

SINGULAR MULTIPLIERS ON MULTISCALE ZYGMUND SETS

ODYSEAS BAKAS, VALENTINA CICCONE, FRANCESCO DI PLINIO, MARCO FRACCAROLI,
IOANNIS PARISSIS, AND MARCO VITTURI

ABSTRACT. Given an Orlicz space $L^2 \subseteq X \subseteq L^1$ on $[0, 1]$, with submultiplicative Young function Y_X , we fully characterize the closed null sets Ξ of the real line with the property that Hörmander-Mihlin or Marcinkiewicz multiplier operators T_m with singularities on Ξ obey weak-type endpoint modular bounds on X of the type

$$|\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |T_m f(x)| > \lambda\}| \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_X \left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda} \right), \quad \forall \lambda > 0.$$

These sets Ξ are exactly those enjoying a scale invariant version of Zygmund's $(L\sqrt{\log L}, L^2)$ improving inequality with X in place of the former space, which is termed *multiscale Zygmund property*. Our methods actually yield sparse and quantitative weighted estimates for the Fourier multipliers T_m and for the corresponding square functions.

In particular, our framework covers the case of singular sets Ξ of finite lacunary order and thus leads to modular and quantitative weighted versions of the classical endpoint theorems of Tao and Wright for Marcinkiewicz multipliers. Moreover, we obtain a pointwise sparse bound for the Marcinkiewicz square function answering a recent conjecture of Lerner. On the other hand, examples of non-lacunary sets enjoying the multiscale Zygmund property for each $X = L^p$, $1 < p \leq 2$ are also covered.

The main new ingredient in the proofs is a multi-frequency, multi-scale projection lemma based on Gabor expansion, and possessing independent interest.

Date: June 26, 2024.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 42B20. Secondary: 42B25.

Key words and phrases. Fourier multipliers, $\Lambda(p)$ -sets, lacunary sets, sparse domination, Gabor decomposition, Zygmund's inequality.

O. Bakas is partially supported by grant PID2021-122156NB-I00 funded by MICIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and FEDER, UE and by the funding programme "MEDICUS" of the University of Patras.

V. Ciccone is supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy – EXC2047/1 390685813 as well as SFB 1060.

F. Di Plinio is partially supported by the FRA 2022 Program of University of Napoli Federico II, project ReSinA-PAS - Regularity and Singularity in Analysis, PDEs, and Applied Sciences.

M. Fraccaroli is supported by the Basque Government through the BERC 2022-2025 program and by the Ministry of Science and Innovation: BCAM Severo Ochoa accreditation CEX2021-001142-S / MICIN / AEI / 10.13039/501100011033.

I. Parissis is partially supported by grant PID2021-122156NB-I00 funded by MICIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and FEDER, UE, grant IT1615-22 of the Basque Government and IKERBASQUE.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

Let $\Xi \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a closed null set and Ω_Ξ stand for the countable collection of connected components of $O_\Xi := \mathbb{R} \setminus \Xi$. Consider hereafter the class of Fourier multipliers

$$(1.1) \quad T_m f(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} m(\xi) \widehat{f}(\xi) e^{-2\pi i x \xi} d\xi, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

with *singular set* Ξ , namely whose symbol m satisfies the M -th order, for some fixed, suitably large integer M , Hörmander-Mihlin type condition

$$(1.2) \quad \sup_{0 \leq j \leq M} \sup_{\xi \in O_\Xi} \text{dist}(\xi, \Xi)^j \left| m^{(j)}(\xi) \right| =: \|m\|_{\text{HM}(\Xi)} < \infty.$$

The class of multipliers satisfying (1.2) will be referred to as *Hörmander-Mihlin multipliers with respect to* Ξ .

This paper focuses on the endpoint and localized behavior of multipliers as in (1.2) and of their related square functions, whose singular set Ξ exhibits a suitable multiscale version of the Zygmund property (1.3) below. Hereby, we refer to the classical inequality of Zygmund, illustrating how the approximate independence of the lacunary characters $e^{2\pi i 2^k \cdot}$ leads to exponential square integrability, written in the adjoint form as

$$(1.3) \quad \left| \left\langle \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} a_k \exp(2\pi i 2^k \cdot), f \right\rangle \right| \leq C \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |a_k|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_{L^{\sqrt{\log L}}(0,1)}.$$

A more specific description of the problem at hand is given through the next three definitions.

Definition 1.1 (Orlicz spaces, B_p property, modular estimates). Throughout the article, X stands for the Orlicz space of measurable functions on $[0, 1]$ endowed with the Luxemburg norm

$$\|f\|_X := \inf \left\{ t > 0 : \int_{[0,1]} Y_X \left(\frac{|f(x)|}{t} \right) dx \leq 1 \right\}$$

induced by a Young function Y_X . This means that $Y_X : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is continuous, convex and strictly increasing, $Y_X(0) = 0$ and either $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Y(t)/t = \infty$ or $Y_X(t) = t$ for all $t \in [0, \infty)$. The latter case allows us to consider $X = L^1$. In particular, X is a Banach function space on $[0, 1]$ and the inclusion $X \subseteq L^1(0, 1)$ holds. A typical example of Young function that the reader should keep in mind is of the form $Y_{p,s}(t) := t^p \log^s(e + t)$ with $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $s \in [0, \infty)$.

The following structural assumption appears in a few of our corollaries. Say that X has the B_p property for some $1 < p < \infty$ if

- i. Y_X is submultiplicative, namely $Y_X(st) \leq C Y_X(s) Y_X(t)$ uniformly over $s, t > 0$;
- ii. there holds $B_p(X) := \left(\int_0^1 s^{p-1} Y_X(s^{-1}) ds \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty$.

Condition ii. is easily motivated as being necessary and sufficient for the L^p -boundedness of the Orlicz maximal operator M_X defined in (2.1) below. This is due to C. Pérez [52], see also [62].

Modular estimates, formally defined hereafter, are the Orlicz space substitute of weak-type bounds. Let T be a quasi-sublinear operator sending the class $L_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ of bounded, compactly

supported functions into measurable functions on \mathbb{R} . If w is a weight on \mathbb{R} , say that T has the X -modular estimate with weight w if there exists $C > 0$ with the property that

$$(1.4) \quad w(\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |Tf(x)| > \lambda\}) \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_X \left(\frac{|f(x)|}{\lambda} \right) w(x) dx,$$

for all $f \in L_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and $\lambda > 0$, and denote by $[T]_{X,w}$ the least such constant C ; we omit w from the subscript when $w = 1$. As anticipated, modular estimates are relevant e.g. because they imply [3] local weak type inequalities such as

$$\|T : X \mapsto L^{1,\infty}(0,1)\| \lesssim_{Y_X} [T]_X,$$

under the assumption that Y_X is submultiplicative.

Definition 1.2 ($\mathcal{Z}(X)$ property). Let X be a local Orlicz space on $(0,1)$ as in Definition 1.1. Say that $\mathbb{K} \subset \mathbb{Z}$ has the $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ property if there exists $C \geq 1$ such that, cf. (1.3),

$$\left| \left\langle \sum_{k \in \mathbb{K}} a_k \exp(2\pi i k \cdot), f \right\rangle \right| \leq C \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{K}} |a_k|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_X$$

uniformly over all finitely supported complex sequences $\{a_k : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and $f \in X$. In that case we denote by $\mathcal{Z}(X, \mathbb{K})$ the least such $C > 0$ and refer to it as the $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ constant of \mathbb{K} . Otherwise, simply set $\mathcal{Z}(X, \mathbb{K}) = \infty$. It is rather obvious that

$$(1.5) \quad \mathcal{Z}(X, \mathbb{K}) = \sup_{\mathbb{K}' \subset \mathbb{K}} \mathcal{Z}(X, \mathbb{K}'),$$

and we record this fact for future use.

Remark 1.2.1. Some observations concerning Definition 1.2 are in order. To begin with, $\mathcal{Z}(L^2, \mathbb{Z}) \leq 1$ trivially, which typically leads to considering spaces X with $L^2 \subseteq X \subseteq L^1$. Secondly, note that the classical Zygmund inequality (1.3) is equivalent to

$$(1.6) \quad \mathcal{Z}(L\sqrt{\log L}, \{2^k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}) < \infty,$$

which is why we refer to the defining inequality for $\mathcal{Z}(X, \mathbb{K})$ as *Zygmund property*. Note that (1.6) may be equivalently restated as

$$\|f\|_{\exp(L^2)(0,1)} \sim \sup_{p \geq 2} \left(p^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_p \right) \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(0,1)}$$

for all trigonometric polynomials f with frequencies in $\{2^k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Analogously, the $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ property may be equivalently rewritten in the adjoint form

$$\|f\|_{X'} \leq \mathcal{Z}(X, \mathbb{K}) \|f\|_{L^2(0,1)}, \quad f(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{K}} a_k e^{2\pi i k x},$$

where X' is the dual Banach space of X . As trigonometric polynomials *a priori* belong to any X as above, the possible lack of reflexivity of X is inconsequential. In particular, the $\mathcal{Z}(L^p)$ property for $1 < p < 2$ is equivalent to the classical $\Lambda(q)$ property of $\mathbb{K} \subset \mathbb{Z}$, $q = p'$. The latter is a central property in the study of thin sets in analysis, a theme with extensive literature; see e.g. [10, 56] and also the discussion in §1.10.

Definition 1.3 (Multiscale $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ property). Let X be a local Orlicz space on $(0, 1)$ as in Definition 1.1. Say that a singular set $\Xi \subset \mathbb{R}$ has the *multiscale $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ property*, or *multiscale Zygmund property* when X is generic or clear from context, if

$$\mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{Z}(X, \lfloor 2^n \Xi \rfloor) < \infty$$

where $\lfloor \lambda \Xi \rfloor := \{\lfloor \lambda \xi \rfloor : \xi \in \Xi\}$. In words, the integer parts of each dyadic rescaling of the set Ξ have the $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ property uniformly in the rescaling. Property (1.5) is inherited, so that

$$(1.7) \quad \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) = \sup_{\Xi' \subset \Xi} \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi').$$

As we shall see momentarily in §1.8, examples of infinite sets with nontrivial multiscale Zygmund properties are those enjoying limited additive structure, such as lacunary sets of finite order. At the other end of the spectrum, the set of integers and more generally sets containing arbitrarily long arithmetic progressions do not satisfy any non-trivial multiscale Zygmund property.

The above definitions are tied together by one of the main results of this article, which also serves as a guiding principle throughout the introduction. In words, the content of the following theorem is a quantitative version of the equivalence that T_m has the X -modular estimate uniformly in $m \in \text{HM}(\Xi)$ if and only if Ξ has the multiscale $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ property.

Theorem A. *Suppose X has the B_p property for some $1 < p < \infty$ and $B_p(X) \lesssim 1$. Then, with reference to (1.4),*

$$(1.8) \quad \frac{1}{\text{CY}_X \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi)} \right)} \leq \sup \{ \|T_m\|_{\text{HM}(\Xi)} : \|m\|_{\text{HM}(\Xi)} = 1 \} \leq \text{CY}_X (\mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi)).$$

The structural B_p property assumption is rather tame, as it is automatically true, with $p = 3$ say, whenever Y_X is submultiplicative and L^2 continuously embeds into X . The characterization of endpoint bounds for Fourier multiplier operators is a central problem within Fourier analysis and a question to this regard appears explicitly e.g. in [60, pp. 521], albeit tailored to the case of $L^p \log^s(L)$ scales. Theorem A provides a complete answer to such a question, under the mere assumption of submultiplicativity.

1.4. Main results. Theorem A actually descends from an essentially stronger inequality quantifying the sparse form behavior of $\text{HM}(\Xi)$ -multipliers. More broadly, our work yields *pointwise* and *bilinear form sparse bounds* for multipliers and square functions whose singular set Ξ enjoys the multiscale $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ properties. Through the rest of the introduction, the widespread local norm notation $\langle f \rangle_{X, Q}$ points to (2.1), and sparse collections are defined in §2.3.

Definition 1.5 (Sparse norms). Let X_1, X_2 be a pair of local Orlicz spaces on $(0, 1)$ as in Definition 1.1. Let T be a linear operator sending $f \in L_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ to $Tf \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Say that T has the (X_1, X_2) -sparse bound if there exists $C > 0$ such that the inequality

$$|\langle Tf_1, f_2 \rangle| \leq C \sup_{\mathcal{S}} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}} |Q| \langle f_1 \rangle_{X_1, Q} \langle f_2 \rangle_{X_2, Q}$$

holds for all pairs $f_1, f_2 \in L_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, where the supremum is being taken over all η -sparse collections \mathcal{S} of intervals of the real line for some fixed parameter $\eta \in (0, 1)$. The least such constant

C is indicated with $\|T\|_{X_1, X_2}$ and termed the (X_1, X_2) -sparse norm of T . The dependence on η in the definitions above is suppressed, as the minimum value of η remains fixed throughout this paper.

Originally motivated by the precise, and sometimes sharp quantification of the weighted Lebesgue behavior of Calderón-Zygmund singular integrals, the modern usage of sparse operators dates back to the earlier works of Lerner [41, 43]. Sparse form bounds akin to those in Definition 1.5 have since appeared in the pursuit of weighted and local estimates within and beyond Calderón-Zygmund theory, in a subsequent flurry of activity, see e.g. [4, 6, 14, 15, 19, 36]. The sparse bounds of this paper will be used to deduce the weighted and optimal endpoint behavior of several operators covered by our general formalism. In the unweighted case, and for the special case that the singular set Ξ is a lacunary set of finite order, these endpoint results first appeared [60] for first order lacunary sets, and in [3] for lacunary sets of general order.

The first couple of results deals with two types of square functions closely related to the multipliers of (1.1)-(1.2). The first is the family of square functions

$$(1.9) \quad H_{\Xi, m} f := \left(\sum_{\omega \in \Omega_{\Xi}} |T_{m1_{\omega}} f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

with $m \in \text{HM}(\Xi)$, cf. (1.2). When $m = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}}$, in analogy with the well studied case $\Xi = \{2^k : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, (1.9) is termed the Ξ -Marcinkiewicz square function associated to the rough frequency projections $H_{\omega} := T_{1_{\omega}}$, $\omega \in \Omega_{\Xi}$, and we reserve the notation H_{Ξ} for this special case.

Theorem B. *For each $f \in L_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ there exists a sparse collection \mathcal{S} such that*

$$(1.10) \quad H_{\Xi, m} f \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) \|m\|_{\text{HM}(\Xi)} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}} \langle f \rangle_{X, Q} \mathbf{1}_Q$$

pointwise almost everywhere on \mathbb{R} . The implied constant is absolute. A fortiori,

$$\|H_{\Xi, m}\|_{X, L^1} \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) \|m\|_{\text{HM}(\Xi)}.$$

Theorem B entails an equivalence between the $\mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi)$ constant and the best constant in global modular inequality for the square functions $H_{m, \Xi}$.

Corollary B.1. *Suppose X has the B_p property for some $1 < p < \infty$ and $B_p(X) \lesssim 1$. Then, with reference to (1.4),*

$$(1.11) \quad \frac{1}{CY_X \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi)} \right)} \leq \sup_{\Xi' \subset \Xi} \sup_{\|m\|_{\text{HM}(\Xi')} \leq 1} [H_{\Xi', m}]_X \leq CY_X (\mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi)).$$

Furthermore, there exists a positive increasing function Q such that

$$(1.12) \quad \sup_{\|m\|_{\text{HM}(\Xi)} \leq 1} [H_{\Xi, m}]_{X, w} \lesssim Q([w]_{A_1}) Y_X (\mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi))$$

uniformly over all weights w .

Estimate (1.12) is deduced immediately from the theorem through an application of Proposition Z.1, which is stated and proved in Appendix Z. The right side bound in (1.11), by virtue of (1.7), is just a particular case of (1.12), while the leftmost almost inequality is proved in Section 9. The leftward estimate of (1.11) also shows that the (X, L^1) sparse form of Theorem B is

best possible, in the sense that X may not be replaced with an Orlicz space $X_1 \supsetneq X$ for which $\mathcal{Z}^\star(X_1, \Xi) = \infty$.

If ω is a bounded interval, a smooth analogue of H_ω may be defined by using smooth frequency projections from the class

$$\Phi_\omega := \left\{ \varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}) : \text{supp } \varphi \subset \omega, \sup_{0 \leq \alpha \leq D} \ell_\omega^\alpha \left\| \varphi^{(\alpha)} \right\|_\infty \leq 1 \right\}$$

consisting of D -smooth functions supported on ω and L^∞ -normalized. Throughout the paper, the smoothness parameter D will in general be chosen to be as large as needed and will be omitted from the notation. One then defines the intrinsic smooth frequency projections on ω as

$$G_\omega f(x) = \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi_\omega} |\mathbb{T}_\varphi f(x)|, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

and introduces the Ξ -Littlewood-Paley square function by

$$G_\Xi f := \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathbf{w}_D(O_\Xi)} |G_\omega f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $\mathbf{w}_D(O)$ stands for the dyadic Whitney decomposition of the open set $O \subset \mathbb{R}$ as detailed in §2.6. For example, if $\Xi = \{0\}$ then $\mathbf{w}_D(O)$ is the standard collection of Littlewood-Paley intervals and G_Ξ is the intrinsic version of the smooth Littlewood-Paley square function, considered e.g. by Wilson [61].

Theorem C. *For each $f \in L_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ there exists a sparse collection \mathcal{S} such that*

$$(1.13) \quad G_\Xi f \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^\star(X, \Xi) \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}} \langle f \rangle_{X, Q}^2 \mathbf{1}_Q \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

pointwise almost everywhere on \mathbb{R} . The implied constant is absolute.

Corollary C.1. *Suppose X has the B_p property for some $1 < p < \infty$ and $B_p(X) \lesssim 1$. Then, with reference to (1.4),*

$$(1.14) \quad \frac{1}{\text{CY}_X \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}^\star(X, \Xi)} \right)} \leq \sup_{\Xi' \subset \Xi} [G_{\Xi'}]_X \leq \text{CY}_X \left(\mathcal{Z}^\star(X, \Xi) \right).$$

The left side bound in (1.14) is also proved in Section 9 and provides, along with Theorem A and Corollary B.1, another characterization of the multiscale Zygmund property. The estimate in the conclusion of Theorem C is stronger than the corresponding one of Theorem B, whence G_Ξ also satisfies the weighted modular inequalities of Corollary B.1, and in particular the right side estimate in (1.14). However, stronger quantitative weighted estimates may be deduced from the quadratic sparse domination of the conclusion of Theorem C; see Corollary C.2 in Section 8. As it was the case in Theorem B, the sparse domination of Theorem C is best possible. Firstly, the space X cannot be replaced by any Orlicz space $X_1 \supsetneq X$ for which $\mathcal{Z}^\star(X_1, \Xi) = \infty$.

Furthermore, the ℓ^2 -sum over the sparse collection in the right hand side cannot be replaced in general by any ℓ^q -sum with $q > 2$. To see this it is enough to note that sparse forms

$$f \mapsto \mathcal{S}_q f := \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}} \langle f \rangle_{X, Q}^q \mathbf{1}_Q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

satisfy $\|\mathcal{S}_q f\|_p = O(p^{\frac{1}{q}})$ for p large. If for example $\Xi = \{0\}$, G_Ξ is the usual smooth Littlewood-Paley square function, and $\|G_\Xi\|_{L^p} \gtrsim p^{1/2}$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$, hence this forces $q \leq 2$; see e.g. [42, 48].

For Hörmander-Mihlin multipliers adapted to a singular set Ξ as in (1.2), a sparse form domination holds instead.

Theorem D. *Let Ξ be a singular set with the multiscale $\mathcal{Z}(X_j)$ property for $j = 1, 2$ and suppose m is a multiplier satisfying (1.2). Then*

$$\|T_m\|_{X_1, X_2} \lesssim \|m\|_{\text{HM}(\Xi)} \prod_{j=1,2} \mathcal{Z}^*(X_j, \Xi)$$

with absolute implicit constant.

Taking $X_2 = L^q(0, 1)$ with $1 \leq q \leq 2$ and applying Proposition Z.1 yields the next corollary. In the particular case $q = 2$, the corresponding \mathcal{Z}^* -constant trivializes to 1. Note that the rightmost bound in (1.8) from Theorem A is a particular case, while the leftward bound is proved in Section 9.

Corollary D.1. *Let $1 \leq q \leq 2$ and suppose that X has the B_p property for some $1 < p < q'$ and $B_p(X) \lesssim 1$. Then, there exists a positive increasing function Q such that*

$$\sup_{\|m\|_{\text{HM}(\Xi)} \leq 1} [T_m]_{X, w} \lesssim Q \left([w]_{A_1}, [w]_{\text{RH}} \frac{q}{q-p(q-1)} \right) Y_X(\mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi)) Y_X(\mathcal{Z}^*(L^q(0, 1), \Xi))$$

uniformly over all weights w .

1.6. Marcinkiewicz-type multipliers and maximal multiscale $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ property. The next definition strengthens that of the multiscale $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ property.

Definition 1.7 (Maximal multiscale $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ property). Let X be a local Orlicz space on $(0, 1)$ as in Definition 1.1. Say that a pairwise disjoint collection of intervals Ω has the *maximal multiscale $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ property* if

$$\mathcal{Z}^{**}(X, \Omega) := \sup \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \{p_\omega : \omega \in \Omega\}) < \infty,$$

the supremum being taken over all choices of points $\{p_\omega : \omega \in \Omega\}$ consisting of exactly one point $p_\omega \in \overline{\omega}$ per interval $\omega \in \Omega$. If Ξ is a singular set, we abuse notation to say that Ξ has the maximal multiscale $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ property if the collection of complementary intervals Ω_Ξ does, and write $\mathcal{Z}^{**}(X, \Xi)$ in place of $\mathcal{Z}^{**}(X, \Omega_\Xi)$.

Typical examples of sets possessing non-trivial maximal multiscale Zygmund properties are again finite unions of lacunary sets of finite order, see §1.8 for more details.

Given a singular set Ξ , a bounded function $m : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is said to be a *Marcinkiewicz multiplier with singular set Ξ* if m has bounded variation uniformly on all $\omega \in \Omega_\Xi$, where Ω_Ξ indicates the complementary intervals of Ξ as before. Denote by $\|m\|_{\text{Mar}(\Xi)}$ the corresponding multiplier

norm. These Marcinkiewicz multipliers satisfy a similar result to Theorem D, but requiring of Ξ the formally stronger maximal multiscale Zygmund property.

Theorem E. *Let Ξ be a singular set with the maximal multiscale $\mathcal{Z}(X_j)$ property for $j = 1, 2$, and suppose m is a Marcinkiewicz multiplier with singular set Ξ . Then*

$$\|T_m\|_{X_1, X_2} \lesssim \|m\|_{\text{Mar}(\Xi)} \prod_{j=1,2} \mathcal{Z}^{\star\star}(X_j, \Xi)$$

with absolute implicit constant.

Weighted modular inequalities for these multipliers identical to those of Corollary D.1 hold, up to replacing \mathcal{Z}^{\star} by $\mathcal{Z}^{\star\star}$ and $\text{HM}(\Xi)$ by $\text{Mar}(\Xi)$; we omit the formal statements. However, in analogy with Theorem A, it is worthwhile to record the following characterization of the maximal multiscale Zygmund constant $\mathcal{Z}^{\star\star}(X, \Xi)$.

Corollary E.1. *Suppose X has the B_p property for some $1 < p < \infty$ and $B_p(X) \lesssim 1$. Then, with reference to (1.4),*

$$\frac{1}{\text{CY}_X \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}^{\star\star}(X, \Xi)} \right)} \leq \sup \{ [T_m]_X : \|m\|_{\text{Mar}(\Xi)} = 1 \} \leq \text{CY}_X (\mathcal{Z}^{\star\star}(X, \Xi)).$$

In accordance with the point of view of [3, 13, 60], Marcinkiewicz multipliers can be understood by embedding them into a wider class of symbols satisfying suitable variation estimates, uniformly on each interval of Ω_{Ξ} . These are the classes of $R_{p,q}^{\Xi}$ -multipliers which will be discussed in §2.7 below. We note here that Marcinkiewicz multipliers with singular set Ξ are $R_{1,1}^{\Xi}$ -multipliers and when $\Xi = \Lambda_1 := \{2^k : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ these are exactly the classical Marcinkiewicz multipliers; see [12, Proposition 2.9]. The class of multipliers $R_{2,2}^{\Lambda_1}$ is the R_2 class of [3, 60]. In §2.7 we will also present a suitable version of Theorem E for $R_{p,1}^{\Xi}$ multipliers with $1 \leq p \leq 2$; see Theorem G.

1.8. Lacunary examples and weighted bounds. For $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, the singular set $\Xi = \{\xi\}$ of standard Hörmander-Mihlin multipliers is a singleton, enjoying the strongest possible maximal multiscale property $\mathcal{Z}^{\star\star}(L^1, \{\xi\}) \leq 2$. In this case, Theorem B and Theorem C recover respectively the pointwise sparse bound for Hörmander-Mihlin multipliers, and the well known square sparse bound for the Littlewood-Paley square function [11]. Theorem D is instead a sparse form domination for Hörmander-Mihlin multipliers, well within the results of [43, 35]. If Ξ is a finite set, it is easy to check that

$$\mathcal{Z}^{\star\star}(L^p, \Xi) \lesssim [\#\Xi]^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}}, \quad 1 \leq p \leq 2.$$

Specializing our results to this case leads to sparse and weighted versions of the multi-frequency estimates discussed in [5]. A more general family of singular sets with the Zygmund property is that of lacunary sets. The next definition has countless analogues in the literature, the closest being that of [58]; see also [51].

Definition 1.9. Let $\gamma \in (1, \infty)$. A sequence $\{\theta_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is called γ -lacunary if there exists $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\theta_k \neq \theta$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\gamma(\theta_{k+1} - \theta) \leq (\theta_k - \theta)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. A γ -lacunary set of order 0 is a single point in \mathbb{R} . If $\tau \geq 1$ is a positive integer then a set $\Xi \subset \mathbb{R}$ will be called γ -lacunary of order τ if there exists a γ -lacunary sequence $\{\theta_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ such that, for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

the set $\Xi \cap (\theta_{k+1}, \theta_k]$ is lacunary of order $\tau - 1$. In the sequel, we do not refer to γ explicitly and simply say *lacunary* of order τ .

Lacunary sets Ξ of order $\tau \geq 0$ enjoy the maximal multiscale Zygmund properties

$$(1.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}^{**}(L^p, \Xi) &\lesssim (p-1)^{-\frac{\tau}{2}}, & 1 < p \leq 2, \\ \mathcal{Z}^{**}\left(L[\log L]^{\frac{\tau}{2}}, \Xi\right) &\lesssim 1, \end{aligned}$$

with implied constants depending on γ, τ only. This is trivial for $\tau = 0$, a routine check relying upon the already mentioned inequality of Zygmund for $\tau = 1$, see [63] and [64, Theorem 7.6, Chapter XII], or upon the higher order analogue due to Bonami [7] for $\tau > 1$; see also [3, Remark 4.3]. We note in passing that the corresponding Young function for the local $L[\log L]^{\frac{\tau}{2}}$ space can be taken to be $Y_{1, \frac{\tau}{2}}(t) := t[\log(e+t)]^{\frac{\tau}{2}}$ which satisfies the formalism of Orlicz spaces in Definition 1.1; in particular $Y_{1, \frac{\tau}{2}}$ satisfies the B_p -condition in Definition 1.1 for all $p > 1$.

The article [44, §5.2] conjectures sparse norm bounds respectively for the rough Littlewood-Paley square function H_Ξ of Theorem B and for the corresponding Marcinkiewicz multipliers T_m of Theorem E when Ξ is a lacunary set of order 1. Theorem B yields in this case

$$\|H_\Xi\|_{L\sqrt{\log L}, L^1} \lesssim 1, \quad \|H_\Xi\|_{L^p, L^1} \lesssim (p-1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad 1 < p \leq 2$$

and the second estimate matches the conjectured bound in [44]. On the other hand, applying Theorem E tells us that

$$\|T_m\|_{L\sqrt{\log L}, L\sqrt{\log L}} \lesssim 1, \quad \|T_m\|_{L^p, L^p} \lesssim (p-1)^{-1}, \quad 1 < p \leq 2.$$

The second estimate is sharp as $p \rightarrow 1^+$, cf. [12, Prop. 7.1], both showing that [44, eq. (5.1)] is too optimistic and deducing the correct substitute. In addition, neither space in the first estimate can be improved to a space $X \supsetneq L\sqrt{\log L}$, as otherwise T_m would satisfy an X -modular estimate of the form appearing in Corollary D.1, and in particular map $X \rightarrow L^{1, \infty}$ locally, which is known to fail whenever $X \supsetneq L\sqrt{\log L}$; see [60].

Lerner's conjectures [44] aimed at furthering the study of quantitative weighted norm inequalities for the operators H_Ξ, T_m in the first order lacunary case. Our sparse estimates lead to a few improvements of known quantifications, and extend the scope to a much wider array of singular sets. For these sets the lacunarity assumption is replaced by requiring the multiscale or maximal multiscale Zygmund properties with $X = L^p$ with a specific blow-up rate as $p \rightarrow 1^+$, covering in particular the finite order lacunary case. See Section 8 for statements and proofs.

1.10. Characterizing the LP-property and non-lacunary examples. Let $\Xi \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a closed null set and recall that $\Omega_\Xi = \{\omega\}_{\omega \in \Omega_\Xi}$ denotes the collection of complementary intervals of Ξ , namely $O_\Xi = \bigcup_{\omega \in \Omega_\Xi} \omega$. Let $1 < p < \infty$. The set Ξ has the *Littlewood-Paley p -property*, in short $\text{LP}(p)$, if there exist constants $C_p, c_p > 1$, depending only on p , such that the following two-sided square function estimate

$$(1.16) \quad c_p^{-1} \|f\|_p \leq \|H_\Xi f\|_p \leq C_p \|f\|_p$$

holds, with H_Ξ defined as in (1.9). By duality, it is clear that Ξ has the $\text{LP}(p)$ property if and only if it has the $\text{LP}(p')$ property. Moreover, say that Ξ is an *LP-set* or *that it has the LP property* if Ξ has the $\text{LP}(p)$ -property for all $p \in (1, \infty)$.

Similar definitions can be given in terms of Hörmander-Mihlin multipliers or Marcinkiewicz multipliers with singular set Ξ . Say that a closed null set $\Xi \subset \mathbb{R}$ has the property $\text{HM}(p)$ if every Hörmander-Mihlin multiplier with singular set Ξ as in (1.1) is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$. Similarly, say Ξ has the property $\text{Mar}(p)$ if every Marcinkiewicz multiplier with singular set Ξ as in §1.6 is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R})$.

These definitions are rather classical, see [58] for the case of the real line and [27] of the torus. We stress that the definitions above are insensitive to the value of the constants involved in $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ -boundedness assumptions. Furthermore, the main results in [58] show that the properties $\text{LP}(p)$, $\text{Mar}(p)$ and $\text{HM}(p)$ are all equivalent for any fixed $p \in (1, \infty)$, whence we focus on the $\text{LP}(p)$ property in the next characterization.

Theorem F. *Let $\Xi \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a singular set and let $q \in [1, 2)$. Then the following are equivalent.*

1. $\mathcal{Z}^{**}(L^p, \Xi) < \infty$ for all $p \in (q, 2)$.
2. $\mathcal{Z}^*(L^p, \Xi) < \infty$ for all $p \in (q, 2)$.
3. The set Ξ has the $\text{LP}(p)$ property for all $p \in (q, q')$.

In particular, the set Ξ has the LP property if and only if $\mathcal{Z}^(L^p, \Xi) < +\infty$ for all $p \in (1, 2)$.*

Theorem F, although interesting on its own, helps us delineate the connections between the multiscale Zygmund property and the $\text{LP}(p)$ property. Additionally, it leads to examples of non-lacunary sets enjoying nontrivial $\mathcal{Z}^*(L^p)$ -properties, thereby greatly extending the applicability of our multiplier theorems. This is expounded in the next series of remarks

Remark 1.10.1 (Relation with $\Lambda(q)$). As previously observed, finiteness of $\mathcal{Z}(L^p, \mathbb{K})$ for $p \in (1, 2]$ coincides with the $\Lambda(q)$ -property of $\mathbb{K} \subset \mathbb{Z}$ for $q = p' \in [2, \infty)$. It follows from the work of Pisier [53] that $\mathbb{K} \subset \mathbb{Z}$ satisfies the $\mathcal{Z}(L\sqrt{\log L})$ property if and only if it is a Sidon set; see also the monograph by Marcus and Pisier [49], where an analogous characterization is obtained in the setting of compact groups. Note that the easier of the two equivalences in the previous characterization was first proved by Rudin, [56, Theorem 3.1]. Arithmetic characterizations of Sidon sets in the dual of a compact abelian group, and in particular of subsets of integers satisfying the Zygmund property, were also found by Pisier, see e.g. [54] and references therein. In [9] Bourgain, using a different approach, obtained an additional characterization of Sidon sets in the dual of a compact abelian group and recovered the aforementioned results of Pisier. See also the treatise by Graham and Hare [26] and references therein.

It is well known that a $\text{LP}(p)$ set is necessarily a $\Lambda(\max(p, p'))$ set; see [27, §3]. At the same time, there exist $\Lambda(q)$ -sets, $q > 2$, which are not $\text{LP}(q)$ -sets. Most importantly for us, there exist sets of integers that are $\Lambda(q)$ for all $q < \infty$ but are not LP -sets, and in particular there exist sets that satisfy the $\mathcal{Z}(L\sqrt{\log L})$ property but are not LP -sets, see [27, §4]. Combining these examples with Theorem F, we infer that the $\Lambda(q)$, $2 < q < \infty$, property of \mathbb{K} is strictly weaker than the finiteness of $\mathcal{Z}^*(L^{q'}, \mathbb{K})$. Equivalently, the $\mathcal{Z}(L^{q'})$ property is strictly weaker than the $\mathcal{Z}^*(L^{q'})$ property.

Remark 1.10.2 (Non-lacunary examples of multiscale Zygmund sets). An example of an LP -set Ξ which may not be written as a finite union of finite-order lacunary sets has been constructed in [27, 28]. More precisely, the authors in [27] construct a certain family of sets $E_\infty \subset \mathbb{Z}$ which are *not* finite unions of lacunary sets of finite order. In [28] the authors verify that for a suitable choice of parameters in the construction of E_∞ , the latter set gives rise to a partition

of the integers that satisfies the LP property on the torus. In [29], the authors mention that the proof of the Littlewood-Paley property for the torus transfers to the real line. By Theorem F, we gather that $\mathcal{Z}^*(L^p, E_\infty) < +\infty$ for all $p \in (1, 2)$.

Remark 1.10.3 (Idempotent multipliers). Let $\mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R})$ denote the algebra of L^p -bounded Fourier multipliers, $1 < p < \infty$. Every measurable set $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ generates the idempotent multiplier $\mathbf{1}_E \in \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R})$. If $\mathbf{1}_E \in \mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R})$ for some $p \neq 2$ then the set E generates a complemented subspace of L^p . By a theorem of Rudin, [57], extended by Rosenthal to non-compact groups, [55], all translation invariant complemented subspaces of $L^p(\mathbb{R})$, $1 < p < \infty$, are of the form

$$\{T_E f : f \in L^p(\mathbb{R})\} \subset L^p(\mathbb{R}), \quad T_E f := \left(\mathbf{1}_E \hat{f}\right)^\vee,$$

for some unique measurable E such that $\mathbf{1}_E \in \mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R})$. A theorem of Lebedev and Olevskii, [40], shows that a necessary condition for $\mathbf{1}_E \in \mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R})$ for $p \neq 2$ is that E is open up to a set of measure zero. Using the results of the previous paragraph, we can give a sufficient condition for E to generate an idempotent multiplier in $\mathcal{M}_q(\mathbb{R})$ via the multiscale Zygmund property.

Corollary F.1. *Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ be measurable. If E coincides up to a set of measure zero with an open set and $\mathcal{Z}^*(L^p, \Xi_E) < +\infty$, where Ξ_E denotes the set of endpoints of the component intervals of E , then $\mathbf{1}_E \in \mathcal{M}_q(\mathbb{R})$ for all $q \in (p, p')$.*

Structure of the article. Section 2 establishes the basic notation being used throughout the paper. It also contains the reduction of the multiplier classes $\text{HM}(\Xi)$, $\text{Mar}(\Xi)$, and corresponding square functions to suitably defined phase plane model sums adapted to the singular set Ξ . The discretization of the class $\text{Mar}(\Xi)$ is actually realized by viewing it as a special case of the more general family $R_{p,1}^\Xi$, $1 \leq p \leq 2$. A sparse domination bound extending Theorem E to this family may be found in Section 2 as well, see Theorem G.

Section 3 is the technical heart of the article. It contains Lemma 3.2.1, where the multiscale Zygmund property of Ξ is exploited to construct an appropriate Gabor projection of a given function f localized to an interval. The function f is projected on the subspace generated by wave packets with frequency localized coming from a Whitney decomposition of O_Ξ . Most importantly, the localized L^2 norm of this projection are kept under control by the local X -norms of f . In the same section, Lemma 3.2.1 is used to produce single scale and tail estimates for Ξ -adapted model sums.

Section 4 contains the main multiscale part of the arguments, mostly summarized by Proposition 4.2, whose proof relies again on the projection Lemma 3.2.1 together with the single scale estimates of Section 3. Sections 5, 6, and 7 are devoted to the proofs of the main Theorems B, C, D and E respectively, and all rely on the above mentioned proposition or variants thereof, as well as on arguments typical of sparse domination.

Section 8 contains a plethora of quantitative weighted norm inequalities for Ξ -singular multipliers under the assumption of controlled blowup of the constants, e.g. $\mathcal{Z}^*(L^p, \Xi)$, as $p \rightarrow 1^+$. Sections 9 and 10 are respectively dedicated to the reverse controls in Theorems A, Corollaries B.1, C.1 and D.1, and to the proof of Theorem F.

Acknowledgments. The authors are grateful to Giacomo Ascione for an expert reading and valuable suggestions on the exposition.

2. NOTATION AND BACKGROUND MATERIAL

2.1. Recurring notation. Throughout the paper, the same convention used in the introduction is kept: Ξ is a closed null set, $O_\Xi := \mathbb{R} \setminus \Xi$, and Ω_Ξ stands for the collection of connected components of O_Ξ . The Fourier transform follows the normalization

$$\widehat{f}(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) e^{-2\pi i x \xi} dx, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The large positive constant C , small positive constant c , and those constants implied by the almost inequality signs are meant to be absolute unless otherwise specified, and may vary at each occurrence without explicit mention.

2.2. Dyadic grids, weighted spaces, maximal functions. Given an interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, denote by c_I, ℓ_I the center and Euclidean length of I , respectively. Hereafter, \mathcal{D} stands for a generic dyadic system on \mathbb{R} . For instance

$$\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{D}_n = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ [k2^{-n}, (k+1)2^{-n}) : k \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}.$$

It is useful to isolate

$$\mathcal{D}(I) := \{J \in \mathcal{D} : J \subseteq I\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_n(I) := \{J \in \mathcal{D}(I) : \ell_J = 2^{-n} \ell_I\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

If $I \in \mathcal{D}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ then there is exactly one element J of \mathcal{D} with $I \in \mathcal{D}_n(J)$. Denote this element by $I^{\uparrow n}$ and refer to it as the n -th dyadic parent of I . For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ denote by

$$I^{\uparrow n, +k} := I^{\uparrow n} + k \ell_{I^{\uparrow n}}, \quad I^{+k} := I + k \ell_I,$$

the corresponding higher order parents and their translates. Linear changes of coordinates are indicated by

$$\text{Tr}_a f := f(\cdot - a), \quad \text{Dil}_b^p f := b^{-\frac{1}{p}} f(b^{-1} \cdot), \quad a \in \mathbb{R}, \quad b > 0.$$

The smooth replacement for indicators will be

$$\chi(x) := \frac{1}{1+x^2}, \quad \chi_I := \text{Tr}_{c_I} \text{Dil}_{\ell_I}^\infty \chi = \chi \circ \text{Sy}_I^{-1},$$

where $I \in \mathcal{D}$. Note that Sy_I is the unique linear map such that I is the image of $[0, 1)$. Positively/negatively weighted local L^p -norms are denoted by

$$\langle f \rangle_{p, I, \pm} := \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f \chi_I^{\pm \text{dec}}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \left\| [f \circ \text{Sy}_I] \chi^{\pm \text{dec}} \right\|_p$$

where dec is a large but bounded power whose value might change at each occurrence. The dependence on dec may thus be kept implicit in the notation. A word on functions f with $\langle f \rangle_{p, I, -}$ under control: these are functions that are strongly localized to I in the sense that they decay polynomially fast away from it. On the other hand $\langle f \rangle_{p, I, +}$ is a tailed average of f on I , and an exact average if f happens to be supported on I .

Let X be a local Orlicz space as in Definition 1.1. Orlicz averages localized to a not necessarily dyadic interval I , and the corresponding maximal operator, are indicated with

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle f \rangle_{X,I} &:= \|(f\mathbf{1}_I) \circ \text{Sy}_I\|_X, \\ M_X f(x) &:= \sup_{I \ni x} \langle f \rangle_{X,I}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \langle f \rangle_{X,I,\pm} &:= \left\| [f \circ \text{Sy}_I] \chi^{\pm \text{dec}} \right\|_X. \end{aligned}$$

When $I = [0, 1)$, we use just $\langle f \rangle_X$ in place of $\langle f \rangle_{X,I}$ for the local Orlicz norms.

2.3. Sparse operators. If $0 < \eta < 1$ and $E \subset F \subset \mathbb{R}$ are measurable, say that E is η -major, or simply *major* in F , if $|E| \geq \eta|F|$. A collection \mathcal{S} of intervals in \mathbb{R} is said to be η -sparse if there exists a pairwise disjoint collection of η -major subsets $\{E_S \subset S : S \in \mathcal{S}\}$. A well-known principle, see e.g. [45], is that for each $0 < \eta < 1$, a collection $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{D}$ for some fixed dyadic grid \mathcal{D} is η -sparse if and only if the packing condition

$$\sum_{\substack{S \in \mathcal{S} \\ S \subset I}} |S| \leq \eta^{-1} |I|$$

holds uniformly over all intervals $I \subset \mathbb{R}$. To each sparse collection \mathcal{S} , local Orlicz space X and exponent $0 < p < \infty$, associate the sublinear sparse operators

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{S}_{X,p} f := \left(\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \langle f \rangle_{X,S}^p \mathbf{1}_S \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \mathcal{S}_{X,p,\pm} f := \left(\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \langle f \rangle_{X,S,\pm}^p \mathbf{1}_S \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

The former appears for example in the statements of Theorems B and C, with $p = 1$ and $p = 2$ respectively. When $X = L^q(\mathbb{R})$ for some $0 < q < \infty$, the notations in (2.2) are replaced by the simpler $\mathcal{S}_{q,p}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{q,p,\pm}$ respectively. The bilinear sparse forms

$$(2.3) \quad \Lambda_{X_1, X_2}^{\mathcal{S}}(f_1, f_2) := \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} |S| \langle f_1 \rangle_{X_1, S} \langle f_2 \rangle_{X_2, S}, \quad \Lambda_{X_1, X_2, \pm}^{\mathcal{S}}(f_1, f_2) := \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} |S| \langle f_1 \rangle_{X_1, S, \pm} \langle f_2 \rangle_{X_2, S, \pm},$$

are also used, with the first one appearing for example in the statements of Theorems D and E through Definition 1.5. As before, when $X_j = L^{q_j}(\mathbb{R})$ for some $0 < q_j < \infty$ the simpler notations $\Lambda_{q_1, q_2}^{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\Lambda_{q_1, q_2, \pm}^{\mathcal{S}}$, respectively, are preferred.

2.4. Tiles, adapted classes. A *tile* $P = I_P \times \omega_P$ is a product of dyadic intervals with area 1, that is

$$(2.4) \quad I_P \in \mathcal{D}, \quad \omega_P \in \mathcal{D}', \quad \ell_{I_P} \ell_{\omega_P} = 1,$$

where $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'$ are two possibly different dyadic grids. Overloading notation, write $\ell_P := \ell_{I_P}$ when $P = I_P \times \omega_P$ and refer to it as the *scale* of P . The notation $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'}$ refers to the collection of all tiles arising as in (2.4), and the subscript is dropped once $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'$ are fixed and clear from context. We use \mathbb{Q} to denote a generic subset of $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'}$. In general, if $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{D}'$, write

$$(2.5) \quad \mathbb{Q}^{\mathcal{J}} = \{P = I_P \times \omega_P \in \mathbb{Q} : \omega_P \in \mathcal{J}\}.$$

Instead, when I is any interval in \mathbb{R} ,

$$\mathbb{Q}_=(I) := \{P = I_P \times \omega_P \in \mathbb{Q} : I_P = I\}, \quad \mathbb{Q}(I) := \{P = I_P \times \omega_P \in \mathbb{Q} : I_P \subseteq I\}.$$

To each tile P associate the L^1 -normalized wavelet class $\Psi_P(D)$ consisting of those $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with

$$\text{supp } \widehat{\phi} \subset \omega_P, \quad \sup_{0 \leq j \leq D} |I_P|^{1+j} \left\| \chi_{I_P}^{-D} (\exp(2\pi i c_{\omega_P} \cdot) \phi)^{(j)} \right\|_\infty \leq 1,$$

where D is a large positive integer.

Remark 2.4.1. The localization trick in the form

$$\phi_P \in \Psi_P(D), \quad I_P \subset I \implies \varphi_P := \chi_{I_P}^{-\text{dec}} \phi_P \in C\Psi_P(D - \text{dec})$$

for a suitable constant C depending on dec , will be used often, but only finitely many times within each argument. We may thus assume that every instance of D in $\Psi_P(D)$ is much larger than any instance of dec appearing in the proofs, and thus drop D from the notation altogether and write Ψ_P for each instance. We do not aim to optimize the number of derivatives of the wavelets used in this paper and the choices of parameters $D = 100$ and $0 \leq \text{dec} \leq 50$ will suffice.

2.5. Almost orthogonal collections. A collection of tiles $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'}$ will be called *almost orthogonal* if

$$(2.6) \quad P, P' \in \mathbb{Q}, \quad \omega_P \cap \omega_{P'} \neq \emptyset \implies \omega_P = \omega_{P'}.$$

For instance, $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathcal{J}}$ is an almost orthogonal collection whenever the elements of $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{D}'$ are pairwise disjoint. The choice of name is motivated via the following reasoning, ultimately leading to (2.8) below. To begin with, let us introduce the operators

$$(2.7) \quad T_{\mathbb{Q}} f := \sum_{P \in \mathbb{Q}} |I_P| \langle f, \phi_P \rangle \psi_P,$$

where \mathbb{Q} is a subset of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'}$ and $\phi_P, \psi_P \in \Psi_P$ are choices of adapted wave packets for each $P \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'}$.

Lemma 2.5.1. *Suppose \mathbb{Q} satisfies (2.6). Then $\langle T_{\mathbb{Q}(I)} f \rangle_{2, I, -} \lesssim \langle f \rangle_{2, I, +}$ uniformly over $I \in \mathcal{D}$.*

Proof. Let us denote

$$\widetilde{T}_{\mathbb{Q}(I)} f := \sum_{P \in \mathbb{Q}(I)} |I_P| \langle f, \widetilde{\phi}_P \rangle \widetilde{\psi}_P, \quad \widetilde{\psi}_P := \chi_I^{-\text{dec}} \psi_P, \quad \widetilde{\phi}_P := \chi_I^{-\text{dec}} \phi_P.$$

By Remark 2.4.1 and a standard TT^* argument reliant on the almost orthogonality property (2.6) as for example in [1, §4.3], we have

$$\langle T_{\mathbb{Q}(I)} f \rangle_{2, I, -}^2 = \frac{1}{|I|} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \widetilde{T}_{\mathbb{Q}(I)} (f \chi_I^{\text{dec}}) \right|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{|I|} \int \left| f \chi_I^{\text{dec}} \right|^2 = \langle f \rangle_{2, I, +}^2$$

which is the desired estimate. \square

If \mathbb{Q} satisfies (2.6), an immediate consequence of the lemma is that

$$(2.8) \quad \frac{1}{|I|} \sum_{P \in \mathbb{Q}(I)} |I_P| |\langle f, \phi_P \rangle|^2 = \frac{\langle T_{\mathbb{Q}(I)} f, f \rangle}{|I|} \leq \langle T_{\mathbb{Q}(I)} f \rangle_{2, I, -} \langle f \rangle_{2, I, +} \lesssim \langle f \rangle_{2, I, +}^2$$

uniformly over $I \in \mathcal{D}$ and choices of wave packets $\phi_P \in \Psi_P$.

2.6. Discretization of multipliers with singular set Ξ . In this paragraph, we recast the well-known time-frequency discretization of Fourier multipliers of the type (1.1), originating e.g. in [34, 39]; see also [22] for a list of more recent references and a proof of (2.10) below.

Let \mathcal{D} be a standard dyadic grid on \mathbb{R} . The \mathcal{D} -Whitney decomposition of an open set $O \subsetneq \mathbb{R}$ is the collection $\mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{D}}(O) \subset \mathcal{D}$ of intervals I satisfying

$$c_1 \ell_I \leq \text{dist}(I, \mathbb{R} \setminus O) \leq c_2 \ell_I$$

which are maximal with respect to inclusion. Here $1 < c_1 < c_2$ are fixed numerical constants. For the arguments of this paper, it suffices to take $c_1 = 3, c_2 = 5$. To each such nontrivial open set O and $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'}$, we may associate the collection

$$(2.9) \quad \mathbb{Q}^O := \mathbb{Q}^{\mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{D}'}(O)}.$$

Observe that there is no notational overload between (2.5) and (2.9); in the former, the superscript is a collection of intervals, while for the latter the superscript is an open set. The elements of $\mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{D}'}(O)$ are pairwise disjoint whence each \mathbb{Q}^O above is almost orthogonal. The purpose of this definition is that for each multiplier m satisfying (1.1) with singular set Ξ , the equality

$$(2.10) \quad T_m = \sum_{j=1}^3 c_j T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_j}^{O_{\Xi}}}$$

holds for a canonical choice of grids $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_j, 1 \leq j \leq 3$, suitably chosen constants c_j and adapted wave packets in (2.7). From this point onward, we will work with a fixed pair $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_j$ of grids and omit this pair from the notation, writing for instance \mathbb{P}^O in place of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_j}^O$. Therefore, well-known reductions summarized e.g. in [21, §4.9], see also [22, eq. (2.10)], show that Theorem D follows from the same estimate for the generic model form, namely

$$\sup_{\substack{\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi}} \\ \#\mathbb{Q} < \infty}} |\langle T_{\mathbb{Q}} f_1, f_2 \rangle| \lesssim \left(\prod_{j=1,2} \mathcal{Z}^{\star}(X_j, \Xi) \right) \sup_{\mathcal{S} \text{ sparse}} \Lambda_{X_1, X_2}^{\mathcal{S}}(f_1, f_2).$$

Similarly, the square function estimate involving $H_{\Xi, m}$ of Theorem B is a consequence of the pointwise bound

$$(2.11) \quad H_{\Xi, m} f \lesssim \|m\|_{\text{HM}(\Xi)} \|T_{\mathbb{P}^{\omega}} f\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_{\Xi})} \lesssim \|m\|_{\text{HM}(\Xi)} \mathcal{Z}^{\star}(X, \Xi) \mathcal{S}_{X, 1} f$$

for each $f \in L_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ and a suitable choice of sparse collection \mathcal{S} . In the definition of $H_{\Xi, m}$ we have tacitly used that $\mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi}}$ is the union of the collections \mathbb{P}^{ω} over the connected components $\omega \in \Omega_{\Xi}$ of O_{Ξ} . In particular, through the almost orthogonal decomposition of f for each fixed scale detailed in (3.2), the Hörmander-Mihlin type condition in (1.2) is inherited by the wavelets appropriately chosen in the classes $\Psi_P(D)$ with $P \in \mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi}}$. Finally, Theorem C for the smooth square function G_{Ξ} is a consequence of the pointwise bound

$$G_{\Xi} f := \left(\sum_{P \in \mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi}}} \left(\sup_{\phi \in \Psi_P} |\langle f, \phi \rangle| \right)^2 \mathbf{1}_{I_P} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^{\star}(X, \Xi) \mathcal{S}_{X, 2} f$$

for each $f \in L_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ and a suitable choice of sparse collection \mathcal{S} .

2.7. Discretization of multipliers obeying Ξ -variation assumptions. This subsection addresses the discretization of the multiplier class $\text{Mar}(\Xi)$ as a special case of the more general $R_{p,1}^\Xi$, $1 \leq p \leq \Xi$, classes defined momentarily. In order to describe these, the following equivalent version of the Lorentz sequence norms

$$\left\| \{a_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}\} \right\|_{\ell^{p,q}(j)} := \left\| 2^n (\#\{j \in \mathbb{Z} : |a_j| \in [2^n, 2^{n+1})\})^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{\ell^q(n \in \mathbb{Z})}$$

with $0 < p < \infty$, $0 < q \leq \infty$, is used below.

Definition 2.8 ($R_{p,q}^\Xi$ multipliers). Let $\Xi \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a closed null set. Say that m is a $R_{p,q}^\Xi$ -atom if for each $\omega \in \Omega_\Xi$ there exists $J_\omega \in \mathbb{N}$ and coefficients $\{a_{j,\omega} : 1 \leq j \leq J_\omega\}$ and a collection $\{\alpha(j,\omega) : 1 \leq j \leq J_\omega\}$ consisting of pairwise disjoint subintervals of ω , such that

$$m \mathbf{1}_\omega = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq J_\omega} a_{j,\omega} \mathbf{1}_{\alpha(j,\omega)}, \quad \left\| a_{j,\omega} \right\|_{\ell^{p,q}(j)} \leq 1.$$

The class of $R_{p,q}^\Xi$ multipliers is then the atomic space generated by $R_{p,q}^\Xi$ -atoms as defined above, equipped with the corresponding atomic norm. As customary, R_p^Ξ stands for $R_{p,q}^\Xi$ when $p = q$.

These classes of multipliers have previously appeared in the literature in different forms, at least when Ξ has lacunary structure. The class of $R_{1,1}^{\Lambda_1}$ multipliers associated to the typical first order lacunary set $\Lambda_1 := \{2^k : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ coincides with the classical Marcinkiewicz class. More generally, the class $R_{1,1}^\Xi$ coincides with the $\text{Mar}(\Xi)$ class of §1.6 with singular set Ξ ; see the elementary argument of [12, Proposition 2.9]. Similarly, the class of multipliers $R_{p,p}^{\Lambda_1}$ coincides with the R_p -multipliers appearing in [3, 60]; see also [13]. The class $R_2 = R_{2,2}^{\Lambda_\tau}$ with singular set Λ_τ being a lacunary set of general order $\tau \geq 1$ has been introduced and studied in [3] where it is shown that these multipliers satisfy the best-possible endpoint modular estimate as in Corollary B.1 with $X = L \log^{\frac{\tau}{2}}(L)$ and $w \equiv 1$.

One more definition is needed for the discretization of $R_{p,1}^\Xi$ -multipliers. Its importance is revealed by Lemma 2.9.1 below.

Definition 2.9. Let J be a positive integer. We say that m is a $R_{p,1,J}^\Xi$ -atom and write $m \in \mathcal{R}_{p,1,J}^\Xi$ if for every $\omega \in \Omega_\Xi$ there exist $J_\omega \leq J$ and coefficients $\{a_{j,\omega} : 1 \leq j \leq J_\omega\}$ and a collection $\{\alpha(j,\omega) : 1 \leq j \leq J_\omega\}$ consisting of pairwise disjoint subintervals of ω , such that

$$m \mathbf{1}_\omega = \frac{1}{J^{\frac{1}{p}}} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq J_\omega} \varepsilon_{j,\omega} \mathbf{1}_{\alpha(j,\omega)}, \quad \sup_{1 \leq j \leq J_\omega} |\varepsilon_{j,\omega}| \leq 1.$$

Lemma 2.9.1. *The class $R_{p,1}^\Xi$ coincides with the atomic space generated by $\bigcup_{J \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}} \mathcal{R}_{p,1,J}^\Xi$.*

Proof. The fact that each $R_{p,1,J}^\Xi$ -atom is a uniformly bounded multiple of an $R_{p,1}^\Xi$ -atom follows by the routine verification of the bound

$$\sup_{\omega \in \Omega_\Xi} \left\| \left\{ J_\omega^{-\frac{1}{p}} \varepsilon_{j,\omega} : j \in \mathbb{Z} \right\} \right\|_{\ell^{p,1}(j)} \lesssim 1$$

with $\{\varepsilon_{j,\omega} : 1 \leq j \leq J_\omega, \omega \in \Omega_\Xi\}$ as in the definition of a $R_{p,1,J}^\Xi$ -atom. It remains to check that if m is an $R_{p,1}^\Xi$ -atom then m may be obtained as a convex combination in $J \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ of $R_{p,1,J}^\Xi$ -atoms.

To that end let us fix $\omega \in \Omega_{\Xi}$ and consider an $R_{p,1}^{\Xi}$ -atom

$$m\mathbf{1}_{\omega} = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq J_{\omega}} a_{j,\omega} \mathbf{1}_{\alpha(j,\omega)}.$$

For $J \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ consider the non-increasing rearrangement of the sequence $\{a_{j,\omega} : 1 \leq j \leq J_{\omega}\}$, defined as

$$a_{J,\omega}^* := \inf \{t > 0 : \#\{j : |a_{j,\omega}| > t\} \leq J\},$$

and set

$$\text{ind}(J, \omega) := \left\{ j : |a_{j,\omega}| \in \left(a_{2J,\omega}^*, a_{J,\omega}^* \right] \right\}.$$

By definition $\#\text{ind}(J, \omega) \leq 2J$, whence

$$m\mathbf{1}_{\omega} = \sum_{J \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}} J^{\frac{1}{p}} a_{J/2,\omega}^* m_J \mathbf{1}_{\omega}, \quad m_J \mathbf{1}_{\omega} := \frac{1}{J^{\frac{1}{p}}} \sum_{j \in \text{ind}(J/2,\omega)} \frac{a_{j,\omega}}{a_{J/2,\omega}^*} \mathbf{1}_{\alpha(j,\omega)}.$$

It is clear that $m_J \in R_{p,1,J}^{\Xi}$ and it is not difficult to see that

$$\sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \sum_{J \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}} J^{\frac{1}{p}} a_{J,\omega}^* \approx \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \|a_{j,\omega}\|_{\ell^{p,1}(j)} = 1.$$

Thus we proved that every $R_{p,q}^{\Xi}$ -atom is in the convex hull over $J \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ of $R_{p,1,J}^{\Xi}$ -atoms. In particular, these two collections of atoms generate the same space and the proof of the lemma is complete. \square

The concepts above are linked via the following two lemmas. It is convenient to separate the two cases $p \in \{1, 2\}$ but a unified statement is also possible.

Lemma 2.9.2. *Let m be a $R_{1,1,J}^{\Xi}$ -atom as in Definition 2.9. Then the multiplier operator associated to m belongs to the convex hull of the model sums $T_{\mathbb{Q}}f$ defined as in (2.7) with $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi_m}}$, with $\mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi_m}}$ given as in (2.9) and $\Xi_m \subset \mathbb{R}$ being a closed null set satisfying the Zygmund property*

$$\mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi_m) \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^{**}(X, \Xi).$$

Proof. Since m is a $R_{1,1,J}^{\Xi}$ -atom, the multiplier operator associated with m can be written in the form

$$T_m = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq J} \sum_{\omega \in \Omega_{\Xi}} \varepsilon_{j,\omega} H_{\alpha(j,\omega)}, \quad \sup_{1 \leq j \leq J_{\omega}} |\varepsilon_{j,\omega}| \leq 1,$$

where we recall that H_{ω} denotes the rough frequency projection onto some interval $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}$. As already seen in the discussion leading up to (2.11), the operator H_{ω} is in the convex hull of model forms $T_{\mathbb{Q}}$ with $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}^{\omega}$. Defining $\Xi_{m,j}$ to be the set of endpoints of the collection of intervals $\{\alpha(j, \omega) : \omega \in \Omega_{\Xi}\}$ it follows that T_m is in the convex hull in j of the model sums $T_{\mathbb{Q}}f$ with $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi_m,j}}$. Note that as a direct consequence of the definitions of property $\mathcal{Z}^{**}(X, \Xi)$ and of the sets $\Xi_{m,j}$ it follows that

$$\sup_j \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi_{m,j}) \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^{**}(X, \Xi)$$

and the proof is complete. \square

Lemma 2.9.3. *Let m be a $R_{2,1,J}^\Xi$ atom as given in Definition 2.9. Then the multiplier operator associated to m belongs to the convex hull of the model sums $J^{-\frac{1}{2}}T_\mathbb{Q}$ where $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi_m}}$, the set of tiles $\mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi_m}}$ is given as in (2.9), and $\Xi_m \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a closed null set satisfying the Zygmund property*

$$\mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi_m) \lesssim \sqrt{J} \mathcal{Z}^{**}(X, \Xi).$$

Proof. As before, use that $m \in R_{2,1,J}^\Xi$ in order to write

$$T_m = \frac{1}{J^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq J} \sum_{\omega \in \Omega_\Xi} \varepsilon_{j,\omega} H_{\alpha(j,\omega)}.$$

This time we set $\Xi_m := \cup_{1 \leq j \leq J} \Xi_{m,j}$ where each $\Xi_{m,j}$ is defined as in the previous proof. It follows that T_m can be written as a convex combination of model sums $J^{-\frac{1}{2}}T_\mathbb{Q}$ with $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi_m}}$. As before, note that $\sup_j \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi_{m,j}) \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^{**}(X, \Xi)$. In order to complete the proof of the lemma it thus suffices to observe that, in general, if $\Theta = \cup_{1 \leq j \leq J} \Theta_j$ then there holds

$$\mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Theta) \leq \sqrt{J} \sup_{1 \leq j \leq J} \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Theta_j)$$

as can be easily checked by applying the definition of the \mathcal{Z}^* -property and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. \square

Lemma 2.9.3 will be used to deduce a sparse domination theorem for $R_{p,1}^\Xi$ -multipliers with $1 \leq p \leq 2$, involving a complex interpolation space, see [30, Theorem 5.5.1], in the Orlicz scale

$$(2.12) \quad [X, L^2(0, 1)]_\theta = X^{1-\theta} [L^2(0, 1)]^\theta, \quad 0 \leq \theta \leq 1.$$

Theorem G. *Suppose Ξ has the maximal multiscale $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ property. Let m be a $R_{p,1}^\Xi$, $1 \leq p \leq 2$, multiplier with singular set Ξ . Then*

$$\|T_m\|_{X, X_p} \lesssim \|m\|_{R_{p,1}^\Xi} [\mathcal{Z}^{**}(X, \Xi)]^{\frac{2}{p}}$$

where X_p is given by (2.12) with $\theta = \frac{2(p-1)}{p}$ and the implicit constant is absolute.

The proof of Theorem G is postponed to Section 7.

3. GABOR DECOMPOSITION AND SMOOTH ZYGMUND PROJECTION

This section develops a smooth projection theorem adapted to a singular set Ξ enjoying the multiscale $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ property. This is done in §3.2. In §3.3, the projection lemma is employed to deduce a few estimates for model operators in (2.7).

3.1. Gabor decomposition and sum of localized functions. The main projection argument employed in this paper uses two previously known ingredients. The first is the following almost orthogonal decomposition [20, 34]. Let η be a Schwartz function on \mathbb{R} with the properties

$$(3.1) \quad \text{supp } \widehat{\eta} \subset [0, 1], \quad \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \widehat{\eta} \left(\xi - \frac{k}{2} \right) \right|^2 \equiv 1.$$

For each $I \in \mathcal{D}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ let

$$\eta_{I,k} := \text{Tr}_{c_I} \text{Dil}_t^1 \text{Mod}_{\frac{k}{2}} \eta, \quad \zeta_{I,k} := \chi_I^{-6\text{dec}} \eta_{I,k},$$

where $\text{Mod}_a f(x) := e^{2\pi i a x} f(x)$, $a \in \mathbb{R}$. For each $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, Poisson summation yields

$$(3.2) \quad f = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_m} |I| \langle f, \eta_{I,k} \rangle \eta_{I,k}$$

with convergence in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and almost everywhere.

Remark 3.1.1. Given $A \subset \mathbb{R}$, set

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{N}(A) := \{k \in \mathbb{Z} : \text{dist}(A, k) < 9\}.$$

Suppose Ξ has the multiscale $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ property. Triangle inequality and averaging then yield

$$(3.4) \quad \left\| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}(\lambda \Xi)} a_k \zeta_{[0,1],k} \right\|_{X'} \leq \sum_{j=-9}^9 \left\| \sum_{k \in j + [\lambda \Xi]} a_k \zeta_{[0,1],k} \right\|_{X'} \leq \sum_{j=-9}^9 \mathcal{Z}(X, j + [\lambda \Xi]) \sqrt{\sum_{k \in j + [\lambda \Xi]} |a_k|^2} \\ \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) \sqrt{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}(\lambda \Xi)} |a_k|^2}$$

for all $\lambda \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and all $\{a_k : k \in \mathcal{N}(\lambda \Xi)\}$. We used that, by modulation invariance,

$$\mathcal{Z}(X, \mathbb{K}) = \mathcal{Z}(X, k + \mathbb{K}), \quad \forall \mathbb{K} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}$$

to pass to the second line. Property (3.4) will be used in the proof of Lemma 3.2.1.

The second is a technical lemma used to efficiently L^2 -estimate sums of spatially localized functions. Its proof is literally a rewriting of [50, Lemma 5.1] and thus we omit it.

Lemma 3.1.2. *Let $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{D}$ be a collection of pairwise disjoint intervals. For each $L \in \mathcal{L}$ let $F_L \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Then*

$$\left\| \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} F_L \right\|_2 \lesssim \left(\sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} |L| \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \langle F_L \rangle_{2,L,-}.$$

3.2. The projection lemma. In this paragraph, Ξ is a closed null set with the multiscale $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ property. Notice that the next lemma involves the tile collection \mathbb{P}^{O_Ξ} as defined in (2.9) and the frequencies $\mathcal{N}(\lambda \Xi)$ from (3.3).

Lemma 3.2.1 (Projection). *Let $L \in \mathcal{D}$ and f be a function with $\text{supp } f \subset L$. Then*

$$g := \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}(\ell_L \Xi)} |L| \langle f, \eta_{L+m,k} \rangle \eta_{L+m,k}$$

satisfies

$$(3.5) \quad \langle f, \phi_P \rangle = \langle g, \phi_P \rangle, \quad \forall P \in \mathbb{P}^{O_\Xi} : \ell_P \geq \ell_L, \quad \forall \phi_P \in \Psi_P,$$

$$(3.6) \quad \langle g \rangle_{2,L,-} \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) \|f \circ \text{Sy}_L\|_X.$$

Proof. Statement (3.5) is immediate from the representation (3.1) applied to f ,

$$f = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |L| \langle f, \eta_{L+m,k} \rangle \eta_{L+m,k}$$

and from the comparison of the frequency supports of $f - g$ and ϕ_P , $P \in \mathbb{P}^{O_\Xi}$, $\ell_P \geq \ell_L$. To wit, if $P \in \mathbb{P}^{O_\Xi}$, the definitions force the existence of $\xi \in \Xi$ such that

$$\omega_P \subset [\xi - 6\ell_P^{-1}, \xi + 6\ell_P^{-1}) \subset [\xi - 6\ell_L^{-1}, \xi + 6\ell_L^{-1}) \subset \ell_L^{-1} \left[\lfloor \ell_L \xi \rfloor - 7, \lfloor \ell_L \xi \rfloor + 7 \right)$$

and the latter set is disjoint from the support of $f - g$.

Turn to the proof of (3.6). By the invariance over linear changes of coordinates of the assumptions and statement, it suffices to prove the case $L = [0, 1)$, so that $L^{+m} = [m, m + 1)$. For this reason, we may write $\eta_{m,k}$ in place of $\eta_{[m,m+1),k}$, $\chi_m = \chi_{[m,m+1)}$ and similarly, $\mathbb{K} = \mathcal{N}(1\Xi)$ and

$$g = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} g_m, \quad g_m := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{K}} \langle f, \eta_{m,k} \rangle \eta_{m,k}.$$

By the triangle inequality, it suffices to prove

$$\sup_{\|h\|_2=1} \left| \langle g_m \chi^{-\text{dec}}, h \rangle \right| \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) (1 + m^2)^{-4\text{dec}} \|f\|_X.$$

In fact, rewriting

$$g_m \chi^{-\text{dec}} = \gamma_m \cdot \left[\chi^{-\text{dec}} \chi_m^{6\text{dec}} \right], \quad \gamma_m := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{K}} \langle f \chi_m^{6\text{dec}}, \zeta_{m,k} \rangle \zeta_{m,k}$$

and using that $\|\chi^{-\text{dec}} \chi_m^{\text{dec}}\|_\infty \lesssim (1 + |m|^2)^{\text{dec}}$, it is enough to prove that

$$(3.7) \quad \sup_{\|h\|_2=1} |\langle \gamma_m, h \rangle| \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) (1 + m^2)^{-6\text{dec}} \|f\|_X.$$

We apply the representation formula (3.2) to h of L^2 -norm 1, obtaining

$$(3.8) \quad h = \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle h, \eta_{n,z} \rangle \eta_{n,z}, \quad \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |\langle h, \eta_{n,z} \rangle|^2 \lesssim 1.$$

Then, by disjointness of frequency supports,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \gamma_m, h \rangle| &= \left| \sum_{\kappa \in \{0, \pm 1\}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{K}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle f \chi_m^{6\text{dec}}, \zeta_{m,k} \rangle \langle \zeta_{m,k}, \eta_{n,k+\kappa} \rangle \langle \eta_{n,k+\kappa}, h \rangle \right| = \left| \langle f \chi_m^{6\text{dec}}, h_m \rangle \right| \\ &\leq \|f \chi_m^{6\text{dec}}\|_X \|h_m\|_{X'} \lesssim (1 + m^2)^{-6\text{dec}} \|f\|_X \|h_m\|_{X'}, \end{aligned}$$

having set

$$h_m = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{K}} a_{m,k} \zeta_{m,k}, \quad a_{m,k} = \sum_{\kappa \in \{0, \pm 1\}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle \zeta_{m,k}, \eta_{n,k+\kappa} \rangle \langle \eta_{n,k+\kappa}, h \rangle$$

and used $\text{supp } f \subset [0, 1)$, $\|\chi_m^{6\text{dec}} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)}\|_\infty \lesssim (1+m^2)^{-6\text{dec}}$. To finish the proof of (3.7) it remains to appeal to (3.4) translated to $[m, m+1)$ and estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_m\|_{X'} &\leq \mathcal{Z}^\star(X, \Xi) \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{K}} |a_{m,k}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{Z}^\star(X, \Xi) \left(\sup_{\substack{\kappa \in \{0, \pm 1\} \\ k \in \mathbb{K}}} \sum_{u \in \mathbb{Z}} |\langle \zeta_{m,k}, \eta_{m+u, k+\kappa} \rangle|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{\substack{z \in \mathbb{Z} \\ n \in \mathbb{Z}}} |\langle h, \eta_{n,z} \rangle|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^\star(X, \Xi), \end{aligned}$$

taking into account (3.8) and the easy estimate $|\langle \zeta_{m,k}, \eta_{m+u, k+\kappa} \rangle| \lesssim (1+|u|^2)^{-1}$. The proof of (3.7), and consequently of the lemma, is thus complete. \square

3.3. Tail estimates for the multipliers. We now turn to a first series of applications of Lemma 3.2.1. As anticipated, throughout this paragraph Ξ is a fixed singular set with the multiscale $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ property for $X \in \{X_1, X_2\}$. For brevity, $C_{X_j} := \mathcal{Z}^\star(X_j, \Xi)$ for $j = 1, 2$. Hereafter, \mathbb{Q} is a generic subset of \mathbb{P}^{O_Ξ} so that the collections $\mathbb{Q}_=(G)$ contain tiles from \mathbb{Q} of fixed spatial component $G \in \mathcal{D}$ and frequency component belonging to the \mathcal{D}' -Whitney decomposition of the open set O_Ξ . The latter fact is what makes the $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ property relevant. Furthermore, unless otherwise mentioned ϕ_P stands for a generic element of Ψ_P , $P \in \mathbb{P}$.

Lemma 3.3.1. *Let $f_1, f_2 \in L_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be given functions, and $G_0, G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ be intervals of equal length ℓ such that $\max\{\text{dist}(G_0, G_1), \text{dist}(G_0, G_2)\} \geq \ell/2$. Then*

$$(3.9) \quad \left(\sum_{P \in \mathbb{Q}(G_0)} |I_P|^2 |\langle f_1 \mathbf{1}_{G_1}, \phi_P \rangle|^2 \left| \chi_P^{\text{dec}}(x) \mathbf{1}_{G_2}(x) \right|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \lesssim C_{X_1} \prod_{j=1,2} \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(G_0, G_j)}{\ell} \right)^{2-\text{dec}} \inf_{G_0 \cup G_1 \cup G_2} M_{X_1} f_1,$$

$$(3.10) \quad \|T_{\mathbb{Q}(G_0)}(f_1 \mathbf{1}_{G_1}) \mathbf{1}_{G_2}\|_2 \lesssim C_{X_1} \sqrt{\ell} \prod_{j=1,2} \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(G_0, G_j)}{\ell} \right)^{2-\text{dec}} \inf_{G_0 \cup G_1 \cup G_2} M_{X_1} f_1,$$

$$(3.11) \quad |\langle T_{\mathbb{Q}(G_0)}(f_1 \mathbf{1}_{G_1}), \mathbf{1}_{G_2} f_2 \rangle| \lesssim \prod_{j=1,2} C_{X_j} \sqrt{\ell} \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(G_0, G_j)}{\ell} \right)^{2-\text{dec}} \inf_{G_0 \cup G_j} M_{X_j} f_j.$$

Remark 3.3.2. The presence of the multiscale collections, e.g. $\mathbb{Q}(G_0)$, in the statement is more convenient for applications below. However, at the root of the lemma lies a purely single scale analysis, which is exemplified by the intermediate inequality (3.12). Consulting (3.12) in advance might facilitate the parsing of the rather technical and crowded statements contained in Lemma 3.3.1.

Proof of Lemma 3.3.1. We begin the proof of (3.9) showing an *a priori* weaker version of the inequality in the case of dyadic intervals $R, S \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\ell_R = \ell_S$ restricting $\mathbb{Q}(R)$ to $\mathbb{Q}_=(R)$,

namely

$$(3.12) \quad \left(\sum_{P \in \mathbb{Q}_=(R)} |\langle f_1 \mathbf{1}_S, \phi_P \rangle|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim C_{X_1} \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, S)}{\ell_R} \right)^{1-\text{dec}} \inf_{R \cup S} M_{X_1} f_1.$$

We apply Lemma 3.2.1 to $f_1 \mathbf{1}_S$ yielding the projection g_1 with

$$\langle f_1 \mathbf{1}_S, \phi_P \rangle = \langle g_1, \phi_P \rangle, \quad \forall P \in \mathbb{Q}_=(R), \quad \phi_P \in \Psi_P,$$

and $\langle g_1 \rangle_{2,S,-} \lesssim C_{X_1} \langle f_1 \rangle_{X_1,S}$. Since \mathbb{P}^{O_Ξ} satisfies (2.6), the left hand side of (3.12) can be estimated applying the L^2 -bound for $T_{\mathbb{Q}_=(R)}$ from Lemma 2.5.1 as

$$\left(\sum_{P \in \mathbb{Q}_=(R)} |\langle f_1 \mathbf{1}_S, \phi_P \rangle|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \langle g_1 \rangle_{2,R,+}.$$

Using the decay properties of the function χ in the first line and the estimates on the averages of the functions g_1 to pass to the second line, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle g_1 \rangle_{2,R,+}^2 &\leq \frac{1}{\ell_R} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |g_1|^2 \chi_S^{-2\text{dec}} (\chi_R \chi_S)^{2\text{dec}} \lesssim \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, S)}{\ell_R} \right)^{-2\text{dec}} \langle g_1 \rangle_{2,S,-}^2 \\ &\lesssim C_{X_1}^2 \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, S)}{\ell_R} \right)^{-2\text{dec}} \langle f_1 \rangle_{X_1,S}^2 \lesssim C_{X_1}^2 \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, S)}{\ell_R} \right)^{2-2\text{dec}} \langle f_1 \rangle_{X_1,R^*}^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $R^* := 3 \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R,S)}{\ell_R} \right) R$ so that $R, S \subseteq R^*$, hence the proof is complete. To obtain the proof of (3.9), we observe that splitting $\mathbb{Q}(G_0)$ and G_1 , and summing up it suffices to prove that for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $R \in \mathcal{D}_m(G_0)$, and $S \in \mathcal{D}_m(G_1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\sum_{P \in \mathbb{Q}_=(R)} |I_P|^2 |\langle f_1 \mathbf{1}_S, \phi_P \rangle|^2 \left| \chi_P^{\text{dec}}(x) \mathbf{1}_{G_2}(x) \right|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim C_{X_1} \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, S)}{\ell_R} \right)^{1-\text{dec}} \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, G_2)}{\ell_R} \right)^{1-\text{dec}} \inf_{G_0 \cup G_1 \cup G_2} M_{X_1} f_1. \end{aligned}$$

However, using (3.12) to pass to the second line, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\sum_{P \in \mathbb{Q}_=(R)} |I_P|^2 |\langle f_1 \mathbf{1}_S, \phi_P \rangle|^2 \left| \chi_P^{\text{dec}}(x) \mathbf{1}_{G_2}(x) \right|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \left(\sum_{P \in \mathbb{Q}_=(R)} |\langle f_1 \mathbf{1}_S, \phi_P \rangle|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sup_{G_2} \chi_R^{\text{dec}}(x) \\ &\lesssim \left(C_{X_1} \inf_{R^*} M_{X_1} f_1 \right) \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, S)}{\ell_R} \right)^{1-\text{dec}} \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, G_2)}{\ell_R} \right)^{-\text{dec}} \\ &\lesssim C_{X_1} \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, S)}{\ell_R} \right)^{1-\text{dec}} \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, G_2)}{\ell_R} \right)^{1-\text{dec}} \inf_{R^{**}} M_{X_1} f_1, \end{aligned}$$

where $R^{**} := 3 \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, G_2)}{\ell_R} \right) R^*$ so that $G_0, G_1, G_2 \subseteq R^{**}$, hence the proof is complete.

The proof of (3.10) is almost identical and relies on the inequality in the case of dyadic intervals $R, S \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\ell_R = \ell_S$ restricting $\mathbb{Q}(R)$ to $\mathbb{Q}_=(R)$, namely

$$(3.13) \quad \|T_{\mathbb{Q}_=(R)}(f_1 \mathbf{1}_S)\|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{\ell_R} C_{X_1} \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, S)}{\ell_R}\right)^{1-\text{dec}} \inf_{RUS} M_{X_1} f_1.$$

To prove (3.13), apply again Lemma 3.2.1 to $f_1 \mathbf{1}_S$ thus constructing the projection g_1 with

$$\langle f_1 \mathbf{1}_S, \phi_P \rangle = \langle g_1, \phi_P \rangle, \quad \forall P \in \mathbb{Q}_=(R), \quad \phi_P \in \Psi_P,$$

with $\langle g_1 \rangle_{2,S,-} \lesssim C_{X_1} \langle f_1 \rangle_{X_1,S}$. Using (2.6) of \mathbb{P}^{O_Ξ} , the left hand side of (3.13) is estimated applying the L^2 -bound for $T_{\mathbb{Q}_=(R)}$ from Lemma 2.5.1 as

$$\|T_{\mathbb{Q}_=(R)}(f_1 \mathbf{1}_S)\|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{\ell_R} \langle g_1 \rangle_{2,S,+}.$$

As before we can pass from R to S to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \langle g_1 \rangle_{2,R,+}^2 &\lesssim \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, S)}{\ell_R}\right)^{-2\text{dec}} \langle g_1 \rangle_{2,S,-}^2 \lesssim C_X^2 \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, S)}{\ell_R}\right)^{-2\text{dec}} \langle f_1 \rangle_{X_1,S}^2 \\ &\lesssim C_X^2 \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, S)}{\ell_R}\right)^{2-2\text{dec}} \langle f_1 \rangle_{X_1,R^*}^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $R^* := 3 \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R,S)}{\ell_R}\right) R$ so that $R, S \subseteq R^*$, hence concluding the proof of (3.13).

To prove (3.10), we observe that splitting $\mathbb{Q}(G_0)$ and G_1 and summing up it suffices to prove that for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $R \in \mathcal{D}_m(G_0)$, and $S \in \mathcal{D}_m(G_1)$ we have

$$\|T_{\mathbb{Q}_=(R)}(f_1 \mathbf{1}_S) \mathbf{1}_{G_2}\|_2 \lesssim C_{X_1} \sqrt{\ell} \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, S)}{\ell}\right)^{2-\text{dec}} \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, G_2)}{\ell}\right)^{2-\text{dec}} \inf_{G_0 \cup G_1 \cup G_2} M_{X_1} f_1.$$

However, using (3.13) to pass to the second line, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_{\mathbb{Q}_=(R)}(f_1 \mathbf{1}_S) \mathbf{1}_{G_2}\|_2 &\leq \|T_{\mathbb{Q}_=(R)}(f_1 \mathbf{1}_S)\|_2 \sup_{G_2} \chi_R^{\text{dec}}(x) \\ &\lesssim \left(\sqrt{\ell_R} C_{X_1} \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, S)}{\ell_R}\right)^{1-\text{dec}} \inf_{R^*} M_{X_1} f_1 \right) \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, G_2)}{\ell_R}\right)^{-\text{dec}} \\ &\lesssim C_{X_1} \sqrt{\ell_R} \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, S)}{\ell_R}\right)^{1-\text{dec}} \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, G_2)}{\ell_R}\right)^{1-\text{dec}} \inf_{R^{**}} M_{X_1} f_1, \end{aligned}$$

where $R^{**} := 3 \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(R, G_2)}{\ell_R}\right) R^*$ so that $G_0, G_1, G_2 \subseteq R^{**}$, hence the proof is complete.

Finally, the proof of (3.11) is also similar and relies on the inequality in the case of dyadic intervals $R, S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\ell_R = \ell_{S_1} = \ell_{S_2}$ restricting $\mathbb{Q}(R)$ to $\mathbb{Q}_=(R)$, namely

$$(3.14) \quad |\langle T_{\mathbb{Q}_=(R)}(f_1 \mathbf{1}_{S_1}), \mathbf{1}_{S_2} f_2 \rangle| \lesssim \prod_{j=1,2} C_{X_j} \sqrt{\ell_R} \left(\frac{\text{dist}(R, S_j)}{\ell_R}\right)^{1-\text{dec}} \inf_{RUS_j} M_{X_j} f_j.$$

To prove (3.14), apply Lemma 3.2.1 to $f_j \mathbf{1}_{S_j}$ and constructing the projections g_j , $j \in \{1, 2\}$, with $\langle f_j \mathbf{1}_{S_j}, \phi_P \rangle = \langle g_j, \phi_P \rangle$ for all $P \in \mathbb{Q}_=(R)$ and $\langle g_j \rangle_{2,S_j,-} \lesssim C_{X_j} \langle f_j \rangle_{X_j,S_j}$. Then we apply the

Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the L^2 -bound for $T_{\mathbb{Q}=(R)}$ from Lemma 2.5.1 to estimate

$$|\langle T_{\mathbb{Q}=(R)}(f_1 \mathbf{1}_{S_1}), \mathbf{1}_{S_2} f_2 \rangle| \leq \sum_{P \in \mathbb{Q}=(R)} |I_P| |\langle g_1, \phi_P \rangle| |\langle g_2, \psi_P \rangle| \lesssim \ell_R \langle g_1 \rangle_{2,R,+} \langle g_2 \rangle_{2,R,+}$$

and the proof is completed by using the same argument as for (3.13) in order to pass from $\langle g_j \rangle_{2,R,+}$ to $\langle g_j \rangle_{2,S_j,-}$. This concludes the proof of (3.14). In order to prove (3.11), again it suffices to split $\mathbb{Q}(G_0)$, G_1 , and G_2 , use (3.14), and sum up the contributions for different $R \in \mathcal{D}_m(G_0)$ and $S_j \in \mathcal{D}_m(G_j)$. \square

The next lemmas use the obvious disjoint splitting

$$\mathbb{P}^{O_\Xi} \supset \mathbb{Q} = \bigcup_{\omega \in \Omega_\Xi} \mathbb{Q}^\omega.$$

For $P \in \mathbb{Q}^\omega$ let $P^{\downarrow,\omega} = I_P \times (\omega_P - a_\omega)$. Then $\phi_P = \exp(2\pi i a_\omega \cdot) \phi_{P^{\downarrow,\omega}}$ for some $\phi_{P^{\downarrow,\omega}} \in \Psi_{P^{\downarrow,\omega}}$. Thus the distance from the origin to the frequency support of $\phi_{P^{\downarrow,\omega}}$ is $\sim \ell_{P^{\downarrow,\omega}}^{-1}$, whence the latter is a bump function adapted to I_P . Clearly

$$(3.15) \quad T_{\mathbb{Q}^\omega} f = \exp(2\pi i a_\omega \cdot) \sum_{P \in \mathbb{Q}^\omega} |I_P| \langle f, \phi_P \rangle \phi_{P^{\downarrow,\omega}} =: \exp(2\pi i a_\omega \cdot) Z_{\mathbb{Q}^\omega} f$$

whence the equality, used in Lemma 3.3.4 below,

$$(3.16) \quad \|T_{\mathbb{Q}^\omega} f\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)} = \|Z_{\mathbb{Q}^\omega} f\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)}.$$

Recall that $\mathcal{D}_m(I) = \{J \in \mathcal{D}(I) : \ell(J) = 2^{-m} \ell(I)\}$. In the next lemma we deal with the first and second terms in the decomposition

$$(3.17) \quad \mathbb{Q} = \left(\bigcup_{|j| \leq 1} \mathbb{Q}(L^{+j}) \right) \sqcup \left(\bigcup_{|j| \geq 2} \mathbb{Q}(L^{+j}) \right) \sqcup \left(\bigcup_{m \geq 1} \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}=(L^{\uparrow m, +j}) \right) =: \mathbb{Q}(3L) \sqcup \mathbb{Q}_{\text{far},L} \sqcup \mathbb{Q}_{\text{ov},L}$$

that we will use for a generic $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}^{O_\Xi}$ and any $L \in \mathcal{D}$.

Lemma 3.3.3. *We have*

$$(3.18) \quad \sup_{\mathbb{R} \setminus 5L} \|T_{\mathbb{Q}^\omega(3L)} f\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)} \lesssim C_X \inf_L M_X(f \chi_L^{\text{dec}}),$$

$$(3.19) \quad \sup_L \|T_{\mathbb{Q}_{\text{far},L}^\omega} f\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)} \lesssim C_X \inf_L M_X(f \chi_L^{\text{dec}}),$$

$$(3.20) \quad \sup_{\mathbb{R}} \|T_{\mathbb{Q}_{\text{ov},L}^\omega}(f \mathbf{1}_L)\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)} \lesssim C_X \inf_L M_X(f \mathbf{1}_L).$$

Proof. By the localization trick in Remark 2.4.1 it suffices to bound the left hand sides by $\inf_L M_X f$, without the χ_L^{dec} factor. The desired inequality follows by the triangle inequality, partitioning $3L$, \mathbb{R} and $\mathbb{R} \setminus (2k_0 + 1)L$ into intervals of the form $\{L^{-1}, L, L^{+1}\}$ and L^{+j}, L^{+k} for $j, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $|k| \geq k_0 + 1$, and (3.9) of Lemma 3.3.1. \square

For the third term in the decomposition (3.17) we obtain an oscillation inequality instead. Compare with (3.15)-(3.16).

$$\mathbf{Lemma\ 3.3.4.} \quad \sup_{x,y \in 9L} \left\| Z_{\mathbb{Q}_{\text{ov},L}^\omega} f(x) - Z_{\mathbb{Q}_{\text{ov},L}^\omega} f(y) \right\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)} \lesssim C_X \inf_L M_X(f \chi_L^{\text{dec}}).$$

Proof. Fix $x, y \in 9L$. By the triangle inequality and the localization trick in Remark 2.4.1, it suffices to estimate

$$\left\| Z_{\mathbb{Q}^\omega(L\uparrow^{m,j})}f(x) - Z_{\mathbb{Q}^\omega(L\uparrow^{m,j})}f(y) \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} \lesssim C_X 2^{-m} (1 + |j|)^{-10} \inf_L M_X f.$$

To do so, apply a Lipschitz estimate and (3.12) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| Z_{\mathbb{Q}^\omega(L\uparrow^{m,j})}f(x) - Z_{\mathbb{Q}^\omega(L\uparrow^{m,j})}f(y) \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} \\ &= |I_P| \left(\sum_{\omega \in \Omega_\Xi} \sum_{P \in \mathbb{Q}^\omega(L\uparrow^{m,j})} |\langle f, \phi_P \rangle|^2 |\phi_{P\downarrow, \omega}(x) - \phi_{P\downarrow, \omega}(y)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{|x - y|}{\ell(L\uparrow^{m,j})} (1 + |j|)^{-\text{dec}} \left(\sum_{\omega \in \Omega_\Xi} \sum_{P \in \mathbb{Q}^\omega(L\uparrow^{m,j})} |\langle f, \phi_P \rangle|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim C_X 2^{-m} (1 + |j|)^{-\text{dec}} \inf_{L\uparrow^{m,j}} M_X f \\ &\lesssim C_X 2^{-m} (1 + |j|)^{-\text{dec}+2} \inf_{4jL\uparrow^{m,j}} M_X f \leq C_X 2^{-m} (1 + |j|)^{-10} \inf_L M_X f, \end{aligned}$$

where the latter step simply holds because $4jL\uparrow^{m,j}$ contains L . The proof is complete. \square

An easier estimate in the spirit of (3.20) of Lemma 3.3.3 is available for compactly supported functions.

Lemma 3.3.5. $\left\| T_{\mathbb{Q}^\omega, L}(f\mathbf{1}_L) \right\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)} \lesssim C_X \inf_L M_X(f\mathbf{1}_L).$

Proof. Fixing $m \geq 0$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, apply (3.12) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}_=(L\uparrow^{m,j})}(f\mathbf{1}_L\mathbf{1}_{L\uparrow^m}) \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)}(x) &\lesssim \left(C_X \inf_{L\uparrow^m} M_X(f\mathbf{1}_L) \right) \left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(L\uparrow^m, L\uparrow^{m,j})}{2^m \ell_L} \right)^{-\text{dec}} \\ &\lesssim C_X 2^{-m} \langle f \rangle_{X, L} (1 + |j|)^{-9}. \end{aligned}$$

A routine summation completes the proof. \square

4. STOPPING COLLECTION ESTIMATES

This section contains the main multiscale part of the argument. The projection Lemma 3.2.1 is used to estimate the localized L^2 -norm of model operators in (2.7) restricted to tiles from \mathbb{P}^{Ω_Ξ} , see Proposition 4.2 below. In the subsequent paragraphs, localized, weak-type, and bilinear estimates are derived from the proposition in preparation for the proofs of the main theorems.

4.1. Stopping collections and an L^2 -estimate. Let $I \in \mathcal{D}$ and $f \in L_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be fixed throughout this paragraph. Also fix $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{D}(3I)$ to be a collection of pairwise disjoint dyadic intervals whose union is $B \subset 3I$. Such a collection \mathcal{L} will be referred to as a *stopping collection*, following the terminology introduced in [12]; see also [15]. Let

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}' &= \{L' \in \mathcal{D}(I) : L' = L^{+j} \text{ for some } L \in \mathcal{L}, j = 0, \pm 1\}, \\ \mathcal{G} &= \{G \in \mathcal{D}(I) : G \not\subset 3L \text{ for all } L \in \mathcal{L}\}, \end{aligned}$$

and let \mathcal{L}'' be the collection of maximal elements in \mathcal{L}' . The collection \mathcal{G} has the property that

$$\begin{aligned} G \in \mathcal{G}, L \in \mathcal{L}, \ell_G < \ell_L &\implies \text{dist}(L, G) \geq \ell_L, \\ G \in \mathcal{D}(I) \setminus \mathcal{G} &\implies G \in \mathcal{D}(L'') \text{ for some } L'' \in \mathcal{L}''. \end{aligned}$$

Define $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}^{O_{\Xi}}(I) := \{\mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi}}(I) : I_P \in \mathcal{G}\}$, and partition for each $L \in \mathcal{L}$

$$\begin{aligned} (4.2) \quad \mathcal{G} &= \mathcal{G}_0(L) \cup \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0, \pm 1\}} \mathcal{G}_k(L), \\ \mathcal{G}_0(L) &:= \{G \in \mathcal{G} : \ell_G > \ell_L\}, \\ \mathcal{G}_k(L) &:= \mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{D}(L^{+k}), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0, \pm 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, set $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_k(L) := \mathcal{G}_k(L) \setminus \{L^{+k}\}$. Below, we turn to the estimation of the operator

$$(4.3) \quad T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}^{O_{\Xi}}(I)} = T_{\mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi}}(I)} - \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}''} T_{\mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi}}(L)}$$

in terms of the local quantity

$$(4.4) \quad \lambda_{f,X} := \|f \mathbf{1}_{3I \setminus B}\|_{\infty} + \sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \inf_L M_X f,$$

cf. (2.1). When the space X is fixed and understood from context in (4.4), write λ_f instead.

Proposition 4.2. *There holds*

$$(4.5) \quad \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}^{O_{\Xi}}(I)} f \right\|_2 \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) \sqrt{|I|} \lambda_{f, X_I^{\text{dec}}}.$$

Proof. During this proof, as no confusion may arise, we drop the superscript O_{Ξ} from all occurrences and write for brevity $C_X := \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi)$. Notice that it is enough to prove the weaker estimate

$$(4.6) \quad \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(I)} f \right\|_2 \lesssim C_X \sqrt{|I|} \lambda_f$$

as in fact (4.5) then follows from (4.6) and the localization trick in Remark 2.4.1. The proof of the proposition is thus reduced to the proof of (4.6) which involves estimating several pieces. Namely, after setting

$$\mathbb{P}_{\uparrow, L} := \{P \in \mathbb{P}(I) : I_P \in \mathcal{G}_0(L)\},$$

decompose

$$(4.7) \quad T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(I)} (f \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus 3I})$$

$$(4.8) \quad + T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(I)} (f \mathbf{1}_{3I \setminus B})$$

$$(4.9) \quad T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(I)} f = + \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} T_{\mathbb{P}_{\uparrow, L}} (f \mathbf{1}_L)$$

$$(4.10) \quad + \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{|k| \geq 2} T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}_k(L)}} (f \mathbf{1}_L).$$

Applying Lemma 3.2.1 to each $f\mathbf{1}_L$ and denoting by g_L the corresponding output, we have

$$(4.11) \quad \sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \langle g_L \rangle_{2,L,-} \lesssim C_X \lambda_f,$$

$$(4.12) \quad \left\| g := \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} g_L \right\|_2 \lesssim C_X \lambda_f \sqrt{\sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} |L|},$$

where (4.12) follows from (4.11) and Lemma 3.1.2. It is then easy to see that

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} (4.9) &= \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} T_{\mathbb{P}_{\uparrow,L}}(f\mathbf{1}_L) = \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} T_{\mathbb{P}_{\uparrow,L}}(g_L) \\ &= T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}(I)}}(g) \end{aligned}$$

$$(4.14) \quad - \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{|k| \geq 2} T_{\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_k(L)}}(g_L).$$

It remains to estimate the term (4.8) and main term (4.13), followed by the tail terms (4.7), (4.10), (4.14).

Estimates for (4.8) and (4.13). These terms are easily estimated by applying the L^2 -bound for $T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}(I)}}$ from Lemma 2.5.1 in the form

$$\|T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}(I)}} h\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \sqrt{|I|} \langle h \rangle_{2,I,+},$$

and then using the definition of λ_f for the proof of (4.8), and (4.11) for the proof of (4.13), respectively.

Estimate for (4.7). The inequality

$$\|T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}(I)}}(f\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus 3I})\|_2 \lesssim C_X \inf_I M_X f \sqrt{|I|} \lesssim C_X \inf_{3I} M_X f \sqrt{|I|}$$

follows by the triangle inequality, partitioning \mathbb{R} and $\mathbb{R} \setminus 3I$ into intervals of the form I^j , I^k for $j, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $|k| \geq 2$, and using (3.10) of Lemma 3.3.1. Since

$$\bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} L \subset 3I, \quad \inf_{3I} M_X f \leq \inf_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \inf_L M_X f \leq \lambda_f,$$

the proof of (4.7) is complete.

Estimate for (4.10). In this paragraph, dec is fixed to being the one from Lemma 3.2.1, and $\text{dec}' = \text{dec} - 10$ is good enough for Lemma 3.1.2. We start by the basic estimate

$$(4.15) \quad \|(4.10)\|_2 \leq \sum_{|k| \geq 2} \left\| \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} F_L \right\|_2$$

where we have set $F_L := T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}_k(L)}}(f\mathbf{1}_L)$. An application of Lemma 3.1.2 thus tells us that

$$\left\| \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} F_L \right\|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{\sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} |L|} \sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \langle F_L \rangle_{2,L,-} \lesssim \sqrt{\sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} |L|} \sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{(1 + |j|)^{\text{dec}'}}{\sqrt{|L|}} \|T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}_k(L)}}(f\mathbf{1}_L)\mathbf{1}_{L^j}\|_2.$$

Fixing momentarily $L \in \mathcal{L}$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, we apply (3.10) of Lemma 3.3.1 to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{g}_k(L)}}(f \mathbf{1}_L) \mathbf{1}_{L+j} \right\|_2 &\lesssim C_X \sqrt{|L|} |k|^{2-\text{dec}} (1+|j|)^{2-\text{dec}} \inf_L M_X f \\ &\lesssim C_X \sqrt{|L|} |k|^{2-\text{dec}} (1+|j|)^{2-\text{dec}} \lambda_f \end{aligned}$$

which yields the desired estimate upon summing in $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, and in $k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0, \pm 1\}$ in (4.15).

Estimate for (4.14). In this paragraph, dec is fixed to be the one from (4.11), hence from Lemma 3.2.1, and $\text{dec}' = \text{dec} - 10$. We make use of the operator

$$Q_{k,L} h := \chi_L^{-\text{dec}'} T_{\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{g}_k(L)}}(\chi_{L+k}^{-\text{dec}} h) =: \chi_L^{-\text{dec}'} \chi_{L+k}^{\text{dec}'} \tilde{T}_{\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{g}_k(L)}} h.$$

Note that $\|Q_{k,L}\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} \lesssim (1+|k|)^{\text{dec}'}$ as we have localized using χ_L instead of χ_{L+k} , and applied Lemma 2.5.1. At this point

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle T_{\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{g}_k(L)}} g_L \right\rangle_{2,L,-} &= \frac{\left\| \chi_L^{-\text{dec}'} T_{\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{g}_k(L)}}(g_L) \right\|_2}{\sqrt{|L|}} = \frac{\left\| Q_{k,L}(\chi_{L+k}^{\text{dec}} g_L) \right\|_2}{\sqrt{|L|}} \\ &\lesssim (1+|k|)^{\text{dec}'} \left\| \chi_{L+k}^{\text{dec}} \chi_L^{\text{dec}} \right\|_\infty \frac{\left\| \chi_L^{-\text{dec}} g_L \right\|_2}{\sqrt{|L|}} \lesssim (1+|k|)^{-10} \langle g_L \rangle_{2,L,-} \lesssim C_X (1+|k|)^{-10} \lambda_f. \end{aligned}$$

We may then apply Lemma 3.1.2 to $T_{\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{g}_k(L)}}(g_L)$, thus obtaining for $|k| \geq 2$

$$\left\| \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} T_{\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{g}_k(L)}} g_L \right\|_2 \lesssim C_X |k|^{-10} \lambda_f \sqrt{\sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} |L|}$$

whence the estimate

$$\left\| (4.14) = - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} T_{\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{g}_k(L)}}(g_L) \right\|_2 \lesssim C_X \lambda_f \sqrt{\sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} |L|} \lesssim C_X \sqrt{|I|} \lambda_f$$

follows upon summing in $|k| \geq 2$.

Summing the estimates for the terms (4.7), (4.8), (4.10), (4.13) and (4.14) above concludes the proof of (4.6) and with that the proof of the proposition is complete. \square

4.3. Localized estimates. Hereafter, $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}^{O_\Xi}$ denotes again a generic subcollection. Proposition 4.2 can then be reformulated as

$$(4.16) \quad \left\langle T_{\mathbb{Q}}(f) \right\rangle_{2,I,-} \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) \sup_{P \in \mathbb{Q}(I)} \inf_{I_P} M_X \left(f \chi_I^{\text{dec}} \right).$$

Indeed, letting $\lambda := \sup_{P \in \mathbb{Q}(I)} \inf_{I_P} M_X(f \chi_I^{\text{dec}})$, we define the stopping collection \mathcal{L}_{all} to be the maximal elements of the collection

$$\left\{ L \in \mathcal{D}(I) : \langle f \chi_I^{\text{dec}} \rangle_{X,L} > 2\lambda \right\}.$$

Note that $\inf_L M_X \left(f \chi_I^{\text{dec}} \right) \geq 2\lambda$ for every $L \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{all}}$ and so $\mathbb{Q}(I)$ coincides with $\mathbb{Q}_{\mathcal{G}}(I)$ for the choice of stopping collection \mathcal{L}_{all} . Proposition 4.2 and the localization trick of Remark 2.4.1 then implies

$$\langle T_{\mathbb{Q}(I)} f \rangle_{2,I,-} \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) \lambda_{f \chi_I^{\text{dec}}} \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) \lambda,$$

the last approximate inequality following by the definition of the stopping collection.

Secondly, the tail estimate

$$(4.17) \quad \langle \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus 3I} T_{\mathbb{Q}(I)} f \rangle_{2,I,-} \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) \inf_I M_X \left(f \chi_I^{\text{dec}} \right)$$

can also be easily deduced from (4.16) as follows. Fix $I \in \mathcal{D}$, let $m \geq 0$ and $J \in \mathcal{D}_m(I)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus 3I} T_{\mathbb{Q}=(J)} f \rangle_{2,I,-} &= \frac{\| \chi_I^{-\text{dec}} [\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus 3I} T_{\mathbb{Q}=(J)} f] \|_2}{\sqrt{|I|}} = \frac{\| [\chi_I^{-\text{dec}} \chi_J^{\text{dec}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus 3I}] \tilde{T}_{\mathbb{Q}=(J)}(f \chi_J^{\text{dec}}) \|_2}{\sqrt{|I|}} \\ &\leq \| \chi_I^{-\text{dec}} \chi_J^{\text{dec}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus 3I} \|_{\infty} \frac{\| \tilde{T}_{\mathbb{Q}=(J)}(f \chi_J^{\text{dec}}) \|_2}{\sqrt{|I|}} \lesssim 2^{-m \text{dec}} \frac{\| \tilde{T}_{\mathbb{Q}=(J)}(f \chi_J^{\text{dec}}) \|_2}{\sqrt{|I|}} \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) 2^{-m \text{dec}} \inf_J M_X(f \chi_J^{\text{dec}}) \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) 2^{-m(\text{dec}-1)} \inf_I M_X(f \chi_I^{\text{dec}}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{Q}=(J)} f := \chi_J^{-\text{dec}} T_{\mathbb{Q}=(J)}(\chi_J^{\text{dec}} f)$. In the passage to the last line we applied (4.16) for the collection $\mathbb{Q}=(J)$. This estimate is summable over $J \in \mathcal{D}_m$ and $m \geq 0$ which completes the proof of (4.17). Of course, we could just as well have deduced (4.17) directly from the tail estimates carried out in the proof of Proposition 4.2.

Estimates (4.16) and (4.17) have vector-valued counterparts in the following sense. If $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi}}$, we have

$$(4.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \left\langle \| T_{\mathbb{Q}^{\omega}}(I) f \|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_{\Xi})} \right\rangle_{2,I,-} &\lesssim \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) \sup_{P \in \mathbb{Q}(I)} \inf_{I_P} M_X \left(f \chi_I^{\text{dec}} \right) \\ \left\langle \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus 3I} \| T_{\mathbb{Q}^{\omega}}(I) f \|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_{\Xi})} \right\rangle_{2,I,-} &\lesssim \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) \inf_I M_X \left(f \chi_I^{\text{dec}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This estimates follow easily, for example by using the corresponding scalar estimates (4.16) and (4.17) and a randomization argument involving Khintchine's inequality; we omit the details.

4.4. Weak-type estimates for multiplier operators. The estimates we obtained up to this point may be easily repurposed to obtain a local weak-type estimate for the multipliers $T_{\mathbb{Q}}$ of (2.7), when $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi}}$ as above.

Proposition 4.5. *There exists an absolute constant Θ such that the following holds. Let $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi}}$. Then*

$$\left| \{x \in I : |T_{\mathbb{Q}(I^j)} f(x)| > \Theta \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) \langle f \rangle_{X, I^j}\} \right| \leq 2^{-9} |I|$$

for all $I \in \mathcal{D}$, $|j| \leq 2$.

Proof. To keep the notation compact, set again $C_X := \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi)$ in this proof, and restrict attention to the case $j = 0$ in what follows, as the cases $0 < |j| \leq 2$ follow by a completely

analogous argument. Also, the statement is invariant under replacement of f by $f \circ \text{Sy}_I$ and I by $[0, 1)$. We can thus restrict ourselves to proving the case $I = [0, 1)$. Define

$$E := \left\{ x \in I : M_X(f \chi_I^{\text{dec}}) > 2^{14} \langle f \rangle_{X,I,+} \right\}$$

and let $L \in \mathcal{L}$ be the collection of the maximal elements of $\mathcal{D}(I)$ such that $L \subset E$. Define also

$$\tilde{E} := \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} 5L.$$

Using pairwise disjointness of $L \in \mathcal{L}$ and the weak-type (X, L^1) -inequality of M_X , which in dimension 1 holds with constant 3, let us first check that

$$(4.19) \quad |\tilde{E}| \leq 5 \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} |L| \leq 5|E| \leq \frac{15}{2^{14} \langle f \rangle_{X,I,+}} \|f \chi_I^{\text{dec}}\|_X = \frac{15}{2^{14}} |I| \leq 2^{-10} |I|.$$

Say $P \in \mathbb{Q}_g(I)$ if $P \in \mathbb{Q}(I)$ and I_P is not contained in $3L$ for any $L \in \mathcal{L}$. Then

$$\mathbb{Q}(I) = \mathbb{Q}_g(I) \sqcup \mathbb{Q}_b(I), \quad \mathbb{Q}_b(I) := \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \bigcup_{j=0, \pm 1} \mathbb{Q}(L^{+j}).$$

By construction, and applying estimate (4.16)

$$(4.20) \quad \langle T_{\mathbb{Q}_g(I)} f \rangle_{2,I,-} \lesssim C_X \sup_{P \in \mathbb{Q}_g(I)} \inf_{I_P} M_X \left(f \chi_I^{\text{dec}} \right) \lesssim C_X \langle f \rangle_{X,I,+}.$$

Furthermore, applying Lemma 3.1.2 and estimate (4.17),

$$(4.21) \quad \left\| \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{E}} T_{\mathbb{Q}_b(I)} f \right\|_2 = \left\| \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{j=0, \pm 1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{E}} T_{\mathbb{Q}_b(L^{+j})} f \right\|_2 \lesssim C_X \sqrt{|I|} \sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \inf_L M_X f \\ \lesssim C_X \sqrt{|I|} \langle f \rangle_{X,I,+}.$$

Let C equal four times the largest of the implicit constants appearing in the inequalities (4.20) and (4.21). Then

$$\left| \left\{ x \in I \setminus \tilde{E} : |T_{\mathbb{Q}(I)} f(x)| > \Theta C_X \langle f \rangle_{X,I,+} \right\} \right| \leq \frac{1}{[\Theta C_X \langle f \rangle_{X,I,+}]^2} \left\| \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{E}} T_{\mathbb{Q}(I)} f \right\|_2^2 \\ \leq \frac{[C C_X \langle f \rangle_{X,I,+}]^2}{[\Theta C_X \langle f \rangle_{X,I,+}]^2} |I| = \frac{C^2}{\Theta^2} |I| \leq 2^{-10} |I|$$

provided $\Theta \geq 2^5 C$. Combining the latter estimate with (4.19) returns the claim. \square

Remark 4.5.1. The vector-valued version of the estimate in Proposition 4.5 holds, namely

$$\left| \left\{ x \in I : \left\| T_{\mathbb{Q}^\omega(I^{+j})} f(x) \right\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)} > \Theta \mathcal{Z}^\star(X, \Xi) \langle f \rangle_{X,I,+} \right\} \right| \leq 2^{-9} |I|.$$

This follows by an obvious modification of the proof of Proposition 4.5 above, using the estimates in (4.18).

4.6. A bilinear stopping estimate. This paragraph contains a strengthening of Proposition 4.2 into a bilinear form estimate. Hereafter \mathcal{L} stands for a fixed stopping collection, as in §4.1, \mathcal{G} is defined as in (4.1), and the decomposition (4.2) is referred. All instances of (4.4) and (4.3), as well as the splitting (4.2), refer to the stopping collection \mathcal{L} .

Proposition 4.7. $\left| \left\langle T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}^{O_{\Xi}(I)}} f_1, f_2 \right\rangle \right| \lesssim |I| \prod_{j=1,2} \mathcal{Z}^*(X_j, \Xi) \lambda_{f_j, X_j}$.

Remark 4.7.1. Before the proof of the general case, note that if $X_2 = L^2$ the proposition follows directly from Proposition 4.2. Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left\langle T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}^{O_{\Xi}(I)}} f_1, f_2 \right\rangle \right| &\leq |I| \left\langle T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}^{O_{\Xi}(I)}} f_1 \right\rangle_{2, I, -} \langle f_2 \rangle_{2, I, +} = \sqrt{|I|} \left\| \tilde{T}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}^{O_{\Xi}(I)}} f_1 \right\|_2 \langle f_2 \rangle_{2, I, +} \\ &\lesssim |I| \mathcal{Z}^*(X_1, \Xi) \lambda_{f_1, X_1} \lambda_{f_2, L^2} \end{aligned}$$

applying the localization trick in Remark 2.4.1 in the first equality, and Proposition 4.2 with $X = X_1, f = f_1$ to pass to the second line.

Proof of Proposition 4.7. As before, the superscript O_{Ξ} is dropped from all instances in this proof, and $C_{X_j} := \mathcal{Z}^*(X_j, \Xi)$. The basic decomposition is

$$\langle T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}(I)}} f_1, f_2 \rangle = \langle T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}(I)}} f_1, \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus B} f_2 \rangle + \langle f_1 \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus B}, T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}(I)}}^*(\mathbf{1}_B f_2) \rangle + \langle T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}(I)}}(f_1 \mathbf{1}_B), \mathbf{1}_B f_2 \rangle.$$

The first two terms are estimated via the exact same strategy, relying on the further splitting

$$(4.22) \quad \langle T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}(I)}} f_1, \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus B} f_2 \rangle = \langle T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}(I)}} f_1, \mathbf{1}_{3I \setminus B} f_2 \rangle + \langle T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}(I)}} f_1, \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus 3I} f_2 \rangle.$$

For the first term in the above display we have

$$\left| \langle T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}(I)}} f_1, \mathbf{1}_{3I \setminus B} f_2 \rangle \right| \lesssim \sqrt{|I|} \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}(I)}} f_1 \right\|_2 \|f_2 \mathbf{1}_{3I \setminus B}\|_{\infty} \lesssim |I| C_{X_1} \lambda_{f_1, X_1} \lambda_{f_2, X_2},$$

with a straightforward application of Proposition 4.2 and using Definition (4.4).

For the second term we partition \mathbb{R} and $\mathbb{R} \setminus 3I$ into intervals of the form I^{+j}, I^{+k} for $j, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $|k| \geq 2$, and apply (3.11) of Lemma 3.3.1. It is not difficult to see that the summation returns a control of the second term in (4.22) by the correct right hand side. It remains to handle $\langle T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}(I)}}(f_1 \mathbf{1}_B), \mathbf{1}_B f_2 \rangle$. Arguing as in (4.9)-(4.10)

$$T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}(I)}}(f_1 \mathbf{1}_B) = \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} T_{\mathbb{P}_{\uparrow, L}}(f_1 \mathbf{1}_L) + \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{|k| \geq 2} T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}_k(L)}}(f_1 \mathbf{1}_L).$$

Applying this to $f = f_1$ yields

$$\langle T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}(I)}}(f_1 \mathbf{1}_B), \mathbf{1}_B f_2 \rangle = \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \langle T_{\mathbb{P}_{\uparrow, L}}(f_1 \mathbf{1}_L), \mathbf{1}_B f_2 \rangle + \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{|k| \geq 2} \langle T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}_k(L)}}(f_1 \mathbf{1}_L), \mathbf{1}_B f_2 \rangle.$$

For the first term we argue as in Lemma 3.3.5 with (3.12) replaced by (3.14). For the second term we argue as in the proof of (3.20) of Lemma 3.3.3 with (3.9) replaced by (3.11), completing the proof. \square

5. PROOF OF THEOREM B

By virtue of the considerations in §2.6, it suffices to prove the same estimate of Theorem B for the model square function $\|T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega} f\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)}$, cf. (2.11). We do so by reducing to the localized estimate of the next proposition.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $I_0 \in \mathcal{D}$. Given any $f \in L_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, there exists a sparse collection \mathcal{S} with the property that*

$$\mathbf{1}_{I_0} \|T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3I_0)} f\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)} \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^\star(X, \Xi) \mathcal{S}_{X,1} f$$

pointwise almost everywhere. The implicit constant is absolute.

This reduction is carried out in §5.2 while the proof of Proposition 5.1 is given in §5.3.

5.2. Reduction to Proposition 5.1. Fix a function $f \in L_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. As \mathcal{D} is a standard dyadic grid, we may find $I_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ with the property that $\text{supp } f \subset (1 + 3^{-1})I_0$. The reduction consists in handling the square sum of the tail terms

$$T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega}^{\text{out}} f := T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega} f - \mathbf{1}_{5I_0} T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3I_0)} f, \quad \omega \in \Omega_\Xi,$$

by means of the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2.1. *Let $I_0 \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a finite interval and $f \in L_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $\text{supp } f \subset (1 + 3^{-1})I_0$. Then*

$$\|T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega}^{\text{out}} f\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)} \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^\star(X, \Xi) \langle f \rangle_{X,3I_0}.$$

Proof. Firstly, the estimate

$$\|\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus 5I_0} T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3I_0)} f\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)} \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^\star(X, \Xi) \inf_{I_0} M_X(f) \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^\star(X, \Xi) \langle f \rangle_{X,3I_0}$$

is a consequence of (3.18) of Lemma 3.3.3. It will thus suffice to control the $\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)$ -norm of

$$T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega} f - T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3I_0)} f = T_{\text{far},I_0}^\omega f + T_{\text{ov},I_0}^\omega f, \quad \omega \in \Omega_\Xi,$$

where the equality relies upon (3.17). Now the estimates

$$\|T_{\text{far},I_0}^\omega f\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)}, \|T_{\text{ov},I_0}^\omega f\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)} \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^\star(X, \Xi) \langle f \rangle_{X,3I_0}$$

follow by (3.20) of Lemma 3.3.3 and Lemma 3.3.5, respectively. \square

With the estimates for the tails being taken care of by Lemma 5.2.1, the proof of Theorem B reduces to proving the sparse estimate for the operator $f \mapsto \|\mathbf{1}_{5I_0} T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3I_0)} f\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)}$. To that end we write

$$\mathbf{1}_{5I_0} T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3I_0)} = \sum_{0 \leq |j| \leq 2} \mathbf{1}_{I_0^{+j}} \widetilde{T}_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3I_0^{+j})} f + \sum_{|j|=1} \mathbf{1}_{I_0^{+j}} \widetilde{T}_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(I_0^{-j})} f + \sum_{|j|=2} \mathbf{1}_{I_0^{+j}} \widetilde{T}_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(I_0 \cup I_0^{-\text{sgn}(j)})} f$$

where \widetilde{T} is an operator of the form (3.15) given by possibly different wave packets than the ones defining T , allowing the choices $\phi_P, \psi_P \equiv 0$ for $P \in \mathbb{P}$. The first summand in the display above is estimated in $\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)$ by a constant multiple of $\mathcal{Z}^\star(X, \Xi) \mathcal{S}_{X,1} f$ by appealing to Proposition 5.1. The last two summands are estimated by a constant multiple of $\mathcal{Z}^\star(X, \Xi) \langle f \rangle_{X,3I_0}$ using an appropriate modification of (3.18) of Lemma 3.3.3 after noting that

$$|j| = 1 \implies \text{dist}(I_0^{+j}, I_0^{-j}) \geq |I_0|, \quad |j| = 2 \implies \text{dist}(I_0^{+j}, I_0 \cup I_0^{-\text{sgn}(j)}) \geq |I_0|,$$

and the reduction is complete.

5.3. **Proof of Proposition 5.1.** As usual, we adopt the shorthand $C_X := \mathcal{Z}^\star(X, \Xi)$. The main step of the proof is carried out in the lemma below.

Lemma 5.3.1. *Let $I \in \mathcal{D}$. Then there exists a pairwise disjoint collection $\mathcal{L}(I) \subset \mathcal{D}(I)$ with the properties that*

$$(5.1) \quad \left| \mathbf{1}_I \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3I)} f \right\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)} - \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}(I)} \mathbf{1}_L \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3L)} f \right\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)} \right| \leq KC_X \langle f \rangle_{X, I, +} \mathbf{1}_I,$$

$$(5.2) \quad \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}(I)} |L| \leq 2^{-4} |I|.$$

Proof. For brevity, write $\lambda := \langle f \rangle_{X, I, +}$. Below, we plan to apply (3.17) with $\mathbb{Q} := \mathbb{P}^{O_\Xi}(3I)$ for some $L \in \mathcal{D}(3I)$. This reads

$$(5.3) \quad \mathbb{Q} := \mathbb{P}^{O_\Xi}(3I) = \mathbb{P}^{O_\Xi}(3L) \sqcup \mathbb{Q}_{\text{far}, L} \sqcup \mathbb{Q}_{\text{ov}, L}.$$

Note that (3.19) in Lemma 3.3.3 and Lemma 3.3.4 may be legitimately appealed to, as those estimates hold for generic $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}^{O_\Xi}$, to which (3.17) is applied. To begin the proper proof, start with defining the set

$$E := \left\{ x \in I : \left\| T_{\mathbb{Q}} f(x) \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} > 3\Theta C_X \lambda \right\} \cup \left\{ x \in 3I : M_X(f \chi_I^{\text{dec}})(x) > 2^{15} \lambda \right\},$$

for some sufficiently large constant Θ and notice that

$$|E| \leq \sum_{|j| \leq 1} \left| \left\{ x \in I : \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(I^+j)} f(x) \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} > \Theta C_X \lambda \right\} \right| + 2^{-9} |I| \leq 3 \cdot 2^{-9} |I| + 2^{-9} |I| = 2^{-7} |I|$$

where the first bound is obtained by the maximal theorem and the second by applying Proposition 4.5 in the form of Remark 4.5.1. Let \mathcal{L} be the collection of the maximal elements L of $\mathcal{D}(3I)$ such that

$$|L \cap E| > 2^{-3} |L|.$$

The elements of \mathcal{L} are pairwise disjoint and contained in the set \tilde{E} where the dyadic maximal function of $\mathbf{1}_E$ is larger than 2^{-3} , whence the packing condition (5.2). By maximality, $|L \cap E| \leq 2^{-2} |L|$ for each $L \in \mathcal{L}$. It follows that for each $L \in \mathcal{L}$, the set $F_L := L \setminus E$ has the properties

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} |F_L| &\geq 3 \cdot 2^{-2} |L|, \\ \sup_{F_L} M_X(f \chi_I^{\text{dec}}) &\leq 2^{15} \lambda, \\ \sup_{F_L} \left\| T_{\mathbb{Q}^\omega} f \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} &\leq 3\Theta C_X \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

To further refine F_L define for each $L \in \mathcal{L}$

$$E_L := \left\{ x \in L : \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3L)} f(x) \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} > 3\Theta C_X \langle f \rangle_{X, L, +} \right\}.$$

Another application of Proposition 4.5 in the form of Remark 4.5.1 tells us that $|E_L| \leq 3 \cdot 2^{-9} |L|$, therefore $G_L := F_L \setminus E_L$ satisfies also

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{aligned} |G_L| &\geq 2^{-1} |L|, \\ \sup_{G_L} \|T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3L)} f\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} &\leq 3\Theta C_X \langle f \rangle_{X,L,+} \leq KC_X \lambda \end{aligned}$$

where K is an absolute implicit constant and the last bound is obtained via the control

$$\langle f \rangle_{X,L,+} \leq \inf_L M_X(f \chi_L^{\text{dec}}) \leq \sup_{F_L} M_X(f \chi_I^{\text{dec}}) \lesssim \lambda.$$

For any $y_L \in G_L$, comparing with (5.3),

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \left\| T_{\mathbb{Q}_{\text{ov},L}^\omega} f(y_L) \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} &\leq \left\| T_{\mathbb{Q}^\omega} f(y_L) \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} + \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3L)} f(y_L) \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} + \left\| T_{\mathbb{Q}_{\text{far},L}^\omega} f(y_L) \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} \\ &\leq KC_X \lambda \end{aligned}$$

for some absolute constant K , as the first term on the right hand side of (5.6) is controlled by (5.4), the central term is controlled by (5.5), and the rightmost term is bounded by (3.19) of Lemma 3.3.3.

We are ready to prove the sparse bound (5.1). First, note that the intervals \mathcal{L} are contained in and cover the set $\tilde{E} \supset E$. Suppose $x \in I \setminus \tilde{E}$. Then $x \notin E$ as well and

$$\left| \mathbf{1}_I \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3I)} f \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} - \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}(I)} \mathbf{1}_L \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3L)} f \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} \right| = \mathbf{1}_I \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3I)} f \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} \leq 3\Theta C_X \lambda,$$

by the definition of E , complying with (5.1). Next, assume $x \in \tilde{E}$ so that $x \in L$ for some unique $L \in \mathcal{L}$. In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3I)} f \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} - \mathbf{1}_L \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3L)} f \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} \right| \leq \left\| Z_{\mathbb{Q}_{\text{ov},L}^\omega} f(x) \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} + \left\| T_{\mathbb{Q}_{\text{far},L}^\omega} f(x) \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} \\ &\leq \left\| Z_{\mathbb{Q}_{\text{ov},L}^\omega} f(x) \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} + KC_X \lambda \\ &\leq \left[\left\| Z_{\mathbb{Q}_{\text{ov},L}^\omega} f(x) - Z_{\mathbb{Q}_{\text{ov},L}^\omega} f(y_L) \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} + \left\| Z_{\mathbb{Q}_{\text{ov},L}^\omega} f(y_L) \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} \right] + KC_X \lambda \\ &\leq KC_X \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

In the chain above, we have applied (5.3), used equality (3.16) and the triangle inequality for the first bound, and then applied (3.19) of Lemma 3.3.3 to control the term $\tilde{T}_{\mathbb{Q}_{\text{far},L}^\omega} f(x)$ and pass to the second line. At that point we picked any $y_L \in G_L$, used the triangle inequality, applied Lemma 3.3.4 to control the difference term and applied (5.6) together with the equality (3.16) to control the inserted term. The above inequality completes the proof of (5.1) and thus the proof of the iterative lemma. \square

With Lemma 5.3.1 in hand, we are ready to complete the proof of Proposition 5.1. The first step is the following inductive construction of a pairwise disjoint collection $\mathcal{S}_n \subset \mathcal{D}$ for each $n \geq 0$. Begin with $\mathcal{S}_0 = \{I_0\}$. For $n \geq 0$, suppose \mathcal{S}_n has already been constructed. For each

$I \in \mathcal{S}_n$, apply Lemma 5.3.1 to I . This application returns the pairwise disjoint collection $\mathcal{L}(I)$, and consequently we define

$$\mathcal{S}_{n+1}(I) := \mathcal{L}(I), \quad I \in \mathcal{S}_n, \quad \mathcal{S}_{n+1} := \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{S}_n} \mathcal{S}_{n+1}(I),$$

completing the inductive step. Leveraging (5.2), it is not difficult to see that $\mathcal{S} := \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{S}_n$ is a sparse collection, with major pairwise disjoint subsets

$$E_I := I \setminus \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{n+1}(I)} J, \quad I \in \mathcal{S}_n, \quad n \geq 0.$$

Setting

$$\Delta_I(x) := \mathbf{1}_I(x) \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3I)} f(x) \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} - \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{n+1}(I)} \mathbf{1}_J(x) \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3J)} f(x) \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

estimate (5.1) may instead be rewritten as

$$|\Delta_I| \leq KC_X \langle f \rangle_{X, I, +} \mathbf{1}_I, \quad I \in \mathcal{S}_n.$$

Telescoping and applying the above estimate, we obtain for each $n \geq 0$

$$(5.7) \quad \left| \mathbf{1}_{I_0} \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3I_0)} f \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} - \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{n+1}} \mathbf{1}_J \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3J)} f \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} \right| = \left| \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_k} \Delta_I \right| \leq \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_k} |\Delta_I| \\ \leq KC_X \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_k} \langle f \rangle_{X, I, +} \mathbf{1}_I =: KC_X \mathcal{S}_{X, 1, +} f.$$

As $f \in L_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, we have that $\mathcal{S}_{X, 1, +} f$ belongs to $L^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R})$ and is finite almost everywhere. Assuming for the moment that up to a subsequence

$$(5.8) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n(x) = 0 \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad F_n := \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_n} \mathbf{1}_J \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3J)} f \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)}$$

we get, by passing to the limit in (5.7), the intermediate sparse estimate

$$(5.9) \quad \mathbf{1}_{I_0} \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3I_0)} f \right\|_{\ell^2(\omega \in \Omega_\Xi)} \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) \mathcal{S}_{X, 1, +} f.$$

Subsequently, (5.9) upgrades to the claim of Proposition 5.1, with a possibly different sparse collection, by appealing to [16, Theorem A and Corollary A.1]. It remains to prove (5.8). The easiest way to do so is to prove that $\|F_n\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ and pass to a subsequence. To see this, note that the intervals $J \in \mathcal{S}_n$ are pairwise disjoint by construction, as revealed by an easy induction argument. The localization trick then yields

$$\|F_n\|_2^2 \leq \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_n} \left\| \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}^\omega(3J)} f \right\|_{\ell^2(\Omega_\Xi)} \right\|_2^2 \lesssim \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_n} |J| \langle f \rangle_{2, J, +}^2 \lesssim \|f\|_\infty^2 \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_n} |J| \lesssim 2^{-4n} |I_0| \|f\|_\infty^2$$

where the last inequality is also easily proved by induction on n . Therefore (5.8) holds, up to a subsequence, and the proof of Proposition 5.1 is complete.

6. PROOF OF THEOREM C

The proof of Theorem C consists of the combination of an abstract Carleson embedding theorem generalizing [21, Prop. 2.4] with an application of Proposition 4.2. The first tool is developed in §6.1 while the proof of Theorem C is concluded in the final paragraph §6.3.

6.1. Generalized Carleson embedding. For a fixed dyadic grid \mathcal{D} and a collection $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{D}$, the \mathcal{I} -balayage of the sequence of complex numbers $\mathbf{a} = \{a_Q : Q \in \mathcal{D}\}$ is

$$A_{\mathcal{I}}[\mathbf{a}] := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{I}} a_Q \mathbf{1}_Q.$$

The definition of a subordinated Carleson sequence [21, eq. (2.3)] can be modified as follows. Firstly, let us call $\mathcal{G}(I) \subset \mathcal{D}(I)$ major if the maximal dyadic elements $\mathcal{M}(I)$ of $\mathcal{D}(I) \setminus \mathcal{G}(I)$ satisfy

$$\sum_{L \in \mathcal{M}(I)} |L| \leq \frac{1}{4}|I|.$$

Observe that, necessarily, any $\mathcal{G}(I)$ which is major contains I . Fixing an Orlicz space X , say that \mathbf{a} is a *generalized Carleson sequence subordinated to f* if

$$(6.1) \quad \frac{1}{|I|} \inf_{\substack{\mathcal{G}(I) \subset \mathcal{D}(I) \\ \mathcal{G}(I) \text{ major}}} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{G}(I)} |J| |a_J| \leq C \langle f \rangle_{X, I, +}^2$$

with $C > 0$ a numerical constant which is independent of $I \in \mathcal{D}$ and f . The least constant C such that (6.1) holds is denoted by $\|\mathbf{a}\|_{\mathcal{D}}$ and termed the *generalized Carleson norm* of \mathbf{a} . A minor modification of the proof of [21, Prop. 2.4] yields the following result.

Proposition 6.2. *For $f \in L_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and a generalized Carleson sequence \mathbf{a} subordinated to f , there exists a sparse collection \mathcal{J} of intervals with the property*

$$A_{\mathcal{D}}[\mathbf{a}] \lesssim \|\mathbf{a}\|_{\mathcal{D}} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \mathbf{1}_J \langle f \rangle_{X, J}^2$$

pointwise almost everywhere.

Proof. We follow closely the proof of [21, Prop. 2.4]. We fix a function f with compact support and we select an interval $Q \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\text{supp } f \subset (1 + 5^{-1})Q$. Let \mathbf{a} be a fixed generalized Carleson sequence subordinated to f and let $\mathcal{G}^*(I)$ be a fixed major collection of intervals that realizes the infimum in (6.1) within a factor of two. Denote by $\mathcal{M}^*(I)$ the set of maximal dyadic intervals in $\mathcal{D}(I) \setminus \mathcal{G}^*(I)$. Following [21] we have the basic estimate

$$(6.2) \quad A_{\mathcal{D}}[\mathbf{a}] \leq \sum_{|j| \leq 1} A_{\mathcal{D}(Q^{+j})}[\mathbf{a}] + \sum_{\substack{k \geq 1 \\ |j| \leq 1}} a_{Q \uparrow^{k,j}} \mathbf{1}_{Q \uparrow^{k,j}} + \sum_{\substack{k \geq 0 \\ 2 \leq |j| \leq 3}} A_{\mathcal{D}(Q \uparrow^{k,j})}[\mathbf{a}],$$

arising from the decomposition

$$\mathcal{D} \subseteq \left(\bigcup_{|j| \leq 1} \mathcal{D}(Q^{+j}) \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{\substack{k \geq 1 \\ |j| \leq 1}} \{Q \uparrow^{k,j}\} \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{\substack{k \geq 0 \\ 2 \leq |j| \leq 3}} \mathcal{D}(Q \uparrow^{k,j}) \right).$$

The second and third terms in (6.2) correspond to the tails and can be treated as in [21] by accounting for the obvious modifications, obtaining

$$\sum_{\substack{k \geq 1 \\ |j| \leq 1}} a_{Q^{\uparrow k, +j}} \mathbf{1}_{Q^{\uparrow k, +j}} + \sum_{\substack{k \geq 0 \\ 2 \leq |j| \leq 3}} A_{\mathcal{D}(Q^{\uparrow k, +j})}[\mathbf{a}] \lesssim \|\mathbf{a}\|_{\mathcal{D}} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{R}(Q)} \langle f \rangle_{X, I}^2 \mathbf{1}_I,$$

where $\mathcal{R}(Q)$ is a suitably constructed sparse collection.

Hence we are left to deal with the main term, namely with the first term in (6.2). Following [21], we want to control it by the intermediate estimate

$$(6.3) \quad A_{\mathcal{D}(J)}[\mathbf{a}] \lesssim \|\mathbf{a}\|_{\mathcal{D}} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{R}(J)} \langle f \rangle_{X, I, +}^2 \mathbf{1}_I$$

for each $J \in \{Q^{+j} : |j| \leq 1\}$, where $\mathcal{R}(J)$ is another suitably constructed sparse collection. From (6.3) we deduce a sparse bound

$$A_{\mathcal{D}(J)}[\mathbf{a}] \lesssim \|\mathbf{a}\|_{\mathcal{D}} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{R}'(J)} \langle f \rangle_{X, I}^2 \mathbf{1}_I$$

for some possibly different sparse collection $\mathcal{R}'(J)$ by the very same arguments in [21] noticing that [16, Theorem A and Corollary A.1] remain true if we replace the usual local averages with local averages in the Orlicz space X . Hence we are left with proving (6.3). For each $R \in \mathcal{D}(J)$ let $\mathcal{G}^*(R)$ be as above. Recall that $\mathcal{M}^*(R)$ consists of the maximal elements of $\mathcal{D}(R) \setminus \mathcal{G}^*(R)$ and it is such that

$$\sum_{L \in \mathcal{M}^*(R)} |L| \leq \frac{|R|}{4}.$$

For each $R \in \mathcal{D}(J)$ we define

$$\mathcal{S}(R) := \text{maximal elements of } \left\{ Z \in \mathcal{G}^*(R) : \sum_{\substack{W \in \mathcal{G}^*(R) \\ Z \subset W}} a_W > 24 \|\mathbf{a}\|_{\mathcal{D}} \langle f \rangle_{X, R, +}^2 \right\}.$$

Using the definition of $\mathcal{S}(R)$ and the Carleson condition we have

$$\sum_{Z \in \mathcal{S}(R)} |Z| \leq \frac{1}{12 \|\mathbf{a}\|_{\mathcal{D}} \langle f \rangle_{X, R, +}^2} \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{S}(R)} \int_Z A_{\mathcal{G}^*(R)} \leq \frac{|R|}{12}.$$

Armed with this fact, we perform the following step of recursive nature, which will lead us to the desired sparse domination in (6.3). We consider the decomposition

$$A_{\mathcal{D}(R)}[\mathbf{a}] = A_{\mathcal{G}^*(R) \cup \bigcup_{Z \in \mathcal{S}(R)} \mathcal{D}(Z)}[\mathbf{a}] + \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{S}(R)} A_{\mathcal{D}(Z)}[\mathbf{a}] + \sum_{L \in \mathcal{M}^*(R)} A_{\mathcal{D}(L)}[\mathbf{a}].$$

It follows from the definition of $\mathcal{S}(R)$ that

$$A_{\mathcal{G}^*(R) \cup \bigcup_{Z \in \mathcal{S}(R)} \mathcal{D}(Z)}[\mathbf{a}] \leq 24 \|\mathbf{a}\|_{\mathcal{D}} \langle f \rangle_{X, R, +}^2 \mathbf{1}_R.$$

Moreover, we have that

$$\sum_{Z \in \mathcal{S}(R)} |Z| + \sum_{L \in \mathcal{M}^*(R)} |L| \leq \frac{|R|}{3}.$$

We can therefore construct a sparse collection $\mathcal{R}(J)$ by the very same John-Nirenberg-type recursive argument as in [21], applying the above decomposition to each $\mathcal{D}(Z)$ and each $\mathcal{D}(L)$. This concludes the proof of (6.3). \square

6.3. Deducing Theorem C. As usual, we employ the shorthand $C_X := \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi)$. As explained in §2.6, it suffices to prove the same estimate for the model G_Ξ . For a suitable choice of wave packets $\{\phi_P : P \in \mathbb{P}\}$,

$$[G_\Xi f]^2 \leq 2 \sum_{P \in \mathbb{P}^{O_\Xi}} |\langle f, \phi_P \rangle|^2 \mathbf{1}_{I_P} = 2 \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} a_I \mathbf{1}_I, \quad a_I := \sum_{P \in \mathbb{P}^{O_\Xi}(I)} |\langle f, \phi_P \rangle|^2.$$

By virtue of Proposition 6.2, it is then enough to show that $\{a_I : I \in \mathcal{D}\}$ is a generalized Carleson sequence subordinated to f . We fix $I \in \mathcal{D}$ and turn to the task of constructing the major collection $\mathcal{G}(I)$. Let

$$(6.4) \quad E_I := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : M_X(f \chi_I^{\text{dec}})(x) > \Theta \langle f \rangle_{X, I, +}\}.$$

We claim the estimate

$$(6.5) \quad |E_I| \leq 2^{-9} |I|,$$

and postpone the proof at the end of the section. Therefore, if $\mathcal{L}(I)$ stands for the collection of maximal elements of \mathcal{D} contained in the set $E_I \cap 3I$,

$$(6.6) \quad \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}(I)} |L| \leq |E_I| \leq 2^{-9} |I|,$$

$$\sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}(I)} \inf_L M_X(f \chi_I^{\text{dec}}) \lesssim \langle f \rangle_{X, I, +}.$$

In particular (6.6) shows that $\mathcal{G}(I)$, constructed from $\mathcal{L}(I)$ as \mathcal{G} from \mathcal{L} in (4.1) of §4.1, is major. Constructing $T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}^{O_\Xi}(I)}$ as in (4.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}(I)} |G| a_G &= \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}(I)} |G| \sum_{P \in \mathbb{P}^{O_\Xi}(G)} |\langle f, \phi_P \rangle|^2 \lesssim \left\| T_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}^{O_\Xi}(I)} f \right\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim C_X^2 |I| \left(\left\| f \chi_I^{\text{dec}} \right\|_{L^\infty(3I \setminus B)} + \sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \inf_L \left[M_X(f \chi_I^{\text{dec}}) \right] \right)^2 \lesssim C_X^2 |I| \langle f \rangle_{X, I, +}^2, \end{aligned}$$

having applied Proposition 4.2 to pass to the second line. This verifies the assumption of Proposition 6.2 and therefore completes the proof of Theorem C.

Proof of (6.5). Let \mathcal{D}' be any dyadic grid on \mathbb{R} . Because of our assumptions on the Orlicz space X and its Young function Y_X in Definition 1.1, the maximal function

$$M_{X, \mathcal{D}'} g := \sup_{I \in \mathcal{D}'} \mathbf{1}_I \langle g \rangle_{X, I}$$

enjoys the modular inequality

$$|\{x \in \mathbb{R} : M_{X, \mathcal{D}'} g(x) > \lambda\}| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_X \left(\frac{g(x)}{\lambda} \right) dx,$$

see [52, Lemma 4.1] and [17, Theorem 5.5]. Using the three lattice theorem as in [45], it follows that

$$|E_{g,\lambda} := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : M_X g(x) > \lambda\}| \leq 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_X \left(\frac{3g(x)}{\lambda} \right) dx.$$

Now, notice that E_I defined in (6.4) coincides with the set $E_{f\chi_I^{\text{dec}}, \Theta \langle f \rangle_{X,I,+}}$. Therefore, provided that $\Theta > 3$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} |E_I| &\leq 3 \int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_X \left(\frac{3}{\Theta} \frac{f(x)\chi_I^{\text{dec}}(x)}{\langle f \rangle_{X,I,+}} \right) dx \leq \frac{9}{\Theta} \int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_X \left(\frac{f(x)\chi_I^{\text{dec}}(x)}{\langle f \rangle_{X,I,+}} \right) dx \\ &\leq \frac{9}{\Theta} |I| \int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_X \left(\frac{f(\ell_I y + c_I)\chi^{\text{dec}}(y)}{\langle f \rangle_{X,I,+}} \right) dy \leq |I| \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality uses the convexity of Y_X , the step to the second line is a change of variable and the subsequent bound is the Orlicz norm definition of $\langle f \rangle_{X,I,+}$. The bound (6.5) is then obtained by choosing $\Theta > 3$ sufficiently large. \square

7. PROOFS OF THEOREMS D, E, G

In this section we complete the proofs of Theorems D, E and G. Using the discretization arguments in §2.6 and §2.7, the proofs of Theorems D and E reduce to a general sparse estimate for model operators $f \mapsto T_{\mathbb{Q}} f$ with $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi}}$ a finite collection of tiles.

Proposition 7.1. *Let $\Xi \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a null closed set and $\mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi}}$ be defined as in (2.9). For $f_1, f_2 \in L_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$, and $I_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ with $\text{supp } f_j \subset 3I_0$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$, there holds*

$$\sup_{\substack{\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi}} \\ \#\mathbb{Q} < \infty}} |\langle \mathbf{1}_{I_0} T_{\mathbb{Q}(3I_0)} f_1, f_2 \rangle| \lesssim \left(\prod_{j=1}^2 \mathcal{Z}^*(X_j, \Xi) \right) \sup_{S \text{ sparse}} \Lambda_{X_1, X_2}^S(f_1, f_2)$$

with absolute implicit constant.

Given the proposition above and the discussion that preceded it, the proof of Theorem D follows via (2.10) in §2.6. Similarly, the proof of Theorem E follows by the proposition above in combination with Lemma 2.9.2. We prove Proposition 7.1 at the end of this section.

Proof of Theorem G. The case $p = 1$ is a special case of Theorem E with $X_1 = X_2 = X$. The case $p = 2$ is dealt with next. By Lemma 2.9.1, it suffices to obtain a uniform estimate for atoms $m \in R_{2,1,J}^{\Xi}$, $J \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$. To this aim, if Ξ_m is the set defined within Lemma 2.9.3, an application of Proposition 7.1 with $X_1 = X, X_2 = L^2$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\substack{\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}^{O_{\Xi_m}} \\ \#\mathbb{Q} < \infty}} |\langle \mathbf{1}_{I_0} T_{\mathbb{Q}(3I_0)} f_1, f_2 \rangle| &\lesssim \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi_m) \mathcal{Z}^*(L^2, \Xi_m) \sup_{S \text{ sparse}} \Lambda_{X, L^2}^S(f_1, f_2) \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{J} \mathcal{Z}^{**}(X, \Xi) \sup_{S \text{ sparse}} \Lambda_{X, L^2}^S(f_1, f_2) \end{aligned}$$

and the $p = 2$ case of the theorem follows by taking advantage once more of Lemma 2.9.3.

The case $1 < p < 2$ is obtained by means of an interpolation argument of independent interest. While the exposition is tailored to this specific setting, the argument may easily be

formulated as an interpolation result for generic sparse bounds. Fixing a nonzero function $f_1 \in L_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, let \mathcal{E} be the union of the three canonical shifted dyadic grids on \mathbb{R} , see e.g. [45]. For $\theta \in [0, 1]$, referring to the notation in (2.12), and $g \in L_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ say, define

$$G_\theta[g](x, I) := \mathbf{1}_I(x) \langle f_1 \rangle_X \langle g \rangle_{X_\theta}, \quad (x, I) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{E},$$

$$\|g\|_{Y_\theta} := \left\| \|G_\theta[g](x, I)\|_{\ell^\infty(I \in \mathcal{E})} \right\|_{L^1(x \in \mathbb{R})}.$$

It is immediate to check that Y_θ is a Banach space norm for each $\theta \in [0, 1]$. Furthermore, the characterization of sparse bounds from e.g. [18, 38] tells us that

$$\sup_{\mathcal{S} \text{ sparse}} \mathcal{S}_{X, X_\theta}(f_1, g) \sim \|g\|_{Y_\theta}, \quad \theta \in [0, 1].$$

Theorems E and the $p = 2$ case just obtained can therefore be restated as estimates for the complex valued map $(m, g) \mapsto \Lambda(m, g) := \langle T_m f_1, g \rangle$

$$|\Lambda(m, g)| \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^{**}(X, \Xi)^{2-\theta} \|m\|_{R_{\frac{2}{2-\theta}, 1}^\Xi} \|g\|_{Y_\theta}$$

for $\theta = 0, 1$ respectively. Applying the bilinear complex interpolation theorem [25, Theorem 1.1], and recalling the well-known characterization of complex interpolates of Lorentz spaces [31] which in this particular case reads $[R_{1,1}^\Xi, R_{2,1}^\Xi]_\theta = R_{\frac{2}{2-\theta}, 1}^\Xi$, we obtain the estimate

$$|\Lambda(m, g)| \lesssim \mathcal{Z}^{**}(X, \Xi)^{2-\theta} \|m\|_{R_{\frac{2}{2-\theta}, 1}^\Xi} \|g\|_{Y_\theta}, \quad 0 < \theta < 1,$$

which is exactly the claim of the theorem for $p = \frac{2}{2-\theta}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 7.1. We begin by fixing a finite collection of tiles $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{P}^{O_\Xi}$ and a dyadic interval I_0 such that $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}(3I_0)$ and $\text{supp } f_i \subset 3I_0$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. We let \mathcal{D}_{n_0} denote the dyadic grid of the same generation as I_0 , namely $|I_0| = 2^{-n_0}$.

In order to facilitate the reader we recall some notation from the previous sections. Given a collection of intervals $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{D}$ and an interval $I \in \mathcal{S}$ we will consider *stopping collections* \mathcal{L}_I , indexed by the elements of \mathcal{S} , with the following properties

$$\mathcal{L}_I \subset \mathcal{D}(3I), \quad B_I =: \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}_I} L \subset 3I, \quad \mathcal{G}_I := \{G \in \mathcal{D}(I) : G \not\subset 3L \text{ for every } L \in \mathcal{L}_I\},$$

$$\mathbb{Q}(I) := \mathbb{Q}_G^{O_\Xi}(I) = \{P \in \mathbb{Q}^{O_\Xi}(I) : I_P \in \mathcal{G}_I\}, \quad \lambda_{i,I} := \lambda_{f_i, X_i} = \|f_i \mathbf{1}_{3I \setminus B_I}\|_\infty + \sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}_I} \inf_L M_{X_i} f_i.$$

We will construct a *sparse collection* $\mathcal{S} \subset \cup_{n \geq n_0} \mathcal{D}_n$ such that

$$\mathbb{Q} = \bigsqcup_{I \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{Q}(I), \quad \lambda_{i,I} \lesssim \langle f_i \rangle_{X_i, I}, \quad I \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Once this is done we can use Proposition 4.7 to complete the proof. Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle T_{\mathbb{Q}} f_1, f_2 \rangle| &\leq \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}} |\langle T_{\mathbb{Q}(I)} f_1, f_2 \rangle| \lesssim \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}} |I| \prod_{j=1}^2 \mathcal{Z}^*(X_j, \Xi) \lambda_{j,I} \\ &\lesssim \prod_{j=1}^2 \mathcal{Z}^*(X_j, \Xi) \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}} \langle f_1 \rangle_{X_{1,I}} \langle f_2 \rangle_{X_{2,I}} |I| \end{aligned}$$

as desired. It thus remains to construct the sparse family \mathcal{S} with the desired properties above.

This is done exactly as in [22, §6]. The construction is inductive, where we begin by setting $\mathcal{S}_0 = \mathcal{D}_{n_0}$. Then for $m \geq 1$ and for each $I \in \mathcal{S}_{m-1}$ we choose \mathcal{L}_I to denote the collection of maximal elements of the collection

$$J \in \mathcal{D}, \quad J \subseteq I, \quad J \in \bigcup_{j=1,2} \{J : \langle f_j \rangle_{J, X_j} > \Theta \langle f_j \rangle_{X_j, 3I}\}.$$

We then set

$$\mathcal{S}_m := \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{S}_{m-1}} \mathcal{L}_I, \quad \mathcal{S} := \bigcup_{m \geq 0} \mathcal{S}_m$$

and the desired properties can be verified as in [22, §6], inserting the bounds for the maximal functions M_{X_j} for $j \in \{1, 2\}$ in order to verify the sparseness condition. \square

8. WEIGHTED NORM INEQUALITIES

This section summarizes the weighted norm inequalities that can be derived from Theorems B, C, E and G, assuming either

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 < \varepsilon \leq 1} \varepsilon^{\frac{\tau}{2}} \mathcal{Z}^\star(L^{1+\varepsilon}, \Xi) &=: K^\star(\tau, \Xi) < \infty, \\ \sup_{0 < \varepsilon \leq 1} \varepsilon^{\frac{\tau}{2}} \mathcal{Z}^{\star\star}(L^{1+\varepsilon}, \Xi) &=: K^{\star\star}(\tau, \Xi) < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau > 0$ is a fixed growth order. These conditions are verified when Ξ is a lacunary set of order $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, see (1.15). For $1 < p < \infty$, the p -th dual of a weight w is the weight $\sigma := w^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}$. The standard characteristics

$$\begin{aligned} [w]_{A_p} &:= \sup_I \langle w \rangle_{1,I} \langle w^{-1} \rangle_{\frac{1}{p-1}, I}^{-1}, \quad 1 < p < \infty, \\ [w]_{A_1} &:= \sup_I \langle w \rangle_{1,I} \|w^{-1} \mathbf{1}_I\|_\infty^{-1}, \\ (8.1) \quad [w]_{A_\infty} &:= \sup_I \frac{\langle M(w \mathbf{1}_I) \rangle_{1,I}}{\langle w \rangle_{1,I}}, \\ [w]_{\text{RH}_s} &:= \sup_I \frac{\langle w \rangle_{s,I}}{\langle w \rangle_{1,I}}, \quad 1 < s < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

with the supremum in the definitions above being taken over all bounded intervals $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, are referred throughout this section. See e.g. [17] for a thorough review of their basic properties.

8.1. Main estimates. The first corollary contains weighted bounds for the Ξ -Marcinkiewicz square function H_Ξ . By virtue of the considerations in §2.6, analogous bounds can be proved for $H_{\Xi, m}$, with $m \in \text{HM}(\Xi)$.

Corollary B.2. *Let $1 < p < \infty$, $s \in \{p, \infty\}$. Referring to the square function H_Ξ defined in (1.10), the operator norm bounds*

$$(8.2) \quad \|H_\Xi\|_{L^p(w) \rightarrow L^{p,s}(w)} \lesssim_p K^\star(\tau, \Xi) [\sigma]_{A_{p'}}^{\frac{\tau}{2}} [w]_{A_p}^{\frac{1}{p}} \begin{cases} [\sigma]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{1}{p}} + [w]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{1}{p'}} & s = p, \\ [w]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{1}{p'}} & s = \infty, \end{cases}$$

hold with implicit constant depending on $1 < p < \infty$ only.

Remark 8.1.1. The case $s = p$ of (8.2) can be slightly improved to

$$(8.3) \quad \|H_{\Xi}\|_{L^p(w)} \lesssim_p K^{\star}(\tau, \Xi) [\sigma]_{A_{\infty}}^{\frac{\tau}{2}} [w]_{A_p}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left([\sigma]_{A_{\infty}}^{\frac{1}{p}} + [w]_{A_{\infty}}^{\frac{1}{p'}} \right), \quad 1 < p < \infty.$$

We chose to state (8.2) as the two cases may be given a unified proof. An argument for (8.3) is sketched at the end of §8.2.

Remark 8.1.2. As a further corollary, we obtain the less precise estimates

$$(8.4) \quad \|H_{\Xi}\|_{L^p(w)} \lesssim K^{\star}(\tau, \Xi) [w]_{A_p}^{\alpha(p, \tau)}, \quad \alpha(p, \tau) := \frac{\tau}{2(p-1)} + \max\left\{\frac{1}{p-1}, 1\right\},$$

$$(8.5) \quad \|H_{\Xi}\|_{L^p(w) \rightarrow L^{p, \infty}(w)} \lesssim K^{\star}(\tau, \Xi) [w]_{A_p}^{\beta(p, \tau)}, \quad \beta(p, \tau) := \frac{\tau}{2(p-1)} + 1.$$

When Ξ is lacunary set of order τ , estimate (8.4) was proved by Lerner [44, Theorem 1.1] for $\tau = 1$ and in [2, Eq. (4.3)] for $\tau \geq 2$. In these, it is also established that the exponent $\alpha(p, \tau)$ is sharp for $1 < p \leq 2$. Sharpness follows from the knowledge of the blowup rate $\|H_{\Xi}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \sim (p-1)^{-(\frac{\tau}{2}+1)}$ as $p \rightarrow 1^+$, see Bourgain's paper [8] for $\tau = 1$ and [2] for $\tau \geq 2$, together with an application of [48, Theorem 1.2]. The weak-type estimate (8.5) is new; of course, it is only relevant in the range $1 < p < 2$, being superseded by (8.4) otherwise; we cannot comment on its sharpness outside of the well known case $\tau = 0$.

The following corollary summarizes the weighted bounds for the smooth higher order square function G_{Ξ} , with Ξ as above.

Corollary C.2. *Referring to the square function G_{Ξ} defined in (1.13), the operator norm bounds*

$$\|G_{\Xi}\|_{L^p(w)} \lesssim K^{\star}(\tau, \Xi) \begin{cases} [w]_{A_p}^{\frac{1+\frac{\tau}{2}}{p-1}}, & 1 < p \leq 3, \\ [\sigma]_{A_{\infty}}^{\frac{\tau}{2}} [w]_{A_p}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left([w]_{A_{\infty}}^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}} + [\sigma]_{A_{\infty}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \right), & 3 \leq p < \infty, \end{cases}$$

hold with implicit constant depending on $1 < p < \infty$ only.

Remark 8.1.3. As in (8.4) we can conclude the following less precise estimate

$$\|G_{\Xi}\|_{L^p(w)} \lesssim K^{\star}(\tau, \Xi) [w]_{A_p}^{\alpha_1(p, \tau)}, \quad \alpha_1(p, \tau) := \frac{\tau}{2(p-1)} + \max\left(\frac{1}{p-1}, \frac{1}{2}\right).$$

When Ξ is a lacunary set of order $\tau \geq 0$, we have the blowup rate $\|G_{\Xi}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \sim (p-1)^{-(1+\frac{\tau}{2})}$ as $p \rightarrow 1^+$, see for example [3, §6.1.2], and an application of [48, Theorem 1.2] reveals that the exponent in estimate of Corollary C.2 for $1 < p \leq 3$ is sharp.

The next estimate is a corollary of Theorem E on Marcinkiewicz multipliers. An analogous estimate for Hörmander-Mihlin multipliers (1.2), with $K^{\star}(\tau, \Xi)$ replacing $K^{\star\star}(\tau, \Xi)$, may instead be deduced from Theorem D.

Corollary E.2. *Let m be a Marcinkiewicz, or equivalently, $R_{1,1}^{\Xi}$ multiplier, with singular set Ξ and $\|m\|_{R_{1,1}^{\Xi}} \leq 1$. Then*

$$(8.6) \quad \|T_m\|_{L^p(w)} \lesssim [K^{\star\star}(\tau, \Xi)]^2 [\sigma]_{A_{\infty}}^{\frac{\tau}{2}} [w]_{A_{\infty}}^{\frac{\tau}{2}} [w]_{A_p}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left([\sigma]_{A_{\infty}}^{\frac{1}{p}} + [w]_{A_{\infty}}^{\frac{1}{p'}} \right), \quad 1 < p < \infty.$$

Remark 8.1.4. Further estimate of the right hand side of (8.6) leads to the less precise bound

$$(8.7) \quad \|T_m\|_{L^p(w)} \lesssim [w]_{A_p}^{\gamma(p,\tau)}, \quad \gamma(p,\tau) := \frac{\tau p'}{2} + \max\left\{1, \frac{1}{p-1}\right\},$$

for $1 < p < \infty$: details are provided in §8.4. When Ξ is a first order lacunary set, for which $\tau = 1$, (8.7) coincides with the upper bound obtained by Lerner in [44, Theorem 1.2]. Interestingly, the approach of [44] is to forgo direct estimation of weighted norms of T_m , appealing instead to the weighted Chang-Wilson-Wolff inequality to reduce to a rough square function bound analogous to that of Corollary B.2. Our proof avoids the Chang-Wilson-Wolff inequality which may not be available for a generic set Ξ .

Finally, we turn to weighted estimates for the rougher classes $R_{\mu,1}^\Xi$, $1 < \mu \leq 2$.

Corollary G.1. *Let $1 \leq \mu \leq 2$. Let m be a $R_{\mu,1}^\Xi$ multiplier with singular set Ξ and $\|m\|_{R_{\mu,1}^\Xi} \leq 1$. Then*

$$\|T_m\|_{L^p(w)} \lesssim [K^{**}(\tau, \Xi)]^{\frac{2}{\mu}} \begin{cases} \left([w]_{A_p} [w]_{RH_{\frac{\mu}{\mu-p(\mu-1)}}} \right)^\beta & 1 < p < \mu', \\ [w]_{A_p}^\beta & \mu < p < \infty, \end{cases}$$

where the exponent $\beta = \beta(p, \mu, \tau)$ depends only on the indicated parameters and may be explicitly computed.

8.2. Proof of Corollary B.2. The proof hinges on the inequality

$$(8.8) \quad \|H_\Xi\|_{L^p(w) \rightarrow L^{p,s}(w)} \lesssim K^*(\tau, \Xi) \sup_{\mathcal{S} \text{ sparse}} \inf_{0 < \varepsilon \leq 1} \frac{\|\mathcal{S}_{1+\varepsilon,1}\|_{L^p(w) \rightarrow L^{p,s}(w)}}{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

for $1 < p < \infty$, $s \in \{p, \infty\}$, which is a consequence of Theorem B, with reference to the notation (2.2). The main steps are summarized in the upcoming two lemmas.

Lemma 8.2.1. *Let $1 < p < \infty$, $\sigma = w^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}$ be the p -th dual weight of w and*

$$\varepsilon(w, p) := \frac{1}{2^8 p [\sigma]_{A_{p'}}}.$$

There holds

$$\|\mathcal{S}_{1+\varepsilon(w,p), 1+\varepsilon(w,p)}\|_{L^p(w) \rightarrow L^{p,s}(w)} \lesssim_p [w]_{A_p}^{\frac{1}{p}} \begin{cases} [\sigma]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{1}{p}} + [w]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{1}{p}} & s = p, \\ [w]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{1}{p}} & s = \infty, \end{cases}$$

uniformly over the sparse collection \mathcal{S} .

Proof. For brevity write $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(w, p)$ and set $q = \frac{p}{1+\varepsilon}$. Then

$$\|\mathcal{S}_{1+\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon}\|_{L^p(w)} = \|\mathcal{S}_{1,1}\|_{L^q(w)}^{\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}}, \quad \|\mathcal{S}_{1+\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon}\|_{L^p(w) \rightarrow L^{p,\infty}(w)} = \|\mathcal{S}_{1,1}\|_{L^q(w) \rightarrow L^{q,\infty}(w)}^{\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}}.$$

The strong norm of $\mathcal{S}_{1,1}$ above is estimated via an appeal to [46, Theorem 1.2] and a subsequent use of the sharp reverse Hölder inequality of [32], where the latter motivates the definition of $\varepsilon(w, p)$. See [23, Section 7] for details of a similar computation. The weak norm of $\mathcal{S}_{1,1}$ is instead estimated by an appeal to [47, Theorem 1.2] and a similar usage of the reverse Hölder inequality. \square

Lemma 8.2.2. *For $1 < p < \infty, s \in \{p, \infty\}$ we have*

$$\|\mathcal{S}_{1+\varepsilon,1}\|_{L^p(w) \rightarrow L^{p,s}(w)} \lesssim_p [w]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}} \|\mathcal{S}_{1+\varepsilon,1+\varepsilon}\|_{L^p(w) \rightarrow L^{p,s}(w)}$$

with constant independent of $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$.

Proof. The norm control follows easily from the good- λ inequality

$$w(\{\mathcal{S}_{1+\varepsilon,1}f > 2\lambda, \mathcal{S}_{1+\varepsilon,1+\varepsilon}f \leq \gamma\lambda\}) \leq C \exp\left(-\delta \frac{\gamma^{-\frac{1+\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}}}{[w]_{A_\infty}}\right) w(\{\mathcal{S}_{1+\varepsilon,1}f > \lambda\})$$

with absolute constants $C, \delta > 0$, whose proof is a minor variation of [21, Theorem E], to which we send for details. \square

Combining (8.8) with Lemma 8.2.2 entails the control

$$(8.9) \quad \|\mathbb{H}_\Xi\|_{L^p(w) \rightarrow L^{p,s}(w)} \lesssim K^\star(\tau, \Xi) \varepsilon(w, p)^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} [w]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{\varepsilon(w,p)}{1+\varepsilon(w,p)}} \|\mathcal{S}_{1+\varepsilon(w,p),1+\varepsilon(w,p)}\|_{L^p(w) \rightarrow L^{p,s}(w)}.$$

However

$$[w]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{\varepsilon(w,p)}{1+\varepsilon(w,p)}} \leq [\sigma]_{A_{p'}}^{(p-1)\varepsilon(w,p)} = \exp\left(\frac{\log[\sigma]_{A_{p'}}}{2^8 p [\sigma]_{A_{p'}}}\right) \lesssim_p 1$$

and Corollary B.2 follows from (8.9) together with Lemma 8.2.1.

Proof of (8.3). An application of [46, Theorem 1.2] together with the sharp reverse Hölder inequality yield

$$(8.10) \quad \|\mathcal{S}_{1+\tilde{\varepsilon}(w,p),1+\tilde{\varepsilon}(w,p)}\|_{L^p(w)} \lesssim_p [w]_{A_p}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left([\sigma]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{1}{p}} + [w]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{1}{p}}\right), \quad \tilde{\varepsilon}(w, p) := \frac{1}{2^8 p [\sigma]_{A_\infty}},$$

and (8.3) is then a direct consequence of (8.9). \square

8.3. Proof of Corollary C.2. The relevant consequence of Theorem C is

$$(8.11) \quad \|\mathbb{G}_\Xi\|_{L^p(w)} \lesssim K^\star(\tau, \Xi) \sup_{\mathcal{S} \text{ sparse}} \inf_{0 < \varepsilon \leq 1} \frac{\|\mathcal{S}_{1+\varepsilon,2}\|_{L^p(w)}}{\varepsilon^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}}, \quad 1 < p < \infty,$$

with reference to the notation (2.2). Fix $p \geq 3$, let σ stand for the p -th dual of w and $\varepsilon = \tilde{\varepsilon}(w, p)$ as defined in (8.10). Then, uniformly over sparse collections \mathcal{S} ,

$$(8.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{S}_{1+\varepsilon,2}\|_{L^p(w)} &= \left\| \mathcal{S}_{1, \frac{2}{1+\varepsilon}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{p}{1+\varepsilon}}(w)}^{\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}} \lesssim_p [w]_{A_{\frac{p}{1+\varepsilon}}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left([w]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} + \left[\sigma^{1 + \frac{\varepsilon p}{p-(1+\varepsilon)}} \right]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{1}{p}} \right) \\ &\lesssim_p [w]_{A_p}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left([w]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} + [\sigma]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{1}{p}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used [37, Theorem 2.3] for the approximate inequality in the first line, and the sharp reverse Hölder property of σ to pass to the second line. Note that (8.12) yields the case $p \geq 3$ of the corollary in combination with (8.11). Specializing to $p = 3$ we get

$$\|\mathbb{G}_\Xi\|_{L^p(w)} \lesssim K^\star(\tau, \Xi) [w]_{A_p}^{\frac{1+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}{2}}$$

and the case $1 < p < 3$ is then obtained by sharp extrapolation theorems; see e.g. [24].

8.4. **Proof of Corollary E.2.** This time the starting point is the inequality

$$(8.13) \quad \|T_m\|_{L^p(w)} \lesssim [K^{**}(\tau, \Xi)]^2 \sup_{S \text{ sparse}} \inf_{0 < \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \leq 1} \frac{\left\| \Lambda_{1+\varepsilon_1, 1+\varepsilon_2}^S \right\|_{L^p(w) \times L^{p'}(\sigma)}}{(\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2)^{\frac{\tau}{2}}}$$

for $1 < p < \infty$, a consequence of Theorem E, with reference to the notation (2.3). Fix $1 < p < \infty$ and apply again [46, Theorem 1.2] together with two instances of the sharp reverse Hölder properties of σ and w , yielding

$$\left\| \Lambda_{1+\tilde{\varepsilon}_1, 1+\tilde{\varepsilon}_2}^S \right\|_{L^p(w) \times L^{p'}(\sigma)} \lesssim_p [w]_{A_p}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left([\sigma]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{1}{p}} + [w]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{1}{p'}} \right), \quad \tilde{\varepsilon}_1 := \frac{1}{2^8 p [\sigma]_{A_\infty}}, \quad \tilde{\varepsilon}_2 := \frac{1}{2^8 p' [w]_{A_\infty}}.$$

With these choices, estimate (8.6) follows by combining the estimate in the previous display with (8.13).

Proof of (8.7). First, let us argue for the case $1 < p \leq 2$. Starting from (8.6) in this particular range, estimate

$$(8.14) \quad \frac{\|T_m\|_{L^p(w)}}{[K^{**}(\tau, \Xi)]^2} \lesssim [\sigma]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{\tau}{2}} [w]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{\tau}{2}} [w]_{A_p}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left([\sigma]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{1}{p}} + [w]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{1}{p'}} \right) \lesssim [w]_{A_p}^{\frac{\frac{\tau}{2}+1}{p-1} + \frac{\tau}{2}}.$$

Now if $2 < p < \infty$, use duality to obtain

$$(8.15) \quad \|T_m\|_{L^p(w)} = \|T_m\|_{L^{p'}(\sigma)} \lesssim [K^{**}(\tau, \Xi)]^2 [\sigma]_{A_{p'}}^{\frac{\frac{\tau}{2}+1}{p-1} + \frac{\tau}{2}} = [K^{**}(\tau, \Xi)]^2 [w]_{A_p}^{\frac{\tau}{2}+1 + \frac{\tau}{2(p-1)}}.$$

Collecting (8.14) and (8.15) with some algebra results exactly into (8.7). \square

8.5. **Proof of Corollary G.1.** Let $m \in R_{\mu, 1}^\Xi$, $1 < \mu < 2$ of unit norm. It is best to argue separately for $1 < p < \mu'$ and $p > \mu$. In this proof, we apply the conventions that $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon)$ is a generic sublinear function of $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ and β is positive real exponent which are allowed to vary between occurrences. The exact forms of η and β are allowed to depend on p, μ and may be explicitly computed.

We begin with the first range. Applying Theorem G with $X = L^{1+\varepsilon}(0, 1)$ and computing the interpolation space $X_\mu := [X, L^2(0, 1)]_\theta$ in (2.12) for the value $\theta = \frac{2(\mu-1)}{\mu}$ leads to the inequality

$$(8.16) \quad \frac{\|T_m\|_{L^p(w)}}{[K^{**}(\tau, \Xi)]^{\frac{2}{\mu}}} \lesssim \sup_{S \text{ sparse}} \inf_{0 < \varepsilon \leq 1} \frac{\left\| \Lambda_{1+\varepsilon, \mu+\varepsilon\delta(\varepsilon, \mu)}^S \right\|_{L^p(w) \times L^{p'}(\sigma)}}{\varepsilon^{\frac{\tau}{\mu}}}, \quad \delta(\varepsilon, \mu) = \frac{\mu(2-\mu)}{1+\varepsilon(\mu-1)},$$

with reference to the notation (2.3). Applying [46, Theorem 1.2] leads to

$$\left\| \Lambda_{1+\varepsilon, \mu+\varepsilon\delta(\varepsilon, \mu)}^S \right\|_{L^p(w) \times L^{p'}(\sigma)} \lesssim \left[w^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-p(\mu-1)} + \eta(\varepsilon)} \right]_{A_{\frac{\mu'}{\mu'-p}(\mu-1)+1-\eta(\varepsilon)}}^\beta, \quad 0 < \varepsilon \leq 1.$$

Choosing now $\varepsilon = c[w^{\frac{\mu}{\mu-p(\mu-1)}}]_{A_\infty}^{-1}$ and using (8.16) leads via the reverse Hölder inequality to

$$\frac{\|T_m\|_{L^p(w)}}{[K^{**}(\tau, \Xi)]^{\frac{2}{\mu}}} \lesssim [w^v]_{A_\infty}^{\frac{\tau}{\mu}} [w^v]_{A_v}^\beta \lesssim [w^v]_{A_v}^\beta \lesssim ([w]_{A_p} [w]_{RH_v})^\beta$$

where

$$v(\mu, p) = \frac{\mu}{\mu - p(\mu - 1)}, \quad v(\mu, p) = \frac{\mu'}{\mu' - p}(p - 1) + 1,$$

and this completes the proof of the case $1 < p < \mu'$.

We turn to the range $p > \mu$. This time Theorem G is applied in adjoint form, leading to the inequality

$$\|T_m\|_{L^p(w)} \lesssim [K^{**}(\tau, \Xi)]^{\frac{2}{\mu}} \sup_{S \text{ sparse}} \inf_{0 < \varepsilon \leq 1} \frac{\|\Lambda_{\mu+\varepsilon\delta(\varepsilon, \mu), 1+\varepsilon}^S\|_{L^p(w) \times L^{p'}(\sigma)}}{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\mu}}}, \quad \delta(\varepsilon, \mu) = \frac{\mu(2-\mu)}{1+\varepsilon(\mu-1)}.$$

The claimed estimate is again a simple consequence of [46, Theorem 1.2] and of the reverse Hölder inequality, and we omit the details.

9. UPPER BOUNDS FOR $\mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi)$

This section contains the proofs of the leftmost upper bounds in Theorem A, Corollary B.1 eq. (1.11), and Corollary C.1 eq. (1.14). These share the same broad goal, which, up to easy algebra, corresponds to showing

$$(9.1) \quad \mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) \leq C \frac{1}{Y_X^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{CK}\right)},$$

where K is the corresponding maximal modular estimate in the assumption and $C \geq 1$ is an absolute constant which will be explicitly computed in each case. All arguments rely on the characterization

$$\mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) = \sup \left\{ \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [\mu\Xi]} |\widehat{f}(k)|^2} : \mu \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}, f = \sum_{|k| \leq N} \widehat{f}(k) \exp(2\pi i k \cdot) : \|f\|_X = 1, N \geq 1 \right\},$$

which is a simple consequence of duality, as well as upon the upcoming construction (9.2). Pick a nonnegative even Schwartz function ϕ with $\text{supp } \phi \subset [-1, 1]$, $\widehat{\phi}(0) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(x) dx = 1$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a fixed parameter to be chosen during each argument, and for each trigonometric polynomial f define

$$(9.2) \quad Pf(x) := \sum_{|k| \leq N} \widehat{f}(k) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi\left(\frac{\xi - k}{\varepsilon}\right) e^{2\pi i \xi x} \frac{d\xi}{\varepsilon}, \quad Qf(x) := \widehat{\phi}(\varepsilon x) Pf(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Notice that Pf, Qf are Schwartz functions. For further use, we claim the existence of a constant C depending on ε only, such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_X\left(\frac{|Qf|}{\lambda}\right) \leq C \int_{[0,1]} Y_X\left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda}\right)$$

uniformly over $\lambda > 0$. To verify this, notice the equality

$$Pf(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) e^{2\pi i t x} \phi\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) \frac{dt}{\varepsilon}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}$$

which in particular entails $|Pf| \leq |f|$, and exploit the rapid decay of $\widehat{\phi}(\varepsilon \cdot)$ at scale ε^{-1} . Furthermore, the equality

$$(9.3) \quad \widehat{Qf} = \sum_{|k| \leq N} \widehat{f}(k) \widetilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}, \quad \widetilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}(\xi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi\left(\frac{\xi - \zeta}{\varepsilon}\right) \phi\left(\frac{\zeta - k}{\varepsilon}\right) \frac{d\zeta}{\varepsilon^2}$$

holds, and we highlight the properties that $\widetilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}$ is nonnegative, supported in $(k - 4\varepsilon, k + 4\varepsilon)$, and has integral 1. This has in particular the consequence that $\widetilde{\phi}_{k,\varepsilon}(x) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ for $\varepsilon|x| \leq c$ for some absolute constant c .

9.1. Proof of the leftmost bounds in (1.11), (1.14). By virtue of the inequality

$$(9.4) \quad \sup_{\Xi' \subset \Xi} \sup_{\|m\|_{\text{HM}(\Xi')} \leq 1} [\text{H}_{\Xi',m}]_X \gtrsim \sup_{\Xi' \subset \Xi} [\text{G}_{\Xi'}]_X,$$

it suffices to present the argument for (1.14). For convenience, let K stand for the right hand side of (9.4). Fix a trigonometric polynomial f with $\|f\|_X = 1$ and $\widehat{f}(k) = 0$ for $|k| > N$. Fix also $\mu \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and define

$$A_j := \{k \in [\mu\Xi] : k \equiv j \pmod{4}, |k| \leq N\}, \quad j = 0, \dots, 3.$$

Fixing $j \in \{0, \dots, 3\}$ for the moment, let $a_1 < \dots < a_M$ be an ordering of A_j . The set $\mu\Xi \cap [a_m, a_m+1)$ is clearly nonempty for each $m = 1, \dots, M$, therefore $\xi_m := \max[\mu\Xi \cap [a_m, a_m+1))$ is well defined. Setting also $\zeta_m := \xi_m + \frac{1}{2}$, $\zeta_0 := -\infty$ it holds that

$$a_m \in (\zeta_{m-1}, \zeta_m), \quad \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(a_m, \zeta_m) < \frac{3}{2}, \quad \text{dist}(\zeta_{m-1}, \zeta_m) \geq 3 \quad m = 1, \dots, M.$$

If $Z = \{\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_M\}$, the above situation entails for each $m = 1, \dots, M$ the existence of an interval $\omega_m \in \mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{D}}(O_Z)$ with the property that the interval $(a_m - 2^{-9}, a_m + 2^{-9}) \subset \omega_m$, so that we may pick $\varphi_m \in c\Phi_{\omega_m}$ with the property that $\widehat{\varphi}_m = 1$ on $(a_m - 2^{-10}, a_m + 2^{-10})$. The latter choice, together with (9.3), entails the chain

$$|\text{T}_{\widehat{\varphi}_m}[Qf](x)| = |\widehat{f}(a_m)| \left| \int \widetilde{\phi}_{a_m,\varepsilon}(\xi) e^{2\pi i x \xi} d\xi \right| = |\widehat{f}(a_m)| \left| \widetilde{\phi}_{a_m,\varepsilon}(-x) \right| \geq \frac{1}{2} |\widehat{f}(a_m)|, \quad x \in [0, 1]$$

provided that ε is chosen small enough. We have achieved the key inequality

$$(9.5) \quad \text{G}_Z[Qf](x) \geq c \left(\sum_{m=1}^M |\text{T}_{\widehat{\varphi}_m}[Qf](x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq c \left(\sum_{k \in A_j} |\widehat{f}(k)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad x \in [0, 1]$$

while on the other hand by modulation invariance

$$[\text{G}_Z]_X \leq \sup_{\Xi' \subset \Xi} [\text{G}_{\Xi'}]_X = K.$$

Call λ the right hand side of (9.5). By virtue of (9.5) itself,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \leq |\{\text{G}_Z[Qf] > \lambda\}| &\leq K \int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_X \left(\frac{|Qf|}{\lambda} \right) \leq CK \int_{[0,1]} Y_X \left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda} \right) \\ &\leq CK Y_X \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right) \int_{[0,1]} Y_X(|f|) \leq CK Y_X \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the passage to the second line uses submultiplicativity and the last inequality exploits $\|f\|_X \leq 1$. Rearranging,

$$\lambda \leq Q(K), \quad Q(t) := \frac{1}{Y_X^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{Ct}\right)}$$

which, up to repeating the proof for all values of $j = 0, \dots, 3$, yields, with reference to (9.4),

$$\mathcal{Z}^*(X, \Xi) \leq 4Q(K)$$

which is a form of (9.1), and thus completes the proof of the leftmost estimate in (1.14).

9.2. Proof of the leftmost estimate of Theorem A. The proof uses the same tools and notation seen in the previous argument. In this proof,

$$K := \sup_{\|m\|_{\text{HM}(\Xi)} \leq 1} [T_m]_X.$$

Fix again a trigonometric polynomial f with $\|f\|_X = 1$, $\widehat{f}(k) = 0$ for $|k| > N$, and $\mu \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}$. For our purposes, it suffices to deal with those f with $\widehat{f}(k) \neq 0$ for at least one $k \in [\mu\Xi]$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ to be chosen momentarily and introduce the corresponding multiplier

$$m(\xi) := \sum_{k \in [\mu\Xi]} \eta_k \psi\left(\frac{\xi - k}{\varepsilon}\right), \quad \eta_k := \frac{\overline{\widehat{f}(k)}}{\left(\sum_{j \in [\mu\Xi]} |\widehat{f}(j)|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad k \in [\mu\Xi],$$

and $\psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ with the properties $\mathbf{1}_{[-4,4]} \leq \psi \leq \mathbf{1}_{[-6,6]}$. The condition on the support of ψ ensures that $\|m\|_{\text{HM}(\Xi)} \leq M$ for a fixed $M < \infty$ and

$$T_m[Qf](x) = \sum_{k \in [\mu\Xi]} \eta_k \widehat{f}(k) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \widetilde{\phi}_{\varepsilon,k}(\xi) e^{2\pi i \xi x} d\xi.$$

An easy computation shows that for $\varepsilon|x| \leq c$ we have

$$|T_m[Qf](x)| \geq \left(\sum_{k \in [\mu\Xi]} |\widehat{f}(k)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \inf_{k \in [\mu\Xi]} \left| \widetilde{\phi}_{\varepsilon,k}(x) \right| \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{k \in [\mu\Xi]} |\widehat{f}(k)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Therefore, choosing $\varepsilon \leq c$ and setting λ equal to the right hand side of the last display, we may argue in the previous section and achieve the inequality

$$1 \leq |\{|T_m[Qf]| > \lambda\}| \leq CKMY_X \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right).$$

The leftmost estimate in Theorem A then follows along the same exact lines.

10. A CHARACTERIZATION OF THE LITTLEWOOD-PALEY PROPERTY

For the proof of the characterization of the $\text{LP}(p)$ -property in terms of the maximal multi-scale Zygmund property, as stated in Theorem F, it will be useful to work with perturbations of a given sets of frequencies. Such definitions are standard in the literature, see [27, Definition 2.6]. We give below the appropriate version for the real line.

Definition 10.1 (Perturbations of LP-sets). Given a closed null set $\Xi \subset \mathbb{R}$ as above we will say that Ξ' is a *perturbation of Ξ* if for every $\omega \in \Omega_{\Xi'}$ there exist at most two intervals $\omega_-, \omega_+ \in \Omega_{\Xi}$ such that $\omega \subset \omega_- \cup \omega_+$ up to a set of measure zero.

Remark 10.1.1. It is easy to check that a perturbation of an $LP(p)$ -set is also a $LP(p)$ -set. Indeed, for each $\omega \in \Omega_{\Xi'}$ there holds

$$H_\omega = H_{\omega \cap \omega_-} + H_{\omega \cap \omega_+} = H_\omega \circ H_{\omega_-} + H_\omega \circ H_{\omega_+}$$

and our claim follows by $L^p(\ell^2)$ bound for the Hilbert transform.

Proof of Theorem F. Clearly $1. \Rightarrow 2.$ as \mathcal{Z}^{**} is a stronger version of \mathcal{Z}^* . The fact that $2. \Rightarrow 3.$ is a consequence of Theorem B applied with $X = L^p$ for any $p > q$. The sparse control of our theorem implies in particular that H_Ξ is bounded on L^p for any $p > q$. It remains to show that $3. \Rightarrow 1.$ For this note that any set $\{p_\omega : \omega \in \Omega\}$ with $p_\omega \in \overline{\omega}$ with one point per interval is a perturbation of Ξ . Hence, Remark 10.1.1 shows that $\tilde{\Omega} := \{p_\omega : \omega \in \Omega\}$ has the $LP(p)$ property for any $p > q$, and by scale invariance of the square function estimate (1.16) so does any rescaling of the form $\lambda \Xi$ with $\lambda > 0$. Applying Corollary B.1 with $X = L^p$ for any $p > q$ shows that $\mathcal{Z}^*(L^p, \{p_\omega : \omega \in \Omega\}) < +\infty$, uniformly over choices of points $p_\omega \in \overline{\omega}$ and this completes the proof of the theorem. \square

APPENDIX Z. SPARSE DOMINATION IMPLIES MODULAR INEQUALITIES

This appendix is devoted to the statement and proof of Proposition Z.1 below. We have appealed to this proposition to deduce Corollaries B.1 and D.1 from Theorems B and D respectively. Throughout the appendix, X is a local Orlicz space with Young function Y_X enjoying the B_p property as spelled out in Definition 1.1. We refer to (8.1) for the definitions of the characteristics of weights.

Proposition Z.1. *Let $1 \leq q < \infty$, $1 < p < q'$ and let X be a local Orlicz space with $B_p(X) \lesssim 1$. Referring to Definition 1.5, assume $\|T\|_{X,L^q} \lesssim 1$. Then, there exists a positive increasing function Q such that*

$$w(\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |Tf(x)| > \lambda\}) \leq Q\left([w]_{A_1}, [w]_{RH_{\frac{q}{q-p(q-1)}}}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_X\left(\frac{|f(x)|}{\lambda}\right) w(x) dx$$

uniformly over all weights w .

Remark Z.1.1. If $\|T\|_{X,L^q} \lesssim_q 1$ for all $1 < q < \infty$, and $B_p(X) \lesssim_p 1$ for some $1 < p < \infty$, the reverse Hölder property of A_1 weights, see [59, Chpt. 5, Prop. 3], may be also used to prove that

$$w(\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |Tf(x)| > \lambda\}) \leq \tilde{Q}([w]_{A_1}) \int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_X\left(\frac{|f(x)|}{\lambda}\right) w(x) dx,$$

where $\tilde{Q}(x) := Q(x, c(x))$ for a specific increasing function c , hence \tilde{Q} is positive increasing as well.

Z.2. Proof of Proposition Z.1. We will need two lemmas. The first one is proved exactly in the same way as the Fefferman-Stein theorem. The second one follows from the first via a simple layer cake argument which we omit. In both, f, λ are fixed and $\eta > 0$ is the sparsity constant.

$$H_\lambda := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : M_X f(x) > \lambda\}, \quad \widetilde{H}_\lambda := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : M\mathbf{1}_{H_\lambda}(x) > 2^{-4}\eta\}, \quad G_\lambda := \mathbb{R} \setminus H_\lambda.$$

Lemma Z.2.1. $w(\widetilde{H}_\lambda) \lesssim [w]_{A_1} w(H_\lambda) \lesssim [w]_{A_1}^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_X \left(\frac{|f(x)|}{\lambda} \right) w(x) dx$.

Lemma Z.2.2. $\|\mathbf{1}_{G_\lambda} M_X f\|_{L^p(w)} \lesssim [w]_{A_1}^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda [pB_p(X)^p]^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_X \left(\frac{|f(x)|}{\lambda} \right) w(x) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$.

We now come to the actual proof of the proposition. By virtue of Lemma Z.2.1, it suffices to prove the estimate

$$(Z.1) \quad w(F_\lambda) \lesssim \mathcal{Q} \left([w]_{A_1}, [w]_{\text{RH}_{\frac{q}{q-p(q-1)}}} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_X \left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda} \right) w, \quad F_\lambda := \left\{ x \in \widetilde{H}_\lambda^c : |Tf(x)| > \lambda \right\}.$$

The observation we will use in the sequel is the following. If I is any interval with $I \cap F_\lambda \neq \emptyset$, then $|I \cap H_\lambda| < 2^{-4}\eta|I|$. Therefore, if E_I is an η -major subset of such I , the set $E_I \cap G_\lambda$ is a $\frac{\eta}{2}$ -major subset of I as well. At this point, invoking the sparse domination with collection \mathcal{S} for the pair $(f, \theta w \mathbf{1}_{F_\lambda})$ for a suitably chosen unimodular function θ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda w(F_\lambda) &\leq \langle Tf, \theta w \mathbf{1}_{F_\lambda} \rangle \lesssim \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}} |I| \langle f \rangle_{X,I} \langle w \mathbf{1}_{F_\lambda} \rangle_{q,I} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \cap F_\lambda \neq \emptyset}} |I| \langle f \rangle_{X,I} \langle w \mathbf{1}_{F_\lambda} \rangle_{q,I} \lesssim \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}} |E_I \cap G_\lambda| \langle f \rangle_{X,I} \langle w \mathbf{1}_{F_\lambda} \rangle_{q,I} \\ &\leq \int_{G_\lambda} M_X f M_q(w \mathbf{1}_{F_\lambda}) = \int_{G_\lambda} \left[w^{\frac{1}{p}} M_X f \right] \left[M_q(w \mathbf{1}_{F_\lambda}) w^{-\frac{1}{p}} \right] \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{1}_{G_\lambda} M_X f\|_{L^p(w)} \|M_q(w \mathbf{1}_{F_\lambda})\|_{L^{p'}(w^{1-p'})} \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{Q} \left([w]_{A_1}, [w]_{\text{RH}_{\frac{q}{q-p(q-1)}}} \right) \lambda \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} Y_X \left(\frac{|f(x)|}{\lambda} \right) w(x) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} (w(F_\lambda))^{\frac{1}{p'}} \end{aligned}$$

and this completes the proof of (Z.1). In the passage to the last line we have used Lemma Z.2.2 and the well known weighted estimate

$$\|M_q\|_{L^{p'}(w^{1-p'})} \lesssim \widetilde{\mathcal{Q}} \left([w^{1-p'}]_{A_{\frac{p'}{q}}} \right) \sim \mathcal{Q} \left([w]_{A_p}, [w]_{\text{RH}_{\frac{q}{q-p(q-1)}}} \right),$$

where $\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ is a positive increasing function; see [33] for the last equivalence.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Accomazzo, F. Di Plinio, P. Hagelstein, I. Parissis, and L. Roncal, *Directional square functions*, Anal. PDE **16** (2023), no. 7, 1651–1699. MR4644118 ↑14
- [2] O. Bakas, *Sharp asymptotic estimates for a class of Littlewood-Paley operators*, Studia Math. **260** (2021), no. 2, 195–206. MR4289669 ↑42

- [3] O. Bakas, V. Ciccone, I. Parissis, and M. Vitturi, *Endpoint estimates for higher order marcinkiewicz multipliers* (2024), available at [2401.06083](#). ↑[3](#), [5](#), [8](#), [9](#), [16](#), [42](#)
- [4] D. Beltran and L. Cladek, *Sparse bounds for pseudodifferential operators*, J. Anal. Math. **140** (2020), no. 1, 89–116. MR[4094458](#) ↑[5](#)
- [5] F. Bernicot, *Multi-frequency Calderón-Zygmund analysis and connexion to Bochner-Riesz multipliers*, Harmonic analysis and partial differential equations, 2014, pp. 29–43. MR[3204855](#) ↑[8](#)
- [6] F. Bernicot, D. Frey, and S. Petermichl, *Sharp weighted norm estimates beyond Calderón-Zygmund theory*, Anal. PDE **9** (2016), no. 5, 1079–1113. MR[3531367](#) ↑[5](#)
- [7] A. Bonami, *Étude des coefficients de Fourier des fonctions de $L^p(G)$* , Ann. Inst. Fourier **20** (1970), no. 2, 335–402. ↑[9](#)
- [8] J. Bourgain, *On the behavior of the constant in the Littlewood-Paley inequality*, Geometric aspects of functional analysis (1987–88), 1989, pp. 202–208. MR[1008724](#) ↑[42](#)
- [9] J. Bourgain, *Sidon sets and Riesz products*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **35** (1985), no. 1, 137–148. MR[781783](#) ↑[10](#)
- [10] J. Bourgain, *Λ_p -sets in analysis: results, problems and related aspects*, Handbook of the geometry of Banach spaces, Vol. I, 2001, pp. 195–232. MR[1863693](#) ↑[3](#)
- [11] G. Brocchi, *A sparse quadratic $T(1)$ theorem*, New York J. Math. **26** (2020), 1232–1272. MR[4170148](#) ↑[8](#)
- [12] W. Chen, A. Culiuc, F. Di Plinio, M. Lacey, and Y. Ou, *Endpoint sparse bounds for Walsh-Fourier multipliers of Marcinkiewicz type*, arXiv e-prints (May 2018), arXiv:1805.06060, available at [1805.06060](#). ↑[8](#), [9](#), [16](#), [25](#)
- [13] R. Coifman, J. L. Rubio de Francia, and S. Semmes, *Multiplicateurs de Fourier de $L^p(\mathbf{R})$ et estimations quadratiques*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **306** (1988), no. 8, 351–354. MR[934617](#) ↑[8](#), [16](#)
- [14] J. M. Conde-Alonso, A. Culiuc, F. Di Plinio, and Y. Ou, *A sparse domination principle for rough singular integrals*, Anal. PDE **10** (2017), no. 5, 1255–1284. MR[3668591](#) ↑[5](#)
- [15] J. M. Conde-Alonso, F. Di Plinio, I. Parissis, and M. N. Vempati, *A metric approach to sparse domination*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **201** (2022), no. 4, 1639–1675. MR[4454372](#) ↑[5](#), [25](#)
- [16] J. M. Conde-Alonso and G. Rey, *A pointwise estimate for positive dyadic shifts and some applications*, Math. Ann. **365** (2016), no. 3–4, 1111–1135. MR[3521084](#) ↑[35](#), [37](#)
- [17] D. V. 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. MR[2797562](#) ↑[39](#), [41](#)
- [18] A. Culiuc, F. Di Plinio, and Y. Ou, *A sparse estimate for multisublinear forms involving vector-valued maximal functions*, Bruno Pini Mathematical Analysis Seminar 2017, 2017, pp. 168–184. MR[3893587](#) ↑[40](#)
- [19] A. Culiuc, F. Di Plinio, and Y. Ou, *Domination of multilinear singular integrals by positive sparse forms*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **98** (2018), no. 2, 369–392. MR[3873113](#) ↑[5](#)
- [20] C. Demeter, M. T. Lacey, T. Tao, and C. Thiele, *Breaking the duality in the return times theorem*, Duke Math. J. **143** (2008), no. 2, 281–355. MR[2420509](#) ↑[18](#)
- [21] F. Di Plinio, M. Flórez-Amatriain, I. Parissis, and L. Roncal, *Pointwise localization and sharp weighted bounds for Rubio de Francia square functions*, arXiv e-prints (August 2023), arXiv:2308.01442, available at [2308.01442](#). ↑[15](#), [36](#), [37](#), [38](#), [44](#)
- [22] F. Di Plinio and A. Fragkos, *The weak-type Carleson theorem via wave packet estimates* (2022), available at [2204.08051](#). ↑[15](#), [41](#)
- [23] F. Di Plinio, T. P. Hytönen, and K. Li, *Sparse bounds for maximal rough singular integrals via the Fourier transform*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **70** (2020), no. 5, 1871–1902. MR[4245601](#) ↑[43](#)
- [24] J. Duoandikoetxea, *Extrapolation of weights revisited: new proofs and sharp bounds*, J. Funct. Anal. **260** (2011), no. 6, 1886–1901. MR[2754896](#) ↑[44](#)
- [25] L. Grafakos and M. Mastyło, *Analytic families of multilinear operators*, Nonlinear Anal. **107** (2014), 47–62. MR[3215473](#) ↑[40](#)
- [26] C. C. Graham and K. E. Hare, *Interpolation and Sidon sets for compact groups*, CMS Books in Mathematics/Ouvrages de Mathématiques de la SMC, Springer, New York, 2013. MR[3025283](#) ↑[10](#)
- [27] K. E. Hare and I. Klemes, *Properties of Littlewood-Paley sets*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **105** (1989), no. 3, 485–494. MR[985685](#) ↑[10](#), [48](#)

- [28] K. E. Hare and I. Klemes, *A new type of Littlewood-Paley partition*, Ark. Mat. **30** (1992), no. 2, 297–309. MR1289757 ↑10
- [29] K. E. Hare and I. Klemes, *On permutations of lacunary intervals*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **347** (1995), no. 10, 4105–4127. MR1308014 ↑11
- [30] P. Harjulehto and P. Hästö, *Orlicz spaces and generalized Orlicz spaces*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 2236, Springer, Cham, 2019. MR3931352 ↑18
- [31] E. Hernández and J. Soria, *Spaces of Lorentz type and complex interpolation*, Ark. Mat. **29** (1991), no. 2, 203–220. MR1150373 ↑40
- [32] T. Hytönen, C. Pérez, and E. Rela, *Sharp reverse Hölder property for A_∞ weights on spaces of homogeneous type*, J. Funct. Anal. **263** (2012), no. 12, 3883–3899. MR2990061 ↑43
- [33] S. Indratno, D. Maldonado, and S. Silwal, *A visual formalism for weights satisfying reverse inequalities*, Expo. Math. **33** (2015), no. 1, 1–29. MR3310925 ↑50
- [34] M. Lacey and C. Thiele, *L^p estimates on the bilinear Hilbert transform for $2 < p < \infty$* , Ann. of Math. (2) **146** (1997), no. 3, 693–724. MR1491450 ↑15, 18
- [35] M. T. Lacey, *An elementary proof of the A_2 bound*, Israel J. Math. **217** (2017), no. 1, 181–195. MR3625108 ↑8
- [36] M. T. Lacey, *Sparse bounds for spherical maximal functions*, J. Anal. Math. **139** (2019), no. 2, 613–635. MR4041115 ↑5
- [37] M. T. Lacey and K. Li, *On A_p - A_∞ type estimates for square functions*, Math. Z. **284** (2016), no. 3-4, 1211–1222. MR3563275 ↑44
- [38] M. T. Lacey and D. Mena Arias, *The sparse $T1$ theorem*, Houston J. Math. **43** (2017), no. 1, 111–127. MR3647935 ↑40
- [39] M. T. Lacey and C. Thiele, *A proof of boundedness of the Carleson operator*, Math. Res. Lett. **7** (2000), no. 4, 361–370. MR1783613 ↑15
- [40] V. Lebedev and A. Olevskii, *Idempotents of Fourier multiplier algebra*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **4** (1994), no. 5, 539–544. MR1296567 ↑11
- [41] A. K. Lerner, *Sharp weighted norm inequalities for Littlewood-Paley operators and singular integrals*, Adv. Math. **226** (2011), no. 5, 3912–3926. MR2770437 ↑5
- [42] A. K. Lerner, *Sharp weighted norm inequalities for Littlewood-Paley operators and singular integrals*, Adv. Math. **226** (2011), no. 5, 3912–3926. MR2770437 ↑7
- [43] A. K. Lerner, *On an estimate of Calderón-Zygmund operators by dyadic positive operators*, J. Anal. Math. **121** (2013), 141–161. MR3127380 ↑5, 8
- [44] A. K. Lerner, *Quantitative weighted estimates for the Littlewood-Paley square function and Marcinkiewicz multipliers*, Math. Res. Lett. **26** (2019), no. 2, 537–556. MR3999554 ↑9, 42, 43
- [45] A. K. Lerner and F. Nazarov, *Intuitive dyadic calculus: the basics*, Expo. Math. **37** (2019), no. 3, 225–265. MR4007575 ↑13, 39, 40
- [46] K. Li, *Two weight inequalities for bilinear forms*, Collect. Math. **68** (2017), no. 1, 129–144. MR3591468 ↑43, 44, 45, 46
- [47] K. Li and W. Sun, *Weak and strong type weighted estimates for multilinear Calderón-Zygmund operators*, Adv. Math. **254** (2014), 736–771. MR3161113 ↑43
- [48] T. Luque, C. Pérez, and E. Rela, *Optimal exponents in weighted estimates without examples*, Math. Res. Lett. **22** (2015), no. 1, 183–201. MR3342184 ↑7, 42
- [49] M. B. Marcus and G. Pisier, *Random Fourier series with applications to harmonic analysis*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, vol. No. 101, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ; University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1981. MR630532 ↑10
- [50] C. Muscalu, T. Tao, and C. Thiele, *Uniform estimates on multi-linear operators with modulation symmetry*, J. Anal. Math. **88** (2002), 255–309. Dedicated to the memory of Tom Wolff. MR1979774 ↑19
- [51] J. Parcet and K. M. Rogers, *Directional maximal operators and lacunarity in higher dimensions*, Amer. J. Math. **137** (2015), no. 6, 1535–1557. MR3432267 ↑8
- [52] C. Pérez, *On sufficient conditions for the boundedness of the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator between weighted L^p -spaces with different weights*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **71** (1995), no. 1, 135–157. MR1327936 ↑2, 39

- [53] G. Pisier, *Ensembles de Sidon et processus gaussiens*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B **286** (1978), no. 15, A671–A674. MR511046 ↑10
- [54] G. Pisier, *Arithmetic characterizations of Sidon sets*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **8** (1983), no. 1, 87–89. MR682829 ↑10
- [55] H. P. Rosenthal, *Projections onto translation-invariant subspaces of $L^p(G)$* , Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **63** (1966), 84. MR211198 ↑11
- [56] W. Rudin, *Trigonometric series with gaps*, J. Math. Mech. **9** (1960), 203–227. MR116177 ↑3, 10
- [57] W. Rudin, *Projections on invariant subspaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **13** (1962), 429–432. MR138012 ↑11
- [58] P. Sjögren and P. Sjölin, *Littlewood-Paley decompositions and Fourier multipliers with singularities on certain sets*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **31** (1981), no. 1, vii, 157–175. MR613033 ↑8, 10
- [59] E. M. Stein, *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, Princeton Mathematical Series, vol. 43, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993. With the assistance of Timothy S. Murphy, Monographs in Harmonic Analysis, III. MR1232192 ↑49
- [60] T. Tao and J. Wright, *Endpoint multiplier theorems of Marcinkiewicz type*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **17** (2001), no. 3, 521–558. MR1900894 ↑4, 5, 8, 9, 16
- [61] J. M. Wilson, *Weighted norm inequalities for the continuous square function*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **314** (1989), no. 2, 661–692. MR972707 ↑6
- [62] M. Wilson, *Weighted Littlewood-Paley theory and exponential-square integrability*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1924, Springer, Berlin, 2008. MR2359017 ↑2
- [63] A. Zygmund, *On the convergence of lacunary trigonometric series*, Fundam. Math. **16** (1930), 90–107. ↑9
- [64] A. Zygmund, *Trigonometric series. Volumes I and II combined. With a foreword by Robert Fefferman*, 3rd ed., Camb. Math. Libr., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. ↑9

(O. Bakas) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF PATRAS,
26504 PATRAS, GREECE
Email address: obakas@upatras.gr

(V. Ciccone) HAUSDORFF CENTER FOR MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITÄT BONN,
ENDENICHER ALLEE 60, 53115 BONN, GERMANY
Email address: ciccone@math.uni-bonn.de

(F. Di Plinio) DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA E APPLICAZIONI, UNIVERSITÀ DI NAPOLI,
VIA CINTIA, MONTE S. ANGELO 80126 NAPOLI, ITALY
Email address: francesco.diplinio@unina.it

(M. Fraccaroli) BCAM - BASQUE CENTER FOR APPLIED MATHEMATICS,
ALAMEDA DE MAZARREDO 14, E48009 BILBAO, BASQUE COUNTRY, SPAIN.
Email address: mfraccaroli@bcamath.org

(I. Parissis) DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD DEL PAÍS VASCO, APTDO. 644, 48080 BILBAO, SPAIN
AND IKERBASQUE, BASQUE FOUNDATION FOR SCIENCE, BILBAO, SPAIN
Email address: ioannis.parissis@ehu.eus

(M. Vitturi) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE CORK,
WESTERN GATEWAY BUILDING, WESTERN ROAD, CORK, IRELAND
Email address: marco.vitturi@ucc.ie