

ON THE FAILURE OF MULTILINEAR MULTIPLIER THEOREM WITH ENDPOINT SMOOTHNESS CONDITIONS

BAE JUN PARK

ABSTRACT. We study a multilinear version of the Hörmander multiplier theorem, namely

$$\|T_\sigma(f_1, \dots, f_n)\|_{L^p} \lesssim \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\sigma(2^k \cdot, \dots, 2^k \cdot) \widehat{\phi^{(n)}}\|_{L^2_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}} \|f_1\|_{H^{p_1}} \cdots \|f_n\|_{H^{p_n}}.$$

We show that the estimate does not hold in the limiting case $\min(s_1, \dots, s_n) = d/2$ or $\sum_{k \in J} (s_k/d - 1/p_k) = -1/2$ for some $J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$. This provides the necessary and sufficient condition on (s_1, \dots, s_n) for the boundedness of T_σ .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let n be a positive integer and σ be a bounded function on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^n$. The n -linear multiplier operator T_σ associated with σ is defined by

$$T_\sigma(f_1, \dots, f_n)(x) := \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^n} \sigma(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \left(\prod_{j=1}^n \widehat{f_j}(\xi_j) \right) e^{2\pi i \langle x, \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j \rangle} d\xi_1 \cdots d\xi_n$$

for Schwartz functions f_1, \dots, f_n in $S(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where $\widehat{f}(\xi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) e^{-2\pi i \langle x, \xi \rangle} dx$ is the Fourier transform of f . The study on $L^{p_1} \times \cdots \times L^{p_n} \rightarrow L^p$ boundedness of T_σ , $1/p = 1/p_1 + \cdots + 1/p_n$, is one of principal questions in harmonic analysis as a multilinear extension of classical Fourier multiplier theorems and there have been many attempts to characterize σ for which the boundedness holds. A multilinear version of the Hörmander multiplier theorem was studied by Tomita [11] who obtained $L^{p_1} \times \cdots \times L^{p_n} \rightarrow L^p$ boundedness ($1 < p_1, \dots, p_n, p < \infty$) under the condition

$$(1.1) \quad \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\sigma(2^j \cdot_1, \dots, 2^j \cdot_n) \widehat{\phi^{(n)}}\|_{L^2_s((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)} < \infty, \quad s > nd/2.$$

Here $L^2_s((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)$ denotes the standard fractional Sobolev space on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^n$ and $\phi^{(n)}$ is a Schwartz function on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^n$ having the properties that $\text{Supp}(\widehat{\phi^{(n)}}) \subset \{\vec{\xi} := (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^n : 2^{-1} \leq |\vec{\xi}| \leq 2\}$ and $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \widehat{\phi^{(n)}}(\vec{\xi}/2^k) = 1$ for $\vec{\xi} \neq 0$. Grafakos and Si [6] extended the result of Tomita to the case $p \leq 1$, using L^r -based Sobolev

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 42B15, 46E35.

Key words and phrases. Hörmander multiplier theorem, Multilinear operator, Sobolev space with sharp regularity conditions.

The author is supported in part by NRF grant 2019R1F1A1044075 and by a KIAS Individual Grant MG070001 at Korea Institute for Advanced Study.

spaces with $1 < r \leq 2$. Fujita and Tomita [1] provided weighted extensions of these results for $1 < p_1, \dots, p_n, p < \infty$ with

$$(1.2) \quad \mathcal{L}_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}^{2, (n)}[\sigma] := \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\| \sigma(2^j \cdot_1, \dots, 2^j \cdot_n) \widehat{\phi^{(n)}} \right\|_{L_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}^2((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)} < \infty,$$

for $s_1, \dots, s_n > d/2$, instead of (1.1), where $L_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}^2((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)$ is a product-type Sobolev space with the norm

$$\|f\|_{L_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}^2((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)} := \left(\int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^n} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n (1 + 4\pi^2 |x_j|^2)^{s_j} \right) |\widehat{f}(x_1, \dots, x_n)|^2 dx_1 \cdots dx_n \right)^{1/2}.$$

The range of p in this result was extended by Grafakos, Miyachi, and Tomita [2]. In [7] Miyachi and Tomita obtained minimal conditions of s_1, s_2 in (1.2) for the $H^{p_1} \times H^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p$ boundedness of the bilinear operator ($n = 2$) and more recently, Grafakos and Nguyen [4] and Grafakos, Miyachi, Nguyen, and Tomita [3] generalize the result of bilinear operators to n -linear cases for $n \geq 3$.

Theorem A. Let $0 < p_1, \dots, p_n \leq \infty$, $0 < p < \infty$, $1/p_1 + \dots + 1/p_n = 1/p$, and suppose that

$$(1.3) \quad s_1, \dots, s_n > d/2, \quad \sum_{k \in J} \left(\frac{s_k}{d} - \frac{1}{p_k} \right) > -\frac{1}{2}$$

for every nonempty subset $J \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. If σ satisfies (1.2), then we have

$$(1.4) \quad \|T_\sigma\|_{H^{p_1} \times \dots \times H^{p_n} \rightarrow L^p} \lesssim \mathcal{L}_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}^{2, (n)}[\sigma].$$

We also refer to [9, 10] for *BMO* extensions of the result.

The optimality of (1.3) was also studied in [3, 4, 7] and indeed, if (1.4) holds, then we must necessarily have

$$s_1, \dots, s_n \geq d/2, \quad \sum_{k \in J} \left(\frac{s_k}{d} - \frac{1}{p_k} \right) \geq -\frac{1}{2}$$

for every nonempty subset $J \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. The proof is based on a scaling argument by constructing two different multipliers $\sigma_1^{(\epsilon)}$ and $\sigma_2^{(\epsilon)}$ such that for $1 \leq m \leq n$,

$$\mathcal{L}_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}^{2, (n)}[\sigma_1^{(\epsilon)}] \lesssim \epsilon^{d/2 - s_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \|T_{\sigma_1^{(\epsilon)}}\|_{H^{p_1} \times \dots \times H^{p_n} \rightarrow L^p} \gtrsim 1 \quad \text{uniformly in } \epsilon,$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}^{2, (n)}[\sigma_2^{(\epsilon)}] \lesssim \epsilon^{d/2 - (s_1 + \dots + s_m)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|T_{\sigma_2^{(\epsilon)}}\|_{H^{p_1} \times \dots \times H^{p_n} \rightarrow L^p} \gtrsim \epsilon^{d - d(1/p_1 + \dots + 1/p_m)}.$$

However, (1.4) still remains unknown in the critical case

$$\min(s_1, \dots, s_n) = d/2 \quad \text{or} \quad \sum_{k \in J} \left(\frac{s_k}{d} - \frac{1}{p_k} \right) = -\frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for some } J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

In this paper we shall address this question so that the necessary and sufficient conditions on (s_1, \dots, s_n) for (1.4) are completely achieved.

Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $0 < p_1, \dots, p_n \leq \infty$, $0 < p < \infty$, $1/p_1 + \dots + 1/p_n = 1/p$. Suppose (1.2) holds for $s_1, \dots, s_n > 0$. Then (1.4) does not hold if*

$$(1.5) \quad \min(s_1, \dots, s_n) \leq d/2$$

or

$$\sum_{k \in J} \left(\frac{s_k}{d} - \frac{1}{p_k} \right) \leq -\frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for some } J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

In order to prove Theorem 1.1, two different multipliers will be constructed. For the first case (1.5) we will use a more sophisticated scaling argument. The proof of the other case relies on a variant of Bessel potentials that appeared in [5, 8].

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

For notational convenience, we will occasionally write $\vec{f} := (f_1, \dots, f_n)$, $\vec{\xi} := (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$, $\vec{x} := (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, $\vec{y} := (y_1, \dots, y_n)$, $d\vec{x} := dx_1 \cdots dx_n$, $d\vec{y} := dy_1 \cdots dy_n$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let g be a function in $L^2_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)$. Then*

$$\|\widehat{\phi^{(n)}} \cdot g\|_{L^2_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^2_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)}.$$

Proof. By using the Minkowski inequality, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\phi^{(n)}} \cdot g\|_{L^2_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)} &= \left(\int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^n} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n (1 + 4\pi^2 |x_j|^2)^{s_j} \right) |\phi^{(n)} * g^\vee(\vec{x})|^2 d\vec{x} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^n} \phi^{(n)}(\vec{y}) \left(\int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^n} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n (1 + 4\pi^2 |x_j|^2)^{s_j} \right) |g^\vee(\vec{x} - \vec{y})|^2 d\vec{x} \right)^{1/2} d\vec{y} \end{aligned}$$

and then using $(1 + 4\pi^2 |x_j|^2)^{s_j} \lesssim (1 + 4\pi^2 |x_j - y_j|^2)^{s_j} (1 + 4\pi^2 |y_j|^2)^{s_j}$, the last expression is dominated by a constant multiple of $\|g\|_{L^2_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)}$. \square

Case 1 : Suppose that $\min(s_1, \dots, s_n) \leq d/2$.

Let $\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots\}$ be a sequence of disjoint lattices in \mathbb{Z}^d such that

$$(2.1) \quad |\lambda_m| \leq \sqrt{d} m^{1/d}.$$

One way to select such a sequence is as follows. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ let

$$\lambda_{k^d} := (k, 0, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

We observe that there are at most $d(k+1)^{d-1}$ integers between k^d and $(k+1)^d$, and there exist at least $2d(2k-1)^{d-1}$ lattices on the surface of cube $[-k, k]^d$. Since $d(k+1)^{d-1} \leq 2d(2k-1)^{d-1}$ we can choose lattices $\lambda_{k^d+1}, \lambda_{k^d+2}, \dots, \lambda_{(k+1)^d-1}$ on the surface of the cube and then clearly the length of those lattices is less than $\sqrt{d}k$, which yields (2.1).

It is enough to consider the case $s_1 \leq s_2, \dots, s_n$ and $s_1 \leq d/2$ as other cases will follow from a rearrangement.

Let η and $\tilde{\eta}$ denote Schwartz functions on \mathbb{R}^d having the properties that $\eta \geq 0$, $\eta(x) \geq c$ on $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| \leq \frac{1}{100}\}$ for some $c > 0$, $\text{Supp}(\tilde{\eta}) \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\xi| \leq \frac{1}{1000}\}$, $\tilde{\eta}(\xi) = 1$ for $|\xi| \leq \frac{1}{1000}$, and $\text{Supp}(\hat{\tilde{\eta}}) \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\xi| \leq \frac{1}{100}\}$. We further denote by θ and $\tilde{\theta}$ two Schwartz functions on \mathbb{R}^d such that $\text{Supp}(\hat{\theta}) \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : \frac{1}{2000\sqrt{n}} \leq |\xi| \leq \frac{1}{1000\sqrt{n}}\}$, $\text{Supp}(\hat{\tilde{\theta}}) \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\xi| \leq \frac{1}{100\sqrt{n}}\}$, and $\hat{\tilde{\theta}}(\xi) = 1$ for $|\xi| \leq \frac{1}{1000\sqrt{n}}$. Then it is clear that $\eta * \tilde{\eta} = \eta$ and $\theta * \tilde{\theta} = \theta$. Let $e_1 := (1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.

Let $1/2 < \delta \leq 1$ and set $N > 100$ to be a sufficiently large number. We define

$$\sigma^{(N)}(\vec{\xi}) := \sum_{m=100}^N \frac{1}{m} \frac{1}{(\ln m)^\delta} e^{2\pi i \langle \lambda_m, \xi_1 - e_1 \rangle} \hat{\tilde{\eta}}(\xi_1 - e_1) \hat{\tilde{\theta}}(\xi_2) \cdots \hat{\tilde{\theta}}(\xi_n).$$

Then it follows from the supports of $\hat{\tilde{\eta}}$ and $\hat{\tilde{\theta}}$ that $\sigma^{(N)}$ is supported in $\{\vec{\xi} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^n : \frac{99}{100} \leq |\vec{\xi}| \leq \frac{51}{50}\}$, which implies that $\sigma^{(N)}(2^j \vec{\xi}) \widehat{\phi^{(n)}}(\vec{\xi})$ vanishes unless $-1 \leq j \leq 1$. Moreover, due to Lemma 2.1 we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}^{2, (n)}[\sigma^{(N)}] \lesssim \max_{-1 \leq j \leq 1} \left\| \sigma^{(N)}(2^j \cdot_1, \dots, 2^j \cdot_n) \right\|_{L^2_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)},$$

which is further estimated, using scaling, by a constant times

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sigma^{(N)} \right\|_{L^2_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)} \\ & \lesssim \left\| \sum_{m=100}^N \frac{1}{m} \frac{1}{(\ln m)^\delta} e^{2\pi i \langle \lambda_m, \cdot - e_1 \rangle} \hat{\tilde{\eta}}(\cdot - e_1) \right\|_{L^2_{s_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ & = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + 4\pi^2 |x|^2)^{s_1} \left(\sum_{m=100}^N \frac{1}{m} \frac{1}{(\ln m)^\delta} |\tilde{\eta}(\lambda_m - x)| \right)^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\ & \lesssim_M \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + 4\pi^2 |x|^2)^{s_1} \left(\sum_{m=100}^\infty \frac{1}{m} \frac{1}{(\ln m)^\delta} \frac{1}{(1 + |x - \lambda_m|)^M} \right)^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently large $M > 0$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} E_0 &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| \leq 1\}, \\ E_j &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : 2^{j-1} < |x| \leq 2^j\}, \quad j \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Then the preceding expression is less than a constant times that

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^\infty 2^{2js_1} \int_{E_j} \left(\sum_{m=100}^\infty \frac{1}{m} \frac{1}{(\ln m)^\delta} \frac{1}{(1 + |x - \lambda_m|)^M} \right)^2 dx \right)^{1/2}$$

and the sum over m can be written as

$$\sum_{m \geq 100: 2^j \geq 10\sqrt{d}m^{1/d}} \cdots + \sum_{m: 2^j < 10\sqrt{d}m^{1/d}} \cdots =: \mathcal{I}^{(j)} + \mathcal{J}^{(j)}.$$

Choose $M > d$ and we see that for $x \in E_j$,

$$\mathcal{I}^{(j)} \lesssim 2^{-jM} (1+j)^{1-\delta} \lesssim 2^{-jd} (1+j)^{-\delta}$$

and

$$\mathcal{J}^{(j)} \lesssim 2^{-jd}(1+j)^{-\delta} \sum_{m=100}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1+|x-\lambda_m|)^M} \lesssim 2^{-jd}(1+j)^{-\delta}$$

where the last inequality holds since λ_m 's are disjoint lattices in \mathbb{Z}^d .

Combining these estimates, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}^{2, (n)}[\sigma^{(N)}] &\lesssim \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{-j(d-2s_1)} (1+j)^{-2\delta} \right)^{1/2} \\ (2.2) \quad &\leq \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (1+j)^{-2\delta} \right)^{1/2} \lesssim 1, \quad \text{uniformly in } N \end{aligned}$$

since $|E_j| \approx 2^{jd}$, $s_1 \leq d/2$, and $2\delta > 1$.

On the other hand, for $0 < \epsilon < 1/100$, let

$$f_1^{(\epsilon)}(x) := \epsilon^{d/p_1} \eta(\epsilon x) e^{2\pi i \langle x, e_1 \rangle}, \quad f_j^{(\epsilon)}(x) := \epsilon^{d/p_j} \theta(\epsilon x), \quad j = 2, \dots, n$$

Then it is clear that for each $1 \leq j \leq n$

$$(2.3) \quad \|f_j^{(\epsilon)}\|_{H^{p_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim 1, \quad \text{uniformly in } \epsilon.$$

We now assume toward a contradiction that for $\vec{f}^{(\epsilon)} := (f_1^{(\epsilon)}, \dots, f_n^{(\epsilon)})$

$$\|T_{\sigma^{(N)}} \vec{f}^{(\epsilon)}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\sigma^{(N)}(2^j \cdot) \widehat{\phi^{(n)}}\|_{L_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}^{2, (n)}((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)} \prod_{j=1}^n \|f_j^{(\epsilon)}\|_{H^{p_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

Then the estimates (2.2) and (2.3) yield that

$$(2.4) \quad \|T_{\sigma^{(N)}} \vec{f}^{(\epsilon)}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim 1, \quad \text{uniformly in } \epsilon, N.$$

Note that

$$T_{\sigma^{(N)}} \vec{f}^{(\epsilon)}(x) = \epsilon^{d/p} (\theta(\epsilon x))^{n-1} \sum_{m=100}^N \frac{1}{m} \frac{1}{(\ln m)^\delta} \eta(\epsilon x + \epsilon \lambda_m) e^{2\pi i \langle x, e_1 \rangle}$$

since $\widehat{\eta}(\xi/\epsilon) \widehat{\eta}(\xi) = \widehat{\eta}(\xi/\epsilon)$, $\widehat{\theta}(\xi/\epsilon) \widehat{\theta}(\xi) = \widehat{\theta}(\xi/\epsilon)$, and $1/p = 1/p_1 + \dots + 1/p_n$. Thus we have

$$\|T_{\sigma^{(N)}} \vec{f}^{(\epsilon)}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \left\| |\theta|^{n-1} \sum_{m=100}^N \frac{1}{m} \frac{1}{(\ln m)^\delta} \eta(\cdot + \epsilon \lambda_m) \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}$$

by using a scaling argument. Then (2.4) and the Fatou lemma yield that

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &\gtrsim \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|T_{\sigma(N)} \vec{f}^{(\epsilon)}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\
&\geq \left\| \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} |\theta|^{n-1} \sum_{m=100}^N \frac{1}{m} \frac{1}{(\ln m)^\delta} \eta(\cdot + \epsilon \lambda_m) \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\
&= \left\| |\eta| |\theta|^{n-1} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \sum_{m=100}^N \frac{1}{m} \frac{1}{(\ln m)^\delta} \approx \sum_{m=100}^N \frac{1}{m} \frac{1}{(\ln m)^\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the above estimate is independent of $N > 100$, by taking $N \rightarrow \infty$, we see that

$$1 \gtrsim \sum_{m=100}^N \frac{1}{m} \frac{1}{(\ln m)^\delta} \rightarrow \infty,$$

which finally leads to a contradiction and the desired result follows.

Case 2 : Suppose that $s_1, \dots, s_n > d/2$ and $\sum_{k \in J} (s_k/d - 1/p_k) \leq -1/2$ for some $J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $J = \{1, \dots, m\}$ for some $1 \leq m \leq n$, by using a rearrangement argument.

We first consider the case $1 \leq m < n$. Then the condition

$$\sum_{k=1}^m (s_k/d - 1/p_k) \leq -1/2$$

is equivalent to

$$(2.5) \quad s_1 + \dots + s_m + d/2 \leq d/p_1 + \dots + d/p_m = d/p - (d/p_{m+1} + \dots + d/p_n).$$

On the other hand, we observe from $s_j > d/2$, $1 \leq j \leq n$, that

$$s_1 + \dots + s_m + d/2 > (m+1)d/2,$$

which further implies that

$$m+1 < 2/p - (2/p_{m+1} + \dots + 2/p_n).$$

Now we choose $\tau, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_n > 0$ such that

$$\tau_{m+1} > 2/p_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_n > 2/p_n$$

and

$$(2.6) \quad 1 < \tau < m+1 < 2/p - (\tau_{m+1} + \dots + \tau_n) < 2/p - (2/p_{m+1} + \dots + 2/p_n).$$

Let $\psi, \tilde{\psi} \in S(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy $\psi \geq 0$, $\psi(0) \neq 0$, $\text{Supp}(\hat{\psi}) \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\xi| \leq \frac{1}{200mn}\}$, $\text{Supp}(\hat{\tilde{\psi}}) \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\xi| \leq \frac{1}{100n}\}$, and $\hat{\tilde{\psi}}(\xi) = 1$ for $|\xi| \leq \frac{1}{200n}$.

We define

$$\mathcal{H}^{(m)}(x) := \frac{1}{(1 + 4\pi^2|x|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}(s_1 + \dots + s_m + \frac{d}{2})}} \frac{1}{(1 + \ln(1 + 4\pi^2|x|^2))^{\frac{\tau}{2}}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

$$K^{(m)}(x) := \mathcal{H}^{(m)} * \psi(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

and

$$M^{(m)}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m) := \widehat{K^{(m)}}\left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{l=1}^m (\xi_l - \mu_1)\right) \prod_{j=2}^m \widehat{\psi}\left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{l=1}^m (\xi_l - \xi_j)\right)$$

where $\mu_1 := (n^{-1/2}, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Here, $M^{(m)}$ is defined on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^m$. Then the multiplier σ on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^n$ is defined by

$$\sigma(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) := M^{(m)}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m) \widehat{\psi}(\xi_{m+1} - \mu_1) \cdots \widehat{\psi}(\xi_n - \mu_1).$$

To investigate the support of σ we first look at the support of $M^{(m)}$. From the support $\widehat{\psi}$, we have

$$|\xi_1 + \cdots + \xi_m - m\mu_1| \leq \frac{1}{200n},$$

and for each $2 \leq j \leq m$

$$(2.7) \quad |\xi_1 + \cdots + \xi_m - m\xi_j| \leq \frac{1}{200n}.$$

By adding up all of them, we obtain

$$(2.8) \quad |\xi_1 - \mu_1| \leq \frac{1}{200n}$$

and the sum of (2.7) and (2.8) yields that for each $2 \leq j \leq m$

$$|\mu_1 + \xi_2 + \cdots + \xi_m - m\xi_j| \leq \frac{1}{100n}.$$

Let us call the above estimate $\mathcal{E}(j)$. Then for $2 \leq j \leq m$, it follows from

$$\mathcal{E}(j) + \sum_{l=2}^m \mathcal{E}(l)$$

that

$$|\xi_j - \mu_1| \leq \frac{1}{100n},$$

which proves, together with (2.8),

$$(2.9) \quad \text{Supp}(M^{(m)}) \subset \{(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^m : |\xi_j - \mu_1| \leq \frac{1}{100n}, 1 \leq j \leq m\}.$$

Since $\widehat{\psi}$ is also supported in $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\xi| \leq \frac{1}{100n}\}$, it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Supp}(\sigma) &\subset \{(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^n : |\xi_j - \mu_1| \leq \frac{1}{100n}, 1 \leq j \leq n\} \\ &\subset \{\vec{\xi} := (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^n : \frac{99}{100} \leq |\vec{\xi}| \leq \frac{101}{100}\}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\sigma(2^j \vec{\xi}) \widehat{\phi^{(n)}}(\vec{\xi})$ vanishes unless $-1 \leq j \leq 1$. Furthermore, using Lemma 2.1 and the scaling argument we used in **Case 1**,

$$\mathcal{L}_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}^{2, (n)}[\sigma] \lesssim \|\sigma\|_{L_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}^2((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)}.$$

We notice that $\|\sigma\|_{L^2_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)}$ is dominated by a constant times

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|M^{(m)}\|_{L^2_{(s_1, \dots, s_m)}((\mathbb{R}^d)^m)} \prod_{j=m+1}^n \|\widehat{\psi}\|_{L^2_{s_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|M^{(m)}\|_{L^2_{(s_1, \dots, s_m)}((\mathbb{R}^d)^m)} \\
 (2.10) \quad & = \left(\int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^m} \left(\prod_{j=1}^m (1 + 4\pi^2 |x_j|^2)^{s_j} \right) |(M^{(m)})^\vee(x_1, \dots, x_m)|^2 dx_1 \dots dx_m \right)^{1/2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

By using a change of variables

$$\zeta_1 := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l=1}^m (\xi_l - \mu_1), \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta_j := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l=1}^m (\xi_l - \xi_j), \quad 2 \leq j \leq m,$$

so that

$$(2.11) \quad \xi_1 = \zeta_1 + \dots + \zeta_m + \mu_1, \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_j = \zeta_1 - \zeta_j + \mu_1, \quad 2 \leq j \leq m,$$

we can write

$$(2.12) \quad |(M^{(m)})^\vee(x_1, \dots, x_m)| = m |K^{(m)}(x_1 + \dots + x_m)| \prod_{j=2}^m |\psi(x_1 - x_j)|$$

since the Jacobian of the system (2.11) is m .

Consequently, (2.10) is less than a constant multiple of

$$\left(\int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^m} \left(\prod_{j=1}^m (1 + 4\pi^2 |x_j|^2)^{s_j} \right) |K^{(m)}(x_1 + \dots + x_m)| \prod_{j=2}^m |\psi(x_1 - x_j)| dx_1 \dots dx_m \right)^{1/2}$$

and we perform another change of variables

$$y_1 := x_1 + \dots + x_m, \quad \text{and} \quad y_j := x_1 - x_j, \quad 2 \leq j \leq m,$$

which is equivalent to

$$x_1 = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l=1}^m y_l, \quad \text{and} \quad x_j = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l=1}^m (y_l - y_j), \quad 2 \leq j \leq m,$$

to obtain that the preceding expression is controlled by a constant times

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + 4\pi^2 |y_1|^2)^{s_1 + \dots + s_m} |K^{(m)}(y_1)|^2 dy_1 \right)^{1/2} \\
 & \quad \times \prod_{j=2}^m \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + 4\pi^2 |y_j|^2)^{s_1 + \dots + s_m} |\psi(y_j)|^2 dy_j \right)^{1/2} \\
 & \lesssim \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + 4\pi^2 |y|^2)^{s_1 + \dots + s_m} |\mathcal{H}^{(m)} * \psi(y)|^2 dy \right)^{1/2}
 \end{aligned}$$

where we applied the triangle inequality

$$(1 + 4\pi^2 |x_j|^2)^{s_j} \lesssim (1 + 4\pi^2 |y_1|^2)^{s_j} \dots (1 + 4\pi^2 |y_m|^2)^{s_j} \quad \text{for each } 1 \leq j \leq m.$$

Since $\mathcal{H}^{(m)} * \psi(y) \lesssim \mathcal{H}^{(m)}(y)$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{(s_1, \dots, s_n)}^{2, (n)}[\sigma] &\lesssim \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + 4\pi^2|y|^2)^{s_1 + \dots + s_m} |\mathcal{H}^{(m)}(y)|^2 dy \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{(1 + 4\pi^2|y|^2)^{d/2}} \frac{1}{(1 + \ln(1 + 4\pi^2|y|^2))^\tau} dy \right)^{1/2} \lesssim 1 \end{aligned}$$

since $\tau > 1$.

To achieve

$$(2.13) \quad \|T_\sigma\|_{H^{p_1} \times \dots \times H^{p_n} \rightarrow L^p} = \infty,$$

let

$$h^{(j)}(x) := \frac{1}{(1 + 4\pi^2|x|^2)^{\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{p_j}}} \frac{1}{(1 + \ln(1 + 4\pi^2|x|^2))^{\frac{\tau_j}{2}}}, \quad m+1 \leq j \leq n$$

and we define

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x) &= \dots = f_m(x) = 2^d \tilde{\psi}(2x) e^{2\pi i \langle x, \mu_1 \rangle}, \\ f_j(x) &:= h^{(j)} * \psi(x) e^{2\pi i \langle x, \mu_1 \rangle}, \quad m+1 \leq j \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\|f_j\|_{H^{p_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$ and

$$\|f_j\|_{H^{p_j}} \approx \|f_j\|_{L^{p_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|h^{(j)}\|_{L^{p_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim 1 \quad m+1 \leq j \leq n$$

since $\tau_j p_j > 2$.

On the other hand, using (2.9) and the facts that $\psi * \tilde{\psi} = \psi$ and

$$\widehat{f_j}(\xi) = 1 \quad \text{for } |\xi - \mu_1| \leq \frac{1}{100n} \quad \text{and } 1 \leq j \leq m,$$

we see that

$$\sigma(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \widehat{f_1}(\xi_1) \cdots \widehat{f_n}(\xi_n) = M^{(m)}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m) \widehat{f_{m+1}}(\xi_{m+1}) \cdots \widehat{f_n}(\xi_n),$$

which implies that

$$T_\sigma \vec{f}(x) = (M^{(m)})^\vee(x, \dots, x) f_{m+1}(x) \cdots f_n(x).$$

Since $\mathcal{H}^{(m)}$, $h^{(j)}$, and ψ are nonnegative functions,

$$|T_\sigma \vec{f}(x)| = m \mathcal{H}^{(m)} * \psi(mx) \psi(0)^{m-1} \prod_{j=m+1}^n (h^{(j)} * \psi(x))$$

where (2.12) is applied. Now, using the fact that

$$\mathcal{H}^{(m)}(x - y) \geq \mathcal{H}^{(m)}(x) \mathcal{H}^{(m)}(y),$$

$$h^{(j)}(x - y) \geq h^{(j)}(x) h^{(j)}(y), \quad m+1 \leq j \leq n,$$

we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_\sigma \vec{f}(x)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} &\gtrsim \left\| \mathcal{H}^{(m)}(m \cdot) \prod_{j=m+1}^n h^{(j)} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\gtrsim \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{(1 + 4\pi^2|x|^2)^{d/2}} \frac{1}{(1 + \ln(1 + 4\pi^2|x|^2))^{\frac{p}{2}(\tau + \tau_{m+1} + \dots + \tau_n)}} dx \right)^{1/p} \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to (2.5). Since $\tau + \tau_{m+1} + \cdots + \tau_n < 2/p$, which follows from (2.6), the preceding expression diverges and this completes the proof of (2.13).

When $m = n$, the exactly same argument is applicable with $1 < \tau < n + 1 < \frac{2}{p}$, $\sigma := M^{(n)}$, and $f_j(x) := 2^d \tilde{\psi}(2x) e^{2\pi i \langle x, \mu_1 \rangle}$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$. Since the proof is just a repetition, we omit the details.

This ends the proof.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Part of this research was carried out during my stay at the University of Missouri-Columbia. I would like to thank L. Grafakos for his invitation, hospitality, and very useful discussions during the stay. I also would like to express gratitude to the anonymous referee for the careful reading and suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Fugita and N. Tomita, *Weighted norm inequalities for multilinear Fourier multipliers*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **364** (2012) 6335-6353.
- [2] L. Grafakos, A. Miyachi, and N. Tomita, *On multilinear Fourier multipliers of limited smoothness*, Can. J. Math. **65** (2013) 299-330.
- [3] L. Grafakos, A. Miyachi, H.V. Nguyen, and N. Tomita, *Multilinear Fourier multipliers with minimal Sobolev regularity, II*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **69** (2017) 529-562.
- [4] L. Grafakos and H.V. Nguyen, *Multilinear Fourier multipliers with minimal Sobolev regularity, I*, Colloquium Math. **144** (2016) 1-30.
- [5] L. Grafakos and B. Park, *Sharp Hardy space estimates for multipliers*, submitted.
- [6] L. Grafakos and Z. Si, *The Hörmander multiplier theorem for multilinear operators*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **668** (2012) 133-147.
- [7] A. Miyachi and N. Tomita, *Minimal smoothness conditions for bilinear Fourier multipliers*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **29** (2013) 495-530.
- [8] B. Park, *Fourier multiplier theorems for Triebel-Lizorkin spaces*, Math. Z **293** (2019) 221-258.
- [9] B. Park, *Equivalence of (quasi-)norms on a vector-valued function space and its applications to multilinear operators*, Indiana Univ. Math. J, to appear.
- [10] B. Park, *BMO multilinear multiplier theorem of Mikhlin-Hormander type*, submitted.
- [11] N. Tomita, *A Hörmander type multiplier theorem for multilinear operators*, J. Func. Anal. **259** (2010) 2028-2044.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, KOREA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY, SEOUL, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Email address: qkrqowns@kias.re.kr