mathcal{U}_j)) \rightarrow D'(\pi_{\tilde{M}}(\text{Sp}(\mathcal{U}_j)))$  quantizing  $\text{Sp}|_{\mathcal{U}_j}$ , being elliptic on and microlocally unitary on  $\mathcal{U}_j$  in the sense that

$$T_j^*T_j - \text{Id}_M \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^{-\infty, 0}(M) \text{ on } \mathcal{U}_j, T_jT_j^* - \text{Id}_{\tilde{M}} \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^{-\infty, 0}(\tilde{M}) \text{ on } \text{Sp}(\mathcal{U}_j).$$

The unitary property is not included in [12], but as stated before (2.7) of [17], we can achieve this by adding a smooth factor to the amplitude. In addition, for  $\mathbf{A} \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^{m, r}(M)$  with principal symbol  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\text{WF}'(\mathbf{A}) \subset \mathcal{U}_j$ , we know  $\mathbf{B} := T_j\mathbf{A}T_j^* \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^{m, r}(\tilde{M})$ . And it has the same symbol modulo  $S_{\text{cu}}^{m-2, r}(M)$ :

$$(5.22) \quad \mathbf{b} = (\text{Sp}^{-1})^*(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{a} \circ (\text{Sp}^{-1}) \bmod S_{\text{cu}}^{m-2, r}(M),$$

which is the improved Egorov’s property, i.e., their symbol coincide up to the sub-principal level and this comes from the argument in [17, Section 2]. Although the argument there is for the semiclassical case, but the part

starting from equation (2.6) there goes through for classical case as well.  $O(h^\mu)$ -terms are understood as  $\mu$ -order lower symbol or operators in the classical case. And the factors  $\frac{1}{h}$  in phases are not needed. The fact we use is that differences between oscillatory integrals in different patches are purely imaginary. Thus when we go back to the same point following a closed loop, the product of all these factors, which is the obstruction to the compatibility, is a purely imaginary factor. This factor is cancelled when we apply both the Fourier integral operator and its adjoint.

We mention that this property is also discussed in [27], and the global version is mentioned in remark i) in Section 1.2.

Now we verify that [12, Theorem 10.1] applies to the cusp calculus as well. In each  $\mathcal{U}_j$ , we choose  $T_j$  of the form

$$(5.23) \quad T_j u(x) = \int e^{i(\varphi(x,\eta) - y \cdot \eta)} t_j(x, y, \eta) u(z) dy d\eta + Ku,$$

where  $K$  is a smoothing operator, and  $T_j^*$  has a similar expression.

Under composition, for  $\mathbf{A} \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^{m,r}(M)$  with principal symbol  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\text{WF}'(\mathbf{A}) \subset \mathcal{U}_j$ ,  $T\mathbf{A}T^*$  has an oscillatory integral representation (see [12, page 109])

$$(T_j \mathbf{A} T_j^* u)(x) = \int e^{i(\varphi(x,\eta) - x' \cdot \eta + x' \cdot \theta - \varphi(y,\theta))} t(x, x', \eta) \mathbf{a}(y, \varphi'_x(x, \eta)) \\ t^*(x', y, \theta) u(y) dx' d\eta dy d\theta$$

for  $u \in C^\infty(\mathcal{U}_j)$  and we used  $(y', \eta')$  to denote a point on  ${}^{\text{cu}}T^*\tilde{M}$ . Applying the stationary phase lemma, its leading contribution is from the non-degenerate critical point  $\eta = \theta, x' = \varphi'_\eta(x, \eta)$ , and we have (on the principal symbol level)

$$(T_j \mathbf{A} T_j^* u)(x) = \int e^{i(\varphi(x,\theta) - \varphi(y,\theta))} c(x, y, \theta) u(y) dy d\theta.$$

Notice that,

$$\varphi(x, \theta) - \varphi(y, \theta) = (x - y) \Xi(x, y, \theta),$$

where  $\Xi$  is smooth and homogeneous of degree 1 with respect to  $\theta$ . and so does its inverse. After a change of variable we have

$$(5.24) \quad (T_j \mathbf{A} T_j^* u)(x) = \int e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi} c(x, y, \xi) u(y) dy d\xi + Ku,$$

This has the form of a cusp pseudodifferential operator, as long as we verify that  $c(x, y, \eta)|_{x=y}$  is a cusp symbol. This is because  $c$  is  $t(x, \varphi'_\eta(x, \eta), \theta) \mathbf{a}(y, \varphi'_x(x, \eta)) t^*(\varphi'_\eta(x, \eta), y, \theta)$  multiplied by a factor involving the second derivative of  $\varphi(x, \eta) - x' \cdot \eta + x' \cdot \theta - \varphi(y, \theta)$  with respect to  $(x', \eta)$ . By the remark at the end of [12, Section 9], the generating function is

$$\varphi(x, \eta) = y \cdot \eta|_{G(\text{Sp})} = \pi_y(\pi_{x,\eta}^{-1}(x, \eta)) \cdot \eta.$$

Notice that the only part in  $y$  that involves  $t$  is  $x_4 = t + X_4$ , with  $X_4$  being independent of  $t$ , thus all these extra factors arise from applying the method of stationary phase is bounded under iterated application of  $t^2 \partial_t$ , which is the desired property for a cusp symbol (the boundedness when taking other derivatives is clear).

Let  $\{\chi_j\}_{j \in J}$  be a partition of unity subordinate to  $\{\pi_M(\mathcal{U}_j)\}_{j \in J}$ , shrinking  $\mathcal{U}_j$  if necessary, we can choose a family of Fourier integral operators  $T_j$  associated to  $\text{Sp}|_{\mathcal{U}_j}$  satisfying properties listed in Proposition 5.8. Define the global Fourier integral operator  $T$  by

$$Tu = T_1 \chi_1 u + c_{21} e^{i\alpha_{21}} T_2 \chi_2 u, \quad u \in D'(M).$$

By Property (3) in the statement of the proposition, two terms here are microlocally equal on  $\mathcal{U}_j \cap \mathcal{U}_k$ , and since  $T_j$  is elliptic on  $\mathcal{U}_j$ ,  $T$  is elliptic on  $\mathcal{U}$ . Notice that  $T_1^* T_2 T_2^* T_1 = \text{Id}_M$  microlocally on  $\mathcal{U}_1 \cap \mathcal{U}_2$ , thus we know

$$c_{12} = c_{21}^{-1}, \alpha_{12} = -\alpha_{21}.$$

Direct computation shows

$$T^* T - \text{Id}_M \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^{-\infty, 0}(M) \text{ on } \mathcal{U}, \quad T T^* - \text{Id}_{\tilde{M}} \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^{-\infty, 0}(\tilde{M}) \text{ on } \text{Sp}(\mathcal{U}).$$

Then we consider  $\tilde{P} := \sum_{j \in J} T_j (\chi_j P) T_j^*$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P} T u &= (T_1 \chi_1 P T_1^* + T_2 \chi_2 P T_2^*) (T_1 \chi_1 u + c_{21} e^{i\alpha_{21}} T_2 \chi_2 u) \\ &= (T_1 \chi_1 P \chi_1 + T_2 \chi_2 P c_{21} e^{i\alpha_{21}} \chi_1 + T_1 \chi_1 P T_1^* c_{21} e^{i\alpha_{21}} T_2 \chi_2 + \\ &\quad c_{21} e^{i\alpha_{21}} T_2 \chi_2 P \chi_2) u + R u. \end{aligned}$$

Since the third term has both  $\chi_1, \chi_2$  factor, and on  $\mathcal{U}_1 \cap \mathcal{U}_2$  we have  $T_1^* T_2 = c_{12} e^{i\alpha_{12}} + R$ . So

$$T_1 \chi_1 P T_1^* c_{21} e^{i\alpha_{21}} T_2 \chi_2 u = T_1 \chi_1 P c_{21} c_{12} e^{i(\alpha_{21} + \alpha_{12})} \chi_2 u = T_1 \chi_1 P \chi_2 u.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} (5.25) \quad \tilde{P} T u &= (T_1 \chi_1 P \chi_1 + T_2 \chi_2 P c_{21} e^{i\alpha_{21}} \chi_1 + T_1 \chi_1 P \chi_2 + c_{21} e^{i\alpha_{21}} T_2 \chi_2 P \chi_2) u \\ &\quad + R u \\ &= (T_1 \chi_1 + c_{21} e^{i\alpha_{21}}) P u + R u \\ &= T P u + R u. \end{aligned}$$

$R$  representing the microlocal errors in different steps may represent different operators, but all of them are infinitely smoothing operators and do not affect estimates.  $\square$

### 5.5. Properties of the conjugated operator.

In this part we verify that  $\tilde{P}$  fits into the framework in Section 2 to Section 4. In particular, the microlocal estimate in Section 4 holds with  $P$  replaced by  $\tilde{P}$  and  $v$  replaced by  $Tv$ .

First we prove that weighted Sobolev spaces are preserved under  $T$ . When an inequality involves norms on both  $M$  and  $\tilde{M}$ , we write  $H_{\text{cu}}^s(\tilde{M}), H_{\text{cu}}^s(M)$  to index the norm instead of only writing the orders.

**Proposition 5.9.** *Suppose  $u \in \tau^\mu H_{\text{cu}}^s(M)$  and  $\text{supp} u \subset \pi_M(\mathcal{U})$ , then  $Tu \in \tilde{\tau}^\mu H_{\text{cu}}^s(\tilde{M})$ . And conversely if  $Tu \in \tilde{\tau}^\mu H_{\text{cu}}^s(\tilde{M})$ , then  $u \in \tau^\mu H_{\text{cu}}^s(M)$  and*

$$(5.26) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\tau}^{-\mu} Tu\|_{H_{\text{cu}}^s(\tilde{M})} &\lesssim \|\tau^{-\mu} u\|_{H_{\text{cu}}^s(M)}, \\ \|\tau^{-\mu} u\|_{H_{\text{cu}}^s(M)} &\lesssim \|\tilde{\tau}^{-\mu} Tu\|_{H_{\text{cu}}^s(\tilde{M})} + \|\tau^{-\mu} u\|_{H_{\text{cu}}^{-N}(M)}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* By the definition of  $T$ , we only need to prove the same estimates for  $T_j, j = 1, 2$  respectively. In this proof we denote the coordinates on  $\mathcal{U}_j$  by  $(y, \eta) = (t_y, r_y, \varphi_y, \theta_y, \eta_t, \eta_r, \eta_\varphi, \eta_\theta)$  and the coordinates on  $\text{Sp}(\mathcal{U}_j)$  by  $(x, \xi) = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 = \tilde{\tau}^{-1}, \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \xi_4)$ , which is valid down to  $\tau = 0$  when we consider oscillatory integral expression of  $T_j$ . First suppose that  $u \in \tau^\mu H_{\text{cu}}^s(M)$  and  $\text{supp} u \subset \pi_M(\mathcal{U}_j)$  and we need to show  $T_j u \in \tilde{\tau}^\mu H_{\text{cu}}^s(\tilde{M})$ . By the remark at the end of Section 9 of [12], the generating function is

$$\varphi(x, \eta) = y \cdot \eta|_{G(\text{Sp})} = \pi_y(\pi_{x, \eta}^{-1}(x, \eta)) \cdot \eta.$$

By the argument in [12], this is valid on the entire  $G(\text{Sp})$  since we have shown that the projection from  $G(\text{Sp})$  to  $(x, \eta)$  is a diffeomorphism.  $\pi_y(\pi_{x, \eta}^{-1}(x, \eta))$  is the  $y$ -component of the point on  $G(\text{Sp})$  parametrized by  $(x, \eta)$ , which is different, actually independent of, the  $y$  written in the oscillatory integral.  $T_j$  can be written as

$$T_j u(x) = \int \int e^{i(\pi_y(\pi_{x, \eta}^{-1}(x, \eta)) - y) \cdot \eta} a(x, y, \eta) u(y) dy d\eta.$$

We choose  $a(x, y, \eta)$  to be smooth and uniformly bounded. Denote  $\pi_y(\pi_{x, \eta}^{-1}(x, \eta))$  by  $z(x, \eta) = (t_z, r_z, \varphi_z, \theta_z)$ , then

$$(5.27) \quad T_j u(x) = \int \int e^{i(z(x, \eta) - y) \cdot \eta} a(x, y, \eta) u(y) dy d\eta.$$

In discussion below, subindex  $X$  means function spaces or variables corresponds to variables on  $X$  and their dual variables. For example,  $y_X = (r_y, \varphi_y, \theta_y)$ . Define the Sobolev space  $H_{\text{cu}, t}^{s_1} H_{\text{cu}, X}^{s_2}(M)$  as:  $u \in H_{\text{cu}, t}^{s_1} H_{\text{cu}, X}^{s_2}(M)$  if and only if

$$(5.28) \quad \langle \eta_t \rangle^{s_1} \langle \eta_X \rangle^{s_2} \hat{u}(\eta) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^4),$$

where  $\eta_X = (\eta_\theta, \eta_\varphi, \eta_r)$ . Now suppose  $t^\mu u(y) \in H_{\text{cu}}^s(M)$ , which is equivalent to

$$|t|^\mu D_t^{\alpha_1} D_X^{\alpha_2} u \in L_{\text{cu}}^2(M),$$

for all  $\alpha_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  such that  $\alpha_1$  and components of  $\alpha_2$  have the same sign as  $s$  and sum to be  $s$ .  $D_t^{\alpha_1}, D_X^{\alpha_2}$  are understood as the left quantizations of  $\eta_t^{\alpha_1}, \eta_X^{\alpha_2}$ . Thus we can take partial Fourier transform in  $t$  and obtain

$$(5.29) \quad |\eta_t|^{\alpha_1} D_X^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{F}_t u \in H_{\eta_t}^\mu L_{\text{cu}, X}^2(\mathbb{R}_{\eta_t} \times X),$$

where  $H_{\eta_t}^\mu L_{\text{cu},X}^2(\mathbb{R}_{\eta_t} \times X)$  is defined in the same manner as (5.28). Integrate against  $t_y$  in (5.27) first, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T_j u(x) &= \int \int e^{i(z(x,\eta) \cdot \eta - y_X \cdot \eta_X)} \mathcal{F}_t(au)(x, \eta_t, y_X, \eta) d\eta_t dX d\eta_X \\ &= \int \int e^{it_x \eta_t} e^{-iX_4(z(x,\eta))\eta_t} e^{i(z_X - y_X) \cdot \eta_X} \mathcal{F}_t(au)(x, \eta_t, y_X, \eta) d\eta_t dX d\eta_X. \end{aligned}$$

By the construction process of  $X_4$ , it is independent of  $t_x$ , hence we can interchange  $e^{-iX_4(z(x,\eta))\eta_t} e^{i(z_X - y_X) \cdot \eta_X}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_t$ , and multiplying  $e^{-iX_4(z(x,\eta))\eta_t} e^{i(z_X - y_X) \cdot \eta_X}$  does not affect both smoothness and integrability of  $au$ , thus

$$(5.30) \quad |\eta_t|^{\alpha_1} D_X^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{F}_t(e^{-iX_4(z(x,\eta))\eta_t} e^{i(z_X - y_X) \cdot \eta_X} u) \in H_{\eta_t}^\mu L_X^2(\mathbb{R}_{\eta_t} \times X).$$

The integration against  $\eta_t$  is an inverse Fourier transform evaluated at  $t_x$ , and by (5.30) we know

$$\langle t_x \rangle^\mu T_j u(x) \in H_{\text{cu}}^s(\tilde{M}),$$

which completes the proof of the first claim. Notice that our procedure above is using the equivalences of norms between different Sobolev spaces, hence we have the first inequality of (5.26):

$$\|\tilde{\tau}^{-\mu} T u\|_{H_{\text{cu}}^s(\tilde{M})} \lesssim \|\tau^{-\mu} u\|_{H_{\text{cu}}^s(M)}.$$

Conversely, the same argument applies to  $T^*$ , which quantizes  $\text{Sp}^{-1}$ , and notice that  $T^*T = \text{Id}_M + R$ , with  $R \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^{-\infty,0}(M)$ , we obtain the second inequality of (5.26).  $\square$

Since the symplectomorphism preserves the symplectic form, it preserves equations using Hamiltonian vector fields, hence the normally hyperbolic trapping is preserved under the symplectomorphism. Define  $\tilde{\Gamma}^u = \text{Sp}(\Gamma^u)$ ,  $\tilde{\Gamma}_g^u = \text{Sp}(\Gamma_g^u)$ ,  $\tilde{\Gamma}^s = \text{Sp}(\Gamma^s)$ ,  $\tilde{\Gamma}_g^s = \text{Sp}(\Gamma_g^s)$ ,  $\tilde{p} = (\text{Sp}^{-1})^* p$ . Since  $\text{Sp}$  is a symplectomorphism, we know  $H_{\tilde{p}} = \text{Sp}_* H_p$ . We have:

**Proposition 5.10.** *The trapping of the flow of  $H_{\tilde{p}}$  is eventually absolutely  $r$ -normally hyperbolic for every  $r$  in the sense of [36]. The unstable and stable manifolds are  $\tilde{\Gamma}_g^u, \tilde{\Gamma}_g^s$  respectively, and the stationary extension of their intersection with the time infinity  $\{\tau = 0\}$  are  $\tilde{\Gamma}^{u/s}$ , which have defining functions  $x_1, (\text{Sp}^{-1})^* \varphi^s$  respectively, which satisfy (3.5) with  $\phi^u, \phi^s$  replaced by  $x_1, (\text{Sp}^{-1})^* \varphi^s$  respectively.*

This means the dynamical assumption we needed in Lemma 3.1 and Section 4 applies to  $\tilde{p}$ . Next we prove that wave front sets of functions and operators are preserved under the action of  $\text{Sp}$  and its quantization.

**Proposition 5.11.**

$$(5.31) \quad \text{WF}_{\text{cu}}^{s,r}(Tv) = \text{Sp}(\text{WF}_{\text{cu}}^{s,r}(v))$$

*Proof.* We consider the complement of  $\text{WF}_{\text{cu}}^{s,r}(v)$ . Suppose  $x_0 \notin \text{WF}_{\text{cu}}^{s,r}(v)$ , then there is an  $A \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^{0,0}(M)$  such that  $Au \in H_{\text{cu}}^{s,r}(M)$  and  $A$  is elliptic at  $x_0$ . Since  $T^*T = \text{Id}_M$  microlocally, this is equivalent to the existence of  $B \in \Psi_{\text{cu}}^{0,0}(\tilde{M})$  such that  $BTv \in H_{\text{cu}}^{s,r}(\tilde{M})$  with  $B = TAT^*$ , which is elliptic at  $\text{Sp}(x_0)$ . This shows  $\text{Sp}((\text{WF}_{\text{cu}}^{s,r}(v))^c) \subset (\text{WF}_{\text{cu}}^{s,r}(Tv))^c$ . The converse also holds, which implies  $\text{WF}_{\text{cu}}^{s,r}(Tv) = \text{Sp}(\text{WF}_{\text{cu}}^{s,r}(v))$ .  $\square$

Proposition 5.9 and (5.25) imply that, the estimate (3.14) in which  $\tilde{P}$  and  $Tv$  play the role of  $P$  and  $v$  implies the same estimate for  $P$  and  $v$ :

**Theorem 5.12.** *There exists  $B \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,r}(\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Gamma}^u)$  which is elliptic on  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  and the front face in blown-up  ${}^{\text{cu}}T^*\tilde{M}$ ,  $B_1, G_0 \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,r}(\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Gamma}^u)$  and  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B_1) \cap \tilde{\Gamma}^u = \emptyset$ ,  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(G_0) \cap \tilde{\Gamma}^u = \emptyset$ , and  $\lambda, c$  satisfy (3.8), such that for  $s, N \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $0 < \alpha < 1$ , we have:*

(5.32)

$$\begin{aligned} \|BTv\|_{s,s,0} &\lesssim \|B_1Tv\|_{s+1-\lambda\alpha,s,0} + c^{-1}\|G_0TPv\|_{s-m+2-\lambda\alpha,s-m+2-\alpha,0} \\ &\quad + \|Tv\|_{-N,-N,0}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Applying (3.14) with  $\tilde{P}, Tv$  being  $P, v$  there, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|BTv\|_{s,s,r} &\lesssim \|B_1Tv\|_{s+1-\lambda\alpha,s,r} + c^{-1}\|G_0\tilde{P}Tv\|_{s-m+2-\lambda\alpha,s-m+2-\alpha,r} \\ &\quad + \|Tv\|_{-N,-N,r}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $B \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,r}(\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Gamma}^u)$  which is elliptic near  $\tilde{\Gamma} = \tilde{\Gamma}^u \cap \tilde{\Gamma}^s \cap \{\tilde{\tau} = 0\}$  and the front face.  $B_1, G_0 \in \Psi_{\text{cu},\alpha}^{0,0,r}(\tilde{M}, \tilde{\Gamma}^u)$  and  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(B_1) \cap \tilde{\Gamma}^u = \emptyset$ ,  $\text{WF}'_{\text{cu},\alpha}(G_0) \cap \tilde{\Gamma}^u = \emptyset$ , and  $\lambda, c$  satisfy (3.8), such that for  $s, N \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $0 < \alpha < 1$ ,  $\lambda, c$  satisfying (3.8) with sup and inf being that of subprincipal part of  $\tilde{P}$  over  $\text{Sp}(M_{0,2C_1} \cap \mathcal{U}_{2\eta_1})$ . Then we apply (5.25) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|BTv\|_{s,s,r} &\lesssim \|B_1Tv\|_{s+1-\lambda\alpha,s,r} + c^{-1}\|G_0TPv\|_{s-m+2-\lambda\alpha,s-m+2-\alpha,r} \\ &\quad + \|Tv\|_{-N,-N,r}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.33}$$

$\square$

Away from the trapped set, we apply the real principal type propagation. Combining this, Proposition 5.11 and the microlocal estimate in Theorem 5.12, we obtain Theorem 1.2.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Sarp Akcay and Richard A Matzner. The Kerr–de Sitter universe. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 28(8):085012, Mar 2011.
- [2] Lars Andersson and Pieter Blue. Hidden symmetries and decay for the wave equation on the Kerr spacetime. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 787–853, 2015.
- [3] Marc Casals and Rita Teixeira da Costa. Hidden spectral symmetries and mode stability of subextremal Kerr (-dS) black holes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.13329*, 2021.

- [4] Mihalis Dafermos, Gustav Holzegel, Igor Rodnianski, and Martin Taylor. The non-linear stability of the Schwarzschild family of black holes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08222*, 2021.
- [5] Mihalis Dafermos and Igor Rodnianski. The black hole stability problem for linear scalar perturbations. In *The Twelfth Marcel Grossmann Meeting: On Recent Developments in Theoretical and Experimental General Relativity, Astrophysics and Relativistic Field Theories (In 3 Volumes)*, pages 132–189. World Scientific, 2012.
- [6] Mihalis Dafermos, Igor Rodnianski, and Yakov Shlapentokh-Rothman. Decay for solutions of the wave equation on Kerr exterior spacetimes III: The full subextremal case —a—j M. *Annals of mathematics*, pages 787–913, 2016.
- [7] Maarten De Hoop, Gunther Uhlmann, and András Vasy. Diffraction from conormal singularities. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 48(2):351–408, 2015.
- [8] Johannes J Duistermaat and Lars Hörmander. Fourier integral operators. II. *Acta mathematica*, 128:183–269, 1972.
- [9] Semyon Dyatlov. Asymptotics of linear waves and resonances with applications to black holes. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 335(3):1445–1485, 2015.
- [10] Semyon Dyatlov. Spectral gaps for normally hyperbolic trapping. In *Annales de l’Institut Fourier*, volume 66, pages 55–82, 2016.
- [11] Loukas Grafakos. *Modern fourier analysis*. Springer, 2014.
- [12] Alain Grigis and Johannes Sjöstrand. *Microlocal analysis for differential operators: an introduction*, volume 196. Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [13] Dietrich Häfner, Peter Hintz, and András Vasy. Linear stability of slowly rotating Kerr black holes. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 223(3):1227–1406, 2021.
- [14] Peter Hintz. Normally hyperbolic trapping on asymptotically stationary spacetimes. *Probability and Mathematical Physics*, 2(1):71–126, 2021.
- [15] Peter Hintz and András Vasy. The global non-linear stability of the Kerr–de Sitter family of black holes. *Acta mathematica*, 220(1):1–206, 2018.
- [16] Morris W Hirsch, Charles Chapman Pugh, and Michael Shub. *Invariant manifolds*, volume 583. Springer, 2006.
- [17] Michael Hitrik and Johannes Sjöstrand. Non-selfadjoint perturbations of selfadjoint operators in 2 dimensions I. *Annales Henri Poincaré*, 5(1):1–73, 2004.
- [18] Lars Hörmander. On the existence and the regularity of solutions of linear pseudo-differential equations. *Enseign. Math. (2)*, 17:99–163, 1971.
- [19] Lars Hörmander. *The analysis of linear partial differential operators III: Pseudo-differential operators*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [20] Bony Jean-Michel. Second microlocalization and propagation of singularities for semi-linear hyperbolic equations. In *Hyperbolic equations and related topics*, pages 11–49. Elsevier, 1986.
- [21] Jonathan Luk. The null condition and global existence for nonlinear wave equations on slowly rotating Kerr spacetimes. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 15(5):1629–1700, 2013.
- [22] Rafe Mazzeo and Richard B Melrose. Pseudodifferential operators on manifolds with fibred boundaries. *arXiv preprint math/9812120*, 1998.
- [23] Stéphane Nonnenmacher and Maciej Zworski. Decay of correlations for normally hyperbolic trapping. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 200(2):345–438, 2015.
- [24] Oliver Lindblad Petersen and András Vasy. Wave equations in the Kerr-de Sitter spacetime: the full subextremal range, 2022.
- [25] Richard H. Price. Nonspherical perturbations of relativistic gravitational collapse. I. Scalar and gravitational perturbations. *Phys. Rev. D*, 5:2419–2438, May 1972.
- [26] Yakov Shlapentokh-Rothman. Quantitative mode stability for the wave equation on the Kerr spacetime. In *Annales Henri Poincaré*, volume 16, pages 289–345. Springer, 2015.

- [27] Jorge Drumond Silva. An accuracy improvement in Egorov's theorem. *Publicacions Matemàtiques*, pages 77–120, 2007.
- [28] Daniel Tataru. Local decay of waves on asymptotically flat stationary space-times. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 135(2):361–401, 2013.
- [29] Daniel Tataru and Mihai Tohaneanu. A local energy estimate on Kerr black hole backgrounds. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2011(2):248–292, 2011.
- [30] András Vasy and Jared Wunsch. Semiclassical econd microlocalization on a Lagrangian.
- [31] András Vasy. Microlocal analysis of asymptotically hyperbolic and Kerr-de Sitter spaces (with an appendix by Semyon Dyatlov). *Inventiones mathematicae*, 194(2):381–513, 2013.
- [32] András Vasy. A minicourse on microlocal analysis for wave propagation. *Asymptotic analysis in general relativity*, 443:219–374, 2018.
- [33] András Vasy. Resolvent near zero energy on Riemannian scattering (asymptotically conic) spaces, a Lagrangian approach. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 46(5):823–863, 2021.
- [34] Robert M. Wald. Note on the stability of the Schwarzschild metric. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 20(6):1056–1058, 1979.
- [35] Bernard F Whiting. Mode stability of the kerr black hole. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 30(6):1301–1305, 1989.
- [36] Jared Wunsch and Maciej Zworski. Resolvent estimates for normally hyperbolic trapped sets. In *Annales Henri Poincaré*, volume 12, pages 1349–1385. Springer, 2011.
- [37] Miguel Zilhao, Vitor Cardoso, Carlos Herdeiro, Luis Lehner, and Ulrich Sperhake. Testing the nonlinear stability of Kerr-Newman black holes. *Physical Review D*, 90(12):124088, 2014.