

A CHARACTERIZATION OF COMPACTNESS VIA BILINEAR $T1$ THEOREM

MINGMING CAO, HONGHAI LIU, ZENGYAN SI, AND KÔZÔ YABUTA

ABSTRACT. In this paper we solve a long standing problem about the bilinear $T1$ theorem to characterize the (weighted) compactness of bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operators. Let T be a bilinear operator associated with a standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel. We prove that T can be extended to a compact bilinear operator from $L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2})$ to $L^p(w^p)$ for all exponents $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} > 0$ with $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty]$ and for all weights $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$ if and only if the following hypotheses hold: (H1) T is associated with a compact bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel, (H2) T satisfies the weak compactness property, and (H3) $T(1, 1), T^{*1}(1, 1), T^{*2}(1, 1) \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. This is also equivalent to the endpoint compactness: (1) T is compact from $L^1(w_1) \times L^1(w_2)$ to $L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(w^{\frac{1}{2}})$ for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(1, 1)}$, or (2) T is compact from $L^\infty(w_1^\infty) \times L^\infty(w_2^\infty)$ to $\text{CMO}_\lambda(w^\infty)$ for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(\infty, \infty)}$. Besides, any of these properties is equivalent to the fact that T admits a compact bilinear dyadic representation.

Our main approaches consist of the following new ingredients: (i) a resulting representation of a compact bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operator as an average of some compact bilinear dyadic shifts and paraproducts; (ii) extrapolation of endpoint compactness for bilinear operators; and (iii) compactness criterion in weighted Lorentz spaces. Finally, to illustrate the applicability of our result, we demonstrate the hypotheses (H1)–(H3) through examples including bilinear continuous/dyadic paraproducts, bilinear pseudo-differential operators, and bilinear commutators.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
1.1. The main theorem	5
1.2. Compact bilinear dyadic representation	6
1.3. Compactness criterions in Lorentz spaces	7
1.4. Weighted compactness of dyadic operators	9
1.5. Necessary hypotheses	9
1.6. Extrapolation of endpoint compactness	10
1.7. Endpoint weighted compactness	11

Date: July 30, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 42B20, 42B25, 42B35.

Key words and phrases. Bilinear $T1$ theorem, Compactness, Endpoint estimates, Extrapolation, Interpolation, Dyadic analysis, Kolmogorov–Riesz theorem, Bilinear paraproducts, Bilinear pseudo-differential operators, Bilinear commutators.

The first author acknowledges financial support from Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation through the Ramón y Cajal 2021 (RYC2021-032600-I), through the “Severo Ochoa Programme for Centres of Excellence in R&D” (CEX2019-000904-S), and through PID2019-107914GB-I00, and from the Spanish National Research Council through the “Ayuda extraordinaria a Centros de Excelencia Severo Ochoa” (20205CEX001). The third author is supported by Natural Science Foundation of Henan (No. 202300410184).

1.8. Applications	11
1.9. Structure of the paper	12
2. Preliminaries	13
2.1. Notation	13
2.2. Bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operators	13
2.3. Dyadic grids	14
2.4. Haar functions	15
2.5. BMO and CMO spaces	16
2.6. Muckenhoupt weights	17
2.7. Technical lemmas	19
3. A compact bilinear dyadic representation	22
3.1. Initial reductions	22
3.2. Separated part	24
3.3. Adjacent part	25
3.4. Nested part	27
4. Characterizations of compactness	30
4.1. Unweighted Kolmogorov–Riesz theorems	30
4.2. Weighted Kolmogorov–Riesz theorems	36
4.3. Characterizations of compactness via projection	38
5. Weighted $L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p$ compactness	41
5.1. Weighted compactness of bilinear dyadic shifts	41
5.2. Weighted compactness of bilinear dyadic paraproducts	45
6. The necessity of hypotheses (H1)–(H3)	48
6.1. Compact Calderón–Zygmund kernels	49
6.2. Weak compactness property	54
6.3. CMO conditions	55
7. Rubio de Francia extrapolation of compactness	59
7.1. Extrapolation from L^p compactness	59
7.2. Extrapolation from $L^{p,\infty}$ compactness	59
7.3. Extrapolation from CMO compactness	62
8. $L^1 \times L^1 \rightarrow L^{\frac{1}{2},\infty}$ compactness	63
8.1. $L^1 \times L^1 \rightarrow L^{\frac{1}{2},\infty}$ compactness implies weighted $L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p$ compactness	63
8.2. Hypotheses (H1)–(H3) imply $L^1 \times L^1 \rightarrow L^{\frac{1}{2},\infty}$ compactness	64
8.3. Hypotheses (H1)–(H3) imply weighted $L^1 \times L^1 \rightarrow L^{\frac{1}{2},\infty}$ compactness	67
8.4. Pointwise estimates for bilinear singular integrals	68
8.5. Estimates involving bad functions	72
9. $L^\infty \times L^\infty \rightarrow$ CMO compactness	77
9.1. $L^\infty \times L^\infty \rightarrow$ CMO compactness implies weighted $L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p$ compactness	77
9.2. Hypotheses (H1)–(H3) imply weighted $L^\infty \times L^\infty \rightarrow$ CMO compactness	79

10. Applications	82
10.1. Bilinear continuous paraproducts	82
10.2. Bilinear dyadic paraproducts	83
10.3. Bilinear pseudo-differential operators	85
10.4. Bilinear commutators	92
Appendix A. Some properties in Lorentz spaces	94
Appendix B. Interpolation of multiple weights	98
References	102

1. INTRODUCTION

The classical Calderón–Zygmund theory originated in the initial work of Calderón and Zygmund in the 1950s [12], which was motivated by the connections with potential theory and elliptic partial differential equations. Over the past seven decades, this theory and its branches have proved to be a powerful tool in many fields, such as real and complex analysis, operator theory, approximation theory, partial differential equations, and geometric measure theory, see [29, 30, 42, 43, 44, 67, 68, 80, 81]. For additional related research, see [33, 56, 71, 74].

The multilinear Calderón–Zygmund theory, pioneered by Coifman and Meyer [24, 25], was inspired by the natural appearance in the study of certain singular integral operators, for example, the Calderón commutator, paraproducts, and pseudodifferential operators. Subsequently, this topic was further developed by several authors, including Christ and Journé [21], Lacey and Thiele [61, 62], Kenig and Stein [58], and Grafakos and Torres [38, 39]. It is worth mentioning that the remarkable work [38] provides a systematic treatment to general multilinear Calderón–Zygmund operators. In the weighted theory, genuinely multilinear weighted estimates were first established by Lerner et al. using a natural class of multiple weights in their groundbreaking paper [63]. Beyond that, it has witnessed the fundamental importance of L^p estimates for multilinear singular integrals in pure and applied analysis—for example, the fractional Leibniz rules used in dispersive equations [37, 57], paraproducts employed to Navier–Stokes equations [73], and certain multilinear transforms applied to the stability of the absolutely continuous spectrum of Schrödinger operators [22].

The boundedness of operators on various function spaces is a central theme of the (multilinear) Calderón–Zygmund theory. It is therefore natural to ask what conditions to guarantee the boundedness of T from L^p to L^q . A necessary and sufficient condition for this to happen is given by the celebrated $T1$ theorem due to David and Journé [28]. More precisely,

a singular integral T associated with a Calderón–Zygmund
kernel is bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if and only if it satisfies the
weak boundedness property and $T1, T^*1 \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

In addition, the L^2 boundedness is essential to the further analysis, such as achieving L^p boundedness, the weak type $(1, 1)$ estimate, and weighted norm inequalities. This formulation of the $T1$ theorem was extended to the multilinear setting by Christ and Journé [21], while an alternative expression of the multilinear $T1$ theorem was provided by Grafakos and Torres [38]. The latter is very effective in obtaining some continuity results for multilinear translation invariant operators and multilinear pseudodifferential operators. Although further developments

were made in [40, 41], more modern bilinear dyadic-probabilistic methods were exploited in [65] on Euclidean spaces and [70] on nonhomogeneous spaces.

Recently, the study of compactness has attracted a lot of attention. In terms of commutators $[b, T]$, one would like to use the compactness of $[b, T]$ to characterize the fact $b \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. This is the case of bilinear Riesz potential [20]. The weighted compactness was investigated in [2, 83] for bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operators, where the latter weakened the CMO condition by a new vanishing Lipschitz-type condition. Besides, for non-degenerate Calderón–Zygmund operators, a characterization in the off-diagonal case was obtained in [53, 54]. All compactness results aforementioned are traced back to the work of Uchiyama [85]. Furthermore, extrapolation of compactness introduced in [50] provides a new approach to establish weighted compactness, and shortly after, the multilinear extension was presented in [14, 16, 51], which have a wide range of applications. On the contrary, the existing literature exploring the compactness of singular integrals is exceedingly scarce. Based on new $T1$ type assumptions, Villarroja [86] first characterized the compactness for a large class of singular integral operators, which later was extended to the endpoint case in [76, 78].

However, the $T1$ theorem to deduce compactness of multilinear singular integrals has been an open problem for almost ten years. The purpose of this work is to solve this problem by establishing a characterization of (weighted) compactness of bilinear singular integrals via bilinear $T1$ theorem. Before stating the precise result, let us illustrate some difficulties brought by the bilinearity with some examples and facts, and elucidate why such a compactness question has been open.

First, in general, bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operators (cf. Definition 2.7) are not compact. A typical example is the bilinear Riesz transform \mathcal{R}_j defined by

$$\mathcal{R}_j(f, g)(x) := \text{p.v.} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{(x_j - y_j) + (x_j - z_j)}{(|x - y|^2 + |x - z|^2)^{\frac{2n+1}{2}}} f(y)g(z) dy dz, \quad j = 1, \dots, n,$$

where x_j is the j -th coordinate of x . Given a bilinear operator T , if we define its adjoints via

$$\langle T(f_1, f_2), g \rangle = \langle T^{*1}(g, f_2), f_1 \rangle = \langle T^{*2}(f_1, g), f_2 \rangle,$$

then by the translation invariance property of \mathcal{R}_j and the antisymmetry of its kernel,

$$\mathcal{R}_j(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}) = 0 = \langle \mathcal{R}_j(\mathbf{1}_Q, \mathbf{1}_Q), \mathbf{1}_Q \rangle = \langle \mathcal{R}_j^{*1}(\mathbf{1}_Q, \mathbf{1}_Q), \mathbf{1}_Q \rangle = \langle \mathcal{R}_j^{*2}(\mathbf{1}_Q, \mathbf{1}_Q), \mathbf{1}_Q \rangle,$$

but Lemma A.13 implies that

$$\mathcal{R}_j \text{ is not compact from } L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \text{ to } L^p \text{ for all } \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} \text{ with } p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty).$$

This means that the assumption of bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernels is not sufficient to achieve compactness, which is not only the main reason why there is very limited literature concerning the compactness of singular integrals, but also indicates that one has to strengthen the assumption on kernels in order to obtain compactness of bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operators.

Second, in the bilinear setting, the natural range for compactness is $L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p$ for $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$, and reaching the quasi-Banach range $p < 1$ (even for boundedness) can often turn out to be a crucial challenge. From the technical perspective, there is no existing approach to this problem: even in the Banach range $p \geq 1$, the convoluted geometrical structure among cubes I_1, I_2, I_3 make it impossible to establish good estimates for the pair $\langle T(\psi_{I_1}, \psi_{I_2}), \psi_{I_3} \rangle$ in terms of the space and frequency localization of bump functions using wavelet analysis as in [86], and for the pair $\langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle$ in terms of the relative size and distance of cubes using dyadic analysis as in [18]. Not merely that, the modern tools

including dyadic representation theorems and sparse domination are missing even in the linear case.

Third, in terms of the weighted $L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2}) \rightarrow L^p(w^p)$ compactness, this problem involves a genuinely bilinear nature because the right class of weights is $A_{(p_1, p_2)}$ introduced in [63], which is strictly richer than $A_{p_1} \times A_{p_2}$. In the context of the natural multiple weights class $A_{(p_1, p_2)}$, one has to work with component weights that are linked another, and each individual weight may be not locally integrable but their product should behave well. This has happened to weighted compactness of commutators in [2, 20], which only treats product weights in $A_p \times A_p$ with $p, p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$, and thus does not quite embody the bilinear nature of the problem.

In this paper we will overcome these difficulties and give a bilinear compact T1 theorem which is not only valid for the natural multiple weights class $A_{(p_1, p_2)}$ but also enables us to work with the endpoint exponents $p_i = 1$ or $p_i = \infty$.

1.1. The main theorem. Now let us proceed to formulate some basic definitions and present our theorem. Let $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}$ be quasi-normed spaces and let $T : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ be a bilinear operator. We say that T is *bounded* from $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ to \mathcal{Z} if

$$\|T\|_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}} := \inf \{C_0 > 0 : \|T(f, g)\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \leq C_0 \|f\|_{\mathcal{X}} \|g\|_{\mathcal{Y}}, \forall (f, g) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}\} < \infty.$$

We say that T is *compact* from $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ to \mathcal{Z} if for all bounded sets $A \times B \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, the set $T(A, B)$ is *precompact* in \mathcal{Z} , i.e. $\overline{T(A, B)}$ is a compact subset of \mathcal{Z} . Equivalently, T is compact if for all bounded sequences $\{(f_k, g_k)\} \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, the sequence $\{T(f_k, g_k)\}$ has a convergent subsequence in \mathcal{Z} . See [7] for more properties about the compactness of bilinear operators.

To state the main theorem conveniently, we make the following hypotheses:

- (H1) T is associated with a compact bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel (cf. Definition 2.2),
- (H2) T satisfies the weak compactness property (cf. Definition 2.8),
- (H3) $T(1, 1), T^{*1}(1, 1), T^{*2}(1, 1) \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (cf. Definition 2.17).

More definitions and notation are given in Section 2.

Our main result is a compact bilinear T1 theorem as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $0 < \lambda < 1/2$. Let $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a bilinear operator associated with a standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) T satisfies the hypotheses (H1), (H2), and (H3).
- (b) T admits a compact bilinear dyadic representation (cf. Definition 1.2).
- (c) T is a compact operator from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty]$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} > 0$.
- (c)' T is a compact operator from $L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2})$ to $L^p(w^p)$ for all $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty]$ and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} > 0$ and $w = w_1 w_2$.
- (d) T is a compact operator from $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.
- (d)' T is a compact operator from $L^1(w_1) \times L^1(w_2)$ to $L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(w^{\frac{1}{2}})$ for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(1, 1)}$, where $w = w_1 w_2$.

- (e) T is a compact operator from $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $\text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.
- (e)' T is a compact operator from $L^\infty(w_1^\infty) \times L^\infty(w_2^\infty)$ to $\text{CMO}_\lambda(w^\infty)$ for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(\infty, \infty)}$, where $w = w_1 w_2$.

To prove Theorem 1.1, we will adopt the following strategy:

$$\begin{aligned} (a) &\implies (b) \implies (c)' \implies (c) \implies (a), \\ (a) &\implies (d)' \implies (d) \implies (c)', \quad \text{and} \\ (a) &\implies (e)' \implies (e) \implies (c)'. \end{aligned}$$

Since the implications $(c)' \implies (c)$, $(d)' \implies (d)$, and $(e)' \implies (e)$ are trivial, it suffices to show other implications.

The remainder of this section elaborates on the novel ideas, the obstacles, and the methods in our proof, which are conducive to understand this lengthy article. Moreover, at the end of this section, as applications, we present some examples of bilinear operators implicitly in the literature, which satisfy the hypotheses (H1), (H2), and (H3).

1.2. Compact bilinear dyadic representation. Let us focus on the proof of $(a) \implies (b)$. The definition of dyadic grids and Haar functions is postponed until Sections 2.3 and 2.4. Given $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ and a dyadic grid \mathcal{D} , we define the *compact bilinear dyadic shift* as

$$\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2) := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} A_Q^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2)$$

with

$$A_Q^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2) := \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{D}_i(Q) \\ J \in \mathcal{D}_j(Q) \\ K \in \mathcal{D}_k(Q)}} a_{I,J,K,Q} \langle f_1, \tilde{h}_I \rangle \langle f_2, \tilde{h}_J \rangle h_K,$$

where $\mathcal{D}_i(Q) := \{I \in \mathcal{D} : I \subset Q, \ell(I) = 2^{-i} \ell(Q)\}$, $(\tilde{h}_I, \tilde{h}_J) \in \{(h_I, h_J), (h_I, h_J^0), (h_I^0, h_J)\}$, and the coefficients $a_{I,J,K,Q}$ satisfy

$$|a_{I,J,K,Q}| \leq \mathbf{F}(Q) \frac{|I|^{\frac{1}{2}} |J|^{\frac{1}{2}} |K|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^2}$$

with

$$\mathbf{F}(Q) \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_N := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{Q \notin \mathcal{Q}(N)} \mathbf{F}(Q) = 0.$$

Given a sequence of complex numbers $\mathbf{b} := \{b_I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}}} := \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}: I \subset Q} |b_I|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 1,$$

the *bilinear dyadic paraproduct* is defined by

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{b}}(f_1, f_2) := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} b_I \langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I h_I.$$

We say that $\mathbf{b} := \{b_I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if $\|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}}} \leq 1$ and

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{D}} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{|Q|} \sum_{I \notin \mathcal{D}(N): I \subset Q} |b_I|^2 = 0.$$

Definition 1.2. Given a bilinear operator T , we say that T admits a *compact bilinear dyadic representation* if there exists a constant $C_0 \in (0, \infty)$ so that for all compactly supported and bounded functions f_1, f_2 , and f_3 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T(f_1, f_2), f_3 \rangle &= C_0 \mathbb{E}_\omega \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^k 2^{-k\delta/2} \langle \mathbb{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}^{i,k}(f_1, f_2), f_3 \rangle + C_0 \mathbb{E}_\omega \langle \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega^0}(f_1, f_2), f_3 \rangle \\ &\quad + C_0 \mathbb{E}_\omega \langle \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega^1}^*(f_1, f_2), f_3 \rangle + C_0 \mathbb{E}_\omega \langle \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega^2}^*(f_1, f_2), f_3 \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}^{i,k}$ is a finite sum of cancellative shifts $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}^{i,i,k}$, $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}^{i,i+1,k}$, and adjoints of such operators. In addition, $\Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}$ is the bilinear dyadic paraproduct with $\mathbf{b}_\omega := \{b_I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}_\omega} \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

We, for the first time, introduce a compact dyadic representation in order to investigate the compactness of singular integrals, even in the linear case. It gives the exact dyadic structure behind compact bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operators by representing them as an average of some compact bilinear dyadic shifts and paraproducts, which allows us to reduce initial problems into corresponding dyadic problems. More importantly, the dyadic-probabilistic method indeed overcomes the drawbacks of the technique of [18, 86] in the bilinear setting, which explains why we here develop a compact dyadic representation. Such a general representation theorem was proved by Hytönen in [47, 48] to settle the well-known A_2 conjecture for general Calderón–Zygmund operators. Its usefulness and powerfulness have been shown in the last decade. For example, a representation theorem holds also in the multi-parameter setting [52, 69] and the bilinear case [65, 66], and can be applied to obtain weighted estimates for maximal truncations of Calderón–Zygmund operators (cf. [49]) and for commutators (cf. [45, 46, 77]). Furthermore, we will establish a compact dyadic representation in the multi-parameter situation to study weighted compactness of multi-parameter singular integrals in our forthcoming papers [13, 17].

1.3. Compactness criterions in Lorentz spaces. Before moving on to the proof of weighted compactness, we present some compactness criterions. To establish the endpoint compactness of $L^1 \times L^1 \rightarrow L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}$, it is natural to study compactness criterions in Lorentz spaces $L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The characterization of precompactness in Lebesgue spaces was first discovered by Kolmogorov [59], and then extended by Riesz [79] and Tsuji [84]. Such result has shown its own utility by application to compactness of commutators (cf. [2, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20]). Inspired by these work, we will establish Kolmogorov-Riesz theorems in (weighted) Lorentz spaces.

Let τ_h be the translation operator, i.e., $\tau_h f(x) := f(x - h)$ for all $x, h \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $0 < p, q < \infty$ and $\mathcal{K} \subset L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then \mathcal{K} is precompact in $L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if and only if the following are satisfied:*

- (a) $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f\|_{L^{p,q}} < \infty$,
- (b) $\lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f \mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^{p,q}} = 0$,
- (c) $\lim_{|h| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|\tau_h f - f\|_{L^{p,q}} = 0$.

Moreover, in the case $q = \infty$, the conditions (a), (b), and (c) are sufficient, but (b) and (c) are not necessary.

Unfortunately, Theorem 1.3 does not hold in the weighted case. In fact, it just gives a sufficient condition of precompactness in $L^{p,q}(w)$. To be precise, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 1.4. *Let w be a weight so that $w, w^{-\lambda} \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\lambda > 0$. Let $0 < p, q < \infty$ and $\mathcal{K} \subset L^{p,q}(w)$. Then \mathcal{K} is precompact in $L^{p,q}(w)$ if the following are satisfied:*

- (a) $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} < \infty$,
- (b) $\lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f \mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} = 0$,
- (c) $\lim_{|h| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|\tau_h f - f\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} = 0$.

Moreover, (a) and (b) are necessary, but (c) is not. In the case $q = \infty$, the conditions (a), (b), and (c) are sufficient, but (b) and (c) are not necessary.

As seen from Theorem 1.4, to give a characterization of precompactness in $L^{p,q}(w)$ with $q \in (0, \infty)$, one has to replace the condition (c) by a weaker condition. To achieve this, we show the equivalence as follows. It is worth mentioning that the exponents p, q are allowed to be quasi-Banach.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $w \in A_{p_0}$ for some $p_0 \in (1, \infty)$. Let $0 < p, q < \infty$ and $\mathcal{K} \subseteq L^{p,q}(w)$. Let $0 < a < \min\{p/p_0, q, 1\}$. Then $\mathcal{K} \subseteq L^{p,q}(w)$ is precompact if and only if the following are satisfied:*

- (a) $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} < \infty$,
- (b) $\lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f \mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} = 0$,
- (c) $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \left\| \left(\int_{B(0,r)} |\tau_y f - f|^a dy \right)^{\frac{1}{a}} \right\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} = 0$.

Moreover, in the case $q = \infty$, the conditions (a), (b), and (c) are sufficient, but (b) and (c) are not necessary.

From Theorems 1.3–1.5, we see that the precompactness in $L^{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ becomes much more delicate. A main reason is that the collection of continuous functions and functions with compact support is not dense in $L^{p,\infty}(w)$ for all exponents $p \in (0, \infty)$ and all weights $w \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (cf. Lemma A.4). Besides, the space $L^{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $p \in (0, \infty)$ does not have absolutely continuous quasi-norm (cf. Lemma A.3), which leads to the invalidity of some classical precompactness criterion (for example, Lemma A.2). Beyond that, in terms of $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, they are not lattices, which means that $|f| \leq |g|$ does not imply $\|f\|_{\text{BMO}} \leq \|g\|_{\text{BMO}}$. This indicates that it is impossible to characterize precompactness in CMO as Theorems 1.3–1.5. Based on these facts, we have to seek new precompactness criterion in $L^{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For this purpose, we make use of the projection operator in (2.15) and establish the following characterizations of precompactness.

Theorem 1.6. *Let T be a bilinear operator and $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} > 0$ with $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty]$.*

- (1) *Assume that T is bounded from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then T is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if and only if $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} = 0$.*

- (2) Assume that T is bounded from $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^{\frac{1}{2},\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then T is compact from $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^{\frac{1}{2},\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^1 \times L^1 \rightarrow L^{\frac{1}{2},\infty}} = 0$. But the converse fails.
- (3) Assume that T is bounded from $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then T is compact from $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $\text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if and only if $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^\infty \times L^\infty \rightarrow \text{BMO}} = 0$.

1.4. Weighted compactness of dyadic operators. To demonstrate (b) \implies (c)', in light of Definition 1.2, we will use the duality and prove the weighted compactness of bilinear dyadic shifts and paraproducts (cf. Theorems 1.7 and 1.8). The duality brings about the restriction $p \in (1, \infty)$. To obtain the quasi-Banach range, we apply Rubio de Francia extrapolation of compactness (cf. Theorem 1.9), which asserts that to obtain the weighted compactness in the full range of exponents, it just needs the unweighted compactness for some Banach exponent, if weighted boundedness is already known. This provides a great convenience for most applications. Here we also consider the situations where some of the exponents of the Lebesgue spaces appearing in the hypotheses and/or in the conclusion can be possibly infinity, which extends the results in [16, 50]. Meanwhile, these advantages of extrapolation and Theorem 1.3 are used in the proof of Theorems 1.7 and 1.8.

Theorem 1.7. For all $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{E}_\omega \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}^{i,j,k}$ is compact from $L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2})$ to $L^p(w^p)$ for all $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty]$ and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} > 0$ and $w = w_1 w_2$.

Theorem 1.8. Let $\mathbf{b}_\omega := \{b_I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}_\omega} \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for each $\omega \in \Omega$. Then $\mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}$, $\mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}^{*1}$, and $\mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}^{*2}$ are compact from $L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2})$ to $L^p(w^p)$ for all $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty]$ and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} > 0$ and $w = w_1 w_2$.

Theorem 1.9. Assume that T is a bilinear operator such that

$$T \text{ is compact from } L^{p_1}(u_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(u_2^{p_2}) \text{ to } L^p(u^p)$$

for some $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} > 0$ with $p_1, p_2 \in [1, \infty]$ and for some $(u_1, u_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$, where $u = u_1 u_2$; and

$$T \text{ is bounded from } L^{q_1}(v_1^{q_1}) \times L^{q_2}(v_2^{q_2}) \text{ to } L^q(v^q)$$

for some $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$ with $q_1, q_2 \in [1, \infty]$ and for all $(v_1, v_2) \in A_{(q_1, q_2)}$, where $v = v_1 v_2$. Then

$$T \text{ is compact from } L^{r_1}(w_1^{r_1}) \times L^{r_2}(w_2^{r_2}) \text{ to } L^r(w^r)$$

for all $r_1, r_2 \in (1, \infty]$ and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(r_1, r_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2} > 0$ and $w = w_1 w_2$.

1.5. Necessary hypotheses. The implication (c) \implies (a) follows from Theorems 1.10–1.12. Indeed, it just requires the compactness holding for one triple of exponents $(p, p_1, p_2) \in (1, \infty)^3$ to justify the hypotheses (H1)–(H3).

Theorem 1.10. Let T be a bilinear operator associated with a standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel K . Let $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $p, p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$. If T is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then K is a compact bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel.

Theorem 1.11. Let $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $p, p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$. If a bilinear operator T is bounded from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then

$$|\langle T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle| \lesssim [\|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} + \|T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} F(I; 2N)] |I|,$$

for all $I \in \mathcal{D}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, where

$$F(I; N) := F_1(2^N \ell(I)) F_2(2^{-N} \ell(I)) F_3(N^{-1} \text{rd}(I, 2^N \mathbb{I})),$$

$$F_1(t) := (1 + t^{-1})^{-\frac{n}{p}}, \quad \text{and} \quad F_2(t) = F_3(t) := \mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}(t).$$

In particular, if T is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then it satisfies the weak compactness property.

Theorem 1.12. *Let T be a bilinear operator associated with a standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel K . Let $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $p, p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$. If T is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then $T(1, 1), T^{*1}(1, 1), T^{*2}(1, 1) \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

1.6. Extrapolation of endpoint compactness. To show (d) \implies (c)', we establish extrapolation of $L^{p, \infty}$ compactness, see Theorem 1.13. In light of Theorem 1.9, Theorem 1.13 can be reduced to showing the unweighted $L^{r_1} \times L^{r_2} \rightarrow L^r$ compactness, where $r_1, r_2 \in (1, \infty)$. As seen above, Theorems 1.3–1.5 do not give the necessary conditions of precompactness in the space $L^{p, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which leads they can not be directly applied to show Theorem 1.13. To circumvent this obstacle, we have to first transfer the $L^{p, \infty}$ compactness to the $L^{s, t}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ compactness, where $s \neq \infty$ and $t \neq \infty$. In Lorentz space $L^{s, t}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, Theorem 1.3 is a sufficient and necessary of precompactness, and to conclude the $L^{r_1} \times L^{r_2} \rightarrow L^r$ compactness, we use the bilinear Marcinkiewicz interpolation with initial restricted weak type conditions (cf. Theorem 7.1), for which it needs three initial points that form a triangle in \mathbb{R}^2 . The latter is provided by extrapolation of boundedness (cf. Theorem 2.25).

Theorem 1.13. *Assume that T is a bilinear operator such that*

$$T \text{ is compact from } L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^{p, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

for some $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $p_1, p_2 \in [1, \infty]$, and

$$T \text{ is bounded from } L^{q_1}(v_1^{q_1}) \times L^{q_2}(v_2^{q_2}) \text{ to } L^q(v^q)$$

for some $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$ with $q_1, q_2 \in [1, \infty]$ and for all $(v_1, v_2) \in A_{(q_1, q_2)}$, where $v = v_1 v_2$. Then

$$T \text{ is compact from } L^{r_1}(w_1^{r_1}) \times L^{r_2}(w_2^{r_2}) \text{ to } L^r(w^r)$$

for all $r_1, r_2 \in (1, \infty]$ and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(r_1, r_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2} > 0$ and $w = w_1 w_2$.

To prove (e) \implies (c)', we establish extrapolation of CMO compactness, see Theorem 1.14. We utilize Theorem 1.9 to reduce Theorem 1.14 to the $L^{r_1} \times L^{r_2} \rightarrow L^r$ compactness, whose proof relies on a bilinear interpolation (cf. Theorem 7.22), which just needs two different initial points. Since there is extremely limited information about the necessary conditions of CMO compactness, we will use the projection operator which characterizes the L^p and CMO compactness, see Theorem 1.6.

Theorem 1.14. *Assume that T is a bilinear operator such that*

$$T \text{ is compact from } L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

and

$$T \text{ is bounded from } L^{q_1}(v_1^{q_1}) \times L^{q_2}(v_2^{q_2}) \text{ to } L^q(v^q)$$

for some $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$ with $q_1, q_2 \in [1, \infty]$ and for all $(v_1, v_2) \in A_{(q_1, q_2)}$, where $v = v_1 v_2$. Then

$$T \text{ is compact from } L^{r_1}(w_1^{r_1}) \times L^{r_2}(w_2^{r_2}) \text{ to } L^r(w^r)$$

for all $r_1, r_2 \in (1, \infty]$ and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(r_1, r_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2} > 0$ and $w = w_1 w_2$.

1.7. Endpoint weighted compactness. To conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1, it remains to show (a) \implies (d)' and (a) \implies (e)'. The proof of (a) \implies (d)' is based on Theorem 1.4, and to check each condition in Theorem 1.4, it requires the unweighted $L^1 \times L^1 \rightarrow L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}$ compactness. The latter is proved by Theorem 1.3 and the Calderón–Zygmund decomposition. It is the first time to use Kolmogorov–Riesz theorems to investigate endpoint compactness. Moreover, the implication (a) \implies (e)' follows from a pointwise estimate (9.16). It was shown that for any Calderón–Zygmund operator T ,

$$M^\#(Tf)(x) \lesssim M_r f(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad r > 1.$$

But this inequality does not hold for $r = 1$ and T being the Hilbert transform, see [25]. The same argument holds in the bilinear case, but it can not yield the desired weighted estimate if $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(\infty, \infty)}$. This is the main reason why we use CMO_λ instead of CMO .

1.8. Applications. To illustrate the applicability of Theorem 1.1, we present several kinds of bilinear operators, which satisfy the hypotheses (H1)–(H3).

The first example is bilinear paraproducts. Let $\Phi, \Psi \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be radial functions such that $\text{supp}(\Phi) \subset B(0, 1)$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Phi(x) dx = 1$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Psi(x) dx = 0$, and $\int_0^\infty |\widehat{\Psi}(te_1)|^2 \frac{dt}{t} = 1$, where $e_1 := (1, 0, \dots, 0)$. For any $t > 0$, define convolution operators

$$P_t f := \Phi_t * f \quad \text{and} \quad Q_t f := \Psi_t * f,$$

where $\Phi_t(x) := t^{-n} \Phi(t^{-1}x)$ and $\Psi_t(x) := t^{-n} \Psi(t^{-1}x)$. Given $b \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the *bilinear continuous paraproduct* π_b is defined by

$$\pi_b(f, g) := \int_0^\infty Q_t((Q_t b)(P_t f)(P_t g)) \frac{dt}{t}.$$

The paraproduct goes back to the seminal work of Bony [9] and Coifman and Meyer [25], and one of its significant applications is the $T1$ theorem due to David and Journé [28]. The bilinear extension first appeared explicitly in the work of Yabuta [89], and was used to prove bilinear $T1$ theorem [40].

Theorem 1.15. *For any $b \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, π_b satisfies the hypotheses (H1), (H2), and (H3).*

The second example is bilinear dyadic paraproducts, which have developed into a fundamental tool in dyadic analysis, see [17, 65, 70]. Fix a dyadic grid \mathcal{D} , and let $\{\psi_I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$ be a system of wavelets (cf. Definition 10.3). Given a function $b \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we define *bilinear dyadic paraproducts* as

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_b(f_1, f_2) &:= \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \langle b, \psi_I \rangle \langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I \psi_I, \\ \Pi_b^{*1}(f_1, f_2) &:= \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \langle b, \psi_I \rangle \langle f_1, \psi_I \rangle \langle f_2 \rangle_I \frac{\mathbf{1}_I}{|I|}, \\ \Pi_b^{*2}(f_1, f_2) &:= \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \langle b, \psi_I \rangle \langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2, \psi_I \rangle \frac{\mathbf{1}_I}{|I|}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1.16. *Let $b \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then each operator $T \in \{\Pi_b, \Pi_b^{*1}, \Pi_b^{*2}\}$ satisfies the hypotheses (H1), (H2), and (H3).*

Let us proceed to the third example. Given a symbol σ , the *bilinear pseudo-differential operator* T_σ is defined by

$$T_\sigma(f_1, f_2)(x) := \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \sigma(x, \xi_1, \xi_2) e^{2\pi i x \cdot (\xi_1 + \xi_2)} \widehat{f}_1(\xi_1) \widehat{f}_2(\xi_2) d\xi_1 d\xi_2,$$

for all $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $\widehat{f}(\xi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \xi} f(x) dx$. Given $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\rho, \delta \in [0, 1]$, we say that $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}_{\rho, \delta}^m$ if it satisfies

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \partial_\eta^\gamma \sigma(x, \xi, \eta)| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma}(x, \xi, \eta) (1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{m + \delta|\alpha| - \rho(|\beta| + |\gamma|)},$$

for all multi-indices α, β and γ , where $C_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma}$ is a bounded function satisfying

$$\lim_{|x| + |\xi| + |\eta| \rightarrow \infty} C_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma}(x, \xi, \eta) = 0.$$

We say that $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^m$ if the above function $C_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma}$ depends only on α, β , and γ .

In the linear case, the condition $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}_{\rho, \delta}^m$ implicitly originated in [26] to establish L^2 compactness of T_σ , and was further adapted in [19] to obtain weighted L^p compactness of T_σ .

Theorem 1.17. *Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}_{1, \delta}^0$ with $\delta \in [0, 1]$. Then the bilinear pseudo-differential operator T_σ satisfies the hypotheses (H1), (H2), and (H3).*

Our last example is bilinear commutators. A function b on \mathbb{R}^n is called *Lipschitz* if there exists a constant $C_0 \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$|b(x) - b(y)| \leq C_0 |x - y| \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Given a bilinear operator T and a measurable function b , we define, whenever they make sense, the *bilinear commutators* of T as

$$\begin{aligned} [b, T]_1(f_1, f_2) &:= bT(f_1, f_2) - T(bf_1, f_2), \\ [b, T]_2(f_1, f_2) &:= bT(f_1, f_2) - T(f_1, bf_2). \end{aligned}$$

As mentioned before, the study of compactness of commutators has been very extensive, see [2, 14, 16, 20, 51, 50, 53, 83, 85]. But unfortunately, in general, even if it is assumed that $b \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the corresponding kernel of commutators is not a (bilinear) Calderón–Zygmund kernel. Considering this fact and the bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel shown in [6], we use the condition $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}_{\rho, \delta}^m$ as above to obtain the following result.

Theorem 1.18. *Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}_{1, 0}^1$ and b be a Lipschitz function with $\nabla b \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then the bilinear commutators $[b, T_\sigma]_1$ and $[b, T_\sigma]_2$ satisfy the hypotheses (H1), (H2), and (H3).*

1.9. Structure of the paper. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains some preliminaries including notation, bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operators, dyadic grids, Haar functions, BMO and CMO spaces, Muckenhoupt weights, and technical lemmas. In Section 3, we show the compact bilinear dyadic representation, namely, (a) \implies (b). Section 4 is devoted to establishing compactness criterion in Lorentz spaces, Theorems 1.3–1.6. After that, we present the proof of Theorems 1.7–1.8 in Section 5, and the proof of Theorems 1.10–1.12 in Section 6. Then in Section 7, we focus on showing Rubio de Francia extrapolation of compactness, Theorems 1.9, 1.13, and 1.14. Besides, the implications (a) \implies (d)' and (a) \implies (e)' are proved in Section 8 and Section 9 respectively. Finally, we show Theorems 1.15–1.18 in Section 10. For completeness, we give two appendices. Appendix A includes some properties in Lorentz spaces, and Appendix B covers some properties of multiple weights $A_{\vec{p}}$ with exponents $p_i = \infty$.

Acknowledgments. Part of this work was carried out while the first three authors were visiting the Institute for Advanced Study in Mathematics, Harbin Institute of Technology. The authors express their gratitude to this institution. The authors would like to thank Professor Tuomas Hytönen for his valuable comments to improve this work.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. **Notation.** Let us introduce some notation used throughout this article.

- For convenience, we use ℓ^∞ metric on \mathbb{R}^n .
- Let $\mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ be the set of natural numbers.
- Write $\mathbb{I} = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^n$ and $\lambda\mathbb{I} := [-\frac{\lambda}{2}, \frac{\lambda}{2}]^n$ for any $\lambda > 0$.
- Given $p \in (1, \infty)$, let p' denote the Hölder conjugate exponent of p , i.e., $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$.
- The translation operator is defined by $\tau_h f(x) := f(x - h)$ for all $x, h \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
- For any $p \in (0, \infty]$ and a weight w on \mathbb{R}^n , we simply write $\|f\|_{L^p(w^p)} := \|fw\|_{L^p}$.
- For a measurable set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $0 < |A| < \infty$, write $\langle f \rangle_A = \int_A f dx := \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A f dx$.
- By a cube I in \mathbb{R}^n we mean $I := \prod_{i=1}^n [a_i, a_i + \ell)$, where $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\ell > 0$.
- Let \mathcal{Q} denote the family of all cubes in \mathbb{R}^n .
- Let \mathcal{D} denote a generic dyadic grid on \mathbb{R}^n (see Section 2.3).
- For every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, set $\mathcal{Q}(N) := \{I \in \mathcal{Q} : 2^{-N} \leq \ell(I) \leq 2^N, \text{rd}(I, 2^N \mathbb{I}) \leq N\}$ and $\mathcal{D}(N) := \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{Q}(N)$.
- For any cube $I \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote its center by c_I and its sidelength by $\ell(I)$. For any $\lambda > 0$, we denote by λI the cube with the center c_I and sidelength $\lambda \ell(I)$.
- The distance between cubes I and J is given by $d(I, J) := \inf\{|x - y| : x \in I, y \in J\}$.
- The relative distance between cubes I and J is defined by $\text{rd}(I, J) := \frac{d(I, J)}{\max\{\ell(I), \ell(J)\}}$.
- Let $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be the space of continuous functions on \mathbb{R}^n .
- Let $\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be the collection of smooth functions with compact support on \mathbb{R}^n .
- Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denote the class of Schwarz functions on \mathbb{R}^n , and let $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denote the space of tempered distributions.
- We shall use $A \lesssim B$ and $A \simeq B$ to mean, respectively, that $A \leq CB$ and $0 < c \leq A/B \leq C$, where the constants c and C are harmless positive constants, not necessarily the same at each occurrence, which depend only on dimension and the constants appearing in the hypotheses of theorems.

2.2. Bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operators.

Definition 2.1. Let \mathcal{F} consist of all triples (F_1, F_2, F_3) of bounded functions $F_1, F_2, F_3 : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfying

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} F_1(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_2(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_3(t) = 0.$$

Let \mathcal{F}_0 be the collection of all bounded functions $F : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfying

$$\lim_{\ell(Q) \rightarrow 0} F(Q) = \lim_{\ell(Q) \rightarrow \infty} F(Q) = \lim_{|c_Q| \rightarrow \infty} F(Q) = 0.$$

Definition 2.2. Let Δ be the diagonal of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. A function $K : (\mathbb{R}^{3n} \setminus \Delta) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is called a *compact bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel* if there exists $\delta \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$(2.3) \quad |K(x, y, z)| \leq \frac{F(x, y, z)}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n}},$$

$$(2.4) \quad |K(x, y, z) - K(x', y, z)| \leq F(x, y, z) \frac{|x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}$$

whenever $|x - x'| \leq \max\{|x - y|, |x - z|\}/2$,

$$(2.5) \quad |K(x, y, z) - K(x, y', z)| \leq F(x, y, z) \frac{|y - y'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}$$

whenever $|y - y'| \leq \max\{|x - y|, |x - z|\}/2$,

$$(2.6) \quad |K(x, y, z) - K(x, y, z')| \leq F(x, y, z) \frac{|y - y'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}$$

whenever $|z - z'| \leq \max\{|x - y|, |x - z|\}/2$, where

$$F(x, y, z) := F_1(|x - y| + |x - z|)F_2(|x - y| + |x - z|)F_3(|x + y| + |x + z|)$$

with the triple $(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{F}$.

We say that K is a *standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel* if the function F above is replaced by a uniform constant $C \geq 1$. The smallest constant C is denoted by $\|K\|_{\text{CZ}(\delta)}$.

Definition 2.7. We say that a bilinear operator $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is *associated with a compact (or standard) bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel* if there exists a compact (or standard) bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel K such that

$$\langle T(f_1, f_2), g \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3n}} K(x, y, z) f_1(y) f_2(z) g(x) dx dy dz,$$

for any $f_1, f_2, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\text{supp}(f_1) \cap \text{supp}(f_2) \cap \text{supp}(g) = \emptyset$.

An operator T is called a *bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operator* if it is associated with a standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel and can be boundedly extended from $L^{q_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{q_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$ with $q_1, q_2 \in (1, \infty)$.

Definition 2.8. Let $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a bilinear operator. We say that T satisfies the *weak compactness property* if there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}_0$ such that

$$|\langle T(\mathbf{1}_Q, \mathbf{1}_Q), \mathbf{1}_Q \rangle| \leq F(Q)|Q|, \quad \text{for all } Q \in \mathcal{Q}.$$

We say that T satisfies the *weak boundedness property* if the function F above is replaced by a uniform constant $C \geq 1$.

2.3. Dyadic grids. Let \mathcal{D}_0 be the standard dyadic grid on \mathbb{R}^n :

$$\mathcal{D}_0 := \{2^{-k}([0, 1]^n + m) : k \in \mathbb{Z}, m \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}.$$

Let $\Omega := (\{0, 1\}^n)^\mathbb{Z}$ and let \mathbb{P}_ω be the natural probability measure on Ω : each component ω_j has an equal probability 2^{-n} of taking any of the 2^n values in $\{0, 1\}^n$, and all components are independent of each other. Given $\omega = (\omega_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \Omega$, the *random dyadic grid* \mathcal{D}_ω on \mathbb{R}^n is defined by

$$\mathcal{D}_\omega := \left\{ Q + \omega := Q + \sum_{j: 2^{-j} < \ell(Q)} 2^{-j} \omega_j : Q \in \mathcal{D}_0 \right\}.$$

By a *dyadic grid* \mathcal{D} we mean that $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_\omega$ for some $\omega \in \Omega$.

A cube $Q \in \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_\omega$ is called *bad* if there exists a cube $Q' \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$\ell(Q') \geq 2^r \ell(Q) \quad \text{and} \quad d(Q, \partial Q') \leq 2\ell(Q)^\gamma \ell(Q')^{1-\gamma}.$$

Here $\gamma = \frac{\delta}{2(2n+\delta)}$, where $\delta > 0$ appears in the kernel estimates. Otherwise a cube is called *good*. Let $\mathcal{D}_{\omega, \text{good}}$ denote the family of good cubes in \mathcal{D}_ω . Note that $\pi_{\text{good}} := \mathbb{P}_\omega(Q + \omega \text{ is good})$ is independent of the choice of $Q \in \mathcal{D}_0$. The appearing parameter r is a large enough fixed constant so that $\pi_{\text{good}} > 0$.

2.4. Haar functions. Let h_I be an L^2 normalized Haar function related to $I \in \mathcal{D}$, where \mathcal{D} is a dyadic grid on \mathbb{R}^n . With this we mean that h_I , $I = I_1 \times \cdots \times I_n$, is one of the 2^n functions h_I^η , $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n$, defined by

$$h_I^\eta := h_{I_1}^{\eta_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes h_{I_n}^{\eta_n},$$

where $h_{I_i}^0 = |I_i|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{1}_{I_i}$ and $h_{I_i}^1 = |I_i|^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbf{1}_{I_i^-} - \mathbf{1}_{I_i^+})$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. Here I_i^- and I_i^+ are the left and right halves of the interval I_i respectively. If $\eta \neq 0$, the Haar function is cancellative: $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} h_I dx = 0$. All the cancellative Haar functions form an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. If $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we may write

$$f = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\eta \in \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{0\}} \langle f, h_I^\eta \rangle h_I^\eta.$$

However, we suppress the finite η summation and just write $f = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \langle f, h_I \rangle h_I$.

Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $Q \in \mathcal{D}$, let $\mathcal{D}_k(Q) := \{I \in \mathcal{D} : I \subset Q, \ell(I) = 2^{-k} \ell(Q)\}$. Define

$$\Delta_Q f := \sum_{Q' \in \text{ch}(Q)} (\langle f \rangle_{Q'} - \langle f \rangle_Q) \mathbf{1}_{Q'} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_Q^k f := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_k(Q)} \Delta_I f.$$

Then for every $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, there holds

$$(2.9) \quad f = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \Delta_Q f = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \langle f, h_Q \rangle h_Q,$$

where the convergence takes place unconditionally (that is, independently of the order) in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and a dyadic grid \mathcal{D} , define the dyadic square function as

$$S_{\mathcal{D}}^k f := \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |\Delta_Q^k f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For $k = 0$, denote $S_{\mathcal{D}} := S_{\mathcal{D}}^0$. It follows from [87, Exercise 3.7] that

$$(2.10) \quad \|S_{\mathcal{D}} f\|_{L^r} \simeq \|f\|_{L^r}, \quad \text{for all } r \in (0, \infty).$$

Moreover, it was shown in [87, Theorem 2.5] that for any $r \in (0, \infty)$ and $v \in A_\infty$,

$$(2.11) \quad \|f\|_{L^r(v)} \lesssim \|S_{\mathcal{D}}^k f\|_{L^r(v)}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N},$$

Given $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define the operators

$$(2.12) \quad E_{2^k} f := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(Q)=2^k} \langle f \rangle_Q \mathbf{1}_Q \quad \text{and} \quad D_{2^k} f := E_{2^{k-1}} f - E_{2^k} f.$$

Then it is not hard to check that

$$(2.13) \quad E_{2^k} f = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(Q) > 2^k} \Delta_Q f, \quad D_{2^k} f = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(Q)=2^k} \Delta_Q f,$$

and

$$(2.14) \quad \left\| \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |D_{2^k} f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^r} \simeq \|f\|_{L^r}, \quad \text{for all } r \in (0, \infty).$$

Given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the *projection operator* and its *orthogonal operator* by

$$(2.15) \quad P_N f := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}(N)} \langle f, h_Q \rangle h_Q \quad \text{and} \quad P_N^\perp f := f - P_N f,$$

with convergence interpreted pointwise almost everywhere. Then there holds

$$(2.16) \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \|P_N^\perp f\|_{L^r} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^r}, \quad \text{for all } r \in (0, \infty).$$

Indeed, by (2.10), for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_N f\|_{L^r} &\simeq \|S_{\mathcal{D}}(P_N f)\|_{L^r} = \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |\Delta_Q(P_N f)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^r} \\ &= \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}(N)} |\Delta_Q f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^r} \leq \|S_{\mathcal{D}} f\|_{L^r} \simeq \|f\|_{L^r}, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constants are independent of N .

2.5. BMO and CMO spaces.

Definition 2.17. A locally integrable function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ belongs to $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if

$$\|f\|_{\text{BMO}} := \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \int_Q |f(x) - \langle f \rangle_Q| dx < \infty.$$

Let $\text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denote the closure of $\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Additionally, the space $\text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is endowed with the norm of $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

By [60] and [85], we see that $f \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if and only if

$$(2.18) \quad f \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|P_N^\perp f\|_{\text{BMO}} = 0.$$

Let $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denote the Hardy space (cf. [80, Chapter VII, Section 3]). It was shown by Fefferman and Stein [32] that $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the dual space of $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Given $\lambda > 0$, the sharp maximal function $M_\lambda^\#$ is defined by

$$M_\lambda^\# f(x) := \sup_{Q \ni x} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\int_Q |f(y) - c|^\lambda dy \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}.$$

When $\lambda = 1$, denote $M^\# = M_\lambda^\#$. The operator $M_\lambda^\#$ was introduced by Strömberg [82] and is a modification of $M^\#$ of Fefferman and Stein [32]. In addition, it was shown in [82, p. 518] that

$$(2.19) \quad \|f\|_{\text{BMO}} \simeq \|M_\lambda^\# f\|_{L^\infty}, \quad 0 < \lambda < \infty.$$

Inspired by (2.18) and (2.19), we define the weighted BMO and CMO spaces as follows.

Definition 2.20. Let $\lambda > 0$ and $0 < w(x) < \infty$ a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We say that a locally integrable function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ belongs to $\text{BMO}_\lambda(w^\infty)$ if

$$\|f\|_{\text{BMO}_\lambda(w^\infty)} := \|(M_\lambda^\# f)w\|_{L^\infty} < \infty.$$

We say that a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ belongs to $\text{CMO}_\lambda(w^\infty)$ if

$$f \in \text{BMO}_\lambda(w^\infty) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|P_N^\perp f\|_{\text{BMO}_\lambda(w^\infty)} = 0.$$

2.6. Muckenhoupt weights. A measurable function w on \mathbb{R}^n is called a *weight* if $0 < w(x) < \infty$ for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Given $p \in (1, \infty)$, we define the Muckenhoupt class A_p as the collection of all weights w on \mathbb{R}^n satisfying

$$[w]_{A_p} := \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \left(\int_Q w \, dx \right) \left(\int_Q w^{1-p'} \, dx \right)^{p-1} < \infty.$$

In the endpoint case $p = 1$, we say that $w \in A_1$ if

$$[w]_{A_1} := \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \left(\int_Q w \, dx \right) \left(\text{ess sup}_Q w^{-1} \right) < \infty.$$

Then, we define $A_\infty := \bigcup_{p \geq 1} A_p$.

Let us recall two properties of Muckenhoupt classes. The first one is the reverse Hölder inequality: for every $w \in A_p$ with $p \in [1, \infty]$,

$$(2.21) \quad \left(\int_Q w^{r_w} \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{r_w}} \lesssim \int_Q w \, dx, \quad \text{for each cube } Q,$$

where $r_w \in (1, \infty)$. The second one is the openness of the class A_p : for any $p \in (1, \infty)$,

$$(2.22) \quad w \in A_p \implies w \in A_{p-\varepsilon} \quad \text{for some } \varepsilon \in (0, p-1).$$

More properties about Muckenhoupt classes can be found in [35, Section 7].

Next, we turn to the multilinear version of Muckenhoupt weights introduced in [63].

Definition 2.23. Given $\vec{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$ with $1 \leq p_1, \dots, p_m \leq \infty$ and $\vec{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_m)$ with $0 < w_1, \dots, w_m < \infty$ a.e. on \mathbb{R}^n , we say that $\vec{w} \in A_{\vec{p}}$ if

$$[\vec{w}]_{A_{\vec{p}}} := \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \left(\int_Q w^p \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \prod_{i=1}^m \left(\int_Q w_i^{-p'_i} \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p'_i}} < \infty,$$

where $\frac{1}{p} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{p_i}$ and $w = \prod_{i=1}^m w_i$. If $p_i = 1$, $(\int_Q w_i^{-p'_i} \, dx)^{1/p'_i}$ is understood as $(\text{ess inf}_Q w_i)^{-1}$; and if $p = \infty$, $(\int_Q w^p \, dx)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ is understood as $\text{ess sup}_Q w$.

The following characterization of the class $A_{\vec{p}}$ was essentially contained in [63, Theorem 3.6]. Although [63, Theorem 3.6] only concerns the setting $1 \leq p_1, \dots, p_m < \infty$, some minor modifications of its proof will give the corresponding result in the case $p_i = \infty$ for some/all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.

Lemma 2.24. Let $\vec{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$ with $1 \leq p_1, \dots, p_m \leq \infty$ and let $\vec{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_m)$ be a vector of weights. Then

$$\vec{w} \in A_{\vec{p}} \iff w^p \in A_{mp} \quad \text{and} \quad w_i^{-p'_i} \in A_{mp'_i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m,$$

where $\frac{1}{p} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{p_i}$ and $w = \prod_{i=1}^m w_i$. If $p_i = 1$, $w_i^{-p'_i} \in A_{mp'_i}$ is understood as $w_i^{1/m} \in A_1$; and if $p = \infty$, $w^p \in A_{mp}$ is understood as $w^{-1/m} \in A_1$.

Let us present the multivariable Rubio de Francia extrapolation theorem from [75].

Theorem 2.25. *Let \mathcal{F} be a collection of $(m+1)$ -tuples of non-negative functions. Assume that there exist some $q_1, \dots, q_m \in [1, \infty]$ such that*

$$\|f\|_{L^q(v^q)} \text{ (resp. } \|f\|_{L^{q,\infty}(v^q)}) \leq C_1 \prod_{i=1}^m \|f_i\|_{L^{q_i}(v_i^{q_i})}, \quad \forall (f, f_1, \dots, f_m) \in \mathcal{F},$$

for all $\vec{v} \in A_{\vec{q}}$, where $\frac{1}{q} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{q_i}$ and $v = \prod_{i=1}^m v_i$. Then

$$\|f\|_{L^p(w^p)} \text{ (resp. } \|f\|_{L^{p,\infty}(w^p)}) \leq C_2 \prod_{i=1}^m \|f_i\|_{L^{p_i}(w_i^{p_i})}, \quad \forall (f, f_1, \dots, f_m) \in \mathcal{F},$$

for all $p_1, \dots, p_m \in (1, \infty]$ and for all $\vec{w} \in A_{\vec{p}}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{p_i} > 0$ and $w = \prod_{i=1}^m w_i$.

To give a characterization of $A_{\vec{p}}$, let us define the multilinear maximal operator

$$\mathcal{M}(\vec{f})(x) := \sup_{Q \ni x} \prod_{i=1}^m \int_Q |f_i(y_i)| dy_i,$$

where the supremum is taken over all cubes $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ containing x . In the case $m=1$, we write $M = \mathcal{M}$ and $M_\lambda f = M(|f|^\lambda)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}$ for any $\lambda > 0$.

Theorem 2.26. *Let $p_1, \dots, p_m \in (1, \infty]$. Then $\vec{w} \in A_{\vec{p}}$ if and only if \mathcal{M} is bounded from $L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times \dots \times L^{p_m}(w_m^{p_m})$ to $L^p(w^p)$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{p_i}$ and $w = \prod_{i=1}^m w_i$.*

Proof. In the situation $p_1, \dots, p_m \in (1, \infty)$, this result was proved in [63, Theorem 3.7]. But the endpoint case $p_i = \infty$ will occur in the current scenario, we here present a new proof.

To show the sufficiency, assume that $\vec{w} \in A_{\vec{\infty}}$ and $w = \prod_{i=1}^m w_i$. By [55, p. 792], each cube Q is contained in a shifted dyadic cube $Q_\alpha \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha$ with $\ell(Q_\alpha) \leq 6\ell(Q)$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda := \{0, 1/3\}^n$, where

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

Thus,

$$(2.27) \quad \mathcal{M}(\vec{f})(x) \lesssim \sup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}_\alpha}(\vec{f})(x) := \sup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \sup_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha \\ Q \ni x}} \prod_{i=1}^m \int_Q |f_i| dy_i, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

For each cube $Q \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathcal{D}_\alpha$, there exists a subset $E_Q \subset Q$ such that $|E_Q| = 0$ and $w(x) \leq \text{ess sup}_Q w$ for all $x \in Q \setminus E_Q$. Denote $E := \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha} E_Q$. Then $|E| = 0$ and for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus E$,

$$(2.28) \quad \sup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \sup_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha \\ Q \ni x}} \frac{w(x)}{\text{ess sup}_Q w} \leq 1.$$

Gathering (2.27) and (2.28), we obtain that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus E$,

$$\mathcal{M}(\vec{f})(x)w(x) \lesssim w(x) \sup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \sup_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha \\ Q \ni x}} \prod_{i=1}^m \|f_i w_i\|_{L^\infty} \left(\int_Q w_i^{-1} dy_i \right) \leq [\vec{w}]_{A_{\vec{\infty}}} \prod_{i=1}^m \|f_i w_i\|_{L^\infty},$$

which asserts that $\|\mathcal{M}(\vec{f})w\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^m \|f_i w_i\|_{L^\infty}$ for all $\vec{w} \in A_{\vec{\infty}}$. By Theorem 2.25, this implies that \mathcal{M} is bounded from $L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times \dots \times L^{p_m}(w_m^{p_m})$ to $L^p(w^p)$ for all $p_1, \dots, p_m \in (1, \infty]$ and $\vec{w} \in A_{\vec{p}}$.

To demonstrate the necessity, assume that \mathcal{M} is bounded from $L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times \cdots \times L^{p_m}(w_m^{p_m})$ to $L^p(w^p)$. First, consider the case $p_1 = \cdots = p_m = \infty$. Let $f_i = w_i^{-1}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. Let Q be a cube. By definition, there exists a subset $E_Q \subset Q$ such that $|E_Q| = 0$ and $\mathcal{M}(\vec{f})(x)w(x) \leq \|\mathcal{M}(\vec{f})w\|_{L^\infty}$ for all $x \in Q \setminus E_Q$. Then for all $x \in Q \setminus E_Q$,

$$w(x) \prod_{i=1}^m \left(\int_Q w_i^{-1} dy_i \right) \leq \|\mathcal{M}(\vec{f})w\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^m \|f_i w_i\|_{L^\infty} = 1,$$

which shows $\vec{w} \in A_\infty$.

Next, let us handle the case $p_i \neq \infty$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. There exists a subset $\mathcal{I}_1 \subset \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $\#\mathcal{I}_1 \geq 1$, $p_i \neq \infty$ for each $i \in \mathcal{I}_1$, and $p_j = \infty$ for each $j \in \mathcal{I}_2 := \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \mathcal{I}_1$. Note that $\frac{1}{p} := \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{p_i} > 0$. Let Q be a cube. Let \vec{f} satisfy $0 < \prod_{i=1}^m \langle |f_i| \rangle_Q < \infty$. Then for any $0 < \lambda < \prod_{i=1}^m \langle |f_i| \rangle_Q$,

$$\lambda w^p(Q)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \lambda w^p(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathcal{M}(\vec{f}\mathbf{1}_Q)(x) > \lambda\})^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \|\mathcal{M}(\vec{f}\mathbf{1}_Q)w\|_{L^p} \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^m \|f_i \mathbf{1}_Q w_i\|_{L^{p_i}}.$$

Letting $\lambda \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^m \langle |f_i| \rangle_Q$, we have

$$w^p(Q)^{\frac{1}{p}} \prod_{i=1}^m \langle |f_i| \rangle_Q \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^m \|f_i \mathbf{1}_Q w_i\|_{L^{p_i}}.$$

Pick $f_i = w_i^{-p'_i}$ for every $i \in \mathcal{I}_1$, and $f_j = w_j^{-1}$ for every $j \in \mathcal{I}_2$. Thus, the above inequality gives

$$w^p(Q)^{\frac{1}{p}} \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1} \langle w_i^{-p'_i} \rangle_Q \prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}_2} \langle w_j^{-1} \rangle_Q \lesssim |Q|^{\frac{1}{p}} \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1} \langle w_i^{-p'_i} \rangle_Q^{\frac{1}{p_i}},$$

which implies $\vec{w} \in A_{\vec{p}}$ as desired. \square

2.7. Technical lemmas. We end up this section with some useful technical results.

Lemma 2.29 ([18]). *Let $r > 1$ and $1 < s < 1 + \frac{1}{n}$. Assume that a bounded and decreasing function $F_2 : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_2(t) = 0$. Then there exists a bounded and decreasing function $\tilde{F}_2 : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfying $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{F}_2(t) = 0$ such that for all cubes $I, J \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\ell(I) = \ell(J)$, $I \cap J = \emptyset$, and $d(I, J) = 0$,*

$$\mathcal{I}_1 := \left(\int_I \int_J F_2(|x-y|^r) dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \lesssim \tilde{F}_2(\ell(I)),$$

and

$$\mathcal{I}_2 := \left(\int_I \int_J \frac{1}{|x-y|^{sn}} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \lesssim |I|^{-1}.$$

Lemma 2.30. *Given $(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{F}$, let*

$$F(x, y, z) := F_1(|x-y| + |x-z|)F_2(|x-y| + |x-z|)F_3(|x+y| + |x+z|).$$

(i) *There exists a triple $(F'_1, F'_2, F'_3) \in \mathcal{F}$ such that F'_1 is monotone increasing, F'_2 and F'_3 are monotone decreasing, and*

$$(2.31) \quad F(x, y, z) \leq F'(x, y, z) := F'_1(|x-y| + |x-z|)F'_2(|x-y| + |x-z|)$$

$$\times F'_3 \left(1 + \frac{|x+y|+|x+z|}{1+|x-y|+|x-z|} \right).$$

(ii) Assume that F_1 is monotone increasing. Then there exist $\delta' \in (0, \delta)$ and $(F'_1, F'_2, F'_3) \in \mathcal{F}$ such that F'_1 is monotone increasing, F'_2 and F'_3 are monotone decreasing, and

$$(2.32) \quad F(x, y, z) \frac{|x-x'|^\delta}{(|x-y|+|x-z|)^{2n+\delta}} \leq F'(x, y, z) \frac{|x-x'|^{\delta'}}{(|x-y|+|x-z|)^{2n+\delta'}},$$

whenever $|x-x'| \leq \max\{|x-y|, |x-z|\}/2$, where

$$(2.33) \quad F'(x, y, z) := F'_1(|x-x'|)F'_2(|x-y|+|x-z|)F'_3 \left(1 + \frac{|x+y|+|x+z|}{1+|x-y|+|x-z|} \right).$$

Proof. Note that $|x+y|+|x+z| \geq \frac{|x+y|+|x+z|}{1+|x-y|+|x-z|}$. Then by definition,

$$(2.34) \quad \lim_{|x-y|+|x-z| \rightarrow 0} F(x, y, z) = \lim_{|x-y|+|x-z| \rightarrow \infty} F(x, y, z) \\ = \lim_{1 + \frac{|x+y|+|x+z|}{1+|x-y|+|x-z|} \rightarrow \infty} F(x, y, z) = 0.$$

Define

$$F'_1(t) := \sup_{|x-y|+|x-z| \leq t} F(x, y, z)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ F'_2(t) := \sup_{|x-y|+|x-z| \geq t} F(x, y, z)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ F'_3(t) := \sup_{1 + \frac{|x+y|+|x+z|}{1+|x-y|+|x-z|} \geq t} F(x, y, z)^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

It is obvious that F'_1 is bounded and monotone increasing, both F'_2 and F'_3 are bounded and monotone decreasing. Moreover, (2.34) implies that $(F'_1, F'_2, F'_3) \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$(2.35) \quad F(x, y, z)^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq F'_i(|x-y|+|x-z|), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

and

$$(2.36) \quad F(x, y, z)^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq F'_3 \left(1 + \frac{|x+y|+|x+z|}{1+|x-y|+|x-z|} \right).$$

Thus, (2.31) is a consequence of (2.35) and (2.36).

To prove part (ii), pick $\delta' \in (0, \delta)$ and denote

$$(2.37) \quad F(x, y, z; x') := F(x, y, z) \frac{|x-x'|^{\delta-\delta'}}{(|x-y|+|x-z|)^{\delta-\delta'}}$$

for all $|x-x'| \leq \max\{|x-y|, |x-z|\}/2$. We claim that

$$(2.38) \quad \lim_{|x-x'| \rightarrow 0} F(x, y, z; x') = \lim_{|x-y|+|x-z| \rightarrow \infty} F(x, y, z; x') \\ = \lim_{1 + \frac{|x+y|+|x+z|}{1+|x-y|+|x-z|} \rightarrow \infty} F(x, y, z; x') = 0.$$

Indeed, the last two limits in (2.38) follow from (2.34). To show the first one, assume that there exists a sequence $\{(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $|x_k - x'_k| \leq \max\{|x_k - y_k|, |x_k - z_k|\}/2$ with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |x_k - x'_k| = 0$, but

$$(2.39) \quad \inf_k F(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k) > 0.$$

If $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|x_k - x'_k|}{|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k|} = 0$, then the finiteness of F gives $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k) = 0$, which contradicts (2.39). If $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|x_k - x'_k|}{|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k|} > 0$, then there exist a constant $C_0 > 0$ and a subsequence (which we relabel) $\{(x_k, y_k, z_k, x'_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k| \leq C_0 |x_k - x'_k|$. By the monotonicity of F_1 and that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |x_k - x'_k| = 0$, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq F(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k) \leq F(x_k, y_k, z_k) \\ &\lesssim F_1(|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k|) \leq F_1(C_0 |x_k - x'_k|) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k) = 0$, which contradicts (2.39). Consequently, the first limit in (2.38) holds.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} F'_1(t) &:= \sup_{|x-x'| \leq t} F(x, y, z; x')^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ F'_2(t) &:= \sup_{|x-y| + |x-z| \geq t} F(x, y, z; x')^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ F'_3(t) &:= \sup_{1 + \frac{|x+y| + |x+z|}{1 + |x-y| + |x-z|} \geq t} F(x, y, z; x')^{\frac{1}{3}}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that F'_1 is bounded and monotone increasing, both F'_2 and F'_3 are bounded and monotone decreasing. Besides, (2.38) gives that $(F'_1, F'_2, F'_3) \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$(2.40) \quad F(x, y, z; x')^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq F'_1(|x - x'|), \quad F(x, y, z; x')^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq F'_2(|x - y| + |x - z|),$$

and

$$(2.41) \quad F(x, y, z; x')^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq F'_3\left(1 + \frac{|x + y| + |x + z|}{1 + |x - y| + |x - z|}\right).$$

Therefore, (2.40) and (2.41) imply

$$\frac{F(x, y, z) |x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n + \delta}} = \frac{F(x, y, z; x') |x - x'|^{\delta'}}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n + \delta'}} \leq \frac{F'(x, y, z) |x - x'|^{\delta'}}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n + \delta'}},$$

which coincides with (2.32). The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 2.42. *The following statements hold:*

- (1) *If the estimates in Definition 2.2 are satisfied for different triples $(F_1^1, F_2^1, F_3^1) \in \mathcal{F}$ and $(F_1^2, F_2^2, F_3^2) \in \mathcal{F}$ respectively, then they also hold for a new triple $(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{F}$.*
- (2) *If the weak compactness property in Definition 2.8 is satisfied for different functions $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ and $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ respectively, then it also holds for a new function $F \in \mathcal{F}_0$.*
- (3) *For each triple $(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{F}$ in Definitions 2.2, we may assume that F_1 is monotone increasing while F_2 and F_3 are monotone decreasing.*
- (4) *Since any dilation of functions in \mathcal{F}_0 and \mathcal{F} still belongs to the original space, we may omit all universal constants appearing in the argument involving these functions.*
- (5) *In light of Lemma 2.30, we may use alternative estimates for kernels in Definitions 2.2.*

Proof. Let us first show item (1). Given $(F_1^1, F_2^1, F_3^1) \in \mathcal{F}$ and $(F_1^2, F_2^2, F_3^2) \in \mathcal{F}$ in Definition 2.2, if we define

$$F_j := \max\{F_j^1, F_j^2\}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3,$$

then the size and Hölder conditions hold for $(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{F}$. Item (2) can be shown in the same way. To show item (3), given $(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{F}$ in Definitions 2.2, we define

$$F_1^*(t) := \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} F_1(s), \quad F_2^*(t) := \sup_{s \geq t} F_2(s), \quad \text{and} \quad F_3^*(t) := \sup_{s \geq t} F_3(s).$$

Then it is easy to check that all estimates in Definitions 2.2 are satisfied for $(F_1^*, F_2^*, F_3^*) \in \mathcal{F}$, F_1^* is monotone increasing, F_2^* and F_3^* are monotone decreasing. Items (4) and (5) are direct. \square

3. A COMPACT BILINEAR DYADIC REPRESENTATION

The goal of this section is to prove (a) \implies (b) in Theorem 1.1, for which we will combine the ideas from [18] and [65]. To proceed to the proof, let us keep Lemma 2.42 in mind, namely, we always assume that all functions in \mathcal{F}_0 and \mathcal{F} appearing in the hypotheses (H1)–(H3) satisfy those properties there.

3.1. Initial reductions. By definition and (2.9), we rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T(f_1, f_2), f_3 \rangle &= \mathbb{E}_\omega \sum_{I_1, I_2, I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega} \langle T(\Delta_{I_1} f_1, \Delta_{I_2} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\omega \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega} \sum_{\substack{I_1 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_1)}} \sum_{\substack{I_2 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_2)}} \langle T(\Delta_{I_1} f_1, \Delta_{I_2} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_\omega \sum_{I_2 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega} \sum_{\substack{I_1 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega \\ \ell(I_2) \leq \ell(I_1)}} \sum_{\substack{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega \\ \ell(I_2) < \ell(I_3)}} \langle T(\Delta_{I_1} f_1, \Delta_{I_2} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_\omega \sum_{I_1 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega} \sum_{\substack{I_2 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega \\ \ell(I_1) < \ell(I_2)}} \sum_{\substack{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega \\ \ell(I_1) < \ell(I_3)}} \langle T(\Delta_{I_1} f_1, \Delta_{I_2} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\ &=: \mathcal{S}_1 + \mathcal{S}_2 + \mathcal{S}_3. \end{aligned}$$

Throughout this paper, we only focus on \mathcal{S}_1 since other two terms can be shown with minor modifications. It follows from (2.13) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_1 &= \mathbb{E}_\omega \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega} \langle T(E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_1, E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\omega \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_0} \langle T(E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_1, E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_2), \Delta_{I_3 + \omega} f_3 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathbf{1}_{\text{good}}(I_3 + \omega)$ depends on ω_j for $2^{-j} \geq \ell(I_3)$, while both $E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_1$ and $E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_2$ depend on ω_j for $2^{-j} < \ell(I_3)/2 < \ell(I_3)$, and $\Delta_{I_3 + \omega} f_3$ depends on ω_j for $2^{-j} < \ell(I_3)$. Then using independence, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_1 &= \frac{1}{\pi_{\text{good}}} \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_0} \mathbb{E}_\omega [\mathbf{1}_{\text{good}}(I_3 + \omega)] \mathbb{E}_\omega [\langle T(E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_1, E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_2), \Delta_{I_3 + \omega} f_3 \rangle] \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi_{\text{good}}} \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_0} \mathbb{E}_\omega [\mathbf{1}_{\text{good}}(I_3 + \omega) \langle T(E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_1, E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_2), \Delta_{I_3 + \omega} f_3 \rangle] \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi_{\text{good}}} \mathbb{E}_\omega \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\omega, \text{good}}} \langle T(E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_1, E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{\pi_{\text{good}}} \mathbb{E}_{\omega} \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\omega, \text{good}}} \sum_{\substack{I_1 \in \mathcal{D}_{\omega} \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_1)}} \sum_{\substack{I_2 \in \mathcal{D}_{\omega} \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_2)}} \langle T(\Delta_{I_1} f_1, \Delta_{I_2} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\
&=: \frac{1}{\pi_{\text{good}}} \mathbb{E}_{\omega} \mathcal{S}_1(\omega).
\end{aligned}$$

In what follows, fix ω , and let $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_{\omega}$ and $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{S}_1(\omega)$. By (2.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}_1 &= \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{\substack{I_1 \in \mathcal{D} \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_1)}} \sum_{\substack{I_2 \in \mathcal{D} \\ \ell(I_1) \leq \ell(I_2)}} \langle T(\Delta_{I_1} f_1, \Delta_{I_2} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\
&+ \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{\substack{I_2 \in \mathcal{D} \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_2)}} \sum_{\substack{I_1 \in \mathcal{D} \\ \ell(I_2) < \ell(I_1)}} \langle T(\Delta_{I_1} f_1, \Delta_{I_2} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\
&= \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{\substack{I_1 \in \mathcal{D} \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_1)}} \langle T(\Delta_{I_1} f_1, E_{\ell(I_1)/2} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\
&+ \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{\substack{I_2 \in \mathcal{D} \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_2)}} \langle T(E_{\ell(I_2)} f_1, \Delta_{I_2} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\
&=: \mathcal{S}_{1,1} + \mathcal{S}_{1,2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By symmetry, we will be mainly concerned with the first term $\mathcal{S}_{1,1}$:

$$\mathcal{S}_{1,1} = \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{\substack{I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{D} \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_2) = 2\ell(I_1)}} \langle T(\Delta_{I_1} f_1, \langle f_2 \rangle_{I_2} \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle.$$

Furthermore, we split

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{S}_{1,1} = \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^1 + \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^2 + \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}_{1,1}^1 &:= \sum_{\substack{I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{D}, I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}} \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_1) = 2\ell(I_2) \\ \max\{d(I_3, I_1), d(I_3, I_2)\} > 2\ell(I_3)^{\gamma} \ell(I_2)^{1-\gamma}}} \langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1, h_{I_1} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_2}^0 \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle, \\
\mathcal{S}_{1,1}^2 &:= \sum_{\substack{I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{D}, I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}} \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_1) = 2\ell(I_2) \\ \max\{d(I_3, I_1), d(I_3, I_2)\} \leq 2\ell(I_3)^{\gamma} \ell(I_2)^{1-\gamma} \\ I_3 \cap I_1 = \emptyset \text{ or } I_3 \cap I_2 = \emptyset \text{ or } I_3 = I_1}} \langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1, h_{I_1} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_2}^0 \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle, \\
\mathcal{S}_{1,1}^3 &:= \sum_{\substack{I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{D}, I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}} \\ \ell(I_1) = 2\ell(I_2), I_3 \subset I_2 \subset I_1}} \langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1, h_{I_1} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_2}^0 \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

These three parts are called separated, adjacent, and nested respectively. Recall that we use the ℓ^{∞} metric.

Henceforth, given $(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{F}$, we define

$$(3.2) \quad \tilde{F}_2(t) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k\theta} F_2(2^{-k}t) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{F}_3(I) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k\theta} F_3(\text{rd}(2^k I, \mathbb{I})),$$

where the parameter $\theta \in (0, 1)$ is harmless and small enough. By homogeneity, we may assume that

$$\|F\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2^{-n}, \quad \|F_i\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\tilde{F}_j\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1, \quad j = 2, 3,$$

where $F \in \mathcal{F}_0$ comes from Definition 2.8.

3.2. Separated part. We begin with the term $\mathcal{S}_{1,1}^1$. In the current scenario, by [65, Lemma 4.1], there exists a minimal cube $Q := I_1 \vee I_2 \vee I_3 \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$(3.3) \quad I_1 \cup I_2 \cup I_3 \subset Q \quad \text{and} \quad \max\{d(I_3, I_1), d(I_3, I_2)\} \gtrsim \ell(I_3)^\gamma \ell(Q)^{1-\gamma}.$$

Observe that for all $x \in I_3$, $y \in I_1$, and $z \in I_2$,

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \max\{|x - y|, |x - z|\} &\geq \max\{d(I_3, I_1), d(I_3, I_2)\} \\ &> 2\ell(I_3)^\gamma \ell(I_2)^{1-\gamma} \geq 2^\gamma \ell(I_3) \geq 2^{1+\gamma} |x - c_{I_3}| \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} 1 + \frac{|x + y| + |x + z|}{1 + |x - y| + |x - z|} &\geq \frac{2(|y| + |z|)}{1 + |x - y| + |x - z|} \\ &\geq \frac{4d(Q, \mathbb{I})}{1 + 2\ell(Q)} \geq \frac{d(Q, \mathbb{I})}{\max\{\ell(Q), 1\}} = \text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the monotonicity of F_1 , F_2 , and F_3 , (3.4) and (3.5) yield

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} F(x, y, z) &:= F_1(|x - c_{I_3}|) F_2(|x - y| + |x - z|) F_3\left(1 + \frac{|x + y| + |x + z|}{1 + |x - y| + |x - z|}\right) \\ &\leq F_1(\ell(I_3)) F_2(\ell(I_3)) F_3(\text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I})) =: F(I_1, I_2, I_3, Q). \end{aligned}$$

In light of (3.3), (3.4), and (3.6), we use the cancellation of h_{I_3} and the Hölder condition of K to deduce

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle| &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3n}} \frac{F(x, y, z) \ell(I_3)^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}} |h_{I_1}(y)| |h_{I_2}^0(z)| |h_{I_3}(x)| dx dy dz \\ &\leq \frac{F(I_1, I_2, I_3, Q) \ell(I_3)^\delta}{\max\{d(I_3, I_1), d(I_3, I_2)\}^{2n+\delta}} |I_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C_1 \frac{F(I_1, I_2, I_3, Q) \ell(I_3)^\delta}{[\ell(I_3)^\gamma \ell(Q)^{1-\gamma}]^{2n+\delta}} |I_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= C_1 \left[\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(Q)}\right]^{\frac{\delta}{2}} F(I_1, I_2, I_3, Q) \frac{|I_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $C_0 \in (0, \infty)$ be a universal constant chosen later. Set

$$a_{I_1, I_2, I_3, Q} := \frac{\langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle}{C_0 [\ell(I_3) / \ell(Q)]^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}$$

if $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}$ satisfy $\ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_1) = 2\ell(I_2)$, $\max\{d(I_3, I_1), d(I_3, I_2)\} > 2\ell(I_3)^\gamma \ell(I_2)^{1-\gamma}$, and $I_1 \vee I_2 \vee I_3 = Q$, and otherwise set $a_{I_1, I_2, I_3, Q} = 0$. This enables us to rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^1 &= \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq k \\ \bar{Q} \in \mathcal{D}}} \sum_{\substack{I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{D}, I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}} \\ \max\{d(I_3, I_1), d(I_3, I_2)\} > 2\ell(I_3)^\gamma \ell(I_2)^{1-\gamma} \\ 2\ell(I_2) = \ell(I_1) = 2^{-i} \ell(Q) \\ \ell(I_3) = 2^{-k} \ell(Q), I_1 \vee I_2 \vee I_3 = Q}} \langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1, h_{I_1} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_2}^0 \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= C_0 \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k} 2^{-k\delta/2} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{I_1 \in \mathcal{D}_i(Q) \\ I_2 \in \mathcal{D}_{i+1}(Q) \\ I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_k(Q)}} a_{I_1, I_2, I_3, Q} \langle f_1, h_{I_1} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_2}^0 \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle \\
&= C_0 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^k 2^{-k\delta/2} \langle \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i, i+1, k}, f_3 \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that for any $C_0 \geq C_1$, the estimate (3.7) and the condition $(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{F}$ imply

$$(3.8) \quad |a_{I_1, I_2, I_3, Q}| \leq \mathbf{F}(Q) \frac{|I_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^2}$$

with

$$(3.9) \quad \mathbf{F}(Q) \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_N := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{Q \notin \mathcal{Q}(N)} \mathbf{F}(Q) = 0.$$

In the current scenario, the exact form of $\mathbf{F}(Q)$ is given by

$$\mathbf{F}(Q) := F_1(\ell(Q)) F_2(2^{-k} \ell(Q)) F_3(\text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I})).$$

In fact we do not care about the exact form of $\mathbf{F}(Q)$, but just require (3.8) and (3.9).

3.3. Adjacent part. In this case, by [65, Lemma 4.3], there exists a minimal cube $Q := I_1 \vee I_2 \vee I_3 \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$(3.10) \quad I_1 \cup I_2 \cup I_3 \subset Q \quad \text{and} \quad \ell(Q) \leq 2^r \ell(I_3).$$

We would like to prove

$$(3.11) \quad |\langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle| \leq C_2 \left[\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(Q)} \right]^{\frac{\delta}{2}} F(I_1, I_2, I_3, Q) \frac{|I_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^2},$$

where $F(I_1, I_2, I_3, Q) := F(I_2)$ if $I_3 = I_1$ and $I_2 \in \text{ch}(I_3)$, otherwise

$$F(I_1, I_2, I_3, Q) := F_1(\ell(I_3)) \tilde{F}_2(\ell(I_3)) F_3(\text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I})).$$

Recall that \tilde{F}_2 is defined in (3.2).

First, consider the case $I_3 \cap I_1 = \emptyset$. In this case, $d(I_3, I_1) \leq 2\ell(I_3)^\gamma \ell(I_2)^{1-\gamma} \leq 2\ell(I_1)$, and hence, $I_3 \subset 7I_1 \setminus I_1$. Then the size condition gives

$$(3.12) \quad |\langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle| \leq |I_1|^{-\frac{1}{2}} |I_2|^{-\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{I_2} \int_{I_1} \int_{I_3} \frac{F(x, y, z) dx dy dz}{(|x-y| + |x-z|)^{2n}},$$

where

$$F(x, y, z) := F_1(|x-y| + |x-z|) F_2(|x-y| + |x-z|) F_3 \left(1 + \frac{|x+y| + |x+z|}{1 + |x-y| + |x-z|} \right).$$

Let $\beta \in (0, 1)$ be an auxiliary parameter. Note that for any $x \in I_3$, we have $I_2 - x \subset \{|z| \leq \ell(Q)\}$ and

$$(3.13) \quad \int_{I_2} \frac{dz}{|x-z|^{n-\beta}} = \int_{I_2-x} \frac{dz}{|z|^{n-\beta}} \lesssim \int_0^{\ell(Q)} t^{\beta-1} dt \lesssim \ell(Q)^\beta.$$

Additionally, given $q \in (1, \frac{n+1}{n+\beta})$, Lemma 2.29 yields

$$(3.14) \quad \int_{I_1} \int_{7I_1 \setminus I_1} \frac{F_2(|x-y|)}{|x-y|^{n+\beta}} dx dy$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \left[\int_{I_1} \int_{7I_1 \setminus I_1} \frac{dx dy}{|x-y|^{q(n+\beta)}} \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \left[\int_{I_1} \int_{7I_1 \setminus I_1} F_2(|x-y|)^{q'} dx dy \right]^{\frac{1}{q'}} \\ &\lesssim |I_1|^{\frac{2}{q}-1-\frac{\beta}{n}} \tilde{F}_2(\ell(I_1)) |I_1|^{\frac{2}{q'}} \leq \tilde{F}_2(\ell(I_3)) |I_1| \ell(I_1)^{-\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

and for all $(x, y, z) \in I_3 \times I_1 \times I_2$, $|x-y| + |x-z| \leq 2\ell(Q) \leq 2^{r+1}\ell(I_3)$ and

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} 1 + \frac{|x+y| + |x+z|}{1 + |x-y| + |x-z|} &\geq \frac{2(|y| + |z|)}{1 + |x-y| + |x-z|} \\ &\geq \frac{4d(Q, \mathbb{I})}{1 + 2\ell(Q)} \geq \frac{d(Q, \mathbb{I})}{\max\{\ell(Q), 1\}} = \text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, invoking (3.10)–(3.15), we arrive at

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle| &\lesssim |I_1|^{-\frac{1}{2}} |I_2|^{-\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{-\frac{1}{2}} F_1(\ell(I_3)) F_3(\text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I})) \\ &\quad \times \int_{I_1} \int_{7I_1 \setminus I_1} \frac{F_2(|x-y|)}{|x-y|^{n+\beta}} \left(\int_{I_2} \frac{dz}{|x-z|^{n-\beta}} \right) dx dy \\ &\lesssim F_1(\ell(I_3)) \tilde{F}_2(\ell(I_3)) F_3(\text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I})) \frac{|I_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^2} \left(\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

In the same way, we have the same bound in the case $I_3 \cap I_2 = \emptyset$.

Next, we treat the case $I_3 \cap I_2 \neq \emptyset$ and $I_3 = I_1$. Obviously, $I_2 \in \text{ch}(I_3)$. Then we rewrite

$$(3.17) \quad \langle T(h_{I_3}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle = \sum_{I_3', I_3'' \in \text{ch}(I_3)} \langle h_{I_3} \rangle_{I_3'} \langle h_{I_3} \rangle_{I_3''} |I_2|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle T(\mathbf{1}_{I_3'}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), \mathbf{1}_{I_3''} \rangle.$$

If $I_3' = I_2 = I_3''$, the weak compactness property implies

$$(3.18) \quad |\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{I_2}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), \mathbf{1}_{I_2} \rangle| \leq F(I_2) |I_2|.$$

If $I_3' \neq I_2$, then $I_3'' \subset 3I_2 \setminus I_2$, which is similar to the case $I_3 \cap I_1 = \emptyset$. As in (3.16), there holds

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{I_3'}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), \mathbf{1}_{I_3''} \rangle| &\lesssim F_1(\ell(I_3'')) \tilde{F}_2(\ell(I_3')) F_3(\text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I})) \frac{|I_3'| |I_2| |I_3''|}{|Q|^2} \left(\frac{\ell(I_3'')}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{\frac{\delta}{2}} \\ &\lesssim F_1(\ell(I_3)) \tilde{F}_2(\ell(I_3)) F_3(\text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I})) \frac{|I_1| |I_2| |I_3|}{|Q|^2} \left(\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, in the case $I_3' \neq I_2$, one has

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{I_3'}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), \mathbf{1}_{I_3''} \rangle| &= |\langle T^{*1}(\mathbf{1}_{I_3''), \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), \mathbf{1}_{I_3'} \rangle| \\ &\lesssim F_1(\ell(I_3)) \tilde{F}_2(\ell(I_3)) F_3(\text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I})) \frac{|I_1| |I_2| |I_3|}{|Q|^2} \left(\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Gathering (3.17)–(3.20), we obtain (3.11).

In this situation, one has $\ell(I_1) \simeq \ell(I_2) \simeq \ell(I_3) \simeq \ell(Q)$. Letting

$$\mathbf{F}(Q) := \max \left\{ \sum_{Q' \in \text{ch}(Q)} F(Q'), F_1(\ell(Q)) \tilde{F}_2(\ell(Q)) F_3(\text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I})) \right\},$$

we invoke (3.11) to obtain

$$(3.21) \quad |\langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle| \leq C_2 \left[\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(Q)} \right]^{\frac{\delta}{2}} \mathbf{F}(Q) \frac{|I_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^2}.$$

Set

$$a_{I_1, I_2, I_3, Q} := \frac{\langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle}{C_0[\ell(I_3)/\ell(Q)]^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}$$

if $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}$ satisfy $\ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_1) = 2\ell(I_2)$, $\max\{d(I_3, I_1), d(I_3, I_2)\} \leq 2\ell(I_3)^\gamma \ell(I_2)^{1-\gamma}$, and $I_3 \cap I_1 = \emptyset$ or $I_3 \cap I_2 = \emptyset$ or $I_3 = I_1$, and otherwise set $a_{I_1, I_2, I_3, Q} = 0$. Then by (3.21) and that $(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{F}$, we see that (3.8) and (3.9) hold whenever $C_0 \geq \max\{C_1, C_2\}$. Thus, in light of (3.10) and (3.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^2 &= \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k \leq r} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{D}, I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}} \\ \max\{d(I_3, I_1), d(I_3, I_2)\} \leq 2\ell(I_3)^\gamma \ell(I_2)^{1-\gamma} \\ I_3 \cap I_1 = \emptyset \text{ or } I_3 \cap I_2 = \emptyset \text{ or } I_3 = I_1 \\ 2\ell(I_2) = \ell(I_1) = 2^{-i}\ell(Q) \\ \ell(I_3) = 2^{-k}\ell(Q), I_1 \vee I_2 \vee I_3 = Q}} \langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1, h_{I_1} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_2}^0 \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle \\ &= C_0 \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k \leq r} 2^{-k\delta/2} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{I_1 \in \mathcal{D}_i(Q) \\ I_2 \in \mathcal{D}_{i+1}(Q) \\ I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_k(Q)}} a_{I_1, I_2, I_3, Q} \langle f_1, h_{I_1} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_2}^0 \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle \\ &= C_0 \sum_{k=0}^r \sum_{i=0}^k 2^{-k\delta/2} \langle \mathbf{S}_D^{i, i+1, k}, f_3 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

3.4. Nested part. By definition, there holds

$$\mathcal{S}_{1,1}^3 = \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{I_2 \supset I_3} \langle T(h_{I_2^{(1)}}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1, h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_2}^0 \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle.$$

We begin with the decomposition

$$\langle T(h_{I_2^{(1)}}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle = \langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2} \langle T(1, 1), h_{I_3} \rangle - \langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2} \langle T(1, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle + \langle T(\phi_{I_2}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle,$$

where $\phi_{I_2} := \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}(h_{I_2^{(1)}} - \langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2})$. This allows us to write

$$(3.22) \quad \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^3 = \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,1} - \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,2} + \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,3},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,1} &:= \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{I_2 \supset I_3} \langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2} \langle T(1, 1), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1, h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle \langle f_2 \rangle_{I_2} \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle, \\ \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,2} &:= \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{I_2 \supset I_3} \langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2} \langle T(1, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1, h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle \langle f_2 \rangle_{I_2} \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle, \\ \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,3} &:= \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{I_2 \supset I_3} \langle T(\phi_{I_2}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1, h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle \langle f_2 \rangle_{I_2} \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, considering $\mathcal{S}_{1,2}$, we obtain the corresponding paraproduct term

$$\mathcal{S}_{1,2}^{3,1} := \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{I_2 \supset I_3} \langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2} \langle T(1, 1), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1 \rangle_{I_2^{(1)}} \langle f_2, h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle.$$

Note that

$$\langle f, h_{I^{(1)}} \rangle \langle h_{I^{(1)}} \rangle_I = \langle f \rangle_I - \langle f \rangle_{I^{(1)}},$$

which gives

$$\langle f_1, h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle \langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2} \langle f_2 \rangle_{I_2} + \langle f_1 \rangle_{I_2^{(1)}} \langle f_2, h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle \langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2} = \langle f_1 \rangle_{I_2} \langle f_2 \rangle_{I_2} - \langle f_1 \rangle_{I_2^{(1)}} \langle f_2 \rangle_{I_2^{(1)}}.$$

Hence, this leads to

$$(3.23) \quad \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,1} + \mathcal{S}_{1,2}^{3,1} = \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \langle T(1, 1), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1 \rangle_{I_3} \langle f_2 \rangle_{I_3} \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle = C_0 \langle \Pi_{\mathbf{b}}(f_1, f_2), f_3 \rangle,$$

where we set

$$b_I = C_0^{-1} \langle T(1, 1), h_I \rangle, \quad \text{if } I \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}},$$

otherwise set $b_I = 0$. Choose $C_0 \geq \max\{C_1, C_2, \|T(1, 1)\|_{\text{BMO}}\}$. Then the fact $T(1, 1) \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ implies the sequence $\mathbf{b} := \{b_I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$ belongs to $\text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

To analyze $\mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,2}$, we claim that

$$(3.24) \quad |\langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2}| |\langle T(1, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle| \leq C_3 \left[\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(I_2)} \right]^{\frac{\delta}{2}} F(I_2, I_3) |I_2|^{-\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where

$$(3.25) \quad F(I_2, I_3) := F_1(\ell(I_3)) \tilde{F}_2(\ell(I_3)) \tilde{F}_3(I_2).$$

Recall that \tilde{F}_2 and \tilde{F}_3 are defined in (3.2). Indeed, if $\ell(I_2) > 2^r \ell(I_3)$, then for all $x \in I_3$ and $z \in I_2^c$, the goodness of I_3 yields

$$(3.26) \quad |x - z| \geq d(I_3, I_2^c) > 2\ell(I_3)^\gamma \ell(I_2)^{1-\gamma} \geq \ell(I_3)^{\frac{1}{2}} \ell(I_2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq \ell(I_3) \geq 2|x - c_{I_3}|,$$

which together with the Hölder condition of K implies

$$(3.27) \quad |\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{3I_3}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle| \leq |I_3|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{I_2^c} \int_{3I_3} \int_{I_3} \frac{F(x, y, z) \ell(I_3)^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}} dx dy dz,$$

where

$$(3.28) \quad F(x, y, z) := F_1(|x - c_{I_3}|) F_2(|x - y| + |x - z|) F_3 \left(1 + \frac{|x + y| + |x + z|}{1 + |x - y| + |x - z|} \right).$$

The inequality (3.13) gives

$$(3.29) \quad \int_{3I_3} \frac{dy}{|x - y|^{n-\beta}} \lesssim \ell(I_3)^\beta, \quad x \in I_3,$$

and for any $\alpha > 0$ and $\ell := \ell(I_3)^{\frac{1}{2}} \ell(I_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$,

$$(3.30) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi(\alpha) &:= \int_{I_3} \int_{|x-z| \geq \ell} F_3 \left(\frac{4|x|}{1 + |x - z|} \right) \frac{dz dx}{|x - z|^{n+\alpha}} \\ &\leq \sum_{k \geq 0} \int_{I_3} \int_{2^k \ell \leq |x-z| < 2^{k+1} \ell} (2^k \ell)^{-n-\alpha} F_3(\text{rd}(2^k I_2, \mathbb{I})) dz dx \\ &\lesssim |I_3| [\ell(I_3)^{\frac{1}{2}} \ell(I_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}]^{-\alpha} \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{-k\alpha} F_3(\text{rd}(2^k I_2, \mathbb{I})) \end{aligned}$$

provided that for all $x \in I_3$ and $2^k \ell \leq |x - z| < 2^{k+1} \ell$,

$$\frac{4|x|}{1 + |x - z|} \geq \frac{4d(2^k I_2, 0)}{1 + 2^{k+1} \ell(I_2)} \geq \frac{d(2^k I_2, 0)}{\max\{2^k \ell(I_2), 1\}} = \text{rd}(2^k I_2, \mathbb{I}).$$

Then it follows from (3.26)–(3.30) that

$$(3.31) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{3I_3}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle| &\lesssim F_1(\ell(I_3))F_2(\ell(I_3))|I_3|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\ell(I_3)^{\delta+\beta}\psi(\delta+\beta) \\ &\lesssim F_1(\ell(I_3))F_2(\ell(I_3))\tilde{F}_3(I_2)|I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(I_2)}\right)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by (3.26), we see that for any $x \in I_3$, $y \in (3I_3)^c$, and $z \in I_2^c$,

$$\begin{aligned} |x-y|+|x-z| &\geq \max\{|x-y|, |x-z|\} \geq |x-z| \\ &\geq \ell(I_3)^{\frac{1}{2}}\ell(I_2)^{\frac{1}{2}} =: \ell \geq \ell(I_3) \geq 2|x-c_{I_3}|, \end{aligned}$$

which along with the Hölder condition of K leads to

$$|\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{(3I_3)^c}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle| \leq |I_3|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{I_3} \left[\int_{I_2^c} \int_{(3I_3)^c} \frac{\ell(I_3)^\delta F(x, y, z)}{(|x-y|+|x-z|)^{2n+\delta}} dy dz \right] dx,$$

where $F(x, y, z)$ is defined in (3.28). Given $k \geq 0$ and $x \in I_3 \subset I_2$, letting

$$R_k(x) := \{(y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} : 2^k \ell \leq |x-y|+|x-z| < 2^{k+1} \ell\},$$

we have for all $(y, z) \in R_k(x)$,

$$1 + \frac{|x+y|+|x+z|}{1+|x-y|+|x-z|} \geq \frac{4|x|}{1+2^{k+1}\ell(I_2)} \geq \frac{d(2^k I_2, 0)}{\max\{2^k \ell(I_2), 1\}} = \text{rd}(2^k I_2, \mathbb{I}).$$

Thus, using the estimates above and the monotonicity of F_1, F_2, F_3 , we conclude

$$(3.32) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{(3I_3)^c}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle| &\lesssim F_1(\ell(I_3))F_2(\ell(I_3))|I_3|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\ell(I_3)^\delta \\ &\quad \times \int_{I_3} \left[\sum_{k \geq 0} \iint_{R_k(x)} \frac{F_3(\text{rd}(2^k I_2, \mathbb{I}))}{(2^k \ell)^{2n+\delta}} dy dz \right] dx \\ &\lesssim F_1(\ell(I_3))F_2(\ell(I_3))|I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}}\ell(I_3)^\delta \ell^{-\delta} \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{-k\delta} F_3(\text{rd}(2^k I_2, \mathbb{I})) \\ &\leq F_1(\ell(I_3))F_2(\ell(I_3))\tilde{F}_3(I_2)|I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(I_2)}\right)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, (3.31) and (3.32) imply (3.24) in the case $\ell(I_2) > 2^r \ell(I_3)$.

To treat the case $\ell(I_2) \leq 2^r \ell(I_3)$, we split

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle &= \langle T(\mathbf{1}_{3I_3}, \mathbf{1}_{3I_2 \setminus I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle + \langle T(\mathbf{1}_{3I_3}, \mathbf{1}_{(3I_2)^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle T(\mathbf{1}_{(3I_3)^c}, \mathbf{1}_{3I_2 \setminus I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle + \langle T(\mathbf{1}_{(3I_3)^c}, \mathbf{1}_{(3I_2)^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The first term is similar to $\langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle$ in the case $I_3 \cap I_2 = \emptyset$ in Section 3.3, which along with (3.11) yields the desired bound. The second and third terms are symmetric, while the estimates for the second and last terms are analogous to (3.31) and (3.32) respectively, but now ℓ is replaced by $\ell(I_3)$. Eventually, both are dominated by $F_1(\ell(I_3))F_2(\ell(I_3))\tilde{F}_3(I_2)|I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}}$, which together with $\ell(I_2) \simeq \ell(I_3)$ gives the estimate as desired. This shows (3.24) in the case $\ell(I_2) \leq 2^r \ell(I_3)$.

For $\mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,3}$, we have

$$(3.33) \quad |\langle T(\phi_{I_2}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle| \leq C_4 \left[\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(I_2)} \right]^{\frac{\delta}{2}} F(I_2, I_3) |I_2|^{-\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $F(I_2, I_3)$ is defined in (3.25). Indeed, in the case $\ell(I_2) > 2^r \ell(I_3)$, it is similar to $\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{(3I_3)^c}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle$. If $\ell(I_2) \leq 2^r \ell(I_3)$, we split

$$\langle T(\phi_{I_2}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle = \langle T(\phi_{I_2} \mathbf{1}_{3I_2 \setminus I_2}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle + \langle T(\phi_{I_2} \mathbf{1}_{(3I_2)^c}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle,$$

where the last two terms are similar to $\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{3I_3}, \mathbf{1}_{3I_2 \setminus I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle$ and $\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{3I_3}, \mathbf{1}_{(3I_2)^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle$ respectively.

Now set

$$a_{I_2, I_3} := \frac{\langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2} \langle T(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle + \langle T(\phi_{I_2}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle}{C_0 [\ell(I_3) / \ell(I_2)]^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}$$

if $I_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}$ satisfy $I_3 \subset I_2$, and otherwise set $a_{I_2, I_3} = 0$. For any $k \geq 0$ and $I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_k(I_2)$, let

$$\mathbf{F}(I_2) := F_1(\ell(I_2)) \tilde{F}_2(2^{-k} \ell(I_2)) \tilde{F}_2(I_2).$$

Then the estimates (3.24) and (3.33) and that $(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{F}$ imply both (3.8) and (3.9) hold whenever

$$C_0 \geq \max\{C_1, C_2, C_3 + C_4, \|T(1, 1)\|_{\text{BMO}}\}.$$

Consequently, by (3.24) and (3.33), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,2} + \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,3} &= C_0 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k\delta/2} \sum_{I_2 \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_k(I_2)} a_{I_2, I_3} \langle f_1, h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_2^0} \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle \\ &= C_0 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-k\delta/2} \langle \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{0,1,k}, f_3 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

For the remaining terms, one can obtain the corresponding dyadic shifts symmetrically and similarly. To guarantee (3.8) holds, choose C_0 to be the largest one of finite bounds $\|T(1, 1)\|_{\text{BMO}}$, $\|T^{*1}(1, 1)\|_{\text{BMO}}$, $\|T^{*2}(1, 1)\|_{\text{BMO}}$, and C_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots$. Collecting all parts together, we conclude the proof of the compact dyadic representation theorem.

4. CHARACTERIZATIONS OF COMPACTNESS

4.1. Unweighted Kolmogorov–Riesz theorems.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $1 < p, q < \infty$, $w \in A_p$, and $\mathcal{K} \subset L^{p,q}(w)$. Then \mathcal{K} is precompact in $L^{p,q}(w)$ if and only if the following are satisfied:*

- (a) $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} < \infty$,
- (b) $\lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f \mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} = 0$,
- (c) $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f - \langle f \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)}\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} = 0$.

Moreover, in the case $q = \infty$, the conditions (a), (b), and (c) are sufficient, but (b) and (c) are not necessary.

Proof. First, let us prove the necessity. Assume that \mathcal{K} is precompact in $L^{p,q}(w)$. In particular, \mathcal{K} is totally bounded. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a finite number of functions $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^N \subset \mathcal{K}$ such that $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^N B(f_k, \varepsilon)$, where

$$B(f_k, \varepsilon) := \{f \in L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n) : \|f - f_k\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} < \varepsilon\}, \quad k = 1, \dots, N.$$

Let $f \in \mathcal{K}$ be an arbitrary function. Then there exists some $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$,

$$(4.2) \quad \|f - f_k\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \leq \varepsilon.$$

which gives

$$\|f\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \lesssim \|f - f_k\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} + \|f_k\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \leq \varepsilon + \max_{1 \leq k \leq N} \|f_k\|_{L^{p,q}(w)}.$$

This shows the condition (a). Note that

$$(4.3) \quad w \in A_p \implies w, w^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Since $\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is dense in $L^{p,q}(w)$ (cf. Lemma A.4), there exists $g_k \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$\|f_k - g_k\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \leq \varepsilon,$$

which together with (4.2) implies

$$(4.4) \quad \|f - g_k\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \lesssim \|f - f_k\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} + \|f_k - g_k\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

Set $\text{supp } g_k \subset B(0, A_k)$ for each $k = 1, \dots, N$, and $A_0 := \max\{A_1, \dots, A_N\}$. Then for any $A \geq A_0$, by (4.2) and (4.4),

$$\|f \mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \lesssim \|f - g_k\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} + \|g_k \mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

which justifies the condition (b). To proceed, we split

$$(4.5) \quad \|f - \langle f \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)}\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \lesssim \|f - g_k\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} + \|g_k - \langle g_k \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)}\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \\ + \|\langle g_k \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)} - \langle f \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)}\|_{L^{p,q}(w)}.$$

Since $g_k \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, there exists some $r_0 > 0$ so that

$$\sup_{|x-y| < r_0} |g_k(x) - g_k(y)| \leq \varepsilon w(B(0, 2A_0))^{-\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Hence, for any $0 < r < \min\{r_0, A_0\}$, this in turn gives

$$(4.6) \quad \|g_k - \langle g_k \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)}\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \leq \left\| \mathbf{1}_{B(0, 2A_0)} \int_{B(0, r)} |g_k(\cdot) - g_k(\cdot + y)| dy \right\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

To treat the last term, observe that

$$|\langle g_k \rangle_{B(x, r)} - \langle f \rangle_{B(x, r)}| \leq \int_{B(x, r)} |f - g_k| dy \leq M(f - g_k)(x),$$

and

$$(4.7) \quad \|Mh\|_{L^{s,t}(v)} \lesssim \|h\|_{L^{s,t}(v)}, \quad 1 < s < \infty, \quad 1 \leq t \leq \infty, \quad v \in A_s,$$

where the latter was given in [15, eq. (2.55)]. In view of (4.4), these in turn yield

$$(4.8) \quad \|\langle g_k \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)} - \langle f \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)}\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \leq \|M(f - g_k)\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \lesssim \|f - g_k\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

Gathering (4.2)–(4.8), we deduce that for any $r \in (0, r_0)$,

$$\|f - \langle f \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)}\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \lesssim \varepsilon, \quad \text{uniformly in } f \in \mathcal{K}.$$

This shows the condition (c).

Next, we turn to the sufficiency. Assume that the conditions (a), (b), and (c) hold. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, the conditions (b) and (c) imply that there exist $A > 0$ and $r > 0$ such that

$$(4.9) \quad \|f \mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \|f - \langle f \rangle_{B(\cdot,r)}\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{K}.$$

By (2.22), there exists $\kappa \in (1, p)$ so that $w \in A_\kappa$. Thus, $w, w^{1-\kappa'} \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Pick $p_0 \in (1, p/\kappa)$, $p_1 \in (\kappa p_0, p)$, and $s = \frac{p_1}{p_0}$. Then,

$$(4.10) \quad \frac{1}{s-1} < \frac{1}{\kappa-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\kappa-1}{s-1} \frac{1}{p_0 s'} = \frac{\kappa-1}{p_1}.$$

Recall the well-known Kolmogorov's inequality (see [35, Exercise 1.1.11]):

$$(4.11) \quad \left(\int_E |f|^s d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \leq \left(\frac{t}{t-s} \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \mu(E)^{-\frac{1}{t}} \|f\|_{L^{t,\infty}(E)}, \quad 0 < s < t < \infty,$$

where E is a measurable set with $0 < \mu(E) < \infty$.

Fix $x \in \overline{B(0, A)}$, and denote $B := B(x, r) \subset B(0, 2A+r) =: B_0$. Then by Hölder's inequality, (4.10), and (4.11),

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \left(\int_B |f|^{p_0} dz \right)^{\frac{1}{p_0}} &= \left(\int_B |f|^{p_0} w^{\frac{1}{s}} w^{-\frac{1}{s}} dz \right)^{\frac{1}{p_0}} \\ &\leq \left(\int_B |f|^{p_1} w dz \right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \left(\int_B w^{-\frac{1}{s-1}} dz \right)^{\frac{1}{p_0 s'}} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{w(B)}{|B|} \right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \left(\int_B |f|^{p_1} dw \right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \left(\int_B w^{-\frac{1}{\kappa-1}} dz \right)^{\frac{\kappa-1}{s-1} \frac{1}{p_0 s'}} \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{w(B)}{|B|} \right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} w(B)^{-\frac{1}{p}} \|f\|_{L^{p,\infty}(w)} \left(\int_B w^{1-\kappa'} dz \right)^{\frac{\kappa-1}{p_1}} \\ &\lesssim |B|^{-\frac{\kappa}{p_1}} w(B)^{\frac{1}{p_1} - \frac{1}{p}} w^{1-\kappa'}(B)^{\frac{\kappa-1}{p_1}} \|f\|_{L^{p,\infty}(w)} \\ &\lesssim r^{-\frac{n\kappa}{p_1}} w(B_0)^{\frac{1}{p_1} - \frac{1}{p}} w^{1-\kappa'}(B_0)^{\frac{\kappa-1}{p_1}} \|f\|_{L^{p,q}(w)}. \end{aligned}$$

The fact $w, w^{1-\kappa'} \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ gives $w(B_0), w^{1-\kappa'}(B_0) < \infty$. Now invoking (4.12), we have for any $x, y \in \overline{B(0, A)}$,

$$(4.13) \quad |\langle f \rangle_{B(x,r)}| \lesssim r^{-\frac{n\kappa}{p_1}} w(B_0)^{\frac{1}{p_1} - \frac{1}{p}} w^{1-\kappa'}(B_0)^{\frac{\kappa-1}{p_1}} \|f\|_{L^{p,q}(w)},$$

and

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle f \rangle_{B(x,r)} - \langle f \rangle_{B(y,r)}| &\leq \frac{1}{|B(0, r)|} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f(z)| |\mathbf{1}_{B(x,r)} - \mathbf{1}_{B(y,r)}| dz \\ &\lesssim r^{-n} \left(\int_{B(x,r) \cup B(y,r)} |f|^{p_0} dz \right)^{\frac{1}{p_0}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\mathbf{1}_{B(x,r)} - \mathbf{1}_{B(y,r)}|^{p'_0} dz \right)^{\frac{1}{p'_0}} \\ &\lesssim r^{-\frac{n}{p_0} - \frac{n\kappa}{p_1}} w(B_0)^{\frac{1}{p_1} - \frac{1}{p}} w^{1-\kappa'}(B_0)^{\frac{\kappa-1}{p_1}} \|f\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\mathbf{1}_{B(x,r)} - \mathbf{1}_{B(y,r)}| dz \right)^{\frac{1}{p'_0}}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the condition (a) and (4.13)–(4.14) that $\{\langle f \rangle_{B(x,r)}\}_{f \in \mathcal{K}}$ is equi-bounded and equi-continuous on the closed ball $\overline{B(0, A)}$. Hence, by the classical Ascoli–Arzelà theorem (cf.

[90, p. 85]), it is precompact in $\mathcal{C}(\overline{B(0, A)})$, and hence, totally bounded in $\mathcal{C}(\overline{B(0, A)})$. Then, one can find a finite number of functions $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^N \subset \mathcal{K}$ such that

$$\inf_{1 \leq j \leq N} \sup_{|x| \leq A} |\langle f \rangle_{B(x, r)} - \langle f_j \rangle_{B(x, r)}| \leq \varepsilon w(B(0, A))^{-\frac{1}{p}} \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{K},$$

which gives that for each $f \in \mathcal{K}$ there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ such that

$$(4.15) \quad \sup_{|x| \leq A} |\langle f \rangle_{B(x, r)} - \langle f_j \rangle_{B(x, r)}| \leq \varepsilon w(B(0, A))^{-\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Consequently, we utilize (4.9) and (4.15) to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - f_j\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} &\lesssim \|(f - f_j)\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)}\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} + \|(f - f_j)\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} \\ &\lesssim \|(f - \langle f \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)})\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)}\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} + \|(\langle f \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)} - \langle f_j \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)})\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)}\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} \\ &\quad + \|(\langle f_j \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)} - f_j)\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)}\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} + \|f\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} + \|f_j\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} \\ &\leq \|f - \langle f \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)}\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} + \varepsilon w(B(0, A))^{-\frac{1}{p}} \|\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)}\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} \\ &\quad + \|f_j - \langle f_j \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)}\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} + \|f\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} + \|f_j\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} \\ &\lesssim 5\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that \mathcal{K} is totally bounded. Therefore, \mathcal{K} is precompact in $L^{p, q}(w)$.

Finally, let us treat the case $q = \infty$. One can easily verify that the proof of the sufficiency above still holds. The necessity of the condition (a) is trivial. To show that the conditions (b) and (c) are not necessary, we construct a counterexample in \mathbb{R} . Given $1 < p < \infty$, denote

$$w \equiv 1 \in A_p \quad \text{and} \quad f(x) := |x|^{-\frac{1}{p}} \mathbf{1}_{\{x > 0\}}.$$

Then $\|f\|_{L^{p, \infty}} = 1$. Let $r > 0$. For any $0 < x < r$,

$$\int_{B(x, r)} f(y) dy = \frac{1}{2r} \int_0^{x+r} y^{-\frac{1}{p}} dy = \frac{p}{2r(p-1)} (x+r)^{1-\frac{1}{p}},$$

and hence, for all $0 < x < 2r \left(\frac{p-1}{2p}\right)^p$,

$$f(x) - \int_{B(x, r)} f(y) dy \geq x^{-\frac{1}{p}} - \frac{p}{2r(p-1)} (2r)^{1-\frac{1}{p}} > \frac{x^{-\frac{1}{p}}}{2}.$$

Then for every $\lambda > p'(2r)^{-\frac{1}{p}}$ (equivalently, $(2\lambda)^{-p} < 2r \left(\frac{p-1}{2p}\right)^p$), the above inequality gives

$$|\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |f(x) - \langle f \rangle_{B(x, r)}| > \lambda\}| \geq \left| \left\{ 0 < x < 2r \left(\frac{p-1}{2p}\right)^p : \frac{x^{-\frac{1}{p}}}{2} > \lambda \right\} \right| = (2\lambda)^{-p},$$

which immediately implies

$$(4.16) \quad \|f - \langle f \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)}\|_{L^{p, \infty}} \geq 1/2, \quad \text{for all } r > 0.$$

Additionally, for all $A > 0$ and $0 < \lambda < A^{-\frac{1}{p}}$,

$$\lambda |\{x \in B(0, A)^c : |f(x)| > \lambda\}|^{\frac{1}{p}} = \lambda(\lambda^{-p} - A)^{\frac{1}{p}} = (1 - A\lambda^p)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

which leads to

$$(4.17) \quad \|f\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}\|_{L^{p, \infty}} = 1, \quad \text{for all } A > 0.$$

Since $\mathcal{K} := \{f\}$ is a compact set in $L^{p, \infty}(\mathbb{R})$, the estimates (4.16) and (4.17) show that the conditions (b) and (c) are not necessary. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Before starting the proof, let us give some reductions. Denote

$$\mathcal{K}^+ := \{f^+ : f \in \mathcal{K}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{K}^- := \{f^- : f \in \mathcal{K}\},$$

where

$$f^+ := (|f| + f)/2 \quad \text{and} \quad f^- := (|f| - f)/2.$$

Then for all $f, g \in \mathcal{K}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq f^+(x) &\leq |f(x)|, & |f^+(x) - g^+(x)| &\leq |f(x) - g(x)|, \\ 0 \leq f^-(x) &\leq |f(x)|, & |f^-(x) - g^-(x)| &\leq |f(x) - g(x)|, \\ \text{and } |f(x) - g(x)| &\leq |f^+(x) - g^+(x)| + |f^-(x) - g^-(x)|, \end{aligned}$$

which along with $(\tau_h f)^\pm = \tau_h f^\pm$ implies that

$$\text{(a)-(c) hold for } \mathcal{K} \iff \text{(a)-(c) hold for } \mathcal{K}^+ \text{ and } \mathcal{K}^-,$$

and

$$\mathcal{K} \text{ is precompact in } L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n) \iff \mathcal{K}^+ \text{ and } \mathcal{K}^- \text{ are precompact in } L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Considering these, we may assume that \mathcal{K} is a family of non-negative functions.

Pick a positive number a such that $a < \min\{1, p, q\}$. Then $1 < \frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a} < \infty$. Setting $\mathcal{K}^a := \{f^a : f \in \mathcal{K}\}$, we claim that

$$(4.18) \quad \text{(a)-(c) hold for } \mathcal{K} \subset L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n) \iff \text{(a)-(c) hold for } \mathcal{K}^a \subset L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

and

$$(4.19) \quad \mathcal{K} \text{ is precompact in } L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n) \iff \mathcal{K}^a \text{ is precompact in } L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

To justify (4.18) and (4.19), we present an elementary calculation (cf. [84]): for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$(4.20) \quad |s^\alpha - t^\alpha| \leq |s - t|^\alpha \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{s+t}{|s-t|} \right)^{1-\alpha} |s^\alpha - t^\alpha|, \quad \text{for all } s, t > 0.$$

Then for all $f, g \in \mathcal{K}$,

$$(4.21) \quad \|f^a - g^a\|_{L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}} \leq \| |f - g|^a \|_{L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}} = \|f - g\|_{L^{p,q}}^a.$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $f, g \in \mathcal{K}$, then denote

$$E_\varepsilon := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \frac{f(x) + g(x)}{|f(x) - g(x)|} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right\}.$$

By (4.20), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (4.22) \quad \|f - g\|_{L^{p,q}} &\leq \| |f - g|^a \mathbf{1}_{E_\varepsilon} \|_{L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}}^{\frac{1}{a}} + \|(f - g) \mathbf{1}_{E_\varepsilon^c}\|_{L^{p,q}} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{a-1} \| |f - g|^a \mathbf{1}_{E_\varepsilon} \|_{L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}}^{\frac{1}{a}} + \varepsilon \|(f + g) \mathbf{1}_{E_\varepsilon^c}\|_{L^{p,q}} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{a-1} \|f^a - g^a\|_{L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}}^{\frac{1}{a}} + \varepsilon \|f^a\|_{L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}}^{\frac{1}{a}} + \varepsilon \|g^a\|_{L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}}^{\frac{1}{a}} \\ &\leq \varepsilon^{a-1} \|f^a - g^a\|_{L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}}^{\frac{1}{a}} + 2\varepsilon K_0, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constants are independent of ε , f , and g . Here,

$$K_0 := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f\|_{L^{p,q}} = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f^a\|_{L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}}^{\frac{1}{a}}.$$

Thus, (4.21) and (4.22) imply (4.18) holds.

Furthermore, (4.21) gives the left-to-right implication in (4.19). To show the inverse, assume that \mathcal{K}^a is precompact in $L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and let $\{f_j\}$ be an arbitrary sequence of functions in \mathcal{K} . By the precompactness of \mathcal{K}^a , one can find a Cauchy subsequence of $\{f_j^a\}$ (which we relabel). Then $K_0 := \sup_j \|f_j^a\|_{L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}}^{\frac{1}{a}} < \infty$, and given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an integer $N = N(\varepsilon)$ such that for all $i, j \geq N$,

$$(4.23) \quad \|f_i^a - f_j^a\|_{L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}} \leq \varepsilon^a.$$

Fix $i, j \geq N$. By (4.23), the estimate (4.22) applied to $(f, g) = (f_i, f_j)$ implies

$$\|f_i - f_j\|_{L^{p,q}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{a-1} \|f_i^a - f_j^a\|_{L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}}^{\frac{1}{a}} + 2\varepsilon K_0 \leq \varepsilon^a + 2\varepsilon K_0,$$

where the implicit constants are independent of i, j , and ε . This asserts that $\{f_j\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{K} \subset L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Thus, by the completeness of $L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, \mathcal{K} is precompact in $L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

By (4.18) and (4.19), to conclude the proof, it is enough to show the case $1 < p, q < \infty$. The sufficiency follows from Theorem 4.1 and the following estimates

$$(4.24) \quad \|f - \langle f \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)}\|_{L^{p,q}} \leq \left\| \int_{B(0,r)} |f - \tau_y f| dy \right\|_{L^{p,q}} \\ \lesssim \int_{B(0,r)} \|f - \tau_y f\|_{L^{p,q}} dy \leq \sup_{|h| < r} \|\tau_h f - f\|_{L^{p,q}},$$

where to achieve the second inequality, we used the duality between $L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $L^{p',q'}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and Fubini's theorem. To show the necessity, we assume that \mathcal{K} is precompact in $L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be an arbitrary number. Then, there exists a finite number of functions $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^N \subset L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that for each $f \in \mathcal{K}$, there exists some $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ such that $\|f - f_j\|_{L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \varepsilon$. Hence,

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f\|_{L^{p,q}} \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\inf_{1 \leq j \leq N} \|f - f_j\|_{L^{p,q}} + \sup_{1 \leq j \leq N} \|f_j\|_{L^{p,q}} \right) \leq \varepsilon + \sup_{1 \leq j \leq N} \|f_j\|_{L^{p,q}},$$

which proves the condition (a) holds.

Let $f \in \mathcal{K}$. Then

$$(4.25) \quad \|f - f_j\|_{L^{p,q}} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{for some } j \in \{1, \dots, N\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is dense in $L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (cf. Lemma A.4), there exists $g_j \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\|f_j - g_j\|_{L^{p,q}} \leq \varepsilon$. This together with (4.25) gives

$$(4.26) \quad \|f - g_j\|_{L^{p,q}} \leq \|f - f_j\|_{L^{p,q}} + \|f_j - g_j\|_{L^{p,q}} \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

If we let $A_0 > 0$ satisfy $\bigcup_{j=1}^N \text{supp } g_j \subset B(0, A_0)$, then for any $A \geq A_0$, (4.26) implies

$$\|f \mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^{p,q}} \lesssim \|f - g_j\|_{L^{p,q}} + \|g_j \mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^{p,q}} \leq 2\varepsilon,$$

which coincides with the condition (b). Moreover, by the fact $g_j \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, there exists $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$(4.27) \quad \sup_{|x-y| < \delta_0} |g_j(x) - g_j(y)| \leq \varepsilon |B(0, 2A_0)|^{-\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Consequently, for every $|h| < \min\{\delta_0, A_0\}$, the inequality (4.27) yields

$$(4.28) \quad \|\tau_h g_j - g_j\|_{L^{p,q}} \leq \varepsilon |B(0, 2A_0)|^{-\frac{1}{p}} \|\mathbf{1}_{B(0, 2A_0)}\|_{L^{p,q}} \lesssim \varepsilon,$$

provided $\text{supp}(\tau_h g_j - g_j) \subset B(0, 2A_0)$. Invoking (4.26) and (4.28), we deduce that for all $|h| < \min\{\delta_0, A_0\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tau_h f - f\|_{L^{p,q}} &\leq \|\tau_h f - \tau_h g_j\|_{L^{p,q}} + \|\tau_h g_j - g_j\|_{L^{p,q}} + \|g_j - f\|_{L^{p,q}} \\ &= 2\|f - g_j\|_{L^{p,q}} + \|\tau_h g_j - g_j\|_{L^{p,q}} \lesssim 5\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant is independent of ε , h , and f . This immediately implies the condition (c) as desired.

It remains to deal with the case $0 < p < \infty$ and $q = \infty$. As above, we are reduced to treating the case $1 < p < \infty$. The sufficiency of (a), (b), and (c) is a consequence of Theorem 4.1 and (4.24) with $q = \infty$. To obtain the latter, we use the duality between $L^{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $L^{p',1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, see [35, Exercise 1.4.12]. In addition, the necessity of (a) is trivial, while by Theorem 4.1, (b) is not necessary. To prove (c) is not necessary, we denote

$$f(x) := |x|^{-\frac{1}{p}} \mathbf{1}_{\{x>0\}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then $\|f\|_{L^{p,\infty}} = 1$, and for any $h > 0$, $\tau_h f(x) = |x-h|^{-\frac{1}{p}}$ if $x > h$, $\tau_h f(x) = 0$ if $x \leq h$. Thus, for all $h > 0$ and $\lambda > h^{-\frac{1}{p}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |\tau_h f(x) - f(x)| > \lambda\}| &\geq |\{0 < x < h : |\tau_h f(x) - f(x)| > \lambda\}| \\ &= |\{0 < x < h : |x|^{-\frac{1}{p}} > \lambda\}| = \lambda^{-p}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\|\tau_h f - f\|_{L^{p,\infty}} \geq 1, \quad \text{for all } h > 0.$$

This asserts that $\mathcal{K} := \{f\}$ is a compact set in $L^{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R})$, but does not satisfy the condition (c). \square

4.2. Weighted Kolmogorov–Riesz theorems.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Write $p_0 := 1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}$. By the rescaling argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.3, it suffices to consider the case $p_0^2 < p, q < \infty$. Pick $p_1 \in (p_0^2, p)$ and $s = \frac{p_1}{p_0}$. Similarly to (4.24), there holds

$$\|f - \langle f \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)}\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \lesssim \int_{B(0,r)} \|f - \tau_y f\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} dy \leq \sup_{|h|<r} \|\tau_h f - f\|_{L^{p,q}(w)}.$$

Thus, the proof is analogous to that of the sufficiency of Theorem 4.1, where κ is replaced by p_0 .

Since $\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is dense in $L^{p,q}(w)$ (cf. Lemma A.4), the necessity of (a) and (b) can be shown much as in the proof of the necessity of Theorem 1.3. The condition (c) is not necessary because [16, Theorem 2.8 (b)] presented a counterexample in the case $w \in A_2$ and $0 < p = q < \infty$.

When $q = \infty$, the sufficiency of (a)–(c) can be proved as above, while by Theorem 1.3, (b) and (c) are not necessary. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.5. To show the sufficiency, assume that the conditions (a)–(c) hold. As argued in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we assume that \mathcal{K} is a family of non-negative functions. Since

$$|f^a(x) - \langle f^a \rangle_{B(x,r)}| \leq \int_{B(0,r)} |\tau_y f(x) - f(x)|^a dy,$$

the conditions (a)–(c) imply

$$(4.29) \quad \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f^a\|_{L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}(w)} < \infty,$$

$$(4.30) \quad \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f^a \mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}\|_{L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}(w)} = 0,$$

$$(4.31) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f^a - \langle f^a \rangle_{B(\cdot, r)}\|_{L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}(w)} = 0.$$

Note that $1 < \frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a} < \infty$ and $w \in A_{p_0} \subset A_{\frac{p}{a}}$. Then by Theorem 4.1 and (4.29)–(4.31), $\mathcal{K}^a := \{f^a : f \in \mathcal{K}\}$ is precompact in $L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}(w)$. Much as in (4.19), one can prove that \mathcal{K} is precompact in $L^{p, q}(w)$.

To justify the necessity, assume that \mathcal{K} is precompact in $L^{p, q}(w)$. The condition $w \in A_{p_0}$ implies $w, w^{1-p'_0} \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then this, together with Theorem 1.4, gives the conditions (a) and (b). To check (c), let $\varepsilon > 0$. By the precompactness of \mathcal{K} , there exists a finite number of functions $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^N \subset \mathcal{K}$ such that $\inf_{1 \leq j \leq N} \|f - f_j\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} \leq \varepsilon$ for all $f \in \mathcal{K}$. Fix $f \in \mathcal{K}$. Then there is some $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ such that

$$(4.32) \quad \|f - f_j\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} \leq \varepsilon.$$

By Lemma A.4, $\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is dense in $L^{p, q}(w)$. Then for each $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, there exists $g_j \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ so that $\|f_j - g_j\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} \leq \varepsilon$, which gives

$$(4.33) \quad \|f - g_j\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} \lesssim \|f - f_j\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} + \|f_j - g_j\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} \leq 2\varepsilon,$$

and

$$(4.34) \quad \sup_{|x-y| < r_0} |g_j(x) - g_j(y)| \leq \varepsilon w(B(0, 2A_0))^{-\frac{1}{p}} \quad \text{for some } r_0 > 0,$$

where $\bigcup_{j=1}^N \text{supp}(g_j) \subset B(0, A_0)$. We split

$$(4.35) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} &:= \left\| \left(\int_{B(0, r)} |\tau_y f - f|^a dy \right)^{\frac{1}{a}} \right\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \left(\int_{B(0, r)} |\tau_y f - \tau_y g_j|^a dy \right)^{\frac{1}{a}} \right\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} \\ &\quad + \left\| \left(\int_{B(0, r)} |\tau_y g_j - g_j|^a dy \right)^{\frac{1}{a}} \right\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} \\ &\quad + \left\| \left(\int_{B(0, r)} |g_j - f|^a dy \right)^{\frac{1}{a}} \right\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} \\ &=: \mathcal{I}_1 + \mathcal{I}_2 + \mathcal{I}_3. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the fact $w \in A_{p_0} \subset A_{\frac{p}{a}}$, (4.7), and (4.33) that

$$(4.36) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1 &\leq \|M(|f - g_j|^a)^{\frac{1}{a}}\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} = \|M(|f - g_j|^a)\|_{L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}(w)}^{\frac{1}{a}} \\ &\lesssim \| |f - g_j|^a \|_{L^{\frac{p}{a}, \frac{q}{a}}(w)}^{\frac{1}{a}} = \|f - g_j\|_{L^{p, q}(w)} \lesssim 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

For all $0 < r < \min\{r_0, A_0\}$, using (4.34) and that $\text{supp}(\tau_y g_j - g_j) \subset B(0, 2A_0)$ for any $|y| < r$, we have

$$(4.37) \quad \mathcal{I}_2 \leq \|\mathbf{1}_{B(0, 2A_0)}\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \sup_{|x-y| < r_0} |g_j(x) - g_j(y)| \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

Additionally, (4.33) implies

$$(4.38) \quad \mathcal{I}_3 = \|g_j - f\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} \lesssim 2\varepsilon.$$

Now gathering (4.35)–(4.38), we conclude that

$$\mathcal{I} \lesssim 5\varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } 0 < r < \min\{r_0, A_0\}.$$

This yields (c).

In the case $q = \infty$, the sufficiency of (a)–(c) is the same as above because of the rescaling argument and Theorem 4.1 with $q = \infty$. By Theorem 4.1 again, the condition (b) is not necessary. Pick

$$f(x) := |x|^{-\frac{1}{p}} \mathbf{1}_{\{x > 0\}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then $\|f\|_{L^{p,\infty}} = 1$. Let $r > 0$ and $0 < x < r/2$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} S_r f(x) &:= \left(\int_{B(0,r)} |\tau_y f(x) - f(x)|^a dy \right)^{\frac{1}{a}} \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2r} \int_{\frac{r}{2}}^r |\tau_y f(x) - f(x)|^a dy \right)^{\frac{1}{a}} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2r} \int_{\frac{r}{2}}^r |x|^{-\frac{a}{p}} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{a}} = 4^{-\frac{1}{a}} |x|^{-\frac{1}{p}}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\{x \in \mathbb{R} : S_r f(x) > \lambda\}| &\geq |\{0 < x < r/2 : S_r f(x) > \lambda\}| \\ &\geq |\{0 < x < r/2 : 4^{-\frac{1}{a}} x^{-\frac{1}{p}} > \lambda\}| = \min\{r/2, 4^{-\frac{p}{a}} \lambda^{-p}\} = 4^{-\frac{p}{a}} \lambda^{-p}, \end{aligned}$$

provided $\lambda > 4^{\frac{1}{a}} (r/2)^{\frac{1}{p}}$. Hence,

$$\|S_r f\|_{L^{p,\infty}} \geq 4^{-\frac{1}{a}}, \quad \text{for all } r > 0.$$

This shows that the compact subset $\mathcal{K} := \{f\}$ in $L^{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ does not satisfy the condition (c). \square

4.3. Characterizations of compactness via projection. The following result was shown in [34, Lemma 6.1], which states that the limit of a sequence of compact bilinear operators is also compact.

Lemma 4.39. *Let \mathcal{X}_1 and \mathcal{X}_2 be Banach spaces and \mathcal{Y} be a quasi-Banach space. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let T_j be a compact bilinear operator from $\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$ to \mathcal{Y} . If a bilinear operator $T : \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ satisfies*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|T_j - T\|_{\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} = 0,$$

then T is compact from $\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$ to \mathcal{Y} .

Proof of Theorem 1.6. We begin with showing item (1). Let us first prove the sufficiency. Assume that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} = 0$. Note that P_N is a finite-dimensional operator for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, by [31, Proposition 15.1], $\{P_N T\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a collection of compact operators from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$. By Lemma 4.39 and that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|P_N T - T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} = 0$, we conclude that T is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

To show the necessity, let T be compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then

$$\mathcal{K} := \{T(f_1, f_2) : \|f_1\|_{L^{p_i}} \leq 1, i = 1, 2\}$$

is a precompact subset in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$. It suffices to demonstrate that

$$(4.40) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \leq 1}} \|P_N^\perp(T(f_1, f_2))\|_{L^p} = 0.$$

Assume that (4.40) does not hold. Then there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and a sequence $\{f_i^k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ with $\|f_i^k\|_{L^{p_i}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 1$, $i = 1, 2$, so that

$$(4.41) \quad \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1^k, f_2^k))\|_{L^p} \geq \varepsilon_0.$$

By the precompactness of \mathcal{K} , one can find a subsequence (which we relabel) $\{f_i^k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ so that

$$(4.42) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|f_i^k - f_i\|_{L^{p_i}} = 0 \text{ for some } f_i \in L^{p_i}(\mathbb{R}^n), i = 1, 2.$$

Observe that

$$(4.43) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1, f_2))\|_{L^p} = 0,$$

and by (2.16) and the $L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p$ boundedness of T ,

$$(4.44) \quad \sup_{k \geq 1} \|P_k^\perp T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} \lesssim \|T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} < \infty.$$

We split

$$\begin{aligned} & \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1^k, f_2^k))\|_{L^p} \\ & \leq \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1, f_2))\|_{L^p} + \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1, f_2^k - f_2))\|_{L^p} + \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1^k - f_1, f_2^k))\|_{L^p} \\ & \leq \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1, f_2))\|_{L^p} + \|P_k^\perp T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2^k - f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \\ & \quad + \|P_k^\perp T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} \|f_1^k - f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2^k\|_{L^{p_2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which along with (4.42)–(4.44) leads to

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1^k, f_2^k))\|_{L^p} = 0.$$

This contradicts with (4.41). Therefore, (4.40) holds.

Much as above, it is easy to prove the first part in item (2). To show the second part, we follow [76] to construct a counterexample in \mathbb{R} . Define a bilinear operator

$$T(f_1, f_2) := \langle f_1, h_{I_0} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_0} \rangle \mathbf{1}_{I_0},$$

where $I_0 = [0, 1)$. Since T is a finite-dimensional operator, it is compact from $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Choose $f_1 = f_2 = h_{I_0}$ such that $\|f_1\|_{L^1} = \|f_2\|_{L^1} = 1$. Then for any $N \geq 1$,

$$P_N^\perp T(f_1, f_2) = P_N^\perp \mathbf{1}_{I_0} = \mathbf{1}_{I_0} - \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(N)} \langle \mathbf{1}_{I_0}, h_I \rangle h_I.$$

Given $I \in \mathcal{D}(N)$, if $\langle \mathbf{1}_{I_0}, h_I \rangle \neq 0$, then $I_0 \subsetneq I$, hence $I = [0, 2^k)$ with $1 \leq k \leq N$ and $\langle \mathbf{1}_{I_0}, h_I \rangle = \langle h_I \rangle_{I_0} = |I|^{-\frac{1}{2}} = 2^{-\frac{k}{2}}$. This gives

$$(4.45) \quad P_N^\perp T(f_1, f_2) = \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)} + \sum_{k=1}^N 2^{-k} \mathbf{1}_{[2^{k-1}, 2^k)} - \sum_{k=1}^N 2^{-k} \mathbf{1}_{[0, 2^{k-1})}.$$

Note that

$$(4.46) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^N 2^{-k} \mathbf{1}_{[0, 2^{k-1})} &= \sum_{k=1}^N 2^{-k} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)} + \sum_{k=2}^N 2^{-k} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbf{1}_{[2^{j-1}, 2^j)} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^N 2^{-k} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)} + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=j+1}^N 2^{-k} \mathbf{1}_{[2^{j-1}, 2^j)} \\ &= (1 - 2^{-N}) \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)} + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} (2^{-j} - 2^{-N}) \mathbf{1}_{[2^{j-1}, 2^j)}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.45) with (4.46), we obtain

$$P_N^\perp T(f_1, f_2) = 2^{-N} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)} + \sum_{k=1}^N 2^{-N} \mathbf{1}_{[2^{k-1}, 2^k)} + 2^{-N} \mathbf{1}_{[2^{N-1}, 2^N)} = 2^{-N} \mathbf{1}_{[0, 2^N)},$$

which implies for any $N \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda |\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |P_N^\perp T(f_1, f_2)(x)| > \lambda\}|^2 &\geq \sup_{0 < \lambda < 2^{-N}} \lambda |\{x \in [0, 2^N) : 2^{-N} > \lambda\}|^2 \\ &= \sup_{0 < \lambda < 2^{-N}} \lambda 2^{2N} = 2^N \rightarrow \infty, \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This shows $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^1 \times L^1 \rightarrow L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}} \neq 0$.

The proof of item (3) is similar to that of item (1). The only difference is that (4.43) and (4.44) are respectively replaced by the following estimates

$$(4.47) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1, f_2))\|_{\text{BMO}} = 0, \quad \text{whenever } f_1, f_2 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

and

$$(4.48) \quad \sup_{k \geq 1} \|P_k^\perp T\|_{L^\infty \times L^\infty \rightarrow \text{BMO}} < \infty.$$

Indeed, (4.47) follows from that $T(f_1, f_2) \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. To prove (4.48), note that for any $k \geq 1$ and $b \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$|P_k b| \leq \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(k)} |\langle b, h_I \rangle| |h_I| \leq \#\mathcal{D}(k) \sup_{I \in \mathcal{D}} |\langle b, h_I \rangle| |I|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq C_k \|b\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}}} \leq C_k \|b\|_{\text{BMO}}.$$

Hence, for all $k \geq 1$ and $f_1, f_2 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_k^\perp T(f_1, f_2)\|_{\text{BMO}} &\leq \|P_k T(f_1, f_2)\|_{\text{BMO}} + \|T(f_1, f_2)\|_{\text{BMO}} \\ &\leq 2 \|P_k T(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^\infty} + \|T(f_1, f_2)\|_{\text{BMO}} \\ &\leq (2C_k + 1) \|T(f_1, f_2)\|_{\text{BMO}} \leq C'_k \|f_1\|_{L^\infty} \|f_2\|_{L^\infty}, \end{aligned}$$

where the constant C'_k is independent of f_1 and f_2 , which means

$$(4.49) \quad \|P_k^\perp T\|_{L^\infty \times L^\infty \rightarrow \text{BMO}} \leq C'_k, \quad \text{for each } k \geq 1.$$

Moreover, (4.47) implies

$$(4.50) \quad \sup_{k \geq 1} \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1, f_2))\|_{\text{BMO}} \leq C(f_1, f_2), \quad \text{for all } f_1, f_2 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Thus, (4.48) is a consequence of Banach–Steinhaus theorem, (4.49), and (4.50). \square

The following result will provide us great convenience in practice.

Lemma 4.51. *Let $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $p, p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$. Let $\{\alpha_j\}_{j \geq 0}$ be a sequence of positive numbers satisfying $\sum_{j \geq 0} \alpha_j < \infty$. Assume that a bilinear operator T satisfies the following:*

- (1) $T = \sum_{j \geq 0} \alpha_j T_j$, where each T_j is a bilinear operator.
- (2) $\sup_{j \geq 0} \|T_j\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} \leq C_0 < \infty$.
- (3) For every $j \geq 0$, T_j is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Then, T is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Proof. For each $N \geq 1$, let $T^N := \sum_{j=0}^N \alpha_j T_j$. Then T^N is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Note that

$$\|T - T^N\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} = \left\| \sum_{j > N} \alpha_j T_j \right\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} \leq \sum_{j > N} \alpha_j \|T_j\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} \leq C_0 \sum_{j > N} \alpha_j,$$

which tends to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$. This and Lemma 4.39 imply the compactness of T . \square

5. WEIGHTED $L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p$ COMPACTNESS

Now let us conclude (b) \implies (c)' in Theorem 1.1. Assume (b) holds. Then by duality, Theorems 1.3, 1.7, and 1.8, and Lemma 4.51, we deduce that

$$(5.1) \quad T \text{ is compact from } L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

for all $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $p, p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$. On the other hand, (H2) and (H3) respectively imply the weak boundedness property and $T(1, 1), T^{*1}(1, 1), T^{*2}(1, 1) \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which yields [65, Theorem 1.1]. The later along with Theorems 5.3 and 5.24 gives that

$$(5.2) \quad T \text{ is bounded from } L^{q_1}(v_1^{q_1}) \times L^{q_2}(v_2^{q_2}) \text{ to } L^p(v^q)$$

for all $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$ with $q, q_1, q_2 \in (1, \infty)$ and for all $(v_1, v_2) \in A_{(q_1, q_2)}$, where $v = v_1 v_2$. Thus, the conclusion (c)' follows from (5.1), (5.2), and Theorem 1.9.

5.1. Weighted compactness of bilinear dyadic shifts. In order to show Theorem 1.7, we first establish the weighted boundedness of dyadic shifts $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i,j,k}$.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$. There holds*

$$\sup_{\mathcal{D}} \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p(w^p)} \lesssim \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1})} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2})},$$

for all $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty]$ and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} > 0$ and $w = w_1 w_2$.

Proof. By symmetry, it suffices to treat the case $\tilde{h}_I = h_I$. Noting that

$$\langle \Delta_Q^i f, h_I \rangle = \langle f, h_I \rangle \mathbf{1}_{\{I \in \mathcal{D}_i(Q)\}},$$

we have

$$|\langle \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2), f_3 \rangle| \leq \|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i,k}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^1},$$

where

$$\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i,k}(f_1, f_2, f_3) := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \langle |\Delta_Q^i f_1| \rangle_Q \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \langle |\Delta_Q^k f_3| \rangle_Q \mathbf{1}_Q.$$

By duality and Theorem 2.25, we are deduced to showing

$$(5.4) \quad \sup_{\mathcal{D}} \|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i,k}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^p(w^p)} \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_{L^{p_i}(w_i^{p_i})},$$

for all $p_1, p_2, p_3 \in (1, \infty)$ and for all $(w_1, w_2, w_3) \in A_{(p_1, p_2, p_3)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{p_3}$ and $w = w_1 w_2 w_3$.

Let $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{p_3}$ with $1 < p, p_1, p_2, p_3 < \infty$, and let $(w_1, w_2, w_3) \in A_{(p_1, p_2, p_3)}$. Write $w = w_1 w_2 w_3$. By Theorem 2.25 again, it is enough to prove (5.4) for such exponents (p_1, p_2, p_3) and weights (w_1, w_2, w_3) . Let $p_4 = p'$, $w_4 = w^{-1}$, and $f_4 w_4 \in L^{p_4}$ with $\|f_4 w_4\|_{L^{p_4}} \leq 1$. Observe that

$$(5.5) \quad \langle |\Delta_Q^k f|, \mathbf{1}_Q \rangle = \langle \Delta_Q^k f, \varphi_{Q,f}^k \rangle = \langle f, \Delta_Q^k \varphi_{Q,f}^k \rangle,$$

where $|\varphi_{Q,f}^k| \leq \mathbf{1}_Q$. Setting

$$\Phi_{i,k} := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \langle |\Delta_Q^i f_1| \rangle_Q \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \langle |f_4| \rangle_Q \Delta_Q^k \varphi_{Q,f_3}^k,$$

we use the fact $\Delta_{Q'}^k \Delta_Q^k f = \Delta_Q^k f \mathbf{1}_{\{Q'=Q\}}$ to arrive at

$$S_{\mathcal{D}}^k \Phi_{i,k} \lesssim \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |\langle |\Delta_Q^i f_1| \rangle_Q \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \langle |f_4| \rangle_Q|^2 \mathbf{1}_Q \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which together with (2.11) gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i,k}(f_1, f_2, f_3), f_4 \rangle| &\leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \langle |\Delta_Q^i f_1| \rangle_Q \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \langle f_3, \Delta_Q^k \varphi_{Q,f_3}^k \rangle \langle |f_4| \rangle_Q \\ &\leq \|f_3 w_3\|_{L^{p_3}} \|\Phi_{i,k} w_3^{-1}\|_{L^{p'_3}} \lesssim \|f_3 w_3\|_{L^{p_3}} \|(S_{\mathcal{D}}^k \Phi_{i,k}) w_3^{-1}\|_{L^{p'_3}} \\ &\lesssim \|f_3 w_3\|_{L^{p_3}} \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |\langle |\Delta_Q^i f_1| \rangle_Q \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \langle |f_4| \rangle_Q|^2 \mathbf{1}_Q \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} w_3^{-1} \right\|_{L^{p'_3}}. \end{aligned}$$

Fix a sequence of functions $\{f_3^Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ satisfying $\left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |f_3^Q|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{p_3}} \leq 1$. By duality, it suffices to prove

$$(5.6) \quad \mathcal{I} := \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \langle |\Delta_Q^i f_1| \rangle_Q \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \langle |f_4| \rangle_Q \mathbf{1}_Q f_3^Q w_3^{-1} dx \right| \lesssim \prod_{i=1,2,4} \|f_i w_i\|_{L^{p_i}}.$$

By (5.5) and (2.11), there holds

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} &\leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \langle f_1, \Delta_Q^i \varphi_{Q,f_1}^i \rangle \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \langle |f_4| \rangle_Q \langle f_3^Q | w_3^{-1} \rangle_Q \\ &=: \langle f_1 w_1, \Phi_i w_1^{-1} \rangle \leq \|f_1 w_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|\Phi_i w_1^{-1}\|_{L^{p'_1}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim \|f_1 w_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|(S_{\mathcal{D}}^i \Phi_i) w_1^{-1}\|_{L^{p_1'}},$$

where

$$\Phi_i := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \langle |f_3^Q| w_3^{-1} \rangle_Q \langle |f_4| \rangle_Q \Delta_Q^i \varphi_{Q, f_1}^i,$$

and

$$S_{\mathcal{D}}^i \Phi_i \lesssim \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \langle |f_3^Q| w_3^{-1} \rangle_Q \langle |f_4| \rangle_Q^2 \mathbf{1}_Q \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{M}(f_2, f_3^Q w_3^{-1}, f_4)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Note that

$$\frac{1}{p_1'} = \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{p_3} + \frac{1}{p_4}, \quad w_1^{-1} = w_2 w_3 w_4, \quad \text{and} \quad (w_2, w_3, w_4) \in A_{(p_2, p_3, p_4)}.$$

Thus,

$$(5.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \|(S_{\mathcal{D}}^i \Phi_i) w_1^{-1}\|_{L^{p_1'}} &\leq \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{M}(f_2, f_3^Q w_3^{-1}, f_4)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} w_1^{-1} \right\|_{L^{p_1'}} \\ &\lesssim \prod_{i=2,4} \|f_i w_i\|_{L^{p_i}} \times \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |f_3^Q w_3^{-1}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} w_3 \right\|_{L^{p_3}} \leq \prod_{i=2,4} \|f_i w_i\|_{L^{p_i}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the vector-valued inequality

$$(5.9) \quad \left\| \left(\sum_{k_1, \dots, k_m} |\mathcal{M}(f_1^{k_1}, \dots, f_m^{k_m})|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{r(v^r)}} \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^m \left\| \left(\sum_{k_i} |f_i^{k_i}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{r_i(v_i^{r_i})}},$$

for all $\vec{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_m) \in (1, \infty)^m$ and for all $\vec{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_m) \in A_{\vec{r}}$, which follows from [36, Theorem 7.3.1] and [63, Theorem 3.7]. Therefore, (5.6) is a consequence of (5.7) and (5.8). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\tilde{h}_I = h_I$. For simplicity, denote $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}} := \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i,j,k}$. Fix $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $p, p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$. By Theorems 1.9 and 5.3, it suffices to prove that $\mathbb{E}_{\omega} \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_{\omega}}$ is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$. In light of Theorem 1.3, we are deduced to showing the following estimates

$$(5.10) \quad \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \leq 1}} \|\mathbb{E}_{\omega} \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_{\omega}}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p} \lesssim 1,$$

$$(5.11) \quad \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \leq 1}} \|\mathbb{E}_{\omega} \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_{\omega}}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^p} = 0,$$

$$(5.12) \quad \lim_{|v| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \leq 1}} \|\tau_v \mathbb{E}_{\omega} \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_{\omega}}(f_1, f_2) - \mathbb{E}_{\omega} \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_{\omega}}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p} = 0.$$

Note that (5.10) immediately follows from Theorem 5.3.

To justify (5.11), given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^N f := \sum_{Q \notin \mathcal{D}(N)} A_Q^{i,j,k} f.$$

Observe that

$$(5.13) \quad \Delta_{Q'}^k (A_Q^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2)) = A_Q^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{Q'=Q\}} = A_Q^{i,j,k}(\Delta_{Q'}^i f_1, f_2),$$

$$(5.14) \quad \Delta_Q^k(\mathbf{S}_D^N(f_1, f_2)) = A_Q^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{Q \notin \mathcal{D}(N)\}},$$

$$(5.15) \quad |A_Q^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2)| \leq F_N \langle |f_1| \rangle_Q \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \mathbf{1}_Q, \quad \text{for all } Q \notin \mathcal{D}(N).$$

Then it follows from (5.13)–(5.15) that

$$(5.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{S}_D^N f\|_{L^p} &\simeq \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |\Delta_Q^k(\mathbf{S}_D^N(f_1, f_2))|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^p} \\ &= \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \notin \mathcal{D}(N)} |A_Q^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^p} \\ &= \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \notin \mathcal{D}(N)} |A_Q^{i,j,k}(\Delta_Q^i f_1, f_2)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^p} \\ &\leq F_N \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \langle |\Delta_Q^i f_1| \rangle_Q^2 \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q^2 \mathbf{1}_Q \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^p} \\ &\leq F_N \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |\Delta_Q^i f_1|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} M_{\mathcal{D}} f_2 \right\|_{L^p} \\ &\leq F_N \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |\Delta_Q^i f_1|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{p_1}} \|M_{\mathcal{D}} f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \\ &\lesssim F_N \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constants are independent of \mathcal{D} , N , f_1 , and f_2 .

Let $A \geq 2^{10}$ and $N := \lfloor \frac{1}{2} \log_2 A \rfloor > 2$. Note that for any $\omega \in \Omega$ and $K \in \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)$,

$$(5.17) \quad K \subset \{|x| \leq (N+2)2^N\} \subset \{|x| \leq 2^{2N}\} \subset \{|x| \leq A\}.$$

Thus, by Minkowski's inequality, (5.16), and (5.17),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}_\omega \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{|\cdot| > A\}}\|_{L^p} &\leq \mathbb{E}_\omega \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{|\cdot| > A\}}\|_{L^p} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\omega \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}^N(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{|\cdot| > A\}}\|_{L^p} \lesssim F_N \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant is independent of A , ω , f_1 , and f_2 . This gives (5.11).

In order to demonstrate (5.12), observe that

$$(5.18) \quad \|\tau_v \mathbb{E}_\omega \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) - \mathbb{E}_\omega \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p} \leq \mathbb{E}_\omega \|\tau_v \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) - \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p}.$$

Let $0 < |v| < 2^{-j-10}$ and $a \geq 2$ be an integer chosen later. Then there exists an integer $N = N(v) \geq 5$ such that $2^{-a(N+1)} \leq 2^{j+1}|v| < 2^{-aN}$. We split

$$(5.19) \quad \|\tau_v \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) - \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p} \leq \Xi_1(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) + \Xi_2(v; \omega, f_1, f_2),$$

where

$$\Xi_1(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) := \left\| \sum_{Q \notin \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{D}_i(Q) \\ J \in \mathcal{D}_j(Q) \\ K \in \mathcal{D}_k(Q)}} \alpha_{I,J,K,Q} \langle f_1, h_I \rangle \langle f_2, \tilde{h}_J \rangle (\tau_v h_K - h_K) \right\|_{L^p},$$

$$\Xi_2(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) := \left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{D}_i(Q) \\ J \in \mathcal{D}_j(Q) \\ K \in \mathcal{D}_k(Q)}} \alpha_{I,J,K,Q} \langle f_1, h_I \rangle \langle f_2, \tilde{h}_J \rangle (\tau_v h_K - h_K) \right\|_{L^p}.$$

By changing variables and (5.16), we obtain

$$(5.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \Xi_1(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) &\leq \|\tau_v \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}^N(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p} + \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}^N(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p} \\ &= 2\|\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}^N(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p} \lesssim F_N \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant is independent of v , ω , f_1 , and f_2 . Since $|v| \rightarrow 0$ implies $N \rightarrow \infty$, (3.9) and (5.20) imply

$$(5.21) \quad \limsup_{|v| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \leq 1}} \Xi_1(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) = 0.$$

Observe that for any $N \geq 2$,

$$(5.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \#\mathcal{D}_\omega(N) &\leq \#\{K \in \mathcal{D}_\omega : 2^{-N} \leq \ell(K) \leq 2^N, K \subset 2^{2N+1}\mathbb{I}\} \\ &\leq \sum_{-N \leq k \leq N} 2^{(2N+1)n} 2^{-kn} \leq 2^{(2N+1)n} 2^{nN+1} = 2^{3nN+n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_2(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) &\leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} \langle |f_1| \rangle_Q \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \sum_{K \in \mathcal{D}_k(Q)} |K|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\tau_v h_K - h_K\|_{L^p} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} |Q|^{-\frac{1}{p}} \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{D}_k(Q)} |v|^{\frac{1}{p}} \ell(K)^{\frac{1}{p}(n-1)} \\ &\leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} 2^{kn} 2^{-k\frac{n}{p}} (2^{-k} \ell(Q))^{-\frac{1}{p}} |v|^{\frac{1}{p}} \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \\ &\leq 2^{3nN+n+1} 2^{k(n-\frac{n}{p}+\frac{1}{p})} 2^{\frac{N}{p}} (2^{-j-1} 2^{-aN})^{\frac{1}{p}} \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \\ &\leq 2^{kn+n+1} 2^{\frac{N}{p}(3np+1-a)} \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $a > 3np + 1$, we see that

$$(5.23) \quad \limsup_{|v| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \leq 1}} \Xi_2(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) = 0.$$

Therefore, (5.12) is a consequence of (5.18), (5.19), (5.21), and (5.23). \square

5.2. Weighted compactness of bilinear dyadic paraproducts. To prove Theorem 1.8, it is necessary to first show the weighted boundedness of dyadic paraproducts.

Theorem 5.24. *For any $\mathbf{b} := \{b_I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \in \text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $T_{\mathbf{b}} \in \{\Pi_{\mathbf{b}}, \Pi_{\mathbf{b}}^{*1}, \Pi_{\mathbf{b}}^{*2}\}$, there holds*

$$\|T_{\mathbf{b}}\|_{L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2}) \rightarrow L^p(w^p)} \lesssim \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}}},$$

for all $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty]$ and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} > 0$, $w = w_1 w_2$, and the implicit constant is independent of \mathbf{b} and \mathcal{D} .

Proof. By duality, it suffices to consider $\Pi_{\mathbf{b}}$. The H^1 -BMO duality (see [88]) gives

$$(5.25) \quad |\langle \Pi_{\mathbf{b}}(f_1, f_2), f_3 \rangle| \lesssim \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}}} \|S_{\mathcal{D}}\Phi\|_{L^1},$$

where

$$\Phi := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I \langle f_3, h_I \rangle h_I.$$

Observe that

$$(5.26) \quad S_{\mathcal{D}}\Phi = \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} |\langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I \langle f_3, h_I \rangle|^2 \frac{\mathbf{1}_I}{|I|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} =: \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D}}(f_1, f_2, f_3).$$

By duality, (5.25)–(5.26), and Theorem 2.25, we are reduced to proving

$$(5.27) \quad \|\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D}}(f_1, f_2, f_3) w\|_{L^p} \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i w_i\|_{L^{p_i}}$$

for all $p_1, p_2, p_3 \in (1, \infty)$ and for all $(w_1, w_2, w_3) \in A_{(p_1, p_2, p_3)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{p_3}$ and $w = w_1 w_2 w_3$.

In view of Theorem 2.25, it is enough to show (5.27) in the case $p > 1$. Note that given a sequence of functions $\{a_I(x)\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$, we have

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} |a_I|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} w \right\|_{L^p} = \sup \left\{ \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} a_I b_I w \, dx \right| : \left\| \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} |b_I|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{p'}} \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Fix a sequence of functions $\{f_3^I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$ satisfying $\left\| \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} |f_3^I|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{p'}} \leq 1$. It suffices to demonstrate

$$\mathcal{J} := \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I \langle f_3, h_I \rangle \mathbf{1}_I |I|^{-\frac{1}{2}} f_3^I w \, dx \right| \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i w_i\|_{L^{p_i}}.$$

By Hölder's inequality,

$$(5.28) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} &= \left| \left\langle f_3 w_3, \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I \langle f_3^I w \rangle_I |I|^{\frac{1}{2}} h_I w_3^{-1} \right\rangle \right| \\ &=: |\langle f_3 w_3, \Psi w_3^{-1} \rangle| \leq \|f_3 w_3\|_{L^{p_3}} \|\Psi w_3^{-1}\|_{L^{p'_3}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$S_{\mathcal{D}}\Psi = \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} |\langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I \langle f_3^I w \rangle_I|^2 \mathbf{1}_I \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2, f_3^I w)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Observe that

$$\frac{1}{p'_3} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{p'}, \quad w_3^{-1} = w_1 w_2 w^{-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad (w_1, w_2, w^{-1}) \in A_{(p_1, p_2, p')}.$$

Then (5.9) implies

$$(5.29) \quad \begin{aligned} \|(S_{\mathcal{D}}\Phi)w_3^{-1}\|_{L^{p'_3}} &\leq \left\| \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2, f_3^I w)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} w_3^{-1} \right\|_{L^{p'_3}} \\ &\lesssim \|f_1 w_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2 w_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \left\| \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} |f_3^I w|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} w^{-1} \right\|_{L^{p'}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \|f_1 w_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2 w_2\|_{L^{p_2}}.$$

Hence, it follows from (5.28)–(5.29) and (2.11) that

$$\mathcal{J} \leq \|f_3 w_3\|_{L^{p_3}} \|\Phi w_3^{-1}\|_{L^{p'_3}} \lesssim \|f_3 w_3\|_{L^{p_3}} \|(S_{\mathcal{D}}\Phi)w_3^{-1}\|_{L^{p'_3}} \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i w_i\|_{L^{p_i}}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Let us recall the dyadic Carleson embedding theorem from [55, Theorem 4.5].

Lemma 5.30. *let \mathcal{D} be a dyadic grid. Assume that the nonnegative numbers $\{\alpha_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ satisfy*

$$\sum_{Q' \in \mathcal{D}: Q' \subset Q} \alpha_{Q'} \leq A |Q|, \quad \forall Q \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Then for all $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_Q |\langle f \rangle_Q|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq A^{\frac{1}{p}} p' \|f\|_{L^p}.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.8. We only present the proof for $\mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}$ because other cases can be shown by the same scheme and duality. In view of Theorems 1.9 and 5.24, it is enough to show that $\mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}$ is compact from $L^4(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^4(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. With Theorem 1.3 in hand, this is reduced to proving that

$$(5.31) \quad \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^4} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^4} \leq 1}} \|\mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} \lesssim 1,$$

$$(5.32) \quad \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^4} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^4} \leq 1}} \|\mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{|\cdot| > A\}}\|_{L^2} = 0,$$

$$(5.33) \quad \lim_{|v| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^4} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^4} \leq 1}} \|\tau_v \mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) - \mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} = 0.$$

Theorem 5.24 gives (5.31) at once.

Denote $\mathbf{b}_\omega^N := \{b_I \mathbf{1}_{\{I \notin \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)\}}\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}_\omega}$. Then $\mathbf{b}_\omega \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ gives

$$(5.34) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \|\mathbf{b}_\omega^N\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}} = 0.$$

As did in (5.17), Minkowski's inequality and Theorem 5.24 yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{|\cdot| > A\}}\|_{L^2} \leq \mathbb{E}_\omega \|\Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{|\cdot| > A\}}\|_{L^2} \\ & = \mathbb{E}_\omega \|\Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega^N}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{|\cdot| > A\}}\|_{L^2} \leq \mathbb{E}_\omega \|\Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega^N}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} \\ & \lesssim \mathbb{E}_\omega \|\mathbf{b}_\omega^N\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}} \|f_1\|_{L^4} \|f_2\|_{L^4} \leq \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \|\mathbf{b}_\omega^N\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}} \|f_1\|_{L^4} \|f_2\|_{L^4}, \end{aligned}$$

which together with (5.34) implies (5.32).

To proceed, note that

$$(5.35) \quad \|\tau_v \mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) - \mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} \leq \mathbb{E}_\omega \|\tau_v \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) - \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2}$$

Let $0 < |v| \leq \frac{1}{16}$ and $a \geq 2$ be an integer chosen later. Then there exists an integer $N = N(v) \geq 2$ so that $2^{-a(N+1)} < |v| \leq 2^{-aN}$. We split

$$(5.36) \quad \|\tau_v \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) - \Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} \leq \Upsilon_1(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) + \Upsilon_2(v; \omega, f_1, f_2),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Upsilon_1(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) &:= \left\| \sum_{I \notin \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} b_I \langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I (\tau_v h_I - h_I) \right\|_{L^2}, \\ \Upsilon_2(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) &:= \left\| \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} b_I \langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I (\tau_v h_I - h_I) \right\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

For the first term, we use Theorem 5.24 to deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\Upsilon_1(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) &\leq 2 \left\| \sum_{I \notin \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} b_I \langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I h_I \right\|_{L^2} \\ &= 2 \|\Pi_{\mathbf{b}_\omega^N}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \|\mathbf{b}_\omega^N\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}} \|f_1\|_{L^4} \|f_2\|_{L^4},\end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant is independent of ω . This along with (5.34) gives

$$(5.37) \quad \lim_{|v| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^4} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^4} \leq 1}} \Upsilon_1(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) = 0.$$

To estimate Υ_2 , observe that

$$(5.38) \quad \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_\omega: I \subset Q} |b_I|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}}^2 |Q| \leq |Q|, \quad \forall Q \in \mathcal{D}_\omega.$$

Then, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (5.22), (5.38), and Lemma 5.30,

$$\begin{aligned}\Upsilon_2(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) &\leq \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} |b_I| |\langle f_1 \rangle_I| |\langle f_2 \rangle_I| \|\tau_v h_I - h_I\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} |b_I| |\langle f_1 \rangle_I| |\langle f_2 \rangle_I| |v|^{\frac{1}{2}} \ell(I)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq |v|^{\frac{1}{2}} \ell(I)^{-\frac{1}{2}} [\#\mathcal{D}_\omega(N)]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_\omega} |b_I|^2 |\langle f_1 \rangle_I|^2 |\langle f_2 \rangle_I|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq 2^{-a \frac{N}{2}} 2^{\frac{N}{2}} 2^{\frac{1}{2}(3nN+n+1)} \prod_{i=1}^2 \left[\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_\omega} |b_I|^2 |\langle f_i \rangle_I|^4 \right]^{\frac{1}{4}} \\ &\lesssim 2^{\frac{N}{2}(3n+1-a)} \|f_1\|_{L^4} \|f_2\|_{L^4},\end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant are independent of v , ω , f_1 , and f_2 . Choosing $a > 3n + 1$, this immediately implies

$$(5.39) \quad \lim_{|v| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^4} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^4} \leq 1}} \Upsilon_2(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) = 0.$$

Consequently, (5.33) follows from (5.35)–(5.39). The proof is complete. \square

6. THE NECESSITY OF HYPOTHESES (H1)–(H3)

This section is devoted to showing Theorems 1.10, 1.11, and 1.12, which immediately gives (c) \implies (a) in Theorem 1.1.

6.1. Compact Calderón–Zygmund kernels. First, let us demonstrate Theorem 1.10. To this end, we present two lemmas below.

Lemma 6.1. *Assume that K satisfies the smoothness conditions (2.4)–(2.6) and that*

$$\lim_{|x-y|+|x-z|\rightarrow\infty} K(x, y, z) = 0.$$

Then K satisfies the size condition (2.3) with another triple $(F'_1, F'_2, F'_3) \in \mathcal{F}$.

Proof. We first claim that

$$(6.2) \quad |K(x, y, z) - K(x', y', z')| \leq F(x, y, z) \frac{(|x - x'| + |y - y'| + |z - z'|)^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}$$

whenever $|x - x'| + |y - y'| + |z - z'| \leq (|x - y| + |x - z|)/8$. Indeed, for such x, y and z , the condition (2.4) and Lemma 2.42 give

$$(6.3) \quad |K(x, y, z) - K(x', y, z)| \leq F_1(x, y, z) \frac{|x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}},$$

where

$$F_1(x, y, z) := F_{1,1}(|x - y| + |x - z|)F_{1,2}(|x - y| + |x - z|)F_{1,3}(|x + y| + |x + z|),$$

and $(F_{1,1}, F_{1,2}, F_{1,3}) \in \mathcal{F}$ with $F_{1,1}$ being monotone increasing, $F_{1,2}$ and $F_{1,3}$ being monotone decreasing. It is easy to verify that

$$(6.4) \quad \frac{3}{4} \leq \frac{|x' - y| + |x' - z|}{|x - y| + |x - z|} \leq \frac{5}{4},$$

and

$$|y - y'| \leq (|x - y| + |x - z|)/8 \leq (|x' - y| + |x' - z|)/6,$$

which together with (2.5) implies

$$(6.5) \quad |K(x', y, z) - K(x', y', z)| \leq F_1(x', y, z) \frac{|y - y'|^\delta}{(|x' - y| + |x' - z|)^{2n+\delta}} \\ \leq 2^{2n+\delta} F_1(x', y, z) \frac{|y - y'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}.$$

Define

$$F_{2,1}(t) := \sup_{\substack{|x-y|+|x-z|\leq t \\ 8|x-x'|\leq|x-y|+|x-z|}} (2^{2n+\delta} F_1(x', y, z))^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ F_{2,2}(t) := \sup_{\substack{|x-y|+|x-z|\geq t \\ 8|x-x'|\leq|x-y|+|x-z|}} (2^{2n+\delta} F_1(x', y, z))^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ F_{2,3}(t) := \sup_{\substack{|x+y|+|x+z|\geq t \\ 8|x-x'|\leq|x-y|+|x-z|}} (2^{2n+\delta} F_1(x', y, z))^{\frac{1}{3}},$$

and then set

$$F_2(x, y, z) := F_{2,1}(|x - y| + |x - z|)F_{2,2}(|x - y| + |x - z|)F_{2,3}(|x + y| + |x + z|).$$

Thus, $F_{2,1}$ is bounded and monotone increasing, both $F_{2,2}$ and $F_{2,3}$ are bounded and monotone decreasing, and

$$(6.6) \quad 2^{2n+\delta} F_1(x', y, z) \leq F_2(x, y, z).$$

Together with (6.4), the property $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} F_{1,1}(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_{1,2}(t) = 0$ implies $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} F_{2,1}(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_{2,2}(t) = 0$. Moreover, if $|x + y| + |x + z| \leq |x - y| + |x - z|$, then $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_{1,2}(t) = 0$ gives $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_{2,3}(t) = 0$. If $|x + y| + |x + z| \geq |x - y| + |x - z|$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |x' + y| + |x' + z| &\geq |x - y| + |x - z| - 2|x - x'| \\ &\geq |x - y| + |x - z| - (|x - y| + |x - z|)/4 \geq 3(|x - y| + |x - z|)/4, \end{aligned}$$

which along with $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_{1,3}(t) = 0$ yields $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_{2,3}(t) = 0$. This shows $(F_{2,1}, F_{2,2}, F_{2,3}) \in \mathcal{F}$. Collecting (6.4)–(6.6), we conclude

$$(6.7) \quad |K(x', y, z) - K(x', y', z)| \leq F_2(x, y, z) \frac{|y - y'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}.$$

Much as above, there exists $(F_{3,1}, F_{3,2}, F_{3,3}) \in \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$(6.8) \quad |K(x', y', z) - K(x', y', z')| \leq F_3(x, y, z) \frac{|z - z'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}},$$

where

$$F_3(x, y, z) := F_{3,1}(|x - y| + |x - z|)F_{3,2}(|x - y| + |x - z|)F_{3,3}(|x + y| + |x + z|).$$

Hence, as did in the proof of Lemma 2.42, (6.2) is a consequence of (6.3), (6.7), and (6.8).

Let $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $x \neq y$ or $x \neq z$. Let $a = 7/6$. We may assume that $x \geq y$ and $x \geq z$. Let $x_0 = x$, $y_0 = y$, and $z_0 = z$. For each $k \geq 1$, define

$$\begin{aligned} x_k &= x_{k-1} + (|x_{k-1} - y_{k-1}| + |x_{k-1} - z_{k-1}|)/24, \\ y_k &= y_{k-1} - (|x_{k-1} - y_{k-1}| + |x_{k-1} - z_{k-1}|)/24, \\ z_k &= z_{k-1} - (|x_{k-1} - y_{k-1}| + |x_{k-1} - z_{k-1}|)/24. \end{aligned}$$

Then for any $k \geq 0$, $x_k \geq y_k$, $x_k \geq z_k$, and

$$\begin{aligned} |x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k| &= a(|x_{k-1} - y_{k-1}| + |x_{k-1} - z_{k-1}|), \\ |x_k + y_k| + |x_k + z_k| &= |x_{k-1} + y_{k-1}| + |x_{k-1} + z_{k-1}|, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$(6.9) \quad |x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k| = a^k(|x - y| + |x - z|),$$

$$(6.10) \quad |x_k + y_k| + |x_k + z_k| = |x + y| + |x + z|.$$

Moreover,

$$|x_{k-1} - x_k| + |y_{k-1} - y_k| + |z_{k-1} - z_k| \leq (|x_{k-1} - y_{k-1}| + |x_{k-1} - z_{k-1}|)/8,$$

which along with (6.2) implies

$$|K(x_{k-1}, y_{k-1}, z_{k-1})| \leq |K(x_k, y_k, z_k)| + \frac{F(x_{k-1}, y_{k-1}, z_{k-1})}{(|x_{k-1} - y_{k-1}| + |x_{k-1} - z_{k-1}|)^2}.$$

Iterating the inequality above, we have

$$|K(x, y, z)| \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |K(x_k, y_k, z_k)| + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{F(x_k, y_k, z_k)}{(|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k|)^2}.$$

Choosing

$$F_3'(t) := F_3(t) \quad \text{and} \quad F_i'(t) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a^{-k} F_i(a^k t), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

we see that $(F'_1, F'_2, F'_3) \in \mathcal{F}$, and (6.9)–(6.10) imply

$$|K(x, y, z)| \lesssim \frac{F'(x, y, z)}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^2},$$

where

$$F'(x, y, z) := F'_1(|x - y| + |x - z|)F'_2(|x - y| + |x - z|)F'_3(|x + y| + |x + z|).$$

The proof is complete. \square

Given $\lambda > 0$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and a function Φ on \mathbb{R}^n , we denote

$$\tau_y \Phi(x) := \Phi(x - y) \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_\lambda(x) := \lambda^{-n} \Phi(\lambda^{-1}x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Lemma 6.11. *Let T be a bilinear operator associated with a standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel K with the parameter $\delta \in (0, 1]$. Let $0 < \varepsilon < 2^{-\delta} \|K\|_{\text{CZ}(\delta)}$, $x' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{3n} \setminus \Delta$ such that $|x - x'| \leq \frac{1}{4} \max\{|x - y|, |x - z|\}$. Then for any $0 < \lambda_i < (\varepsilon \|K\|_{\text{CZ}(\delta)}^{-1})^{\frac{1}{\delta}} |x - x'|$, $i = 1, 2, 3$,*

$$(6.12) \quad |\langle T(\tau_y \Phi_{\lambda_2}, \tau_z \Phi_{\lambda_3}), \tau_x \Phi_{\lambda_1} \rangle - K(x, y, z)| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon |x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}},$$

$$(6.13) \quad |\langle T(\tau_y \Phi_{\lambda_2}, \tau_z \Phi_{\lambda_3}), \tau_x \Phi_{\lambda_1} - \tau_{x'} \Phi_{\lambda_1} \rangle| \lesssim \frac{|x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}},$$

where Φ is a positive smooth function such that $\text{supp } \Phi \subset \mathbb{I}$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Phi dx = 1$.

Proof. Fix $0 < \lambda_i < (\varepsilon \|K\|_{\text{CZ}(\delta)}^{-1})^{\frac{1}{\delta}} |x - x'|$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. For any $v_i \in \text{supp}(\Phi_{\lambda_i})$, we see that

$$4 \max_i |v_i| \leq 2 \max_i \lambda_i \leq |x - x'| \leq \max\{|x - y|, |x - z|\}/4,$$

which implies

$$(6.14) \quad |x - x'| \leq \max\{|x + v_1 - y - v_2|, |x + v_1 - z - v_3|\}/2,$$

$$(6.15) \quad |v_1| \leq \max\{|x - y - v_2|, |x - z - v_3|\}/2,$$

$$(6.16) \quad |v_2| \leq \max\{|x - y|, |x - z - v_3|\}/2,$$

$$(6.17) \quad |v_3| \leq \max\{|x - y|, |x - z|\}/2.$$

Then by (2.4)–(2.6) and (6.15)–(6.17),

$$\begin{aligned} & |K(x + v_1, y + v_2, z + v_3) - K(x, y, z)| \\ & \leq |K(x + v_1, y + v_2, z + v_3) - K(x, y + v_2, z + v_3)| \\ & \quad + |K(x, y + v_2, z + v_3) - K(x, y, z + v_3)| \\ & \quad + |K(x, y, z + v_3) - K(x, y, z)| \\ & \lesssim \frac{|v_1|^\delta}{(|x - y - v_2| + |x - z - v_3|)^{2n+\delta}} \\ & \quad + \frac{|v_2|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z - v_3|)^{2n+\delta}} + \frac{|v_3|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}} \\ & \lesssim \frac{\max_i \lambda_i^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon |x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS of (6.12)} &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3n}} [K(x + v_1, y + v_2, z + v_3) - K(x, y, z)] \prod_{i=1}^3 \Phi_{\lambda_i}(v_i) dv_i \right| \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3n}} \frac{\varepsilon |x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}} \prod_{i=1}^3 \Phi_{\lambda_i}(v_i) dv_i \leq \frac{\varepsilon |x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove (6.13), we use (2.4) and (6.14) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{K}(v_1, v_2, v_3)| &:= |K(x + v_1, y + v_2, z + v_3) - K(x', y + v_2, z + v_3)| \\ &\lesssim \frac{|x - x'|^\delta}{(|x + v_1 - y - v_2| + |x + v_1 - z - v_3|)^{2n+\delta}} \simeq \frac{|x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence,

$$\text{LHS of (6.13)} = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3n}} \mathbf{K}(v_1, v_2, v_3) \prod_{i=1}^3 \Phi_{\lambda_i}(v_i) dv_i \right| \lesssim \frac{|x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.10. By symmetry and Lemma 6.1, it suffices to prove that there exists $\delta' \in (0, \delta)$ such that

$$\sup_{\substack{x' \in \mathbb{R}^n: x' \neq x \\ |x - x'| \leq \max\{|x - y|, |x - z|\}/2}} \mathcal{E}(x, y, z; x') \rightarrow 0,$$

whenever $|x - x'| \rightarrow 0$, or $|x - y| + |x - z| \rightarrow \infty$, or $|x + y| + |x + z| \rightarrow \infty$ and $|x - y| + |x - z| \simeq 1$, where

$$\mathcal{E}(x, y, z; x') := |x - x'|^{-\delta'} \frac{|K(x, y, z) - K(x', y, z)|}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{-(2n+\delta)'}}$$

since the smoothness condition (2.4) gives

$$\mathcal{E}(x, y, z; x') \lesssim \frac{|x - x'|^{\delta-\delta'}}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{\delta-\delta'}} \lesssim 1,$$

whenever $|x - x'| \leq \max\{|x - y|, |x - z|\}/2$. The above immediately implies that

$$(6.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k) &= 0 \text{ for any sequence } \{(x_k, y_k, z_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \\ &\text{with } |x_k - x'_k| \leq \max\{|x_k - y_k|, |x_k - z_k|\}/2 \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$(6.19) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|x_k - x'_k|}{|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k|} = 0.$$

This means that it remains to demonstrate (6.18) when $\{(x_k, y_k, z_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ does not satisfy (6.19) but satisfies one of the following:

$$(6.20) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{(i) } |x_k - x'_k| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{(ii) } |x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k| \rightarrow \infty, \\ &\text{(iii) } |x_k + y_k| + |x_k + z_k| \rightarrow \infty \text{ and } |x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k| \simeq 1. \end{aligned}$$

In this scenario, there exists $c_0 \in (0, 1/2)$ and a subsequence (which we relabel) $\{(x_k, y_k, z_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$(6.21) \quad c_0 < \frac{|x_k - x'_k|}{|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k|} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let (x_k, y_k, z_k) and x'_k satisfy (6.21). Let $0 < \varepsilon < 2^{-\delta}C$ be fixed and arbitrarily small. We choose a sequence $\{\lambda_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$(6.22) \quad (C^{-1}\varepsilon)^{1/\delta}|x_k - x'_k|/2 \leq \lambda_k \leq (C^{-1}\varepsilon)^{1/\delta}|x_k - x'_k|.$$

Using (6.21), (6.12) and (6.22), we deduce that

$$(6.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k) &\leq C_0^{\delta'} (|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k|)^{2n} |K(x_k, y_k, z_k) - K(x'_k, y_k, z_k)| \\ &\leq 2C_0^{\delta'} \varepsilon + C_0^{\delta'} (|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k|)^{2n} \Delta(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k) \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon + |x_k - x'_k|^{2n} \Delta(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k) := |\langle T(\tau_{y_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k}, \tau_{z_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k}), \tau_{x_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k} - \tau_{x'_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k} \rangle|$. If we denote

$$(6.24) \quad \begin{aligned} f_k &:= |x_k - x'_k|^{\frac{n}{p_1}} \tau_{y_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k}, \quad g_k := |x_k - x'_k|^{\frac{n}{p_2}} \tau_{z_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k}, \\ \text{and } h_k &:= |x_k - x'_k|^{\frac{n}{p}} (\tau_{x_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k} - \tau_{x'_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k}), \end{aligned}$$

then (6.22) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_k\|_{L^{p_1}} &= (\lambda_k^{-1}|x_k - x'_k|)^{\frac{n}{p_1}} \|\Phi\|_{L^{p_1}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{n}{\delta p_1}}, \\ \|g_k\|_{L^{p_2}} &= (\lambda_k^{-1}|x_k - x'_k|)^{\frac{n}{p_2}} \|\Phi\|_{L^{p_2}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{n}{\delta p_2}}, \\ \|h_k\|_{L^{p'}} &\lesssim (\lambda_k^{-1}|x_k - x'_k|)^{\frac{n}{p}} \|\Phi\|_{L^{p'}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{n}{\delta p}}, \end{aligned}$$

This says that $\{f_k\}$ is a bounded sequence in $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\{g_k\}$ is a bounded sequence in $L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then by the compactness of T , there exists a convergent subsequence (which we relabel) $\{T(f_k, g_k)\}$. This gives that for any $\eta > 0$ chosen later, there is $N_\eta > 0$ such that for all $k, j > N_\eta$,

$$(6.25) \quad \|T(f_k, g_k) - T(f_j, g_j)\|_{L^p} < \eta.$$

Thus, by (6.23)–(6.25), we have for all $k, j > N_\eta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k) &\lesssim \varepsilon + |\langle T(f_k, g_k), h_k \rangle| \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon + |\langle T(f_k, g_k) - T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle| + |\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle| \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon + \|T(f_k, g_k) - T(f_j, g_j)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|h_k\|_{L^{p'}} + |\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle| \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon + \eta \varepsilon^{-\frac{n}{\delta p}} + |\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle| \lesssim \varepsilon + |\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle|, \end{aligned}$$

provided $\eta < \varepsilon^{1+\frac{n}{\delta p}}$. To complete the proof, it suffices to show that for given $k > N_\eta$, there exists $j = j(k) > N_\eta$ sufficiently large such that

$$(6.26) \quad |\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle| \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

To proceed, we rewrite $\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle$ as

$$\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle = |x_j - x'_j|^{n(2-\frac{1}{p})} |x_k - x'_k|^{\frac{n}{p}} \langle T(\tau_{y_j} \Phi_{\lambda_j}, \tau_{z_j} \Phi_{\lambda_j}), \tau_{x_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k} - \tau_{x'_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k} \rangle.$$

Recall that T is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$. This and [38, Theorem 3] give that

$$(6.27) \quad T \text{ is bounded from } L^{q_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{q_2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^q(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

for all $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$ with $q_1, q_2 \in (1, \infty)$. Choose $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$ with $q, q_1, q_2 \in (1, \infty)$. Accordingly, we use (6.27) to deduce that

$$(6.28) \quad |\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle| \lesssim |x_j - x'_j|^{n(2-\frac{1}{p})} |x_k - x'_k|^{\frac{n}{p}} \|\tau_{y_j} \Phi_{\lambda_j}\|_{L^{q_1}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \times \|\tau_{z_j} \Phi_{\lambda_j}\|_{L^{q_2}} \|\tau_{x_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k} - \tau_{x'_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k}\|_{L^{q'}} \\
& \lesssim |x_j - x'_j|^{n(2-\frac{1}{p})} |x_k - x'_k|^{\frac{n}{p}} \lambda_j^{-\frac{n}{q_1}} \lambda_j^{-\frac{n}{q_2}} \lambda_k^{\frac{n}{q}} \\
& \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{2n}{\delta}} \left(\frac{|x_k - x'_k|}{|x_j - x'_j|} \right)^{n(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q})} = \varepsilon^{-\frac{2n}{\delta}} \left(\frac{|x_j - x'_j|}{|x_k - x'_k|} \right)^{n(\frac{1}{p'}-\frac{1}{q'})}.
\end{aligned}$$

If the sequence $\{(x_k, y_k, z_k)\}$ satisfies the case (i) in (6.20) and (6.21), then for fixed $k > N_\eta$, we choose $j > k$ large enough and $q \in (1, p)$ in (6.28) so that

$$|\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{2n}{\delta}} \left(\frac{|x_j - x'_j|}{|x_k - x'_k|} \right)^{n(\frac{1}{p'}-\frac{1}{q'})} < \varepsilon.$$

If the sequence $\{(x_k, y_k, z_k)\}$ satisfies the case (ii) in (6.20) and (6.21), then $|x_k - x'_k| \rightarrow \infty$. For fixed $k > N_\eta$, we choose $j > k$ large enough and $q \in (p, \infty)$ in (6.28) so that

$$|\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{2n}{\delta}} \left(\frac{|x_k - x'_k|}{|x_j - x'_j|} \right)^{n(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q})} < \varepsilon.$$

If the sequence $\{(x_k, y_k, z_k)\}$ satisfies the case (iii) in (6.20) and (6.21), then

$$2(|y_k| + |z_k|) \geq (|x_k + y_k| + |x_k + z_k|) - (|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k|),$$

which implies $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (|y_k| + |z_k|) = \infty$, and furthermore, $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |x_k - y_j| + |x_k - z_j| = \infty$ for any fixed k . Therefore, fixed $k > N_\eta$, we use (6.13) and (6.21), and choose $j > k$ sufficiently large to conclude that

$$|\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle| \lesssim \frac{|x_j - x'_j|^{n(2-\frac{1}{p})} |x_k - x'_k|^{\frac{n}{p}+\delta}}{(|x_k - y_j| + |x_k - z_j|)^{2n+\delta}} \lesssim \frac{1}{(|x_k - y_j| + |x_k - z_j|)^{2n+\delta}} < \varepsilon.$$

This shows (6.26) and completes the proof. \square

6.2. Weak compactness property. Next, let us give the proof of Theorem 1.11. Fix $I \in \mathcal{D}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. We split

$$(6.29) \quad \langle T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle = \langle P_N(T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle + \langle P_N^\perp(T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle.$$

By Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.30) \quad |\langle P_N^\perp(T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle| & \leq \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} \|\mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^{p_1}} \|\mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^{p_2}} \|\mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^{p'}} \\
& = \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} |I|,
\end{aligned}$$

and by the boundedness of T ,

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.31) \quad |\langle P_N(T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle| & \leq \|P_N\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \|T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} |I| \\
& \lesssim \|T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} F(I; 2N) |I|
\end{aligned}$$

for any $I \in \mathcal{D}(2N)$.

To proceed, fix $I \notin \mathcal{D}(2N)$. It suffices to consider the following three cases:

- (i) $\ell(I) < 2^{-2N}$, (ii) $\ell(I) > 2^{2N}$, (iii) $2^{-2N} \leq \ell(I) \leq 2^{2N}$ and $\text{rd}(I, 2^{2N}\mathbb{I}) > 2N$.

Since $P_N \circ P_N = P_N = P_N^*$, we have

$$(6.32) \quad \langle P_N(T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle = \langle P_N^2(T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle = \langle P_N(T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)), P_N \mathbf{1}_I \rangle.$$

By the cancellation of Haar functions, there holds

$$(6.33) \quad P_N \mathbf{1}_I = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}(N): I \subsetneq J} \langle \mathbf{1}_I, h_J \rangle h_J.$$

Observe that if $J \in \mathcal{D}(N)$ with $I \subsetneq J$, then in case (ii), there holds $\ell(J) > 2^N$, and in case (iii), we have

$$d(J, 2^N \mathbb{I}) \geq d(I, 2^N \mathbb{I}) - \ell(J) \geq 2N \cdot 2^{2N} - 2^N > N2^N, \quad \text{hence, } \text{rd}(J, 2^N \mathbb{I}) > N.$$

This means that there does not exist $J \in \mathcal{D}(N)$ such that $I \subsetneq J$ in cases (ii) and (iii), which along with (6.32) and (6.33) implies

$$(6.34) \quad \langle P_N(T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle = 0, \quad \text{for any } I \text{ in cases (ii) and (iii).}$$

Let us next treat the case (i). By definition, one can find a sequence of dyadic cubes $\{I_j\}_{j=-N}^N$ such that $\{J \in \mathcal{D}(N) : I \subsetneq J\} = \{I_j\}_{j=-N}^N$ and $\ell(I_j) = 2^j$. Then (6.33) gives

$$(6.35) \quad \begin{aligned} \|P_N \mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^{p'}} &\leq \sum_{j=-N}^N |\langle \mathbf{1}_I, h_{I_j} \rangle| \|h_{I_j}\|_{L^{p'}} \leq \sum_{j=-N}^N |I| |I_j|^{-1 + \frac{1}{p'}} \\ &= \sum_{j=-N}^N 2^{-jn/p} |I| \lesssim 2^{Nn/p} |I|, \end{aligned}$$

Now collecting (6.32) and (6.35), we conclude

$$(6.36) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle P_N(T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle| &\leq \|P_N\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \|T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)\|_{L^p} \|P_N \mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^{p'}} \\ &\lesssim \|P_N\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \|T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} |I|^{\frac{1}{p_1}} |I|^{\frac{1}{p_2}} 2^{\frac{Nn}{p}} |I| \\ &\leq \|P_N\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \|T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} (2^{2N} \ell(I))^{\frac{n}{p}} |I| \\ &\simeq \|P_N\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \|T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} F(I; 2N) |I|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the desired estimate follows from (6.29)–(6.31), (6.34), and (6.36).

Furthermore, if T is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then Theorem 1.6 gives that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} = 0,$$

which together with $\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \|P_N\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \lesssim 1$ yields the weak compactness property. \square

6.3. CMO conditions. Finally, we turn to the proof of Theorem 1.12.

Lemma 6.37. *Let T be a bilinear operator associated with a compact bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel K with parameter $\delta \in (0, 1]$. Let $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a cut-off function such that $\mathbf{1}_{B(0,1)} \leq \Phi \leq \mathbf{1}_{B(0,2)}$. Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a cube and let $f \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ have compact support in I and mean zero. Then the following hold:*

(1) *For any $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the limit*

$$\mathcal{L}(f) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle T\left(\Phi\left(\frac{\cdot - a}{2^k \ell(I)}\right), \Phi\left(\frac{\cdot - a}{2^k \ell(I)}\right)\right), f \right\rangle \quad \text{exists.}$$

(2) For all $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^k \geq \sqrt{n} + |a - x_I|/\ell(I)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathcal{L}(f) - \left\langle T\left(\Phi\left(\frac{\cdot - a}{2^k \ell(I)}\right), \Phi\left(\frac{\cdot - a}{2^k \ell(I)}\right)\right), f \right\rangle \right| \\ & \lesssim 2^{-k\delta} (1 + |a - x_I|/\ell(I))^\delta \sum_{k'=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k'\delta} F(2^{k'+k}|I|) \|f\|_{L^1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $F(t) := F_1(t)F_2(t)F_3\left(1 + \frac{a}{1+t}\right)$.

(3) The limit above is independent of the parameter $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and the function Φ .

(4) If T is bounded from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $p, p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$, then \mathcal{L} is a bounded linear functional on $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. In particular, by the duality between $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $BMO(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we define $T(1, 1)$ as

$$\mathcal{L}(f) = \langle T(1, 1), f \rangle.$$

Proof. Fix $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $2^k \geq \sqrt{n} + 2|a - x_I|/\ell(I)$, and write $\Psi_k := \Phi\left(\frac{\cdot - a}{2^k \ell(I)}\right)$. It is easy to see that $\text{supp}(\Psi_k) \subset \{x : |x - a| \leq 2^{k+1}\ell(I)\}$ and $\text{supp}(\Psi_{k+1} - \Psi_k) \subset \{x : 2^k \ell(I) < |x - a| \leq 2^{k+2}\ell(I)\}$. Let $x \in \text{supp}(f) \subset I$ and $y \in \text{supp}(\Psi_{k+1} - \Psi_k)$. Then we have

$$|x - a| \leq |x - x_I| + |a - x_I| \leq \ell(I)(\sqrt{n}/2 + |a - x_I|/\ell(I)) \leq 2^{k-1}\ell(I) < |y - a|/2,$$

and hence, $|x - y| \geq |y - a| - |x - a| > |x - a| \geq 0$. This means $\text{supp}(f) \cap \text{supp}(\Psi_{k+1} - \Psi_k) = \emptyset$. Moreover, if we denote

$$F_a(x, y, z) := F_1(|x - a|)F_2(|y - a| + |z - a|)F_3\left(1 + \frac{a}{1 + |y - a| + |z - a|}\right),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} F_a(x, y, z) & \leq F_1(2^k|I|)F_2(2^{k+1}|I|)F_3\left(1 + \frac{a}{1 + 2^{k+3}|I|}\right) \\ & \lesssim F_1(2^k|I|)F_2(2^k|I|)F_3\left(1 + \frac{a}{1 + 2^k|I|}\right) = F(2^k|I|), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the monotonicity properties of F_1 , F_2 and F_3 .

We are going to show that $\{\langle T(\Psi_k, \Psi_k), f \rangle\}_{k \geq 1}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Note that

$$(6.38) \quad \begin{aligned} & |\langle T(\Psi_{k+1}, \Psi_{k+1}), f \rangle - \langle T(\Psi_k, \Psi_k), f \rangle| \\ & \leq |\langle T(\Psi_{k+1} - \Psi_k, \Psi_k), f \rangle| + |\langle T(\Psi_{k+1}, \Psi_{k+1} - \Psi_k), f \rangle|. \end{aligned}$$

By the disjoint support, the mean zero of f , and $|x - a| \leq \max\{|y - a|, |z - a|\}/2$, we obtain

$$(6.39) \quad \begin{aligned} & |\langle T(\Psi_{k+1} - \Psi_k, \Psi_k), f \rangle| \\ & = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3n}} [K(x, y, z) - K(a, y, z)] (\Psi_{k+1} - \Psi_k)(y) \Psi_k(z) f(x) dx dy dz \right| \\ & \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3n}} \frac{|x - a|^\delta F_a(x, y, z)}{(|y - a| + |z - a|)^{2n+\delta}} \mathbf{1}_{\text{supp}(\Psi_{k+1} - \Psi_k)}(y) \Psi_k(z) |f(x)| dx dy dz \\ & \lesssim (2^k \ell(I))^n |I| F(2^k|I|) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{(\ell(I) + |a - x_I|)^\delta}{(2^k \ell(I))^{2n+\delta}} \Phi\left(\frac{z - a}{2^k \ell(I)}\right) |f(x)| dx dz \\ & \lesssim 2^{-k\delta} (1 + |a - x_I|/\ell(I))^\delta F(2^k|I|) \|f\|_{L^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one has

$$|\langle T(\Psi_k, \Psi_{k+1} - \Phi_k), f \rangle| \lesssim 2^{-k\delta} (1 + |a - x_I|/\ell(I))^\delta F(2^k|I|) \|f\|_{L^1},$$

which together (6.38) and (6.39) implies

$$(6.40) \quad |\langle T(\Psi_{k+1}, \Psi_{k+1}), f \rangle - \langle T(\Psi_k, \Psi_k), f \rangle| \lesssim 2^{-k\delta} (1 + |a - x_I|/\ell(I))^\delta F(2^k|I|) \|f\|_{L^1}.$$

Since F_1, F_2, F_3 are bounded, (6.40) gives that $\{\langle T(\Psi_k, \Psi_k), f \rangle\}_{k \geq 1}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Therefore, the limit in item (1) exists, which we denote by $\mathcal{L}_a(f)$. This shows item (1).

Additionally,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_a(f) - \langle T(\Psi_k, \Psi_k), f \rangle &= \mathcal{L}_a(f) - \langle T(\Psi_{k+j+1}, \Psi_{k+j+1}), f \rangle \\ &\quad + \sum_{k'=k}^{k+j} (\langle T(\Psi_{k'+1}, \Psi_{k'+1}), f \rangle - \langle T(\Psi_{k'}, \Psi_{k'}), f \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $j \rightarrow \infty$ and invoking (6.40), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}_a(f) - \langle T(\Psi_k, \Psi_k), f \rangle| &\leq \sum_{k'=k}^{\infty} (\langle T(\Psi_{k'+1}, \Psi_{k'+1}), f \rangle - \langle T(\Psi_{k'}, \Psi_{k'}), f \rangle) \\ &\lesssim (1 + |a - x_I|/\ell(I))^\delta \sum_{k'=k}^{\infty} 2^{-k'\delta} F(2^{k'}|I|) \|f\|_{L^1} \\ &= 2^{-k\delta} (1 + |a - x_I|/\ell(I))^\delta \sum_{k'=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k'\delta} F(2^{k'+k}|I|) \|f\|_{L^1}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows item (2).

Finally, to show item (4), we modify the definition of Ψ_k above into $\Psi_k := \Phi\left(\frac{\cdot - x_I}{2^k \ell(I)}\right)$. Then we use item (2), the boundedness of T , and (6.40) to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}(f)| &\leq |\mathcal{L}(f) - \langle T(\Psi_k, \Psi_k), f \rangle| + \langle T(\Psi_0, \Psi_0), f \rangle| \\ &\quad + \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} (\langle T(\Psi_{k'+1}, \Psi_{k'+1}), f \rangle - \langle T(\Psi_{k'}, \Psi_{k'}), f \rangle) \\ &\lesssim 2^{-k\delta} \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\Psi_0\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|\Psi_0\|_{L^{p_2}} \|f\|_{L^{p'}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} 2^{-k'\delta} F(2^{k'}|I|) \|f\|_{L^1} \\ &\lesssim 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we assert that \mathcal{L} is a bounded linear functional on $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.12. By symmetry, it suffices to show $T(1, 1) \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which follows from

$$(6.41) \quad T(1, 1) \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle P_N^\perp(T(1, 1)), f \rangle = 0,$$

uniformly for all $f \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in the unit ball of $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with mean zero and support in a dyadic cube $I \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. By Theorem 1.10, we see that K is a compact bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel. This together with Lemma 6.37 item (4) implies that $T(1, 1) \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Note that

$$P_N f = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_N} (|J|^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle f, h_J \rangle) (|J|^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_J)$$

is a finite linear combination of 1-atoms $|J|^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_J$. Then, $P_N f \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, hence

$$P_N^\perp f = f - P_N f \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Since P_N^\perp is self-adjoint, we invoke $T(1, 1) \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $P_N^\perp f \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to obtain

$$(6.42) \quad \langle P_N^\perp(T(1, 1)), f \rangle = \langle T(1, 1), P_N^\perp f \rangle = \mathcal{L}(P_N^\perp f),$$

where the functional \mathcal{L} is defined in Lemma 6.37.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be an arbitrary number. Choose $k \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $2^{-k\delta} < \varepsilon$. Since T is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, by Theorem 1.6, there exists $N_0 > 0$ such that for all $N > N_0$,

$$(6.43) \quad \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} \leq 2^{-\frac{kn}{p}} \varepsilon.$$

Considering that $\text{supp}(f) \subset I$ and $\text{supp}(h_J) \subset J$, we rewrite

$$(6.44) \quad \mathcal{L}(P_N^\perp f) = \mathcal{L}(h) + \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_N^c: I \subsetneq J} \langle f, h_J \rangle \mathcal{L}(h_J),$$

where $\varphi := \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_N^c: J \subset I} \langle f, h_J \rangle h_J$ with

$$\|\varphi\|_{L^{p'}} \leq \|f\|_{L^{p'}} \lesssim |I|^{-\frac{1}{p}}.$$

To proceed, choose a cut-off function $\Phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying $\mathbf{1}_{B(0,1)} \leq \Phi \leq \mathbf{1}_{B(0,2)}$, and set $\Phi_I(x) := \Phi\left(\frac{x-x_I}{2^k \ell(I)}\right)$. By Hölder's inequality and (6.43),

$$(6.45) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1 &:= |\langle P_N^\perp(T(\Phi_I, \Phi_I)), \varphi \rangle| \\ &\lesssim \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} \|\Phi_I\|_{L^{p_1}} \|\Phi_I\|_{L^{p_2}} \|\varphi\|_{L^{p'}} \\ &\lesssim 2^{-\frac{kn}{p}} \varepsilon (2^k \ell(I))^{\frac{n}{p_1}} (2^k \ell(I))^{\frac{n}{p_2}} |I|^{-\frac{1}{p}} = \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and Lemma 6.37 applied to $f = \varphi$ and $a = x_I$ gives

$$(6.46) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_2 &:= |\mathcal{L}(\varphi) - \langle P_N^\perp(T(\Phi_I, \Phi_I)), \varphi \rangle| \\ &\lesssim 2^{-k\delta} \sum_{k'=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k'\delta} F(2^{k'+k}|I|) \|\varphi\|_{L^1} \lesssim \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

since $\text{supp}(\varphi) \subset I$ and F is bounded. Analogously, writing $\Psi_J(x) := \Phi\left(\frac{x-x_I}{2^k \ell(J)}\right)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{1,J} &:= |\langle P_N^\perp(T(\Psi_J, \Psi_J)), h_J \rangle| \\ &\lesssim \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} \|\Psi_J\|_{L^{p_1}} \|\Psi_J\|_{L^{p_2}} \|h_J\|_{L^{p'}} \\ &\lesssim 2^{-\frac{kn}{p}} \varepsilon (2^k \ell(J))^{\frac{n}{p_1}} (2^k \ell(J))^{\frac{n}{p_2}} |J|^{-\frac{1}{p}} = \varepsilon |J|^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

and for any $J \supsetneq I$,

$$\mathcal{I}_{2,J} := |\mathcal{L}(h_J) - \langle P_N^\perp(T(\Psi_J, \Psi_J)), h_J \rangle| \lesssim (2^k \ell(J)/\ell(I))^{-\delta} \|h_J\|_{L^1},$$

which respectively yields

$$(6.47) \quad \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_N^c: I \subsetneq J} |\langle f, h_J \rangle| \mathcal{I}_{1,J} \lesssim \varepsilon \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_N^c: I \subsetneq J} |I||J|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|f\|_{L^1} \lesssim \varepsilon \sum_{j \geq 1} 2^{-j} \lesssim \varepsilon,$$

and

$$(6.48) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_N^c: I \subsetneq J} |\langle f, h_J \rangle| \mathcal{I}_{2,J} &\lesssim 2^{-k\delta} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_N^c: I \subsetneq J} \left(\frac{\ell(I)}{\ell(J)} \right)^\delta \|f\|_{L^1} \|h_J\|_{L^\infty} \|h_J\|_{L^1} \\ &\lesssim 2^{-k\delta} \sum_{j \geq 1} 2^{-j\delta} \|f\|_{L^1} \lesssim \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Now collecting the estimates (6.44)–(6.48), we conclude

$$\mathcal{L}(P_N^\perp f) \leq \mathcal{I}_1 + \mathcal{I}_2 + \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_N^c: I \subsetneq J} |\langle f, h_J \rangle| (\mathcal{I}_{1,J} + \mathcal{I}_{2,J}) \lesssim \varepsilon,$$

which together with (6.42) implies (6.41) as desired. \square

7. RUBIO DE FRANCIA EXTRAPOLATION OF COMPACTNESS

7.1. Extrapolation from L^p compactness. The proof of Theorem 1.9 is essentially contained in [16], which does not consider the endpoint case $p_i = \infty$, or/and $q_i = \infty$, or/and $r_i = \infty$. We give an outline of the proof. It needs three main ingredients:

- the target spaces $L^{r_i}(w_i^{r_i})$ can be written as the interpolation space of $L^{p_i}(u_i^{p_i})$ and $L^{\tilde{q}_i}(v_i^{\tilde{q}_i})$, for which T is compact from $L^{p_1}(u_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(u_2^{p_2}) \rightarrow L^p(u^p)$ and T is bounded from $L^{\tilde{q}_1}(v_1^{\tilde{q}_1}) \times L^{\tilde{q}_2}(v_2^{\tilde{q}_2}) \rightarrow L^{\tilde{q}}(v^{\tilde{q}})$. This corresponds to [16, Lemma 4.3] and follows from Theorem 2.25 and Lemma B.1. The latter extends [16, Lemma 4.1] to the context of exponents being 1 and ∞ , so that we can handle the endpoint case $r_i = \infty$.
- a characterization of precompactness in $L^s(w)$ for $s \in (0, \infty)$ and $w \in A_\infty$. This was established in [16, Theorem 2.10]. To apply it, we here put the restriction $p \neq \infty$ and $r \neq \infty$.
- the interpolation for compact bilinear operators [16, Theorem 3.6], which has involved exponents $p_i, q_i \in [1, \infty]$. Thus, it can be used directly in the current scenario.

More details are left to the reader. \square

7.2. Extrapolation from $L^{p, \infty}$ compactness. Before showing Theorem 1.13, let us present a bilinear version of the Marcinkiewicz interpolation theorem with initial restricted weak type conditions, which is a straightforward corollary of [36, Theorem 7.2.2].

Theorem 7.1. *Let $\frac{1}{p^k} = \frac{1}{p_1^k} + \frac{1}{p_2^k}$ with $0 < p_1^k, p_2^k \leq \infty$, $k = 0, 1, 2$. Assume that T is a bilinear operator such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(\mathbf{1}_{E_1}, \mathbf{1}_{E_2})\|_{L^{p^0, \infty}} &\leq C_0 |E_1|^{\frac{1}{p_1^0}} |E_2|^{\frac{1}{p_2^0}}, \\ \|T(\mathbf{1}_{E_1}, \mathbf{1}_{E_2})\|_{L^{p^1, \infty}} &\leq C_1 |E_1|^{\frac{1}{p_1^1}} |E_2|^{\frac{1}{p_2^1}}, \\ \|T(\mathbf{1}_{E_1}, \mathbf{1}_{E_2})\|_{L^{p^2, \infty}} &\leq C_2 |E_1|^{\frac{1}{p_1^2}} |E_2|^{\frac{1}{p_2^2}}, \end{aligned}$$

for all measurable sets $E_j \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|E_j| < \infty$, $j = 1, 2$. If the points $(\frac{1}{p_1^0}, \frac{1}{p_2^0})$, $(\frac{1}{p_1^1}, \frac{1}{p_2^1})$, and $(\frac{1}{p_1^2}, \frac{1}{p_2^2})$ form a triangle in \mathbb{R}^2 , then

$$\|T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} \lesssim C_0^{\theta_0} C_1^{\theta_1} C_2^{\theta_2},$$

for all $\theta_0 + \theta_1 + \theta_2 = 1$ with $0 < \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2 < 1$, and for all $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{\theta_0}{p^0} + \frac{\theta_1}{p^1} + \frac{\theta_2}{p^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{p_j} = \frac{\theta_0}{p_j^0} + \frac{\theta_1}{p_j^1} + \frac{\theta_2}{p_j^2}, \quad j = 1, 2.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.13. Let $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2}$ with $r_1, r_2 \in (1, \infty)$. It suffices to show

$$(7.2) \quad T \text{ is compact from } L^{r_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{r_2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^r(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Assuming (7.2) momentarily, we conclude the proof as follows. By Theorem 2.25, the $L^{q_1}(v_1^{q_1}) \times L^{q_2}(v_2^{q_2}) \rightarrow L^q(v^q)$ boundedness implies

$$(7.3) \quad T \text{ is bounded from } L^{s_1}(u_1^{s_1}) \times L^{s_2}(u_2^{s_2}) \text{ to } L^s(u^s),$$

for all $s_1, s_2 \in (1, \infty)$ and for all $(u_1, u_2) \in A_{(s_1, s_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{s} = \frac{1}{s_1} + \frac{1}{s_2}$ and $u = u_1 u_2$. Thus, the desired conclusion immediately follows from Theorem 1.9, (7.2), and (7.3).

Let us next justify (7.2). Recall that

$$(7.4) \quad T \text{ is compact from } L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^{p, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Pick $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$ with $q_1, q_2 \in (1, \infty)$, $q_1 \neq p_1$, and $q_2 \neq p_2$. The estimate (7.3) gives

$$(7.5) \quad T \text{ is bounded from } L^{q_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{q_2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^q(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Given $\theta \in (0, 1)$, define

$$(7.6) \quad \frac{1}{r^0} = \frac{1-\theta}{p} + \frac{\theta}{q} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{r_j^0} = \frac{1-\theta}{p_j} + \frac{\theta}{q_j}, \quad j = 1, 2.$$

Then properly choose $\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that the point $(\frac{1}{r_1^0}, \frac{1}{r_2^0})$ is different from $(\frac{1}{r_1}, \frac{1}{r_2})$. In addition, for each $k = 1, 2$, take $\frac{1}{r^k} = \frac{1}{r_1^k} + \frac{1}{r_2^k}$ with $1 < r_1^k, r_2^k < \infty$ so that

$$(7.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{the points } (\frac{1}{r_1^0}, \frac{1}{r_2^0}), (\frac{1}{r_1^1}, \frac{1}{r_2^1}), \text{ and } (\frac{1}{r_1^2}, \frac{1}{r_2^2}) \text{ form a triangle in } \mathbb{R}^2, \\ & \text{whose interior contains the target point } (\frac{1}{r_1}, \frac{1}{r_2}). \end{aligned}$$

This enables us to write

$$(7.8) \quad \frac{1}{r} = \frac{\theta_0}{r^0} + \frac{\theta_1}{r^1} + \frac{\theta_2}{r^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{r_j} = \frac{\theta_0}{r_j^0} + \frac{\theta_1}{r_j^1} + \frac{\theta_2}{r_j^2}, \quad j = 1, 2,$$

for some $\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2 \in (0, 1)$ satisfying $\theta_0 + \theta_1 + \theta_2 = 1$.

Fix $0 < s < \min\{p, q, 1\}$. Then $L^{p, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are s -normed quasi-Banach spaces. In view of (7.4), (7.5), and (7.6), the compact bilinear interpolation [23, Theorem 4.9] applied to the case $q_0 = q_1 = q = r = s$ yields

$$(7.9) \quad T \text{ is compact from } L^{r_1^0, s}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{r_2^0, s}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^{r^0, s}(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

where we have used the real interpolation (cf. [8, Theorem 5.3.1]):

$$(L^{p_0, q_0}(\mathbb{R}^n), L^{p_1, q_1}(\mathbb{R}^n))_{\vartheta, q} = L^{p, q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

for all $0 < p_0 \neq p_1 \leq \infty$, $0 < q_0, q_1, q \leq \infty$, $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1-\vartheta}{p_0} + \frac{\vartheta}{p_1}$, and $0 < \vartheta < 1$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be an arbitrary number and $E_1, E_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be measurable sets with $|E_1|, |E_2| < \infty$. By (7.9) and Theorem 1.3, there exist $A_0 = A_0(\varepsilon) > 0$ and $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$(7.10) \quad \|T(\mathbf{1}_{E_1}, \mathbf{1}_{E_2})\|_{L^{r^0, \infty}} \lesssim \|T(\mathbf{1}_{E_1}, \mathbf{1}_{E_2})\|_{L^{r^0, s}} \leq C_1 |E_1|^{\frac{1}{r_1^0}} |E_2|^{\frac{1}{r_2^0}},$$

$$(7.11) \quad \|T(\mathbf{1}_{E_1}, \mathbf{1}_{E_2})\mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^{r_0,\infty}} \lesssim \|T(\mathbf{1}_{E_1}, \mathbf{1}_{E_2})\mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^{r_0,s}} \leq \varepsilon |E_1|^{\frac{1}{r_1^0}} |E_2|^{\frac{1}{r_2^0}},$$

$$(7.12) \quad \|(\tau_h T - T)(\mathbf{1}_{E_1}, \mathbf{1}_{E_2})\|_{L^{r_0,\infty}} \lesssim \|(\tau_h T - T)(\mathbf{1}_{E_1}, \mathbf{1}_{E_2})\|_{L^{r_0,s}} \leq \varepsilon |E_1|^{\frac{1}{r_1^0}} |E_2|^{\frac{1}{r_2^0}},$$

for all $A \geq A_0$ and $0 < |h| \leq \delta_0$, where C_1 is an absolute constant. In addition, by (7.3), one has

$$(7.13) \quad \|T(\mathbf{1}_{E_1}, \mathbf{1}_{E_2})\|_{L^{r_1,\infty}} \lesssim \|T(\mathbf{1}_{E_1}, \mathbf{1}_{E_2})\|_{L^{r_1}} \leq C_2 |E_1|^{\frac{1}{r_1}} |E_2|^{\frac{1}{r_2}},$$

for some uniform constant C_2 , which further implies

$$(7.14) \quad \|T(\mathbf{1}_{E_1}, \mathbf{1}_{E_2})\mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^{r_1,\infty}} \leq C_2 |E_1|^{\frac{1}{r_1}} |E_2|^{\frac{1}{r_2}}, \quad \text{for all } A > 0,$$

$$(7.15) \quad \|(\tau_h T - T)(\mathbf{1}_{E_1}, \mathbf{1}_{E_2})\|_{L^{r_1,\infty}} \leq C_3 |E_1|^{\frac{1}{r_1}} |E_2|^{\frac{1}{r_2}}, \quad \text{for all } h \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Likewise,

$$(7.16) \quad \|T(\mathbf{1}_{E_1}, \mathbf{1}_{E_2})\|_{L^{r_2,\infty}} \leq C_4 |E_1|^{\frac{1}{r_1}} |E_2|^{\frac{1}{r_2}},$$

$$(7.17) \quad \|T(\mathbf{1}_{E_1}, \mathbf{1}_{E_2})\mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^{r_2,\infty}} \leq C_4 |E_1|^{\frac{1}{r_1}} |E_2|^{\frac{1}{r_2}}, \quad \text{for all } A > 0,$$

$$(7.18) \quad \|(\tau_h T - T)(\mathbf{1}_{E_1}, \mathbf{1}_{E_2})\|_{L^{r_2,\infty}} \leq C_5 |E_1|^{\frac{1}{r_1}} |E_2|^{\frac{1}{r_2}}, \quad \text{for all } h \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We mention that all constants C_1, \dots, C_5 are independent of ε , E_1 , E_2 , A , and h .

By (7.7), (7.8), (7.10), (7.13), (7.16), and Theorem 7.1, there holds

$$(7.19) \quad \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^{r_1}} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^{r_2}} \leq 1}} \|T(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^r} \leq C_1^{\theta_0} C_2^{\theta_1} C_4^{\theta_2}.$$

In light of (7.7), (7.8), (7.11), (7.14), and (7.17), Theorem 7.1 applied to the bilinear operator $T(f_1, f_2)\mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}$ gives

$$\|T(f_1, f_2)\mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^r} \leq \varepsilon^{\theta_0} C_2^{\theta_1} C_4^{\theta_2} \|f_1\|_{L^{r_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{r_2}}, \quad \text{for all } A \geq A_0,$$

which leads to

$$(7.20) \quad \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^{r_1}} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^{r_2}} \leq 1}} \|T(f_1, f_2)\mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^r} = 0.$$

Moreover, considering (7.7), (7.8), (7.12), (7.15), and (7.18), we invoke Theorem 7.1 applied to the bilinear operator $\tau_h T - T$ to arrive at

$$\|(\tau_h T - T)(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^r} \leq \varepsilon^{\theta_0} C_3^{\theta_1} C_5^{\theta_2} \|f_1\|_{L^{r_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{r_2}}, \quad \text{for all } 0 < |h| \leq \delta_0,$$

which means

$$(7.21) \quad \lim_{|h| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^{r_1}} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^{r_2}} \leq 1}} \|(\tau_h T - T)(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^r} = 0.$$

Therefore, (7.2) follows at once from (7.19)–(7.21) and Theorem 1.3 with $p = q = r$. \square

7.3. Extrapolation from CMO compactness. To prove Theorem 1.14, we will use the following bilinear interpolation by Calderón and Zygmund [11, Theorem B₁].

Theorem 7.22. *Let $0 < p_0, q_0 \leq \infty$ with $1 \leq p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2 \leq \infty$. Assume that T is a bilinear operator such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^{p_0}} &\leq C_0, \\ \|T\|_{L^{q_1} \times L^{q_2} \rightarrow L^{q_0}} &\leq C_1. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\|T\|_{L^{r_1} \times L^{r_2} \rightarrow L^{r_0}} \leq C_0^{1-\theta} C_1^\theta,$$

where

$$0 < \theta < 1, \quad \frac{1}{r_0} = \frac{1-\theta}{p_0} + \frac{\theta}{q_0}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{r_j} = \frac{1-\theta}{p_j} + \frac{\theta}{q_j} > 0, \quad j = 1, 2.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.14. Let $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2} > 0$ with $r_1, r_2 \in (1, \infty]$. We claim that

$$(7.23) \quad T \text{ is compact from } L^{r_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{r_2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^r(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Let us see how (7.23) implies the required weighted compactness. In view of Theorem 2.25, the $L^{q_1}(v_1^{q_1}) \times L^{q_2}(v_2^{q_2}) \rightarrow L^q(v^q)$ boundedness gives

$$(7.24) \quad T \text{ is bounded from } L^{s_1}(u_1^{s_1}) \times L^{s_2}(u_2^{s_2}) \text{ to } L^s(u^s),$$

for all $s_1, s_2 \in (1, \infty]$ and for all $(u_1, u_2) \in A_{(s_1, s_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{s} = \frac{1}{s_1} + \frac{1}{s_2} > 0$ and $u = u_1 u_2$. Hence, the desired result is a consequence of (7.23), (7.24), and Theorem 1.9.

It remains to demonstrate (7.23). Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be an arbitrary number. In light of Theorem 1.6, the $L^\infty \times L^\infty \rightarrow \text{CMO}$ compactness implies that there exists $N_0 = N_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$ such that

$$(7.25) \quad \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^\infty \times L^\infty \rightarrow \text{BMO}} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } N \geq N_0.$$

Firs, we treat the case $r_1 \neq \infty$ and $r_2 = \infty$ (the case $r_1 = \infty$ and $r_2 \neq \infty$ can be handled symmetrically). Pick $q_1 \in (1, r_1)$ and $\alpha = 1 - \frac{q_1}{r_1} \in (0, 1)$. Then $\frac{1}{r_1} = \frac{1-\alpha}{q_1} + \frac{\alpha}{\infty}$. The estimates (2.16) and (7.24) lead to

$$(7.26) \quad \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^{q_1} \times L^\infty \rightarrow L^{q_1}} \leq C_0 \|T\|_{L^{q_1} \times L^\infty \rightarrow L^{q_1}} \leq C_1, \quad \text{for all } N \geq 1,$$

where the constants C_0 and C_1 are independent of N . Using (7.25)–(7.26) and the linear interpolation (cf. [35, Theorem 1.3.4]), we obtain

$$(7.27) \quad \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^{r_1} \times L^\infty \rightarrow L^{r_1}} \leq C_1^{1-\alpha} \varepsilon^\alpha, \quad \text{for all } N \geq N_0,$$

which together with Theorem 1.6 implies that T is compact from $L^{r_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^{r_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Next, let us analyze the case $r_1 \neq \infty$ and $r_2 \neq \infty$. Let $s_1 \in (1, \infty)$. As shown in (7.27), there holds

$$(7.28) \quad \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^{s_1} \times L^\infty \rightarrow L^{s_1}} \leq C_1^{1-\alpha} \varepsilon^\alpha, \quad \text{for all } N \geq N_0.$$

Now choose $t_1, t_2 \in (1, \infty)$ such that the point $(\frac{1}{r_1}, \frac{1}{r_2})$ lies in the segment connecting $(\frac{1}{t_1}, \frac{1}{t_2})$ and $(\frac{1}{s_1}, \frac{1}{\infty})$. This means

$$(7.29) \quad \frac{1}{r_1} = \frac{1-\beta}{t_1} + \frac{\beta}{s_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{r_2} = \frac{1-\beta}{t_2} + \frac{\beta}{\infty}, \quad \text{for some } \beta \in (0, 1).$$

Set $\frac{1}{t} = \frac{1}{t_1} + \frac{1}{t_2}$. By (7.24) and (2.16),

$$(7.30) \quad \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^{t_1} \times L^{t_2} \rightarrow L^t} \leq C_2 \|T\|_{L^{t_1} \times L^{t_2} \rightarrow L^t} \leq C_3, \quad \text{for all } N \geq 1,$$

where C_2 and C_3 are independent of N . Invoking Theorem 7.22 and (7.29), we interpolate between (7.28) and (7.30) to achieve

$$\|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^{r_1} \times L^{r_2} \rightarrow L^r} \leq C_3^{1-\beta} (C_1^{1-\alpha} \varepsilon^\alpha)^\beta, \quad \text{for all } N \geq N_0.$$

This shows

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|P_N T - T\|_{L^{r_1} \times L^{r_2} \rightarrow L^r} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^{r_1} \times L^{r_2} \rightarrow L^r} = 0.$$

Consequently, by Lemma 4.39, T is compact from $L^{r_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{r_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)$. \square

8. $L^1 \times L^1 \rightarrow L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}$ COMPACTNESS

In this section, we would like to show (a) \implies (d)' and (d) \implies (c)' in Theorem 1.1.

8.1. $L^1 \times L^1 \rightarrow L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}$ compactness implies weighted $L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p$ compactness.

Proposition 8.1. *Let T be a bilinear operator associated with a standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) T is bounded from $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.
- (ii) T is bounded from $L^1(w_2) \times L^1(w_1)$ to $L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(w^{\frac{1}{2}})$ for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(1,1)}$, where $w = w_1 w_2$.
- (iii) T is bounded from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all (or for some) $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty]$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} > 0$.
- (iv) T is bounded from $L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2})$ to $L^p(w^p)$ for all (or for some) $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty]$ and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} > 0$ and $w = w_1 w_2$.

Proof. It suffices to prove the implications: (i) \implies (iv) \implies (iii) \implies (ii) \implies (i). The implication (ii) \implies (i) is trivial, and (i) \implies (iv) is contained in [64, Theorem 3.5] applied to $r = 1$. If (iv) holds for some exponent $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty]$, then Theorem 2.25 gives that (iv) holds for all such exponents (p, p_1, p_2) . This immediately yields (iv) \implies (iii). Now assuming (iii) holds, we use [36, Proposition 7.4.7] to obtain (iii) for all $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$, which along with [63, Corollary 3.9] gives that (ii) holds. \square

Let us justify (d) \implies (c)' in Theorem 1.1. Let T be a bilinear operator associated with a standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel such that

$$(8.2) \quad T \text{ is compact from } L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

In particular,

$$T \text{ is bounded from } L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

which together with Proposition 8.1 yields

$$(8.3) \quad T \text{ is bounded from } L^{q_1}(v_1^{q_1}) \times L^{q_2}(v_2^{q_2}) \text{ to } L^q(v^q)$$

for all $q_1, q_2 \in (1, \infty)$ and for all $(v_1, v_2) \in A_{(q_1, q_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$ and $v = v_1 v_2$. In light of (8.2) and (8.3), we invoke Theorem 1.13 to conclude that

$$(8.4) \quad T \text{ is compact from } L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2}) \text{ to } L^p(w^p)$$

for all $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty]$ and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} > 0$ and $w = w_1 w_2$. \square

8.2. Hypotheses (H1)–(H3) imply $L^1 \times L^1 \rightarrow L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}$ compactness.

Theorem 8.5. *Let T be a bilinear operator associated with a standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel. Assume that T satisfies the hypotheses (H1), (H2), and (H3). Then T can be extended to a compact operator from $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

In view of Theorem 1.3, it suffices to prove the following estimates:

$$(8.6) \quad \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^1} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^1} \leq 1}} \|T(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}} < \infty,$$

$$(8.7) \quad \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^1} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^1} \leq 1}} \|T(f_1, f_2)\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}} = 0,$$

$$(8.8) \quad \lim_{|h| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^1} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^1} \leq 1}} \|(\tau_h T - T)(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}} = 0.$$

By the hypotheses (H2) and (H3), T satisfies the weak boundedness property and $T(1, 1)$, $T^{*1}(1, 1)$, $T^{*2}(1, 1) \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. This, along with [65, Theorem 1.1] and estimates for bilinear dyadic shifts and paraproducts in [65, Section 3], implies that

$$(8.9) \quad T \text{ is bounded from } L^{r_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{r_2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^r(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

for all $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2}$ with $1 < r, r_1, r_2 < \infty$. Then it follows from (8.9) and [38, Theorem 1] that

$$\|T\|_{L^1 \times L^1 \rightarrow L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}} \lesssim 1.$$

Thus, (8.6) holds.

To show (8.7), by homogeneity, it is enough to show that given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $A_0 > 0$ such that

$$(8.10) \quad \mathcal{I} := |\{x \in B(0, A)^c : |T(f_1, f_2)(x)| > 1\}| \lesssim \varepsilon \|f_1\|_{L^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f_2\|_{L^1}^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

for all $A \geq A_0$ and $f_1, f_2 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\|f_1\|_{L^1} = \|f_2\|_{L^1} = 1$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. For each $j = 1, 2$, applying the Calderón–Zygmund decomposition to the function f_j at height $\alpha = \varepsilon^{-1}$ (cf. [35, Theorem 5.3.1]), we obtain the following:

$$(CZ-1) \quad f_j = g_j + b_j = g_j + \sum_{Q \in \Lambda_j} b_{j, Q};$$

$$(CZ-2) \quad \|g_j\|_{L^s} \leq (2^n \varepsilon^{-1})^{1 - \frac{1}{s}} \|f_j\|_{L^1}^{\frac{1}{s}} \text{ for all } s \in [1, \infty];$$

$$(CZ-3) \quad \text{supp}(b_{j, Q}) \subset Q, \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} b_{j, Q} dx = 0, \text{ and } \|b_{j, Q}\|_{L^1} \leq 2^{n+1} \varepsilon^{-1} |Q|;$$

$$(CZ-4) \quad \text{the dyadic cubes } \{Q\}_{Q \in \Lambda_j} \text{ are disjoint and } \sum_{Q \in \Lambda_j} |Q| \leq \varepsilon \|f_j\|_{L^1}.$$

Denote $\Omega := \bigcup_{j=1}^2 \bigcup_{Q \in \Lambda_j} 3Q$. Then, $|\Omega| \lesssim \varepsilon$. By (CZ-1), we have

$$(8.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} &\leq |\{x \in B(0, A)^c : |T(g_1, g_2)(x)| > 1/4\}| \\ &\quad + |\{x \in B(0, A)^c : |T(g_1, b_2)(x)| > 1/4\}| \\ &\quad + |\{x \in B(0, A)^c : |T(b_1, g_2)(x)| > 1/4\}| \\ &\quad + |\{x \in B(0, A)^c : |T(b_1, b_2)(x)| > 1/4\}| \\ &=: \mathcal{I}_{g, g} + \mathcal{I}_{g, b} + \mathcal{I}_{b, g} + \mathcal{I}_{b, b}. \end{aligned}$$

Choose $p, p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ so that $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$. Recall that it has been shown that the hypotheses (H1)–(H3) imply the $L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p$ compactness of T . Thus, by Theorem 1.3 applied to $p = q$, there exists $A_0 = A_0(\varepsilon) > 0$ and $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\varepsilon) > 0$ so that

$$(8.12) \quad \|T(h_1, h_2)\mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^p} \leq \varepsilon^2 \|h_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|h_2\|_{L^{p_2}}, \quad \text{for all } A \geq A_0,$$

$$(8.13) \quad \|(\tau_h T - T)(h_1, h_2)\|_{L^p} \leq \varepsilon^2 \|h_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|h_2\|_{L^{p_2}}, \quad \text{for all } 0 < |h| \leq \delta_0,$$

for all $h_1 \in L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $h_2 \in L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then for all $A \geq A_0$, (CZ-2) and (8.12) give

$$(8.14) \quad \mathcal{I}_{g,g} \lesssim \|T(g_1, g_2)\mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^p}^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{2p} \|g_1\|_{L^{p_1}}^p \|g_2\|_{L^{p_2}}^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{p[2-(1-\frac{1}{p_1})-(1-\frac{1}{p_2})]} = \varepsilon.$$

By Lemma 8.50 applied to $\eta = \varepsilon^2$ and (CZ-2)–(CZ-4), there holds

$$(8.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{g,b} &\leq |\Omega| + |\{x \in \Omega^c \cap B(0, A)^c : |T(g_1, b_2)(x)| > 1/4\}| \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon + \sum_Q \int_{(3Q)^c \cap B(0,A)^c} |T(g_1, b_{2,Q})(x)| dx \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 \|g_1\|_{L^\infty} \sum_Q \|b_{2,Q}\|_{L^1} \lesssim \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Symmetrically,

$$(8.16) \quad \mathcal{I}_{b,g} \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

By Lemma 8.55, for any $A \geq A_0$ large enough,

$$(8.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{b,b} &\leq |\Omega| + |\{x \in \Omega^c \cap B(0, A)^c : |T(b_1, b_2)(x)| > 1/4\}| \\ &\lesssim |\Omega| + \int_{\Omega^c \cap B(0,A)^c} |T(b_1, b_2)(x)|^{\frac{1}{2}} dx \lesssim \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, (8.10) follows from (8.11) and (8.14)–(8.17).

It remains to verify (8.8). By homogeneity, it is enough to show that given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$(8.18) \quad \mathcal{J} := |\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |(\tau_h T - T)(f_1, f_2)(x)| > 1\}| \lesssim \varepsilon \|f_1\|_{L^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f_2\|_{L^1}^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

for all $0 < |h| \leq \delta_0$ and $f_1, f_2 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Assume that $\|f_1\|_{L^1} = \|f_2\|_{L^1} = 1$. By the Calderón–Zygmund decomposition above, we have

$$(8.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} &\leq |\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |(\tau_h T - T)(g_1, g_2)(x)| > 1/4\}| \\ &\quad + |\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |(\tau_h T - T)(g_1, b_2)(x)| > 1/4\}| \\ &\quad + |\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |(\tau_h T - T)(b_1, g_2)(x)| > 1/4\}| \\ &\quad + |\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |(\tau_h T - T)(b_1, b_2)(x)| > 1/4\}| \\ &=: \mathcal{J}_{g,g} + \mathcal{J}_{g,b} + \mathcal{J}_{b,g} + \mathcal{J}_{b,b}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $0 < |h| \leq \delta_0$. Then (CZ-2) and (8.13) give

$$(8.20) \quad \mathcal{J}_{g,g} \lesssim \|(\tau_h T - T)(g_1, g_2)\|_{L^p}^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{2p} \|g_1\|_{L^{p_1}}^p \|g_2\|_{L^{p_2}}^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{p[2-(1-\frac{1}{p_1})-(1-\frac{1}{p_2})]} = \varepsilon.$$

To bound $\mathcal{J}_{g,b}$, we split

$$\mathcal{J}_{g,b} \leq \left| \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_Q |(\tau_h T - T)(g_1, b_{2,Q})(x)| > 1/4 \right\} \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left| \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{\ell(Q) \leq 2|h|} |\tau_h T(g_1, b_{2,Q})(x)| > 1/16 \right\} \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{\ell(Q) \leq 2|h|} |T(g_1, b_{2,Q})(x)| > 1/16 \right\} \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{\ell(Q) > 2|h|} |(\tau_h T - T)(g_1, b_{2,Q})(x)| > 1/8 \right\} \right| \\
&= 2 \left| \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{\ell(Q) \leq 2|h|} |T(g_1, b_{2,Q})(x)| > 1/16 \right\} \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{\ell(Q) > 2|h|} |(\tau_h T - T)(g_1, b_{2,Q})(x)| > 1/8 \right\} \right| \\
&\lesssim |\Omega| + \sum_{\ell(Q) \leq 2|h|} \int_{\Omega^c} |T(g_1, b_{2,Q})| + \sum_{\ell(Q) > 2|h|} \int_{\Omega^c} |(\tau_h T - T)(g_1, b_{2,Q})|.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Lemma 8.58 applied to $\eta = \varepsilon^2$ and (CZ-2)–(CZ-4),

$$(8.21) \quad \mathcal{J}_{g,b} \lesssim |\Omega| + \varepsilon^2 \|g_1\|_{L^\infty} \sum_Q \|b_{2,Q}\|_{L^1} \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

Analogously,

$$(8.22) \quad \mathcal{J}_{b,g} \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

As above, to analyze $\mathcal{J}_{b,b}$, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_{b,b} &\leq \left| \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{Q_1, Q_2} |(\tau_h T - T)(b_{1,Q_1}, b_{2,Q_2})(x)| > 1/4 \right\} \right| \\
&\leq \left| \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{\substack{\ell(Q_1) \leq 2|h| \\ \ell(Q_2) \leq 2|h|}} |(\tau_h T - T)(b_{1,Q_1}, b_{2,Q_2})(x)| > 1/8 \right\} \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{\substack{\ell(Q_1) > 2|h| \\ Q_2 \in \Lambda_2}} |(\tau_h T - T)(b_{1,Q_1}, b_{2,Q_2})(x)| > 1/16 \right\} \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{\substack{Q_1 \in \Lambda_1 \\ \ell(Q_2) > 2|h|}} |(\tau_h T - T)(b_{1,Q_1}, b_{2,Q_2})(x)| > 1/16 \right\} \right| \\
&=: \mathcal{J}_{b,b}^1 + \mathcal{J}_{b,b}^2 + \mathcal{J}_{b,b}^3.
\end{aligned}$$

Invoking (8.60) and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_{b,b}^1 &\leq 2 \left| \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{\substack{\ell(Q_1) \leq 2|h| \\ \ell(Q_2) \leq 2|h|}} |T(b_{1,Q_1}, b_{2,Q_2})(x)| > 1/16 \right\} \right| \\
&\lesssim |\Omega| + \int_{\Omega^c} \left[\sum_{\substack{\ell(Q_1) \leq 2|h| \\ \ell(Q_2) \leq 2|h|}} |T(b_{1,Q_1}, b_{2,Q_2})(x)| \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} dx
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim |\Omega| + F_1(|h|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\Omega^c} \prod_{j=1}^2 \left[\sum_{Q_j} \|b_{j,Q_j}\|_{L^1} \frac{\ell(Q_j)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}{|x - c_{Q_j}|^{n+\frac{\delta}{2}}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} dx \\
&\leq |\Omega| + F_1(|h|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \prod_{j=1}^2 \left[\sum_{Q_j} \|b_{j,Q_j}\|_{L^1} \int_{(3Q_j)^c} \frac{\ell(Q_j)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}{|x - c_{Q_j}|^{n+\frac{\delta}{2}}} dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\lesssim |\Omega| + F_1(|h|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

for any $0 < |h| \leq \delta_0$ sufficiently small, provided (CZ-3)–(CZ-4) and that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} F_1(t) = 0$. Much as in the same way, the inequality (8.61) implies

$$\mathcal{J}_{b,b}^2 \lesssim |\Omega| + \int_{\Omega^c} \left[\sum_{\substack{\ell(Q_1) > 2|h| \\ Q_2 \in \Lambda_2}} |T(b_{1,Q_1}, b_{2,Q_2})(x)| \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} dx \lesssim |\Omega| + F_1(|h|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

Symmetrically, one has

$$\mathcal{J}_{b,b}^3 \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

Gathering the estimates above, we achieve

$$(8.23) \quad \mathcal{J}_{b,b} \leq \mathcal{J}_{b,b}^1 + \mathcal{J}_{b,b}^2 + \mathcal{J}_{b,b}^3 \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

Therefore, (8.18) follows from (8.19)–(8.23). \square

8.3. Hypotheses (H1)–(H3) imply weighted $L^1 \times L^1 \rightarrow L^{\frac{1}{2},\infty}$ compactness.

Theorem 8.24. *Let T be a bilinear operator associated with a standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel. Assume that T satisfies the hypotheses (H1), (H2), and (H3). Then T can be extended to a compact operator from $L^1(w_1) \times L^1(w_2)$ to $L^{\frac{1}{2},\infty}(w^{\frac{1}{2}})$ for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(1,1)}$, where $w = w_1 w_2$.*

Let $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(1,1)}$ and $w = w_1 w_2$. Then $w^{\frac{1}{2}} \in A_1$ by Lemma 2.24. In view of Theorem 1.4, it suffices to prove the following estimates:

$$(8.25) \quad \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^1(w_1)} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^1(w_2)} \leq 1}} \|T(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2},\infty}(w^{\frac{1}{2}})} < \infty,$$

$$(8.26) \quad \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^1(w_1)} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^1(w_2)} \leq 1}} \|T(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{B(0,A)^c}\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2},\infty}(w^{\frac{1}{2}})} = 0,$$

$$(8.27) \quad \lim_{|h| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^1(w_1)} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^1(w_2)} \leq 1}} \|(\tau_h T - T)(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2},\infty}(w^{\frac{1}{2}})} = 0.$$

It follows from (8.9) and [63, Corollary 3.9] that

$$T \text{ is bounded from } L^1(w_1) \times L^1(w_2) \text{ to } L^{\frac{1}{2},\infty}(w^{\frac{1}{2}}),$$

which gives (8.25). It was shown in [32] that for all $0 < p, \lambda < \infty$ and $w \in A_\infty$,

$$(8.28) \quad \|f\|_{L^p(w)} \leq \|M_\lambda f\|_{L^p(w)} \lesssim \|M_\lambda^\# f\|_{L^p(w)},$$

for any function f for which the left-hand side is finite. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < \lambda < \frac{1}{2}$. By (8.28), Lemma 8.39, and [63, Theorem 3.3], there exists $\delta_0 = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ so that for all $0 < |h| \leq \delta_0$,

$$(8.29) \quad \begin{aligned} \|(\tau_h - T)T(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(w^{\frac{1}{2}})} &\lesssim \|M_\lambda^\#((\tau_h T - T)(f_1, f_2))\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(w^{\frac{1}{2}})} \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|\mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(w^{\frac{1}{2}})} + \varepsilon \|\mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(\cdot + h)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(w^{\frac{1}{2}})} \\ &= 2\varepsilon \|\mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(w^{\frac{1}{2}})} \lesssim \varepsilon \|f_1\|_{L^1(w_1)} \|f_2\|_{L^1(w_2)}, \end{aligned}$$

for all functions $f_i \in L^1(w_i) \cap L_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $i = 1, 2$. Note that in the first inequality above, to use (8.28), it requires $\|M_\lambda(T(f_1, f_2))\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(w^{\frac{1}{2}})} < \infty$, which can be checked as in [63, p. 1248]. Since simple functions in $L^p(v)$ is dense in $L^p(v)$ for any $p \in [1, \infty)$ and for any weight v (cf. [1, p. 211]), using (8.29) and a limiting argument, we can obtain (8.27). With Lemma 8.30 in hand, the inequality (8.26) can be shown in the same way. \square

8.4. Pointwise estimates for bilinear singular integrals.

Lemma 8.30. *Let T be a bilinear singular integral operator associated with a compact bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel. Let $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$. Then for any $\eta > 0$, there exists $A_0 = A_0(\eta) > 0$ such that*

$$M_\lambda^\#(T(f_1, f_2)\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c})(x) \leq \eta \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $A \geq A_0$.

Proof. Fix a cube Q and let $x \in Q$. Let $\eta > 0$ be an arbitrary number and $A > 0$ be chosen later. Since $||a|^\lambda - |b|^\lambda| \leq |a - b|^\lambda$, it is enough to prove

$$(8.31) \quad \mathcal{I} := \left(\int_Q |T(f_1, f_2)(\xi)\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}(\xi) - \alpha_Q|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}} \lesssim \eta \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x),$$

for all $A > 0$ sufficiently large, where the constant $\alpha_Q = \alpha_Q^1 + \alpha_Q^2 + \alpha_Q^3$ will be determined below. Write $f_i^0 = f_i \mathbf{1}_{3Q}$ and $f_i^\infty = f_i \mathbf{1}_{(3Q)^c}$, $i = 1, 2$. We split

$$(8.32) \quad \mathcal{I} \lesssim \mathcal{I}_0 + \mathcal{I}_1 + \mathcal{I}_2 + \mathcal{I}_3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_0 &:= \left(\int_Q |T(f_1^0, f_2^0)(\xi)\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}(\xi)|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}, \\ \mathcal{I}_1 &:= \left(\int_Q |T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(\xi)\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}(\xi) - \alpha_Q^1|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}, \\ \mathcal{I}_2 &:= \left(\int_Q |T(f_1^\infty, f_2^0)(\xi)\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}(\xi) - \alpha_Q^2|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}, \\ \mathcal{I}_3 &:= \left(\int_Q |T(f_1^\infty, f_2^\infty)(\xi)\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}(\xi) - \alpha_Q^3|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Kolmogorov's inequality (4.11) and (8.7), there exists $A_0 = A_0(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$(8.33) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_0 &\lesssim |Q|^{-2} \|T(f_1^0, f_2^0)\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}} \\ &\leq \eta |Q|^{-2} \|f_1^0\|_{L^1} \|f_2^0\|_{L^1} \end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim \eta \prod_{i=1}^2 \langle |f_i| \rangle_{3Q} \leq \eta \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x).$$

In order to bound \mathcal{J}_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, we present an estimate. For any $\xi \in Q$, much as in (8.52), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (8.34) \quad G_Q(\xi) &:= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n} \setminus (3Q)^2} |K(\xi, y, z) - K(c_Q, y, z)| |f_1(y)| |f_2(z)| dy dz \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k \geq 0} \iint_{R_k} \frac{\ell(Q)^\delta F(\xi, y, z)}{(|\xi - y| + |\xi - z|)^{2n+\delta}} |f_1(y)| |f_2(z)| dy dz \\ &\lesssim F_1(\ell(Q)) F_2(\ell(Q)) \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{-k\delta} F_3(\text{rd}(2^k Q, \mathbb{I})) \prod_{i=1}^2 \int_{B(x, 2^{k+2}\ell(Q))} |f_i| \\ &=: F(Q) \prod_{i=1}^2 \int_{B(x, 2^{k+2}\ell(Q))} |f_i| \leq F(Q) \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $R_k := \{(y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} : 2^k \ell(Q) \leq |\xi - y| + |\xi - z| < 2^{k+1} \ell(Q)\}$, and

$$F(\xi, y, z) := F_1(|\xi - c_Q|) F_2(|\xi - y| + |\xi - z|) F_3\left(1 + \frac{|\xi + y| + |\xi + z|}{1 + |\xi - y| + |\xi - z|}\right).$$

Observe that for any $A \geq 16$, choosing $N := N(A) \geq 2$ so that $4^N \leq A < 4^{N+1}$, we see that for each cube Q with $2^{-N} \leq \ell(Q) \leq 2^N$ and $Q \cap B(0, A)^c \neq \emptyset$,

$$(8.35) \quad d(Q, 2^N \mathbb{I}) \geq A - \ell(Q) - 2^{N-1} \geq 4^N - 2^N - 2^{N-1} > N \cdot 2^N.$$

Choose

$$(8.36) \quad \begin{aligned} \alpha_Q^1 &= 0, \text{ if } Q \cap B(0, A)^c = \emptyset, & \alpha_Q^1 &= T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(c_Q), \text{ otherwise;} \\ \alpha_Q^2 &= 0, \text{ if } Q \cap B(0, A)^c = \emptyset, & \alpha_Q^2 &= T(f_1^\infty, f_2^0)(c_Q), \text{ otherwise;} \\ \alpha_Q^3 &= 0, \text{ if } Q \cap B(0, A)^c = \emptyset, & \alpha_Q^3 &= T(f_1^\infty, f_2^\infty)(c_Q), \text{ otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

Then by (8.34)–(8.36),

$$(8.37) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_1 &\lesssim \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_{Q \cap B(0, A)^c} |T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(\xi) - T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(c_Q)|^s d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \\ &\leq \sup_{Q \notin \mathcal{Q}(N)} \sup_{\xi \in Q} G_Q(\xi) \lesssim \sup_{Q \notin \mathcal{Q}(N)} F(Q) \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x) \leq \eta \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x), \end{aligned}$$

provided $A \geq 16$ large enough. In the same way, one has

$$(8.38) \quad \mathcal{J}_i \leq \eta \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x), \quad i = 2, 3.$$

Therefore, (8.31) is a consequence of (8.32), (8.33), (8.37), and (8.38). \square

Lemma 8.39. *Let T be a bilinear singular integral operator associated with a compact bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel. Let $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$. Then for any $\eta > 0$, there exists $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\eta) > 0$ such that*

$$M_\lambda^\#((\tau_h T - T)(f_1, f_2))(x) \leq \eta \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x) + \eta \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x + h)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $0 < |h| \leq \delta_0$.

Proof. Fix a cube Q and let $x \in Q$. Let $\eta > 0$ be an arbitrary number. It suffices to show

$$(8.40) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} &:= \left(\int_Q |(\tau_h T - T)(f_1, f_2)(\xi) - \alpha_Q|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}} \\ &\lesssim \eta \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x) + \eta \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x+h), \end{aligned}$$

for all $0 < |h| \leq \delta_0$ sufficiently small, where the constant $\alpha_Q = \alpha_Q^1 + \alpha_Q^2 + \alpha_Q^3$ will be determined below. Write $f_i^0 = f_1 \mathbf{1}_{3Q}$ and $f_i^\infty = f_1 \mathbf{1}_{(3Q)^c}$, $i = 1, 2$. We split

$$(8.41) \quad \mathcal{J} \lesssim \mathcal{J}_0 + \mathcal{J}_1 + \mathcal{J}_2 + \mathcal{J}_3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_0 &:= \left(\int_Q |(\tau_h T - T)(f_1^0, f_2^0)(\xi)|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}, \\ \mathcal{J}_1 &:= \left(\int_Q |(\tau_h T - T)(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(\xi) - \alpha_Q^1|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}, \\ \mathcal{J}_2 &:= \left(\int_Q |(\tau_h T - T)(f_1^\infty, f_2^0)(\xi) - \alpha_Q^2|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}, \\ \mathcal{J}_3 &:= \left(\int_Q |(\tau_h T - T)(f_1^\infty, f_2^\infty)(\xi) - \alpha_Q^3|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Kolmogorov's inequality (4.11) and (8.8), there exists $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$(8.42) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_0 &\lesssim |Q|^{-2} \|(\tau_h T - T)(f_1^0, f_2^0)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}} \\ &\leq \eta |Q|^{-2} \|f_1^0\|_{L^1} \|f_2^0\|_{L^1} \\ &\lesssim \eta \prod_{i=1}^2 \langle |f_i| \rangle_{3Q} \leq \eta \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x). \end{aligned}$$

To dominate \mathcal{J}_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, we treat two cases: $\ell(Q) > 2|h|$ and $\ell(Q) \leq 2|h|$. Choose

$$(8.43) \quad \begin{aligned} \alpha_Q^1 &= 0, \text{ if } \ell(Q) > 2|h|, & \alpha_Q^1 &= T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(c_{Q+h}) - T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(c_Q), & \text{ otherwise;} \\ \alpha_Q^2 &= 0, \text{ if } \ell(Q) > 2|h|, & \alpha_Q^2 &= T(f_1^\infty, f_2^0)(c_{Q+h}) - T(f_1^\infty, f_2^0)(c_Q), & \text{ otherwise;} \\ \alpha_Q^3 &= 0, \text{ if } \ell(Q) > 2|h|, & \alpha_Q^3 &= T(f_1^\infty, f_2^\infty)(c_{Q+h}) - T(f_1^\infty, f_2^\infty)(c_Q), & \text{ otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

In the case $\ell(Q) > 2|h|$, for all $\xi \in Q$, there holds

$$(8.44) \quad \begin{aligned} H_Q(\xi) &:= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n} \setminus (3Q)^2} |K(\xi+h, y, z) - K(\xi, y, z)| |f_1(y)| |f_2(z)| dy dz \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k \geq 0} \iint_{R_k(\xi)} \frac{|h|^\delta F(\xi, y, z)}{(|\xi - y| + |\xi - z|)^{2n+\delta}} |f_1(y)| |f_2(z)| dy dz \\ &\lesssim F_1(|h|) \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{-k\delta} \prod_{i=1}^2 \int_{B(x, 2^{k+2}\ell(Q))} |f_i| \leq F_1(|h|) \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $R_k(\xi) := \{(y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} : 2^k \ell(Q) \leq |\xi - y| + |\xi - z| < 2^{k+1} \ell(Q)\}$, and

$$F(\xi, y, z) := F_1(|h|) F_2(|\xi - y| + |\xi - z|) F_3 \left(1 + \frac{|\xi + y| + |\xi + z|}{1 + |\xi - y| + |\xi - z|} \right) \lesssim F_1(|h|).$$

It follows from (8.43) and (8.44) that for each $i = 1, 2, 3$,

$$(8.45) \quad \mathcal{J}_i \leq \sup_{Q: \ell(Q) > 2|h|} \sup_{\xi \in Q} H_Q(\xi) \lesssim F_1(|h|) \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x) \leq \eta \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x),$$

provided $0 < |h| \leq \delta_0$ small enough.

In the case $\ell(Q) \leq 2|h|$, we have for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$(8.46) \quad \begin{aligned} S_h(x) &:= \sup_{\substack{Q \ni x \\ \ell(Q) \leq 2|h|}} \sup_{\xi \in Q} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n} \setminus (3Q)^2} |K(\xi, y, z) - K(c_Q, y, z)| |f_1(y)| |f_2(z)| dy dz \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k \geq 0} \iint_{R_k(\xi)} \frac{\ell(Q)^\delta F(\xi, y, z)}{(|\xi - y| + |\xi - z|)^{2n+\delta}} |f_1(y)| |f_2(z)| dy dz \\ &\lesssim F_1(|h|) \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{-k\delta} \prod_{i=1}^2 \int_{B(x, 2^{k+2}\ell(Q))} |f_i| \leq F_1(|h|) \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F(\xi, y, z) := F_1(|\xi - c_Q|) F_2(|\xi - y| + |\xi - z|) F_3 \left(1 + \frac{|\xi + y| + |\xi + z|}{1 + |\xi - y| + |\xi - z|} \right) \lesssim F_1(|h|).$$

Note that

$$(8.47) \quad \mathcal{J}_1 \lesssim \mathcal{J}_{1,1}(x) + \mathcal{J}_{1,2}(x),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{1,1}(x) &:= \sup_{\substack{Q \ni x \\ \ell(Q) \leq 2|h|}} \left(\int_Q |T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(\xi) - T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(c_Q)|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}, \\ \mathcal{J}_{1,2}(x) &:= \sup_{\substack{Q \ni x \\ \ell(Q) \leq 2|h|}} \left(\int_Q |\tau_h T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(\xi) - T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(c_{Q+h})|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}. \end{aligned}$$

The latter satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{1,2}(x) &= \sup_{\substack{Q+h \ni x+h \\ \ell(Q+h) \leq 2|h|}} \left(\int_{Q+h} |T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(\xi) - T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(c_{Q+h})|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}} \\ &= \sup_{\substack{Q \ni x+h \\ \ell(Q) \leq 2|h|}} \left(\int_Q |T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(\xi) - T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(c_Q)|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}} = \mathcal{J}_{1,1}(x+h), \end{aligned}$$

which along with (8.46) and (8.47) gives

$$(8.48) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_1 &\lesssim \mathcal{J}_{1,1}(x) + \mathcal{J}_{1,1}(x+h) \leq S_h(x) + S_h(x+h) \\ &\lesssim F_1(|h|) \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x) + F_1(|h|) \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x+h). \end{aligned}$$

The same argument leads to

$$(8.49) \quad \mathcal{J}_i \lesssim F_1(|h|) \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x) + F_1(|h|) \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x+h), \quad i = 2, 3.$$

Consequently, whenever $0 < |h| \leq \delta_0$ sufficiently small, we conclude (8.40) from (8.41), (8.42), (8.45), (8.48), and (8.49). \square

8.5. Estimates involving bad functions. This section contains some useful estimates, which have been used in the preceding section to prove the $L^1 \times L^1 \rightarrow L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}$ compactness.

Lemma 8.50. *For any $\eta > 0$, there exists $A_0 = A_0(\eta) > 0$ such that for all dyadic cubes Q ,*

$$\int_{(3Q)^c \cap B(0, A)^c} |T(g_1, b_{2, Q})(x)| dx \leq \eta \|g_1\|_{L^\infty} \|b_{2, Q}\|_{L^1}, \quad \text{for all } A \geq A_0.$$

Proof. Let $\eta > 0$. Let $A \geq 2^{10}$ and $N = \lceil \frac{1}{2} \log_2 A \rceil \geq 5$. Consider the case $Q \in \mathcal{D}(N)$. Then

$$Q \subset B(0, (N+2)2^N) \quad \text{and} \quad 3Q \subset B(0, (N+3)2^N) \subset B(0, 2^{2N-1}) \subset B(0, A/2),$$

which implies $(3Q)^c \cap B(0, A)^c = B(0, A)^c$, and for all $x \in B(0, A)^c$ and $z \in Q$,

$$\min\{|x-z|, |x+z|\} \geq |x|-|z| \geq A-A/2 = A/2 \geq 16\ell(Q) \geq 32|z-c_Q|.$$

This, along with the cancellation of $b_{2, Q}$ and the Hölder condition of K , gives

$$\begin{aligned} (8.51) \quad & \int_{(3Q)^c \cap B(0, A)^c} |T(g_1, b_{2, Q})(x)| dx \\ &= \int_{B(0, A)^c} \left| \int_Q \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (K(x, y, z) - K(x, y, c_Q)) g_1(y) b_{2, Q}(z) dy dz \right| dx \\ &\lesssim \int_Q |b_{2, Q}(z)| \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{B(0, A)^c} \frac{\ell(Q)^\delta |g_1(y)|}{(|x-y|+|x-z|)^{2n+\delta}} F(x, y, z) dx dy \right] dz \\ &\lesssim \int_Q |b_{2, Q}(z)| \left[\iint_{|x-y|+|x-z| \geq A/2} \frac{A^\delta \|g_1\|_{L^\infty}}{(|x-y|+|x-z|)^{2n+\delta}} F_3(A) dx dy \right] dz \\ &\lesssim F_3(A) \|g_1\|_{L^\infty} \|b_{2, Q}\|_{L^1}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F(x, y) := F_1(|x-y|+|x-z|) F_2(|x-y|+|x-z|) F_3(|x+y|+|x+z|) \lesssim F_3(A),$$

provided the monotonicity of F_3 and the boundedness of F_1 and F_2 .

Let us treat the case $Q \notin \mathcal{D}(N)$. For any $x \in (3Q)^c$ and $z \in Q$, we have $|x-y| \geq \ell(Q) \geq 2|z-c_Q|$. Then by the cancellation of $b_{2, Q}$, the Hölder condition, and Lemma 2.30 part (ii),

$$\begin{aligned} |T(g_1, b_{2, Q})(x)| &= \left| \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} (K(x, y, z) - K(x, y, c_Q)) g_1(y) b_{2, Q}(z) dy dz \right| \\ &\lesssim \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{\ell(Q)^\delta}{(|x-y|+|x-z|)^{2n+\delta}} F(x, y, z) |g_1(y)| |b_{2, Q}(z)| dy dz, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F(x, y, z) := F_1(|z-c_Q|) F_2(|x-y|+|x-z|) F_3 \left(1 + \frac{|x+y|+|x+z|}{1+|x-y|+|x-z|} \right).$$

For any $k \geq 0$ and $z \in Q$, set $R_k(z) := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} : 2^k \ell(Q) \leq |x-y|+|x-z| < 2^{k+1} \ell(Q)\}$. Then for any $(x, y) \in R_k(z)$,

$$\begin{aligned} (8.52) \quad 1 + \frac{|x+y|+|x+z|}{1+|x-y|+|x-z|} &\geq \frac{2|z|}{1+|x-y|+|x-z|} \geq \frac{2d(2^k Q, \mathbb{I})}{1+2^{k+1}\ell(Q)} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{d(2^k Q, \mathbb{I})}{\max\{1, 2^k \ell(Q)\}} = \frac{1}{2} \text{rd}(2^k Q, \mathbb{I}). \end{aligned}$$

This in turn yields for any $z \in Q$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(8.53) \quad G(z) &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{(3Q)^c} \frac{\ell(Q)^\delta}{(|x-y|+|x-z|)^{2n+\delta}} F(x,y,z) |g_1(y)| dx dy \\
&\lesssim \|g_1\|_{L^\infty} F_1(\ell(Q)) F_2(\ell(Q)) \sum_{k \geq 0} \iint_{R_k(z)} \frac{\ell(Q)^\delta}{(2^k \ell(Q))^{2n+\delta}} F_3(\text{rd}(2^k Q, \mathbb{I})) dx dy \\
&\lesssim \|g_1\|_{L^\infty} F_1(\ell(Q)) F_2(\ell(Q)) \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{-k\delta} F_3(\text{rd}(2^k Q, \mathbb{I})) =: \|g_1\|_{L^\infty} F(Q),
\end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$(8.54) \quad \int_{(3Q)^c \cap B(0,A)^c} |T(g_1, b_{2,Q})| dx \lesssim \int_Q |b_{2,Q}(z)| G(z) dz \lesssim F(Q) \|g_1\|_{L^\infty} \|b_{2,Q}\|_{L^1}.$$

As a consequence (8.51) and (8.54), we deduce

$$\int_{(3Q)^c \cap B(0,A)^c} |T(g_1, b_{2,Q})| dx \lesssim [F_3(A) + \sup_{Q \notin \mathcal{D}(N)} F(Q)] \|b_Q\|_{L^1} \leq \eta \|b_Q\|_{L^1},$$

provided $A \geq 2^{10}$ sufficiently large and the fact that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{Q \notin \mathcal{D}(N)} F(Q) = 0$ (cf. [18, Lemma 4.5 (d)]). This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 8.55. *For any $\eta > 0$, there exists $A_0 = A_0(\eta) > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{\Omega^c \cap B(0,A)^c} |T(b_1, b_2)(x)|^{\frac{1}{2}} dx \lesssim \eta, \quad \text{for all } A \geq A_0.$$

Proof. Let $\eta > 0$. Let $A \geq 2^{10}$ and $N = \lceil \frac{1}{2} \log_2 A \rceil \geq 5$. It suffices to prove that for all $x \in \Omega^c \cap B(0,A)^c$,

$$(8.56) \quad |T(b_{1,Q_1}, b_{2,Q_2})(x)| \lesssim F_3(A) \|b_{1,Q_1}\|_{L^1} \frac{\ell(Q_1)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}{|x-c_{Q_1}|^{n+\frac{\delta}{2}}} \|b_{2,Q_2}\|_{L^1} \frac{\ell(Q_2)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}{|x-c_{Q_2}|^{n+\frac{\delta}{2}}}$$

whenever $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{D}(N)$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
(8.57) \quad |T(b_{1,Q_1}, b_{2,Q_2})(x)| &\lesssim F_1(\min\{\ell(Q_1), \ell(Q_2)\}) F_2(\max\{\ell(Q_1), \ell(Q_2)\}) \|b_{1,Q_1}\|_{L^1} \\
&\quad \times \frac{\ell(Q_1)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}{|x-c_{Q_1}|^{n+\frac{\delta}{2}}} \int_{Q_2} \frac{|b_{2,Q_2}(z)| \ell(Q_2)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}{|x-c_{Q_{1,2}}|^{n+\frac{\delta}{2}}} F_3\left(\frac{2|z|}{1+|x-c_{Q_{1,2}}|}\right) dz
\end{aligned}$$

whenever $Q_2 \notin \mathcal{D}(N)$, where $|x-c_{Q_{1,2}}| := |x-c_{Q_1}| + |x-c_{Q_2}|$. An analogy holds for $Q_1 \notin \mathcal{D}(N)$. Assuming these estimates momentarily, let us conclude the proof as follows. By (CZ-1), we write

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega^c \cap B(0,A)^c} |T(b_1, b_2)|^{\frac{1}{2}} dx &\leq \int_{\Omega^c \cap B(0,A)^c} \left[\sum_{Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{D}(N)} |T(b_{1,Q_1}, b_{2,Q_2})| \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega^c \cap B(0,A)^c} \left[\sum_{\substack{Q_1 \in \Lambda_1 \\ Q_2 \notin \mathcal{D}(N)}} |T(b_{1,Q_1}, b_{2,Q_2})| \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega^c \cap B(0,A)^c} \left[\sum_{\substack{Q_1 \notin \mathcal{D}(N) \\ Q_2 \in \Lambda_2}} |T(b_{1,Q_1}, b_{2,Q_2})| \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} dx
\end{aligned}$$

$$=: \mathcal{I}_1 + \mathcal{I}_2 + \mathcal{I}_3.$$

We only bound \mathcal{I}_2 since the terms \mathcal{I}_1 and \mathcal{I}_3 can be estimated in a similar way. It follows from (8.57) and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality that

$$\mathcal{I}_2 \lesssim (\mathcal{I}_{2,1} \times \mathcal{I}_{2,2})^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}_{2,1} := \sum_{Q_1} \|b_{1,Q_1}\|_{L^1} \int_{(3Q_1)^c} \frac{\ell(Q_1)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}{|x - c_{Q_1}|^{n+\frac{\delta}{2}}} dx \lesssim \sum_{Q_1} \|b_{1,Q_1}\|_{L^1} \lesssim 1,$$

and

$$\mathcal{I}_{2,2} := \sum_{Q_2 \notin \mathcal{D}(N)} \int_{Q_2} |b_{2,Q_2}(z)| G(z) dz,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} G(z) &:= F_1(\ell(Q_2))F_2(\ell(Q_2)) \int_{\Omega^c} \frac{\ell(Q_2)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}{|x - c_{Q_{1,2}}|^{n+\frac{\delta}{2}}} F_3\left(\frac{2|z|}{1 + |x - c_{Q_{1,2}}|}\right) dx \\ &\lesssim F_1(\ell(Q_2))F_2(\ell(Q_2)) \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{-k\frac{\delta}{2}} F_3(\text{rd}(2^k Q_2, \mathbb{I})) =: F(Q_2). \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality can be obtained as in (8.53) because $|x - c_{Q_{1,2}}| = |x - c_{Q_1}| + |x - c_{Q_2}| \geq \ell(Q_1) + \ell(Q_2) \geq \ell(Q_2)$ for all $x \in \Omega^c \subset (3Q_1)^c \cap (3Q_2)^c$. Accordingly, by (CZ-3),

$$\mathcal{I}_{2,2} \lesssim \sum_{Q_2 \notin \mathcal{D}(N)} \|b_{2,Q_2}\|_{L^1} F(Q_2) \lesssim \sup_{Q_2 \notin \mathcal{D}(N)} F(Q_2) \leq \eta^2,$$

provided $A \geq A_0$ sufficiently large. Hence,

$$\mathcal{I}_2 \lesssim (\mathcal{I}_{2,1} \times \mathcal{I}_{2,2})^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \eta.$$

Next, let us turn to the proof of (8.56) and (8.57). Let $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{D}(N)$. By symmetry, we may assume $\ell(Q_1) \leq \ell(Q_2)$. Then

$$Q_1 \cup Q_2 \subset B(0, (N+2)2^N) \quad \text{and} \quad 3Q_1 \cup 3Q_2 \subset B(0, 2^{2N-1}) \subset B(0, A/2),$$

which implies for all $x \in \Omega^c \cap B(0, A)^c \subset (3Q_1 \cup 3Q_2)^c \cap B(0, A)^c = B(0, A)^c$, $y \in Q_1$, and $z \in Q_2$,

$$\min\{|x - y|, |x + y|\} \geq |x| - |y| \geq A - A/2 = A/2 \geq 16\ell(Q_1) \geq 32|y - c_{Q_1}|,$$

and

$$\min\{|x - z|, |x + z|\} \geq |x| - |z| \geq A - A/2 = A/2 \geq 16\ell(Q_2) \geq 32|z - c_{Q_2}|.$$

These further give

$$|x - y| \simeq |x - c_{Q_1}|, \quad |x - z| \simeq |x - c_{Q_2}|,$$

and

$$F(x, y, z) := F_1(|x - y| + |x - z|)F_2(|x - y| + |x - z|)F_3(|x + y| + |x + z|) \lesssim F_3(A).$$

Using these estimates, the cancellation of b_{1,Q_1} , and the Hölder condition of K , we deduce

$$|T(b_{1,Q_1}, b_{2,Q_2})(x)| = \left| \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} (K(x, y, z) - K(x, c_{Q_1}, z)) b_{1,Q_1}(y) b_{2,Q_2}(z) dy dz \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{\ell(Q_1)^\delta F(x, y, z)}{(|x-y| + |x-z|)^{2n+\delta}} |b_{1,Q_1}(y)| |b_{2,Q_2}(z)| dy dz \\ &\lesssim F_3(A) \|b_{1,Q_1}\|_{L^1} \frac{\ell(Q_1)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}{|x-c_{Q_1}|^{n+\frac{\delta}{2}}} \|b_{2,Q_2}\|_{L^1} \frac{\ell(Q_2)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}{|x-c_{Q_2}|^{n+\frac{\delta}{2}}}, \end{aligned}$$

which coincides with (8.56).

To justify (8.57), firstly let $Q_2 \notin \mathcal{D}(N)$ with $\ell(Q_1) \leq \ell(Q_2)$. Let $x \in \Omega^c$, $y \in Q_1$, and $z \in Q_2$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \min\{|x-y|, |x-c_{Q_1}|\} &\geq \ell(Q_1) \geq 2|y-c_{Q_1}|, \\ \min\{|x-z|, |x-c_{Q_2}|\} &\geq \ell(Q_2) \geq 2|z-c_{Q_2}|, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} |x-c_{Q_1}|/2 &\leq |x-y| \leq 3|x-c_{Q_1}|/2, \\ |x-c_{Q_2}|/2 &\leq |x-z| \leq 3|x-c_{Q_2}|/2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + |x-y| + |x-z| &\leq 1 + 2|x-c_{Q_1}| + 2|x-c_{Q_2}| \\ &\leq 2(1 + |x-c_{Q_1}| + |x-c_{Q_2}|) =: 2(1 + |x-c_{Q_{1,2}}|). \end{aligned}$$

By the monotonicity of F_1, F_2, F_3 ,

$$\begin{aligned} F(x, y, z) &:= F_1(|y-c_{Q_1}|) F_2(|x-y| + |x-z|) F_3\left(1 + \frac{|x+y| + |x+z|}{1 + |x-y| + |x-z|}\right) \\ &\leq F_1(\ell(Q_1)) F_2(\ell(Q_2)) F_3\left(\frac{2|z|}{1 + |x-c_{Q_{1,2}}|}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Now it follows from the cancellation of b_{1,Q_1} , the Hölder condition of K , and Lemma 2.30 part (ii) that

$$\begin{aligned} |T(b_{1,Q_1}, b_{2,Q_2})(x)| &= \left| \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} (K(x, y, z) - K(x, c_{Q_1}, z)) b_{1,Q_1}(y) b_{2,Q_2}(z) dy dz \right| \\ &\lesssim \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{\ell(Q_1)^\delta F(x, y, z)}{(|x-y| + |x-z|)^{2n+\delta}} |b_{1,Q_1}(y)| |b_{2,Q_2}(z)| dy dz, \end{aligned}$$

which along with the estimates above shows (8.57). Analogously, in the case $\ell(Q_1) > \ell(Q_2)$, we use the cancellation of b_{2,Q_2} to deduce the desired estimate. \square

Lemma 8.58. *For any $\eta > 0$, there exists $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\eta) > 0$ such that for all $0 < |h| \leq \delta_0$,*

$$\int_{(3Q)^c} |T(g_1, b_{2,Q})| dx \leq \eta \|g_1\|_{L^\infty} \|b_{2,Q}\|_{L^1}, \quad \text{if } \ell(Q) \leq 2|h|;$$

and

$$\int_{(3Q)^c} |(\tau_h T - T)(g_1, b_{2,Q})| dx \leq \eta \|g_1\|_{L^\infty} \|b_{2,Q}\|_{L^1}, \quad \text{if } \ell(Q) > 2|h|.$$

Proof. First, let us handle the case $\ell(Q) \leq 2|h|$. For all $x \in (3Q)^c$ and $z \in Q$, there holds $|x-z| \geq \ell(Q) \geq 2|z-c_Q|$. Then using the cancellation of $b_{2,Q}$, the Hölder condition of K , and Lemma 2.30 part (ii), we obtain

$$\int_{(3Q)^c} |T(g_1, b_{2,Q})| dx = \int_{(3Q)^c} \left| \iint_Q (K(x, y, z) - K(x, y, c_Q)) g_1(y) b_{2,Q}(z) dy dz \right| dx$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \int_Q |b_{2,Q}(z)| \left[\iint_{|x-y|+|x-z|\geq\ell(Q)} \frac{\ell(Q)^\delta F(x,y,z) \|g_1\|_{L^\infty}}{(|x-y|+|x-z|)^{2n+\delta}} dx dy \right] dz \\ &\lesssim F_1(|h|) \|g_1\|_{L^\infty} \|b_{2,Q}\|_{L^1}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F(x,y,z) := F_1(|z-c_Q|) F_2(|x-y|+|x-z|) F_3\left(1 + \frac{|x+y|+|x+z|}{1+|x-y|+|x-z|}\right) \lesssim F_1(|h|).$$

Next, we deal with the case $\ell(Q) > 2|h|$. Then for all $x \in (3Q)^c$ and $z \in Q$, we have $|x-z| \geq \ell(Q) \geq 2|h|$. Then by the Hölder condition of K and Lemma 2.30 part (ii),

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{(3Q)^c} |(\tau_h T - T)(g_1, b_{2,Q})| dx \\ &= \int_{(3Q)^c} \left| \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} (K(x+h,y,z) - K(x,y,z)) g_1(y) b_{2,Q}(z) dy dz \right| dx \\ &\lesssim \int_Q |b_{2,Q}(z)| \left[\iint_{|x-y|+|x-z|\geq 2|h|} \frac{|h|^\delta F(x,y,z) \|g_1\|_{L^\infty}}{(|x-y|+|x-z|)^{2n+\delta}} dx dy \right] dz \\ &\lesssim F_1(|h|) \|g_1\|_{L^\infty} \|b_{2,Q}\|_{L^1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that

$$F(x,y,z) = F_1(|h|) F_2(|x-y|+|x-z|) F_3\left(1 + \frac{|x+y|+|x+z|}{1+|x-y|+|x-z|}\right) \lesssim F_1(|h|).$$

Noting that $\lim_{|h|\rightarrow 0} F_1(|h|) = 0$, we conclude the proof. \square

Lemma 8.59. *Let $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|h| > 0$. For all $x \in (3Q_1 \cup 3Q_2)^c$, there holds*

$$(8.60) \quad |T(b_{1,Q_1}, b_{2,Q_2})(x)| \lesssim F_1(|h|) \prod_{j=1}^2 \|b_{j,Q_j}\|_{L^1} \frac{\ell(Q_j)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}{|x-c_{Q_j}|^{n+\frac{\delta}{2}}},$$

whenever $\ell(Q_1) \leq 2|h|$ and $\ell(Q_2) \leq 2|h|$, and

$$(8.61) \quad |(\tau_h T - T)(b_{1,Q_1}, b_{2,Q_2})(x)| \lesssim F_1(|h|) \prod_{j=1}^2 \|b_{j,Q_j}\|_{L^1} \frac{|h|^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}{|x-c_{Q_j}|^{n+\frac{\delta}{2}}},$$

whenever $\ell(Q_1) > 2|h|$ or $\ell(Q_2) > 2|h|$.

Proof. Let $\ell(Q_1) \leq 2|h|$ and $\ell(Q_2) \leq 2|h|$. By symmetry, we may assume that $\ell(Q_1) \leq \ell(Q_2)$. Let $x \in (3Q_1 \cup 3Q_2)^c$, $y \in Q_1$, and $z \in Q_2$. Then it is easy to see that

$$|x-y| \geq \ell(Q_1) \geq 2|y-c_{Q_1}| \quad \text{and} \quad |x-z| \geq \ell(Q_2) \geq 2|z-c_{Q_2}|,$$

which implies $|x-y| \simeq |x-c_{Q_1}|$ and $|x-z| \simeq |x-c_{Q_2}|$. By the cancellation of b_{1,Q_1} , the Hölder condition of K , and Lemma 2.30 part (ii),

$$\begin{aligned} |T(b_{1,Q_1}, b_{2,Q_2})(x)| dx &= \left| \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} (K(x,y,z) - K(x,c_{Q_1},z)) b_{1,Q_1}(y) b_{2,Q_2}(z) dy dz \right| \\ &\lesssim \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{\ell(Q_1)^\delta F(x,y,z)}{(|x-y|+|x-z|)^{2n+\delta}} |b_{1,Q_1}(y)| |b_{2,Q_2}(z)| dy dz \\ &\lesssim F_1(|h|) \prod_{j=1}^2 \|b_{j,Q_j}\|_{L^1} \frac{\ell(Q_j)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}{|x-c_{Q_j}|^{n+\frac{\delta}{2}}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F(x, y) := F_1(|y - c_{Q_1}|)F_2(|x - y| + |x - z|)F_3\left(1 + \frac{|x + y| + |x + z|}{1 + |x - y| + |x - z|}\right) \lesssim F_1(|h|).$$

This gives (8.60).

To show (8.61), note that for all $x \in (3Q_1 \cup 3Q_2)^c$, $y \in Q_1$, and $z \in Q_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{|x - y|, |x - z|\} &\geq \max\{\ell(Q_1), \ell(Q_2)\} \geq 2|h|, \\ |x - y| &\simeq |x - c_{Q_1}|, \quad \text{and} \quad |x - z| \simeq |x - c_{Q_2}|. \end{aligned}$$

This, along with the Hölder condition of K and Lemma 2.30 part (ii), implies

$$\begin{aligned} &|(\tau_h T - T)(b_{1, Q_1}, b_{2, Q_2})(x)| \\ &= \left| \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} (K(x + h, y, z) - K(x, y, z)) b_{1, Q_1}(y) b_{2, Q_2}(z) dy dz \right| \\ &\lesssim \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{|h|^\delta F(x, y, z)}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n + \delta}} |b_{1, Q_1}(y)| |b_{2, Q_2}(z)| dy dz \\ &\lesssim F_1(|h|) \prod_{j=1}^2 \|b_{j, Q_j}\|_{L^1} \frac{|h|^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}{|x - c_{Q_j}|^{n + \frac{\delta}{2}}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F(x, y, z) = F_1(|h|)F_2(|x - y| + |x - z|)F_3\left(1 + \frac{|x + y| + |x + z|}{1 + |x - y| + |x - z|}\right) \lesssim F_1(|h|).$$

The proof is complete. \square

9. $L^\infty \times L^\infty \rightarrow \text{CMO}$ COMPACTNESS

In this section we aim to show (a) \implies (e)' and (e) \implies (c)' in Theorem 1.1.

9.1. $L^\infty \times L^\infty \rightarrow \text{CMO}$ compactness implies weighted $L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p$ compactness.

Proposition 9.1. *Let $0 < \lambda < 1/2$. Let T be a bilinear operator associated with a standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) T is bounded from $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.
- (ii) T is bounded from $L^\infty(w_1^\infty) \times L^\infty(w_2^\infty)$ to $\text{BMO}_\lambda(w^\infty)$ for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(\infty, \infty)}$, where $w = w_1 w_2$.
- (iii) T is bounded from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all (or for some) $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty]$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} > 0$.
- (iv) T is bounded from $L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2})$ to $L^p(w^p)$ for all (or for some) $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty]$ and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} > 0$ and $w = w_1 w_2$.

Proof. We follow the scheme (i) \implies (iii) \implies (iv) \implies (iii) \implies (ii) \implies (i). Both (iv) \implies (iii) and (ii) \implies (i) are trivial. Thus, it suffices to prove (i) \implies (iii), (iii) \implies (iv), and (iii) \implies (ii).

First, let us demonstrate (iii) \implies (iv). Assume (iii) holds. By [36, Proposition 7.4.7], (iii) holds for all $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$, which along with [63, Corollary 3.9] gives that (iv) holds for all $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$. The latter and Theorem 2.25 imply (iv) holds for all exponents $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty]$.

Next, we show (i) \implies (iii). Assume (i) holds. Let f_2 be an arbitrary function in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Define a linear operator

$$\begin{aligned} T_{f_2}(f_1)(x) &:= T(f_1, f_2)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} K(x, y, z) f_2(z) dz \right] f_1(y) dy \\ &=: \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} K_{f_2}(x, y) f_1(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Then it is not hard to verify that K_{f_2} is a standard Calderón–Zygmund kernel with a constant $\|K_{f_2}\|_{\text{CZ}(\delta)}$ satisfying

$$(9.2) \quad \|K_{f_2}\|_{\text{CZ}(\delta)} \lesssim \|K\|_{\text{CZ}(\delta)} \|f_2\|_{L^\infty}.$$

By definition,

$$(9.3) \quad \|T_{f_2}(f_1)\|_{\text{BMO}} = \|T(f_1, f_2)\|_{\text{BMO}} \lesssim \|f_2\|_{L^\infty} \|f_1\|_{L^\infty},$$

which says that T_{f_2} is bounded from $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. In view of (9.2) and (9.3), a careful examination of the proof of [56, p. 50] gives

$$(9.4) \quad \|T_{f_2}(f_1)\|_{\text{H}^1} \lesssim (\|K_{f_2}\|_{\text{CZ}(\delta)} + \|T_{f_2}\|_{L^\infty \rightarrow \text{BMO}}) \|f_1\|_{L^1} \lesssim \|f_2\|_{L^\infty} \|f_1\|_{L^1}.$$

Then by the interpolation theorem [56, p. 43] (see also [36, Theorem 3.4.7] for the precise bound), the estimates (9.3) and (9.4) imply

$$(9.5) \quad \|T(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^{r_1}} = \|T_{f_2}(f_1)\|_{L^{r_1}} \lesssim \|f_1\|_{L^{r_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^\infty}, \quad 1 < r_1 < \infty,$$

where the implicit constant is independent of f_1 and f_2 . Similarly, given $f_1 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, defining $T_{f_1}(f_2)(x) := T(f_1, f_2)(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we deduce

$$(9.6) \quad \|T(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^{r_2}} = \|T_{f_1}(f_2)\|_{L^{r_2}} \lesssim \|f_1\|_{L^\infty} \|f_2\|_{L^{r_2}}, \quad 1 < r_2 < \infty.$$

In view of Theorem 7.22, interpolating between (9.5) and (9.6) yields

$$\|T(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}},$$

for all $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $1 < p, p_1, p_2 < \infty$. This along with [38, Theorem 3] implies (iii) holds.

Finally, to justify (iii) \implies (ii), in view of Theorem 2.26, it suffices to prove

$$(9.7) \quad M_\lambda^\#(T(f_1, f_2))(x) \lesssim \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Assume (iii) holds. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and Q be a cube containing x . Let $f_1 w_1, f_2 w_2 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For each $i = 1, 2$, write $f_i^0 = f_i \mathbf{1}_{3Q}$ and $f_i^\infty = f_i \mathbf{1}_{(3Q)^c}$. Denote

$$\beta_Q := T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(c_Q) + T(f_1^\infty, f_2^0)(c_Q) + T(f_1^\infty, f_2^\infty)(c_Q).$$

Using the fact $0 < \lambda < 1/2$ and Kolmogorov's inequality (4.11), we have

$$(9.8) \quad \mathcal{G} := \left(\int_Q |T(f_1, f_2) - \beta_Q|^\lambda dy \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}} \lesssim |Q|^{-2} \|T(f_1, f_2) - \beta_Q\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(Q)} \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^4 \mathcal{G}_i,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_1 &:= |Q|^{-2} \|T(f_1^0, f_2^0)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(Q)}, \\ \mathcal{G}_2 &:= |Q|^{-2} \|T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty) - T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(c_Q)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(Q)}, \\ \mathcal{G}_3 &:= |Q|^{-2} \|T(f_1^\infty, f_2^0) - T(f_1^\infty, f_2^0)(c_Q)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(Q)}, \\ \mathcal{G}_4 &:= |Q|^{-2} \|T(f_1^\infty, f_2^\infty) - T(f_1^\infty, f_2^\infty)(c_Q)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2}, \infty}(Q)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 8.1 and the assumption (iii), T is bounded from $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^{\frac{1}{2},\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which yields

$$(9.9) \quad \mathcal{G}_1 \lesssim |Q|^{-2} \|f_1^0\|_{L^1} \|f_2^0\|_{L^1} \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^2 \langle |f_i| \rangle_{3Q} \leq \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x).$$

To estimate \mathcal{G}_i , $i = 2, 3, 4$, note that

$$(9.10) \quad |Q|^{-2} \|f\|_{L^{\frac{1}{2},\infty}(Q)} \leq |Q|^{-1} \|f\|_{L^1,\infty(Q)} \leq \int_Q |f(\xi)| d\xi \leq \sup_{\xi \in Q} |f(\xi)|,$$

and for any $\xi \in Q$,

$$(9.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(\xi) &:= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n} \setminus (3Q)^2} |K(\xi, y, z) - K(c_Q, y, z)| |f_1(y)| |f_2(z)| dy dz \\ &\lesssim \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n} \setminus (3Q)^2} \frac{\ell(Q)^\delta}{(|\xi - y| + |\xi - z|)^{2n+\delta}} |f_1(y)| |f_2(z)| dy dz \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, invoking (9.10) and (9.11), we conclude

$$(9.12) \quad \mathcal{G}_i \leq \sup_{\xi \in Q} \mathcal{G}(\xi) \lesssim \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x), \quad i = 2, 3, 4.$$

Consequently, (9.7) follows from (9.8), (9.9), and (9.12). \square

We are ready to prove (e) \implies (c)' in Theorem 1.1. Assume that

$$(9.13) \quad T \text{ is compact from } L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Then T is bounded from $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which along with Proposition 9.1 implies

$$(9.14) \quad T \text{ is bounded from } L^{q_1}(v_1^{q_1}) \times L^{q_2}(v_2^{q_2}) \text{ to } L^q(v^q)$$

for all $q_1, q_2 \in (1, \infty]$ and for all $(v_1, v_2) \in A_{(q_1, q_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2} > 0$ and $v = v_1 v_2$. Thus, we apply Theorem 1.14, (9.13), and (9.14) to conclude that

$$(9.15) \quad T \text{ is compact from } L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2}) \text{ to } L^p(w^p)$$

for all $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty]$ and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} > 0$ and $w = w_1 w_2$. This corresponds to (c)'. \square

9.2. Hypotheses (H1)–(H3) imply weighted $L^\infty \times L^\infty \rightarrow \text{CMO}$ compactness. Next, let us verify (a) \implies (e)' in Theorem 1.1. Let $0 < \lambda < 1/2$ and $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(\infty, \infty)}$. Set $w = w_1 w_2$. It suffices to show

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1 w_1\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2 w_2\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1}} \|P_N^\perp(T(f_1, f_2))\|_{\text{BMO}_\lambda(w^\infty)} = 0,$$

which is equivalent to that given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N_0 = N_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$ such that

$$(9.16) \quad M_\lambda^\#(P_N^\perp(T(f_1, f_2)))(x) w(x) \lesssim \varepsilon \|f_1 w_1\|_{L^\infty} \|f_2 w_2\|_{L^\infty}, \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

It was shown in [55, p. 792] that every cube Q is contained in a shifted dyadic cube $Q_\alpha \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha$ with $\ell(Q_\alpha) \leq 6\ell(Q)$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda := \{0, 1/3\}^n$, where

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

Thus, in (9.16), $M_\lambda^\#$ can be restricted to the family of cubes $Q \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathcal{D}_\alpha$.

Let $f_1 w_1, f_2 w_2 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For each cube $Q \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathcal{D}_\alpha$, there exists a subset $E_Q \subset 3Q$ such that $|E_Q| = 0$, $w(x) \leq \text{ess sup}_{3Q} w$, and $\mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x)w(x) \leq \|\mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)w\|_{L^\infty}$ for all $x \in 3Q \setminus E_Q$. Denote $E := \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha} E_Q$. Then $|E| = 0$.

Fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus E$. Let $Q \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \mathcal{D}_\alpha$ be an arbitrary cube containing x . By the choice of E , there holds

$$(9.17) \quad w(x) \leq \text{ess sup}_{3Q} w \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x)w(x) \leq \|\mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)w\|_{L^\infty}.$$

For each $i = 1, 2$, write $f_i^0 = f_i \mathbf{1}_{3Q}$ and $f_i^\infty = f_i \mathbf{1}_{(3Q)^c}$. Denote

$$\beta_Q := T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(c_Q) + T(f_1^\infty, f_2^0)(c_Q) + T(f_1^\infty, f_2^\infty)(c_Q).$$

Then

$$(9.18) \quad \mathcal{H}(x) := w(x) \left(\int_Q |P_N^\perp(T(f_1, f_2))(\xi) - \beta_Q|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^4 \mathcal{H}_i(x),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_1(x) &:= w(x) \left(\int_Q |P_N^\perp(T(f_1^0, f_2^0))(\xi)|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}, \\ \mathcal{H}_2(x) &:= w(x) \left(\int_Q |P_N^\perp(T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty))(\xi) - T(f_1^0, f_2^\infty)(c_Q)|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}, \\ \mathcal{H}_3(x) &:= w(x) \left(\int_Q |P_N^\perp(T(f_1^\infty, f_2^0))(\xi) - T(f_1^\infty, f_2^0)(c_Q)|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}, \\ \mathcal{H}_4(x) &:= w(x) \left(\int_Q |P_N^\perp(T(f_1^\infty, f_2^\infty))(\xi) - T(f_1^\infty, f_2^\infty)(c_Q)|^\lambda d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.24, we see that $w_1^{-1}, w_2^{-1} \in A_2$. This, together with (2.21), yields

$$(9.19) \quad \left(\int_Q w_i^{-r_i} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{r_i}} \lesssim \int_Q w_i^{-1} dx, \quad \text{for some } r_i \in (1, \infty), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2}$. Since we have shown (a) \implies (b) \implies (c) in Theorem 1.1, the hypotheses (H1)–(H3) imply that T is compact from $L^{r_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{r_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)$. By the latter and Theorem 1.6, there exists $N_0 = N_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$ so that

$$(9.20) \quad \|P_N^\perp T\|_{L^{r_1} \times L^{r_2} \rightarrow L^r} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } N \geq N_0.$$

Hence, in light of the fact $0 < \lambda < 1/2 < r$ and Jensen's inequality, the estimates (9.17), (9.19), and (9.20) imply that for all $N \geq N_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} (9.21) \quad \mathcal{H}_1(x) &\leq w(x) |Q|^{-\frac{1}{r}} \|P_N^\perp(T(f_1^0, f_2^0))\|_{L^r} \leq \varepsilon w(x) |Q|^{-\frac{1}{r}} \|f_1^0\|_{L^{r_1}} \|f_2^0\|_{L^{r_2}} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon w(x) \prod_{i=1}^2 \left(\int_{3Q} |f_i w_i|^{r_i} w_i^{-r_i} \right)^{\frac{1}{r_i}} \lesssim \varepsilon w(x) \prod_{i=1}^2 \|f_i w_i\|_{L^\infty} \left(\int_{3Q} w_i^{-r_i} \right)^{\frac{1}{r_i}} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon (\text{ess sup}_{3Q} w) \prod_{i=1}^2 \|f_i w_i\|_{L^\infty} \left(\int_{3Q} w_i^{-1} \right) \leq \varepsilon [(w_1, w_2)]_{A(\infty, \infty)} \prod_{i=1}^2 \|f_i w_i\|_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

To bound $\mathcal{H}_i(x)$, $i = 2, 3, 4$, let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in \{(0, \infty), (\infty, 0), (\infty, \infty)\}$. We claim that for all $\xi \in Q$,

$$(9.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_Q^\alpha(\xi) &:= |P_N^\perp(T(f_1^{\alpha_1}, f_2^{\alpha_2}))(\xi) - P_N^\perp(T(f_1^{\alpha_1}, f_2^{\alpha_2}))(c_Q)| \\ &\lesssim F_N(Q) \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(9.23) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_N(Q) := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\substack{I \notin \mathcal{D}(N) \\ I \subset Q}} F(I) = 0,$$

where

$$F(I) := F_1(\ell(I))F_2(\ell(I)) \sum_{k \geq \ell(Q)/\ell(I)} 2^{-k\delta} F_3(\text{rd}(2^k I, \mathbb{I})).$$

Then it follows from (9.17), (9.22), (9.23), and Theorem 2.26 that

$$(9.24) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_i(x) &\leq w(x) \sup_{\alpha} \sup_{\xi \in Q} \mathcal{H}_Q^\alpha(\xi) \lesssim F_N(Q) \|\mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)w\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon \|f_1 w_1\|_{L^\infty} \|f_2 w_2\|_{L^\infty}, \quad i = 2, 3, 4, \end{aligned}$$

whenever $N \geq N_0$ large enough. Hence, (9.16) is a consequence of (9.18), (9.21), and (9.24).

Next, we turn to the proof of (9.22). Given $\xi \in Q$, we have

$$(9.25) \quad \mathcal{H}_Q^\alpha(\xi) \leq \sum_{I \notin \mathcal{D}(N)} |\langle T(f_1^{\alpha_1}, f_2^{\alpha_2}), h_I \rangle| |h_I(\xi) - h_I(c_Q)|.$$

If $I \cap Q = \emptyset$, then $h_I(\xi) = h_I(c_Q) = 0$. If $Q \subsetneq I$, then $h_I(\xi) = h_I(c_Q) = \langle h_I \rangle_Q$. Thus, it suffices to treat the case $I \subset Q$. Besides, $|h_I(\xi) - h_I(c_Q)| \neq 0$ implies $\xi \in I$ or $c_Q \in I$. Such dyadic cubes I can be parametrized by $I = Q_j \in \mathcal{D}$ with $Q_j \subset Q$ and $\ell(Q_j) = 2^{-j}\ell(Q)$, $j \geq 0$.

Fix a such dyadic cube $I = Q_j$. Let $\xi \in I$ and denote

$$R_k(\xi) := \{(y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} : 2^k \ell(Q) \leq |\xi - y| + |\xi - z| < 2^{k+1} \ell(Q)\}.$$

Then for all and $y \in R_k(\xi)$,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \frac{|\xi + y| + |\xi + z|}{1 + |\xi - y| + |\xi - z|} &\geq \frac{4|\xi|}{1 + |\xi - y| + |\xi - z|} \geq \frac{4 \text{d}(2^{k+j} I, \mathbb{I})}{1 + 2^{k+j+1} \ell(I)} \\ &\geq \frac{\text{d}(2^{k+j} I, \mathbb{I})}{\max\{2^{k+j} \ell(I), 1\}} = \text{rd}(2^{k+j} I, \mathbb{I}) \end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} F(\xi, y, z) &:= F_1(|\xi - c_I|) F_2(|\xi - y| + |\xi - z|) F_3\left(1 + \frac{|\xi + y| + |\xi + z|}{1 + |\xi - y| + |\xi - z|}\right) \\ &\leq F_1(\ell(I)) F_2(\ell(I)) F_3(\text{rd}(2^{k+j} I, \mathbb{I})). \end{aligned}$$

This, along with the cancellation of h_I and the Hölder condition of K , implies

$$(9.26) \quad \begin{aligned} &|\langle T(f_1^{\alpha_1}, f_2^{\alpha_2}), h_I \rangle| \\ &= \left| \int_I \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n} \setminus (3Q)^2} (K(\xi, y, z) - K(c_I, y, z)) f_1^{\alpha_1}(y) f_2^{\alpha_2}(z) h_I(x) dy dz d\xi \right| \\ &\lesssim |I|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{k \geq 0} \int_I \iint_{R_k(\xi)} \frac{\ell(I)^\delta F(\xi, y, z)}{(|\xi - y| + |\xi - z|)^{2n+\delta}} |f_1(y)| |f_2(z)| dy dz d\xi \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim |I|^{\frac{1}{2}} F_1(\ell(I)) F_2(\ell(I)) \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{2^{-k\delta} F_3(\text{rd}(2^{k+j}I, \mathbb{I}))}{[\ell(Q)/\ell(I)]^\delta} \prod_{i=1}^2 \int_{B(x, 2^{k+2}\ell(Q))} |f_i| \\
&\lesssim |I|^{\frac{1}{2}} F_1(\ell(I)) F_2(\ell(I)) \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{-(k+j)\delta} F_3(\text{rd}(2^{k+j}I, \mathbb{I})) \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Then we deduce (9.22) from (9.25) and (9.26).

Finally, let us prove (9.23). Observe that

$$(9.27) \quad \sum_{\substack{I \subset Q \\ \ell(I) < 2^{-N}}} F(I) \lesssim \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{k \geq j} 2^{-k\delta} F_1(2^{-N}) \lesssim \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{-j\delta} F_1(2^{-N}) \lesssim F_1(2^{-N}),$$

and

$$(9.28) \quad \sum_{\substack{I \subset Q \\ \ell(I) > 2^N}} F(I) \lesssim \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{k \geq j} 2^{-k\delta} F_2(2^N) \lesssim \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{-j\delta} F_2(2^N) \lesssim F_2(2^N).$$

If $2^{-N} \leq \ell(I) \leq 2^N$ and $\text{rd}(I, 2^N \mathbb{I}) > N$, then for any $N \geq 9$ and $k \leq k_N := [\log_2(N^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1)]$,

$$\text{d}(2^k I, \mathbb{I}) \geq \text{d}(I, 2^N \mathbb{I}) + (2^{N-1} - 1/2) - 2^k \ell(I)/2 \geq N \cdot 2^N - 2^{k+N},$$

which gives

$$\text{rd}(2^k I, \mathbb{I}) = \frac{\text{d}(2^k I, \mathbb{I})}{\max\{2^k \ell(I), 1\}} \geq \frac{N \cdot 2^N - 2^{k+N}}{2^{k+N}} = 2^{-k} N - 1 \geq N^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(9.29) \quad \sum_{\substack{I \subset Q \\ 2^{-N} \leq \ell(I) \leq 2^N \\ \text{rd}(I, 2^N \mathbb{I}) > N}} F(I) &\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq j \leq k_N} \sum_{j \leq k \leq k_N} + \sum_{0 \leq j \leq k_N} \sum_{k > k_N} + \sum_{j > k_N} \sum_{k \geq j} 2^{-k\delta} F_3(N^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\
&\lesssim \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{k \geq j} 2^{-k\delta} F_3(N^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \sum_{0 \leq j \leq k_N} \sum_{k > k_N} 2^{-k\delta} + \sum_{j > k_N} \sum_{k \geq j} 2^{-k\delta} \\
&\lesssim F_3(N^{\frac{1}{2}}) + k_N \cdot 2^{-k_N \delta} + 2^{-k_N \delta} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Accordingly, (9.23) follows from (9.27)–(9.29). \square

10. APPLICATIONS

This section is devoted to presenting some examples of bilinear operators, which satisfy the hypotheses (H1), (H2), and (H3). Thus, by Theorem 1.1, they are compact from $L^{p_1}(w_1) \times L^{p_2}(w_2)$ to $L^p(w)$ for all exponents $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $1 < p_1, p_2 < \infty$, and for all weights $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$.

10.1. Bilinear continuous paraproducts. Let us prove Theorem 1.15. Recall that $b \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. By [40, Lemma 5.1], we see that

$$(10.1) \quad \pi_b \text{ is a bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operator}$$

satisfying

$$\pi_b(1, 1) = b \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_b^{*1}(1, 1) = \pi_b^{*2}(1, 1) = 0,$$

which yields (H3). Additionally, it was shown in [3, Proposition 3.1] that

$$(10.2) \quad \pi_b \text{ is compact from } L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

for all $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$. Then (H1) and (H2) follow from Theorems 1.10 and 1.11, (10.1), and (10.2). \square

10.2. Bilinear dyadic paraproducts. In [72, Chapter 3], Meyer constructed the smooth 1-dimensional wavelets with compact support. Let $\psi^0 := \phi$ be the father wavelet, and $\psi^1 := \psi$ be the mother wavelet. Then the n -dimensional wavelet is given by $\psi^\eta(x) := \prod_{i=1}^n \psi^{\eta_i}(x_i)$, where $\eta \in \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{0\}$.

Definition 10.3. We say that $\{\psi_I^\eta : I \in \mathcal{D}, \eta \in \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{0\}\}$ is a *system of wavelets* if $\psi_I^\eta(x) := 2^{nk/2} \psi^\eta(2^k x - l)$, where ψ^η is an n -dimensional wavelet and $I = 2^{-k}([0, 1]^n + l)$, and this collection has the following fundamental properties of a wavelet basis:

- (1) It is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$;
- (2) Localization: $\text{supp}(\psi_I^\eta) \subset I$;
- (3) Regularity: $|\partial^\alpha \psi_I^\eta| \lesssim \ell(I)^{-|\alpha| - n/2}$ for any multi-index $|\alpha| \leq N_0$;
- (4) Cancellation: $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x^\alpha \psi_I^\eta(x) dx = 0$ for any multi-index $|\alpha| \leq N_1$.

Since the different η 's play a minor role, ψ_I^η will be often abbreviated as ψ_I .

Next, we would like to show Theorem 1.16. By symmetry, it suffices to consider Π_b . By definition, it is easy to see that

$$\Pi_b(1, 1) = b \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_b^{*1}(1, 1) = \Pi_b^{*2}(1, 1) = 0,$$

which verifies (H3). Similarly to (2.15), we define

$$\mathcal{P}_N f := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(N)} \langle f, \psi_I \rangle \psi_I \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}_N^\perp f := f - \mathcal{P}_N f,$$

Moreover, by Theorem 1.11, the fact $\mathcal{P}_N^\perp \Pi_b = \Pi_{\mathcal{P}_N^\perp b}$, and Theorem 5.24 applied to $\mathbf{b} = \{b_I = \langle b, \psi_I \rangle\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$, we obtain that for all cube I ,

$$(10.4) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle \Pi_b(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle| &\lesssim [\|\mathcal{P}_N^\perp \Pi_b\|_{L^4 \times L^4 \rightarrow L^2} + \|\Pi_b\|_{L^4 \times L^4 \rightarrow L^2} F(I; N)] |I| \\ &\lesssim [\|\mathcal{P}_N^\perp b\|_{\text{BMO}} + \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} F(I; N)] |I|, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant are independent of I and N . The condition $b \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ gives

$$(10.5) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathcal{P}_N^\perp b\|_{\text{BMO}} = 0.$$

Thus, (10.4) and (10.5) imply that Π_b satisfies the weak compactness property. This shows (H2).

It remains to justify (H1), i.e., Π_b has a compact Calderón–Zygmund kernel:

$$K(x, y_1, y_2) := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \langle b, \psi_I \rangle \psi_I(x) \phi_I(y_1) \phi_I(y_2), \quad \text{where } \phi_I := \frac{\mathbf{1}_I}{|I|}.$$

Let I_0 be the smallest dyadic cube in \mathcal{D} containing x, y_1, y_2 . Note that for all $x, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|x - y_1| + |x - y_2| > 0$,

$$|K(x, y_1, y_2)| \lesssim \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}: I_0 \subset I} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} \| |I|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \psi_I \|_{\text{H}^1} |I|^{-2} \lesssim |I_0|^{-2} \lesssim (|x - y_1| + |x - y_2|)^{-2n},$$

which yields

$$(10.6) \quad \lim_{|x-y_1|+|x-y_2| \rightarrow \infty} K(x, y_1, y_2) = 0.$$

Since we will no longer need the vanishing property of $\psi_I(x)$, by symmetry, (10.5)–(10.6), and Lemma 6.1, it suffices to prove that in either case of the following:

- (i) $\max\{|x - y_1|, |x - y_2|\} < 2^{-3N}$,
- (ii) $\max\{|x - y_1|, |x - y_2|\} > 2^N$,
- (iii) $\max\{|x + y_1|, |x + y_2|\} > N2^{N+2}$,

we have

$$(10.7) \quad |\mathcal{K}| \lesssim \left(2^{-2nN} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} + \|\mathcal{P}_N^\perp b\|_{\text{BMO}} \right) \frac{|x - x'|}{(|x - y_1| + |x - y_2|)^{2n+1}},$$

whenever $|x - x'| \leq \frac{1}{2} \max\{|x - y_1|, |x - y_2|\}$, where

$$(10.8) \quad \mathcal{K} := K(x, y_1, y_2) - K(x', y_1, y_2) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \langle b, \psi_I \rangle [\psi_I(x) - \psi_I(x')] \phi_I(y_1) \phi_I(y_2).$$

If the inner part in (10.8) is non-zero, then $y_1, y_2 \in I$ and either $x \in I$ or $x' \in I$. Keeping $I_0 \subset I$ in mind, we rewrite

$$(10.9) \quad \mathcal{K} = \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(N)} + \sum_{I \notin \mathcal{D}(N)} \right) \langle b, h_I \rangle [\psi_I(x) - \psi_I(x')] \phi_I(y_1) \phi_I(y_2) =: \mathcal{K}_1 + \mathcal{K}_2.$$

Let us first deal with \mathcal{K}_2 . Observe that

$$(10.10) \quad \mathcal{K}_2 = \left\langle \mathcal{P}_N^\perp b, \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} [\psi_I(x) - \psi_I(x')] \phi_I(y_1) \phi_I(y_2) h_I \right\rangle =: \langle \mathcal{P}_N^\perp b, \Phi \rangle,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\mathcal{D}} \Phi(z) &= \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} | [h_I(x) - h_I(x')] \phi_I(y_1) \phi_I(y_2) |^2 \frac{\mathbf{1}_I(z)}{|I|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} |I|^{-\frac{1}{2}} |h_I(x) - h_I(x')| \phi_I(y_1) \phi_I(y_2) \mathbf{1}_I(z). \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$(10.11) \quad \|S_{\mathcal{D}} \Phi\|_{L^1} \leq \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}: I_0 \subset I} \frac{|x - x'|}{\ell(I)^{2n+1}} \lesssim \frac{|x - x'|}{\ell(I_0)^{2n+1}} \lesssim \frac{|x - x'|}{(|x - y_1| + |x - y_2|)^{2n+1}}.$$

Combining (10.10) with (10.11), we obtain

$$(10.12) \quad |\mathcal{K}_2| \lesssim \|\mathcal{P}_N^\perp b\|_{\text{BMO}} \|S_{\mathcal{D}} \Phi\|_{L^1} \lesssim \frac{\|\mathcal{P}_N^\perp b\|_{\text{BMO}} |x - x'|}{(|x - y_1| + |x - y_2|)^{2n+1}}.$$

To proceed, we claim that

$$(10.13) \quad \mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_2, \quad \text{in both cases (ii) and (iii).}$$

Indeed, let $I \in \mathcal{D}$ be in the sum so that the inner part in (10.8) is non-zero. In case (ii), $\ell(I) \geq \ell(I_0) \geq \max\{|x - y_1|, |x - y_2|\} > 2^N$, and hence, $I \notin \mathcal{D}(N)$. If $\ell(I) > 2^N$, then

$I \notin \mathcal{D}(N)$. If I belongs to the case (iii) with $\ell(I) \leq 2^N$, then writing $x_i := \frac{1}{2}(x + y_i)$, we have $x_i \in I_0 \subset I$ and $|x_i - c_I| \leq \ell(I)/2 \leq 2^{N-1}$, $i = 1, 2$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rd}(I, 2^N \mathbb{I}) &= 2^{-N} \text{d}(I, 2^N \mathbb{I}) \geq 2^{-N} |c_I| \\ &\geq 2^{-N} \max_{i=1,2} \{|x_i| - |x_i - c_I|\} \geq 2^{-N} (\max_{i=1,2} |x_i| - 2^{N-1}) \\ &= 2^{-N-1} (\max\{|x + y_1|, |x + y_2|\} - 2^N) \geq 2^{-N-1} (N2^{N+2} - 2^N) > N, \end{aligned}$$

which shows $I \notin \mathcal{D}(N)$. Thus, (10.13) holds.

Let us turn to the estimate for \mathcal{K}_1 in case (i). We rewrite

$$(10.14) \quad \mathcal{K}_1 = \left\langle b, \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(N)} (\psi_I(x) - \psi_I(x')) \phi_I(y_1) \phi_I(y_2) h_I \right\rangle =: \langle b, \Psi \rangle.$$

Set $k_0 := \max\{0, -N - \log_2 \ell(I_0)\}$. As done for Φ , we have

$$(10.15) \quad \|S_{\mathcal{D}} \Psi\|_{L^1} \lesssim \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(N): I_0 \subset I} \frac{|x - x'|}{\ell(I)^{2n+1}} = \sum_{k \geq k_0} \frac{|x - x'|}{(2^k \ell(I_0))^{2n+1}}.$$

Then (10.14) and (10.15) imply

$$|\mathcal{K}_1| \lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} \|S_{\mathcal{D}} \Psi\|_{L^1} \lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} |x - x'| \sum_{k \geq k_0} \frac{2^{-2kn}}{\ell(I_0)^{2n+1}}.$$

To analyze the last term, we treat two cases as follows. If $\max\{|x - y_1|, |x - y_2|\} \leq 2^{-N} \ell(I_0)$, then

$$(10.16) \quad |\mathcal{K}_1| \lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} \frac{|x - x'|}{\ell(I_0)^{2n+1}} \leq \frac{2^{-2nN} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} |x - x'|}{(|x - y_1| + |x - y_2|)^{2n+1}},$$

where the implicit constants are independent of N . If $\max\{|x - y_1|, |x - y_2|\} > 2^{-N} \ell(I_0)$, then

$$\ell(I_0) < 2^N \max\{|x - y_1|, |x - y_2|\} \leq 2^{-2N} \quad \text{and} \quad k_0 \geq -N - \log_2 \ell(I_0) \geq N,$$

which in turn leads to

$$(10.17) \quad |\mathcal{K}_1| \lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} |x - x'| \sum_{k \geq N} \frac{2^{-2kn}}{\ell(I_0)^{2n+1}} \lesssim \frac{2^{-2nN} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} |x - x'|}{(|x - y_1| + |x - y_2|)^{2n+1}}.$$

Consequently, (10.7) follows from (10.9), (10.12), (10.13), (10.16), and (10.17). \square

10.3. Bilinear pseudo-differential operators. For any $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^m$, we define the seminorm

$$P_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma}^{m, \rho, \delta}(\sigma) := \sup_{x, \xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \partial_\eta^\gamma \sigma(x, \xi, \eta)|}{(1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{m + \delta|\alpha| - \rho(|\beta| + |\gamma|)}}$$

for all multi-indices α, β and γ .

Combining [5, Theorem 2.1] with [38, Corollary 1], one has that for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{1, \delta}^0$ with $\delta \in [0, 1)$,

$$(10.18) \quad T_\sigma \text{ is a bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operator.}$$

In what follows, let K_σ denote the kernel of T_σ .

Proof of Theorem 1.17. Note that $\mathcal{K}_{1,\delta}^0 \subset \mathcal{S}_{1,\delta}^0$. It follows from (10.18) that

$$(10.19) \quad T_\sigma \text{ is a bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operator.}$$

Considering Theorems 1.10, 1.11, and 1.12, we are reduced to proving that

$$(10.20) \quad T_\sigma \text{ is compact from } L^4(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^4(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad k = 1, 2.$$

Our proof is a bilinear extension of the proof of [19, Theorem 3.2], which itself builds on the idea in [26, Theorem E].

Let ψ be a smooth cut-off function such that $\mathbf{1}_{B(0,1)} \leq \psi \leq \mathbf{1}_{B(0,2)}$. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$(10.21) \quad \phi_j(x, \xi, \eta) = \psi_j(x)\psi_j(\xi)\psi_j(\eta) := \psi(2^{-j}x)\psi(2^{-j}\xi)\psi(2^{-j}\eta).$$

Then we see that

$$(10.22) \quad \sigma_j := \sigma\phi_j \in \mathcal{S}_{1,\delta}^0 \quad \text{uniformly in } j \in \mathbb{N},$$

which along with (10.18) gives

$$(10.23) \quad T_{\sigma_j} \text{ is a bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operator.}$$

By Lemma 4.39, to obtain (10.20), it suffices to show

$$(10.24) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|T_{\sigma_j} - T_\sigma\|_{L^4 \times L^4 \rightarrow L^2} = 0$$

and

$$(10.25) \quad T_{\sigma_j} \text{ is compact from } L^4(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^4(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let us bound $\|T_{\sigma_j} - T_\sigma\|_{L^4 \times L^4 \rightarrow L^2}$. By Lemma 10.44,

$$(10.26) \quad \|K_{\sigma_j} - K_\sigma\|_{CZ(\delta)} = \|K_{\sigma_j - \sigma}\|_{CZ(\delta)} \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq 2N_0} P_{\alpha, \beta, 0}^{0,1,\delta}(\sigma_j - \sigma),$$

where $N_0 > 2n$. From [5, Theorem 2.1] and its proof, it follows that both symbols of T_σ^{*1} and T_σ^{*2} belong to $\mathcal{S}_{1,\delta}^0$ and

$$(10.27) \quad \begin{aligned} |(\sigma_j - \sigma)(x, \xi, \eta)| &\lesssim P_{0,0,0}^{0,1,\delta}(\sigma_j - \sigma), \\ |(\sigma_j^{*k} - \sigma^{*k})(x, \xi, \eta)| &\lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta|, |\gamma| \leq 2N_1} P_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma}^{0,1,\delta}(\sigma_j - \sigma), \end{aligned}$$

where $N_1 > n/2$ sufficiently large. Pick $N := \max\{N_0, N_1\}$. Then together with (10.26) and (10.27), [38, Corollary 1] implies

$$(10.28) \quad \|T_{\sigma_j} - T_\sigma\|_{L^4 \times L^4 \rightarrow L^2} \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta|, |\gamma| \leq 2N} P_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma}^{0,1,\delta}(\sigma_j - \sigma).$$

Thus, (10.24) is a consequence of (10.28) and Lemma 10.43.

It remains to demonstrate (10.25). By (10.23) and [38, Theorem 3], we have

$$(10.29) \quad \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^4} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^4} \leq 1}} \|T_{\sigma_j}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} \lesssim 1.$$

Note that $\text{supp } \sigma_j \subset \{(x, \xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^{3n} : |x| \leq 2^{j+1}, |\xi| \leq 2^{j+1}, |\eta| \leq 2^{j+1}\}$. Then,

$$K_{\sigma_j}(x, y, z) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad T_{\sigma_j}(f_1, f_2)(x) = 0, \quad \text{for all } |x| > 2^{j+1},$$

which yields

$$(10.30) \quad \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^4} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^4} \leq 1}} \|T_{\sigma_j}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}\|_{L^2} = 0.$$

We are going to show

$$(10.31) \quad \lim_{|h| \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^4} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^4} \leq 1}} \|\tau_h T_{\sigma_j}(f_1, f_2) - T_{\sigma_j}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} = 0.$$

Once this is established, (10.25) follows from Theorem 1.3 and (10.29)–(10.31).

The kernel of T_{σ_j} is given by

$$(10.32) \quad K_{\sigma_j}(x, y, z) = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \sigma_j(x, \xi, \eta) e^{2\pi i[(x-y)\cdot\xi + (x-z)\cdot\eta]} d\xi d\eta.$$

Fix an even number $N > n$. By definition, we see that $\sigma_j \in \mathcal{S}_{1,0}^{-2N}$ and

$$(10.33) \quad \|K_{\sigma_j}\|_{L^\infty} + \|K_{\Delta_\xi^N \sigma_j}\|_{L^\infty} + \|K_{\Delta_\eta^N \sigma_j}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{d\xi d\eta}{(1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{2N}} \lesssim 1.$$

Using integration by parts and the fact that $e^{i\xi \cdot x} = (-1)^k |x|^{-2k} \Delta_\xi^k e^{i\xi \cdot x}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \neq 0$, we deduce

$$(10.34) \quad \begin{aligned} K_{\Delta_\xi^N \sigma_j}(x, y, z) &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \Delta_\xi^N \sigma_j(x, \xi, \eta) e^{2\pi i\xi \cdot (x-y)} e^{2\pi i\eta \cdot (x-z)} d\xi d\eta \\ &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \Delta_\xi^N (e^{2\pi i\xi \cdot (x-y)}) e^{2\pi i\eta \cdot (x-z)} \sigma_j(x, \xi, \eta) d\xi d\eta \\ &= (2\pi|x-y|)^{2N} K_{\sigma_j}(x, y, z). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$(10.35) \quad K_{\Delta_\eta^N \sigma_j}(x, y, z) = (2\pi|x-z|)^{2N} K_{\sigma_j}(x, y, z).$$

Thus, it follows from (10.34) and (10.35) that

$$(10.36) \quad K_{\sigma_j}(x, y, z) = \frac{K_{\sigma_j}(x, y, z) + K_{\Delta_\xi^N \sigma_j}(x, y, z) + K_{\Delta_\eta^N \sigma_j}(x, y, z)}{1 + (2\pi|x-y|)^{2N} + (2\pi|x-z|)^{2N}},$$

which along with (10.33) implies that for any $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$(10.37) \quad |K_{\sigma_j}(x-h, y, z) - K_{\sigma_j}(x, y, z)| \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^4 \mathbf{K}_j^i(x, y, z),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{K}_j^1(x, y, z) &:= \left| \frac{1}{1 + (2\pi|x-h-y|)^{2N} + (2\pi|x-h-z|)^{2N}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{1 + (2\pi|x-y|)^{2N} + (2\pi|x-z|)^{2N}} \right|, \\ \mathbf{K}_j^2(x, y, z) &:= \frac{|K_{\sigma_j}(x-h, y, z) - K_{\sigma_j}(x, y, z)|}{1 + (2\pi|x-y|)^{2N} + (2\pi|x-z|)^{2N}}, \\ \mathbf{K}_j^3(x, y, z) &:= \frac{|K_{\Delta_\xi^N \sigma_j}(x-h, y, z) - K_{\Delta_\xi^N \sigma_j}(x, y, z)|}{1 + (2\pi|x-y|)^{2N} + (2\pi|x-z|)^{2N}}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbf{K}_j^4(x, y, z) := \frac{|K_{\Delta_\eta^N \sigma_j}(x-h, y, z) - K_{\Delta_\eta^N \sigma_j}(x, y, z)|}{1 + (2\pi|x-y|)^{2N} + (2\pi|x-z|)^{2N}}.$$

Denote

$$(10.38) \quad \mathbf{G}_j^i(x) := \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \mathbf{K}_j^i(x, y, z) |f_1(y)| |f_2(z)| dy dz, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, 4.$$

Note that

$$\mathbf{K}_j^1(x, y, z) \lesssim |h| \sum_{k=0}^{2N-1} \frac{(1 + |x-h-y| + |x-h-z|)^{-k}}{(1 + |x-y| + |x-z|)^{2N-k-1}} =: |h| \sum_{k=0}^{2N-1} \mathbf{K}_{j,k}^1(x, y, z).$$

If we set $\phi_k(x) := \frac{(1+|x-h|)^{-k/2}}{(1+|x|)^{(2N-k-1)/2}}$, then

$$\mathbf{G}_{j,k}^1(x) := \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \mathbf{K}_{j,k}^1(x, y, z) |f_1(y)| |f_2(z)| dy dz \leq \phi_k * |f_1|(x) \phi_k * |f_2|(x),$$

and hence,

$$(10.39) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{G}_j^1\|_{L^2} &\lesssim |h| \sup_k \|\mathbf{G}_{j,k}^1\|_{L^2} \leq |h| \sup_k \|\phi_k * |f_1|\|_{L^4} \|\phi_k * |f_2|\|_{L^4} \\ &\leq |h| \|f_1\|_{L^4} \|f_2\|_{L^4} \sup_k \|\phi_k\|_{L^1}^2 \lesssim |h| \|f_1\|_{L^4} \|f_2\|_{L^4}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, to control \mathbf{G}_j^2 , we use (10.32) and the mean value theorem to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} &|K_{\sigma_j}(x-h, y, z) - K_{\sigma_j}(x, y, z)| \\ &\leq \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} |\sigma_j(x-h, \xi, \eta) - \sigma_j(x, \xi, \eta)| d\xi d\eta + \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} |\sigma_j(x, \xi, \eta)| |e^{2\pi i h \cdot (\xi + \eta)} - 1| d\xi d\eta \\ &\lesssim |h| \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} |\nabla_x \sigma_j(x + \theta h, \xi, \eta)| d\xi d\eta + |h| \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} |\sigma_j(x, \xi, \eta)| |\xi + \eta| d\xi d\eta \\ &\lesssim |h| \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{\psi_{2j}(\xi) \psi_{2j}(\eta)}{(1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{2N}} d\xi d\eta + |h| \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{|\xi| + |\eta|}{(1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{2N}} d\xi d\eta \lesssim |h|, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$(10.40) \quad \mathbf{G}_j^2(x) \lesssim |h| \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{|f_1(y)| |f_2(z)|}{(1 + |x-y| + |x-z|)^{2N}} dy dz \lesssim |h| \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x),$$

and

$$(10.41) \quad \|\mathbf{G}_j^2\|_{L^2} \lesssim |h| \|\mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} \lesssim |h| \|f_1\|_{L^4} \|f_2\|_{L^4}.$$

The same argument holds for \mathbf{G}_j^3 and \mathbf{G}_j^4 :

$$(10.42) \quad \|\mathbf{G}_j^i\|_{L^2} \lesssim |h| \|f_1\|_{L^4} \|f_2\|_{L^4}, \quad i = 3, 4.$$

Therefore, (10.37)–(10.42) lead to

$$\|\tau_h T_{\sigma_j}(f_1, f_2) - T_{\sigma_j}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^4 \|\mathbf{G}_j^i\|_{L^2} \lesssim |h| \|f_1\|_{L^4} \|f_2\|_{L^4},$$

which yields (10.31). \square

Lemma 10.43. *Let $0 < \rho \leq 1$, $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$, and $m \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}_{\rho, \delta}^m$ and define σ_j as in (10.22). Then for all multi-indices α, β , and γ ,*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} P_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma}^{m, \rho, \delta}(\sigma - \sigma_j) = 0.$$

Proof. Fix multi-indices α , β , and γ . By Leibniz's rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \partial_\eta^\gamma (\sigma - \sigma_j)(x, \xi, \eta)| &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 = \alpha \\ \beta_0 + \beta_1 = \beta \\ \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 = \gamma}} S_{\alpha_0, \beta_0, \gamma_0}^{\alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1} \\ &=: \sum_{\substack{\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 = \alpha \\ \beta_0 + \beta_1 = \beta \\ \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 = \gamma}} |\partial_x^{\alpha_0} \partial_\xi^{\beta_0} \partial_\eta^{\gamma_0} \sigma(x, \xi, \eta)| |\partial_x^{\alpha_1} \partial_\xi^{\beta_1} \partial_\eta^{\gamma_1} (1 - \phi_j)(x, \xi, \eta)|. \end{aligned}$$

If $|\alpha_1| = |\beta_1| = |\gamma_1| = 0$, then by definition and the fact that $\text{supp}(1 - \phi_j) \subset \{|x| + |\xi| + |\eta| \geq 2^j\}$,

$$S_{\alpha_0, \beta_0, \gamma_0}^{\alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1} \lesssim C_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma}(x, \xi, \eta)(1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{m + \delta|\alpha| - \rho(|\beta| + |\gamma|)} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| + |\xi| + |\eta| \geq 2^j\}}.$$

If $|\alpha_1| \neq 0$ and $|\beta_1| = |\gamma_1| = 0$, then

$$|\partial_x^{\alpha_1} (1 - \phi_j)(x, \xi, \eta)| \leq |\partial_x^{\alpha_1} \psi_j(x)| |\psi_j(\xi)| |\psi_j(\eta)| \lesssim 2^{-j|\alpha_1|} \mathbf{1}_{\{2^j \leq |x| \leq 2^{j+1}\}},$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\alpha_0, \beta_0, \gamma_0}^{\alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1} &\lesssim C_{\alpha_0, \beta_0, \gamma_0}(x, \xi, \eta)(1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{m + \delta|\alpha_0| - \rho(|\beta| + |\gamma|)} \mathbf{1}_{\{2^j \leq |x| \leq 2^{j+1}\}} \\ &\leq C_{\alpha_0, \beta_0, \gamma_0}(x, \xi, \eta)(1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{m + \delta|\alpha| - \rho(|\beta| + |\gamma|)} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| + |\xi| + |\eta| \geq 2^j\}}. \end{aligned}$$

If $|\beta_1| \neq 0$ or $|\gamma_1| \neq 0$, then we may assume that $|\beta_1| \neq 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &|\partial_x^{\alpha_1} \partial_\xi^{\beta_1} \partial_\eta^{\gamma_1} (1 - \phi_j)(x, \xi, \eta)| \\ &\leq |\partial_x^{\alpha_1} \psi_j(x)| |\partial_\xi^{\beta_1} \psi_j(\xi)| |\partial_\eta^{\gamma_1} \psi_j(\eta)| \lesssim 2^{-j(|\alpha_1| + |\beta_1| + |\gamma_1|)} \mathbf{1}_{\{2^j \leq |\xi| \leq 2^{j+1}\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\eta| \leq 2^{j+1}\}} \\ &\lesssim (1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{-\rho(|\beta_1| + |\gamma_1|)} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\xi| \geq 2^j\}} \leq (1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{-\rho(|\beta_1| + |\gamma_1|)} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| + |\xi| + |\eta| \geq 2^j\}}, \end{aligned}$$

provided that $2^j \leq |\xi| \leq 1 + |\xi| + |\eta| \leq 1 + 2^{j+1} + 2^{j+1} = 5 \cdot 2^j$. This in turn implies

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\alpha_0, \beta_0, \gamma_0}^{\alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1} &\lesssim C_{\alpha_0, \beta_0, \gamma_0}(x, \xi, \eta)(1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{m + \delta|\alpha_0| - \rho(|\beta_0| + |\gamma_0|)} \\ &\quad \times (1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{-\rho(|\beta_1| + |\gamma_1|)} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| + |\xi| + |\eta| \geq 2^j\}} \\ &\leq C_{\alpha_0, \beta_0, \gamma_0}(x, \xi, \eta)(1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{m + \delta|\alpha| - \rho(|\beta| + |\gamma|)} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| + |\xi| + |\eta| \geq 2^j\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the fact $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}_{\rho, \delta}^m$ gives $\lim_{|x| + |\xi| + |\eta| \rightarrow \infty} C_{\alpha', \beta', \gamma'}(x, \xi, \eta) = 0$ for all multi-indices α' , β' , and γ' , we utilize the preceding estimates to conclude that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} P_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma}^{m, \rho, \delta}(\sigma - \sigma_j) = 0$. \square

Lemma 10.44. *Let $0 < \rho \leq 1$, $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$, $m \in \mathbb{R}$, and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $2N\rho > 2n + m > 1$. Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{\rho, \delta}^m$ and K_σ be the kernel of T_σ . Then for all multi-indices α , β and γ ,*

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta \partial_z^\gamma K_\sigma(x, y, z)| \lesssim \frac{\sum_{\substack{\alpha' \leq \alpha \\ |\beta'| \leq 2N_0}} P_{\alpha', \beta', 0}^{m, \rho, \delta}(\sigma)}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n + m + 2N(1 - \rho) + |\alpha| + |\beta| + |\gamma|}},$$

whenever $x \neq y$ or $x \neq z$, where N_0 is an integer such that $N_0 \geq (n + |m| + N)/\rho$.

Proof. Let ψ and σ_j be defined in (10.21) and (10.22), respectively. Let K_{σ_j} be the kernel of T_{σ_j} . Since σ_j converges pointwise to σ , it follows that K_{σ_j} converges to K_σ in the sense of distributions. Hence, it is enough to show the same bound holds for K_{σ_j} uniformly in $j \in \mathbb{N}$. By definition and Leibniz's rule, there holds

$$|\partial_x^{\alpha_2} \partial_\xi^{\beta_2} \partial_\eta^{\gamma_2} \sigma_j(x, \xi, \eta)|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{\substack{\alpha_0+\alpha_1=\alpha_2 \\ \beta_0+\beta_1=\beta_2 \\ \gamma_0+\gamma_1=\gamma_2}} C_{\alpha_2,\beta_2,\gamma_2}^{\alpha_1,\beta_1,\gamma_1} |\partial_x^{\alpha_1} \partial_\xi^{\beta_1} \partial_\eta^{\gamma_1} \sigma(x, \xi, \eta)| |\partial_x^{\alpha_0} \psi_j(x)| |\partial_\xi^{\beta_0} \psi_j(\xi)| |\partial_\eta^{\gamma_0} \psi_j(\eta)| \\
&\leq \sum_{\substack{\alpha_0+\alpha_1=\alpha_2 \\ \beta_0+\beta_1=\beta_2 \\ \gamma_0+\gamma_1=\gamma_2}} C_{\alpha_2,\beta_2,\gamma_2}^{\alpha_1,\beta_1,\gamma_1} P_{\alpha_1,\beta_1,\gamma_1}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma) (1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{m+\delta|\alpha_1|-\rho(|\beta_1|+|\gamma_1|)-|\beta_0|-|\gamma_0|},
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant $C_{\alpha_2,\beta_2,\gamma_2}^{\alpha_1,\beta_1,\gamma_1}$ is independent of j and we have used that for $\beta_0 \neq 0$ (or $\gamma_0 \neq 0$),

$$|\partial_\xi^{\beta_0} \psi_j(\xi)| |\partial_\eta^{\gamma_0} \psi_j(\eta)| \lesssim 2^{-j|\beta_0|} \text{ (or } 2^{-j|\gamma_0|}) \lesssim (1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{-|\beta_0|-|\gamma_0|},$$

provided the construction of ψ_j . Hence,

$$(10.45) \quad \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} P_{\alpha_2,\beta_2,\gamma_2}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma_j) \lesssim \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \\ \beta_1 \leq \beta_2 \\ \gamma_1 \leq \gamma_2}} P_{\alpha_1,\beta_1,\gamma_1}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma).$$

Additionally, observe that

$$(10.46) \quad \partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta \partial_z^\gamma K_{\sigma_j}(x, y, z) = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} e^{2\pi i \xi \cdot (x-y)} e^{2\pi i \eta \cdot (x-z)} \tilde{\sigma}_j(x, \xi, \eta) d\xi d\eta,$$

where

$$\tilde{\sigma}_j(x, \xi, \eta) = \sum_{\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3=\alpha} C_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}^{\alpha_1,\alpha_2} \xi^{\alpha_2+\beta} \eta^{\alpha_3+\gamma} \partial_x^{\alpha_1} \sigma_j(x, \xi, \eta),$$

with

$$(10.47) \quad P_{\alpha',\beta',\gamma'}^{m+|\alpha|+|\beta|+|\gamma|,\rho,\delta}(\xi^{\alpha_2+\beta} \eta^{\alpha_3+\gamma} \partial_x^{\alpha_1} \sigma_j(x, \xi, \eta)) \lesssim \sum_{\substack{\beta'' \leq \beta' \\ \gamma'' \leq \gamma'}} P_{\alpha_1+\alpha',\beta'',\gamma''}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma_j),$$

where the implicit constant is independent of j . By (10.45)–(10.47), it suffices to show

$$(10.48) \quad |K_{\sigma_j}(x, y, z)| \lesssim \frac{\sum_{|\beta'| \leq 2N_0} P_{0,\beta',0}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma_j)}{(|x-y| + |x-z|)^{2n+m+2N(1-\rho)}}, \quad \text{uniformly in } j \in \mathbb{N},$$

whenever $x \neq y$ or $x \neq z$.

We may assume that $|x-y| \geq |x-z|$. Thus, $|x-y| \simeq |x-y| + |x-z|$. Consider first the case $|x-y| \geq 1$. Let Δ_ξ denote the Laplace operator in the variable ξ . Using the fact that $e^{i\xi \cdot x} = (-1)^k |x|^{-2k} \Delta_\xi^k e^{i\xi \cdot x}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \neq 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|K_{\sigma_j}(x, y, z)| &= \frac{1}{(2\pi|x-y|)^{2N_0}} \left| \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \Delta_\xi^{N_0} (e^{2\pi i \xi \cdot (x-y)} e^{2\pi i \eta \cdot (x-z)}) \sigma_j(x, \xi, \eta) d\xi d\eta \right| \\
&= \frac{1}{(2\pi|x-y|)^{2N_0}} \left| \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} e^{2\pi i \xi \cdot (x-y)} e^{2\pi i \eta \cdot (x-z)} \Delta_\xi^{N_0} \sigma_j(x, \xi, \eta) d\xi d\eta \right| \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{|x-y|^{2N_0}} \sum_{|\beta|=2N_0} P_{0,\beta,0}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma_j) \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{d\xi d\eta}{(1+|\xi|+|\eta|)^{2N_0\rho-m}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{|x-y|^{2N_0}} \sum_{|\beta|=2N_0} P_{0,\beta,0}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma_j) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{d\xi}{(1+|\xi|)^{N_0\rho-\frac{m}{2}}} \right)^2 \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{|x-y|^{2n+m+2N(1-\rho)}} \sum_{|\beta|=2N_0} P_{0,\beta,0}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma_j),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $2N_0\rho - m > 2n$ and $2N_0 \geq 2n + m + 2N(1 - \rho)$.

It remains to deal with the case $0 < r := |x - y| < 1$. Letting $u := \frac{x-y}{|x-y|}$ and $\tilde{\psi} := 1 - \psi$, we rewrite

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{\sigma_j}(x, y, z) &= r^{-2n} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} e^{2\pi i \xi \cdot u} e^{2\pi i r^{-1} \eta \cdot (x-z)} \sigma_j(x, r^{-1} \xi, r^{-1} \eta) d\xi d\eta \\
&= r^{-2n} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} e^{2\pi i \xi \cdot u} e^{2\pi i r^{-1} \eta \cdot (x-z)} \sigma_j(x, r^{-1} \xi, r^{-1} \eta) \psi(\xi) \psi(\eta) d\xi d\eta \\
&\quad + r^{-2n} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} e^{2\pi i \xi \cdot u} e^{2\pi i r^{-1} \eta \cdot (x-z)} \sigma_j(x, r^{-1} \xi, r^{-1} \eta) \tilde{\psi}(\xi) \psi(\eta) d\xi d\eta \\
&\quad + r^{-2n} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} e^{2\pi i \xi \cdot u} e^{2\pi i r^{-1} \eta \cdot (x-z)} \sigma_j(x, r^{-1} \xi, r^{-1} \eta) \tilde{\psi}(\eta) d\xi d\eta \\
&=: K_{\sigma_j}^1(x, y, z) + K_{\sigma_j}^2(x, y, z) + K_{\sigma_j}^3(x, y, z).
\end{aligned}$$

The condition $m + 2n - 1 > 0$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}
|K_{\sigma_j}^1(x, y, z)| &\leq r^{-2n} P_{0,0,0}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma_j) \int_{|\xi| \leq 2} \int_{|\eta| \leq 2} (1 + r^{-1}|\xi| + r^{-1}|\eta|)^m d\xi d\eta \\
&\simeq P_{0,0,0}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma_j) \int_0^{\frac{2}{r}} \int_0^{\frac{2}{r}} (1 + s + t)^m s^{n-1} t^{n-1} ds dt \\
&\leq P_{0,0,0}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma_j) \int_0^{\frac{2}{r}} \int_0^{\frac{2}{r}} (1 + s + t)^{m+2n-2} ds dt \\
&\leq P_{0,0,0}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma_j) (1 + r^{-1})^{m+2n} \\
&\lesssim P_{0,0,0}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma_j) r^{-2n-m-2N(1-\rho)}.
\end{aligned}$$

To proceed, note that for any $|\xi| \geq 1$ or $|\eta| \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial_\xi^\beta(\sigma_j(x, r^{-1} \xi, r^{-1} \eta))| &\leq P_{0,\beta,0}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma_j) r^{-|\beta|} (1 + r^{-1}|\xi| + r^{-1}|\eta|)^{m-\rho|\beta|} \\
&\simeq P_{0,\beta,0}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma_j) r^{-m-|\beta|(1-\rho)} (1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{m-\rho|\beta|},
\end{aligned}$$

provided that $1 + |\xi| + |\eta| \geq r + |\xi| + |\eta| \geq (1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)/2$. Note also that $\text{supp } \tilde{\psi} \subset \{|\xi| \geq 1\}$, and for any $|\beta| > 0$, $\partial_\xi^\beta \tilde{\psi}(\xi) \neq 0$ implies $1 \leq |\xi| \leq 2$. Thus, we use integration by parts to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
|K_{\sigma_j}^2(x, y, z)| &= \frac{r^{-2n}}{(2\pi)^{2N}} \left| \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \Delta_\xi^N (e^{2\pi i \xi \cdot u}) e^{2\pi i r^{-1} \eta \cdot (x-z)} \sigma_j(x, r^{-1} \xi, r^{-1} \eta) \tilde{\psi}(\xi) \psi(\eta) d\xi d\eta \right| \\
&\leq r^{-2n} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} |\Delta_\xi^N(\sigma_j(x, r^{-1} \xi, r^{-1} \eta) \tilde{\psi}(\xi))| |\psi(\eta)| d\xi d\eta \\
&\lesssim r^{-2n} \iint_{\substack{\{|\xi| \geq 1\} \\ \{|\eta| \leq 2\}}} |\Delta_\xi^N(\sigma_j(x, r^{-1} \xi, r^{-1} \eta))| |\tilde{\psi}(\xi)| |\psi(\eta)| d\xi d\eta \\
&\quad + r^{-2n} \iint_{\substack{\{1 \leq |\xi| \leq 2\} \\ \{|\eta| \leq 2\}}} \sum_{0 < |\beta| \leq 2N} |\partial_\xi^{2N-\beta}(\sigma_j(x, r^{-1} \xi, r^{-1} \eta))| |\partial_\xi^\beta \tilde{\psi}(\xi)| |\psi(\eta)| d\xi d\eta \\
&\lesssim \sum_{|\beta| \leq 2N} P_{0,\beta,0}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma_j) \iint_{\substack{\{|\xi| \geq 1\} \\ \{|\eta| \leq 2\}}} \frac{r^{-2n-m-(2N-\beta)(1-\rho)} |\xi|^{-|\beta|}}{(1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{(2N-|\beta|)\rho-m}} d\xi d\eta
\end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim \sum_{|\beta| \leq 2N} P_{0,\beta,0}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma_j) r^{-2n-m-2N(1-\rho)},$$

where we used that for any $|\beta| \leq 2N$,

$$\int_{\{|\xi| \geq 1\}} \frac{|\xi|^{-|\beta|} d\xi}{(1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{(2N-|\beta|)\rho-m}} \leq \int_{\{|\xi| \geq 1\}} \frac{d\xi}{|\xi|^{2N\rho-m}} \lesssim 1.$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} |K_{\sigma_j}^3(x, y, z)| &\leq r^{-2n} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} |\Delta_\xi^N(\sigma_j(x, r^{-1}\xi, r^{-1}\eta))| |\tilde{\psi}(\eta)| d\xi d\eta \\ &\leq \sum_{|\beta|=2N} P_{0,\beta,0}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma_j) \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{r^{-2n-m-2N(1-\rho)}}{(1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{2N\rho-m}} d\xi d\eta \\ &\lesssim \sum_{|\beta|=2N} P_{0,\beta,0}^{m,\rho,\delta}(\sigma_j) r^{-2n-m-2N(1-\rho)}, \end{aligned}$$

provided $2N\rho - m > 2n$. Thus, we conclude (10.48) from these estimates above. \square

10.4. Bilinear commutators. Let us present the proof of Theorem 1.18. We will apply the strategy in the proof of Theorem 1.17. It was proved in [6, Theorem 1] that for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{1,0}^1$ and Lipschitz function b with $\nabla b \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$(10.49) \quad [b, T_\sigma]_k \text{ is a bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operator, } \quad k = 1, 2.$$

By the fact that $\mathcal{K}_{1,0}^1 \subset \mathcal{S}_{1,0}^1$ and (10.49), we see that

$$(10.50) \quad [b, T_\sigma]_k \text{ is a bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operator, } \quad k = 1, 2.$$

In view of Theorems 1.10, 1.11, and 1.12, it suffices to prove

$$(10.51) \quad [b, T_\sigma]_k \text{ is compact from } L^4(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^4(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad k = 1, 2.$$

For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let ϕ_j be defined in (10.21). Then it is not hard to check that

$$\sigma_j := \sigma \phi_j \in \mathcal{S}_{1,0}^1 \quad \text{uniformly in } j \in \mathbb{N},$$

which together with (10.49) gives

$$(10.52) \quad [b, T_{\sigma_j}]_k \text{ is a bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operator,}$$

for all $k = 1, 2$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 4.39, to obtain (10.51), it is enough to justify

$$(10.53) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|[b, T_{\sigma_j}]_k - [b, T_\sigma]_k\|_{L^4 \times L^4 \rightarrow L^2} = 0$$

and

$$(10.54) \quad [b, T_{\sigma_j}]_k \text{ is compact from } L^4(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^4(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We only focus on the case $k = 1$. The kernel of $[b, T_\sigma]_1$ is given by

$$(10.55) \quad K_\sigma^b(x, y, z) := (b(x) - b(y))K_\sigma(x, y, z).$$

Then it follows from Lemma 10.44 that

$$(10.56) \quad \|K_{\sigma_j}^b - K_\sigma^b\|_{\text{CZ}(\delta)} = \|K_{\sigma_j - \sigma}^b\|_{\text{CZ}(\delta)} \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq 2N_0} P_{\alpha, \beta, 0}^{1, 1, 0}(\sigma_j - \sigma),$$

where $N_0 > 2n$. To avoid the confuse of notation, we use ν_j and $\tilde{\nu}_j$ instead of σ_j and $\tilde{\sigma}_j$ respectively in [6, p. 294]. As calculated there, one has

$$(10.57) \quad P_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}^{0,1,0}(\nu_j) \lesssim P_{\alpha,\tilde{\beta},\tilde{\gamma}}^{1,1,0}(\sigma) \quad \text{and} \quad P_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}^{0,1,0}(\tilde{\nu}_j) \lesssim P_{\alpha,\beta,\tilde{\gamma}}^{1,1,0}(\sigma),$$

where $\tilde{\beta} := \beta + (0, \dots, j, \dots, 0)$ and $\tilde{\gamma} := \gamma + (0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0)$. Invoking (10.57) and checking the proof of [6, Lemmas 7–8], we obtain

$$(10.58) \quad \|[b, T_\sigma]_1(1, 1)\|_{\text{BMO}} + \|[b, T_\sigma]_1^{*i}(1, 1)\|_{\text{BMO}} \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta|, |\gamma| \leq N_0} P_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}^{1,1,0}(\sigma),$$

for each $i = 1, 2$, where $N_0 > 2n$ large enough. Moreover, from the proof of [6, Lemma 10], we see that the constant of the weak boundedness property of $[b, T_\sigma]_1$ is dominated by

$$(10.59) \quad \|\nabla b\|_{L^\infty} (\|T_{\nu_j}\|_{L^4 \times L^4 \rightarrow L^2} + \|T_{\tilde{\nu}_j}\|_{L^4 \times L^4 \rightarrow L^2}) \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta|, |\gamma| \leq N_0} P_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}^{1,1,0}(\sigma),$$

where the above inequality can be shown as (10.28) by means of (10.57). Accordingly, by (10.56), (10.58), (10.59), and [40, Theorem 1.1] (or [65]), we conclude that

$$\|[b, T_{\sigma_j}]_1 - [b, T_\sigma]_1\|_{L^4 \times L^4 \rightarrow L^2} \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta|, |\gamma| \leq N_0} P_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}^{1,1,0}(\sigma_j - \sigma),$$

which along with Lemma 10.43 gives (10.53).

Next, we prove (10.54). Combining (10.52) with [38, Theorem 3], we achieve

$$(10.60) \quad \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^4} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^4} \leq 1}} \|[b, T_{\sigma_j}]_1(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} \lesssim 1.$$

The support of σ_j implies

$$K_{\sigma_j}(x, y, z) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad [b, T_{\sigma_j}]_1(f_1, f_2)(x) = 0, \quad \text{for all } |x| > 2^{j+1},$$

which gives

$$(10.61) \quad \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^4} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^4} \leq 1}} \|[b, T_{\sigma_j}]_1(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}\|_{L^2} = 0.$$

In view of Theorem 1.3 and (10.60)–(10.61), the estimate (10.54) is reduced to showing

$$(10.62) \quad \lim_{|h| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^4} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^4} \leq 1}} \|\tau_h [b, T_{\sigma_j}]_1(f_1, f_2) - [b, T_{\sigma_j}]_1(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} = 0.$$

Let $N > n$ be an even number. It follows from (10.33), (10.36), and (10.55) that for any $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$(10.63) \quad |K_{\sigma_j}^b(x - h, y, z) - K_{\sigma_j}^b(x, y, z)| \lesssim \sum_{i=0}^4 \mathbf{K}_j^{b,i}(x, y, z),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{K}_j^{b,0}(x, y, z) &:= |b(x - h) - b(x)| |K_{\sigma_j}(x, y, z)|, \\ \mathbf{K}_j^{b,1}(x, y, z) &:= |b(x - h) - b(y)| \left| \frac{1}{1 + (2\pi|x - h - y|)^{2N} + (2\pi|x - h - z|)^{2N}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{1 + (2\pi|x - y|)^{2N} + (2\pi|x - z|)^{2N}} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{K}_j^{b,2}(x, y, z) &:= |b(x-h) - b(y)| \frac{|K_{\sigma_j}(x-h, y, z) - K_{\sigma_j}(x, y, z)|}{1 + (2\pi|x-h-y|)^{2N} + (2\pi|x-h-z|)^{2N}}, \\ \mathbf{K}_j^{b,3}(x, y, z) &:= |b(x-h) - b(y)| \frac{|K_{\Delta_\xi^N \sigma_j}(x-h, y, z) - K_{\Delta_\xi^N \sigma_j}(x, y, z)|}{1 + (2\pi|x-h-y|)^{2N} + (2\pi|x-h-z|)^{2N}}, \\ \mathbf{K}_j^{b,4}(x, y, z) &:= |b(x-h) - b(y)| \frac{|K_{\Delta_\eta^N \sigma_j}(x-h, y, z) - K_{\Delta_\eta^N \sigma_j}(x, y, z)|}{1 + (2\pi|x-h-y|)^{2N} + (2\pi|x-h-z|)^{2N}}.\end{aligned}$$

Set

$$\mathbf{G}_j^{b,i}(x) := \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \mathbf{K}_j^{b,i}(x, y, z) |f_1(y)| |f_2(z)| dy dz, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4.$$

The fact $\sigma_j \in \mathcal{S}_{1,0}^{-2N}$ gives

$$\mathbf{G}_j^{b,0}(x) \lesssim \|\nabla b\|_{L^\infty} |h| \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{|f_1(y)| |f_2(z)|}{(1 + |x-y| + |x-z|)^{2N}} dy dz \lesssim |h| \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x),$$

and hence,

$$(10.64) \quad \|\mathbf{G}_j^{b,0}\|_{L^2} \lesssim |h| \|\mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} \lesssim |h| \|f_1\|_{L^4} \|f_2\|_{L^4}.$$

Since it is not hard to check that

$$\mathbf{K}_j^{b,1}(x, y, z) \lesssim \|\nabla b\|_{L^\infty} |h| \sum_{k=0}^{2N-1} \frac{(1 + |x-h-y| + |x-h-z|)^{-k}}{(1 + |x-y| + |x-z|)^{2N-k-1}},$$

we use the same argument as in (10.39) to deduce

$$(10.65) \quad \|\mathbf{G}_j^{b,1}\|_{L^2} \lesssim |h| \|f_1\|_{L^4} \|f_2\|_{L^4}.$$

Moreover, analogously to (10.40),

$$\mathbf{G}_j^{b,2}(x) \lesssim \|\nabla b\|_{L^\infty} |h| \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{|f_1(y)| |f_2(z)| dy dz}{(1 + |x-h-y| + |x-h-z|)^{2N-1}} \lesssim |h| \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)(x-h),$$

which yields

$$(10.66) \quad \|\mathbf{G}_j^{b,2}\|_{L^2} \lesssim |h| \|\mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} \lesssim |h| \|f_1\|_{L^4} \|f_2\|_{L^4}.$$

Much as above, there holds

$$(10.67) \quad \|\mathbf{G}_j^{b,i}\|_{L^2} \lesssim |h| \|f_1\|_{L^4} \|f_2\|_{L^4}, \quad i = 3, 4.$$

Consequently, from (10.63)–(10.67), we conclude

$$\|\tau_h[b, T_{\sigma_j}](f_1, f_2) - [b, T_{\sigma_j}](f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \sum_{i=0}^4 \|\mathbf{G}_j^{b,i}\|_{L^2} \lesssim |h| \|f_1\|_{L^4} \|f_2\|_{L^4},$$

which justifies (10.62) as desired. \square

APPENDIX A. SOME PROPERTIES IN LORENTZ SPACES

Definition A.1. Given a quasi-Banach space \mathbb{X} , a function $f \in \mathbb{X}$ is said to *have absolutely continuous quasi-norm* if $\|f \mathbf{1}_{E_k}\|_{\mathbb{X}} \rightarrow 0$ for every sequence $\{E_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ such that $E_k \rightarrow \emptyset$ μ -a.e.

Let \mathbb{X}_a denote the collection of all functions in \mathbb{X} which have absolutely continuous quasi-norm. If $\mathbb{X}_a = \mathbb{X}$, then the space \mathbb{X} is said to *have absolutely continuous quasi-norm*.

The set $K \subset \mathbb{X}_a$ is said to *have uniformly absolutely continuous quasi-norm* in \mathbb{X} , denoted by $K \subset \text{UAC}(\mathbb{X})$, if $\sup_{f \in K} \|f \mathbf{1}_{E_k}\|_{\mathbb{X}} \rightarrow 0$ for every sequence $\{E_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ such that $E_k \rightarrow \emptyset$ μ -a.e.

Let $\mathcal{M}(\mu)$ denote the family of all measurable functions in (Σ, μ) . The following result gives a criterion of precompactness quasi-Banach function spaces (cf. [10, Theorem 3.17]), which improves [1, p. 31, Exercise 8] in the context of Banach function spaces.

Lemma A.2 ([1, 10]). *Let \mathbb{X} be a quasi-Banach function space and $K \subset \mathbb{X}_a$. Then K is precompact in \mathbb{X} if and only if it is precompact in $\mathcal{M}(\mu)$ and $K \subset \text{UAC}(\mathbb{X})$.*

Lemma A.3. *For any $0 < p, q < \infty$, $L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ has absolutely continuous quasi-norm, but $L^{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ does not have absolutely continuous quasi-norm.*

Proof. Let $0 < p, q < \infty$ and $\{E_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of measurable sets satisfying $E_k \rightarrow \emptyset$ almost everywhere. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $f \in L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For any $t > 0$, define

$$F(t) := t^{1-\frac{1}{q}} d_f(t)^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad \text{and} \quad F_k(t) := t^{1-\frac{1}{q}} d_{f\mathbf{1}_{E_k}}(t)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where $d_f(t) := |\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |f(x)| > t\}|$. Note that $d_{f\mathbf{1}_{E_k}}(t) \leq \min\{|E_k|, d_f(t)\}$, then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F_k(t) = 0, \quad 0 \leq F_k(t) \leq F(t), \quad \text{and} \quad F \in L^q(\mathbb{R}_+).$$

Hence, it follows from Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|f\mathbf{1}_{E_k}\|_{L^{p,q}} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} p^{\frac{1}{p}} \|F_k\|_{L^q} = 0.$$

This shows every function in $L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ has absolutely continuous quasi-norm.

To continue, let $f(x) = |x|^{-\frac{n}{p}}$ and $E_k = B(0, k^{-1})$ for each $k \geq 1$. Then for any $s > 0$,

$$d_f(s) = |\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x|^{-\frac{n}{p}} > s\}| = |B(0, s^{-\frac{p}{n}})| = s^{-p}\nu_n,$$

and

$$d_{f\mathbf{1}_{E_k}}(s) = |\{x \in B(0, k^{-1}) : |x|^{-\frac{n}{p}} > s\}| = k^{-n}\nu_n \mathbf{1}_{\{0 < s < k^{\frac{n}{p}}\}} + s^{-p}\nu_n \mathbf{1}_{\{s \geq k^{\frac{n}{p}}\}},$$

where ν_n is the volume of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^n . Thus,

$$\|f\mathbf{1}_{E_k}\|_{L^{p,\infty}} = \sup_{s>0} s d_{f\mathbf{1}_{E_k}}(s)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \nu_n^{\frac{1}{p}} = \|f\|_{L^{p,\infty}}.$$

Since $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |E_k| = 0$, this asserts that $L^{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ does not have absolutely continuous quasi-norm. \square

Let μ be a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n . A μ -simple function is a finite linear combination of characteristic functions of measurable subsets in \mathbb{R}^n , where these subsets may have infinite μ -measure. A finitely μ -simple function has the form $f = \sum_{j=1}^N a_j \mathbf{1}_{B_j}$, where $1 \leq N < \infty$, $a_j \in \mathbb{R}$, and B_j are pairwise disjoint measurable sets with $\mu(B_j) < \infty$. When μ is the Lebesgue measure, we shall suppress the presence of μ .

Lemma A.4. *Let w be a weight on \mathbb{R}^n such that $w \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then $\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is dense in $L^{p,q}(w)$ for all $0 < p, q < \infty$, but the collection of continuous functions and functions with compact supports is not dense in $L^{p,\infty}(w)$ for all $0 < p < \infty$.*

Proof. Let $0 < p, q < \infty$. The density of $\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in $L^{p,q}(w)$ is a consequence of the following three facts:

$$(A.5) \quad \text{finitely } w\text{-simple functions are dense in } L^{p,q}(w),$$

$$(A.6) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{every finitely } w\text{-simple function can be approximated} \\ &\text{in } L^{p,q}(w) \text{ by simple functions with compact supports,} \end{aligned}$$

(A.7) every characterization function $\mathbf{1}_E$ of a bounded measurable set can be approximated in $L^{p,q}(w)$ by $\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ functions.

The statement (A.5) was given by [35, Theorem 1.4.13]. To show (A.6), it suffices to consider $f = \mathbf{1}_E$, where $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a measurable set with $w(E) < \infty$. Let $f_N := \mathbf{1}_{E \cap B(0,N)}$ for each $N \geq 1$. Then $\text{supp}(f_N) \subset B(0, N)$, $|E \cap B(0, N)| \leq |B(0, N)| < \infty$, and for any $s > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{f_N-f}(s) &:= w(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |f_N(x) - f(x)| > s\}) \\ &= w(\{x \in E \setminus B(0, N) : \mathbf{1}_E(x) > s\}) \\ &= w(E \setminus B(0, N)) \mathbf{1}_{\{0 < s < 1\}}, \end{aligned}$$

which in turn gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_N - f\|_{L^{p,q}(w)} &= p^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\int_0^\infty [s d_{f_N-f}(s)]^{\frac{1}{p}} \frac{ds}{s} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &= p^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\int_0^1 w(E \setminus B(0, N))^{\frac{q}{p}} s^{q-1} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &= p^{\frac{1}{p}} q^{-1} w(E \setminus B(0, N)) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (A.6) holds.

To prove (A.7), let E be a bounded measurable set such that $E \subset B(0, A)$ for some $A \geq 1$. Write $f = \mathbf{1}_E$. Choose a positive function $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ so that $\text{supp} \varphi \subset B(0, 1)$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi dx = 1$. For any $t \in (0, 1)$, denote $\varphi_t(x) := t^{-n} \varphi(t^{-1}x)$ and $f_t := \varphi_t * f$. It is easy to check that

$$\begin{aligned} (A.8) \quad & f_t \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad \text{supp } f_t \subset B(0, 2A), \\ & \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} |f_t(x) - f(x)| = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ & \sup_{t > 0} |f_t(x)| \leq \mathbf{1}_{B(0, 2A)}(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ & \text{and } \mathbf{1}_{B(0, 2A)} \in L^1(w), \end{aligned}$$

provided that $w \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then by Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem,

$$(A.9) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \|f_t - f\|_{L^1(w)} = 0.$$

Since convergence in measure is a weaker than convergence in either $L^r(w)$ or $L^{r,\infty}(w)$ for any $r \in (0, \infty]$, the estimate (A.9) enables us to choose a decreasing sequence $\{t_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset (0, 1)$ such that

$$(A.10) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_k = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad d_{f_{t_k}-f}(k^{-1}) \leq 2^{-k}.$$

Moreover, by (A.8) and (A.10),

$$\begin{aligned} d_{f_{t_k}-f}(s) &\leq w(B(0, 2A)), \quad 0 < s < 1, \\ d_{f_{t_k}-f}(s) &\leq 2^{-k}, \quad 1/k \leq s \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{t_k} - f\|_{L^{p,q}(w)}^q &= p^{\frac{q}{p}} \int_0^\infty [s d_{f_{t_k}-f}(s)]^{\frac{1}{p}} \frac{ds}{s} \\ &\lesssim \int_0^{\frac{1}{k}} w(B(0, 2A))^{\frac{q}{p}} s^{q-1} ds + \int_{\frac{1}{k}}^1 2^{-k \frac{q}{p}} s^{q-1} ds \end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim w(B(0, 2A))^{\frac{q}{p}} k^{-q} + 2^{-k\frac{q}{p}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

This completes the proof of (A.7).

Finally, to demonstrate the nondensity, choose $w \equiv 1$ and $f := |x|^{-\frac{n}{p}} \in L^{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, let $\psi \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and ϕ be a function with $\text{supp } \phi \subset B(0, A)$ for some $A > 0$. By the continuity of ψ , there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$||\psi(x)| - |\psi(0)|| \leq |\psi(x) - \psi(0)| \leq 1, \quad \text{for all } x \in B(0, \delta).$$

Set $s_0 := \max\{\delta^{-n}, |\psi(0)| + 1\}$. Then for any $s > s_0$ and $x \in B(0, s^{-\frac{p}{n}})$,

$$f(x) \geq s > s_0 \geq |\psi(0)| + 1 \geq |\psi(x)|.$$

Thus, $f(x) - |\psi(s)| > s - s_0 =: t$ and

$$\begin{aligned} t d_{f-\psi}(t)^{\frac{1}{p}} &:= t |\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |f(x) - \psi(x)| > t\}|^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\geq t |\{x \in B(0, s^{-\frac{p}{n}}) : |f(x) - |\psi(x)|| > t\}|^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= t |B(0, s^{-\frac{p}{n}})|^{\frac{1}{p}} = t s^{-1} \nu_n^{\frac{1}{p}}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$(A.11) \quad \|f - \psi\|_{L^{p,\infty}} \geq \sup_{t>0} \frac{t}{t + s_0} \nu_n^{\frac{1}{p}} = \nu_n^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

On the other hand, for any $s > 0$,

$$d_f(s) = \nu_n s^{-p} \quad \text{and} \quad d_\phi(s) \leq |B(0, A)| = \nu_n A^n,$$

which implies

$$d_{f-\phi}(s) \geq d_f(2s) - d_\phi(s) \geq s^{-p} \nu_n (2^{-p} - s^p A^n),$$

and hence,

$$(A.12) \quad \|f - \phi\|_{L^{p,\infty}} \geq \sup_{0 < s < A^{-\frac{n}{p}}/2} \nu_n^{\frac{1}{p}} (2^{-p} - s^p A^n)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \nu_n^{\frac{1}{p}}/2.$$

As a consequence of (A.11) and (A.12), we have already proved that there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $f \in L^{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ so that $\|f - \psi\|_{L^{p,\infty}} \geq \varepsilon_0$ for all $\psi \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and $\|f - \phi\|_{L^{p,\infty}} \geq \varepsilon_0$ for all functions ϕ with compact support. This means that the collection of continuous functions and functions with compact supports is not dense in $L^{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. \square

Recall that $\tau_h f(x) := f(x-h)$ is the translation of a function f on \mathbb{R}^n by $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$. A bilinear operator T from $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is called translation invariant, if

$$\tau_h(T(f_1, f_2)) = T(\tau_h f_1, \tau_h f_2)$$

for all $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and all $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

The following is a bilinear extension of [4, Proposition A.1].

Lemma A.13. *Let $0 < p, q, p_1, q_1, p_2, q_2 < \infty$. A translation invariant bilinear operator T is not compact from $L^{p_1, q_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2, q_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^{p, q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Proof. Since the compactness is stronger than the boundedness, we may assume that T is bounded from $L^{p_1, q_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2, q_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^{p, q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Pick $f \in L^{p_1, q_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $g \in L^{p_2, q_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\|f\|_{L^{p_1, q_1}} = \|g\|_{L^{p_2, q_2}} = 1$ and $0 < \|T(f, g)\|_{L^{p, q}} < \infty$. Let $\{h_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be a sequence in \mathbb{R}^n satisfying $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |h_j| = \infty$. Then denote $f_j := \tau_{h_j} f$ and $g_j := \tau_{h_j} g$ for every $j \geq 1$.

Assume that T is compact from $L^{p_1, q_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2, q_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^{p, q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then by Theorem 1.3, given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $A = A(\varepsilon) > 0$ so that

$$\|T(f_j, g_j)\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}\|_{L^{p, q}} \leq \varepsilon \|f_j\|_{L^{p_1, q_1}} \|g_j\|_{L^{p_2, q_2}} = \varepsilon \|f\|_{L^{p_1, q_1}} \|g\|_{L^{p_2, q_2}} = \varepsilon,$$

for all $j \geq 1$. Choose $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2} \|T(f, g)\|_{L^{p, q}}$. Note that for any measurable function ϕ ,

$$d_\phi(t) \geq d_{\phi_j}(t) \geq |\{|x| < |h_j| - A : |\phi(x)| > t\}|, \quad \forall j : |h_j| > A,$$

where $\phi_j(x) := \phi(x)\mathbf{1}_{\{|x+h_j|>A\}}(x)$. From the estimates above and the translation invariance of T , we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\geq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|T(f_j, g_j)\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}\|_{L^{p, q}} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|T(f, g)(\cdot - h_j)\mathbf{1}_{B(0, A)^c}\|_{L^{p, q}} \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|T(f, g)\mathbf{1}_{\{|\cdot+h_j|>A\}}\|_{L^{p, q}} = \|T(f, g)\|_{L^{p, q}} > 2\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem was used in the last equality. This is a contradiction. Consequently, T is not compact from $L^{p_1, q_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2, q_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^{p, q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. \square

APPENDIX B. INTERPOLATION OF MULTIPLE WEIGHTS

Lemma B.1. *Let $\frac{1}{p} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{p_i} > 0$ with $p_1, \dots, p_m \in (1, \infty]$ and $\frac{1}{s} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{s_i}$ with $s_1, \dots, s_m \in [1, \infty]$. Assume that $\vec{w} \in A_{\vec{p}}$ and $\vec{v} \in A_{\vec{s}}$. Then there exists $\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that $\vec{u} \in A_{\vec{r}}$, where*

$$(B.2) \quad \frac{1}{r} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{r_i}, \quad u = \prod_{i=1}^m u_i, \quad w_i = u_i^{1-\theta} v_i^\theta, \quad \frac{1}{p_i} = \frac{1-\theta}{r_i} + \frac{\theta}{s_i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Proof. We only present the proof in the scenario $p_1, \dots, p_m \in (1, \infty)$ and $s_1 = \dots = s_m = \infty$ because it involves all cases of exponents belonging to $[1, \infty]$, which will reveal the general strategy. By Lemma 2.24, we see that

$$w^p \in A_{mp}, \quad v^{-\frac{1}{m}} \in A_1, \quad w_i^{-p'_i} \in A_{mp'_i}, \quad \text{and} \quad v_i^{-1} \in A_m, \quad i = 1, \dots, m,$$

which implies

$$w^{-\frac{p}{mp-1}} \in A_{\frac{mp}{mp-1}}, \quad w_i^{\frac{p'_i}{mp'_i-1}} \in A_{\frac{mp'_i}{mp'_i-1}}, \quad \text{and} \quad v_i^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \in A_{\frac{m}{m-1}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

In view of (2.21), there exists $\tau \in (1, \infty)$ such that

$$(B.3) \quad \left(\int_Q w^{p\tau} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \lesssim \int_Q w^p dx, \quad \left(\int_Q w^{-\frac{p\tau}{mp-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \lesssim \int_Q w^{-\frac{p}{mp-1}} dx,$$

and

$$(B.4) \quad \left(\int_Q v^{-\frac{\tau}{m}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \lesssim \int_Q v^{-\frac{1}{m}} dx, \quad \left(\int_Q v^{-\frac{1}{m}} dx \right) (\text{ess sup}_Q v^{\frac{1}{m}}) \leq [v^{-\frac{1}{m}}]_{A_1},$$

for every cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Additionally, for each $i = 1, \dots, m$, there exists $\tau_i \in (1, \infty)$ so that

$$(B.5) \quad \left(\int_Q w_i^{-p'_i \tau_i} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{\tau_i}} \lesssim \int_Q w_i^{-p'_i} dx, \quad \left(\int_Q v_i^{\frac{\tau_i}{m-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{\tau_i}} \lesssim \int_Q v_i^{\frac{1}{m-1}} dx,$$

and

$$(B.6) \quad \left(\int_Q w_i^{\frac{p'_i \tau_i}{mp'_i - 1}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{\tau_i}} \lesssim \int_Q w_i^{\frac{p'_i}{mp'_i - 1}} dx, \quad \left(\int_Q v_i^{-\tau_i} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{\tau_i}} \lesssim \int_Q v_i^{-1} dx,$$

for every cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Given $\theta \in (0, 1)$ chosen later, we define u , s , u_i and s_i as in (B.2), and pick

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \alpha(\theta) := \theta mp, & \kappa &= \kappa(\theta) := \frac{(mp - 1)(1 + \theta)}{mp(1 - \theta) - 1}, \\ \alpha_i &= \alpha_i(\theta) := \theta p'_i(m - 1), & \beta_i &= \beta_i(\theta) := \frac{\theta p'_i}{mp'_i - 1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned}$$

Then one can check that

$$(B.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \kappa_i &= \kappa_i(\theta) := \frac{(p_i - 1)(1 + \alpha_i)}{p_i(1 - \theta) - 1} = \frac{\theta p_i(m - 1)}{p_i(1 - \theta) - 1} \frac{1 + \alpha_i}{\alpha_i} \\ &= \frac{(p_i - 1)(1 + \theta p'_i(m - 1))}{p_i(1 - \theta) - 1}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(B.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{\kappa}_i &= \tilde{\kappa}_i(\theta) := \frac{r'_i(mp'_i - 1)(1 + \beta_i)}{p'_i(mr'_i - 1)(1 - \theta)} = \frac{r'_i \theta (1 + \beta_i)}{(mr'_i - 1)(1 - \theta) \beta_i} \\ &= \frac{m - 1 + \theta + 1/p_i}{(m - 1)(1 - \theta) + 1/p_i}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives that

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} \alpha(\theta) = 0, \quad \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} \kappa(\theta) = 1 < \tau, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} \kappa_i(\theta) = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{\kappa}_i(\theta) = 1 < \tau_i.$$

By continuity, there exists some $\theta \in (0, 1)$ small enough so that

$$(B.9) \quad 1 + \alpha < \tau, \quad \kappa < \tau, \quad \kappa_i < \tau_i, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\kappa}_i < \tau_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

It follows from (B.2) that $u = w^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}} v^{-\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}}$ and $r = p(1 - \theta)$. Along with (B.3), (B.4), and (B.9), this yields

$$(B.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_Q u^r dx &= \int_Q (w^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}} v^{-\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}})^{p(1-\theta)} dx = \int_Q w^p v^{-\theta p} dx \\ &\leq \left(\int_Q w^{p(1+\alpha)} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}} \left(\int_Q v^{-\theta p \frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha}} dx \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}} \\ &= \left(\int_Q w^{p(1+\alpha)} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}} \left(\int_Q v^{-\frac{1+\alpha}{m}} dx \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}} \\ &\leq \left(\int_Q w^{p\tau} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \left(\int_Q v^{-\frac{\tau}{m}} dx \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\tau}} \\ &\lesssim \left(\int_Q w^p dx \right) \left(\int_Q v^{-\frac{1}{m}} dx \right)^{\theta mp}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(B.11) \quad \int_Q u^{-\frac{r}{mr-1}} dx = \int_Q w^{-\frac{p}{mp(1-\theta)-1}} v^{\frac{\theta p}{mr-1}} dx$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left(\int_Q w^{-\frac{p(1+\theta)}{mp(1-\theta)-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\theta}} \left(\int_Q v^{\frac{\theta p}{mr-1} \frac{1+\theta}{\theta}} dx \right)^{\frac{\theta}{1+\theta}} \\
&= \left(\int_Q w^{-\frac{p\kappa}{mp-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\theta}} \left(\int_Q v^{\frac{\theta p}{mr-1} \frac{1+\theta}{\theta}} dx \right)^{\frac{\theta}{1+\theta}} \\
&\leq \left(\int_Q w^{-\frac{p\tau}{mp-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{\kappa}{\tau(1+\theta)}} \left(\operatorname{ess\,sup}_Q v^{\frac{1}{m}} \right)^{\frac{\theta mp}{mr-1}} \\
&\lesssim \left(\int_Q w^{-\frac{p}{mp-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{mp-1}{mr-1}} \left(\operatorname{ess\,sup}_Q v^{\frac{1}{m}} \right)^{\frac{\theta mp}{mr-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, gathering (B.10) and (B.11), we obtain

$$(B.12) \quad [u^r]_{A_{mr}} \lesssim [w^p]_{A_{mp}} [v^{-\frac{1}{m}}]_{A_1}^{\theta mp}.$$

On the other hand, from $w_i = u_i^{1-\theta} v_i^\theta$, Hölder's inequality, (B.5), (B.7), and (B.9), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
(B.13) \quad &\int_Q u_i^{-r'_i} dx = \int_Q (w_i^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}} v_i^{-\frac{\theta}{1-\theta}})^{-\frac{p_i(1-\theta)}{p_i(1-\theta)-1}} dx \\
&= \int_Q (w_i^{-p'_i})^{\frac{p_i-1}{p_i(1-\theta)-1}} (v_i^{\frac{1}{m-1}})^{\frac{\theta p_i(m-1)}{p_i(1-\theta)-1}} dx \\
&\leq \left(\int_Q (w_i^{-p'_i})^{\frac{(p_i-1)(1+\alpha_i)}{p_i(1-\theta)-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha_i}} \left(\int_Q (v_i^{\frac{1}{m-1}})^{\frac{\theta p_i(m-1)}{p_i(1-\theta)-1} \frac{1+\alpha_i}{\alpha_i}} dx \right)^{\frac{\alpha_i}{1+\alpha_i}} \\
&= \left(\int_Q w_i^{-p'_i \kappa_i} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha_i}} \left(\int_Q v_i^{\frac{\kappa_i}{m-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{\alpha_i}{1+\alpha_i}} \\
&\leq \left(\int_Q w_i^{-p'_i \tau_i} dx \right)^{\frac{\kappa_i}{\tau_i(1+\alpha_i)}} \left(\int_Q v_i^{\frac{\tau_i}{m-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{\kappa_i \alpha_i}{\tau_i(1+\alpha_i)}} \\
&\lesssim \left(\int_Q w_i^{-p'_i} dx \right)^{\frac{\kappa_i}{1+\alpha_i}} \left(\int_Q v_i^{\frac{1}{m-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{\kappa_i \alpha_i}{1+\alpha_i}} \\
&= \left(\int_Q w_i^{-p'_i} dx \right)^{\frac{p_i-1}{p_i(1-\theta)-1}} \left(\int_Q v_i^{\frac{1}{m-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{\theta p_i(m-1)}{p_i(1-\theta)-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
(B.14) \quad &\int_Q u_i^{\frac{r'_i}{mr'_i-1}} dx = \int_Q w_i^{\frac{1}{1-\theta} \frac{r'_i}{mr'_i-1}} v_i^{-\frac{\theta}{1-\theta} \frac{r'_i}{mr'_i-1}} dx \\
&= \int_Q (w_i^{\frac{p'_i}{mp'_i-1}})^{\frac{1}{1-\theta} \frac{r'_i(mp'_i-1)}{p'_i(mr'_i-1)}} (v_i^{-1})^{\frac{\theta}{1-\theta} \frac{r'_i}{mr'_i-1}} dx \\
&\leq \left(\int_Q (w_i^{\frac{p'_i}{mp'_i-1}})^{\frac{r'_i(mp'_i-1)(1+\beta_i)}{p'_i(mr'_i-1)(1-\theta)}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\beta_i}} \left(\int_Q (v_i^{-1})^{\frac{r'_i \theta (1+\beta_i)}{(mr'_i-1)(1-\theta) \beta_i}} dx \right)^{\frac{\beta_i}{1+\beta_i}} \\
&= \left(\int_Q w_i^{\frac{p'_i \tilde{\kappa}_i}{mp'_i-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\beta_i}} \left(\int_Q v_i^{-\tilde{\kappa}_i} dx \right)^{\frac{\beta_i}{1+\beta_i}}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left(\int_Q w_i^{\frac{p'_i \tau_i}{mp'_i-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{\tilde{\kappa}_i}{\tau_i(1+\beta_i)}} \left(\int_Q v_i^{-\tau_i} dx \right)^{\frac{\tilde{\kappa}_i \beta_i}{\tau_i(1+\beta_i)}} \\
&\lesssim \left(\int_Q w_i^{\frac{p'_i}{mp'_i-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{\tilde{\kappa}_i}{1+\beta_i}} \left(\int_Q v_i^{-1} dx \right)^{\frac{\tilde{\kappa}_i \beta_i}{1+\beta_i}} \\
&= \left(\int_Q w_i^{\frac{p'_i}{mp'_i-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{r'_i(mp'_i-1)}{(mr'_i-1)p'_i(1-\theta)}} \left(\int_Q v_i^{-1} dx \right)^{\frac{r'_i \theta}{(mr'_i-1)(1-\theta)}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\frac{r'_i}{p'_i(1-\theta)} = \frac{p_i-1}{p_i(1-\theta)-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{r'_i}{1-\theta} = \frac{p_i}{p_i(1-\theta)-1}.$$

Hence, (B.13) and (B.14) lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\int_Q u_i^{-r'_i} dx \right) \left(\int_Q u_i^{\frac{r'_i}{mr'_i-1}} dx \right)^{mr'_i-1} \\
&\leq \left[\left(\int_Q w_i^{-p'_i} dx \right) \left(\int_Q w_i^{\frac{p'_i}{mp'_i-1}} dx \right)^{mp'_i-1} \right]^{\frac{p_i-1}{p_i(1-\theta)-1}} \\
&\quad \times \left[\left(\int_Q v_i^{-1} dx \right) \left(\int_Q v_i^{\frac{1}{m-1}} dx \right)^{m-1} \right]^{\frac{\theta p_i}{p_i(1-\theta)-1}},
\end{aligned}$$

which shows

$$(B.15) \quad [u_i^{-r'_i}]_{A_{mr'_i}} \lesssim [w_i^{-p'_i}]_{A_{mp'_i}}^{\frac{p_i-1}{p_i(1-\theta)-1}} [v_i^{-1}]_{A_m}^{\frac{\theta p_i}{p_i(1-\theta)-1}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Therefore, the conclusion $\vec{u} \in A_{\vec{r}}$ follows from (B.12), (B.15), and Lemma 2.24. \square

Lemma B.16. $A_{(\infty, \infty)} \subsetneq \bigcup_{1 < p_1, p_2 < \infty} A_{(p_1, p_2)}$ and $\bigcap_{1 \leq p_1, p_2 < \infty} A_{(p_1, p_2)} \not\subset A_{(\infty, \infty)}$.

Proof. Let $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(\infty, \infty)}$ and $w = w_1 w_2$. Then Lemma 2.24 implies $w_1^{-1}, w_2^{-1} \in A_2$ and $w^{-\frac{1}{2}} \in A_1$. By , there exist $\tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2, r \in (1, \infty)$ such that

$$(B.17) \quad w_1^{-\tilde{r}_1}, w_2^{-\tilde{r}_2} \in A_2 \quad \text{and} \quad w^{-\frac{r}{2}} \in A_1.$$

Note that

$$(B.18) \quad v \in A_s \implies v^\theta \in A_s \quad \text{for all } \theta \in (0, 1).$$

Take $1 < r_i \leq \min\{r, \tilde{r}_i\}$ and $p_i = r'_i$, $i = 1, 2$, then $\frac{1}{p} := \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} = 2 - \frac{1}{r_1} - \frac{1}{r_2} \leq \frac{2(r-1)}{r}$, which is equivalent to $\frac{p}{2p-1} \leq \frac{r}{2}$. Using these and (B.17)–(B.18), we obtain

$$(B.19) \quad w_i^{-p'_i} = w_i^{-r_i} \in A_2 \subset A_{2p'_i}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad \text{and} \quad w^{-\frac{p}{2p-1}} \in A_1 \subset A_{\frac{2p}{2p-1}}.$$

Since $w^{-\frac{p}{2p-1}} \in A_{\frac{2p}{2p-1}}$ is equivalent to $w^p \in A_{2p}$, the estimate (B.19) and Lemma 2.24 give $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$. This shows $A_{(\infty, \infty)} \subset \bigcup_{1 < p_1, p_2 < \infty} A_{(p_1, p_2)}$.

To justify $\bigcap_{1 \leq p_1, p_2 < \infty} A_{(p_1, p_2)} \not\subset A_{(\infty, \infty)}$, it suffices to prove $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)} \setminus A_{(\infty, \infty)}$ in the following three cases:

- (1) $w_1(x) = |x|^{-n}$, $w_2 \equiv 1$, if $p_1 = p_2 = 1$;
- (2) $w_1(x) = |x|^\alpha$ ($-n/p < \alpha < 0$), $w_2 \equiv 1$, if $p_1 \in (1, \infty)$, $p_2 \in [1, \infty)$;

$$(3) \quad w_1 \equiv 1, w_2(x) = |x|^\alpha \quad (-n/p < \alpha < 0), \text{ if } p_1 \in [1, \infty), p_2 \in (1, \infty).$$

Write $w = w_1 w_2$ and $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$. In case (1), $w_1^{\frac{1}{2}} = w^{\frac{1}{2}} \in A_1$ and $w_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \in A_1$, but $w_1 \notin L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, hence $w_1 \notin A_2$ (equivalently, $w_1^{-1} \notin A_2$). Thus, it follows from Lemma 2.24 that $A_{(1,1)} \setminus A_{(\infty,\infty)}$.

In case (2), it is easy to see that $0 < -\alpha p'_1 < n p'_1/p \leq n(2p'_1 - 1)$ and $-n < \alpha p < 0$. Then $w_1^{-p'_1} \in A_{2p'_1}$, $w_2^{-p'_2} \in A_{2p'_2}$ (which is interpreted as $w_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \in A_1$ in the case $p_2 = 1$), and $w^p \in A_{2p}$, but $w^{-\frac{1}{2}} = w_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} \notin A_1$. Then Lemma 2.24 implies $A_{(p_1,p_2)} \setminus A_{(\infty,\infty)}$. A similar argument can be given in case (3).

Finally, if $A_{(\infty,\infty)} = \bigcup_{1 < p_1, p_2 < \infty} A_{(p_1,p_2)}$, then $\bigcap_{1 \leq p_1, p_2 < \infty} A_{(p_1,p_2)} \subset \bigcup_{1 < p_1, p_2 < \infty} A_{(p_1,p_2)} = A_{(\infty,\infty)}$, which contradicts the preceding conclusion. Hence, $A_{(\infty,\infty)} \subsetneq \bigcup_{1 < p_1, p_2 < \infty} A_{(p_1,p_2)}$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Bennett and R. Sharpley, *Interpolation of Operators*, Academic Press, Boston, 1988.
- [2] Á. Bényi, W. Damián, K. Moen, and R.H. Torres, *Compact bilinear commutators: the weighted case*, Michigan Math. J. **64** (2015), 39–51.
- [3] Á. Bényi, G. Li, T. Oh, and R.H. Torres, *Compact bilinear operators and paraproducts revisited*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.08412>.
- [4] Á. Bényi, G. Li, T. Oh, and R.H. Torres, *Compact $T(1)$ theorem à la Stein*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.08416>.
- [5] Á. Bényi, D. Maldonado, V. Naibo, and R.H. Torres, *On the Hörmander classes of bilinear pseudodifferential operators*, Integral Equ. Oper. Theory **67** (2010), 341–364.
- [6] Á. Bényi and T. Oh, *Smoothing of commutators for a Hörmander class of bilinear pseudodifferential operators*, J Fourier Anal. Appl. **20** (2014), 282–300.
- [7] Á. Bényi and R.H. Torres, *Compact bilinear operators and commutators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **141** (2013), 3609–3621.
- [8] J. Bergh and J. Löfström, *Interpolation Spaces: An Introduction*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976.
- [9] J.M. Bony, *Calcul symbolique et propagation des singularités pour les équations aux dérivées partielles non-linéaires*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. **14** (1981), 209–246.
- [10] A. Caetano, A. Gogatishvili, and B. Opic, *Compactness in quasi-Banach function spaces and applications to compact embeddings of Besov-type spaces*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **146** (2016), 905–927.
- [11] A.P. Calderón and A. Zygmund, *A note on the interpolation of linear operations*, Studia Math. **12** (1951), 194–204.
- [12] A.P. Calderón and A. Zygmund, *On the existence of certain singular integrals*, Acta Math. **88** (1952), 85–139.
- [13] M. Cao, J. Chen, Z. Li, F. Liao, K. Yabuta, and J. Zhang, *A compact $T1$ theorem for singular integrals associated with Zygmund dilations*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.13932>.
- [14] M. Cao, G. Ibañez-Firnkorn, I.P. Rivera-Ríos, Q. Xue, and K. Yabuta, *A class of multilinear bounded oscillation operators on measure spaces and applications*, Math. Ann. **388** (2024), 3627–3755.
- [15] M. Cao, J.J. Marín, and J.M. Martell, *Extrapolation on function and modular spaces, and applications*, Adv. Math. **406** (2022), 108520.
- [16] M. Cao, A. Olivo, and K. Yabuta, *Extrapolation for multilinear compact operators and applications*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **375** (2022), 5011–5070.
- [17] M. Cao and K. Yabuta, *A compact multilinear $T1$ theorem on product spaces*, in preparation.
- [18] M. Cao, K. Yabuta, and D. Yang, *A compact extension of Journé’s $T1$ theorem on product spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. (2024), <https://doi.org/10.1090/tran/9206>.
- [19] M. Carro, J.Soria, and R.H. Torres, *Extrapolation of compactness for certain pseudodifferential operators*, Rev. Un. Mat. Argentina **66** (2023), 177–186.
- [20] L. Chaffee and R.H. Torres, *Characterization of compactness of the commutators of bilinear fractional integral operators*, Potential Anal. **43** (2015), 481–494.
- [21] M. Christ and J.L. Journé, *Polynomial growth estimates for multilinear singular integral operators*, Acta Math. **159** (1987), 51–80.

- [22] M. Christ and A. Kiselev, *Absolutely continuous spectrum for one-dimensional Schrödinger operators with slowly decaying potentials: some optimal results*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **11** (1998), 771–797.
- [23] F. Cobos, L.M. Fernández-Cabrera, and A. Martínez, *Interpolation of compact bilinear operators among quasi-Banach spaces and applications*, Math. Nachr. **291** (2018), 2168–2187.
- [24] R.R. Coifman and Y. Meyer, *On commutators of singular integrals and bilinear singular integrals*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **212** (1975), 315–331.
- [25] R.R. Coifman and Y. Meyer, *Au delà des opérateurs pseudodifférentiels*, Asterisque **57** (1978).
- [26] H.O. Cordes, *On compactness of commutators of multiplications and convolutions, and boundedness of pseudodifferential operators*, J. Funct. Anal. **18** (1975), 115–131.
- [27] D. Cruz-Uribe, J.M. Martell and C. Pérez, *Weights, Extrapolation and the Theory of Rubio de Francia*, Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, Vol. 215, Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2011.
- [28] G. David and J.L. Journé, *A boundedness criterion for generalized Calderón–Zygmund operators*, Ann. of Math. **120** (1984), 371–397.
- [29] G. David and S. Semmes, *Singular Integrals and Rectifiable Sets in \mathbb{R}^n : beyond Lipschitz Graphs*, Astérisque 193, 1991.
- [30] G. David and S. Semmes, *Analysis of and on Uniformly Rectifiable Sets*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs 38, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1993.
- [31] M. Fabian, P. Habala, P. Hájek, V. Montesinos, and V. Zizler, *Banach space theory. The basis for linear and nonlinear analysis*, Springer, New York, 2011.
- [32] C. Fefferman and E.M. Stein, *H^p spaces of several variables*, Acta Math. **129** (1972), 137–193.
- [33] J. García-Cuerva and J.L. Rubio de Francia, *Weighted norm inequalities and related topics*, North-Holland Math. Studies 116, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1985.
- [34] H. Gu, Q. Xue, and K. Yabuta, *On some properties of dyadic operators*, Taiwa. J. Math. **26** (2022), 521–544.
- [35] L. Grafakos, *Classical Fourier Analysis*, Third edition. GTM, 249. Springer, New York, 2014.
- [36] L. Grafakos, *Modern Fourier Analysis*, Third edition. GTM, 250. Springer, New York, 2014.
- [37] L. Grafakos and S. Oh, *The Kato-Ponce inequality*, Commun. Partial Differ. Equ. **39** (2014), 1128–1157.
- [38] L. Grafakos and R.H. Torres, *Multilinear Calderón–Zygmund theory*, Adv. Math. **165** (2002), 124–164.
- [39] L. Grafakos and R.H. Torres, *Maximal operator and weighted norm inequalities for multilinear singular integrals*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **51** (2002), 1261–1276.
- [40] J. Hart, *A new proof of the bilinear $T(1)$ theorem*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **142** (2014), 3169–3181.
- [41] J. Hart, *A bilinear $T(b)$ theorem for singular integral operators*, J. Funct. Anal. **268** (2015), 3680–3733.
- [42] S. Hofmann, J.M. Martell, and S. Mayboroda, *Uniform rectifiability, Carleson measure estimates, and approximation of harmonic functions*, Duke Math. J. **165** (2016), 2331–2389.
- [43] S. Hofmann, J.M. Martell, and I. Uriarte-Tuero, *Uniform rectifiability and harmonic measure, II: Poisson kernels in L^p imply uniform rectifiability*, Duke Math. J. **163** (2014), 1601–1654.
- [44] S. Hofmann, D. Mitrea, M. Mitrea, and A.J. Morris, *L^p -square function estimates on spaces of homogeneous type and on uniformly rectifiable sets*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **245** (2017), no. 1159.
- [45] I. Holmes, M.T. Lacey, and B.D. Wick, *Commutators in the two-weight setting*, Math. Ann. **367** (2017), 51–80.
- [46] I. Holmes, S. Petermichl, and B.D. Wick, *Weighted little bmo and two-weight inequalities for Journé commutators*, Anal. PDE, **11** (2018), 1693–1740.
- [47] T.P. Hytönen, *The sharp weighted bound for general Calderón–Zygmund operators*, Ann. of Math. **175** (2012), 1473–1506.
- [48] T.P. Hytönen, *Representation of singular integrals by dyadic operators, and the A_2 theorem*, Expo. Math. **35** (2017), 166–205.
- [49] T. Hytönen, M. Lacey, H. Martikainen, T. Orponen, M.C. Reguera, E. Sawyer, and I. Uriarte-Tuero, *Weak and strong type estimates for maximal truncations of Calderón–Zygmund operators on A_p weighted spaces*, J. Anal. Math. **118** (2011), 177–220.
- [50] T.P. Hytönen and S. Lappas, *Extrapolation of compactness on weighted spaces*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **39** (2023), 91–122.
- [51] T.P. Hytönen and S. Lappas, *Extrapolation of compactness on weighted spaces: bilinear operators*, Indag. Math. **33** (2022), 397–420.
- [52] T. Hytönen, K. Li, H. Martikainen, and E. Vuorinen, *Multiresolution analysis and Zygmund dilations*, Amer. J. Math. (2024), to appear.
- [53] T. Hytönen, K. Li, J. Tao, and D. Yang, *The L^p -to- L^q compactness of commutators with $p > q$* , Studia Math. **271** (2023), 85–105.

- [54] T.P. Hytönen, T. Oikari, and J. Sinko, *Fractional Bloom boundedness and compactness of commutators*, Forum Math. **35** (2023), 809–830.
- [55] T.P. Hytönen and C. Pérez, *Sharp weighted bounds involving A_∞* , Anal. PDE **6** (2013), 777–818.
- [56] J.-L. Journé, *Calderón–Zygmund Operators, Pseudodifferential Operators and the Cauchy Integral of Calderón*, Lecture Notes in Math., 994, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.
- [57] T. Kato and G. Ponce, *Commutator estimates and the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations*, Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **41** (1988), 891–907.
- [58] C.E. Kenig and E.M. Stein, *Multilinear estimates and fractional integration*, Math. Res. Lett. **6** (1999), 1–15.
- [59] A. Kolmogorov, *Über kompaktheit der funktionenmengen bei der konvergenz im mittel*, Nach. Gess. Wiss. Göttingen, Math. Phys. KI, 1931: 60–63, 1931.
- [60] M. Lacey, E. Terwilleger, and B. Wick, *Remarks on product VMO*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **2** (2006), 465–474.
- [61] M. Lacey and C. Thiele, *L^p bounds for the bilinear Hilbert transform for $2 < p < \infty$* , Ann. of Math. **146** (1997), 693–724.
- [62] M. Lacey and C. Thiele, *On Calderón’s conjecture*, Ann. of Math. **149** (1999), 475–496.
- [63] A.K. Lerner, S. Ombrosi, C. Pérez, R.H. Torres, and R. Trujillo-González, *New maximal functions and multiple weights for the multilinear Calderón–Zygmund theory*, Adv. Math. **220** (2009), 1222–1264.
- [64] K. Li, *Sparse domination theorem for multilinear singular integral operators with L^r -Hörmander condition*, Michigan Math. J. **67** (2018), 253–265.
- [65] K. Li, H. Martikainen, Y. Ou, and E. Vuorinen, *Bilinear representation theorem*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **371** (2019), 4193–4214.
- [66] K. Li, H. Martikainen, and E. Vuorinen, *Bilinear Calderón–Zygmund theory on product spaces*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **138** (2020), 356–412.
- [67] J.J. Marín, J.M. Martell, D. Mitrea, I. Mitrea, and M. Mitrea, *Singular Integral Operators, Quantitative Flatness, and Boundary Problems*, Progr. Math., 344 Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2022.
- [68] J.M. Martell, D. Mitrea, I. Mitrea, and M. Mitrea, *The BMO-Dirichlet problem for elliptic systems in the upper half-space and quantitative characterizations of VMO*, Anal. PDE **12** (2019), 605–720.
- [69] H. Martikainen, *Representation of bi-parameter singular integrals by dyadic operators*, Adv. Math. **229** (2012), 1734–1761.
- [70] H. Martikainen and E. Vuorinen, *Dyadic-probabilistic methods in bilinear analysis*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **274** (2021), No. 1344.
- [71] Y. Meyer, *Ondelettes et opérateurs, II: Opérateurs de Calderón–Zygmund*, Hermann, Paris, 1990.
- [72] Y. Meyer, *Wavelets and Operators*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1992).
- [73] Y. Meyer, *Wavelets, paraproducts and Navier–Stokes equations*, Current Developments in Mathematics 1996, International Press, Cambridge, MA (1999), 105–212.
- [74] Y. Meyer and R. Coifman, *Wavelets, Calderón–Zygmund and Multilinear Operators*, Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [75] Z. Nieraeth, *Quantitative estimates and extrapolation for multilinear weight classes*, Math. Ann. **375** (2019), 453–507.
- [76] J.-F. Olsen and P. Villarroya, *Endpoint estimates for compact Calderón–Zygmund operators*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **33** (2017), 1285–1308.
- [77] Y. Ou, S. Petermichl, and E. Strouse, *Higher order Journé commutators and characterizations of multi-parameter BMO*, Adv. Math. **291** (2016), 24–58.
- [78] K.-M. Perfekt, S. Pott, and P. Villarroya, *Endpoint compactness of singular integrals and perturbations of the Cauchy integral*, Kyoto J. Math. **57** (2017), 365–393.
- [79] M. Riesz, *Sur les ensembles compacts de fonctions sommables*, Acta Szeged Sect. Math., 1933.
- [80] E.M. Stein, *Singular Integrals and Differentiability Properties of Functions*, Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 30, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970.
- [81] E.M. Stein, *Harmonic Analysis: Real-variable Methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory Integrals*, Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 43, Princeton Univ. Press, 1993.
- [82] J.-O. Strömberg, *Bounded mean oscillation with Orlicz norms and duality of Hardy spaces*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **28** (1979), 511–544.
- [83] J. Tao, D. Yang, and D. Yang, *A new vanishing Lipschitz-type subspace of BMO and compactness of bilinear commutators*, Math. Ann. **386** (2023), 495–531.
- [84] M. Tsuji, *On the compactness of space L^p ($p > 0$) and its application to integral operators*, Kodai Math. Sem. Rep. **101** (1951), 33–36.

- [85] A. Uchiyama, *On the compactness of operators of the Hankel type*, Tohoku Math. J. **30** (1978), 163–171.
- [86] P. Villarroya, *A characterization of compactness for singular integrals*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **104** (2015), 485–532.
- [87] M. Wilson, *Weighted Littlewood-Paley Theory and Exponential-Square Integrability*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1924, Springer, Berlin, 2008.
- [88] S. Wu, *A wavelet characterization for weighted Hardy spaces*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **8** (1992), 329–349.
- [89] K. Yabuta, *A multilinearization of Littlewood–Paley’s g -function and Carleson measures*, Tôhoku Math. J. **34** (1982), 251–275.
- [90] K. Yosida, *Functional Analysis*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.

MINGMING CAO, INSTITUTO DE CIENCIAS MATEMÁTICAS CSIC-UAM-UC3M-UCM, CONSEJO SUPERIOR DE INVESTIGACIONES CIENTÍFICAS, C/ NICOLÁS CABRERA, 13-15, E-28049 MADRID, SPAIN

Email address: mingming.cao@icmat.es

HONGHAI LIU, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATION SCIENCE, HENAN POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, JIAOZUO 454000, PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Email address: hhliu@hpu.edu.cn

ZENGYAN SI, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATION SCIENCE, HENAN POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, JIAOZUO 454000, PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Email address: zengyan@hpu.edu.cn

KÔZÔ YABUTA, RESEARCH CENTER FOR MATHEMATICS AND DATA SCIENCE, KWANSEI GAKUIN UNIVERSITY, GAKUEN 2-1, SANDA 669-1337, JAPAN

Email address: kyabuta3@kwansei.ac.jp