



HAL
open science

Microlocal Partition of Energy for Fractional-Type Dispersive Equations

Haocheng Yang

► **To cite this version:**

Haocheng Yang. Microlocal Partition of Energy for Fractional-Type Dispersive Equations. 2023. hal-04219225

HAL Id: hal-04219225

<https://hal.science/hal-04219225v1>

Preprint submitted on 26 Sep 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

MICROLOCAL PARTITION OF ENERGY FOR FRACTIONAL-TYPE DISPERSIVE EQUATIONS

HAOCHENG YANG^{1,2}

ABSTRACT. This paper is devoted to the proof of microlocal partition of energy for fractional-type dispersive equations including Schrödinger equation, linearized gravity or capillary water-wave equation and half-Klein-Gordon equation. Roughly speaking, a quarter of the L^2 energy lies inside or outside the “light cone” $|x| = |tP'(\xi)|$ for large time. In addition, based on the study of half-Klein-Gordon equation, the microlocal partition of energy will also be proved for Klein-Gordon equation.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Background.** The classical partition of energy states that the energy of the solution w to linear wave equation

$$(W) \quad \begin{cases} (\partial_t^2 - \Delta)w = 0, \\ w|_{t=0} = w_0 \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d), \\ \partial_t w|_{t=0} = w_1 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \end{cases}$$

inside and outside the light cone $|x| = |t|$ satisfies, in *odd* dimension d ,

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (E^{\text{in}}(w_0, w_1, t) + E^{\text{in}}(w_0, w_1, -t)) &= \|\partial_t w\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2, \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (E^{\text{out}}(w_0, w_1, t) + E^{\text{out}}(w_0, w_1, -t)) &= \|\partial_t w\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E^{\text{in}}(w_0, w_1, t) &:= \int_{|x| < |t|} (|\nabla w|^2 + |\partial_t w|^2) dx, \\ E^{\text{out}}(w_0, w_1, t) &:= \int_{|x| > |t|} (|\nabla w|^2 + |\partial_t w|^2) dx. \end{aligned}$$

A proof of this can be found in [10] and [11], where the authors applied this result to study the soliton of focusing energy-critical nonlinear wave equation in dimension $d = 3, 5$ via some nonlinear analysis on small data solutions. One may also refer to [3] and [4] for the application in equivariant wave maps. In *even* dimension d , the limits (1.1) do not hold in general settings. It is essential to add some extra corrections, which have been calculated in detail for radial solutions in [6] and for general data in [8]. In these references, the authors also discovered some special data such that the corrections vanish, an application of which to 4-dimensional focusing energy-critical wave equation can be found in [5].

¹Ecole Normale Supérieure Paris-Saclay, CNRS Centre Borelli UMR9010, 4 Avenue des Sciences, F-91190 Gif-sur-Yvette.

²Université Paris XIII (Sorbonne Paris-Nord), LAGA, CNRS (UMR 7539), 99 Avenue J.-B. Clément, F-93430 Villetaneuse.

The above results have been recently revisited in [9] using the tools of microlocal analysis. Consider first a solution u of the half-wave equation

$$(HW) \quad \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\partial_t}{i} - |D_x| \right) u = 0, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0 \in L^2. \end{cases}$$

Since $u = e^{it|D_x|}u_0$, stationary phase formula shows that one expects the microlocalized energy of the solution outside a convenient neighborhood of $\{(x, \xi) : x = t \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}\}$ at time t to vanish when t goes to infinity. Because of that, it is natural to ask whether the microlocalized energy close to the preceding point, truncated outside the wave cone, gives rise to lower bound of the form (1.1). More precisely, if one defines this microlocalized truncated energy as

$$(1.2) \quad E_{\chi, \tilde{\chi}, \delta}^{HW}(u_0, t) := \|\text{Op}(a_{\chi, \tilde{\chi}, \delta}^{HW}(t)) u(t)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

$$(1.3) \quad a_{\chi, \tilde{\chi}, \delta}^{HW}(t, x, \xi) := \chi \left(\frac{x + t \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}}{|t|^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right) \tilde{\chi} \left(\frac{|x| - |t|}{|t|^\delta} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |t|},$$

where $\chi, \tilde{\chi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are chosen to be real, radial and equal to 1 near zero with $\delta \in]0, \frac{1}{2}]$, then it has been proved in [9] that in any dimension d ,

$$(1.4) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (E_{\chi, \tilde{\chi}, \delta}^{HW}(u_0, t) + E_{\chi, \tilde{\chi}, \delta}^{HW}(u_0, -t)) = \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2.$$

This result may be used to recover (1.1) in odd dimension by taking $u = (-i\partial_t + |D_x|)w$. Actually, the truncated energy in (1.2) may be expressed from the microlocalized truncated energy for the solution u of the half wave equation and from extra terms. These extra terms give a zero contribution at the limit t tending to infinity in *odd* dimensions, but not in even ones.

The heuristics underlying estimate (1.4) for the half wave equation are as follows. Define the quantization $\text{Op}(a_{\chi, \tilde{\chi}, \delta}^{HW})$ of the symbol (1.3) by

$$(\text{Op}(a_{\chi, \tilde{\chi}, \delta}^{HW}) f)(t, x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{ix \cdot \xi} a_{\chi, \tilde{\chi}, \delta}^{HW}(t, x, \xi) \hat{f}(t, \xi) d\xi.$$

Then (1.2) may be written as

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{aligned} E_{\chi, \tilde{\chi}, \delta}^{HW}(u_0, t) &= \langle \text{Op}(a_{\chi, \tilde{\chi}, \delta}^{HW}) e^{it|D_x|} u_0, \text{Op}(a_{\chi, \tilde{\chi}, \delta}^{HW}) e^{it|D_x|} u_0 \rangle_{L^2} \\ &= \langle u_0, e^{-it|D_x|} \text{Op}(a_{\chi, \tilde{\chi}, \delta}^{HW})^* \text{Op}(a_{\chi, \tilde{\chi}, \delta}^{HW}) e^{it|D_x|} u_0 \rangle_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

If the symbols were smooth ones, so that symbolic calculus (whose details can be found in [21]) could be used, one would expect the composition $\text{Op}(a_{\chi, \tilde{\chi}, \delta}^{HW})^* \text{Op}(a_{\chi, \tilde{\chi}, \delta}^{HW})$ to be equal, modulo negligible remainders, to $\text{Op}(b)$, with $b = |a_{\chi, \tilde{\chi}, \delta}^{HW}|^2$, and the conjugation $e^{-it|D_x|} \text{Op}(b) e^{it|D_x|}$ to be equal, up to remainders, to $\text{Op}(c)$ where $c(x, \xi) = b(x - t \frac{\xi}{|\xi|})$. Applying this to (1.5), one could write this quantity as $\langle u_0, \text{Op}(e) u_0 \rangle$ modulo a term tending to zero when t goes to infinity, where e is given by

$$e(t, x, \xi) = \chi^2 \left(\frac{x}{|t|^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right) \tilde{\chi}^2 \left(\frac{|x - t \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}| - |t|}{|t|^\delta} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x - t \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}| > |t|}$$

This symbol e roughly cuts-off the phase space on the domain

$$\left\{ (x, \xi) : |x| \lesssim |t|^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}, \left| x - t \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} \right| > |t| \right\}.$$

When $t \rightarrow +\infty$, the truncated domain tends to the half-space

$$(1.6) \quad \left\{ (x, \xi) : \operatorname{sgn}(t)x \cdot \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} < 0 \right\}.$$

As a consequence, the sum of truncated energy at time t and $-t$ covers the whole phase space.

We emphasize that all the arguments above are merely formal. They hold only if all the involved functions are regular enough. In fact, it has also been proved in [9] that the cut-off operator $\operatorname{Op}(a_{\chi, \bar{\chi}, \delta}^{\text{HW}})$ may not even be bounded if the singular cut-off $|x| > |t|$ is replaced by $x \cdot \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} > t$, which seems to work formally.

The above formal point of view, though purely heuristic, makes expect that the classical result (1.1) might be extended to a large class of dispersive equations. In general system

$$\left(\frac{\partial_t}{i} - P(D_x) \right) u = 0,$$

as in half-wave equation, one may expect that the energy concentrates in the phase space around $x + tP'(\xi) = 0$ and the partition of energy holds with generalized ‘‘light cone’’

$$|x| = |tP'(\xi)|.$$

The first result for Schrödinger equation has been given in [9] with truncation

$$(1.7) \quad E_{\chi, \delta}^{\text{Schr}}(u_0, t) := \left\| \operatorname{Op}(a_{\chi, \delta}^{\text{Schr}}(t)) u(t) \right\|_{L^2}^2,$$

$$(1.8) \quad a_{\chi, \delta}^{\text{Schr}}(t, x, \xi) := \chi \left(\frac{x + t\xi}{|t\xi| \langle \sqrt{|t||\xi|} \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |t\xi|}.$$

The result is similar:

$$(1.9) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (E_{\chi, \delta}^{\text{Schr}}(u_0, t) + E_{\chi, \delta}^{\text{Schr}}(u_0, -t)) = \frac{1}{2} \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Here the extra factors in the cut-off χ is only for technical use, and the loss of half of total energy $\|u_0\|_{L^2}^2$ is due to the convexity of $P(\xi) = \frac{|\xi|^2}{2}$.

The goal of this paper is to examine if the microlocal partition of energy results (1.4), (1.9) may be extended to a large class of dispersive equations. In particular, this generalized result covers the system of linearized gravity or capillary water-wave with infinite depth

$$(1\text{GWW}) \quad \frac{\partial_t u}{i} - |D_x|^{\frac{1}{2}} u = 0,$$

$$(1\text{CWW}) \quad \frac{\partial_t u}{i} - |D_x|^{\frac{3}{2}} u = 0,$$

or with finite and constant depth h ,

$$(1\text{GWW}_h) \quad \frac{\partial_t u}{i} - |D_x|^{\frac{1}{2}} \tanh(h|D_x|) u = 0,$$

$$(1\text{CWW}_h) \quad \frac{\partial_t u}{i} - |D_x|^{\frac{3}{2}} \tanh(h|D_x|) u = 0.$$

Moreover, the system of half-Klein-Gordon

$$(1\text{HKG}) \quad \frac{\partial_t u}{i} - \langle D_x \rangle u = 0$$

can also be covered by the generalized result, and the associated conclusion will further imply the microlocal partition of energy for standard Klein-Gordon equation

$$(KG) \quad \begin{cases} (\partial_t^2 - \Delta + 1)w = 0, \\ w|_{t=0} = w_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d), \\ \partial_t w|_{t=0} = w_1 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d). \end{cases}$$

One may have noticed that (1.4) and (1.9) are proved only for $\delta \in]0, \frac{1}{2}]$ or $]0, \frac{1}{2}[$. The case $\delta \geq \frac{1}{2}$ seems useless since with such δ the cut-off χ gives no information in the concentration of energy. The critical case $\delta = 0$, however, leads to some interesting results in the limit of truncated energy. The related results will be presented in detail in the next part.

1.2. Main results. We consider the fractional-type dispersive equation:

$$(E) \quad \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\partial_t}{i} - P(D_x) \right) u = 0, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0, \end{cases}$$

where P is radial and smooth except at $\xi = 0$. For simplicity, P will be identified as a function of $\rho = |\xi|$ in what follows. We further assume that P is a fractional-type symbol. Namely, the following hypothesis hold for some $p_0, p_1 \neq 0$.

$$(H_{p_0, p_1}) \quad \begin{aligned} (1) & P^{(1)} \text{ is strictly positive and monotone on }]0, +\infty[; \\ (2.0) & \exists P_0 \geq 0, \rho \rightarrow 0+, \quad |P^{(1)}(\rho) - P_0| \sim \rho^{p_0}, \quad |P^{(2)}(\rho)| \sim \rho^{p_0-1}; \\ (2.1) & \exists P_1 \geq 0, \rho \rightarrow +\infty, \quad |P^{(1)}(\rho) - P_1| \sim \rho^{p_1}, \quad |P^{(2)}(\rho)| \sim \rho^{p_1-1}; \\ (3.0) & \forall j \in \mathbb{N}^*, j \geq 3, \forall \rho \in]0, 1[, \quad |P^{(j)}(\rho)| \lesssim \rho^{p_0+1-j}; \\ (3.1) & \forall j \in \mathbb{N}^*, j \geq 3, \forall \rho \in]1, \infty[, \quad |P^{(j)}(\rho)| \lesssim \rho^{p_1+1-j}. \end{aligned}$$

We introduce the symbol

$$(1.10) \quad a(t, x, \xi) = a_{\chi, \delta}(t, x, \xi) = \chi \left(\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{|t|^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |t|P'(\xi)},$$

where $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is real with $\chi(0) = 1$. The corresponding truncated energy is defined as

$$(1.11) \quad \begin{aligned} E(u_0, t) = E_{\chi, \delta}(u_0, t) &= \| \text{Op} (a_{\chi, \delta}(t)) (u(t)) \|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= \| \text{Op} (a_{\chi, \delta}(t)) (e^{itP(D_x)} u_0) \|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(1.12) \quad \text{Op} (a_{\chi, \delta}(t)) (e^{itP(D_x)} u_0) (x) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{ix\xi + itP(\xi)} a_{\chi, \delta}(t, x, \xi) \hat{u}_0(\xi) d\xi.$$

In Proposition 2.1, 2.2, and 3.1, we shall prove that, under some extra conditions on P , operator $\text{Op} (a(t))$, together with its variations to be introduced later, is bounded on L^2 , uniformly in $|t| \gg 1$. $E(u_0, t)$ is therefore a well-defined truncated energy, at least when time $|t|$ is sufficiently large.

We first state the fundamental result which is available for fractional equations, namely equation (E) with $P'(\xi) = |\xi|^p \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}$, such as Schrödinger equation ($p = 1$), linearized gravity water-wave equation ($p = -\frac{1}{2}$), and linearized capillary water-wave equation ($p = \frac{1}{2}$).

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a real function such that $\chi(0) = 1$. We further assume that P satisfies hypothesis (H_{p_0, p_1}) with $P_0 = P_1 = 0$.*

(i) *If $\delta < 0$,*

$$(1.13) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} E_{\chi, \delta}(u_0, t) = 0.$$

(ii) *If $\delta = 0$,*

$$(1.14) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} E_{\chi, \delta}(u_0, t) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int G_\chi(\rho, \omega) |\hat{u}_0(\rho\omega)|^2 \rho^{d-1} d\rho d\omega,$$

where (ρ, ω) is polar coordinate. The function $G_\chi(\rho, \omega)$ is defined, when P is convex, by

$$(1.15) \quad G_\chi(\rho, \omega) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \left| \int_0^\infty \int_{y \cdot \omega = 0} e^{i \frac{r^2 + |y|^2}{2}} \chi \left(\sqrt{P''(\rho)} r \omega + \sqrt{\rho^{-1} P'(\rho)} y \right) dy dr \right|^2,$$

and, when P is concave, by

$$(1.16) \quad G_\chi(\rho, \omega) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \left| \int_0^\infty \int_{y \cdot \omega = 0} e^{i \frac{-r^2 + |y|^2}{2}} \chi \left(\sqrt{-P''(\rho)} r \omega + \sqrt{\rho^{-1} P'(\rho)} y \right) dy dr \right|^2.$$

(iii) *If $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$, we further assume that χ is radial. Then*

$$(1.17) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} E_{\chi, \delta}(u_0, t) = \frac{1}{4} \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Remark 1.2. *In (1.17), we manage to calculate the limit of $E_{\chi, \delta}(u_0, t)$ and $E_{\chi, \delta}(u_0, -t)$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, instead of their sum as in (1.1) and (1.9). Notice that the heuristics discussed after (1.6) in the case of half-wave equations do not predict this fact. This shows the limitation of this formal reasoning when sharp cut-offs are involved in the symbols.*

Remark 1.3. *For Schrödinger equation, the special structure of $P'(\xi) = \xi$ allows us to reduce the regularity required for χ . In Appendix C, we will show that limits (1.13) and (1.14) hold for all $\chi \in L^1$.*

We will see later that our proof of Theorem 1.1 does not hold for P with nonzero P_0, P_1 , such as half-Klein-Gordon equation (HKG), where $P_1 = 1$. In order to deal with this difficulty, one way is to add some cut-off in frequency ξ . To be precise, we introduce the modified truncated symbol

$$(1.18) \quad a^{\text{mod}}(t, x, \xi) = a_{\chi, \delta}^{\text{mod}}(t, x, \xi) = \chi \left(\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{|t|^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |t| |P'(\xi)|} (1 - \chi_l) \left(\frac{\xi}{|t|^{-\epsilon_0}} \right) \chi_h \left(\frac{\xi}{|t|^{\epsilon_1}} \right),$$

where ϵ_0, ϵ_1 satisfies

$$(1.19) \quad 0 < \epsilon_0 \leq \frac{1}{p_0 + 1}, \quad 0 < \epsilon_1 \leq \begin{cases} +\infty, & \text{if } -1 \leq p_1 < 0, \\ \frac{1}{-(p_1 + 1)}, & \text{if } p_1 < -1, \end{cases}$$

and $\chi_l, \chi_h \in C_c^\infty$ are radial and equal to 1 near zero. This symbol will be concerned only when $p_1 < 0 < p_0$, the reason of which will be explained later. The corresponding truncated energy is denoted by

$$E^{\text{mod}}(u_0, t) = E_{\chi, \delta}^{\text{mod}}(u_0, t) := \|\text{Op}(a_{\chi, \delta}^{\text{mod}}(t)) u(t)\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a real function such that $\chi(0) = 1$. We further assume that P satisfies hypothesis (\mathbf{H}_{p_0, p_1}) with $p_1 < 0 < p_0$, $P_0, P_1 > 0$, and ϵ_0, ϵ_1 satisfy condition (1.19).*

(i) *If $\delta < 0$,*

$$(1.20) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} E_{\chi, \delta}^{\text{mod}}(u_0, t) = 0.$$

(ii) *If $\delta = 0$,*

$$(1.21) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} E_{\chi, \delta}^{\text{mod}}(u_0, t) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int G_\chi(\rho, \omega) |\hat{u}_0(\rho\omega)|^2 \rho^{d-1} d\rho d\omega,$$

where (ρ, ω) is polar coordinate. The function $G_\chi(\rho, \omega)$ is the same one defined by (1.15) and (1.16).

(iii) *If $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$, we further assume that χ is radial. Then*

$$(1.22) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} E_{\chi, \delta}^{\text{mod}}(u_0, t) = \frac{1}{4} \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Remark 1.5. *In this theorem, we only consider the case $p_1 < 0 < p_0$, which is enough to cover all $P_0, P_1 \neq 0$. Actually, when $p_0 < 0$ (resp. $p_1 > 0$), the hypothesis (\mathbf{H}_{p_0, p_1}) with $P_0 > 0$ (resp. $P_1 > 0$) is equivalent to (\mathbf{H}_{p_0, p_1}) with $P_0 = 0$ (resp. $P_1 = 0$), which has been studied in Theorem 1.1.*

Another way to deal with nonzero P_0, P_1 is to add extra factor in the cut-off χ , namely, considering an alternative truncated symbol

$$(1.23) \quad a^{\text{alt}}(t, x, \xi) = a_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}^{\text{alt}}(t, x, \xi) = \chi \left(\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{|t|^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta} \Lambda(|t|^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi)} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |t| |P'(\xi)|},$$

where $\Lambda \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\})$ is strictly positive, radial and satisfies the following condition for some $\sigma_0, \sigma_1 \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned} (1.0) \quad & \rho \rightarrow 0+, \quad \Lambda(\rho) \sim \rho^{\sigma_0}; \\ (1.1) \quad & \rho \rightarrow +\infty, \quad \Lambda(\rho) \sim \rho^{\sigma_1}; \\ (\mathbf{C}_{\sigma_0, \sigma_1}) \quad & (2.0) \quad \forall \rho \in]0, 1[, \quad \Lambda^{(j)}(\rho) \lesssim \rho^{\sigma_0 - j}; \\ & (2.1) \quad \forall \rho \in]1, \infty[, \quad \Lambda^{(j)}(\rho) \lesssim \rho^{\sigma_1 - j}; \\ & (3) \quad \lim_{\rho \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\Lambda(\rho)}{\rho^{\sigma_1}} = \lambda_1 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

The associated truncated energy is denoted by

$$E^{\text{alt}}(u_0, t) = E_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}^{\text{alt}}(u_0, t) := \|\text{Op}(a_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}^{\text{alt}}(t)) u(t)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

and the result becomes

Theorem 1.6. *Let $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a real function such that $\chi(0) = 1$. We assume that P satisfies hypothesis (\mathbf{H}_{p_0, p_1}) and Λ satisfies condition $(\mathbf{C}_{\sigma_0, \sigma_1})$ with $\sigma_0 \geq p_0, \sigma_1 \leq p_1$.*

(i) *If $\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} < 0$,*

$$(1.24) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} E_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}^{\text{alt}}(u_0, t) = 0.$$

(ii) *If $\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} = 0$,*

$$(1.25) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} E_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}^{\text{alt}}(u_0, t) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int G_\chi^{\text{alt}}(\rho, \omega) |\hat{u}_0(\rho\omega)|^2 \rho^{d-1} d\rho d\omega,$$

where (ρ, ω) is polar coordinate. The function $G_\chi^{\text{alt}}(\rho, \omega)$ is defined, when P is convex, by

$$(1.26) \quad G_\chi^{\text{alt}}(\rho, \omega) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \left| \int_0^\infty \int_{y \cdot \omega = 0} e^{i \frac{r^2 + |y|^2}{2}} \chi \left(\frac{\sqrt{P''(\rho)} r \omega + \sqrt{\rho^{-1} P'(\rho)} y}{\lambda_1 \rho^{\sigma_1}} \right) dy dr \right|^2,$$

and, when P is concave, by

(1.27)

$$G_\chi^{\text{alt}}(\rho, \omega) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \left| \int_0^\infty \int_{y \cdot \omega = 0} e^{i \frac{-r^2 + |y|^2}{2}} \chi \left(\frac{\sqrt{-P''(\rho)} r \omega + \sqrt{\rho^{-1} P'(\rho)} y}{\lambda_1 \rho^{\sigma_1}} \right) dy dr \right|^2.$$

(iii) If $0 < \delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} < \frac{1}{2}$, we further assume that χ is radial. Then

$$(1.28) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} E_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}^{\text{alt}}(u_0, t) = \frac{1}{4} \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Remark 1.7. The proof of Theorem 1.1 fails when $|x/t|$ is close to P_0 or P_1 . The extra factor Λ together with condition $\sigma_0 \geq p_0, \sigma_1 \leq p_1$ allows us to eliminate this case, and a demonstration similar to Theorem 1.1 will work when $|x/t|$ is away from P_0, P_1 .

As a byproduct of Proposition 2.1 and 2.2, where the uniform-in- t boundedness on L^2 of $\text{Op}(a(t))$ and $\text{Op}(a^{\text{mod}}(t))$ will be proved, these operators are also uniformly bounded with χ identically equal to 1, namely

Theorem 1.8. Let $p_0, p_1 \neq 0$ and P satisfy the hypothesis (H_{p_0, p_1}) . There exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of t , such that,

(i) when $P_0 = P_1 = 0$,

$$\|\text{Op}(\mathbb{1}_{|x| > |t| P'(\xi)})\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq C$$

holds for all $|t| > 0$;

(ii) when $P_0, P_1 > 0$,

$$\|\text{Op} \left(\mathbb{1}_{|x| > |t| P'(\xi)} (1 - \chi_l) \left(\frac{\xi}{|t|^{-\epsilon_0}} \right) \chi_h \left(\frac{\xi}{|t|^{\epsilon_1}} \right) \right)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq C$$

holds for all $|t| > t_0 \gg 1$, where ϵ_0, ϵ_1 are arbitrary parameters satisfying (1.19) and $\chi_l, \chi_h \in C_c^\infty$ are equal to 1 near zero.

The boundedness of $\text{Op}(\mathbb{1}_E)$ for measurable sets $E \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ is of great concern in microrlocal analysis, and the results above give a positive answer to some E defined via convex functions. If one changes to Weyl quantization, this problem is known as localization of Wigner distribution. In fact, in this case, we have

$$\langle \text{Op}^w(\mathbb{1}_E) u, v \rangle_{L^2} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \int_E \mathcal{W}(u, v)(x, \xi) dx d\xi,$$

where

$$\mathcal{W}(u, v)(x, \xi) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{iy \cdot \xi} u\left(x + \frac{y}{2}\right) \overline{v\left(x - \frac{y}{2}\right)} dy$$

is the Wigner distribution of (u, v) . It has been found that the operator properties of $\text{Op}^w(\mathbb{1}_E)$ (boundedness, positivity, spectrum, etc) is related to the geometry of E . For example, when E is an ellipsoid, in [12] and [16], the authors gave some sharp estimates of the L^2 -norm of $\text{Op}^w(\mathbb{1}_E)$, which is related to the size of the ellipsoid. As another example, when E is a polygon on \mathbb{R}^2 with N sides, it was proved in [15] that the norm of $\text{Op}^w(\mathbb{1}_E)$ can be controlled by $\sqrt{N/2}$ for $N \geq 3$. In the same paper, the author also proved that there exists open set E such that $\text{Op}^w(\mathbb{1}_E)$ is not even bounded on L^2 . The

readers may refer to [15] for more results on this topic.

By applying the results of Theorem 1.4 and 1.8 to half-Klein-Gordon equation (HKG), we are able to obtain the following microlocal partition of energy for Klein-Gordon equation, which is an analogue of partition of energy for wave equation.

Theorem 1.9. *Let w be the unique solution to Klein-Gordon equation (KG), namely*

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t^2 - \Delta + 1)w = 0, \\ w|_{t=0} = w_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d), \\ \partial_t w|_{t=0} = w_1 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \end{cases}$$

where w_0, w_1 are real, so as w . Then, the truncated energy

$$(1.29) \quad E_\epsilon^{KG}(w_0, w_1, t) := \|\text{Op}(a_\epsilon^{KG}(t)) \partial_t w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\text{Op}(a_\epsilon^{KG}(t)) \nabla w(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\text{Op}(a_\epsilon^{KG}(t)) w(t)\|_{L^2}^2$$

satisfies

$$(1.30) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} E_\epsilon^{KG}(w_0, w_1, t) = \frac{1}{4} (\|w_0\|_{H^1}^2 + \|w_1\|_{L^2}^2),$$

where

$$(1.31) \quad a_\epsilon^{KG}(t, x, \xi) = a_\epsilon^{KG}(t, x, \xi) := \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |t \frac{\xi}{\langle \xi \rangle}} \chi \left(\frac{\xi}{|t|^\epsilon} \right),$$

$0 < \epsilon < 1$, and $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a real and radial function equal to 1 near zero.

Remark 1.10. *In view of the similarity between wave equation and Klein-Gordon equation, one may ask what (1.30) will become if we apply the same truncation $\mathbb{1}_{|x| > |t|}$ as in classical result (1.1). The answer is, for all $0 \leq r_0 \leq r_1$,*

$$(1.32) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \int_{r_0 < \frac{|x|}{|t|} < r_1} (|\partial_t w|^2 + |\nabla w|^2 + |w|^2) dx = \|\mathbb{1}_{]r_0, r_1[}(|D_x|)w_0\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\mathbb{1}_{]r_0, r_1[}(|D_x|)w_1\|_{L^2}^2,$$

where $]r_0, r_1[= P'^{-1}(]r_0, r_1[)$. Since P' takes value in $[0, 1[$, we have in particular,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \int_{|x| > |t|} (|\partial_t w|^2 + |\nabla w|^2 + |w|^2) dx = 0.$$

A detailed discussion of (1.32) will be given in Section D.

1.3. Non-nullity of the limit in critical case. In Theorem 1.1, 1.4, and 1.6, we calculate the limit of energy in three cases. In sub-critical case $\delta < 0$ (or $\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} < 0$), the truncated energy tends to 0, no matter which χ we choose. This phenomenon also exists in super-critical case $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$ (or $0 < \delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} < \frac{1}{2}$), where the limit is always half of total energy $\|u_0\|_{L^2}$. In critical case $\delta = 0$ (or $\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} = 0$), however, the limit does depend on our choice of χ . If we further assume χ to be radial, it is not difficult to check that the limits (1.14), (1.21), and (1.25) are bounded and non-negative.

In fact, when χ is radial, the function $G_\chi, G_\chi^{\text{alt}}$ can be written in the form

$$\frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i \frac{\pm x_1^2 + |x'|^2}{2}} \chi \left(\frac{\sqrt{\pm P''(\rho)} x_1 + \sqrt{P'(\rho)/\rho} x'}{\lambda \rho^\sigma} \right) dx \right|^2,$$

where $+$ and $-$ stand for convex and concave case, respectively, $x = (x_1, x') \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, and $\lambda > 0$, $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$. By Plancherel Theorem, it equals to

$$\frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i \frac{\pm \xi_1^2 + |\xi'|^2}{2(\lambda\rho\sigma)^2}} \hat{\chi} \left(\frac{\xi_1}{\sqrt{\pm P''(\rho)}} + \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{P'(\rho)}} \xi' \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pm P''(\rho)}} \left(\frac{\rho}{P'(\rho)} \right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} d\xi \right|^2,$$

which, after a change of variable, reads

$$(1.33) \quad \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i \frac{P''(\rho)\rho\xi_1^2 + P'(\rho)|\xi'|^2}{2\rho(\lambda\rho\sigma)^2}} \hat{\chi}(\xi) d\xi \right|^2.$$

Therefore, G_χ can be estimated by

$$0 \leq G_\chi(\rho, \omega) \leq \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \|\hat{\chi}\|_{L^1}^2.$$

A natural question is then whether limits (1.14), (1.21), and (1.25) are nonzero for nontrivial initial data u_0 . The answer is positive for fractional equation, i.e. with $P'(\xi) = |\xi|^{p-1}\xi$, $p \neq 0$. More precisely,

Proposition 1.11. *Under the assumption $P'(\xi) = |\xi|^{p-1}\xi$, (1.33) can be written, up to some multiple with constants, as*

$$\tilde{G}(\rho) = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i \frac{1}{2\lambda^2} \rho^{p-1-2\sigma} (p\xi_1^2 + |\xi'|^2)} \hat{\chi}(\xi) d\xi \right|^2.$$

If $p \neq 2\sigma + 1$ and $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\chi(0) \neq 0$, $\tilde{G}(\rho)$ is nonzero except on a set of null Lebesgue measure.

Proof. Since χ is a Schwartz function, the complex function

$$F(z) := \frac{1}{2(2\pi)^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i \frac{z}{2\lambda^2} (\frac{p}{2}\xi_1^2 + \frac{1}{2}|\xi'|^2)} \hat{\chi}(\xi) d\xi$$

is analytic on upper half plane $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Im } z > 0\}$ and continuous on its closure. In [17], the authors proved that either the real zeros of such function form a set of zero Lebesgue measure, or it is identically zero. The same result holds thus for $\tilde{G}(\rho) = |F(\rho^{p-1-2\sigma})|^2$. Due to the fact that $\chi(0) \neq 0$, \tilde{G} is nonzero as $\rho^{p-1-2\sigma_1}$ is small enough, and \tilde{G} is therefore nonzero almost everywhere. \square

As a consequence, the limits (1.14), (1.21), and (1.25) are strictly positive for all nontrivial $u_0 \in L^2$ under the assumption $p \neq 1$ (or $p \neq 2\sigma_1 + 1$). If $p = 1$ (or $p = 2\sigma_1 + 1$), the function $G_\chi(\rho)$ (or G_χ^{alt}) will no more depend on ρ and the limits (1.14), (1.21), (1.25) will take the form $c_0(\chi) \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2$, where

$$c_0(\chi) = \left| \frac{1}{2(2\pi)^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i(\frac{p}{2}\xi_1^2 + \frac{1}{2}|\xi'|^2)} \hat{\chi}(\xi) d\xi \right|^2.$$

To obtain a nonzero limit, it suffices to choose χ such that the quantity above is nonzero. For example, one may take

- χ to be positive and supported in a sufficiently small ball centered at zero;
- χ to be Gaussian;
- χ of the form $\chi = \tilde{\chi}(\cdot/R)$, with $\tilde{\chi} \in C_c^\infty$, $\tilde{\chi}(0) \neq 0$, and $R \gg 1$.

1.4. Plan of this paper. The proof of Theorem 1.1, 1.4, and 1.6 will be divided into two parts: uniform boundedness of truncated operator and calculation of limit. In Section 2, we will prove that $\text{Op}(a(t))$ and $\text{Op}(a^{\text{mod}}(t))$ are uniformly bounded on L^2 in three steps. The first two steps are exactly the same, while the difference arises in the last step where one may see the difficulties caused by nonzero P_0, P_1 . As a byproduct of this proof, Theorem 1.8 can be shown easily. Section 3 is devoted to the uniform boundedness of $\text{Op}(a^{\text{alt}}(t))$, which is much simpler than that of $\text{Op}(a(t))$ and $\text{Op}(a^{\text{mod}}(t))$ thanks to the extra factor Λ . The uniform boundedness of truncated operators allows us to calculate the limits stated in Theorem 1.1, 1.4, and 1.6 only for some regular data u_0 , which will be precised in Section 4. In Section 5, we will prove the microlocal partition of energy for Klein-Gordon equation by studying the half-Klein-Gordon equation.

In Appendix A, we collect technical inequalities which are frequently used in this paper, as well as some criteria of L^2 -boundedness for pseudo-differential operators. Several stationary phase lemmas are presented in Appendix B which is a key technique in calculating the limit of truncated energy. As mentioned before, our main result Theorem 1.1 can be refined for Schrödinger equation, whose rigorous statement and proof will be given in Appendix C. Appendix D is devoted to the discussion on the classical partition of energy for Klein-Gordon equation due to the study of asymptotic behavior of solution to half-Klein-Gordon equation. The last part, Appendix E, contains some details omitted in Section 4, especially for concave P .

1.5. Notations and conventions. To end this section, we clarify some notations and conventions used in this paper.

- We say a is a symbol on \mathbb{R}^d , if a is a function on $\{(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d\}$. The corresponding (pseudo-differential) operator is defined by

$$\text{Op}(a)f(x) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{ix\xi} a(x, \xi) \hat{f}(\xi) d\xi.$$

To make this definition meaningful, we will assume in this paper that a is a measurable function with at most polynomial growth in ξ and that f belongs to the class of Schwartz functions.

- For any function $P : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, which can be regarded as a symbol independent of x , the corresponding operator will be denoted by $P(D_x)$.

- The kernel (or kernel function) of a linear operator $A : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d) \mapsto \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is defined as (if it exists) a tempered distribution K on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, such that

$$Au(x) = \int K(x, y)u(y)dy.$$

For the simplicity of notation, in this paper, we will use the symbol of kernel function to represent the operator, i.e.

$$Ku(x) = \int K(x, y)u(y)dy.$$

- A function $F : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ is said to be radial, if there exists a function $f : [0, \infty[\mapsto \mathbb{C}$, such that $F(x) = f(|x|)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. In this case, we will not distinguish function F and f . That is, we will write instead $F(x) = F(|x|)$ or $f(x) = f(|x|)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

- We will use c, C , sometimes equipped with superscripts and subscripts, to represent all the small and large constants respectively.

- For non-zero quantities ρ, r , the notation $\rho \sim r$ means that there exists constants $c, C > 0$, such that $c < \frac{\rho}{r} < C$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank Luis Vega and Carlos Kenig for some discussions related to Proposition 1.11 above.

 2. L^2 -BOUNDEDNESS OF MICROLOCAL TRUNCATION OPERATORS

The goal of this section is the demonstration of following proposition, which eventually implies Theorem 1.8.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $p_0, p_1 \neq 0$, $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of t , such that, for all $|t| > 0$,*

$$\|\text{Op}(a_{\chi,\delta}(t))\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq C,$$

where the symbol $a_{\chi,\delta}(t)$ is defined in (1.10) and P satisfies the hypothesis (H_{p_0,p_1}) with $P_0 = P_1 = 0$.

In parallel, we shall also prove the following result:

Proposition 2.2. *Let $p_0 > 0 > p_1$, $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We assume that P satisfies the hypothesis (H_{p_0,p_1}) with $P_0, P_1 > 0$. Then the modified truncated symbol*

$$a_{\chi,\delta}^{\text{mod}}(t, x, \xi) = a_{\chi,\delta}(t, x, \xi)(1 - \chi_l) \left(\frac{\xi}{|t|^{-\epsilon_0}} \right) \chi_h \left(\frac{\xi}{|t|^{\epsilon_1}} \right),$$

which has already been defined in (1.18), corresponds to a bounded operator on L^2 , uniformly in $|t| > t_0 \gg 1$. Here $\chi_l, \chi_h \in C_c^\infty$ are radial and equal to 1 near zero and ϵ_0, ϵ_1 satisfy the condition (1.19).

One can see in the following proof that our demonstration cannot eliminate the truncation in ξ in the definition (1.18) of a^{mod} . In fact, after some change of scaling, we will decompose the symbol a (or a^{mod}) into three components, two of which are bounded for all $P_0, P_1 \geq 0$, while our treatment for the last component does not hold for nonzero P_0, P_1 . The complementary cut-off in ξ is used to solve this problem. Remark that it is still unknown whether such restriction is essential.

To begin with, one observes that, it is equivalent to study the cut-off inside the cone, namely

$$a^{\text{in}}(t, x, \xi) = \chi \left(\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{|t|^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| < |t| |P'(\xi)|},$$

since the operator with symbol

$$\chi \left(\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{|t|^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right)$$

is bounded uniformly in t and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, due to Lemma A.10 together with Lemma A.5. In this section, we will distinguish a and a^{in} and denote both of them as a .

With a reflection in ξ , t can be assumed to be positive. The application of Lemma A.4 allows us to replace a by

$$\tilde{a}(t, x, \xi) = a(t, \sqrt{t}x, \frac{\xi}{\sqrt{t}}) = \chi \left(\frac{\frac{x}{\sqrt{t}} + P' \left(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{t}} \right)}{t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}}} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\left| \frac{x}{\sqrt{t}} \right| < |P' \left(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{t}} \right)|}.$$

Now, we split \tilde{a} into high and low frequency, namely $\tilde{a} = \tilde{a}^b + \tilde{a}^\sharp$, where

$$\tilde{a}^b(t, x, \xi) = \tilde{a}(t, x, \xi) \tilde{\chi}(\xi),$$

and $\tilde{\chi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a radial function which equals 1 near zero. In the following, we shall treat high and low frequency part at the same time. Before entering the next step, we introduce some notations which will be frequently used in this section. In all cases, we set

$$\mu = t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}} \in]0, +\infty[.$$

With $j = 0$ for low frequency part and $j = 1$ for high frequency part, we set

-when $P_j = 0$,

$$X(t, x) := \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{t}}, \quad \Xi(t, \xi) := P' \left(\frac{|\xi|}{\sqrt{t}} \right), \quad \nu_j = +;$$

-when $P_j > 0$, $P' > P_j$

$$X(t, x) := \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{t}} - P_j, \quad \Xi(t, \xi) := P' \left(\frac{|\xi|}{\sqrt{t}} \right) - P_j, \quad \nu_j = +;$$

-when $P_j > 0$, $P' < P_j$

$$X(t, x) := P_j - \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{t}}, \quad \Xi(t, \xi) := P_j - P' \left(\frac{|\xi|}{\sqrt{t}} \right) \quad \nu_j = -.$$

Remark that for all nonzero ξ , Ξ is strictly positive. With these notations, our problem can be reduced to the uniform-in- μ, t boundedness of

$$b^\flat(t, \mu, x, \xi) = \chi \left(\frac{(P_j + \nu_j X) \frac{x}{|x|} + (P_j + \nu_j \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}}{\mu} \right) \mathbb{1}_{0 < \frac{x}{\Xi} < 1} \tilde{\chi} \left(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{t}} \right),$$

$$b^\sharp(t, \mu, x, \xi) = \chi \left(\frac{(P_j + \nu_j X) \frac{x}{|x|} + (P_j + \nu_j \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}}{\mu} \right) \mathbb{1}_{0 < \frac{x}{\Xi} < 1} (1 - \tilde{\chi}) \left(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{t}} \right).$$

We emphasize that our definition of X does not ensure its strict positivity, but one may always eliminate the part $X < 0$, due to the uniform boundedness of operator with symbol

$$\chi \left(\frac{(P_j + \nu_j X) \frac{x}{|x|} + (P_j + \nu_j \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}}{\mu} \right),$$

which is also a consequence of Lemma A.10 and Lemma A.5.

Now, we decompose b^ι ($\iota = \flat, \sharp$) as the sum of $b_0^\iota, \tilde{b}^\iota, b_1^\iota$ with cut-off $0 < \frac{x}{\Xi} \ll 1$ and $\frac{x}{\Xi} \sim 1$ and $0 < 1 - \frac{x}{\Xi} \ll 1$, respectively. To be precise,

$$b^\iota(t, \mu, x, \xi) = b_0^\iota(t, \mu, x, \xi) + \tilde{b}^\iota(t, \mu, x, \xi) + b_1^\iota(t, \mu, x, \xi),$$

$$b_0^\iota(t, \mu, x, \xi) = b^\iota(t, \mu, x, \xi) \chi_0 \left(\frac{x}{\Xi} \right),$$

$$\tilde{b}^\iota(t, \mu, x, \xi) = b^\iota(t, \mu, x, \xi) \Psi \left(\frac{x}{\Xi} \right),$$

$$b_1^\iota(t, \mu, x, \xi) = b^\iota(t, \mu, x, \xi) \chi_1 \left(1 - \frac{x}{\Xi} \right),$$

where χ_0, χ_1 and Ψ are radial, smooth and compactly supported. χ_0, χ_1 are supported in a small neighborhood of zero and equal to 1 near zero, while Ψ is compactly supported in $]0, 1[$. By regarding μ as a t -independent parameter, we can reduce Proposition 2.1 and 2.2 to the following proposition:

Proposition 2.3. *There exists t, μ -independent constants $C > 0$, such that,*

(i) *if $P_0, P_1 \geq 0$, for all $t, \mu > 0$,*

$$(2.1) \quad \|\text{Op}(b_1^t(t, \mu))\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq C,$$

$$(2.2) \quad \|\text{Op}(\tilde{b}^t(t, \mu))\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq C,$$

(ii) *if $P_0 = P_1 = 0$, for all $t, \mu > 0$.*

$$(2.3) \quad \|\text{Op}(b_0^t(t, \mu))\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq C;$$

(iii) *if $P_0, P_1 > 0$ and $p_1 < 0 < p_0$, for all $\mu > 0, t > 1$,*

$$(2.4) \quad \left\| \text{Op} \left(b_0^t(t, \mu)(1 - \chi_l) \left(\frac{\xi}{t^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon_0}} \right) \chi_h \left(\frac{\xi}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon_1}} \right) \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq C.$$

Before giving the proof, we indicate below the consequence of this proposition, which implies Proposition 2.1, 2.2, and will be used in the end of this section to conclude Theorem 1.8.

Corollary 2.4. *Let χ, χ_l, χ_h be defined as before.*

(i) *If P verifies (\mathbf{H}_{p_0, p_1}) with $p_0, p_1 \neq 0$ and $P_0 = P_1 = 0$, the operator*

$$\text{Op} \left(\chi \left(\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{|t|\mu} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |tP'(\xi)|} \right)$$

is bounded on L^2 uniformly in $t \neq 0$ and $\mu > 0$.

(ii) *If P verifies (\mathbf{H}_{p_0, p_1}) with $p_0, p_1 \neq 0$ and ϵ_0, ϵ_1 satisfy conditions (1.19), the operator*

$$\text{Op} \left(\chi \left(\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{|t|\mu} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |tP'(\xi)|} (1 - \chi_l) \left(\frac{\xi}{t^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon_0}} \right) \chi_h \left(\frac{\xi}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon_1}} \right) \right)$$

is bounded on L^2 uniformly in $t > 1$ and $\mu > 0$.

2.1. Study of symbol b_1 and \tilde{b} . In this part, we shall prove (2.1) and (2.2). One observes that both b_1^t and \tilde{b}^t are supported for $X \sim \Xi$, which allows us to reduce our problem via dyadic decomposition.

Proof of (2.2). We start with a homogeneous dyadic decomposition

$$1 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi \left(\frac{\eta}{2^k} \right),$$

where $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is radial and supported away from zero. In this way, we may decompose \tilde{b}^\sharp as $\sum_{k \geq 0} \tilde{b}_k$, and \tilde{b}^\flat as $\sum_{k < 0} \tilde{b}_k$ where

$$(2.5) \quad \tilde{b}_k(t, \mu, x, \xi) = \chi \left(\frac{(P_j + \nu_j X) \frac{x}{|x|} + (P_j + \nu_j \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}}{\mu} \right) \Psi \left(\frac{X}{\Xi} \right) \psi(2^{-kp_j} X) \varphi \left(\frac{\xi}{2^k \sqrt{t}} \right),$$

where $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is also radial and supported away from zero. The extra factor ψ comes from the truncation $X \sim \Xi \sim (t^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\xi|)^{p_j} \sim 2^{kp_j}$. This factors implies that the \tilde{b}_k 's are almost orthogonal so that it suffices to prove the uniform (in k, t, μ) boundedness of $\text{Op}(\tilde{b}_k)$.

Remark that, due to the compact support of χ and the fact that $0 < c < \frac{X}{\Xi} < 1 - c$ for some small $c > 0$, we have

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} 2^{kp_j} \sim \Xi &\lesssim |X - \Xi| = \left| |(P_j + \nu_j X) \frac{x}{|x|}| - |(P_j + \nu_j \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}| \right| \\ &\leq \left| (P_j + \nu_j X) \frac{x}{|x|} - (P_j + \nu_j \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} \right| \lesssim \mu. \end{aligned}$$

When $t2^{k(p_j+1)} \geq 1$, we shall apply Calderon-Vaillancourt Theorem (see Lemma A.11). For each derivative in x , if it acts on χ , one gains $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mu^{-1} \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{-kp_j}$ by (2.6). If ∂_x acts on Ψ or ψ , one obtains factors of size $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{-kp_j}$. As for the derivatives in ξ , similarly, it leads to factors of size $P''(\xi/\sqrt{t})t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mu^{-1}$, $\Xi^{-1}P''(\xi/\sqrt{t})t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ or $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{-k}$, which are all controlled by $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{-k}$, as $|\xi| \sim 2^k\sqrt{t}$ and $2^{kp_j} \lesssim \mu$. Since

$$t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{-kp_j} \times t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{-k} = t^{-1}2^{-k(p_j+1)} \leq 1,$$

we may conclude by a change of scaling (Lemma A.4).

When $t2^{k(p+1)} \leq 1$, we shall use Lemma A.9. We first check the assumption (A.6) of this lemma with $\mu_k \in]0, +\infty[$ defined below

$$\mu_k = \begin{cases} \mu 2^{-kp_j}, & \text{if } P_j + \nu_j X \sim 2^{kp_j}, \\ \mu, & \text{if } P_j + \nu_j X \sim 1. \end{cases}$$

Note that we have either $P_j + \nu_j X \sim P_j + \nu_j \Xi \sim 1$ or $P_j + \nu_j X \sim P_j + \nu_j \Xi \sim 2^{kp_j}$. In fact, by definition, $P_j + \nu_j X$ and $P_j + \nu_j \Xi$ are both strictly positive. Thus, it is sufficient to consider $|k| \gg 1$. When P_j is nonzero and $kp_j < 0$, we have $X \sim \Xi \sim 2^{kp_j} \ll 1$ and then $P_j + \nu_j X \sim P_j + \nu_j \Xi \sim 1$. While P_j is nonzero and $kp_j > 0$, we have similarly $X \sim \Xi \sim 2^{kp_j} \gg 1$ and $P_j + \nu_j X \sim P_j + \nu_j \Xi \sim 2^{kp_j}$. Otherwise, P_j equals to zero, which implies trivially $P_j + \nu_j X = X \sim 2^{kp_j}$ and $P_j + \nu_j \Xi = \Xi \sim 2^{kp_j}$. Due to observation $X \sim \Xi \sim 2^{kp_j}$, it is easy to obtain that, for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{d-1}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\partial_\omega^\alpha \partial_\theta^\beta \tilde{b}_k(t, \mu, r\omega, \rho\theta)| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta, N} g_k(r, \rho) \mu_k^{-|\alpha| - |\beta|} \left\langle \frac{d(\omega, -\theta)}{\mu_k} \right\rangle^{-N},$$

where $x = r\omega, \xi = \rho\theta$ are polar coordinates and

$$g_k(r, \rho) = \mathbb{1}_{\rho \sim 2^k \sqrt{t}} \mathbb{1}_{r \sim t^{\frac{1}{2}} 2^{kp_j}}.$$

The operator of kernel g_k is controlled by

$$\|g_k\|_{L^2(dr d\rho)} \lesssim (\sqrt{t}2^k \times \sqrt{t}2^{kp_j})^{\frac{1}{2}} = (t2^{k(p_j+1)})^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 1,$$

which is no more than the assumption (A.5) of Lemma A.9. As a result, we may conclude (2.2) by (A.7). \square

The idea of proof of (2.1) is similar. The only difficulty is that b_1 has a singularity near $X = \Xi$. We may treat the part away from $X = \Xi$ as above and study the area near $X = \Xi$ by convexity (or concavity) of P .

Proof of (2.1). As before, we begin with the homogeneous dyadic decomposition in $\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{t}}$, namely $b_1^\sharp = \sum_{k \geq 0} b_{1,k}$ and $b_1^\flat = \sum_{k < 0} b_{1,k}$, with

$$b_{1,k} = \chi \left(\frac{(P_j + \nu_j X) \frac{x}{|x|} + (P_j + \nu_j \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}}{\mu} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\frac{X}{\Xi} < 1} \chi_1 \left(1 - \frac{X}{\Xi} \right) \psi(2^{-kp_j} X) \varphi \left(\frac{\xi}{2^k \sqrt{t}} \right).$$

It suffices to prove that $\text{Op}(b_{1,k})$ is bounded on L^2 , uniformly in k, t, μ . In comparison with \tilde{b}_k defined by (2.5), the main difficulty is that the non-smooth term cannot be

deleted. In the case $t2^{k(p_j+1)} \leq 1$, we may repeat exactly the same argument as the study of \tilde{b}_k since this argument does not require any regularity in $|x|, |\xi|$.

When $t2^{k(p_j+1)} > 1$, we will separate the singularity near $\frac{X}{\Xi} = 1$. Consider the following decomposition :

$$\begin{aligned} b_{1,k} &= b'_{1,k} + b''_{1,k}, \\ b'_{1,k} &= b_{1,k} \tilde{\chi}_1(\sqrt{t}2^{k\frac{1-p_j}{2}}(\Xi - X)), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\chi}_1 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is radial and equal to 1 near zero.

The proof of boundedness of $b'_{1,k}$ is similar to that of the case $t2^{k(p_j+1)} \leq 1$. By setting $\mu_k \in]0, +\infty[$ as before, namely

$$\mu_k = \begin{cases} \mu 2^{-kp_j}, & \text{if } P_j + \nu_j X \sim 2^{kp_j}, \\ \mu, & \text{if } P_j + \nu_j X \sim 1, \end{cases}$$

we may have, for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{d-1}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\partial_\omega^\alpha \partial_\theta^\beta b'_{1,k}(t, \mu, r\omega, \rho\theta)| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta, N} h_k(r, \rho) \mu_k^{-|\alpha| - |\beta|} \left\langle \frac{d(\omega, -\theta)}{\mu_k} \right\rangle^{-N},$$

where

$$(2.7) \quad h_k(r, \rho) = \sum_{n \sim \sqrt{t}2^{k\frac{p_j+1}{2}}} \mathbb{1}_{I_n}(r) \mathbb{1}_{J_n}(\rho),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} J_n &:= [2^{k\frac{1-p_j}{2}}n, 2^{k\frac{1-p_j}{2}}(n+1)], \\ I_n &:= \begin{cases} \left[\sqrt{t}P' \left(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{k\frac{1-p_j}{2}}n \right) - c2^{k\frac{p_j-1}{2}}, \sqrt{t}P' \left(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{k\frac{1-p_j}{2}}(n+1) \right) + c2^{k\frac{p_j-1}{2}} \right], & \text{if } P'' > 0, \\ \left[\sqrt{t}P' \left(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{k\frac{1-p_j}{2}}(n+1) \right) - c2^{k\frac{p_j-1}{2}}, \sqrt{t}P' \left(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{k\frac{1-p_j}{2}}n \right) + c2^{k\frac{p_j-1}{2}} \right], & \text{if } P'' < 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Note that by writing in polar system $r = |x|$ $\rho = |\xi|$, $b'_{1,k}$ is supported for $\rho \sim 2^k \sqrt{t}$ and $\sqrt{t}2^{k\frac{1-p_j}{2}}|\Xi - X| \ll 1$ due to cut-off $\tilde{\chi}_1$. We first make a decomposition in ρ , namely

$$\rho \in [C^{-1}2^k \sqrt{t}, C2^k \sqrt{t}] \subset \bigcup_{n \sim \sqrt{t}2^{k\frac{p_j+1}{2}}} J_n,$$

and then the support $\sqrt{t}2^{k\frac{1-p_j}{2}}|\Xi - X| \ll 1$ ensures that r lies in I_n defined above, once ρ belongs to J_n . This gives the control h_k defined in (2.7).

In order to apply Lemma A.9, it suffices to check that the operator with kernel h_k is uniformly bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$, which can be reduced to $|I_n||J_n| \lesssim 1$ and that $\{I_n\}$ forms a uniformly finite cover. The first assertion is obvious since $n \sim \sqrt{t}2^{k\frac{p_j+1}{2}}$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |J_n||I_n| &\lesssim 2^{k\frac{1-p_j}{2}} \left(\left| \sqrt{t}P' \left(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{k\frac{1-p_j}{2}}(n+1) \right) - \sqrt{t}P' \left(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{k\frac{1-p_j}{2}}n \right) \right| + 2c2^{k\frac{p_j-1}{2}} \right) \\ &\lesssim 2^{k\frac{1-p_j}{2}} \left(\sqrt{t}2^{k(p_j-1)}t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{k\frac{1-p_j}{2}} + 2c2^{k\frac{p_j-1}{2}} \right) \lesssim 1. \end{aligned}$$

As for the second one, we observe that $I_n \cap I_{n+l} \neq \emptyset$ if and only if

$$\left| \sqrt{t}P' \left(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{k\frac{1-p_j}{2}}n \right) - \sqrt{t}P' \left(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{k\frac{1-p_j}{2}}(n+l) \right) \right| \leq 2c2^{k\frac{p_j-1}{2}}.$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume $l \geq 0$. Actually, the left hand side has the following equivalence:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sqrt{t} P' \left(t^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^k \frac{1-p_j}{2} n \right) - \sqrt{t} P' \left(t^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^k \frac{1-p_j}{2} (n+l) \right) \right| \\ &= \left| 2^k \frac{1-p_j}{2} l P'' \left(t^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^k \frac{1-p_j}{2} (n+sl) \right) \right|, \quad \text{for some } s \in [0, 1], \\ &\sim 2^k \frac{1-p_j}{2} l \times \left(t^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^k \frac{1-p_j}{2} (n+sl) \right)^{p_j-1}, \quad \text{since } |P''(\rho)| \sim \rho^{p_j-1} \\ &\sim 2^k \frac{1-p_j}{2} l \times 2^{k(p_j-1)} = 2^k \frac{p_j-1}{2} l. \end{aligned}$$

To prove the last equivalence, we may use the fact that $n, n+l \sim \sqrt{t} 2^k \frac{p_j+1}{2}$, which implies that

$$c\sqrt{t} 2^k \frac{p_j+1}{2} \leq n \leq n+sl \leq n+l \leq C\sqrt{t} 2^k \frac{p_j+1}{2}.$$

In conclusion, we have that $I_n \cap I_{n+l} \neq \emptyset$ holds for finitely many l . As a result,

$$\|h_k\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \lesssim \sup_{n \sim \sqrt{t} 2^k \frac{p_j+1}{2}} \|\mathbb{1}_{J_n} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{I_n}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq \sup_{n \sim \sqrt{t} 2^k \frac{p_j+1}{2}} \|\mathbb{1}_{J_n} \mathbb{1}_{I_n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2)} \lesssim 1.$$

It remains to study the smooth symbol $b''_{1,k}$, which reads

$$\begin{aligned} b''_{1,k} &= \chi \left(\frac{(P_j + \nu_j X) \frac{x}{|x|} + (P_j + \nu_j \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}}{\mu} \right) \psi(2^{-kp} X) \varphi \left(\frac{\xi}{2^k \sqrt{t}} \right) \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{1}_{\frac{X}{\Xi} < 1} \chi_1 \left(1 - \frac{X}{\Xi} \right) (1 - \tilde{\chi}_1) (\sqrt{t} 2^k \frac{1-p_j}{2} (\Xi - X)). \end{aligned}$$

Remark that this symbol is smooth, since the singularity $\frac{X}{\Xi} = 1$ is removed by $(1 - \tilde{\chi}_1)$ factor. Under the condition $t 2^{k(p_j+1)} > 1$, it verifies the condition of Calderon-Vaillancourt Theorem (see Lemma A.11). In fact, each derivative in x leads to a factor of size $t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-1}$ (from χ), $t^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^{-kp_j}$ (from ψ and χ_1), or $2^k \frac{1-p_j}{2}$ (from $(1 - \tilde{\chi}_1)$). The condition $t 2^{k(p_j+1)} > 1$ implies that $t^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^{-kp_j} \leq 2^k \frac{1-p_j}{2}$, while the compact support of χ and support of $(1 - \tilde{\chi}_1)$ ensures that

$$t^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^k \frac{p_j-1}{2} \lesssim |X - \Xi| \lesssim \mu,$$

i.e. $t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-1} \lesssim 2^{\frac{1-p_j}{2} k}$. The same argument for ∂_ξ gives that each derivative in ξ leads to a factor of size $2^{-k \frac{1-p_j}{2}}$. The desired result thus follows from a change of scaling (Lemma A.4). \square

2.2. Study of symbol b_0 with $P_0 = P_1 = 0$. In the case $P_0 = P_1 = 0$, due to the lack of almost orthogonality as \tilde{b}_k 's and $b_{1,k}$'s, the remaining symbol b_0^\flat will be treated via Cotlar-Stein Lemma (Lemma A.3). As before, we start with homogeneous dyadic decomposition in ξ , namely $b_0^\sharp = \mathbb{1}_{X>0} \sum_{k \geq 0} c_k$ and $b_0^\flat = \mathbb{1}_{X>0} \sum_{k < 0} c_k$, with

$$(2.8) \quad c_k = \chi \left(\frac{(P_j + \nu_j X) \frac{x}{|x|} + (P_j + \nu_j \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}}{\mu} \right) \chi_0 \left(\frac{X}{\Xi} \right) \varphi \left(\frac{\xi}{2^k \sqrt{t}} \right).$$

It suffices to prove the (uniform in t) boundedness of $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} c_k$ as the multiplication with $\mathbb{1}_{X>0}$ is trivially bounded on L^2 .

We first check that $\text{Op}(c_k)$'s are bounded uniformly in k, t, μ . More precisely, all the c_k 's satisfy the following estimate:

Lemma 2.5. *There exists $C > 0$ independent of k, t , such that for all $t > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,*

$$(2.9) \quad \|\text{Op}(c_k)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq C \min\left(\max\left(1, (t2^{k(p_j+1)})^{-N_d}\right), (t2^{k(p_j+1)})^{\frac{d}{2}}\right) \leq C,$$

where $N_d \in \mathbb{N}$ depends only on dimension d .

Proof. We observe that c_k is supported for $X \ll \Xi \sim 2^{kp_j}$, which implies from one hand, as in (2.6),

$$2^{kp_j} \sim |X - \Xi| \leq \left| (P_j + \nu_j X) \frac{x}{|x|} + (P_j + \nu_j \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} \right| \lesssim \mu,$$

and, from another hand,

$$|x| \ll \sqrt{t}2^{kp_j}, \quad |\xi| \sim \sqrt{t}2^k.$$

As a consequence of the second result, $\|\text{Op}(c_k)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)}$ can be trivially bounded by

$$\|\text{Op}(c_k)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \lesssim \|c_k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2d})} \lesssim (t2^{k(p_j+1)})^{\frac{d}{2}}.$$

It remains to check that

$$\|\text{Op}(c_k)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq C \max\left(1, (t2^{k(p_j+1)})^{-N_d}\right),$$

which can be proved via Calderon-Vaillancourt Theorem (see Lemma A.11). In fact, from each derivative in x , we may obtain extra factors of size $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mu^{-1}$ (action on χ) or $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{-kp_j}$ (action on χ_0). As we have seen that $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mu^{-1} \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{-kp_j}$, each derivative in x leads to a factor of size $(t^{\frac{1}{2}}2^{kp_j})^{-1}$. Similarly, the action of ∂_ξ on χ, χ_0, φ gives factors of size $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mu^{-1}2^{k(p_j-1)}$, $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{-k}$, and $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}2^{-k}$, respectively. We may also check that $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mu^{-1}2^{k(p_j-1)} \lesssim 2^{-k}t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. To sum up, c_k is smooth and satisfies

$$(2.10) \quad \left| \partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta c_k(x, \xi) \right| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}2^{kp_j}} \right)^{|\alpha|} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}2^k} \right)^{|\beta|}, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^d.$$

By Lemma A.4, it is equivalent to consider rescaled symbol

$$\tilde{c}_k(x, \xi) = c_k\left(2^{\frac{p_j-1}{2}}x, 2^{-k\frac{p_j-1}{2}}\xi\right),$$

which, as a result of (2.10), satisfies for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^{2d}$,

$$\|\partial_{x, \xi}^\gamma \tilde{c}_k\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})} \lesssim (t2^{k(p_j+1)})^{-|\gamma|}.$$

By applying Calderon-Vaillancourt Theorem (Lemma A.11) to \tilde{c}_k , we have, due to estimate (A.8), that

$$\|\text{Op}(c_k)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} = \|\text{Op}(\tilde{c}_k)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq C \max\left(1, (t2^{k(p_j+1)})^{-N_d}\right).$$

□

In order to conclude (2.3) by Cotlar-Stein Lemma (Lemma A.3), it is sufficient to check condition (A.2) and (A.3), namely

Lemma 2.6. *There exists t, μ -independent constants C , such that for all $t, \mu > 0$,*

$$(2.11) \quad \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \|\text{Op}(c_k) \text{Op}(c_l)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C, \quad \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_-} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}_-} \|\text{Op}(c_k) \text{Op}(c_l)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C,$$

$$(2.12) \quad \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \|\text{Op}(c_k)^* \text{Op}(c_l)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C, \quad \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_-} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}_-} \|\text{Op}(c_k)^* \text{Op}(c_l)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C,$$

where $\mathbb{Z}_- = \mathbb{Z} \cap]-\infty, 0[$ corresponds to low frequency part and $\mathbb{Z}_+ = \mathbb{Z} \cap [0, +\infty[$ corresponds to high frequency part.

Proof of (2.11). By symbolic calculus, $\text{Op}(c_k)\text{Op}(c_l)^*$ is an operator of symbol

$$c_k \sharp c_l^*(x, \xi) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{-iy\eta} c_k(x, \xi + \eta) \overline{c_l(x + y, \xi + \eta)} d\eta.$$

By definition (2.8), $c_l(x, \xi)$ is supported for $|\xi| \sim 2^l \sqrt{t}$. Thus, $c_k \sharp c_l^*$ is nonzero only if $|l - k| < N_0$ for some large $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}^*$. As a consequence, (2.11) can be reduced to the uniform boundedness of $\text{Op}(c_l)$, which has already been proved in Lemma 2.5. \square

Proof of (2.12). We apply again the symbolic calculus to obtain the following expression of symbol of $\text{Op}(c_k)^* \text{Op}(c_l)$,

$$c_k^* \sharp c_l(x, \xi) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{i(x-y)\eta} \overline{c_k(y, \xi + \eta)} c_l(y, \xi) d\eta dy.$$

Recall that c_l is supported for $|x| \ll \sqrt{t} 2^{lp_j}$ and $|\xi| \sim t^{\frac{1}{2}} 2^l$ with the estimate (2.10). We shall check that for all $l, k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(2.13) \quad \|\text{Op}(c_k)^* \text{Op}(c_l)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \lesssim 2^{-\frac{d}{2}|k-l|},$$

which is enough to conclude (2.12). Due to (2.9), we may ignore the case $|k - l| \leq N_0$, for some fixed large $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. Remark that it is possible to prove (2.13) only for $l \geq k$, since for terms with $l < k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{Op}(c_k)^* \text{Op}(c_l)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} &= \|(\text{Op}(c_k)^* \text{Op}(c_l))^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \\ &= \|\text{Op}(c_l)^* \text{Op}(c_k)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \lesssim 2^{-\frac{d}{2}|l-k|}. \end{aligned}$$

One observes that the bound of operator with symbol $c_k^* \sharp c_l$ can be controlled by

$$\|\text{Op}(c_k^* \sharp c_l)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \lesssim \|c_k^* \sharp c_l\|_{L^2(dx d\xi)} \lesssim \left\| \int e^{-iy\eta} \overline{c_k(y, \xi + \eta)} c_l(y, \xi) dy \right\|_{L^2(d\eta d\xi)}.$$

The integrand of the last integral is supported for

$$(2.14) \quad |\xi + \eta| \sim 2^k \sqrt{t}, |\xi| \sim 2^l \sqrt{t}, \text{ and } |y| \lesssim \min(2^{kp_j} \sqrt{t}, 2^{lp_j} \sqrt{t}).$$

Moreover, we may apply integration by parts in y to obtain some extra bounds in the estimate. To be precise, for all $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int e^{-iy\eta} \overline{c_k(y, \xi + \eta)} c_l(y, \xi) dy \\ &= \int \left(\frac{-\Delta_y}{|\eta|^2} \right)^{N_1} e^{-iy\eta} \overline{c_k(y, \xi + \eta)} c_l(y, \xi) dy \\ &= \int e^{-iy\eta} (-\Delta_y)^{N_1} \left(\overline{c_k(y, \xi + \eta)} c_l(y, \xi) \right) |\eta|^{-2N_1} dy \\ &= \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|=2N_1} C_{\alpha,\beta} \int e^{-iy\eta} \overline{\partial_y^\alpha c_k(y, \xi + \eta)} \partial_y^\beta c_l(y, \xi) |\eta|^{-2N_1} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Since we have reduced our problem to the case $l \geq k + N_0$, the integral above is supported for $|\eta| \sim 2^l \sqrt{t}$. Together with (2.10) and (2.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int e^{-iy\eta} \overline{c_k(y, \xi + \eta)} c_l(y, \xi) dy \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|=2N_1} C_{\alpha,\beta} \int |\partial_y^\alpha c_k(y, \xi + \eta)| |\partial_y^\beta c_l(y, \xi)| |\eta|^{-2N_1} dy \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|=2N_1} \mathbb{1}_{|\xi+\eta|\sim 2^k\sqrt{t}} \mathbb{1}_{|\xi|\sim 2^l\sqrt{t}} \left(2^{kp_j}\sqrt{t}\right)^{-|\alpha|} \left(2^{lp_j}\sqrt{t}\right)^{-|\beta|} (2^l\sqrt{t})^{-2N_1} \int \mathbb{1}_{|y|\lesssim \min(2^{kp_j}\sqrt{t}, 2^{lp_j}\sqrt{t})} dy \\
 &\lesssim \mathbb{1}_{|\xi+\eta|\sim 2^k\sqrt{t}} \mathbb{1}_{|\xi|\sim 2^l\sqrt{t}} (2^l\sqrt{t})^{-2N_1} \min\left(2^{kp_j}\sqrt{t}, 2^{lp_j}\sqrt{t}\right)^{d-2N_1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

The estimate above holds for all $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, thus for all $N_1 \in [0, \infty[$. In particular, we choose $N_1 = \frac{d}{2}$, which gives that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\text{Op}(c_k^* \sharp c_l)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} &\lesssim \left\| \int e^{-iy\eta} \overline{c_k(y, \xi + \eta)} c_l(y, \xi) dy \right\|_{L^2(d\eta d\xi)} \\
 &\lesssim (2^l\sqrt{t})^{-d} \|\mathbb{1}_{|\xi+\eta|\sim 2^k\sqrt{t}} \mathbb{1}_{|\xi|\sim 2^l\sqrt{t}}\|_{L^2(d\eta d\xi)} \\
 &\lesssim (2^l\sqrt{t})^{-d} \times \left(2^k\sqrt{t} \times 2^l\sqrt{t}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} = 2^{\frac{d}{2}(k-l)} = 2^{-\frac{d}{2}|k-l|}.
 \end{aligned}$$

As a conclusion, we have managed to prove that

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_\pm} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}_\pm} \|\text{Op}(c_k)^* \text{Op}(c_l)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_\pm} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}_\pm} 2^{-\frac{d}{4}|k-l|} < \infty,$$

which completes the proof. \square

2.3. Study of symbol b_0 with $P_0, P_1 > 0$. Till now, we have finished the proof of Proposition 2.1. To complete the proof of Proposition 2.2, it remains to check (2.4). Remark that the argument above relies on the fact that $|X| \ll 2^{kp_j}$ implies x is supported in a region of area $(\sqrt{t}2^{kp_j})^d$, which is not true in the case where P_0, P_1 are non zero. To overcome this problem we need the extra truncation in ξ .

Proof of (2.4). As above, we may ignore the non-smooth factor $\mathbb{1}_{0 < \frac{x}{\Xi} < 1}$. It remains smooth symbols

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{c}^\sharp(t, x, \xi) &= \chi \left(\frac{(P_1 + \nu_1 X) \frac{x}{|x|} + (P_1 \nu_1 \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}}{\mu} \right) \chi_0 \left(\frac{X}{\Xi} \right) (1 - \tilde{\chi}) \left(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{t}} \right) \chi_h \left(\frac{\xi}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon_1}} \right), \\
 \tilde{c}^\flat(t, x, \xi) &= \chi \left(\frac{(P_0 + \nu_0 X) \frac{x}{|x|} + (P_0 \nu_0 \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}}{\mu} \right) \chi_0 \left(\frac{X}{\Xi} \right) \tilde{\chi} \left(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{t}} \right) (1 - \chi_l) \left(\frac{\xi}{t^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon_0}} \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

We shall first check that \tilde{c}^\sharp belongs uniformly to the Hörmander class $S_{1, \kappa}^0$ for some $\kappa \in]0, 1[$, namely the collection of smooth symbols $c(x, \xi)$ such that for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^d$,

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta c(x, \xi)| \lesssim \langle \xi \rangle^{-|\beta| + \kappa|\alpha|}.$$

It is well-known that the operators of symbol in this class is bounded on L^2 , a proof of which can be found in [14]. We begin with the observation that high frequency symbol \tilde{c}^\sharp is supported for $t^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim |\xi| \lesssim t^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon_1}$. Before calculating the bounds of derivatives in x and ξ , recall that our goal is to show (2.4) under the condition $t > 1$.

For each derivative in ξ , we obtain from χ a factor of size

$$t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-1} P''(|\xi|/\sqrt{t}) \sim \mu^{-1} \left(\frac{|\xi|}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^{p_1} |\xi|^{-1} \lesssim \langle \xi \rangle^{-1}.$$

The last inequality is due the support of \tilde{c}^\sharp . More precisely,

$$\left(\frac{|\xi|}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^{p_1} \sim \Xi \lesssim |X - \Xi| \lesssim \left| (P_1 + \nu_1 X) \frac{x}{|x|} + (P_1 + \nu_1 \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} \right| \lesssim \mu.$$

From the factor χ_0 , one gains

$$\frac{X P''(\xi/\sqrt{t})}{\Xi \sqrt{t}} \sim \frac{X}{\Xi} \frac{1}{|\xi|} \lesssim \langle \xi \rangle^{-1}.$$

Trivially, we will also obtain $\langle \xi \rangle^{-1}$ from derivative on $(1 - \tilde{\chi})$ and χ_h .

As for derivatives in x , if ∂_x acts on χ , one gains $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mu^{-1} \lesssim (\sqrt{t}\Xi)^{-1}$. When it acts on χ_0 , the resulting factor is of size

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}\Xi} \sim \frac{1}{t} \left(\frac{|\xi|}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^{-p_1-1} |\xi|.$$

When $0 > p_1 \geq -1$, we have

$$\frac{1}{t} \left(\frac{|\xi|}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^{-p_1-1} |\xi| = |\xi|^{-p_1} t^{\frac{p_1-1}{2}} \lesssim \langle \xi \rangle t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \langle \xi \rangle^\kappa t^{(\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon_1)(1-\kappa)-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Thus, $\tilde{c}^\sharp \in S_{1,\kappa}^0$ for any $\kappa \in]0, 1[$ such that

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon_1 \right) (1 - \kappa) - \frac{1}{2} \leq 0,$$

which is possible by choosing κ close to 1. When $p_1 < -1$, the estimate above becomes

$$\frac{1}{t} \left(\frac{|\xi|}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^{-p_1-1} |\xi| = \frac{|\xi|^{1-\kappa}}{t} \left(\frac{|\xi|}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^{-p_1-1} |\xi|^\kappa \lesssim t^{-1+(\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon_1)(1-\kappa)-(p_1+1)\epsilon_1} \langle \xi \rangle^\kappa.$$

To conclude $\tilde{c}^\sharp \in S_{1,\kappa}^0$, it suffices to choose $\kappa \in]0, 1[$ such that

$$-1 + \left(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon_1 \right) (1 - \kappa) - (p_1 + 1)\epsilon_1 \leq 0,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\epsilon_1 \leq \frac{1}{-(p_1 + 1)} \left[1 - \left(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon_1 \right) (1 - \kappa) \right].$$

This can be realized by choosing κ close to 1, due to the definition (1.19) of ϵ_1 .

To prove the uniform boundedness of \tilde{c}^\flat , which is supported for $t^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon_0} \lesssim |\xi| \lesssim t^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we shall apply Calderon-Vaillancourt Theorem (Lemma A.11). As above one may check easily that each ∂_ξ gives

$$|\xi|^{-1} \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon_0};$$

while each ∂_x gives

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \left(\frac{|\xi|}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^{-p_0} \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{2}+p_0\epsilon_0}.$$

As a consequence, the desired result follows from Lemma A.4 and Calderon-Vaillancourt Theorem (Lemma A.11) once we have

$$t^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon_0} \times t^{-\frac{1}{2}+p_0\epsilon_0} \lesssim 1, \quad \forall t > 1,$$

equivalently, $(1 + p_0)\epsilon_0 \leq 1$, which is exactly the definition (1.19) of ϵ_0 . \square

2.4. Proof of Theorem 1.8. In all the proof above, we regard $\mu = t^{\delta-\frac{1}{2}} \in]0, +\infty[$ as a time-independent parameter. This allows us to take the limit $\mu \rightarrow +\infty$ with all the uniform estimates remaining true. Rigorously, due to Corollary 2.4, for all $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}, \mu > 0$,

$$(2.15) \quad \left| \left\langle f, \text{Op} \left(\chi \left(\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{|t|\mu} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |tP'(\xi)|} \Omega(t, \xi) \right) g \right\rangle \right| \leq C \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2},$$

where $\Omega = 1$ when $P_0 = P_1 = 0$, and

$$\Omega(t, \xi) = (1 - \chi_l) \left(\frac{\xi}{|t|^{-\epsilon_0}} \right) \chi_h \left(\frac{\xi}{|t|^{\epsilon_1}} \right)$$

when $P_0, P_1 > 0$.

The left hand side of (2.15) is equal to

$$\left| \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int f(x) e^{-ix\xi} \chi \left(\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{|t|\mu} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |tP'(\xi)|} \Omega(t, \xi) \overline{\hat{g}(\xi)} d\xi dx \right|,$$

which, when $\mu \rightarrow +\infty$, due to Dominated Convergence Theorem, tends to

$$\left| \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int f(x) e^{-ix\xi} \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |tP'(\xi)|} \Omega(t, \xi) \overline{\hat{g}(\xi)} d\xi dx \right|,$$

where we take $\chi(0) = 1$ without loss of generality. In conclusion, for all $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\left| \left\langle f, \text{Op} \left(\mathbb{1}_{|x| > |tP'(\xi)|} \Omega(t, \xi) \right) g \right\rangle \right| \leq C \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2}.$$

Theorem 1.8 follows from the density of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in L^2 .

3. L^2 -BOUNDEDNESS OF MICROLOCAL TRUNCATION OPERATORS - AN ALTERNATIVE SYMBOL

In this section, we will treat those P with nonzero P_0, P_1 in an alternative way. Instead of adding extra truncation in ξ , we shall add some extra factor in the main truncation χ . To be precise,

Proposition 3.1. *Let P, Λ satisfy conditions (H_{p_0, p_1}) and (C_{σ_0, σ_1}) of Section 1.2 respectively, with $p_1 < 0 < p_0$, $\sigma_0 \geq p_0$, and $\sigma_1 \leq p_1$. We further assume that $\delta + \frac{\sigma_j}{2} < \frac{1}{2}$, $j = 0, 1$. Then there exist time-independent constants $C > 0, t_0 \gg 1$, such that, for all $|t| > t_0$*

$$\| \text{Op} (a_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}^{alt}(t)) \|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq C,$$

where $a_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}^{alt}$ is defined in (1.23)

Without loss of generality, we may assume $t > 0$. Meanwhile, the change of scaling (Lemma A.4) allows us to reduce to the symbol

$$(3.1) \quad b(t, x, \xi) = \chi \left(\frac{\frac{x}{\sqrt{t}} + P' \left(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{t}} \right)}{t^{\delta-\frac{1}{2}} \Lambda(\xi)} \right) H \left(\frac{\frac{|x|}{\sqrt{t}} - P' \left(\frac{|\xi|}{\sqrt{t}} \right)}{t^{\delta-\frac{1}{2}} \Lambda(\xi)} \right),$$

where $H \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. To recover the desired result in Proposition 3.1, it suffices to take $H = \mathbb{1}_{]0, +\infty[}$.

As in previous section, we set

-when $P_j = 0$,

$$X := \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{t}}, \quad \Xi := P' \left(\frac{|\xi|}{\sqrt{t}} \right), \quad \nu_j = +;$$

-when $P_j > 0, P' > P_j$

$$X := \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{t}} - P_j, \quad \Xi := P' \left(\frac{|\xi|}{\sqrt{t}} \right) - P_j, \quad \nu_j = +;$$

-when $P_j > 0, P' < P_j$

$$X := P_j - \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{t}}, \quad \Xi := P_j - P' \left(\frac{|\xi|}{\sqrt{t}} \right), \quad \nu_j = -.$$

With these notations, via homogeneous dyadic decomposition, we may rewrite symbol b as

$$b(t, x, \xi) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} b_k(t, x, \xi),$$

$$b_k(t, x, \xi) = \chi \left(\frac{(P_1 + \nu_1 X) \frac{x}{|x|} + (P_1 + \nu_1 \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}}{t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}} \Lambda(\xi)} \right) H \left(\frac{X - \Xi}{t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}} \Lambda(\xi)} \right) \varphi \left(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{t} 2^k} \right), \quad \forall k \geq 0,$$

$$b_k(t, x, \xi) = \chi \left(\frac{(P_0 + \nu_0 X) \frac{x}{|x|} + (P_0 + \nu_0 \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}}{t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}} \Lambda(\xi)} \right) H \left(\frac{X - \Xi}{t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}} \Lambda(\xi)} \right) \varphi \left(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{t} 2^k} \right), \quad \forall k < 0,$$

where $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is radial and supported in an annulus centered at zero.

One observes that, due to factors χ and φ , b_k is supported for

$$|X - \Xi| \lesssim t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}} \Lambda(\xi) \sim t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}} (\sqrt{t} 2^k)^{\sigma_j},$$

where $j = 0$ when $k < 0$, $j = 1$ when $k \geq 0$. By using the fact that $\Xi \sim \left| \frac{\xi}{\sqrt{t}} \right|^{p_j} \sim 2^{kp_j}$, we obtain

$$\left| \frac{X}{\Xi} - 1 \right| \lesssim t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_j}{2} - \frac{1}{2}} 2^{k(\sigma_j - p_j)} \leq t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_j}{2} - \frac{1}{2}}.$$

The last inequality is the consequence of our assumptions $\sigma_0 \geq p_0$ and $\sigma_1 \leq p_1$. Since $\delta + \frac{\sigma_j}{2} - \frac{1}{2} < 0$, if we further assume that $t \geq t_0 \gg 1$, the inequality above implies that $X \sim \Xi$, which allows us to add a complementary factor $\psi(2^{-kp_j} X)$ to the definition of b_k , where $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is radial and supported in an annulus centered at zero. In this way, we may reduce Proposition 3.1 to

Proposition 3.2. *Under the same assumptions as in Proposition 3.1, the operator $\text{Op}(b_k)$ is bounded, uniformly in t and k .*

In what follows, we keep using the subscript j , where $j = 0$ for $k < 0$ and $j = 1$ for $k \geq 0$. By definition,

$$b_k(t, x, \xi) = \chi \left(\frac{(P_j + \nu_j X) \frac{x}{|x|} + (P_j + \nu_j \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}}{t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}} \Lambda(\xi)} \right) H \left(\frac{X - \Xi}{t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}} \Lambda(\xi)} \right) \varphi \left(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{t} 2^k} \right) \psi \left(\frac{X}{2^{kp_j}} \right).$$

When $P_j = 0$, b_k is supported for

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{x}{|x|} + \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} \right| &\leq \frac{1}{X} \left| X \frac{x}{|x|} + \Xi \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} \right| + \frac{1}{X} \left| (X - \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} \right| \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{X} t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}} \Lambda(\xi) \sim 2^{-kp_j} t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}} (\sqrt{t} 2^k)^{\sigma_j} = t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_j}{2} - \frac{1}{2}} 2^{k(\sigma_j - p_j)}. \end{aligned}$$

When $P_j \neq 0$, we observe that $2^{k\sigma_j} \leq 2^{kp_j} \leq 1$, due to the choice $p_1 < 0 < p_0$. By choosing $\text{Supp } \varphi$ small, which allows us to take $\text{Supp } \psi$ small, we have $P_j + \nu_j X \sim 1$.

Thus, b_k is supported for

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{x}{|x|} + \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} \right| &\leq \frac{1}{P_j + \nu_j X} \left| (P_j + \nu_j X) \frac{x}{|x|} + (P_j + \nu_j \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} \right| + \frac{1}{P_j + \nu_j X} \left| (X - \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} \right| \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{P_j + \nu_j X} t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}} \Lambda(\xi) \sim t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}} (\sqrt{t} 2^k)^{\sigma_j} = t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_j}{2} - \frac{1}{2}} 2^{k\sigma_j}. \end{aligned}$$

If $t2^{k(p_j+1)} \leq 1$, by setting $\mu := t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_j}{2} - \frac{1}{2}} 2^{k(\sigma_j - p_j)} \in]0, 1[$ in the case $P_j = 0$, and $\mu := t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_j}{2} - \frac{1}{2}} 2^{k\sigma_j} \in]0, 1[$ in the case $P_j \neq 0$, one may check that, for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{d-1}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left| \partial_\omega^\alpha \partial_\theta^\beta b_k(r\omega, \rho\theta) \right| \lesssim \mu^{-|\alpha| - |\beta|} \mathbb{1}_{r \lesssim \sqrt{t} 2^{kp}} \mathbb{1}_{\rho \sim \sqrt{t} 2^k} \left\langle \frac{d(\omega, -\theta)}{\mu} \right\rangle^{-N}.$$

By applying Lemma A.9, we have

$$\| \text{Op}(b_k) \|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \lesssim \| \mathbb{1}_{r \lesssim \sqrt{t} 2^{kp_j}} \mathbb{1}_{\rho \sim \sqrt{t} 2^k} \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2)} = C \sqrt{t 2^{k(p_j+1)}} \leq C.$$

If $t2^{k(p_j+1)} > 1$, we decompose b_k as the sum of b'_k, b''_k , which are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} b_k(t, x, \xi) &= b'_k(t, x, \xi) + b''_k(t, x, \xi), \\ b'_k(t, x, \xi) &= b_k \chi_0 \left(\sqrt{t} 2^{k \frac{1-p_j}{2}} (X - \Xi) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\chi_0 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is radial, supported in a neighborhood of zero, and equal to 1 near zero.

Clearly, b''_k is smooth on \mathbb{R}^{2d} . Thus, to prove the boundedness of $\text{Op}(b''_k)$, we may apply Calderon-Vaillancourt Theorem (Lemma A.11). By definition, b''_k reads

$$\begin{aligned} &\chi \left(\frac{(P_j + \nu_j X) \frac{x}{|x|} + (P_j + \nu_j \Xi) \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}}{t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}} \Lambda(\xi)} \right) H \left(\frac{X - \Xi}{t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}} \Lambda(\xi)} \right) \\ &\quad \times \varphi \left(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{t} 2^k} \right) \psi \left(\frac{X}{2^{kp_j}} \right) (1 - \chi_0) \left(\sqrt{t} 2^{k \frac{1-p_j}{2}} (X - \Xi) \right), \end{aligned}$$

which is supported for

$$t^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^{k \frac{p_j-1}{2}} \lesssim |X - \Xi| \lesssim t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}} \Lambda(\xi) \sim t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_j}{2} - \frac{1}{2}} 2^{k\sigma_j}.$$

As a consequence, $t^{-(\delta + \frac{\sigma_j}{2})} \lesssim 2^{k(\sigma_j + \frac{1-p_j}{2})}$.

For each ∂_x , when it acts on χ , one obtains in its bound an extra factor of size

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} t^{\frac{1}{2} - \delta} \Lambda(\xi)^{-1} \sim t^{-(\delta + \frac{\sigma_j}{2})} 2^{-kp_j} \lesssim 2^{k \frac{1-p_j}{2}} 2^{k(\sigma_j - p_j)} \leq 2^{k \frac{1-p_j}{2}}.$$

When ∂_x acts on ψ and $(1 - \chi_0)$ factors, we gain $t^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^{-kp_j} < 2^{k \frac{p_j+1}{2} - kp_j} = 2^{k \frac{1-p_j}{2}}$ and $2^{k \frac{1-p_j}{2}}$, respectively. For each ∂_ξ , similarly, one gains $2^{k \frac{p_j-1}{2}}$ in its bound. Namely, for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^d$,

$$\left| \partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta b''_k(x, \xi) \right| \lesssim 2^{k \frac{1-p_j}{2} (|\alpha| - |\beta|)}.$$

The uniform boundedness of $\text{Op}(b''_k)$ follows from Lemma A.4 and Calderon-Vaillancourt Theorem (Lemma A.11).

It remains to study the symbol b'_k . To overcome the singularity near $X = \Xi$, we will apply Lemma A.9 with the same setting of μ as in previous paragraph, namely

$\mu := t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_j}{2} - \frac{1}{2}} 2^{k(\sigma_j - p_j)} \in]0, 1[$ in the case $P_j = 0$, and $\mu := t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_j}{2} - \frac{1}{2}} 2^{k\sigma_j} \in]0, 1[$ in the case $P_j \neq 0$. It is easy to check that, for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{d-1}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left| \partial_\omega^\alpha \partial_\theta^\beta b_k(r\omega, \rho\theta) \right| \lesssim \mu^{-|\alpha| - |\beta|} h_k(r, \rho) \left\langle \frac{d(\omega, -\theta)}{\mu} \right\rangle^{-N},$$

where

$$h_k(r, \rho) = \sum_{n \sim \sqrt{t} 2^{k \frac{p_j + 1}{2}}} \mathbb{1}_{I_n}(r) \mathbb{1}_{J_n}(\rho),$$

which is exactly the same one defined in (2.7). We have seen that the operator with symbol h_k is bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$ uniformly in k . By Lemma A.9, we may conclude the uniform-in- k boundedness of b'_k and the proof of Proposition 3.2, hence Proposition 3.1 is completed.

4. LIMIT OF TRUNCATED ENERGY

In this section, we will complete the proof of Theorem 1.1, 1.4, and 1.6 by calculating the limit of truncated energy for some regular initial data u_0 . These three results will follow from the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $a_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}(t)$ be the symbol defined by*

$$(4.1) \quad a = a_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}(t, x, \xi) = \chi \left(\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{|t|^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta} \Lambda(|t|^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi)} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |t| |P'(\xi)|},$$

where $P \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\})$ is assumed to be a real radial function satisfying that $P''(\rho) \neq 0$ for all $\rho \in]0, \infty[$. Furthermore, we assume that $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is real and radial with $\chi(0) = 1$ and that Λ verifies condition (C $_{\sigma_0, \sigma_1}$) without any restriction in σ_0, σ_1 .

With these settings, if there exists $t_0 \gg 1$, such that $\text{Op}(a(t))$ is bounded on L^2 uniformly in $|t| > t_0$, for all $u_0 \in L^2$, the limits (1.24), (1.25), and (1.28) hold true.

Corollary 4.2. *We consider the same symbol a with an extra truncation in ξ , i.e.*

$$\tilde{a} = \tilde{a}_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}(t, x, \xi) = \chi \left(\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{|t|^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta} \Lambda(|t|^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi)} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |t| |P'(\xi)|} (1 - \chi_l) \left(\frac{\xi}{|t|^{-\epsilon_0}} \right) \chi_h \left(\frac{\xi}{|t|^{\epsilon_1}} \right)$$

where $\chi_l, \chi_h \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are equal to 1 in a neighborhood of zero, and $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1 > 0$.

If P, Λ satisfy the same conditions as in Proposition 4.1 and $\text{Op}(\tilde{a}_{\delta, \chi, \Lambda}(t))$ is bounded uniformly in $|t| > t_0 \gg 1$, then, for all $u_0 \in L^2$, the limits (1.24), (1.25), and (1.28) hold true with $E_{\delta, \chi, \Lambda}^{alt}(t)$ replaced by $\| \text{Op}(\tilde{a}_{\delta, \chi, \Lambda}(t)) u(t) \|_{L^2}^2$.

In order to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 and 1.6, we may combine Proposition 2.1, 3.1 with Proposition 4.1, where we need to take $\Lambda \equiv 1$ in the proof of Theorem 1.1. In the same way, Theorem 1.4 follows from Proposition 2.2 and Corollary 2.4 with $\Lambda \equiv 1$.

Before calculating the limit of truncated energy, we remark that, in the hypothesis of Proposition 4.1, $\text{Op}(a(t))$ (or $\text{Op}(\tilde{a}(t))$) is assumed to be bounded uniformly in $|t| > t_0 \gg 1$, which allows us to replace general $u_0 \in L^2$ by those belonging to some dense subset of L^2 . In what follows, we may assume that $\hat{u}_0 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$. As a consequence, by taking $t_0 \gg 1$,

$$(1 - \chi_l) \left(\frac{\xi}{|t|^{-\epsilon_0}} \right) \chi_h \left(\frac{\xi}{|t|^{\epsilon_1}} \right) \hat{u}_0(\xi) = \hat{u}_0(\xi),$$

which proves Corollary 2.4 from Proposition 4.1.

4.1. **Super-critical case** $0 < \delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} < \frac{1}{2}$. In this part, we will study the case $\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} \in]0, \frac{1}{2}[$ (associated to limit (1.17), (1.22), or (1.28)) by following the same method introduced in [9].

By definition, the truncated energy introduced in (1.11) is

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}(\epsilon t) &= \| \text{Op} (a_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}(\epsilon t)) u(\epsilon t) \|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int e^{ix \cdot (\xi - \xi')} e^{i\epsilon t(P(\xi) - P(\xi'))} \chi \left(\frac{x + \epsilon t P'(\xi)}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi)} \right) \\ &\quad \times \chi \left(\frac{x + \epsilon t P'(\xi')}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi')} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\frac{|x|}{t} > |P'(\xi)|, |P'(\xi')|} \hat{u}_0(\xi) \overline{\hat{u}_0(\xi')} dx d\xi d\xi', \end{aligned}$$

where $t \gg 1$ and $\epsilon = \pm$. In polar system $x = r\omega$, $\xi = \rho\theta$, $\xi' = \rho'\theta'$, the integral above can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int e^{i(r\rho\omega \cdot \theta - r\rho'\omega \cdot \theta')} e^{i\epsilon t(P(\rho) - P(\rho'))} \chi \left(\frac{r\omega + \epsilon t P'(\rho)\theta}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho)} \right) \chi \left(\frac{r\omega + \epsilon t P'(\rho')\theta'}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho')} \right) \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{1}_{\frac{r}{t} > P'(\rho), P'(\rho')} \hat{u}_0(\rho\theta) \overline{\hat{u}_0(\rho'\theta')} (r\rho\rho')^{d-1} d\theta d\theta' d\omega dr d\rho d\rho'. \end{aligned}$$

We firstly focus on the integral in θ , with integral in θ' treated in exactly the same way,

$$(4.2) \quad \int e^{ir\rho\omega \cdot \theta} \chi \left(\frac{r\omega + \epsilon t P'(\rho)\theta}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho)} \right) \hat{u}_0(\rho\theta) d\theta.$$

In this part, we always set

$$\mu = t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}} \in]0, 1[,$$

which is strictly positive and small, since we may choose $t > t_0 \gg 1$. Due to Lemma B.5, (4.2) can be written as the sum of

$$(2\pi)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} e^{i\epsilon \frac{\pi}{4}(d-1)} e^{-i\epsilon r\rho} (r\rho)^{-\frac{d-1}{2}} \chi \left(\frac{r - tP'(\rho)}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho)} \right) \hat{u}_0(-\epsilon r\omega) \kappa \left(\frac{r}{t} \right)$$

and a remainder

$$e^{-i\epsilon r\rho} \mu^{d-1} S_{-\frac{d+1}{2}}(\omega, \mu, \rho, \frac{r}{t} - P'(\rho), t; r\rho\mu^2) \kappa \left(\frac{r}{t} \right),$$

where $\kappa \in C_c^\infty(]0, \infty[)$ equals to 1 in a neighborhood of 1, and $S_m(\omega, \mu, \rho, r', t; \zeta)$ is supported for $\zeta > c > 0$, $\rho \sim 1$ and $|r'| \lesssim \mu$ and satisfies for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{d-1}$, $j, k, l, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\partial_\omega^\alpha \partial_\mu^j \partial_\rho^k \partial_{r'}^l \partial_\zeta^\gamma S_m| \leq C \mu^{-(|\alpha| + j + l)} \langle \zeta \rangle^{m - \gamma}.$$

Remark that it is harmless to add an extra factor κ , since the integrand of (4.2) is supported for $r \sim t$, which is a consequence of the cut-off χ together with $t \gg 1$, $\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} < \frac{1}{2}$, and $\rho \sim 1$. We may repeat this argument for the integral in θ' and the truncated energy $E_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}(\epsilon t)$ can be decomposed into a principal part

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d+1}} \int e^{-i\epsilon r(\rho - \rho')} e^{i\epsilon t(P(\rho) - P(\rho'))} \chi \left(\frac{r - tP'(\rho)}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho)} \right) \chi \left(\frac{r - tP'(\rho')}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho')} \right) \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{1}_{\frac{r}{t} > P'(\rho), P'(\rho')} \hat{u}_0(-\epsilon r\omega) \overline{\hat{u}_0(-\epsilon r'\omega)} (\rho\rho')^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \kappa^2 \left(\frac{r}{t} \right) d\omega dr d\rho d\rho', \end{aligned}$$

and remainders

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d+1}} \int e^{-i\epsilon r(\rho-\rho')} e^{i\epsilon t(P(\rho)-P(\rho'))} \mu^{2(d-1)} \kappa^2 \left(\frac{r}{t}\right) S_m(\omega, \mu, \rho, \frac{r}{t} - P'(\rho), t; r\rho\mu^2) \\ & \quad \times S_{m'}(\omega, \mu, \rho', \frac{r}{t} - P'(\rho'), t; r\rho'\mu^2) \mathbb{1}_{\frac{r}{t} > P'(\rho), P'(\rho')} (r\rho\rho')^{d-1} d\omega dr d\rho d\rho', \end{aligned}$$

where (m, m') takes values among $(-\frac{d-1}{2}, -\frac{d+1}{2}), (-\frac{d+1}{2}, -\frac{d-1}{2}), (-\frac{d+1}{2}, -\frac{d+1}{2})$. Note that due to the condition $\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} > \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$r\rho\mu^2 = r\rho t^{2(\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2})-1} \sim t^{2(\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2})} > c > 0.$$

The sum of these remainders can be simplified as

$$(4.4) \quad \int e^{-i\epsilon r(\rho-\rho')} e^{i\epsilon t(P(\rho)-P(\rho'))} \frac{1}{\mu^2 r} \Sigma(\omega, \mu, \rho, \rho', r, t; \frac{r}{t} - P'(\rho), \frac{r}{t} - P'(\rho')) \mathbb{1}_{\frac{r}{t} > P'(\rho), P'(\rho')} d\omega dr d\rho d\rho',$$

where $\Sigma(\omega, \mu, \rho, \rho', r, t; s, s')$ is supported for $r \sim t$, $\rho, \rho' \sim 1$ and $|s|, |s'| \lesssim \mu$ and satisfies for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{d-1}$, $j, k, k', l, \gamma, \gamma' \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\partial_\omega^\alpha \partial_\mu^j \partial_\rho^k \partial_{\rho'}^{k'} \partial_r^l \partial_s^\gamma \partial_{s'}^{\gamma'} \Sigma| \lesssim \mu^{-(|\alpha|+j+\gamma+\gamma')} t^{-l}.$$

Before stepping further, we introduce the following integral:

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} I(t, \epsilon_1, \epsilon'_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon'_2; F) & := \int e^{i[r(\epsilon_1\rho + \epsilon'_1\rho') - t(\epsilon_2 P(\rho) + \epsilon'_2 P(\rho'))]} \mathbb{1}_{\frac{r}{t} > P'(\rho), P'(\rho')} \\ & \quad \times F(\rho, \rho', r, t; r - \epsilon_1\epsilon_2 t P'(\rho), r - \epsilon'_1\epsilon'_2 t P'(\rho')) dr d\rho d\rho'. \end{aligned}$$

The limit of such integral has been studied in [9] for strictly convex P , while the concave case can be studied with almost the same argument. To be precise,

Proposition 4.3. *Let $F(\rho, \rho', r, t; \zeta, \zeta')$ be a smooth function on $\mathbb{R}_+^4 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\delta' \in]\frac{1}{2}, 1[$. Assume that F is supported for*

$$\rho, \rho' \sim 1, \quad r \sim t, \quad |\zeta|, |\zeta'| \lesssim t^{\delta'},$$

and for all $j, j', k, \gamma, \gamma' \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\partial_\rho^j \partial_{\rho'}^{j'} \partial_r^k \partial_\zeta^\gamma \partial_{\zeta'}^{\gamma'} F(\rho, \rho', r, t; \zeta, \zeta')| \lesssim t^{-\delta'(k+\gamma+\gamma')}.$$

We assume further that the following point-wise limit exists

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} F(\rho, \rho', r\sqrt{t} + tP'(\rho'), t; \zeta\sqrt{t}, \zeta'\sqrt{t}) = F_0(\rho, \rho').$$

Under all the assumptions above, we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} I(t, -\epsilon, \epsilon, -\epsilon, \epsilon; F) = \frac{\pi}{2} \int_0^\infty F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho,$$

for all $\epsilon = \pm$ and $P \in C^\infty$ with $P'' > 0$ or $P'' < 0$.

The proof for strictly convex P follows from that of Proposition 3.1.3 in [9]. As for concave case, we will give a brief proof in Appendix E. Remark that we compute the limit of $I(t, -\epsilon, \epsilon, -\epsilon, \epsilon; F)$ for both signs $\epsilon = \pm 1$, while in [9] only the limit of the sum of these two terms was determined. The proof of our stronger result is not essentially different from the one in [9] and we shall explain the modification one has to make to the argument in Appendix E.

With the notations above, the truncated energy $E_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}(\epsilon t)$ given by the sum of (4.3) and (4.4) equals to

$$E_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}(\epsilon t) = I(t, -\epsilon, \epsilon, -\epsilon, \epsilon; F) + I(t, -\epsilon, \epsilon, -\epsilon, \epsilon; F_R),$$

where

$$F(\rho, \rho', r, t; \zeta, \zeta') = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d+1}} \kappa^2 \left(\frac{r}{t} \right) \int \chi \left(\frac{\zeta}{t^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho)} \right) \chi \left(\frac{\zeta'}{t^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho')} \right) \\ \times \hat{u}_0(-\epsilon \rho \omega) \overline{\hat{u}_0(-\epsilon \rho' \omega)} (\rho \rho')^{\frac{d-1}{2}} d\omega, \\ F_R(\rho, \rho', r, t; \zeta, \zeta') = t^{-2(\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2})} \int \frac{t}{r} \Sigma(\omega, t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}}, \rho, \rho', r, t; \frac{\zeta}{t}, \frac{\zeta'}{t}) d\omega.$$

It is easy to check that F, F_R satisfy the conditions of Proposition 4.3 with

$$\delta' = \delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}.$$

Note that due to condition $\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} \in]0, \frac{1}{2}[$, we have $\delta' \in]\frac{1}{2}, 1[$, which is required by Proposition 4.3. The corresponding limit is

$$F_0(\rho, \rho') = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d+1}} \int \hat{u}_0(-\epsilon \rho \omega) \overline{\hat{u}_0(-\epsilon \rho' \omega)} (\rho \rho')^{\frac{d-1}{2}} d\omega$$

and 0, respectively. Therefore, we may conclude (1.17), (1.22), and (1.28) by Proposition 4.3. In fact, with $\epsilon = \pm$, one has

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} E_{\chi, \delta}(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} E_{\chi, \delta}(\epsilon t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} I(t, -\epsilon, \epsilon, -\epsilon, \epsilon; F) + \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} I(t, -\epsilon, \epsilon, -\epsilon, \epsilon; F_R) \\ = \frac{\pi}{2} \int_0^\infty F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho + 0 \\ = \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int \hat{u}_0(-\epsilon \rho \omega) \overline{\hat{u}_0(-\epsilon \rho \omega)} \rho^{d-1} d\omega d\rho = \frac{1}{4} \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2.$$

4.2. Sub-critical and critical case $\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} \leq 0$. In the rest of this section, we will study, under the condition $\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} \leq 0$, the truncated energy $E_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}(u_0, \epsilon t)$, with $\epsilon = \pm$, $t > t_0 \gg 1$. Here, we only write the proof of the case $P'' > 0$, while the case $P'' < 0$ can be calculated in exactly the same way.

By definition (1.11), the truncated energy $E_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}(u_0, \epsilon t)$ equals to

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int e^{ix \cdot (\xi - \xi')} e^{i\epsilon t(P(\xi) - P(\xi'))} \chi \left(\frac{x + \epsilon t P'(\xi)}{t^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi)} \right) \chi \left(\frac{x + \epsilon t P'(\xi')}{t^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi')} \right) \\ \times \mathbb{1}_{\frac{|x|}{t} > |P'(\xi)|, |P'(\xi')|} \hat{u}_0(\xi) \overline{\hat{u}_0(\xi')} d\xi d\xi' dx,$$

which can be rewritten in polar system $x = r\omega$, $\xi = \rho\theta$, $\xi' = \rho'\theta'$ as

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int e^{ir\omega \cdot (\rho\theta - \rho'\theta')} e^{i\epsilon t(P(\rho) - P(\rho'))} \chi \left(\frac{r\omega + \epsilon t P'(\rho)\theta}{t^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho)} \right) \chi \left(\frac{r\omega + \epsilon t P'(\rho')\theta'}{t^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho')} \right) \\ \times \mathbb{1}_{\frac{r}{t} > P'(\rho), P'(\rho')} \hat{u}_0(\rho\theta) \overline{\hat{u}_0(\rho'\theta')} (r\rho\rho')^{d-1} dr d\theta d\theta' d\omega d\rho d\rho'.$$

We decompose $E_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}(u_0, \epsilon t)$ as the sum of $E_\pm(\epsilon t)$, where E_+, E_- are defined as integral over $\rho > \rho'$, $\rho' > \rho$, respectively, and the dependence on $\chi, \delta, \Lambda, u_0$ is omitted for the simplicity of notation. Since $E_- = \overline{E_+}$, it is enough to focus on the study of $E_+(\epsilon t)$. We first check that

Lemma 4.4. *The integral*

$$E_+(\epsilon t) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int e^{ir\omega \cdot (\rho\theta - \rho'\theta')} e^{i\epsilon t(P(\rho) - P(\rho'))} \chi \left(\frac{r\omega + \epsilon t P'(\rho)\theta}{t^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho)} \right) \chi \left(\frac{r\omega + \epsilon t P'(\rho')\theta'}{t^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho')} \right) \\ \times \mathbb{1}_{\frac{r}{t} > P'(\rho)} \mathbb{1}_{\rho > \rho'} \hat{u}_0(\rho\theta) \overline{\hat{u}_0(\rho'\theta')} (r\rho\rho')^{d-1} dr d\theta d\theta' d\omega d\rho d\rho'$$

equals, up to some $O(t^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ terms, to

$$(4.6) \quad \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int_{\theta, \theta' \in \sqrt{t}(\epsilon\omega + \mathbb{S}^{d-1})} e^{i[\sqrt{t}P'(\rho)\rho\omega \cdot (\theta - \theta') + r\rho\omega \cdot (\theta - \theta') + wP'(\rho)\theta' \cdot \omega]} e^{-\epsilon i[rw + \frac{1}{2}P''(\rho)w^2]} \\ \times \chi\left(\frac{r\omega + \epsilon P'(\rho)\theta}{t^\delta \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho)}\right) \chi\left(\frac{(r + P''(\rho)w)\omega + \epsilon P'(\rho)\theta'}{t^\delta \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho)}\right) \\ \times \mathbb{1}_{r>0} \mathbb{1}_{\rho > \frac{w}{\sqrt{t}} > 0} |\hat{u}_0(-\epsilon\rho\omega)|^2 (P'(\rho))^{d-1} \rho^{2(d-1)} d\theta d\theta' dr dw d\omega d\rho.$$

Proof. To begin with, via change of variable,

$$r \rightarrow rt^{\frac{1}{2}} + tP'(\rho), \quad \rho' \rightarrow \rho - \frac{w}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

the integral $E_+(et)$ can be rewritten as

$$\frac{t^{d-1}}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int e^{i[tP'(\rho)\rho\omega \cdot (\theta - \theta') + \sqrt{t}r\rho\omega \cdot (\theta - \theta') + \sqrt{t}wP'(\rho)\theta' \cdot \omega + rw\theta' \cdot \omega]} \\ \times e^{\epsilon it(P(\rho) - P(\rho - \frac{w}{\sqrt{t}}))} \chi\left(\frac{r\omega + \sqrt{t}P'(\rho)(\omega + \epsilon\theta)}{t^\delta \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho)}\right) \\ \times \chi\left(\frac{r\omega + \sqrt{t}P'(\rho)(\omega + \epsilon\theta') - \epsilon\sqrt{t}(P'(\rho) - P'(\rho - t^{-\frac{1}{2}}w))\theta'}{t^\delta \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho - w)}\right) \\ \times \mathbb{1}_{r>0} \mathbb{1}_{\rho > \frac{w}{\sqrt{t}} > 0} \overline{\hat{u}_0(\rho\theta)} \hat{u}_0((\rho - t^{-\frac{1}{2}}w)\theta') \\ \times \left(\frac{r}{\sqrt{t}} + P'(\rho)\right)^{d-1} \rho^{d-1} (\rho - t^{-\frac{1}{2}}w)^{d-1} d\theta d\theta' dr dw d\omega d\rho.$$

Due to χ , \hat{u}_0 factors, the integrand is supported for

$$(4.7) \quad 0 < r, w \lesssim t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2}}, \quad \rho \sim 1, \\ |\omega + \epsilon\theta|, |\omega + \epsilon\theta'| \lesssim t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}}.$$

In fact, $\rho \sim 1$ follows directly from the fact that \hat{u}_0 is compactly supported away from zero. Since χ is compactly supported, the first χ factor implies that

$$r = \left| |(r + \sqrt{t}P'(\rho))\omega| - |\sqrt{t}P'(\rho)\theta| \right| \\ \leq \left| r\omega + \sqrt{t}P'(\rho)(\omega + \epsilon\theta) \right| \lesssim t^\delta \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho) \sim t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2}},$$

which further implies that

$$\sqrt{t}|\omega + \epsilon\theta| \lesssim |\sqrt{t}P'(\rho)(\omega + \epsilon\theta)| \\ \leq \left| r\omega + \sqrt{t}P'(\rho)(\omega + \epsilon\theta) \right| + |r\omega| \lesssim t^\delta \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho) \sim t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2}}.$$

By applying a similar argument to the second χ factor, we obtain

$$w \sim \left| \sqrt{t}P'(\rho) - \sqrt{t}P'(\rho - t^{-\frac{1}{2}}w) \right| \\ \leq \left| (r + \sqrt{t}P'(\rho)) - \sqrt{t}P'(\rho - t^{-\frac{1}{2}}w) \right| + r \\ \leq \left| (r + \sqrt{t}P'(\rho))\omega + \epsilon\sqrt{t}P'(\rho - t^{-\frac{1}{2}}w)\theta' \right| + r \lesssim t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2}},$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sqrt{t}|\omega + \epsilon\theta'| &\sim \left| \sqrt{t}P'(\rho)(\omega + \epsilon\theta') \right| \\
 &\leq \left| r\omega + \sqrt{t}P'(\rho)(\omega + \epsilon\theta') - \epsilon\sqrt{t}(P'(\rho) - P'(\rho - t^{-\frac{1}{2}}w))\theta' \right| \\
 &\quad + r + \left| \sqrt{t}(P'(\rho) - P'(\rho - t^{-\frac{1}{2}}w)) \right| \\
 &\lesssim t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2}} + r + w \lesssim t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

As a result, the boundedness of integrand implies that

$$E_+(\epsilon t) \lesssim t^{d-1} \times t^{2(\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2})} \times \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} t^{\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2}} \right)^{2(d-1)} = t^{2(\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2})d},$$

which tends to zero as $t \rightarrow +\infty$ when $\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} < 0$, and the limit (1.13), (1.20), and (1.24) follow. In the remaining of this section, we take $\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} = 0$.

The support of integrand also allows us to simplify $E_+(\epsilon t)$, up to some $O(t^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ terms, as

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\frac{t^{d-1}}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int e^{i[tP'(\rho)\rho\omega \cdot (\theta - \theta') + \sqrt{t}r\rho\omega \cdot (\theta - \theta') + \sqrt{t}wP'(\rho)\theta' \cdot \omega + rw\theta' \cdot \omega]} \\
 &\quad \times e^{i[\sqrt{t}P'(\rho)w - \frac{1}{2}P''(\rho)w^2]} \chi \left(\frac{r\omega + \sqrt{t}P'(\rho)(\omega + \epsilon\theta')}{t^\delta \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho)} \right) \\
 &\quad \times \chi \left(\frac{r\omega + \sqrt{t}P'(\rho)(\omega + \epsilon\theta') - \epsilon P''(\rho)w\theta'}{t^\delta \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho)} \right) \\
 &\quad \times \mathbb{1}_{r>0} \mathbb{1}_{\rho > \frac{w}{\sqrt{t}} > 0} \hat{u}_0(\rho\theta) \overline{\hat{u}_0(\rho\theta')} (P'(\rho))^{d-1} \rho^{2(d-1)} d\theta d\theta' dr dw d\omega d\rho.
 \end{aligned}$$

Here, we use the approximations

$$\begin{aligned}
 t \left(P(\rho) - P \left(\rho - \frac{w}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right) &= t \left(-P'(\rho) \left(-\frac{w}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) - \frac{P''(\rho)}{2} \frac{w^2}{t} + O \left(\frac{w^3}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right) \right) \\
 &= \sqrt{t}P'(\rho)w - \frac{1}{2}P''(\rho)w^2 + O \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

to simplify the phase and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sqrt{t} \left(P'(\rho) - P' \left(\rho - \frac{w}{\sqrt{t}} \right) \right) &= \sqrt{t} \left(-P''(\rho) \left(-\frac{w}{\sqrt{t}} \right) + O \left(\frac{w^2}{t} \right) \right) \\
 &= P''(\rho)w + O \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

to simplify the argument of the second χ .

By applying a change of variable in θ, θ' ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \theta &\mapsto t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\theta - \epsilon\omega, \\
 \theta' &\mapsto t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\theta' - \epsilon\omega,
 \end{aligned}$$

we can rewrite $E_+(\epsilon t)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int_{\theta, \theta' \in \sqrt{t}(\epsilon\omega + \mathbb{S}^{d-1})} e^{i[\sqrt{t}P'(\rho)\rho\omega \cdot (\theta - \theta') + r\rho\omega \cdot (\theta - \theta') + wP'(\rho)\theta' \cdot \omega + t^{-\frac{1}{2}}rw\theta' \cdot \omega]} \\ & \quad \times e^{-\epsilon i[rw + \frac{1}{2}P''(\rho)w^2]} \chi\left(\frac{r\omega + \epsilon P'(\rho)\theta}{t^\delta \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho)}\right) \\ & \quad \times \chi\left(\frac{(r + P''(\rho)w)\omega + \epsilon P'(\rho)\theta' - \epsilon t^{-\frac{1}{2}}P''(\rho)w\theta'}{t^\delta \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho)}\right) \\ & \quad \times \mathbb{1}_{r>0} \mathbb{1}_{\rho>\frac{w}{\sqrt{t}}>0} \hat{u}_0(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho\theta - \epsilon\rho\omega) \overline{\hat{u}_0(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho\theta' - \epsilon\rho\omega)} \\ & \quad \times (P'(\rho))^{d-1} \rho^{2(d-1)} d\theta d\theta' dr dw d\omega d\rho + O(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}), \end{aligned}$$

where the integrand is supported for $0 < r, w \lesssim 1$, $\rho \sim 1$, and $|\theta|, |\theta'| \lesssim 1$ due to (4.7) together with $\delta + \frac{\sigma_1}{2} = 0$, which allows us to do another simplification and write $E_+(\epsilon t)$ as (4.6). \square

Till now, we have managed to write $E_+(\epsilon t)$, up to some admissible terms, as (4.6), namely

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int_{\theta, \theta' \in \sqrt{t}(\epsilon\omega + \mathbb{S}^{d-1})} e^{i[\sqrt{t}P'(\rho)\rho\omega \cdot (\theta - \theta') + r\rho\omega \cdot (\theta - \theta') + wP'(\rho)\theta' \cdot \omega]} e^{-\epsilon i[rw + \frac{1}{2}P''(\rho)w^2]} \\ & \quad \times \chi\left(\frac{r\omega + \epsilon P'(\rho)\theta}{t^\delta \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho)}\right) \chi\left(\frac{(r + P''(\rho)w)\omega + \epsilon P'(\rho)\theta'}{t^\delta \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho)}\right) \\ & \quad \times \mathbb{1}_{r>0} \mathbb{1}_{\rho>\frac{w}{\sqrt{t}}>0} |\hat{u}_0(-\epsilon\rho\omega)|^2 (P'(\rho))^{d-1} \rho^{2(d-1)} d\theta d\theta' dr dw d\omega d\rho. \end{aligned}$$

In the rest of this section, we will calculate the limit of this integral and conclude Proposition 4.1. Since the integral in θ, θ' is over a sphere centered at $\epsilon\omega$ with radius \sqrt{t} , we may write θ, θ' in local coordinate

$$\begin{aligned} \theta &= h\epsilon\omega + y, \quad h = \sqrt{t} - \sqrt{t - |y|^2}, \\ \theta' &= h'\epsilon\omega + y', \quad h' = \sqrt{t} - \sqrt{t - |y'|^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $h, h' \in \mathbb{R}$, $y, y' \in \omega^\perp := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : z \cdot \omega = 0\}$. The condition of support implies that $|h|, |h'|, |y|, |y'| \lesssim 1$. It is easy to check that, as $t \rightarrow +\infty$

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{t}\omega \cdot (\theta - \theta') &= \epsilon\sqrt{t} \left(\sqrt{t - |y'|^2} - \sqrt{t - |y|^2} \right) \rightarrow \epsilon \left(\frac{|y|^2}{2} - \frac{|y'|^2}{2} \right), \\ \theta \cdot \omega &= \epsilon \left(\sqrt{t} - \sqrt{t - |y|^2} \right) \rightarrow 0, \\ \theta' \cdot \omega &= \epsilon \left(\sqrt{t} - \sqrt{t - |y'|^2} \right) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Dominated Convergence Theorem, as t tends to infinity, the limit of $E_+(\epsilon t)$ equals to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int_{y, y' \in \omega^\perp, r, w > 0} e^{\epsilon i \left[P'(\rho)\rho \left(\frac{|y|^2}{2} - \frac{|y'|^2}{2} \right) - rw - \frac{1}{2}P''(\rho)w^2 \right]} \\ & \quad \times \chi\left(\frac{r\omega + \epsilon P'(\rho)y}{\lambda_1 \rho^{\sigma_1}}\right) \chi\left(\frac{(r + P''(\rho)w)\omega + \epsilon P'(\rho)y'}{\lambda_1 \rho^{\sigma_1}}\right) \\ & \quad \times |\hat{u}_0(-\epsilon\rho\omega)|^2 (P'(\rho))^{d-1} \rho^{2(d-1)} dy dy' dr dw d\omega d\rho, \end{aligned}$$

which, after a change of variable, is equal to

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int_{y, y' \in \omega^\perp, r, w > 0} e^{i\left[\left(\frac{|y|^2}{2} - \frac{|y'|^2}{2}\right) - rw - \frac{1}{2}w^2\right]} \chi\left(\frac{\sqrt{P''(\rho)}r\omega + \epsilon\sqrt{\rho^{-1}P'(\rho)}y}{\lambda_1\rho^{\sigma_1}}\right) \\ & \times \chi\left(\frac{\sqrt{P''(\rho)}(r+w)\omega + \epsilon\sqrt{\rho^{-1}P'(\rho)}y'}{\lambda_1\rho^{\sigma_1}}\right) \\ & \times |\hat{u}_0(-\epsilon\rho\omega)|^2 \rho^{d-1} dy dy' dr dw d\omega d\rho. \end{aligned}$$

In order to give a compact form, we introduce the following functions,

$$\begin{aligned} H(r, \omega) &:= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \int_{y \cdot \omega = 0} e^{i\frac{r^2 + |y|^2}{2}} \chi\left(\frac{\sqrt{P''(\rho)}r\omega + \epsilon\sqrt{\rho^{-1}P'(\rho)}y}{\lambda_1\rho^{\sigma_1}}\right) dy, \\ F(r, \omega) &:= \int_r^\infty H(s, \omega) ds, \end{aligned}$$

Remark that since $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, H decay rapidly at infinity, uniformly in ω . Thus, F is well-defined. With these functions, we can rewrite the integral (4.8) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int \int_0^\infty H(r, \omega) \int_0^\infty \overline{H(r+w, \omega)} dw dr |\hat{u}_0(-\epsilon\rho\omega)|^2 \rho^{d-1} d\omega d\rho \\ & = -\frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int \int_0^\infty \partial_r F(r, \omega) \overline{F(r, \omega)} dr |\hat{u}_0(-\epsilon\rho\omega)|^2 \rho^{d-1} d\omega d\rho. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} E_{\chi, \delta, \Lambda}(u_0, \epsilon t) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} 2 \operatorname{Re} E_+(\epsilon t) \\ &= -\frac{2}{(2\pi)^d} \operatorname{Re} \int \int_0^\infty \partial_r F(r, \omega) \overline{F(r, \omega)} dr |\hat{u}_0(-\epsilon\rho\omega)|^2 \rho^{d-1} d\omega d\rho \\ &= -\frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int \int_0^\infty \frac{\partial}{\partial r} |F|^2(r, \omega) dr |\hat{u}_0(-\epsilon\rho\omega)|^2 \rho^{d-1} d\omega d\rho \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int |F(0, \omega)|^2 |\hat{u}_0(-\epsilon\rho\omega)|^2 \rho^{d-1} d\omega d\rho, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$|F(0, \omega)|^2 = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \left| \int_0^\infty \int_{y \cdot \omega = 0} e^{i\frac{r^2 + |y|^2}{2}} \chi\left(\frac{\sqrt{P''(\rho)}r\omega + \epsilon\sqrt{\rho^{-1}P'(\rho)}y}{\lambda_1\rho^{\sigma_1}}\right) dy dr \right|^2,$$

which is exactly $G_\chi^{\text{alt}}(\rho, \omega)$ defined in (1.26), or (1.15) with $\sigma_1 = 0$ and $\lambda_1 = 1$. The limits (1.14), (1.21), and (1.25) thus follow.

5. STUDY OF KLEIN-GORDON EQUATION

In this section, we shall prove Theorem 1.9 via a study of half-Klein-Gordon equation, i.e. (E) with $P(\xi) = \langle \xi \rangle$. Let w be the (real) solution to Klein-Gordon equation (KG). We have then

$$0 = (\partial_t^2 - \Delta + 1)w = -\left(\frac{\partial_t}{i} - P(D_x)\right) \left(\frac{\partial_t}{i} + P(D_x)\right) w.$$

Thus, the complex-valued function

$$u := \left(\frac{\partial_t}{i} + P(D_x)\right) w,$$

is the unique solution to half-Klein-Gordon equation with initial data

$$u_0 := u|_{t=0} = \frac{w_1}{i} + P(D_x)w_0 \in L^2.$$

Due to the fact that w is real-valued, we have the following relations

$$\partial_t w = -\operatorname{Im} u, \quad w = \langle D_x \rangle^{-1} \operatorname{Re} u.$$

In this section, we denote the truncation $\operatorname{Op}(a_\epsilon^{\text{KG}}(t))$, whose symbol is defined in (1.31), as $A(t)$, and define operators $A_\pm(t)$ as $\operatorname{Op}(a_\pm^{\text{KG}}(t))$, where

$$(5.1) \quad a_\pm^{\text{KG}}(t) = \chi \left(\frac{x \pm tP'(\xi)}{|t|^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta}} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |tP'(\xi)|} \chi \left(\frac{\xi}{|t|^\epsilon} \right),$$

$0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$, $0 < \epsilon < 1$, and $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are the same as in (1.31). Since we are interested in the behavior as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, it is harmless to assume $t \gg 1$. Before continuing the proof, we clarify that all the involved operators are bounded uniformly in $t \gg 1$.

Lemma 5.1. *There exists time-independent constant $C > 0$ and $t_0 \gg 1$, such that for all $t > t_0$,*

$$\|A(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)}, \|A_\pm(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq C.$$

Proof. It is obvious that $P(\xi) = \langle \xi \rangle$ satisfies hypothesis (\mathbf{H}_{p_0, p_1}) with $p_0 = 1$, $P_0 = 0$, and $p_1 = -2$, $P_1 = 1$. In what follows, we shall focus on symbols $a_\pm^{\text{KG}}(t)$ (with $a_\epsilon^{\text{KG}}(t)$ treated in the same way) and decompose them in high and low frequency. Let $\tilde{\chi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a radial function which is equal to 1 in the ball $B(0, 1)$ and vanishes outside a larger ball $B(0, 2)$. We may write

$$a_{\pm, l}^{\text{KG}}(t) := a_\pm^{\text{KG}}(t) \tilde{\chi}(\xi), \quad a_{\pm, h}^{\text{KG}}(t) := a_\pm^{\text{KG}}(t) (1 - \tilde{\chi})(\xi).$$

For low frequency part $a_{\pm, l}^{\text{KG}}(t)$, it is easy to construct a symbol $P_l(\xi)$ such that P_l verifies hypothesis (\mathbf{H}_{p_0, p_1}) with $p_0 = p_1 = 1$ and $P_0 = P_1 = 0$, and that $P_l(\xi) = P(\xi)$ for all $|\xi| \leq 2$. In this way, we have

$$a_{\pm, l}^{\text{KG}}(t, x, \xi) = \chi \left(\frac{x \pm tP_l'(\xi)}{|t|^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta}} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |tP_l'(\xi)|} \tilde{\chi}(\xi),$$

where the factor involving t^ϵ disappears since the symbol is supported for $|\xi| \leq 2 \ll t^\epsilon$, by choosing $t \gg 1$. Now, we may apply Proposition 2.1 to obtain the uniform-in- t boundedness of operator with symbol

$$\chi \left(\frac{x \pm tP_l'(\xi)}{|t|^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta}} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |tP_l'(\xi)|}$$

and hence boundedness of the operator $\operatorname{Op}(a_{\pm, l}^{\text{KG}}(t))$.

The boundedness of $\operatorname{Op}(a_{\pm, h}^{\text{KG}}(t))$ is actually an immediate consequence of Proposition 2.2. More precisely, by choosing arbitrary ϵ' such that (ϵ', ϵ) satisfies conditions (1.19) associated to P (i.e. with $p_0 = 1$ and $p_1 = -2$), namely

$$0 < \epsilon' \leq \frac{1}{p_0 + 1} = \frac{1}{2}, \quad 0 < \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{-(p_1 + 1)} = 1,$$

we are able to apply Proposition 2.2 to obtain the uniform boundedness of operator with symbol

$$\chi \left(\frac{x \pm tP'(\xi)}{|t|^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta}} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |tP'(\xi)|} (1 - \chi) \left(\frac{\xi}{t^{-\epsilon'}} \right) \chi \left(\frac{\xi}{t^\epsilon} \right).$$

If we add the high frequency truncation $(1 - \tilde{\chi})(\xi)$, the symbol will be supported in $|\xi| \geq 1 \gg t^{-\epsilon'}$ since we have chosen $t \gg 1$. As a result, the truncation $(1 - \chi)$ equals 1 and the uniform boundedness of $\text{Op}(a_{\pm, h}^{\text{KG}}(t))$ follows.

We have shown that $A_{\pm}(t) = \text{Op}(a_{\pm, l}^{\text{KG}}(t)) + \text{Op}(a_{\pm, h}^{\text{KG}}(t))$ is uniformly bounded on L^2 . By repeating the same argument and replacing Proposition 2.1, 2.2 by Theorem 1.8, we may also obtain the uniform boundedness of $A(t)$. \square

Now we turn back to the proof of Theorem 1.9. By definition, the truncated energy (1.30) can be expressed as

$$E_{\epsilon}^{\text{KG}}(\pm t) = \|A(t) \text{Im } u(\pm t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\| A(t) \frac{D_x}{\langle D_x \rangle} \text{Re } u(\pm t) \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\| A(t) \frac{1}{\langle D_x \rangle} \text{Re } u(\pm t) \right\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The three terms on the right hand side takes the form

$$(5.2) \quad Q_{\pm}^{\text{KG}}(t, \epsilon_0, R) = \frac{1}{4} \left\| A(t) \left(Ru(\pm t) + \epsilon_0 \overline{Ru(\pm t)} \right) \right\|_{L^2}^2,$$

where $\epsilon_0 \in \{+, -\}$ and R is a bounded Fourier multiplier taking values among 1, $D_x \langle D_x \rangle^{-1}$, and $\langle D_x \rangle^{-1}$. Due to the uniform boundedness of truncation operators $A(t)$, $A_{\pm}(t)$, (5.2) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4} \left\| A_{\pm}(t) Ru(\pm t) + \epsilon_0 A_{\mp}(t) \overline{Ru(\pm t)} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + O(\|(A(t) - A_{\pm}(t)) Ru(\pm t)\|_{L^2}) \\ & + O\left(\|(A(t) - A_{\mp}(t)) \overline{Ru(\pm t)}\|_{L^2}\right) \\ & = \frac{1}{4} \|A_{\pm}(t) Ru(\pm t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{4} \|A_{\mp}(t) \overline{Ru(\pm t)}\|_{L^2}^2 + \epsilon_0 \text{Re} \left\langle A_{\pm}(t) Ru(\pm t), A_{\mp}(t) \overline{Ru(\pm t)} \right\rangle_{L^2} \\ & + O(\|(A(t) - A_{\pm}(t)) Ru(\pm t)\|_{L^2}) + O\left(\|(A(t) - A_{\mp}(t)) \overline{Ru(\pm t)}\|_{L^2}\right) \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \|A_{\pm}(t) Ru(\pm t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \epsilon_0 \text{Re} \left\langle A_{\pm}(t) Ru(\pm t), A_{\mp}(t) \overline{Ru(\pm t)} \right\rangle_{L^2} \\ & + O(\|(A(t) - A_{\pm}(t)) Ru(\pm t)\|_{L^2}), \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that for all complex-valued function $f \in L^2$

$$A(t) \bar{f} = \overline{A(t) f}, \quad A_{\pm}(t) \bar{f} = \overline{A_{\mp}(t) f}.$$

In order to conclude the desired limit (1.30), it suffices to prove

Proposition 5.2. *Let $v_0, v_{1,0}$ be two functions in L^2 . With $A(t)$, $A_{\pm}(t)$ as above, we have following limits:*

$$(5.3) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \|A_{\pm}(t) e^{\pm itP(D_x)} v_0\|_{L^2}^2 = \frac{1}{4} \|v_0\|_{L^2}^2,$$

$$(5.4) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \left\langle A_{\pm}(t) e^{\pm itP(D_x)} v_0, A_{\mp}(t) e^{\mp itP(D_x)} v_{0,1} \right\rangle_{L^2} = 0,$$

$$(5.5) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \|(A(t) - A_{\pm}(t)) e^{\pm itP(D_x)} v_0\|_{L^2}^2 = 0.$$

Once Proposition 5.2 is proved, we may apply the three limits with $v_0 = Ru_0$ and $v_{0,1} = \overline{Ru_0}$ to obtain that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} Q_{\pm}^{\text{KG}}(t, \epsilon_0, R) = \frac{1}{8} \|Ru_0\|_{L^2}^2,$$

since, due to the definition of u , we have, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$Ru(t) = e^{itP(D_x)} Ru_0, \quad \overline{Ru(t)} = e^{-itP(D_x)} \overline{Ru_0}.$$

As a result, the limit (1.30) follows from

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} E_\epsilon^{KG}(w_0, w_1, t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} E_\epsilon^{KG}(w_0, w_1, \pm t) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} Q_\pm^{KG}(t, -1, 1) + Q_\pm^{KG}(t, -1, D_x \langle D_x \rangle^{-1}) + Q_\pm^{KG}(t, 1, \langle D_x \rangle^{-1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{8} \left(\|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\| \frac{D_x}{\langle D_x \rangle} u_0 \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\| \frac{1}{\langle D_x \rangle} u_0 \right\|_{L^2}^2 \right) = \frac{1}{4} \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 = \frac{1}{4} (\|w_0\|_{H^1}^2 + \|w_1\|_{L^2}^2). \end{aligned}$$

In the rest of this section, we shall prove the limits (5.3), (5.4), and (5.5). We have seen that operators $A(t)$, $A_\pm(t)$ are bounded uniformly in $t > t_0 \gg 1$. As a result, it suffices to calculate these limits for those $v_0, v_{0,1}$ belonging to some dense subspace of L^2 . In what follows, we assume $\hat{v}_0, \hat{v}_{0,1}$ are smooth and supported in a annulus centered at zero.

The first limit (5.3) is no more than a consequence of (1.22) with $P(\xi) = \langle \xi \rangle$, $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon$, $\chi_h = \chi$, and any $\epsilon_0 \in]0, \frac{1}{2}]$. The exceptional truncation χ_l is not a problem, since it disappears when $|t|$ is large enough. For the remaining results (5.4) and (5.5), we will apply a similar argument as in the proof of Proposition 4.1 for super-critical case.

5.1. Limit of interaction term. We first calculate the limit (5.4). Clearly, via conjugation, it is enough to study the limit of

$$(5.6) \quad \langle A_+(t) e^{itP(D_x)} v_0, A_-(t) e^{-itP(D_x)} v_{0,1} \rangle_{L^2},$$

since the other one can be recovered by relation

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\langle A_-(t) e^{-itP(D_x)} v_0, A_+(t) e^{itP(D_x)} v_{0,1} \rangle_{L^2}} &= \left\langle \overline{A_-(t) e^{-itP(D_x)} v_0}, \overline{A_+(t) e^{itP(D_x)} v_{0,1}} \right\rangle_{L^2} \\ &= \langle A_+(t) e^{itP(D_x)} \bar{v}_0, A_-(t) e^{-itP(D_x)} \bar{v}_{0,1} \rangle_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the Fourier transform of $\bar{v}_0, \bar{v}_{0,1}$ still belongs to the class $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\})$.

By definition (5.1) of $A_\pm(t) = \text{Op}(a_\pm^{KG}(t))$, (5.6) equals, in polar system, to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int e^{i(r\rho\omega \cdot \theta - r\rho'\omega \cdot \theta')} e^{it(P(\rho) + P(\rho'))} \chi \left(\frac{r\omega + tP'(\rho)\theta}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right) \chi \left(\frac{r\omega - tP'(\rho')\theta'}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right) \\ & \quad \times \mathbb{1}_{\frac{r}{t} > P'(\rho), P'(\rho')} \hat{v}_0(\rho\theta) \overline{\hat{v}_{0,1}(\rho'\theta')} (r\rho\rho')^{d-1} d\theta d\theta' d\omega dr d\rho d\rho'. \end{aligned}$$

Here we may omit the truncation in $\xi = \rho\theta$ and $\xi' = \rho'\theta'$ by taking $t \gg 1$. As in previous section, we focus on the integral in θ and θ' , which are equal to, by Lemma B.5,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int e^{ir\rho\omega \cdot \theta} \chi \left(\frac{r\omega + tP'(\rho)\theta}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right) \overline{\hat{v}_0(\rho\theta)} d\theta \\ & \quad = e^{-ir\rho} \mu^{d-1} S_{-\frac{d-1}{2}}^+(\omega, \mu, \rho, \frac{r}{t} - P'(\rho), t; r\rho\mu^2) \kappa \left(\frac{r}{t} \right), \\ & \int e^{-ir\rho'\omega \cdot \theta'} \chi \left(\frac{r\omega - tP'(\rho')\theta'}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right) \hat{v}_{0,1}(\rho'\theta') d\theta' \\ & \quad = e^{-ir\rho'} \mu^{d-1} S_{-\frac{d-1}{2}}^-(\omega, \mu, \rho', \frac{r}{t} - P'(\rho'), t; r\rho'\mu^2) \kappa \left(\frac{r}{t} \right), \end{aligned}$$

respectively, where $\mu = t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}}$ and $S_m^\pm(\omega, \mu, \rho, r', t; \zeta)$ is supported for $\zeta > c > 0$, $\rho \sim 1$ and $|r'| \lesssim \mu$ and satisfies for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{d-1}$, $j, k, l, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\partial_\omega^\alpha \partial_\mu^j \partial_\rho^k \partial_{r'}^l \partial_\zeta^\gamma S_m| \leq C \mu^{-(|\alpha| + j + l)} \langle \zeta \rangle^{m - \gamma}.$$

Here we add extra factor $\kappa \in C_c^\infty(]0, +\infty[)$, which equals to 1 in a neighborhood of 1, due to the support of integrand.

As a consequence, (5.6) reads

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2d}} \int e^{i[r(-\rho-\rho')-t(-P(\rho)-P(\rho'))]} S_0^+(\omega, \mu, \rho, \frac{r}{t} - P'(\rho), t; r\rho\mu^2) \\ & \quad \times S_0^-(\omega, \mu, \rho', \frac{r}{t} - P'(\rho'), t; r\rho'\mu^2) \kappa^2\left(\frac{r}{t}\right) \mathbb{1}_{\frac{r}{t} > P'(\rho), P'(\rho')} \\ & \quad \times \hat{v}_0(\rho\theta) \overline{\hat{v}_{0,1}(\rho'\theta')} (\rho\rho')^{\frac{d-1}{2}} d\omega dr d\rho d\rho', \end{aligned}$$

which can be rewritten as $I(t, -, -, -, -; F)$ defined in (4.5), with (5.7)

$$F(\rho, \rho', r, t; \zeta, \zeta') = S_0^+(\omega, t^{\delta-\frac{1}{2}}, \rho, \frac{\zeta}{t}, t; r\rho t^{2\delta-1}) S_0^-(\omega, t^{\delta-\frac{1}{2}}, \rho', \frac{\zeta'}{t}, t; r\rho' t^{2\delta-1}) \kappa^2\left(\frac{r}{t}\right).$$

In [9], the author has proved in Proposition 3.1.1 that

Proposition 5.3. *Let $F(\rho, \rho', r, t; \zeta, \zeta')$ be a smooth function on $\mathbb{R}_+^4 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\delta' \in]\frac{1}{2}, 1[$. Assume that F is supported for*

$$\rho, \rho' \sim 1, \quad r \sim t, \quad |\zeta|, |\zeta'| \lesssim t^{\delta'},$$

and for all $j, j', k, \gamma, \gamma' \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\partial_\rho^j \partial_{\rho'}^{j'} \partial_r^k \partial_\zeta^\gamma \partial_{\zeta'}^{\gamma'} F(\rho, \rho', r, t; \zeta, \zeta')| \lesssim t^{-\delta'(k+\gamma+\gamma')}.$$

Under all the assumptions above, we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} I(t, \pm, \pm, \pm, \pm; F) = 0.$$

It is easy to check that the function F defined in (5.7) satisfies the conditions above with $\delta' = \delta + \frac{1}{2}$ and limit (5.4) follows.

5.2. Limit of energy outside the truncation area. It remains to prove (5.5), which requires a study of the L^2 -norm of $(A(t) - A_\pm(t))e^{\pm itP(D_x)}v_0$. As in previous part, by conjugation, it suffices to focus on

$$(A(t) - A_+(t))e^{itP(D_x)}v_0(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{ix\xi} e^{itP(\xi)} (1 - \chi)\left(\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{t^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta}}\right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |tP'(\xi)|} \hat{v}_0(\xi) d\xi,$$

where we omit again the truncation in ξ by assuming $t \gg 1$. Actually, we have

$$\overline{(A(t) - A_-(t))e^{-itP(D_x)}v_0} = (A(t) - A_+(t))e^{itP(D_x)}\overline{v_0},$$

with \hat{v}_0 belonging to the same subspace $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\})$.

We first check that the L^2 -norm of $(A(t) - A_+(t))e^{itP(D_x)}v_0$ concentrates near $|x| = t$, i.e.

Lemma 5.4. *There exists a radial function $\kappa \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ supported in an annulus centered at zero, such that, when $t \rightarrow +\infty$,*

$$(A(t) - A_+(t))e^{itP(D_x)}v_0 = \kappa\left(\frac{x}{t}\right) (A(t) - A_+(t))e^{itP(D_x)}v_0 + O_{L^2}(t^{-N}),$$

for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let $\kappa_0 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a radial function supported near zero and equal to 1 near zero. By definition,

$$(A(t) - A_+(t))e^{itP(D_x)}v_0(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{ix\xi} e^{itP(\xi)} (1 - \chi)\left(\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{t^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta}}\right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |tP'(\xi)|} \hat{v}_0(\xi) d\xi.$$

Due to the support of integrand, namely $0 < c < |\xi| < C$ and $|x| > tP'(|\xi|)$, the function above is supported for $|x| > tc_0$, where $0 < c_0 < P'(c)$. That is to say, when $\text{Supp } \kappa_0$ is chosen small enough,

$$\kappa_0 \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) (A(t) - A_+(t)) e^{itP(D_x)} v_0(x) = 0, \quad \forall t, x.$$

Let $\kappa_1 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a radial function supported outside the unit ball. We further assume that κ_1 equals to 1 away from zero. By observing that $|P'(\xi)| < 1$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$\kappa_1 \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) (A(t) - A_+(t)) e^{itP(D_x)} v_0(x) = \frac{\kappa_1 \left(\frac{x}{t} \right)}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{i(x\xi + tP(\xi))} (1 - \chi) \left(\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right) \hat{v}_0(\xi) d\xi.$$

Remark that the non-smooth term $\mathbb{1}_{|x| > tP'(|\xi|)}$ is identically 1 as we add the cut-off κ_1 . By integration by parts in ξ , we may rewrite the quantity above as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\kappa_1 \left(\frac{x}{t} \right)}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{i(x\xi + tP(\xi))} \frac{-\partial_\xi}{i} \cdot \left[\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{|x + tP'(\xi)|^2} (1 - \chi) \left(\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right) \hat{v}_0(\xi) \right] d\xi \\ &= \frac{\kappa_1 \left(\frac{x}{t} \right)}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{i(x\xi + tP(\xi))} q_1(t, x, \xi) \hat{v}_0(\xi) d\xi + \frac{\kappa_1 \left(\frac{x}{t} \right)}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{i(x\xi + tP(\xi))} q_0(t, x, \xi) \cdot \hat{v}_1(\xi) d\xi, \end{aligned}$$

where $v_1(x) = xv_0(x)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} q_0(t, x, \xi) &= \frac{-\partial_\xi}{i} \left[\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{|x + tP'(\xi)|^2} (1 - \chi) \left(\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right) \right], \\ q_1(t, x, \xi) &= \frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{|x + tP'(\xi)|^2} (1 - \chi) \left(\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

are smooth symbols satisfying for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^d$,

$$\left| \partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta q_k(t, x, \xi) \right| \lesssim t^{-2\delta} t^{-(\frac{1}{2} + \delta)|\alpha|} t^{(\frac{1}{2} - \delta)|\beta|}, \quad k = 0, 1.$$

By Calderon-Vaillancourt Theorem (Lemma A.11) and Lemma A.4, the $\mathcal{L}(L^2)$ -norm of operators $\text{Op}(q_k)$'s is bounded by $t^{-2\delta}$, which implies that

$$\left\| \kappa_1 \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) (A(t) - A_+(t)) e^{itP(D_x)} v_0 \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim t^{-2\delta} (\|v_0\|_{L^2} + \|v_1\|_{L^2}) \sim t^{-2\delta} \|\langle x \rangle v_0\|_{L^2}.$$

By repeating this procedure for M times, we obtain

$$\left\| \kappa_1 \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) (A(t) - A_+(t)) e^{itP(D_x)} v_0 \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim t^{-2M\delta} \|\langle x \rangle^M v_0\|_{L^2} \lesssim t^{-2M\delta}.$$

The last estimate follows from the fact that v_0 is a Schwartz function. The proof is completed by choosing $\kappa = 1 - \kappa_0 - \kappa_1$. \square

Thanks to Lemma 5.4, it remains to estimate the $L^2(dx)$ -norm of

$$\kappa \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) (A(t) - A_+(t)) e^{itP(D_x)} v_0(x),$$

or equivalently, in polar system, the $L^2(r^{d-1} dr d\omega)$ -norm of $I(t, r, \omega)$ defined by

$$(5.8) \quad I(t, r, \omega) = \kappa \left(\frac{r}{t} \right) \int e^{ir\rho\omega\theta} e^{itP(\rho)} (1 - \chi) \left(\frac{r\omega + tP'(\rho)\theta}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right) \mathbb{1}_{r > tP'(\rho)} \hat{v}_0(\rho\theta) \rho^{d-1} d\rho d\theta$$

To begin with, we decompose (5.8) into three parts $I_+(t, r, \omega), I_-(t, r, \omega), I_0(t, r, \omega)$ by inserting

$$\chi_0 \left(\frac{\omega + \theta}{t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}}} \right), \quad \chi_0 \left(\frac{\omega - \theta}{t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}}} \right), \quad 1 - \chi_0 \left(\frac{\omega + \theta}{t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}}} \right) - \chi_0 \left(\frac{\omega - \theta}{t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}}} \right)$$

to the integral respectively, where $\chi_0 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is radial, supported in a small ball centered at zero, and equal to 1 near zero. The desired result (5.5) thus follows from the lemma below :

Lemma 5.5. *For all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists constants C, C_N which is independent of t, r, ω , such that*

$$(5.9) \quad \|I_+(t, r, \omega)\|_{L^2(r^{d-1}drd\omega)}^2 \leq C_N t^{-N},$$

$$(5.10) \quad \|I_-(t, r, \omega)\|_{L^2(r^{d-1}drd\omega)}^2 \leq C t^{-1},$$

$$(5.11) \quad \|I_0(t, r, \omega)\|_{L^2(r^{d-1}drd\omega)}^2 \leq C_N t^{-N}.$$

Proof of (5.9). The integral $I_+(t, r, \omega)$, by definition, reads

$$\kappa \left(\frac{r}{t} \right) \int e^{i[r\rho\omega \cdot \theta + tP(\rho)]} (1 - \chi) \left(\frac{r\omega + tP'(\rho)\theta}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right) \chi_0 \left(\frac{\omega + \theta}{t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}}} \right) \mathbb{1}_{r > tP'(\rho)} \hat{v}_0(\rho\theta) \rho^{d-1} d\rho d\theta.$$

The integrand of I_+ is supported for

$$|r - tP'(\rho)| = |-r\theta + tP'(\rho)\theta| \geq |r\omega + tP'(\rho)\theta| - r|\theta + \omega| \geq ct^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta} - Cc_0 t \times t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}} = (c - Cc_0)t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta},$$

where $0 < c_0 \ll 1$ is the radius of $\text{Supp } \chi_0$. This implies that

$$|r - tP'(\rho)| \geq c't^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}.$$

As a consequence, the integrand of I_+ is smooth. This allows us to apply integration by parts in ρ , since $\rho \sim 1$ and

$$|r\omega \cdot \theta + tP'(\rho)| \geq |-r + tP'(\rho)| - r|\omega + \theta| \geq (c - 2Cc_0)t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta} \geq c''t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}.$$

More precisely, by using

$$e^{i[r\rho\omega \cdot \theta + tP(\rho)]} = \frac{-i}{r\omega \cdot \theta + tP'(\rho)} \partial_\rho e^{i[r\rho\omega \cdot \theta + tP(\rho)]},$$

one may gain $t^{-(\frac{1}{2} + \delta)}$ from $|r\omega \cdot \theta + tP'(\rho)|^{-1}$ and $t^{\frac{1}{2} - \delta}$ from each ∂_ρ . In conclusion, after M times integration by parts in ρ we have

$$|I_+(t, r, \omega)| \lesssim t^{-2M\delta}.$$

Due to factor κ , I_+ is supported for $r \sim t$, which implies that

$$\|I_+(t, r, \omega)\|_{L^2(r^{d-1}drd\omega)}^2 \lesssim t^{-4M\delta + d} \leq t^{-N},$$

where M is large enough so that $4M\delta - d \geq N$. \square

Proof of (5.10). The integral I_- will be treated as in Section 4. We first observe that the integrand of $I_-(t, r, \omega)$, which reads

$$\kappa \left(\frac{r}{t} \right) \int e^{i[r\rho\omega \cdot \theta + tP(\rho)]} (1 - \chi) \left(\frac{r\omega + tP'(\rho)\theta}{t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right) \chi_0 \left(\frac{\omega - \theta}{t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}}} \right) \mathbb{1}_{r > tP'(\rho)} \hat{v}_0(\rho\theta) \rho^{d-1} d\rho d\theta,$$

is supported for, as $t \gg 1$,

$$|r\omega + tP'(\rho)\theta| \geq |r\theta + tP'(\rho)\theta| - r|\omega - \theta| \geq r + tP'(\rho) - Cc_0 t^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta} \geq c't,$$

where $0 < c_0 \ll 1$ is the radius of $\text{Supp } \chi_0$. That is to say, the factor $(1 - \chi)$ is identically 1, and I_- becomes

$$\kappa \left(\frac{r}{t} \right) \int_{\rho_0}^{\min(\rho_1, (P')^{-1}(r/t))} e^{itP(\rho)} \int_{\mathbb{S}^d} e^{ir\rho\omega \cdot \theta} \chi_0 \left(\frac{\omega - \theta}{t^{\delta - \frac{1}{2}}} \right) \hat{v}_0(\rho\theta) d\theta \rho^{d-1} d\rho,$$

where $\hat{v}_0(\rho\theta)$ is supported for $\rho \in [\rho_0, \rho_1]$ and we use the convention $(P')^{-1}(s) = +\infty$ when $s \geq 1$. Now, we may apply Lemma B.1 with $\lambda = r\rho$, $\mu = t^{\delta-\frac{1}{2}}$, and

$$F(x, y, z, \mu; \rho) = \chi_0 \left(\frac{y-z}{\mu} \right) \tilde{\chi}_0 \left(\frac{x-y}{\mu} \right) \hat{v}_0(\rho y).$$

Here $\tilde{\chi}_0 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is chosen to be equal to 1 on the support of χ_0 . Note that F has to be taken at $(x, y, z) = (\omega, \theta, \omega)$ in order to recover the above integral. This corresponds in the statement of Lemma B.1 to $x = \theta$, $y = \theta'$, and $z = \omega$ (and no variable ω'). The extra term ρ is an extra parameter staying in a compact subset. Due to our choice of μ , it is clear that $r \sim t$ and $\rho \sim 1$ imply $\lambda\mu^2 \geq ct^{2\delta} \gg 1$. As a result, the integral in θ equals to

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^d} e^{ir\rho\omega \cdot \theta} \chi_0 \left(\frac{\omega - \theta}{t^{\delta-\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \hat{v}_0(\rho\theta) d\theta = (2\pi)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} e^{ir\rho\omega} \mu^{d-1} S_{-\frac{d-1}{2}}(\omega, \rho, \mu; r\rho\mu^2),$$

with $S_m(\omega, \rho, \mu; \zeta)$ smooth, supported for $\rho \sim 1$, $\zeta > 1$, and satisfying for all $\alpha, \in \mathbb{N}$, $j, k, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}$

$$|\partial_\omega^\alpha \partial_\rho^j \partial_\mu^k \partial_\zeta^\gamma S_m^\pm(\omega, \rho, \mu; \zeta)| \leq C \mu^{-|\alpha|-k} \langle \zeta \rangle^{m-\gamma}.$$

This formulation allows us to rewrite $I_- r^{\frac{d-1}{2}}$, up to multiplication with constants, as

$$I_-(t, r, \omega) r^{\frac{d-1}{2}} = \kappa \left(\frac{r}{t} \right) \int_{\rho_0}^{\min(\rho_1, (P')^{-1}(r/t))} e^{i[r\rho + tP(\rho)]} S_0(\omega, \rho, \mu; r\rho\mu^2) \rho^{\frac{d-1}{2}} d\rho.$$

Now, we may apply integration by parts in ρ . Due to the fact that $r + tP'(\rho) \sim t$ and $\min(\rho_1, (P')^{-1}(r/t)) \sim 1$, the boundary terms and remaining term are all bounded by t^{-1} , namely

$$\left| I_-(t, r, \omega) r^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \right| \lesssim \mathbb{1}_{r \sim t} t^{-1},$$

which implies (5.10). \square

Proof of (5.11). Unlike the study of I_\pm , I_0 will be estimated via integration by parts in θ variable. It is clear that the integrand of

$$\begin{aligned} I_0(t, r, \omega) &= \kappa \left(\frac{r}{t} \right) \int e^{ir\rho\omega \cdot \theta} e^{itP(\rho)} (1 - \chi) \left(\frac{r\omega + tP'(\rho)\theta}{t^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta}} \right) \mathbb{1}_{r > tP'(\rho)} \hat{v}_0(\rho\theta) \rho^{d-1} \\ &\quad \times \left[1 - \chi_0 \left(\frac{\omega + \theta}{t^{\delta-\frac{1}{2}}} \right) - \chi_0 \left(\frac{\omega - \theta}{t^{\delta-\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right] d\rho d\theta \end{aligned}$$

is supported away from $\{\theta \pm \omega = 0\}$, which allows us to rewrite the integral above in local coordinate

$$\theta = h\omega + \sqrt{1-h^2}y, \quad h \in [-1, 1], y \in \omega^\perp \cap \mathbb{S}^{d-1},$$

where ω^\perp is defined as the hyperplane $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : y \cdot \omega = 0\}$. In this way, we may rewrite I_0 as

$$\begin{aligned} (5.12) \quad &\kappa \left(\frac{r}{t} \right) \int e^{ir\rho h} F_0(t, r, \rho, \omega, h\omega + \sqrt{1-h^2}y) (1-h^2)^{\frac{d}{2}-1} \\ &\quad \times \left[1 - \chi_0 \left(\frac{(h+1)\omega + \sqrt{1-h^2}y}{t^{\delta-\frac{1}{2}}} \right) - \chi_0 \left(\frac{(h-1)\omega + \sqrt{1-h^2}y}{t^{\delta-\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right] dh dy d\rho, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F_0(t, r, \rho, \omega, \theta) = e^{itP(\rho)} (1 - \chi) \left(\frac{r\omega + tP'(\rho)\theta}{t^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta}} \right) \mathbb{1}_{r > tP'(\rho)} \hat{v}_0(\rho\theta) \rho^{d-1}.$$

Remark that due to the cut-off away from $\pm\omega$, the integrand of (5.12) is supported for

$$|(h \pm 1)\omega + \sqrt{1-h^2}y|^2 \geq ct^{2\delta-1}.$$

By developing the inequality above we obtain

$$\sqrt{1-h^2} \geq c't^{\delta-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Thus, F_0 is supported for $\rho \sim 1$ and satisfies for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left| \partial_h^k \left(F_0(t, r, \rho, \omega, h\omega + \sqrt{1-h^2}y) \right) \right| \lesssim t^{(1-2\delta)k}.$$

The same estimates hold for $(1-h^2)^{\frac{d}{2}-1}$ and cut-off χ_0 's in dimension $d \geq 2$, while in trivial case $d = 1$, I_0 is identically zero.

Now, we may apply M times integration by parts in h for (5.12). As $r \sim t$, $\rho \sim 1$, each ∂_h in the amplitude gives $t^{1-2\delta}$, we have

$$|I_0(t, r, \omega)| \lesssim \mathbb{1}_{r \sim t} t^{-2M\delta},$$

and (5.11) follows from

$$\|I_0(t, r, \omega)\|_{L^2(r^{d-1}drd\omega)}^2 \lesssim t^{-4M\delta+d} \lesssim t^{-N},$$

by choosing $4M\delta - d \geq N$. □

APPENDIX A. TECHNICAL LEMMAS

This appendix is a collection of technical lemmas which are used in previous sections.

A.1. Some technical inequalities.

Lemma A.1. *For any real number $m > d - 1$, there exists constant $C = C(m, d) > 0$, such that*

$$\sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \langle R\omega - \xi \rangle^{-m} d\omega \leq CR^{-(d-1)}.$$

Proof. By change of variable, it is equivalent to study the boundedness of

$$\int_{R\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} K(\omega - \xi) d\omega,$$

where $K(x) = (1 + |x|^m)^{-1}$. This integral can be regarded as a convolution of K and the Borel measure μ_R , which is defined by

$$\forall \phi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \langle \mu_R, \phi \rangle := \int_{R\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \phi(\omega) d\omega.$$

We introduce the α -dimensional density of a Borel measure μ :

$$M_\mu^{(\alpha)}(x) := \sup_{r>0} \frac{\mu(B(x, r))}{r^\alpha}.$$

Remark that $M_{\mu_R}^{(d-1)}(\xi) = M_{\mu_1}^{(d-1)}(\xi/R)$ and that $M_{\mu_1}^{(d-1)}$ is a bounded function. Thus, $M_{\mu_R}^{(d-1)}(\xi)$ is bounded uniformly in $R > 0$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Now, it suffices to show that there exists some constant $c = c(m, d)$, such that for any Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d ,

$$K * \mu(\xi) \leq cM_\mu^{(d-1)}(\xi).$$

By applying a translation, the problem can be reduced to the case $\xi = 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} K * \mu(0) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(-y) d\mu(y) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(y) d\mu(y) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mu(B(0, r_j^{(n)})), \end{aligned}$$

where that last equality follows from dominated convergence theorem, with $r_j^{(n)}$ defined by $K^{-1}(1 - \frac{j}{n}) = r_j^{(n)} \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. We may calculate $r_j^{(n)}$ explicitly $r_j^{(n)} = \left(\frac{j/n}{1-j/n} \right)^{\frac{1}{m}}$. Therefore, by definition of $(d-1)$ -dimensional density, we have

$$\begin{aligned} K * \mu(0) &\leq M_{\mu}^{(d-1)}(0) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \left(r_j^{(n)} \right)^{d-1} \\ &= M_{\mu}^{(d-1)}(0) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{j/n}{1-j/n} \right)^{\frac{d-1}{m}} \\ &= M_{\mu}^{(d-1)}(0) \int_0^1 \left(\frac{x}{1-x} \right)^{\frac{d-1}{m}} dx. \end{aligned}$$

The last quantity is finite since $m > d-1$. \square

Lemma A.2. *Let $S_{-1} \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ with $|S_{-1}^{(\alpha)}(\xi)| \leq C_{\alpha} \langle \xi \rangle^{-1-\alpha}$, for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists some constant C , such that*

$$(A.1) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\lambda\xi} S_{-1}(\xi) d\xi \right| \leq C \langle \lambda \rangle^{-N} (1 + \log_{-}(|\lambda|)), \quad \forall \lambda \neq 0,$$

where the integral on the left hand side should be understood as oscillatory integral and the function \log_{-} is defined by:

$$\log_{-}(t) := \begin{cases} |\log(t)| & \text{if } t \in]0, 1[\\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Proof. For simplicity, we may assume $\lambda > 0$ and that S_{-1} is supported in $[c_0, \infty[$ for some $c_0 > 0$.

When $\lambda \geq c$ for some small constant $c > 0$, we may apply integration by part on ξ , then the left hand side of (A.1) can be controlled by

$$\frac{C}{\lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \langle \xi \rangle^{-2} d\xi \lesssim \langle \lambda \rangle^{-1}.$$

To obtain arbitrary polynomial decrease for large λ , we only need to apply integration by parts several times.

When $\lambda < c$, we introduce a cut-off $\chi \in C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$, such that $\chi = 1$ in a large neighbourhood of 0. For the part where $|\lambda\xi|$ is small:

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\lambda\xi} S_{-1}(\xi) \chi(\lambda\xi) d\xi \right| \leq C \int_{c_1}^{\frac{c_2}{\lambda}} \frac{d\xi}{\xi} \leq C' (1 + \log_{-}(\lambda)).$$

For the remaining part where $|\lambda\xi|$ is large, we need to estimate

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\lambda\xi} S_{-1}(\xi) (1 - \chi)(\lambda\xi) d\xi.$$

By applying integration by parts in ξ , we will obtain two integrals. The first one is of the form

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\lambda\xi} S_{-1}(\xi) \chi'(\lambda\xi) d\xi,$$

which can be treated as above. The second one take the form

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\lambda\xi} S_{-2}(\xi) (1 - \chi)(\lambda\xi) d\xi,$$

which is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} \int_{|\xi| > \frac{c'}{\lambda}} \langle \xi \rangle^{-2} d\xi \leq C.$$

□

Lemma A.3 (Cotlar-Stein Lemma). *Let H be a Hilbert space and $\{T_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a series of bounded operators on H . If*

$$(A.2) \quad A = \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|T_j T_k^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)}^{\frac{1}{2}} < +\infty,$$

$$(A.3) \quad B = \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|T_j^* T_k\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)}^{\frac{1}{2}} < +\infty,$$

the operator $T = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} T_j$ is well-defined via point-wise limit

$$\forall u \in H, \quad Tu := \lim_{J \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{j=0}^J T_j u \quad \text{in } H.$$

Moreover, T is bounded on H with estimate

$$(A.4) \quad \|T\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)} \leq \sqrt{AB}.$$

The inequality (A.4) was first given in [7] for finite sum with $\|T_j T_k^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)}$ and $\|T_j^* T_k\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)}$ decreasing exponentially in $|j - k|$. The generalized version stated above and its proof can be found, for example, in Theorem 1, Chapter VII of [19].

A.2. Criteria on L^2 -boundedness of pseudo-differential operators.

Lemma A.4. *Let a be a symbol on \mathbb{R}^d and $\lambda > 0$. The rescaled symbol*

$$a_\lambda(x, \xi) := a\left(\lambda x, \frac{\xi}{\lambda}\right)$$

satisfies

$$\|\text{Op}(a_\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} = \|\text{Op}(a)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)}.$$

Lemma A.5. *Let a be a symbol on \mathbb{R}^d and symbol \tilde{a} is defined as*

$$\tilde{a}(x, \xi) := a(\xi, x).$$

Then we have

$$\|\text{Op}(a)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} = \|\text{Op}(\tilde{a})\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)}.$$

Lemma A.6. *Let K be a kernel function of operator \mathcal{K} defined as*

$$\mathcal{K}u(x) := \int K(x, x-y)u(y)dy.$$

If there exists $K_0 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$|K(x, z)| \leq K_0(z), \quad \forall x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

we have

$$\|\mathcal{K}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq \|K_0\|_{L^1}.$$

Lemma A.7. *Let a and b be symbols satisfying*

$$|a(x, \xi)| \leq b(x, \xi),$$

and $B \in \mathcal{L}(L^2)$ be an operator defined by

$$Bu(x) = \int b(x, \xi)v(\xi)d\xi.$$

Then

$$\|\text{Op}(a)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq \|B\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)}.$$

Lemma A.8. *Let $m : \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \times]0, \infty[\rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a smooth function satisfying for all $\alpha, \alpha' \in \mathbb{N}^{d-1}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$|\partial_\omega^\alpha \partial_{\omega'}^{\alpha'} m(\omega, \omega', \mu)| \leq C_{\alpha, \alpha', N} A \mu^{-|\alpha| - |\alpha'|} \left\langle \frac{d(\omega, -\omega')}{\mu} \right\rangle^{-N},$$

where A is a quantity independent of ω and ω' , d is the distance on the sphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . For all $\lambda > 0$, the operator T_λ is defined by

$$T_\lambda u(\omega') = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} e^{i\lambda\omega\omega'} m(\omega, \omega', \mu) u(\omega) d\omega.$$

Then there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\|T_\lambda\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathbb{S}^{d-1}))} \leq C A \lambda^{-\frac{d-1}{2}}.$$

The case of $\mu \in [1, \infty[$ is classical, the proof of which can be found in, for example, [18], Theorem 2.1.1. As for the case $\mu \in]0, 1]$, one may refer to [9]. A direct consequence is stated as following:

Lemma A.9. *Let $a(x, \xi, \mu)$ be a smooth symbol on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ depending on a parameter $\mu \in]0, \infty[$. Let b be a function on \mathbb{R}_+^2 , such that the associated operator B defined below is bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$, namely*

$$(A.5) \quad \|B\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathbb{R}_+))} < \infty, \quad Bf(r) = \int_0^\infty b(r, \rho)f(\rho)d\rho.$$

If, in polar system $x = r\omega$, $\xi = \rho\theta$, $a(x, \xi, \mu)$ satisfies for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{d-1}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(A.6) \quad |\partial_\omega^\alpha \partial_\theta^\beta a(r\omega, \rho\theta, \mu)| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta, N} b(r, \rho) \mu^{-|\alpha| - |\beta|} \left\langle \frac{d(\omega, -\theta)}{\mu} \right\rangle^{-N},$$

then we have

$$(A.7) \quad \|\text{Op}(a)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C \|B\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathbb{R}_+))},$$

where $C > 0$ is a universal constant.

Proof. By definition of $\text{Op}(a)$, we have

$$\text{Op}(a)u(r\omega) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} e^{ir\rho\omega\theta} a(r\omega, \rho\theta) \hat{u}(\rho\theta) \rho^{d-1} d\theta d\rho.$$

It is easy to check that $\|f(\rho, \theta)\|_{L^2(d\rho d\theta)} = (2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}} \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}$, with $f(\rho, \theta) = \hat{u}(\rho\theta) \rho^{\frac{d-1}{2}}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{Op}(a)u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} &= \|\text{Op}(a)u(r\omega) r^{\frac{d-1}{2}}\|_{L^2(dr d\omega)} \\ &= \left\| \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} e^{ir\rho\omega\theta} a(r\omega, \rho\theta) f(\rho, \theta) (r\rho)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} d\theta d\rho \right\|_{L^2(dr d\omega)} \\ &\leq C_0 \left\| \int_0^\infty (r\rho)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \left\| \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} e^{ir\rho\omega\theta} a(r\omega, \rho\theta) f(\rho, \theta) d\theta \right\|_{L^2(d\omega)} d\rho \right\|_{L^2(dr)}. \end{aligned}$$

By applying previous lemma with $m(\omega, \theta, \mu) = a(r\omega, \rho\theta, \mu)$, where r, ρ should be regarded as parameters, $A = b(r, \rho)$, and $\lambda = r\rho$, we obtain

$$\left\| \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} e^{ir\rho\omega\theta} a(r\omega, \rho\theta) f(\rho, \theta) d\theta \right\|_{L^2(d\omega)} \leq C_1 (r\rho)^{-\frac{d-1}{2}} b(r, \rho) \|f(\theta, \rho)\|_{L^2(d\theta)}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{Op}(a)u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} &\leq C_0 C_1 \left\| \int_0^\infty b(r, \rho) \|f(\theta, \rho)\|_{L^2(d\theta)} d\rho \right\|_{L^2(dr)} \\ &\leq C_0 C_1 \|B\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathbb{R}_+))} \|f(\theta, \rho)\|_{L^2(d\theta d\rho)} = C \|B\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathbb{R}_+))} \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma A.10. *Let a be a symbol on \mathbb{R}^d , depending on some parameter $\lambda \in]0, \infty[$. If for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d$,*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\partial_\xi^\alpha a(x, \cdot)\|_{L_\xi^1} \leq C_\alpha \lambda^{d-|\alpha|},$$

the operator $\text{Op}(a)$ is bounded on L^2 , uniformly in λ .

Proof. Due to Lemma A.4, the problem can be reduced to the case $\lambda = 1$. The kernel of operator $\text{Op}(a)$ is $K(x, y) = J(x, x - y)$, where

$$J(x, z) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{iz \cdot \xi} a(x, \xi) d\xi.$$

We first observe that, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $|J(x, z)| \leq (2\pi)^{-d} \|a(x, \cdot)\|_{L_\xi^1}$, which is uniformly bounded. Then, by integration by part, we have, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} ||z|^{2N} J(x, z)| &\lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|=2N} \left| \int e^{iz \cdot \xi} \partial_\xi^\alpha a(x, \xi) d\xi \right| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|=2N} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\partial_\xi^\alpha a(x, \cdot)\|_{L_\xi^1} \leq C_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

That is to say, J is bounded and has any polynomial decay in z , uniformly in x . In particular,

$$|K(x, y)| = |J(x, x - y)| \lesssim \langle x - y \rangle^{-(d+1)}.$$

The conclusion follows from Schur's Lemma. □

Lemma A.11 (Calderon-Vaillancourt Theorem). *For smooth symbol $a \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, the following estimate holds :*

$$(A.8) \quad \|\text{Op}(a)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \lesssim \sup_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq N_d} \|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_x^d \times \mathbb{R}_\xi^d)},$$

where N_d is a universal constant depending only on dimension d .

The earliest version of (A.8) was given in [1] where α_j, β_j are required to be no more than 3 for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$. Then, in [2], the authors optimized it to $N_d = \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor + 1$, while some other assumptions in α, β are given in the same paper. The readers may also find an alternative proof via Gabor transform in [13].

APPENDIX B. STATIONARY PHASE LEMMAS

Lemma B.1. *Let*

$$F : (\mathbb{S}^{d-1})^4 \times]0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \\ (\theta, \theta', \omega, \omega', \mu) \mapsto F(\theta, \theta', \omega, \omega', \mu)$$

be a smooth function supported for $d(\theta', \theta) + d(\theta', \omega') < \delta'$, where d is the metric on sphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} and $\delta' > 0$ is a small constant. We assume that F satisfies for all $\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta' \in \mathbb{N}$, $j, N \in \mathbb{N}$

$$|\partial_\theta^\alpha \partial_{\theta'}^{\alpha'} \partial_\omega^\beta \partial_{\omega'}^{\beta'} \partial_\mu^j F| \leq C \mu^{-|\alpha| - |\alpha'| - |\beta| - j} \langle \frac{d(\theta', \omega)}{\mu} \rangle^{-N}.$$

For any parameter $\lambda > 0$, we define the integral

$$I_\pm(\theta, \omega, \omega'; \lambda, \mu) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} e^{\pm i \lambda \theta \theta'} F(\theta, \theta', \omega, \omega', \mu) d\theta'.$$

If δ' is small enough (depending on the sphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1}), and $\lambda \mu^2 \geq c > 0$, then we can write

$$I_\pm(\theta, \omega, \omega'; \lambda, \mu) = e^{\pm i \lambda} \mu^{d-1} S_{-\frac{d-1}{2}}^\pm(\theta, \omega, \omega', \mu; \lambda \mu^2),$$

where $S_{-\frac{d-1}{2}}^\pm(\theta, \omega, \omega', \mu; \zeta)$ is a smooth function supported for $d(\theta, \omega') \leq 2\delta'$, satisfying for all $\alpha, \beta, \beta' \in \mathbb{N}$, $j, \gamma, N \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(B.1) \quad |\partial_\theta^\alpha \partial_\omega^\beta \partial_{\omega'}^{\beta'} \partial_\mu^j \partial_\zeta^\gamma S_{-\frac{d-1}{2}}^\pm| \leq C \mu^{-|\alpha| - |\beta| - j} \langle \zeta \rangle^{-\frac{d-1}{2} - \gamma} \langle \frac{d(\theta, \omega)}{\mu} \rangle^{-N}.$$

Moreover, for $|\zeta| \geq c > 0$, $S_{-\frac{d-1}{2}}^\pm(\theta, \omega, \omega', \mu; \zeta)$ can be decomposed as

$$(B.2) \quad (2\pi)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} e^{\mp i \frac{\pi}{4}(d-1)} F(\theta, \theta, \omega, \omega', \mu) \zeta^{-\frac{d-1}{2}} + S_{-\frac{d+1}{2}}^\pm(\theta, \omega, \omega', \mu; \zeta),$$

where $S_{-\frac{d+1}{2}}^\pm(\theta, \omega, \omega', \mu; \zeta)$ is smooth and supported for $d(\theta, \omega') \leq 2\delta'$, satisfying the estimate (B.1) with $d-1$ replaced by $d+1$.

Lemma B.2. *Let*

$$F_0 : (\mathbb{S}^{d-1})^4 \times]0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \\ (\theta, \theta', \omega, \omega', \mu) \mapsto F(\theta, \theta', \omega, \omega', \mu)$$

be a smooth function supported for $\min(d(\theta', \theta), d(\theta', -\theta)) > \delta' > 0$, where d is the metric on sphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} and δ' is constant. We assume that F satisfies for all $\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta' \in \mathbb{N}$, $j, N \in \mathbb{N}$

$$|\partial_\theta^\alpha \partial_{\theta'}^{\alpha'} \partial_\omega^\beta \partial_{\omega'}^{\beta'} \partial_\mu^j F_0| \leq C \mu^{-|\alpha| - |\alpha'| - |\beta| - j} \langle \frac{d(\theta', \omega)}{\mu} \rangle^{-N}.$$

For any parameter $\lambda > 0$, the integral

$$I_{\pm}(\theta, \omega, \omega'; \lambda, \mu) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} e^{\pm i\lambda\theta\theta'} F_0(\theta, \theta', \omega, \omega', \mu) d\theta'$$

can be written as

$$I_{\pm}(\theta, \omega, \omega'; \lambda, \mu) = e^{\pm i\lambda\theta\omega} \mu^{d-1} R^{\pm}(\theta, \omega, \omega', \mu; \lambda\mu),$$

where $R^{\pm}(\theta, \omega, \omega', \mu; \zeta)$ is a smooth function satisfying for all $\alpha, \beta, \beta' \in \mathbb{N}$, $j, \gamma, N \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(B.3) \quad |\partial_{\theta}^{\alpha} \partial_{\omega}^{\beta} \partial_{\omega'}^{\beta'} \partial_{\mu}^j \partial_{\zeta}^{\gamma} R^{\pm}| \leq C \mu^{-|\alpha|-|\beta|-j} \langle \zeta \rangle^{-N}.$$

For the proof of Lemma B.1 and B.2, one may find a general result in [9], Proposition A.1.1.

Remark B.3. In Lemma B.1 and Lemma B.2, the dependence on ω' is not crucial in the proof, we may eliminate the conditions and results involving ω' . Meanwhile, if F (resp. F_0) depends on some other parameters, the same condition can be inherited by $S_{-\frac{d-1}{2}}$ (resp. R) from F (resp. F_0).

Lemma B.1 and B.2, together with Remark B.3, result in the following lemmas, which are important techniques used in the main text.

Lemma B.4. Let

$$\begin{aligned} G : (\mathbb{S}^{d-1})^2 \times]0, 1] &\rightarrow \mathbb{C} \\ (\theta', \omega, \mu) &\mapsto G(\theta', \omega, \mu) \end{aligned}$$

be a smooth function supported for $d(\theta', \omega) < \delta'$, where d is the metric on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} and $\delta' > 0$ is a small constant. We further assume that, for all $\alpha', \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{d-1}$, $j, N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\partial_{\theta'}^{\alpha'} \partial_{\omega}^{\beta} \partial_{\mu}^j G| \lesssim \mu^{-|\alpha'|-|\beta|-j} \left\langle \frac{d(\theta', \omega)}{\mu} \right\rangle^{-N}.$$

For $\lambda > 0$, $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$, we define

$$I(\theta, \omega, \mu; \lambda) := \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} e^{\epsilon i\lambda\theta \cdot \theta'} G(\theta', \omega, \mu) d\theta'.$$

Then, under the conditions that δ' is small enough and that $\lambda\mu^2 > c > 0$ for some constant c , the integral I may be written as the sum of principal terms

$$e^{\pm \epsilon i\lambda} \mu^{d-1} S_{-\frac{d-1}{2}}^{\pm}(\theta, \omega, \mu; \lambda\mu^2),$$

and a reminder

$$e^{\epsilon i\lambda\theta \cdot \omega} \mu^{d-1} R(\theta, \omega, \mu; \lambda\mu),$$

where $S_m^{\pm}(\theta, \omega, \mu; \zeta)$ is a smooth function supported on $d(\theta, \pm\omega) < 2\delta'$, $\zeta > c > 0$, satisfying for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{d-1}$, $j, n, N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\partial_{\theta}^{\alpha} \partial_{\omega}^{\beta} \partial_{\mu}^j \partial_{\zeta}^n S_m^{\pm}| \lesssim \mu^{-|\alpha|-|\beta|-j} \langle \zeta \rangle^{m-n} \left\langle \frac{d(\theta, \pm\omega)}{\mu} \right\rangle^{-N};$$

and $R(\theta, \omega, \mu; \zeta)$ is a smooth function satisfying for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|R| \lesssim \langle \zeta \rangle^{-N}.$$

Moreover, if G depends on some extra parameters, the same bound for G (and its derivatives in parameters) can be inherited by $S_{-\frac{d-1}{2}}^{\pm}$ and R .

Proof. We only give the proof for $\epsilon = +$, while the other one can be treated in the same way. To begin with, we introduce the functions

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\pm}(\theta, \theta', \omega, \mu) &:= G(\pm\theta', \pm\omega, \mu)\chi(\theta - \theta'), \\ F_0(\theta, \theta', \omega, \mu) &:= G(\theta', \omega, \mu)(1 - \chi(\theta - \theta') - \chi(\theta + \theta')), \end{aligned}$$

where $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is radial and supported in a small neighbor of zero, with value 1 near zero. By using these functions, we may rewrite the integral I into $I_+ + I_- + I_0$ with

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\pm} &= \int e^{\pm i\lambda\theta \cdot \theta'} F_{\pm}(\theta, \theta', \pm\omega, \mu) d\theta', \\ I_0 &= \int e^{i\lambda\theta \cdot \theta'} F_0(\theta, \theta', \omega, \mu) d\theta'. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that F_{\pm}, F_0 verify the conditions in Lemma B.1 and B.2, respectively. Then, by applying these lemmas, we can obtain the desired expressions and corresponding estimates. There remain two points to check: the support of $S_{-\frac{d-1}{2}}^{\pm}$ and the dependence on extra parameters. The latter is merely an application of Remark B.3, while the former can be shown by observing that, when $\text{Supp } \chi$ is taken to be small enough, the integrand of integrals I_{\pm} is supported on $d(\pm\theta', \omega) < \delta'$ and $d(\theta, \theta') < \delta'$. \square

Lemma B.5. *Let $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\})$. Assume that P is smooth on $]0, \infty[$, and Λ is a positive function, such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(\rho) &\sim \rho^\sigma, \quad \text{as } \rho \rightarrow +\infty, \\ |\Lambda^{(j)}(\rho)| &\lesssim \rho^{\sigma-j}, \quad \forall \rho > \rho_0 > 0, j \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \frac{\Lambda(\rho)}{\rho^\sigma} &\rightarrow \lambda_0, \quad \text{as } \rho \rightarrow +\infty, \end{aligned}$$

hold for some $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda_0 > 0$.

Then there exists $t_0 \gg 1$ depending on f, P' , and Λ , such that for $\epsilon, \epsilon' \in \{+1, -1\}$, $\delta + \frac{\sigma}{2} \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, $r > c > 0$, and $t > t_0$, the integral

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} e^{i\epsilon' r \rho \omega \theta} \chi \left(\frac{r\omega + \epsilon t P'(\rho)\theta}{t^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho)} \right) f(\rho\theta) d\theta$$

can be decomposed as a principal term

$$(2\pi)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} e^{i\epsilon\epsilon' \frac{\pi}{4}(d-1)} e^{-i\epsilon\epsilon' r \rho} (r\rho)^{-\frac{d-1}{2}} \chi \left(\frac{r - t P'(\rho)}{t^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho)} \right) f(-\epsilon\rho\omega)$$

and a remainder

$$e^{-i\epsilon\epsilon' r \rho} \mu^{d-1} S_{-\frac{d+1}{2}}(\omega, \mu, \rho, \frac{r}{t} - P'(\rho), t; r\rho\mu^2),$$

where $\mu = t^{\delta+\frac{\sigma}{2}-\frac{1}{2}}$, $S_m(\omega, \mu, \rho, r', t; \zeta)$ is supported for $\zeta > c > 0$, $\rho \sim 1$ and $|r'| \lesssim \mu$ and satisfies for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{d-1}$, $j, k, l, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\partial_\omega^\alpha \partial_\mu^j \partial_\rho^k \partial_{r'}^l \partial_\zeta^\gamma S_{-\frac{d+1}{2}}| \leq C \mu^{-(|\alpha|+j+l)} \langle \zeta \rangle^{m-\gamma}.$$

Proof. Using the notation $r = t(r' + P'(\rho))$, where $|r'| \lesssim \mu = t^{\delta+\frac{\sigma}{2}-\frac{1}{2}}$, we can rewrite the integral as

$$(B.4) \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} e^{i\epsilon' t(r'+P'(\rho))\rho\omega\theta} \chi \left(\frac{r'\omega + P'(\rho)(\omega + \epsilon\theta)}{t^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho)} \right) f(\rho\theta) d\theta.$$

Consider the function

$$F(x, y, z, \mu; \rho, r', t) = \chi \left(\frac{r'x + P'(\rho)(x - y)}{\mu t^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \Lambda(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho)} \right) \tilde{\chi} \left(\frac{x - y}{\mu} \right) \tilde{\chi} \left(\frac{y - z}{\mu} \right) f(\rho y),$$

with $\tilde{\chi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ taking value 1 in a large ball centered at the origin. By setting $\lambda = t(r' + P'(\rho))\rho > c > 0$, we may rewrite the integral (B.4) as

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} e^{-i\epsilon\epsilon'\lambda(-\epsilon\omega)\theta} F(-\epsilon\omega, \theta, -\epsilon\omega, \mu; \rho, r', t) d\theta.$$

Remark that the integrand in (B.4) ensures that $|\omega + \epsilon\theta| \lesssim \mu \ll 1$, which allows us to add $\tilde{\chi}$ factors in the definition of F .

By using the fact that $\rho \sim 1$, it is easy to verify that when $x, y, z \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, for all $\alpha, \alpha', \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{d-1}$, $j, k, l, N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^{\alpha'} \partial_z^\beta \partial_\mu^j \partial_\rho^k \partial_{r'}^l F(x, y, z, \mu; \rho, r')| \leq C \mu^{-|\alpha| - |\alpha'| - |\beta| - j - l} \left\langle \frac{d(y, z)}{\mu} \right\rangle^{-N},$$

and that F is supported for $\rho \sim 1$, $|r'| \lesssim \mu$, $d(x, y) \leq C_0 \mu \ll 1$, which ensures that $\lambda \mu^2 = t^{2(\delta + \frac{\sigma}{2})} (r' + P'(\rho)) \rho > c > 0$. Therefore, the conclusion follows from Lemma B.1 with extra parameters ρ, r', t but without ω' variable. \square

APPENDIX C. A REFINED RESULT FOR SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION

In the case of Schrödinger equation $P(\xi) = \frac{|\xi|^2}{2}$, the structure of $P'(\xi) = \xi$ allows us to prove the parts (i) and (ii) of Theorem 1.1 for non-smooth χ , namely

Theorem C.1. *Let $a_{\chi, \delta}$ and $E_{\chi, \delta}$ be as defined in (1.10) and (1.11), respectively. We assume, as in Theorem 1.1, that Λ is identically equal to 1. Then, for any $u_0 \in L^2$, we have :*

(i) if $\chi \in L^1$ and $\delta < 0$,

$$(C.1) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} E_{\chi, \delta}(u_0, t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} E_{\chi, \delta}(u_0, -t) = 0;$$

(ii) if $\chi \in L^1$ and $\delta = 0$,

$$(C.2) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} E_{\chi, \delta}(u_0, t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} E_{\chi, \delta}(u_0, -t) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int G_\chi(\omega) |\hat{u}_0(\rho\omega)|^2 \rho^{d-1} d\rho d\omega,$$

where (ρ, ω) is polar coordinate, and function $G_\chi(\omega)$ is defined as

$$(C.3) \quad G_\chi(\omega) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \left| \int_{x \cdot \omega > 0} e^{i \frac{|x|^2}{2}} \chi(x) dx \right|^2;$$

In order to prove the limit (C.1) and (C.2), we indicate that, compared with Theorem 1.1, the only difficulty is the loss of regularity in χ , which can be overcome by finding a bound of operator $\text{Op}(a(t))$ depending merely on $\|\chi\|_{L^1}$.

C.1. An alternative bound of truncated operator. The goal of this subsection is to find a uniform bound of $\text{Op}(a(t))$, which involves less regularity of χ than Proposition 2.1. Via Lemma A.4, it suffices to study the symbol

$$b(x, \xi) = \chi \left(\frac{x + \xi}{\lambda} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |\xi|},$$

where $\lambda = |t|^\delta \in]0, \infty[$. To be precise, we shall prove the following proposition

Proposition C.2. *There exists constant $C > 0$ independent of λ , such that, for all $\lambda > 0$,*

$$\|\text{Op}(b)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq C \lambda^d \|\chi\|_{L^1}.$$

Proof of Proposition C.2. It is easy to calculate that

$$\begin{aligned}\int |b(x, \xi)| dx &\leq \int \left| \chi \left(\frac{x + \xi}{\lambda} \right) \right| dx = \lambda^d \|\chi\|_{L^1}, \\ \int |b(x, \xi)| d\xi &\leq \int \left| \chi \left(\frac{x + \xi}{\lambda} \right) \right| d\xi = \lambda^d \|\chi\|_{L^1}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the desired estimate follows from Schur's Lemma and Lemma A.7. \square

C.2. Calculation of limit. By Proposition C.2, when $\delta < 0$, we have

$$\|\text{Op}(a)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq Ct^{\delta d} \|\chi\|_{L^1} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

which implies (C.1).

In the critical case $\delta = 0$, when χ is smooth, compactly supported, and constant near zero, limit (C.2) follows from the limit (1.14). If χ is no more than an L^1 function, we may approximate χ by some regular function in L^1 . To be precise, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $\chi_n \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ which are constant near zero, such that

$$\|\chi - \chi_n\|_{L^1} < \frac{1}{n}.$$

To highlight the dependence in χ , in the rest of this section, we will add subscript χ for concerning terms, for example,

$$a_\chi(t, x, \xi) = \chi \left(\frac{x + t\xi}{|t|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > |t||\xi|}.$$

Proposition C.2 implies that, for all $u_0 \in L^2$ and $t \neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\text{Op}(a_\chi) e^{itP(D_x)} u_0 - \text{Op}(a_{\chi_n}) e^{itP(D_x)} u_0\|_{L^2} &= \|\text{Op}(a_{\chi - \chi_n}) e^{itP(D_x)} u_0\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \|\chi - \chi_n\|_{L^1} \|e^{itP(D_x)} u_0\|_{L^2} \\ &< C \frac{1}{n} \|u_0\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for fixed $u_0 \in L^2$, the limit

$$\text{Op}(a_\chi) e^{itP(D_x)} u_0 \rightarrow \text{Op}(a_{\chi_n}) e^{itP(D_x)} u_0 \text{ in } L^2, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

is uniform in t . We may conclude (C.2) by passing to the limit $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$:

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} E_{\chi, \delta}(u_0, t) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|\text{Op}(a_\chi) e^{itP(D_x)} u_0\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\text{Op}(a_{\chi_n}) e^{itP(D_x)} u_0\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|\text{Op}(a_{\chi_n}) e^{itP(D_x)} u_0\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int G_{\chi_n}(\omega) |\hat{u}_0(\rho\omega)|^2 \rho^{d-1} d\rho d\omega \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int G_\chi(\omega) |\hat{u}_0(\rho\omega)|^2 \rho^{d-1} d\rho d\omega\end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from Dominated Convergence Theorem and the continuity of G on $\chi \in L^1$, which is obvious due to the definition (C.3) of G_χ .

APPENDIX D. PARTITION OF ENERGY FOR KLEIN-GORDON EQUATION : A
 CLASSICAL SETTING

In this part, we shall give a proof of (1.32) via an alternative study of asymptotic behavior of solution to half-Klein-Gordon equation (HKG), namely

$$\begin{cases} \left(\frac{\partial_t}{i} - P(D_x) \right) u = 0, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0, \end{cases}$$

where $P(\xi) = \langle \xi \rangle$ is a smooth symbol. As in Section 5, instead of studying the solution w to Klein-Gordon equation (KG), we turn to

$$u = \left(\frac{\partial_t}{i} + P(D_x) \right) w,$$

which is a solution to half-Klein-Gordon equation with initial data

$$u_0 = u|_{t=0} = \frac{w_1}{i} + P(D_x)w_0 \in L^2.$$

Using this notation, we may rewrite the integral on the left hand side of (1.32) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{r_0 < |\frac{x}{t}| < r_1} (|\partial_t w|^2 + |\nabla w|^2 + |w|^2) dx \\ &= \int \left(\left| \mathbb{1}_{r_0 < |\frac{x}{t}| < r_1} \partial_t w \right|^2 + \left| \mathbb{1}_{r_0 < |\frac{x}{t}| < r_1} \nabla w \right|^2 + \left| \mathbb{1}_{r_0 < |\frac{x}{t}| < r_1} w \right|^2 \right) dx \\ &= \int \left(\left| \mathbb{1}_{r_0 < |\frac{x}{t}| < r_1} \operatorname{Im} u \right|^2 + \left| \mathbb{1}_{r_0 < |\frac{x}{t}| < r_1} i \frac{D_x}{\langle D_x \rangle} \operatorname{Re} u \right|^2 + \left| \mathbb{1}_{r_0 < |\frac{x}{t}| < r_1} \langle D_x \rangle^{-1} \operatorname{Re} u \right|^2 \right) dx \\ &= \int \left(\left| \operatorname{Im} \mathbb{1}_{r_0 < |\frac{x}{t}| < r_1} u \right|^2 + \left| \operatorname{Im} \mathbb{1}_{r_0 < |\frac{x}{t}| < r_1} \frac{D_x}{\langle D_x \rangle} u \right|^2 + \left| \operatorname{Re} \mathbb{1}_{r_0 < |\frac{x}{t}| < r_1} \langle D_x \rangle^{-1} u \right|^2 \right) dx \\ &= \int \left(\left| \operatorname{Im} \mathbb{1}_{r_0 < |\frac{x}{t}| < r_1} e^{itP(D_x)} u_0 \right|^2 + \left| \operatorname{Im} \mathbb{1}_{r_0 < |\frac{x}{t}| < r_1} e^{itP(D_x)} \frac{D_x}{\langle D_x \rangle} u_0 \right|^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left| \operatorname{Re} \mathbb{1}_{r_0 < |\frac{x}{t}| < r_1} e^{itP(D_x)} \langle D_x \rangle^{-1} u_0 \right|^2 \right) dx \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the term on the right hand takes the form of

$$(D.1) \quad \int \left| \mathcal{A}g \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) v(t, x) \right|^2 dx,$$

where $\mathcal{A} \in \{\operatorname{Re}, \operatorname{Im}\}$, $g(y) = \mathbb{1}_{r_0 < |y| < r_1}$, and v is a solution to half-Klein-Gordon equation, which can be written as $v(t) = e^{itP(D_x)} v_0$, with

$$v_0 = u_0, \frac{D_x}{\langle D_x \rangle} u_0, \langle D_x \rangle^{-1} u_0,$$

which all belong to L^2 , since $u_0 \in L^2$. In order to calculate the limit of such quantity, we need to study the asymptotic behavior of v , which will be given in the next part.

D.1. Asymptotic behavior. In this part, we shall state our problem in a general setting. Let u be the unique solution to (E) with initial data $u_0 \in L^2$. We assume the symbol P is smooth except at zero, which covers all the fractional-type equations. Since P' is well-defined except at zero, we may introduce ν the push forward of Lebesgue measure under P' , i.e.

$$(D.2) \quad \nu(E) := \text{Leb}(P'^{-1}(E)), \quad \forall E \subset \mathbb{R}^d \text{ measurable.}$$

For all function $g \in L^\infty$, we are interested in the following asymptotic formula :

$$(D.3) \quad g\left(\frac{x}{t}\right)u(t) = g(-P'(D_x))u(t) + o_{L^2}(1), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \pm\infty.$$

We denote by \mathcal{G} the collection of those function g satisfying this formula for all $u_0 \in L^2$, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G} &:= \{g \in L^\infty : (D.3) \text{ holds for all } u_0 \in L^2\} \\ &:= \{g \in L^\infty : (D.3) \text{ holds for all } u_0 \text{ with } \hat{u}_0 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The two definitions given above are equivalent since the multiplication with $g(x/t)$ and Fourier multiplier $g(-P'(D_x))$ are both bounded on L^2 uniformly in time. The equivalence then follows from the fact that the subspace $\mathcal{F}^{-1}C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\})$ is dense in L^2 , where \mathcal{F} is the Fourier transform.

In order to prove (1.32), we may use the following lemma

Lemma D.1. *Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be any measurable set whose boundary has null Lebesgue measure, namely*

$$\text{Leb}(\partial E) = 0.$$

If the measure ν defined in (D.2) is absolutely continuous w.r.t. Lebesgue measure, we have

$$\mathbb{1}_E \in \mathcal{G}.$$

We assume this lemma is true and prove it later. It is easy to check that the assumptions in Lemma D.1 hold true for $P(\xi) = \langle \xi \rangle$ and $E = \{r_0 < |y| < r_1\}$. As a result, (D.1) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \int \left| \mathcal{A} \mathbb{1}_E \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) v(t, x) \right|^2 dx &= \int \left| \mathcal{A} \mathbb{1}_E (-P'(D_x)) v(t, x) \right|^2 dx + o(1) \\ &= \int \left| \mathcal{A} \mathbb{1}_{] \rho_0, \rho_1[} (|D_x|) v(t, x) \right|^2 dx + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

when $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$. Recall that $] \rho_0, \rho_1[= P'^{-1}(]r_0, r_1[)$. Actually, this formula implies (1.32), since as $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{r_0 < |\frac{x}{t}| < r_1} (|\partial_t w|^2 + |\nabla w|^2 + |w|^2) dx \\ &= \int \left(\left| \text{Im} \mathbb{1}_{r_0 < |\frac{x}{t}| < r_1} u(t, x) \right|^2 + \left| \text{Im} \mathbb{1}_{r_0 < |\frac{x}{t}| < r_1} \frac{D_x}{\langle D_x \rangle} u(t, x) \right|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left| \text{Re} \mathbb{1}_{r_0 < |\frac{x}{t}| < r_1} \langle D_x \rangle^{-1} u(t, x) \right|^2 \right) dx \\ &= \int \left(\left| \text{Im} \mathbb{1}_{] \rho_0, \rho_1[} (|D_x|) u(t, x) \right|^2 + \left| \text{Im} \mathbb{1}_{] \rho_0, \rho_1[} (|D_x|) \frac{D_x}{\langle D_x \rangle} u(t, x) \right|^2 \right) dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & + \left| \operatorname{Re} \mathbb{1}_{]_{\rho_0, \rho_1}[}(|D_x|) \langle D_x \rangle^{-1} u(t, x) \right|^2 dx + o(1) \\
 & = \left\| \mathbb{1}_{]_{\rho_0, \rho_1}[}(|D_x|) \partial_t w \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{]_{\rho_0, \rho_1}[}(|D_x|) \nabla w \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{]_{\rho_0, \rho_1}[}(|D_x|) w \right\|_{L^2}^2 + o(1) \\
 & = \left\| \mathbb{1}_{]_{\rho_0, \rho_1}[}(|D_x|) \partial_t w \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{]_{\rho_0, \rho_1}[}(|D_x|) w \right\|_{H^1}^2 + o(1) \\
 & = \left\| \mathbb{1}_{]_{\rho_0, \rho_1}[}(|D_x|) w_1 \right\|_{H^1}^2 + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{]_{\rho_0, \rho_1}[}(|D_x|) w_0 \right\|_{L^2}^2 + o(1).
 \end{aligned}$$

In order to complete the proof of (1.32), we give now the proof of Lemma D.1.

Proof of Lemma D.1. Without loss of generality, we may assume in what follows that $\hat{u}_0 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Now, we fix $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ which equals to 1 in a ball centered at zero and consider the symbol

$$(D.4) \quad a_0(t, x, \xi) = \chi \left(\frac{x + tP'(\xi)}{|t|^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta}} \right),$$

where $\delta \in]0, \frac{1}{2}[$. We have seen that Lemma A.5 and A.10 imply the uniform-in- t boundedness of $\operatorname{Op}(a_0(t))$. Moreover, by integration by parts, we can prove that for all $u_0 \in L^2$

$$\|u(t) - \operatorname{Op}(a_0(t)) u(t)\|_{L^2} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \pm\infty.$$

By writing

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_t & := E + B(0, ct^{-\frac{1}{2} + \delta}), \\
 \tilde{E}_t & := E^c + B(0, ct^{-\frac{1}{2} + \delta}),
 \end{aligned}$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant determined by $\operatorname{Supp} \chi$, we may apply the uniform-in-time L^2 -boundedness of multiplication with $\mathbb{1}_E(x/t)$ and Fourier multiplier $\mathbb{1}_E(-P'(D_x))$ to obtain that, as $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{1}_E \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) u(t, x) - \mathbb{1}_E(-P'(D_x)) u(t, x) \\
 & = \mathbb{1}_E \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) \operatorname{Op}(a_0(t)) u(t, x) - \operatorname{Op}(a_0(t)) \mathbb{1}_E(-P'(D_x)) u(t, x) + o_{L^2}(1) \\
 & = \mathbb{1}_E \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) \operatorname{Op}(a_0(t)) \mathbb{1}_{E_t}(-P'(D_x)) u(t, x) - \operatorname{Op}(a_0(t)) \mathbb{1}_E(-P'(D_x)) u(t, x) + o_{L^2}(1) \\
 & = \mathbb{1}_E \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) \operatorname{Op}(a_0(t)) \mathbb{1}_{E_t \setminus E}(-P'(D_x)) u(t, x) \\
 & \quad - \mathbb{1}_{E^c} \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) \operatorname{Op}(a_0(t)) \mathbb{1}_E(-P'(D_x)) u(t, x) + o_{L^2}(1) \\
 & = \mathbb{1}_E \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) \operatorname{Op}(a_0(t)) \mathbb{1}_{E_t \setminus E}(-P'(D_x)) u(t, x) \\
 & \quad - \mathbb{1}_{E^c} \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) \operatorname{Op}(a_0(t)) \mathbb{1}_{E \cap \tilde{E}_t}(-P'(D_x)) u(t, x) + o_{L^2}(1)
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that in the calculation above, it is possible to add extra cut-off in $-P'(D_x)$ since the symbol $a_0(t)$ is supported for

$$\left| \frac{x}{t} - (-P'(\xi)) \right| \leq ct^{-\frac{1}{2} + \delta}.$$

As a consequence, the uniform boundedness of multiplication with $\mathbb{1}_E(x/t)$, $\mathbb{1}_{E^c}$ and $\operatorname{Op}(a_0(t))$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \left\| \mathbb{1}_E \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) u(t) - \mathbb{1}_E(-P'(D_x)) u(t) \right\|_{L^2} \\
 & \lesssim \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\left\| \mathbb{1}_{E_t \setminus E}(-P'(D_x)) u(t) \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{E \cap \tilde{E}_t}(-P'(D_x)) u(t) \right\|_{L^2} \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$=(2\pi)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\|\mathbb{1}_{E_t \setminus E}(-P')\hat{u}_0\|_{L^2} + \|\mathbb{1}_{E \cap \tilde{E}_t}(-P')\hat{u}_0\|_{L^2} \right) \quad (\text{Plancherel Theorem})$$

$$=(2\pi)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \left(\|\mathbb{1}_{\cap_{t>0} E_t \setminus E}(-P')\hat{u}_0\|_{L^2} + \|\mathbb{1}_{\cap_{t>0} E \cap \tilde{E}_t}(-P')\hat{u}_0\|_{L^2} \right) \quad (\text{DCT})$$

$$\lesssim \|\mathbb{1}_{\partial E}(-P')\hat{u}_0\|_{L^2}$$

The last quantity is actually zero since ∂E has zero Lebesgue measure and ν is absolutely continuous w.r.t. Lebesgue measure, which ensures that $\mathbb{1}_{\partial E}(-P'(\xi))$ vanishes almost everywhere. \square

D.2. Further remarks on \mathcal{G} . In the proof of (1.32), we only study the function

$$g(y) = \mathbb{1}_{r_0 < |y| < r_1}.$$

A natural question is whether (1.32) holds true for other function g , or equivalently, which type of function is contained in class \mathcal{G} . In this part, we shall indicate an error in a classical result and prove that \mathcal{G} contains at least the continuous functions.

The asymptotic formula (D.3) is, to our knowledge, firstly studied in [20], where the author claimed in Corollary 2.2 of [20] that, when ν is absolutely continuous w.r.t Lebesgue measure,

$$(D.5) \quad L^\infty = \mathcal{G}.$$

However, the original proof given in [20] is false. Actually, the author managed to prove in Theorem 2.1 that for general ν ,

$$\{\text{Fourier transform of finite measure}\} \subset \mathcal{G},$$

and reduce the conjecture to

$$(D.6) \quad \mathbb{1}_E \in \mathcal{G}, \quad \text{for bounded and measurable } E \subset \mathbb{R}^d.$$

The method used in [20] is that, by regularity of Lebesgue measure, we may choose a series of compact sets $\{K_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and bounded open sets $\{U_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$K_n \subset K_{n+1}, \quad U_{n+1} \subset U_n, \quad K_n \subset E \subset U_n;$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \text{Leb}(U_n \setminus K_n) = 0.$$

Then it is easy to find smooth functions $g_n \in C_c^\infty(U_n)$ which are non-negative, range in $[0, 1]$, and equal to 1 on K_n . Clearly, $\mathbb{1}_E - g_n$ is supported in $U_n \setminus K_n$, whose measure tends to zero. By Dominated Convergence Theorem and the fact that $0 \leq \mathbb{1}_E - g_n \leq 1$, we have

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|(\mathbb{1}_E - g_n)(-P'(D_x))u\|_{L^2}^2 = (2\pi)^{-d} \|(\mathbb{1}_E - g_n)(-P'(\xi))\hat{u}_0(\xi)\|_{L_\xi^2}^2 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

Remark that, to apply Dominated Convergence Theorem, we need $(\mathbb{1}_E - g_n)(-P'(\xi))$ converges to zero almost everywhere, which is a consequence of absolute continuity of ν w.r.t Lebesgue measure. Therefore, in order to prove (D.6), it suffices to check that

$$(D.7) \quad \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|(\mathbb{1}_E - g_n)(x/t)u\|_{L_x^2}^2 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

Once it holds true, one has, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|\mathbb{1}_E(x/t)u - \mathbb{1}_E(-P'(D_x))u\|_{L_x^2} \\ & \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|g_n(x/t)u - g_n(-P'(D_x))u\|_{L_x^2} + \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|(\mathbb{1}_E - g_n)(x/t)u\|_{L_x^2} \\ & \quad + \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|(\mathbb{1}_E - g_n)(-P'(D_x))u\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|(\mathbb{1}_E - g_n)(x/t)u\|_{L_x^2} + \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|(\mathbb{1}_E - g_n)(-P'(D_x))u\|_{L^2},$$

since g_n is obviously the Fourier transform of some finite measure. The two quantities on the right hand side vanish as n tends to infinity, and the desired conclusion $\mathbb{1}_E \in \mathcal{G}$ follows.

The proof of (D.7) given in [20] is to find $h_n \in \mathcal{G}$ such that

$$C \geq h_n \geq \mathbb{1}_{O_n} \quad \text{and} \quad h_n \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{a.e.},$$

where $O_n = U_n \setminus K_n$ is an open set. If such h_n exists, one obtains immediately that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|(\mathbb{1}_E - g_n)(x/t)u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|h_n(x/t)u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|h_n(-P'(D_x))u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} (2\pi)^{-d} \int h_n^2(-\nabla P(\xi)) |\hat{u}_0(\xi)|^2 d\xi = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the second inequality is a consequence of $h_n \in \mathcal{G}$ and the last equality follows from Dominated Convergence Theorem.

Since we only know that \mathcal{G} contains a subset of continuous function (Fourier transform of finite measures), it is essential to assume h_n 's to be continuous. However, for general decreasing bounded open sets O_n , even if their measures decrease to zero, such continuous h_n 's do NOT exist. Otherwise, it is harmless to assume h_n 's are supported in the same large ball. Then, for one thing by Dominated Convergence Theorem,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int h_n(y) dy = 0;$$

and for another thing, we have

$$\int h_n(y) dy \geq \int_{\overline{O_n}} h_n(y) dy = \text{Leb}(\overline{O_n}) \geq 0,$$

where $\overline{O_n}$ is the closure of open set O_n . Here the first inequality is due to the continuity of h_n 's. As a result,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \text{Leb}(\overline{O_n}) = 0.$$

The contradiction arises from the fact that $\text{Leb}(O_n)$ tends to zero does not imply that $\text{Leb}(\overline{O_n})$ tends to zero. For example, Let $\{r_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a numeration of rational numbers in the unit ball $B = B(0, 1)$ of \mathbb{R}^d centered at zero. Consider the series of open sets

$$O_n := \cup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} B(r_j, 2^{-j-n}).$$

Clearly O_n 's are open as the union of open sets and

$$\text{Leb}(O_n) \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Leb}(B(r_j, 2^{-j-n})) \lesssim \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{-(j+n)d} \sim 2^{-nd} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Since $\{r_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is dense in $B = B(0, 1)$, the closure of each O_n contains at least the unit ball B . As a consequence,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \text{Leb}(\overline{O_n}) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \text{Leb}(B) = C_d > 0.$$

We emphasize that the argument above does not falsify (D.5) and it is still unknown whether this conjecture is true. Here we shall prove rigorously that all bounded continuous functions belong to \mathcal{G} .

Proposition D.2. *If the measure ν defined in (D.2) is absolutely continuous w.r.t. Lebesgue measure, we have*

$$C_b^0(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{G}.$$

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma D.1, we assume that $\hat{u}_0 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. To begin with, we check that the Schwartz class $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{G}$. For any $g \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(g\left(\frac{x}{t}\right) - g(-P'(D_x)) \right) u(t, x) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{i(x \cdot \xi + tP(\xi))} \left(g\left(\frac{x}{t}\right) - g(-P'(\xi)) \right) \hat{u}_0(\xi) d\xi \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{i(x \cdot \xi + tP(\xi))} \left(\frac{x}{t} + P'(\xi) \right) \int_0^1 g' \left(\frac{\tau}{t}x - (1-\tau)P'(\xi) \right) d\tau \hat{u}_0(\xi) d\xi \\ &= \frac{i}{(2\pi)^{d+1}} \int e^{i(x \cdot \xi + tP(\xi))} \partial_\xi \left[\int_0^1 g' \left(\frac{\tau}{t}x - (1-\tau)P'(\xi) \right) d\tau \hat{u}_0(\xi) \right] d\xi \\ &= \frac{i}{(2\pi)^{d+1}} \int e^{i(x \cdot \xi + tP(\xi))} \int_0^1 g'' \left(\frac{\tau}{t}x - (1-\tau)P'(\xi) \right) (\tau-1) d\tau P''(\xi) \hat{u}_0(\xi) d\xi \\ &+ \frac{i}{(2\pi)^{d+1}} \int e^{i(x \cdot \xi + tP(\xi))} \int_0^1 g' \left(\frac{\tau}{t}x - (1-\tau)P'(\xi) \right) d\tau \partial_\xi \hat{u}_0(\xi) d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that, by Lemma A.5 and A.10, the operator of symbol

$$g'' \left(\frac{\tau}{t}x - (1-\tau)P'(\xi) \right), \quad g' \left(\frac{\tau}{t}x - (1-\tau)P'(\xi) \right)$$

is bounded uniformly in t and τ and that functions

$$P''(\xi) \hat{u}_0(\xi), \quad \partial_\xi \hat{u}_0(\xi)$$

belong to L^2 , since we have assumed $\hat{u}_0 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. As a consequence,

$$\left\| \left(g\left(\frac{x}{t}\right) - g(-P'(D_x)) \right) u(t, x) \right\|_{L_x^2} \lesssim |t|^{-1} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} 0.$$

By noticing that \mathcal{G} is closed under L^∞ -norm, we have

$$C_0^0 := \{g \in C^0 : \lim_{|y| \rightarrow +\infty} g(y) = 0\} = \bar{\mathcal{S}} \subset \mathcal{G},$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ is the closure of \mathcal{S} w.r.t. L^∞ -norm.

It remains to pass to general continuous function g . In fact, we only need to consider those $g \geq 0$, since once may always write g as the difference of two non-negative continuous functions, which are both bounded. Let us fix $\chi \in C_c^\infty$ which equals to 1 near zero and define, for all $R > 0$,

$$\chi_R(y) := \chi\left(\frac{y}{R}\right).$$

For arbitrary $R > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|(g(x/t) - g(-P'(D_x))) u(t)\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|((g\chi_R)(x/t) - (g\chi_R)(-P'(D_x))) u(t)\|_{L^2} \\ & \quad + \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|(g(1 - \chi_R))(x/t)u(t)\|_{L^2} + \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|(g(1 - \chi_R))(-P'(D_x))u(t)\|_{L^2} \\ & = \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|(g(1 - \chi_R))(x/t)u(t)\|_{L^2} + \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|(g(1 - \chi_R))(-P'(D_x))u(t)\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

since $g\chi_R \in C_0^0$. The second term on the right hand side can be calculated as follows

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|(g(1 - \chi_R))(-P'(D_x))u(t)\|_{L^2} = (2\pi)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \|(g(1 - \chi_R))(-P')\hat{u}_0\|_{L^2},$$

which, due to Dominated Convergence Theorem and the absolute continuity of ν w.r.t. Lebesgue measure, converges to zero as $R \rightarrow +\infty$. As for the cut-off in x , we observe that,

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|(g(1 - \chi_R))(x/t)u(t)\|_{L^2} \leq \|g\|_{L^\infty} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|(1 - \chi_R)(x/t)u(t)\|_{L^2}.$$

Note that since $\chi_R \in \mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{G}$, $(1 - \chi_R)(x/t)u(t)$ can be written, when $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$, as

$$u(t) - \chi_R(-P'(D_x))u(t) + o_{L^2}(1).$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|(1 - \chi_R)(x/t)u(t)\|_{L^2} &= \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|(1 - \chi_R)(-P'(D_x))u(t)\|_{L^2} \\ &= (2\pi)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \|(1 - \chi_R)\hat{u}_0\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We have seen that the last quantity tends to zero as $R \rightarrow +\infty$. In conclusion, we have proved that, for all $u_0 \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\})$,

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|(g(x/t) - g(-P'(D_x)))u(t)\|_{L^2} = 0,$$

and thus $g \in \mathcal{G}$. □

D.3. Proof of (D.5) for dispersive system. Before ending this section, we give a proof of (D.5) for dispersive system. To be precise, we assume that there exists some dense subspace $\mathcal{D}_0 \subset L^2$, such that

$$(D.8) \quad \|e^{itP(D_x)}u_0\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(u_0)|t|^{-\frac{d}{2}}, \quad \forall u_0 \in \mathcal{D}_0, \quad \forall |t| > 1,$$

where $C(u_0)$ is a constant depending on u_0 .

Theorem D.3. *Assume that P is smooth except at zero and ν defined in (D.2) is absolutely continuous w.r.t. Lebesgue measure. Then the dispersion estimate (D.8), associated with some dense subspace $\mathcal{D}_0 \subset L^2$, implies (D.5).*

Proof. Recall that, as mentioned in previous section, it has been proved in [20] that, when ν is absolutely continuous w.r.t. Lebesgue measure, (D.5) is equivalent to (D.6). Therefore, it suffices to check that, for all $u_0 \in \mathcal{D}_0$,

$$\left\| \mathbb{1}_E \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) u(t) - \mathbb{1}_E(D_x)u(t) \right\|_{L^2} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \pm\infty,$$

where E is any bounded measurable set.

In Lemma D.1, we have proved this result for those E whose boundary has zero Lebesgue measure. The idea of treatment of general E is to approximate it by finite union of cubes and control the remaining part via dispersion estimate. To begin with, we fix an arbitrarily small $\epsilon > 0$. By outer regularity of Lebesgue measure, there exists open set $\tilde{E}_\epsilon \supset E$, such that

$$\text{Leb}(\tilde{E}_\epsilon \setminus E) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Since any open set can be expressed as the union of almost disjoint closed cubes, we may find finitely many closed cubes $\{K_j\}_{j=1}^N$, such that $K_j \subset \tilde{E}_\epsilon$ and

$$\text{Leb}(\tilde{E}_\epsilon \setminus E_\epsilon) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \quad \text{where } E_\epsilon = \bigcup_{j=1}^N K_j.$$

One may observe that

$$\text{Leb}(E \setminus E_\epsilon \sqcup E_\epsilon \setminus E) < \epsilon.$$

Now, for any $u_0 \in \mathcal{D}_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{1}_E \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) u(t) - \mathbb{1}_E(D_x)u(t) \right\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq \left\| (\mathbb{1}_{E_\epsilon} - \mathbb{1}_E) \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) u(t) \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{E_\epsilon} \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) u(t) - \mathbb{1}_{E_\epsilon}(D_x)u(t) \right\|_{L^2} \\ & \quad + \left\| (\mathbb{1}_{E_\epsilon} - \mathbb{1}_E)(D_x)u(t) \right\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq C(u_0) \left\| (\mathbb{1}_{E_\epsilon} - \mathbb{1}_E) \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) \right\|_{L^2} |t|^{-\frac{d}{2}} + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{E_\epsilon} \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) u(t) - \mathbb{1}_{E_\epsilon}(D_x)u(t) \right\|_{L^2} \\ & \quad + (2\pi)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \left\| (\mathbb{1}_{E_\epsilon} - \mathbb{1}_E)u_0 \right\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq C(u_0) \text{Leb}(E \setminus E_\epsilon \sqcup E_\epsilon \setminus E)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{E_\epsilon} \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) u(t) - \mathbb{1}_{E_\epsilon}(D_x)u(t) \right\|_{L^2} \\ & \quad + (2\pi)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \left\| \mathbb{1}_{E \setminus E_\epsilon \sqcup E_\epsilon \setminus E}(\xi) \hat{u}_0(\xi) \right\|_{L^2_\xi} \\ & < C(u_0) \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{E_\epsilon} \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) u(t) - \mathbb{1}_{E_\epsilon}(D_x)u(t) \right\|_{L^2} + (2\pi)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \left\| \mathbb{1}_{E \setminus E_\epsilon \sqcup E_\epsilon \setminus E}(\xi) \hat{u}_0(\xi) \right\|_{L^2_\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

Due to the fact that E_ϵ is the union of finitely many closed cubes, the boundary of E_ϵ has zero Lebesgue measure. As a result, the second term on the right hand side tends to zero as $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$, i.e.

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \left\| \mathbb{1}_E \left(\frac{x}{t} \right) u(t) - \mathbb{1}_E(D_x)u(t) \right\|_{L^2} \lesssim \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left\| \mathbb{1}_{E \setminus E_\epsilon \sqcup E_\epsilon \setminus E}(\xi) \hat{u}_0(\xi) \right\|_{L^2_\xi}.$$

Since $\hat{u}_0 \in L^2$ and $\text{Leb}(E \setminus E_\epsilon \sqcup E_\epsilon \setminus E) < \epsilon$, the right hand side becomes arbitrarily small, if $\epsilon > 0$ is taken small enough. The desired result thus follows. \square

The dispersion estimate (D.8) holds for all symbols P we deal with in the present paper, as a consequence of stationary phase lemma.

Proposition D.4. *Let P be radial and smooth except at zero. If $P'' > 0$ or $P'' < 0$, the dispersion estimate (D.8) holds with $\mathcal{D}_0 = \mathcal{F}^{-1}C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\})$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that $t > 1$. Let u_0 be any function in $\mathcal{D}_0 = \mathcal{F}^{-1}C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\})$. To prove the inequality (D.8), it is equivalent by definition to prove that

$$\left\| \int e^{i(x \cdot \xi + tP(\xi))} \hat{u}_0(\xi) d\xi \right\|_{L^\infty(dx)} \lesssim t^{-\frac{d}{2}}.$$

Since P is radial, we may write the inequality above in polar system $\xi = \rho\theta$ as

$$\left\| \int e^{it(\frac{x \cdot \theta}{t} \rho + P(\rho))} \hat{u}_0(\rho\theta) \rho^{d-1} d\rho d\theta \right\|_{L^\infty(dx)} \lesssim t^{-\frac{d}{2}}.$$

By denoting $s = x \cdot \theta / t \in \mathbb{R}$, it suffices to prove that

$$\sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}, \theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \left| \int e^{it(s\rho + P(\rho))} \hat{u}_0(\rho\theta) \rho^{d-1} d\rho \right| \lesssim t^{-\frac{d}{2}}.$$

Since ρ stays between two positive constants and $P'' \neq 0$ on $]0, +\infty[$, this inequality follows from stationary phase lemma. \square

Corollary D.5. (D.5) holds for all P satisfying condition (H _{p_0, p_1}) with $p_0, p_1 \neq 0$.

APPENDIX E. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.3

In [9], the author has proved Proposition 4.3 for strictly convex P . In this part, we will explain how the same argument works for strictly concave P and how to calculate the limit for $\epsilon = \pm$ respectively. Since most of calculations has been done in Section 3 of [9], we will omit these details.

By definition $I(t, -\epsilon, \epsilon, -\epsilon, \epsilon; F)$ equals to

$$\int e^{i\epsilon[r(-\rho+\rho')-t(-P(\rho)+P(\rho'))]} \mathbb{1}_{\frac{r}{t} > P'(\rho), P'(\rho')} \\ \times F(\rho, \rho', r, t; r - tP'(\rho), r - tP'(\rho')) dr d\rho d\rho',$$

which can be split into I_+ and I_- , with domain of integral $\rho - \rho' > 0$ and $\rho - \rho' < 0$, respectively. Namely,

$$I_+ = \int e^{i\epsilon[r(-\rho+\rho')-t(-P(\rho)+P(\rho'))]} \mathbb{1}_{r > tP'(\rho')} \mathbb{1}_{\rho - \rho' > 0} \\ \times F(\rho, \rho', r, t; r - tP'(\rho), r - tP'(\rho')) dr d\rho d\rho', \\ I_- = \int e^{i\epsilon[r(-\rho+\rho')-t(-P(\rho)+P(\rho'))]} \mathbb{1}_{r > tP'(\rho')} \mathbb{1}_{\rho - \rho' < 0} \\ \times F(\rho, \rho', r, t; r - tP'(\rho), r - tP'(\rho')) dr d\rho d\rho'.$$

In what follows, we study mainly integral I_+ with I_- manipulated in the same way. By change of variable $r \rightarrow tr + tP'(\rho')$, $\rho' \rightarrow \rho - w$, I_+ reads

$$t \int e^{i\epsilon t[-(r+P'(\rho-w))w - (-P(\rho)+P(\rho-w))]} \mathbb{1}_{r > 0} \mathbb{1}_{w > 0} \\ \times F(\rho, \rho - w, t(r + P'(\rho - w)), t; tr - tP'(\rho) + tP'(\rho - w), tr) dr d\rho dw.$$

We introduce the following notation:

$$P(\rho') - P(\rho) = P'(\rho)(\rho' - \rho) + g(\rho, \rho')(\rho' - \rho)^2,$$

where g is strictly negative since P is concave;

$$\tilde{F}(\rho, \rho', r, t; \zeta, \zeta') = F(\rho, \rho', tr, t; t\zeta, t\zeta'),$$

which is smooth, supported for

$$\rho, \rho', r \sim 1, |\zeta|, |\zeta'| \lesssim t^{\delta-1},$$

and satisfies for all $j, j', k, \gamma, \gamma' \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\partial_\rho^j \partial_{\rho'}^{j'} \partial_r^k \partial_\zeta^\gamma \partial_{\zeta'}^{\gamma'} \tilde{F}(\rho, \rho', r, t; \zeta, \zeta')| \lesssim t^{(1-\delta')(k+\gamma+\gamma')}.$$

Moreover, we have the point-wise limit

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{F}(\rho, \rho', \frac{r}{\sqrt{t}} + P'(\rho'), t; \frac{\zeta}{\sqrt{t}}, \frac{\zeta'}{\sqrt{t}}) = F_0(\rho, \rho').$$

With these notations, I_+ can be expressed as

$$t \int e^{-i\epsilon t[rw - g(\rho-w, \rho)w^2]} \mathbb{1}_{r > 0} \mathbb{1}_{w > 0} \\ \times \tilde{F}(\rho, \rho - w, r + P'(\rho - w), t; r - P'(\rho) + P'(\rho - w), r) dr d\rho dw.$$

The same calculus as in Lemma 3.1.4 of [9] shows that, up to some terms tending to zero, I_+ equals to

$$t \int e^{-i\epsilon trw} \mathbb{1}_{r > 0} e^{i\epsilon tg(\rho-w, \rho)w^2} \mathbb{1}_{w > 0} \tilde{F}(\rho, \rho - w, r + P'(\rho), t; r, r) dr dw d\rho$$

$$= \int e^{-i\epsilon r w} \mathbb{1}_{r>0} e^{i\epsilon g(\rho - \frac{w}{\sqrt{t}}, \rho) w^2} \mathbb{1}_{w>0} \tilde{F}(\rho, \rho - \frac{w}{\sqrt{t}}, \frac{r}{\sqrt{t}} + P'(\rho), t; \frac{r}{\sqrt{t}}, \frac{r}{\sqrt{t}}) dr dw d\rho,$$

whose formal limit by taking point-wise limit of integrand is

$$\int e^{-i\epsilon r w} \mathbb{1}_{r>0} e^{i\epsilon g(\rho, \rho) w^2} \mathbb{1}_{w>0} F_0(\rho, \rho) dr dw d\rho.$$

The error between this integral and I_+ is actually $o(1)$, due the calculation of the proof of Proposition 3.1.3 of [9]. In conclusion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_+ &= \int e^{-i\epsilon r w} \mathbb{1}_{r>0} e^{i\epsilon g(\rho, \rho) w^2} \mathbb{1}_{w>0} F_0(\rho, \rho) dr dw d\rho + o(1), \\ I_- &= \int e^{-i\epsilon r w} \mathbb{1}_{r>0} e^{-i\epsilon g(\rho, \rho) w^2} \mathbb{1}_{w<0} F_0(\rho, \rho) dr dw d\rho + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, the limit of $I(t, -\epsilon, \epsilon, -\epsilon, \epsilon; F)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \int e^{-i\epsilon r w} \mathbb{1}_{r>0} dr \left(e^{i\epsilon g(\rho, \rho) w^2} \mathbb{1}_{w>0} + e^{-i\epsilon g(\rho, \rho) w^2} \mathbb{1}_{w<0} \right) dw F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho \\ &= \int -i\epsilon (w - i\epsilon 0)^{-1} \left(\cos(\epsilon g(\rho, \rho) w^2) + \operatorname{sgn}(w) i \sin(\epsilon g(\rho, \rho) w^2) \right) dw F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho \\ &= \int -i\epsilon (w - i\epsilon 0)^{-1} \cos(g(\rho, \rho) w^2) dw F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho \\ & \quad + \int \frac{\sin(g(\rho, \rho) w^2)}{|w|} dw F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho, \end{aligned}$$

where the integrals in r and w should be understood in the sense of oscillatory integral and distribution, respectively.

Due to the assumption that P is strictly concave, or equivalently $P'' < 0$, g is negative. Since $(w - i\epsilon 0)^{-1}$ is homogeneous of degree -1 , the right hand side of equality above can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int -i\epsilon (w - i\epsilon 0)^{-1} \cos(w^2) dw F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho \\ & \quad - \int \frac{\sin(w^2)}{|w|} dw F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho, \end{aligned}$$

For one thing, the distribution $(w \pm i0)^{-1}$ can be expressed as

$$(w \pm i0)^{-1} = \mp \pi i \delta_0 + \text{P. V.} \frac{1}{w}.$$

And for another thing, due to Dirichlet integral $\int_0^\infty \frac{\sin y}{y} dy = \frac{\pi}{2}$, we have

$$\int \frac{\sin(w^2)}{|w|} dw = \frac{\pi}{2}.$$

These identities imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} I(t, -\epsilon, \epsilon, -\epsilon, \epsilon; F) &= \int \left(\pi \delta_0 - i\epsilon \text{P. V.} \frac{1}{w} \right) \cos(w^2) dw F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho \\ & \quad + \operatorname{sgn}(g) \frac{\pi}{2} \int F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho \\ &= \pi \int F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho - \frac{\pi}{2} \int F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{\pi}{2} \int F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho.$$

In the case of strictly convex P , it has been proved in [9] that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} I(t, -\epsilon, \epsilon, -\epsilon, \epsilon; F) &= \int i\epsilon(w + i\epsilon 0)^{-1} \cos(g(\rho, \rho)w^2) dw F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho \\ &\quad - \int \frac{\sin(g(\rho, \rho)w^2)}{|w|} dw F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho, \end{aligned}$$

where g is positive. We may repeat the argument above and conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} I(t, -\epsilon, \epsilon, -\epsilon, \epsilon; F) &= \int \left(\pi\delta_0 + i\epsilon \text{P.V.} \frac{1}{w} \right) \cos(w^2) dw F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho \\ &\quad - \frac{\pi}{2} \int F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho \\ &= \pi \int F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho - \frac{\pi}{2} \int F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho \\ &= \frac{\pi}{2} \int F_0(\rho, \rho) d\rho. \end{aligned}$$

REFERENCES

- [1] A. P. Calderón and R. Vaillancourt. On the boundedness of pseudo-differential operators. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 23:374–378, 1971.
- [2] R. R. Coifman and Y. Meyer. *Au delà des opérateurs pseudo-différentiels*, volume 57 of *Astérisque*. Société Mathématique de France (SMF), Paris, 1978.
- [3] R. Côte, C. E. Kenig, A. Lawrie, and W. Schlag. Characterization of large energy solutions of the equivariant wave map problem. I. *Am. J. Math.*, 137(1):139–207, 2015.
- [4] R. Côte, C. E. Kenig, A. Lawrie, and W. Schlag. Characterization of large energy solutions of the equivariant wave map problem. II. *Am. J. Math.*, 137(1):209–250, 2015.
- [5] R. Côte, C. E. Kenig, A. Lawrie, and W. Schlag. Profiles for the radial focusing $4d$ energy-critical wave equation. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 357(3):943–1008, 2018.
- [6] R. Côte, C. E. Kenig, and W. Schlag. Energy partition for the linear radial wave equation. *Mathematische Annalen*, 358(3-4):573–607, 2014.
- [7] M. Cotlar. A combinatorial inequality and its applications to L^2 -spaces. *Rev. Mat. Cuyana* 1, 41-55 (1956)., 1956.
- [8] R. Côte and C. Laurent. Concentration close to the cone for linear waves, 2021.
- [9] J.-M. Delort. Microlocal partition of energy for linear wave or schrödinger equations. *Tunisian Journal of Mathematics*, 4(2):329–385, 2022.
- [10] T. Duyckaerts, C. Kenig, and F. Merle. Universality of blow-up profile for small radial type II blow-up solutions of the energy-critical wave equation. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 13(3):533–599, 2011.
- [11] T. Duyckaerts, C. E. Kenig, and F. Merle. Universality of the blow-up profile for small type ii blow-up solutions of the energy-critical wave equation: the nonradial case. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 14(5):1389–1454, 2012.
- [12] P. Flandrin. Maximum signal energy concentration in a time-frequency domain. *ICASSP-88., International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, pages 2176–2179 vol.4, 1988.
- [13] I. L. Hwang. The L^2 -boundedness of pseudodifferential operators. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 302:55–76, 1987.
- [14] L. Hörmander. *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators III*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.
- [15] N. Lerner. Integrating the Wigner distribution on subsets of the phase space, a survey, 2023.
- [16] E. H. Lieb and Y. Ostrover. Localization of multidimensional Wigner distributions. *Journal of mathematical physics*, 51(10):102101, 2010.

- [17] P. J. Lusin, N. Sur l'unicité et la multiplicité des fonctions analytiques. *Annales scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure*, 42:143–191, 1925.
- [18] C. D. Sogge. *Fourier Integrals in Classical Analysis*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2 edition, 2017.
- [19] E. M. Stein. *Harmonic analysis: Real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals. With the assistance of Timothy S. Murphy*, volume 43 of *Princeton Math. Ser.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- [20] R. S. Strichartz. Asymptotic behavior of waves. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 40(3):341–357, 1981.
- [21] M. Zworski. *Semiclassical analysis*, volume 138. American Mathematical Society, 2022.