

SHARP SPECTRAL PROJECTION ESTIMATES FOR THE TORUS AT

$$p = \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1}$$

DANIEL PEZZI

ABSTRACT. We prove sharp spectral projection estimates for tori in all dimensions at the exponent $p_c = \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1}$ for shrinking windows of width 1 down to windows of length $\lambda^{-1+\kappa}$ for fixed $\kappa > 0$. This improves and slightly generalizes the work of Blair-Huang-Sogge who proved sharp results for windows of width $\lambda^{-\frac{1}{n+3}}$ in [1], and the work of Hickman [7], Germain-Myerson [6], and Demeter-Germain [5] who proved results for windows of all widths but incurred a sub-polynomial loss. Our work uses the approaches of these two groups of authors, combining the bilinear decomposition and microlocal techniques of Blair-Huang-Sogge with the decoupling theory and explicit lattice point lemmas used by Hickman, Germain-Myerson, and Demeter-Germain to remove these losses.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Stating the Problem.** The goal of this paper is to improve on the spectral projection estimates for tori. Let $\mathbb{T}^n = \mathbb{R}/(e_1\mathbb{Z} + \dots + e_n\mathbb{Z})$ where $\{e_i\}$ is a basis of \mathbb{R}^n . We will denote the corresponding lattice L , and all implicit constants will be allowed to depend on this lattice. For ease of computation we will also assume a scaling such that the injectivity radius is larger than $\frac{1}{2}$. Let $k_L = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i e_i^*$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ where e_i^* is the dual basis vector to e_i . An orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{T}^n)$ is given by

$$\{e_{k_L}(x) = c_{k_L} e^{2\pi i(k_L \cdot x)} : k_L \in L^*\}.$$

Here, L^* is the dual lattice of L . Each of these vectors is an eigenvector of the Laplacian. We then have the following representation of $f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^n)$ in terms of this basis.

$$f(x) = \sum_{k_L \in L^*} \hat{f}_{k_L} e_{k_L}(x), \quad \hat{f}_{k_L} = \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} f(x) e_{k_L}(-x) dx.$$

We shall also normalize such that $\|f\|_2 = 1$. We define at the outset the following spectral projection operators

$$P_{\lambda,\delta} f = \sum_{k_L \in A_{\lambda,\delta}} \hat{f}_{k_L} e_{k_L}(x),$$

where $A_{\lambda,\delta}$ is the annulus of radius λ and width δ . Our goal is to prove bounds on these spectral projection operators in terms of λ and δ . The case of $\delta = 1$ was settled by Sogge for all compact boundaryless manifolds (see [9]). That is to say

$$\|P_{\lambda,1} f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^n)} \lesssim \lambda^{\mu(p)} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^n)}$$

where $\mu(p) = \max\{\frac{n-1}{2}(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}), \frac{n-1}{2} - \frac{n}{p}\}$. The transition between these two regimes occurs at the critical exponent $p_c = \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1}$.

To gain improvements over these estimates we must consider shrinking windows, that is $\delta \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. The case $\delta = 1$ has been settled and the smallest width that will be considered is $\sim \lambda^{-1}$ as any smaller window results in the projection operator just being a projection onto an

eigenspace for rational tori. Shrinking windows do not give improvements for all manifolds as S^{n-1} follows the same bounds as the universal case ($\delta \sim 1$) for all values of δ . In the negative and non-positive sectional curvature cases gains are expected, see [1], [2], and [8] for results at this level of generality. In that setting, there is a natural barrier to methods that makes it difficult to get results for windows smaller than $(\log \lambda)^{-1}$ because of the role of Ehrenfest time and the fact that universal covers of general manifolds have a number of Dirichlet domains that grows exponentially with respect to radius of a ball centered at the origin. The torus case is different as its universal cover is a tiling of \mathbb{R}^n which clearly has a number of Dirichlet domains that grows polynomially with the radius of a ball centered at the origin. This allows us to access the conjectured bounds for the torus all the way down to the smallest reasonable window for rational tori $\sim \lambda^{-1}$.

The conjecture we are interested in is the following, originally stated by Germain and Myerson and partially proved in [6]. We state it in its full level of generality for reference.

Conjecture 1.1 (The Germain-Myerson Conjecture, spectral projection bounds for the Tours). *Let $\delta > \lambda^{-1+\kappa}$ for some fixed $\kappa \in (0, 1]$. Then the spectral projection operators for \mathbb{T}^n obey the following estimates*

$$\|P_{\lambda, \delta}\|_{2 \rightarrow p} \lesssim \begin{cases} (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{n-1}{2}(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p})} = (\lambda \delta)^{\mu_1(p)} & p \leq p_c \\ (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{n-1}{2}(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p})} = (\lambda \delta)^{\mu_1(p)} & p_c \leq p \leq p^* \text{ and } \delta \leq \lambda^{e(p)} \\ \lambda^{(\frac{n-1}{2} - \frac{n}{p})} \delta^{1/2} = \lambda^{\mu_2(p)} \delta^{1/2} & p^* \leq p \text{ and } \delta \geq \lambda^{e(p)}. \end{cases}$$

Where $p_c = \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1}$ is the critical exponent, $p^* = \frac{2n}{n-2}$, and $e(p) = \frac{n+1}{n-1}(\frac{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{p_c}}{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2(n-1)}})$. We have labeled

$$\mu_1(p) = \frac{n-1}{2}(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}), \quad \mu_2(p) = \frac{n-1}{2} - \frac{n}{p}.$$

When the torus in question is $\mathbb{T}^n = \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{Z}^n$, one conjectures analogous bounds up to $\delta \sim \lambda^{-1}$. This is the discrete restriction conjecture studied extensively by Bourgain, Demeter, and others. The above conjecture can be viewed as filling the gaps between the universal estimates of Sogge and the discrete restriction conjecture.

A full derivation of the bounds for the torus and an explanation of the relevant constants is provided by Germain and Myerson in [6]. They also demonstrate the conjectured bounds would be sharp if true.

Partial progress has been made on Conjecture 1.1. Germain and Myerson in [6] proved this estimate when $p \leq p_c$ with an additional factor of λ^ϵ for general lattices. This is the result we shall improve on. Progress was also made when $p > p_c$ for some region of (p, δ) . These results took inspiration from and improved over the results of Hickman [7]. Demeter and Germain ([5]) specialized to the case $n = 2$ and $\mathbb{T}^n = \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{Z}^n$ to obtain improved bounds, some sharp and some not.

All of these approaches critically use the decoupling theorem of Bourgain and Demeter, which incurs a λ^ϵ loss at the critical exponent p_c . This loss is necessary when the decoupling theorem is applied. The conjecture at $p = p_c$ without epsilon loss was proved for windows of width $\delta > \lambda^{-\frac{1}{n+3}}$ by Blair-Huang-Sogge in [1] using methods applicable to more general manifolds that does not include technology such as decoupling. The general strategy of this paper will be to combine the techniques of Blair-Huang-Sogge with the techniques of Hickman, Germain-Myerson, and Demeter-Germain. This leads to the following sharp result.

Theorem 1.2 (Spectral Projection bounds for this Tours). *Let $\mathbb{T}^n = \mathbb{R}/(e_1\mathbb{Z} + \dots + e_n\mathbb{Z})$. Let $\delta > \lambda^{-1+\kappa}$ for some fixed $\kappa \in (0, 1]$. Then*

$$(1) \quad \|P_{\lambda, \delta}\|_{2 \rightarrow p_c} \lesssim (\lambda \delta)^{\mu_1(p_c)} = (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{1}{p_c}},$$

which after interpolation with the trivial $L^2 \rightarrow L^2$ estimates yields

$$(2) \quad \|P_{\lambda, \delta}\|_{2 \rightarrow p} \lesssim (\lambda \delta)^{\mu_1(p)} \quad 2 \leq p \leq p_c,$$

which verifies Conjecture 1.1 for $2 \leq p \leq p_c$.

Remark 1.3. $p_c = \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1}$ is referred to as the critical exponent, but it is not strictly speaking a critical exponent for this problem as the full result does not follow from the result at p_c . Instead we have a critical curve in the (δ, p) plane. When $\delta = 1$ this curve is at p_c but when $\delta \sim \lambda^{-1}$ the corresponding p value is $p^* = \frac{2n}{n-2}$. Still, we will call p_c the critical exponent as it bears this name in other problems.

1.2. An Overview of the Proof. This paper largely follows the work of [1] which began by approximating the spectral projection operator with a smoothed out version. This argument is standard. Microlocal cutoffs, Q_ν , were then introduced. The phase support of the kernels $Q_\nu(x, y)$ were contained in the intersection of an annulus of unit width, $A_{\lambda, 1}$, and a cone with aperture δ pointing in the direction ν where ν comes from a δ separated set in S^{n-1} . These operators satisfy estimates that align with the conjecture when composed with $P_{\lambda, 1}$ which allows them to be inserted into the problem with an acceptable loss.

Next, a bilinear decomposition in terms of the Q_ν was deployed. Terms in this decomposition were sorted into two operators: one collected the near diagonal terms where the supports of the kernels were close, and the other collected the far terms where the supports of the kernels sufficiently separated. This can be encoded in the separation of the ν directions. Techniques explained in that paper were able to handle both the diagonal terms and the far terms in the context of general manifolds of non-positive sectional curvature, and sharp results were obtained.

There are two major departures in this paper from the work of Blair-Huang-Sogge needed to get sharp results in the torus case. First, we employ a bilinear decomposition of the discrete projection operator and only introduce the microlocal cutoffs afterwards. This sidesteps the use of estimates in the original paper that did not present issues with the larger windows under consideration, but are problematic with our target width of $\lambda^{-1+\kappa}$. Second, we will handle the off diagonal terms using decoupling and an explicit computation using Fourier series, tools which are not available in the more general case and require our projection operator to be written as a Fourier multiplier. This is another motivation for doing the bilinear decomposition before introducing microlocal cutoffs.

The diagonal terms are handled much in the same way as [1], but are easier in this setting because of the added flexibility of working with torus multipliers. Whereas the estimate proved in that paper needed to be a l^{p_c} norm, we can instead use the larger l^2 norm and orthogonality.

The off diagonal terms will be handled by adapting the techniques used in Hickman [7], Demeter-Germain [5], and Germain-Myerson [6] to the bilinear setting. This involves a second decomposition of our operator into smaller caps so decoupling can be applied. Bilinear decoupling is then used to handle the vast majority of caps, while the caps that are nearly saturated with lattice points will be handled with an explicit computation that exploits transversality. The bounds for the off diagonal case are better than those required by the conjecture which is what allows us to conclude.

Acknowledgement. The author would like to thank Christopher D. Sogge, Xiaoqi Huang, and Connor Quinn for invaluable feedback, input, and support for the duration of this project.

2. A DECOMPOSITION

We follow the setup in [1] but instead partition the Fourier multiplier before any approximation. Our decomposition into multipliers will be analogous to our decomposition that defines the microlocal cutoffs Q_ν that will be used later.

Let $\theta_0 = \delta$. Let $\{\nu\}$ be a θ_0 -separated set in S^{n-1} such that every $x \in S^{n-1}$ is within $C\theta_0$ of a ν . This collection of points will also be used to define the Q_ν . But for now, let

$$A'_{\lambda,\delta} = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\xi| \in (\lambda - \delta, \lambda + \delta), |\xi/|\xi| - \nu| \leq \theta_0\}.$$

As written there is overlap at the boundary. We amend this by removing pieces of the boundary from the $A'_{\lambda,\delta}$ until we have a true partition. Additionally, by the triangle inequality, it suffices to prove the results in this paper with the ν restricted to a sufficiently small $O(1)$ neighborhood of $(0, \dots, 0, 1)$. This reduction is to allow us to organize our sum based on the projection of ν to \mathbb{R}^{n-1} in the bilinear section.

Define

$$P_\nu f = \sum_{k_L \in A'_{\lambda,\delta}} \hat{f}_{k_L} e_{k_L}(x),$$

which allows us to make the following organization

$$(3) \quad (P_{\lambda,\delta} f)^2 = \sum_{(\nu,\nu') \in \Xi_{\theta_0}} P_\nu f P_{\nu'} f + \sum_{(\mu,\mu') \notin \Xi_{\theta_0}} P_\mu f P_{\mu'} f = \Upsilon^{diag}(f) + \Upsilon^{far}(f),$$

where $(\nu, \nu') \in \Xi_{\theta_0}$ if and only if $|\nu - \nu'| < C\theta_0$ for some fixed constant C . Our goal now is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1 (Spectral Projection operators for the Torus at p_c). *Let $\delta > \lambda^{-1+\kappa}$ for some $\kappa \in (0, 1]$. Let $\mathbb{T}^n = \mathbb{R}/(e_1\mathbb{Z} + \dots + e_n\mathbb{Z})$. Then*

$$(4) \quad \|P_{\lambda,\delta} f\|_{L^{p_c}(\mathbb{T}^n)} \leq \|(\Upsilon^{diag} f)^{1/2}\|_{L^{p_c}(\mathbb{T}^n)} + \|(\Upsilon^{far} f)^{1/2}\|_{L^{p_c}(\mathbb{T}^n)} \lesssim (\lambda\delta)^{\frac{1}{p_c}} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^n)}.$$

The first inequality follows from our previous discussion and the triangle inequality. We shall prove the bound for the diagonal term in a later section using microlocal cutoffs. The far terms will be handled next.

3. HANDLING THE FAR TERMS

3.1. A reduction. We wish to prove a bound like (2) for Υ^{far} , that is

Proposition 3.1.

$$\|(\Upsilon^{far} f)^{1/2}\|_{p_c} = \|(\sum_{(\nu,\nu') \notin \Xi_{\theta_0}} P_\nu f P_{\nu'} f)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{p_c} = \|(\sum_{(\nu,\nu') \notin \Xi_{\theta_0}} P_\nu f P_{\nu'} f)\|_{p_c/2}^{1/2} \lesssim (\lambda\delta)^{\frac{1}{p_c}} \|f\|_2.$$

We shall organize our sum using a Whitney decomposition as was done successfully in [1] and [2]. Here we use our reduction to directions close to $(0, \dots, 0, 1)$.

We organize based on the first $n-1$ coordinates. Consider dyadic cubes in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} of sidelength $\theta_k = \theta_0 2^k$. We will label $\tau_\mu^{\theta_k}$ as the translations of $[0, \theta_k)^{n-1}$ by $\mu \in \theta_k \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$.

We do not have to worry about μ, μ' that are close by the definition of Ξ_{θ_0} , so we will instead worry about organizing based on distance. We will call two cubes close if they have sidelength θ_k , are not adjacent, and are contained in adjacent cubes of sidelength $2\theta_k$. Clearly there are $O(1)$ close pairs for any fixed cube, and all close cubes are separated by about θ_k . We write $\tau_\mu^{\theta_k} \sim \tau_{\mu'}^{\theta_k}$ if two cubes $\tau_\mu^{\theta_k}, \tau_{\mu'}^{\theta_k}$ of sidelength θ_k are close.

We will write $\nu \in \tau_\mu^{\theta_k}$ if the projection of ν onto the first $n-1$ coordinates is within $\tau_\mu^{\theta_k}$. Because of our restriction to a region near $(0, \dots, 0, 1)$, this is a well defined assignment. Additionally, given $(\nu, \nu') \notin \Xi_{\theta_0}$ there is a unique set $(\theta_k, \tau_\mu^{\theta_k}, \tau_{\mu'}^{\theta_k})$ such that $\nu \in \tau_\mu^{\theta_k}, \nu' \in \tau_{\mu'}^{\theta_k}$, and $\tau_\mu^{\theta_k} \sim \tau_{\mu'}^{\theta_k}$.

All of this allows for the following organization:

$$(5) \quad \sum_{(\nu, \nu') \notin \Xi_{\theta_0}} (P_\nu f)(P_{\nu'} f) = \sum_{\{k \geq r: 2^k \theta_0 < < 1\}} \sum_{(\mu, \mu'): \tau_\mu^{\theta_k} \sim \tau_{\mu'}^{\theta_k}} \sum_{(\nu, \nu') \in \tau_\mu^{\theta_k} \times \tau_{\mu'}^{\theta_k}} (P_\nu f)(P_{\nu'} f).$$

The advantage of this organization is that we have isolated the terms that contribute. The first sum contains λ^ϵ terms, while the second sum has $O(1) \mu'$ for each μ . This allows us to reduce to the following proposition.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $P_\gamma, P_{\gamma'}$ be projections onto disjoint angular sectors of $A_{\lambda, \delta}$ that are subsets of a fixed conic neighborhood that contains $(0, \dots, 0, 1)$. Let each be defined by angular aperture $\sim \theta_k$ and have angular separation $\sim \theta_k$. Then the following estimate holds*

$$(6) \quad \| (P_\gamma f P_{\gamma'} f)^{1/2} \|_{p_c} \lesssim (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{1}{p_c} -} \left(\|P_\gamma f\|_2 \|P_{\gamma'} f\|_2 \right)^{1/2}$$

where $1/p_c -$ is a fixed number less than $1/p_c$.

Before we prove this, let us show that it implies Proposition 3.1.

Proof Proposition 3.2 \implies Proposition 3.1. Note that by our restriction using the triangle inequality and rotation, the following equality holds

$$(7) \quad P_\gamma \left(\sum_{\nu \in \tau_\mu^{\theta_k}} P_\nu f \right) = \sum_{\nu \in \tau_\mu^{\theta_k}} P_\nu f,$$

if we widen the definition of P_γ by a constant that does not depend on λ . This allows us to apply the following inequalities assuming Proposition 3.2.

$$\begin{aligned} & \| \left(\sum_{(\nu, \nu') \notin \Xi_{\theta_0}} P_\nu f P_{\nu'} f \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|_{p_c} \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{\{k \geq r: 2^k \theta_0 < < 1\}} \sum_{(\mu, \mu'): \tau_\mu^{\theta_k} \sim \tau_{\mu'}^{\theta_k}} \left\| \sum_{(\nu, \nu') \in \tau_\mu^{\theta_k} \times \tau_{\mu'}^{\theta_k}} P_\nu f P_{\nu'} f \right\|_{p_c/2} \right)^{1/2} \\ & = \left(\sum_{\{k \geq r: 2^k \theta_0 < < 1\}} \sum_{(\mu, \mu'): \tau_\mu^{\theta_k} \sim \tau_{\mu'}^{\theta_k}} \|P_\gamma \left(\sum_{\nu \in \tau_\mu^{\theta_k}} P_\nu f \right) P_{\gamma'} \left(\sum_{\nu' \in \tau_{\mu'}^{\theta_k}} P_{\nu'} f \right)\|_{p_c/2} \right)^{1/2} \\ & \lesssim \left(\sum_{\{k \geq r: 2^k \theta_0 < < 1\}} \sum_{(\mu, \mu'): \tau_\mu^{\theta_k} \sim \tau_{\mu'}^{\theta_k}} (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{2}{p_c} -} \left\| \sum_{\nu \in \tau_\mu^{\theta_k}} P_\nu f \right\|_2 \left\| \sum_{\nu' \in \tau_{\mu'}^{\theta_k}} P_{\nu'} f \right\|_2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \lesssim (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{1}{p_c} -} \left(\sum_{\{k \geq r: 2^k \theta_0 < < 1\}} \sum_{(\mu, \mu'): \tau_\mu^{\theta_k} \sim \tau_{\mu'}^{\theta_k}} \left(\sum_{\nu \in \tau_\mu^{\theta_k}} \|P_\nu f\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{\nu' \in \tau_{\mu'}^{\theta_k}} \|P_{\nu'} f\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \right)^{1/2} \\ & \lesssim (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{1}{p_c} -} \left(\sum_{\{k \geq r: 2^k \theta_0 < < 1\}} \left(\sum_{(\mu, \mu') \nu \in \tau_\mu^{\theta_k}} \|P_\nu f\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{(\mu, \mu') \nu' \in \tau_{\mu'}^{\theta_k}} \|P_{\nu'} f\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \right)^{1/2} \\ & \lesssim (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{1}{p_c} -} \left(\sum_{\{k \geq r: 2^k \theta_0 < < 1\}} \sum_{\mu} \sum_{\nu \in \tau_\mu^{\theta_k}} \|P_\nu f\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \lesssim (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{1}{p_c} -} \|f\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the fact the first sum only has λ^ϵ terms and there are only $O(1)\mu'$ for a fixed μ such that $\tau_\mu^{\theta_k} \sim \tau_{\mu'}^{\theta_k}$. We also used Cauchy-Schwartz and orthogonality. \square

So we have reduced to proving Proposition 3.2. In order to prove this it is helpful to recall how decoupling was used to prove the conjecture at p_c with ϵ -loss in [6] and [7]. Decoupling necessitates covering the annulus with $(\lambda\delta)^{1/2} \times \dots \times (\lambda\delta)^{1/2} \times \delta$ caps. The L^∞ norms of these caps are the square root of the number of lattice points they contain. Most caps have a number of lattice points like their volume, $\lambda^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \delta^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \delta$, but some bad caps, a label that will be used informally, have a number of lattice points like $(\lambda\delta)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$ which is the maximum allowed. There are only $O(1)$ caps with the maximum number of lattice points (as will later be proved), so there are not that many bad caps in total.

This $L^2 \rightarrow L^\infty$ bound can be used along with the trivial $L^2 \rightarrow L^2$ estimates to obtain $L^2 \rightarrow L^{p_c}$ estimates for these caps. Decoupling is then used to introduce a l^2 norm, with the operator norm for the worst caps being used as a uniform bound.

Initially, it seems that using the worst uniform bound for all caps, especially when it is sharp only for a small number of caps, is inefficient. The only loss comes from the application of decoupling itself. This is explained by the Knapp example saturating the conjectured bounds for the value of p_c being a bad cap. For example, using the square torus $\mathbb{T}^n = \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{Z}^n$ with λ an integer, consider the cap that contains $(0, \dots, 0, \lambda)$ with normal vector $(0, \dots, 0, 1)$. This cap contains many lattice points and the corresponding norm saturate the bounds in Conjecture 1.1 for p_c . See [6] for detailed calculations.

As we will handle the diagonal case by other means, we are free to exploit advantages present in the bilinear case. We will only use decoupling on caps who do not have a large number of lattice points. For the bad caps, we will compute their bilinear interaction more directly to get a gain. Essentially, any two interacting bad caps must be sufficiently transverse so that their product has an improved norm.

To do this, let us first make our decomposition. Let Ω be the collection of all caps in our partition of $A_{\lambda,\delta}$ and let $\Omega_\gamma = \{\omega \in \Omega : \omega \cap P_\gamma \neq \emptyset\}$ with a similar definition for $\Omega_{\gamma'}$. Also, for $\omega \in \Omega$, let $\#\omega$ be the number of lattice points in this cap and let P_ω be the Fourier projection onto this cap intersected with $A_{\lambda,\delta}$. Now we make the following separation

$$\begin{aligned} A(\gamma, 0) &= \{\omega \in \Omega_\gamma : \#\omega \lesssim \lambda^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \delta^{\frac{n-1}{2} + \epsilon_0}\} \\ A(\gamma, 1) &= \{\omega \in \Omega_\gamma : \lambda^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \delta^{\frac{n-1}{2} + \epsilon_0} \lesssim \#\omega \lesssim (\lambda\delta)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}\} \\ P_\gamma^0 &= \sum_{\omega \in A(\gamma, 0)} P_\omega \\ P_\gamma^1 &= \sum_{\omega \in A(\gamma, 1)} P_\omega, \end{aligned}$$

for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ to be selected later with analogous definitions involving γ' . Here, ϵ_0 will depend on certain parameters like n and κ , but will never depend on λ the spectral parameter. Clearly $P_\gamma = P_\gamma^0 + P_\gamma^1$. By the triangle inequality it suffices to bound the following by the bound in Proposition 3.2 to prove Proposition 3.2.

$$(8) \quad \| (P_\gamma^0 f P_{\gamma'}^0 f)^{1/2} \|_{p_c} + \| (P_\gamma^1 f P_{\gamma'}^0 f)^{1/2} \|_{p_c} + \| (P_\gamma^0 f P_{\gamma'}^1 f)^{1/2} \|_{p_c} + \| (P_\gamma^1 f P_{\gamma'}^1 f)^{1/2} \|_{p_c}.$$

3.2. Estimating the Good Caps. The first three terms will be bounded from an application of bilinear decoupling. Bilinear decoupling follows from linear decoupling after an application of Hölder's inequality. We must also do some work to adapt one of the standard statements of decoupling to our situation. For reference, (discrete) decoupling says the following

Theorem 3.3 (Discrete Decoupling for the Sphere). *Let $\omega \in \Omega$ be a covering of λS^{n-1} by $(\lambda\delta)^{1/2} \times \dots \times (\lambda\delta)^{1/2} \times \delta$ caps. Then for any 1-separated set $\xi_\alpha \subset \lambda S^{n-1}$ and sequence $\{a_\alpha\}$ it follows*

$$(9) \quad \left\| \sum_{\alpha} a_{\alpha} e(x \cdot \xi_{\alpha}) \right\|_{L^{p_c}(B_{\delta^{-1}})} \lesssim \lambda^{\epsilon} \left(\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \left\| \sum_{\alpha: \xi_{\alpha} \in \omega} a_{\alpha} e(x \cdot \xi_{\alpha}) \right\|_{L^{p_c}(w_{B_{\delta^{-1}}})}^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

where $B_{\delta^{-1}}$ is a spatial ball of radius δ^{-1} and $L^{p_c}(w_{B_{\delta^{-1}}})$ is a weighted norm.

It is known that there must be a λ^{ϵ} loss in the above theorem, see [4] and a precise definition of the weighted norm appearing on the right hand side. That the above theorem can be applied in our situation is known and was used by Hickman [7] and Germain-Myerson [6] to make progress on Conjecture 1.1.

The outline for applying this result to our situation is as follows. We will always take ξ_{α} to be coming from a lattice, which allows us to interpret the exponential sums as Fourier series. The uncertainty at scale δ^{-1} gives us uncertainty at scale δ in Fourier space, so we can consider points ξ_{α} that are contained in the annulus $A_{\lambda, \delta}$. This is done rigorously in the proof of Corollary 9 in [7]. Fourier series are periodic, and so the spatial norms can be replaced by an integral over the fundamental domain of the lattice which can be associated to \mathbb{T}^n . The loss λ^{ϵ} ostensibly depends on λ and δ , but the exact power is subsumed by the ϵ exponent and so this dependency is suppressed. This justifies the following statement which is what we shall apply in our proofs.

Proposition 3.4. *Let Ω be a collection of $(\delta\lambda)^{1/2} \times \dots \times (\delta\lambda)^{1/2} \times \delta$ caps covering the annulus $A_{\lambda, \delta}$. Let $P_{\lambda, \delta}$ be the Fourier projection operator onto $A_{\lambda, \delta}$ and P_{ω} be the projection onto $\omega \cap A_{\lambda, \delta}$ where $\omega \in \Omega$. Then we have*

$$(10) \quad \|P_{\lambda, \delta} f\|_{L^{p_c}(\mathbb{T}^n)} \lesssim \lambda^{\epsilon} \left(\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \|P_{\omega} f\|_{L^{p_c}(\mathbb{T}^n)}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

We now are in a position to bound the majority of caps with a direct application of the above Proposition.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $P_{\gamma}^0, P_{\gamma'}^1$ be the collections of caps as before. Then*

$$(11) \quad \| (P_{\gamma}^0 f P_{\gamma'}^0 f)^{1/2} \|_{p_c} + \| (P_{\gamma}^1 f P_{\gamma'}^0 f)^{1/2} \|_{p_c} + \| (P_{\gamma}^0 f P_{\gamma'}^1 f)^{1/2} \|_{p_c} \lesssim (\lambda\delta)^{\frac{1}{p_c}-} \|f\|_2$$

Proof. Proposition 3.4 in the context of our projections onto arcs implies the following:

$$(12) \quad \|P_{\gamma}^0 f\|_{L^{p_c}(\mathbb{T}^n)} \lesssim \lambda^{\epsilon} \left(\sum_{\omega \in A(0, \gamma)} \|P_{\omega} f\|_{L^{p_c}(\mathbb{T}^n)}^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

with analogous results for $P_{\gamma}^1 f, P_{\gamma'}^0 f$, and $P_{\gamma'}^1 f$. By Cauchy-Schwartz and Plancherel's theorem, we have

$$\|P_{\omega} f\|_{\infty} \leq (\#\omega)^{1/2} \|P_{\omega} f\|_2,$$

which after Hausdorff-Young, Hölder, and then Plancherel gives

$$\|P_{\omega} f\|_p \leq (\#\omega)^{1/2-1/p} \|P_{\omega} f\|_2.$$

Estimating the first term using Hölder, Proposition 3.4, and then our bound for the number of lattice points yields,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(P_\gamma^0 f P_{\gamma'}^0 f)^{1/2}\|_{p_c} &\lesssim \left(\|P_\gamma^0 f\|_{p_c} \|P_{\gamma'}^0 f\|_{p_c} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\lesssim \lambda^\epsilon \left(\sum_{\omega \in A(\gamma, 0)} \|P_\omega f\|_{p_c}^2 \sum_{\omega' \in A(\gamma', 0)} \|P_{\omega'} f\|_{p_c}^2 \right)^{1/4} \\
&\lesssim \lambda^\epsilon \left(\sup_{\omega \in A(\gamma, 0)} \#\omega \right)^{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2p_c}} \left(\sup_{\omega' \in A(\gamma', 0)} \#\omega' \right)^{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2p_c}} \left(\sum_{\omega \in A(\gamma, 0)} \|P_\omega f\|_2^2 \sum_{\omega' \in A(\gamma', 0)} \|P_{\omega'} f\|_2^2 \right)^{1/4} \\
&\lesssim \lambda^\epsilon \lambda^{\frac{1}{p_c}} \delta^{\frac{1}{p_c} + 2\epsilon_0} \|f\|_2 \lesssim (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{1}{p_c} - \epsilon} \|f\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we use that ϵ_0 is a fixed positive number, while ϵ can be made arbitrarily small. As $\delta = \lambda^{-s}$ for some power, this fixed gain in λ overrules the ϵ loss that comes from using decoupling. We can assume $s > \frac{1}{n+3}$ by the result in [1]. A similar argument holds for $\|(P_\gamma^0 f P_{\gamma'}^1 f)^{1/2}\|_{p_c}$ and $\|(P_\gamma^1 f P_{\gamma'}^0 f)^{1/2}\|_{p_c}$. \square

To conclude we need to estimate $P_\gamma^1 P_{\gamma'}^1$, which requires us to be more precise about our description of lattice points in the bad caps.

3.3. Estimating the Bad Caps. To estimate the bad caps, we will use an explicit computation of the L^4 norm. We will then interpolate with the L^∞ or L^2 norm depending on n . First, we import the following result from [6] which controls the number of caps with a large number of lattice points.

Proposition 3.6 (Theorem 4.1, Germain-Myerson, [6]). *Let ω be such that $\#\omega \sim (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \delta^\alpha$ with $0 \leq \alpha < \epsilon_0$ with ϵ_0 small enough. Let C_α be the collection of all such ω . Then*

$$(13) \quad \#C_\alpha \lesssim \delta^{-n\alpha}$$

Note that $\alpha = 0$ implies $\#C_\alpha = O(1)$. Here we are taking $k = 1$ in the language of Theorem 4.1 in [6], which is allowed as we are only considering caps with a large number of lattice points. If α is sufficiently small and λ large enough, then $(\lambda \delta)^{1/2} \delta^\alpha > K$ where K is an absolute constant depending on the dimension which is required to apply Theorem 4.1 from that paper. This forces α , and hence ϵ_0 , to depend on κ which is allowable as κ is fixed at the beginning of the problem.

The following general result connects the geometry of lattice points in caps to L^4 norms. We will use this to estimate the L^4 norm of two bad caps interacting and then interpolate with the appropriate trivial estimates to conclude.

Theorem 3.7. *Let $n \geq 2$ and A, B be subsets of a lattice L . For $(a, b) \in A \times B$, define*

$$S(a, b) = \{(a', b') \in A \times B : a + b = a' + b'\}$$

and suppose S is such that $S(a, b) \leq S$ for every $a, b \in A \times B$. Then

$$\left\| (P_A f_1 P_B f_2)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^4(\mathbb{T}^n)} \lesssim S^{1/4} \left(\|f_1\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^n)} \|f_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^n)} \right)^{1/2}$$

where $P_A f_1, P_B f_2$ is the Fourier projection of f_1, f_2 onto the set A, B respectively.

Proof. This is an explicit calculation. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(P_A f_1 P_B f_2)^{1/2}\|_4^4 &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} \left| \sum_{(a,b) \in A \times B} \hat{f}_1(a) \hat{f}_2(b) e_{a+b}(x) \right|^2 dx \\
&\leq \sum_{(a,b) \in A \times B} |\hat{f}_1(a) \hat{f}_2(b)| \left(\sum_{(a',b') \in S(a,b)} |\hat{f}_1(a') \hat{f}_2(b')| \right) \\
&\leq S^{1/2} \sum_{(a,b) \in A \times B} |\hat{f}_1(a) \hat{f}_2(b)| \left(\sum_{(a',b') \in S(a,b)} |\hat{f}_1(a') \hat{f}_2(b')|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq S^{1/2} \left(\sum_{(a,b) \in A \times B} |\hat{f}_1(a) \hat{f}_2(b)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{(a,b) \in A \times B} \sum_{(a',b') \in S(a,b)} |\hat{f}_1(a') \hat{f}_2(b')|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq S \sum_{(a,b) \in A \times B} |\hat{f}_1(a) \hat{f}_2(b)|^2 \\
&= S \left(\sum_{a \in A} |\hat{f}_1(a)|^2 \right) \left(\sum_{b \in B} |\hat{f}_2(b)|^2 \right) \\
&\leq S \|f_1\|_2^2 \|f_2\|_2^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Cauchy-Schwartz twice. Taking 4-th roots allows us to conclude. \square

Proposition 3.8. *Let $P_\gamma^1, P_{\gamma'}^1$ be the collections of bad caps as before. Then*

$$(14) \quad \left\| (P_\gamma^1 f P_{\gamma'}^1 f)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^{p_c}(\mathbb{T}^n)} \lesssim (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{1}{p_c} -} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^n)}.$$

Which also implies Proposition 3.2.

Proof. First, write $P_\gamma^1 f = \sum_{\omega \in A(1,\gamma)} P_\omega f$ and $P_{\gamma'}^1 f = \sum_{\omega' \in A(1,\gamma')} P_{\omega'} f$.

Note that if $a, a' \in \omega$ and $b, b' \in \omega'$ with $\omega, \omega' \in A(1,\gamma), A(1,\gamma')$ respectively, then $a + b = a' + b'$ if and only if $a - a' = b - b'$. Fix a, b . This restricts the pairs $(a', b') \in S(a, b)$. Geometrically, a' must lie within the intersection of the the caps $\omega - a \cap \omega' - b$. This set is a rhombus \times a $n - 2$ dimensional square with a 0 dimensional square being interpreted as a point. The rhombus comes from intersecting two eccentric rectangles with short side of length δ at an angle of at least θ_k . As θ_k is bounded below by δ the diagonals of the rhombus are at most $O(1)$. As this is true for both directions of the rhombus, $O(1)$ separation of the lattice means there are $\lesssim (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}$ admissible points a' . As a, b are fixed and selecting a, b , and a' forces a choice of b' , we have $S \lesssim (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}$.

The number of lattice points on each individual cap is bounded by $(\lambda \delta)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$, so we have

$$(15) \quad \|(P_\omega f P_{\omega'} f)^{1/2}\|_\infty \lesssim (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{n-1}{4}} \|f\|_2.$$

Applying Theorem 3.7 gives us

$$(16) \quad \|(P_\omega f P_{\omega'} f)^{1/2}\|_4 \lesssim (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{n-2}{8}} \|f\|_2.$$

If $n = 2$, then we interpolate with $L^2 \rightarrow L^\infty$ estimates to get

$$\left\| (P_\omega f P_{\omega'} f)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^{p_c=6}(\mathbb{T}^2)} \lesssim (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{1}{12}} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)}.$$

which is better than a $(\lambda \delta)^{\frac{1}{6}}$ bound. If $n = 3$, then $p_c = 4$ and this bound is sufficient as $\frac{1}{8} \leq \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{p_c}$.

If $n \geq 4$ we interpolate with the trivial $L^2 \rightarrow L^2$ estimate to get

$$\left\| (P_\omega f P_{\omega'} f)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^{p_c}(\mathbb{T}^n)} \lesssim (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{n-2}{2(n+1)}} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^n)},$$

which is better than $(\lambda \delta)^{\frac{n-1}{2(n+1)}}$. We can conclude with the triangle inequality and $\#C_\alpha \lesssim \delta^{-n\alpha}$ supposing, as we may, that α is small enough. Here we use that $\lambda^{-1+\kappa} \lesssim \delta$ for κ fixed at the beginning of the problem. \square

This completes are proof of the bound for the off diagonal bilinear terms. Now we turn to the diagonal terms which require the use of microlocal cutoffs.

4. MICROLOCAL CUTOFFS AND HANDLING THE DIAGONAL TERMS

4.1. Setting Up. We now introduce the microlocal cutoffs constructed in the following way, such as in [1]. Let ν be a θ_0 -separated set in S^{n-1} . We shall always take $\theta_0 = \delta$ but write them with separate variables both for consistency with previous work and to track which factors come from the angular separation and which come the radial width. Let $\sum_\nu \beta_\nu(\xi) = 1$ be a partition of unity on S^{n-1} such that β_ν is supported in a $2\theta_0$ cap centered at $\nu \in S^{n-1}$. Also write β_ν for the degree zero extension of these bump functions such that they serve as a partition of unity away from the origin. Additionally, let $\tilde{\beta}(\xi)$ be a bump function that is supported on $[1/4, 4]$ and identically 1 on $[1/2, 2]$. Define the kernel

$$Q_\nu(x, y) = \frac{\lambda^n}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{i\lambda\langle x-y, \xi \rangle} \beta_\nu(\xi/|\xi|) \tilde{\beta}(|\xi|) d\xi,$$

with associated operators Q_ν . The symbol of these operators is given by $q_\nu(x, \xi) = \beta_\nu(\xi/|\xi|) \tilde{\beta}(|\xi|)$ and is supported in phase space on an angular sector of the unit width annulus defined by aperture $2\theta_0$. An advantage of this construction is the following estimate whose proof is postponed until the next section.

$$(17) \quad \left\| (I - \sum_\nu Q_\nu) P_{\lambda, 1} \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^n) \rightarrow L^p(\mathbb{T}^n)} \lesssim \lambda^{-N}.$$

This is the estimate that will allow us to insert our microlocal cutoffs. We also know from the proof of (6.18) in [1] that these operators satisfy the following estimate when $\delta > \lambda^{-1+\kappa}$

$$(18) \quad \sup_\nu \|Q_\nu \rho_\lambda\|_{2 \rightarrow p_c} \lesssim (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{1}{p_c}},$$

where ρ_λ is a smoothed out version of the projection operator $P_{\lambda, \delta}$. This follows from interpolating $L^2 \rightarrow L^2$ bounds and summed dyadic $L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty$ bounds found in that paper. Duality and orthogonality show this is equivalent to

$$(19) \quad \sup_\nu \|Q_\nu P_{\lambda, \delta}\|_{2 \rightarrow p_c} \lesssim (\lambda \delta)^{\frac{1}{p_c}},$$

which is the form we shall use to settle the diagonal case.

Remark 4.1. *The above sharp result can be extended to $\delta \sim \lambda^{-1}$ at the expense of λ^ϵ losses. As we shall see, integration by parts gives $(\theta_0 \lambda^{-1})^N$ for certain error terms that arise in our analysis. This is fine when θ_0 is larger than λ^{-1} which we can always assume. When $\theta_0 \sim \lambda^{-1}$ this error term cannot be dealt with. This can be worked around by taking a slightly wider $\theta_0 = \lambda^{-1+\epsilon_0}$, but this forces a factor of λ^ϵ to appear in the main term which prevents them from having applications to proving sharp eigenfunciton bounds.*

Remark 4.2. *As the above estimate follows from interpolation, analogous estimates that agree with the bounds in Conjecture 1.1 can be proven for $p > p_c$. Our application of decoupling prevents this method from applying in that regime, but the author plans to explore this in future work.*

4.2. A decomposition and handling of the Diagonal terms. We shall use microlocal cutoffs and their interactions with the spectral projectors to prove the following

Proposition 4.3. *Assume (17) and (19). Let $\Upsilon^{diag} f$ be as above. Then we have the following.*

$$(20) \quad \left\| (\Upsilon^{diag} f)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^{p_c}(\mathbb{T}^n)} = \left\| \Upsilon^{diag} f \right\|_{L^{p_c/2}(\mathbb{T}^n)}^{1/2} \lesssim (\lambda\delta)^{\frac{1}{p_c}} \|f\|_2.$$

Proof. Note that for a fixed ν , there are only $O(1)\nu'$ such that $(\nu, \nu') \in \Xi_{\theta_0}$. This fact and the triangle inequality give

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Upsilon^{diag} f\|_{p_c/2}^{1/2} &= \left\| \sum_{(\nu, \nu') \in \Xi_{\theta_0}} P_\nu f P_{\nu'} f \right\|_{p_c/2}^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{(\nu, \nu') \in \Xi_{\theta_0}} \|P_\nu f P_{\nu'} f\|_{p_c/2} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{(\nu, \nu') \in \Xi_{\theta_0}} \|P_\nu f\|_{p_c} \|P_{\nu'} f\|_{p_c} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{(\nu, \nu') \in \Xi_{\theta_0}} \|P_\nu f\|_{p_c}^2 \right)^{1/4} \left(\sum_{(\nu, \nu') \in \Xi_{\theta_0}} \|P_{\nu'} f\|_{p_c}^2 \right)^{1/4} \\ &\lesssim \left(\sum_{\nu} \|P_\nu f\|_{p_c}^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we need to introduce the microlocal cutoffs. Using the fact $P_\nu = P_{\lambda,1} P_{\lambda,\delta} P_\nu$ and (17), we get the following

$$\sum_{\nu} \|P_\nu f\|_{p_c}^2 \lesssim \sum_{\nu} \left\| \sum_{\nu'} Q_{\nu'} P_{\lambda,1} P_{\lambda,\delta} P_\nu f \right\|_{p_c}^2 + O(\lambda^{-N}),$$

where the error term with rapidly decreasing norm can be ignored. As of now, the sum in ν' has θ_0^{-1} terms. We shall now show that only $O(1)$ terms in this sum significantly contribute.

Specifically, let (ν, ν') be such that $|\nu - \nu'| \geq C\theta_0$ for a fixed C . We shall also introduce a partition of unity $\sum \psi(x) = 1$ on the torus where each $\psi(x)$ is 1 on some compact set. This partition will not depend on the spectral parameter and so the number of terms will be an absolute constant. The triangle inequality then let's us reduce to estimating the operator $\psi(x)(Q_{\nu'} P_\nu)$. The kernel of $\psi(x)Q_{\nu'} P_\nu$ is as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x)(Q_{\nu'} P_\nu)(x, z) &= \psi(x) \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} Q_{\nu'}(x, y) \sum_{k_L \in A'_{\lambda,\delta}} c_{k_L} e^{-2\pi i(z-y) \cdot k_L} dy \\ &= \psi(x) \frac{\lambda^n}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} e^{i\lambda(x-y, \xi)} \beta_{\nu'}(\xi/|\xi|) \tilde{\beta}(|\xi|) \sum_{k_L \in A'_{\lambda,\delta}} c_{k_L} e^{-2\pi i(z-y) \cdot k_L} dy d\xi \\ &= \psi(x) \sum_{k_L \in A'_{\lambda,\delta}} c_{k_L} \frac{\lambda^n}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} \tilde{\psi}(y) e^{i\lambda(x-y, \xi) - 2\pi i(z-y) \cdot k_L} \beta_{\nu'}(\xi/|\xi|) \tilde{\beta}(|\xi|) dy d\xi + R_\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\psi}(y)$ is a cutoff function identically 1 on a neighborhood of the set where $\psi(x)$ is 1 and R_λ is an error term with rapidly decreasing norm as can be seen by non-stationary phase. Our y -stationary point is $2\pi k_L = \lambda\xi$. By the support properties of our cutoffs and our assumption, we know $|2\pi k_L - \lambda\xi| \geq C\theta_0$. Therefore, an integration by parts in y gives us rapid decay. As we are summing up in polynomially many k_L , we have the rapid decay for the full kernel. This yields

$$\sum_{\nu} \|P_\nu f\|_{p_c}^2 \lesssim \sum_{\nu} \left\| \sum_{\nu': |\nu - \nu'| < C\theta_0} Q_{\nu'} P_{\lambda,1} P_{\lambda,\delta} P_\nu f \right\|_{p_c}^2 + O(\lambda^{-N}).$$

Using that there are only $O(1)\nu' : |\nu - \nu'| \leq C\theta_0$, (19), and properties of spectral projection operators gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\nu} \|P_\nu f\|_{p_c}^2 &\lesssim \sum_{\nu} \left\| \sum_{\nu': |\nu - \nu'| < C\theta_0} Q_{\nu'} P_{\lambda,1} P_{\lambda,\delta} P_\nu f \right\|_{p_c}^2 + O(\lambda^{-N}) \\ &\lesssim \sup_{\nu} \|Q_{\nu} P_{\lambda,\delta}\|_{2 \rightarrow p_c}^2 \sum_{\nu} \|P_\nu f\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim (\lambda\delta)^{2/p_c} \|f\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Raising both sides to the $1/2$ finishes the proof of the Proposition. \square

5. THE MICROLOCAL ESTIMATES

5.1. The Microlocal L^{q_c} Kakeya-Nikodym Estimate. We have reduced matters to showing (17) and (19) which follows from (18) by standard arguments of duality and orthogonality. We shall handle the second estimate first, and restate our goal here.

Proposition 5.1. *Let Q_ν be the microlocal operators previously described. Let ρ_λ be a smoothed out version of the spectral projection operator onto windows of width δ . Then*

$$(21) \quad \sup_{\nu} \|Q_\nu \rho_\lambda\|_{2 \rightarrow p_c} \lesssim (\lambda\delta)^{\mu_1(p_c)} = (\lambda\delta)^{\frac{1}{p_c}}.$$

To ease our calculations later we introduce a spatial partition of unity $\sum \psi(x) = 1$ on \mathbb{T}^n which does not depend on λ such as in the proof of Proposition 4.3. It then suffices to prove the above result for $\psi(x)Q_\nu$ (which we will relabel Q_ν) by the triangle inequality.

As $Q_\nu : L^p \rightarrow L^p$ with an $O(1)$ norm for $2 \leq p \leq \infty$, we have that $Q_\nu^* : L^p \rightarrow L^p$ with bounded norm for $1 \leq p \leq 2$. Thus Proposition 5.1 is equivalent to

$$(22) \quad \|Q_\nu \rho(\delta^{-1}(\lambda - P))^2\|_{p'_c \rightarrow p_c} \lesssim (\lambda\delta)^{2\mu_1(p_c)}.$$

We will use a dyadic decomposition of the operator $\Psi = \rho^2$. Let $\beta \in C^\infty((1/2, 2))$ that satisfies $\sum_{-\infty}^{\infty} \beta(t/2^j)$ for $t > 0$. Let $\beta_0 = 1 - \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta(t/2^j)$. Let

$$L_\lambda = \frac{\delta}{2\pi} \int e^{i\lambda t} e^{-itP} \beta_0(|t|) \hat{\Psi}(\delta t) dt$$

be the local part of our decomposition and let the global part be

$$G_\lambda = \frac{\delta}{2\pi} \int e^{i\lambda t} e^{-itP} (1 - \beta_0(|t|)) \hat{\Psi}(\delta t) dt.$$

By Euler's formula and stationary phase we can reduce to considering the following for $\mu = 2^j, j \geq 0$.

$$\tilde{G}_{\lambda,\mu} = \frac{\delta}{2\pi} \int e^{i\lambda t} \cos(t\sqrt{-\Delta_{\mathbb{T}^n}}) (1 - \beta_0(|t|/\mu)) \hat{\Psi}(\delta t) dt.$$

As $\Psi = L_\lambda + G_\lambda = L_\lambda + \sum_\mu \tilde{G}_{\lambda,\mu}$ and $\tilde{G}_{\lambda,\mu} = 0$ when $\mu : \delta^{-1} \leq C\mu$ we would resolve if we could use two bounds to sum the series. The first of the bounds in the local estimate

$$(23) \quad \|Q_\nu L_\lambda\|_{p'_c \rightarrow p_c} \lesssim \delta \lambda^{\frac{2}{p_c}},$$

which follows immediately from $\|Q_\nu\|_{p \rightarrow p} \lesssim 1$ for $2 \leq p \leq \infty$ and applying the universal estimates for L_λ . The second global estimate needed is

$$(24) \quad \|Q_\nu \tilde{G}_{\lambda,\mu}\|_{p'_c \rightarrow p_c} \lesssim \mu^{\frac{2}{n+1}} \delta \lambda^{\frac{2}{p_c}}.$$

Let us take a moment to interpret these estimates in the context of Conjecture 1.1. The local piece of the operator obeys the bound associated to Sogge's second exponent $\mu_2(p)$. This corresponds to the point focusing regime. At p_c , geodesic focusing saturates the bounds and so L_λ is better than needed. However, for larger values of p , the above bound L_λ will dominate.

The global piece of the operator corresponds to geodesic focusing and will require more work to bound.

5.2. Proving the dyadic Global bounds. To prove (24) we will use interpolation. It follows from properties of the Fourier Transform that

$$\|Q_\nu \tilde{G}_{\lambda,\mu}\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} \lesssim \mu \delta,$$

and so we could conclude by showing

$$\|Q_\nu \tilde{G}_{\lambda,\mu}\|_{1 \rightarrow \infty} \lesssim \mu^{1 - \frac{n-1}{2}} \delta \lambda^{\frac{n-1}{2}}.$$

This will be achieved by lifting to the universal cover and summing over all domains. We will be able to estimate the contribution from a single term without the aid of the microlocal cutoffs. The Q_ν factor will limit the number of terms that contribute to $O(\mu)$.

Lifting to the universal cover will allow us to use the Hadamard parametrix. Specifically,

$$(\cos t \sqrt{-\Delta_{\mathbb{T}^n}})(x, y) = \sum_{k_L \in L^*} (\cos t \sqrt{-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^n}})(x - (y + k_L)).$$

We have used the identification of \mathbb{T}^n with the fundamental domain of the lattice L in \mathbb{R}^n . Let $K_{\lambda,\mu}(x, y)$ be the kernel of $\tilde{G}_{\lambda,\mu}$ which gives the formula

$$K_{\lambda,\mu}(x, y) = \sum_{k_L \in L^*} \tilde{K}_{\lambda,\mu}(x, y + k_L),$$

using the Hadamard parametrix (see [10]) we have the following representation up to lower order terms that will be ignored

$$\tilde{K}_{\lambda,\mu}(x, y) = \frac{\delta}{\pi} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-i\lambda t} e^{i\langle x-y, \xi \rangle} \cos(t|\xi|) \beta(|t|/\mu) \hat{\Psi}(\delta t) dt d\xi.$$

By finite speed of propagation and integration by parts only the region $|x - y| \approx \mu$ contributes. By a stationary phase argument, see Lemma 5.13 in [9], we get that

$$|\tilde{K}_{\lambda,\mu}(x, y)| \lesssim \mu^{-\frac{n-1}{2}} \delta \lambda^{\frac{n-1}{2}}.$$

There are only $O(\mu^n)$ integers k such that $|x - (y + k_L)| \approx \mu$, and so our calculations without the microlocal cutoffs yield

$$|K_{\lambda,\mu}(x, y)| \lesssim \mu^{\frac{n+1}{2}} \delta \lambda^{\frac{n-1}{2}},$$

which is not strong enough to conclude. The inclusion of the Q_ν will limit the number of terms that contribute.

Proof of Proposition 5.1. Let

$$(25) \quad Q_\nu \tilde{G}_{\lambda,\mu}(x, y) = \sum_{k_L \in L^*} K_{\lambda,\mu,\nu}(x, y + k_L)$$

where $K_{\lambda,\mu,\nu} = Q_\nu \tilde{K}_{\lambda,\mu}$. It follows from the previous discussion that $\|K_{\lambda,\mu,\nu}\|_\infty \lesssim \mu^{-\frac{n-1}{2}} \delta \lambda^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$ as Q_ν is bounded $L^\infty \rightarrow L^\infty$. But we shall find that only $O(\mu)$ terms contribute to the sum (25) because of the Q_ν . To do this note that, up to negligible terms, we can write $K_{\lambda,\mu,\nu}(x, y + k_L)$ as

$$(2\pi)^{-n} \mu^{-\frac{n-1}{2}} \lambda^{\frac{3n-1}{2}} \delta \int \int e^{i\lambda\langle x-z, \xi \rangle \pm i\lambda|z-(y+k_L)|} a_\pm(\lambda, |z-(y+k_L)|) \psi(x) \tilde{\psi}(z) \beta_\nu(\xi/|\xi|) \tilde{\beta}(|\xi|) d\xi dz,$$

for some amplitude a_\pm whose support allows us to only consider $|z-(y+k_L)| \approx \mu$. As the Q_ν operator rapidly decreases outside a $\lambda^{-\kappa}$ neighborhood of the diagonal we can insert the bump function $\tilde{\psi}(z)$ which is 1 on the support of $\psi(x)$. As usual, by integration by parts, we can assume $|x-(y+k_L)| \approx \mu$.

Fix x, y . Note that if

$$(26) \quad \left| \frac{x-(y+k_L)}{|x-(y+k_L)|} - \nu \right| \geq C\mu^{-1},$$

by the spatial supports of the cutoffs ψ and $\tilde{\psi}$ and the ξ -support of β_ν , this also implies

$$(27) \quad \left| \frac{z-(y+k_L)}{|z-(y+k_L)|} - \xi \right| \geq C'\mu^{-1},$$

which allows us to integrate by parts in z and achieve rapid decay for these terms. For fixed x, y , note that in the set $|x-(y+k_L)| \approx \mu$, which was our first reduction on the number of k_L that significantly contribute, there are $O(\mu^n)$ k_L as this set is all lattice points ball of radius μ in \mathbb{R}^n centered at $x-y$. However only $O(\mu)$ lattice points in this set do not satisfy (27). Such a lattice point would be contained in an angular sector of aperture μ^{-1} in a ball of radius μ which leads to the desired cardinality.

Therefore,

$$(28) \quad |Q_\nu \tilde{G}_{\lambda,\mu}(x, y)| = \left| \sum_{k_L \in L^*} K_{\lambda,\mu,\nu}(x, y + k_L) \right| \leq \mu \cdot \mu^{-\frac{n-1}{2}} \delta \lambda^{\frac{n-1}{2}} + O(\lambda^{-N}),$$

which allows us to conclude Proposition 5.1. \square

5.3. The Final Microlocal Insert Estimate. The last result we need to prove is (17), which we restate as the following proposition

Proposition 5.2. *Let Q_ν and $P_{\lambda,1}$ be as above. Then the following estimate holds*

$$(29) \quad \|(I - \sum_\nu Q_\nu) P_{\lambda,1}\|_{2 \rightarrow p} \lesssim_N \lambda^{-N}.$$

Proof. By duality and orthogonality, it suffices to prove

$$(30) \quad \|(I - \sum_\nu Q_\nu) \sigma_\lambda\|_{2 \rightarrow p} \lesssim_N \lambda^{-N},$$

where σ_λ is a smoothed out version of the discrete spectral projection operator $P_{\lambda,1}$. Let $\beta(\xi)$ be a bump function identical on $[1/2, 2]$ and supported on $[1/4, 4]$. Let $\beta(P/\lambda)$ be the associated multiplier. We have the following estimate (c.f. [2])

$$(31) \quad \|(I - \beta(P/\lambda)) \cdot \sigma_\lambda\|_{2 \rightarrow p} \lesssim \lambda^{-N}.$$

Therefore, it is equivalent to Proposition 5.2 to prove

$$(32) \quad \|(I - \sum_{\nu} Q_{\nu})\beta(P/\lambda)\sigma_\lambda\|_{2 \rightarrow p} \lesssim_N \lambda^{-N}.$$

By work in [2], we have that the kernel of this operator, $(I - \sum_{\nu} Q_{\nu})\beta(P/\lambda)\sigma_\lambda(x, z)$, is given by the following up to a rapidly decreasing error

$$(33) \quad \frac{\lambda^{2n}}{(2\pi)^n} \int e^{i\lambda(t(1-|\xi|) + \langle y-z, \xi \rangle + \langle x-y, \eta \rangle)} \hat{\rho}(t/c_0)v(t, y, \xi)(1 - \tilde{\beta}(|\eta|)) dt dy d\eta d\xi,$$

where $v(t, y, \xi)$ can be selected to have ξ support in $[3/4, 3/2]$. As the y -stationary point of this integral is $\xi = \eta$, support properties of v and $\tilde{\beta}$ allow us to apply non-stationary phase to get that the kernel is λ^{-N} . Young's kernel inequality allows us to conclude Proposition 5.2 and therefore Theorem 1.2. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] M. D. Blair, X. Huang, and C. D. Sogge. Improved spectral projection estimates. preprint, arXiv:2211.17266, to appear in Journal of the European Mathematical Society.
- [2] M. D. Blair and C. D. Sogge. Logarithmic improvements in L^p bounds for eigenfunctions at the critical exponent in the presence of nonpositive curvature. *Invent. Math.*, 217(2):703–748, 2019.
- [3] J. Bourgain and C. Demeter. The proof of the l^2 decoupling conjecture. *Annals of mathematics*, pages 351–389, 2015.
- [4] C. Demeter. *Fourier Restriction, Decoupling and Applications*, Cambridge University Press, 2020
- [5] C. Demeter and P. Germain. L^2 to L^p bounds for spectral projectors on the Euclidean two-dimensional torus. arXiv:2306.14286
- [6] P. Germain and S. L. Rydin Myerson. Bounds for spectral projectors on tori. *Forum Math. Sigma*, 10:Paper No. e24, 20, 2022.
- [7] J. Hickman. Uniform L^p resolvent estimates on the torus. *Mathematics Research Reports*, 1:31–45, 2020.
- [8] X. Huang and C. Sogge. Curvature and sharp growth rates of log-quasimodes on compact manifolds. preprint, arXiv:2404.13734
- [9] C. D. Sogge. *Fourier integrals in classical analysis*, volume 105 of Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993
- [10] C. D. Sogge. *Hangzhou lectures on eigenfunctions of the Laplacian*, volume 188 of Annals of Mathematics Studies. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2014.

(D. P.) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND, 21218
E-mail address: dpezzi1@jhu.edu