

# CURVED COMMUTATORS IN THE PLANE

KANGWEI LI, HENRI MARTIKAINEN, AND TUOMAS OIKARI

ABSTRACT. We complete the  $L^p$  boundedness theory of commutators of Hilbert transforms along monomial curves by providing the previously missing lower bounds. This optimal result now covers all monomial curves while previous results had significant geometric restrictions. We also, for the first time, develop the corresponding necessity theory for curves with non-vanishing torsion.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We push forward the theory of commutators of singular integrals along curves by the third named author [5] and Bongers–Guo–Li–Wick [1]. First of all, commutators of singular integral operators (SIOs)  $T$  and functions  $b$  have the general form  $[b, T]f := bTf - T(bf)$ . The theory and applications of commutator estimates with standard SIOs, such as, the Riesz transforms  $R_j f(x) := \int \frac{x_j - y_j}{|x - y|^{d+1}} f(y) dy$ , are extremely rich and well-developed. This includes everything from classical contributions, such as, [3] to more recent state-of-the-art characterizations [4]. A fundamental problem has been to *characterize* when  $[b, T]$  maps  $L^p \rightarrow L^p$  in terms of a suitable function space of the symbol, often BMO.

Our setting is significantly different in that we consider singular integrals along *curves*  $\gamma$ , in particular, the Hilbert transform  $H_\gamma$  along a monomial curve, where

$$H_\gamma f(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x - \gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t}.$$

Here the monomial curve is given by

$$\gamma(t) = \begin{cases} (\epsilon_1 |t|^{\beta_1}, \epsilon_2 |t|^{\beta_2}) & t > 0, \\ (\delta_1 |t|^{\beta_1}, \delta_2 |t|^{\beta_2}) & t \leq 0, \end{cases}$$

$\beta_2 > \beta_1 > 0$ ,  $\epsilon_i, \delta_i = \pm 1$  with  $\epsilon_j \neq \delta_j$  for at least one  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ . In this curved setting all commutator estimates are very recent and certainly not yet fully developed.

First, in [1] upper bounds of the form

$$\|[b, H_\gamma]\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \lesssim \sup_{\substack{Q=I \times J \\ \ell(I)^{1/\beta_1} = \ell(J)^{1/\beta_2}}} \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |b - \langle b \rangle_Q| =: \|b\|_{\text{BMO}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}^2)},$$

$$\langle b \rangle_Q := \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q b,$$

were proved, giving sufficiency in terms of a  $\gamma$ -adapted BMO space – for instance, the parabolic BMO space when  $\gamma(t) = (t, t^2)$ . This was based on sparse domination in this

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 42B20.

*Key words and phrases.* Singular integrals, commutators, monomial curves, non-vanishing torsion.

setting by Cladek and Ou [2]. The corresponding lower bound, or necessity, was left missing and was later proved in [5] using a completely new curved adaptation of the recently very successful approximate weak factorization method of [4]. However, even [5] did not deal with all of the monomial curves. The argument only worked for those monomial curves that intersect adjacent quadrants of the plane – that is  $\epsilon_j = \delta_j$  for exactly one  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ . Moreover, [5] only dealt with the parabolic case  $\gamma(t) = (t, t^2)$  in detail.

We provide a new argument that, importantly, is able to deal with curves intersecting opposite quadrants. In addition, we provide full details for general  $\beta$  parameters. To fully complete the theory, the case of interest to us is  $\gamma(t) = (|t|^{\beta_1} \operatorname{sgn} t, |t|^{\beta_2} \operatorname{sgn} t)$ . The following theorem, our first main result, thus completes the  $L^p \rightarrow L^p$  commutator boundedness theory for the Hilbert transform along monomial curves.

**1.1. Theorem.** *Let  $b \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{C})$  and  $H_\gamma f(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x - \gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t}$  be the Hilbert transform along the curve*

$$\gamma(t) = (|t|^{\beta_1} \operatorname{sgn} t, |t|^{\beta_2} \operatorname{sgn} t),$$

*where  $\beta_2 > \beta_1 > 0$ . Let  $1 < p < \infty$  and suppose that  $[b, H_\gamma]$  is a bounded operator on  $L^p$ . Then  $b \in \text{BMO}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}^2)$  – in fact, we have the quantitative commutator lower bound*

$$\|b\|_{\text{BMO}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}^2)} \lesssim \|[b, H_\gamma]\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p}.$$

Approximate weak factorization (awf) arguments rely on setting up suitable translations of cubes that respect the structure of the underlying singular integral, and this is significantly harder in curved settings. Moreover, the proof presented here is different and more complicated than the one provided in [5]. In particular, we introduce an additional parameter into the construction of the underlying geometry that amounts to a geometric scale jump between two successive factorizations. Morally speaking, the previous curved proof from [5] did not have this aspect, instead exploiting the symmetry of the graph of  $\gamma$  across the  $x_2$ -axis.

We have also written the proofs of all of our auxiliary results so that they are purely analytic and formally easier to check, as compared to relying on geometric facts; in particular, even when the claim is similar, our proofs are different in style from those given in [5]. We handle the general  $\beta$  parameters with a change of variables and a careful argument adapted to the case  $\beta_1 = 1$  and  $\beta_2 > 1$ . The change of variables is simple but at the very least constitutes a major quality of life improvement – the proof, at least as written now, would not otherwise work with general  $\beta$ .

We also study commutators of Hilbert transforms along boundedly supported curves with non-vanishing torsion. The non-vanishing torsion condition ensures that the vectors  $\gamma'(0)$  and  $\gamma''(0)$  are linearly independent. While the curve can in this setting lack a true nonisotropic dilation structure, the assumptions nevertheless allow one to develop the corresponding theory for the truncated Hilbert transform

$$f \mapsto \int_{-1}^1 f(x - \gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t}.$$

Results of this flavor, but only regarding commutator upper bounds, have been relatively briefly studied at least in [1, 2]. In section 4 we carefully develop the corresponding commutator lower bound theory by bootstrapping it from the parabolic results of [5]. The details turn out to be somewhat subtle.

**Acknowledgements.** K. Li was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China through project numbers 12222114 and 12001400. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under Grant No. 2247234 (H. Martikainen). H.M. was, in addition, supported by the Simons Foundation through MP-TSM-00002361 (travel support for mathematicians). T.O. was supported by the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**Change of variables.** We study the following monomial curve

$$\gamma(t) = (|t|^{\beta_1} \operatorname{sgn} t, |t|^{\beta_2} \operatorname{sgn} t), \quad \beta_2 > \beta_1 > 0.$$

The complementary case of curves  $\gamma$  satisfying that their graph “intersects adjacent quadrants” was dealt with in [5]; although, the argument was explicitly given only in the parabolic case  $\gamma(t) = (t, t^2)$ . In fact, big portions of the proofs become, at the very least, significantly more laborious to run through directly with these general  $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2)$  and thus, in retrospect, the following simple change of variables becomes very useful:

$$\begin{aligned} (2.1) \quad H_\gamma f(x) &= \int_{-\infty}^0 f(x - \gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t} + \int_0^\infty f(x - \gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t} \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^0 f(x + (|t|^{\beta_1}, |t|^{\beta_2})) \frac{dt}{t} + \int_0^\infty f(x - (|t|^{\beta_1}, |t|^{\beta_2})) \frac{dt}{t} \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^0 f(x + (|u|, |u|^{\beta_2/\beta_1})) \frac{d(-u^{1/\beta_1})}{-u^{1/\beta_1}} + \int_0^\infty f(x - (|u|, |u|^{\beta_2/\beta_1})) \frac{d(u^{1/\beta_1})}{u^{1/\beta_1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta_1} \left( \int_{-\infty}^0 f(x + (|u|, |u|^{\beta_2/\beta_1})) \frac{du}{u} + \int_0^\infty f(x - (|u|, |u|^{\beta_2/\beta_1})) \frac{du}{u} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta_1} H_{\tilde{\gamma}} f(x), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{\gamma}(t) = (|t| \operatorname{sgn} t, |t|^{\beta_2/\beta_1} \operatorname{sgn} t)$ . Hence we will assume in the future that  $\beta_1 = 1$  and  $\beta_2 =: \beta > 1$ .

**2.A. Geometry behind the factorization.** Fix a closed rectangle  $Q = I \times J \in \mathcal{R}_\gamma$  – this means that  $\ell(J) = \ell(I)^\beta$ . Let

$$A_1 > 10, \quad A_2 := (3^{\beta/(\beta-1)} + 10)A_1 =: C_\beta A_1.$$

Define

$$V_1 = Q + \gamma(A_1 \ell(I)), \quad P = V_1 + \gamma(A_2 \ell(I)).$$

We also define

$$V_2 = P + \gamma(-A_1 \ell(I)).$$

It then holds that

$$Q = V_2 + \gamma(-A_2 \ell(I)).$$

Next, we define

$$\tilde{Q} = \{Q + \gamma(t) : t \geq 0\}, \quad \tilde{P} = \{P + \gamma(s) : s \leq 0\}.$$

Note that

$$V_1 = Q + \gamma(A_1 \ell(I)) = P + \gamma(-A_2 \ell(I))$$

and

$$V_2 = Q + \gamma(A_2\ell(I)) = P + \gamma(-A_1\ell(I)),$$

and so  $V_1 \cup V_2 \subset \tilde{Q} \cap \tilde{P}$ .

Finally, consider the following subset of  $\tilde{Q} \cap \tilde{P}$ :

$$W_1 := \{Q + \gamma(t) : (A_1 - 2)\ell(I) < t < (A_1 + 2)\ell(I)\} \\ \cap \{P + \gamma(s) : (A_2 - 3)\ell(I) < |s| < (A_2 + 3)\ell(I)\}.$$

We study the set  $W_1$  now (but will define a similar set  $W_2$  later), starting with the following trivial observation.

**2.2. Lemma.** *We have*

$$|W_1| \sim_{A_1} |Q|.$$

*Proof.* First, notice that  $V_1 \subset W_1$ . Second, we have

$$W_1 \subset [u_1, u_1 + (A_1 + 3)\ell(I)] \times [u_2, u_2 + ((A_1 + 2)^\beta + 1)\ell(I)^\beta],$$

where  $u = (u_1, u_2)$  is the left bottom corner of  $Q$ . □

**2.3. Lemma.** *If  $t \leq |s|$  and  $x + \gamma(t) = y + \gamma(s)$  for some  $x \in Q$  and  $y \in P$ , then we must have  $t \in ((A_1 - 2)\ell(I), (A_1 + 2)\ell(I))$  and  $|s| \in ((A_2 - 3)\ell(I), (A_2 + 3)\ell(I))$ .*

*Moreover, for any  $x \in Q$  and  $y \in P$ , there is a unique pair  $(t, s) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_-$  with*

$$x + \gamma(t) = y + \gamma(s) \in W_1.$$

*Proof.* Fix  $x \in Q$  and  $y \in P$ . By the definition of  $P$ , we have  $y = x' + \gamma(A_1\ell(I)) + \gamma(A_2\ell(I))$  for some  $x' \in Q$ . We derive what  $x + \gamma(t) = y + \gamma(s)$  for  $t \leq |s|$  requires. For this to hold, we must have

$$x + \gamma(t) = x' + \gamma(A_1\ell(I)) + \gamma(A_2\ell(I)) + \gamma(s).$$

Componentwise this reads

$$(2.4) \quad x_1 + t = x'_1 + A_1\ell(I) + A_2\ell(I) - |s|,$$

$$(2.5) \quad x_2 + t^\beta = x'_2 + (A_1\ell(I))^\beta + (A_2\ell(I))^\beta - |s|^\beta.$$

Now, these equations give that

$$(2.6) \quad (A_1^\beta + A_2^\beta)\ell(I)^\beta + x'_2 - x_2 = t^\beta + [(A_1 + A_2)\ell(I) + x'_1 - x_1 - t]^\beta.$$

A requirement for  $t \leq |s|$  is obtained by (2.4):

$$t = [(A_1 + A_2)\ell(I) + x'_1 - x_1] - |s| \leq [(A_1 + A_2)\ell(I) + x'_1 - x_1] - t,$$

and so

$$(2.7) \quad t \leq [(A_1 + A_2)\ell(I) + x'_1 - x_1]/2.$$

In this range (2.7) of  $t$  we note that

$$\eta(t) := t^\beta + [(A_1 + A_2)\ell(I) + x'_1 - x_1 - t]^\beta = \text{RHS}(2.6)$$

is a decreasing function of  $t$ . Indeed, a function  $t \mapsto t^\beta + (\rho - t)^\beta$  is decreasing if  $t^{\beta-1} \leq (\rho - t)^{\beta-1}$ , which is clearly true if  $t \leq \rho/2$ . Also note for future use that  $(A_1 + 2)\ell(I) \leq (A_1 + A_2 - 1)\ell(I)/2 \leq [(A_1 + A_2)\ell(I) + x'_1 - x_1]/2$ , so  $t = A_1 + 2$  is in this range with any  $x, x'$ .

Using  $|x_1 - x'_1| \leq \ell(I)$  and  $|x_2 - x'_2| \leq \ell(J) = \ell(I)^\beta$ , we see that for  $(A_1 + 2)\ell(I) \leq t \leq [(A_1 + A_2)\ell(I) + x'_1 - x_1]/2$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(t) &\leq \eta((A_1 + 2)\ell(I)) \leq \ell(I)^\beta \left( (A_1 + 2)^\beta + (A_2 - 1)^\beta \right) \\ &< \ell(I)^\beta (A_1^\beta + A_2^\beta - 1) \leq \text{LHS(2.6)}, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction, thus for (2.6) to hold  $t < (A_1 + 2)\ell(I)$  necessarily. We used above that  $(A_1 + 2)^\beta + (A_2 - 1)^\beta < A_1^\beta + A_2^\beta - 1$  is true with our explicit choice of  $A_2$ . Indeed – to this end, define  $h(t) = t^\beta$  and then by the mean value theorem we have for  $\xi_1 \in (A_1, A_1 + 2)$  and  $\xi_2 \in (A_2 - 1, A_2)$  that

$$\begin{aligned} A_2^\beta - (A_2 - 1)^\beta &= h(A_2) - h(A_2 - 1) \\ &= h'(\xi_2)(A_2 - A_2 + 1) > h'(A_2 - 1) = \beta(A_2 - 1)^{\beta-1} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + (A_1 + 2)^\beta - A_1^\beta &= 1 + h(A_1 + 2) - h(A_1) \\ &= 1 + h'(\xi_1)(A_1 + 2 - A_1) < 3\beta(A_1 + 2)^{\beta-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This together with

$$\beta(A_2 - 1)^{\beta-1} > \beta(3^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}} A_1)^{\beta-1} = 3\beta(3A_1)^{\beta-1} > 3\beta(A_1 + 2)^{\beta-1}$$

gives the desired inequality.

Using again that the function  $\eta(t)$  is decreasing for  $t \leq (A_1 + 2)\ell(I)$ , in particular for  $t \leq (A_1 - 2)\ell(I)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(t) &\geq \eta((A_1 - 2)\ell(I)) \geq \ell(I)^\beta \left( (A_1 - 2)^\beta + (A_2 + 1)^\beta \right) \\ &> \ell(I)^\beta (A_1^\beta + A_2^\beta + 1) \geq \text{LHS(2.6)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used  $(A_1 - 2)^\beta + (A_2 + 1)^\beta > A_1^\beta + A_2^\beta + 1$ , Indeed, again by the mean value theorem, we have that

$$(A_2 + 1)^\beta - A_2^\beta = h(A_2 + 1) - h(A_2) > h'(A_2)(A_2 + 1 - A_2) = \beta A_2^{\beta-1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + A_1^\beta - (A_1 - 2)^\beta &= 1 + h(A_1) - h(A_1 - 2) < 1 + h'(A_1)(A_1 - (A_1 - 2)) \\ &= 1 + 2\beta A_1^{\beta-1} < 3\beta A_1^{\beta-1} < \beta A_2^{\beta-1}. \end{aligned}$$

So for (2.6) to hold, we must have  $t > (A_1 - 2)\ell(I)$ . Notice that now by (2.4) we have

$$|s| = x'_1 - x_1 + (A_1 + A_2)\ell(I) - t,$$

and so

$$|s| < (1 + A_1 + A_2 - A_1 + 2)\ell(I) = (A_2 + 3)\ell(I)$$

and

$$|s| > (-1 + A_1 + A_2 - A_1 - 2)\ell(I) = (A_2 - 3)\ell(I).$$

We have shown the first part of the lemma.

To see the second part of the lemma, recall that we already showed that

$$\eta((A_1 + 2)\ell(I)) < \text{LHS(2.6)} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta((A_1 - 2)\ell(I)) > \text{LHS(2.6)}.$$

By the strict monotonicity and continuity of  $\eta$ , we know that there is a unique solution to (2.6) lying in  $((A_1 - 2)\ell(I), (A_1 + 2)\ell(I))$ . This shows the second part of the lemma.  $\square$

Notice that  $x + \gamma(t) = y + \gamma(s)$  if and only if  $x + \gamma(|s|) = y + \gamma(-t)$ . If  $|s| < |-t| = t$  we can solve the latter equation using Lemma 2.3 – we find the unique  $(|s|, -t)$  so that  $|s| \in ((A_1 - 2)\ell(I), (A_1 + 2)\ell(I))$  and  $t \in ((A_2 - 3)\ell(I), (A_2 + 3)\ell(I))$  with  $x + \gamma(|s|) = y + \gamma(-t)$ . So the original equation  $x + \gamma(t) = y + \gamma(s)$  has, for  $t > |s|$ , the unique solution  $(t, s)$  with  $t \in ((A_2 - 3)\ell(I), (A_2 + 3)\ell(I))$  and  $|s| \in ((A_1 - 2)\ell(I), (A_1 + 2)\ell(I))$ . For this reason, we define

$$W_2 := \{Q + \gamma(t) : (A_2 - 3)\ell(I) < t < (A_2 + 3)\ell(I)\} \\ \cap \{P + \gamma(s) : (A_1 - 2)\ell(I) < |s| < (A_1 + 2)\ell(I)\}$$

and notice that

$$\tilde{Q} \cap \tilde{P} = W_1 \cup W_2.$$

We now prove results related to the pair  $(Q, W_1)$  – similar results then also hold by symmetry for the pair  $(P, W_2)$ .

For  $x \in Q$ , the set

$$I(x, W_1) := \{t \in ((A_1 - 2)\ell(I), (A_1 + 2)\ell(I)) : x + \gamma(t) \in W_1\}$$

is important for us. We have the following result.

**2.8. Lemma.** *For all  $Q \in \mathcal{R}_\gamma$  and  $x \in Q$  we have*

$$\frac{|I(x, W_1)|}{\ell(I)} \sim \frac{A_1^{1-\beta} + \beta C_\beta^{\beta-1}}{\beta(C_\beta^{\beta-1} - 1)}.$$

In particular, we have

$$\lim_{A_1 \rightarrow \infty} |I(x, W_1)| = \frac{C_\beta^{\beta-1}}{C_\beta^{\beta-1} - 1} \ell(I) \sim \ell(I)$$

and

$$\lim_{A_1 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|I(x, W_1)|}{|I(x', W_1)|} = 1$$

uniformly on  $Q \in \mathcal{R}_\gamma$  and  $x, x' \in Q$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $x \in Q$ . By definition, if  $x + \gamma(t) \in W_1$ , then there exists some  $y \in P$  and  $s < 0$  with  $|s| \in ((A_2 - 3)\ell(I), (A_2 + 3)\ell(I))$  such that

$$x + \gamma(t) = y + \gamma(s).$$

We claim that if  $t_1$  is the minimal value such that  $x + \gamma(t_1) \in W_1$ , then the corresponding  $y$  should be the left top vertex of  $P$ ; in other words, in the equation (2.6) the point  $(x'_1, x'_2)$  should be the left top vertex of  $Q$ . But this is immediate by (2.6) since monotonely a bigger  $x'_2$  and a smaller  $x'_1$  require a monotonely smaller  $t$ .

So there is some  $s_1 < 0$  with  $-s_1 = |s_1| \in ((A_2 - 3)\ell(I), (A_2 + 3)\ell(I))$  such that

$$(2.9) \quad x + \gamma(t_1) = v_{lt} + \gamma(s_1) = u_{lt} + \gamma(A_1\ell(I)) + \gamma(A_2\ell(I)) + \gamma(s_1),$$

where  $v_{lt}$  and  $u_{lt}$  are the left top vertices of  $P$  and  $Q$ , respectively. Suppose that  $h > 0$  is maximal such that  $x + \gamma(t_1 + h) \in W_1$ . Similarly, this means that

$$(2.10) \quad x + \gamma(t_1 + h) = u_{rb} + \gamma(A_1\ell(I)) + \gamma(A_2\ell(I)) + \gamma(s_2),$$

where  $u_{rb}$  is the right bottom vertex of  $Q$  and  $-s_2 \in ((A_2 - 3)\ell(I), (A_2 + 3)\ell(I))$ . By (2.9) and (2.10) we have

$$\gamma(t_1 + h) - \gamma(t_1) = u_{rb} - u_{lt} + \gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1).$$

Componentwise this reads

$$(2.11) \quad h = \ell(I) - |s_2| + |s_1|,$$

$$(2.12) \quad (t_1 + h)^\beta - t_1^\beta = -\ell(I)^\beta - |s_2|^\beta + |s_1|^\beta.$$

Now, by the mean value theorem, there exist some  $\xi_1$  and  $\xi_2$  with

$$\xi_1 \in ((A_1 - 2)\ell(I), (A_1 + 2)\ell(I)) \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_2 \in ((A_2 - 3)\ell(I), (A_2 + 3)\ell(I))$$

such that

$$(t_1 + h)^\beta - t_1^\beta = \beta h \xi_1^{\beta-1} \quad \text{and} \quad |s_1|^\beta - |s_2|^\beta = \beta(|s_1| - |s_2|)\xi_2^{\beta-1}.$$

Hence, by (2.12) and (2.11) we have

$$(2.13) \quad \beta h \xi_1^{\beta-1} = -\ell(I)^\beta + \beta(|s_1| - |s_2|)\xi_2^{\beta-1} = -\ell(I)^\beta + \beta(h - \ell(I))\xi_2^{\beta-1},$$

from which we get

$$|I(x, W_1)| = h = \frac{\ell(I)^\beta + \beta \ell(I) \xi_2^{\beta-1}}{\beta(\xi_2^{\beta-1} - \xi_1^{\beta-1})} = \frac{\ell(I)^\beta / \xi_1^{\beta-1} + \beta \ell(I) (\xi_2 / \xi_1)^{\beta-1}}{\beta((\xi_2 / \xi_1)^{\beta-1} - 1)}.$$

Here we used that  $x + \gamma(t) \in W_1$  for all  $t \in [t_1, t_1 + h]$  so that, indeed,  $|I(x, W_1)| = h$  – we will comment about this soon. First, however, we now get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|I(x, W_1)|}{\ell(I)} &= \frac{(\ell(I)/\xi_1)^{\beta-1} + \beta(\xi_2/\xi_1)^{\beta-1}}{\beta((\xi_2/\xi_1)^{\beta-1} - 1)} \\ &\sim \frac{A_1^{1-\beta} + \beta C_\beta^{\beta-1}}{\beta(C_\beta^{\beta-1} - 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

We now comment on the fact why  $x + \gamma(t) \in W_1$  also for all  $t \in (t_1, t_1 + h)$ .

Fix such  $t$ . We need to find  $x' \in Q$  such that (2.6) holds. To simplify the notation we denote the lower left corner of  $Q$  by  $(u_1, u_2)$ . If

$$(A_1^\beta + A_2^\beta)\ell(I)^\beta + u_2 - x_2 = t^\beta + [(A_1 + A_2)\ell(I) + u_1 - x_1 - t]^\beta$$

we are done, so suppose on the contrary, first, that

$$(A_1^\beta + A_2^\beta)\ell(I)^\beta + u_2 - x_2 < t^\beta + [(A_1 + A_2)\ell(I) + u_1 - x_1 - t]^\beta.$$

On the other hand, we have by monotonicity (using  $t > t_1$ ) and the definition of  $t_1$  that

$$\begin{aligned} t^\beta + [(A_1 + A_2)\ell(I) + u_1 - x_1 - t]^\beta &< t_1^\beta + [(A_1 + A_2)\ell(I) + u_1 - x_1 - t_1]^\beta \\ &= (A_1^\beta + A_2^\beta)\ell(I)^\beta + (u_2 + \ell(I)^\beta) - x_2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there must exist  $y_2 \in (u_2, u_2 + \ell(I)^\beta)$  such that

$$(A_1^\beta + A_2^\beta)\ell(I)^\beta + y_2 - x_2 = t^\beta + [(A_1 + A_2)\ell(I) + u_1 - x_1 - t]^\beta$$

showing that  $x' = (u_1, y_2) \in Q$  works. Similarly, if

$$t^\beta + [(A_1 + A_2)\ell(I) + u_1 - x_1 - t]^\beta < (A_1^\beta + A_2^\beta)\ell(I)^\beta + u_2 - x_2,$$

then we use again monotonicity to conclude that

$$(A_1^\beta + A_2^\beta)\ell(I)^\beta + u_2 - x_2 = (t_1 + h)^\beta + [(A_1 + A_2)\ell(I) + (u_1 + \ell(I)) - x_1 - (t_1 + h)]^\beta \\ < t^\beta + [(A_1 + A_2)\ell(I) + (u_1 + \ell(I)) - x_1 - t]^\beta.$$

Hence, there exists some  $y_1 \in (u_1, u_1 + \ell(I))$  such that

$$(A_1^\beta + A_2^\beta)\ell(I)^\beta + u_2 - x_2 = t^\beta + [(A_1 + A_2)\ell(I) + y_1 - x_1 - t]^\beta,$$

showing that  $x' = (y_1, u_2) \in Q$  works. We are done.  $\square$

We continue studying the geometry of  $W_1$ . Let  $v = (v_1, v_2)$  be the lower left corner of  $P$ . For  $1 \leq r < \infty$  define

$$P_r^{lt} := (v_1, v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta) + \left[0, 2^{-r} \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}}\right] \times [-2^{-r} \ell(I)^\beta, 0],$$

$$P_r^{rb} := (v_1 + \ell(I), v_2) + \left[-2^{-r} \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}}, 0\right] \times [0, 2^{-r} \ell(I)^\beta]$$

and

$$P^{\text{cen}} := P \setminus (P_1^{lt} \cup P_1^{rb}).$$

We also define

$$\Delta P_r^{lt} = \left\{ (x_1, x_2) \in P_r^{lt} : x_1 = v_1 + 2^{-r} \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}} \text{ or } x_2 = v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta - 2^{-r} \ell(I)^\beta \right\},$$

and

$$\Delta P_r^{rb} = \left\{ (x_1, x_2) \in P_r^{rb} : x_1 = v_1 + \ell(I) - 2^{-r} \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}} \text{ or } x_2 = v_2 + 2^{-r} \ell(I)^\beta \right\}.$$

To state our next result, we also introduce the following notation. For  $z \in P$  and  $y \in W_1$  we set

$$\phi(z, W_1) := \{z + \gamma(s) \in W_1 : -s \in ((A_2 - 3)\ell(I), (A_2 + 3)\ell(I))\},$$

and

$$I(y, P) := \{u \in ((A_2 - 3)\ell(I), (A_2 + 3)\ell(I)) : y + \gamma(u) \in P\}.$$

**2.14. Lemma.** *Let  $z \in P^{\text{cen}} \subset P$  and  $y \in \phi(z, W_1)$ . Then, there holds*

$$|I(y, P)| \sim \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}}.$$

*On the other hand, let  $z \in \Delta P_r^{lt} \cup \Delta P_r^{rb}$ , where  $1 \leq r < \infty$ , and  $y \in \phi(z, W_1)$ . Then, there holds*

$$|I(y, P)| \sim 2^{-r} \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}}.$$

*The implicit constants in the above estimates are independent of  $y, z$  and  $P$ .*

*Proof.* We first consider the case  $z \in \Delta P_r^{lt}$ , that is, we have  $z \in P_r^{lt}$  and either

$$z_1 = v_1 + 2^{-r} \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}} \quad \text{or} \quad z_2 = v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta - 2^{-r} \ell(I)^\beta.$$



Let then  $y \in \phi(z, W_1)$ . This means that

$$y = z + \gamma(s) \in W_1 \quad \text{for some} \quad -s \in ((A_2 - 3)\ell(I), (A_2 + 3)\ell(I)).$$

Then, by definition,  $-s \in I(y, P)$ . Suppose first that  $z_1 = v_1 + 2^{-r} \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}}$ . Notice that we can write

$$y + \gamma(-s - h) = z + \gamma(s) + \gamma(-s - h).$$

Fix  $0 < h < 2^{-r} \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta(A_2+3)^{\beta-1}}$  and we will show that  $y + \gamma(-s - h) \in P$ . First, there holds that (the precise upper bound for  $h$  is not yet used here)

$$y_1 + (-s - h) - v_1 = z_1 - h - v_1 = 2^{-r} \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}} - h \in (0, \ell(I))$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} y_2 + (-s - h)^\beta - v_2 &= z_2 - v_2 - |s|^\beta + (|s| - h)^\beta \\ &\leq \ell(I)^\beta - |s|^\beta + (|s| - h)^\beta \leq \ell(I)^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

To obtain a lower bound for the last line, notice that by the mean value theorem and the upper bound for  $h$  we have

$$|s|^\beta - (|s| - h)^\beta < \beta |s|^{\beta-1} h < 2^{-r} \ell(I)^\beta$$

so that (using the location of  $z_2$ ) we have

$$\begin{aligned} z_2 - v_2 - |s|^\beta + (|s| - h)^\beta &\geq (1 - 2^{-r}) \ell(I)^\beta - (|s|^\beta - (|s| - h)^\beta) \\ &> (1 - 2^{1-r}) \ell(I)^\beta \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The above proves that  $y + \gamma(-s - h) \in P$  for all such  $h$ . Notice also that  $-s - h$  must belong to the range  $((A_2 - 3)\ell(I), (A_2 + 3)\ell(I))$  – indeed,  $y + \gamma(-s - h) = w$  for some  $w \in P$  and so  $w + \gamma(s + h) = y \in W_1$  implying the claim by Lemma 2.3. Thus, we have

$$|I(y, P)| \geq 2^{-r} \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta(A_2 + 3)^{\beta-1}}.$$

We discuss the corresponding upper bound next. Suppose  $-s' \in I(y, P)$ . Then

$$y + \gamma(-s') = z + \gamma(s) + \gamma(-s') \in P,$$

and so

$$(2.15) \quad (z_1 - v_1) + s - s' = y_1 - s' - v_1 \geq 0,$$

$$(2.16) \quad (z_2 - v_2) - |s|^\beta + |s'|^\beta = y_2 + |s'|^\beta - v_2 \leq \ell(I)^\beta.$$

By (2.15) we have

$$s - s' \geq -(z_1 - v_1) = -2^{-r} \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}},$$

and by (2.16) we have

$$-|s|^\beta + |s'|^\beta \leq \ell(I)^\beta - (z_2 - v_2) \leq 2^{-r} \ell(I)^\beta.$$

Using the mean value theorem there exists some  $\xi \in ((A_2 - 3)\ell(I), (A_2 + 3)\ell(I))$  such that

$$|s'|^\beta - |s|^\beta = \beta \xi^{\beta-1} (|s'| - |s|)$$

and so

$$s - s' = |s'| - |s| = \frac{-|s|^\beta + |s'|^\beta}{\beta\xi^{\beta-1}} < 2^{-r} \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta(A_2 - 3)^{\beta-1}}.$$

Therefore,

$$|I(y, P)| \leq \frac{2^{-r+1}}{\beta(A_2 - 3)^{\beta-1}} \ell(I).$$

This completes the proof of the case  $z \in \Delta P_r^{lt}$  with  $z_1 = v_1 + 2^{-r} \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}}$ .

The case  $z_2 = v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta - 2^{-r} \ell(I)^\beta$  is similar. The argument for  $z \in P^{\text{cen}}$  is essentially the same, too (if  $z_2 - v_2 > \ell(I)^\beta/2$  this will be similar as the proof presented above, and if  $z_2 - v_2 \leq \ell(I)^\beta/2$  it will be similar as the case  $z \in \Delta P_r^{lt}$  with  $z_2 = v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta - 2^{-r} \ell(I)^\beta$ ). Finally, the case  $\Delta P_r^{rb}$  follows with similar arguments as well.  $\square$

**Auxiliary functions.** We next introduce certain auxiliary functions that will be important in the upcoming weak factorization argument. Define

$$g_P := 1_P, \quad g_Q := 1_Q.$$

We will next define  $g_{W_1}$ , which is more complicated. Let

$$W_1^{\text{cen}} := \{y \in W_1 : \exists z \in P^{\text{cen}} \text{ such that } y \in \phi(z, W_1)\}$$

and let  $\eta \geq 0$  be the smallest constant so that

$$W_1 = \bigcup_{r \in [-\eta, \infty)} W_1(r), \quad W_1(r) := \left\{ y \in W_1 : |I(y, P)| = 2^{-r} \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}} \right\}.$$

Note that the existence of such an  $\eta$  is guaranteed by Lemma 2.14. Then we define

$$\varphi(y, M) := \sum_{-\eta \leq r < M} 1_{W_1(r)}(y) + \sum_{r \geq M} 1_{W_1(r)}(y) 2^{-(r-M)}, \quad y \in W_1, \quad M > 0,$$

where  $M$  is sufficiently large to be fixed during the proof of the next Lemma 2.17.

**2.17. Lemma.** *There exists an absolute constant  $M > 1$  such that*

$$g_{W_1}(y) := \varphi(y, M)$$

*satisfies the following properties:*

$$(2.18) \quad 1_{W_1^{\text{cen}}} g_{W_1} = 1_{W_1^{\text{cen}}},$$

$$(2.19) \quad g_{W_1}(y) \sim_M |I(y, P)| \frac{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}}{\ell(I)},$$

$$(2.20) \quad \lim_{A_1 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s))}{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s'))} = 1,$$

where in (2.19) the implicit constants do not depend on  $y \in W_1$  and  $Q$ , and in (2.20) the limit is uniform on  $Q \in \mathcal{R}_\gamma$ ,  $z \in P \setminus \{v_{lt}, v_{rb}\}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} & s, s' \in I(z, W_1) \\ & := \{s : -s \in ((A_2 - 3)\ell(I), (A_2 + 3)\ell(I)) \text{ and } z + \gamma(s) \in W_1\}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We first prove (2.18). For  $y \in W_1^{\text{cen}}$  by Lemma 2.14 we have

$$|I(y, P)| \sim \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}},$$

and therefore if  $M$  is such that

$$|I(y, P)| > 2^{-M} \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}},$$

then  $y \notin W_1(r)$  for  $r \geq M$ , hence  $g_{W_1} = 1$  on  $W_1^{\text{cen}}$  and (2.18) is proved. The claim (2.19) is immediate from definition.

It remains to verify (2.20). Fix for the remaining argument a point  $z \in P \setminus \{v_{lt}, v_{rb}\}$ . Let  $-s, u \in ((A_2 - 3)\ell(I), (A_2 + 3)\ell(I))$  satisfy  $z + \gamma(s) + \gamma(u) \in P$ , i.e. with  $(v_1, v_2)$  being the lower left corner of  $P$  there holds that

$$(2.21) \quad 0 \leq z_1 + s + u - v_1 \leq \ell(I), \quad 0 \leq z_2 - |s|^\beta + u^\beta - v_2 \leq \ell(I)^\beta.$$

Now let  $a(s)$  stand for the minimal  $u_*$  such that both of the above bounds (2.21) hold, and let  $b(s)$  stand for the maximal  $u^*$  such that both hold; then it is clear that

$$(2.22) \quad |I(z + \gamma(s), P)| = b(s) - a(s) = u^* - u_*.$$

Explicitly, it is clear from (2.21) that

$$\begin{aligned} a(s) &:= \max\{v_1 - z_1 - s, (v_2 - z_2 + |s|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}\}, \\ b(s) &:= \min\{v_1 + \ell(I) - z_1 - s, (v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta - z_2 + |s|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now  $|I(z + \gamma(s), P)|$  is positive (by  $z \in P \setminus \{v_{lt}, v_{rb}\}$ ) and from (2.22) it is clearly continuous, and then also

$$r(s) := -\log_2 \left( |I(z + \gamma(s), P)| \frac{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}}{\ell(I)} \right)$$

is continuous. By definition  $z + \gamma(s) \in W_1(r(s))$ , i.e. if  $r(s) \leq M$ , then

$$g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s)) = 1$$

and if  $r(s) \geq M$ , then

$$g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s)) = 2^{-(r(s)-M)} = 2^M \frac{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}}{\ell(I)} |I(z + \gamma(s), P)|.$$

So if  $r(s), r(s') \leq M$ , then

$$\frac{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s))}{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s'))} = \frac{1}{1} = 1,$$

and if  $r(s), r(s') \geq M$ , then

$$\frac{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s))}{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s'))} = \frac{|I(z + \gamma(s), P)|}{|I(z + \gamma(s'), P)|}.$$

Suppose that  $r(s) \geq M$  and  $r(s') \leq M$ . By the continuity of  $r(s)$  we find  $s_0$  between  $s$  and  $s'$  such that  $r(s_0) = M$ . We then have

$$\frac{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s))}{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s'))} = \frac{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s))}{1} = \frac{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s))}{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s_0))} = \frac{|I(z + \gamma(s), P)|}{|I(z + \gamma(s_0), P)|}.$$

Similarly, if  $r(s) \leq M$  and  $r(s') \geq M$ , we again find such an  $s_0$ , and again

$$\frac{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s))}{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s'))} = \frac{1}{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s'))} = \frac{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s_0))}{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s'))} = \frac{|I(z + \gamma(s_0), P)|}{|I(z + \gamma(s'), P)|}.$$

So if the limit (2.20) exists and is uniform, then

$$\lim_{A_1 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s))}{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s'))} = \lim_{A_1 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|I(z + \gamma(s), P)|}{|I(z + \gamma(s'), P)|}.$$

In the following Lemma 2.23 we show that this is indeed so. □

**2.23. Lemma.** *There holds that*

$$(2.24) \quad \lim_{A_1 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|I(z + \gamma(s'), P)|}{|I(z + \gamma(s), P)|} = 1.$$

*In particular, to be recorded for later use in the proof of Proposition 3.1, there holds that*

$$(2.25) \quad \lim_{A_1 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s))}{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s'))} \cdot \frac{|I(z + \gamma(s'), P)|}{|I(z + \gamma(s), P)|} = 1.$$

*Crucially, in (2.24) and (2.25) the implicit constants do not depend on  $Q$  and the limits are uniform on  $Q \in \mathcal{R}_\gamma$ ,  $z \in P \setminus \{v_{lt}, v_{rb}\}$  and  $s, s' \in I(z, W_1)$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that  $|I(z + \gamma(s), P)| = b(s) - a(s)$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} a(s) &= \max\{v_1 - z_1 - s, (v_2 - z_2 + |s|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}\}, \\ b(s) &= \min\{v_1 + \ell(I) - z_1 - s, (v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta - z_2 + |s|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

We have four cases to consider.

**Case 1.**  $b(s') = (v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta - z_2 + |s'|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}$ ,  $a(s') = v_1 - z_1 - s'$ . In this case we have

$$\begin{aligned} b(s') - a(s') &= (v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta - z_2 + |s'|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} - (v_1 - z_1 - s') \\ &= (z_1 - v_1) + (v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta - z_2 + |s'|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} - (|s'|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \\ &\geq (z_1 - v_1) + \frac{v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta - z_2}{\beta(v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta - z_2 + |s'|^\beta)^{1 - \frac{1}{\beta}}} \\ &\geq (z_1 - v_1) + \frac{v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta - z_2}{\beta((A_2 + 3)^\beta + 1)^{1 - \frac{1}{\beta}} \ell(I)^{\beta-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} b(s) - a(s) &\leq (v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta - z_2 + |s|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} - (v_1 - z_1 - s) \\ &\leq (z_1 - v_1) + \frac{v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta - z_2}{\beta((A_2 - 3)\ell(I))^{\beta-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

We record the simple fact that for  $0 < x < y$  and  $a, b \geq 0$  with  $\max\{a, b\} > 0$  we have

$$(2.26) \quad \frac{a + bx}{a + by} \geq \frac{axy^{-1} + bx}{a + by} = \frac{x(ay^{-1} + b)}{y(ay^{-1} + b)} = \frac{x}{y}.$$

Using this we get

$$\frac{|I(z + \gamma(s'), P)|}{|I(z + \gamma(s), P)|} \geq \frac{(A_2 - 3)^{\beta-1}}{((A_2 + 3)^\beta + 1)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}}.$$

We are happy with this for now (we calculate the limit after all of the cases), and move on now.

**Case 2.**  $b(s') = (v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta - z_2 + |s'|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}$ ,  $a(s') = (v_2 - z_2 + |s'|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}$ . In this case we have

$$\begin{aligned} b(s') - a(s') &= (v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta - z_2 + |s'|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} - (v_2 - z_2 + |s'|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \\ &\geq \frac{\ell(I)^\beta}{\beta(v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta - z_2 + |s'|^\beta)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}} \geq \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta((A_2 + 3)^\beta + 1)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} b(s) - a(s) &\leq (v_2 + \ell(I)^\beta - z_2 + |s|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} - (v_2 - z_2 + |s|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \\ &\leq \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta((A_2 - 3)^\beta - 1)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, in this case we obtain

$$\frac{|I(z + \gamma(s'), P)|}{|I(z + \gamma(s), P)|} \geq \frac{((A_2 - 3)^\beta - 1)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}}{((A_2 + 3)^\beta + 1)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}}.$$

**Case 3.**  $b(s') = v_1 + \ell(I) - z_1 - s'$ ,  $a(s') = (v_2 - z_2 + |s'|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}$ . Notice that now

$$\begin{aligned} b(s') - a(s') &= v_1 + \ell(I) - z_1 - s' - (v_2 - z_2 + |s'|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \\ &= v_1 + \ell(I) - z_1 + (|s'|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} - (v_2 - z_2 + |s'|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \\ &\geq v_1 + \ell(I) - z_1 + \frac{z_2 - v_2}{\beta(|s'|^\beta)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}} \\ &\geq v_1 + \ell(I) - z_1 + \frac{z_2 - v_2}{\beta((A_2 + 3)\ell(I))^{\beta-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, we have

$$\begin{aligned} b(s) - a(s) &\leq v_1 + \ell(I) - z_1 + (|s|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} - (v_2 - z_2 + |s|^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \\ &\leq v_1 + \ell(I) - z_1 + \frac{z_2 - v_2}{\beta((A_2 - 3)^\beta - 1)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}\ell(I)^{\beta-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by using (2.26) we get

$$\frac{|I(z + \gamma(s'), P)|}{|I(z + \gamma(s), P)|} \geq \frac{((A_2 - 3)^\beta - 1)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}}{(A_2 + 3)^{\beta-1}}.$$

**Case 4.**  $b(s') = v_1 + \ell(I) - z_1 - s'$ ,  $a(s') = v_1 - z_1 - s'$ . Now trivially  $b(s') - a(s') = \ell(I)$  and also

$$b(s) - a(s) \leq v_1 + \ell(I) - z_1 - s - (v_1 - z_1 - s) = \ell(I).$$

Thus, we get

$$\frac{|I(z + \gamma(s'), P)|}{|I(z + \gamma(s), P)|} \geq 1.$$

In summary, for all cases we have

$$\frac{|I(z + \gamma(s'), P)|}{|I(z + \gamma(s), P)|} \geq \frac{((A_2 - 3)^\beta - 1)^{1 - \frac{1}{\beta}}}{((A_2 + 3)^\beta + 1)^{1 - \frac{1}{\beta}}}.$$

The assumptions on  $s, s'$  were symmetric, so swithing the roles of  $s$  and  $s'$  gives that we also have

$$\frac{|I(z + \gamma(s), P)|}{|I(z + \gamma(s'), P)|} \geq \frac{((A_2 - 3)^\beta - 1)^{1 - \frac{1}{\beta}}}{((A_2 + 3)^\beta + 1)^{1 - \frac{1}{\beta}}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{((A_2 + 3)^\beta + 1)^{1 - \frac{1}{\beta}}}{((A_2 - 3)^\beta - 1)^{1 - \frac{1}{\beta}}} \geq \frac{|I(z + \gamma(s'), P)|}{|I(z + \gamma(s), P)|} \geq \frac{((A_2 - 3)^\beta - 1)^{1 - \frac{1}{\beta}}}{((A_2 + 3)^\beta + 1)^{1 - \frac{1}{\beta}}},$$

and we conclude (2.24).  $\square$

### 3. APPROXIMATE WEAK FACTORIZATION

We begin with the following proposition, which is the main step of our approximate weak factorization argument.

**3.1. Proposition.** *Let  $f \in L^\infty$  be supported on  $Q = I \times J \in \mathcal{R}_\gamma$ . Then for all  $A_1$  large enough (independently of  $Q$ ), the function  $f$  can be written as*

$$f = [h_Q H_\gamma^* g_{W_1} - g_{W_1} H_\gamma h_Q] + [h_{W_1} H_\gamma g_P - g_P H_\gamma^* h_{W_1}] + \tilde{f}_P,$$

where

$$h_Q := \frac{f}{H_\gamma^* g_{W_1}}, \quad h_{W_1} := \frac{g_{W_1} H_\gamma h_Q}{H_\gamma g_P}, \quad \tilde{f}_P := g_P H_\gamma^* \left( \frac{g_{W_1} H_\gamma}{H_\gamma g_P} H_\gamma \left( \frac{f}{H_\gamma^* g_{W_1}} \right) \right)$$

and there holds that

$$|h_Q| \lesssim A_1 |f|, \quad |h_{W_1}| \lesssim A_1 \|f\|_\infty 1_{W_1}.$$

Moreover, suppose that  $\int_Q f = 0$  and let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then for all  $A_1$  large enough (independently of  $Q$ ), there holds that

$$\int_P \tilde{f}_P = 0, \quad |\tilde{f}_P| \lesssim \varepsilon \|f\|_\infty 1_P.$$

*Proof.* The identity for  $f$  (provided that all of the functions are well-defined) is a triviality (everything just cancels out leaving  $f$ ). So, it only remains to deal with the estimates.

Fix  $x \in Q$ . We denote

$$I^{\text{cen}}(x, W_1) = \{t \in I(x, W_1) : g_{W_1}(x + \gamma(t)) = 1\}.$$

By Lemma 2.17 we have that, if  $x + \gamma(t) = y + \gamma(s) \in W_1$  with  $y \in P^{\text{cen}}$ , then

$$g_{W_1}(x + \gamma(t)) = 1.$$

Therefore, we have

$$(3.2) \quad I(x, W_1) \setminus I^{\text{cen}}(x, W_1) \subset \{t : \exists y \in P \setminus P^{\text{cen}} \text{ such that } x + \gamma(t) = y + \gamma(s) \in W_1\}.$$

To estimate  $|I(x, W_1) \setminus I^{\text{cen}}(x, W_1)|$  we will follow ideas from the proof of Lemma 2.8. Indeed, in the proof of Lemma 2.8 we had a  $t_1$  associated with the top left corner of  $P$ , and a  $t_1 + h$  associated with the bottom right corner of  $P$ . Here we will have some  $h_1$  associated with  $P_1^{lt}$  and some  $h_2$  associated with  $P_1^{rb}$ . Indeed, using the notation from the proof of Lemma 2.8 we have the following analogies of (2.11) and (2.12):

$$h_1 = \frac{\ell(I)}{2\beta A_2^{\beta-1}} - |s_2| + |s_1|,$$

$$(t_1 + h_1)^\beta - t_1^\beta = -\frac{\ell(I)^\beta}{2} - |s_2|^\beta + |s_1|^\beta.$$

Following the computations there we get

$$h_1 \leq \frac{\frac{\ell(I)}{2(A_1-2)^{\beta-1}} + \frac{\beta\ell(I)}{2\beta A_2^{\beta-1}} \cdot \left(\frac{A_2+3}{A_1-2}\right)^{\beta-1}}{\beta\left[\left(\frac{A_2-3}{A_1+2}\right)^{\beta-1} - 1\right]} \lesssim \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}}.$$

The estimate for  $h_2$  is the same. Hence

$$|I(x, W_1) \setminus I^{\text{cen}}(x, W_1)| \leq h_1 + h_2 \lesssim \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}} \leq \frac{|I(x, W_1)|}{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}}.$$

Notice now that

$$H_\gamma^* g_{W_1}(x) = \int_{I(x, W_1)} g_{W_1}(x + \gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t} \geq \int_{I^{\text{cen}}(x, W_1)} \frac{dt}{t} \geq \frac{|I^{\text{cen}}(x, W_1)|}{(A_1 + 2)\ell(I)}.$$

Hence, we get

$$(3.3) \quad \left(1 - \frac{c}{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}}\right) \frac{|I(x, W_1)|}{(A_1 + 2)\ell(I)} \leq \frac{|I^{\text{cen}}(x, W_1)|}{(A_1 + 2)\ell(I)} \leq H_\gamma^* g_{W_1}(x)$$

$$= \int_{I(x, W_1)} g_{W_1}(x + \gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t} \leq \frac{|I(x, W_1)|}{(A_1 - 2)\ell(I)}.$$

In particular, by Lemma 2.8 we have

$$|h_Q(x)| \lesssim A_1 |f(x)|.$$

provided that  $A_1$  (and hence  $A_2$ ) is sufficiently large.

Next, we estimate  $h_{W_1}(y)$  for  $y \in W_1$ . To this end, we first estimate  $H_\gamma g_P(y)$  (recall  $g_P = 1_P$ ). By a direct computation, we have

$$H_\gamma g_P(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g_P(y - \gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t} = - \int_{\mathbb{R}} g_P(y + \gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t}$$

$$= - \int_{I(y, P)} \frac{dt}{t} \sim - \frac{|I(y, P)|}{A_2 \ell(I)}.$$

Then, for  $H_\gamma h_Q$  we have

$$|H_\gamma h_Q(y)| = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} h_Q(y - \gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t} \right| = \left| \int_{I(y, Q)} h_Q(y - \gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t} \right| \lesssim \|h_Q\|_\infty \frac{|I(y, Q)|}{A_1 \ell(I)},$$

where

$$I(y, Q) := \{t : y - \gamma(t) \in Q\}.$$

Observe that if  $t_1, t_2 \in I(y, Q)$ , then

$$\ell(I)^\beta \geq |(y_2 - t_1^\beta) - (y_2 - t_2^\beta)| \geq \beta[(A_1 - 2)\ell(I)]^{\beta-1}|t_2 - t_1|.$$

Hence, we have

$$|I(y, Q)| \lesssim \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_1^{\beta-1}}.$$

Now, by (2.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |h_{W_1}(y)| &= \left| \frac{g_{W_1}(y)H_\gamma h_Q(y)}{H_\gamma g_P(y)} \right| \\ &\lesssim \|h_Q\|_\infty \frac{g_{W_1}(y)A_2|I(y, Q)|}{A_1|I(y, P)|} \\ &\lesssim A_1\|f\|_\infty \cdot |I(y, P)| \frac{\beta A_2^{\beta-1}}{\ell(I)} \cdot \frac{A_2}{A_1} \cdot \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_1^{\beta-1}} \cdot \frac{1}{|I(y, P)|} 1_{W_1}(y) \\ &= A_1\|f\|_\infty \frac{A_2^\beta}{A_1^\beta} 1_{W_1}(y) \lesssim A_1\|f\|_\infty 1_{W_1}(y). \end{aligned}$$

Having now estimated  $h_Q$  and  $h_{W_1}$ , it only remains to deal with  $\tilde{f}_P$ . So we are now assuming  $\int_Q f = 0$ . The property  $\int_P \tilde{f}_P = 0$  is obvious:

$$\int g_P H_\gamma^* \left( \frac{g_{W_1}}{H_\gamma g_P} H_\gamma \left( \frac{f}{H_\gamma^* g_{W_1}} \right) \right) = \int g_{W_1} H_\gamma \left( \frac{f}{H_\gamma^* g_{W_1}} \right) = \int f = 0.$$

Fix now  $z \in P$ . We can write

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_P(z) &= H_\gamma^* \left( \frac{g_{W_1}}{H_\gamma g_P} H_\gamma \left( \frac{f}{H_\gamma^* g_{W_1}} \right) \right)(z) \\ &= \int_{I(z, W_1)} \left( \frac{g_{W_1}}{H_\gamma g_P} \right)(z + \gamma(s)) H_\gamma \left( \frac{f}{H_\gamma^* g_{W_1}} \right)(z + \gamma(s)) \frac{ds}{s} \\ &= \int_{I(z, W_1)} \int_{I(z + \gamma(s), Q)} \left( \frac{g_{W_1}}{H_\gamma g_P} \right)(z + \gamma(s)) \frac{f(z + \gamma(s) - \gamma(t))}{(H_\gamma^* g_{W_1})(z + \gamma(s) - \gamma(t))} \frac{dt}{t} \frac{ds}{s} \\ &=: \int_{I(z, W_1)} \int_{I(z + \gamma(s), Q)} C_z(t, s) f(z + \gamma(s) - \gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t} \frac{ds}{s}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_z(t, s) := \left( \frac{g_{W_1}}{H_\gamma g_P} \right)(z + \gamma(s)) \frac{1}{(H_\gamma^* g_{W_1})(z + \gamma(s) - \gamma(t))}.$$

Observe that if  $z \in \{v_{lt}, v_{rb}\}$  then  $g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s)) = 0$  and trivially  $\tilde{f}_P(z) = 0$ . So we may assume  $z \in P \setminus \{v_{lt}, v_{rb}\}$ . By (3.3), we have that

$$\frac{(A_1 - 2)\ell(I)}{|I(z + \gamma(s) - \gamma(t), W_1)|} \leq \frac{1}{(H_\gamma^* g_{W_1})(z + \gamma(s) - \gamma(t))} \leq \frac{(A_1 + 2)\ell(I)}{|I^{\text{cen}}(z + \gamma(s) - \gamma(t), W_1)|}.$$

As above, by

$$H_\gamma g_P(z + \gamma(s)) = - \int_{I(z + \gamma(s), P)} \frac{dt}{t}$$



we have

$$(3.4) \quad -\frac{|I(z + \gamma(s), P)|}{(A_2 - 3)\ell(I)} \leq H_\gamma g_P(z + \gamma(s)) \leq -\frac{|I(z + \gamma(s), P)|}{(A_2 + 3)\ell(I)}.$$

Now, define the set

$$F_z := \{(t, s) : z + \gamma(s) \in W_1, \quad z + \gamma(s) - \gamma(t) \in Q\}$$

and fix  $(t_0, s_0) \in F_z$ . By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{C_z(t, s)}{C_z(t_0, s_0)} &= \frac{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s))}{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s_0))} \cdot \frac{H_\gamma g_P(z + \gamma(s_0))}{H_\gamma g_P(z + \gamma(s))} \cdot \frac{(H_\gamma^* g_{W_1})(z + \gamma(s_0) - \gamma(t_0))}{(H_\gamma^* g_{W_1})(z + \gamma(s) - \gamma(t))} \\ &\sim \frac{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s))}{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s_0))} \cdot \frac{|I(z + \gamma(s_0), P)|}{|I(z + \gamma(s), P)|} \cdot \frac{|I(z + \gamma(s_0) - \gamma(t_0), W_1)|}{|I(z + \gamma(s) - \gamma(t), W_1)|}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, by (2.25) and Lemma 2.8 we have

$$\lim_{A_1 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_z(t, s)}{C_z(t_0, s_0)} = 1$$

uniformly on  $z, t, s, t_0, s_0$  and  $Q$ . In other words,

$$\lim_{A_1 \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{z \in P \setminus \{v_{lt}, v_{rb}\} \\ (t, s) \in F_z}} \frac{|C_z(t, s) - C_z(t_0, s_0)|}{|C_z(t_0, s_0)|} = 0.$$

However, by (3.4), (2.19), (3.3) and Lemma 2.8 we have

$$(3.5) \quad |C_z(t_0, s_0)| \leq \frac{(A_1 + 2)\ell(I)}{|I^{\text{cen}}(z + \gamma(s_0) - \gamma(t_0), W_1)|} \frac{g_{W_1}(z + \gamma(s_0))(A_2 + 3)\ell(I)}{|I(z + \gamma(s_0), P)|} \lesssim A_1^{\beta+1}.$$

So we get

$$\lim_{A_1 \rightarrow \infty} A_1^{-(\beta+1)} \sup_{\substack{z \in P \setminus \{v_{lt}, v_{rb}\} \\ (t, s) \in F_z}} |C_z(t, s) - C_z(t_0, s_0)| = 0.$$

This means that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists some  $A(\varepsilon) > 0$  such that as long as  $A_1 > A(\varepsilon)$ , we have

$$\sup_{\substack{z \in P \setminus \{v_{lt}, v_{rb}\} \\ (t, s) \in F_z}} |C_z(t, s) - C_z(t_0, s_0)| < \varepsilon A_1^{\beta+1}.$$

Hence, if we define

$$D_z f := \int_{I(z, W_1)} \int_{I(z + \gamma(s), Q)} (C_z(t, s) - C_z(t_0, s_0)) f(z + \gamma(s) - \gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t} \frac{ds}{s},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} |D_z f| &\leq \varepsilon A_1^{\beta+1} \|f\|_\infty \int_{I(z, W_1)} \int_{I(z + \gamma(s), Q)} \frac{dt}{|t|} \frac{ds}{|s|} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon A_1^{\beta+1} \|f\|_\infty \int_{I(z, W_1)} \frac{|I(z + \gamma(s), Q)|}{A_1 \ell(I)} \frac{ds}{|s|} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon A_1^{\beta+1} \|f\|_\infty \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_1^{\beta-1}} \frac{|I(z, W_1)|}{A_1 A_2 \ell(I)^2} \lesssim \varepsilon \|f\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the already familiar bound

$$|I(z + \gamma(s), Q)| \lesssim \frac{\ell(I)}{\beta A_1^{\beta-1}}$$

and

$$|I(z, W_1)| \leq |(-(A_2 + 3)\ell(I), -(A_2 - 3)\ell(I))| = 6\ell(I).$$

It now remains to control

$$\tilde{f}_P(z) - D_z f = C_z(t_0, s_0) \int_{I(z, W_1)} \int_{I(z+\gamma(s), Q)} f(z + \gamma(s) - \gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t} \frac{ds}{s}.$$

Consider the map  $h_z: F_z \rightarrow Q$  defined by

$$h_z(t, s) = z + \gamma(s) - \gamma(t).$$

For any  $x \in Q$  and  $z \in P \setminus \{v_{lt}, v_{rb}\}$ , by Lemma 2.3 there is a unique pair  $(t, s)$  with

$$x + \gamma(t) = z + \gamma(s) \in W_1.$$

This means that given any  $x \in Q$  and  $z \in P$ , we find a unique  $(t_{x,z}, s_{x,z})$  such that  $(t_{x,z}, s_{x,z}) \in F_z$ . Thus,  $h_z$  is bijective, and clearly  $h_z$  is differentiable. Set  $\rho(t, s) := (ts)^{-1}$ . By a change of variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{I(z, W_1)} \int_{I(z+\gamma(s), Q)} f(z + \gamma(s) - \gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t} \frac{ds}{s} &= \int_{F_z} f(h_z(t, s)) \rho(t, s) d(t, s) \\ &= \int_Q f(x) \rho(h_z^{-1}(x)) \det J_{h_z^{-1}}(x) dx \\ &= \int_Q f(x) \rho(h_z^{-1}(x)) \frac{dx}{\det J_{h_z}(t_{x,z}, s_{x,z})}, \end{aligned}$$

where we denote  $(t_{x,z}, s_{x,z}) = h_z^{-1}(x)$ . A direct computation gives that

$$\det J_{h_z}(t_{x,z}, s_{x,z}) = \det \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ -\beta t_{x,z}^{\beta-1} & \beta (-s_{x,z})^{\beta-1} \end{bmatrix} = \beta(t_{x,z}^{\beta-1} - (-s_{x,z})^{\beta-1}).$$

Due to this we define

$$\theta_z(x) = \frac{1}{\beta(t_{x,z}^{\beta-1} - (-s_{x,z})^{\beta-1})} \frac{1}{t_{x,z} s_{x,z}}, \quad \text{where } t_{x,z} \sim A_1 \ell(I), \quad s_{x,z} \sim -A_2 \ell(I).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{I(z, W_1)} \int_{I(z+\gamma(s), Q)} f(z + \gamma(s) - \gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t} \frac{ds}{s} \\ = \int_Q f(x) \theta_z(x) dx = \int_Q f(x) (\theta_z(x) - \theta_z(c_Q)) dx, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have finally used the critical assumption  $\int_Q f = 0$ . Here  $c_Q$  is the center of  $Q$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} |\theta_z(x) - \theta_z(c_Q)| &= \left| \frac{1}{\beta(t_{x,z}^{\beta-1} - (-s_{x,z})^{\beta-1}) t_{x,z} s_{x,z}} \left( 1 - \frac{(t_{x,z}^{\beta-1} - (-s_{x,z})^{\beta-1}) t_{x,z} s_{x,z}}{(t_{c_Q,z}^{\beta-1} - (-s_{c_Q,z})^{\beta-1}) t_{c_Q,z} s_{c_Q,z}} \right) \right| \\ &\lesssim (A_1 \ell(I))^{-(\beta+1)} \left| 1 - \frac{((A_2 + 3)^{\beta-1} - (A_1 - 2)^{\beta-1})(A_2 + 3)(A_1 + 2)}{((A_2 - 3)^{\beta-1} - (A_1 + 2)^{\beta-1})(A_2 - 3)(A_1 - 2)} \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq (A_1 \ell(I))^{-(\beta+1)} \varepsilon,$$

provided  $A_1$  is big enough, combining the above and (3.5) we get

$$|\tilde{f}_P(z) - D_z f| \lesssim A_1^{\beta+1} (A_1 \ell(I))^{-(\beta+1)} \varepsilon \|f\|_\infty |Q| = \varepsilon \|f\|_\infty.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Fix  $Q = I \times J \in \mathcal{R}_\gamma$  and then choose  $f$  with  $\|f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 1$  and  $\int_Q f = 0$  so that

$$\int_Q |b - \langle b \rangle_Q| = \int_Q bf.$$

Now, apply our approximate weak factorization, Proposition 3.1, to get the said decomposition of  $f$ . Then, since  $(Q, W_1)$  and  $(P, W_2)$  are in symmetric roles, we also have the following factorization for  $\tilde{f}_P$ :

$$\tilde{f}_P = [u_P H_\gamma g_{W_2} - g_{W_2} H_\gamma^* u_P] + [u_{W_2} H_\gamma^* g_Q - g_Q H_\gamma u_{W_2}] + \tilde{f}_Q,$$

where

$$u_P = \frac{\tilde{f}_P}{H_\gamma g_{W_2}}, \quad u_{W_2} = \frac{g_{W_2} H_\gamma^* u_P}{H_\gamma^* g_Q}, \quad \tilde{f}_Q = g_Q H_\gamma \left( \frac{g_{W_2} H_\gamma^*}{H_\gamma^* g_Q} H_\gamma^* \left( \frac{\tilde{f}_P}{H_\gamma g_{W_2}} \right) \right)$$

and there holds that

$$|u_P| \lesssim A_1 |\tilde{f}_P| \lesssim A_1 1_P, \quad |u_{W_2}| \lesssim A_1 \|\tilde{f}_P\|_\infty 1_{W_2} \lesssim A_1 1_{W_2}.$$

Moreover, given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , for all  $A_1$  large enough (independently of  $Q$ ), there holds that

$$\int_Q \tilde{f}_Q = 0, \quad |\tilde{f}_Q| \lesssim \varepsilon \|\tilde{f}_P\|_\infty 1_Q \lesssim \varepsilon^2 1_Q.$$

By our decomposition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_Q bf &= - \int g_{W_1} [b, H_\gamma] (h_Q) + \int h_{W_1} [b, H_\gamma] (g_P) + \int u_P [b, H_\gamma] (g_{W_2}) \\ &\quad - \int g_Q [b, H_\gamma] (u_{W_2}) + \int b \tilde{f}_Q. \end{aligned}$$

By the vanishing moment of  $\tilde{f}_Q$  we have

$$\int b \tilde{f}_Q = \int_Q (b - \langle b \rangle_Q) \tilde{f}_Q.$$

Hence, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_Q |b - \langle b \rangle_Q| &\leq \| [b, H_\gamma] \|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} (\|g_{W_1}\|_{L^{p'}} \|h_Q\|_{L^p} + \|h_{W_1}\|_{L^{p'}} \|g_P\|_{L^p} + \|g_{W_2}\|_{L^p} \|u_P\|_{L^{p'}} \\ &\quad + \|u_{W_2}\|_{L^p} \|g_Q\|_{L^{p'}}) + C \varepsilon^2 \int_Q |b - \langle b \rangle_Q| \\ &\leq C_{A_1} \| [b, H_\gamma] \|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} |Q| + C \varepsilon^2 \int_Q |b - \langle b \rangle_Q|, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  is absolute constant and we have, in addition to the various size estimates of the appearing functions, used Lemma 2.2. Hence, by fixing  $\varepsilon$  small enough (that is  $A_1$  big enough) we obtain

$$\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |b - \langle b \rangle_Q| \lesssim \|[b, H_\gamma]\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p}.$$

We are done.  $\square$

#### 4. CURVES WITH NON-VANISHING TORSION

In this section we consider curves with non-vanishing torsion. In particular, we are interested in  $C^2$  curves  $\gamma : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  with a Taylor expansion of the form

$$\gamma(t) = \gamma'(0)t + \frac{\gamma''(0)}{2}t^2 + R(t), \quad t \in (-1, 1),$$

where  $\gamma'(0), \gamma''(0)$  are linearly independent and the remainder term  $R$  is assumed to satisfy

$$(4.1) \quad R \in C^2(-1, 1), \quad \lim_{|t| \rightarrow 0} \frac{|R(t)|}{|t|^2} = 0.$$

Writing  $\gamma'(0), \gamma''(0)$  as column vectors we define the matrix

$$A := \begin{bmatrix} \gamma'(0) & \frac{\gamma''(0)}{2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then a straightforward computation shows that the matrix  $O$ ,

$$(4.2) \quad O := AB, \quad B := \begin{bmatrix} |\gamma'(0)|^{-1} & -\left\langle \frac{\gamma''(0)}{2}, \frac{\gamma'(0)}{|\gamma'(0)|} \right\rangle |\gamma'(0)|^{-1} c \\ 0 & c \end{bmatrix},$$

is orthonormal, where

$$c := \left| \frac{\gamma''(0)}{2} - \left\langle \frac{\gamma''(0)}{2}, \frac{\gamma'(0)}{|\gamma'(0)|} \right\rangle \frac{\gamma'(0)}{|\gamma'(0)|} \right|^{-1}.$$

Denote the columns of  $O$  by  $e_1, e_2$ . As in [2], we let  $\mathcal{R}_\gamma$  be the collection of rectangles with sides parallel to  $e_1, e_2$  and satisfying that, for some  $\ell$ , the side-length of the side parallel to  $e_j$  is  $\ell^j$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ . We say  $b \in \text{BMO}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}^2)$  if

$$\|b\|_{\text{BMO}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}^2)} := \sup_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{R}_\gamma \\ \ell(Q) \leq 1}} \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |b - \langle b \rangle_Q|,$$

where  $\ell(Q)$  denotes the side-length of the side parallel to  $e_1$ . It is stated in [1] that if  $b \in \text{BMO}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}^2)$ , then  $[b, H_\gamma]$  is bounded in  $L^p$ , where

$$H_\gamma f(x) := \int_{-1}^1 f(x - \gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the collection of all the parabolic cubes in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  – recall that  $Q = I \times J$  is a parabolic cube if the sides of  $Q$  are parallel to the coordinate axes and  $\ell(J) = \ell(I)^2$ . For a parabolic cube we define  $\ell(Q) = \ell(I)$ . Then it is clear that  $\mathcal{R}_\gamma = \mathcal{OP}$ .

We next record several small auxiliary results for the various appearing BMO spaces.

**4.3. Lemma.** *Let  $E$  be an invertible  $2 \times 2$  matrix. Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and  $0 < \tau < 1$ . Then we have that*

$$(4.4) \quad \sup_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{P} \\ \ell(Q) \leq 1}} \left( \frac{1}{|EQ|} \int_{EQ} |b - \langle b \rangle_{EQ}|^p \right)^{1/p} \lesssim_{p,\tau} \sup_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{P} \\ \ell(Q) \leq \tau}} \left( \frac{1}{|EQ|} \int_{EQ} |b - \langle b \rangle_{EQ}|^p \right)^{1/p},$$

where the implicit constant is independent from  $E$ .

*Proof.* By the change of variables  $\int_{EQ} f = |\det E| \int_Q f \circ E$  and  $|EQ| = |\det E| |Q|$  it is enough to prove claim with  $E = \text{id}$ . But for the collection of parabolic cubes  $\mathcal{P}$  the claim is proved exactly as in the Euclidean case, which is simple.  $\square$

We also make the following observation that removes the matrix  $B$  from the rest of our considerations.

**4.5. Lemma.** *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Then*

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}: \ell(Q) \leq 1} \left( \frac{1}{|AQ|} \int_{AQ} |b - \langle b \rangle_{AQ}|^p \right)^{1/p} \sim \sup_{R \in \mathcal{R}_\gamma: \ell(R) \leq 1} \left( \frac{1}{|R|} \int_R |b - \langle b \rangle_R|^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

*Proof.* We begin with the observation that  $\mathcal{R}_\gamma = \{ABQ : Q \in \mathcal{P}\}$ , where  $B$  is defined in (4.2). Again, a change of variables gives that  $\int_{AQ} b = |\det A| \int_Q b \circ A$  and  $|AQ| = |\det A| |Q|$ . Hence, it suffices to connect the quantities

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}: \ell(Q) \leq 1} \left( \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |b \circ A - \langle b \circ A \rangle_Q|^p \right)^{1/p}$$

and

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}: \ell(Q) \leq 1} \left( \frac{1}{|BQ|} \int_{BQ} |b \circ A - \langle b \circ A \rangle_{BQ}|^p \right)^{1/p}$$

by suitable coverings. Suppose the lower left corner of  $Q$  is  $(u_1, u_2)$ . Then  $B$  maps  $(u_1, u_2) + \ell(I)(1, 0)$  into

$$B \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix} + \ell(I)B \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = B \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix} + |\gamma'(0)|^{-1} \ell(I) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Also,  $B$  maps  $(u_1, u_2) + \ell(I)^2(0, 1)$  into

$$B \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix} + \ell(I)^2 B \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = B \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix} + c \ell(I)^2 \begin{pmatrix} -\langle \frac{\gamma''(0)}{2}, \frac{\gamma'(0)}{|\gamma'(0)|} \rangle |\gamma'(0)|^{-1} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

So we have seen that  $B$  maps  $Q$  into a parallelogram with one side parallel to the axis. When  $\ell(Q)$  is sufficiently small, it is clear that there is a parabolic cube  $Q_1$  such that  $BQ \subset Q_1$  and  $\ell(Q_1) \sim \ell(Q)$ . Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \frac{1}{|BQ|} \int_{BQ} |b \circ A - \langle b \circ A \rangle_{BQ}|^p \right)^{1/p} &\leq 2 \left( \frac{1}{|BQ|} \int_{BQ} |b \circ A - \langle b \circ A \rangle_{Q_1}|^p \right)^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \left( \frac{1}{|Q_1|} \int_{Q_1} |b \circ A - \langle b \circ A \rangle_{Q_1}|^p \right)^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

Now,  $B^{-1}$  is also an upper triangular matrix. When  $\ell(Q)$  is sufficiently small, there is a parabolic cube  $Q_2$  such that  $Q \subset BQ_2$  (i.e.  $B^{-1}Q \subset Q_2$ ) and  $\ell(Q_2) \sim \ell(Q)$ , and so

$$\left( \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |b \circ A - \langle b \circ A \rangle_Q|^p \right)^{1/p} \lesssim \left( \frac{1}{|BQ_2|} \int_{BQ_2} |b \circ A - \langle b \circ A \rangle_{BQ_2}|^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

Thus, the desired equivalence is proved for  $\ell(Q)$  small enough. The general case is obtained by applying Lemma 4.3.  $\square$

Finally, we note the John-Nirenberg property of  $\text{BMO}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}^2)$ .

**4.6. Lemma.** *Suppose that  $b \in \text{BMO}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}^2)$ . Then for any  $1 < p < \infty$  we have*

$$\sup_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{R}_\gamma \\ \ell(Q) \leq 1}} \left( \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |b - \langle b \rangle_Q|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}^2)}.$$

*Proof.* By a change of variables the proof is essentially as in the classical Euclidean case.  $\square$

Now, a crucial observation is that to estimate  $\|b\|_{\text{BMO}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}^2)}$ , by Lemma 4.3, Lemma 4.5 and a change of variables we know that it is enough to bound

$$\sup_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{P} \\ \ell(Q) \leq \tau}} \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |b \circ A - \langle b \circ A \rangle_Q|,$$

where  $\tau$  is a sufficiently small number to be specified later. Fix  $Q$ . By applying the result in [5] we get that

$$\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |b \circ A - \langle b \circ A \rangle_Q| \lesssim \frac{1}{|Q|} \sum_{j=1}^4 \left| \int \psi_j [b \circ A, H_\eta] \varphi_j \right|,$$

where  $\eta(t) := (t, t^2)$ ,  $(\text{spt } \psi_j, \text{spt } \varphi_j) \in \{(Q, W), (P, W), (W, Q), (W, P)\}$ . Here

$$|\psi_j| \lesssim 1, \quad |\varphi_j| \lesssim 1, \quad |Q| \sim |W| \sim |P|,$$

and

$$|x_1 - y_1| \sim \ell(Q), \quad \forall x \in \text{spt}(\varphi_j) \forall y \in \text{spt}(\psi_j),$$

which in particular gives

$$\text{dist}(\pi_1 P, \pi_1 Q) \sim \text{dist}(\pi_1 P, \pi_1 W) \sim \text{dist}(\pi_1 Q, \pi_1 W) \sim \ell(Q).$$

Here  $W$  is the key auxiliary set defined in [5] which is different from the  $W_1, W_2$  defined in this article. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int \psi_j [b \circ A, H_\eta] \varphi_j &= \int \psi_j(x) \int (b(Ax) - b(Ax - A\eta(t))) \varphi_j(x - \eta(t)) \frac{dt}{t} dx \\ &= |\det A|^{-1} \int \psi_j(A^{-1}x) \int (b(x) - b(x - \tilde{\gamma}(t))) \varphi_j(A^{-1}x - \eta(t)) \frac{dt}{t} dx \\ &= |\det A|^{-1} \int (\psi_j \circ A^{-1}) [b, H_{\tilde{\gamma}}] (\varphi_j \circ A^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{\gamma} = A\eta$  and we also note that in the above integral the support localization of the pair  $(\text{spt } \psi_j, \text{spt } \varphi_j)$  forces  $|t| \sim \ell(Q)$ .

We are ready to state and prove the main result of this section – the current proof requires the a priori qualitative assumption  $b \in \text{BMO}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}^2)$  that we did not attempt to remove. A possible way to remove the a priorization would be to repeat proofs given in Section 2 for curves with non-vanishing torsion.

**4.7. Theorem.** *Suppose  $\|[b, H_\gamma]\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} < \infty$ . With the qualitative a priori assumption  $b \in \text{BMO}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}^2)$  we have the quantitative bound*

$$\|b\|_{\text{BMO}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}^2)} \lesssim \|[b, H_\gamma]\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p}.$$

*Proof.* By the above discussion, for fixed  $Q \in \mathcal{P}$  with  $\ell(Q) \leq \tau$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |b \circ A - \langle b \circ A \rangle_Q| &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^4 \frac{1}{|\det A||Q|} \left| \int (\psi_j \circ A^{-1})[b, H_{\tilde{\gamma}}](\varphi_j \circ A^{-1}) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^4 \frac{1}{|\det A||Q|} \left| \int (\psi_j \circ A^{-1})[b, H_\gamma](\varphi_j \circ A^{-1}) \right| \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^4 \frac{1}{|\det A||Q|} \left| \int (\psi_j \circ A^{-1})[b, H_{\tilde{\gamma}} - H_\gamma](\varphi_j \circ A^{-1}) \right| \\ &=: I + II. \end{aligned}$$

The estimate of  $I$  is easy – indeed, we have

$$I \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^4 \frac{1}{|\det A||Q|} \|\psi_j \circ A^{-1}\|_{L^{p'}} \|[b, H_\gamma]\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \|\varphi_j \circ A^{-1}\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|[b, H_\gamma]\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p}.$$

We then focus on the term  $II$ . Recall that the supports of  $\psi_j$  and  $\varphi_j$  force  $|t| \sim \ell(Q)$  in the kernel representation of

$$\int (\psi_j \circ A^{-1})[b, H_{\tilde{\gamma}}](\varphi_j \circ A^{-1}).$$

Next we look at

$$\begin{aligned} &\int (\psi_j \circ A^{-1})[b, H_\gamma](\varphi_j \circ A^{-1}) \\ &= \int \psi_j(A^{-1}x) \int (b(x) - b(x - \gamma(t))) \varphi_j(A^{-1}x - A^{-1}\gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Again we have  $|A^{-1}\gamma(t)| \sim \ell(Q)$ . Now observe that if  $|t| \ll \ell(Q)$ , then by  $\gamma$  being  $C^2$  (e.g.  $C^1$  with bounded derivative) we have

$$|A^{-1}\gamma(t)| \leq C|\gamma(t)| = C|\gamma(t) - \gamma(0)| \leq C'|t| \ll \ell(Q),$$

which is a contradiction. Hence  $|t| \gtrsim \ell(Q)$ . On the other hand by the limiting assumption on the line (4.1) we may let  $c$  be an absolute constant (depending only on  $\gamma$ ) such that

$$|\gamma(t) - \tilde{\gamma}(t)| \leq |R(t)| \leq \frac{1}{2}|\tilde{\gamma}(t)|, \quad \forall |t| \in [0, c].$$

Above we used that  $|\tilde{\gamma}(t)| \sim |t|$ . Thus, for  $|t| \in [0, c]$  we have  $|\gamma(t)| \sim |\tilde{\gamma}(t)|$ , from which we get that  $|t| \sim \ell(Q)$  (assuming  $\tau/c$  is sufficiently small).

Hence, by the above discussion there exists  $\theta, \Theta$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} II &= \sum_{j=1}^4 \frac{1}{|\det A||Q|} \left| \int (\psi_j \circ A^{-1}) [b, H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{\tilde{\gamma}} - H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{\gamma}] (\varphi_j \circ A^{-1}) \right| \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^4 \frac{1}{|\det A||Q|} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{|t| \in (c, 1]} |\psi_j(A^{-1}x) (b(x) - b(x - \gamma(t))) \varphi_j(A^{-1}x - A^{-1}\gamma(t))| \frac{dt}{t} dx \\ &=: II_1 + II_2, \end{aligned}$$

where both  $H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{\tilde{\gamma}}$  and  $H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{\gamma}$  are defined through the formula

$$H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{\rho} f(x) := \int_{\theta\ell(Q) \leq |t| \leq \Theta\ell(Q)} f(x - \rho(t)) \frac{dt}{t}.$$

We estimate  $II_2$  first. A key observation is that

$$(4.8) \quad \lim_{\ell(Q) \rightarrow 0} |I_Q| = 0, \quad \text{where } I_Q := ([-1, -c] \cup [c, 1]) \cap \{t : |A^{-1}\gamma(t)| \sim \ell(Q)\}.$$

We will prove this soon. First, note that

$$\begin{aligned} II_2 &= \sum_{j=1}^4 \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{|t| \in (c, 1]} |\psi_j(x) ((b \circ A)(x) - (b \circ A)(x - A^{-1}\gamma(t))) \varphi_j(x - A^{-1}\gamma(t))| \frac{dt}{t} dx \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^4 \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_{I_Q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |(b \circ A)(x) - \langle b \circ A \rangle_{\Lambda Q}| |\psi_j(x)| \cdot |\varphi_j(x - A^{-1}\gamma(t))| dx dt \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^4 \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_{I_Q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |(b \circ A)(x - A^{-1}\gamma(t)) - \langle b \circ A \rangle_{\Lambda Q}| |\psi_j(x)| \cdot |\varphi_j(x - A^{-1}\gamma(t))| dx dt \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_{I_Q} \int_{\Lambda Q} |(b \circ A)(x) - \langle b \circ A \rangle_{\Lambda Q}| dx dt \\ &\lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}_\gamma} |I_Q|, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Lambda > 0$  is a suitable large constant such that  $\Lambda Q$  is a parabolic cube with  $\ell(\Lambda Q) = \Lambda\ell(Q)$  and  $\Lambda Q \supset Q \cup W \cup P$ .

To complete the estimate of  $II_2$  it remains to prove (4.8). Aiming for a contradiction, assume that

$$\limsup_{\ell(Q) \rightarrow 0} |I_Q| > 0.$$

Then there exists some  $\varepsilon > 0$  and a sequence of parabolic cubes  $\{Q_j\}$  such that  $\ell(Q_j) \rightarrow 0$  and  $|I_{Q_j}| \geq \varepsilon$ . Note that  $|A^{-1}\gamma(t)| \sim |\gamma(t)|$ . Thus there exist constants  $c_1, c_2$  such that

$$I_{Q_j} \subset ([-1, -c] \cup [c, 1]) \cap \{t : c_1\ell(Q_j) \leq |\gamma(t)| \leq c_2\ell(Q_j)\}, \quad \forall j.$$

Thus we may further pick a subsequence of  $\{Q_j\}$ , which we denote by  $Q_{j_k}$ , such that  $[c_1\ell(Q_{j_k}), c_2\ell(Q_{j_k})]$  are pairwise disjoint. Then  $I_{Q_{j_k}}$  are pairwise disjoint and we obtain a contradiction

$$1 - c \geq \sum_k |I_{Q_{j_k}}| = +\infty.$$



Thus (4.8) holds and for any prescribed  $\varepsilon > 0$  we may choose  $\tau = \tau(\varepsilon)$  sufficiently small so that

$$II_2 \leq \varepsilon \|b\|_{\text{BMO}_\gamma}.$$

The rest of the proof is devoted to estimating  $II_1$ . Write

$$\begin{aligned} II_1 &= \sum_{j=1}^4 \frac{1}{|Q|} \left| \int \psi_j [b \circ A, H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{A^{-1}\tilde{\gamma}} - H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{A^{-1}\gamma}] \varphi_j \right| \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^4 \frac{1}{|Q|} \left| \int \psi_j [(b \circ A) - \langle b \circ A \rangle_{\Lambda Q}, H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{A^{-1}\tilde{\gamma}} - H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{A^{-1}\gamma}] \varphi_j \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^4 \frac{1}{|Q|} \left( \|\psi_j((b \circ A) - \langle b \circ A \rangle_{\Lambda Q})\|_{L^2} \| (H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{A^{-1}\tilde{\gamma}} - H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{A^{-1}\gamma}) \varphi_j \|_{L^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\psi_j\|_{L^2} \| (H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{A^{-1}\tilde{\gamma}} - H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{A^{-1}\gamma}) ((b \circ A) - \langle b \circ A \rangle_{\Lambda Q}) \varphi_j \|_{L^2} \right) \\ &\lesssim \|H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{A^{-1}\tilde{\gamma}} - H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{A^{-1}\gamma}\|_{L^2} \left( \int_{\Lambda Q} |b \circ A - \langle b \circ A \rangle_{\Lambda Q}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \|H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{A^{-1}\tilde{\gamma}} - H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{A^{-1}\gamma}\|_{L^2} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}_\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly the proof is completed by applying the following lemma.  $\square$

**4.9. Lemma.** *There holds that*

$$\lim_{\ell(Q) \rightarrow 0} \|H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{A^{-1}\tilde{\gamma}} - H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{A^{-1}\gamma}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} = 0.$$

*Proof.* Fix some  $f \in L^2$ . By Plancherel's theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{A^{-1}\tilde{\gamma}} f - H_{\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)}^{A^{-1}\gamma} f\|_{L^2} \\ &= \left\| \int_{\theta\ell(Q) \leq |t| \leq \Theta\ell(Q)} \left( e^{-2\pi i \xi \cdot A^{-1}\tilde{\gamma}(t)} - e^{-2\pi i \xi \cdot A^{-1}\gamma(t)} \right) \frac{dt}{t} \widehat{f}(\xi) \right\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to provide uniform bounds in  $\xi$  for

$$K = K(\xi) = \left| \int_{\theta\ell(Q)}^{\Theta\ell(Q)} \left( e^{-2\pi i \xi \cdot A^{-1}\tilde{\gamma}(t)} - e^{-2\pi i \xi \cdot A^{-1}\gamma(t)} \right) \frac{dt}{t} \right|,$$

as the integration over  $[-\Theta\ell(Q), -\theta\ell(Q)]$  is similar.

For any prescribed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , if  $\tau = \tau(\varepsilon)$  is sufficiently small, we always have the bound

$$K \lesssim \int_{\theta\ell(Q)}^{\Theta\ell(Q)} |\xi| |A^{-1}R(t)| \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim |\xi| \sup_{t \sim \ell(Q)} |R(t)| \lesssim \varepsilon |\xi| \ell(Q)^2,$$

this bound is clearly not always sufficient. To obtain a complementary bound we use van der Corput's lemma.

Set

$$\widetilde{\phi}(t) = -2\pi\xi \cdot A^{-1}\tilde{\gamma}(t) = -2\pi(\xi_1 t + \xi_2 t^2), \quad \phi(t) = -2\pi\xi \cdot A^{-1}\gamma(t).$$

Let us first assume that  $|\xi_1| \leq |\xi_2|$ . Note that  $|\tilde{\phi}''(t)| = 4\pi|\xi_2|$  and by continuity of  $\gamma'', \tilde{\gamma}''$  and that  $\gamma''(0) = \tilde{\gamma}''(0) = (0, 2)$ , there exists some absolute constant  $\delta_1$  such that for  $|t| \leq \delta_1$  (we may let  $\tau < \delta_1/\Theta$ ) we have  $|(A^{-1}\gamma)''(t) - (A^{-1}\tilde{\gamma})''(t)| < 1/2$  which gives that

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi''(t)| &\geq |\tilde{\phi}''(t)| - |\tilde{\phi}''(t) - \phi''(t)| \geq 4\pi|\xi_2| - 2\pi|\xi||\gamma''(t) - \tilde{\gamma}''(t)| \\ &\geq 4\pi|\xi_2| - \pi|\xi| \geq 2\pi|\xi_2| \gtrsim |\xi|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by van der Corput's lemma 4.11, see below, we obtain

$$K \lesssim |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\ell(Q)^{-1}.$$

Then let us look at the case  $|\xi_1| \geq |\xi_2|$ . It is clear that  $\tilde{\phi}'(t) = -2\pi(\xi_1 + 2\xi_2 t)$  is monotone and then

$$|\tilde{\phi}'(t)| \geq |\xi_1| \gtrsim |\xi|, \quad \forall |t| < 1/4.$$

Thus applying van der Corput's lemma we have

$$\left| \int_{\theta\ell(Q)}^{\Theta\ell(Q)} e^{i\tilde{\phi}(t)} \frac{dt}{t} \right| \lesssim |\xi|^{-1}\ell(Q)^{-1}.$$

However, the monotonicity of  $\phi'$  is unclear. Instead, write

$$\left| \int_{\theta\ell(Q)}^{\Theta\ell(Q)} e^{i\phi(t)} \frac{dt}{t} \right| = \left| \int_{\theta\ell(Q)}^{\Theta\ell(Q)} e^{i\tilde{\phi}(t)} e^{-2\pi i\xi \cdot A^{-1}R(t)} \frac{dt}{t} \right| =: \left| \int_{\theta\ell(Q)}^{\Theta\ell(Q)} e^{i\tilde{\phi}(t)} \psi(t) dt \right|.$$

Now again,  $\tilde{\phi}'(t) = -2\pi(\xi_1 + 2\xi_2 t)$  is monotone. And note that

$$\sup_{t \in [\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)]} |\psi(t)| = \sup_{t \in [\theta\ell(Q), \Theta\ell(Q)]} |e^{-2\pi i\xi \cdot A^{-1}R(t)} t^{-1}| \sim \ell(Q)^{-1}$$

and

$$\int_{\theta\ell(Q)}^{\Theta\ell(Q)} |\psi'(t)| dt \lesssim \int_{\theta\ell(Q)}^{\Theta\ell(Q)} (t^{-2} + |\xi||R'(t)|t^{-1}) dt \leq \ell(Q)^{-1} + |\xi|\ell(Q),$$

where we simply used

$$|R'(t)| = |\gamma'(t) - \tilde{\gamma}'(t)| \leq |\gamma'(t) - \gamma'(0)| + |\tilde{\gamma}'(t) - \tilde{\gamma}'(0)| \lesssim t.$$

Thus by van der Corput's lemma we get

$$\left| \int_{\theta\ell(Q)}^{\Theta\ell(Q)} e^{i\tilde{\phi}(t)} \psi(t) dt \right| \lesssim |\xi|^{-1}(\ell(Q)^{-1} + |\xi|\ell(Q)) \leq |\xi|^{-1}\ell(Q)^{-1} + \ell(Q).$$

Gathering the above estimates together we have obtained

$$K \lesssim \min \left( \varepsilon|\xi|\ell(Q)^2, \quad 1_{|\xi_1| \leq |\xi_2|} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\ell(Q)^{-1} + 1_{|\xi_1| \geq |\xi_2|} (|\xi|^{-1}\ell(Q)^{-1} + \ell(Q)) \right).$$

From the above estimate we obtain

$$(4.10) \quad K \lesssim \begin{cases} \varepsilon^{1/2}, & |\xi| \leq \varepsilon^{-1/2}\ell(Q)^{-2}, \\ \varepsilon^{1/4} + \varepsilon^{1/2}\ell(Q) + \ell(Q), & |\xi| > \varepsilon^{-1/2}\ell(Q)^{-2}, \end{cases}$$

which gives the desired asymptotics.  $\square$

**4.11. Lemma** (Van der Corput's lemma). *Let  $I = [a, b]$  be a fixed interval and  $\phi, \psi : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Denote*

$$I(a, b) = \int_a^b e^{i\phi(t)} \psi(t) dt.$$

*Then, there exist absolute constants  $C, C_k > 0$  such that the following hold.*

(1) *If  $|\phi'(t)| \geq \lambda > 0$  and  $\phi'$  is monotone, then*

$$|I(a, b)| \leq C\lambda^{-1} \left( \|\psi\|_{L^\infty(I)} + \|\psi'\|_{L^1(I)} \right).$$

(2) *If  $\phi \in C^k[a, b]$  and  $|\phi^{(k)}(t)| > \lambda > 0$ , then*

$$|I(a, b)| \leq C_k \lambda^{-1/k} \left( \|\psi\|_{L^\infty(I)} + \|\psi'\|_{L^1(I)} \right).$$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] T. Bongers, Z. Guo, J. Li, and B. Wick, *Commutators of Hilbert transforms along monomial curves*, *Studia Math.* **257** (2021), 295–311. [↑1, 2, 20](#)
- [2] L. Cladek and Y. Ou, *Sparse domination of Hilbert transforms along curves*, *Math. Res. Lett.* **25** (2018), 415–436. [↑2, 20](#)
- [3] R. R. Coifman, R. Rochberg, and G. Weiss, *Factorization theorems for Hardy spaces in several variables*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **103** (1976), no. 3, 611–635. [MR412721 ↑1](#)
- [4] T. P. Hytönen, *The  $L^p$ -to- $L^q$  boundedness of commutators with applications to the Jacobian operator*, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **156** (2021), 351–391. [↑1, 2](#)
- [5] T. Oikari, *Lower bound of the parabolic Hilbert commutator*, *Adv. Math.* **404** (2022), 108451. [↑1, 2, 3, 22](#)

(K.L.) CENTER FOR APPLIED MATHEMATICS, TIANJIN UNIVERSITY, WEIJIN ROAD 92, 300072 TIANJIN, CHINA

*Email address:* kli@tju.edu.cn

(H.M.) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS, 1 BROOKINGS DRIVE, ST. LOUIS, MO 63130, USA

*Email address:* henri@wustl.edu

(T.O.) DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTIQUES, UNIVERSITAT AUTÒNOMA DE BARCELONA, EDIFICI C FACULTAT DE CIÈNCIES, 08193 BELLATERRA (BARCELONA), CATALONIA

*Email address:* tuomas.oikari@gmail.com