

# Strichartz estimates for the kinetic transport equation

Susana Gutiérrez

U. Birmingham

7-11 September 2015

# Introduction: (Classical) Strichartz estimates

The solution of the kinetic transport equation

$$\partial_t f(t, x, v) + v \cdot \nabla_x f(t, x, v) = 0, \quad f(0, x, v) = f^0(x, v)$$

for  $(t, x, v) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfies the Strichartz estimates

$$\|f\|_{L_t^q L_x^p L_v^r} \lesssim \|f^0\|_{L_{x,v}^a}, \quad \text{where}$$

$$\frac{2}{q} = d \left( \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{p} \right), \quad \frac{1}{a} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{p} \right), \quad p \geq a \quad q > a. \quad (1)$$

**Castella-Perthame [1996]:**

- With the further condition  $q > 2 \geq a$ .

**Keel-Tao [1998]:**

- Observed that this condition can be relaxed to  $q > a$ .
- The homogeneity condition,  $p \geq a$  and  $q \geq a$  are necessary.
- Conjectured that the Strichartz estimate holds at the endpoint  $q = a$ .

# Endpoint Strichartz estimate: $q = a$

## Endpoint conjecture:

$$\|f\|_{L_t^a L_x^{\frac{d}{d-1}a} L_v^{\frac{d}{d+1}a}} \lesssim \|f^0\|_{L_{x,v}^a}$$

## Invariance:

$$f^0 \longrightarrow (f^0)^\lambda, \quad \text{then} \quad f \longrightarrow f^\lambda$$

If the Strichartz estimate is true  $\implies$  Strichartz estimate is ALSO true  
for  $(q, p, r, a)$  for  $(\lambda q, \lambda p, \lambda r, \lambda a)$ .

This invariance allows us to fix/choose one of the Strichartz exponents!

$$\|f\|_{L_t^a L_x^{\frac{d}{d-1}a} L_v^{\frac{d}{d+1}a}} \lesssim \|f^0\|_{L_{x,v}^a}$$

Choosing  $a = 2$  (classical) the endpoint-conjecture rewrites

$$\|f\|_{L_t^2 L_x^{\frac{2d}{d-1}} L_v^{\frac{2d}{d+1}}} \lesssim \|f^0\|_{L_{x,v}^2}$$

- $d = 1$  The endpoint estimate

$$\|f\|_{L_t^2 L_x^\infty L_v^1} \lesssim \|f^0\|_{L_{x,v}^2} \quad \text{is FALSE}$$

- Guo-Peng [2007]. Replacement for the endpoint:

$$\|f\|_{L_t^2 \text{BMO}_x L_v^1} \lesssim \|f^0\|_{L_{x,v}^2}$$

- Ovcharov [2011]: Counterexample based on testing the estimate on the characteristic function of a Besicovich set.

- $d > 1$  Open question.

## Aim:

- Prove the failure of the endpoint Strichartz estimate for the kinetic transport equation in any dimension.
- Prove all the non-endpoint Strichartz estimates using multilinear analysis.

Joint work with

*Jonathan Bennett* (U. Birmingham),  
*Neal Bez* (Saitama University),  
*Sanghyuk Lee* (Seoul National University).

## Approach:

- Multilinear analysis.

- Strichartz estimates for the free wave and Schrödinger propagators (and others) have been used extensively to study the well-posedness of associated nonlinear equations/systems.
- Strichartz estimates for the kinetic transport equation have been used to prove global existence of (weak) solutions for kinetic models of chemotaxis with smallness assumption of the initial data.  
[Bournaveas-Calvez-Gutierrez-Perthame, 2008]

# Failure of the endpoint

$$\|f\|_{L_t^a L_x^{\frac{d}{d-1}a} L_v^{\frac{d}{d+1}a}} \lesssim \|f^0\|_{L_{x,v}^a}$$

Choosing  $a = \frac{d+1}{d}$ , the endpoint-conjecture rewrites

$$\|f\|_{L_t^{\frac{d+1}{d}} L_x^{\frac{d+1}{d-1}} L_v^1} \lesssim \|f^0\|_{L_{x,v}^{\frac{d+1}{d}}}$$

Notice that  $f(t, x, v) = f^0(x - tv, v)$ , and then

$$\|f(t, x, \cdot)\|_{L_v^1} = \underbrace{\int f(t, x, v) dv}_{\text{Velocity average}} = \int f^0(x - tv, v) dv = \rho(f^0)(t, x)$$

The endpoint-conjecture rewrites as the following estimate for  $\rho(f^0)$

$$\|\rho(f^0)\|_{L_t^{\frac{d+1}{d}} L_x^{\frac{d+1}{d-1}}} \lesssim \|f^0\|_{L_{x,v}^{\frac{d+1}{d}}}$$

$$\|\rho(f^0)\|_{L_t^{\frac{d+1}{d}} L_x^{\frac{d+1}{d-1}}} \lesssim \|f^0\|_{L_{x,v}^{\frac{d+1}{d}}}$$

$\Updownarrow$  **Duality**

$$\|\rho^*(g)\|_{L_{x,v}^{d+1}} \lesssim \|g\|_{L_t^{d+1} L_x^{\frac{d+1}{2}}}$$

where  $\rho^*$  is the adjoint operator given by

$$(\rho^*(g))(x, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(t, x + tv) dt$$

## Theorem

*The following estimate*

$$\|\rho^*(g)\|_{L_{x,v}^{d+1}} \lesssim \|g\|_{L_t^{d+1} L_x^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} \quad \text{is FALSE!}$$



**Argument:** Frank-Lewin-Lieb-Seiringer [2014]

Refined Strichartz estimates for solutions of the free Schrödinger equation associated with systems of orthonormal functions.

The argument follows the authors' approach in the proof of the failure of a conjectured endpoint.

**Proof:** Recall that

$$(\rho^*(g))(x, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(t, x + tv) dt.$$

Suppose  $g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$  is nonnegative and such that  $\widehat{g} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$  is also nonnegative. Formally,

$$\|\rho^*(g)\|_{\mathbf{L}_{x,v}^{d+1}}^{d+1} = \int \prod_{j=1}^{d+1} g(t_j, x + t_j v) d\vec{t} dx dv.$$

Denoting  $\widehat{g}$  the space-time Fourier transform of  $g$ , using Fourier inversion

$$\begin{aligned} g(t_j, x + t_j v) &= c \int e^{i\tau_j t_j} e^{\xi_j \cdot (x + t_j v)} \widehat{g}(\tau_j, \xi_j) d\tau_j d\xi_j \\ &= c \int \underbrace{e^{t_j(\tau_j + \xi_j \cdot v)}} e^{i\xi_j \cdot x} \underbrace{\widehat{g}(\tau_j, \xi_j)} d\tau_j d\xi_j. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho^*(g)\|_{L_{x,v}^{d+1}}^{d+1} &= \int \prod_{j=1}^{d+1} g(t_j, x + t_j v) d\vec{t} dx dv \\ &= c \int \prod_{j=1}^{d+1} \widehat{g}(\tau_j, \xi_j) \left( \prod_{k=1}^{d+1} e^{it_k(\tau_k + v \cdot \xi_k)} \right) e^{ix \cdot \sum_{\ell=1}^{d+1} \xi_\ell} d\vec{\tau} d\vec{\xi} d\vec{t} dx dv \\ &= c \int \prod_{j=1}^{d+1} \widehat{g}(\tau_j, \xi_j) \prod_{k=1}^{d+1} \delta(\tau_k + v \cdot \xi_k) \delta\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{d+1} \xi_\ell\right) d\vec{\tau} d\vec{\xi} dv \\ &= c \int \prod_{j=1}^{d+1} \widehat{g}(-v \cdot \xi_j, \xi_j) \delta\left(\sum_{l=1}^{d+1} \xi_l\right) d\vec{\xi} dv \end{aligned}$$

$$\|\rho^*(g)\|_{L_{x,v}^{d+1}}^{d+1} = c \int \prod_{j=1}^d \widehat{g}(-v \cdot \xi_j, \xi_j) \widehat{g}\left(v \cdot \sum_{k=1}^d \xi_k, -\sum_{\ell=1}^d \xi_\ell\right) dv d\vec{\xi}. \quad (2)$$

On  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , consider the change of variables:  $v \longrightarrow w_j = -\xi_j \cdot v, \quad j = 1, \dots, d$

$$\left| \frac{\partial w}{\partial v} \right| = |\det(-\xi_1, \dots, -\xi_d)|$$

$$\|\rho^*(g)\|_{L_{x,v}^{d+1}}^{d+1} = c \int \prod_{j=1}^d \widehat{g}(w_j, \xi_j) \widehat{g}\left(-\sum_{k=1}^d w_k, -\sum_{\ell=1}^d \xi_\ell\right) \frac{1}{|\det(-\xi_1, \dots, -\xi_d)|} dw d\vec{\xi}.$$

- Notice that  $\widehat{g}$  is continuous and  $\widehat{g}(0, 0) = \int g(t, x) > 0$
- Writing  $\xi_j = r_j \theta_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, d$  (*polar coordinates*)

$$|\det(-\xi_1, \dots, -\xi_d)| = \left( \prod_{j=1}^d r_j \right) |\det(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d)|$$

$$\|\rho^* g\|_{L_{x,v}^{d+1}}^{d+1} \gtrsim \int_{|r| \lesssim 1} \int_{(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})^d} \left( \prod_{j=1}^d r_j^{d-2} \right) \frac{1}{|\det(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d)|} d\vec{r} d\vec{\theta}. \quad (3)$$

- $d = 1$ : the radial integral

$$\int_{|r| \lesssim 1} \frac{dr}{r} = \infty$$

- $d \geq 2$ : the angular integral

$$\int_{(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})^d} \frac{1}{|\det(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d)|} d\vec{\theta} = \infty,$$

## Remarks:

- For the free Schrödinger propagator:

The endpoint Strichartz estimate is TRUE for all  $d \geq 3$  [Keel-Tao, 1998]

This theorem highlights a fundamental difference in the Strichartz estimates for the kinetic transport and the Schrödinger equations.

- The endpoint estimate fails rather **generically**.
- Replacements for the endpoint: Keel-Tao, Ovcharov, Guo-Peng...

It seems natural to conjecture that  $\rho^*$  satisfies the weak-type estimate

$$\|\rho^*(g)\|_{L_{x,v}^{d+1,\infty}} \lesssim \|g\|_{L_t^{d+1} L_x^{\frac{d+1}{2}}}.$$

# Multilinear approach to nonendpoint cases

- **Argument:** Multilinear variant of Perthame-Castella.
- Suffices to prove the estimate for  $r = 1$ :

$$\|\rho(f^0)\|_{L_t^q L_x^p} \lesssim \|f^0\|_{L_{x,v}^a},$$
$$\frac{2}{q} = d \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right); \quad \frac{1}{a} = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right); \quad q > a, \quad p \geq a$$

$\Updownarrow$  **Duality**

$$\|\rho^*(g)\|_{L_{x,v}^{a'}} \lesssim \|g\|_{L_t^{q'} L_x^{\frac{a'}{2}}},$$

$$\frac{1}{q'} + \frac{d}{a'} = 1, ; \quad a' > (d+1)$$

$$\Updownarrow \quad a' = \sigma(d+1); \text{ with } \sigma = \frac{a'}{d+1}$$

$$\|\rho^*(g)\|_{L_{x,v}^{\sigma(d+1)}} \lesssim \|g\|_{L_t^{q_\sigma} L_x^{\frac{(d+1)\sigma}{2}}},$$

$$\frac{1}{q_\sigma} + \frac{d}{(d+1)\sigma} = 1, \quad \sigma > 1.$$

## Theorem

The following inequalities are true:

$$\|\rho^*(g)\|_{L_{x,v}^{\sigma(d+1)}} \lesssim \|g\|_{L_t^{q\sigma} L_x^{\frac{(d+1)\sigma}{2}}}, \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{1}{q_\sigma} + \frac{d}{(d+1)\sigma} = 1, \quad \sigma > 1.$$

**Proof:** Suppose  $g$  is nonnegative.

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho^*(g)\|_{L_{x,v}^{\sigma(d+1)}}^{d+1} &= \left( \int \left( \int \prod_{j=1}^{d+1} g(t_j, x + t_j v) d\vec{t} \right)^\sigma dx dv \right)^{1/\sigma} \\ &\leq \underbrace{\int \left( \int \prod_{j=1}^{d+1} g^\sigma(t_j, x + t_j v) dx dv \right)^{1/\sigma} d\vec{t}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now fix  $t_1, \dots, t_{d+1}$ ,  $g_j = g^\sigma$   $j = 1, \dots, d$ , and consider

$$\int \prod_{j=1}^{d+1} g_j(t_j, x + t_j v) dx dv \quad (\text{Multilinear form})$$

$$\int \prod_{j=1}^{d+1} g_j(t_j, x + t_j v) dx dv \quad (\text{Multilinear form})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \prod_{k \neq i, j}^{d+1} \|g_k(t_k, \cdot)\|_{L_x^\infty} \int g_i(t_i, \underbrace{x + t_i v}_y) g_j(t_j, \underbrace{x + t_j v}_z) dx dv \\ &= \left( \prod_{k \neq i, j}^{d+1} \|g_k(t_k, \cdot)\|_{L_x^\infty} \right) \frac{1}{|t_i - t_j|^d} \|g_i(t_i, \cdot)\|_{L_x^1} \|g_j(t_j, \cdot)\|_{L_x^1} \\ &\quad \text{for each } 1 \leq i < j \leq d. \end{aligned}$$



## Multilinear Interpolation

$$\int \prod_{j=1}^{d+1} g_j(t_j, x + t_j v) dx dv \lesssim \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq d} |t_i - t_j|^{-\frac{2}{d+1}} \prod_{k=1}^{d+1} \|g_k(t_k, \cdot)\|_{L_x^{\frac{d+1}{2}}}.$$



$$\int \prod_{j=1}^{d+1} g_j(t_j, x + t_j v) dx dv \lesssim \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq d} |t_i - t_j|^{-\frac{2}{d+1}} \prod_{k=1}^{d+1} \|g_k(t_k, \cdot)\|_{L_x^{\frac{d+1}{2}}}$$

Since  $g_j = g^\sigma$  for each  $j = 1, \dots, d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho^*(g)\|_{L_{x,v}^{\sigma(d+1)}}^{d+1} &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq d} |t_i - t_j|^{-\frac{2}{(d+1)\sigma}} \prod_{k=1}^{d+1} \|g(t_k, \cdot)\|_{L_x^{\frac{(d+1)\sigma}{2}}}^{\frac{(d+1)\sigma}{2}} d\vec{t} \\ &\lesssim \|g\|_{L_t^{q\sigma} L_x^{\frac{(d+1)\sigma}{2}}}^{d+1} \end{aligned}$$

**Multilinear Hardy–Littlewood–Sobolev** [Christ, 1985]

## Remark:

- Natural question:

Can one prove the validity of all the non-endpoint Strichartz estimates for the free Schrödinger propagator using this “multilinear argument”?

Not clear

# Some Perspectives

## Geometric interpretation

$$(\rho^*(g))(x, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(t, x + tv) dt$$

Notice that  $(t, x + tv) = (0, x) + t(1, v)$ , so

$(\rho^*(g))(x, v)$  is the integral of  $g$  along the line  $l(x, v)$  given by

$$l(x, v) = \{(0, x) + t(1, v) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Thus

$$\rho^*(g)(x, v) = \int g(t, x + tv) dt = \int_{l(x, v)} g = X[g] \quad \text{X-ray transform of } g$$

## Sharp constants and extremizers

There is an emerging literature on sharp constants and extremisers for Strichartz estimates in a variety of contexts (Schrödinger, Wave, Klein-Gordon...).

Drouot and Flock [2014]: The best constant  $C$  for

$$\|\rho^*(g)\|_{L_{x,v}^{d+2}} \leq C \|g\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{d+2}{2}}} \quad (*)$$

is attained (up to symmetries of the inequality) if and only if

$$g(t, x) = \frac{1}{1 + t^2 + |x|^2}$$

- $(*)$  is the endpoint in the scale of pure norm estimates for  $\rho^*$  (or  $\rho$ ).
- All other exponents are open from this point of view (conjecture of Baernstein&Loss 1997).

## Other related problems

Validity of estimates of the type:

$$\|\rho^*(g)\|_{L_v^q L_x^r} \leq \|g\|_{W^{p,\alpha}} \quad (**)$$

- Drury&Christ (1984): conjecture on the range of exponents  $(p, q, r, \alpha)$ .
- Partial results (certain  $r < \infty$ ) due to Wolff (98) and Laba-Tao (2001).
- Conjecture  $\Leftrightarrow (**)$  for  $(p, q, r, \alpha) = (n, n, \infty, \varepsilon)$ ,  $\forall \varepsilon > 0$ .

$r = \infty$

$$\|\rho^*(g)\|_{L_x^\infty} = \sup_{I \parallel (1,v)} \int_I g = \text{Variant of the Kakeya maximal function}$$

Conjecture  $(**)$  for  $\rho^* \Leftrightarrow$  **Kakeya maximal conjecture!**

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!