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#### Abstract

In [4], Temlyakov provides an error bound for a near best $m$-term approximation of a function $g \in L^{p}\left([0,1]^{d}\right), 1<p<\infty, d \in \mathbb{N}$, using a basis $L^{p}{ }^{{ }_{-}}$ equivalent to the Haar system $\mathcal{H}$. The bound includes a constant $C(p)$ that is not given explicitly. The goal of this paper is to find an upper bound of the constant for the Haar system $\mathcal{H}$, following the proof in [4].


1. Determining the constant in the one-dimensional case

Let $\mathcal{H}:=\left\{H_{I}\right\}_{I}$ be the Haar basis in $L^{p}[0,1]$ indexed by dyadic intervals $I=\left[(j-1) 2^{-n}, j 2^{-n}\right), j=1, \ldots, 2^{n}, n=0,1, \ldots$ and $I=[0,1]$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_{[0,1]}(x) & =1 \text { for } x \in[0,1) \\
H_{\left[(j-1) 2^{-n}, j 2^{-n}\right)}(x) & = \begin{cases}2^{n / 2}, & x \in\left[(j-1) 2^{-n},\left(j-\frac{1}{2}\right) 2^{-n}\right), \\
-2^{-n / 2}, & x \in\left[\left(j-\frac{1}{2}\right) 2^{-n}, j 2^{-n}\right), \\
0, & \text { otherwise. }\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

Let

$$
f=\sum_{I} c_{I}(f) H_{I},
$$

where

$$
c_{I}(f):=\left(f, H_{I}\right)=\int_{0}^{1} f(x) H_{I}(x) d x
$$

and denote

$$
c_{I}(f, p):=\left\|c_{I}(f) H_{I}\right\|_{p} .
$$

Then $c_{I}(f, p) \rightarrow 0$ as $|I| \rightarrow 0$.
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Denote by $\Lambda_{m}$ a set of $m$ dyadic intervals $I$ such that

$$
\min _{I \in \Lambda_{m}} c_{I}(f, p) \geq \max _{J \notin \Lambda_{m}} c_{J}(f, p) .
$$

This means that $\Lambda_{m}$ contains the $m$ largest values of $c_{I}(f, p)$ where $I$ runs through all dyadic intervals. Then we define the Greedy algorithm $G_{m}^{p}(\cdot, \mathcal{H})$ as

$$
G_{m}^{p}(f, \mathcal{H}):=\sum_{I \in \Lambda_{m}} c_{I}(f) H_{I} .
$$

The following theorem provides an error bound for the approximation of a function $f \in L^{p}[0,1]$ by the Greedy algorithm $G_{m}^{p}(\cdot, \mathcal{H})$ :

Theorem 1.1. Let $1<p<\infty$. Then for any $g \in L^{p}[0,1]$, we have

$$
\left\|g-G_{m}^{p}(g, \mathcal{H})\right\|_{p} \leq\left(2+\frac{1}{\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / p}\right)^{2}}\right) \cdot\left(\max \left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right)-1\right)^{2} \cdot \sigma_{m}(g)_{p}
$$

Proof. The Littlewood-Paley theorem for the Haar system gives for $1<p<\infty$

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{3}(p)\left\|\left(\sum_{I}\left|c_{I}(g) H_{I}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\|_{p} \leq\|g\|_{p} \leq C_{4}(p)\left\|\left(\sum_{I}\left|c_{I}(g) H_{I}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\|_{p} . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In case of $g$ being a martingale, explicit formulas for these constants are known (cf. [1]). In Lemma 1.6, page 8, it is shown that the Haar series

$$
g=\sum_{I} c_{I}(g) H_{I}
$$

is in fact a (conditionally symmetric) martingale.
Thus, taking the constants in [1], page 87, we have

$$
C_{3}(p)=\frac{1}{\max \left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right)-1} \quad \text { and } \quad C_{4}(p)=\max \left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right)-1
$$

Let $T_{m}$ be an $m$-term Haar polynomial of best $m$-term approximation to $g$ in $L^{p}[0,1]$ :

$$
T_{m}=\sum_{I \in \Lambda} a_{I} H_{I}, \quad|\Lambda|=m .
$$

For any finite set $Q$ of dyadic intervals we denote by $S_{Q}$ the projector

$$
S_{Q}(f):=\sum_{I \in Q} c_{I}(f) H_{I}
$$

With these definitions, one can derive the following inequality:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|g-S_{\Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p} & =\left\|g-T_{m}-S_{\Lambda}\left(g-T_{m}\right)\right\|_{p} \\
& \leq\left\|I d-S_{\Lambda}\right\|_{p \rightarrow p} \sigma_{m}(g)_{p} \\
& \leq C_{4}(p) C_{3}(p)^{-1} \sigma_{m}(g)_{p},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $I d$ denotes the identical operator. The last inequality holds since

$$
\|g\|_{p} \leq 1
$$

implies by the Littlewood-Paley theorem (cf. (11)) that

$$
\left\|\left(\sum_{I}\left|c_{I}(g) H_{I}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\|_{p} \leq C_{3}(p)^{-1}
$$

so that by again applying (11) we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\left(I d-S_{\Lambda}\right)(g)\right\|_{p} & =\left\|\sum_{I \notin \Lambda} c_{I}(g) H_{I}\right\|_{p} \\
& \leq C_{4}(p)\left\|\left(\sum_{I \notin \Lambda}\left|c_{I}(g) H_{I}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\|_{p} \\
& \leq C_{4}(p)\left\|\left(\sum_{I}\left|c_{I}(g) H_{I}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\|_{p} \\
& \leq C_{4}(p) C_{3}(p)^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

With $C_{3}(p)$ and $C_{4}(p)$ given above we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|g-S_{\Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p} \leq\left(\max \left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right)-1\right)^{2} \cdot \sigma_{m}(g)_{p} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since

$$
G_{m}^{p}(g)=S_{\Lambda_{m}}(g),
$$

we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\|g-G_{m}^{p}(g)\right\|_{p} \\
\leq & \left\|g-S_{\Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p}+\left\|S_{\Lambda}(g)-S_{\Lambda_{m}}(g)\right\|_{p} \\
\stackrel{\text { (2) }}{\leq} & \left(\max \left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right)-1\right)^{2} \cdot \sigma_{m}(g)_{p}+\left\|S_{\Lambda}(g)-S_{\Lambda_{m}}(g)\right\|_{p} \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

It remains to estimate $\left\|S_{\Lambda}(g)-S_{\Lambda_{m}}(g)\right\|_{p}$ appropriately:

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\|S_{\Lambda}(g)-S_{\Lambda_{m}}(g)\right\|_{p} & =\left\|S_{\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}}(g)-S_{\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p} \\
& \leq\left\|S_{\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}}(g)\right\|_{p}+\left\|S_{\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p} . \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

The second term in the last expression can be estimated by

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\|S_{\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p} & =\left\|\left(I d-S_{\left(\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda\right)^{C}}\right)(g)\right\|_{p} \\
& =\left\|g-T_{m}-S_{\Lambda \cup \Lambda_{m}^{C}}\left(g-T_{m}\right)\right\|_{p} \\
& \leq\left\|I d-S_{\Lambda \cup \Lambda_{m}^{C}}\right\|_{p \rightarrow p} \sigma_{m}(g)_{p} \\
& \leq \frac{C_{4}(p)}{C_{3}(p)} \sigma_{m}(g)_{p} \\
& =\left(\max \left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right)-1\right)^{2} \cdot \sigma_{m}(g)_{p} \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

Furthermore

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|S_{\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}}(g)\right\|_{p} \leq \frac{1}{\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / p}\right)^{2}} \cdot\left\|S_{\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

which will be derived in the following lemmas (Lemma 1.2 - 1.5 ).
Combining (3)-(6), we get

$$
\left\|g-G_{m}^{p}(g)\right\|_{p} \leq\left(2+\frac{1}{\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / p}\right)^{2}}\right) \cdot\left(\max \left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right)-1\right)^{2} \cdot \sigma_{m}(g)_{p}
$$

Lemma 1.2. Let $n_{1}<n_{2}<\cdots<n_{s}$ be integers and let $E_{j} \subset[0,1]$ be measurable sets, $j=1, \ldots, s$. Then for any $0<q<\infty$ we have

$$
\int_{0}^{1}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{s} 2^{n_{j} / q} \chi_{E_{j}}(x)\right)^{q} d x \leq\left(\frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / q}}\right)^{q} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{s} 2^{n_{j}}\left|E_{j}\right| .
$$

where $\chi_{I}(\cdot)$ is the characteristic function of the interval I:

$$
\chi_{I}(x)= \begin{cases}1, & x \in I \\ 0, & x \notin I\end{cases}
$$

Proof. Denote

$$
F(x):=\sum_{j=1}^{s} 2^{n_{j} / q} \chi_{E_{j}}(x)
$$

and estimate it on the sets

$$
E_{l}^{-}:=E_{l} \backslash \bigcup_{k=l+1}^{s} E_{k}, \quad l=1, \ldots, s-1 ; \quad E_{s}^{-}:=E_{s}
$$

We have for $x \in E_{l}^{-}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
F(x) & \leq \sum_{j=1}^{l} 2^{n_{j} / q} \\
& =2^{n_{l} / q}\left(\frac{2^{n_{1} / q}}{2^{n_{l} / q}}+\cdots+1\right) \\
& \leq 2^{n_{l} / q} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{1}{2^{1 / q}}\right)^{i} \\
& =2^{n_{l} / q} \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / q}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\int_{0}^{1} F(x)^{q} d x \leq\left(\frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / q}}\right)^{q} \sum_{l=1}^{s} 2^{n_{l}}\left|E_{l}^{-}\right| \leq\left(\frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / q}}\right)^{q} \sum_{l=1}^{s} 2^{n_{l}}\left|E_{l}\right|
$$

which proves the lemma.
Lemma 1.3. Consider

$$
f=\sum_{I \in Q} c_{I} H_{I}, \quad|Q|=N
$$

Let $1 \leq p<\infty$. Assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|c_{I} H_{I}\right\|_{p} \leq 1, \quad I \in Q \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then

$$
\|f\|_{p} \leq \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / p}} N^{1 / p}
$$

Proof. Denote by $n_{1}<n_{2}<\cdots<n_{s}$ all integers such that there is $I \in Q$ with $|I|=2^{-n_{j}}$. Introduce the sets

$$
E_{j}:=\bigcup_{I \in Q:|I|=2^{-n_{j}}} I .
$$

Then the number $N$ of elements in $Q$ can be written in the form

$$
N=\sum_{j=1}^{s}\left|E_{j}\right| 2^{n_{j}}
$$

Furthermore, we have

$$
\left\|c_{I} H_{I}\right\|_{p}=\left|c_{I}\right||I|^{1 / p-1 / 2} .
$$

The assumption (7) implies $\left|c_{I}\right| \leq|I|^{1 / 2-1 / p}$. Next, we have

$$
\|f\|_{p} \leq\left\|\sum_{I \in Q}\left|c_{I} H_{I}\right|\right\|_{p} \leq\left\|\sum_{I \in Q}|I|^{-1 / p} \chi_{I}(x)\right\|_{p}
$$

The right hand side of this inequality cna be rewritten as

$$
Y:=\left(\int_{0}^{1}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{s} 2^{n_{j} / p} \chi_{E_{j}}(x)\right)^{p} d x\right)^{1 / p}
$$

Applying Lemma 1.2 with $q=p$, we get

$$
\|f\|_{p} \leq Y \leq \frac{1}{1-(1 / 2)^{1 / p}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{s}\left|E_{j}\right| 2^{n_{j}}\right)^{1 / p}=\frac{1}{1-(1 / 2)^{1 / p}} N^{1 / p}
$$

Lemma 1.4. Consider

$$
f=\sum_{I \in Q} c_{I} H_{I}, \quad|Q|=N .
$$

Let $1 \leq p<\infty$. Assume

$$
\left\|c_{I} H_{I}\right\|_{p} \geq 1, \quad I \in Q
$$

Then

$$
\|f\|_{p} \geq\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / p}\right) N^{1 / p}
$$

Proof. Define

$$
u:=\sum_{I \in Q} \bar{c}_{I}\left|c_{I}\right|^{-1}|I|^{1 / p-1 / 2} H_{I},
$$

where the bar means complex conjugate number. Then for $p^{\prime}=\frac{p}{p-1}$ we have

$$
\left\|\bar{c}_{I}\left|c_{I}\right|^{-1}|I|^{1 / p-1 / 2} H_{I}\right\|_{p^{\prime}}=1
$$

and, by Lemma 1.3

$$
\|u\|_{p^{\prime}} \leq \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / p}} N^{1 / p^{\prime}}
$$

Consider $(f, u)$. We have on the one hand

$$
(f, u)=\sum_{I \in Q}\left|c_{I}\right||I|^{1 / p-1 / 2}=\sum_{I \in Q}\left\|c_{I} H_{I}\right\|_{p} \geq N
$$

and on the other hand

$$
(f, u) \leq\|f\|_{p}\|u\|_{p^{\prime}}
$$

so that

$$
N \leq(f, u) \leq\|f\|_{p}\|u\|_{p^{\prime}} \leq\|f\|_{p} \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / p}} N^{1 / p^{\prime}}
$$

which implies

$$
\|f\|_{p} \geq\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / p}\right) N^{1 / p}
$$

Lemma 1.5. Let $1<p<\infty$. Then for any $g \in L^{p}[0,1]$ we have

$$
\left\|S_{\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}}(g)\right\|_{p} \leq \frac{1}{\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / p}\right)^{2}} \cdot\left\|S_{\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p}
$$

Proof. Denote

$$
A:=\max _{I \in \Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}}\left\|c_{I}(g) H_{I}\right\|_{p} \quad \text { and } \quad B:=\min _{I \in \Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda}\left\|c_{I}(g) H_{I}\right\|_{p} .
$$

Then by the definition of $\Lambda_{m}$ we have

$$
B \geq A
$$

Using Lemma 1.3, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|S_{\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}}(g)\right\|_{p} \leq A \cdot \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / p}} \cdot\left|\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}\right|^{1 / p} \leq B \cdot \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / p}} \cdot\left|\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}\right|^{1 / p} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using Lemma 1.4, we get

$$
\left\|S_{\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p} \geq B \cdot\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / p}\right) \cdot\left|\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda\right|^{1 / p}
$$

so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda\right|^{1 / p} \leq \frac{1}{B \cdot\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / p}\right)}\left\|S_{\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $|\Lambda|=\left|\Lambda_{m}\right|=m$, we have $\left|\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda\right|=\left|\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}\right|$ and finally get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|S_{\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}}(g)\right\|_{p} & \stackrel{(8)}{\leq} B \cdot \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / p}} \cdot\left|\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}\right|^{1 / p} \\
& \stackrel{\text { (90) }}{\leq} \frac{1}{\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1 / p}\right)^{2}}\left\|S_{\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p}
\end{aligned}
$$

Lemma 1.6. Let $f \in L^{p}[0,1]$. Then the Haar series

$$
g=\sum_{I} c_{I}(g) H_{I}
$$

is a conditionally symmetric martingale.

Proof. First, we give a definition of a conditionally symmetric martingale (cf. 5] and [6]).

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space with a nondecreasing sequence of $\sigma$-fields

$$
\{\Omega, \phi\}=\mathcal{F}_{0} \subset \mathcal{F}_{1} \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{F}_{n} \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{F}
$$

Let $H$ be a real or complex Hilbert space with norm $|\cdot|$. A sequence of $H$-valued strongly integrable functions $\left(f_{n}\right)_{n \geq 1}$ is a martingale if for each $n \geq 1, f_{n}$ is strongly measurable relative to $\mathcal{F}_{n}$, and for $n \geq 2$,

$$
\mathbb{E}\left(d_{n} \mid \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)=0 \quad \text { a.e. }
$$

Here the difference sequence $\left(d_{n}\right)_{n \geq 1}$ is defined by $f_{n}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{i}, n \geq 1$. In the following, we also call the limit $f=\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} d_{n}$ martingale if the corresponding sequence $\left(f_{n}\right)_{n \geq 1}$ is a martingale.

A martingale is called conditionally symmetric if $d_{n+1}$ and $-d_{n+1}$ have the same conditional distribution given $d_{1}, \ldots, d_{n}$.

We can write the Haar series as

$$
g=(f, \varphi) \varphi+\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{2^{k} \leq j \leq 2^{k+1}-1}\left(g, \Psi_{j, k}\right) \Psi_{j, k},
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi(x) & = \begin{cases}1, & x \in[0,1), \\
0, & \text { otherwise }\end{cases} \\
\Psi_{0,0}(x) & =\varphi(2 x)-\varphi(2 x-1), \\
\Psi_{j, k}(x) & =2^{k / 2} \cdot \Psi_{0,0}\left(2^{k} x-j\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Consider the probability space $\{\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}\}$ defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Omega & =[0,1], \\
\mathcal{F} & =\mathcal{B}([0,1]), \\
\mathbb{P}(A) & =|A|, \quad A \in \mathcal{F},
\end{aligned}
$$

and the sequence of $\sigma$-fields

$$
\begin{aligned}
\{\Omega, \phi\}= & \{\Omega, \emptyset\} \\
& \subset \sigma(\varphi) \\
& \subset \sigma\left(\varphi, \Psi_{0,0}\right) \\
& \subset \sigma\left(\varphi, \Psi_{0,0}, \Psi_{2,1}\right) \\
& \subset \sigma\left(\varphi, \Psi_{0,0}, \Psi_{2,1}, \Psi_{3,1}\right) \subset \cdots \\
& \subset \sigma\left(\varphi, \cdots, \Psi_{2^{k}, k}, \cdots, \Psi_{2^{k+1}-1, k}, \Psi_{2^{k+1}, k+1}\right) \subset \cdots \\
& \subset \mathcal{F}
\end{aligned}
$$

We define

$$
d_{0}=(g, \varphi) \varphi, \quad d_{1}=\left(g, \Psi_{0,0}\right) \Psi_{0,0}, \quad d_{2}=\left(g, \Psi_{2,1}\right) \Psi_{2,1}, \cdots
$$

and

$$
c_{0}=(g, \varphi), \quad c_{1}=\left(g, \Psi_{0,0}\right), \quad c_{2}=\left(g, \Psi_{2,1}\right), \cdots
$$

where the indices of $\left(f, \Psi_{.,}\right) \Psi_{.,}$and $\left(f, \Psi_{.,}\right)$increase as in the definition of the sequence of $\sigma$-fields.

For each fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$ and each $i=0, \cdots, n$, each of the sets $\left\{x: d_{i}(x)=c_{i}\right\}$, $\left\{x: d_{i}(x)=-c_{i}\right\}$, and $\left\{x: d_{i}(x)=0\right\}$ is either a superset of the support of $d_{n+1}$ or each of the sets and the support $d_{n+1}$ are disjoint. This implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.\mathbb{P}\left(d_{n+1}=c_{n+1} \mid d_{i}=j_{i}, \quad i \in\{1, \ldots, n\}\right), \quad j_{i} \in\left\{c_{i},-c_{i}, 0\right\}\right) \\
= & \left.\mathbb{P}\left(d_{n+1}=-c_{n+1} \mid d_{i}=j_{i}, \quad i \in\{1, \ldots, n\}\right), \quad j_{i} \in\left\{c_{i},-c_{i}, 0\right\}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

so that the conditional distribution of $d_{n+1}$ and $-d_{n+1}$ is the same given $d_{1}, \ldots, d_{n}$. Furthermore, we have $\mathbb{E}\left(d_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_{n}\right)=0$.

## 2. Extension of the calculation to the multidimensional case

A very common way to extend the Haar basis to $[0,1]^{d}$ is given by the following construction (cf. [2]). Let $E$ denote the collection of nonzero vertices of $[0,1]^{d}$. For each $e \in E$, we define the multivariate functions

$$
\Psi^{e}\left(x_{1}, \cdots, x_{d}\right):=\Psi^{e_{1}}\left(x_{1}\right) \cdots \Psi^{e_{d}}\left(x_{d}\right)
$$

where $\Psi^{0}(x)=\varphi(x), \Psi^{1}(x)=\Psi_{0,0}(x)$. Furthermore, let

$$
\Psi_{j, k}^{e}(x)=2^{k d / 2} \cdot \Psi^{e}\left(2^{k} x-j\right), \quad k \geq 0, \quad 2^{k} \leq j_{i} \leq 2^{k+1}-1, \quad i=1, \ldots, d
$$

and

$$
\Psi^{*}(x)=1, \quad x \in[0,1]^{d} .
$$

Then the collection of functions $\Psi^{*}, \Psi_{j, k}^{e}, e \in E, k \geq 0,2^{k} \leq j_{i} \leq 2^{k+1}-1, i=1, \cdots, d$ forms a basis for $L^{p}[0,1]^{d}$.

By considering the set $\mathcal{D}$ of dyadic cubes $I$ which form the supports of the functions $\Psi^{*}, \Psi_{j, k}^{e}$ and exchanging the notation of $\Psi^{*}, \Psi_{j, k}^{e}$ to $H_{I}$, we can also write the multivariate Haar basis as

$$
\mathcal{H}=\left\{H_{I}\right\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}
$$

Lemma 2.1. Consider $f \in L^{p}[0,1]^{d}$ with corresponding Haar series

$$
f=\left(f, \Psi^{*}\right) \Psi^{*}+\sum_{e \in E} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{2^{k} \leq j_{j} \leq 2^{k+1}-1 \\ i=1, \cdots, d}}\left(f, \Psi_{j, k}^{e}\right) \Psi_{j, k}^{e} .
$$

Then the inner double sum

$$
\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{2^{k} \leq j_{i} \leq 2^{k+1}-1 \\ i=1, \cdots, d}}\left(f, \Psi_{j, k}^{e}\right) \Psi_{j, k}^{e}
$$

forms a conditionally symmetric martingale on $[0,1]^{d}$ for each fixed $e \in E$, but so does not the Haar series itself.

Proof. First we show that the Haar series itself does not form a conditionally symmetric martingale.

Let us assume that $d=2$ and remark that the proof goes analogously for $d>2$. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(0,1)}\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right)= \begin{cases}1, & \left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right) \in[0,1] \times\left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right], \\
-1, & \left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right) \in[0,1] \times\left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right], \\
0, & \text { otherwise },\end{cases} \\
& \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(1,0)}\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right)= \begin{cases}1, & \left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right) \in\left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right] \times[0,1], \\
-1, & \left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right) \in\left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right] \times[0,1], \\
0, & \text { otherwise },\end{cases} \\
& \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(1,1)}\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right)= \begin{cases}1, & \left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right) \in\left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right] \times\left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right] \cup\left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right] \times\left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right], \\
-1, & \left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right) \in\left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right] \times\left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right] \bigcup\left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right] \times\left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right], \\
0, & \text { otherwise. }\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, the functions $\Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(0,1)}, \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(1,0)}$, and $\Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(1,1)}$ can be represented as in Figure $\mathbb{1}$. Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(1,1)}=1 \mid \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(0,1)}=1, \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(1,0)}=1\right)=1, \\
& \mathbb{P}\left(\Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(0,1)}=1 \mid \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(1,0)}=1, \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(1,1)}=1\right)=1, \\
& \mathbb{P}\left(\Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(1,0)}=1 \mid \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(0,1)}=1, \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(1,1)}=1\right)=1,
\end{aligned}
$$



Figure 1. The functions $\Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(0,1)}, \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(1,0)}$, and $\Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(1,1)}$.
which implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\left(\Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(1,1)} \mid \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(0,1)}=1, \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(1,0)}=1\right)=1 \\
& \mathbb{E}\left(\Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(0,1)} \mid \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(1,0)}=1, \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(1,1)}=1\right)=1 \\
& \mathbb{E}\left(\Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(1,0)} \mid \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(0,1)}=1, \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{(1,1)}=1\right)=1
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore the multiparameter Haar series cannot a martingale.

Let us now consider the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Omega & =[0,1]^{d}, \\
\mathcal{F} & =\mathcal{B}\left([0,1]^{d}\right), \\
\mathbb{P}(A) & =|A|, \quad A \subset \mathcal{F},
\end{aligned}
$$

with the sequence of $\sigma$-fields

$$
\begin{aligned}
\{\Omega, \phi\}= & \sigma\left(\Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{e}\right) \\
& \subset \sigma\left(\Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{e}, \Psi_{(2,2), 1}^{e}\right) \subset \cdots \\
& \subset \sigma\left(\Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{e}, \cdots, \Psi_{(3,2), 1}^{e}, \Psi_{(2,3), 1}^{e}, \Psi_{(3,3), 1}^{e}\right) \subset \cdots \\
& \subset \sigma\left(\Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{e}, \cdots, \Psi_{(3,3), 1}^{e}, \Psi_{(4,4), 2}^{e}, \Psi_{(5,4), 2}^{e}, \Psi_{(6,4), 2}^{e}, \Psi_{(7,4), 2}^{e}\right) \subset \cdots \\
& \subset \sigma\left(\Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{e}, \cdots, \Psi_{(7,4), 2}^{e}, \Psi_{(4,5), 2}^{e}, \Psi_{(5,5), 2}^{e}, \Psi_{(6,5), 2}^{e}\right) \subset \cdots \\
& \subset \mathcal{F}
\end{aligned}
$$

for each vertex $e \in E$. We denote this sequence of $\sigma$-fields by

$$
\mathcal{F}_{0}=\sigma\left(\Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{e}\right), \quad \mathcal{F}_{1}=\sigma\left(\Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{e}, \Psi_{(2,2), 1}^{e}\right), \quad \cdots
$$

Furthermore, for a fixed $e \in E$, we consider the partial sums of the inner sums of the Haar series

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{2^{k} \leq j_{i} \leq 2^{k+1}-1 \\ i=1, \cdots, d}}\left(f, \Psi_{j, k}^{e}\right) \Psi_{j, k}^{e} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

and show that they form a conditionally symmetric martingale.
Let us denote the difference sequence $\left(d_{n}\right)_{n \geq 1}$ of (10) by

$$
d_{0}=\left(f, \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{e}\right) \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{e}, \quad d_{1}=\left(f, \Psi_{(2,2), 1}^{e}\right) \Psi_{(2,2), 1}^{e},, \quad \cdots
$$

The corresponding coefficients are denoted by

$$
c_{0}=\left(f, \Psi_{(0,0), 0}^{e}\right), \quad c_{1}=\left(f, \Psi_{(2,2), 1}^{e}\right), \quad \cdots
$$

For a fixed $k$ and $e \in E$, the support of the functions $\Psi_{j, k}^{e}$ is disjoint. Furthermore, for $l<k$ and $e \in E$, each of the sets $\left\{x: \Psi_{j, l}^{e}(x)=1\right\},\left\{x: \Psi_{j, l}^{e}(x)=-1\right\}$, and $\left\{x: \Psi_{j, l}^{e}(x)=0\right\}$ is either a superset of the support of $\Psi_{j, k}^{e}$ or each of the sets and the support of $\Psi_{j, k}^{e}$ are disjoint.

This implies that $-d_{n+1}$ and $d_{n+1}$ have the same conditional distribution given $d_{1}, \ldots, d_{n}$ and therefore

$$
E\left(d_{n} \mid \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right)=0
$$

Thus, the partial sums of

$$
\sum_{\substack{k=0}}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{2^{k} \leq j_{i} \leq \leq^{k+1}-1 \\ i=1, \cdots, d}}\left(f, \Psi_{j, k}^{e}\right) \Psi_{j, k}^{e}
$$

form a conditionally symmetric martingale.
It is clear that the series $\left(f, \Psi^{*}\right) \Psi^{*}+\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{2^{k} \leq j_{i} \leq 2^{k+1}-1 \\ i=1, \cdots, d}}\left(f, \Psi_{j, k}^{e}\right) \Psi_{j, k}^{e}$ is also a martingale.
Theorem 2.2. Let $1<p \leq 2$. Then for any $g \in L^{p}[0,1]^{d}$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\|g-G_{m}^{p}(g, \mathcal{H})\right\|_{p} \\
& \leq\left(2+\frac{1}{\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / p}\right)^{2}}\right)\left(\left(2^{d}-1\right)\left(\max \left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right)-1\right)\right)^{2} \sigma_{m}(g)_{p}
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. Using Lemma 2.1, we get an estimate for the upper bound in the LittlewoodPaley inequality by additionally applying the triangle inequality. Let $e^{*} \in E$. Then

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\|\left(g, \Psi^{*}\right) \Psi^{*}+\sum_{e \in E} \sum_{\substack{k=0}}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{2^{k} \leq j_{i} \leq 2^{k+1}-1 \\
i=1, \cdots, d}}\left(g, \Psi_{j, k}^{e}\right) \Psi_{j, k}^{e}\right\|_{p} \\
\leq & \left\|\left(g, \Psi^{*}\right) \Psi^{*}+\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{2^{k} \leq j_{i} \leq 2^{k+1}-1 \\
i=1, \cdots, d}}\left(g, \Psi_{j, k}^{e^{*}}\right) \Psi_{j, k}^{e^{*}}\right\|_{p} \\
& +\sum_{e \in E \backslash\left\{e^{*}\right\}} \| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{2^{k} \leq j_{i} \leq 2^{k+1}-1}^{i=1, \cdots, d} \mid \\
\leq & \sum_{e \in E} C_{4}(p)\left\|\left(\Psi_{j, k}^{e}\left\|\Psi_{j, k}^{e}\right\|_{I \in \mathcal{D}}\left|c_{I}(g) H_{I}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\|_{p} \\
= & \left(2^{d}-1\right) C_{4}(p)\left\|\left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}}\left|c_{I}(g) H_{I}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\|_{p} . \tag{11}
\end{align*}
$$

We now apply the method of duality (cf. [3]) in order to determine the lower bound of the Littlewood-Paley inequality. The idea is to consider

$$
S(g):=\left\|\left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}}\left|c_{I}(g) H_{I}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\|_{p}
$$

as an element of $L_{l^{2}(\mathcal{D})}^{p}$, that is

$$
\varphi=\left\{\sqrt{\left|c_{I}(g) H_{I}\right|^{2}}: I \in \mathcal{D}\right\}
$$

is considered as a $p$-integrable function taking values in $l^{2}(\mathcal{D})$. Due to the HahnBanach theorem, the dual function $\gamma=\left\{\gamma_{I}(x): I \in \mathcal{D}\right\} \in L_{l^{2}(\mathcal{D})}^{p^{\prime}}$ is of norm one and satisfies

$$
\|\varphi\|_{L_{l^{2}}^{p}}=(\varphi, \gamma)=\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \sqrt{\left|c_{I}(g) H_{I}\right|^{2}} \int_{I} \gamma_{I} d y
$$

where $p^{\prime}$ is the conjugate index, i. e. $1 / p+1 / p^{\prime}=1$. This implies that we can assume that $\gamma_{I}$ is supported on $I$ and constant on $I$ since in the above formula, only the mean value of $\gamma_{I}$ over $I$ is important.

By defining the function

$$
h:=\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}}\left(\gamma_{I} \sqrt{|I|}\right) H_{I},
$$

we have on the one hand

$$
S(h)=\|\gamma\|_{l^{2}(\mathcal{D})}
$$

and on the other hand

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|S(g)\|_{p}=\|\varphi\|_{L_{l^{2}}^{p}} & =(\varphi, \gamma) \\
& =\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} c_{I}(g) \gamma_{I} \sqrt{|I|} \\
& =(g, h) \\
& \leq\|g\|_{p}\|h\|_{p^{\prime}} \\
& \leq\|g\|_{p}\left(2^{d}-1\right) C_{4}(p)\|S(h)\|_{p^{\prime}} \\
& =\|g\|_{p}\left(2^{d}-1\right) C_{4}(p)\| \| \gamma\left\|_{l^{2}(\mathcal{D})}\right\|_{p^{\prime}} \\
& =\|g\|_{p}\left(2^{d}-1\right) C_{4}(p)
\end{aligned}
$$

so that in the multidimensional case, the Littlewood-Paley inequality reads

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{C_{4}^{*}(p, d)}\left\|\left(\sum_{I}\left|c_{I}(g) H_{I}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\|_{p} \leq\|g\|_{p} \leq C_{4}^{*}(p, d)\left\|\left(\sum_{I}\left|c_{I}(g) H_{I}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\|_{p} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $C_{4}^{*}(p, d)=\left(2^{d}-1\right) C_{4}(p)=\left(2^{d}-1\right)\left(\max \left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right)-1\right)$.
Now, the remainder of the proof goes as for the univariate case. We note that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|g-S_{\Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p} & \leq C_{4}^{*}(p, d)^{2} \cdot \sigma_{m}(g)_{p} \\
\left\|S_{\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p} & \leq C_{4}^{*}(p, d)^{2} \cdot \sigma_{m}(g)_{p}
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\left\|S_{\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}}(g)\right\|_{p} \leq \frac{1}{\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / p}\right)^{2}}\left\|S_{\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p}
$$

which will be derived in the following lemmas.
Combining the last three inequalities, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\|g-G_{m}^{p}(g)\right\|_{p} \\
\leq & \left\|g-S_{\Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p}+\left\|S_{\Lambda}(g)-S_{\Lambda_{m}}(g)\right\|_{p} \\
= & \left\|g-S_{\Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p}+\left\|S_{\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}}(g)-S_{\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p} \\
\leq & \left\|g-S_{\Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p}+\left\|S_{\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}}(g)\right\|_{p}+\left\|S_{\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p} \\
\leq & \left(2+\frac{1}{\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / p}\right)^{2}}\right)\left(\left(2^{d}-1\right)\left(\max \left(p, \frac{p}{p-1}\right)-1\right)\right)^{2} \sigma_{m}(g)_{p} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Lemma 2.3. Let $n_{1}<n_{2}<\cdots<n_{s}$ be integers and let $E_{j} \subset[0,1]^{d}$ be measurable sets, $j=1, \ldots, s$. Then for any $0<q<\infty$ we have

$$
\int_{[0,1]^{d}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{s} 2^{n_{j} d / q} \chi_{E_{j}}(x)\right)^{q} d x \leq\left(\frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / q}}\right)^{q} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{s} 2^{n_{j} d}\left|E_{j}\right| .
$$

Proof. Denote

$$
F(x):=\sum_{j=1}^{s} 2^{n_{j} d / q} \chi_{E_{j}}(x)
$$

and estimate it on the sets

$$
E_{l}^{-}:=E_{l} \backslash \bigcup_{k=l+1}^{s} E_{k}, \quad l=1, \ldots, s-1 ; \quad E_{s}^{-}:=E_{s}
$$

We have for $x \in E_{l}^{-}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
F(x) & \leq \sum_{j=1}^{l} 2^{n_{j} d / q}=2^{n_{l} d / q}\left(\frac{2^{n_{1} d / q}}{2^{n_{l} d / q}}+\cdots+1\right) \\
& \leq 2^{n_{l} d / q} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{1}{2^{d / q}}\right)^{i}=2^{n_{l} d / q} \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / q}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\int_{0}^{1} F(x)^{q} d x \leq\left(\frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / q}}\right)^{q} \sum_{l=1}^{s} 2^{n_{l} d}\left|E_{l}^{-}\right| \leq\left(\frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / q}}\right)^{q} \sum_{l=1}^{s} 2^{n_{l} d}\left|E_{l}\right|,
$$

which proves the lemma.
Lemma 2.4. Consider

$$
f=\sum_{I \in Q} c_{I} H_{I}, \quad|Q|=N .
$$

Let $1 \leq p<\infty$. Assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|c_{I} H_{I}\right\|_{p} \leq 1, \quad I \in Q \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then

$$
\|f\|_{p} \leq \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / p}} N^{1 / p}
$$

Proof. Denote by $n_{1}<n_{2}<\cdots<n_{s}$ all integers such that there is $I \in Q$ with $|I|=2^{-d n_{j}}$. Introduce the sets

$$
E_{j}:=\bigcup_{I \in Q:|I|=2^{-d n_{j}}} I .
$$

Then the number $N$ of elements in $Q$ can be written in the form

$$
N=\sum_{j=1}^{s}\left|E_{j}\right| 2^{d n_{j}} .
$$

Furthermore, we have for $|I|=2^{-k d}, k=0,1,2, \cdots$

$$
\left\|c_{i} H_{I}\right\|_{p}=\left|c_{I}\right|\left(\int_{I}\left|2^{d k / 2}\right|^{p} d x\right)^{1 / p}=\left|c_{I}\right| \cdot 2^{d k / 2} \cdot 2^{-k d / p}=\left|c_{I}\right||I|^{1 / p-1 / 2}
$$

The assumption (13) implies

$$
\left|c_{I}\right| \leq|I|^{1 / 2-1 / p}
$$

Next, we have

$$
\|f\|_{p} \leq\left\|\sum_{I \in Q}\left|c_{I} H_{I}\right|\right\|_{p} \leq\left\|\sum_{I \in Q}|I|^{-1 / p} \chi_{I}(x)\right\|_{p}
$$

The right hand side of this inequality can be rewritten as

$$
Y:=\left(\int_{[0,1]^{d}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{s} 2^{d n_{j} / p} \chi_{E_{j}}(x)\right)^{p} d x\right)^{1 / p}
$$

Applying Lemma 2.3 with $q=p$, we get

$$
\|f\|_{p} \leq Y \leq \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / p}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{s}\left|E_{j}\right| 2^{d n_{j}}\right)^{1 / p}=\frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / p}} N^{1 / p}
$$

Lemma 2.5. Consider

$$
f=\sum_{I \in Q} c_{I} H_{I}, \quad|Q|=N .
$$

Let $1 \leq p<\infty$. Assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|c_{I} H_{I}\right\|_{p} \geq 1, \quad I \in Q \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then

$$
\|f\|_{p} \geq\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / p}\right) N^{1 / p}
$$

Proof. Define

$$
u:=\sum_{I \in Q} \bar{c}_{I}\left|c_{I}\right|^{-1}|I|^{1 / p-1 / 2} H_{I},
$$

where the bar means complex conjugate number. Then for $p^{\prime}=\frac{p}{p-1}$ we have

$$
\left\|\bar{c}_{I}\left|c_{I}\right|^{-1}|I|^{1 / p-1 / 2} H_{I}\right\|_{p^{\prime}}=1
$$

and, by Lemma 2.3

$$
\|u\|_{p^{\prime}} \leq \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / p}} N^{1 / p^{\prime}}
$$

Consider $(f, u)$. We have on the one hand

$$
(f, u)=\sum_{I \in Q}\left|c_{I}\right||I|^{1 / p-1 / 2}=\sum_{I \in Q}\left\|c_{I} H_{I}\right\|_{p} \geq N
$$

and on the other hand

$$
(f, u) \leq\|f\|_{p}\|u\|_{p^{\prime}},
$$

so that

$$
N \leq(f, u) \leq\|f\|_{p}\|u\|_{p^{\prime}} \leq\|f\|_{p} \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / p}} N^{1 / p^{\prime}}
$$

which implies

$$
\|f\|_{p} \geq\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / p}\right) N^{1 / p}
$$

Lemma 2.6. Let $1<p<\infty$. Then for any $g \in L^{p}[0,1]^{d}$ we have

$$
\left\|S_{\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}}(g)\right\|_{p} \leq \frac{1}{\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / p}\right)^{2}} \cdot\left\|S_{\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p}
$$

Proof. Denote

$$
A:=\max _{I \in \Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}}\left\|c_{I}(g) H_{I}\right\|_{p} \quad \text { and } \quad B:=\min _{I \in \Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda}\left\|c_{I}(g) H_{I}\right\|_{p} .
$$

Then by the definition of $\Lambda_{m}$ we have

$$
B \geq A
$$

Using Lemma 2.3, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|S_{\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}}(g)\right\|_{p} \leq A \cdot \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / p}} \cdot\left|\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}\right|^{1 / p} \leq B \cdot \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / p}} \cdot\left|\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}\right|^{1 / p} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using Lemma 2.4, we get

$$
\left\|S_{\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p} \geq B \cdot\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / p}\right) \cdot\left|\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda\right|^{1 / p}
$$

so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda\right|^{1 / p} \leq \frac{1}{B \cdot\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / p}\right)}\left\|S_{\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Taking into account that $\left|\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda\right|=\left|\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}\right|$, we get

$$
\left\|S_{\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}}(g)\right\|_{p} \stackrel{\sqrt{150}}{\leq} B \cdot \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / p}} \cdot\left|\Lambda \backslash \Lambda_{m}\right|^{1 / p} \stackrel{\sqrt{16}}{\leq} \frac{1}{\left(1-\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{d / p}\right)^{2}}\left\|S_{\Lambda_{m} \backslash \Lambda}(g)\right\|_{p}
$$
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