

BILINEAR PSEUDO-DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS WITH EXOTIC CLASS SYMBOLS OF LIMITED SMOOTHNESS

TOMOYA KATO

ABSTRACT. We consider bilinear pseudo-differential operators with symbols in the bilinear Hörmander class, $BS_{\rho,\rho}^m$, $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 \leq \rho < 1$. The aim of this paper is to discuss smoothness conditions for symbols to assure the boundedness from $L^2 \times L^2$ to h^1 and from $L^2 \times bmo$ to L^2 .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 \leq \delta \leq \rho \leq 1$. The bilinear Hörmander symbol class $BS_{\rho,\delta}^m = BS_{\rho,\delta}^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ consists of all functions $\sigma(x, \xi, \eta) \in C^\infty((\mathbb{R}^n)^3)$ such that

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \partial_\eta^\gamma \sigma(x, \xi, \eta)| \leq C_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} (1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{m+\delta|\alpha|-\rho(|\beta|+|\gamma|)}$$

for all multi-indices $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^n = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}^n$. For a bounded measurable function $\sigma = \sigma(x, \xi, \eta)$ on $(\mathbb{R}^n)^3$, the bilinear pseudo-differential operator T_σ is defined by

$$T_\sigma(f, g)(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2n}} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^2} e^{ix \cdot (\xi + \eta)} \sigma(x, \xi, \eta) \widehat{f}(\xi) \widehat{g}(\eta) d\xi d\eta$$

for $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. To mention about the boundedness of the operator T_σ , we will use the following terminology with a slight abuse. Let X, Y, Z be function spaces. If there exists a constant C such that the estimate

$$\|T_\sigma(f, g)\|_Z \leq C \|f\|_X \|g\|_Y$$

holds for all $f \in \mathcal{S} \cap X$ and $g \in \mathcal{S} \cap Y$, then we simply say that the operator T_σ is bounded from $X \times Y$ to Z . If $\mathcal{A}$ is a class of symbols, we denote by $\text{Op}(\mathcal{A})$ the class of all bilinear operators T_σ such that $\sigma \in \mathcal{A}$. If the operator T_σ is bounded from $X \times Y$ to Z for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{A}$, then we write $\text{Op}(\mathcal{A}) \subset B(X \times Y \rightarrow Z)$.

The boundedness of the bilinear pseudo-differential operators with symbols in the bilinear Hörmander class has been studied by a lot of researches. In the case $\rho = 1$ and $\delta < 1$, since the bilinear operator T_σ for $\sigma \in BS_{1,\delta}^0$ becomes a bilinear Carderón–Zygmund operator in the sense of Grafakos–Torres [9], it is bounded from $L^p \times L^q$ to L^r , $1 < p, q < \infty$, $1/p + 1/q = 1/r$. See Coifman–Meyer [7], Bényi–Torres [3], and Bényi–Maldonado–Naibo–Torres [2]. Moreover, in the case $\rho = \delta = 1$, Bényi–Torres [3] and Kozuka–Tomita [16] proved that the bilinear operator T_σ for $\sigma \in BS_{1,1}^0$ is bounded from $L_s^p \times L_s^q$ to L_s^r , $1 < p, q < \infty$, $1/p + 1/q = 1/r$, $s > 0$, where L_s^p is the L^p -Sobolev space equipped with the norm $\|f\|_{L_s^p} = \|(I - \Delta)^{s/2} f\|_{L^p}$.

Date: December 11, 2021.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35S05, 42B15, 42B35.

Key words and phrases. Bilinear pseudo-differential operators, bilinear Hörmander symbol classes.

This work was supported by the association for the advancement of Science and Technology, Gunma University.

In this paper, we are interested in the case $0 \leq \rho = \delta < 1$. Also, we only consider the boundedness of the operator T_σ from $L^2 \times L^2$ to L^1 and its dual, the boundedness from $L^2 \times L^\infty$ to L^2 , which are often understood as bases of the bilinear case. Now, in the case $0 \leq \rho = \delta < 1$, it is known that the class $BS_{\rho,\rho}^0$ does not provide the boundedness on $L^p \times L^q$. This was pointed out by Bényi–Torres [4]. Then, Miyachi–Tomita [20, 22] proved that

$$(1.1) \quad \text{Op}(BS_{\rho,\rho}^{-(1-\rho)n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)) \subset B(L^2 \times L^2 \rightarrow L^1)$$

and

$$(1.2) \quad \text{Op}(BS_{\rho,\rho}^{-(1-\rho)n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)) \subset B(L^2 \times L^\infty \rightarrow L^2),$$

where, if $\rho = 0$, L^1 in (1.1) is replaced by the local Hardy space h^1 and L^∞ in (1.2) is replaced by the local *BMO* space *bmo*. (See also [1, 18] for the preceding results in the case $m < -(1-\rho)n/2$.) Also, in the case $\rho = 0$, these boundedness were further extended to sharper ones by using L^2 -based amalgam spaces in [14, 15]. Now, by interpolation between (1.1) and (1.2), it holds that

$$(1.3) \quad \text{Op}(BS_{\rho,\rho}^{-(1-\rho)n/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)) \subset B(L^p \times L^q \rightarrow L^r)$$

for $1 \leq r \leq 2 \leq p, q \leq \infty$ and $1/p + 1/q = 1/r$. In [20], it was also proved that the order $m = -(1-\rho)n/2$ is critical to have (1.1), (1.2), and (1.3).

We shall have a look to regularity conditions for symbols to assure the boundedness of the bilinear pseudo-differential operator. Before that, let us recall the linear case. The linear Hörmander symbol class, $S_{\rho,\delta}^m = S_{\rho,\delta}^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$, is defined by the set of all functions $\sigma \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \sigma(x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha,\beta} (1 + |\xi|)^{m+\delta|\alpha|-\rho|\beta|}$$

for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$. For a bounded measurable function $\sigma = \sigma(x, \xi)$ on $(\mathbb{R}^n)^2$, the linear pseudo-differential operator $\sigma(X, D)$ is defined by

$$\sigma(X, D)f(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix \cdot \xi} \sigma(x, \xi) \widehat{f}(\xi) d\xi$$

for $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The celebrated Calderón–Vaillancourt theorem in [6] states that if symbols are in $S_{\rho,\rho}^0$, $0 \leq \rho < 1$, the linear pseudo-differential operator is bounded on L^2 . However, this theorem requires much smoothness to symbols. Then, this was relaxed to, roughly speaking, the smoothness of symbols up to $n/2$ for each variable x and ξ by Cordes [8], Coifman–Meyer [7], Miyachi [19], Muramatu [23], Sugimoto [24], and Boulkhemair [5], for $\rho = 0$, and Marschall [17] and Sugimoto [25], for $0 < \rho < 1$. Now, we shall consider the bilinear case. For $\rho = 0$, it was shown by [14, 15] that the smoothness of symbols up to $n/2$ for each variable x , ξ , and η assures the boundedness (1.3). See also Herbert–Naibo [12, 13] for the preceding results. For $0 < \rho < 1$, the author cannot find related results.

The purpose of this paper is to improve the boundedness (1.3) for $0 < \rho < 1$ in two ways. Firstly, we show that the target space L^1 for $r = 1$ can be replaced by h^1 and the domain space L^∞ for $p = \infty$ or $q = \infty$ can be replaced by *bmo* when $0 < \rho < 1$ as well as $\rho = 0$. Secondly, we determine a smoothness condition of symbols for $0 < \rho < 1$ to obtain the boundedness (1.3) as for $\rho = 0$.

We shall state the main theorem of this paper. Before that, we define a Besov type symbol class. Let $\{\psi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and $\{\Psi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be Littlewood–Paley partitions of unity

on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $(\mathbb{R}^n)^2$, respectively. For $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\mathbf{k} = (k_0, k_1, k_2) \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3$, $\mathbf{s} = (s_0, s_1, s_2) \in [0, \infty)^3$, and $\sigma = \sigma(x, \xi, \eta) \in L^\infty((\mathbb{R}^n)^3)$, write $\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{s} = k_0 s_0 + k_1 s_1 + k_2 s_2$,

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} \sigma(x, \xi, \eta) = \psi_{k_0}(D_x) \psi_{k_1}(D_\xi) \psi_{k_2}(D_\eta) \sigma(x, \xi, \eta),$$

and

$$\sigma_j^\rho(x, \xi, \eta) = \sigma(2^{-j\rho}x, 2^{j\rho}\xi, 2^{j\rho}\eta) \Psi_j(2^{j\rho}\xi, 2^{j\rho}\eta).$$

Then, for $m \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $BS_{\rho, \rho}^m(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)$ the set of all $\sigma \in L^\infty((\mathbb{R}^n)^3)$ such that

$$\|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho, \rho}^m(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} = \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} 2^{-jm + \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{s}} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2((\mathbb{R}^n)^3)} < \infty,$$

where L_{ul}^2 is the uniformly local L^2 space (see Section 2.1). By using this symbol class, the main theorem of this paper is given as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $0 \leq \rho < 1$, $m = -(1 - \rho)n/2$, and $\mathbf{s} = (s_0, s_1, s_2) \in [0, \infty)^3$ satisfy $s_0 > n/2$ and $s_1, s_2 \geq n/2$. Then, if $\sigma \in BS_{\rho, \rho}^m(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)$, the bilinear pseudo-differential operator T_σ is bounded from $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $h^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and is bounded from $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \times bmo(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

We write

$$X^p = \begin{cases} h^1, & \text{if } p = 1, \\ L^p, & \text{if } 1 < p < \infty, \\ bmo, & \text{if } p = \infty. \end{cases}$$

Then, by virtue of Theorem 1.1, we have the following boundedness related to (1.3) for the bilinear Hörmander class with limited smoothness.

Corollary 1.2. *Let $0 \leq \rho < 1$ and $1 \leq r \leq 2 \leq p, q \leq \infty$ satisfy $1/p + 1/q = 1/r$. Then, if $\sigma \in C^{([n/2]+1, [n/2]+1, [n/2]+1)}((\mathbb{R}^n)^3)$ satisfies that*

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \partial_\eta^\gamma \sigma(x, \xi, \eta)| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} (1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{-(1-\rho)n/2 + \rho(|\alpha| - |\beta| + |\gamma|)}$$

for all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ with $|\alpha|, |\beta|, |\gamma| \leq [n/2] + 1$, the bilinear pseudo-differential operator T_σ is bounded from $X^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \times X^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $X^r(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

We end this section by explaining the plan of this paper. In Section 2, we introduce basic notations, function spaces and their properties which will be used throughout this paper. In Section 3, we display two key theorems, Theorems 3.2 and 3.3, and then we derive Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2 from them. In Section 4, we prepare several lemmas which will be used to prove Theorems 3.2 and 3.3. After we decompose symbols into easy forms to handle in Section 5, we actually prove Theorems 3.2 and 3.3 in Sections 6 and 7, respectively. In Section 8, we consider the sharpness of indices stated in Theorem 1.1. In Appendix A, we consider the existence of the decomposition used in Section 5. In Appendix B, we give a small remark on the critical case $s_0 = n/2$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author sincerely express very deep thanks to Professor Akihiko Miyachi and Professor Naohito Tomita, who discussed with him many times and always gave him many remarkable comments. Especially, they gave the author an unpublished memo considering the boundedness from $X^p \times X^q$ to X^r of bilinear Fourier multiplier operators with symbols in the exotic class. Thanks to their fruitful helps, the author could complete this paper.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Basic notations. We collect notations which will be used throughout this paper. We denote by $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{N}_0$ the sets of reals, natural numbers, integers and nonnegative integers, respectively. We denote by Q the n -dimensional unit cube $[-1/2, 1/2]^n$. A disjoint union of translations $\tau + Q$, $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, generates the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$. This implies integral of a function on $\mathbb{R}^n$ can be written as

$$(2.1) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) dx = \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \int_Q f(x + \tau) dx.$$

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $R > 0$, we denote $Q(x, R)$ by the closed cube $x + [-R, R]^n$ and $B_R = B(0, R)$ by the closed ball $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| \leq R\}$. We write the characteristic function on the set Ω as $\mathbf{1}_\Omega$. For $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, p' is the conjugate number of p defined by $1/p + 1/p' = 1$. We write $[s] = \max\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : n \leq s\}$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

For two nonnegative functions $A(x)$ and $B(x)$ defined on a set X , we write $A(x) \lesssim B(x)$ for $x \in X$ to mean that there exists a positive constant C such that $A(x) \leq CB(x)$ for all $x \in X$. We often omit to mention the set X when it is obviously recognized. Also $A(x) \approx B(x)$ means that $A(x) \lesssim B(x)$ and $B(x) \lesssim A(x)$.

We denote the Schwartz space of rapidly decreasing smooth functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ by $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and its dual, the space of tempered distributions, by $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The Fourier transform and the inverse Fourier transform of $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}f(\xi) &= \widehat{f}(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-ix \cdot \xi} f(x) dx, \\ \mathcal{F}^{-1}f(x) &= \check{f}(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{ix \cdot \xi} f(\xi) d\xi, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. We sometimes write $\mathcal{F}[f]$ and $\mathcal{F}^{-1}[f]$ when the form of f is complicated. Furthermore, we sometimes deal with the partial Fourier transform of a Schwartz function $f(x, \xi, \eta)$, $x, \xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We denote the partial Fourier transform with respect to the x , ξ , and η variables by $\mathcal{F}_0$, $\mathcal{F}_1$, and $\mathcal{F}_2$, respectively. We also write $\mathcal{F}_{1,2} = \mathcal{F}_1 \mathcal{F}_2$. For $m \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the Fourier multiplier operator is given by

$$m(D)f = \mathcal{F}^{-1}[m\widehat{f}] = (\mathcal{F}^{-1}m) * f.$$

We also use the notation $(m(D)f)(x) = m(D_x)f(x)$ when we indicate which variable is considered.

For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $C((\mathbb{R}^n)^m)$ the set of all bounded and uniformly continuous functions on $(\mathbb{R}^n)^m$. For $N_i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} &C^{(N_1, \dots, N_m)}((\mathbb{R}^n)^m) \\ &= \{f : \partial_{x_1}^{\alpha_1} \dots \partial_{x_m}^{\alpha_m} f(x_1, \dots, x_m) \in C((\mathbb{R}^n)^m) \text{ for } |\alpha_i| \leq N_i, i = 1, \dots, m\}. \end{aligned}$$

For a measurable subset $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the Lebesgue space $L^p(E)$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, is the set of all those measurable functions f on E such that $\|f\|_{L^p(E)} = (\int_E |f(x)|^p dx)^{1/p} < \infty$ if $1 \leq p < \infty$ or $\|f\|_{L^\infty(E)} = \text{ess sup}_{x \in E} |f(x)| < \infty$ if $p = \infty$. We also use the notation $\|f\|_{L^p(E)} = \|f(x)\|_{L_x^p(E)}$ when we indicate the variable explicitly. The uniformly local L^2 space, denoted by L_{ul}^2 , is the set of all measurable functions f on $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\|f\|_{L_{ul}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \sup_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left(\int_{[-1/2, 1/2]^d} |f(x + \nu)|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} < \infty.$$

Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a countable set. For $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, we denote by $\ell^q = \ell^q(\mathbb{K})$ the set of all complex number sequences $\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}$ such that $\|\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}\|_{\ell^q} = (\sum_{k \in \mathbb{K}} |a_k|^q)^{1/q} < \infty$ if $1 \leq q < \infty$ or $\|\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}\|_{\ell^\infty} = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{K}} |a_k| < \infty$ if $q = \infty$. For the sake of simplicity, we will write $\|a_k\|_{\ell^q}$ instead of the more correct notation $\|\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{K}}\|_{\ell^q}$. Moreover, we use the notation $\|a_k\|_{\ell^q} = \|a_k\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{K})}$ when we indicate the variable.

Let X, Y, Z be function spaces. We denote the mixed norm by

$$\|f(x, y, z)\|_{X_x Y_y Z_z} = \left\| \left\| \|f(x, y, z)\|_{X_x} \right\|_{Y_y} \right\|_{Z_z}.$$

(Here pay special attention to the order of taking norms.) We shall use these mixed norms for X, Y, Z being L^p or ℓ^p .

We end this subsection by stating the Schur lemma. See, e.g., [11, Appendix A].

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\{A_{j,k}\}_{j,k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a sequence of nonnegative numbers satisfying that $\|A_{j,k}\|_{\ell_k^1(\mathbb{N}_0)\ell_j^\infty(\mathbb{N}_0)} \leq 1$ and $\|A_{j,k}\|_{\ell_j^1(\mathbb{N}_0)\ell_k^\infty(\mathbb{N}_0)} \leq 1$. Then, we have*

$$\sum_{j,k \in \mathbb{N}_0} A_{j,k} b_j c_k \leq \|b_j\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0)} \|c_k\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0)}$$

for all sequences of nonnegative numbers $\{b_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and $\{c_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$.

2.2. Besov spaces. We recall the definition of the Besov space.

Let $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy that $\phi = 1$ on $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\xi| \leq 1\}$ and $\text{supp } \phi \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\xi| \leq 2\}$. We set $\phi_k = \phi(\cdot/2^k)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We write $\psi = \phi - \phi(2\cdot)$ and set $\psi_0 = \phi$ and $\psi_k = \psi(\cdot/2^k)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, $\text{supp } \psi \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : 1/2 \leq |\xi| \leq 2\}$ and $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \psi_k \equiv 1$. We denote the Fourier multiplier operators $\psi_k(D)$ by Δ_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We call $\{\psi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ a Littlewood–Paley partition of unity. For $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$, the Besov space $B_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ consists of all $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|2^{ks} \|\Delta_k f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|_{\ell_k^q(\mathbb{N}_0)} < \infty.$$

We will sometimes write $\Delta_k[f]$ when the form of f is complicated. It is known that Besov spaces are independent of the choice of the Littlewood–Paley partition of unity. See [27] for more properties of Besov spaces.

2.3. Local Hardy space h^1 and spaces bmo and BMO . We recall the definition of the local Hardy space $h^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and the spaces $bmo(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $BMO(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Let $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \phi(x) dx \neq 0$. Then, the local Hardy space $h^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ consists of all $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\|f\|_{h^1} = \|\sup_{0 < t < 1} |\phi_t * f|\|_{L^1} < \infty$, where $\phi_t(x) = t^{-n} \phi(x/t)$. It is known that $h^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ does not depend on the choice of the function ϕ , and that $h^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

The space $bmo(\mathbb{R}^n)$ consists of all locally integrable functions f on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\|f\|_{bmo} = \sup_{|Q| \leq 1} \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |f(x) - f_Q| dx + \sup_{|Q| \geq 1} \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |f(x)| dx < \infty,$$

where $f_Q = |Q|^{-1} \int_Q f$, and Q ranges over the cubes in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

The space $BMO(\mathbb{R}^n)$ consists of all locally integrable functions f on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\|f\|_{BMO} = \sup_Q \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |f(x) - f_Q| dx < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all cubes in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

It is known that the dual space of $h^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is $bmo(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and that the embeddings $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow bmo(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow BMO(\mathbb{R}^n)$ hold. See Goldberg [10] for more properties.

We end this subsection by stating the following lemma. This was mentioned in the memo by Miyachi–Tomita. Hence, although this lemma is not the author's contribution, let the author give a proof below for the reader's convenience.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $a \geq 0$. Suppose that $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies $\psi(0) = 0$. Then, the following hold for any $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

$$(1) \quad \|\varphi(D/2^a)f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim (1+a)\|f\|_{bmo(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

$$(2) \quad \|\psi(D/2^a)f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|f\|_{BMO(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Here, the implicit constants above are independent of $a \geq 0$.

Proof. We first consider the assertion (1). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(D/2^a)f(x) &= 2^{an} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \check{\varphi}(2^a(x-y))f(y) dy \\ &\lesssim 2^{an} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1+2^a|x-y|)^{-N} |f(y) - f_{Q(x,2^{-a})}| dy + |f_{Q(x,2^{-a})}|, \end{aligned}$$

where N is a constant such that $N > n$ and $f_\Omega = |\Omega|^{-1} \int_\Omega f(y) dy$ for the set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. The first term is estimated by a constant times $\|f\|_{BMO}$ (see [11, Proposition 3.1.5 (ii)]). For the second term,

$$|f_{Q(x,2^{-a})}| \leq \sum_{0 \leq \ell \leq [a]} |f_{Q(x,2^{-a+\ell})} - f_{Q(x,2^{-a+\ell+1})}| + |f_{Q(x,2^{-a+([a]+1)})}|.$$

Here, we have $|f_{Q(x,R)} - f_{Q(x,2R)}| \leq 2^n \|f\|_{BMO}$ for $R > 0$ (see [11, Proposition 3.1.5 (i)]) and $|f_{Q(x,2^{-a+([a]+1)})}| \leq \|f\|_{bmo}$, since $-a + ([a] + 1) > 0$. Hence, we obtain

$$|f_{Q(x,2^{-a})}| \lesssim (1+[a])\|f\|_{BMO} + \|f\|_{bmo} \lesssim (1+a)\|f\|_{bmo},$$

which completes the proof.

For (2), since the assumption $\psi(0) = 0$ means that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \check{\psi}(x) dx = 0$, we have

$$\psi(D/2^a)f(x) = 2^{an} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \check{\psi}(2^a(x-y))(f(y) - f_{Q(x,2^{-a})}) dy.$$

Since this is estimated by a constant times $\|f\|_{BMO}$, we complete the proof. $\square$

3. MAIN THEOREMS

3.1. Key theorems. In this subsection, we display two boundedness results which immediately derive Theorem 1.1. These will be proved later in the next sections, Sections 5, 6, and 7, by using lemmas which will be stated in Section 4.

To state the results, we give the definition of the Besov type symbol class.

Definition 3.1. *Let $0 \leq \rho < 1$. Let $\{\psi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and $\{\Psi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be Littlewood–Paley partition of unity on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $(\mathbb{R}^n)^2$, respectively. For $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\mathbf{k} = (k_0, k_1, k_2) \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3$, $\mathbf{s} = (s_0, s_1, s_2) \in [0, \infty)^3$, and $\sigma = \sigma(x, \xi, \eta) \in L^\infty((\mathbb{R}^n)^3)$, we write $\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{s} = k_0 s_0 + k_1 s_1 + k_2 s_2$,*

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}\sigma(x, \xi, \eta) = \psi_{k_0}(D_x)\psi_{k_1}(D_\xi)\psi_{k_2}(D_\eta)\sigma(x, \xi, \eta),$$

and

$$\sigma_j^\rho(x, \xi, \eta) = \sigma(2^{-j\rho}x, 2^{j\rho}\xi, 2^{j\rho}\eta)\Psi_j(2^{j\rho}\xi, 2^{j\rho}\eta).$$

Then, for $m \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)$ the set of all $\sigma \in L^\infty((\mathbb{R}^n)^3)$ such that

$$\|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} = \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \left\{ \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{-jm + \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{s}} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2((\mathbb{R}^n)^3)} \right\} < \infty.$$

Note that $BS_{\rho,\rho}^m(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n) \subset BS_{\rho,\rho}^m(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)$ for $\mathbf{s} \in [0, \infty)^3$. See Lemma 3.5 below for the first inclusion relation. Now, we have the following theorems.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $0 \leq \rho < 1$, $m = -(1 - \rho)n/2$, and $\mathbf{s} = (s_0, s_1, s_2) \in [0, \infty)^3$ satisfy $s_0 > n/2$ and $s_1, s_2 \geq n/2$. Then, if $\sigma \in BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)$, the bilinear pseudo-differential operator T_σ is bounded from $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $h^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Theorem 3.3. *Let $0 \leq \rho < 1$, $m = -(1 - \rho)n/2$, and $\mathbf{s} = (s_0, s_1, s_2) \in [0, \infty)^3$ satisfy $s_0, s_1, s_2 \geq n/2$. Then, if $\sigma \in BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)$, the bilinear pseudo-differential operator T_σ is bounded from $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \times bmo(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Remark 3.4. For the critical case $s_0 = n/2$ in Theorem 3.2, we can prove that $\text{Op}(BS_{\rho,\rho}^m(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)) \subset B(L^2 \times L^2 \rightarrow L^1)$ for $m = -(1 - \rho)n/2$ and $s_0, s_1, s_2 \geq n/2$. (See Appendix B below for the proof of this boundedness.) In order to improve the target space L^1 to h^1 , we will use the small loss with respect to s_0 .

3.2. Proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2. Theorem 1.1 follows from Theorems 3.2 and 3.3 with the following inclusion relation among the symbol classes: $BS_{\rho,\rho}^m((s_0 + \varepsilon, s_1, s_2); \mathbb{R}^n) \subset BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}((s_0, s_1, s_2); \mathbb{R}^n)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Moreover, Corollary 1.2 is obtained by using the following lemma, Theorem 1.1, and interpolation. The idea contained in the argument goes back to [14, Proposition 4.7].

Lemma 3.5. *Let $0 \leq \rho < 1$, $m \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\mathbf{s} = (s_0, s_1, s_2) \in [0, \infty)^3$. Suppose that $\sigma \in C^{([s_0]+1, [s_1]+1, [s_2]+1)}((\mathbb{R}^n)^3)$ satisfies that*

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \partial_\eta^\gamma \sigma(x, \xi, \eta)| \leq C_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} (1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{m+\rho(|\alpha|-|\beta|-|\gamma|)}$$

for all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ with $|\alpha| \leq [s_0] + 1$, $|\beta| \leq [s_1] + 1$, and $|\gamma| \leq [s_2] + 1$. Then, $\sigma \in BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Proof. We let $N_i = [s_i] + 1$, $i = 0, 1, 2$. We first consider $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]$ for $j, k_0, k_1, k_2 \geq 1$. By using the Taylor expansion to the η variable, the ξ variable, and the x variable (in this order), together with the moment condition $\partial^\alpha \psi(0) = \int x^\alpha \check{\psi} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho](x, \xi, \eta) &= 2^{(k_0+k_1+k_2)n} \sum_{|\alpha|=N_0} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \sum_{|\beta|=N_1} \frac{1}{\beta!} \sum_{|\gamma|=N_2} \frac{1}{\gamma!} \\ (3.1) \quad &\times \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^3} \int_{[0,1]^3} \check{\psi}(2^{k_0}x')(-x')^\alpha \check{\psi}(2^{k_1}\xi')(-\xi')^\beta \check{\psi}(2^{k_2}\eta')(-\eta')^\gamma \\ &\times \left(\prod_{i=0,1,2} N_i(1-t_i)^{N_i-1} \right) (\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \partial_\eta^\gamma (\sigma_j^\rho))(x - t_0x', \xi - t_1\xi', \eta - t_2\eta') dT dX', \end{aligned}$$

where $dT = dt_0 dt_1 dt_2$ and $dX' = dx' d\xi' d\eta'$. Here, we observe that

$$\left| \left(\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \partial_\eta^\gamma \sigma \right) (2^{-j\rho}x, 2^{j\rho}\xi, 2^{j\rho}\eta) \right| \lesssim 2^{jm+j\rho(|\alpha|-|\beta|-|\gamma|)}$$

on the support of $\Psi_j(2^{j\rho}\cdot, 2^{j\rho}\cdot)$. Then, we have

$$(3.2) \quad \left| \left(\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \partial_\eta^\gamma (\sigma_j^\rho) \right) (x, \xi, \eta) \right| \lesssim \sum_{\beta' \leq \beta, \gamma' \leq \gamma} 2^{-j\rho(|\alpha|-|\beta'|-|\gamma'|)} 2^{jm+j\rho(|\alpha|-|\beta'|-|\gamma'|)} \approx 2^{jm}.$$

Collecting (3.1) and (3.2), we have

$$\left| \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho](x, \xi, \eta) \right| \lesssim 2^{jm} 2^{-k_0N_0-k_1N_1-k_2N_2},$$

and hence

$$(3.3) \quad \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \lesssim 2^{jm} 2^{-k_0 N_0 - k_1 N_1 - k_2 N_2}$$

for $j, k_0, k_1, k_2 \geq 1$. For the case $j \geq 1$ and at least one of k_0, k_1, k_2 is zero, by avoiding the usage of the Taylor expansion for the corresponding variables, we obtain the same conclusion as above. Also, the case $j = 0$ is similarly obtained. Therefore, the estimate in (3.3) holds for $j, k_0, k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0$. This means $\|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim 1$. $\square$

4. LEMMAS

4.1. Elemental lemmas. In this subsection, we denote by S the operator

$$S(f)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{f(y)}{(1 + |x - y|)^{n+1}} dy.$$

Note that S is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. We display basic properties of the operator S . The proof can be found in [15, Lemmas 4.1 and 4.3].

Lemma 4.1. *Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Then, the following assertions (1)-(3) hold for all nonnegative functions f, g on $\mathbb{R}^n$.*

- (1) $S(f * g)(x) = (S(f) * g)(x) = (f * S(g))(x)$.
- (2) $S(f)(x) \approx S(f)(y)$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $|x - y| \lesssim 1$.
- (3) $\|S(f)(x)\|_{L_x^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \approx \|S(f)(\nu)\|_{\ell_\nu^p(\mathbb{Z}^n)}$.
- (4) Let φ be a function in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with compact support. Then, $|\varphi(D - \nu)f(x)|^2 \lesssim S(|\varphi(D - \nu)f|^2)(x)$ for any $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

In the following lemma, the first assertion for $R = 1$ was proved by Miyachi–Tomita [22, Lemma 3.2]. Moreover, the second assertion for $R = 1$ was proved in the unpublished memo by Miyachi–Tomita. We generalize them to the cases $R \geq 1$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $2 \leq p \leq \infty$, $R \geq 1$, and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, the following hold for any $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

- (1) $\left\| \left(\sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \left| \varphi \left(\frac{D - \nu}{R} \right) f \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim R^{n/2} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$
- (2) $\left\| \left(\sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \varphi(-\nu/R)=0} \left| \varphi \left(\frac{D - \nu}{R} \right) f \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim R^{n/2} \|f\|_{BMO(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$

Here, the implicit constants above are independent of $R \geq 1$.

Proof. We consider the assertion (1). Since $\mathbb{R}^n = \bigcup_{\nu' \in \mathbb{Z}^n} 2\pi\nu' + [-\pi, \pi]^n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi \left(\frac{D - \nu}{R} \right) f(x) &= R^n \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{i(x-y) \cdot \nu} \check{\varphi}(R(x-y)) f(y) dy \\ &= R^n e^{ix \cdot \nu} \sum_{\nu' \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \int_{2\pi\nu' + [-\pi, \pi]^n} e^{-iy \cdot \nu} \check{\varphi}(R(x-y)) f(y) dy \\ &= R^n e^{ix \cdot \nu} \int_{[-\pi, \pi]^n} e^{-iy \cdot \nu} \left\{ \sum_{\nu' \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \check{\varphi}(R(x-y-2\pi\nu')) f(y+2\pi\nu') \right\} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we realize that the function $\sum_{\nu' \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \check{\varphi}(R(x - y - 2\pi\nu'))f(y + 2\pi\nu')$ is $2\pi\mathbb{Z}^n$ -periodic with respect to the y -variable. Hence, we have by the Parseval identity

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \varphi\left(\frac{D - \nu}{R}\right) f(x) \right\|_{\ell_v^2}^2 \\ &= (2\pi)^n R^{2n} \int_{[-\pi, \pi]^n} \left| \sum_{\nu' \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \check{\varphi}(R(x - y - 2\pi\nu')) f(y + 2\pi\nu') \right|^2 dy. \end{aligned}$$

By applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to the sum over ν' , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \varphi\left(\frac{D - \nu}{R}\right) f(x) \right\|_{\ell_v^2}^2 &\lesssim R^{2n} \int_{[-\pi, \pi]^n} \sum_{\nu' \in \mathbb{Z}^n} |\check{\varphi}(R(x - y - 2\pi\nu'))| |f(y + 2\pi\nu')|^2 dy \\ &= R^{2n} (|\check{\varphi}(R \cdot)| * |f|^2)(x), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\sum_{\nu' \in \mathbb{Z}^n} |\check{\varphi}(R(z - 2\pi\nu'))| \lesssim 1$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $R \geq 1$. Taking the $L^{p/2}$ norm of the above, since $2 \leq p \leq \infty$, we have by the Young inequality

$$\left\| \left\| \varphi\left(\frac{D - \nu}{R}\right) f(x) \right\|_{\ell_v^2} \right\|_{L_x^p}^2 \lesssim R^n \|f\|_{L^p}^2,$$

which completes the proof of the assertion (1).

For the assertion (2), we have for $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $\varphi(-\nu/R) = 0$

$$\varphi\left(\frac{D - \nu}{R}\right) f(x) = R^n e^{ix \cdot \nu} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-iy \cdot \nu} \check{\varphi}(R(x - y)) (f(y) - c) dy$$

for any constant $c \in \mathbb{C}$. Repeating the same lines as above with $f(y) - c$, we obtain

$$\sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \varphi(-\nu/R)=0} \left| \varphi\left(\frac{D - \nu}{R}\right) f(x) \right|^2 \lesssim R^{2n} (|\check{\varphi}(R \cdot)| * |f - c|^2)(x).$$

Choose $c = f_{Q(x, R^{-1})} = |Q(x, R^{-1})|^{-1} \int_{Q(x, R^{-1})} f(y) dy$ and observe that

$$R^n \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\check{\varphi}(R(x - y))| |f(y) - f_{Q(x, R^{-1})}|^2 dy \lesssim \|f\|_{BMO}^2$$

(with the aid of [11, Proposition 3.1.5 (i) and Corollary 3.1.8]). Then, we have

$$\sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \varphi(-\nu/R)=0} \left| \varphi\left(\frac{D - \nu}{R}\right) f(x) \right|^2 \lesssim R^n \|f\|_{BMO}^2,$$

which completes the proof of the assertion (2). $\square$

Corollary 4.3. *Let $r > 0$, $R \geq 1$, and $\varphi, \phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then,*

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \varphi(-\nu/R)=0} \left| \varphi\left(\frac{D - \nu}{R}\right) \phi\left(\frac{D}{r}\right) f \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim R^{n/2} \|f\|_{BMO(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

where the implicit constant above is independent of $r > 0$ and $R \geq 1$.

Proof. The summand can be written by

$$\varphi\left(\frac{D-\nu}{R}\right)\phi\left(\frac{D}{r}\right)f(x) = r^n \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi\left(\frac{D-\nu}{R}\right)f(x-y)\check{\phi}(ry)dy.$$

We take the ℓ_ν^2 norm restricted to the set $\{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \varphi(-\nu/R) = 0\}$ of the above and use the Minkowski inequality for the integral. Then, by Lemma 4.2 (2), we have the desired results, since $r^n \|\check{\phi}(r\cdot)\|_{L^1} \approx 1$ for $r > 0$. $\square$

4.2. Lemmas for Theorems 3.2 and 3.3. In this subsection, we show some lemmas for the dual form of bilinear pseudo-differential operators. The basic idea for the argument used here goes back to Boulkhemair [5]. See also [15, Proposition 5.1].

Throughout this subsection, we will denote the Fourier multiplier operator $\kappa(D-\mu)$ by $\square_\mu$ for $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, where $\kappa \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, the norm $\|\sigma_\nu(x, \xi, \eta)\|_{L_{\xi, \eta}^2 L_{ul, x}^2 \ell_\nu^\infty}$ will be abbreviated to $\|\sigma_\nu\|$ for the sake of simplicity.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $R_0, R_1, R_2 \geq 1$ and $2 \leq p, q, r \leq \infty$ satisfy $1/p + 1/q + 1/r = 1$. Let $\Lambda, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2$ be subsets of $\mathbb{Z}^n$. Suppose that $\kappa \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies that $\text{supp } \kappa \subset [-1, 1]^n$ and that $\{\sigma_\nu\}$, $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2) \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2$, is a sequence of bounded functions on $(\mathbb{R}^n)^3$ satisfying that $\text{supp } \mathcal{F}[\sigma_\nu] \subset B_{R_0} \times B_{R_1} \times B_{R_2}$ for $\nu \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2$. Then, the following (1) and (2) hold for any $f, g, h \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and (3) holds for any $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\{h_\tau\}_{\tau \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad & \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_\nu}(\square_{\nu_1} f, \square_{\nu_2} g)(x) h(x) dx \right| \\ & \lesssim \min_{i=1,2} (|\Lambda_i|^{1/2}) (R_0 R_1 R_2)^{n/2} \|\sigma_\nu\| \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|\square_{\nu_2} g\|_{\ell_{\nu_2}^2(\Lambda_2) L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|h\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \\ (2) \quad & \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_\nu}(\square_{\nu_1} f, \square_{\nu_2} g)(x) h(x) dx \right| \\ & \lesssim (|\Lambda_1| |\Lambda_2|)^{1/2} (R_1 R_2)^{n/2} \|\sigma_\nu\| \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|\square_{\nu_2} g\|_{\ell_{\nu_2}^2(\Lambda_2) L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|h\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \\ (3) \quad & \sum_{\tau \in \Lambda} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \nu_1 + \nu_2 = \tau} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_\nu}(\square_{\nu_1} f, \square_{\nu_2} g)(x) h_\tau(x) dx \right| \\ & \lesssim |\Lambda|^{1/2} (R_1 R_2)^{n/2} \|\sigma_\nu\| \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|g\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|h_\tau\|_{\ell_\tau^2(\Lambda) L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the absolute values of Λ , Λ_1 , and Λ_2 are the cardinality of these sets, and the implicit constants are independent of R_0, R_1, R_2 . In particular, $\|\square_{\nu_2} g\|_{\ell_{\nu_2}^2(\Lambda_2) L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ in (1) and (2) can be replaced by $\|g\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)}$.

To prove this, we use the following lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $R_1, R_2 \geq 1$. Suppose that $\kappa \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies that $\text{supp } \kappa \subset [-1, 1]^n$ and that $\{\sigma_\nu\}$, $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2) \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2$, is a sequence of bounded functions on $(\mathbb{R}^n)^3$ such that $\text{supp } \mathcal{F}_{1,2}[\sigma_\nu](x, \cdot, \cdot) \subset B_{R_1} \times B_{R_2}$ for $\nu \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} (4.1) \quad & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_\nu}(\square_{\nu_1} f, \square_{\nu_2} g)(x) h_{\nu_1 + \nu_2}(x) dx \right| \\ & \lesssim \|\sigma_\nu\| \sum_{\nu_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \left\{ S\left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_1}} * |\square_{\nu_1} f|^2\right)(\nu_0) \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ S\left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_2}} * |\square_{\nu_2} g|^2\right)(\nu_0) \right\}^{1/2} \\ & \quad \times \|h_{\nu_1 + \nu_2}(x + \nu_0)\|_{L_x^2(Q)} \end{aligned}$$

for any $\nu \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and $\{h_\tau\}_{\tau \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Proof. We simply denote by I the left hand side of (4.1). Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & (2\pi)^{2n} T_{\sigma_\nu}(\square_{\nu_1} f, \square_{\nu_2} g)(x) \\ &= \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^2} \mathcal{F}_{1,2}[\sigma_\nu](x, y-x, z-x) \mathbf{1}_{B_{R_1}}(x-y) \square_{\nu_1} f(y) \mathbf{1}_{B_{R_2}}(x-z) \square_{\nu_2} g(z) dy dz. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the Cauchy–Schwarz inequalities and the Plancherel theorem give

$$|T_{\sigma_\nu}(\square_{\nu_1} f, \square_{\nu_2} g)(x)|^2 \lesssim \|\sigma_\nu(x, \xi, \eta)\|_{L_{\xi, \eta}^2}^2 \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_1}} * |\square_{\nu_1} f|^2 \right)(x) \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_2}} * |\square_{\nu_2} g|^2 \right)(x)$$

for any $\nu \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. From this, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (4.2) \quad I &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \|\sigma_\nu(x, \xi, \eta)\|_{L_{\xi, \eta}^2} |h_{\nu_1+\nu_2}(x)| \\ &\quad \times \left\{ \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_1}} * |\square_{\nu_1} f|^2 \right)(x) \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_2}} * |\square_{\nu_2} g|^2 \right)(x) \right\}^{1/2} dx. \end{aligned}$$

We separate the integral by using (2.1). Then, the inequality (4.2) coincides with

$$\begin{aligned} I &\lesssim \sum_{\nu_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \int_Q \|\sigma_\nu(x + \nu_0, \xi, \eta)\|_{L_{\xi, \eta}^2} |h_{\nu_1+\nu_2}(x + \nu_0)| \\ &\quad \times \left\{ \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_1}} * |\square_{\nu_1} f|^2 \right)(x + \nu_0) \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_2}} * |\square_{\nu_2} g|^2 \right)(x + \nu_0) \right\}^{1/2} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since we have by Lemma 4.1 (4), (1), and (2)

$$\left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_1}} * |\square_{\nu_1} f|^2 \right)(x + \nu_0) \lesssim S \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_1}} * |\square_{\nu_1} f|^2 \right)(\nu_0)$$

for $x \in Q$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I &\lesssim \sum_{\nu_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \left\{ S \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_1}} * |\square_{\nu_1} f|^2 \right)(\nu_0) \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ S \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_2}} * |\square_{\nu_2} g|^2 \right)(\nu_0) \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\quad \times \int_Q \|\sigma_\nu(x + \nu_0, \xi, \eta)\|_{L_{\xi, \eta}^2} |h_{\nu_1+\nu_2}(x + \nu_0)| dx \\ &\leq \sum_{\nu_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \left\{ S \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_1}} * |\square_{\nu_1} f|^2 \right)(\nu_0) \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ S \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_2}} * |\square_{\nu_2} g|^2 \right)(\nu_0) \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\quad \times \|\sigma_\nu(x + \nu_0, \xi, \eta)\|_{L_{\xi, \eta}^2 L_x^2(Q)} \|h_{\nu_1+\nu_2}(x + \nu_0)\|_{L_x^2(Q)}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over ν_0 and ν of the factor of σ_ν , we complete the proof. $\square$

Now, we shall prove Lemma 4.4.

Proof of Lemma 4.4 (1). We may assume that $|\Lambda_1| < \infty$ or $|\Lambda_2| < \infty$. We simply denote by I the left hand side of the assertion (1). We first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{F}[T_{\sigma_\nu}(\square_{\nu_1} f, \square_{\nu_2} g)](\zeta) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2n}} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^2} \mathcal{F}_0[\sigma_\nu](\zeta - (\xi + \eta), \xi, \eta) \kappa(\xi - \nu_1) \widehat{f}(\xi) \kappa(\eta - \nu_2) \widehat{g}(\eta) d\xi d\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Here, since $\text{supp } \mathcal{F}_0[\sigma_\nu](\cdot, \xi, \eta) \subset B_{R_0}$ and $\text{supp } \kappa(\cdot - \nu_i) \subset \nu_i + [-1, 1]^n$, we see that

$$\text{supp } \mathcal{F}[T_{\sigma_\nu}(\square_{\nu_1} f, \square_{\nu_2} g)] \subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta - (\nu_1 + \nu_2)| \lesssim R_0\}.$$

We take a function $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying that $\varphi = 1$ on $\{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \lesssim 1\}$. Then,

$$I = \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_\nu}(\square_{\nu_1} f, \square_{\nu_2} g)(x) \varphi\left(\frac{D + \nu_1 + \nu_2}{R_0}\right) h(x) dx \right|.$$

By the use of Lemma 4.5,

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} I &\lesssim \|\sigma_\nu\| \sum_{\nu_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2} \left\| \varphi\left(\frac{D + \nu_1 + \nu_2}{R_0}\right) h(x + \nu_0) \right\|_{L_x^2(Q)} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ S\left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_1}} * |\square_{\nu_1} f|^2\right)(\nu_0) \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ S\left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_2}} * |\square_{\nu_2} g|^2\right)(\nu_0) \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

In what follows, we simply write each summand by

$$\begin{aligned} F(\nu_1, \nu_0) &= \left\{ S\left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_1}} * |\square_{\nu_1} f|^2\right)(\nu_0) \right\}^{1/2}, \\ G(\nu_2, \nu_0) &= \left\{ S\left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_2}} * |\square_{\nu_2} g|^2\right)(\nu_0) \right\}^{1/2}, \\ H(\nu_3, \nu_0) &= \left\| \varphi\left(\frac{D + \nu_3}{R_0}\right) h(x + \nu_0) \right\|_{L_x^2(Q)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the inequality (4.3) is rewritten as

$$(4.4) \quad I \lesssim \|\sigma_\nu\| II$$

with

$$II = \sum_{\nu_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \Lambda_1} \sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda_2} F(\nu_1, \nu_0) G(\nu_2, \nu_0) H(\nu_1 + \nu_2, \nu_0).$$

Let us estimate II . We first consider the case $|\Lambda_1| \leq |\Lambda_2|$. We apply the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality firstly to the sum over ν_2 and secondly to the sum over ν_1 , and thirdly apply the Hölder inequality with $1/p + 1/q + 1/r = 1$ to the sum over ν_0 . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} II &\leq \sum_{\nu_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \Lambda_1} F(\nu_1, \nu_0) \|G(\nu_2, \nu_0)\|_{\ell_{\nu_2}^2(\Lambda_2)} \|H(\nu_3, \nu_0)\|_{\ell_{\nu_3}^2(\mathbb{Z}^n)} \\ &\leq |\Lambda_1|^{1/2} \sum_{\nu_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \|F(\nu_1, \nu_0)\|_{\ell_{\nu_1}^2(\Lambda_1)} \|G(\nu_2, \nu_0)\|_{\ell_{\nu_2}^2(\Lambda_2)} \|H(\nu_3, \nu_0)\|_{\ell_{\nu_3}^2} \\ &\leq |\Lambda_1|^{1/2} \|F(\nu_1, \nu_0)\|_{\ell_{\nu_1}^2 \ell_{\nu_0}^p} \|G(\nu_2, \nu_0)\|_{\ell_{\nu_2}^2(\Lambda_2) \ell_{\nu_0}^q} \|H(\nu_3, \nu_0)\|_{\ell_{\nu_3}^2 \ell_{\nu_0}^r}. \end{aligned}$$

For the opposite case $|\Lambda_2| \leq |\Lambda_1|$, we switch the order to use the Cauchy–Schwarz inequalities with respect to ν_1 and ν_2 . Thus, we obtain

$$(4.5) \quad II \leq \min_{i=1,2} (|\Lambda_i|^{1/2}) \|F(\nu_1, \nu_0)\|_{\ell_{\nu_1}^2 \ell_{\nu_0}^p} \|G(\nu_2, \nu_0)\|_{\ell_{\nu_2}^2(\Lambda_2) \ell_{\nu_0}^q} \|H(\nu_3, \nu_0)\|_{\ell_{\nu_3}^2 \ell_{\nu_0}^r}.$$

We shall estimate the norms of F , G , and H . Firstly, for the norm of F , we have by Lemma 4.1 (3)

$$(4.6) \quad \|F(\nu_1, \nu_0)\|_{\ell_{\nu_1}^2 \ell_{\nu_0}^p} \approx \left\| S\left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_1}} * \|\square_{\nu_1} f\|_{\ell_{\nu_1}^2}^2\right)(x) \right\|_{L_x^{p/2}}^{1/2}.$$

By the boundedness of the operator S on $L^{p/2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $p \geq 2$, and the Young inequality, the right hand side of (4.6) is estimated by a constant times

$$(4.7) \quad \left\| \mathbf{1}_{B_{R_1}} * \|\square_{\nu_1} f\|_{\ell_{\nu_1}^2}^2 \right\|_{L^{p/2}}^{1/2} \lesssim R_1^{n/2} \left\| \|\square_{\nu_1} f\|_{\ell_{\nu_1}^2} \right\|_{L^p}.$$

Since $\square_{\nu_1} = \kappa(D - \nu_1)$ with $\kappa \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have $\|\square_{\nu_1} f\|_{\ell_{\nu_1}^2 L^p} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p}$ by Lemma 4.2 (1) with $R = 1$. Therefore, we obtain

$$(4.8) \quad \|F(\nu_1, \nu_0)\|_{\ell_{\nu_1}^2 \ell_{\nu_0}^p} \lesssim R_1^{n/2} \|f\|_{L^p}.$$

For the norm of G , repeating the same line as for F , we have by (4.6) and (4.7)

$$(4.9) \quad \|G(\nu_2, \nu_0)\|_{\ell_{\nu_2}^2(\Lambda_2) \ell_{\nu_0}^q} \lesssim R_2^{n/2} \left\| \|\square_{\nu_2} g\|_{\ell_{\nu_2}^2(\Lambda_2)} \right\|_{L^q}.$$

Lastly, we consider the norm of H . Since $L^r(Q) \hookrightarrow L^2(Q)$ for $2 \leq r \leq \infty$, we have by Lemma 4.2 (1)

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \|H(\nu_3, \nu_0)\|_{\ell_{\nu_3}^2 \ell_{\nu_0}^r} &= \left\| \varphi \left(\frac{D + \nu_3}{R_0} \right) h(x + \nu_0) \right\|_{\ell_{\nu_3}^2 L_x^2(Q) \ell_{\nu_0}^r} \\ &\leq \left\| \varphi \left(\frac{D + \nu_3}{R_0} \right) h(x) \right\|_{\ell_{\nu_3}^2 L_x^r(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim R_0^{n/2} \|h\|_{L^r}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, collecting (4.4), (4.5), (4.8), (4.9), and (4.10), we obtain the desired estimate. Moreover, by virtue of Lemma 4.2 (1), $\|\square_{\nu_2} g\|_{\ell_{\nu_2}^2(\Lambda_2) L^q}$ can be replaced by $\|g\|_{L^q}$. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 4.4 (2). We may assume $|\Lambda_1|, |\Lambda_2| < \infty$. We simply denote by I the left hand side of the inequality of the assertion (2). Since h is independent of $\nu_1 + \nu_2$, we have by Lemma 4.5

$$\begin{aligned} I &\lesssim \|\sigma_\nu\| \sum_{\nu_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \|h(x + \nu_0)\|_{L_x^2(Q)} \\ &\quad \times \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2} \left\{ S \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_1}} * |\square_{\nu_1} f|^2 \right) (\nu_0) \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ S \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_2}} * |\square_{\nu_2} g|^2 \right) (\nu_0) \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

We use the Cauchy–Schwarz inequalities to the sums over ν_1 and ν_2 and then use the Hölder inequality to the sum over ν_0 with $1/p + 1/q + 1/r = 1$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} I &\lesssim (|\Lambda_1| |\Lambda_2|)^{1/2} \|\sigma_\nu\| \|h(x + \nu_0)\|_{L_x^2(Q) \ell_{\nu_0}^r} \\ &\quad \times \left\| \left\{ S \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_1}} * |\square_{\nu_1} f|^2 \right) (\nu_0) \right\}^{1/2} \right\|_{\ell_{\nu_1}^2(\Lambda_1) \ell_{\nu_0}^p} \left\| \left\{ S \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_2}} * |\square_{\nu_2} g|^2 \right) (\nu_0) \right\}^{1/2} \right\|_{\ell_{\nu_2}^2(\Lambda_2) \ell_{\nu_0}^q}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, from (4.8) and (4.9), the factors of f and g are bounded by a constant times $R_1^{n/2} \|f\|_{L^p}$ and $R_2^{n/2} \|\square_{\nu_2} g\|_{\ell_{\nu_2}^2(\Lambda_2) L^q}$, respectively. From the embedding $L^r(Q) \hookrightarrow L^2(Q)$ for $2 \leq r \leq \infty$, $\|h(x + \nu_0)\|_{L_x^2(Q) \ell_{\nu_0}^r} \leq \|h\|_{L^r}$. Hence, we obtain the desired estimate. Also, by Lemma 4.2 (1), $\|\square_{\nu_2} g\|_{\ell_{\nu_2}^2(\Lambda_2) L^q}$ can be replaced by $\|g\|_{L^q}$. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 4.4 (3). We may assume $|\Lambda| < \infty$. We denote by I the left hand side of the assertion (3). By Lemma 4.5,

$$\begin{aligned} I &\lesssim \|\sigma_\nu\| \sum_{\nu_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \sum_{\tau \in \Lambda} \sum_{\nu_1: \nu_1 + \nu_2 = \tau} \|h_\tau(x + \nu_0)\|_{L_x^2(Q)} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ S \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_1}} * |\square_{\nu_1} f|^2 \right) (\nu_0) \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ S \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_2}} * |\square_{\nu_2} g|^2 \right) (\nu_0) \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Firstly, we apply the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to the sum over ν_1 , since $\nu_2 = \tau - \nu_1$. Secondly, we use the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to the sum over τ and thirdly use

the Hölder inequality to the sum over ν_0 with $1/p + 1/q + 1/r = 1$. Then,

$$I \lesssim |\Lambda|^{1/2} \|\sigma_\nu\| \|h_\tau(x + \nu_0)\|_{L_x^2(Q) \ell_\tau^2(\Lambda) \ell_{\nu_0}^r} \\ \times \left\| \left\{ S \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_1}} * |\square_{\nu_1} f|^2 \right) (\nu_0) \right\}^{1/2} \right\|_{\ell_{\nu_1}^2 \ell_{\nu_0}^p} \left\| \left\{ S \left(\mathbf{1}_{B_{R_2}} * |\square_{\nu_2} g|^2 \right) (\nu_0) \right\}^{1/2} \right\|_{\ell_{\nu_2}^2 \ell_{\nu_0}^q}.$$

By (4.8), the factors of f and g are bounded by a constant times $R_1^{n/2} \|f\|_{L^p}$ and $R_2^{n/2} \|g\|_{L^q}$, respectively. For the factor of h_τ , since $L^r(Q) \hookrightarrow L^2(Q)$ for $2 \leq r \leq \infty$, $\|h_\tau(x + \nu_0)\|_{L_x^2(Q) \ell_\tau^2(\Lambda) \ell_{\nu_0}^r} \leq \|h_\tau\|_{\ell_\tau^2(\Lambda) L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)}$. Hence, we obtain the desired estimate. $\square$

5. DECOMPOSITION OF SYMBOLS

In this section, we decompose symbols of the bilinear operator T_σ by Littlewood–Paley partitions and the following lemma given by Sugimoto [24, Lemma 2.2.1]. An explicit proof can be found in [15, Lemma 4.4].

Lemma 5.1. *There exist functions $\kappa \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying that $\text{supp } \kappa \subset [-1, 1]^n$, $\text{supp } \hat{\chi} \subset B_1$, $|\chi| \geq c > 0$ on $[-1, 1]^n$, and*

$$\sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \kappa(\xi - \nu) \chi(\xi - \nu) = 1, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

As a first step of this section, we decompose symbols by a Littlewood–Paley partition of unity $\{\Psi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ on $(\mathbb{R}^n)^2$ as follows:

$$\sigma(x, \xi, \eta) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sigma_j(x, \xi, \eta) \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sigma_j(x, \xi, \eta)$$

with

$$(5.1) \quad \sigma_j(x, \xi, \eta) = \sigma(x, \xi, \eta) \Psi_j(\xi, \eta).$$

Here, we observe the following two identities for Ψ_j . Firstly, we let a function $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfy that $\phi = 1$ on $\{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \leq 2\}$ and $\text{supp } \phi \subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \leq 4\}$, and write $\phi_j = \phi(\cdot/2^j)$. Then, we have for $j \geq 0$

$$\Psi_j(\xi, \eta) = \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) \phi_j(\xi) \phi_j(\eta).$$

Secondly, there exist functions $\phi', \psi', \psi'' \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying that for $j \geq 1$

$$\Psi_j(\xi, \eta) = \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) \phi'_j(\xi) \psi'_j(\eta) + \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) \psi'_j(\xi) \phi'_j(\eta) + \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) \psi''_j(\xi) \psi''_j(\eta),$$

where $\phi'_j = \phi'(\cdot/2^j)$, $\psi'_j = \psi'(\cdot/2^j)$, and $\psi''_j = \psi''(\cdot/2^j)$, and that

$$(5.2) \quad \text{supp } \phi' \subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \leq 2^{-5}\},$$

$$(5.3) \quad \text{supp } \psi' \subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{-4} \leq |\zeta| \leq 2^2\},$$

$$(5.4) \quad \text{supp } \psi'' \subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{-6} \leq |\zeta| \leq 2^2\}.$$

See Appendix A for the existence of such functions. (By this, the annulus of $\text{supp } \Psi_j$ is decomposed into the three parts: $|\xi| \ll |\eta|$, $|\xi| \gg |\eta|$, $|\xi| \approx |\eta|$.) Then, we have

$$\sigma(x, \xi, \eta) = \sum_{j \lesssim 1} \sigma_j(x, \xi, \eta) \phi_j(\xi) \phi_j(\eta) + \sum_{j \gg 1} \sigma_j(x, \xi, \eta) \phi'_j(\xi) \psi'_j(\eta) \\ + \sum_{j \gg 1} \sigma_j(x, \xi, \eta) \psi'_j(\xi) \phi'_j(\eta) + \sum_{j \gg 1} \sigma_j(x, \xi, \eta) \psi''_j(\xi) \psi''_j(\eta),$$

where the implicit constant of the sum over j depends only on ρ and dimensions.

As a second step, we rewrite the dual form of $T_\sigma(f, g)$. By using the decomposition of symbols just above, the dual form of $T_\sigma(f, g)$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_\sigma(f, g)(x) h(x) dx &= \sum_{j \lesssim 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_j}(\phi_j(D)f, \phi_j(D)g)(x) h(x) dx \\
 &+ \sum_{j \gg 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_j}(\phi'_j(D)f, \psi'_j(D)g)(x) h(x) dx \\
 &+ \sum_{j \gg 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_j}(\psi'_j(D)f, \phi'_j(D)g)(x) h(x) dx \\
 &+ \sum_{j \gg 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_j}(\psi''_j(D)f, \psi''_j(D)g)(x) h(x) dx \\
 &=: I_0 + I_1 + I_2 + I_3.
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

In what follows, we rewrite this forms I_i , $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$.

To do this, we shall consider the following:

$$I := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_j}(F, G)(x) h(x) dx,$$

where σ_j is in (5.1). By changes of variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 I &= \frac{2^{-j\rho n}}{(2\pi)^{2n}} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^3} e^{ix \cdot (\xi + \eta)} \sigma_j(2^{-j\rho}x, 2^{j\rho}\xi, 2^{j\rho}\eta) \widehat{F(2^{-j\rho} \cdot)}(\xi) \widehat{G(2^{-j\rho} \cdot)}(\eta) h(2^{-j\rho}x) dX \\
 &= 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_j^\rho}(F_j, G_j)(x) h_j(x) dx,
 \end{aligned}$$

where we simply wrote $dX = dx d\xi d\eta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.6) \quad \sigma_j^\rho &= \sigma_j(2^{-j\rho} \cdot, 2^{j\rho} \cdot, 2^{j\rho} \cdot), \\
 F_j &= F(2^{-j\rho} \cdot), \quad G_j = G(2^{-j\rho} \cdot), \quad \text{and} \quad h_j = h(2^{-j\rho} \cdot),
 \end{aligned}$$

with σ_j in (5.1). We next decompose the symbol σ_j^ρ . We use the product type operator $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}$ defined in Definition 3.1 and then use Lemma 5.1 to have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sigma_j^\rho(x, \xi, \eta) &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}=(k_0, k_1, k_2) \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho](x, \xi, \eta) \\
 &= \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} \sum_{(\nu_1, \nu_2) \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2} \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho](x, \xi, \eta) \chi(\xi - \nu_1) \chi(\eta - \nu_2) \kappa(\xi - \nu_1) \kappa(\eta - \nu_2).
 \end{aligned}$$

Then, by writing as

$$(5.7) \quad \sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^\rho(x, \xi, \eta) = \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho](x, \xi, \eta) \chi(\xi - \nu_1) \chi(\eta - \nu_2)$$

for $\mathbf{k} = (k_0, k_1, k_2) \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu} = (\nu_1, \nu_2) \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2$, we can see that

$$T_{\sigma_j^\rho}(F_j, G_j)(x) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\nu} \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2} T_{\sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^\rho}(\kappa(D - \nu_1)F_j, \kappa(D - \nu_2)G_j)(x).$$

By denoting the Fourier multiplier operator $\kappa(D - \nu_i)$ by $\square_{\nu_i}$, $i = 1, 2$, we have

$$(5.8) \quad I = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\nu} \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2} 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1}F_j, \square_{\nu_2}G_j)(x) h_j(x) dx.$$

Now, we actually rewrite the form I_i defined in (5.5). For I_0 , substituting $F = \phi_j(D)f$ and $G = \phi_j(D)g$ into (5.8), then we have

$$(5.9) \quad I_0 = \sum_{j \lesssim 1} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\nu} \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2} 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\boldsymbol{\nu}}}^\rho(\square_{\nu_1} f_j, \square_{\nu_2} g_j)(x) h_j(x) dx,$$

where $\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\boldsymbol{\nu}}^\rho$ is in (5.7) with (5.6) and (5.1),

$$f_j = \phi_j(D)f(2^{-j\rho \cdot}), \quad g_j = \phi_j(D)g(2^{-j\rho \cdot}), \quad \text{and} \quad h_j = h(2^{-j\rho \cdot}).$$

Also, since $\text{supp } \phi \subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \leq 4\}$, f_j and g_j satisfy that

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{supp } \widehat{f_j} &\subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\xi| \leq 2^{j(1-\rho)+2}\}, \\ \text{supp } \widehat{g_j} &\subset \{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\eta| \leq 2^{j(1-\rho)+2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting $(F, G) = (\phi'_j(D)f, \psi'_j(D)g)$, $(\psi'_j(D)f, \phi'_j(D)g)$, and $(\psi''_j(D)f, \psi''_j(D)g)$ into (5.8), the corresponding forms I_1 , I_2 , and I_3 are respectively given as follows. For I_1 , we have

$$(5.11) \quad I_1 = \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\nu} \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2} 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\boldsymbol{\nu}}}^\rho(\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(1)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(1)})(x) h_j(x) dx,$$

where

$$(5.12) \quad f_j^{(1)} = \phi'_j(D)f(2^{-j\rho \cdot}), \quad g_j^{(1)} = \psi'_j(D)g(2^{-j\rho \cdot}), \quad \text{and} \quad h_j = h(2^{-j\rho \cdot}).$$

Also, $f_j^{(1)}$ and $g_j^{(1)}$ satisfy from (5.2) and (5.3) that

$$(5.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{supp } \widehat{f_j^{(1)}} &\subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\xi| \leq 2^{j(1-\rho)-5}\}, \\ \text{supp } \widehat{g_j^{(1)}} &\subset \{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{j(1-\rho)-4} \leq |\eta| \leq 2^{j(1-\rho)+2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, in this case, it should be remarkable that

$$(5.14) \quad 2^{j(1-\rho)-5} \leq |\xi + \eta| \leq 2^{j(1-\rho)+3}, \quad \text{if } (\xi, \eta) \in \text{supp } \widehat{f_j^{(1)}} \times \text{supp } \widehat{g_j^{(1)}}.$$

For I_2 , we have

$$(5.15) \quad I_2 = \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\nu} \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2} 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\boldsymbol{\nu}}}^\rho(\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(2)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(2)})(x) h_j(x) dx,$$

where

$$(5.16) \quad f_j^{(2)} = \psi'_j(D)f(2^{-j\rho \cdot}), \quad g_j^{(2)} = \phi'_j(D)g(2^{-j\rho \cdot}), \quad \text{and} \quad h_j = h(2^{-j\rho \cdot}).$$

Also, $f_j^{(2)}$ and $g_j^{(2)}$ satisfy from (5.3) and (5.2) that

$$(5.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{supp } \widehat{f_j^{(2)}} &\subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{j(1-\rho)-4} \leq |\xi| \leq 2^{j(1-\rho)+2}\}, \\ \text{supp } \widehat{g_j^{(2)}} &\subset \{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\eta| \leq 2^{j(1-\rho)-5}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Again, in this case, it should be remarkable that

$$(5.18) \quad 2^{j(1-\rho)-5} \leq |\xi + \eta| \leq 2^{j(1-\rho)+3}, \quad \text{if } (\xi, \eta) \in \text{supp } \widehat{f_j^{(2)}} \times \text{supp } \widehat{g_j^{(2)}}.$$

For I_3 , we have

$$(5.19) \quad I_3 = \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\nu} \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2} 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\boldsymbol{\nu}}}^\rho(\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(3)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(3)})(x) h_j(x) dx,$$

where

$$(5.20) \quad f_j^{(3)} = \psi_j''(D)f(2^{-j\rho}\cdot), \quad g_j^{(3)} = \psi_j''(D)g(2^{-j\rho}\cdot), \quad \text{and} \quad h_j = h(2^{-j\rho}\cdot).$$

Also, $f_j^{(3)}$ and $g_j^{(3)}$ satisfy from (5.4) that

$$(5.21) \quad \text{supp } \widehat{f_j^{(3)}}, \text{ supp } \widehat{g_j^{(3)}} \subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{j(1-\rho)-6} \leq |\zeta| \leq 2^{j(1-\rho)+2}\}.$$

We remark that a fact like (5.14) and (5.18) does not hold in this case.

In the forthcoming sections, we will estimate the rewritten dual forms in (5.9), (5.11), (5.15), and (5.19) to show the boundedness in Theorems 3.2 and 3.3.

Remark 5.2. Through the argument above, we have been able to examine precisely the annulus $\{ |(\xi, \eta)| \approx 2^{j(1-\rho)} \}$ by $\boldsymbol{\nu} + [-1, 1]^{2n}$, $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}^n$. On the other hands, in [22, Section 3], Miyachi–Tomita employed the method examining the annulus $\{ |(\xi, \eta)| \approx 2^j \}$ by $2^{j\rho}\boldsymbol{\nu} + [-2^{j\rho}, 2^{j\rho}]^{2n}$. These two are essentially the same, and so the idea used in this section goes back to their method in [22]. Moreover, the essential idea of decomposing the annulus into the three parts, the sets $\{ |\xi| \ll |\eta| \}$ and $\{ |\xi| \gg |\eta| \}$ to have $|\xi + \eta| \gg 1$ and the set $\{ |\xi| \approx |\eta| \}$, also goes back to [22].

The changes of variables concerned with $2^{\pm j\rho}$ were used to show the boundedness on L^2 of linear pseudo-differential operators with symbols in the exotic class $S_{\rho, \rho}^0$, $0 \leq \rho < 1$. See, e.g., [26, Chapter VII, Section 2.5].

The idea of decomposing symbols by using the functions κ and χ in Lemma 5.1 comes from Sugimoto [24].

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.2

In this section, we prove Theorem 3.2. To this end, we show that the absolute values of I_i , given in (5.9), (5.11), (5.15), and (5.19), are bounded by a constant times

$$\|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho, \rho}^{m, *}(s; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{bmo}$$

with $m = -(1 - \rho)n/2$ and $\mathbf{s} = (n/2 + \varepsilon, n/2, n/2)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, these complete the proof of Theorem 3.2 by recalling the expression in (5.5). In what follows, we will first consider I_1 . However, we omit the proof for I_2 because of symmetry between I_2 and I_1 . After that, we mention about I_3 and finally about I_0 . The basic idea contained in the proof goes back to Miyachi–Tomita [22].

Before the proof, we shall give two remarks. In order to obtain the desired boundedness, we will apply Lemma 4.4 to the dual forms I_i . This means that this lemma will be used under the setting $\sigma_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = \sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^{\rho}$. Recall from (5.7) and Lemma 5.1 that

$$\sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^{\rho}(x, \xi, \eta) = \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^{\rho}](x, \xi, \eta) \chi(\xi - \nu_1) \chi(\eta - \nu_2)$$

with $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying that $\text{supp } \widehat{\chi} \subset B_1$ and $|\chi| \geq c > 0$ on $[-1, 1]^n$.

Firstly, let us investigate the support of the Fourier transform of $\sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^{\rho}$. Since $\text{supp } \widehat{\chi} \subset B_1$,

$$(6.1) \quad \text{supp } \mathcal{F}[\sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^{\rho}] \subset B_{2^{k_0+1}} \times B_{2^{k_1+2}} \times B_{2^{k_2+2}}$$

holds. Hence, we will use Lemma 4.4 with $R_0 = 2^{k_0+1}$ and $R_i = 2^{k_i+2}$, $i = 1, 2$.

Secondly, we have

$$(6.2) \quad \|\sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^{\rho}(x, \xi, \eta)\|_{L_{\xi, \eta}^2 L_{ul, x}^2 \ell_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}^{\infty}} \approx \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^{\rho}]\|_{L_{ul}^2((\mathbb{R}^n)^3)}.$$

To see this, we separate the integrals of $L_{\xi, \eta}^2$ by using (2.1). Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^\rho(x + \nu_0, \xi, \eta) \right\|_{L_{\xi, \eta}^2 L_x^2(Q)}^2 \\ &= \sum_{\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \int_{Q^3} \left| \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho](x + \nu_0, \xi + \mu_1, \eta + \mu_2) \chi(\xi + \mu_1 - \nu_1) \chi(\eta + \mu_2 - \nu_2) \right|^2 dX \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \prod_{i=1,2} (1 + |\mu_i - \nu_i|)^{-(n+1)} \int_{Q^3} \left| \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho](x + \nu_0, \xi + \mu_1, \eta + \mu_2) \right|^2 dX \end{aligned}$$

for $\nu_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu} = (\nu_1, \nu_2) \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2$, where $dX = dx d\xi d\eta$. Thus, it holds that

$$\left\| \sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^\rho(x + \nu_0, \xi, \eta) \right\|_{L_{\xi, \eta}^2 L_x^2(Q)} \lesssim \left\| \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho] \right\|_{L_{ul}^2}$$

for $\nu_0, \nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, which yields the inequality $\lesssim$ of (6.2). The opposite inequality $\gtrsim$ of (6.2) can be proved in a similar way by using the fact $|\chi| \geq c > 0$ on $[-1, 1]^n$. Therefore, when we use Lemma 4.4 under the situation $\sigma_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = \sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^\rho$, the equivalence (6.2) allows us to replace $\left\| \sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^\rho \right\| = \left\| \sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^\rho(x, \xi, \eta) \right\|_{L_{\xi, \eta}^2 L_{ul, x}^2 \ell_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}^\infty}$ by $\left\| \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho] \right\|_{L_{ul}^2}$.

6.1. Estimate for I_1 . In this subsection, we consider the dual form I_1 in (5.11). We decompose the factor of f by a Littlewood–Paley partition $\{\psi_\ell\}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ as

$$\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(1)} = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} \Delta_\ell \left[\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(1)} \right] = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} \square_{\nu_1} \Delta_\ell f_j^{(1)}.$$

Then, I_1 can be expressed by

$$I_1 = \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\nu} \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2} I_{j, \mathbf{k}, \ell, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^{(1)}$$

with

$$(6.3) \quad I_{j, \mathbf{k}, \ell, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^{(1)} = 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} \Delta_\ell f_j^{(1)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(1)})(x) h_j(x) dx.$$

The sums over ℓ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ are restricted by the factors $\square_{\nu_1} \Delta_\ell f_j^{(1)}$ and $\square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(1)}$. Firstly, recalling the notation $\square_{\nu_i} = \kappa(D - \nu_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, with $\kappa \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\text{supp } \kappa \subset [-1, 1]^n$, we have by (5.13)

$$(6.4) \quad \nu_1 \in \Lambda_{1, \ell} = \{ \nu_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |\nu_1| \lesssim 2^\ell \}, \quad \nu_2 \in \Lambda_{2, j} = \{ \nu_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |\nu_2| \lesssim 2^{j(1-\rho)} \}.$$

Secondly, from the factor $\Delta_\ell f_j^{(1)}$, we see that $2^{\ell-1} \leq 2^{j(1-\rho)-5}$, which implies that

$$(6.5) \quad \ell \leq j(1-\rho) - 4 \leq j(1-\rho).$$

Note that the set $\{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \ell \leq j(1-\rho) - 4\}$ is not empty, since $j \gg 1$. Hence,

$$I_1 = \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \ell \leq j(1-\rho)} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \Lambda_{1, \ell} \times \Lambda_{2, j}} I_{j, \mathbf{k}, \ell, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^{(1)}.$$

For this expression, we further separate the sum over j as

$$\begin{aligned} (6.6) \quad I_1 &= \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \left\{ \sum_{\substack{j \gg 1: \\ j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + L}} + \sum_{\substack{j \gg 1: \\ j(1-\rho) > k_0 + L}} \right\} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\substack{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0: \\ \ell \leq j(1-\rho)}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \Lambda_{1, \ell} \times \Lambda_{2, j}} I_{j, \mathbf{k}, \ell, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^{(1)} \\ &=: I^{(1,1)} + I^{(1,2)} \end{aligned}$$

for some sufficiently large constant $L > 0$, where $I_{j, \mathbf{k}, \ell, \boldsymbol{\nu}}^{(1)}$ is in (6.3).

6.1.1. *Estimate of $I^{(1,1)}$ in (6.6).* Firstly, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{F} \left[T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho} (\square_{\nu_1} \Delta_\ell f_j^{(1)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(1)}) \right] (\zeta) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2n}} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^2} \mathcal{F}_0[\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho](\zeta - (\xi + \eta), \xi, \eta) \widehat{\square_{\nu_1} \Delta_\ell f_j^{(1)}}(\xi) \widehat{\square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(1)}}(\eta) d\xi d\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the fact $\text{supp } \mathcal{F}_0[\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho](\cdot, \xi, \eta) \subset B_{2^{k_0+1}}$ from (6.1), we have

$$(6.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{supp } \mathcal{F} \left[T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho} (\square_{\nu_1} \Delta_\ell f_j^{(1)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(1)}) \right] \\ & \subset \left\{ \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta - (\xi + \eta)| \leq 2^{k_0+1}, \xi \in \text{supp } \widehat{\square_{\nu_1} \Delta_\ell f_j^{(1)}}, \eta \in \text{supp } \widehat{\square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(1)}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, since we are considering the sum over j such that $j(1 - \rho) \leq k_0 + L$, we have $|\xi|, |\eta| \lesssim 2^{k_0}$ for $\xi \in \text{supp } \widehat{\square_{\nu_1} \Delta_\ell f_j^{(1)}}$ and $\eta \in \text{supp } \widehat{\square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(1)}}$. Hence, by (6.7)

$$\text{supp } \mathcal{F} \left[T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho} (\square_{\nu_1} \Delta_\ell f_j^{(1)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(1)}) \right] \subset \{ \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \lesssim 2^{k_0} \}.$$

We take a function $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\varphi = 1$ on $\{ \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \lesssim 1 \}$. Then, $I^{(1,1)}$ can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(1,1)} &= \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + L} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\ell: \ell \leq j(1-\rho)} \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda_{1,\ell} \times \Lambda_{2,j}} \\ & \times 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho} (\square_{\nu_1} \Delta_\ell f_j^{(1)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(1)})(x) \varphi(D/2^{k_0})[h_j](x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

In what follows, we shall estimate this rewritten $I^{(1,1)}$. Again, recall that $\square_{\nu_i} = \kappa(D - \nu_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, with $\kappa \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\text{supp } \kappa \subset [-1, 1]^n$. Then, since $\min(|\Lambda_{1,\ell}|, |\Lambda_{2,j}|) \lesssim 2^{\ell n}$, we have by Lemma 4.4 (1) with $p = q = 2$ and $r = \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} |I^{(1,1)}| &\lesssim \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + L} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\ell: \ell \leq j(1-\rho)} \\ & \times 2^{-j\rho n} 2^{\ell n/2} 2^{(k_0 + k_1 + k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|\Delta_\ell f_j^{(1)}\|_{L^2} \|g_j^{(1)}\|_{L^2} \|\varphi(D/2^{k_0})[h_j]\|_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, recall the notations of $f_j^{(1)}$, $g_j^{(1)}$, and h_j from (5.12). Then, we have

$$(6.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\Delta_\ell f_j^{(1)}\|_{L^2} &= \|\Delta_\ell [\phi_j'(D) f(2^{-j\rho} \cdot)]\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{j\rho n/2} \|\Delta_{\ell+j\rho} f\|_{L^2}, \\ \|g_j^{(1)}\|_{L^2} &= 2^{j\rho n/2} \|\psi_j'(D) g\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where, $\Delta_{\ell+j\rho} = \psi_\ell(D/2^{j\rho})$ for $\ell \geq 0$. Moreover, since $j(1 - \rho) \leq k_0 + L$, by Lemma 2.2 (1), we have for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$(6.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\varphi(D/2^{k_0})[h_j]\|_{L^\infty} &= \|\varphi(D/2^{k_0+j\rho})h(2^{-j\rho} \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim (1 + k_0 + j\rho) \|h\|_{bmo} \leq C_\varepsilon 2^{k_0\varepsilon} \|h\|_{bmo}. \end{aligned}$$

(The role of the condition $j(1 - \rho) \leq k_0 + L$ is finished by obtaining this estimate.)

Hence, by denoting the Fourier multiplier operator $\psi'_j(D)$ by Δ'_j , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.10) \quad |I^{(1,1)}| &\lesssim \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\ell: \ell \leq j(1-\rho)} \\
&\quad \times 2^{\ell n/2} 2^{k_0(n/2+\varepsilon)} 2^{(k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|\Delta_{\ell+j\rho} f\|_{L^2} \|\Delta'_j g\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{bmo} \\
&\leq \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|h\|_{bmo} \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{\ell: \ell \leq j(1-\rho)} 2^{-j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{\ell n/2} \|\Delta_{\ell+j\rho} f\|_{L^2} \|\Delta'_j g\|_{L^2} \\
&= \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|h\|_{bmo} II,
\end{aligned}$$

where $m = -(1-\rho)n/2$, $\mathbf{s} = (n/2 + \varepsilon, n/2, n/2)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, and

$$(6.11) \quad II := \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{0 \leq \ell \leq j(1-\rho)} 2^{-j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{\ell n/2} \|\Delta_{\ell+j\rho} f\|_{L^2} \|\Delta'_j g\|_{L^2}.$$

In what follows, we shall show that

$$(6.12) \quad II \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2}.$$

To this end, we divide II into the two parts $\ell = 0$ and $\ell \geq 1$. We write

$$(6.13) \quad II = II_{\ell=0} + II_{\ell \geq 1}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
II_{\ell=0} &= \sum_{j \gg 1} 2^{-j(1-\rho)n/2} \|\psi_0(D/2^{j\rho}) f\|_{L^2} \|\Delta'_j g\|_{L^2}, \\
II_{\ell \geq 1} &= \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq j(1-\rho)} 2^{-j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{\ell n/2} \|\psi_\ell(D/2^{j\rho}) f\|_{L^2} \|\Delta'_j g\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The sum for $\ell = 0$ is estimated as

$$(6.14) \quad II_{\ell=0} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2} \sum_{j \gg 1} 2^{-j(1-\rho)n/2} \approx \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2},$$

since $0 \leq \rho < 1$. For the sum in the case $\ell \geq 1$, we take a function $\psi^\dagger \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\psi^\dagger = 1$ on $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : 1/4 \leq |\xi| \leq 4\}$ and $\text{supp } \psi^\dagger \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : 1/8 \leq |\xi| \leq 8\}$. Then, we realize that $\psi^\dagger(\cdot/2^{\ell+[j\rho]}) = 1$ on $\text{supp } \psi_\ell(\cdot/2^{j\rho})$, since $[j\rho] \leq j\rho \leq [j\rho] + 1$. Hence, by writing the operator $\Delta_{\ell+[j\rho]}^\dagger = \psi^\dagger(D/2^{\ell+[j\rho]})$, we have

$$\|\psi_\ell(D/2^{j\rho}) f\|_{L^2} = \|\Delta_{\ell+[j\rho]}^\dagger \psi_\ell(D/2^{j\rho}) f\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\Delta_{\ell+[j\rho]}^\dagger f\|_{L^2}.$$

Therefore, we see that

$$II_{\ell \geq 1} \lesssim \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq j(1-\rho)} 2^{-j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{\ell n/2} \|\Delta_{\ell+[j\rho]}^\dagger f\|_{L^2} \|\Delta'_j g\|_{L^2}.$$

By using the fact $2^{j\rho} \approx 2^{[j\rho]}$ and the translation as $\ell + [j\rho] \mapsto \ell'$, we have

$$II_{\ell \geq 1} \lesssim \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{1 \leq \ell' \leq j} 2^{-jn/2} 2^{\ell' n/2} \|\Delta_{\ell'}^\dagger f\|_{L^2} \|\Delta'_j g\|_{L^2}.$$

Here, we verify that

$$\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sum_{\ell' \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{\ell' \leq j} 2^{-jn/2} 2^{\ell' n/2} \right\} \approx 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\ell' \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{\ell' \leq j} 2^{\ell' n/2} 2^{-jn/2} \right\} \approx 1.$$

Then, we obtain from Lemma 2.1

$$(6.15) \quad \mathcal{I}_{\ell \geq 1} \lesssim \|\Delta_{\ell'}^{\dagger} f\|_{L^2 \ell_{\ell'}^2(\mathbb{N})} \|\Delta_j' g\|_{L^2 \ell_j^2(\mathbb{N})} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2}.$$

Therefore, from (6.13), (6.14), and (6.15), we obtain (6.12).

Finally, collecting (6.10), (6.11), and (6.12), we obtain

$$|I^{(1,1)}| \lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{bmo},$$

where $m = -(1 - \rho)n/2$ and $\mathbf{s} = (n/2 + \varepsilon, n/2, n/2)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

6.1.2. *Estimate for $I^{(1,2)}$ in (6.6).* In this subsection, since we are considering the sum over j such that $j(1 - \rho) > k_0 + L$ with some large $L > 0$, we have by (6.7)

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{supp } \mathcal{F} \left[T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^{\rho}} (\square_{\nu_1} \Delta_{\ell} f_j^{(1)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(1)}) \right] \\ & \subset \left\{ \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta - (\xi + \eta)| \leq 2^{j(1-\rho)+1-L}, \xi \in \text{supp } \widehat{\square_{\nu_1} \Delta_{\ell} f_j^{(1)}}, \eta \in \text{supp } \widehat{\square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(1)}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we recall from (5.14) that if $\xi \in \text{supp } \widehat{f_j^{(1)}}$ and $\eta \in \text{supp } \widehat{g_j^{(1)}}$, then $2^{j(1-\rho)-5} \leq |\xi + \eta| \leq 2^{j(1-\rho)+3}$ holds. Then, we see that

$$(6.16) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{supp } \mathcal{F} \left[T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^{\rho}} (\square_{\nu_1} \Delta_{\ell} f_j^{(1)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(1)}) \right] \\ & \subset \{ \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{j(1-\rho)-6} \leq |\zeta| \leq 2^{j(1-\rho)+4} \}. \end{aligned}$$

We take a function $\psi^{\dagger} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying that $\psi^{\dagger} = 1$ on $\{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{-6} \leq |\zeta| \leq 2^4\}$ and $\text{supp } \psi^{\dagger} \subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{-7} \leq |\zeta| \leq 2^5\}$. Then, $I^{(1,2)}$ can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(1,2)} &= \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + L} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\ell: \ell \leq j(1-\rho)} \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda_{1,\ell} \times \Lambda_{2,j}} \\ & \times 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^{\rho}} (\square_{\nu_1} \Delta_{\ell} f_j^{(1)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(1)})(x) \psi^{\dagger}(D/2^{j(1-\rho)})[h_j](x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

(The role of the condition $j(1 - \rho) > k_0 + L$ is finished by obtaining this expression.)

Now, we shall estimate the newly given $I^{(1,2)}$. Since $\min(|\Lambda_{1,\ell}|, |\Lambda_{2,j}|) \lesssim 2^{\ell n}$, we have by using Lemma 4.4 (1) with $p = q = 2$ and $r = \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} |I^{(1,2)}| &\lesssim \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\ell: \ell \leq j(1-\rho)} \\ & \times 2^{-j\rho n} 2^{\ell n/2} 2^{(k_0 + k_1 + k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^{\rho}]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|\Delta_{\ell} f_j^{(1)}\|_{L^2} \|g_j^{(1)}\|_{L^2} \|\psi^{\dagger}(D/2^{j(1-\rho)})[h_j]\|_{L^{\infty}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, for the factors of f and g , we have the estimate (6.8). For the factor of h , since $\psi^{\dagger}(0) = 0$, we have by Lemma 2.2 (2)

$$\|\psi^{\dagger}(D/2^{j(1-\rho)})[h_j]\|_{L^{\infty}} = \|\psi^{\dagger}(D/2^j)h(2^{-j\rho})\|_{L^{\infty}} \lesssim \|h\|_{BMO}.$$

Therefore, by writing as $\Delta_j' = \psi_j'(D)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I^{(1,2)}| &\lesssim \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\ell: \ell \leq j(1-\rho)} \\ & \times 2^{\ell n/2} 2^{(k_0 + k_1 + k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^{\rho}]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|\Delta_{\ell+j\rho} f\|_{L^2} \|\Delta_j' g\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{BMO} \\ & \leq \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|h\|_{BMO} \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{\ell: \ell \leq j(1-\rho)} 2^{-j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{\ell n/2} \|\Delta_{\ell+j\rho} f\|_{L^2} \|\Delta_j' g\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $m = -(1 - \rho)n/2$ and $\mathbf{s} = (n/2, n/2, n/2)$. Since the sums over j and ℓ are exactly identical with $\mathcal{I}$ defined in (6.11), we see from (6.12) that

$$|I^{(1,2)}| \lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{BMO},$$

where $m = -(1 - \rho)n/2$ and $\mathbf{s} = (n/2, n/2, n/2)$.

6.2. Estimate for I_2 . In this subsection, we consider the dual form I_2 given in (5.15). However, by comparing (5.16) with (5.12), (5.17) with (5.13), and (5.18) with (5.14), we realize that I_2 and I_1 are in symmetrical positions. Moreover, in this section, we are considering the boundedness on $L^2 \times L^2$. Therefore, following the same lines as in Section 6.1, we obtain

$$|I_2| \lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{bmo}$$

with $m = -(1 - \rho)n/2$ and $\mathbf{s} = (n/2 + \varepsilon, n/2, n/2)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

6.3. Estimate for I_3 . In this subsection, we consider the dual form I_3 given in (5.19). As in the previous subsections, we put

$$I_{j,\mathbf{k},\boldsymbol{\nu}}^{(3)} = 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\boldsymbol{\nu}}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(3)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(3)})(x) h_j(x) dx.$$

We separate the sum of I_3 into three parts with slight changes of the way to sum over $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ as follows. For some sufficiently large constants $N > 0$ and $C > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &= \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\substack{j \gg 1: \\ j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + N}} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\nu} \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2} I_{j,\mathbf{k},\boldsymbol{\nu}}^{(3)} \\ &+ \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\substack{j \gg 1: \\ j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N}} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\substack{\tau \in \mathbb{Z}^n: \\ |\tau| \leq C2^{k_0}}} \sum_{\substack{\nu_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^n: \\ \nu_1 + \nu_2 = \tau}} I_{j,\mathbf{k},\boldsymbol{\nu}}^{(3)} \\ &+ \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\substack{j \gg 1: \\ j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N}} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\substack{\tau \in \mathbb{Z}^n: \\ |\tau| > C2^{k_0}}} \sum_{\substack{\nu_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^n: \\ \nu_1 + \nu_2 = \tau}} I_{j,\mathbf{k},\boldsymbol{\nu}}^{(3)} \\ &=: I^{(3,1)} + I^{(3,2)} + I^{(3,3)}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.17}$$

6.3.1. Estimate for $I^{(3,1)}$ in (6.17). By the factors $\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(3)}$ and $\square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(3)}$ with (5.21), we have the restriction of the sum over $\boldsymbol{\nu}$:

$$\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \Lambda_j = \{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |\nu| \lesssim 2^{j(1-\rho)}\}.$$

We next observe that $|\xi|, |\eta| \lesssim 2^{k_0}$ hold for $\xi \in \widehat{\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(3)}}$ and $\eta \in \widehat{\square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(3)}}$, since $j(1 - \rho) \leq k_0 + N$. Then, by referring to the argument around (6.7), we see that

$$\text{supp } \mathcal{F} \left[T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\boldsymbol{\nu}}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(3)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(3)}) \right] \subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \lesssim 2^{k_0}\}.$$

We take a function $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\varphi = 1$ on $\{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \lesssim 1\}$. Then, $I^{(3,1)}$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(3,1)} &= \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + N} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \Lambda_j \times \Lambda_j} \\ &\times 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\boldsymbol{\nu}}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(3)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(3)})(x) \varphi(D/2^{k_0})[h_j](x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.4 (1) with $p = q = 2$, $r = \infty$, and the fact $|\Lambda_j| \lesssim 2^{j(1-\rho)n}$, we have

$$|I^{(3,1)}| \lesssim \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + N} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{-j\rho n} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{(k_0+k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|f_j^{(3)}\|_{L^2} \|g_j^{(3)}\|_{L^2} \|\varphi(D/2^{k_0})[h_j]\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Here, $\|f_j^{(3)}\|_{L^2} = 2^{j\rho n/2} \|\psi_j''(D)f\|_{L^2}$ and $\|g_j^{(3)}\|_{L^2} = 2^{j\rho n/2} \|\psi_j''(D)g\|_{L^2}$ hold from (5.20). Also, since $j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + N$, $\|\varphi(D/2^{k_0})[h_j]\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_\varepsilon 2^{k_0\varepsilon} \|h\|_{bmo}$ holds for $\varepsilon > 0$ from (6.9). (Again, the role of the condition $j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + N$ is finished by obtaining this estimate.) Hence, we obtain from the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned} |I^{(3,1)}| &\lesssim \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{k_0(n/2+\varepsilon)} 2^{(k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|\psi_j''(D)f\|_{L^2} \|\psi_j''(D)g\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{bmo} \\ &\leq \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|h\|_{bmo} \sum_{j \gg 1} \|\psi_j''(D)f\|_{L^2} \|\psi_j''(D)g\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{bmo}, \end{aligned}$$

where $m = -(1-\rho)n/2$ and $\mathbf{s} = (n/2 + \varepsilon, n/2, n/2)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

6.3.2. *Estimate for $I^{(3,2)}$ in (6.17).* We here write $\Lambda_{k_0} = \{\tau \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |\tau| \leq C2^{k_0}\}$.

We shall consider the support of the Fourier transform of $T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho}(\cdots)$. We observe that $|\xi + \eta| \lesssim 2^{k_0}$ holds for $(\xi, \eta) \in \widehat{\text{supp } \square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(3)}} \times \widehat{\text{supp } \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(3)}}$, since $|\xi - \nu_1| \lesssim 1$ and $|\eta - \nu_2| \lesssim 1$ for this (ξ, η) and $\nu_1 + \nu_2 = \tau \in \Lambda_{k_0}$ in the sum of $I^{(3,2)}$. Then, by referring to the argument around (6.7),

$$\text{supp } \mathcal{F} \left[T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(3)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(3)}) \right] \subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \lesssim 2^{k_0}\}.$$

Take a function $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\varphi = 1$ on $\{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \lesssim 1\}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(3,2)} &= \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\tau \in \Lambda_{k_0}} \sum_{\nu_1: \nu_1 + \nu_2 = \tau} \\ &\quad \times 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(3)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(3)})(x) \varphi(D/2^{k_0})[h_j](x) dz. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we shall estimate this $I^{(3,2)}$. By Lemma 4.4 (3) with $p = q = 2$ and $r = \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} |I^{(3,2)}| &\lesssim \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{-j\rho n} 2^{k_0 n/2} 2^{(k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|f_j^{(3)}\|_{L^2} \|g_j^{(3)}\|_{L^2} \|\varphi(D/2^{k_0})[h_j]\|_{\ell_\tau^2(\Lambda_{k_0})L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, recalling (5.20), we have $\|f_j^{(3)}\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{j\rho n/2} \|f\|_{L^2}$ and $\|g_j^{(3)}\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{j\rho n/2} \|g\|_{L^2}$. Moreover, since $\varphi(D/2^{k_0})[h_j]$ is independent of τ , we have by Lemma 2.2 (1)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi(D/2^{k_0})[h_j]\|_{\ell_\tau^2(\Lambda_{k_0})L^\infty} &= |\Lambda_{k_0}|^{1/2} \|\varphi(D/2^{k_0})[h_j]\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim 2^{k_0 n/2} (1 + k_0 + j\rho) \|h\|_{bmo} \leq 2^{k_0 n/2} (1 + j) \|h\|_{bmo}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the condition $j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N$ in the last inequality. From these,

$$\begin{aligned}
|I^{(3,2)}| &\lesssim \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \\
&\quad \times (1+j) 2^{k_0 n/2} 2^{(k_0+k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{bmo} \\
&\leq \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \left\{ \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{(k_0+k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \right\} \\
&\quad \times 2^{k_0 n/2} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N} (1+j) 2^{-j(1-\rho)n/2} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{bmo}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have for $0 < \varepsilon < n/2$

$$\sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N} (1+j) 2^{-j(1-\rho)n/2} \leq C_{\varepsilon, \rho} 2^{-k_0(n/2-\varepsilon)}, \quad k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

since $0 \leq \rho < 1$. Therefore, we obtain

$$|I^{(3,2)}| \lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho, \rho}^{m, *}(s; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{bmo},$$

where $m = -(1-\rho)n/2$ and $s = (n/2 + \varepsilon, n/2, n/2)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

6.3.3. *Estimate for $I^{(3,3)}$ in (6.17).* The sum over τ is further restricted to

$$\tau \in \Lambda_{j, k_0} = \{\tau \in \mathbb{Z}^n : C 2^{k_0} < |\tau| \lesssim 2^{j(1-\rho)}\},$$

by the factors $\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(3)}$ and $\square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(3)}$. Here, note that the set Λ_{j, k_0} is not empty, since $j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N$ with a sufficiently large N . Moreover, referring to the argument around (6.7), we have

$$\text{supp } \mathcal{F} \left[T_{\sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \nu}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(3)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(3)}) \right] \subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta - \tau| \lesssim 2^{k_0}\},$$

since $|\xi - \nu_1| \lesssim 1$ and $|\eta - \nu_2| \lesssim 1$ hold for $\xi \in \widehat{\text{supp } \square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(3)}}$ and $\eta \in \widehat{\text{supp } \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(3)}}$, where $\nu_1 + \nu_2 = \tau$. We take a function $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\varphi = 1$ on $\{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \lesssim 1\}$. Then, $I^{(3,3)}$ can be rewritten by

$$\begin{aligned}
I^{(3,3)} &= \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\tau \in \Lambda_{j, k_0}} \sum_{\nu_1: \nu_1 + \nu_2 = \tau} \\
&\quad \times 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \nu}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(3)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(3)})(x) \varphi\left(\frac{D + \tau}{2^{k_0}}\right) [h_j](x) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we shall estimate this $I^{(3,3)}$. By Lemma 4.4 (3) with $p = q = 2$ and $r = \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|I^{(3,3)}| &\lesssim \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \\
&\quad \times 2^{-j\rho n} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{(k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|f_j^{(3)}\|_{L^2} \|g_j^{(3)}\|_{L^2} \left\| \varphi\left(\frac{D + \tau}{2^{k_0}}\right) [h_j] \right\|_{\ell_\tau^2(\Lambda_{j, k_0}) L^\infty}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, from (5.20), $\|f_j^{(3)}\|_{L^2} = 2^{j\rho n/2} \|\psi_j''(D)f\|_{L^2}$ and $\|g_j^{(3)}\|_{L^2} = 2^{j\rho n/2} \|\psi_j''(D)g\|_{L^2}$. Moreover, since $\varphi(\tau/2^{k_0}) = 0$ for $\tau \in \Lambda_{j, k_0}$, we see from Lemma 4.2 (2) that

$$\left\| \varphi\left(\frac{D + \tau}{2^{k_0}}\right) [h_j] \right\|_{\ell_\tau^2(\Lambda_{j, k_0}) L^\infty} \lesssim 2^{k_0 n/2} \|h(2^{-j\rho \cdot})\|_{BMO} = 2^{k_0 n/2} \|h\|_{BMO}.$$

Here, it is remarkable that BMO is scaling invariant, that is, $\|f(\lambda \cdot)\|_{BMO} = \|f\|_{BMO}$ for $\lambda > 0$, although the space bmo is not so in general. See, e.g., [11, Proposition 3.1.2 (6)]. Hence, we obtain from the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
|I^{(3,3)}| &\lesssim \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \\
&\quad \times 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{(k_0+k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|\psi_j''(D)f\|_{L^2} \|\psi_j''(D)g\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{BMO} \\
&\leq \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|h\|_{BMO} \sum_{j \gg 1} \|\psi_j''(D)f\|_{L^2} \|\psi_j''(D)g\|_{L^2} \\
&\lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{BMO},
\end{aligned}$$

where $m = -(1 - \rho)n/2$ and $\mathbf{s} = (n/2, n/2, n/2)$.

6.4. Estimate for I_0 . In this subsection, we consider I_0 in (5.9). Considering $\square_{\nu_1} f_j$ and $\square_{\nu_2} g_j$, we see from (5.10) that $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ satisfy that $|\nu_1| \lesssim 1$ and $|\nu_2| \lesssim 1$, since $j \lesssim 1$. Moreover, we see that $\text{supp } \mathcal{F}[T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f_j, \square_{\nu_2} g_j)] \subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \lesssim 2^{k_0}\}$. We take a function $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\varphi = 1$ on $\{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \lesssim 1\}$. Then, by Lemma 4.4 (2) and Lemma 2.2 (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_0| &\leq \sum_{j \lesssim 1} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} \sum_{|\nu_1|, |\nu_2| \lesssim 1} 2^{-j\rho n} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f_j, \square_{\nu_2} g_j)(x) \varphi(D/2^{k_0})[h_j](x) dx \right| \\
&\lesssim \sum_{j \lesssim 1} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} 2^{(k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|f_j\|_{L^2} \|g_j\|_{L^2} \|\varphi(D/2^{k_0})[h_j]\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\lesssim \sum_{j \lesssim 1} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} (1 + k_0) 2^{(k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{bmo} \\
&\lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{bmo},
\end{aligned}$$

where $m = -(1 - \rho)n/2$ and $\mathbf{s} = (\varepsilon, n/2, n/2)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

Remark 6.1. The conclusion requiring the class $BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)$ is only in Section 6.3.2. The conclusions in the other subsections hold for the wider class $BS_{\rho,\rho}^m(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)$.

7. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.3

In this section we prove Theorem 3.3. To this end, we will estimate the dual forms I_i , $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$, given in (5.9), (5.11), (5.15), and (5.19), by a constant times

$$\|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{bmo} \|h\|_{L^2}$$

for $m = -(1 - \rho)n/2$ and $\mathbf{s} = (n/2, n/2, n/2)$. Then, these complete the proof of Theorem 3.3. The basic idea of the proof here again goes back to [22].

We will again use Lemma 4.4 under the setting $\sigma_\nu = \sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho$. Hence, from the same reasons as stated in Section 6, we will use the lemma with $R_0 = 2^{k_0+1}$, $R_i = 2^{k_i+2}$, $i = 1, 2$, and the equivalence (6.2). Now, we shall start the proof of Theorem 3.3.

7.1. Estimate for I_1 . In this subsection, we consider the dual form I_1 given in (5.11). As was done in the previous subsections, we divide the sum over j as follows.

For some sufficiently large constant $L > 0$,

$$(7.1) \quad I_1 = \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \left\{ \sum_{\substack{j \gg 1: \\ j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + L}} + \sum_{\substack{j \gg 1: \\ j(1-\rho) > k_0 + L}} \right\} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\nu \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2} I_{j, \mathbf{k}, \nu}^{(1)} \\ =: I^{(1,1)} + I^{(1,2)}$$

with

$$I_{j, \mathbf{k}, \nu}^{(1)} = 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \nu}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(1)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(1)})(x) h_j(x) dx.$$

7.1.1. *Estimate for $I^{(1,1)}$ in (7.1).* The sum over ν of $I^{(1,1)}$ is restricted to

$$\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \Lambda_j = \{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |\nu| \lesssim 2^{j(1-\rho)}\},$$

because of the factors $\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(1)}$ and $\square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(1)}$ with (5.13). Hence, $I^{(1,1)}$ is rewritten by

$$I^{(1,1)} = \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + L} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda_j \times \Lambda_j} I_{j, \mathbf{k}, \nu}^{(1)}.$$

By Lemma 4.4 (2) with $p = r = 2$ and $q = \infty$, we have

$$|I^{(1,1)}| \lesssim \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + L} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \\ \times 2^{-j\rho n} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{(k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|f_j^{(1)}\|_{L^2} \|g_j^{(1)}\|_{L^\infty} \|h_j\|_{L^2}.$$

Here, $\|f_j^{(1)}\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{j\rho n/2} \|f\|_{L^2}$ and $\|h_j\|_{L^2} = 2^{j\rho n/2} \|h\|_{L^2}$ hold. Moreover, it holds from Lemma 2.2 (2) that

$$(7.2) \quad \|g_j^{(1)}\|_{L^\infty} = \|\psi_j'(D)g(2^{-j\rho \cdot})\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|g\|_{BMO}.$$

Hence, since $\sum_{j: j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + L} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} \lesssim 2^{k_0 n/2}$, we have

$$|I^{(1,1)}| \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{BMO} \|h\|_{L^2} \\ \times \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + L} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \left\{ \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{(k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \right\} \\ \lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho, \rho}^{m, *}(s; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{BMO} \|h\|_{L^2},$$

where $m = -(1 - \rho)n/2$ and $s = (n/2, n/2, n/2)$.

7.1.2. *Estimate for $I^{(1,2)}$ in (7.1).* We follow the same lines as in Section 6.1.

We use a Littlewood–Paley partition on $\mathbb{R}^n$ to decompose $\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(1)}$ as $\sum_{\ell} \square_{\nu_1} \Delta_{\ell} f_j^{(1)}$. Then, the sum over ν is restricted to $\nu_1 \in \Lambda_{1, \ell} = \{\nu_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |\nu_1| \lesssim 2^{\ell}\}$ and $\nu_2 \in \Lambda_{2, j} = \{\nu_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |\nu_2| \lesssim 2^{j(1-\rho)}\}$ (see (6.4)), and the sum over ℓ is restricted to $\ell \leq j(1 - \rho)$ (see (6.5)). Moreover, recall (6.16) and take a function $\psi^\dagger \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\psi^\dagger = 1$ on $\{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{-6} \leq |\zeta| \leq 2^4\}$ and $\text{supp } \psi^\dagger \subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{-7} \leq |\zeta| \leq 2^5\}$. Then, $I^{(1,2)}$ can be expressed as

$$I^{(1,2)} = \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + L} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\ell: \ell \leq j(1-\rho)} \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda_{1, \ell} \times \Lambda_{2, j}} \\ \times 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \nu}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} \Delta_{\ell} f_j^{(1)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(1)})(x) \psi^\dagger(D/2^{j(1-\rho)})[h_j](x) dx.$$

We shall estimate this new $I^{(1,2)}$. We use Lemma 4.4 (1) with $p = r = 2$ and $q = \infty$ to the sum over ν , and use the fact $\min(|\Lambda_{1,\ell}|, |\Lambda_{2,j}|) \lesssim 2^{\ell n}$ to have

$$|I^{(1,2)}| \lesssim \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\ell: \ell \leq j(1-\rho)} \times 2^{-j\rho n} 2^{\ell n/2} 2^{(k_0+k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|\Delta_\ell f_j^{(1)}\|_{L^2} \|g_j^{(1)}\|_{L^\infty} \|\psi^\dagger(D/2^{j(1-\rho)})[h_j]\|_{L^2}.$$

Here, $\|\Delta_\ell f_j^{(1)}\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{j\rho n/2} \|\Delta_{\ell+j\rho} f\|_{L^2}$ and $\|g_j^{(1)}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|g\|_{BMO}$ hold (see (6.8) and (7.2), respectively). Also, $\|\psi^\dagger(D/2^{j(1-\rho)})[h_j]\|_{L^2} = 2^{j\rho n/2} \|\psi^\dagger(D/2^j)h\|_{L^2}$. Hence, by denoting $\psi^\dagger(D/2^j)$ by $\Delta_j^\dagger$, we have

$$|I^{(1,2)}| \lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|g\|_{BMO} \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{\ell: \ell \leq j(1-\rho)} 2^{-j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{\ell n/2} \|\Delta_{\ell+j\rho} f\|_{L^2} \|\Delta_j^\dagger h\|_{L^2},$$

$$\lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{BMO} \|h\|_{L^2},$$

where $m = -(1-\rho)n/2$ and $\mathbf{s} = (n/2, n/2, n/2)$, since the sums over j and ℓ are identical with $\mathcal{I}$ in (6.11) whose factor $\|\Delta_j^{(1)} g\|_{L^2}$ is replaced by $\|\Delta_j^\dagger h\|_{L^2}$ and the inequality $\|\Delta_j^\dagger h\|_{L^2 \ell^2(\mathbb{N})} \lesssim \|h\|_{L^2}$ holds.

7.2. Estimate for I_2 . As in the previous sections, we divide the sum of I_2 defined in (5.15) as follows. For some sufficiently large constants $M > 0$ and $C > 0$,

$$(7.3) \quad \begin{aligned} I_2 &= \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} \sum_{\substack{\nu_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \\ \nu_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^n: |\nu_2| \leq C}} I_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^{(2)} \\ &+ \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\substack{j \gg 1: \\ j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + M}} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\substack{\nu_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \\ \nu_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^n: |\nu_2| > C}} I_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^{(2)} \\ &+ \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\substack{j \gg 1 \\ j(1-\rho) > k_0 + M}} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\substack{\nu_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \\ \nu_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^n: |\nu_2| > C}} I_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^{(2)} \\ &=: I^{(2,1)} + I^{(2,2)} + I^{(2,3)} \end{aligned}$$

with

$$I_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^{(2)} = 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(2)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(2)})(x) h_j(x) dx.$$

7.2.1. Estimate for $I^{(2,1)}$ in (7.3). We write $\Lambda_2 = \{\nu_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |\nu_2| \leq C\}$ and observe that $\min(|\mathbb{Z}^n|, |\Lambda_2|) \lesssim 1$. Then, by Lemma 4.4 (1) with $p = r = 2$ and $q = \infty$

$$|I^{(2,1)}| \lesssim \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} 2^{-j\rho n} 2^{(k_0+k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|f_j^{(2)}\|_{L^2} \|g_j^{(2)}\|_{L^\infty} \|h_j\|_{L^2}.$$

Here, we have $\|f_j^{(2)}\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{j\rho n/2} \|f\|_{L^2}$ and $\|h_j\|_{L^2} = 2^{j\rho n/2} \|h\|_{L^2}$ by (5.16), and

$$\|g_j^{(2)}\|_{L^\infty} = \|\phi_j^{(2)}(D)g(2^{-j\rho \cdot})\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim (1+j)\|g\|_{bmo}$$

by Lemma 2.2 (1). Hence, recalling the assumption $0 \leq \rho < 1$, we obtain

$$|I^{(2,1)}| \lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{bmo} \|h\|_{L^2} \sum_{j \gg 1} (1+j) 2^{-j(1-\rho)n/2}$$

$$\lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{bmo} \|h\|_{L^2},$$

where $m = -(1-\rho)n/2$ and $\mathbf{s} = (n/2, n/2, n/2)$.

7.2.2. *Estimate for $I^{(2,2)}$ in (7.3).* The sum over ν is restricted to

$$\nu_1 \in \{\nu_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |\nu_1| \lesssim 2^{j(1-\rho)}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_2 \in \{\nu_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^n : C < |\nu_2| \lesssim 2^{j(1-\rho)}\}.$$

Denote by $\Lambda_{2,j}$ the set to which ν_2 belongs. Then, we have by Lemma 4.4 (2) with $p = r = 2$ and $q = \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} |I^{(2,2)}| &\lesssim \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + M} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{-j\rho n} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{(k_1+k_2)n/2} \\ &\quad \times \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|f_j^{(2)}\|_{L^2} \|\square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(2)}\|_{\ell_{\nu_2}^2(\Lambda_{2,j})L^\infty} \|h_j\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we have $\|f_j^{(2)}\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{j\rho n/2} \|f\|_{L^2}$ and $\|h_j\|_{L^2} = 2^{j\rho n/2} \|h\|_{L^2}$. Moreover, we have

$$(7.4) \quad \|\square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(2)}\|_{\ell_{\nu_2}^2(\Lambda_{2,j})L^\infty} \lesssim \|g\|_{BMO}.$$

To see this, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(2)}(x) &= \kappa(D - \nu_2) [\phi_j'(D) g(2^{-j\rho} \cdot)](x) \\ &= \kappa(D - \nu_2) \phi'(D/2^{j(1-\rho)}) [g(2^{-j\rho} \cdot)](x) \end{aligned}$$

and also that $\kappa(-\nu_2) = 0$ for $\nu_2 \in \Lambda_{2,j}$, since $\text{supp } \kappa \subset [-1, 1]^n$. Then, by Corollary 4.3 and the scaling invariance of the space BMO , we have

$$\|\square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(2)}\|_{\ell_{\nu_2}^2(\Lambda_{2,j})L^\infty} \lesssim \|g(2^{-j\rho} \cdot)\|_{BMO} = \|g\|_{BMO}.$$

Therefore, since $\sum_{j: j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + M} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} \lesssim 2^{k_0 n/2}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |I^{(2,2)}| &\lesssim \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{BMO} \|h\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad \times \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + M} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \left\{ \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{(k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \right\} \\ &\lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{BMO} \|h\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $m = -(1-\rho)n/2$ and $\mathbf{s} = (n/2, n/2, n/2)$.

7.2.3. *Estimate for $I^{(2,3)}$ in (7.3).* The sum over ν in $I^{(2,3)}$ is restricted to

$$\nu_1 \in \Lambda_{1,j} = \{\nu_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |\nu_1| \lesssim 2^{j(1-\rho)}\}, \quad \nu_2 \in \Lambda_{2,j} = \{\nu_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^n : C < |\nu_2| \lesssim 2^{j(1-\rho)}\}.$$

Moreover, recalling the argument around (6.16), in the sum over j such that $j(1-\rho) > k_0 + M$, we have

$$\text{supp } \mathcal{F} \left[T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(2)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(2)}) \right] \subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{j(1-\rho)-6} \leq |\zeta| \leq 2^{j(1-\rho)+4}\},$$

since $2^{j(1-\rho)-5} \leq |\xi + \eta| \leq 2^{j(1-\rho)+3}$ holds for $\xi \in \widehat{\text{supp } f_j^{(2)}}$ and $\eta \in \widehat{\text{supp } g_j^{(2)}}$ (see (5.18)). Hence, by taking a function $\psi^\dagger \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\psi^\dagger = 1$ on $\{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{-6} \leq |\zeta| \leq 2^4\}$ and $\text{supp } \psi^\dagger \subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{-7} \leq |\zeta| \leq 2^5\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(2,3)} &= \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + M} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda_{1,j} \times \Lambda_{2,j}} \\ &\quad \times 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(2)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(2)})(x) \psi^\dagger(D/2^{j(1-\rho)})[h_j](x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we shall estimate the rewritten $I^{(2,3)}$ above. Using Lemma 4.4 with $p = r = 2$ and $q = \infty$ and recalling the estimate (7.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|I^{(2,3)}| &\lesssim \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{-j\rho n} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{(k_0+k_1+k_2)n/2} \\
&\quad \times \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|f_j^{(2)}\|_{L^2} \|\square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(2)}\|_{\ell_{\nu_2}^2(\Lambda_{2,j})L^\infty} \|\psi^\dagger(D/2^{j(1-\rho)})[h_j]\|_{L^2} \\
&\lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|g\|_{BMO} \sum_{j \gg 1} \|\psi_j''(D)f\|_{L^2} \|\psi^\dagger(D/2^j)h\|_{L^2} \\
&\lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{BMO} \|h\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where $m = -(1-\rho)n/2$ and $\mathbf{s} = (n/2, n/2, n/2)$.

7.3. Estimate for I_3 . As in Section 6.3, we split the sum into two parts and slightly change the way to sum over ν . For some sufficiently large $N > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(7.5) \quad I_3 &= \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\substack{j \gg 1: \\ j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + N}} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\nu \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2} I_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^{(3)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\substack{j \gg 1: \\ j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N}} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \sum_{\substack{\nu_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^n: \\ \nu_1 + \nu_2 = \tau}} I_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^{(3)} \\
&=: I^{(3,1)} + I^{(3,2)}
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$I_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^{(3)} = 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(3)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(3)})(x) h_j(x) dx.$$

7.3.1. Estimate of $I^{(3,1)}$ in (7.5). The sum over ν is restricted to $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |\nu| \lesssim 2^{j(1-\rho)}\}$. Then, by Lemma 4.4 (2) with $p = r = 2$ and $q = \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|I^{(3,1)}| &\lesssim \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + N} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \\
&\quad \times 2^{-j\rho n} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{(k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|f_j^{(3)}\|_{L^2} \|g_j^{(3)}\|_{L^\infty} \|h_j\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, since $\|g_j^{(3)}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|g\|_{BMO}$ from Lemma 2.2 (2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|I^{(3,1)}| &\lesssim \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{BMO} \|h\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad \times \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) \leq k_0 + N} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \left\{ \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{(k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \right\} \\
&\lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,*}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{BMO} \|h\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where $m = -(1-\rho)n/2$ and $\mathbf{s} = (n/2, n/2, n/2)$.

7.3.2. Estimate of $I^{(3,2)}$ in (7.5). Let $\{\psi_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be the Littlewood–Paley partition of unity on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then, it holds that

$$\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} \psi_\ell(\zeta/2^{k_0}) = 1, \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

By using this, we further decompose $I^{(3,2)}$ as follows:

$$I^{(3,2)} = \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \sum_{\nu_1: \nu_1 + \nu_2 = \tau} I_{j,\mathbf{k},\ell,\nu}^{(3)}$$

with

$$I_{j,\mathbf{k},\ell,\nu}^{(3)} = 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(3)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(3)})(x) \psi_\ell(D/2^{k_0})[h_j](x) dx.$$

As in the previous sections, observe that

$$\text{supp } \mathcal{F} \left[T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(3)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(3)}) \right] \subset \{ \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta - \tau| \lesssim 2^{k_0} \}$$

and take a function $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\varphi = 1$ on $\{ \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \lesssim 1 \}$. Then, $I_{j,\mathbf{k},\ell,\nu}^{(3)}$ can be rewritten as

(7.6)

$$I_{j,\mathbf{k},\ell,\nu}^{(3)} = 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j,\mathbf{k},\nu}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f_j^{(3)}, \square_{\nu_2} g_j^{(3)})(x) \varphi \left(\frac{D + \tau}{2^{k_0}} \right) \psi_\ell(D/2^{k_0})[h_j](x) dx.$$

We next investigate restrictions of ℓ and τ by considering the multipliers operated to h_j . Observe that $|\nu_1|, |\nu_2| \lesssim 2^{j(1-\rho)}$ with $\nu_2 = \tau - \nu_1$. Then, since $j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N$,

$$(7.7) \quad \text{supp } \varphi \left(\frac{\cdot + \tau}{2^{k_0}} \right) \subset \{ \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta + \tau| \lesssim 2^{k_0} \}$$

$$(7.8) \quad \subset \{ \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \lesssim 2^{j(1-\rho)} \}.$$

Furthermore,

$$(7.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{supp } \psi_0(\cdot/2^{k_0}) &\subset \{ \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \leq 2^{k_0+1} \}, \quad \text{if } \ell = 0, \\ \text{supp } \psi_\ell(\cdot/2^{k_0}) &\subset \{ \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{k_0+\ell-1} \leq |\zeta| \leq 2^{k_0+\ell+1} \}, \quad \text{if } \ell \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

From (7.8) and (7.9), the sum over ℓ is restricted to

$$\ell \in \Omega_{j,k_0} = \{ \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \ell \leq j(1-\rho) - k_0 + C \}$$

with a suitable constant $C > 0$ depending on dimensions. From (7.7) and (7.9), the sum over τ is restricted to

$$\tau \in \Lambda_{k_0,\ell} = \{ \tau \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |\tau| \lesssim 2^{k_0+\ell} \}.$$

Therefore, with $I_{j,\mathbf{k},\ell,\nu}^{(3)}$ newly given in (7.6), $I^{(3,2)}$ can be rewritten by

$$I^{(3,2)} = \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_{j,k_0}} \sum_{\tau \in \Lambda_{k_0,\ell}} \sum_{\nu_1: \nu_1 + \nu_2 = \tau} I_{j,\mathbf{k},\ell,\nu}^{(3)}.$$

We shall estimate this new $I^{(3,2)}$. By Lemma 4.4 (3) with $p = r = 2$ and $q = \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} |I^{(3,2)}| &\lesssim \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_{j,k_0}} 2^{-j\rho n} 2^{(k_0+\ell)n/2} 2^{(k_1+k_2)n/2} \\ &\quad \times \left\| \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho] \right\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|f_j^{(3)}\|_{L^2} \|g_j^{(3)}\|_{L^\infty} \left\| \varphi \left(\frac{D + \tau}{2^{k_0}} \right) \psi_\ell(D/2^{k_0})[h_j] \right\|_{\ell_\tau^2(\Lambda_{k_0,\ell}) L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\|g_j^{(3)}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|g\|_{BMO}$ hold from Lemma 2.2 (2). Moreover, we have by Lemma 4.2 (1) and changes of variable

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \varphi \left(\frac{D + \tau}{2^{k_0}} \right) \psi_\ell(D/2^{k_0})[h_j] \right\|_{\ell_\tau^2(\mathbb{Z}^n) L^2} &\lesssim 2^{k_0 n/2} \|\psi_\ell(D/2^{k_0})[h_j]\|_{L^2} \\ &= 2^{k_0 n/2} 2^{j\rho n/2} \|\psi_\ell(D/2^{k_0+j\rho})h\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by denoting the operators $\psi_j''(D)$ by Δ_j'' and $\psi_\ell(D/2^{k_0+j\rho})$ by $\Delta_{\ell+k_0+j\rho}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(7.10) \quad & |I^{(3,2)}| \lesssim \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N} \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_{j, k_0}} 2^{(k_0+\ell)n/2} 2^{(k_0+k_1+k_2)n/2} \\
& \times \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|\Delta_j'' f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{BMO} \|\Delta_{\ell+k_0+j\rho} h\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq \|g\|_{BMO} \sum_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \left\{ \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{j(1-\rho)n/2} 2^{(k_0+k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \right\} \\
& \times \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N} \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_{j, k_0}} 2^{(k_0+\ell)n/2} 2^{-j(1-\rho)n/2} \|\Delta_j'' f\|_{L^2} \|\Delta_{\ell+k_0+j\rho} h\|_{L^2} \\
& \leq \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho, \rho}^{m, *}(s; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|g\|_{BMO} \sup_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0} \mathcal{I}_{k_0}
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\mathcal{I}_{k_0} = \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N} \sum_{\ell \in \Omega_{j, k_0}} 2^{(k_0+\ell)n/2} 2^{-j(1-\rho)n/2} \|\Delta_j'' f\|_{L^2} \|\Delta_{\ell+k_0+j\rho} h\|_{L^2}.$$

We shall estimate $\mathcal{I}_{k_0}$ and prove that this is bounded by a constant times $\|f\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{L^2}$ for all $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The way to estimate $\mathcal{I}_{k_0}$ is almost the same as was done to have (6.12). We divide $\mathcal{I}_{k_0}$ into the two parts $\ell = 0$ and $\ell \geq 1$. That is,

$$(7.11) \quad \mathcal{I}_{k_0} = \mathcal{I}_{k_0}^{\ell=0} + \mathcal{I}_{k_0}^{\ell \geq 1}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_{k_0}^{\ell=0} &= \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N} 2^{k_0 n/2} 2^{-j(1-\rho)n/2} \|\Delta_j'' f\|_{L^2} \|\psi_0(D/2^{k_0+j\rho}) h\|_{L^2}, \\
\mathcal{I}_{k_0}^{\ell \geq 1} &= \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cap \Omega_{j, k_0}} 2^{(k_0+\ell)n/2} 2^{-j(1-\rho)n/2} \|\Delta_j'' f\|_{L^2} \|\psi_\ell(D/2^{k_0+j\rho}) h\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the first sum $\mathcal{I}_{k_0}^{\ell=0}$, we have

$$(7.12) \quad \mathcal{I}_{k_0}^{\ell=0} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{L^2} \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N} 2^{k_0 n/2} 2^{-j(1-\rho)n/2} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{L^2}.$$

We next consider the second sum $\mathcal{I}_{k_0}^{\ell \geq 1}$. We take a function $\psi^\dagger \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\psi^\dagger = 1$ on $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : 1/4 \leq |\xi| \leq 4\}$ and $\text{supp } \psi^\dagger \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : 1/8 \leq |\xi| \leq 8\}$. Then, by writing as $\Delta_{\ell+k_0+j\rho}^\dagger = \psi^\dagger(D/2^{\ell+k_0+j\rho})$, we have

$$\|\psi_\ell(D/2^{k_0+j\rho}) h\|_{L^2} = \|\Delta_{\ell+k_0+j\rho}^\dagger \psi_\ell(D/2^{k_0+j\rho}) h\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\Delta_{\ell+k_0+j\rho}^\dagger h\|_{L^2}.$$

From this and the fact $2^{j\rho} \approx 2^{[j\rho]}$, it holds that

$$\mathcal{I}_{k_0}^{\ell \geq 1} \lesssim \sum_{j: j(1-\rho) > k_0 + N} \sum_{\ell: 1 \leq \ell \leq j(1-\rho) - k_0 + C} 2^{(\ell+k_0+[j\rho])n/2} 2^{-jn/2} \|\Delta_j'' f\|_{L^2} \|\Delta_{\ell+k_0+j\rho}^\dagger h\|_{L^2}.$$

Changing the sum of ℓ as $\ell + k_0 + [j\rho] \mapsto \ell'$, we have by Lemma 2.1

$$(7.13) \quad \mathcal{I}_{k_0}^{\ell \geq 1} \lesssim \sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{\ell': 1 \leq \ell' \leq j+C} 2^{\ell' n/2} 2^{-jn/2} \|\Delta_j'' f\|_{L^2} \|\Delta_{\ell'}^\dagger h\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{L^2}.$$

Lastly, collecting (7.10), (7.11), (7.12), and (7.13), we obtain that

$$|I^{(3,2)}| \lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho, \rho}^{m, *}(s; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{BMO} \|h\|_{L^2},$$

where $m = -(1-\rho)n/2$ and $s = (n/2, n/2, n/2)$.

7.4. Estimate for I_0 . In this section, we consider I_0 in (5.9). Considering $\square_{\nu_1} f_j$ and $\square_{\nu_1} g_j$, we see from (5.10) that $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ satisfy that $|\nu_1|, |\nu_2| \lesssim 1$, since $j \lesssim 1$. Hence, we have by Lemma 4.4 (2) with $p = r = 2$, $r = \infty$ and Lemma 2.2 (1),

$$\begin{aligned} |I_0| &\leq \sum_{j \lesssim 1} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} \sum_{|\nu_1|, |\nu_2| \lesssim 1} 2^{-j\rho n} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \nu}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f_j, \square_{\nu_2} g_j)(x) h_j(x) dx \right| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j \lesssim 1} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} 2^{-j\rho n} 2^{(k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|f_j\|_{L^2} \|g_j\|_{L^\infty} \|h_j\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho, \rho}^{m, *}(s; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{bmo} \|h\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $m = -(1 - \rho)n/2$ and $\mathbf{s} = (0, n/2, n/2)$.

8. SHARPNESS OF THEOREM 1.1

In this section, we consider the sharpness of the conditions of the order m and the smoothness $\mathbf{s} = (s_0, s_1, s_2)$ stated in Theorem 1.1.

8.1. Sharpness of the order m . In this subsection, we show the following.

Proposition 8.1. *Let $0 \leq \rho < 1$, $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{s} = (s_0, s_1, s_2) \in [0, \infty)^3$, and $1 \leq r \leq 2 \leq p, q \leq \infty$ satisfy $1/p + 1/q = 1/r$. If all bilinear pseudo-differential operators with symbols in $BS_{\rho, \rho}^m(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)$ are bounded from $L^p \times L^q$ to L^r , then $m \leq -(1 - \rho)n/2$.*

This is immediately obtained by the fact that $BS_{\rho, \rho}^m(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset BS_{\rho, \rho}^m(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)$, $\mathbf{s} \in [0, \infty)^3$, from Lemma 3.5 and the following theorem proved by Miyachi–Tomita [20, Theorem A.2].

Theorem 8.2. *Let $0 \leq \rho < 1$, $m \in \mathbb{R}$, and $1 \leq r \leq 2 \leq p, q \leq \infty$ satisfy $1/p + 1/q = 1/r$. If all bilinear pseudo-differential operators with symbols in $BS_{\rho, \rho}^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are bounded from $L^p \times L^q$ to L^r , then $m \leq -(1 - \rho)n/2$.*

8.2. Sharpness of the smoothness s_1 and s_2 . In this subsection, we show the following. The idea of the proof comes from Miyachi–Tomita [21, Section 7].

Proposition 8.3. *Let $0 \leq \rho < 1$, $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{s} = (s_0, s_1, s_2) \in (0, \infty)^3$, and $1 \leq p, q, r \leq \infty$ satisfy $1/p + 1/q = 1/r$. Suppose that the inequality*

$$(8.1) \quad \|T_\sigma(f, g)\|_{L^r} \lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho, \rho}^m(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^p} \|g\|_{L^q}$$

holds for all $\sigma \in BS_{\rho, \rho}^m(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, $s_1, s_2 \geq n/2$.

We will use the following fact. See, e.g., [25, Proposition 1.1 (i)].

Lemma 8.4. *Let $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$ and $s > 0$. Then, we have*

$$\|f(\lambda \cdot)\|_{B_{p, q}^s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \lambda^{-n/p} \max(1, \lambda^s) \|f\|_{B_{p, q}^s(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \quad \lambda > 0.$$

Proof of Proposition 8.3. It suffices to prove $s_1 \geq n/2$. Let $u, v \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfy that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp } \widehat{u} &\subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\xi| \leq 1\}, \\ \text{supp } \widehat{v} &\subset \{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 9/10 \leq |\eta| \leq 11/10\}, \\ \widehat{v} &= 1 \quad \text{on} \quad \{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 19/20 \leq |\eta| \leq 21/20\}, \end{aligned}$$

and put for $\varepsilon > 0$

$$(8.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \sigma(x, \xi, \eta) &= \sigma(\xi, \eta) = \widehat{u}(\xi/\varepsilon) \widehat{v}(\eta), \\ \widehat{f}(\xi) &= \varepsilon^{n/p-n} \widehat{u}(\xi/\varepsilon), \quad \widehat{g}(\xi) = \varepsilon^{n/q-n} \widehat{u}((\eta - e_1)/\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where $e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then,

$$(8.3) \quad \|T_\sigma(f, g)\|_{L^r} \approx 1, \quad \|f\|_{L^p} \approx 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \|g\|_{L^q} \approx 1$$

for a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. In fact, since $\widehat{v} = 1$ on the support of $\widehat{u}((\cdot - e_1)/\varepsilon)$ by choosing a suitably small $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$T_\sigma(f, g)(x) = \varepsilon^{n/p} (u * u)(\varepsilon x) \varepsilon^{n/q} e^{ix_1} u(\varepsilon x),$$

where $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Hence, $\|T_\sigma(f, g)\|_{L^r} \approx 1$, since $1/p + 1/q = 1/r$. The second and third equivalences are obvious.

Next, we let a function $\Psi_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfy that for a sufficiently small $\delta > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp } \Psi_0 &\subset \{(\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n : |(\xi, \eta)| \leq 2^{1/2+\delta}\}, \\ \Psi_0 &= 1 \quad \text{on} \quad \{(\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n : |(\xi, \eta)| \leq 2^{1/2-\delta}\}. \end{aligned}$$

We put $\Psi = \Psi_0 - \Psi_0(2\cdot, 2\cdot)$ and $\Psi_j = \Psi(\cdot/2^j, \cdot/2^j)$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp } \Psi &\subset \{(\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{-1/2-\delta} \leq |(\xi, \eta)| \leq 2^{1/2+\delta}\}, \\ \Psi &= 1 \quad \text{on} \quad \{(\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{-1/2+\delta} \leq |(\xi, \eta)| \leq 2^{1/2-\delta}\}, \end{aligned}$$

and $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \Psi_j = 1$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. This $\{\Psi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is a Littlewood–Paley partition of unity on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Now, observe that $\text{supp } \sigma \subset \{(\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n : |(\xi, \eta)| \leq 2^{1/2-\delta}\}$, choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ suitably. Then, we see that

$$\sigma_j^\rho(\xi, \eta) = \sigma(2^{j\rho}\xi, 2^{j\rho}\eta) \Psi_j(2^{j\rho}\xi, 2^{j\rho}\eta) = \begin{cases} \sigma, & \text{if } j = 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } j \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, since the symbol σ is independent of x , we have

$$\Delta_k[\sigma_j^\rho](x, \xi, \eta) = \begin{cases} \psi_{k_1}(D_\xi) \psi_{k_2}(D_\eta) [\sigma_j^\rho](\xi, \eta), & \text{if } k_0 = 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } k_0 \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

These two facts mean that

$$\|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho, \rho}^m(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} = \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{s_1 k_1 + s_2 k_2} \|\psi_{k_1}(D_\xi) \psi_{k_2}(D_\eta) \sigma(\xi, \eta)\|_{L_{ul}^2((\mathbb{R}^n)^2)}.$$

Therefore, from the embedding $L^2 \hookrightarrow L_{ul}^2$ and Lemma 8.4, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho, \rho}^m(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{s_1 k_1 + s_2 k_2} \|\psi_{k_1}(D_\xi) \psi_{k_2}(D_\eta) \sigma(\xi, \eta)\|_{L^2((\mathbb{R}^n)^2)}, \\ (8.4) \quad &= \|\widehat{u}(\cdot/\varepsilon)\|_{B_{2,1}^{s_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|\widehat{v}\|_{B_{2,1}^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \varepsilon^{n/2-s_1} \end{aligned}$$

for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small.

Test (8.2) to the assumption (8.1). Then, by (8.3) and (8.4), we have $\varepsilon^{n/2-s_1} \gtrsim 1$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. This means that $s_1 \geq n/2$. $\square$

8.3. Sharpness of the smoothness s_0 . In this subsection, we show the following.

Proposition 8.5. *Let $0 \leq \rho < 1$, $m = -(1 - \rho)n/2$, $\mathbf{s} = (s_0, s_1, s_2) \in (0, \infty)^3$, and $1 \leq p, q, r \leq \infty$ satisfy $1/p + 1/q = 1/r$. Suppose that the inequality*

$$(8.5) \quad \|T_\sigma(f, g)\|_{L^r} \lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho, \rho}^m(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^p} \|g\|_{L^q}$$

holds for all $\sigma \in BS_{\rho, \rho}^m(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, $s_0 \geq n/2$.

To prove this, we employ a strategy by Miyachi–Tomita [20, Appendix A]. Define

$$\|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,\dagger}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} = \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0, \mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} 2^{-jm+\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{s}} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L^\infty((\mathbb{R}^n)^3)},$$

with the same notations as in Definition 3.1. Then, we have the following.

Lemma 8.6. *Let $0 < \rho < 1$, $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{s} = (s_0, s_1, s_2) \in (0, \infty)^3$, and $1 \leq p, q, r \leq \infty$ satisfy $1/p + 1/q = 1/r$. Suppose that the inequality*

$$(8.6) \quad \|T_\varsigma(f, g)\|_{L^r} \lesssim \|\varsigma\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,\dagger}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^p} \|g\|_{L^q}$$

holds for all $\varsigma \in BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,\dagger}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, the inequality

$$\|T_\sigma(f, g)\|_{L^r} \lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{0,0}^{m',\dagger}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^p} \|g\|_{L^q}$$

holds for all $\sigma \in BS_{0,0}^{m',\dagger}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $m' < m/(1 - \rho)$ and $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

To prove this, we will use the following lemma given by Sugimoto [25].

Lemma 8.7. *Let $\{\psi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be the Littlewood–Paley partition of unity on $\mathbb{R}^n$.*

(1) *Let $(s_1, s_2) \in (0, \infty)^2$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{s_1 k_1 + s_2 k_2} \|\psi_{k_1}(D_\xi) \psi_{k_2}(D_\eta) [f_1 f_2](\xi, \eta)\|_{L^\infty((\mathbb{R}^n)^2)} \\ & \lesssim \prod_{i=1,2} \sup_{k_i \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{s_i k_i} \|\psi_{k_i}(D_\xi) \psi_{k_i}(D_\eta) [f_i](\xi, \eta)\|_{L^\infty((\mathbb{R}^n)^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

(2) *Let $\mathbf{s} = (s_0, s_1, s_2) \in (0, \infty)^3$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} 2^{\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{s}} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[f(\lambda_0 \cdot, \lambda_1 \cdot, \lambda_2 \cdot)]\|_{L^\infty((\mathbb{R}^n)^3)} \\ & \lesssim \max(1, \lambda_0^{s_0}) \max(1, \lambda_1^{s_1}) \max(1, \lambda_2^{s_2}) \sup_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} 2^{\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{s}} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} f\|_{L^\infty((\mathbb{R}^n)^3)} \end{aligned}$$

for $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in (0, \infty)$.

The assertion (1) was stated in [25, Theorem 1.4]. See also [27, Theorem and Remark 1 in Section 2.8.2]. The two variables version of the assertion (2) was mentioned in [25, Proposition 1.1]. Following the same lines as there, one can show the assertion (2) for the three variables. Therefore, we omit these proofs.

Proof of Lemma 8.6. Assume $\sigma \in BS_{0,0}^{m',\dagger}(\mathbf{s};\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $m' < m/(1 - \rho)$. Let $\{\Psi_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a Littlewood–Paley partition of unity on $(\mathbb{R}^n)^2$. Then,

$$(8.7) \quad \sigma(x, \xi, \eta) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sigma(x, \xi, \eta) \Psi_\ell(\xi, \eta) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sigma_\ell(x, \xi, \eta)$$

with $\sigma_\ell(x, \xi, \eta) = \sigma(x, \xi, \eta) \Psi_\ell(\xi, \eta)$. For simplicity, we write $\varrho = \frac{\rho}{1-\rho}$ for $0 < \rho < 1$. We have by changes of variables

$$\begin{aligned} & T_{\sigma_\ell}(f, g)(x) \\ (8.8) \quad & = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2n}} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^2} e^{i2^{-\ell\varrho}x \cdot (\xi + \eta)} \sigma_\ell(x, 2^{-\ell\varrho}\xi, 2^{-\ell\varrho}\eta) \widehat{f(2^{\ell\varrho} \cdot)}(\xi) \widehat{g(2^{\ell\varrho} \cdot)}(\eta) d\xi d\eta \\ & = T_{\varsigma_\ell}(f_\ell, g_\ell)(2^{-\ell\varrho}x) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\varsigma_\ell = \sigma_\ell(2^{\ell\varrho} \cdot, 2^{-\ell\varrho} \cdot, 2^{-\ell\varrho} \cdot), \quad f_\ell = f(2^{\ell\varrho} \cdot), \quad \text{and} \quad g_\ell = g(2^{\ell\varrho} \cdot).$$

Then, $\varsigma_\ell \in BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,\dagger}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)$, and more precisely, the inequality

$$(8.9) \quad \|\varsigma_\ell\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,\dagger}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim 2^{\ell(m'-m/(1-\rho))} \|\sigma\|_{BS_{0,0}^{m',\dagger}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)}$$

holds for any $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We shall prove (8.9). Since

$$\text{supp } \varsigma_\ell \subset \{(\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{\ell/(1-\rho)-1} \leq |(\xi, \eta)| \leq 2^{\ell/(1-\rho)+1}\},$$

recalling the notation of $(\varsigma_\ell)_j^\rho$:

$$(\varsigma_\ell)_j^\rho(x, \xi, \eta) = \varsigma_\ell(2^{-j\rho}x, 2^{j\rho}\xi, 2^{j\rho}\eta) \Psi_j(2^{j\rho}\xi, 2^{j\rho}\eta),$$

we see that j must be in the set

$$\Omega_\ell = \left\{ j \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \max\left(0, \frac{\ell}{1-\rho} - 2\right) \leq j \leq \frac{\ell}{1-\rho} + 2 \right\}$$

(otherwise, $(\varsigma_\ell)_j^\rho$ vanishes). Then, we have

$$(8.10) \quad \|\varsigma_\ell\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,\dagger}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} \approx 2^{-\ell m/(1-\rho)} \sup_{j \in \Omega_\ell} \sup_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} 2^{\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{s}} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} [(\varsigma_\ell)_j^\rho]\|_{L^\infty}$$

for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Here, since

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} [(\varsigma_\ell)_j^\rho] = \psi_{k_1}(D_\xi) \psi_{k_2}(D_\eta) \left[\psi_{k_0}(D_x) [\varsigma_\ell(2^{-j\rho}x, 2^{j\rho}\xi, 2^{j\rho}\eta)] \times \Psi_j(2^{j\rho}\xi, 2^{j\rho}\eta) \right],$$

it holds from Lemma 8.7 (1) that

$$(8.11) \quad \sup_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} 2^{\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{s}} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} [(\varsigma_\ell)_j^\rho]\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \sup_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} 2^{\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{s}} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} [\varsigma_\ell(2^{-j\rho}\cdot, 2^{j\rho}\cdot, 2^{j\rho}\cdot)]\|_{L^\infty}$$

for $j \in \Omega_\ell$, where we used the fact that

$$\sup_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{s_1 k_1 + s_2 k_2} \|\psi_{k_1}(D_\xi) \psi_{k_2}(D_\eta) [\Psi_j(2^{j\rho}\cdot, 2^{j\rho}\cdot)]\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 1$$

holds with the implicit constant independent of $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Moreover, since

$$\varsigma_\ell(2^{-j\rho}\cdot, 2^{j\rho}\cdot, 2^{j\rho}\cdot) = \sigma_\ell(2^{\ell\rho-j\rho}\cdot, 2^{-(\ell\rho-j\rho)}\cdot, 2^{-(\ell\rho-j\rho)}\cdot)$$

and $2^{\ell\rho-j\rho} \approx 1$ for $j \in \Omega_\ell$, we have by Lemma 8.7 (2)

$$(8.12) \quad \sup_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} 2^{\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{s}} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} [\varsigma_\ell(2^{-j\rho}\cdot, 2^{j\rho}\cdot, 2^{j\rho}\cdot)]\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \sup_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} 2^{\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{s}} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} [\sigma_\ell]\|_{L^\infty}, \quad j \in \Omega_\ell.$$

Collecting (8.10), (8.11), and (8.12), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varsigma_\ell\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,\dagger}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} &\lesssim 2^{-\ell m/(1-\rho)} \sup_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} 2^{\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{s}} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}} [\sigma_\ell]\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq 2^{-\ell m/(1-\rho)} 2^{\ell m'} \|\sigma\|_{BS_{0,0}^{m',\dagger}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)}, \end{aligned}$$

since $\sigma_\ell = \sigma_\ell^0$. This is the desired inequality (8.9).

Therefore, we have by (8.7), (8.8), (8.6), and (8.9)

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_\sigma(f, g)\|_{L^r} &\leq \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} \|T_{\sigma_\ell}(f, g)\|_{L^r} = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{\ell \rho n/r} \|T_{\varsigma_\ell}(f_\ell, g_\ell)\|_{L^r} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{\ell \rho n/r} \|\varsigma_\ell\|_{BS_{\rho,\rho}^{m,\dagger}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|f_\ell\|_{L^p} \|g_\ell\|_{L^q} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{\ell(m'-m/(1-\rho))} \|\sigma\|_{BS_{0,0}^{m',\dagger}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^p} \|g\|_{L^q} \\ &\approx \|\sigma\|_{BS_{0,0}^{m',\dagger}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^p} \|g\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned}$$

since $1/p + 1/q = 1/r$ and $m' < m/(1 - \rho)$. This completes the proof. $\square$

We also use the following lemma proved by Wainger [28, Theorem 10] and Miyachi–Tomita [20, Lemma 6.1].

Lemma 8.8. *Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $0 < a < 1$, $0 < b < n$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For $t > 0$, put*

$$f_{a,b,t}(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}} e^{-t|k|} |k|^{-b} e^{i|k|^a} e^{ik \cdot x} \varphi(x).$$

Then, if $b > n(1 - a/2 - 1/p + a/p)$, we have $\sup_{t>0} \|f_{a,b,t}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} < \infty$.

By using this lemma, we shall show the following. See also [15, Proposition 7.3].

Lemma 8.9. *Let $m \geq -n$, $\mathbf{s} = (s_0, s_1, s_2) \in [0, \infty)^3$, and $1 \leq p, q, r \leq \infty$. Suppose that*

$$(8.13) \quad \|T_\sigma(f, g)\|_{L^r} \lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{0,0}^{m,\dagger}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^p} \|g\|_{L^q}$$

holds for all $\sigma \in BS_{0,0}^{m,\dagger}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, $s_0 \geq m + n$.

Proof. In this proof, we will use nonnegative functions $\varphi, \tilde{\varphi} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying that $\text{supp } \varphi \subset [-1/4, 1/4]^n$, $\tilde{\varphi} = 1$ on $[-1/4, 1/4]^n$, and $\text{supp } \tilde{\varphi} \subset [-1/2, 1/2]^n$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{a_1, a_2}(x, \xi, \eta) &= \varphi(x) e^{-ix \cdot (\xi + \eta)} \\ &\quad \times \sum_{k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}} (1 + |k| + |\ell|)^{m-s_0} e^{-i|k|^{a_1}} e^{-i|\ell|^{a_2}} \varphi(\xi - k) \varphi(\eta - \ell), \\ f_{a_1, b_1, t}(x) &= \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}} e^{-t|\nu|} |\nu|^{-b_1} e^{i|\nu|^{a_1}} e^{i\nu \cdot x} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \tilde{\varphi}(x), \\ g_{a_2, b_2, t}(x) &= \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}} e^{-t|\mu|} |\mu|^{-b_2} e^{i|\mu|^{a_2}} e^{i\mu \cdot x} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \tilde{\varphi}(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $t > 0$, $0 < a_1, a_2 < 1$, $b_1 = n(1 - a_1/2 - 1/p + a_1/p) + \varepsilon_1$, and $b_2 = n(1 - a_2/2 - 1/q + a_2/q) + \varepsilon_2$, with $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$. Note that $f_{a_1, b_1, t}, g_{a_2, b_2, t} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, thanks to the exponential decay factors.

For these functions, the following hold:

$$(8.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\sigma_{a_1, a_2}\|_{BS_{0,0}^{m,\dagger}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} &\lesssim 1, \\ \sup_{t>0} \|f_{a_1, b_1, t}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} &\lesssim 1, \quad \sup_{t>0} \|g_{a_2, b_2, t}\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim 1. \end{aligned}$$

The second and third inequalities follow from Lemma 8.8. We shall consider the first inequality. We write $N_i = [s_i] + 1$, $i = 0, 1, 2$ and recall the notation $\sigma_j^0(x, \xi, \eta) = \sigma(x, \xi, \eta) \Psi_j(\xi, \eta)$ for $\rho = 0$. Then, observing that

$$\left| \partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \partial_\eta^\gamma \sigma_{a_1, a_2}(x, \xi, \eta) \right| \lesssim (1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{|\alpha| + m - s_0},$$

and that $1 + |\xi| + |\eta| \approx 2^j$ on the support of Ψ_j , we realize that

$$\left| \partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \partial_\eta^\gamma (\sigma_{a_1, a_2})_j^0(x, \xi, \eta) \right| \lesssim 2^{j(|\alpha| + m - s_0)}.$$

Hence, as in the proof of Lemma 3.5, applying the Taylor expansion (see the argument around (3.1)) to $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[(\sigma_{a_1, a_2})_j^0]$, we have

$$(8.15) \quad \left\| \Delta_{\mathbf{k}} [(\sigma_{a_1, a_2})_j^0] \right\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 2^{-k_0 N_0 - k_1 N_1 - k_2 N_2} 2^{j(N_0 + m - s_0)}$$

for $j \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3$. On the other hand, in the derivation of (3.1), by avoiding the Taylor expansion with respect to the x -variable, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta_{\mathbf{k}} \sigma(x, \xi, \eta) \\ &= 2^{n(k_0+k_1+k_2)} \sum_{|\beta|=N_1} \frac{1}{\beta!} \sum_{|\gamma|=N_2} \frac{1}{\gamma!} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^3} \check{\psi}(2^{k_0}x') \check{\psi}(2^{k_1}\xi') (-\xi')^\beta \check{\psi}(2^{k_2}\eta') (-\eta')^\gamma \\ & \quad \times \int_{[0,1]^2} \left(\prod_{i=1,2} N_i (1-t_i)^{N_i-1} \right) \left(\partial_\xi^\beta \partial_\eta^\gamma \sigma \right) (x-x', \xi-t_1\xi', \eta-t_2\eta') dT dX', \end{aligned}$$

where $dT = dt_1 dt_2$ and $dX' = dx' d\xi' d\eta'$. Then, we have by the same lines as above

$$(8.16) \quad \left\| \Delta_{\mathbf{k}} [(\sigma_{a_1, a_2})_j^0] \right\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 2^{-k_1 N_1 - k_2 N_2} 2^{j(m-s_0)}$$

for $j \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3$. Take $0 < \theta < 1$ such that $N_0 \theta = s_0$. By (8.15) and (8.16)

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \Delta_{\mathbf{k}} [(\sigma_{a_1, a_2})_j^0] \right\|_{L^\infty} &= \left\| \Delta_{\mathbf{k}} [(\sigma_{a_1, a_2})_j^0] \right\|_{L^\infty}^\theta \left\| \Delta_{\mathbf{k}} [(\sigma_{a_1, a_2})_j^0] \right\|_{L^\infty}^{1-\theta} \\ &\lesssim 2^{-k_0 s_0} 2^{-k_1 N_1 - k_2 N_2} 2^{j m}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain the first inequality in (8.14).

We next investigate the left hand side of (8.13). Observe that $\text{supp } \varphi(\cdot - k) \cap \text{supp } \tilde{\varphi}(\cdot - k') = \emptyset$ if $k \neq k'$, and $\tilde{\varphi} = 1$ on $\text{supp } \varphi$. Then,

$$T_{\sigma_{a_1, a_2}}(f_{a_1, b_1, t}, g_{a_2, b_2, t})(x) = \frac{\|\varphi\|_{L^1}^2}{(2\pi)^{2n}} \varphi(x) \sum_{k, \ell} e^{-t(|k|+|\ell|)} (1+|k|+|\ell|)^{m-s_0} |k|^{-b_1} |\ell|^{-b_2}.$$

Taking the L^r norm of both sides, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_{\sigma_{a_1, a_2}}(f_{a_1, b_1, t}, g_{a_2, b_2, t})\|_{L^r} &\gtrsim \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}} \sum_{\ell: 0 < |\ell| \leq |k|} e^{-2t|k|} (1+|k|)^{m-s_0} |k|^{-b_1} |k|^{-b_2} \\ (8.17) \quad &\approx \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}} e^{-2t|k|} (1+|k|)^{m-s_0-b_1-b_2+n}. \end{aligned}$$

Collecting (8.13), (8.14), and (8.17), we obtain

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}} e^{-2t|k|} (1+|k|)^{m-s_0-b_1-b_2+n} \lesssim 1$$

with the implicit constant independent of t . Thus, we have by the Fatou lemma

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}} (1+|k|)^{m-s_0-b_1-b_2+n} \lesssim 1.$$

This yields $m - s_0 - b_1 - b_2 + n < -n$, which is identical with

$$s_0 > m + 2n - n \left(1 - \frac{a_1}{2} - \frac{1}{p} + \frac{a_1}{p} \right) - n \left(1 - \frac{a_2}{2} - \frac{1}{q} + \frac{a_2}{q} \right) - \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2.$$

Since $0 < a_i < 1$ and $\varepsilon_i > 0$, $i = 1, 2$, are arbitrary, if we take the limits as $a_i \rightarrow 1$ and $\varepsilon_i \rightarrow 0$, we obtain the condition $s_0 \geq m + n$, which gives the desired result. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 8.5. We first observe that $BS_{\rho, \rho}^{m, \dagger}(\mathbf{s}_\varepsilon; \mathbb{R}^n) \subset BS_{\rho, \rho}^m(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)$ holds with $\mathbf{s}_\varepsilon = (s_0 + \varepsilon, s_1 + \varepsilon, s_2 + \varepsilon)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Now, we first consider the case $0 < \rho < 1$. In this case, we have by (8.5) and the inclusion relation above

$$\|T_\sigma(f, g)\|_{L^r} \lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho, \rho}^{-(1-\rho)n/2, \dagger}(\mathbf{s}_\varepsilon; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^p} \|g\|_{L^q},$$

and then, by Lemma 8.6

$$\|T_\sigma(f, g)\|_{L^r} \lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{0,0}^{-n/2-\delta,\dagger}(\mathbf{s}_\varepsilon; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^p} \|g\|_{L^q}$$

for any $\delta > 0$. Thus, we conclude by Lemma 8.9 that $s_0 + \varepsilon \geq n/2 - \delta$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ are both arbitrary, if we take the limits as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we obtain $s_0 \geq n/2$, which is the desired result for the case $0 < \rho < 1$. The case $\rho = 0$ is similarly proved by the embedding above, Lemma 8.9, and a limit argument. $\square$

APPENDIX A. EXISTENCE OF DECOMPOSITION

In this appendix, we determine functions used to decompose symbols in Section 5. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfy that $\text{supp } \phi \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\xi| \leq 2\}$ and $\phi = 1$ for $|\xi| \leq 1$. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we write $\phi_k = \phi(\cdot/2^k)$. Then, we see that $\text{supp } \phi_k \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\xi| \leq 2^{k+1}\}$ and $\text{supp } (1 - \phi_k) \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\xi| \geq 2^k\}$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, since $\phi_k = 1$ for $|\xi| \leq 2^k$.

Let $\{\Psi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a Littlewood–Paley partition on $(\mathbb{R}^n)^2$. Then, for $j \geq 1$, Ψ_j can be expressed into the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) &= \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) \phi_{j+1}(\xi) \phi_{j+1}(\eta) \\ &\quad \times \{\phi_{j-6}(\xi) + (1 - \phi_{j-6}(\xi))\} \{\phi_{j-6}(\eta) + (1 - \phi_{j-6}(\eta))\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\phi_j \phi_{j'} = \phi_{j'}$ if $j > j'$ and $\phi_{j-6}(\xi) \phi_{j-6}(\eta)$ vanishes on $\text{supp } \Psi_j$, $j \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) &= \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) \phi_{j-6}(\xi) \phi_{j+1}(\eta) (1 - \phi_{j-6}(\eta)) \\ &\quad + \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) \phi_{j+1}(\xi) (1 - \phi_{j-6}(\xi)) \phi_{j-6}(\eta) \\ &\quad + \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) \phi_{j+1}(\xi) (1 - \phi_{j-6}(\xi)) \phi_{j+1}(\eta) (1 - \phi_{j-6}(\eta)). \end{aligned}$$

We further decompose the first factor above as follows:

$$\Psi_j(\xi, \eta) \phi_{j-6}(\xi) \phi_{j+1}(\eta) (1 - \phi_{j-6}(\eta)) \{\phi_{j-4}(\eta) + (1 - \phi_{j-4}(\eta))\}.$$

Then, this is equal to $\Psi_j(\xi, \eta) \phi_{j-6}(\xi) \phi_{j+1}(\eta) (1 - \phi_{j-4}(\eta))$, since $\phi_{j-6}(\xi) \phi_{j-4}(\eta)$ vanishes on $\text{supp } \Psi_j$, $j \geq 1$, and $(1 - \phi_j)(1 - \phi_{j'}) = (1 - \phi_j)$ if $j > j'$. The second factor can be expressed similarly because of symmetry. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) &= \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) \phi_{j-6}(\xi) \phi_{j+1}(\eta) (1 - \phi_{j-4}(\eta)) \\ &\quad + \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) \phi_{j+1}(\xi) (1 - \phi_{j-4}(\xi)) \phi_{j-6}(\eta) \\ &\quad + \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) \phi_{j+1}(\xi) (1 - \phi_{j-6}(\xi)) \phi_{j+1}(\eta) (1 - \phi_{j-6}(\eta)) \\ &=: \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) \phi'_j(\xi) \psi'_j(\eta) + \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) \psi'_j(\xi) \phi'_j(\eta) + \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) \psi''_j(\xi) \psi''_j(\eta) \end{aligned}$$

with $\phi'_j = \phi'(\cdot/2^j)$, $\psi'_j = \psi'(\cdot/2^j)$, and $\psi''_j = \psi''(\cdot/2^j)$, and then we realize that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp } \phi' &\subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \leq 2^{-5}\}, \\ \text{supp } \psi' &\subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{-4} \leq |\zeta| \leq 2^2\}, \\ \text{supp } \psi'' &\subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{-6} \leq |\zeta| \leq 2^2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain the information (5.2), (5.3), and (5.4) given in Section 5.

APPENDIX B. BOUNDEDNESS FROM $L^2 \times L^2$ TO L^1

In this appendix, we shall prove the following boundedness stated in Remark 3.4.

Theorem B.1. *Let $0 \leq \rho < 1$, $m = -(1 - \rho)n/2$, and $\mathbf{s} = (s_0, s_1, s_2) \in [0, \infty)^3$ satisfy $s_0, s_1, s_2 \geq n/2$. Then, if $\sigma \in BS_{\rho, \rho}^m(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)$, the bilinear pseudo-differential operator T_σ is bounded from $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

The proof is much simpler than that of the boundedness to h^1 done in Section 6.

Proof. As in Section 5 and Appendix A, we decompose a Littlewood–Paley partition $\{\Psi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ on $(\mathbb{R}^n)^2$ into the following form: For $j \geq 1$,

$$\Psi_j(\xi, \eta) = \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) \phi'_j(\xi) \psi'_j(\eta) + \Psi_j(\xi, \eta) \psi'_j(\xi) \phi'_j(\eta),$$

where $\phi'_j = \phi'(\cdot/2^j)$, $\psi'_j = \psi'(\cdot/2^j)$, $\text{supp } \phi' \subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\zeta| \leq 2^{-2}\}$, and $\text{supp } \psi' \subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{-3} \leq |\zeta| \leq 2^2\}$. Then, repeating the same lines as in Section 5, the dual form of $T_\sigma(f, g)$ can be expressed by the sum of the forms I_0 , I_1 , and I_2 as follows. The form I_0 is the same as in (5.9). The form I_1 is the following:

$$I_1 = \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} \sum_{\nu \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2} 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \nu}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} f'_j, \square_{\nu_2} g'_j)(x) h_j(x) dx,$$

where $f'_j = \phi'_j(D)f(2^{-j\rho}\cdot)$, $g'_j = \psi'_j(D)g(2^{-j\rho}\cdot)$, and $h_j = h(2^{-j\rho}\cdot)$. Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp } \widehat{f'_j} &\subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\xi| \leq 2^{j(1-\rho)-2}\}, \\ \text{supp } \widehat{g'_j} &\subset \{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{j(1-\rho)-3} \leq |\eta| \leq 2^{j(1-\rho)+2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

The form I_2 is in a symmetrical position with I_1 , and thus we omit stating it.

We shall consider the three forms above. However, we only consider I_1 , since the proof for I_0 is exactly the same as in Section 6.4 and the proof for I_2 is similar to that for I_1 because of symmetry. We take a Littlewood–Paley partition $\{\psi_\ell\}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and decompose the factor of f as

$$I_1 = \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{\nu \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^2} 2^{-j\rho n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} T_{\sigma_{j, \mathbf{k}, \nu}^\rho}(\square_{\nu_1} \Delta_\ell f'_j, \square_{\nu_2} g'_j)(x) h_j(x) dx.$$

Then, the sums over ν and ℓ are restricted to $\nu_1 \in \{\nu_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |\nu_1| \lesssim 2^\ell\}$, $\nu_2 \in \{\nu_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^n : |\nu_2| \lesssim 2^{j(1-\rho)}\}$, and $\ell \leq j(1-\rho)$ (see Section 6.1). Applying Lemma 4.4 (1) with $p = q = 2$ and $r = \infty$ to the restricted sums, we have

$$|I_1| \lesssim \sum_{j, \mathbf{k}} \sum_{\ell: \ell \leq j(1-\rho)} 2^{\ell n/2} 2^{(k_0+k_1+k_2)n/2} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}[\sigma_j^\rho]\|_{L_{ul}^2} \|\Delta_{\ell+j\rho} f\|_{L^2} \|\psi'_j(D)g\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{L^\infty}$$

where we used the calculation as in (6.8) to the factors of f and g . Since we are not dividing the sum over j , the right hand side above is simply bounded by

$$\|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho, \rho}^m(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|h\|_{L^\infty} \sum_{j \gg 1} \sum_{\ell: \ell \leq j(1-\rho)} 2^{\ell n/2} 2^{-j(1-\rho)n/2} \|\Delta_{\ell+j\rho} f\|_{L^2} \|\psi'_j(D)g\|_{L^2},$$

where $m = -(1-\rho)n/2$ and $\mathbf{s} = (n/2, n/2, n/2)$. The sums over j and ℓ are bounded by a constant times $\|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2}$, recalling the proof of (6.12). Hence, we obtain

$$|I_1| \lesssim \|\sigma\|_{BS_{\rho, \rho}^m(\mathbf{s}; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{L^\infty},$$

where $m = -(1-\rho)n/2$ and $\mathbf{s} = (n/2, n/2, n/2)$. This completes the proof. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] Á. Bényi, F. Bernicot, D. Maldonado, V. Naibo, R.H. Torres, On the Hörmander classes of bilinear pseudodifferential operators II, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **62** (2013), 1733–1764.
- [2] Á. Bényi, D. Maldonado, V. Naibo, R.H. Torres, On the Hörmander classes of bilinear pseudodifferential operators, *Integral Equations Operator Theory* **67** (2010), 341–364.
- [3] Á. Bényi, R.H. Torres, Symbolic calculus and the transposes of bilinear pseudodifferential operators, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **28** (2003), 1161–1181.

- [4] Á. Bényi, R.H. Torres, Almost orthogonality and a class of bounded bilinear pseudodifferential operators, *Math. Res. Lett.* **11** (2004), 1–11.
- [5] A. Boulkhemair, L^2 estimates for pseudodifferential operators, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)* **22** (1995), 155–183.
- [6] A.-P. Calderón, R. Vaillancourt, A class of bounded pseudo-differential operators, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **69** (1972), 1185–1187.
- [7] R.R. Coifman and Y. Meyer, Au delà des opérateurs pseudo-différentiels, *Astérisque* **57** (1978), 1–185.
- [8] H.O. Cordes, On compactness of commutators of multiplications and convolutions, and boundedness of pseudodifferential operators, *J. Funct. Anal.* **18** (1975), 115–131.
- [9] L. Grafakos, R.H. Torres, Multilinear Calderón-Zygmund theory, *Adv. Math.* **165** (2002), 124–164.
- [10] D. Goldberg, A local version of real Hardy spaces, *Duke Math. J.* **46** (1979), 27–42.
- [11] L. Grafakos, *Modern Fourier analysis*, 3rd edition, GTM 250, Springer, New York, 2014.
- [12] J. Herbert, V. Naibo, Bilinear pseudodifferential operators with symbols in Besov spaces, *J. Pseudo-Differ. Oper. Appl.* **5** (2014), 231–254.
- [13] J. Herbert, V. Naibo, Besov spaces, symbolic calculus, and boundedness of bilinear pseudo-differential operators, in: *Harmonic analysis, partial differential equations, complex analysis, Banach spaces, and operator theory. Vol. 1*, 275–305, Assoc. Women Math. Ser., 4, Springer, [Cham], 2016.
- [14] T. Kato, A. Miyachi, N. Tomita, Boundedness of bilinear pseudo-differential operators of $S_{0,0}$ -type on $L^2 \times L^2$, available at arXiv:1901.07237.
- [15] T. Kato, A. Miyachi, N. Tomita, Boundedness of multilinear pseudo-differential operators of $S_{0,0}$ -type in L^2 -based amalgam spaces, available at arXiv:1908.11641.
- [16] K. Koezuka, N. Tomita, Bilinear pseudo-differential operators with symbols in $BS_{1,1}^m$ on Triebel-Lizorkin spaces, *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.* **24** (2018), 309–319.
- [17] J. Marschall, Pseudodifferential operators with nonregular symbols of the class $S_{\rho,\delta}^m$, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **12** (1987), 921–965.
- [18] N. Michalowski, D. Rule, W. Staubach, Multilinear pseudodifferential operators beyond Calderón-Zygmund theory, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **414** (2014), 149–165.
- [19] A. Miyachi, Estimates for pseudodifferential operators of class $S_{0,0}$, *Math. Nachr.* **133** (1987), 135–154.
- [20] A. Miyachi, N. Tomita, Calderón-Vaillancourt-type theorem for bilinear operators, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **62** (2013), 1165–1201.
- [21] A. Miyachi, N. Tomita, Minimal smoothness conditions for bilinear Fourier multipliers, *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* **29** (2013), 495–530.
- [22] A. Miyachi, N. Tomita, Bilinear pseudo-differential operators with exotic symbols, To appear in *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, arXiv:1801.06744.
- [23] T. Muramatu, *Estimates for the norm of pseudo-differential operators by means of Besov spaces*, in: “Pseudo-Differential Operators”, H.O. Cordes, B. Gramsch, H. Widom (eds.), *Lecture Notes in Math.*, vol 1256, Springer, Berlin, 1987, 330–349.
- [24] M. Sugimoto, L^p -boundedness of pseudo-differential operators satisfying Besov estimates I, *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **40** (1988), 105–122.
- [25] M. Sugimoto, Pseudo-differential operators on Besov spaces, *Tsukuba J. Math.* **12** (1988), 43–63.
- [26] E.M. Stein, *Harmonic Analysis: Real-Variable Methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory Integrals*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993.
- [27] H. Triebel, *Theory of Function Spaces*, Birkhäuser, Verlag, 1983.
- [28] S. Wainger, Special trigonometric series in k-dimensions, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **59** (1965).

DIVISION OF PURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE, FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, GUNMA UNIVERSITY, KIRYU, GUNMA 376-8515, JAPAN
E-mail address: t.katou@gunma-u.ac.jp