

SCHATTEN CLASSES AND COMMUTATORS IN THE TWO WEIGHT SETTING, II. RIESZ TRANSFORMS

MICHAEL LACEY, JI LI, BRETT D. WICK, AND LIANGCHUAN WU

ABSTRACT. We characterize the Schatten class S^p of the commutator of Riesz transforms $[b, R_j]$ in \mathbb{R}^n ($j = 1, \dots, n$) in the two weight setting for $n < p < \infty$, by introducing the condition that the symbol b being in Besov spaces associated with the given two weights. At the critical index $p = n$, the commutator $[b, R_j]$ belongs to Schatten class S^n if and only if b is a constant, and to the weak Schatten class $S^{n, \infty}$ if and only if b is in an oscillation sequence space associated with the given two weights. As a direct application, we have the Schatten class estimate for A. Connes' quantised derivative in the two weight setting.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	4
3. Weighted Besov space $\mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and its dyadic versions	7
4. Schatten class estimate for $n < p < \infty$: proof of Theorem 1.2	11
5. Critical index $p = n$: proof of Theorem 1.3	17
6. Oscillation spaces associated with two weights: proof of Theorem 1.5	18
7. Weak Schatten class estimate at critical index $p = n$: proof of Theorem 1.6	24
8. Application: The Quantised Derivative in the two weight setting	31
References	32

1. INTRODUCTION

Suppose $1 < p < \infty$. Let μ, λ be in the Muckenhoupt class A_p , $\nu = \mu^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}}$, and denote by R_j the j th Riesz transform on \mathbb{R}^n , $j = 1, \dots, n$. In [2] Bloom first showed that the commutator $[b, R_j]$, defined as $[b, R_j]f(x) = b(x)R_j f(x) - R_j(bf)(x)$, is bounded from $L_\mu^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L_\lambda^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if and only if b is in $\text{BMO}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which extends the remarkable result of Coifman–Rochberg–Weiss [3]. Just recently, the first and second authors [18] showed that $[b, R_j]$ is compact from $L_\mu^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L_\lambda^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if and only if b is in $\text{VMO}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$ via a constructive proof. This was also addressed in [13, 14] via extrapolation. A next step in this program is to understand the Schatten class membership (the definition is given in §2.3) of the commutator as this is a more refined property than compactness.

Schatten class estimates provide a better understanding of the behaviour of compact operators in infinite dimensional spaces and connect to non-commutative analysis, geometry, and complex analysis (see for example [29, 5, 26, 17, 15, 23, 22]). It is well-known from Peller [24] that the commutator with the Hilbert transform $[b, H]$ is in the Schatten class S^p if and only if b is in the Besov space $B^p(\mathbb{R})$ for $0 < p < \infty$. While in the higher dimensional case, there is a “cut-off”

phenomenon in the sense that when $p \leq n$, if $[b, R_j]$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, is in S^p then b must be a constant. At the critical index $p = n$, $[b, R_j]$ is in the weak Schatten class $S^{n, \infty}$ if and only if b is in the homogeneous Sobolev space $\dot{W}^{1, n}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. This further links to the $S^{n, \infty}$ estimate for the quantised derivative $\bar{d}b := i[\text{sgn}(\mathfrak{D}), 1 \otimes M_b]$, $i^2 = 1$, of Alain Connes [4, Chapter IV], where \mathfrak{D} is the n -dimensional Dirac operator, and M_b is the multiplication operator: $M_b f(x) = b(x)f(x)$. Details of these notation will be stated in the last section. This has been intensively studied, see for example [6, 8, 9, 22, 27, 28, 16, 5]. We note that in [22, 8] they implemented a new approach to prove that for $b \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\bar{d}b$ is in the $S^{n, \infty}$ if and only if b is in the homogeneous Sobolev space $\dot{W}^{1, n}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

The Schatten class for $[b, H]$ in the two weight setting was first studied in [19], where only the case $p = 2$ was solved, and the questions for $p \neq 2$ and for the higher dimensional case were raised.

In this paper, we address these questions by establishing the Schatten class S^p characterisation for the Riesz transform commutator $[b, R_j]$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, in the two weight setting in \mathbb{R}^n . We also characterise the critical index in the two weight setting for both Schatten class S^n and weak Schatten class $S^{n, \infty}$. The key is to introduce the suitable Besov space and sequence spaces associated with the given two weights and to use the approach of martingales. The idea and techniques in this paper give the answer to Schatten class S^p for $[b, H]$ in the two weight setting for $p \neq 2$.

Throughout this paper, we assume $n \geq 2$.

We now introduce the Besov spaces associated with the weight $\nu \in A_2$.

Definition 1.1. *Suppose $\nu \in A_2$ and $0 < p < \infty$. Let \mathcal{D} be any dyadic system in \mathbb{R}^n . For $b \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we say that $b \in \mathbf{B}^p_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if the following sequence*

$$\{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} := \left\{ \frac{1}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}| dx \right\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$$

is in ℓ^p . Here $\langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}$ is the average of b over $20\sqrt{n}Q$. We set $\|b\|_{\mathbf{B}^p_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \|\{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}\|_{\ell^p}$.

The specific value of the parameter $20\sqrt{n}$ here is not essential, we choose it to ensure the subsequent arguments proceed smoothly. We will show in Section 3 that $\mathbf{B}^p_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is contained in $\text{VMO}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

The main result is the following, which addresses the question in [19].

Theorem 1.2. *Let R_j be the j th Riesz transform on \mathbb{R}^n with $n \geq 2$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Suppose $n < p < \infty$, $\lambda, \mu \in A_2$ and set $\nu = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Suppose $b \in \text{VMO}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then commutator $[b, R_j]$ belongs to $S^p(L^2_\mu(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2_\lambda(\mathbb{R}^n))$ if and only if $b \in \mathbf{B}^p_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, we have*

$$\|b\|_{\mathbf{B}^p_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)} \approx \|[b, R_j]\|_{S^p(L^2_\mu(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2_\lambda(\mathbb{R}^n))},$$

where the implicit constants depend on $p, n, [\lambda]_{A_2}$ and $[\mu]_{A_2}$.

The proof of Theorem 1.2 proceeds by translating the inequality into a form more symmetric with respect to the weights, and then relying upon familiar (but in this context, new) dyadic methods. Using the approach of Petermichl, Treil and Volberg in [25], we can represent the Riesz transforms as dyadic shifts. The commutator is then seen to be a sum of paraproduct type operators. The dyadic formalism allows easy access to the important method of nearly weakly orthogonal sequences of Rochberg and Semmes [28]. The dyadic methods give the continuous result, as the Besov space is the intersection of a finite number of dyadic Besov spaces. We note that following the same idea and techniques, the characterization in Theorem 1.2 also holds for the Schatten–Lorentz class $S^{p, q}(L^2_\mu(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2_\lambda(\mathbb{R}^n))$, $n < p < \infty$, $0 < q \leq \infty$, via assuming the sequences $\{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ defined in Definition 1.1 to be in $\ell^{p, q}$.

The tools we need include a dyadic characterization for the Besov space $\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, that is, $\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ coincides with the intersection of several ‘translated’ copies of the dyadic weighted Besov space $\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})$ (see Theorem 3.4 in Section 3); and the Schatten class characterization of the paraproduct $\Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}}$ with symbol b defined as

$$(1.1) \quad \Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}} := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}: \epsilon \neq 1} \langle b, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle h_Q^\epsilon \otimes \frac{1_Q}{|Q|}$$

and its adjoint (see Proposition 4.2 in Section 4):

$$\|\Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}}\|_{S^p(L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} \approx \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}.$$

It is natural to further ask the question on the critical index $p = n$ as this is an important fact due to the work of Janson–Wolff [16] (see also [7, 8]). We give a criteria in this two weight setting, i.e. $\mu, \lambda \in A_2$, and $\nu = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. By using these weights we recover the classical phenomenon in [16] when the A_2 weight ν is the Lebesgue measure.

Theorem 1.3. *Let R_j be the j th Riesz transform on \mathbb{R}^n with $n \geq 2$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Suppose $\lambda, \mu \in A_2$ and set $\nu = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Suppose $b \in \text{VMO}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $0 < p \leq n$. If $[b, R_j]$ belongs to $S^p(L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$, then b must be a constant almost everywhere.*

Next, it is natural to explore the weak Schatten class estimate for the critical index $p = n$. We now introduce the corresponding new function space of weighted oscillation.

Definition 1.4. *Suppose $\nu \in A_2$. For $b \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we say that $b \in \mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if the following sequence*

$$\{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} := \left\{ \frac{1}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}| dx \right\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$$

is in $\ell^{n, \infty}$ (a sequence $\{a_k\}$ is in $\ell^{n, \infty}$ if $\sup_k \{k^{1/n} a_k^\} < +\infty$ with $\{a_k^*\}$ the non-increasing rearrangement of $\{a_k\}$). Here $\langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}$ is the average of b over $20\sqrt{n}Q$. We set*

$$\|b\|_{\mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \|\{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}\|_{\ell^{n, \infty}}.$$

From this definition we see directly that $\mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset \text{BMO}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (explained at the beginning of Section 6). In fact, we can further show that $\mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset \text{VMO}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (hence $[b, R_j]$ is compact when $b \in \mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$). We will prove this in Section 6. We also note that when μ and λ are constants, $\mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$ will become the standard homogeneous Sobolev space $\dot{W}^{1, n}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (see for example [7]).

To continue, we establish the following equivalent characterization of $\mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\nu = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, where $\lambda, \mu \in A_2$. This is crucial to the characterization for the weak Schatten class $S^{n, \infty}$.

Theorem 1.5. *Suppose $\lambda, \mu \in A_2$ and set $\nu = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. $\mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$ can be characterized equivalently as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} \|b\|_{\mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)} &\approx \left\| \left\{ \left[\frac{1}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}|^2 \lambda(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \right\|_{\ell^{n, \infty}} \\ &\approx \left\| \left\{ \left[\frac{1}{\lambda^{-1}(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}|^2 \mu^{-1}(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \right\|_{\ell^{n, \infty}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constants are independent of b .

Then we have the following characterization for the weak Schatten class $S^{n, \infty}$.

Theorem 1.6. *Let R_j be the j th Riesz transform on \mathbb{R}^n with $n \geq 2$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Suppose $\lambda, \mu \in A_2$ and set $\nu = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Suppose $b \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then $[b, R_j]$ belongs to $S^{n,\infty}(L^2_\mu(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2_\lambda(\mathbb{R}^n))$ if and only if $b \in \mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$, with*

$$\|b\|_{\mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)} \approx \|[b, R_j]\|_{S^{n,\infty}(L^2_\mu(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2_\lambda(\mathbb{R}^n))},$$

where the implicit constants depends on $p, n, [\lambda]_{A_2}$ and $[\mu]_{A_2}$.

The key idea is to introduce a suitable version of oscillation sequence space and characterize its structures, and then expand the localized Riesz commutator kernel via martingales, which further links to the nearly weakly orthogonal sequences of functions associated with the weights μ and λ . It is still an open question whether $\mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is equivalent to some two-weight Sobolev spaces.

Regarding the two weight Besov space in dimension one introduced by the first, second and third authors in [19], it is natural to explore a two weight Besov space of the following form, i.e., via the Sobolev–Slobodeckii norms.

Definition 1.7. *Suppose $2 \leq p < \infty$, $\lambda, \mu \in A_2$ and set $\nu = \mu^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}}$. Let $b \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. We say that b belongs to the weighted Besov space $B^p_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if*

$$(1.2) \quad \|b\|_{B^p_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)}^p := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|b(x) - b(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{2n}} \lambda(x) \mu^{-1}(y) dy dx < \infty.$$

We point out that this will lead to a slightly different version of characterisations: $[b, R_j]$ belongs to $S^p(L^2_{\mu^{2/p}}(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2_{\lambda^{2/p}}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ if and only if $b \in B^p_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, we have

$$\|b\|_{B^p_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)} \approx \|[b, R_j]\|_{S^p(L^2_{\mu^{2/p}}(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2_{\lambda^{2/p}}(\mathbb{R}^n))}.$$

Note that this setting is well-defined since $\lambda, \mu \in A_2$ imply that $\lambda^{\frac{p}{2}}, \mu^{\frac{p}{2}} \in A_2$, $p \geq 2$. Hence, $\nu = \mu^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}} \in A_2$. As this is of independent interest regarding the different versions of two weight Besov spaces, we refer readers to the full details in Version 1 of our paper [20].

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the necessary preliminaries in the two weight setting and the Schatten classes. In Section 3 we characterize the dyadic structure for the weighted Besov space $B^p_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$. In Section 4 we present the proof of Theorem 1.2. In Section 5 we provide the proof of Theorem 1.3 for the critical index $p = n$. In Section 6 we study the properties of the weighted oscillation space $\mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and prove Theorem 1.5, and in Section 7 we give the proof of Theorem 1.6. As an application, we have the Schatten class estimate for the quantised derivative of A. Connes, which will be briefly addressed in the last section.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We recall some preliminaries for the dyadic systems and the Schatten class.

2.1. Dyadic system in \mathbb{R}^n .

Definition 2.1. *Let the collection $\mathcal{D}^0 = \mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denote the standard system of dyadic cubes in \mathbb{R}^n , where*

$$\mathcal{D}^0(\mathbb{R}^n) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{D}^0_k(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

with

$$\mathcal{D}^0_k(\mathbb{R}^n) = \{2^{-k}([0, 1]^n + m) : k \in \mathbb{Z}, m \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}.$$

Next, we recall shifted dyadic systems of dyadic cubes in \mathbb{R}^n .

Definition 2.2 ([12, 21]). For $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_n) \in \left\{0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\right\}^n$, we can define the dyadic system $\mathcal{D}^\omega = \mathcal{D}^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\mathcal{D}^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{D}_k^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}_k^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n) = \left\{2^{-k} \left([0, 1)^n + m + (-1)^k \omega\right) : k \in \mathbb{Z}, m \in \mathbb{Z}^n\right\}.$$

It is straightforward to check that \mathcal{D}^ω inherits the nestedness property of \mathcal{D}^0 : if $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{D}^\omega$, then $Q \cap Q' \in \{Q, Q', \emptyset\}$. See [12, 21] for more details. When the particular choice of ω is unimportant, the notation \mathcal{D} is sometimes used for a generic dyadic system.

The fundamental property of the adjacent dyadic systems is the following: for any ball B in \mathbb{R}^n , there exists a dyadic cube $Q \in \mathcal{D}^\omega$ for some $\omega \in \left\{0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\right\}^n$, such that $B \subset Q$ and that

$$|Q| \leq C|B|,$$

where C is a positive constant independent of B , Q and ω .

2.2. An expression of Haar functions. For any dyadic cube $Q \in \mathcal{D}$, there exist dyadic intervals I_1, \dots, I_n on \mathbb{R} with common length $\ell(Q)$, such that $Q = I_1 \times \dots \times I_n$. Then Q is associated with 2^n Haar functions:

$$h_Q^\epsilon(x) := h_{I_1 \times \dots \times I_n}^{(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) := \prod_{i=1}^n h_{I_i}^{(\epsilon_i)}(x_i),$$

where $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and

$$h_{I_i}^{(1)} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|I_i|}} \mathbf{1}_{I_i} \quad \text{and} \quad h_{I_i}^{(0)} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|I_i|}} (\mathbf{1}_{I_i^-} - \mathbf{1}_{I_i^+}).$$

Writing $\epsilon \equiv 1$ when $\epsilon_i \equiv 1$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, $h_Q^1 := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|Q|}} \mathbf{1}_Q$ is non-cancellative; on the other hand, when $\epsilon \neq 1$, the rest of the $2^n - 1$ Haar functions h_Q^ϵ associated with Q satisfy the following properties:

Lemma 2.3. For $\epsilon \neq 1$, we have

- (1) h_Q^ϵ is supported on Q and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} h_Q^\epsilon(x) dx = 0$;
- (2) $\langle h_Q^\epsilon, h_Q^\eta \rangle = 0$, for $\epsilon \neq \eta$;
- (3) if $h_Q^\epsilon \neq 0$, then $\|h_Q^\epsilon\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} = |Q|^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}}$ for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$;
- (4) $\|h_Q^\epsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \cdot \|h_Q^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 1$;
- (5) noting that the average of a function b over a dyadic cube Q : $\langle b \rangle_Q := \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q b(x) dx$ can be expressed as:

$$\langle b \rangle_Q = \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}, Q \subset P \\ \epsilon \neq 1}} \langle b, h_P^\epsilon \rangle h_P^\epsilon(Q),$$

where $h_P^\epsilon(Q)$ is a constant;

- (6) fixing a cube Q , and expanding b in the Haar basis, we have

$$(b(x) - \langle b \rangle_Q) \mathbf{1}_Q(x) = \sum_{\substack{R \in \mathcal{D}, R \subset Q \\ \epsilon \neq 1}} \langle b, h_R^\epsilon \rangle h_R^\epsilon;$$

- (7) denote by $E_k b(x) = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_k} \langle b \rangle_Q \mathbf{1}_Q(x)$, then we have

$$E_{k+1} b(x) - E_k b(x) = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_k} \sum_{\epsilon \neq 1} \langle b, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle h_Q^\epsilon.$$

We will also use the notation

$$(2.1) \quad \Delta_Q b = \sum_{\epsilon \neq 1} \langle b, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle h_Q^\epsilon = (E_{k+1} b - E_k b) \cdot \mathbf{1}_Q.$$

2.3. Characterization of Schatten Class. Let \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 be separable complex Hilbert spaces. Suppose T is a compact operator from \mathcal{H}_1 to \mathcal{H}_2 , let T^* be the adjoint operator, it is clear that $|T| = (T^*T)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is a compact, self-adjoint, non-negative operator from \mathcal{H}_1 to \mathcal{H}_1 . Let $(\psi_k)_k$ be an orthonormal basis for \mathcal{H}_1 consisting of eigenvectors of $|T|$, and let $s_k(T)$ be the eigenvalue corresponding to the eigenvector ψ_k , $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. The numbers $s_1(T) \geq s_2(T) \geq \cdots \geq s_n(T) \geq \cdots \geq 0$, are called the singular values of T . If $0 < p < \infty$, $0 < q \leq \infty$ and the sequence of singular values is $\ell^{p,q}$ -summable (with respect to a weight), then T is said to belong to the Schatten–Lorentz class $S^{p,q}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)$. That is, $\|T\|_{S^{p,q}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)} = (\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^+} (s_k(T))^q k^{\frac{q}{p}-1})^{\frac{1}{q}}$, $q < \infty$, and $\|T\|_{S^{p,\infty}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)} = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^+} s_k(T) k^{\frac{1}{p}}$, $q = \infty$. Clearly, $S^{p,p}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2) = S^p(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)$.

In 1989, Rochberg and Semmes [28] introduced methods that are very useful in estimating Schatten norms in the setting of commutators. A key concept is that of *nearly weakly orthogonal* (NWO) sequences of functions.

Definition 2.4. Let $\{e_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ be a collection of functions. We say $\{e_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ is a NWO sequence, if $\text{supp } e_Q \subset Q$ and the maximal function f^* is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where f^* is defined as

$$f^*(x) = \sup_Q \frac{|\langle f, e_Q \rangle|}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \mathbf{1}_Q(x).$$

In this paper, we work with weighted versions. We will use the following result proved by Rochberg and Semmes.

Lemma 2.5 ([28]). *If the collection of functions $\{e_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ are supported on Q and satisfy for some $2 < r < \infty$, $\|e_Q\|_r \lesssim |Q|^{\frac{1}{r}-\frac{1}{2}}$, then $\{e_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ is a NWO sequence.*

Let $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2$ be separable complex Hilbert spaces. In [28] Rochberg and Semmes provided a substitute for the Schmidt decomposition of the operator T

$$T = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \lambda_Q \langle \cdot, e_Q \rangle f_Q$$

with $\{e_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ and $\{f_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ being NWO sequences and $\{\lambda_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ is a sequence of scalars. From [28, Corollary 2.8] we see that

$$(2.2) \quad \|T\|_{S^{p,q}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)} \lesssim \left\| \{\lambda_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \right\|_{\ell^{p,q}}, \quad 0 < p < \infty, 0 < q \leq \infty.$$

When $1 < p = q < \infty$, Rochberg and Semmes also obtained

Lemma 2.6 ([28]). *For any bounded compact operator T on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and $\{e_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ and $\{f_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ NWO sequences, then for $1 < p < \infty$,*

$$\left[\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |\langle T e_Q, f_Q \rangle|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim \|T\|_{S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))}.$$

2.4. Muckenhoupt weights. Let $w(x)$ be a nonnegative locally integrable function on \mathbb{R}^n . For $1 < p < \infty$, we say w is an A_p weight, written $w \in A_p$, if

$$[w]_{A_p} := \sup_Q \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q w(x) dx \right) \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q w(x)^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} dx \right)^{p-1} < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all cubes $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. The quantity $[w]_{A_p}$ is called the A_p constant of w .

It is well known that A_p weights are doubling. Namely,

Lemma 2.7 ([10]). *Let $w \in A_p$. Then for every $\lambda > 1$ and for every cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$w(\lambda Q) \leq [w]_{A_p} \lambda^{pn} w(Q).$$

In this article, we will also use the reverse Hölder inequality for A_2 weights.

Lemma 2.8 ([10]). *Let $w \in A_2$. There is a reverse doubling index $\sigma_w > 0$, such that for every cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we have*

$$(2.3) \quad \left[\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q w^{1+\sigma_w}(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{1+\sigma_w}} \lesssim \frac{w(Q)}{|Q|}.$$

Lemma 2.9 ([10]). *Suppose $w \in A_p$ for some $p \in (1, \infty)$. For $0 < \delta < 1$, $w^\delta \in A_q$ for $q = \delta + 1 < 2$. Moreover, $[w^\delta]_{A_q} \leq [w]_{A_p}^\delta$.*

2.5. Weight BMO and VMO spaces. We recall the weighted BMO space and VMO space and their dyadic versions.

Definition 2.10. *Suppose $w \in A_\infty$. A function $b \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ belongs to $\text{BMO}_w(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if*

$$\|b\|_{\text{BMO}_w(\mathbb{R}^n)} := \sup_B \frac{1}{w(B)} \int_B |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_B| dx < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all balls $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. The dyadic weighted BMO space $\text{BMO}_w(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})$ associated with \mathcal{D} consists of functions $b \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\|b\|_{\text{BMO}_w(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})} < \infty$, where the $\|b\|_{\text{BMO}_w(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}$ is defined the same as above with intervals replaced by dyadic cubes.

Definition 2.11. *Suppose $w \in A_\infty$. A function $b \in \text{BMO}_w(\mathbb{R}^n)$ belongs to $\text{VMO}_w(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if*

- (i) $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \sup_{B: r_B=a} \frac{1}{w(B)} \int_B |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_B| dx = 0,$
- (ii) $\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{B: r_B=a} \frac{1}{w(B)} \int_B |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_B| dx = 0,$
- (iii) $\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{B \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x_0, a)} \frac{1}{w(B)} \int_B |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_B| dx = 0,$

where x_0 is any fixed point in \mathbb{R}^n . A function $b \in \text{BMO}_w(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})$ belongs to the dyadic weighted VMO space $\text{VMO}_w(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})$ if the above three limits hold with intervals replaced by dyadic cubes in \mathcal{D} .

3. WEIGHTED BESOV SPACE $\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ AND ITS DYADIC VERSIONS

As a companion to the definition of the weighted Besov space $\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, in Definition 1.1, we have its dyadic versions on \mathbb{R}^n defined here.

Definition 3.1. Suppose $0 < p < \infty$. Suppose $\nu \in A_2$ and $0 < p < \infty$. Let $b \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and \mathcal{D} be an arbitrary dyadic system in \mathbb{R}^n . Then b belongs to the weighted dyadic Besov space $\mathbf{B}^p_{\nu}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})$ associated with \mathcal{D} , if and only if

$$(3.1) \quad \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}^p_{\nu}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}^p := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \left(\frac{1}{\nu(Q)} \int_Q |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_Q| dx \right)^p < \infty.$$

This space has several alternate definitions, which are useful in different ways. Among them, an equivalent set of definitions in terms of Haar functions will be very useful in the analysis of the Haar shift paraproducts to come.

Proposition 3.2. Suppose $0 < p < \infty$, $\mu, \lambda \in A_2$ and set $\nu = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. We have the equivalences below

$$(3.2) \quad \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}^p_{\nu}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}^p \approx \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}: \epsilon \neq 1} \left(\frac{|\langle b, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle|}{\sqrt{|Q|}} \right)^p R(Q)^p,$$

where the term $R(Q)$ can be any of the expressions below:

$$R(Q) \in \left\{ \frac{|Q|}{\nu(Q)}, \frac{|Q|}{\lambda^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \frac{\nu^{-1}(Q)}{|Q|}, \frac{\lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|} \right\}.$$

Proof. For each $Q \in \mathcal{D}$, it follows from Hölder's inequality that

$$\frac{|Q|}{\lambda^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \frac{|Q|}{\nu(Q)} \approx \frac{\nu^{-1}(Q)}{|Q|} \leq \frac{\lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|},$$

where the “ \approx ” above holds by $\nu \in A_2$. Similarly, the last term above is approximately equal to the first one, due to $\mu, \lambda \in A_2$.

Therefore, it suffices to prove (3.2) for taking $R_Q = \frac{|Q|}{\nu(Q)}$.

Step I. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\nu(Q)} \int_Q |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_Q| dx &= \frac{1}{\nu(Q)} \int_Q \left| \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}, P \subset Q \\ \epsilon \neq 1}} \langle b, h_P^\epsilon \rangle h_P^\epsilon \right| dx \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}, P \subset Q \\ \epsilon \neq 1}} \frac{|\langle b, h_P^\epsilon \rangle|}{\sqrt{|P|}} \frac{|P|}{\nu(P)} \cdot \frac{\nu(P)}{\nu(Q)}. \end{aligned}$$

When $0 < p \leq 1$, by using concavity property of $(\sum |a_k|)^p \leq \sum |a_k|^p$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}^p_{\nu}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}^p &\leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}, P \subset Q \\ \epsilon \neq 1}} \left(\frac{|\langle b, h_P^\epsilon \rangle|}{\sqrt{|P|}} \frac{|P|}{\nu(P)} \right)^p \cdot \left(\frac{\nu(P)}{\nu(Q)} \right)^p \\ &\leq \sum_{P \in \mathcal{D}: \epsilon \neq 1} \left[\left(\frac{|\langle b, h_P^\epsilon \rangle|}{\sqrt{|P|}} \frac{|P|}{\nu(P)} \right)^p \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, P \subset Q} \left(\frac{\nu(P)}{\nu(Q)} \right)^p \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{P \in \mathcal{D}: \epsilon \neq 1} \left(\frac{|\langle b, h_P^\epsilon \rangle|}{\sqrt{|P|}} \frac{|P|}{\nu(P)} \right)^p. \end{aligned}$$

When $1 < p < \infty$, the doubling property of $\nu \in A_2$ ensures that there exists $\theta = \theta(n, [\nu]_{A_2}) \in (0, 1)$, such that for any $Q \in \mathcal{D}$ and $P \subset Q$ with $\ell(P) = 2^{-k} \ell(Q)$, we have $\nu(P) \leq \theta^k \nu(Q)$. Note that for any

$1 < p < \infty$, we can choose some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that $\alpha p' > 1$. Then

$$\sum_{P \in \mathcal{D}, P \subset Q} \left(\frac{\nu(P)}{\nu(Q)} \right)^{\alpha p'} \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}, P \subset Q \\ \ell(P)=2^{-k}\ell(Q)}} \theta^{(\alpha p' - 1)k} \frac{\nu(P)}{\nu(Q)} \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \theta^{(\alpha p' - 1)k} \lesssim 1.$$

Based on this, we further have

$$\begin{aligned} \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}^p &\leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \left(\sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}, P \subset Q \\ \epsilon \neq 1}} \frac{|\langle b, h_P^\epsilon \rangle|}{\sqrt{|P|}} \frac{|P|}{\nu(P)} \cdot \frac{\nu(P)}{\nu(Q)} \right)^p \\ &\leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \left[\left(\sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}, P \subset Q \\ \epsilon \neq 1}} \left(\frac{\nu(P)}{\nu(Q)} \right)^{\alpha p'} \right)^{p-1} \cdot \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}, P \subset Q \\ \epsilon \neq 1}} \left(\frac{|\langle b, h_P^\epsilon \rangle|}{\sqrt{|P|}} \frac{|P|}{\nu(P)} \right)^p \left(\frac{\nu(P)}{\nu(Q)} \right)^{(1-\alpha)p} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{P \in \mathcal{D}: \epsilon \neq 1} \left(\frac{|\langle b, h_P^\epsilon \rangle|}{\sqrt{|P|}} \frac{|P|}{\nu(P)} \right)^p. \end{aligned}$$

Step II. On the other hand, by the cancellation and size properties of Haar functions,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}: \epsilon \neq 1} \left(\frac{|\langle b, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle|}{\sqrt{|Q|}} \frac{|Q|}{\nu(Q)} \right)^p &= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}: \epsilon \neq 1} \left(\frac{|\langle b - \langle b \rangle_Q, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle|}{\sqrt{|Q|}} \frac{|Q|}{\nu(Q)} \right)^p \\ &\lesssim \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \left(\frac{1}{\nu(Q)} \int_Q |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_Q| dx \right)^p, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. The proof is complete. \square

As a consequence, the dyadic Besov spaces have alternative definitions in terms of martingale differences.

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose $0 < p < \infty$, $\mu, \lambda \in A_2$ and set $\nu = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. We have the equivalent (semi-)norms*

$$\begin{aligned} \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}^p &\approx \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \left(\frac{1}{\nu(Q)} \int_Q |\Delta_Q b(x)| dx \right)^p \\ &\approx \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \left(\frac{1}{\mu(Q)} \int_Q |\Delta_Q b(x)|^2 \lambda(x) dx \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ (3.3) \quad &\approx \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda^{-1}(Q)} \int_Q |\Delta_Q b(x)|^2 \mu^{-1}(x) dx \right)^{\frac{p}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constants are independent of b .

Proof. Note that for $Q \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$\frac{1}{\nu(Q)} \int_Q |\Delta_Q b(x)| dx \approx \sum_{\epsilon \neq 1} \frac{|\langle b, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle|}{\sqrt{|Q|}} \frac{|Q|}{\nu(Q)},$$

this is simply because all norms on a finite-dimensional space are equivalent (the space is ℓ^1 over the children of Q which has dimension 2^n).

Hence, the first equivalence in (3.3) follows from (3.2) with taking $R(Q)$ therein as $\frac{|Q|}{\nu(Q)}$.

Furthermore, note that the martingale difference $\Delta_Q b$ is constant on every child of Q . This yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\mu(Q)} \int_Q |\Delta_Q b(x)|^2 \lambda(x) dx &\approx \frac{\lambda(Q)}{\mu(Q)|Q|} \int_Q |\Delta_Q b(x)|^2 dx \\ &\approx \sum_{\epsilon \neq 1} \frac{\lambda(Q)}{\mu(Q)|Q|} \left(\frac{|\langle b, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle|}{\sqrt{|Q|}} \right)^2 |Q| \\ &\approx \sum_{\epsilon \neq 1} \left(\frac{|\langle b, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle|}{\sqrt{|Q|}} \frac{|Q|}{\lambda^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the second equivalence in (3.3) follows from (3.2) with taking $R(Q)$ therein as $\frac{|Q|}{\lambda^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$.

The proof of the remaining third one is similar, and we skip it. \square

The weighted Besov space is the intersection of a finite number of dyadic Besov spaces.

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose $\nu \in A_2$ and $0 < p < \infty$. We have*

$$\mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n) = \bigcap_{\omega \in \{0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\}^n} \mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D}^\omega)$$

with equivalent (semi-)norms

$$\|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \approx \sum_{\omega \in \{0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\}^n} \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D}^\omega)}.$$

Proof. Note that every adjacent dyadic system is constructed by shifting from the standard dyadic system; see Definition 2.2. Hence for any $\omega \in \{0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\}^n$ and $Q^\omega \in \mathcal{D}^\omega$, there exists $Q \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$(3.4) \quad Q^\omega \subset 20\sqrt{n}Q, \quad \text{and} \quad |20\sqrt{n}Q| \leq C_n |Q^\omega|.$$

Then the doubling property of $\nu \in A_2$ implies that

$$\frac{1}{\nu(Q^\omega)} \int_{Q^\omega} |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{Q^\omega}| dx \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}| dx.$$

Moreover, by the size condition and the nestedness property of dyadic cubes,

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \#\{Q^\omega \in \mathcal{D}^\omega : Q^\omega \text{ satisfies (3.4)}\}$$

is finite and only depends on n . Hence, $\|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D}^\omega)} \lesssim \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}$.

On the other hand, the adjacent dyadic systems ensure that for any $Q \in \mathcal{D}$, there exists some $\omega \in \{0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\}^n$ and $\tilde{Q}^\omega \in \mathcal{D}^\omega$ such that

$$20\sqrt{n}Q \subset \tilde{Q}^\omega, \quad |\tilde{Q}^\omega| \leq C_n |20\sqrt{n}Q|.$$

Similarly, the number of such each $20\sqrt{n}Q$ for $Q \in \mathcal{D}$ contained in a same \tilde{Q}^ω is bounded uniformly, and

$$\frac{1}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}| dx \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu(\tilde{Q}^\omega)} \int_{\tilde{Q}^\omega} |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{\tilde{Q}^\omega}| dx.$$

Then

$$\|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \sum_{\omega \in \{0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\}^n} \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D}^\omega)}.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Now we assure ourselves that our Besov spaces are contained in the VMO spaces.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that $v \in A_2$ and $0 < p < \infty$. Then*

$$\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D}) \subset \text{VMO}_v(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D}).$$

Proof. Note that

$$\|b\|_{\text{BMO}_v(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})} := \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{v(Q)} \int_Q |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_Q| dx \leq \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}$$

for any $0 < p < \infty$.

Moreover, we are able to apply the analogous argument in [19, Lemma 3.4] to deduce that $\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D}) \subset \text{VMO}_v(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})$ for $0 < p < \infty$. \square

Remark 3.6. *Note that from [21],*

$$\text{BMO}_v(\mathbb{R}^n) = \bigcap_{\omega \in \{0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\}^n} \text{BMO}_v(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D}^\omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{VMO}_v(\mathbb{R}^n) = \bigcap_{\omega \in \{0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\}^n} \text{VMO}_v(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D}^\omega).$$

Hence, by Lemma 3.5, we have

$$\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset \text{VMO}_v(\mathbb{R}^n) \quad \text{for} \quad 0 < p < \infty.$$

Therefore, it follows from [18, Theorem 1.1] that when $b \in \mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the commutator of the Riesz transform $[b, R_j]$ is compact from $L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Remark 3.7. *Suppose $0 < p < \infty$, $\mu, \lambda \in A_2$ and set $v = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. We have the following equivalence for the Besov space $\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} &\approx \left\| \left\{ \left[\frac{1}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}|^2 \lambda(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \right\|_{\ell^p} \\ &\approx \left\| \left\{ \left[\frac{1}{\lambda^{-1}(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}|^2 \mu^{-1}(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \right\|_{\ell^p}. \end{aligned}$$

This is implied by the proof of Lemma 6.3 below. See Remark 6.4 for further results.

4. SCHATTEN CLASS ESTIMATE FOR $n < p < \infty$: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

4.1. Sufficiency. We are studying the Schatten norms of the commutators in the case that p is larger than the dimension n . We first address the sufficiency of the symbol being in the Besov space for the Schatten norm estimate.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose $n < p < \infty$, $\mu, \lambda \in A_2$ and set $v = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Let $b \in \mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then we have*

$$\| [b, R_j] \|_{S^p(L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

We depend on the work of Petermichl, Treil and Volberg [25]. They have shown that Riesz transforms are averages of relatively simple dyadic shifts. Given a dyadic system \mathcal{D} with Haar basis $\{h_Q^\epsilon\}$, let $\sigma : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ satisfying $|\sigma(Q)| = 2^{-n}|Q|$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{D}$. Using the same notation for a map $\sigma : \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{1\}^n \rightarrow (\{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{1\}^n) \cup \{0\}$, if $\sigma(\epsilon) = 0$ then set $h^{\sigma(\epsilon)} := 0$. The resulting dyadic shift operator is

$$\text{III}^{\mathcal{D}} f(x) := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, \epsilon \neq 1} \langle f, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle h_{\sigma(Q)}^{\sigma(\epsilon)}(x).$$

It is known that for any $w \in A_2$, $\|\mathbb{I}^{\mathcal{D}}\|_{L_w^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L_w^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim 1$. Moreover, the Riesz transforms are in the convex hull of the class of operators $\mathbb{I}^{\mathcal{D}}$, see [25]. This result involves a random choice of dyadic systems, which implies that whenever considering the commutator $[b, R_j]$, it suffices to prove that the norms of $[b, \mathbb{I}^{\mathcal{D}}]$ associated to different dyadic systems \mathcal{D} , are uniformly controlled with respect to the choice of \mathcal{D} .

The commutator with the Haar shift operator $\mathbb{I}^{\mathcal{D}}$ can be represented in terms of the paraproducts and $\mathbb{I}^{\mathcal{D}}$:

$$[b, \mathbb{I}^{\mathcal{D}}]f = (\Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}} + \Pi_b^{*\mathcal{D}} + \Gamma_b^{\mathcal{D}})(\mathbb{I}^{\mathcal{D}}f) - \mathbb{I}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}} + \Pi_b^{*\mathcal{D}} + \Gamma_b^{\mathcal{D}})f + \Pi_{\mathbb{I}^{\mathcal{D}}f}^{\mathcal{D}}b - \mathbb{I}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Pi_f^{\mathcal{D}}b),$$

where

$$\Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}}f := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, \epsilon \neq 1} \langle b, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle \langle f \rangle_Q h_Q^\epsilon, \quad \Pi_b^{*\mathcal{D}}f := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, \epsilon \neq 1} \langle b, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle \langle f, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle \frac{1_Q}{|Q|},$$

and

$$\Gamma_b^{\mathcal{D}}f := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\epsilon, \eta \neq 1, \epsilon \neq \eta} \langle b, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle \langle f, h_Q^\eta \rangle h_Q^\epsilon h_Q^\eta.$$

See [11] for details. The point of this expansion is that it gives us a finite sum of paraproducts composed with L^2 bounded operators. To give one example, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{I}^{\mathcal{D}}\cdot)\|_{S^p(L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} &\lesssim \|\Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}}(\cdot)\|_{S^p(L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} \cdot \|\mathbb{I}^{\mathcal{D}}\|_{L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\lesssim \|\Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}}(\cdot)\|_{S^p(L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n))}. \end{aligned}$$

This depends upon the condition that $\mu \in A_2$. If the operator $\mathbb{I}^{\mathcal{D}}$ comes *before* the paraproduct, a similar inequality holds, and we use the condition that $\lambda \in A_2$. As a consequence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|[b, \mathbb{I}^{\mathcal{D}}]\|_{S^p(L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} &\lesssim \|\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} + \|\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_b^{*\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} \\ &\quad + \|\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} + \|\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{R}_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(4.1) \quad \mathcal{R}_b^{\mathcal{D}}f := \Pi_{\mathbb{I}^{\mathcal{D}}f}^{\mathcal{D}}b - \mathbb{I}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Pi_f^{\mathcal{D}}b).$$

To continue, we have to estimate the $S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ norm for each of the four terms above. We address three of them here.

Proposition 4.2. *Suppose $n < p < \infty$, $\mu, \lambda \in A_2$ and set $\nu = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Let $b \in \text{VMO}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then $\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, $\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_b^{*\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ belong to $S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ respectively, if and only if $b \in \mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})$, that is,*

$$(4.2) \quad \|\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} \approx \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})},$$

$$(4.3) \quad \|\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_b^{*\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} \approx \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})},$$

$$(4.4) \quad \|\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} \approx \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}$$

with the implicit constants depending only on $[\mu]_{A_2}$, $[\lambda]_{A_2}$ and n , regardless of the choice of \mathcal{D} .

For our main theorem, we only need the upper bounds, or sufficiencies, above. We include the lower bounds for completeness.

Proof. Both directions will depend on the nearly weakly orthogonal sequence approach of Rochberg and Semmes.

Sufficiency for (4.2): Suppose $b \in \mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})$. It follows from the definition of $\Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(f)(x) &= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, \epsilon \neq 1} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) \langle b, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle h_Q^\epsilon(x) \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} 1_Q(y) \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(y) f(y) dy \\ &= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, \epsilon \neq 1} \frac{\langle b, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle \lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{2}+1}} \cdot \frac{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) |Q|^{\frac{1}{2}} h_Q^\epsilon(x)}{\lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \cdot \left\langle f, \frac{\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(y) 1_Q(y)}{\mu^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$G_Q(x) := \frac{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) |Q|^{\frac{1}{2}} h_Q^\epsilon(x)}{\lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad \text{and} \quad H_Q(x) := \frac{\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) 1_Q(x)}{\mu^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Using the reverse Hölder inequality for A_2 weights in Lemma 2.8, both $\{G_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ and $\{H_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ are NWO sequences for $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which gives using (2.2) that

$$\left\| \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}.$$

Necessity for (4.2): Suppose $\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \in S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Note that for each $Q \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\epsilon \neq 1$, $\langle b, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle = \langle \Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}}(1_Q), h_Q^\epsilon \rangle$. Then

$$\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, \epsilon \neq 1} \left| \frac{\langle b, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle \lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^{1/2}} \right|^p = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, \epsilon \neq 1} \left\| \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} 1_Q}{\mu(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right), \frac{\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} |Q|^{\frac{1}{2}} h_Q^\epsilon}{\lambda^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\|^p.$$

Denote

$$G'_Q(x) := \frac{\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) 1_Q(x)}{\mu(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad H'_Q(x) := \frac{\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) |Q|^{\frac{1}{2}} h_Q^\epsilon(x)}{\lambda^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Similarly, these two collections of functions are also NWOs. Since $1 < p < \infty$, by Lemma 2.6 it holds that

$$\|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}^p \lesssim \left\| \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))}^p.$$

That is, we have established (4.2). The second estimate (4.3) is dual to the first, so it holds.

It remains to prove the last estimate (4.4).

Sufficiency for (4.4): Suppose $b \in \mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})$. By the definition of $\Gamma_b^{\mathcal{D}} f$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) f(x) \\ &= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\epsilon, \eta \neq 1, \epsilon \neq \eta} \langle b, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle \langle \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} f, h_Q^\eta \rangle h_Q^\epsilon(x) h_Q^\eta(x) \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) \\ &= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\epsilon, \eta \neq 1, \epsilon \neq \eta} \frac{\langle b, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle \lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{2}+1}} \cdot \frac{h_Q^\epsilon(x) h_Q^\eta(x) \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) |Q|}{\lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \cdot \left\langle f, \frac{\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_Q^\eta |Q|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\mu^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$G''_Q(x) := \frac{h_Q^\epsilon(x) h_Q^\eta(x) \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) |Q|}{\lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad H''_Q(x) := \frac{\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) h_Q^\eta(x) |Q|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\mu^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Similarly, these two collections of functions are also NWOs.

Therefore, using (2.2)

$$\left\| \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))}^p \lesssim \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}^p.$$

Necessity for (4.4): For any $Q \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\epsilon \neq 1$, note that for each $\eta \neq 1$ and $\eta \neq \epsilon$,

$$\left\langle \Gamma_b^{\mathcal{D}}(h_Q^\eta), h_Q^\epsilon h_Q^\eta |Q| \right\rangle = \left\langle \sum_{\epsilon' \neq 1, \epsilon' \neq \eta} \langle b, h_Q^{\epsilon'} \rangle h_Q^{\epsilon'} h_Q^\eta, h_Q^\epsilon h_Q^\eta |Q| \right\rangle = \langle b, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}^p &\approx \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\epsilon, \eta \neq 1, \epsilon \neq \eta} \left(\frac{\langle \Gamma_b^{\mathcal{D}}(h_Q^\eta), h_Q^\epsilon h_Q^\eta |Q| \rangle |Q|}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right)^p \\ &= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\epsilon, \eta \neq 1, \epsilon \neq \eta} \left(\frac{\langle \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} h_Q^\eta), \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_Q^\epsilon h_Q^\eta |Q| \rangle |Q|}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right)^p \\ &= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\epsilon, \eta \neq 1, \epsilon \neq \eta} \left| \left\langle \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} h_Q^\eta |Q|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\mu(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right), \frac{\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_Q^\epsilon h_Q^\eta |Q|}{\lambda^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\rangle \right|^p. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have by Lemma 2.6

$$\|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}^p \lesssim \left\| \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))}^p.$$

This completes the argument. \square

The last of the four terms to address is defined in (4.1), which is done here. We only assert the sufficiency.

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose $n < p < \infty$, $\mu, \lambda \in A_2$ and set $\nu = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Let $b \in \mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})$ and denote $\mathcal{R}_b^{\mathcal{D}} f := \Pi_{\text{III}^{\mathcal{D}}}^{\mathcal{D}} b - \text{III}^{\mathcal{D}}(\Pi_f^{\mathcal{D}} b)$. We have*

$$\left\| \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{R}_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})},$$

with the implicit constants depending only on $[\mu]_{A_2}$, $[\lambda]_{A_2}$ and n , regardless of the choice of \mathcal{D} .

Proof. By definitions of $\text{III}^{\mathcal{D}}$ and the paraproduct operator $\Pi_b^{\mathcal{D}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_b^{\mathcal{D}} f &= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, \epsilon \neq 1} \left\langle \sum_{P \in \mathcal{D}, \eta \neq 1} \langle f, h_P^\eta \rangle h_{\sigma(P)}^{\sigma(\eta)}, h_Q^\epsilon \right\rangle \langle b \rangle_Q h_Q^\epsilon - \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, \epsilon \neq 1} \left\langle \sum_{P \in \mathcal{D}, \eta \neq 1} \langle f, h_P^\eta \rangle \langle b \rangle_P h_P^\eta, h_Q^\epsilon \right\rangle h_{\sigma(Q)}^{\sigma(\epsilon)} \\ &= \sum_{P \in \mathcal{D}, \eta \neq 1} \langle f, h_P^\eta \rangle \langle b \rangle_{\sigma(P)} h_{\sigma(P)}^{\sigma(\eta)} - \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, \eta \neq 1} \langle f, h_Q^\eta \rangle \langle b \rangle_Q h_{\sigma(Q)}^{\sigma(\eta)} \\ &= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, \eta \neq 1} \langle f, h_Q^\eta \rangle (\langle b \rangle_{\sigma(Q)} - \langle b \rangle_Q) h_{\sigma(Q)}^{\sigma(\eta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\langle b \rangle_P = \sum_{R \in \mathcal{D}, P \subseteq R, \eta \neq 1} \langle b, h_R^\eta \rangle h_R^\eta(P)$, where $h_R^\eta(P)$ denotes the constant value of h_R^η on P , thus

$$\langle b \rangle_{\sigma(Q)} - \langle b \rangle_Q = \sum_{\eta \neq 1} \langle b, h_Q^\eta \rangle h_Q^\eta(\sigma(Q)).$$

Therefore,

$$\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) \mathcal{R}_b^{\mathcal{D}}(\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} f)(x)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, \epsilon, \eta \neq 1} \langle \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} f, h_Q^\epsilon \rangle \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) \langle b, h_Q^\eta \rangle h_Q^\eta(\sigma(Q)) h_{\sigma(Q)}^{\sigma(\epsilon)}(x) \\
&= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, \epsilon, \eta \neq 1} \frac{\langle b, h_Q^\eta \rangle h_Q^\eta(x) (\sigma(Q)) \lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|} \cdot \frac{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) h_{\sigma(Q)}^{\sigma(\epsilon)}(x) |Q|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \cdot \left\langle \frac{\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_Q^\epsilon |Q|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\mu^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}, f \right\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Due to $|h_Q^\eta(\sigma(Q))|$, $|h_{\sigma(Q)}^{\sigma(\epsilon)}|$, $|h_Q^\epsilon| \approx |Q|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, similar to the argument in Proposition 4.2, we have

$$\left\| \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{R}_b^{\mathcal{D}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))}^p \lesssim \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, \eta \neq 1} \left| \frac{\langle b, h_Q^\eta \rangle h_Q^\eta(\sigma(Q)) \lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|} \right|^p \lesssim \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}^p,$$

as desired. \square

Combining Propositions 4.2, 4.3, we have

$$\| [b, R_j] \|_{S^p(L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} = \left\| \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} [b, R_j] \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}$$

for $n < p < \infty$. That is, the Schatten norm is controlled by the Besov space norm, which is the conclusion of Proposition 4.1.

4.2. Necessity. We turn to the necessity of the Besov norm condition. This will complete the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose $\mu, \lambda \in A_2$ and set $\nu = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ for $n < p < \infty$. Suppose $b \in \text{VMO}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\| [b, R_j] \|_{S^p(L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} < \infty$, then $b \in \mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with*

$$\|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \| [b, R_j] \|_{S^p(L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n))}.$$

We setup an alternate norm for the Besov space, adapted to a particular Riesz transform.

Proposition 4.5. *There are absolute constants and integer N so that this holds for any grid \mathcal{D} . Fix $1 \leq j \leq n$. For all $Q \in \mathcal{D}_k$, for integer k , there are functions*

$$(4.5) \quad g_{Q,s} = 2^{(k+1)n/2} (1_{Q(s,1)} - 1_{Q(s,2)}), \quad 1 \leq s \leq N.$$

where

- The span of the $\{g_{Q,s}\}$ equals the range of $1_Q(E_{k+2} \cdot -E_k \cdot)$;
- $Q(j, 1), Q(j, 2)$ are contained in Q , and elements of \mathcal{D}_{k+2} ;
- $K_j(x_1 - x_2)$ does not change signs where $x_s \in Q(j, s)$, and K_j is the kernel of the j th Riesz transform;
- $|K_j(x_1 - x_2)| \gtrsim |Q|^{-1}$, where $x_s \in Q(j, s)$;
- We have the equivalence of norms

$$(4.6) \quad \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}^p \simeq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{s=1}^N \left(\frac{|Q|}{\nu(Q)} \right)^p \left(\frac{|\langle b, g_{Q,s} \rangle|}{\sqrt{|Q|}} \right)^p.$$

Proof. Since the weights in question are doubling, the $g_{Q,s}$ have the spanning property listed above, and all norms on finite dimensional space are equivalent, we have

$$\|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}^p \simeq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_k} \left(\frac{1}{\nu(Q)} \int_Q |E_{k+2} b - E_k b| dx \right)^p.$$

In comparison to our definition of the dyadic Besov space in (3.1), we are using the difference of conditional expectations, which differ by 2 instead of 1. Then, by the spanning properties of the $g_{Q,s}$, the equivalence (4.6) follows.

The approach is to construct the $g_{Q,s}$ meeting all but property (4.6). And, in addition, the span of the $\{g_{Q,s}\}$ is the range of $1_Q(E_{k+2} \cdot -E_k \cdot)$.

We can fix $j = 1$, for which the kernel of the Riesz transform is $K_1(y) = \frac{y_1}{|y|^{n+1}}$, for $y \neq 0$. Fix $Q \in \mathcal{D}_k$. The vector space of the range of $1_Q(E_{k+2} \cdot -E_k \cdot)$ has dimension $2^{2n} - 1$, and consists of functions with zero integral, constant on the grandchildren of Q . The grandchildren of Q are the cubes $\mathcal{P}(Q)$ consisting of all the cubes $P \in \mathcal{D}_{k+2}$, which are contained in Q . Let x_P be the center of P . Then our basis is the collection of functions

$$(4.7) \quad g_{P_1, P_2} := 2^{(k+1)n/2}(1_{P_1} - 1_{P_2}), \quad P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{P}(Q), |(x_{P_1} - x_{P_2}) \cdot (1, \dots, 0)| \geq 2^{-k-1}.$$

That is, we form the difference of the indicator of two cubes in $\mathcal{P}(Q)$ provided they are *not adjacent in the first coordinate*. Call the pairs (P_1, P_2) that meet this condition *admissible*.

This is certainly a system of functions, bounded in number independently of the choice of Q . They satisfy the cancellation and size conditions claimed by Lemma 2.3, and satisfy the conditions relative to the kernel K_1 . It is not immediately clear that their span is as required, namely the range of $1_Q(E_{k+2} \cdot -E_k \cdot)$. This is an elementary argument, which completes this proof.

We claim that every function g_{P_1, P_2} is in the linear span of the admissible functions. This immediately implies the required spanning property. There are two cases. First, suppose that $P_1 \neq P_2 \in \mathcal{P}(Q)$ are such that there is a third cube P_3 so that (P_1, P_3) and (P_2, P_3) are admissible. It is clear that g_{P_1, P_2} is in the linear span of the admissible g_{P_1, P_3} and g_{P_2, P_3} .

Second, if this is not the case, it must be that $P_1 \neq P_2 \in \mathcal{P}(Q)$ are *adjacent* in the first coordinate. Then, pick P_3 and P_4 so that (P_1, P_3) , (P_2, P_4) and (P_3, P_4) are admissible. It follows that g_{P_1, P_2} is in the linear span of the three admissible g_{P_1, P_3} , g_{P_2, P_4} and g_{P_3, P_4} . The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.4. For a fixed $b \in \mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$(4.8) \quad \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}^p \lesssim \sum_{\omega \in \{0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\}^n} \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}^p \lesssim \sum_{\omega \in \{0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\}^n} \sum_{Q^\omega \in \mathcal{D}^\omega} \sum_{s=1}^N \left(\frac{|Q^\omega|^2}{\mu(Q^\omega)\lambda^{-1}(Q^\omega)} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left(\frac{|\langle b, g_{Q^\omega, s} \rangle|}{\sqrt{|Q^\omega|}} \right)^p.$$

We will recognize the right hand side as an expression involving NWO functions. Now, we inspect a single inner product in the sum above. Recall the definition of $g_{Q^\omega, j}$ in (4.5) and so

$$|\langle b, g_{Q^\omega, s} \rangle| \lesssim \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{|Q^\omega|}} \int_{Q^\omega(s,1)} \int_{Q^\omega(s,2)} [b(x) - b(y)] K_j(x-y) dx dy \right|.$$

On the right-hand side, we insert $\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x)\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)$ and $\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}(y)\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(y)$. That with some manipulations leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{|Q^\omega|^2}{\mu(Q^\omega)\lambda^{-1}(Q^\omega)} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left(\frac{|\langle b, g_{Q^\omega, s} \rangle|}{\sqrt{|Q^\omega|}} \right)^p \\ & \lesssim \left(\frac{|Q^\omega|^2}{\mu(Q^\omega)\lambda^{-1}(Q^\omega)} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \frac{1}{|Q^\omega|^p} \\ & \quad \cdot \left| \iint (b(x) - b(y)) \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) K_j(x-y) \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(y) \mu^{\frac{1}{2}}(y) 1_{Q^\omega(s,2)}(y) \cdot \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) 1_{Q^\omega(s,1)}(x) dy dx \right|^p \end{aligned}$$

$$(4.9) = \left| \iint (b(x) - b(y)) [\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x)K_j(x-y)\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(y)] \frac{\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}(y)\mathbf{1}_{Q^{\omega}(s,2)}(y)}{\mu(Q^{\omega})^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)\mathbf{1}_{Q^{\omega}(s,1)}(x)}{\lambda^{-1}(Q^{\omega})^{\frac{1}{2}}} dy dx \right|^p.$$

Denote

$$G_{Q^{\omega},s}(y) = \frac{\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}(y)\mathbf{1}_{Q^{\omega}(s,2)}(y)}{\mu(Q^{\omega})^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad H_{Q^{\omega},j}(x) = \frac{\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)\mathbf{1}_{Q^{\omega}(s,1)}(x)}{\lambda^{-1}(Q^{\omega})^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Then, we have

$$(4.9) = \left| \langle \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}[b, R_j]\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}G_{Q^{\omega},s}, H_{Q^{\omega},j} \rangle \right|^p.$$

Moreover, both $\{H_{Q^{\omega},s}\}_{Q^{\omega} \in \mathcal{D}^{\omega}}$ and $\{G_{Q^{\omega},s}\}_{Q^{\omega} \in \mathcal{D}^{\omega}}$ are NWOs. Hence, we have a replacement for the Schmidt decomposition for $[b, R_j]$ and so by Lemma 2.6 we have

$$(4.10) \quad \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D}^{\omega})}^p \lesssim \sum_{Q^{\omega} \in \mathcal{D}^{\omega}} \sum_{s=1}^N \left| \langle \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}[b, R_j]\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}G_{Q^{\omega},s}, H_{Q^{\omega},s} \rangle \right|^p \lesssim \left\| \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}[b, R_j]\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{S^p(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))}^p.$$

Combining this and (4.8), the proof is finished. \square

5. CRITICAL INDEX $p = n$: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

Let all the notation be the same as in Theorem 1.3. We will show that if b is non-constant, then the Schatten S^n norm of the weighted commutator is infinite.

We begin by considering non-constant $b \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Thus, ∇b is non-zero at some x_0 . And, we can further assume that x_0 is a Lebesgue point of v^{-1} , $v^{-1}(x_0) \neq 0$, and does not fall on the boundary of any of our shifted dyadic cubes. From these considerations, this follows. There exists $N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, so that for any dyadic grid \mathcal{D} , and letting $Q_k^{x_0}$ be the cube in \mathcal{D}_k which contains x_0 , we have

$$(5.1) \quad \frac{v^{-1}(Q_k^{x_0})}{|Q_k^{x_0}|} \approx v^{-1}(x_0) > 0, \quad k > N.$$

Recall the inequality (4.10) also holds for $p = n$, that is,

$$(5.2) \quad \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^n(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}^n \lesssim \left\| \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}[b, R_j]\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{S^n(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))}^n.$$

And, for the same dyadic grid \mathcal{D} , we have

$$\|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^n(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}^n \approx \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \left(\frac{1}{v(Q)} \int_Q |\Delta_Q b| dx \right)^n.$$

We claim that this last sum is infinite. Fix a cube Q_0 containing x_0 with $\inf_{x \in Q_0} |\nabla b(x)| > c$. Then, for any cube $Q \subset Q_0$, we have $|\Delta_Q b(x)| > c\ell(Q)$ on at least one child Q' . Without loss of generality, assume that $Q_0 \in \mathcal{D}_k$ for some $k > N$. Hence, we have by application of the A_2 conditions and (5.1) to see

$$(5.3) \quad \|b\|_{\mathbf{B}_v^n(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D})}^n \gtrsim \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{D}, Q \subset Q_0 \\ \ell(Q) = 2^{-j}\ell(Q_0)}} \left(\ell(Q) \frac{v^{-1}(Q)}{|Q|} \right)^n \gtrsim v^{-1}(x_0)^n \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |Q_0| = +\infty.$$

In general, consider $b \in \text{VMO}_v(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Following the proof of Proposition 4.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}(b) &:= \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \left(\frac{1}{v(Q)} \int_Q \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |b(x) - b(y)| dy dx \right)^n \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \\ &\lesssim \|[b, R_j]\|_{S^n(L_v^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_v^2(\mathbb{R}^n))}. \end{aligned}$$

Let ψ be a nonnegative function in $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\int \psi(x)dx = 1$. Denote $\psi_\epsilon(x) = \epsilon^{-n}\psi(x/\epsilon)$ and let $b_\epsilon(x) = \psi_\epsilon * b(x)$, then $b_\epsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Note that for ϵ sufficiently small,

$$\mathcal{T}(b_\epsilon) \lesssim \sup_{h \in B(0,1)} \mathcal{T}(\tau_h b),$$

where $\tau_h b(x) = b(x-h)$. For any fixed $h \in B(0,1)$ and for $f \in L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$[\tau_h b, R_j]f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (b(x-h) - b(y-h)) K_j(x-y) f(y) dy,$$

then the translation invariance of the kernel K_j of R_j yields

$$\|[\tau_h b, R_j]f\|_{L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (b(x) - b(y)) K_j(x-y) \tau_{-h} f(y) dy \right|^2 \tau_{-h} \lambda(x) dx.$$

Observe that

$$\int |\tau_{-h} f(y)|^2 \tau_{-h} \mu(y) dy = \int |f(y)|^2 \mu(y) dy,$$

$[\tau_{-h} \mu]_{A_2} = [\mu]_{A_2}$ and $[\tau_{-h} \lambda]_{A_2} = [\lambda]_{A_2}$ by definition. Hence

$$\mathcal{T}(\tau_h b) \lesssim \| [b, R_j] \|_{S^n(L_{\tau_{-h}\mu}^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_{\tau_{-h}\lambda}^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} = \| [b, R_j] \|_{S^n(L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n))}.$$

This yields that for ϵ sufficiently small,

$$\mathcal{T}(b_\epsilon) \leq \| [b, R_j] \|_{S^n(L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n))}.$$

Nevertheless, a similar argument yields that if the smooth function b_ϵ is non-constant, then $\mathcal{T}(b_\epsilon) = \infty$. Hence b_ϵ is constant almost everywhere when $[b, R_j]$ belongs to $S^n(L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Since $b_\epsilon \rightarrow b$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0+$, we obtain b is constant as well.

Remark 5.1. We note that $p = n$ is critical. In fact, for $p > n$, we see that there are many non-constant functions in $\mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For example, we take $\mu(x) = |x|^\alpha$ and $\lambda(x) = |x|^\beta$, where $\alpha, \beta \in (-n, n)$. Then both $\mu, \lambda \in A_2$. Next, we choose $b(x) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, with $b(x) \geq 0$, $\text{supp } b \subset B(x_0, 1)$, where $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|x_0| > 10$, and $|\nabla b(x)| > 0$ for $x \in B(x_0, 1)$. Then we see that all such functions $b \in \mathbf{B}_\nu^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\nu = (\mu/\lambda)^{1/2}$.

6. OSCILLATION SPACES ASSOCIATED WITH TWO WEIGHTS: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.5

We begin with three auxiliary lemmas, to study the structure of the weighted oscillation sequence space $\mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Lemma 6.1. Suppose $\nu \in A_2$. Then $\mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset \text{BMO}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Proof. For each $\omega \in \{0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\}^n$ and $Q^\omega \in \mathcal{D}^\omega$, it follows from Definition 2.2 that there exists $Q \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfying $|Q| = |Q^\omega|$ and $Q^\omega \subset 20\sqrt{n}Q$. Using the doubling property of A_2 weights, there exists a positive constant $C = C(n, [\nu]_{A_2})$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\nu(Q^\omega)} \int_{Q^\omega} |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{Q^\omega}| dx \leq C R_Q,$$

where

$$(6.4) \quad R_Q := \frac{1}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}| dx.$$

Hence, combined with Definition 1.4, we see that for each function $b \in \mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have $b \in \bigcap_{\omega \in \{0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\}^n} \text{BMO}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{D}^\omega) = \text{BMO}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$. \square

In fact, we further have the following argument.

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose $v \in A_2$. Then $\mathcal{W}_v(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset \text{VMO}_v(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Proof. Based on Lemma 6.1, for each $b \in \mathcal{W}_v(\mathbb{R}^n)$, it suffices to verify that b satisfies the three limiting conditions concerning the weighted mean oscillation over balls, as listed in Definition 2.11.

Recall that the adjacent dyadic systems possess the property that there exists a positive constant C such that for any ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists $Q^\omega \in \mathcal{D}^\omega$ for some $\omega \in \{0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\}^n$, satisfying $B \subset Q^\omega$ and $|Q^\omega| \leq C|B|$. Combining the argument in Lemma 6.1, we have that for any ball B , there exists $Q \in \mathcal{D}$ such that the weighted mean oscillation of b over B is governed by R_Q , which was defined as in (6.4). Therefore, it remains to prove that

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \sup_{Q: \ell(Q) \leq a} R_Q = \lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{Q: \ell(Q) \geq a} R_Q = \lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{Q: Q \cap B(0, a) = \emptyset} R_Q = 0.$$

We verify the first condition. That is, it will be shown that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $K_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\sup \{R_Q : Q \in \mathcal{D}, \ell(Q) \leq 2^{-K_\epsilon}\} < \epsilon.$$

Otherwise, there exists a sequence $\{Q_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathcal{D} such that $R_{Q_j} \geq \epsilon_0$ uniformly for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$, and $\ell(Q_j) \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Thus $\| \{R_Q\} \|_{\ell^{n, \infty}} = \sup_k \{k^{1/n} a_k^*\} = +\infty$, where $\{a_k^*\}$ is the non-increasing rearrangement of $\{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$. This contradicts $b \in \mathcal{W}_v(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Hence the first limiting condition holds. The proofs of the remaining two conditions are similar. \square

Next we show that $\mathcal{W}_v(\mathbb{R}^n)$ has the following properties which are crucial for Theorem 1.5.

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose $\lambda, \mu \in A_2$ and set $v = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. For $b \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, assume that the sequence*

$$\{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} = \left\{ \frac{1}{v(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}| dx \right\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \in \ell^{n, \infty},$$

then:

(1) *There is a smooth function $F(x, t)$ on \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} with $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} F(x, t) = b(x)$, a.e., and*

$$F^*(x, t) := \sup \left\{ |s \nabla F(y, s)| : |y - x| < t, \frac{t}{2} < s < t \right\} \cdot \int_{t/2}^t \int_{B(x, t)} 1 \frac{dy ds}{v(B(y, s))s}$$

is in $L^{n, \infty}(\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}, \frac{dx dt}{t^{n+1}})$, where $\nabla = (\nabla_x, \partial_t)$. Moreover, we have

$$\|F^*\|_{L^{n, \infty}(\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}, \frac{dx dt}{t^{n+1}})} \lesssim \| \{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \|_{\ell^{n, \infty}}.$$

(2) *The sequences $\left\{ \left[\frac{1}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}|^2 \lambda(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ and*

$$\left\{ \left[\frac{1}{\lambda^{-1}(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}|^2 \mu^{-1}(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$$

are both in $\ell^{n, \infty}$ with norms dominated by $\| \{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \|_{\ell^{n, \infty}}$.

Proof. We will begin by proving (1), and then apply it to show (2).

Let φ be a smooth function on \mathbb{R}^n , which is supported in $[-1, 1]^n$ and satisfies $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi(x) dx = 1$. Let $\varphi_t(x) = t^{-n} \varphi(\frac{x}{t})$, then $\nabla \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_t(x) dx = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ for each $t > 0$.

Set $F(x, t) = \varphi_t * b(x)$. For each $(x, t) \in Q \times [\frac{\ell(Q)}{2}, \ell(Q)]$, where $Q \in \mathcal{D}$, let $T_{x,t} := \{(y, s) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} : |y - x| < t, \frac{t}{2} < s < t\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(y,s) \in T_{x,t}} s |\nabla F(y, s)| &= \sup_{(y,s) \in T_{x,t}} s \left| \int_{y-z \in [-\frac{s}{2}, \frac{s}{2}]^n} (b(z) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}) \nabla \varphi_s(y-z) dz \right| \\ &\leq c \frac{1}{\ell(Q)^n} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(z) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}| dz, \end{aligned}$$

where the positive constant c is independent of Q , (x, t) and (y, s) . As a consequence, there exists a positive constant $C = C(c, \nu, n)$ such that for each $Q \in \mathcal{D}$ and $(x, t) \in Q \times [\frac{\ell(Q)}{2}, \ell(Q)]$,

$$F^*(x, t) \leq C \cdot R_Q.$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} Q \times \left[\frac{\ell(Q)}{2}, \ell(Q) \right]$$

up to a zero measure set, and the interiors of $\{Q \times [\frac{\ell(Q)}{2}, \ell(Q)]\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ are mutually disjoint. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|F^*\|_{L^{n,\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}, \frac{dxdt}{t^{n+1}}\right)} &= \sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda \left(\iint_{\{(x,t): F^*(x,t) > \lambda\}} 1 \frac{dxdt}{t^{n+1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \\ &= \sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \int_{\ell(Q)/2}^{\ell(Q)} \int_Q 1_{\{F^* > \lambda\}} \frac{dxdt}{t^{n+1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \\ &\lesssim \sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda \left(\text{the number of } \{Q \in \mathcal{D} : \sup_{(x,t) \in Q \times [\frac{\ell(Q)}{2}, \ell(Q)]} F^*(x, t) > \lambda\} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \\ &\leq \sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda \left(\text{the number of } \{Q \in \mathcal{D} : R_Q > C^{-1}\lambda\} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \\ &\lesssim \|\{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}\|_{\ell^{n,\infty}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that

$$\|\{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}\|_{\ell^{n,\infty}} = \sup_{k \geq 1} k^{1/n} R_k^* \geq \sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda \left(\text{the number of } \{Q \in \mathcal{D} : R_Q \geq \lambda\} \right)^{1/n},$$

where $\{R_k^*\}_{k \geq 1}$ is the non-increasing rearrangement of $\{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$. That is, $F^* \in L^{n,\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}, \frac{dxdt}{t^{n+1}}\right)$, and we complete the proof of (1).

It remains to show (2). Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[\frac{1}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}|^2 \lambda(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \left[\frac{1}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(x) - F(c_Q, \ell(Q))|^2 \lambda(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} + |\langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q} - F(c_Q, \ell(Q))| \left(\frac{\lambda(20\sqrt{n}Q)}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \left[\frac{1}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(x) - F(c_Q, \ell(Q))|^2 \lambda(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{|20\sqrt{n}Q|} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(x) - F(c_Q, \ell(Q))| dx \right) \frac{|20\sqrt{n}Q|}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \end{aligned}$$

$$=: I_Q + \Pi_Q.$$

For the term I_Q , writing $b(x) - F(c_Q, \ell(Q)) = F(x, \ell(Q)) - F(c_Q, \ell(Q)) + b(x) - F(x, \ell(Q))$ to see

$$\begin{aligned} I_Q &\lesssim \sup_{x \in 20\sqrt{n}Q} |F(x, \ell(Q)) - F(c_Q, \ell(Q))| \frac{|20\sqrt{n}Q|}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{1}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} \left(\int_0^{\ell(Q)} |\partial_t F(x, t)| dt \right)^2 \lambda(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\Pi_Q \lesssim \sup_{x \in 20\sqrt{n}Q} |F(x, \ell(Q)) - F(c_Q, \ell(Q))| \frac{|20\sqrt{n}Q|}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} + \frac{1}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} \int_0^{\ell(Q)} |\partial_t F(x, t)| dt dx.$$

Obviously,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{x \in 20\sqrt{n}Q} |F(x, \ell(Q)) - F(c_Q, \ell(Q))| \frac{|20\sqrt{n}Q|}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \\ &\lesssim \sup_{x \in 20\sqrt{n}Q} \ell(Q) |\nabla F(x, \ell(Q))| \frac{|20\sqrt{n}Q|}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(P) = \ell(Q) \\ P \cap 20\sqrt{n}Q \neq \emptyset}} R_P. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the operator M defined on the sequence $\mathcal{R} = \{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ by

$$M(\mathcal{R})(Q) := \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(P) = \ell(Q) \\ P \cap 20\sqrt{n}Q \neq \emptyset}} R_P$$

is a bounded map of $\ell^{n, \infty}$ to itself. Hence it suffices to consider

$$I'_Q := \left[\frac{1}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} \left(\int_0^{\ell(Q)} |\partial_t F(x, t)| dt \right)^2 \lambda(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and its analogy

$$\Pi'_Q := \frac{1}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} \int_0^{\ell(Q)} |\partial_t F(x, t)| dt dx.$$

Let $\tilde{F}(y, t) = \sup_{t/2 < s < t} s |\nabla F(y, s)|$, then $F^*(x, t) = \sup_{|y-x| < t} \tilde{F}(y, t) \cdot \int_{t/2}^t \int_{B(x, t)} 1 \frac{dy ds}{\nu(B(y, s))s}$. By the convexity of the power function,

$$\begin{aligned} I'_Q &\leq \left[\frac{1}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} \left(\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\log_2 \ell(Q)} \sup_{1/2 \leq 2^{-j}t \leq 1} t |\nabla F(x, t)| \right)^2 \lambda(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \left[\frac{1}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} \left(\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\log_2 \ell(Q)} \tilde{F}(x, 2^j) \right)^2 \lambda(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \left[\frac{1}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} \left(\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\log_2 \ell(Q)} [(\log_2 \ell(Q)) - j + 1]^{-2} [(\log_2 \ell(Q)) - j + 1]^2 \tilde{F}(x, 2^j) \right)^2 \lambda(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim \left[\frac{1}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q}^{\log_2 \ell(Q)} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\log_2 \ell(Q)} [(\log_2 \ell(Q)) - j + 1]^{-2} \left([(\log_2 \ell(Q)) - j + 1]^2 \widetilde{F}(x, 2^j) \right)^2 \lambda(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \left[\frac{1}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q}^{\log_2 \ell(Q)} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\log_2 \ell(Q)} [(\log_2 \ell(Q)) - j + 1]^2 \widetilde{F}(x, 2^j)^2 \lambda(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \left[\frac{1}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(P) \leq \ell(Q) \\ P \cap 20\sqrt{n}Q \neq \emptyset}} \lambda(P) \left(\log_2 \frac{\ell(Q)}{\ell(P)} + 1 \right)^2 \sup_{x \in P} \widetilde{F}(x, \ell(P))^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By observing that

$$\sup_{x \in P} \widetilde{F}(x, \ell(P))^2 \leq \sup_{x \in P} F^*(x, \ell(P))^2 \cdot \left(\frac{\nu(P)}{|P|} \right)^2 \lesssim (R_P)^2 \cdot \frac{\lambda^{-1}(P)\mu(P)}{|P|^2} \approx (R_P)^2 \frac{\mu(P)}{\lambda(P)},$$

we have

$$I_Q \lesssim \left[\frac{1}{\mu(Q)} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(P) \leq \ell(Q) \\ P \cap 20\sqrt{n}Q \neq \emptyset}} \mu(P) \left(\log_2 \frac{\ell(Q)}{\ell(P)} + 1 \right)^2 (R_P)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We claim that the operator \widetilde{M} defined on the sequence $\mathcal{R} = \{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ by

$$\widetilde{M}(\mathcal{R})(Q) := \left[\frac{1}{\mu(Q)} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(P) \leq \ell(Q) \\ P \cap 20\sqrt{n}Q \neq \emptyset}} \mu(P) \left(\log_2 \frac{\ell(Q)}{\ell(P)} + 1 \right)^2 (R_P)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

is a bounded map of $\ell^{n, \infty}$ to itself. By interpolation (see for example [1, Section 5.3]), it suffices to show that \widetilde{M} is bounded on ℓ^p for $p \geq 1$.

To see this, note that for $1 \leq p \leq 2$, by definition we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \left\{ \widetilde{M}(\mathcal{R})(Q) \right\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \right\|_{\ell^p} &= \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \widetilde{M}(\mathcal{R})(Q)^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&= \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \left[\sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(P) \leq \ell(Q) \\ P \cap 20\sqrt{n}Q \neq \emptyset}} \frac{\mu(P)}{\mu(Q)} \left(\log_2 \frac{\ell(Q)}{\ell(P)} + 1 \right)^2 (R_P)^2 \right]^{\frac{p}{2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(P) \leq \ell(Q) \\ P \cap 20\sqrt{n}Q \neq \emptyset}} \left(\frac{\mu(P)}{\mu(Q)} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left(\log_2 \frac{\ell(Q)}{\ell(P)} + 1 \right)^p (R_P)^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{P \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(P) \leq \ell(Q) \\ P \cap 20\sqrt{n}Q \neq \emptyset}} \left(\frac{\mu(P)}{\mu(Q)} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left(\log_2 \frac{\ell(Q)}{\ell(P)} + 1 \right)^p (R_P)^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\lesssim \left(\sum_{P \in \mathcal{D}} (R_P)^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we consider the case $p > 2$. The doubling property of $\mu \in A_2$ ensures that there exists $\theta = \theta(n, [\mu]_{A_2}) \in (0, 1)$, such that for any $Q \in \mathcal{D}$ and $P \cap 20\sqrt{n}Q \neq \emptyset$ with $\ell(P) = 2^{-k}\ell(Q)$, we have

$\mu(P) \leq \theta^k \mu(Q)$. Note that for any $p > 2$, then $(\frac{p}{2})' > 1$ and we can choose some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that $\alpha(\frac{p}{2})' > 1$. Hence

$$\sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(P) \leq \ell(Q) \\ P \cap 20\sqrt{n}Q \neq \emptyset}} \left(\frac{\mu(P)}{\mu(Q)} \right)^{\alpha(\frac{p}{2})'} \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(P) = 2^{-k}\ell(Q) \\ P \cap 20\sqrt{n}Q \neq \emptyset}} \theta^{(\alpha(\frac{p}{2})'-1)k} \frac{\mu(P)}{\mu(Q)} \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \theta^{(\alpha(\frac{p}{2})'-1)k} \lesssim 1.$$

Based on this, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left\{ \widetilde{M}(\mathcal{R})(Q) \right\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \right\|_{\ell^p} \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \left[\left(\sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(P) \leq \ell(Q) \\ P \cap 20\sqrt{n}Q \neq \emptyset}} \left(\frac{\mu(P)}{\mu(Q)} \right)^{\alpha(\frac{p}{2})'} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \cdot \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(P) \leq \ell(Q) \\ P \cap 20\sqrt{n}Q \neq \emptyset}} \left(\frac{\mu(P)}{\mu(Q)} \right)^{\frac{(1-\alpha)p}{2}} \left(\log_2 \frac{\ell(Q)}{\ell(P)} + 1 \right)^p (R_P)^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \right. \\ & \lesssim \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(P) \leq \ell(Q) \\ P \cap 20\sqrt{n}Q \neq \emptyset}} \left(\frac{\mu(P)}{\mu(Q)} \right)^{\frac{(1-\alpha)p}{2}} \left(\log_2 \frac{\ell(Q)}{\ell(P)} + 1 \right)^p (R_P)^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & = \left(\sum_{P \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(P) \leq \ell(Q) \\ P \cap 20\sqrt{n}Q \neq \emptyset}} \left(\frac{\mu(P)}{\mu(Q)} \right)^{\frac{(1-\alpha)p}{2}} \left(\log_2 \frac{\ell(Q)}{\ell(P)} + 1 \right)^p (R_P)^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \lesssim \left(\sum_{P \in \mathcal{D}} (R_P)^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\Pi'_Q \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(P) \leq \ell(Q) \\ P \cap 20\sqrt{n}Q \neq \emptyset}} |P| \sup_{x \in P} \widetilde{F}(x, \ell(P)) \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu(Q)} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(P) \leq \ell(Q) \\ P \cap 20\sqrt{n}Q \neq \emptyset}} \nu(P) R_P,$$

and an analogous of the argument for the ℓ^p -boundedness of \widetilde{M} in the case $p > n$ can deduce that the operator M' defined on the sequence $\mathcal{R} = \{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ by

$$M'(\mathcal{R})(Q) := \frac{1}{\nu(Q)} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(P) \leq \ell(Q) \\ P \cap 20\sqrt{n}Q \neq \emptyset}} \nu(P) R_P$$

is also a bounded map of $\ell^{n, \infty}$ to itself.

From the above, we obtain that the sequence $\left\{ \left[\frac{1}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}|^2 \lambda(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ is in $\ell^{n, \infty}$ and its norm is dominated by $\|\{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}\|_{\ell^{n, \infty}}$.

In the end, observe that $\lambda, \lambda^{-1}, \mu, \mu^{-1} \in A_2$, By definition, for each $Q \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$\frac{|Q|}{\nu(Q)} \approx \frac{\nu^{-1}(Q)}{|Q|} \approx \frac{\lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|} \approx \frac{\mu^{-1}(Q)}{\lambda^{-1}(Q)},$$

this allows that the argument of the sequence

$$\left\{ \left[\frac{1}{\lambda^{-1}(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}|^2 \mu^{-1}(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$$

is similar, and we skip it. The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.5. We first note that by Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\left\| \{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \right\|_{\ell^{n,\infty}} \lesssim \left\| \left\{ \left[\frac{1}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}|^2 \lambda(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \right\|_{\ell^{n,\infty}}$$

and

$$\left\| \{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \right\|_{\ell^{n,\infty}} \lesssim \left\| \left\{ \left[\frac{1}{\lambda^{-1}(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}|^2 \mu^{-1}(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \right\|_{\ell^{n,\infty}}.$$

Next, from Lemma 6.3, we have the reverse inequalities of the above two inequalities. Thus, the proof of Theorem 1.5 is complete. \square

Remark 6.4. *Combining the interpolation theory of Lorentz spaces (see for example [1, Section 5.3]), the argument in Lemma 6.3 indeed deduces the equivalence that*

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \{R_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \right\|_{\ell^{p,q}} &\approx \left\| \left\{ \left[\frac{1}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}|^2 \lambda(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \right\|_{\ell^{p,q}} \\ &\approx \left\| \left\{ \left[\frac{1}{\lambda^{-1}(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}|^2 \mu^{-1}(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \right\|_{\ell^{p,q}} \end{aligned}$$

for any $0 < p < \infty$ and $0 < q \leq \infty$.

7. WEAK SCHATTEN CLASS ESTIMATE AT CRITICAL INDEX $p = n$: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.6

Throughout this section, let R_j be the j th Riesz transform on \mathbb{R}^n with $n \geq 2$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. Suppose $\lambda, \mu \in A_2$ and set $\nu = \mu^{\frac{1}{n}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{n}}$.

7.1. Proof of the sufficient condition. In this subsection, we assume that $b \in \mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then prove that

$$[b, R_j] \in S^{n,\infty}(L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n)).$$

By noting that

$$\| [b, R_j] \|_{S^{n,\infty}(L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} = \left\| \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} [b, R_j] \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{S^{n,\infty}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))},$$

it suffices to show that $\left\| \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} [b, R_j] \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{S^{n,\infty}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim \|b\|_{\mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)}$.

Let $\Lambda = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n : x = y\}$, and $\Omega = (\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n) \setminus \Lambda$. Assuming that \mathcal{P} is a dyadic Whitney decomposition family of the open set Ω , that is, $\bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P = \Omega$ and $\sqrt{2n} \ell(P) \leq \text{distance}(P, \Lambda) \leq 4\sqrt{2n} \ell(P)$; see [10, Appendix J.1] for instance. Therefore, we write $K_j(x - y) = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} K_j(x - y) 1_P(x, y)$, and P can be the cubes $P_1 \times P_2$, where $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{D}$, have the same side length and that distance between them must be comparable to this sidelength, due to

$$\text{distance}(P, \Lambda) \approx \text{distance}(c_P, \Lambda) = \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sqrt{|x - c_{P_1}|^2 + |x - c_{P_2}|^2} = \frac{|c_{P_1} - c_{P_2}|}{\sqrt{2}},$$

where $c_P = (c_{P_1}, c_{P_2})$ is the center of P . More precisely, we have $3\sqrt{n} \ell(P_1) \leq |c_{P_1} - c_{P_2}| \leq 9\sqrt{n} \ell(P_1)$.

Thus, for each dyadic cube $P_1 \in \mathcal{D}$, P_2 is related to P_1 and at most M of the cubes P_2 such that $P_1 \times P_2 \in \mathcal{P}$, where $M \leq (20\sqrt{n})^n$ depends only on the dimension n . Therefore, let $Q = P_1$, there

is $R_{Q,s}$ such that $Q \times R_{Q,s} \in \mathcal{P}$, where $s = 1, 2, \dots, M$, we can reorganize the sum

$$K_j(x-y) = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} K_j(x-y) \mathbf{1}_P(x, y) = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{s=1}^M K_j(x-y) \mathbf{1}_{Q \times R_{Q,s}}(x, y),$$

where $|Q| = |R_{Q,s}|$ and $\text{distance}(Q, R_{Q,s}) \approx \ell(Q)$.

Assume $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small such that $((1+\epsilon)Q \times (1+\epsilon)R_{Q,s}) \cap \Lambda = \emptyset$. Take a smooth function η on \mathbb{R}^n with $\text{supp } \eta \subset [-(1+\epsilon)/2, (1+\epsilon)/2]^n$, satisfying $\eta \equiv 1$ on $[-1/2, 1/2]^n$ and $|\partial^\alpha \eta| \leq C_\alpha$ for every multi-index $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$. Now define $\eta_Q(x) = \eta((x - c_Q)/\ell(Q))$, where c_Q is the center of Q . It's clear that $\text{supp } \eta_Q \subset (1+\epsilon)Q$ and $|\partial^\alpha \eta_Q| \leq C_\alpha \ell(Q)^{-|\alpha|}$.

For each $(x, y) \in Q \times R_{Q,s}$,

$$K_j(x-y) \mathbf{1}_{Q \times R_{Q,s}}(x, y) = K_j(x-y) \eta_Q(x) \eta_{R_{Q,s}}(y).$$

Expanding in a multiple Fourier series on $(1+\epsilon)Q \times (1+\epsilon)R_{Q,s}$, we can write

$$K_j(x-y) \eta_Q(x) \eta_{R_{Q,s}}(y) = \sum_{\vec{l} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}} c_{\vec{l}, Q}^j e^{2\pi i \vec{l} \cdot \vec{x}} e^{2\pi i \vec{l}' \cdot \vec{y}} \mathbf{1}_{(1+\epsilon)Q}(x) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(1+\epsilon)R_{Q,s}}(y),$$

where $x = c_Q + (1+\epsilon)\ell(Q)\vec{x}$, $y = c_{R_{Q,s}} + (1+\epsilon)\ell(R_{Q,s})\vec{y}$, $\vec{l} = (\vec{l}', \vec{l}'') \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}^n$, and

$$c_{\vec{l}, Q}^j = \int_{(1+\epsilon)R_{Q,s}} \int_{(1+\epsilon)Q} K_j(x-y) \eta_Q(x) \eta_{R_{Q,s}}(y) e^{-2\pi i \vec{l} \cdot \vec{x}} e^{-2\pi i \vec{l}' \cdot \vec{y}} dx dy \frac{1}{|(1+\epsilon)Q|} \frac{1}{|(1+\epsilon)R_{Q,s}|}.$$

For any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, note that $K_j(x-y)$ has the regularity condition

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta K_j(x-y)| \leq C(\alpha, \beta) \frac{1}{|x-y|^{n+|\alpha|+|\beta|}},$$

which, in combination with the fact that $\text{distance}(Q, R_{Q,s}) \approx \ell(Q)$, yields

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta K_j(x-y) \eta_Q(x) \eta_{R_{Q,s}}(y)| \leq C(\alpha, \beta) \frac{1}{|x-y|^{n+|\alpha|+|\beta|}}.$$

Hence, one may apply $\hat{f}(\vec{l}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi i \vec{l})^{(\alpha, \beta)}} (\widehat{\partial^{(\alpha, \beta)} f})(\vec{l})$ to see

$$|c_{\vec{l}, Q}^j| \lesssim \frac{1}{|Q|} \frac{1}{(1+|\vec{l}|)^{|\alpha|+|\beta|}}.$$

Let $\lambda_{\vec{l}, Q}^j = |Q|^{\frac{1}{2}} |R_{Q,s}|^{\frac{1}{2}} c_{\vec{l}, Q}^j$, then

$$|\lambda_{\vec{l}, Q}^j| \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|\vec{l}|)^{|\alpha|+|\beta|}},$$

and so

$$K_j(x-y) \mathbf{1}_{Q \times R_{Q,s}}(x, y) = \sum_{\vec{l} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}} \lambda_{\vec{l}, Q}^j \frac{1}{|Q|^{1/2}} F_{\vec{l}, Q}(x) \frac{1}{|R_{Q,s}|^{1/2}} G_{\vec{l}', R_{Q,s}}(y),$$

where $F_{\vec{l}, Q}(x) = e^{2\pi i \vec{l} \cdot \vec{x}} \mathbf{1}_Q(x)$ and $G_{\vec{l}', R_{Q,s}}(y) = e^{2\pi i \vec{l}' \cdot \vec{y}} \mathbf{1}_{R_{Q,s}}(y)$. Then, we get

$$K_j(x-y) = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{s=1}^M \sum_{\vec{l} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}} \lambda_{\vec{l}, Q}^j \frac{1}{|Q|^{1/2}} F_{\vec{l}, Q}(x) \frac{1}{|R_{Q,s}|^{1/2}} G_{\vec{l}', R_{Q,s}}(y).$$

Thus, the kernel of $\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}[b, R_j]\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ can be represented as

$$K_b^{\mu, \lambda}(x, y) = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{s=1}^M \sum_{\tilde{l} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}} (b(x) - b(y)) \lambda_{\tilde{l}, Q}^j \frac{1}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) F_{\tilde{l}, Q}(x) \frac{1}{|R_{Q,s}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} G_{\tilde{l}', R_{Q,s}}(y) \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(y).$$

Note that for each Q , $20\sqrt{n}Q$ contains $Q \cup R_{Q,s}$. We rewrite $b(x) - b(y)$ as $(b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}) + (\langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q} - b(y))$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} K_b^{\mu, \lambda}(x, y) &= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{s=1}^M \sum_{\tilde{l} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}} \lambda_{\tilde{l}, Q}^j (b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}) \frac{1}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) F_{\tilde{l}, Q}(x) \frac{1}{|R_{Q,s}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} G_{\tilde{l}', R_{Q,s}}(y) \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(y) \\ &\quad + \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{s=1}^M \sum_{\tilde{l} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}} \lambda_{\tilde{l}, Q}^j \frac{1}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) F_{\tilde{l}, Q}(x) (\langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q} - b(y)) \frac{1}{|R_{Q,s}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} G_{\tilde{l}', R_{Q,s}}(y) \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(y) \\ &=: K_{b,1}^{\mu, \lambda}(x, y) + K_{b,2}^{\mu, \lambda}(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

We begin by verifying $K_{b,2}^{\mu, \lambda}(x, y)$. Let $r = 2(1 + \gamma)$ and let $r \in (2, r)$, where γ is related to the reverse Hölder inequality (see Lemma 2.8 and one may take $\gamma = \min\{\sigma_\lambda, \sigma_{\mu^{-1}}\}$ to ensure the follow-up proof). Let r' and r' be the conjugate index of r and r , respectively. Note that $r > r > 2$, and hence $r' < r' < 2$.

We introduce the notation

$$\text{osc}_2(b, Q) = \left[\frac{1}{\lambda^{-1}(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(y) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}|^2 \mu^{-1}(y) dy \right]^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and write

$$\begin{aligned} K_{b,2}^{\mu, \lambda}(x, y) &= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{s=1}^M \sum_{\tilde{l} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}} \lambda_{\tilde{l}, Q}^j \text{osc}_2(b, Q) \frac{|Q|^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{r}}}{|Q|} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) F_{\tilde{l}, Q}(x) \frac{1}{\lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\quad \times (\text{osc}_2(b, Q))^{-1} (\langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q} - b(y)) \frac{1}{|R_{Q,s}|^{1/2}} G_{\tilde{l}', R_{Q,s}}(y) \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(y) \frac{\lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{r}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we set

$$F_{\tilde{l}, Q, 2}(x) = \frac{|Q|^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{r}}}{|Q|} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) F_{\tilde{l}, Q}(x) \frac{1}{\lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

and

$$G_{\tilde{l}', R_{Q,s}, 2}(y) = (\text{osc}_2(b, Q))^{-1} (\langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q} - b(y)) \frac{1}{|R_{Q,s}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} G_{\tilde{l}', R_{Q,s}}(y) \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(y) \frac{\lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{r}}}.$$

We first consider $F_{\tilde{l}, Q, 2}(x)$. The maximal function associated to $F_{\tilde{l}, Q, 2}$ is given by the following: for every $f \in L^{r'}(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$f^{*,r}(x) = \sup_{Q: |x - c_Q| \leq \ell(Q)} \frac{1}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{r}}} |\langle f, F_{\tilde{l}, Q, 2} \rangle|,$$

where c_Q is the center of Q and $\ell(Q)$ is the side-length. For more details about this maximal function, we refer to [28, (7.38)].

Note that for every Q with $|x - c_Q| \leq \ell(Q)$,

$$\frac{1}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{r}}} |\langle f, F_{\tilde{l}, Q, 2} \rangle| \leq \frac{1}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{r}}} \left(\int_Q |f(y)|^{r'} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}} \|F_{\tilde{l}, Q, 2}\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{|Q|^{\frac{1}{r}}}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{r'}}} \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |f(y)|^{r'} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}} \frac{|Q|^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{r'}}}{|Q|} \frac{|Q|^{\frac{1}{r}}}{\lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q \lambda^{\frac{r}{2}}(y) dy \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \\
&\lesssim \frac{|Q|^{\frac{1}{r}}}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{r'}}} \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |f(y)|^{r'} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}} \frac{|Q|^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{r'}}}{|Q|} \frac{|Q|^{\frac{1}{r}}}{\lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q \lambda(y) dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |f(y)|^{r'} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}} \\
&\lesssim (\mathcal{M}(|f|^{r'})(x))^{\frac{1}{r'}},
\end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{M} is the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function. Since $r' < r$, the $L^{r'/r}$ boundedness of \mathcal{M} implies that

$$\|(\mathcal{M}(|f|^{r'}))^{\frac{1}{r'}}\|_{L^{r'}} \lesssim \| |f|^{r'} \|_{L^{r'/r}}^{1/r'} = \|f\|_{L^{r'}}.$$

Hence $f^{*,r}$ is bounded on $L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which shows that $F_{\vec{v},Q,2}(x)$ is a NWO_r ([28, (7.38)]).

Next, we consider $G_{\vec{v},R_{Q,s},2}(y)$ for $1 \leq s \leq M$. The maximal function associated to $G_{\vec{v},R_{Q,s},2}$ is given by the following: for every $f \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$f^{*,r}(x) = \sup_{R_{Q,s}: |x - c_{R_{Q,s}}| \leq \ell(R_{Q,s})} \frac{1}{|R_{Q,s}|^{\frac{1}{r'}}} |\langle f, G_{\vec{v},R_{Q,s},2} \rangle|.$$

To continue, we first have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|G_{\vec{v},R_{Q,s},2}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq (\text{osc}_2(b, Q))^{-1} \frac{1}{|R_{Q,s}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{r'}}} \left(\int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(y) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}|^2 \mu^{-1}(y) dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{|R_{Q,s}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\lambda(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{-1}(20\sqrt{n}Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{r'}}} \\
&\lesssim |Q|^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{r'}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for every $R_{Q,s}$ with $|x - c_{R_{Q,s}}| \leq \ell(R_{Q,s})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{|R_{Q,s}|^{\frac{1}{r'}}} |\langle f, G_{\vec{v},R_{Q,s},2} \rangle| &\leq \frac{1}{|R_{Q,s}|^{\frac{1}{r'}}} \|G_{\vec{v},R_{Q,s},2}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \left(\int_{R_{Q,s}} |f(y)|^2 dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\lesssim \left(\frac{1}{|R_{Q,s}|} \int_{R_{Q,s}} |f(y)|^2 dy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq (\mathcal{M}(|f|^2)(x))^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, since $r > 2$, it is direct to see that $f^{*,r}$ is bounded on $L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which shows that $G_{\vec{v},R_{Q,s},2}(y)$ is a NWO_r .

Therefore,

$$K_{b,2}^{\mu,\lambda}(f)(x) = \sum_{\vec{l} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}} \sum_{s=1}^M \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \lambda_{\vec{l},Q}^j \text{osc}_2(b, Q) \langle f, G_{\vec{v},R_{Q,s},2} \rangle F_{\vec{v},Q,2},$$

where $\{G_{\vec{v},R_{Q,s},2}\}$ and $\{F_{\vec{v},Q,2}\}$ are NWO_r and NWO_r sequences, respectively, with $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{r'} = 1$ (this yields (2.2) also holds; see [28, p. 303]); and numbers $\{\lambda_{\vec{l},Q}^j\}$ satisfy $|\lambda_{\vec{l},Q}^j| \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|\vec{l}|)^{|\alpha|+|\beta|}}$ for all multi-indices $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$.

We now consider $K_{b,1}^{\mu,\lambda}(x, y)$. Let

$$\text{osc}_1(b, Q) = \left[\frac{1}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}|^2 \lambda(x) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} K_{b,1}^{\mu,\lambda}(x, y) &= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{s=1}^M \sum_{\vec{l} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}} \lambda_{\vec{l}, Q}^j \text{osc}_1(b, Q) \text{osc}_1(b, Q)^{-1} (b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}) \frac{1}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) F_{\vec{l}, Q}(x) \frac{\mu^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{\tau}}} \\ &\quad \times \frac{|Q|^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\tau}}}{|R_{Q,s}|} G_{\vec{l}, R_{Q,s}}(y) \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(y) \frac{1}{\mu^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

We set

$$F_{\vec{l}, Q, 1}(x) = (\text{osc}_1(b, Q))^{-1} (b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}) \frac{1}{|Q|^{1/2}} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) F_{\vec{l}, Q}(x) \frac{\mu^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^{\frac{1}{\tau}}},$$

and

$$G_{\vec{l}, R_{Q,s}, 1}(y) = \frac{|Q|^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\tau}}}{|R_{Q,s}|} G_{\vec{l}, R_{Q,s}}(y) \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(y) \frac{1}{\mu^{-1}(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Note that $\text{osc}_1(b, Q)$ has the same construct of $\text{osc}_2(b, Q)$. Meanwhile, $F_{\vec{l}, Q, 1}(x)$ (reps. $G_{\vec{l}, R_{Q,s}, 1}(y)$) plays the role of $G_{\vec{l}, R_{Q,s}, 2}(y)$ (resp. $F_{\vec{l}, Q, 2}(x)$). Therefore, a similar argument yields that $\{F_{\vec{l}, Q, 1}\}$ and $\{G_{\vec{l}, R_{Q,s}, 1}\}$ are $\text{NWO}_{\tau'}$ and NWO_{τ} sequences, respectively.

Hence,

$$(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}[b, R_j] \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(f))(x) = \sum_{\vec{l} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}} \sum_{m=1}^2 \sum_{s=1}^M \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \lambda_{\vec{l}, Q}^j \text{osc}_m(b, Q) \langle f, G_{\vec{l}, R_{Q,s}, m} \rangle F_{\vec{l}, Q, m},$$

where $\{G_{\vec{l}, R_{Q,s}, m}\}$ and $\{F_{\vec{l}, Q, m}\}$ are NWO sequences and numbers $\{\lambda_{\vec{l}, Q}^j\}$ which satisfy $|\lambda_{\vec{l}, Q}^j| \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|\vec{l}|)^{|\alpha|+|\beta|}}$ for all multi-indices $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$. Thus, combining (2.2) and Definition 1.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}[b, R_j] \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{S^{n,\infty}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} &\lesssim \|\text{osc}_1(b, Q)\|_{\ell^{n,\infty}} + \|\text{osc}_2(b, Q)\|_{\ell^{n,\infty}} \\ &\lesssim \|b\|_{\mathcal{W}_v(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we see that $\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}[b, R_j] \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \in S^{n,\infty}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

7.2. Proof of the necessary condition. We now assume that $[b, R_j] \in S^{n,\infty}(L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_\lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$, then prove that $b \in \mathcal{W}_v(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

First, for each $Q \in \mathcal{D}$, similar to the proof of Proposition 4.4, one may choose another dyadic cube $\widehat{Q} \in \mathcal{D}$, such that: (i) $|Q| = |\widehat{Q}|$ and $\text{distance}(20\sqrt{n}Q, 20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}) \approx \ell(Q)$; (ii) the kernel of Riesz transform $K_j(x - \widehat{x})$ does not change sign for all $(x, \widehat{x}) \in 20\sqrt{n}Q \times 20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}$, and $|K_j(x - \widehat{x})| \geq |Q|^{-1}$. Moreover, we can assume that these three properties are also valid when enlarging $20\sqrt{n}$ to $(1 + \epsilon')20\sqrt{n}$ for some $\epsilon' > 0$ sufficiently small.

Define

$$(7.5) \quad J_Q(x, y) = |20\sqrt{n}Q|^{-2} K_j^{-1}(x - y) \mathbf{1}_{20\sqrt{n}Q}(x) \mathbf{1}_{20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}}(y).$$

Similar to the proof of the sufficient condition in Section 7.1, take a smooth function ζ on \mathbb{R}^n with $\text{supp } \zeta \subset [-(1 + \epsilon')/2, (1 + \epsilon')/2]^n$, satisfying $\eta \equiv 1$ on $[-1/2, 1/2]^n$ and $|\partial^\alpha \eta| \leq C_\alpha$ for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$.

Define $\zeta_Q(x) = \zeta\left(\frac{x - c_Q}{20\sqrt{n}\ell(Q)}\right)$, we have

$$K_j^{-1}(x - y)\mathbf{1}_{20\sqrt{n}Q}(x)\mathbf{1}_{20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}}(y) = K_j^{-1}(x - y)\zeta_Q(x)\zeta_{\widehat{Q}}(y)$$

for $(x, y) \in 20\sqrt{n}Q \times 20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}$.

Applying the multiple Fourier series on $\left((1 + \epsilon')20\sqrt{n}Q\right) \times \left((1 + \epsilon')20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}\right)$, we can write

$$K_j^{-1}(x - y)\zeta_Q(x)\zeta_{\widehat{Q}}(y) = \sum_{\vec{l} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}} \tilde{c}_{\vec{l}, Q}^j e^{2\pi i \vec{l} \cdot \vec{x}} e^{2\pi i \vec{l}' \cdot \vec{y}} \mathbf{1}_{(1+\epsilon')20\sqrt{n}Q}(x) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(1+\epsilon')20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}}(y),$$

where $x = c_Q + (1 + \epsilon')20\sqrt{n}\ell(Q)\vec{x}$, $y = c_{\widehat{Q}} + (1 + \epsilon')20\sqrt{n}\ell(\widehat{Q})\vec{y}$, $\vec{l} = (\vec{l}', \vec{l}'') \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}^n$, and

$$\tilde{c}_{\vec{l}, Q}^j = \int_{(1+\epsilon')20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}} \int_{(1+\epsilon')20\sqrt{n}Q} K_j^{-1}(x - y)\zeta_Q(x)\zeta_{\widehat{Q}}(y) e^{-2\pi i \vec{l} \cdot \vec{x}} e^{-2\pi i \vec{l}' \cdot \vec{y}} dx dy \frac{1}{|(1 + \epsilon')20\sqrt{n}Q|} \frac{1}{|(1 + \epsilon')20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}|}.$$

Combining $|Q| = |\widehat{Q}|$, distance $((1 + \epsilon')20\sqrt{n}Q, (1 + \epsilon')20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}) \approx \ell(Q)$ and the regularity estimate

$$\left| \partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta K_j^{-1}(x - y)\zeta_Q(x)\zeta_{\widehat{Q}}(y) \right| \leq C(\alpha, \beta) |x - y|^{n - |\alpha| - |\beta|}$$

for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{c}_{\vec{l}, Q}^j| &\lesssim \frac{\ell(Q)^{|\alpha|} \ell(\widehat{Q})^{|\beta|}}{(1 + |\vec{l}|)^{|\alpha| + |\beta|}} \int_{(1+\epsilon')20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}} \int_{(1+\epsilon')20\sqrt{n}Q} \left| \partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta K_j^{-1}(x - y)\zeta_Q(x)\zeta_{\widehat{Q}}(y) \right| dx dy \frac{1}{|(1 + \epsilon')20\sqrt{n}Q|^2} \\ &\lesssim |Q| \frac{1}{(1 + |\vec{l}|)^{|\alpha| + |\beta|}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can denote $\tilde{\lambda}_{\vec{l}, Q}^j = \frac{1}{|20\sqrt{n}Q|} \tilde{c}_{\vec{l}, Q}^j$, then

$$|\tilde{\lambda}_{\vec{l}, Q}^j| \lesssim \frac{1}{(1 + |\vec{l}|)^{|\alpha| + |\beta|}}.$$

Obviously,

$$J_Q(x, y) = \sum_{\vec{l} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}} \tilde{\lambda}_{\vec{l}, Q}^j \frac{1}{|20\sqrt{n}Q|^{\frac{1}{2}}} F_{\vec{l}, Q}(x) \frac{1}{|20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} G_{\vec{l}', \widehat{Q}}(y),$$

where $F_{\vec{l}, Q}(x) = e^{2\pi i \vec{l} \cdot \vec{x}} \mathbf{1}_{20\sqrt{n}Q}(x)$ and $G_{\vec{l}', \widehat{Q}}(y) = e^{2\pi i \vec{l}' \cdot \vec{y}} \mathbf{1}_{20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}}(y)$.

Next, suppose that for each $Q \in \mathcal{D}$, we have two functions $\varepsilon_Q, \eta_{\widehat{Q}} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ with $\text{supp } \varepsilon_Q \subset 20\sqrt{n}Q$, $\text{supp } \eta_{\widehat{Q}} \subset 20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}$. Define the operator L_Q as

$$\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) L_Q(\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} f)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mu^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) \varepsilon_Q(x) J_Q(x, y) \eta_{\widehat{Q}}(y) \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(y) f(y) dy.$$

Considering an arbitrary sequence $\{a_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \in \ell_{\frac{n}{n-1}, 1}$. Here $\ell_{\frac{n}{n-1}, 1}$ is the Lorentz sequence space defined as the set of all sequences $\{a_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ such that

$$\|\{a_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}\|_{\ell_{\frac{n}{n-1}, 1}} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{-\frac{1}{n}} a_k^*,$$

where the sequence $\{a_k^*\}$ is the sequence $\{|a_Q|\}$ rearranged in a decreasing order.

Define the operator L as

$$\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) L(\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} f)(x) = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} a_Q \mu^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) L_Q(\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} f)(x).$$

Similar to the proof of the sufficient condition in Section 7.1, let $r = 2(1 + \gamma)$ and let $r \in (2, r)$, where $\gamma = \min\{\sigma_\mu, \sigma_{\mu^{-1}}\}$. Let r' and r' be the conjugate index of r and r , respectively. Note that $r > r > 2$, and hence $r' < r' < 2$. Therefore, we also write

$$\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}(x)L(\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}f)(x) = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\tilde{l} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}} \tilde{\lambda}_{\tilde{l}, Q}^j a_Q \varepsilon_Q(x) \frac{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-1}(20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q})^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|20\sqrt{n}Q|^{\frac{1}{r}} |20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}|^{\frac{1}{r}}} \langle f, \tilde{G}_{\tilde{l}, Q} \rangle \tilde{F}_{\tilde{l}, Q}(x),$$

where

$$\tilde{G}_{\tilde{l}, Q}(y) = \frac{G_{\tilde{l}, Q} \eta_{\widehat{Q}} \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{\mu^{-1}(20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q})^{\frac{1}{2}}} |20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}|^{\frac{1}{r}-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{F}_{\tilde{l}, Q} = \frac{F_{\tilde{l}, Q} \mu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}} |20\sqrt{n}Q|^{\frac{1}{r}-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then the argument for $F_{\tilde{l}, Q, 2}$ in the proof of Theorem 1.6 deduces that $\tilde{G}_{\tilde{l}, Q}$ is a $\text{NWO}_{r'}$. Note that $\|\tilde{F}_{\tilde{l}, Q}\|_{L^2} \lesssim |20\sqrt{n}Q|^{\frac{1}{r}-\frac{1}{2}}$, hence the argument for $G_{\tilde{l}, R_{Q, s, 2}}$ in the proof of the sufficient condition in Section 7.1, also deduces that $\tilde{F}_{\tilde{l}, Q}$ is a $\text{NWO}_{r'}$.

Thus, applying (2.2) and the fact $\frac{\mu(20\sqrt{n}Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-1}(20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q})^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|20\sqrt{n}Q|^{\frac{1}{r}} |20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}|^{\frac{1}{r}}} \lesssim 1$ to give

$$\|L\|_{S^{\frac{n}{n-1}, 1}(L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L_\mu^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} = \|\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}L\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{S^{\frac{n}{n-1}, 1}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} \lesssim \|a_Q\|_{\ell^{\frac{n}{n-1}, 1}}.$$

Recall that for an integral operator \mathcal{T} with the associated kernel $K(x, y)$,

$$\mathcal{T}f(x) = \int_X K(x, y)f(y) dy,$$

then

$$\text{Trace}(\mathcal{T}) = \int_X K(x, x) dx.$$

By definition,

$$\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}[b, R_j]L_Q(\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}f)(x) = \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} \int_{20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x)(b(x) - b(y))K_j(x, y)\varepsilon_Q(y)J_Q(y, z)\eta_{\widehat{Q}}(z)\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(z)f(z) dz dy,$$

then we have

$$\text{Trace}(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}[b, R_j]L_Q\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} \int_{20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x)(b(x) - b(y))K_j(x, y)\varepsilon_Q(y)J_Q(y, x)\eta_{\widehat{Q}}(x)\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) dx dy.$$

Combining the definition (7.5) of J_Q , we choose $\varepsilon_Q(x)$ and $\eta_{\widehat{Q}}(y)$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Trace}\left(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}[b, R_j]L_Q\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{|20\sqrt{n}Q|^2} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} \int_{20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(x)|b(x) - b(y)|\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) dx dy \\ &\geq \frac{1}{|20\sqrt{n}Q|^2} \int_{E_1^Q} \int_{F_1^{\widehat{Q}}} v^{-1}(x)|b(y) - m_b(\widehat{Q})| dx dy + \frac{1}{|Q|^2} \int_{E_2^Q} \int_{F_2^{\widehat{Q}}} v^{-1}(x)|b(y) - m_b(\widehat{Q})| dx dy, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E_1^Q &= \{x \in 20\sqrt{n}Q : b(x) < m_b(\widehat{Q})\}, & E_2^Q &= \{x \in 20\sqrt{n}Q : b(x) > m_b(\widehat{Q})\} \\ F_1^{\widehat{Q}} &= \{y \in 20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q} : b(y) \geq m_b(\widehat{Q})\}, & F_2^{\widehat{Q}} &= \{y \in 20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q} : b(y) \leq m_b(\widehat{Q})\}, \end{aligned}$$

and $m_b(\widehat{Q})$ is a median value of b over $20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}$ in the sense of

$$\max \left\{ \left| \left\{ y \in 20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q} : b(y) < m_b(\widehat{Q}) \right\} \right|, \left| \left\{ y \in 20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q} : b(y) > m_b(\widehat{Q}) \right\} \right| \right\} \leq \frac{|20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}|}{2},$$

that is, the analogs of those in the proof of Proposition 4.4. Note that $|\mathbb{F}_s^{\widehat{Q}}| \approx |20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}|$ for $s = 1, 2$ and $\nu \in A_2$, we have

$$\text{Trace} \left(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} [b, R_j] L_Q \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \gtrsim \frac{\nu^{-1}(\mathbb{F}_1^{\widehat{Q}})}{|20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}|^2} \int_{\mathbb{E}_1^{\widehat{Q}}} |b(y) - m_b(\widehat{Q})| dy \approx \frac{1}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{\mathbb{E}_1^{\widehat{Q}}} |b(y) - m_b(\widehat{Q})| dy$$

and

$$\text{Trace} \left(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} [b, R_j] L_Q \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \gtrsim \frac{\nu^{-1}(\mathbb{F}_2^{\widehat{Q}})}{|20\sqrt{n}\widehat{Q}|^2} \int_{\mathbb{E}_2^{\widehat{Q}}} |b(y) - m_b(\widehat{Q})| dy \approx \frac{1}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{\mathbb{E}_2^{\widehat{Q}}} |b(y) - m_b(\widehat{Q})| dy.$$

Then

$$\text{Trace} \left(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} [b, R_j] L_Q \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \gtrsim \frac{1}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(y) - m_b(\widehat{Q})| dy.$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} M(b, Q) &:= \frac{1}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(x) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}| dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(y) - m_b(\widehat{Q})| dy + \frac{|20\sqrt{n}Q|}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} |m_b(\widehat{Q}) - \langle b \rangle_{20\sqrt{n}Q}| \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\nu(20\sqrt{n}Q)} \int_{20\sqrt{n}Q} |b(y) - m_b(\widehat{Q})| dy. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by duality, there exists a sequence $\{a_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ with $\|a_Q\|_{\ell^{\frac{n}{n-1}}, 1} \leq 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|b\|_{\mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)} &= \|M(b, Q)\|_{\ell^{n, \infty}} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \text{Trace} \left(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} [b, R_j] L_Q \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right\|_{\ell^{n, \infty}} \\ &= \sup_{\|a_Q\|_{\ell^{\frac{n}{n-1}}, 1} \leq 1} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \text{Trace} \left(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} [b, R_j] L_Q \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \cdot a_Q \\ &= \sup_{\|a_Q\|_{\ell^{\frac{n}{n-1}}, 1} \leq 1} \text{Trace} \left(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} [b, R_j] L \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\ &\lesssim \sup_{\|a_Q\|_{\ell^{\frac{n}{n-1}}, 1} \leq 1} \left\| \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} [b, R_j] \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{S^{n, \infty}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} \left\| \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} L \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{S^{\frac{n}{n-1}, 1}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} [b, R_j] \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{S^{n, \infty}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the proof of the necessary condition in Theorem 1.6 is complete.

8. APPLICATION: THE QUANTISED DERIVATIVE IN THE TWO WEIGHT SETTING

Let n be a positive integer, and let x_1, \dots, x_n be the coordinates of \mathbb{R}^n . For $j = 1, \dots, n$, we define \mathfrak{D}_j to be the derivative in the direction x_j , $\mathfrak{D}_j = \frac{1}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} = -i\partial_j$. When $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is not a smooth function then $\mathfrak{D}_j f$ denotes the distributional derivative of f . Let $N = 2^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$. We use n -dimensional Euclidean gamma matrices, which are $N \times N$ self-adjoint complex matrices $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$ satisfying the anticommutation relation, $\gamma_j \gamma_k + \gamma_k \gamma_j = 2\delta_{j,k}$, $1 \leq j, k \leq n$, where δ is the Kronecker delta. The

precise choice of matrices satisfying this relation is unimportant so we assume that a choice is fixed for the rest of this paper. Using this choice of gamma matrices, we can define the n -dimensional Dirac operator, $\mathfrak{D} = \sum_{j=1}^n \gamma_j \otimes \mathfrak{D}_j$. This is a linear operator on the Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^N \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ initially defined with dense domain $\mathbb{C}^N \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the Schwartz space of functions on \mathbb{R}^n . Taking the closure we obtain a self-adjoint operator which we also denote by \mathfrak{D} . We then define the sign of \mathfrak{D} as the operator $\text{sgn}(\mathfrak{D})$ via the Borel functional calculus, i.e., $\text{sgn}(\mathfrak{D}) = \frac{\mathfrak{D}}{|\mathfrak{D}|}$.

Given $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, denote by M_f the operator of pointwise multiplication by f on the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The operator $1 \otimes M_f$ is a bounded linear operator on $\mathbb{C}^N \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where 1 denotes the identity operator on \mathbb{C}^N . The commutator,

$$\bar{d}f := i \left[\text{sgn}(\mathfrak{D}), 1 \otimes M_f \right]$$

denotes the quantised derivative of Alain Connes introduced in [4, IV].

Along with our main results in Theorems 1.2, 1.3, and 1.6, we have the analogy of [5, 22, 8, 7] in the two weight setting.

Theorem 8.1. *Suppose $n \geq 2$, $\lambda, \mu \in A_2$ and set $\nu = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Suppose $f \in \text{BMO}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then $\bar{d}f \in S^{n,\infty}(\mathbb{C}^N \otimes (L^2_\mu(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^2_\lambda(\mathbb{R}^n)))$ if and only if $f \in \mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover,*

$$\|\bar{d}f\|_{S^{n,\infty}(\mathbb{C}^N \otimes (L^2_\mu(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^2_\lambda(\mathbb{R}^n)))} \approx \|f\|_{\mathcal{W}_\nu(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

where the implicit constants depends on $p, n, [\lambda]_{A_2}$ and $[\mu]_{A_2}$.

Acknowledgements: Lacey is supported in part by National Science Foundation DMS Grant. Li, Wick and Wu are supported by ARC DP 220100285. Wick is also supported by National Science Foundation Grants DMS # 2054863. Wu is also supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China # 12201002 and Anhui Natural Science Foundation of China # 2208085QA03.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bergh and J. Löfström. *Interpolation spaces. An introduction*. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, No. 223. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1976. 22, 24
- [2] S. Bloom. A commutator theorem and weighted BMO. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **292** (1985), no. 1, 103–122. 1
- [3] R. Coifman, R. Rochberg and G. Weiss. Factorization theorems for Hardy spaces in several variables. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **103** (1976), 611–635. 1
- [4] A. Connes. *Noncommutative Geometry*. Academic Press, Inc., San Diego, CA, 1994. 2, 32
- [5] A. Connes, D. Sullivan and N. Teleman. Quasiconformal mappings, operators on Hilbert space, and local formulae for characteristic classes. *Topology* **33** (1994), no. 4, 663–681. 1, 2, 32
- [6] Z.J. Fan, J. Li, E. McDonald, F. Sukochev and D. Zanin. Endpoint weak Schatten class estimates and trace formula for commutators of Riesz transforms with multipliers on Heisenberg groups. *J. Funct. Anal.* **286** (2024), no. 1, Paper No. 110188. 2
- [7] R.L. Frank. A characterization of $\dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. *Pure Appl. Funct. Anal.* **9** (2024), no. 1, 53–68. 3, 32
- [8] R.L. Frank, F. Sukochev and D. Zanin. Asymptotics of singular values for quantum derivatives. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **376** (2023), no. 3, 2047–2088. 2, 3, 32
- [9] H. Gimpferlein and M. Goffeng. Nonclassical spectral asymptotics and Dixmier traces: from circles to contact manifolds. *Forum Math. Sigma* **5** (2017), Paper No. e3, 57pp. 2
- [10] L. Grafakos. *Classical Fourier analysis*. Third edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **249**. Springer, New York, 2014. 7, 24
- [11] I. Holmes, M.T. Lacey and B.D. Wick. Commutators in the two-weight setting. *Math. Ann.* **367** (2017), no. 1–2, 51–80. 12

- [12] T. Hytönen and A. Kairema. Systems of dyadic cubes in a doubling metric space. *Colloq. Math.* **126** (2012), 1–33. [5](#)
- [13] T. Hytönen and S. Lappas. Extrapolation of compactness on weighted spaces. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* **39** (2023), no.1, 91–122. [1](#)
- [14] T. Hytönen and S. Lappas. Extrapolation of compactness on weighted spaces II: Off-diagonal and limited range estimates. arXiv:2006.15858v2. [1](#)
- [15] J. Isralowitz. Schatten p class commutators on the weighted Bergman space $L^2_\alpha(\mathbb{B}_n, d\nu_\gamma)$ for $2n/(n+1+\gamma) < p < \infty$. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **62** (2013), no. 1, 201–233. [1](#)
- [16] S. Janson and T.H. Wolff. Schatten classes and commutators of singular integral operators. *Ark. Mat.* **20** (1982), no.2, 301–310. [2, 3](#)
- [17] M. Junge, Q.H. Xu. Representation of certain homogeneous Hilbertian operator spaces and applications. *Invent. Math.* **179** (2010), no. 1, 75–118. [1](#)
- [18] M.T. Lacey and J. Li. Compactness of commutator of Riesz transforms in the two weight setting. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **508** (1), 125869 (2022). [1, 11](#)
- [19] M.T. Lacey, J. Li and B.D. Wick. Schatten classes and commutator in the two weight setting, I. Hilbert transform. *Potential Anal.* (2023). [2, 4, 11](#)
- [20] M.T. Lacey, J. Li, B.D. Wick and L.C. Wu. Schatten classes and commutators in the two weight setting, II. Riesz transforms. arXiv:2404.00329 V1. [4](#)
- [21] J. Li, J. Pipher and L.A. Ward. Dyadic structure theorems for multiparameter function spaces. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* **31** (2015), no. 3, 767–797. [5, 11](#)
- [22] S. Lord, E. McDonald, F. Sukochev and D. Zanin. Quantum differentiability of essentially bounded functions on Euclidean space. *J. Funct. Anal.* **273** (2017) 2353–2387. [1, 2, 32](#)
- [23] J. Pau. Characterization of Schatten-class Hankel operators on weighted Bergman spaces. *Duke Math. J.* **165** (2016), no. 14, 2771–2791. [1](#)
- [24] V.V. Peller. *Hankel operators and their applications*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003. [1](#)
- [25] S. Petermichl, S. Treil and A. Volberg. Why the Riesz transforms are averages of the dyadic shifts? Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Harmonic Analysis and Partial Differential Equations (El Escorial, 2000), *Publ. Mat.*, Vol. Extra (2002), 209–228. [2, 11, 12](#)
- [26] G. Pisier. *Non-commutative vector valued L_p -spaces and completely p -summing maps*. Astérisque No. **247** (1998), vi+131 pp. [1](#)
- [27] R. Rochberg and S. Semmes. End point results for estimates of singular values of singular integral operators. In: *Contributions to operator theory and its applications* (Mesa, AZ, 1987), 217–231, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., 35, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1988. [2](#)
- [28] R. Rochberg and S. Semmes. Nearly weakly orthonormal sequences, singular value estimates, and Calderon-Zygmund operators. *J. Funct. Anal.* **86** (2), 237–306 (1989). [2, 6, 26, 27](#)
- [29] K.H. Zhu. Schatten class Hankel operators on the Bergman space of the unit ball. *Amer. J. Math.* **113** (1991), no. 1, 147–167. [1](#)

MICHAEL LACEY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ATLANTA, GA 30332, USA
Email address: lacey@math.gatech.edu

Ji LI, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES, MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY, NSW 2109, AUSTRALIA
Email address: ji.li@mq.edu.au

BRETT D. WICK, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY - ST. LOUIS, ST. LOUIS, MO 63130-4899 USA
Email address: wick@math.wustl.edu

LIANGCHUAN WU, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE, ANHUI UNIVERSITY, HEFEI, 230601, P.R. CHINA, AND SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES, MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY, NSW 2109, AUSTRALIA
Email address: wuliangchuan@ahu.edu.cn