

Recent progress on decouplings

Ciprian Demeter, Indiana University

MSRI, May 2017

Decouplings

Let $(f_j)_{j=1}^N$ be N elements of a Banach space X . The triangle inequality

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^N f_j \right\|_X \leq \sum_{j=1}^N \|f_j\|_X$$

is universal, it does not incorporate any possible cancellations between the f_j . It leads to

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^N f_j \right\|_X \leq N^{1/2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \|f_j\|_X^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

But if X is a Hilbert space (think $X = L^2(\mathbb{T}^n)$) and if $f_j \in X, \mathbf{j} \in J$ are pairwise orthogonal (think $f_j(\mathbf{x}) = e(\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{j})$) then we have

$$l^2 \text{ decoupling} \quad \left\| \sum_{\mathbf{j}} f_{\mathbf{j}} \right\|_X \leq \left(\sum_{\mathbf{j}} \|f_{\mathbf{j}}\|_X^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

$$l^p \text{ decoupling} \quad \left\| \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in J} f_{\mathbf{j}} \right\|_X \leq |J|^{1/2 - 1/p} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{j} \in J} \|f_{\mathbf{j}}\|_X^p \right)^{1/p}$$

Motivated in part by investigations by Thomas Wolff from late 1990s, Bourgain and I have developed a decoupling theory for L^p spaces. In a nutshell, our theorems go as follows:

Theorem (Abstract decoupling theorem)

Let $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function on some compact manifold \mathcal{M} in \mathbb{R}^n , with natural measure σ . Partition the manifold into caps τ of size δ (with some variations forced by curvature) and let $f_\tau = f1_\tau$ be the restriction of f to τ . Then there is a critical index $p_c > 2$ and some $q \geq 2$ (both depending on the manifold) so that we have an l^2 (or sometimes just the analogous l^p) decoupling

$$\|\widehat{fd\sigma}\|_{L^p(B_{\delta^{-q}})} \lesssim_\epsilon \delta^{-\epsilon} \left(\sum_{\tau:\delta\text{-cap}} \| \widehat{f_\tau d\sigma} \|_{L^p(B_{\delta^{-q}})}^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

for each ball $B_{\delta^{-q}}$ in \mathbb{R}^n with radius δ^{-q} and each $2 \leq p \leq p_c$.

Most of the applications of our abstract decoupling theorem for estimating exponential sums rely on the very simple observation that for each $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the Fourier transform of the Dirac delta distribution

$$\delta_\xi(\eta) := \begin{cases} 1, & \eta = \xi \\ 0, & \eta \neq \xi \end{cases}$$

is an exponential

$$\widehat{\delta}_\xi(x) = e(x \cdot \xi)$$

Bourgain's observation (2011): To get from...

Theorem (Abstract decoupling theorem)

$$\|\widehat{fd\sigma}\|_{L^p(B_{\delta^{-q}})} \lesssim_{\epsilon} \delta^{-\epsilon} \left(\sum_{\tau: \delta\text{-cap}} \|\widehat{f_{\tau}d\sigma}\|_{L^p(B_{\delta^{-q}})}^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

for each ball $B_{\delta^{-q}}$ in \mathbb{R}^n with radius δ^{-q} and each $2 \leq p \leq p_c$.

...to the exponential sum estimate

Theorem (Discrete decoupling)

For each cap τ let $\xi_{\tau} \in \tau$ and $a_{\tau} \in \mathbb{C}$. Then

$$|B_{\delta^{-q}}|^{-1/p} \left\| \sum_{\tau} a_{\tau} e(\xi_{\tau} \cdot \mathbf{x}) \right\|_{L^p(B_{\delta^{-q}})} \lesssim_{\epsilon} \delta^{-\epsilon} \left(\sum_{\tau} |a_{\tau}|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

for each ball $B_{\delta^{-q}}$ in \mathbb{R}^n with radius δ^{-q} and each $2 \leq p \leq p_c$,

apply the decoupling to (a smooth approximation of)

$$f(\xi) = \sum_{\tau} a_{\tau} \delta_{\xi_{\tau}}$$

Key ingredient: Multilinear Keakeya (a decoupling in disguise)

Theorem (Bennett, Carbery, Tao, 2006)

Consider n families \mathcal{T}_j consisting of $R \times R^{1/2} \times \dots \times R^{1/2}$ tubes $T \subset B_{4R}$ in \mathbb{R}^n having the following property

Transversality: The direction of the long axis of $T \in \mathcal{T}_j$ is in a small neighborhood of $e_j = (0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0)$

Then we have the following inequality (\int denotes the average)

$$\int_{B_{4R}} \left| \prod_{j=1}^n F_j \right|^{\frac{1}{2n} \frac{2n}{n-1}} \lesssim_{\epsilon} R^{\epsilon} \left[\prod_{j=1}^n \int_{B_{4R}} |F_j|^{\frac{1}{2n}} \right]^{\frac{2n}{n-1}} \quad (1)$$

for all functions F_j of the form

$$F_j = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_j} c_T 1_T.$$

Some examples with sharp decoupling theory

- Hypersurfaces in \mathbb{R}^n with nonzero Gaussian curvature ($p_c = \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1}$). **Many applications:** Optimal Strichartz estimates for Schrödinger equation on both rational and irrational tori in all dimensions, improved L^p estimates for the eigenfunctions of the Laplacian on the torus, etc
- The cone (zero Gaussian curvature) in \mathbb{R}^n ($p_c = \frac{2n}{n-2}$). **Many applications:** progress on Sogge's "local smoothing conjecture for the wave equation", etc
- (Bourgain) Two dimensional surfaces in \mathbb{R}^4 ($p_c = 6$). **Application:** Bourgain used this to improve the estimate in the Lindelöf hypothesis for the growth of Riemann zeta
- (with Bourgain and Guth) Curves with torsion in \mathbb{R}^n ($p_c = n(n+1)$). **Application:** Vinogradov's Mean Value Thm.
- (with Bourgain and Guo) Surfaces in \mathbb{R}^9 ($p_c = 20$). **Application:** Parsell-Vinogradov systems

Some recent developments by others

1. Fan, Staffilani, Wang and Wilson obtained a new proof of the decoupling theorem for the paraboloid in \mathbb{R}^3 that does not make use of trilinearity.

2. Du, Guth and Li combined the polynomial method with sharp decouplings for the parabola to prove

Theorem (Improved bilinear Strichartz estimate in \mathbb{R}^2)

Let I_1, I_2 be two separated intervals in $[-1, 1]$ and let $f_i : I_i \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Let σ be the standard measure on the parabola. Let S_1, \dots, S_N be (dyadic) squares with side length \sqrt{R} inside $[-R, R]^2$ such that

$$\int_{S_j} |\widehat{f_i d\sigma}|^6 \sim C_i, \quad i = 1, 2$$

for each S_j . Then

$$\| |\widehat{f_1 d\sigma} \widehat{f_2 d\sigma}|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|_{L^6(S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_N)} \lesssim N^{-\frac{1}{6}} R^\epsilon (\|f_1\|_2 \|f_2\|_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

Note the $N^{-\frac{1}{6}}$ gain over the classical (unrestricted) estimate.

Many questions are still left open, about decouplings on curves, on the cone, manifolds of intermediate co-dimension, with further potential applications to number theory.

Question

Can one make progress on the conjectured estimate

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N a_n e(nx + n^3 y) \right\|_{L^p_{dx,dy}([0,1]^2)} \lesssim N^\epsilon \|a_n\|_{l^2}, \quad 2 \leq p \leq 8$$

using decouplings?

If yes, it would have to involve a very subtle/novel argument, for the following reason.

$$C_1 = \{(t, t^2)\}$$

$$C_2 = \{(t, \phi(t) := t^3) : t \sim 1\} : \text{Note that } \phi'', \phi''' \sim 1$$

We know that for both C_1, C_2 the following l^2 decoupling holds

$$\|\widehat{fd\sigma}_{C_i}\|_{L^p(B_{\delta^{-2}})} \lesssim_{\epsilon} \delta^{-\epsilon} \left(\sum_{\tau \subset C_i: \delta\text{-arc}} \|\widehat{f_{\tau}d\sigma}_{C_i}\|_{L^p(B_{\delta^{-2}})}^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

within the range $2 \leq p \leq 6$. This range is sharp both C_i :

$$\|\widehat{fd\sigma}_{C_i}\|_{L^p(B_1)} \lesssim_{\epsilon} \delta^{-\epsilon} \left(\sum_{\tau \subset C_i: \delta\text{-arc}} \|\widehat{f_{\tau}d\sigma}_{C_i}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

is false for $p > 6$, even when \mathbb{R}^2 is placed on the right. (test with $f \equiv 1$.)

Question

Is it true that for each ~ 1 -separated set Γ with $\sim N$ points on

$$\{(x, x^3) : 1 \leq x \leq N\}$$

we have

$$|\{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_8) \in \Gamma^8 : \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_4 = \lambda_5 + \dots + \lambda_8\}| \lesssim_\epsilon N^{4+\epsilon}?$$

Let

$$E_I g(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \widehat{g_I d\sigma}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \int_I g(t) e(tx_1 + \dots + t^n x_n) dt$$

The next question is about $L^p(L^p)$ decoupling at spatial scale N^2 .

Question

What is the largest $p = p_n$ for which we have $L^p(L^p)$ decoupling

$$\|E_{[0,1]} g\|_{L^p(B_{N^2})} \lesssim_\epsilon N^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p} + \epsilon} \left(\sum_{|I|=N^{-1}} \|E_I g\|_{L^p(B_{N^2})}^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

If one integrates over larger balls B_{N^n} then Bourgain-D-Guth proved the above holds for p as large as $n(n+1)$.

This is connected with open questions about the size of

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^{n-1}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{N^\alpha}} \left| \sum_{k \sim N} e(kx_1 + \dots + k^n x_n) \right|^p dx_1 \dots dx_n, \quad 0 < \alpha < 1$$

Question

What is the largest $p = p_n$ for which we have

$$\|E_{[0,1]}g\|_{L^p(B_{N^2})} \lesssim_{\epsilon} N^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p} + \epsilon} \left(\sum_{|I|=N^{-1}} \|E_I g\|_{L^p(B_{N^2})}^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

We know that p_n is nondecreasing, but also bounded from above ($p_n \leq 22$).

We also know $p_2 = 6$ (standard **linear** decoupling for the parabola)

Using **bilinear** methods one can prove $p_3 \geq 8$ and $p_4 \geq 12$.

I will next show how to use **trilinear** arguments to prove that $p_5 \geq 14$.

None of these lower bounds is known to be sharp.

For two symmetric matrices $A_1, A_2 \in M_3(\mathbb{R})$ consider the quadratic forms

$$Q_i(r, s, t) = [r, s, t]A_i[r, s, t]^T$$

and the associated three dimensional quadratic surface in \mathbb{R}^5

$$S_{Q_1, Q_2} := \{(r, s, t, Q_1(r, s, t), Q_2(r, s, t)) : (r, s, t) \in [0, 1]^3\}.$$

Theorem (D,Guo,Shi, to appear in Revista)

Assume that for each nonzero vector $(u, v, w) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, the following **curvature condition** holds: the determinant

$$P(r, s, t) := \det \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial r} & \frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial s} & \frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial t} \\ \frac{\partial Q_2}{\partial r} & \frac{\partial Q_2}{\partial s} & \frac{\partial Q_2}{\partial t} \\ u & v & w \end{bmatrix}$$

is not the zero polynomial, when regarded as a function of r, s, t . Then there is an $L^p(L^p)$ decoupling for $2 \leq p \leq \frac{14}{3}$. (sharp range)

- This is a decoupling on (spatial) balls B_{N^2} into (frequency) cubes with side length N^{-1} .
- Restriction theorems for 3 dimensional manifolds in \mathbb{R}^5 have been established under various assumptions by Christ (PhD thesis), De Carli and Iosevich (1998)...
- Our curvature condition is very general, in fact it may be also (at least very close to being) necessary in order to have the range $2 \leq p \leq \frac{14}{3}$.
- The very symmetric manifold

$$\{(r, s, t, r^2 + s^2 + t^2, rs + rt + st) : (r, s, t) \in [0, 1]^3\}$$

fails to satisfy our curvature condition. We could prove that there is no l^p decoupling for $p > 4$.

The main new difficulties associated with our theorem (compared to previous decoupling results) are

- Identifying the “correct” notion of curvature
- Linear algebra associated with checking Brascamp-Lieb-type transversality conditions.
- Subtle analytic issues associated with cylindrical decoupling needed to address the complexity of the geometry of our manifolds.
- Lower dimensional contribution in the Bourgain-Guth iteration may come from a **non planar** 2-variety in \mathbb{R}^3 (the zero set of $P(r, s, t)$). We use an approximation argument/induction on scales à la Seeger-Pramanik, Bourgain-D. which most closely resembles a very recent argument of Oh. The point is to make quantitative use of the fact that 2-varieties are locally close to planes.

Back to the original problem, i.e proving that we have an $L^p(L^p)$ decoupling at spatial scale N^2

$$\|E_{[0,1]}g\|_{L^p(B_{N^2})} \lesssim_{\epsilon} N^{\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p})+\epsilon} \left(\sum_{|I|=N^{-1}} \|E_I g\|_{L^p(B_{N^2})}^p \right)^{1/p}$$

for $2 \leq p \leq 14$ for the moment curve (t, t^2, t^3, t^4, t^5) .

The idea is to first get the L^{14} estimate for the trilinear term. Note that with

$$\gamma_{5,I} = \{(t, t^2, t^3, t^4, t^5) : t \in I\}$$

we have (I_i separated intervals in $[0, 1]$) that

$$\gamma_{5,I_1} + \gamma_{5,I_2} + \gamma_{5,I_3}$$

is a subset of the manifold

$$S := \left(r, s, t, \frac{r^4}{6} - r^2s + \frac{4rt}{3} + \frac{s^2}{2}, \frac{r^5}{6} - \frac{5r^3s}{6} + \frac{5r^2t}{6} + \frac{5st}{6} \right)$$

via Newton's identities.

$$S := (r, s, t, Q_1 := \frac{r^4}{6} - r^2s + \frac{4rt}{3} + \frac{s^2}{2}, Q_2 := \frac{r^5}{6} - \frac{5r^3s}{6} + \frac{5r^2t}{6} + \frac{5st}{6})$$

While the entries Q_1 and Q_2 are not quadratic (as in our theorem), we can use Taylor's formula and induction on scales à la Seeger-Pramanik to reduce matters to our theorem. Our curvature condition turns out to be good enough.

This argument gives a trilinear decoupling for our moment curve via the key formula

$$14 = \frac{14}{3} \times 3$$

The passage to a linear decoupling is done via a (slightly less standard) Bourgain-Guth type iteration.

Other questions that I would love to see solved (hopefully making use of, or drawing inspiration from decouplings) until we meet again at MSRI are

- The restriction conjecture (at least in \mathbb{R}^3 , at least modulo Keakeya-type estimates)
- The L^4 square function estimate for the cone in \mathbb{R}^3