## 18.118 DECOUPLING LECTURE 2

## INSTRUCTOR: LARRY GUTH TRANSCRIBED BY HONG WANG

## 1. Decoupling for interval

Let  $\Omega = [0, N] = \bigcup_{j=1}^{N} [j - 1, j]$  for some large integer N. Let  $\theta_j$  denote the unit interval [j - 1, j]. If  $\operatorname{supp} \widehat{f} \subset \Omega$ , then  $f = \sum_{j=1}^{N} f_j$  with  $f_j(x) = \int_{\theta_j} e^{2\pi i w x} \widehat{f}(w) dw$ .

**Definition 1.1.** The decoupling constant  $D_p(N)$  is the smallest constant such that for all f,  $supp \widehat{f} \subset \Omega$ ,

(1) 
$$||f||_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \le D_p(N) (\sum_{j=1}^N ||f_j||_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}^2)^{1/2}.$$

1.1. Building blocks. We consider  $f_1$ ,  $\operatorname{supp} \widehat{f_1} \subset [0, 1]$ .

**Question 1.2.** Could the graph of  $|f_1|$  look like several very narrow (say width  $\frac{1}{10000}$ ) peaks and the rest is about zero (see Figure 1 in the attached picture)?

Let  $\eta$  be a Schwartz function and  $\eta = 1$  on [0, 1]. We have  $\hat{f}_1 = \hat{f}_1 \cdot \eta$ . Then  $f_1 = f_1 * \check{\eta}$  and  $\check{\eta}$  is also a Schwartz function.

**Corollary 1.3.** If  $supp \widehat{f}_1 \subset [0, 1]$ , then

$$||f_1||_{L^{\infty}} \lesssim ||f_1||_{L^1}.$$

Proof. By Young's inequality,

$$\|f_{1}\|_{L^{\infty}} = \|f_{1} * \check{\eta}\|_{L^{\infty}}$$
  

$$\leq \|f_{1}\|_{L^{1}} \|\check{\eta}\|_{L^{\infty}}$$
  

$$\lesssim \|f_{1}\|_{L^{1}}.$$

The answer is NO by the above corollary. The height of peaks of  $|f_1|$  is as much as  $||f_1||_{L^{\infty}}$ . However several very narrow peaks with limited height can not add up to the same  $L^1$ -norm.

**Question 1.4.** How about if we add a flat low tail (see Figure 2) to the graph of  $|f_1|$ , such that  $||f_1||_{L^1}$  is dominated by the flat part. Can the graph of  $|f_1|$  still have very narrow peaks?

The answer is still NO. We actually know more about  $\check{\eta}$  other than its  $L^{\infty}$ -norm. We know that  $\check{\eta}$  is a Schwartz function:

$$|\check{\eta}(y)| \lesssim_M \left(\frac{1}{1+|y|}\right)^M$$

for any large constant M. In fact, we almost know that  $||f_1||_{L^{\infty}(I)} \leq ||f_1||_{L^1(2I)}$  for any unit interval I, where 2I means that we stretch I to twice the length with the same center point.

**Lemma 1.5.** Locally Constant Lemma If  $supp \widehat{f}_1 \subset [0,1]$ , and I unit interval, then

$$||f_1||_{L^{\infty}(I)} \lesssim ||f_1||_{L^1(w_I)}.$$

The weighted  $L^1$ -norm is defined as  $||f_1||_{L^1(w_I)} := \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f_1|w_I$ . The weight function  $w_I$  has the following property:

•  $w_I \geq 0$ .

2

- $w_I \sim 1$  on I.
- $w_I$  is rapidly decaying off I.
- $w_I$  is uniform in choice of I in the sense that  $w_{I+a} = w_I(\cdot a)$ .

*Proof.* For any  $x \in I$ ,

$$|f_1(x)| \le \int |f_1(y)| |\check{\eta}(x-y)| dy$$
  
$$\le \int |f_1(y)| \sup_{x \in I} |\check{\eta}(x-y)| dy$$

We define  $w_I(y) = \sup_{x \in I} |\check{\eta}(x-y)|.$ 

One option of  $w_I$  is

$$w_I(y) = (\frac{1}{1 + \operatorname{dist}(y, I)})^{50}.$$

The graph of  $|f_1|$  should look like Figure 3: each peak should have width about 1.

**Remark 1.6.** If  $supp \widehat{f}_j \subset [j-1,j]$ , then the Fourier transform of  $e^{-2\pi i(j-1)x} f_j$  is supported in [0,1]. The Locally Constant Lemma still holds for  $f_j, \forall j$ .

**Example 1.7.** We consider  $f_1$  a bump function with height  $(||f_1||_{L^{\infty}})$ 1 concentrated on [-1, 1] and  $f_1(0)=1$ . Figure 4 is the graph of  $Ref_1$ .

We take  $f_j(x) = e^{2\pi i (j-1)x} f_1(x)$  and we sum over  $j: f = \sum_{j=1}^N f_j$ . Now  $f_i(0) = 1$  and f(0) = N.

Notice that  $Ref_j$  oscillates with frequency about  $\frac{1}{j}$ . When  $|x| \leq 1$  $\frac{1}{10N} \le \frac{1}{10j}, |f_j(x) - 1| \le \frac{1}{4}, \text{ so } |f(x)| \sim N.$ This implies that  $||f||_{L^p} \gtrsim N \cdot N^{-1/p} = N^{1-1/p}.$ 

For the right-hand side,  $\|f_j\|_{L^p} \sim 1$  and  $(\sum_j \|f_j\|_{L^p}^2)^{1/2} \sim N^{1/2}$ . This example gives a lower bound of the decoupling constant as defined in 1

$$D_p(N) \gtrsim N^{1/2 - 1/p}.$$

**Proposition 1.8.** If  $supp \hat{f}_j \subset [j-1, j], j = 1, \ldots, N$ , and  $f = \sum_j f_j$ , then for any  $2 \leq p \leq \infty$ , the decoupling constant defined in 1

$$D_p(N) \lesssim N^{1/2 - 1/p}$$

In particular, the example described above is sharp.

**Remark 1.9.** For p = 2 and  $p = \infty$ , it is easy to estimate  $D_p(N)$ . When p = 2, by Plancherel's inequality,

$$||f||_{L^2}^2 = \sum_j ||f_j||_{L^2}^2$$

When  $p = \infty$ , by triangle inequality,

$$||f||_{L^{\infty}} \le \sum_{j=1}^{N} ||f_j||_{L^{\infty}} \le N^{1/2} (\sum_{j=1}^{N} ||f_j||_{L^{\infty}}^2)^{1/2}.$$

1.2. Main Issue. In this subsection, we discuss a hypothetical example for the issue might occur when 2 . Let <math>p = 4 for example, suppose  $\forall j, |f_j|$  looks like a function that is 1 at [0,1] and  $\frac{1}{N}$  at  $[1, N^3]$ and zero elsewhere (See Figure 5 for the graph of  $|f_i|$ ).

- $||f_j||_{L^2} \sim N^{1/2}$  is dominated by the short wide piece at interval  $[1, N^3].$
- $||f_i||_{L^4} \sim 1$  is dominated by the peak at [0, 1].

We analyse f through the information provided by  $f_i$ .

- By orthogonality,  $||f||_{L^2} \sim N$ .
- By triangle inequality,  $||f||_{L^{\infty}} \leq N$ .

**Question 1.10.** Could it happen that  $|f(x)| \sim N$  for most  $x \in [0, 1]$ ?

Proposition 1.8 tells us that this is impossible.

$$||f||_{L^4} \lesssim N^{1/4} (\sum_{j=1}^N ||f_j||_{L^4}^2)^{1/2} \sim N^{3/4}.$$

The following Local Orthogonality Lemma gives an even better estimate.

**Lemma 1.11.** Local Orthogonality If I is a unit interval,  $f = \sum_{j=1}^{N} f_j$  and  $supp \hat{f}_j \subset [j-1,j]$ , then

$$\|f\|_{L^2(I)}^2 \lesssim \sum_j \|f_j\|_{L^2(w_I)}^2$$

for the weight function  $w_I$  with the same property as in the Locally Constant Lemma 1.5.

*Proof.* We choose  $\eta(x)$  such that  $|\eta| \sim 1$  on I, and  $\operatorname{supp} \widehat{\eta} \subset [-1, 1]$ .

$$\begin{split} \int_{I} |f|^{2} &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f\eta|^{2} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\widehat{\eta} * \widehat{f}|^{2} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\sum_{j} \widehat{\eta} * \widehat{f_{j}}|^{2} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\widehat{\eta} * \widehat{f_{j}}|^{2} = \sum_{j} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f_{j}|^{2} |\eta|^{2} \end{split}$$

Since  $\operatorname{supp} \widehat{\eta} \subset [-1, 1]$ , the support of  $\widehat{\eta} * \widehat{f_j}$  lies in [j - 2, j + 1]. Any frequency lies inside at most O(1) intervals of the form [j - 2, j + 1]. We define  $w_I = |\eta|^2$ .

**Proposition 1.12.** (Local decoupling). If I is a unit interval,  $2 \le p \le \infty$ ,  $f_j$  and f are defined as in Proposition 1.8, then

$$||f||_{L^p(I)} \lesssim N^{1/2-1/p} (\sum_{j=1}^N ||f_j||_{L^p(w_I)}^2)^{1/2}.$$

*Proof.* By Local Orthogonality Lemma 1.11 and triangle inequality

$$\int_{I} |f|^{p} \leq (\int_{I} |f|^{2}) ||f||_{L^{\infty}(I)}^{p-2}$$
$$\leq (\sum_{j} ||f_{j}||_{L^{2}(w_{I})}^{2}) (\sum_{j} ||f_{j}||_{L^{\infty}(I)})^{p-2}.$$

By Locally Constant Lemma 1.5,

$$|f_j||_{L^{\infty}(I)} \lesssim ||f_j||_{L^1(w_I)} \lesssim ||f_j||_{L^2(w_I)}.$$

$$\int_{I} |f|^{p} \leq \left(\sum_{j} \|f_{j}\|_{L^{2}(w_{I})}^{2}\right) \left(\sum_{j} \|f_{j}\|_{L^{2}(w_{I})}^{2}\right)^{p-2}$$
$$\lesssim N^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \left(\sum_{j} \|f_{j}\|_{L^{2}(w_{I})}^{2}\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}$$
$$\lesssim N^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \left(\sum_{j} \|f_{j}\|_{L^{p}(w_{I})}^{2}\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}$$

The last inequality follows from Hölder's inequality.

**Remark 1.13.** Since  $w_I$  is a measure with total mass about 1. Hölder's inequality implies that  $||f||_{L^p(w_I)} \leq ||f||_{L^q(w_I)}$  if  $p \leq q$  and for any function f.

For  $f_j$  in particular, Locally Constant Lemma says  $||f_j||_{L^{\infty}(I)} \lesssim ||f_j||_{L^1(w_I)}$ . Furthermore, we can show  $||f_j||_{L^p(w_I)} \lesssim ||f_j||_{L^q(w_I)}$  for any  $1 \leq p, q$ . It suffices to prove for p > q since other cases are provided by Hölder's inequality. We consider a collection of unit intervals  $\{I'\}$  that tiles  $\mathbb{R}$ .

$$\begin{split} \|f_{j}\|_{L^{p}(w_{I})}^{p} &\leq \sum_{I'} c(I') \|f_{j}\|_{L^{p}(I')}^{p} \\ &\leq \sum_{I'} c(I') \|f_{j}\|_{L^{\infty}(I')}^{p} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{I'} c(I') \|f_{j}\|_{L^{1}(w_{I'})}^{p} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{I'} c(I') \|f_{j}\|_{L^{q}(w_{I'})}^{p} \\ &\lesssim \|f_{j}\|_{L^{q}(w_{I})}^{p} \end{split}$$

 $c(I') := \sup_{x \in I'} w_I(x)$ . Since  $w_I$  is a Schwartz function and satisfies the property listed in Lemma 1.5,

$$\sum_{I'} c(I')^{q/p} w_{I'} \lesssim w_I.$$

In the end we used  $l^q \ge l^p$  when  $q \le p$  to sum up  $\|f_j\|_{L^q(w_{I'})}^p$ .

1.3. **Parallel Decoupling Lemma.** In this subsection, we prove a general Parallel Decoupling Lemma for general decoupling inequalities.

**Lemma 1.14.** For some  $p \ge 2$  and for any function  $g_j$ ,  $g = \sum_j g_j$  and any measure  $\mu_i, w_i, \mu = \sum_i \mu_i, w = \sum_i w_i$ , if we know

$$||g||_{L^p(\mu_i)} \le D(\sum_j ||g_j||^2_{L^p(w_i)})^{1/2}, \forall i,$$

then we have

$$||g||_{L^p(\mu)} \le D(\sum_j ||g_j||^2_{L^p(w_i)})^{1/2}$$

for the same decoupling constant D.

*Proof.* The proof is an application of Minkowski's inequality.

$$\int |g|^{p} \mu = \sum_{i} \int |g|^{p} \mu_{i}$$

$$\leq D^{p} \sum_{i} (\sum_{j} ||g_{j}||_{L^{p}(w_{i})}^{2})^{p/2}$$

$$= D^{p} ||\sum_{j} ||g_{j}||_{L^{p}(w_{i})}^{2} ||_{l_{i}^{p/2}}^{p/2}$$

$$\leq D^{p} [\sum_{j} |||g_{j}||_{L^{p}(w_{i})}^{2} ||_{l_{i}^{p/2}}^{p/2}]^{p/2}$$

$$= D^{p} [\sum_{j} (\sum_{i} ||g_{j}||_{L^{p}(w_{i})}^{p})^{2/p}]^{p/2}$$

$$= D^{p} (\sum_{j} ||g_{j}||_{L^{p}(w)}^{2})^{p/2}$$

6