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# ON QUANTITATIVE TWO WEIGHT ESTIMATES FOR SOME DYADIC OPERATORS 
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#### Abstract

In this paper, a comparison of two types of quantitative two weight conditions for the boundedness of the dyadic paraproduct and the commutator of the Hilbert transform is provided. In the case of the commutator $[b, H]$, the conditions of the well-known Bloom's inequality [2] and the slightly different types of two weight inequality introduced in [1] are compared around the $A_{2}$-conditions on weights and the novel conditions on the function $b$.


## 1. Introduction

Let $u$ be a weight on $\mathbb{R}$, i.e. an almost everywhere positive locally integrable function. Then we define $L^{2}(\mathbb{R}, u)=L^{2}(u)$ to be the space of functions that are square integrable with respect to the measure $u(x) d x$, namely

$$
\|f\|_{L^{2}(u)}:=\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}}|f(x)|^{2} u(x) d x\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

For a given weight $u$ and an interval $I$, let $u(I)=\int_{I} u(x) d x$ and $m_{I} u=u(I) /|I|$. We say that a weight $u$ satisfies the $A_{p}$ condition if and only if $u$ is a weight, so $u^{-1}$ is also a weight, and the supremum over intervals below is finite.

$$
[u]_{A_{p}}:=\sup _{I} m_{I} u\left(m_{I}\left(u^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}\right)\right)^{p-1}<\infty .
$$

In 1985, Bloom characterized the boundedness of the commutator of the Hilbert transform $[b, H]$ from $L^{p}(u)$ into $L^{p}(v)$ when both weights $u$ and $v$ are in $A_{p}$. When the weights $u=v \in A_{2}$ then it is well-known that the characterization is $b \in \mathrm{BMO}$. However, Bloom provides boundedness in case $u \neq v$ and $u, v \in A_{p}$. The boundedness is characterized in terms of a BMO space adapted to the weight $\rho=(u / v)^{1 / p}$, namely

$$
\|b\|_{B M O_{\rho}}:=\sup _{I}\left(\frac{1}{\rho(I)} \int_{I}\left|b(x)-m_{I} b\right|^{2} d x\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

[^0]Theorem $1.1([2], p=2)$. Let $u, v \in A_{2}$ and put $\rho=(u / v)^{1 / 2}$ and suppose that $b \in L^{1}$. Then
(i) If $b \in B M O_{\rho}$, the commutator $[b, H]$ is a bounded map from $L^{2}(u)$ into $L^{2}(v)$, with

$$
\|[b, H] f\|_{L^{2}(v)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^{2}(u)} .
$$

(ii) Conversely, if $[b, H]: L^{2}(u) \rightarrow L^{2}(v)$ is bounded, then $b \in B M O_{\rho}$.

Let us denote $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}(J)$ the collection of all dyadic intervals and the collection of all dyadic subintervals of $J$ respectively. For $I \in \mathcal{D}$ the Haar function associated with $I$ is

$$
h_{I}=|I|^{-1 / 2}\left(\mathbb{1}_{I_{+}}-\mathbb{1}_{I_{-}}\right)
$$

where $I_{ \pm}$are the left and right dyadic children of $I$. In [5] and [6], the authors present the modern proof of the Theorem 1.1 and also provide the boundedness of the dyadic paraproduct in the spirit of the Theorem 1.1. Here the dyadic paraproduct is defined as

$$
\pi_{b} f:=\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} m_{I} f b_{I} h_{I},
$$

where $b_{I}=\left\langle b, h_{I}\right\rangle$.
Theorem $1.2([5], p=2)$. Let $u, v \in A_{2}$ and suppose that $\mathbf{B}_{2}[u, v]$ is finite where

$$
\mathbf{B}_{2}[u, v]:=\sup _{J \in \mathcal{D}} u^{-1}(J)^{-1 / 2}\left\|\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(J)} b_{I} m_{I}\left(u^{-1}\right) h_{I}\right\|_{L^{2}(v)}
$$

Then

$$
\left\|\pi_{b} f\right\|_{L^{2}(v)} \leq C \mathbf{B}_{2}[u, v]\|f\|_{L^{2}(u)}
$$

Note that by the boundedness of the square function in one weight case, if $v \in A_{2}$ one can easily characterize $\mathbf{B}_{2}[u, v]$ by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{B}_{2}[u, v]^{2}:=\sup _{J \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{u^{-1}(J)} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(J)} b_{I}^{2}\left(m_{I}\left(u^{-1}\right)\right)^{2} m_{I} v \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

We also say that a pair of weight $(u, v)$ satisfies the joint $A_{2}$ condition if and only if both $v$ and $u$ are weights and

$$
[u, v]_{A_{2}}:=\sup _{I \in \mathcal{D}} m_{I}\left(u^{-1}\right) m_{I} v<\infty .
$$

A positive sequence $\left\{\alpha_{I}\right\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$ is a $v$-Carleson sequence if there is a constant $C>0$ such that for all dyadic intervals $J$

$$
\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(J)} \alpha_{I} \leq C v(J)
$$

The infimum among all $C$ 's that satisfy the inequality is called the intensity of the $v$-Carleson sequence $\left\{\alpha_{I}\right\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$.

In [4], the author provides quantitative estimates with a slightly different condition on $b$, namely the two weight Carleson class denoted by $\operatorname{Carl}_{u, v}$, and also on the weights $u$ and $v$, namely the joint $A_{2}$ condition. The function class $\operatorname{Carl}_{u, v}$ is introduced and studied in many papers, such as [1] , [9], and [10]. Given a pair of weights $(u, v)$, we say that a locally integrable function $b$ belongs to the two weight Carleson class, $\operatorname{Carl}_{u, v}$, if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{B}_{u, v}:=\sup _{J \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{u^{-1}(J)} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(J)} \frac{b_{I}^{2}}{m_{I} v}<\infty . \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Theorem 1.3 ([4]). Let $(u, v) \in A_{2}$. If $u, v \in A_{2}$ and $b \in \operatorname{Carl}_{u, v}$ then the commutator $[b, H]$ is bounded from $L^{2}(u)$ into $L^{2}(v)$ with

$$
\|[b, H] f\|_{L^{2}(v)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^{2}(u)} .
$$

For the dyadic paraproduct, the authors in [1] provide the following quantitative two weight estimates.

Theorem $1.4([1])$. Let $(u, v)$ be a pair of weights such that
(i) $(u, v) \in A_{2}$
(ii) there is a constant $\mathcal{D}_{u, v}>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{J \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{v(J)} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(J)}\left|\Delta_{I} v\right|^{2}|I| m_{I}\left(u^{-1}\right) \leq \mathcal{D}_{u, v} \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Delta_{I} v:=m_{I_{+}} v-m_{I_{-}} v$
Assume that $b \in \operatorname{Carl}_{u, v}$, that is $\mathcal{B}_{u, v}<\infty$, then $\pi_{b}$ is bounded from $L^{2}(u)$ into $L^{2}(v)$.

Since the joint $A_{2}$-condition is a condition for the relationship between the two weights, and $A_{2}$-condition on each weight is a condition for each function, we can easily see that the two conditions are independent of each other. However, it is a very strong assumption to assume both conditions. Comparisons of the conditions on $b$ such as $\mathrm{BMO}_{\rho}, \mathbf{B}_{2}[u, v]$, and $\mathcal{B}_{u, v}$ are discussed in Section 2. We provide the discussion about the joint $A_{2}$-conditions as a necessary condition for the boundedness of the dyadic operators in Section 3. Then in Section 4 we restate the theorems which are introduced in this section.

## 2. $\mathbf{B M O}_{\rho}, \mathbf{B}_{2}[u, v]$, and $\mathcal{B}_{u, v}$

In this section we will compare conditions on $b$. Throughout the paper a constant $C$ will be a numerical constant that may chage from line to line. First, we will compare the conditions on $b$ under the joint- $A_{2}$ conditions.

Proposition 2.1. For $(u, v) \in A_{2}$, there holds

$$
\mathbf{B}_{2}[u, v] \leq[u, v]_{A_{2}} \sqrt{\mathcal{B}_{u, v}}
$$

Proof. The result follows immediately from the joint- $A_{2}$ condition, $m_{I}\left(u^{-1}\right) m_{I} v<$ $[u, v]_{A_{2}}$ for all $I \in \mathcal{D}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{B}_{2}[u, v]^{2} & =\sup _{J \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{u^{-1}(J)} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(J)} b_{I}^{2}\left(m_{I}\left(u^{-1}\right)\right)^{2} m_{I} v \\
& \leq[u, v]_{A_{2}} \sup _{J \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{u^{-1}(J)} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(J)} b_{I}^{2}\left(m_{I}\left(u^{-1}\right)\right) \\
& \leq[u, v]_{A_{2}}^{2} \sup _{J \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{u^{-1}(J)} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(J)} \frac{b_{I}^{2}}{m_{I} v} \\
& =[u, v]_{A_{2}}^{2} \mathcal{B}_{u, v}
\end{aligned}
$$

However, we can't get the inequality in opposite way for Proposition 2.1. Let us assume that $(u, v) \in A_{2},\left\{|I|\left|\Delta_{I} v\right|^{2} m_{I}\left(u^{-1}\right)\right\}_{I}$ is a $v$-Carleson sequence. Then, by using the fact that the dyadic square function $S^{d}$ is bounded from $L^{2}\left(v^{-1}\right)$ into $L^{2}\left(u^{-1}\right)$ and $1 \leq m_{I} v m_{I} v^{-1}$, we have the followings

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B}_{u, v} & =\sup _{J \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{u^{-1}(J)} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(J)} \frac{b_{I}^{2}}{m_{I} v} \\
& \leq \sup _{J \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{u^{-1}(J)} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(J)} b_{I}^{2} m_{I}\left(v^{-1}\right) \\
& \leq \sup _{J \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{u^{-1}(J)}\left\|S^{d}\left(\left(b-m_{J} b\right) \mathbb{1}_{J}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(v^{-1}\right)}^{2} \\
& \leq\left\|S^{d}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(v^{-1}\right) \rightarrow L^{2}\left(u^{-1}\right)} \sup _{J \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{u^{-1}(J)} \|\left(\left(b-m_{J} b\right) \mathbb{1}_{J} \|_{L^{2}\left(u^{-1}\right)}^{2}\right. \\
& =\left\|S^{d}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(v^{-1}\right) \rightarrow L^{2}\left(u^{-1}\right)} \sup _{J \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{u^{-1}(J)} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(J)} b_{I}^{2} m_{I}\left(u^{-1}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

In order to compare the last quantity in the inequality with $\mathbf{B}_{2}[u, v]^{2}$, we need an extra assumption that there is a constant $q>0$ such that $m_{I}\left(u^{-1}\right) m_{I} v \geq q$ for all $I \in \mathcal{D}$. But this extra assumption essentially reduces the problem to the one weight case [8]. Assuming the opposite case, that is $u, v \in A_{2}$, the following results are obtained. In [6], it is shown that the following are equivalent conditions
(i) $\sup _{I \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{\rho(I)} \int_{I}\left|b(x)-m_{I} b\right| d x<\infty$.
(ii) $\sup _{I \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{\rho(I)} \int_{I}\left|b(x)-m_{I} b\right|^{2} \rho^{-1}(x) d x<\infty$.
(iii) $\sup _{I \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{u(I)} \int_{I}\left|b(x)-m_{I} b\right|^{2} v(x) d x<\infty$.
(iv) $\sup _{I \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{v^{-1}(I)} \int_{I}\left|b(x)-m_{I} b\right|^{2} u^{-1}(x) d x<\infty$.

Proposition 2.2. For $u, v \in A_{2}$ and $\rho=(u / v)^{1 / 2}$ there holds

$$
\operatorname{Carl}_{v, u}=B M O_{\rho}
$$

Proof. First we assume that $b \in \operatorname{Carl}_{v, u}$, that is, there is a constant $C$ such that $\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(J)} b_{I}^{2} / m_{I} u \leq m_{J}\left(v^{-1}\right)$ for all $J \in \mathcal{D}$. When $w \in A_{2}$ the dyadic square function $S^{d}$ obeys a lower bound $\|f\|_{L^{2}(w)} \leq C[w]_{A_{2}}^{1 / 2}\left\|S^{d} f\right\|_{L^{2}(w)}$. Using the lower bounds for $S^{d}$, for all $J \in \mathcal{D}$, we get the estimate

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\left(b-m_{J} b\right) \mathbb{1}_{J}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(u^{-1}\right)}^{2} & \leq C[u]_{A_{2}}\left\|S^{d}\left(\left(b-m_{J} b\right) \mathbb{1}_{J}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(u^{-1}\right)}^{2} \\
& =C[u]_{A_{2}} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(J)} b_{I}^{2} m_{I}\left(u^{-1}\right) \\
& \leq C[u]_{A_{2}}^{2} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(J)} \frac{b_{I}^{2}}{m_{I} u} \\
& \leq C[u]_{A_{2}}^{2} v^{-1}(J) \mathcal{B}_{v, u}
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence we have that

$$
\sup _{J \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{v^{-1}(J)} \int_{J}\left|b(x)-m_{I} b\right|^{2} u^{-1}(x) d x<C \mathcal{B}_{v, u}
$$

Assume now that $b \in \mathrm{BMO}_{\rho}$, that is, there is a constant $C$ such that

$$
\left\|\left(b-m_{J} b\right) \mathbb{1}_{J}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(u^{-1}\right)}^{2} \leq C \mathbf{B}_{2}[u, v] v^{-1}(J)
$$

We can conclude that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(J)} \frac{b_{I}^{2}}{m_{I} u} & \leq \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(J)} b_{I}^{2} m_{I}\left(u^{-1}\right)=\left\|S^{d}\left(\left(b-m_{J} b\right) \mathbb{1}_{J}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(u^{-1}\right)}^{2} \\
& \leq[u]_{A_{2}}\left\|\left(b-m_{J} b\right) \mathbb{1}_{J}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(u^{-1}\right)}^{2} \\
& \leq C[u]_{A_{2}} v^{-1}(J)
\end{aligned}
$$

## 3. The joint $A_{2}$-condition as a necessary condition

In this section we will discuss about the joint- $A_{2}$ condition which is a necessary condition for the boundedness of the dyadic paraproduct and the commutator. For fixed $I \in \mathcal{D}$, let us choose $b=\sqrt{|I|} h_{I}=\mathbb{1}_{I_{+}}-\mathbb{1}_{I_{-}}$and $f=u^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{I}$. Since $\left\langle\sqrt{|I|} h_{I}, h_{J}\right\rangle=\sqrt{|I|}$ for $I=J$ only and $\left\langle\sqrt{|I|} h_{I}, h_{J}\right\rangle=0$ for others,

$$
\left\|\pi_{b}\right\|_{L^{2}(u) \rightarrow L^{2}(v)}=\sup _{f \in L^{2}(u)} \frac{\left\|\pi_{b} f\right\|_{L^{2}(v)}}{\|f\|_{L^{2}(u)}} \geq \frac{\left\|\pi_{h_{I}} u^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{I}\right\|_{L^{2}(v)}}{\left\|u^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{I}\right\|_{L^{2}(u)}}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\frac{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left|\sqrt{|I|} m_{I}\left(u^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{I}\right) h_{I}\right|^{2} v d x\right)^{1 / 2}}{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left|u^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{I}\right|^{2} u d x\right)^{1 / 2}} \\
& =\frac{m_{I}\left(u^{-1}\right)\left(m_{I} v\right)^{1 / 2}}{\left(m_{I}\left(u^{-1}\right)\right)^{1 / 2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

We, therefore, have

$$
m_{I}\left(u^{-1}\right) m_{I} v \leq\left\|\pi_{b}\right\|_{L^{2}(u) \rightarrow L^{2}(v)}
$$

To see the necessary condition for the commutator of the Hilbert transform, it suffices to check them for the commutator of the Haar shift operator, which has proven to be useful proof technique. With the decomposition of the commutator of the Haar shift operator from [3],

$$
\begin{equation*}
[b, \amalg] f=\left[\amalg\left(\pi_{b} f\right)-\pi_{b}(\amalg f)\right]+\left[\amalg\left(\pi_{b}^{*} f\right)-\pi_{b}^{*}(\amalg f)\right]+\left[\pi_{\amalg f} b-\amalg\left(\pi_{f} b\right)\right] \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In [3], it also has presented that the first two terms have more singularities than the last term. Indeed, the last term is well localized due to some cancellations, but the others lost the localized property. Thus, we will only observe the necessary conditions by dealing with the last term of the decomposition (3.1). Similar to the calculation of the dyadic paraproduct, we choose $b=\sqrt{|I|} h_{I}$ and $f=u^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{I_{ \pm}}$. By direct calculation,

$$
\pi_{\amalg f} b-\amalg\left(\pi_{f} b\right)=\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{b_{I} f_{I}}{\sqrt{|I|}}\left(h_{I_{+}}-h_{I_{-}}\right) .
$$

Thus, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\|\pi_{\amalg\left(u^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{I_{ \pm}}\right)} \sqrt{|I|} h_{I}-\amalg\left(\pi_{\left(u^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{I_{ \pm}}\right)} \sqrt{|I|} h_{I}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}(v)} \\
& \quad=\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left|\left\langle u^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{I_{ \pm}}, h_{I}\right\rangle^{2}\left(h_{I_{+}}-h_{I_{-}}\right)\right|^{2} v d x\right)^{1 / 2} \\
& \quad=\frac{1}{4} m_{I_{ \pm}}\left(u^{-1}\right)|I|^{1 / 2}\left(\int_{I}\left|h_{I_{+}}-h_{I_{-}}\right|^{2} v d x\right)^{1 / 2} \\
& \quad=\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} m_{I_{ \pm}}\left(u^{-1}\right)|I|^{1 / 2}\left(m_{I} v\right)^{1 / 2}
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\left\|u^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{I_{ \pm}}\right\|_{L^{2}(u)}=\left(\int_{I_{ \pm}} u^{-1} d x\right)^{1 / 2}=u^{-1}\left(I_{ \pm}\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

Similar to the case of the dyadic paraproduct, the following two inequalities can be obtained:

$$
\left\|\pi_{\amalg f} b-\amalg\left(\pi_{f} b\right)\right\|_{L^{2}(u) \rightarrow L^{2}(v)} \geq C \sqrt{m_{I_{+}}\left(u^{-1}\right)\left(m_{I} v\right)}
$$

and

$$
\left\|\pi_{\amalg f} b-\amalg\left(\pi_{f} b\right)\right\|_{L^{2}(u) \rightarrow L^{2}(v)} \geq C \sqrt{m_{I_{-}}\left(u^{-1}\right)\left(m_{I} v\right)}
$$

By adding these inequalities, we get

$$
\left\|\pi_{\amalg f} b-\amalg\left(\pi_{f} b\right)\right\|_{L^{2}(u) \rightarrow L^{2}(v)} \geq C \sqrt{m_{I}\left(u^{-1}\right)\left(m_{I} v\right)}
$$

Therefore, we can see in both cases of the dyadic paraproduct and the commutators of the Hilbert transform that $[u, v]_{A_{2}}$ is bounded by the operator norm from $L^{2}(u)$ into $L^{2}(v)$ and so $(u, v) \in A_{2}$.

## 4. Two weight estimate for some dyadic operators

In this section, we introduce the new versions of Theorem 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 which are stated in Section 1. First using Proposition 2.2, we can replace $\mathrm{BMO}_{\rho}$ with Carl $_{u, v}$ as follows.
Theorem 4.1. Let $u, v \in A_{2}$ and suppose that $b \in L^{1}$. Then
(i) If $b \in C$ Carl $l_{v, u}$, the commutator $[b, H]$ is a bounded map from $L^{2}(u)$ into $L^{2}(v)$.
(ii) Conversely, if $[b, H]: L^{2}(u) \rightarrow L^{2}(v)$ is bounded, then $b \in \operatorname{Carl}_{v, u}$.

Using the observation in Section 3, we place the joint $A_{2}$-conditions as a necessary and sufficient condition for the boundedness of the given dyadic operators. Then we have the following theorems

Theorem 4.2. Let $u, v \in A_{2}$ and $b \in \operatorname{Carl}_{u, v}$. Then
(i) If $(u, v) \in A_{2}$ then the commutator $[b, H]$ is a bounded map from $L^{2}(u)$ into $L^{2}(v)$.
(ii) Conversely, if $[b, H]: L^{2}(u) \rightarrow L^{2}(v)$ is bounded, then $(u, v) \in A_{2}$.

Theorem 4.3. Let $(u, v)$ be a pair of weights such that

$$
\sup _{J \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{v(J)} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}(J)}\left|\Delta_{I} v\right|^{2}|I| m_{I}\left(u^{-1}\right)<\infty
$$

and $b \in \operatorname{Carl}_{u, v}$. Then
(i) If $(u, v) \in A_{2}$ then the dyadic paraproduct $\pi_{b}$ is a bounded map from $L^{2}(u)$ into $L^{2}(v)$.
(ii) Conversely, if $\pi_{b}$ is bounded from $L^{2}(u)$ into $L^{2}(v)$ then $(u, v) \in A_{2}$.
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