

Non-homogeneous boundary value problems for coupled KdV-KdV systems posed on the half line

Shenghao Li, Min Chen, Xin Yang and Bing-Yu Zhang

Abstract

In this article, we study an initial-boundary-value problem of a coupled KdV-KdV system on the half line \mathbb{R}^+ with non-homogeneous boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} u_t + v_x + uu_x + v_{xxx} = 0, \\ v_t + u_x + (vu)_x + u_{xxx} = 0, \\ u(x, 0) = \phi(x), \quad v(x, 0) = \psi(x), \\ u(0, t) = h_1(t), \quad v(0, t) = h_2(t), \quad v_x(0, t) = h_3(t), \end{cases} \quad x, t > 0.$$

It is shown that the problem is locally unconditionally well-posed in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^+) \times H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ for $s > -\frac{3}{4}$ with initial data (ϕ, ψ) in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^+) \times H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and boundary data (h_1, h_2, h_3) in $H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+) \times H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+) \times H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$. The approach developed in this paper can also be applied to study more general KdV-KdV systems posed on the half line.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Outline of the method and applications	4
2.1	Key ingredients in the proof of Theorem 1.4	4
2.2	Application to general KdV-KdV systems	9
2.3	Outline of the remaining paper	10
3	Preliminaries	11
4	Linear problems	13
4.1	KdV flow traveling to the right	13
4.2	KdV flow traveling to the left	22
5	Bilinear Estimates	26
6	Well-posedness	36
A	Proofs of Lemma 6.5–Lemma 6.7	41

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35Q53, 35M13, 35C13, 35D30

Key words and phrases. Coupled KdV-KdV Systems, Non-homogeneous boundary value problems, Unconditional well-posedness, Mild solutions and uniqueness

1 Introduction

The coupled KdV-KdV system

$$\begin{cases} u_t + v_x + uu_x + v_{xxx} = 0, \\ v_t + u_x + (vu)_x + u_{xxx} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

is a special case of a broad class of Boussinesq systems or the so-called abcd systems derived by Bona, Chen and Saut in [BCS02, BCS04] from the two-dimensional Euler equations. Compared to those uni-directional models, such as the KdV equation, the Boussinesq equation and the BBM equation, the bi-directional systems (1.1) provide wider range of applications in reality. The Cauchy problem of the system (1.1) posed either on \mathbb{R} or on the periodic domain \mathbb{T} has been well studied. In particular, it is known to be analytically well-posed in the space $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ for any $s > -\frac{3}{4}$, but related bilinear estimates fail in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ for any $s < -\frac{3}{4}$. (See e.g. [AC08, BGK10, YZ22a]). In this paper, we are concerned with the well-posedness of the initial-boundary-value problem (IBVP) for the coupled KdV-KdV system posed on the half line \mathbb{R}^+ :

$$\begin{cases} u_t + v_x + uu_x + v_{xxx} = 0, \\ v_t + u_x + (vu)_x + u_{xxx} = 0, \\ u(x, 0) = \phi(x), \quad v(x, 0) = \psi(x), \\ u(0, t) = h_1(t), \quad v(0, t) = h_2(t), \quad v_x(0, t) = h_3(t). \end{cases} \quad x, t > 0. \quad (1.2)$$

Let's first briefly review some highly related literatures. The IBVP for the single KdV equation

$$\begin{cases} w_t + w_x + w_{xxx} = 0, \\ w(x, 0) = \phi(x), \quad w(0, t) = h(t). \end{cases} \quad x, t > 0. \quad (1.3)$$

posed on the half line has been investigated extensively. Bona, Sun and Zhang [BSZ02] developed a method by using the Laplace transform to establish the well-posedness of (1.3) in the space $H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ for $s > \frac{3}{4}$. Later, they improved the range of s to be $s > -\frac{3}{4}$ in [BSZ06] by taking advantage of the Fourier restriction spaces introduced by Bourgain [Bou93a]. During the same period, Colliander and Kenig [CK02] introduced the Duhamel boundary forcing operator to establish the well-posedness of (1.3) in the space $H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ for $s \geq 0$. After that, Holmer [Hol06] generalized this method to improve the range of the index s to be $s > -\frac{3}{4}$ by constructing an analytic family of boundary forcing operators. These two methods automatically establish locally analytical well-posedness since both of them took advantage of a certain fixed point argument. As a result, the threshold $-\frac{3}{4}$ is optimal concerning the analytical well-posedness, see [CCT03]. These two methods were also applied to study the well-posedness of the IBVP for more general equations, such as the Boussinesq equations [Xue08, CT17, LCZ18], the BBM equation [BCH14], the nonlinear Schrodinger equations [Hol05, ET16, Cav17, BSZ18, GW20], the Klein-Gordon-Schrodinger system [CT19], the Schrodinger-KdV systems [CC19] and many more. But few works have been devoted to investigate the low regularity well-posedness of the IBVP for KdV-KdV systems such as (1.2). Part of the reason is due to the complicated structure of the systems. Actually, it was discovered in [Oh09] and [YZ22a] that the threshold index for the well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for KdV-KdV systems on \mathbb{R} may be as large as 0 or $\frac{3}{4}$ instead of $-\frac{3}{4}$, depending on the dispersion coefficients and how u and v are interacted in the systems. The goal of this paper is to study the IBVP for the particular KdV-KdV system (1.2) on the half line \mathbb{R}^+ and establish the well-posedness beyond the threshold $-\frac{3}{4}$.

In order to adopt results and techniques obtained in the study of KdV-type equations, the new variables $U := \frac{1}{4}(u + v)$ and $V := \frac{1}{4}(u - v)$ are introduced so that the linear parts of (1.2) on U and V

are decoupled with the KdV type. More precisely, the new system reads as

$$\begin{cases} U_t + U_x + U_{xxx} + 3UU_x + (UV)_x - VV_x = 0, \\ V_t - V_x - V_{xxx} - UU_x + (UV)_x + 3VV_x = 0, \\ U(x, 0) = \frac{1}{4}(\phi + \psi), \quad V(x, 0) = \frac{1}{4}(\phi - \psi), \\ U(0, t) = \frac{1}{4}(h_1 + h_2), \quad V(0, t) = \frac{1}{4}(h_1 - h_2), \quad V_x(0, t) - U_x(0, t) = -\frac{1}{2}h_3. \end{cases} \quad x, t > 0.$$

For ease of notations, we still denote (U, V) as (u, v) , and write $(\frac{1}{4}(\phi + \psi), \frac{1}{4}(\phi - \psi))$ as (ϕ, ψ) and $(\frac{1}{4}(h_1 + h_2), \frac{1}{4}(h_1 - h_2), -\frac{1}{2}h_3)$ as (h_1, h_2, h_3) . Then it reduces to study the following IBVP:

$$\begin{cases} u_t + u_{xxx} + u_x + 3uu_x + (uv)_x - vv_x = 0, \\ v_t - v_{xxx} - v_x - uv_x + (uv)_x + 3vv_x = 0, \\ u(x, 0) = \phi(x), \quad v(x, 0) = \psi(x), \\ u(0, t) = h_1(t), \quad v(0, t) = h_2(t), \quad v_x(0, t) - u_x(0, t) = h_3(t), \end{cases} \quad x, t > 0. \quad (1.4)$$

which is equivalent to the IBVP (1.2) for the well-posedness in the space $H^s(\mathbb{R}^+) \times H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$.

For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$\mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+) := H^s(\mathbb{R}^+) \times H^s(\mathbb{R}^+), \quad \mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+) := H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+) \times H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+) \times H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+).$$

When $s \geq 3$, the well-posedness of (1.4) in the space $H^s(\mathbb{R}^+) \times H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ can be established concerning the classical solutions $(u, v) \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+))$. So in the remaining of this paper, we will focus on the case $s \leq 3$. In addition, for lower regularity solutions, there will be a serious uniqueness issue. For more details, the readers can refer to Remark 2.4 in section 2. In this situation, the type of solutions of (1.4) that we are interested in is the so-called mild solutions which can be viewed as limits of strong solutions. The precise definition is given below.

Definition 1.1 (Mild solutions). *Let $s \leq 3$ and $T > 0$ be given.*

- (i) *A function pair $(u, v) \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{H}_x^3(\mathbb{R}^+)) \cap C^1([0, T]; \mathcal{H}_x^0(\mathbb{R}^+))$ is said to be a strong solution of the IBVP (1.4) in the space $C([0, T]; \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+))$ if the equations in (1.4) hold for a.e. $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times (0, T)$ and $(u, v, v_x)|_{x=0} \in \mathcal{H}_t^s(0, T)$.*
- (ii) *A function pair $(u, v) \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+))$ is said to be a mild solution of the IBVP (1.4) if there exists a sequence of strong solutions $(u_n, v_n) \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{H}_x^3(\mathbb{R}^+))$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (u_n, v_n) \rightarrow (u, v)$ in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+))$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow 0} (h_{1,n}, h_{2,n}, h_{3,n}) \rightarrow (h_1, h_2, h_3)$ in $\mathcal{H}_t^s(0, T)$, where $(h_{1,n}, h_{2,n}, h_{3,n}) := (u_n, v_n, \partial_x v_n)|_{x=0}$.*

After the concept of solutions is fixed, we can discuss the (unconditional) local well-posedness of (1.4) which is understood in the following sense.

Definition 1.2 (Local well-posedness). *For any $s \leq 3$, the IBVP (1.4) is said to be locally well-posed in the space $\mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ if for any $r > 0$, there exists some time $T > 0$, depending only on r and s , such that for any naturally compatible¹ $(\phi, \psi) \in \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $\vec{h} = (h_1, h_2, h_3) \in \mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ with $\|(\phi, \psi)\|_{\mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|\vec{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} \leq r$, the IBVP (1.4) admits a unique mild solution $(u, v) \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+))$ and, moreover, the solution map is continuous in the corresponding spaces. If the solution map is real analytic instead, then the IBVP (1.4) is said to be locally analytically well-posed.*

We intend to find those values of s for which the IBVP (1.4) is locally well-posed in the space $\mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$. The following theorem is the main result of this paper.

¹For the concept of compatibility, the reader can refer to Definition 2.7.

Theorem 1.3. *The IBVP (1.4) is locally analytically well-posed in the space $\mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$, with any naturally compatible data $(\phi, \psi) \in \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $\vec{h} = (h_1, h_2, h_3) \in \mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$, for any $s > -\frac{3}{4}$.*

To prove Theorem 1.3 which is a result on local well-posedness, we use scaling argument to introduce

$$u^\beta(x, t) = \beta u(\beta^{\frac{1}{2}}x, \beta^{\frac{3}{2}}t) \quad \text{and} \quad v^\beta(x, t) = \beta v(\beta^{\frac{1}{2}}x, \beta^{\frac{3}{2}}t),$$

where $\beta \in (0, 1]$ is a parameter. Then (1.4) becomes

$$\begin{cases} u_t^\beta + u_{xxx}^\beta + \beta u_x^\beta + 3u^\beta u_x^\beta + (u^\beta v^\beta)_x - v^\beta v_x^\beta = 0, \\ v_t^\beta - v_{xxx}^\beta - \beta v_x^\beta - u^\beta u_x^\beta + (u^\beta v^\beta)_x + 3v^\beta v_x^\beta = 0, \\ u^\beta(x, 0) = \phi^\beta(x), \quad v^\beta(x, 0) = \psi^\beta(x), \\ u^\beta(0, t) = h_1^\beta(t), \quad v^\beta(0, t) = h_2^\beta(t), \quad v_x^\beta(0, t) - u_x^\beta(0, t) = h_3^\beta(t), \end{cases} \quad x, t > 0,$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \phi^\beta(x) := \beta \phi(\beta^{\frac{1}{2}}x), & \psi^\beta(x) := \beta \psi(\beta^{\frac{1}{2}}x), \\ h_1^\beta(t) := \beta h_1(\beta^{\frac{3}{2}}t), & h_2^\beta(t) := \beta h_2(\beta^{\frac{3}{2}}t), \quad h_3^\beta(t) := \beta^{\frac{3}{2}} h_3(\beta^{\frac{3}{2}}t). \end{cases}$$

When $s > -\frac{3}{4}$,

$$\|(\phi^\beta, \psi^\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} \lesssim \beta^{\frac{3}{8}} \|(\phi, \psi)\|_{\mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)}, \quad \|(h_1^\beta, h_2^\beta, h_3^\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} \lesssim \beta^{\frac{3}{8}} \|(h_1, h_2, h_3)\|_{\mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)},$$

which implies

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0^+} \|(\phi^\beta, \psi^\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|(h_1^\beta, h_2^\beta, h_3^\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} = 0.$$

Thus, in order to prove Theorem 1.3, it is sufficient to establish Theorem 1.4 below for the following IBVP:

$$\begin{cases} u_t + u_{xxx} + \beta u_x + 3uu_x + (uv)_x - vv_x = 0, \\ v_t - v_{xxx} - \beta v_x - uv_x + (uv)_x + 3vv_x = 0, \\ u(x, 0) = \phi(x), \quad v(x, 0) = \psi(x), \\ u(0, t) = h_1(t), \quad v(0, t) = h_2(t), \quad v_x(0, t) - u_x(0, t) = h_3(t). \end{cases} \quad x, t > 0. \quad (1.5)$$

Theorem 1.4. *For any $s > -\frac{3}{4}$ and $T > 0$, there exists an $\epsilon > 0$, depending only on T and s , such that for any $\beta \in (0, 1]$ and for any naturally compatible data $(\phi, \psi) \in \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $\vec{h} = (h_1, h_2, h_3) \in \mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ with*

$$\|(\phi, \psi)\|_{\mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|\vec{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} \leq \epsilon,$$

the IBVP (1.5) admits a unique mild solution $(u, v) \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+))$, and moreover, the solution map is real analytic in the corresponding spaces.

We remark that the well-posedness obtained in Theorem 1.4 (or equivalently Theorem 1.3) is unconditional (see Remark 2.4) since the uniqueness is secured in the space $C([0, T]; \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+))$ itself rather than in a smaller subspace. The reason that the unconditional uniqueness can be justified is because we are concerning with the mild solutions. If the distributional solutions, instead of the mild solutions, are adopted in Definition 1.2, then the unconditional uniqueness is still a challenging open problem.

2 Outline of the method and applications

2.1 Key ingredients in the proof of Theorem 1.4

Theorem 1.4 will be proved using the approach similar to that developed in [BSZ02, BSZ06, CK02, Hol06] for the KdV equation but with some modifications to handle the bi-directional system (1.5). Consider

the Cauchy problem for the linear KdV-type equation posed on \mathbb{R} ,

$$w_t + \alpha w_{xxx} + \beta w_x = 0, \quad w(x, 0) = w_0(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $W_R^{\alpha, \beta}$ be the semigroup operator associated to (2.1). The solution of (2.1) is then given explicitly by

$$W_R^{\alpha, \beta}(t)w_0(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\xi x} e^{i\phi^{\alpha, \beta}(\xi)t} \widehat{w_0}(\xi) d\xi, \quad (2.2)$$

where $\widehat{w_0}(\xi)$ is the Fourier transform of $w_0(x)$, and $\phi^{\alpha, \beta}$ is the cubic polynomial defined as below:

$$\phi^{\alpha, \beta}(\xi) = \alpha \xi^3 - \beta \xi. \quad (2.3)$$

Definition 2.1. For $\alpha, \beta, s, b \in \mathbb{R}$, the Fourier restriction space $X_{s, b}^{\alpha, \beta}$ is defined to be the completion of the Schwarz class $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ under the norm

$$\|w\|_{X_{s, b}^{\alpha, \beta}} = \|\langle \xi \rangle^s \langle \tau - \phi^{\alpha, \beta}(\xi) \rangle^b \widehat{w}(\xi, \tau)\|_{L_{\xi, \tau}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}, \quad (2.4)$$

where $\phi^{\alpha, \beta}$ is as defined in (2.3) and \widehat{w} represents the space-time Fourier transform of w .

When $b > \frac{1}{2}$, it follows directly from the Sobolev embedding that $X_{s, b}^{\alpha, \beta} \subset C_t(\mathbb{R}; H^s(\mathbb{R}))$. But the estimate on the boundary integral operator (see e.g. Lemma 4.3 and 4.10) forces $b \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and then the space $X_{s, b}^{\alpha, \beta}$ may not be in $C_t(\mathbb{R}; H^s(\mathbb{R}))$. In addition, the bilinear estimates used in the Cauchy problems will fail. In order to overcome these difficulties, we introduce some modified Fourier restriction spaces $X_{s, b, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}$ and $Y_{s, b, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}$. The spaces $X_{s, b, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}$ will be used to justify the bilinear estimates and $Y_{s, b, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}$ will serve as suitable solution spaces.

Definition 2.2. For $\alpha, \beta, s, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$, let $\Lambda_{s, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}$ be the completion of the Schwarz class $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ under the norm

$$\|w\|_{\Lambda_{s, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} = \|\mathbb{1}_{\{e^{|\xi|} \leq 3+|\tau|\}} \langle \xi \rangle^s \langle \tau - \phi^{\alpha, \beta}(\xi) \rangle^\sigma \widehat{w}(\xi, \tau)\|_{L_{\xi, \tau}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}, \quad (2.5)$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ means the characteristic function. In addition, we denote

$$X_{s, b, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta} = X_{s, b}^{\alpha, \beta} \cap \Lambda_{s, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta} \quad \text{and} \quad Y_{s, b, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta} = X_{s, b, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta} \cap C_t(\mathbb{R}, H^s(\mathbb{R})).$$

The norm of the space $X_{s, b, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}$ is defined to be

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{X_{s, b, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} &= \|w\|_{X_{s, b}^{\alpha, \beta}} + \|w\|_{\Lambda_{s, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \\ &\sim \|\langle \xi \rangle^s [\langle L \rangle^b + \mathbb{1}_{\{e^{|\xi|} \leq 3+|\tau|\}} \langle L \rangle^\sigma] \widehat{w}(\xi, \tau)\|_{L_{\xi, \tau}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

where $L = \tau - \phi^{\alpha, \beta}(\xi)$, and the norm of the space $Y_{s, b, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}$ is defined to be

$$\|w\|_{Y_{s, b, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} = \|w\|_{X_{s, b, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} + \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|w(x, t)\|_{H_x^s(\mathbb{R})}. \quad (2.7)$$

From the above definition, we see that when $b \leq \frac{1}{2}$, the space $X_{s, b, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}$ provides more regularity in time than the space $X_{s, b}^{\alpha, \beta}$ in the low frequency region. This improvement is essential to establish the bilinear estimates in Proposition 2.10. Note that for any $b \leq \sigma$,

$$\|w\|_{X_{s, b, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \leq 2\|w\|_{X_{s, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}}. \quad (2.8)$$

Besides, $e^{|\xi|} \leq 3 + |\tau|$ when $|\xi| \leq 1$. Thus,

$$\|w\|_{X_{s,b,\sigma}^{\alpha,\beta}} \gtrsim \|\langle \xi \rangle^s [\langle L \rangle^b + \mathbb{1}_{\{|\xi| \leq 1\}} \langle L \rangle^\sigma] \widehat{w}(\xi, \tau)\|_{L_{\xi,\tau}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}, \quad \text{where } L = \tau - \phi^{\alpha,\beta}(\xi). \quad (2.9)$$

For technical reasons, when $\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$, we define the $Z_{s,\sigma-1}^{\alpha,\beta}$ space to be the completion of the Schwarz class $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with respect to the following norm.

$$\|w\|_{Z_{s,\sigma-1}^{\alpha,\beta}} := \left\| \langle \tau \rangle^{\frac{s}{3} + \frac{1}{2} - \sigma} \langle \tau - \phi^{\alpha,\beta}(\xi) \rangle^{\sigma-1} \widehat{w}(\xi, \tau) \right\|_{L_{\xi,\tau}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}. \quad (2.10)$$

This space is an intermediate space which will only be used to estimate the inhomogeneous term in the Duhamel formula, see Lemma 3.6. The definition of this space is a modification of the $Y_{s,\sigma-1}$ space defined in Section 5.3 in [Hol06].

Let $\Omega_T := \mathbb{R}^+ \times (0, T)$ for given $T > 0$. We define a restricted version of the space $X_{s,b}$ to the domain Ω_T as $X_{s,b}^{\alpha,\beta}(\Omega_T) := X_{s,b}^{\alpha,\beta} \Big|_{\Omega_T}$ with the quotient norm

$$\|u\|_{X_{s,b}^{\alpha,\beta}(\Omega_T)} = \inf_{w \in X_{s,b}^{\alpha,\beta}} \{\|w\|_{X_{s,b}^{\alpha,\beta}} : w = u \text{ on } \Omega_T\}.$$

The spaces $X_{s,b,\sigma}^{\alpha,\beta}(\Omega_T)$, $Y_{s,b,\sigma}^{\alpha,\beta}(\Omega_T)$ and $Z_{s,b,\sigma}^{\alpha,\beta-1}(\Omega_T)$ are defined similarly.

For those nonlinear terms in (1.5), we denote

$$F(u, v) := -3uu_x - (uv)_x + vv_x, \quad G(u, v) := uu_x - (uv)_x - 3vv_x,$$

then the IBVP (1.5) is converted to the following equations

$$\begin{cases} u(x, t) = W_{\mathbb{R}^+}^{1,\beta}(t)\phi(x) + \int_0^t W_{\mathbb{R}^+}^{1,\beta}(t-\tau)F(u, v)(\tau) d\tau + W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}[h_1](x, t), \\ v(x, t) = W_{\mathbb{R}^+}^{-1,-\beta}(t)\psi(x) + \int_0^t W_{\mathbb{R}^+}^{-1,-\beta}(t-\tau)G(u, v)(\tau) d\tau + W_{bdr}^{-1,-\beta}[h_2, h_3 + u_x(0, t)](x, t), \end{cases} \quad (2.11)$$

where $x, t > 0$, $W_{\mathbb{R}^+}^{1,\beta}(t)$ and $W_{\mathbb{R}^+}^{-1,-\beta}(t)$ are the C^0 semigroups associated to the IBVPs of the linear KdV equations posed on \mathbb{R}^+ :

$$\begin{cases} w_t + w_{xxx} + \beta w_x = 0, \\ w|_{x=0} = 0, \quad w|_{t=0} = \phi(x) \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^+), \end{cases} \quad x, t > 0, \quad (2.12)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} w_t - w_{xxx} - \beta w_x = 0, \\ w|_{x=0} = 0, \quad w_x|_{x=0} = 0, \quad w|_{t=0} = \psi(x) \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^+), \end{cases} \quad x, t > 0, \quad (2.13)$$

respectively, $W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(t)$ and $W_{bdr}^{-1,-\beta}(t)$ are the boundary integral operators associated with the IBVPs of the linear KdV equation posed on \mathbb{R}^+ :

$$\begin{cases} u_t + u_{xxx} + \beta u_x = 0, \\ u(x, 0) = 0, \\ u(0, t) = h_1(t), \end{cases} \quad x, t > 0, \quad (2.14)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} v_t - v_{xxx} - \beta v_x = 0, \\ v(x, 0) = 0, \\ v(0, t) = h_2(t), \quad v_x(0, t) = h_3(t), \end{cases} \quad x, t > 0, \quad (2.15)$$

respectively. Here for simplicity, we have assumed that $\phi(0) = h_1(0) = \psi(0) = h_2(0) = 0$ if $\frac{1}{2} < s < \frac{3}{2}$ and $h_3(0) = \phi'(0) = \psi'(0) = 0$ if $\frac{3}{2} < s \leq 3$. We will first establish the following conditional well-posedness.

Theorem 2.3 (Conditional Well-posedness). *Let $-\frac{3}{4} < s \leq 3$, $T > 0$ and $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$ be given. There exist $\sigma = \sigma(s) > \frac{1}{2}$ and $r = r(s, T) > 0$ such that for any naturally compatible $(\phi, \psi) \in \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $\vec{h} = (h_1, h_2, h_3) \in \mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ related to the IBVP (1.5) with*

$$\|(\phi, \psi)\|_{\mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|\vec{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} \leq r,$$

the system of the integral equations (SIE) (2.11) admits a unique solution

$$(u, v) \in \mathcal{Y}_\sigma(\Omega_T) := Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1, \beta}(\Omega_T) \times Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1, -\beta}(\Omega_T)$$

Moreover, the solution map is real analytic in the corresponding spaces.

Remark 2.4. *The well-posedness presented in Theorem 2.3 is conditional in the sense that the solution $(u, v) \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+))$ of (2.11) is in fact the restriction for a function defined on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ to the region $(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^+$, and the uniqueness of the solution holds in a subspace $\mathcal{Y}_\sigma(\Omega_T)$ rather than in the full space $C([0, T]; \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+))$, which leads to a serious issue: If a solution of the IBVP (1.5) is found in a different approach, will it be the same as that presented by Theorem 2.3?*

In this paper, we will prove Theorem 1.4 to give a positive answer to the above question. The justification of Theorem 1.4 follows from Theorem 2.3 and the following two further properties.

- (i) the solution of SIE (2.11) is a mild solution of the IBVP (1.5)
- (ii) for given initial data (ϕ, ψ) and the boundary data \vec{h} , the IBVP (1.5) admits at most one mild solution.

More precise statements about these two properties are given below in Theorem 2.5 and Theorem 2.6.

Theorem 2.5 (Existence of the mild solution). *Fix $s \in (-\frac{3}{4}, 3]$ and $r > 0$. Then there exist $\sigma = \sigma(s) > \frac{1}{2}$ and $T = T(s, r) > 0$ such that for any compatible data $(p, q) \in \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $(a, b, c) \in \mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ with*

$$\|(p, q)\|_{\mathcal{H}_1^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|(a, b, c)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} \leq r,$$

the IBVP (1.4) admits a mild solution $(u, v) \in C(0, T; H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)) \times C(0, T; H^s(\mathbb{R}^+))$ such that $u \in Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1, 1}(\Omega_T)$, $v \in Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1, -1}(\Omega_T)$, and

$$\|(u, v)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_s} \leq \alpha_{r, s} (\|(p, q)\|_{\mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|(a, b, c)\|_{\mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)}),$$

where α is a continuous function from \mathbb{R}^+ to \mathbb{R}^+ depending only on r and s .

Theorem 2.6 (Uniqueness of the mild solution). *For $s \in (-\frac{3}{4}, 3]$, $(p, q) \in \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $(a, b, c) \in \mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$, the IBVP (1.4) admits at most one mild solution (u, v) in the sense of Definition 1.1.*

Theorem 2.3 will be justified by the standard contraction mapping principle. We first need to investigate the following two forced linear IBVPs whose compatibility will be introduced in Definition 2.7.

$$\begin{cases} u_t + u_{xxx} + \beta u_x = f, \\ u(x, 0) = p(x), \\ u(0, t) = a(t), \end{cases} \quad x, t > 0, \quad (2.16)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} v_t - v_{xxx} - \beta v_x = g, \\ v(x, 0) = q(x), \\ v(0, t) = b_1(t), \quad v_x(0, t) = b_2(t). \end{cases} \quad x, t > 0. \quad (2.17)$$

Definition 2.7. Let $s \in (-\frac{3}{4}, 3]$, $(p, q) \in \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $(a, b_1, b_2) \in \mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$. Then

- the data (p, a) is said to be compatible for (2.16) if $p(0) = a(0)$ when $s > \frac{1}{2}$;
- the data (q, b_1, b_2) is said to be compatible for (2.15) if they satisfy $q(0) = b_1(0)$ when $s > \frac{1}{2}$ and further satisfy $q'(0) = b_2(0)$ when $s > \frac{3}{2}$. The compatibility for (2.17) is defined similarly.

The following two estimates for their solutions are key tools in proving Theorem 2.3. For ease of notation, we denote $\mathbb{R}_0^+ = \mathbb{R} \cup \{0\} = [0, \infty)$.

Proposition 2.8. Let $s \in (-\frac{3}{4}, 3]$, $T > 0$ and $0 < \beta \leq 1$. Assume $p \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $a \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ are compatible for (2.16). Then there exists $\sigma_1 = \sigma_1(s) > \frac{1}{2}$ such that for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \sigma_1]$ and for any $f \in X_{s, \sigma-1}^{1, \beta} \cap Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{1, \beta}$, the equation (2.16) has a solution up to time T . More precisely, there exists a function

$$\tilde{u} := \Gamma_\beta^+(f, p, a), \quad (2.18)$$

defined on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, belongs to $Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1, \beta} \cap C_x^j(\mathbb{R}_0^+; H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R}))$ for $j = 0, 1$, and its restriction $\tilde{u}|_{\mathbb{R}_0^+ \times [0, T]}$ solves (2.16) on $\mathbb{R}_0^+ \times [0, T]$. In addition, \tilde{u} satisfies the following estimates with $C = C(s, \sigma)$.

$$\|\tilde{u}\|_{Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1, \beta}} \leq C \left(\|f\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{1, \beta}} + \|f\|_{Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{1, \beta}} + \|p\|_{H^s} + \|a\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}} \right), \quad (2.19)$$

$$\sup_{x \geq 0} \|\partial_x^j \tilde{u}\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \left(\|f\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{1, \beta}} + \|f\|_{Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{1, \beta}} + \|p\|_{H^s} + \|a\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}} \right), \quad j = 0, 1. \quad (2.20)$$

Proposition 2.9. Let $s \in (-\frac{3}{4}, 3]$, $T > 0$ and $0 < \beta \leq 1$. Assume $q \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $b_1 \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $b_2 \in H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ are compatible for (2.17). Then there exists $\sigma_2 = \sigma_2(s) > \frac{1}{2}$ such that for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \sigma_2]$ and for any $g \in X_{s, \sigma}^{-1, -\beta} \cap Z_{s, \sigma}^{-1, -\beta}$, the equation (2.17) has a solution up to time T . More precisely, there exists a function

$$\tilde{v} := \Gamma_\beta^-(g, q, b_1, b_2), \quad (2.21)$$

defined on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, belongs to $Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1, -\beta} \cap C_x^j(\mathbb{R}_0^+; H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R}))$ for $j = 0, 1$, and its restriction $\tilde{v}|_{\mathbb{R}_0^+ \times [0, T]}$ solves (2.17) on $\mathbb{R}_0^+ \times [0, T]$. In addition, \tilde{v} satisfies the following estimates with $C = C(s, \sigma)$.

$$\|\tilde{v}\|_{Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1, -\beta}} \leq C \left(\|g\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{-1, -\beta}} + \|g\|_{Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{-1, -\beta}} + \|q\|_{H^s} + \|b_1\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}} + \|b_2\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}} \right), \quad (2.22)$$

$$\sup_{x \geq 0} \|\partial_x^j \tilde{v}\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \left(\|g\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{-1, -\beta}} + \|g\|_{Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{-1, -\beta}} + \|q\|_{H^s} + \|b_1\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}} + \|b_2\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}} \right), \quad j = 0, 1. \quad (2.23)$$

Proposition 2.8 and Proposition 2.9 will be proved in Section 4 and they will be used to handle linear estimates in the proof of Theorem 2.3, while for the nonlinear part, the following bilinear estimates will be the key ingredient.

Proposition 2.10. Let $-\frac{3}{4} < s \leq 3$, $\alpha \neq 0$ and $|\beta| \leq 1$. Then there exists $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0(s, \alpha) > \frac{1}{2}$ such that

for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \sigma_0]$, the following bilinear estimates hold for any w_1, w_2 with $C = C(s, \alpha, \sigma)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x(w_1 w_2)\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{\alpha, \beta}} + \|\partial_x(w_1 w_2)\|_{Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{\alpha, \beta}} &\leq C \|w_1\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}}, \\ \|\partial_x(w_1 w_2)\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{-\alpha, -\beta}} + \|\partial_x(w_1 w_2)\|_{Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{-\alpha, -\beta}} &\leq C \|w_1\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}}, \\ \|\partial_x(w_1 w_2)\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{\alpha, \beta}} + \|\partial_x(w_1 w_2)\|_{Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{\alpha, \beta}} &\leq C \|w_1\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}}. \end{aligned}$$

The verification of Proposition 2.10 will be presented in Section 5. Then one can take advantage of Proposition 2.8–Proposition 2.10 to justify Theorem 2.3. Based on Theorem 2.3, we will establish the persistence of regularity property in Proposition 6.4 which is the key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 2.5 and Theorem 2.6.

2.2 Application to general KdV-KdV systems

We point out that the approach developed in this paper for the IBVP (1.2) can also be applied to study the IBVPs of general coupled KdV-KdV systems (2.24):

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_t \\ v_t \end{pmatrix} + A_1 \begin{pmatrix} u_{xxx} \\ v_{xxx} \end{pmatrix} + A_2 \begin{pmatrix} u_x \\ v_x \end{pmatrix} = A_3 \begin{pmatrix} uu_x \\ vv_x \end{pmatrix} + A_4 \begin{pmatrix} u_x v \\ uv_x \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.24)$$

where $\{A_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq 4}$ are 2×2 real constant matrices and A_1 is diagonalizable: $A_1 = M \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 \end{pmatrix} M^{-1}$ with $a_1 a_2 \neq 0$. By regarding $M^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}$ as the new unknown functions (still denoted by u and v), the third order terms u_{xxx} and v_{xxx} in system (2.24) can be decoupled such that

$$\begin{cases} u_t + a_1 u_{xxx} + b_{11} u_x &= -b_{12} v_x + c_{11} uu_x + c_{12} vv_x + d_{11} u_x v + d_{12} uv_x, \\ v_t + a_2 v_{xxx} + b_{22} v_x &= -b_{21} u_x + c_{21} uu_x + c_{22} vv_x + d_{21} u_x v + d_{22} uv_x, \end{cases} \quad (2.25)$$

where the dispersion coefficients a_1 and a_2 are the nonzero eigenvalues of the matrix A_1 . Systems (2.24) include many practical models, such as the well-known Majda-Biello system [MB03], the Hirota-Satsuma system [HS81] and the Gear-Grimshaw system [GG84]. The Cauchy problem for general systems (2.24) posed either on \mathbb{R} or on the torus \mathbb{T} has been well studied in the literature for its well-posedness in the space $H^s(\mathbb{R}) \times H^s(\mathbb{R})$ or $H^s(\mathbb{T}) \times H^s(\mathbb{T})$. The interested readers are referred to [YZ22a, YZ22b] and the references therein for an overall review of this study. For the IBVPs of systems (2.24) posed on \mathbb{R}^+ , we can justify the well-posedness results similar to that presented in Theorem 1.3 for the IBVP (1.2) using the same approach.

In the following, we list two such results for the IBVPs of the Gear-Grimshaw system (2.26) on \mathbb{R}^+ :

$$\begin{cases} u_t + u_{xxx} + \sigma_3 v_{xxx} &= -uu_x + \sigma_1 vv_x + \sigma_2 (uv)_x, \\ \rho_1 v_t + \rho_2 \sigma_3 u_{xxx} + v_{xxx} + \sigma_4 v_x &= \rho_2 \sigma_2 uu_x - vv_x + \rho_2 \sigma_1 (uv)_x, \end{cases} \quad (2.26)$$

where $\sigma_i \in \mathbb{R} (1 \leq i \leq 4)$ and $\rho_1, \rho_2 > 0$. This system can be written in the format of (2.24) with

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sigma_3 \\ \rho_2 \sigma_3 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & \sigma_1 \\ \rho_2 \sigma_2 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_4 = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_2 & \sigma_2 \\ \rho_2 \sigma_1 & \rho_2 \sigma_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that when $\rho_2 \sigma_3^2 \neq 1$, A_1 possesses two nonzero real eigenvalues λ_1 and λ_2 with $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$. Moreover, $\lambda_1 < 0 < \lambda_2$ if $\rho_2 \sigma_3^2 > 1$; $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ if $\rho_2 \sigma_3^2 < 1$; and $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 1$ if $\sigma_3 = 0$ and $\rho_1 = 1$. Thus, when

$\rho_2\sigma_3^2 > 1$, we need to impose three boundary conditions as that in the case of the IBVP (1.2),

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} u_t + u_{xxx} + \sigma_3 v_{xxx} &= -uu_x + \sigma_1 vv_x + \sigma_2 (uv)_x, & x, t > 0, \\ \rho_1 v_t + \rho_2 \sigma_3 u_{xxx} + v_{xxx} + \sigma_4 v_x &= \rho_2 \sigma_2 uu_x - vv_x + \rho_2 \sigma_1 (uv)_x, & x, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) = \phi(x), & v(x, 0) = \psi(x), & x > 0, \\ u(0, t) = h_1(t), & v(0, t) = h_2(t), \quad v_x(0, t) = h_3(t), & t > 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (2.27)$$

But in the case of $\rho_2\sigma_3^2 < 1$, we only need to impose two boundary conditions since λ_1 and λ_2 have the same sign.

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} u_t + u_{xxx} + \sigma_3 v_{xxx} &= -uu_x + \sigma_1 vv_x + \sigma_2 (uv)_x, & x, t > 0, \\ \rho_1 v_t + \rho_2 \sigma_3 u_{xxx} + v_{xxx} + \sigma_4 v_x &= \rho_2 \sigma_2 uu_x - vv_x + \rho_2 \sigma_1 (uv)_x, & x, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) = \phi(x), & v(x, 0) = \psi(x), & x > 0, \\ u(0, t) = h_1(t), & v(0, t) = h_2(t), & t > 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (2.28)$$

In Theorem 1.6 in [YZ22a], the authors obtained a complete list of well-posedness results for the Cauchy problem of the Gear-Grimshaw system (2.26) posed on \mathbb{R} for all possibilities of the parameters ρ_1, ρ_2 and $\sigma_i (1 \leq i \leq 4)$. Based on this result and the method we developed to prove Theorem 1.3, we can also establish the following well-posedness results concerning the IBVP of (2.27) or (2.28) on \mathbb{R}^+ .

Corollary 2.11. *If $\rho_1 > 0, \rho_2 > 0$ and $\rho_2\sigma_3^2 > 1$, then the IBVP (2.27) is locally analytically well-posed in the space $\mathcal{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$, with any naturally compatible data $(\phi, \psi) \in \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $\vec{h} = (h_1, h_2, h_3) \in \mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$, for any $s > -\frac{3}{4}$.*

Corollary 2.12. *If $\rho_1 > 0, \rho_2 > 0$ and $\rho_2\sigma_3^2 < 1$, then the IBVP (2.28) is locally analytically well-posed in the space $\mathcal{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$, with any naturally compatible data $(\phi, \psi) \in \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $(h_1, h_2) \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+) \times H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$, for any*

(i) $s > -\frac{3}{4}$ if $\sigma_3 = 0$ and $\rho_1 = 1$;

(ii) $s \geq 0$ if $\rho_2\sigma_3^2 < 1$ but (2.29) below is not satisfied;

(iii) $s \geq \frac{3}{4}$ if

$$\rho_2\sigma_3^2 \leq \frac{9}{25}, \quad \rho_1 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\alpha \pm \sqrt{\alpha^2 - 4} \right) \quad (2.29)$$

with

$$\alpha = \frac{17 - 25\rho_2\sigma_3^2}{4}.$$

Finally, we remark that the current paper only studies the 1D Boussinesq systems, however, the 2D Boussinesq systems are also of great importance and has attracted significant attention, see e.g. [BCL05, BLS08, DMS07, MSZ12, SWX17, LPS12]. These earlier works mainly focus on the well-posedness of the 2D Boussinesq systems on the space-time region $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, T)$, it might be an interesting future task to study their well-posedness on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$.

2.3 Outline of the remaining paper

- In Section 3, we will present some results for the Cauchy problem of the KdV equation and the reversed KdV equation posed on the whole line \mathbb{R} which will play an important role later in dealing with the initial boundary value problems of the coupled KdV systems.
- In Section 4, we investigate the linear IBVPs (2.16) and (2.17) to carry out the proofs of Proposition 2.8 and Proposition 2.9.

- In Section 5, various bilinear estimates presented in Proposition 2.10 will be established.
- Section 6 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.4, the main result of this paper. Equivalently, we will establish Theorems 2.3, 2.5 and 2.6 in Section 6.

3 Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, $\eta(t)$ is fixed to be a bump function in $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ which satisfies $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$ and

$$\eta(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |t| \leq 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } |t| \geq 2. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

The notation $a+$ denotes $a + \epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. Similarly, $a-$ denotes $a - \epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. For a function f in both x and t variables, we use $\mathcal{F}f$ (or \widehat{f}) to denote its space-time Fourier transform. Meanwhile, we use $\mathcal{F}_x f$ or \widehat{f}^x to denote its Fourier transform with respect to x , and use $\mathcal{F}_t f$ or \widehat{f}^t to denote its Fourier transform with respect to t . If a function h is only in x variable, then we use \widehat{h}^x (or just \widehat{h} when there is no ambiguity) to denote its Fourier transform. Similar notations are applied to functions which are only in t variable. For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote E_s to be an extension operator from $H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ to $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\|E_s f\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \|f\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)}, \quad \forall f \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^+), \quad (3.2)$$

where C is a constant which only depends on s .

Lemma 3.1. *Let $h \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and*

$$h^*(x) := \begin{cases} h(x) & \text{if } x \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } x < 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

Assume either $-\frac{5}{2} < s < \frac{1}{2}$, or $\frac{1}{2} < s < \frac{7}{2}$ and $h(0) = 0$. Then $h^ \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})$ and there exists $C = C(s)$ such that*

$$\|h^*\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \|h\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)}. \quad (3.4)$$

The result in Lemma 3.1 is standard, see e.g. Lemma 2.1(i)(ii) in [ET16] or [JK95].

For any $\beta > 0$, we define the function $P_\beta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$P_\beta(\mu) = \mu^3 - \beta\mu. \quad (3.5)$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 < \beta \leq 1$. If a function $M : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ satisfies*

$$|M(\mu)| \leq C |(P_\beta)'(\mu)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle \mu \rangle^{s+1}, \quad \forall \mu \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (3.6)$$

for some constant $C = C(s)$. Then there exists $C_1 = C_1(s)$ such that

$$\left\| M(\mu) \widehat{f}(P_\beta(\mu)) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq C_1 \|f\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}, \quad \forall f \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}). \quad (3.7)$$

Proof. First, it follows from (3.6) that

$$\left\| M(\mu) \widehat{f}(P_\beta(\mu)) \right\|_{L^2}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |M(\mu)|^2 |\widehat{f}(P_\beta(\mu))|^2 d\mu \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} |(P_\beta)'(\mu)| \langle \mu \rangle^{2(s+1)} |\widehat{f}(P_\beta(\mu))|^2 d\mu.$$

Then applying the change of variable $\xi = P_\beta(\mu) = \mu^3 - \beta\mu$ yields (3.7). \square

Based on Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2, we immediately obtain the following conclusion.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $a \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and denote a^* to be the zero extension of a as defined in (3.3). Assume either $-\frac{5}{2} < s < \frac{1}{2}$, or $\frac{1}{2} < s < \frac{7}{2}$ and $a(0) = 0$. Let $M : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function that satisfies (3.6). Then there exists $C = C(s)$ such that*

$$\|M(\mu)\widehat{a^*}(P_\beta(\mu))\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\|a\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)}, \quad \forall a \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+).$$

Next, we present some results about the Cauchy problem for the KdV equation and the reversed KdV equation posed on the whole line \mathbb{R} which will play important roles later in dealing with the initial boundary value problems of the coupled KdV system.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $|\beta| \leq 1$ and $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1$. Then for any $w_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$ and $F \in X_{s,\sigma-1}^{\alpha,\beta}$, there exists $C = C(s, \alpha, \sigma)$ such that*

$$\|\eta(t)W_R^{\alpha,\beta}(t)w_0\|_{Y_{s,\frac{1}{2},\sigma}^{\alpha,\beta}} \leq C\|w_0\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$\left\| \eta(t) \int_0^t W_R^{\alpha,\beta}(t-\tau)F(\cdot, \tau) d\tau \right\|_{Y_{s,\frac{1}{2},\sigma}^{\alpha,\beta}} \leq C\|F\|_{X_{s,\sigma-1}^{\alpha,\beta}}. \quad (3.9)$$

Proof. Recalling (2.8), the norm $\|\cdot\|_{Y_{s,\frac{1}{2},\sigma}^{\alpha,\beta}}$ is bounded by $\|\cdot\|_{X_{s,\sigma}^{\alpha,\beta}}$, so it suffices to prove

$$\|\eta(t)W_R^{\alpha,\beta}(t)w_0\|_{X_{s,\sigma}^{\alpha,\beta}} \leq C\|w_0\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} \quad (3.10)$$

and

$$\left\| \eta(t) \int_0^t W_R^{\alpha,\beta}(t-\tau)F(\cdot, \tau) d\tau \right\|_{X_{s,\sigma}^{\alpha,\beta}} \leq C\|F\|_{X_{s,\sigma-1}^{\alpha,\beta}}. \quad (3.11)$$

The proofs for (3.10) and (3.11) follow directly from Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.3 in [KPV93]. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and $|\beta| \leq 1$. Then for any $w_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$, $\eta(t)[W_R^{\alpha,\beta}(t)w_0]$ belongs to $C_x^j(\mathbb{R}; H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R}))$, where $j = 0, 1$. In addition, there exists $C = C(s, \alpha)$ such that*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \|\eta(t)\partial_x^j[W_R^{\alpha,\beta}(t)w_0]\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\|w_0\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}, \quad j = 0, 1.$$

Proof. The proof is standard, see e.g. [KPV91] or Lemma 5.5 in [Hol06]. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $|\beta| \leq 1$ and $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1$. Then for any $F \in X_{s,\sigma-1}^{\alpha,\beta} \cap Z_{s,\sigma-1}^{\alpha,\beta}$, $\eta(t) \int_0^t W_R^{\alpha,\beta}(t-\tau)F(\cdot, \tau) d\tau$ lies in $C_x^j(\mathbb{R}; H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R}))$ for $j = 0, 1$. In addition, there exists $C = C(s, \alpha, \sigma)$ such that*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left\| \eta(t) \partial_x^j \int_0^t W_R^{\alpha,\beta}(t-\tau)F(\cdot, \tau) d\tau \right\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C(\|F\|_{X_{s,\sigma-1}^{\alpha,\beta}} + \|F\|_{Z_{s,\sigma-1}^{\alpha,\beta}}), \quad j = 0, 1. \quad (3.12)$$

Similar results of Lemma 3.6 can be found in ([Hol06], Lemma 5.6) or ([CK02], Lemma 5.4 and 5.5), so we omit its proof. But we would like to emphasize that if $j = 0$ and $-1 \leq s \leq 3\sigma - 1$, then the term $\|F\|_{Z_{s,\sigma-1}^{\alpha,\beta}}$ in (3.12) can be dropped, but this term is necessary if $j = 0$ and $s > 3\sigma - 1$. Similarly, if $j = 1$ and $0 \leq s \leq 3\sigma$, then the term $\|F\|_{Z_{s,\sigma-1}^{\alpha,\beta}}$ is not needed in (3.12), but this term has to be present if $j = 1$ and $s > 3\sigma$.

4 Linear problems

In this section, we will study the linear IBVPs (2.16) and (2.17), present the proofs of Proposition 2.8 and Proposition 2.9.

4.1 KdV flow traveling to the right

Consideration is first given to the linear IBVP (2.16) which is copied below for convenience of readers.

$$\begin{cases} u_t + u_{xxx} + \beta u_x = f, \\ u(x, 0) = p(x), \\ u(0, t) = a(t), \end{cases} \quad x, t > 0. \quad (4.1)$$

This system describes a linear dispersive wave traveling to the right, where $p \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $a \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$, and f is a function defined on \mathbb{R}^2 . The function space that f lives in will be specified later. In addition, the data p and a are assumed to be compatible as in Definition 2.7, that is $p(0) = a(0)$ if $s > \frac{1}{2}$. The solution u of (4.1) can be written as $u = u_1 + u_2$ with

$$u_1 = \Phi_R^{1,\beta}(f, p) := W_R^{1,\beta}(E_s p) + \int_0^t W_R^{1,\beta}(t - \tau) f(\cdot, \tau) d\tau, \quad (4.2)$$

where $E_s p$ being the extension of p as (3.2), and $u_2 = W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a - q)$, where $q(t) := u_1(0, t)$ and $W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$ denotes the solution operator (also called the boundary integral operator) associated to the following linear IBVP (4.3).

$$\begin{cases} z_t + z_{xxx} + \beta z_x = 0, \\ z(x, 0) = 0, \\ z(0, t) = a(t), \end{cases} \quad x, t > 0. \quad (4.3)$$

Lemma 4.1. *Let $s \in (-\frac{3}{4}, 3]$, $0 < \beta \leq 1$ and $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1$. For any $p \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $f \in X_{s,\sigma-1}^{1,\beta} \cap Z_{s,\sigma-1}^{1,\beta}$, the function $\widetilde{u}_1 := \eta(t) \Phi_R^{1,\beta}(f, p)$ belongs to $Y_{s,\frac{1}{2},\sigma}^{1,\beta} \cap C_x^j(\mathbb{R}; H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R}))$ for $j = 0, 1$. In addition, the following estimates hold with some constant $C = C(s, \sigma)$.*

$$\|\widetilde{u}_1\|_{Y_{s,\frac{1}{2},\sigma}^{1,\beta}} \leq C(\|f\|_{X_{s,\sigma-1}^{1,\beta}} + \|p\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)}), \quad (4.4)$$

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \|\partial_x^j \widetilde{u}_1\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\left(\|f\|_{X_{s,\sigma-1}^{1,\beta}} + \|f\|_{Z_{s,\sigma-1}^{1,\beta}} + \|p\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)}\right), \quad j = 0, 1. \quad (4.5)$$

Proof. (4.4) follows from (3.2) and Lemma 3.4. (4.5) follows from (3.2), Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6. \square

Next, we will provide an explicit formula (in integral form) for the boundary integral operator $W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$. For any $\beta > 0$, let P_β be as given in (3.5) and define the function $R_\beta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$R_\beta(\mu) := \frac{\sqrt{3\mu^2 - 4\beta}}{2} = \begin{cases} i \frac{\sqrt{4\beta - 3\mu^2}}{2} & \text{if } \mu^2 \leq \frac{4}{3}\beta, \\ \frac{\sqrt{3\mu^2 - 4\beta}}{2} & \text{if } \mu^2 > \frac{4}{3}\beta. \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

Lemma 4.2. *The boundary integral operator $W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}$ associated to (4.3) has the following explicit integral*

representation

$$W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)(x,t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \operatorname{Re} \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^{\infty} e^{iP_{\beta}(\mu)t} e^{-i\mu x/2} e^{-R_{\beta}(\mu)x} \widehat{a}^*[P_{\beta}(\mu)] dP_{\beta}(\mu), \quad x, t \geq 0, \quad (4.7)$$

where a^* is the zero extension of a from \mathbb{R}^+ to \mathbb{R} .

The proof of this lemma is standard based on the Laplace transform method in [BSZ02] and is therefore omitted.

By taking advantage of formula (4.7), we will extend $W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$ to the whole plane \mathbb{R}^2 with some desired properties. According to (4.6), when $\sqrt{\beta} \leq \mu \leq \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}\beta}$, $R_{\beta}(\mu)$ is a pure imaginary number, so it will not cause much trouble to handle $W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$ even for $x, t < 0$. But when $\mu > \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}\beta}$, if we do not modify the definition of $W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$ for $x < 0$, then $e^{-R_{\beta}(\mu)x} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $R_{\beta}(\mu)x \rightarrow -\infty$, which makes it difficult to control $W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$.

To resolve this issue, our first strategy is to multiply a cut-off function (see (4.10)) to eliminate the part where $R_{\beta}(\mu)x \leq -1$, this idea comes from [ET16]. Let $\psi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $0 \leq \psi \leq 1$ and

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \leq -1. \end{cases} \quad (4.8)$$

Define $\Phi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a) : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\Phi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)(x,t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \operatorname{Re} \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^{\infty} e^{iP_{\beta}(\mu)t} e^{-i\mu x/2} K_{\beta}(x,\mu) \widehat{a}^*[P_{\beta}(\mu)] dP_{\beta}(\mu), \quad (4.9)$$

where

$$K_{\beta}(x,\mu) := \begin{cases} e^{-R_{\beta}(\mu)x} & \text{if } \sqrt{\beta} \leq \mu \leq \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}\beta}, \\ e^{-R_{\beta}(\mu)x} \psi(R_{\beta}(\mu)x) & \text{if } \mu > \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}\beta}. \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

It is easily seen that $\Phi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$ is well-defined on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. In addition, when $x \geq 0$, $K_{\beta}(x,\mu) = e^{-R_{\beta}(\mu)x}$, so $\Phi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$ matches $W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$ on $\mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}_0^+$. Hence, $\Phi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$ is an extension of $W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$ to $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, if $s > -\frac{1}{2}$, it enjoys some good properties after being localised in time.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $s \in (-\frac{1}{2}, 3]$, $0 < \beta \leq 1$ and $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq \min\{1, \frac{2s+7}{12}\}$. For any $a \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ that is compatible with (4.3), the function*

$$\widetilde{u}_2 := \eta(t) \Phi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$$

equals $W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$ on $\mathbb{R}_0^+ \times [0, 1]$ and belongs to $Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1,\beta} \cap C_x^j(\mathbb{R}; H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R}))$ for $j = 0, 1$. In addition, the following estimates hold with some constant $C = C(s, \sigma)$.

$$\|\widetilde{u}_2\|_{Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1,\beta}} \leq C \|a\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)}, \quad (4.11)$$

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \|\partial_x^j \widetilde{u}_2\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \|a\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)}, \quad j = 0, 1. \quad (4.12)$$

Although the extension $\Phi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}$ has a very simple expression, the estimate (4.11) fails for $s < -\frac{1}{2}$, see Remark 4.6. So in order to deal with the case when $-\frac{3}{4} < s \leq -\frac{1}{2}$, we have to use another extension, written as $\Psi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$, for $W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$. In fact, we will combine the extension $\Phi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$ and the construction in [BSZ06] to define $\Psi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$. Since the construction in [BSZ06] is too technical to be written as an explicit expression, we will first state the conclusion and then provide more details later in the proof.

Lemma 4.4. Let $-\frac{3}{4} < s \leq -\frac{1}{2}$, $0 < \beta \leq 1$ and $a \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$. Then there exist $\sigma_1 = \sigma_1(s) > \frac{1}{2}$ and an extension $\Psi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$ of $W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$ such that for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \sigma_1]$, the function

$$\widetilde{u}_2 := \eta(t)\Psi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$$

equals $W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$ on $\mathbb{R}_0^+ \times [0, 1]$ and belongs to $Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1,\beta} \cap C_x^j(\mathbb{R}_0^+; H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R}))$ for $j = 0, 1$. In addition, the following estimates hold with some constant $C = C(s, \sigma)$.

$$\|\widetilde{u}_2\|_{Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1,\beta}} \leq C\|a\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)}, \quad (4.13)$$

$$\sup_{x \geq 0} \|\partial_x^j \widetilde{u}_2\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\|a\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)}, \quad j = 0, 1. \quad (4.14)$$

Remark 4.5. We want to point out a slight difference between Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4. On the one hand, the extension function $\eta(t)\Phi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$ in Lemma 4.3 is shown to live in $C_x^j(\mathbb{R}; H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R}))$ and the estimate (4.12) is valid for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, the extension function $\eta(t)\Psi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)$ in Lemma 4.4 is only proved to live in $C_x^j(\mathbb{R}_0^+; H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R}))$ and the estimate (4.14) is only justified for $x \geq 0$.

We will first carry out the proof of Proposition 2.8 by assuming Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4 hold. After that, these two lemmas will be verified.

Proof of Proposition 2.8 . Without loss of generality, we assume $T = 1$. We first deal with the case when $s \in (-\frac{1}{2}, 3]$. Choose $\sigma_1(s) = \min\{1, \frac{2s+7}{12}\}$ and consider any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \sigma_1(s)]$. Based on the operator $\Phi_R^{1,\beta}$ in Lemma 4.1 and $\Phi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}$ in Lemma 4.3, we define

$$\widetilde{u} = \Gamma_\beta^+(f, p, a) := \eta(t)\Phi_R^{1,\beta}(f, p) + \eta(t)\Phi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a - \eta(t)\Phi_R^{1,\beta}(f, p)|_{x=0}).$$

Then \widetilde{u} is defined on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ and solves (2.16) on $\mathbb{R}_0^+ \times [0, 1]$. Furthermore, it follows from Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.3 that \widetilde{u} belongs to $Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1,\beta} \cap C_x^j(\mathbb{R}_0^+; H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R}))$ for $j = 0, 1$. Meanwhile, we infer from (4.4) and (4.11) that there exists a constant $C = C(s, \sigma)$ such that

$$\|\Gamma_\beta^+(f, p, a)\|_{Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1,\beta}} \leq C\left(\|f\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{1,\beta}} + \|p\|_{H^s} + \|a - \eta(t)\Phi_R^{1,\beta}(f, p)|_{x=0}\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1}{3}}}\right).$$

By (4.5) with $j = 0$, $\|\eta(t)\Phi_R^{1,\beta}(f, p)|_{x=0}\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1}{3}}} \leq C(\|f\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{1,\beta}} + \|f\|_{Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{1,\beta}} + \|p\|_{H^s})$. Combining the above two estimates yields (2.19). Next, by similar argument and using (4.5) and (4.12), we can justify (2.20) as well.

Then we treat the case when $s \in (-\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{1}{2}]$. The proof for this case is almost the same as the above case except we replace $\Phi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}$ by $\Psi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}$ and replace Lemma 4.3 by Lemma 4.4. The proof of Proposition 2.8 is thus complete. \square

Now we are ready to deal with Lemma 4.3 and 4.4.

Proof of Lemma 4.3 . We will first establish estimates (4.11) and (4.12) for $s \in (-\frac{1}{2}, 3] \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}\}$. Then the corresponding estimates in the case of $s = \frac{1}{2}$ can be deduced by interpolating between the case $s = 0$ and the case $s = 3$. Fix $s \in (-\frac{1}{2}, 3] \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}\}$ and $0 < \beta \leq 1$. Define h_β such that $\widehat{h_\beta}(\mu) = (P_\beta)'(\mu)\widehat{a^*}[P_\beta(\mu)]$. Then

$$\Phi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)(x, t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \operatorname{Re} \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^{\infty} e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{-i\mu x/2} K_\beta(x, \mu) \widehat{h_\beta}(\mu) d\mu,$$

where K_β is as defined in (4.10). Since $|(P_\beta)'(\mu)| = |3\mu^2 - \beta| \lesssim \langle \mu \rangle^2$, then

$$\langle \mu \rangle^s |\widehat{h_\beta}(\mu)| \lesssim |(P_\beta)'(\mu)|^{1/2} \langle \mu \rangle^{s+1} \widehat{a^*}[P_\beta(\mu)].$$

Since $a \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$, it then follows from Corollary 3.3 that $h_\beta \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$ and $\|h_\beta\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \|a\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)}.$ Inspired by the above observation, we define an operator \mathcal{T}_β as

$$[\mathcal{T}_\beta(h)](x, t) := \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^{\infty} e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{-i\mu x/2} K_\beta(x, \mu) \widehat{h}(\mu) d\mu. \quad (4.15)$$

Recalling $Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1, \beta} = X_{s, \frac{1}{2}}^{1, \beta} \cap \Lambda_{s, \sigma}^{1, \beta} \cap C_t(\mathbb{R}, H^s(\mathbb{R}))$, so the proof of Lemma 4.3 reduces to establishing the following estimates for the operator \mathcal{T}_β .

$$\|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_\beta(h)\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}}^{1, \beta}} \leq C\|h\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (4.16)$$

$$\|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_\beta(h)\|_{\Lambda_{s, \sigma}^{1, \beta}} \leq C\|h\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (4.17)$$

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_\beta(h)\|_{H_x^s(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\|h\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (4.18)$$

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \|\partial_x^j [\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_\beta(h)]\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\|h\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}, \quad j = 0, 1. \quad (4.19)$$

Before showing those estimates hold, we introduce some notations. Recalling the formula (4.10), we have

$$K_\beta(x, \mu) = \begin{cases} e^{-i\sqrt{4\beta-3\mu^2}x/2} & \text{if } \sqrt{\beta} \leq \mu \leq \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}\beta}, \\ k(R_\beta(\mu)x) & \text{if } \mu > \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}\beta}, \end{cases}$$

where

$$k(y) := e^{-y}\psi(y), \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.20)$$

It is easily seen that k is a real-valued Schwarz function on \mathbb{R} . We will first justify (4.19).

Proof of (4.19). We first consider the case when $j = 0$. For any fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}$, taking the Fourier transform of $\eta\mathcal{T}_\beta(h)$ (see (4.15) for the expression of $\mathcal{T}_\beta(h)$) with respect to t leads to

$$\mathcal{F}_t[\eta\mathcal{T}_\beta(h)](x, \tau) = \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^{\infty} \widehat{\eta}(\tau - P_\beta(\mu)) e^{-i\mu x/2} K_\beta(x, \mu) \widehat{h}(\mu) d\mu.$$

Since $|e^{-i\mu x/2} K_\beta(x, \mu)| \leq C$ for a universal constant C and $\langle \tau \rangle^{\frac{s+1}{3}} \leq \langle \tau - P_\beta(\mu) \rangle^{\frac{|s+1|}{3}} \langle P_\beta(\mu) \rangle^{\frac{s+1}{3}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tau \rangle^{\frac{s+1}{3}} |\mathcal{F}_t[\eta\mathcal{T}_\beta(h)](x, \tau)| &\lesssim \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^{\infty} \langle \tau - P_\beta(\mu) \rangle^{\frac{|s+1|}{3}} |\widehat{\eta}(\tau - P_\beta(\mu))| \langle P_\beta(\mu) \rangle^{\frac{s+1}{3}} |\widehat{h}(\mu)| d\mu \\ &= \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^{\infty} \widehat{f_s}(\tau - P_\beta(\mu)) \langle P_\beta(\mu) \rangle^{\frac{s+1}{3}} |\widehat{h}(\mu)| d\mu, \end{aligned}$$

where f_s is defined such that $\widehat{f_s}(\cdot) = \langle \cdot \rangle^{\frac{|s+1|}{3}} |\widehat{\eta}(\cdot)|$. Then by splitting the above integral domain $[\sqrt{\beta}, \infty]$ into $[\sqrt{\beta}, 4]$ and $[4, \infty]$, we are able to complete the proof of (4.19) for the case $j = 0$.

Next, for the case $j = 1$,

$$\mathcal{F}_t(\partial_x [\eta\mathcal{T}_\beta(h)])(x, \tau) = \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^{\infty} \widehat{\eta}(\tau - P_\beta(\mu)) \partial_x [e^{-i\mu x/2} K_\beta(x, \mu)] \widehat{h}(\mu) d\mu.$$

Noticing there exists a universal constant C such that $|\partial_x [e^{-i\mu x/2} K_\beta(x, \mu)]| \lesssim C\mu$ for any $\mu \geq 4$, this

leads to

$$|\mathcal{F}_t(\partial_x[\eta\mathcal{T}_\beta(h)])(x, \tau)| \lesssim \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^{\infty} |\widehat{\eta}(\tau - P_\beta(\mu))| |\mu| \widehat{h}(\mu) d\mu.$$

Define h_1 such that $\widehat{h}_1(\mu) = \mathbb{1}_{\{\mu > \sqrt{\beta}\}} \mu |\widehat{h}(\mu)|$. Then by following the same argument as that for the case $j = 0$, we obtain

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \|\partial_x[\eta\mathcal{T}_\beta(h)]\|_{H_t^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \|h_1\|_{H^{s-1}(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \|h\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}.$$

□

Next, in order to prove (4.16)–(4.18), we decompose $\mathcal{T}_\beta(h)$ as $\mathcal{T}_\beta(h) = \mathcal{T}_{\beta,1}(h) + \mathcal{T}_{\beta,2}(h)$, where

$$[\mathcal{T}_{\beta,1}(h)](x, t) := \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^{\sqrt{\frac{4}{3}\beta}} e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{-i(\mu + \sqrt{4\beta - 3\mu^2})x/2} \widehat{h}(\mu) d\mu, \quad (4.21)$$

$$[\mathcal{T}_{\beta,2}(h)](x, t) := \int_{\sqrt{\frac{4}{3}\beta}}^{\infty} e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{-i\mu x/2} k(R_\beta(\mu)x) \widehat{h}(\mu) d\mu. \quad (4.22)$$

Proof of (4.16). Firstly, we discuss the estimate for $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,1}(h)$ and we will actually prove a stronger result:

$$\|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,1}(h)\|_{X_{3,1}^{1,\beta}} \lesssim \|h\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}. \quad (4.23)$$

Since the integral range for μ in $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,1}(h)$ is a finite interval $[\sqrt{\beta}, \sqrt{4\beta/3}]$, the verification of (4.23) is very straightforward and therefore is omitted. Next we discuss the estimate for $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,2}(h)$ which is further decomposed into two parts: $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,2}(h) = \mathcal{T}_{\beta,3}(h) + \mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)$, where

$$[\mathcal{T}_{\beta,3}(h)](x, t) := \int_{\sqrt{\frac{4}{3}\beta}}^4 e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{-i\mu x/2} k(R_\beta(\mu)x) \widehat{h}(\mu) d\mu, \quad (4.24)$$

$$[\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)](x, t) := \int_4^{\infty} e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{-i\mu x/2} k(R_\beta(\mu)x) \widehat{h}(\mu) d\mu. \quad (4.25)$$

The reason of introducing such a decomposition is to make sure that $R_\beta(\mu)$ has a positive lower bound in $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)$. For example, with the choice of 4, we have $R_\beta(\mu) > 3$ for any $\mu \geq 4$ since $0 < \beta \leq 1$. The choice of the cut-off number 4 is flexible, as long as it is away from $\sqrt{\frac{4}{3}\beta}$. For the estimate on $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,3}$, we will also prove a stronger result:

$$\|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,3}(h)\|_{X_{3,1}^{1,\beta}} \lesssim \|h\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}. \quad (4.26)$$

Again, since the integral region for μ in $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,3}(h)$ is a finite interval $[\sqrt{4\beta/3}, 4]$, the inequality (4.26) can be built without much difficulty.

So the focus is turned to the estimate on $\|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}}^{1,\beta}}$. By direct computation,

$$\mathcal{F}[\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)](\xi, \tau) = \int_4^{\infty} \widehat{\eta}(\tau - P_\beta(\mu)) \frac{1}{R_\beta(\mu)} \widehat{k}\left(\frac{\xi + \mu/2}{R_\beta(\mu)}\right) \widehat{h}(\mu) d\mu.$$

Since k is a Schwarz function, so is \widehat{k} , hence,

$$\left| \widehat{k} \left(\frac{\xi + \mu/2}{R_\beta(\mu)} \right) \right| \lesssim \frac{R_\beta^6(\mu)}{R_\beta^6(\mu) + |\xi + \mu/2|^6} \sim \frac{\mu^6}{\mu^6 + |2\xi + \mu|^6}.$$

As a result,

$$|\mathcal{F}[\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)](\xi, \tau)| \lesssim \int_4^\infty |\widehat{\eta}(\tau - P_\beta(\mu))| \frac{\mu^5 |\widehat{h}(\mu)|}{\mu^6 + |2\xi + \mu|^6} d\mu. \quad (4.27)$$

For any $\mu \geq 4$, $\langle \tau - \phi^{1,\beta}(\xi) \rangle \leq \langle \tau - P_\beta(\mu) \rangle \langle P_\beta(\mu) - \phi^{1,\beta}(\xi) \rangle \lesssim \langle \tau - P_\beta(\mu) \rangle (\mu + |\xi|)^3$, so it follows from (4.27) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \xi \rangle^s \langle \tau - \phi^{1,\beta}(\xi) \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} |\mathcal{F}[\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)](\xi, \tau)| \\ & \lesssim \int_4^\infty \langle \tau - P_\beta(\mu) \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} |\widehat{\eta}(\tau - P_\beta(\mu))| \frac{\langle \xi \rangle^s (\mu + |\xi|)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\mu^6 + |2\xi + \mu|^6} \mu^5 |\widehat{h}(\mu)| d\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (4.28)$$

It remains to estimate the $L_{\xi, \tau}^2$ norm of the right hand side of (4.28). First, for any fixed $\mu \geq 4$, by dividing \mathbb{R} into $\{\xi : |\xi| \geq \mu\}$ and $\{\xi : |\xi| < \mu\}$, and by utilizing the assumption $-\frac{1}{2} < s \leq 3$, we attain

$$\left\| \frac{\langle \xi \rangle^s (\mu + |\xi|)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\mu^6 + |2\xi + \mu|^6} \right\|_{L_\xi^2} \lesssim C \mu^{s-4}. \quad (4.29)$$

Thus, by (4.28) and Minkowski's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \langle \xi \rangle^s \langle \tau - \phi^{1,\beta}(\xi) \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{F}[\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)](\xi, \tau) \right\|_{L_\xi^2} \\ & \lesssim \int_4^\infty \langle \tau - P_\beta(\mu) \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} |\widehat{\eta}(\tau - P_\beta(\mu))| \mu^{s+1} |\widehat{h}(\mu)| d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

This leads to

$$\|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}}^{1,\beta}} \lesssim \left\| \int_4^\infty \langle \tau - P_\beta(\mu) \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} |\widehat{\eta}(\tau - P_\beta(\mu))| \mu^{s+1} |\widehat{h}(\mu)| d\mu \right\|_{L_\tau^2}. \quad (4.30)$$

Note that the function $P_\beta(\mu) = \mu^3 - \beta\mu$ is increasing on $[4, \infty)$, so its inverse function is well-defined which is denoted as P_β^{-1} . By making the change of variable $y = P_\beta(\mu)$, we have $y \sim \mu^3$ and

$$\|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}}^{1,\beta}} \lesssim \left\| \int_{P_\beta(4)}^\infty \langle \tau - y \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} |\widehat{\eta}(\tau - y)| y^{\frac{s-1}{3}} |\widehat{h}(P_\beta^{-1}(y))| dy \right\|_{L_\tau^2}. \quad (4.31)$$

Since η is a Schwarz function, $\langle \cdot \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \widehat{\eta}(\cdot)$ is integrable. Then we apply Young's inequality to (4.31) to find

$$\|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}}^{1,\beta}} \lesssim \left(\int_{P_\beta(4)}^\infty y^{\frac{2(s-1)}{3}} |\widehat{h}(P_\beta^{-1}(y))|^2 dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (4.32)$$

Finally, making the change of variable $\mu = P_\beta^{-1}(y)$ yields $\|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}}^{1,\beta}} \lesssim \|h\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}$. \square

Proof of (4.17). By taking advantage of the above proof, it is not difficult to justify (4.17). Next, we will sketch its proof with a focus on illustrating why the restriction $\sigma \leq \frac{2s+7}{12}$ is needed in Lemma 4.3. Firstly, since $s \leq 3$ and $\sigma \leq 1$, then $\|f\|_{\Lambda_{s,\sigma}^{1,\beta}} \lesssim \|f\|_{X_{3,1}^{1,\beta}}$ for any function f . Combining this fact with

(4.23) and (4.26), we deduce

$$\|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,1}(h)\|_{\Lambda_{s,\sigma}^{1,\beta}} + \|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,3}(h)\|_{\Lambda_{s,\sigma}^{1,\beta}} \lesssim \|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,1}(h)\|_{X_{3,1}^{1,\beta}} + \|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,3}(h)\|_{X_{3,1}^{1,\beta}} \lesssim \|h\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}.$$

It thus remains to estimate $\|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)\|_{\Lambda_{s,\sigma}^{1,\beta}}$. On the one hand, it follows from (4.27) that

$$|\mathcal{F}[\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)](\xi, \tau)| \lesssim \int_4^\infty |\widehat{\eta}(\tau - P_\beta(\mu))| \mu^{-1} |\widehat{h}(\mu)| d\mu.$$

On the other hand, it is easily seen that for any $\epsilon_1 > 0$,

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}_{\{e^{|\xi|} \leq 3+|\tau|\}} \langle \xi \rangle^s \langle \tau - \phi^{\alpha,\beta}(\xi) \rangle^\sigma \right\|_{L_\xi^2} \lesssim C_{\epsilon_1} \langle \tau \rangle^{\sigma+\epsilon_1},$$

where C_{ϵ_1} denotes a constant that depends on ϵ_1 . The specific value of ϵ_1 will be chosen later in (4.34) and it only depends on s . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_\beta(h)\|_{\Lambda_{s,\sigma}^{1,\beta}} &= \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\{e^{|\xi|} \leq 3+|\tau|\}} \langle \xi \rangle^s \langle \tau - \phi^{\alpha,\beta}(\xi) \rangle^\sigma \mathcal{F}[\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)](\xi, \tau) \right\|_{L_{\xi,\tau}^2} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \int_4^\infty \langle \tau \rangle^{\sigma+\epsilon_1} |\widehat{\eta}(\tau - P_\beta(\mu))| \mu^{-1} |\widehat{h}(\mu)| d\mu \right\|_{L_\tau^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.33)$$

Noticing $\langle \tau \rangle^{\sigma+\epsilon_1} \lesssim \langle \tau - P_\beta(\mu) \rangle^{\sigma+\epsilon_1} \langle \mu \rangle^{3(\sigma+\epsilon_1)}$, so

$$\|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_\beta(h)\|_{\Lambda_{s,\sigma}^{1,\beta}} \lesssim \left\| \int_4^\infty \langle \tau - P_\beta(\mu) \rangle^{\sigma+\epsilon_1} |\widehat{\eta}(\tau - P_\beta(\mu))| \mu^{3(\sigma+\epsilon_1)-1} |\widehat{h}(\mu)| d\mu \right\|_{L_\tau^2}.$$

Comparing to (4.30), as long as $3(\sigma + \epsilon_1) - 1 \leq s + 1$, that is $\sigma \leq \frac{s+2}{3} - \epsilon_1$, we can finish the proof by similar argument as that after (4.30). Choosing

$$\epsilon_1 = \frac{2s+1}{12} \quad (4.34)$$

fulfills this requirement thanks to the restriction $\sigma \leq \frac{2s+7}{12}$. \square

Proof of (4.18). Again, based on the proof of (4.16), it will not take significantly more effort to verify (4.18), but we will still carry out its proof with the purpose of revealing the necessity of the assumption $s > -\frac{1}{2}$ in Lemma 4.3. Firstly, it follows from the 1-D Sobolev embedding and the condition $s \leq 3$ that $\|f\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^s} \lesssim \|f\|_{X_{s,1}^{1,\beta}} \lesssim \|f\|_{X_{3,1}^{1,\beta}}$. Then we use (4.23) and (4.26) again to deduce

$$\|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,1}(h)\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^s} + \|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,3}(h)\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^s} \lesssim \|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,1}(h)\|_{X_{3,1}^{1,\beta}} + \|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,3}(h)\|_{X_{3,1}^{1,\beta}} \lesssim \|h\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}.$$

It thus remains to estimate $\|\eta(t)\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^s}$. We first consider the case when $t = 0$ which reduces to the proof of $\|[\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)](x, 0)\|_{H_x^s} \lesssim \|h\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}$. By direct computation,

$$\|[\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)](x, 0)\|_{H_x^s} = \left\| \langle \xi \rangle^s \int_4^\infty \widehat{k}\left(\frac{\xi + \mu/2}{R_\beta(\mu)}\right) \frac{\widehat{h}(\mu)}{R_\beta(\mu)} d\mu \right\|_{L_\xi^2}.$$

According to duality,

$$\|[\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)](x, 0)\|_{H_x^s} = \sup_{\|g\|_{L_\xi^2}=1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_4^\infty g(\xi) \langle \xi \rangle^s \widehat{k}\left(\frac{\xi + \mu/2}{R_\beta(\mu)}\right) \frac{\widehat{h}(\mu)}{R_\beta(\mu)} d\mu d\xi. \quad (4.35)$$

Exchanging the order of integration and shifting ξ , we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_4^\infty g(\xi) \langle \xi \rangle^s \widehat{k} \left(\frac{\xi + \mu/2}{R_\beta(\mu)} \right) \frac{\widehat{h}(\mu)}{R_\beta(\mu)} d\mu d\xi = \int_4^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}} g \left(\xi - \frac{\mu}{2} \right) \left\langle \xi - \frac{\mu}{2} \right\rangle^s \widehat{k} \left(\frac{\xi}{R_\beta(\mu)} \right) \frac{\widehat{h}(\mu)}{R_\beta(\mu)} d\xi d\mu. \quad (4.36)$$

Then it suffices to control the RHS of (4.36). We split the integral domain $[4, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ as $B_1 \cup B_2$, where $B_1 = \{(\mu, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \mu \geq 4, |\xi - \frac{\mu}{2}| \lesssim 1\}$ and $B_2 = \{(\mu, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \mu \geq 4, |\xi - \frac{\mu}{2}| \gg 1\}$.

Since ξ is restricted to a small region for each fixed μ in B_1 , the contribution of the integral on B_1 can be handled easier, so the focus will be put on the contribution on B_2 . By the change of variable $\xi = R_\beta(\mu)y$,

$$\text{Contribution on } B_2 \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{B_3}(\mu, y) \left| g \left(R_\beta(\mu)y - \frac{\mu}{2} \right) \right| \left\langle R_\beta(\mu)y - \frac{\mu}{2} \right\rangle^s |\widehat{k}(y)| |\widehat{h}(\mu)| dy d\mu, \quad (4.37)$$

where $B_3 := \{(\mu, y) : \mu \geq 4, |R_\beta(\mu)y - \frac{\mu}{2}| \gg 1\}$. Switching the order of integration yields

$$\text{RHS of (4.37)} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\widehat{k}(y)| \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{B_3}(\mu, y) \left| g \left(R_\beta(\mu)y - \frac{\mu}{2} \right) \right| \left\langle R_\beta(\mu)y - \frac{\mu}{2} \right\rangle^s |\widehat{h}(\mu)| d\mu \right) dy. \quad (4.38)$$

For any $(\mu, y) \in B_3$, $\mu \geq 4$ and $|R_\beta(\mu)y - \frac{\mu}{2}| \gg 1$. Then we find

$$\left| R_\beta(\mu)y - \frac{\mu}{2} \right| \sim \left| \mu \left(y - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \right) \right| \quad \text{and} \quad \left| R'_\beta(\mu)y - \frac{1}{2} \right| \sim \left| y - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \right|. \quad (4.39)$$

Since $\|g\|_{L^2} = 1$ and $\frac{d}{d\mu} [R_\beta(\mu)y - \frac{\mu}{2}] = R'_\beta(\mu)y - \frac{1}{2}$, it follows from Hölder's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{B_3}(\mu, y) \left| g \left(R_\beta(\mu)y - \frac{\mu}{2} \right) \right| \left\langle R_\beta(\mu)y - \frac{\mu}{2} \right\rangle^s |\widehat{h}(\mu)| d\mu \\ & \lesssim \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{B_3}(\mu, y)}{|R'_\beta(\mu)y - \frac{1}{2}|} \left\langle R_\beta(\mu)y - \frac{\mu}{2} \right\rangle^{2s} |\widehat{h}(\mu)|^2 d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.40)$$

Based on (4.39),

$$\text{RHS of (4.40)} \lesssim \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{B_3}(\mu, y) \left| y - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \right|^{2s-1} \mu^{2s} |\widehat{h}(\mu)|^2 d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \left| y - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \right|^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|h\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Then we plug this inequality into (4.38) to deduce

$$\text{RHS of (4.37)} \lesssim \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\widehat{k}(y)| \left| y - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \right|^{s-\frac{1}{2}} dy \right) \|h\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \|h\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})},$$

where the last inequality is due to the assumption $s > -\frac{1}{2}$.

Having established the case when $t = 0$, the general case follows immediately. Actually, for any t , by defining f such that $\widehat{f}(\mu) = e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} \widehat{h}(\mu)$, we have $[\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(f)](x, 0) = [\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)](x, t)$. So we infer from the $t = 0$ case that

$$\|[\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)](x, t)\|_{H_x^s} = \|[\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(f)](x, 0)\|_{H_x^s} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^s} = \|h\|_{H^s}.$$

□

Thus, the proof of Lemma 4.3 is completed. □

Remark 4.6. We emphasize that the above proof for (4.18) can not be extended to $s < -\frac{1}{2}$. Actually, if we choose $g(\xi) = \mathbb{1}_{\{|\xi| \leq 1\}}$ in (4.35), then RHS of (4.35) $\sim \int_4^\infty \frac{\widehat{h}(\mu)}{R_\beta(\mu)} d\mu \sim \int_4^\infty \frac{\widehat{h}(\mu)}{\mu} d\mu$. In order to prove

$\int_4^\infty \frac{\widehat{h}(\mu)}{\mu} d\mu \lesssim \|h\|_{H^s}$ for any $h \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$, s has to be at least $-\frac{1}{2}$. In fact, by the scaling $\widehat{h}_\lambda := \widehat{h}(\lambda\mu)$ and sending $\lambda \rightarrow 0^+$, we can see $s \geq -\frac{1}{2}$.

Next, we will take advantage of the proof of Lemma 4.3 to justify Lemma 4.4.

Proof of Lemma 4.4. Recall the definition of $W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}$ in (4.7), we write

$$\begin{aligned} W_{bdr}^{1,\beta}(a)(x, t) &= \frac{1}{\pi} Re \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^4 e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{-i\mu x/2} e^{-R_\beta(\mu)x} \widehat{a^*}[P_\beta(\mu)] dP_\beta(\mu) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\pi} Re \int_4^\infty e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{-i\mu x/2} e^{-R_\beta(\mu)x} \widehat{a^*}[P_\beta(\mu)] dP_\beta(\mu) \\ &:= I_1(x, t) + I_2(x, t), \quad \forall x, t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that one can extend $I_1(x, t)$ for all x and t with its extension chosen as

$$\mathcal{E}I_1(x, t) := \frac{1}{\pi} Re \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^4 e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{-i\mu x/2} K_\beta(x, \mu) \widehat{a^*}[P_\beta(\mu)] dP_\beta(\mu), \quad \forall x, t \in \mathbb{R} \quad (4.41)$$

where K_β is as defined in (4.10). For this part, it is very similar to the operator $\Phi_{bdr}^{1,\beta}$ in Lemma 4.3 but with μ restricted on $[\sqrt{\beta}, 4]$. On this small interval $[\sqrt{\beta}, 4]$, the proof of Lemma 4.3 also works for $-\frac{3}{4} < s \leq -\frac{1}{2}$ and the extension for this part satisfies all the desired estimates. Unfortunately, the same extension fails to work if μ is large. So we need a more subtle extension for $I_2(x, t)$. For the convenience of statement and the latter generalization in Section 4.2, we introduce the following operator $\mathcal{I}_{\beta, m}$ for $0 < \beta \leq 1$ and $m \in \mathbb{R}$.

$$[\mathcal{I}_{\beta, m}(f)](x, t) = Re \int_4^\infty e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{-im\mu x} e^{-R_\beta(\mu)x} \widehat{f}(P_\beta(\mu)) dP_\beta(\mu), \quad \forall x \geq 0, t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.42)$$

Then $I_2(x, t) = \frac{1}{\pi} [\mathcal{I}_{\beta, \frac{1}{2}}(a^*)](x, t)$ for any $x, t \geq 0$. So in order to extend I_2 , it suffices to extend $\mathcal{I}_{\beta, \frac{1}{2}}(a^*)$. By the following Claim 4.7, we can choose the extension to be $\frac{1}{\pi} \mathcal{E}\mathcal{I}_{\beta, \frac{1}{2}}(a^*)$ to prove Lemma 4.4. Therefore, the justification of Lemma 4.4 reduces to establishing the following result.

Claim 4.7. Let $-\frac{3}{4} < s \leq -\frac{1}{2}$, $0 < \beta \leq 1$, $m \neq 0$ and $f \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})$. Then there exist $\sigma_1 = \sigma_1(s) > \frac{1}{2}$ and an extension $\mathcal{E}\mathcal{I}_{\beta, m}(f)$ of $\mathcal{I}_{\beta, m}(f)$ from $\mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \sigma_1]$ and for $j = 0, 1$,

$$\eta(t) \mathcal{E}\mathcal{I}_{\beta, m}(f) \in Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1, \beta} \bigcap C_x^j(\mathbb{R}_0^+; H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})).$$

In addition, the following estimates hold with some constant $C = C(s, \sigma, m)$.

$$\|\eta(t) \mathcal{E}\mathcal{I}_{\beta, m}(f)\|_{Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1, \beta}} \leq C \|f\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}, \quad (4.43)$$

$$\sup_{x \geq 0} \left\| \partial_x^j [\eta(t) \mathcal{E}\mathcal{I}_{\beta, m}(f)] \right\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \|f\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}, \quad j = 0, 1. \quad (4.44)$$

Proof of Claim 4.7. Without loss of generality, we assume $m = \frac{1}{2}$, the general case is similar. First, we notice that when $x \geq 0$, any extension of $\mathcal{I}_{\beta, \frac{1}{2}}(f)$ from $\mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ is equal to $\mathcal{I}_{\beta, \frac{1}{2}}(f)$ on $\mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}$, so the LHS of (4.44) is the same for all extensions. Define h such that $\widehat{h}(\mu) = \widehat{f}(P_\beta(\mu))(P_\beta)'(\mu) \mathbb{1}_{\mu > 4}$. Then $\|h\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}$. Meanwhile, it follows from (4.42) that

$$[\mathcal{I}_{\beta, \frac{1}{2}}(f)](x, t) = Re \int_4^\infty e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{-i\mu x/2} e^{-R_\beta(\mu)x} \widehat{h}(\mu) d\mu, \quad \forall x \geq 0, t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Recalling the definition (4.25) for the operator $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)$, we see that $\mathcal{I}_{\beta,\frac{1}{2}}(f)$ agrees with $Re(\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h))$ when $x \geq 0$. So $Re(\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h))$ is an extension of $\mathcal{I}_{\beta,\frac{1}{2}}(f)$ from $\mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. As a result, for any other extension $\mathcal{E}\mathcal{I}_{\beta,\frac{1}{2}}(f)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \geq 0} \left\| \partial_x^j [\eta(t) \mathcal{E}\mathcal{I}_{\beta,\frac{1}{2}}(f)] \right\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} &= \sup_{x \geq 0} \left\| \partial_x^j [\eta(t) Re(\mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h))] \right\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}, \quad j = 0, 1. \\ &\leq \sup_{x \geq 0} \left\| \partial_x^j [\eta(t) \mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)] \right\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \end{aligned}$$

Although the value of s is required to be greater than $-1/2$ in Lemma 4.3, the proof of (4.19) is valid for any s in $(-\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{1}{2}]$. So we conclude $\eta(t) \mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h) \in C_x^j(\mathbb{R}_0^+; H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R}))$ and

$$\sup_{x \geq 0} \left\| \partial_x^j [\eta(t) \mathcal{T}_{\beta,4}(h)] \right\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \|h\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \|f\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Then it remains to find an extension $\mathcal{E}\mathcal{I}_{\beta,\frac{1}{2}}(f)$ which belongs to $Y_{s,\frac{1}{2},\sigma}^{1,\beta}$ and satisfies (4.43).

In [BSZ06], the authors provided an extension for the integral $I_2(x, t)$, see page 16 in Section 2.2 in [BSZ06]. Essentially, the term $I_2(x, t)$ in [BSZ06] can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} I_2(x, t) &= Re \int_4^\infty e^{i(\mu^3 - \mu)t} e^{-(\sqrt{3\mu^2 - 4 + i\mu}) \frac{x}{2}} \widehat{h^*}(\mu^3 - \mu) d(\mu^3 - \mu), \\ &= [\mathcal{I}_{1,\frac{1}{2}}(h^*)](x, t), \quad \forall x \geq 0, t \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned}$$

where $h \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and h^* is the zero extension of h from \mathbb{R}^+ to \mathbb{R} . By Lemma 3.1, $h^* \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R})$ and this is the only property needed in [BSZ06] to carry out the extension which satisfies the property (4.43), see the extension $\mathcal{B}I_{m1}$ on page 21, Theorem 3.1 on page 22, and Lemma 3.10 on page 36 in [BSZ06]. After replacing h^* by f , the method also applies to extend $\mathcal{I}_{1,\frac{1}{2}}(f)$ to satisfy (4.43). Thus, Claim 4.7 is justified when $\beta = 1$ and $m = \frac{1}{2}$. For general $\beta \in (0, 1)$, it follows from $\mu \geq 4$ that $P_\beta(\mu) \sim \mu^3$ and $R_\beta(\mu) \sim \mu$, so Claim 4.7 can also be justified in a similar way for any $0 < \beta \leq 1$. \square

Hence, the proof of Lemma 4.4 is finished. \square

4.2 KdV flow traveling to the left

In this section, we will consider the linear IBVP (2.17) which is copied below for convenience of readers.

$$\begin{cases} v_t - v_{xxx} - \beta v_x = g, \\ v(x, 0) = q(x), \\ v(0, t) = b_1(t), \quad v_x(0, t) = b_2(t), \end{cases} \quad x, t > 0. \quad (4.45)$$

This system describes a linear dispersive wave traveling to the left, where $q \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $b_1 \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$, $b_2 \in H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$, and g is a function defined on \mathbb{R}^2 . The function space that g lives in will be specified later. In addition, the data q , b_1 and b_2 are assumed to be compatible as in Definition 2.7, that is they satisfy $q(0) = b_1(0)$ if $s > \frac{1}{2}$ and further satisfy $q'(0) = b_2(0)$ if $s > \frac{3}{2}$. The solution v of (4.45) can be decomposed into $v = v_1 + v_2$ with

$$v_1 = \Phi_R^{-1,-\beta}(g, q) := W_R^{-1,-\beta}(E_s q) + \int_0^t W_R^{-1,-\beta}(t - \tau) g(\cdot, \tau) d\tau. \quad (4.46)$$

where $E_s q$ is defined as in (3.2), and $v_2 = W_{bdr}^{-1,-\beta}(b_1 - q_1, b_2 - q_2)$, where $q_1 := v_1(0, t)$, $q_2(t) := \partial_x v_1(0, t)$, and $W_{bdr}^{-1,-\beta}(b_1, b_2)$ denotes the solution operator (also called the boundary integral operator) associated

to the following IBVP (4.47).

$$\begin{cases} z_t - z_{xxx} - \beta z_x = 0, \\ z(x, 0) = 0, \\ z(0, t) = b_1(t), \quad z_x(0, t) = b_2(t), \end{cases} \quad x, t > 0. \quad (4.47)$$

Lemma 4.8. *Let $s \in (-\frac{3}{4}, 3]$, $0 < \beta \leq 1$ and $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1$. For any $q \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $g \in X_{s, \sigma-1}^{-1, -\beta} \cap Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{-1, -\beta}$, the function $\tilde{v}_1 := \eta(t) \Phi_R^{-1, -\beta}(g, q)$ belongs to $Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1, -\beta} \cap C_x^j(\mathbb{R}; H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R}))$ for $j = 0, 1$. In addition, the following estimates hold with some constant $C = C(s, \sigma)$.*

$$\|\tilde{v}_1\|_{Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1, -\beta}} \leq C(\|g\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{-1, -\beta}} + \|q\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)}), \quad (4.48)$$

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \|\partial_x^j \tilde{v}_1\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\left(\|g\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{-1, -\beta}} + \|g\|_{Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{-1, -\beta}} + \|q\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)}\right), \quad j = 0, 1. \quad (4.49)$$

Proof. (4.48) follows from (3.2) and Lemma 3.4. (4.49) follows from (3.2), Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6. \square

Parallel to Lemma 4.2, we can use the Laplace transform method in [BSZ02] to derive an explicit formula for the boundary integral operator $W_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)$. For any $\beta > 0$, recall the definitions (3.5) and (4.6) for P_β and R_β .

Lemma 4.9. *The boundary integral operator $W_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)$ associated to (4.47) has the explicit integral representation*

$$W_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)(x, t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \operatorname{Re} \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^{\infty} e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} \left[e^{-i\mu x} A - e^{\frac{i\mu x}{2}} e^{-R_\beta(\mu)x} B \right] dP_\beta(\mu), \quad x, t \geq 0, \quad (4.50)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} A = A(\mu) = \frac{R_\beta(\mu) - i\mu/2}{R_\beta(\mu) - 3\mu i/2} \widehat{b}_1^*[P_\beta(\mu)] + \frac{1}{R_\beta(\mu) - 3\mu i/2} \widehat{b}_2^*[P_\beta(\mu)], \\ B = B(\mu) = \frac{i\mu}{R_\beta(\mu) - 3\mu i/2} \widehat{b}_1^*[P_\beta(\mu)] + \frac{1}{R_\beta(\mu) - 3\mu i/2} \widehat{b}_2^*[P_\beta(\mu)], \end{cases} \quad (4.51)$$

b_1^* and b_2^* are the zero extensions of b_1 and b_2 from \mathbb{R}_0^+ to \mathbb{R} , respectively.

Similar to the discussion after Lemma 4.2, we intend to extend $W_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)$ to the whole plane \mathbb{R}^2 with some specific properties. Recalling the function $K_\beta(x, \mu)$ in (4.10), we define $\Phi_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2) : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\Phi_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)(x, t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \operatorname{Re} \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^{\infty} e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} \left[e^{-i\mu x} A - e^{\frac{i\mu x}{2}} K_\beta(x, \mu) B \right] dP_\beta(\mu), \quad (4.52)$$

where A and B are as defined in (4.51). It is easily seen that when $x, t \geq 0$, $K_\beta(x, \mu) = e^{-R_\beta(\mu)x}$, so $\Phi_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)$ agrees with $W_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)$ on $\mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}_0^+$. Hence, $\Phi_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)$ is an extension of $W_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)$ to $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, if $s > -\frac{1}{2}$, then it satisfies some desired properties as shown below.

Lemma 4.10. *Let $s \in (-\frac{1}{2}, 3]$, $0 < \beta \leq 1$ and $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq \min\{1, \frac{2s+7}{12}\}$. For any $b_1 \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $b_2 \in H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ that are compatible with (4.47), the function*

$$\tilde{v}_2 := \eta(t) \Phi_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2),$$

equals $W_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)$ on $\mathbb{R}_0^+ \times [0, 1]$ and belongs to $Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1, -\beta} \cap C_x^j(\mathbb{R}; H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R}))$ for $j = 0, 1$. In addition,

the following estimates hold with some constant $C = C(s, \sigma)$.

$$\|\tilde{v}_2\|_{Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1, -\beta}} \leq C \left(\|b_1\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|b_2\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)} \right), \quad (4.53)$$

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \|\partial_x^j \tilde{v}_2\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \left(\|b_1\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|b_2\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)} \right), \quad j = 0, 1. \quad (4.54)$$

Proof. We will first establish the estimates (4.53) and (4.54) for $s \in (-\frac{1}{2}, 3] \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}\}$. Then the corresponding estimates in the case of $s = \frac{1}{2}$ or $s = \frac{3}{2}$ can be deduced by interpolating between the case $s = 0$ and the case $s = 3$. Fix $s \in (-\frac{1}{2}, 3] \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}\}$ and $0 < \beta \leq 1$. Define f_β and g_β such that $\widehat{f_\beta}(\mu) = (P_\beta)'(\mu)A$ and $\widehat{g_\beta}(\mu) = (P_\beta)'(\mu)B$, where A and B are as defined in (4.51). Then

$$\Phi_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)(x, t) = \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^{\infty} e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} \left[e^{-i\mu x} \widehat{f_\beta}(\mu) - e^{i\mu x/2} K_\beta(x, \mu) \widehat{g_\beta}(\mu) \right] d\mu.$$

Since $0 < \beta \leq 1$ and $(P_\beta)'(\mu) = 3\mu^2 - \beta$, then $|(P_\beta)'(\mu)| \sim \mu$ and $|R_\beta(\mu) - 3\mu i/2| \sim \mu$. Therefore,

$$\begin{cases} \left| (P_\beta)'(\mu) \frac{R_\beta(\mu) - i\mu/2}{R_\beta(\mu) - 3\mu i/2} \right| & \lesssim |(P_\beta)'(\mu)|^{1/2} \langle \mu \rangle, \\ \left| (P_\beta)'(\mu) \frac{i\mu}{R_\beta(\mu) - 3\mu i/2} \right| & \lesssim |(P_\beta)'(\mu)|^{1/2} \langle \mu \rangle, \\ \left| (P_\beta)'(\mu) \frac{1}{R_\beta(\mu) - 3\mu i/2} \right| & \lesssim |(P_\beta)'(\mu)|^{1/2}. \end{cases} \quad (4.55)$$

Hence, it follows from (4.55) and (4.51) that

$$|\widehat{f_\beta}(\mu)| + |\widehat{g_\beta}(\mu)| \lesssim |(P_\beta)'(\mu)|^{1/2} \left(\langle \mu \rangle \widehat{b_1^*}[P_\beta(\mu)] + \widehat{b_2^*}[P_\beta(\mu)] \right).$$

Therefore, $\langle \mu \rangle^s (|\widehat{f_\beta}(\mu)| + |\widehat{g_\beta}(\mu)|) \lesssim |(P_\beta)'(\mu)|^{1/2} (\langle \mu \rangle^{s+1} \widehat{b_1^*}[P_\beta(\mu)] + \langle \mu \rangle^s \widehat{b_2^*}[P_\beta(\mu)])$. Since $b_1 \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $b_2 \in H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ are compatible with (4.47), it then follows from Corollary 3.3 that $f_\beta, g_\beta \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$ and

$$\|f_\beta\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} + \|g_\beta\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \|b_1\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|b_2\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)}.$$

Inspired by the above observation, we define an operator \mathcal{L}_β as

$$[\mathcal{L}_\beta(f, g)](x, t) := \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^{\infty} e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} \left[e^{-i\mu x} \widehat{f}(\mu) - e^{i\mu x/2} K_\beta(x, \mu) \widehat{g}(\mu) \right] d\mu. \quad (4.56)$$

Recalling $Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1, -\beta} = X_{s, \frac{1}{2}}^{-1, -\beta} \cap \Lambda_{s, \sigma}^{-1, -\beta} \cap C_t(\mathbb{R}, H^s(\mathbb{R}))$, the proof of Lemma 4.3 reduces to establishing the following estimates for the operator \mathcal{L}_β .

$$\|\eta(t) \mathcal{L}_\beta(f, g)\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}}^{-1, -\beta}} \leq C(\|f\|_{H^s} + \|g\|_{H^s}), \quad (4.57)$$

$$\|\eta(t) \mathcal{L}_\beta(f, g)\|_{\Lambda_{s, \sigma}^{-1, -\beta}} \leq C(\|f\|_{H^s} + \|g\|_{H^s}), \quad (4.58)$$

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\eta(t) \mathcal{L}_\beta(f, g)\|_{H_x^s(\mathbb{R})} \leq C(\|f\|_{H^s} + \|g\|_{H^s}), \quad (4.59)$$

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \|\partial_x^j [\eta(t) \mathcal{L}_\beta(f, g)]\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C(\|f\|_{H^s} + \|g\|_{H^s}), \quad j = 0, 1. \quad (4.60)$$

To justify these estimates, we write $\mathcal{L}_\beta(f, g) = \mathcal{L}_{\beta,1}(f) - \mathcal{L}_{\beta,2}(g)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{L}_{\beta,1}(f)](x, t) &:= \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^{\infty} e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{-i\mu x} \widehat{f}(\mu) d\mu, \\ [\mathcal{L}_{\beta,2}(g)](x, t) &:= \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^{\infty} e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{i\mu x/2} K_\beta(x, \mu) \widehat{g}(\mu) d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

- Firstly, we define h such that $\widehat{h}(\mu) = \mathbb{1}_{\{\mu > \sqrt{\beta}\}} \widehat{f}(\mu)$. Then $\|h\|_{H^s} \leq \|f\|_{H^s}$ and it follows from (2.2) that

$$[\mathcal{L}_{\beta,1}(f)](x, t) = [W_R^{-1, -\beta}(-t)h](-x), \quad \forall x, t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Noticing that for any function $F(x, t)$, its $X_{s, \frac{1}{2}}^{-1, -\beta}$, $\Lambda_{s, \sigma}^{-1, -\beta}$, $L_t^\infty H_x^s$ and $L_x^\infty H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}$ norms are preserved under the operation $F(x, t) \rightarrow F(-x, -t)$, so the estimates (4.57)-(4.60) for $\mathcal{L}_{\beta,1}(f)$ follow from Lemma 3.4, Lemma 3.5 and the fact $\|h\|_{H^s} \leq \|f\|_{H^s}$.

- Secondly, the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\beta,2}$ is very similar to \mathcal{T}_β (see (4.15)). So by analogous arguments, the estimates (4.57)-(4.60) for $\mathcal{L}_{\beta,2}(g)$ can also be established.

Therefore, Lemma 4.10 is established. \square

Analogous to Lemma 4.3, the estimate (4.53) fails for $s < -\frac{1}{2}$, so in order to handle the case when $-\frac{3}{4} < s \leq -\frac{1}{2}$, we need another extension, denoted as $\Psi_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)$, for $W_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)$. Again, we will combine the above extension $\Phi_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)$ as in (4.52) and the construction in [BSZ06] to find it.

Lemma 4.11. *Let $-\frac{3}{4} < s \leq -\frac{1}{2}$, $0 < \beta \leq 1$, $b_1 \in H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $b_2 \in H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$. Then there exist $\sigma_2 = \sigma_2(s) > \frac{1}{2}$ and an extension $\Psi_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)$ of $W_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)$ such that for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \sigma_2]$, the function*

$$\widetilde{v}_2 := \eta(t) \Psi_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)$$

equals $W_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)$ on $\mathbb{R}_0^+ \times [0, 1]$ and belongs to $Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1, -\beta} \cap C_x^j(\mathbb{R}_0^+; H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R}))$ for $j = 0, 1$. In addition, the following estimates hold with some constant $C = C(s, \sigma)$.

$$\|\widetilde{v}_2\|_{Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1, -\beta}} \leq C \left(\|b_1\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|b_2\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)} \right), \quad (4.61)$$

$$\sup_{x \geq 0} \|\partial_x^j \widetilde{v}_2\|_{H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \left(\|b_1\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|b_2\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)} \right), \quad j = 0, 1. \quad (4.62)$$

Proof of Lemma 4.11. Recall the definition of $W_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}$ in (4.50) and write

$$\begin{aligned} W_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}(b_1, b_2)(x, t) &= \frac{1}{\pi} \operatorname{Re} \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^{\infty} e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{-i\mu x} A dP_\beta(\mu) - \frac{1}{\pi} \operatorname{Re} \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^4 e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{i\mu x/2} e^{-R_\beta(\mu)x} B dP_\beta(\mu) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\pi} \operatorname{Re} \int_4^{\infty} e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{i\mu x/2} e^{-R_\beta(\mu)x} B dP_\beta(\mu) \\ &:= I_1(x, t) - I_2(x, t) - I_3(x, t), \quad \forall x, t \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where A and B are defined as in (4.51). For $I_1(x, t)$, it is actually well defined for any $x, t \in \mathbb{R}$, so the trivial extension

$$\mathcal{E} I_1(x, t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \operatorname{Re} \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^{\infty} e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{-i\mu x} A dP_\beta(\mu), \quad \forall x, t \in \mathbb{R},$$

satisfies (4.61) and (4.62), see the estimates for the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\beta,1}$ in the proof of Lemma 4.10. For $I_2(x, t)$,

we define the extension to be

$$\mathcal{E}I_2(x, t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \operatorname{Re} \int_{\sqrt{\beta}}^4 e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{i\mu x/2} K_\beta(x, \mu) B dP_\beta(\mu), \quad \forall x, t \in \mathbb{R},$$

where K_β is as defined in (4.10). Then again, by similar argument as that in the proof of Lemma 4.10, this extension works. For $I_3(x, t)$, due to the formula (4.51) for B , we define h such that

$$\widehat{h}(\lambda) = \mathbb{1}_{\{\lambda \geq P_\beta(4)\}} \left(\frac{i\mu}{R_\beta(\mu) - 3\mu i/2} \widehat{b}_1^*(\lambda) + \frac{1}{R_\beta(\mu) - 3\mu i/2} \widehat{b}_2^*(\lambda) \right),$$

where $\mu = P_\beta^{-1}(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \geq P_\beta(4)$. This choice of h implies $\widehat{h}(P_\beta(\mu)) = \mathbb{1}_{\{\mu \geq 4\}} B$. So $I_3(x, t)$ can be rewritten as

$$I_3(x, t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \operatorname{Re} \int_4^\infty e^{iP_\beta(\mu)t} e^{i\mu x/2} e^{-R_\beta(\mu)x} \widehat{h}(P_\beta(\mu)) dP_\beta(\mu) = \frac{1}{\pi} [\mathcal{I}_{\beta, -\frac{1}{2}}(h)](x, t),$$

where the operator $\mathcal{I}_{\beta, -\frac{1}{2}}(h)$ is defined as in (4.42). Then it follows from Claim 4.7 that the extension $\mathcal{E}I_3(x, t) := \frac{1}{\pi} [\mathcal{E}\mathcal{I}_{\beta, -\frac{1}{2}}(h)](x, t)$ satisfies (4.61) and (4.62). Hence, Lemma 4.11 is verified. \square

We now at the stage to present the poof of Proposition 2.9.

Proof of Proposition 2.9. Without loss of generality, we assume $T = 1$. We then first deal with the case when $s \in (-\frac{1}{2}, 3]$. Choose $\sigma_2(s) = \min \{1, \frac{2s+7}{12}\}$ and consider any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \sigma_2(s)]$. According to the operators $\Phi_R^{-1, -b}$ and $\Phi_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta}$ in Lemma 4.8 and Lemma 4.10 respectively, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{v} &= \Gamma_\beta^-(g, q, b_1, b_2) \\ &:= \eta(t) \Phi_R^{-1, -\beta}(g, q) + \eta(t) \Phi_{bdr}^{-1, -\beta} \left(b_1 - \eta(t) \Phi_R^{-1, -\beta}(g, q) \Big|_{x=0}, b_2 - \partial_x [\eta(t) \Phi_R^{-1, -\beta}(g, q)] \Big|_{x=0} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The rest proof can be carried out by a parallel argument as that for Proposition 2.8 except we apply Lemmas 4.8, 4.10 and 4.11 instead of Lemmas 4.1, 4.3 and 4.4 respectively. \square

5 Bilinear Estimates

This section is intended to prove Proposition 2.10. Since $b \leq \frac{1}{2}$ is required to deal with the boundary integral operators, it brings two issues. First, the bilinear estimate may not be justified in the space $X_{s,b}^{\alpha,\beta}$ via the classical methods as in [Bou93b, KPV93, KPV96]. Secondly, $X_{s,b}^{\alpha,\beta}$ is not a subspace of $C_t(\mathbb{R}; H_x^s)$, so living in $X_{s,b}^{\alpha,\beta}$ may not guarantee the continuity of the solution flow. In order to overcome these two barriers, we will take advantage of the modified Fourier restriction spaces as defined in (2.6) and (2.7). On the other hand, as it is well-known that the resonance function plays an essential role in the bilinear estimates, so we first specify its definition, see e.g. [Tao01].

Definition 5.1 ([Tao01]). *Let $((\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2), (\alpha_3, \beta_3))$ be a triple in $((\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}) \times \mathbb{R})^3$. Define the resonance function H associated to this triple by*

$$H(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) = \sum_{i=1}^3 \phi^{\alpha_i, \beta_i}(\xi_i), \quad \forall (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ with } \sum_{i=1}^3 \xi_i = 0, \quad (5.1)$$

where ϕ is defined as in (2.3).

Since Proposition 2.10 contains many inequalities, we split its proof into three parts for the sake of clarity, see the following Proposition 5.2–Proposition 5.4.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $-\frac{3}{4} < s \leq 3$, $\alpha \neq 0$ and $|\beta| \leq 1$. Then there exists $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0(s, \alpha) > \frac{1}{2}$ such that for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \sigma_0]$, the following bilinear estimates*

$$\|\partial_x(w_1 w_2)\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{\alpha, \beta}} \leq C \|w_1\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \quad (5.2)$$

$$\|\partial_x(w_1 w_2)\|_{Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{\alpha, \beta}} \leq C \|w_1\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \quad (5.3)$$

hold for any $w_1, w_2 \in X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}$ with some constant $C = C(s, \alpha, \sigma)$.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $-\frac{3}{4} < s \leq 3$, $\alpha \neq 0$ and $|\beta| \leq 1$. Then there exists $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0(s, \alpha) > \frac{1}{2}$ such that for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \sigma_0]$, the following bilinear estimates*

$$\|\partial_x(w_1 w_2)\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{-\alpha, -\beta}} \leq C \|w_1\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \quad (5.4)$$

$$\|\partial_x(w_1 w_2)\|_{Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{-\alpha, -\beta}} \leq C \|w_1\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \quad (5.5)$$

hold for any $w_1, w_2 \in X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}$ with some constant $C = C(s, \alpha, \sigma)$.

Proposition 5.4. *Let $-\frac{3}{4} < s \leq 3$, $\alpha \neq 0$ and $|\beta| \leq 1$. Then there exists $\sigma_0 = \sigma_0(s, \alpha) > \frac{1}{2}$ such that for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \sigma_0]$, the following bilinear estimates*

$$\|\partial_x(w_1 w_2)\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{\alpha, \beta}} \leq C \|w_1\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}} \quad (5.6)$$

$$\|\partial_x(w_1 w_2)\|_{Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{\alpha, \beta}} \leq C \|w_1\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}} \quad (5.7)$$

hold for any $w_1 \in X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}$ and $w_2 \in X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}$ with some constant $C = C(s, \alpha, \sigma)$.

The proofs for these three propositions are similar while Proposition 5.4 is slightly more challenging since w_1 and w_2 live in different spaces. As a result, we will only prove Proposition 5.4. Before the proof, we first recall some elementary technical results.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\rho_1 \geq \rho_2 > \frac{1}{2}$ and $\rho_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy*

$$\begin{cases} \rho_3 = \rho_2 & \text{if } \rho_1 > 1, \\ \rho_3 < \rho_2 & \text{if } \rho_1 = 1, \\ \rho_3 = \rho_1 + \rho_2 - 1 & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < \rho_1 < 1, \end{cases}$$

then there exists $C = C(\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3)$ such that for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dx}{\langle x-a \rangle^{\rho_1} \langle -x-b \rangle^{\rho_2}} \leq \frac{C}{\langle a+b \rangle^{\rho_3}}. \quad (5.8)$$

The proof for this lemma is standard (see e.g. [ET16, KPV96]) and therefore omitted, we just want to remark that $\langle a+b \rangle = \langle (x-a) + (-x-b) \rangle$.

Lemma 5.6. *If $\rho > \frac{1}{2}$, then there exists $C = C(\rho)$ such that for any $\sigma_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ($0 \leq i \leq 2$) with $\sigma_2 \neq 0$,*

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dx}{\langle \sigma_2 x^2 + \sigma_1 x + \sigma_0 \rangle^{\rho}} \leq \frac{C}{|\sigma_2|^{1/2}}. \quad (5.9)$$

Similarly, if $\rho > \frac{1}{3}$, then there exists $C = C(\rho)$ such that for any $\sigma_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ($0 \leq i \leq 3$) with $\sigma_3 \neq 0$,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dx}{\langle \sigma_3 x^3 + \sigma_2 x^2 + \sigma_1 x + \sigma_0 \rangle^\rho} \leq \frac{C}{|\sigma_3|^{1/3}}. \quad (5.10)$$

Proof. We refer the reader to the proof of Lemma 2.5 in [BOP97] where (5.10) was proved. The similar argument can also be applied to obtain (5.9). \square

For the proof of the bilinear estimate, it is usually beneficial to reduce it to an estimate of some weighted convolution of L^2 functions as pointed out in [Tao01, CKS⁺03]. The next lemma illustrates this in a general situation. For the convenience of notations, we denote $\vec{\xi} = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)$, $\vec{\tau} = (\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3)$ and

$$A := \left\{ (\vec{\xi}, \vec{\tau}) \in \mathbb{R}^6 : \sum_{i=1}^3 \xi_i = \sum_{i=1}^3 \tau_i = 0 \right\}. \quad (5.11)$$

Lemma 5.7. *Let $(\alpha_i, \beta_i) \in (\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}) \times \mathbb{R}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$. Then the bilinear estimate*

$$\|\partial_x(w_1 w_2)\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{\alpha_3, \beta_3}} \leq C \|w_1\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha_1, \beta_1}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha_2, \beta_2}}, \quad \forall w_1 \in X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha_1, \beta_1}, w_2 \in X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha_2, \beta_2},$$

is equivalent to

$$\int_A \frac{\xi_3 \langle \xi_3 \rangle^s \prod_{i=1}^3 f_i(\xi_i, \tau_i)}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^s \langle \xi_2 \rangle^s M_1 M_2 \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma}} \leq C \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_{L_{\xi_\tau}^2}, \quad \forall f_i \in L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}), \quad i = 1, 2, 3,$$

where $L_i = \tau_i - \phi^{\alpha_i, \beta_i}(\xi_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, and

$$M_1 = \langle L_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{e^{|\xi_1|} \leq 3 + |\tau_1|\}} \langle L_1 \rangle^\sigma, \quad M_2 = \langle L_2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{e^{|\xi_2|} \leq 3 + |\tau_2|\}} \langle L_2 \rangle^\sigma.$$

Similarly, the bilinear estimate

$$\|\partial_x(w_1 w_2)\|_{Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{\alpha_3, \beta_3}} \leq C \|w_1\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha_1, \beta_1}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha_2, \beta_2}}, \quad \forall w_1 \in X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha_1, \beta_1}, w_2 \in X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha_2, \beta_2},$$

is equivalent to

$$\int_A \frac{\xi_3 \langle \tau_3 \rangle^{\frac{s}{3} + \frac{1}{2} - \sigma} \prod_{i=1}^3 f_i(\xi_i, \tau_i)}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^s \langle \xi_2 \rangle^s M_1 M_2 \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma}} \leq C \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_{L_{\xi_\tau}^2}, \quad \forall f_i \in L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}), \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Proof. The proof is straightforward by using duality and Plancherel theorem. The details are omitted since the argument is standard, see e.g. [Tao01, CKS⁺03]. \square

Now we are ready to verify Proposition 5.4.

Proof of Proposition 5.4. The triple $((\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2), (\alpha_3, \beta_3))$ associated to the bilinear estimates (5.6) and (5.7) is

$$(\alpha_1, \beta_1) = (\alpha, \beta), \quad (\alpha_2, \beta_2) = (-\alpha, -\beta), \quad (\alpha_3, \beta_3) = (\alpha, \beta).$$

Define the set A as in (5.11). For any $(\vec{\xi}, \vec{\tau}) \in A$, let

$$L_1 := \tau_1 - \phi^{\alpha, \beta}(\xi_1), \quad L_2 := \tau_2 - \phi^{-\alpha, -\beta}(\xi_2), \quad L_3 := \tau_3 - \phi^{\alpha, \beta}(\xi_3). \quad (5.12)$$

According to Definition 5.1, the resonance function $H = H(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)$ has the property that $H = -\sum_{i=1}^3 L_i$ and has the following formula.

$$H(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) = -\alpha\xi_2(2\xi_2^2 + 3\xi_1\xi_2 + 3\xi_1^2) + 2\beta\xi_2, \quad \forall \sum_{i=1}^3 \xi_i = 0. \quad (5.13)$$

If (ξ_3, τ_3) is fixed, then by substituting $(\xi_2, \tau_2) = -(\xi_1 + \xi_3, \tau_1 + \tau_3)$, $L_1 + L_2$ can be viewed as a function in ξ_1 :

$$L_1 + L_2 = P(\xi_1) := -2\alpha\xi_1^3 - 3\alpha\xi_3\xi_1^2 + (-3\alpha\xi_3^2 + 2\beta)\xi_1 + \phi^{-\alpha, -\beta}(\xi_3) - \tau_3. \quad (5.14)$$

Taking the derivative of P with respect to ξ_1 yields

$$P'(\xi_1) = -3\alpha(2\xi_1^2 + 2\xi_3\xi_1 + \xi_3^2) + 2\beta. \quad (5.15)$$

Similarly, if (ξ_1, τ_1) is fixed, then by substituting $(\xi_3, \tau_3) = -(\xi_1 + \xi_2, \tau_1 + \tau_2)$, $L_2 + L_3$ can be viewed as a function in ξ_2 :

$$L_2 + L_3 = Q(\xi_2) := 2\alpha\xi_2^3 + 3\alpha\xi_1\xi_2^2 + (3\alpha\xi_1^2 - 2\beta)\xi_2 + \phi^{\alpha, \beta}(\xi_1) - \tau_1. \quad (5.16)$$

Taking the derivative of Q with respect to ξ_2 yields

$$Q'(\xi_2) = 3\alpha(2\xi_2^2 + 2\xi_1\xi_2 + \xi_1^2) - 2\beta. \quad (5.17)$$

Finally, if (ξ_2, τ_2) is fixed, then by substituting $(\xi_1, \tau_1) = -(\xi_2 + \xi_3, \tau_2 + \tau_3)$, $L_3 + L_1$ can be viewed as a function in ξ_3 :

$$L_3 + L_1 = R(\xi_3) := 3\alpha\xi_2\xi_3^2 + 3\alpha\xi_2^2\xi_3 + \phi^{\alpha, \beta}(\xi_2) - \tau_2. \quad (5.18)$$

Taking the derivative of R with respect to ξ_3 yields

$$R'(\xi_3) = 3\alpha\xi_2(2\xi_3 + \xi_2). \quad (5.19)$$

These formulas (5.14)–(5.19) will play an important role in this section.

On the other hand, since $|\beta| \leq 1$ and $2\xi_2^2 + 3\xi_1\xi_2^2 + 3\xi_1^2 \geq (\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2)/2$, it follows from formula (5.13) and the fact $\sum_{i=1}^3 \xi_i = 0$ that

$$|H(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)| \gtrsim_\alpha |\xi_2| \sum_{i=1}^3 \langle \xi_i \rangle^2 \quad (5.20)$$

as long as $\sum_{i=1}^3 |\xi_i| \geq C_1$ for some constant $C_1 = C_1(\alpha)$. Analogously, based on (5.15) and (5.17), there exists a constant $C_2 = C_2(\alpha)$ such that if $\sum_{i=1}^3 |\xi_i| \geq C_2$, then

$$|P'(\xi_1)| \gtrsim_\alpha \sum_{i=1}^3 \langle \xi_i \rangle^2 \quad \text{and} \quad |Q'(\xi_2)| \gtrsim_\alpha \sum_{i=1}^3 \langle \xi_i \rangle^2. \quad (5.21)$$

Define $C^* = \max\{4, C_1, C_2\}$ and fix it in the rest of this section. Next, we will prove (5.6) first and then justify (5.7). For ease of notations, the dependence of constants on s, α, σ may not be explicitly shown.

Proof of (5.6). By Lemma 5.7, it suffices to prove for any $\{f_i\}_{i=1,2,3} \subset L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$,

$$\int_A \frac{\xi_3 \langle \xi_3 \rangle^s \prod_{i=1}^3 f_i(\xi_i, \tau_i)}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^s \langle \xi_2 \rangle^s M_1 M_2 \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma}} \leq C \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_{L_{\xi_\tau}^2},$$

where A is defined as in (5.11),

$$M_1 = \langle L_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{e^{|\xi_1|} \leq 3 + |\tau_1|\}} \langle L_1 \rangle^\sigma \quad \text{and} \quad M_2 = \langle L_2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{e^{|\xi_2|} \leq 3 + |\tau_2|\}} \langle L_2 \rangle^\sigma. \quad (5.22)$$

Noticing $\langle \xi_3 \rangle \leq \langle \xi_1 \rangle \langle \xi_2 \rangle$, it suffices to consider the case when s is close to $-\frac{3}{4}$. Without loss of generality, we assume $-\frac{3}{4} < s \leq -\frac{9}{16}$ and denote $\rho = -s$. Then $\frac{9}{16} \leq \rho < \frac{3}{4}$ and it reduces to show

$$\int_A \frac{|\xi_3| \langle \xi_1 \rangle^\rho \langle \xi_2 \rangle^\rho \prod_{i=1}^3 |f_i(\xi_i, \tau_i)|}{\langle \xi_3 \rangle^\rho M_1 M_2 \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma}} \leq C \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_{L_{\xi\tau}^2}. \quad (5.23)$$

Define

$$\sigma_0 = \frac{7}{12} - \frac{\rho}{9}. \quad (5.24)$$

Then (5.23) will be justified for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \sigma_0]$. The choice of σ_0 in (5.24) implies

$$\sigma \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\rho+1}{3}, \frac{7}{12} - \frac{\rho}{9} \right\}. \quad (5.25)$$

The remaining proof will be divided into three cases depending on the size of the resonance function H . The first case is when $\sum_{i=1}^3 |\xi_i|$ is small which does not guarantee the estimate (5.20). The second case is when $\sum_{i=1}^3 |\xi_i|$ is large enough but $|\xi_2|$ is small, so although the estimate (5.20) holds, the lower bound in (5.20) may be small. It is this step that forces to use the modified Fourier restriction space. The last case is when $\sum_{i=1}^3 |\xi_i|$ is large enough and $|\xi_2|$ is not too small, so estimate (5.20) holds with a large lower bound. In the following, we will show more details.

- **Case 1:** $\sum_{i=1}^3 |\xi_i| \leq C^*$.

Although there is no effective lower bound for H in this case, the LHS of (5.23) can be greatly simplified by dropping all norms of $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^3$ and it suffices to prove

$$\int \frac{\prod_{i=1}^3 |f_i(\xi_i, \tau_i)|}{\langle L_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle L_2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma}} \leq C \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_{L_{\xi\tau}^2}. \quad (5.26)$$

In the following, we will adopt the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality argument as in [KPV96].

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS of (5.26)} &= \iint \frac{|f_3|}{\langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma}} \left(\iint \frac{|f_1 f_2|}{\langle L_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle L_2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}} d\tau_1 d\xi_1 \right) d\tau_3 d\xi_3 \\ &\lesssim \iint \frac{|f_3|}{\langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma}} \left(\iint \frac{d\tau_1 d\xi_1}{\langle L_1 \rangle \langle L_2 \rangle} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\iint f_1^2 f_2^2 d\tau_1 d\xi_1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} d\tau_3 d\xi_3. \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

If

$$\sup_{\xi_3, \tau_3} \frac{1}{\langle L_3 \rangle^{2(1-\sigma)}} \iint \frac{d\tau_1 d\xi_1}{\langle L_1 \rangle \langle L_2 \rangle} \leq C, \quad (5.28)$$

then it follows from (5.27) and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that

$$\text{RHS of (5.27)} \lesssim \iint |f_3| \left(\iint f_1^2 f_2^2 d\tau_1 d\xi_1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} d\tau_3 d\xi_3 \leq \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_{L^2}. \quad (5.29)$$

So it remains to verify (5.28). Noticing

$$L_1 = \tau_1 - \phi^{\alpha, \beta}(\xi_1), \quad L_2 = \tau_2 - \phi^{-\alpha, -\beta}(\xi_2) = -\tau_1 - \tau_3 - \phi^{\alpha, \beta}(\xi_1 + \xi_3),$$

then it follows from Lemma 5.5 (with $\rho_1 = \rho_2 = 1$, $\rho_3 = 2 - 2\sigma$) that

$$\text{LHS of (5.28)} \lesssim \sup_{\xi_3, \tau_3} \frac{1}{\langle L_3 \rangle^{2(1-\sigma)}} \int \frac{d\xi_1}{\langle L_1 + L_2 \rangle^{2-2\sigma}}. \quad (5.30)$$

Recalling (5.14), $L_1 + L_2 = P(\xi_1)$ is a cubic polynomial in ξ_1 , so it follows from $2 - 2\sigma > \frac{1}{3}$ and Lemma 5.6 that the right hand side of (5.30) is bounded.

- **Case 2:** $\sum_{i=1}^3 |\xi_i| > C^*$ and $|\xi_2| \leq 1$.

In this case, $|\xi_1| \sim |\xi_3| \geq 1$ since $C^* \geq 4$. In addition, thanks to the modified Fourier restriction space, we now have $M_2 \geq \langle L_2 \rangle^\sigma$. So the proof of (5.23) reduces to show

$$\int \frac{|\xi_3| \prod_{i=1}^3 |f_i(\xi_i, \tau_i)|}{\langle L_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle L_2 \rangle^\sigma \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma}} \leq C \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_{L_{\xi_\tau}^2}. \quad (5.31)$$

- **Case 2.1:** $\langle L_1 \rangle \leq \langle L_3 \rangle$.

The key strategy is to adjust the term $\langle L_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in the denominator in (5.31) to be $\langle L_1 \rangle^\sigma$ whose power σ is larger than $\frac{1}{2}$. Actually, since $\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2} + (1 - \sigma) = \sigma + (\frac{3}{2} - 2\sigma)$, we deduce

$$\frac{1}{\langle L_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma}} \leq \frac{1}{\langle L_1 \rangle^\sigma \langle L_3 \rangle^{\frac{3}{2}-2\sigma}}.$$

So in order to prove (5.31), it suffices to establish

$$\int \frac{|\xi_3| |f_3|}{\langle L_3 \rangle^{\frac{3}{2}-2\sigma}} \frac{|f_1 f_2|}{(\langle L_1 \rangle \langle L_2 \rangle)^\sigma} \leq C \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_{L^2}.$$

Analogous to the Cauchy-Schwarz argument in Case 1, it remains to verify

$$\sup_{\xi_3, \tau_3} \frac{\xi_3^2}{\langle L_3 \rangle^{3-4\sigma}} \int \frac{d\tau_1 d\xi_1}{(\langle L_1 \rangle \langle L_2 \rangle)^{2\sigma}} \leq C. \quad (5.32)$$

It then follows from $2\sigma > 1$ and Lemma 5.8 that

$$\int \frac{d\tau_1 d\xi_1}{(\langle L_1 \rangle \langle L_2 \rangle)^{2\sigma}} \lesssim \int \frac{d\xi_1}{(\langle P(\xi_1) \rangle)^{2\sigma}},$$

where $P(\xi_1) = L_1 + L_2$ is as defined in (5.14). Thus, it suffices to establish

$$\sup_{\xi_3, \tau_3} \frac{\xi_3^2}{\langle L_3 \rangle^{3-4\sigma}} \int \frac{d\xi_1}{\langle P(\xi_1) \rangle^{2\sigma}} \leq C. \quad (5.33)$$

Since $\sum_{i=1}^3 |\xi_i| > C^*$, it follows from (5.21) that $|P'(\xi_1)| \gtrsim \sum_{i=1}^3 \xi_i^2$. Therefore,

$$\text{LHS of (5.32)} = \sup_{\xi_3, \tau_3} \frac{1}{\langle L_3 \rangle^{3-4\sigma}} \int \frac{\xi_3^2}{|P'(\xi_1)|} \frac{|P'(\xi_1)|}{\langle P(\xi_1) \rangle^{2\sigma}} d\xi_1 \lesssim \int \frac{|P'(\xi_1)|}{\langle P(\xi_1) \rangle^{2\sigma}} d\xi_1 \leq C.$$

- **Case 2.2:** $\langle L_3 \rangle \leq \langle L_1 \rangle$. This case can be verified using similar argument as in Case 2.1.

- **Case 3:** $\sum_{i=1}^3 |\xi_i| > C^*$ and $|\xi_2| > 1$.

In this case, $|\xi_2| \sim \langle \xi_2 \rangle$, so it suffices to prove

$$\int \frac{|\xi_3| \langle \xi_1 \rangle^\rho |\xi_2|^\rho \prod_{i=1}^3 |f_i(\xi_i, \tau_i)|}{\langle \xi_3 \rangle^\rho \langle L_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle L_2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma}} \leq C \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_{L_{\xi_\tau}^2}. \quad (5.34)$$

Define

$$\text{MAX} = \max\{\langle L_1 \rangle, \langle L_2 \rangle, \langle L_3 \rangle\}. \quad (5.35)$$

Since $H = -\sum_{i=1}^3 L_i$ and $\sum_{i=1}^3 |\xi_i| > C^*$, it follows from (5.20) that $\text{MAX} \gtrsim \langle H \rangle \gtrsim |\xi_2| \sum_{i=1}^3 \langle \xi_i \rangle^2$. Next, we will further decompose the proof into three cases depending on which L_i equals MAX.

– **Case 3.1:** $\langle L_1 \rangle = \text{MAX}$.

In this case, $\langle L_1 \rangle = \text{MAX} \gtrsim |\xi_2| \sum_{i=1}^3 \langle \xi_i \rangle^2$. The key strategy is again to adjust the terms $\langle L_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\langle L_2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in the denominator in (5.34) to be $\langle L_1 \rangle^\sigma$ and $\langle L_2 \rangle^\sigma$ whose power σ is larger than $\frac{1}{2}$. Meanwhile, it follows from $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + (1 - \sigma) = (2 - 3\sigma) + \sigma + \sigma$ that

$$\frac{1}{\langle L_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle L_2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma}} \leq \frac{1}{\langle L_1 \rangle^{2-3\sigma} (\langle L_2 \rangle \langle L_3 \rangle)^\sigma}.$$

Then similar as before, it suffices to establish

$$\sup_{\xi_1, \tau_1} \frac{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^{2\rho}}{\langle L_1 \rangle^{4-6\sigma}} \int \frac{|\xi_2|^{2\rho} \xi_3^2}{\langle \xi_3 \rangle^{2\rho} \langle Q(\xi_2) \rangle^{2\sigma}} d\xi_2 \leq C, \quad (5.36)$$

where $Q(\xi_2) = L_2 + L_3$ is as defined in (5.16). Since $\sum_{i=1}^3 |\xi_i| > C^*$, then $|Q'(\xi_2)| \gtrsim \sum_{i=1}^3 \langle \xi_i \rangle^2$. Combining with the relation $\langle L_1 \rangle \gtrsim |\xi_2| \sum_{i=1}^3 \langle \xi_i \rangle^2$, we find

$$\frac{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^{2\rho} |\xi_2|^{2\rho} \xi_3^2}{\langle \xi_3 \rangle^{2\rho}} \lesssim \langle L_1 \rangle^{2-2\rho} |Q'(\xi_2)|.$$

As a result,

$$\text{LHS of (5.36)} \lesssim \sup_{\xi_1, \tau_1} \frac{\langle L_1 \rangle^{2-2\rho}}{\langle L_1 \rangle^{4-6\sigma}} \int \frac{|Q'(\xi_2)|}{\langle Q(\xi_2) \rangle^{2\sigma}} d\xi_2 \lesssim \sup_{\xi_1, \tau_1} \frac{\langle L_1 \rangle^{2-2\rho}}{\langle L_1 \rangle^{4-6\sigma}}. \quad (5.37)$$

Thanks to (5.25), the right hand side of (5.37) is bounded.

– **Case 3.2:** $\langle L_2 \rangle = \text{MAX}$.

Similar to Case 3.1, we have $\langle L_2 \rangle \gtrsim |\xi_2| \sum_{i=1}^3 \langle \xi_i \rangle^2$ and it suffices to justify

$$\sup_{\xi_2, \tau_2} \frac{|\xi_2|^{2\rho}}{\langle L_2 \rangle^{4-6\sigma}} \int \frac{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^{2\rho} \xi_3^2}{\langle \xi_3 \rangle^{2\rho} \langle R(\xi_3) \rangle^{2\sigma}} d\xi_3 \leq C, \quad (5.38)$$

where $R(\xi_3) = L_3 + L_1$ is as defined in (5.18).

If $|2\xi_3 + \xi_2| \geq \frac{1}{10} \langle \xi_1 \rangle$, then it follows from (5.19) that $|R'(\xi_3)| \gtrsim |\xi_2| \langle \xi_1 \rangle$, so

$$\frac{|\xi_2|^{2\rho} \langle \xi_1 \rangle^{2\rho} \xi_3^2}{\langle \xi_3 \rangle^{2\rho}} \lesssim \langle L_2 \rangle^{2-2\rho} |R'(\xi_3)|.$$

Consequently,

$$\text{LHS of (5.38)} \lesssim \sup_{\xi_2, \tau_2} \frac{\langle L_2 \rangle^{2-2\rho}}{\langle L_2 \rangle^{4-6\sigma}} \int \frac{|R'(\xi_3)|}{\langle R(\xi_3) \rangle^{2\sigma}} d\xi_3 \lesssim \sup_{\xi_2, \tau_2} \frac{\langle L_2 \rangle^{2-2\rho}}{\langle L_2 \rangle^{4-6\sigma}} \leq C, \quad (5.39)$$

where the last inequality is due to (5.25). If $|2\xi_3 + \xi_2| \leq \frac{1}{10}\langle \xi_1 \rangle$, then $|\xi_1| \sim |\xi_2| \sim |\xi_3|$ and

$$\frac{|\xi_2|^{2\rho} \langle \xi_1 \rangle^{2\rho} \xi_3^2}{\langle \xi_3 \rangle^{2\rho}} \lesssim |\xi_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle L_2 \rangle^{\frac{2\rho}{3} + \frac{1}{2}}.$$

As a result,

$$\text{LHS of (5.38)} \lesssim \sup_{\xi_2, \tau_2} \frac{|\xi_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle L_2 \rangle^{\frac{2\rho}{3} + \frac{1}{2}}}{\langle L_2 \rangle^{4-6\sigma}} \int \frac{d\xi_3}{\langle R(\xi_3) \rangle^{2\sigma}}. \quad (5.40)$$

It then follows from (5.18) and Lemma 5.6 and that $\int \frac{d\xi_3}{\langle R(\xi_3) \rangle^{2\sigma}} \lesssim |\xi_2|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, so

$$\text{RHS of (5.40)} \lesssim \sup_{\xi_2, \tau_2} \frac{\langle L_2 \rangle^{\frac{2\rho}{3} + \frac{1}{2}}}{\langle L_2 \rangle^{4-6\sigma}} \leq C,$$

where the last inequality is due to (5.25).

– **Case 3.3:** $\langle L_3 \rangle = \text{MAX}$. This case can be demonstrated via parallel argument as in Case 3.1.

□

Proof of (5.7). Thanks to Lemma 5.7, it suffices to prove

$$\int_A \frac{|\xi_3| \langle \tau_3 \rangle^{\frac{s}{3} + \frac{1}{2} - \sigma} \prod_{i=1}^3 |f_i(\xi_i, \tau_i)|}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^s \langle \xi_2 \rangle^s M_1 M_2 \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma}} \leq C \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_{L_{\xi_\tau}^2}, \quad (5.41)$$

where M_1, M_2 are as defined in (5.22). It suffices to consider the case $-\frac{3}{4} < s \leq -\frac{9}{16}$ and the case $s = 3$ since

$$\left(\frac{\langle \tau_3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}}}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle \langle \xi_2 \rangle} \right)^s \leq \left(\frac{\langle \tau_3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}}}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle \langle \xi_2 \rangle} \right)^{-\frac{9}{16}} + \left(\frac{\langle \tau_3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}}}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle \langle \xi_2 \rangle} \right)^3$$

for any $-\frac{9}{16} < s < 3$.

For the case of $-\frac{3}{4} < s \leq -\frac{9}{16}$, let $\rho = -s$. Then $\frac{9}{16} \leq \rho < \frac{3}{4}$ and (5.41) becomes

$$\int_A \frac{|\xi_3| \langle \xi_1 \rangle^\rho \langle \xi_2 \rangle^\rho \prod_{i=1}^3 |f_i(\xi_i, \tau_i)|}{\langle \tau_3 \rangle^{\frac{\rho}{3} + \sigma - \frac{1}{2}} M_1 M_2 \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma}} \leq C \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_{L_{\xi_\tau}^2}, \quad (5.42)$$

Denote $\sigma_0 = \frac{7}{12} - \frac{\rho}{9}$ as in (5.24). Then (5.42) will be proved for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \sigma_0]$. Noticing that this choice of σ_0 not only implies (5.25) but also guarantees

$$\sigma \leq \frac{2}{3} - \frac{2\rho}{9}. \quad (5.43)$$

Firstly, in the region where $\langle \tau_3 \rangle \gtrsim \langle \xi_3 \rangle^3$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\langle \tau \rangle^{\frac{\rho}{3} + \sigma - \frac{1}{2}}} \leq \frac{1}{\langle \tau \rangle^{\frac{\rho}{3}}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\langle \xi_3 \rangle^\rho},$$

so (5.42) holds as a corollary of (5.23). Then it suffices to consider the region where $\langle \tau_3 \rangle \ll \langle \xi_3 \rangle^3$. Because of this simplification, we can assume

$$|\xi_3| \gg 1, \quad |\xi_3| > C^*, \quad |L_3| = |\tau_3 - \phi^{\alpha, \beta}(\xi_3)| \sim |\xi_3|^3. \quad (5.44)$$

Consequently, it follows from (5.20) and (5.21) that

$$|H| \sim |\xi_2| \sum_{i=1}^3 \xi_i^2, \quad |P'(\xi_1)| \gtrsim \sum_{i=1}^3 \xi_i^2, \quad |Q'(\xi_2)| \gtrsim \sum_{i=1}^3 \xi_i^2. \quad (5.45)$$

Thanks to (5.44) and (5.45), we will actually prove (5.46) which is a stronger estimate than (5.42).

$$\int \frac{|\xi_3| \langle \xi_1 \rangle^\rho \langle \xi_2 \rangle^\rho \prod_{i=1}^3 |f_i(\xi_i, \tau_i)|}{\langle L_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle L_2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma}} \leq C \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_{L_{\xi\tau}^2}. \quad (5.46)$$

Since $\langle L_3 \rangle \sim |\xi_3|^3$, the justification of (5.46) depends essentially on how large $|\xi_3|$ is. By dividing the integral region into two parts: $|\xi_3| \gtrsim \min\{|\xi_1|, |\xi_2|\}$ and $|\xi_3| \ll \min\{|\xi_1|, |\xi_2|\}$, we can establish (5.46) via similar argument as that in the proof of (5.6).

For the case of $s = 3$, (5.41) becomes

$$\int_A \frac{|\xi_3| \langle \tau_3 \rangle^{\frac{3}{2}-\sigma} \prod_{i=1}^3 |f_i(\xi_i, \tau_i)|}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^3 \langle \xi_2 \rangle^3 M_1 M_2 \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma}} \leq C \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_{L_{\xi\tau}^2}, \quad (5.47)$$

where

$$M_1 = \langle L_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{e|\xi_1| \leq 3+|\tau_1|\}} \langle L_1 \rangle^\sigma \quad \text{and} \quad M_2 = \langle L_2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{e|\xi_2| \leq 3+|\tau_2|\}} \langle L_2 \rangle^\sigma$$

are defined as in (5.22). Define

$$\sigma_0 = \frac{7}{12} - \frac{1}{9} \cdot \frac{9}{16} = \frac{25}{48}.$$

Then (5.23) can be verified for $\rho = \frac{9}{16}$ (i.e. $s = -\frac{9}{16}$), and therefore also holds for $\rho = -3$ (i.e. $s = 3$). Taking advantage of this result, we will justify (5.47) for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{25}{48}]$. Firstly, if $\langle \tau_3 \rangle \lesssim \langle \xi_3 \rangle^3$, then (5.47) holds as a corollary of (5.23), so we assume $\langle \tau_3 \rangle \gg \langle \xi_3 \rangle^3$ in the following. In particular, this assumption implies $\langle \tau_3 \rangle \sim \langle L_3 \rangle$. Then (5.47) reduces to

$$\int \frac{|\xi_3| \langle \tau_3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \prod_{i=1}^3 |f_i(\xi_i, \tau_i)|}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^3 \langle \xi_2 \rangle^3 M_1 M_2} \leq C \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_{L_{\xi\tau}^2}. \quad (5.48)$$

The key observation in the rest proof is

$$\langle \xi_1 \rangle^3 + \langle \xi_2 \rangle^3 + \langle L_1 \rangle + \langle L_2 \rangle \geq \langle \tau_3 \rangle. \quad (5.49)$$

Based on this observation, we divide the proof into two cases.

- Case 1: $\langle \xi_1 \rangle^3 \gtrsim |\tau_3|$ or $\langle \xi_2 \rangle^3 \gtrsim |\tau_3|$.

We will only prove for the case $\langle \xi_1 \rangle^3 \gtrsim |\tau_3|$ since the other case is similar. Under this assumption, we have $\langle \tau_3 \rangle^{1/2} \lesssim \langle \xi_1 \rangle^{3/2}$. Moreover, since $|\xi_3| \lesssim \langle \xi_1 \rangle \langle \xi_2 \rangle$, it suffices to show

$$\int \frac{\prod_{i=1}^3 |f_i(\xi_i, \tau_i)|}{\langle \xi_2 \rangle^2 \langle L_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle L_2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_{L_{\xi\tau}^2} \quad (5.50)$$

in order to prove (5.48). Similar as before, it remains to establish

$$\sup_{\xi_3, \tau_3} \iint \frac{d\tau_2 d\xi_2}{\langle \xi_2 \rangle^4 \langle L_1 \rangle \langle L_2 \rangle} \leq C. \quad (5.51)$$

By Lemma 5.5, $\int \frac{1}{\langle L_1 \rangle \langle L_2 \rangle} d\tau_2 \lesssim \langle L_1 + L_2 \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} \leq 1$, so

$$\text{LHS of (5.51)} \lesssim \sup_{\xi_3, \tau_3} \int \frac{d\xi_2}{\langle \xi_2 \rangle^4} \lesssim 1.$$

- Case 2: $\langle \xi_1 \rangle^3 \ll |\tau_3|$, $\langle \xi_2 \rangle^3 \ll |\tau_3|$ and $\langle L_1 \rangle \geq \langle L_2 \rangle$.

The assumptions in this case and the key observation (5.49) together imply

$$\langle L_1 \rangle \geq \frac{1}{4} \langle \tau_3 \rangle, \quad |\tau_1| \sim \langle L_1 \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad |\tau_1| \gg \langle \xi_1 \rangle^3. \quad (5.52)$$

- Case 2.1: $e^{|\xi_1|} \leq 3 + |\tau_1|$. Thanks to the definition of M_1 , this case implies $M_1 \geq \langle L_1 \rangle^\sigma \gtrsim |\tau_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle L_2 \rangle^{\sigma - \frac{1}{2}}$. So

$$\text{LHS of (5.48)} \lesssim \int \frac{|\xi_3| \prod_{i=1}^3 |f_i(\xi_i, \tau_i)|}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^3 \langle \xi_2 \rangle^3 \langle L_2 \rangle^\sigma}.$$

Since $|\xi_3| \lesssim \langle \xi_1 \rangle \langle \xi_2 \rangle$, it then remains to establish $\sup_{\xi_3, \tau_3} \iint \frac{1}{\langle \xi_2 \rangle^4 \langle L_2 \rangle^{2\sigma}} d\tau_2 d\xi_2 \leq C$, which is obvious due to $\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$.

- Case 2.2: $e^{|\xi_1|} > 3 + |\tau_1|$. In this case, $M_1 = \langle L_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \gtrsim |\tau_3|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $|\xi_1| > \ln(3 + |\tau_1|)$. In addition, because of (5.52), we have

$$|\xi_1| \gtrsim \ln(3 + |L_1|) \geq \ln(3 + |L_2|). \quad (5.53)$$

As a result,

$$\frac{|\xi_3| \langle \tau_3 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^3 \langle \xi_2 \rangle^3 M_1} \lesssim \frac{1}{\langle \xi_1 \rangle^2 \langle \xi_2 \rangle^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{[\ln(3 + |L_2|)]^2 \langle \xi_2 \rangle^2}.$$

Hence,

$$\text{LHS of (5.48)} \lesssim \int \frac{\prod_{i=1}^3 |f_i(\xi_i, \tau_i)|}{\langle \xi_2 \rangle^2 \langle L_2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} [\ln(3 + |L_2|)]^2}.$$

Similar as before, it remains to show

$$\sup_{\xi_3, \tau_3} \iint \frac{d\tau_2 d\xi_2}{\langle \xi_2 \rangle^4 \langle L_2 \rangle [\ln(3 + |L_2|)]^4} \leq C. \quad (5.54)$$

Noticing

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d\tau_2}{\langle L_2 \rangle [\ln(3 + |L_2|)]^4} = 2 \int_0^\infty \frac{dx}{(1+x) [\ln(3+x)]^4} < \infty,$$

so

$$\text{LHS of (5.54)} \lesssim \int \frac{d\xi_2}{\langle \xi_2 \rangle^4} \leq C.$$

□

Thus, the proof of Proposition 5.4 is finished. \square

6 Well-posedness

This section is devoted to the verification of Theorem 1.4. Equivalently, we will justify Theorem 2.3, Theorem 2.5 and Theorem 2.6.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Without loss of generality, we assume $T = 1$. Let $s \in (-\frac{3}{4}, 3]$ and $\beta \in (0, 1]$ be given. Define

$$\sigma = \min \{ \sigma_1(s), \sigma_2(s), \sigma_0(s, 1), \sigma_0(s, -1) \},$$

where $\sigma_1(s)$ and $\sigma_2(s)$ are the thresholds as in Proposition 2.8 and Proposition 2.9, and $\sigma_0(s, 1), \sigma_0(s, -1)$ are the thresholds as in Proposition 2.10 when $\alpha = 1$ or -1 . Then $\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$ and σ only depends on s , so in the following, the dependence of any constant on σ will be considered as the dependence on s . The choice of r will be determined later, see (6.6).

Define the space \mathcal{Y} to be $Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1, \beta}(\Omega_1) \times Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1, -\beta}(\Omega_1)$ equipped with the product norm. Denote

$$E_0 = \|(p, q)\|_{\mathcal{H}_x(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|(a, b, c)\|_{\mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)}.$$

Then it follows from the assumption that $E_0 \leq r$. Define $\mathcal{B}_{C^*} = \{(u, v) \in \mathcal{Y} : \|(u, v)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq C^*\}$. We will choose suitable C^* and r to guarantee the existence of a solution in the space \mathcal{B}_{C^*} . For any $(u, v) \in \mathcal{B}_{C^*}$, denote

$$f(u, v) = -3uu_x - (uv)_x + vv_x, \quad g(u, v) = uu_x - (uv)_x - 3vv_x. \quad (6.1)$$

Then we infer from Proposition 2.10 that $f \in X_{s, \sigma-1}^{1, \beta}(\Omega_1) \cap Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{1, \beta}(\Omega_1)$ and $g \in X_{s, \sigma-1}^{-1, -\beta}(\Omega_1) \cap Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{-1, -\beta}(\Omega_1)$.

Since the data (p, q) and (a, b, c) are compatible for (1.5), then it implies p and a are compatible for (2.16). So according to Proposition 2.8, we define $\tilde{u} = \Gamma_{\beta}^+(f, p, a)$. By the properties of $\Gamma_{\beta}^+(f, p, a)$ stated in Proposition 2.8, $\tilde{u}_x(0, t)$ is well-defined and belongs to $H_t^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R})$. Then again the compatibility of (p, q) and (a, b, c) for (1.5) implies the compatibility of q and $b, c + \tilde{u}_x|_{x=0}$. So based on Proposition 2.9, we define $\tilde{v} = \Gamma_{\beta}^-(g, q, b, c + \tilde{u}_x|_{x=0})$. Combining Γ_{β}^+ and Γ_{β}^- together, we define $\Gamma(u, v) = (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})$, where

$$\tilde{u} = \Gamma_{\beta}^+(f, p, a), \quad \tilde{v} = \Gamma_{\beta}^-(g, q, b, c + \tilde{u}_x|_{x=0}). \quad (6.2)$$

We will prove Γ is a contraction mapping in \mathcal{B}_{C^*} so that its fixed point (u, v) are the desired functions in Theorem 2.3.

It will be shown first that Γ maps the closed ball \mathcal{B}_{C^*} into itself for suitable C^* . For any $(u, v) \in \mathcal{B}_{C^*}$, it follows from (2.19) in Proposition 2.8 and (2.22) in Proposition 2.9 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{u}\|_{Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1, \beta}(\Omega_1)} &\leq C_1 \left(\|f\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{1, \beta}(\Omega_1)} + \|f\|_{Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{1, \beta}(\Omega_1)} + \|p\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|a\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)} \right), \\ \|\tilde{v}\|_{Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1, -\beta}(\Omega_1)} &\leq C_1 \left(\|g\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{-1, -\beta}(\Omega_1)} + \|g\|_{Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{-1, -\beta}(\Omega_1)} + \|q\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|b\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|c\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|\tilde{u}_x|_{x=0}\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where C_1 is a constant that only depends on s . Adding these two together and recalling the definition of E_0 , we obtain

$$\|(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq C_1 \left(E_0 + \|f\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{1, \beta}(\Omega_1)} + \|f\|_{Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{1, \beta}(\Omega_1)} + \|g\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{-1, -\beta}(\Omega_1)} + \|g\|_{Z_{s, \sigma-1}^{-1, -\beta}(\Omega_1)} + \|\tilde{u}_x|_{x=0}\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)} \right). \quad (6.3)$$

By the second estimate (2.20) in Proposition 2.8,

$$\|\tilde{u}_x|_{x=0}\|_{H^{\frac{s}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)} \leq C_1 \left(\|f\|_{X_{s,\sigma-1}^{1,\beta}(\Omega_1)} + \|f\|_{Z_{s,\sigma-1}^{1,\beta}(\Omega_1)} + \|p\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|a\|_{H^{\frac{s+1}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+)} \right).$$

Plugging this estimate into (6.3) leads to

$$\|(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq C_1(C_1 + 1) \left(E_0 + \|f\|_{X_{s,\sigma-1}^{1,\beta}(\Omega_1)} + \|f\|_{Z_{s,\sigma-1}^{1,\beta}(\Omega_1)} + \|g\|_{X_{s,\sigma-1}^{-1,-\beta}(\Omega_1)} + \|g\|_{Z_{s,\sigma-1}^{-1,-\beta}(\Omega_1)} \right). \quad (6.4)$$

Since f and g are defined as in (6.1), we apply Proposition 2.10 to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{X_{s,\sigma-1}^{1,\beta}(\Omega_1)} + \|f\|_{Z_{s,\sigma-1}^{1,\beta}(\Omega_1)} &\leq C_2 \left(\|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2},\sigma}^{1,\beta}(\Omega_1)} + \|v\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2},\sigma}^{-1,-\beta}(\Omega_1)} \right)^2, \\ \|g\|_{X_{s,\sigma-1}^{-1,-\beta}(\Omega_1)} + \|g\|_{Z_{s,\sigma-1}^{-1,-\beta}(\Omega_1)} &\leq C_2 \left(\|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2},\sigma}^{1,\beta}(\Omega_1)} + \|v\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2},\sigma}^{-1,-\beta}(\Omega_1)} \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where C_2 is a constant which only depends on s . Putting these two estimates into (6.4), we find

$$\|(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq C_3 \left[E_0 + \left(\|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2},\sigma}^{1,\beta}(\Omega_1)} + \|v\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2},\sigma}^{-1,-\beta}(\Omega_1)} \right)^2 \right] \leq C_3 (E_0 + \|(u, v)\|_{\mathcal{Y}}^2),$$

where the constant C_3 only depends on s . Since $(u, v) \in \mathcal{B}_{C^*}$, $\|(u, v)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq C^*$. Hence,

$$\|(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq C_3 [E_0 + (C^*)^2] \leq C_3 [r + (C^*)^2].$$

Choosing $C^* = 8C_3r$, then

$$\|(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq C_3r + 64C_3^3r^2. \quad (6.5)$$

Define

$$r = \frac{1}{64C_3^2}. \quad (6.6)$$

Then r only depends on s and it follows from (6.5) that $\|(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq C^*/4$, which implies $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \in \mathcal{B}_{C^*}$.

Next for any $(u_j, v_j) \in \mathcal{B}_{C^*}$, $j = 1, 2$, similar argument as above yields

$$\|\Gamma(u_1, v_1) - \Gamma(u_2, v_2)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \|(u_1, v_1) - (u_2, v_2)\|_{\mathcal{Y}}.$$

We have thus shown that Γ is a contraction on \mathcal{B}_{C^*} , which implies Γ has a fixed point $(u, v) \in \mathcal{B}_{C^*}$. By definition of Γ , (u, v) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} u = \Gamma_{\beta}^+(f, p, a), \\ v = \Gamma_{\beta}^-(g, q, b, c + u_x|_{x=0}), \end{cases}$$

where f and g are defined as in (6.1). Taking advantage of Proposition 2.8 and Proposition 2.9, we conclude that $u \in Y_{s,\frac{1}{2},\sigma}^{1,\beta}(\Omega_1) \cap C_x^j(\mathbb{R}_0^+; H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+))$ and $v \in Y_{s,\frac{1}{2},\sigma}^{-1,-\beta}(\Omega_1) \cap C_x^j(\mathbb{R}_0^+; H_t^{\frac{s+1-j}{3}}(\mathbb{R}^+))$ for $j = 0, 1$. Hence, the proof of Theorem 2.3 is completed. \square

Now we turn to consider the unconditional well-posedness for the IBVP (1.5) and prove Theorem 2.5 and Theorem 2.6. Note first that by scaling argument, Theorem 2.3 can be restated as the following result.

Corollary 6.1 (Conditional Well-posedness). *Let $-\frac{3}{4} < s \leq 3$, $r > 0$ and $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$ be given. There exist $\sigma = \sigma(s) > \frac{1}{2}$ and $T = T(s, r) > 0$ such that for any naturally compatible $(\phi, \psi) \in \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $\vec{h} = (h_1, h_2, h_3) \in \mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ related to the IBVP (1.5) with*

$$\|\phi, \psi\|_{\mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|\vec{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} \leq r,$$

the system of the integral equations (SIE) (2.11) admits a unique solution

$$(u, v) \in \mathcal{Y}_\sigma(\Omega_T) := Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1, \beta}(\Omega_T) \times Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1, -\beta}(\Omega_T).$$

Moreover, the solution map is real analytic in the corresponding spaces.

By standard extension arguments, the solutions given in Corollary 6.1 possess a blow-up alternative property as described below.

Lemma 6.2 (Blow-up alternative). *Let $-\frac{3}{4} < s \leq 3$ be given. For any given*

$$(p, q) \in \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+), \quad (a, b, c) \in \mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+),$$

there exists a $T_{max}^s > 0$ such that the corresponding solution $(u, v) \in C(0, T_{max}^s; H^s(\mathbb{R}^+))$ and

$$\text{either } T_{max}^s = +\infty \quad \text{or} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow T_{max}^s} (\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)}) = +\infty.$$

We then intend to prove Theorem 2.5, that is to show the solution (u, v) given in Corollary 6.1 is a mild solution of the IBVP (1.4). According to Definition 1.1, mild solutions can be regarded as limits of classical solutions. So we first recall a well-known result about classical solutions.

Lemma 6.3 (Existence and uniqueness of classical solutions). *Let $r > 0$ be given. There exists a $T > 0$ such that for compatible set $(p, q) \in \mathcal{H}_x^3(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $(a, b, c) \in \mathcal{H}_t^3(\mathbb{R}^+)$ with*

$$\|((p, q))\|_{\mathcal{H}_x^3(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|(a, b, c)\|_{\mathcal{H}_t^3(\mathbb{R}^+)} \leq r,$$

the IBVP (1.4) admits a unique strong solution (u, v) such that both u and v belong to $C^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^+)) \cap C(0, T; H^3(\mathbb{R}^+))$.

Proof. The existence of the classical solution (u, v) follows directly from Corollary 6.1 with $s = 3$, and the uniqueness of the solution can be proved using the standard energy estimate method. \square

Based on the notations in Lemma 6.2, it can be readily checked that $T_{max}^{s_1} \geq T_{max}^{s_2}$ for $s_1 < s_2$. We then propose that $T_{max}^{s_1} = T_{max}^{s_2}$.

Proposition 6.4 (Persistence of regularity). *For $-\frac{3}{4} < s_1 < s_2 \leq 3$, $(p, q) \in \mathcal{H}_x^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $(a, b, c) \in \mathcal{H}_t^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^+)$, one has $T_{max}^{s_2} = T_{max}^{s_1}$, where $T_{max}^{s_2}$ and $T_{max}^{s_1}$ are the lifespans of the solutions, corresponding to s_2 and s_1 respectively, determined in Lemma 6.2.*

Before stating the proof of Proposition 6.4, we list some smoothing properties based on the linear estimate in Lemma 3.4 and the bilinear estimates in Proposition 2.10, the proofs of the following Lemma 6.5–Lemma 6.7 will be given in Appendix A.

Lemma 6.5. *Let $-\frac{3}{4} < s_1 < s_2 \leq 3$, $0 < T \leq 1$, $\alpha \neq 0$ and $|\beta| \leq 1$. Then there exists $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon(s_1, s_2, \alpha) > 0$ such that for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon_0]$, the following bilinear estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \eta\left(\frac{t}{T}\right) \int_0^t W_R^{\alpha, \beta}(t - \tau)(w_1 w_2)_x d\tau \right\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \\ & \leq CT^{\epsilon_0} \left(\|w_1\|_{X_{s_1, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} + \|w_1\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s_1, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

holds for any $w_1, w_2 \in X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}$ with some positive constant $C = C(s_1, s_2, \alpha, \epsilon_0, \sigma)$.

Lemma 6.6. *Let $-\frac{3}{4} < s_1 < s_2 \leq 3$, $0 < T \leq 1$, $\alpha \neq 0$ and $|\beta| \leq 1$. Then there exists $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon(s_1, s_2, \alpha) > 0$ such that for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon_0]$, the following bilinear estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \eta\left(\frac{t}{T}\right) \int_0^t W_R^{-\alpha, -\beta}(t - \tau)(w_1 w_2)_x d\tau \right\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}} \\ & \leq CT^{\epsilon_0} \left(\|w_1\|_{X_{s_1, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} + \|w_1\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s_1, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

holds for any $w_1, w_2 \in X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}$ with some positive constant $C = C(s_1, s_2, \alpha, \epsilon_0, \sigma)$.

Lemma 6.7. *Let $-\frac{3}{4} < s_1 < s_2 \leq 3$, $0 < T \leq 1$, $\alpha \neq 0$ and $|\beta| \leq 1$. Then there exists $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon(s_1, s_2, \alpha) > 0$ such that for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon_0]$, the following bilinear estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \eta\left(\frac{t}{T}\right) \int_0^t W_R^{\alpha, \beta}(t - \tau)(w_1 w_2)_x d\tau \right\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \\ & \leq CT^{\epsilon_0} \left(\|w_1\|_{X_{s_1, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}} + \|w_1\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s_1, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.9)$$

holds for any $w_1 \in X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}$ and $w_2 \in X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}$ with some positive constant $C = C(s_1, s_2, \alpha, \epsilon_0, \sigma)$.

Now we are ready to justify Proposition 6.4.

Proof of Proposition 6.4. For $s = s_1$ or s_2 , denote $\mathcal{Y}_s = Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1, 1} \times Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1, -1}$. If $t^* := T_{max}^{s_2} < T_{max}^{s_1}$, then by Lemma 6.2,

$$r := \sup_{0 \leq t \leq t^*} (\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{H^{s_1}(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{H^{s_1}(\mathbb{R}^+)}) < +\infty, \quad (6.10)$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow t^*} (\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{H^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{H^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^+)}) = +\infty. \quad (6.11)$$

According to Corollary 6.1 and its proof, there exists some $T = T(s_2, r) > 0$ such that for any $\delta \in (0, T)$,

$$\|(u, v)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times (t^* - 2\delta, t^* - \delta))} \leq \alpha_{r, s_1} \left(\|(p, q)\|_{\mathcal{H}_x^{s_1}(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|(a, b, c)\|_{\mathcal{H}_t^{s_1}(\mathbb{R}^+)} \right).$$

In addition, according to Lemma 6.5- 6.7, one also has,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t^* - 2\delta < t < t^* - \delta} \|(u, v)\|_{H^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^+) \times H^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^+)} \\ & \leq \|(u, v)\|_{\mathcal{Y}_{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times (t^* - 2\delta, t^* - \delta))} \\ & \leq C_1 \left(\|(p, q)\|_{\mathcal{H}_1^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|(a, b, c)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^+)} \right) + C_2 \delta^{\epsilon_0} \left(\|u\|_{X_{s_1, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1, 1}} + \|v\|_{X_{s_1, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1, -1}} \right) \left(\|u\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1, 1}} + \|v\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1, -1}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon_0]$ are some constants which only depend on s_1 and s_2 . Hence, we can choose δ small enough such that

$$C_2 \delta^{\epsilon_0} \left(\|u\|_{X_{s_1, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1, 1}} + \|v\|_{X_{s_1, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1, -1}} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

This yields

$$\sup_{t^* - 2\delta < t < t^* - \delta} \|(u, v)\|_{H^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^+) \times H^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^+)} \leq 2C_1 \left(\|(p, q)\|_{\mathcal{H}_x^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^+)} + \|(a, b, c)\|_{\mathcal{H}_t^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^+)} \right),$$

which contradicts with (6.11). Therefore, $T_{max}^{s_2} = T_{max}^{s_1}$ and the proof is complete. \square

The combination of Corollary 6.1 through Proposition 6.4 enables one to justify Theorem 2.5.

Proof of Theorem 2.5. According to Corollary 6.1, for given $(p, q) \in \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $(a, b, c) \in \mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$, one can obtain a solution $(u, v) \in Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{1,1}(\Omega_T) \times Y_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-1,-1}(\Omega_T)$. We will show that such a solution (u, v) is, in fact, a mild solution of IBVP (1.4). We choose sequences $\{(p_n, q_n)\}_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{H}_x^3(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $\{(a_n, b_n, c_n)\}_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{H}_t^3(\mathbb{R}^+)$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (p_n, q_n) = (p, q) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+), \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n, b_n, c_n) = (a, b, c) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+).$$

Since the solution map in Corollary 6.1 is continuous, there exist solutions $\{(u_n, v_n)\}_{n \geq 1}$ under the initial-boundary conditions with data $\{(p_n, q_n, a_n, b_n, c_n)\}_{n \geq 1}$ such that $\{(u_n, v_n)\}_{n \geq 1}$ lie in $C(0, T; H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)) \times C(0, T; H^s(\mathbb{R}^+))$ and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n = u, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_n = v \quad \text{in } C(0, T; H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)).$$

On the other hand, according to Lemma 6.2, Lemma 6.3 and Proposition 6.4, we know both u_n and v_n belong to $C(0, T_{n, \max}^3; H^3(\mathbb{R}^+))$ for $n \geq 1$ with $T_{n, \max}^3 \geq T$. This leads to $u_n, v_n \in C(0, T; H^3(\mathbb{R}^+))$, so the proof is now complete. \square

Finally, we show that the mild solution of IBVP (1.4) is unique, that is to prove Theorem 2.6.

Proof of Theorem 2.6. For given $(p, q) \in \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $(a, b, c) \in \mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+)$, we assume that there are two mild solutions for the IBVP (1.4), denoted as, $(u^{(1)}, v^{(1)})$ and $(u^{(2)}, v^{(2)})$ with

$$u^{(1)}, v^{(1)} \in C(0, T_1; H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)), \quad u^{(2)}, v^{(2)} \in C(0, T_2; H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)),$$

for some $T_1, T_2 > 0$. Without loss of generality, one can set $T := T_1 \leq T_2$. According to the definition of mild solutions, one can find two sequences of classic solutions of the IBVP (1.4),

$$(u_n^{(1)}, v_n^{(1)}), (u_n^{(2)}, v_n^{(2)}) \in C(0, T; H^3(\mathbb{R}^+)) \times C(0, T; H^3(\mathbb{R}^+)), \quad n \geq 1,$$

with

$$\begin{cases} u_n^{(1)}(x, 0) = p_n^{(1)}(x), & v_n^{(1)}(x, 0) = q_n^{(1)}(x), \\ u_n^{(1)}(0, t) = a_n^{(1)}(t), & v_n^{(1)}(0, t) = b_n^{(1)}(t), \quad \partial_x(v_n^{(1)} - u_n^{(1)})(0, t) = c_n^{(1)}(t), \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} u_n^{(2)}(x, 0) = p_n^{(2)}(x), & v_n^{(2)}(x, 0) = q_n^{(2)}(x), \\ u_n^{(2)}(0, t) = a_n^{(2)}(t), & v_n^{(2)}(0, t) = b_n^{(2)}(t), \quad \partial_x(v_n^{(2)} - u_n^{(2)})(0, t) = c_n^{(2)}(t), \end{cases}$$

such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (u_n^{(1)}, v_n^{(1)}) = (u^{(1)}, v^{(1)}), \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (u_n^{(2)}, v_n^{(2)}) = (u^{(2)}, v^{(2)}), \quad \text{in } C(0, T; H^s(\mathbb{R}^+) \times H^s(\mathbb{R}^+)),$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (p_n^{(1)}, q_n^{(1)}) = (p, q), \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (p_n^{(2)}, q_n^{(2)}) = (p, q) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{H}_x^s(\mathbb{R}^+),$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n^{(1)}, b_n^{(1)}, c_n^{(1)}) = (a, b, c), \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n^{(2)}, b_n^{(2)}, c_n^{(2)}) = (a, b, c) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{H}_t^s(\mathbb{R}^+).$$

We then denote

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) &\in [C(0, T_3; H^s(\mathbb{R}^+))]^2, \\ (\tilde{u}_n^{(1)}, \tilde{v}_n^{(1)}) &\in [C(0, T_{n, \max}^1; H^3(\mathbb{R}^+))]^2, \\ (\tilde{u}_n^{(2)}, \tilde{v}_n^{(2)}) &\in [C(0, T_{n, \max}^2; H^3(\mathbb{R}^+))]^2, \end{aligned}$$

to be the solutions provided by Corollary 6.1 with conditions corresponding to

$$(p, q, a, b, c), \quad (p_n^{(1)}, q_n^{(1)}, a_n^{(1)}, b_n^{(1)}, c_n^{(1)}), \quad (p_n^{(2)}, q_n^{(2)}, a_n^{(2)}, b_n^{(2)}, c_n^{(2)}),$$

respectively. We define $T^* := \min\{T, T_3\}$. According to Lemma 6.2, we can infer that $T_{n, \max}^1 \geq T^*$, $T_{n, \max}^2 \geq T^*$ and

$$(u_n^{(1)}, v_n^{(1)}) = (\tilde{u}_n^{(1)}, \tilde{v}_n^{(1)}), \quad (u_n^{(2)}, v_n^{(2)}) = (\tilde{u}_n^{(2)}, \tilde{v}_n^{(2)}), \quad \text{in } [C(0, T^*; H^3(\mathbb{R}^+))]^2,$$

due to the uniqueness of the classic solution of the IBVP (1.4). Moreover, according to the continuity of the solution map in Corollary 6.1, one has

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\tilde{u}_n^{(1)}, \tilde{v}_n^{(1)}) = (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}), \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\tilde{u}_n^{(2)}, \tilde{v}_n^{(2)}) = (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}), \quad \text{in } [C(0, T^*; H^s(\mathbb{R}^+))]^2.$$

Therefore, we deduce that $(u^{(1)}, v^{(1)}) = (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) = (u^{(2)}, v^{(2)})$ in $[C(0, T^*; H^s(\mathbb{R}^+))]^2$. Finally, we can use continuity property of the solutions $(u^{(1)}, v^{(1)})$, $(u^{(2)}, v^{(2)})$ and (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) to show $T_1 = T_2 = T_3$. \square

A Proofs of Lemma 6.5–Lemma 6.7

The proofs for Lemma 6.5, Lemma 6.6 and Lemma 6.7 are similar, so we will only prove Lemma 6.7. In order to make the argument more clearly, we first present several auxiliary results. We start with the following Lemma A.1 which is a refinement of Proposition 5.4 on the temporal regularity of the term $(uv)_x$.

Lemma A.1. *Let $-\frac{3}{4} < s \leq 3$, $\alpha \neq 0$ and $|\beta| \leq 1$. Then there exists $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(s, \alpha) > 0$ such that for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon_0]$,*

$$\|(uv)_x\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1+\epsilon_0}^{\alpha, \beta}} \leq C \|u\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|v\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $C = C(s, \alpha, \sigma)$.

Proof. By duality, it suffices to prove

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} \xi \widehat{uv} \widehat{w} d\xi d\tau \leq C \|u\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|v\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}} \|w\|_{X_{-s, 1-\sigma-\epsilon_0}^{\alpha, \beta}},$$

for any $u \in X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}$, $v \in X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}$ and $w \in X_{-s, 1-\sigma-\epsilon_0}^{\alpha, \beta}$. Similar to the proof of Proposition 5.4, we denote

$$L_1 = \tau_1 - \phi^{\alpha, \beta}(\xi_1), \quad L_2 = \tau_2 - \phi^{-\alpha, -\beta}(\xi_2), \quad L_3 = \tau_3 - \phi^{\alpha, \beta}(\xi_3).$$

and

$$M_1 = \langle L_1 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{e^{|\xi_1|} \leq 3+|\tau_1|\}} \langle L_1 \rangle^\sigma, \quad M_2 = \langle L_2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{e^{|\xi_2|} \leq 3+|\tau_2|\}} \langle L_2 \rangle^\sigma.$$

In addition, we define

$$f_1(\xi_1, \tau_1) = \langle \xi_1 \rangle^s M_1 \widehat{u}(\xi_1, \tau_1), \quad f_2(\xi_2, \tau_2) = \langle \xi_2 \rangle^s M_2 \widehat{v}(\xi_2, \tau_2), \\ f_3(\xi_3, \tau_3) = \langle \xi_3 \rangle^{-s} \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma-\epsilon_0} \widehat{w}(\xi_3, \tau_3).$$

Then it reduces to justify

$$\int_A \frac{|\xi_3| \langle \xi_1 \rangle^\rho \langle \xi_2 \rangle^\rho \prod_{i=1}^3 |f_i(\xi_i, \tau_i)|}{\langle \xi_3 \rangle^\rho M_1 M_2 \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma-\epsilon_0}} \leq C \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_{L_{\xi\tau}^2}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $\rho = -s$ and the set A is as defined in (5.11). In the remaining proof, instead of introducing σ_0 as in (5.24), we define $\epsilon_0 = \frac{1}{16} - \frac{1}{12} \rho$. Then for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon_0]$, (A.2) can be proved in an analogous way as the proof of (5.6) in Proposition 5.4. \square

Next, we will take advantage of Proposition A.1 to deduce a slightly stronger estimate since the spatial regularity requirement on the right-hand side of (A.3) is weaker than that of (A.1).

Lemma A.2. *Let $-\frac{3}{4} < s_1 \leq s_2 \leq 3$, $\alpha \neq 0$, $|\beta| \leq 1$. Then there exists $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(s_1, s_2, \alpha) > 0$ such that for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon_0]$,*

$$\|(uv)_x\|_{X_{s_2, \sigma-1+\epsilon_0}^{\alpha, \beta}} \leq C \left(\|u\|_{X_{s_1, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|v\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}} + \|u\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|v\|_{X_{s_1, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}} \right), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where $C = C(s_1, s_2, \alpha, \sigma)$.

Proof. By duality, it suffices to prove

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} \xi \widehat{w} \widehat{v} d\xi d\tau \leq C \left(\|u\|_{X_{s_1, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|v\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}} + \|u\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|v\|_{X_{s_1, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}} \right) \|w\|_{X_{-s_2, 1-\sigma-\epsilon_0}^{\alpha, \beta}},$$

for any $u \in X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}$, $v \in X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}$ and $w \in X_{-s_2, 1-\sigma-\epsilon_0}^{\alpha, \beta}$. Denote L_1, L_2, L_3, M_1, M_2 in the same way as the above proof for Lemma A.1, and define

$$f_1(\xi_1, \tau_1) = \langle \xi_1 \rangle^{s_1} M_1 \widehat{u}(\xi_1, \tau_1), \quad f_2(\xi_2, \tau_2) = \langle \xi_2 \rangle^{s_1} M_2 \widehat{v}(\xi_2, \tau_2), \quad f_3(\xi_3, \tau_3) = \langle \xi_3 \rangle^{-s_2} \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma-\epsilon_0} \widehat{w}(\xi_3, \tau_3).$$

Denote $\rho = -s_1$ and $r = s_2 - s_1 \geq 0$. Then similar to (A.2), it reduces to show

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_A \langle \xi_3 \rangle^r \frac{|\xi_3| \langle \xi_1 \rangle^\rho \langle \xi_2 \rangle^\rho |f_1(\xi_1, \tau_1) f_2(\xi_2, \tau_2) f_3(\xi_3, \tau_3)|}{\langle \xi_3 \rangle^\rho M_1 M_2 \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma-\epsilon_0}} \\ & \leq C \left(\|f_1\|_{L_{\xi\tau}^2} \|\langle \xi \rangle^r f_2\|_{L_{\xi\tau}^2} + \|\langle \xi \rangle^r f_1\|_{L_{\xi\tau}^2} \|f_2\|_{L_{\xi\tau}^2} \right) \|f_3\|_{L_{\xi\tau}^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Since $r \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^3 \xi_i = 0$, then $\langle \xi_3 \rangle^r = \langle \xi_1 + \xi_2 \rangle^r \leq 2^r (\langle \xi_1 \rangle^r + \langle \xi_2 \rangle^r)$. Consequently, LHS of (A.4) $\leq 2^r (I + II)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \int_A \frac{|\xi_3| \langle \xi_1 \rangle^\rho \langle \xi_2 \rangle^\rho |\langle \xi_1 \rangle^r f_1(\xi_1, \tau_1)| |f_2(\xi_2, \tau_2) f_3(\xi_3, \tau_3)|}{\langle \xi_3 \rangle^\rho M_1 M_2 \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma-\epsilon_0}}, \\ II &= \int_A \frac{|\xi_3| \langle \xi_1 \rangle^\rho \langle \xi_2 \rangle^\rho |f_1(\xi_1, \tau_1)| |\langle \xi_2 \rangle^r f_2(\xi_2, \tau_2) f_3(\xi_3, \tau_3)|}{\langle \xi_3 \rangle^\rho M_1 M_2 \langle L_3 \rangle^{1-\sigma-\epsilon_0}}. \end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma A.1,

$$I \leq C \|\langle \xi \rangle^r f_1\|_{L_{\xi\tau}^2} \|f_2\|_{L_{\xi\tau}^2} \|f_3\|_{L_{\xi\tau}^2}, \quad II \leq C \|f_1\|_{L_{\xi\tau}^2} \|\langle \xi \rangle^r f_2\|_{L_{\xi\tau}^2} \|f_3\|_{L_{\xi\tau}^2}.$$

Thus, (A.4) is verified. \square

Recalling the cut-off function $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ which satisfies $\eta(t) = 1$ on $(-1, 1)$ and $\text{supp } \eta \subset (-2, 2)$, the following is a classical estimate on the Fourier restriction norms when the time is localized.

Lemma A.3. *For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $-\frac{1}{2} < b_1 \leq b_2 < \frac{1}{2}$, $\alpha \neq 0$, $|\beta| \leq 1$ and $0 < T \leq 1$, there exists a constant $C = C(s, b_1, b_2)$ such that*

$$\left\| \eta\left(\frac{t}{T}\right) w \right\|_{X_{s, b_1}^{\alpha, \beta}} \leq C T^{b_2 - b_1} \|w\|_{X_{s, b_2}^{\alpha, \beta}}, \quad \forall w \in X_{s, b_2}^{\alpha, \beta}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

The proof of this estimate is well-known, see e.g. Lemma 2.11 in [Tao06]. Combining Lemma A.2 and Lemma A.3 yields the outcome below.

Lemma A.4. *Let $-\frac{3}{4} < s_1 \leq s_2 \leq 3$, $\alpha \neq 0$, $|\beta| \leq 1$ and $0 < T \leq 1$. Then there exists $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(s_1, s_2, \alpha) > 0$ such that for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon_0]$,*

$$\left\| \eta\left(\frac{t}{T}\right) (uv)_x \right\|_{X_{s_2, \sigma-1}^{\alpha, \beta}} \leq C T^{\epsilon_0} \left(\|u\|_{X_{s_1, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|v\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}} + \|u\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|v\|_{X_{s_1, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}} \right), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where $C = C(s_1, s_2, \alpha, \sigma)$.

Proof. Firstly, we choose ϵ_0 as that in Lemma A.2. Then for any $\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon_0]$, we choose $w = (uv)_x$, $s = s_2$, $b_1 = \sigma - 1$ and $b_2 = \sigma - 1 + \epsilon_0$ in (A.5) to obtain

$$\left\| \eta\left(\frac{t}{T}\right) (uv)_x \right\|_{X_{s_2, \sigma-1}^{\alpha, \beta}} \leq C T^{\epsilon_0} \|(uv)_x\|_{X_{s_2, \sigma-1}^{\alpha, \beta}}.$$

Then we can apply Lemma A.2 to verify (A.6). \square

Similar to Lemma A.3, the estimate for modified Fourier restriction norms of the localized (in time) Duhamel term associated with the semigroup operator $W_R^{\alpha, \beta}$ can also be established.

Lemma A.5. *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha \neq 0$, $|\beta| \leq 1$, $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 1$ and $0 < T \leq 1$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(s, \alpha, \sigma)$ such that*

$$\left\| \eta\left(\frac{t}{T}\right) \int_0^t W_R^{\alpha, \beta}(t - \tau) F d\tau \right\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \leq C \left\| \eta\left(\frac{t}{2T}\right) F \right\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{\alpha, \beta}}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Proof. Define $g(x, t) = \eta\left(\frac{t}{2T}\right) F(x, t)$. Then it is easily seen that

$$\text{LHS of (A.7)} = \left\| \eta\left(\frac{t}{T}\right) \int_0^t W_R^{\alpha, \beta}(t - \tau) g d\tau \right\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}}.$$

Then similar to Lemma 3.4 (also see Lemma 2.1 in [GTV97]), we have

$$\left\| \eta\left(\frac{t}{T}\right) \int_0^t W_R^{\alpha, \beta}(t - \tau) g d\tau \right\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \leq C \|g\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{\alpha, \beta}} = C \left\| \eta\left(\frac{t}{2T}\right) F \right\|_{X_{s, \sigma-1}^{\alpha, \beta}}.$$

\square

Now we have developed all the tools needed to justify Lemma 6.7.

Proof of Lemma 6.7. Firstly, we choose $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(s_1, s_2, \alpha) > 0$ as that in Lemma A.4. Then for any

$\sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon_0]$, we apply Lemma A.5, with $s = s_2$ and $F = (w_1 w_2)_x$, to conclude that

$$\left\| \eta\left(\frac{t}{T}\right) \int_0^t W_R^{\alpha, \beta}(t - \tau)(w_1 w_2)_x \right\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \leq C \left\| \eta\left(\frac{t}{2T}\right)(w_1 w_2)_x \right\|_{X_{s_2, \sigma-1}^{\alpha, \beta}}.$$

Then it follows from Lemma A.4 that

$$\left\| \eta\left(\frac{t}{2T}\right)(w_1 w_2)_x \right\|_{X_{s_2, \sigma-1}^{\alpha, \beta}} \leq CT^{\epsilon_0} \left(\|w_1\|_{X_{s_1, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}} + \|w_1\|_{X_{s_2, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{\alpha, \beta}} \|w_2\|_{X_{s_1, \frac{1}{2}, \sigma}^{-\alpha, -\beta}} \right),$$

where $C = C(s_1, s_2, \alpha, \sigma)$. Combining the above two estimates leads to (6.9) in Lemma 6.7. \square

Acknowledgements

S. Li is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (no. 12001084 and no. 12071061), and the Applied Basic Research Program of Sichuan Province (no. 2020YJ0264).

References

- [AC08] B. Alvarez and X. Carvajal. On the local well-posedness for some systems of coupled KdV equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 69(2):692–715, 2008. 2
- [BCH14] J. L. Bona, H. Chen, and C.-H. Hsia. Well-posedness for the BBM-equation in a quarter plane. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S*, 7(6):1149–1163, 2014. 2
- [BCL05] J. L. Bona, T. Colin, and D. Lannes. Long wave approximations for water waves. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 178(3):373–410, 2005. 10
- [BCS02] J. L. Bona, M. Chen, and J.-C. Saut. Boussinesq equations and other systems for small-amplitude long waves in nonlinear dispersive media. I. Derivation and linear theory. *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, 12(4):283–318, 2002. 2
- [BCS04] J. L. Bona, M. Chen, and J.-C. Saut. Boussinesq equations and other systems for small-amplitude long waves in nonlinear dispersive media. II. The nonlinear theory. *Nonlinearity*, 17(3):925–952, 2004. 2
- [BGK10] J. L. Bona, Z. Grujić, and H. Kalisch. A KdV-type Boussinesq system: from the energy level to analytic spaces. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 26(4):1121–1139, 2010. 2
- [BLS08] J. L. Bona, D. Lannes, and J.-C. Saut. Asymptotic models for internal waves. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 89(6):538–566, 2008. 10
- [BOP97] D. Bekiranov, T. Ogawa, and G. Ponce. Weak solvability and well-posedness of a coupled Schrödinger-Korteweg-de Vries equation for capillary-gravity wave interactions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 125(10):2907–2919, 1997. 28
- [Bou93a] J. Bourgain. Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations. I. Schrödinger equations. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 3(2):107–156, 1993. 2
- [Bou93b] J. Bourgain. Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations. II. The KdV-equation. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 3(3):209–262, 1993. 26
- [BSZ02] Jerry L. Bona, S.-M. Sun, and B.-Y. Zhang. A non-homogeneous boundary-value problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation in a quarter plane. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 354(2):427–490, 2002. 2, 4, 14, 23
- [BSZ06] Jerry L. Bona, S.-M. Sun, and B.-Y. Zhang. Boundary smoothing properties of the Korteweg-de Vries equation in a quarter plane and applications. *Dyn. Partial Differ. Equ.*, 3(1):1–69, 2006. 2, 4, 14, 22, 25

- [BSZ18] J. L. Bona, S.-M. Sun, and B.-Y. Zhang. Nonhomogeneous boundary-value problems for one-dimensional nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 109:1–66, 2018. 2
- [Cav17] M. Cavalcante. The initial boundary value problem for some quadratic nonlinear Schrödinger equations on the half-line. *Differential Integral Equations*, 30(7-8):521–554, 2017. 2
- [CC19] M. Cavalcante and A. J. Corcho. The initial-boundary value problem for the Schrödinger-Korteweg-de Vries system on the half-line. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 21(8):1850066, 47, 2019. 2
- [CCT03] M. Christ, J. Colliander, and T. Tao. Asymptotics, frequency modulation, and low regularity ill-posedness for canonical defocusing equations. *Amer. J. Math.*, 125(6):1235–1293, 2003. 2
- [CK02] J. E. Colliander and C. E. Kenig. The generalized Korteweg-de Vries equation on the half line. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 27(11-12):2187–2266, 2002. 2, 4, 12
- [CKS⁺03] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka, and T. Tao. Sharp global well-posedness for KdV and modified KdV on \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{T} . *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 16(3):705–749, 2003. 28
- [CT17] E. Compaan and N. Tzirakis. Well-posedness and nonlinear smoothing for the “good” Boussinesq equation on the half-line. *J. Differential Equations*, 262(12):5824–5859, 2017. 2
- [CT19] E. Compaan and N. Tzirakis. Low-regularity global well-posedness for the Klein-Gordon-Schrödinger system on \mathbb{R}^+ . *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 39(7):3867–3895, 2019. 2
- [DMS07] V. A. Dougalis, D. E. Mitsotakis, and J.-C. Saut. On some Boussinesq systems in two space dimensions: theory and numerical analysis. *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 41(5):825–854, 2007. 10
- [ET16] M. B. Erdoğan and N. Tzirakis. Regularity properties of the cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the half line. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 271(9):2539–2568, 2016. 2, 11, 14, 27
- [GG84] J. A. Gear and R. Grimshaw. Weak and strong interactions between internal solitary waves. *Stud. Appl. Math.*, 70(3):235–258, 1984. 9
- [GTV97] J. Ginibre, Y. Tsutsumi, and G. Velo. On the Cauchy problem for the Zakharov system. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 151(2):384–436, 1997. 43
- [GW20] B. Guo and J. Wu. Local regularity properties for 1D mixed nonlinear Schrödinger equations on half-line. *Front. Math. China*, 15(6):1121–1142, 2020. 2
- [Hol05] J. Holmer. The initial-boundary-value problem for the 1D nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the half-line. *Differential Integral Equations*, 18(6):647–668, 2005. 2
- [Hol06] J. Holmer. The initial-boundary value problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 31(7-9):1151–1190, 2006. 2, 4, 6, 12
- [HS81] R. Hirota and J. Satsuma. Soliton solutions of a coupled Korteweg-de Vries equation. *Phys. Lett. A*, 85(8-9):407–408, 1981. 9
- [JK95] D. Jerison and C. E. Kenig. The inhomogeneous Dirichlet problem in Lipschitz domains. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 130(1):161–219, 1995. 11
- [KPV91] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega. Oscillatory integrals and regularity of dispersive equations. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 40(1):33–69, 1991. 12
- [KPV93] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega. The Cauchy problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation in Sobolev spaces of negative indices. *Duke Math. J.*, 71(1):1–21, 1993. 12, 26
- [KPV96] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega. A bilinear estimate with applications to the KdV equation. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 9(2):573–603, 1996. 26, 27, 30
- [LCZ18] S. Li, M. Chen, and B.-Y. Zhang. A non-homogeneous boundary value problem of the sixth order Boussinesq equation in a quarter plane. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 38(5):2505–2525, 2018. 2
- [LPS12] F. Linares, D. Pilod, and J.-C. Saut. Well-posedness of strongly dispersive two-dimensional surface wave Boussinesq systems. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 44(6):4195–4221, 2012. 10
- [MB03] A. J. Majda and J. A. Biello. The nonlinear interaction of barotropic and equatorial baroclinic Rossby waves. *J. Atmospheric Sci.*, 60(15):1809–1821, 2003. 9

- [MSZ12] M. Ming, J.-C. Saut, and P. Zhang. Long-time existence of solutions to Boussinesq systems. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 44(6):4078–4100, 2012. 10
- [Oh09] T. Oh. Diophantine conditions in well-posedness theory of coupled KdV-type systems: local theory. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, (18):3516–3556, 2009. 2
- [SWX17] J.-C. Saut, C. Wang, and L. Xu. The Cauchy problem on large time for surface-waves-type Boussinesq systems II. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 49(4):2321–2386, 2017. 10
- [Tao01] T. Tao. Multilinear weighted convolution of L^2 -functions, and applications to nonlinear dispersive equations. *Amer. J. Math.*, 123(5):839–908, 2001. 26, 28
- [Tao06] T. Tao. *Nonlinear Dispersive Equations: Local and Global Analysis*. CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, vol.106. Published by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2006. 43
- [Xue08] R. Xue. The initial-boundary-value problem for the “good” Boussinesq equation on the half line. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 69(2):647–682, 2008. 2
- [YZ22a] X. Yang and B.-Y. Zhang. Local well-posedness of the coupled KdV-KdV systems on \mathbb{R} . *Evol. Equ. Control Theory*, 11(5):1829–1871, 2022. 2, 9, 10
- [YZ22b] X. Yang and B.-Y. Zhang. Well-posedness and critical index set of the Cauchy problem for the coupled KdV-KdV systems on \mathbb{T} . *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 42(11):5167–5199, 2022. 9

(S. Li) School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu, Sichuan 611731, China

Email: lish@uestc.edu.cn

(M. Chen) Department of Mathematics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA

Email: chen45@purdue.edu

(X. Yang) Department of Mathematics, University of California, Riverside, CA, 92521, USA

Email: xiny@ucr.edu

(B.-Y. Zhang) Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221, USA

Email: zhangb@ucmail.uc.edu