

THE FULL RANGE OF UNIFORM BOUNDS FOR THE BILINEAR HILBERT TRANSFORM

GENNADY URALTSEV AND MICHAŁ WARCHALSKI

ABSTRACT. We prove uniform L^p bounds for the family of bilinear Hilbert transforms $\text{BHT}_\beta[f_1, f_2](x) := \text{p.v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_1(x-t)f_2(x+\beta t) \frac{dt}{t}$. We show that the operator BHT_β maps $L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2}$ into L^p as long as $p_1 \in (1, \infty)$, $p_2 \in (1, \infty)$, and $p > \frac{2}{3}$ with a bound independent of $\beta \in (0, 1]$. This is the full open range of exponents where the modulation invariant class of bilinear operators containing BHT_β can be bounded uniformly. This is done by proving boundedness of certain affine transformations of the frequency-time-scale space \mathbb{R}_+^3 in terms of iterated outer Lebesgue spaces. This results in new linear and bilinear wave packet embedding bounds well suited to study uniform bounds.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Applications	3
1.2. Wave packet representation and the space of symmetries	4
1.3. Outline of the argument	7
1.4. Structure of the paper	11
1.5. Notation	11
1.6. Acknowledgments	13
2. Wave packet representation.	13
3. Outer Lebesgue spaces and the time-frequency-scale space.	15
3.1. Generalities of outer measure spaces	15
3.2. The time-frequency-scale space	23
3.3. Changes of variables and product sizes	30
3.4. Localized outer Lebesgue spaces	33
4. The single tree estimate	39
5. Forest estimates	50
6. Non-uniform embedding bounds	55
6.1. SIO truncation size control	56
6.2. Counting function improvement	67
7. Uniform embedding bounds - linear case	69
7.1. Uniform bounds for the exterior size	72
7.2. Uniform bounds for the singular size	78
7.3. Uniform bounds for the $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_\Gamma^u \Phi_\tau^N$ size	86
8. Uniform embedding bounds - bilinear case	102

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 42B20, 42B35, Secondary 46B70, 47A07, 47B38.

Key words and phrases. Time-frequency analysis, bilinear Hilbert transform, outer Lebesgue spaces, interpolation, uniform bounds, wave packet analysis.

1. INTRODUCTION

The bilinear Hilbert transform with parameter $\beta \in (0, 1]$ is a bilinear singular integral operator given by

$$(1.1) \quad \text{BHT}_\beta[f_1, f_2](x) := \text{p.v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_1(x-t)f_2(x+\beta t) \frac{dt}{t}$$

where $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ are Schwartz functions on the real line. It arises in diverse context: averages of (1.1) over β can yield relevant correction terms for evaluating Cauchy integrals along Lipschitz domains in \mathbb{C} and for inverting elliptic operators with non-constant coefficients; fiberwise applications of bounds on (1.1) can be used to obtain bounds on multilinear singular integral operators with full Gl_2 symmetry. We elaborate and provide references for these applications further on.

In this paper we are interested in showing the a-priori bounds

$$(1.2) \quad \|\text{BHT}_\beta[f_1, f_2]\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \leq C_{p_1, p_2, \beta} \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R})} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R})}, \quad p^{-1} = p_1^{-1} + p_2^{-1}$$

for some constant $C_{p_1, p_2, \beta} > 0$ that does not depend on f_1 and f_2 . A scaling argument shows that the constraints on the exponents (p_1, p_2, p) in (1.2) must hold. In [LT97], Lacey and Thiele proved the first estimates of the type (1.2): they showed that the bound holds in the range $2 < p_1, p_2 < \infty, p < 2$. This corresponds to the open triangle c in Figure 1. The range of exponents for (1.2) was later extended by Lacey and Thiele in [LT98] to the convex hull of the open triangles a_1, a_2, a_3 in Figure 1, where bounds below the line $(0, 1, 0) - (0, 0, 1)$ and to the upper right side of the line $(0, 1, 0) - (0, 0, 1)$ are to be intended in the restricted weak sense, discussed in [Thi06]. Inspired by the works of Carleson [Car66] and Fefferman [Fef73] the authors of the above results used the paradigm of time scale frequency analysis.

When $\beta = 0$ the operator $\text{BHT}_\beta[f_1, f_2](x)$ becomes simpler and is given by the pointwise product of the Hilbert transform of f_1 with f_2 :

$$\text{BHT}_0[f_1, f_2](x) = \text{H}f_1(x) f_2(x);$$

this immediately implies boundedness for any $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ by the boundedness of $f \mapsto \text{H}f$ on $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R})$ for any $p_1 \in (1, \infty)$ and by Hölder's inequality. For any fixed $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$, the constant $C_{p_1, p_2, \beta}$ obtained in [LT97] and [LT98], while this is not stated explicitly, grows linearly in $|\beta|^{-1}$. Naturally, in [LT98] the authors posed the question of whether bounds (1.2) can be shown with a constant C_{p_1, p_2} independent of $\beta \in (0, 1]$, in place of $C_{p_1, p_2, \beta}$, and if so, for what range of exponents p_1, p_2 . This is in accordance with the observation that in the limit $\beta = 0$ we are still dealing with a bounded operator. These bounds are referred to as “uniform bounds”; any bound that holds only for $\beta \gtrsim 1$ or with a constant that is allowed to depend on β , will be referred to in this paper as a “non-uniform” bound.

There is a rich collection of partial results concerning uniform variants of (1.2). In [Thi02] Thiele established weak uniform bounds at the two upper corners of the triangle c in Figure 1. Grafakos and Li in [GL04] showed the uniform inequality in the open triangle c , and Li [Li06] proved the uniform bounds in the open triangles a_1, a_2 . By interpolation one obtains the uniform variant of (1.2) in the range

corresponding to the convex hull of the open triangles a_2, a_3 , and c . What, however, was not known up to date, is whether the uniform bounds hold in the vicinity of $(p_1, p_2) = (\infty, 1)$ and $(p_1, p_2) = (\infty, \infty)$ i.e. in the corners of triangles b_2 and b_3 . This is precisely the main result of this work.

Theorem 1. *Bounds (1.2) holds for all functions $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ as long as $p_1 \in (1, \infty)$, $p_2 \in (1, \infty)$, and $p > \frac{2}{3}$ with a constant dependent only on p_1 and p_2 but not on $\beta \in (0, 1]$.*

Our methods cover directly the regions b_1, b_2, b_3, c in Figure 1. The extension to the full shaded region in Figure 1 can be obtained by interpolation with the result in [Li06]. As noted before, bounds on the same side of the triangle a_3 of the segment $(0, 1, 0) - (0, 0, 1)$ are to be intended in the restricted weak type sense. Otherwise, we believe our methods can be used to obtain a uniform sparse domination of the trilinear form associated to BHT_β that would imply Theorem 1 in the full range. However, we leave this for possible subsequent works.

Since the Hilbert transform is not bounded on L^∞ , bounds (1.2) cannot hold uniformly below the $(0, 1, 0) - (0, 0, 1)$ segment. Thus, Theorem 1 covers the full range where bounds (1.2) can hold uniformly in $\beta \in (0, 1]$, inside the range where bounds (1.2) are known to hold at all (non-uniformly). Furthermore Lacey in [Lac00] shows that the above range of exponents is sharp, modulo endpoints, for the non-uniform modulation invariant class of bilinear operators.

Oberlin and Thiele, showed Theorem 1 for a Walsh model of the bilinear Hilbert transform. The techniques there rely crucially on the perfect time frequency analysis of the Walsh phase space and on the possibility of constructing phase space tree projections, tools that we were unable to generalize for obtaining the current result in the real case.




FIGURE 1. Points $(p_1^{-1}, p_2^{-1}, 1 - p^{-1}) \in (-1, 1)^3$ with $p^{-1} = p_1^{-1} + p_2^{-1}$ for which (1.2) may hold, represented as affine combinations.

1.1. Applications. The bilinear Hilbert transform has shown up in multiple circumstances. One of the original motivations for the interest in BHT_β was Calderón’s

first commutator $C_1(f, A)$, that arises naturally as a correction term when studying solutions for elliptic operators with non-smooth coefficients. In the one-dimensional case one has

$$C_1(f, A)(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{A(x) - A(y)}{(x - y)^2} f(y) dy.$$

In [Cal65] Calderón showed that $f \mapsto C_1(f, A)$ is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ for all $p \in (1, \infty)$ when $\|A\|_{\text{Lip}} < +\infty$. Formally rewriting $C_1(f, A)$ using the fundamental theorem of calculus yields

$$C_1(f, A)(x) := \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(y) A'(y + \beta(x - y)) \frac{dy}{x - y} d\beta = \int_0^1 \text{BHT}_{\beta}[f, A'] d\beta.$$

Dualizing and enacting a change of variables allows one to recover Calderón's result from [Li06]. An alternative proof of the boundedness of Calderón's first commutator was given in [Mus14]. For a more detailed discussion of Calderón's commutators see Chapter 4 of [MS13].

More recently in [Gre+16], bounds on a trilinear form with full $\text{GL}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ symmetry acting on functions on \mathbb{R}^2 was obtained by a fiber-wise application of uniform bounds in the range covered by [GL04].

Generalizations of the bilinear Hilbert transform to functions on \mathbb{R}^2 have been systematically studied in [DT10]. Instead of just one parameter β , the corresponding trilinear form on \mathbb{R}^2 is determined by three matrixes $\vec{B} = (B_j)_{j \in \{1,2,3\}} \in (\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})^3$ and is given by

$$\text{BHF}_{\vec{B}}^K(f_1, f_2, f_3) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \prod_{j=1}^3 f_j \left(\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} + B_j \begin{pmatrix} s \\ t \end{pmatrix} \right) K(s, t) ds dt dx dy,$$

where K is a two-dimensional smooth Calderón-Zygmund kernel. If B is non-invertible, one can obtain completely novel multilinear integral operators, some of which have been studied independently (see Kováč's work on the twisted para-product in [Kov12]), while others remain beyond the current level understanding, like the triangular Hilbert transform (see [KTZK15]). A partial investigation of uniform bounds in the context of the 2-dimensional bilinear Hilbert transform has been carried by the second author in his PhD thesis [War19]. A preliminary version of this joint work also appeared there.

1.2. Wave packet representation and the space of symmetries. The bilinear Hilbert transform is symmetric under translations, modulations, and dilations, given by

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Tr}_y \varphi(z) &:= \varphi(z - y), \\ \text{Mod}_{\eta} \varphi(z) &:= e^{2\pi i \eta z} \varphi(z), \quad (\eta, y, t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^3 := \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \text{Dil}_t \varphi(z) &:= t^{-1} \varphi\left(\frac{z}{t}\right), \end{aligned}$$

that act on the functions f_1 and f_2 . In particular, up to a linear combination with the pointwise product, BHT_{β} is the unique bilinear operator that satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BHT}_{\beta} [\text{Tr}_y f_1, \text{Tr}_y f_2] &= \text{Tr}_y \text{BHT}_{\beta}[f_1, f_2] \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \text{BHT}_{\beta} [\text{Mod}_{\beta \eta} f_1, \text{Mod}_{\eta} f_2] &= \text{Mod}_{(1+\beta)\eta} \text{BHT}_{\beta}[f_1, f_2] \quad \forall \eta \in \mathbb{R}, \\ t^2 \text{BHT}_{\beta} [\text{Dil}_t f_1, \text{Dil}_t f_2] &= t \text{Dil}_t \text{BHT}_{\beta}[f_1, f_2] \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}^+. \end{aligned}$$

Based on this we show that BHT_β admits the following wave packet representation

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\pi i} \text{BHT}_\beta[f_1, f_2](x) &= f_1(x)f_2(x) \\ &- C_\beta \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \text{Emb}[f_1](\eta, y, t)[\varphi_0] \text{Emb}[f_2](\beta^{-1}\eta - (\beta t)^{-1}, y, \beta t)[\varphi_0] \\ &\quad \times \text{Tr}_y \text{Mod}_{\frac{1+\beta}{\beta}\eta - (\beta t)^{-1}} \text{Dil}_{\beta t} \varphi_0(x) d\eta dy dt; \end{aligned}$$

the wave packet $\varphi_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ can be chosen independently of β , and to satisfy $\text{spt} \widehat{\varphi_0} \subseteq B_{\tau_0}$ for any fixed $\tau_0 < 2^{-20}$. The constant $C_\beta > 0$ is uniformly bounded above and away from 0 for all $\beta \in (0, 1]$.

The model wave packet φ is allowed to be any function in $\Phi_\tau^\infty \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, the subset of Schwartz functions with compact Fourier support in $\overline{B}_\tau := [-\tau, \tau]$ for some $\tau > 0$. Hölder's inequality shows that the pointwise product $(f_1, f_2) \mapsto f_1(x)f_2(x)$ satisfies the bounds of Theorem 1; thus we concern ourselves only with the second summand on RHS(1.4).

When $p > 1$, we prove Theorem 1 by using identity (1.4) and dualizing: we reduce to showing that

$$(1.5) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \text{Emb}[f_1](\eta, y, t)[\varphi_0] \prod_{j=2}^3 \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j(\eta, y, t)[\varphi_0] d\eta dy dt \right| \lesssim \prod_{j=1}^3 \|f_j\|_{L^{p_j}(\mathbb{R})},$$

holds as long as $p_1, p_2, p_3 \in (1, \infty)$ and $\sum_{j=1}^3 p_j^{-1} = 1$. The maps $\Gamma_j : \mathbb{R}_+^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^3$ are given by

$$(1.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \Gamma_j(\eta, y, t) &:= \Gamma_{(\alpha_j, \beta_j, \gamma_j)}(\eta, y, t) := \left(\alpha_j(\eta + \gamma_j t^{-1}), y, \beta_j t \right), \\ (\alpha_2, \beta_2, \gamma_2) &:= \left(\frac{1}{\beta}, \beta, -1 \right), \\ (\alpha_3, \beta_3, \gamma_3) &:= \left(-\frac{1+\beta}{\beta}, \beta, \frac{-1}{1+\beta} \right); \end{aligned}$$

for convenience of notation we set $\Gamma_1(\eta, y, t) = (\eta, y, t)$. One should think of Γ_j as encoding the geometric datum of the degeneration parameter $\beta \in (0, 1]$ in terms of the group of symmetries generated by (1.3).

The embedding coefficients $\text{Emb}[f](\eta, y, t)[\varphi]$ appearing above provide a description of a function f in terms of the defining symmetries of BHT_β . They are given by

$$(1.7) \quad \text{Emb}[f](\eta, y, t)[\varphi] := \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(z) \text{Tr}_y \text{Mod}_{-\eta} \text{Dil}_t \varphi(z) dz.$$

An appropriate functional analytic framework to understand the embedded functions $F = \text{Emb}[f] : \mathbb{R}_+^3 \times \Phi_\tau^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is given by outer Lebesgue spaces introduced in [DT15].

Non-uniform ($\beta \gtrsim 1$) variants of the bounds (1.5) can be obtained in this framework from the chain of inequalities

$$(1.8) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \prod_{j=1}^3 \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j(\eta, y, t)[\varphi_0] d\eta dy dt \right| \\ \lesssim \left\| \prod_{j=1}^3 \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j[\varphi_0] \right\|_{L_{\nu_1^1}^1 \Psi_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1^1}^1 \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(1,1)}} \\ \lesssim \prod_{j=1}^3 \left\| \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j[\varphi_0] \right\|_{L_{\nu_1^1}^{p_j} \Psi_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1^1}^{q_j, +} \mathbb{S}_{\text{en}, j}},$$

and from the embedding bounds

$$(1.9) \quad \left\| \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j \right\|_{L_{\nu_1^1}^{p_j} \Psi_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1^1}^{q_j, +} \mathbb{S}_{\text{en}, j}} \lesssim \|f_j\|_{L^{p_j}(\mathbb{R})}.$$

for some appropriately chosen exponents $q_j \in (2, \infty]$. The terms appearing on RHS(1.8) are *iterated outer Lebesgue quasi-norms* $\|\cdot\|_{L_{\nu_1^1}^{p_j} \Psi_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1^1}^{q_j, +} \mathbb{S}_{\text{en}, j}}$. One should

think of these quasi-norms as appropriate generalizations of product Lebesgue space norms defined on \mathbb{R}_+^3 , the parameterization of the symmetries (1.3) of the problem at hand. Unlike in the case of classical Lebesgue integral norms, the outer measures ν_1 and μ_{Θ}^1 appearing in (1.9) fail to satisfy Carathéodory measurability conditions on any non-trivial sets: thus the need for a generalized integration theory. The symbols $\mathbb{S}_{\text{en}, j}$ and $\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(1,1)}$ appearing in the definition of the outer Lebesgue quasi-norms are *sizes*, quantities that allow us to control the magnitude of $\text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j$ locally.

The two inequalities in (1.8) are abstract functional analytic statements about (iterated) outer Lebesgue quasi-norms: a Radon-Nikodym -type domination lemma and an outer Hölder inequality. Inequalities (1.9) are bounds on wave packet embeddings $f \mapsto \text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma$. In [Ura16], with minor notational differences, one of the authors formulated inequalities (1.9) using this framework in the context of the variation norm Carleson operator, deducing them from Di Plinio and Ou's ideas in [PO18]. The iterated variants of outer Lebesgue spaces (e.g. bounds (1.8)) were initially introduced therein. A complete study of non-uniform bounds for BHT_{β} in this framework is carried out with suitable generalizations in [AU20b] for Banach-valued functions; the result there subsumes the non-uniform scalar results above. Originally, the approach to non-uniform bounds for BHT_{β} using outer Lebesgue spaces was carried out in [DT15], where the non-iterated variants of outer Lebesgue quasi-norms have been introduced and were sufficient to obtain bounds (1.5) for $p_j \in (2, \infty]$, $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

The [DT15] proof of the non-iterated variant of bound (1.9) relies on Calderón-Zygmund techniques when $p = \infty$ and on orthogonality considerations together with a covering lemma for sets on \mathbb{R}_+^3 when $p = 2$. The range $p \in (2, \infty]$ is then obtained by interpolation. To go to $p < 2$, [PO18] made use of a multi-frequency Calderón-Zygmund decomposition. In [AU20b] provided an alternative proof of (1.9) in the context of Banach space-valued spaces by interpolating the result with $p > 2$ with an endpoint that does not rely on cancellation at all, thus avoiding Hilbert space techniques. On the other hand, in the recent result [DPF22], Di Plinio and Fragos improve on [PO18] and obtain an endpoint embedding result

close to L^1 for the embedding bound (1.9) in the context of endpoint estimates for the Carleson operator. Their result do not follow by interpolation; they make use Gabor frame techniques and work in a localized outer Lebesgue endpoint space formally reminiscent of the space $X_{\mu_{\Theta}, \nu_{\beta}}^{q,r,+}$ we introduce in Section 3.4.

In the current paper, we generalize the framework of outer Lebesgue spaces and the bounds (1.9). However, we do not prove the analogue of (1.9) directly. With few exceptions, arguments are carried out purely in terms of properties of embedded functions $F : \mathbb{R}_+^3 \times \Phi_{\tau}^{\infty} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and corresponding outer Lebesgue quasi-norms; we mainly rely on a extensions of ideas related to the covering lemma from [DT15].

1.3. Outline of the argument. In this paper, we require a significant extensions of the framework of outer Lebesgue spaces. A Radon-Nikodym domination type result, as before, allows us to write

$$(1.10) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \prod_{j=1}^3 \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j(\eta, y, t) [\varphi_0] d\eta dy dt \right| \lesssim \left\| \prod_{j=1}^3 \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j \right\|_{L_{\nu_1}^1 \mathbb{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}, \nu_1}^1 \mathbb{I}_{\Theta} \Phi_{\tau}^N}.$$

First of all, the sizes we use no longer evaluate the function $\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma$ at a fixed $\varphi_0 \in \Phi_{\tau}^{\infty}$ but they track the dependence of $\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma$ on all possible generating wave packets $\varphi \in \Phi_{\tau}^{\infty}$. This is emphasized by the notation Φ_{τ}^N appearing in the size above; the parameter $N \in \mathbb{N}$ controls the rate of spatial decay of φ while $\tau > 0$ governs the support of $\widehat{\varphi}$. In the subsequent discussion and in the entirety of this paper the specific values of $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\tau > 0$ are inessential: inequalities hold with constants dependent on N and τ for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough and all $\tau > 0$ small enough independently. However, the choice of N and τ can be made independently of $\beta \in (0, 1]$. Actually, all implicit constants henceforth are uniformly bounded in $\beta \in (0, 1]$.

Continuing with the difference with respect to the non-uniform bound (1.8), we use a much more involved size

$$(1.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}_{\Theta} \Phi_{\tau}^N &:= \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l,l,l)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(o,l,l)} \Phi_{\tau}^N \\ &\quad + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l,l,o)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l,o,l)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l,o,o)} \Phi_{\tau}^N \end{aligned}$$

that replaces the simpler size $\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(1,1)}$ modeled locally on a classical L^1 Lebesgue norm.

The outer Lebesgue quasi-norm on the RHS(1.10) is then divided into two parts. A part with all but one size forming $\mathbb{I}_{\Theta} \Phi_{\tau}^N$ in (1.11), can be bound, similarly to (1.8), by a product of outer Lebesgue norms of the embedded functions $\text{Emb}[f_j]$. It holds that

$$(1.12) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left\| \prod_{j=1}^3 \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j \right\|_{L_{\nu_1}^1 \mathbb{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}, \nu_1}^1 \left(\mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l,l,l)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(o,l,l)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l,o,l)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l,o,o)} \Phi_{\tau}^N \right)} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \text{Emb}[f_1] \right\|_{L_{\nu_1}^{p_1} \mathbb{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}, \nu_1}^{q_1,+} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \prod_{j=2}^3 \left\| \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j \right\|_{L_{\nu_{\beta}}^{p_j} X_{\mu_{\Theta}, \nu_{\beta}}^{q_j, r_j,+} \mathbb{F}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \end{aligned}$$

for any $p_j \in (1, \infty)$ with $\sum_{j=1}^3 p_j^{-1} = 1$ with the powers q_j , r_j , and u_j chosen appropriately depending on p_j . We introduce a new outer measures ν_{β_j} on \mathbb{R}_+^3 to deal with the functions $\text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j$ with $j \in \{2, 3\}$, for which $\beta_j = \beta \ll 1$. Bounds (1.12) are deduced from an ‘‘atomic estimate’’ using restricted weak type

interpolation for outer measure Lebesgue spaces (Proposition 3.3). This generalizes the simpler Hölder inequality for outer Lebesgue spaces used in the non-uniform case of bounds (1.8). We then obtain bounds

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \prod_{j=1}^3 \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j \right\|_{L_{\nu_1}^1 \mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1}^1 \left(\mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l, l, l)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(o, l, l)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l, o, l)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l, l, o)} \Phi_{\tau}^N \right)} \\ & \lesssim \prod_{j=1}^3 \|f_j\|_{L^{p_j}(\mathbb{R})} \end{aligned}$$

by using (1.12) and by showing the non-uniform ($\beta = 1$) embedding bounds

$$(1.13) \quad \left\| \text{Emb}[f_1] \right\|_{L_{\nu_1}^{p_1} \mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}, \nu_1}^{q_1, +} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^{u_1} \Phi_{\tau}^N} \lesssim \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R})}$$

and the uniform embedding bounds

$$(1.14) \quad \left\| \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j \right\|_{L_{\nu_{\beta}}^{p_j} X_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_{\beta}}^{q_j, r_j, +} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{\tau}^N} \lesssim \|f_j\|_{L^{p_j}(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Bounds (1.13) mostly extend the available results from [AU20b] to account for additional terms in the size $\mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^{u_1}$ and a larger outer measure μ_{Θ}^{∞} (cfr. (1.9)). Bounds (1.14) are an innovation of the current work. Unlike (1.13), they are not proven directly as in [AU20b] and [DT15] by analyzing the function f_j . Rather, we obtain (1.14) from geometric properties of the diffeomorphisms Γ_j on the time-frequency-scale space and by proving a covering lemma directly on \mathbb{R}_+^3 .

To deal with the outer Lebesgue quasi-norms with the size $\mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l, o, o)} \Phi_{\tau}^N$ we prove the bound

$$(1.15) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left\| \prod_{j=1}^3 \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j \right\|_{L_{\nu_1}^1 \mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1}^1 \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l, o, o)} \Phi_{\tau}^N} \\ & \lesssim \left\| \text{Emb}[f_1] \right\|_{L_{\nu_1}^{p_1} \mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}, \nu_1}^{q_1, +} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \left\| \prod_{j=2}^3 \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j \right\|_{L_{\nu_{\beta}}^{p_{\times}} X_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_{\beta}}^{q_{\times}, r_{\times}, +} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_{\times}}^{u_{\times}} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \end{aligned}$$

for any $p_1, p_{\times} \in (1, \infty)$ with $p_1^{-1} + p_{\times}^{-1} = 1$ and for an appropriate choice of $q_1, q_{\times}, r_{\times}$, and u_1, u_{\times} . To show

$$\left\| \prod_{j=1}^3 \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j \right\|_{L_{\nu_1}^1 \mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1}^1 \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l, o, o)} \Phi_{\tau}^N} \lesssim \prod_{j=1}^3 \|f_j\|_{L^{p_j}(\mathbb{R})}$$

requires us, in addition to using (1.13), to prove a bilinear uniform embedding bound

$$(1.16) \quad \left\| \text{Emb}[f_2] \circ \Gamma_2 \text{Emb}[f_3] \circ \Gamma_3 \right\|_{L_{\nu_{\beta}}^{p_{\times}} X_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_{\beta}}^{q_{\times}, r_{\times}, +} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_{\times}}^{u_{\times}} \Phi_{\tau}^N} \lesssim \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R})} \|f_3\|_{L^{p_3}(\mathbb{R})}.$$

The product term in LHS(1.16) is another new result of this work. We believe it to be of crucial importance since for any fixed $f_{1,2,3} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ the term

$$\left\| \prod_{j=1}^3 \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j \right\|_{L_{\nu_1}^1 \mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1}^1 \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l, o, o)} \Phi_{\tau}^N}$$

becomes the most relevant one when $\beta \rightarrow 0^+$. Furthermore, we believe that bounds (1.16) are intrinsically bilinear and they cannot be deduced from linear embedding bounds similar to (1.14).

After setting up the appropriate extension of the outer measure Lebesgue space framework, we prove the following results.

Theorem 2. *Let $\Gamma_j = \Gamma_{(\alpha_j, \beta_j, \gamma_j)}$, $j \in \{2, 3\}$ with $(\alpha_j, \beta_j, \gamma_j)$ as in (1.6). In particular suppose $1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = 0$ and $|\gamma_j| \geq 1/4$, $j \in \{2, 3\}$. The bound*

$$(1.17) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|F_1 F_2 F_3\|_{\left(\mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l,l)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(o,l)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l,o)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(o,o)} \Phi_{\tau}^N\right)} \\ & \lesssim \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \|F_2\|_{\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_2}^{u_2} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \|F_3\|_{\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_3}^{u_3} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \end{aligned}$$

holds for any three functions $F_1, F_2, F_3 \in L_{\text{loc}}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{4\tau}^{(N-3)'}$ as long as $u_j \in \{1, 2, 3\} \in [1, \infty]$ with $\sum_{j=1}^3 u_j^{-1} \leq 1$. Furthermore the bound

$$(1.18) \quad \|F_1 F_2 F_3\|_{\mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l,o,o)} \Phi_{\tau}^N} \lesssim \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{F}_{\Gamma_1}^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{(N-5)}} \|F_2 F_3\|_{\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_{\times}}^{u_{\times}} \Phi_{4\tau}^{(N-5)}}$$

holds for any three functions $F_1, F_2, F_3 \in L_{\text{loc}}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{4\tau}^{(N-3)'}$ as long as $u_1, u_{\times} \in [1, \infty]$ with $u_1^{-1} + u_{\times}^{-1} \leq 1$.

The bounds (1.17) and (1.18) are referred to as the ‘‘single tree estimate’’ and they serve as the L^{∞} endpoints for the interpolation procedure to obtain (1.12) and (1.15), respectively.

The second main result of this work consists of proving uniform embedding bounds.

Theorem 3. *Let $\Gamma = \Gamma_{(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)}$ be as in (3.28). Let Θ be a open interval with $B_4 \subsetneq \Theta \subsetneq B_{2^8}$, and let Θ^{in} be a bounded open interval with $B_{2^{-5}}(-\gamma) \subsetneq \Theta^{\text{in}} \subsetneq B_{2^{-3}}(-\gamma)$. Let the size $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$ be given by*

$$(1.19) \quad \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N := \beta^{\frac{1}{u}} \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, \infty)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, 2)} \mathfrak{d}_{\tau}^N + \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u, 1)} \square_{\tau}^N$$

The bounds (1.14) hold with $\Gamma_j = \Gamma$ and with $(p_j, q_j, r_j, u_j) = (p, q, r, u)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ as long as $p \in (1, \infty]$, $q \in (\max(p', 2), \infty]$, and $1 \leq u < r < q$. The implicit constant is independent of $\Gamma_{(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)}$ and f .

Theorem 4. *Let $\Gamma_j = \Gamma_{(\alpha_j, \beta_j, \gamma_j)}$, $j \in \{2, 3\}$ with $(\alpha_j, \beta_j, \gamma_j)$ as in (1.6). Let Θ and Θ^{in} be as in Theorem 3. Let the size $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_{\times}}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$ is given by*

$$(1.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_{\times}}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N & := \beta^{\frac{1}{u}} \left(\Gamma_{\times}^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u, \infty)} (\Phi \otimes \Phi)_{\tau}^N + \Gamma_{\times}^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u, 2)} (\Phi \otimes \mathfrak{d})_{\tau}^N \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \Gamma_{\times}^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u, 2)} (\mathfrak{d} \otimes \Phi)_{\tau}^N \right) + \Gamma_{\times}^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, 1)} (\mathfrak{d} \otimes \mathfrak{d})_{\tau}^N + \Gamma_{\times}^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u, 1)} \square_{\tau}^N \end{aligned}$$

The bounds (1.16) hold for all $f_2, f_3 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ as long as $(p_2, p_3) \in (1, \infty]$, $p_{\times}^{-1} = p_2^{-1} + p_3^{-1}$, $q_{\times}^{-1} < \min\left(1 - \frac{1}{p_2}, \frac{1}{2}\right)^{-1} + \min\left(1 - \frac{1}{p_3}, \frac{1}{2}\right)^{-1}$, and $1 \leq u_{\times} < r_{\times} < q_{\times}$. The implicit constant is independent of $\beta \in (0, 1]$, that determines $(\alpha_j, \beta_j, \gamma_j)$ and Γ_j , $j \in \{2, 3\}$, and of f_2, f_3 .

As mentioned before, we do not prove these results directly but rather we deduce them from the non-uniform bounds (1.13), that in turn follow from [AU20b]. To do so we make use of covering lemmata depending on the geometry of the outer measure

space \mathbb{R}_+^3 . The arguments involved in the proof of the above results are purely positive and can be interpreted as boundedness properties of the map $F \mapsto F \circ \Gamma$ in terms of outer Lebesgue quasi-norms. As a matter of fact, with few exceptions, the functions $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{\tau}^{\infty'}$ in play need not be of the form $F = \text{Emb}[f]$ for some $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. We are hopeful that appropriate refinements can lead to completely removing such assumptions in the intermediate lemmata.

Finally, we carry out some improvements to the non-uniform embedding bounds in [AU20b] to obtain the following theorem. The improvement from using the outer measure μ_{Θ}^1 to μ_{Θ}^{∞} is common knowledge in time-scale-frequency analysis and had to merely be codified using the outer Lebesgue framework. We are not aware of a prior use of the quantity (size) $\mathbb{J}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$, appearing as a part of $\mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$; it represents a maximal truncation of a singular integral operator.

Theorem 5. *Let Θ be an bounded open real interval with $B_1 \subsetneq \Theta \subsetneq B_{2^{10}}$. Let the size $\mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$ be given by*

$$(1.21) \quad \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N := \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(\infty, \infty)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, 2)} \mathfrak{d}_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, 1)} \square_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{J}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N.$$

The bounds (1.13) hold for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ as long as $p \in (1, \infty)$, $q \in (\max(p', 2), \infty)$, and $u \in (1, \infty)$. The implicit constant is independent of f .

We summarize the steps necessary to prove Theorem 1.

Proof. Proof of Theorem 1 Given the identity (1.4), the claim follows by interpolation of bound (1.5) for any fixed $(p_1, p_2, p_3) \in (1, \infty)^3$ with $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} p_j^{-1} = 1$ boundedness result [Li06, Theorem 2].

To show that the bound (1.5) holds we first apply the bound (1.10) to reduce ourselves to showing the bounds

$$\text{RHS}(1.10) = \text{LHS}(1.12) + \text{LHS}(1.15) \lesssim \prod_{j=1}^3 \|f_j\|_{L^{p_j}(\mathbb{R})} = \text{RHS}(1.5).$$

Let us fix $(p_1, p_2, p_3) \in (1, \infty)^3$.

Bounds (1.14) hold for $j \in \{2, 3\}$ as long as $q_j > \max(2, p'_j)$, and $1 < u_j < r_j < q_j$. Bounds (1.13) hold as long as $q_1 > \max(2, p'_1)$ and $u_1 < \infty$. Bounds (1.16) hold with $p_{\times}^{-1} = p_2^{-1} + p_3^{-2} = 1 - p_1^{-1}$, with $q_{\times}^{-1} = q_2^{-1} + q_3^{-1}$, with $r_{\times}^{-1} = r_2^{-1} + r_3^{-1} > q_{\times}^{-1}$. From this we get that

$$\text{RHS}(1.12) + \text{RHS}(1.15) \lesssim \prod_{j=1}^3 \|f_j\|_{L^{p_j}(\mathbb{R})}.$$

It remains to show that bounds (1.12) and (1.15) hold for an appropriate choice of $1 < u_j < r_j < q_j$. Let $q_j = \max(2, p'_j) + 4\varepsilon$ and let $r_j = 2 + 2\varepsilon'$ and $u_j = 2 + \varepsilon''$, $j \in \{2, 3\}$, for some small $\varepsilon > \varepsilon' > \varepsilon'' > 0$ to be determined later. It then holds that $\sum_{j=1}^3 q_j^{-1} > 1$ if $\varepsilon > 0$ is chosen small enough. We also have $2 < u_j < r_j < q_j$ for $j \in \{2, 3\}$ for all sufficiently small choices of $\varepsilon' > \varepsilon'' > 0$. Fix $u_1 = (1 - u_2^{-1} - u_3^{-1})^{-1} < \infty$.

Note that $p_2^{-1} + p_3^{-2} = 1 - p_1^{-1} < 1$ while $r_2^{-1} + r_3^{-1} = \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon'} > 1 - p_1^{-1}$ if $\varepsilon' > 0$ is chosen small enough. Under these conditions the bound (1.12) and the bound (1.15) hold (see Proposition 5.4). \square

1.4. Structure of the paper. In Section 2 we show that the identity (1.4) holds.

In Section 3 we discuss the functional framework used to deal with embedded functions $F : \mathbb{R}_+^3 \times \Phi_\tau^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ for which an important example are functions of the form $F = \text{Emb}[f]$. In Section 3.1 we discuss the general outer Lebesgue space framework and prove abstract functional analytic results. We recall the necessary facts and prove a restricted weak type interpolation theorem for these spaces. In Section 3.2 we discuss the outer Lebesgue space structure specifically on \mathbb{R}_+^3 that we will be using throughout the paper. In particular, we introduce the outer measures μ_Θ^1 and μ_Θ^∞ , trees, and sizes. We first discuss the sizes used to locally control the magnitude of embedded functions $F : \mathbb{R}_+^3 \times \Phi_\tau^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and then we introduce the size \mathbb{I}_Θ appearing in (1.10) adapted to controlling the term $\prod_{j=1}^3 \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j$ i.e. the product of several functions $F_j : \mathbb{R}_+^3 \times \Phi_\tau^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. In Section 3.3 we discuss how the former sizes must be modified when dealing with compositions with diffeomorphisms: $F \mapsto F \circ \Gamma$. We also define the product sizes used to deal with functions $F_\times = F_2 F_3$ appearing in (1.15) and (1.16). In Section 3.4 we introduce the strip outer measures ν_1 and ν_β , and we construct *localized outer Lebesgue quasi-norms* based on a localization procedure of the already defined outer Lebesgue quasi-norms. We thus give meaning to the symbols $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\Theta^\infty, \nu_1}^{q,+}$, $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_\beta}^{q,+}$, and $X_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_\beta}^{q,r,+}$.

In Section 4 we prove Theorem 2, the single tree estimate. This is the starting point for showing bounds (1.12) and (1.15) in the following section. The technically involved proof can be seen as the motivation for the specific choice of sizes introduced in Section 3.

We begin Section 5 by showing that (1.10) holds and by doing so we justify the choice of the size \mathbb{I}_Θ introduced in Section 3.2. We then prove bounds (1.12) and (1.15) by using the restricted weak type interpolation statement from Section 3.2. The bulk of this part consists of deducing the atomic bound necessary to apply interpolation (Proposition 3.3) from the single tree estimate (Theorem 2).

In Section 6 we prove Theorem 5. We begin by referencing available non-uniform results that apply to $\text{Emb}[f_1]$. We then prove the necessary improvements consisting of controlling the new term \mathbb{J}_Θ^u , that is part of the size \mathbb{F}_Θ^u , and improving the localized outer Lebesgue norm $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_1}^{q,+}$ to $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\Theta^\infty, \nu_1}^{q,+}$. In doing so we loose the $p = \infty$ endpoint for the embedding.

In Section 7 we prove Theorem 3. We begin by proving two boundedness results for the map $F \mapsto F \circ \Gamma$ in terms of outer Lebesgue quasi-norms. The two results, encoded in Proposition 7.1 and Proposition 7.2, are expressed in terms of two auxiliary Lebesgue quasi-norms, that do not appear in Theorem 3. Next, in Lemma 7.3 we show that as long as $F = \text{Emb}[f]$ the two auxiliary Lebesgue quasi-norms control the ones appearing in Theorem 3. Then, by appealing to Theorem 5 we deduce that Theorem 3 holds. Section 7.1 is dedicated to proving Proposition 7.1, Section 7.2 is dedicated to proving Proposition 7.2, and Section 7.3 is dedicated to proving Lemma 7.3. Proposition 7.1 and Proposition 7.2 are a consequence of two purely geometric covering lemmata on \mathbb{R}_+^3 that can be found in the respective sections.

In Section 8 we prove Theorem 4 that follows along the same lines of the proof Theorem 3. Most of the arguments will rely on the results of Section 7.

1.5. Notation. We denote by $B_r(c)$ the Euclidean open ball of radius r . The dimension can usually be extrapolated from context. If $c = 0$ then we use the

shorthand B_r . We use the bracket notation:

$$\langle x \rangle := (1 + x^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Given two subsets A, B of a metric space we set $\text{dist}(A, B) := \inf_{a \in A, b \in B} \text{dist}(a, b)$ and $\text{dist}(a, B) := \inf_{b \in B} \text{dist}(a, b)$. Given $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ we denote by $|A|$ its Lebesgue measure. The Schwartz space, denoted by $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, is the space of $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ functions for which

$$\left\| \langle x \rangle^N f \right\|_{C^N} < +\infty \quad \forall N \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We denote $\mathbb{R}_+ := (0, +\infty)$ and $\mathbb{R}_+^d := \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Given a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ we set

$$E + x = \{y + x : y \in E\}, \quad \lambda E = \{\lambda y : y \in E\}.$$

We denote the total derivative in a variable (z) by d_z ; the partial derivative in the i^{th} coordinate is denoted by ∂_i . We use the convention on the order of variables that allows us to use more descriptive notation:

$$\partial_\eta \equiv \partial_\theta \equiv \partial_1, \quad \partial_y \equiv \partial_\zeta \equiv \partial_2, \quad \partial_t \equiv \partial_\sigma \equiv \partial_3.$$

We do not use φ' to denote the derivative of a function φ : we prefer $\partial\varphi$ and leave the notation φ' to denote another function that is not necessarily related to φ .

The Fourier transform of a function f on \mathbb{R}^d is given by

$$\mathfrak{F}f(\widehat{z}) \equiv \widehat{f}(\widehat{z}) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(z) e^{-2\pi i z \widehat{z}} dz.$$

If f depends on multiple variables we will denote the variable in which we take the Fourier transform by writing \mathfrak{F}_z in place of \mathfrak{F} . We often denote the ‘‘dual’’ variable to z by \widehat{z} . Given a functions f we set $f^\vee(z) = f(-z)$.

We write $A \lesssim B$ if there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that $A \leq CB$. The constant may implicitly depend on some parameters, as judged from context, but it will always be independent of $\beta \in (0, 1]$ in our problem. If we want to emphasize that the constant C may depend on a parameter p , we write $A \lesssim_p B$. We generally allow the constant C in our bounds to change value from one line to the next. We say that a quantity A is bounded if $|A| \lesssim 1$ and we say it is bounded away from 0 if $|A|^{-1} \lesssim 1$.

Given an equality or inequality (\star) we denote by $\text{LHS}(\star)$ and $\text{RHS}(\star)$ the expressions on the left and right hand sides of (\star) , respectively.

If $K \in D'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we abuse the integral to denote duality pairing by writing $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} fK$ or $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(z)K(z)dz$. The distribution δ is given by

$$\int f(z)\delta(z)dz = f(0).$$

Given $\varphi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$ we set

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(z)\delta(\varphi(z))dz = \int_{\varphi^{-1}(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{f(z)}{|\nabla\varphi(z)|} d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(z)$$

as long as $\nabla\varphi \neq 0$ on $\varphi^{-1}(0)$. The above can be interpreted using the limiting procedure if $f \in C^0$ by setting

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(z)\delta(\varphi(z))dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(z)\delta_\varepsilon(\varphi(z))dz$$

where $\delta_\varepsilon(z) = \varepsilon^{-1}\delta_1(z/\varepsilon)$ for some $\delta_1 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $\int \delta_1(x)dx = 1$. We do not elaborate on the formal theory of such integrals; the interested reader is directed to [Fed96].

1.6. Acknowledgments. We thank Christoph Thiele, Pavel Zorin-Kranich, and Marco Fraccaroli for their encouragement, suggestions, and insightful questions.

We thank Walker Stern and Filippo Mazzoli for helpful stylistic comments.

This paper has been written with the GNU TeXmacs system [He98]

2. WAVE PACKET REPRESENTATION.

Proposition 2.1. *For any $\mathfrak{r}_0 < 2^{-20}$ there exists $\varphi \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}_0}^\infty$ i.e. $\varphi_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ with $\text{spt}\widehat{\varphi}_0 \subset [-\mathfrak{r}_0, \mathfrak{r}_0]$, such that identity (1.4) holds for all $\beta \in (0, 1]$ and all $f_j \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ with a real constant $C_\beta > 0$ uniformly bounded from above and away from 0. The integral in (1.4) converges absolutely and locally uniformly in x . In particular, for any $R \gg 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a compact set $\mathbb{K} \subset \mathbb{R}_+^3$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus \mathbb{K}} \left| \text{Emb}[f_1](\eta, y, t)[\varphi_0] \text{Emb}[f_2](\beta^{-1}\eta - (\beta t)^{-1}, y, \beta t)[\varphi_0] \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \text{Tr}_y \text{Mod}_{\frac{1+\beta}{\beta}\eta - (\beta t)^{-1}} \text{Dil}_{\beta t} \varphi_0(x) \right| d\eta dy dt < \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in B_R$.

Proof. Using the Fourier inversion formula we can write that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BHT}_\beta[f_1, f_2](x) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\varepsilon < |t| < \varepsilon^{-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widehat{f}_1(\xi_1) \widehat{f}_2(\xi_2) e^{2\pi i(\xi_1(x-t) + \xi_2(x+\beta t))} d\xi_1 d\xi_2 \frac{dt}{t} \\ &= -\pi i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widehat{f}_1(\xi_1) \widehat{f}_2(\xi_2) e^{2\pi i(\xi_1 + \xi_2)x} \text{sgn}(\xi_1 - \beta \xi_2) d\xi_1 d\xi_2. \end{aligned}$$

We used that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{|t| > \varepsilon} e^{-2\pi i \xi t} \frac{dt}{t} &= -\pi i \text{sgn}(\xi) \quad \forall \xi \neq 0, \\ \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \sup_{\xi} \left| \int_{|t| > \varepsilon} e^{-2\pi i \xi t} \frac{dt}{t} \right| &< +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\frac{1}{2} f_1(x) f_2(x) - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \text{BHT}_\beta[f_1, f_2](x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widehat{f}_1(\xi_1) \widehat{f}_2(\xi_2) e^{2\pi i(\xi_1 + \xi_2)x} \mathbb{1}_{\xi_1 - \beta \xi_2 > 0} d\xi_1 d\xi_2.$$

Let $\widehat{\varphi}_0 \in C_c^\infty(B_{\mathfrak{r}_0})$ be real-valued, even, with $0 \leq \widehat{\varphi}_0(\widehat{z}) \leq 1$, and with $\widehat{\varphi}_0(\widehat{z}) = 1$ for $\widehat{z} \in B_{\mathfrak{r}_0/2}$. We show that the multiplier $\mathbb{1}_{\xi_1 - \beta \xi_2 > 0}$ admits the representation

$$\mathbb{1}_{(\xi_1 - \beta \xi_2) > 0} = \frac{1}{C_\beta} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \widehat{\varphi}_0(t\xi_1 - \theta) \widehat{\varphi}_0(\beta t\xi_2 - \theta + 1) \widehat{\varphi}_0(\beta t(\xi_1 + \xi_2) - (1 + \beta)\theta + 1) d\theta \frac{dt}{t};$$

the integral converges uniformly for (ξ_1, ξ_2) on any compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(\beta\xi, \xi), \xi \in \mathbb{R}\}$. A change of variables $\theta' = \theta - t\xi_1$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} m_{t,\beta}(\xi_1, \xi_2) &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \widehat{\varphi}_0(t\xi_1 - \theta) \widehat{\varphi}_0(\beta t\xi_2 - \theta + 1) \widehat{\varphi}_0(\beta t(\xi_1 + \xi_2) - (1 + \beta)\theta + 1) d\theta \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \widehat{\varphi}_0(-\theta) \widehat{\varphi}_0(-\widetilde{\xi} - \theta + 1) \widehat{\varphi}_0(-\widetilde{\xi} - (1 + \beta)\theta + 1) d\theta = m(\widetilde{\xi}) \end{aligned}$$

with $\tilde{\xi} := t(\xi_1 - \beta\xi_2)$. The integrand vanishes unless $\theta \in B_{\tau_0} \cap B_{\tau_0}(1 - \tilde{\xi})$ and is 1 when $\theta \in B_{\tau_0/4} \cap B_{\tau_0/4}(1 - \tilde{\xi})$. This shows that

$$\frac{\tau_0}{4} \mathbb{1}_{B_{\frac{\tau_0}{4}}(1)}(\tilde{\xi}) \leq m(\tilde{\xi}) \leq \tau_0 \mathbb{1}_{B_{2\tau_0}(1)}(\tilde{\xi}).$$

Using the change of variables $t' = t\tilde{\xi}$ if $\tilde{\xi} > 0$ and support considerations if $\tilde{\xi} \leq 0$ we obtain that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} m_{t,\beta}(\xi_1, \xi_2) \frac{dt}{t} = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} m(t(\xi_1 - \beta\xi_2)) \frac{dt}{t} = C_{\varphi,\beta} \mathbb{1}_{(0+\infty)}(t(\xi_1 - \beta\xi_2))$$

with $C_{\varphi,\beta} \in \left(\frac{\tau_0^2}{8}, 8\tau_0^2\right)$. Using this identity and the Fourier inversion formula we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widehat{f}_1(\xi_1) \widehat{f}_2(\xi_2) \mathbb{1}_{(\xi_1 - \beta\xi_2) > 0} e^{2\pi i(\xi_1 + \xi_2)x} d\xi_1 d\xi_2 \\ &= \frac{1}{C_{\varphi,\beta}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widehat{f}_1(\xi_1) \widehat{f}_2(\xi_2) \mathbb{1}_{(\xi_1 - \beta\xi_2) > 0} e^{2\pi i(\xi_1 + \xi_2)x} d\xi_1 d\xi_2 d\theta \frac{dt}{t} \\ &= \frac{1}{C_{\varphi,\beta}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f_1 * \text{Dil}_t \text{Mod}_\theta \varphi_0(y_1) f_2 * \text{Dil}_{\beta t} \text{Mod}_{\theta-1} \varphi_0(y_2) \\ &\quad \times \text{Dil}_{\beta t} \text{Mod}_{(1+\beta)\theta-1} \varphi_0(y_3) e^{2\pi i(\xi_1(x-y_1-y_3) + \xi_2(x-y_2-y_3))} d\xi_1 d\xi_2 dy_1 dy_2 dy_3 d\theta \frac{dt}{t} \\ &= \frac{1}{C_{\varphi,\beta}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f_1 * \text{Dil}_t \text{Mod}_\theta \varphi_0(y_1) f_2 * \text{Dil}_{\beta t} \text{Mod}_{\theta-1} \varphi_0(y_2) \\ &\quad \times \text{Dil}_{\beta t} \text{Mod}_{(1+\beta)\theta-1} \varphi_0(y_3) \delta(x - y_1 - y_3) \delta(x - y_2 - y_3) dy_1 dy_2 dy_3 d\theta \frac{dt}{t} \\ &= \frac{1}{C_{\varphi,\beta}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} f_1 * \text{Dil}_t \text{Mod}_\theta \varphi_0(y) f_2 * \text{Dil}_{\beta t} \text{Mod}_{\theta-1} \varphi_0(y) \\ &\quad \times \text{Tr}_y \text{Dil}_{\beta t} \text{Mod}_{(1+\beta)\theta-1} \varphi_0(x) d\theta dy \frac{dt}{t} \\ &= \frac{1}{C_{\varphi,\beta}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} f_1 * \text{Dil}_t \text{Mod}_\theta \varphi_0(y) f_2 * \text{Dil}_{\beta t} \text{Mod}_{\theta-1} \varphi_0(y) \\ &\quad \times \text{Tr}_y \text{Mod}_{\frac{1+\beta}{\beta} \eta - (\beta t)^{-1}} \text{Dil}_{\beta t} \varphi_0(x) d\eta dy \frac{dt}{t}. \end{aligned}$$

The detailed verification of the validity of the above manipulations is omitted. To justify the convergence claim let us first suppose that $\text{spt} \widehat{f}_1, \text{spt} \widehat{f}_2 \subset B_S$ for some $S \gg 1$. For $t > \frac{1}{100S}$ and $x \in B_R$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & |f_1 * \text{Dil}_t \text{Mod}_\theta \varphi_0(y)| + |f_2 * \text{Dil}_{\beta t} \text{Mod}_{\theta-1} \varphi_0(y)| \lesssim_{\varphi,\beta} t^{-1} (\|f_1\|_{L^1} + \|f_2\|_{L^1}), \\ & \left| \text{Tr}_y \text{Mod}_{\frac{1+\beta}{\beta} \eta - (\beta t)^{-1}} \text{Dil}_{\beta t} \widehat{\varphi}_0(x) \right| \lesssim_{\varphi} t^{-1} \left\langle \frac{|y| - R}{t} \right\rangle^{-100} \end{aligned}$$

while for $t < \frac{1}{100S}$ either $\widehat{z} \rightarrow \widehat{\varphi}_0(\widehat{z} - \theta)$ or $\widehat{z} \rightarrow \widehat{\varphi}_0(\widehat{z} - \theta - 1)$ vanishes on $B_{\frac{1}{100}}$ so

$$f_1 * \text{Dil}_t \text{Mod}_\theta \varphi_0(y) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad f_2 * \text{Dil}_{\beta t} \text{Mod}_{\theta-1} \varphi_0(y) = 0.$$

The claim for $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ without restrictions on the support of the Fourier transform follows by standard approximation arguments. \square

3. OUTER LEBESGUE SPACES AND THE TIME-FREQUENCY-SCALE SPACE.

In this section we discuss outer Lebesgue spaces and quasi-norms in general and, specifically, their details in the case of the time-scale-frequency space \mathbb{R}_+^3 . We begin by discussing embedded functions i.e. functions of the form $\mathbb{R}_+^3 \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \text{Emb}[f](\eta, y, t)[\varphi]$ that are the main actors of our functional analytic framework.

We define the Banach space of band-limited wave packets of order $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and frequency radius $\tau > 0$ by setting

$$\Phi_\tau^N := \{\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) : \widehat{\varphi} \in C^N(\mathbb{R}), \text{spt}\widehat{\varphi} \subseteq \overline{B_\tau}\}$$

with an associated norm $\|\varphi\|_{\Phi_\tau^N} = \|\widehat{\varphi}\|_{C^N}$; we set $\Phi_\tau^\infty := \bigcap_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \Phi_\tau^N$. We say that $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes^k \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$ if the map $(\Phi_\tau^\infty)^k \ni (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k) \mapsto F(\cdot)[\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k] \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$ is k -linear and is valued in signed Radon measures on \mathbb{R}_+^3 . Recall that a Radon measure is a measure that is locally finite and inner and outer regular. In the special case of $k = 0$, the space $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes^0 \Phi_\tau^{\infty'} = \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$ is simply the space of \mathbb{C} -valued Radon measures on \mathbb{R}_+^3 . When $k = 1$ we omit k from the notation and simply write $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$. We denote by $L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes^k \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$ the subspaces of $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes^k \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$ given by functions such that for every compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}_+^3$ there exists $N_K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sup_{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k} \left\| F(\eta, y, t)[\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k] \right\|_{L^\infty(K)} < \infty,$$

where the upper bound is taken over $\varphi_j \in \Phi_\tau^\infty$ with $\|\varphi_j\|_{\Phi_\tau^{N_K}} \leq 1$, $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. For any fixed $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k \in \Phi_\tau^\infty$ we have identified the function $F(\eta, y, t)[\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k]$ with the measure $F(\eta, y, t)[\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k] d\eta dy dt$. According to this notation, $\text{Emb}[f] \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$ for any $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. If $\tau' > \tau$ then by restricting we can identify a function $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{\tau'}^{\infty'}$ with a function $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$. Analogously to the above we can define $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes \Phi_{\tau'}^{\infty'}$ for any locally compact topological space \mathbb{X} .

3.1. Generalities of outer measure spaces. We now provide a with brief overview of the construction and properties of general outer Lebesgue spaces. Specific instances for the space \mathbb{R}_+^3 of all the objects introduced here will be discussed in the next section. The reader may want to always assume that $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{R}_+^3$ as that is the context in which we will be using the subsequent construction. Generally, let \mathbb{X} be a locally compact topological space. An outer measure μ on \mathbb{X} is a function $\mu : 2^{\mathbb{X}} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ that is σ -subadditive. A σ -generating collection on \mathbb{X} is a collection $\mathbb{B} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ of Borel sets B with $\mu(B) < \infty$ such that \mathbb{X} can be written as a union of countably many elements of \mathbb{B} and such that $\mu(E)$ for any $E \subset \mathbb{X}$ can be recovered by countable coverings of elements of \mathbb{B} :

$$(3.1) \quad \mu(E) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{B \in \mathbb{B}} \mu(B) : E \supseteq \bigcup_{B \in \mathbb{B}} B \right\}.$$

We denote countable unions of \mathbb{B} by

$$\mathbb{B}^\cup := \left\{ \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n \text{ with } B_n \in \mathbb{B} \right\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes^k \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$ be defined as in the beginning of Section 3, that we refer to, by a light abuse of lexicon, as “functions” on \mathbb{X} . A size is a positive norm-like functional

$\mathbb{S} : \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes^k \Phi_{\mathbb{r}}^{\infty'} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ with the following properties. First of all it possesses the properties of a quasi-norm:

$$\|\lambda F\|_{\mathbb{S}} = |\lambda| \|F\|_{\mathbb{S}} \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes^k \Phi_{\mathbb{r}}^{\infty'},$$

and there exists $\text{Tri}_{\mathbb{S}} \geq 1$ such that

$$\|F_1 + F_2\|_{\mathbb{S}} \leq \text{Tri}_{\mathbb{S}} (\|F_1\|_{\mathbb{S}} + \|F_2\|_{\mathbb{S}}), \quad \forall F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes^k \Phi_{\mathbb{r}}^{\infty'}.$$

We do not require separation and allow functions $F \neq 0$ with $\|F\|_{\mathbb{S}} = 0$. We require monotonicity in the following form:

$$(3.2) \quad \|\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{X} \setminus E} F\|_{\mathbb{S}} \leq \|F\|_{\mathbb{S}}, \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes^k \Phi_{\mathbb{r}}^{\infty'}, \quad \forall E \in \mathbb{B}^{\cup}.$$

Finally, we ask that \mathbb{S} be regular: if $E_n^+ \in \mathbb{B}^{\cup}$ is an increasing sequence of sets and $E_n^- \in \mathbb{B}^{\cup}$ is a decreasing sequences of sets such that $\bigcup_n E_n^+ \setminus E_n^- = \mathbb{X}$ then

$$(3.3) \quad \|F\|_{\mathbb{S}} \lesssim \liminf_n \left\| \mathbb{1}_{E_n^+ \setminus E_n^-} F \right\|_{\mathbb{S}}.$$

We call the tuple $(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{B}, \mu, \mathbb{S})$ an outer Lebesgue space. Sizes and measures can be combined via positive linear combinations. Two sizes \mathbb{S} and \mathbb{S}' are equivalent if $\|F\|_{\mathbb{S}} \approx \|F\|_{\mathbb{S}'}$ and similarly two outer measures μ and μ' are equivalent if $\mu(E) \approx \mu'(E)$ for all $E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$.

Given an outer Lebesgue space, we define outer Lebesgue quasi-norms by combining the notions of size and outer measures. The λ -superlevel measure of a function $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes^k \Phi_{\mathbb{r}}^{\infty'}$ is given by

$$\mu(\|F\|_{\mathbb{S}} > \lambda) := \inf \{ \mu(E) : E \in \mathbb{B}^{\cup}, \|\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{X} \setminus E} F\|_{\mathbb{S}} \leq \lambda \}.$$

This quantity, in general, is not a measure of any specific set, but rather it is an interpolating quantity between the outer measure μ and the size \mathbb{S} . The notion above encodes the optimal way of splitting F into two parts: $F = \mathbb{1}_E F + \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{X} \setminus E} F$ with $E \in \mathbb{B}^{\cup}$ so that $\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{X} \setminus E} F$ has controlled size and $\mathbb{1}_E F$ is supported on a set of controlled measure.

Given $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes^k \Phi_{\mathbb{r}}^{\infty'}$, its outer Lebesgue quasi-norms and their weak variants are given by

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \|F\|_{L_{\mu}^p \mathbb{S}} &:= \left(\int_0^{\infty} \lambda \mu(\|F\|_{\mathbb{S}} > \lambda^{\frac{1}{p}}) \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \\ \|F\|_{L_{\mu}^{p, \infty} \mathbb{S}} &:= \left(\sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda \mu(\|F\|_{\mathbb{S}} > \lambda^{\frac{1}{p}}) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \forall p \in (0, \infty) \\ \|F\|_{L_{\mu}^{\infty} \mathbb{S}} &:= \|F\|_{\mathbb{S}}. \end{aligned}$$

The quantities above vanish only if $\mu(\|F\|_{\mathbb{S}} > 0) = 0$ so we quotient out such functions similarly to how one does in classical Lebesgue theory. Using the monotonicity property (3.2), one can check that the quantities above are indeed quasi-norms with

$$\|F_1 + F_2\|_{L_{\mu}^p \mathbb{S}} \leq \text{Tri}_{L_{\mu}^p \mathbb{S}} \left(\|F_1\|_{L_{\mu}^p \mathbb{S}} + \|F_2\|_{L_{\mu}^p \mathbb{S}} \right), \quad \text{Tri}_{L_{\mu}^p \mathbb{S}} \leq 2^{1+\frac{1}{p}} \text{Tri}_{\mathbb{S}}.$$

The quasi-norms $L_{\mu}^p \mathbb{S}$ are themselves regular for any $p \in (0, \infty)$ since

$$\mu(\|\mathbb{1}_{E_n^+ \setminus E_n^-} F\|_{\mathbb{S}} > 2\lambda) \lesssim \liminf_n \mu(\|\mathbb{1}_{E_n^+ \setminus E_n^-} F\|_{\mathbb{S}} > \lambda)$$

for any sequence of sets $E_n^+, E_n^- \in \mathbb{B}^{\cup}$ (respectively increasing and decreasing) such that $\bigcup_n E_n^+ \setminus E_n^- = \mathbb{X}$.

We write $F \in L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}$ if $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{X}) \otimes^k \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$ and $\|F\|_{L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}} < \infty$; the space \mathbb{X} and the values of k and τ are encoded in the domains for the size \mathbb{S} and the measure \mathbb{X} and thus can be deduced without being explicitly specified.

We now summarize some of the properties of outer Lebesgue quasi-norms relevant for our work. First of all, outer Lebesgue spaces are a quasi-normed space; in general, if $\|\cdot\| : X \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ is a function on a vector space X that satisfies

$$\|v_1 + v_2\| \leq \text{Tri}_{\|\cdot\|}(\|v_1\| + \|v_2\|)$$

then for any $K \in \mathbb{N}$ one has

$$(3.5) \quad \left\| \sum_{k=1}^K v_k \right\| \leq C_{\|\cdot\|} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K k^{C_{\|\cdot\|}} \|v_k\| \right)$$

for some $C_{\|\cdot\|} > 0$ depending only on $\text{Tri}_{\|\cdot\|}$. In particular, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $C_{\|\cdot\|, \varepsilon}$ such that

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^K v_k \right\| \leq C_{\|\cdot\|, \varepsilon} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K 2^{\varepsilon k} \|v_k\| \right).$$

We omit the proof of this fact; it relies on a dyadic partitioning argument.

Outer Lebesgue quasi-norms satisfy many of the properties that hold for classical Lebesgue spaces.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{B}, \mu, \mathbb{S})$ be an outer space. If $\bar{\mu}$ is another outer measure then for any $p \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that*

$$(3.6) \quad \|F\|_{L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}} \leq \sup_{E \in \mathbb{B} \cup} \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}(E)}{\mu(E)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \|F\|_{L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}}$$

(the bound is non-trivial only if $\mu(E) = 0 \implies \bar{\mu}(E) = 0$). The Chebyshev inequality holds: for any $p \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$\|F\|_{L_\mu^{p, \infty} \mathbb{S}} \lesssim \|F\|_{L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}} \quad \forall F \in L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}.$$

On finite measure spaces, outer Lebesgue quasi-norms are nested: for any $p_-, p_+ \in (0, \infty]$ with $p_- \leq p_+$ it holds that

$$(3.7) \quad \|F\|_{L_\mu^{p_-} \mathbb{S}} \lesssim \mu(\|F\|_{\mathbb{S}} > 0)^{\frac{1}{p_-} - \frac{1}{p_+}} \|F\|_{L_\mu^{p_+, \infty} \mathbb{S}}$$

for any $F \in L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}$ with an implicit constant independent of F . Outer Lebesgue quasi-norms are log-convex in the exponent p . Given any $p_0, p_1 \in (0, \infty]$ and any $\theta \in (0, 1)$ it holds that

$$(3.8) \quad \|F\|_{L_\mu^{p_\theta} \mathbb{S}} \leq C_{p_0, p_1, \theta} \|F\|_{L_\mu^{p_0, \infty} \mathbb{S}}^{1-\theta} \|F\|_{L_\mu^{p_1, \infty} \mathbb{S}}^\theta, \quad \forall F \in L_\mu^{p_0, \infty} \mathbb{S} \cap L_\mu^{p_1, \infty} \mathbb{S}.$$

with $p_\theta^{-1} := (1 - \theta)p_0^{-1} + \theta p_1^{-1}$.

We omit the proof of this statement as it the same as for classical Lebesgue spaces and relies on the super-level set representation (3.4) of the (outer) integral. The properties above motivate the definition of a $L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}$ -atom and an associated decomposition statement for functions $F \in L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}$.

Proposition 3.2 (Atomic decomposition). *Let $(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{B}, \mu, \mathbb{S})$ be an outer space. Given $p \in (0, \infty]$, an $L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}$ -atom is a function $F \in L_\mu^\infty \mathbb{S}$ such that*

$$\mu(\|F\|_{\mathbb{S}} > 0)^{\frac{1}{p}} \|F\|_{L_\mu^\infty \mathbb{S}} \leq 1.$$

Given any $F \in L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}$ there exists a decreasing sequence of sets $A_k \subset A_{k-1} \subset \mathbb{X}$ such that

$$\lim_N \left\| F - \sum_{k=-N}^N \mathbb{1}_{\Delta A_k} F \right\|_{L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}} = 0$$

with $\Delta A_k := A_{k-1} \setminus A_k$. The sets ΔA_k are such that

$$\|\mathbb{1}_{\Delta A_k} F\|_{\mathbb{S}} \leq 2^{\frac{k}{p}}, \quad \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu(\Delta A_k) 2^k \approx \|F\|_{L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}}^p,$$

and $A_k = \emptyset$ if $\|F\|_{\mathbb{S}} < 2^{k/p}$. In particular, for some $C \gtrsim 1$, the functions $\frac{1}{C} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\Delta A_k} F}{\|F\|_{L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}}}$ are $L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}$ -atoms. Furthermore, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$

$$F - \left(\sum_{k=-N}^N \mathbb{1}_{\Delta A_k} F \right) = \mathbb{1}_{A_N} F + \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{X} \setminus A_{-N-1}} F,$$

and the bounds

$$\|\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{X} \setminus A_{-N-1}} F\|_{\mathbb{S}} \leq 2^{-\frac{(N+1)}{p}}, \quad \mu(\|\mathbb{1}_{A_N} F\|_{\mathbb{S}} > 0) \leq 2^{-N} \|F\|_{L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}}^p,$$

hold, as well as

$$\lim_N \|\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{X} \setminus A_{-N-1}} F\|_{L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}} = \lim_N \|\mathbb{1}_{A_N} F\|_{L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}} = 0.$$

As a consequence, finite linear combination of $L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}$ -atoms and functions $F \in L_\mu^\infty \mathbb{S}$ with $\mu(\|F\|_{\mathbb{S}} > 0) < \infty$ are dense in $L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}$.

Proof. Choose $\tilde{A}_k \subset \mathbb{X}$ such that

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{X} \setminus \tilde{A}^k} F \right\|_{\mathbb{S}} \leq 2^{\frac{k}{p}}, \quad \mu(\tilde{A}_k) \leq 2\mu(\|F\|_{\mathbb{S}} > 2^{\frac{k}{p}}).$$

Setting $A_k := \bigcup_{l \geq k} \tilde{A}_l$ we guarantee that $A_k \subset A_{k-1}$ and we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu(A_k) 2^k &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \geq k} \mu(\tilde{A}_l) 2^k \leq \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu(\tilde{A}_l) 2^l \sum_{k \leq l} 2^{k-l} \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu(\tilde{A}_l) 2^l \leq 4 \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu(\|F\|_{\mathbb{S}} > 2^{\frac{l}{p}}) 2^l \\ &\leq 4 \int_0^\infty \lambda \mu(\|F\|_{\mathbb{S}} > \lambda^{\frac{1}{p}}) \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \leq 4 \|F\|_{L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}}^p. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\Delta A_k = A_{k-1} \setminus A_k$, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$F = \sum_{k=-N}^N \mathbb{1}_{\Delta A_k} F + \mathbb{1}_{A_N} F + \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{X} \setminus A_{-N-1}} F.$$

To show the claims on outer Lebesgue norm convergence notice that

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}_{A_N} F \right\|_{L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}}^p \leq \int_{2^N}^\infty \lambda \mu(\|F\|_{\mathbb{S}} > \lambda^{\frac{1}{p}}) \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} + 2^N \mu(A_N)$$

while

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{X} \setminus A_{-N-1}} F \right\|_{L_\mu^p \mathbb{S}}^p \leq \int_0^{2^{-N-1}} \lambda \mu(\|F\|_{\mathbb{S}} > \lambda^{\frac{1}{p}}) \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}.$$

□

Proposition 3.3 (Restricted weak type interpolation for outer measure spaces).
 Let $(\mathbb{X}_j, \mathbb{B}_j, \mu_j, \mathbb{S}_j)$ for each $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}$ be outer spaces and let

$$\Pi : \prod_{j=1}^M L_{\mu_j}^\infty \mathbb{S}_j \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{X}_0) \otimes^k \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}}^{\infty'}$$

be an M -linear map. Let $\Omega_{\text{restr}} \subset [0, 1]^M$ be the set of points $(p_1^{-1}, \dots, p_M^{-1}) \in [0, 1]^M$ such that the restricted bounds

$$\left\| \Pi(F_1, \dots, F_M) \right\|_{L_{\mu_0}^{p_0, \infty} \mathbb{S}_0} \leq C_{\text{restr}}(\vec{p}) \prod_{j=1}^M \mu_j(\|F_j\|_{\mathbb{S}_j} > 0)^{\frac{1}{p_j}} \|F_j\|_{\mathbb{S}_j} \quad \forall F_j \in L_{\mu_j}^\infty \mathbb{S}_j$$

hold with $p_0^{-1} := \sum_{j=1}^M p_j^{-1}$ for some constant $C_{\text{restr}}(\vec{p}) > 0$ independent of F_j . Then Ω_{restr} is convex and if $(\bar{p}_1^{-1}, \dots, \bar{p}_M^{-1}) \in [0, 1]^M$ is an interior point of Ω_{restr} then the strong bounds

$$(3.9) \quad \left\| \Pi(F_1, \dots, F_M) \right\|_{L_{\mu_0}^{\bar{p}_0} \mathbb{S}_0} \leq C(\vec{\bar{p}}) \prod_{j=1}^M \|F_j\|_{L_{\mu_j}^{\bar{p}_j} \mathbb{S}_j} \quad \forall F_j \in L_{\mu_j}^{\bar{p}_j} \mathbb{S}_j$$

hold with $\bar{p}_0^{-1} := \sum_{j=1}^M \bar{p}_j^{-1}$ and some $C(\vec{\bar{p}}) \geq 0$ independent of F_j .

The proof of this fact is a direct adaptation of the proof of restricted weak type interpolation for multilinear forms on classical Lebesgue spaces.

Proof. Let us first show that Ω_{restr} is convex. Let $(p_{1,0}^{-1}, \dots, p_{M,0}^{-1}), (p_{1,1}^{-1}, \dots, p_{M,1}^{-1}) \in \Omega_{\text{restr}}$ and let $\bar{p}_j^{-1} = (1 - \theta)p_{j,0}^{-1} + \theta p_{j,1}^{-1}$ for a fixed $\theta \in (0, 1)$. By log convexity of outer Lebesgue spaces ((3.8) in Proposition 3.1) it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \Pi(F_1, \dots, F_M) \right\|_{L_{\mu_0}^{\bar{p}_0, \infty} \mathbb{S}_0} &\leq \left\| \Pi(F_1, \dots, F_M) \right\|_{L_{\mu_0}^{\bar{p}_0} \mathbb{S}_0} \\ &\leq C_{\bar{p}_0, \bar{p}_1, \theta} \left\| \Pi(F_1, \dots, F_M) \right\|_{L_{\mu_0}^{p_0, 0, \infty} \mathbb{S}_0}^{(1-\theta)} \left\| \Pi(F_1, \dots, F_M) \right\|_{L_{\mu_0}^{p_1, 0, \infty} \mathbb{S}_0}^{\theta} \\ &\leq C_{\bar{p}_0, \bar{p}_1, \theta} C_0^{(1-\theta)} C_1^{\theta} \prod_{j=1}^M \mu_j(\|F_j\|_{\mathbb{S}_j} > 0)^{\frac{1-\theta}{p_{j,0}} + \frac{\theta}{p_{j,1}}} \|F_j\|_{\mathbb{S}_j}, \end{aligned}$$

$$C_0 := C_{\text{restr}}((p_{1,0}, \dots, p_{M,0})) \quad C_1 := C_{\text{restr}}((p_{1,1}, \dots, p_{M,1})),$$

thus showing that $(\bar{p}_1^{-1}, \dots, \bar{p}_M^{-1}) \in \Omega_{\text{restr}}$, as required. We need to show that the bounds above hold with the strong outer Lebesgue norms instead.

Assume that the factors on the right hand side of (3.9) are finite and non-zero, for otherwise there is nothing to prove. By homogeneity we may assume that $\|F_j\|_{L_{\mu_j}^{\bar{p}_j} \mathbb{S}_j} = 1$ for each $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. Using the atomic decomposition of F_j (proposition 3.2) let us represent

$$F_j = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} F_j^k \quad \text{with } F_j^k := \mathbb{1}_{\Delta A_j^k} F_j$$

and

$$\|F_j^k\|_{\mathbb{S}_j} \leq 2^{\frac{k}{\bar{p}_j}} \quad \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_j(\Delta A_j^k) 2^k \approx 1.$$

We reason under the assumptions that the above sums are finite; the full statement then follows by a limiting argument that we omit. We represent any $\vec{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_M) \in \mathbb{Z}^M$ as

$$k_i = n + d^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,i},$$

with $n \in \frac{1}{M}\mathbb{Z}$, for some $\vec{l} = (l_1, \dots, l_{M-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{M-1}$, $\vec{\mathfrak{s}} = (\mathfrak{s}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{s}_{M-1}) \in \{-1, 1\}^{M-1}$, and with $\vec{\mathfrak{w}}_1, \dots, \vec{\mathfrak{w}}_{M-1} \in \mathbb{Z}_0^M \subset \mathbb{Z}^M$ a pairwise orthogonal collection of vectors that we denote by $\vec{\mathfrak{w}}_j := (\mathfrak{w}_{j,i})_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, M-1\}$, where

$$\mathbb{Z}_0^M := \left\{ \vec{\mathfrak{w}} = (\mathfrak{w}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{w}_{M-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^M : \sum_{j=1}^M \mathfrak{w}_j = 0 \right\}.$$

This is always possible by choosing $n = M^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^M k_i$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that the map $\mathbb{Z}^{M-1} \ni (l_1, \dots, l_{M-1}) \mapsto d^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \vec{\mathfrak{w}}_j$ is surjective onto the set $M^{-1}\mathbb{Z}_0^M$. Using the above representation of \vec{k} , we can decompose

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(F_1, \dots, F_M) &= \sum_{\vec{\mathfrak{s}} \in \{-1, 1\}^{M-1} \rightarrow} \Pi^{\vec{\mathfrak{s}}}(F_1, \dots, F_M), \\ \Pi^{\vec{\mathfrak{s}}}(F_1, \dots, F_M) &:= \\ &\sum_{n \in \frac{1}{M}\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{(l_1, \dots, l_{M-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{M-1}} \Pi \left(F_1^{n+d^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,1}}, \dots, F_M^{n+d^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,M}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

In the above notation we set $F_i^{k_i} = 0$ if $k_i \notin \mathbb{Z}$. Let us fix $\vec{\mathfrak{s}}$ and show that (3.9) holds for $\Pi^{\vec{\mathfrak{s}}}$ in place of Π . There exists a point $\vec{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_M) \in (0, \infty)$ with $(p_1^{-1}, \dots, p_M^{-1})$ in the interior of Ω_{restr} such that $\sum_{i=1}^M p_i^{-1} = \bar{p}_0^{-1}$ and such that

$$\mathfrak{s}_j \sum_{i=1}^M (p_i^{-1} - \bar{p}_i^{-1}) \mathfrak{w}_{j,i} > 0 \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, M-1\}.$$

Let us choose an $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ small enough to have

$$\begin{aligned} ((1 \pm \varepsilon)^{-1} p_1^{-1}, \dots, (1 \pm \varepsilon)^{-1} p_M^{-1}) &\in \Omega_{\text{restr}}, \\ \mathfrak{s}_j \sum_{i=1}^M (p_i^{-1} - (1 \pm \varepsilon)^{-1} \bar{p}_i^{-1}) \mathfrak{w}_{j,i} &> \varepsilon \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, M-1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the restricted weak boundedness assumptions with the exponents above, for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mu_0 \left(\left\| \Pi(F_1^{n+d^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,1}}, \dots, F_M^{n+d^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,M}}) \right\|_{\mathbb{S}_0} > \lambda^{\frac{1}{\bar{p}_0}} \right) \\ &\lesssim \lambda^{-(1 \pm \varepsilon)} \prod_{i=1}^M \mu_i \left(\|F_i\|_{\mathbb{S}_i} \right)^{\frac{\bar{p}_0(1 \pm \varepsilon)}{p_i(1 \pm \varepsilon)}} 2^{\frac{\bar{p}_0(1 \pm \varepsilon)}{\bar{p}_i}} (n+d^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,i}) \\ &= \lambda^{-(1 \pm \varepsilon)} \prod_{i=1}^M \mu_i \left(\left\| F_i^{n+d^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,i}} \right\|_{\mathbb{S}_i} \right)^{\frac{\bar{p}_0}{p_i}} 2^{\frac{\bar{p}_0}{p_i}} (n+d^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,i}) \\ &\quad \times 2^{\pm \varepsilon n} 2^{-\bar{p}_0 d^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \sum_{i=1}^M \mathfrak{w}_{j,i} (p_i^{-1} - (1 \pm \varepsilon) \bar{p}_i^{-1})} \end{aligned}$$

By the quasi-triangle inequality on $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{S}_0}$, for a sufficiently large $C > 1$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mu_0 \left(\left\| \sum_{n \in \frac{1}{M}\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{(l_1, \dots, l_{M-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^M} \Pi(F_1^{n+d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,1}, \dots, \dots, F_M^{n+d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,M}) \right\|_{\mathbb{S}_0} > C 2^{\frac{n_0}{\bar{p}_0}} \right) \\
 & \lesssim \sum_{n \in \frac{1}{M}\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{(l_1, \dots, l_{M-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^M} \mu_0 \left(\left\| \Pi(F_1^{n+d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,1}, \dots, \dots, F_M^{n+d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,M}) \right\|_{\mathbb{S}_0} > 2^{\frac{n_0}{\bar{p}_0} - \frac{\varepsilon'}{\bar{p}_0} |n-n_0| - \frac{\varepsilon'}{\bar{p}_0} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j} \right) \\
 & \lesssim 2^{-n_0} \sum_{(l_1, \dots, l_{M-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^M} 2^{-\bar{p}_0 \varepsilon d^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j} \sum_{n \in \frac{1}{M}\mathbb{Z}} 2^{-(\varepsilon - \varepsilon') |n-n_0|} \\
 & \quad \times \prod_{i=1}^M \mu_i \left(\left\| F_i^{n+d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,i} \right\|_{\mathbb{S}_i} \right)^{\frac{\bar{p}_0}{p_i}} 2^{\frac{\bar{p}_0}{p_i} (n+d-1 \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,i})}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Summing over $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_0 \left(\left\| \sum_{n \in \frac{1}{M}\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{(l_1, \dots, l_{M-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^M} \Pi(F_1^{n+d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,1}, \dots, \dots, F_M^{n+d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,M}) \right\|_{\mathbb{S}_0} > C 2^{\frac{n_0}{\bar{p}_0}} \right) \\
 & \lesssim \sum_{(l_1, \dots, l_{M-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^M} 2^{-\bar{p}_0 \varepsilon d^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j} \sum_{n \in \frac{1}{M}\mathbb{Z}} \prod_{i=1}^M \mu_i \left(\left\| F_i^{n+d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,i} \right\|_{\mathbb{S}_i} \right)^{\frac{\bar{p}_0}{p_i}} \\
 & \quad \times 2^{\frac{\bar{p}_0}{p_i} (n+d-1 \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,i})} \\
 & \lesssim \sum_{(l_1, \dots, l_{M-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^M} 2^{-\bar{p}_0 \varepsilon d^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j} \prod_{i=1}^M \left(\sum_{n \in \frac{1}{M}\mathbb{Z}} \mu_i \left(\left\| F_i^{n+d-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,i} \right\|_{\mathbb{S}_i} \right)^{\bar{p}_0} \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \times 2^{\bar{p}_0 (n+d-1 \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j \mathfrak{s}_j \mathfrak{w}_{j,i})} \right)^{\frac{p_i}{\bar{p}_0}} \\
 & \lesssim \sum_{(l_1, \dots, l_{M-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^M} 2^{-\bar{p}_0 \varepsilon d^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} l_j} \lesssim 1
 \end{aligned}$$

□

As a result we deduce the outer Hölder inequality used extensively in the context of outer Lebesgue spaces; variants include [AU20b, Proposition 2.34], [DT15, Proposition 3.4].

Corollary 3.4 (Hölder inequality for outer Lebesgue spaces). *For each $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}$ let $(\mathbb{X}_j, \mathbb{B}_j^\cup, \mu_j, \mathbb{S}_j)$ be an outer space. Let*

$$\Pi : \prod_{j=1}^M L_{\mu_j}^\infty \mathbb{S}_j \rightarrow L_{\mu_0}^\infty \mathbb{S}_j$$

be an M -linear map such that

$$(3.10) \quad \|\Pi(F_1, \dots, F_M)\|_{\mathbb{S}_0} \leq C_\infty \prod_{j=1}^M \|F_j\|_{\mathbb{S}_j}$$

and suppose that for all $F_j \in L_{\mu_j}^\infty \mathbb{S}_j$ it holds that

$$(3.11) \quad \mu_0(\|\Pi(F_1, \dots, F_M)\|_{\mathbb{S}_0} > 0) \leq \min_{j=1, \dots, M} \mu_j(\|F_j\|_{\mathbb{S}_j} > 0).$$

Then for all $\vec{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_M) \in (0, \infty]^M$ it holds that

$$\|\Pi(F_1, \dots, F_M)\|_{L_{\mu_0}^{p_0} \mathbb{S}_0} \lesssim_{p_j} C \prod_{j=1}^M \|F_j\|_{L_{\mu_j}^{p_j} \mathbb{S}_j}$$

with $p_0^{-1} := \sum_{j=1}^M p_j^{-1}$.

Proof. The claim above follows by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi(F_1, \dots, F_M)\|_{L_{\mu_0}^{p_0} \mathbb{S}_0} &\leq \mu_0(\|\Pi(F_1, \dots, F_M)\|_{\mathbb{S}_0} > 0)^{\frac{1}{p_0}} \|\Pi(F_1, \dots, F_M)\|_{L_{\mu_0}^\infty \mathbb{S}_0} \\ &\leq \prod_{j=1}^M \mu_j(\|F_j\|_{\mathbb{S}_j} > 0)^{\frac{1}{p_j}} \|F_j\|_{\mathbb{S}_j} \end{aligned}$$

and applying Proposition 3.3. \square

The next statement is usually referred to as outer Radon-Nikodym. It has been used extensively in results proved using the framework of outer Lebesgue spaces e.g. in [AU20b, Proposition 2.33], [AU20a, Corollary 4.13], [Ura16, Lemma 2.2]. We merely sketch its proof. This result allows one to compare classical integrals with L^1 -type outer Lebesgue quasi-norms e.g. the one appearing on LHS(1.10), that represents the dual form to BHT_β in terms of embedded functions.

Proposition 3.5 (Radon-Nikodym -type domination). *Let $(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{B}^\cup, \mu, \mathbb{S})$ be an outer space and let \mathfrak{m} be a Radon measure on \mathbb{X} and let $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^\infty$. Suppose the bound*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_B F(x) [\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k] d\mathfrak{m}(x) \right| &\leq C_{\mathfrak{m}} \mu(B) \|\mathbb{1}_B F\|_{\mathbb{S}} \quad \forall B \in \mathbb{B}, \\ \forall F &\in L_{\text{dm}}^1(E) \otimes^k \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^{N'} \end{aligned}$$

holds with some constant $C_{\mathfrak{m}} > 0$ and

$$\mu(A) = 0 \Rightarrow \mathfrak{m}(A) = 0 \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}).$$

Then we have

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{X}} F(x) [\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k] d\mathfrak{m}(x) \right| \lesssim C_{\mathfrak{m}} \|F\|_{L_{\mu}^1 \mathbb{S}} \quad \forall F \in L_{\text{dm}}^1(E) \otimes^k \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^{N'}.$$

Proof. If $\|F\|_{L_{\mu}^1 \mathbb{S}} \leq 1$ and $F \in L_{\text{dm}}^1(E) \otimes^k \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^{N'}$ we enact the atomic decomposition of F as per Proposition 3.2 to obtain

$$F = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} F_k$$

with

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu(\|F_k\|_{\mathbb{S}} > 0) \|F_k\|_{\mathbb{S}} \lesssim \|F\|_{L_{\mu}^1 \mathbb{S}}.$$

We claim that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{X}} F_k(x) [\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k] \mathrm{d}\mathbf{m}(x) \right| \leq C_{\mathbf{m}} \mu(\|F_k\|_{\mathbb{S}} > 0) \|F_k\|_{\mathbb{S}}.$$

This would allow us to conclude by summing the above estimate over $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and using that F_k are supported on disjoint sets. The assumptions on μ , \mathbf{m} , and on the integrability of F justify the convergence of appropriate series. To prove the claimed bound on F_k we choose $E_k \in \mathbb{B}^{\cup}$ such that $\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{X} \setminus E_k} F_k = 0$ and $\mu(E_k) \approx \mu(\|F_k\|_{\mathbb{S}} > 0)$. We then cover E_k optimally with sets from \mathbb{B} by selecting $B_{k,n} \in \mathbb{B}$ such that $E_k \subset \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_{k,n}$ with $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(B_{k,n}) \lesssim \mu(E_k)$. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{X}} F_k(x) [\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k] \mathrm{d}\mathbf{m}(x) \mathbf{m}(x) \right| &\leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \int_{\Delta B_{k,n}} F_k(x) [\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k] \mathrm{d}\mathbf{m}(x) \mathbf{m}(x) \right| \\ &\lesssim C_{\mathbf{m}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(\Delta B_{k,n}) \|\mathbb{1}_{\Delta B_{k,n}} F_k\|_{\mathbb{S}} \lesssim \mu(\|F_k\|_{\mathbb{S}} > 0) \|F_k\|_{\mathbb{S}}. \end{aligned}$$

We used the monotonicity property (3.2) in the above inequalities, and (3.1) to find the sets $B_{k,n} \in \mathbb{B}$. Summing the above inequality over k yields the claim. \square

3.2. The time-frequency-scale space. In this section we discuss the outer Lebesgue space structure we will be using in this paper. First we introduce trees: distinguished subsets of \mathbb{R}_+^3 that represent frequency- and space-localized portions of \mathbb{R}_+^3 , interpreted as the group of symmetries (as per (1.3)). Next we introduce the multiple sizes that will come into play in our argument. We first present all of them succinctly to allow for efficient consultation; we postpone the discussion about the motivation and approximate meaning of these sizes to the end of the corresponding subsection.

3.2.1. The σ -generating collection: trees. We begin our construction of the outer Lebesgue space on \mathbb{R}_+^3 by introducing the family of distinguished sets, *trees*, efficiently describe the local geometry of the time-frequency-scale space and play the role of a σ -generating collection.

Definition 3.6 (Trees). *A tree $T_{\Theta}(\xi_T, x_T, s_T)$ with top $(\xi_T, x_T, s_T) \in \mathbb{R}_+^3$ is the set given by*

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\Theta}(\xi_T, x_T, s_T) &:= \pi_{(\xi_T, x_T, s_T)}(\mathfrak{T}_{\Theta}), \\ \mathfrak{T}_{\Theta} &:= \{(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) \in \Theta \times B_1 \times (0, 1) : \sigma < 1 - |\zeta|\}, \\ \pi_{(\xi, x, s)}(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) &:= (\xi + \theta(s\sigma)^{-1}, x + s\zeta, s\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

The set $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}$ can be any Borel, that mainly is assumed to be an open interval $\Theta \supset B_4$.

There is a one-to-one correspondence between the datum Θ , (ξ_T, x_T, s_T) and a tree T . Given a tree T , we call \mathfrak{T}_{Θ} its model tree, Θ is its model frequency band, the ξ_T is the tree's frequency, $B_{s_T}(x_T)$ is its spatial interval, $\xi_T + s_T^{-1}\Theta$ is its frequency band, and $\pi_T := \pi_{(\xi_T, x_T, s_T)}$ is its local coordinate map. We denote by \mathbb{T}_{Θ} the collection of all trees $T = T_{\Theta}(\xi_T, x_T, s_T)$. By $\mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}$ we denote countable unions of trees.

We can now use trees to generate an outer measures $\mu_{\Theta}^{\mathbf{p}}$ on \mathbb{R}_+^3 that allow us to measure how large a collection of trees is.

Definition 3.7 (Forest outer measure). *Given a countable collection $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ we denote its counting function by*

$$N_{\mathcal{T}}(z) := \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}_{B_{s_T}(x_T)}(z).$$

The outer measures $\mu_\Theta^{\mathfrak{p}}$ of a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}_+^3$ is defined in terms of the counting function of a covering by trees:

$$\mu_\Theta^{\mathfrak{p}}(E) := \inf \left\{ \|N_{\mathcal{T}}(z)\|_{L_{dz}^{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbb{R})} : \mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{T}_\Theta, E \subset \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T \right\}, \quad \mathfrak{p} \in [1, +\infty].$$

We are principally interested in $\mathfrak{p} \in \{1, \infty\}$.

Any tree $T_\Theta(\xi_T, x_T, s_T)$ can be obtained from $T_\Theta(0, 0, 1)$ as follows.

$$(3.12) \quad T_\Theta(\xi_T, x_T, s_T) = \{(\xi_T + s_T^{-1}\eta, x_T + s_T y, s_T t) : (\eta, y, t) \in T_\Theta(0, 0, 1)\}.$$

This is in agreement with the understanding that trees represent localized subsets of \mathbb{R}_+^3 seen as a group of symmetries. As a matter of fact, if $(\eta, y, t) \in T_\Theta(\xi_T, x_T, s_T)$ it holds that the spatial support of $\text{Tr}_y \text{Mod}_\eta \text{Dil}_t \varphi(z)$ is essentially contained in $B_{s_T}(x_T)$; more precisely

$$|\text{Tr}_y \text{Mod}_\eta \text{Dil}_t \varphi(z)| \lesssim \left\langle \frac{z - x_T}{s_T} \right\rangle^{-N} \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N}.$$

Furthermore, localization in Fourier space can be seen from the fact that

$$\text{dist} \left(\text{spt} \left(\widehat{\text{Tr}_y \text{Mod}_\eta \text{Dil}_t \varphi} \right), \xi_T \right) \lesssim \text{diam} \left(\text{spt} \left(\widehat{\text{Tr}_y \text{Mod}_\eta \text{Dil}_t \varphi} \right) \right)$$

for any $(\eta, y, t) \in T_\Theta(\xi_T, x_T, s_T)$. Note however that trees are not scale-localized e.g. if $(\eta, y, t) \in T_\Theta(\xi_T, x_T, s_T)$ then $(\eta, y, t') \in T_\Theta(\xi_T, x_T, s_T)$ for all $t' < t$. Trees respects the symmetry property of the map $f \mapsto \text{Emb}[f]$. It follows from (1.7) that

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{Emb}[f](\eta, y, t)[\varphi] \\ &= e^{2\pi i \xi(y-x)} \text{Emb} [s \text{Dil}_{s^{-1}} \text{Mod}_{-\xi} \text{Tr}_{-x} f] \left(s(\eta - \xi), \frac{y-x}{s}, \frac{t}{s} \right) [\varphi] \end{aligned}$$

Identities (3.12) and (3.13) together give

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{Emb}[f] \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) \\ &= e^{2\pi i \xi_T s_T \zeta} \text{Emb} \left[s_T \text{Dil}_{s_T^{-1}} \text{Mod}_{-\xi_T} \text{Tr}_{-x_T} f \right] \circ \pi_{(0,0,1)}(\theta, \zeta, \sigma). \end{aligned}$$

3.2.2. Sizes. The second ingredient of an outer Lebesgue spaces are sizes. To construct sizes, we first introduce *local sizes* measure how “large” a function is on any fixed tree $T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta$. Formally, a *local size* is a collection $(\mathbb{S}(T))_{T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta}$ indexed by $T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ of quasi-norms on $\mathcal{R}(T) \otimes^k \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\infty'}$ for some fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$; we require that the quasi-triangle constants $\text{Tri}_{\mathbb{S}(T)}$ be uniform i.e. that there exist $\text{Tri}_{\mathbb{S}} \geq 1$ such that

$$\|F_1 + F_2\|_{\mathbb{S}(T)} \leq \text{Tri}_{\mathbb{S}} (\|F_1\|_{\mathbb{S}(T)} + \|F_2\|_{\mathbb{S}(T)}) \quad \forall T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta, \forall F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{R}(T) \otimes^k \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\infty'}.$$

Local sizes generate a size by setting

$$(3.15) \quad \|F\|_{\mathbb{S}} := \sup_{T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta} \sup_{W^- \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathfrak{p}}} \|\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W^-} F\|_{\mathbb{S}(T)}$$

where we identify $\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W^-} F$ appearing above with its restriction to T . The upper bound over W^- guarantees that monotonicity (3.2) holds.

We will now introduce several (local) sizes that will each control relevant properties of functions $F \in \mathcal{R}(T) \otimes \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\infty'}$. These sizes are combined to obtain the size $\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N$ in (1.21). Most of the sizes below depend on the datum N, \mathfrak{r} and Θ that we track but do not explicitly discuss.

Definition 3.8 (Lebesgue size). *Let $(u, v) \in [1, \infty]^2$. We define the local sizes $\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)}$ as follows. For $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$ and $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$ set*

$$(3.16) \quad \|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)}(T)} := \sup_G \left| \frac{1}{|\Theta|s_T} \int_T G(\eta, y, t) dF(\eta, y, t) \right|$$

where the upper bound gets taken over all $G \in C_c^{\infty}(T)$ with $\|G \circ \pi_T\|_{L_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}^{u'} L_{\frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}}^{v'}} \leq 1$, where $u' = \frac{u}{u-1}, v' = \frac{v}{v-1}$ and

$$\|G \circ \pi_T\|_{L_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}^{u'} L_{\frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}}^{v'}} := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} |G \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)|^{v'} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \right)^{\frac{u'}{v'}} \frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|} \right)^{\frac{1}{u'}}.$$

The integral in (3.16) should be interpreted as the integration of the test function $G(\eta, y, t)$ against the measure F . For $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes^k \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\infty'}$ we define the local sizes

$$(3.17) \quad \|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N(T)} := \sup_{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k} \|F[\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)}(T)}$$

with the upper bound being taken over all wave packets $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\infty}$ with $\|\varphi_j\|_{\Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N} \leq 1, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

In (3.16) we defined the size by duality because we need to deal with the eventuality that F is a Radon measure and is not given by a locally integrable function w.r.t to the measure $d\eta dy dt$. If $F \in L_{\text{loc}}^1$ then it simply holds that

$$\|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)}} = \|(\mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{I}_{\Theta}} F \circ \pi_T)(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)\|_{L_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}^u L_{\frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}}^v}.$$

Furthermore, if $u \neq \{1, \infty\}$ and $v \neq \{1, \infty\}$ then $\|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)}} < \infty$ only if $F \in L_{\text{loc}}^1$. However, we will come across functions of the form $F(\eta, y, t) t \delta(t - \mathfrak{b}(\eta, y)) d\eta dy dt$ for some $F \in L_{\text{loc}}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$ and for some continuous function $\mathfrak{b} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$. Integrating a test function G against such a Radon measure amounts to computing the integral

$$G \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} G(\eta, y, \mathfrak{b}(\eta, y)) F(\eta, y, \mathfrak{b}(\eta, y)) \mathfrak{b}(\eta, y) d\eta dy.$$

Definition 3.9 (Lacunary size). *Let $(u, v) \in [1, \infty]^2$; we define the local sizes $\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{r}}^N$ as follows. For $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\infty'}$ and $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$ set*

$$\|F(\eta, y, t)\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{r}}^N(T)} := \|\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(t(\eta - \xi_T))F(\eta, y, t)\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N(T)}.$$

The linear operator $\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta)$, defined on $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})'$ is given by

$$(3.18) \quad \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta)F(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi] := F(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[(-d_z + 2\pi i\theta)\varphi(z)]$$

where z in RHS(3.18) plays the role of a dummy variable.

Definition 3.10 (Defect size). *Let $(u, v) \in [1, \infty]^2$; we define the space defect local sizes $\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\zeta, \mathfrak{r}}^N$ and the scale defect local sizes $\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\sigma, \mathfrak{r}}^N$ as follows. For*

$F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{\tau}^{\infty'}$ and $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$ set

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\zeta, \tau}^N(T)} &:= \|(\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(t(\eta - \xi_T)) - t d_y + 2\pi i \xi_T) F(\eta, y, t)\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \Phi_{\tau}^N(T)}, \\ \|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\sigma, \tau}^N(T)} &:= \|(\mathfrak{d}_{\sigma}(t(\eta - \xi_T)) - t d_t + (\eta - \xi_T) d_{\eta}) F(\eta, y, t)\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \Phi_{\tau}^N(T)}. \end{aligned}$$

The operator $\mathfrak{d}_{\sigma}(\theta)$, defined on $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{\tau}^{\infty'}$, is given by

$$(3.20) \quad \mathfrak{d}_{\sigma}(\theta)F(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi] := F(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[(-d_z + 2\pi i \theta)(z\varphi(z))].$$

The derivatives appearing in (3.19) are intended in the distributional sense.

We combine the two defect sizes and use the shorthand

$$\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\tau}^N(T) := \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\zeta, \tau}^N(T) + \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\sigma, \tau}^N(T).$$

We introduce an additional size that represents the maximal truncation of a localized singular integral operator. This size has not been studied in prior works that use outer Lebesgue spaces in the context of time frequency analysis. Controlling this size for functions $F = \text{Emb}[f]$ is one of the main objectives of Section 6.1.

Definition 3.11 (SIO truncation size). *Let $u \in [1, \infty)$; we define the SIO truncation local sizes $\mathbb{J}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$ as follows. For $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{\tau}^{\infty'}$ and $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$ set*

$$(3.21) \quad \|F\|_{\mathbb{J}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N(T)} := \sup_{\varphi, G} \left| \frac{1}{s_T |\Theta|} \int_T \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(t(\eta - \xi_T)) F(\eta, y, t) G(\eta, y, t) d\eta dy dt \right|$$

where the upper bound gets taken over all $\varphi \in \Phi_{\tau}^{\infty}$ with $\|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{\tau}^N} \leq 1$ and over all $G \in C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$ such that

$$\|\sigma d_{\sigma} G \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)\|_{L_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}^{u'} L_{\frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}}^{\infty}} \leq 1.$$

With these definitions in hand we have all the elements necessary to understand (1.21) that defines the size $\mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$. The single summands in (1.21) are related to the local sizes above through (3.15).

3.2.3. Sizes: some technical remarks. All the sizes above are regular in the sense of (3.3). On a technical level, this allows us to prove most of our statements under the assumptions that the functions $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{\tau}^{\infty'}$ in play are compactly supported.

Remark 3.12. *There exists two sequences of forests $W_n^+ \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}$ and $W_n^- \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}$ such that W_n^+ is increasing, W_n^- is decreasing, and $\mathbb{K}_n := W_n^+ \setminus W_n^-$ are compact, increasing, and satisfy $\bigcup_n \mathbb{K}_n = \mathbb{R}_+^3$.*

We simplify dealing with the dependence on $\varphi \in \Phi_{\tau}^{\infty}$ appearing in the definition of all sizes above using the following wave packet decomposition result.

Lemma 3.13. *For any $0 < N' < N$ there exists a sequence of test functions $\tilde{\varphi}_k \in \Phi_{2\tau}^{N'}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $\|\tilde{\varphi}_k\|_{\Phi_{2\tau}^{N'}} \lesssim 1$ such that the following decomposition holds. For any $\varphi \in \Phi_{\tau}^N$ there exists a sequence $a_k \in \mathbb{C}$ such that*

$$\varphi(z) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} a_k \tilde{\varphi}_k,$$

and $|a_k| \lesssim \langle k \rangle^{-(N-N')} \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{\tau}^N}$. In particular, the above sum converges absolutely in $\Phi_{2\tau}^{N'}$ if $N > N' + 1$.

Proof. The proof is based on the Fourier inversion formula. Fix $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and set

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\varphi}(\widehat{z}) &:= (|\widehat{z}| - 2\mathfrak{r})^{(N'+\varepsilon)} \mathbb{1}_{B_{2\mathfrak{r}}}(\widehat{z}), \\ \widetilde{\varphi}_k(z) &:= \langle k \rangle^{-N'} \widetilde{\varphi}\left(z + \frac{k}{4\mathfrak{r}}\right)\end{aligned}$$

so that $\|\widetilde{\varphi}_k(z)\|_{\Phi_{2\mathfrak{r}}^{N'}} \lesssim 1$. Let

$$a_k := \frac{\langle k \rangle^{N'}}{(4\mathfrak{r})^2} \int_{B_{2\mathfrak{r}}} e^{-2\pi i \frac{k}{4\mathfrak{r}} \widehat{w}} \widehat{\varphi}(\widehat{w}) (|\widehat{w}| - 2\mathfrak{r})^{-(N'+\varepsilon)} d\widehat{w}.$$

Since $\widehat{\varphi}$ is supported on $B_{\mathfrak{r}}$ it holds that $\left\| \widehat{\varphi}(\widehat{w}) (|\widehat{w}| - 2\mathfrak{r})^{-(N'+\varepsilon)} \right\|_{C^N} \approx \|\widehat{\varphi}(\widehat{w})\|_{C^N}$ so $|a_k| \lesssim \langle k \rangle^{-(N-N')} \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N}$. The Fourier inversion formula gives us that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} a_k \langle k \rangle^{-N'} e^{2\pi i \frac{k}{4\mathfrak{r}} \widehat{z}} = \widehat{\varphi}(\widehat{z}) (|\widehat{z}| - 2\mathfrak{r})^{-(N'+\varepsilon)}$$

with the series converging uniformly. It follows that

$$\widehat{\varphi}(\widehat{z}) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} a_k \langle k \rangle^{-N'} e^{2\pi i \frac{k}{4\mathfrak{r}} \widehat{z}} \widehat{\varphi}(\widehat{z})$$

i.e.

$$\varphi(z) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} a_k \widetilde{\varphi}_k(z)$$

as required. □

As a consequence one can compare $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{2\mathfrak{r}}^{\infty N'}$ with scalar functions in the following sense.

Corollary 3.14. *Let $(\eta, y, t) \mapsto \varphi_{(\eta, y, t)} \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N$ be a measurable function with $\|\varphi_{(\eta, y, t)}\|_{\Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N} \lesssim 1$. Then $(\eta, y, t) \mapsto F(\eta, y, t)[\varphi_{(\eta, y, t)}]$ defines an element of $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$ with*

$$(3.22) \quad \|F(\eta, y, t)[\varphi_{(\eta, y, t)}]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, v)}} \lesssim \|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, v)} \Phi_{2\mathfrak{r}}^{N'}}$$

as long as $\|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, v)} \Phi_{2\mathfrak{r}}^{N'}} < \infty$ and $N \geq N' + 4$. Furthermore

$$(3.23) \quad \|F(\eta, y, t)[\varphi_{(\eta, y, t)}]\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^p}^p \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, v)}} \lesssim \|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, v)} \Phi_{2\mathfrak{r}}^{N'}}.$$

for any $p \in (0, +\infty]$ and

$$(3.24) \quad \mu_{\Theta}^p \left(\|F(\eta, y, t)[\varphi_{(\eta, y, t)}]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, v)}} > \lambda \right) \leq \mu_{\Theta}^p \left(\|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, v)} \Phi_{2\mathfrak{r}}^{N'}} > C\lambda \right).$$

Finally, for any $p \geq 1$ it holds that that

$$(3.25) \quad \|F\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^p}^p \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, v)} \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N} \lesssim \sup_{\varphi} \|F(\eta, y, t)[\varphi]\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^p}^p \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, v)}},$$

where the upper bound is taken over all $\varphi \in \Phi_{2\mathfrak{r}}^{\infty}$ with $\|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{2\mathfrak{r}}^{N'}} \lesssim 1$, as long as $N \geq N' + 4$.

Proof. Bounds (3.22) and (3.24) follow directly from Lemma 3.13 noting that the quasi-triangle inequality holds with constant 1. From those two bounds one deduces (3.23). For bound (3.25) note that

$$\|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, v)} \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N} \lesssim \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle k \rangle^{-(N-N')} \|F \circ \Gamma[\widetilde{\varphi}_k]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, v)}}$$

with $\tilde{\varphi}_k$ given by Lemma 3.13. Thus

$$\mu_{\Theta}^p \left(\|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \Phi_{\tau}^N} > \lambda \right) \lesssim \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_{\Theta}^p \left(\|F[\tilde{\varphi}_k]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)}} > \lambda C \langle k \rangle^2 \right)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^p}^p \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \Phi_{\tau}^N} &\lesssim \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_0^{\infty} \mu_{\Theta}^p \left(\|F[\tilde{\varphi}_k]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)}} > \lambda^{\frac{1}{p}} C \langle k \rangle^2 \right) d\lambda \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle k \rangle^{-2p} \int_0^{\infty} \mu_{\Theta}^p \left(\|F[\tilde{\varphi}_k]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)}} > \lambda^{\frac{1}{p}} \right) d\lambda \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle k \rangle^{-2p} \|F[\tilde{\varphi}_k]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)}}^p. \end{aligned}$$

This shows (3.25). \square

3.2.4. *Sizes: motivation.* We conclude this section by providing some details and motivation for the definition of the sizes introduced so far. As already discussed for the trees themselves, the sizes are adapted to treating \mathbb{R}_+^3 as the group of symmetries (1.3). If $\mathbb{S}_{\Theta} \Phi_{\tau}^N$ is any of the sizes $\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \Phi_{\tau}^N$, $\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \mathfrak{d}_{\tau}^N$, $\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\tau}^N$, or $\mathbb{J}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$ above, then setting

$$\tilde{F}(\eta, y, t) = e^{2\pi i \xi(y-x)} F\left(s(\eta - \xi), \frac{y-x}{s}, \frac{t}{s}\right)$$

it holds that

$$(3.26) \quad \|\tilde{F}\|_{\mathbb{S}_{\Theta} \Phi_{\tau}^N(T_{\Theta}(\xi', x', s'))} = \|F\|_{\mathbb{S}_{\Theta} \Phi_{\tau}^N(T_{\Theta}(s(\xi'-\xi), \frac{x'-x}{s}, \frac{s'}{s}))}$$

and thus $\|\tilde{F}\|_{\mathbb{S}_{\Theta} \Phi_{\tau}^N} = \|F\|_{\mathbb{S}_{\Theta} \Phi_{\tau}^N}$. Thanks to this fact and identities (3.14) and (3.12), in our proofs we will often be able to restrict our focus to $T = T_{\Theta}(0, 0, 1)$. Let us make this assumption also for the discussion below that motivates the sizes we introduce and relates them to well-known quantities in harmonic analysis.

The Lebesgue size $\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)}$ of Definition 3.8 controls the magnitude of the coefficients of the embedding on a tree. If $v = \infty$ this is closely related to bounding a space and frequency localized version of a Hardy-Littlewood maximal function. Let $\varphi \in \Phi_{\tau}^N$ be chosen to maximize RHS(3.17) for $F = \text{Emb}[f]$. Setting $\tilde{\varphi}_{\theta} = \text{Mod}_{\theta}(\varphi^{\vee})$ we have

$$\|\text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,\infty)} \Phi_{\tau}^N(T)} \approx \int_{\Theta} \int_{B_1} \sup_{0 < \sigma < 1-|\zeta|} |f * \text{Dil}_{\sigma} \tilde{\varphi}_{\theta}(\zeta)|^u \frac{d\zeta d\theta}{\Theta}.$$

For every fixed $\theta \in \Theta$ the inner integrand is a Hardy-Littlewood maximal function over scales bounded from above. The lacunary size $\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,2)} \mathfrak{d}_{\tau}^N$ encodes the magnitude of a localized square function. Let $\varphi \in \Phi_{\tau}^N$ be chosen to extremize the upper bound in the size Definition 3.9. Setting $\psi_{\theta}(z) = d_z(\text{Mod}_{\theta}(\varphi^{\vee})(z))$ we have that

$$\|\text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,2)} \mathfrak{d}_{\tau}^N(T)} \approx \int_{\Theta} \int_{B_1} \left(\int_0^{1-|\zeta|} |f * \text{Dil}_{\sigma} \psi_{\theta}(\zeta)|^2 \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \right)^{u/2} \frac{d\zeta d\theta}{\Theta}.$$

For every fixed $\theta \in \Theta$ the innermost integral is the Littlewood-Paley square function. Note that ψ_{θ} satisfies $\int \psi_{\theta}(z) dz = 0$.

Next, the *defect sizes* quantify by how much a function $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{\tau}^{\infty}$ fails to be of the form $F = \text{Emb}[f]$. The differential operators $td_y + 2\pi i \xi_T$ and $td_t -$

$(\eta - \xi_T)d_\eta$ appearing in Definition 3.10 are the push forwards of σd_σ and σd_ζ using the map π_T . More explicitly

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma d_\zeta (e^{2\pi i \xi_T s_T \zeta} F \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)) \\ &= e^{2\pi i \xi_T s_T \zeta} (s_T \sigma \partial_y + 2\pi i \xi_T) F(\xi_T + \theta s_T^{-1} \sigma^{-1}, x_T + s_T \zeta, s_T \sigma) \\ &= e^{2\pi i \xi_T s_T \zeta} ((td_y + 2\pi i \xi_T) F(\eta, y, t)) \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) \\ & \sigma d_\sigma (e^{2\pi i \xi_T s_T \zeta} F \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)) \\ &= e^{2\pi i \xi_T s_T \zeta} (-\theta s_T^{-1} \sigma^{-1} \partial_\eta + s_T \sigma \partial_t) F(\xi_T + \theta s_T^{-1} \sigma^{-1}, x_T + s_T \zeta, s_T \sigma) \\ &= e^{2\pi i \xi_T s_T \zeta} ((td_t - (\eta - \xi_T)d_\eta) F(\eta, y, t)) \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) \end{aligned}$$

A direct computation gives that for any $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.27) \quad & \sigma d_\zeta (e^{2\pi i \xi_T s_T \zeta} \text{Emb}[f] \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)) = \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) (e^{2\pi i \xi_T s_T \zeta} \text{Emb}[f] \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)) \\ & \sigma d_\sigma (e^{2\pi i \xi_T s_T \zeta} \text{Emb}[f] \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)) = \mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta) (e^{2\pi i \xi_T s_T \zeta} \text{Emb}[f] \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\|\text{Emb}[f]\|_{L_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\zeta, \tau}^N} = \|\text{Emb}[f]\|_{L_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\sigma, \tau}^N} = 0$. We actually use identity (3.27) to *define* the operators $\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta)$ and $\mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta)$ acting on general functions $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$ not necessarily of the form $F = \text{Emb}[f]$. In (3.18) and (3.20) we postulate that the operators $\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta)$ and $\mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta)$ should act on the argument Φ_τ^∞ of $F \circ \pi_{T_\Theta(0,0,1)}$ in the same way as the derivatives σd_ζ and σd_σ act on $\text{Emb}[f] \circ \pi_{T_\Theta(0,0,1)}$. The defect size then encodes and quantifies the local failure of a function $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$ to be of the form $F = \text{Emb}[f]$. We cannot expect that the functions $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$ in play in the arguments of this paper to always be of the form $F = \text{Emb}[f]$. Even in the process of defining size itself, described by (3.15), we need to consider at least functions of the form

$$F = \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W^-} \text{Emb}[f]$$

with $W^- \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^\cup$. For the sake of discussion let us suppose that $T = T_\Theta(0,0,1)$: the quantity intervening in the definition of $\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\zeta, \tau}^N(T)$ then becomes

$$(\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(t\eta) - td_y) F(\eta, y, t) = - \left(td_y \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W^-}(\eta, y, t) \right) \text{Emb}[f](\eta, y, t).$$

Based on the geometry of the set W^- , as explained in more detail further down in Lemma 3.20, the term $\left(td_y \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W^-}(\eta, y, t) \right)$ is a Radon measure supported on the boundary of W^- . A similar discussion can be carried out for the size $\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\sigma, \tau}^N$. The crucial theme when dealing with the defect is showing that mostly this is that generally we can guarantee that the defect of the functions $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$ in play will resemble the one discussed above.

Finally, the $\mathbb{J}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N$ represents the maximal truncation of a localized singular integral operator. To see this chose $\varphi \in \Phi_\tau^N$ to extremize the upper bound in (3.21). Setting $\psi_\theta(z) = d_z(\text{Mod}_\theta(\varphi^\vee)(z))$ and computing the upper bound over G we get that

$$\|\text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{J}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N(T)}^u \lesssim \int_{\Theta} \int_{B_1} \sup_{\sigma < 1 - |\zeta|} \left| \int_0^\sigma f * \text{Dil}_\rho \psi_\theta(\zeta) \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right|^u \frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}.$$

The inner integral is related and can be bound by the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function of $f * K$ where the kernel K is Calderón-Zygmund given by

$$K(z) := \int_0^\infty \text{Dil}_\rho \psi_\theta(\zeta) \frac{d\rho}{\rho}.$$

3.3. Changes of variables and product sizes. The sizes that make up size $\mathbb{F}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N$, introduced in the previous section, are well suited to control functions of the form $F = \text{Emb}[f] \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$. To control functions $\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma$ appearing in (1.14) we pull back the sizes via the change of variables Γ . We consider changes of variables $\Gamma = \Gamma_{(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)}$ of the form

$$(3.28) \quad \begin{aligned} \Gamma_{(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)}(\eta, y, t) &:= (\alpha(\eta + \gamma t^{-1}), y, \beta t), \\ \beta &\in (0, 1], \quad |\alpha\beta| \in \left(\frac{1}{2}, 2\right), \quad |\gamma| < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Let us introduce the notation $\theta_\Gamma := \alpha\beta(\theta + \gamma)$, and let $\Theta_\Gamma := \{\theta_\Gamma : \theta \in \Theta\}$. The former is an implicit function of $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$.

First we study how Γ acts on trees and forests. It holds that $\Gamma(T) \subset T_{\Theta_\Gamma}(\alpha\xi_T, x_T, s_T)$ and, in particular, we have

$$\Gamma \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) = \pi_{(\alpha\xi_T, x_T, s_T)}(\theta_\Gamma, \zeta, \beta\sigma);$$

furthermore, $\Gamma(W) \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^\cup$ for any $W \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^\cup$. This implies that $\mu_\Theta^p(W) = \mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^p(\Gamma(W))$. For any $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ we have that (cfr. (3.14))

$$(3.29) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) \\ = e^{2\pi i \alpha \xi_T s_T \zeta} \text{Emb} \left[s_T \text{Dil}_{s_T^{-1}} \text{Mod}_{-\alpha \xi_T} \text{Tr}_{-x_T} f \right] \circ \pi_{(0,0,1)}(\theta_\Gamma, \zeta, \beta\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we define pullbacks of some of the sizes introduced above in Section 3.2.2: if \mathbb{S} is any of the local sizes we have so far defined we ensure that for any $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$ supported in compactly in $\Gamma(T)$ we have that

$$\|F \circ \Gamma\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{S}_{\Theta_\Gamma}(T)} = \|F\|_{\mathbb{S}_{\Theta_\Gamma}(T_{\Theta_\Gamma}(\alpha\xi_T, x_T, s_T))}.$$

The pullbacks of Lebesgue (local) sizes are then given by

$$\|F\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)}(T)} := \|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)}(T)};$$

the pullbacks of the lacunary (local) sizes are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\tau}^N(T)} &:= \|\Gamma^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(t(\eta - \xi_T)) F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \Phi_\tau^N(T)}, \\ \Gamma^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) &:= \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_\Gamma); \end{aligned}$$

the pullbacks of the defect (local) sizes are given by

$$(3.30) \quad \begin{aligned} \|F\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\zeta, \tau}^N(T)} &:= \|(\Gamma^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(t(\eta - \xi_T)) - \beta t \partial_y + 2\pi i \alpha \xi_T) F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \Phi_\tau^N(T)}, \\ \|F\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\sigma, \tau}^N(T)} &:= \|(\Gamma^* \mathfrak{d}_\sigma(t(\eta - \xi_T)) - t \partial_t + (\eta - \xi_T) \partial_\eta) F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \Phi_\tau^N(T)}, \\ \Gamma^* \mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta) &:= \mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta_\Gamma). \end{aligned}$$

and we set $\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\tau}^N(T) = \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\sigma, \tau}^N(T) + \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\zeta, \tau}^N(T)$. Similarly to the computation (3.27), using (3.29), one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\Gamma^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(t(\eta - \xi_T)) - \beta t \partial_y + 2\pi i \alpha \xi_T) F \\ &= (\Gamma^* \mathfrak{d}_\sigma(t(\eta - \xi_T)) - t \partial_t + (\eta - \xi_T) \partial_\eta) F = 0 \end{aligned}$$

if $F = \text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma$. We do not make use of the pullback of the local sizes $\mathbb{J}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^u \Phi_\tau^N(T)$ since these sizes only appear in relation to the term $\text{Emb}[f_1] \circ \Gamma_1$, for which $\Gamma_1 = \text{Id}$.

We introduce frequency restricted variants of all the sizes above. Let us fix $\tilde{\Theta} \subset \Theta$; denoting by $\mathbb{S}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$ any of the (local) sizes above we set

$$\|F\|_{\mathbb{S}_{(\Theta, \tilde{\Theta})}(T)} := \|\mathbb{1}_{\pi_T(\mathfrak{T}_{\tilde{\Theta}})} F\|_{\mathbb{S}_{\Theta}(T)},$$

with $\mathfrak{T}_{\tilde{\Theta}} := \left\{ (\theta, \zeta, \sigma) \in \tilde{\Theta} \times B_1 \times (0, 1) : \sigma < 1 - |\zeta| \right\}$. Setting $\tilde{\Theta}_\Gamma := \{\theta_\Gamma : \theta \in \tilde{\Theta}\}$, we have that

$$\|F \circ \Gamma\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{S}_{(\Theta, \tilde{\Theta})}(T)} = \|F\|_{\mathbb{S}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \tilde{\Theta}_\Gamma)}(T_{\Theta_\Gamma}(\alpha \xi_T, x_T, s_T))}$$

for any $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$ supported compactly in $\Gamma(T)$. This concludes the definition of the pullback sizes and provides us with all the elements necessary to understand (1.19) that defines the size $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_\Gamma^u \Phi_\tau^N$. The single summands in (1.19) are related to the local sizes above through (3.15).

The sizes defined so far are well suited to control the single functions $F_j = \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j$. The size $\mathbb{I}_\Theta \Phi_\tau^N$, defined below, controls the product term

$$\prod_{j=1}^3 \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j$$

appearing in RHS(1.5). We make sure that this size is large enough to satisfy the hypothesis of Proposition 3.5 to be able to conclude that (1.10) holds. On the other hand, the size $\mathbb{I}_\Theta \Phi_\tau^N$ has to be small enough to be able to control it by the sizes $\mathbb{F}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N$ of $\text{Emb}[f_1]$ by the sizes $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_\tau^N$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_\times}^{u_\times} \Phi_\tau^N$, defined subsequently, of the functions $\text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j$, $j \in \{2, 3\}$ and of the function $\text{Emb}[f_2] \circ \Gamma_2 \text{Emb}[f_3] \circ \Gamma_3$. This is required to be able to show that (1.12) and (1.15) hold.

Definition 3.15 (Integral size). *Let us fix $\omega \in \Phi_1^\infty$ such that $\hat{\omega}(\hat{z}) = 1$ for $\hat{z} \in B_{7/8}$. For any $\varphi \in \Phi_{\tau/2}^\infty$ and $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, we define*

$$(3.31) \quad \begin{aligned} \varphi_{j,\theta}^o(z) &:= \hat{\varphi}(\theta_{\Gamma_j}) \text{Dil}_{\tau^{-1}} \omega(z), \\ \varphi_{j,\theta}^l(z) &:= \varphi(z) - \hat{\varphi}(\theta_{\Gamma_j}) \text{Dil}_{\tau^{-1}} \omega(z). \end{aligned}$$

We define the local sizes $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(\star_1, \star_2, \star_3)} \Phi_\tau^N(T)}$ with $(\star_1, \star_2, \star_3) \in \{o, l\}^3$ as follows. For $H \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes^3 \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$ and $T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ set

$$\begin{aligned} &\|H\|_{\mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(\star_1, \star_2, \star_3)} \Phi_\tau^N(T)} \\ &:= \sup_\varphi \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_\Theta \left| \int_\varepsilon^\infty (\mathbb{1}_T H) \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) [\varphi_{1,\theta}^{\star_1}, \varphi_{2,\theta}^{\star_2}, \varphi_{3,\theta}^{\star_3}] d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \right| \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|}, \end{aligned}$$

where the upper bound is taken over $\varphi \in \Phi_{\tau/2}^\infty$ with $\|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{\tau/2}^N} \leq 1$. Using the local sizes above we have given meaning to the definition (1.11) of the size $\mathbb{I}_\Theta \Phi_\tau^N$. The single summands in (1.11) are related to the local sizes above through (3.15).

We now define the (local) sizes used to control the product term $\text{Emb}[f_2] \circ \Gamma_2 \text{Emb}[f_3] \circ \Gamma_3$ appearing in (1.16). Our procedure of bounding the term

$$\|\text{Emb}[f_1] \text{Emb}[f_2] \circ \Gamma_2 \text{Emb}[f_3] \circ \Gamma_3\|_{\mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l, o, o)} \Phi_\tau^N}$$

that appears in Theorem 2 requires controlling quantities that cannot be bounded uniformly by products of sizes of $\text{Emb}[f_2] \circ \Gamma_2$ and $\text{Emb}[f_3] \circ \Gamma_3$. We believe that

these additional quantities, that arise in the proof of Theorem 2 and that we encoded in the size $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_\times}^{u \times} \Phi_\tau^N$, is an intrinsically bilinear feature dependent on the interaction between $\text{Emb}[f_2] \circ \Gamma_2$ and of $\text{Emb}[f_3] \circ \Gamma_3$. For this reason, we believe that our inability to control them using products of sizes of $\text{Emb}[f_2] \circ \Gamma_2$ and $\text{Emb}[f_3] \circ \Gamma_3$ is intrinsic and not a shortcoming of the current method.

In general, given two function $G_2, G_3 \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$ their pointwise product is a function in $G_\times \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes^2 \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$ given by

$$G_\times(\eta, y, t)[\varphi_2, \varphi_3] := G_2(\eta, y, t)[\varphi_2]G_3(\eta, y, t)[\varphi_3].$$

This brings us to define the following product (local) sizes indexed by $T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ on functions $H \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes^2 \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$. In our notation we “remember” both diffeomorphisms Γ_2 and Γ_3 by including the symbol Γ_\times^* . The product Lebesgue local size is given by

$$\|H\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_\Theta^{(u,v)}(\Phi \otimes \Phi)_\tau^N(T)} := \sup_{\varphi_2, \varphi_3} \|H[\varphi_2, \varphi_3]\|_{\mathbb{L}_\Theta^{(u,v)}(T)}$$

where the upper bound is taken over all $\varphi_j \in \Phi_\tau^\infty$ with $\|\varphi_j\|_{\Phi_\tau^N} \leq 1$, $j \in \{2, 3\}$. The product lacunary local sizes, with $\theta_{\Gamma_j} := \alpha_j \beta_j (\theta + \gamma_j)$, $j \in \{2, 3\}$, are given by

$$(3.32) \quad \begin{aligned} \|H\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_\Theta^{(u,v)}(\Phi \otimes \Phi)_\tau^N(T)} &:= \|(\text{Id} \otimes \Gamma_3^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(t(\eta - \xi_T))) H\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_\Theta^{(u,v)}(\Phi \otimes \Phi)_\tau^N(T)}, \\ \|H\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_\Theta^{(u,v)}(\mathfrak{d} \otimes \Phi)_\tau^N(T)} &:= \|(\Gamma_2^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(t(\eta - \xi_T)) \otimes \text{Id}) H\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_\Theta^{(u,v)}(\Phi \otimes \Phi)_\tau^N(T)}, \\ \|H\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_\Theta^{(u,v)}(\mathfrak{d} \otimes \mathfrak{d})_\tau^N(T)} &:= \|(\Gamma_2^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(t(\eta - \xi_T)) \otimes \Gamma_3^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(t(\eta - \xi_T))) H\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_\Theta^{(u,v)}(\Phi \otimes \Phi)_\tau^N(T)}. \end{aligned}$$

The linear operators $(\text{Id} \otimes \Gamma_3^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta))$, $(\Gamma_2^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) \otimes \text{Id})$, and $(\Gamma_2^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) \otimes \Gamma_3^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta))$, defined on functions $H \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes^2 \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$, are given by

$$(3.33) \quad \begin{aligned} (\text{Id} \otimes \Gamma_3^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta)) H(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2, \varphi_3] &:= H(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2, (-d_z + 2\pi i \theta_{\Gamma_3}) \varphi_3(z)], \\ (\Gamma_2^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) \otimes \text{Id}) H(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2, \varphi_3] &:= H(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[(-d_z + 2\pi i \theta_{\Gamma_2}) \varphi_2(z), \varphi_3], \\ (\Gamma_2^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) \otimes \Gamma_3^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta)) H(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2, \varphi_3] &:= H(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[(-d_z + 2\pi i \theta_{\Gamma_2}) \varphi_2(z), (-d_z + 2\pi i \theta_{\Gamma_3}) \varphi_3(z)]. \end{aligned}$$

To define product defect sizes, we also introduce the operators $(\text{Id} \otimes \Gamma_3^* \mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta))$, $(\Gamma_2^* \mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta) \otimes \text{Id})$ and $(\Gamma_2^* \mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta) \otimes \Gamma_3^* \mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta))$ analogously to (3.33) with \mathfrak{d}_σ in place of \mathfrak{d}_ζ . We set

$$(3.34) \quad \begin{aligned} \|H\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_\Theta^{(u,v)} \square_{\zeta, \tau}^N(T)} &:= \|(\Gamma_2^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) \otimes \text{Id} + \text{Id} \otimes \Gamma_3^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) - \beta t d_y + 2\pi i (\alpha_2 + \alpha_3) \xi_T) H\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_\Theta^{(u,v)}(\Phi \otimes \Phi)_\tau^N(T)}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(3.35) \quad \begin{aligned} \|H\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_\Theta^{(u,v)} \square_{\sigma, \tau}^N(T)} &:= \|(\Gamma_2^* \mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta) \otimes \text{Id} + \text{Id} \otimes \Gamma_3^* \mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta) - t d_t + (\eta - \xi_T) d_\eta) H\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_\Theta^{(u,v)}(\Phi \otimes \Phi)_\tau^N(T)}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly to the computation (3.27), using (3.29), one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\Gamma_2^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) \otimes \text{Id} + \text{Id} \otimes \Gamma_3^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) - \beta t d_y + 2\pi i (\alpha_2 + \alpha_3) \xi_T) H \\ &= (\Gamma_2^* \mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta) \otimes \text{Id} + \text{Id} \otimes \Gamma_3^* \mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta) - t d_t + (\eta - \xi_T) d_\eta) H = 0 \end{aligned}$$

if $H = \text{Emb}[f_2] \circ \Gamma_2 \text{Emb}[f_3] \circ \Gamma_3$. We denote $\Gamma_{\times}^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\tau}^N(T) := \Gamma_{\times}^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\zeta, \tau}^N(T) + \Gamma_{\times}^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,v)} \square_{\sigma, \tau}^N(T)$. This concludes the definition of the bilinear sizes and provides us with all the elements necessary to understand (1.20) that defines the size $\mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$. The single summands in (1.20) are related to the local sizes above through (3.15).

3.4. Localized outer Lebesgue spaces. In this section we localize the outer Lebesgue quasi-norm $L_{\mu_{\Theta}^p}^p \mathbb{S}$ to spatial regions. Iterated outer measure spaces appear already in the context of non-uniform bounds in (1.5). In the range of exponents $p_j \in (2, \infty]$, $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ (triangle c in Figure 1) it is possible to reason at the level of non-iterated outer Lebesgue quasi-norms both for non-uniform (see [DT15]) and uniform bounds (we do not elaborate on this in this paper). Introducing localization is necessary to prove (1.5) outside of the regime $p_j \in (2, \infty]$. This necessity is dictated by the fact that the embedding bounds

$$\|\text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^1}^{p_j} \mathbb{S}_{\text{en}, j}} \lesssim \|f_j\|_{L^{p_j}(\mathbb{R})}.$$

are known not to hold when $p_j \leq 2$. Iterated outer Lebesgue norms can be thought of as appropriate generalizations of product Lebesgue norms to the outer Lebesgue setting. The symbols $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}, \nu_1}^{q,+}$, $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_{\beta}}^{q,+}$, and $X_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_{\beta}}^{q,r,+}$, defined subsequently, play the role of sizes on analogues of fibers (in our setup: strips). These sizes are themselves outer Lebesgue quasi-norms on said fibers. This is completely analogous to the classical fact that the product Lebesgue norm

$$\|f(x, y)\|_{L_{x \in \mathbb{R}}^p L_{y \in \mathbb{R}}^q}$$

is defined by taking the Lebesgue norm $L_{x \in \mathbb{R}}^p$ of the function $x \mapsto \|f(x, y)\|_{L_{y \in \mathbb{R}}^q}$ where, effectively, the magnitude of the function on each fiber $\{x\} \times \mathbb{R}$ is measured by taking its L^q norm. The difficulty in our setup is that different fibers, or “strips”, are not necessarily disjoint in largely the same way as different trees are not necessarily disjoint either.

We begin by introducing a family of distinguished sets: β -strips. Countable unions thereof will play the role of a σ -generating collection. As for trees (Definition 3.6) and sizes in Section 3.2.2, our localization procedure must be adapted to each map Γ_j separately. This calls for having strips depend on the parameter $\beta \in (0, 1]$.

Definition 3.16 (Strips and strip outer measure). *Let $\beta \in (0, 1]$. A strip $D_{\beta}(x_D, s_D)$ with top $(x_D, s_D) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ is given by*

$$D_{\beta}(x_D, s_D) = \{(\eta, y, t) : \beta t < \beta(s_D - |y - x_D|)\}.$$

We denote by \mathbb{D}_{β} the collection of all strips $D_{\beta}(x_T, s_T)$. The outer measure $\nu_{\beta}(E)$ is given by

$$\nu_{\beta}(E) := \inf \left\{ \|N_{\mathcal{D}}(z)\|_{L_{dz}^1(\mathbb{R})} : \mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{D}_{\beta}, E \subset \bigcup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} D \right\},$$

$$N_{\mathcal{D}}(z) := \sum_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{1}_{B_{s_T}(x_T)}(z).$$

There is a one-to-one correspondence between the datum $\beta, (x_D, s_D)$ and a given strip. We call $B_{s_D}(x_D)$ the spatial interval of a strip. We denote countable unions of strips in \mathbb{D}_β by \mathbb{D}_β^\cup . We define two ways to localize the outer Lebesgue quasi-norms $L_{\mu_\ominus^p}^q \mathbb{S}$ to unions of strips; here \mathbb{S} can be any size on $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes^k \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$.

Definition 3.17 (Localized outer Lebesgue quasi-norms). *Let $\beta \in (0, 1]$ and let \mathbb{S} be a size on $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes^k \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$; we define the localized outer Lebesgue (local) sizes $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^q, \nu_\beta}^q \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^q, \nu_\beta}^{q,+} \mathbb{S}$ as follows. For $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes^k \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$ and $V^+ \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup$ set*

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^q, \nu_\beta}^q \mathbb{S}(V^+)} &:= \|\mathbb{1}_{V^+} F\|_{L_{\mu_\ominus^q}^q \mathbb{S}} \\ \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^q, \nu_\beta}^{q,+} \mathbb{S}(V^+)} &:= \sup_{\bar{q} \in [q, \infty]} \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^{\bar{q}}, \nu_\beta}^{\bar{q}} \mathbb{S}(V^+)}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we define $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^q \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^{q,+} \mathbb{S}$; for $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes^k \Phi_\tau^{\infty'}$ and $V^+ \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup$ set

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^q \mathbb{S}(V^+)} &:= \nu_\beta(V^+)^{-\frac{1}{q}} \|\mathbb{1}_{V^+} F\|_{L_{\mu_\ominus^1}^q \mathbb{S}(V^+)}, \\ \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^{q,+} \mathbb{S}(V^+)} &:= \sup_{\bar{q} \in [q, \infty]} \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^{\bar{q}} \mathbb{S}(V^+)}. \end{aligned}$$

We then set, analogously to (3.15),

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^q, \nu_\beta}^q \mathbb{S}} &:= \sup_{V^+ \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup} \sup_{V^- \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup} \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-} F \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^q, \nu_\beta}^q \mathbb{S}(V^+)}, \\ \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^q, \nu_\beta}^{q,+} \mathbb{S}} &:= \sup_{V^+ \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup} \sup_{V^- \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup} \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-} F \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^q, \nu_\beta}^{q,+} \mathbb{S}(V^+)}, \\ \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^q \mathbb{S}} &:= \sup_{V^+ \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup} \sup_{V^- \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup} \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-} F \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^q \mathbb{S}(V^+)}, \\ \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^{q,+} \mathbb{S}} &:= \sup_{V^+ \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup} \sup_{V^- \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup} \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-} F \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^{q,+} \mathbb{S}(V^+)}, \end{aligned}$$

to obtain the corresponding sizes.

We also define the local sizes $X_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^{q,r,+} \mathbb{S}$ as follows. For $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes^k \Phi_\tau^{N'}$ and $V^+ \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup$ set

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\|_{X_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^{q,r} \mathbb{S}(V^+)} &:= \nu_\beta(V^+)^{-\frac{1}{r}} \sup_{W^+ \in \mathbb{T}_\ominus^\cup} \left(\mu_\ominus^\infty(W^+)^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{r}} \|\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+)} F\|_{L_{\mu_\ominus^1}^r \mathbb{S}} \right), \\ \|F\|_{X_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^{q,r,+} \mathbb{S}(V^+)} &:= \sup_{\bar{r} \in [r, q]} \|F\|_{X_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^{q,\bar{r}} \mathbb{S}(V^+)} \end{aligned}$$

and we get the corresponding sizes by setting

$$\begin{aligned} (3.37) \quad \|F\|_{X_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^{q,r} \mathbb{S}} &:= \sup_{V^+ \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup} \sup_{V^- \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup} \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-} F \right\|_{X_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^{q,r} \mathbb{S}(V^+)}, \\ \|F\|_{X_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^{q,r,+} \mathbb{S}} &:= \sup_{V^+ \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup} \sup_{V^- \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup} \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-} F \right\|_{X_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^{q,r,+} \mathbb{S}(V^+)}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us now discuss the meaning of the sizes above. The sizes $\|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^q \mathbb{S}}$ were first introduced in [Ura16] (cfr. [Ura16, (2.14)]) albeit their local variants were indexed by strips $D \in \mathbb{D}_1$ rather than by countable unions V_+ thereof, as in Definition 3.17. For the case $\beta = 1$ these two approaches are functionally the same while for $\beta \ll 1$

they yield non uniformly equivalent sizes. Note that the sizes $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^p, \nu_{\beta}}^{q,+} \mathbb{S}$ are monotone in q in the sense that $\|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^p, \nu_{\beta}}^{q,+} \mathbb{S}} \geq \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^p, \nu_{\beta}}^{\bar{q},+} \mathbb{S}}$ if $q < \bar{q}$.

The size $X_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_{\beta}}^{q,r} \mathbb{S}$ are weaker variants of the sizes $\|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_{\beta}}^q \mathbb{S}}$. Clearly

$$\|F\|_{\left(X_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_{\beta}}^{q,q} \mathbb{S}\right)(V)} = \nu_{\beta}(V)^{-\frac{1}{q}} \|\mathbb{1}_V F\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^1}^q \mathbb{S}} = \|\mathbb{1}_V F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_{\beta}}^q \mathbb{S}(V^+)}.$$

On the other hand, for $r \leq q$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\|_{\left(X_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_{\beta}}^{q,r} \mathbb{S}\right)(V)} &= \sup_{W \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}} \nu_{\beta}(V)^{-\frac{1}{r}} \mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}(W)^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{r}} \|\mathbb{1}_V \mathbb{1}_W F\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^1}^r \mathbb{S}} \\ &\lesssim \sup_{W \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}} \beta^{-\frac{1}{r}} \mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}(W)^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{r}} \|\mathbb{1}_V \mathbb{1}_W F\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}}^r \mathbb{S}} \leq \beta^{-\frac{1}{r}} \|\mathbb{1}_V F\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}}^q \mathbb{S}} \end{aligned}$$

showing that $\|F\|_{\left(X_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_{\beta}}^{q,1,+} \mathbb{S}\right)(V)} \leq \beta^{-1} \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}, \nu_{\beta}}^q \mathbb{S}(V)}$. In practice, this means that the local sizes $\|F\|_{\left(X_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_{\beta}}^{q,r,+} \mathbb{S}\right)(V)}$ are weaker than $\|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}, \nu_{\beta}}^q \mathbb{S}(V)}$ for $\beta = 1$ but they may be better behaved when β is small.

The claimed bound above follows from the following lemma.

Lemma 3.18. *Given any $V \in \mathbb{D}_{\beta}^{\cup}$ and any $W \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}$ it holds that*

$$\mu_{\Theta}^1(W \cap V) \leq 4\beta^{-1} \nu_{\beta}(V) \mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}(W \cap V).$$

Proof. Given any strip $D \in \mathbb{D}_{\beta}$ and any tree $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$ it holds that

$$T(\xi_T, x_{D,T}, 2\beta^{-1}s_{D,T}) \supset T \cap D$$

where $B_{s_{D,T}}(x_{D,T}) := I_T \cap I_D$. From this it follows that

$$\mu_{\Theta}^1(W \cap V) \leq 2\beta^{-1} \nu(V) \mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}(W \cap V)$$

for any $V \in \mathbb{D}_{\beta}^{\cup}$ and any $W \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}$. As a matter of fact, let $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{D}_{\beta}$ be such that $V \subset \bigcup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} D$ and $\|N_{\mathcal{D}}\|_{L^1} \leq 2\nu_{\beta}(V)$ and let $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$ be such that

$$\|N_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^{\infty}} \leq 2\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}(W \cap V), \quad W \cap V \subset \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T.$$

It then holds that

$$\sum_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} |I_D \cap I_T| = \int \sum_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}_{I_D}(z) \mathbb{1}_{I_T}(z) dz \leq \|N_{\mathcal{D}}\|_{L^1} \|N_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^{\infty}}.$$

Since $W \cap V \subset \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \bigcup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} (D \cap T)$ we have that

$$W \cap V \subset \bigcup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T(\xi_T, x_{D,T}, 2\beta^{-1}s_{D,T}),$$

so $\mu_{\Theta}^1(W \cap V) \leq \sum_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} 4\beta^{-1}s_{D,T} = \sum_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} 2\beta^{-1}|I_D \cap I_T|$, as required \square

Finally, note that the sizes $X_{\mu_{\Theta}^p, \nu_{\beta}}^{q,r,+} \mathbb{S}$ are monotone in q and r in the sense that $\|F\|_{X_{\mu_{\Theta}^p, \nu_{\beta}}^{q,r,+} \mathbb{S}} \geq \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^p, \nu_{\beta}}^{\bar{q},r,+} \mathbb{S}}$ if $q < \bar{q}$ and $\|F\|_{X_{\mu_{\Theta}^p, \nu_{\beta}}^{q,r,+} \mathbb{S}} \geq \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^p, \nu_{\beta}}^{q,\bar{r},+} \mathbb{S}}$ if $r < \bar{r}$.

When proving iterated bounds of the form (1.13) and (1.14) it is necessary to unwrap the sequence of definitions above; since this is going to be a recurrent

procedure in this work we find it useful to explicitly go through this procedure in the following remark.

Remark 3.19. *Let us unwrap Definition 3.17: in that setup suppose we need to show that*

$$\|F\|_{L_{\nu_\beta}^p \mathbb{L}_{\mu_\Theta^p, \nu_\beta}^q \mathbb{S}} \lesssim A$$

with some $A \in [0, +\infty)$ and an implicit constant independent of A and $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes^k \Phi_\tau^{N'}$. This is tantamount to exhibiting a choice of sets $V^-(\lambda) \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^U$ for any $\lambda \in (0, +\infty)$ such that

$$(3.38) \quad \int_0^\infty \nu_\beta \left(V^-(\lambda^{1/p}) \right) d\lambda \lesssim A^p, \quad \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-(\lambda)} F \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\mu_\Theta^p, \nu_\beta}^q \mathbb{S}} \lesssim \lambda.$$

The second condition amounts to exhibiting a choice of sets $W_q(\tau, V^+, V^-) \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^U$ for any $V^\pm \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^U$ and $\tau \in (0, +\infty)$ such that if $V^- \supseteq \bar{V}(\lambda)$ then

$$(3.39) \quad \int_0^\infty \mu_\Theta^p(W_q(\tau^{1/q}, V^+, V^-)) d\tau \lesssim \lambda^q \nu_\beta(V^+)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}_{V^+ \setminus (V^- \cup W_q(\lambda, \tau, V^+, V^-))} F \right\|_{\mathbb{S}} \lesssim \tau.$$

When we are showing $\|F\|_{L_{\nu_\beta}^p \mathbb{L}_{\mu_\Theta^p, \nu_\beta}^q \mathbb{S}} \lesssim A$, then we need to show that (3.38) holds with \bar{q} in place of q , for all $\bar{q} \in \{q, +\infty\}$. This follows by log convexity of outer Lebesgue quasi-norms ((3.8) in Proposition 3.1). All the implicit constants above cannot depend on any of the variable quantities λ, τ, V^\pm .

Similarly, showing that

$$\|F\|_{L_{\nu_\beta}^p X_{\mu_\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}}, \nu_\beta}^{q, r, +} \mathbb{S}} \lesssim A$$

amounts to exhibiting a choice of sets $V^-(\lambda) \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^U$ for any $\lambda \in (0, +\infty)$ such that

$$\int_0^\infty \nu_\beta \left(V^-(\lambda^{1/p}) \right) d\lambda \lesssim A^p, \quad \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-(\lambda)} F \right\|_{X_{\mu_\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}}, \nu_\beta}^{q, r, +} \mathbb{S}} \lesssim \lambda.$$

According to (3.37) and using log convexity of outer Lebesgue quasi-norms ((3.8) in Proposition 3.1). The second bound amounts to showing that for any $V^+ \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^U$, $W^+ \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^U$, it holds that

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-(\lambda)} F \right\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^{\bar{r}}}^{\bar{r}} \mathbb{S}} \lesssim \lambda \nu_\beta(V^+)^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}}} \mu_\Theta^\infty(W^+)^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}} - \frac{1}{q}}$$

with $\bar{r} \in \{r, q\}$.

We conclude this section with a lemma that encodes how the boundary of sets $V \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^U$ and $W \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^U$ looks like. We showed in Section 3.2.4 that this is of crucial importance because the defect size of a function of the form

$$\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} \text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma$$

is going to be a bound on a singular measure supported on the boundary of $(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)$.

Lemma 3.20 (Geometry of the boundary of generating sets). *Let*

$V \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^U$, $W_1, \dots, W_n \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^U$ and E a set of the form $E = V \cap \left(\bigcap_{l=1}^k W \right)$ or

$E = V \cup \left(\bigcup_{l=1}^k W \right)$. The boundary of E is described by the graph of a function $\mathbf{b}_E : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ i.e.

$$E = \{(\eta, y, t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^3 : t \in (0, \mathbf{b}_E(\eta, y))\}.$$

The function \mathbf{b}_E is locally Lipschitz; if we denote $\Theta = (\theta_-, \theta_+)$ then it holds that

$$(3.40) \quad |\partial_y \mathbf{b}_E(\eta, y)| \leq \beta^{-1}, \quad \frac{\mathbf{b}_E(\eta, y)}{-\theta_+} \leq \frac{\partial_\eta \mathbf{b}_E(\eta, y)}{\mathbf{b}_E(\eta, y)} \leq \frac{\mathbf{b}_E(\eta, y)}{-\theta_-}.$$

The distributional derivative $\text{td}_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)$ is given by measure $t\delta(t - \mathbf{b}_E(\eta, y))$. Given any $F \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$ and any $\mathbf{b} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ satisfying (3.40) it holds that

$$(3.41) \quad \|F(\eta, y, t)t\delta(t - \mathbf{b}(\eta, y))\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \tilde{\Theta})}^{(u, 1)}(T)} \\ \approx \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{1}_{\pi_T(\mathfrak{T}_{\tilde{\Theta}})}(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) |F(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y))|^u \mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \frac{d\eta dy}{|\Theta|s_T} \right)^{\frac{1}{u}}.$$

The statement above has an analogue in local coordinates given by π_T . Let $T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ and let $\mathbf{b} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be a locally Lipschitz function that satisfies (3.40). Then there exists a function $\mathbf{b}^* : \Theta \times B_1 \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ such that

$$(3.42) \quad \pi_T(\{(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{T}_\Theta : \sigma \leq \mathbf{b}^*(\theta, \zeta)\}) = \{(\eta, y, t) \in T : t < \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)\}.$$

This function \mathbf{b}^* satisfies

$$(3.43) \quad |\partial_\zeta \mathbf{b}^*(\theta, \zeta)| \leq \beta^{-1}, \quad \frac{1}{\theta - \theta_+} \leq \frac{\partial_\theta \mathbf{b}^*(\theta, \zeta)}{\mathbf{b}^*(\theta, \zeta)} \leq \frac{1}{\theta - \theta_-}.$$

Given any $F \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$ it holds that

$$(3.44) \quad \|F(\eta, y, t)t\delta(t - \mathbf{b}(\eta, y))\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \tilde{\Theta})}^{(u, 1)}(T)} \\ \approx \left(\int_{\tilde{\Theta} \times B_1} |\mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{T}_{\tilde{\Theta}}}(F \circ \pi_T)(\theta, \zeta, \mathbf{b}^*(\theta, \zeta))|^u \frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|} \right)^{\frac{1}{u}}.$$

All the implicit constants are uniformly bounded from above and away from 0 as long as $\text{dist}(\tilde{\Theta}, \mathbb{R} \setminus \Theta)$ is bounded away from 0.

Proof. The bound (3.40) holds for $E = D_\beta(x, s)$ and $E = T_\Theta(\xi, x, s)$ since, explicitly,

$$\mathbf{b}_{D_\beta(x, s)}(\eta, y) = \max(\beta^{-1}(s - |y - x|), 0), \\ \mathbf{b}_{T_\Theta(\xi, x, s)}(\eta, y) = \min \left(\max(\beta^{-1}(s - |y - x|), 0), \mathbb{1}_{\eta > 0} \frac{\theta_+}{|\eta - \xi|} + \mathbb{1}_{\eta < 0} \frac{\theta_-}{|\eta - \xi|} \right),$$

where $\Theta = (\theta_-, \theta_+)$. The bounds (3.40) follow since for any collection E_i it holds that

$$\mathbf{b}_{\bigcup_i E_i}(\eta, y) = \sup_i \mathbf{b}_{E_i}(\eta, y) \quad \mathbf{b}_{\bigcap_i E_i}(\eta, y) = \inf_i \mathbf{b}_{E_i}(\eta, y)$$

and the conditions (3.40) are stable with respect to the operations above.

Now, given $\mathbf{b}_E : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ let us construct $\mathbf{b}^* : \Theta \times B_1 \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$. Let us define

$$\mathbf{b}^*(\theta, \zeta) := \sup \{ \sigma : s_T \sigma \leq \mathbf{b}(\xi_T + \theta(s_T \sigma)^{-1}, x_T + s_T \zeta) \}$$

that gives $\mathfrak{b}^*(\theta, \zeta) \geq 0$ since $\mathfrak{b}(\eta, y) \geq 0$. Note that the function

$$\sigma \mapsto s_T \sigma - \mathfrak{b}_E(\xi_T + \theta(s_T \sigma)^{-1}, x_T + s_T \zeta)$$

is continuous and for any $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that

$$\frac{d_\sigma}{s_T} (s_T \sigma - \mathfrak{b}_E(\xi_T + \theta(s_T \sigma)^{-1}, x_T + s_T \zeta)) = 1 + \theta \frac{\partial_\eta \mathfrak{b}_E(\xi_T + \theta(s_T \sigma)^{-1}, x_T + s_T \zeta)}{s_T \sigma^2}.$$

Thus if $s_T \sigma - \mathfrak{b}_E(\xi_T + \theta(s_T \sigma)^{-1}, x_T + s_T \zeta)$ is in a small neighborhood of 0 and $\theta \in \Theta = (\theta_-, \theta_+)$ it holds, thank to (3.40), that

$$\frac{d_\sigma}{s_T} (s_T \sigma - \mathfrak{b}_E(\xi_T + \theta(s_T \sigma)^{-1}, x_T + s_T \zeta)) > 0.$$

It follows that $s_T \sigma - \mathfrak{b}_E(\xi_T + \theta(s_T \sigma)^{-1}, x_T + s_T \zeta)$ can change sign only once and from < 0 to > 0 . This shows (3.42). We can now differentiate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{b}(\eta, y) &= s_T \mathfrak{b}^*(\theta, \zeta), \\ \mathfrak{b}(\eta, y)(\eta - \xi_T) &= \theta, \\ y &= x_T + s_T \zeta \end{aligned}$$

to obtain

$$|\partial_\zeta \mathfrak{b}^*(\theta, \zeta)| \leq \beta^{-1}$$

and

$$\partial_\eta \mathfrak{b}(\eta, y) = s_T \partial_\theta \mathfrak{b}^*(\theta, \zeta) (\partial_\eta \mathfrak{b}(\eta, y)(\eta - \xi_T) + \mathfrak{b}(\eta, y))$$

giving that

$$\frac{\partial_\theta \mathfrak{b}^*(\theta, \zeta)}{\mathfrak{b}^*(\theta, \zeta)} = \frac{\partial_\eta \mathfrak{b}(\eta, y)}{\mathfrak{b}(\eta, y)^2} \left(\frac{\partial_\eta \mathfrak{b}(\eta, y)}{\mathfrak{b}(\eta, y)^2} \theta + 1 \right)^{-1}$$

and thus

$$\frac{1}{\theta - \theta_+} \leq \frac{\partial_\theta \mathfrak{b}^*(\theta, \zeta)}{\mathfrak{b}^*(\theta, \zeta)} \leq \frac{1}{\theta - \theta_-},$$

as required.

Finally, by definition of the local size $\mathbb{L}_\Theta^{(u,1)}(T)$ we dualize with $G \in C_c^\infty(T)$ and obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.45) \quad & \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} F(\eta, y, t) G(\eta, y, t) t \delta(t - \mathfrak{b}_E(\eta, y)) d\eta dy dt \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} F(\eta, y, \mathfrak{b}_E(\eta, y)) G(\eta, y, \mathfrak{b}_E(\eta, y)) \mathfrak{b}_E(\eta, y) d\eta dy. \end{aligned}$$

We enact the change of variables $\theta = \mathfrak{b}_E(\eta, y)(\eta - \xi_T)$, $\zeta = \frac{y - x_T}{s_T}$ with Jacobian it holds that

$$J(\eta, y) = \mathfrak{b}_E(\eta, y) \left(1 + (\eta - \xi_T) \frac{\partial_\eta \mathfrak{b}_E(\eta, y)}{\mathfrak{b}_E(\eta, y)} \right).$$

From bound (3.40) we obtain that when $(\eta, y, t) \in T$ and, in particular, $t(\eta - \xi_T) \in \Theta$ it holds that

$$0 < J(\eta, y) \lesssim 1$$

so the change of variables is valid. We set $J^*(\theta, \zeta) := J(\eta(\theta), y(\zeta))$ and from bound (3.40) we obtain that

$$\text{dist}(\theta, \mathbb{R} \setminus \Theta) \lesssim J^*(\theta, \zeta) \lesssim 1.$$

Rewriting (3.45) in new coordinates we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} F(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) G(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) \mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \frac{d\eta dy}{|\Theta|_{s_T}} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} F \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \mathbf{b}_E^*(\sigma, \zeta)) G(\theta, \zeta, \mathbf{b}_E^*(\sigma, \zeta)) \frac{1}{J^*(\theta, \zeta)} \frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the upper bound over G with $\|G \circ \pi_T\|_{L^{\frac{u'}{|\Theta|}}_{d\theta d\zeta} L^\infty_{\frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}}} \leq 1$ we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|F(\eta, y, t) t d_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \bar{\Theta})}^{(u, 1)}(T)}^u = \\ & \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} |\mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{I}_{\bar{\Theta}}}(F \circ \pi_T)(\theta, \zeta, \mathbf{b}_E^*(\sigma, \zeta))|^u J^*(\theta, \zeta)^{-u} \frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}, \end{aligned}$$

that shows (3.44). Finally, using the inverse change of variables

$(\eta, y) = (\xi_T + \theta(s_T \mathbf{b}_E^*(\theta, \zeta))^{-1}, x_T + s_T \zeta)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|F(\eta, y, t) t d_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \bar{\Theta})}^{(u, 1)}(T)}^u \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{1}_{\pi_T(\mathfrak{I}_{\bar{\Theta}})}(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}_E(\eta, y)) |F(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}_E(\eta, y))|^u \\ & \quad \times J(\eta, y)^{1-u} \mathbf{b}_E(\eta, y) \frac{d\eta dy}{|\Theta|_{s_T}}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows (3.41), concluding the proof. \square

4. THE SINGLE TREE ESTIMATE

In this section we focus on proving Theorem 2 (bounds (1.17) and (1.18)). These bounds correspond to the L^∞ endpoint bound when applying Proposition 3.3 since, tautologically, $L^\infty_{\mu} \mathbb{S} \equiv \mathbb{S}$. We will use Theorem 2 recurrently in Section 5 to prove to prove bounds (1.12) and (1.15).

The bounds (1.17) and (1.18) are often referred to as the single tree estimates since the sizes in play are generated using identity (3.15) starting from local sizes indexed by single trees. Accordingly, it is sufficient to fix $T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ and show that that bounds

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|F_1 F_2 F_3\|_{\left(\mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l, l, l)} \Phi_{\mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(o, l, l)}}^N\right)(T)} \\ & \lesssim \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^{u_1} \Phi_{2\tau}^{N-3}(T)} \|F_2\|_{\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_2}^{u_2} \Phi_{2\tau}^{N-3}(T)} \|F_3\|_{\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_3}^{u_3} \Phi_{2\tau}^{N-3}(T)}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|F_1 F_2 F_3\|_{\left(\mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l, l, o)} \Phi_{\mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l, o, l)}}^N\right)(T)} \\ & \lesssim \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-5}(T)} \|F_2\|_{\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_2}^{u_2} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-5}(T)} \|F_3\|_{\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_3}^{u_3} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-5}(T)}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(4.3) \quad \|F_1 F_2 F_3\|_{\mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l, o, o)} \Phi_{\tau}^N(T)} \lesssim \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-5}(T)} \|F_2 F_3\|_{\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma \times}^{u \times} (\Phi \otimes \Phi)_{4\tau}^{N-5}(T)}.$$

hold for all $F_j \in C_c^\infty(T) \otimes \Phi_{4\tau}^{\infty'}$.

Let us argue that this implies the claim of Theorem 2. Assuming that the bounds (4.1), (4.2), and (4.3) hold, using a standard mollification argument, the same inequalities continue to hold for all functions $F_j \in L^\infty(T) \otimes \Phi_{4\tau}^{\infty'}$ that are compactly supported in the interior of T . As a matter of fact all the sizes in play

are lower-semicontinuous when convolving with a compactly supported approximate identity. To extend bounds (4.1), (4.2), and (4.3) from the case of functions F_j that are compactly supported in T to arbitrary functions $F_j \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{4\mathbf{r}}^{\infty'}$ let us set

$$\mathbb{K}_n = \left(T \cap T_\Theta(\xi_T + 2^{-n}, x_T, (1 - 2^{-n})s_T) \cap T_\Theta(\xi_T + 2^{-n}, x_T, (1 - 2^{-n})s_T) \right) \setminus \{(\eta, y, t), t > 2^{-n}s_T\}$$

and let us assume bounds (4.1), (4.2), and (4.3) hold for $\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{K}_n} F_j$ in place of F_j . According to Definition 3.15 of sizes $\mathbb{1}_{\Theta}^{(\star_1, \star_2, \star_3)} \Phi_{\mathbf{r}}^N$, we have that

$$\|F_1 F_2 F_3\|_{\mathbb{1}_{\Theta}^{(\star_1, \star_2, \star_3)} \Phi_{\mathbf{r}}^N(T)} \leq \liminf_n \|\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{K}_n} F_1 F_2 F_3\|_{\mathbb{1}_{\Theta}^{(\star_1, \star_2, \star_3)} \Phi_{\mathbf{r}}^N(T)}$$

for any $(\star_1, \star_2, \star_3) \in \{o, l\}^3$. On the other hand, according to (3.15), the terms on RHS(1.17) and RHS(1.18) increase at most by a fixed factor when replacing F_j by $\mathbb{1}_{W^+} F_j$ or by $\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W^-} F_j$ with $W^\pm \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^\cup$; the transformation $F_j \mapsto \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{K}_n} F_j$ can be expressed as at most 4 such steps. This concludes the reduction to $F_j \in C_c^\infty(T) \otimes \Phi_{4\mathbf{r}}^{\infty'}$.

Thus, for the subsequent proof we assume that $F_j \in C_c^\infty(T) \otimes \Phi_{4\mathbf{r}}^{\infty'}$; let us introduce the notation

$$(4.4) \quad F_j^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) := e^{-2\pi i \alpha_j \xi_T s_T \zeta} F_j \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma), \quad j \in \{1, 2, 3\};$$

According to (1.6) it holds that $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = 1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = 0$ so

$$\left(\prod_{j=1}^3 F_j \right) \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) = \prod_{j=1}^3 F_j^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma).$$

With the notation of Definition 3.15, given a wave packet $\varphi \in \Phi_{\mathbf{r}/2}^\infty$ we define the wave packets $\widetilde{\varphi}_{j,\theta}^l(z)$ and $\widetilde{\varphi}_{j,\theta}^o(z)$ to satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} (-d_z + 2\pi i \theta_{\Gamma_j}) \widetilde{\varphi}_{j,\theta}^l(z) &= \varphi_{j,\theta}^l(z), \\ (-d_z + 2\pi i \theta_{\Gamma_j}) \widetilde{\varphi}_{j,\theta}^o(z) &= z \varphi_{j,\theta}^o(z) \end{aligned}$$

by setting

$$\widehat{\widetilde{\varphi}_{j,\theta}^l}(\widehat{z}) := \frac{\widehat{\varphi_{j,\theta}^l}(\widehat{z})}{-2\pi i (\widehat{z} - \theta_{\Gamma_j})}$$

and

$$\widehat{\widetilde{\varphi}_{j,\theta}^o}(\widehat{z}) := \frac{\partial \widehat{\varphi_{j,\theta}^o}(\widehat{z})}{-4\pi^2 (\widehat{z} - \theta_{\Gamma_j})}$$

These expressions give well defined wave packets $\widetilde{\varphi}_{j,\theta}^l, \widetilde{\varphi}_{j,\theta}^o \in \Phi_{\mathbf{r}}^\infty$ with

$$\|\widetilde{\varphi}_{j,\theta}^o\|_{\Phi_{\mathbf{r}}^{N-1}} + \|\widetilde{\varphi}_{j,\theta}^l\|_{\Phi_{\mathbf{r}}^{N-1}} \lesssim \|\varphi_{j,\theta}^o\|_{\Phi_{\mathbf{r}}^N} + \|\varphi_{j,\theta}^l\|_{\Phi_{\mathbf{r}}^N} \|\varphi_j\|_{\Phi_{\mathbf{r}}^N}.$$

This holds since $\widehat{\varphi_{j,\theta}^l}(\widehat{z}) = \widehat{\varphi}_j(\widehat{z}) - \widehat{\varphi}_j(\theta_{\Gamma_j}) \widehat{\omega}(\frac{\widehat{z}}{\mathbf{r}})$ and $\partial \widehat{\varphi_{j,\theta}^o}(\widehat{z}) = \widehat{\varphi}_j(\theta_{\Gamma_j}) \mathbf{r}^{-1} \widehat{\omega}'(\frac{\widehat{z}}{\mathbf{r}})$ and in particular, $\widehat{\varphi_{j,\theta}^l}(\theta_{\Gamma_j}) = d_{\widehat{z}} \widehat{\varphi_{j,\theta}^o}(\theta_{\Gamma_j}) = 0$.

Finally, we mention that main motivation for introducing the specific sizes in Section 3.2 is given by the quantities arising in the proof of Theorem 2.

We offer the following suggestions for a preliminary reading of these proofs. First of all one can suppose that $T = T_\Theta(0, 0, 1)$. Next, we encourage the reader to suppose that $F_j^* = \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j \circ \pi_T$. This guarantees that

$$\begin{aligned} F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi] &:= f_1 * \text{Dil}_\sigma \text{Mod}_\theta \varphi^\vee, \\ F_j^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi] &:= f_j * \text{Dil}_{\beta_j \sigma} \text{Mod}_{\theta_{\Gamma_j}} \varphi^\vee. \end{aligned}$$

where $\theta_{\Gamma_j} = \alpha_j \beta_j (\theta + \gamma_j)$. Furthermore, this assumption guarantees that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi] &= \sigma \mathfrak{d}_\sigma (f_1 * \text{Dil}_\sigma \text{Mod}_\theta \varphi^\vee), \\ \mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta_{\Gamma_j}) F_j^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi] &= \sigma \mathfrak{d}_\sigma (f_j * \text{Dil}_{\beta_j \sigma} \text{Mod}_{\theta_{\Gamma_j}} \varphi^\vee), \\ \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi] &= \sigma \mathfrak{d}_\zeta (f_1 * \text{Dil}_\sigma \text{Mod}_\theta \varphi^\vee), \\ \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_j}) F_j^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi] &= \beta_j \sigma \mathfrak{d}_\zeta (f_j * \text{Dil}_{\beta_j \sigma} \text{Mod}_{\theta_{\Gamma_j}} \varphi^\vee). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, any term in the subsequent manipulations that contains the difference between the LHS and RHS of the quantities above vanishes. In the complete proof the defect sizes included in $\mathbb{F}_\Theta^{u_1} \Phi_\tau^N$, $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_\tau^N$, and $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j^\times}^{u_j} (\Phi \otimes \Phi)_\tau^N$ are used to control the discrepancies. Similarly, the reader is invited to disregard boundary terms appearing when integrating by parts: they too are controlled by the defect sizes. The reader can also suppose that $\beta_2 = \beta_3 = \beta$, $\alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \beta^{-1}$, and $\gamma_2 = \gamma_3 = \frac{1}{2}$. The second assumption is formally not allowed since we require $1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = 0$. However, this fact is used only in the reduction following (4.4) and is not of relevance for the remainder of the proof. Finally, in the proof of (4.1) the reader can assume simply that $\theta = 0$ instead of having an integral over $\theta \in \Theta$ while in the proof of (4.2) and of (4.3) the reader can assume that $\theta = -\frac{1}{2}$ so that $\theta_{\Gamma_j} = 0$ for $j \in \{2, 3\}$.

Proof. Proof of bound (4.1) We deal only with the size $\mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(\alpha, l, l)} \Phi_\tau^N$ appearing on LHS(4.1); the term $\mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l, l, l)} \Phi_\tau^N$ is dealt with in the same way. We begin by fixing $T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ and $\varphi \in \Phi_\tau^N$ with $\|\varphi\|_{\Phi_\tau^N} \leq 1$ so that we now need to show bound

$$\int_\Theta \left| \int_0^{1-|\zeta|} F_1 F_2 F_3 \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) [\varphi_{1, \theta}^o, \varphi_{2, \theta}^l, \varphi_{3, \theta}^l] d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \right| \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|}.$$

Using the notation from the discussion preceding this proof we can rewrite and bound this expression as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_\Theta \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} F_1 F_2 F_3 \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) [\varphi_{1, \theta}^o, \varphi_{2, \theta}^l, \varphi_{3, \theta}^l] d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \right| \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \\ & \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} |F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) [\varphi_{1, \theta}^o] \cdot \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) F_2^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) [\widetilde{\varphi}_{2, \theta}^l] \\ & \quad \times \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3}) F_3^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) [\widetilde{\varphi}_{2, \theta}^l]| d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \\ & \lesssim \sup_{\widetilde{\varphi}_1, \widetilde{\varphi}_2, \widetilde{\varphi}_3} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} |F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) [\widetilde{\varphi}_1]| |\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) F_2^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) [\widetilde{\varphi}_2]| \\ & \quad \times |\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3}) F_3^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) [\widetilde{\varphi}_3]| d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|}, \end{aligned}$$

with the upper bound being taken over wave packets $\widetilde{\varphi}_j \in \Phi_{2\tau}^\infty$ with $\|\widetilde{\varphi}_j\|_{\Phi_{2\tau}^{N-3}} \leq 1$, $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. The second inequality follows from Lemma 3.13 according to

which we can decompose each of the wave packets $\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^o, \tilde{\varphi}_{2,\theta}^l, \tilde{\varphi}_{3,\theta}^l$ into an absolutely convergent series e.g.

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l := \sum_k \tilde{a}_{1,k}^l(\theta) \tilde{\varphi}_k$$

with $\|\tilde{\varphi}_k\|_{\Phi_{2\tau}^{N-3}} \lesssim \|\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l\|_{\Phi_{\tau}^{N-1}} \lesssim 1$. We bound the RHS of the chain of inequalities above Cauchy-Schwartz inequality: we obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} |F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\tilde{\varphi}_1]| |\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2})F_2^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\tilde{\varphi}_2]| \\ & \quad \times |\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3})F_3^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\tilde{\varphi}_3]| d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \\ & \lesssim \|F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\tilde{\varphi}_1]\|_{L_{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}}^{u_1} L_{\frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}}^\infty} \|\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2})F_2^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\tilde{\varphi}_2]\|_{L_{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}}^{u_2} L_{\frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}}^2} \\ & \quad \times \|\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3})F_3^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\tilde{\varphi}_3]\|_{L_{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}}^{u_3} L_{\frac{d\rho}{\rho}}^2} \\ & \lesssim \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_1, \infty)} \Phi_{2\tau}^{N-2}(T)} \|F_2\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_2, 2)} \Gamma_2^* \mathfrak{d}_{2\tau}^{N-3}(T)} \|F_3\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_3, 2)} \Gamma_3^* \mathfrak{d}_{2\tau}^{N-3}(T)}, \end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

Proof. Proof of bound (4.2) We deal only with the size $\mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l, l, o)} \Phi_{\tau}^N$ appearing on LHS(4.2); the term with $\mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l, o, l)} \Phi_{\tau}^N$ is dealt with analogously, by exchanging the role of the indexes 2 and 3. We begin by fixing $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$ and $\varphi \in \Phi_{\tau}^N$ with $\|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{\tau}^N} \leq 1$. Using the notation from the discussion preceding this proof, we need to bound the expression

$$(4.5) \quad \int_{\Theta} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) [\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l] \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) F_2^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) [\tilde{\varphi}_{2,\theta}^l] F_3^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) [\varphi_{3,\theta}^o] d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \right| \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|}.$$

We claim that

$$\begin{aligned} (4.6) \quad (4.5) & \leq \int_{\Theta} (|M1(\theta)[\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l, \tilde{\varphi}_{2,\theta}^l, \tilde{\varphi}_{3,\theta}^o]| + |M2(\theta)[\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l, \tilde{\varphi}_{2,\theta}^l, \tilde{\varphi}_{3,\theta}^o]| + \\ & \quad + |B1(\theta)[\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l, \tilde{\varphi}_{2,\theta}^l, \varphi_{3,\theta}^o]| + |B2(\theta)[\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l, \tilde{\varphi}_{2,\theta}^l, \tilde{\varphi}_{3,\theta}^o]| \\ & \quad + |B3(\theta)[\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l, \tilde{\varphi}_{2,\theta}^l, \tilde{\varphi}_{3,\theta}^o]| + |B4(\theta)[\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l, \tilde{\varphi}_{2,\theta}^l, \tilde{\varphi}_{3,\theta}^o]|) \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \\ & \lesssim \sup_{\substack{\|\varphi_j\|_{\Phi_{\tau}^N} \leq 1 \\ j \in \{1, 2, 3\}}} \int_{\Theta} (|M1(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| + |M2(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| + \\ & \quad + |B1(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| + |B2(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| \\ & \quad + |B3(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| + |B4(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]|) \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M1(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3] & := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) [\varphi_1] \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2})^2 F_2^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) [\varphi_2] \\ & \quad \times \int_0^\sigma \frac{\rho}{\sigma} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3}) F_3^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi_3] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} d\zeta, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{M2}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3] &:= \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta)^2 F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1] \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) F_2^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2] \\ &\quad \times \int_0^\sigma \frac{\rho}{\sigma} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3}) F_3^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_3] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} d\zeta, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{B1}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3] &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1] \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) F_2^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2] \\ &\quad \times \int_0^\sigma (\mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta_{\Gamma_3}) - \rho d_\rho) F_3^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_3] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} d\zeta, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{B2}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3] &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1] \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) F_2^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2] \\ &\quad \times \int_0^\sigma (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3} - \beta \rho d_\zeta) \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3} F_3^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_3] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} d\zeta, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{B3}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3] &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1] (\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) - \beta \sigma d_\zeta) \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) F_2^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2] \\ &\quad \times \int_0^\sigma \frac{\rho}{\sigma} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3}) F_3^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_3] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} d\zeta, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{B4}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3] &:= \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) - \sigma d_\zeta) \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1] \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) F_2^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2] \\ &\quad \times \int_0^\sigma \frac{\rho}{\sigma} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3}) F_3^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_3] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} d\zeta. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality in (4.6) follows from Lemma 3.13 according to which we can decompose each of the wave packets $\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l, \tilde{\varphi}_{2,\theta}^l, \tilde{\varphi}_{3,\theta}^o, \varphi_{3,\theta}^o$ into an absolutely convergent series e.g.

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l := \sum_k \tilde{a}_{1,k}^l(\theta) \tilde{\varphi}_k$$

with $\|\tilde{\varphi}_k\|_{\Phi_\zeta^N} \leq 1$.

Let us now show that each of the 6 terms in RHS(4.6) contributes a quantity bounded by RHS(1.17). We record Young's convolution inequality in a form useful for us. A direct computation gives

$$\|\rho \mathbb{1}_{\rho < 1}\|_{L^1_{\frac{d\rho}{\rho}}(\mathbb{R})} + \|\rho \mathbb{1}_{\rho < 1}\|_{L^\infty_{\frac{d\rho}{\rho}}(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim 1,$$

so it follows that for any $q \in [1, \infty]$ and any $h \in L^q_{\frac{d\rho}{\rho}}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ it holds that

$$\left\| \int_0^\sigma \frac{\rho}{\sigma} h(\rho) \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right\|_{L^q_{\frac{d\rho}{\rho}}(\mathbb{R}) + L^\infty_{\frac{d\rho}{\rho}}(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \|h\|_{L^q_{\frac{d\rho}{\rho}}(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Note that the integral above is a multiplicative convolution with respect to the multiplicative Haar measure $\frac{d\rho}{\rho}$. For $\|\varphi_j\|_{\Phi_\zeta^N} \leq 1$, $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, the following

bounds thus hold:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Theta} |\text{M1}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| d\theta \\
& \lesssim \|\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1]\|_{L^{\frac{u_1}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^\infty}{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\sigma}{|\Theta|}}} \|\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2})^2 F_2^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2]\|_{L^{\frac{u_2}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\sigma}{|\Theta|}}} \\
& \quad \times \|\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3}) F_3^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_3]\|_{L^{\frac{u_3}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\sigma}{|\Theta|}}} \\
& \lesssim \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_1, \infty)} \Phi_{\ddagger}^N(T)} \|F_2\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_2, 2)} \Gamma_2^* \mathfrak{d}_{\ddagger}^N(T)} \|F_3\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_3, 2)} \Gamma_3^* \mathfrak{d}_{\ddagger}^N(T)};
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Theta} |\text{M2}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| d\theta \\
& \lesssim \beta \|\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta)^2 F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1]\|_{L^{\frac{u_1}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^\infty}{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\sigma}{|\Theta|}}} \|\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) F_2^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2]\|_{L^{\frac{u_2}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\sigma}{|\Theta|}}} \\
& \quad \times \|\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3}) F_3^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_3]\|_{L^{\frac{u_3}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\sigma}{|\Theta|}}} \\
& \lesssim \beta \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_1, \infty)} \Phi_{\ddagger}^N(T)} \|F_2\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_2, 2)} \Gamma_2^* \mathfrak{d}_{\ddagger}^N(T)} \|F_3\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_3, 2)} \Gamma_3^* \mathfrak{d}_{\ddagger}^N(T)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Bounding the boundary terms B1, B2, B3, and B4 requires the use of defect sizes:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Theta} |\text{B1}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| d\theta \\
& \lesssim \|\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1]\|_{L^{\frac{u_1}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\sigma}{|\Theta|}}} \|\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) F_2^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2]\|_{L^{\frac{u_2}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\sigma}{|\Theta|}}} \\
& \quad \times \|(\mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta_{\Gamma_3}) - \rho d_\rho) F_3^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_3]\|_{L^{\frac{u_3}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^1}{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^1}{\frac{d\rho}{|\Theta|}}} \\
& \lesssim \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_1, \infty)} \mathfrak{d}_{\ddagger}^N(T)} \|F_2\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_2, 2)} \Gamma_2^* \mathfrak{d}_{\ddagger}^N(T)} \|F_3\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_3, 1)} \Gamma_3^* \square_{\ddagger}^N(T)},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Theta} |\text{B2}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| d\theta \\
& \lesssim \|\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1]\|_{L^{\frac{u_1}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\sigma}{|\Theta|}}} \|\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) F_2^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2]\|_{L^{\frac{u_2}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\sigma}{|\Theta|}}} \\
& \quad \times \|(\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3} - \beta \rho d_\zeta) \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3}) F_3^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_3]\|_{L^{\frac{u_3}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^1}{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^1}{\frac{d\rho}{|\Theta|}}} \\
& \lesssim \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_1, \infty)} \mathfrak{d}_{\ddagger}^N(T)} \|F_2\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_2, 2)} \Gamma_2^* \mathfrak{d}_{\ddagger}^N(T)} \|F_3\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_3, 1)} \Gamma_3^* \square_{\ddagger}^N(T)},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Theta} |\text{B3}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| d\theta \\
& \lesssim \|\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1]\|_{L^{\frac{u_1}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^\infty}{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\sigma}{|\Theta|}}} \\
& \quad \times \|(\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) - \beta \sigma d_\zeta) \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) F_2^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2]\|_{L^{\frac{u_2}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^1}{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\sigma}{|\Theta|}}} \\
& \quad \times \|\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3}) F_3^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_3]\|_{L^{\frac{u_3}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2}{\frac{d\rho}{|\Theta|}}} \\
& \lesssim \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_1, \infty)} \Phi_{\ddagger}^N(T)} \|F_2\|_{\Gamma_2^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_2, 1)} \square_{\ddagger}^N(T)} \|F_3\|_{\Gamma_3^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_3, 2)} \mathfrak{d}_{\ddagger}^N(T)},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\Theta} |\mathbf{B4}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| \, d\theta \\
 & \lesssim \beta \|(\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) - \sigma d_\zeta) \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)\|_{L^{\frac{u_1}{|\Theta|}} L^1_{\frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}}} \\
 & \quad \times \|\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) F_2^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2]\|_{L^{\frac{u_2}{|\Theta|}} L^\infty_{\frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}}} \|\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3}) F_3^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_3]\|_{L^{\frac{u_3}{|\Theta|}} L^2_{\frac{d\rho}{\rho}}} \\
 & \lesssim \beta \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{L}^{(u_1,1)} \square^N(T)} \|F_2\|_{\mathbb{L}^{(u_2,\infty)} \Phi^N(T)} \|F_3\|_{\mathbb{L}^{(u_3,2)} \Gamma^*_3 \mathfrak{d}^N(T)}
 \end{aligned}$$

We conclude the proof by showing that (4.6) holds. Our manipulations rely on using the fundamental theorem of calculus in the scale parameter on F_3^* . To exploit certain cancellations we need to integrate by parts in the spatial variable. Every integration causes “defect” terms to appear that have to be accounted for; they are grouped into the terms B1 – B4.

We crucially rely on the following algebraic identity that follows directly from definitions (3.18) and (3.20):

$$\mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta) F(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi] = \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[z\varphi(z)].$$

In what follows we drop θ from the notation and keep the dependence on this variable implicit: we write \mathfrak{d}_{ζ_j} in place of $\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_j})$, \mathfrak{d}_{σ_j} in place of $\mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta_{\Gamma_j})$, $F_j^*(\zeta, \sigma)$ in place of $F_j^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)$, $\tilde{\varphi}_j^{l/o}$ in place of $\tilde{\varphi}_{j,\theta}^{l/o}$, and so on.

It holds that (using the convention of keeping θ implicit)

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.7) \quad \rho d_\rho F_3^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_3^o] &= \mathfrak{d}_{\sigma_3} F_3^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_3^o] - (\mathfrak{d}_{\sigma_3} - \rho d_\rho) F_3^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_3^o] \\
 &= \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3}^2 F_3^*(\zeta, \rho)[\tilde{\varphi}_3^o] - (\mathfrak{d}_{\sigma_3} - \rho d_\rho) F_3^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_3^o] \\
 &= \beta \rho d_\zeta \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3} F_3^*(\zeta, \rho)[\tilde{\varphi}_3^o] + (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3} - \beta \rho d_\zeta) \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3} F_3^*(\zeta, \rho)[\tilde{\varphi}_3^o] \\
 &\quad - (\mathfrak{d}_{\sigma_3} - \rho d_\rho) F_3^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_3^o]
 \end{aligned}$$

We now concentrate on the inner \mathbb{R}_+^2 integral in LHS(4.6). Applying the fundamental theorem of calculus in the scale variable to term $F_3^*(\zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_3^o]$ and using identity (4.7) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_1} F_1^*(\zeta, \sigma)[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l] \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} F_2^*(\zeta, \sigma)[\tilde{\varphi}_2^l] F_3^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_3^o] \, d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \\
 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_1} F_1^*(\zeta, \sigma)[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l] \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} F_2^*(\zeta, \sigma)[\tilde{\varphi}_2^l] \int_0^\sigma \rho d_\rho F_3^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_3^o] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \, d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \\
 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_1} F_1^*(\zeta, \sigma)[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l] \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} F_2^*(\zeta, \sigma)[\tilde{\varphi}_2^l] \int_0^\sigma \beta \rho d_\zeta \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3} F_3^*(\zeta, \rho)[\tilde{\varphi}_3^o] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \, d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \\
 &\quad - \mathbf{B1}[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l, \tilde{\varphi}_2^l, \varphi_3^o] + \mathbf{B2}[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l, \tilde{\varphi}_2^l, \tilde{\varphi}_3^o].
 \end{aligned}$$

Integrating the first summand on the RHS by parts in ζ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_1} F_1^*(\zeta, \sigma)[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l] \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} F_2^*(\zeta, \sigma)[\tilde{\varphi}_2^l] \int_0^\sigma \beta \rho \mathfrak{d}_\zeta \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3} F_3^*(\zeta, \rho)[\tilde{\varphi}_3^o] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_1} F_1^*(\zeta, \sigma)[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l] \beta \sigma \mathfrak{d}_\zeta \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} F_2^*(\zeta, \sigma)[\tilde{\varphi}_2^l] \int_0^\sigma \frac{\rho}{\sigma} \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3} F_3^*(\zeta, \rho)[\tilde{\varphi}_3^o] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} d\zeta \\
&\quad + \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \sigma \mathfrak{d}_\zeta \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_1} F_1^*(\zeta, \sigma)[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l] \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} F_2^*(\zeta, \sigma)[\tilde{\varphi}_2^l] \int_0^\sigma \frac{\rho}{\sigma} \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3} F_3^*(\zeta, \rho)[\tilde{\varphi}_3^o] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} d\zeta \\
&= \text{M1}[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l, \tilde{\varphi}_2^l, \tilde{\varphi}_3^o] + \text{B3}[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l, \tilde{\varphi}_2^l, \tilde{\varphi}_3^o] + \text{M2}[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l, \tilde{\varphi}_2^l, \tilde{\varphi}_3^o] + \text{B4}[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l, \tilde{\varphi}_2^l, \tilde{\varphi}_3^o].
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the decomposition (4.6). \square

Proof. Proof of bound (4.3) Fix $\varphi_j \in \Phi_{\tau/4}^{N+3}$ with $\|\varphi_j\|_{\Phi_{\tau/4}^{N+3}} \leq 1$ so that $\|\varphi_{j,\theta}^{o/l}\|_{\Phi_{\tau/2}^{N+3}} \leq 1$. Using the notation from the discussion preceding this proof, we need to bound the expression

$$(4.8) \quad \int_{\Theta} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l] F_\times^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_{2,\theta}^o, \varphi_{3,\theta}^o] d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \right| \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|}$$

for every $\varphi_j \in \Phi_{\tau/4}^{N+3}$ with $\|\varphi_j\|_{\Phi_{\tau/4}^{N+3}} \leq 1$. We claim that

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.9) \quad & \leq \int_{\Theta} (|\text{M1}(\theta)[\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l, \tilde{\varphi}_{2,\theta}^o, \varphi_{3,\theta}^o]| + |\text{M1}(\theta)[\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l, \varphi_{2,\theta}^o, \tilde{\varphi}_{3,\theta}^o]| \\
& \quad + |\text{M2}_{(\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \text{Id})}[\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l, \tilde{\varphi}_{2,\theta}^o, \varphi_{3,\theta}^o]| + |\text{M2}_{(\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3})}[\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l, \varphi_{2,\theta}^o, \tilde{\varphi}_{3,\theta}^o]| \\
& \quad + |\text{B1}(\theta)[\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l, \varphi_{2,\theta}^o, \varphi_{3,\theta}^o]| \\
& \quad + |\text{B2}_{(\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \text{Id})}(\theta)[\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l, \tilde{\varphi}_{2,\theta}^o, \varphi_{3,\theta}^o]| + |\text{B2}_{(\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3})}(\theta)[\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l, \varphi_{2,\theta}^o, \tilde{\varphi}_{3,\theta}^o]| \\
& \quad + |\text{B3}_{(\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \text{Id})}(\theta)[\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l, \tilde{\varphi}_{2,\theta}^o, \varphi_{3,\theta}^o]| \\
& \quad + |\text{B3}_{(\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3})}(\theta)[\tilde{\varphi}_{1,\theta}^l, \varphi_{2,\theta}^o, \tilde{\varphi}_{3,\theta}^o]|) \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \\
& \lesssim_N \sup_{\substack{\|\varphi_j\|_{\Phi_{\tau/4}^N} \leq 1 \\ j \in \{1, 2, 3\}}} \int_{\Theta} (|\text{M1}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| + |\text{M2}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| + \\
& \quad + |\text{B1}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| + |\text{B2}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| \\
& \quad + |\text{B3}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]|) \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{M1}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3] &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1] \\
&\quad \times \int_0^\sigma (\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3})) F_\times^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2, \varphi_3] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} d\zeta,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{M2}_{(\mathfrak{d}_\zeta \otimes \text{Id})}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3] &:= \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta)^2 F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1] \\
&\quad \times \int_0^\sigma \frac{\rho}{\sigma} (\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) \otimes \text{Id}) F_\times^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2, \varphi_3] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} d\zeta,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{M2}_{(\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\zeta)}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3] &:= \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta)^2 F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1] \\ &\quad \times \int_0^\sigma \frac{\rho}{\sigma} (\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3})) F_\times^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2, \varphi_3] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} d\zeta, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{B1}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3] &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1] \\ &\quad \times \int_0^\sigma (\mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) \otimes \text{Id} + \text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta_{\Gamma_3}) - \rho d_\rho) F_\times^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2, \varphi_3] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} d\zeta, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{B2}_{(\mathfrak{d}_\zeta \otimes \text{Id})}[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3] &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1] \int_0^\sigma (\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) \otimes \text{Id} + \text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3}) - \beta \rho d_\zeta) \\ &\quad (\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) \otimes \text{Id}) F_\times^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2, \varphi_3] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} d\zeta, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{B2}_{(\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\zeta)}[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3] &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1] \int_0^\sigma (\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) \otimes \text{Id} + \text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3}) - \beta \rho d_\zeta) \\ &\quad (\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3})) F_\times^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2, \varphi_3] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} d\zeta, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{B3}_{(\mathfrak{d}_\zeta \otimes \text{Id})}[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3] &:= \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) - \sigma d_\zeta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1] \\ &\quad \times \int_0^\sigma \frac{\rho}{\sigma} (\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) \otimes \text{Id}) F_\times^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2, \varphi_3] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} d\zeta, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{B3}_{(\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\zeta)}[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3] &:= \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) - \sigma d_\zeta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1] \\ &\quad \times \int_0^\sigma \frac{\rho}{\sigma} (\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3})) F_\times^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2, \varphi_3] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} d\zeta, \end{aligned}$$

Let us now show that each of the 6 terms in RHS(4.9) contributes a quantity bounded by RHS(1.18). For $\|\varphi_j\|_{\Phi_T^N} \leq 1$, $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, the following bounds thus hold:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Theta^{\text{in}}} |\text{M1}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| d\theta \\ &\lesssim \|\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1]\|_{L_{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}}^{u_1} L_{\frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}}^\infty} \\ &\quad \times \left\| (\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3})) F_\times^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2, \varphi_3] \right\|_{L_{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}}^{u_\times} L_{\frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}}^1} \\ &\lesssim \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{L}_\Theta^{(u_1, \infty)} \Phi_T^N} \|F_2 F_3\|_{\mathbb{L}_\Theta^{(u_\times, 1)} \Gamma_\times^*(\mathfrak{d} \otimes \mathfrak{d})_T^N}; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Theta^{\text{in}}} |\text{M2}_{(\mathfrak{d}_\zeta \otimes \text{Id})}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| \, d\theta \\
& \lesssim \beta \left\| \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta)^2 F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1] \right\|_{L^{\frac{u_1}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2_{\frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}}}{|\Theta|}} \\
& \quad \times \left\| (\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) \otimes \text{Id}) F_\times^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_2, \varphi_3] \right\|_{L^{\frac{u_\times}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2_{\frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}}}{|\Theta|}} \\
& \lesssim \beta \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_1, 2)} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta^N(T)} \|F_2 F_3\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_\times, 2)} (\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\zeta)^N(T)};
\end{aligned}$$

similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Theta} |\text{M2}_{(\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\zeta)}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| \, d\theta \\
& \lesssim \beta \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_1, 2)} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta^N(T)} \|F_2 F_3\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_\times, 2)} (\mathfrak{d} \otimes \text{Id})^N(T)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Bounding the boundary terms B1, B2, and B3, requires the use of defect sizes:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Theta^{\text{in}}} |\text{B1}(\theta)[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| \, d\theta \\
& \lesssim \left\| \int_{\rho}^{+\infty} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1] \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \right\|_{L^{\frac{u_1}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^\infty_{\frac{d\rho}{\rho}}}{|\Theta|}} \\
& \quad \times \left\| (\mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) \otimes \text{Id} + \text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\sigma(\theta_{\Gamma_3}) - \rho d_\rho) F_\times^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_2, \varphi_3] \right\|_{L^{\frac{u_\times}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^1_{\frac{d\rho}{\rho}}}{|\Theta|}} \\
& \lesssim \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{J}_{\Theta}^{(u_1, \infty)} \Phi_\zeta^N(T)} \|F_2 F_3\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u_\times, 1)} \square_\zeta^N(T)};
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Theta} |\text{B2}_{(\mathfrak{d}_{c_2} \otimes \text{Id})}[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| \, d\theta \\
& \lesssim \left\| \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1] \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \right\|_{L^{\frac{u_1}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2_{\frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}}}{|\Theta|}} \\
& \quad \times \left\| (\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) \otimes \text{Id} + \text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_3}) - \beta \rho d_\zeta) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times (\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) \otimes \text{Id}) F_\times^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_2, \varphi_3] \right\|_{L^{\frac{u_\times}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^1_{\frac{d\rho}{\rho}}}{|\Theta|}} \\
& \lesssim \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_1, 2)} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta^N(T)} \|F_2 F_3\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u_\times, 1)} \square_\zeta^N(T)}
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Theta} |\text{B2}_{(\mathfrak{d}_{c_2} \otimes \text{Id})}[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| \, d\theta \lesssim \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_1, 2)} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta^N(T)} \|F_2 F_3\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u_\times, 1)} \square_\zeta^N(T)}; \\
& \int_{\Theta} |\text{B3}_{(\mathfrak{d}_{c_2} \otimes \text{Id})}[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3]| \, d\theta \lesssim \beta \left\| (\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) - \sigma d_\zeta) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1] \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \right\|_{L^{\frac{u_1}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^1_{\frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}}}{|\Theta|}} \\
& \quad \times \left\| (\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_{\Gamma_2}) \otimes \text{Id}) F_\times^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_2, \varphi_3] \right\|_{L^{\frac{u_\times}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2_{\frac{d\rho}{\rho}}}{|\Theta|}} \\
& \lesssim \beta \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_1, 1)} \square_\zeta^N(T)} \|F_2 F_3\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_\times, 1)} (\mathfrak{d} \otimes \text{Id})^N(T)}
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Theta} \left| \text{B3}_{(\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3})}[\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3] \right| d\theta &\lesssim \beta \left\| (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta) - \sigma d_{\zeta}) F_1^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_1] \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \right\|_{L^{\frac{u_1}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^1_{\frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}}}{|\Theta|}} \\ &\quad \times \left\| (\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta_{\Gamma_3})) F_{\times}^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_2, \varphi_3] \right\|_{L^{\frac{u}{|\Theta|}} \frac{L^2_{\frac{d\rho}{\rho}}}{|\Theta|}} \\ &\lesssim \beta \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_1, 1)} \square_{\zeta}^N(T)} \|F_2 F_3\|_{\Gamma_{\times}^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u \times, 1)} (\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d})_{\zeta}^N(T)}. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude the proof by showing that (4.9) holds. Our manipulations rely on using the fundamental theorem of calculus in the scale parameter on the product $F_2^* F_3^*$. To exploit certain cancellations we need to integrate by parts in the spatial variable. Every integration causes “defect” terms to appear that have to be accounted for; they are grouped into the terms B1 – B3.

In what follows we drop θ from the notation and keep the dependence on this variable implicit: we write \mathfrak{d}_{ζ} in place of $\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta_{\Gamma_j})$, \mathfrak{d}_{σ_j} in place of $\mathfrak{d}_{\sigma}(\theta_{\Gamma_j})$, $\tilde{\varphi}_j^{l/o}$ in place of $\tilde{\varphi}_{j, \theta}^{l/o}$, and so on. For conciseness, we also write $F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)$ for $F_2^*(\zeta, \rho) F_3^*(\zeta, \rho)$. It holds that (using the convention of keeping θ implicit)

$$\begin{aligned} (4.10) \quad \rho d_{\rho}(F_2^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_2^o] F_3^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_3^o]) &= \rho d_{\rho} F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_2^o, \varphi_3^o] \\ &= + (\mathfrak{d}_{\sigma_2} \otimes \text{Id} + \text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\sigma_3}) F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_2^o, \varphi_3^o] \\ &\quad - (\mathfrak{d}_{\sigma_2} \otimes \text{Id} + \text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\sigma_3} - \rho d_{\rho}) F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_2^o, \varphi_3^o] \\ &= + (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \text{Id})^2 F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)[\tilde{\varphi}_2^o, \varphi_3^o] + (\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3})^2 F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_2^o, \tilde{\varphi}_3^o] \\ &\quad - (\mathfrak{d}_{\sigma_2} \otimes \text{Id} + \text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\sigma_3} - \rho d_{\rho}) F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_2^o, \varphi_3^o] \\ &= + (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \text{Id} + \text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3}) (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \text{Id}) F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)[\tilde{\varphi}_2^o, \varphi_3^o] \\ &\quad + (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \text{Id} + \text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3}) (\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3}) F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_2^o, \tilde{\varphi}_3^o] \\ &\quad - (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3}) F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)[\tilde{\varphi}_2^o, \varphi_3^o] - (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3}) F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_2^o, \tilde{\varphi}_3^o] \\ &\quad - (\mathfrak{d}_{\sigma_2} \otimes \text{Id} + \text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\sigma_3} - \rho d_{\rho}) F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_2^o, \varphi_3^o] \\ &= + \beta \rho d_{\zeta} (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \text{Id}) F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)[\tilde{\varphi}_2^o, \varphi_3^o] \\ &\quad + \beta \rho d_{\zeta} (\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3}) F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_2^o, \tilde{\varphi}_3^o] \\ &\quad + (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \text{Id} + \text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3} - \beta \rho d_{\zeta}) (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \text{Id}) F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)[\tilde{\varphi}_2^o, \varphi_3^o] \\ &\quad + (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \text{Id} + \text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3} - \beta \rho d_{\zeta}) (\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3}) F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_2^o, \tilde{\varphi}_3^o] \\ &\quad - (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3}) F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)[\tilde{\varphi}_2^o, \varphi_3^o] - (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3}) F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_2^o, \tilde{\varphi}_3^o] \\ &\quad - (\mathfrak{d}_{\sigma_2} \otimes \text{Id} + \text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\sigma_3} - \rho d_{\rho}) F_{\times}^*(\zeta, \rho)[\varphi_2^o, \varphi_3^o]. \end{aligned}$$

We now concentrate on the inner \mathbb{R}_+^2 integral in LHS(4.9). Applying the fundamental theorem Differentiating and integrating back in scale the term $F_3^*(\zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_3^o]$

in the first summand gives and using identity (4.10) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta F_1^*(\zeta, \sigma) [\tilde{\varphi}_1^l] F_2^*(\zeta, \sigma) [\varphi_2^o] F_3^*(\zeta, \sigma) [\varphi_3^o] d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta F_1^*(\zeta, \sigma) [\tilde{\varphi}_1^l] \int_0^\sigma \rho d_\rho F_\times^*(\zeta, \rho) [\varphi_2^o, \varphi_3^o] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta F_1^*(\zeta, \sigma) [\tilde{\varphi}_1^l] \int_0^\sigma \beta \rho d_\zeta (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \text{Id}) F_\times^*(\zeta, \rho) [\tilde{\varphi}_2^o, \varphi_3^o] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta F_1^*(\zeta, \sigma) [\tilde{\varphi}_1^l] \int_0^\sigma \beta \rho d_\zeta (\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3}) F_\times^*(\zeta, \rho) [\varphi_2^o, \tilde{\varphi}_3^o] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \\
&\quad - \text{B1}[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l, \varphi_2^o, \varphi_3^o] - \text{M1}[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l, \tilde{\varphi}_2^o, \varphi_3^o] - \text{M1}[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l, \varphi_2^o, \tilde{\varphi}_3^o] \\
&\quad + \text{B2}_{(\mathfrak{d}_\zeta \otimes \text{Id})}[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l, \tilde{\varphi}_2^o, \varphi_3^o] + \text{B2}_{(\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\zeta)}[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l, \varphi_2^o, \tilde{\varphi}_3^o].
\end{aligned}$$

Integrating the first two summands on the RHS by parts in ζ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta F_1^*(\zeta, \sigma) [\tilde{\varphi}_1^l] \int_0^\sigma \beta \rho d_\zeta (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \text{Id}) F_\times^*(\zeta, \rho) [\tilde{\varphi}_2^o, \varphi_3^o] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \\
&= -\beta \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \sigma d_\zeta \mathfrak{d}_\zeta F_1^*(\zeta, \sigma) [\tilde{\varphi}_1^l] \int_0^\sigma \frac{\rho}{\sigma} (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \text{Id}) F_\times^*(\zeta, \rho) [\tilde{\varphi}_2^o, \varphi_3^o] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \\
&= -\beta \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta^2 F_1^*(\zeta, \sigma) [\tilde{\varphi}_1^l] \int_0^\sigma \frac{\rho}{\sigma} (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \text{Id}) F_\times^*(\zeta, \rho) [\tilde{\varphi}_2^o, \varphi_3^o] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \\
&\quad + \beta \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} (\mathfrak{d}_\zeta - \sigma d_\zeta) \mathfrak{d}_\zeta F_1^*(\zeta, \sigma) [\tilde{\varphi}_1^l] \int_0^\sigma \frac{\rho}{\sigma} (\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \text{Id}) F_\times^*(\zeta, \rho) [\tilde{\varphi}_2^o, \varphi_3^o] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \\
&= -\text{M2}_{(\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \text{Id})}[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l, \tilde{\varphi}_2^o, \varphi_3^o] + \text{B3}_{(\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_2} \otimes \text{Id})}[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l, \tilde{\varphi}_2^o, \varphi_3^o]
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta F_1^*(\zeta, \sigma) [\tilde{\varphi}_1^l] \int_0^\sigma \beta \rho d_\zeta (\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta_3}) F_\times^*(\zeta, \rho) [\varphi_2^o, \tilde{\varphi}_3^o] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} d\zeta \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \\
&= -\text{M2}_{(\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\zeta)}[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l, \varphi_2^o, \tilde{\varphi}_3^o] + \text{B3}_{(\text{Id} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\zeta)}[\tilde{\varphi}_1^l, \varphi_2^o, \tilde{\varphi}_3^o].
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the decomposition (4.9). \square

5. FOREST ESTIMATES

In this section we prove bounds (1.10), (1.12), and (1.15). These bounds are proven for general functions $F_j \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^\infty$ in place of $\text{Emb}[f_j](\eta, y, t)$ specifically. The results are generally obtained using interpolation using geometric considerations on the support of the functions F_j and on properties of the outer Lebesgue norms in play. The single tree estimates of Section 4 serve as the L^∞ endpoint when proving bounds (1.12), and (1.15). Bound (1.10), on the other hand relies on the correctness of Definition 3.15 of the size \mathbb{I}_Θ .

We begin this section by showing in Proposition 5.1 that (1.10) holds. The role of this estimate allows us to pass from trying to bound the trilinear form on LHS(1.5) directly to bounding appropriate outer Lebesgue norms of the integrand

$$\text{Emb}[f_1](\eta, y, t) [\varphi_0] \prod_{j=2}^3 \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j(\eta, y, t) [\varphi_0].$$

Subsequently, our goal is to prove bounds (1.12) and (1.15) that we do in Proposition 5.4. This relies first on proving a non-iterated version of these bounds in Lemma 5.2. This is just a straight-forward application of the outer Hölder inequality. Then we deducing an atomic estimate for iterated outer Lebesgue spaces in Lemma 5.3. This is the more involved procedure and involves. Then Proposition 5.4 follows by interpolation as a corollary of Lemma 5.3.

Proposition 5.1. *Given any $\varphi_0 \in \Phi_{\tau}^N$, the bound*

$$(5.1) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} H(\eta, y, t)[\varphi_0, \varphi_0, \varphi_0] d\eta dy dt \right| \lesssim \|\varphi_0\|_{\Phi_{\tau}^N}^3 \|H(\eta, y, t)\|_{L_{\mu_{\ominus}^1, \nu_1}^1 \mathbb{I}_{\Theta} \Phi_{\tau}^N}$$

holds for any compactly supported $H \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes^3 \Phi_{\tau}^{\infty'}$. As a consequence, the bound (1.10) holds for all functions $f_j \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

Proof. Bound (1.10) follows from (5.1) by applying it to $H = \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{K}_n} \prod_{j=1}^3 \text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j$ where $\mathbb{K}_n \subset \mathbb{R}_+^3$ are compact subsets as specified in Remark Remark 3.12. Convergence follows by Proposition 2.1: the integral on the LHS(1.10) is absolutely convergent.

The bound (5.1) follows by a two-fold application of Proposition 3.5. At the first level we obtain that

$$(5.2) \quad \left| \int H(\eta, y, t)[\varphi_0, \varphi_0, \varphi_0] d\eta dy dt \right| \lesssim \|H(\eta, y, t)\|_{L_{\mu_{\ominus}^1}^1 \mathbb{I}_{\Theta} \Phi_{\tau}^N}$$

as long as for any fixed tree $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$ one has

$$\left| \int_T H(\eta, y, t)[\varphi_0, \varphi_0, \varphi_0] d\eta dy dt \right| \lesssim_N \mu_{\Theta}^1(T) \|H(\eta, y, t)\|_{\mathbb{I}_{\Theta} \Phi_{\tau}^N}.$$

To show the latter bound it is sufficient to decompose each $\varphi_j = \varphi_0$ into $\varphi_j = \varphi_{j,\theta}^o + \varphi_{j,\theta}^l$ as described in (3.31) to obtain that

$$H(\eta, y, t)[\varphi_0, \varphi_0, \varphi_0] = \sum_{(\star_1, \star_2, \star_3) \in \{l, o\}^3} H(\eta, y, t)[\varphi_{1,\theta}^{\star_1}, \varphi_{2,\theta}^{\star_2}, \varphi_{3,\theta}^{\star_3}].$$

The terms with $(\star_1, \star_2, \star_3) = (o, o, l)$ and $(\star_1, \star_2, \star_3) = (o, l, o)$ vanish because if $\widehat{\varphi}_0(\theta_{\Gamma_1}) \neq 0$ then $\varphi_{j,\theta}^o(z) = 0$ for $j \in \{2, 3\}$. This is because if $\theta_{\Gamma_1} = \theta \in B_{\tau}$ then $\theta_{\Gamma_2} \in \alpha_2 \beta_2 (B_{\tau} + \gamma_2) = B_{\tau} - 1$ and $\theta_{\Gamma_3} \in \alpha_3 \beta_3 (B_{\tau} + \gamma_3) \in B_{(1+\beta)\tau} + 1$; in particular $\theta_{\Gamma_2} \notin B_{\tau}$ and $\theta_{\Gamma_3} \notin B_{\tau}$. The claim then follows by directly integrating each term and recalling Definition 3.15 of $\mathbb{I}_{\Theta} \Phi_{\tau}^N$.

From (5.2) it follows that that for any $V^+ \in \mathbb{D}^U$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int \mathbb{1}_{V^+} H(\eta, y, t)[\varphi_0, \varphi_0, \varphi_0] d\eta dy dt \right| &\lesssim \|\mathbb{1}_{V^+} H(\eta, y, t)\|_{L_{\mu_{\ominus}^1, \nu_1}^1 \mathbb{I}_{\Theta} \Phi_{\tau}^N} \\ &\lesssim \nu_1(V^+) \|\mathbb{1}_{V^+} H(\eta, y, t)\|_{L_{\mu_{\ominus}^1, \nu_1}^1 \mathbb{I}_{\Theta} \Phi_{\tau}^N}. \end{aligned}$$

This allows us to apply Proposition 3.5 again and obtain bound (5.1). \square

Lemma 5.2. *The bound*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|F_1 F_2 F_3\|_{L_{\mu_{\ominus}^1}^q \left(\mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l,l,l)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(o,l,l)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l,l,o)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l,o,l)} \Phi_{\tau}^N \right)} \\ &\lesssim \|F_1\|_{L_{\mu_{\ominus}^1}^{q_1} \mathbb{F}_{\Gamma_4\tau}^{\mu_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \|F_2\|_{L_{\mu_{\ominus}^1}^{q_2} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_2}^{\mu_2} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \|F_3\|_{L_{\mu_{\ominus}^1}^{q_3} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_3}^{\mu_3} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \end{aligned}$$

holds for any three functions $F_1, F_2, F_3 \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{4\tau}^\infty$ as long as $(q_1, q_2, q_3) \in [1, \infty]^3$ with $q^{-1} = \sum_{j=1}^3 q_j^{-1}$ and as long as $(u_1, u_2, u_3) \in [1, \infty]^3$ are such that $\sum_{j=1}^3 u_j^{-1} \leq 1$. Similarly, it holds that

$$\|F_1 F_2 F_3\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^q \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l, o, o)} \Phi_{4\tau}^N} \lesssim \|F_1\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^{q_1} \mathbb{F}_\Theta^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \|F_2 F_3\|_{\mathbb{F}_{\Gamma_\times}^{u_\times} (\Phi \otimes \Phi)_{4\tau}^{N-3}}$$

as long as $(q_1, q_\times) \in [1, \infty]^2$ with $q^{-1} = q_1^{-1} + q_\times^{-1}$ and as long as $(u_1, u_\times) \in [1, \infty]^2$ are such that $u_1^{-1} + u_\times^{-1} \leq 1$. The implicit constants are independent of F_1, F_2, F_3 .

Proof. The claim follows from Theorem 2 by the outer Hölder inequality (Corollary 3.4). To apply the outer Hölder notice that the bound (3.10) corresponds to the bounds (1.17) and (1.18) of Theorem 2. Bound (3.11), on the other hand, follows directly from the fact that $F_1 F_2 F_3$ is a point-wise product: if $W_j \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^\cup$ are such that

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W_j} F_j = 0$$

then

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W_\cap} F_1 F_2 F_3 = 0$$

where $W_\cap = W_{j_0}$ for j_0 such that $\mu_\Theta^1(W_{j_0}) = \min_{j \in \{1, 2, 3\}} (\mu_\Theta^1(W_j))$. \square

Lemma 5.3. *Let $(q_1, q_2, q_3) \in [1, \infty]^3$ and let*

$$q_\times := (q_2^{-1} + q_3^{-1})^{-1}, \quad q := (q_1^{-1} + q_\times^{-1})^{-1} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^3 q_j^{-1} \right)^{-1}.$$

Then the bound

$$(5.3) \quad \|F_1 F_2 F_3\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^p (\mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l, l, l)} \Phi_{4\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(o, l, l)} \Phi_{4\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l, l, o)} \Phi_{4\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l, o, l)} \Phi_{4\tau}^N)} \\ \lesssim \nu_1 (\|F_1\|_{\mathbb{F}_\Theta^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} > 0)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \min_{j \in \{2, 3\}} \left(\nu_\beta (\|F_j\|_{\mathbb{F}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} > 0) \right)^{\frac{1}{p_\times}} \\ \times \|F_1\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_1}^{q_1, +} \mathbb{F}_\Theta^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \left(\prod_{j=2}^3 \|F_j\|_{X_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_\beta}^{q_j, r_j, +} \mathbb{F}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \right)$$

holds for any $F_j \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{4\tau}^\infty$ as long as $(p_1, p_\times, p) \in (q, +\infty]^3$ with $p^{-1} = p_1^{-1} + p_\times^{-1}$, as long as $r_j \in (0, q_j]$, $j \in \{2, 3\}$, are such that $r_2^{-1} + r_3^{-1} \geq p_\times^{-1}$, and as long as $(u_1, u_2, u_3) \in [1, \infty]^3$ satisfy $\sum_{j=1}^3 u_j^{-1} \leq 1$.

Similarly, let $(q_1, q_\times) \in [1, \infty]^2$ and let $q := (q_1^{-1} + q_\times^{-1})^{-1}$. The bound

$$(5.4) \quad \|F_1 F_2 F_3\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^p \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l, o, o)} \Phi_{4\tau}^N} \lesssim \nu_1 (\|F_1\|_{\mathbb{F}_{\Gamma_1}^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} > 0)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \nu_\beta (\|F_2 F_3\|_{\mathbb{F}_{\Gamma_2 \times \Gamma_3}^{u_\times} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} > 0)^{\frac{1}{p_\times}} \\ \times \|F_1\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_1}^{q_1} \mathbb{F}_\Theta^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \|F_2 F_3\|_{X_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_\beta}^{q_\times, r_\times} \mathbb{F}_{\Gamma_2 \times \Gamma_3}^{u_\times} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}}$$

holds for any $F_j \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{4\tau}^\infty$ as long as $(p_1, p_\times, p) \in (q, +\infty]^3$ with $p^{-1} = p_1^{-1} + p_\times^{-1}$, as long as $r_\times \in (0, q_\times]$, is such that $r_\times \leq p_\times$, and as long as $(u_1, u_\times) \in [1, \infty]^3$ satisfy $u_1^{-1} + u_\times^{-1} \leq 1$.

Proof. Proof of Lemma 5.3 We first prove bound (5.3). The condition $r_j \leq q_j$ for $j \in \{2, 3\}$ is required for the sizes $X_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_\beta}^{q_j, r_j, +} \mathbb{F}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}$ to even be defined. We may

assume that all terms on RHS(5.3) are finite; otherwise there is nothing to prove. Let $V_1 \in \mathbb{D}_1^\cup$ and $V_\times \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup$ be such that $\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V_1} F_1 = 0$, $\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V_\times} F_2 F_3 = 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_1(V_1) &\leq 2\nu_1(\|F_1\|_{\mathbb{F}_\Theta^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} > 0), \\ \nu_\beta(V_\times) &\leq 2 \min_{j \in \{2,3\}} \nu_\beta(\|F_j\|_{\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} > 0). \end{aligned}$$

Let us first reason under the assumption that $q < p_\times \leq q_\times$. Since $r_2^{-1} + r_3^{-1} \geq p_\times^{-1} \geq q_\times^{-1}$ let us choose $p_2 \in [r_2, q_2]$ and $p_3 \in [r_3, q_2]$ such that $p_\times^{-1} = p_2^{-1} + p_3^{-1}$.

By homogeneity, we may assume that $\|F_1\|_{\mathbb{F}_\Theta^{q_1, +} \mathbb{F}_\Theta^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} = 1$ and

$\|F_j\|_{X_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_\beta}^{q_j, r_j, +} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} = 1$ for $j \in \{2, 3\}$. Let us enact the atomic decomposition (Proposition 3.2) of F_1 to obtain a sequence of sets $W_k \in \mathbb{T}^\cup$ so that

$$\|\mathbb{1}_{\Delta W_k} F_1\|_{\mathbb{F}_\Theta^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k}{q_1}}, \quad \mu_\Theta^\infty(\Delta W_k) \lesssim 2^{-k}, \quad \Delta W_k = W_{k-1} \setminus W_k.$$

Since $\|F_1\|_{\mathbb{F}_\Theta^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} = \|F_1\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^\infty}^\infty \mathbb{F}_\Theta^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \lesssim \|F_1\|_{\mathbb{F}_\Theta^{q_1, +} \mathbb{F}_\Theta^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}}$ it holds that $W_k = \emptyset$ for $k \geq 1$. As a consequence we will only be concerned with $k \leq 1$. Turning our attention to F_j , according to the definition of the size $\|\cdot\|_{X_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_\beta}^{q_j, r_j, +} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}}$ (given in (3.36) and (3.37)) we have that

$$\|\mathbb{1}_{V_\times} \mathbb{1}_{\Delta W_k} F_j\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^{\bar{r}_j} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \lesssim \nu_\beta(V_\times)^{\frac{1}{p_j}} \mu_{\Theta_j}^\infty(\Delta W_k)^{\frac{1}{p_j} - \frac{1}{q_j}}$$

since $p_j \in [r_j, q_j]$. Using Lemma 5.2 we get that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \mathbb{1}_{V_1} \mathbb{1}_{V_\times} \mathbb{1}_{\Delta W_k} \prod_{j=1}^3 F_j \right\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^{\bar{r}} \left(\mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l,l,l)} \Phi_\tau^N + \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(o,l,l)} \Phi_\tau^N + \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l,l,o)} \Phi_\tau^N + \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l,o,l)} \Phi_\tau^N \right)} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbb{1}_{V_1} \mathbb{1}_{\Delta W_k} F_1\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^{p_1} \mathbb{F}_\Theta^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \prod_{j=1}^3 \|\mathbb{1}_{V_\times} \mathbb{1}_{\Delta W_k} F_j\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^{p_j} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \\ &\lesssim \nu_1(V_1)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \mu_\Theta^\infty(\Delta W_k)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \|\mathbb{1}_{\Delta W_k} F_1\|_{\mathbb{F}_\Theta^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \prod_{j=2}^3 \nu_1(V_\times)^{\frac{1}{p_j}} \mu_{\Theta_j}^\infty(\Delta W_{k+1})^{\frac{1}{p_j} - \frac{1}{q_j}} \\ &\lesssim \nu_1(V_1)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \nu_\beta(V_\times)^{\frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{p_3}} 2^{k \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{1}{q_j} - \frac{1}{p_j}} = \nu_1(V_1)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \nu_\beta(V_\times)^{\frac{1}{p_\times}} 2^{k(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p})}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the triangle inequality (3.5) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \prod_{j=1}^3 F_j \right\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^p \left(\mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l,l,l)} \Phi_\tau^N + \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(o,l,l)} \Phi_\tau^N + \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l,l,o)} \Phi_\tau^N + \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l,o,l)} \Phi_\tau^N \right)} \\ &\lesssim \nu_1(V_1)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \nu_\beta(V_\times)^{\frac{1}{p_\times}} \sum_{k=-\infty}^1 k^C \|\cdot\| 2^{k(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p})} \lesssim \nu_1(V_1)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \nu_\beta(V_\times)^{\frac{1}{p_\times}}, \end{aligned}$$

as required. The sum is convergent because $\frac{1}{q} > \frac{1}{p}$.

Now let us reason under the assumption that $q_\times \leq p_\times$. From the above proof we have obtained that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|F_1 F_2 F_3\|_{L^p_{\mu_\Theta^1}(\mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l,l,l)} \Phi_\tau^N + \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(o,l,l)} \Phi_\tau^N + \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l,l,o)} \Phi_\tau^N + \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l,o,l)} \Phi_\tau^N)} \\ &= \|\mathbb{1}_{V_1 \cap V_\times} F_1 F_2 F_3\|_{L^p_{\mu_\Theta^1}(\mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l,l,l)} \Phi_\tau^N + \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(o,l,l)} \Phi_\tau^N + \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l,l,o)} \Phi_\tau^N + \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l,o,l)} \Phi_\tau^N)} \\ &\lesssim \nu_1(V_1)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \nu_\beta(V_\times)^{\frac{1}{p_\times}} \|F_1\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\Theta^\infty, \nu_1}^{q_1, +} \mathbb{F}_\Theta^{u_1} \Phi_{4r}^{N-3}} \left(\prod_{j=2}^3 \|F_j\|_{X_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_\beta}^{q_j, q_j, +} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{4r}^{N-3}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for any $p_1 \in (0, +\infty]$ such that $p^{-1} = p_1^{-1} + q_\times^{-1} < q^{-1}$. We may assume that $V_\times \subseteq V_1$ by carrying out the proof with $\widetilde{V}_\times = V_\times \cap V_1 \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^U$ in place of V_\times . It holds that $\nu_\beta(V_1) \leq \nu_1(V_1)$. Thus we obtain that for any $p_\times > q_\times$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|F_1 F_2 F_3\|_{L^p_{\mu_\Theta^1}(\mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l,l,l)} \Phi_\tau^N + \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(o,l,l)} \Phi_\tau^N + \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l,l,o)} \Phi_\tau^N + \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l,o,l)} \Phi_\tau^N)} \\ &\lesssim \nu_1(V_1)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\frac{\nu_\beta(V_\times \cap V_1)}{\nu_\beta(V_1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_\times}} \|F_1\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\Theta^\infty, \nu_1}^{q_1, +} \mathbb{F}_\Theta^{u_1} \Phi_{4r}^{N-3}} \left(\prod_{j=2}^3 \|F_j\|_{X_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_\beta}^{q_j, q_j, +} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{4r}^{N-3}} \right) \\ &\lesssim \nu_1(V_1)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\frac{\nu_\beta(V_\times \cap V_1)}{\nu_\beta(V_1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p_\times}} \|F_1\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\Theta^\infty, \nu_1}^{q_1, +} \mathbb{F}_\Theta^{u_1} \Phi_{4r}^{N-3}} \left(\prod_{j=2}^3 \|F_j\|_{X_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_\beta}^{q_j, q_j, +} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{4r}^{N-3}} \right) \\ &\lesssim \nu_1(V_1)^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{p_\times}} \nu_\beta(V_\times \cap V_1)^{\frac{1}{p_\times}} \|F_1\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\Theta^\infty, \nu_1}^{q_1, +} \mathbb{F}_\Theta^{u_1} \Phi_{4r}^{N-3}} \left(\prod_{j=2}^3 \|F_j\|_{X_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_\beta}^{q_j, q_j, +} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{4r}^{N-3}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have shown the claim for any $p_\times > q_\times$ and any $p_1 \in (q, +\infty]$ with the cited restrictions.

Bound (5.4) is proved analogously with the following natural modifications. We require $r_\times \leq q_\times$ for the size $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_2 \times \Gamma_3}^{u_\times} \Phi_{4r}^{N-3}$ to be defined. By homogeneity we assume that $\|F_2 F_3\|_{X_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_\beta}^{q_\times, r_\times, +} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_2 \times \Gamma_3}^{u_\times} \Phi_{4r}^{N-3}} = 1$. Assuming $p_\times \leq q_\times$ and taking the sets ΔW_k to be the same as before, we obtain that

$$\|\mathbb{1}_{V_\times} \mathbb{1}_{\Delta W_k} F_2 F_3\|_{L^{p_\times}_{\mu_\Theta^1} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_j^{u_j}} \lesssim \nu_\beta(V_\times)^{\frac{1}{p_\times}} \mu_{\Theta_j}^\infty (\Delta W_k)^{\frac{1}{p_\times} - \frac{1}{q_\times}}$$

and we conclude that

$$\|\mathbb{1}_{V_1} \mathbb{1}_{V_\times} \mathbb{1}_{\Delta W_k} F_1 F_2 F_3\|_{L^p_{\mu_\Theta^1} \mathbb{I}_\Theta^{(l,o,o)} \Phi_\tau^N} \lesssim \nu_1(V_1)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \nu_\beta(V_\times)^{\frac{1}{p_\times}} 2^{k(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p})}.$$

Summing up in $k \in \mathbb{Z}, k \leq 1$ yields the claim. To address the case $p_\times > q_\times$ the procedure is the same as above and relies on noticing that one may assume $\nu_\beta(V_\times) \leq \nu_\beta(V_1) \leq \nu_1(V_1)$. \square

Proposition 5.4. *Let $(q_1, q_2, q_3) \in [1, \infty)^3$ and let*

$$q_\times := (q_2^{-1} + q_3^{-1})^{-1}, \quad q := (q_1^{-1} + q_\times^{-1})^{-1} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^3 q_j^{-1} \right)^{-1},$$

with $q < 1$. Then the bounds

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|F_1 F_2 F_3\|_{L^1_{\mu_{\Theta}^1}(\mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l,l,l)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(o,l,l)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l,l,o)} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l,o,l)} \Phi_{\tau}^N)} \\ & \lesssim \|F_1\|_{L^{p_1}_{\nu_1} \mathbb{I}_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}, \nu_1} \mathbb{F}_{\Gamma_1}^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \left(\prod_{j=2}^3 \|F_j\|_{L^{p_j}_{\nu_j} X_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_j}^{q_j, r_j, +} \mathbb{F}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

holds for any $F_j \in L^{\infty}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{4\tau}^{\infty}$ as long as $(p_1, p_2, p_3) \in [1, \infty]^3$ with $\sum_{j=1}^3 p_j^{-1} = 1$, as long as $(u_1, u_2, u_3) \in [1, \infty]^3$ with $\sum_{j=1}^3 u_j^{-1} \leq 1$, as long as $r_j \in (0, q_j]$, $j \in \{2, 3\}$, are such that $r_2^{-1} + r_3^{-1} \geq p_2^{-1} + p_3^{-1}$.

In particular, bound (1.12) holds under the above assumptions on the exponents.

Similarly, the bound

$$(5.6) \quad \|F_1 F_2 F_3\|_{L^1_{\mu_{\Theta}^1} \mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(l,o,o)} \Phi_{\tau}^N} \lesssim \|F_1\|_{L^{p_1}_{\nu_1} \mathbb{I}_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}, \nu_1} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^{u_1} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}} \|F_2 F_3\|_{L^{p_{\times}}_{\nu_{\times}} X_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_{\times}}^{q_{\times}, r_{\times}, +} \mathbb{F}_{\Gamma_2 \times \Gamma_3}^{u_{\times}} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-3}}$$

holds for any $F_j \in L^{\infty}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{4\tau}^{\infty}$ as long as $(p_1, p_{\times}) \in [1, \infty]^2$ with $p^{-1} := p_1^{-1} + p_{\times}^{-1}$, as long as $r_{\times} \in [1, \infty]$ and $(q_1, q_{\times}) \in [1, \infty]^2$ are such that

$$r_{\times} < p_{\times} < q_{\times},$$

and

$$q_1^{-1} + q_{\times}^{-1} > 1,$$

and as long as $(u_1, u_{\times}) \in [1, \infty]^2$ with $u_1^{-1} + u_{\times}^{-1} \leq 1$.

In particular, bound (1.15) holds under the above assumptions on the exponents.

Proof. Proposition 3.3 can be applied to the bounds (5.3) to yield bound (5.5). As a matter of fact the conditions of Lemma 5.3 are open, the condition $q < 1$ and $p_1^{-1} + p_2^{-1} + p_3^{-1} = 1$ imply that $p_{\times}^{-1} := p_2^{-1} + p_3^{-1}$ satisfies $p_{\times}^{-1} < q^{-1}$.

Similarly Proposition 3.3 can be applied to the bounds (5.4) to obtain bounds (5.6). \square

6. NON-UNIFORM EMBEDDING BOUNDS

In this section we prove Theorem 5. We will start by recording the following embedding bounds that have been shown in [AU20b], the proof of which we will not repeat here.

Theorem 6 ([AU20b, Theorem 1.3]). *The bounds*

$$\|\text{Emb}[f]\|_{L^p_{\nu_1} \mathbb{I}_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1}^{q,+}(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{\infty, \infty} \Phi_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{u, 2} \mathfrak{d}_{\tau}^N + \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,1)} \square_{\tau}^N)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}$$

hold for any $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ as long as $p \in (1, \infty]$, $q \in (\max(p', 2), \infty)$, and $u \in (1, \infty)$.

The statement [AU20b, Theorem 1.3] covers more general embeddings for functions valued in Banach spaces. For our purposes, it is sufficient to apply it for scalar-valued functions. That corresponds to setting $r = 2$ the statement of [AU20b, Theorem 1.3]. This corresponds to the case of functions valued in Hilbert spaces.

Bounds (1.13) of Theorem 5 are an improvement over Theorem 6 in two ways. First of all, the size $\mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$ appearing in Theorem 5 contains the term $\mathbb{J}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$, absent in the bounds of Theorem 6. Next, we show that the embedding holds with localized

outer Lebesgue norm $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}, \nu_1}^{q,+}$ in place of $\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1}^{q,+}$. According to Lemma 3.18, for $\beta = 1$ this is a strengthening of the result since we have that

$$\nu(V)^{-\frac{1}{q}} \|\mathbb{1}_V F\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^1}^q \mathbb{S}} \lesssim \|\mathbb{1}_V F\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}}^q \mathbb{S}}$$

for any $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{\tau}^{\infty}$ and, in particular,

$$\|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1}^{q,+} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N} \lesssim \|\mathbb{1}_V F\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}, \nu_1}^{q,+} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N}.$$

This strengthening costs us the $p = \infty$ endpoint for the embedding. Section 6.1 is dedicated to showing the bound

$$(6.1) \quad \|\text{Emb}[f]\|_{L_{\nu_1}^p \mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1}^{q,+} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}$$

by appropriately controlling the $\mathbb{J}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$ size using the sizes appearing on the LHS of the bound in Theorem 6. Section 6.2 is dedicated to deducing bounds (1.13) of Theorem 5 from (6.1) by showing that super-level sets of $\text{Emb}[f]$ can be selected to satisfy appropriate bounds in the μ_{Θ}^{∞} outer measure.

6.1. SIO truncation size control. This section concentrates on proving the bound below..

Proposition 6.1. *Given any sets $V^+, V^- \in \mathbb{D}_1^{\cup}$, and $W^+, W^- \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}$, the bounds*

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} \text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{J}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N} \\ & \lesssim \|\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} \text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(2,2)} \mathfrak{d}_{8\tau}^{N-8}} \\ & \quad + \|\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} \text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(\infty, \infty)} \Phi_{8\tau}^{N-8}} \end{aligned}$$

hold for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ as long as $u \in [1, \infty)$. The implicit constant is independent of f and of the sets V^{\pm}, W^{\pm} .

This is sufficient to show (6.1).

Corollary 6.2. *The bounds (6.1) hold for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ as long as $p \in (1, \infty]$, $q \in (\max(p', 2), \infty)$, and $u \in [1, \infty]$.*

Proof. According to Remark Remark 3.19, Theorem 6 provides us with a choice of $V^-(\lambda) \in \mathbb{D}_1^{\cup}$ and $W_q(\lambda, \tau, V^+) \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}$ satisfying (3.38) and (3.39) with

$$\begin{aligned} F &= \text{Emb}[f], & A &= \|f\|_{L^p}, & \beta &= 1, \\ \mathbb{S} &= \left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(\infty, \infty)} \Phi_{8\tau}^{N-8} + \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, 2)} \mathfrak{d}_{8\tau}^{N-8} + \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, 1)} \square_{8\tau}^{N-8} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Bound (6.2) shows that this same choice also satisfies conditions (3.38) and (3.39) with $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$, instead. Again, by Remark Remark 3.19, this is exactly what is claimed by bound (6.1). \square

Proof. Proof of Proposition 6.1 After some preliminary geometric reductions, this proof is divided into two parts. First we reduce the claim of the proposition to the case $u = 2$. We do so by assuming that bound (6.2) holds with $u = 2$ for any function $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ and any sets $V^+, V^- \in \mathbb{D}_1^{\cup}$, and $W^+, W^- \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}$, and then we deduce that bound (6.2) also holds for any $u \in [1, +\infty)$. We then conclude the proof by showing bound (6.2) holds with $u = 2$.

We start by introducing some notation. Let us fix $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$ and use the shorthand

$$F_T^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) := \left(\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} \text{Emb}[f] \right) \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma).$$

Let $E^{*+} := \pi_T^{-1}(\mathfrak{I}_\Theta \cap V^+ \cap W^+)$ and $E^{*-} := \pi_T^{-1}(V^- \cup W^-)$ and let $E^* := E^{*+} \setminus E^{*-}$. Let $\mathfrak{b}_\pm : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be two functions such that their graphs are the boundary of E^\pm and let $\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_\pm^* : \Theta \times B_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be two functions such that their graphs are the boundaries of $E^{*\pm} \cap \Theta \times B_1 \times \mathbb{R}_+$. These functions are obtained from Lemma 3.20. Let

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta) = \max_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\zeta, \theta) \quad \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta) = \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\zeta, \theta).$$

Let us begin by showing that for any $T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ it holds that

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} \text{Emb}[f] \right\|_{\mathbb{J}_\Theta \Phi_T^N(T)} \\ & \lesssim \sup_{\varphi} \left\| \sup_{\sigma > \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta)} \left| \int_{\sigma}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right\| \right\|_{L_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}^u(\Theta \times B_1)} \\ & \quad + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} \text{Emb}[f] \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_\Theta(\infty, \infty) \Phi_T^N(T)}. \end{aligned}$$

As a matter of fact it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} \text{Emb}[f] \right\|_{\mathbb{J}_\Theta \Phi_T^N(T)} \\ & \lesssim \sup_{\varphi} \left\| \sup_{\sigma > \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta)} \left| \int_{\sigma}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right\| \right\|_{L_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}^u(\Theta \times B_1)} \\ & \quad + \left\| \left| \log \left(\frac{\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\zeta, \theta)}{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta)} \right) \right| + \left| \log \left(\frac{\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\zeta, \theta)}{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \right) \right| \right\|_{L_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}^u(\Theta \times B_1)} \\ & \quad \times \sup_{\varphi} \left\| \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi] \right\|_{L_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}^\infty \frac{d\rho}{\rho}} \end{aligned}$$

where the upper bound is taken over $\varphi \in \Phi_T^\infty$ with $\|\varphi\|_{\Phi_T^N} \leq 1$. We assume that the integrand vanishes when $\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta) \leq \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta)$. Since $\|(-d_z + 2\pi i\theta)\varphi(z)\|_{\Phi_T^N} \leq \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_T^N}$, we have that

$$\text{ssup}_{\varphi} \left\| \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi] \right\|_{L_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}^\infty \frac{d\rho}{\rho}} \lesssim \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} \text{Emb}[f] \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_\Theta(\infty, \infty) \Phi_T^N}.$$

On the other hand, let $\bar{\theta}$ be the point where $\max_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\zeta, \theta)$ is attained. From (3.43) we get for $\theta > \bar{\theta}$ that

$$1 \geq \frac{\mathfrak{b}^*(\theta, \zeta)}{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta)} \geq \frac{\theta_+ - \theta}{\theta_+ - \bar{\theta}}$$

and for $\theta < \bar{\theta}$ that

$$1 \geq \frac{\mathfrak{b}^*(\theta, \zeta)}{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta)} \geq \frac{\theta - \theta_-}{\bar{\theta} - \theta_-}$$

where we denote $\Theta = (\theta_-, \theta_+)$. This shows that

$$\left\| \log \left(\frac{\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\zeta, \theta)}{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta)} \right) \right\|_{L_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}^u(\Theta \times B_1)} + \left\| \log \left(\frac{\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\zeta, \theta)}{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \right) \right\|_{L_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}^u(\Theta \times B_1)} \lesssim 1.$$

Reduction to the case $u = 2$:

Recall that we assume bound (6.2) holds with $u = 2$. For $u < 2$, bound (6.2) follows by the classical Hölder inequality that shows that for any $T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ one has

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} \text{Emb}[f] \right\|_{\mathbb{J}_\Theta \Phi_T^N(T)} \lesssim \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} \text{Emb}[f] \right\|_{\mathbb{J}_\Theta^2 \Phi_T^N(T)}.$$

We henceforth fix $u \in (2, +\infty)$. The subsequent proof relies mainly on the fact that the size over trees is a BMO-style quantity and thus any two integrability exponents u_1, u_2 can be compared. We adopt a procedure inspired by the proof of the John-Nirenberg inequality: we prove the reduction by induction on the scales of the trees $T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ in play. According to (6.3) we need to show that for any $T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ it holds that

$$\sup_{\varphi} \left\| \sup_{\sigma > \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta)} \left| \int_{\sigma}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right| \right\|_{L_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}^u(\Theta \times B_1)} \lesssim \text{RHS(6.1)}$$

Let us begin by showing that for any $T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ and for any $\varphi \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^\infty$ with $\|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N} \leq 1$ it holds that

$$(6.4) \quad \left\| \sup_{\sigma > \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta)} \left| \int_{\sigma}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right| \right\|_{L_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}^u(\Theta \times B_1)} \lesssim \sup_{\varphi'} \left\| \left(\int_{\Theta} \sup_{\sigma > \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta)} \left| \int_{\sigma}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right|^2 \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^u(B_1)}$$

where the upper bound gets taken over $\varphi' \in \Phi_{4\mathfrak{r}}^\infty$ with $\|\varphi'\|_{\Phi_{4\mathfrak{r}}^{N-4}} \leq 1$. This amounts to reducing the exponent of the integral in the frequency variable θ . According to (1.7) (that defines Emb), to (3.18) (that defines $\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta)$), and to the symmetry property (3.14), we have that

$$\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi] = e^{2\pi i \xi_T s_T \zeta} \rho d_{\zeta}(f_T * \text{Dil}_{\rho} \text{Mod}_{\theta} \varphi^{\vee}(\zeta))$$

with $f_T = s_T \text{Dil}_{s_T^{-1}} \text{Mod}_{-\xi_T} \text{Tr}_{-x_T} f$. This allows us to write that

$$\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi] = \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta') F^*(\theta', \zeta, \rho) [\text{Mod}_{(\theta-\theta')} \varphi]$$

for any $\theta' \in B_{\mathfrak{r}}(\theta)$ with $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta) < \theta' < \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)$ since then $(\theta', \zeta, \sigma) \in E^*$. Note also that $\text{Mod}_{(\theta-\theta')} \varphi \in \Phi_{2\mathfrak{r}}^\infty$ with $\|\text{Mod}_{(\theta-\theta')} \varphi\|_{\Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N} \leq \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{2\mathfrak{r}}^N}$. We thus have that

$$\sup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left| \int_{\sigma}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right| \leq \frac{1}{\mathfrak{r}} \int_{B_{\mathfrak{r}}(\theta) \cap \Theta} \sup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left| \int_{\sigma}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta') F^*(\theta', \zeta, \rho) [\text{Mod}_{(\theta-\theta')} \varphi] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right| d\theta'.$$

Note that $\mathfrak{r} < |B_{\mathfrak{r}}(\theta) \cap \Theta| < 2\mathfrak{r}$. Using Lemma 3.13 we decompose $\text{Mod}_{(\theta-\theta')} \varphi \in \Phi_{2\mathfrak{r}}^N$ into an absolutely convergent sum:

$$\text{Mod}_{(\theta-\theta')} \varphi = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} a_k(\theta, \theta', \varphi) \varphi'_k.$$

with $\|\varphi'_k\|_{\Phi_{4\tau}^{N-2}} \leq 1$ with uniformly summable coefficients. This shows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left| \int_{\sigma}^{\tilde{b}_+^*(\zeta)} \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right| \right\|_{L^u_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}(\Theta \times B_1)} \\ & \lesssim \sup_{\varphi'} \int_{\Theta \times B_1} \left(\frac{1}{\tau} \int_{B_{\tau}(\theta) \cap \Theta} \sup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left| \int_{\sigma}^{\tilde{b}_+^*(\zeta)} \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta') F^*(\theta', \zeta, \rho) [\varphi'] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right|^2 d\theta' \right)^{\frac{u}{2}} d\zeta \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \\ & \lesssim \sup_{\varphi'} \left\| \left(\int_{\Theta} \sup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left| \int_{\sigma}^{\tilde{b}_+^*(\zeta)} \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta) F^*(\theta', \zeta, \rho) [\varphi'] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right|^2 \frac{d\theta'}{|\Theta|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^u(B_1)} \end{aligned}$$

with the upper bounds being taken over $\varphi' \in \Phi_{\tau}^{\infty}$ with $\|\varphi'\|_{\Phi_{4\tau}^{N-2}} \leq 1$. This shows that bound (6.4) holds.

With bound (6.4) in hand, to deduce bound (6.2) we now need to show that for every $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (6.5) \quad & \sup_{\varphi} \left\| \left(\int_{\Theta} \sup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left| \int_{\sigma}^{\tilde{b}_+^*(\zeta)} \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right|^2 \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^u(B_1)} \\ & \lesssim \sup_{\substack{T' \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta} \\ s_{T'} \leq s_T}} \left(\|\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} \text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(2,2)} \mathfrak{d}_{8\tau}^{N-8}(T')} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} \text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(\infty, \infty)} \mathfrak{d}_{8\tau}^{N-8}(T')} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the upper bound is taken over $\varphi \in \Phi_{4\tau}^{\infty}$ with $\|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{4\tau}^{N-4}} \leq 1$. We do an induction on scales argument. Suppose we have shown that (6.5) holds with implicit constant C_* for fixed V^+, V^- , for any $\tilde{W}^+, \tilde{W}^- \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}$, and for all $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$ with $s_T < S$ for some $S > 0$. Let us show that it holds for those same V^+, V^- , and any $W^+, W^- \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}$, and all $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$ with $s_T < C_{\text{ind}} S$ for some $C_{\text{ind}} > 1$. This is sufficient to conclude that (6.5) holds for all $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$. As a matter of fact, first check that it holds for all $V^- \supset \{(\eta, y, t) : t < \varepsilon\}$ for a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ because (6.5) holds trivially for $s_T < S < \varepsilon$ and thus, by induction, (6.5) holds for all $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$. Since the implicit constant in (6.5) is independent of $\varepsilon > 0$ and RHS(6.5) then we can pass to the limit and conclude that (6.5) holds for any V^+, V^- , as required.

We will fix the constants $C_* > 1$ and $C_{\text{ind}} > 1$ at the end of this discussion. By symmetry (identity (3.26) and subsequent discussion), we can suppose, without loss of generality, that $T = T_{\Theta}(0, 0, 1)$ and $S > C_{\text{ind}}^{-1}$. Consider the function

$$\mathfrak{F}(\zeta) := \left(\int_{\Theta} \sup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left| \int_{\sigma}^{\tilde{b}_+^*(\zeta)} F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi_{\theta}] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right|^2 \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

with some fixed $\varphi \in \Phi_{4\tau}^{\infty}$ with $\|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{4\tau}^{N-4}} \leq 1$ and with $\varphi_{\theta}(z) := (-d_z + 2\pi i\theta)\varphi(z)$. We need to show that

$$\int_{B_1} \mathfrak{F}(\zeta)^u d\zeta \leq C_* \text{RHS}(6.5)^u.$$

We separate B_1 into a part where $\mathfrak{F}(\zeta)$ is bounded and an exceptional set

$$E := \left\{ \zeta : M\mathfrak{F}(\zeta) \geq C_2 \|\mathfrak{F}(\zeta)\|_{L^2(B_1)} \right\}$$

for some $C_2 \gg 1$ to be chosen later. E is open and we can represent $E = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_{s_n}(x_n)$ with pairwise disjoint $B_{s_n}(x_n)$. Let us set $\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_{+,n}^*(\zeta) := 10s_n - |\zeta - x_n|$ so that $9s_n < \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_{+,n}^*(\zeta) \leq 10s_n$ on $B_{s_n}(x_n)$. By the boundedness of the Hardy Littlewood maximal function it holds that $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} 2s_n \leq C_M C_2^{-1}$. We can now write that

$$(6.6) \quad \mathfrak{F}(\zeta)^u \leq \mathbb{1}_{B_1 \setminus E}(\zeta) \mathfrak{F}(\zeta)^u + 2^u \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (\mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow(\zeta)^u + \mathfrak{F}_n^\downarrow(\zeta)^u)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow(\zeta) &:= \mathbb{1}_{B_{s_n}(x_n)}(\zeta) \left(\int_{\Theta} \sup_{\sigma > s_n} \left| \int_{\sigma}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi_\theta] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right|^2 \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \mathfrak{F}_n^\downarrow(\zeta) &:= \mathbb{1}_{B_{s_n}(x_n)}(\zeta) \left(\int_{\Theta} \sup_{\sigma < \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_{+,n}^*(\zeta)} \left| \int_{\sigma}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_{+,n}^*(\zeta)} F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi_\theta] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right|^2 \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

We will prove that

$$(6.7) \quad \int_{B_1} \mathfrak{F}(\zeta)^u d\zeta \leq (1 + 2^u)(C_2 C_{u=2} + C_M C_5 + C_M C_2^{-1} C_*) \text{RHS}(6.5)^u$$

that will allow us to conclude that

$$\int_{B_1} \mathfrak{F}(\zeta)^u d\zeta \leq C_* \text{RHS}(6.5)^u,$$

as required, as long as C_2 is chosen to satisfy $2(1 + 2^u) < C_2$ and C_* satisfies $2(1 + 2^u)(C_2 C_{u=2} + C_M C_5) \leq C_*$. Let us now show that (6.7) by bounding integrals of terms in (6.6).

The term $\mathbb{1}_{B_1 \setminus E}(\zeta) \mathfrak{F}(\zeta)^u$ on RHS(6.6) can be bound since $M\mathfrak{F}(\zeta) \geq \mathfrak{F}(\zeta)$; thus

$$\int_{B_1 \setminus E} \mathfrak{F}(\zeta)^u d\zeta \leq C_2 \|\mathfrak{F}(\zeta)\|_{L^2(B_1)} \leq C_2 C_{u=2} \text{RHS}(6.5)^u$$

for some $C_{u=2} > 0$ that comes from assuming that bound (6.2) holds with $u = 2$.

Let us now concentrate on the term $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow(\zeta)^u$ on RHS(6.6). We will show that

$$\int_{B_1} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow(\zeta)^u d\zeta = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{B_{s_n}(x_n)} \mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow(\zeta)^u d\zeta \leq C_M C_5 C_{u=2} \text{RHS}(6.5)^u$$

for some fixed $C_5 > 1$ by showing that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\int_{B_{s_n}(x_n)} \mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow(\zeta)^u d\zeta \leq s_n C_2 C_5 C_{u=2} \text{RHS}(6.5)^u$$

and using that $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} 2s_n \leq C_M C_2^{-1}$, i.e. the boundedness of the Hardy Littlewood maximal function. To do so we will argue that $\mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow(\zeta)$ is essentially constant on $B_{s_n}(x_n)$. Since $\left\| \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta) \right\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1$ this shows that $\min_{\zeta \in B_{s_n}(x_n)} \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta) \geq \min_{\zeta \in B_{s_n}(x_n)} \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\bar{\zeta}) - 2s_n$. If \mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow is not constantly vanishing, then $\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\bar{\zeta}) > 9s_n$ for some $\bar{\zeta} \in B_{s_n}(x_n)$ and thus for any $\zeta, \zeta' \in B_{s_n}(x_n)$ it holds that $5/7 \leq$

$\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta')/\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta) \leq 9/7$. Similarly, since $9s_n < \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_{+,n} \leq 10s_n$ on $B_{s_n}(x_n)$ it holds that $9/10 \leq \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_{+,n}^*(\zeta')/\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_{+,n}^*(\zeta) \leq 10/9$ for any $\zeta, \zeta' \in B_{s_n}(x_n)$. Finally either $\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_- < 7s_n$ on $B_{s_n}(x_n)$ or $5/7 \leq \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta')/\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta) \leq 9/7$ for any $\zeta, \zeta' \in B_{s_n}(x_n)$. Let us use this to compare $\mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow(\zeta)$ with $\mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow(\zeta')$ for any $\zeta, \zeta' \in B_{s_n}(x_n)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow(\zeta) - \mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow(\zeta')| &\leq \left(\int_{\Theta} \left| \int_{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta)/2}^{2\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} |F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta]| + |F^*(\theta, \zeta', \rho)[\varphi_\theta]| \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right|^2 \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\quad + \left(\int_{\Theta} \left| \int_{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_{+,n}^*(\zeta)/2}^{2\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_{+,n}^*(\zeta)} |F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta]| + |F^*(\theta, \zeta', \rho)[\varphi_\theta]| \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right|^2 \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\quad + \left(\int_{\Theta} \left| \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta)/2 < \rho < 2\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta)} \right. \right. \\
 &\quad \quad \left. \left. \times |F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta]| + |F^*(\theta, \zeta', \rho)[\varphi_\theta]| \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right|^2 \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\quad + \left(\int_{\Theta} \left| \int_{2\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_{+,n}^*(\zeta')}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta')/2} \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta') \vee \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta) < \rho < \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta') \wedge \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \right. \right. \\
 &\quad \quad \left. \left. \times |F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] - F^*(\theta, \zeta', \rho)[\varphi_\theta]| \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right|^2 \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} .
 \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 3.13 to decompose φ_θ we can bound all but the last summand on RHS above by $\|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W+) \setminus (V-UW-)} \text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(\infty, \infty)} \Phi_{\text{str}}^{N-6}(\mathcal{T})}$. To bound the last summand notice that as long as $\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta') \vee \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta) < \rho < \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta') \wedge \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] &= f * \text{Dil}_\rho \text{Mod}_\theta \varphi^\vee(\zeta) \\
 &= f * \text{Tr}_{(\zeta'-\zeta)} \text{Dil}_\rho \text{Mod}_\theta \varphi^\vee(\zeta') = F^*(\theta, \zeta', \rho) \left[e^{2\pi i \theta \frac{(\zeta-\zeta')}{\rho}} \text{Tr}_{\frac{(\zeta'-\zeta)}{\rho}} \varphi_\theta \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $\left\| e^{2\pi i \frac{(\zeta - \zeta')\theta}{\rho}} \text{Tr} \left(\frac{\zeta - \zeta'}{\rho} \right) \varphi_\theta - \varphi_\theta \right\|_{\Phi_{4r}^{N-4}} \lesssim \frac{|\zeta - \zeta'|}{\rho} \|\varphi_\theta\|_{\Phi_{4r}^{N-5}} \lesssim \frac{|\zeta - \zeta'|}{\rho} \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{4r}^{N-5}}$ for $\frac{|\zeta - \zeta'|}{\rho} \lesssim 1$ we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{\Theta} \left| \int_{2\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{+,n}^*(\zeta')}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta')/2} \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta') \vee \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta) < \rho < \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta') \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. \left. |F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] - F^*(\theta, \zeta', \rho)[\varphi_\theta]| \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right|^2 \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \left(\int_{\Theta} \left| \int_{2\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{+,n}^*(\zeta')}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta')/2} \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta') \vee \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta) < \rho < \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta') \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. \left. |F^*(\theta, \zeta', \rho) \left[e^{2\pi i \frac{(\zeta - \zeta')\theta}{\rho}} \text{Tr} \left(\frac{\zeta - \zeta'}{\rho} \right) \varphi_\theta - \varphi_\theta \right] \right| \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right|^2 \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \left(\int_{\Theta} \left(\int_{2\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{+,n}^*(\zeta')}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta')/2} \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta') \vee \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta) < \rho < \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta') \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \frac{|\zeta - \zeta'|}{\rho} \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right)^2 \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad \times \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W+) \setminus (V-\cup W-)} \text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(\infty, \infty)} \Phi_{4r}^{N-5}(T)} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W+) \setminus (V-\cup W-)} \text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(\infty, \infty)} \Phi_{4r}^{N-5}(T)} \end{aligned}$$

where the last bound holds because integration happens over $\rho \geq s_n$ and $|\zeta - \zeta'| \lesssim s_n$. We can now average in $\zeta \in B_{s_n}(x_n)$ to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{s_n}(x_n)} \mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow(\zeta)^u d\zeta &\lesssim \int_{B_{s_n}(x_n)} \left(\frac{1}{2s_n} \int_{B_{s_n}(x_n)} (|\mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow(\zeta')| + |\mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow(\zeta) - \mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow(\zeta')|) d\zeta' \right)^u d\zeta \\ &\lesssim s_n \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W+) \setminus (V-\cup W-)} \text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(\infty, \infty)} \Phi_{8r}^{N-6}(T)}^u \\ &\quad + s_n \left(\frac{1}{2s_n} \int_{B_{s_n}(x_n)} |\mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow(\zeta')| d\zeta' \right)^u \end{aligned}$$

By maximality of $B_{s_n}(x_n) \subset E$ it holds that

$$\frac{1}{2s_n} \int_{B_{s_n}(x_n)} |\mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow(\zeta')| d\zeta' \leq \frac{1}{2s_n} \int_{B_{s_n}(x_n)} |\mathfrak{F}(\zeta')| d\zeta' \lesssim C_2 \|\mathfrak{F}\|_{L^2(B_1)}.$$

As a matter of fact

$$\frac{1}{2s_n} \int_{B_{s_n}(x_n)} |\mathfrak{F}(\zeta')| d\zeta' \lesssim M \mathfrak{F}(x_n + s_n) \leq C_2 \|\mathfrak{F}\|_{L^2(B_1)}$$

because $x_n + s_n \notin E$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_n \int_{B_{s_n}(x_n)} \mathfrak{F}_n^\uparrow(\zeta)^u d\zeta &\leq C_M C_5 \left(\text{RHS}(6.5)^u + C_2 \|\mathfrak{F}\|_{L^2(B_1)}^u \right) \\ &\leq C_M C_5 (1 + C_2 C_{u=2}) \text{RHS}(6.5)^u, \end{aligned}$$

as required.

Finally, let us concentrate on the term $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{F}_n^\downarrow(\zeta)^u$ on RHS(6.6). Setting $T_n = T_\Theta(0, x_n, 10s_n)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{s_n} \int_{B_{s_n}(x_n)} \mathfrak{F}_n^\downarrow(\zeta)^u d\zeta \\ &= \frac{1}{s_n} \int_{B_{s_n}(x_n)} \left(\int_\Theta \sup_{\sigma < \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \left| \int_\sigma^{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi_\theta] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right|^2 \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \right)^{\frac{u}{2}} d\zeta \\ &\lesssim \sup_{\varphi'} \left\| \left(\int_\Theta \sup_{\sigma > 0} \left| \int_\sigma^{1-|\zeta|} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) (\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)}) \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \times \left. \left. \left. \text{Emb}[f] \circ \pi_{T_n}(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi'] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right|^2 \frac{d\theta}{|\Theta|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^u(B_1)}^u \end{aligned}$$

where the upper bound is taken over $\varphi' \in \Phi_{4\tau}^\infty$ with $\|\varphi'\|_{\Phi_{4\tau}^{N-4}} \leq 1$. Since $s_n \leq C_M C_2^{-1}$ by the boundedness of the Hardy Littlewood maximal function, we can choose C_2 sufficiently large so that $10s_n \leq C_{\text{ind}}^{-1}$ and we can apply the induction hypothesis to the bound above to get

$$\frac{1}{s_n} \int_{B_{s_n}(x_n)} \mathfrak{F}_n^\downarrow(\zeta)^u d\zeta \lesssim C_* \text{RHS}(6.5)^u.$$

Summing up, this gives

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{B_{s_n}(x_n)} \mathfrak{F}_n^\downarrow(\zeta)^u d\zeta \leq C_M C_2^{-2} C_* \text{RHS}(6.5)^u.$$

This concludes showing (6.7).

The case $u = 2$:

The final step is showing that (6.5) holds for $u = 2$. By symmetry considerations (identity (3.20) and subsequent discussion) we can suppose, without loss of generality, that $T = T_\Theta(0, 0, 1)$. We need to show that given any smooth $\sigma : \Theta \times B_1 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ it holds that

$$\left\| \int_{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right\|_{L^2_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}(\Theta \times B_1)} \lesssim \text{RHS}(6.5)$$

with $\varphi \in \Phi_{4\tau}^\infty$ being any wave packet with $\|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{4\tau}^{N-4}} \leq 1$. Let $\varphi_\theta(z) := (-d_z + 2\pi i\theta)\varphi(z)$ so that $\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi] = F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi_\theta]$. Next, we will show that we can assume that $\sigma(\theta, \zeta) = \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta)$ and, in particular, we may assume that $\|\zeta \mapsto \sigma(\theta, \zeta)\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1$. For any $C \geq 1$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \int_{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)}^{\min(C\sigma(\theta, \zeta), \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta))} F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi_\theta] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right\|_{L^2_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}(\Theta \times B_1)} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} \text{Emb}[f] \right\|_{\mathbb{I}_{\Theta}^{(\infty, \infty)} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-4}} \end{aligned}$$

so we can assume without loss of generality that that $\sigma(\theta, \zeta) \in (C\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta), C^{-1}\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta))$ for some large $C \gg 1$. Let us freeze $\theta \in \Theta$ and, for the sake of the subsequent

argument, assume that $\zeta \geq 0$; the case $\zeta < 0$ is handled symmetrically. Since $\|\zeta \mapsto \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\zeta)\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1$ it holds that $\rho \in (\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-(\zeta'), \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+(\zeta'))$ if $\rho \in (\sigma(\theta, \zeta), C^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+(\zeta))$ and $|\zeta' - \zeta| \leq \sigma(\theta, \zeta)$. We decompose

$$\int_{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+(\zeta)} F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} = \text{I}(\theta, \zeta) + \text{II}(\theta, \zeta) + \text{III}(\theta, \zeta) + \text{IV}(\theta, \zeta)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I}(\theta, \zeta) &:= \int_{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+(\zeta)/C} \left(F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} - \frac{1}{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} \int_{\zeta - \sigma(\theta, \zeta)}^{\zeta} F^*(\theta, \zeta', \rho)[\varphi_\theta] d\zeta' \right) \frac{d\rho}{\rho}, \\ \text{II}(\theta, \zeta) &:= -\frac{1}{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} \int_{\zeta - \sigma(\theta, \zeta)}^{\zeta} \int_{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+(\zeta)/C}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+(\zeta')} F^*(\theta, \zeta', \rho)[\varphi_\theta] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} d\zeta', \\ \text{III}(\theta, \zeta) &:= -\frac{1}{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} \int_{\zeta - \sigma(\theta, \zeta)}^{\zeta} \int_{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-(\zeta')}^{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} F^*(\theta, \zeta', \rho)[\varphi_\theta] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} d\zeta', \\ \text{IV}(\theta, \zeta) &:= \frac{1}{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} \int_{\zeta - \sigma(\theta, \zeta)}^{\zeta} \int_{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-(\zeta')}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+(\zeta')} F^*(\theta, \zeta', \rho)[\varphi_\theta] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} d\zeta'. \end{aligned}$$

Terms $\text{I}(\theta, \zeta)$ and $\text{II}(\theta, \zeta)$ are ‘‘correction’’ terms since we will show that they can be bounded by the size $\|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W+)\setminus(V-\cup W-)} \text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(\infty, \infty)} \Phi_{8\tau}^{N-8}(T)}$. We will then proceed to bound the latter 2 terms.

For any value of (ζ, ρ) in the integral expression defining $\text{I}(\theta, \zeta)$, we have that

$$F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] - \frac{1}{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} \int_{\zeta - \sigma(\theta, \zeta)}^{\zeta} F^*(\theta, \zeta', \rho)[\varphi_\theta] d\zeta' = F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_{(\theta, \zeta)}]$$

where

$$\varphi_{(\theta, \zeta)} = \frac{1}{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} \int_{\zeta - \sigma(\theta, \zeta)}^{\zeta} \left(\varphi_\theta - e^{2\pi i \theta \frac{(\zeta' - \zeta)}{\rho}} \text{Tr}_{\frac{(\zeta - \zeta')}{\rho}} \varphi_\theta \right) d\zeta'$$

satisfies

$$\|\varphi_{(\theta, \zeta)}(z)\|_{\Phi_{4\tau}^{N-4}} \lesssim \left| \frac{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)}{\rho} \right| \|\varphi_\theta(z)\|_{\Phi_{4\tau}^{N-5}}.$$

This holds since

$$F^*(\theta, \zeta', \rho)[\varphi_\theta] = F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) \left[e^{2\pi i \theta \frac{(\zeta' - \zeta)}{\rho}} \text{Tr}_{\frac{(\zeta - \zeta')}{\rho}} \varphi_\theta \right]$$

for any $\rho \in (\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-(\zeta') \vee \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-(\zeta), \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+(\zeta') \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+(\zeta))$. Thus

$$|\text{I}(\theta, \zeta)| \lesssim \int_{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+(\zeta)/C} \left| \frac{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)}{\rho} \right| \frac{d\rho}{\rho} (\sup_{\tilde{\varphi}} \sup_{\rho \in (0, 1)} |F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\tilde{\varphi}]|)$$

with the upper bound taken over $\tilde{\varphi} \in \Phi_{4\tau}^\infty$ with $\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{\Phi_{4\tau}^{N-5}} \leq 1$. Integrating and using Lemma 3.13 this gives the bound

$$\|\text{I}(\theta, \zeta)\|_{L^2_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}(\Theta \times B_1)} \lesssim \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W+)\setminus(V-\cup W-)} \text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(\infty, \infty)} \Phi_{8\tau}^{N-7}(T)}.$$

The term $\text{II}(\zeta, \theta)$, again using Lemma 3.13, satisfies

$$|\text{II}(\theta, \zeta)| \lesssim \frac{1}{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} \int_{\zeta - \sigma(\theta, \zeta)}^{\zeta} \int_{\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\zeta)/C}^{\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\zeta')} (\sup_{\tilde{\varphi}} \sup_{\rho \in (0,1)} |F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\tilde{\varphi}]|) \frac{d\rho}{\rho} d\zeta'$$

with the upper bound taken over $\tilde{\varphi} \in \Phi_{4\tau}^\infty$ with $\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{\Phi_{4\tau}^{N-5}} \leq 1$. Integrating and using Lemma 3.13 gives the bound

$$\|\text{II}(\theta, \zeta)\|_{L^2_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}(\Theta \times B_1)} \lesssim \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W+) \setminus (V-\cup W-)} \text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}(\infty, \infty)_{\Phi_{8\tau}^{N-7}(T)}}.$$

Let us now deal with the term $\text{III}(\theta, \zeta)$. Recall (see (3.27)) that

$$F^*(\theta, \zeta', \rho)[\varphi_\theta] = \mathfrak{d}(\theta) F^*(\theta, \zeta', \rho)[\varphi] = \rho d_{\zeta'} F^*(\theta, \zeta', \rho)[\varphi]$$

as long as $\rho \in (\mathfrak{b}_-(\theta, \zeta'), \mathfrak{b}_+(\theta, \zeta'))$, which is the case for $\zeta' \in (\zeta - \sigma(\theta, \zeta), \zeta)$. Integration by parts gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{III}(\theta, \zeta) &= - \int_{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta)}^{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} \frac{\rho}{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \\ &\quad + \int_{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta - \sigma(\theta, \zeta))}^{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} \frac{\rho}{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} F^*(\theta, \zeta - \sigma(\theta, \zeta), \rho)[\varphi] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} \int_{\zeta - \sigma(\theta, \zeta)}^{\zeta} d_{\zeta'} \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta') F^*(\theta, \zeta', \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta')) [\varphi] d\zeta' \end{aligned}$$

Since $|d_{\zeta'} \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta')| \leq 1$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{1}{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} \int_{\zeta - \sigma(\theta, \zeta)}^{\zeta} d_{\zeta'} \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta') F^*(\theta, \zeta', \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta')) [\varphi] d\zeta' \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} \int_{\zeta - \sigma(\theta, \zeta)}^{\zeta} |F^*(\theta, \zeta', \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta')) [\varphi]| d\zeta' \lesssim \sup_{\zeta' \in B_1} |F^*(\theta, \zeta', \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta')) [\varphi]|. \end{aligned}$$

The other two summands satisfy

$$\left| \int_{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta)}^{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} \frac{\rho}{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right| \lesssim \sup_{\rho \in (\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta), \sigma(\theta, \zeta))} |F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi]|$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta - \sigma(\theta, \zeta))}^{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} \frac{\rho}{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)} F^*(\theta, \zeta - \sigma(\theta, \zeta), \rho)[\varphi] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right| \\ &\lesssim \sup_{\zeta' \in B_1} \sup_{\rho \in (\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta'), \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta'))} |F^*(\theta, \zeta', \rho)[\varphi]|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\|\text{III}(\zeta, \theta)\|_{L^2_{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}}(B_1 \times \Theta)} \lesssim \|\mathbb{1}_{V+\setminus(V-\cup W)} \text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}^{(2, \infty)}_{\Phi_{\tau}^{\tilde{N}-3'}}$.

It remains to deal with the term $\text{IV}(\theta, \zeta)$. Up to an application of the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function, $\text{IV}(\theta, \zeta)$ can be compared with the original quantity to bound but with $\sigma(\theta, \zeta) = \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-(\zeta)$. More explicitly $|\text{IV}(\theta, \zeta)| \leq M(\tilde{\text{IV}}(\theta, \cdot))(\zeta)$ where

$$\tilde{\text{IV}}(\theta, \zeta) = \int_{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\zeta)}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] \frac{d\rho}{\rho}$$

so, using the boundedness of the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function M on L^2 , we need to show that

$$\|\widetilde{IV}(\theta, \zeta)\|_{L^2_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}(\Theta \times B_1)} \lesssim \text{RHS}(6.5).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta)}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right|^2 \\ &= 2\Re \left(\int_{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta)}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] \int_\rho^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \overline{F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho')[\varphi_\theta]} \frac{d\rho'}{\rho'} \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right). \end{aligned}$$

As before, recall that

$$F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] = \rho' d_\zeta F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho')[\varphi]$$

Integrating by parts we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_1} \left| \int_{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta)}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right|^2 d\zeta \\ &= 2\Re \int_{B_1} \left(\int_{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta)}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] \int_\rho^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \rho' d_\zeta \overline{F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho')[\varphi]} \frac{d\rho'}{\rho'} \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right) d\zeta \\ &= -2\Re \int_{B_1} \left(\int_{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta)}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \rho d_\zeta F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] \int_\rho^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \frac{\rho'}{\rho} \overline{F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho')[\varphi]} \frac{d\rho'}{\rho'} \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right) d\zeta \\ &\quad + 2\Re \int_{B_1} \left(d_\zeta \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] \int_{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta)}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \frac{\rho'}{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta)} \overline{F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho')[\varphi]} \frac{d\rho'}{\rho'} \right) d\zeta \\ &\quad - 2\Re \int_{B_1} \left(\int_{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta)}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} d_\zeta \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta) \overline{F^*(\theta, \zeta, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta))[\varphi]} \right) d\zeta. \end{aligned}$$

Using the bounds $|d_\zeta \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta)| \leq 1$, $|d_\zeta \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)| \leq 1$, the identity

$$\rho d_\zeta F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] = \mathfrak{d}(\theta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] = F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi'_\theta]$$

with $\varphi'_\theta(z) = (-d_z + 2\pi i\theta)\varphi_\theta(z)$, the fact that $\|\varphi'_\theta\|_{\Phi_{4\tau}^{N-4}} \lesssim \|\varphi_\theta\|_{\Phi_{4\tau}^{N-4}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{4\tau}^{N-4}} \leq 1$, and Young's convolution inequality in the multiplicative measure $\frac{d\rho'}{\rho'}$ we can integrate in $(\theta, \zeta) \in \Theta \times B_1$ to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Theta \times B_1} \left| \int_{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta)}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \rho d_\zeta F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] \int_\rho^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \frac{\rho'}{\rho} \overline{F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho')[\varphi]} \frac{d\rho'}{\rho'} \frac{d\rho}{\rho} \right| \frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|} \\ & \lesssim \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W+)\setminus(V-\cup W-)} \text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\mathfrak{G}}^{(2,2)}\Phi_{4\tau}^{N-4}}^2, \\ & \int_{\Theta \times B_1} \left| d_\zeta \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho)[\varphi_\theta] \int_{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta)}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} \frac{\rho'}{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_-^*(\zeta)} \overline{F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho')[\varphi]} \frac{d\rho'}{\rho'} \right| \frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|} \\ & \lesssim \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W+)\setminus(V-\cup W-)} \text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\mathfrak{G}}^{(2,2)}\Phi_{4\tau}^{N-4}} \\ & \quad \times \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W+)\setminus(V-\cup W-)} \text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\mathfrak{G}}^{(\infty, \infty)}\Phi_{4\tau}^{N-4}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Theta \times B_1} \left| \int_{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)}^{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)} F^*(\theta, \zeta, \rho) [\varphi_\theta] \frac{d\rho}{\rho} d_\zeta \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta) \overline{F^*(\theta, \zeta, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_+^*(\zeta)) [\varphi]} \right| \frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|} \\ & \lesssim \|\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} \text{Emb}[f]\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(\infty, \infty)} \Phi_{4r}^{N-4}} \\ & \quad \times \|\widetilde{\text{IV}}(\zeta, \theta)\|_{L^2_{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}}(\Theta \times B_1)}. \end{aligned}$$

With the above we have shown that

$$\|\widetilde{\text{IV}}(\zeta, \theta)\|_{L^2_{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}}(\Theta \times B_1)} \lesssim \text{RHS(6.5)} \left(\text{RHS(6.5)} + \|\widetilde{\text{IV}}(\zeta, \theta)\|_{L^2_{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}}(\Theta \times B_1)} \right).$$

This implies that

$$\|\widetilde{\text{IV}}(\zeta, \theta)\|_{L^2_{\frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}}(\Theta \times B_1)} \lesssim \text{RHS(6.5)},$$

as required \square

6.2. Counting function improvement. To conclude that Theorem 5 holds we now need to improve the bound (6.1). In particular, we need to bound $\text{Emb}[f]$ in the localized outer Lebesgue quasi-norm $L_{\nu_1}^p / L_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}, \nu_1}^{q, +} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$ in place of $L_{\nu_1}^p / L_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1}^{q, +} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$.

Proof. Proof of Theorem 5: μ_{Θ}^1 to μ_{Θ}^{∞} Fix $q_0 \in [1, +\infty)$. We aim to show that for any $q \in (q_0, +\infty]$ it holds that

$$\|F\|_{L_{\nu_1}^p \mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}, \nu_1}^{q, +} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N(V)} \lesssim \|F\|_{L_{\nu_1}^p \mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1}^{q_0, +} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N}$$

for any $p \in (1, +\infty)$. To do so let us use the restricted weak interpolation. To apply Proposition 3.3 we can suppose that F is supported on $V \in \mathbb{D}_1^{\cup}$ and we need to check that

$$\|F\|_{L_{\nu_1}^p \mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}, \nu_1}^{q, +} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N} \lesssim \nu_1(V)^{\frac{1}{p}} \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1}^{q_0, +} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N}$$

for any $p > 1$. If $q = +\infty$ the claim is immediate because for any V^+

$$\|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}, \nu_1}^{\infty} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N(V^+)} = \|\mathbb{1}_{V^+} F\|_{\mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N} = \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1}^{\infty} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N(V^+)} \leq \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1}^{q_0, +} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N}.$$

Thus it is sufficient to show that

$$(6.8) \quad \|F\|_{L_{\nu_1}^p \mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}, \nu_1}^q \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N} \lesssim \nu_1(V)^{\frac{1}{p}} \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1}^{q_0, +} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N}.$$

We will show that for any $V^+ \in \mathbb{D}_1^{\cup}$ there exists $V^{\text{ecc}}(V^+) \in \mathbb{D}_1^{\cup}$ with $\nu_1(V^{\text{ecc}}(V^+)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \nu_1(V^+)$ such that

$$(6.9) \quad \|\mathbb{1}_{V^+ \setminus V^{\text{ecc}}(V^+)} F\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}}^{\bar{q}, \infty} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N} \lesssim \|\mathbb{1}_{V^+} F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_1}^{q_0, +} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N}$$

for any $q_0 < \bar{q} < q$. Let us show that this is sufficient. Start by setting $V_0 = V$ and $V_{k+1} = V^{\text{ecc}}(V_k)$ to obtain that

$$F = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{V_k \setminus V_{k+1}} F_k$$

so by quasi-subadditivity for any $\varepsilon > 0$ it holds that

$$\|F\|_{L_{\nu_1}^p \mathcal{L}_{\mu_\infty^q, \nu_1}^q \mathbb{F}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N} \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{\varepsilon k} \|\mathbb{1}_{V_k \setminus V_{k+1}} F\|_{L_{\nu_1}^p \mathcal{L}_{\mu_\infty^q, \nu_1}^q \mathbb{F}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N}.$$

By Definition 3.17, by the construction of V_k , and by log-convexity of outer Lebesgue norms ((3.8) in Proposition 3.1) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbb{1}_{V_k \setminus V_{k+1}} F\|_{L_{\nu_1}^\infty \mathcal{L}_{\mu_\infty^q, \nu_1}^q \mathbb{F}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N} \lesssim \|\mathbb{1}_{V_k \setminus V_{k+1}} F\|_{L_{\mu_\infty^{\bar{q}/q}, \nu_1}^{\bar{q}/q} \mathbb{F}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N} \|\mathbb{1}_{V_k \setminus V_{k+1}} F\|_{L_{\mu_\infty^{\bar{q}/q}}^\infty \mathbb{F}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N} \\ & \leq \|\mathbb{1}_{V_k} F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\Theta^{\bar{q}/q}, \nu_1}^{\bar{q}/q} \mathbb{F}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N} \|\mathbb{1}_{V_k \setminus V_{k+1}} F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\Theta^{\bar{q}/q}, \nu_1}^\infty \mathbb{F}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N} \leq \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\Theta^{\bar{q}/q}, \nu_1}^{\bar{q}/q} \mathbb{F}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbb{1}_{V_k \setminus V_{k+1}} F$ is supported on V_k that satisfies $\nu_1(V_k) \leq 2^{-k} \nu(V)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|F\|_{L_{\nu_1}^p \mathcal{L}_{\mu_\infty^q, \nu_1}^q \mathbb{F}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{\varepsilon k} 2^{-k/p} \nu(V)^{1/p} \|\mathbb{1}_{V_k} F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\Theta^{\bar{q}/q}, \nu_1}^{\bar{q}/q} \mathbb{F}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N} \lesssim \nu(V)^{1/p} \|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\Theta^{\bar{q}/q}, \nu_1}^{\bar{q}/q} \mathbb{F}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N} \end{aligned}$$

as long as $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{p}$. This is what was required by (6.8).

Let us now show that (6.9) holds. Assume by homogeneity that $\|F\|_{\mathcal{L}_{\mu_\Theta^{\bar{q}/q}, \nu_1}^{\bar{q}/q} \mathbb{F}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N} =$

1. Since $\|\mathbb{1}_{V^+} F\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^{\bar{q}/q}, \nu_1}^{\bar{q}/q} \mathbb{F}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N} \leq \|\mathbb{1}_{V^+} F\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^{\bar{q}/q}, \nu_1}^{\bar{q}/q} \mathbb{F}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N}$, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $W_k \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^U$ such that

$$\|\mathbb{1}_{V^+ \setminus W_k} F\|_{\mathbb{F}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N} \leq 2^{-\frac{k}{q_0}}, \quad \mu_\Theta^1(W_k) \leq 2^k \nu_1(V^+).$$

Let $\mathcal{T}_k^1 \subset \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ be such that $W_k \subset \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_k^1} T$ and $\|N_{\mathcal{T}_k^1}\|_{L^1} \lesssim 2^k \nu_1(V^+)$. Set

$$\mathbb{V}_k = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : MN_{\mathcal{T}_k^1} > C 2^{\frac{\bar{q}}{q_0} k} \right\}$$

and using the fact that \mathbb{V}_k is open let us represent it as a countable union of its connected components (open balls):

$$\mathbb{V}_k = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_{s_{k,n}}(x_{k,n}).$$

Setting $V_k = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} D(x_{k,n}, 100s_{k,n})$ and $V^{\text{ecc}}(V^+) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} V_k$, by the boundedness of the Hardy Littlewood maximal function we have that

$$\nu_1(V^{\text{ecc}}(V^+)) \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \nu_1(V_k) \lesssim \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} C^{-1} 2^k (1 - \frac{\bar{q}}{q_0}) \nu_1(V^+) \lesssim C^{-1} \nu_1(V^+)$$

as required, as long as $C > 1$ is chosen large enough. Let us now show that

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}_{V^+ \setminus (V^{\text{ecc}}(V^+) \cup W_k^\infty)} F \right\|_{\mathbb{F}_\Theta^u \Phi_\tau^N} \leq 2^{-\frac{k}{q_0}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_\Theta^\infty(W_k^\infty) \lesssim 2^{\frac{\bar{q}}{q_0} k}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} W_k^\infty & := \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_k^\infty} T \\ \mathcal{T}_k^\infty & := \left(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{T \in \mathcal{T}_k^1 : B_{s_T}(x_T) \cap B_{s_{k,n}}(x_{k,n}) \neq \emptyset, s_T > 10s_{k,n}\} \right) \\ & \quad \cup \{T \in \mathcal{T}_k^1 : B_{s_T}(x_T) \cap V_k = \emptyset\}. \end{aligned}$$

The two bounds imply that $\|\mathbb{1}_{V+\setminus V^{ecc}(V+)}F\|_{L^{\bar{q},\infty}_{\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}}}^{\bar{q}} \lesssim 1$, concluding the proof of (6.9). The former bound holds because $W_k \subset V_k \cup W_k^{\infty}$. As a matter of fact, $W_k \subset \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_k^1} T$ and if $T \in \mathcal{T}_k^1 \setminus \mathcal{T}_k^{\infty}$ then there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $B_{s_T}(x_T) \cap B_{s_{k,n}}(x_{k,n})$ and $s_T < 10s_{k,n}$ but then $B_{s_T}(x_T) \subset B_{100s_{k,n}}(x_{k,n})$ and thus $T \subset V_k$.

To show that $\mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}(W_k^{\infty}) \lesssim 2^{\frac{\bar{q}}{q_0}k}$ it is sufficient to show that $N_{\mathcal{T}_k^{\infty}}(x) \lesssim 2^{\frac{\bar{q}}{q_0}k}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. If $x \notin \mathbb{V}_k$ then the claim follows by the definition of \mathbb{V}_k and from the fact that $N_{\mathcal{T}_k^{\infty}}(x) \leq N_{\mathcal{T}_k^1}(x) \leq MN_{\mathcal{T}_k^1}(x)$. If $x \in \mathbb{V}_k$ then $x \in B_{s_{k,n}}(x_{k,n})$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let

$$\mathcal{T}_k^{\infty}(x) := \{T \in \mathcal{T}_k^{\infty} : B_{s_T}(x_T) \ni x\}$$

so that $N_{\mathcal{T}_k^{\infty}}(x)$ coincides with the cardinality of $\mathcal{T}_k^{\infty}(x)$. Given the way \mathcal{T}_k^{∞} was defined for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_k^{\infty}(x)$ it holds that $s_T > 10s_{k,n}$ and thus either $B_{s_T}(x_T) \supset (x, x + 4s_T)$ or $B_{s_T}(x_T) \supset (x - 4s_T, x)$ showing that

$$\int_{B_{3s_{k,n}}(x_{k,n})} N_{\mathcal{T}_k^{\infty}}(y) dy > 3s_{k,n} N_{\mathcal{T}_k^{\infty}}(x).$$

Thus for any $y \in B_{3s_{k,n}}(x_{k,n})$ it holds that $MN_{\mathcal{T}_k^1}(y) \gtrsim N_{\mathcal{T}_k^{\infty}}(x)$ while we know from the maximality of $B_{s_{k,n}}(x_{k,n})$ that there exists $y \in B_{3s_{k,n}}(x_{k,n}) \setminus B_{s_{k,n}}(x_{k,n})$ with $MN_{\mathcal{T}_k^1}(y) < C2^{\frac{\bar{q}}{q_0}k}$, showing the claimed bound $N_{\mathcal{T}_k^{\infty}}(x) \lesssim 2^{\frac{\bar{q}}{q_0}k}$. \square

7. UNIFORM EMBEDDING BOUNDS - LINEAR CASE

In this section we prove Theorem 3 about the linear embedding bounds (1.14). of. Recall from the setup of Theorem 3 that $\Gamma = \Gamma_{(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)}$ is as described (3.28), Θ is an bounded open interval with $B_4 \subsetneq \Theta \subsetneq \mathbb{R}$, and let Θ^{in} is a bounded open interval with $B_{2^{-5}}(-\gamma) \subsetneq \Theta^{\text{in}} \subsetneq B_{2^{-3}}(-\gamma)$ and let $\Theta^{\text{ex}} := \Theta \setminus \Theta^{\text{in}}$. We will consistently use the notation $\theta_{\Gamma} := \alpha\beta(\theta + \gamma)$ as introduced in Section 3.3. Furthermore $\Theta_{\Gamma} := \alpha\beta(\Theta + \gamma)$, $\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}} := \{\theta_{\Gamma} : \theta \in \Theta^{\text{in}}\}$, and $\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{ex}} := \{\theta_{\Gamma} : \theta \in \Theta^{\text{ex}}\}$. As in the rest of the paper we assume that the parameter N is large enough and $\tau > 0$ is small enough. These parameters, that govern the rate of decay and the Fourier support of wave packets φ appear in the size $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$ and are ubiquitous in the subsequent section. The values $N > 100$ and $\tau < 2^{-10}$ are, in particular, always admissible and the choice of N and τ can be made independently of $\beta \in (0, 1]$. All implicit constants appearing in Theorem 3 and in this entire section are uniform in $\beta \in (0, 1]$. The constants are also uniform in Θ and τ as long as $|\Theta|$ is uniformly bounded and $\tau > 0$ is bounded away from 0.

While Theorem 3 holds for all $\beta \in (0, 1]$, we are mainly interested in the case $0 < \beta \ll 1$.

In this section, for simplicity, the reader may assume that $\alpha = \beta^{-1}$ and $\gamma = 0$. This maintains the important features of the subsequent discussion and of the proofs but avoids unnecessary complications. Under these assumption one has that $\theta_{\Gamma} = \theta$, $\Theta_{\Gamma} = \Theta$. There does not, however, seem to be a direct way to deduce the statements below and Theorem 3 itself in their full generality from these restricted assumptions on the parameters (α, β, γ) .

The boundedness properties the map $F \mapsto F \circ \Gamma$ are encoded in the two propositions below. They allow us to control outer Lebesgue quasi-norms with two auxiliary sizes that do not appear, per se, in the size $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$. However, for functions of

the form $F = \text{Emb}[f]$ these auxiliary sizes can be used to control outer Lebesgue quasi-norms with size $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$.

Proposition 7.1 (Uniform bounds for exterior size). *The bounds*

$$(7.1) \quad \|F \circ \Gamma\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^1}^r \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u,2)} \Phi_{\tau}^N} \lesssim \|F\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^1}^r \left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_{\Gamma}}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_{\Gamma}, \Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{u}, 2)} \right) \Phi_{2\tau}^{N-4}},$$

hold for all $F \in L_{\text{loc}}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{2\tau}^{\infty'}$ as long as $2 \leq u < r \leq +\infty$, and as long as $\bar{u} \in (u, \infty)$ is sufficiently large, depending on (u, r) .

Proposition 7.2 (Uniform bounds for singular size). *Let $V \in \mathbb{D}_{\beta}^{\cup}$, $W \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}$ and $E = V \cap W$ or $E = V \cup W$. The bounds*

$$(7.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t) \text{td}_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^1}^r \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \Phi_{\tau}^N} \\ & \lesssim \|F(\eta, y, t)\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^1}^r \mathbb{L}_{\Theta_{\Gamma}}^{(\infty, \infty)} \Phi_{2\tau}^{N-4}} \end{aligned}$$

hold for all $F \in L_{\text{loc}}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{2\tau}^{\infty'}$ as long as $1 < u < r \leq \infty$. The implicit constant is independent of E . The derivative in $\text{td}_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)$ is intended in the distributional sense and is a Radon measure on \mathbb{R}_+^3 .

These two statements are proved in Section 7.1 and in Section 7.2 respectively. The two sections follow a similar outline: first we prove a geometric covering lemma on \mathbb{R}_+^3 (Lemmata 7.4 and 7.6), from this we deduce a weak-endpoint result for scalar valued functions $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$. Finally, using restricted weak interpolation and Lemma 3.13 we deduce the desired claim.

The next lemma shows that sizes $\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u,2)} \Phi_{\tau}^N$ and $\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \Phi_{\tau}^N$ can be used to control the size $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$, that appears in Theorem 3.

Lemma 7.3 (Uniform bounds for the $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$ size). *Let $V^+, V^- \in \mathbb{D}_{\beta}^{\cup}$ and $W^+ \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}$. The bounds*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-} \text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma \right\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^1}^r \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N} \\ & \lesssim \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-} \text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma \right\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^1}^r \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u,2)} \Phi_{16\tau}^{N-10}} \\ & \quad + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-} \text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t) \text{td}_t \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+)}(\eta, y, t) \right\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^1}^r \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \Phi_{16\tau}^{N-10}} \\ & \quad + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-} \text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t) \text{td}_t \mathbb{1}_{(\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-)}(\eta, y, t) \right\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^1}^r \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \Phi_{16\tau}^{N-10}} \end{aligned}$$

hold for any $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ and for all $r \in (u, \infty]$. The implicit constant is independent of V^+ , V^- , and W^+ .

We prove this lemma in Section 7.3. Now we conclude by showing how Proposition 7.1, Proposition 7.2, and Lemma 7.3 can be used to deduce the embedding bounds (1.14) of Theorem 3.

Proof. Proof of Theorem 3 Using homogeneity let us assume that $\|f_j\|_{L^{p_j}(\mathbb{R})} = 1$. According to the discussion in Remark Remark 3.19 we need to exhibit a choice of

sets $V^-(\lambda) \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup$ such that

$$\int_0^\infty \nu_\beta \left(V^-(\lambda^{1/p}) \right) d\lambda \lesssim 1,$$

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-(\lambda)} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \right\|_{X_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_\beta}^{q, r, +} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_\Gamma^u \Phi_\tau^N} \lesssim \lambda.$$

Using Theorem 5. with $N + 14$, 32τ and some large enough $\bar{u} \in (2, \infty)$ in place of N , τ , and u , we can find $\widetilde{V}^-(\lambda) \in \mathbb{D}_1^\cup$ such that

$$\int_0^\infty \nu_\beta(\widetilde{V}^-(\lambda^{1/p})) d\lambda \lesssim 1, \quad \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus \widetilde{V}^-(\lambda)} \text{Emb}[f] \right\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_1}^{q, +} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^{\bar{u}} \Phi_{32\tau}^{N+14}} \lesssim \lambda.$$

Recall that $\mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^{\bar{u}} \Phi_{32\tau}^{N+14} \gtrsim \mathbb{L}_{\Theta_r}^{(\infty, \infty)} \Phi_{32\tau}^{N+14} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_r, \Theta_r^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{u}, 2)} \Phi_{32\tau}^{N+14}$ because $\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(\bar{u}, 2)} \mathfrak{d}_{32\tau}^{N+14} \gtrsim \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_r, \Theta_r^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{u}, 2)} \Phi_{32\tau}^{N+14}$ since $\Theta_r^{\text{ex}} \cap B_{64\tau} = \emptyset$. We set $V^-(\lambda) := \Gamma^{-1}(\widetilde{V}^-(\lambda)) \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup$ and we claim that

$$\nu_\beta(V^-(\lambda)) = \nu_1(\widetilde{V}^-(\lambda))$$

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-(\lambda)} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \right\|_{X_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_\beta}^{q, r, +} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_\Gamma^u \Phi_\tau^N} \lesssim \lambda.$$

The first bound follows since $\Gamma(D_\beta(x, s)) = D_1(x, s)$ and $\nu_\beta(D_\beta(x, s)) = \nu_1(D_1(x, s)) = s$. To show the latter bound, according to Remark Remark 3.19, we need to prove that for any $V^+ \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup$ and $W^+ \in \mathbb{T}_\beta^\cup$, and for $\bar{r} \in \{r, q\}$ the bounds

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-(\lambda)} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \right\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^{\bar{r}} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_\Gamma^u \Phi_\tau^N} \lesssim \lambda \nu_\beta(V^+)^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}}} \mu_\Theta^\infty(W^+)^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}} - \frac{1}{q}}$$

hold. Lemma 7.3 allows us, instead of working with the size $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_\Gamma^u \Phi_\tau^N$ directly, to work with two alternative quantities: specifically those appearing in LHS(7.1) and LHS(7.2). More precisely, according to Lemma 7.3 it is sufficient to prove that

$$(7.3) \quad \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-(\lambda)} \text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma \right\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^{\bar{r}} \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u, 2)} \Phi_{16\tau}^{N-10}} \lesssim \lambda \nu_\beta(V^+)^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}}} \mu_\Theta^\infty(W^+)^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}} - \frac{1}{q}},$$

and that

$$(7.4) \quad \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\overline{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-(\lambda)}} \text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t) t d_t \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+)}(\eta, y, t) \right\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^{\bar{r}} \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u, 1)} \Phi_{16\tau}^{N-10}}$$

$$+ \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\overline{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-(\lambda)}} \text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t) t d_t \mathbb{1}_{(\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-)}(\eta, y, t) \right\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^{\bar{r}} \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u, 1)} \Phi_{16\tau}^{N-10}}$$

$$\lesssim \lambda \nu_\beta(V^+)^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}}} \mu_\Theta^\infty(W^+)^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}} - \frac{1}{q}}.$$

Since Proposition 7.1 and Proposition 7.2 show that

$$\text{LHS}(7.3) + \text{LHS}(7.4) \leq \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma((V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-(\lambda))} \text{Emb}[f] \right\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^{\bar{r}} \left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_r}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_r, \Theta_r^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{u}, 2)} \right) \Phi_{32\tau}^{N-14}}$$

as long as \bar{u} is large enough, all we need to do is show that

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma((V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-(\lambda))} \text{Emb}[f] \right\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^{\bar{r}} \left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_r}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_r, \Theta_r^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{u}, 2)} \right) \Phi_{32\tau}^{N-14}}$$

$$\lesssim \lambda \nu_\beta(V^+)^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}}} \mu_\Theta^\infty(W^+)^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}} - \frac{1}{q}},$$

which will be the goal for the rest of the proof. This follows essentially by (3.7), up to controlling $\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^1(W^+)$. More precisely, since $\bar{r} \leq q$, by (3.7) it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma((V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-)} \text{Emb}[f] \right\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^1}^{\bar{r}} \left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{r}, 2)} \right)} \Phi_{32\bar{r}}^{N-14} \\ & \lesssim \mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^1(\Gamma(V^+) \cap \Gamma(W^+))^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}} - \frac{1}{q}} \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma((V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-)} F \right\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^1}^q \left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{r}, 2)} \right)} \Phi_{32\bar{r}}^{N-14}, \end{aligned}$$

while Lemma 3.18 applied with $\beta = 1$ gives that

$$\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^1(\Gamma(V^+) \cap W) \lesssim \nu_1(\Gamma(V^+)) \mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^\infty(\Gamma(V^+) \cap W) \quad \forall W \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^\cup.$$

Using the above bound and (3.6) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma((V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-)} F \right\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^1}^q \left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{r}, 2)} \right)} \Phi_{32\bar{r}}^{N-14} \\ & \lesssim \nu_1(\Gamma(V^+))^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma((V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-)} F \right\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^\infty}^q \left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{r}, 2)} \right)} \Phi_{32\bar{r}}^{N-14}. \end{aligned}$$

We also have that

$$\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^1(\Gamma(V^+) \cap \Gamma(W^+))^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}} - \frac{1}{q}} \leq \nu_\beta(V^+)^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}} - \frac{1}{q}} \mu_{\Theta}^\infty(W^+)^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}} - \frac{1}{q}}$$

because $\Gamma(V^+) \in \mathbb{D}_1^\cup$, $\Gamma(W^+) \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^\cup$, $\nu_1(\Gamma(V^+)) = \nu_\beta(V^+)$, and $\mu_{\Theta}^\infty(W^+) = \mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^\infty(\Gamma(W^+))$. The estimates above, combined, give that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma((V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-)} \text{Emb}[f] \right\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^1}^{\bar{r}} \left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{r}, 2)} \right)} \Phi_{32\bar{r}}^{N-14} \\ & \lesssim \nu_\beta(V^+)^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}}} \mu_{\Theta}^\infty(W^+)^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}} - \frac{1}{q}} \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma((V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-)} \text{Emb}[f] \right\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^\infty}^q \left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{r}, 2)} \right)} \Phi_{32\bar{r}}^{N-14}. \end{aligned}$$

This is the required bound (7.3) since $\Gamma(V^-(\lambda)) = \widetilde{V}^-(\lambda)$ so

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma((V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-(\lambda))} \text{Emb}[f] \right\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^\infty}^q \left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{r}, 2)} \right)} \Phi_{32\bar{r}}^{N-14} \\ & \lesssim \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus \widetilde{V}^-(\lambda)} \text{Emb}[f] \right\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^\infty, \nu_1}^{q, +} \mathbb{F}_{\Theta}^{\bar{r}} \Phi_{32\bar{r}}^{N-14}} \lesssim \lambda \end{aligned}$$

by construction. \square

7.1. Uniform bounds for the exterior size. We now prove Proposition 7.1. We begin with a uniform covering argument.

Lemma 7.4 (Exterior tree covering). *Suppose $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$ is a compactly supported Radon measure. For all $\lambda > 0$ there exists a set $W_\lambda \subset \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^\cup$ and finite collection of trees $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$ such that*

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W_\lambda} F \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(1, 1)}} \leq \lambda, \quad W_\lambda \supset \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T, \quad \mu_{\Theta}^1(W_\lambda) \lesssim \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mu_{\Theta}^1(T).$$

Each $T \in \mathcal{T}$ is endowed with a distinguished subset $X_T \subset \pi_T(\mathfrak{I}_{\Theta^{\text{ex}}})$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\mu_{\Theta}^1(T)} \int_{X_T} |F(\eta, y, t)| d\eta dy dt \geq \lambda.$$

The subsets X_T satisfy

$$(7.5) \quad \left\| \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_T)}(\eta, y, t) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)}} \lesssim 1$$

and

$$(7.6) \quad \left\| \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_T)}(\eta, y, t) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ip}})}^{(1,1)}} \lesssim 1.$$

The implicit constants do not depend on Γ .

Proof. Let us define local sizes $\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}^{(1,1)}$ and $\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}-})}^{(1,1)}$ by setting

$$\Theta^{\text{ex} \pm} := \Theta \cap \{\theta : \pm\theta \geq \gamma\}.$$

It suffices to prove this lemma with $\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}^{(1,1)}$ in place of $\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(1,1)}$. A symmetric proof handles the size $\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}-})}^{(1,1)}$ and the two results can then be added together.

Without loss of generality we assume that F is supported on $\mathbb{K} \subset [-S; S]^2 \times [S^{-1}; S]$ for some $S \gg 1$, and by homogeneity we assume that $\|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}^{(1,1)}} = 1$.

This guarantees a bound on the parameters (ξ_T, x_T, s_T) of any tree $T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ for which $\|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}^{(1,1)}}(T) \geq \lambda$. As a matter of fact, it must hold that $s_T > S^{-1}$, because otherwise $T_\Theta(\xi_T, x_T, s_T) \cap \mathbb{K} = \emptyset$. It also holds that $s_T \leq 2S\lambda^{-1}$ because

$$s_T \|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}^{(1,1)}}(T_\Theta(\xi_T, x_T, s_T)) \leq 2S \|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}^{(1,1)}}(T_\Theta(\xi_T, 0, 2S)) \leq 2S$$

since $T_\Theta(\xi_T, x_T, s_T) \cap \mathbb{K} \subset T_\Theta(\xi_T, 0, 2S) \cap \mathbb{K}$ and since we assumed that $\|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}^{(1,1)}} = 1$.

It also holds that $|x_T| < S + 2S\lambda^{-1}$ because otherwise, again $T_\Theta(\xi_T, x_T, s_T) \cap \mathbb{K} = \emptyset$. For the same reason we must have that $|\xi_T| < 4S^2(S^2 + |\Theta|)\lambda^{-1}$.

We want to construct \mathcal{T} by an iterative algorithm. The following preparatory step guarantees that the algorithm will terminate. We discretize the set of all trees by setting

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}_+^{3, \text{latt}} &:= \{(\eta, y, t) : \eta t, yt^{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}, t \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}\}, \\ \mathbb{T}_\Theta^{\text{latt}} &:= \left\{ T_\Theta(\eta, y, t) : (\eta, y, t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{3, \text{latt}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Given any $T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ we associate to it a collection of trees $\mathcal{W}(T) \subset \mathbb{T}_\Theta^{\text{latt}}$ given by

$$\mathcal{W}(T) := \left\{ T_\Theta(\xi, x, s) \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^{\text{latt}} : 1 \leq \frac{s}{s_T} < 2^4, |x - x_T| \leq 2s_T, s_T |\xi - \xi_T| < 2^8 \right\}.$$

It holds that $\mu_\Theta^1(\bigcup_{T' \in \mathcal{W}(T)} T') \lesssim \mu_\Theta^1(T)$ and

$\bigcup_{\vartheta \in \{-1, 0, 1\}} T_{(\xi_T + \vartheta s_T^{-1}, x_T, s_T)} \subset \bigcup_{T' \in \mathcal{W}(T)} T'$. Take $\mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\text{latt}} \subset \mathbb{T}_\Theta^{\text{latt}}$ to be

$$\mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\text{latt}} := \bigcup_{(\xi_T, x_T, s_T) \in A \subset \mathbb{R}_+^3} \mathcal{W}(T_\Theta(\xi_T, x_T, s_T)) \subset \mathbb{T}_\Theta^{\text{latt}}$$

where

$$A := \{(\xi_T, x_T, s_T) : S^{-1} \leq s_T \leq 2S\lambda^{-1}, |x_T| \leq S + 2S\lambda^{-1}, |\xi_T| \leq 4S^2(S^2 + |\Theta|)\lambda^{-1}\},$$

so that the trees in $\mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\text{latt}}$ cover \mathbb{K} and so that for any tree $T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ such that $\|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}^{(1,1)}}(T) \geq \lambda$ it holds that $\mathcal{W}(T) \subset \mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\text{latt}}$. The collection $\mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\text{latt}}$ is finite, since the tops of trees in $\mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\text{latt}}$ are a bounded subset of the discrete set $\mathbb{R}_+^{3, \text{latt}}$.

Let us now proceed to the actual selection algorithm. Given a collection of trees $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ we say that $T \in \mathcal{X}$ is *quasi-maximal* if

$$T' \in \mathcal{X} \implies \xi_{T'} \leq \xi_T + \varepsilon_{\max}$$

with a constant $\varepsilon_{\max} = \varepsilon_{\max}(\lambda, S)$ to be determined later. We start with the collection $\mathcal{T}_0 = \emptyset$ and let $\mathbb{K}_0 := \mathbb{K}$. Suppose that at step n we have a collection $\mathcal{T}_n = \{T_1, \dots, T_n\} \subset \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ and a subset $\mathbb{K}_n \subset \mathbb{K}$. At step $n+1$ let

$$\mathcal{X}_{n+1} := \left\{ T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta : \|\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{K}_n} F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}^{(1,1)}}(T) \geq \lambda \right\};$$

if \mathcal{X}_{n+1} is empty, we terminate the iteration, otherwise we choose a quasi-maximal element T_{n+1} of \mathcal{X}_{n+1} ; this can be done since $\left\{ (\xi, x, s) \in \mathbb{R}_+^3 : T_\Theta(\xi, x, s) \in \mathcal{X}_{n+1} \right\}$ is precompact and non-empty, and thus has at least one quasi-maximal element. Let $\mathcal{T}_{n+1} = \mathcal{T}_n \cup \{T_{n+1}\}$ and let $X_{T'} := \mathbb{K}_n \cap \pi_{T_{n+1}}(\mathfrak{T}_{\Theta^{\text{ex}+})}$. Now set $\mathbb{K}_{n+1} = \mathbb{K}_n \setminus \bigcup_{T' \in \mathcal{W}(T_{n+1})} T'$. This process terminates after finitely many steps: if T_{n+1} gets selected then

$$\mathcal{W}(T_{n+1}) \cap \left(\mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\text{latt}} \setminus \bigcup_{n'=0}^n \mathcal{W}(T_{n'}) \right) \neq \emptyset,$$

given that $T_{n'} \subset \bigcup_{T' \in \mathcal{W}(T_{n'})} T'$ for any n' and that

$$\|F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}^{(1,1)}}(T_{n+1}) \geq \|\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{K}_n} F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}^{(1,1)}}(T_{n+1}) > \lambda$$

and thus $\mathcal{W}(T) \subset \mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\text{latt}}$. By construction, $\mathcal{K}_\lambda^{\text{latt}} \setminus \bigcup_{n'=0}^n \mathcal{W}(T_{n'})$ is thus a sequence of finite collections of trees that is strictly decreasing in n as long as the algorithm continues. The collection eventually stabilizes so the algorithm terminates.

The procedure described above yields a collection of trees $\mathcal{T} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{T}_n$ and distinguished subsets $X_{T'} \subset \pi_{T'}(\mathfrak{T}_{\Theta^{\text{ex}+})}$ for any $T' \in \mathcal{T}$. According to the selection criterion, it holds that

$$\frac{1}{\mu_\Theta^1(T)} \int_{X_T} |F(\eta, y, t)| d\eta dy dt \geq \lambda.$$

We set $W_\lambda = \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mathcal{W}(T) \supset \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T$ and thus we have $\mu_\Theta^1(W_\lambda) \lesssim \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mu_\Theta^1(T)$. Since the procedure terminated it holds that $\|\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{K} \setminus W_\lambda} F\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}^{(1,1)}} \leq \lambda$. It remains to show bounds (7.5) and (7.6). The former follows since the sets X_T are constructed to be pairwise disjoint. To show the latter bound let us show that

$$(7.7) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}_{X_T}(\xi + \theta t^{-1}, x, t) \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim 1 + \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Theta^{\text{ex}+}|}{\text{dist}(\theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})} \right)$$

for any $\xi, x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\theta \in \Theta^{\text{in}}$ with some absolute constant. This is sufficient to deduce (7.6): using a change of variables we would then rewrite condition (7.6) and

get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_T)}(\eta, y, t) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta^\Gamma, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1,1)}(T_{\Theta^\Gamma}(\alpha\xi, x, s))} \\
& \leq \int_{B_1} \int_{\Theta^{\text{in}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_T)}(\alpha\xi + \theta(s\sigma)^{-1}, x + s\zeta, s\sigma) \frac{d\sigma \, d\zeta \, d\theta}{\sigma \, |\Theta_\Gamma|} \\
& \leq \int_{B_1} \int_{\Theta^{\text{in}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_T)}(\alpha\xi + \alpha\beta(\theta' + \gamma)(s\beta\sigma')^{-1}, x + s\zeta, s\beta\sigma') \frac{d\sigma' \, d\zeta \, d\theta'}{\sigma' \, |\Theta|} \\
& \leq \int_{B_1} \int_{\Theta^{\text{in}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}_{X_T}(\xi + \theta'(s\sigma')^{-1}, x_T + s\zeta, s\sigma') \frac{d\sigma' \, d\zeta \, d\theta'}{\sigma' \, |\Theta|} \\
& \leq \int_{B_1} \int_{\Theta^{\text{in}}} \left(1 + \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Theta^{\text{ex}}|}{\text{dist}(\theta', \Theta^{\text{ex}})} \right) \right) \frac{d\zeta \, d\theta'}{|\Theta|} \lesssim 1 + |\Theta|.
\end{aligned}$$

Fix $\xi, x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\theta \in \Theta^{\text{in}}$ and let us prove (7.7) by showing that

$$\frac{\tau_+}{\tau_-} \leq \frac{2|\Theta^{\text{ex}}|}{\text{dist}(\theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})} + 1,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_+ &:= \sup \left\{ t \in [0, +\infty) : (\xi + \theta t^{-1}, x, t) \in \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} X_T \right\}, \\
\tau_- &:= \inf \left\{ t \in [0, +\infty) : (\xi + \theta t^{-1}, x, t) \in \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} X_T \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The quantity τ_+ is positive and finite unless $\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}_{X_T}(\xi + \theta t^{-1}, x, t) = 0$ for all t , but then LHS(7.7) vanishes. According to the definition of τ_+ we may find $t_0 \in \left(\frac{\tau_+}{1+\varepsilon}, \tau_+ \right)$ and a tree T_0 such that $(\xi + \theta t^{-1}, x, t) \in X_{T_0}$.

Let $\mathcal{T}_>$ be the subset of trees in \mathcal{T} selected *after* T_0 by the algorithm of this proof. It holds that

$$\inf \left\{ t \in [0, +\infty) : (\xi + \theta t^{-1}, x, t) \in \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_>} X_T \right\} \geq t_0 = \frac{\tau_+}{1 + \varepsilon_{\max}}.$$

As a matter of fact $(\xi + \theta \tilde{t}^{-1}, x, \tilde{t}) \in T_0$ for any $\tilde{t} < t_0$ so in particular $(\xi + \theta \tilde{t}^{-1}, x, \tilde{t}) \notin X_{\mathcal{T}_>} \subset \mathcal{T}_> \setminus T_0$ for any $\mathcal{T}_> \in \mathcal{T}$ selected after T_0 .

Let us then focus a tree $T_< \in \mathcal{T}_<$ selected before T_0 . By quasi-maximality we have that $-\varepsilon_{\max} + \xi_{T_0} \leq \xi_{T_<}$ and thus

$$\xi - \xi_{T_<} \leq \xi - \xi_{T_0} + \varepsilon_{\max}.$$

If $\xi_{T_<} \geq \xi$ then we would have that $\pi_{T_<}(\mathfrak{I}_{\Theta^{\text{ex}}}) \cap \{(\xi + \theta t^{-1}, x, t) : t \in \mathbb{R}_+\} = \emptyset$ so $T_<$ would not contribute to defining τ^- . Suppose $\xi_{T_<} < \xi$; then it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\{t : (\xi + \theta t^{-1}, x, t) \in \pi_{T_<}(\mathfrak{I}_{\Theta^{\text{ex}}})\} &\subset \left(\frac{\text{dist}(\theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}{\xi - \xi_{T_<}}, +\infty \right) \\
&\subset \left(\frac{\text{dist}(\theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}{\xi - \xi_{T_0} + \varepsilon_{\max}}, +\infty \right)
\end{aligned}$$

To bound $\frac{\text{dist}(\theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}{\xi - \xi_{T_0} + \varepsilon_{\max}}$ from below we use the fact that $(\xi + \theta t_0^{-1}, x, t_0) \in X_{T_0}$ and, as a consequence,

$$\frac{\text{dist}(\theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}{t_0} < \xi - \xi_{T_0} < \frac{|\Theta^{\text{ex}+}|}{t_0}$$

because $X_{T_0} \subset \left\{ (\xi_{T_0} + \bar{\theta} \bar{t}^{-1}, \bar{x}, \bar{t}) : \bar{\theta} \in \Theta^{\text{ex}+}, \bar{x} \in B_{s_{T_0}}(x_{T_0}), \bar{t} < s_{T_0} \right\}$. It follows that

$$\{t : (\xi + \theta t^{-1}, x, t) \in \pi_{T_<}(\mathfrak{T}_{\Theta^{\text{ex}+})\} \subset \left(t_0 \frac{\text{dist}(\theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}{|\Theta^{\text{ex}+}| + \varepsilon_{\max} t_0}, +\infty \right).$$

Recall that $t_0 < 2S\lambda^{-1}$ since all trees T in \mathcal{T} satisfy $s_T < 2S\lambda^{-1}$. It is sufficient to take $\varepsilon_{\max} = \frac{\lambda|\Theta^{\text{ex}+}|}{2S}$ to yield

$$\{t : (\xi + \theta t^{-1}, x, t) \in \pi_{T_<}(\mathfrak{T}_{\Theta^{\text{ex}+})\} \subset \left(\frac{\tau_+}{(1+\varepsilon)} \frac{\text{dist}(\theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}{2|\Theta^{\text{ex}+}|}, +\infty \right)$$

and prove that

$$\tau_- > \frac{\tau_+}{(1+\varepsilon)} \min \left(\frac{\text{dist}(\theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}{2|\Theta^{\text{ex}+}|(1+\varepsilon)}, 1 \right)$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily, this proves our claim. \square

The covering lemma above allows us to obtain the following uniform weak L^1 bound.

Lemma 7.5. *The bound*

$$(7.8) \quad \|F \circ \Gamma\|_{L^1_{\mu_{\Theta}^1} \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}^{(1,1)}} \lesssim \|F\|_{L^1_{\mu_{\Theta}^1} \left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}^{(1,1)} \right)}$$

holds for any $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$.

Proof. We need to show that for every $\lambda > 0$ there exists a set $W_\lambda = \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{T}_\Theta} T$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W_\lambda} F \circ \Gamma \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}^{(1,1)}} &\leq \lambda, \\ \mu_{\Theta}^1(W_\lambda) &\lesssim \lambda^{-1} \|F\|_{L^1_{\mu_{\Theta}^1} \left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}+})}^{(1,1)} \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

We may assume that F is supported on a compact set by the discussion at the end of Section 3.2.2. Fix $\lambda > 0$ and let $W_\lambda := \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda \subset \mathbb{T}_\Theta} T$ where $\mathcal{T}_\lambda \subset \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ is obtained by applying Lemma 7.4 to $F \circ \Gamma$ in place of F . It remains to prove the required bounds on $\mu_{\Theta}^1(W_\lambda)$. For each tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda$, Lemma 7.4 gives the bound

$$\lambda \mu_{\Theta}^1(T) \leq \int_{X_T} |F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t)| d\eta dy dt.$$

Summing the bound over all trees $T \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda$ and applying a change of variables gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lambda \mu_\Theta^1(W_\lambda) &\lesssim \lambda \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \mu_\Theta^1(T) \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \left(\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{X_T}(\eta, y, t) \right) |F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t)| d\eta dy dt \\
 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \left(\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{X_T}(\eta, y, t) \right) |F(\alpha(\eta + \gamma t^{-1}), y, \beta t)| d\eta dy dt \\
 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \left(\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_T)}(\alpha(\eta + \gamma t^{-1}), y, \beta t) \right) |F(\alpha(\eta + \gamma t^{-1}), y, \beta t)| d\eta dy dt \\
 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \frac{1}{\alpha\beta} \left(\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_T)}(\eta, y, t) \right) |F(\eta, y, t)| d\eta dy dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

It remains to bound the RHS of this inequality from above. By Proposition 3.5 we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \left(\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_T)}(\eta, y, t) \right) |F(\eta, y, t)| d\eta dy dt \\
 &\lesssim \|F\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^1 \left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}})}^{(1, 1)} \right)} \left\| \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_T)}(\eta, y, t) \right\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^\infty \left(\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{in}})}^{(1, 1)} + \mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)} \right)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\left\| \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_T)}(\eta, y, t) \right\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^\infty \left(\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{in}})}^{(1, 1)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}})}^{(\infty, \infty)} \right)} \lesssim 1$$

this concludes the proof. \square

We are now ready to deduce Proposition 7.1 from Lemma 7.5. We use Lemma 3.13 to reduce to the scalar case i.e. to proving bounds for $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$ instead of for $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}}^N$. Then we conclude using a restricted weak type interpolation argument.

Proof. Proof of Proposition 7.1 We begin by reducing to the scalar bound. In particular, a straightforward adaptation of Corollary 3.14 to the case of the sizes $\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u, 2)}$ shows that

$$\|F \circ \Gamma\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^r \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u, 2)} \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}}^N} \lesssim \sup_{\varphi} \|F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t)[\varphi]\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^r \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u, 2)}}$$

where the upper bound is taken over all $\varphi \in \Phi_{2\mathfrak{t}}^{N'}$ with $\|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{2\mathfrak{t}}^{N'}} \lesssim 1$, as long as $N \geq N' + 4$. Bound (7.1) can thus be deduced from

$$(7.9) \quad \|F \circ \Gamma\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^r \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u, 2)}} \lesssim \|F\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^r \left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{u}, 2)} \right)}$$

for all $F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$. The remaining step is to deduce bound (7.9) from bound (7.8) of Lemma 7.5. In particular let us show that

$$(7.10) \quad \|F \circ \Gamma\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^r \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u, 1)}} \lesssim \|F\|_{L_{\mu_\Theta^1}^r \left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{u}, 1)} \right)}$$

for $1 \leq u < \bar{u} \leq \infty$ and $r \in \left(u \frac{\bar{u}-1}{\bar{u}-u}, \infty \right]$ from (7.8). Bound (7.9) follows from (7.10) by applying it to F^2 in lieu of F and choosing \bar{u} appropriately large. For any $\bar{u} > u$

the $r = \infty$ endpoint for (7.10), given by

$$\|F \circ \Gamma\|_{L^\infty_{\mu_\Theta^1} \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u,1)}} \leq \|F\|_{L^\infty_{\mu_\Theta^1} \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{u},1)}},$$

follows from the fact that $\Gamma(T_\Theta(\xi_T, x_T, s_T)) \subset T_{\Theta_\Gamma}(\alpha\xi_T, x_T, s_T)$. We can use Proposition 3.3 to conclude that bound (7.10) holds for all other $r > u^* := u \frac{\bar{u}-1}{\bar{u}-u}$ if we show the u^* restricted weak endpoint

$$(7.11) \quad \|F \circ \Gamma\|_{L^\infty_{\mu_\Theta^1} \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u,1)}} \lesssim \mu_\Theta^1 \left(\|F\|_{\left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ext}})}^{(1,1)} \right)} > 0 \right)^{\frac{1}{u^*}} \\ \times \|F\|_{\left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{u},1)} \right)}.$$

Fix any $\tau > 0$ and let us apply Lemma 7.5: there exists $W_\tau \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^\cup$ such that

$$\mu_\Theta^1(W_\tau) \lesssim \tau^{-1} \mu_\Theta^1 \left(\|F\|_{\left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ext}})}^{(\bar{u},1)} \right)} > 0 \right) \\ \times \|F\|_{\left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{u},1)} \right)}, \\ \|\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W_\tau} F \circ \Gamma\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(1,1)}} \leq \tau.$$

By log-convexity of the $\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u,1)}$ sizes in the parameter $u \in [1, \infty]$, we have that

$$\|\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W_\tau} F \circ \Gamma\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ext}})}^{(u,1)}} \leq \|\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W_\tau} F \circ \Gamma\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(1,1)}}^{\frac{1}{u^*}} \|\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W_\tau} F \circ \Gamma\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{u},1)}}^{\frac{u^*-1}{u^*}}. \\ \leq \tau^{\frac{1}{u^*}} \|F\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{u},1)}}^{\frac{u^*-1}{u^*}}$$

Combining the estimate above with the measure bound on W_τ we get that

$$\mu_\Theta^1(W_\tau) \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W_\tau} F \circ \Gamma \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ext}})}^{(u,1)}}^{u^*} \lesssim \mu_\Theta^1 \left(\|F\|_{\left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{u},1)} \right)} > 0 \right) \\ \times \|F\|_{\left(\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)} + \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta_\Gamma, \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}})}^{(\bar{u},1)} \right)}^{u^*}.$$

Since $\tau > 0$ is arbitrary we have shown that (7.11) holds. \square

7.2. Uniform bounds for the singular size. We now prove Proposition 7.2, proceeding roughly in the same manner as in Section 7.1 while proving Proposition 7.1. We begin with a uniform covering argument for the interior part of trees.

Lemma 7.6 (Singular tree covering). *Let $V \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup$, $W \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^\cup$ and let $E = V \cap W$ or $E = V \cup W$. Suppose $F \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$ is a compactly supported function. For all $\lambda > 0$ there exists a set $W_\lambda \subset \mathbb{T}_\Theta^\cup$ and finite collection of trees $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ such that*

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W_\lambda} F(\eta, y, t) \text{td}_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1,1)}} \leq \lambda, \\ W_\lambda \supset \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T, \quad \mu_\Theta^1(W_\lambda) \lesssim \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mu_\Theta^1(T).$$

Each $T \in \mathcal{T}$ is endowed with a distinguished bounded subset $X_T \subset \pi_T(\mathfrak{T}_{\Theta^{\text{in}}})$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\mu_{\Theta}^1(T)} \int_{X_T} |F(\eta, y, t)| td_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t) d\eta dy dt \geq \lambda.$$

and

$$(7.12) \quad \left\| \left(\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_T)}(\eta, y, t) \right) td_t \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(E)}(\eta, y, t) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta^{\text{in}}}^{(1,1)}} \lesssim 1$$

for any Γ as in (3.28). The implicit constants do not depend on the set E nor on Γ .

Proof. Proof of Lemma 7.6 The proof follows along the same lines of the proof of Lemma 7.4. We begin by making a geometric assumption on W . If $W = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T_n$ then let us set $W^{\pm} := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T_n^{\pm}$ where

$$T^{\pm} : \{(\eta \pm h, y, t), (\eta, y, t) \in T, h \geq 0\};$$

notice that $T^+ \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}$ if $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}$ and it holds that $T = T^+ \cap T^-$. Thus, if $E = V \cap W$ it holds that $E = E^+ \cap E^-$ where $E^{\pm} := V \cap W^{\pm}$ and we have that

$$|F(\eta, y, t) td_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)| \leq F(\eta, y, t) |td_t \mathbb{1}_{E^-}(\eta, y, t)| + F(\eta, y, t) |td_t \mathbb{1}_{E^+}(\eta, y, t)|$$

Similarly, if $E = V \cup W$ then $E = E^+ \cup E^-$ and

$$|F(\eta, y, t) td_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)| \leq F(\eta, y, t) |td_t \mathbb{1}_{E^-}(\eta, y, t)| + F(\eta, y, t) |td_t \mathbb{1}_{E^+}(\eta, y, t)|.$$

By the quasi triangle inequality, it is thus sufficient to show the claim for E^+ in place of E . We reason in the case $E^+ = V \cap W^+$ and we write F in place of $F(\eta, y, t) \mathbb{1}_{E^-}(\eta, y, t)$.

Without loss of generality we assume that F is supported on $\mathbb{K} \subset [-S; S]^2 \times [S^{-1}; S]$ for some $S \gg 1$. It follows from Lemma 3.20 that

$\|F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t) td_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1,1)}} < \infty$ so by homogeneity we assume that

$$\|F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t) td_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1,1)}} = 1.$$

The parameters (ξ_T, x_T, s_T) of any tree $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$ for which

$$\|F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t) td_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1,1)}(T)} \geq \lambda$$

are bounded and s_T is bounded away from 0. As a matter of fact

$$\begin{aligned} s_T \|F(\eta, y, t) td_t \mathbb{1}_{E^+}(\eta, y, t)\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1,1)}(T_{\Theta}(\xi_T, x_T, s_T))} \\ \leq 2S \|F(\eta, y, t) td_t \mathbb{1}_{E^+}(\eta, y, t)\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1,1)}(T_{\Theta}(\xi_T, 0, 2S))}. \end{aligned}$$

We want to construct \mathcal{T} by an iterative procedure. We enact the same preparatory steps that we have done in the proof of Lemma 7.4: we introduce $\mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\text{latt}}$, the discrete collection of trees; to any $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$ we associate a collection of trees $\mathcal{W}(T) \subset \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\text{latt}}$ such that $\mu_{\Theta}^1(\bigcup_{T' \in \mathcal{W}(T)} T') \lesssim \mu_{\Theta}^1(T)$ and $\bigcup_{\varnothing \in \{-1, 0, 1\}} T_{(\xi_T + \varnothing s_T^{-1}, x_T, s_T)} \subset \bigcup_{T' \in \mathcal{W}(T)} T'$. We define a finite collection $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda}^{\text{latt}} \subset \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\text{latt}}$ so that the trees in $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda}^{\text{latt}}$ cover \mathbb{K} and so that for any tree $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$ such that

$\|F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t) td_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1,1)}(T)} \geq \lambda$ it holds that $\mathcal{W}(T) \subset \mathcal{K}_{\lambda}^{\text{latt}}$.

Let us now proceed to the selection algorithm. Given a collection of trees $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ we say that $T \in \mathcal{X}$ is *quasi-maximal* if

$$T' \in \mathcal{X} \implies \xi_{T'} \leq \xi_T + \varepsilon_{\max}$$

with $\varepsilon_{\max} \leq 2^{-100}S$. Let us start with the collection $\mathcal{T}_0 = \emptyset$ and let $\mathbb{K}_0 := \mathbb{K}$. Suppose that at step n we have a collection $\mathcal{T}_n = \{T_1, \dots, T_n\} \subset \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ and a subset $\mathbb{K}_n \subset \mathbb{K}$. At step $n+1$ let

$$\mathcal{X}_{n+1} := \left\{ T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta : \|\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{K}_n} F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t) \text{td}_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1,1)}(T)} \geq \lambda \right\};$$

if \mathcal{X}_{n+1} is empty, we terminate the iteration. Otherwise choose a quasi-maximal element T_{n+1} of \mathcal{X}_{n+1} and let $\mathcal{T}_{n+1} = \mathcal{T}_n \cup \{T_{n+1}\}$, $X_{T'} := \mathbb{K}_n \cap \pi_{T_{n+1}}(\mathfrak{T}_{\Theta^{\text{in}}})$ and $\mathbb{K}_{n+1} = \mathbb{K}_n \setminus \bigcup_{T' \in \mathcal{W}(T_{n+1})} T'$. This process terminates after finitely many steps. This procedure yields a collection of trees $\mathcal{T} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{T}_n$ and distinguished subsets $X_{T'} \subset \pi_{T'}(\mathfrak{T}_{\Theta^{\text{in}}})$ for any $T' \in \mathcal{T}$. According to the selection criterion (and Lemma Lemma 3.20) we have that

$$\frac{1}{\mu_\Theta^1(T)} \int_{X_T} |F(\eta, y, t)| \text{td}_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t) d\eta dy dt \geq \lambda.$$

We set $W_\lambda = \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} W(T) \supset \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T$ and we have $\mu_\Theta^1(W_\lambda) \lesssim \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mu_\Theta^1(T)$. Since the procedure terminated it holds that

$$\|\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W_\lambda} F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t) \text{td}_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1,1)}(T)} \leq \lambda.$$

It remains to show that (7.12) holds. It holds that $\Gamma(E^+) = \Gamma(V) \cap \Gamma(W^+)$ with $\Gamma(V) \in \mathbb{D}_1^\cup$ and $\Gamma(W^+) \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^\cup$, so let $\mathfrak{b}(\eta, y)$ be the function whose graph is the boundary of $\Gamma(E^+)$, as described in Lemma 3.20. Denoting $\Theta_\Gamma = (\theta_{\Gamma^-}, \theta_{\Gamma^+})$, according to Lemma 3.20 it holds that

$$(7.13) \quad 0 \leq -d_\eta \left(\frac{1}{\mathfrak{b}(\eta, y)} \right) \leq |\theta_{\Gamma^-}|^{-1};$$

the condition $d_\eta \mathfrak{b}(\eta, y) \geq 0$ comes from the fact that $\eta \mapsto \mathfrak{b}(\eta, y)$ is non-decreasing: if $(\eta, y, t) \in \Gamma(E^+)$ then $(\eta', y, t) \in \Gamma(E^+)$ for any $\eta' \geq \eta$. It follows that for any $\eta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and any $\eta_0 < \eta < \frac{|\theta_{\Gamma^-}|}{\mathfrak{b}(\eta_0, y)}$ one has

$$(7.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathfrak{b}(\eta_0, y) &\leq \mathfrak{b}(\eta, y), \quad \forall \eta \geq \eta_0, \\ \mathfrak{b}(\eta, y) &\leq \frac{|\theta_{\Gamma^-}| \mathfrak{b}(\eta_0, y)}{|\theta_{\Gamma^-}| - \mathfrak{b}(\eta_0, y)(\eta - \eta_0)}, \quad \forall \eta \in \left(\eta_0, \frac{|\theta_{\Gamma^-}|}{\mathfrak{b}(\eta_0, y)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We must bound the expression

$$(7.15) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left\| \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_T)}(\eta, y, t) \text{td}_t \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(E)}(\eta, y, t) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(1,1)}(T)} \\ &= \frac{1}{sT} \int_{B_{sT}(x_T)} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_T)}(\eta, y, \mathfrak{b}(\eta, y)) \right) \mathbb{1}_T(\eta, y, \mathfrak{b}(\eta, y)) \mathfrak{b}(\eta, y) \frac{d\eta}{|\Theta|} \right) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, let us suppose that $T = T_{\Theta_\Gamma}(0, 0, 1)$. Fix $y \in B_1(0)$ and fix $\bar{\theta} > \theta_{\Gamma^-}$ close to θ_{Γ^-} ; in particular let $\bar{\theta} < -|\theta_{\Gamma^-}^{\text{in}}|$.

Let $\bar{\eta}$ be the lower bound of $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\eta \mathbf{b}(\eta, y) > \bar{\theta}$ (or $+\infty$ if no such η exists). The quantity $\eta \mapsto \eta \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)$ is non-decreasing, according to (7.13). Let us start by showing that

$$\int_{\eta > \bar{\eta}} \left(\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_T)}(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) \right) \mathbb{1}_T(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) \mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \frac{d\eta}{|\Theta|} \lesssim 1.$$

This is relevant only if $\bar{\eta} < +\infty$. From (7.14) we can deduce that for $\bar{\eta} < \eta < \frac{\bar{\theta} - \theta_{\Gamma-}}{2\mathbf{b}(\bar{\eta}, y)}$ it holds that

$$\mathbf{b}(\eta, y) < \frac{2|\theta_{\Gamma-}| \mathbf{b}(\bar{\eta}, y)}{\bar{\theta} - \theta_{\Gamma-}}.$$

When the graph $\eta \mapsto \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)$ intersects T we have that $\mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \leq \frac{\theta_{\Gamma+}}{\eta}$. Thus for $\eta > \frac{\bar{\theta} - \theta_{\Gamma-}}{2\mathbf{b}(\bar{\eta}, y)}$ we have

$$\mathbf{b}(\eta, y) < \frac{\theta_{\Gamma+} 2\mathbf{b}(\bar{\eta}, y)}{\bar{\theta} - \theta_{\Gamma-}}.$$

We have shown that for all $\eta > \bar{\eta}$ when the graph $\eta \mapsto \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)$ intersects T it holds that

$$\mathbf{b}(\eta, y) < \frac{(2|\theta_{\Gamma-}| + \theta_{\Gamma+}) 2\mathbf{b}(\bar{\eta}, y)}{|\Theta|}.$$

The graph $\eta \mapsto \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)$ intersects T only if $\eta < \frac{\theta_{\Gamma+}}{\mathbf{b}(\bar{\eta}, y)}$ so

$$\int_{\eta > \bar{\eta}} \left(\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_T)}(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) \right) \mathbb{1}_T(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) \mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \frac{d\eta}{|\Theta|} \leq 2(|\theta_{\Gamma-}| + \theta_{\Gamma+}).$$

It thus remains to bound the inner integrand of (7.15) restricted to when $\eta < \bar{\eta}$ and in particular when $\theta_{\Gamma-} < \eta \mathbf{b}(\eta, y) < \bar{\theta}$. Let $A = \{(\eta, y, t) : \theta_{\Gamma-} < \eta \mathbf{b}(\eta, y) < \bar{\theta}\}$. Let $T_0 \in \mathcal{T}$ be the tree selected earliest by the algorithm among those for which the graph $\eta \mapsto \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)$ intersects $\Gamma(X_{T_0}) \cap T \cap A$. We need to show the bound

$$\int_{\eta = -\infty}^{\bar{\eta}} \left(\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{>0}} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_T)}(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) \right) \mathbb{1}_{T \cap A}(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) \mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \frac{d\eta}{|\Theta|} \lesssim 1$$

where $\mathcal{T}_{>0}$ is the sub collection of those trees in \mathcal{T} selected after T_{n_0} . Let η_0 be the lower bound of η for which the graph $\eta \mapsto \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)$ intersects $\Gamma(X_{T_{n_0}}) \cap T$. It holds that

$$\alpha \xi_{T_{n_0}} < \eta_0 + |\theta_{\Gamma-}^{\text{in}}| \mathbf{b}(\eta_0, y)^{-1} < 0$$

because $\eta_0 \mathbf{b}(\eta_0, y) < \bar{\theta} < -|\theta_{\Gamma-}^{\text{in}}|$. It follows that $\{(\eta, y, t) \in T : \eta \leq \eta_0, t < \mathbf{b}(\eta_0, t)\} \subset \Gamma(T_{n_0})$ and thus the graph $\eta \mapsto \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)$ over $\eta \in (-\infty, \eta_0]$ cannot intersect $\Gamma(X_{T_{>}}) \cap T \cap A$ for any $T_{>} \in \mathcal{T}$ selected after T_{n_0} . We are down to bounding

$$\int_{\eta = \eta_0}^{\bar{\eta}} \left(\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{>0}} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_T)}(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) \right) \mathbb{1}_{T \cap A}(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) \mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \frac{d\eta}{|\Theta|}$$

Any tree $T_{>} \in \mathcal{T}_{>0}$ satisfies

$$\alpha \xi_{T_{>}} < \alpha \xi_{T_{n_0}} + \alpha \varepsilon_{\max} < \eta_0 + |\theta_{\Gamma-}^{\text{in}}| \mathbf{b}(\eta_0, y)^{-1} + \alpha \varepsilon_{\max} < \eta_0 + 2|\theta_{\Gamma-}^{\text{in}}| \mathbf{b}(\eta_0, y)^{-1}$$

by the selection condition, given that $\varepsilon_{\max} < \frac{|\theta_{\Gamma-}^{\text{in}}|}{S}$. The graph $\eta \mapsto \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)$ intersects $\Gamma(X_{T_{>}}) \cap T \subset \Gamma(\pi_{T_{>}}(\mathfrak{X}_{\Theta^{\text{in}}})) \cap T$ only if

$$\mathbf{b}(\eta, y) < \frac{|\theta_{\Gamma+}^{\text{in}}|}{\eta - \alpha\xi_{T_{>}}}.$$

This shows that if $\eta > \alpha\xi_{T_{>}} + \varepsilon' \mathbf{b}(\eta_0, y)^{-1}$ for some $\varepsilon' > 0$ then

$$\mathbf{b}(\eta, y) < \frac{|\theta_{\Gamma+}^{\text{in}}| \mathbf{b}(\eta_0, y)}{\varepsilon'}.$$

We have already established that

$$\mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \leq \frac{|\theta_{\Gamma-}| \mathbf{b}(\eta_0, y)}{|\theta_{\Gamma-}| - \mathbf{b}(\eta_0, y)(\eta - \eta_0)}$$

so if $\eta < \alpha\xi_{T'} + \varepsilon' \mathbf{b}(\eta_0, y)^{-1}$ then $0 < \eta - \eta_0 < (2|\theta_{\Gamma-}^{\text{in}}| + \varepsilon') \mathbf{b}(\eta_0, y)^{-1}$ so

$$\mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \leq \frac{|\theta_{\Gamma-}| \mathbf{b}(\eta_0, y)}{|\theta_{\Gamma-}| - (2|\theta_{\Gamma-}^{\text{in}}| + \varepsilon')}.$$

Choosing $\varepsilon' = 1/4$ we get that

$$\mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \leq (|\theta_{\Gamma-}| + 4|\theta_{\Gamma+}^{\text{in}}|) \mathbf{b}(\eta_0, y)$$

when the graph $\eta \mapsto \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)$ intersects $\Gamma(X_{T_{>}}) \cap T$. Since $\eta \mapsto \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)$ is non-decreasing it holds that the graph $\eta \mapsto \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)$ intersects T only if $\eta \mathbf{b}(\eta_0, y) < \theta_{\Gamma+}$ so we have shown that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\eta=\eta_0}^{\bar{\eta}} \left(\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{>0}} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_T)}(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) \right) \mathbb{1}_{T \cap A}(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) \mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \frac{d\eta}{|\Theta|} \\ & \leq \int_{\eta=\theta_{\Gamma-}/\mathbf{b}(\eta_0, y)}^{\theta_{\Gamma+}/\mathbf{b}(\eta_0, y)} (|\theta_{\Gamma-}| + 4|\theta_{\Gamma+}^{\text{in}}|) \mathbf{b}(\eta_0, y) \frac{d\eta}{|\Theta|} \lesssim |\theta_{\Gamma-}| + 4|\theta_{\Gamma+}^{\text{in}}|. \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows. \square

The covering lemma above allows us to obtain the following uniform weak L^1 bound.

Lemma 7.7. *Let $V \in \mathbb{D}_{\beta}^{\cup}$, $W \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}$ and $E = V \cap W$ or $E = V \cup W$. The bound*

$$(7.16) \quad \|F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t) t d_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{L^1_{\mu_{\Theta}^1} \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1,1)}} \lesssim \|F(\eta, y, t)\|_{L^1_{\mu_{\Theta}^1} \mathbb{L}_{\Theta_{\Gamma}}^{(\infty, \infty)}},$$

holds for any function $F \in L^{\infty}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$. The implicit constant is independent of the set E .

Proof. We need to show that for every $\lambda > 0$ there exists a set $W_{\lambda} = \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}} T$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W_{\lambda}} F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t) t d_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1,1)}} \leq \lambda, \\ & \mu_{\Theta}^1(W_{\lambda}) \lesssim \lambda^{-1} \|F\|_{L^1_{\mu_{\Theta}^1} \mathbb{L}_{\Theta_{\Gamma}}^{(\infty, \infty)}}. \end{aligned}$$

We may assume that F is supported on a compact set by the discussion at the end of Section 3.2.2. Fix $\lambda > 0$ and let $W_{\lambda} := \bigcup_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_{\lambda} \subset \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}} T'$ where $\mathcal{T}_{\lambda} \subset \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}$ is obtained by applying Lemma 7.6 to $F \circ \Gamma$ in place of F . It remains to prove the required bounds on $\mu_{\Theta}^1(W_{\lambda})$. Let $(\eta, y) \mapsto \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)$ be the function whose graph is

the boundary of E , as described in Lemma 3.20. For each tree $T' \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda$, Lemma 7.6 gives the bound

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{1}_{X_{T'}}(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) |F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y))| \mathbf{b}(\eta, y) d\eta dy \geq \lambda \mu_\Theta^1(T).$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \mu_\Theta^1(W_\lambda) &\lesssim \lambda \sum_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \mu_\Theta^1(T') \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\sum_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{X_{T'}}(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) \right) |F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y))| \mathbf{b}(\eta, y) d\eta dy \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\sum_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_{T'})}(\alpha(\eta + \gamma \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)^{-1}), y, \beta \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) \right) \\ &\quad \times |F(\alpha(\eta + \gamma \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)^{-1}), y, \beta \mathbf{b}(\eta, y))| \mathbf{b}(\eta, y) d\eta dy. \end{aligned}$$

Let us enact the Lipschitz change of variables $\eta'(\eta, y) = \alpha(\eta + \gamma \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)^{-1})$. We have the following bound on the Jacobian:

$$\frac{d\eta'(\eta, y)}{d\eta} = \alpha \left(1 - \gamma \frac{\partial_\eta \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)}{\mathbf{b}(\eta, y)^2} \right) \gtrsim \alpha;$$

this holds since $|\gamma| < 1$ and $|\theta_+|, |\theta_-| \geq 2$ and thus, according to (3.40), it holds that $\left| \gamma \frac{\partial_\eta \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)}{\mathbf{b}(\eta, y)^2} \right| < \frac{1}{2}$. Let $(\eta', y) \mapsto \mathbf{b}_\Gamma(\eta', y)$ be the function whose graph is the boundary of $\Gamma(E)$. Lemma 3.20 applies since $\Gamma(E) = \Gamma(V) \cap \Gamma(W)$ (or, respectively, $\Gamma(E) = \Gamma(V) \cup \Gamma(W)$) and it holds that $\Gamma(V) \in \mathbb{D}_1^\cup$ and $\Gamma(W) \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^\cup$. It follows that

$$\beta \mathbf{b}(\eta, y) = \mathbf{b}_\Gamma(\eta', y)$$

since the boundary of E is the set $\{(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)), (\eta, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2\}$ while the image under Γ of this set is

$$\begin{aligned} &\Gamma(\{(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)), (\eta, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2\}) \\ &= \{((\eta + \gamma \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)^{-1}), y, \beta \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) : (\eta, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2\} \\ &= \{(\eta', y, \mathbf{b}_\Gamma(\eta', y)) : (\eta', y) \in \mathbb{R}^2\}. \end{aligned}$$

We get that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \mu_\Theta^1(W_\lambda) &\lesssim \frac{1}{\alpha \beta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\sum_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_{T'})}(\eta', y, \mathbf{b}_\Gamma(\eta', y)) \right) \\ &\quad \times |F(\eta', y, \mathbf{b}_\Gamma(\eta', y))| \mathbf{b}_\Gamma(\eta', y) d\eta' dy \end{aligned}$$

It remains to bound the RHS of this inequality from above. By Proposition 3.5 and by the Hölder inequality (Corollary 3.4) we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\sum_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_{T'})}(\eta', y, \mathbf{b}_\Gamma(\eta', y)) \right) |F(\eta', y, \mathbf{b}_\Gamma(\eta', y))| \mathbf{b}_\Gamma(\eta', y) d\eta' dy \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\sum_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_{T'})}(\eta', y, t') \right) |F(\eta', y, t')| t' \delta(t' - \mathbf{b}_\Gamma(\eta', y)) d\eta' dy \\
&\leq \left\| \left(\sum_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_{T'})}(\eta', y, t') \right) F(\eta', y, t') t' \delta(t' - \mathbf{b}_\Gamma(\eta', y)) \right\|_{L^1_{\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^1} \mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(1,1)}} \\
&\leq \|F(\eta', y, t')\|_{L^1_{\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^1} \mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)}} \left\| \left(\sum_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_{T'})}(\eta', y, t') \right) t' \delta(t' - \mathbf{b}_\Gamma(\eta', y)) \right\|_{L^\infty_{\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^1} \mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(1,1)}}
\end{aligned}$$

Using bound (7.12) provided by Lemma 7.6 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \left(\sum_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_{T'})}(\eta', y, t') \right) t' \delta(t' - \mathbf{b}_\Gamma(\eta', y)) \right\|_{L^\infty_{\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^1} \mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(1,1)}} \\
&= \left\| \left(\sum_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(X_{T'})}(\eta', y, t') \right) t' d_t \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma(E)}(\eta', y, t') \right\|_{L^\infty_{\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^1} \mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(1,1)}} \lesssim 1
\end{aligned}$$

that concludes the proof. \square

We are now ready to deduce Proposition 7.2 from Lemma 7.7. The procedure is analogous to the deduction of Proposition 7.1 from Lemma 7.5: first we reduce to a scalar inequality and then we conclude using restricted weak type interpolation with one endpoint provided by Lemma 7.7. The L^∞ endpoint of this argument is more involved than in the proof of Proposition 7.1. The reader is encouraged to refer to the proof of Proposition 7.1 for the explanation of the common steps with the proof below, that here are presented succinctly.

Proof. Proof of Proposition 7.2 Bound (7.2) follows from the scalar bound

$$(7.17) \quad \|F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t) t d_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{L^r_{\mu_{\Theta}^1} \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u, 1)}} \lesssim \|F(\eta, y, t)\|_{L^r_{\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^1} \mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)}}$$

for all $F \in L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$, as has been discussed in Corollary 3.14 and at the beginning of the proof of Proposition 7.1. Next, we deduce the bound (7.17) from the bound (7.16). It is sufficient to prove (7.17) with $u = 1$ since $F \in L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$ is arbitrary,

$$\|F(\eta, y, t)\|_{L^r_{\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^1} \mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)}} = \| |F(\eta, y, t)|^u \|_{L^{r/u}_{\mu_{\Theta_\Gamma}^1} \mathbb{L}_{\Theta_\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)}}^{1/u},$$

and by (3.41) it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t) t d_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{L^r_{\mu_{\Theta}^1} \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u, 1)}} \\
& \lesssim \| |F|^u \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t) t d_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{L^{r/u}_{\mu_{\Theta}^1} \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1, 1)}}^{1/u}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, supposing $u = 1$, we prove the bound by interpolation (Proposition 3.3). The weak L^1 endpoint is given by Lemma 7.7. The $r = \infty$ endpoint for (7.10), given by

$$\|F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t) t d_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^1}^\infty \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1,1)}} \leq \|F(\eta, y, t)\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta\Gamma}^1}^r \mathbb{L}_{\Theta\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)}}.$$

This bound holds because

$$\begin{aligned} & \|F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t) t d_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^1}^\infty \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1,1)}} \\ & \leq \|F \circ \Gamma(\eta, y, t)\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^1}^\infty \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(\infty, \infty)}} \|t d_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^1}^\infty \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1,1)}} \\ & \leq \|F\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta\Gamma}^1}^\infty \mathbb{L}_{\Theta\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)}} \|t d_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta}^1}^\infty \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1,1)}} \leq \|F\|_{L_{\mu_{\Theta\Gamma}^1}^\infty \mathbb{L}_{\Theta\Gamma}^{(\infty, \infty)}}. \end{aligned}$$

The last bound requires us to show that

$$\|t d_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1,1)}}(T) \lesssim 1 \quad \forall T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta,$$

that we will now show and, allowing us to conclude the proof. Let $(\eta, y) \mapsto \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)$ is the function whose graph is the boundary of E , as described by Lemma 3.20. The same lemma gives that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|t d_t \mathbb{1}_E(\eta, y, t)\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(1,1)}}(T) \\ & = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathbb{1}_{\pi_T(\mathfrak{X}_{\Theta^{\text{in}}})}(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) \mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \frac{dy d\eta}{s_T |\Theta|}. \end{aligned}$$

By symmetry, assume $T = T_\Theta(0, 0, 1)$. Let us denote $\Theta = (\theta_-, \theta_+)$ and $\Theta^{\text{in}} = (\theta_-^{\text{in}}, \theta_+^{\text{in}})$. Integrating bounds (3.40), for $\eta > 0$ it holds that

$$\frac{|\theta_+ \mathbf{b}(0, y)|}{|\theta_+| + \eta \mathbf{b}(0, y)} \leq \mathbf{b}(\eta, y),$$

and if also $\eta < |\theta_-| \mathbf{b}(0, y)^{-1}$ then

$$\mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \leq \frac{|\theta_-| \mathbf{b}(0, y)}{|\theta_-| - \eta \mathbf{b}(0, y)}.$$

When $\eta < 0$ it holds that

$$\frac{|\theta_-| \mathbf{b}(0, y)}{|\theta_-| - \eta \mathbf{b}(0, y)} \leq \mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \leq \frac{|\theta_+| \mathbf{b}(0, y)}{|\theta_+| + \eta \mathbf{b}(0, y)}$$

and if also $\eta > -|\theta_+| \mathbf{b}(0, y)^{-1}$ then

$$\mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \leq \frac{|\theta_+| \mathbf{b}(0, y)}{|\theta_+| + \eta \mathbf{b}(0, y)}.$$

Since $(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) \in \pi_T(\mathfrak{X}_{\Theta^{\text{in}}})$ only if $|\eta \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)| < \theta_*^{\text{in}} := \max(|\theta_+^{\text{in}}|, |\theta_-^{\text{in}}|)$.

Let us show that if the graph of \mathbf{b} intersects $\pi_T(\mathfrak{X}_{\Theta^{\text{in}}})$ then $\mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \lesssim \mathbf{b}(0, y)$. Supposing that $\eta > 0$, if \mathbf{b} intersects $\pi_T(\mathfrak{X}_{\Theta^{\text{in}}})$ then

$$\mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \leq \frac{|\theta_-| \mathbf{b}(0, y)}{|\theta_-| - \eta \mathbf{b}(0, y)} \mathbb{1}_{\eta < \frac{|\theta_-|}{2\mathbf{b}(0, y)}} + \frac{\theta_*^{\text{in}}}{\eta} \mathbb{1}_{\eta > \frac{|\theta_-|}{2\mathbf{b}(0, y)}} \leq 2 \left(1 + \frac{\theta_+^{\text{in}}}{|\theta_-|} \right) \mathbf{b}(0, y)$$

On the other hand if $\eta < 0$ then

$$\mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \leq \frac{|\theta_+| \mathbf{b}(0, y)}{|\theta_+| + \eta \mathbf{b}(0, y)} \mathbb{1}_{\eta > -\frac{|\theta_+|}{2\mathbf{b}(0, y)}} + \frac{\theta_*^{\text{in}}}{|\eta|} \mathbb{1}_{\eta < -\frac{|\theta_+|}{2\mathbf{b}(0, y)}} \leq 2 \left(1 + \frac{|\theta_-^{\text{in}}|}{|\theta_+|} \right) \mathbf{b}(0, y).$$

Let us show that if the graph of \mathbf{b} intersects $\pi_T(\mathfrak{T}_{\Theta^{\text{in}}})$ then $|\eta| \lesssim \mathbf{b}(0, y)^{-1}$. Given the bounds on \mathbf{b} , the graph of \mathbf{b} intersects $\pi_T(\mathfrak{T}_{\Theta^{\text{in}}})$ only if

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\theta_+| \mathbf{b}(0, y)}{|\theta_+| + \eta \mathbf{b}(0, y)} &< \frac{\theta_*^{\text{in}}}{\eta} \text{ when } \eta > 0, \\ \frac{|\theta_-| \mathbf{b}(0, y)}{|\theta_-| + |\eta| \mathbf{b}(0, y)} &< \frac{\theta_*^{\text{in}}}{|\eta|} \text{ when } \eta < 0, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{b}(0, y)(|\theta_+| - \theta_*^{\text{in}})|\eta| &< |\theta_+| \theta_*^{\text{in}} \text{ when } \eta > 0, \\ \mathbf{b}(0, y)(|\theta_-| - \theta_*^{\text{in}})|\eta| &< |\theta_+| \theta_*^{\text{in}} \text{ when } \eta < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\theta_*^{\text{in}} < 1 < \max(|\theta_+|, |\theta_-|)$ it follows that $|\eta| \lesssim \mathbf{b}(0, y)^{-1}$. Together with the bound $\mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \lesssim \mathbf{b}(0, y)$ it shows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathbb{1}_{\pi_T(\mathfrak{T}_{\Theta^{\text{in}}})}(\eta, y, \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) \mathbf{b}(\eta, y) \frac{dy d\eta}{s_T |\Theta|} \lesssim 1$$

as required. \square

7.3. Uniform bounds for the $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$ size. In this section we prove Lemma 7.3. The size $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma}^u \Phi_{\tau}^N$, as defined in (1.19), consists of three parts; the three lemmata 7.8, 7.9, and 7.10 below address these parts: the sizes $\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \square_{\tau}^N$, $\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,2)} \mathfrak{d}_{\tau}^N$, and $\beta^{\frac{1}{u}} \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u,\infty)} \Phi_{\tau}^N$ respectively. Lemma 7.8, up next, amounts to showing that the defect of $\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-} \text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma$ is essentially concentrated on the boundary of the region $(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus V^-$ and thus can be controlled by the quantity on LHS(7.2), introduced in Proposition 7.2.

Lemma 7.8 (Defect size domination). *Let $V^+, V^- \in \mathbb{D}_{\beta}^{\cup}$ and $W^+, W^- \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}$. The bounds*

$$\begin{aligned} (7.18) \quad & \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \square_{\tau}^N} \\ & \lesssim \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\overline{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)}} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma)(\eta, y, t) t d_t \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+)}(\eta, y, t) \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \Phi_{16\tau}^{N-8}} \\ & \quad + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\overline{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)}} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma)(\eta, y, t) t d_t \mathbb{1}_{(\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-)}(\eta, y, t) \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \Phi_{16\tau}^{N-8}} \\ & \quad + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u,2)} \Phi_{16\tau}^{N-8}} \end{aligned}$$

hold for any $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ and for all $u \in [1, +\infty]$. The implicit constant is independent of the sets $V^+, V^-, W^+,$ and W^- .

Proof. To show (7.18) it is sufficient to prove that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \square_{\zeta, \tau}^N(T)} \\
 & \quad + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \square_{\sigma, \tau}^N(T)} \\
 & \lesssim \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\overline{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)}} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) (\eta, y, t) t d_t \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+)} (\eta, y, t) \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \Phi_{16\tau}^{N-8}} \\
 & \quad + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\overline{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)}} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) (\eta, y, t) t d_t \mathbb{1}_{(\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-)} (\eta, y, t) \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \Phi_{16\tau}^{N-8}} \\
 & \quad + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\overline{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)}} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u,2)} \Phi_{16\tau}^{N-8}}
 \end{aligned}$$

holds for any $T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta$. Let us fix $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. By symmetry, according to (3.26) and the subsequent discussion, we can assume that $T = T_\Theta(0, 0, 1)$ so that $\Gamma \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) = (\alpha\beta(\theta + \gamma)(\beta\sigma)^{-1}, \zeta, \beta\sigma) = (\theta_\Gamma(\beta\sigma)^{-1}, \zeta, \beta\sigma)$. For conciseness we set $F_\Gamma = \text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma$. By (3.27) it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\Gamma^* \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(t\eta) - \beta t d_y) F_\Gamma(\eta, y, t) &= 0, \\
 (\Gamma^* \mathfrak{d}_\sigma(t\eta) - t d_t + \eta d_\eta) F_\Gamma(\eta, y, t) &= 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

According to definitions (3.30) (see also the discussion below (3.27)) it holds that (7.19)

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|F_\Gamma(\eta, y, t)\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \square_{\zeta, \tau}^N(T)} \\
 & \leq \left\| (\beta t d_y \mathbb{1}_{(W^+ \cap V^+)}(\eta, y, t)) \left(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus (W^- \cup V^-)} F_\Gamma \right) (\eta, y, t) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \Phi_\tau^N(T)} \\
 & \quad + \left\| (\beta t d_y \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-}(\eta, y, t)) \left(\mathbb{1}_{\overline{(W^+ \cap V^+) \setminus (W^- \cup V^-)}} F_\Gamma \right) (\eta, y, t) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \Phi_\tau^N(T)} \\
 & \quad + \left\| (\beta t d_y \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W^-}(\eta, y, t)) \left(\mathbb{1}_{\overline{(W^+ \cap V^+) \setminus (W^- \cup V^-)}} F_\Gamma \right) (\eta, y, t) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \Phi_\tau^N(T)},
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (7.20) \\
 & \|F_\Gamma(\eta, y, t)\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,v)} \square_{\sigma, \tau}^N(T)} \\
 & \leq \left\| ((t d_t - \eta d_\eta) \mathbb{1}_{(W^+ \cap V^+)}(\eta, y, t)) \left(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus (W^- \cup V^-)} F_\Gamma \right) (\eta, y, t) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \Phi_\tau^N(T)} \\
 & \quad + \left\| ((t d_t - \eta d_\eta) \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-}(\eta, y, t)) \left(\mathbb{1}_{\overline{(W^+ \cap V^+) \setminus (W^- \cup V^-)}} F_\Gamma \right) (\eta, y, t) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \Phi_\tau^N(T)} \\
 & \quad + \left\| ((t d_t - \eta d_\eta) \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W^-}(\eta, y, t)) \left(\mathbb{1}_{\overline{(W^+ \cap V^+) \setminus (W^- \cup V^-)}} F_\Gamma \right) (\eta, y, t) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u,1)} \Phi_\tau^N(T)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Let \mathfrak{b}_+ , \mathfrak{b}_- and \mathfrak{b}_{W^-} be the functions whose graphs are the boundaries of $V^+ \cap W^+$, V^- , and W^- respectively, given by Lemma 3.20. According to (3.40) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\beta t d_y \mathbb{1}_{V^+ \cap W^+}(\eta, y, t)| &\lesssim t\delta(t - \mathfrak{b}_+(\eta, y)), \\
 |\beta t d_y \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-}(\eta, y, t)| &\lesssim t\delta(t - \mathfrak{b}_-(\eta, y)), \\
 |\beta t d_y \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W^-}(\eta, y, t)| &\lesssim t\delta(t - \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}(\eta, y)).
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, when $(\eta, y, t) \in \pi_T(\mathfrak{T}_\Theta)$, or in general when ηt is bounded it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} |(td_t - \eta d_\eta) \mathbb{1}_{V^+ \cap W^+}(\eta, y, t)| &\lesssim t\delta(t - \mathbf{b}_+(\eta, y)), \\ |(td_t - \eta d_\eta) \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-}(\eta, y, t)| &\lesssim t\delta(t - \mathbf{b}_-(\eta, y)), \\ |(td_t - \eta d_\eta) \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W^-}(\eta, y, t)| &\lesssim t\delta(t - \mathbf{b}_{W^-}(\eta, y)). \end{aligned}$$

As a matter of fact, if \mathbf{b} is any of the functions \mathbf{b}_+ , \mathbf{b}_- , \mathbf{b}_{W^-} then

$$\eta d_\eta \mathbb{1}_{t > \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)} = -\delta(t - \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) \eta d_\eta \mathbf{b}(\eta, y) = -t\delta(t - \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)) \eta t \frac{d_\eta \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)}{\mathbf{b}(\eta, y)^2}$$

and, according to (3.40), $\left| \eta t \frac{d_\eta \mathbf{b}(\eta, y)}{\mathbf{b}(\eta, y)^2} \right| \lesssim 1$. Thus the first two summands in RHS(7.19) and in RHS(7.20) are bounded by the first two summands in RHS(7.18). It remains to show that the last summand of RHS(7.19) and the last summand of RHS(7.20) are each bounded by RHS(7.18). According to the discussion above, this follows by showing the bound

$$\left\| \left(\mathbb{1}_{\overline{(W^+ \cap V^+) \setminus (W^- \cup V^-)}} F_\Gamma \right) (\eta, y, t) \delta(t - \mathbf{b}_{W^-}(\eta, y)) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u, 1)} \Phi_\Gamma^N(T)} \lesssim \text{RHS}(7.18).$$

Let \mathbf{b}_+^* , \mathbf{b}_-^* and $\mathbf{b}_{W^-}^*$ be the functions \mathbf{b}_+ , \mathbf{b}_- and \mathbf{b}_{W^-} expressed in local coordinates of π_T i.e. such that (3.42) holds for $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}_+$, $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}_-$ or $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}_{W^-}$, respectively. By (3.44) we need to show that

$$\int_{\Theta^{\text{in}} \times B_1} |\mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta, \zeta, \mathbf{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)) [\varphi]|^u \frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|} \lesssim \text{RHS}(7.18)^u \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_\Gamma^N}$$

where we use the shorthand $F^* = \mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{T}_{\Theta^{\text{in}}}}(\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma \circ \pi_T)$ and

$E^* = \{(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) : \mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta) < \sigma < \mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta, \zeta)\}$. First we record that locally in θ and σ the function F^* is almost constant. As a matter of fact, it follows from the definitions (1.7) and (3.28) of Emb and Γ that

$$F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) [\varphi] = \mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{T}_{\Theta^{\text{in}}}}(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) f * \text{Dil}_\sigma \text{Mod}_{\theta_\Gamma} \varphi^\vee(\zeta)$$

where $\varphi^\vee(z) = \varphi(-z)$. Thus, if we define $\varphi_{(\theta', \sigma', \theta, \sigma)}$ by setting

$$(7.21) \quad \text{Dil}_{\sigma'} \text{Mod}_{\theta'_\Gamma} \varphi_{(\theta', \sigma', \theta, \sigma)}^\vee := \text{Dil}_\sigma \text{Mod}_{\theta_\Gamma} \varphi^\vee.$$

it holds that $F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) [\varphi] = F^*(\theta', \zeta', \sigma') [\varphi_{(\theta', \sigma', \theta, \sigma)}]$ as long as $(\theta', \zeta', \sigma') \in \mathfrak{T}_{\Theta^{\text{in}}}$. Furthermore, any $\bar{r} > 0$ small enough independently of Γ , if $|\theta' - \theta| < \bar{r}$ and $|\sigma'/\sigma - 1| < \bar{r}$ one has that $\|\varphi_{(\theta', \sigma', \theta, \sigma)}\|_{\Phi_{2l+1_\Gamma}^N} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{2l_\Gamma}^N}$ for any $l \in \{0, \dots, 10\}$, any $N < N_0$ for some fixed arbitrary large $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\varphi \in \Phi_{2l_\Gamma}^N$. Let us fix such a small $\bar{r} > 0$ so that the facts above hold.

Next we want to show that close to any point $(\theta, \zeta, \mathbf{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)) \in \mathfrak{T}_{\Theta^{\text{in}}} \cap E^*$ there exists a small neighborhood in $\pi_T^{-1}(T \setminus W^-)$ such that the contribution of $|\mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta, \zeta, \mathbf{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)) [\varphi]|^u$ to the integral we are bounding is controlled by F^* on that neighborhood. We will then, in turn, bound F^* on that neighborhood by

RHS(7.18). For small enough $r_\theta, r_\zeta, r_\sigma > 0$ let

$$\begin{aligned} R(\theta, \zeta) &:= \{(\theta', \zeta') \in \Theta_{\mathbb{F}}^{\text{in}} \times B_1 : |\theta' - \theta| < r_\theta, |\zeta' - \zeta| < r_\zeta \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)\} \\ R^0(\theta, \zeta) &:= \left\{ (\theta', \zeta', \sigma') : (\theta', \zeta') \in R(\theta, \zeta), \frac{\sigma'}{\mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)} \in [1 - 10r_\sigma, 1 + 10r_\sigma] \right\}, \\ R^+(\theta, \zeta) &:= \left\{ (\theta', \zeta', \sigma') : (\theta', \zeta') \in R(\theta, \zeta), \frac{\sigma'}{\mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)} \in (1 + 2r_\sigma, 1 + 8r_\sigma) \right\}, \\ R^{++}(\theta, \zeta) &:= \left\{ (\theta', \zeta', \sigma') : (\theta', \zeta') \in R(\theta, \zeta), \frac{\sigma'}{\mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)} \in (1 + 4r_\sigma, 1 + 6r_\sigma) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly $R^{++}(\theta, \zeta) \subset R^+(\theta, \zeta) \subset R^0(\theta, \zeta) \subset R(\theta, \zeta) \times \mathbb{R}_+$. From the bounds (3.43) and in particular from the fact that $W^- \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^\cup$ so $|\partial_\zeta \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)| \leq 1$ we can see that $r_\theta, r_\zeta, r_\sigma$ can be chosen small enough so that

$$\begin{aligned} (\theta', \zeta', \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta', \zeta')) &\subset R^0(\theta, \zeta) \quad \forall (\theta', \zeta') \in R(\theta, \zeta), \\ (\theta', \zeta', \sigma'), (\theta'', \zeta', \sigma'') &\in R^0(\theta, \zeta) \implies |\theta' - \theta| < \bar{r}, |\sigma'/\sigma - 1| < \bar{r}, \\ R^{++}(\theta, \zeta) &\subset R^+(\theta, \zeta) \subset \pi_T^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W^-). \end{aligned}$$

As a matter of fact for fixed $r_\theta > 0$ and $r_\zeta > 0$ it holds that for any $(\theta', \zeta') \in R(\theta, \zeta)$ one has

$$\mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)(e^{-Cr_\theta} - r_\zeta) < \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta', \zeta') < \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)(e^{Cr_\theta} + r_\zeta)$$

where $C = \frac{1}{\text{dist}(\Theta^{\text{in}}, \mathbb{R} \setminus \Theta) - r_\theta} \lesssim 1$. Thus, choosing $10r_t < |(e^{Cr_\theta} + r_\zeta) - 1| + |(e^{-Cr_\theta} - r_\zeta) - 1|$ provides us with the first claim. The other claims can be satisfied analogously. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (7.22) \quad &\int_{R(\theta, \zeta)} |\mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta', \zeta', \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta', \zeta')) [\varphi]|^u d\zeta' d\theta' \\ &\lesssim \int_{R^+(\theta, \zeta)} \left| \mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta', \zeta', \sigma') \left[\varphi_{(\theta'', \sigma', \theta', \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta', \zeta'))} \right] \right|^u \\ &\quad \times (\mathbb{1}_{L(\theta, \zeta)}(\zeta') + \sigma' \delta(\sigma' - \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta'', \zeta')) + \sigma' \delta(\sigma' - \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta'))) d\zeta' d\theta' \frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$L(\theta, \zeta) = \bigcap_{\theta'} \{ \zeta' \in B_1 : (\theta', \zeta') \times \{ \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta'), \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta') \} \cap R^{++}(\theta, \zeta) = \emptyset \}$$

with the intersection taken over all θ' with $(\theta', \zeta') \in R(\theta, \zeta)$. The bound follows because for every fixed ζ' either $\mathbb{1}_{L(\theta, \zeta)}(\zeta') \neq 0$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{1}_{R(\theta, \zeta)}(\theta', \zeta') |\mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta', \zeta', \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta', \zeta')) [\varphi]|^u \\ &\lesssim \left| \mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta', \zeta', \sigma') \left[\varphi_{(\theta'', \sigma', \theta', \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta', \zeta'))} \right] \right|^u \end{aligned}$$

for every θ' with $(\theta', \zeta') \in R(\theta, \zeta)$. Otherwise, if $\mathbb{1}_{L(\theta, \zeta)}(\zeta') = 0$ then there exist $\bar{\theta}$ with $(\bar{\theta}, \zeta') \in R(\theta, \zeta)$ such that either $(\bar{\theta}, \zeta', \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\bar{\theta}, \zeta')) \in R^{++}(\theta, \zeta) \neq \emptyset$ or $(\bar{\theta}, \zeta', \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\bar{\theta}, \zeta')) \in R^{++}(\theta, \zeta) \neq \emptyset$. In the former case, there exists an absolute $\bar{r} > 0$ depending on $r_\theta, r_\zeta, r_\sigma > 0$ such that $(\theta'', \zeta', \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta')) \in R^+(\theta, \zeta)$ for all $|\theta'' - \theta| < \bar{r}$. Similarly, $(\theta'', \zeta', \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta')) \in R^+(\theta, \zeta)$ in the case $(\bar{\theta}, \zeta', \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\bar{\theta}, \zeta')) \in R^{++}(\theta, \zeta) \neq \emptyset$. The claim then follows by integrating over ζ' and θ'' .

Our argument then proceeds as follows. We need to show that

$$(7.23) \quad \text{RHS}(7.22) \lesssim \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta) \text{RHS}(7.18)^u \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_t^N}$$

Then we will show the following fact:

$$(7.24) \quad \int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}} \times B_1} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)} \mathbb{1}_{R(\theta, \zeta)}(\theta', \zeta') d\theta d\zeta \gtrsim \mathbb{1}_{\Theta^{\text{in}} \times B_1}(\theta', \zeta').$$

From these two bounds we can conclude the proof: using (7.24) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}} \times B_1} |\mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta', \zeta', \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta', \zeta')) [\varphi]|^u d\theta' d\zeta' \\ & \lesssim \int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}} \times B_1} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)} \left(\int_{R(\theta, \zeta)} |\mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta', \zeta', \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta', \zeta')) [\varphi]|^u d\theta' d\zeta' \right) d\theta d\zeta; \end{aligned}$$

using (7.23) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}} \times B_1} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)} \left(\int_{R(\theta, \zeta)} |\mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta', \zeta', \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta', \zeta')) [\varphi]|^u d\theta' d\zeta' \right) d\theta d\zeta \\ & \lesssim \int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}} \times B_1} \text{RHS}(7.18)^u \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_t^N} d\theta d\zeta, \end{aligned}$$

and this concludes the claim. Let us show that (7.24) holds. For any fixed $(\theta', \zeta') \in \Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}} \times B_1$ and any $(\theta'', \zeta'') \in R(\theta', \zeta')$ it holds that $\mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta'', \zeta'') > \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)(1 - 10r_t)$. It follows that if $|\theta'' - \theta'| < r_\theta$ and $|\zeta'' - \zeta'| < r_\zeta(1 - 10r_t)\mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta', \zeta')$ then $(\theta', \zeta') \in R(\theta'', \zeta'')$. It follows that

$$\int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}} \times B_1} \mathbb{1}_{R(\theta'', \zeta'')}(\theta', \zeta') d\theta'' d\zeta'' \gtrsim \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta', \zeta')$$

with an absolute constant depending on $r_\theta, r_\zeta, r_\sigma$ and r'' , as required.

It remains to show that (7.23) holds. Note that $\pi_T \left(R^+(\theta, \zeta) \cap \mathfrak{T}_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}} \right) \subset \pi_{T'} \left(\mathfrak{T}_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}} \right)$ with $T' = T_\Theta(\xi_T, x_T + \zeta, 2\mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta))$. As a matter of fact, $(\theta', \zeta', \sigma') \in R^+(\theta, \zeta) \cap \mathfrak{T}_{\Theta^{\text{in}}}$ only if $\theta' \in \Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}$, $|\zeta' - \zeta| < r_\zeta \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)$, and $\sigma' < (1 + 8r_t)\mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)$. In particular, this means that if $(\eta', y', t') = \pi_T(\theta', \zeta', \sigma')$ then

$$\begin{aligned} t' & < (1 + 8r_t)\mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta), \\ |y' - (x_T + \zeta)| & < r_\zeta \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta), \\ t'(\eta' - \xi_T) & \in \Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}, \end{aligned}$$

that shows the claimed inclusion. Applying Lemma 3.13 to $\varphi_{(\theta', \sigma', \theta', \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta', \zeta'))}$ we get that

$$\varphi_{(\theta', \sigma', \theta', \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta', \zeta'))} = \sum_k a_k(\theta', \sigma', \theta', \mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta', \zeta')) \widetilde{\varphi}_k$$

with $\|\widetilde{\varphi}_k\|_{\Phi_{4r}^{N-2}} \lesssim 1$ and $|a_k(\theta', \sigma', \theta', \mathbf{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta', \zeta'))| \lesssim \langle k \rangle^{-2} \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N}$ so

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{R^+(\theta, \zeta)} \left| \mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta', \zeta', \sigma') \left[\varphi(\theta', \sigma', \theta', \mathbf{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta', \zeta')) \right] \right|^u \\ & \quad \times \left(\mathbb{1}_{L(\theta, \zeta)}(\zeta') + \sigma' \delta(\sigma' - \mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta')) + \sigma' \delta(\sigma' - \mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta')) \right) d\zeta' d\theta' \frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'} \\ & \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N} \sup_{\widetilde{\varphi}} \int_{R^+(\theta, \zeta)} \left| \mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta', \zeta', \sigma') [\widetilde{\varphi}] \right|^u \\ & \quad \times \left(\mathbb{1}_{L(\theta, \zeta)}(\zeta') + \sigma' \delta(\sigma' - \mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta')) + \sigma' \delta(\sigma' - \mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta')) \right) d\zeta' d\theta' \frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'}. \end{aligned}$$

where the upper bound is taken over $\widetilde{\varphi} \in \Phi_{4r}^\infty$ with $\|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\Phi_{4r}^{N-2}} \lesssim 1$. By (3.44) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N} \sup_{\widetilde{\varphi}} \int_{R^+(\theta, \zeta)} \left| \mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta', \zeta', \sigma') [\widetilde{\varphi}] \right|^u \\ & \quad \times \left(\sigma' \delta(\sigma' - \mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta')) + \sigma' \delta(\sigma' - \mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta')) \right) d\zeta' d\theta' \frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'} \\ & \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N} \mu_\Theta^1(T') \left(\left\| \mathbb{1}_{\overline{(W^+ \cap V^+) \setminus (W^- \cup V^-)}} F_\Gamma(\eta, y, t) t \delta(t - \mathbf{b}_-(\eta, y)) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u, 1)}(T')} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\overline{(W^+ \cap V^+) \setminus (W^- \cup V^-)}} F_\Gamma(\eta, y, t) t \delta(t - \mathbf{b}_+(\eta, y)) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u, 1)}(T')} \right) \\ & \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N} \text{RHS}(7.18)^u \mu_\Theta^1(T') \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N} \mathbf{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta) \text{RHS}(7.18)^u, \end{aligned}$$

as required. It remains to show the bound

$$\left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)} \int_{R^+(\theta, \zeta)} \mathbb{1}_{L(\theta, \zeta)}(\zeta') \left| \mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta', \zeta', \sigma') [\widetilde{\varphi}] \right|^u d\zeta' d\theta' \frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'} \right)^{\frac{1}{u}} \lesssim \text{RHS}(7.18)$$

for any fixed $\widetilde{\varphi} \in \Phi_{4r}^\infty$ with $\|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\Phi_{4r}^{N-2}} \leq 1$. It holds that $\pi_T \left(R^{++}(\theta, \zeta) \cap \mathfrak{T}_{\Theta_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\text{in}}} \right) \subset \pi_{T''} \left(\mathfrak{T}_{\Theta_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\text{in}}} \right)$ with $T'' = T_\Theta \left(\xi_T - \frac{1}{2\mathbf{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)}, x_T + \zeta, 2\mathbf{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta) \right)$. As a matter of fact, $(\theta', \zeta', \sigma') \in R^{++}(\theta, \zeta) \cap \mathfrak{T}_{\Theta_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\text{in}}}$ only if $\theta' \in \Theta_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\text{in}}$, $|\zeta' - \zeta| < r_\zeta \mathbf{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)$, and $(1 + 4r_t) \mathbf{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta) < \sigma' < (1 + 6r_t) \mathbf{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)$. In particular, this means that if $(\eta', y', t') = \pi_T(\theta', \zeta', \sigma')$ then

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 + 4r_t) \mathbf{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta) < t' < (1 + 6r_t) \mathbf{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta), \\ & |y' - (x_T + \zeta)| < r_\zeta \mathbf{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta), \\ & t'(\eta' - \xi_T) \in \Theta_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\text{in}}. \end{aligned}$$

But then

$$t' \left(\eta' - \left(\xi_T - \frac{1}{2\mathbf{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)} \right) \right) \in \Theta_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\text{in}} + \left(\frac{1 + 4r_t}{2}, \frac{1 + 6r_t}{2} \right) \subset \Theta_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\text{ex}},$$

as required. If $u \leq 2$ this is sufficient to conclude: it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{\mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)} \int_{R^+(\theta, \zeta)} \mathbb{1}_{L(\theta, \zeta)}(\zeta') \left| \mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta', \zeta', \sigma') [\tilde{\varphi}] \right|^u d\zeta' d\theta' \frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'} \right)^{\frac{1}{u}} \\ & \lesssim \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\overline{(W^+ \cap V^+) \setminus (W^- \cup V^-)}} \mathbb{1}_{\pi_T(R^+(\theta, \zeta))} F_\Gamma \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u, u)} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-2}(T'')} \\ & \lesssim \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\overline{(W^+ \cap V^+) \setminus (W^- \cup V^-)}} \mathbb{1}_{\pi_T(R^+(\theta, \zeta))} F_\Gamma \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u, 2)} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-2}(T'')} \\ & \quad \times \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\overline{(W^+ \cap V^+) \setminus (W^- \cup V^-)}} \mathbb{1}_{\pi_T(R^+(\theta, \zeta))} \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(\infty, \frac{2u}{2-u})}(T'')} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\overline{(W^+ \cap V^+) \setminus (W^- \cup V^-)}} \mathbb{1}_{\pi_T(R^+(\theta, \zeta))} \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(\infty, \frac{2u}{2-u})}(T'')} \\ & \lesssim \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\zeta \in B_1} \int_0^1 \left| \mathbb{1}_{R^+(\theta, \zeta)} (\pi_T^{-1} \pi_{T''}(\theta', \zeta', \sigma')) \right|^{\frac{2u}{2-u}} \frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'} \\ & \lesssim \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\zeta \in B_1} \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}_{(1+2r_\sigma)/2 < \sigma' < (1+8r_\sigma)/2} \frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'} \end{aligned}$$

since $(\theta'', \zeta'', \sigma'') = \pi_T^{-1} \pi_{T''}(\theta', \zeta', \sigma')$ only if $\sigma'' = 2\mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)\sigma'$. If $u > 2$ we use that the integrand $\mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta', \zeta', \sigma') [\tilde{\varphi}]$ is almost constant over $R^+(\theta, \zeta)$. As a matter of fact it holds that

$$\mathbb{1}_{L(\theta, \zeta)}(\zeta') \left| \mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta', \zeta', \sigma') [\tilde{\varphi}] \right| = \mathbb{1}_{L(\theta, \zeta)}(\zeta') \left| \mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta'', \zeta', \sigma'') [\varphi_{(\theta'', \sigma'', \theta', \sigma')}] \right|$$

as per (7.21) for any $(\theta'', \zeta', \sigma'') \in R^{++}(\theta, \zeta)$. Applying Lemma 3.13 to $\varphi_{(\theta'', \sigma'', \theta', \sigma')}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{1}_{L(\theta, \zeta)}(\zeta') \left| \mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta', \zeta', \sigma') [\tilde{\varphi}] \right| \\ & = \sup_{\tilde{\varphi}} \left(\frac{\int_{R^{++}(\theta, \zeta)} \mathbb{1}_{L(\theta, \zeta)}(\zeta') \left| \mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta'', \zeta', \sigma'') [\tilde{\varphi}] \right|^2 \frac{d\sigma''}{\sigma''} d\theta'}{\int_{R^{++}(\theta, \zeta)} \mathbb{1}_{L(\theta, \zeta)}(\zeta') \frac{d\sigma''}{\sigma''} d\theta'} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

where the upper bound is taken over $\tilde{\varphi} \in \Phi_{16\tau}^\infty$ with $\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{\Phi_{16\tau}^{N-4}} \lesssim 1$. Since

$$\int_{R^{++}(\theta, \zeta)} \mathbb{1}_{L(\theta, \zeta)}(\zeta') \frac{d\sigma''}{\sigma''} d\theta' \gtrsim 1$$

we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)} \int_{R^+(\theta, \zeta)} \mathbb{1}_{L(\theta, \zeta)}(\zeta') \left| \mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta', \zeta', \sigma') [\tilde{\varphi}] \right|^u d\zeta' d\theta' \frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'} \\ & \lesssim \sup_{\tilde{\varphi}} \int_{B_1} \left(\int_{\Theta^{\text{in}} \times [0, 1]} \mathbb{1}_{L(\theta, \zeta)}(\zeta') \left| \mathbb{1}_{R^{++}(\theta, \zeta)} \mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta'', \zeta', \sigma'') [\tilde{\varphi}] \right|^2 \frac{d\sigma''}{\sigma''} d\theta' \right)^{u/2} d\zeta'. \end{aligned}$$

Now, the same procedure as before allows us, using that $u \geq 2$ to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(\frac{1}{\mathfrak{b}_{W^-}^*(\theta, \zeta)} \int_{R^+(\theta, \zeta)} \mathbb{1}_{L(\theta, \zeta)}(\zeta') |\mathbb{1}_{E^*} F^*(\theta', \zeta', \sigma') [\tilde{\varphi}]|^u d\zeta' d\theta' \frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'} \right)^{\frac{1}{u}} \\
 & \lesssim \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\overline{(W^+ \cap V^+) \setminus (W^- \cup V^-)}} \mathbb{1}_{\pi_T(R^+(\theta, \zeta))} F_\Gamma \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u, 2)} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-2}(T'')} \\
 & \quad \times \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\overline{(W^+ \cap V^+) \setminus (W^- \cup V^-)}} \mathbb{1}_{\pi_T(R^+(\theta, \zeta))} \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(\infty, \infty)}(T'')} \\
 & \lesssim \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\overline{(W^+ \cap V^+) \setminus (W^- \cup V^-)}} \mathbb{1}_{\pi_T(R^+(\theta, \zeta))} F_\Gamma \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u, 2)} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-2}(T'')} .
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 7.9 (Lacunary size domination). *Given any sets $V^+, V^- \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup$, and let $W^+, W^- \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^\cup$, the bounds*

$$\begin{aligned}
 (7.25) \quad & \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_\Theta^{(u, 2)} \mathfrak{d}_\tau^N} \\
 & \lesssim \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u, 2)} \Phi_{16\tau}^{N-10}} \\
 & \quad + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u, 1)} \square_{16\tau}^{N-10}}
 \end{aligned}$$

hold for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ as long as $u \in [1, \infty]$. The implicit constant is independent of f and of the sets V^\pm, W^\pm .

Proof. Let us fix $T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ and show that

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_\Theta^{(u, 2)} \mathfrak{d}_\tau^N(T)} \lesssim \text{RHS}(7.25).$$

By symmetry, (see (3.26) and the subsequent discussion), we can assume that $T = T_\Theta(0, 0, 1)$ so that

$$\Gamma \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) = (\alpha\beta(\theta + \gamma)(\beta\sigma)^{-1}, \zeta, \beta\sigma) = (\theta_\Gamma(\beta\sigma)^{-1}, \zeta, \beta\sigma) = \pi_T(\theta_\Gamma, \zeta, \beta\sigma).$$

For the sake of this proof, let us suppose that $\alpha\beta > 0$ and $\gamma < 0$. Any other combination of signs can be dealt with, mutatis mutandis, following the same argument. We use the shorthand $E_+^* := \pi_T^{-1}(V^+ \cap W^+ \cap T)$, $E_-^* := \pi_T^{-1}(V^- \cup W^-)$, and $F^* := \mathbb{1}_{E_+^* \setminus E_-^*} \text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma \circ \pi_T$. From Definition 3.9 we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_\Theta^{(u, 2)} \mathfrak{d}_\tau^N(T)} = \sup_\varphi \|F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi\theta]\|_{L_{\frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|}}^u L_{\frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}}^2} \\
 & \varphi_\theta(z) := (-d_z + 2\pi i \theta_\Gamma) \varphi(z)
 \end{aligned}$$

with the upper bound taken over $\varphi \in \Phi_\tau^\infty$ with $\|\varphi\|_{\Phi_\tau^N} \leq 1$. First we address the case $\theta \in \Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}}$ i.e. $\theta_\Gamma \notin \Theta^{\text{in}}$. Since

$$\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_\Gamma) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi] = F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi\theta]$$

and $\| -d_z \varphi \|_{\Phi_{\mathbb{r}}^N} + \| 2\pi i \theta_{\Gamma} \varphi \|_{\Phi_{\mathbb{r}}^N} \lesssim \| \varphi \|_{\Phi_{\mathbb{r}}^N}$ it follows immediately that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\varphi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{I}_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{ex}}}} \mathbb{1}_{E_+^* \setminus E_-^*} |\partial_{\zeta}(\theta_{\Gamma}) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi]|^2 \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \right)^{\frac{u}{2}} \frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|} \\ & \lesssim \sup_{\varphi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{I}_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{ex}}}} \mathbb{1}_{E_+^* \setminus E_-^*} |F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi]|^2 \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \right)^{\frac{u}{2}} \frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|} \\ & \lesssim \| \mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W+) \setminus (V-\cup W-)} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u, 2)} \Phi_{\mathbb{r}}^N}. \end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof is dedicated to dealing with the case $\theta \in \Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}$. Note that $\widehat{\varphi}_{\theta}$ vanishes at $-\theta_{\Gamma}$ while for any $\theta \notin \Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}$, $\widehat{\varphi}$ vanishes on a large neighborhood of $-\theta_{\Gamma}$ simply because $|\theta_{\Gamma}| > \mathfrak{r}$ and $\text{spt} \widehat{\varphi} \subset B_{\mathfrak{r}}$. This brings us to compare $F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi_{\theta}]$ or $\theta \in \Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}$ with $F^*(\theta', \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi'_{\theta'}]$ for $\theta' \in \Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{ex}}$ and for an appropriate $\varphi'_{\theta'} \in \Phi_{16\mathfrak{r}}^{\infty}$, and to expect to be able to bound LHS(7.25) by the first addend on RHS(7.25). In practice, we also need to control some remainder terms by the boundary integral

$$\| \mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W+) \setminus (V-\cup W-)} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u, 1)} \square_{16\mathfrak{r}}^{N-10}}.$$

This proof goes along the lines of [AU20b, Lemma 5.3], however care is taken to

- make sure the estimates are uniform in Γ and in particular in the deformation parameter $\beta \in (0, 1]$,
- use the defect size $\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u, 1)} \square_{16\mathfrak{r}}^{N-10}$ instead of the size $\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(\infty, \infty)} \Phi_{16\mathfrak{r}}^{N-10}$ that is not available in this setting.

Let \mathbf{b}_+^* , \mathbf{b}_-^* be the two functions whose graphs are the boundaries of E_+^* and E_-^* respectively so that $E_+^* \setminus E_-^* = \{(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) : \mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta) < \sigma < \mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta, \zeta)\}$. The existence of such functions is guaranteed by Lemma 3.20. Our goal is to show that

$$(7.26) \quad \sup_{\varphi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{I}_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}}} \mathbb{1}_{E_+^* \setminus E_-^*} |\partial_{\zeta}(\theta_{\Gamma}) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi]|^2 \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \right)^{\frac{u}{2}} \frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|} \lesssim \text{RHS}(7.25)$$

with φ as before.

Let us denote $\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}} = (\theta_{\Gamma_-}^{\text{in}}, \theta_{\Gamma_+}^{\text{in}})$, $\Theta^{\text{in}} = (\theta_{\pm}^{\text{in}}, \theta_{\pm}^{\text{in}})$ with $\theta_{\pm}^{\text{in}} = \alpha\beta\theta_{\Gamma_{\pm}}^{\text{in}} + \gamma$, let $\overline{\Theta}_{\Gamma} := (\overline{\theta}_{\Gamma_-}, \overline{\theta}_{\Gamma_+}) = (\theta_{\Gamma_-}^{\text{in}} - (\alpha\beta)^{-1}, \theta_{\Gamma_+}^{\text{in}} + (\alpha\beta)^{-1})$ be an enlargement of $\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}$ that still satisfies $\overline{\Theta}_{\Gamma} \subset \Theta$, and let $\overline{\Theta}_{\Gamma}^{\text{ex}} = \overline{\Theta}_{\Gamma} \setminus \Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}$.

Our main claim is that for any $(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{I}_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}} \cap (E_+^* \setminus E_-^*)$ and for any $\varphi \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\infty}$ with $\| \varphi \|_{\Phi_{\mathbb{r}}^N} \leq 1$ we have that

$$(7.27) \quad \begin{aligned} & |\partial_{\zeta}(\theta_{\Gamma}) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi]| \\ & \lesssim \sup_{\varphi} \left(\int_{\overline{\Theta}_{\Gamma}^{\text{ex}}} \int_{\mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta)}^{\mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)} e^{-|\log(\frac{\sigma}{\sigma'})|} |F^*(\theta', \zeta, \sigma')[\varphi]| \frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'} d\theta' \right. \\ & \quad + \int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta) < \mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)} e^{-\left| \log\left(\frac{\sigma}{\mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta)}\right) \right|} |F^*(\theta', \zeta, \mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta))[\varphi]| \\ & \quad \quad \times (1 + \delta(\theta - \theta')) d\theta' \\ & \quad \left. + \int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta) < \mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)} e^{-\left| \log\left(\frac{\sigma}{\mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)}\right) \right|} |F^*(\theta', \zeta, \mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta))[\varphi]| d\theta' \right) \end{aligned}$$

with the upper bound taken over functions $\tilde{\varphi} \in \Phi_{8r}^{N-8}$ with $\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{\Phi_{8r}^{N-8}} \leq 1$. Furthermore, if $\sigma < C_{\text{sep}} \mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)$ for some fixed large $C_{\text{sep}} \gg 1$ the above statement also holds for any $\varphi \in \Phi_{4r}^\infty$ with $\|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{4r}^\infty} \leq 1$ on LHS(7.27) while the upper bound is still taken over $\tilde{\varphi} \in \Phi_{8r}^{N-8}$ on RHS(7.27).

We now show how this would allow us to conclude that (7.26) \lesssim RHS(7.25)^u, as required. Applying Lemma 3.13 we represent any $\tilde{\varphi} \in \Phi_{8r}^{N-8}$ with $\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{\Phi_{8r}^{N-8}} \leq 1$ as

$$\tilde{\varphi} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} a_k \tilde{\varphi}_k$$

with $\tilde{\varphi}_k \in \Phi_{16r}^{N-10}$, $\|\tilde{\varphi}_k\|_{\Phi_{16r}^{N-10}} \leq 1$, and $|a_k| \lesssim \langle k \rangle^{-2}$. Using (7.27) and the triangle inequality we get that (7.26) \lesssim I + I⁻ + I⁺ where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} &:= \sup_{\tilde{\varphi}} \int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}} \times B_1} \left(\int_{[0,1]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{I}_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}} \cap (E_+^* \setminus E_-^*)}(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) \right. \\ &\quad \times \left. \left(\int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{ex}}} \int_{\mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta)}^{\mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)} e^{-|\log(\frac{\sigma}{\sigma'})|} |F^*(\theta', \zeta, \sigma')| [\tilde{\varphi}] \frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'} d\theta' \right)^2 \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \right)^{\frac{u}{2}} \frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}, \\ \text{I}^- &:= \sup_{\tilde{\varphi}} \int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}} \times B_1} \left(\int_{[0,1]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{I}_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}} \cap (E_+^* \setminus E_-^*)}(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) \left(\int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}} e^{-\left| \log\left(\frac{\sigma}{\mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta)}\right) \right|} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \times \left. \left. |F^*(\theta', \zeta, \mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta))| [\tilde{\varphi}] (1 + \delta(\theta - \theta')) d\theta' \right)^2 \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \right)^{\frac{u}{2}} \frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}, \\ \text{I}^+ &:= \sup_{\tilde{\varphi}} \int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}} \times B_1} \left(\int_{[0,1]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{I}_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}} \cap (E_+^* \setminus E_-^*)}(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) \right. \\ &\quad \times \left. \left(\int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}} e^{-\left| \log\left(\frac{\sigma}{\mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)}\right) \right|} |F^*(\theta', \zeta, \mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta))| [\tilde{\varphi}] d\theta' \right)^2 \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \right)^{\frac{u}{2}} \frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|}. \end{aligned}$$

where the upper bound, this time, is taken over functions $\tilde{\varphi} \in \Phi_{16r}^{N-10}$ with $\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{\Phi_{16r}^{N-10}} \leq 1$. We bound the term I using the Minkowski inequality and using the Young convolution inequality with respect to the multiplicative Haar measure $\frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} &\lesssim \sup_{\tilde{\varphi}} \int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{ex}} \times B_1} \left(\int_{\mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta)}^{\mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)} |F^*(\theta', \zeta, \sigma')| [\tilde{\varphi}]^2 \frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'} \right)^{\frac{u}{2}} d\zeta d\theta' \\ &\lesssim \left\| \mathbb{1}_{V^+ \setminus V^-} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus W^-} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u,2)} \Phi_{8r}^{N-8}(T)}^u. \end{aligned}$$

Bounding the terms I⁻ and I⁺ makes use of the defect size.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I}^+ &\lesssim \sup_{\tilde{\varphi}} \int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}} \times B_1} \left(\int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta) < \mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)} |F^*(\theta', \zeta, \mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta))| [\tilde{\varphi}] d\theta' \right)^{\frac{u}{2}} \frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|} \\ &\lesssim \sup_{\tilde{\varphi}} \int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}} \times B_1} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta) < \mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)} |F^*(\theta', \zeta, \mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta))| [\tilde{\varphi}]^{\frac{u}{2}} \frac{d\zeta d\theta'}{|\Theta|} \lesssim \text{RHS}(7.25)^u. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^- &\lesssim \sup_{\tilde{\varphi}} \int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}} \times B_1} \left(\int_{\Theta} \mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta) < \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)} |F^*(\theta', \zeta, \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta))[\tilde{\varphi}]| \right. \\ &\quad \times (1 + \delta(\theta - \theta')) d\theta' \Big)^{\frac{u}{2}} \frac{d\zeta d\theta}{|\Theta|} \\ &\lesssim \sup_{\tilde{\varphi}} \int_{\Theta_{\Gamma} \times B_1} \mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta) < \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)} |F^*(\theta', \zeta, \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta))[\tilde{\varphi}]|^{\frac{u}{2}} \frac{d\zeta d\theta'}{|\Theta|} \\ &\lesssim \text{RHS}(7.25)^u. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality in each of the chains above follows from Lemma 3.20 and in particular from (3.44).

The remaining part of this proof is dedicated to showing that (7.27) holds. In LHS(7.27) fix $(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{X}_{\Theta} \cap (E_+^* \setminus E_-^*)$ and $\varphi \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\infty}$ with $\|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N} \leq 1$. We will discuss two cases. First we consider when $\sigma \leq C_{\text{sep}} \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)$ for some very large $C_{\text{sep}} \gg 1$. This corresponds to the point (θ, ζ, σ) being close to the boundary of E_-^* . We then address the more general case when $\sigma \in (C_{\text{sep}} \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta), \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta, \zeta))$.

We start with the former case. In this regime we also allow φ to have larger frequency support: $\varphi \in \Phi_{4\mathfrak{r}}^{\infty}$ with $\|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{4\mathfrak{r}}^N} \leq 1$ instead of only $\varphi \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\infty}$; this will be necessary in the other regime. We further distinguish two cases: **Case 1.0** and **Case 1.5**. The former is when $\sigma < (1 + 2^{-10}\mathfrak{r}) \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)$ or if $|\theta_{\Gamma}| < \mathfrak{r}$ while the latter is when $\sigma \leq C_{\text{sep}} \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)$ but the conditions of **Case 1.0** do not hold.

Case 1.0: Suppose $\sigma < (1 + 2^{-10}\mathfrak{r}) \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)$ or $|\theta_{\Gamma}| < \mathfrak{r}$ with $\sigma \leq C_{\text{sep}} \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)$. We will use the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi] &= F^*(\theta, \zeta, \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta))[\tilde{\varphi}], \\ \tilde{\varphi}^{\vee} &:= \text{Mod}_{-\theta_{\Gamma}} \text{Dil}_{\sigma/\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)} \text{Mod}_{\theta_{\Gamma}} \varphi_{\theta}^{\vee}, \\ \varphi_{\theta}(z) &:= (-d_z + 2\pi i \theta_{\Gamma}) \varphi(z) \end{aligned}$$

This identity follows from (1.7) that defines Emb. Since

$$\text{spt} \left(\widehat{\text{Dil}_{\sigma} \text{Mod}_{\theta_{\Gamma}} \varphi_{\theta}^{\vee}} \right) \subset (\sigma^{-1}(\theta_{\Gamma} - 4\mathfrak{r}), \sigma^{-1}(\theta_{\Gamma} + 4\mathfrak{r}))$$

it holds that

$$\text{spt} \left(\widehat{\tilde{\varphi}^{\vee}} \right) \subset \left(\frac{\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)}{\sigma} (\theta_{\Gamma} - 4\mathfrak{r}) - \theta_{\Gamma}, \frac{\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)}{\sigma} (\theta_{\Gamma} + 4\mathfrak{r}) - \theta_{\Gamma} \right).$$

Since $\theta_{\Gamma} \in \Theta$ and thus $|\theta_{\Gamma}| < 10$ and either $|\theta_{\Gamma}| < \mathfrak{r}$ or $\frac{1}{1+2^{-10}\mathfrak{r}} < \frac{\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)}{\sigma} < 1$ we have that $\left| \left(\frac{\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)}{\sigma} - 1 \right) \theta_{\Gamma} \right| < 2\mathfrak{r}$. This implies that $\tilde{\varphi} \in \Phi_{8\mathfrak{r}}^N$ with $\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{\Phi_{8\mathfrak{r}}^N} \lesssim C_{\text{sep}} \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{4\mathfrak{r}}^N} \leq 1$. This shows bound (7.27) in this case because we have obtained that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathfrak{d}_{\zeta}(\theta_{\Gamma}) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi]| &\lesssim \sup_{\tilde{\varphi}} \int_{\Theta_{\Gamma}^{\text{in}}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta) < \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)} e^{-\left| \log \left(\frac{\sigma}{\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta)} \right) \right|} \\ &\quad \times |F^*(\theta', \zeta, \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta))[\tilde{\varphi}]| (1 + \delta(\theta - \theta')) d\theta' \end{aligned}$$

Case 1.5: We now suppose that $1 + 2^{-10}\mathfrak{r} \leq \frac{\sigma}{\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)} < C_{\text{sep}}$ and $|\theta_{\Gamma}| > \mathfrak{r}$. We assume that $\theta > -\gamma + \frac{\mathfrak{r}}{\alpha\beta}$, the case $\theta < -\gamma - \frac{\mathfrak{r}}{\alpha\beta}$ is dealt with symmetrically. Let $(\omega, \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\omega, \zeta))$ be the point in $\Theta \times \mathbb{R}_+$ where the segment connecting the points

$(\theta, \sigma) \in \Theta \times \mathbb{R}_+$ and $(-\gamma, 0) \in \Theta \times [0, +\infty)$ intersects the graph of $\theta' \mapsto \mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta)$. We claim that

- such a point exists,
- it is unique,
- it holds that $\mathbf{b}_-^*(\omega, \zeta) < \mathbf{b}_+^*(\omega, \zeta)$,
- there exists a small $\bar{r} > 0$ such that $(\omega, \omega + \bar{r}) \subset (-\gamma, \theta)$ and $\mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta) < \mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)$ for all $\theta' \in (\omega, \omega + \bar{r})$.

Assuming for now that this holds, we define $\tilde{\varphi}_{\theta'}$ by setting

$$\text{Dil}_{\mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta)} \text{Mod}_{\theta'} \tilde{\varphi}_{\theta'}^\vee := \text{Dil}_\sigma \text{Mod}_{\theta'} \varphi_\theta^\vee$$

so that

$$\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_\Gamma) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi] = \frac{1}{\bar{r}} \int_\omega^{\omega + \bar{r}} F^*(\theta', \zeta, \mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta))[\tilde{\varphi}_{\theta'}] d\theta'.$$

It holds that $\text{spt}(\widehat{\tilde{\varphi}_\omega}) \subset B_{4\tau} \frac{\mathbf{b}_-^*(\omega, \zeta)}{\sigma} \subset B_{4\tau}$; using bound (3.43), and in particular that

$$e^{-|\theta' - \omega|} < \frac{\mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta)}{\mathbf{b}_-^*(\omega, \zeta)} < e^{|\theta' - \omega|},$$

we deduce, by continuity, that $\text{spt}(\widehat{\tilde{\varphi}_\omega}) \subset B_{8\tau}$ if $\bar{r} > 0$ is chosen small enough.

Furthermore, since $\sigma < C_{\text{sep}} \mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)$ and $\mathbf{b}_-^*(\omega, \zeta) > e^{-|\theta - \gamma|} \mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)$ it holds that $\sigma \lesssim C_{\text{sep}} \mathbf{b}_-^*(\omega, \zeta)$. Thus $\tilde{\varphi}_{\theta'} \in \Phi_{8\tau}^N$ with $\|\tilde{\varphi}_{\theta'}\|_{\Phi_{8\tau}^N} \lesssim C_{\text{sep}} \|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{4\tau}^N} \leq 1$. An application of Lemma 3.13 allows us to conclude that

$$|\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_\Gamma) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi]| = \sup_{\tilde{\varphi}} \frac{1}{\bar{r}} \int_\omega^{\omega + \bar{r}} |F^*(\theta', \zeta, \mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta))[\tilde{\varphi}]| d\theta'$$

with the upper bound taken over $\tilde{\varphi} \in \Phi_{16\tau}^\infty$ with $\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{\Phi_{16\tau}^{N-2}} \lesssim C_{\text{sep}} 1$. This would conclude showing bound (7.27) in this case. It remains to prove the properties about the point $(\omega, \mathbf{b}_-^*(\omega, \zeta))$ claimed above.

At least one point of intersection between the segment connecting $(\theta, \sigma) \in \Theta \times [0, +\infty)$ and $(-\gamma, 0) \in \Theta \times [0, +\infty)$ and the graph of $\theta' \mapsto \mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta)$ exists because $\mathbf{b}_-^*(-\gamma, \zeta) > 0$, $\mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta) < \sigma$, and $\theta' \mapsto \mathbf{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta)$ is continuous. Let us call $(\omega, \mathbf{b}_-^*(\omega, \zeta))$ one such point. Let us show that the intersection is unique. As a matter of fact, if \mathbf{b} is any function satisfying (3.43) then its graph can only cross the segment connecting $(\theta, \sigma) \in \Theta \times [0, +\infty)$ and $(-\gamma, 0) \in \Theta \times [0, +\infty)$ from above to below. To see this suppose that θ_0 is the Θ coordinate of a point of intersection: we then have

$$\mathbf{b}(\theta_0, \zeta) = \sigma \frac{\theta_0 + \gamma}{\theta_0 + \gamma}.$$

By (3.43) we have that $\mathfrak{d}_{\theta'} \mathbf{b}^*(\theta', \zeta) \leq \frac{\mathbf{b}^*(\theta', \zeta)}{\theta' - \theta_-}$ from which we get that for any $\theta' > \theta_0$

$$\mathbf{b}^*(\theta', \zeta) \leq \mathbf{b}^*(\theta_0, \zeta) \frac{\theta' - \theta_-}{\theta_0 - \theta_-} = \sigma \frac{\theta_0 + \gamma}{\theta_0 + \gamma} \frac{\theta' - \theta_-}{\theta_0 - \theta_-} \leq \sigma \frac{\theta' + \gamma}{\theta_0 + \gamma};$$

we used that $\theta_0 - \theta_- > \theta_0 + \gamma$. This is exactly the property we claimed. By the same reasoning, if we were to have $\mathbf{b}_+^*(\omega, \zeta) < \mathbf{b}_-^*(\omega, \zeta) = \sigma \frac{\omega + \gamma}{\omega + \gamma}$ then it would hold that

$$\mathbf{b}_+^*(\theta, \zeta) \leq \sigma$$

which is a contradiction to the fact that $(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{T}_\Theta \cap (E_+^* \setminus E_-^*)$.

Let us now address the existence of $\bar{r} > 0$. Since $\sigma > \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta) (1 + 2^{-10}\mathfrak{r})$, $\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta) < \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)e^{|\theta' - \theta|}$ and the slope of the segment connecting $(-\gamma, 0)$ to (θ, σ) is bounded from above by $\alpha\beta \frac{\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)}{\mathfrak{r}}$ it follows that $\omega < \theta - 2\bar{r}$ for some universal $\bar{r} > 0$ independent of Γ , θ and ζ . Finally, for any $\theta' \in (\omega, \omega + \bar{r})$ it holds that $\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta) \leq \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)$ because otherwise, as before, we would be able to deduce that $\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta, \zeta) \leq \sigma$ in contradiction with the fact that $(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{T}_\Theta \cap (E_+^* \setminus E_-^*)$.

Case 2: Now let us discuss the case $\sigma > C_{\text{sep}} \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)$. Let $\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\zeta) = \sup_{\theta' \in \bar{\Theta}_\Gamma} \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta)$ and $\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\zeta) = \inf_{\theta' \in \bar{\Theta}_\Gamma} \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)$. By (3.43) and in particular from the fact that for any $\theta' \in \bar{\Theta}_\Gamma$ it holds that

$$e^{-|\bar{\Theta}_\Gamma|} \mathfrak{b}_\pm^*(\theta, \zeta) \leq \mathfrak{b}_\pm^*(\theta', \zeta) \leq e^{|\bar{\Theta}_\Gamma|} \mathfrak{b}_\pm^*(\theta, \zeta)$$

so we obtain that $\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta) < \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\zeta) < 2\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)$, $\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta, \zeta) < \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\zeta) < 2\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta, \zeta)$, and in particular $\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\zeta) > \frac{C_{\text{sep}}}{4} \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\zeta)$ and $\sigma > \frac{C_{\text{sep}}}{2} \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\zeta)$. We set $C_{\text{sep}} = 2^{11}$. Fix $\chi \in \Phi_2^\infty$ with $\widehat{\chi}(\widehat{z}) \in [0, 1]$ and $\widehat{\chi}(\widehat{z}) = 1$ for $\widehat{z} \in B_{7/4}$ and let $\chi_\mathfrak{r}(z) = \mathfrak{r}\chi(\mathfrak{r}z)$. Let us define

$$M^+(\widehat{z}) = \int_{\bar{\Theta}_\Gamma} \widehat{\chi}_\mathfrak{r}(\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)\widehat{z} - \theta'_\Gamma) d\theta'.$$

It holds that $M^+(\widehat{z}) \geq 0$, $M^+(\widehat{z}) \gtrsim 1$ for $|\widehat{z}| < \frac{1}{2\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\zeta)}$, and $|\partial_{\widehat{z}}^n M^+(\widehat{z})| \lesssim \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\zeta)^{-n}$. Recall that for $(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) \in \mathfrak{T}_\Theta \cap (E_+^* \setminus E_-^*)$ we have $\mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_\Gamma)F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi] = f * \text{Dil}_\sigma \Upsilon$ with $\Upsilon := \text{d}_z \text{Mod}_{\theta_\Gamma} \varphi^\vee(z)$; we keep the dependence on θ_Γ implicit. It holds that

$$\text{spt}(\widehat{\text{Dil}}_\sigma \Upsilon) \subset (\sigma^{-1}(\theta_\Gamma - \mathfrak{r}), \sigma^{-1}(\theta_\Gamma + \mathfrak{r})).$$

Let us decompose

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{Dil}}_\sigma \Upsilon(\widehat{z}) &= \widehat{\chi}(4\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\zeta)\widehat{z}) \widehat{\text{Dil}}_\sigma \Upsilon_{\theta_\Gamma}(\widehat{z}) + (1 - \widehat{\chi}(4\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\zeta)\widehat{z})) \widehat{\text{Dil}}_\sigma \Upsilon(\widehat{z}) \\ &= \widehat{\Upsilon}_\sigma^\dagger + \widehat{\Upsilon}_\sigma^0. \end{aligned}$$

It holds that

$$\widehat{\Upsilon}_\sigma^\dagger = \int_{\bar{\Theta}_\Gamma} \frac{\widehat{\Upsilon}_\sigma^\dagger(\widehat{z})}{M^+(\widehat{z})} \widehat{\chi}_\mathfrak{r}(\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)\widehat{z} - \theta'_\Gamma) d\theta'$$

so let us define

$$\widehat{\varphi}_{\theta'}(\widehat{z}) := \frac{\widehat{\Upsilon}_\sigma^\dagger\left(\frac{\widehat{z} + \theta'_\Gamma}{\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)}\right)}{M^+\left(\frac{\widehat{z} + \theta'_\Gamma}{\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)}\right)} \widehat{\chi}_\mathfrak{r}(\widehat{z})$$

so that $\varphi_{\theta'} \in \Phi_{2\mathfrak{r}}^\infty$, $\|\varphi_{\theta'}\|_{\Phi_{2\mathfrak{r}}^\infty} \lesssim 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}_\zeta(\theta_\Gamma)F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)[\varphi] &= \int_{\bar{\Theta}_\Gamma^{\text{in}}} F^*(\theta', \zeta, \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta))[\varphi_{\theta'}] d\theta' \\ &\quad + \int_{\bar{\Theta}_\Gamma^{\text{ex}}} F^*(\theta', \zeta, \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta))[\varphi_{\theta'}] d\theta'. \end{aligned}$$

An application of Lemma 3.13 allows us to conclude that

$$\left| \int_{\bar{\Theta}_\Gamma^{\text{in}}} F^*(\theta', \zeta, \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta))[\varphi_{\theta'}] d\theta' \right| \lesssim \sup_{\widehat{\varphi}} \left| \int_{\bar{\Theta}_\Gamma^{\text{in}}} F^*(\theta', \zeta, \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta))[\widehat{\varphi}] d\theta' \right|$$

with the upper bound taken over $\tilde{\varphi} \in \Phi_{4\mathfrak{r}}^\infty$ with $\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{\Phi_{4\mathfrak{r}}^{N-4}} \leq 1$. To bound the second addend, define $\varphi_{\theta', \sigma'}$ for all $\sigma' \in \left(\frac{\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)}{1+\bar{\mathfrak{r}}}, \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)\right)$ for some sufficiently small $\bar{\mathfrak{r}} > 0$ by setting

$$\text{Dil}_{\sigma'} \text{Mod}_{\theta'_\Gamma} \varphi_{\theta', \sigma'} = \text{Dil}_{\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)} \text{Mod}_{\theta'_\Gamma} \varphi_{\theta'}.$$

Note that if $\bar{\mathfrak{r}} > 0$ is small enough and since $\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\zeta)/\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\zeta) > C_{\text{sep}}/4$ we have that $\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta', \zeta) < \sigma' < \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)$ and $\varphi_{\theta', \sigma'} \in \Phi_{4\mathfrak{r}}^\infty$ with $\|\varphi_{\theta', \sigma'}\|_{\Phi_{4\mathfrak{r}}^{N-2}} \lesssim 1$. An application of Lemma 3.13 allows us to conclude that

$$\left| \int_{\bar{\Theta}_\Gamma} F^*(\theta', \zeta, \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)) [\varphi_{\theta'}] d\theta' \right| \lesssim \left| \int_{\bar{\Theta}_\Gamma^{\text{in}}} \int_{\frac{\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)}{1+\bar{\mathfrak{r}}}}^{\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)} F^*(\theta', \zeta, \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)) [\varphi_{\theta', \sigma'}] d\theta' \frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'} \right|$$

$$\sup_{\tilde{\varphi}} \int_{\bar{\Theta}_\Gamma^{\text{in}}} \int_{\frac{\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)}{1+\bar{\mathfrak{r}}}}^{\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)} |F^*(\theta', \zeta, \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta)) [\tilde{\varphi}]| d\theta'$$

with the upper bound taken over $\tilde{\varphi} \in \Phi_{4\mathfrak{r}}^\infty$ with $\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{\Phi_{8\mathfrak{r}}^{N-4}} \leq 1$. It remains to decompose $\widehat{\Upsilon}_\sigma^0$. Recall that

$$\widehat{\Upsilon}_\sigma^0(\widehat{z}) = (1 - \widehat{\chi}(4\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\zeta)\widehat{z})) \widehat{\text{Dil}}_\sigma \widehat{\Upsilon}(\widehat{z}),$$

$$\text{spt}(\widehat{\Upsilon}_\sigma^0) \subset B_{\frac{1+4\mathfrak{r}}{4\sigma}} \setminus B_{\frac{7}{16\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\zeta)}}.$$

For any $\theta' \in \bar{\Theta}_\Gamma^{\text{ex}}$ it holds that $\theta'_\Gamma > 2^{-4}$ or $3 < \theta'_\Gamma < -2^{-4}$

$$m_{\theta'_\Gamma}(\widehat{z}) = \int_1^\infty \widehat{\chi}(\sigma\widehat{z} - \theta'_\Gamma) \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}.$$

Note that $\text{spt}(\widehat{\chi}(\sigma\widehat{z} - \theta'_\Gamma)) \subset (\sigma^{-1}(\theta'_\Gamma - 2\mathfrak{r}), \sigma^{-1}(\theta'_\Gamma + 2\mathfrak{r}))$ and $\widehat{\chi}(\sigma\widehat{z} - \theta'_\Gamma) = 1$ on $(\sigma^{-1}(\theta'_\Gamma - 7\mathfrak{r}/4), \sigma^{-1}(\theta'_\Gamma + 7\mathfrak{r}/4))$. It follows that if θ'_Γ then

$$\text{spt}(m_{\theta'_\Gamma}(\widehat{z})) \subset (0, \theta'_\Gamma + 2\mathfrak{r})$$

and

$$m_{\theta'_\Gamma}(\widehat{z}) = \int_0^\infty \widehat{\chi}(\widehat{z} - \theta'_\Gamma) \frac{d\widehat{z}}{\widehat{z}}$$

for $\widehat{z} \in (0, \theta'_\Gamma - 2\mathfrak{r})$; $\int_0^\infty \widehat{\chi}(\widehat{z} - \theta'_\Gamma) \frac{d\widehat{z}}{\widehat{z}}$ is bounded above and away from 0 uniformly in θ'_Γ . It follows that

$$m(\widehat{z}) = \int_{\bar{\Theta}_\Gamma^{\text{ex}}} m_{\theta'_\Gamma}(\widehat{z}) d\theta'$$

satisfies

$$\text{spt}(m(\widehat{z})) \subset (-2 - 2\mathfrak{r}, 2 + 2\mathfrak{r})$$

and

$$m(\widehat{z}) = \int_{\bar{\Theta}_\Gamma^{\text{ex}}} \int_0^\infty \widehat{\chi}_\mathfrak{r}(\widehat{z} - \theta'_\Gamma) \frac{d\widehat{z}}{\widehat{z}} d\theta'$$

for $\widehat{z} \in B_{2^{-6}-2\mathfrak{r}}$. Let us re-define $m(0) = \lim_{\widehat{z} \rightarrow 0} m(\widehat{z})$ to obtain a smooth function $\widehat{z} \rightarrow m(\widehat{z})$. Now set $M_{\sigma_-, \sigma_+}(\widehat{z}) := \frac{m(\sigma_-\widehat{z}) - m(\sigma_+\widehat{z})}{m(0)}$ for any $\sigma_- < \sigma_+$. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\sigma_-, \sigma_+}(\widehat{z}) &\geq 0, \\ M_{\sigma_-, \sigma_+}(\widehat{z}) &= 0 \quad \text{if } |\widehat{z}| > 2\sigma_-^{-1}(1 + \mathfrak{r}), \\ M_{\sigma_-, \sigma_+}(\widehat{z}) &= 0 \quad \text{if } |\widehat{z}| < 2\sigma_+^{-1}(2^{-7} - \mathfrak{r}), \\ M_{\sigma_-, \sigma_+}(\widehat{z}) &= 1 \quad \text{if } 2\sigma_+^{-1}(1 + \mathfrak{r}) < |\widehat{z}| < 2\sigma_-^{-1}(2^{-7} - \mathfrak{r}). \end{aligned}$$

The first claim follows from the fact that

$$M_{\sigma_-, \sigma_+}(\widehat{z}) = \frac{1}{m(0)} \int_{\Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}}} \int_{\sigma_-}^{\sigma_+} \widehat{\chi}_\tau(\sigma \widehat{z} - \theta'_\Gamma) \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} d\theta'$$

while subsequent claims follow from support considerations on m above. Let us write

$$\widehat{\Upsilon}_\sigma^0(\widehat{z}) = M_{\mathfrak{b}_-(\zeta), \mathfrak{b}_+(\zeta)}(\widehat{z}) \widehat{\Upsilon}_\sigma^0(\widehat{z}).$$

This identity holds because of support considerations and since $\frac{\mathfrak{b}_-(\zeta) C_{\text{sep}}}{2} < \sigma < \mathfrak{b}_+(\zeta)$. We obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Upsilon}_\sigma^0(\widehat{z}) &= \int_{\Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}}} \int_0^\infty \widehat{\Upsilon}_\sigma^0(\widehat{z}) \widehat{\chi}_\tau(\sigma' \widehat{z} - \theta'_\Gamma) \frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'} d\theta' \\ &= \int_{\Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}}} \int_0^\infty (1 - \widehat{\chi}(4\mathfrak{b}_+(\zeta)\widehat{z})) \sigma \widehat{z} \widehat{\varphi}(\sigma \widehat{z} - \theta_\Gamma) \widehat{\chi}_\tau(\sigma' \widehat{z} - \theta'_\Gamma) \frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'} d\theta' \end{aligned}$$

By support considerations it holds that

$$\widehat{\varphi}(\sigma \widehat{z} - \theta_\Gamma) \widehat{\chi}_\tau(\sigma' \widehat{z} - \theta'_\Gamma) = 0$$

unless $\sigma' \gtrsim \sigma$ and $(1 - \widehat{\chi}(4\mathfrak{b}_+(\zeta)\widehat{z})) \widehat{\chi}_\tau(\sigma' \widehat{z} - \theta'_\Gamma) = 0$ unless $\sigma' \gtrsim \mathfrak{b}_+(\zeta)\widehat{z}$. It follows that setting

$$\varphi_{\theta', \sigma'}(\sigma' \widehat{z} - \theta'_\Gamma) := (1 - \widehat{\chi}(4\mathfrak{b}_+(\zeta)\widehat{z})) \sigma' \widehat{z} \widehat{\varphi}(\sigma \widehat{z} - \theta_\Gamma) \widehat{\chi}_\tau(\sigma' \widehat{z} - \theta'_\Gamma)$$

we obtain a function $\varphi_{\theta', \zeta', \sigma'} \in \Phi_{2\tau}^N$ with $\|\varphi_{\theta', \zeta', \sigma'}\|_{\Phi_{2\tau}^N} \lesssim 1$ so

$$\widehat{\Upsilon}_\sigma^0(\widehat{z}) = \int_{\Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}}} \int_0^\infty \frac{\sigma}{\sigma'} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma' > a\sigma} \varphi_{\theta', \zeta', \sigma'}(\sigma' \widehat{z} - \theta'_\Gamma) \frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'} d\theta'.$$

or some $a > 0$. Making sure to choose $C_{\text{sep}} > \frac{4}{a}$ and applying Lemma 3.13 allows us to conclude that

$$|f * \Upsilon_\sigma^0(\zeta)| \lesssim \sup_{\widehat{\varphi}} \int_{\Theta_\Gamma^{\text{ex}}} \int_0^\infty \frac{\sigma}{\sigma'} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma' > a\sigma} |F^*(\theta', \zeta', \sigma')[\widehat{\varphi}]| \frac{d\sigma'}{\sigma'} d\theta'.$$

with the upper bound taken over $\widehat{\varphi} \in \Phi_{4\tau}^\infty$ with $\|\widehat{\varphi}\|_{\Phi_{8\tau}^{N-4}} \leq 1$, as required. \square

Lemma 7.10 (Maximal size domination). *Let $V^+, V^- \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^U$, and let $W^+, W^- \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^U$. The bounds*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)}(\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma)\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u, \infty)} \Phi_\tau^N} \\ &\lesssim \beta^{-\frac{1}{u}} \|\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)}(\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma)\|_{\left(\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{ex}})}^{(u, 2)} \Phi_{4\tau}^{N-2} + \Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, 1)} \square_{4\tau}^{N-2}\right)}, \end{aligned}$$

hold for any $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ as long as $u \in [2, \infty]$. The implicit constant is independent of f and of the sets V^\pm, W^\pm .

Proof. Let us fix $T \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta$ and show that

$$\|\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)}(\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma)\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u, \infty)} \Phi_\tau^N(T)} \lesssim \text{RHS}(7.25).$$

By symmetry, (see (3.26) and the subsequent discussion), we can assume that $T = T_\Theta(0, 0, 1)$ so that

$$\Gamma \circ \pi_T(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) = (\alpha\beta(\theta + \gamma)(\beta\sigma)^{-1}, \zeta, \beta\sigma) = (\theta_\Gamma(\beta\sigma)^{-1}, \zeta, \beta\sigma) = \pi_T(\theta_\Gamma, \zeta, \beta\sigma).$$

We use the shorthand $E_+^* := \mathfrak{T}_{\Theta^{\text{in}}} \cap \pi_T^{-1}(V^+ \cap W^+)$, $E_-^* := \pi_T^{-1}(V^- \cup W^-)$, and $F^* := \mathbb{1}_{E_+^* \setminus E_-^*} \text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma \circ \pi_T$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u, \infty)} \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N(T)} \\ &= \sup_{\varphi} \sup_{\sigma} \int_{\Theta^{\text{in}} \times B_1} F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma(\theta, \zeta)) [\varphi]^u \frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|} \end{aligned}$$

where the upper bound is taken over all $\varphi \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^{\infty}$ with $\|\varphi\|_{\Phi_{\mathfrak{r}}^N} \leq 1$ and over all continuous functions $\sigma : \Theta \times B_1 \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$. Let \mathfrak{b}_+^* , \mathfrak{b}_-^* be the two functions whose graphs are the boundaries of E_+^* and E_-^* respectively so that $E_+^* \setminus E_-^* = \{(\theta, \zeta, \sigma) : \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta) < \sigma < \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta, \zeta)\}$. The existence of such functions is guaranteed by Lemma 3.20. Let $\bar{r} > 0$ be a small absolute constant to depending only on \mathfrak{r} be determined later. We distinguish the points (θ, ζ) based on how far $\sigma(\theta, \zeta)$ is from the boundary of $E_+^* \setminus E_-^*$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} U_- &:= \{(\theta, \zeta) \in \Theta^{\text{in}} \times B_1 : \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta) \leq \sigma(\theta, \zeta) < (1 + \bar{r})\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)\}, \\ U_+ &:= \{(\theta, \zeta) \in \Theta^{\text{in}} \times B_1 : (1 - \bar{r})\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta, \zeta) < \sigma(\theta, \zeta) \leq \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta, \zeta)\}, \\ U_0 &:= \{(\theta, \zeta) \in \Theta^{\text{in}} \times B_1 : (1 + \bar{r})\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta) \leq \sigma(\theta, \zeta) \leq (1 - \bar{r})\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta, \zeta)\}. \end{aligned}$$

If $(\theta, \zeta) \in U_-$ we use that

$$(\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma)(\theta, \zeta, \sigma(\theta, \zeta))[\varphi] = (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma)(\theta, \zeta, \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta))[\varphi_{(\theta, \zeta)}]$$

with

$$\varphi_{(\theta, \zeta)} := \text{Mod}_{\theta_{\mathfrak{r}}} \text{Dil}_{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)/\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)} \text{Mod}_{-\theta_{\mathfrak{r}}} \varphi.$$

Since $1 \leq \sigma(\theta, \zeta)/\mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta) < 1 + \bar{r}$ we have that $\varphi_{(\theta, \zeta)} \in \Phi_{2\mathfrak{r}}^{\infty}$ with $\|\varphi_{(\theta, \zeta)}\|_{\Phi_{2\mathfrak{r}}^N} \lesssim 1$. Using Lemma 3.13 we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Theta^{\text{in}} \times B_1} \mathbb{1}_{U_-}(\theta, \zeta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma(\theta, \zeta)) [\varphi]^u \frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|} \\ & \lesssim \sup_{\tilde{\varphi}} \int_{\Theta^{\text{in}} \times B_1} \mathbb{1}_{U_-}(\theta, \zeta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \mathfrak{b}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)) [\tilde{\varphi}]^u \frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|} \end{aligned}$$

with the upper bound taken over $\tilde{\varphi} \in \Phi_{2\mathfrak{r}}^{\infty}$ with $\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{\Phi_{2\mathfrak{r}}^{N-2}} \leq 1$. The RHS of the entry above is bounded by $\|\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} (\text{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u, 1)} \square_{4\mathfrak{r}}^{N-2}(T)}$ and thus by RHS(7.25)^u, as required. The same procedure applies to the case when $(\theta, \zeta) \in U_+$: Set $\varphi_{(\theta, \zeta)} := \text{Mod}_{\theta_{\mathfrak{r}}} \text{Dil}_{\sigma(\theta, \zeta)/\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta, \zeta)} \text{Mod}_{-\theta_{\mathfrak{r}}} \varphi$ to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Theta^{\text{in}} \times B_1} \mathbb{1}_{U_+}(\theta, \zeta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma(\theta, \zeta)) [\varphi]^u \frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|} \\ & \lesssim \sup_{\tilde{\varphi}} \int_{\Theta^{\text{in}} \times B_1} \mathbb{1}_{U_+}(\theta, \zeta) F^*(\theta, \zeta, \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta, \zeta)) [\tilde{\varphi}]^u \frac{d\theta d\zeta}{|\Theta|} \lesssim \text{RHS}(7.25)^u. \end{aligned}$$

In the case $(\theta, \zeta) \in U_0$ we will just show the pointwise bound $|F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma(\theta, \zeta))[\varphi]| \lesssim \text{RHS}(7.25)$. Integrating this bound will yield the claim. Let $\tilde{W}^- := W^- \cup T_{\Theta}(0, \zeta, \sigma(\theta, \zeta))$; let $\tilde{E}_-^* = E_-^* \cup \pi_T^{-1}(T_{\Theta}(0, \zeta, \sigma(\theta, \zeta)))$ and let $\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^* : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be the function given by Lemma 3.20 such that its graphs is the boundary of the set \tilde{E}_-^* . For any $(\theta', \zeta', \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\theta', \zeta')) \in E_+^* \setminus \tilde{E}_-^*$ it holds that

$$F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma(\theta, \zeta))[\varphi] = F^*(\theta', \zeta', \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\theta', \zeta'))[\varphi_{(\theta', \zeta')}]$$

with $\varphi_{(\theta', \zeta')}$ defined by the relation

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\zeta'} \mathrm{Dil}_{\beta \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\theta', \zeta')} \mathrm{Mod}_{-\theta'} \varphi_{(\theta', \zeta')} := \mathrm{Tr}_{\zeta} \mathrm{Dil}_{\beta \sigma(\theta, \zeta)} \mathrm{Mod}_{-\theta'} \varphi.$$

If $|\zeta' - \zeta| < \bar{r}^2 \beta \sigma(\theta, \zeta)$ and $\theta' \in B_{\bar{r}^2}(\theta) \cap \Theta^{\mathrm{in}}$ it holds that $\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\theta', \zeta') < \mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta', \zeta')$ given the continuity assumptions (3.43) on $\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*$ and \mathfrak{b}_+^* and since $\mathfrak{b}_+^*(\theta, \zeta) > (1 - \bar{r})^{-1} \sigma(\theta, \zeta) = \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\theta, \zeta)$. Furthermore, we have that $\varphi_{(\theta', \zeta')} \in \Phi_{2\bar{r}}^\infty$ with $\|\varphi_{(\theta', \zeta')}\|_{\Phi_{2\bar{r}}^N} \lesssim 1$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & |F^*(\theta, \zeta, \sigma(\theta, \zeta))[\varphi]| \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\beta \sigma(\theta, \zeta) \bar{r}^4} \sup_{\tilde{\varphi}} \int_{(B_{\bar{r}^2}(\theta) \cap \Theta^{\mathrm{in}}) \cap \bar{r}^2 \beta \sigma(\theta, \zeta)} \left| F^* \left(\theta', \zeta', \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_-^*(\theta', \zeta') \right) [\tilde{\varphi}] \right| d\theta' d\zeta' \\ & \lesssim \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W+) \setminus (V-\cup \tilde{W}-)} (\mathrm{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\mathrm{in}})}^{(1, \infty)} \square_{4\bar{r}}^{N-2}(T')} \end{aligned}$$

with $T' = T_\Theta(0, \zeta, 10\sigma(\theta, \zeta))$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W+) \setminus (V-\cup \tilde{W}-)} (\mathrm{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\mathrm{in}})}^{(1, \infty)} \square_{4\bar{r}}^{N-2}(T')} \\ & \lesssim \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W+) \setminus (V-\cup \tilde{W}-)} (\mathrm{Emb}[f] \circ \Gamma) \right\|_{\Gamma^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\mathrm{in}})}^{(u, \infty)} \square_{4\bar{r}}^{N-2}(T')} \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

8. UNIFORM EMBEDDING BOUNDS - BILINEAR CASE

In this section we prove the bilinear embedding bounds (1.16) of Theorem 4. It is noteworthy that all but the last size $\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\mathrm{in}})}^{(u, 1)} \square_{\bar{r}}^N$ appearing in the expression of $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_\times}^u \Phi_{\bar{r}}^N$ can be bound using sizes $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^u \Phi_{\bar{r}}^N$, $j \in \{2, 3\}$. Thus, an application of the outer Hölder inequality (Corollary 3.4) can yields bounds (1.16) with $\mathbb{S}_{\Gamma_\times}^{u_\times} \Phi_{\bar{r}}^N$ in place of $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_\times}^u \Phi_{\bar{r}}^N$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{S}_{\Gamma_\times}^{u_\times} \Phi_{\bar{r}}^N & := \beta^{u_\times} \left(\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\mathrm{in}})}^{(u_\times, 2)} (\Phi \otimes \mathfrak{d})_{\bar{r}}^N + \Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\mathrm{in}})}^{(u_\times, 2)} (\mathfrak{d} \otimes \Phi)_{\bar{r}}^N \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\mathrm{in}})}^{(u_\times, \infty)} (\Phi \otimes \Phi)_{\bar{r}}^N \right) + \Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_\times, 1)} (\mathfrak{d} \otimes \mathfrak{d})_{\bar{r}}^N. \end{aligned}$$

We show this in Proposition 8.1. It then remains to show the validity of bound (1.16) with the size $\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\mathrm{in}})}^{(u, 1)} \square_{\bar{r}}^N$ in place of $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_\times}^u \Phi_{\bar{r}}^N$. This is done in Proposition 8.2.

Proposition 8.1. *The bound*

$$(8.1) \quad \|F_2 F_3\|_{L_{\nu_\beta}^{p_\times} X_{\mu_{\Theta, \nu_\beta}^1}^{q_\times, r_\times, +} \mathbb{S}_{\Gamma_\times}^{u_\times} \Phi_{\bar{r}}^N} \lesssim \prod_{j=2}^3 \|F_j\|_{L_{\nu_\beta}^{p_j} X_{\mu_{\Theta, \nu_\beta}^1}^{q_j, r_j, +} \tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{\bar{r}}^N}$$

holds for any $F_j \in L_{\nu_\beta}^{p_j} X_{\mu_{\Theta, \nu_\beta}^1}^{q_j, r_j, +} \tilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{\bar{r}}^N$ with

$$\begin{aligned} p_\times^{-1} &= p_2^{-1} + p_3^{-1} & q_\times^{-1} &= q_2^{-1} + q_3^{-1} \\ r_\times^{-1} &= r_2^{-1} + r_3^{-1} & u_\times^{-1} &= u_2^{-1} + u_3^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

as long as $p_j \in (1, \infty]$ and $r_j \leq q_j$, $j \in \{2, 3\}$. As a consequence, the bound

$$(8.2) \quad \|\mathrm{Emb}[f_2] \circ \Gamma_2 \mathrm{Emb}[f_3] \circ \Gamma_3\|_{L_{\nu_\beta}^{p_\times} X_{\mu_{\Theta, \nu_\beta}^1}^{q_\times, r_\times, +} \mathbb{S}_{\Gamma_\times}^{u_\times} \Phi_{\bar{r}}^N} \lesssim \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R})} \|f_3\|_{L^{p_3}(\mathbb{R})}.$$

holds for any $p_j \in (1, \infty]$ as long as $q_\times^{-1} < \min(\frac{1}{2}, 1 - p_2^{-1}) + \min(\frac{1}{2}, 1 - p_3^{-1})$ and as long as $1 \leq u_\times < r_\times < q_\times$. The implicit constant is independent of $\beta \in (0, 1]$, that determines $(\alpha_j, \beta_j, \gamma_j)$ and Γ_j , $j \in \{2, 3\}$, and of F_2, F_3 .

Proof. Bound (8.2) follows from bound (8.1) thanks to the linear embedding bounds (1.14). As a matter of fact, fix $1 \leq u_\times < r_\times < q_\times$ with $q_\times^{-1} < \min(\frac{1}{2}, 1 - p_2^{-1}) + \min(\frac{1}{2}, 1 - p_3^{-1})$ and set

$$\begin{aligned} q_j^{-1} &= \min\left(\frac{1}{2}, 1 - p_j^{-1}\right) - \varepsilon_q/2, \\ r_j^{-1} &= q_j^{-1} - \varepsilon_r/2, \\ u_j &= r_j - \varepsilon_u/2. \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_q &:= q_\times^{-1} - \min\left(\frac{1}{2}, 1 - p_2^{-1}\right) - \min\left(\frac{1}{2}, 1 - p_3^{-1}\right) > 0, \\ \varepsilon_r &:= r_\times^{-1} - q_\times^{-1} > 0, \\ \varepsilon_u &:= u_\times^{-1} - r_\times^{-1} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

For such a choice of (q_j, r_j, u_j) , Theorem 3 holds so $\text{RHS}(8.1) \lesssim \text{RHS}(8.2)$ proving our claim.

Let us now prove (8.1) by appropriately applying the outer Hölder inequality (Corollary 3.4). For any $F_j \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_\tau^\infty$, $j \in \{2, 3\}$, it holds that that

$$\nu_\beta(\|F_2 F_3\|_{X_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^{q_\times, r_\times, +} \mathbb{S}_{\Gamma_\times}^{u_\times} \Phi_\tau^N} > 0) \leq \min_{j=2,3} \nu_\beta(\|F_j\|_{X_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^{q_j, r_j, +} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_\tau^N} > 0)$$

since for any $V^- \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup$ it holds that if $\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-} F_j = 0$ for $j = 2$ or $j = 3$ then, trivially, $\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V^-} F_2 F_3 = 0$. To apply the outer Hölder inequality we must check that for any $F_j \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \otimes \Phi_\tau^\infty$, $j \in \{2, 3\}$ it holds that

$$\|F_2 F_3\|_{X_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^{q_\times, r_\times, +} \mathbb{S}_{\Gamma_\times}^{u_\times} \Phi_\tau^N} \lesssim \prod_{j=2}^3 \|F_j\|_{X_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^{q_j, r_j, +} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_\tau^N}.$$

The sizes $X_{\mu_\ominus^1, \nu_\beta}^{q_\times, r_\times, +} \mathbb{S}_{\Gamma_\times}^{u_\times} \Phi_\tau^N$ are themselves (localized) outer Lebesgue norms. According to (3.37), it is sufficient to check that for any $V^+ \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup$ and any $W^+ \in \mathbb{T}_\ominus^\cup$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu_\beta(V^+)^{-\frac{1}{r_\times}} \mu_\ominus^\infty(W^+)^{\frac{1}{q_\times} - \frac{1}{r_\times}} \|\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+)} F_2 F_3\|_{L_{\mu_\ominus^1}^{r_\times} \mathbb{S}_{\Gamma_\times}^{u_\times} \Phi_\tau^N} \\ &\lesssim \prod_{j=2}^3 \left(\nu_\beta(V^+)^{-\frac{1}{r_j}} \mu_\ominus^\infty(W^+)^{\frac{1}{q_j} - \frac{1}{r_j}} \|\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+)} F_j\|_{L_{\mu_\ominus^1}^{r_j} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_\tau^N} \right) \end{aligned}$$

that boils down to showing

$$\|\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+)} F_2 F_3\|_{L_{\mu_\ominus^1}^{r_\times} \mathbb{S}_{\Gamma_\times}^{u_\times} \Phi_\tau^N} \lesssim \prod_{j=2}^3 \|\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+)} F_j\|_{L_{\mu_\ominus^1}^{r_j} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_\tau^N}.$$

This amounts to the outer Hölder inequality at the level of the outer Lebesgue norms $L_{\mu_\ominus^1}^{r_\times} \mathbb{S}_{\Gamma_\times}^{u_\times} \Phi_\tau^N$ and $L_{\mu_\ominus^1}^{r_j} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_\tau^N$, $j \in \{2, 3\}$.

Using that $\mu_{\Theta}^1(\|F_2 F_3\|_{\mathbb{S}_{\Gamma_{\times}^u} \Phi_{\Gamma}^N} > 0) \leq \min_{j=2,3} \mu_{\Theta}^1(\|F_j\|_{\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{\Gamma}^N} > 0)$, we can apply the Hölder inequality to obtain the above bound as long as it holds that

$$\|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W^+)} F_2 F_3\|_{\mathbb{S}_{\Gamma_{\times}^u} \Phi_{\Gamma}^N} \lesssim \prod_{j=2}^3 \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W^+)} F_j\|_{\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{\Gamma}^N}.$$

This however is a simple consequence of the classical Hölder inequality and the definitions (3.32) of the sizes in play. We immediately have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W^+)} F_2 F_3\|_{\beta^{\frac{1}{u_{\times}}} \Gamma_{\times}^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_{\times}, \infty)} (\Phi \otimes \Phi)_{\Gamma}^N} &\lesssim \prod_{j=2}^3 \beta^{\frac{1}{u_j}} \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W^+)} F_j\|_{\Gamma_j^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u_j, \infty)} \Phi_{\Gamma}^N}, \\ \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W^+)} F_2 F_3\|_{\beta^{\frac{1}{u_{\times}}} \Gamma_{\times}^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_{\times}, 1)} (\Phi \otimes \mathfrak{d})_{\Gamma}^N} &\lesssim \beta^{\frac{1}{u_2}} \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W^+)} F_2\|_{\Gamma_2^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u_2, \infty)} \Phi_{\Gamma}^N} \\ &\quad \times \beta^{\frac{1}{u_3}} \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W^+)} F_3\|_{\Gamma_3^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_3, 2)} \mathfrak{d}_{\Gamma}^N}, \\ \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W^+)} F_2 F_3\|_{\beta^{\frac{1}{u_{\times}}} \Gamma_{\times}^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_{\times}, 1)} (\Phi \otimes \mathfrak{d})_{\Gamma}^N} &\lesssim \beta^{\frac{1}{u_2}} \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W^+)} F_2\|_{\Gamma_2^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_2, \infty)} \mathfrak{d}_{\Gamma}^N} \\ &\quad \times \beta^{\frac{1}{u_3}} \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W^+)} F_3\|_{\Gamma_3^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u_3, \infty)} \Phi_{\Gamma}^N}, \\ \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W^+)} F_2 F_3\|_{\Gamma_{\times}^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_{\times}, 1)} (\mathfrak{d} \otimes \mathfrak{d})_{\Gamma}^N} &\lesssim \prod_{j=2}^3 \|\mathbb{1}_{(V+\cap W^+)} F_j\|_{\Gamma_j^* \mathbb{L}_{\Theta}^{(u_j, 2)} \mathfrak{d}_{\Gamma}^N}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 8.2. *The bound*

$$\|\text{Emb}[f_2] \circ \Gamma_2 \text{Emb}[f_3] \circ \Gamma_3\|_{L^{\nu_{\beta}} \times X_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_{\beta}}^{q_{\times}, r_{\times}, +} \Gamma_{\times}^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u_{\times}, 1)} \square_{\Gamma}^N} \lesssim \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R})} \|f_3\|_{L^{p_3}(\mathbb{R})}$$

holds for any $f_j \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, and any $p_j \in (1, \infty]$, $j \in \{2, 3\}$, as long as $p_{\times}^{-1} = p_2^{-1} + p_3^{-1}$ and as long as $q_{\times} \in (0, +\infty]$ with $q_{\times}^{-1} < \min(\frac{1}{2}, 1 - p_2^{-1}) + \min(\frac{1}{2}, 1 - p_3^{-1})$ and as long as $1 \leq u_{\times} < r_{\times} \leq q_{\times}$. The implicit constant is independent of $\beta \in (0, 1]$, that determines $(\alpha_j, \beta_j, \gamma_j)$ and Γ_j , $j \in \{2, 3\}$, and of f_2, f_3 .

We believe that the bounds above cannot be obtained as in the case of Proposition 8.1 from linear embeddings. This is because the expressions (3.34) and (3.35) for the sizes $\square_{\zeta, \tau}^N$ and $\square_{\sigma, \tau}^N$ are intrinsically bilinear and cannot be controlled through a classical Hölder inequality. In the subsequent proof we mimic the parts of Section 7 related to bounding the defect sizes.

Proof. Using homogeneity let us assume that $\|f_j\|_{L^{p_j}(\mathbb{R})} = 1$. Fix $q_j \in (\max(2, p'_j), \infty]$ such that $q_{\times}^{-1} = q_2^{-1} + q_3^{-1}$ and select u_j and r_j , $j \in \{2, 3\}$, so that $1 \leq u_j \leq r_j \leq q_j$ and $r_{\times}^{-1} = r_2^{-2} + r_3^{-2}$ and $u_{\times}^{-1} = u_2^{-2} + u_3^{-2}$. Under these conditions Theorem 3 holds for the exponents (u_j, r_j, q_j, p_j) for $j \in \{2, 3\}$. According to the discussion in Remark Remark 3.19 this means that for $j \in \{2, 3\}$ there exists a choice of sets $V_j^-(\lambda) \in \mathbb{D}_{\beta}^{\cup}$ such that

$$\int_0^{\infty} \nu_{\beta} \left(V_j^-(\lambda^{1/p_j}) \right) d\lambda \lesssim 1, \quad \left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V_j^-(\lambda)} \text{Emb}[f_j] \right\|_{X_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_{\beta}}^{q_j, r_j, +} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{\Gamma}^N} \lesssim \lambda.$$

Unwrapping the definition of the size $X_{\mu_{\Theta}^1, \nu_{\beta}}^{q_j, r_j, +} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{\Gamma}^N$ this means that for any any $\bar{r}_j \in \{r_j, q_j\}$, any $V^+ \in \mathbb{D}_{\beta}^{\cup}$, any $W^+ \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}$, and any $\tau > 0$ there exists a choice of

$W_j^-(\tau) \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^\cup$ such that

$$\int_0^\infty \mu_\Theta^1(W_j^-(\tau^{1/\bar{r}_j})) d\tau \lesssim 1,$$

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V_j^-(\lambda) \cup W_j^-(\tau))} \text{Emb}[f_j] \right\|_{\tilde{F}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_\tau^N} \lesssim \tau \lambda \nu_\beta(V^+)^{1/\bar{r}_j} \mu_\Theta^\infty(W^+)^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}_j} - \frac{1}{q_j}}.$$

Note that for any $V^+, V^- \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup$ and $W^+, W^- \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^\cup$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} \text{Emb}[f_2] \circ \Gamma_2 \text{Emb}[f_3] \circ \Gamma_3 \right\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u_\times, 1)} \square_\tau^N(T)} \\ & \lesssim \left\| (\text{Emb}[f_2] \circ \Gamma_2 \text{Emb}[f_3] \circ \Gamma_3)(\eta, y, t) \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. t d_t \left(\mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)}(\eta, y, t) \right) \right\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u_\times, 1)} \square_\tau^N(T)} \\ & \lesssim \left\| (\text{Emb}[f_2] \circ \Gamma_2 \text{Emb}[f_3] \circ \Gamma_3)(\eta, y, t) \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)}(\eta, y, t) \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. (t\delta(t - \mathbf{b}_+(\eta, y)) + t\delta(t - \mathbf{b}_-(\eta, y))) \right\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u_\times, 1)} (\Phi \otimes \Phi)_\tau^N(T)} \\ & \lesssim \prod_{j=2}^3 \left\| (\text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j)(\eta, y, t) \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)}(\eta, y, t) \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. (t\delta(t - \mathbf{b}_+(\eta, y)) + t\delta(t - \mathbf{b}_-(\eta, y))) \right\|_{\Gamma_j^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u_j, 1)} \Phi_\tau^N}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (\text{Emb}[f_j] \circ \Gamma_j)(\eta, y, t) \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)}(\eta, y, t) \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. (t\delta(t - \mathbf{b}_+(\eta, y)) + t\delta(t - \mathbf{b}_-(\eta, y))) \right\|_{\Gamma_j^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u_j, 1)} \Phi_\tau^N} \\ & \lesssim \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V^- \cup W^-)} \text{Emb}[f_j] \right\|_{\tilde{F}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_\tau^N}. \end{aligned}$$

Based on the above two bounds, the rest of the proof is merely an unwrapping of definitions of iterated outer Lebesgue norms. We set $V_\times^-(\lambda) = \bigcup_{j \in \{2,3\}} V_j^-(\lambda^{p_\times/p_j})$ so that

$$\int_0^\infty \nu_\beta \left(V_\times^-(\lambda^{1/p_\times}) \right) d\lambda \leq \sum_{j \in \{2,3\}} \int_0^\infty \nu_\beta \left(V_j^-(\lambda^{1/p_j}) \right) d\lambda \lesssim 1.$$

We claim that

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus V_\times^-(\lambda)} \text{Emb}[f_2] \circ \Gamma_2 \text{Emb}[f_3] \circ \Gamma_3 \right\|_{X_{\mu_\Theta^1, \nu_\beta}^{q_j, r_j, +} \Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u_\times, 1)} \square_\tau^N(T)} \lesssim \lambda$$

i.e. that for $\bar{r}_\times \in \{r_\times, q_\times\}$ and for any $V^+ \in \mathbb{D}_\beta^\cup$, any $W^+ \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^\cup$, and for any $\tau > 0$ there exists $W_\times^-(\tau) \in \mathbb{T}_\Theta^\cup$ such that

$$\int_0^\infty \mu_\Theta^1(W_\times^-(\tau^{1/\bar{r}_\times})) d\tau \lesssim 1$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V_\times^-(\lambda) \cup W_\times^-(\tau))} \text{Emb}[f_2] \circ \Gamma_2 \text{Emb}[f_3] \circ \Gamma_3 \right\|_{\Gamma_\times^* \mathbb{L}_{(\Theta, \Theta^{\text{in}})}^{(u_\times, 1)} \square_\tau^N(T)} \\ & \lesssim \tau \lambda \nu_\beta(V^+)^{1/\bar{r}_\times} \mu_\Theta^\infty(W^+)^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}_\times} - \frac{1}{q_\times}} \end{aligned}$$

It is sufficient to set $W_{\times}^{-}(\tau) = \bigcup_{j \in \{2,3\}} W_j^{-}(\tau^{\bar{r}_{\times}/\bar{r}_j})$ where $W_j^{-}(\tau) \in \mathbb{T}_{\Theta}^{\cup}$ is such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{\infty} \mu_{\Theta}^1(W_j^{-}(\tau^{1/\bar{r}_j})) d\tau \lesssim 1, \\ & \left\| \mathbb{1}_{(V^+ \cap W^+) \setminus (V_j^{-}(\lambda^{p_{\times}/p_j}) \cup W_j^{-}(\tau))} \text{Emb}[f_j] \right\|_{\tilde{F}_{\Gamma_j}^{u_j} \Phi_{\Gamma}^N} \\ & \lesssim \tau \lambda^{p_{\times}/p_j} \nu_{\beta}(V^+)^{1/\bar{r}_j} \mu_{\Theta}^{\infty}(W^+)^{\frac{1}{\bar{r}_j} - \frac{1}{q_j}}. \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows. \square

REFERENCES

- [AU20a] Alex Amenta and Gennady Uraltsev. “Banach-valued modulation invariant Carleson embeddings and outer- $\mathcal{L}p$ spaces: the Walsh case”. In: *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications* 26.4 (June 22, 2020), p. 53. ISSN: 1531-5851. DOI: [10.1007/s00041-020-09768-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00041-020-09768-0).
- [AU20b] Alex Amenta and Gennady Uraltsev. “The bilinear Hilbert transform in UMD spaces”. In: *Mathematische Annalen* 378.3 (Dec. 1, 2020), pp. 1129–1221. ISSN: 1432-1807. DOI: [10.1007/s00208-020-02052-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00208-020-02052-y).
- [Cal65] A. P. Calderón. “Commutators of singular integral operators”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 53.5 (May 1, 1965), pp. 1092–1099. ISSN: 0027-8424, 1091-6490. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.53.5.1092](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.53.5.1092).
- [Car66] Lennart Carleson. “On convergence and growth of partial sums of Fourier series”. In: *Acta Mathematica* 116.0 (1966), pp. 135–157. ISSN: 0001-5962. DOI: [10.1007/BF02392815](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02392815).
- [DPF22] Francesco Di Plinio and Anastasios Fragkos. “The weak-type Carleson theorem via wave packet estimates”. Apr. 17, 2022. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2204.08051](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2204.08051). arXiv: [2204.08051](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.08051) [math].
- [DT10] Ciprian Demeter and Christoph Thiele. “On the two-dimensional bilinear Hilbert transform”. In: *American Journal of Mathematics* 132.1 (2010), pp. 201–256. ISSN: 1080-6377. DOI: [10.1353/ajm.0.0101](https://doi.org/10.1353/ajm.0.0101).
- [DT15] Yen Do and Christoph Thiele. “ $\mathcal{L}p$ theory for outer measures and two themes of Lennart Carleson united”. In: *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 52.2 (2015), pp. 249–296.
- [Fed96] Herbert Federer. *Geometric Measure Theory*. Ed. by B. Eckmann and B. L. van der Waerden. Classics in Mathematics. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1996. ISBN: 978-3-540-60656-7 978-3-642-62010-2. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-642-62010-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-62010-2).
- [Fef73] Charles Fefferman. “Pointwise convergence of Fourier series”. In: *The Annals of Mathematics* 98.3 (Nov. 1973), p. 551. ISSN: 0003486X. DOI: [10.2307/1970917](https://doi.org/10.2307/1970917).
- [GL04] Loukas Grafakos and Xiaochun Li. “Uniform bounds for the bilinear Hilbert transforms, I”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 159.3 (May 1, 2004), pp. 889–933. ISSN: 0003-486X. DOI: [10.4007/annals.2004.159.889](https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2004.159.889).
- [Gre+16] Philip Gressman et al. “On a trilinear singular integral form with determinantal kernel”. In: *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 144.8 (2016), pp. 3465–3477. ISSN: 0002-9939. DOI: [10.1090/proc/13007](https://doi.org/10.1090/proc/13007).

- [He98] Joris van der Hoeven and et al. *GNU TeXmacs: A Scientific Editing Platform*. <https://www.texmacs.org>. 1998. URL: <https://www.texmacs.org>.
- [Kov12] Vjekoslav Kovač. “Boundedness of the twisted paraproduct”. In: *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana* 28.4 (2012), pp. 1143–1164. ISSN: 0213-2230. DOI: [10.4171/RMI/707](https://doi.org/10.4171/RMI/707).
- [KTZK15] Vjekoslav Kovač, Christoph Thiele, and Pavel Zorin-Kranich. “Dyadic triangular hilbert transform of two general functions and one not too general function”. In: *Forum of Mathematics, Sigma* 3 (Nov. 2015). ISSN: 2050-5094. DOI: [10.1017/fms.2015.25](https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2015.25).
- [Lac00] Michael T. Lacey. “The bilinear maximal functions map into L^p for $2/3 < p \leq 1$ ”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 151.1 (2000), pp. 35–57. ISSN: 0003-486X. DOI: [10.2307/121111](https://doi.org/10.2307/121111).
- [Li06] Xiaochun Li. “Uniform bounds for the bilinear Hilbert transforms, II”. In: *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana* 22.3 (2006), pp. 1069–1126. ISSN: 0213-2230. DOI: [10.4171/RMI/483](https://doi.org/10.4171/RMI/483).
- [LT97] M. Lacey and C. Lp Thiele. “Estimates on the bilinear Hilbert transform for $2 < p < \infty$ ”. In: *Ann. Math* 146 (1997), pp. 693–724.
- [LT98] Michael T. Lacey and Christoph M. Thiele. “On Calderón’s conjecture for the bilinear Hilbert transform”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 95.9 (1998), p. 4828. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.95.9.4828>.
- [MS13] Camil Muscalu and Wilhelm Schlag. *Classical and multilinear harmonic analysis. Vol. II*. Vol. 138. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013. xvi+324. ISBN: 978-1-107-03182-1.
- [Mus14] Camil Muscalu. “Calderón commutators and the Cauchy integral on Lipschitz curves revisited I. First commutator and generalizations”. In: *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana* 30.2 (2014), pp. 727–750. ISSN: 0213-2230. DOI: [10.4171/RMI/798](https://doi.org/10.4171/RMI/798).
- [PO18] Francesco di Plinio and Yumeng Ou. “A modulation invariant Carleson embedding theorem outside local L^2 ”. In: *Journal d’Analyse Mathématique* 135.2 (June 1, 2018), pp. 675–711. ISSN: 1565-8538. DOI: [10.1007/s11854-018-0049-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11854-018-0049-4).
- [Thi02] Christoph Thiele. “A Uniform Estimate”. In: *The Annals of Mathematics* 156.2 (Sept. 2002), pp. 519–563. ISSN: 0003486X. DOI: [10.2307/3597197](https://doi.org/10.2307/3597197).
- [Thi06] Christoph Thiele. *Wave packet analysis*. Vol. 105. CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2006. vi+86. ISBN: 978-0-8218-3661-3. DOI: [10.1090/cbms/105](https://doi.org/10.1090/cbms/105).
- [Ura16] Gennady Uraltsev. “Variational Carleson embeddings into the upper 3-space”. Oct. 24, 2016. arXiv: [1610.07657](https://arxiv.org/abs/1610.07657).
- [War19] Michał Warchalski. “Uniform Estimates in One- and Two-Dimensional Time-Frequency Analysis”. Thesis. RFWU Bonn, Feb. 22, 2019. URL: <https://bonndoc.ulb.uni-bonn.de/xmlui/handle/20.500.11811/7882>.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA, USA
Email address: gennady.uraltesv@gmail.com
Email address: waral91@gmail.com