

LOWER BOUNDS FOR DYADIC SQUARE FUNCTIONS OF INDICATOR FUNCTIONS OF SETS

NATANAEL ALPAY AND PAATA IVANISVILI

ABSTRACT. We prove that for any Borel measurable subset $A \subset [0, 1]$, the inequality $\|S_2(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_1 \geq I(|A|)$ holds, where I denotes the Gaussian isoperimetric profile. This improves upon the classical lower bound $\|S_2(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_1 \gtrsim |A|(1 - |A|)$ by a factor of $\sqrt{\log \frac{1}{|A|(1 - |A|)}}$. In addition, we study lower bounds for the α -norm of $S_1(\mathbb{1}_A)$, and we obtain a threshold behavior around $\alpha = 1$. We show that

$$\|S_1(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_1 \geq \min\{|A|, 1 - |A|\} \log_2 \frac{1}{\min\{|A|, 1 - |A|\}},$$

and that this bound is sharp at points $|A| = 2^{-k}$ or $|A| = 1 - 2^{-k}$ for every nonnegative integer k . For each fixed $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we further establish that $\|S_1(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_\alpha \geq \min\{|A|, 1 - |A|\}$, with the decay rate $|A|$, as $|A| \rightarrow 0$, being optimal.

2020 AMS Classification: 46B09, 60E15, 05C35, 65G30.

Keywords: isoperimetric inequality, square functions, dyadic martingales, bellman functions, indicator functions, endpoint inequality.

1. INTRODUCTION AND THE MAIN RESULTS

Let $([0, 1], \mathcal{B}, dx)$ be the probability space, where \mathcal{B} is the Borel σ -algebra, and dx is the Lebesgue measure. For each $n \geq 0$ we denote by \mathcal{D}_n dyadic intervals belonging to $[0, 1]$ of level n , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{D}_n = \left\{ \left[\frac{k}{2^n}, \frac{k+1}{2^n} \right), \quad k = 0, \dots, 2^n - 1 \right\}.$$

Let $\{[0, 1], \emptyset\} = \mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}_1 \subset \dots$ be the sequence of increasing family of filtrations, i.e., σ -algebras generated by the dyadic intervals \mathcal{D}_n , and let $\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{F}_n$. Let us also introduce a symbol D_n denoting dyadic numbers of level n , i.e., $D_n = \{k/2^n, k = 0, \dots, 2^n\}$, and set and $D = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} D_n$. For any $f \in L^1[0, 1]$, and any interval $I \subset [0, 1]$ we set

$$\langle f \rangle_I = \frac{1}{|I|} \int_I f(y) dy,$$

where $|I|$ denotes the Lebesgue length of the interval. Given $f \in L^1[0, 1]$, the sequence $\{f_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, where

$$f_n = \mathbb{E}(f|\mathcal{F}_n) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbb{1}_I(x) \langle f \rangle_I$$

is called the dyadic martingale generated by f . Clearly $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = f$ a.e. We say that $\{f_n\}$ is a simple martingale (also called Paley–Walsh martingale [8]) if $f_N = f_{N+1} = \dots$ after some large N . In what follows we will be working only with simple martingales to avoid issues with convergence of infinity series. Define $\{d_n\}_{n \geq 1}$, where $d_n := f_n - f_{n-1}$, to be the martingale difference sequence. Next we define the quadratic variation (Square function)

$$S_2(f) = \sqrt{\sum_{n \geq 1} d_n^2}.$$

In this paper we will be also concerned with β -variations $S_\beta(f)$, $\beta \geq 1$, defined as follows

$$S_\beta(f) = \left(\sum_{n \geq 1} |d_n|^\beta \right)^{1/\beta}.$$

The celebrated Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality states that the L_p norm of the square function $S_2(f)$ is comparable to L_p norm of f for all p , $1 < p < \infty$ (see [1], [2]). For conditionally symmetric martingales, in particular dyadic martingales, we have better bounds (see [5], [6], [7] and references therein): there exist universal constants $0 < c, C < \infty$ such that

$$(1.1) \quad c \frac{\sqrt{p}}{p+1} \|f - \mathbb{E}f\|_p \stackrel{0 < p < \infty}{\leq} \|S_2(f)\|_p \stackrel{1 < p < \infty}{\leq} C \frac{p^{3/2}}{p-1} \|f - \mathbb{E}f\|_p$$

holds for all $f \in L^p([0, 1])$ (here $\mathbb{E}f = \int_0^1 f$). The endpoint behavior of the constants in (1.1) are sharp for general dyadic martingales.

In this paper we will be concerned with the lower bounds on $\|S_2(f)\|_1$ and $\|S_1(f)\|_1$ in the case when f is an indicator function of a set, i.e., $f = \mathbb{1}_A$ for some $A \subset [0, 1]$. Applying (1.1) to $f(x) = \mathbb{1}_A(x)$ we obtain

$$\|S_2(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_1 \geq C|A|^*$$

with some universal constant $C > 0$, where

$$|A|^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{|A|, 1 - |A|\} \asymp |A|(1 - |A|).$$

Here the symbol $f \asymp g$ means that there exist two universal constants $c, C > 0$ such that $c \leq \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} \leq C$. Our first main result is the following

Theorem 1.1. *For any $A \in \mathcal{D}$ we have*

$$\|S_2(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_1 \geq C|A|^* \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{|A|^*}}.$$

In fact we will show that $\|S_2(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_1 \geq I(|A|)$, where $I(x)$ is the Gaussian isoperimetric profile

$$I(x) = \Phi'(\Phi^{-1}(x)), \quad \text{where} \quad \Phi(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \frac{e^{-t^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dt.$$

It is a technical calculation to verify (see also [9]) that

$$I(x) \asymp x^* \sqrt{\log(1/x^*)}.$$

Remark 1.2. It was proved in [9] that $I(x)$ is the maximal among all non-negative continuous functions on $[0, 1]$ satisfying $I(0) = I(1) = 0$ and

$$(1.2) \quad I\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{I^2(x) + \left|\frac{x-y}{2}\right|^2} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{I^2(y) + \left|\frac{x-y}{2}\right|^2}$$

holds for all $x, y \in [0, 1]$ (see Section 1.1) for more details).

Fix some parameters (α, β) such that $\beta \geq 1 \geq \alpha > 0$.

Definition 1.3. Let $B(x) = B_{\alpha, \beta}(x)$ be the pointwise maximal non-negative continuous function on $[0, 1]$, satisfying the following two-point inequality

$$(1.3) \quad B^\alpha\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(B^\beta(x) + \left|\frac{x-y}{2}\right|^\beta \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} + \frac{1}{2} \left(B^\beta(y) + \left|\frac{x-y}{2}\right|^\beta \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}$$

for all $x, y \in [0, 1]$, and having the boundary condition $B(0) = B(1) = 0$.

By a beautiful theorem of Bobkov mentioned in Remark 1.2 we have $B_{1,2}(x) = I(x)$.

Theorem 1.4. For all pairs (α, β) with $\beta \geq 1 \geq \alpha > 0$ we have

$$(1.4) \quad \|S_\beta(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_\alpha \geq B_{\alpha, \beta}(|A|).$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{D}$.

Remark 1.5. The conclusion of Theorem 1.4 holds with any $\tilde{B}_{\alpha, \beta}$ satisfying the obstacle condition $\tilde{B}_{\alpha, \beta}(0) = \tilde{B}_{\alpha, \beta}(1) = 0$, and two-point inequality 1.3.

It turns out that Theorem 1.4 is sharp for the pair $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 1)$.

Theorem 1.6. We have

$$(1.5) \quad \inf_{A \in \mathcal{D}, |A|=x} \|S_1(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_1 = B_{1,1}(x)$$

for all $x \in D$.

The function $B_{1,1}(x)$, unlike $B_{1,2}(x) = I(x)$, is not differentiable on $(0, 1)$. We will see that $B_{1,1}$ has a fractal like structure, i.e., it will satisfy the functional equation $B_{1,1}(x) + x = 2B_{1,1}(x/2)$. We will also see that

$$B_{1,1}(x) \geq x^* \log_2 \frac{1}{x^*} \quad \text{for all } x \in [0, 1]$$




FIGURE 1. $B_{1,1}$ and $x^* \log_2(1/x^*)$.

with equality whenever $x = 2^{-k}$ or $x = 1 - 2^{-k}$ for any nonnegative integer $k \geq 0$, see Figure 1.

The next theorem gives explicit description of $B_{1,1}(x)$ and its regularity properties. For any integer $n \geq 0$, let $s(n)$ be the sum of 1's in the binary representation of n .

For any integer $k \geq 0$, set

$$(1.6) \quad F(k) = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} s(j)$$

and let $F(0) = 0$. Define the sequence of functions $B_n : D_n \mapsto [0, \infty)$ as follows

$$(1.7) \quad B_n(x) = nx - \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} F(x2^n),$$

where we recall $D_n = \{\frac{k}{2^n}, k = 0, \dots, 2^n\}$. We will see that $B_{n+1}|_{D_n} = B_n$ for all $n \geq 1$.

Theorem 1.7. *We have*

- (i) *For any $x \in D$ the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} B_n(x)$ exists and is denoted by $P(x)$.*
- (ii) *The limit $P : D \mapsto [0, \infty)$ is the pointwise maximal function defined on D satisfying $P(0) = P(1) = 0$, and the two-point inequality (1.3) with $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 1)$.*
- (iii) *There exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$|P(x) - P(y)| \leq C|x - y| \log \left(\frac{1}{|x - y|} \right)$$

for all $x, y \in D$ with $|x - y| < \frac{1}{2}$.

- (iv) For all $x \in D$ we have $P(x) = P(1 - x)$ and $P(x) + x = 2P(x/2)$.
 (v) For all $x \in D$ we have

$$P(x) \geq x^* \log_2(1/x^*)$$

with equality¹ at points $x = 2^{-k}$ and $x = 1 - 2^{-k}$ for all nonnegative integers k .

- (vi) We have $B_{1,1}|_D = P$, and $B_{1,1}$ satisfies (iii), (iv), and (v) for all $x \in [0, 1]$.

In the next theorem for each fixed $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we obtain lower bounds on $\|S_1(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_\alpha$ which are sharp (up to a constant factor).

Theorem 1.8. For each $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$\|S_1(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_\alpha \geq |A|^*$$

holds for any $A \in \mathcal{D}$. Moreover for each $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ there exists a constant $C_\alpha > 0$ and a sequence of sets $A_j \in \mathcal{D}$ with nonzero measure such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |A_j| = 0$ and $\|S_1(\mathbb{1}_{A_j})\|_\alpha \leq C_\alpha |A_j|$.

Comparing theorems 1.6 and 1.8 we see that the sharp lower bounds on $\|S_1(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_\alpha$ are $|A| \log(1/|A|)$ and $|A|$ (assuming $|A| \leq 1/2$) when $\alpha = 1$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ correspondingly. Surprisingly there is no such a threshold in the case of discrete gradient on the hypercube which we discuss in the next section.

The next section does not contain any new theorems. Its purpose is (which also served as our original motivation for this project) to describe similarities and differences between lower bounds of a discrete gradient of boolean functions on the hypercube (so called “edge isoperimetric inequalities”) and the dyadic square functions of an indicator functions of sets.

1.1. Discrete gradient on the hypercube. Another way to model dyadic martingales is through the hypercube. Let $n \geq 1$, and consider the n -dimensional hypercube $\{-1, 1\}^n$ equipped with uniform probability measure. Let x_1, \dots, x_n be independent identically distributed Bernoulli symmetric ± 1 random variables. Set $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \{-1, 1\}^n$. For any $f : \{-1, 1\}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, the sequence

$$\begin{aligned} f_0 &= \mathbb{E}f(x); \\ f_1(\varepsilon_1) &= \mathbb{E}(f(x)|x_1 = \varepsilon_1); \\ f_2(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) &= \mathbb{E}(f(x)|x_1 = \varepsilon_1, x_2 = \varepsilon_2); \\ &\dots \\ f_n(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n) &= \mathbb{E}(f(x)|x_1 = \varepsilon_1, \dots, x_n = \varepsilon_n) = f(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n). \end{aligned}$$

¹Recall that $x^* = \min\{x, 1 - x\}$

defines a dyadic martingale $\{f_k\}_{k=0}^n$. Notice that here

$$\begin{aligned} f_0 &= \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_n = \pm 1} f(x_1, \dots, x_n), \\ f_1(\varepsilon_1) &= \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \sum_{x_2, \dots, x_n = \pm 1} f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), \\ &\dots \\ f_{n-1}(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{n-1}) &= \frac{f(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{n-1}, 1) + f(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{n-1}, -1)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we define discrete derivatives. For each $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we set

$$D_j f(x) = \frac{f(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_j, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n) - f(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, -x_j, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n)}{2}.$$

Let $\nabla f(x) = (D_1 f(x), \dots, D_n f(x))$, and for each $\beta \geq 1$ set β - gradient to be defined as

$$|\nabla f|_\beta(x) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |D_j f(x)|^\beta \right)^{1/\beta}.$$

In general the functions $S_\beta(f)$ and $|\nabla f|_\beta$ are not comparable. One may ask: how different are they? Let us make couple of observations.

1. If f is boolean, i.e., $f(x) = \mathbb{1}_A$ for some $A \subset \{-1, 1\}^n$ then $|\nabla f|_\beta$ equals to $(|\nabla f|_1)^{1/\beta}$ up to a constant factor. Indeed, since $|2D_j f| \in \{0, 1\}$, we have

$$|\nabla f|_\beta = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |2D_j f| \right)^{1/\beta} = 2^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1} (|\nabla f|_1)^{1/\beta}.$$

Therefore for boolean f we always have

$$(1.8) \quad \|\nabla f|_\beta\|_p = 2^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1} \|\nabla f|_1\|_{p/\beta}^{1/\beta}.$$

The identity (1.8) shows that studying lower bounds on $\|\nabla f|_\beta\|_p$ is the same as studying lower bounds on $\|\nabla f|_1\|_q$ with $q = p/\beta$.

2. Talagrand's isoperimetric inequality with "two-sided gradient" says that there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that for any $A \subset \{-1, 1\}^n$ we have

$$(1.9) \quad \|\nabla \mathbb{1}_A|_1\|_q \geq C(|A|^*)^{1/q} \log \frac{1}{|A|^*}$$

holds for all $q \geq 1/2$. The estimate (1.9) is sharp up to a universal constant factor C . Moreover, as soon as $q < 1/2$ there is no lower bound on $\|\nabla f|_1\|_q$ in terms of $|A|$ independent of n (see [4] and references therein). See [3] about the state of the art of the best constant C in (1.9).

Notice that when $q = 1$ the left hand side in (1.9) counts number of edges joining A and A^c , and it gives the lower bound of the edge boundary of A in terms of the size of A . This inequality ($q = 1$) is known as edge-isoperimetric inequality on the hamming cube, see [11].

Combining (1.9) and (1.8) we get that for all $2p \geq \beta \geq 1$ and any $A \subset \{-1, 1\}^n$ we have

$$(1.10) \quad \|\nabla \mathbb{1}_A\|_\beta \geq C(|A|^*)^{1/p} \left(\log \frac{1}{|A|^*} \right)^{1/\beta}$$

The reader should compare (1.10) with lower bounds for $\|S_\beta(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_p$ obtained in Theorems 1.1, 1.6 and 1.8.

3. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (S_\beta f(x))^\beta &= \sum_{k=1}^n (f_k - f_{k-1})^\beta = |\mathbb{E}(D_1 f(x)|x_1)|^\beta \\ &+ |\mathbb{E}(D_2 f(x)|x_1, x_2)|^\beta + \dots + |\mathbb{E}(D_n f(x)|x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)|^\beta \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain

$$\|\nabla \mathbb{1}_A\|_1 \geq \|S_1(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_1 \stackrel{\text{Theorem 1.6}}{\geq} B_{1,1}(|A|)$$

However, the equality cases in the edge-isoperimetric inequality (see [4]) say that

$$\inf_{A \subset \{-1, 1\}^n, |A|=t} \|\nabla f\|_1 = B_{1,1}(t),$$

therefore, Theorem 1.6 can be seen as sharpening of the edge-isoperimetric inequality.

4. Stein's theorem (see Theorem 8 in [12]) implies for any $p \in (1, \infty)$ existence of a universal constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|S_2(f)\|_p \leq C \max\{p^{1/2}, (p-1)^{-1/2}\} \|\nabla f\|_2$$

holds for all $f : \{-1, 1\}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and all $n \geq 1$.

In general it is an interesting question to find sharp lower bounds on $\|S_\beta(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_p$ in terms of the size of $|A|$. We have showed in this paper that for certain parameters β and p the sharp lower bounds on $\|S_\beta(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_p$ and $\|\nabla \mathbb{1}_A\|_\beta$ sometimes match (up to universal constant factors) and sometimes they are different.

Acknowledgements. P.I. was supported in part by NSF CAREER-DMS-2152401.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.6

Recall the Martingale difference sequence $d_n = f_n - f_{n-1}$ defined in Section 1.1. If we let f to be an indicator function of a set, i.e., $f(x) = \mathbb{1}_A$ for some $A \in \mathcal{D}$, define $\tilde{P} : D \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ by

$$(2.11) \quad \tilde{P}(x) = \inf_{A \in \mathcal{D}, |A|=x} \left\{ \int_0^1 \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |f_i - f_{i-1}| \right), \int_0^1 f = x \right\}.$$

We later show that $\tilde{P} = P$ using Theorem (1.7), where $P : D \mapsto [0, \infty)$ is the pointwise limit the pointwise maximal function defined on D satisfying $P(0) = P(1) = 0$, $P \geq 0$, and the two-point inequality (1.3) with $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 1)$.

Lemma 2.1. *For any $x, y \in D$, $\tilde{P}(x)$ satisfies the two-point inequality (1.3) with $\alpha = \beta = 1$, i.e.*

$$(2.12) \quad \tilde{P}\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \leq \frac{\tilde{P}(x) + \tilde{P}(y)}{2} + \left| \frac{x-y}{2} \right|,$$

and $\tilde{P}(0) = \tilde{P}(1) = 0$.

Proof. It is easy to see that $\tilde{P}(0) = \tilde{P}(1) = 0$. Take any $\epsilon > 0$, for any given $x \in D$, we can find an indicator function f_1 such that $\int_0^1 f_1 = x$ and

$$\int_0^1 S_1(f_1) \leq \tilde{P}(x) + \epsilon.$$

Similarly, given $y \in D$ we can find f_2 such that $\int_0^1 S_1(f_2) \leq \tilde{P}(y) + \epsilon$. Define F to be the indicator function resulted from concatenating f_1 and f_2 as follows,

$$(2.13) \quad F(x) = \begin{cases} f_1(2x) & \text{if } x \in [0, 1/2], \\ f_2(2x-1) & \text{if } x \in [1/2, 1]. \end{cases}$$

We have

$$(2.14) \quad \int_0^1 F(t)dt = \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} f_1(2t)dt + \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^1 f_2(2t-1)dt = \frac{1}{2}(x+y).$$

Thus

$$\tilde{P}\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \leq \int_0^1 S_1(F) = \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} S_1(F) + \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^1 S_1(F)$$

Let $d_n = F_n - F_{n-1}$ where $F_n = \sum_{|I|=2^{-n}} \langle F \rangle_I \mathbb{1}_I$, notice that

$$\langle F \rangle_{[0, \frac{1}{2}]} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} f_1(2t)dt = x, \quad \text{and} \quad \langle F \rangle_{[\frac{1}{2}, 1]} = y.$$

Furthermore, for all $x \in [0, 1/2]$ we have $F_n(x) = f_{n-1}(2x)$. Using (2.11), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} S_1(F) &= \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} |d_1| + |d_2| + \dots \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{|x-y|}{2} + \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} |d_2| + |d_3| + \dots \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{|x-y|}{2} + \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} |F_2 - F_1| + |F_3 - F_2| + \dots \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{|x-y|}{2} + \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} |f_{11}(2t) - f_{10}(2t)| + |f_{12}(2t) - f_{11}(2t)| + \dots \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{|x-y|}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 |f_{11}(s) - f_{10}(s)| + |f_{12}(s) - f_{11}(s)| + \dots \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{|x-y|}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 S_1(f_1) \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|x-y|}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{P}(x) + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon.
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly for $\int_{\frac{1}{2}}^1 S_1(F)$ with $F(t) = f_2(2t-1)$, from 2.13, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^1 S_1(F) &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{|x-y|}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 S_1(f_2) \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|x-y|}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{P}(y) + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon.
 \end{aligned}$$

By adding the two inequalities, it follows

$$\tilde{P}\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \leq \frac{|x-y|}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{P}(x) + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{P}(y) + \epsilon.$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary, we get the result we wanted. \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let $Q : D \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ s.t. $Q(0) = Q(1) = 0$. If Q satisfies the two-point inequality (1.3) with $\alpha = \beta = 1$, then for $f = \mathbb{1}_A$, $A \in \mathcal{D}$, it holds*

$$\int_0^1 S_1(f) \geq Q\left(\int_0^1 f\right).$$

It follows that $\tilde{P}(x) \geq Q(x)$ for all $x \in D$.

Proof. Let $f = \mathbb{1}_A$, and recall that $\langle f \rangle_I = \frac{1}{I} \int_I f$. Let ϵ_n denote the nodes of dyadic intervals \mathcal{D}_n . i.e. $\epsilon_n = \{-1, +1\}$ where $+1$ refers to the right side of the node, and -1 refers to the left side of the node. For example, for $\epsilon_1 = -1$, $I_{\epsilon_1} = [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1} = [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ where $\bar{\epsilon}_1 = -\epsilon_1$; and for $\epsilon_1 = +1$ and $\epsilon_2 = -1$, $I_{\epsilon_1 \epsilon_2} = [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}]$, while

$$I_{\epsilon_1 \bar{\epsilon}_2} = \left[\frac{3}{4}, 1\right], \quad I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1 \epsilon_2} = \left[1, \frac{1}{4}\right], \quad I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1 \bar{\epsilon}_2} = \left[\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}\right].$$

Taking $x = \langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1}}$ and $y = \langle f \rangle_{I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1}}$, applying (1.3) on Q yields

$$\begin{aligned} Q(|A|) &= Q(\langle f \rangle_{[0,1]}) = Q\left(\frac{\langle f \rangle_{[0,1/2]} + \langle f \rangle_{[1/2,1]}}{2}\right) \\ &= Q\left(\frac{\langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1}} + \langle f \rangle_{I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1}}}{2}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{Q(\langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1}}) + Q(\langle f \rangle_{I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1}})}{2} + \left| \frac{\langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1}} - \langle f \rangle_{I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1}}}{2} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the inequality recursively on $Q(|A|)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} Q(|A|) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k \in \{-1,1\}} \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} |\langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_k}} - \langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \dots \bar{\epsilon}_k}}| \\ &\quad + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} \sum_{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k \in \{-1,1\}} Q(\langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_k}}) \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n \in \{-1,1\}} Q(\langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_n}}) = 0.$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_n}} = 0$ or 1 . It follows

$$Q(|A|) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k \in \{-1,1\}} \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} |\langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_k}} - \langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \dots \bar{\epsilon}_k}}| = \int_0^1 S(f)(x),$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Corollary 2.3. *For all $x \in D$, it holds $\tilde{P}(x) = B_{1,1}(x)$.*

Proof. We know that \tilde{P} is pointwise maximal function satisfying (2.12), with $\tilde{P}(0) = \tilde{P}(1) = 0$. By Theorem 2.6 part (ii), it follows $\tilde{P} = P$, and then by Theorem 2.6 part (vi) it follows $B_{1,1}|_D = P = \tilde{P}$. \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.7

We need the following lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *For any integer k , $0 \leq k \leq 2^n$, we have*

$$F(2k) = 2F(k) + k,$$

where F is defined as in (2.13).

Proof. From [11, Remark 2.5], we know that F satisfies $F(1) = 0$, and

$$(3.15) \quad F(l) = \max_{0 \leq m \leq l/2} (F(m) + F(l-m) + m),$$

where the maximum in the right hand side of (4.21) is achieved at $m = \lfloor l/2 \rfloor$. Choosing $l = 2k$ proves the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.2. *For nonnegative integers a and b , it holds*

$$F(a + b) - \min(a, b) \geq F(a) + F(b).$$

Proof. Without loss of generality assume $b \leq a$. Set $m = b$ and $l = a + b$. Notice that in this case we have $0 \leq m \leq l/2$. Hence the lemma follows from Lemma 3.1. \square

To prove (i), we show that for all $x \in D = \cup_{n \geq 0} D_n$ the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} B_n(x)$, where B_n is defined in (1.7), exists and is denoted by $P(x)$. i.e.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} B_n(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(nx - \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} F(x2^n) \right) = P(x).$$

Recall that B_n is defined on D_n , and $D_n \subseteq D_{n+1}$. It suffices to show that, $B_{n+1}|_{D_n} = B_n$ for all $n \geq 1$. Let $x \in D_n$, then $x = \frac{k}{2^n}$ for some $0 \leq k \leq 2^n$. Using Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_{n+1}(x) &= (n+1) \frac{k}{2^n} - \frac{1}{2^n} F(2k) \\ &= (n+1) \frac{k}{2^n} - \frac{1}{2^n} (k + 2F(k)) \\ &= \frac{n}{2^n} k + \frac{k}{2^n} - \frac{k}{2^n} + \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} F(k) \\ &= B_n(x). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the limit exists.

To prove (ii), We first show that the limit function $P : D \mapsto [0, \infty)$ defined on D indeed satisfies $P(0) = P(1) = 0$, and the two-point inequality (1.3) with $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 1)$, that is

$$(3.16) \quad \left| \frac{x-y}{2} \right| + \frac{P(x) + P(y)}{2} \geq P\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in D.$$

Note that indeed $P(0) = B_1(0) = 0$, and $P(1) = B_1(1) = 0$, so we show the two-point inequality. Pick arbitrary points $x, y \in D$. Then there exists $n \geq 1$, s.t. $x, y, \frac{x+y}{2} \in D_{n+1}$. It suffices to show

$$(3.17) \quad \left| \frac{x-y}{2} \right| + \frac{B_{n+1}(x) + B_{n+1}(y)}{2} \geq B_{n+1}\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right).$$

Without loss of generality assume $x \geq y$. Then there exist k and l such that $0 \leq l \leq k \leq 2^{n+1}$,

$$x = \frac{k}{2^{n+1}}, \quad y = \frac{l}{2^{n+1}}, \quad \text{and } k+l \text{ is even.}$$

Rewriting (3.17) using the definition (1.7) for B_n , we get

$$\frac{k-l}{2^{n+2}} + \frac{(n+1)(k+l)}{2^{n+2}} - \frac{F(k) + F(l)}{2^{n+1}} \geq \frac{k+l}{2^{n+2}}(n+1) - \frac{F\left(\frac{k+l}{2}\right)}{2^n},$$

the above line is equivalent to

$$\frac{k-l}{2} + 2F\left(\frac{k+l}{2}\right) \geq F(k) + F(l).$$

Using the identity $F(2k) = k + 2F(k)$ from Lemma (3.1), the above inequality simplifies to

$$F(k+l) \geq F(k) + F(l) + l,$$

which is true by Lemma 3.2.

We are left to show that P is the pointwise maximal function defined on dyadic numbers $D \subset [0, 1]$, satisfying the boundary condition $P(0) = P(1) = 0$ and the two-point inequality (3.16).

For $n \geq 1$, let $\{0, 1\}^n$ be the hypercube of dimension n . The vertices $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ are joined by an edge if $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ differ by exactly one coordinate. Denote such an edge by (x, y) . Let $A \subset \{0, 1\}^n$ and $A^c := \{0, 1\}^n \setminus A$, we call $y \in A^c$ a neighbor of $x \in A$ if it joins x by an edge. Define the edge boundary of A by $\nabla A := \{(x, y) : x \in A, y \in A^c\}$, and the function

$$h_A(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in A^c, \\ \text{number of neighbors of } x & \text{if } x \in A. \end{cases}$$

The quantity $\mathbb{E}h_A(x)$, where $x \sim \text{unif}(\{0, 1\}^n)$, has the property $\mathbb{E}h_A(x) = \mathbb{E}h_{A^c}(x)$, and we have $\mathbb{E}h_A(x) = \frac{|\nabla A|}{2^n}$. It is known (see [4]) that

$$P(t) = \min_{A \subset \{0, 1\}^n, |A|=t} \mathbb{E}h_A(x) \quad \text{for all } t \in D_n.$$

Here $|A| = \mathbb{P}(x \in A)$ is the uniform probability measure. It suffices to show that $\mathbb{E}h_A(x) \geq Q(|A|)$ for any $Q : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies $Q(0) = Q(1) = 0$ and (3.16).

Let $f = \mathbb{1}_A$ be the indicator function of a set $A \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$, for $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$, denote $x^i = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, 1 - x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$ and denote $(\cdot)_+ = \max(\cdot, 0)$. We prove the inequality

$$(3.18) \quad \mathbb{E}h_A = \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n (f(x) - f(x^i))_+ \geq Q(x)$$

by induction on n . For $n = 1$, we have $\mathbb{E}h_A = \frac{|\nabla A|}{2}$. We verify that for all $A \in \text{eq}\{0, 1\}$, (3.18) holds. Let $A = \{\emptyset\}$ (the case $A = \{0, 1\}$ is similar), then $\mathbb{E}h_A = 0 = Q(0)$. Let $A = \{1\}$ (the case $A = \{0\}$ is similar), then $\mathbb{E}h_A = \frac{1}{2}$. Since Q satisfies (3.16), and $|A| = \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$Q\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = Q\left(\frac{1+0}{2}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{Q(1) + Q(0)}{2} = \frac{1}{2} = \mathbb{E}h_A.$$

Assume now the statement holds for $n - 1$. For $\bar{x} = (x_2, \dots, x_n)$, denote,

$$\begin{aligned} f(1, x_2, \dots, x_n) &= f_1(\bar{x}), \\ f(0, x_2, \dots, x_n) &= f_0(\bar{x}). \end{aligned}$$

For any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, observe that $(a - b)_+ + (b - a)_+ = |a - b|$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}h_A &= \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^n (f(x) - f(x^j))_+ \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x_2 \dots x_n} \mathbb{E}_{x_1} (f(x) - f(x^1))_+ + \mathbb{E}_{x_2 \dots x_n} \mathbb{E}_{x_1} \sum_{j=2}^n (f(x) - f(x^j))_+ \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x_2 \dots x_n} \frac{1}{2} (f_1(\bar{x}) - f_0(\bar{x}))_+ + (f_0(\bar{x}) - f_1(\bar{x}))_+ \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{x_2 \dots x_n} \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{j=0}^n (f_1(\bar{x}) - f_1(\bar{x}^j))_+ + (f_0(\bar{x}) - f_0(\bar{x}^j))_+ \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x_2 \dots x_n} \frac{1}{2} |f_1(\bar{x}) - f_0(\bar{x})| + \mathbb{E}_{x_2 \dots x_n} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^n |f_1(\bar{x}) - f_1(\bar{x}^j)|. \end{aligned}$$

Remark that $f(x) = x_1 f_1(\bar{x}) + (1 - x_1) f_0(\bar{x})$, and for $f_1 = \mathbb{1}_{A_1}$ and $f_2 = \mathbb{1}_{A_2}$, we have $|A| = \frac{|A_1| + |A_0|}{2}$. From Jensen's inequality it follows,

$$\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{x_2 \dots x_n} |f_1(\bar{x}) - f_0(\bar{x})| \geq \frac{1}{2} |\mathbb{E}_{x_2 \dots x_n} f_1(\bar{x}) - \mathbb{E}_{x_2 \dots x_n} f_0(\bar{x})| = \frac{1}{2} ||A_1| - |A_0||.$$

Using the induction hypothesis and the fact that Q satisfies (3.16), it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}h_A &\geq \frac{1}{2} ||A_1| - |A_0|| + \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{E}h_{A_1} + \mathbb{E}h_{A_0}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} ||A_1| - |A_0|| + \frac{1}{2} (Q(|A_1|) + Q(|A_0|)) \\ &\geq Q\left(\frac{|A_1| + |A_0|}{2}\right) = Q(|A|). \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of (ii). To prove (iii), we equivalently prove that for all $x, y \in D$ such that $|x - y| < \frac{1}{2^m}$ for some $m \geq 0$, we have $|P(x) - P(y)| \lesssim \frac{m}{2^m}$. The proof of the claim is given in the next section.

To prove (iv), first, we show that $P(x) = P(1 - x)$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$. Let $L(x) = P(1 - x)$; then $L(1) = L(0) = 0$ and clearly L satisfies 3.16. Define $G(x) = \max(P(x), L(x))$, then similarly, $G(0) = G(1) = 0$, and G satisfies (3.16). By construction, $P(x) \leq G(x)$, but since $P(x)$ is pointwise maximal function, we have $G(x) \leq P(x)$. Hence, $G(x) = P(x)$. Next we turn to verifying the identity $P(x) + x = 2P(x/2)$. Pick any $x \in D_n$. We have $x = \frac{k}{2^n}$ for some $n \geq 1$ and $k, 0 \leq k \leq 2^n$. It follows from the definition of

B_n that

$$\begin{aligned} P(x) + x &= \frac{(n+1)k}{2^n} - \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}F(k), \\ 2P\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) &= \frac{(n+1)k}{2^{n-1}} - \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}F(k), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we used the definition of B_{n+1} since $\frac{x}{2} \in D_{n+1}$.

To prove (v), note that for all $x \in [0, 1]$,

$$B(x) = x^* \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{x^*} \right) = \max_{x \in [0,1]} \left(x \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{x} \right), (1-x) \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{1-x} \right) \right).$$

By symmetry, it suffices to show that $B(x) = x \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{x} \right)$ satisfies $B(0) = B(1) = 0$ and (1.3) with $\alpha = \beta = 1$. Then, by part (ii), since $P(x)$ is the pointwise maximal function, it follows that $P(x) \geq B(x)$. Note that $B(0) = B(1) = 0$, so we are left to show (3.16). Take $x, y \in D$ such that $x \leq y$. The left hand side minus the right hand side in (3.16) multiplied by two takes the form

$$(3.19) \quad x \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{x} \right) + y \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{y} \right) + (y-x) - (x+y) \log_2 \left(\frac{2}{x+y} \right).$$

We want to show that the above expression is non-negative. Note that for $y = 0$, (3.19) evaluates to 0. Next, we divide the expression in (3.19) by $y \neq 0$, and we introduce a new variable $t = \frac{x}{y} \in [0, 1]$. Using properties of logarithms the resulted expression in (3.19) simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} & t \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{ty} \right) + \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{y} \right) + 1 - t - (t+1) \log_2 \left(\frac{2}{t+1} \cdot \frac{1}{y} \right) \\ &= \underbrace{t \log_2 \left(\frac{1}{t} \right) - 2t + (t+1) \log_2(t+1)}_{:=\varphi(t)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varphi(0) = \varphi(1) = 0$, it is sufficient to show that $\varphi''(t) \leq 0$. To this end, we calculate the derivatives,

$$\varphi'(t) = -2 + \log_2 \left(\frac{t+1}{t} \right), \quad \varphi''(t) = \frac{1}{\log(2)} \left(\frac{1}{1+t} - \frac{1}{t} \right) \leq 0.$$

This completes the proof of (v).

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.7.III

In this section we verify part (iii) of Theorem 1.7. It suffices to show that there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that for any $m \geq 1$ if $|x - y| < 2^{-m}$ where $x, y \in D$, then $|P(x) - P(y)| \leq Cm/2^m$.

For any $x, y \in D$, there exists $n \geq 1$ such that $x, y \in D_n$, $x = \frac{k}{2^n}$, and $y = \frac{l}{2^n}$ for some $0 \leq k, l < 2^n$. The condition $|x - y| < 2^{-m}$ implies

$|k - l| \leq 2^{n-m}$. Using the definition of B_n we have

$$\begin{aligned} |B_n(x) - B_n(y)| &= \left| B_n\left(\frac{k}{2^n}\right) - B_n\left(\frac{l}{2^n}\right) \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{(n+1)(k-l) - (F(2k) - F(2l))}{2^n} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

For such k, l , it suffices to show

$$(4.20) \quad \left| \frac{n(k-l) - (F(2k) - F(2l))}{2^n} \right| \leq C \frac{m}{2^m}.$$

Recall $F(0) = 0$, and $F(k) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} s(i)$, where $s(i)$ is the number of 1's in the binary representation of k . From [11, Remark 2.5] we have

$$(4.21) \quad F(l) = \max_{0 \leq m \leq l/2} (F(m) + F(l-m) + m).$$

For any integer $0 < k \leq 2^n$, its binary representation can be written as

$$k = 2^{k_1} + 2^{k_2} + \cdots + 2^{k_T},$$

where

$$n \geq k_1 > k_2 > \cdots > k_T \geq 0.$$

We further make the following observations.

Lemma 4.1. *For any integer $k > 0$ and integer p such that $0 \leq p \leq 2^k$, it holds*

$$F(2^k + p) = k2^{k-1} + p + F(p).$$

Proof. It is easy to see that

$$(4.22) \quad F(2^k) = \sum_{j=0}^{2^k-1} s(j) = k2^{k-1},$$

and for all $0 \leq j < 2^k$ we have

$$s(2^k + j) = 1 + s(j).$$

Let $0 \leq p \leq 2^k$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} F(2^k + p) &= \sum_{j=0}^{2^k+p-1} s(j) = \sum_{j=0}^{2^k-1} s(j) + \sum_{j=2^k}^{2^k+p-1} s(j) \\ &= F(2^k) + \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} s(2^k + j) \\ &= k2^{k-1} + \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} (1 + s(j)) \\ &= k2^{k-1} + p + F(p). \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 4.2. *For any $0 < k \leq 2^n$ of the form*

$$k = 2^{k_1} + 2^{k_2} + \dots + 2^{k_T},$$

where $n \geq k_1 > k_2 > \dots \geq 0$ it holds

$$F(k) = \sum_{j=1}^T (k_j + 2(j-1))2^{k_j-1}.$$

Proof. Let $p = k - 2^{k_1}$, then $p < 2^{k_1}$. Hence by Lemma 4.1 we have

$$(4.23) \quad F(k) = F(2^{k_1} + (k - 2^{k_1})) = k_1 2^{k_1-1} + (k - 2^{k_1}) + F(k - 2^{k_1}).$$

Take $p = k - 2^{k_1} - 2^{k_2}$, then $p < 2^{k_2}$. Using Lemma 4.1 again, we have

$$(4.24) \quad \begin{aligned} F(k - 2^{k_1}) &= F(2^{k_2} + (k - 2^{k_1} - 2^{k_2})) \\ &= k_2 2^{k_2-1} + (k - 2^{k_1} - 2^{k_2}) + F(k - 2^{k_1} - 2^{k_2}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.23) and (4.24), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F(k) &= k_1 2^{k_1-1} + (k - 2^{k_1}) + k_2 2^{k_2-1} + (k - 2^{k_1} - 2^{k_2}) + F(k - 2^{k_1} - 2^{k_2}) \\ &= k_1 2^{k_1-1} + (2^{k_2} + \dots + 2^{k_T}) + k_2 2^{k_2-1} + (2^{k_3} + \dots + 2^{k_T}) \\ &\quad + F(k - 2^{k_1} - 2^{k_2}). \end{aligned}$$

Iterating this process, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F(k) &= k_1 2^{k_1-1} + (2^{k_2} + \dots + 2^{k_T}) + k_2 2^{k_2-1} + (2^{k_3} + \dots + 2^{k_T}) + \\ &\quad \dots + k_{T-1} 2^{k_{T-1}-1} + 2^{k_T} + F(2^{k_T}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^T k_j 2^{k_j-1} + \sum_{j=2}^T (j-1) 2^{k_j} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^T (k_j + 2(j-1)) 2^{k_j-1}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.3. *Let $0 \leq l < k \leq 2^n$ such that $|k - l| \leq 2^{n-m}$; consider the binary representations*

$$l = 2^{l_1} + 2^{l_2} + \dots + 2^{l_R}, \quad k = 2^{k_1} + 2^{k_2} + \dots + 2^{k_T},$$

where $k_1 > k_2 > \dots \geq 0$ and $l_1 > l_2 > \dots > l_R \geq 0$. Then, for a fixed $p > 0$, if $l_i = k_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, p-1$ and $k_p \geq l_p + 2$, we have

$$k_p \leq n - m + 1.$$

Proof. Fix $p > 0$, such that $l_i = k_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, p-1$, and $k_p \geq l_p + 2$. Using the finite geometric series formula, we have

$$(4.25) \quad 2^{k_p-1} - 1 = 2^{k_p-2} + 2^{k_p-3} + \dots + 2^0 \geq 2^{l_p} + 2^{l_p-1} + \dots + 2^0.$$

From (4.25) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |k - l| &= 2^{k_p} + \dots + 2^{k_T} - (2^{l_p} + \dots + 2^{l_R}) \\ &\geq 2^{k_p} - (2^{k_p-1} - 1) \\ &= 2^{k_p-1} + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|k - l| \leq 2^{n-m}$, it follows $2^{k_p-1} + 1 \leq 2^{n-m}$. Hence,

$$k_p - 1 \leq n - m.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 4.4. *Let $0 \leq l < k \leq 2^n$, such that $|k - l| \leq 2^{n-m}$, and having the binary representations*

$$l = 2^{l_1} + 2^{l_2} + \dots + 2^{l_R}, \quad k = 2^{k_1} + 2^{k_2} + \dots + 2^{k_T},$$

where $n \geq k_1 > k_2 > \dots \geq 0$ and $n \geq l_1 > l_2 > \dots > l_R \geq 0$. For a fixed $p > 0$ assume $l_i = k_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, p-1$ and $k_p = l_p + 1$. Denote $M \geq 1$ to be the first index such that

$$\begin{cases} l_{p+j} = k_p - (j+1) & \text{for } 0 \leq j \leq M-1, \\ l_{p+j} \leq l_{p+j-1} - 2 & \text{for } M \leq j \leq R-p. \end{cases}$$

i.e. $l_{p+j} = l_p - j$ for all $j = 1, \dots, M-1$ and the jump down between l_{p+M-1} next to l_{p+M} is at least two. Then it holds

$$(4.26) \quad k_{p+1} \leq n - m + 1,$$

$$(4.27) \quad k_p - M \leq n - m + 1,$$

$$(4.28) \quad l_{p+M} \leq n - m + 1.$$

Proof. For $L \geq 1$ we have

$$2^{k_p-1} + 2^{k_p-2} + \dots + 2^{k_p-L} = 2^{k_p}(2^{-1} + \dots + 2^{-L}) = 2^{k_p} - 2^{k_p-L},$$

Fix $p > 0$ such that $l_i = k_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, p-1$, and $k_p - 1 = l_p$. Since $l_p > l_{p+1}$ it follows $l_{p+1} \leq k_p - 2$ and by iterating it we get

$$(4.29) \quad l_{p+L-1} \leq k_p - L.$$

We start by proving (4.26), i.e. $k_{p+1} \leq n - m + 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |k - l| &= 2^{k_p} + 2^{k_{p+1}} + \dots + 2^{k_T} - (2^{l_p} + \dots + 2^{l_R}) \\ &\geq 2^{k_p} + 2^{k_{p+1}} + \dots + 2^{k_T} - (2^{k_p-1} + \dots + 2^0) \\ &= 2^{k_p} + 2^{k_{p+1}} + \dots + 2^{k_T} - (2^{k_p} - 1) \\ &\geq 2^{k_{p+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|k - l| \leq 2^{n-m}$ we have $k_{p+1} \leq n - m$ and so (4.26) follows.

By definition of $M \geq 1$, we know

$$(4.30) \quad l_{p+M} \leq l_{p+M-1} - 2 = k_p - M - 2.$$

To prove (4.27), i.e. $k_p - M \leq n - m + 1$, we recall that $l_{p+j} = k_p - (j + 1)$ for all $j = 0, \dots, M - 1$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |k - l| &= 2^{k_p} + \dots + 2^{k_T} - (2^{l_p} + \dots + 2^{l_R}) \\ &= 2^{k_p} + \dots + 2^{k_T} - (2^{k_p-1} + \dots + 2^{k_p-M}) - (2^{l_{p+M}} + \dots + 2^{l_R}) \\ &= 2^{k_p} + \dots + 2^{k_T} - (2^{k_p} - 2^{k_p-M}) - (2^{l_{p+M}} + \dots + 2^{l_R}). \end{aligned}$$

From (4.30) it follows

$$\begin{aligned} |k - l| &\geq 2^{k_p-M} - (2^{l_{p+M}} + \dots + 2^{l_R}) \\ &\geq 2^{k_p-M} - (2^{k_p-M-2} + \dots + 2^0) \\ &= 2^{k_p-M} - (2^{k_p-M-1} - 1) \\ &\geq 2^{k_p-M-1} \end{aligned}$$

Since $|k - l| < 2^{n-m}$, hence $k_p - M \leq n - m + 1$ as wanted. Since $l_{p+M} \leq k_p - M - 2$, it follows $l_{p+M} \leq n - m + 1$, and this finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 4.5. *For $M \geq 1$, we have*

$$\sum_{j=1}^M j2^{-j} = 2 - 2^{-M}(M + 2).$$

Proof. Indeed, recall that

$$\sum_{j=1}^M x^j = \frac{1 - x^{M+1}}{1 - x}.$$

Differentiating both sides and then multiplying by x , yields

$$\sum_{j=1}^M jx^j = \frac{-(M+1)x^M(1-x) + x(1-x^{M+1})}{(1-x)^2}x.$$

Substituting $x = 2^{-1}$ the identity follows. \square

For $x, y \in D$ such that $|x - y| \leq 2^{-m}$, to show $|P(x) - P(y)| \leq Cm/2^m$, it is sufficient to show (4.20). That is for $k, l \neq 0$ such that $|k - l| \leq 2^{n-m}$, we have

$$(4.31) \quad \left| \frac{n(k-l) - (F(2k) - F(2l))}{2^n} \right| \leq C \frac{m}{2^m}.$$

Here we can consider $n \geq m$ to be as large as we wish. Consider the following binary representation of k, l and $2k, 2l$,

$$(4.32) \quad \begin{aligned} l &= 2^{l_1} + 2^{l_2} + \dots + 2^{l_R}, & k &= 2^{k_1} + \dots + 2^{k_T}, \\ 2l &= 2^{l_1+1} + 2^{l_2+1} + \dots + 2^{l_R+1}, & 2k &= 2^{k_1+1} + \dots + 2^{k_T+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|k - l| \leq 2^{n-m}$, we know

$$(4.33) \quad |2^{l_1} + 2^{l_2} + \dots + 2^{l_R} - 2^{k_1} - 2^{k_2} - \dots - 2^{k_T}| \leq 2^{n-m}.$$

Using Lemma 4.2 on $F(2l)$ and $F(2k)$, we rewrite (4.31) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2^n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^T n 2^{k_j} - \sum_{j=1}^R n 2^{l_j} \right. \\ & \left. - \left(\sum_{j=1}^T ((k_j + 1) + 2(j-1)) 2^{k_j} - \sum_{j=1}^R ((l_j + 1) + 2(j-1)) 2^{l_j} \right) \right| \leq C \frac{m}{2^m}, \end{aligned}$$

which simplifies to

$$\frac{1}{2^n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^T (n - k_j - 2j + 1) 2^{k_j} - \sum_{j=1}^R (n - l_j - 2j + 1) 2^{l_j} \right| \leq C \frac{m}{2^m}.$$

Using the triangle inequality, it is sufficient to show

$$\frac{1}{2^n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^T (n - k_j - 2j) 2^{k_j} - \sum_{j=1}^R (n - l_j - 2j) 2^{l_j} \right| + \left| \frac{k-l}{2^n} \right| \leq C \frac{m}{2^m}.$$

Since $\left| \frac{k-l}{2^n} \right| < 2^{-m}$, it is enough to show

$$(4.34) \quad \frac{1}{2^n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^T (n - k_j - 2j) 2^{k_j} - \sum_{j=1}^R (n - l_j - 2j) 2^{l_j} \right| \leq C \frac{m}{2^m}.$$

Without loss of generality assume $l < k$ (the case $k = l$ is trivial). Therefore we must have an integer $p > 0$ such that $2^{k_p} > 2^{l_p}$ in the binary representation (4.32). Let p be the first instance for which $2^{k_p} > 2^{l_p}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2^n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^T (n - k_j - 2j) 2^{k_j} - \sum_{j=1}^R (n - l_j - 2j) 2^{l_j} \right| \\ & = \frac{1}{2^n} \left| \sum_{j=p}^T (n - k_j - 2j) 2^{k_j} - \sum_{j=p}^R (n - l_j - 2j) 2^{l_j} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

To show (4.34), we consider two cases, $k_p = l_p + 1$ and $k_p \geq l_p + 2$.

Case 1 (simple case). Consider the case $k_p \geq l_p + 2$. To verify (4.34) observe that from the triangle inequality, it follows

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.35) \quad & \frac{1}{2^n} \left| \sum_{j=p}^T (n - k_j - 2j) 2^{k_j} - \sum_{j=p}^R (n - l_j - 2j) 2^{l_j} \right| \\
& \leq \sum_{j=p}^T \frac{|n - k_j - 2j|}{2^{n-k_j}} + \sum_{j=p}^R \frac{|n - l_j - 2j|}{2^{n-l_j}} \\
& \leq \underbrace{\sum_{j=p}^T \frac{|n - k_j|}{2^{n-k_j}}}_{(I)} + 2 \underbrace{\sum_{j=p}^T \frac{j}{2^{n-k_j}}}_{(II)} + \underbrace{\sum_{j=p}^R \frac{|n - l_j|}{2^{n-l_j}}}_{(III)} + 2 \underbrace{\sum_{j=p}^R \frac{j}{2^{n-l_j}}}_{(VI)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We study each summation separately. For summation (I) by Lemma 4.3 we have $n - k_p \geq m - 1$. Thus

$$\{n - k_p, n - k_{p+1}, \dots, n - k_T\} \subseteq \{m - 1, m, m + 1, \dots\}.$$

Therefore it follows

$$(I) = \sum_{j=p}^T \frac{|n - k_j|}{2^{n-k_j}} \leq \sum_{j=m-1}^T \frac{j}{2^j} \lesssim \frac{m}{2^m}.$$

To bound (III) notice that $l_p + 2 \leq k_p \leq n - m + 1$, hence $n - l_p \geq m + 1$ and the similar argument applies.

To estimate (II), notice that by binary representation of k (see (4.32)) we have $n \geq k_1$. Hence it follows $n - 1 \geq k_2$, and by iterating we get $n - (j - 1) \geq k_j$, i.e.,

$$(4.36) \quad j \leq n - k_j + 1$$

Thus

$$(II) = \sum_{j=p}^T \frac{j}{2^{n-k_j}} \leq \sum_{j=p}^T \frac{n - k_j + 1}{2^{n-k_j}} \leq \sum_{j=m-1}^T \frac{j + 1}{2^j} \lesssim \frac{m}{2^m}.$$

To bound (IV) notice that $l_p + 2 \leq k_p \leq n - m + 1$, hence $n - l_p \geq m + 1$, and so a similar argument applies. This completes the proof in the case $k_p \geq l_p + 2$.

Case 2. For the same l, k given by (4.32), the second case corresponds to $l_i = k_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, p - 1$ and $l_p = k_p - 1$. Denote $M \geq 1$ to be the first index such that

$$\begin{cases} l_{p+j} = k_p - (j + 1) & \text{for } 0 \leq j \leq M - 1, \\ l_{p+j} \leq l_{p+j-1} - 2 & \text{for } M \leq j \leq R - p - 1. \end{cases}$$

i.e. $l_{p+j} = l_p - j$ for all $j = 1, \dots, M-1$ and the jump down between l_{p+M-1} next to l_{p+M} is at least two. Remark that if no such M exists, we are back to the previous case. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{2^n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^T (n - k_j - 2j) 2^{k_j} - \sum_{j=1}^R (n - l_j - 2j) 2^{l_j} \right| \\
 &= \frac{1}{2^n} \left| \sum_{j=p}^T (n - k_j - 2j) 2^{k_j} - \sum_{j=p}^R (n - l_j - 2j) 2^{l_j} \right| \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{2^n} \underbrace{\left| (n - k_p - 2p) 2^{k_p} - \sum_{j=p}^{p+M-1} (n - l_j - 2j) 2^{l_j} \right|}_{(I)} \\
 &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{j=p+1}^T |n - k_j - 2j| 2^{k_j}}_{(II)} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{j=p+M}^R |n - l_j - 2j| 2^{l_j}}_{(III)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

We bound each summation individually. For summation (II), by the triangle inequality we have

$$(II) \leq \underbrace{\sum_{j=p+1}^T \frac{|n - k_j|}{2^{n-k_j}}}_{(II.1)} + 2 \underbrace{\sum_{j=p+1}^T \frac{j}{2^{n-k_j}}}_{(II.2)}.$$

By Lemma 4.4 equation (4.26), we have $n - k_{p+1} \geq m - 1$. Thus

$$\{n - k_{p+1}, \dots, n - k_T\} \subseteq \{m - 1, m, m + 1, \dots\},$$

and so summation (II.1) can be bounded by

$$\sum_{j=p+1}^T \frac{|n - k_j|}{2^{n-k_j}} \leq \sum_{j=m-1}^{\infty} \frac{j}{2^j} \lesssim \frac{m}{2^m}.$$

To bound summation (II.2), from (4.36) recall that $j \leq n - k_j + 1$, thus

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{j=p+1}^T \frac{j}{2^{n-k_j}} &\leq \sum_{j=p+1}^T \frac{n - k_j + 1}{2^{n-k_j}} \\
 &= \sum_{j=p+1}^T \frac{n - k_j}{2^{n-k_j}} + \sum_{j=p+1}^T \frac{1}{2^{n-k_j}} \\
 &\leq \sum_{j=m-1}^{\infty} \frac{j}{2^j} + \sum_{j=m-1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^j} \\
 &\lesssim \frac{m}{2^m}.
 \end{aligned}$$

To bound summation (III), we have

$$(III) = \sum_{j=p+M}^R \frac{|n - l_j - 2j|2^{l_j}}{2^n} \leq \sum_{j=p+M}^R \frac{n - l_j}{2^{n-l_j}} + 2 \sum_{j=p+M}^R \frac{j}{2^{n-l_j}}$$

By Lemma 4.4 (4.28), we know $n - l_{p+M} \geq m - 1$, and so by a similar reasoning as in bounding (II), we get (III) $\lesssim \frac{m}{2^m}$.

Finally, to bound summation (I), recall that $l_{p+j} = k_p - (j + 1)$ for $j = 0, \dots, M - 1$, and, therefore,

$$n - l_{p+j} - 2(p + j) = n - k_p + (j + 1) - 2(p + j) = n - k_p - 2p - j + 1$$

for all $j = 0, \dots, M - 1$. Hence

$$(4.37) \quad \begin{aligned} (I) &= \frac{1}{2^n} \left| (n - k_p - 2p)2^{k_p} - \sum_{j=p}^{p+M-1} (n - l_j - 2j)2^{l_j} \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{2^n} \left| (n - k_p - 2p)2^{k_p} - \sum_{j=0}^{M-1} (n - k_p - 2p - j + 1)2^{k_p - (j+1)} \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{2^n} \left| (n - k_p - 2p)2^{k_p} - \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^M (n - k_p - 2p - i + 2)2^{k_p - i}}_{(I.1)} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

We now study (I.1). Recall from Lemma 4.5 that

$$\sum_{j=1}^M 2^{k_p - j} = 2^{k_p} - 2^{k_p - M}, \quad \sum_{j=1}^M j 2^{k_p - j} = 2^{k_p} (2 - 2^{-M} (M + 2)).$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} (I.1) &= \sum_{j=1}^M (n - k_p - 2p)2^{k_p - j} + 2 \sum_{j=1}^M 2^{k_p - j} - \sum_{j=1}^M j 2^{k_p - j} \\ &= (n - k_p - 2p)(2^{k_p} - 2^{k_p - M}) + 2(2^{k_p} - 2^{k_p - M}) - 2^{k_p} (2 - 2^{-M} (M + 2)) \\ &= (n - k_p - 2p)2^{k_p} - 2^{k_p - M} (n - k_p - 2p - M). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging the above into (4.37) yields,

$$\begin{aligned} (I) &= \frac{1}{2^n} \left| (n - k_p - 2p)2^{k_p} - (n - k_p - 2p)2^{k_p} + 2^{k_p - M} (n - k_p - 2p - M) \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{n - k_p + M}} |n - k_p - M - 2p| \leq \frac{|n - k_p + M|}{2^{n - k_p + M}} + \frac{2(p + M)}{2^{n - k_p + M}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.4 (4.27) we have $n - k_p + M \geq m - 1$, thus

$$(I) \leq \frac{m-1}{2^{m-1}} + \frac{2(p+M)}{2^{n-k_p+M}}.$$

By (4.36) we have $p \leq n - k_p + 1$, and so $p + M \leq n - k_p + M + 1$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} (I) &\leq \frac{m-1}{2^{m-1}} + \frac{2(p+M)}{2^{n-k_p+M}} \\ &\leq \frac{m-1}{2^{m-1}} + \frac{2(n-k_p+M)}{2^{n-k_p+M}} + \frac{2}{2^{n-k_p+M}} \lesssim \frac{m}{2^m}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof for the case; $k_p = l_p + 1$, and so we conclude the proof of part (iii) of Theorem 1.7, and in particular Theorem 1.7 is completely proved.

5. PROOF OF THEOREMS 1.4, 1.1, AND REMARK 1.5

In this section we provide a proof for Theorem 1.4, that is for all pairs (α, β) with $\beta \geq 1 \geq \alpha > 0$ we have

$$(5.38) \quad \|S_\beta(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_\alpha \geq B_{\alpha,\beta}(|A|).$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{D}$. Theorem 1.1 would be a direct application for $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 2)$. For an arbitrary function $M(x, y)$, we define $U(p, q)$, $p \in [0, 1]$, $q \geq 0$, as follows

$$U(p, q) = \inf_{A \in \mathcal{D}} \left\{ \int_0^1 M(\mathbb{1}_A, (S_\beta^\beta(\mathbb{1}_A) + q^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}), |A| = p \right\}.$$

Clearly we have

$$(5.39) \quad U(0, q) \leq M(0, q) \quad \text{and} \quad U(1, q) \leq M(1, q).$$

Notice that for M satisfying $M(0, q) = M(1, q) \leq q^\alpha$ for all $q \geq 0$ we have

$$U(p, 0) \leq \int_0^1 M(\mathbb{1}_A, S_\beta(\mathbb{1}_A)) \leq \int_0^1 S_\beta^\alpha(\mathbb{1}_A) = \|S_\beta(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_\alpha^\alpha$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{D}$ with $|A| = p$. Therefore, the goal is to find good lower bounds on $U(p, 0)$. We start by verifying the following 3-point inequality.

Lemma 5.1. *For all $p, a \geq 0$ with $p \pm a \in [0, 1]$, $\beta \geq 1$, and all $q \geq 0$, it holds,*

$$(5.40) \quad U(p+a, (a^\beta + q^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}) + U(p-a, (a^\beta + q^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}) \geq 2U(p, q).$$

Proof. Set $x = p+a$, $y = p-a$, and $t = (a^\beta + q^\beta)^{1/\beta}$. Then 3-point inequality takes the form:

$$(5.41) \quad U(x, t) + U(y, t) \geq 2U\left(\frac{x+y}{2}, \left(t^\beta - \left|\frac{x-y}{2}\right|^\beta\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}\right).$$

Let $f_1 = \mathbb{1}_{A_1}$ be the function that up to $\varepsilon > 0$ error minimizes $U(x, t)$, and let $f_2 = \mathbb{1}_{A_2}$ be the function that almost (up to ε) minimizes $U(y, t)$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 M(\mathbb{1}_{A_1}, (S_\beta^\beta(\mathbb{1}_{A_1}) + q^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}) &\leq U(x, q) + \varepsilon \\ \int_0^1 M(\mathbb{1}_{A_2}, (S_\beta^\beta(\mathbb{1}_{A_2}) + q^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}) &\leq U(y, q) + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Define F to be the indicator function resulted from concatenating f_1 and f_2 in the same manner as in (2.13), i.e.

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} f_1(2x) & \text{if } x \in [0, 1/2], \\ f_2(2x - 1) & \text{if } x \in [1/2, 1]. \end{cases}$$

We have

$$\int_0^1 F(t) dt = \frac{1}{2}(x + y).$$

Recall that $F_n = \sum_{|I|=2^{-n}} \langle F \rangle_I \mathbb{1}_I$. Notice that

$$\langle F \rangle_{[0, \frac{1}{2}]} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} f_1(2t) dt = x, \quad \text{and} \quad \langle F \rangle_{[\frac{1}{2}, 1]} = y.$$

Clearly $F = \mathbb{1}_A$ for some $A \in \mathcal{D}$. By definition of U we have

$$\int_0^1 M(\mathbb{1}_A, (S_\beta^\beta(\mathbb{1}_A) + q^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}) \geq U(|A|, q)$$

Next recall that $d_n(F) = F_n - F_{n-1}$. Also notice that $|A| = \frac{x+y}{2}$, and $|d_1| = \left| \frac{x-y}{2} \right|$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &U\left(\frac{x+y}{2}, \left(t - \left|\frac{x-y}{2}\right|\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}\right) \\ &\leq \int_0^1 M\left(F, \left(S_\beta^\beta(F) + t^\beta - \left|\frac{x-y}{2}\right|^\beta\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}\right) \\ &= \int_0^1 M\left(F, \left(|d_2(F)|^\beta + |d_3(F)|^\beta + \dots + t^\beta\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} M \left(f_1, \left(|d_2(F)|^\beta + |d_3(F)|^\beta + \cdots + t^\beta \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \right) \\
&\quad + \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^1 M \left(f_2, \left(|d_2(F)|^\beta + |d_3(F)|^\beta + \cdots + t^\beta \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 M \left(f_1, \left(|d_1(f_1)|^\beta + |d_2(f_1)|^\beta + \cdots + t^\beta \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 M \left(f_2, \left(|d_1(f_2)|^\beta + |d_2(f_2)|^\beta + \cdots + t^\beta \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} U(x, t) + \frac{1}{2} U(y, t) + \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, the claim follows. \square

Lemma 5.2. *If an arbitrary function Q satisfies the 3-point inequality (5.40) with $\beta \geq 1$, and the obstacle condition (5.39), then the inequality*

$$Q(p, q) \leq U(p, q).$$

holds for all $q \geq 0$ and all $p \in D$.

Proof. Let $f = \mathbb{1}_A$ for some $A \in \mathcal{D}$ with $|A| = p$. We will show

$$Q(|A|, q) \leq \int_0^1 M \left(f, \left(S_\beta^\beta(f) + q^\beta \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \right).$$

Recall that $\langle f \rangle_I = \frac{1}{|I|} \int_I f$, and note the use of ϵ_n , which denotes the nodes of the dyadic intervals \mathcal{D}_n as described in Lemma 2.2, i.e., $\epsilon_n \in \{-1, +1\}$, where $+1$ refers to the right side of the node and -1 to the left side.

Starting from the three-point inequality given in (5.41), with

$$|A| = \langle f \rangle_{[0,1]} = \frac{\langle f \rangle_{[0,1/2]} + \langle f \rangle_{[1/2,1]}}{2},$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& Q(\langle f \rangle_{[0,1]}, q) \leq \\
& \frac{1}{2} Q \left(\langle f \rangle_{[0,1/2]}, \left(q^\beta + \left| \frac{\langle f \rangle_{[0,1/2]} - \langle f \rangle_{[1/2,1]}}{2} \right|^\beta \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \right) \\
& + \frac{1}{2} Q \left(\langle f \rangle_{[1/2,1]}, \left(q^\beta + \left| \frac{\langle f \rangle_{[0,1/2]} - \langle f \rangle_{[1/2,1]}}{2} \right|^\beta \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \right) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2^2} Q \left(\langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \epsilon_2}}, \left(q^\beta + \left| \frac{\langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1}} - \langle f \rangle_{I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1}}}{2} \right|^\beta + \left| \frac{\langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \epsilon_2}} - \langle f \rangle_{I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1 \bar{\epsilon}_2}}}{2} \right|^\beta \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \right) \\
& + \frac{1}{2^2} Q \left(\langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \bar{\epsilon}_2}}, \left(q^\beta + \left| \frac{\langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1}} - \langle f \rangle_{I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1}}}{2} \right|^\beta + \left| \frac{\langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \bar{\epsilon}_2}} - \langle f \rangle_{I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1 \epsilon_2}}}{2} \right|^\beta \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \right) \\
& + \frac{1}{2^2} Q \left(\langle f \rangle_{I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1 \epsilon_2}}, \left(q^\beta + \left| \frac{\langle f \rangle_{I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1}} - \langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1}}}{2} \right|^\beta + \left| \frac{\langle f \rangle_{I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1 \epsilon_2}} - \langle f \rangle_{I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1 \bar{\epsilon}_2}}}{2} \right|^\beta \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \right) \\
& + \frac{1}{2^2} Q \left(\langle f \rangle_{I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1 \bar{\epsilon}_2}}, \left(q^\beta + \left| \frac{\langle f \rangle_{I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1}} - \langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1}}}{2} \right|^\beta + \left| \frac{\langle f \rangle_{I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1 \bar{\epsilon}_2}} - \langle f \rangle_{I_{\bar{\epsilon}_1 \epsilon_2}}}{2} \right|^\beta \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying the inequality recursively we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& Q(|A|, q) \leq \\
& \sum_{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k \in \{-1, 1\}} \frac{1}{2^k} Q \left(\langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_k}}, \left(q^\beta + \sum_{i=1}^k \left| \frac{1}{2} \langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_i}} - \langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \dots \bar{\epsilon}_i}} \right|^\beta \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k \in \{\pm 1\}} \frac{1}{2^k} M \left(\langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_k}}, \left(q^\beta + \sum_{i=1}^k \left| \frac{1}{2} \langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_i}} - \langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \dots \bar{\epsilon}_i}} \right|^\beta \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^k \left| \frac{1}{2} \langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_i}} - \langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \dots \bar{\epsilon}_i}} \right|^\beta = S_\beta^\beta(f)(x),$$

and for large k we have $\langle f \rangle_{I_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_k}} \in \{0, 1\}$, therefore taking into account the obstacle condition $Q(0, t) \leq M(0, t)$ and $Q(1, t) \leq M(1, t)$ we obtain

$$Q(|A|, q) \leq \int_0^1 M(f, (S_\beta^\beta(f) + q^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}).$$

Which concludes the proof. \square

Thus for given $M(p, q)$ we want to find the pointwise maximal $U(p, q)$ that satisfies three-point inequality (5.40) together with obstacle conditions

$U(0, q) \leq M(0, q)$ and $U(1, q) \leq M(1, q)$ for all $q \geq 0$.

In what follows we set $M(1, q) = M(0, q) = q^\alpha$. We consider the candidate

$$\tilde{U}(p, q) = (B(p)^\beta + q^\beta)^{\alpha/\beta}.$$

Then \tilde{U} satisfies obstacle condition if $B(0) = B(1) = 0$. The next lemma shows that if B satisfies two-point inequality (1.3), then \tilde{U} satisfies the three-point inequality (5.43).

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\beta \geq 1 \geq \alpha > 0$, and let $\tilde{U}(p, q) = (B(p)^\beta + q^\beta)^{\alpha/\beta}$. Then \tilde{U} satisfies the three-point inequality (5.40) and the obstacle condition $\tilde{U}(1, q), \tilde{U}(0, q) \leq q^\alpha$ if $B(p)$ satisfies the two-point inequality (1.3) and the obstacle condition $B(0) = B(1) = 0$.*

Proof. The verification of the obstacle condition for $\tilde{U}(p, q)$ is trivial.

Since B satisfies (1.3) for $\beta \geq 1 \geq \alpha > 0$, by taking $p = \frac{x+y}{2}$ and $a = \frac{x-y}{2}$, we can rewrite (1.3) as

$$(5.42) \quad \left(B^\beta(p+a) + |a|^\beta \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} + \left(B^\beta(p-a) + |a|^\beta \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} \geq 2B^\alpha(p).$$

We want to show the three-point inequality, i.e.

$$\tilde{U}(p+a, (|a|^\beta + q^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}) + \tilde{U}(p-a, (|a|^\beta + q^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}) \geq 2\tilde{U}(p, q).$$

Plugging the definition of \tilde{U} , we get

$$(5.43) \quad \left(B^\beta(p+a) + |a|^\beta + q^\beta \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} + \left(B^\beta(p-a) + |a|^\beta + q^\beta \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} \geq 2 \left(B^\beta(p) + q^\beta \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}},$$

We note that for $q = 0$, the inequality (5.43) coincides with (5.42). For $A = p+a$ and $B = p-a$, with $p = \frac{A+B}{2}$ and $a = \left| \frac{A-B}{2} \right|$, we can rewrite the inequality (5.43) as

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(q) &= \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(B^\beta(A) + \left| \frac{A-B}{2} \right|^\beta + q^\beta \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} + \frac{1}{2} \left(B^\beta(B) + \left| \frac{A-B}{2} \right|^\beta + q^\beta \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} \right]^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}} \\ &\quad - q^\beta \geq B^\beta \left(\frac{A+B}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

If we can show that $\varphi(q)$ is non-decreasing in q for $q \geq 0$ then the result would follow as the inequality holds for $q = 0$.

Consider Bernoulli random variable X given by

$$X = \begin{cases} B^\beta(A) + \left| \frac{A-B}{2} \right|^\beta & \text{with probability } 1/2 \\ B^\beta(B) + \left| \frac{A-B}{2} \right|^\beta & \text{with probability } 1/2 \end{cases}.$$

We can rewrite $\varphi(q)$ as follows

$$\varphi(q) = \left(\mathbb{E}((X + q^\beta)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}) \right)^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}} - q^\beta$$

Recall that $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and $\beta \geq 1 \geq \alpha > 0$. Using Hölder's inequality we obtain

$$\left(\mathbb{E} \left((X + q^\beta)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} \right) \right)^{1 - \frac{\alpha}{\beta}} \cdot \left(\mathbb{E} \left((X + q^\beta)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta} - 1} \right) \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} \geq 1.$$

To show that $\varphi(q)$ is non-decreasing, we need to verify $\varphi'(q) \geq 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi'(q) &= \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \left(\mathbb{E}(X + q^\beta)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} \right)^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha} - 1} \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \left(\mathbb{E}(X + q^\beta)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta} - 1} \right) \beta q^{\beta-1} - \beta q^{\beta-1} \\ &= \beta q^{\beta-1} \left(\left(\mathbb{E}(X + q^\beta)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} \right)^{\frac{\beta-\alpha}{\alpha}} \left(\mathbb{E}(X + q^\beta)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta} - 1} \right) - 1 \right) \\ &= \beta q^{\beta-1} \left(\left[\underbrace{\left(\mathbb{E}(X + q^\beta)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} \right)^{1 - \frac{\alpha}{\beta}} \left(\mathbb{E}(X + q^\beta)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta} - 1} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}}_{\geq 1} \right]^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}} - 1 \right) \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

So indeed $\varphi(q)$ is non-decreasing for all $q \geq 0$. Since the statement holds for $\varphi(0)$, we proved that \tilde{U} satisfies the three-point inequality and so the result follows. \square

This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.4 and Remark 1.5. Taking $B_{1,2}(x) = I(x)$, proves Theorem 1.1.

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.8

In this section we provide a proof for Theorem 1.8, which is a particular case of Theorem 1.4 for $(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha, 1)$. That is for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $A \in \mathcal{D}$, we have

$$\|S_1(\mathbb{1}_A)\|_\alpha \geq |A|^*.$$

Taking $\tilde{U}(p, q) = (B(p) + q)^\alpha$, observe that the obstacle conditions (5.39) follow directly by setting $p = 0$ or $p = 1$. From Lemma 5.3, U satisfies the three-point inequality (5.43) if B satisfies the two-point inequality (1.3) for $(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha, 1)$. Then, from Lemma 5.2, we know that

$$(6.44) \quad \left(B \left(\int_0^1 f \right) + q \right)^\alpha \leq \int_0^1 (S_1(f) + q)^\alpha.$$

Considering $B(x) = 2x(1-x)$, we demonstrate that B satisfies two-point inequality (1.3).

Lemma 6.1. *Let $B(x) = 2x(1-x)$. Then B satisfies the two-point inequality (1.3) with $(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha, 1)$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, i.e., that is*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(2x(1-x) + \left|\frac{x-y}{2}\right|\right)^\alpha + \left(2y(1-y) + \left|\frac{x-y}{2}\right|\right)^\alpha \\ & \geq 2 \left((x+y) \left(1 - \frac{x+y}{2}\right) \right)^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

holds true for all $x, y, \in [0, 1]$ and all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Proof. Let $x, y \in [0, 1]$ and define $f(\alpha)$ as
(6.45)

$$f(\alpha) := \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(2x(1-x) + \frac{|x-y|}{2} \right)^\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \left(2y(1-y) + \frac{|x-y|}{2} \right)^\alpha \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}.$$

First we notice that $f(\alpha) \geq f(0)$, indeed, consider Bernoulli random variable X given by

$$X = \begin{cases} 2x(1-x) + \frac{|x-y|}{2} & \text{with probability } 1/2 \\ 2y(1-y) + \frac{|x-y|}{2} & \text{with probability } 1/2 \end{cases}.$$

We can rewrite f as $f(\alpha) = (\mathbb{E}|X|^\alpha)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$, and notice that the monotonicity of f follows from monotonicity of the α moment of the random variable X . Next notice that

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} f(\alpha) = e^{\mathbb{E} \ln X}.$$

Thus to verify the inequality in Lemma 6.1 it suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \ln X &= \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(2x(1-x) + \frac{|x-y|}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(2y(1-y) + \frac{|x-y|}{2} \right) \\ &\geq \ln \left(\frac{x+y}{2} \left(1 - \frac{x+y}{2} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The inequality is the same as

$$\left(2x(1-x) + \frac{|x-y|}{2} \right) \left(2y(1-y) + \frac{|x-y|}{2} \right) \geq 4 \left(\frac{x+y}{2} \left(1 - \frac{x+y}{2} \right) \right)^2.$$

Without loss of generality we can assume $x > y$. By expanding both sides of the inequality, we obtain

$$-\frac{1}{4} (4x^2 - 5x + y) (x + 3y - 4y^2) \geq \frac{1}{4} (x + y - 2)^2 (x + y)^2.$$

Moving all the terms to the right yields

$$(x-y)(x-y+1)(x^2+x(6y-1)) + (y-7)y \leq 0.$$

It suffices to show $P(x) := x^2 + x(6y-1) + (y-7)y \leq 0$. Notice that $P(x)$ is convex in x , hence we must check nonnegativity of P at the endpoints of the interval the $[y, 1]$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} P(y) &= y^2 + y(6y-1) + (y-7)y = 8y(y-1) \leq 0, \\ P(1) &= 1 + 6y - 1 + (y-7)y = y(y-1) \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 6.1. \square

Thus by (6.44) at $q = 0$ we obtain

$$B\left(\int_0^1 f\right) \leq \|S_1(f)\|_\alpha$$

Next notice that $B(x) = 2x(1-x) \geq \min\{x, 1-x\} = x^*$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$, and this finishes the proof of Theorem 1.8.

7. SHARPNESS OF THEOREM (1.8)

In this section we show that the bound found in Theorem (1.8) is sharp. By Theorem (1.6), we know that the inequality is sharp for $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 1)$ we prove sharpness of claim for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Let

$$U(p, q) = \inf_{A \in \mathcal{D}, |A|=p} \int_0^1 (S(\mathbb{1}_A) + q)^\alpha.$$

We would like to show that there exists $c(\alpha) > 0$ such that

$$U(p, 0) = \inf_{A \in \mathcal{D}, |A|=p} \left(\int_0^1 S^\alpha(\mathbb{1}_A) \right) \leq c(\alpha)p^\alpha$$

holds for a sequence $p = p_n > 0$ tending to zero. For any $p \in D$ there exists m, k such that $p = \frac{m}{2^k}$ and $0 \leq m \leq 2^k$. In Lemma 5.1, we showed that U satisfies the three-point inequality (5.41). For $\beta = 1$, (5.41) can be expressed as

$$(7.46) \quad U(x, t) + U(y, t) \geq 2U\left(\frac{x+y}{2}, t - \left|\frac{x-y}{2}\right|\right).$$

Lemma 7.1. *There exists a universal constant $c > 0$ such that for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and any $k \geq 1$ we have*

$$U\left(\frac{1}{2^k}, 0\right) \leq \frac{c}{1-\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^\alpha.$$

Proof. By iterating the three-point inequality (5.41) with $x = 0$, we have

$$U\left(\frac{y}{2}, q\right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left[U\left(0, q + \frac{y}{2}\right) + U\left(y, q + \frac{y}{2}\right) \right].$$

Notice the obstacle condition given by $U(0, q), U(1, q) \leq q^\alpha$. For $y = 1$, and $q = 0$, we have

$$U\left(\frac{1}{2}, 0\right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(U\left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right) + U\left(1, \frac{1}{2}\right) \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^\alpha + \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^\alpha \right] = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^\alpha.$$

Next, for $y = \frac{1}{2}$, and $q = 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 U\left(\frac{1}{4}, 0\right) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(U\left(0, \frac{1}{4}\right) + U\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}\right) \right) \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^b + \frac{1}{2} \left[U\left(0, \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2}\right) + U\left(1, \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2}\right) \right] \right] \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2}\right)^\alpha + \left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2}\right)^\alpha \right] \right] \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^\alpha + \left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2}\right)^\alpha \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $y = \frac{1}{4}$, $q = 0$ we can follow the same process and get

$$U\left(\frac{1}{8}, 0\right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{1}{8}\right)^\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{4}\right)^\alpha + \left(\frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2}\right)^\alpha \right] \right].$$

Using the same idea, by simply iterating the three-point inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 U\left(\frac{1}{2^k}, 0\right) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^\alpha + \frac{1}{2^2} \left(\frac{1}{2^k} + \frac{1}{2^{k-1}}\right)^\alpha + \frac{1}{2^3} \left(\frac{1}{2^k} + \frac{1}{2^{k-1}} + \frac{1}{2^{k-2}}\right)^\alpha + \\
 &\quad \cdots + \frac{1}{2^{k-1}} \left(\frac{1}{2^k} + \cdots + \frac{1}{2^2}\right)^\alpha + \frac{1}{2^{k-1}} \left(\frac{1}{2^k} + \cdots + \frac{1}{2}\right)^\alpha.
 \end{aligned}$$

The right hand side of the inequality can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\sum_{n=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{2^n} \left(\sum_{m=1}^n \frac{1}{2^{k-m+1}} \right)^\alpha + \frac{1}{2^{k-1}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{2^j} \right)^\alpha \\
 &= \sum_{n=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{2^n} \left(\frac{2^n - 1}{2^k} \right)^\alpha + \frac{1}{2^{k-1}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{2^j} \right)^\alpha
 \end{aligned}$$

Next we upper bounds this expression as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^\alpha \left[\sum_{n=1}^{k-1} \frac{(2^n - 1)^\alpha}{2^n} + \frac{2^{k\alpha}}{2^{k-1}} \right] \\
 &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^\alpha \left[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (2^{\alpha-1})^n + 2 \right] \\
 &= \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^\alpha \left[\frac{1}{1 - 2^{\alpha-1}} + 2 \right] \\
 &\lesssim \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^\alpha \frac{1}{1 - \alpha}.
 \end{aligned}$$

And so completing the lemma and showing the bound is sharp. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] D.L. Burkholder, B. Davis, R.F. Gundy, *Integral inequalities for convex functions of operators on martingales*, Proc. 6th Berkeley Symp. Math. Statistics and Probability, 2 (1972) pp. 223–240
- [2] D.L. Burkholder, R.F. Gundy, *Extrapolation and interpolation for convex functions of operators on martingales* Acta Math. , 124 (1970) pp. 249–304
- [3] Durcik, P. , Ivanisvili, P. , and Joris R.. *Sharp isoperimetric inequalities on the Hamming cube near the critical exponent*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.12674 (2024).
- [4] Beltran, D., Ivanisvili, P., and Madrid, J. (2023). *On sharp isoperimetric inequalities on the hypercube*. arXiv [Math.CA]. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.06738>
- [5] G. Wang, *Sharp Square-Function Inequalities for Conditionally Symmetric Martingales*, TAMS Vol. 328, No. 1 (Nov., 1991), pp. 393–419 (27 pages)
- [6] G. Wang, *Sharp inequalities for the conditional square function of a martingale*, The Annals of Probability 1991, Vol. 19, No. 4, 1679-1688
- [7] Davis, Burgess. *On the L^p norms of stochastic integrals and other martingales*, Duke Mathematical Journal Vol. 43, No. 4 (1976): 697-704.
- [8] T. Hytönen, J. V. Neerven, M. Veraar, and L. Weis. *Analysis in Banach spaces. Vol. 12*. Berlin: Springer, 2016.
- [9] Bobkov, Sergey G. *An isoperimetric inequality on the discrete cube, and an elementary proof of the isoperimetric inequality in Gauss space*. The Annals of Probability 25.1 (1997): 206-214.
- [10] Oseřowski, A. (2012). *Sharp martingale and semimartingale inequalities*. (Vol. 72) Springer Science & Business Media.
- [11] Hart, S. (1976). *A note on the edges of the n -cube*. Discrete Mathematics, 14(2), 157–163.
- [12] Stein, E. M. (1970). *Topics in Harmonic Analysis Related to the Littlewood-Paley Theory*. (AM-63). Princeton University Press.

(NA) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA IRVINE, IRVINE, CA 92697, USA

Email address: nalpay@uci.edu

(PI) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA IRVINE, IRVINE, CA 92697, USA

Email address: pivanisv@uci.edu