

SCALE-INVARIANT TANGENT-POINT ENERGIES FOR KNOTS

SIMON BLATT, PHILIPP REITER, ARMIN SCHIKORRA,
AND NICOLE VORDEROBERMEIER

ABSTRACT. We investigate minimizers and critical points for scale-invariant tangent-point energies $TP^{p,q}$ of closed curves. We show that a) minimizing sequences in ambient isotopy classes converge to locally critical embeddings in all but finitely many points and b) show regularity of locally critical embeddings.

Technically, the convergence theory a) is based on a gap-estimate of a fractional Sobolev spaces in comparison to the tangent-point energy. The regularity theory b) is based on constructing a new energy $\mathcal{E}^{p,q}$ and proving that the derivative γ' of a parametrization of a $TP^{p,q}$ -critical curve γ induces a critical map with respect to $\mathcal{E}^{p,q}$ acting on torus-to-sphere maps.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction and main results	1
2. Preliminaries on Sobolev maps	7
3. Ambient isotopy for Sobolev curves	9
4. Homeomorphisms appear as limits: Proof of Theorem 1.2	18
5. Weak limits of minimizing sequences are critical: Proof of Theorem 1.6	35
6. The Regularity theory for critical points: Proof of Theorem 1.7	45
Appendix A. Gagliardo-Sobolev Space	79
Appendix B. Localization Arguments	84
Appendix C. Tail estimates	86
Appendix D. Mean Value Arguments	87
References	93

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

When modeling and simulating topological effects in the sciences like, e.g. protein knotting, one has to make a choice how to incorporate the avoidance of interpenetration of matter, i.e. self-intersections. Either one explicitly models partial differential equations that incorporate effects such as self-repulsion through penalization. Or one constructs a comprehensive variational energy that includes self-repulsive behavior, and hopes that minimizing the energy (or following the steepest descent) delivers a realistic description. Several such self-repulsive energy functionals have been proposed and studied extensively over the last forty years¹ – and all have one thing in common: modeling topological resistance, i.e. self-repulsion, they are necessarily nonlocal functionals. Consequently, questions of most central interest such as existence and regularity for minimizing configurations are very challenging. This holds

¹for an overview we refer the interested reader to [71, 9]

especially true for the geometrically most interesting case of *scale-invariant* knot energies, i.e. energies for which a curve γ and any scaled version $\lambda\gamma$ have the same value for any $\lambda > 0$.

O’Hara and Möbius knot energies. The first *knot energies* have been introduced by Fukuhara [26] and O’Hara [52, 53, 54], and are known as *O’Hara energies*. Let $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ be the parametrization of a closed regular Lipschitz curve, i.e., γ is both an immersion and an embedding. For any $\alpha p \geq 4$ and $p \geq 2$, the O’Hara energy $\mathcal{O}^{\alpha,p}(\cdot)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{O}^{\alpha,p}(\gamma) := \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \left(\frac{1}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)|^\alpha} - \frac{1}{d_\gamma(\gamma(x), \gamma(y))^\alpha} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} |\gamma'(x)| |\gamma'(y)| dx dy$$

where d_γ is the intrinsic distance on the submanifold $\gamma(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$.

These energies are scale-invariant functionals if $\alpha p = 4$. In this scaling invariant regime, until recently, only the case of the so-called *Möbius energy* $\mathcal{O}^{2,2}$ was understood at all. This was due to the celebrated work by Freedman, He, and Wang [25]. They discussed existence of minimizers within prime knot classes and established $C^{1,1}$ -regularity of local minimizers. One can then bootstrap to smoothness [31] and even analyticity [14].²

The techniques employed in [25] by Freedman et al. crucially rely on the Möbius invariance of $\mathcal{O}^{2,2}$, and largely fall apart for $\mathcal{O}^{4/p,p}$ when $p \neq 2$ since Möbius invariance does not hold anymore, cf. [13]. Indeed, there was no progress on neither existence nor regularity of scale-invariant knot energies besides the Möbius energy for a long time, until in the two recent works [12, 13], three of the authors established the regularity theory for all scale-invariant O’Hara energies $\mathcal{O}^{\alpha,p}$ (for critical points and minimizers) via a new approach. Namely, they showed that critical knots γ induce via their derivative γ' a sort of fractional harmonic map between $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \cong \mathbb{S}^1$ and \mathbb{S}^2 . Then, extending the tools developed for fractional harmonic maps [22, 64], they obtained a regularity theory via arguments based on compensation effects and harmonic analysis.

Tangent-point energies for curves. In this work we are interested in scale-invariant *tangent-point* energies. As in the case of O’Hara energies, the scale-invariant situation is the most interesting and challenging one, and up to now it was completely out of reach. Due to the lack of Möbius invariance,³ the geometric techniques of Freedman, He, and Wang [25] cannot be applied. Let us stress that Möbius invariance of an energy does not have any impact for applications and it might be considered a curiosity mostly of geometric-topological interest. Actually, from the point of view of applications, one can argue that the tangent-point energies might be preferable to O’Hara energies because they are numerically simpler to compute [1, 2, 3, 57], and they have a natural generalization to embedded surfaces [70] which seems to be more convenient than higher dimensional analogues of O’Hara-type energies, cf. [55, 39].

²Higher regularity via bootstrapping is possible because $p = 2$ implies the functional is a Hilbert-space functional; in particular, such arguments are independent of the presence of scale-invariance, see [56, 10, 74].

³As for O’Hara energies [13] one can check this assertion by numerically computing the energy of a stadion curve before and after applying a Möbius transform.




FIGURE 1. The tangent-point radius R_t is the radius of the smallest sphere tangential to γ at $\gamma(x)$ and traversing $\gamma(y)$. It tends to zero when $\gamma(x) \rightarrow \gamma(y)$ while $\gamma(x)$ and $\gamma(y)$ belong to two different strands of γ . Its reciprocal converges to the local curvature as $y \rightarrow x$.

The “classical” tangent-point energy has been studied first by Buck and Orloff [20]. It amounts to the double integral over the reciprocal of

$$R_t(x, y) := \frac{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)|^2}{2|\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y))|}$$

which is the smallest radius of a sphere passing through $\gamma(x)$ and $\gamma(y)$ while being tangential at $\gamma(x)$, see Figure 1. Later on, Gonzalez and Maddocks [28] obtained a family of energies by taking the integrand to suitable powers. Decoupling these powers as proposed in [11], we arrive at the two-parameter family

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma) &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \frac{\left| \frac{\gamma'(x)}{|\gamma'(x)|} \wedge (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)) \right|^q}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)|^p} |\gamma'(x)| |\gamma'(y)| dx dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y))|^q}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)|^p} |\gamma'(x)|^{1-q} |\gamma'(y)| dx dy \end{aligned}$$

for any embedded $\gamma \in C^2(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$. As a standing assumption, we will always restrict the parameters to satisfy $q + 2 \leq p < 2q + 1$. If $p \geq 2q + 1$, the energy is infinite even for some smooth diffeomorphisms. If $p < q + 2$, then $\text{TP}^{p,q}$ is not self-repulsive. The subfamily studied by Gonzalez and Maddocks can be recovered by letting $p = 2q$; the Buck–Orloff functional corresponds to $\text{TP}^{4,2}$. While the O’Hara energies $\mathcal{O}^{\alpha,p}$ for $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ and $p = \frac{4}{\alpha}$ converge to Gromov’s *distortion* functional, cf. [29, 53, 13], the tangent point energies $\text{TP}^{2q,q}$ converge to Federer’s *reach* as $q \rightarrow \infty$, cf. [24, 28].

Strzelecki and von der Mosel [69] obtained the first and so far only fundamental result concerning the scale-invariant case $p = q + 2$. They showed in particular that the images of curves with finite $\text{TP}^{q+2,q}$ -energy form a topological one-manifold. However, this could be a nonsmooth object, e.g., a non-differentiable curve, see Example 4.7 – or even worse: a doubly-traversed line which has zero energy, see Example 4.1! So there is an issue with even defining the notion of *minimizing* embedded curves of the tangent-point energies. While the energy of the doubly-traversed line is zero and thus the global minimizer, it is certainly not a smooth manifold and therefore should not count as an acceptable minimizer. Let us remark that none of this was an issue for O’Hara energies which would be infinite on any

periodic parametrization of a straight segment – *the tangent point energies are more extrinsic than the O’Hara energies.*

Main results. With the example of the doubly-traversed line in mind, in order to discuss minimizers in the class of knots (i.e. closed embedded curves), we restrict our interest to those curves which appear as limits of diffeomorphisms.

Let us introduce the localized energy for $A \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ by

$$\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma; A) := |\gamma'|^{2-q} \int_A \int_A \frac{|\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y))|^q}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)|^p} dx dy$$

where we assume γ to be parametrized by arclength, $|\gamma'| \equiv \text{const}$.

Following the spirit of an analogue strategy for Willmore surfaces [59, Definition I.1], we introduce the following terminology.

Definition 1.1 (Homeomorphisms with locally small tangent-point energy). A Lipschitz map $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is called a *homeomorphism with locally ε -small tangent-point energy at $x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$* if there exists an open interval $B(x, r) \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and a sequence of C^1 -homeomorphisms $\gamma_k : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$, $|\gamma'_k| \equiv c > 0$, such that

- (1) γ_k converges uniformly to γ on \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} ,
- (2) $\sup_k \text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma_k; \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) < \infty$, and
- (3) $\sup_k \text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma_k; B(x, r)) < \varepsilon$ for some $r > 0$.

Our first main result states that *sequences of curves with uniformly bounded tangent-point energy converge to homeomorphisms with locally ε -small tangent-point energy outside of at most finitely many points.* More precisely, we will prove the following assertion.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $p = q + 2$, $q > 1$, $\Lambda > 0$, and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists an integer $K = K(q, \varepsilon, \Lambda)$ such that any sequence $(\gamma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C^1(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ of closed embedded curves with*

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{TP}^{q+2,q}(\gamma_k) < \Lambda$$

converges – after possibly translating, rescaling, and reparametrizing γ_k and passing to a subsequence – to a Lipschitz map $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ with the following properties.

- embeddedness: γ is a bi-Lipschitz homeomorphism.
- arclength parametrization: $|\gamma'(x)| = 1$ for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$.
- lower semicontinuity: $\text{TP}^{q+2,q}(\gamma) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{TP}^{q+2,q}(\gamma_k)$.
- subcritical Sobolev-space: $\gamma \in W^{1+s,q}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ for any $0 < s < \frac{1}{q}$.

Moreover – and this is crucial – we locally control the critical Sobolev norm outside of a singular set Σ containing at most K points: *for any $x_0 \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \setminus \Sigma$ there exists some $r_{x_0} > 0$ such that*

- $\sup_k \text{TP}^{q+2,q}(\gamma_k, B(x_0, r_{x_0})) < \varepsilon$,
- γ_k weakly converges to γ in the Sobolev space $W^{1+\frac{1}{q},q}(B(x_0, r_{x_0}), \mathbb{R}^3)$,
- and $\sup_k [\gamma_k]_{W^{1+\frac{1}{q},q}(B(x_0, r_{x_0}))}^q \lesssim \sup_k \text{TP}^{q+2,q}(\gamma_k, B(x_0, r_{x_0})) < \varepsilon$.

Remark 1.3 (Pull-tight). In analogy to harmonic maps and O’Hara energies, we expect examples for $p = q + 2$ where the singular set Σ in Theorem 1.2 is nonempty. The idea is as follows. Take a (closed) smooth curve containing a piece of a straight line and replace the latter by a small *nontrivially* knotted arc. Shrinking this arc to zero (“pull-tight”) produces a sequence of curves with uniformly bounded energy,

cf. [53, Thm. 3.1]. In the limit curve we observe a change of topology along with a loss of energy, ruling out strong convergence with respect to the Sobolev norm.

For the Möbius energy $\mathcal{O}^{2,2}$, one can use the Möbius invariance to rewrite a minimizing sequence into one that avoids “concentration of topology in a small set” see [25] for this notion, and [50] for a survey. Even more is true in this special case: the Möbius energy can be decomposed into several Möbius invariant energies that control different features, cf. [35, 36, 37, 38, 51, 40].

Remark 1.4. In light of two-dimensional analogues [34, 49], one might conjecture that the limit curve γ from Theorem 1.2 does not necessarily belong to a Sobolev space on \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} , but this is certainly not clear to us.

Theorem 1.2 is much simpler to prove if $p > q + 2$, cf. [6, 11]. In our limiting range $p = q + 2$, Theorem 1.2 can be understood as a one-dimensional counterpart to the fundamental theorem of Müller and Sverak [49], who showed that surfaces with small second fundamental form w.r.t. the L^2 -norm can be conformally parametrized. We also refer to earlier works by Toro [72, 73] as well as [41, 44, 42, 60, 61, 66]. Indeed, Theorem 1.2 is strongly inspired by the “weak closure theorem” for the Willmore energy, see [61, Theorem 3.55].

As a particular consequence of Theorem 1.2, homeomorphisms with locally small tangent-point energy as described in Definition 1.1 appear as limits of smooth minimizing sequences (minimizing, e.g., with respect to isotopy classes, see Section 3). Since the convergence of minimizing sequence is only weak, in general the limits of minimizing sequences may not be minimizers – indeed they may not belong to the same isotopy class due to bubbling effects (also called pull-tights). This is why we introduce, once more in analogy to Willmore surfaces [59, Definition I.2], the notion of local critical embeddings.

Definition 1.5 (Locally critical embedding). A homeomorphism with locally small tangent-point energy at $x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ as in Definition 1.1 is a *locally critical embedding* in $B(x, r)$ if

$$\delta \text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma, \varphi) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_c^\infty(B(x, r), \mathbb{R}^3).$$

The notion of locally critical embedding as in Definition 1.5 can be justified by the following theorem which states that *any minimizing sequence of curves* (w.r.t. isotopy classes, cf. Section 3) *converges away from finitely many points to a local critical embedding*.

Theorem 1.6. *Let $p = q + 2$. Let $[\gamma_0]$ be an ambient isotopy class and let $(\gamma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [\gamma_0]$ be a minimizing sequence for*

$$\Lambda := \inf_{\gamma \in [\gamma_0]} \text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma)$$

in the sense that $\gamma_k \in C^1(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ are homeomorphisms and $\gamma_k(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ belongs to the ambient isotopy class $[\gamma_0]$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Then, up to reparametrization, translation, rescaling and passing to a subsequence, γ_k uniformly converges to a limit map $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ which is a locally critical embedding in the sense of Definition 1.5 except for a finite exception set $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ whose cardinality is bounded in terms of Λ .

Our last main result concerns regularity: *the limit of minimizing sequences is regular outside a finite singular set Σ* . Indeed, we have regularity theory for critical points as in Definition 1.5.

Theorem 1.7. *Let $q \geq 2$. Let $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ be a homeomorphism with finite global and small local tangent-point energy around $B(x_0, r)$ as in Definition 1.1 that is a locally critical embedding in $B(x_0, r)$ of $\text{TP}^{q+2, q}$ as in Definition 1.5. Then $\gamma \in C^{1, \alpha}(B(x_0, \frac{r}{2}), \mathbb{R}^3)$ for some uniform constant $\alpha = \alpha(q) > 0$.*

From the previous two results we draw the following conclusion.

Corollary 1.8. *Let $[\gamma_0]$ be an ambient isotopy class and let $\gamma_k \subset [\gamma_0]$ be a minimizing sequence for*

$$\Lambda := \inf_{\gamma \in [\gamma_0]} \text{TP}^{p, q}(\gamma)$$

in the sense that $(\gamma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ is a sequence of homeomorphisms and $\gamma_k(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ belongs to the knot class $[\gamma_0]$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Then, up to reparametrization, translation, and rescaling and taking a subsequence, γ_k converges to a limit map $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ which is a weak critical point in the sense of Definition 1.5 outside of finitely many points (whose number is bounded in terms of Λ). In particular, in view of Theorem 1.7, the limit is $C^{1, \alpha}$ outside of finitely many points.

Remark 1.9. In Theorem 1.7 we restrict to the scale-invariant case $p = q + 2$. For the non scaling-invariant case $q \geq 2$ and $p > q + 2$ a $C^{1, \alpha}$ -regularity is a consequence of previous work by [69], with α depending on $p - q - 2 > 0$. Let us remark that a slight adaptation of our arguments, similar in spirit to adaptations carried out in [46] implies $C^{1, \alpha}$ -regularity with α independent of $p - q - 2 \geq 0$.

Also, in Theorem 1.7 we restrict our attention to $q \geq 2$ (which includes the “classical” tangent point energy $T^{4, 2}$), but we expect that it is only a minor technical difficulty to obtain the same result for the case $q > 1$.

Lastly, we consider the target space \mathbb{R}^3 throughout this paper to keep the notation simple, but again we expect our results to carry over to curves of arbitrary co-dimension without more than minor technical difficulties.

Outline and comments on the proofs. In Section 2 we introduce the Sobolev spaces that are essential for this article. In Section 3 we review the notion of ambient isotopy and adapt this concept to $W^{1+s, \frac{1}{s}}$ -curves. While this is, to the best of our knowledge, a new result, the main ideas are related to the well-established theory of homotopy groups of Sobolev maps, e.g. in [67, 4].

In Section 4 we prove our first main theorem, Theorem 1.2, which states that sequences of diffeomorphisms with uniformly bounded tangent-point energy converge outside of a finite singular set. The argument is based on a gap-estimate, vaguely reminiscent of and substantially inspired by arguments due to Müller–Sverak [49] and Hélein [32] who showed that limits of conformally parametrized two-dimensional maps with a sufficiently small L^2 -bound on the second fundamental form are either point maps or bi-Lipschitz. A further crucial ingredient is an adaptation of the “straightness” analysis developed by Strzelecki and von der Mosel [69] (which in their case leads to the fact that finite energy curves are topological one-manifolds).

In Section 5 we prove our second main theorem, Theorem 1.6, which asserts that minimizing sequences converge to critical points. This is based on Theorem 1.2 combined with a fractional Luckhaus-type lemma, Lemma 5.3, and the theory of isotopy classes for Sobolev maps from Section 3.

In Section 6 we prove the regularity theory, Theorem 1.7. We follow the spirit of [13], building a bridge to harmonic map theory. Namely, we introduce an energy

\mathcal{E}^q such that the arclength parametrization γ of a critical knot $\text{TP}^{q+2,q}$ induces via its derivative γ' a critical map of \mathcal{E}^q in the class of maps from \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} to the sphere \mathbb{S}^2 . The energy \mathcal{E}^q is structurally similar to the $W^{\frac{1}{q},q}$ -seminorm whose critical points are called $W^{\frac{1}{q},q}$ -harmonic maps. For $q = 2$ techniques for regularity theory of $W^{\frac{1}{2},2}$ harmonic maps between manifolds were introduced in the pioneering work by Da Lio and Rivière [22, 21]; this was extended to $W^{\frac{1}{q},q}$ harmonic maps into spheres in [64]. Here, we extend the techniques of [64] to obtain the regularity for derivatives γ' of the arclength-parametrization of critical knots γ .

Notation. When $A \leq CB$ for some constant C , we write $A \lesssim B$ or $B \gtrsim A$. We use the notation $A \approx B$ if both $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$. Throughout this work, constants will depend on “unimportant” factors like p and q and may change from line to line.

Balls (i.e. intervals) in \mathbb{R} will be denoted by $B(x, \rho)$. We will allow ourselves an abuse of notation to denote *geodesic balls* in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} by the same notation. All our arguments are local in nature, so that we only need to work with balls which correspond to Euclidean balls.

Acknowledgement. Grant funding is acknowledged as follows.

- Austrian Science Fund (FWF), Grant P29487 (SB, NV)
- German Research Foundation (DFG), grant RE 3930/1–1 (Φ R)
- National Science Foundation (NSF) Career DMS 2044898 (AS)
- Simons foundation, grant no 579261 (AS)

Part of this work was conducted while the authors were at the IMA Minnesota and visits to each other’s institutions. A long-term visit by NV at the University of Pittsburgh funded by the Austrian Marshall Plan Scholarship is also gratefully acknowledged.

2. PRELIMINARIES ON SOBOLEV MAPS

In this section we recall some basic notation and properties of Sobolev maps.

For $s \in (0, 1)$, $p \in (1, \infty)$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}$ open, the Sobolev space $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ is defined as all maps $f \in L^p(\Omega)$ such that

$$[f]_{W^{s,p}(\Omega)} := \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty.$$

For $s \in (1, 2)$ the Sobolev space $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ is defined to be the space of $f \in L^p(\Omega)$, $f' \in L^p(\Omega)$, and

$$[f']_{W^{s-1,p}(\Omega)} < \infty.$$

One important observation, cf. [5, Lemma 2.1], is that small $W^{1+s, \frac{1}{s}}$ -Sobolev norm implies a bi-Lipschitz estimate if $|\gamma'| > 0$. Namely we have,

Lemma 2.1. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$. For any $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, s) > 0$ such that the following holds. For any $-\infty < a < b < \infty$ and for any $\gamma \in \text{Lip}([a, b], \mathbb{R}^3)$ such that*

$$\inf_{[a,b]} |\gamma'| \geq \lambda_1$$

and

$$[\gamma']_{W^{s, \frac{1}{s}}((a,b))} < \varepsilon,$$

we have

$$|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| \geq \lambda_2 |x - y|.$$

Proof. First we prove the following inequality

$$(2.1) \quad \frac{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^2}{|x - y|^2} \geq (\lambda_1)^2 - \frac{1}{2|x - y|^2} \int_{[x,y]} \int_{[x,y]} |\gamma'(z_1) - \gamma'(z_2)|^2 dz_1 dz_2.$$

The estimate (2.1) is a consequence of the fundamental theorem of calculus, which says that for any $x \neq y$ we have

$$\gamma(y) - \gamma(x) = \int_x^y \gamma'(z) dz.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^2 &= \int_x^y \int_x^y \langle \gamma'(z_1), \gamma'(z_2) \rangle dz_1 dz_2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_x^y \int_x^y |\gamma'(z_1)|^2 + |\gamma'(z_2)|^2 dz_1 dz_2 - \frac{1}{2} \int_x^y \int_x^y |\gamma'(z_1) - \gamma'(z_2)|^2 dz_1 dz_2 \\ &\geq |x - y|^2 (\lambda_1)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \int_{[x,y]} \int_{[x,y]} |\gamma'(z_1) - \gamma'(z_2)|^2 dz_1 dz_2. \end{aligned}$$

This establishes (2.1).

The claim of Lemma 2.1 follows from (2.1) once we show that for any $s \in (0, 1)$ there exists a constant $C = C(s)$ such that

$$(2.2) \quad \frac{1}{2|x - y|^2} \int_{[x,y]} \int_{[x,y]} |\gamma'(z_1) - \gamma'(z_2)|^2 dz_1 dz_2 \leq C(s) [\gamma']_{W^{s, \frac{1}{s}}((a,b))}^2.$$

Indeed, once (2.2) is established, we choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$(\lambda_1)^2 - C(s)\varepsilon^2 > (\lambda_2)^2.$$

Then – under the assumptions of Lemma 2.1 – we conclude that

$$\frac{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^2}{|x - y|^2} \geq (\lambda_2)^2,$$

which is what we wanted to show.

It remains to establish (2.2), and for this we consider three cases.

For $s = \frac{1}{2}$, (2.2) is a consequence of the following observation

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2|x - y|^2} \int_{[x,y]} \int_{[x,y]} |\gamma'(z_1) - \gamma'(z_2)|^2 dz_1 dz_2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{[x,y]} \int_{[x,y]} \frac{|\gamma'(z_1) - \gamma'(z_2)|^2}{|z_1 - z_2|^2} dz_1 dz_2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} [\gamma']_{W^{\frac{1}{2}, 2}([x,y])}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} [\gamma']_{W^{\frac{1}{2}, 2}([a,b])}^2. \end{aligned}$$

For the case $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, we additionally observe that by Lemma A.3 there exists a constant $C = C(s)$ such that

$$[\gamma']_{W^{\frac{1}{2}, 2}((a,b))}^2 \leq C(s) [\gamma']_{W^{s, \frac{1}{s}}((a,b))}^2.$$

This establishes (2.2) for all $s \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$.

If $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, then $\frac{1}{2s} > 1$. Hence, by Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & |x - y|^{-2} \int_{[x,y]} \int_{[x,y]} |\gamma'(z_1) - \gamma'(z_2)|^2 dz_1 dz_2 \\ &= \left(|x - y|^{-2} \int_{[x,y]} \int_{[x,y]} |\gamma'(z_1) - \gamma'(z_2)|^2 dz_1 dz_2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2s} 2s} \\ &\leq \left(|x - y|^{-2} \int_{[x,y]} \int_{[x,y]} |\gamma'(z_1) - \gamma'(z_2)|^{\frac{1}{s}} dz_1 dz_2 \right)^{2s} \\ &\leq \left(\int_{[x,y]} \int_{[x,y]} \frac{|\gamma'(z_1) - \gamma'(z_2)|^{\frac{1}{s}}}{|z_1 - z_2|^2} dz_1 dz_2 \right)^{2s}. \end{aligned}$$

This establishes (2.2) for $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, and we can conclude. \square

Let us also remark the following consequence of Lemma 2.1, which states that closed curves have minimal $W^{1+s, \frac{1}{s}}$ -energy.

Corollary 2.2. *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $-\infty < a < b < \infty$. For any $\lambda > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\lambda, a, b, s) > 0$ so that the following holds.*

Whenever $\gamma \in \text{Lip}((a, b), \mathbb{R}^3) \cap C^0([a, b])$ with $\gamma(a) = \gamma(b)$ and $\inf |\gamma'| \geq \lambda$, then $[\gamma']_{W^{s, \frac{1}{s}}([a, b])} \geq \varepsilon$.

Proof. If $[\gamma']_{W^{s, \frac{1}{s}}([a, b])} < \varepsilon$ for small enough ε we know from Lemma 2.1 that γ is bilipschitz, and thus

$$|\gamma(a) - \gamma(b)| = \lim_{x \rightarrow a^+} \lim_{y \rightarrow b^-} |\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| \geq c|b - a|.$$

\square

3. AMBIENT ISOTOPY FOR SOBOLEV CURVES

A homotopy theory for Sobolev maps has been introduced and established a long time ago. The spirit is that for maps in VMO (see e.g. the phenomenal work [18, 19]) homotopy classes exist, and by Sobolev embedding, homotopy groups for $W^{s, \frac{n}{s}}(\Sigma^n, \mathcal{N})$ coincide with the classical homotopy groups for continuous maps. In particular, this leads to a beautiful theory of density [67, 4]. There are many extensions, e.g. to more general Sobolev spaces [30, 58, 48, 15, 17, 16].

We begin here to introduce the fundamental results on isotopy classes (for curves) in fractional Sobolev spaces following the spirit of homotopy classes. To the best of our knowledge, the results in this section are new, in particular our main result, Theorem 3.7, which says that small Sobolev-variations of smooth curves do not change their isotopy class. However, there is some overlap with [8] where an isotopy theory for closed sets with controlled bi-Lipschitz constant is developed.

We begin by defining ambient isotopy (by which we mean C^1 -ambient isotopy).

Definition 3.1. Two sets $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ are called ambient isotopic, if there exists an ambient isotopy, namely $I \in C^1([0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^3)$, such that

- $I(t, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is a surjective diffeomorphism for all $t \in [0, 1]$,
- $I(0, p) = p$ for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$,

- $I(1, \cdot) : X \rightarrow Y$ is a surjective homeomorphism.

When working with parametrized curves, the following result is very useful: Smooth enough isotopy coincides with ambient isotopy, see [33, Chapter 8, Theorem 1.6, p.181].

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\gamma_0, \gamma_1 \in C^1(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ be two diffeomorphisms, and assume there exists a C^1 -isotopy between them, that is $\Gamma \in C^1([0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $\Gamma(0, \cdot) = \gamma_0(\cdot)$ and $\Gamma(1, \cdot) = \gamma_1(\cdot)$ and*

$$\Gamma(t, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \quad \text{is a diffeomorphism for all } t \in [0, 1].$$

Then the images $\gamma_0(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ and $\gamma_1(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ are ambient isotopic.

We begin by defining ambient isotopy classes for regular $W^{1+s, \frac{1}{s}}$ -homeomorphisms. Observe that in view of the formal analogy to homotopy classes, having the techniques by Brezis and Nirenberg [18, 19], one might hope for an “s=0” theory (i.e. $\gamma' \in VMO$), but we will not pursue that question here. Also, we will make no attempt to consider the higher-dimensional version, but rather focus on the situation at hand, which are curves.

Definition 3.3 (Regular Sobolev homeomorphism). A homeomorphism $\gamma \in W^{1+s, \frac{1}{s}}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ is called *regular* if

$$0 < \inf |\gamma'| \leq \sup |\gamma'| < \infty$$

where inf and sup are the essential infimum and supremum, respectively.

The isotopy class is derived from smooth approximating maps, whose existence is the content of the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\gamma \in W^{1+s, \frac{1}{s}}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ be a regular homeomorphism. Then there exists a sequence of smooth diffeomorphisms $\gamma_k : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ with*

$$\frac{1}{2} \inf |\gamma'| \leq \inf |\gamma'_k| \leq \sup |\gamma'_k| \leq \sup |\gamma'| \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}$$

such that

$$\|\gamma_k - \gamma\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})} + [\gamma_k - \gamma]_{W^{1+s, \frac{1}{s}}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})} \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Proof. Set

$$\lambda := \inf |\gamma'|.$$

Fix some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ to be specified later.

By absolute continuity of the integral there exists $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\gamma) \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\sup_{B(10\delta_0) \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} [\gamma']_{W^{s, \frac{1}{s}}(B(10\delta_0))} < \varepsilon_0.$$

Since γ is a continuous and injective map, the following infimum is attained and larger than 0

$$\varepsilon_1 := \inf_{|x-y| \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta_0} |\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| > 0.$$

Let $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B(0, 1), [0, 1])$, $\int \eta = 1$, be the usual mollifier kernel, and $\eta_\delta := \delta^{-1}\eta(\cdot/\delta)$. Set

$$\gamma_\delta(x) := \eta_\delta * \gamma(x) = \int_{-1}^1 \eta(z) \gamma(x + \delta z) dz.$$

By periodicity of γ , γ_δ is 1-periodic, and thus is well-defined $\gamma_\delta : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$. Moreover, $[\gamma_\delta - \gamma]_{W^{1+s, \frac{1}{s}}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})} \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} 0$, and by Sobolev embedding $\|\gamma_\delta - \gamma\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})} \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} 0$.

Let $\delta_1 \in (0, \delta_0)$ such that

$$(3.1) \quad \|\gamma_\delta - \gamma\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})} < \frac{1}{10}\varepsilon_1 \quad \text{for all } \delta \in [0, \delta_1].$$

We need to show (for the right choice of ε_0) that for $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$ γ_δ is a diffeomorphism as requested in the claim.

It is easy to see from the definition of γ_δ that

$$|\gamma'_\delta(x)| \leq \sup |\gamma'| \quad \forall \delta > 0.$$

First we observe that for almost any $x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and almost any $z \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$|\gamma'_\delta(x)| \geq |\gamma'(z)| - |\gamma'_\delta(x) - \gamma'(z)| \geq \lambda - |\gamma'_\delta(x) - \gamma'(z)|.$$

Since this holds for almost every $z \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, we can integrate this inequality, $\int_{B(x,\delta)} dz$, and find

$$|\gamma'_\delta(x)| \geq \lambda - \int_{B(x,\delta)} |\gamma'_\delta(x) - \gamma'(z)| dz.$$

Now we have $\gamma'_\delta = \eta_\delta * (\gamma')$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(x,\delta)} |\gamma'_\delta(x) - \gamma'(z)| dz \\ & \leq \int_{B(x,\delta)} \int_{B(x,\delta)} |\gamma'(z_1) - \gamma'(z)| dz_1 dz \\ & \lesssim [\gamma']_{W^{s,\frac{1}{s}}(B(x,\delta))} < \varepsilon_0. \end{aligned}$$

That is, we have shown

$$|\gamma'_\delta(x)| \geq \lambda - C\varepsilon_0 \quad \text{for almost any } x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}.$$

So if we choose $\varepsilon_0 < \frac{\lambda}{2C}$, we therefore have

$$\inf |\gamma'_\delta| \geq \frac{\lambda}{2} \quad \forall \delta \in (0, \delta_0).$$

Now choosing ε_0 possibly even smaller (depending on λ), we obtain from Lemma 2.1 that

$$(3.2) \quad \frac{\lambda}{4}|x - y| \leq |\gamma_\delta(x) - \gamma_\delta(y)| \quad \forall \delta \in [0, \delta_0], |x - y| < \delta_0.$$

On the other hand,

$$|\gamma_\delta(x) - \gamma_\delta(y)| \geq |\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| - 2\|\gamma - \gamma_\delta\|_{L^\infty}.$$

In view of (3.1), we thus have

$$(3.3) \quad |\gamma_\delta(x) - \gamma_\delta(y)| \geq (1 - \frac{2}{10})\varepsilon_1 \quad \forall |x - y| > \frac{1}{2}\delta_0, \quad \delta \in [0, \delta_1].$$

Combining (3.2) and (3.3), we obtain

$$|\gamma_\delta(x) - \gamma_\delta(y)| \geq \frac{1}{100} \min\{\lambda, \delta_0\varepsilon_1\}|x - y| \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \quad \forall \delta \in [0, \delta_1].$$

Consequently, γ_δ is a one-to-one map with $\inf |\gamma'_\delta| > 0$.

Hence, γ_δ is a smooth homeomorphism with nonvanishing derivative (i.e. its an immersion), thus γ_δ is a diffeomorphism. The proof is concluded by choosing $\gamma_k := \gamma_{\frac{\delta_1}{k}}$. \square

Now that we have approximating smooth diffeomorphisms, we argue that they all eventually are of the same ambient isotopy type.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $\gamma \in W^{1+s, \frac{1}{s}}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ be a regular homeomorphism. Then there exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\gamma, s) > 0$ such that for any $\tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2 \in C^1(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ with*

$$(3.4) \quad \|\tilde{\gamma}_i - \gamma\|_{L^\infty} + [\tilde{\gamma}'_i - \gamma']_{W^{s, \frac{1}{s}}} < \varepsilon$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} \inf |\gamma'| \leq \inf |\tilde{\gamma}'_i| \leq \sup |\tilde{\gamma}'_i| \leq 2 \sup |\gamma'| \quad i = 1, 2,$$

we have that $\tilde{\gamma}_1$ is ambient isotopic to $\tilde{\gamma}_2$.

Proof. The strategy of the proof is very similar to the proof of Lemma 3.4.

Set

$$\lambda := \frac{1}{2} \inf |\gamma'|.$$

Fix some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ to be specified later.

By absolute continuity there exists $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\gamma) \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\sup_{B(10\delta_0) \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} [\gamma']_{W^{s, \frac{1}{s}}(B(10\delta_0))} < \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_0.$$

Since γ is continuous and injective, the following infimum is attained and larger than 0

$$\varepsilon_1 := \frac{1}{10} \inf_{|x-y| \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta_0} |\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| > 0.$$

Assume $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{100} \min\{\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1\}$ in (3.4), then we have

$$\sup_{B(10\delta_0) \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} [\tilde{\gamma}'_i]_{W^{s, \frac{1}{s}}(B(10\delta_0))} < \varepsilon_0 \quad i = 1, 2$$

and

$$\inf_{|x-y| \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta_0} |\tilde{\gamma}_i(x) - \tilde{\gamma}_i(y)| > \varepsilon_1 > 0.$$

Let $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B(0, 1), [0, 1])$, $\int \eta = 1$, be the usual mollifier kernel, and $\eta_\delta := \delta^{-1} \eta(\cdot/\delta)$. Set

$$\gamma_\delta := \eta_\delta * \gamma$$

and

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{i, \delta} := \eta_\delta * \tilde{\gamma}_i.$$

Let δ_1 be such that

$$\|\gamma_\delta - \gamma\|_{L^\infty} < \frac{1}{100} \varepsilon_1 \quad \forall \delta \in [0, \delta_1].$$

By the choice of $\varepsilon \ll \varepsilon_1$ we then have

$$\|\tilde{\gamma}_{i, \delta} - \tilde{\gamma}_i\|_{L^\infty} < \frac{1}{10} \varepsilon_1 \quad \forall \delta \in [0, \delta_1], \quad i = 1, 2.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 3.4, we obtain that for each $\delta \in [0, \delta_0]$, $\gamma_\delta, \tilde{\gamma}_{i, \delta}$ are diffeomorphisms satisfying

$$|\tilde{\gamma}_{i, \delta}(x) - \tilde{\gamma}_{i, \delta}(y)|, |\gamma_\delta(x) - \gamma_\delta(y)| \geq \tilde{\lambda} |x - y| \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \quad \forall \delta \in [0, \delta_1]$$

for $\tilde{\lambda} := \frac{1}{100} \min\{\lambda, \delta_0 \varepsilon_1\}$.

Since $\tilde{\gamma}_{i, \delta} \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} \tilde{\gamma}_i$, and $\tilde{\gamma}_i$ are smooth diffeomorphisms, we get from Theorem 3.2 that $\tilde{\gamma}_{i, \delta_0}$ is ambient isotopic to $\tilde{\gamma}_i$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Now we show that $\tilde{\gamma}_{i,\delta_0}$ is ambient isotopic to $\tilde{\gamma}_{\delta_0}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Indeed set

$$\Gamma_i(\cdot, t) := t\tilde{\gamma}_{i,\delta_0} + (1-t)\gamma_{\delta_0}.$$

This is clearly a smooth homotopy, we only need to show that for each fixed $t \in [0, 1]$ it is a diffeomorphism. But observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\Gamma_i(x, t) - \Gamma_i(y, t)| \\ & \geq |\gamma_{\delta_0}(x) - \gamma_{\delta_0}(y)| - |x - y| \|\gamma'_{\delta_0} - \tilde{\gamma}'_{i,\delta_0}\|_{L^\infty} \\ & \geq (\tilde{\lambda} - \|\gamma'_{\delta_0} - \tilde{\gamma}'_{i,\delta_0}\|_{L^\infty}) |x - y|. \end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\|\gamma'_{\delta_0} - \tilde{\gamma}'_{i,\delta_0}\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{1}{\delta_0} \|\eta'\|_{L^1} \|\gamma - \tilde{\gamma}_i\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta_0} \|\eta'\|_{L^1}.$$

That is,

$$|\Gamma_i(x, t) - \Gamma_i(y, t)| \geq \left(\tilde{\lambda} - \|\eta'\|_{L^1} \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta_0} \right) |x - y| \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}.$$

So if we choose ε even smaller, namely if we ensure that $\varepsilon < \frac{\tilde{\lambda}}{100} \delta_0 \|\eta'\|_{L^1}$, then we have found that $\Gamma(t, \cdot)$ is globally bilipschitz, and thus a diffeomorphism for each $t \in [0, 1]$. This and Theorem 3.2 imply that γ_{δ_0} and $\tilde{\gamma}_{i,\delta_0}$ are ambient isotopic, for each $i = 1, 2$.

In particular, $\tilde{\gamma}_{1,\delta_0}$ is ambient isotopic to $\tilde{\gamma}_{2,\delta_0}$. Since we have already shown that $\tilde{\gamma}_{i,\delta_0}$ is ambient isotopic to $\tilde{\gamma}_i$ for each $i = 1, 2$, we conclude that $\tilde{\gamma}_1$ is ambient isotopic to $\tilde{\gamma}_2$. \square

Since by Lemma 3.4 any $W^{1+s, \frac{1}{s}}$ -regular Sobolev homeomorphism has an approximation by a regular diffeomorphisms, and by Proposition 3.5 these approximating diffeomorphisms eventually are all of the same ambient isotopy type, the following definition is justified.

Definition 3.6. • Let $[\gamma_0]$ be an ambient isotopy class. We say that a regular $W^{1+s, \frac{1}{s}}$ -Sobolev homeomorphism γ_1 belongs to $[\gamma_0]$ if there exist approximating diffeomorphisms $\tilde{\gamma}_{1,k}$ such that $\tilde{\gamma}_{1,k} \in [\gamma_0]$ for eventually all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

- Equivalently, let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in W^{1+s, \frac{1}{s}}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ be two regular homeomorphisms. We say that γ_1 and γ_2 are (Sobolev-)ambient isotopic,

$$\gamma_1 \sim \gamma_2,$$

if the following properties are met: There exist approximating diffeomorphisms $\tilde{\gamma}_{1,k}$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_{2,k}$ converging in $L^\infty \cap W^{1+s, \frac{1}{s}}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ to γ_1 and γ_2 , respectively, and each satisfy

$$\frac{1}{2} \inf |\gamma'_i| \leq \inf |\tilde{\gamma}'_{i,k}| \leq \sup |\tilde{\gamma}'_{i,k}| \leq 2 \sup |\gamma'_i| \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Moreover, $\gamma_{1,k}$ and $\gamma_{2,\ell}$ are ambient isotopic for all but finitely many k and ℓ .

Our main result in this section is that two curves which differ only locally and in a set where they have small critical Sobolev norm, have the same ambient isotopy type.

Theorem 3.7. *There exists a uniform $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the following holds.*

Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in C^1(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ be diffeomorphisms with

- $\frac{3}{4} \leq |\gamma'_i| \leq \frac{5}{4}$ in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} for $i = 1, 2$

and assume that there is a ball $B(\rho) \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ such that the following holds:

- $\frac{3}{4}|x - y| \leq |\gamma_i(x) - \gamma_i(y)| \leq \frac{5}{4}|x - y|$ for all $x, y \in B(10\rho)$,
- $[\gamma_i]_{W^{s, \frac{1}{s}}(B(10\rho))} < \varepsilon$, $i = 1, 2$,
- we have $\text{dist}(\gamma_i(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(9\rho)), \gamma_i(B(8\rho))) \geq \frac{1}{1000}\rho$ for $i = 1, 2$,
- $\gamma_1(x) = \gamma_2(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(3\rho)$,
- $\|\gamma_1 - \gamma_2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})} < \frac{1}{100} \frac{1}{1000}\rho$.

Then $\gamma_1(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ and $\gamma_2(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ are ambient isotopic.

Proof. Let $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B(0, 2), [0, 1])$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta = 1$. Denote by $\eta_\delta := \delta^{-1}\eta(\cdot/\delta)$.

Let $\theta \in C_c^\infty(B(5\rho), [0, 1])$ such that $\theta \equiv 1$ in $B(4\rho)$. We can construct θ such that $\|\theta'\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \frac{1}{\rho}$.

Set

$$\gamma_{i,\delta}(x) := \int_{B(0,1)} \eta(z) \gamma_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z) dz.$$

In the following we need to choose first some $\sigma > 0$, and then obtain some $\varepsilon > 0$ depending on σ .

γ_i is ambient isotopic to $\gamma_{i,\sigma\rho}$ for some uniform constant $\sigma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$

$\gamma_{i,\delta}$ would be the usual convolution if $\theta \equiv 1$.

First observe that $\gamma_{i,\delta}(x) = \gamma_i(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(5\rho)$. Moreover, we have

$$\gamma_{i,\delta}(x) - \gamma_i(x) = \int_{B(0,1)} \eta(z) (\gamma_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z) - \gamma_i(x)) dz \lesssim \|\gamma'_i\|_{L^\infty} \delta \|\theta\|_{L^\infty} \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} 0.$$

Also we have

$$\gamma'_{i,\delta}(x) = \int_{B(0,1)} \eta(z) \gamma'_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z) (1 + \delta\theta'(x)z) dz.$$

Thus (recall $|\theta'| \lesssim \frac{1}{\rho}$)

$$|\gamma'_{i,\delta}(x)| \leq \|\gamma'_i\|_{L^\infty} \left(1 + C \frac{\delta}{\rho}\right),$$

that is for a certain (essentially uniform) $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ we can ensure that

$$\|\gamma'_{i,\delta}\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{11}{8} \quad \forall \delta < \sigma\rho.$$

It is the other direction which is more tricky. We have for any $x, z \in B(5\rho)$

$$\begin{aligned} & | |\gamma'_{i,\delta}(x)| - 1 | \\ & \leq | |\gamma'_{i,\delta}(x)| - |\gamma'_i(z)| | + \frac{1}{4} \\ & \leq | \gamma'_{i,\delta}(x) - \gamma'_i(z) | + \frac{1}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for any $z \in B(0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & | |\gamma'_{i,\delta}(x)| - 1 | \\ & \leq | \gamma'_{i,\delta}(x) - \gamma'_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z) | + \frac{1}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating in z , as the left-hand side is a constant, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| |\gamma'_{i,\delta}(x)| - 1 \right| \\
&= \int_{B(0,1)} \left| \int_{B(0,1)} \eta(z_2) \gamma'_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z_2) (1 + \delta\theta'(x)z_2) dz_2 - \gamma'_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z) \right| dz + \frac{1}{4} \\
&= \int_{B(0,1)} \left| \int_{B(0,1)} \eta(z_2) (\gamma'_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z_2) (1 + \delta\theta'(x)z_2) - \gamma'_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z)) dz_2 \right| dz + \frac{1}{4} \\
&\leq \int_{B(0,1)} \int_{B(0,1)} |\gamma'_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z_2) (1 + \delta\theta'(x)z_2) - \gamma'_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z)| dz_2 dz + \frac{1}{4} \\
&\leq \int_{B(0,1)} \int_{B(0,1)} |\gamma'_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z_2) - \gamma'_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z)| dz dz_2 + \frac{1}{4} + C \frac{\delta}{\rho}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now observe that $\theta(x)$ is a fixed, nonnegative number. If $\theta(x) = 0$, then the double integral is zero. If $\theta(x) > 0$, by substitution,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B(0,1)} \int_{B(0,1)} |\gamma'_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z_2) - \gamma'_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z)| dz dz_2 \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{(\delta\theta(x))^2} \int_{B(x,\delta\theta(x))} \int_{B(x,\delta\theta(x))} |\gamma'_i(\tilde{x}) - \gamma'_i(\tilde{y})| d\tilde{x} d\tilde{y} \\
&\lesssim [\gamma'_i]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(x,\delta\theta(x)))} \\
&\leq [\gamma'_i]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(10\rho))} < \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

That is, we have shown that for each $x \in B(5\rho)$ we have

$$\left| |\gamma'_{i,\delta}(x)| - 1 \right| \leq \frac{1}{4} + C \left(\frac{\delta}{\rho} + \varepsilon \right).$$

The constant C is uniform, so if $\delta < \sigma\rho$ and $\varepsilon \ll 1$ (uniform constant), we get that

$$(3.5) \quad \frac{5}{8} \leq |\gamma'_{i,\delta}(x)| \leq \frac{11}{8} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}.$$

(Observe this estimate is trivial for all x where $\gamma_{i,\delta} = \gamma_i$).

Next we estimate the Sobolev norm, namely we have

$$[\gamma'_{i,\delta}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(9\rho))} \lesssim [\gamma'_i]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(10\rho))} + \frac{\delta}{\rho}.$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\gamma'_{i,\delta}(x) - \gamma'_{i,\delta}(y)| \\
&\leq \int_{B(0,1)} |\gamma'_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z) (1 + \delta\theta'(x)z) - \gamma'_i(y + \delta\theta(y)z) (1 + \delta\theta'(y)z)| dz \\
&\leq (1 + C \frac{\delta}{\rho}) \int_{B(0,1)} |\gamma'_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z) - \gamma'_i(y + \delta\theta(y)z)| dz \\
&\quad + \|\gamma'_i\|_{L^\infty} \int_{B(0,1)} |\delta\theta'(x) - \delta\theta'(y)| dz.
\end{aligned}$$

First we observe

$$\int_{B(0,1)} |\delta\theta'(x) - \delta\theta'(y)| dz \lesssim \frac{\delta}{\rho} |x - y|$$

and consequently, for any $q > 1$

$$\int_{B(9\rho)} \int_{B(9\rho)} \frac{\left(\int_{B(0,1)} |\delta\theta'(x) - \delta\theta'(y)| dz \right)^q}{|x-y|^2} dx dy \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{\rho} \right)^q \rho^q = \delta^q.$$

We thus arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & [\gamma'_{i,\delta}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(9\rho))}^q \\ & \leq C\delta^q + \left(1 + C\frac{\delta}{\rho}\right)^q \int_{B(0,1)} \int_{B(9\rho)} \int_{B(9\rho)} \frac{|\gamma'_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z) - \gamma'_i(y + \delta\theta(y)z)|^q}{|x-y|^2} dx dy dz. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $|1 + \delta\theta'(x)z| \geq 1 - C\frac{\delta}{\rho} \geq 1 - C\sigma$ (for $\delta \leq \sigma\rho$). Moreover,

$$|x + \delta\theta(x)z - (y + \delta\theta(y)z)| \leq |x-y| + \frac{\delta}{\rho}|x-y| \leq 2|x-y|.$$

So we can use the change of variables formula, to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(9\rho)} \int_{B(9\rho)} \frac{|\gamma'_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z) - \gamma'_i(y + \delta\theta(y)z)|^q}{|x-y|^2} dx dy \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{(1-C\sigma)^2} \int_{B(9\rho)} \int_{B(9\rho)} \frac{|\gamma'_i(x + \delta\theta(x)z) - \gamma'_i(y + \delta\theta(y)z)|^q}{|x + \delta\theta(x)z - (y + \delta\theta(y)z)|^2} |1 + \delta\theta'(x)z| dx |1 + \delta\theta'(y)z| dy \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{(1-C\sigma)^2} \int_{B(10\rho)} \int_{B(10\rho)} \frac{|\gamma'_i(x) - \gamma'_i(y)|^q}{|x-y|^2} dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, for σ (and ε) small enough we have shown

$$(3.6) \quad [\gamma'_{i,\delta}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(9\rho))} \lesssim \varepsilon_0 \quad \forall \delta \leq \sigma\rho.$$

Here ε_0 can be the small constant of Lemma 2.1, and get that $\gamma'_{i,\delta}$ is uniformly bilipschitz in $B(9\rho)$. Outside it does not even change for all $\delta \leq \sigma\rho$.

Consequently,

$$\gamma_{i,\delta} : [0, \sigma\rho] \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$$

is an isotopy with uniformly bounded bilipschitz estimate, and by Theorem 3.2, γ_i and $\gamma_{i,\sigma\rho}$ are ambient isotopic.

$\gamma_{1,\sigma\rho}$ and $\gamma_{2,\sigma\rho}$ are ambient isotopic

Let

$$\Gamma : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$$

given by the convex combination

$$\Gamma(t, x) := t\gamma_{1,\sigma\rho}(x) + (1-t)\gamma_{2,\sigma\rho}(x).$$

From the estimates above, we have

$$\|\partial_x \Gamma(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{11}{8} \quad \forall t \in [0, 1].$$

We need to get a uniform bilipschitz estimate for Γ .

First, since $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$ in $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(3\rho)$ and $\sigma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$,

$$\gamma_{1,\sigma\rho}(x) = \gamma_{2,\sigma\rho}(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(\frac{7}{2}\rho).$$

Thus,

$$\Gamma(t, x) = \gamma_{1,\sigma\rho}(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(\frac{7}{2}\rho).$$

In view of (3.6) and (3.5) combined with Lemma 2.1, we know that $\gamma_{1,\sigma\rho}$ is uniformly bilipschitz in $B(9\rho)$, namely

$$(3.7) \quad \inf_{t \in [0,1]} \inf_{x,y \in B(9\rho) \setminus B(7\rho/2)} \frac{\Gamma(t,x) - \Gamma(t,y)}{|x-y|} > 0.$$

Secondly, since $\theta \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(5\rho)$,

$$\gamma_{1,\sigma\rho}(x) = \gamma_{2,\sigma\rho}(x) = \gamma_1(x) = \gamma_2(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(5\rho).$$

Thus,

$$\Gamma(t,x) = \gamma_1(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(5\rho).$$

Since γ_1 is a regular diffeomorphism, this implies that

$$(3.8) \quad \inf_{t \in [0,1]} \inf_{x,y \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(5\rho)} \frac{\Gamma(t,x) - \Gamma(t,y)}{|x-y|} > 0.$$

Combining (3.7) and (3.8) we have

$$(3.9) \quad \inf_{t \in [0,1]} \inf_{x,y \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(\frac{3}{2}\rho)} \frac{\Gamma(t,x) - \Gamma(t,y)}{|x-y|} > 0.$$

It remains to show the bilipschitz estimate for $|\Gamma(t,x) - \Gamma(t,y)|$ only for $x, y \in B(4\rho)$. For such x, y ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma(t,x) - \Gamma(t,y)| &\geq |\gamma_{1,\sigma\rho}(x) - \gamma_{1,\sigma\rho}(y)| \\ &\quad - |\Gamma(t,x) - \gamma_{1,\sigma\rho}(x) - (\Gamma(t,y) - \gamma_{1,\sigma\rho}(y))| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}|x-y| \\ &\quad - |(t-1)\gamma_{1,\sigma\rho}(x) + (1-t)\gamma_{2,\sigma\rho}(x) - ((t-1)\gamma_{1,\sigma\rho}(y) + (1-t)\gamma_{2,\sigma\rho}(y))| \\ &= \frac{1}{2}|x-y| \\ &\quad - (1-t)|\gamma_{1,\sigma\rho}(y) - \gamma_{1,\sigma\rho}(x) - (\gamma_{2,\sigma\rho}(y) - \gamma_{2,\sigma\rho}(x))| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}|x-y| \\ &\quad - \int_{[x,y]} |\gamma'_{1,\sigma\rho}(z) - \gamma'_{2,\sigma\rho}(z)| dz \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \|\gamma'_{1,\sigma\rho} - \gamma'_{2,\sigma\rho}\|_{L^\infty(B(4\rho))} \right) |x-y|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $x, y \in B(4\rho)$, $\theta(x) = \theta(y) = 1$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\gamma'_{1,\sigma\rho} - \gamma'_{2,\sigma\rho}\|_{L^\infty(B(4\rho))} &= \|\eta_{\sigma\rho} * \gamma'_1 - \eta_{\sigma\rho} * \gamma'_2\|_{L^\infty(B(4\rho))} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sigma\rho} \|\gamma'_1 - \gamma'_2\|_{L^1(B(6\rho))} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\rho}{\sigma\rho} [\gamma'_1 - \gamma'_2]_{W^{\frac{1}{4},q}(B(6\rho))} \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last step we used Poincaré inequality (and the fact that $\gamma'_1 = \gamma'_2$ close to $\partial B(6\rho)$).

So if we choose ε such that $\varepsilon \ll \sigma$ we obtain

$$|\Gamma(t,x) - \Gamma(t,y)| \geq \frac{1}{4}|x-y| \quad \forall x, y \in B(4\rho).$$

Combining this with (3.9), we have shown that Γ is an isotopy. In view of Theorem 3.2, $\gamma_{1,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ and $\gamma_{2,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ are ambient isotopic. Since in turn $\gamma_{i,\sigma}$ and γ_i are ambient isotopic for $i = 1, 2$, we have proven that γ_1 is ambient isotopic to γ_2 . \square

4. HOMEOMORPHISMS APPEAR AS LIMITS: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

It is easy to construct Lipschitz parametrization of curves $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ with vanishing tangent-point energy $\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma) = 0$, $p \geq q + 2$, but with no reasonable regularity, namely $\gamma \notin C^1(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\gamma \notin W^{1+\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$.

Example 4.1. For any Lipschitz map $\tilde{\gamma} : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow [0, 1/2]$ with $|\tilde{\gamma}'| \equiv 1$, if we set $\gamma(x) := (\tilde{\gamma}, 0, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ then

$$|\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y))| = 0.$$

In particular, if for any $x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ there are only finitely many $y \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ such that $\tilde{\gamma}(x) = \tilde{\gamma}(y)$, we have that

$$\frac{|\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y))|^q}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)|^p} = 0 \quad \mathcal{L}^2\text{-a.e. } (x, y) \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2,$$

and thus $\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma) = 0$.

E.g., take $\tilde{\gamma}$ to be

$$\tilde{\gamma}(t) := \begin{cases} t & t < \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} - t & t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \end{cases}.$$

Then γ' has a jump discontinuity at $t = \frac{1}{2}$ and $t = 0$. Thus $\gamma' \notin C(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\gamma' \notin W^{\frac{p-1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ whenever $\gamma \notin W^{1+\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ for any $p \geq q + 2$ and $q \in (1, \infty)$.

It is easy to extend this example into a map γ with countably many points of non-differentiability but still $\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma) = 0$.

See also example of k -covered circle [69, after Theorem 1.1].

Example 4.1 shows that there is no hope to classify a reasonable energy space of Lipschitz maps $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ with finite tangent-point energy. Rather we investigate the space of diffeomorphisms with finite tangent-point energy, which turns out to be more manageable – this is the content of the following Theorem 4.2 which is the main theorem of this section. In particular, Theorem 4.2 implies Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 4.2. *For any $\Lambda > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an $L = L(\varepsilon, \Lambda) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds.*

Let $\gamma_k \in C^1(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$, $|\gamma_k'| \equiv 1$, be homeomorphisms with

$$\sup_k \|\gamma_k\|_{L^\infty} + \sup_k \text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma_k) \leq \Lambda.$$

Then there exists a subsequence $(\gamma_{k_i})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\gamma \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ such that the following holds for some finite set $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ with $\#\Sigma \leq L$.

- (1) γ_{k_i} converges uniformly to γ and $\gamma \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$.
- (2) For any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \Sigma$ there exists a radius $\rho(x_0) > 0$ such that γ_{k_i} weakly converges to γ in $W^{1+\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}(B(x_0, \rho))$.
- (3) $|\gamma'| = 1$ a.e.

(4) γ is uniformly bilipschitz in $B(x_0, \rho)$ with the estimate

$$(1 - \varepsilon)|x - y| \leq |\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| \leq |x - y| \quad \forall x, y \in B(x_0, \rho).$$

(5) We have lower semicontinuity, namely

$$\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma_k).$$

(6) γ is a bi-Lipschitz homeomorphism.

(7) $\gamma \in W^{1+s,q}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ for any $0 < s < \frac{1}{q}$.

We will prove a more detailed version of Theorem 4.2 in Proposition 4.10.

In order to prove Theorem 4.2, we proceed in several steps.

- First we prove in Section 4.1 that for the approximating sequence γ_k the local tangent-point energy is uniformly small away from a finite set Σ (we will refer to it as the “singular set”) of points of energy concentration.
- In Section 4.2 we obtain the Sobolev estimate for smooth curves whenever the tangent-point energy is locally small, see Theorem 4.5, and as a consequence a bi-Lipschitz estimate. This estimate is obtained by a gap-estimate. In particular this method characterizes the energy space for the tangent-point energies in the scale-invariant case.
- In Section 4.3 we adapt an argument due to Strzelecki and von der Mosel [69] to obtain a uniform estimate on global injectivity of the approximating sequence γ_k away from the singular points, see Theorem 4.9.
- In Section 4.4 we then obtain in Proposition 4.10 the convergence outside the singular set which implies Theorem 4.2.

4.1. Locally uniform smallness. In the first step we ensure that away from a discrete set we have locally uniformly small energy in the approximating sequence.

Proposition 4.3. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\Lambda > 0$ there exists $L = L(\varepsilon, \Lambda)$ such that the following holds.*

For any sequence $\gamma_k \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$, $|\gamma'_k| \equiv 1$, such that

$$\sup_k \text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma_k) \leq \Lambda,$$

there exists a subsequence γ_{k_i} and set $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ consisting of at most L points such that for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \Sigma$ there exists a radius $\rho = \rho_{x_0} > 0$ and an index $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sup_{i \geq K} \int_{B(x_0, \rho_{x_0})} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\gamma'_{k_i}(x) \wedge (\gamma_{k_i}(x) - \gamma_{k_i}(y))|^q}{|\gamma_{k_i}(x) - \gamma_{k_i}(y)|^p} dy dx < \varepsilon.$$

Proposition 4.3 follows for any integral energy from a relatively standard covering argument, see e.g. [63, Proposition 4.3 and Theorem 4.4].

Proof. We give the details for the convenience of the reader.

Pick $\delta < \frac{\varepsilon}{2\Lambda}$ and let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then cover \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} by at most $2\lceil(\delta 2^{-m})^{-1}\rceil$ intervals $B(x_i, \delta 2^{-m})$ such that every point $x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ is covered at most two times. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_i \int_{B(x_i, \delta 2^{-m})} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\gamma'_k(x) \wedge (\gamma_k(x) - \gamma_k(y))|^q}{|\gamma_k(x) - \gamma_k(y)|^{q+2}} dy dx \\ & \leq 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\gamma'_k(x) \wedge (\gamma_k(x) - \gamma_k(y))|^q}{|\gamma_k(x) - \gamma_k(y)|^{q+2}} dy dx < 2\Lambda = \frac{2\Lambda}{\varepsilon} \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence for every γ_k there exist at most $L := L(\varepsilon, \Lambda) := \lfloor \frac{2\Lambda}{\varepsilon} \rfloor$ intervals $B(x_i, \delta 2^{-m})$ such that

$$\int_{B(x_i, \delta 2^{-m})} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\gamma'_k(x) \wedge (\gamma_k(x) - \gamma_k(y))|^q}{|\gamma_k(x) - \gamma_k(y)|^{q+2}} dy dx \geq \varepsilon.$$

Now assume that we have already shown for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ that

$$\sup_k \int_{B(x_i, \delta 2^{-m})} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\gamma'_k(x) \wedge (\gamma_k(x) - \gamma_k(y))|^q}{|\gamma_k(x) - \gamma_k(y)|^{q+2}} dy dx < \varepsilon.$$

If there exist more than L intervals $B(x_i, \delta 2^{-m})$, $i > n$, with

$$\sup_k \int_{B(x_i, \delta 2^{-m})} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\gamma'_k(x) \wedge (\gamma_k(x) - \gamma_k(y))|^q}{|\gamma_k(x) - \gamma_k(y)|^{q+2}} dy dx \geq \varepsilon,$$

there must exist at least one $B(x_{n+1}, \delta 2^{-m})$ among them and a subsequence of γ_k such that

$$\sup_k \int_{B(x_{n+1}, \delta 2^{-m})} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\gamma'_k(x) \wedge (\gamma_k(x) - \gamma_k(y))|^q}{|\gamma_k(x) - \gamma_k(y)|^{q+2}} dy dx < \varepsilon.$$

By repeating this step, we find a subsequence of γ_k for which

$$\sup_k \int_{B(x_i, \delta 2^{-m})} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\gamma'_k(x) \wedge (\gamma_k(x) - \gamma_k(y))|^q}{|\gamma_k(x) - \gamma_k(y)|^{q+2}} dy dx < \varepsilon$$

holds for all given intervals apart from L many $B(x_{i,m}, \delta 2^{-m})$.

Applying this method iteratively for $m \rightarrow \infty$, we can construct a series of subsequences such that for each subsequence $\gamma_{k,m}$ we have

$$\sup_k \int_{B(x_i, \delta 2^{-m})} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\gamma'_{k,m}(x) \wedge (\gamma_{k,m}(x) - \gamma_{k,m}(y))|^q}{|\gamma_{k,m}(x) - \gamma_{k,m}(y)|^{q+2}} dy dx < \varepsilon,$$

where $B(x_i, \delta 2^{-m}) \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \bigcup_{j \leq m-1} B(x_{i,j}, \delta 2^{-j})$.

Now we choose a diagonal subsequence γ_{k_i} (one element per $\gamma_{k,m}$). Since

$$\bigcup_m (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \bigcup_{i \leq L} B(x_{i,m}, \delta 2^{-m})) = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \bigcap_m \bigcup_{i \leq L} B(x_{i,m}, \delta 2^{-m}) = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_L\}$$

for at most $x_1, \dots, x_L \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, there indeed exists for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_L\}$ a $\rho_{x_0} > 0$ such that $B(x_0, \rho_{x_0}) \subset B(z_i, \delta 2^{-K})$ for a $K \in \mathbb{N}$ and therefore

$$\sup_{i \geq K} \int_{B(x_0, \rho_{x_0})} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\gamma'_{k_i}(x) \wedge (\gamma_{k_i}(x) - \gamma_{k_i}(y))|^q}{|\gamma_{k_i}(x) - \gamma_{k_i}(y)|^{q+2}} dy dx < \varepsilon.$$

□

4.2. Small local energy implies local Sobolev space estimates. The main novel ingredient underlying our argument for Theorem 4.2 is a gap estimate for Sobolev spaces with respect to the tangent-point energy.

As discussed in Example 4.1, it is impossible to control the Sobolev norm of γ in terms of the tangent-point energy of γ , $\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma)$, without assuming a priori bilipschitz estimates (as it was done in [11] see also [7]). This is however not a viable method for the scale-invariant case $p = q + 2$ because the bi-Lipschitz constant is not uniformly controlled as a sequence γ_k converges to γ . We turn this argument around and first a priori assume that the Sobolev norm is finite, and then conclude that this is an estimate which is uniform for sequences γ_k converging to γ .

The first step is the following gap estimate⁴.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $p \in [q + 2, 2q + 1)$ and $q > 1$. Let $\gamma \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$, $|\gamma'| \equiv 1$. Then for any ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ of diameter less than $\frac{1}{2}$,*

$$(4.1) \quad [\gamma']_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B)}^q \leq C(p, q) \text{TP}^{p, q}(\gamma, B) + C(p, q) [\gamma']_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B)}^{2q},$$

whenever the right-hand side is finite.

Proof of Lemma 4.4. The assumption that B has diameter less than $\frac{1}{2}$ implies that B is a geodesic ball and thus convex with respect to the \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} -metric. To simplify matters even more, we assume w.l.o.g. that the ball B is centered at 0 so that $|x - y|$ is actually the Euclidean distance.

Recall the Lagrange identity for $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $|v| = 1$,

$$|v \wedge w|^2 = |w|^2 - |v \cdot w|^2.$$

Moreover, observe that $|\gamma'| \equiv 1$ implies

$$|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| \leq |x - y|.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{|\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y))|^q}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)|^p} \\ & \geq \frac{|\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y))|^q}{|x - y|^p} \\ & = \frac{\left(|\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(y) - \gamma(x) - \gamma'(x)(y - x))|^2 \right)^{\frac{q}{2}}}{|x - y|^p} \\ & = \frac{\left(|(\gamma(y) - \gamma(x) - \gamma'(x)(y - x))|^2 - |\gamma'(x) \cdot (\gamma(y) - \gamma(x) - \gamma'(x)(y - x))|^2 \right)^{\frac{q}{2}}}{|x - y|^p}. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \gamma'(x) \cdot (\gamma'(z) - \gamma'(x)) &= \frac{1}{2} (2\gamma'(x) \cdot \gamma'(z) - 1 - 1) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} |\gamma'(x) - \gamma'(z)|^2, \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} & |\gamma'(x) \cdot (\gamma(y) - \gamma(x) - \gamma'(x)(y - x))| \\ & = |y - x| \left| \int_{(x, y)} \gamma'(x) \cdot (\gamma'(z) - \gamma'(x)) dz \right| \\ & = \frac{1}{2} |y - x| \int_{(x, y)} |\gamma'(x) - \gamma'(z)|^2 dz. \end{aligned}$$

⁴Lemma 4.4 is called a gap estimate, because it implies the following: For $\varepsilon := \left(\frac{1}{2C(p, q)}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$ we have either $[\gamma']_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B)}^q \leq 2C(p, q) \text{TP}^{q+2, q}(\gamma, B)$ or $[\gamma']_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B)}^q \geq \varepsilon$.

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{|\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y))|^q}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)|^p} \\ & \geq \frac{\left(|(\gamma(y) - \gamma(x) - \gamma'(x)(y-x))|^2 - \frac{1}{4}|y-x|^2 \left| \int_{(x,y)} |\gamma'(x) - \gamma'(z)|^2 dz \right|^2 \right)^{\frac{q}{2}}}{|x-y|^p}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that from our computations we know that in particular,

$$|(\gamma(y) - \gamma(x) - \gamma'(x)(y-x))|^2 \geq \frac{1}{4}|y-x|^2 \left| \int_{(x,y)} |\gamma'(x) - \gamma'(z)|^2 dz \right|^2.$$

Also observe that for any $r > 0$ there exists $c_r \in (0, 1)$, $C_r > 0$ such that for any $a \geq b \geq 0$

$$(a-b)^r \geq c_r a^r - C_r b^r.$$

From this, and by Jensen's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{|\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y))|^q}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)|^p} \\ & \geq c \frac{|(\gamma(y) - \gamma(x) - \gamma'(x)(y-x))|^q}{|x-y|^p} - C \frac{|y-x|^q \left| \int_{(x,y)} |\gamma'(x) - \gamma'(z)|^2 dz \right|^q}{|x-y|^p} \\ & = c \frac{\left| \frac{\gamma(y) - \gamma(x) - \gamma'(x)(y-x)}{|x-y|} \right|^q}{|x-y|^{p-q}} - C \frac{\int_{(x,y)} |\gamma'(x) - \gamma'(z)|^{2q} dz}{|x-y|^{p-q}} \end{aligned}$$

Integrating x and y in B we obtain

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_B \int_B \frac{\left| \frac{\gamma(y) - \gamma(x) - \gamma'(x)(y-x)}{|x-y|} \right|^q}{|x-y|^{p-q}} dx dy \\ & \leq C_q \left(\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma, B) + \int_B \int_B \frac{\int_{(x,y)} |\gamma'(x) - \gamma'(z)|^{2q} dz}{|x-y|^{p-q}} dx dy \right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $p \in [q+2, 2q+1)$, so $\frac{p-q-1}{q} \in (0, 1)$. From Lemma A.1

$$[\gamma']_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B)}^q \approx \int_B \int_B \frac{\left| \frac{\gamma(y) - \gamma(x) - \gamma'(x)(y-x)}{|x-y|} \right|^q}{|x-y|^{p-q}} dx dy.$$

From Lemma A.2

$$[\gamma']_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{2q}, 2q}(B)}^{2q} \approx \int_B \int_B \frac{\int_{(x,y)} |\gamma'(x) - \gamma'(z)|^{2q} dz}{|x-y|^{p-q}} dx dy.$$

Also, from the Sobolev inequality, Lemma A.3, we have

$$[\gamma']_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{2q}, 2q}(B)} \lesssim (\text{diam } B)^{\frac{p-q-2}{2q}} [\gamma']_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B)} \leq [\gamma']_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B)}.$$

Thus, (4.3) implies

$$[\gamma']_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B)}^q \lesssim \text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma, B) + [\gamma']_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B)}^{2q},$$

which is (4.1). The proof is concluded. \square

The gap-estimate leads to the following control of the Sobolev norm. We stress that we need to assume *a priori* that γ already belongs to the Sobolev space in question, which rules out the irregular curves in Example 4.1.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $q_0, p_0 > 1$, $q_1 < \infty$, $p_1 < \infty$ such that $p_1 - 2q_0 < 1$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, then there exists $\delta = \delta(q_0, p_0, q_1, p_1, \varepsilon) > 0$ and a constant $C = C(q_0, p_0, q_1, p_1) > 0$ such that the following holds for any $p \in [p_0, p_1]$ and $q \in [q_0, q_1]$.*

Let $\gamma \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$, $|\gamma'| \equiv 1$, and assume that for some ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, $\text{diam}(B) < \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma, B) < \delta$$

and

$$(4.4) \quad \text{either } \gamma \in C^1(B) \quad \text{or} \quad [\gamma']_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B)}^q < \infty.$$

Then

$$(4.5) \quad [\gamma']_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B)}^q \leq C(q_0, p_0, q_1, p_1) \text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma, B)$$

and we have the bi-Lipschitz estimate

$$(4.6) \quad (1 - \varepsilon)|x - y| \leq |\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| \leq |x - y| \quad \forall x, y \in B.$$

Proof. In view of [11, Theorem 1.1, Remark 1.6], $\gamma \in C^1(B)$ and $\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma, B) < \infty$ implies

$$[\gamma']_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B)}^q < \infty,$$

so that in (4.4) we can assume the Sobolev-space estimate to hold.

Assume that $B = B(x_0, R)$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and $R \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$.

Set

$$\lambda := \text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma, B) < \delta.$$

For $r \in (0, R]$ set $B(r) := B(x_0, r)$.

By Lemma 4.4 we have for any $r \in (0, R]$,

$$[\gamma']_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B(r))}^q \leq C_1 \text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma, B(r)) + C_2 [\gamma']_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B(r))}^{2q}.$$

Set

$$f(r) := [\gamma']_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B(r))}^q.$$

Then we have

$$f(r) \leq C_1 \lambda + C_2 (f(r))^2 \quad \forall r \in (0, R).$$

Setting $p(t) := C_2 t^2 - t + C_1 \lambda$, we have

$$(4.7) \quad p(f(r)) \geq 0 \quad \forall r \in (0, R).$$

The roots of the polynomial p are

$$t_{\lambda;1} := \frac{1}{2C_2} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{(2C_2)^2} - \frac{C_1}{C_2} \lambda}, \quad t_{\lambda;2} := \frac{1}{2C_2} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{(2C_2)^2} - \frac{C_1}{C_2} \lambda}.$$

Let δ be small enough so that $\frac{1}{(2C_2)^2} - \frac{C_1}{C_2} \delta > \frac{1}{(4C_2)^2}$. Then, whenever $\lambda \in (0, \delta)$ we have $t_{\lambda;1} < t_{\lambda;2}$ and moreover

$$(4.8) \quad t_{\lambda;1} \leq C(C_1, C_2) \lambda \quad \forall \lambda \in (0, \delta).$$

The polynomial p is negative only on the interval $(t_{\lambda,1}, t_{\lambda,2})$. From (4.7) we deduce that for each $r \in (0, R)$ either $f(r) \leq t_{\lambda,1}$ or $f(r) \geq t_{\lambda,2}$. Since $f(0) = 0$ and f is continuous, we conclude that necessarily

$$f(r) \leq t_{\lambda,1} \quad \text{for each } r < R.$$

That is, in view of (4.8),

$$[\gamma']^q_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B)} \leq C(C_1, C_2) \lambda.$$

Recalling the definition of λ , we conclude (4.5).

Choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ possibly even smaller, we obtain also (4.6) as a consequence of (4.5) and Lemma 2.1. \square

Let us also remark, for the sake of completeness, that the argument in the proof of Lemma 4.4 also gives a real classification of the energy space, if one assumes a priori bi-Lipschitz estimates (cf. [11, Proposition 2.4]).

Lemma 4.6. *Let $p \in [q+2, 2q+1)$ and $q > 1$. Let $\gamma \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$, $|\gamma'| \equiv 1$ and $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ be bi-Lipschitz, i.e.*

$$(1 - \lambda)|x - y| \leq |\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| \leq |x - y|$$

Then for any ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ of diameter less than $\frac{1}{2}$,

$$\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma, B) \leq C(p, q, \lambda) [\gamma']^q_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B)} + C(p, q, \lambda) [\gamma']^{2q}_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B)}.$$

With the help of Lemma 4.6 we obtain

Example 4.7. There exists a homeomorphism $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ which is bilipschitz, whose derivative is not everywhere continuous, but has finite tangent-point energy $\text{TP}^{q+2,q}(\gamma)$ for any $q > 1$. Moreover, there exists a sequence of C^∞ -diffeomorphisms γ_k converging uniformly to γ with uniformly bounded tangent-point energy, i.e.

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{TP}^{q+2,q}(\gamma_k) < \infty.$$

Indeed, denote by $N = (0, 0, 1)$ the north pole of \mathbb{S}^2 .

Let $u \in W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}([-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}], \mathbb{S}^2) \setminus C^0([-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}], \mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$\langle u, N \rangle \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

and u is constant for $|x| \leq -\frac{1}{8}$ and $|x| \geq \frac{1}{8}$.

For example for any $\eta \in C_c^\infty((-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}), [0, 1])$ with $\eta \equiv 1$ in $[-\frac{1}{16}, \frac{1}{16}]$ we could set

$$u(x) = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sin(\eta(x) \log \log 1/|x|), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cos(\eta(x) \log \log 1/|x|), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right).$$

Now let for $x \in [-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}]$,

$$\gamma(x) = \int_{-\frac{1}{4}}^x u(z) dz.$$

Then γ is bilipschitz in $[-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}]$ because

$$|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| \geq \langle \gamma(x) - \gamma(y), N \rangle = \int_{[x,y]} \langle u, N \rangle \geq \frac{1}{4} |x - y|.$$

Observe that γ' is constant around $x \approx -\frac{1}{4}$ and $x \approx \frac{1}{4}$, so γ can be smoothly extended into a closed curve on $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ which is a smooth 1-D manifold outside of

$[-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}]$. By Lemma 4.6 the curve γ has finite tangent-point energy $\text{TP}^{q+2,q}$ but γ is not C^1 since γ' is discontinuous.

On the other hand, in view of Section 3 any regular homeomorphism $\gamma \in W^{1+\frac{1}{q},q}$ can be approximated by smooth homeomorphisms with uniformly controlled bi-Lipschitz constant, so that in view of Lemma 4.6 the tangent-point energy $\text{TP}^{q+2,q}$ is uniformly bounded.

4.3. The Strzelecki–von der Mosel argument: Locally small energy implies global injectivity. In this section we provide a reformulation of a powerful argument due to Strzelecki and von der Mosel, [69], see also [11, Appendix]. They used it to show that the image of a curve with finite tangent-point energy ($p \geq q+2$) is a topological 1-manifold embedded into \mathbb{R}^3 . Recall that this manifold could be the twice covered straight line, Example 4.1.

We rework their argument to provide us with uniform injectivity for intervals with small energy, Theorem 4.9.

The following is essentially a reformulation (with a slight refinement) of [69, Lemma 2.1].

Lemma 4.8 (Strzelecki–von der Mosel). *Let $p \geq q+2$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that the following holds.*

Let $\gamma \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$, $|\gamma'| \equiv 1$, and assume that for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and $\rho > 0$ we have

$$(4.9) \quad \int_{B(x_0, \rho)} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(y) - \gamma(x))|^q}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)|^p} dy dx < \delta.$$

Moreover, assume that there is $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ with $d := |\gamma(y_0) - \gamma(x_0)| \leq \rho$.

Then

$$\gamma(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \cap B_{2d}(\gamma(x_0)) \subset B_{\varepsilon d}(L(\gamma(x_0), \gamma(y_0))),$$

where $L(\gamma(x_0), \gamma(y_0))$ is the straight line containing $\gamma(x_0)$ and $\gamma(y_0)$ defined by

$$L(\gamma(x_0), \gamma(y_0)) = \{(1-t)\gamma(x_0) + t\gamma(y_0), t \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Proof. For $r > 0$ and $p, v \in \mathbb{R}^3$ we define

$$\begin{aligned} A(r, p) &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} : |\gamma(x) - p| < r\}, \\ X(r, v) &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} : |\gamma'(x) \wedge v| \geq r\}. \end{aligned}$$

Fix $x_0, y_0 \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and $d := |\gamma(x_0) - \gamma(y_0)|$ as in the assumption. Set $v := \frac{\gamma(x_0) - \gamma(y_0)}{|\gamma(x_0) - \gamma(y_0)|}$.

Step 1 is devoted to show the following: There exists $\delta_0, \sigma_0 \in (0, 1)$ depending only on p and q such that if $\delta < \delta_0$ in (4.9) and $\sigma < \sigma_0$, we have

$$(4.10) \quad |B(x_0, \rho) \cap A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(x_0)) \cap X(\sigma, v)^c| > \frac{3}{2} \sigma^2 d.$$

In order to establish (4.10), we first observe that for any $x \in A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(x_0))$ and $y \in A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(y_0))$ we have

$$|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| \in [(1 - 2\sigma^2)d, (1 + 2\sigma^2)d].$$

Moreover, for $x \in A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(x_0)) \cap X(\sigma, v)$ and $y \in A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(y_0))$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \gamma'(x) \wedge \frac{\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)|} \right| \\
& \geq \frac{1}{(1 + 2\sigma^2)d} |\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y))| \\
& \geq \frac{1}{(1 + 2\sigma^2)d} (|\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(x_0) - \gamma(y_0))| - 2\sigma^2 d) \\
& = \frac{1}{(1 + 2\sigma^2)} \left(\left| \gamma'(x) \wedge \frac{\gamma(x_0) - \gamma(y_0)}{|\gamma(x_0) - \gamma(y_0)|} \right| - 2\sigma^2 \right) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{(1 + 2\sigma^2)} (\sigma - 2\sigma^2) \\
& = \sigma \frac{1 - 2\sigma}{1 + 2\sigma^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, whenever $x \in A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(x_0)) \cap X(\sigma, v)$ and $y \in A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(y_0))$,

$$\frac{|\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y))|^q}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)|^p} \geq \frac{\sigma^q}{d^{p-q}} \left(\frac{1 - 2\sigma}{1 + 2\sigma^2} \right)^q \frac{1}{(1 + 2\sigma^2)^{p-q}}.$$

From (4.9) we find

$$\delta > \frac{\sigma^q}{d^{p-q}} \left(\frac{1 - 2\sigma}{1 + 2\sigma^2} \right)^q \frac{1}{(1 + 2\sigma^2)^{p-q}} |B(x_0, \rho) \cap A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(x_0)) \cap X(\sigma, v)| |A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(y_0))|.$$

Observe that since $|\gamma'| \equiv 1$, we have $|A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(y_0))| \geq 2\sigma^2 d$. Then we have

$$(4.11) \quad |B(x_0, \rho) \cap A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(x_0)) \cap X(\sigma, v)| \leq \frac{d^{p-q-1}}{\sigma^{q+2}} \left(\frac{1 + 2\sigma^2}{1 - 2\sigma} \right)^q (1 + 2\sigma^2)^{p-q} \frac{1}{2} \delta.$$

Since $d < \rho$, $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, and $|\gamma'| \equiv 1$, we have

$$(4.12) \quad |B(x_0, \rho) \cap A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(x_0))| \geq 2\sigma^2 d.$$

Taking σ_0 and δ_0 to be small enough, combining (4.11) and (4.12), we obtain for any $\sigma \in (0, \sigma_0)$ and any $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |B(x_0, \rho) \cap A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(x_0)) \cap X(\sigma, v)^c| \\
& \geq 2\sigma^2 d - |B(x_0, \rho) \cap A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(x_0)) \cap X(\sigma, v)| \\
& \geq \frac{3}{2} \sigma^2 d.
\end{aligned}$$

This establishes (4.10).

Step 2: We are going to show below that if σ is small enough and

$$(4.13) \quad \gamma(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \cap B_{2d}(\gamma(x_0)) \not\subset B_{20\sqrt{\sigma}d}(L(\gamma(x_0), \gamma(y_0))),$$


then necessarily for a uniform constant $C = C(p, q)$

$$(4.14) \quad 1 < 2C \delta \sigma^{p-q-4-\frac{q}{2}}.$$

Once we have obtained that we can argue by contradiction: Choose σ small enough so that in particular $20\sqrt{\sigma} < \varepsilon$. Pick δ depending on σ such that (4.14) is false. Then (4.13) would lead to a contradiction and thus is false, meaning

$$\gamma(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \cap B_{2d}(\gamma(x_0)) \subset B_{20\sqrt{\sigma}d}(L(\gamma(x_0), \gamma(y_0))) \subset B_{\varepsilon d}(L(\gamma(x_0), \gamma(y_0))),$$

which is what is claimed in the statement.

FIGURE 2. Definition of α

So what we have to show is that (4.13) implies (4.14), which we will do now.

If (4.13) was true, there necessarily must be a point $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$(4.15) \quad \gamma(z_0) \in B_{2d}(\gamma(x_0)) \setminus B_{20\sqrt{\sigma}d}(L(\gamma(x_0), \gamma(y_0))).$$

Denote the angle between $\gamma(z_0) - \gamma(x_0)$ and $\gamma(y_0) - \gamma(x_0)$ by α , cf. Figure 2.

Observe

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\gamma(z_0) - \gamma(x_0)}{|\gamma(z_0) - \gamma(x_0)|} \wedge \frac{\gamma(y_0) - \gamma(x_0)}{|\gamma(y_0) - \gamma(x_0)|} \right| &= |\sin(\alpha)| = \frac{\text{dist}(\gamma(z_0), L(\gamma(x_0), \gamma(y_0)))}{|\gamma(z_0) - \gamma(x_0)|} \\ &\stackrel{(4.15)}{\geq} \frac{20\sqrt{\sigma}d}{2d} = 10\sqrt{\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Denote by β the angle between $\gamma'(x)$ and $\gamma(y_0) - \gamma(x_0)$ and θ the angle between $\gamma'(x)$ and $\gamma(z_0) - \gamma(x_0)$. Then we have

$$|\alpha| \leq |\beta| + |\theta|.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \gamma'(x) \wedge \frac{\gamma(z_0) - \gamma(x_0)}{|\gamma(z_0) - \gamma(x_0)|} \right| \\ &= |\sin(\theta)| \\ &\geq |\sin(\alpha)| - |\sin(\beta)| \\ &\geq \left| \frac{\gamma(z_0) - \gamma(x_0)}{|\gamma(z_0) - \gamma(x_0)|} \wedge \frac{\gamma(y_0) - \gamma(x_0)}{|\gamma(y_0) - \gamma(x_0)|} \right| - \left| \gamma'(x) \wedge \frac{\gamma(y_0) - \gamma(x_0)}{|\gamma(y_0) - \gamma(x_0)|} \right| \\ &\geq 10\sqrt{\sigma} - \left| \gamma'(x) \wedge \frac{\gamma(y_0) - \gamma(x_0)}{|\gamma(y_0) - \gamma(x_0)|} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, for any $x \in X(\sigma, v)^c$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \gamma'(x) \wedge \frac{\gamma(z_0) - \gamma(x_0)}{|\gamma(z_0) - \gamma(x_0)|} \right| \\ &\geq 10\sqrt{\sigma} - \sigma. \end{aligned}$$

For all σ small enough this implies that for any $x \in X(\sigma, v)^c$ necessarily

$$(4.16) \quad \left| \gamma'(x) \wedge \frac{\gamma(z_0) - \gamma(x_0)}{|\gamma(z_0) - \gamma(x_0)|} \right| \geq 9\sqrt{\sigma}.$$

Observe next that for any $x \in B(x_0, \rho) \cap A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(x_0))$ and $z \in A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(z_0))$ (it is very important that $z \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and does not need to lie in $B(x_0, \rho)$) we have

$$|\gamma(z) - \gamma(x)| \geq |\gamma(z_0) - \gamma(x_0)| - 2\sigma^2 d \geq \sqrt{\sigma}(20 - 2\sigma^{\frac{3}{2}})d.$$

and

$$|\gamma(z) - \gamma(x)| \leq |\gamma(z_0) - \gamma(x_0)| + 2\sigma^2 d \leq (2 + 2\sigma^2)d.$$

That is, for all σ small enough

$$(4.17) \quad |\gamma(z) - \gamma(x)| \in (19\sqrt{\sigma}d, (2 + 2\sigma^2)d).$$

We combine (4.17) and (4.16), and obtain for any $x \in B(x_0, \rho) \cap A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(x_0)) \cap X(\sigma, v)^c$ and $z \in A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(z_0))$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \gamma'(x) \wedge \frac{\gamma(x) - \gamma(z)}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(z)|} \right| \\ & \geq \frac{1}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(z)|} |\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(x) - \gamma(z))| \\ & \geq \frac{1}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(z)|} (|\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(x_0) - \gamma(z_0))| - 2\sigma^2 d) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(z)|} \left(|\gamma(x_0) - \gamma(z_0)| \left| \gamma'(x) \wedge \frac{\gamma(x_0) - \gamma(z_0)}{|\gamma(x_0) - \gamma(z_0)|} \right| - 2\sigma^2 d \right) \\ & \geq \frac{d}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(z)|} (180\sigma - 2\sigma^2) \\ & \geq \frac{\sigma}{2 + 2\sigma^2} (180 - 2\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

Again, for all small enough σ this implies for any $x \in B(x_0, \rho) \cap A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(x_0)) \cap X(\sigma, v)^c$ and $z \in A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(z_0))$,

$$(4.18) \quad \left| \gamma'(x) \wedge \frac{\gamma(x) - \gamma(z)}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(z)|} \right| \geq 3\sqrt{\sigma}.$$

Integrating this inequality in $x \in B(x_0, \rho) \cap A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(x_0)) \cap X(\sigma, v)^c$ and $z \in A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(z_0))$, we obtain from (4.9), (4.17), and (4.18),

$$\delta > \frac{(3\sqrt{\sigma})^q}{(\sigma d)^{p-q}} |B(x_0, \rho) \cap A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(x_0)) \cap X(\sigma, v)^c| |A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(z_0))|.$$

With (4.10) we find

$$\delta > \frac{(3\sqrt{\sigma})^q}{(\sigma d)^{p-q}} \frac{3}{2} \sigma^2 d |A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(z_0))|.$$

On the other hand, since $|\gamma'| \equiv 1$, we have $|A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(z_0))| \geq 2\sigma^2 d$. That is,

$$2\sigma^2 d \leq |A(\sigma^2 d, \gamma(z_0))| < C \delta d^{p-q-1} \sigma^{p-q-2-\frac{q}{2}}.$$

That is,

$$d^{-(p-2-q)} < 2C \delta \sigma^{p-q-4-\frac{q}{2}}.$$

If $p \geq q + 2$ we have (observe that $d \leq 1$ since $\text{diam}(\gamma(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})) \leq 1$),

$$1 < 2C \delta \sigma^{p-q-4-\frac{q}{2}}.$$

That is, under the assumption (4.13), we have shown (4.14) which, as explained above, implies the claim of Lemma 4.8. \square

Theorem 4.9. *Let $p \geq q + 2$. There exists $\delta > 0$ such that the following holds.*

Let $\gamma \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ be a homeomorphism, $|\gamma'| \equiv 1$, and assume that for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and $\rho > 0$ we have that

$$(4.19) \quad \text{either } \gamma \in C^1(B(x_0, \rho)) \text{ or } [\gamma']_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B(x_0, \rho))} < \infty.$$

Also assume

$$(4.20) \quad \int_{B(x_0, \rho)} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(y) - \gamma(x))|^q}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)|^p} dy dx < \delta.$$

If for any $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$|\gamma(x_0) - \gamma(z_0)| < \frac{1}{10}\rho,$$

then there exists $\bar{x} \in B(x_0, \rho)$ such that $\gamma(\bar{x}) = \gamma(z_0)$. In particular, we have $z_0 \in B(x_0, \rho)$.

Proof. Fix $\sigma, \varepsilon > 0$ to be specified later. Take δ small enough so that Lemma 2.1 and Theorem 4.5 are applicable (in view of in view of (4.19)), so that we have

$$(4.21) \quad (1 - \sigma)|x - y| \leq |\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| \leq |x - y| \quad \forall x, y \in B(x_0, \rho).$$

Moreover, we can assume that δ is small enough so that Lemma 4.8 is applicable.

Starting from x_0 , we are going to construct a sequence $(x_k)_{k=0}^\infty \subset B(x_0, \rho)$ and a sequence $(d_k)_{k=0}^\infty \subset (0, \infty)$ such that for all $k \geq 0$,

- $|x_k - x_{k+1}| \leq \frac{1}{1-\sigma} d_k$,
- $|\gamma(x_k) - \gamma(z_0)| = d_k$,
- $d_{k+1} \leq \frac{1}{100} d_k$,
- $B(x_k, 10d_k) \subset B(x_0, \rho)$.

Once we have constructed this sequence, we see that x_k is convergent to some $\bar{x} := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_k \in B(x_0, \rho)$ and $\gamma(\bar{x}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(x_k) = \gamma(z_0)$. Since γ is injective, this implies $\bar{x} = z_0$ and thus $z_0 \in B(x_0, \rho)$.

Let x_k be already given, we need to construct x_{k+1} .

Set

$$d_k := |\gamma(x_k) - \gamma(z_0)|$$

and

$$\eta_k(t) := \gamma(x_k + td_k).$$

Observe that for $1 \leq |t| \leq (1 - \sigma)^{-1}$, by (4.21),

$$d_k \leq |\eta_k(t) - \gamma(x_k)| \leq (1 - \sigma)^{-1} d_k.$$

Since $\eta_k(0) - \gamma(x_k) = 0$, we obtain from the intermediate value theorem that there must be $t_- \in [-(1 - \sigma)^{-1}, -1]$ and $t_+ \in [1, (1 - \sigma)^{-1}]$ such that

$$|\eta_k(t_\pm) - \gamma(x_k)| = d_k.$$

W.l.o.g. (otherwise we interchange the role of t_- and t_+ below) we may assume that

$$(4.22) \quad |\eta_k(t_-) - \gamma(z_0)| \geq \frac{1}{2} d_k.$$

Indeed, if the inequality was false for both t_+ and t_- , we would have

$$|\eta_k(t_-) - \eta_k(t_+)| \leq d_k,$$

which violates the bi-Lipschitz assumption (4.21).

Set

$$y_k := x_k + t_+ d_k.$$

Denote the line through $\gamma(x_k)$ and $\gamma(y_k)$ by L_{x_k, y_k} , more precisely let

$$L_{x_k, y_k}(t) := (1-t)\gamma(x_k) + t\gamma(y_k), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Since $B(x_k, d_k) \subset B(x_0, \rho)$, we can apply Lemma 4.8 and have

$$(4.23) \quad |L_{x_k, y_k}(t_1) - \gamma(z_0)| = \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |L_{x_k, y_k}(t) - \gamma(z_0)| \leq \varepsilon d_k.$$

for some $t_1 \in [-1, 1]$. By Pythagoras,

$$(d_k)^2(1 - \varepsilon^2) = |L_{x_k, y_k}(t_1) - \gamma(x_k)|^2 = t_1^2(d_k)^2.$$

That is, if ε is chosen small enough, $|t_1| \geq 1 - 2\varepsilon$.

We now argue that $t_1 \geq 1 - 2\varepsilon$. Indeed, if we had $t_1 \leq -1 + 2\varepsilon$, then from the bilipschitz estimate

$$|\eta_k(t_1) - \eta_k(t_+)| \geq (1 - \sigma)(2 - 2\varepsilon)d_k.$$

On the other hand,

$$|L_{x_k, y_k}(t_1) - \eta_k(t_+)| = |1 - t_1| |\gamma(x_k) - \gamma(y_k)| \geq (2 - 2\varepsilon)d_k.$$

Moreover,

$$|\eta_k(t_1) - \gamma(x_k)| \leq d_k$$

and

$$|L_{x_k, y_k}(t_1) - \gamma(x_k)| = |t_1|d_k \leq d_k.$$

So we have that

$$L_{x_k, y_k}(t_1), \eta_k(t_1) \in B(\gamma(x_k), d_k) \setminus B(\eta_k(t_+), (1 - \sigma)(2 - 2\varepsilon)d_k).$$

But we also have that

$$|\eta_k(t_+) - \gamma(x_k)| = d_k.$$

From elementary geometry this implies that for small enough ε and σ we have

$$|L_{x_k, y_k}(t_1) - \eta_k(t_1)| < \frac{1}{4}d_k.$$

But then from the projection assumption (4.23)

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta_k(t_-) - \gamma(z_0)| &\leq |\eta_k(t_-) - \eta_k(t_1)| + |\eta_k(t_1) - L_{x_k, y_k}(t_1)| + |L_{x_k, y_k}(t_1) - \gamma(z_0)| \\ &\leq |t_- - t_1|d_k + \frac{1}{4}d_k + \varepsilon d_k \\ &< \frac{1}{2}d_k, \end{aligned}$$

for small enough ε and σ . This contradicts (4.22). That is, we have established that $t_1 \in [1 - 2\varepsilon, 1]$.

Now we compare

$$|\gamma(y_k) - L_{x_k, y_k}(t_1)| \leq (1 - t_1)|\gamma(x_k) - \gamma(y_k)| \leq 2\varepsilon d_k.$$

Consequently, by (4.23), for ε small enough

$$|\gamma(y_k) - \gamma(z_0)| \leq 3\varepsilon d_k < \frac{1}{100}d_k.$$

So if we set $x_{k+1} := y_k = x_k + t_+ d_k \in B(x_0, \rho)$, we have from (4.21)

$$|x_{k+1} - x_k| \leq (1 - \sigma)^{-1}d_k.$$

Also, by the definition, $d_{k+1} := |\gamma(x_{k+1}) - \gamma(z_0)| < \frac{1}{100}d_k$. Lastly,

$$(4.24) \quad \begin{aligned} B(x_{k+1}, 10d_{k+1}) &\subset B(x_{k+1}, \frac{1}{10}d_k) \\ &\subset B(x_k, (\frac{1}{10} + (1-\sigma)^{-1})d_k) \subset B(x_k, 10d_k) \subset B(x_0, \rho). \end{aligned}$$

We thus have constructed x_{k+1} with the required properties, and can conclude. \square

4.4. Convergence.

Proposition 4.10. *For any $\Lambda > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an $L = L(\varepsilon, \Lambda) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds.*

Let $\gamma_k : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$, $|\gamma'_k| \equiv 1$, be C^1 -homeomorphisms with

$$\sup_k \|\gamma_k\|_{L^\infty} + \sup_k \text{TP}^{q+2, q}(\gamma_k) \leq \Lambda$$

Then there exists a subsequence $(\gamma_{k_i})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\gamma \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ such that the following holds for some finite set $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ with $\#\Sigma \leq L$.

- (1) γ_{k_i} converges uniformly to γ and $\gamma \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$.
- (2) For any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \Sigma$ there exists a radius $\rho(x_0) > 0$ such that γ_{k_i} weakly converges to γ in $W^{1+\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B(x_0, \rho))$.
- (3) $|\gamma'| = 1$ a.e.
- (4) γ_{k_i} and γ are uniformly bilipschitz in $B(x_0, \rho)$ with the estimates

$$(4.25) \quad (1-\varepsilon)|x-y| \leq |\gamma_{k_i}(x) - \gamma_{k_i}(y)| \leq |x-y| \quad \forall x, y \in B(x_0, \rho) \forall i.$$

and

$$(4.26) \quad (1-\varepsilon)|x-y| \leq |\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| \leq |x-y| \quad \forall x, y \in B(x_0, \rho).$$

- (5) For any point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \Sigma$ and any $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ with $|\gamma_{k_i}(x_0) - \gamma_{k_i}(y_0)| \leq \frac{1}{100}\rho(x_0)$ or $|\gamma(x_0) - \gamma(y_0)| \leq \frac{1}{100}\rho(x_0)$ we have $|x_0 - y_0| \leq \rho(x_0)$.
- (6) In particular, whenever $\gamma(x) = \gamma(y)$, then either $x = y$ or $\{x, y\} \subset \Sigma$.
- (7) We have lower semi-continuity, namely

$$(4.27) \quad \text{TP}^{p, q}(\gamma) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{TP}^{p, q}(\gamma_k).$$

- (8) $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is a homeomorphism.
- (9) γ is globally bi-Lipschitz.
- (10) $\gamma \in W^{1+s, q}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ for any $0 < s < \frac{1}{q}$.

Proof. **Item 1:** By Arzela-Ascoli, up to taking a subsequence, we may assume that (1) holds.

Item 2: Fix $\delta > 0$ to be specified later. By Proposition 4.3 up to taking a further subsequence we find a discrete singular set Σ with $\#\Sigma \leq L$ such that for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \Sigma$ there exists $\rho_{x_0} > 0$ such that

$$(4.28) \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B(x_0, 10\rho_{x_0})} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\gamma'_k(x) \wedge (\gamma_k(x) - \gamma_k(y))|^q}{|\gamma_k(x) - \gamma_k(y)|^p} dx dy < \delta.$$

From Theorem 4.5 we find that for each $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \Sigma$,

$$(4.29) \quad \sup_k [\gamma'_k]^q_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B(x_0, \rho_{x_0}))} \lesssim C\delta.$$

By reflexivity of $W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, p}(B(x_0, \rho_{x_0}))$ and Banach-Alaoglu, combined with Rellich's theorem, we find that γ'_k weakly converges to γ' in $W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, p}(B(x_0, \rho_{x_0}))$ and the

convergence is pointwise a.e. in $B(x_0, \rho_{x_0})$ and strong in $L^1(B(x_0, \rho_{x_0}))$. Observe that by uniqueness of the weak limit we do not need to pass to a further subsequence here. This establishes (2).

Item 3: In particular, γ'_k a.e. converges to γ in $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \Sigma$, and since Σ is a \mathcal{L}^1 -zero-set. we have that γ'_k a.e. converges to γ . This implies

$$|\gamma'(x)| = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\gamma'_k(x)| = 1 \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}.$$

We have established (3).

Item 4: Having chosen δ in (4.28) small enough, we get a small $W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, p}(B(x_0, \rho_{x_0}))$ -norm from (4.29), and from Lemma 2.1 we obtain (4.25). From the uniform convergence $\gamma_k \rightarrow \gamma$ we obtain (4.26). This establishes (4).

Item 5: The statement in (5) for γ_k is a consequence of Theorem 4.9. By uniform convergence this takes over to γ .

Item 6: Assume $x, y \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ with $\gamma(x) = \gamma(y)$. If $x \notin \Sigma$, we obtain from (5) that $y \in B(x, \rho(x))$. But by (4.26) this implies $x = y$. Similarly, if $y \notin \Sigma$ we obtain $y = x$. So if $\gamma(x) = \gamma(y)$ then either $x = y$ or x and y both belong to Σ .

Item 7: In order to prove (4.27) observe that by (6) we have

$$|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| = 0 \Rightarrow \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} : x = y\} \cup \Sigma \times \Sigma$$

In particular,

$$\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} : |\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| = 0\} \quad \text{is a } \mathcal{L}^2\text{-zero set.}$$

Consequently, we have from the pointwise convergence of γ_k to γ and the \mathcal{L}^1 -almost everywhere convergence of γ'_k to γ' that

$$\frac{|\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y))|^q}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)|^p} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\gamma'_k(x) \wedge (\gamma_k(x) - \gamma_k(y))|^q}{|\gamma_k(x) - \gamma_k(y)|^p} \quad \mathcal{L}^2\text{-a.e. in } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}.$$

From Fatou's lemma we thus have

$$\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma_k),$$

and (7) is established.

Item 8: By now we know that γ has finite tangent-point energy. By [69, Theorem 1.1.] this implies that $\gamma(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ is a topological 1-manifold. On the other hand $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ has only at most finitely many self-intersection points, namely $\gamma(\Sigma)$. This means that there can be no intersection points at all.

Indeed, assume there is an intersection $x_1, x_2 \in \Sigma$, $\gamma(x_1) = \gamma(x_2)$. Assume by contradiction that $x_1 \neq x_2$. Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $[x_i - \varepsilon, x_i + \varepsilon] \cap \Sigma = \{x_i\}$, $i = 1, 2$, since Σ is a discrete set. Now $\gamma : [x_i - \varepsilon, x_i + \varepsilon] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is a one-to-one map and it is (even Lipschitz-)continuous.

Now let denote by C a cross,

$$C := \{z = (z_1, z_2) \in [-1, 1]^2, z_1 = 0 \text{ or } z_2 = 0\}$$

and define $f : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$

$$f(z) := \begin{cases} \gamma(x_1 + \varepsilon z_1) & z = (z_1, 0), \\ \gamma(x_2 + \varepsilon z_2) & z = (0, z_2). \end{cases}$$

Then f is injective and continuous. Since C is a compact set, we conclude that $f : C \rightarrow f(C) \subset \gamma(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ is a homeomorphism. Since $\gamma(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ is a one-dimensional

topological manifold, so around any point $p_0 \in \gamma(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ there exists a homeomorphism $h : \gamma(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \cap B_{\tilde{\delta}}(p_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for some small $\tilde{\delta} > 0$. Taking $p_0 := \gamma(x_1)$ we see that $h \circ f : C \cap B_{\tilde{\delta}}(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a homeomorphism for a smaller $\tilde{\delta} > 0$. But the cross C is not homeomorphic to any subset in \mathbb{R} , and we have a contradiction to our assumption that $x_1 \neq x_2$. In conclusion, whenever $\gamma(x) = \gamma(y)$, we have $x = y$, that is γ is injective. Since $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is continuous and \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} compact we conclude that $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is a homeomorphism. Thus (8) is established.

Item 9: Assume

$$\inf_{x \neq y \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)|}{|x - y|} = 0.$$

Then there exists a (w.l.o.g. convergent) sequences $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \ni x_k \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{x}$ and $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \ni y_k \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{y}$ with

$$(4.30) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\gamma(x_k) - \gamma(y_k)|}{|x_k - y_k|} = 0.$$

We make several observations:

- $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$. Indeed, assume that $\bar{x} \neq \bar{y}$, then continuity of γ combined with (4.30) implies

$$0 = \gamma(\bar{x}) - \gamma(\bar{y}).$$

Since γ is injective, this implies $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$, contradiction.

- $\bar{x} \in \Sigma$. Indeed, assume that $\bar{x} \notin \Sigma$. Then for all k sufficiently large, $x_k, y_k \in B(\bar{x}, \rho_{\bar{x}})$, thus by (4.26),

$$\frac{|\gamma(x_k) - \gamma(y_k)|}{|x_k - y_k|} \geq 1 - \varepsilon \quad \forall k \gg 1.$$

This contradicts (4.30).

- For all but finitely many $k \in \mathbb{N}$ (up to interchanging the role of x_k and y_k) we have $x_k < \bar{x} < y_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Indeed let $K > 0$ such that

$$(4.31) \quad \frac{|\gamma(x_k) - \gamma(y_k)|}{|x_k - y_k|} < \frac{1}{4} \quad \forall k \geq K.$$

Also, combining Lemma 2.1 and Theorem 4.5, let $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for any ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ of diameter $\leq \frac{1}{2}$

$$(4.32) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma, B) < \delta \text{ and } [\gamma']_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B)} < \infty \\ & \text{implies } |\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| \geq \frac{1}{2}|x - y| \quad \forall x, y \in B. \end{aligned}$$

By absolute continuity of the integral, and since $\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma) < \infty$, there exists a $\bar{\rho} > 0$ such that

$$(4.33) \quad \text{TP}^{p,q}(B) < \delta \text{ for all balls } B \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \text{ with } |B| < \bar{\rho}.$$

Now assume by contradiction that $x_k, y_k \in B(\bar{x}, \bar{\rho}/2)$ and $x_k < y_k \leq \bar{x}$ for some $k > K$. Take a sequence $(\tilde{y}_{k;i})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $x_k < \tilde{y}_{k;i} < \bar{x}$ with $\tilde{y}_{k;i} \xrightarrow{i \rightarrow \infty} y_k$. There exists an open ball $B_{k,i} \subset \overline{B_{k,i}} \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \Sigma$ of radius $< \bar{\rho}$ such that $x_k, \tilde{y}_{k;i} \in B_{k,i}$. By a covering argument, from (2), we obtain that $\gamma' \in W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B_{k,i})$ (without any estimate for the norm). However, since

the ball $B_{k,i}$ is small enough, we have $\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma, B_{k,i}) < \delta$ by (4.33), so from (4.32) we obtain

$$\frac{|\gamma(x_k) - \gamma(\tilde{y}_{k;i})|}{|x_k - \tilde{y}_{k;i}|} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

This holds for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, so letting $i \rightarrow \infty$ we get

$$\frac{|\gamma(x_k) - \gamma(y_k)|}{|x_k - y_k|} \geq \frac{1}{2},$$

a contradiction to (4.31).

- There exists $K \in \mathbb{N}$ so that for any $k \geq K$

$$(4.34) \quad |\gamma(x_k) - \gamma(y_k)| \geq \frac{1}{20} \max\{|x_k - \bar{x}|, |y_k - \bar{x}|\}.$$

Indeed, let $\delta > 0$ be from Theorem 4.9, and let $R > 0$ be such that (4.20) is satisfied for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and any $\rho \in (0, R)$ – such an $R > 0$ exists by absolute continuity of the integral and since $\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma) < \infty$. We can assume by taking R possibly smaller that $B(\bar{x}, R) \cap \Sigma = \{\bar{x}\}$.

Let $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|x_k - y_k| < \frac{1}{100}R$ for all $k \geq K$.

Set $\rho := \frac{1}{2}|x_k - \bar{x}| < R$. Observe that $B(x_k, \rho) \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$ and thus $\gamma' \in W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}}(B(x_k, \rho))$ by a covering argument and (2). Since $\bar{x} \notin B(x_k, \rho)$ and $x_k < \bar{x} < y_k$, we have that $y_k \notin B(x_k, \rho)$. Applying Theorem 4.9 in $B(x_k, \rho)$, we conclude that

$$|\gamma(x_k) - \gamma(y_k)| \geq \frac{1}{20}|x_k - \bar{x}|.$$

By a similar argument we also obtain

$$|\gamma(x_k) - \gamma(y_k)| \geq \frac{1}{20}|y_k - \bar{x}|.$$

To conclude (9), observe that by triangular inequality

$$\max\{|x_k - \bar{x}|, |y_k - \bar{x}|\} \geq \frac{1}{2}|x_k - y_k|.$$

Combining this with (4.34), implies

$$|\gamma(x_k) - \gamma(y_k)| \geq \frac{1}{40}|x_k - y_k|,$$

which is a contradiction to (4.30). This establishes (9).

Item 10: There are at most finitely many points Σ where we do not know already that γ is Sobolev. For simplicity of notation assume that $0 \in \Sigma$. Take $r > 0$ small enough such that $B(r) \cap \Sigma = \{0\}$, and that for δ from Theorem 4.5,

$$\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma, B(r)) < \delta.$$

For small $\sigma > 0$ let

$$X_\sigma := ([-r, -\sigma] \times [-r, -\sigma]) \cup ([\sigma, r] \times [\sigma, r]) \cup ([-r, -\sigma] \times [\sigma, r]).$$

Since $\mathcal{L}^2([-r, r]^2 \setminus X_\sigma) \xrightarrow{\sigma \rightarrow 0} 0$, it suffices to show that

$$\limsup_{\sigma \rightarrow 0^+} \int \int_{X_\sigma} \frac{|\gamma'(x) - \gamma'(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{1+sq}} dx dy < \infty.$$

Since we already know that $\gamma' \in W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}([-r, -\sigma]) \cup W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}([\sigma, r])$, we can use Theorem 4.5 to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \int_{X_\sigma} \frac{|\gamma'(x) - \gamma'(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{1+sq}} dx dy \\ & \lesssim \int \int_{[\sigma,r]^2 \cup [-r,-\sigma]^2} \frac{|\gamma'(x) - \gamma'(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{p-q}} dx dy + \|\gamma'\|_{L^\infty} \int_{(-r,0)} \int_{(0,r)} \frac{1}{|x - y|^{1+sq}} dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

The second integral is finite for $s < \frac{1}{q}$. \square

Remark 4.11. It is unclear to us whether Proposition 4.10, property 10, holds for $s = \frac{1}{q}$. If one were able to prove it, then there is a chance to remove the singular set for the regularity theory in Corollary 1.8 with the removability argument as in [46].

5. WEAK LIMITS OF MINIMIZING SEQUENCES ARE CRITICAL: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.6

We would like to compare our minimizing sequence γ_k with the variation $\gamma + t\varphi$, where φ is a locally supported test-function. Computing the Euler-Lagrange equations then proves Corollary 1.8. For notational convenience, we restrict ourselves to the case $p = q + 2$ instead of $p \geq q + 2$. The case $p > q + 2$ follows the same way, but it can also be obtained by simpler, more direct methods.

Theorem 5.1 (Minimizing sequence becomes critical point). *There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that the following holds.*

Let $q > 1$, $\gamma_k \in C^1(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$, $\gamma \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$, $|\gamma'_k| = |\gamma'| = 1$ a.e., with

$$\sup_k \text{TP}^{q+2,q}(\gamma_k) < \infty.$$

Assume that γ_k is approximately minimizing, in the sense that

$$\text{TP}^{q+2,q}(\gamma_k) \leq \text{TP}^{q+2,q}(\tilde{\gamma}) + \frac{1}{k}$$

holds for any $\tilde{\gamma}$ ambient isotopic to γ_k .

Assume that γ_k uniformly converges to γ in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} and for a geodesic ball $B(100\rho) \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, e.g. $\rho < \frac{1}{1000}$,

$$(5.1) \quad \sup_k \int_{B(100\rho)} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \mu(\gamma, x, y) dy dx < \varepsilon_0.$$

Then for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B(\rho), \mathbb{R}^3)$ there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that

$$\int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(\rho)^c)^2} \mu(\gamma, x, y) dx dy \leq \int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(\rho)^c)^2} \mu(\gamma + t\varphi, x, y) dx dy \quad \forall t \in (-t_0, t_0).$$

Here,

$$\mu(\sigma, x, y) := \frac{|\sigma'(x) \wedge (\sigma(x) - \sigma(y))|^q}{|\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)|^{q+2}} |\sigma'(x)|^{1-q} |\sigma'(y)|.$$

For the proof of Theorem 5.1 we need to obtain first a fractional version of the Luckhaus Lemma.

5.1. A fractional Luckhaus Lemma in one dimension. The Luckhaus Lemma, [45, Lemma 1], is an important tool for harmonic maps, usually it is given in the following form, see [68, Section 2.6, Lemma 1]. It essentially provides a way to glue together two maps u and v along the boundary $\partial B(0, 1)$ with explicit dependence on the size δ of the glued region.

Lemma 5.2. *Let \mathcal{N} be any compact subset of \mathbb{R}^3 , $n \geq 2$.*

Assume $u, v \in W^{1,2}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Then there exists $w \in W^{1,2}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, \delta])$ with $w = u$ in a neighborhood of $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \{0\}$, $w = v$ in a neighborhood of $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \{\delta\}$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times [0, \delta]} |\nabla w|^n \leq C\delta \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (|\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2) + C\delta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |u - v|^2,$$

and

$$\text{dist}^2(w, \mathcal{N}) \leq C\delta^{1-n} \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\nabla u|^2 + |\nabla v|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |u - v|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C\delta^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |u - v|^2.$$

We will need a version of this lemma for fractional Sobolev spaces in one dimension. Working in one-dimension has advantages and disadvantages: The advantage is that the boundary of a ball consists of two points, and the possibility of explicit computations. The main disadvantage is that there may be no reasonable trace spaces for $W^{s,p}([0, 1])$ when $sp \leq 1$. In any case, the following might be interesting on its own.

Lemma 5.3. *Assume $u, v : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ be locally integrable, have a Lebesgue point in $x = \pm 1$, and*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dy < \infty \quad x = -1, 1.$$

Then for any $\delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ there exists $w : (-2, 2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ with the following properties:

- $w(x) = u(x)$ for $|x| > 1$ and $w(x) = v(x/(1 - \delta))$ for $|x| < 1 - \delta$, namely we can choose

$$w(x) = \begin{cases} u(x) & |x| > 1 \\ (1 - \eta_\delta(x))u(-1) + \eta_\delta(x)v(-1) & x \in [-1, -1 + \delta] \\ v(x/(1 - \delta)) & |x| < 1 - \delta \\ (1 - \eta_\delta(x))u(1) + \eta_\delta(x)v(1) & x \in [1 - \delta, 1] \end{cases}$$

where $\eta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is any smooth map such that $\eta \equiv 0$ for $|x| > 1 - \frac{\delta}{4}$, $\eta \equiv 1$ for $|x| \leq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\delta$, and $|\eta'| \lesssim \frac{1}{\delta}$.

- For any $r > 1$ we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.2) \quad [w]_{W^{s,p}(-r,r)}^p &\leq \int_{1 < |y| < r} \int_{r > |x| > 1} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dx dy + (1 - \delta)^{1-sp} [v]_{W^{s,p}(-1,1)}^p \\
&+ 2(1 - \delta) \int_{|y| < 1} \int_{r > |x| > 1} \frac{|u(x) - v(y)|^p}{|x - (1 - \delta)y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \\
&+ C \delta \left(\int_{r > |y| > 1} \frac{|u(1) - u(y)|^p}{|1 - y|^{1+sp}} dy + \int_{|y| > 1} \frac{|u(-1) - u(y)|^p}{|-1 - y|^{1+sp}} dy \right) \\
&+ C \delta (1 - \delta)^{-sp} \left(\int_{|y| < 1} \frac{|v(1) - v(y)|^p}{|1 - y|^{1+sp}} dy + \int_{|y| < 1} \frac{|v(-1) - v(y)|^p}{|-1 - y|^{1+sp}} dy \right) \\
&+ C \delta^{1-sp} (|u(1) - v(1)|^p + |u(-1) - v(-1)|^p).
\end{aligned}$$

- If we set $K := u(-2, 2) \cup v(-2, 2)$, then

$$\text{dist}(w, K) \leq |u(-1) - v(-1)| + |u(1) - v(1)|.$$

Proof. Let $\eta : (-2, 2) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\eta \equiv 0$ for $|x| > 1 - \frac{\delta}{4}$ and $\eta \equiv 1$ for $|x| \leq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\delta$. We can find η such that $|\eta'| \lesssim \frac{1}{\delta}$.

Set

$$w(x) := \begin{cases} u(x) & |x| > 1 \\ (1 - \eta(x))u(-1) + \eta(x)v(-1) & x \in [-1, -1 + \delta] \\ v(x/(1 - \delta)) & |x| < 1 - \delta \\ (1 - \eta(x))u(1) + \eta(x)v(1) & x \in [1 - \delta, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{(-2,2)} \int_{(-2,2)} \frac{|w(x) - w(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \\
&= \int_{|y| > 1} \int_{|x| > 1} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \\
&+ (1 - \delta)^{1-sp} \int_{|y| < 1} \int_{|x| < 1} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \\
&+ III + 2IV + 2V + 2VI
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
III &:= \int_{|y| \in (1-\delta, 1)} \int_{|x| \in (1-\delta, 1)} \frac{|w(x) - w(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dx dy, \\
IV &:= \int_{|y| < 1-\delta} \int_{|x| > 1} \frac{|w(x) - w(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dx dy, \\
V &:= \int_{|y| \in (1-\delta, 1)} \int_{|x| < 1-\delta} \frac{|w(x) - w(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dx dy, \\
VI &:= \int_{|y| \in (1-\delta, 1)} \int_{|x| > 1} \frac{|w(x) - w(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dx dy.
\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$III = |v(\pm 1) - u(\pm 1)|^p \int_{|y| \in (1-\delta, 1)} \int_{|x| \in (1-\delta, 1)} \frac{|\eta(x) - \eta(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \lesssim \delta^{1-sp} |v(\pm 1) - u(\pm 1)|^p.$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} IV &= \int_{|y| < 1-\delta} \int_{|x| > 1} \frac{|u(x) - v(y/(1-\delta))|^p}{|x-y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \\ &= (1-\delta) \int_{|y| < 1} \int_{|x| > 1} \frac{|u(x) - v(y)|^p}{|x-(1-\delta)y|^{1+sp}} dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

The tricky terms (that need to vanish as $\delta \rightarrow 0$) are the remaining ones:

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \int_{y \in (1-\delta, 1)} \int_{|x| < 1-\delta} \frac{|v(x/(1-\delta)) - (1-\eta(y))u(1) - \eta(y)v(1)|^p}{|x-y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \\ &\quad + \int_{y \in (-1, -1+\delta)} \int_{|x| < 1-\delta} \frac{|v(x/(1-\delta)) - (1-\eta(y))u(-1) - \eta(y)v(-1)|^p}{|x-y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \\ &= \int_{y \in (1-\delta, 1)} \int_{|x| < 1-\delta} \frac{|v(x/(1-\delta)) - v(1) + (1-\eta(y))(v(1) - u(1))|^p}{|x-y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \\ &\quad + \int_{y \in (-1, -1+\delta)} \int_{|x| < 1-\delta} \frac{|v(x/(1-\delta)) - v(-1) + (1-\eta(y))(v(-1) - u(-1))|^p}{|x-y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \\ &= \int_{y \in (1-\delta, 1)} \int_{|x| < 1-\delta} \frac{|v(x/(1-\delta)) - v(1) + (\eta(x) - \eta(y))(v(1) - u(1))|^p}{|x-y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \\ &\quad + \int_{y \in (-1, -1+\delta)} \int_{|x| < 1-\delta} \frac{|v(x/(1-\delta)) - v(-1) + (\eta(x) - \eta(y))(v(-1) - u(-1))|^p}{|x-y|^{1+sp}} dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\begin{aligned} V &\lesssim \int_{y \in (1-\delta, 1)} \int_{|x| < 1-\delta} \frac{|v(x/(1-\delta)) - v(1)|^p}{|x-y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \\ &\quad + \int_{y \in (-1, -1+\delta)} \int_{|x| < 1-\delta} \frac{|v(x/(1-\delta)) - v(-1)|^p}{|x-y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \\ &\quad + \delta^{1-sp} (|u(1) - v(1)|^p + |u(-1) - v(-1)|^p). \end{aligned}$$

Now for $y \in (1-\delta, 1)$ and $x < 1-\delta$ we have $|x-y| \geq |x-(1-\delta)|$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{y \in (1-\delta, 1)} \int_{|x| < 1-\delta} \frac{|v(x/(1-\delta)) - v(1)|^p}{|x-y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \\ &\leq \int_{y \in (1-\delta, 1)} \int_{|x| < 1-\delta} \frac{|v(x/(1-\delta)) - v(1)|^p}{|x-(1-\delta)|^{1+sp}} dx dy \\ &= \delta \int_{|x| < 1-\delta} \frac{|v(x/(1-\delta)) - v(1)|^p}{|x-(1-\delta)|^{1+sp}} dx \\ &= \delta(1-\delta)^{-sp} \int_{|x| < 1} \frac{|v(x) - v(1)|^p}{|x-1|^{1+sp}} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Arguing similarly for the other part, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V &\leq C \delta(1-\delta)^{-sp} \int_{|x| < 1} \frac{|v(x) - v(-1)|^p}{|-1-x|^{1+sp}} dx \\ &\quad + C \delta(1-\delta)^{-sp} \int_{|x| < 1} \frac{|v(x) - v(1)|^p}{|x-1|^{1+sp}} dx \\ &\quad + \delta^{1-sp} (|u(1) - v(1)|^p + |u(-1) - v(-1)|^p). \end{aligned}$$

Now for VI ,

$$VI = \int_{|y| \in (1-\delta, 1)} \int_{|x| > 1} \frac{|u(x) - w(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dx dy.$$

Again we have two parts, of which we only estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{y \in (1-\delta, 1)} \int_{|x| > 1} \frac{|u(x) - w(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \\ &= \int_{y \in (1-\delta, 1)} \int_{|x| > 1} \frac{|u(x) - (1 - \eta(y))u(1) - \eta(y)v(1)|^p}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \\ &= \int_{y \in (1-\delta, 1)} \int_{|x| > 1} \frac{|u(x) - u(1) + \eta(y)(u(1) - v(1))|^p}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \\ &\lesssim \int_{y \in (1-\delta, 1)} \int_{|x| > 1} \frac{|u(x) - u(1)|^p}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dx dy + |u(1) - v(1)|^p \delta^{1-sp} \\ &\lesssim \int_{y \in (1-\delta, 1)} \int_{|x| > 1} \frac{|u(x) - u(1)|^p}{|x - 1|^{1+sp}} dx dy + |u(1) - v(1)|^p \delta^{1-sp} \\ &= \delta \int_{|x| > 1} \frac{|u(x) - u(1)|^p}{|x - 1|^{1+sp}} dx + |u(1) - v(1)|^p \delta^{1-sp}. \end{aligned}$$

For the last inequality we used that whenever $\delta \in (0, 1)$ if $y \in (1 - \delta, 1)$ and $x > 1$ or $x < -1$, we have that $|x - y| \geq c|x - 1|$ for some uniform constant c . \square

5.2. Proof of Theorem 5.1. Armed with the Luckhaus Lemma, we can now prove Theorem 5.1. The idea is to work with γ'_k and $\gamma' + t\varphi'$, using Luckhaus Lemma to glue $\gamma' + t\varphi'$ into γ'_k where the gluing happens in an annulus $B(R) \setminus B(R(1 - \delta))$. The important observation is that even under the assumption of only weak convergence the norms on the annulus $B(R) \setminus B(R(1 - \delta))$ vanish in the limit.

We face an additional technicality, which is that we want to glue derivatives. Up to adding a corrector term after integration, this leads to a curve $\sigma_{k,\delta}$ which coincides with γ_k outside of a ball $B(R)$. The map $\sigma_{k,\delta}$ may not coincide with $\gamma + t\varphi$ inside the ball $B(R)$, however, its derivative $\sigma'_{k,\delta}$ is essentially γ' inside the ball, which is good enough for our purposes.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. We may assume that the ball $B(\rho)$ is centered at zero. Since ρ is small, w.l.o.g. we will assume for simplicity that the distance $|x - y|$ corresponds to the Euclidean distance.

For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that (5.1) implies

$$(5.3) \quad [\gamma']_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(100\rho))} + \sup_k [\gamma'_k]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(100\rho))} < \varepsilon.$$

Indeed this follows, similar to the arguments in Section 4, from the fact that γ_k is smooth and (5.1) implies by Theorem 4.5 a uniform bound of γ'_k in $W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(100\rho))$, so that a subsequence of γ'_k converges to γ weakly in $W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(100\rho))$.

Let $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B(\rho))$.

By Fubini's theorem, there exists $R \in (\rho, 2\rho)$ such that $\pm R$ are Lebesgue points of γ'_k and γ' ,

$$(5.4) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|\gamma'(x) - \gamma'(y)|^q}{|x - y|^2} dy + \sup_k \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|\gamma'_k(x) - \gamma'_k(y)|^q}{|x - y|^2} dy < \infty \quad x = -R, R,$$

and we can also assume that $\gamma'_k(\pm R)$ converges to $\gamma'(\pm R)$ for this R , and that $\gamma'_k \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma'$ weakly in $W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(100\rho))$ and strongly in $L^q(B(100\rho))$.

Observe, this also implies

$$(5.5) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|(\gamma + t\varphi)'(x) - (\gamma + t\varphi)'(y)|^q}{|x - y|^2} dy < \infty \quad x = -R, R, \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Construction of a comparison map $\sigma_{k,\delta}$

Fix $\delta > 0$. Apply Luckhaus Lemma, Lemma 5.3, to $\gamma' + t\varphi'$ (within $B(R)$) and γ'_k (in $B(R)^c$). Then we obtain

$$g_{k,\delta}(x) = \begin{cases} \gamma'_k(x) & x < -R \\ (\gamma + t\varphi)'(x/(1-\delta)) & |x| < (1-\delta)R \\ \gamma'_k(x) & x > R. \end{cases}$$

For $(1-\delta)R \leq |x| \leq R$ we have a interpolation between $\gamma'(\pm R)$ and $\gamma'_k(\pm R)$ as in Lemma 5.3.

Observe that for $t_0 \ll 1$ we have that $|(\gamma + t\varphi)'|$ is as close to 1 as we want, so we also get the estimate

$$\text{dist}(g'_{k,\delta}(x), \mathbb{S}^{N-1}) \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for } k \gg 1, t_0 \ll 1.$$

Pick $\theta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $\theta \equiv 0$ for $x < -R/2$, $\theta \equiv 1$ for $x \geq R/2$, and with $|\theta'| \lesssim \frac{1}{R}$. We set

$$(5.6) \quad \sigma_{k,\delta}(x) := \int_{-1}^x g_{k,\delta}(z) dz + \gamma_k(-1) + \theta(x) \left(\int_{-R}^R \gamma'_k(z) - g_{k,\delta}(z) dz \right).$$

Properties of $\sigma_{k,\delta}$ We need to show that $\sigma_{k,\delta}$ (for all small t , small δ and large k) is a comparison function for γ_k .

First we show

$$(5.7) \quad \sigma_{k,\delta} \equiv \gamma_k \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus [-R, R].$$

Indeed, observe for $x < -R/2$ that we have

$$\sigma_{k,\delta}(x) = \int_{-1}^x g_{k,\delta}(z) dz + \gamma_k(-1),$$

and thus $\sigma'_{k,\delta}(x) = g_{k,\delta}(x) = \gamma'_k(x)$ whenever $x < -R$. Since moreover $\sigma_{k,\delta}(-1) = \gamma_k(-1)$, we have

$$\sigma_{k,\delta} \equiv \gamma_k \quad \text{on } [-1, -R].$$

Moreover, for $x > R$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{k,\delta}(x) &= \int_{-1}^x g_{k,\delta}(z) dz + \gamma_k(-1) + \left(\int_{-R}^R \gamma'_k(z) - g_{k,\delta}(z) dz \right) \\ &= \int_{-1}^x \gamma'_k(z) dz + \gamma_k(-1). \end{aligned}$$

Again, this implies that $\sigma'_{k,\delta}(x) = \gamma'_k(x)$ for $x > R$ and since $\int_{-1}^1 \gamma'_k = 0$, we have that $\sigma_{k,\delta}(1) = \gamma_k(-1) = \gamma_k(1)$.

Therefore, (5.7) is established.

Next, we show that there exists $t_0 > 0$, $\delta_0 > 0$ and $K_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for

$$(5.8) \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq |\sigma'_{k,\delta}| \leq \frac{3}{2} \quad \forall |t| < t_0, \delta \in (0, \delta_0), k \geq K_0.$$

Indeed, there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $|\gamma' + t\varphi'| \in (1 - \frac{1}{1000}, 1 + \frac{1}{1000})$ for all $|t| < t_0$. From Lemma 5.3 we then have

$$|g_{k,\delta}(x) - 1| \leq \frac{1}{1000} + |\gamma'_k(-R) - \gamma'(-R)| + |\gamma'_k(R) - \gamma'(R)|.$$

Since by assumption $\gamma'_k(\pm R) \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma'(\pm R)$, we can find $K_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(5.9) \quad |g_{k,\delta}(x) - 1| \leq \frac{2}{1000} \quad \forall |t| < t_0, k \geq K_0.$$

On the other hand, the term involving θ is converging in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ to zero. Namely, we have (recall that $\varphi(\pm R) = 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{-R}^R \gamma'_k(z) - g_{k,\delta}(z) dz \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_{-R}^R \gamma'_k(z) - \int_{-(1-\delta)R}^{(1-\delta)R} (\gamma + t\varphi)'(z/(1-\delta)) dz \right| + 2\delta R \|g_{k,\delta}\|_{L^\infty} \\ & \stackrel{(5.9)}{\leq} \left| \int_{-R}^R \gamma'_k(z) - \int_{-(1-\delta)R}^{(1-\delta)R} (\gamma + t\varphi)'(z/(1-\delta)) dz \right| + 4\delta R \\ & = |\gamma_k(R) - \gamma_k(-R) - ((1-\delta)(\gamma + t\varphi)(R) - (1-\delta)(\gamma + t\varphi)(-R))| + 4\delta R \\ & = |\gamma_k(R) - \gamma_k(-R) - ((1-\delta)\gamma(R) - (1-\delta)\gamma(-R))| + 4\delta R \\ & \leq 2 \max_{x \in \{-R, R\}} |\gamma_k(x) - \gamma(x)| + \delta |\gamma(x)| + 4\delta R. \end{aligned}$$

Since γ_k uniformly converges to γ , we obtain that for any $L \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(5.10) \quad \forall \tilde{\varepsilon} > 0 \exists \delta_0 > 0, K_0 \in \mathbb{N} : \left\| \theta(\cdot) \int_{-R}^R \gamma'_k(z) - g_{k,\delta}(z) dz \right\|_{C^L(\mathbb{R})} < \tilde{\varepsilon} \quad \forall \delta \in (0, \delta_0), k \geq K_0.$$

(5.9) and (5.10) readily imply (5.8).

Next we estimate the Sobolev norm of $\sigma_{k,\delta}$. From Luckhaus Lemma, (5.2), we obtain the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & [g_{k,\delta}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(100\rho))}^q \\ & \lesssim [\gamma'_k]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(100\rho))}^q + [\gamma']_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(100\rho))}^q + |t|[\varphi']_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(100\rho))}^q \\ & \quad + C(R) \delta \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|(\gamma + t\varphi)'(R) - (\gamma + t\varphi)'(y)|^q}{|R-y|^2} dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|(\gamma + t\varphi)'(-R) - (\gamma + t\varphi)'(y)|^q}{|-R-y|^2} dy \right) \\ & \quad + C(R) \delta \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|\gamma'_k(R) - \gamma'_k(y)|^q}{|R-y|^2} dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|\gamma'_k(-R) - \gamma'_k(y)|^q}{|-R-y|^2} dy \right) \\ & \quad + C(R) (|\gamma'_k(R) - \gamma'(R)|^q + |\gamma'_k(-R) - \gamma'(-R)|^q) \\ & \quad + C(R) \delta^{-2} \|\gamma'_k - \gamma\|_{L^q(B(100\rho))}^q. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used that

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2(1-\delta) \int_{|y|<R} \int_{100\rho>|x|>R} \frac{|\gamma'_k(x) - (\gamma + t\varphi)'(y)|^q}{|x - (1-\delta)y|^2} dx dy \\
&= 2(1-\delta) \int_{|y|<R} \int_{100\rho>|x|>R} \frac{|(\gamma_k + t\varphi)'(x) - (\gamma + t\varphi)'(y)|^q}{|x - (1-\delta)y|^2} dx dy \\
&\lesssim (1-\delta)[(\gamma_k + t\varphi)']_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(100\rho))}^q + (1-\delta)\delta^{-2}\|\gamma'_k - \gamma'\|_{L^q(B(R))}^q.
\end{aligned}$$

In view of the convergence $\gamma'_k(\pm R) \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma'(\pm R)$, the L^q -convergence of γ'_k to γ' , (5.4), and (5.5) together with (5.3), we obtain that there are δ_0, t_0 such that

$$\forall \delta \in (0, \delta_0) \exists K(\delta) : [g_{k,\delta}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(100\rho))}^q < 4\varepsilon \quad \forall k \geq K(\delta), |t| < t_0.$$

From (5.10) we thus conclude that taking possibly δ_0 and t_0 smaller and $K(\delta)$ larger,

$$\forall \delta \in (0, \delta_0) \exists K(\delta) : [\sigma_{k,\delta}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(100\rho))}^q < 4\varepsilon \quad \forall k \geq K(\delta), |t| < t_0.$$

The comparison

In view of uniform convergence, (5.1), and (5.3), we can apply Theorem 4.9 and Lemma 2.1 to conclude that the assumptions of Theorem 3.7 are satisfied for $\sigma_{k,\delta}$ and γ_k for all $k \geq K(\delta)$ for some large number K .

Theorem 3.7 implies $\sigma_{k,\delta}$ and γ_k are ambient isotopic (technically: we can mollify $\sigma_{k,\delta}$ around $B(5\rho)$, then this mollification is ambient isotopic to γ_k , so we get the estimate and remove the mollification again (observe that γ_k is smooth)), and thus

$$\text{TP}^{q+2,q}(\gamma_k) \leq \text{TP}^{q+2,q}(\sigma_{k,\delta}) + \frac{1}{k} \quad \forall k \geq K(\delta).$$

Since $\gamma_k \equiv \sigma_{k,\delta}$ on $B(R)^c = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(R)$, this implies

$$\int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2} \mu(\gamma_k, x, y) dx dy \leq \int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2} \mu(\sigma_{k,\delta}, x, y) dx dy + \frac{1}{k}.$$

But if $(x, y) \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(2\rho)^c)^2$, we have that $\gamma(x) = \gamma(y)$ if and only if $x = y$ (a set of measure zero), that is we have

$$\mu(\gamma, x, y) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\gamma_k, x, y) \quad \text{a.e. } (x, y) \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(2\rho)^c)^2.$$

From Fatou's Lemma we then find

$$\int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2} \mu(\gamma, x, y) dx dy \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2} \mu(\sigma_{k,\delta}, x, y) dx dy.$$

The convergence of $\sigma_{k,\delta}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ We now fix $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ and consider the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Set

$$g_\delta(x) := \begin{cases} \gamma'(x) & x < -R \\ \gamma'(-R) & x \in (-R, -R(1-\delta)) \\ (\gamma + t\varphi)'(x/(1-\delta)) & |x| < (1-\delta)R \\ \gamma'(R) & x \in (R(1-\delta), R) \\ \gamma'(x) & x > R \end{cases}$$

and

$$\sigma_\delta(x) := \int_{-1}^x g_\delta(z) dz - \gamma(-1) + \theta(x) \left(\int_{-R}^R \gamma'(z) - g_\delta(z) dz \right).$$

We claim that

$$(5.11) \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2} \mu(\sigma_{k,\delta}, x, y) dx dy - \int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2} \mu(\sigma_\delta, x, y) dx dy \right| \leq C\delta.$$

First observe that

$$(5.12) \quad |\sigma'_{\delta,k}(x)| \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} |\sigma'_\delta(x)| \quad \forall \delta < \delta_0, \text{ uniformly for } x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}.$$

Indeed, by the support of φ ,

$$|x| > R : |\sigma'_{\delta,k}(x)| = |\gamma'_k(x)| = 1 = |\gamma'(x)| = |\sigma'_\delta(x)|.$$

Also for $|x| \in ((1-\delta)R, R)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |g_{k,\delta}(x)| &= |\eta(x)\gamma'(\pm R) + (1-\eta(x))\gamma'_k(\pm R)| \\ &\xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} |\eta(x)\gamma'(\pm R) + (1-\eta(x))\gamma'(\pm R)| \\ &= |\gamma'(\pm R)| = |g_\delta(x)|. \end{aligned}$$

and for $|x| < (1-\delta)R$ we have

$$|g_{k,\delta}(x)| = |g_\delta(x)|.$$

By the definition of σ_δ and in view of (5.10) we have established (5.12).

Next we observe that for $(x, y) \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2$ with $|x-y| > \frac{\delta}{100}$ we have by the bilipschitz estimate or the global distance estimate

$$\inf_k |\sigma_{k,\delta}(x) - \sigma_{k,\delta}(y)| \gtrsim C(\delta).$$

Thus we can make a brute force estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2 \cap |x-y| \gtrsim \delta} \mu(\sigma_{k,\delta}, x, y) dx dy - \int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2 \cap |x-y| \gtrsim \delta} \mu(\sigma_\delta, x, y) dx dy \right| \\ & \lesssim C(\delta, \|\gamma'_k\|_{L^\infty}, \|\gamma_k\|_{L^\infty}) \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} |\gamma'_k(x) - \gamma'(x)|^q + |\gamma_k(x) - \gamma(x)|^q dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\gamma_k \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma$ a.e., by dominated convergence (recall $|\gamma'_k| \leq 1$), we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2 \cap |x-y| \gtrsim \delta} \mu(\sigma_{k,\delta}, x, y) dx dy - \int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2 \cap |x-y| \gtrsim \delta} \mu(\sigma_\delta, x, y) dx dy \right| = 0.$$

That is,

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2} \mu(\sigma_{k,\delta}, x, y) dx dy - \int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2} \mu(\sigma_\delta, x, y) dx dy \right| \\ & \lesssim \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2, |x-y| \leq \frac{1}{100}\delta} \mu(\sigma_{k,\delta}, x, y) - \mu(\sigma_\delta, x, y) dx dy \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Also observe that $\mu(\sigma_{k,\delta}, x, y) = \mu(\sigma_\delta, x, y)$ for all $x, y \in B((1-\delta)R)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

So we have to consider the following terms, (observe μ is not symmetric in x, y)

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2} \mu(\sigma_{k,\delta}, x, y) dx dy - \int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2} \mu(\sigma_\delta, x, y) dx dy \right| \\ & \lesssim \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{\ell=1}^5 \int \int_{A_\ell} \left(\frac{|\sigma_{k,\delta}(x)' \wedge (\sigma_{k,\delta}(x) - \sigma_{k,\delta}(y))|^q}{|\sigma_{k,\delta}(x) - \sigma_{k,\delta}(y)|^{q+2}} - \frac{|\sigma_\delta(x)' \wedge (\sigma_\delta(x) - \sigma_\delta(y))|^q}{|\sigma_\delta(x) - \sigma_\delta(y)|^{q+2}} \right) |\sigma'_\delta(x)|^{1-q} |\sigma'_\delta(y)| dx dy \right| \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 & := (\pm R, \pm R(1 + \delta)) \times (\pm R(1 - \delta), \pm R) \\ A_2 & := (\pm R(1 - \delta), \pm R) \times (\pm R, \pm R(1 + \delta)) \\ A_3 & := (\pm R(1 - 2\delta), \pm R(1 - \delta)) \times (\pm R(1 - \delta), \pm R) \\ A_4 & := (\pm R(1 - \delta), \pm R) \times (\pm R(1 - 2\delta), \pm R(1 - \delta)) \\ A_5 & := (\pm R(1 - \delta), \pm R) \times (\pm R(1 - \delta), \pm R). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that in each of these regimes $\theta \equiv 1$ or $\theta \equiv 0$, that is

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2} \mu(\sigma_{k,\delta}, x, y) dx dy - \int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2} \mu(\sigma_\delta, x, y) dx dy \right| \\ & \lesssim \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{\ell=1}^5 \int \int_{A_\ell} \left(\frac{|g_{k,\delta}(x) \wedge \int_x^y g_{k,\delta}(z) dz|^q}{|\sigma_{k,\delta}(x) - \sigma_{k,\delta}(y)|^{q+2}} - \frac{|g_\delta(x) \wedge \int_x^y g_\delta(z) dz|^q}{|\sigma_\delta(x) - \sigma_\delta(y)|^{q+2}} \right) |\sigma'_\delta(x)|^{1-q} |\sigma'_\delta(y)| dx dy \right| \\ & = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{\ell=1}^5 \int \int_{A_\ell} \left(\frac{|g_{k,\delta}(x) \wedge \int_x^y g_{k,\delta}(z) dz|^q}{|\int_x^y g_{k,\delta}(z) dz|^{q+2}} - \frac{|g_\delta(x) \wedge \int_x^y g_\delta(z) dz|^q}{|\int_x^y g_\delta(z) dz|^{q+2}} \right) |\sigma'_\delta(x)|^{1-q} |\sigma'_\delta(y)| dx dy \right| \\ & \lesssim \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^5 \int \int_{A_\ell} \frac{||g_{k,\delta}(x) \wedge \int_x^y g_{k,\delta}(z) dz|^q - |g_\delta(x) \wedge \int_x^y g_\delta(z) dz|^q|}{|\int_x^y g_{k,\delta}(z) dz|^{q+2}} |\sigma'_\delta(x)|^{1-q} |\sigma'_\delta(y)| dx dy \\ & \quad + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^5 \int \int_{A_\ell} \frac{||\int_x^y g_\delta(z) dz|^{q+2} - |\int_x^y g_{k,\delta}(z) dz|^{q+2}||}{|\int_x^y g_\delta(z) dz|^{q+2}} \frac{|g_\delta(x) \wedge \int_x^y g_\delta(z) dz|^q}{|\int_x^y g_{k,\delta}(z) dz|^{q+2}} |\sigma'_\delta(x)|^{1-q} |\sigma'_\delta(y)| dx dy \end{aligned}$$

By the uniform bi-Lipschitz estimate we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lesssim \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^5 \int \int_{A_\ell} \frac{||g_{k,\delta}(x) \wedge \int_x^y g_{k,\delta}(z) dz|^q - |g_\delta(x) \wedge \int_x^y g_\delta(z) dz|^q|}{|x - y|^{q+2}} dx dy \\ & \quad + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^5 \int \int_{A_\ell} \frac{||\int_x^y g_\delta(z) dz|^{q+2} - |\int_x^y g_{k,\delta}(z) dz|^{q+2}||}{|x - y|^{q+2}} \frac{|g_\delta(x) \wedge \int_x^y g_\delta(z) dz|^q}{|\int_x^y g_\delta(z) dz|^{q+2}} |\sigma'_\delta(x)|^{1-q} |\sigma'_\delta(y)| dx dy \end{aligned}$$

The second set of integrals converges to zero by dominated convergence theorem since $g_{k,\delta}$ converges a.e. to g_δ . To establish (5.11) we argue as in the proof Lemma 5.3 to obtain that the first terms satisfy

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^5 \int \int_{A_\ell} \frac{||g_{k,\delta}(x) \wedge \int_x^y g_{k,\delta}(z) dz|^q - |g_\delta(x) \wedge \int_x^y g_\delta(z) dz|^q|}{|x - y|^{q+2}} dx dy \lesssim \delta.$$

The convergence of σ_δ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$

By now we have shown that for any $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$

$$\int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2} \mu(\gamma, x, y) dx dy \leq \int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2} \mu(\sigma_\delta, x, y) dx dy + C\delta.$$

Observe that $\sigma_\delta \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} \gamma + t\varphi$, in view of (5.10) – indeed essentially repeating the Luckhaus-Lemma argument from above, we see that as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ we get

$$\int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2} \mu(\sigma_\delta, x, y) dx dy \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2 \setminus (B(R)^c)^2} \mu(\gamma + t\varphi, x, y) dx dy.$$

□

6. THE REGULARITY THEORY FOR CRITICAL POINTS: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.7

This section is dedicated to show $C^{1,\alpha}$ -regularity of locally critical points for scale-invariant tangent-point energies $\text{TP}^{q+2,q}$ with $q \geq 2$. Our main goal is the following decay estimate.

Proposition 6.1 (Local decay estimate). *Let $q \geq 2$ and γ be a locally critical embedding in the sense of Definition 1.5 with small tangent-point energy $\text{TP}^{q+2,q}$ around a geodesic ball $B(x_0, r) \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, and assume $|\gamma'| \equiv \text{const} > 0$ almost everywhere. Let $u := \frac{\gamma'}{|\gamma'|}$, that is $u : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} u = 0$, and let $\tilde{u} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ be a $L^\infty \cap W^{\frac{1}{q},q}$ -extension of $u|_{B(x_0,r)}$ from $B(x_0, r)$ to \mathbb{R} . Then there exist $\varepsilon, \tau, \theta \in (0, 1)$ and $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds.*

If $N \geq N_0$, $\rho > 0$, and $y \in B(x_0, \frac{r}{2})$ such that $B_{2^N \rho} := B(y, 2^N \rho) \subset B(x_0, r)$, and $[\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2^N \rho})} \leq \varepsilon$, then

$$[u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_\rho)}^q \leq \tau [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2^N \rho})}^q + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\theta(N+l)} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2^{N+l} \rho})}^q + \rho.$$

Proposition 6.1 implies Theorem 1.7 by the usual Dirichlet growth-type iteration techniques.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. First note that by definition u and \tilde{u} coincide locally around $B(x_0, r)$, therefore we have for any ball $B \subset B(x_0, r)$ that

$$[u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B)} = [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B)}.$$

By iterating the decay estimate on small balls, cf. [12, Lemma A.8], we obtain a $\sigma > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{0 < \rho < \frac{r}{2}, y \in B(x, \frac{r}{2})} \rho^{-\sigma} [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(y,\rho))}^q \lesssim C(u).$$

By Jensen's inequality, we conclude that

$$\sup_{0 < \rho < \frac{r}{2}, y \in B(x, \frac{r}{2})} \rho^{-\sigma} \int_{B(y,\rho)} |u(z) - (u)_{B(y,\rho)}|^q dz \lesssim C(u),$$

where $(u)_{B(y,\rho)}$ denotes the mean value of u in $B(y, \rho)$, and hence u belongs to the Campanato space $\mathcal{L}^{q,1+\sigma}(B(x_0, r))$. The characterization of Campanato spaces with Hölder spaces, cf. [27, Theorem 1.2], implies that $u \in C_{loc}^{\frac{\sigma}{q}}(B(x_0, \frac{r}{2}))$, which concludes the proof of Theorem 1.7. □

In order to obtain Proposition 6.1 – inspired by the investigations of critical O’Hara energies in [13] by comparison to the theory of fractional harmonic maps, cf. [22, 64] – we proceed as follows:

- In Section 6.1 we relate critical knots of the tangent-point energies $\text{TP}^{p,q}$ with $p \in [q+2, 2q+1]$ and $q > 1$ to fractional harmonic maps: We first define a suitable energy $\mathcal{E}^{p,q}$ such that the unit tangent $u := \frac{\gamma'}{|\gamma'|}$ of locally critical embeddings γ of $\text{TP}^{p,q}$ with constant-speed parametrization are locally critical maps of the energy $\mathcal{E}^{p,q}$ in the class of maps $v : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$. We then establish that the new energy $\mathcal{E}^{p,q}$ is locally comparable to a $W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}$ -seminorm, see Section 4. Consequently, the equations, that the critical maps u satisfy, are indeed structurally similar to the Euler-Lagrange equations of fractional harmonic maps into the sphere \mathbb{S}^2 as treated in [64].
- In Section 6.2 we derive the Euler-Lagrange equations of the new energies $\mathcal{E}^{p,q}$ for $p \in [q+2, 2q+1]$, $q > 1$, and study the highest order and remainder terms of the Lagrangian.
- In Section 6.3 we finally treat the actual decay estimate of Proposition 6.1.

Before continuing with the upcoming subsections, we need to introduce some notation for integration on \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} , cf. [13, Remark 2.2]:

- (1) We identify by $\rho(x, y)$ the distance of two points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ on \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} , in particular $\rho(x, y) = |x - y| \bmod \frac{1}{2}$.
- (2) If x and y are not antipodal, which means $|x - y| \neq \frac{1}{2}$, we denote by $x \triangleright y$ the shortest geodesic from x to y . Hence, we define for any \mathbb{Z} -periodic f

$$\oint_{x \triangleright y} f := \int_x^{\tilde{y}} f(z) dz,$$

where $\tilde{y} \in y + \mathbb{Z}$ such that $|x - \tilde{y}| < \frac{1}{2}$.

- (3) Furthermore, we write

$$\sigma(x \triangleright y) = \text{sgn} \oint_{x \triangleright y} 1.$$

That means, if $x \triangleright y$ is positively oriented, we have $\sigma(x \triangleright y) = 1$, and if $x \triangleright y$ is negatively oriented, we get $\sigma(x \triangleright y) = -1$.

- (4) Now given a \mathbb{Z} -periodic function f , we define

$$\int_{x \triangleright y} f := \frac{\sigma(x \triangleright y)}{\rho(x, y)} \oint_{x \triangleright y} f.$$

We also have to deal with the fact that the critical embeddings of interest are only locally known to be of class $W^{1+\frac{1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$, which motivates the use of the extension \tilde{u} as described below. This is a mere technical inconvenience, and we recommend the first-time reader to mentally identify u and \tilde{u} in the arguments to come.

Remark 6.2. Let $p \in [q+2, 2q+1]$, $q > 1$, and $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ be a homeomorphism with locally small tangent-point energy according to Definition 1.1 that is a locally critical embedding in $B(x_0, r)$ of $\text{TP}^{p,q}$ as in Definition 1.5. Then Theorem 1.2 implies that γ is globally bi-Lipschitz and of class $W^{1+s,q}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ for any $0 < s < \frac{1}{q}$. However, γ is not known to globally belong to the class $W^{1+\frac{1}{q},q}$ or even $W^{1+\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}$, we only have the local statement $\gamma \in W^{1+\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}(B(x_0, r), \mathbb{R}^3)$ due to Theorem 4.5.

Although we aim to mostly work with the local $W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}$ -Gagliardo seminorm of γ' , we also have to acknowledge global terms thereof on account of the non-locality of the proposed problem. For this reason, when necessary, we may interpret $B(x_0, r)$ as an interval in $[-1, 2]$ and extend $\gamma'|_{B(x_0, r)}$ from $B(x_0, r)$ to a function $\tilde{u} \in W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ such that \tilde{u} is uniformly bounded. Such extension exists since $\|\gamma'\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1$ and by standard construction of extensions, e.g. [23, Theorem 5.4]. Note that in this setting we have for any ball $B \subset B(x_0, r)$ that

$$[\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}(B)} = [\gamma']_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}(B)}.$$

6.1. A new energy $\mathcal{E}^{p,q}$. Our first objective in this subsection is to construct a new energy $\mathcal{E}^{p,q}$, which coincides with the tangent-point energies $\text{TP}^{p,q}$ for sufficiently regular curves γ , but only depends on the first derivative γ' . We then show that any locally critical embedding of the tangent-point energies $\text{TP}^{p,q}$ parametrized by arclength produces a locally critical \mathbb{S}^2 -valued map of the new energy $\mathcal{E}^{p,q}$.

For this purpose, we recall that the tangent-point energies are for any $\gamma \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ given by

$$\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma) = \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y))|^q}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)|^p} |\gamma'(x)|^{1-q} |\gamma'(y)| dy dx.$$

Now we transform the wedge product in the numerator by Lagrange's identity and the fundamental theorem of calculus to

$$\begin{aligned} & |\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(y) - \gamma(x))|^2 \\ &= |\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y) - \gamma'(x)(y-x))|^2 \\ &= |\gamma'(x)|^2 |\gamma(y) - \gamma(x) - \gamma'(x)(y-x)|^2 - (\gamma'(x) \cdot (\gamma(y) - \gamma(x) - \gamma'(x)(y-x)))^2 \\ &= |y-x|^2 \left(|\gamma'(x)|^2 \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} \gamma'(z) dz - \gamma'(x) \right|^2 - \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} \gamma'(x) \cdot \gamma'(z) dz \right|^2 \right) \\ &= |y-x|^2 \left(|\gamma'(x)|^2 \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} \gamma'(z) - \gamma'(x) dz \right|^2 - \frac{1}{4} \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} |\gamma'(x) - \gamma'(z)|^2 dz \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + |\gamma'(x)|^2 - \int_{x \triangleright y} |\gamma'(z)|^2 dz \right|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (6.1) \quad \frac{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^2}{|y-x|^2} &= \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} \gamma'(s) \cdot \gamma'(t) ds dt \\ &= \int_{x \triangleright y} |\gamma'(z)|^2 dz - \frac{1}{2} \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} |\gamma'(s) - \gamma'(t)|^2 ds dt. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can rewrite $\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma)$ in terms of the first derivative γ' as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \frac{(|\gamma'(x)|^2 \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} \gamma'(z) - \gamma'(x) dz \right|^2 - \frac{1}{4} \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} |\gamma'(x) - \gamma'(z)|^2 dz + |\gamma'(x)|^2 - \int_{x \triangleright y} |\gamma'(z)|^2 dz \right|^2)^{\frac{q}{2}}}{|y-x|^{p-q}} \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |\gamma'(z)|^2 dz - \frac{1}{2} \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} |\gamma'(s) - \gamma'(t)|^2 ds dt \right)^{-\frac{p}{2}} |\gamma'(x)|^{1-q} |\gamma'(y)| dy dx. \end{aligned}$$

This motivates to introduce the following real-valued energy $\mathcal{E}^{p,q}$ for any maps $u : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^{p,q}(u) &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \left(|u(x)|^2 \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(x) - u(z)|^2 dz + |u(x)|^2 - \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z)|^2 dz \right)^2 \Big)^{\frac{q}{2}} \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z)|^2 dz - \frac{1}{2} \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(s) - u(t)|^2 ds dt \right)^{-\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\quad \cdot |u(x)|^{1-q} |u(y)| \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}}. \end{aligned}$$

For $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, [0, \infty))$, we set moreover

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\eta^{p,q}(u) &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \left(|u(x) - \eta(x)(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}|^2 \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(x) - u(z)|^2 dz + |u(x) - \eta(x)(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}|^2 - \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - \eta(z)(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}|^2 dz \right)^2 \Big)^{\frac{q}{2}} \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - \eta(z)(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}|^2 dz - \frac{1}{2} \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(s) - u(t)|^2 ds dt \right)^{-\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\quad \cdot |u(x) - \eta(x)(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}|^{1-q} |u(y) - \eta(y)(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}| \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Its localized version for any $D \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ is denoted by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\eta, D}^{p,q}(u) &:= \iint_D \left(|u(x) - \eta(x)(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}|^2 \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(x) - u(z)|^2 dz + |u(x) - \eta(x)(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}|^2 - \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - \eta(z)(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}|^2 dz \right)^2 \Big)^{\frac{q}{2}} \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - \eta(z)(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}|^2 dz - \frac{1}{2} \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(s) - u(t)|^2 ds dt \right)^{-\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\quad \cdot |u(x) - \eta(x)(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}|^{1-q} |u(y) - \eta(y)(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}| \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}}. \end{aligned}$$

We observe that the energies $\text{TP}^{p,q}$ and $\mathcal{E}^{p,q}$ coincide for our embeddings of interest accordingly, recalling that $(\gamma')_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} = 0$.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $p \in [q + 2, 2q + 1)$ and $q > 1$. For any embedding $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ with finite tangent-point energies $\text{TP}^{p,q}$ and constant speed parametrization as well as $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, [0, \infty))$, we have*

$$\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma) = \mathcal{E}_\eta^{p,q}(\gamma') = \mathcal{E}^{p,q}(\gamma'),$$

and, in particular, for any subset $D \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$,

$$\iint_D \frac{|\gamma'(x) \wedge (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y))|^q}{|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)|^p} |\gamma'(x)|^{1-q} |\gamma'(y)| dy dx = \mathcal{E}_{\eta, D}^{p,q}(\gamma').$$

It remains to show that locally critical embeddings of the tangent-point energies $\text{TP}^{p,q}$, cf. Definition 1.5, indeed induce locally critical maps into the sphere \mathbb{S}^2 of $\mathcal{E}^{p,q}$.

The main result of this section is the analogue of [13, Theorem 2.1]: (Locally) Critical knots $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ induce a (locally) $\mathcal{E}_\eta^{p,q}$ -critical maps $u : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ by setting $u := \frac{\gamma'}{|\gamma'|}$.

Theorem 6.4. *Let $p \in [q+2, 2q+1)$, $q > 1$, and $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ be a homeomorphism with locally small tangent-point energy $\text{TP}^{p,q}$ around the open interval $B(x_0, r)$, in the sense of Definition 1.1, and assume $|\gamma'| \equiv \text{const}$. Denote the unit tangent field of γ by $u := \frac{\gamma'}{|\gamma'|} : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$.*

If γ is a locally critical embedding of $\text{TP}^{p,q}$ in $B(x_0, r)$, in the sense of Definition 1.5, then there exists some $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B(x_0, r), [0, \infty))$ such that the map $u : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ is a critical map of $\mathcal{E}_\eta^{p,q}$ in $B(x_0, r)$ in the class of maps $v : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$.

Namely, we have for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B(x_0, r), \mathbb{R}^3)$, if we set $u_\varepsilon = \frac{u + \varepsilon\varphi}{|u + \varepsilon\varphi|}$,

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \mathcal{E}_\eta^{p,q}(u_\varepsilon) = \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \mathcal{E}^{p,q}(u_\varepsilon - \eta(u_\varepsilon)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}) = 0.$$

Proof. We argue similar to the proof of [13, Theorem 2.1], but additional problems appear since we only have the criticality in a ball, not globally (which is what makes us to introduce $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B(x_0, r))$, while in [13, Theorem 2.1] we can choose $\eta \equiv 1$).

For simplicity we assume that $x_0 \in (0, 1)$ and that $r \ll \min\{x_0, 1 - x_0\}$ (namely, we can always assume that $x_0 = \frac{1}{2}$ by the periodicity of the problem).

First define for $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B(x_0, r), \mathbb{R}^3)$ the maps

$$u_\varepsilon := \frac{u + \varepsilon\varphi}{|u + \varepsilon\varphi|}.$$

Pick $\theta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $\theta \equiv 0$ for $x < x_0 - r/2$ and $\theta \equiv 1$ for $x \geq x_0 + r/2$, and with $|\theta'| \lesssim \frac{1}{r}$. We can also assume that $\theta' \geq 0$. Below we will chose $\eta := \theta'$.

Similar to (5.6),

$$\gamma_\varepsilon(x) := \gamma(0) + \int_0^x u_\varepsilon(z) dz + \theta(x) \left(\int_{x_0-r}^{x_0+r} \gamma'(z) - u_\varepsilon(z) dz \right).$$

We observe that $\gamma_\varepsilon(x) = \gamma(x)$ for $x < x_0 - r$ and $x > x_0 + r$. Indeed, for $x < x_0 - r$ we have

$$\gamma_\varepsilon(x) = \gamma(0) + \int_0^x \gamma'(z) dz = \gamma(x),$$

and for $x > x_0 + r$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_\varepsilon(x) &= \gamma(0) + \int_0^{x_0-r} \gamma'(z) dz + \int_{x_0-r}^{x_0+r} u_\varepsilon(z) dz + \int_{x_0+r}^x \gamma'(z) dz + \theta(x) \left(\int_{x_0-r}^{x_0+r} \gamma'(z) - u_\varepsilon(z) dz \right) \\ &= \gamma(0) + \int_0^{x_0-r} \gamma'(z) dz + \int_{x_0-r}^{x_0+r} u_\varepsilon(z) dz + \int_{x_0+r}^x \gamma'(z) dz + 1 \left(\int_{x_0-r}^{x_0+r} \gamma'(z) - u_\varepsilon(z) dz \right) \\ &= \gamma(0) + \int_0^{x_0-r} \gamma'(z) dz + \int_{x_0+r}^x \gamma'(z) dz + \int_{x_0-r}^{x_0+r} \gamma'(z) dz \\ &= \gamma(0) + \int_0^x \gamma'(z) dz \\ &= \gamma(x). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we find for almost every x that

$$u_\varepsilon(x) = \gamma'(x) + \varepsilon (\varphi(x) - \langle \varphi(x), \gamma'(x) \rangle \gamma'(x)) + O(\varepsilon^2),$$

and, using again the support of φ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_\varepsilon(x) &= \gamma(x) \\ &+ \varepsilon \left(\int_0^x (\varphi(z) - \langle \varphi(z), \gamma'(z) \rangle \gamma'(z)) dz - \theta(x) \left(\int_0^1 (\varphi(z) - \langle \varphi(z), \gamma'(z) \rangle \gamma'(z)) dz \right) \right) \\ &+ O(\varepsilon^2) \end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma'_\varepsilon(x) &= \gamma'(x) \\ &+ \varepsilon \left(\varphi(x) - \langle \gamma'(x), \varphi(x) \rangle \gamma'(x) - \theta'(x) \left(\int_0^1 (\varphi(z) - \langle \varphi(z), \gamma'(z) \rangle \gamma'(z)) dz \right) \right) \\ &+ O(\varepsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6.3, we have for small $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\text{TP}^{p,q}(\gamma_\varepsilon) = \mathcal{E}^{p,q}(\gamma'_\varepsilon).$$

Since by assumption γ is critical in $B(x_0, r)$ and γ_ε is a permissible variation we obtain

$$0 = \left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \mathcal{E}^{p,q}(\gamma'_\varepsilon) = \delta \mathcal{E}^{p,q}(u)[\psi],$$

where we observe that

$$\psi := \varphi(x) - \langle \gamma'(x), \varphi(x) \rangle \gamma'(x) - \theta'(x) \left(\int_0^1 (\varphi(z) - \langle \varphi(z), \gamma'(z) \rangle \gamma'(z)) dz \right)$$

has support in $B(x_0, r)$. Setting $\eta := \theta'$, we conclude the proof. \square

Remark 6.5. The function η appearing in the previous theorem might remind of a Lagrange multiplier. However, in our setting η can be chosen more freely. The presented construction of η in the proof above is only one out of many possibilities to define permissible functions η .

6.2. Euler-Lagrange equations of $\mathcal{E}^{p,q}$. In this section, we derive the Euler-Lagrange equations of $\mathcal{E}_\eta^{p,q}$ for $p \in [q + 2, 2q + 1]$, $q > 1$, and suitable $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, [0, \infty))$. We realize that the new energies $\mathcal{E}_\eta^{q,q}$ have a nonlinear and nonlocal Lagrangian. Furthermore, we obtain a decomposition of the Lagrangian into a term of highest order, denoted by Q , and terms of lower order, denoted by R .

The leading order operator Q on a subset $D \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ for $u : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\varphi : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (6.2) \quad Q_D^{(p,q)}(u, \varphi) &:= \\ & q \iint_D \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right|^{q-2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(s) - u(t)|^2 ds dt \right)^{-\frac{p}{2}} \\ & \cdot \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} (u(z_1) - u(x)) \cdot (\varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x)) dz_1 dz_2 \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} \\ &= \frac{q}{2} \iint_D a^{q-2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} c \right)^{-\frac{p}{2}} a'(\varphi) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}}. \end{aligned}$$

(For the definition of a, a', c , etc., see below).

The remainders, which are, as we shall see, “of lower order”, are given as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
R_D^{1,(p,q)}(u, \varphi) &:= \frac{q}{2} \iint_D \left((a - \frac{1}{4}b^2)^{\frac{q-2}{2}} - a^{\frac{q-2}{2}} \right) (1 - \frac{1}{2}c)^{-\frac{p}{2}} a'(\varphi) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}}, \\
R_D^{2,(p,q)}(u, \varphi) &:= -\frac{q}{4} \iint_D (a - \frac{1}{4}b^2)^{\frac{q-2}{2}} (1 - \frac{1}{2}c)^{-\frac{p}{2}} b b'(\varphi) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}}, \\
R_D^{3,(p,q)}(u, \varphi) &:= \frac{p}{4} \iint_D (a - \frac{1}{4}b^2)^{\frac{q}{2}} (1 - \frac{1}{2}c)^{-\frac{p+2}{2}} c'(\varphi) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}}, \\
R_{\eta, D}^{4,(p,q)}(u, \varphi) &:= -\frac{p}{2} \iint_D (a - \frac{1}{4}b^2)^{\frac{q}{2}} (1 - \frac{1}{2}c)^{-\frac{p+2}{2}} d'(\varphi) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}}, \\
R_{\eta, D}^{5,(p,q)}(u, \varphi) &:= q \iint_D (a - \frac{1}{4}b^2)^{\frac{q-2}{2}} (1 - \frac{1}{2}c)^{-\frac{p}{2}} (a - \frac{1}{2}b) e'(\varphi) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}}, \\
R_{\eta, D}^{6,(p,q)}(u, \varphi) &:= \frac{q}{4} \iint_D (a - \frac{1}{4}b^2)^{\frac{q-2}{2}} (1 - \frac{1}{2}c)^{-\frac{p}{2}} b d'(\varphi) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}}, \\
R_{\eta, D}^{7,(p,q)}(u, \varphi) &:= \iint_D (a - \frac{1}{4}b^2)^{\frac{q}{2}} (1 - \frac{1}{2}c)^{-\frac{p}{2}} ((1 - q)e'(\varphi) + f'(\varphi)) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned}
a &:= \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right|^2, \quad a'(\varphi) = 2 \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} (u(z_1) - u(x)) \cdot (\varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x)) dz_1 dz_2, \\
b &:= \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - u(x)|^2 dz, \quad b'(\varphi) = 2 \int_{x \triangleright y} (u(z) - u(x)) \cdot (\varphi(z) - \varphi(x)) dz, \\
c &:= \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(s) - u(t)|^2 ds dt, \quad c'(\varphi) = 2 \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} (u(s) - u(t)) \cdot (\varphi(s) - \varphi(t)) ds dt,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
d'(\varphi) &= -2 \int_{x \triangleright y} \eta(z) u(z) \cdot (\varphi)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} dz, \\
e'(\varphi) &= -\eta(x) u(x) \cdot (\varphi)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}, \\
f'(\varphi) &= -\eta(y) u(y) \cdot (\varphi)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that in case of considering the entire domain $D = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, we drop the label D in the definition of $Q_D^{(p,q)}(u, \varphi)$ and the remainders $R_D^{k,(p,q)}(u, \varphi)$ and $R_{\eta, D}^{k,(p,q)}(u, \varphi)$.

Lemma 6.6. (*Euler-Lagrange equations*) Let $p \in [q + 2, 2q + 1]$, $q > 1$, and $u : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ with $\int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} u = 0$ be a locally critical map of $\mathcal{E}_\eta^{p,q}$ around the interval $B(x_0, r)$ in the class of maps $v : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ and let $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B(x_0, r), [0, \infty))$. Then for any test function $\varphi \in W_0^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B(x_0, r), \mathbb{R}^3)$, which is also tangential, i.e. $\varphi \in T_u \mathbb{S}^2$, if we set $u_\varepsilon = u + \varepsilon \varphi$, it holds

$$\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \mathcal{E}_\eta^{p,q}(u_\varepsilon) = Q^{(p,q)}(u, \varphi) + \sum_{k=1}^3 R^{k,(p,q)}(u, \varphi) + \sum_{k=4}^7 R_\eta^{k,(p,q)}(u, \varphi) = 0.$$

Proof. Let us recall the definition of $\mathcal{E}_\eta^{p,q}$ first by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\eta^{p,q}(u) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \left(|u(x) - \eta(x)(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}|^2 \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{4} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(x) - u(z)|^2 dz + |u(x) - \eta(x)(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}|^2 - \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - \eta(z)(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}|^2 dz \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - \eta(z)(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}|^2 dz - \frac{1}{2} \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(s) - u(t)|^2 ds dt \right)^{-\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\quad \cdot |u(x) - \eta(x)(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}|^{1-q} |u(y) - \eta(y)(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}| \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}}. \end{aligned}$$

We set

$$F(a, b, c, d, e) := (e^2 a - \frac{1}{4}(b + e^2 - d)^2)^{\frac{q}{2}} (d - \frac{1}{2}c)^{-\frac{p}{2}},$$

which implies

$$\mathcal{E}_\eta^{p,q}(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} F(a(0), b(0), c(0), d(0), e(0)) e(0)^{1-q} f(0) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a(\varepsilon) &:= \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u_\varepsilon(z) - u_\varepsilon(x) dz \right|^2, \\ b(\varepsilon) &:= \int_{x \triangleright y} |u_\varepsilon(z) - u_\varepsilon(x)|^2 dz, \\ c(\varepsilon) &:= \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} |u_\varepsilon(s) - u_\varepsilon(t)|^2 ds dt, \\ d(\varepsilon) &:= \int_{x \triangleright y} |u_\varepsilon(z) - \eta(z)(u_\varepsilon)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}|^2 dz, \\ e(\varepsilon) &:= |u_\varepsilon(x) - \eta(x)(u_\varepsilon)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}|, \\ f(\varepsilon) &:= |u_\varepsilon(y) - \eta(y)(u_\varepsilon)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}|. \end{aligned}$$

First we note that $d(0) = e(0) = f(0) = 1$ since $|u| \equiv 1$ and $(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} = 0$. Furthermore, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} a'(0) &\equiv a'(0)(u, \varphi) = 2 \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} (u(z_1) - u(x)) \cdot (\varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x)) dz_1 dz_2, \\ b'(0) &\equiv b'(0)(u, \varphi) = 2 \int_{x \triangleright y} (u(z) - u(x)) \cdot (\varphi(z) - \varphi(x)) dz, \\ c'(0) &\equiv c'(0)(u, \varphi) = 2 \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} (u(s) - u(t)) \cdot (\varphi(s) - \varphi(t)) ds dt, \end{aligned}$$

and due to $u \cdot \varphi \equiv 0$ and $(u)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} d'(0) &\equiv d'(0)(u, \varphi, \eta) = -2 \int_{x \triangleright y} \eta(z) u(z) \cdot (\varphi)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} dz, \\ e'(0) &\equiv e'(0)(u, \varphi, \eta) = -\eta(x) u(x) \cdot (\varphi)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}, \\ f'(0) &\equiv f'(0)(u, \varphi, \eta) = -\eta(y) u(y) \cdot (\varphi)_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain by the product rule

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} F(a(\varepsilon), b(\varepsilon), c(\varepsilon), d(\varepsilon), e(\varepsilon)) d(\varepsilon)^{1-q} e(\varepsilon) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} \\
&= \frac{q}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} a(0)^{\frac{q-2}{2}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}c(0)\right)^{-\frac{p}{2}} a'(0) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} \\
&\quad + \frac{q}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \left((a(0) - \frac{1}{4}b(0)^2)^{\frac{q-2}{2}} - a(0)^{\frac{q-2}{2}} \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}c(0)\right)^{-\frac{p}{2}} a'(0) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} \\
&\quad - \frac{q}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \left(a(0) - \frac{1}{4}b(0)^2 \right)^{\frac{q-2}{2}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}c(0)\right)^{-\frac{p}{2}} b(0) b'(0) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} \\
&\quad + \frac{p}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \left(a(0) - \frac{1}{4}b(0)^2 \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}c(0)\right)^{-\frac{p+2}{2}} c'(0) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} \\
&\quad - \frac{p}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \left(a(0) - \frac{1}{4}b(0)^2 \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}c(0)\right)^{-\frac{p+2}{2}} d'(0) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} \\
&\quad + q \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \left(a(0) - \frac{1}{4}b(0)^2 \right)^{\frac{q-2}{2}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}c(0)\right)^{-\frac{p}{2}} \left(a(0) - \frac{1}{2}b(0) \right) e'(0) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} \\
&\quad + \frac{q}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \left(a(0) - \frac{1}{4}b(0)^2 \right)^{\frac{q-2}{2}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}c(0)\right)^{-\frac{p}{2}} b(0) d'(0) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \left(a(0) - \frac{1}{4}b(0)^2 \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}c(0)\right)^{-\frac{p}{2}} \left((1-q)e'(0) + f'(0) \right) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 6.7. For a given homeomorphism $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ with locally small tangent-point energy $\text{TP}^{p,q}$ and its unit tangent field $u : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$, we introduce the following abbreviation

$$k(x, y) := 1 - \frac{1}{2} \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(s) - u(t)|^2 ds dt = 1 - \frac{1}{2}c(0).$$

Note that in all terms of the Euler-Lagrange equation either $k(x, y)^{-\frac{p}{2}}$ or $k(x, y)^{-\frac{p+2}{2}}$ appears as a factor. The motivation behind this definition is the observation that $k(x, y)^{-r}$ for any $r > 0$ is bounded: On the one hand it is easy to see that

$$1 - \frac{1}{2} \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(s) - u(t)|^2 ds dt \leq 1.$$

On the other hand, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$0 < c \leq 1 - \frac{1}{2} \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(s) - u(t)|^2 ds dt.$$

The latter can be shown by recalling that u denotes the unit tangent field of γ and by applying the fundamental theorem of calculus as in (6.1) as well as the global bi-Lipschitz continuity of γ due to Theorem 1.2, from which we conclude that

$$1 - \frac{1}{2} \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} |\gamma'(s) - \gamma'(t)|^2 ds dt = \frac{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^2}{|y - x|^2} \geq (1 - \varepsilon)^2 > 0$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$ small and $x \neq y$.

As next steps we are going to show that Q is indeed the leading order operator and the remainder R are of “lower order”. Namely, in Proposition 6.8 we essentially show that $Q(u, \varphi)$ controls the Sobolev-norm $[u]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B(\rho))}^{q-1}$ for a good choice of $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B_\rho)$, in particular, whenever B_ρ is a ball compactly contained in $B(x_0, r)$ and $[\varphi]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(\mathbb{R})} \leq 1$. Then, Proposition 6.9 shows that each of the remainder terms R essentially satisfy the following estimate

$$(6.3) \quad |R^{k, (p, q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})| \lesssim [u]_{W^{\tilde{q}, q}(B_{2\rho})}^{\tilde{q}} + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma l} [u]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B_{2^{l+1}\rho})}^{q-1} + C(r, u)\rho^\sigma$$

for some $\tilde{q} > q - 1$ and some $\sigma > 0$. Such terms on the right-hand side can be absorbed by an iteration argument, as discussed in the proof of Theorem 1.7.

Next we show that the leading order term $Q^{p, q}$ controls the Sobolev norm.

Proposition 6.8. *Let $p \in [q + 2, 2q + 1)$, $q > 1$, and $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ be a homeomorphism with locally small tangent-point energy $\text{TP}^{p, q}$ around the interval $B(x_0, r)$, in the sense of Definition 1.1. Furthermore, denote the unit tangent field of γ by $u : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} u = 0$, let $y_0 \in B(x_0, \frac{r}{2})$, and choose $\rho > 0$ such that $B_\rho := B(y_0, \rho) \subset B(x_0, r)$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} [u]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B_\rho)}^q &\lesssim \iint_{B_\rho^2} k(x, y)^{-\frac{p}{2}} \frac{|\int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz|^q}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} dy dx \\ &\approx Q_{B_\rho \times B_\rho}^{(p, q)}(u, u) \end{aligned}$$

with constants only depending on p and q .

Proof. We begin with recalling the definition of the main term $Q_{B_\rho \times B_\rho}^{(p, q)}$ in (6.2) and test it with u , such that the expression simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} &Q_{B_\rho \times B_\rho}^{(p, q)}(u, u) \\ &= q \iint_{B_\rho^2} \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right|^{q-2} \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} (u(z_1) - u(x)) \cdot (u(z_2) - u(x)) dz_1 dz_2 \\ &\quad \cdot k(x, y)^{-\frac{p}{2}} \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} \\ &= q \iint_{B_\rho^2} k(x, y)^{-\frac{p}{2}} \frac{|\int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz|^q}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} dy dx. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the factor $k(x, y)^{-\frac{p}{2}}$ is strictly positive and bounded by Remark 6.7. Furthermore, we have

$$|u(y) - u(x)| \leq |u(y) - \int_{y \triangleright x} u(z) dz| + \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) dz - u(x) \right|,$$

which implies by the previous arguments

$$\begin{aligned}
[u]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}(B_\rho)}^q &= \iint_{B_\rho^2} \frac{|u(y) - u(x)|^q}{\rho(x,y)^{p-q}} dy dx \\
&\lesssim \iint_{B_\rho^2} \frac{|\int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz|^q}{\rho(x,y)^{p-q}} dy dx + \iint_{B_\rho^2} \frac{|\int_{y \triangleright x} u(z) - u(y) dz|^q}{\rho(x,y)^{p-q}} dy dx \\
&\lesssim \iint_{B_\rho^2} k(x,y)^{-\frac{p}{2}} \frac{|\int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz|^q}{\rho(x,y)^{p-q}} dy dx \approx Q_{B_\rho \times B_\rho}^{(p,q)}(u,u).
\end{aligned}$$

□

It remains to obtain the “lower order”-property for the the remainder terms R . We recall that for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$ the linear map $v \wedge : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is represented by the $\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ -matrix

$$v \wedge = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -v_3 & v_2 \\ v_3 & 0 & -v_1 \\ -v_2 & v_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proposition 6.9. *Let $p \in [q + 2, 2q + 1)$, $q \geq 2$, and $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ be a homeomorphism with locally small tangent-point energy $\text{TP}^{p,q}$ around the interval $B(x_0, r)$, in the sense of Definition 1.1. We denote the unit tangent field of γ by $u : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} u = 0$ and take $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B(x_0, \frac{r}{2}), [0, \infty))$. Furthermore, let $y_0 \in B(x_0, \frac{r}{2})$, choose $\rho > 0$ such that $B(y_0, 4\rho) \subset B(x_0, r)$, and define $B_\rho := B(y_0, \rho)$. Let $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B_\rho, \mathbb{R})$ such that $[\varphi]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})} \leq 1$. Then the following holds for any $j = 1, 2, 3$:*

For the first remainder $k = 1$ in case of $2 < q < 4$, we have

$$|R^{1,(p,q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})| \lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}(B_{2\rho})}^{2q-3} + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-(l+1)\frac{p-q}{q}} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}(B_{2^{l+1}\rho})}^{q-1} + \rho r^{-(p-q+1)}.$$

For $q = 2$ we have $R^{1,(p,q)} \equiv 0$. For the remainders $k = 1$ in case of $q \geq 4$ and $k = 2, 3$ for any $q \geq 2$, we have

$$|R^{k,(p,q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})| \lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}(B_{2\rho})}^{q+1} + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-(l+1)\frac{p-q}{q}} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}(B_{2^{l+1}\rho})}^{q-1} + \rho r^{-(p-q+1)},$$

and for the remaining terms $k = 4, 5, 6, 7$ with $q \geq 2$, we have

$$\sum_{k=4}^7 |R_\eta^{k,(p,q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})| \lesssim \rho \left(\mathcal{E}^{p,q}(u) + r^{-(p-q)} + r^{\frac{p-q-2}{2}} [u]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}(B(x_0,r))}^q \right),$$

where \tilde{u} denotes a $W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}$ -extension of $u|_{B(x_0,r)}$ from $B(x_0, r)$ to \mathbb{R} as discussed in Remark 6.2. The constants in these inequalities depend on the p and q and may also depend on global properties of u such as $\|u\|_{L^\infty}$, $[u]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}(B(x_0,r))}$ and $[\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})}$.

A very similar statement holds for $q \in (1, 2)$, only the tail's exponents change, but one still obtains an estimate as in (6.3). We leave the details to the reader.

Proof of Proposition 6.9. We begin with making some general observations on factors appearing in the integrands of the remainder terms. First the remainders contain a factor of the form $k(x, y)^{-r}$, for some $r > 0$, which is strictly positive and bounded by Remark 6.7. Next we consider the factors $(a - \frac{1}{4}b^2)^{\frac{q-2}{2}}$ and $(a - \frac{1}{4}b^2)^{\frac{q}{2}}$ appearing for the cases $k = 2, \dots, 7$. Recall that

$$a = \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad b = \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - u(x)|^2 dz.$$

As we have by (4.2)

(6.4)

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - u(x)|^2 dz = \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(x) \cdot (u(z) - u(x)) dz \right| \leq \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right|,$$

it follows $0 \leq a - \frac{1}{4}b^2$ and thus the factors can be simplified, when necessary, to

$$\begin{aligned} (a - \frac{1}{4}b^2)^{\frac{q-2}{2}} &\leq a^{\frac{q-2}{2}} = \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right|^{q-2}, \\ (a - \frac{1}{4}b^2)^{\frac{q}{2}} &\leq a^{\frac{q}{2}} = \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right|^q. \end{aligned}$$

For the case $k = 1$ we have to study the factor $((a - \frac{1}{4}b^2)^{\frac{q-2}{2}} - a^{\frac{q-2}{2}})$ instead. For $q = 2$ this factor equals 0, whereas for $2 < q < 4$ it can be estimated by

$$(a - \frac{1}{4}b^2)^{\frac{q-2}{2}} - a^{\frac{q-2}{2}} \leq 2^{2-q} b^{q-2} = 2^{2-q} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - u(x)|^2 dz \right)^{q-2},$$

since $x^r - y^r \leq (x - y)^r$ for any $x \geq y \geq 0$ and $0 \leq r < 1$, and for $q \geq 4$ by

$$(a - \frac{1}{4}b^2)^{\frac{q-2}{2}} - a^{\frac{q-2}{2}} \lesssim b^2 a^{\frac{q-4}{2}} = \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - u(x)|^2 dz \right)^2 \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right|^{q-4}$$

since we have $|x^r - y^r| \leq c(r)|x - y||x^{r-1} + y^{r-1}|$ for any $x \geq y \geq 0$ and $r \geq 0$. Last but not least we note that the test functions $(\varphi u \wedge)_{ij}$ are tangential, i.e. $(\varphi u \wedge)_{ij} \in T_u \mathbb{S}^2$, for any $j = 1, 2, 3$ due to the fact that $u \wedge u = 0$.

After these first considerations, we proceed with studying the full remainder terms.

We begin with the first remaining term $R_D^{1,(p,q)}$ for some general $D \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ in the case of $2 \leq q < 4$ and gain with help of the introductory comments on occurring factors for any $j = 1, 2, 3$

$$\begin{aligned} &|R_D^{1,(p,q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})| \\ &\lesssim \iint_D \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - u(x)|^2 dz \right|^{q-2} \\ &\cdot \left| \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} u(z_1) - u(x) dz_1 \right) \cdot \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij}(z_2) - (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij}(x) dz_2 \right) \right| \frac{dx dy}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}}. \end{aligned}$$

If we consider the exemplary case $j = 1$, the dot product reads as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} u(z_1) - u(x) dz_1 \right) \cdot \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} (\varphi u \wedge)_{i1}(z_2) - (\varphi u \wedge)_{i1}(x) dz_2 \right) \\ &= \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} u_2(z_1) - u_2(x) dz_1 \right) \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} \varphi(z_2) u_3(z_2) - \varphi(x) u_3(x) dz_2 \right) \\ &+ \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} u_3(z_1) - u_3(x) dz_1 \right) \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} \varphi(z_2) (-u_2)(z_2) - \varphi(x) (-u_2)(x) dz_2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

By adding $0 = \varphi(x) u_3(z_2) - \varphi(x) u_3(z_2)$ to second factor in the first summand, respectively, $0 = \varphi(x) (-u_2)(z_2) - \varphi(x) (-u_2)(z_2)$ to the second factor in the second summand, the dot product turns to

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} u(z_1) - u(x) dz_1 \right) \cdot \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} (\varphi u \wedge)_{i1}(z_2) - (\varphi u \wedge)_{i1}(x) dz_2 \right) \\ &= \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} u(z_1) - u(x) dz_1 \right) \cdot \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} (\varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x)) (u \wedge)_{i1}(z_2) dz_2 \right) \\ &+ \varphi(x) \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} u(z_1) - u(x) dz_1 \right) \cdot \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} (u \wedge)_{i1}(z_2) - (u \wedge)_{i1}(x) dz_2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

But since $(u \wedge)_{i1} \in T_u \mathbb{S}^2$, the last summand in the previous equation vanishes. Now by the same arguments for $j = 2, 3$, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} & |R_D^{1,(p,q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})| \\ (6.5) \quad & \lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty} \iint_D \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - u(x)|^2 dz \right)^{q-2} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_1) - u(x)| dz_1 \right) \\ & \cdot \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |\varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x)| dz_2 \right) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using $\|u\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1$, simplifies this inequality. Now to take advantage of the local behavior of u and φ , we split the integration domain into

$$\begin{aligned} & |R_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}^{1,(p,q)}| \\ & \leq |R_{B_{2\rho} \times B_{2\rho}}^{1,(p,q)}| + |R_{B_{2\rho} \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{2\rho})}^{1,(p,q)}| + |R_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \setminus B_{2\rho} \times B_{2\rho}}^{1,(p,q)}| + |R_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \setminus B_{2\rho} \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{2\rho})}^{1,(p,q)}|. \end{aligned}$$

The first term can be estimated by (6.5), Hölder's inequality for $1 = \frac{q-2}{q} + \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q}$, Jensen's inequality, and identification Lemma A.2 such that for any $j = 1, 2, 3$

$$\begin{aligned}
& |R_{B_{2\rho} \times B_{2\rho}}^{1,(p,q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})| \\
& \lesssim \iint_{B_{2\rho}^2} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - u(x)|^2 dz \right)^{q-2} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_1) - u(x)| dz_1 \right) \\
& \cdot \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |\varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x)| dz_2 \right) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} \\
& \lesssim \left(\iint_{B_{2\rho}^2} \frac{\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_0) - u(x)|^{2q} dz_0}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} dy dx \right)^{\frac{q-2}{q}} \left(\iint_{B_{2\rho}^2} \frac{\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_1) - u(x)|^q dz_1}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} dy dx \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
& \cdot \left(\iint_{B_{2\rho}^2} \frac{\int_{x \triangleright y} |\varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x)|^q dz_2}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
& \approx [u]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{2q}, 2q}(B_{2\rho})}^{2q-4} [u]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B_{2\rho})} [\varphi]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B_{2\rho})} \\
& \lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B_{2\rho})}^{2q-3},
\end{aligned}$$

where we applied the Sobolev embedding Lemma A.3 and the assumption on φ , i.e. $[\varphi]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(\mathbb{R})} \leq 1$ in the last inequality. For the second term of the splitting, we subdivide the integration domain $B_{2\rho} \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{2\rho})$ into $B_{2\rho} \times (B(x_0, r) \setminus B_{2\rho})$, for using the local fractional Sobolev regularity of u in $B(x_0, r)$, and the rest $B_{2\rho} \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r))$. At this point recall that \tilde{u} denotes a $W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}$ -extension of $u|_{B(x_0, r)}$ from $B(x_0, r)$ to \mathbb{R} , which coincides with u on $B(x_0, r)$ by construction, cf. Remark 6.2. We then get by inequality (6.5) and the disjoint support estimate Lemma C.1

$$\begin{aligned}
& |R_{B_{2\rho} \times (B(x_0, r) \setminus B_{2\rho})}^{1,(p,q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})| \\
& \lesssim \int_{B_{2\rho}} \int_{B(x_0, r) \setminus B_{2\rho}} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z) - \tilde{u}(x)|^2 dz \right)^{q-2} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z_1) - \tilde{u}(x)| dz_1 \right) \\
& \cdot \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |\varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x)| dz_2 \right) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} \\
(6.6) \quad & \lesssim \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-(l+1)\frac{p-q}{q}} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B_{2^l \rho})}^{2q-3} [\varphi]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B_\rho)} \\
& \lesssim [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(\mathbb{R})}^{q-2} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-(l+1)\frac{p-q}{q}} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B_{2^l \rho})}^{q-1} [\varphi]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(\mathbb{R})} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-(l+1)\frac{p-q}{q}} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B_{2^l \rho})}^{q-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant depends on $[\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(\mathbb{R})} < \infty$ as well as $[\varphi]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(\mathbb{R})} \leq 1$. By the fact that $\rho(x, y) \geq \frac{r}{4}$ for $x \in B_{2\rho}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r)$, we estimate the

rest term by (6.5) such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |R_{B_{2\rho} \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r))}^{1, (p, q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})| \\
(6.7) \quad & \lesssim \int_{B_{2\rho}} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r)} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - u(x)|^2 dz \right)^{q-2} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_1) - u(x)| dz_1 \right) \\
& \cdot \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |\varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x)| dz_2 \right) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} \\
& \lesssim \left(\frac{r}{4}\right)^{-(p-q+1)} \|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2q-3} \|\varphi\|_{L^1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that by $\varphi \in W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ with $\text{supp } \varphi \subset B_\rho$ together with the Sobolev inequalities Theorem A.4 and Theorem A.5 leads to

$$(6.8) \quad \|\varphi\|_{L^1} \lesssim \rho [\varphi]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \rho.$$

The estimates on $R_{B_{2\rho} \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{2\rho})}^{1, (p, q)}$ also work for $R_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{2\rho}) \times B_{2\rho}}^{1, (p, q)}$ by symmetry. In case of $R_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{2\rho}) \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{2\rho})}^{1, (p, q)}$, we have to consider

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{2\rho}) \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{2\rho}) &= (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r)) \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r)) \\
&\cup (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r)) \times (B(x_0, r) \setminus B_{2\rho}) \\
&\cup (B(x_0, r) \setminus B_{2\rho}) \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r)) \\
&\cup (B(x_0, r) \setminus B_{2\rho}) \times (B(x_0, r) \setminus B_{2\rho}).
\end{aligned}$$

$R_D^{1, (p, q)}$ can be estimated for first three domains thereof like in (6.7), due to $\text{supp } \varphi \subset B_\rho$, which implies that either $\int_{x \triangleright y} \varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x) dz_2 = 0$ or $\rho(x, y) \geq r$. For the fourth domain we proceed with help of the tail estimate Lemma C.1 similar to (6.6). Therefore, the statement follows for the first remaining term in the case of $2 \leq q < 4$.

For the range $q \geq 4$ in $R^{1, (p, q)}$ we notice that the same methods work as well, in particular, for $D \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |R_D^{1, (p, q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})| \\
& \lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty} \iint_D \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - u(x)|^2 dz \right)^2 \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_1) - u(x)| dz_1 \right)^{q-3} \\
& \cdot \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |\varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x)| dz_2 \right) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We only need to change the exponents in Hölder's inequality to $1 = \frac{2}{q} + \frac{q-3}{q} + \frac{1}{q}$, since we deal with the factor

$$\left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - u(x)|^2 dz \right)^2 \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right|^{q-4}$$

instead of $(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - u(x)|^2 dz)^{q-2}$, and slightly adapt the disjoint support estimate Lemma C.1 as well as (6.7), to achieve the desired result.

For the second and third remainder we observe that we have to deal for $j = 1, 2, 3$ with the scalar products

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{x \triangleright y} (u(z) - u(x)) \cdot ((\varphi u \wedge)_{ij}(z) - (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij}(x)) dz, \\ & \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} (u(s) - u(t)) \cdot ((\varphi u \wedge)_{ij}(s) - (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij}(t)) ds dt, \end{aligned} \text{ respectively,}$$

in contrast to

$$\int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} (u(z_1) - u(x)) \cdot ((\varphi u \wedge)_{ij}(z_2) - (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij}(x)) dz_1 dz_2.$$

However, the techniques presented for the first remainder, in particular adding zeros and using $(u \wedge)_{ij} \in T_u \mathbb{S}^2$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$, work out similarly and lead for any $D \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ to

$$\begin{aligned} & |R_D^{2,(p,q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})| \\ & \lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty} \iint_D \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - u(x)|^2 dz \right) \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_1) - u(x)| dz_1 \right)^{q-1} \\ & \quad \cdot \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |\varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x)| dz_2 \right) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} \end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} & |R_D^{3,(p,q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})| \\ & \lesssim \|u\|_{L^\infty} \iint_D \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_1) - u(x)| dz_1 \right)^{q+1} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |\varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x)| dz_2 \right) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by proceeding as for the first remainder, the statement follows for $k = 2, 3$ from adjusting the exponents used in Hölder's inequality and the tail estimate in Lemma C.1.

Let us turn the focus to the remainders $k = 4, \dots, 7$ now. The remainder terms for $k = 4$ and $k = 7$ are easier to handle since

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} \eta(z) u(z) \cdot ((\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} dz \right| \lesssim \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\varphi\|_{L^1}, \\ (6.9) \quad & \left| \eta(x) u(x) \cdot ((\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \right| \lesssim \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\varphi\|_{L^1}, \\ & \left| \eta(y) u(y) \cdot ((\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \right| \lesssim \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\varphi\|_{L^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\|u\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1$, $\|\eta\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 1$, and by (6.8) $\|\varphi\|_{L^1} \lesssim \rho$. We then obtain that the remaining factors emerge to the energy $\mathcal{E}^{p,q}(u)$, in particular

$$|R_\eta^{k,(p,q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})| \lesssim \rho \mathcal{E}^{p,q}(u),$$

since in case $k = 4$ we can extend the integrand with an extra factor $(1 - \frac{1}{2}c)$ due to its boundedness, cf. Remark 6.7, and in case $k = 7$ the necessary factors of the energy are already given. It remains to study the cases $k = 5$ and $k = 6$, whose factors in the integrand are not necessarily comparable with the energy. We begin with $k = 5$ and observe by $\text{supp } \eta \subset B(x_0, \frac{r}{2})$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & R_\eta^{5,(p,q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij}) \\ & = -q \int_{B(x_0, \frac{r}{2})} \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \left(a - \frac{1}{4}b^2 \right)^{\frac{q-2}{2}} k(x, y)^{-\frac{p}{2}} \left(a - \frac{1}{2}b \right) (\eta(x) u(x) \cdot ((\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}}. \end{aligned}$$

By splitting the integration domain into

$$B(x_0, \frac{r}{2}) \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} = (B(x_0, \frac{r}{2}) \times B(x_0, r)) \cup (B(x_0, \frac{r}{2}) \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r))),$$

we have for the first domain by the previous comments on the factors appearing in the integrand, inequalities (6.9) and (6.8), Jensen's inequality, identity Lemma A.2, and Sobolev embedding Lemma A.3, that

$$(6.10) \quad \begin{aligned} & |R_{\eta, B(x_0, \frac{r}{2}) \times B(x_0, r)}^{5, (p, q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})| \\ & \lesssim \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\varphi\|_{L^1} \left(\int_{B(x_0, r)} \int_{B(x_0, r)} \frac{\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - u(x)|^{2q} dz}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} dy dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \lesssim \rho [u]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{2q}, 2q}(B(x_0, r))}^q \\ & \lesssim \rho r^{\frac{p-q-2}{2}} [u]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B(x_0, r))}^q, \end{aligned}$$

and for the second domain we notice $\rho(x, y) \geq \frac{r}{2}$ for $x \in B(x_0, \frac{r}{2})$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r)$, which leads by (6.9), estimates like (6.7), and (6.8) to

$$(6.11) \quad \begin{aligned} |R_{\eta, B(x_0, \frac{r}{2}) \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r))}^{5, (p, q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})| & \lesssim (\frac{r}{2})^{-(p-q)} \|u\|_{L^\infty}^{q+2} \|\eta\|_{L^\infty} \|\varphi\|_{L^1} \\ & \lesssim \rho r^{-(p-q)}. \end{aligned}$$

In case of $k = 6$ we distinguish for the integration domain the cases

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} &= B(x_0, r) \times B(x_0, r) \\ &\cup B(x_0, r) \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r)) \\ &\cup (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r)) \times B(x_0, r) \\ &\cup (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r)) \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r)). \end{aligned}$$

For the first integration domain we gain the same estimate as in (6.10) and for the other integration domains we find by $\text{supp } \eta \subset B(x_0, \frac{r}{2})$ that either $\rho(x, y) \geq \frac{r}{2}$ or

$$\int_{x \triangleright y} \eta(z) u(z) \cdot ((\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} dz = 0.$$

Therefore, we deduce the same estimate like in (6.11). All remainder cases got estimated hereby. \square

6.3. Regularity theory for \mathcal{E}^q -critical points: Proof of Proposition 6.1.

In this section we finally apply the grand machinery of showing Hölder regularity for (essentially) fractional harmonic maps, which correspond to the first derivative of our critical knots of interest. We establish a proof for the scale-invariant tangent-point energies, i.e. for $\text{TP}^{p, q}$ with $p = q + 2$ and $q \geq 2$, along the lines of [64] and [13], but face some major obstacles due to the local definition of critical points for scale-invariant tangent-point energies, cf. Definition 1.5, on the way. Our main goal is to show the decay estimate Proposition 6.1.

In order to attain the desired statement, we begin with estimating the Gagliardo semi-norm of u by an operator $\Gamma_{\beta, B} u$ reminding of the Riesz potential, which is introduced in the following.

First we recall that the term containing the highest order in the Euler-Lagrange equation of \mathcal{E}^q , $q \geq 2$, for maps $u, \varphi : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ and some small interval $B \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{B \times B}(u, \varphi) &:= Q_{B \times B}^{(q+2, q)}(u, \varphi) \\ &= q \int_B \int_B \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right|^{q-2} k(x, y)^{-\frac{q+2}{2}} \\ &\quad \cdot \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} (u(z_1) - u(x)) \cdot (\varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x)) dz_1 dz_2 \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for our functions of interest the factor $k(x, y)^{-\frac{q+2}{2}}$ is strictly positive and bounded, cf. Remark 6.7.

As in [64] and [13], we now define a vector-valued potential for some $0 < \beta < 1$ by

$$(6.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\beta, B \times B} u(z) &:= \int_B \int_B \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right|^{q-2} k(x, y)^{-\frac{q+2}{2}} \\ &\quad \cdot \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} (u(z_1) - u(x)) (|z - z_2|^{\beta-1} - |z - x|^{\beta-1}) dz_1 dz_2 \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

following the definition of the Riesz potential \mathcal{I}_β of order β , which is defined by

$$\mathcal{I}_\beta f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |z - x|^{\beta-1} f(z) dz.$$

The inverse of the Riesz potential \mathcal{I}_β is called the fractional Laplacian of order β , which for $\beta \in (0, 2)$ has the form

$$(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} f(x) = c \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{f(y) - f(x)}{|x - y|^{1+\beta}} dy$$

for some $c > 0$, cf. [23]. Applied to our situation, we hence observe that

$$(6.13) \quad Q_{B \times B}(u, \varphi) = c \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Gamma_{\beta, B \times B} u(z) \cdot (-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \varphi(z) dz.$$

Note that we have

$$(6.14) \quad \mathcal{I}_\alpha \Gamma_{\beta, B \times B} u = \Gamma_{\alpha+\beta, B \times B} u$$

for any $\alpha, \beta > 0$.

Our first interim result is the following.

Proposition 6.10. *(Left-hand side estimates) Let $q \geq 2$, $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu} > 0$ small, and $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ be a homeomorphism with locally small tangent-point energy $\text{TP}^{q+2, q}$ around an interval $B(x_0, r)$ in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} , in the sense of definition Definition 1.1. Moreover, denote the unit tangent field of γ by $u : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} u = 0$ and for any $y_0 \in B(x_0, \frac{r}{2})$, choose $\rho > 0$ such that $B_{2^L \rho} := B(y_0, 2^L \rho) \subset B(x_0, r)$ for large $L \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Then we have for any $\delta > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_\rho)}^q &\lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L\rho})} \|\chi_{B_{2K\rho}} \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}} + \delta [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L\rho})}^q \\ &\quad + C_\delta \left([u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L\rho})}^q - [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_\rho)}^q \right) \end{aligned}$$

for any $L, K \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough with $L \gg K$. The constant in this inequality only depends on q .

Proof. Let $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_{2\rho})$, $\eta \equiv 1$ on B_ρ , with $|\nabla^k \eta| \leq C(k)\rho^{-k}$. Set $(u)_{B_{2\rho} \setminus B_\rho} := \frac{1}{|B_{2\rho} \setminus B_\rho|} \int_{B_{2\rho} \setminus B_\rho} u$ and

$$\psi(x) := \eta(x)(u(x) - (u)_{B_{2\rho} \setminus B_\rho}).$$

Then for any $x, y \in B_\rho$ we have

$$\left| \int_{x \triangleright y} \psi(z) - \psi(x) dz \right|^2 = \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right|^2$$

and therefore by Proposition 6.8 for any $L \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_\rho)}^q &\lesssim \int_{B_{2L\rho}} \int_{B_{2L\rho}} \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right|^{q-2} k(x, y)^{-\frac{q+2}{2}} \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} \psi(z) - \psi(x) dz \right|^2 \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we decompose

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(z) - \psi(x) &= (u(z) - u(x)) - (1 - \eta(z))(u(z) - u(x)) \\ &\quad + (\eta(z) - \eta(x))(u(x) - (u)_{B_{2\rho} \setminus B_\rho}), \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$[u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_\rho)}^q \lesssim I - II + III,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I &:= \iint_{B_{2L\rho}^2} \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right|^{q-2} k(x, y)^{-\frac{q+2}{2}} \\ &\quad \cdot \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} (u(z_1) - u(x)) \cdot (\psi(z_2) - \psi(x)) dz_1 dz_2 \frac{dx dy}{\rho(x, y)^2}, \\ II &:= \iint_{B_{2L\rho}^2} \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right|^{q-2} k(x, y)^{-\frac{q+2}{2}} \\ &\quad \cdot \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} ((1 - \eta(z_1))(u(z_1) - u(x))) \cdot (\psi(z_2) - \psi(x)) dz_1 dz_2 \frac{dx dy}{\rho(x, y)^2}, \\ III &:= \iint_{B_{2L\rho}^2} \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} u(z) - u(x) dz \right|^{q-2} k(x, y)^{-\frac{q+2}{2}} \\ &\quad \cdot \int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} ((\eta(z_1) - \eta(x))(u(x) - (u)_{B_{2\rho} \setminus B_\rho})) \cdot (\psi(z_2) - \psi(x)) dz_1 dz_2 \frac{dx dy}{\rho(x, y)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We start to deal with the terms involving the cutoff function. Observe by the boundedness of the factor $k(x, y)^{-\frac{q+2}{2}}$ in Remark 6.7, Hölder's inequality for

$1 = \frac{q-2}{q} + \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q}$, Jensen's inequality and identification Lemma A.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |II| \\
& \lesssim \iint_{(B_{2L\rho})^2} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - u(x)| dz \right)^{q-2} \\
& \quad \cdot \int_{x \triangleright y} (1 - \eta(z_1)) |u(z_1) - u(x)| dz_1 \int_{x \triangleright y} |\psi(z_2) - \psi(x)| dz_2 \frac{dx dy}{\rho(x, y)^2} \\
& \lesssim \left(\iint_{(B_{2L\rho})^2} \frac{\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - u(x)|^q dz}{\rho(x, y)^2} dx dy \right)^{\frac{q-2}{q}} \\
& \quad \cdot \left(\iint_{(B_{2L\rho})^2} \frac{\int_{x \triangleright y} (1 - \eta(z_1))^q |u(z_1) - u(x)|^q dz_1}{\rho(x, y)^2} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
& \quad \cdot \left(\iint_{(B_{2L\rho})^2} \frac{\int_{x \triangleright y} |\psi(z_2) - \psi(x)|^q dz_2}{\rho(x, y)^2} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
& \lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L\rho})}^{q-2} [\psi]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L\rho})} \left(\iint_{(B_{2L\rho})^2} (1 - \eta(z))^q |u(z) - u(x)|^q \frac{dz dx}{\rho(z, x)^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then $[\psi]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L\rho})} \lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L\rho})}$ by Proposition A.7, the assumption $\eta \equiv 1$ on B_ρ , and Young's inequality lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
|II| & \lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L\rho})}^{q-1} \left(\int_{B_{2L\rho}} \int_{B_{2L\rho} \setminus B_\rho} |u(z) - u(x)|^q \frac{dz dx}{\rho(z, x)^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
& \lesssim \delta [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L\rho})}^q + C_\delta \left([u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L\rho})}^q - [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_\rho)}^q \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Regarding III , we estimate along the lines of II , first of all

$$|III| \lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L\rho})}^{q-2} [\psi]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L\rho})} \left(\int_{B_{2L\rho}} \int_{B_{2L\rho}} |\eta(x) - \eta(z)|^q |u(x) - (u)_{B_{2\rho} \setminus B_\rho}|^q \frac{dz dx}{\rho(z, x)^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

and next with help of Proposition A.6 for $L \geq 2$ as well as Young's inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
|III| & \lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L\rho})}^{q-1} \left(\int_{B_{2L\rho}} \int_{B_{2L\rho}} |\eta(x) - \eta(z)|^q |u(x) - (u)_{B_{2\rho} \setminus B_\rho}|^q \frac{dz dx}{\rho(z, x)^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
& \lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L\rho})}^{q-1} \left([u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L\rho})}^q - [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_\rho)}^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
& \lesssim \delta [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L\rho})}^q + C_\delta \left([u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L\rho})}^q - [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_\rho)}^q \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$|II| + |III| \lesssim \delta [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L\rho})}^q + C_\delta \left([u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L\rho})}^q - [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_\rho)}^q \right).$$

For the remaining term I we see by definition of $Q_{B \times B}$ in (6.2) and Proposition A.7 for $L \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} |I| &\lesssim [\psi]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})} \sup_{\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B_{2\rho}, \mathbb{R}^3), [\varphi]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})} \leq 1} |Q_{B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}}(u, \varphi)| \\ &\lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L\rho})} \sup_{\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B_{2\rho}, \mathbb{R}^3), [\varphi]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})} \leq 1} |Q_{B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}}(u, \varphi)|. \end{aligned}$$

By using the identity (6.13) for $\mu > q$ with $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu} > 0$ small and introducing cutoff functions $\eta_{B_R} \in C_c^\infty(B_{2R})$ with $\eta_{B_R} \equiv 1$ on B_R and $\|\nabla^k \eta_{B_R}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim R^{-k}$ for $R > 0$, we get for any $K \geq 1$ and some $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B_{2\rho}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $[\varphi]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})} \leq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_{B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}}(u, \varphi)| &= c \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u(z) \cdot (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \varphi(z) dz \right| \\ &\lesssim \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta_{B_{2K-1\rho}}(z) \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u(z) \cdot (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \varphi(z) dz \right| \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=K}^{\infty} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\eta_{B_{2k\rho}} - \eta_{B_{2k-1\rho}})(z) \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u(z) \cdot (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \varphi(z) dz \right| \end{aligned}$$

We estimate the first term by Hölder's inequality, Sobolev's inequality, cf. Theorem A.5, and $[\varphi]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})} \leq 1$ as

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta_{B_{2K-1\rho}}(z) \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u(z) \cdot (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \varphi(z) dz \right| \\ &\lesssim \|\eta_{B_{2K-1\rho}} \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \varphi\|_{L^\mu} \\ &\lesssim \|\chi_{B_{2K\rho}} \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}} [\varphi]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})} \\ &\lesssim \|\chi_{B_{2K\rho}} \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using integration by parts and the property $\mathcal{I}_\alpha \Gamma_{\beta, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u = \Gamma_{\alpha+\beta, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u$, cf. (6.14), the second part can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=K}^{\infty} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\eta_{B_{2k\rho}} - \eta_{B_{2k-1\rho}})(z) \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u(z) \cdot (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \varphi(z) dz \right| \\ &= \sum_{k=K}^{\infty} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}} \left(\mathcal{I}_{\frac{2}{q} - \frac{2}{\mu}} \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u \right) (z) \cdot \left((\eta_{B_{2k\rho}} - \eta_{B_{2k-1\rho}}) (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \varphi \right) (z) dz \right| \\ &= \sum_{k=K}^{\infty} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Gamma_{\frac{2}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u(z) \cdot (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}} \left((\eta_{B_{2k\rho}} - \eta_{B_{2k-1\rho}}) (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \varphi \right) (z) dz \right| \end{aligned}$$

and then estimated by Hölder's inequality, Proposition A.8 for $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu} > 0$ small enough, the localization argument Proposition B.1, and Sobolev's inequality Theorem A.5,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=K}^{\infty} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Gamma_{\frac{2}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2^k L \rho} \times B_{2^k L \rho}} u(z) \cdot (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}} \left((\eta_{B_{2^k \rho}} - \eta_{B_{2^{k-1} \rho}}) (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \varphi \right) (z) dz \right| \\
& \lesssim \sum_{k=K}^{\infty} \left\| \Gamma_{\frac{2}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2^k L \rho} \times B_{2^k L \rho}} u \right\|_{L^{(1 - \frac{2}{q} + \frac{1}{\mu})^{-1}}} \left\| (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}} \left((\eta_{B_{2^k \rho}} - \eta_{B_{2^{k-1} \rho}}) (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \varphi \right) \right\|_{L^{(\frac{2}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu})^{-1}}} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{k=K}^{\infty} [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2^k L \rho})}^{q-1} 2^{-\sigma k} \left\| (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \varphi \right\|_{L^\mu} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{k=K}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma k} [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2^k L \rho})}^{q-1},
\end{aligned}$$

for some $\sigma > 0$. The statement of the proposition follows by choosing K large enough. \square

In the next step we need to investigate estimates involving the operator $\Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B \times B} u$, which appears in the left-hand side estimates Proposition 6.10, to obtain the decay estimate Proposition 6.1 subsequently. We start by splitting the operator $\Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B \times B} u$ by projecting it into the linear space spanned by u as well as into linear space orthogonal to u . More precisely, we observe by $|u| = 1$ a.e. that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.15) \quad & \left\| \chi_{B_{2^k \rho}} \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2^k L \rho} \times B_{2^k L \rho}} u \right\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}} \\
& \lesssim \left\| \chi_{B_{2^k \rho}} u \cdot \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2^k L \rho} \times B_{2^k L \rho}} u \right\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}} + \left\| \chi_{B_{2^k \rho}} u \wedge \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2^k L \rho} \times B_{2^k L \rho}} u \right\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we recall that $v \wedge$ for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is given by the $\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ -matrix

$$v \wedge = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -v_3 & v_2 \\ v_3 & 0 & -v_1 \\ -v_2 & v_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We then treat each part of the splitting separately. However, both estimates are based on effects of integration by compensation using non-linear commutators as well as information from the Euler-Lagrange equations.

Lemma 6.11. (*Right-hand side estimates I*) *Let $q \geq 2$, $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu} > 0$ small, and $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ be a homeomorphism with small tangent-point energy $\text{TP}^{q+2, q}$ around the interval $B(x_0, r)$ in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} , in the sense of definition Definition 1.1. Denote the unit tangent field of γ by $u : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} u = 0$ and let \tilde{u} be a $W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}$ -extension of $u|_{B(x_0, r)}$ from $B(x_0, r)$ to \mathbb{R} as discussed in Remark 6.2. Moreover, for $y_0 \in B(x_0, \frac{r}{2})$, choose $\rho > 0$ such that $B_{2^L \rho} := B(y_0, 2^{2L} \rho) \subset B(x_0, r)$ for large $L \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \chi_{B_{2^k \rho}} u \cdot \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2^k L \rho} \times B_{2^k L \rho}} u \right\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}} \\
& \lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2^k L \rho})}^q + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma(L+k)} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2^{2L+k} \rho})}^q,
\end{aligned}$$

for any $K, L \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough with $L \gg K$. The constant in this inequality only depends on q .

Proof. First observe by $|u| = 1$ a.e. in $B(x_0, r)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & u(z) \cdot \int_x^y \int_x^y (u(z_1) - u(x))(|z - z_2|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z - x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1}) dz_1 dz_2 \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_x^y \int_x^y (u(z_1) - u(x)) \cdot (u(z_1) + u(x) - 2u(z))(|z - z_2|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z - x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1}) dz_1 dz_2 \end{aligned}$$

for almost any $x, y, z \in B(x_0, r)$. Therefore, we have with help of the definition of Γ in (6.12) and the boundedness of the appearing factor $k(x, y)^{-\frac{q+2}{2}}$ by Remark 6.7

$$\begin{aligned} & |\chi_{B_{2K\rho}} u(z) \cdot \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u(z)| \\ & \lesssim \chi_{B_{2L\rho}}(z) \int_{B_{2L\rho}} \int_{B_{2L\rho}} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_0) - u(x)| dz_0 \right)^{q-2} \\ & \cdot \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_1) - u(x)| |u(z_1) + u(x) - 2u(z)| dz_1 \int_{x \triangleright y} ||z - z_2|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z - x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1}| dz_2 \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that u is evaluated only in $B(x_0, r)$ here as both $B_{2K\rho} \subset B_{2L\rho} \subset B(x_0, r)$ ($L \gg K$). Since u and \tilde{u} coincide on $B(x_0, r)$ by construction, cf. Remark 6.2, we can continue with \tilde{u} from now on as it is globally $W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}$ -regular in comparison to u , which is only in $W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B(x_0, r), \mathbb{R}^3)$.

For the next step, we need the notation of the uncentered Hardy-Littlewood maximal function, which is given by

$$\mathcal{M}f(x) = \sup_{B(x, r) \ni y} \frac{1}{|B(y, r)|} \int_{B(y, r)} |f(z)| dz.$$

By Proposition D.3 for small $\delta > 0$

$$\left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z_0) - \tilde{u}(x)| dz_0 \right)^{q-2} \lesssim |x - y|^{(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)(q-2)} \left(\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1-\delta}{2}} \tilde{u}(x) \right)^{q-2}.$$

Now we decompose the integral $\int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z_1) - \tilde{u}(x)| | \tilde{u}(z_1) + \tilde{u}(x) - 2\tilde{u}(z) | dz_1$ into four terms

$$\int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z_1) - \tilde{u}(x)| | \tilde{u}(z_1) + \tilde{u}(x) - 2\tilde{u}(z) | dz_1$$

$$(6.16) \quad \leq \int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z_1) - \tilde{u}(y)|^2 dz_1$$

$$(6.17) \quad + \int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z_1) - \tilde{u}(y)| dz_1 |\tilde{u}(y) + \tilde{u}(x) - 2\tilde{u}(z)|$$

$$(6.18) \quad + |\tilde{u}(y) - \tilde{u}(x)| \int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z_1) - \tilde{u}(y)| dz_1$$

$$(6.19) \quad + |\tilde{u}(y) - \tilde{u}(x)| |\tilde{u}(y) + \tilde{u}(x) - 2\tilde{u}(z)|.$$

For the first term (6.16), we obtain by duality for some $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $\|\varphi\|_{L^\mu} \leq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\chi_{B_{2K\rho}} u \cdot \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}} \\
& \lesssim \left\| \int_{B_{2L\rho}} \int_{B_{2L\rho}} |x-y|^{(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)(q-2)} \left(\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta}{2}} \tilde{u}(x) \right)^{q-2} \right. \\
& \quad \cdot \left. \int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z_1) - \tilde{u}(y)|^2 dz_1 \int_{x \triangleright y} \|\cdot - z_2\|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z-x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} dz_2 \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x,y)^2} \right\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}(B_{2K\rho})} \\
& \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{B_{2L\rho}} \int_{B_{2L\rho}} \left(\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta}{2}} \tilde{u}(x) \right)^{q-2} |\varphi(z)| \\
& \quad \cdot \int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z_1) - \tilde{u}(y)|^2 dz_1 \int_{x \triangleright y} \|\cdot - z_2\|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z-x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} dz_2 |x-y|^{(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)(q-2)-2} dy dx dz.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for an admissible $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $(\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta)(q - 1) + \frac{1}{2q} - 1 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{\mu}$, we can apply Lemma D.6 to the previous inequality and achieve

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.20) \quad & \left\| \int_{B_{2L\rho}} \int_{B_{2L\rho}} |x-y|^{(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)(q-2)} \left(\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta}{2}} \tilde{u}(x) \right)^{q-2} \right. \\
& \quad \cdot \left. \int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z_1) - \tilde{u}(y)|^2 dz_1 \int_{x \triangleright y} \|\cdot - z_2\|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z-x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} dz_2 \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x,y)^2} \right\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}(B_{2K\rho})} \\
& \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{I}_{(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)(q-1)+\frac{1}{2q}+\varepsilon-1} \left(\chi_{B_{2L\rho}} \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta}{2}} \tilde{u}(z) \right)^{q-2} \\
& \quad \cdot \mathcal{M} \left(\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta}{2}} \tilde{u} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1/(2q)}{2}} \tilde{u} \right) (z) \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon} |\varphi|(z) dz \\
& \quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\chi_{B_{2L\rho}} \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta}{2}} \tilde{u}(z) \right)^{q-2} \\
& \quad \cdot \mathcal{I}_{(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)(q-1)+\frac{1}{2q}+\varepsilon-1} \mathcal{M} \left(\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta}{2}} \tilde{u} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1/(2q)}{2}} \tilde{u} \right) (z) \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon} |\varphi|(z) dz \\
& \quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{I}_{(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)(q-1)+\frac{1}{2q}+\varepsilon-1} \left(\chi_{B_{2L\rho}} \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta}{2}} \tilde{u}(z) \right)^{q-2} \\
& \quad \cdot \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta}{2}} \tilde{u}(z) \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1/(2q)}{2}} \tilde{u}(z) \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon} |\varphi|(z) dz \\
& \quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\chi_{B_{2L\rho}} \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta}{2}} \tilde{u}(z) \right)^{q-2} \\
& \quad \cdot \mathcal{I}_{(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)(q-1)+\frac{1}{2q}+\varepsilon-1} \left(\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta}{2}} \tilde{u} \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1/(2q)}{2}} \tilde{u} \right) (z) \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon} |\varphi|(z) dz.
\end{aligned}$$

The integrals appearing on the right-hand side do make sense as they can be traced back to $\tilde{u} \in W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(\mathbb{R})$ by applying Hölder's inequality and the following estimates: First we have by Hardy-Littlewood maximal inequality and Sobolev's inequality

Theorem A.5

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(\chi_{B_{2L\rho}} \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{u})^{q-2}\|_{L^{((\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)(q-2))^{-1}}} \\
&= \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\chi_{B_{2L\rho}}(z) \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{u}(z)|^{(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)^{-1}} dz \right)^{(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)(q-2)} \\
&\lesssim \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{u}(z)|^{(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)^{-1}} dz \right)^{(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)(q-2)} \\
&\lesssim [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})}^{q-2} < \infty
\end{aligned}$$

and with additional help of Theorem A.4

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathcal{I}_{(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)(q-1)+\frac{1}{2q}+\varepsilon-1}(\chi_{B_{2L\rho}} \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{u})^{q-2}\|_{L^{(1-\frac{1}{2q}-\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon)^{-1}}} \\
&\lesssim \|(\chi_{B_{2L\rho}} \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{u})^{q-2}\|_{L^{((\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)(q-2))^{-1}}} \\
&\lesssim [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})}^{q-2} < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

In a similar fashion with slightly adapted Hölder's inequality we observe

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \mathcal{M} \left(\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{u} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} u \right) \right\|_{L^{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2q}+\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta}}} \\
&\lesssim \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{u}\|_{L^{\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta}} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4q}} \tilde{u}\|_{L^{2q}} \\
&\lesssim [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})}^2 < \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

and hence also

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{u} \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{u} \right\|_{L^{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2q}+\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta}}} \lesssim [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})}^2, \\
& \left\| \mathcal{I}_{(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)(q-1)+\frac{1}{2q}+\varepsilon-1} \left(\mathcal{M} \left(\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{u} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{u} \right) \right) \right\|_{L^{\frac{1}{1-(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)(q-2)-\varepsilon}}} \lesssim [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})}^2, \\
& \left\| \mathcal{I}_{(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)(q-1)+\frac{1}{2q}+\varepsilon-1} \left(\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{u} \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{u} \right) \right\|_{L^{\frac{1}{1-(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)(q-2)-\varepsilon}}} \lesssim [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\|\mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon}|\varphi|\|_{L^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{L^\mu}.$$

Therefore, we conclude by composing these observations and recalling $\|\varphi\|_{L^\mu} \leq 1$, that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \int_{B_{2L\rho}} \int_{B_{2L\rho}} |x-y|^{(\frac{1}{\mu}-\delta)(q-2)} \left(\chi_{B_{2L\rho}} \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{u}(x) \right)^{q-2} \right. \\
& \cdot \left. \int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z_1) - \tilde{u}(y)|^2 dz_1 \int_{x \triangleright y} \|z - z_2\|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - \|z - x\|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} dz_2 \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x,y)^2} \right\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}(B_{2K\rho})} \\
&\lesssim [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})}^q.
\end{aligned}$$

In view of the desired decay estimate Proposition 6.1, we need to take advantage of the local Sobolev regularity of u , i.e. $u \in W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(x_0, r))$. Recall that u and

\tilde{u} coincide on $B(x_0, r)$ by construction, cf. Remark 6.2, and therefore also their Gagliardo seminorms on subsets of $B(x_0, r)$. For this reason, we localize the previous estimates with help of the factor $\chi_{B_{2L\rho}}$ to gain for some $\sigma = \sigma(q) > 0$ the upper bound

$$[u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L\rho})}^q + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma(L+k)} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L+k\rho})}^q$$

instead. In particular, we applied Proposition B.3 to (6.20), localized maximal inequality Proposition B.4 and localized Sobolev inequality Lemma B.5 here.

We proceed with the remaining terms (6.17), (6.18), and (6.19), shortly

$$\begin{aligned} U(x, y, z) &:= (6.17) + (6.18) + (6.19) \\ &= \int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z_1) - \tilde{u}(y)| dz_1 |\tilde{u}(y) + \tilde{u}(x) - 2\tilde{u}(z)| \\ &\quad + |\tilde{u}(y) - \tilde{u}(x)| \int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z_1) - \tilde{u}(y)| dz_1 \\ &\quad + |\tilde{u}(y) - \tilde{u}(x)| |\tilde{u}(y) + \tilde{u}(x) - 2\tilde{u}(z)|, \end{aligned}$$

in the following similar manner. We begin with estimating the first factors $\int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z_1) - \tilde{u}(y)| dz_1$, respectively, $|\tilde{u}(y) - \tilde{u}(x)|$, by Proposition D.3 and Lebesgue's differentiation theorem by

$$|x - y|^{\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta} \left(\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta}{2}} \tilde{u}(x) + \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta}{2}} \tilde{u}(y) \right).$$

Together with Lemma D.4 we gain the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_{2L\rho}} \int_{B_{2L\rho}} |x - y|^{(\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta)(q-1)} \left(\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta}{2}} \tilde{u}(x) + \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta}{2}} \tilde{u}(y) \right)^{q-1} \\ &\cdot |x - y|^{\frac{1}{q} + \varepsilon} \left(\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4q}} \tilde{u}(x) + \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4q}} \tilde{u}(y) + \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4q}} \tilde{u}(z) \right) \\ &\cdot k_{\frac{1}{\mu} - \frac{1}{2q} - \varepsilon, \frac{1}{\mu}}(x, y, z) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We arrive for some $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $\|\varphi\|_{L^\mu} \leq 1$ at

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \int_{B_{2L\rho}} \int_{B_{2L\rho}} |x - y|^{(\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta)(q-1)} \left(\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta}{2}} \tilde{u}(x) + \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta}{2}} \tilde{u}(y) \right)^{q-1} \right. \\ &\quad \cdot U(x, y, \cdot) \left. \int_{x \triangleright y} \left\| \cdot - z_2 \right|^{\frac{1}{\mu} - 1} - |z - x|^{\frac{1}{\mu} - 1} \right| dz_2 \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^2} \right\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}(B_{2K\rho})} \\ &\lesssim \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left((\chi_{B_{2L\rho}} \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta}{2}} \tilde{u})^{q-1}(x) + (\chi_{B_{2L\rho}} \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta}{2}} \tilde{u})^{q-1}(y) \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4q}} \tilde{u}(x) + \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4q}} \tilde{u}(y) + \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4q}} \tilde{u}(z) \right) k_{\frac{1}{\mu} - \frac{1}{2q} - \varepsilon, \frac{1}{\mu}}(x, y, z) \\ &\quad \cdot |\varphi(z)| \frac{dx dy dz}{|x - y|^{2 - (\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta)(q-1) - \frac{1}{q} - \varepsilon}} \\ &\lesssim \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta}{2}} \tilde{u}\|_{L^{\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta}}^{q-1} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4q}} \tilde{u}\|_{L^{2q}} \|\varphi\|_{L^\mu} \\ &\lesssim [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(\mathbb{R})}^q, \end{aligned}$$

where we applied Proposition D.5 and then estimated analogously to the case (6.16). In consideration of $u \in W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(x_0, r))$, we make use of the factor $\chi_{B_{2L\rho}}$ again and localize the estimate as described in the case above. \square

It remains to treat the second term appearing on the right-hand side of the projection estimate (6.15).

Lemma 6.12. (*Right-hand side estimates II*) *Let $q \geq 2$, $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu} > 0$ small, and $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ be a locally critical embedding of $\text{TP}^{q+2,q}$ in the interval $B(x_0, r) \subset \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, in the sense of Definition 1.5. Denote the unit tangent field of γ by $u : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} u = 0$ and let \tilde{u} be a $W^{\frac{1}{q},q}$ -extension of $u|_{B(x_0, r)}$ from $B(x_0, r)$ to \mathbb{R} as discussed in Remark 6.2. Moreover, for $y_0 \in B(x_0, \frac{r}{2})$, choose $\rho > 0$ such that $B_{2^L\rho} := B(y_0, 2^{2L}\rho) \subset B(x_0, r)$ for large $L \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\chi_{B_{2K\rho}} u \wedge \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}} \\ & \lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L\rho})}^q + [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L\rho})}^{2q-3} + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma(K+l)} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2^{2L+l}\rho})}^{q-1} \\ & \quad + 2^{-\sigma K} [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2^L\rho})}^{q-1} + \rho \left(\mathcal{E}^q(u) + r^{-3} + [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(x_0, r))}^q \right), \end{aligned}$$

for any large enough $K \in \mathbb{N}$ and $L \in \mathbb{N}$ with $L \gg K$. The constant, besides depending on q , may also depend on global properties of u such as $\|u\|_{L^\infty}$, $\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty}$, $[u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(x_0, r))}$, and $[\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})}$.

Proof. We prove the statement along the lines of [13, Lemma 3.8]. We first have by duality that

$$\|\chi_{B_{2K\rho}} u \wedge \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}} \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} u(z) \wedge \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u(z) \cdot \psi(z) dz$$

for a map $\psi \in C_c^\infty(B_{2K\rho}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\|\psi\|_{L^\mu} \leq 1$. Hence, it is sufficient to show for a scalar $\psi \in C_c^\infty(B_{2K\rho})$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} u(z) \wedge \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u(z) \cdot \psi(z) dz \right| \\ & \lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L\rho})}^q + [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L\rho})}^{2q-3} + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma(K+l)} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2^{2L+l}\rho})}^{q-1} \\ & \quad + 2^{-\sigma K} [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2^L\rho})}^{q-1} + \rho \left(\mathcal{E}^q(u) + r^{-3} + [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(x_0, r))}^q \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that u in

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} u(z) \wedge \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u(z) \cdot \psi(z) dz \right|$$

is only considered on $B(x_0, r)$ due to $\text{supp } \psi \subset B_{2K\rho}$, the local definition of Γ for $B_{2L\rho}$ in (6.12), and $B_{2K\rho} \subset B_{2L\rho} \subset B(x_0, r)$ ($L \gg K$). Therefore, using that u coincides with \tilde{u} on $B(x_0, r)$ by construction, cf. Remark 6.2, we can continue with \tilde{u} from now on as it is globally $W^{\frac{1}{q},q}$ -regular in contrast to u , which is only in $W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(x_0, r), \mathbb{R}^3)$. However, if later on we obtain $W^{\frac{1}{q},q}$ -seminorms of \tilde{u} restricted to subsets of $B(x_0, r)$, we may switch back to the original function u .

With the help of usual cutoff functions, i.e. $\eta_{B_R} \in C_c^\infty(B_{2R})$ with $\eta_{B_R} \equiv 1$ on B_R and $\|\nabla^k \eta_{B_R}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim R^{-k}$ for $R > 0$, we decompose the left-hand side into

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{u}(z) \wedge \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L_\rho} \times B_{2L_\rho}} \tilde{u}(z) \psi(z) dz = I + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} II_l,$$

where

$$I := \int_{\mathbb{R}} (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} (\eta_{B_{2^{2K}\rho}} \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}} \psi)(z) \tilde{u}(z) \wedge \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L_\rho} \times B_{2L_\rho}} \tilde{u}(z) dz,$$

$$II_l := \int_{\mathbb{R}} (-\Delta)^{\left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}\right)} \left((-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} (\eta_{B_{2^{2K+l+1}\rho}} \setminus B_{2^{2K+l}\rho}) \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}} \psi \right) \tilde{u}(z) \wedge \mathcal{I}_{\left(\frac{2}{q} - \frac{2}{\mu}\right)} \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L_\rho} \times B_{2L_\rho}} \tilde{u}(z) dz.$$

We first focus on the terms II_l . For that, we define

$$\varphi(z) := (-\Delta)^{\left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}\right)} \left((-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} (\eta_{B_{2^{2K+l+1}\rho}} \setminus B_{2^{2K+l}\rho}) \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}} \psi \right) \tilde{u}(z),$$

and get by equalities (6.13) as well as (6.14), and the boundedness of the factor $k(x, y)^{-\frac{q+2}{2}}$ by Remark 6.7, that

$$(6.21) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi(z) \wedge \mathcal{I}_{\left(\frac{2}{q} - \frac{2}{\mu}\right)} \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L_\rho} \times B_{2L_\rho}} \tilde{u}(z) dz \right|$$

$$= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi(z) \wedge \Gamma_{\frac{2}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L_\rho} \times B_{2L_\rho}} \tilde{u}(z) dz \right|$$

$$= c \left| \iint_{B_{2L_\rho}^2} \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} \tilde{u}(z_0) - \tilde{u}(x) dz_0 \right|^{q-2} k(x, y)^{-\frac{q+2}{2}} \right.$$

$$\left. \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} ((\tilde{u} \wedge)_{ij}(z_1) - (\tilde{u} \wedge)_{ij}(x)) \cdot \left(\mathcal{I}_{\left(\frac{2}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}\right)} \varphi(z_2) - \mathcal{I}_{\left(\frac{2}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}\right)} \varphi(x) \right) dz_1 dz_2 \right)^3 \frac{dx dy}{\rho(x, y)^2} \right|$$

$$\lesssim \iint_{B_{2L_\rho}^2} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z_0) - \tilde{u}(x)| dz_0 \right)^{q-2} \int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z_1) - \tilde{u}(x)| dz_1$$

$$\cdot \int_{x \triangleright y} |\mathcal{I}_{\left(\frac{2}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}\right)} \varphi(z_2) - \mathcal{I}_{\left(\frac{2}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}\right)} \varphi(x)| dz_2 \frac{dx dy}{\rho(x, y)^2}$$

$$\lesssim [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L_\rho})}^{q-1} [\mathcal{I}_{\left(\frac{2}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}\right)} \varphi]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L_\rho})}$$

$$\lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L_\rho})}^{q-1} \|\varphi\|_{L^{\frac{1}{\frac{2}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}}}},$$

where we applied the identity Lemma A.2 and Sobolev inequality Theorem A.5 at the end. It remains to estimate $\|\varphi\|_{L^{\frac{1}{\frac{2}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}}}}$. For this purpose we introduce the three term commutator for any $\alpha > 0$ by

$$H_\alpha(f, g) = (-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(fg) - f(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}g - g(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}f.$$

Taking advantage of the three term commutator estimate Theorem B.6 and, in addition, of the uniform boundedness of \tilde{u} , cf. Remark 6.2, Hölder's inequality, Sobolev inequalities Theorem A.4 and Theorem A.5 for $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu} > 0$ very small, and

Proposition B.1, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\varphi_1\|_{L^{\frac{1}{\frac{2}{q}-\frac{1}{\mu}}}}} \\
& \lesssim \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{\mu}+2(\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{\mu}))}(\eta_{B_{2^{2K+l+1}\rho}} \setminus B_{2^{2K+l}\rho} \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}} \psi)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{\frac{2}{q}-\frac{1}{\mu}}}} \\
& \quad + \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{\mu}} \tilde{u}\|_{L^{\frac{1}{\frac{2}{q}-\frac{1}{\mu}}}} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}}(\eta_{B_{2^{2K+l+1}\rho}} \setminus B_{2^{2K+l}\rho} \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}} \psi)\|_{L^\mu} \\
& \quad + \|H_{\frac{2}{q}-\frac{2}{\mu}}(\tilde{u}, (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}}(\eta_{B_{2^{2K+l+1}\rho}} \setminus B_{2^{2K+l}\rho} \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}} \psi))\|_{L^{\frac{1}{\frac{2}{q}-\frac{1}{\mu}}}} \\
& \lesssim \left(\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty} + \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \tilde{u}\|_{L^\mu} \right) 2^{-(K+l+1)\frac{\mu-1}{\mu}} \|\psi\|_{L^\mu} \\
& \quad + \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{\mu}} \tilde{u}\|_{L^{\frac{1}{\frac{2}{q}-\frac{1}{\mu}}}} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{\mu}+2(\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{\mu}))}(\eta_{B_{2^{2K+l+1}\rho}} \setminus B_{2^{2K+l}\rho} \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}} \psi)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{\frac{2}{q}-\frac{1}{\mu}}}} \\
& \lesssim 2^{-(K+l)\sigma} \left(\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty} + [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

for some small $\sigma = \sigma(q) > 0$.

Now we switch to the term I . We again start by introducing

$$\varphi(z) := \eta_{B_{2^{2K}\rho}} \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}} \psi(z),$$

and observe by Proposition B.1 together with our assumption $\|\psi\|_{L^\mu} \leq 1$ that

$$(6.22) \quad \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \varphi\|_{L^\mu} \lesssim 1.$$

Next we split I into three terms with respect to the three term commutator (6.3) as

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}} (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} (\varphi \tilde{u})(z) \wedge \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2^L\rho} \times B_{2^L\rho}} \tilde{u}(z) dz, \\
I_2 &:= - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi(z) (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \tilde{u}(z) \wedge \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2^L\rho} \times B_{2^L\rho}} \tilde{u}(z) dz, \\
I_3 &:= - \int_{\mathbb{R}} H_{\frac{1}{\mu}}(\varphi, \tilde{u})(z) \wedge \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2^L\rho} \times B_{2^L\rho}} \tilde{u}(z) dz.
\end{aligned}$$

For the term I_1 , we have up to a constant depending on q by (6.13)

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_1| &= c \left| \left(Q_{B_{2^L\rho} \times B_{2^L\rho}}^{(q)}(u, (\varphi \tilde{u} \wedge)_{ij}^T) \right)_{i=1}^3 \right| \\
&= c \left| \iint_{B_{2^L\rho}^2} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} \tilde{u}(z_0) - \tilde{u}(x) dz_0 \right)^{q-2} k(x, y)^{-\frac{q+2}{2}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} (\tilde{u}(z_1) - \tilde{u}(x)) \cdot ((\varphi \tilde{u} \wedge)_{ij}^T(z_2) - (\varphi \tilde{u} \wedge)_{ij}^T(x)) dz_1 dz_2 \right)_{i=1}^3 \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^2} \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that \tilde{u} is considered only on $B_{2^L\rho} \subset B(x_0, r)$ here anymore. Hence, we can exchange \tilde{u} back to u , as they coincide on $B(x_0, r)$ by construction, cf. Remark 6.2. Then we simplify the expression by the skew-symmetry of $\varphi u \wedge$ and split I_1 by

triangle inequality into

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m=1}^4 \left| \iint_{D_m} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} u(z_0) - u(x) dz_0 \right)^{q-2} k(x, y)^{-\frac{q+2}{2}} \right. \\ & \left. \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} \int_{x \triangleright y} (u(z_1) - u(x)) \cdot ((\varphi u \wedge)_{ij}(z_2) - (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij}(x)) dz_1 dz_2 \right)^3 \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^2} \right| \\ & \lesssim \sum_{m=1}^4 \sum_{j=1}^3 |Q_{D_m}^{(q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})|, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &= \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \\ D_2 &= (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{2L\rho}) \times B_{2L\rho}, \\ D_3 &= B_{2L\rho} \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{2L\rho}), \\ D_4 &= (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{2L\rho}) \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{2L\rho}). \end{aligned}$$

For the term with integration domain D_1 , we employ the assumption of locally critical embeddedness of γ with respect to $\text{TP}^{q+2, q}$ in $B(x_0, r)$. Hence Theorem 6.4 yields that u is a critical map of \mathcal{E}_η^q in $B(x_0, r)$ for some suitable smooth function $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B(x_0, \frac{r}{2}), [0, \infty))$. As therefore u fulfills the Euler-Lagrange equations Lemma 6.6 for any $(\varphi u \wedge)_{ij} \in T_u \mathbb{S}^2$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, we observe

$$|Q^{(q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})| \lesssim \sum_{k=1}^3 |R^{k, (q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})| + \sum_{k=4}^7 |R_\eta^{k, (q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})|,$$

where we set $R^{k, (q)} = R^{k, (q+2, q)}$ for $q \geq 2$. Therefore, Proposition 6.9 leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & |Q^{(q)}(u, (\varphi u \wedge)_{ij})| \\ & \lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{23K\rho})}^{2q-3} + [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{23K\rho})}^{q+1} \\ & + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma(3K+l)} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{23K+l\rho})}^{q-1} + \rho \left(\mathcal{E}^q(u) + r^{-3} + [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B(x_0, r))}^q \right) \end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \sigma := \frac{2}{q} \leq 1$. We estimate the terms with domains D_m for $m = 2, 3, 4$ up to positive constant by methods similar to (6.5) by

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty} \iint_{D_m} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_0) - u(x)| dz_0 \right)^{q-1} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |\varphi(z_1) - \varphi(x)| dz_1 \right) \frac{dx dy}{\rho(x, y)^2}.$$

Due to the fact that u is not known to be in the fractional Sobolev space $W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}$ outside of $B(x_0, r)$, we need to distinguish for the domain D_2 the cases $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r)) \times B_{2L\rho}$ and $(B(x_0, r) \setminus B_{2L\rho}) \times B_{2L\rho}$. The first case we estimate along the lines of (6.7) since $\rho(x, y) \geq \frac{r}{4}$ and to the second case we can apply due to $\text{supp } \varphi \subset B_{22K\rho}$ an adapted version of Lemma C.1, which gives in total with $\tilde{u} \in W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(\mathbb{R})$ the upper bound up to a positive constant

$$\rho r^{-3} + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma(L+l)} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_{2L+2K+l\rho})}^{q-1}.$$

We treat the term with domain D_3 similarly by symmetry. For the integration domain D_4 we can deduce the same bound in the following manner. First we also distinguish several subdomains according to the only locally known fractional Sobolev regularity of u in $B(x_0, r)$. In particular, we have to study the cases

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{2L\rho}) \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B_{2L\rho}) &= (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r)) \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r)) \\ &\cup (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r)) \times (B(x_0, r) \setminus B_{2L\rho}) \\ &\cup (B(x_0, r) \setminus B_{2L\rho}) \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus B(x_0, r)) \\ &\cup (B(x_0, r) \setminus B_{2L\rho}) \times (B(x_0, r) \setminus B_{2L\rho}), \end{aligned}$$

where we observe in the first three cases that the double integral either equals 0 due to $\text{supp } \varphi \subset B_{2\kappa\rho}$ or can be estimated with help of $\rho(x, y) \geq r$ similarly to (6.7). For the last appearing case we use an adapted version of Lemma C.1.

For the term I_2 , we first observe by the definition of $\Gamma_{\beta, B \times B}$ in (6.12)

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\approx - \int_{B_{2L\rho}} \int_{B_{2L\rho}} \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} \tilde{u}(z_0) - \tilde{u}(x) dz_0 \right|^{q-2} k(x, y)^{-\frac{q+2}{2}} \\ &\quad \int_{x \triangleright y} (\tilde{u}(z_1) - \tilde{u}(x))^T dz_1 \int_{x \triangleright y} (\mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}}(\varphi(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \tilde{u} \wedge)(z_2) - \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}}(\varphi(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \tilde{u} \wedge)(x)) dz_2 \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now since $\tilde{u} \wedge$ is orthogonal to \tilde{u} , we rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{x \triangleright y} (\tilde{u}(z_1) - \tilde{u}(x))^T dz_1 \int_{x \triangleright y} (\mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}}(\varphi(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \tilde{u} \wedge)(z_2) - \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}}(\varphi(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \tilde{u} \wedge)(x)) dz_2 \\ &= \int_{x \triangleright y} (\tilde{u}(z_1) - \tilde{u}(x))^T dz_1 \int_{x \triangleright y} \tilde{\Phi}(z_2, x) dz_2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{\Phi}(z_2, x) := \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}}(\varphi(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \tilde{u} \wedge)(z_2) - \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}}(\varphi(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \tilde{u} \wedge)(x) - \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{u} \wedge(z_2) - \tilde{u} \wedge(x))(\varphi(x) + \varphi(y)).$$

Therefore, we have by Remark 6.7

$$(6.23) \quad |I_2| \lesssim \int_{B_{2L\rho}} \int_{B_{2L\rho}} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z_0) - \tilde{u}(x)| dz_0 \right)^{q-1} \int_{x \triangleright y} |\Phi(z_2, x)| dz_2 \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^2},$$

where

$$\Phi(z_2, x) := \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}}(\varphi(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \tilde{u})(z_2) - \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}}(\varphi(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \tilde{u})(x) - \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{u}(z_2) - \tilde{u}(x))(\varphi(x) + \varphi(y)).$$

Now we are in the position to apply an adapted version of [64, Lemma 6.6]. For that reason, we begin with defining $U := (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \tilde{u}$, and find

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(z_2, x) &= \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}}(\varphi U)(z_2) - \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}}(\varphi U)(x) - \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{u}(z_2) - \tilde{u}(x))(\varphi(x) + \varphi(y)) \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} (|z_2 - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |x - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1}) U(z) \varphi(z) dz \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (|z_2 - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |x - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1}) U(z) (\varphi(x) + \varphi(y)) dz \\ &\lesssim -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (|z_2 - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |x - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1}) U(z) (\varphi(x) + \varphi(y) - 2\varphi(z)) dz. \end{aligned}$$

Together with Lemma D.4 we obtain for $\frac{1}{\mu} < \frac{1}{q}$ large enough and $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{\mu} - \frac{1}{2q} < 1$ small enough

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{x \triangleright y} \Phi(z_2, x) dz_2 \right| \\ & \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} \|z_2 - z\|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |x - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} dz_2 \right) |U(z)| |\varphi(x) + \varphi(y) - 2\varphi(z)| dz \\ & \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x - y|^{\frac{1}{q} + \varepsilon} (\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4q}} \varphi(x) + \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4q}} \varphi(y) + \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4q}} \varphi(z)) \\ & \quad \cdot k_{\frac{1}{\mu} - \frac{1}{2q} - \varepsilon, \frac{1}{\mu}}(x, y, z) |U(z)| dz. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have by Proposition D.3 for small $\delta > 0$

$$\left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |\tilde{u}(z_0) - \tilde{u}(x)| dz_0 \right)^{q-1} \lesssim |x - y|^{(\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta)(q-1)} \left(\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2}} \tilde{u}(x) \right)^{q-1}.$$

We conclude,

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2| & \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x - y|^{\frac{1}{q} + \varepsilon + (\frac{1}{\mu} - \delta)(q-1) - 2} \chi_{B_{2L\rho}}(x) \left(\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2}} \tilde{u}(x) \right)^{q-1} \\ & \quad \cdot (\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4q}} \varphi(x) + \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4q}} \varphi(y) + \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4q}} \varphi(z)) \\ & \quad \cdot k_{\frac{1}{\mu} - \frac{1}{2q} - \varepsilon, \frac{1}{\mu}}(x, y, z) |U(z)| dy dz dx. \end{aligned}$$

Arguing along the lines of the proof of Lemma 6.11, we therefore gain with assumption (6.22)

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2| & \lesssim \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2}} \tilde{u}\|_{L^{\frac{1}{1-\delta}}}^{q-1} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4q}} \varphi\|_{L^{2q}} \|U\|_{L^\mu} \\ & \lesssim [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(\mathbb{R})}^{q-1} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \varphi\|_{L^\mu} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(\mathbb{R})} \\ & \lesssim [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(\mathbb{R})}^q, \end{aligned}$$

where we applied Sobolev's inequality in the last step. To take $u \in W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B(x_0, r))$ into consideration, we localize this estimate by introducing the factor $\chi_{B_{2L\rho}}$ in the inequality (6.23) and using Proposition B.3, localized maximal inequality Proposition B.4, and localized Sobolev inequality Lemma B.5.

With help of integration by parts, equality (6.14), and Hölder's inequality, the last term I_3 can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 & = - \int_{\mathbb{R}} H_{\frac{1}{\mu}}(\varphi, \tilde{u})(z) \wedge \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} \tilde{u}(z) dz \\ & \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} |(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}} H_{\frac{1}{\mu}}(\varphi, \tilde{u})(z)| |\mathcal{I}_{\frac{2}{q} - \frac{2}{\mu}} \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} \tilde{u}(z)| dz \\ & \lesssim \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}} H_{\frac{1}{\mu}}(\varphi, \tilde{u})\|_{L^{(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu})^{-1}}} \|\Gamma_{\frac{2}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} \tilde{u}\|_{L^{(1 - \frac{2}{q} + \frac{1}{\mu})^{-1}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then applying the three-term-commutator estimate Theorem B.6, Proposition A.8, Sobolev inequality Theorem A.5 and assumption (6.22), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &\lesssim \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \varphi\|_{L^\mu} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2\mu}} \tilde{u}\|_{L^\mu} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L\rho})}^{q-1} \\ &\lesssim [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L\rho})}^{q-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Also this estimate can get localized, in particular by the localized Sobolev inequality Lemma B.5 and the localized version of the three-term-commutator estimate Theorem B.6.

In total, using again that u and \tilde{u} coincide on $B(x_0, r)$ by construction, cf. Remark 6.2, we obtain an estimate of the form

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\chi_{B_{2K\rho}} u \wedge \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}} \\ &\lesssim 2^{-\sigma K} [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{22L\rho})}^{q-1} + [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{23K\rho})}^{2q-3} + [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{23K\rho})}^{q+1} \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma(3K+l)} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{23K+l\rho})}^{q-1} + \rho \left(\mathcal{E}^q(u) + r^{-3} + [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(x_0,r))}^q \right) \\ &\quad + \rho r^{-3} + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma(L+l)} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L+2K+l\rho})}^{q-1} \\ &\quad + [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{22L\rho})}^q + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma(L+l)} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{22L+l\rho})}^q \\ &\quad + [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L\rho})}^{q-1} \left([u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{23K\rho})} + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma(L+k)} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{23K+l\rho})} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which can be simplified by choosing $L \geq 3K$ and factoring out the constant $[u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(x_0,r))}$, wherever it makes sense, to

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\chi_{B_{2K\rho}} u \wedge \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L\rho} \times B_{2L\rho}} u\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}} \\ &\lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{22L\rho})}^q + [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{22L\rho})}^{2q-3} + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma(K+l)} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{22L+l\rho})}^{q-1} \\ &\quad + 2^{-\sigma K} [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{22L\rho})}^{q-1} + \rho \left(\mathcal{E}^q(u) + r^{-3} + [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(x_0,r))}^q \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

It only remains to prove the decay estimate based on the elaborated left-hand side and right-hand side estimates.

Proof of Proposition 6.1. This proof is in the spirit of [13, Proposition 3.9].

First let K_0 be a large number, which will be specified later, and we set for $K \geq K_0$ $L := 10K$ and $N := 20K$. Moreover, let $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ be small numbers, that will be chosen in the following, and assume

$$(6.24) \quad [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2N\rho})} < \varepsilon.$$

We then combine the left-hand side and right-hand side estimates to obtain a recursive estimate. First recall from the left-hand side estimate Proposition 6.10

that there exists a large constant $C_\delta > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_\rho)}^q &\lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L_\rho})} \|\chi_{B_{2K_\rho}} \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L_\rho} \times B_{2L_\rho}} u\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}} + \delta [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L_\rho})}^q \\ &\quad + C_\delta \left([u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L_\rho})}^q - [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_\rho)}^q \right) \end{aligned}$$

for K large and $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{\mu} > 0$ small enough. In the next step we split the operator $\Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2K_\rho} \times B_{2L_\rho}}$ by (6.15) into

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\chi_{B_{2K_\rho}} \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L_\rho} \times B_{2L_\rho}} u\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}} \\ &\lesssim \|\chi_{B_{2K_\rho}} u \cdot \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L_\rho} \times B_{2L_\rho}} u\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}} + \|\chi_{B_{2K_\rho}} u \wedge \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L_\rho} \times B_{2L_\rho}} u\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}}. \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right-hand side may be estimated by Lemma 6.11

$$\|\chi_{B_{2K_\rho}} u \cdot \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L_\rho} \times B_{2L_\rho}} u\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}} \lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L_\rho})}^q + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma(L+l)} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L+l_\rho})}^q,$$

whereas the second term on the right-hand side is by Lemma 6.12 bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\chi_{B_{2K_\rho}} u \wedge \Gamma_{\frac{1}{\mu}, B_{2L_\rho} \times B_{2L_\rho}} u\|_{L^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-1}}} \\ &\lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L_\rho})}^q + [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L_\rho})}^{2q-3} + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma(K+l)} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L+l_\rho})}^{q-1} \\ &\quad + 2^{-\sigma K} [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2L_\rho})}^{q-1} + \rho \left(\mathcal{E}^q(u) + r^{-3} + [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(x_0, r))}^q \right). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude with setting $\theta := \frac{\sigma}{20} > 0$ that there exists a large constant $C = C(q, r, \mathcal{E}^q(u), \|u\|_{L^\infty}, \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty}, [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B(x_0, r))}, [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(\mathbb{R})}) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &[u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_\rho)}^q \\ &\leq C [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2N_\rho})}^q \left([u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2N_\rho})} + \delta + 2^{-\theta N} \right) \\ &\quad + CC_\delta \left([u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2N_\rho})}^q - [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_\rho)}^q \right) + C\rho \\ &\quad + C \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\theta(N+l)} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2N+l_\rho})}^q. \end{aligned}$$

Now we employ the hole-filling technique: We add $CC_\delta [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2N_\rho})}^q$ to both sides of the inequality and divide by $2CC_\delta + 1$ subsequently so that we obtain under consideration of the initial bound (6.24) on $[u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2N_\rho})}^q$

$$\begin{aligned} [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_\rho)}^q &\leq [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2N_\rho})}^q \frac{\varepsilon + \delta + 2^{-\theta N} + 2CC_\delta}{2CC_\delta + 1} + \rho \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\theta(N+l)} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2N+l_\rho})}^q. \end{aligned}$$

If we then choose δ and ε small enough, whereas K_0 big enough, such that

$$\varepsilon + \delta + 2^{-\theta K_0} \leq \frac{1}{2},$$

we gain by defining

$$0 < \tau := \frac{\frac{1}{2} + 2CC_\delta}{2CC_\delta + 1} < 1$$

the desired estimate for any $N \geq N_0$ with $N_0 = 20K_0$

$$[u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_\rho)}^q \leq \tau [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2N\rho})}^q + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\theta(N+l)} [\tilde{u}]_{W^{\frac{1}{q},q}(B_{2N+l\rho})}^q + \rho.$$

□

APPENDIX A. GAGLIARDO-SOBOLEV SPACE

Recall that the seminorm for the fractional Sobolev space $W^{s,p}(B)$ for $s \in (0, 1)$, $p \in (1, \infty)$, and $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ is given as

$$[f]_{W^{s,p}(B)} = \left(\int_B \int_B \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

In this section we gather a few useful facts that we need throughout the paper. Most likely all of them are known at least to experts and we do not claim any originality here, but we could not find them in the literature.

We begin with two identifications for the fractional Sobolev space.

Lemma A.1 (Identification 1). *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $p \in (1, \infty)$. Then for any ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ or $B = \mathbb{R}$ and any $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$,*

$$[f']_{W^{s,p}(B)}^p := \int_B \int_B \frac{|f'(x) - f'(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{n+sp}} dx dy \approx \int_B \int_B \frac{\left| \frac{f(y) - f(x) - f'(x)(y-x)}{|x-y|} \right|^p}{|x - y|^{n+sp}} dx dy$$

The constant depends on s and p , but not on the set B or the function f .

Proof. The \lesssim -estimate.

We have

$$|f'(x) - f'(y)|^p \lesssim |f'(x) - \frac{1}{y-x} \int_x^y f'(z) dz|^p + |f'(y) - \frac{1}{x-y} \int_y^x f'(z) dz|^p.$$

By the fundamental theorem of calculus,

$$\begin{aligned} & |f'(x) - \frac{1}{y-x} \int_x^y f'(z) dz|^p + |f'(y) - \frac{1}{x-y} \int_y^x f'(z) dz|^p \\ &= 2 \frac{|f(y) - f(x) - f'(x)(y-x)|^p}{|y-x|^p}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have the \lesssim -inequality,

$$\int_B \int_B \frac{|f'(x) - f'(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{n+sp}} dx dy \lesssim \int_B \int_B \frac{\left| \frac{f(y) - f(x) - f'(x)(y-x)}{|x-y|} \right|^p}{|x - y|^{n+sp}} dx dy.$$

The \gtrsim -estimate.

For the opposite inequality, by the fundamental theorem of calculus and Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{f(y) - f(x) - f'(x)(y-x)}{|x-y|} \right|^p &= \left| \frac{(y-x) \left(\frac{1}{y-x} \int_x^y f'(z) - f'(x) dz \right)}{|x-y|} \right|^p \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|y-x|} \int_{(x,y)} |f'(z) - f'(x)|^p dz. \end{aligned}$$

We integrate both sides over B in x and y ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B \int_B \frac{\left| \frac{f(y) - f(x) - f'(x)(y-x)}{|x-y|} \right|^p}{|x-y|^{1+sp}} dy dx &\leq \int_B \int_B \int_{(x,y)} \frac{|f'(z) - f'(x)|^p}{|x-y|^{2+sp}} dz dy dx \\ &\leq \int_B \int_B \int_{x>z>y} \frac{|f'(z) - f'(x)|^p}{|x-y|^{2+sp}} dz dy dx \\ &\quad + \int_B \int_B \int_{y>z>x} \frac{|f'(z) - f'(x)|^p}{|x-y|^{2+sp}} dz dy dx \end{aligned}$$

Observe that by Fubini for any $x \in B$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_B \int_{y>z>x} \frac{|f'(z) - f'(x)|^p}{|x-y|^{2+sp}} dz dy \\ &\leq \int_{B \cap \{z>x\}} |f'(z) - f'(x)|^p \int_z^\infty \frac{1}{|x-y|^{2+sp}} dy dz \\ &= \int_{B \cap \{z>x\}} |f'(z) - f'(x)|^p \frac{1}{1+sp} \frac{1}{|x-z|^{1+sp}} dz \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1+sp} \int_B \frac{|f'(z) - f'(x)|^p}{|x-z|^{1+sp}} dz \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

Thus,

$$\int_B \int_B \int_{y>z>x} \frac{|f'(z) - f'(x)|^p}{|x-y|^{2+sp}} dz dy dx \lesssim [f']_{W^{s,q}(B)}^p,$$

and likewise

$$\int_B \int_B \int_{x>z>y} \frac{|f'(z) - f'(x)|^p}{|x-y|^{2+sp}} dz dy dx \lesssim [f']_{W^{s,q}(B)}^p.$$

We can conclude. □

Lemma A.2 (Identification 2). *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $p \in (1, \infty)$. For any $g \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and any $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ a ball or $B = \mathbb{R}$ we have*

$$[g]_{W^{s,p}(B)}^p \approx \int_B \int_B \frac{f_{(x,y)} |g(x) - g(z)|^p dz}{|x-y|^{1+sp}} dx dy.$$

The constant depends on s and p but not on the set B or the function g .

Proof. The \lesssim -estimate

We have by Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |g(x) - g(y)|^p &\lesssim \left| g(x) - \int_{(x,y)} g(z) dz \right|^p + \left| g(y) - \int_{(x,y)} g(z) dz \right|^p \\ &\leq \int_{(x,y)} |g(x) - g(z)|^p dz + \int_{(x,y)} |g(y) - g(z)|^p dz. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$[g]_{W^{s,p}(B)}^p \lesssim \int_B \int_B \frac{f_{(x,y)} |g(x) - g(z)|^p dz}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dx dy.$$

The \lesssim -estimate

The opposite direction is a consequence of Fubini's theorem and the fact that B is convex. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_B \int_B \frac{f_{(x,y)} |g(x) - g(z)|^p dz}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dy dx \\ &\leq \int_B \int_B \int_{x>z>y} \frac{|g(x) - g(z)|^p}{|x - y|^{2+sp}} dz dy dx \\ &\quad + \int_B \int_B \int_{y>z>x} \frac{|g(x) - g(z)|^p}{|x - y|^{2+sp}} dz dy dx. \end{aligned}$$

Now we argue as in (A.1) to obtain the claim. \square

Lemma A.3 (Sobolev embedding). *Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ a ball. For $s, t \in (0, 1)$, $t < s$, $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ with*

$$s - \frac{1}{p} \geq t - \frac{1}{q},$$

we have

$$(A.2) \quad [f]_{W^{t,q}(B)} \leq C(s, t, p, q) \text{diam}(B)^{s-t-\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{q}} [f]_{W^{s,p}(B)}.$$

If $B = \mathbb{R}$ and $s - \frac{1}{p} = t - \frac{1}{q}$, then

$$(A.3) \quad [f]_{W^{t,q}(B)} \leq C(s, t, p, q) [f]_{W^{s,p}(B)}.$$

The constant $C(s, t, p, q)$ does not depend on f and B .

Proof. We first treat (A.3), for $B = \mathbb{R}$, $s - \frac{1}{p} = t - \frac{1}{q}$.

In \mathbb{R} we can use the abstract Sobolev embedding theorem for Triebel-spaces,

$$[g]_{W^{t,q}(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim [g]_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Indeed, by [62, Proposition, p.14], for $s \in (0, 1)$,

$$[g]_{W^{t,q}(\mathbb{R})} \approx [g]_{\dot{F}_{q,q}^t(\mathbb{R})}.$$

By [62, 2.2.3 p.31] we have

$$[g]_{F_{qq}^t(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim [g]_{F_{pp}^s(\mathbb{R})}.$$

So (A.3) is established.

Next we treat (A.2), for a ball B .

Observe that for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r > 0$ we have

$$[f(x_0 + r \cdot)]_{W^{t,q}(B(0,1))} = r^{t-\frac{1}{q}} [f]_{W^{t,q}(B(x_0,r))}$$

and

$$[f(r\cdot)]_{W^{s,p}(B(0,1))} = r^{s-\frac{1}{p}} [f]_{W^{t,q}(B(x_0,1))}.$$

So (A.2) follows by scaling and translation from the case $B = B(0,1)$.

Moreover, we can assume that $(f)_B := \int_B f = 0$. Indeed, once we have shown (A.2) under the assumption $(f)_B = 0$ we can apply it to $f - (f)_B$ to get the full result.

So from now on we assume $(f)_B = 0$ and $B = B(0,1)$.

Set

$$g(x) := \begin{cases} f(x) & |x| \leq 1 \\ f(x/|x|^2) & |x| > 1. \end{cases}$$

We claim that

$$(A.4) \quad [g]_{W^{t,q}(\mathbb{R})} \approx [f]_{W^{t,q}(B)}, \quad [g]_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R})} \approx [f]_{W^{s,p}(B)}.$$

Indeed, we have

$$[g]_{W^{t,q}(\mathbb{R})} \geq [g]_{W^{t,q}(B)} = [f]_{W^{t,q}(B)}$$

which establishes the \gtrsim -case for (A.4). For the \lesssim -case of (A.4) observe that

$$[g]_{W^{t,q}(\mathbb{R})}^q = [g]_{W^{t,q}(B(0,1))}^q + [g]_{W^{t,q}(B(0,1)^c)}^q + 2 \int_{B(0,1)^c} \int_{B(0,1)} \frac{|g(x) - g(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{1+sq}} dx dy.$$

First we observe by the substitution $\tilde{x} := x/|x|^2$,

$$[g]_{W^{t,q}(B(0,1)^c)}^q = \int_{B(0,1)} \int_{B(0,1)} \frac{|f(\tilde{x}) - f(\tilde{y})|^q}{|\tilde{x}/|\tilde{x}|^2 - \tilde{y}/|\tilde{y}|^2|^{1+sq}} |\tilde{x}| |\tilde{y}| d\tilde{x} d\tilde{y}.$$

For $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \in B(0,1)$ we have $|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}| \leq |\tilde{x}/|\tilde{x}|^2 - \tilde{y}/|\tilde{y}|^2|$ and thus

$$[g]_{W^{t,q}(B(0,1)^c)}^q \leq \int_{B(0,1)} \int_{B(0,1)} \frac{|f(\tilde{x}) - f(\tilde{y})|^q}{|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}|^{1+sq}} d\tilde{x} d\tilde{y} = [f]_{W^{t,q}(B(0,1))}^q.$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(0,1)^c} \int_{B(0,1)} \frac{|g(x) - g(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{1+sq}} dx dy \\ & \leq \int_{B(0,1)} \int_{B(0,1)} \frac{|f(x) - f(\tilde{y})|^q}{|x - \tilde{y}/|\tilde{y}|^2|^{1+sq}} |\tilde{y}| dx d\tilde{y}. \end{aligned}$$

For $x, \tilde{y} \in B(0,1)$ we have $|x - \tilde{y}| \lesssim |x - \tilde{y}/|\tilde{y}|^2|$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(0,1)^c} \int_{B(0,1)} \frac{|g(x) - g(y)|^q}{|x - y|^{1+sq}} dx dy \\ & \lesssim [f]_{W^{t,q}(B(0,1))}^q. \end{aligned}$$

This establishes (A.4).

From (A.4) and (A.3) we obtain (A.2) in the case $s - \frac{1}{p} = t - \frac{1}{q}$.

For (A.2) in the case $s - \frac{1}{p} > t - \frac{1}{q}$ we define

$$h(x) := \eta(x)g(x),$$

where $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B(0,2), [0,1])$, $\eta \equiv 1$ in $B(0,1)$ is the typical cutoff function. We apply the inhomogeneous Sobolev-inequality, [62, Proposition, p.14], [62, 2.2.3 p.31] to h , namely

$$[h]_{W^{t,q}(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim [h]_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R})} + \|h\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \leq [h]_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R})} + \|g\|_{L^p(B(0,2))}.$$

Now its not too difficult to obtain

$$[h]_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|g\|_{L^p(B(0,2))} + [g]_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Moreover,

$$\|g\|_{L^p(B(0,2))} \leq \|f\|_{L^p(B(0,1))} = \|f - (f)_{B(0,1)}\|_{L^p(B(0,1))} \lesssim [f]_{W^{s,p}(B(0,1))},$$

where in the last step we used the fact that $(f)_{B(0,1)} = 0$ and Jensen's inequality. This establishes (A.2). \square

Theorem A.4 (Classical Sobolev Inequality). [64, Theorem 1.5] *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $s \geq t \geq 0$, $p \in (1, \frac{n}{s-t})$ and define $p_{s,t}^* = \frac{np}{n-(s-t)p}$. Then we have for any $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$*

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} f\|_{L^{p_{s,t}^*}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

or in other words

$$\|\mathcal{I}_{s-t} f\|_{L^{p_{s,t}^*}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Theorem A.5 (Sobolev Inequality). [64, Theorem 1.6] *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $s > t \geq 0$, $p \in (1, \frac{n}{s-t})$ and define $p_{s,t}^* = \frac{np}{n-(s-t)p}$. Then we have for any $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ that*

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}} f\|_{L^{p_{s,t}^*}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{n+sp}} dz dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

or in other words, let $s + \delta < n$ and $p \leq \frac{n}{\delta}$, then for $p_{s,\delta}^* = \frac{np}{n-\delta p}$

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|\mathcal{I}_\delta f(x) - \mathcal{I}_\delta f(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{n+sp_{s,\delta}^*}} dz dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p_{s,\delta}^*}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Proposition A.6. [64, Proposition D.2] *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $q \in (1, \infty)$, and $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_{2\rho})$ with $\eta \equiv 1$ on B_ρ . Then for any $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L > 1$,*

$$\int_{B_{2L\rho}} \int_{B_{2L\rho}} \frac{|\eta(x) - \eta(y)|^q |u(y) - (u)_{B_{2\rho} \setminus B_\rho}|}{|x - y|^{1+sp}} dx dy \lesssim [u]_{W^{s,p}(B_{2L\rho})}^q - [u]_{W^{s,p}(B_\rho)}^q.$$

Proposition A.7. [64, Proposition D.3] *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $q \in (1, \infty)$, $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_{2\rho})$ with $\eta \equiv 1$ on B_ρ , and*

$$\psi(x) := \eta(x)(u(x) - (u)_{B_{2\rho} \setminus B_\rho}),$$

then for any $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L > 1$,

$$[\psi]_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim [u]_{W^{s,p}(B_{2L\rho})}.$$

We also find use of an adapted version of [64, Proposition D.4]:

Proposition A.8. *For $\delta > 0$ small enough, we have*

$$\|\Gamma_{\frac{1}{q}+\delta, B_\rho} u\|_{L^{1/(1-\frac{1}{q}-\delta)}} \lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_\rho)}^{q-1}.$$

Proof. For some $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $\|\varphi\|_{L^{1/(\frac{1}{q}+\delta)}} \leq 1$, we have by Remark 6.7, Hölder's inequality, the identification for fractional Sobolev spaces Lemma A.2, and the

Sobolev inequality Theorem A.4

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\Gamma_{\frac{1}{q}+\delta, B_\rho} u\|_{L^{1/(1-\frac{1}{q}-\delta)}} \\
& \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Gamma_{\frac{1}{q}+\delta, B_\rho} u(z) \varphi(z) dz \\
& \lesssim \int_{B_\rho} \int_{B_\rho} \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_1) - u(x)|^{q-1} dz_1 \int_{x \triangleright y} |\mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{q}-\delta} \varphi(z_2) - \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{q}-\delta} \varphi(x)| dz_2 \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^2} \\
& \lesssim \left(\int_{B_\rho} \int_{B_\rho} \frac{\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_1) - u(x)|^q dz_1}{\rho(x, y)^2} dy dx \right)^{\frac{q-1}{q}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\int_{x \triangleright y} |\mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{q}-\delta} \varphi(z_2) - \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{q}-\delta} \varphi(x)|^q dz_2}{|x-y|^2} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
& \lesssim [u]_{W^{\frac{1}{q}, q}(B_\rho)}^{q-1} \|\varphi\|_{L^{1/(\frac{1}{q}+\delta)}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

APPENDIX B. LOCALIZATION ARGUMENTS

For the convenience of the reader, we recall some results related to localization. For a good overview of these statements we refer to [64], but they can be found throughout the literature.

Proposition B.1. [64, Proposition B.2] *Let $p > 1$, $t \in (0, 1)$, and $\delta \geq 0$ small. Then for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(B_{2K})$ and $L > 2$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}((\eta_{B_{2K+L}} - \eta_{B_{2K+L-1}})(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}\varphi)\|_{L^{\frac{np}{n+\delta p}}} & \lesssim 2^{-L(\frac{n}{p-1}+t)} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}\varphi\|_{L^p} \\
\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{t+\delta}{2}}((\eta_{B_{2K+L}} - \eta_{B_{2K+L-1}})\mathcal{I}_t\varphi)\|_{L^{\frac{np}{n+\delta p}}} & \lesssim 2^{-L\frac{n}{p-1}} \|\varphi\|_{L^p}
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition B.2. [64, Proposition B.3] *Let $s \in (0, n)$ and $p \in (1, \frac{n}{s})$. Then we have for some $\sigma > 0$ and any $L \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\|\mathcal{I}_s f\|_{L^{\frac{np}{n-sp}}(B_\rho)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(B_{2L\rho})} + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma(L+l)} \|f\|_{L^p(B_{2L+l\rho})}.$$

Proposition B.3. [64, Proposition B.4] *Let $s_1, s_2, s_3 \in [0, n)$ and $p_1, p_2, p_3 \in (1, \infty)$ such that*

$$p_i^* := \frac{np_i}{n - s_i p_i} \in (1, \infty).$$

If moreover

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{1}{p_i} - \frac{s_i}{n} = 1,$$

then we have the following pseudo-local behavior for any $L \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $\sigma > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{I}_{s_1}(\chi_{B_\rho} f_1) \mathcal{I}_{s_2} f_2 \mathcal{I}_{s_3} f_3 \\
& \lesssim \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}(B_{2L\rho})} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}(B_{2L\rho})} \|f_3\|_{L^{p_3}(B_{2L\rho})} \\
& \quad + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-(L+l)\sigma} \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}(B_{2L+l\rho})} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}(B_{2L+l\rho})} \|f_3\|_{L^{p_3}(B_{2L+l\rho})}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition B.4. *Let $p > 1$. Then we have for some $\sigma > 0$ and any $L \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\|\mathcal{M}f\|_{L^p(B_\rho)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(B_{2^L\rho})} + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma(L+l)} \|f\|_{L^p(B_{2^{L+l}\rho})}.$$

Proof. We first split by Fatou's lemma and Minkowski inequality

$$\|\mathcal{M}(f)\|_{L^p(B_\rho)} \leq \|\mathcal{M}(\chi_{B_{2^L\rho}}f)\|_{L^p(B_\rho)} + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \|\mathcal{M}(\chi_{B_{2^{L+l}\rho} \setminus B_{2^{L+l-1}\rho}}f)\|_{L^p(B_\rho)}.$$

For the first term, we get by Hardy-Littlewood maximal inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{M}(\chi_{B_{2^L\rho}}f)\|_{L^p(B_\rho)} &\leq \|\mathcal{M}(\chi_{B_{2^L\rho}}f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leq \|\chi_{B_{2^L\rho}}f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \|f\|_{L^p(B_{2^L\rho})}. \end{aligned}$$

For the remaining terms, we observe for any $x \in B_\rho$ by the definition of the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function and Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(\chi_{B_{2^L\rho}}f)(x) &= \sup_{r>0} \frac{1}{|B(x,r)|} \int_{B(x,r)} \chi_{B_{2^{L+l}\rho} \setminus B_{2^{L+l-1}\rho}}(y) |f(y)| dy \\ &\lesssim (2^{L+l}\rho)^n \int_{B_{2^{L+l}\rho}} \chi_{B_{2^{L+l}\rho} \setminus B_{2^{L+l-1}\rho}}(y) |f(y)| dy \\ &\lesssim (2^{L+l}\rho)^n (2^{L+l}\rho)^{n-\frac{n}{p}} \|f\|_{L^p(B_{2^{L+l}\rho})}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{M}(\chi_{B_{2^{L+l}\rho} \setminus B_{2^{L+l-1}\rho}}f)\|_{L^p(B_\rho)} &= \left(\int_{B_\rho} |\mathcal{M}(\chi_{B_{2^{L+l}\rho} \setminus B_{2^{L+l-1}\rho}}f)(x)|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\lesssim (2^{L+l}\rho)^n (2^{L+l}\rho)^{n-\frac{n}{p}} \rho^{\frac{n}{p}} \|f\|_{L^p(B_{2^{L+l}\rho})} \\ &\approx 2^{-\frac{n}{p}(L+l)} \|f\|_{L^p(B_{2^{L+l}\rho})}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We also need a localized version of the Sobolev inequality Theorem A.5:

Lemma B.5. [64, Lemma C.1] *Given $0 < t < s < 1$ and define $p_s = \frac{n}{s}$, $p_t = \frac{n}{t}$. Then for any $L \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $K \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\|\chi_{B_{2^L}}(-\Delta)^{\frac{t}{2}}f\|_{L^{p_t}} \lesssim [f]_{W^{s,p_s}(B_{2^{L+K}})} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma(K+k)} [f]_{W^{s,p_s}(B_{2^{L+K+k}})}.$$

B.1. Three-Term-Commutator Estimates. For $\alpha > 0$ the three term commutator is defined by

$$H_\alpha(f, g) = (-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(fg) - f(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}g - g(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}f.$$

This operator measures the deviation from the Leibniz rule for $|D|^\alpha$. For fractional harmonic maps it was discovered in [22, 21] how $H_\alpha(\cdot, \cdot)$ takes the role of the div-curl term, and in particular it was shown that in \mathbb{R}^1 , $(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4}}H_{1/2}(f, g)$ belongs to the Hardy-space if $(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4}}f, (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4}}g \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, see also [43]. There have been multiple extensions since, the following estimate and its localized version on the three term commutator will be helpful.

Theorem B.6. [64, Theorem A.1] *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ small and $p \in (1, \infty)$, we have*

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} H_\alpha(f, g)\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} f\|_{L^{p_1}} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} g\|_{L^{p_2}},$$

where $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \frac{n}{\alpha}]$ such that

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{\alpha - \varepsilon}{n}.$$

If $\text{supp } f \subset B_{2^k}$, then we have for any $L \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} H_\alpha(f, g)\|_{L^p} &\lesssim \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} f\|_{L^{p_1}} \left(\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} g\|_{L^{p_2}(B_{2^{K+L}})} \right. \\ &\left. + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\sigma(L+k)} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} g\|_{L^{p_2}(B_{2^{K+L+k}})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

APPENDIX C. TAIL ESTIMATES

Lemma C.1. *Let $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B_r)$, $p \geq q + 2$, $q \geq 2$, and $L, k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we can estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{D_1} \int_{D_2} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z) - u(x)|^2 dz \right)^{q-2} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_1) - u(x)| dz_1 \right) \\ &\cdot \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} |\varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x)| dz_2 \right) \frac{dy dx}{\rho(x, y)^{p-q}} \\ &\lesssim 2^{-(L+k)\frac{p-q}{q}} [u]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B_{2^{L+k}r})}^{2q-3} [\varphi]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B_r)}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\textbf{Case 1: } D_1 \times D_2 = B_{2^L r} \times (B_{2^{L+k}r} \setminus B_{2^{L+k-1}r}),$$

$$\textbf{Case 2: } D_1 \times D_2 = (B_{2^{L+k}r} \setminus B_{2^{L+k-1}r}) \times B_{2^L r},$$

$$\textbf{Case 3: } D_1 \times D_2 = (B_{2^{L+k}r} \setminus B_{2^{L+k-1}r}) \times (B_{2^{L+k}r} \setminus B_{2^{L+k-1}r}).$$

Proof. Since $\int_{x \triangleright y} |\varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x)| dz_2 = 0$ for either $x, y < -r$ or $x, y > r$ due to the support of φ in B_r , we only need to consider the cases

$$\textbf{Case 1: } -2^L r < x < r, \quad 2^{L+k-1} r < y < 2^{L+k} r,$$

$$\textbf{Case 2: } 2^{L+k-1} r < x < 2^{L+k} r, \quad -2^L r < y < r, \text{ and}$$

$$\textbf{Case 3: } -2^{L+k} r < x < -2^{L+k-1} r, \quad 2^{L+k-1} r < y < 2^{L+k} r.$$

The cases

$$\textbf{Case 1: } -r < x < 2^L r, \quad -2^{L+k} r < y < -2^{L+k-1} r,$$

$$\textbf{Case 2: } -2^{L+k} r < x < -2^{L+k-1} r, \quad -r < y < 2^L r, \text{ and}$$

$$\textbf{Case 3: } 2^{L+k-1} r < x < 2^{L+k} r, \quad -2^{L+k} r < y < -2^{L+k-1} r,$$

follow analogously. We first examine **Case 1**. By using Hölder's inequality, Jensen's inequality and the Sobolev embedding Lemma A.3, in consideration of constants

depending on the domain, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{2Lr}} \int_{B_{2L+k_r} \setminus B_{2L+k-1_r}} \rho(x, y)^{-(p-q)} \left(\rho(x, y)^{-1} \int_x^y |u(z) - u(x)|^2 dz \right)^{q-2} \\
& \cdot \left(\rho(x, y)^{-1} \int_x^y |u(z_1) - u(x)| dz_1 \right) \left(\rho(x, y)^{-1} \int_x^y |\varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x)| dz_2 \right) dy dx \\
& \lesssim (2^{L+k_r})^{-(p-q)-q} (2^{L+k_r}) \int_{B_{2L+k_r}} \left(\int_{B_{2L+k_r}} |u(z) - u(x)|^2 dz \right)^{q-2} \\
& \cdot \left(\int_{B_{2L+k_r}} |u(z_1) - u(x)| dz_1 \right) \left(\int_{B_{2L+k_r}} |\varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x)| dz_2 \right) dx \\
& \lesssim (2^{L+k_r})^{-(p-q)-q+1} (2^{L+k_r})^{(q-1)\frac{q-2}{q}} \left(\iint_{(B_{2L+k_r})^2} |u(z) - u(x)|^{2q} dz dx \right)^{\frac{q-2}{q}} \\
& \cdot (2^{L+k_r})^{(q-1)\frac{1}{q}} \left(\iint_{(B_{2L+k_r})^2} |u(z_1) - u(x)|^q dz_1 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
& \cdot (2^{L+k_r})^{(q-1)\frac{1}{q}} \left(\iint_{(B_{2L+k_r})^2} |\varphi(z_2) - \varphi(x)|^q dz_2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
& \lesssim (2^{L+k_r})^{-(p-q)} (2^{L+k_r})^{(p-q)\frac{q-2}{q}} [u]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{2q}, 2q}(B_{2L+k_r})}^{2q-4} (2^{L+k_r})^{(p-q)\frac{1}{q}} [u]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B_{2L+k_r})} \\
& \cdot r^{(p-q)\frac{1}{q}} [\varphi]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B_r)} \\
& \approx 2^{-(L+k)\frac{p-q}{q}} [u]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B_{2L+k_r})}^{2q-3} [\varphi]_{W^{\frac{p-q-1}{q}, q}(B_r)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2 differs from **Case 1** by symmetry only in the integration on y , where we used

$$\int_{B_{2Lr}} dy \lesssim 2^{L+k} r.$$

In **Case 3** the estimates also hold since the distance of x and y is even greater than in the previous cases. \square

APPENDIX D. MEAN VALUE ARGUMENTS

In the following we introduce mean value arguments and compensation effects, which turn out to be crucial for elaborating the right-hand side estimates, subsequently.

The first statement is a typical mean value argument, cf. [47, Lemma 3.3].

Lemma D.1. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|a - b| \lesssim \min\{|a|, |b|\}$. Then for any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$,*

$$||a|^\alpha - |b|^\alpha| \lesssim |a - b|^\varepsilon \min\{|a|^{\alpha-\varepsilon}, |b|^{\alpha-\varepsilon}\}$$

In our situation we will have to deal with the expression

$$\frac{1}{|x - y|} \int_{(x, y)} ||z - z_2|^{\alpha-1} - |z - x|^{\alpha-1}| dz_2.$$

The following lemma tells us, that it behaves very similarly to

$$||z - y|^{\alpha-1} - |z - x|^{\alpha-1}|.$$

Lemma D.2. *Let $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}$ three distinct points be inside a geodesic ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Set*

$$F(x, y, z) := \frac{1}{|x - y|} \int_{(x, y)} ||z - z_2|^{\alpha-1} - |z - x|^{\alpha-1}| dz_2.$$

• *If*

$$(D.1) \quad |x - y| \lesssim \min\{|x - z|, |y - z|\}$$

then for any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$,

$$(D.2) \quad F(x, y, z) \lesssim |x - y|^\varepsilon \min\{|x - z|^{\alpha-\varepsilon-1}, |y - z|^{\alpha-\varepsilon-1}\}.$$

• *If*

$$(D.3) \quad |x - z| \lesssim \min\{|x - y|, |y - z|\}$$

then for any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$,

$$(D.4) \quad F(x, y, z) \lesssim |x - z|^{\alpha-1} \lesssim |x - y|^\varepsilon |x - z|^{\alpha-\varepsilon-1}.$$

• *If*

$$(D.5) \quad |y - z| \lesssim \min\{|x - y|, |x - z|\}$$

then for any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$,

$$(D.6) \quad F(x, y, z) \lesssim |y - z|^{\alpha-1} \lesssim |x - y|^\varepsilon |y - z|^{\alpha-\varepsilon-1}$$

Proof of Lemma D.2, (D.2). Observe that (D.1) implies

$$|x - z| \approx |y - z|.$$

Case 1: $|z - x| \leq 10|x - y|$.

In this case $|x - y| \approx |z - x|$, and for any $z_2 \in (x, y)$ we have $|z - z_2| \lesssim |x - y| \lesssim |z - x|$. We then simply integrate

$$\begin{aligned} F(x, y, z) &\lesssim |x - y|^{-1} \int_{|z - z_2| \lesssim |x - y|} |z - z_2|^{\alpha-1} dz_2 \\ &\approx |x - y|^{\alpha-1} \\ &\approx |x - y|^\varepsilon \min\{|x - z|^{\alpha-\varepsilon-1}, |y - z|^{\alpha-\varepsilon-1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $|z - x| > 10|x - y|$. In this case, for any $z_2 \in (x, y)$ we have $|z - z_2| \gtrsim |x - y|$ and $|z_2 - x| \leq |x - y| \lesssim |z_2 - z|$.

In particular, for any $z_2 \in (x, y)$

$$|z_2 - x| \lesssim \min\{|z_2 - z|, |z - x|\}.$$

By the typical mean value theorem argument, Lemma D.1,

$$||z - z_2|^{\alpha-1} - |z - x|^{\alpha-1}| \lesssim |z_2 - x| |z - x|^{\alpha-2} \lesssim |x - y| |z - x|^{\alpha-2}.$$

Integrating this, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F(x, y, z) &\lesssim |x - y| |z - x|^{\alpha-2} \\ &\lesssim |x - y|^\varepsilon |z - x|^{\alpha-\varepsilon-1} \\ &\approx |x - y|^\varepsilon \min\{|x - z|^{\alpha-\varepsilon-1}, |y - z|^{\alpha-\varepsilon-1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

This settles (D.2). \square

Proof of Lemma D.2, (D.4). Observe that (D.3) implies that $|x - y| \approx |y - z|$.

Observe that for $\alpha > 0$ the function $z_2 \mapsto |z - z_2|^{\alpha-1}$ is integrable with antiderivative $\approx |z - z_2|^\alpha$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |x - y|^{-1} \int_{(x,y)} |z - z_2|^{\alpha-1} \\ & \lesssim |x - y|^{-1} (|z - x|^\alpha + |z - y|^\alpha) \\ & = |x - y|^{-1} |z - x|^\alpha + |x - y|^{-1} |z - y|^\alpha \\ & \lesssim |z - x|^{\alpha-1} + |x - y|^{\alpha-1} \\ & \lesssim |z - x|^{\alpha-1} + |z - x|^{\alpha-1} \end{aligned}$$

In the last step we used that $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ (i.e. $\alpha - 1 < 0$)

Also observe that

$$|x - y|^{-1} \int_{(x,y)} |z - x|^{\alpha-1} dz_2 = |z - x|^{\alpha-1}.$$

This settles (D.4). \square

Proof of Lemma D.2, (D.6). In this case observe that (D.5) implies $|x - y| \approx |z - x|$ so ($\alpha < 1$)

$$\frac{1}{|x - y|} \int_{(x,y)} |z - x|^{\alpha-1} \approx |x - y|^{\alpha-1} \lesssim |y - z|^{\alpha-1}$$

For the remainder we argue as for (D.4) and have

$$\begin{aligned} & |x - y|^{-1} \int_{(x,y)} |z - z_2|^{\alpha-1} \\ & \lesssim |x - y|^{-1} (|z - x|^\alpha + |z - y|^\alpha) \\ & = |x - y|^{-1} |z - x|^\alpha + |x - y|^{-1} |z - y|^\alpha \\ & \approx |z - x|^{\alpha-1} + |z - y|^{\alpha-1} \\ & \lesssim |z - y|^{\alpha-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This settles (D.6). \square

For the upcoming statement, we need the notation of the uncentered Hardy-Littlewood maximal function, which is given by

$$\mathcal{M}f(x) = \sup_{B(x,r) \ni y} \frac{1}{|B(y,r)|} \int_{B(y,r)} |f(z)| dz$$

Let us recall the following proposition first.

Proposition D.3. [65, Proposition 6.6.] *For any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$,*

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \lesssim |x - y|^\alpha \left(\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(x) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(y) \right).$$

This implies

$$\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_1) - u(x)| dz_1 \lesssim |x - y|^\alpha \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(x),$$

and

$$\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_1) - u(y)| dz_1 \lesssim |x - y|^\alpha \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(y).$$

We develop an adapted version of [64, Proposition 6.3] now.

Lemma D.4. *Let*

$$G(x, y, z) := |u(y) + u(x) - 2u(z)| \int_{x \triangleright y} ||z - z_2|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z - x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1}| dz_2$$

and

$$H(x, y, z) := \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_1) - u(x)| dz_1 \int_{x \triangleright y} ||z - z_2|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z - x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1}| dz_2.$$

Then for any $\alpha < \frac{1}{\mu}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1 - \alpha)$ such that $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{\mu} - \frac{\alpha}{2}$, $G(x, y, z)$ and $H(x, y, z)$ are, up to a constant, bounded from above by

$$|x - y|^{\alpha + \varepsilon} (\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) + \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(y) + \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(z)) k_{\frac{1}{\mu} - \frac{\alpha}{2} - \varepsilon, \frac{1}{\mu}}(x, y, z),$$

where $k_{s, \gamma}$ has the form

$$(D.7) \quad k_{s, \gamma}(x, y, z) := \min\{|x - z|^{s-1}, |y - z|^{s-1}\}$$

$$(D.8) \quad + \left(\frac{|y - z|}{|x - y|} \right)^{\gamma - s} |y - z|^{s-n} \chi_{\{|y - z| \lesssim \min\{|x - y|, |x - z|\}\}}$$

$$(D.9) \quad + \left(\frac{|x - z|}{|x - y|} \right)^{\gamma - s} |x - z|^{s-n} \chi_{\{|x - z| \lesssim \min\{|x - y|, |y - z|\}\}}.$$

Proof. In the case of $|x - y| \lesssim \min\{|x - z|, |y - z|\}$, we estimate by Proposition D.3

$$\begin{aligned} & |u(y) + u(x) - 2u(z)| \\ & \leq |u(x) - u(y)| + 2|u(y) - u(z)| \\ & \lesssim |x - y|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(y)) + |y - z|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(y) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(z)), \end{aligned}$$

respectively,

$$\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_1) - u(x)| dz_1 \lesssim |x - y|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x).$$

Therefore, we get by (D.2) for $\gamma_1 = \frac{\alpha}{2} + \varepsilon, \gamma_2 = \alpha + \varepsilon \in [0, 1]$

$G(x, y, z)$

$$\begin{aligned} & \lesssim |x - y|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(y)) \int_{x \triangleright y} ||z - z_2|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z - x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1}| dz_2 \\ & \quad + |y - z|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(y) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(z)) \int_{x \triangleright y} ||z - z_2|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z - x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1}| dz_2 \\ & \lesssim (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(y)) |x - y|^{\frac{\alpha}{2} + \gamma_1} |y - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu} - \gamma_1 - 1} \\ & \quad + (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(y) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(z)) |y - z|^{\frac{\alpha}{2} + \frac{1}{\mu} - \gamma_2 - 1} |x - y|^{\gamma_2}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} H(x, y, z) & \lesssim |x - y|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) \int_{x \triangleright y} ||z - z_2|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z - x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1}| dz_2 \\ & \lesssim \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) |x - y|^{\alpha + \varepsilon} |y - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu} - \frac{\alpha}{2} - \varepsilon - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

In the case of $|y - z| \lesssim \min\{|x - z|, |x - y|\}$, we start with the same estimates as in the previous case, but apply (D.6) for $\gamma_1 = \frac{\alpha}{2} + \varepsilon, \gamma_2 = \alpha + \varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
& G(x, y, z) \\
& \lesssim |x - y|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(y)) \int_{x \triangleright y} ||z - z_2|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z - x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1}| dz_2 \\
& \quad + |y - z|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(y) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(z)) \int_{x \triangleright y} ||z - z_2|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z - x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1}| dz_2 \\
& \lesssim (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(y)) |x - y|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} |y - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} \\
& \quad + (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(y) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(z)) |y - z|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} |y - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} \\
& \lesssim (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(y)) |x - y|^{\frac{\alpha}{2} + \gamma_1} |y - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu} - \gamma_1 - 1} \left(\frac{|y - z|}{|x - y|} \right)^{\gamma_1} \\
& \quad + (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(y) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(z)) |x - y|^{\gamma_2} |y - z|^{\frac{\alpha}{2} + \frac{1}{\mu} - \gamma_2 - 1} \left(\frac{|y - z|}{|x - y|} \right)^{\gamma_1 + (\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)},
\end{aligned}$$

respectively,

$$\begin{aligned}
H(x, y, z) & \lesssim |x - y|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \mathcal{M} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) \int_{x \triangleright y} ||z - z_2|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z - x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1}| dz_2 \\
& \lesssim \mathcal{M} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) |x - y|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} |y - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} \\
& = \mathcal{M} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) |x - y|^{\alpha + \varepsilon} |y - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu} - \frac{\alpha}{2} - \varepsilon - 1} \left(\frac{|y - z|}{|x - y|} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2} + \varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the last case of $|x - z| \lesssim \min\{|y - z|, |x - y|\}$, we gain by Proposition D.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |u(y) + u(x) - 2u(z)| \\
& \leq |u(x) - u(y)| + 2|u(x) - u(z)| \\
& \lesssim |x - y|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(y)) + |x - z|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(z)),
\end{aligned}$$

and hence, by (D.4) for $\gamma_1 = \frac{\alpha}{2} + \varepsilon, \gamma_2 = \alpha + \varepsilon \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned}
& G(x, y, z) \\
& \lesssim |x - y|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(y)) \int_{x \triangleright y} ||z - z_2|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z - x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1}| dz_2 \\
& \quad + |x - z|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(z)) \int_{x \triangleright y} ||z - z_2|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z - x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1}| dz_2 \\
& \lesssim (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(y)) |x - y|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} |x - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} \\
& \quad + (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(z)) |x - z|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} |x - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} \\
& \lesssim (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(y)) |x - y|^{\frac{\alpha}{2} + \gamma_1} |x - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu} - \gamma_1 - 1} \left(\frac{|x - z|}{|x - y|} \right)^{\gamma_1} \\
& \quad + (\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(z)) |x - y|^{\gamma_2} |x - z|^{\frac{\alpha}{2} + \frac{1}{\mu} - \gamma_2 - 1} \left(\frac{|x - z|}{|x - y|} \right)^{\gamma_1 + (\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)},
\end{aligned}$$

respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} H(x, y, z) &\lesssim |x - y|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) \int_{x \triangleright y} ||z - z_2|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z - x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1}| dz_2 \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) |x - y|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} |x - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} \\ &= \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) |x - y|^{\alpha+\varepsilon} |x - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-\frac{\alpha}{2}-\varepsilon-1} \left(\frac{|x - z|}{|x - y|} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}+\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Eventually, note that by Lebesgue differentiation theorem, for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x) \lesssim \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{4}} u(x).$$

□

Furthermore, we also need a result inspired by [64, Proposition 6.4].

Proposition D.5. *Let $F, G, H : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, $\alpha \in (0, n)$, $s, \beta \in (0, 1)$, $s + \alpha < \beta$, and consider*

$$I := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (F(x) + F(y))(G(x) + G(y) + G(z)) |x - y|^{\alpha-n} H(z) k_{s,\beta}(x, y, z) dx dy dz,$$

where $k_{s,\beta}(x, y, z)$ is of the form (D.7), (D.8), or (D.9). Then

$$I \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} G H \mathcal{I}_{s+\alpha} F + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F G \mathcal{I}_{s+\alpha} H + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F \mathcal{I}_{\alpha} G \mathcal{I}_s H + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} G \mathcal{I}_{\alpha} F \mathcal{I}_s H.$$

Lemma D.6. *Let $G, H : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$ such that $\beta < \alpha < \frac{1}{\mu}$, and*

$$\begin{aligned} I := &\int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(x) \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_1) - u(y)|^2 dz_1 H(z) \int_{x \triangleright y} ||z - z_2|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z - x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1}| dz_2 \\ &\cdot |x - y|^{-2+\alpha(q-2)} dx dy dz. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} I &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{I}_{\alpha(q-1)+\beta+\varepsilon-1} G \mathcal{M} \left(\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u \right) \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon} H \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}} G \mathcal{I}_{\alpha(q-1)+\beta+\varepsilon-1} \mathcal{M} \left(\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u \right) \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon} H \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{I}_{\alpha(q-1)+\beta+\varepsilon-1} G \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon} H \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}} G \mathcal{I}_{\alpha(q-1)+\beta+\varepsilon-1} \left(\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u \right) \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon} H \end{aligned}$$

for any admissible $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha(q-1) + \beta - 1 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{\mu}$.

Proof. We begin with treating the term $\int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_1) - u(y)|^2 dz_1$ by Proposition D.3 as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{x \triangleright y} |u(z_1) - u(y)|^2 dz_1 \\ & \lesssim \int_{x \triangleright y} |z_1 - y|^\alpha \left(\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(z_1) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(y) \right) |z_1 - y|^\beta \left(\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u(z_1) + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u(y) \right) dz_1 \\ & \leq |x - y|^{\alpha+\beta} \left(\int_{x \triangleright y} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(z_1) \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u(z_1) dz_1 + \int_{x \triangleright y} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(z_1) dz_1 \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u(y) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(y) \int_{x \triangleright y} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u(z_1) dz_1 + \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(y) \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u(y) \right) \\ & \lesssim |x - y|^{\alpha+\beta} \left(\mathcal{M} \left(\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u \right) (y) + \mathcal{M} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(y) \mathcal{M} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u(y) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We first consider the cases $|x - y| \lesssim \min\{|x - z|, |y - z|\}$ and $|y - z| \lesssim \min\{|x - z|, |x - y|\}$ and observe by (D.2) and (D.6) that

$$\int_{x \triangleright y} \left| |z - z_2|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z - x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} \right| dz_2 \lesssim |x - y|^\varepsilon |y - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon-1}$$

for an admissible $\varepsilon > 0$. Thereby, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^3} G(x) \mathcal{M} \left(\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u \right) (y) H(z) |x - y|^{-2+\alpha(q-1)+\beta+\varepsilon} |y - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon-1} dx dy dz \\ & + \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^3} G(x) \mathcal{M} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(y) \mathcal{M} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u(y) H(z) |x - y|^{-2+\alpha(q-1)+\beta+\varepsilon} |y - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon-1} dx dy dz \\ & \approx \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{I}_{\alpha(q-1)+\beta+\varepsilon-1} G(y) \mathcal{M} \left(\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u \right) (y) \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon} H(y) dy \\ & + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{I}_{\alpha(q-1)+\beta+\varepsilon-1} G(y) \mathcal{M} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(y) \mathcal{M} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u(y) \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon} H(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

For the case $|x - z| \lesssim \min\{|y - z|, |x - y|\}$, we have by (D.4)

$$\int_{x \triangleright y} \left| |z - z_2|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} - |z - x|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-1} \right| dz_2 \lesssim |x - y|^\varepsilon |x - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon-1}$$

for an admissible $\varepsilon > 0$, which implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^3} G(x) \mathcal{M} \left(\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u \right) (y) H(z) |x - y|^{-2+\alpha(q-1)+\beta+\varepsilon} |x - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon-1} dx dy dz \\ & + \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^3} G(x) \mathcal{M} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(y) \mathcal{M} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u(y) H(z) |x - y|^{-2+\alpha(q-1)+\beta+\varepsilon} |x - z|^{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon-1} dx dy dz \\ & \approx \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(x) \mathcal{I}_{\alpha(q-1)+\beta+\varepsilon-1} \mathcal{M} \left(\mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u \right) (x) \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon} H(x) dy \\ & + \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(x) \mathcal{I}_{\alpha(q-1)+\beta+\varepsilon-1} \left(\mathcal{M} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u(x) \mathcal{M} \mathcal{M}(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u(x) \right) \mathcal{I}_{\frac{1}{\mu}-\varepsilon} H(x) dy. \end{aligned}$$

□

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Bartels, P. Reiter, and J. Riege. A simple scheme for the approximation of self-avoiding inextensible curves. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 38(2):543–565, 2018. 2

- [2] S. Bartels and Ph. Reiter. Stability of a simple scheme for the approximation of elastic knots and self-avoiding inextensible curves, 2018. To appear in *Mathematics of Computation*, 2021. [2](#)
- [3] S. Bartels and Ph. Reiter. Numerical solution of a bending-torsion model for elastic rods. *Numer. Math.*, 146(4):661–697, 2020. [2](#)
- [4] F. Bethuel. The approximation problem for Sobolev maps between two manifolds. *Acta Math.*, 167(3-4):153–206, 1991. [6](#), [9](#)
- [5] S. Blatt. Boundedness and regularizing effects of O’Hara’s knot energies. *J. Knot Theory Ramifications*, 21(1):1250010, 9, 2012. [7](#)
- [6] S. Blatt. The energy spaces of the tangent point energies. *J. Topol. Anal.*, 5(3):261–270, 2013. [5](#)
- [7] S. Blatt. Curves between Lipschitz and C^1 and their relation to geometric knot theory. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 29(4):3270–3292, 2019. [20](#)
- [8] S. Blatt, A. Gilsbach, P. Reiter, and H. von der Mosel. Symmetric criticality for Möbius energy. *in preparation*, 2021. [9](#)
- [9] S. Blatt and P. Reiter. Modeling repulsive forces on fibres via knot energies. *Computational and Mathematical Biophysics*, 2(1):56 – 72, 01 Jan. 2014. [1](#)
- [10] S. Blatt and P. Reiter. Stationary points of O’Hara’s knot energies. *Manuscripta Math.*, 140(1-2):29–50, 2013. [2](#)
- [11] S. Blatt and P. Reiter. Regularity theory for tangent-point energies: the non-degenerate sub-critical case. *Adv. Calc. Var.*, 8(2):93–116, 2015. [3](#), [5](#), [20](#), [23](#), [24](#), [25](#)
- [12] S. Blatt, P. Reiter, and A. Schikorra. Harmonic analysis meets critical knots. Critical points of the Möbius energy are smooth. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 368(9):6391–6438, 2016. [2](#), [45](#)
- [13] S. Blatt, P. Reiter, and A. Schikorra. On O’Hara knot energies I: Regularity for critical knots. *Journal Diff. Geom. (accepted)*, 2021. [2](#), [3](#), [6](#), [46](#), [49](#), [61](#), [62](#), [71](#), [77](#)
- [14] S. Blatt and N. Vorderobermeier. On the analyticity of critical points of the Möbius energy. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 58(1):Paper No. 16, 28, 2019. [2](#)
- [15] P. Bousquet, A. C. Ponce, and J. Van Schaftingen. Density of smooth maps for fractional Sobolev spaces $W^{s,p}$ into ℓ simply connected manifolds when $s \geq 1$. *Confluentes Math.*, 5(2):3–22, 2013. [9](#)
- [16] P. Bousquet, A. C. Ponce, and J. Van Schaftingen. Strong density for higher order Sobolev spaces into compact manifolds. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 17(4):763–817, 2015. [9](#)
- [17] H. Brezis and P. Mironescu. Density in $W^{s,p}(\Omega; N)$. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 269(7):2045–2109, 2015. [9](#)
- [18] H. Brezis and L. Nirenberg. Degree theory and BMO. I. Compact manifolds without boundaries. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 1(2):197–263, 1995. [9](#), [10](#)
- [19] H. Brezis and L. Nirenberg. Degree theory and BMO. II. Compact manifolds with boundaries. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 2(3):309–368, 1996. With an appendix by the authors and Petru Mironescu. [9](#), [10](#)
- [20] G. Buck and J. Orloff. A simple energy function for knots. *Topology Appl.*, 61(3):205–214, 1995. [3](#)
- [21] F. Da Lio and T. Rivière. Sub-criticality of non-local Schrödinger systems with antisymmetric potentials and applications to half-harmonic maps. *Adv. Math.*, 227(3):1300–1348, 2011. [7](#), [85](#)
- [22] F. Da Lio and T. Rivière. Three-term commutator estimates and the regularity of $\frac{1}{2}$ -harmonic maps into spheres. *Anal. PDE*, 4(1):149–190, 2011. [2](#), [7](#), [46](#), [85](#)
- [23] E. Di Nezza, G. Palatucci, and E. Valdinoci. Hitchhiker’s guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 136(5):521–573, 2012. [47](#), [62](#)
- [24] H. Federer. Curvature measures. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 93:418–491, 1959. [3](#)
- [25] M. H. Freedman, Z.-X. He, and Z. Wang. Möbius energy of knots and unknots. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 139(1):1–50, 1994. [2](#), [5](#)
- [26] S. Fukuhara. Energy of a knot. In *A fête of topology*, pages 443–451. Academic Press, Boston, MA, 1988. [2](#)
- [27] M. Giaquinta. *Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations and nonlinear elliptic systems*, volume 105 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1983. [45](#)
- [28] O. Gonzalez and J. H. Maddocks. Global curvature, thickness, and the ideal shapes of knots. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 96(9):4769–4773, 1999. [3](#)
- [29] M. Gromov. Filling Riemannian manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.*, 18(1):1–147, 1983. [3](#)

- [30] P. Hajlasz. Approximation of Sobolev mappings. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 22(12):1579–1591, 1994. [9](#)
- [31] Z.-X. He. The Euler-Lagrange equation and heat flow for the Möbius energy. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 53(4):399–431, 2000. [2](#)
- [32] F. Hélein. *Harmonic maps, conservation laws and moving frames*, volume 150 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2002. Translated from the 1996 French original, With a foreword by James Eells. [6](#)
- [33] M. W. Hirsch. *Differential topology*, volume 33 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994. Corrected reprint of the 1976 original. [10](#)
- [34] A. Huber. On subharmonic functions and differential geometry in the large. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 32:13–72, 1957. [5](#)
- [35] A. Ishizeki and T. Nagasawa. A decomposition theorem of the Möbius energy I: Decomposition and Möbius invariance. *Kodai Math. J.*, 37(3):737–754, 2014. [5](#)
- [36] A. Ishizeki and T. Nagasawa. A decomposition theorem of the Möbius energy II: variational formulae and estimates. *Math. Ann.*, 363(1-2):617–635, 2015. [5](#)
- [37] A. Ishizeki and T. Nagasawa. The invariance of decomposed Möbius energies under inversions with center on curves. *J. Knot Theory Ramifications*, 25(2):1650009, 22, 2016. [5](#)
- [38] A. Ishizeki and T. Nagasawa. The L^2 -gradient of decomposed Möbius energies. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 55(3):Art. 56, 31, 2016. [5](#)
- [39] B. Käfer and H. von der Mosel. Möbius-invariant self-avoidance energies for non-smooth sets in arbitrary dimensions, 2020. [2](#)
- [40] S. Kawakami and T. Nagasawa. Variational formulae and estimates of O’Hara’s knot energies. *J. Knot Theory Ramifications*, 29(4):2050017, 22, 2020. [5](#)
- [41] E. Kuwert and Y. Li. $W^{2,2}$ -conformal immersions of a closed Riemann surface into \mathbb{R}^n . *Comm. Anal. Geom.*, 20(2):313–340, 2012. [5](#)
- [42] E. Kuwert and R. Schätzle. The Willmore functional. In *Topics in modern regularity theory*, volume 13 of *CRM Series*, pages 1–115. Ed. Norm., Pisa, 2012. [5](#)
- [43] E. Lenzmann and A. Schikorra. Sharp commutator estimates via harmonic extensions. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 193:111375, 37, 2020. [85](#)
- [44] Y. Li, Y. Luo, and H. Tang. On the moving frame of a conformal map from 2-disk into \mathbb{R}^n . *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 46(1-2):31–37, 2013. [5](#)
- [45] S. Luckhaus. Partial Hölder continuity for minima of certain energies among maps into a Riemannian manifold. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 37(2):349–367, 1988. [36](#)
- [46] K. Mazowiecka and A. Schikorra. Minimal $W^{s, \frac{2s}{s-2}}$ -harmonic maps in homotopy classes. 2020. [6](#), [35](#)
- [47] T. Mengesha, A. Schikorra, and S. Yeepo. Calderon-Zygmund type estimates for nonlocal PDE with Hölder continuous kernel. *Adv. Math.*, 383:107692, 2021. [87](#)
- [48] P. Mironescu. On some properties of S^1 -valued fractional Sobolev spaces. In *Noncompact problems at the intersection of geometry, analysis, and topology*, volume 350 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 201–207. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2004. [9](#)
- [49] S. Müller and V. Šverák. On surfaces of finite total curvature. *J. Differential Geom.*, 42(2):229–258, 1995. [5](#), [6](#)
- [50] T. Nagasawa. On Möbius invariant decomposition of the Möbius energy. In *New directions in geometric and applied knot theory*, Partial Differ. Equ. Meas. Theory, pages 36–76. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2018. [5](#)
- [51] T. Nagasawa. On Möbius invariant decomposition of the Möbius energy. In *New directions in geometric and applied knot theory*, Partial Differ. Equ. Meas. Theory, pages 36–76. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2018. [5](#)
- [52] J. O’Hara. Energy of a knot. *Topology*, 30(2):241–247, 1991. [2](#)
- [53] J. O’Hara. Family of energy functionals of knots. *Topology Appl.*, 48(2):147–161, 1992. [2](#), [3](#), [5](#)
- [54] J. O’Hara. Energy functionals of knots. II. *Topology Appl.*, 56(1):45–61, 1994. [2](#)
- [55] J. O’Hara. Self-repulsiveness of energies for closed submanifolds. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2004.02351, Apr. 2020. [2](#)
- [56] P. Reiter. Regularity theory for the Möbius energy. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.*, 9(5):1463–1471, 2010. [2](#)
- [57] P. Reiter and H. Schumacher. Sobolev gradients for the möbius energy, 2020. [2](#)
- [58] T. Rivière. Dense subsets of $H^{1/2}(S^2, S^1)$. *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.*, 18(5):517–528, 2000. [9](#)
- [59] T. Rivière. Analysis aspects of Willmore surfaces. *Invent. Math.*, 174(1):1–45, 2008. [4](#), [5](#)
- [60] T. Rivière. The variations of yang-mills lagrangian. *Preprint, arXiv:1506.04554*, 2015. [5](#)

- [61] T. Rivière. Weak immersions of surfaces with L^2 -bounded second fundamental form. In *Geometric analysis*, volume 22 of *IAS/Park City Math. Ser.*, pages 303–384. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2016. [5](#)
- [62] T. Runst and W. Sickel. *Sobolev spaces of fractional order, Nemytskij operators, and nonlinear partial differential equations*, volume 3 of *De Gruyter Series in Nonlinear Analysis and Applications*. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1996. [81](#), [82](#)
- [63] J. Sacks and K. Uhlenbeck. The existence of minimal immersions of 2-spheres. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 113(1):1–24, 1981. [19](#)
- [64] A. Schikorra. Integro-differential harmonic maps into spheres. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 40(3):506–539, 2015. [2](#), [7](#), [46](#), [61](#), [62](#), [75](#), [83](#), [84](#), [85](#), [86](#), [90](#), [92](#)
- [65] A. Schikorra. Boundary equations and regularity theory for geometric variational systems with Neumann data. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 229(2):709–788, 2018. [89](#)
- [66] A. Schikorra. Limits of conformal immersions under a bound on a fractional normal curvature quantity. *Vietn. J. Math.*, (Special Issue, J. Jost’s Birthday), 2021. [5](#)
- [67] R. Schoen and K. Uhlenbeck. Boundary regularity and the Dirichlet problem for harmonic maps. *J. Differential Geom.*, 18(2):253–268, 1983. [6](#), [9](#)
- [68] L. Simon. *Theorems on regularity and singularity of energy minimizing maps*. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1996. Based on lecture notes by Norbert Hungerbühler. [36](#)
- [69] P. Strzelecki and H. von der Mosel. Tangent-point self-avoidance energies for curves. *J. Knot Theory Ramifications*, 21(5):1250044, 28, 2012. [3](#), [6](#), [18](#), [19](#), [25](#), [32](#)
- [70] P. Strzelecki and H. von der Mosel. Tangent-point repulsive potentials for a class of non-smooth m -dimensional sets in \mathbb{R}^n . Part I: Smoothing and self-avoidance effects. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 23(3):1085–1139, 2013. [2](#)
- [71] P. Strzelecki and H. von der Mosel. Geometric curvature energies: facts, trends, and open problems. In *New directions in geometric and applied knot theory*, Partial Differ. Equ. Meas. Theory, pages 8–35. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2018. [1](#)
- [72] T. Toro. Surfaces with generalized second fundamental form in L^2 are Lipschitz manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.*, 39(1):65–101, 1994. [5](#)
- [73] T. Toro. Geometric conditions and existence of bi-Lipschitz parameterizations. *Duke Math. J.*, 77(1):193–227, 1995. [5](#)
- [74] N. Vorderobermeier. On the regularity of critical points for O’Hara’s knot energies: From smoothness to analyticity. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, pages 2040045, 28, 2020. [2](#)

(Simon Blatt) PARIS LODRON UNIVERSITÄT SALZBURG, HELLBRUNNER STRASSE 34, 5020 SALZBURG, AUSTRIA
Email address: simon.blatt@sbg.ac.at

(Philipp Reiter) CHEMNITZ UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, 09107 CHEMNITZ, GERMANY
Email address: reiter@math.tu-chemnitz.de

(Armin Schikorra) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, 301 THACKERAY HALL, PITTSBURGH, PA 15260, USA
Email address: armin@pitt.edu

(Nicole Vorderobermeier) PARIS LODRON UNIVERSITÄT SALZBURG, HELLBRUNNER STRASSE 34, 5020 SALZBURG, AUSTRIA
Email address: nicole.vorderobermeier@sbg.ac.at