

THE INITIAL-TO-FINAL-STATE INVERSE PROBLEM WITH UNBOUNDED POTENTIALS AND STRICHARTZ ESTIMATES

PEDRO CARO AND ALBERTO RUIZ

ABSTRACT. The initial-to-final-state inverse problem consists in determining a quantum Hamiltonian assuming the knowledge of the state of the system at some fixed time, for every initial state. We formulated this problem to establish a theoretical framework that would explain the viability of data-driven prediction in quantum mechanics. In a previous work, we analysed this inverse problem for Hamiltonians of the form $-\Delta + V$ with an electric potential $V = V(t, x)$, and we showed that uniqueness holds whenever the potentials are bounded and decay super-exponentially at infinity. In this paper, we extend this result for unbounded potentials. One of the key steps consists in proving a family of suitable Strichartz estimates—including the corresponding endpoint of Keel and Tao.

In the context of the inverse Calderón problem this family of inequalities corresponds to the Carleman inequality proved by Kenig, Ruiz and Sogge. Haberman showed that this inequality can be also retrieved as an embedding of a suitable Bourgain space. The corresponding Bourgain space in our context do not capture the mixed-norm Lebesgue spaces of Strichartz inequalities. In this paper, we give a counterexample that justifies this fact, and shows the limitations of Bourgain spaces to address the initial-to-final-state inverse problem.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Schrödinger equation determines the evolution of a wave function

$$u : (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto u(t, x) \in \mathbb{C}$$

throughout an interval of time $[0, T] \subset \mathbb{R}$, with $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Wave functions provide a mathematical description of the dynamical state of quantum particles.

If the motion takes place under the influence of an electric potential $V = V(t, x)$ and the initial state $u(0, \cdot)$ is prescribed by f , then the corresponding wave function is the solution of the initial-value problem for the Schrödinger equation

$$(1) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u = -\Delta u + Vu & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ u(0, \cdot) = f & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases}$$

Whenever V has suitable integrability properties one can show that there exists a unique $u \in C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ solving the problem (1), and the linear map

$$\mathcal{U} : f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \mapsto u \in C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$$

is bounded. Solutions of this type are usually referred to as *physical solutions*.

In this context, we formulated in [20] the *initial-to-final-state inverse problem* aiming at deciding when is possible to determine $V = V(t, x)$ from the *initial-to-final-state map*—given by the bounded linear map defined as

$$\mathcal{U}_T : f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \mapsto u(T, \cdot) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

with u denoting the solution of the problem (1).

The motivation of this inverse problem was to establish a theoretical framework that would allow to understand rigorously the viability of data-driven prediction in quantum mechanics. Roughly speaking, data-driven prediction aims at computing an exact or approximative inverse of

$$\mathcal{U} \mapsto \mathcal{U}_T$$

ignoring the exact interaction produced by the presence of V .

In our previous work [20], we established that the potential $V = V(t, x)$ is uniquely determined by \mathcal{U}_T . This result, which implies the unique determination of \mathcal{U} itself, holds for potentials $V \in L^1((0, T); L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with $n \geq 2$ that exhibit super-exponential decay. Specifically, we required that $e^{\rho|x|}V \in L^\infty((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ for every $\rho > 0$. The necessity of this strong decay condition stems from the application of specialized exponentially-growing solutions in our proof.

The main goal of this paper is to generalize this uniqueness result to the case of unbounded potentials. In order to state precisely our contributions we need to introduce some notation. For $R > 0$, let $\mathbf{1}_{>R}$ denote the characteristic function of the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| > R\}$. For $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, let $H_{s,\omega}$ denote the hyperplane

$$H_{\omega,s} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \omega \cdot x = s\}.$$

Theorem 1. *Consider V_1 and V_2 in $L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with $n \geq 2$ and $(a, b) \in [1, \infty] \times [1, \infty]$ satisfying*

$$2 - \frac{2}{a} = \frac{n}{b} \text{ with } (n, a, b) \neq (2, \infty, 1).$$

For the endpoint $(a, b) = (\infty, n/2)$ with $n \geq 3$, we also suppose that V_1 and V_2 belongs to $C([0, T]; L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

Let \mathcal{U}_T^1 and \mathcal{U}_T^2 denote the initial-to-final-state map associated to the Hamiltonians $-\Delta + V_1$ and $-\Delta + V_2$.

Assume that V_j with $j \in \{1, 2\}$ satisfies the following conditions:

- (a) $e^{\rho|x|}V_j \in L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$ for all $\rho > 0$,
- (b) *there exists $R_j > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|\mathbf{1}_{>R_j} V_j\|_{L^\infty((0, T) \times H_{\omega,s})} ds < \infty.$$

Then,

$$\mathcal{U}_T^1 = \mathcal{U}_T^2 \Rightarrow V_1 = V_2.$$

We adopt a unified approach to prove both the case $(a, b) \neq (\infty, n/2)$ and the endpoint $(a, b) = (\infty, n/2)$ with $n \geq 3$ of the theorem 1. At some point we need to construct a suitable approximation of the potentials. At that stage, we must rely on the assumed time continuity at the endpoint. Nevertheless, this continuity in time is already required to guarantee the well-posedness of the initial-value problem (1), see the work of Ionescu and Kenig [33]. An alternative to the continuity assumption, in the context of well-posedness, is to impose a smallness condition on $\|V\|_{L^\infty((s, s+\delta); L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))}$ for some $\delta > 0$ and all $s \in [0, T - \delta]$, see again [33].

As noted earlier, the super-exponential decay condition in (a) of the theorem 1 was originally established in [20]. This requirement stems from the use of a family of exponentially-growing solutions. Building on the work of [42, 43, 48], one could potentially relax this to a weaker exponential decay assumption. However, it appears unlikely that any form of exponential decay can be entirely removed [28].

In [21], Cañizares *et al* restricted their analysis of this problem to Hamiltonians with time-independent electric potentials $V = V(x)$. In that scenario, they showed uniqueness in dimension $n \geq 2$ for bounded integrable potentials exhibiting only a

super-linear decay at infinity. This improvement was possible because they avoided the use of exponentially-growing solutions. Instead, they relied on the construction of stationary states at different energies with an explicit leading term plus a correction term that would vanish as the energy grew.

Various inverse problems for the dynamical Schrödinger equation have been previously formulated and analysed, see for example [6, 8, 9, 10, 7, 12]). Many of these studies even considered time-dependent Hamiltonians [26, 22, 11, 36, 37]. Despite this extensive body of work, none have addressed an inverse problem capable of tackling the data-driven prediction question in quantum mechanics. Typically, these studies examine inverse problems where the data consists of a dynamical Dirichlet-to-Neumann map, defined on the boundary of a domain that confines the Hamiltonian's non-constant parts. This setup differs significantly from our own, as the non-constant part of our Hamiltonians is spread throughout the entire space. Furthermore, our approach only requires knowledge of the initial and final states as data.

1.1. General scheme to prove the theorem 1. Writing $\Sigma = (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n$, we derive from the identity $\mathcal{U}_T^1 = \mathcal{U}_T^2$ an orthogonality relation:

$$(2) \quad \int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2) u_1 \overline{v_2} = 0$$

for all physical solutions u_1 and v_2 of the equations

$$(i\partial_t + \Delta - V_1)u_1 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (i\partial_t + \Delta - \overline{V_2})v_2 = 0 \quad \text{in } \Sigma.$$

With the identity (2) in mind, we construct solutions of the form

$$u_1 = e^{i|\nu|^2 t - \nu \cdot x} (u_1^\sharp + u_1^\flat), \quad v_2 = e^{i|\nu|^2 t + \nu \cdot x} (v_2^\sharp + v_2^\flat)$$

with $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, for the equations

$$(i\partial_t + \Delta - V_1^{\text{ext}})u_1 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (i\partial_t + \Delta - \overline{V_2^{\text{ext}}})v_2 = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where V_j^{ext} denotes either the extension by zero outside Σ if $(a, b) \neq (\infty, n/2)$, or a suitable continuous extension with support in $[T', T''] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with $T' < 0 < T < T''$ if $(a, b) = (\infty, n/2)$ with $n \geq 3$.

These type of exponentially-growing solutions are called complex geometrical optics (CGO for short) and will satisfy

$$\lim_{|\nu| \rightarrow \infty} \left(\left| \int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2) u_1^\sharp \overline{v_2^\flat} \right| + \left| \int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2) u_1^\flat \overline{v_2^\sharp} \right| + \left| \int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2) u_1^\flat \overline{v_2^\flat} \right| \right) = 0.$$

The functions u_1^\sharp and v_2^\sharp will be essentially chosen as $e^{-i|\eta|^2 t + i\eta \cdot x}$ and $e^{-i|\kappa|^2 t + i\kappa \cdot x}$ with $\eta, \kappa \in H_{\hat{\nu}}$ where $H_{\hat{\nu}} = H_{\hat{\nu}, 0}$ and $\hat{\nu} = \nu/|\nu|$.

If plugging these CGO solutions into the orthogonality relation (2) were allowed, we would conclude, by making $|\nu|$ tend to infinity, that

$$\int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2) e^{-i(|\eta|^2 - |\kappa|^2)t - i(\kappa - \eta) \cdot x} = 0 \quad \forall \eta, \kappa \in H_{\hat{\nu}}.$$

Then, making suitable choices of η and κ , we would prove that $V_1(t, x) = V_2(t, x)$ for almost every $(t, x) \in \Sigma$.

This approach presents two non-trivial challenges: first to construct the corrections terms u_1^\flat and v_2^\flat of the CGO solutions for the Schrödinger equation, and then showing that the orthogonality relation is satisfied for CGOs—note that their restrictions to Σ grow exponentially in certain regions of the space and, in consequence, they are not physical. These challenges were already addressed in [20] for the case of bounded potentials, however, the extension to the unbounded case is highly non trivial.

In order to construct the correction term u^b of a CGO in the form

$$u = e^{i|\nu|^2 t + \nu \cdot x} (u^\sharp + u^b)$$

satisfying the Schrödinger equation

$$(i\partial_t + \Delta - V)u = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

one needs to solve

$$(i\partial_t + \Delta + 2\nu \cdot \nabla - V)u^b = Vu^\sharp \text{ in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

As in [20], a key step consists of proving suitable estimates for the Fourier multiplier S_ν defined so that if $u = S_\nu f$ with $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ then

$$(i\partial_t + \Delta + 2\nu \cdot \nabla)u = f \text{ in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

In our previous work, we proved an inequality for S_ν with a gain of $|\nu|^{1/2}$ that allowed to deal with the bounded case, see [20, inequality (27)].

In order to extend our analysis for unbounded potentials, we need to estimate S_ν in mixed-norm Lebesgue spaces. This requires to exploit properties of the symbol of S_ν that were completely ignored in [20]. The types of estimates we need here are exact analogues of the classical Strichartz inequalities for the free Schrödinger propagator—including the endpoint of Keel and Tao [34].

In the same way as classical Strichartz estimates, our family of inequalities is scale invariant and therefore it is independent of $|\nu|$. This forces us to use not only the analogues of Strichartz estimates but also another inequality with certain gain in $|\nu|$.

While the estimate in [20, inequality (27)] provides a gain and is an obvious candidate, we prove a stronger result here. Our improved version achieves the full power $|\nu|$, which seems the natural gain for this problem.

In order to be able to gather the gain in $|\nu|$ with the versatility of our Strichartz inequalities for S_ν , we use a trick due to Lavine and Nachman.

It might be convenient for the reader to mention here that the construction of the reminder term u^b only requires a tempered decay for the potential, actually one only needs the decay stated in (b) of the theorem 1.

The second challenge we address is extending the orthogonality relation in (2) to exponentially-growing solutions, as CGOs. While this constitutes a technical step, its core ideas are adaptations from our previous work.

It is important to emphasize that the super-exponential decay condition (a) of the theorem 1 is specifically required for this extension to admit CGO solutions.

1.2. Bourgain spaces for the initial-to-final-state inverse problem. The family of Strichartz inequalities required to deal with unbounded potentials in our context corresponds, in the framework of the Calderón problem, to the Carleman inequality proved by Kenig, Ruiz and Sogge [35]—only for the scale-invariant situation.

Haberman showed using Stein–Tomas that this inequality can be also retrieved as an embedding of a suitable Bourgain space [29]. This Bourgain space also recovers the classical Sylvester–Uhlmann inequality [45], which has the same role as our inequality with a gain of $|\nu|$.

Therefore, the corresponding Bourgain space already gathers the gain of the Sylvester–Uhlmann inequality with the versatility of Kenig–Ruiz–Sogge. This provides an alternative path to avoid the Lavine–Nachman trick when working on the Calderón problem.

Unfortunately, this alternative approach is not available for the initial-to-final-state inverse problem. In fact, the corresponding Bourgain space in our context do not capture the mixed-norm Lebesgue spaces of Strichartz inequalities.

In this paper, we construct a counterexample that shows that the corresponding Bourgain spaces is not embedded in the mixed-norm Lebesgue spaces appearing in the Strichartz inequalities. This highlights some obvious limitations of Bourgain spaces in the context of the initial-to-final-state inverse problem.

1.3. Contents. This paper consists of other six sections plus an appendix with two sections. In the section 2 we construct the CGO solutions assuming several inequalities that will be proved in the sections 3 and 4. In the section 3 we prove the Strichartz inequalities for S_ν as well as the one with the full gain of $|\nu|$. The section 4 is devoted to prove a bound for the Birman–Schwinger operator which is key to make the Lavine–Nachman trick work. In the section 5 we first prove the orthogonality relation (2), and then we extend it to exponentially-growing solutions. This extension requires two results that are straightforward generalizations of our previous work, for that reason, these are postponed to the sections A and B. The section 6 is devoted to prove the theorem 1. In the section 7 we compare the inverse Calderón problem with the initial-to-final-state inverse problem, and we exhibit the counterexample that prevents us of using Bourgain spaces to avoid the Lavine–Nachman trick.

2. COMPLEX GEOMETRICAL OPTICS SOLUTIONS

In this section we construct the exponentially-growing solutions that will be plugged into the orthogonality relation (2). We start by a preliminary discussion that motivates the adopted approach. The arguments presented here are based on several key inequalities that will be proved in the sections 3 and 4.

2.1. Preliminary discussion. We follow the construction of CGO carried out in [20]. As motivated in there, given a suitable potential V defined in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$, we look for solutions of

$$(i\partial_t + \Delta - V)u = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

in the form

$$u = e^\varphi(u^\sharp + u^\flat),$$

where

$$(3) \quad \varphi(t, x) = i|\nu|^2 t + \nu \cdot x \quad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$$

with $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, and u^\sharp chosen so that $e^\varphi u^\sharp$ is a solution of $(i\partial_t + \Delta)(e^\varphi u^\sharp) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$, or equivalently $(i\partial_t + \Delta + 2\nu \cdot \nabla)u^\sharp = 0$ in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$. These choices force u^\flat to satisfy

$$(4) \quad (i\partial_t + \Delta + 2\nu \cdot \nabla - V)u^\flat = Vu^\sharp \text{ in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

At this point, we will guess the mixed-norm Lebesgue spaces where the potential V might belong to, in order for us, to construct u^\flat solving (4). To do so, we need to introduce the Fourier multiplier S_ν such that if $u = S_\nu f$ with $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ then

$$(5) \quad (i\partial_t + \Delta + 2\nu \cdot \nabla)u = f \text{ in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We could construct u^\flat as a solution for the equation

$$(6) \quad (\text{Id} - S_\nu \circ M_V)u^\flat = S_\nu(Vu^\sharp),$$

where M_V denotes the operator

$$M_V : u \mapsto Vu$$

—since applying the differential operator $i\partial_t + \Delta + 2\nu \cdot \nabla$ to both sides of the equation (6) we would see that u^\flat satisfies the identity (4).

A way to solve (6) consists in finding a Banach space where the operator $S_\nu \circ M_V$ is a contraction. This drives us to the need of understanding the boundedness of S_ν in spaces that capture the behaviour of V that we want to allow.

In the section 3, we prove that, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(q, r) \in [1, 2] \times [1, 2]$ satisfying

$$(7) \quad 2 - \frac{2}{q} = \frac{n}{r} - \frac{n}{2} \text{ with } (n, q, r) \neq (2, 2, 1),$$

the Fourier multiplier S_ν is a bounded operator from the mixed-norm Lebesgue space $L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$ to $L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with a norm that is less or equal than a constant C that only depends on n and (q, r) —see the proposition 3.2.

Here $(q', r') \in [2, \infty] \times [2, \infty]$ is the pair the conjugate exponents of q and r , and satisfies the relation

$$(8) \quad \frac{2}{q'} = \frac{n}{2} - \frac{n}{r'} \text{ with } (n, q', r') \neq (2, 2, \infty).$$

Consequently, the operator $S_\nu \circ M_V$ is bounded on $L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$, provided that M_V is bounded from $L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ to $L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Then, if $V \in L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with $(a, b) \in [1, \infty] \times [1, \infty]$ satisfying

$$(9) \quad \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{q'} = \frac{1}{a} \text{ and } \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{r'} = \frac{1}{b}$$

one can check—by Hölder's inequality—that M_V is bounded from $L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ to $L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

Additionally, one can see that such $(a, b) \in [1, \infty] \times [1, \infty]$ has to satisfy the relation

$$(10) \quad 2 - \frac{2}{a} = \frac{n}{b} \text{ with } (n, a, b) \neq (2, \infty, 1).$$

Furthermore, if its norm

$$\|M_V\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)); L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)))} = \|V\|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))} < 1/C$$

—with C an upper bound for the norm of S_ν , then $S_\nu \circ M_V$ is a contraction on the space $L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Hence, we can construct an inverse for $\text{Id} - S_\nu \circ M_V$.

However, in order to solve (6) we need to ensure that $S_\nu(Vu^\sharp) \in L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$. By the boundedness of S_ν from $L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$ to $L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$, we need to guarantee that $Vu^\sharp \in L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

In our previous work [20], u^\sharp was chosen so that $(i\partial_t + \Delta)u^\sharp = 0$ and $\nu \cdot \nabla u^\sharp = 0$ in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Assuming that V is supported in $\bar{\Sigma}$ and it has an extra decay, we have by Hölder's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Vu^\sharp\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} &\leq \|\langle \hat{\nu} \cdot \mathbf{x} \rangle^\rho V\|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))} \|\langle \hat{\nu} \cdot \mathbf{x} \rangle^{-\rho} u^\sharp\|_{L^{q'}((0, T); L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \\ &\leq \|\langle \hat{\nu} \cdot \mathbf{x} \rangle^\rho V\|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))} \|\langle \cdot \rangle^{-\rho}\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R})} \|u^\sharp\|_{L^{q'}((0, T); L^{r'}(H_{\hat{\nu}}))}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\langle \hat{\nu} \cdot \mathbf{x} \rangle = (1 + |\hat{\nu} \cdot \mathbf{x}|^2)^{1/2}$ and $\rho > 1/r'$.

A weight as $\langle \hat{\nu} \cdot \mathbf{x} \rangle^{-\rho}$ has to be introduced because u^\sharp does not depend on $\hat{\nu} \cdot \mathbf{x}$. Moreover, this is enough since u^\sharp can be chosen to have this behaviour on $(0, T) \times H_{\hat{\nu}}$ —for further details see the proof of the proposition 2.3. Thus, we would have $Vu^\sharp \in L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

This argument would allows us to solve (6) under the conditions

$$\sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \|\langle \omega \cdot \mathbf{x} \rangle^\rho V\|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))} < \infty,$$

and $\|V\|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))}$ is sufficiently small.

Fortunately, using a trick that involves the Birman–Schwinger operator we will be able to solve (6) for potentials V supported in $\bar{\Sigma}$ so that $\|V\|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))}$ is arbitrary and $\sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \|\mathbf{1}_{>R} \langle \omega \cdot \mathbf{x} \rangle^\rho V\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} < \infty$ for some $R > 0$ and $\rho > 1$.

In order to make this trick work, we will need the boundedness properties of S_ν stated in the proposition 3.2 as well as the one in the proposition 3.1.

2.2. The Lavine–Nachman trick. Assume for a moment that we have chosen u^\sharp so that $(i\partial_t + \Delta + 2\nu \cdot \nabla)u^\sharp = 0$ in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, we look for u^b solving

$$(11) \quad (i\partial_t + \Delta + 2\nu \cdot \nabla - M_V)u^b = M_V u^\sharp \text{ in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

In order to solve this equation, we will use a trick due to Lavine and Nachman that we learnt in [25].

Start by observing that

$$(i\partial_t + \Delta + 2\nu \cdot \nabla - M_V) \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|V|^{1/2}} = M_{|V|^{1/2}} - M_V \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|V|^{1/2}}.$$

Then, defining

$$(12) \quad W : (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{V(t, x)}{|V(t, x)|^{1/2}} & V(t, x) \neq 0 \\ 0 & V(t, x) = 0 \end{cases}$$

and using that $|V|^{1/2} = |W|$ and $V = |W|W$, we can write

$$(i\partial_t + \Delta + 2\nu \cdot \nabla - M_V) \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|V|^{1/2}} = M_{|W|} \circ (\text{Id} - M_W \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|W|}).$$

Then, u^b in the form $u^b = S_\nu(|W|v)$ with v satisfying

$$(13) \quad (\text{Id} - M_W \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|W|})v = M_W u^\sharp$$

solves the equation (11). Indeed,

$$(i\partial_t + \Delta + 2\nu \cdot \nabla - M_V)S_\nu(|W|v) = M_{|W|} \circ (\text{Id} - M_W \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|W|})v = M_{|W|} \circ M_W u^\sharp.$$

Since $M_{|W|} \circ M_W = M_V$, we have that $u^b = S_\nu(|W|v)$ solves (11).

Therefore, our goal is to find v solving (13). To that end, we will show that the Birman–Schwinger operator $M_W \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|W|}$ is a contraction in $L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ whenever $|\nu|$ is sufficiently large. In the proposition 4.1, we provide conditions on W that guarantee that

$$\lim_{|\nu| \rightarrow \infty} \|M_W \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|W|}\|_{\mathcal{L}[L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)]} = 0.$$

Thus, for $|\nu|$ sufficiently large, the operator $\text{Id} - M_W \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|W|}$ has a bounded inverse in $L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, and v can be chosen as

$$v = (\text{Id} - M_W \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|W|})^{-1}(W u^\sharp).$$

In the rest of the section we state the conditions on V that make it possible, first, to invert $\text{Id} - M_W \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|W|}$ and, second, to construct u^b .

Proposition 2.1. *Consider $S, T \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $S < T$ and $V \in L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with $\text{supp } V \subset [S, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and $(a, b) \in [1, \infty] \times [1, \infty]$ satisfying (10).*

Assume that there is $R > 0$ so that

$$(14) \quad \sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|\mathbf{1}_{>R} V\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\omega, s})} ds < \infty,$$

and $\mathbf{1}_{\leq R} V \in C(\mathbb{R}; L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ if $(a, b) = (\infty, n/2)$ for $n \geq 3$.

Then, there exists a constant $c > 0$ that only depends on n , (a, b) and R as well as on $\|V\|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))}$ and the quantity in (14), such that for every $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|\nu| \geq c$ the operator

$$\text{Id} - M_W \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|W|},$$

with W as in (12), has a bounded inverse in $L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Before proving this proposition, we note that while $|W|^2 \in L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$, we must also ensure that, at the endpoint, the time continuity of V is inherited by W .

Lemma 2.2. *Consider $V \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}; L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ such that $V \in C(\mathbb{R}; L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Then, W defined as in (12) belongs to $C(\mathbb{R}; L^n(\mathbb{R}^n))$.*

Proof. Consider $s \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $W(s, \cdot) \neq 0$. Then, $V(t, \cdot) \neq 0$ for all t sufficiently close to s . By (12), we have that $W(t, \cdot) \neq 0$ for all t sufficiently close to s . Then, for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} W(t, x) - W(s, x) &= \frac{V(t, x)}{|V(t, x)|} |V(t, x)|^{1/2} - \frac{V(s, x)}{|V(s, x)|} |V(s, x)|^{1/2} \\ &= \left(\frac{V(t, x)}{|V(t, x)|} - \frac{V(s, x)}{|V(s, x)|} \right) |V(t, x)|^{1/2} + \frac{V(s, x)}{|V(s, x)|} (|V(t, x)|^{1/2} - |V(s, x)|^{1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|W(t, \cdot) - W(s, \cdot)\|_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq \left\| \left| \frac{V(t, \cdot)}{|V(t, \cdot)|} - \frac{V(s, \cdot)}{|V(s, \cdot)|} \right|^2 |V(t, \cdot)| \right\|_{L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \left\| |V(t, \cdot)|^{1/2} - |V(s, \cdot)|^{1/2} \right\|_{L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, observe that for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{V(t, x)}{|V(t, x)|} - \frac{V(s, x)}{|V(s, x)|} \right|^2 |V(t, x)| &\leq 2 \left| \frac{V(t, x)}{|V(t, x)|} - \frac{V(s, x)}{|V(s, x)|} \right| |V(t, x)| \\ &\leq 2(|V(t, x) - V(s, x)| + ||V(s, x)| - |V(t, x)||) \leq 4|V(t, x) - V(s, x)| \end{aligned}$$

for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Hence,

$$\left\| \left| \frac{V(t, \cdot)}{|V(t, \cdot)|} - \frac{V(s, \cdot)}{|V(s, \cdot)|} \right|^2 |V(t, \cdot)| \right\|_{L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{1/2} \leq 2\|V(t, \cdot) - V(s, \cdot)\|_{L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{1/2}$$

On the other hand, since $|a - b|^2 \leq |a^2 - b^2|$ for all positive constants a and b , we have

$$||V(t, x)|^{1/2} - |V(s, x)|^{1/2}|^2 \leq ||V(s, x)| - |V(t, x)|| \leq |V(t, x) - V(s, x)|.$$

Hence

$$\left\| |V(t, \cdot)|^{1/2} - |V(s, \cdot)|^{1/2} \right\|_{L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{1/2} \leq \|V(t, \cdot) - V(s, \cdot)\|_{L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{1/2}.$$

The inequality $|a - b|^2 \leq |a^2 - b^2|$ follows from

$$(a - b)^2 + b^2 \leq (a - b)^2 + b^2 + 2(a - b)b = a^2$$

in the case $a \geq b \geq 0$.

Gathering these inequalities we have that

$$\|W(t, \cdot) - W(s, \cdot)\|_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 3\|V(t, \cdot) - V(s, \cdot)\|_{L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{1/2},$$

which means that $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto W(t, \cdot) \in L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is continuous at s , by the continuity of $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto V(t, \cdot) \in L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

In order to prove the lemma, it remains to see what happens in the case that $W(s, \cdot) = 0$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|W(t, \cdot) - W(s, \cdot)\|_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)} &= \|W(t, \cdot)\|_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \|V(t, \cdot)\|_{L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{1/2} \\ &= \|V(t, \cdot) - V(s, \cdot)\|_{L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

since $V(s, \cdot) = 0$. Hence, again by the continuity of $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto V(t, \cdot) \in L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we can conclude that $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto W(t, \cdot) \in L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is continuous at s even when $W(s, \cdot) = 0$. \square

Proof of the proposition 2.1. The fact $\text{Id} - M_W \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|W|}$ has a bounded inverse in $L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ for every $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|\nu|$ sufficiently large, is a consequence of the Neumann-series theorem together with the fact that the Birman–Schwinger operator $M_W \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|W|}$ is a contraction in $L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ —see the proposition 4.1. \square

We finish this section by stating the theorem which establishes the existence and properties of the CGO solutions $u = e^\varphi(u^\sharp + u^b)$. In order to present our choice for u^\sharp , it is convenient make some comments.

For $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, the hyperplane $H_{\omega,s} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \omega \cdot x = s\}$ is endowed with the measure $\sigma_{\omega,s}$. This measure is defined as the push-forward of the Lebesgue measure in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} via the map

$$y' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \mapsto y = (y', s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{s\} \mapsto Qy \in H_{\omega,s},$$

where Q is any matrix in $O(n)$ such that $\omega = Qe_n$ with $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^n . The definition of $\sigma_{\omega,s}$ is independent of the choice of Q . We then denote by $L^p(H_{\omega,s})$, for $p \in [1, \infty]$, the usual Lebesgue spaces on $H_{\omega,s}$ with respect to the measure $\sigma_{\omega,s}$.

Now we introduce our choice of u^\sharp . For $\psi \in \mathcal{S}(H_{\hat{\nu}})$, we define

$$(15) \quad u^\sharp(t, x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}} \int_{H_{\hat{\nu}}} e^{ix \cdot \xi} e^{-it|\xi|^2} \psi(\xi) d\sigma_{\hat{\nu}}(\xi) \quad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $\sigma_{\hat{\nu}} = \sigma_{\hat{\nu},0}$.

Theorem 2.3. *Consider $T > 0$ and $V \in L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with $(a, b) \in [1, \infty] \times [1, \infty]$ satisfying (10).*

Assume that there is $R > 0$ so that

$$(16) \quad \sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|\mathbf{1}_{>R} V\|_{L^\infty((0,T) \times H_{\omega,s})} ds < \infty,$$

and $\mathbf{1}_{\leq R} V \in C([0, T]; L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ if $(a, b) = (\infty, n/2)$ for $n \geq 3$.

For $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{S}(H_{\hat{\nu}})$, consider φ as in (3) and u^\sharp as in (15).

Then, there is a positive constant $c > 0$ that only depends on n , (a, b) and R as well as on $\|V\|_{L^a((0,T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))}$ and the quantity in (16), such that for every $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n$, with $|\nu| \geq c$, and every $\psi \in \mathcal{S}(H_{\hat{\nu}})$ there exists $u^b \in L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ so that

$$u = e^\varphi(u^\sharp + u^b)$$

solves the equation

$$i\partial_t u = -\Delta u + V^{\text{ext}} u \text{ in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Here $(q', r') \in [2, \infty] \times [2, \infty]$ satisfying

$$(17) \quad 1 - \frac{2}{q'} = \frac{1}{a} \text{ and } 1 - \frac{2}{r'} = \frac{1}{b},$$

and V^{ext} denotes either the extension by zero outside Σ if $(a, b) \neq (\infty, n/2)$, or a suitable continuous extension with support in $[T', T''] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with $T' < 0 < T < T''$ if $(a, b) = (\infty, n/2)$ with $n \geq 3$.

Additionally, for any measurable function \tilde{W} in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ supported in $[T', T''] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $|\tilde{W}|^2 \in L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$,

$$(18) \quad \sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|\mathbf{1}_{>R} |\tilde{W}|^2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\omega,s})} ds < \infty$$

and $\mathbf{1}_{\leq R} |\tilde{W}|^2 \in C(\mathbb{R}; L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ in the endpoint $(a, b) = (\infty, n/2)$ for $n \geq 3$, we have that

$$(19) \quad \|\tilde{W} u^\sharp\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \|\psi\|_{L^2(H_{\hat{\nu}})},$$

and

$$(20) \quad \lim_{|\nu| \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{W}u^\flat\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} = 0.$$

The constant $C > 0$ of the inequality (19) only depends on n , (a, b) , T and R , as well as on $\|\tilde{W}\|^2_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))}$ and the quantity in (18).

Proof. Start by proving the inequality (19), which in particular shows that $Wu^\sharp \in L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ with W as in (12) so that $|W|W = V^{\text{ext}}$. We have that

$$\|\tilde{W}u^\sharp\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \|\mathbf{1}_{\leq R}\tilde{W}u^\sharp\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\mathbf{1}_{> R}\tilde{W}u^\sharp\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)},$$

with $\mathbf{1}_{\leq R}$ denoting the characteristic function of $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| \leq R\}$.

By Hölder's inequality we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{1}_{\leq R}\tilde{W}u^\sharp\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq (2R)^{1/r'} \|\tilde{W}\|^2_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))}^{1/2} \|u^\sharp\|_{L^{q'}((T', T''); L^{r'}(H_\nu))}, \\ \|\mathbf{1}_{> R}\tilde{W}u^\sharp\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq S^{1/2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \|\mathbf{1}_{> R}\tilde{W}\|^2_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\nu, s})} ds \right)^{1/2} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|u^\sharp(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(H_\nu)}. \end{aligned}$$

Here and below S stands for $T'' - T'$.

Note that there is $s \in [q', \infty]$ so that (s, r') is an admissible Strichartz pair for dimension $n - 1$:

$$\frac{2}{s} = \frac{n-1}{2} - \frac{n-1}{r'} \quad \text{with } (n-1, s, r') \neq (2, 2, \infty).$$

Then, by Hölder's and Strichartz's inequalities, we have that

$$\|u^\sharp\|_{L^{q'}((T', T''); L^{r'}(H_\nu))} \leq S^{1/q' - 1/s} \|u^\sharp\|_{L^s(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(H_\nu))} \lesssim S^{1/q' - 1/s} \|\psi\|_{L^2(H_\nu)}.$$

Furthermore, by Plancherel's identity we have that

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|u^\sharp(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(H_\nu)} \leq \|\psi\|_{L^2(H_\nu)}.$$

This concludes the proof (19).

The proposition 2.1 justifies the existence and boundedness of the operator $(\text{Id} - M_W \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|W|})^{-1}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Moreover, for $v \in L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, we have that $|W|v \in L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$, since Hölder's inequality implies

$$\||W|v\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} \leq \||W|^2\|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))}^{1/2} \|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)}$$

with $(q, r) \in [1, 2] \times [1, 2]$ and $(a, b) \in [1, \infty] \times [1, \infty]$ satisfying the relation

$$(21) \quad \frac{2}{q} - 1 = \frac{1}{a} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{2}{r} - 1 = \frac{1}{b}$$

or equivalently (9).

Then, since $Wu^\sharp \in L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ and the Fourier multiplier S_ν is a bounded operator from $L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$ to $L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$, we have that

$$u^\flat = S_\nu \circ M_{|W|} \circ (\text{Id} - M_W \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|W|})^{-1}(Wu^\sharp)$$

belongs to $L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ and is solution of (11). On the one hand, the fact that u^\flat is solutions of (11) was discussed when explaining the Lavine–Nachman trick. On the other hand, u^\flat belongs to $L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ since naming

$$(22) \quad v = (\text{Id} - M_W \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|W|})^{-1}(Wu^\sharp) \in L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n),$$

we have that $u^\flat = S_\nu(|W|v)$. This concludes the proof that $u^\flat \in L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

Additionally, the limit (20) holds thanks to the bound of the operator $M_{\tilde{W}} \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|W|}$ given in the proposition 4.1, since $\tilde{W}u^b = M_{\tilde{W}} \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|W|}v$ with v as in (22) satisfying

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|Wu^b\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|\psi\|_{L^2(H_\nu)}.$$

Last chain of inequalities holds because of the boundedness of $(\text{Id} - M_W \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|W|})^{-1}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, and (19). \square

3. BOUNDEDNESS PROPERTIES OF S_ν

Here we focus on inverting the constant-coefficient differential operator

$$(23) \quad i\partial_t + \Delta + 2\nu \cdot \nabla,$$

where $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, and finding bounds for its inverse on different spaces. The symbol of (23) is the polynomial function

$$(24) \quad p_\nu(\tau, \xi) = -\tau - |\xi|^2 + i2\nu \cdot \xi \quad \forall (\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

For $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, introduce the set

$$\Gamma_\nu = \{(\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n : p_\nu(\tau, \xi) = 0\}.$$

Then, the function

$$(\tau, \xi) \in (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n) \setminus \Gamma_\nu \mapsto \frac{1}{p_\nu(\tau, \xi)} \in \mathbb{C}$$

can be extended to $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ as a locally integrable function.

For $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, we define

$$(25) \quad S_\nu f(t, x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} e^{i(t\tau + x \cdot \xi)} \frac{1}{p_\nu(\tau, \xi)} \widehat{f}(\tau, \xi) d(\tau, \xi)$$

for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

It might be convenient for the reader to mention at this point that we choose to define the Fourier transform in \mathbb{R}^d , with $d \in \mathbb{N}$, so that for functions $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, it reads as

$$\widehat{f}(\xi) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-i\xi \cdot x} f(x) dx,$$

while its inverse is given by

$$\check{f}(\xi) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\xi \cdot x} f(x) dx.$$

The goal of this section is to prove the following inequalities:

Theorem 3.1. *Consider $n \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists an absolute constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \|S_\nu f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\nu, s})} \leq \frac{C}{|\nu|} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\nu, s})} ds$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Theorem 3.2. *Consider $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(q, r) \in [1, 2] \times [1, 2]$ satisfying (7). There exists a constant $C > 0$ that only depends on n, q and r such that*

$$\|S_\nu f\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \leq C \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$.

The first inequality recalls a local smoothing, while the second is the counterpart of the classical Strichartz inequalities.

Since the operator S_ν has certain homogeneity, we prove the propositions 3.1 and 3.2 studying a normalized version of it.

Consider the polynomial function

$$(26) \quad p(\tau, \xi) = \tau - |\xi|^2 + i\xi_n \quad \forall (\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $\xi_n = \xi \cdot e_n$ and $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ is the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^n .

Setting

$$\Gamma = \{(\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n : p(\tau, \xi) = 0\},$$

the function

$$(\tau, \xi) \in (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n) \setminus \Gamma \mapsto \frac{1}{p(\tau, \xi)} \in \mathbb{C}$$

can be extended to $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ as a locally integrable function.

For $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, we define

$$(27) \quad Sf(t, x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} e^{i(t\tau + x \cdot \xi)} \frac{1}{p(\tau, \xi)} \widehat{f}(\tau, \xi) d(\tau, \xi) \quad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

In order to relate the operators S and S_ν , we choose $Q \in O(n)$ so that $\nu = |\nu|Qe_n$ and make the change $\sigma = -|\nu|^2 4\tau$ and $\eta = 2|\nu|Q\xi$ that implies

$$(28) \quad p_\nu(\sigma, \eta) = 4|\nu|^2 p(\tau, \xi).$$

One can check that if $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ and we define

$$(29) \quad g(s, y) = f\left(-\frac{s}{4|\nu|^2}, \frac{Qy}{2|\nu|}\right) \quad \forall (s, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

then

$$\widehat{g}(\tau, \xi) = (2|\nu|)^{n+2} \widehat{f}(-4|\nu|^2 \tau, 2|\nu|Q\xi) \quad \forall (\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

and consequently

$$(30) \quad S_\nu f(s, y) = \frac{1}{4|\nu|^2} Sg(-4|\nu|^2 s, 2|\nu|Q^\top y) \quad \forall (s, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

3.1. Proof of the proposition 3.1. After the relations (30) and (29), it is a simple task to check that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \|S_\nu f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\nu, s})} &= \frac{1}{4|\nu|^2} \frac{1}{(2|\nu|)^{(n+1)/2}} \sup_{x_n \in \mathbb{R}} \|Sg(\cdot, x_n)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1})}, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|g(\cdot, y_n)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1})} dy_n &= 2|\nu|(2|\nu|)^{(n+1)/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\nu, s})} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the proposition 3.1 is an immediate consequence of the following inequality for the multiplier S .

Proposition 3.3. *Consider $n \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists an absolute constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{x_n \in \mathbb{R}} \|Sf(\cdot, x_n)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1})} \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|f(\cdot, y_n)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1})} dy_n$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Proof. Start by noticing that for $(t, x_n) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ we have that the Fourier transform of $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \mapsto Sf(t, x', x_n)$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{F}[Sf(t, \cdot, x_n)](\xi') = \frac{e^{it|\xi'|^2}}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} e^{i(t\sigma + x_n \xi_n)} \frac{1}{\sigma - \xi_n^2 + i\xi_n} \widehat{f}(\sigma + |\xi'|^2, \xi', \xi_n) d(\sigma, \xi_n)$$

for all $\xi' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. For that, we have performed the translation $\sigma = \tau - |\xi'|^2$.

Applying Plancharel's identity in \mathbb{R} , we have for $(\xi', x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$ that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\mathcal{F}[Sf(t, \cdot, x_n)](\xi')|^2 dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |u(\sigma, \xi', x_n)|^2 d\sigma$$

where

$$u(\sigma, \xi', x_n) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{ix_n \xi_n} \frac{1}{\sigma - \xi_n^2 + i\xi_n} \widehat{f}(\sigma + |\xi'|^2, \xi', \xi_n) d\xi_n.$$

Plancharel's identity now in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \|Sf(t, \cdot, x_n)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})}^2 dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|\mathcal{F}[Sf(t, \cdot, x_n)]\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})}^2 dt = \|u(\cdot, x_n)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1})}^2$$

for every $x_n \in \mathbb{R}$.

Before going on with the argument, we introduce a family of convolution operators. For $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, the function

$$\eta \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \frac{1}{\sigma - \eta^2 + i\eta} \in \mathbb{C}$$

is integrable—since the polynomial function in the denominator does not vanish in \mathbb{R} , so we can define

$$(31) \quad K_\sigma(y) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{iy\eta} \frac{1}{\sigma - \eta^2 + i\eta} d\eta \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then, we introduce the family

$$T_\sigma g = K_\sigma * g \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}).$$

One can check that

$$u(\sigma, \xi', x_n) = T_\sigma \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\widehat{f}(\sigma + |\xi'|^2, \xi', \cdot)](x_n),$$

and consequently, for $(\sigma, \xi', x_n) \in (\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}) \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$, we obtain

$$|u(\sigma, \xi', x_n)| \leq \|K_\sigma\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\widehat{f}(\sigma + |\xi'|^2, \xi', \cdot)]\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Using the proposition 3.4 and performing the translation $\tau = \sigma + |\xi'|^2$, we can conclude that

$$\|u(\cdot, x_n)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1})}^2 \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\widehat{f}(\tau, \xi', \cdot)]\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}^2 d(\tau, \xi').$$

The implicit constant of this inequality is absolute.

Since

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\widehat{f}(\tau, \xi', \cdot)](y_n) = \mathcal{F}[f(\cdot, y_n)](\tau, \xi') \quad \forall (\tau, \xi', y_n) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R},$$

Young's inequalities for integrals, and then Plancherel's identity in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\widehat{f}(\tau, \xi', \cdot)]\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}^2 d(\tau, \xi') \right)^{1/2} &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|\mathcal{F}[f(\cdot, y_n)]\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1})} dy_n \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|f(\cdot, y_n)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1})} dy_n. \end{aligned}$$

Summing up, we have shown that

$$\|Sf(\cdot, x_n)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1})} = \|u(\cdot, x_n)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1})} \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|f(\cdot, y_n)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1})} dy_n.$$

Taking supremum in $x_n \in \mathbb{R}$, we obtain the inequality of the statement. \square

We now state and prove the lemma we used in the proof of the proposition 3.3. In the statement, $\mathbf{1}_I$ denotes the characteristic function of the interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 3.4. *For almost every $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, the function K_σ defined in (31) is explicitly given by*

$$\begin{aligned} K_\sigma(x) = & -\mathbf{1}_{(1/4, \infty)}(\sigma) \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(x) \frac{2e^{x/2}}{|4\sigma - 1|^{1/2}} \sin(|4\sigma - 1|^{1/2}x/2) \\ & - \mathbf{1}_{(0, 1/4)}(\sigma) \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(x) \frac{2e^{x/2}}{|4\sigma - 1|^{1/2}} \sinh(|4\sigma - 1|^{1/2}x/2) \\ & - \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(\sigma) \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(x) \frac{1}{|4\sigma - 1|^{1/2}} e^{(1+|4\sigma-1|^{1/2})x/2} \\ & + \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(\sigma) \mathbf{1}_{(0, \infty)}(x) \frac{1}{|4\sigma - 1|^{1/2}} e^{-(|4\sigma-1|^{1/2}-1)x/2} \end{aligned}$$

for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Consequently,

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}} \|K_\sigma\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} < \infty.$$

Proof. Start by defining the complex polynomial function

$$p_\sigma(\zeta) = -\zeta^2 + i\zeta + \sigma \quad \forall \zeta \in \mathbb{C},$$

and observe that

$$(32) \quad K_\sigma(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_{(\sigma, x)}(\xi) d\xi,$$

where

$$f_{(\sigma, x)}(\zeta) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{e^{-ix\zeta}}{p_\sigma(\zeta)} \quad \forall \zeta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{\eta_\sigma, \kappa_\sigma\}$$

with η_σ and κ_σ denoting the roots of p_σ .

One can check that, whenever $\sigma > 1/4$, p_σ vanishes at

$$\eta_\sigma = \frac{|4\sigma - 1|^{1/2} + i}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_\sigma = \frac{-|4\sigma - 1|^{1/2} + i}{2}.$$

For $\sigma = 1/4$, the polynomial function vanishes to second order at $i/2$. However, whenever $\sigma < 1/4$, it vanishes at the imaginary points

$$\eta_\sigma = i \left[\frac{|4\sigma - 1|^{1/2} + 1}{2} \right] \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_\sigma = i \left[\frac{1 - |4\sigma - 1|^{1/2}}{2} \right].$$

The idea to prove the first part of this lemma is to compute the integral on the right-hand side of (32) for $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, 1/4\}$, avoiding in this way the zero of order 2 at $\sigma = 1/4$. To do so, we will use Cauchy's residue theorem.

The residues of $f_{(\sigma, x)}$ at the points η_σ and κ_σ are respectively

$$\operatorname{res}_{\eta_\sigma} f_{(\sigma, x)} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{e^{-ix\eta_\sigma}}{\kappa_\sigma - \eta_\sigma}, \quad \operatorname{res}_{\kappa_\sigma} f_{(\sigma, x)} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{e^{-ix\kappa_\sigma}}{\eta_\sigma - \kappa_\sigma}.$$

For $\sigma > 1/4$ and $x \leq 0$, we choose a contour γ_R so that

$$(33) \quad \int_{\gamma_R} f_{(\sigma, x)}(\zeta) d\zeta = \int_{-R}^R f_{(\sigma, x)}(\xi) d\xi + \int_0^\pi f_{(\sigma, x)}(Re^{i\theta}) iRe^{i\theta} d\theta.$$

On the one hand, we have that

$$\left| \int_0^\pi f_{(\sigma, x)}(Re^{i\theta}) iRe^{i\theta} d\theta \right| \lesssim \frac{Re^{Rx}}{|R - |\eta_\sigma|| |R - |\kappa_\sigma||},$$

so that

$$(34) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_0^\pi f_{(\sigma, x)}(Re^{i\theta}) iRe^{i\theta} d\theta \right| = 0$$

since $x \leq 0$.

On the other hand, for R sufficiently large, Cauchy's residue theorem ensures that

$$\int_{\gamma_R} f_{(\sigma,x)}(\zeta) d\zeta = 2\pi i [\text{res}_{\eta_\sigma} f_{(\sigma,x)} + \text{res}_{\kappa_\sigma} f_{(\sigma,x)}] = -\frac{2e^{x/2}}{|4\sigma-1|^{1/2}} \sin(|4\sigma-1|^{1/2}x/2).$$

Therefore, whenever $\sigma > 1/4$, we have that

$$K_\sigma(x) = -\frac{2e^{x/2}}{|4\sigma-1|^{1/2}} \sin(|4\sigma-1|^{1/2}x/2) \quad \forall x \in (-\infty, 0].$$

For $\sigma > 1/4$ and $x \geq 0$, we choose a contour γ_R so that

$$(35) \quad \int_{\gamma_R} f_{(\sigma,x)}(\zeta) d\zeta = \int_{-R}^R f_{(\sigma,x)}(\xi) d\xi + \int_0^\pi f_{(\sigma,x)}(Re^{-i\theta})(-i)Re^{-i\theta} d\theta.$$

On the one hand, we have that

$$\left| \int_0^\pi f_{(\sigma,x)}(Re^{-i\theta})(-i)Re^{-i\theta} d\theta \right| \lesssim \frac{Re^{-Rx}}{|R-|\eta_\sigma|| |R-|\kappa_\sigma||},$$

so that

$$(36) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_0^\pi f_{(\sigma,x)}(Re^{-i\theta})(-i)Re^{-i\theta} d\theta \right| = 0$$

since $x \geq 0$.

On the other hand, for every $R > 0$ the Cauchy–Goursat theorem implies that

$$\int_{\gamma_R} f_{(\sigma,x)}(\zeta) d\zeta = 0.$$

Therefore, whenever $\sigma > 1/4$, we have that

$$K_\sigma(x) = 0 \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty).$$

For $0 < \sigma < 1/4$ and $x \leq 0$, we choose a contour γ_R as in (33). Since (34) holds, Cauchy's residue theorem ensures that, for R large enough, we know that

$$\int_{\gamma_R} f_{(\sigma,x)}(\zeta) d\zeta = 2\pi i [\text{res}_{\eta_\sigma} f_{(\sigma,x)} + \text{res}_{\kappa_\sigma} f_{(\sigma,x)}] = -\frac{2e^{x/2}}{|4\sigma-1|^{1/2}} \sinh(|4\sigma-1|^{1/2}x/2).$$

Therefore, whenever $0 < \sigma < 1/4$, we have that

$$K_\sigma(x) = -\frac{2e^{x/2}}{|4\sigma-1|^{1/2}} \sinh(|4\sigma-1|^{1/2}x/2) \quad \forall x \in (-\infty, 0].$$

For $0 < \sigma < 1/4$ and $x \geq 0$, we choose a contour γ_R as in (35). Since (36) holds, the Cauchy–Goursat theorem implies that, for all $R > 0$, we have that

$$\int_{\gamma_R} f_{(\sigma,x)}(\zeta) d\zeta = 0.$$

Therefore, whenever $0 < \sigma < 1/4$, we have that

$$K_\sigma(x) = 0 \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty).$$

For $\sigma < 0$ and $x \leq 0$, we choose a contour γ_R as in (33). Since (34) holds, Cauchy's residue theorem ensures that, for R large enough, we know that

$$\int_{\gamma_R} f_{(\sigma,x)}(\zeta) d\zeta = 2\pi i \text{res}_{\eta_\sigma} f_{(\sigma,x)} = -\frac{1}{|4\sigma-1|^{1/2}} e^{(1+|4\sigma-1|^{1/2})x/2}.$$

Therefore, whenever $\sigma < 0$, we have that

$$K_\sigma(x) = -\frac{1}{|4\sigma-1|^{1/2}} e^{(1+|4\sigma-1|^{1/2})x/2} \quad \forall x \in (-\infty, 0].$$

For $\sigma < 0$ and $x \geq 0$, we choose a contour γ_R as in (35). Since (36) holds, Cauchy's residue theorem ensures that, for R large enough, we know that

$$\int_{\gamma_R} f_{(\sigma,x)}(\zeta) d\zeta = 2\pi i \operatorname{res}_{\kappa_\sigma} f_{(\sigma,x)} = \frac{1}{|4\sigma - 1|^{1/2}} e^{-(|4\sigma - 1|^{1/2} - 1)x/2}.$$

Therefore, whenever $\sigma < 0$, we have that

$$K_\sigma(x) = \frac{1}{|4\sigma - 1|^{1/2}} e^{-(|4\sigma - 1|^{1/2} - 1)x/2} \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty).$$

This concludes the computation of K_σ , which corresponds to the first part of this lemma. The second part consists of a rudimentary verification. \square

3.2. Proof of the proposition 3.2. After the relations in (30) and (29), one can check that

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_\nu f\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} &= \frac{1}{4|\nu|^2} \frac{1}{(2|\nu|)^{2/q' + n/r'}} \|Sg\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))}, \\ \|g\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} &= (2|\nu|)^{2/q + n/r} \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, since

$$\frac{2}{q} + \frac{n}{r} - 2 - \frac{2}{q'} - \frac{n}{r'} = 2 \left[\frac{2}{q} - 2 + \frac{n}{r} - \frac{n}{2} \right] = 0,$$

the proposition 3.2 is a consequence of the following inequality for S .

Proposition 3.5. *Consider $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(q, r) \in [1, 2] \times [1, 2]$ satisfying (7). There exists a constant $C > 0$ that only depends on n, q and r such that*

$$\|Sf\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \leq C \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Before proceeding with the proof, it might be convenient for the reader to recall the notation of the Schrödinger propagator $e^{-it\Delta}$ in \mathbb{R}^d :

$$e^{-it\Delta} f(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\xi \cdot x} e^{it|\xi|^2} \widehat{f}(\xi) d\xi \quad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d,$$

as well as the inequality

$$(37) \quad \|e^{-it\Delta} f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \frac{1}{|t|^{d/2}} \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

where the implicit constant only depends on d .

Proof of the proposition 3.5 when $(q, r) \neq (2, 2n/(n+2))$. In order to prove the inequality, it will be useful to write Sf in the following form:

$$(38) \quad Sf(t, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} U_s[f(t-s, \cdot)](x) ds \quad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Here U_s denotes the Fourier multiplier given by

$$U_s \phi(x) = i \operatorname{sign}(s) \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix \cdot \xi} e^{is|\xi|^2} \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(s\xi_n) e^{s\xi_n} \widehat{\phi}(\xi) d\xi \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

for $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

To check that (38) holds, start by performing the translation $\sigma = \tau - |\xi|^2$, and writing

$$Sf(t, x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} e^{i(t\sigma + x \cdot \xi)} \frac{e^{it|\xi|^2}}{\sigma + i\xi_n} \widehat{f}(\sigma + |\xi|^2, \xi) d(\sigma, \xi).$$

Observe that

$$Sf(t, x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix \cdot \xi} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\sigma + i\xi_n} e^{it\sigma} e^{it|\xi|^2} \widehat{f}(\sigma + |\xi|^2, \xi) d\sigma \right) d\xi$$

with

$$e^{it\sigma} e^{it|\xi|^2} \widehat{f}(\sigma + |\xi|^2, \xi) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\sigma s} e^{is|\xi|^2} \mathcal{F}[f(t-s, \cdot)](\xi) ds.$$

In the view of these two identities, it is natural to compute

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\sigma + i\xi_n} \check{\phi}(\sigma) d\sigma$$

for $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. We could proceed using Cauchy's residue theorem as in the proposition 3.4, but instead, we will use the well-known formula

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{c+i\cdot}\right)(\xi) = (2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-c\xi} \mathbf{1}_{(0, \infty)}(\xi) \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R},$$

with $c \in (0, \infty)$.

For $\xi_n \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\sigma + i\xi_n} \check{\phi}(\sigma) d\sigma &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{i}{-\xi_n + i\sigma} \check{\phi}(\sigma) d\sigma \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_-}(\xi_n) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\frac{i}{|\xi_n| + i\cdot}\right)(s) \phi(s) ds - \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(\xi_n) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\frac{i}{|\xi_n| + i\cdot}\right)(s) \phi(-s) ds \\ &= i(2\pi)^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{s\xi_n} [\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_-}(\xi_n) \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(s) - \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(\xi_n) \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_-}(s)] \phi(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Here \mathbb{R}_- and \mathbb{R}_+ denote the intervals $(-\infty, 0)$ and $(0, \infty)$ respectively.

Hence,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\sigma + i\xi_n} \check{\phi}(\sigma) d\sigma = i(2\pi)^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \text{sign}(s) \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(s\xi_n) e^{s\xi_n} \phi(s) ds$$

whenever $\xi_n \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$.

All these computations show that

$$Sf(t, x) = \frac{i}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix \cdot \xi} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \text{sign}(s) \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(s\xi_n) e^{s\xi_n} e^{is|\xi|^2} \mathcal{F}[f(t-s, \cdot)](\xi) ds \right) d\xi.$$

Then, changing the order of integration, we obtain the expression (38).

Now, we start with the actual boundedness of S . For that, we will bound the norm of the Fourier multiplier U_s from $L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $r \in [1, 2]$ and r' denoting its conjugate exponent. We proceed by interpolating the following two inequalities:

$$(39) \quad \|U_s \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \|\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

$$(40) \quad \|U_s \phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \frac{1}{|s|^{n/2}} \|\phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

for all $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. The implicit constant of the second inequality only depends on n .

The first inequality follows from Plancherel's identity, while to prove the second inequality, we observe that

$$U_s \phi(x) = \frac{i \text{sign}(s)}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_s(x_n - y_n) e^{-is\Delta} [\phi(\cdot, y_n)](x') dy_n$$

with $x' = (x \cdot e_1, \dots, x \cdot e_{n-1})$ and

$$K_s(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{iy\eta} e^{is\eta^2} \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(s\eta) e^{s\eta} d\eta \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then,

$$\|U_s \phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|K_s\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|e^{-is\Delta}[\phi(\cdot, y_n)]\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})} dy_n.$$

From the estimate (37) with $d = n - 1$, we have that (40) holds if

$$(41) \quad \|K_s\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \frac{1}{|s|^{1/2}}.$$

The inequality $\|K_s\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq 1/|s|$ follows directly from the definition of K_s since

$$\|K_s\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(s\eta) e^{s\eta} d\eta.$$

However, this inequality is weaker than (41) whenever $|s| < 1$. In order to obtain (41), we need to consider the effect coming from the oscillations of $\eta \mapsto e^{is\eta^2}$.

Note that changing $\eta = \xi/s$ in the integral defining K_s , evaluated in $2y$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} K_s(2y) &= \frac{1}{|s|} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i2y\xi/s} e^{i\xi^2/s} \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(\xi) e^\xi d\xi = \frac{e^{-iy^2/s}}{|s|} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i(\xi+y)^2/s} \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(\xi) e^\xi d\xi \\ &= \frac{e^{-iy^2/s}}{|s|} e^{-y} \int_{-\infty}^y e^{i\eta^2/s} e^\eta d\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Using the bound in the proposition 3.6, we have that (41) holds, which confirms that (40) also holds.

From the inequalities (39) and (40), we deduce by the Riesz–Thorin interpolation that

$$(42) \quad \|U_s \phi\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \frac{1}{|s|^{n/r-n/2}} \|\phi\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)} \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\},$$

where $r \in [1, 2]$ and r' is its conjugate exponent. The implicit constant of this inequality only depends on n and r .

From the inequality (42) we derive the the wanted estimate as follows:

$$\|Sf(t, \cdot)\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|U_s[f(t-s, \cdot)]\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ds \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\|f(t-s, \cdot)\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)}}{|s|^{n/r-n/2}} ds \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Applying the Hardy–Littlewood–Sobolev inequality in \mathbb{R} for $n/r - n/2 = 1 - n(1/2 + 1/n - 1/r)$ with $1/q' = 1/q - n(1/2 + 1/n - 1/r)$ we have

$$\|Sf\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

whenever $0 < n(1/2 + 1/n - 1/r) < 1$. This yields the relation between q , r and n .

Note that the condition $0 < n(1/2 + 1/n - 1/r)$ prevents us of reaching the case $(q, r) = (2, 2n/(n+2))$. \square

Lemma 3.6. *For every $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, we have that*

$$\left| \int_{-\infty}^y e^{i\frac{\xi^2}{s}} e^\xi d\xi \right| \lesssim e^y |s|^{1/2}.$$

Proof. Take $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\text{supp } \chi \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R} : |\xi| \leq 2\}$ and $\chi(\xi) = 1$ whenever $|\xi| \leq 1$. For $r \in (0, \infty)$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{\leq r}(\xi) &= \chi(\xi/r) \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \chi_{> r}(\xi) &= 1 - \chi_{\leq r}(\xi) \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand,

$$(43) \quad \left| \int_{-\infty}^y e^{i\frac{\xi^2}{s}} e^\xi \chi_{\leq r}(\xi) d\xi \right| \leq r e^y \|\chi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}.$$

On the other hand

$$\int_{-\infty}^y e^{i\frac{\xi^2}{s}} e^{\xi} \chi_{>r}(\xi) d\xi = -i\frac{s}{2} \int_{-\infty}^y \partial[e^{i\frac{\xi^2}{s}}](\xi) \frac{e^{\xi}}{\xi} \chi_{>r}(\xi) d\xi$$

since

$$\partial[e^{i\frac{\xi^2}{s}}](\xi) = i\frac{2}{s}\xi e^{i\frac{\xi^2}{s}} \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Integrating by parts, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^y \partial[e^{i\frac{\xi^2}{s}}](\xi) \frac{e^{\xi}}{\xi} \chi_{>r}(\xi) d\xi &= e^{i\frac{y^2}{s}} e^y \frac{\chi_{>r}(y)}{y} \\ &\quad - \int_{-\infty}^y e^{i\frac{\xi^2}{s}} e^{\xi} \left[\frac{\chi_{>r}(\xi)}{\xi} - \frac{1}{r} \frac{\chi'_{\leq r}(\xi)}{\xi} - \frac{\chi_{>r}(\xi)}{\xi^2} \right] d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\chi'_{\leq r}(\xi) = \chi'(\xi/r)$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, with χ' denoting the first-order derivative of χ .

The integral in the right-hand side of the previous identity can be bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{-\infty}^y e^{i\frac{\xi^2}{s}} e^{\xi} \left[\frac{\chi_{>r}(\xi)}{\xi} - \frac{1}{r} \frac{\chi'_{\leq r}(\xi)}{\xi} - \frac{\chi_{>r}(\xi)}{\xi^2} \right] d\xi \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|\chi_{>r}(\xi)|}{|\xi|} \int_{-\infty}^y e^{\xi} d\xi + e^y \left[\frac{1}{r} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|\chi'_{\leq r}(\xi)|}{|\xi|} d\xi + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|\chi_{>r}(\xi)|}{\xi^2} d\xi \right] \\ &\leq \frac{e^y}{r} \left[\sup_{\eta \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|1 - \chi(\eta)|}{|\eta|} + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|\chi'(\eta)|}{|\eta|} d\eta + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|1 - \chi(\eta)|}{\eta^2} d\eta \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have that

$$\left| \int_{-\infty}^y \partial[e^{i\frac{\xi^2}{s}}](\xi) \frac{e^{\xi}}{\xi} \chi_{>r}(\xi) d\xi \right| \leq \frac{e^y}{r} \left[2 \sup_{\eta \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|1 - \chi(\eta)|}{|\eta|} + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{|\chi'(\eta)|}{|\eta|} + \frac{|1 - \chi(\eta)|}{\eta^2} \right) d\eta \right].$$

Consequently,

$$(44) \quad \left| \int_{-\infty}^y e^{i\frac{\xi^2}{s}} e^{\xi} \chi_{>r}(\xi) d\xi \right| \lesssim \frac{|s|}{r} e^y.$$

From the inequalities (43) and (44), we have that

$$\left| \int_{-\infty}^y e^{i\frac{\xi^2}{s}} e^{\xi} d\xi \right| \lesssim e^y \left(r + \frac{|s|}{r} \right).$$

Choosing $r \in (0, \infty)$ so that $r = |s|/r$, we obtain the bound stated. \square

In order to prove the proposition 3.5 in the endpoint $(q, r) = (2, 2n/(n+2))$ with $n \geq 3$, we need some preliminary results. Recall the definition of the Fourier multiplier U_s defined in the proof of the proposition 3.5

$$U_s \phi(x) = i \operatorname{sign}(s) \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix \cdot \xi} e^{is|\xi|^2} \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(s\xi_n) e^{s\xi_n} \widehat{\phi}(\xi) d\xi \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

for $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Define the map

$$Tf(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} U_s[f(s, \cdot)](x) ds \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Lemma 3.7. *Consider $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(q, r) \in [1, 2] \times [1, 2]$ satisfying (7) with $(q, r) \neq (2, 2n/(n+2))$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ that only depends on n, q and r such that*

$$\|Tf\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Proof. Start by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Tf\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} U_s[f(s, \bullet)](x) \overline{U_t[f(t, \bullet)](x)} dx \right] d(s, t) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} U_t^* U_s[f(s, \bullet)](x) ds \right] \overline{f(t, x)} d(t, x), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$U_t^* \phi(x) = -i \operatorname{sign}(t) \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix \cdot \xi} e^{-it|\xi|^2} \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(t\xi_n) e^{t\xi_n} \widehat{\phi}(\xi) d\xi \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

and

$$U_t^* U_s \phi(x) = \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(st)}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix \cdot \xi} e^{i(s-t)|\xi|^2} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_-}((s+t)\xi_n) e^{(s+t)\xi_n} \widehat{\phi}(\xi) d\xi \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

with $(s, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Here \mathbb{R}_- and \mathbb{R}_+ denote the intervals $(-\infty, 0)$ and $(0, \infty)$ respectively, and we have used that

$$\operatorname{sign}(s) \operatorname{sign}(t) \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(s\xi_n) \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(t\xi_n) = \mathbf{1}_{(0, \infty)}(st) \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}((s+t)\xi_n).$$

Let L denote the linear operator given by

$$Lf(t, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} U_t^* U_s[f(s, \bullet)](x) ds \quad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

The inequality announced in the statement will follow from the next one

$$(45) \quad \|Lf\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \leq C \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, with q' and r' the conjugate exponents of q and r . Indeed,

$$\|Tf\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2 \leq \|Lf\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))}^2.$$

It can be convenient for the reader to mention here that one can check that $L = T^*T$ with T^* denoting the adjoint of T .

We now focus on showing that (45) holds. This is pretty similar to the proof of the proposition 3.5. Start by bounding the norm of $U_t^* U_s$ from $L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

We proceed again by interpolating the following two inequalities:

$$(46) \quad \|U_t^* U_s \phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \|\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

$$(47) \quad \|U_t^* U_s \phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \frac{1}{|s-t|^{n/2}} \|\phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

for all $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $(s, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ such that $s \neq t$. The implicit constant of the second inequality only depends on n .

The first inequality follows from Plancherel's identity, while to prove the second inequality, we observe that

$$U_t^* U_s \phi(x) = \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(st)}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_{(s,t)}(x_n - y_n) e^{-i(s-t)\Delta} [\phi(\bullet, y_n)](x') dy_n$$

with $x' = (x \cdot e_1, \dots, x \cdot e_{n-1})$ and

$$K_{(s,t)}(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{iy\eta} e^{i(s-t)\eta^2} \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}((s+t)\eta) e^{(s+t)\eta} d\eta \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then,

$$\|U_t^* U_s \phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|K_{(s,t)}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|e^{-i(s-t)\Delta} [\phi(\bullet, y_n)]\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})} dy_n.$$

From the estimate (37) with $d = n - 1$, we have that (47) holds if

$$(48) \quad \|K_{(s,t)}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \frac{1}{|s-t|^{1/2}}$$

for $(s, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ such that $s \neq t$.

Since $st > 0$, we have that $s \neq -t$ and, consequently, we can perform the change variables $\eta = \xi/(s+t)$ in the integral defining $K_{(s,t)}$. Evaluating this in $2y$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} K_{(s,t)}(2y) &= \frac{1}{|s+t|} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i \frac{2y}{s+t} \xi} e^{i \frac{s-t}{(s+t)^2} \xi^2} \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(\xi) e^{\xi} d\xi \\ &= \frac{e^{-i \frac{y^2}{s-t}}}{|s+t|} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i \frac{s-t}{(s+t)^2} \left(\xi + \frac{s+t}{s-t} y\right)^2} \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}(\xi) e^{\xi} d\xi \\ &= \frac{e^{-i \frac{y^2}{s-t}}}{|s+t|} e^{-\frac{s+t}{s-t} y} \int_{-\infty}^{\frac{s+t}{s-t} y} e^{i \frac{s-t}{(s+t)^2} \eta^2} e^{\eta} d\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Using the bound in the proposition 3.6, we have that (48) holds, which confirms that (47) also holds.

From the inequalities (46) and (47), we deduce by the Riesz–Thorin interpolation that

$$(49) \quad \|U_t^* U_s \phi\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \frac{1}{|s-t|^{n/r-n/2}} \|\phi\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)} \quad \forall (s, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} : s \neq t,$$

where $r \in [1, 2]$ and r' is its conjugate exponent. The implicit constant of this inequality only depends on n and r .

From the inequality (49) we derive the the wanted estimate as follows:

$$\|Lf(t, \cdot)\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|U_t^* U_s[f(s, \cdot)]\|_{L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} ds \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\|f(s, \cdot)\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)}}{|s-t|^{n/r-n/2}} ds \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Applying the Hardy–Littlewood–Sobolev inequality in \mathbb{R} for $n/r - n/2 = 1 - n(1/2 + 1/n - 1/r)$ with $1/q' = 1/q - n(1/2 + 1/n - 1/r)$ we have

$$\|Lf\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

whenever $0 < n(1/2 + 1/n - 1/r) < 1$. This implies the relation between q , r and n .

This concludes the proof of the inequality (45), which was the key inequality to ensure the lemma. \square

For convenience, let $r_n \in [1, 2]$ denote $r_n = 2n/(n+2)$.

Proof of the proposition 3.5 when $(q, r) = (2, r_n)$ with $n \geq 3$. For $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ consider

$$S_j f(t, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbf{1}_{2^j}(s) U_s[f(t-s, \cdot)](x) ds \quad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{2^j}$ denotes the characteristic function of $\{s \in \mathbb{R} : 2^{j-1} < |s| \leq 2^j\}$.

Following the approach adopted by Keel and Tao in [34], we will prove that

$$(50) \quad \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} S_j f(t, x) \overline{g(t, x)} d(t, x) \right| \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^{r_n}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \|g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^{r_n}(\mathbb{R}^n))}.$$

Observe that (50) implies by the triangle inequality that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} S f(t, x) \overline{g(t, x)} d(t, x) \right| \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^{r_n}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \|g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^{r_n}(\mathbb{R}^n))},$$

and by duality we obtain the inequality announced in the proposition proposition 3.5 when $(q, r) = (2, 2n/(n+2))$ with $n \geq 3$.

As in [34], our first goal will be to prove the two-parameter family of inequalities:

$$(51) \quad \|S_j f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^{b'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim 2^{-j \frac{n}{2} \left(\frac{1}{a} - \frac{1}{r_n} + \frac{1}{b} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right)} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^a(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $(1/a, 1/b)$ in a neighbourhood of $(1/r_n, 1/r_n)$. The implicit constant only depends on n and the neighbourhood around $(1/r_n, 1/r_n)$.

Observe that still here we cannot sum for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ when $(a, b) = (r_n, r_n)$, since in this case the exponent is 0.

The inequality (51) follows by interpolating the next three inequalities:

$$(52) \quad \|S_j f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim 2^{-j \frac{n}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{r_n} + 1 - \frac{1}{r_n}\right)} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^1(\mathbb{R}^n))},$$

$$(53) \quad \|S_j f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim 2^{-j \frac{n}{2} \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{r_n} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{r_n}\right)} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))},$$

$$(54) \quad \|S_j f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim 2^{-j \frac{n}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{r_n} + \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{r_n}\right)} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)},$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $1 \leq r < r_n$. The implicit constants here only depends on n , as well as on r for those in (53) and (54).

Let us show how to derive these three inequalities.

Using (40), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_j f(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbf{1}_{2^j}(s) \|U_s[f(t-s, \cdot)]\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} ds \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{2^j}(s)}{|s|^{n/2}} \|f(t-s, \cdot)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} ds. \end{aligned}$$

By Young's inequality we have that

$$\|S_j f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim 2^{-j(n/2-1)} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^1(\mathbb{R}^n))},$$

which proves (52).

In order to prove (53), it is convenient to realize that

$$S_j f(t, x) = T g_t^j(x) \quad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$$

with T as in the proposition 3.7 and $g_t^j(s, y) = \mathbf{1}_{2^j}(s) f(t-s, y)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_j f(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} &= \|T g_t^j\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\lesssim \|g_t^j\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbf{1}_{2^j}(s) \|f(t-s, \cdot)\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)}^q ds \right)^{1/q}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Young's inequality for $2/q > 1$ we have that

$$\|S_j f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)}^q \lesssim \|\mathbf{1}_{2^j}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))}^q,$$

which can be re-written as

$$\|S_j f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim 2^{j/q} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} = 2^{-j \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{n}{r} - \frac{n}{2} \right) - 1 \right]} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))},$$

by using the relation (7). This proves the inequality (53) since

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{n}{r} - \frac{n}{2} \right) - 1 = \frac{n}{2} \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{n} \right) = \frac{n}{2} \left(\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{r_n} \right).$$

Finally, the inequality (54) is straightforward after (53) and the identity

$$(55) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} S_j f(t, x) \overline{g(t, x)} d(t, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} \tilde{f}(t, x) \overline{S_j \tilde{g}(t, x)} d(t, x),$$

where $\tilde{f}(t, x) = f(t, x', -x_n)$ and $\tilde{g}(t, x) = g(t, x', -x_n)$.

Before checking that the previous identity holds, let us use it, together with the inequality (53), to derive (54):

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} S_j f(t, x) \overline{g(t, x)} \, d(t, x) \right| \\ & \leq \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \|S_j \tilde{g}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim 2^{j/q} \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \|\tilde{g}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} \\ & = 2^{-j} \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{n}{r} - \frac{n}{2} \right) - 1 \right] \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \|g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by duality we conclude that (54) holds.

Let us check that (55) holds. Start by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} S_j f(t, x) \overline{g(t, x)} \, d(t, x) \\ & = \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} f(s, x) \overline{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbf{1}_{2^j}(t-s) U_{t-s}^*[g(t, \cdot)](x) \, dt \right)} \, d(s, x) \\ & = \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} f(s, x) \overline{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbf{1}_{2^j}(t) U_{-t}^*[g(s-t, \cdot)](x) \, dt \right)} \, d(s, x). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the identity $U_{-t}^*[g(s-t, \cdot)](x) = U_t[\tilde{g}(s-t, \cdot)](x', -x_n)$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} f(s, x) \overline{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbf{1}_{2^j}(t) U_t[\tilde{g}(s-t, \cdot)](x', -x_n) \, dt \right)} \, d(s, x) \\ & = \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} \tilde{f}(s, x) \overline{S_j \tilde{g}(s, x)} \, d(s, x). \end{aligned}$$

From the previous two identities we can conclude that (55) holds.

Now that we know that (52), (53) and (54) hold, by interpolation we obtain (51). At this point, we could just ask the reader to follow the interpolation argument in [34, §5] to derive (50) from (51). However, for the sake of completeness, we reproduce the argument here.

In [34, Lemma 5.1], Keel and Tao proved an atomic decomposition functions in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which allows us to write

$$f(t, x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \alpha_k(t) f_k(t, x) \quad g(t, x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \beta_k(t) g_k(t, x) \quad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $\|f_k\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|g_k\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim 2^{-k/r_n}$, $|\text{supp } f_k \cap \text{supp } f_l| = |\text{supp } g_k \cap \text{supp } g_l| = 0$, $|\text{supp } f_k| + |\text{supp } g_k| \lesssim 2^k$, and

$$\left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\alpha_k(t)|^{r_n} \right)^{1/r_n} \lesssim \|f(t, \cdot)\|_{L^{r_n}(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \quad \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\beta_k(t)|^{r_n} \right)^{1/r_n} \lesssim \|g(t, \cdot)\|_{L^{r_n}(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Note that, using (51) for the atoms $\alpha_k f_k$ and $\beta_l g_l$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} S_j [\alpha_k f_k](t, x) \overline{\beta_l(t) g_l(t, x)} \, d(t, x) \right| \\ & \lesssim 2^{-j \frac{n}{2} \left(\frac{1}{a} - \frac{1}{r_n} + \frac{1}{b} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right)} \|\alpha_k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} 2^{k \left(\frac{1}{a} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right)} \|\beta_l\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} 2^{l \left(\frac{1}{b} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right)} \\ & = 2^{(k-j \frac{n}{2}) \left(\frac{1}{a} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right)} 2^{(l-j \frac{n}{2}) \left(\frac{1}{b} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right)} \|\alpha_k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \|\beta_l\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the previous inequality holds for every $(1/a, 1/b)$ in a neighbourhood of $(1/r_n, 1/r_n)$, one can choose a and b so that $1/a - 1/r_n = -\varepsilon \text{sign}(k - jn/2)$ and $1/b - 1/r_n = -\varepsilon \text{sign}(l - jn/2)$ to obtain

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} S_j [\alpha_k f_k](t, x) \overline{\beta_l(t) g_l(t, x)} \, d(t, x) \right| \lesssim 2^{-\varepsilon(|k-j \frac{n}{2}| + |l-j \frac{n}{2}|)} \|\alpha_k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \|\beta_l\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Then,

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} S_j f(t, x) \overline{g(t, x)} d(t, x) \right| \lesssim \sum_{j, k, l} 2^{-\varepsilon(|k-j\frac{n}{2}| + |l-j\frac{n}{2}|)} \|\alpha_k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \|\beta_l\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Since

$$\left| k - j\frac{n}{2} \right| + \left| l - j\frac{n}{2} \right| \geq \frac{1}{2}(|k-l| + |nj - (k+l)|),$$

and

$$\sum_j 2^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}|nj-(k+l)|} \lesssim \sum_j 2^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}|j|} \lesssim 1,$$

we have that

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} S_j f(t, x) \overline{g(t, x)} d(t, x) \right| \lesssim \sum_{k, l} 2^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}|k-l|} \|\alpha_k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \|\beta_l\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Using Cauchy–Schwarz in the sum in k , and then Young’s inequality to deal with the convolution, we obtain that

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} S_j f(t, x) \overline{g(t, x)} d(t, x) \right| \lesssim \sum_j 2^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}|j|} \left(\sum_k \|\alpha_k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_l \|\beta_l\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} S_j f(t, x) \overline{g(t, x)} d(t, x) \right| &\lesssim \left\| \left(\sum_k |\alpha_k|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \left\| \left(\sum_l |\beta_l|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \left(\sum_k |\alpha_k|^{r_n} \right)^{1/r_n} \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \left\| \left(\sum_l |\beta_l|^{r_n} \right)^{1/r_n} \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^{r_n}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \|g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^{r_n}(\mathbb{R}^n))}, \end{aligned}$$

which prove the inequality (50). \square

4. BOUNDS FOR THE BIRMAN–SCHWINGER OPERATOR

The goal of this section is to prove that the norm of the Birman–Schwinger operator $M_W \circ S_\nu \circ M_{|W|}$, with W given by (12), tends to vanish as $|\nu|$ increase. Actually, we will prove a more general result for an operator of the same form $M_{W_1} \circ S_\nu \circ M_{W_2}$ —with W_1 and W_2 unrelated.

Proposition 4.1. *Consider $S, T \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $S < T$. Let W_1 and W_2 be two measurable functions in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with support in $[S, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$.*

For $j \in \{1, 2\}$, assume that

- (a) $|W_j|^2 \in L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with $(a, b) \in [1, \infty] \times [1, \infty]$ satisfying (10),
- (b) *there is $R_j > 0$ so that*

$$(56) \quad \sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|\mathbf{1}_{>R_j} |W_j|^2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\omega, s})} ds < \infty,$$

and $\mathbf{1}_{\leq R_j} W_j \in C(\mathbb{R}; L^n(\mathbb{R}^n))$ if $(a, b) = (\infty, n/2)$ for $n \geq 3$.

Then,

$$\lim_{|\nu| \rightarrow \infty} \|M_{W_1} \circ S_\nu \circ M_{W_2}\|_{\mathcal{L}[L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)]} = 0.$$

Remark 4.2. If we fix a direction $\hat{\nu} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, and we let ν denote any vector in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ parallel to $\hat{\nu}$, then condition (56) is only needed for $\omega = \hat{\nu}$.

Before proving the proposition 4.1, it is convenient to make some observations.
As a consequence of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality we have that

$$(57) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|Wu\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\omega,s})} ds \leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \| |W|^2 \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\omega,s})} ds \right)^{1/2} \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Then, by duality

$$(58) \quad \|Wu\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \| |W|^2 \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\omega,s})} ds \right)^{1/2} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\omega,s})}.$$

It follows from Hölder's inequality that

$$(59) \quad \|Wu\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} \leq \| |W|^2 \|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))}^{1/2} \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)},$$

with $(q, r) \in [1, 2] \times [1, 2]$ and $(a, b) \in [1, \infty] \times [1, \infty]$ satisfying the relation (21), or equivalently (9). Once again, by duality we obtain

$$(60) \quad \|Wu\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \| |W|^2 \|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))}^{1/2} \|u\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

with q' and r' denoting the conjugate exponents of q and r .

Proof of the proposition 4.1. We will decompose W_j as $W_j = W_j^\sharp + W_j^b$, where the choices of W_j^\sharp and W_j^b depend on whether $(a, b) \neq (\infty, n/2)$ for $n \geq 2$ or $(a, b) = (\infty, n/2)$ for $n \geq 3$. Then,

$$(61) \quad \begin{aligned} \|W_1 S_\nu(W_2 u)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq \|W_1^\sharp S_\nu(W_2^\sharp u)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|W_1^\sharp S_\nu(W_2^b u)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\quad + \|W_1^b S_\nu(W_2 u)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, the inequalities (57) and (58), together with the proposition 3.1, imply that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|W_1^\sharp S_\nu(W_2^\sharp u)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{|\nu|} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \| |W_1^\sharp|^2 \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\nu,s})} ds \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \| |W_2^\sharp|^2 \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\nu,s})} ds \right)^{1/2} \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the inequalities (59) and (60), together with the proposition 3.2, imply that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|W_1^\sharp S_\nu(W_2^b u)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} + \|W_1^b S_\nu(W_2 u)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\lesssim \| |W_1^\sharp|^2 \|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))}^{1/2} \| |W_2^b|^2 \|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))}^{1/2} \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\quad + \| |W_1^b|^2 \|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))}^{1/2} \| |W_2|^2 \|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))}^{1/2} \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Whenever $(a, b) \neq (\infty, n/2)$ with $n \geq 2$, we choose, for $\lambda > 0$ and $j \in \{1, 2\}$, the functions

$$W_j^\sharp = \mathbf{1}_{\leq R_j} \mathbf{1}_{|W_j| \leq \lambda} W_j + \mathbf{1}_{> R_j} W_j, \quad W_j^b = W_j - W_j^\sharp,$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{|W_j| \leq \lambda}$ denote the characteristic function of $\{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n : |W_j(t, x)| \leq \lambda\}$ respectively.

With this choice, one can check that

$$\| |W_j^\sharp|^2 \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\nu,s})} \leq \lambda^2 \mathbf{1}_{[-R_j, R_j]}(s) + \| \mathbf{1}_{> R_j} |W_j|^2 \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\nu,s})}$$

which in turns implies that

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \| |W_j^\sharp|^2 \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\nu,s})} ds \right)^{1/2} \leq \lambda (2R_j)^{1/2} + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \| \mathbf{1}_{> R_j} |W_j|^2 \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\nu,s})} ds \right)^{1/2}.$$

Furthermore, $|W_1^\sharp(t, x)| \leq |W_1(t, x)|$ for almost every $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$, and

$$\| |W_j^b|^2 \|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))}^{1/2} = \| \mathbf{1}_{\leq R_j} \mathbf{1}_{|W_j| > \lambda} |W_j|^2 \|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))}^{1/2}.$$

As suggested by the notation, $\mathbf{1}_{|W_j|>\lambda}$ denotes the characteristic function of the set $\{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n : |W_j(t, x)| > \lambda\}$.

Gathering these upper bounds and plugging into the (61), we obtain that there exists a constant $C > 0$ that only depends on n , (a, b) and R_j , as well as on $\|W_j\|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))}$ and the quantity in (56) for $j \in \{1, 2\}$, such that

$$\|M_{W_1} \circ S_\nu \circ M_{W_2}\|_{\mathcal{L}[L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)]} \leq C \left(\frac{\lambda^2 + 1}{|\nu|} + \sum_{j \in \{1, 2\}} \|\mathbf{1}_{|W_j|>\lambda} |W_j|^2\|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))}^{1/2} \right)$$

for all $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and $\lambda > 0$.

Finally, to see that

$$\lim_{|\nu| \rightarrow \infty} \|M_{W_1} \circ S_\nu \circ M_{W_2}\|_{\mathcal{L}[L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)]} = 0$$

it is enough to choose $\lambda^2 = |\nu|^{1/2}$ and make $|\nu|$ tend to ∞ .

We now turn our attention to the endpoint $(a, b) = (\infty, n/2)$ for $n \geq 3$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, one can find a partition $S = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_m < t_{m+1} = T$ for which the piecewise constant-in-time approximation satisfies

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left\| \mathbf{1}_{\leq R_j} \left(W_j(t, \cdot) - \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{(t_{k-1}, t_k]}(t) W_j(t_k, \cdot) \right) \right\|_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \varepsilon.$$

For $\lambda > 0$ and $j \in \{1, 2\}$, we introduce the functions

$$W_j^\sharp = \mathbf{1}_{\leq R_j} \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{(t_{k-1}, t_k]} \mathbf{1}_{|W_j(t_k, \cdot)| \leq \lambda} W_j(t_k, \cdot) + \mathbf{1}_{> R_j} W_j, \quad W_j^\flat = W_j - W_j^\sharp,$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{|W_j(t_k, \cdot)| \leq \lambda}$ denotes the indicator function of $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |W_j(t_k, x)| \leq \lambda\}$.

With this choice, we have again that

$$\|W_j^\sharp\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\nu, s})} \leq \lambda^2 \mathbf{1}_{[-R_j, R_j]}(s) + \|\mathbf{1}_{> R_j} |W_j|^2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\nu, s})}$$

which in turns implies that

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \|W_j^\sharp\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\nu, s})}^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \leq \lambda (2R_j)^{1/2} + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \|\mathbf{1}_{> R_j} |W_j|^2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times H_{\nu, s})} ds \right)^{1/2}.$$

Furthermore $\|W_1^\sharp\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}; L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \leq \|W_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}; L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))}$, and

$$W_j^\flat = \mathbf{1}_{\leq R_j} \left(W_j - \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{(t_{k-1}, t_k]} W_j(t_k, \cdot) \right) + \mathbf{1}_{\leq R_j} \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{(t_{k-1}, t_k]} \mathbf{1}_{|W_j(t_k, \cdot)| > \lambda} W_j(t_k, \cdot)$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{|W_j(t_k, \cdot)| > \lambda}$ denotes the indicator function of $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |W_j(t_k, x)| > \lambda\}$.

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|W_j^\flat\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}; L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))}^{1/2} &\leq \left\| \mathbf{1}_{\leq R_j} \left(W_j - \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{(t_{k-1}, t_k]} W_j(t_k, \cdot) \right) \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}; L^n(\mathbb{R}^n))} \\ &\quad + \left\| \mathbf{1}_{\leq R_j} \left| \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{(t_{k-1}, t_k]} \mathbf{1}_{|W_j(t_k, \cdot)| > \lambda} W_j(t_k, \cdot) \right|^2 \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}; L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbf{1}_{\leq R_j} \left| \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{(t_{k-1}, t_k]} \mathbf{1}_{|W_j(t_k, \cdot)| > \lambda} W_j(t_k, \cdot) \right|^2 \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}; L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))}^{1/2} \\ = \max_{k \in \{1, \dots, m\}} \left\| \mathbf{1}_{\leq R_j} \mathbf{1}_{|W_j(t_k, \cdot)| > \lambda} |W_j(t_k, \cdot)|^2 \right\|_{L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

and λ can be chosen so that the right-hand side of the previous identity becomes

$$\max_{k \in \{1, \dots, m\}} \left\| \mathbf{1}_{\leq R_j} \mathbf{1}_{|W_j(t_k, \cdot)| > \lambda} |W_j(t_k, \cdot)|^2 \right\|_{L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{1/2} < \varepsilon.$$

Therefore,

$$\| |W_j^b|^2 \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}; L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))}^{1/2} \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

Gathering these upper bounds and plugging into the (61), we obtain that there exists a constant $C > 0$ that only depends on n and R_j , as well as on the norm of $|W_j|^2$ in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}; L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ and the quantity in (56) for $j \in \{1, 2\}$, such that

$$\|M_{W_1} \circ S_\nu \circ M_{W_2}\|_{\mathcal{L}[L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)]} \leq C \left(\frac{\lambda^2 + 1}{|\nu|} + \varepsilon \right)$$

for all $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$.

Choosing ν so that $|\nu|$ is sufficiently large, we obtain that

$$\|M_{W_1} \circ S_\nu \circ M_{W_2}\|_{\mathcal{L}[L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)]} \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

This already ensures that the statement also holds for the endpoint with the continuity as an extra assumption. \square

5. HAMILTONIANS WITH IDENTICAL INITIAL-TO-FINAL-STATE MAPS

We begin this section by recalling key facts about the well-posedness of the initial-value problem (1). Following this, we prove an integral identity that establishes the orthogonality relation (2). Finally, we derive a dual description of (2), a formulation essential for later extending the orthogonality relation to CGO solutions.

Consider

$$V = V^\sharp + V^b$$

with $V^\sharp \in L^1((0, T); L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n))$ and $V^b \in L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(a, b) \in [1, \infty] \times [1, \infty]$ satisfying (10). At the endpoint $(a, b) = (\infty, n/2)$ with $n \geq 3$, we further assume that $V^b \in C([0, T]; L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

Then, for every $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, there exists a unique $u \in C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap L^{q'}((0, T); L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ solving the problem (1)—see for example [24, 33, 41]¹—with $(q', r') \in [2, \infty] \times [2, \infty]$ satisfying (17).

Moreover, the linear map

$$f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \mapsto u \in C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap L^{q'}((0, T); L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$$

is bounded. Consequently, for every $t \in [0, T]$, the linear maps

$$\mathcal{U}_t : f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \mapsto u(t, \cdot) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

is also bounded.

One can check that the pair $(q', r') \in [2, \infty] \times [2, \infty]$ is an admissible Strichartz pair that satisfies the relation (8).

The assumption $V^b \in C([0, T]; L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ can be replaced by a smallness condition the quantity $\|V^b\|_{L^\infty((s, s+\delta); L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))}$ for some $\delta > 0$ and all $s \in [0, T - \delta]$ —see [33].

In the view of the relation between the functional spaces involved in the initial-value problem (1), it seems convenient to introduce some notation:

Let X denote the set

$$X = \{F^\sharp + F^b : F^\sharp \in L^1((0, T); L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)) \text{ and } F^b \in L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))\},$$

where $(q, r) \in [1, 2] \times [1, 2]$ satisfies (7). Endowed with the norm

$$\|F\|_X = \inf\{\|F^\sharp\|_{L^1((0, T); L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} + \|F^b\|_{L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} : F = F^\sharp + F^b\},$$

the normed space $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$ becomes Banach.

¹This solution is obtained by solving an integral equation that is a consequence of Duhamel's principle. One can check that this solution u satisfies the equation $(i\partial_t + \Delta - V)u = 0$ in $(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n$ in the sense of distributions.

Let X^\star denote the set

$$X^\star = C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cap L^{q'}((0, T); L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$$

where q' and r' denote the conjugate exponents of q and r . Endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{X^\star} = \max \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \|u\|_{L^{q'}((0, T); L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \right),$$

the normed space $(X^\star, \|\cdot\|_{X^\star})$ becomes Banach and can be identified with a subspace of the dual of $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$.

Consider $(a, b) \in [1, \infty] \times [1, \infty]$ satisfies (10). Let Y denote the set

$$Y = \{V^\sharp + V^\flat : V^\sharp \in L^1((0, T); L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)) \text{ and } V^\flat \in L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))\}$$

if $(a, b) \neq (\infty, n/2)$, or

$$Y = \{V^\sharp + V^\flat : V^\sharp \in L^1((0, T); L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)) \text{ and } V^\flat \in C([0, T]; L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))\}$$

if $(a, b) = (\infty, n/2)$ and $n \geq 3$. Endowed with the norm

$$\|V\|_Y = \inf \{ \|V^\sharp\|_{L^1((0, T); L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n))} + \|V^\flat\|_{L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))} : V = V^\sharp + V^\flat \},$$

the normed space $(Y, \|\cdot\|_Y)$ becomes Banach.

Throughout this section, the pairs (a, b) , (q, r) and (q', r') corresponding to Y , X and X^\star respectively, are always related by the identity (9).

5.1. An integral identity for physical solutions. The main goal here is to state an integral formula that relates the initial-to-final-state maps with their corresponding potentials. The identity consists of a straightforward generalization of the one proved in [20] for potentials V_1 and V_2 in $L^1((0, T); L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

Proposition 5.1. *Let V_1 and V_2 belong to Y . For every $f, g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ we have that*

$$(62) \quad i \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\mathcal{U}_T^1 - \mathcal{U}_T^2) f \bar{g} = \int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2) u_1 \bar{v}_2,$$

where $u_1 \in X^\star$ is the physical solution of (1) with potential V_1 and initial data f , and $v_2 \in X^\star$ is the physical solution of the following final-value problem

$$(63) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t v_2 = -\Delta v_2 + \bar{V}_2 v_2 & \text{in } \Sigma, \\ v_2(T, \cdot) = g & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases}$$

In [20], we showed that the previous identity for potentials in $L^1((0, T); L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n))$ follows from a suitable integration-by-parts formula. We now state the corresponding integration by parts in our context:

Proposition 5.2. *Consider $u, v \in X^\star$ such that $(i\partial_t + \Delta)u$ and $(i\partial_t + \Delta)v$ belong to X . Then, we have*

$$\int_{\Sigma} [(i\partial_t + \Delta)u \bar{v} - u \overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta)v}] = i \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [u(T, \cdot) \overline{v(T, \cdot)} - u(0, \cdot) \overline{v(0, \cdot)}].$$

The proof of the proposition 5.1 is straightforward after one has the right integration-by-parts formula. In fact, the proof follows exactly the same lines as the [20, Proposition 4.1]. Since it is rather short, we include it here for completeness.

Proof of the proposition 5.1. Beside the solutions u_1 and v_2 , consider a third solution $u_2 \in X^\star$ of the initial-value problem (1) with potential V_2 and initial state f .

Note that for $j \in \{1, 2\}$ we have that

$$\int_{\Sigma} (V_j - V_2) u_j \bar{v}_2 = \int_{\Sigma} [(i\partial_t + \Delta)u_j \bar{v}_2 - u_j \overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta)v_2}].$$

Since $u_j, v_2 \in X^*$ and $V_1, \overline{V_2} \in Y$, we have that $(i\partial_t + \Delta)u_j$ and $(i\partial_t + \Delta)v_2$ belong to X . Then, the proposition 5.2 yields

$$\int_{\Sigma} (V_j - V_2)u_j \overline{v_2} = i \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [u_j(T, \cdot) \overline{v_2(T, \cdot)} - u_j(0, \cdot) \overline{v_2(0, \cdot)}].$$

From the previous identity we obtain, for $j = 1$, that

$$(64) \quad \int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2)u_1 \overline{v_2} = i \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [u_1(T, \cdot) \overline{v_2(T, \cdot)} - u_1(0, \cdot) \overline{v_2(0, \cdot)}],$$

while for $j = 2$ we have that

$$(65) \quad i \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [u_2(T, \cdot) \overline{v_2(T, \cdot)} - u_2(0, \cdot) \overline{v_2(0, \cdot)}] = 0.$$

Subtracting the left-hand side of (65) to the right-hand side of (64), we get

$$\int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2)u_1 \overline{v_2} = i \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [u_1(T, \cdot) - u_2(T, \cdot)] \overline{v_2(T, \cdot)}$$

since $u_1(0, \cdot) = u_2(0, \cdot) = f$.

Additionally, since $u_j(T, \cdot) = \mathcal{U}_T^j f$ and $v_2(0, \cdot) = g$, we obtain the identity (62). \square

The proposition 5.2 is proved using the same ideas we used in the proof of [20, Proposition 4.2]. For convenience for the reader, we have include section A a sketch of the proof of proposition 5.2.

5.2. Dual form of the orthogonality relation. When $\mathcal{U}_T^1 = \mathcal{U}_T^2$ the proposition 5.1 yields an orthogonality relation for physical solutions. Here we derive a pair of results that provide a dual description of this orthogonality relation.

It is convenient to recall the well-posedness of the following problem.

$$(66) \quad \begin{cases} (i\partial_t + \Delta - V)u = F & \text{in } \Sigma, \\ u(0, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases}$$

Consider $V \in Y$. Then, for every $F \in X$, there exists a unique $u \in X^*$ solving the problem (66). Moreover, the linear map $F \in X \mapsto u \in X^*$ is bounded. This fact has been proved for example in [24, 41]².

Lemma 5.3. *Given $V \in Y$, let $u \in X^*$ be the solution of the problem (66) with $F \in X$. If F satisfies that*

$$\int_{\Sigma} F \overline{v} = 0$$

for every $v \in X^$ solving the final-value problem*

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t v = -\Delta v + \overline{V}v & \text{in } \Sigma, \\ v(T, \cdot) = g & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

with final value $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then

$$u(T, \cdot) = 0.$$

The proof of the proposition 5.3 follows exactly the same lines as the [20, Lemma 4.4], but we include it here for completeness, and since it is rather short.

²This solution is again obtained by solving an integral equation that is a consequence of Duhamel's principle. One can check that this solution u satisfies the equation $(i\partial_t + \Delta - V)u = F$ in Σ in the sense of distributions.

Proof of the proposition 5.3. Consider $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and let $v \in X^*$ denote the solution of the corresponding final-value problem. Then, by the proposition 5.2, and the fact that $u(0, \cdot) = 0$, we have

$$i \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u(T, \cdot) \bar{g} = \int_{\Sigma} [(i\partial_t + \Delta)u\bar{v} - u\overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta)v}].$$

Note that the proposition 5.2 can be applied because $F \in X$, $V \in Y$, and u and v belong to X^* .

Adding and subtracting $Vu\bar{v}$ we have, by (66), that

$$i \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u(T, \cdot) \bar{g} = \int_{\Sigma} F\bar{v} - \int_{\Sigma} u\overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta - \bar{V})v}.$$

The first term on the right-hand side is assumed to vanish, while the second term vanishes because v is the solution of the final-value problem.

Hence,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u(T, \cdot) \bar{g} = 0$$

Since g is arbitrary, we can conclude that $u(T, \cdot) = 0$. \square

We will need a symmetric version of this lemma that we state without proof.

Lemma 5.4. *Given $V \in Y$, let $v \in X^*$ be the solution of the problem*

$$(67) \quad \begin{cases} (i\partial_t + \Delta - \bar{V})v = G & \text{in } \Sigma, \\ v(T, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

with $G \in X$. If G satisfies that

$$\int_{\Sigma} \bar{G}u = 0$$

for every $u \in X^*$ solving the initial-value problem (1) with $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then

$$v(0, \cdot) = 0.$$

5.3. An integration by parts for exponential growing functions. The dual counterparts of the orthogonality relation for physical solutions can be used to extend the integration-by-parts formula of the proposition 5.2 for a suitable u with vanishing initial and final states and v having an exponential growth. To do so, we need to first show that such u has an exponential decay whenever $(i\partial_t + \Delta)u$ has it too.

Lemma 5.5. *Consider $F \in L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$, with $(q, r) \in [1, 2] \times [1, 2]$ satisfying (7). Let $u \in X^*$ satisfy the conditions*

$$\begin{cases} (i\partial_t + \Delta)u = F & \text{in } \Sigma, \\ u(0, \cdot) = u(T, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases}$$

If we additionally assume that $e^{c|\cdot|}F \in L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$ for some $c > 0$, then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ that only depends on n, q and r such that

$$\|e^{\nu \cdot x} u\|_{L^{q'}((0, T); L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \leq C \|e^{\nu \cdot x} F\|_{L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

for all $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ with $|\nu| < c$.

This lemma is pretty similar to [20, Lemma 4.6]. Actually, it is an adaptation of this to our case in the light of the proposition 3.2. For this reason, we omit the proof at this point and include it in the section B.

Remark 5.6. For F and u in the conditions of the proposition 5.5 we have that $e^{c'|\cdot|}u \in L^{q'}((0, T); L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ for all $c' < c$.

A useful consequence of the propositions 5.5 and 5.6 is the following integration-by-parts formula that admits exponentially-growing functions.

Proposition 5.7. *Consider $F \in L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$, with $(q, r) \in [1, 2] \times [1, 2]$ satisfying (7). Let $u \in X^*$ satisfy the conditions*

$$\begin{cases} (i\partial_t + \Delta)u = F & \text{in } \Sigma, \\ u(0, \cdot) = u(T, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases}$$

For every $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, consider a locally integrable measurable function $v^\nu : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $e^{-\nu \cdot x}(i\partial_t + \Delta)v^\nu \in L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$, and for which there is $w^\nu \in L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ so that $\nu \cdot \nabla(e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu - w^\nu) = 0$, and

$$\|e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu - w^\nu\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(H_{\hat{\nu}}))} < \infty.$$

If we additionally assume that $e^{c|x|}F \in L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$ for some $c > 0$, then,

$$\int_{\Sigma} (i\partial_t + \Delta)u \overline{v^\nu} = \int_{\Sigma} u \overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta)v^\nu}$$

for all $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ with $|\nu| < c$.

Remark 5.8. When reading this statement, it could be helpful for the reader to keep in mind a CGO solution $u = e^{i|\nu|t + \nu \cdot x}(u^\sharp + u^\flat)$ as the one in the proposition 2.3. In the setting of the proposition 5.7, v^ν and w^ν are playing the roles of χu and $\chi e^{i|\nu|t}u^\flat$ respectively, with χ a bump function of the time variable taking value 1 in the interval $(0, T)$.

Remark 5.9. Note that $(i\partial_t + \Delta)u \overline{v^\nu}$ and $u \overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta)v^\nu}$ are in $L^1(\Sigma)$, and therefore, each side of the integration-by-parts formula of the proposition 5.7 makes sense.

- (a) In order to see that $u \overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta)v^\nu} \in L^1(\Sigma)$, we note that by the proposition 5.5 we have $e^{\nu \cdot x}u \in L^{q'}((0, T); L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$, while $e^{-\nu \cdot x}(i\partial_t + \Delta)v^\nu \in L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$ by assumption.
- (b) The fact $(i\partial_t + \Delta)u \overline{v^\nu} \in L^1(\Sigma)$, or equivalently $F \overline{v^\nu} \in L^1(\Sigma)$, can be derived as follows: If we write

$$F \overline{v^\nu} = e^{\nu \cdot x}F \overline{[e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu - w^\nu]} + e^{\nu \cdot x}F \overline{w^\nu},$$

we can apply Hölder's inequality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma} |F \overline{v^\nu}| &\leq \int_0^T \|e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu(t, \cdot) - w^\nu(t, \cdot)\|_{L^{r'}(H_{\hat{\nu}})} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \|e^{\nu \cdot x}F(t, \cdot)\|_{L^r(H_{\hat{\nu}, s})} ds \right) dt \\ &\quad + \|e^{\nu \cdot x}F\|_{L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} \|w^\nu\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used that $\nu \cdot \nabla(e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu - w^\nu) = 0$.

Since

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \|e^{\nu \cdot x}F(t, \cdot)\|_{L^r(H_{\hat{\nu}, s})} ds \leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-r'(c|s| - |\nu|s)} ds \right)^{1/r'} \|e^{c|\hat{\nu} \cdot x|}F(t, \cdot)\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma} |F \overline{v^\nu}| &\lesssim \int_0^T \|e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu(t, \cdot) - w^\nu(t, \cdot)\|_{L^{r'}(H_{\hat{\nu}})} \|e^{c|x|}F(t, \cdot)\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)} dt \\ &\quad + \|e^{c|x|}F\|_{L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} \|w^\nu\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Hölder's inequality we conclude that

$$(68) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma} |F \overline{v^\nu}| &\lesssim \|e^{c|x|}F\|_{L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} \\ &\quad (\|e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu - w^\nu\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(H_{\hat{\nu}}))} + \|w^\nu\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))}), \end{aligned}$$

and consequently $F \overline{v^\nu} \in L^1(\Sigma)$.

Proof. The main idea of the proof is to approximate v^ν by v_ε^ν so that we can integrate by parts following the proposition 5.2. The argument goes as follows.

After proving

$$(69) \quad \int_{\Sigma} (i\partial_t + \Delta) u \overline{v^\nu} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Sigma} (i\partial_t + \Delta) u \overline{v_\varepsilon^\nu},$$

we could apply the proposition 5.2 to obtain

$$\int_{\Sigma} (i\partial_t + \Delta) u \overline{v_\varepsilon^\nu} = \int_{\Sigma} u \overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta) v_\varepsilon^\nu},$$

since $u(0, \cdot) = u(T, \cdot) = 0$. Then, to conclude the identity of the statement, we would only need to check that

$$(70) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Sigma} u \overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta) v_\varepsilon^\nu} = \int_{\Sigma} u \overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta) v^\nu}.$$

The rest of the proof consists of defining the v_ε^ν that will approximate v^ν , and showing that (69) and (70) hold.

Consider a smooth cut-off $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $0 \leq \chi(x) \leq 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\text{supp } \chi \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| \leq 2\}$ and $\chi(x) = 1$ whenever $|x| \leq 1$. Consider $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\text{supp } \varphi \subset [-1, 1] \times K$ with K a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^n , $\int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} \varphi = 1$ and $\varphi(t, x) \in [0, \infty)$ for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Whenever $R, \varepsilon > 0$, define $\chi^R(x) = \chi(x/R)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\varphi_\varepsilon(t, x) = \varepsilon^{-(n+1)} \varphi(t/\varepsilon, x/\varepsilon)$ for $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Define

$$v_\varepsilon^\nu = e^{\nu \cdot x} \chi^{R(\varepsilon)} \varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x} v^\nu),$$

where $\varepsilon \in (0, 1) \mapsto R(\varepsilon) \in (0, \infty)$ is continuous and $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} R(\varepsilon) = \infty$.

The identity (69) is a consequence of

$$(71) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_{\Sigma} F(\overline{v^\nu - v_\varepsilon^\nu}) \right| = 0.$$

In order to check that this limit holds, we re-write $F(\overline{v^\nu - v_\varepsilon^\nu})$ in a similar form as we wrote $F\overline{v^\nu}$ in the item (b) of the proposition 5.9 and we derive an inequality similar to (68). Indeed, from the identity

$$e^{-\nu \cdot x} (v^\nu - v_\varepsilon^\nu) = (e^{-\nu \cdot x} v^\nu - w^\nu) - \chi^{R(\varepsilon)} \varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x} v^\nu - w^\nu) + w^\nu - \chi^{R(\varepsilon)} \varphi_\varepsilon * w^\nu,$$

we have that

$$\begin{aligned} F(\overline{v^\nu - v_\varepsilon^\nu}) &= e^{\nu \cdot x} F[\overline{(e^{-\nu \cdot x} v^\nu - w^\nu) - \chi^{R(\varepsilon)} \varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x} v^\nu - w^\nu)}] \\ &\quad + e^{\nu \cdot x} F[\overline{w^\nu - \chi^{R(\varepsilon)} \varphi_\varepsilon * w^\nu}]. \end{aligned}$$

Arguing as we did to obtain the inequality (68) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma} |F(\overline{v^\nu - v_\varepsilon^\nu})| &\lesssim \|e^{c|x|} F\|_{L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} (\|w^\nu - \chi^{R(\varepsilon)} \varphi_\varepsilon * w^\nu\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \\ &\quad + \|(e^{-\nu \cdot x} v^\nu - w^\nu) - \chi^{R(\varepsilon)} \varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x} v^\nu - w^\nu)\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(H_\nu))}). \end{aligned}$$

After this inequality, (71) holds if

$$(72) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[\|(e^{-\nu \cdot x} v^\nu - w^\nu) - \chi^{R(\varepsilon)} \varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x} v^\nu - w^\nu)\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(H_\nu))} \right] = 0$$

and

$$(73) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|w^\nu - \chi^{R(\varepsilon)} \varphi_\varepsilon * w^\nu\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} = 0.$$

At this point, it is a standard procedure to check that (72) and (73) hold.

This ends the proof of (69). We now turn our attention to (70).

Applying Leibniz's rule we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(i\partial_t + \Delta)v_\varepsilon^\nu &= e^{\nu \cdot x}(i\partial_t + \Delta + 2\nu \cdot \nabla + |\nu|^2)[\chi^{R(\varepsilon)}\varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu)] \\
&= e^{\nu \cdot x}\chi^{R(\varepsilon)}(i\partial_t + \Delta + 2\nu \cdot \nabla + |\nu|^2)[\varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu)] \\
&\quad + e^{\nu \cdot x}\frac{2}{R(\varepsilon)}\nabla\chi(\cdot/R(\varepsilon)) \cdot (\nabla[\varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu)] + \varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu)\nu) \\
&\quad + e^{\nu \cdot x}\frac{1}{R(\varepsilon)^2}\Delta\chi(\cdot/R(\varepsilon))\varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu).
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that part of the first summand on the right-hand side of the second equality can be re-written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
(i\partial_t + \Delta + 2\nu \cdot \nabla + |\nu|^2)[\varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu)] &= \varphi_\varepsilon * [(i\partial_t + \Delta + 2\nu \cdot \nabla + |\nu|^2)(e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu)] \\
&= \varphi_\varepsilon * [e^{-\nu \cdot x}(i\partial_t + \Delta)v^\nu].
\end{aligned}$$

Now, the whole first summand that we were referring to, can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{\nu \cdot x}\chi^{R(\varepsilon)}(i\partial_t + \Delta + 2\nu \cdot \nabla + |\nu|^2)[\varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu)] \\
= (i\partial_t + \Delta)v^\nu + e^{\nu \cdot x}(\chi^{R(\varepsilon)}\varphi_\varepsilon * [e^{-\nu \cdot x}(i\partial_t + \Delta)v^\nu] - e^{-\nu \cdot x}(i\partial_t + \Delta)v^\nu).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
(i\partial_t + \Delta)v_\varepsilon^\nu &= (i\partial_t + \Delta)v^\nu + e^{\nu \cdot x}(\chi^{R(\varepsilon)}\varphi_\varepsilon * [e^{-\nu \cdot x}(i\partial_t + \Delta)v^\nu] - e^{-\nu \cdot x}(i\partial_t + \Delta)v^\nu) \\
&\quad + e^{\nu \cdot x}\frac{2}{R(\varepsilon)}\nabla\chi(\cdot/R(\varepsilon)) \cdot (\nabla[\varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu)] + \varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu)\nu) \\
&\quad + e^{\nu \cdot x}\frac{1}{R(\varepsilon)^2}\Delta\chi(\cdot/R(\varepsilon))\varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu).
\end{aligned}$$

In the view of last identity, (70) holds if the following limits vanish:

$$(74) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Sigma} e^{\nu \cdot x}u(\chi^{R(\varepsilon)}\varphi_\varepsilon * [e^{-\nu \cdot x}\overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta)v^\nu}] - e^{-\nu \cdot x}\overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta)v^\nu}),$$

$$(75) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{2}{R(\varepsilon)} \int_{\Sigma} e^{\nu \cdot x}u\nabla\chi(\cdot/R(\varepsilon)) \cdot (\nabla[\varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x}\overline{v^\nu})] + \varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x}\overline{v^\nu})\nu),$$

$$(76) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{R(\varepsilon)^2} \int_{\Sigma} e^{\nu \cdot x}u\Delta\chi(\cdot/R(\varepsilon))\varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x}\overline{v^\nu}).$$

The limit (74) vanishes because $e^{\nu \cdot x}u$ belongs to $L^{q'}((0, T); L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$, $e^{-\nu \cdot x}(i\partial_t + \Delta)v^\nu \in L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$ by assumption, and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\chi^{R(\varepsilon)}\varphi_\varepsilon * [e^{-\nu \cdot x}\overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta)v^\nu}] - e^{-\nu \cdot x}\overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta)v^\nu}\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} = 0.$$

Note that $e^{\nu \cdot x}u \in L^{q'}((0, T); L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ after the proposition 5.5, while the previous limit follows from the same type of arguments that guarantees that (72) and (73) hold.

Next we will show that

$$(77) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{2}{R(\varepsilon)} \int_{\Sigma} e^{\nu \cdot x}u\nabla\chi(\cdot/R(\varepsilon)) \cdot \nabla[\varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x}\overline{v^\nu})] = 0.$$

Start by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int_{\Sigma} e^{\nu \cdot x}u\nabla\chi(\cdot/R(\varepsilon)) \cdot \nabla[\varphi_\varepsilon * (e^{-\nu \cdot x}\overline{v^\nu})] \right| \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|e^{c'|\mathbf{x}|}u\|_{L^{q'}((0, T); L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \left[\|e^{-c'|\mathbf{x}| + \nu \cdot \mathbf{x}}\|_{L^b(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|w^\nu\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \|e^{-\nu \cdot x}v^\nu - w^\nu\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(H_{\hat{\nu}}))} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \|e^{-c'|\mathbf{x}| + \nu \cdot \mathbf{x}}\|_{L^b(H_{\hat{\nu}, s})}^r ds \right)^{1/r} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used that $\|\nabla\chi(\cdot/R(\varepsilon))\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim 1$ and $\|\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim 1/\varepsilon$.

After the proposition 5.6, we have that $e^{c'|\mathbf{x}|}u \in L^{q'}((0, T); L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ whenever $c' < c$. Furthermore, if $|\nu| < c'$ we have that

$$\|e^{-c'|\mathbf{x}|+\nu \cdot \mathbf{x}}\|_{L^b(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \|e^{-c'|\mathbf{x}|+\nu \cdot \mathbf{x}}\|_{L^b(H_{\hat{\nu}, s})}^r ds \right)^{1/r} < \infty.$$

Then, for c' so that $|\nu| < c' < c$ we have that

$$\left| \frac{1}{R(\varepsilon)} \int_{\Sigma} e^{\nu \cdot \mathbf{x}} u \nabla \chi(\cdot/R(\varepsilon)) \cdot \nabla [\varphi_{\varepsilon} * (e^{-\nu \cdot \mathbf{x}} \overline{v^{\nu}})] \right| \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon R(\varepsilon)} \|e^{c'|\mathbf{x}|}u\|_{L^{q'}((0, T); L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \left[\|w^{\nu}\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} + \|e^{-\nu \cdot \mathbf{x}} v^{\nu} - w^{\nu}\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(H_{\hat{\nu}}))} \right].$$

If the function $\varepsilon \in (0, 1) \mapsto R(\varepsilon) \in (0, \infty)$ is chosen so that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon R(\varepsilon) = \infty$, then (77) holds.³

With the same type of arguments one can show that (76) and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{2}{R(\varepsilon)} \int_{\Sigma} e^{\nu \cdot \mathbf{x}} u \nu \cdot \nabla \chi(\cdot/R(\varepsilon)) \varphi_{\varepsilon} * (e^{-\nu \cdot \mathbf{x}} \overline{v^{\nu}})$$

vanish.

These facts allow us to conclude that (70) holds. \square

5.4. An orthogonality relation for exponentially-growing solutions. Whenever $\mathcal{U}_T^1 = \mathcal{U}_T^2$, the integral identity (62) becomes an orthogonality relation between $V_1 - V_2$ and the product of the physical solutions u_1 and $\overline{v_2}$. Our goal here is to prove that the same orthogonality relation holds for the product of exponentially-growing solutions. A key ingredient in our argument is the integration-by-parts formula of the proposition 5.7. For that reason, it is convenient to define precisely the concept of admissible exponentially-growing solutions.

Definition 5.10. Consider $V \in L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$ for $(a, b) \in [1, \infty] \times [1, \infty]$ satisfying (10) such that $e^{c|\mathbf{x}|}V \in L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

Given $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ with $|\nu| < c$, we say that $u : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a ν -admissible exponentially-growing solution if

(a) it is a measurable and locally integrable solution of

$$(i\partial_t + \Delta - V)u = 0 \text{ in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

(b) there is $v \in L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with q and r satisfying (9) such that $\nu \cdot \nabla(e^{-\nu \cdot \mathbf{x}}u - v) = 0$ and

$$\|e^{-\nu \cdot \mathbf{x}}u - v\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(H_{\hat{\nu}}))} < \infty.$$

Remark 5.11. Again, it could be helpful for the reader to keep in mind a CGO solution $w = e^{i|\nu|\mathbf{t}+\nu \cdot \mathbf{x}}(w^{\sharp} + w^{\flat})$ as the one in the proposition 2.3. Then, for the proposition 5.10, u and v are playing the roles of χw and $\chi e^{i|\nu|\mathbf{t}}w^{\flat}$ respectively, with χ a bump function of the time variable taking value 1 in the interval $(0, T)$.

Remark 5.12. If u is a ν -admissible exponentially-growing solution, then $e^{-\nu \cdot \mathbf{x}}(i\partial_t + \Delta)u \in L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

Indeed, we only have to check that $e^{-\nu \cdot \mathbf{x}}Vu$ belongs to $L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$:

$$\|e^{-\nu \cdot \mathbf{x}}Vu\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} \leq \|V(e^{-\nu \cdot \mathbf{x}}u - v)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} + \|Vv\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

By Hölder's inequality we have that

$$\|Vv\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} \leq \|V\|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))} \|v\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

and

$$\|V(e^{-\nu \cdot \mathbf{x}}u - v)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim \|e^{-\nu \cdot \mathbf{x}}u - v\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(H_{\hat{\nu}}))} \|e^{\varepsilon|\hat{\nu} \cdot \mathbf{x}}V\|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

³Using the dominate convergence theorem it would have been enough to ensure that $\varepsilon R(\varepsilon) \lesssim 1$.

for $\varepsilon < |\nu|$, where the implicit constant is

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-r'\varepsilon|s|} ds \right)^{1/r'}.$$

Remark 5.13. Let u be a ν -admissible exponentially-growing solution for a potential V as in the proposition 5.10, and consider \tilde{V} in the space $L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$, with $(a, b) \in [1, \infty] \times [1, \infty]$ satisfying (10).

If we additionally assume that $e^{c|\mathbf{x}|}\tilde{V} \in L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$, then $e^{\rho|\mathbf{x}|}\tilde{V}u \in L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$ for all $\rho \geq 0$ such that $|\nu| + \rho < c$.

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{\rho|\mathbf{x}|}\tilde{V}u\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} \\ & \leq \|e^{\rho|\mathbf{x}|+\nu\cdot\mathbf{x}}\tilde{V}(e^{-\nu\cdot\mathbf{x}}u - v)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} + \|e^{\rho|\mathbf{x}|+\nu\cdot\mathbf{x}}\tilde{V}v\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))}. \end{aligned}$$

By Hölder's inequality we have that

$$\|e^{\rho|\mathbf{x}|+\nu\cdot\mathbf{x}}\tilde{V}v\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} \leq \|e^{c|\mathbf{x}|}\tilde{V}\|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))} \|v\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e^{\rho|\mathbf{x}|+\nu\cdot\mathbf{x}}\tilde{V}(e^{-\nu\cdot\mathbf{x}}u - v)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} \\ & \leq \|e^{-\nu\cdot\mathbf{x}}u - v\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(H_{\hat{\nu}}))} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-r'((c-\rho)|s| - |\nu|s)} ds \right)^{1/r'} \|e^{c|\mathbf{x}|}\tilde{V}\|_{L^a(\mathbb{R}; L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))} \end{aligned}$$

for $|\nu| < c - \rho$.

Remark 5.14. Let $u_1^{\nu_1}$ and $u_2^{\nu_2}$ be ν_1 - and ν_2 -admissible exponentially-growing solutions for potentials V_1 and V_2 as in the proposition 5.10.

If \tilde{V} is as in the proposition 5.13 with $e^{c|\mathbf{x}|}\tilde{V} \in L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$, then $\tilde{V}u_1^{\nu_1}u_2^{\nu_2} \in L^1(\Sigma)$ whenever $|\nu_1| + |\nu_2| < c$.

Indeed, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}u_1^{\nu_1}u_2^{\nu_2} &= e^{(\nu_1+\nu_2)\cdot\mathbf{x}}\tilde{V}(e^{-\nu_1\cdot\mathbf{x}}u_1^{\nu_1} - v_1^{\nu_1})(e^{-\nu_2\cdot\mathbf{x}}u_2^{\nu_2} - v_2^{\nu_2}) \\ &+ e^{(\nu_1+\nu_2)\cdot\mathbf{x}}\tilde{V}(e^{-\nu_1\cdot\mathbf{x}}u_1^{\nu_1} - v_1^{\nu_1})v_2^{\nu_2} + e^{(\nu_1+\nu_2)\cdot\mathbf{x}}\tilde{V}v_1^{\nu_1}(e^{-\nu_2\cdot\mathbf{x}}u_2^{\nu_2} - v_2^{\nu_2}) \\ &+ e^{(\nu_1+\nu_2)\cdot\mathbf{x}}\tilde{V}v_1^{\nu_1}v_2^{\nu_2} \end{aligned}$$

Writing $w_j^{\nu_j} = (e^{-\nu_j\cdot\mathbf{x}}u_j^{\nu_j} - v_j^{\nu_j})$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}u_1^{\nu_1}u_2^{\nu_2} &= e^{(\nu_1+\nu_2)\cdot\mathbf{x}+\varepsilon(|\hat{\nu}_1\cdot\mathbf{x}|+|\hat{\nu}_2\cdot\mathbf{x}|)}\tilde{V}e^{-\varepsilon|\hat{\nu}_1\cdot\mathbf{x}|}w_1^{\nu_1}e^{-\varepsilon|\hat{\nu}_2\cdot\mathbf{x}|}w_2^{\nu_2} \\ &+ e^{(\nu_1+\nu_2)\cdot\mathbf{x}+\varepsilon|\hat{\nu}_1\cdot\mathbf{x}|}\tilde{V}e^{-\varepsilon|\hat{\nu}_1\cdot\mathbf{x}|}w_1^{\nu_1}v_2^{\nu_2} + e^{(\nu_1+\nu_2)\cdot\mathbf{x}+\varepsilon|\hat{\nu}_2\cdot\mathbf{x}|}\tilde{V}v_1^{\nu_1}e^{-\varepsilon|\hat{\nu}_2\cdot\mathbf{x}|}w_2^{\nu_2} \\ &+ e^{(\nu_1+\nu_2)\cdot\mathbf{x}}\tilde{V}v_1^{\nu_1}v_2^{\nu_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Noticing that

$$\|e^{-\varepsilon|\hat{\nu}_j\cdot\mathbf{x}|}w_j^{\nu_j}\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim \|e^{-\nu_j\cdot\mathbf{x}}u_j^{\nu_j} - v_j^{\nu_j}\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(H_{\hat{\nu}_j}))},$$

and choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ so that $|\nu_1| + |\nu_2| + 2\varepsilon < c$, we can apply Hölder inequality to conclude that $\tilde{V}u_1^{\nu_1}u_2^{\nu_2} \in L^1(\Sigma)$ whenever $|\nu_1| + |\nu_2| < c$.

Theorem 5.15. Consider $V_1, V_2 \in L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with $(a, b) \in [1, \infty] \times [1, \infty]$ satisfying (10). If $(a, b) = (\infty, n/2)$ with $n \geq 3$, we also suppose V_1 and V_2 belong to $C([0, T]; L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

Let \mathcal{U}_T^1 and \mathcal{U}_T^2 denote the initial-to-final-state maps associated to V_1 and V_2 respectively.

Then, if we additionally assume that there exists $c > 0$ so that $e^{c|\mathbf{x}|}V_j \in L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$, the equality $\mathcal{U}_T^1 = \mathcal{U}_T^2$ implies that

$$\int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2)u_1^\eta \overline{v_2^\eta} = 0$$

whenever $|\eta| + |\nu| < c$ and for all η - and ν -admissible exponentially-growing solutions u_1^η and v_2^ν of the equations

$$(i\partial_t + \Delta - V_1)u_1^\eta = 0 \text{ and } (i\partial_t + \Delta - \overline{V_2})v_2^\nu = 0 \text{ in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Proof. We start by proving that if $\mathcal{U}_T^1 = \mathcal{U}_T^2$ then

$$\int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2)u_1 \overline{v_2^\nu} = 0$$

for every u_1 physical solution of (1) with potential V_1 , and every ν -admissible exponentially-growing solution v_2^ν , with $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and $|\nu| < c$.

For every $u_1 \in X^\star$ solution of (1) with potential $V_1 \in Y$, we have that $(V_1 - V_2)u_1 \in X$ since $V_1 - V_2 \in Y$. Let $w_2 \in X^\star$ be the solution of the problem

$$\begin{cases} (i\partial_t + \Delta - V_2)w_2 = (V_1 - V_2)u_1 & \text{in } \Sigma, \\ w_2(0, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases}$$

After the identity $\mathcal{U}_T^1 = \mathcal{U}_T^2$, we can apply the proposition 5.3 with $F = (V_1 - V_2)u_1$ and using (62) to deduce that $w_2(T, \cdot) = 0$.

Furthermore, since $e^{c|\cdot|}V_j$ belong to $L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$, we have that $e^{c|\cdot|}(i\partial_t + \Delta)w_2 \in L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with q and r satisfying (9). One can check that, in fact, $(q, r) \in [1, 2] \times [1, 2]$ satisfies (7). This means that w_2 shares the same properties as u in the proposition 5.7 for all $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ with $|\nu| < c$.

Furthermore, every ν -admissible exponentially-growing solution v_2^ν satisfies the same conditions as v^ν in the proposition 5.7 since $e^{-\nu \cdot x}(i\partial_t + \Delta)v_2^\nu \in L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$, as we observed in the proposition 5.12.

Then, w_2 and v_2^ν satisfy the hypothesis of the proposition 5.7, for all $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ with $|\nu| < c$, and we have the following integration-by-parts formula

$$\int_{\Sigma} (i\partial_t + \Delta)w_2 \overline{v_2^\nu} = \int_{\Sigma} w_2 \overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta)v_2^\nu}.$$

Observe that $e^{c|\cdot|}(V_1 - V_2)u_1 \in L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$ since $e^{c|\cdot|}(V_1 - V_2)$ belongs to $L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$ and $u_1 \in X^\star$. By the exact same argument in (b) of the proposition 5.9, we can ensure that $(V_1 - V_2)u_1 \overline{v_2^\nu} \in L^1(\Sigma)$ whenever $|\nu| < c$.

As a consequence of this fact, we can write

$$\int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2)u_1 \overline{v_2^\nu} = \int_{\Sigma} (i\partial_t + \Delta - V_2)w_2 \overline{v_2^\nu} = \int_{\Sigma} w_2 \overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta - \overline{V_2})v_2^\nu} = 0.$$

In the first identity we have used that $(i\partial_t + \Delta - V_2)w_2 = (V_1 - V_2)u_1$, in the second one we have used the previous integration-by-parts formula for w_2 and v_2^ν , and in the last equality we have used that $(i\partial_t + \Delta - \overline{V_2})v_2^\nu = 0$ in Σ .

This proves that if $\mathcal{U}_T^1 = \mathcal{U}_T^2$ then

$$(78) \quad \int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2)u_1 \overline{v_2^\nu} = 0$$

for every u_1 physical solution with potential V_1 , and every ν -admissible exponentially-growing solution v_2^ν , with $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and $|\nu| < c$.

Finally, we will prove that the orthogonality relation (78) yields the one in the statement, that is,

$$\int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2)u_1^\eta \overline{v_2^\nu} = 0$$

for every η - and ν -admissible exponentially-growing solutions u_1^η and v_2^ν with $|\eta| + |\nu| < c$.

Start by noticing that the proposition 5.13 with $\rho = 0$ ensures that $(\overline{V_1} - \overline{V_2})v_2^\nu$ belongs to $L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)) \subset X$ for all $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ with $|\nu| < c$. Then, let $w_1^\nu \in X^*$ be the solution of the problem

$$\begin{cases} (i\partial_t + \Delta - \overline{V_1})w_1^\nu = (\overline{V_1} - \overline{V_2})v_2^\nu & \text{in } \Sigma, \\ w_1(T, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases}$$

Since $V_1 \in Y$ and $(\overline{V_1} - \overline{V_2})v_2^\nu \in X$, we can use (78) to apply the proposition 5.4 with $G = (\overline{V_1} - \overline{V_2})v_2^\nu$ and deduce that $w_1^\nu(0, \cdot) = 0$. As we argued earlier to prove (78), we want to show that, given $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ with $|\nu| < c$, we have that $e^{c'|\cdot|}(i\partial_t + \Delta)w_1^\nu \in L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$ for all $c' \in (0, c - |\nu|)$. In this way, we could conclude that w_1^ν , with $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and $|\nu| < c$, shares the same properties as u in the proposition 5.7 for all $c' < c - |\nu|$.

Since $e^{c'|\cdot|}\overline{V_1}w_1^\nu \in L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$, in order to prove that $e^{c'|\cdot|}(i\partial_t + \Delta)w_1^\nu \in L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$ for all $c' \in (0, c - |\nu|)$, we only have to check that $e^{c'|\cdot|}(\overline{V_1} - \overline{V_2})v_2^\nu \in L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$ for all $c' < c - |\nu|$. However, this follows from the proposition 5.13 for $\rho = c'$.

Additionally, every η -admissible exponentially-growing solution u_1^η satisfies the same conditions as v^η in the proposition 5.7 since $e^{-\eta \cdot x}(i\partial_t + \Delta)u_1^\eta \in L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$, as we observed in the proposition 5.12.

Then, given $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ with $|\nu| < c$, we have w_1^ν and u_1^η , with $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and $|\eta| < c'$, satisfy the hypothesis of the proposition 5.7 for all $c' \in (0, c - |\nu|)$. Thus, we have that the integration-by-parts formula

$$\int_{\Sigma} (i\partial_t + \Delta)w_1^\nu \overline{u_1^\eta} = \int_{\Sigma} w_1^\nu \overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta)u_1^\eta}$$

holds for all $\eta, \nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ with $|\eta| + |\nu| < c$.

Finally, the proposition 5.14 guarantees that $(V_1 - V_2)u_1^\eta \overline{v_2^\nu} \in L^1(\Sigma)$, so we can write

$$\int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2)u_1^\eta \overline{v_2^\nu} = \int_{\Sigma} u_1^\eta \overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta - \overline{V_1})w_1^\nu} = \int_{\Sigma} (i\partial_t + \Delta - V_1)u_1^\eta \overline{w_1^\nu} = 0.$$

In the first identity we have used that $(i\partial_t + \Delta - \overline{V_1})w_1^\nu = (\overline{V_1} - \overline{V_2})v_2^\nu$, in the second one we have used the previous integration-by-parts formula for w_1^ν and u_1^η , and in the last equality we have used that $(i\partial_t + \Delta - V_1)u_1^\eta = 0$ in Σ .

This proves that the orthogonality relation

$$\int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2)u_1^\eta \overline{v_2^\nu} = 0$$

holds for every every η - and ν -admissible exponentially-growing solutions u_1^η and v_2^ν , with $\eta, \nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and $|\eta| + |\nu| < c$. \square

6. PROOF OF THE THEOREM 1

Consider $V_1, V_2 \in L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with $(a, b) \in [1, \infty] \times [1, \infty]$ satisfying (10). Recall that if $(a, b) = (\infty, n/2)$ with $n \geq 3$, we also have that V_1 and V_2 belong to $C([0, T]; L^{n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Furthermore, for $j \in \{1, 2\}$, $e^{\rho|\cdot|}V_j \in L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$ for all $\rho > 0$, and

$$\sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|\mathbf{1}_{>R} V_j\|_{L^\infty((0, T) \times H_{\omega, s})} ds < \infty$$

for $R = \max(R_1, R_2)$.

Let V_1^{ext} and V_2^{ext} denote either their extensions by zero outside Σ if $(a, b) \neq (\infty, n/2)$, or two suitable continuous extensions with support in $[T', T''] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with $T' < 0 < T < T''$ if $(a, b) = (\infty, n/2)$ with $n \geq 3$.

For $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, choose

$$\varphi_1(t, x) = i|\nu|^2 t - \nu \cdot x, \quad \varphi_2(t, x) = i|\nu|^2 t + \nu \cdot x \quad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Let $u_1 = e^{\varphi_1}(u_1^\# + u_1^b)$ and $v_2 = e^{\varphi_2}(v_2^\# + v_2^b)$ denote the CGO solutions of the proposition 2.3 for the equations

$$(i\partial_t + \Delta - V_1^{\text{ext}})u_1 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (i\partial_t + \Delta - \overline{V_2^{\text{ext}}})v_2 = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

respectively.

For convenience, recall that for $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathcal{S}(H_{\hat{\nu}})$ we chose

$$\begin{aligned} u_1^\#(t, x) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}} \int_{H_{\hat{\nu}}} e^{ix \cdot \xi} e^{-it|\xi|^2} \psi_1(\xi) d\sigma_{\hat{\nu}}(\xi) \quad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ v_2^\#(t, x) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}} \int_{H_{\hat{\nu}}} e^{ix \cdot \xi} e^{-it|\xi|^2} \psi_2(\xi) d\sigma_{\hat{\nu}}(\xi) \quad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n. \end{aligned}$$

For coherence with the choice $-\nu$ for u_1 , we should have written, in the definition of $u_1^\#$, $H_{-\hat{\nu}}$ and $\sigma_{-\hat{\nu}}$ instead of $H_{\hat{\nu}}$ and $\sigma_{\hat{\nu}}$. But observe that $H_{\hat{\nu}} = H_{-\hat{\nu}}$ and $\sigma_{\hat{\nu}} = \sigma_{-\hat{\nu}}$.

We want to apply the proposition 5.15 to conclude that

$$\int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2) u_1^\# \overline{v_2^\#} = - \int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2) u_1^\# \overline{v_2^b} + \int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2) u_1^b \overline{v_2^\#} + \int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2) u_1^b \overline{v_2^b}.$$

In order to apply the proposition 5.15, we only need to take $u^\eta = \chi u_1$ and $v^\nu = \chi v_2$ with χ a bump function of time variable that is identically 1 in $(0, T)$. Note such functions are solutions in $(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2) u_1^\# \overline{v_2^\#} \right| &\leq \| |V_1 - V_2|^{1/2} u_1^b \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \| |V_1 - V_2|^{1/2} v_2^\# \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\quad + \| |V_1 - V_2|^{1/2} u_1^\# \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \| |V_1 - V_2|^{1/2} v_2^b \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\quad + \| |V_1 - V_2|^{1/2} u_1^b \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \| |V_1 - V_2|^{1/2} v_2^b \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $|\nu|$ tend to infinity, we deduce by the proposition 2.3, more particularly by (19) and (20), that

$$\int_{\Sigma} (V_1 - V_2) u_1^\# \overline{v_2^\#} = 0.$$

Write $F = V_1^{\text{ext}} - V_2^{\text{ext}}$, and note that it belongs to $L^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. By Fubini

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} F u_1^\# \overline{v_2^\#} \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}} \int_{H_{\hat{\nu}} \times H_{\hat{\nu}}} \widehat{F}(|\eta|^2 - |\kappa|^2, \kappa - \eta) \psi_1(\eta) \overline{\psi_2(\kappa)} d\sigma_{\hat{\nu}} \otimes \sigma_{\hat{\nu}}(\eta, \kappa). \end{aligned}$$

Here \widehat{F} denotes the Fourier transform of F :

$$\widehat{F}(|\eta|^2 - |\kappa|^2, \kappa - \eta) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} F(t, x) e^{-it|\eta|^2 + ix \cdot \eta} \overline{e^{-it|\kappa|^2 + ix \cdot \kappa}} d(t, x).$$

Since the choices of ψ_1 and ψ_2 in $\mathcal{S}(H_{\hat{\nu}})$ are arbitrary, we can conclude by density that

$$\widehat{F}(|\eta|^2 - |\kappa|^2, \kappa - \eta) = 0 \quad \forall \eta, \kappa \in H_{\hat{\nu}}.$$

Given $(\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\xi \neq 0$, we choose $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ so that $\xi \cdot \nu = 0$ and, $\eta, \kappa \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as

$$\eta = -\frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\tau}{|\xi|^2} \right) \xi, \quad \kappa = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{|\xi|^2} \right) \xi.$$

It is clear that $\eta, \kappa \in H_{\hat{\nu}}$, and after a simple computation we see that $|\eta|^2 - |\kappa|^2 = \tau$ and $\kappa - \eta = \xi$. Hence $\hat{F}(\tau, \xi) = 0$ for all $(\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\})$.

Since $F \in L^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, we know that \hat{F} is continuous in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$, and consequently $\hat{F}(\tau, \xi) = 0$ for all $(\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

By the injectivity of the Fourier transform we have that $F(t, x) = 0$ for almost every $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$, which implies that $V_1(t, x) = V_2(t, x)$ for almost every $(t, x) \in \Sigma$. This concludes the proof of the theorem 1.

7. DIFFERENCES WITH THE CALDERÓN PROBLEM

In the context of the Calderón problem, there is an alternative approach that avoids the use of the Lavine–Nachman trick. This approach involves Bourgain spaces. In this section we explain why this approach fails for the initial-to-final state inverse problem.

7.1. The Bourgain spaces in the Calderón problem. Calderón posed in [16] the following inverse boundary value problem: Let D be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n ($n \geq 2$) with Lipschitz boundary ∂D , and let γ be a real bounded measurable function in D with a positive lower bound. Consider the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map $\Lambda_\gamma : H^{1/2}(\partial D) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\partial D)$ defined by

$$\Lambda_\gamma f = \gamma \partial_\nu u|_{\partial D}$$

where $\partial_\nu = \nu \cdot \nabla$, with ∇ denoting the gradient and ν denoting the outward unit normal vector to ∂D , and $u \in H^1(D)$ is the solution of the boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \cdot (\gamma \nabla u) = 0 \text{ in } D, \\ u|_{\partial D} = f. \end{cases}$$

The inverse Calderón problem is to decide whether the conductivity γ is uniquely determined by Λ_γ , and to calculate γ in terms of Λ_γ whenever the unique determination is possible.

Sylvester and Uhlmann proved uniqueness for smooth conductivities in [45] for dimension $n \geq 3$. However, the key points of their method only requires the conductivity to have bounded second-order partial derivatives [38]. After this piece of work, and some others as [1] by Alessandrini and [39] by Nachman, a standard strategy to address the Calderón problem has been established: One starts by showing

$$\Lambda_{\gamma_1} = \Lambda_{\gamma_2} \Rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (q_1 - q_2) v_1 v_2 = 0,$$

where $q_j = \gamma_j^{-1/2} \Delta \gamma_j^{1/2}$ and v_j is any solution of $-\Delta v_j + q_j v_j = 0$ in \mathbb{R}^n . Then, one constructs CGO solutions of the form:

$$v_j = e^{\zeta_j \cdot x} (1 + w_j)$$

with $\zeta_j \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $\zeta_j \cdot \zeta_j = 0$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$, and so that w_j tends to vanish in some sense as $|\zeta_j|$ goes to ∞ . Finally, one makes appropriate choices of ζ_1 and ζ_2 so that one concludes the uniqueness. The work of Sylvester and Uhlmann has been followed many attempts to lower the regularity assumed, see for example [13, 14, 30, 29, 19, 31, 44].

In [30], Haberman and Tataru introduced the Bourgain spaces \dot{Y}_ζ^s with $s \in \{1/2, -1/2\}$. These spaces have the norms

$$\|f\|_{\dot{Y}_\zeta^s} = \| |q_\zeta|^s \hat{f} \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

where q_ζ stands for the symbol of the differential operator $\Delta + 2\zeta \cdot \nabla$, that is,

$$q_\zeta(\xi) = -|\xi|^2 + 2i\zeta \cdot \xi \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

These spaces were introduced with the idea of making possible an average with respect to the free parameters $|\Re \zeta|$ and $\Re \zeta/|\Re \zeta|$, so that the correction terms of the CGO solutions tend to vanish when the conductivity is assumed to be continuously differentiable. However, the space $\dot{Y}_\zeta^{1/2}$ has other properties such as the embeddings

$$(79) \quad |\zeta|^{1/2} \|f\|_{B^*(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|f\|_{L^{p_n}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{Y}_\zeta^{1/2}}$$

for every $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ —see [30, 29]. Here p_n is defined by the relation $1/p_n = 1/2 - 1/n$ for $n \geq 3$, and

$$\|f\|_{B^*(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} (2^{-j/2} \|f\|_{L^2(D_j)})$$

with $D_j = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{j-1} < |x| \leq 2^j\}$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $D_0 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| \leq 1\}$.

The fact that the Bourgain space $\dot{Y}_\zeta^{1/2}$ enjoys the embeddings in (79) makes it possible to prove uniqueness for the Calderón problem for conductivities satisfying $\nabla \gamma \in L^n(D)^n$ and $\Delta \gamma \in L^{n/2}(D)$, without using the Lavine–Nachman trick. For this reason, one could think that the use of Bourgain spaces in the context of the initial-to-final state inverse problem would avoid the use of the Lavine–Nachman trick. Unfortunately, this is not the case. In fact, we will see in this section the limitations of Bourgain spaces to deal with our problem.

The Calderón problem has been extensively studied: uniqueness, reconstruction and stability. A non-comprehensive list of references is the following. Uniqueness in dimension $n = 2$: [40, 15, 3]. For reconstruction: [39, 27, 18]. For stability: [1, 46, 2, 4, 5, 23, 17].

7.2. The Bourgain spaces for the initial-to-final state inverse problem.

In the context of the initial-to-final state inverse problem one can introduce the Bourgain spaces \dot{X}_ν^s with $s \in \{1/2, -1/2\}$. These spaces have the norms

$$\|u\|_{\dot{X}_\nu^s} = \| |p_\nu|^s \hat{u} \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)},$$

for $u \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, with p_ν as in (24). One can prove that there exists an absolute constant $C > 0$ such that

$$(80) \quad |\nu|^{1/4} \|u\|_{L^2((0,T) \times B_R)} \leq CT^{1/4} R^{1/4} \|u\|_{\dot{X}_\nu^{1/2}}$$

for all $u \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. Here $B_R = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| < R\}$. In fact, this inequality can be thought as half of the inequality for S_ν that we used in our previous work [20, inequality (27)]—for that it is enough to chain (80) with its dual. However, despite what happens in the context of the Calderón problem, the Bourgain space for $s = 1/2$ is not embedded in the mixed-norm Lebesgue spaces appearing in the proposition 3.2. In fact, we will show that the inequality

$$(81) \quad \|u\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{X}_\nu^{1/2}} \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$$

does not hold for $(q', r') \in [2, \infty] \times [2, \infty]$ satisfying (8). Using (28), one can see that (81) is equivalent to

$$(82) \quad \|u\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim \| |p|^{1/2} \hat{u} \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n),$$

with p as in (26). Our goal here is to give a counterexample for the inequality (82). Before that, we make some general comments.

In [47], Tao states that the inequality

$$(83) \quad \|u\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim \| \langle \Re p \rangle^b \hat{u} \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$$

holds for $b > 1/2$, where $\langle \Re p \rangle = (1 + |\Re p|^2)^{1/2}$ with $\Re p(\tau, \xi) = \tau - |\xi|^2$ for all $(\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$. This embedding of the non-homogenous Bourgain space follows

from [47, Corollary 2.10], which states that

$$(84) \quad \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|\langle \mathfrak{R}p \rangle^b \widehat{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$$

whenever $b > 1/2$. In [47, Exercise 2.71], the reader is asked to prove that the inequality (84) fails in the endpoint $b = 1/2$. Here we go beyond that and show a counterexample for the embedding (83) for $b = 1/2$. This counterexample will be adapted to eventually prove that (82) does not hold.

7.2.1. Failure of (83) at the endpoint. In order to point out why (83) fails at the endpoint $b = 1/2$, we test the norms involved in the inequality with functions $u \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ of the form

$$(85) \quad \widehat{u}(\tau, \xi) = \widehat{g}(\tau - |\xi|^2) \widehat{f}(\xi) \quad \forall (\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$$

with $g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ and $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. One can check that

$$(86) \quad \|\langle \mathfrak{R}p \rangle^{1/2} \widehat{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} = \|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

and

$$u(t, x) = \frac{g(t)}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix \cdot \xi} e^{it|\xi|^2} \widehat{f}(\xi) d\xi.$$

Noting that $2/q' = n/2 - n/r'$ defines admissible Strichartz pairs for the Schrödinger equation we have that

$$\|u\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Then, by (86) we have that

$$\|u\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim \frac{\|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}}{\|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})}} \|\langle \mathfrak{R}p \rangle^{1/2} \widehat{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Thus, in order to derive (83) from the previous inequality for the family of functions defined as (85) we should ensure that the quotient $\|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}/\|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})}$ remains bounded for all $g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. Note the relation of this quotient with the endpoint Sobolev embedding, which is known to fail. Thus, one should expect that choosing an unbounded $g \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})$, we could construct a counterexample for (83) with $b = 1/2$. This will be our strategy.

Consider $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $\text{supp } \chi \subset \{z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |z| < 1/e\}$ with $\chi(z) = 1$ whenever $|z| \leq 1/(2e)$. The function

$$z \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\} \mapsto \chi(z) \log(\log 1/|z|) \in [0, \infty)$$

can be extended to represent a $v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$. If g denotes the trace of v to $\mathbb{R} \times \{0\}$, we can ensure that $g \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})$ and $g(t) \geq \log(\log 1/\delta)$ for almost every $t \in (-\delta, \delta)$ with $\delta \in (0, 1/(2e)]$.

Let $f_\rho \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\rho > 0$ be so that

$$\widehat{f}_\rho(\xi) = \rho^{-n/2} \mathbf{1}_{<\rho}(\xi) \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

It is clear that $\|f_\rho\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \|\mathbf{1}_{<1}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ which is independent of ρ .

We consider the family $\{u_\rho : \rho^2 \geq e\}$ with

$$u_\rho(t, x) = \frac{g(t)}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix \cdot \xi} e^{it|\xi|^2} \widehat{f}_\rho(\xi) d\xi \quad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.^4$$

As in (86), one can check that

$$(87) \quad \|\langle \mathfrak{R}p \rangle^{1/2} \widehat{u}_\rho\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} = \|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})} \|\mathbf{1}_{<1}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

⁴The symbol $\dot{\forall}$ means 'for almost every'.

Furthermore,

$$|u_\rho(t, x)| \geq \rho^{-n/2} \frac{g(t)}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \cos(x \cdot \xi + t|\xi|^2) \mathbf{1}_{<\rho}(\xi) d\xi.$$

Note that if $|x \cdot \xi + t|\xi|^2| \leq 1 < \pi/3$, then $\cos(x \cdot \xi + t|\xi|^2) > 1/2$. Thus, for $|x| \leq 1/(2\rho)$ and $|t| \leq 1/(2\rho^2)$ we have that

$$\cos(x \cdot \xi + t|\xi|^2) \mathbf{1}_{<\rho}(\xi) > 1/2,$$

and consequently,

$$|u_\rho(t, x)| \gtrsim \rho^{n/2} \log(\log 2\rho^2)$$

whenever $|x| \leq 1/(2\rho)$ and $|t| \leq 1/(2\rho^2)$. This means that

$$\|u_\rho\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \gtrsim \rho^{n/2} \rho^{-2/q'} \rho^{-n/r'} \log(\log 2\rho^2).$$

Since $2/q' = n/2 - n/r'$ we see that

$$\|u_\rho\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \gtrsim \log(\log 2\rho^2).$$

This inequality together with the identity (87) shows that (83) with $b = 1/2$ fails.

7.2.2. Counterexample to (82). From the failure of (83) for $b = 1/2$, we can not immediately deduce that (82) fails since the counterexample we presented use a family of functions whose Fourier support is not contained in $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\xi_n| \leq 1\}$. However, the main points of the counterexample are robust enough to be adapted to the current situation.

As we did earlier in the section 7.2.1, consider $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $\text{supp } \chi \subset \{z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |z| < 1/e\}$ with $\chi(z) = 1$ whenever $|z| \leq 1/(2e)$. The function

$$z \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\} \mapsto \chi(z) \log(\log 1/|z|) \in [0, \infty)$$

can be extended to represent a $v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$. If g denotes the trace of v to $\mathbb{R} \times \{0\}$, we can ensure that $g \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})$ and $g(t) \geq \log(\log 1/\delta)$ for almost every $t \in (-\delta, \delta)$ with $\delta \in (0, 1/(2e)]$. Define

$$g_\rho(t) = g(\rho t) \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Let $f_\rho \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\rho > 0$ be so that

$$\widehat{f}_\rho(\xi) = \rho^{-n/2} \mathbf{1}_{<\rho}(\xi - 2\rho e_n) \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

It is clear again that $\|f_\rho\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \|\mathbf{1}_{<1}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ which is independent of ρ .

We consider the family $\{u_\rho : \rho \geq e/9\}$ satisfying

$$\widehat{u}_\rho(\tau, \xi) = \widehat{g}_\rho(\tau - |\xi|^2) \widehat{f}_\rho(\xi) \quad \forall (\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

One can check that

$$u_\rho(t, x) = \frac{g_\rho(t)}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix \cdot \xi} e^{it|\xi|^2} \widehat{f}_\rho(\xi) d\xi \quad \dot{V}(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Additionally, since $\text{supp } \widehat{f}_\rho \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : \rho < |\xi_n| < 3\rho\}$ we have

$$\|u_\rho\|_{\dot{X}^{1/2}} \approx \| |\Re p + i\rho|^{1/2} \widehat{u}_\rho \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} = \| |\cdot + i\rho|^{1/2} \widehat{g}_\rho \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \|\widehat{f}_\rho\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Since g_ρ is defined as an $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ scaling of g , we can see that

$$\| |\cdot + i\rho|^{1/2} \widehat{g}_\rho \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = \|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})},$$

and consequently, we have that

$$(88) \quad \|u_\rho\|_{\dot{X}^{1/2}} \approx \|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})} \|\mathbf{1}_{<1}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Once again,

$$|u_\rho(t, x)| \geq \rho^{-n/2} \frac{g_\rho(t)}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \cos(x \cdot \xi + t|\xi|^2) \mathbf{1}_{<\rho}(\xi - 2\rho e_n) d\xi.$$

Note that if $|x \cdot \xi + t|\xi|^2| \leq 1 < \pi/3$, then $\cos(x \cdot \xi + t|\xi|^2) > 1/2$. Thus, since $\text{supp } \widehat{f}_\rho \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\xi| < 3\rho\}$ we have for $|x| \leq 1/(6\rho)$ and $|t| \leq 1/(18\rho^2)$ that

$$\cos(x \cdot \xi + t|\xi|^2) \mathbf{1}_{<\rho}(\xi - 2\rho e_n) > 1/2,$$

and consequently,

$$|u_\rho(t, x)| \gtrsim \rho^{n/2} g(\rho t) \geq \rho^{n/2} \log(\log 18\rho)$$

whenever $|x| \leq 1/(6\rho)$ and $|t| \leq 1/(18\rho^2)$. This means that

$$\|u_\rho\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \gtrsim \rho^{n/2} \rho^{-2/q'} \rho^{-n/r'} \log(\log 18\rho).$$

Since $2/q' = n/2 - n/r'$ we see that

$$\|u_\rho\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \gtrsim \log(\log 18\rho).$$

This inequality together with the estimate (88) shows that (82) fails.

7.2.3. Further thoughts about the (82). A more careful look at our counterexample for (82) indicates that this embedding also fails when $2/q' < n/2 - n/r'$. However, it does not say anything when $2/q' > n/2 - n/r'$.

We have not analysed the latter case, despite that it could be interesting. Indeed, if (82) held true for $2/q' > n/2 - n/r'$, by the scaling rule (28), the inequality (81) would hold with a gain of $|\nu|^{2/q' - n/2 + n/r'}$:

$$(89) \quad |\nu|^{2/q' - n/2 + n/r'} \|u\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{X}_\nu^{1/2}} \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n).$$

This case would allow us to deal with potentials in $L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$ for $n \geq 2$ and $2 - 2/a > n/b$, without appealing to the Lavine–Nachman trick. Furthermore, this embedding would immediately imply an extension of the proposition 3.2 of the following form:

$$(90) \quad |\nu|^{2/q'_1 - n/2 + n/r'_1} \|S_\nu f\|_{L^{q'_1}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'_1}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim |\nu|^{n/r_2 - n/2 - 2 + 2/q_2} \|f\|_{L^{q_2}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r_2}(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $2/q'_1 > n/2 - n/r'_1$ and $2 - 2/q_2 > n/r_2 - n/2$.

It is worth mentioning that the inequality (90) with $2/q'_1 \geq n/2 - n/r'_1$ and $2 - 2/q_2 \geq n/r_2 - n/2$ could hold even if the embedding (89) fails. Fortunately, this situation would still allow to deal with potentials in $L^a((0, T); L^b(\mathbb{R}^n))$ for $n \geq 2$ and $2 - 2/a > n/b$, without appealing to the Lavine–Nachman trick.

Comparing this situation with the elliptic setting of the Calderón problem, (90) corresponds to the full Carlmén inequality that Kenig, Ruiz and Sogge proved in [35]—not only in the scale-invariant situation. In fact, this inequality is enough to prove uniqueness of the Calderón problem for conductivities satisfying $\nabla \gamma \in L^{2p}(D)^n$ and $\Delta \gamma \in L^p(D)$ for $p > n/2$, without using the Lavine–Nachman trick.

APPENDIX A. SKETCH OF THE PROOF OF THE PROPOSITION 5.2

We follow here the same argument we used to prove [20, Proposition 4.2].

Sketch of the proof of the proposition 5.2. Start by noticing that under the assumptions of the proposition 5.2, we can apply the dominate convergence theorem to ensure that

$$(91) \quad \int_{\Sigma} [(i\partial_t + \Delta)u\bar{v} - u\overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta)v}] = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Sigma_\delta} [(i\partial_t + \Delta)u\bar{v} - u\overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta)v}]$$

where $\Sigma_\delta = (\delta, T - \delta) \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Now, we will approximate u and v by u_ε and v_ε respectively, which will be smooth in Σ_δ and compactly supported in space.

Consider a smooth cut-off $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $0 \leq \chi(x) \leq 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\text{supp } \chi \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| \leq 2\}$ and $\chi(x) = 1$ whenever $|x| \leq 1$. Consider $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\text{supp } \varphi \subset [-1, 1] \times K$ with K a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^n ,

$\int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} \varphi = 1$ and $\varphi(t, x) \in [0, \infty)$ for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$. For $R, \varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, define $\chi^R(x) = \chi(x/R)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\varphi_\varepsilon(t, x) = \varepsilon^{-(n+1)} \varphi(t/\varepsilon, x/\varepsilon)$ for $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

Let $(X_\delta, \|\cdot\|_{X_\delta})$ and $(X_\delta^*, \|\cdot\|_{X_\delta^*})$ denote the Banach spaces defined as $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$ and $(X^*, \|\cdot\|_{X^*})$ for the time interval $(\delta, T - \delta)$ instead of $(0, T)$.

For $w \in X^*$ and $\varepsilon < \delta$, we consider

$$w_\varepsilon : (t, x) \in \Sigma_\delta \mapsto \chi^{R(\varepsilon)}(x) \int_{\Sigma} \varphi_\varepsilon(t - s, x - y) w(s, y) \, d(s, y),$$

where $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta) \mapsto R(\varepsilon) \in (0, \infty)$ is continuous and $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} R(\varepsilon) = \infty$.

One can check that

$$(92) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|w(t, \cdot) - w_\varepsilon(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 0 \quad \forall t \in [\delta, T - \delta],$$

and

$$(93) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|w - w_\varepsilon\|_{L^{q'}((\delta, T - \delta); L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} = 0.$$

Furthermore, if $(i\partial_t + \Delta)w \in X_\delta$, then

$$(94) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|(i\partial_t + \Delta)w - (i\partial_t + \Delta)w_\varepsilon\|_{X_\delta} = 0.$$

For the sake of clarity, let us discuss why (94) holds. Let \tilde{w} denote the trivial extension of w

$$\tilde{w}(t, \cdot) = \begin{cases} w(t, \cdot) & t \in [0, T], \\ 0 & t \notin [0, T]. \end{cases}$$

Then, we have that $w_\varepsilon(t, x) = \chi_\varepsilon(x)(\varphi_\varepsilon * \tilde{w})(t, x)$ for all $(t, x) \in \Sigma_\delta$.

In order to show that (94) holds, let us compute

$$(i\partial_t + \Delta)w_\varepsilon = \chi^{R(\varepsilon)}(i\partial_t + \Delta)(\varphi_\varepsilon * \tilde{w}) + 2\nabla \chi^{R(\varepsilon)} \cdot \nabla(\varphi_\varepsilon * \tilde{w}) + \Delta \chi^{R(\varepsilon)}(\varphi_\varepsilon * \tilde{w}) \text{ in } \Sigma_\delta.$$

Observe, that (94) would follow from the following limits

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|(i\partial_t + \Delta)w - \chi^{R(\varepsilon)}(i\partial_t + \Delta)(\varphi_\varepsilon * \tilde{w})\|_{X_\delta} = 0,$$

$$(95) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\nabla \chi^{R(\varepsilon)} \cdot \nabla(\varphi_\varepsilon * \tilde{w})\|_{X_\delta} = 0,$$

and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\Delta \chi^{R(\varepsilon)}(\varphi_\varepsilon * \tilde{w})\|_{X_\delta} = 0.$$

The previous three limits follow from standard arguments, however, for the limit (95) we have to choose the function $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta) \mapsto R(\varepsilon) \in (0, \infty)$ to satisfies the condition $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon R(\varepsilon) = \infty$. With this extra condition, we have that (94) holds.

We now apply these convergences to u_ε and v_ε . By the standard integration-by-parts rules we have that

$$\int_{\Sigma_\delta} [(i\partial_t + \Delta)u_\varepsilon \overline{v_\varepsilon} - u_\varepsilon \overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta)v_\varepsilon}] = i \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [u_\varepsilon(T - \delta, \cdot) \overline{v_\varepsilon(T - \delta, \cdot)} - u_\varepsilon(\delta, \cdot) \overline{v_\varepsilon(\delta, \cdot)}].$$

After (92), (93) and (94) we can conclude, by the dominate convergence theorem, that

$$\int_{\Sigma_\delta} [(i\partial_t + \Delta)u \overline{v} - u \overline{(i\partial_t + \Delta)v}] = i \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [u(T - \delta, \cdot) \overline{v(T - \delta, \cdot)} - u(\delta, \cdot) \overline{v(\delta, \cdot)}].$$

The limits (91) and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [u(T, \cdot) \overline{v(T, \cdot)} - u(0, \cdot) \overline{v(0, \cdot)}] = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [u(T - \delta, \cdot) \overline{v(T - \delta, \cdot)} - u(\delta, \cdot) \overline{v(\delta, \cdot)}],$$

which follows by continuity, yield the identity in the statement. \square

APPENDIX B. TRANSFERENCE OF THE EXPONENTIAL DECAY

Here we include the proof of the proposition 5.5, which is an adaptation of the proof of [20, Lemma 4.6]. The proposition 5.5 requires some well known properties about holomorphic extensions of the Fourier transform. These are all derived from the statement and the proof of [32, Theorem 7.4.2]. In [20, Lemma 4.7], we stated and proved these facts for the particular cases we needed in that context. Unfortunately, the statement in there is different from the one needed here, but its proof is essentially the same. For the sake of completeness, we include its proof here.

Lemma B.1. *Consider $F \in L^1(\mathbb{R}; L^p(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with $p \geq 1$ such that there exists $c > 0$ so that $e^{c|x|}F \in L^1(\mathbb{R}; L^p(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Then:*

- (a) *For every $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $|\nu| < c$, we have $e^{\nu \cdot x}F \in L^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$.*
- (b) *The Fourier transform of F can be extended to $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{C}_{|\Im| < c}$ as the continuous function*

$$\widehat{F} : (\tau, \xi', \zeta) \mapsto \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} e^{-i(\tau t + (\xi', \zeta) \cdot x)} F(t, x) d(t, x),$$

where $\mathbb{C}_{|\Im| < c} = \{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} : |\Im \zeta| < c\}$. Furthermore, it satisfies the relation

$$\widehat{e^{\lambda x_n} F}(\tau, \xi', \xi_n) = \widehat{F}(\tau, \xi', \xi_n + i\lambda)$$

for all $(\tau, \xi', \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\lambda| < c$.

- (c) *For every $(\tau, \xi') \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, the function*

$$\zeta \in \mathbb{C}_{|\Im| < c} \mapsto \widehat{F}(\tau, \xi', \zeta)$$

is holomorphic in $\mathbb{C}_{|\Im| < c}$.

Proof. Start by proving (a). Note that

$$\|e^{\nu \cdot x} F\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \|e^{-(c-|\nu|)|x|}\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|e^{c|x|} F\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}; L^p(\mathbb{R}^n))},$$

where $e^{-(c-|\nu|)|x|} \in L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ since $|\nu| < c$, with p' denoting the conjugate of p .

The property (b) is a direct consequence of (a) since for $(\tau, \xi', \zeta) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{C}_{|\Im| < c}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{e^{\Im \zeta e_n \cdot x} F}(\tau, \xi', \Re \zeta) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} e^{-i(\tau t + (\xi', \Re \zeta) \cdot x)} e^{\Im \zeta e_n \cdot x} F(t, x) d(t, x) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} e^{-i(\tau t + (\xi', \zeta) \cdot x)} F(t, x) d(t, x). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can use the last expression to extend \widehat{F} to $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{C}_{|\Im| < c}$. Furthermore, choosing $\zeta = \xi_n + i\lambda$ we have that

$$\widehat{e^{\lambda x_n} F}(\tau, \xi', \xi_n) = \widehat{F}(\tau, \xi', \xi_n + i\lambda).$$

This proves the property (b).

Finally, to verify the property (c) one needs to check that the function satisfies the Cauchy–Riemann equations. This can be justified since $x_n e^{\Im \zeta e_n \cdot x} F \in L^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. This completes the proof of (c). \square

In order to prove the proposition 5.5, we still need a preparatory result, which is a consequence of the proposition B.1. Again, this is pretty similar to [20, Corollary 4.8]. The statement there does not include the case we need here, but the proof is essentially the same. For convenience for the reader, we include its proof here.

Corollary B.2. Consider $F \in L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$, with $(q, r) \in [1, 2] \times [1, 2]$ satisfying (7). Let $G \in L^p(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with $p \in [1, q]$ denote the function

$$G(t, \cdot) = \begin{cases} F(t, \cdot) & \text{if } t \in (0, T), \\ 0 & \text{if } t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (0, T). \end{cases}$$

If there exists $u \in X^\star$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} (i\partial_t + \Delta)u = F & \text{in } \Sigma, \\ u(0, \cdot) = u(T, \cdot) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n; \end{cases}$$

with $e^{c|\cdot|}F \in L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$ for some $c > 0$, then, for every $(\tau, \xi') \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ such that $\tau \neq -|\xi'|^2$, the function

$$(96) \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{C}_{|\Im| < c} \mapsto \frac{\widehat{G}(\tau, \xi', \zeta)}{-\tau - |\xi'|^2 - \zeta^2}$$

is holomorphic in $\mathbb{C}_{|\Im| < c} = \{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} : |\Im \zeta| < c\}$.

Proof. Since $G \in L^1(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$, we know from (c) in the proposition B.1 that, for every $(\tau, \xi') \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, the function

$$(97) \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{C}_{|\Im| < c} \mapsto \widehat{G}(\tau, \xi', \zeta)$$

is holomorphic in $\mathbb{C}_{|\Im| < c}$. While, whenever $\tau \neq -|\xi'|^2$, the function

$$\zeta \in \mathbb{C}_{|\Im| < c} \mapsto \frac{1}{-\tau - |\xi'|^2 - \zeta^2}$$

is meromorphic, with simple poles at $\zeta_1 = -|\tau + |\xi'|^2|^{1/2}$ and $\zeta_2 = |\tau + |\xi'|^2|^{1/2}$ if $-\tau - |\xi'|^2 > 0$, and $\zeta_3 = -i|\tau + |\xi'|^2|^{1/2}$ and $\zeta_4 = i|\tau + |\xi'|^2|^{1/2}$ if $-\tau - |\xi'|^2 < 0$ and $|\tau + |\xi'|^2| < c^2$. Then, in order to prove that the function (96) is holomorphic is enough to check that (97) vanishes at these poles. Let us focus on proving that.

The item (a) in the proposition B.1 and the fact that $\text{supp } G \subset \overline{\Sigma}$ ensure that, for every $(\sigma, \nu) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $|\nu| < c$, we have $e^{\sigma t + \nu \cdot x} G \in L^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. Thus, the Fourier transform of G can be extended to $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{C}_{|\Im| < c}$ as the continuous function

$$(98) \quad \widehat{G} : (\gamma, \xi', \zeta) \mapsto \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} e^{-i(\gamma t + (\xi', \zeta) \cdot x)} G(t, x) \, d(t, x).$$

One can check that, for every $\xi' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, the function

$$(99) \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{C}_{|\Im| < c} \mapsto \widehat{G}(-|\xi'|^2 - \zeta^2, \xi', \zeta)$$

is holomorphic in $\mathbb{C}_{|\Im| < c}$. We will see later that $\widehat{G}(-|\xi|^2, \xi) = 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, that is, for every $\xi' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ the function (99) vanishes on $\{\zeta \in \mathbb{C}_{|\Im| < c} : \Im \zeta = 0\}$. Then, by analytic continuation we have that

$$\widehat{G}(-|\xi'|^2 - \zeta^2, \xi', \zeta) = 0 \quad \forall (\xi', \zeta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{C}_{|\Im| < c},$$

which implies that (97) vanishes at the poles $\{\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3, \zeta_4\}$. Indeed, if $-\tau - |\xi'|^2 > 0$ we have that

$$\widehat{G}(\tau, \xi', \zeta_j) = \widehat{G}(-|\xi'|^2 - \zeta_j^2, \xi', \zeta_j) = 0 \quad j \in \{1, 2\};$$

however, $-\tau - |\xi'|^2 < 0$ and $|\tau + |\xi'|^2| < c^2$ we have that

$$\widehat{G}(\tau, \xi', \zeta_j) = \widehat{G}(-|\xi'|^2 - \zeta_j^2, \xi', \zeta_j) = 0 \quad j \in \{3, 4\}.$$

Therefore, the function (97) vanishes at the poles.

To conclude the proof of this corollary, we need to show that $\widehat{G}(-|\xi|^2, \xi) = 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. By the expression (98), we have that

$$\widehat{G}(-|\xi|^2, \xi) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} \int_{\Sigma} e^{-i(-|\xi|^2 t + \xi \cdot x)} F(t, x) d(t, x).$$

Since every arbitrary function in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ can be written as $\widehat{\phi}$ with $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \widehat{G}(-|\xi|^2, \xi) \overline{\widehat{\phi(\xi)}} d\xi = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{\Sigma} (i\partial_t + \Delta) u \overline{[e^{it\Delta} \phi]}$$

using the fact that $(i\partial_t + \Delta)u = F$ in Σ . The proposition 5.2 and the fact that $u(0, \cdot) = u(T, \cdot) = 0$ imply that the right-hand side of the previous identity vanishes. Hence $\widehat{G}(-|\xi|^2, \xi) = 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, which concludes this proof. \square

Finally, we focus on proving the proposition 5.5, which follows the lines of [20, Lemma 4.6] but using the new inequality of the proposition 3.2.

Proof of the proposition 5.5. Start by checking that the right-hand side of the inequality in the statement of this lemma is finite:

$$(100) \quad \|e^{\nu \cdot x} F\|_{L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} \leq \|e^{-(c-|\nu|)|x|}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|e^{c|x|} F\|_{L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))}.$$

For $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and $g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, let us define the multiplier T_ν :

$$T_\nu g(t, x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n+1}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} e^{i(t\tau + x \cdot \xi)} \frac{\widehat{g}(\tau, \xi)}{-\tau - (\xi + i\nu) \cdot (\xi + i\nu)} d(\tau, \xi)$$

for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Note that T_ν is the Fourier multiplier with symbol $p_{-\nu}(\tau - |\nu|^2, \xi)^{-1}$ with p_ν defined as in (24). Changing variables according to $\sigma = \tau - |\nu|^2$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} T_\nu g(t, x) &= e^{i|\nu|^2 t} S_{-\nu} f(t, x), \\ f(s, y) &= e^{-i|\nu|^2 s} g(s, y); \end{aligned}$$

where the multiplier S_ν is defined in (25). Using the proposition 3.2 and the previous identities we know that there is a constant $C > 0$, that only depends on n, q and r , such that

$$(101) \quad \|T_\nu g\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \leq C \|g\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

for all $g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Let $G \in L^p(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with $p \in [1, q]$ denote the function

$$G(t, \cdot) = \begin{cases} F(t, \cdot) & \text{if } t \in (0, T), \\ 0 & \text{if } t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (0, T). \end{cases}$$

Obviously, $e^{c|x|} G \in L^p(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with $p \in [1, q]$. As a consequence of the inequality (101), T_ν can be extended to define $T_\nu(e^{\nu \cdot x} G)$ for every $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ such that $|\nu| < c$ since

$$\|e^{\nu \cdot x} G\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}; L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))} = \|e^{\nu \cdot x} F\|_{L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

and (100) holds. Furthermore,

$$(102) \quad \|T_\nu(e^{\nu \cdot x} G)\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}; L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \leq C \|e^{\nu \cdot x} F\|_{L^q((0, T); L^r(\mathbb{R}^n))}$$

for all $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ such that $|\nu| < c$.

For $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ define

$$\Gamma_\nu = \{(\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n : \tau = -(\xi + i\nu) \cdot (\xi + i\nu)\}.$$

Since the codimension of Γ_ν is 2, we have by the item (a) of proposition B.1 that— for every $\phi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ and every $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ such that $|\nu| < c$ —the function

$$(\tau, \xi) \in (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n) \setminus \Gamma_\nu \mapsto \frac{\widehat{e^{\nu \cdot x} G}(\tau, \xi)}{-\tau - (\xi + i\nu) \cdot (\xi + i\nu)} \widetilde{e^{-\nu \cdot x} \phi}(\tau, \xi)$$

can be extended to $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ so that it represents an element in $L^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. Here

$$\widetilde{e^{-\nu \cdot x} \phi}(\tau, \xi) = \widehat{e^{-\nu \cdot x} \phi}(-\tau, -\xi).$$

Hence, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e^{-\nu \cdot x} T_\nu(e^{\nu \cdot x} G), \phi \rangle &= \langle T_\nu(e^{\nu \cdot x} G), e^{-\nu \cdot x} \phi \rangle \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\widehat{e^{\nu \cdot x} G}(\tau, \xi)}{-\tau - (\xi + i\nu) \cdot (\xi + i\nu)} \widetilde{e^{-\nu \cdot x} \phi}(\tau, \xi) d(\tau, \xi) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\phi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ such that $|\nu| < c$. For every $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, there exists a $Q \in O(n)$ so that $\nu = |\nu| Q e_n$, with e_n the n^{th} element of the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^n . Let G_Q and ϕ_Q denote the functions $G_Q(t, x) = G(t, Qx)$ and $\phi_Q(t, x) = \phi(t, Qx)$ for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Changing variables, we have that

$$\langle e^{-\nu \cdot x} T_\nu(e^{\nu \cdot x} G), \phi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{e^{|\nu| x_n} \widehat{G_Q}(\tau, \xi)}{-\tau - (\xi + i|\nu| e_n) \cdot (\xi + i|\nu| e_n)} \widetilde{e^{-|\nu| x_n} \phi_Q}(\tau, \xi) d(\tau, \xi).$$

By the item (b) of the proposition B.1, we have that the right-hand side of the previous identity is equal to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}} \frac{\widehat{G_Q}(\tau, \xi', \xi_n + i|\nu|)}{-\tau - |\xi'|^2 - (\xi_n + i|\nu|)^2} \widetilde{\phi_Q}(\tau, \xi', \xi_n + i|\nu|) d(\tau, \xi', \xi_n).$$

By the Fubini–Tonelli theorem the function

$$\xi_n \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \frac{\widehat{G_Q}(\tau, \xi', \xi_n + i|\nu|)}{-\tau - |\xi'|^2 - (\xi_n + i|\nu|)^2} \widetilde{\phi_Q}(\tau, \xi', \xi_n + i|\nu|)$$

belongs to $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ for almost every $(\tau, \xi') \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, the function

$$H_Q^{|\nu|} : (\tau, \xi') \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\widehat{G_Q}(\tau, \xi', \xi_n + i|\nu|)}{-\tau - |\xi'|^2 - (\xi_n + i|\nu|)^2} \widetilde{\phi_Q}(\tau, \xi', \xi_n + i|\nu|) d\xi_n$$

belongs to $L^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1})$, and

$$\langle e^{-\nu \cdot x} T_\nu(e^{\nu \cdot x} G), \phi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} H_Q^{|\nu|}(\tau, \xi') d(\tau, \xi').$$

Note that, by the proposition B.2 and the proposition B.1 the function

$$(103) \quad \xi_n \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \frac{\widehat{G_Q}(\tau, \xi', \xi_n)}{-\tau - |\xi'|^2 - \xi_n^2} \widetilde{\phi_Q}(\tau, \xi', \xi_n)$$

belongs to $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ for all $(\tau, \xi') \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ such that $\tau \neq -|\xi'|^2$.

Our final goal will be to show that the function

$$H_Q : (\tau, \xi') \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\widehat{G_Q}(\tau, \xi', \xi_n)}{-\tau - |\xi'|^2 - \xi_n^2} \widetilde{\phi_Q}(\tau, \xi', \xi_n) d\xi_n$$

satisfies that

$$(104) \quad H_Q(\tau, \xi') = H_Q^{|\nu|}(\tau, \xi') \quad \forall (\tau, \xi') \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : \tau \neq -|\xi'|^2.$$

With this at hand, we have that

$$(105) \quad \langle e^{-\nu \cdot x} T_\nu(e^{\nu \cdot x} G), \phi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} H_Q(\tau, \xi') d(\tau, \xi').$$

As we will see at a later stage, the function

$$(106) \quad (\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \frac{\widehat{G_Q}(\tau, \xi)}{-\tau - |\xi|^2} \check{\phi}_Q(\tau, \xi)$$

belongs to $L^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. Hence, by the Fubini–Tonelli theorem we have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} H_Q(\tau, \xi') d(\tau, \xi') = \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\widehat{G_Q}(\tau, \xi)}{-\tau - |\xi|^2} \check{\phi}_Q(\tau, \xi) d(\tau, \xi).$$

Using the identity (105) and the change of variables that removes the orthogonal matrix Q , we have

$$(107) \quad \langle e^{-\nu \cdot x} T_\nu(e^{\nu \cdot x} G), \phi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\widehat{G}(\tau, \xi)}{-\tau - |\xi|^2} \check{\phi}(\tau, \xi) d(\tau, \xi)$$

for all $\phi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ such that $|\nu| < c$.

Let $v \in C(\mathbb{R}; L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ denote the function

$$v(t, \cdot) = \begin{cases} u(t, \cdot) & \text{if } t \in [0, T], \\ 0 & \text{if } t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus [0, T]. \end{cases}$$

The continuity follows from the fact that $u(0, \cdot) = u(T, \cdot) = 0$. Using this, one can check that

$$(i\partial_t + \Delta)v = G \text{ in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Taking Fourier transform we have that

$$(108) \quad (-\tau - |\xi|^2)\widehat{v}(\tau, \xi) = \widehat{G}(\tau, \xi) \quad \dot{\forall}(\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.^5$$

This identity and (107) yield

$$\langle e^{-\nu \cdot x} T_\nu(e^{\nu \cdot x} G), \phi \rangle = \langle v, \phi \rangle$$

for all $\phi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, or equivalently

$$\langle T_\nu(e^{\nu \cdot x} G), \psi \rangle = \langle e^{\nu \cdot x} v, \psi \rangle$$

for all $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ —it is enough to consider $\phi = e^{\nu \cdot x} \psi$ for an arbitrary ψ . In particular,

$$T_\nu(e^{\nu \cdot x} G)|_\Sigma = e^{\nu \cdot x} u.$$

Then, the inequality (102) is the one stated in the proposition 5.5.

In order to conclude this proof, it remains to check two points: the function (106) belongs to $L^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, and the identity (104) holds. Start by showing the first of these points. It is clear that (106) belongs to $L^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ if, and only if, the function

$$(109) \quad (\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \frac{\widehat{G}(\tau, \xi)}{-\tau - |\xi|^2} \check{\phi}(\tau, \xi)$$

also belongs to $L^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. In order to check that (109) belongs to $L^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, we derive from the identity (108) that

$$\widehat{v}(\tau, \xi) = \frac{\widehat{G}(\tau, \xi)}{-\tau - |\xi|^2}$$

for almost every $(\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\tau \neq -|\xi|^2$. Since the measure of the set $\{(\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n : \tau = -|\xi|^2\}$ is zero, the above identity holds for almost every $(\tau, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$. This together with fact that $v \in L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ ensure that (109) belongs to $L^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$.

⁵The symbol $\dot{\forall}$ stands 'for almost every'.

Finally, let us check the identity (104). By the proposition B.2 and the proposition B.1 the function

$$\zeta \in \mathbb{C}_{|\Im| < c} \mapsto \frac{\widehat{G_Q}(\tau, \xi', \zeta)}{-\tau - |\xi'|^2 - \zeta^2} \widetilde{\phi_Q}(\tau, \xi', \zeta)$$

is holomorphic. Then, by the Cauchy–Goursat theorem we have that

$$\begin{aligned} H_Q(\tau, \xi') + \lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} i \int_0^{|\nu|} \frac{\widehat{G_Q}(\tau, \xi', \rho + it)}{-\tau - |\xi'|^2 - (\rho + it)^2} \widetilde{\phi_Q}(\tau, \xi', \rho + it) dt \\ = H_Q^{|\nu|}(\tau, \xi') + \lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} i \int_0^{|\nu|} \frac{\widehat{G_Q}(\tau, \xi', -\rho + it)}{-\tau - |\xi'|^2 - (-\rho + it)^2} \widetilde{\phi_Q}(\tau, \xi', -\rho + it) dt \end{aligned}$$

for all $(\tau, \xi') \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ such that $\tau \neq -|\xi'|^2$. The item (b) of the proposition B.1, and the decay as ρ tends to infinity, can be used to show that each of the limits in the previous identity is zero. Hence, the identity (104) holds. This concludes the proof of the proposition 5.5. \square

Acknowledgements. P.C. is supported by the project PID2024-156267NB-I00, as well as BCAM-BERC 2022-2025 and the BCAM Severo Ochoa CEX2021-001142-S.

REFERENCES

- [1] Giovanni Alessandrini. Stable determinations of conductivity by boundary measurements. *Appl. Anal.*, 27(1-3):153–172, 1988.
- [2] Giovanni Alessandrini. Singular solutions of elliptic equations and the determination of conductivity by boundary measurements. *J. Differ. Equations*, 84(2):252–272, 1990.
- [3] Kari Astala and Lassi Päivärinta. Calderón’s inverse conductivity problem in the plane. *Ann. Math. (2)*, 163(1):265–299, 2006.
- [4] Juan Antonio Barceló, Tomeu Barceló, and Alberto Ruiz. Stability of the inverse conductivity problem in the plane for less regular conductivities. *J. Differ. Equations*, 173(2):231–270, 2001.
- [5] Tomeu Barceló, Daniel Faraco, and Alberto Ruiz. Stability of Calderón inverse conductivity problem in the plane. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 88(6):522–556, 2007.
- [6] Lucie Baudouin and Jean-Pierre Puel. Uniqueness and stability in an inverse problem for the Schrödinger equation. *Inverse Probl.*, 18(6):1537–1554, 2002.
- [7] Mourad Bellassoued. Stable determination of coefficients in the dynamical Schrödinger equation in a magnetic field. *Inverse Probl.*, 33(5):36, 2017. Id/No 055009.
- [8] Mourad Bellassoued and Mourad Choulli. Logarithmic stability in the dynamical inverse problem for the Schrödinger equation by arbitrary boundary observation. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 91(3):233–255, 2009.
- [9] Mourad Bellassoued and Mourad Choulli. Stability estimate for an inverse problem for the magnetic Schrödinger equation from the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 258(1):161–195, 2010.
- [10] Mourad Bellassoued and David Dos Santos Ferreira. Stable determination of coefficients in the dynamical anisotropic Schrödinger equation from the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map. *Inverse Probl.*, 26(12):30, 2010. Id/No 125010.
- [11] Ibtissem Ben Aïcha. Stability estimate for an inverse problem for the Schrödinger equation in a magnetic field with time-dependent coefficient. *J. Math. Phys.*, 58(7):071508, 21, 2017.
- [12] Ibtissem Ben Aïcha and Youssef Mejri. Simultaneous determination of the magnetic field and the electric potential in the Schrödinger equation by a finite number of boundary observations. *J. Inverse Ill-Posed Probl.*, 26(2):201–209, 2018.
- [13] Russell M. Brown. Global uniqueness in the impedance-imaging problem for less regular conductivities. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 27(4):1049–1056, 1996.
- [14] Russell M. Brown and Rodolfo H. Torres. Uniqueness in the inverse conductivity problem for conductivities with $3/2$ derivatives in L^p , $p > 2n$. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 9(6):563–574, 2003.
- [15] Russell M. Brown and Gunther A. Uhlmann. Uniqueness in the inverse conductivity problem for nonsmooth conductivities in two dimensions. *Commun. Partial Differ. Equations*, 22(5-6):1009–1027, 1997.
- [16] Alberto P. Calderón. On an inverse boundary value problem. *Comput. Appl. Math.*, 25(2-3):133–138, 2006.

- [17] Pedro Caro, Andoni García, and Juan Manuel Reyes. Stability of the Calderón problem for less regular conductivities. *J. Differ. Equations*, 254(2):469–492, 2013.
- [18] Pedro Caro, María Ángeles García-Ferrero, and Keith M. Rogers. Reconstruction for the Calderón problem with Lipschitz conductivities. *Anal. PDE*, 18(8):2033–2060, 2025.
- [19] Pedro Caro and Keith M. Rogers. Global uniqueness for the Calderón problem with Lipschitz conductivities. *Forum Math. Pi*, 4:28, 2016.
- [20] Pedro Caro and Alberto Ruiz. An inverse problem for data-driven prediction in quantum mechanics. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 65(1):011505, 01 2024.
- [21] Manuel Cañizares, Pedro Caro, Ioannis Parissis, and Thanasis Zacharopoulos. The initial-to-final-state inverse problem with time-independent potentials. *Inverse Problems*, 41(11):115001, oct 2025.
- [22] Mourad Choulli, Yavar Kian, and Eric Soccorsi. Stable determination of time-dependent scalar potential from boundary measurements in a periodic quantum waveguide. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 47(6):4536–4558, 2015.
- [23] Albert Clop, Daniel Faraco, and Alberto Ruiz. Stability of Calderón’s inverse conductivity problem in the plane for discontinuous conductivities. *Inverse Probl. Imaging*, 4(1):49–91, 2010.
- [24] Piero D’Ancona, Vittoria Pierfelice, and Nicola Visciglia. Some remarks on the Schrödinger equation with a potential in $L_t^r L_x^s$. *Math. Ann.*, 333(2):271–290, 2005.
- [25] David Dos Santos Ferreira, Carlos E. Kenig, and Mikko Salo. Determining an unbounded potential from Cauchy data in admissible geometries. *Commun. Partial Differ. Equations*, 38(1-3):50–68, 2013.
- [26] Gregory Eskin. Inverse problems for the Schrödinger equations with time-dependent electromagnetic potentials and the Aharonov-Bohm effect. *J. Math. Phys.*, 49(2):022105, 18, 2008.
- [27] Andoni García and Guo Zhang. Reconstruction from boundary measurements for less regular conductivities. *Inverse Probl.*, 32(11):22, 2016. Id/No 115015.
- [28] Piotr G. Grinevich and Roman G. Novikov. Transparent potentials at fixed energy in dimension two. Fixed-energy dispersion relations for the fast decaying potentials. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 174(2):409–446, 1995.
- [29] Boaz Haberman. Uniqueness in Calderón’s problem for conductivities with unbounded gradient. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 340(2):639–659, 2015.
- [30] Boaz Haberman and Daniel Tataru. Uniqueness in Calderón’s problem with Lipschitz conductivities. *Duke Math. J.*, 162(3):497–516, 2013.
- [31] Seheon Ham, Yehyun Kwon, and Sanghyuk Lee. Uniqueness in the Calderón problem and bilinear restriction estimates. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 281(8):58, 2021. Id/No 109119.
- [32] Lars Hörmander. *The analysis of linear partial differential operators. I: Distribution theory and Fourier analysis*. Class. Math. Berlin: Springer, reprint of the 2nd edition 1990 edition, 2003.
- [33] Alexandru D. Ionescu and Carlos E. Kenig. Well-posedness and local smoothing of solutions of Schrödinger equations. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 12(2-3):193–205, 2005.
- [34] Markus Keel and Terence Tao. Endpoint Strichartz estimates. *Am. J. Math.*, 120(5):955–980, 1998.
- [35] C. E. Kenig, A. Ruiz, and C. D. Sogge. Uniform Sobolev inequalities and unique continuation for second order constant coefficient differential operators. *Duke Math. J.*, 55:329–347, 1987.
- [36] Yavar Kian and Eric Soccorsi. Hölder stably determining the time-dependent electromagnetic potential of the Schrödinger equation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 51(2):627–647, 2019.
- [37] Yavar Kian and Alexander Tetlow. Hölder-stable recovery of time-dependent electromagnetic potentials appearing in a dynamical anisotropic Schrödinger equation. *Inverse Probl. Imaging*, 14(5):819–839, 2020.
- [38] Adrian Nachman, John Sylvester, and Gunther Uhlmann. An n-dimensional Borg-Levinson theorem. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 115(4):595–605, 1988.
- [39] Adrian I. Nachman. Reconstructions from boundary measurements. *Ann. Math. (2)*, 128(3):531–576, 1988.
- [40] Adrian I. Nachman. Global uniqueness for a two-dimensional inverse boundary value problem. *Ann. Math. (2)*, 143(1):71–96, 1996.
- [41] Virginia Naibo and Atanas Stefanov. On some Schrödinger and wave equations with time dependent potentials. *Math. Ann.*, 334(2):325–338, 2006.
- [42] R. G. Novikov and G. M. Khenkin. The $\bar{\partial}$ -equation in the multidimensional inverse scattering problem. *Russ. Math. Surv.*, 42(3):109–180, 1987.
- [43] Roman G. Novikov. The inverse scattering problem at fixed energy for the three-dimensional Schrödinger equation with an exponentially decreasing potential. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 161(3):569–595, 1994.

- [44] Felipe Ponce-Vanegas. A bilinear strategy for Calderón's problem. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 37(6):2119–2160, 2021.
- [45] John Sylvester and Gunther Uhlmann. A global uniqueness theorem for an inverse boundary value problem. *Ann. Math. (2)*, 125:153–169, 1987.
- [46] John Sylvester and Gunther Uhlmann. Inverse boundary value problems at the boundary-continuous dependence. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 41(2):188–219, 1988.
- [47] Terence Tao. *Nonlinear dispersive equations. Local and global analysis*, volume 106. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2006.
- [48] Gunther Uhlmann and András Vasy. Fixed energy inverse problem for exponentially decreasing potentials. *Methods Appl. Anal.*, 9(2):239–247, 2002.

PEDRO CARO, IKERBASQUE & BASQUE CENTER FOR APPLIED MATHEMATICS, BILBAO, SPAIN,
Email address: `pcaro@bcamath.org`

ALBERTO RUIZ, UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE MADRID, 28049 CANTOBLANCO, SPAIN
Email address: `alberto.ruiz@uam.es`