

L^p estimates for the maximal singular integral in terms of the singular integral

Anna Bosch-Camós, Joan Mateu and Joan Orobitg

Abstract

This paper continues the study, initiated in the works [MOV] and [MOPV], of the problem of controlling the maximal singular integral T^*f by the singular integral Tf . Here T is a smooth homogeneous Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator of convolution type. We consider two forms of control, namely, in the weighted $L^p(\omega)$ norm and via pointwise estimates of T^*f by $M(Tf)$ or $M^2(Tf)$, where M is the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator and $M^2 = M \circ M$ its iteration. The novelty with respect to the aforementioned works, lies in the fact that here p is different from 2 and the L^p space is weighted.

1 Introduction

Let T be a smooth homogeneous Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator on \mathbb{R}^n with kernel

$$K(x) = \frac{\Omega(x)}{|x|^n} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}, \quad (1)$$

where Ω is a homogeneous function of degree 0 whose restriction to the unit sphere S^{n-1} is C^∞ and satisfies the cancellation property

$$\int_{|x|=1} \Omega(x) d\sigma(x) = 0,$$

σ being the normalized surface measure in S^{n-1} . Thus, Tf is the principal value convolution operator

$$Tf(x) = \text{p.v.} \int f(x-y)K(y)dy \equiv \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} T^\varepsilon f(x), \quad (2)$$

where $T^\varepsilon f$ is the truncated operator at level ε defined by

$$T^\varepsilon f(x) = \int_{|x-y|>\varepsilon} f(x-y)K(y)dy.$$

For $f \in L^p$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, the limit in (2) exists for almost all x . One says that the operator T is even (or odd) if the kernel (1) is even (or odd), that is, if $\Omega(-x) = \Omega(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ (or $\Omega(-x) = -\Omega(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$). Let T^* be the maximal singular integral

$$T^* f(x) = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} |T^\varepsilon f(x)|, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

In this paper we consider the problem of characterizing those smooth Calderón-Zygmund operators for which one can control $T^* f$ by Tf in the weighted L^p norm

$$\|T^* f\|_{L^p(\omega)} \leq C \|Tf\|_{L^p(\omega)}, \quad f \in L^p(\omega), \quad \text{and } \omega \in A_p, \quad (3)$$

where A_p is the Muckenhoupt class of weights (see below for the definition). A stronger way of saying that T^* is controlled by T is the pointwise inequality

$$T^* f(x) \leq C(M^s(Tf)(x)), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad s \in \{1, 2\}, \quad (4)$$

where M denotes the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator and $M^2 = M \circ M$ its iteration. For the case $p = 2$ and $\omega = 1$, the relationship between (3) and (4) has been studied in [MOV] for even kernels and in [MOPV] for odd kernels (see also [MV]). We will prove that, for any $1 < p < \infty$ and $\omega \in A_p$, the class of operators satisfying (3) coincides with the family of operators obtained for $p = 2$ and $\omega = 1$, thus giving an affirmative answer to Question 1 of [MOV, p. 1480]. Our main result states that for smooth Calderón-Zygmund operators, inequality (4) (with s depending on the parity of the kernel) is equivalent to (3) and also is equivalent to an algebraic condition involving the expansion of Ω in spherical harmonics.

Now we need to introduce some notation. The homogeneous function Ω , like any square-integrable function in S^{n-1} with zero integral, has an expansion in spherical harmonics of the form

$$\Omega(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} P_j(x), \quad x \in S^{n-1}, \quad (5)$$

where P_j is a homogeneous harmonic polynomial of degree j . For the case of even operators in the above sum we only have the even terms P_{2j} and for the odd case we only have the polynomials of odd degree P_{2j+1} . In any case, when Ω is infinitely differentiable on the unit sphere one has that, for each positive integer M ,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^M \|P_j\|_{\infty} < \infty, \quad (6)$$

where the supremum norm is taken on S^{n-1} . When Ω is of the form

$$\Omega(x) = \frac{P(x)}{|x|^d}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\},$$

with P a homogeneous harmonic polynomial of degree $d \geq 1$, one says that T is a higher order Riesz transform. If the homogeneous polynomial P is not required to be harmonic, but has still zero integral on the unit sphere, then we call T a polynomial operator.

Let's recall the definition of Muckenhoupt weights. Let ω be a non negative locally integrable function, and $1 < p < \infty$. Then $\omega \in A_p$ if and only if there exists a constant C such that for all cubes $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q \omega \right) \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q \omega^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \right)^{p-1} \leq C.$$

The important fact worth noting is that Calderón-Zygmund operators and the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator are bounded on $L^p(\omega)$, when $1 < p < \infty$ and ω belongs to A_p . See [Du, Chapter 7] or [Gr2, Chapter 9] to get more information on weights.

Now we state our result. We start with the case of even operators.

Theorem 1. *Let T be an even smooth homogeneous Calderón-Zygmund operator with kernel (1). Then the following are equivalent:*

(a)

$$T^* f(x) \leq CM(Tf)(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

(b) *If $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $\omega \in A_p$, then*

$$\|T^* f\|_{L^p(\omega)} \leq C \|Tf\|_{L^p(\omega)}, \quad \text{for all } f \in L^p(\omega).$$

(c) *Assume that the expansion (5) of Ω in spherical harmonics is*

$$\Omega(x) = \sum_{j=j_0}^{\infty} P_{2j}(x), \quad P_{2j_0} \neq 0.$$

Then, for each j there exists a homogeneous polynomial Q_{2j-2j_0} of degree $2j-2j_0$ such that $P_{2j} = P_{2j_0} Q_{2j-2j_0}$ and $\sum_{j=j_0}^{\infty} \gamma_{2j} Q_{2j-2j_0}(\xi) \neq 0$, $\xi \in S^{n-1}$. Here for a positive integer k we have set

$$\gamma_k = i^{-k} \pi^{\frac{n}{2}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{k}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n+k}{2})}. \quad (7)$$

(d)

$$\|T^* f\|_{1,\infty} \leq C \|Tf\|_1, \quad \text{for all } f \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Recall that $\|g\|_{1,\infty}$ denotes the weak L^1 norm of g and $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the Hardy space. Calderón-Zygmund operators act on H^1 . (For instance, see [Du, Chapter 6], [Gr2, Chapter 7] for more information on the Hardy space).

To get the above result for odd kernels we will replace the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator in (a) by its iteration.

Theorem 2. *Let T be an odd smooth homogeneous Calderón-Zygmund operator with kernel (1). Then the following are equivalent:*

(a)

$$T^* f(x) \leq CM^2(Tf)(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

(b) *If $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $\omega \in A_p$ then*

$$\|T^* f\|_{L^p(\omega)} \leq C \|Tf\|_{L^p(\omega)}, \quad \text{for all } f \in L^p(\omega).$$

(c) *Assume that the expansion (5) of Ω in spherical harmonics is*

$$\Omega(x) = \sum_{j=j_0}^{\infty} P_{2j+1}(x), \quad P_{2j_0+1} \neq 0.$$

Then, for each j there exists a homogeneous polynomial Q_{2j-2j_0} of degree $2j-2j_0$ such that $P_{2j+1} = P_{2j_0+1}Q_{2j-2j_0}$ and $\sum_{j=j_0}^{\infty} \gamma_{2j+1}Q_{2j-2j_0}(\xi) \neq 0$, $\xi \in S^{n-1}$, with γ_{2j+1} as in (7).

Clearly, both in Theorem 1 as in Theorem 2, the condition (a) implies (b) is a consequence of the boundedness of the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator on weighted L^p spaces. The proof of (c) implies (a) in Theorem 1 is proved in [MOV] and the same implication in Theorem 2 is proved in [MOPV]. So the only task to be done is to show that (b) implies (c) in both theorems (and (d) \Rightarrow (c) in Theorem 1). One of the crucial points in the proof of the implication (b) \Rightarrow (c) for the case $p = 2$ and $\omega = 1$ in [MOV] and [MOPV] is to use Plancherel Theorem to get a pointwise inequality to work with it. For $p \neq 2$ we will get the corresponding pointwise inequality using properties of the Fourier transform of the kernels as L^p multipliers.

In Section 2 we introduce L^p Fourier multipliers and some tools to control their norm (see Lemma 1). Section 3 is devoted to the proof of (b) \Rightarrow (c), for polynomial operators. The general case is discussed in Section 4.

As usual, the letter C will denote a constant, which may be different at each occurrence and which is independent of the relevant variables under consideration.

2 Multipliers

Recall that, given $1 \leq p < \infty$, one denotes by $\mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the space of all bounded functions m on \mathbb{R}^n such that the operator

$$T_m(f) = (\hat{f} m)^\vee, \quad f \in \mathcal{S},$$

is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (or is initially defined in a dense subspace of $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and has a bounded extension on the whole space). As usual, \mathcal{S} denotes the space of Schwartz

functions, \hat{f} is the Fourier transform of f and f^\vee the inverse Fourier transform. The norm of m in $\mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is defined as the norm of the bounded linear operator $T_m : L^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Elements of the space $\mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are called L^p (Fourier) multipliers. Similarly, we speak of $L^p(\omega)$ multipliers. It is well known that \mathcal{M}_2 , the set of all L^2 multipliers, is L^∞ and that $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the set of Fourier transforms of finite Borel measures on \mathbb{R}^n . The basic theory on multipliers may be found for example in the monographs [Du],[Gr1].

Let $0 \leq \phi \leq 1$ be a smooth function such that $\phi(\xi) = 1$ if $|\xi| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and $\phi(\xi) = 0$ if $|\xi| \geq 1$. Given $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define $\phi_\delta(\xi) = \phi(\frac{\xi - \xi_0}{\delta})$. Consider $m \in L^\infty$ such that m is continuous in some neighbourhood of ξ_0 with $m(\xi_0) = 0$. It is clear, by Plancherel Theorem, that the norm of $m\phi_\delta$ in \mathcal{M}_2 approaches zero when $\delta \rightarrow 0$. We ask if the same result holds when m is an L^p multiplier. Adding some regularity to m we get a positive answer.

Lemma 1. *Let $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}_p \cap C^n(B(\xi_0, \delta_0))$ with $m(\xi_0) = 0$. Let $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $0 \leq \phi \leq 1$ such that $\phi(\xi) = 1$ if $|\xi| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and $\phi(\xi) = 0$ if $|\xi| \geq 1$. Set $\phi_\delta(\xi) = \phi(\frac{\xi - \xi_0}{\delta})$ and let $T_{m\phi_\delta}$ be the operator with multiplier $m\phi_\delta$.*

1. *If $\omega \in A_p$, $1 < p < \infty$, then $\|T_{m\phi_\delta}\|_{L^p(\omega) \rightarrow L^p(\omega)} \rightarrow 0$, when $\delta \rightarrow 0$.*
2. *$\|T_{m\phi_\delta}\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^{1,\infty}} \rightarrow 0$, when $\delta \rightarrow 0$.*
3. *$\|T_{m\phi_\delta}\|_{H^1 \rightarrow L^1} \rightarrow 0$, when $\delta \rightarrow 0$.*

To prove Lemma 1, we use the next theorem due to Kurtz and Wheeden. Following [KW], we say that a function m belongs to the class $M(s, l)$ if

$$m_{s,l} := \sup_{R>0} \left(R^{s|\alpha|-n} \int_{R<|x|<2R} |D^\alpha m(x)|^s dx \right)^{1/s} < +\infty, \text{ for all } |\alpha| \leq l, \quad (8)$$

where s is a real number greater or equal to 1, l a positive integer and $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ a multiindex of nonnegative integers.

Theorem 3. [KW, p. 344] *Let $1 < s \leq 2$ and $m \in M(s, n)$.*

1. *If $1 < p < \infty$ and $\omega \in A_p$, then there exists a constant C , independent of f , such that*

$$\|T_m f\|_{L^p(\omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^p(\omega)}.$$

2. *There exists a constant C , independent of f and λ , such that*

$$|\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |T_m f(x)| > \lambda\}| \leq \frac{C}{\lambda} \|f\|_{L^1}, \quad \lambda > 0.$$

3. *There exists a constant C , independent of f , such that*

$$\|T_m f\|_{L^1} \leq C \|f\|_{H^1}.$$

Analyzing the proof we check that, in all cases, the constant C , which appears in the statements 1, 2 and 3 of the previous Theorem, depends linearly on the constant $m_{s,n}$ defined at (8). We also remark that when $\omega = 1$ the proof can be adapted to the case $H^1 \rightarrow L^1$, so we get statement 3 which is not explicitly written in [KW].

Proof of Lemma 1. Using Theorem 3 we only need to prove that the multiplier $m\phi_\delta$ is in $M(s, n)$ for some $1 < s \leq 2$, and the constant $m_{s,n}$ tends to 0 if δ tends to 0.

Assume that $\xi_0 \neq 0$ and that $\delta < \delta_0$ is small enough. For $|\alpha| \leq n$, using Leibniz rule one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{R>0} \left(R^{s|\alpha|-n} \int_{R<|\xi|<2R} |D^\alpha(m\phi_\delta)(\xi)|^s d\xi \right)^{1/s} \\ &= \sup_{R>0} \left(R^{s|\alpha|-n} \int_{\{R<|\xi|<2R\} \cap B(\xi_0, \delta)} |D^\alpha(m\phi_\delta)(\xi)|^s d\xi \right)^{1/s} \\ &\leq C|\xi_0|^{|\alpha|-\frac{n}{s}} \left(\int_{B(\xi_0, \delta)} |D^\alpha(m\phi_\delta)(\xi)|^s d\xi \right)^{1/s} \\ &\leq C|\xi_0|^{|\alpha|-\frac{n}{s}} \left(\sum_{\substack{\beta_i \leq \alpha_i, \\ 1 \leq i \leq n}} \binom{\alpha_1}{\beta_1} \binom{\alpha_2}{\beta_2} \cdots \binom{\alpha_n}{\beta_n} \int_{B(\xi_0, \delta)} |D^{\alpha-\beta}(m)(\xi) D^\beta(\phi_\delta)(\xi)|^s d\xi \right)^{1/s}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we will get a bound for each term in the above sum. In order to get it, we consider different cases. In all the cases we will use that for any multiindex α we have $|D^\alpha \phi_\delta(\xi)| \lesssim \frac{1}{\delta^{|\alpha|}}$ and that the modulus of continuity of m , denoted by $\omega(m, \xi_0, \delta)$, satisfies $\omega(m, \xi_0, \delta) \leq C\delta$.

Case 1. $|\alpha| = n$.

For $\beta = \alpha$ one has that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(\xi_0, \delta)} |D^{\alpha-\beta}(m)(\xi) D^\beta(\phi_\delta)(\xi)|^s d\xi &= \int_{B(\xi_0, \delta)} |m(\xi)|^s |D^\alpha(\phi_\delta)(\xi)|^s d\xi \\ &\leq C \frac{1}{\delta^{ns}} |\omega(m, \xi_0, \delta)|^s \delta^n \\ &\leq C \delta^{s+n-ns} \end{aligned}$$

and this term tends to 0 as δ tends to 0 taking $1 < s < \frac{n}{n-1}$. For the remaining terms, that is $\alpha \neq \beta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(\xi_0, \delta)} |D^{\alpha-\beta}(m)(\xi) D^\beta(\phi_\delta)(\xi)|^s d\xi &\leq C \frac{1}{\delta^{|\beta|s}} \delta^n \\ &= C \delta^{n-s|\beta|} \\ &\leq C \delta^{s+n-ns}, \end{aligned}$$

where the derivatives of m are bounded by a constant, and the last inequality holds when δ is small enough. So, if $1 < s < \frac{n}{n-1}$, this term goes to 0 as δ goes to 0.

Case 2. $|\alpha| = k < n$.

For $|\beta| = |\alpha|$, using the boundedness of the modulus of continuity of m we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(\xi_0, \delta)} |D^{\alpha-\beta}(m)(\xi)D^\beta(\phi_\delta)(\xi)|^s d\xi &= \int_{B(\xi_0, \delta)} |m(\xi)|^s |D^\alpha(\phi_\delta)(\xi)|^s d\xi \\ &\leq C \frac{1}{\delta^{ks}} |\omega(m, \xi_0, \delta)|^s \delta^n \\ &= C \delta^{s+n-ks} \\ &\leq C \delta^{s+n-ns} \end{aligned}$$

and this term, again, goes to 0 as δ goes to 0, whenever $1 < s < \frac{n}{n-1}$.

Finally, if $|\beta| < |\alpha|$, one gets the same bound

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(\xi_0, \delta)} |D^{\alpha-\beta}(m)(\xi)D^\beta(\phi_\delta)(\xi)|^s d\xi &\leq C \frac{1}{\delta^{|\beta|s}} \delta^n \\ &= C \delta^{n-s|\beta|} \\ &\leq C \delta^{s+n-ns}. \end{aligned}$$

When $\xi_0 = 0$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{R>0} \left(R^{s|\alpha|-n} \int_{R<|\xi|<2R} |D^\alpha(m\phi_\delta)(\xi)|^s d\xi \right)^{1/s} \\ &= \sup_{\delta \geq R > 0} \left(R^{s|\alpha|-n} \int_{R<|\xi|<2R} |D^\alpha(m\phi_\delta)(\xi)|^s d\xi \right)^{1/s}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that for $|\alpha| > 0$, $D^\alpha \phi_\delta$ lives on $\{\delta/2 \leq |\xi| \leq \delta\}$. Then, similar calculations complete the proof. \square

To prove the first case of Lemma 1 there is another argument due to J. Duoandikoetxea. We thank him for providing us the following lemma. In fact, it is only necessary to assume that the multiplier m is continuous.

Lemma 2. *Let $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$, $1 < q < 2$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}_q \cap \mathcal{C}(B(\xi_0, \delta_0))$ with $m(\xi_0) = 0$. Set $\phi_\delta(\xi)$ as above and let $T_{m\phi_\delta}$ be the operator with multiplier $m\phi_\delta$.*

(a) *For any $p \in (q, 2)$ we have*

$$\|T_{m\phi_\delta}\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \longrightarrow 0, \quad \text{when } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

(b) *Let $\omega \in A_p$ with $p \in (q, 2)$ and let $s > 1$ such that $\omega^s \in A_p$. If m is an $L^p(\omega^s)$ multiplier, then*

$$\|T_{m\phi_\delta}\|_{L^p(\omega) \rightarrow L^p(\omega)} \longrightarrow 0, \quad \text{when } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

Remark 1. Clearly, a similar result holds when $2 < p < q$.

Proof. We first observe that $\|T_{m\phi_\delta}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} = \|m\phi_\delta\|_\infty = \varepsilon(\delta)$ and $\varepsilon(\delta) \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ since m is continuous in ξ_0 . On the other hand, $\|m\phi_\delta\|_{\mathcal{M}_q} \leq \|\phi_\delta^\vee\|_{L^1} \|m\|_{\mathcal{M}_q} = C\|m\|_{\mathcal{M}_q}$, where C is a constant independent of δ . That is, for all $\delta > 0$

$$\|T_{m\phi_\delta}f\|_q \leq M\|f\|_q$$

Then, applying the Riesz-Thorin theorem (e.g. [Gr1, p. 34]), for any $p \in (q, 2)$ ($\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1-\theta}{2} + \frac{\theta}{q}$) we have

$$\|T_{m\phi_\delta}f\|_p \leq M^{1-\theta} \varepsilon(\delta)^\theta \|f\|_p = \varepsilon_1(\delta) \|f\|_p, \quad (9)$$

where $\varepsilon_1(\delta) \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and (a) is proved. For proving (b), since $\omega^s \in A_p$ and ϕ_δ is a cutoff smooth function, note that

$$\|T_{m\phi_\delta}f\|_{L^p(\omega^s)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^p(\omega^s)}, \quad (10)$$

where one can check that C is a constant independent of δ . Finally, from (9) and (10), applying the interpolation theorem with change of measure of Stein-Weiss (e.g. [BeL, p. 115]), we get

$$\|T_{m\phi_\delta}f\|_{L^p(\omega)} \leq C^{1/s} \varepsilon_1(\delta)^{1-1/s} \|f\|_{L^p(\omega)}$$

as desired. \square

3 The polynomial case

As we remarked in the Introduction, to have a complete proof of theorems 1 and 2 only remains to prove that (b) implies (c) (and (d) implies (c) in Theorem 1). Our procedure to get the above implications follows essentially the arguments used in [MOV] and [MOPV]. The main difficulty to overcome is that for $p \neq 2$, we cannot apply Plancherel Theorem and we replace it by a Fourier multiplier argument.

We begin with the proof of (b) implies (c) in Theorem 1 for the case $\omega = 1$. Then we show how to adapt this proof to the case with weights, to the case of odd operators and to the case of weak L^1 . Thus, we assume that T is an even polynomial operator with kernel

$$K(x) = \frac{\Omega(x)}{|x|^n} = \frac{P_2(x)}{|x|^{2+n}} + \frac{P_4(x)}{|x|^{4+n}} + \dots + \frac{P_{2N}(x)}{|x|^{2N+n}}, \quad x \neq 0,$$

where P_{2j} is a homogeneous harmonic polynomial of degree $2j$. Each term has the multiplier (see [St, p. 73])

$$\left(\text{p.v.} \frac{P_{2j}(x)}{|x|^{2j+n}} \right)^\wedge (\xi) = \gamma_{2j} \frac{P_{2j}(\xi)}{|\xi|^{2j+n}},$$

Then,

$$\widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi) = \frac{Q(\xi)}{|\xi|^{2N}}, \quad \xi \neq 0,$$

where Q is the homogeneous polynomial of degree $2N$ defined by

$$Q(x) = \gamma_2 P_2(x) |x|^{2N-2} + \dots + \gamma_{2j} P_{2j}(x) |x|^{2N-2j} + \dots + \gamma_{2N} P_{2N}(x).$$

We want to obtain a convenient expression for the function $K(x)\chi_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B}}$, the kernel K off the unit ball B (see (12)). To find it, we need a simple technical lemma which we state without proof.

Lemma 3. [MOV, p. 1435] *Assume that φ is a radial function of the form*

$$\varphi(x) = \varphi_1(|x|)\chi_B(x) + \varphi_2(|x|)\chi_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B}}(x),$$

where φ_1 is continuously differentiable on $[0, 1)$ and φ_2 on $(1, \infty)$. Let L be a second order linear differential operator with constant coefficients. Then the distribution $L\varphi$ satisfies

$$L\varphi = L\varphi(x)\chi_B(x) + L\varphi(x)\chi_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B}}(x),$$

provided $\varphi_1, \varphi_1', \varphi_2$ and φ_2' extend continuously to the point 1 and the two conditions

$$\varphi_1(1) = \varphi_2(1), \quad \varphi_1'(1) = \varphi_2'(1)$$

are satisfied.

Consider the differential operator $Q(\partial)$ defined by the polynomial $Q(x)$ above and let E be the standard fundamental solution of the N -th power Δ^N of the Laplacian. Then $Q(\partial)E = \text{p.v.}K(x)$, which may be verified by taking the Fourier transform of both sides. The concrete expression of $E(x) = |x|^{2N-n}(a(n, N) + b(n, N) \log |x|^2)$ (e.g. [MOV, p. 1464]) is not important now, just note that it is a radial function. Consider the function

$$\varphi(x) = E(x)\chi_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B}}(x) + (A_0 + A_1|x|^2 + \dots + A_{2N-1}|x|^{4N-2})\chi_B(x),$$

where B is the open ball of radius 1 centered at origin and the constants $A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{2N-1}$ are chosen as follows. Since $\varphi(x)$ is radial, the same is true for $\Delta^j \varphi$ if j is a positive integer. Thus, in order to apply N times Lemma 3, one needs $2N$ conditions, which (uniquely) determine $A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{2N-1}$. Therefore, for some constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{N-1}$,

$$\Delta^N \varphi = (\alpha_0 + \alpha_1|x|^2 + \dots + \alpha_{N-1}|x|^{2(N-1)})\chi_B(x) = b(x), \quad (11)$$

where the last identity is the definition of b . Let's remark that b is a bounded function supported in the unit ball and it only depends on N and not on the kernel K . Since

$$\varphi = E * \Delta^N \varphi,$$

taking derivatives of both sides we obtain

$$Q(\partial)\varphi = Q(\partial)E * \Delta^N \varphi = \text{p.v.}K(x) * b = T(b).$$

On the other hand, applying Lemma 3,

$$Q(\partial)\varphi = K(x)\chi_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B}}(x) + Q(\partial)(A_0 + A_1|x|^2 + \dots + A_{2N-1}|x|^{4N-2})(x)\chi_B(x).$$

We write

$$S(x) := -Q(\partial)(A_0 + A_1|x|^2 + \dots + A_{2N-1}|x|^{4N-2})(x),$$

and we get

$$K(x)\chi_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B}}(x) = T(b)(x) + S(x)\chi_B(x). \quad (12)$$

Let's remark that S will be null when Q is a harmonic polynomial (see [MOV, p. 1437]). Consequently

$$T^1 f = T(b) * f + S\chi_B * f.$$

Our assumption is the L^p estimate between T^* and T . Since the truncated operator T^1 at level 1 is obviously dominated by T^* , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|S\chi_B * f\|_p &\leq \|T^1 f\|_p + \|Tb * f\|_p \\ &\leq \|T^* f\|_p + \|b * Tf\|_p \\ &\leq C\|Tf\|_p + \|b\|_1 \|Tf\|_p \\ &= C\|Tf\|_p, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

that is, for any $f \in L^p$

$$\|S\chi_B * f\|_p \leq C\|\text{p.v.}K * f\|_p. \quad (14)$$

If $p = 2$, we can use Plancherel and this L^2 inequality translates into a pointwise inequality between the Fourier multipliers:

$$|\widehat{S\chi_B}(\xi)| \leq C|\widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi)| = \frac{Q(\xi)}{|\xi|^{2N}}, \quad \xi \neq 0. \quad (15)$$

If $p \neq 2$ we must resort to Fourier multipliers to get (15). We observe that the multipliers we are dealing with, $\widehat{S\chi_B}$ and $\widehat{\text{p.v.}K}$, are in $C^\infty \setminus \{0\}$ and in \mathcal{M}_p . Let $\xi_0 \neq 0$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{S\chi_B}(\xi) &= \widehat{S\chi_B}(\xi)(\xi_0) + E_1(\xi) \quad \text{with} \quad E_1(\xi) = \widehat{S\chi_B}(\xi) - \widehat{S\chi_B}(\xi_0) \\ \widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi) &= \widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi_0) + E_2(\xi) \quad \text{with} \quad E_2(\xi) = \widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi) - \widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi_0) \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\|\text{p.v.}K * f\|_p \leq |\widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi_0)| \|f\|_p + \|T_{E_2} f\|_p, \quad (16)$$

$$\|S\chi_B * f\|_p \geq |\widehat{S\chi_B}(\xi_0)| \|f\|_p - \|T_{E_1} f\|_p, \quad (17)$$

where T_{E_i} denotes the operator with multiplier E_i ($i = 1, 2$). Using (17), (14) and (16) consecutively, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{S\chi_B}(\xi_0)| \|f\|_p - \|T_{E_1}f\|_p &\leq \|S\chi_B * f\|_p \\ &\leq C\|\text{p.v.}K * f\|_p \\ &\leq C(|\widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi_0)| \|f\|_p + \|T_{E_2}f\|_p) \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$|\widehat{S\chi_B}(\xi_0)| \leq C \left(|\widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi_0)| + \frac{\|T_{E_2}f\|_p}{\|f\|_p} + \frac{\|T_{E_1}f\|_p}{\|f\|_p} \right), \quad \xi_0 \neq 0. \quad (18)$$

Now, choosing appropriate functions in (18) we obtain the pointwise inequality. Let $\phi_\delta(\xi) = \phi(\frac{\xi - \xi_0}{\delta})$ as in Lemma 1 and define $g_\delta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by $\widehat{g_\delta}(\xi) = \phi_\delta(\xi)$. Then $T_{E_j}g_\delta = T_{E_j}(g_{2\delta} * g_\delta) = T_{E_j\phi_{2\delta}}(g_\delta)$, because $\phi_{2\delta} = 1$ on the support of ϕ_δ . Changing f by g_δ in (18) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{S\chi_B}(\xi_0)| &\leq C \left(|\widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi_0)| + \frac{\|T_{E_2\phi_{2\delta}}g_\delta\|_p}{\|g_\delta\|_p} + \frac{\|T_{E_1\phi_{2\delta}}g_\delta\|_p}{\|g_\delta\|_p} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(|\widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi_0)| + \|T_{E_2\phi_{2\delta}}\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} + \|T_{E_1\phi_{2\delta}}\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 1 to the multipliers E_j we prove that the two last terms tend to zero as δ tends to zero. So, for $\omega = 1$, we get (15) and from here we would follow the arguments in [MOV, p. 1457].

For the weighted case we must be careful with the inequalities in (13). In general, the inequality $\|f * F\|_{L^p(\omega)} \leq C\|f\|_1\|F\|_{L^p(\omega)}$ is not satisfied. That is, we can not control $\|b * Tf\|_{L^p(\omega)}$ by a constant times $\|b\|_1\|Tf\|_{L^p(\omega)}$. However, in the even case b is a bounded function supported in the unit ball and so

$$|(b * Tf)(x)| = \left| \int_{|x-y|<1} b(x-y)Tf(y) dy \right| \leq CM(Tf)(x).$$

Moreover

$$\|b * Tf\|_{L^p(\omega)} \leq C\|Tf\|_{L^p(\omega)},$$

because $\omega \in A_p$. So, $\|S\chi_B * f\|_{L^p(\omega)} \leq C\|\text{p.v.}K * f\|_{L^p(\omega)}$ and proceeding as above, we would get (15).

The proof of (b) implies (c) in Theorem 2 can be handled in much the same way. The only significant difference, because now the polynomial is odd, lies on the function b in (12), which is not supported in the unit ball but it is a BMO function satisfying the decay $|b(x)| \leq C|x|^{-n-1}$ if $|x| > 2$ (see [MOPV, section 4]). In any case, $b \in L^1$ and the set of inequalities (13) remains valid for the case $\omega = 1$.

On the other hand, for any ω in the Muckenhoupt class we write, arguing as in [MOPV, p. 3675],

$$\begin{aligned} |(b * Tf)(x)| &= \left| \int_{|x-y|<2} (b(x-y) - b_{B(0,2)})Tf(y) dy \right| + \\ &\quad + |b_{B(0,2)}| \int_{|x-y|<2} |Tf(y)| dy + \int_{|x-y|>2} |b(x-y)| |Tf(y)| dy \\ &= I + II + III, \end{aligned}$$

where $b_{B(0,2)} = |B(0,2)|^{-1} \int_{B(0,2)} b$. To estimate the local term I we use the generalized Hölder's inequality and the pointwise equivalence $M_{L(\log L)}f(x) \simeq M^2f(x)$ ([P]) to get

$$|I| \leq C \|b\|_{BMO} \|Tf\|_{L(\log L), B(x,2)} \leq CM^2(Tf)(x).$$

Notice that $b_{B(0,2)}$ is a dimensional constant. Hence

$$|II| \leq CM(Tf)(x).$$

Finally, from the decay of b we obtain

$$|III| \leq C \int_{|x-y|>2} \frac{|Tf(y)|}{|x-y|^{n+1}} dy \leq CM(Tf)(x),$$

by using a standard argument which consists in estimating the integral on the annuli $\{2^k \leq |x-y| < 2^{k+1}\}$. Therefore

$$|(b * Tf)(x)| \leq CM^2(Tf)(x). \quad (19)$$

So, we obtain

$$\|b * Tf\|_{L^p(\omega)} \leq C \|Tf\|_{L^p(\omega)},$$

because $\omega \in A_p$. Then, $\|S\chi_B * f\|_{L^p(\omega)} \leq C \|p.v.K * f\|_{L^p(\omega)}$ and we get (15).

It remains to prove that (d) implies (c) in Theorem 1. To get this implication we need to precise some properties of the functions g_δ that we explain below. First of all, note that $g_\delta(x) = e^{ix\xi_0} \delta^n g(\delta x)$ where $\hat{g} = \phi$. So it is clear that the norms $\|g_\delta\|_1 = \|g\|_1$ and $\|g_\delta\|_{1,\infty} = \|g\|_{1,\infty}$ do not depend on the parameter $\delta > 0$. When $\delta < |\xi_0|$, since $\int g_\delta(x) dx = \phi_\delta(0) = 0$ and $g_\delta \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have that $g_\delta \in H^1$. But, some computations are required to check that $\|g_\delta\|_{H^1} \leq C$ with constant C independent of δ .

Lemma 4. *When $0 < \delta < |\xi_0|$, $\|g_\delta\|_{H^1} \leq C$ with constant C independent of δ .*

Proof. We have $g_\delta(x) = e^{ix\xi_0} \delta^n g(\delta x)$ with $g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\int g_\delta = 0$. Set $F_0^\delta(x) = \chi_{B(0,\delta^{-1})}(x)$ and, for $j \geq 1$, $F_j^\delta(x) = \chi_{B(0,2^j\delta^{-1})}(x) - \chi_{B(0,2^{j-1}\delta^{-1})}(x)$. Note that

$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} F_j^\delta(x) \equiv 1$. Consider the atomic decomposition of g_δ

$$\begin{aligned} g_\delta(x) &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (g_\delta(x) - c_j^\delta) F_j^\delta(x) + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} [(c_j^\delta + d_j^\delta) F_j^\delta(x) - d_{j+1}^\delta F_{j+1}^\delta(x)] \\ &:= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j^\delta(x) + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} A_j^\delta(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $c_j^\delta = \frac{\int g_\delta F_j^\delta}{\int F_j^\delta}$, $d_0^\delta = 0$ and $d_{j+1}^\delta = \frac{\int g_\delta (F_0^\delta + \dots + F_j^\delta)}{\int F_{j+1}^\delta}$, so that $\int a_j^\delta(x) dx = \int A_j^\delta(x) dx = 0$. Note that a_j^δ is supported in the ball $B(0, 2^j \delta^{-1})$ and A_j^δ is supported in $B(0, 2^{j+1} \delta^{-1})$.

Since $g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ we have $(1 + |z|^{n+1})|g(z)| \leq C$. Then

$$|g_\delta(x) F_j^\delta(x)| = \delta^n |g(\delta x)| F_j^\delta(x) \leq \delta^n \sup_{|z| \sim 2^j} |g(z)| \leq C \left(\frac{\delta}{2^j} \right)^n 2^{-j} = \frac{C 2^{-j}}{|B(0, 2^j \delta^{-1})|}$$

and therefore

$$|c_j^\delta| = \left| \frac{\int g_\delta F_j^\delta}{\int F_j^\delta} \right| \leq \frac{C 2^{-j}}{|B(0, 2^j \delta^{-1})|}.$$

On the other hand, $\int g_\delta (F_0^\delta + \dots + F_j^\delta) = \int_{|x| \geq 2^j \delta^{-1}} g_\delta(x) dx$, because $\int g_\delta = 0$, and so

$$d_{j+1}^\delta = \frac{\int_{|x| \geq 2^j \delta^{-1}} g_\delta(x) dx}{\int F_{j+1}^\delta} \leq \frac{\int_{|z| \geq 2^j} |g(z)| dz}{|B(0, 2^{j+1} \delta^{-1})|} \leq \frac{C 2^{-j}}{|B(0, 2^{j+1} \delta^{-1})|}.$$

Consequently

$$\|a_j^\delta\|_{H^1} \leq \frac{C}{2^j} \quad \text{and} \quad \|A_j^\delta\|_{H^1} \leq \frac{C}{2^j}.$$

Therefore, for all $\delta \in (0, |\xi_0|)$, $\|g_\delta\|_{H^1} \leq C$ as we claimed. □

Finally, for functions f in H^1 , and again using (12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|S\chi_B * f\|_{1,\infty} &\leq 2(\|T^1 f\|_{1,\infty} + \|Tb * f\|_{1,\infty}) \\ &\leq C(\|T^* f\|_{1,\infty} + \|b * T f\|_1) \\ &\leq C\|T f\|_1 + \|b\|_1 \|T f\|_1 \\ &= C\|T f\|_1 = C\|\text{p.v.}K * f\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $\xi_0 \neq 0$ and using the same notation as before, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{p.v.}K * f\|_1 &\leq |\widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi_0)| \|f\|_1 + \|T_{E_2} f\|_1, \\ \|S\chi_B * f\|_{1,\infty} &\geq \frac{1}{2} |\widehat{S\chi_B}(\xi_0)| \|f\|_{1,\infty} - \|T_{E_1} f\|_{1,\infty} \end{aligned}$$

and consequently

$$|\widehat{S\chi_B}(\xi_0)| \leq C \left(|\widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi_0)| \frac{\|f\|_1}{\|f\|_{1,\infty}} + \frac{\|T_{E_2}f\|_1}{\|f\|_{1,\infty}} + \frac{\|T_{E_1}f\|_{1,\infty}}{\|f\|_{1,\infty}} \right), \quad \xi_0 \neq 0.$$

Replacing f by g_δ and using the properties of g_δ (that is, $\|g_\delta\|_1 = \|g\|_1$, $\|g_\delta\|_{1,\infty} = \|g\|_{1,\infty}$ and Lemma 4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{S\chi_B}(\xi_0)| &\leq C \left(|\widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi_0)| \frac{\|g_\delta\|_1}{\|g_\delta\|_{1,\infty}} + \frac{\|T_{E_2\phi_{2\delta}}g_\delta\|_1}{\|g_\delta\|_{1,\infty}} + \frac{\|T_{E_1\phi_{2\delta}}g_\delta\|_{1,\infty}}{\|g_\delta\|_{1,\infty}} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(|\widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi_0)| \frac{\|g\|_1}{\|g\|_{1,\infty}} + \frac{\|T_{E_2\phi_{2\delta}}\|_{H^1 \rightarrow L^1} \|g_\delta\|_{H^1}}{\|g_\delta\|_{1,\infty}} + \frac{\|T_{E_1\phi_{2\delta}}\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^{1,\infty}} \|g_\delta\|_1}{\|g_\delta\|_{1,\infty}} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(|\widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi_0)| + \|T_{E_2\phi_{2\delta}}\|_{H^1 \rightarrow L^1} + \|T_{E_1\phi_{2\delta}}\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^{1,\infty}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and therefore, applying Lemma 1 on the right hand side of this inequality, we get

$$|\widehat{S\chi_B}(\xi_0)| \leq C |\widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi_0)| \quad \xi_0 \neq 0$$

as desired.

4 The general case

In our procedure for the polynomial case, the function b has been crucial. It provides a convenient way to express the function $K(x)\chi_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B}}$, where K is the kernel of the operator T . As we mentioned before, b only depends on the degree of the homogeneous polynomial and on the space \mathbb{R}^n . In the even case $2N$ (see (11)), $b = b_{2N}$ is the restriction to the unit ball of some polynomial of degree $2N - 2$. In the odd case $2N + 1$, b_{2N+1} is a BMO function with certain decay at infinity. Until now, we did not need to pay attention to the size of the parameters appearing in the definition of b because the degree of the polynomial (either $2N$ or $2N + 1$) was fixed. In this section we require a control of the L^1 , L^∞ or BMO norms of b , as well as its decay at infinity. We summarize all we need in next lemma.

Lemma 5. *There exists a constant C depending only on n such that*

- (i) $|\widehat{b_{2N}}(\xi)| \leq C$ and $|\widehat{b_{2N+1}}(\xi)| \leq C$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
- (ii) $\|b_{2N}\|_{L^\infty(B)} \leq C(2N)^{2n+2}$ and $\|\nabla b_{2N}\|_{L^\infty(B)} \leq C(2N)^{2n+4}$.
- (iii) $\|b_{2N+1}\|_{\text{BMO}} \leq C(2N+1)^{2n}$ and $\|b_{2N+1}\|_{L^2} \leq C(2N+1)^{2n}$.
- (iv) If $|x| > 2$ then $|b_{2N+1}(x)| \leq C(2N+1)^{2n}|x|^{-n-1}$.

Proof. Parts (i), (ii) and (iii) are proved in [MOV, Lemma 8] and [MOPV, Lemma 5]. It only remains to prove (iv).

Recall that σ denotes the normalized surface measure in S^{n-1} , and let h_1, \dots, h_d be an orthonormal basis of the subspace of $L^2(d\sigma)$ consisting of all homogeneous harmonic polynomials of degree $2N+1$. As it is well known, $d \simeq (2N+1)^{n-2}$. As in the proof of Lemma 6 in [MOV] we have $h_1^2 + \dots + h_d^2 = d$, on S^{n-1} . Set

$$H_j(x) = \frac{1}{\gamma_{2N+1} \sqrt{d}} h_j(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

and let S_j be the higher order Riesz transform with kernel $K_j(x) = H_j(x)/|x|^{2N+1+n}$. The Fourier multiplier of S_j^2 is

$$\frac{1}{d} \frac{h_j(\xi)^2}{|\xi|^{4N+2}}, \quad 0 \neq \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

and thus

$$\sum_{j=1}^d S_j^2 = \text{Identity}. \quad (20)$$

We use again (12), but now the second term at the right hand side vanishes because each h_j is harmonic (see [MOV], p. 1437). We get

$$K_j(x) \chi_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B}}(x) = S_j(b_{2N+1})(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad 1 \leq j \leq d,$$

and so by (20)

$$b_{2N+1} = \sum_{j=1}^d S_j \left(K_j(x) \chi_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B}}(x) \right). \quad (21)$$

Therefore we set

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^d S_j \left(K_j(x) \chi_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B}}(x) \right) &= \sum_{j=1}^d S_j * S_j - \sum_{j=1}^d S_j (K_j(x) \chi_B(x)) \\ &= \delta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^d S_j (K_j(x) \chi_B(x)), \end{aligned}$$

where δ_0 is the Dirac delta at the origin. If $|x| > 2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} S_j(K_j(y) \chi_B(y))(x) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\varepsilon < |y| < 1} K_j(x-y) K_j(y) dy \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\varepsilon < |y| < 1} (K_j(x-y) - K_j(x)) K_j(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

In this situation,

$$|K_j(x - y) - K_j(x)| \leq C \frac{|y|}{|x|^{n+1}} (\|H_j\|_\infty (2N + 1) + \|\nabla H_j\|_\infty),$$

hence

$$|S_j(K_j(y) \chi_B(y))(x)| \leq C \frac{\|H_j\|_\infty (2N + 1) + \|\nabla H_j\|_\infty}{|x|^{n+1}} \int_{|y| < 1} \frac{\|H_j\|_\infty}{|y|^{n-1}} dy$$

where the supremum norms are taken on S^{n-1} . Clearly

$$\|H_j\|_\infty = \frac{1}{\gamma_{2N+1}} \left\| \frac{h_j}{\sqrt{d}} \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{\gamma_{2N+1}} \simeq (2N + 1)^{n/2}.$$

For the estimate of the gradient of H_j we use the inequality [St, p. 276]

$$\|\nabla H_j\|_\infty \leq C (2N + 1)^{n/2+1} \|H_j\|_2,$$

where the L^2 norm is taken with respect to $d\sigma$. Since the h_j are an orthonormal system,

$$\|H_j\|_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d} \gamma_{2N+1}} \simeq \frac{(2N + 1)^{n/2}}{(2N + 1)^{(n-2)/2}} \simeq 2N + 1.$$

Gathering the above inequalities we get, when $|x| > 2$,

$$|S_j(K_j(y) \chi_B(y))(x)| \leq C \frac{(2N + 1)^{n+2}}{|x|^{n+1}}$$

and finally

$$|b_{2N+1}(x)| \leq Cd \frac{(2N + 1)^{n+2}}{|x|^{n+1}} \leq C \frac{(2N + 1)^{2n}}{|x|^{n+1}},$$

as claimed. □

Now, the kernel of the operator $Tf = \text{p.v.} K * f$ is of the type $K(x) = \frac{\Omega(x)}{|x|^n}$ being Ω a $C^\infty(S^{n-1})$ homogeneous function of degree 0, with vanishing integral on the sphere. Then, $\Omega(x) = \sum_{j \geq 1}^\infty \frac{P_{2j}(x)}{|x|^{2j}}$ with P_{2j} homogeneous harmonic polynomials of degree $2j$ when T is an even operator, and $\Omega(x) = \sum_{j \geq 0}^\infty \frac{P_{2j+1}(x)}{|x|^{2j+1}}$ with P_{2j+1} homogeneous harmonic polynomials of degree $2j + 1$ when T is an odd operator. The strategy consists in passing to the polynomial case by looking at a partial sum of the series above. Set, for each $N \geq 1$, $K_N(x) = \frac{\Omega_N(x)}{|x|^n}$, where $\Omega_N(x) = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{P_{2j}(x)}{|x|^{2j}}$ (or $\Omega_N(x) = \sum_{j=0}^N \frac{P_{2j+1}(x)}{|x|^{2j+1}}$ in the odd case), and let T_N be the operator with kernel K_N .

We begin by considering (b) implies (c) in Theorem 1 when $\omega = 1$, that is, T is even and our hypothesis is $\|T^*f\|_p \leq C\|Tf\|_p$, $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$. In this setting, the difficulty is that there is no obvious way of obtaining the inequality

$$\|T_N^*f\|_p \leq C\|T_Nf\|_p, \quad f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n). \quad (22)$$

Instead, we try to get (22) with $\|T_Nf\|_p$ replaced by $\|Tf\|_p$ in the right hand side plus an additional term which becomes small as N tends to ∞ . We start by writing

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_N^1f\|_p &\leq \|T^1f\|_p + \|T^1f - T_N^1f\|_p \\ &\leq C\|Tf\|_p + \left\| \sum_{j>N} \frac{P_{2j}(x)}{|x|^{2j+n}} \chi_{\overline{B}^c} * f \right\|_p. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

By (12), and since every P_{2j} is harmonic, there exists a bounded function b_{2j} supported on B such that

$$\frac{P_{2j}(x)}{|x|^{2j+n}} \chi_{\overline{B}^c}(x) = \text{p.v.} \frac{P_{2j}(x)}{|x|^{2j+n}} * b_{2j}.$$

By Lemma 5 (ii), we have that $\|b_{2j}\|_{L^1} \leq C\|b_{2j}\|_{L^\infty(B)} \leq C(2j)^{2n+2}$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{j>N} \frac{P_{2j}(x)}{|x|^{2j+n}} \chi_{\overline{B}^c} * f \right\|_p &= \left\| \sum_{j>N} \text{p.v.} \frac{P_{2j}(x)}{|x|^{2j+n}} * b_{2j} * f \right\|_p \\ &\leq \sum_{j>N} \left\| \frac{P_{2j}(x)}{|x|^{2j+n}} \right\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \|b_{2j} * f\|_p \\ &\leq \sum_{j>N} \left\| \frac{P_{2j}(x)}{|x|^{2j+n}} \right\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \|b_{2j}\|_1 \|f\|_p \\ &\leq C\|f\|_p \sum_{j>N} \left\| \frac{P_{2j}(x)}{|x|^{2j+n}} \right\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} (2j)^{2n+2} \\ &\leq C\|f\|_p \sum_{j>N} (\|P_{2j}\|_\infty + \|\nabla P_{2j}\|_\infty) (2j)^{2n+2}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The last inequality follows from a well-known estimate for Calderón-Zygmund operators (e.g. [Gr1, Theorem 4.3.3]). On the other hand,

$$K_N(x) \chi_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B}}(x) = T_N(b_{2N})(x) + S_N(x) \chi_B(x)$$

and then

$$T_N^1f = \text{p.v.} K_N * b_{2N} * f + S_N \chi_B * f.$$

So, for each $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, using (23) and (24), we have the L^p inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_N \chi_B * f\|_p &\leq \|T_N^1f\|_p + \|\text{p.v.} K_N * b_{2N} * f\|_p \\ &\leq C \left(\|Tf\|_p + \|f\|_p \sum_{j>N} (\|P_{2j}\|_\infty + \|\nabla P_{2j}\|_\infty) (2j)^{2n+2} + \|\text{p.v.} K_N * b_{2N} * f\|_p \right). \end{aligned}$$

We emphasize that the corresponding multipliers $\widehat{S_N \chi_B}$, $\widehat{\text{p.v.}K}$ and $\text{p.v.}\widehat{K_N} * b_{2N} = \widehat{\text{p.v.}K_N b_{2N}}$ are in $\mathcal{C}^\infty \setminus \{0\}$ and in \mathcal{M}_p . Therefore, proceeding as in the polynomial case, and applying Lemma 1 we obtain the pointwise estimate for $\xi \neq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{S_N \chi_B}(\xi)| &\leq C \left(|\widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi)| + |(\widehat{\text{p.v.}K_N} \cdot \widehat{b_{2N}})(\xi)| + \sum_{j>N} (\|P_{2j}\|_\infty + \|\nabla P_{2j}\|_\infty) (2j)^{2n+2} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(|\widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi)| + |\widehat{\text{p.v.}K_N}(\xi)| + \sum_{j>N} (\|P_{2j}\|_\infty + \|\nabla P_{2j}\|_\infty) (2j)^{2n+2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used Lemma 5 (i), that is, $|\widehat{b_{2N}}(\xi)| \leq C$, for $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

The idea is now to take limits, as N goes to ∞ , in the preceding inequality. By the definition of K_N and (6), the term on the right-hand side converges to $C|\widehat{\text{p.v.}K}(\xi)|$. The next task is to clarify how the left-hand side converges, but at this point we proceed as in [MOV, p. 1463] and we get the desired result.

This argument, which has been explained for the even case and $\omega = 1$, is also valid for the other cases, after taking into account the particular details listed below.

To get (b) implies (c) in Theorem 1 for any $\omega \in A_p$, we would use

$$\|b_{2j} * f\|_{L^p(\omega)} \leq C \|b_{2j}\|_{L^\infty(B)} \|Mf\|_{L^p(\omega)} \leq C (2j)^{2n+2} \|f\|_{L^p(\omega)}$$

to obtain the inequality analogous to (24)

In order to obtain (d) implies (c) in Theorem 1, note that if $c_j > 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^\infty c_j = 1$, then $\|\sum g_j\|_{1,\infty} \leq \sum c_j^{-1} \|g_j\|_{1,\infty}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{j>N} \frac{P_{2j}(x)}{|x|^{2j+n}} \chi_{\overline{B}^c} * f \right\|_{1,\infty} &= \left\| \sum_{j>N} \text{p.v.} \frac{P_{2j}(x)}{|x|^{2j+n}} * b_{2j} * f \right\|_{1,\infty} \\ &\leq \sum_{j>N} j^2 \left\| \text{p.v.} \frac{P_{2j}(x)}{|x|^{2j+n}} * b_{2j} * f \right\|_{1,\infty} \\ &\leq \sum_{j>N} j^2 \left\| \frac{P_{2j}(x)}{|x|^{2j+n}} \right\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^{1,\infty}} \|b_{2j} * f\|_1 \\ &\leq \sum_{j>N} j^2 \left\| \frac{P_{2j}(x)}{|x|^{2j+n}} \right\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^{1,\infty}} \|b_{2j}\|_1 \|f\|_1 \\ &\leq C \|f\|_1 \sum_{j>N} j^2 \left\| \frac{P_{2j}(x)}{|x|^{2j+n}} \right\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^{1,\infty}} (2j)^{2n+2} \\ &\leq C \|f\|_1 \sum_{j>N} (\|P_{2j}\|_\infty + \|\nabla P_{2j}\|_\infty) (2j)^{2n+4}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore, for all functions $f \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_N \chi_B * f\|_{1,\infty} &\leq 2(\|T_N^1 f\|_{1,\infty} + \|\text{p.v.} K_N * b_{2N} * f\|_{1,\infty}) \\ &\leq 4(\|T^1 f\|_{1,\infty} + \|\sum_{j>N} \frac{P_{2j}(x)}{|x|^{2j+n}} \chi_{\overline{B}^c} * f\|_{1,\infty}) + 2\|\text{p.v.} K_N * b_{2N} * f\|_{1,\infty} \\ &\leq C(\|Tf\|_1 + \|f\|_1 \sum_{j>N} (\|P_{2j}\|_\infty + \|\nabla P_{2j}\|_\infty)(2j)^{2n+4} + \\ &\quad + \|\text{p.v.} K_N * b_{2N} * f\|_{1,\infty}). \end{aligned}$$

Again, using Lemma 1, Lemma 4 and Lemma 5, we obtain, for $\xi \neq 0$,

$$|\widehat{S_N \chi_B}(\xi)| \leq C \left(|\widehat{\text{p.v.} K}(\xi)| + |\widehat{\text{p.v.} K_N}(\xi)| + \sum_{j>N} (\|P_{2j}\|_\infty + \|\nabla P_{2j}\|_\infty)(2j)^{2n+4} \right)$$

as desired.

The implication (b) \Rightarrow (c) in Theorem 2 can be adapted as follows. T is odd and the functions b_{2j+1} are in BMO. By Lemma 5, we have $\|\widehat{b_{2j+1}}\|_\infty \leq C$, $\|b_{2j+1}\|_{\text{BMO}} \leq C(2j+1)^{2n}$ and $\|b_{2j+1}\|_2 \leq C(2j+1)^{2n}$. Moreover, $|b_{2j+1}(x)| \leq C(2j+1)^{2n}|x|^{-n-1}$ if $|x| > 2$. Then, proceeding in the same way as in the proof of (19), we get

$$\|b_{2j+1} * f\|_{L^p(\omega)} \leq C(2j+1)^{2n} \|f\|_{L^p(\omega)}$$

and so, the inequality analogous to (24) follows.

Acknowledgements. Thanks are due to Javier Duoandikoetxea for useful conversations on L^p multipliers. The authors were partially supported by grants 2009SGR420 (Generalitat de Catalunya) and MTM2010-15657 (Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, Spain).

References

- [BeL] J. Bergh and J. Löfström, *Interpolation spaces. An introduction*. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften **223**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York (1976).
- [Du] J. Duoandikoetxea, *Fourier Analysis*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics **29**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (2001).
- [Gr1] L. Grafakos, *Classical Fourier Analysis*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **249**, Springer Verlag, Berlin, Second Edition (2008).
- [Gr2] L. Grafakos, *Modern Fourier Analysis*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **250**, Springer Verlag, Berlin, Second Edition (2008).

- [KW] D. S. Kurtz, R. L. Wheeden, *Results on Weighted norm inequalities for multipliers*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **255** (1979), 343–362.
- [MV] J. Mateu and J. Verdera, *L^p and weak L^1 estimates for the maximal Riesz transform and the maximal Beurling transform* Math. Res. Lett. **13** (2006), 957–966.
- [MOV] J. Mateu, J. Orobitg and J. Verdera, *Estimates for the maximal singular integral in terms of the singular integral: the case of even kernels* Ann. of Math. **174** (2011), 1429–1483.
- [MOPV] J. Mateu, J. Orobitg, C. Pérez, and J. Verdera, *New estimates for the maximal singular integral* Int. Math. Res. Not. **19** (2010), 3658–3722.
- [P] C. Pérez, *Weighted norm inequalities for singular integral operators*, J. London Math. Soc., **49** (1994), 296–308.
- [St] E. M. Stein, *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, (1970).

Departament de Matemàtiques
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
08193 Bellaterra, Barcelona, Catalonia

E-mail: abosch@mat.uab.cat
E-mail: mateu@mat.uab.cat
E-mail: ororbitg@mat.uab.cat