

TWO-WEIGHT ESTIMATES FOR SPARSE SQUARE FUNCTIONS AND THE SEPARATED BUMP CONJECTURE

SPYRIDON KAKAROUMPAS

ABSTRACT. We show that two-weight L^2 bounds for sparse square functions, uniformly with respect to the sparseness constant of the underlying sparse family, and in both directions, do not imply a two-weight L^2 bound for the Hilbert transform. We present an explicit example, making use of the construction due to Reguera–Thiele from [18]. At the same time, we show that such two-weight bounds for sparse square functions do not imply both separated Orlicz bump conditions of the involved weights for $p = 2$ (and for Young functions satisfying an appropriate integrability condition). We rely on the domination of $L \log L$ bumps by Orlicz bumps (for Young functions satisfying an appropriate integrability condition) observed by Treil–Volberg in [20].

CONTENTS

1. Introduction and main results	1
2. Overview of the paper	6
3. The Reguera–Thiele [18] construction	10
4. Two-weight estimates for generalized sparse operators	13
5. Investigating separated bump conditions	25
6. Appendix	33
References	35

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

This paper concerns the relation between two-weight estimates for sparse square functions and the so-called “separated bump” conjecture. Here, by weight on $\mathbb{R}^d$ we understand any locally integrable, nonnegative, and positive on a set of positive Lebesgue measure function on $\mathbb{R}^d$. It has been long known that if $1 < p < \infty$ and w is a weight on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $w > 0$ a.e., then the celebrated Muckenhoupt A_p condition

$$(1.1) \quad \sup_Q \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q w(x) dx \right) \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q w(x)^{-1/(p-1)} dx \right)^{p-1} < \infty,$$

where supremum is taken over all cubes Q in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $|\cdot|, dx$ denote Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$, is sufficient for the boundedness over $L^p(w)$ of any Calderón–Zygmund operator T on $\mathbb{R}^d$, and necessary for that boundedness in the case that T is the Hilbert transform on $\mathbb{R}$, or more generally the vector-valued Riesz transform (that is, all Riesz transforms considered together) on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Note that the boundedness of T over $L^p(w)$ is equivalent (with equal norms) to the boundedness of the operator $f \mapsto T(f\sigma)$, denoted in what

follows by $T(\cdot\sigma)$, acting from $L^p(\sigma)$ into $L^p(w)$, where $\sigma := w^{-1/(p-1)}$. Note that if (1.1) holds, then σ is a weight as well.

However, simple examples show that for $1 < p < \infty$ and general weights w, σ on $\mathbb{R}$, the two-weight A_p condition

$$(1.2) \quad \sup_Q \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q w(x) dx \right) \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q \sigma(x) dx \right)^{p-1} < \infty,$$

where supremum is taken over all cubes Q in $\mathbb{R}^d$, is not sufficient for the boundedness of the operator $T(\cdot\sigma)$ from $L^p(\sigma)$ into $L^p(w)$, in the case that T is the Hilbert transform on $\mathbb{R}$; condition (1.2) is still necessary for that boundedness, though. It should be noted that if $\sigma > 0$ a.e., then the boundedness of $T(\cdot\sigma)$ from $L^p(\sigma)$ into $L^p(w)$ is equivalent (with equal norms) to the boundedness of T from $L^p(v)$ into $L^p(w)$, where $v := \sigma^{1-p}$.

It is natural to ask whether “bumping” condition (1.2) could eliminate its lack of sufficiency for two-weight boundedness. It was proved by C. J. Neugebauer [14] that if $1 < p < \infty$ and w, v are weights with $v > 0$ a.e., then for all $r > 1$, the condition

$$(1.3) \quad \sup_Q \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q w(x)^r dx \right) \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q v(x)^{-r/(p-1)} dx \right)^{p-1} < \infty,$$

where supremum is taken over all cubes Q in $\mathbb{R}^d$, is sufficient for the boundedness of any Calderón–Zygmund operator T from $L^p(v)$ into $L^p(w)$. In fact, Neugebauer [14] proved that if condition (1.3) holds for some $r > 1$ then one can find a Muckenhoupt A_p weight u such that $w \leq u \leq cv$ for some positive constant c .

More generally, for any Young function Φ , that is a continuous, increasing and convex function $\Phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with $\Phi(0) = 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(t)/t = \infty$, and for any measure space (X, μ) denote by $\|\cdot\|_{L^\Phi(X, \mu)}$ the Luxemburg norm on (X, μ) with respect to Φ , given by

$$\|f\|_{L^\Phi(X, \mu)} := \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \int_X \Phi \left(\frac{|f(x)|}{\lambda} \right) d\mu(x) \leq 1 \right\}.$$

We refer to [3] for more details on Young functions and Orlicz norms. For all cubes Q on $\mathbb{R}^d$, we will denote $L^\Phi(Q, dx/|Q|)$, where $dx/|Q|$ is normalized Lebesgue measure on Q , by just $L^\Phi(Q)$. The following result, having been conjectured (in a slightly different, but equivalent for sufficiently regular Young functions, form) by D. Cruz-Uribe and C. Pérez in [4], was proved almost simultaneously by F. Nazarov, A. Reznikov, S. Treil and A. Volberg [13], and (in a slightly different, but equivalent for sufficiently regular Young functions, form) A. Lerner [9] (the latter actually proved a similar result for all $1 < p < \infty$, which had also been conjectured by Cruz-Uribe and Pérez in [4]).

Theorem 1.1. *Let Φ_1, Φ_2 be Young functions such that $\int_c^\infty \frac{1}{\Phi_i(x)} dx < \infty$, $i = 1, 2$, for some $c > 0$. Let w, σ be weights on $\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying*

$$(1.4) \quad \sup_Q \|w\|_{L^{\Phi_1}(Q)} \|\sigma\|_{L^{\Phi_2}(Q)} < \infty,$$

where supremum is taken over all cubes Q in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then, for any Calderón–Zygmund operator T , the operator $T(\cdot w)$ is bounded from $L^2(w)$ into $L^2(\sigma)$.

1.1. Separated bump conjecture and motivation for main results. It is natural to ask whether it is possible to separate the two bumps appearing in the supremum in (1.4) in Theorem 1.1. Cruz-Urbe, Reznikov and Volberg [5] conjectured (in a slightly different, but equivalent for sufficiently regular Young functions, form) the following, which is one version of the “separated bump” conjecture (for $p = 2$). Denote $\langle w \rangle_Q := \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q w(x) dx$.

Conjecture 1.2. *Let Φ_1, Φ_2 be Young functions such that $\int_c^\infty \frac{1}{\Phi_i(x)} dx < \infty$, $i = 1, 2$, for some $c > 0$. Let w, σ be weights on $\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying*

$$(1.5) \quad \sup_Q \|w\|_{L^{\Phi_1}(Q)} \langle \sigma \rangle_Q < \infty, \quad \sup_Q \langle w \rangle_Q \|\sigma\|_{L^{\Phi_2}(Q)} < \infty,$$

where both suprema are taken over all cubes Q in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then, for any Calderón–Zygmund operator T , the operator $T(\cdot w)$ is bounded from $L^2(w)$ into $L^2(\sigma)$.

In [5], Cruz-Urbe, Reznikov and Volberg establish a special case of Conjecture 1.2 (these authors establish in [5] an analogous result for all $1 < p < \infty$ as well).

Theorem 1.3 (Cruz-Urbe, Reznikov, Volberg [5]). *Let Φ be a Young function such that one of the following holds.*

(1) *There exists $\delta > 0$, such that*

$$\Phi(t) = t(\log(e + t))^{1+\delta}, \quad 0 \leq t < \infty.$$

(2) *There exists $\delta > 1$, such that*

$$\Phi(t) = t \log(e + t) (\log(\log(e^e + t)))^{1+\delta}, \quad 0 \leq t < \infty.$$

Let w, σ be weights on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $\sigma > 0$ a.e. on $\mathbb{R}^d$, such that

$$\sup_Q \|w\|_{L^\Phi(Q)} \langle \sigma \rangle_Q < \infty, \quad \sup_Q \langle w \rangle_Q \|\sigma\|_{L^\Phi(Q)} < \infty,$$

where both suprema are taken over all cubes Q in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then, for any Calderón–Zygmund operator T , the operator $T(\cdot w)$ is bounded from $L^2(w)$ into $L^2(\sigma)$.

Numerous other partial results and extensions of them to more general contexts have since been achieved regarding Conjecture 1.2, see for instance [1], [7], [15], [20]. The proofs of all these results rely on reducing the problem to establishing two-weight bounds for sparse operators, via domination of Calderón–Zygmund operators by sparse operators. The latter technique, having been initiated by Lerner [9], has become standard for proving weighted estimates in recent years. For a sparse family $\mathcal{S}$ of cubes in $\mathbb{R}^d$ (see Subsection 4.1 for the relevant definitions), we define the sparse (Lerner) operator corresponding to $\mathcal{S}$ by

$$(1.6) \quad \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}} f := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}} \langle |f| \rangle_Q 1_Q, \quad \forall f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Various results (and in various senses) of domination of Calderón–Zygmund operators by sparse operators have been proved, even extending this domination to other classes of operators of interest in harmonic analysis and to the vector-valued setting. We mention just one such result, which motivates the main results of the present paper.

Its proof can be found (for instance) in [8] or [10] (see also [12] for an extension to the vector-valued setting).

Theorem 1.4. *For any Calderón–Zygmund operator T on $\mathbb{R}^d$, for any $\eta > 0$ and for any compactly supported integrable function f on $\mathbb{R}^d$, there exists an η -sparse family $\mathcal{S}$ of cubes in $\mathbb{R}^d$, depending on η, d, T and the function f , such that*

$$|Tf| \leq C\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}}f \quad \text{a.e. on } \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $C = C(\eta, d, T)$ depends on η, d, T but not on the function f .

One can also consider generalized sparse operators. Namely, for any $1 \leq p < \infty$ and for any sparse family $\mathcal{S}$ of cubes in $\mathbb{R}^d$, define the sparse p -function (sparse square function if $p = 2$) corresponding to $\mathcal{S}$ by

$$(1.7) \quad \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S},p}f := \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}} (\langle |f| \rangle_Q)^p 1_Q \right)^{1/p}, \quad \forall f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

and the sparse maximal function corresponding to $\mathcal{S}$ by

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}f := \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{S}} \langle |f| \rangle_Q 1_Q, \quad \forall f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

It is worth noting that the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function on $\mathbb{R}^d$ admits pointwise sparse domination by sparse maximal functions in the sense of Theorem 1.4. Although the separated bump conjecture has not been proved yet in full generality for sparse (Lerner) operators of the type (1.6), it turns out that the following strengthened form of the conjecture is true for sparse square functions, with only mild additional assumptions of regularity for the involved Young functions. It follows immediately by combining Lemma 3.3 and Theorem 4.2 in [20], due to Treil and Volberg.

Proposition 1.5 (Treil–Volberg [20]). *Let Φ be a Young function with $\int_c^\infty \frac{1}{\Phi(t)} dt < \infty$ for some $c > 0$. Assume in addition that Φ is doubling and that the function $t \mapsto \Phi(t)/(t \log t)$ is increasing for sufficiently large t . Let w, σ be weights on $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that*

$$\sup_Q \|w\|_{L^\Phi(Q)} \langle \sigma \rangle_Q < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all cubes Q in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then, for any $0 < \eta < 1$, for any η -sparse family $\mathcal{S}$ of cubes in $\mathbb{R}^d$, there holds $\|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S},2}(\cdot w)\|_{L^2(w) \rightarrow L^2(\sigma)} \leq C = C(\eta, d)$.

In view of the above proposition, one might hope to prove the separated bump conjecture for $p = 2$, and for mildly regular Young functions, by establishing that two-weight bounds for sparse square functions, uniform with respect to the sparseness constant of the underlying sparse family, and in both directions, imply two-weight estimates for singular integral operators. More precisely, one might conjecture the following.

Conjecture 1.6. *Let w, σ be weights on $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that for any $0 < \eta < 1$, for any η -sparse family $\mathcal{S}$ of cubes in $\mathbb{R}^d$, there holds*

$$\|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S},2}(\cdot w)\|_{L^2(w) \rightarrow L^2(\sigma)}, \quad \|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S},2}(\cdot \sigma)\|_{L^2(\sigma) \rightarrow L^2(w)} \leq C = C(\eta, d).$$

Then, for any Calderón–Zygmund operator T on $\mathbb{R}^d$, the operator $T(\cdot w)$ is bounded from $L^2(w)$ into $L^2(\sigma)$.

One might even be tempted to conjecture the following stronger result, in the spirit of sparse domination of Calderón–Zygmund operators.

Conjecture 1.7. *For any $0 < \eta < 1$, for any Calderón–Zygmund operator T on $\mathbb{R}^d$, and for any measurable bounded compactly supported functions f, g on $\mathbb{R}^d$, there exists an η -sparse family $\mathcal{S}$ of cubes in $\mathbb{R}^d$, depending on η, d, T and the functions f, g , such that*

$$|\langle T(f), g \rangle| \leq C(\langle \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S},2} f, |g| \rangle + \langle |f|, \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S},2} g \rangle).$$

where $C = C(\eta, d, T)$ depends only on η, d, T .

1.2. Main results. The main result of the present paper is that Conjecture 1.6, and thus also Conjecture 1.7, is false for the Hilbert transform on $\mathbb{R}$.

Proposition 1.8. *For any $1 < p < \infty$, there exist weights w, σ on $\mathbb{R}$, such that for any $0 < \eta < 1$, for any η -sparse family $\mathcal{S}$ of intervals in $\mathbb{R}$, one has the two-weight bounds*

$$\|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S},p}(\cdot w)\|_{L^p(w) \rightarrow L^p(\sigma)}, \|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S},p'}(\cdot \sigma)\|_{L^{p'}(\sigma) \rightarrow L^{p'}(w)} \leq C = C(\eta, p),$$

but the operator $H(\cdot w)$ is unbounded from $L^p(w)$ into $L^p(\sigma)$, where H denotes the Hilbert transform.

We prove Proposition 1.8 by providing an explicit counterexample, using the construction due to M. C. Reguera and C. Thiele [18], itself a simplified version of the construction due to Reguera [16]. In [18], Reguera and Thiele used their construction to disprove the so-called weak-type Muckenhoupt–Wheeden conjecture, while in [17] Reguera and J. Scurry used the construction from [18] to disprove the so-called strong-type Muckenhoupt–Wheeden conjecture. The latter conjecture concerned joint two-weight estimates between the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function and singular integrals, see Subsection 2.1.

1.2.1. Investigating separated bump conditions. Although the example we provide does disprove Conjecture 1.6, it fails in an essential way to disprove the separated bump conjecture (Conjecture 1.2) itself, for $p = 2$.

Proposition 1.9. *One can find weights w, σ on $\mathbb{R}$ satisfying Proposition 1.8 for $p = 2$, such that for all Young functions Φ with $\int_c^\infty \frac{1}{\Phi(t)} dt < \infty$ for some $c > 0$, there holds*

$$\sup_I \|w\|_{L^\Phi(I)} \langle \sigma \rangle_I = \infty,$$

where supremum is taken over all intervals I in $\mathbb{R}$.

In particular, two-weight bounds for sparse square functions of the type appearing in Conjecture 1.6 do not imply both separated Orlicz bump conditions of the involved weights for $p = 2$, and for Young functions satisfying the integrability condition of Proposition 1.9. In order to prove Proposition 1.9, we rely on the domination of $L \log L$ bumps by Orlicz bumps (for Young functions satisfying the integrability condition of Proposition 1.9) observed by Treil and Volberg in [20].

It is a curious fact that the above issue disappears if one restricts attention to *triadic* intervals.

Proposition 1.10. *One can find weights w, σ on $\mathbb{R}$ satisfying Proposition 1.8 for $p = 2$ as well as Proposition 1.9, such that for some $\delta \in (0, 1)$, the Young function Φ given by*

$$\Phi(t) := t \log(e + t) (\log(\log(e^e + t)))^{1+\delta}, \quad 0 \leq t < \infty,$$

satisfies

$$\sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}} \|w\|_{L^\Phi(I)} \langle \sigma \rangle_I < \infty, \quad \sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}} \|\sigma\|_{L^\Phi(I)} \langle w \rangle_I < \infty,$$

where $\mathcal{T}$ is the family of all triadic intervals in $\mathbb{R}$.

We emphasize that the exponent $1 + \delta$ in Proposition 1.10 satisfies $1 + \delta < 2$; compare with Theorem 1.3.

Acknowledgements. I am grateful to Professor Sergei Treil for suggesting the problem of this paper to me, and for several very helpful discussions on various aspects of this paper.

2. OVERVIEW OF THE PAPER

Here we give an outline of the proofs of the main results. In the sequel, the notation $A \lesssim_{c_1, c_2, \dots} B$, respectively $A \gtrsim_{c_1, c_2, \dots} B$, will mean that $A \leq CB$, respectively $A \geq CB$, for some positive constant C depending only on the quantities $c_1, c_2, \dots$. The notation $A \sim_{c_1, c_2, \dots} B$ will mean that $A \lesssim_{c_1, c_2, \dots} B$ and $B \lesssim_{c_1, c_2, \dots} A$.

2.1. Recalling the estimates from [17] and [18]. In this paper, we make use of a construction of a particular weight on $[0, 1)$ due to Reguera–Thiele [18], which was also used by Reguera–Scurry [17]. For every positive integer parameter $k > 3000$, Reguera–Thiele [18] construct a weight w_k on $[0, 1)$ satisfying

$$(2.1) \quad |Hw_k(x)| \gtrsim kw_k(x), \quad \text{for all } x \in \{w_k > 0\}.$$

The lattice of triadic subintervals of $[0, 1)$ plays a fundamental role in their construction. For the reader's convenience, we recall the construction of the weight w_k due to Reguera–Thiele [18] in Section 3. Fix $1 < p < \infty$. Reguera–Thiele [18] for $p = 2$ and Reguera–Scurry [17] for any $1 < p < \infty$ define the weight $\sigma_k := \frac{w_k}{(Mw_k)^p}$, where M denotes the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function. Reguera–Scurry [17] prove the estimate

$$(2.2) \quad Mw_k(x) \lesssim w_k(x), \quad \text{for all } x \in \{w_k > 0\},$$

a restricted version of which is also established by Reguera–Thiele [18]. Combining (2.1) and (2.2), Reguera–Scurry [17] immediately deduce that

$$(2.3) \quad \|Hw_k\|_{L^p(\sigma_k)} \gtrsim k \|1_{[0, 1)}\|_{L^p(w_k)}.$$

Using (2.2), Reguera–Scurry [17] establish the two-weights bounds

$$(2.4) \quad \|M(\cdot w_k)\|_{L^p(w_k) \rightarrow L^p(\sigma_k)}, \quad \|M(\cdot \sigma_k)\|_{L^{p'}(\sigma_k) \rightarrow L^{p'}(w_k)} \lesssim 1.$$

We emphasize that estimate (2.4) is uniform with respect to k . Using (2.3) and (2.4) and applying a standard “direct sum of singularities” (also known as “gliding hump”) type argument, Reguera–Scurry [17] produce weights w, σ on $\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\|M(\cdot w)\|_{L^p(w) \rightarrow L^p(\sigma)}, \quad \|M(\cdot \sigma)\|_{L^{p'}(\sigma) \rightarrow L^{p'}(w)} < \infty,$$

but there exists $f \in L^p(w)$ with $H(fw) \notin L^p(\sigma)$, thus disproving the strong-type Muckenhoupt–Wheeden conjecture.

2.2. Two-weight estimates for generalized sparse operators. In order to prove Proposition 1.8, we begin by establishing two-weight estimates for sparse p -functions and sparse p' -functions, with respect to the weights constructed by Reguera–Thiele [18] for $p = 2$ and Reguera–Scurry [17] for any $1 < p < \infty$. Denote $u(Q) := \int_Q u(x)dx$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, and let $\mathcal{S}$ be a martingale ε -sparse family of subintervals of $[0, 1)$. Then, there holds*

$$(2.5) \quad \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L}} (\langle w_k \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma_k \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p k \frac{w_k(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}, \quad \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L}} (\langle \sigma_k \rangle_I)^{p'} \langle w_k \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p k \frac{\sigma_k(L)}{1 - \varepsilon},$$

for any subinterval L of $[0, 1)$.

We refer to Subsection 4.1 for the definition of martingale sparse families, and to Subsection 4.3 for the proof of Proposition 2.1. Notice that in contrast to the estimates (2.4) obtained by Reguera–Scurry [17], estimates (2.5) are not uniform with respect to k . To rectify this, we will need to rescale one of the two weights. Namely, pick $r \in (\max(1/(p-1), 1), p')$, where $p' := p/(p-1)$, and define the weight $\tilde{w}_k := k^{-r} w_k$ on $[0, 1)$. Then, it is immediate to see that for any martingale ε -sparse family $\mathcal{S}$ of subintervals of $[0, 1)$ there holds

$$(2.6) \quad \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L}} (\langle \tilde{w}_k \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma_k \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{\tilde{w}_k(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}, \quad \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L}} (\langle \sigma_k \rangle_I)^{p'} \langle \tilde{w}_k \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{\sigma_k(L)}{1 - \varepsilon},$$

for any subinterval L of $[0, 1)$. Although the estimates in (2.6) are formally only truncated and restricted versions of the two-weight bounds we would like to prove, and concern only martingale sparse families, they imply the desired two-weight bounds in full generality. Indeed, it is a special case of a result due to A. Culiuc [6] that L^p two-weight bounds for martingale p -functions are equivalent to Sawyer-type testing conditions like the one appearing in the first estimate in (2.6). Moreover, as explained in [12], estimates for sparse operators with respect to general sparse families can be reduced to estimates for sparse operators with respect to martingale sparse families. We refer to Subsection 4.2 for details.

It is important to note that the rescaling we introduced above does not destroy the blow-up of the norm of the Hilbert transform established by Reguera–Scurry [17]. Indeed, estimate (2.3) is immediately seen to imply the estimate

$$(2.7) \quad \|H\tilde{w}_k\|_{L^p(\sigma_k)} \gtrsim k^{1-(r/p')} \|1_{[0,1]}\|_{L^p(\tilde{w}_k)},$$

where $1 - (r/p') > 0$. Applying a “direct sum of singularities” type argument following the one used by Reguera–Scurry [17], we get weights $\tilde{w}, \sigma$ on $\mathbb{R}$ such that for any $0 < \eta < 1$ and for any η -sparse family $\mathcal{S}$ of intervals in $\mathbb{R}$ there holds

$$\|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S},p}(\cdot \tilde{w})\|_{L^p(\tilde{w}) \rightarrow L^p(\sigma)}, \|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S},p}(\cdot \sigma)\|_{L^{p'}(\sigma) \rightarrow L^{p'}(\tilde{w})} \lesssim_{p,\eta} 1,$$

but there exists $f \in L^p(\tilde{w})$ such that $H(f\tilde{w}) \notin L^p(\sigma)$. We refer to Subsection 4.2 for details. This concludes the proof of Proposition 1.8.

2.3. Investigating separated bump conditions. Although the example introduced in the previous subsection suffices to disprove Conjecture 1.6, it fails dramatically to disprove the separated bump conjecture (Conjecture 1.2) itself, for $p = 2$.

We assume throughout this subsection that $p = 2$. We prove that for all Young functions Φ with $\int_c^\infty \frac{1}{\Phi(t)} dt < \infty$ for some $c > 0$, there holds

$$\sup_I \|\tilde{w}\|_{L^\Phi(I)} \langle \sigma \rangle_I = \infty,$$

where supremum is taken over all intervals I in $\mathbb{R}$. It suffices to prove that there exists a subinterval R of $[0, 1)$, such that for all Young functions Φ with $\int_c^\infty \frac{1}{\Phi(t)} dt < \infty$ for some $c > 0$, there holds

$$(2.8) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{w}_k\|_{L^\Phi(R)} \langle \sigma_k \rangle_R = \infty.$$

We need to estimate Orlicz bumps for the weight w_k constructed by Reguera–Thiele [18] from below. Instead of doing this directly, we estimate certain Lorentz bumps, resulting in a drastic simplification of the required computations.

More precisely, consider the function $\phi_0 : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ given by

$$\phi_0(s) := s(1 - \log s), \quad 0 < s \leq 1, \quad \phi_0(0) := 0.$$

For all intervals I in $\mathbb{R}$, we denote by $\Lambda_{\phi_0}(I)$ the Lorentz space with fundamental function ϕ_0 , with respect to normalized Lebesgue measure on I . We refer to Subsection 5.1 for the definition of Lorentz spaces, and to Subsection 5.2 for further remarks on the Lorentz space Λ_{ϕ_0} .

It is an observation due to Treil and Volberg [20], that for all Young functions Φ with $\int_c^\infty \frac{1}{\Phi(t)} dt < \infty$ for some $c > 0$, one has the estimate

$$(2.9) \quad C \|f\|_{\Lambda_{\phi_0}(I)} \leq \|f\|_{L^\Phi(I)},$$

for some positive constant $C = C(\Phi)$ depending only on the function Φ , for all measurable functions $f \geq 0$ on I , for all intervals I . We refer to Subsection 5.3 for details.

In light of (2.9), it suffices to prove the following stronger result: there exists a subinterval R of $[0, 1)$ such that

$$(2.10) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{w}_k\|_{\Lambda_{\phi_0}(R)} \langle \sigma_k \rangle_R = \infty.$$

After recalling that $\tilde{w}_k := k^{-r} w_k$, where $1 < r < 2$, this follows from the lemma below, proved in Subsection 5.4.

Lemma 2.2. *There exists a subinterval R of $[0, 1)$, such that*

$$\|w_k\|_{\Lambda_{\phi_0}(R)} \gtrsim 3^k \langle w_k \rangle_R, \quad \langle w_k \rangle_R \langle \sigma_k \rangle_R \gtrsim 1,$$

thus $\|w_k\|_{\Lambda_{\phi_0}(R)} \langle \sigma_k \rangle_R \gtrsim 3^k$.

2.3.1. An improvement for triadic intervals. The construction due to Reguera–Thiele [18] relies on the triadic structure of the unit interval. It is a curious fact that if one restricts attention to *triadic* intervals, then the situation regarding separated bump conditions improves.

Namely, consider the Young function Φ given by

$$\Phi(t) := t \log(e + t) (\log(\log(e^e + t)))^r, \quad 0 \leq t < \infty,$$

where we recall that $1 < r < 2$. We show that

$$\sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}} \|\tilde{w}\|_{L^\Phi(I)} \langle \sigma \rangle_I < \infty, \quad \sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}} \|\sigma\|_{L^\Phi(I)} \langle \tilde{w} \rangle_I < \infty,$$

where $\mathcal{T}$ is the family of all triadic intervals in $\mathbb{R}$. The main estimate one has to prove is that

$$(2.11) \quad \sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}([0,1])} \|\tilde{w}_k\|_{L^\Phi(I)} \langle \sigma_k \rangle_I \leq C, \quad \sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}([0,1])} \|\sigma_k\|_{L^\Phi(I)} \langle w_k \rangle_I \leq C$$

for some positive constant C (depending only on r), where $\mathcal{T}([0,1])$ is the family of all triadic subintervals I of $[0, 1)$. As previously, instead of directly estimating Orlicz bumps, we estimate certain Lorentz bumps.

More precisely, consider the function $\psi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ given by

$$\psi(s) := s(12 - \log s)(\log(12 - \log s))^r, \quad 0 < s \leq 1, \quad \psi(0) := 0.$$

Standard facts on rearrangement-invariant Banach function spaces, Lorentz spaces and Orlicz spaces imply that there exists a constant C (depending only on r), such that for all non-atomic probability spaces (X, μ) , there holds

$$\|f\|_{L^\Phi(X, \mu)} \leq C \|f\|_{\Lambda_\psi(X, \mu)},$$

for all measurable functions $f \geq 0$ on X . We refer to Subsection 5.5 for details.

Therefore, recalling that $\tilde{w}_k := k^{-r} w_k$, it suffices to prove that

$$(2.12) \quad \sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}([0,1])} \|w_k\|_{\Lambda_\psi(I)} \langle \sigma_k \rangle_I \lesssim k^r, \quad \sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}([0,1])} \|\sigma_k\|_{\Lambda_\psi(I)} \langle w_k \rangle_I \lesssim 1.$$

The proof of (2.12) is given in Subsection 5.5.

Unfortunately, in view of Lemma 2.2, it does not seem possible to get an estimate like the first one in (2.11) for general subintervals of $[0, 1)$, and preserve at the same time the blow-up of the norm of the Hilbert transform, by merely rescaling the weights w_k, σ_k .

3. THE REGUERA–THIELE [18] CONSTRUCTION

We recall here the construction due to Reguera and Thiele [18], and also used by Reguera and Scurry [17]. For definiteness, by interval we mean a subset of $\mathbb{R}$ of the form $[a, b)$, where $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $a < b$.

Let k be a positive integer greater than 3000. For every interval I , Reguera–Thiele [18] denote by I^m its middle triadic child. Then, they define inductively collections $\mathbf{K}_i, \mathbf{J}_i$ of triadic subintervals of $[0, 1)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{K}_0 &:= \{[0, 1)\}, \\ \mathbf{J}_i &:= \{K^m : K \in \mathbf{K}_{i-1}\}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, \\ \mathbf{K}_i &:= \bigcup_{J \in \mathbf{J}_i} \{\text{triadic subintervals of } J \text{ of length } 3^{1-k}|J|\}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots\end{aligned}$$

Reguera–Thiele [18] set $\mathbf{J} := \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{J}_i$, and for all $J \in \mathbf{J}$ they choose a triadic interval $I(J)$ adjacent to J and of length $3^{1-k}|J|$. Reguera–Thiele [18] choose whether to place each $I(J)$ to the right or to the left of J via an inductive scheme, in a way that serves their estimates for the Hilbert transform. We refer to [18] for the relevant details.

Remark 3.1. Induction shows that

- (a) $\#\mathbf{K}_i = 3^{i(k-1)}$ and each interval in $\mathbf{K}_i$ has length 3^{-ik} , for all $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$
- (b) $\#\mathbf{J}_i = 3^{(i-1)(k-1)}$ and each interval in $\mathbf{J}_i$ has length $3^{-(i-1)k-1}$, for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$

Next, Reguera–Thiele [18] define a weight w on $[0, 1)$, given as the pointwise and weak in $L^1([0, 1))$ limit of a sequence $w^{(-1)}, w^{(0)}, w^{(1)}, \dots$ of weights on $[0, 1)$. The latter weights are constructed inductively as follows.

One begins by setting $w^{(-1)} := 1_{[0, 1)}$. Assuming now that for some $i \geq 0$ one has defined $w^{(i-1)}$, one obtains the weight $w^{(i)}$ in the following way. The weight $w^{(i)}$ is defined to coincide with $w^{(i-1)}$ outside $\bigcup_{K \in \mathbf{K}_i} K$. Moreover, for all $K \in \mathbf{K}_i$ the restriction $w^{(i)}|_K$ of $w^{(i)}$ on K is defined to be

$$w^{(i)}|_K := w^{(i-1)}(K) \frac{1_{K^m \cup I(K^m)}}{|K^m \cup I(K^m)|}.$$

Reguera–Thiele [18] point out that $\{w > 0\} = \bigcup_{J \in \mathbf{J}} I(J)$, and that the weight w is constant on each $I(J)$.

Fix $p \in (1, \infty)$. Reguera–Thiele [18] for $p = 2$, and Reguera–Scurry [17] for any $1 < p < \infty$, define the weight $\sigma := \frac{w}{(Mw)^p}$ on $[0, 1)$, where M is the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function. Reguera–Scurry [17] prove that for all $J \in \mathbf{J}$ and for all $x \in I(J)$ there holds $Mw(x) \leq 13w(x)$, so that in fact $\sigma \sim_p w^{1-p} 1_{\{w>0\}}$.

Let us in what follows simply define

$$\sigma := w^{1-p} 1_{\{w>0\}} = w^{-1/(p'-1)} 1_{\{w>0\}},$$

where $p' := \frac{p}{p-1}$ is the Hölder conjugate exponent to p .

We set throughout $\mathbf{K} := \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{K}_i$. Moreover, for all $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and for all $K \in \mathbf{K}_i$ we let $\text{ch}_{\mathbf{K}}(K)$ be the family of all intervals in $\mathbf{K}_{i+1}$ that are contained in K .

Remark 3.2. For all $K \in \mathbf{K}$, setting $J := K^m$ we notice that w, σ vanish in $K \setminus (J \cup I(J))$.

3.1. Estimating averages over intervals. In this subsection we estimate averages over intervals of the weights w, σ . We begin with triadic intervals.

Lemma 3.3. *The following hold.*

(a) *We have*

$$w|_{I(J)} \equiv \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^i, \quad \sigma|_{I(J)} \equiv \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^{-(p-1)i}, \quad \forall J \in \mathbf{J}_i, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots,$$

and

$$\langle w \rangle_K = \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^i, \quad \langle \sigma \rangle_K = c_{k,p} 3^{-k} \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^{-(p-1)i}, \quad \forall K \in \mathbf{K}_i, \quad \forall i = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

where $1 \lesssim_p c_{k,p} \lesssim 1$.

(b) *For all $K \in \mathbf{K}$, for all $K' \in \text{ch}_{\mathbf{K}}(K)$, and for all triadic intervals L contained in $J := K^m$ but not in any interval in $\text{ch}_{\mathbf{K}}(K)$, we have*

$$\langle w \rangle_K \sim \langle w \rangle_L = \langle w \rangle_J = \langle w \rangle_{K'} = \langle w \rangle_{I(J)},$$

$$\langle \sigma \rangle_K \sim_p \langle \sigma \rangle_L = \langle \sigma \rangle_J = \langle \sigma \rangle_{K'} \sim_p 3^{-k} \langle \sigma \rangle_{I(J)} = \frac{3^{-k}}{\langle w \rangle_{I(J)}^{p-1}},$$

$$w(K) \sim 3^k w(I(J)) = 3^k w(K'), \quad \sigma(K) \sim_p \sigma(I(J)) \sim_p 3^k \sigma(K').$$

Proof. (a) For all $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, for all $K \in \mathbf{K}_i$, and for all $K' \in \mathbf{K}_{i+1}$ with $K' \subseteq K$, we have $w(K) = w^{(i-1)}(K) = w^{(i)}(K)$ and

$$w(I(J)) = w(K') = \frac{w(K)}{3^{k-1} + 1}.$$

The claimed formulas for the averages of w follow then by induction. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(K) &= \sum_{l=i+1}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{J \in \mathbf{J}_l \\ J \subseteq K}} \sigma(I(J)) = \sum_{l=i+1}^{\infty} 3^{(l-i-1)(k-1)} \cdot 3^{-lk} \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^{-(p-1)l} \\ &= 3^{-k(i+1)} \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^{-(p-1)i} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 3^{-l+1} \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^{-(p-1)l}, \end{aligned}$$

therefore

$$\langle \sigma \rangle_K = 3^{-k} \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^{-(p-1)i} \frac{3a_{k,p}}{1 - a_{k,p}},$$

where

$$a_{k,p} := \frac{(3^{k-1} + 1)^{p-1}}{3^{k(p-1)+1}} \in \left(\frac{1}{3^p}, \frac{1}{3} \right).$$

(b) Immediate from (a), after noting that L can be written as the disjoint union of triadic subintervals of J of length $3^{1-k}|J|$, all of which are by definition elements of $\text{ch}_{\mathbf{K}}(K)$, and that $|K'| = 3^{1-k}|J| = |I(J)| = 3^{-k}|K|$. $\square$

We now turn to general intervals.

Lemma 3.4. *Let I be a subinterval of $[0, 1)$. Let K be the smallest interval in $\mathbf{K}$ containing I . Set $J := K^m$.*

(a) *If $I \cap J = \emptyset$, then*

$$\langle w \rangle_I \leq \langle w \rangle_{I(J)}, \quad \langle \sigma \rangle_I \leq \langle \sigma \rangle_{I(J)}.$$

(b) *If I intersects J , but not $I(J)$, then*

$$\langle w \rangle_I \lesssim \langle w \rangle_K, \quad \langle \sigma \rangle_I \lesssim_p \langle \sigma \rangle_K.$$

(c) *If I intersects both J and $I(J)$, then*

$$\langle w \rangle_I \lesssim \langle w \rangle_{I(J)}, \quad \langle \sigma \rangle_I \lesssim_p \max\left(\frac{|I \cap I(J)|}{|I|}, 3^{-k}\right) \langle \sigma \rangle_{I(J)} \leq \frac{|I(J)|}{|I|} \langle \sigma \rangle_{I(J)}.$$

Proof. (a) Clear, since $w(I) = w(I \cap I(J))$ and same for σ .

(b) Assume I intersects J but not $I(J)$. Since by assumption I is not strictly contained in any triadic subinterval of J of length $|I(J)| = 3^{1-k}|J|$, we deduce that the closure of I must contain an endpoint of some triadic subinterval of J of length $3^{1-k}|J|$, which is by definition an interval in $\mathbf{K}$. Therefore, if $|I| < (\frac{1}{3} - 3^{-k})|I(J)|$, then Remark 3.2 implies immediately that w, σ vanish on I .

Assume now that $|I| \geq (\frac{1}{3} - 3^{-k})|I(J)|$. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the family of all triadic subintervals of J of length $|I(J)| = 3^{1-k}|J|$ intersecting I , and set $N := \#\mathcal{I}$. Choose $K' \in \mathcal{I}$. It is then clear that

$$\max(1, (N-2))|K'| = \max(1, (N-2))|I(J)| \lesssim |I|,$$

and it also follows from Lemma 3.3 that

$$w(I) \leq Nw(K'), \quad \sigma(I) \leq N\sigma(K'),$$

implying that

$$\langle w \rangle_I \lesssim \langle w \rangle_{K'} \sim \langle w \rangle_K, \quad \langle \sigma \rangle_I \lesssim \langle \sigma \rangle_{K'} \sim_p \langle \sigma \rangle_K.$$

(c) Assume that I intersects both J and $I(J)$. In view of Remark 3.2 and the facts that $\langle w \rangle_K \sim \langle w \rangle_{I(J)}$, $\langle \sigma \rangle_K \sim_p 3^{-k} \langle \sigma \rangle_{I(J)}$ and $|I| \leq |K| = 3^k |I(J)|$, it is easy to see that it suffices to prove that

$$\langle w \rangle_{I \cap J} \lesssim \langle w \rangle_{I(J)}, \quad \langle \sigma \rangle_{I \cap J} \lesssim_p \langle \sigma \rangle_K.$$

Note that $I \cap J$ contains the common endpoint of $J, I(J)$. Thus, if $|I \cap J| \leq (\frac{1}{3} - 3^{-k})|I(J)|$, then w, σ vanish on $I \cap J$ and we have nothing to show. If $I \cap J$ is not contained in any triadic subinterval of J of length $3^{1-k}|J|$, then we are done by (b).

Assume now that $|I \cap J| > (\frac{1}{3} - 3^{-k})|I(J)|$, and that $I \cap J$ is contained in a triadic subinterval K' of J of length $3^{1-k}|J|$. Then $w(I \cap J) \leq w(K')$, $\sigma(I \cap J) \leq \sigma(K')$, and $|I \cap J| \gtrsim |K'|$, thus we are done by Lemma 3.3. $\square$

Remark 3.5. Lemma 3.4 shows in particular that

$$(3.1) \quad \sup_I \langle w \rangle_I^{p-1} \langle \sigma \rangle_I, \quad \sup_I \langle \sigma \rangle_I^{p'-1} \langle w \rangle_I \lesssim_p 1,$$

where supremum is taken over all subintervals I of $[0, 1)$. Of course, estimate (3.1) also follows immediately from the observation due to Reguera–Scurry [17] (which can also be deduced from Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4) that $Mw \lesssim w$ on $\{w > 0\}$, so $\sigma \sim \frac{w}{(Mw)^p}$.

In the sequel we will make use of the following comparison lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $K \in \mathbf{K}$, and let L be a subinterval of K sharing an endpoint with K . Then, for all intervals $L' \subseteq L$ sharing that same endpoint with K and L , we have $\langle w \rangle_{L'} \lesssim \langle w \rangle_L$ and $\langle \sigma \rangle_{L'} \lesssim \langle \sigma \rangle_L$.*

Proof. The result is clear if L' intersects neither J nor $I(J)$. If L' intersects $J \cup I(J)$, then $|L'| \gtrsim |K| \geq |L|$ and thus the desired result is again clear. $\square$

We conclude this subsection with the following observation.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $K \in \mathbf{K}$. Then, we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{K' \in \mathbf{K} \\ K' \subseteq K}} w(K') \sim 3^k w(K), \quad \sum_{\substack{K' \in \mathbf{K} \\ K' \subseteq K}} \sigma(K') \sim_p \sigma(K).$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.3 (b) we have

$$\sum_{\substack{K' \in \mathbf{K} \\ K' \subseteq K}} w(K') \sim \sum_{\substack{K' \in \mathbf{K} \\ K' \subseteq K}} 3^k w(I((K')^m)) = 3^k w(K)$$

and

$$\sum_{\substack{K' \in \mathbf{K} \\ K' \subseteq K}} \sigma(K') \sim_p \sum_{\substack{K' \in \mathbf{K} \\ K' \subseteq K}} \sigma(I((K')^m)) = \sigma(K).$$

$\square$

4. TWO-WEIGHT ESTIMATES FOR GENERALIZED SPARSE OPERATORS

In this section we obtain two-weight estimates for sparse p -functions and sparse p' -functions, with respect to the weights introduced in Section 3. After rescaling these weights, and applying a “direct sum of singularities” type argument following the one used by Reguera–Scurry in [17], we obtain a proof of Proposition 1.8.

4.1. Sparse families. In this subsection we fix notation and terminology regarding sparse families, following Subsection 2.1 of [12].

Definition 4.1. Let $0 < \eta < 1$. A family $\mathcal{S}$ of cubes in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is said to be (weakly) η -sparse, if there exists a family $\{E(I) : I \in \mathcal{S}\}$ of pairwise disjoint measurable subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$, such that $E(I) \subseteq I$ and $|E(I)| \geq (1 - \eta)|I|$, for all $I \in \mathcal{S}$.

For the purpose of obtaining estimates for sparse operators, an alternative definition of sparse families turns out in many cases to be more useful.

Definition 4.2. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a (nonhomogeneous) grid of cubes in $\mathbb{R}^d$, in the sense of [6] and [19], that is one can write

$$\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{D}_k,$$

where for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathcal{D}_k$ is an at most countable family of pairwise disjoint cubes in $\mathbb{R}^d$ covering $\mathbb{R}^d$, and for all $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $k < l$, for all $Q \in \mathcal{D}_k$ and for all $R \in \mathcal{D}_l$, there holds

either $R \subseteq Q$ or $R \cap Q = \emptyset$. Note that for all $Q, R \in \mathcal{D}$ we have either $Q \subseteq R$ or $R \not\subseteq Q$ or $Q \cap R = \emptyset$. Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. A subfamily $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathcal{D}$ is said to be *martingale ε -sparse* if

$$\sum_{Q \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{S}}(R)} |Q| \leq \varepsilon |R|,$$

where $\text{ch}_{\mathcal{S}}(R)$ is the family of all maximal cubes in $\mathcal{S}$ that are strictly contained in R , for all $R \in \mathcal{S}$.

Note that if $\mathcal{S}$ is a martingale ε -sparse family of cubes in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then $\mathcal{S}$ is ε -sparse in the first sense, since one can just define $E(R) := R \setminus \left(\bigcup_{Q \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{S}}(R)} Q \right)$, for all $R \in \mathcal{S}$, so in particular for all cubes L in $\mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$(4.1) \quad \sum_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{S} \\ Q \subseteq L}} |Q| \leq \frac{|L|}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

Although Definition 4.2 seems more restrictive than Definition 4.1, as it is explained in [12] estimates for sparse operators over sparse families in the first sense can be reduced to estimates for sparse operators over sparse families in the second sense. For reasons of completeness, we include the details of this reduction in the appendix.

Let now $\mathcal{S}$ be a martingale ε -sparse family of cubes in $\mathbb{R}^d$ for some $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Then, for all $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{S}$ we have $Q \subseteq Q'$ or $Q' \not\subseteq Q$ or $Q \cap Q' = \emptyset$. Moreover, for all $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{S}$ with $Q' \not\subseteq Q$ we have $|Q'| \leq \varepsilon |Q|$. Therefore, if $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ is a chain, that is a subfamily of $\mathcal{S}$ linearly ordered with respect to containment, such that there exists $c > 0$ with $|Q| \geq c$, then we have

$$(4.2) \quad \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}'} \frac{1}{|Q|^p} \leq \frac{1}{c^p} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon^{pn} = \frac{1}{c^p(1 - \varepsilon^p)} \leq \frac{1}{c^p(1 - \varepsilon)}.$$

As we will see below, estimate (4.2) will be enough to deal with estimates for sparse p -functions over sparse families of triadic intervals, but in order to deal with general sparse families, a refined version of estimate (4.2) will be necessary.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a martingale ε -sparse family of cubes in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Assume that all cubes in $\mathcal{S}$ are contained in a cube L . Let E be a measurable subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then, there holds*

$$\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\frac{|Q \cap E|}{|Q|} \right)^{p+1} |Q| \lesssim_p \frac{|L \cap E|}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

In order to prove Lemma 4.3, we will use the Carleson Embedding Theorem, in the version stated in [12, Lemma 5.1].

Lemma 4.4 (Carleson Embedding Theorem). *Let μ be a Radon measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$, and let $\mathcal{D}$ be a grid of cubes in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\{a_Q : Q \in \mathcal{D}\}$ be a collection of nonnegative real numbers such that*

$$\sum_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{D} \\ Q \subseteq R}} a_Q \mu(Q) \leq A \mu(R), \quad \forall R \in \mathcal{D},$$

for some $A > 0$. Then, for all measurable functions $f \geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and for all $1 < p < \infty$, there holds

$$(4.3) \quad \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \left(\frac{1}{\mu(Q)} \int_Q f(x) d\mu(x) \right)^p a_Q \mu(Q) \leq (p')^p A \|f\|_{L^p(\mu)}^p.$$

A proof of that version of the Carleson Embedding Theorem can be found in [19]. Let us note that the exact constant $C(p)$ appearing in the right-hand side of (4.3) is not important for our purposes.

Proof (of Lemma 4.3). Applying Lemma 4.4 for the function $f := 1_{L \cap E}$, for the exponent $p+1$ and with μ being Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$, and using (4.1), we obtain

$$\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\frac{|Q \cap E|}{|Q|} \right)^{p+1} |Q| = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}} (\langle f \rangle_Q)^{p+1} |Q| \lesssim_p \frac{\|f\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathbb{R})}^{p+1}}{1-\varepsilon} = \frac{|L \cap E|}{1-\varepsilon}.$$

□

4.2. The main estimates. Here we state the main estimates that lead to a proof of Proposition 1.8. Fix $1 < p < \infty$. For all positive integers $k > 3000$, we denote by w_k, σ_k the weights on $[0, 1)$ constructed in Section 3 for these k, p , following the notation used by Reguera–Scurry [17].

Proposition 4.5. *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, and let $\mathcal{S}$ be a martingale ε -sparse family of subintervals of $[0, 1)$. Fix a positive integer $k > 3000$. Then, we have*

$$(4.4) \quad \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L}} (\langle w_k \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma_k \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p k \frac{w_k(L)}{1-\varepsilon}, \quad \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L}} (\langle \sigma_k \rangle_I)^{p'} \langle w_k \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p k \frac{\sigma_k(L)}{1-\varepsilon},$$

for any subinterval L of $[0, 1)$.

The proof of Proposition 4.5 is postponed to Subsection 4.3. Note that the estimates in (4.4) blow up as $k \rightarrow \infty$. To rectify this, we pick some

$$r \in \left(\max \left(1, \frac{1}{p-1} \right), p' \right),$$

where we recall that $p' := \frac{p}{p-1}$, and we define a rescaled version of w_k by

$$\tilde{w}_k := k^{-r} w_k.$$

Since $pr > r+1$ and $r > 1$, it is easy to see that for any martingale ε -sparse family of subintervals of $[0, 1)$ and any subinterval L of $[0, 1)$ there holds

$$(4.5) \quad \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L}} (\langle \tilde{w}_k \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma_k \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{\tilde{w}_k(L)}{1-\varepsilon}, \quad \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L}} (\langle \sigma_k \rangle_I)^{p'} \langle \tilde{w}_k \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{\sigma_k(L)}{1-\varepsilon}.$$

These estimates are uniform with respect to k . Following Reguera–Scurry [17], we take the “direct sum of singularities” defining the weights $\tilde{w}, \sigma$ on $\mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\tilde{w}(x) := \sum_{k=4000}^{\infty} \tilde{w}_k(x - 9^k), \quad \sigma(x) := \sum_{k=4000}^{\infty} \sigma_k(x - 9^k), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It is not hard to see, and will be explained in detail in Subsection 4.4, that for all martingale ε -sparse families $\mathcal{S}$ of intervals in $\mathbb{R}$ there holds

$$(4.6) \quad \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L}} (\langle \tilde{w} \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{\tilde{w}(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}, \quad \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L}} (\langle \sigma \rangle_I)^{p'} \langle \tilde{w} \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{\sigma(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

The last estimates are referred to as (Sawyer-type) *testing conditions*. To extend them to full bounds for the operators of interest, we will use the following special case of a result due to Culiuc [6].

Theorem 4.6 (Culiuc [6]). *Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a grid of cubes in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\{a_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ be a family of nonnegative measurable functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let $1 < p_1 \leq p_2 < \infty$. Consider the operator T given by*

$$Tf := \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} (|\langle f \rangle_Q|)^{p_2} a_Q 1_Q \right)^{1/p_2}, \quad \forall f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

and for all $L \in \mathcal{D}$, consider the truncation T_L of T given by

$$T_L f := \left(\sum_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{D} \\ Q \subseteq L}} (|\langle f \rangle_Q|)^{p_2} a_Q 1_Q \right)^{1/p_2}, \quad \forall f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Let u, v be weights on $\mathbb{R}^d$, such that for some $A > 0$ there holds

$$\|T_L(1_L v)\|_{L^{p_1}(u)} \leq A \|1_L\|_{L^{p_1}(v)}, \quad \forall L \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Then, there exists a constant $C(p_1) > 0$, such that $\|T(\cdot v)\|_{L^{p_1}(v) \rightarrow L^{p_1}(u)} \leq C(p_1)A$.

In view of Theorem 4.6, the estimates in (4.6) imply that

$$\|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S},p}(\cdot \tilde{w})\|_{L^p(\tilde{w}) \rightarrow L^p(\sigma)} \lesssim_p \frac{1}{(1 - \varepsilon)^{1/p}}, \quad \|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S},p'}(\cdot \sigma)\|_{L^{p'}(\sigma) \rightarrow L^{p'}(\tilde{w})} \lesssim_p \frac{1}{(1 - \varepsilon)^{1/p'}},$$

for any martingale ε -sparse family $\mathcal{S}$ of intervals in $\mathbb{R}$. The reduction from general sparse families to martingale sparse families described in the Appendix allows then to conclude that for any $0 < \eta < 1$ and for any η -sparse family $\mathcal{S}$ of intervals in $\mathbb{R}$ there holds

$$\|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S},p}(\cdot \tilde{w})\|_{L^p(\tilde{w}) \rightarrow L^p(\sigma)}, \|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S},p'}(\cdot \sigma)\|_{L^{p'}(\sigma) \rightarrow L^{p'}(\tilde{w})} \leq C = C(\eta, p).$$

Recall also estimate (2.7)

$$\|H(1_{[0,1)} \tilde{w}_k)\|_{L^p(\sigma_k)} \gtrsim k^{1-(r/p')} \|1_{[0,1)}\|_{L^p(\tilde{w}_k)}, \quad \forall k > 3000.$$

Coupled with translation invariance, it yields

$$\|H(1_{I_k} \tilde{w})\|_{L^p(\sigma)} \gtrsim k^{1-(r/p')} \|1_{I_k}\|_{L^p(\tilde{w})},$$

where $I_k := [9^k, 9^k + 1)$, for all $k \geq 4000$. Since $1 - (r/p') > 0$, we deduce

$$\|H(\cdot \tilde{w})\|_{L^p(\tilde{w}) \rightarrow L^p(\sigma)} = \infty.$$

An application of the closed graph theorem implies then that there exists $f \in L^p(\tilde{w})$ with $H(f\tilde{w}) \notin L^p(\sigma)$, using the facts that $\tilde{w} \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, so $L^p(\tilde{w}) \subseteq L^1(\tilde{w})$, and that the linear operator $H : L^1(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ is bounded.

4.3. Verification of local testing conditions. The proof of Proposition 4.5 will be accomplished in several steps. We fix a positive integer $k > 3000$, $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, and an ε -martingale sparse family $\mathcal{S}$ of subintervals of $[0, 1)$. To simplify the notation, we denote w_k, σ_k by w, σ respectively. Note that by applying the Monotone Convergence Theorem (for series) we can without loss of generality assume that the sparse family $\mathcal{S}$ is finite (as long as no estimate depends on cardinality), and we will be doing so in the sequel. We recall that by interval we mean a subset of $\mathbb{R}$ of the form $[a, b)$, where $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $a < b$.

4.3.1. Triadic case. Here we give a simpler proof of Proposition 4.5 for the case that all intervals are triadic. In this case, it is actually possible to prove a strengthened version of Proposition 4.5. The triadic case already shows some of the main difficulties that will arise in the general case and what strategy one should follow to deal with them.

Proposition 4.7. *Assume that the sparse family $\mathcal{S}$ consists of triadic intervals. Let L be any triadic subinterval of $[0, 1)$. Then*

$$(4.7) \quad \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L}} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{w(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}, \quad \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L}} (\langle \sigma \rangle_I)^{p'} \langle w \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{\sigma(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

The following lemma establishes Proposition 4.7 in an important special case.

Lemma 4.8. *Assume that the sparse family $\mathcal{S}$ consists of triadic intervals. Let $K \in \mathbf{K}$. Set $J := K^m$. Let $S(J)$ be the triadic child of K containing $I(J)$. Set*

$$\mathcal{S}_K^1 := \{I \in \mathcal{S} : I = K, \text{ or } I \subseteq J \text{ and } I \text{ is not contained in any } K' \in \text{ch}_{\mathbf{K}}(K)\},$$

$$\mathcal{S}_K^2 := \{I \in \mathcal{S} : I(J) \not\subseteq I \subseteq S(J)\}.$$

(a) *There holds*

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_K^m} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{3^{-k} w(K)}{1 - \varepsilon}, \quad \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_K^m} (\langle \sigma \rangle_I)^{p'} \langle w \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{\sigma(K)}{1 - \varepsilon}, \quad m = 1, 2.$$

(b) *The testing conditions in (4.7) hold in the case $L = K$.*

Proof. (a) By Lemma 3.3 we have

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_K^1} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \sim_p 3^{-k} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_K^1} \langle w \rangle_K |I| \leq \frac{3^{-k} \langle w \rangle_K |J|}{1 - \varepsilon} = \frac{3^{-k-1} w(K)}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

Moreover, all intervals in $\mathcal{S}_K^2$ contain $|I(J)|$, thus by (4.2) we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_K^2} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| &= \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_K^2} \left(\frac{|I(J)|}{|I|} \right)^{p+1} (\langle w \rangle_{I(J)})^p \langle \sigma \rangle_{I(J)} |I| \leq \frac{\langle w \rangle_{I(J)} |I(J)|}{1 - \varepsilon} \\ &\sim \frac{\langle w \rangle_K 3^{-k} |K|}{1 - \varepsilon} = \frac{3^{-k} w(K)}{1 - \varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

The second estimate is proved similarly, recalling that $\langle \sigma \rangle_{I(J)} \sim_p 3^k \langle \sigma \rangle_K$.

(b) Clearly

$$\sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq K}} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| = \sum_{\substack{K' \in \mathbf{K} \\ K' \subseteq K}} \left(\sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq I((K')^m)}} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| + \sum_{m=1}^2 \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_{K'}^m} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \right)$$

By (a) and Lemma 3.7 we deduce

$$\sum_{\substack{K' \in \mathbf{K} \\ K' \subseteq K}} \sum_{m=1}^2 \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_{K'}^m} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{3^{-k}}{1-\varepsilon} \sum_{\substack{K' \in \mathbf{K} \\ K' \subseteq K}} w(K') \sim \frac{w(K)}{1-\varepsilon}.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 3.3 and (4.1) we have

$$\sum_{\substack{K' \in \mathbf{K} \\ K' \subseteq K}} \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq I((K')^m)}} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \sum_{\substack{K' \in \mathbf{K} \\ K' \subseteq K}} w(I((K')^m)) = \frac{w(K)}{1-\varepsilon},$$

concluding the proof of the first estimate. The second estimate is proved similarly. $\square$

We now prove Proposition 4.7.

Proof (of Proposition 4.7). Let K be the smallest interval in $\mathbf{K}$ containing L . Set $J := K^m$. Since w, σ are constant on $I(J)$, by (4.1) we have

$$\sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L \cap I(J)}} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \leq \frac{\langle w \rangle_{I(J)} |L \cap I(J)|}{1-\varepsilon} = \frac{w(L \cap I(J))}{1-\varepsilon} \leq \frac{w(L)}{1-\varepsilon}.$$

If there are intervals in $\mathcal{S}$ that are contained in L and strictly contain $I(J)$, then $I(J) \subseteq L$, and these intervals have length greater than or equal to $I(J)$ and form a chain, therefore by (4.2) we obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I(J) \subsetneq I \subseteq L}} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| = \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I(J) \subsetneq I \subseteq L}} \left(\frac{|I(J)|}{|I|} \right)^{p+1} (\langle w \rangle_{I(J)})^p \langle \sigma \rangle_{I(J)} |I| \leq \frac{w(I(J))}{1-\varepsilon} \leq \frac{w(L)}{1-\varepsilon}.$$

Finally, assume $L \cap J \neq \emptyset$. Then, by Lemma 3.3 we have $\langle w \rangle_L \sim \langle w \rangle_K$ and $\langle \sigma \rangle_L \sim_p \langle \sigma \rangle_K$. Let $\tilde{A}_J$ be the family of all triadic subintervals of J of length $3^{1-k}|J|$ contained in L . Then, by Lemma 3.3 (b) and (4.1) we have

$$\sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L \cap J \\ I \not\subseteq K', \forall K' \in \tilde{A}_J}} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L \\ I \not\subseteq K', \forall K' \in \tilde{A}_J}} 3^{-k} \langle w \rangle_K |I| \lesssim_p 3^{-k} \langle w \rangle_L \frac{|L|}{1-\varepsilon} = \frac{3^{-k} w(L)}{1-\varepsilon}.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 4.8 we have

$$\sum_{K' \in \tilde{A}_J} \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq K'}} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \sum_{K' \in \tilde{A}_J} w(K') = \frac{w(L \cap J)}{1-\varepsilon} \leq \frac{w(L)}{1-\varepsilon},$$

concluding the proof of the first estimate. The second one is proved similarly. $\square$

4.3.2. *General case.* Here we prove Proposition 4.5 in the general case. This will be accomplished in several steps, but the general strategy will be the same with the one in the triadic case.

We begin by establishing restricted versions of the testing conditions in (4.4), for general intervals L .

Lemma 4.9. *Let L be any subinterval of $[0, 1)$, and let $K \in \mathbf{K}$ with $L \subseteq K$. Set $J := K^m$. Let $\mathcal{S}'$ be the family of all intervals in $\mathcal{S}$ contained in L , such that w, σ vanish on $I \cap J$. Then, there holds*

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}'} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{w(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}, \quad \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}'} (\langle \sigma \rangle_I)^{p'} \langle w \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{\sigma(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

Proof. Since w, σ are constant on $I(J)$, by Lemma 4.3 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}'} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| &= \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}'} \left(\frac{|I \cap I(J)|}{|I|} \right)^{p+1} (\langle w \rangle_{I(J)})^p \langle \sigma \rangle_{I(J)} |I| \lesssim_p \langle w \rangle_{I(J)} \frac{|L \cap I(J)|}{1 - \varepsilon} \\ &= \frac{w(L \cap I(J))}{1 - \varepsilon} \leq \frac{w(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

The second estimate is proved similarly. $\square$

Lemma 4.10. *Let $K \in \mathbf{K}$, and L be any subinterval of K . Set $J := K^m$.*

(a) *There holds*

$$\sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S}, I \subseteq L \\ |I| \geq (\frac{1}{3} - 3^{-k})|I(J)|}} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{kw(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}, \quad \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S}, I \subseteq L \\ |I| \geq (\frac{1}{3} - 3^{-k})|I(J)|}} (\langle \sigma \rangle_I)^{p'} \langle w \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{k\sigma(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}$$

(b) *There holds*

$$\sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S}, I \subseteq L \\ I \not\subseteq K', \forall K' \in \text{ech}_{\mathbf{K}}(K)}} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{kw(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}, \quad \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S}, I \subseteq L \\ I \not\subseteq K', \forall K' \in \text{ech}_{\mathbf{K}}(K)}} (\langle \sigma \rangle_I)^{p'} \langle w \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{k\sigma(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

Proof. (a) Let $\mathcal{S}_L$ be the family of intervals in $\mathcal{S}$ contained in L of length at least $(\frac{1}{3} - 3^{-k})|I(J)|$. Let N be the maximum length of a chain (with respect to containment) in $\mathcal{S}_L$. Set

$$\mathcal{S}_L^1 := \{\text{maximal intervals in } \mathcal{S}_L\},$$

and define inductively

$$\mathcal{S}_L^n := \left\{ \text{maximal intervals in } \mathcal{S}_L \setminus \left(\bigcup_{r=1}^{n-1} \mathcal{S}_L^r \right) \right\}, \quad n = 2, \dots, N.$$

Notice that $\mathcal{S}_L = \bigcup_{n=1}^N \mathcal{S}_L^n$. In particular, for all $n = 2, \dots, N$, for all $I \in \mathcal{S}_L^n$, there exists $I' \in \mathcal{S}_L^{n-1}$ with $I \subsetneq I'$. Thus, picking some $I_N \in \mathcal{S}_L^N$, one can find $I_1 \in \mathcal{S}_L^1$ with $I_N \subsetneq I_1$, therefore

$$\varepsilon^{N-1} 3^k |I(J)| = \varepsilon^{N-1} |K| \geq \varepsilon^{N-1} |L| \geq \varepsilon^{N-1} |I_1| \geq |I_N| \geq \left(\frac{1}{3} - 3^{-k} \right) |I(J)| \geq \frac{1}{4} |I(J)|,$$

therefore

$$N \leq \frac{k \log 3 - \log 4}{\log(1/\varepsilon)} + 1 \lesssim \frac{k}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

It follows by Remark 3.5 that

$$\sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L, |I| \geq (\frac{1}{3} - 3^{-k})|I(J)|}} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_L} \langle w \rangle_I |I| = \sum_{n=1}^N w \left(\bigcup \mathcal{S}_L^n \right) \leq N w(L) \lesssim \frac{k w(L)}{1 - \varepsilon},$$

concluding the proof of the first estimate. The second one is proved similarly.

(b) In view of (a), we only have to prove that

$$(4.8) \quad \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}'} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{w(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}, \quad \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}'} (\langle \sigma \rangle_I)^{p'} \langle w \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{\sigma(L)}{1 - \varepsilon},$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}' := \left\{ I \in \mathcal{S} : I \subseteq L, |I| < \left(\frac{1}{3} - 3^{-k} \right) |I(J)|, I \notin K', \forall K' \in \text{ch}_{\mathbf{K}}(K) \right\}.$$

Recall that $\text{ch}_{\mathbf{K}}(K)$ coincides with the family of all triadic subintervals of J of length $|I(J)| = 3^{1-k}|J|$. Therefore, if an interval $I \in \mathcal{S}'$ intersects J , then the closure of I must contain an endpoint of some interval in $\text{ch}_{\mathbf{K}}(K)$, and since $|I| < \left(\frac{1}{3} - 3^{-k} \right) |I(J)|$ it follows immediately from Remark 3.2 that w, σ vanish on $I \cap J$. Thus, (4.8) follows immediately from Lemma 4.9. $\square$

Proposition 4.11 and Lemma 4.12 below establish the testing conditions (4.4) for special classes of intervals L .

Proposition 4.11. *Let $K \in \mathbf{K}$. Set $J := K^m$, and define the families*

$$\mathcal{S}_K^1 := \{I \in \mathcal{S} : I \subseteq K \setminus I(J), I \text{ is not contained in any } K' \in \text{ch}_{\mathbf{K}}(K)\},$$

$$\mathcal{S}_K^2 := \{I \in \mathcal{S} : I \subseteq K, I \text{ intersects } I(J) \text{ but not } J\},$$

$$\mathcal{S}_K^3 := \{I \in \mathcal{S} : I \subseteq K, I \text{ intersects both } J \text{ and } I(J), |I| \geq 2|I(J)|\},$$

$$\mathcal{S}_K^4 := \{I \in \mathcal{S} : I \subseteq K, I \text{ intersects both } J \text{ and } I(J), |I| < 2|I(J)|\}.$$

(a) *There holds*

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_K^m} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{k 3^{-k} w(K)}{1 - \varepsilon}, \quad \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_K^m} (\langle \sigma \rangle_I)^{p'} \langle w \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{k \sigma(K)}{1 - \varepsilon}, \quad \forall m = 1, 2, 3.$$

(b) *The testing conditions in (4.4) hold in the case $L = K$.*

Proof. (a) By Lemma 3.4 (b) we have

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_K^1} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p 3^{-k} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_K^1} \langle w \rangle_K |I| \leq \frac{3^{-k} \langle w \rangle_K |K|}{1 - \varepsilon} = \frac{3^{-k} w(K)}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

Let $S(J)$ be the triadic child of K containing $I(J)$. All intervals in $\mathcal{S}_K^2$ are contained in $S(J)$, therefore by Lemma 4.9 and Lemma 3.3 we obtain

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_K^2} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{w(S(J))}{1-\varepsilon} = \frac{w(I(J))}{1-\varepsilon} \sim \frac{3^{-k}w(K)}{1-\varepsilon}.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 3.4 (c) and Lemma 3.3 we have

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_K^3} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_K^3} (\langle w \rangle_{I(J)})^p \langle \sigma \rangle_{I(J)} \frac{|I(J)|}{|I|} |I| \sim_p \langle w \rangle_K \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_K^3} |I(J)| = 3^{-k}w(K)(\#\mathcal{S}_K^3).$$

Notice that all elements of $\mathcal{S}_K^3$ contain the common endpoint of J and $I(J)$, therefore $\mathcal{S}_K^3$ is linearly ordered with respect to containment. Denoting by I_1 the largest interval in $\mathcal{S}_K^3$ and by I_N the smallest one, where $N := \#\mathcal{S}_K^3$, we obtain

$$3^k |I(J)| = |K| \geq |I_1| \geq \frac{|I_N|}{\varepsilon^{N-1}} \geq \frac{2|I(J)|}{\varepsilon^{N-1}},$$

therefore

$$\#\mathcal{S}_K^3 = N \leq \frac{k \log 3 - \log 2}{\log(1/\varepsilon)} + 1 \lesssim \frac{k}{1-\varepsilon},$$

concluding the proof of the first three estimates.

The other three estimates are proved similarly, recalling from Lemma 3.3 (b) that $\sigma(I(J)) \sim_p \sigma(K)$ and $\langle \sigma \rangle_{I(J)} \sim_p 3^k \langle \sigma \rangle_K$.

(b) It is clear that

$$\sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq K}} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| = \sum_{\substack{K' \in \mathbf{K} \\ K' \subseteq K}} \sum_{m=1}^4 \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_{K'}^m} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I|.$$

By (a) and Lemma 3.7 we have

$$\sum_{\substack{K' \in \mathbf{K} \\ K' \subseteq K}} \sum_{m=1}^3 \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_{K'}^m} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \sum_{\substack{K' \in \mathbf{K} \\ K' \subseteq K}} \frac{k 3^{-k} w(K')}{1-\varepsilon} \sim \frac{k w(K)}{1-\varepsilon}.$$

Moreover, notice that all intervals in $\mathcal{S}_K^4$ are contained in a subinterval of K of length (say) $200|I(J)|$, therefore by Lemma 3.4 and Remark 3.5 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{K' \in \mathbf{K} \\ K' \subseteq K}} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_{K'}^4} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| &\lesssim_p \sum_{\substack{K' \in \mathbf{K} \\ K' \subseteq K}} \langle w \rangle_{I((K')^m)} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_{K'}^4} |I| \leq \frac{200}{1-\varepsilon} \sum_{\substack{K' \in \mathbf{K} \\ K' \subseteq K}} \langle w \rangle_{I((K')^m)} |I((K')^m)| \\ &= \frac{200}{1-\varepsilon} \sum_{\substack{K' \in \mathbf{K} \\ K' \subseteq K}} w(I((K')^m)) = \frac{200}{1-\varepsilon} w(K), \end{aligned}$$

concluding the proof of the first estimate. The second one is proved similarly. $\square$

Lemma 4.12. *Let $K \in \mathbf{K}$, and let L be any subinterval of K sharing an endpoint with K . Then, the estimates in (4.4) hold for L .*

Proof. We prove only the first estimate in (4.4), noting that the second one is proved similarly.

Set $J := K^m$. We denote by A_J the set of all triadic subintervals of J of length $3^{1-k}|J|$, and we enumerate $A_J := \{K_{1,J}, \dots, K_{3^{k-1},J}\}$, so that successive intervals in this enumeration are adjacent and $I(J), K_{1,J}$ are adjacent. Note that $A_J = \text{ch}_{\mathbf{K}}(K)$.

We denote by $A_{1,J}$ the family of all intervals in A_J that intersect L , and by $A_{2,J}$ the family of all intervals in A_J that are contained in L . We will say that L is **good** if either $A_{1,J} = A_{2,J}$ or L contains at least one interval in $A_J \cup \{I(J)\}$.

Assume first that L is good. By Lemma 4.11 and disjointness of the intervals in A_J we deduce

$$(4.9) \quad \sum_{K' \in A_{2,J}} \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq K'}} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \sum_{K' \in A_{2,J}} \frac{kw(K')}{1-\varepsilon} \leq \frac{kw(L)}{1-\varepsilon}.$$

If $A_{1,J} = A_{2,J}$, then combining Lemma 4.10 with (4.9) we deduce the desired result.

Assume now that $A_{1,J}$ and $A_{2,J}$ do not coincide. Then, it is clear that there is exactly one element K' of $A_{1,J}$ not belonging to $A_{2,J}$. Since L contains at least one interval in $A_J \cup \{I(J)\}$, by Lemma 3.3 (b) we obtain $w(K') \leq w(L)$ (and also $\sigma(K') \lesssim_p \sigma(L)$), and thus by Lemma 4.11 we obtain

$$(4.10) \quad \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L \cap K'}} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{kw(K')}{1-\varepsilon} \lesssim_p \frac{kw(L)}{1-\varepsilon}.$$

Combining Lemma 4.10 with (4.9) and (4.10) we deduce the desired estimate.

Assume now that L is not good. Then, it is clear that $A_{1,J} = \{K_{3^{k-1},J}\}$ and $A_{2,J} = \emptyset$, so in particular

$$(4.11) \quad L \cap (J \cup I(J)) = L \cap K_{3^{k-1},J}.$$

Set

$$K_1 := K, \quad J_1 := (K_1)^m, \quad K_2 := K_{3^{k-1},J_1}, \quad J_2 := (K_2)^m,$$

and

$$L_1 := L, \quad L_2 := L_1 \cap K_2.$$

Note that (4.11) coupled with the fact that L and K_1 share an endpoint implies that

$$(4.12) \quad L = R(J_1) \cup L_2,$$

where $R(J_1)$ denotes the triadic child of K_1 not containing $I(J_1)$.

Next, we repeat the above procedure for the interval $L_2 \subseteq K_2$, noting that L_2 shares an endpoint with K_2 .

Continuing thus inductively, we construct possibly finite sequences of intervals $K_1, K_2, \dots, L_1, L_2, \dots$ and $J_1, J_2, \dots$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &= K, & J_l &= (K_l)^m, & K_{l+1} &= K_{3^{k-1},J_l}, & \forall l &= 1, 2, \dots, \\ L_1 &= L, & L_{l+1} &= L_l \cap K_{l+1} = L_l \cap (J_l \cup I(J_l)), & \forall l &= 1, 2, \dots, \\ & & L_l, K_l & \text{share an endpoint, for all } l &= 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned}$$

The construction terminates at some positive integer $N \geq 2$ if and only if the interval L_N is good. Note that induction using (4.12) shows that

$$L = R(J_1) \cup \dots \cup R(J_{N-1}) \cup L_N, \quad \forall N = 2, 3, \dots$$

In particular, w, σ vanish in $L \setminus K_N$ and $L_N = L \cap K_N$, for all $N = 2, 3, \dots$. We now distinguish two cases.

Case 1. The construction terminates at some positive integer $N \geq 2$. Then, the family of all intervals in $\mathcal{S}$ contained in L and on which w, σ might not identically vanish is contained in the union of the following two families:

$$\mathcal{S}_L^1 := \{I \in \mathcal{S} : I \subseteq L, I \cap K_N \neq \emptyset, I \not\subseteq K_N\}, \quad \mathcal{S}_L^2 := \{I \in \mathcal{S} : I \subseteq L_N\}.$$

It is clear that for every $I \in \mathcal{S}_L^1$, the intervals $I \cap K_N, L_N, K_N$ share an endpoint, and $I \cap K_N \subseteq L_N$. Since w, σ vanish on $L \setminus K_N$, it follows from Lemma 3.6, Remark 3.5 and Lemma 4.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_L^1} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| &= \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_L^1} \left(\frac{|I \cap K_N|}{|I|} \right)^{p+1} (\langle w \rangle_{I \cap K_N})^p \langle \sigma \rangle_{I \cap K_N} |I| \\ &\lesssim_p \langle w \rangle_{L_N} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_L^1} \left(\frac{|I \cap K_N|}{|I|} \right)^{p+1} |I| \lesssim_p \frac{\langle w \rangle_{L_N} |L \cap K_N|}{1 - \varepsilon} = \frac{w(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since L_N is good we have

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_L^2} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{kw(L_N)}{1 - \varepsilon} = \frac{kw(L)}{1 - \varepsilon},$$

concluding the proof in this case.

Case 2. Assume that the sequence never terminates. It is then clear that w, σ vanish on L , and thus we have nothing to show. $\square$

Now we are in a position to prove Proposition 4.5 in full generality.

Proof (of Proposition 4.5). We prove only the first estimate in (4.4), noting that the second one is proved similarly.

Let K be the smallest interval in $\mathbf{K}$ containing L , and set $J := K^m$. We denote by $\tilde{A}_J$ the set of all triadic subintervals of J of length $3^{1-k}|J|$ intersecting L . In view of Lemma 4.10, it suffices to prove that

$$\sum_{K' \in \tilde{A}_J} \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L \cap K'}} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{w(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

It is clear that $L \cap K'$ is a subinterval of K' sharing an endpoint with K' , for all $K' \in \tilde{A}_J$. Therefore, it follows from Lemma 4.12 and disjointness of the intervals in $\tilde{A}_J$ that

$$\sum_{K' \in \tilde{A}_J} \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L \cap K'}} (\langle w \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \sum_{K' \in \tilde{A}_J} \frac{kw(L \cap K')}{1 - \varepsilon} \leq \frac{kw(L)}{1 - \varepsilon},$$

concluding the proof. $\square$

4.4. Verifying global testing conditions. In this subsection we give details on the verification of the global testing conditions (4.6). For all positive integers $k > 3000$, we denote by w_k, σ_k the weights of Section 3 that were constructed for these k, p . Choose some

$$r \in \left(\max \left(1, \frac{1}{p-1} \right), p' \right),$$

where we recall that $p' = \frac{p}{p-1}$. Set

$$\tilde{w}_k := \frac{1}{k^r} w_k, \quad k = 4000, 4001, 4002, \dots$$

Following Reguera–Scurry [17], we consider the weights $\tilde{w}, \sigma$ on $\mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\tilde{w}(x) := \sum_{k=4000}^{\infty} \tilde{w}_k(x - 9^k), \quad \sigma(x) := \sum_{k=4000}^{\infty} \sigma_k(x - 9^k).$$

Note that $\tilde{w}, \sigma$ vanish outside $\bigcup_{k=4000}^{\infty} I_k$, where

$$I_k := [9^k, 9^k + 1), \quad \forall k = 4000, 4001, \dots,$$

and that $\tilde{w}(I_k) = k^{-r}$, $\sigma(I_k) \sim_p 3^{-k}$, for all $k = 4000, 4001, \dots$

Proposition 4.13. *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, and let $\mathcal{S}$ be any martingale ε -sparse family of intervals in $\mathbb{R}$. Let L be any interval in $\mathbb{R}$. Then*

$$\sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L}} (\langle \tilde{w} \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{\tilde{w}(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}, \quad \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L}} (\langle \sigma \rangle_I)^{p'} \langle \tilde{w} \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{\sigma(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

Proof. Clearly

$$\sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L}} (\langle \tilde{w} \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| = \sum_{i=1}^2 \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S}^i \\ I \subseteq L}} (\langle \tilde{w} \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I|,$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}^1 := \left\{ I \in \mathcal{S} : I \subseteq L, |I| \leq 2, I \cap \left(\bigcup_{k=4000}^{\infty} I_k \right) \neq \emptyset \right\}, \quad \mathcal{S}^2 := \{ I \in \mathcal{S} : I \subseteq L, |I| > 2 \}.$$

Notice that for all $I \in \mathcal{S}^1$ there is a unique $k \geq 4000$ such that $I \cap I_k \neq \emptyset$.

Let $k \geq 4000$. We have

$$\sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S}^1 \\ I \cap I_k \neq \emptyset}} (\langle \tilde{w} \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| = \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S}^1 \\ I \cap I_k \neq \emptyset, I \not\subseteq I_k}} (\langle \tilde{w} \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| + \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L \cap I_k}} (\langle \tilde{w} \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I|.$$

By the first estimate in (4.5) coupled with translation invariance we obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L \cap I_k}} (\langle \tilde{w} \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \frac{\tilde{w}(L \cap I_k)}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

Moreover, if $I \in \mathcal{S}^1$ is such that $I \cap I_k \neq \emptyset$ and $I \not\subseteq I_k$, then the intervals $I \cap I_k, L \cap I_k$ and I_k share an endpoint, therefore by Lemma 3.6, Remark 3.5 and Lemma 4.3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L \\ I \cap I_k \neq \emptyset, I \not\subseteq I_k}} (\langle \tilde{w} \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| &= \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L \\ I \cap I_k \neq \emptyset, I \not\subseteq I_k}} \left(\frac{|I \cap I_k|}{|I|} \right)^{p+1} (\langle \tilde{w} \rangle_{I \cap I_k})^p \langle \sigma \rangle_{I \cap I_k} |I| \\ &\lesssim_p \langle \tilde{w} \rangle_{I \cap I_k} \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S} \\ I \subseteq L}} \left(\frac{|I \cap I_k|}{|I|} \right)^{p+1} |I| \lesssim_p \langle \tilde{w} \rangle_{L \cap I_k} \frac{|L \cap I_k|}{1 - \varepsilon} = \frac{\tilde{w}(L \cap I_k)}{1 - \varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}^1} (\langle \tilde{w} \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| = \sum_{k=4000}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{S}^1 \\ I \cap I_k \neq \emptyset}} (\langle \tilde{w} \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \sum_{k=4000}^{\infty} \frac{\tilde{w}(L \cap I_k)}{1 - \varepsilon} = \frac{\tilde{w}(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

Let now m be a positive integer. Set $\mathcal{S}_m^2 := \{I \in \mathcal{S}^2 : 2^m < |I| \leq 2^{m+1}\}$. It is easy to see that for all $I \in \mathcal{S}_m^2$, one has $\#\{k \geq 4000 : I \cap I_k \neq \emptyset\} \leq 2m$, thus $\langle \tilde{w} \rangle_I, \langle \sigma \rangle_I \lesssim_p m 2^{-m}$. Moreover, since $2^m < |I| \leq 2^{m+1}$, for all $I \in \mathcal{S}_m^2$, similarly to the proof of Lemma 4.10 (a) we obtain

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_m^2} \tilde{w}(I) \lesssim \frac{\tilde{w}(L)}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}^2} (\langle \tilde{w} \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_m^2} (\langle \tilde{w} \rangle_I)^p \langle \sigma \rangle_I |I| \lesssim_p \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m^p 2^{-mp} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_m^2} \tilde{w}(I) \lesssim_p \frac{\tilde{w}(L)}{1 - \varepsilon},$$

concluding the proof of the first estimate. The second one is proved similarly. $\square$

5. INVESTIGATING SEPARATED BUMP CONDITIONS

Throughout this section we assume $p = 2$. Recall that by interval we mean a subset of $\mathbb{R}$ of the form $[a, b)$, where $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $a < b$.

5.1. Lorentz spaces. We record here well-known facts about Lorentz spaces.

A function $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is said to be *quasiconcave* if ϕ is increasing, $\phi(s) = 0$ if and only if $s = 0$, and the function $t \mapsto \phi(t)/t$ is decreasing on $(0, 1]$. It is proved in [2, Chapter 2, Proposition 5.10] that every quasiconcave function $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ admits a smallest concave majorant $\tilde{\phi}$ satisfying

$$\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\phi} \leq \phi \leq \tilde{\phi}.$$

Fix now a quasiconcave function $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and a non-atomic probability space (X, μ) . We define for all measurable functions f on X the *distribution function* N_f of f by

$$N_f(t) := \mu(\{|f| > t\}), \quad 0 \leq t < \infty,$$

and the *decreasing rearrangement* f^* of f by

$$f^*(t) := \inf\{s \in [0, \infty) : N_f(s) \leq t\}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1.$$

Following [2, Chapter 2, Definition 5.12], we define the *Lorentz space* $\Lambda_\phi(X, \mu)$ as the space of all measurable functions f on X for which

$$(5.1) \quad \|f\|_{\Lambda_\phi(X, \mu)} := \int_0^1 f^*(s) d\phi(s) < \infty,$$

where the integral is to be understood in the Lebesgue-Stieltjes sense. It is proved in [2, Chapter 2., Theorem 5.13] that if ϕ is concave, then $\|\cdot\|_{\Lambda_\phi(X, \mu)}$ defines a norm on the space $\Lambda_\phi(X, \mu)$. If ϕ is concave and $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \phi(s) = 0$, then as it is noted in [20, Section 3, equation (3.3)], integration by parts and the change of variables $s := N_f(t)$, coupled with an approximation argument, allow one to rewrite (5.1) as

$$(5.2) \quad \|f\|_{\Lambda_\phi(X, \mu)} = \int_0^\infty \phi(N_f(t)) dt.$$

This way of writing Lorentz norms is more useful for explicit computations.

In the special case that (X, μ) coincides with $(I, dx/|I|)$, where I is an interval in $\mathbb{R}$ and $dx/|I|$ normalized Lebesgue measure on I , we denote $\Lambda_\phi(X, \mu)$ by $\Lambda_\phi(I)$.

5.2. $L \log L$ space. We record here well-known facts about the space $L \log L$.

Let (X, μ) be a non-atomic probability space. Consider the continuous, strictly increasing, and concave function $\phi_0 : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ given by

$$\phi_0(s) := s(1 - \log s), \quad 0 < s \leq 1, \quad \phi_0(0) = 0.$$

Consider also the Young function $\Phi_0(t) := t(\log t)^+$, $0 \leq t < \infty$. The Orlicz space $L^{\Phi_0}(X, \mu)$ is denoted by $L \log L(X, \mu)$. It is proved in [2, Chapter 4, Section 8] that the spaces $\Lambda_{\phi_0}(X, \mu)$ and $L \log L(X, \mu)$ coincide, and that the Lorentz norm $\|\cdot\|_{\Lambda_{\phi_0}(X, \mu)}$ and the Orlicz norm $\|\cdot\|_{L \log L(X, \mu)}$ are equivalent. Note that in the special case that (X, μ) coincides with $(I, dx/|I|)$, where I is an interval in $\mathbb{R}$ and $dx/|I|$ normalized Lebesgue measure on I , the norms $\|\cdot\|_{L \log L(I)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\Lambda_{\phi_0}(I)}$ are equivalent with constants not depending on I , due to translation and rescaling invariance. Moreover, if M_I denotes the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function adapted to I , that is

$$M_I f := \sup_J \langle |f| \rangle_J 1_J,$$

where supremum is taken over all subintervals J of I , then there holds

$$\|f\|_{L \log L(I)} \sim \langle M_I f \rangle_I.$$

In what follows, we denote $\|\cdot\|_{\Lambda_{\phi_0}(I)}$ by $\|\cdot\|_I^*$, for all intervals I .

5.3. Comparison principles between Orlicz bumps and Lorentz bumps. We record here three principles of comparison between Orlicz bumps and Lorentz bumps, which allow us to reduce estimates for Orlicz bumps to estimates for Lorentz bumps, thus greatly simplifying the required computations.

5.3.1. *Estimating Orlicz bumps from below.* Let Φ be a Young function with $\int_c^\infty \frac{1}{\Phi(t)} dt < \infty$ for some $c > 0$. Treil and Volberg prove in [20, Lemma 3.4] that Φ must then satisfy $\Phi(t) \geq a \cdot t \log t$ for all sufficiently large t , for some $a > 0$. In fact, if we just assume that $\Phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a function such that the function $t \mapsto \Phi(t)/t$ is increasing in $(0, \infty)$ and $\int_c^\infty \frac{1}{\Phi(t)} dt < \infty$ for some $c > 1$, then adapting the proof of [20, Lemma 3.4] we have for all $t \geq c^2$

$$(5.3) \quad A := \int_c^\infty \frac{1}{\Phi(s)} ds \geq \int_c^t \frac{s}{s\Phi(s)} ds \geq \frac{t}{\Phi(t)} \int_c^t \frac{1}{s} ds = \frac{t(\log t - \log c)}{\Phi(t)} \geq \frac{t \log t}{2\Phi(t)},$$

and therefore $\Phi(t) \geq \frac{1}{2A} t \log t$ (a slightly more careful variant of this argument shows that actually $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Phi(t)}{t \log t} = \infty$). It then follows from the definition of Luxemburg norms, convexity of Young functions, the facts about the $L \log L$ space recorded in Subsection 5.2, and translation and rescaling invariance, that there exists a constant $C = C(\Phi)$ depending only on the Young function Φ , such that one has the estimate

$$C \|f\|_I^* \leq \|f\|_{L^\Phi(I)},$$

for all measurable functions $f \geq 0$ on I , for all intervals I .

Treil–Volberg [20] have shown that if the Young function Φ possesses mild additional regularity, then more can be said. Namely, assume that

- Φ is doubling, i.e. there exists a positive constant C such that $\Phi(2t) \leq C\Phi(t)$, for all $t > 0$
- the function $t \mapsto \Phi(t)/(t \log t)$ is increasing for sufficiently large t .

As Treil–Volberg point out in [20], these additional regularity assumptions are satisfied when Φ is a standard logarithmic bound of the form (for sufficiently large t)

$$\Phi(t) = t(\log t)(\log^{(2)} t) \cdot \dots \cdot (\log^{(n-1)} t)(\log^{(n)} t)^{1+\varepsilon},$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and some positive integer n , where $\log^{(k)} t$ denotes k -fold composition of $\log$ with itself.

The following comparison principle between Orlicz bumps and “penalized” entropy bumps is established by Treil and Volberg in [20].

Lemma 5.1 (Treil–Volberg [20]). *Let I be an interval in $\mathbb{R}$. Assume that the Young function Φ satisfies the above integrability and regularity conditions. Then, there exists a function $\alpha : [1, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, such that the function $t \mapsto t\alpha(t)$ is increasing and*

$$\int_1^\infty \frac{1}{t\alpha(t)} dt < \infty,$$

satisfying

$$\alpha\left(\frac{\|f\|_I^*}{\langle f \rangle_I}\right) \|f\|_I^* \leq \|f\|_{L^\Phi(I)},$$

for all measurable functions $f \geq 0$ on I that are positive on a set of positive measure.

We refer to [20] for the proof of Lemma 5.1. It is worth noting that Lemma 5.1 is stated and proved in [20] in the context of general non-atomic probability spaces. Notice also that the function α in Lemma 5.1 does not depend on the interval I , due to translation and rescaling invariance.

5.3.2. *Estimating Orlicz bumps from above.* Let Φ be any Young function. Consider the right-continuous inverse Φ^{-1} of Φ given by

$$\Phi^{-1}(t) := \sup\{s \in [0, \infty) : \Phi(s) \leq t\}, \quad 0 \leq t < \infty.$$

Let (X, μ) be a probability space. It is proved in [2, Chapter 4, Section 8] that the Orlicz space $L^\Phi(X, \mu)$ equipped with the Luxemburg norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^\Phi(X, \mu)}$ is a rearrangement-invariant Banach function space, and has fundamental function $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ given by

$$\phi(s) := \frac{1}{\Phi^{-1}(1/s)}, \quad 0 < s \leq 1, \quad \phi(0) = 0.$$

We refer to [2] for the relevant definitions and details. It is not hard to see that ϕ is quasiconcave, and that $\int_c^\infty \frac{1}{\Phi(t)} dt < \infty$ for some $c > 0$ if and only if $\int_0^1 \frac{1}{\phi(t)} dt < \infty$. Note that if $\int_0^1 \frac{1}{\phi(t)} dt < \infty$, then an argument similar to (5.3) shows that $\phi(t) \geq a \cdot t(-\log t)$ for all $t \in (0, 1]$, for some $a > 0$. It is proved in [2, Chapter 2, Theorem 5.13] that if ϕ happens to be concave on $[0, 1]$, then

$$\|f\|_{L^\Phi(X, \mu)} \leq \|f\|_{\Lambda_\phi(X, \mu)},$$

for any measurable function $f \geq 0$ on X .

Another way to estimate Orlicz bumps from above using Lorentz bumps is provided by Nazarov, Reznikov, Treil and Volberg in the journal version of [13]. Notice that the integrability condition imposed on fundamental functions of Lorentz spaces in Lemma 5.2 is the same with the one imposed previously.

Lemma 5.2 (Nazarov, Reznikov, Treil, Volberg [13]). *Let I be an interval in $\mathbb{R}$. Let Φ be a Young function such that*

- $\int_c^\infty \frac{1}{\Phi(t)} dt < \infty$, for some $c > 0$
- Φ is doubling
- one can write $\Phi(t) = t\rho(t)$, where $\rho : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ is a continuously differentiable and strictly increasing function such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \rho(t) = \infty$, $t \mapsto t\rho'(t)/\rho(t)$ is decreasing for sufficiently large t , and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{t\rho'(t)}{\rho(t)} \log(\rho(t)) = 0.$$

Then, there exists a quasiconcave function ψ on $[0, 1]$ with $\int_0^1 \frac{1}{\psi(s)} ds < \infty$, such that

$$\|f\|_{L^\Phi(I)} \sim \|f\|_{\Lambda_\psi(I)},$$

for every measurable function $f \geq 0$ on I . In particular, one can take (for sufficiently small $s \in (0, 1)$) $\psi(s) := s\Psi(s)$, where $\Psi(s)$ is given implicitly (for sufficiently small $s \in (0, 1)$) by

$$\Psi(s) := \Phi'(t) \quad \text{for } s = \frac{1}{\Phi(t)\Phi'(t)}.$$

We refer to the journal version of [13] for the proof of Lemma 5.2. Note that the function ψ in Lemma 5.2 does not depend on the interval I , due to translation and rescaling invariance.

5.4. Blow-up of separated bump conditions. Let Φ be any Young function such that $\int_c^\infty \frac{1}{\Phi(t)} dt < \infty$ for some $c > 0$. Recall the weights $\tilde{w}, \sigma$ of Subsection 4.2. We will show that

$$\sup_I \|\tilde{w}\|_{L^\Phi(I)} \langle \sigma \rangle_I = \infty,$$

where supremum ranges over all intervals in $\mathbb{R}$. Recalling the definitions of the weights $\tilde{w}, \sigma$ from Subsection 4.2, in view of translation invariance it suffices to prove that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} k^{-r} \sup_I \|w_k\|_{L^\Phi(I)} \langle \sigma_k \rangle_I = \infty,$$

where the supremum inside the limit ranges over all subintervals of $[0, 1)$, $r \in (1, 2)$, and w_k, σ_k denote the weights of Section 3 corresponding to the positive integer $k > 3000$ and $p = 2$.

In view of Subsection 5.3, it suffices to prove that there exists a subinterval R of $[0, 1)$, such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} k^{-r} \|w_k\|_R^* \langle \sigma_k \rangle_R = \infty.$$

Clearly, it suffices to show that there exists a subinterval R of $[0, 1)$, such that

$$\|w_k\|_R^* \gtrsim 3^k \langle w_k \rangle_R, \quad \langle w_k \rangle_R \langle \sigma_k \rangle_R \gtrsim 1.$$

In Subsection 5.6 we prove the following estimate.

Lemma 5.3. *There holds*

$$\|w_k\|_K^* = b_k 3^k \langle w_k \rangle_K, \quad \forall K \in \mathbf{K},$$

where $b_k \sim 1$.

Assume Lemma 5.3. Choose any $K \in \mathbf{K}$, and set $J := K^m$. Let K' be the unique triadic subinterval of J of length $3^{1-k}|J| = |I(J)|$ that is adjacent to $I(J)$. Consider the non-triadic interval

$$R := I(J) \cup K'.$$

Note that $|R| = 2|K'|$. It then follows from the facts that ϕ_0 is increasing and $\phi_0(s/2) \geq \phi_0(s)/2$, for all $s \in [0, 1]$, expression (5.2) of the Lorentz norm and Lemma 5.3 that

$$\|w_k\|_R^* \geq \frac{1}{2} \|w_k\|_{K'}^* = \frac{b_k 3^k}{2} \langle w_k \rangle_{K'}.$$

Recall also from Lemma 3.3 (a) that $\langle w_k \rangle_{I(J)} = \langle w_k \rangle_{K'}$ and $\langle \sigma_k \rangle_{I(J)} \sim 3^k \langle \sigma_k \rangle_{K'}$, therefore $\langle w_k \rangle_R = \langle w_k \rangle_{K'}$ and $\langle \sigma_k \rangle_R \sim 3^k \langle \sigma_k \rangle_{K'} \sim \langle w_k \rangle_{K'}^{-1}$, thus $\langle w_k \rangle_R \langle \sigma_k \rangle_R \sim 1$.

5.5. An improvement for triadic intervals. Consider the Young function Φ given by

$$\Phi(t) := t \log(e + t) (\log(\log(e^e + t)))^r, \quad 0 \leq t < \infty.$$

Clearly $\int_1^\infty \frac{1}{\Phi(t)} dt < \infty$. Our goal here is to prove that

$$\sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}} \|\tilde{w}\|_{L^\Phi(I)} \langle \sigma \rangle_I < \infty, \quad \sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}} \|\sigma\|_{L^\Phi(I)} \langle \tilde{w} \rangle_I < \infty,$$

where $\mathcal{T}$ is the family of all triadic intervals in $\mathbb{R}$. Recalling the definitions of the weights $\tilde{w}, \sigma$ from Subsection 4.2, similarly to Subsection 4.4 we deduce that it suffices to prove that

$$\sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}([0,1))} \|w_k\|_{L^\Phi(I)} \langle \sigma_k \rangle_I \lesssim_r k^r, \quad \sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}([0,1))} \|\sigma_k\|_{L^\Phi(I)} \langle w_k \rangle_I \lesssim_r 1,$$

where $\mathcal{T}([0,1))$ is the family of all triadic subintervals of $[0,1)$.

Consider the function $\Psi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ given by

$$\Psi(t) := \begin{cases} t, & \text{if } t \leq 1 \\ \frac{1}{12(\log(12))^r} t(12 + \log t)(\log(12 + \log t))^r, & \text{if } t > 1 \end{cases}, \quad \forall t \in [0, \infty).$$

It is directly verified that Ψ is a strictly increasing Young function. Clearly, there exist constants $a, A > 0$ (depending only on r) such that

$$a\Psi(t) \leq \Phi(t) \leq A\Psi(t), \quad \forall t \in [1, \infty).$$

It follows by the definition of the Luxemburg norms and convexity of Young functions that there exist constants c, C (depending only on r) such that

$$(5.4) \quad c\|f\|_{L^\Phi(I)} \leq \|f\|_{L^\Psi(I)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^\Phi(I)},$$

for all measurable functions $f \geq 0$ on I , for all intervals I .

Let Ψ^{-1} be the inverse of Ψ . Note that $\Psi(1) = 1$. Consider the function $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ given by

$$\phi(s) := \frac{1}{\Psi^{-1}(1/s)}, \quad 0 < s \leq 1, \quad \psi(0) = 0.$$

Clearly, ϕ is continuous and strictly increasing. Direct computation shows also that ϕ is strictly convave.

Therefore, in view of Subsection 5.3 and (5.4), it suffices to show that

$$\sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}([0,1))} \|w_k\|_{\Lambda_\phi(I)} \langle \sigma_k \rangle_I \lesssim_r k^r, \quad \sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}([0,1))} \|\sigma_k\|_{\Lambda_\phi(I)} \langle w_k \rangle_I \lesssim_r 1.$$

Consider the function $\psi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ given by

$$\psi(s) := s(12 - \log s)(\log(12 - \log s))^r, \quad 0 < s \leq 1, \quad \psi(0) = 0.$$

Clearly, ψ is continuous and strictly increasing. Direct computation shows also that ψ is strictly convave. It is not hard to see, and we include a proof in the appendix, that there exist constants a_1, A_1 (depending only on r) such that

$$a_1\phi(s) \leq \psi(s) \leq A_1\phi(s), \quad 0 \leq s \leq 1.$$

Therefore, it suffices to show that

$$\sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}([0,1))} \|w_k\|_{\Lambda_\psi(I)} \langle \sigma_k \rangle_I \lesssim k^r, \quad \sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}([0,1))} \|\sigma_k\|_{\Lambda_\psi(I)} \langle w_k \rangle_I \lesssim 1.$$

Recalling the expression (5.2) for the Lorentz norm $\|\cdot\|_{\Lambda_\psi}$, a computation as in the proof of Lemma 3.3 (b) shows that it suffices to prove that

$$\sup_{K \in \mathbf{K}} \|w_k\|_{\Lambda_\psi(K)} \langle \sigma_k \rangle_K \lesssim k^r, \quad \sup_{K \in \mathbf{K}} \|\sigma_k\|_{\Lambda_\psi(K)} \langle w_k \rangle_K \lesssim 1.$$

Recalling from Lemma 3.3 (b) that $\langle \sigma_k \rangle_K \sim 3^{-k} \langle w_k \rangle_K^{-1}$, for all $K \in \mathbf{K}$, it is clear that it suffices to prove that

$$(5.5) \quad \|w_k\|_{\Lambda_\psi(K)} \lesssim 3^k k^r \langle w_k \rangle_K, \quad \|\sigma_k\|_{\Lambda_\psi(K)} \lesssim 3^k \langle \sigma_k \rangle_K.$$

The proof of (5.5) is given in Subsection 5.6 below.

5.6. Computing Lorentz norms. In this subsection we estimate the Lorentz norms $\|w_k\|_{\Lambda_\phi(K)}, \|\sigma_k\|_{\Lambda_\phi(K)}$, $\phi \in \{\phi_0, \psi\}$, for any $K \in \mathbf{K}$, using expression (5.2) for Lorentz norms. In order to simplify the notation, we denote w_k, σ_k by just w, σ respectively.

In what follows, we fix $K \in \mathbf{K}$. Let $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a continuous concave increasing function with $\phi(0) = 0$ and $\phi(s) > 0$, for all $s \in (0, 1]$. Let i be the unique nonnegative integer such that $K \in \mathbf{K}_i$. Note that $|K| = 3^{-ik}$. We compute the distribution function $N_w^K(t)$, $0 < t < \infty$ of $w|_K$ with respect to normalized Lebesgue measure over K . We begin by noting that $w|_K$ vanishes outside

$$\bigcup_{m=i+1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{\substack{J \in \mathbf{J}_m \\ J \subseteq K}} I(J).$$

For each $m \geq i+1$, the inner union above runs over $3^{(m-i-1)(k-1)}$ intervals, each of the intervals $I(J)$ in that union has length 3^{-mk} , and w has constant value $\left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1}+1}\right)^m$ on such $I(J)$. We also note that for all $l = i, i+1, i+2, \dots$ we have

$$\frac{1}{3^{-ik}} \sum_{m=l+1}^{\infty} 3^{(m-i-1)(k-1)} \cdot 3^{-mk} = \sum_{m=l+1}^{\infty} 3^{-k} 3^{-(m-i-1)} = 3^{-k} \cdot 3^{i-l} \sum_{m=l+1}^{\infty} 3^{-(m-l-1)} = \frac{3}{2} \cdot 3^{-k} \cdot 3^{i-l}.$$

It follows that

$$N_w^K(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{|\{w>0\} \cap K|}{|K|} = \frac{3}{2} \cdot 3^{-k}, & \text{if } t < \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1}+1}\right)^{i+1} \\ \frac{3}{2} \cdot 3^{-k} \cdot 3^{i-l}, & \text{if } \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1}+1}\right)^l \leq t < \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1}+1}\right)^{l+1}, \text{ for some } l \geq i+1 \end{cases}, \quad 0 < t < \infty.$$

It follows from (5.2) that

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \|w\|_{\Lambda_\phi(K)} &= \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1}+1}\right)^{i+1} \phi\left(\frac{3}{2} 3^{-k}\right) + \sum_{l=i+1}^{\infty} \left[\left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1}+1}\right)^{l+1} - \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1}+1}\right)^l \right] \phi\left(\frac{3}{2} 3^{-k} 3^{i-l}\right) \\ &\sim \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1}+1}\right)^{i+1} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1}+1}\right)^l \phi\left(\frac{3}{2} 3^{-k} 3^{-l}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that σ takes the values $\left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1}+1}\right)^{-l}$, $l = i+1, i+2, \dots$ on K . Since ϕ is increasing and $\frac{|\{\sigma>0\} \cap K|}{|K|} = \frac{3}{2} \cdot 3^{-k}$, a computation similar to above shows that

$$\|\sigma\|_{\Lambda_\phi(K)} \leq \phi\left(\frac{3}{2} \cdot 3^{-k}\right) \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1}+1}\right)^{-(i+1)} \lesssim \phi(3^{1-k}) \langle w \rangle_K^{-1}.$$

A computation as in the proof of Lemma 3.3 (b) shows then that

$$\sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}([0,1])} \|\sigma\|_{\Lambda_\phi(I)} \langle w \rangle_I \lesssim \max(\phi(3^{1-k}), 1) \leq \max(\phi(1), 1).$$

5.6.1. *Estimating entropy bumps.* Here we specialize to the case

$$\phi(s) = \phi_0(s) = s(1 - \log s), \quad 0 < s \leq 1.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^l \phi_0 \left(\frac{3}{2} 3^{-k} 3^{-l} \right) &= \frac{3^{-k+1}}{2} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{3^{k-1}}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^l (\log 2 - \log 3 + (l+k) \log 3) \\ &= \frac{(3^{1-k} + 1)(\log 2 - \log 3 + k \log 3)}{2} + \frac{3^{-k+1} \log 3}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} l \left(\frac{3^{k-1}}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^l \\ &= \frac{(3^{1-k} + 1)(\log 2 - \log 3 + k \log 3)}{2} + \frac{(3^{k-1} + 1) \log 3}{2} \sim 3^k. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (5.6) that

$$\|w\|_K^* = \|w\|_{\Lambda_{\phi_0}(K)} = b_k 3^k \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^i = b_k 3^k \langle w \rangle_K,$$

where $b_k \sim 1$.

5.6.2. *Estimating “fattened” entropy bumps.* Here we specialize to the case

$$\phi(s) = \psi(s) = s(r + 10 - \log s)(\log(r + 10 - \log s))^r, \quad 0 < s \leq 1.$$

Using (5.6) we deduce

$$\|w\|_{\Lambda_\psi(K)} \lesssim \langle w \rangle_K \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^l \psi(3^{-k-l+1}),$$

since $\langle w \rangle_K = \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^i$. Recall that $1 < r < 2$ and $k > 3000$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^l \psi(3^{-k-l+1}) &\lesssim 3^{-k} \sum_{l=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{3^{k-1}}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^l (k+l)((\log k)^r + (\log l)^r) \\ &\lesssim 1 + \sum_{l=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{3^{k-1}}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^l + \sum_{l=2}^{\infty} (\log l)^r \left(\frac{3^{k-1}}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^l + \\ &\quad + 3^{-k} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} l \left(\frac{3^{k-1}}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^l + 3^{-k} \sum_{l=2}^{\infty} l (\log l)^r \left(\frac{3^{k-1}}{3^{k-1} + 1} \right)^l. \end{aligned}$$

We show in the appendix that

$$\sum_{l=2}^{\infty} (\log l)^r x^l \lesssim \frac{(-\log(1-x))^r}{1-x}, \quad \sum_{l=2}^{\infty} l (\log l)^r x^l \lesssim \frac{(-\log(1-x))^r}{(1-x)^2}, \quad 0 < x < 1.$$

Since $(1 - \frac{3^{k-1}}{3^{k-1}+1})^{-1} = 3^{k-1} + 1 \sim 3^k$, it follows that

$$\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{3^k}{3^{k-1}+1} \right)^l \psi(3^{-k-l}) \lesssim 1 + 3^k + k^r 3^k + 3^{-k} \cdot 3^{2k} + 3^{-k} \cdot k^r 3^{2k} \lesssim 3^k k^r,$$

concluding the proof.

6. APPENDIX

6.1. From martingale sparse families to general sparse families. Here we explain how estimates for sparse p -function over general sparse families can be reduced to estimates for ones over martingale sparse families, see Subsection 4.1 for the relevant definitions. We follow [12, Subsection 2.1].

Let $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $0 < \eta < 1$. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be an η -sparse family of cubes in $\mathbb{R}^d$. We first recall the well-known “three lattices trick”, see for instance [11, Theorem 3.1]: there exist 3^d in number dyadic lattices $\mathcal{D}^j$, $j = 1, \dots, 3^d$ dyadic lattices of cubes in $\mathbb{R}^d$, such that for all cubes Q in $\mathbb{R}^d$ there exist $j \in \{1, \dots, 3^d\}$ and $R \in \mathcal{D}^j$ with $Q \subseteq R$ and $|R| \leq 6^d |Q|$. Using this, it is easy to see that there exist $\frac{6^d+\eta-1}{6^d}$ -sparse families $\mathcal{S}^j$, $j = 1, \dots, 3^d$, such that $\mathcal{S}^j \subseteq \mathcal{D}^j$, for all $j = 1, \dots, 3^d$, and

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S},p} f \leq 6^d \sum_{j=1}^{3^d} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}^j,p} f, \quad \forall f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Let $j \in \{1, \dots, 3^d\}$. Since $\mathcal{S}^j$ is $\frac{6^d+\eta-1}{6^d}$ -sparse, we deduce

$$\sum_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{S}^j \\ Q \subseteq R}} |Q| \leq \frac{6^d}{1-\eta} |R|, \quad \forall R \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Choose an integer m greater than $\max\left(2, \frac{6^d}{1-\eta} - 1\right)$. Then, by [11, Lemma 6.6] we have that one can write $\mathcal{S}^j = \bigcup_{k=1}^m \mathcal{S}^{j,k}$, such that for all $k = 1, \dots, m$, $\mathcal{S}^{j,k}$ satisfies

$$\sum_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{S}^{j,k} \\ Q \subseteq R}} |Q| \leq \lambda |R|, \quad \forall R \in \mathcal{S}^{j,k},$$

where $\lambda := 1 + \frac{6^d}{1-\eta} - 1$. Since $\lambda \in (1, 2)$, setting $\varepsilon := \lambda - 1 \in (0, 1)$ we immediately deduce

$$\sum_{Q \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{S}^{j,k}}(R)} |Q| \leq \varepsilon |R|, \quad \forall R \in \mathcal{S}^{j,k},$$

and thus $\mathcal{S}^{j,k}$ is martingale ε -sparse.

Noting that

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S},p} f \leq 6^d \sum_{j=1}^{3^d} \sum_{k=1}^m \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}^{j,k},p} f, \quad \forall f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

completes the reduction.

6.2. Elementary estimates for functions and series. Here we collect together a couple of elementary estimates for functions and series that were used in the estimates for separated bump conditions.

6.2.1. *Estimating a fundamental function.* Let $r \in (1, 2)$. Consider the strictly increasing Young function $\Phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ given by

$$\Phi(t) := \begin{cases} t, & \text{if } t \leq 1 \\ \frac{1}{12(\log(12))^r} t(12 + \log t)(\log(12 + \log t))^r, & \text{if } t > 1 \end{cases}, \quad \forall t \in [0, \infty).$$

Let $\Phi^{-1} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be the inverse of Φ . Note that $\Phi(1) = 1$. Consider the function $\psi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ given by

$$\psi(s) := \frac{1}{\Phi^{-1}(1/s)}, \quad \forall s \in (0, 1], \quad \psi(0) = 0.$$

We prove that there exist constants a, A (depending only on r) such that

$$as(12 - \log s)(\log(12 - \log s))^r \leq \psi(s) \leq As(12 - \log s)(\log(12 - \log s))^r, \quad \forall s \in [0, 1].$$

It suffices to prove that there exist constants a, A (depending only on r) such that

$$a \frac{t}{(12 + \log t)(\log(12 + \log t))^r} \leq \Phi^{-1}(t) \leq A \frac{t}{(12 + \log t)(\log(12 + \log t))^r}, \quad \forall t \in [1, \infty).$$

Set

$$B(t) := \frac{t}{(12 + \log t)(\log(12 + \log t))^r}, \quad \forall t \in [1, \infty).$$

Clearly $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} B(t) = \infty$, and one can choose $M > 1$ (depending only on r) such that $B(t) > 1$, for all $t \in (M, \infty)$. Set

$$C(t) := \log(12 + \log t) + r \cdot \log(\log(12 + \log t)), \quad \forall t \in [1, \infty).$$

Then, we have

$$\Phi(B(t)) = \frac{t(12 + \log t - C(t))(\log(12 + \log t - C(t)))^r}{12(\log(12))^r(12 + \log t)(\log(12 + \log t))^r}, \quad \forall t > M,$$

therefore since $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C(t)}{12 + \log t} = 0$ we deduce

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Phi(B(t))}{t} = \frac{1}{12(\log(12))^r} \in (0, \infty).$$

It follows that there exist constants $M_1 > M$ and $c < 1 < C$ (depending only on r), such that

$$ct \leq \Phi(B(t)) \leq Ct, \quad \forall t > M_1.$$

Then, since Φ is convex with $\Phi(0) = 0$ we deduce

$$\Phi\left(\frac{1}{C}B(t)\right) \leq t \leq \Phi\left(\frac{1}{c}B(t)\right), \quad \forall t > M_1,$$

therefore

$$\frac{1}{C}B(t) \leq \Phi^{-1}(t) \leq \frac{1}{c}B(t), \quad \forall t > M_1.$$

This yields the desired result.

6.2.2. *Estimating sums of series.* Recall that

$$-\log(1-x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} x^n, \quad \frac{1}{1-x} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x^n, \quad \frac{1}{(1-x)^2} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+1)x^n, \quad 0 < x < 1.$$

Let $r \in (1, 2)$. Set $a := r - 1 \in (0, 1)$. Note the following consequences of the integral test:

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k} \sim \log n, \quad \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{(\log k)^a}{k} \sim (\log n)^r, \quad n = 2, 3, \dots$$

Series multiplication yields then that for all $0 < x < 1$ there holds

$$(-\log(1-x))^2 = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{k(n-k)} \right) x^n = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \left(\frac{1}{k} + \frac{1}{n-k} \right) \right) x^n \sim \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{\log n}{n} x^n.$$

Set $b := 1/a \in (1, \infty)$ and $b' := b/(b-1) = 1/(1-a) \in (1, \infty)$. Then, for all $x \in (0, 1)$, applying Hölder's inequality (for series) for the exponents b, b' we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{(\log n)^a}{n} x^n &= \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{(\log n)^a}{n^a} x^{an} \cdot \frac{1}{n^{1-a}} x^{n(1-a)} \leq \left(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{\log n}{n} x^n \right)^a \left(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} x^n \right)^{1-a} \\ &\lesssim (-\log(1-x))^{2a} (-\log(1-x))^{1-a} = (-\log(1-x))^r. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for all $x \in (0, 1)$, series multiplication yields

$$\frac{(-\log(1-x))^r}{1-x} \gtrsim \left(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{(\log n)^a}{n} x^n \right) \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x^n \right) = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{k=2}^n \frac{(\log k)^a}{k} \right) x^n \gtrsim \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (\log n)^r x^n.$$

Finally, for all $x \in (0, 1)$, series multiplication yields

$$\frac{(-\log(1-x))^r}{(1-x)^2} \gtrsim \left(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{(\log n)^a}{n} x^n \right) \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+1)x^n \right) = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{k=2}^n \frac{(\log k)^a (n-k+1)}{k} \right) x^n.$$

For all $n = 2, 3, \dots$, we have

$$(n+1) \sum_{k=2}^n \frac{(\log k)^a}{k} \gtrsim (n+1)(\log n)^r, \quad \sum_{k=2}^n (\log k)^a \leq n(\log n)^a.$$

Noting that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(\log n)^r}{(\log n)^a} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log n = \infty$, we deduce

$$\frac{(-\log(1-x))^r}{(1-x)^2} \gtrsim \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n(\log n)^r x^n,$$

for all $x \in (0, 1)$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Theresa C. Anderson, David V. Cruz-Uribe, and Kabe Moen, *Logarithmic Bump Conditions for Calderón-Zygmund Operators on Spaces of Homogeneous type*, Publ. Mat., Volume 59, Number 1 (2015), 17-43.
- [2] Colin Bennett, Robert Sharpley, *Interpolation of operators*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 129, Academic Press Inc., Boston, MA, 1988
- [3] David V. Cruz-Uribe, José Maria Martell, and Carlos Pérez, *Weights, extrapolation and the theory of Rubio de Francia*, Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, vol. 215, Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2011.

- [4] David V. Cruz-Uribe, Carlos Pérez, *Two-weight, weak-type norm inequalities for fractional integrals, Calderón–Zygmund operators and commutators*, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 49 (2000), no. 2, 697–721
- [5] David V. Cruz-Uribe, Alexander Reznikov, and Alexander Volberg, *Logarithmic bump conditions and the two-weight boundedness of Calderón–Zygmund operators*, *Adv. Math.* 255 (2014), 706–729, DOI 10.1016/j.aim.2014.01.016. MR3167497.
- [6] Amalia V. Culiuc, *A note on two weight bounds for the generalized Hardy–Littlewood Maximal operator*, arXiv:1506.07125v1
- [7] Michael T. Lacey, *On the separated bumps conjecture for Calderón–Zygmund operators*, *Hokkaido Math. J.*, Volume 45, Number 2 (2016), 223–242.
- [8] Michael T. Lacey, *An elementary proof of the A_2 bound*, *Israel J. of Math.*, March 2017, 217(1), 181–195
- [9] Andrei K. Lerner, *On an estimate of Calderón–Zygmund operators by dyadic positive operators*, *J. d’ Anal. Mat.*, Oct. 2013, Vol. 121, Issue 1, p. 141–161.
- [10] Andrei K. Lerner, *On pointwise estimates involving sparse operators*, *New York J. of Math.*, 22 (2016), 341–349
- [11] Andrei K. Lerner and Fedor Nazarov, *Intuitive dyadic calculus: the basics*, *Expositiones Mathematicae* (2018), ISSN 0723-0869, DOI 10.1016/j.exmath.2018.01.001.
- [12] Fedor Nazarov, Stephanie Petermichl, Sergei Treil, and Alexander Volberg, *Convex Body Domination and Weighted Estimates with Matrix Weights*, *Adv. Math.* 318 (2017), 279–306
- [13] Fedor Nazarov, Alexander Reznikov, Sergei Treil, and Alexander Volberg, *A Bellman function proof of L^2 bump conjecture*, *J. d’ Anal. Mat.*, Oct. 2013, Vol. 121, Issue 1, p. 255–277.
- [14] Christoph J. Neugebauer, *Inserting A_p -weights*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 87(4):644–648, 1983
- [15] Robert Rahm, Scott Spencer, *Entropy bumps and another sufficient condition for the two-weight boundedness of sparse operators*, *Israel J. of Math.*, Febr. 2018, Vol. 223(1), 197–204
- [16] Maria C. Reguera, *On Muckenhoupt–Wheeden Conjecture*, *Adv. Math.* 227 (2011), 1436–1450
- [17] Maria C. Reguera and James Scurry, *On Joint Estimates for Maximal Functions and Singular Integrals in Weighted Spaces*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 141 (2013), 1705–1717
- [18] Maria C. Reguera and Christoph Thiele, *The Hilbert Transform Does Not Map $L^1(Mw)$ to $L^{1,\infty}(w)$* , *Math. Res. Let.* (2012), Vol. 19, Number 1
- [19] Sergei Treil, *A Remark on Two Weight Estimates for Positive Dyadic Operators*, in: Gröchenig K., Lyubarskii Y., Seip K. (eds), *Operator-Related Function Theory and Time-Frequency Analysis* (2015), Abel Symposia, vol 9. Springer, Cham.
- [20] Sergei Treil and Alexander Volberg, *Entropy Conditions in Two Weight Inequalities for Singular Integral Operators*, *Adv. Math.*, Oct. 2016, Volume 301, p. 499–548