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\textbf{Abstract.} It is shown that the Bellman function method can be applied
to study the $L^p$-norms of general operators on martingales, i.e., of operators
that are not necessarily martingale transforms. Informally, we provide a sin-
gle Bellman-type function that "encodes" the $L^p$-boundedness of "almost all" operators from Gundy’s extrapolation theorem. As examples of such opera-
tors, we consider the Haar transforms and the operator whose $L^p$-boundedness
underlies the Rubio de Francia inequality for the Walsh system.

1. Introduction

In this paper, we implement the program announced (without any proofs) in the
short report \cite{1}.

Gundy’s theorem \cite{4} of 1968 can be considered as a martingale analogue of the
statement about the boundedness of Calderón–Zygmund operators of the most gen-
eral type. This generality is supported, for example, by the fact that the variant \cite{6}
of Gundy’s theorem for vector-valued martingales allows us to obtain a direct ana-
logue \cite{3} of Rubio de Francia’s inequality for the Walsh system (Rubio de Francia’s
inequality \cite{10}, in its turn, can be treated as a one-sided analogue of Parseval’s
identity for $L^p$ spaces, and the Walsh basis can be viewed as an analogue of the
Fourier basis in “the martingale world”). We treat this as a passed test for the
generality of Gundy’s theorem because the operator arising in Rubio de Francia’s
original considerations \cite{10} has a vector-valued kernel satisfied only a very weak
smoothness condition of Calderón–Zygmund type.

On the other hand, in the paper \cite{2} of 1984, D. L. Burkholder proves the $L^p$-
boundedness of the martingale transforms using another approach borrowed from
stochastic optimal control. The martingale transforms are a special case of opera-
tors from Gundy’s theorem and can be considered as a martingale analogue of the
Hilbert transform (which is a most basic example of a Calderón–Zygmund operator).
Nevertheless, Burkholder’s work \cite{2} is now considered as a real breakthrough
in harmonic analysis because of his method: it gives a deep insight into the struc-
ture of the estimated $L^p$-norms and, in particular, allows him to calculate sharp
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constants in the corresponding $L^p$-inequalities. His approach gives rise to a new field \[8, 11\] that is now referred to as the Bellman function method in harmonic analysis.

In this paper, we show that Burkholder’s method can be extended to “almost all” operators from the vector Gundy’s theorem \[8\] and provide a single Bellman-type function that “encodes” their $L^p$-boundedness. In particular, this applies to the martingale Rubio de Francia operator from \[9\].

2. Notation and preliminaries

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be at most a countable set of indices. By $l^2_\mathcal{A}$ we denote the corresponding $l^2$ space where elements of vectors are enumerated by $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$. We agree that for vectors $x, y \in l^2_\mathcal{A}$, the notation $xy$ means their inner product, and $|x|$ means the $l^2$-norm of $x$. By $L^p$ and $L^p(l^2_\mathcal{A})$ we mean the $L^p$ spaces, respectively, of scalar-valued and vector-valued functions on the interval $[0, 1]$.

Suppose $n$ runs over $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ is a filtration of the Borel algebra over $[0, 1]$. We also set $\mathcal{F}_\infty \equiv \sigma(\cup_n \mathcal{F}_n)$. For $f \in L^1(l^2_\mathcal{A})$, we denote $E_n f \equiv E[f | \mathcal{F}_n]$. Concerning the operators $E_n$ for vector-valued functions and the properties of vector-valued martingales discussed below, see, e.g., \[2\] Chapter V. A sequence $\{f_n\}$ of $l^2_\mathcal{A}$-valued functions

$$f_n = \{f_n^\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \in L^1(l^2_\mathcal{A})$$

is called a martingale if $E_m f_n = f_m$ for $m \leq n$. The $L^p$-norm of a martingale is defined as

$$\|\{f_n\}\|_{L^p} \equiv \sup_n \|f_n\|_{L^p}.$$ 

and any function $f \in L^p(l^2_\mathcal{A}), 1 \leq p < \infty$, generates a martingale $\{E_n f\}$ such that

$$E_n f \overset{L^p}{\rightarrow} E_\infty f \quad \text{and} \quad \|\{E_n f\}\|_{L^p} = \|E_\infty f\|_{L^p}.$$ 

We call a martingale simple if $f_{n+1} = f_n$ for all sufficiently large $n$. We also impose on $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ the regularity condition \[8\] condition (R): $\mathcal{F}_n$ are finite and the measures of their atoms decrease, as $n$ increases, no faster than a geometric progression. We present a version of Gundy’s theorem for vector-valued martingales that is formulated and proved in \[8\] Theorem 1 (in somewhat greater generality). The original scalar theorem can be found in \[4\].

**Theorem** (R. F. Gundy). Let $T$ be an operator that transforms simple martingales $f = \{f_n\}$ into scalar-valued measurable functions and has the following properties:

- (G1) $|T(f + g)| \leq C_1(|Tf| + |Tg|)$;
- (G2) $\|Tf\|_{L^2} \leq C_2\|f\|_{L^2}$;
- (G3) if $f$ satisfies the relations $\Delta_n f \equiv f_0 = 0$ and

$$\Delta_n f \equiv f_n - f_{n-1} = 1_{e_n}\Delta_n f$$

for $n > 0$ and some $e_n \in \mathcal{F}_{n-1}$, then

$$\{\{|Tf| > 0\}\} \subset \bigcup_{n>0} e_n.$$ 

For such an operator, we have

$$\{\{|Tf| > \lambda\}\} \leq C(C_1, C_2, \{\mathcal{F}_n\}) \lambda^{-1}\|f\|_{L^1} \quad \text{for} \quad \lambda > 0.$$
By "⊆" we denote the relation "is a dyadic subinterval of". Further, we consider an arbitrary interval $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. We denote its left and right halves by $I^\pm$. We also introduce the $l^2_I$-valued functions $\mathbb{1}^\alpha_I$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$: the component of $\mathbb{1}^\alpha_I$ with index $\alpha$ is the indicator function $\mathbb{1}_I$ and the other components are zero. Then the $l^2_I$-valued Haar functions

\begin{equation}
(1) \quad h_0^\alpha \equiv |I|^{-1/2} \mathbb{1}^\alpha_I \quad \text{and} \quad h_j^\alpha \equiv |J|^{-1/2}(\mathbb{1}_{J_+}^\alpha - \mathbb{1}_{J_-}^\alpha), \quad J \subseteq I, \ \alpha \in \mathcal{A},
\end{equation}

form an orthonormal basis in $L^2(I, l^2_I)$. We drop the index $\alpha$ in (1) in situations where we are in the scalar setting.

In the following definition, we transfer operators in Gundy’s theorem to $I$ and demand slightly greater regularity from them.

**Definition 1.** Let $T$ be a linear operator that transforms finite linear combinations of the vector-valued Haar functions (1) into scalar measurable functions. We say that $T$ belongs to the class $\mathcal{G}(I, l^2_I)$ if it has the following properties.

(R1) For the system $\{Th_0^\alpha, Th_j^\alpha\}_{J \subseteq I, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$, Parseval’s identity is fulfilled: for any $g \in L^2(I)$, we have

$$
\|g\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} (g, Th_0^\alpha)^2 + \sum_{J \subseteq I, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}} (g, Th_j^\alpha)^2.
$$

(R2) The operator $T$ does not increase the supports of the basis functions:

$$\text{supp} Th_j^\alpha \subseteq J \quad \text{for} \ \alpha \in \mathcal{A} \ \text{and} \ J \subseteq I.$$

Let $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ be the Haar filtration where the atomic intervals are bisected one by one, from left to right:

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = \sigma\{[0, 1]\}, \quad \mathcal{F}_1 = \sigma\{[0, \frac{1}{2}), [\frac{1}{2}, 1]\}, \quad \mathcal{F}_2 = \sigma\{[0, \frac{1}{4}), [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}), [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}), [\frac{3}{4}, 1]\}, \quad \mathcal{F}_3 = \sigma\{[0, \frac{1}{8}), [\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{4}), [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{8}), [\frac{3}{8}, \frac{1}{2}), [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{5}{8}), [\frac{5}{8}, \frac{3}{4}), [\frac{3}{4}, \frac{7}{8}), [\frac{7}{8}, 1]\}, \quad \mathcal{F}_4 = \sigma\{[0, \frac{1}{16}), [\frac{1}{16}, \frac{1}{8}), [\frac{1}{8}, \frac{3}{16}), [\frac{3}{16}, \frac{1}{4}), [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{5}{16}), [\frac{5}{16}, \frac{3}{8}), [\frac{3}{8}, \frac{7}{16}), [\frac{7}{16}, \frac{1}{2}), [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{9}{16}), [\frac{9}{16}, \frac{5}{8}), [\frac{5}{8}, \frac{11}{16}), [\frac{11}{16}, \frac{3}{4}), [\frac{3}{4}, \frac{13}{16}), [\frac{13}{16}, \frac{7}{8}), [\frac{7}{8}, \frac{15}{16}), [\frac{15}{16}, 1]\}, \ldots$$

**Proposition 1.** Gundy’s theorem and Definition 1 are related as follows.

- **Condition** [R1] implies that $T$ is $L^2$-bounded with constant 1. On the other hand, [R1] is always satisfied for $L^2$-unitary operators.
- **Condition** [R2] is equivalent to [G3] for $\{f_n\} \equiv \{\mathbb{E}_nf\}$, where $\mathbb{E}_nf$ are calculated with respect to the Haar filtration introduced above.

**Proof.** The $L^2$-boundedness follows from [R1] by simple duality arguments (we leave them to the reader). On the other hand, a linear operator from $L^2(I, l^2_I)$ to $L^2(I)$ is unitary if and only if it transforms basis (1) into a scalar orthonormal basis. In particular, we have [R1].

Next, suppose $T$ satisfies [R2]. Consider $f$ such that

$$\Delta_0 f \equiv \mathbb{E}_0 f = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} (f, h_0^\alpha) h_0^\alpha \equiv 0.$$

We have

$$\Delta_n f \equiv \mathbb{E}_n f - \mathbb{E}_{n-1} f = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} (f, h_n^\alpha) h_n^\alpha,$$

where $J_n$ is the interval that is bisected when switching from $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}$ to $\mathcal{F}_n$. Thus, the minimal possible set $e_n$ is empty if $(f, h_n^\alpha) = 0$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, or equals $J_n$. 

otherwise. Due to (R2), we have
\[ T f = \sum_n \mathbb{1}_{e_n} \sum_{\alpha \in A} (f, h^\alpha_{J_n}) T h^\alpha_{J_n}. \]
This implies (G3). The reverse implication is obvious: we only need to apply (G3) to the functions \( h^\alpha_{J_n} \).

Proposition 1 allows us to treat \( T \in \mathcal{G}(I, l^2) \) as bounded linear operators from \( L^2(I, l^2) \) to \( L^2(I) \). We can also apply Gundy’s theorem to obtain the weak-type \( (1, 1) \) estimate for them. Thus, relying on the Marcinkiewicz interpolation theorem, we can prove the uniform \( L^p \)-boundedness of these operators for \( 1 < p \leq 2 \).

On the other hand, the generality of the class \( \mathcal{G}(I, l^2) \) is, to a large extent, close to the generality of conditions (G1)–(G3).

Consider operators \( T \in \mathcal{G}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}) \) defined by the formula
\[
T f \equiv (f, h_0) h_0 + \sum_{J \subseteq [0, 1]} \varepsilon_J (f, h_J) h_J, \quad \varepsilon_J \in \{-1, 1\}.
\]
Such operators are called martingale transforms. In [2], D. L. Burkholder provides an alternative proof of their \( L^p \)-boundedness which relies on the Bellman function method borrowed from stochastic optimal control. Burkholder’s approach gives a deep insight into the structure of the norms \( \|T\|_{L^p \to L^p} \) of the martingale transforms (2). In particular, it has allowed him to calculate the supremum of such norms. Our goal is to show that the Bellman function method can be extended to the whole class \( \mathcal{G}(I, l^2) \). Our considerations are somewhat similar to ones in [7] where a Bellman-type function is built for Burkholder’s problem (we also provide only a Bellman-type function). But since we consider much more general problem, everything becomes substantially more complicated. First, we provide examples of operators in \( \mathcal{G} \) that are not martingale transforms: exact Bellman function from [2] or Bellman-type function from [7] do not suffice for their \( L^p \)-boundedness.

3. Motivating examples

Throughout this section, we suppose \( I = [0, 1] \).

For each \( n \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \), we can easily build a linear operator \( H_n \) on \( L^2 \) that establishes a one-to-one correspondence between
\[
\{h_0, h_J\}_{J \subseteq [0, 1]} \quad \text{and} \quad \{|e|^{-1/2} \mathbb{1}_e\}_{e \in [0, 1]}, \quad |e| = 2^{-n-1},
\]
transforms the other basis functions into themselves, and satisfies (R2). Indeed, suppose we have built \( H_n \). Then, in order to build \( H_{n+1} \), we can set
\[
H_{n+1} h_J \equiv |e|^+^{-1/2} \mathbb{1}_e^+ \quad \text{for} \quad |J| \geq 2^{-n},
\]
where \( e \) is such that \( H_n h_J = |e|^{-1/2} \mathbb{1}_e \), and set
\[
H_{n+1} h_J \equiv |J^-|^{-1/2} \mathbb{1}_{J^-} \quad \text{for} \quad |J| = 2^{-n-1}.
\]
Each operator \( H_n \) acts on a linear combination \( f \) of the first \( 2^{n+1} \) Haar functions as the corresponding Haar transform. It is an analogue of the Fourier transform in a sense: \( H_n \) constructs a step function from the Haar coefficients of \( f \). It is not hard to see that \( H_n \) transforms the Haar basis into an orthonormal basis and, as a result, we have the following fact.
Fact 1. The operators $H_n$ belong to $\mathcal{G}([0,1], \mathbb{R})$.

Now we provide a more complicated example. Consider the Walsh basis $\{w_n\}$ consisting of all possible products of Rademacher functions:

- we set $w_0 \overset{\text{def}}{=} 1_{[0,1]}$;
- for any index $n > 0$, we consider its dyadic decomposition $n = 2^{k_1} + \cdots + 2^{k_s}$, $k_1 > k_2 > \cdots > k_s \geq 0$, and set

$$w_n(x) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{i=1}^{s} r_{k_i+1}(x),$$

where $r_k(x) = \text{sign} \sin 2^k \pi x$.

The system $\{w_n\}$ resembles in its properties the Fourier basis (see, e.g., [3, §4.5]) and can be considered as its discrete analogue. In particular, the following direct analogue of Rubio de Francia’s inequality [10] for the Walsh system is proved in [9].

**Theorem.** Let $\{f^n\}$ be at most a countable collection of functions with Walsh spectra supported in pairwise disjoint intervals $I_n \subset \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$:

$$f^n = \sum_{m \in I_n} (f, w_m) w_m.$$

For $1 < p \leq 2$, we have

$$\left\| \sum_n f^n \right\|_{L^p} \leq C_p \left\| \{f^n\} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{Z})},$$

where $C_p$ does not depend on $\{f^n\}$ or $\{I_n\}$.

Our second example is the operator whose $L^p$-boundedness underlies estimate [4]. In order to introduce it, we need certain simple and well-known properties of the Walsh functions. Let $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ be a standard dyadic filtration: $\mathcal{F}_0 = \sigma\{[0,1]\}$ and all the atomic intervals in $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}$ are bisected at once when switching to $\mathcal{F}_n$.

(W1) For a function $f \in L^1$, its martingale differences $\Delta_n f$ with respect to $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ coincide with the Walsh multipliers for the intervals $D_0 \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{0\}$ and $D_n = \{2^n-1, \ldots, 2^n - 1\}$, $n > 0$:

$$\Delta_0 f = (f, h_0) h_0 = (f, w_0) w_0;$$

$$\Delta_n f = \sum_{J \in [0,1]} (f, h_J) h_J = \sum_{m \in D_n} (f, w_m) w_m.$$ (4)

(W2) For $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have the “exponential” property $w_a w_b \equiv w_{a+b}$, where $a+b$ means the bitwise XOR operation (the corresponding bits in the binary decompositions of $a$ and $b$ are summed modulo 2).

Suppose multi-indices $(j,k)$ run over a subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2_{\geq 0}$ and numbers $a_{j,k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ are such that the sets $a_{j,k} + D_k$ are pairwise disjoint and completely cover $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Consider functions

$$f = \{f^{j,k}\}_{(j,k) \in A} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2).$$

We introduce the operator $G$ that transplants parts of the Walsh spectra of $f^{j,k}$ into $a_{j,k} + D_k$ and combines the results into a single function:

$$Gf \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{(j,k) \in A} a_{j,k} \Delta_k f^{j,k}.$$
The paper [9] mainly consists of combinatorial arguments that reduce estimate (3) to the estimate
\[ \| G f \|_{L^p} \leq C_p \| f \|_{L^p(I^3)}, \quad 1 < p \leq 2, \]
where \( C_p \) depends only on \( p \). The operator \( G \) satisfies the conditions of Gundy’s theorem for the standard dyadic filtration. But we can easily switch to the Haar filtration. Namely, we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.** The operator \( G \) belongs to \( \mathcal{G}([0, 1], l^p_{A}) \).

**Proof.** Expressing \( \Delta_x f^{j,k} \) in terms of \( h_0 \) and \( h_J \) in accordance with (4), we have
- \( G h_0^{j,0} = w_{a_j,0} h_0; \)
- if \( k > 0 \) and \( |J| = 2^{-k+1} \), then \( G h_J^{j,k} = w_{a_j,k} h_J; \)
- \( G \) vanishes on all other \( h_0^{j,0} \) and \( h_J^{j,k} \).

It suffice to prove that the non-zero functions \( G h_0^{j,0} \) and \( G h_J^{j,k} \) form an orthonormal basis. For fixed \((j, k)\), all the functions \( w_{a_j,0} h_J \) are mutually orthonormal. On the other hand, we have \( w_{a_j,0} h_0 = w_{a_j,0} \Delta_0 h_0 \) and \( w_{a_j,k} h_J = w_{a_j,k} \Delta_k h_J \), as \( |J| = 2^{-k+1} \). The Walsh spectra of two such functions with different \((j, k)\) are supported in disjoint intervals and, therefore, they are orthonormal. The completeness follows from the fact that \( a_{j,k} + D_k \) completely cover \( \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \), and from the identities
\[
\sum_{n \in a_{j,k} + D_k} \beta_n w_n = w_{a_{j,k}} \sum_{n \in D_k} \beta_{n+a_{j,k}} w_n = \sum_{J \subseteq [0, 1] \atop |J| = 2^{-k+1}} \gamma_J w_{a_{j,k}} h_J,
\]
where \( \beta_n, \gamma_J \in \mathbb{R} \) are some coefficients. \( \square \)

## 4. Main results

Henceforth, we suppose \( I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \), \( 1 < p \leq 2 \), and \( \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1 \). For
\[
f = \{ f^\alpha \}_{\alpha \in A} \in L^2(I, l^2_{A}) \quad \text{and} \quad g \in L^2(I),
\]
we set
\[
\langle f \rangle_I \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{ \langle f^\alpha \rangle_I \}_{\alpha \in A} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle g T^1 \rangle_I \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{ \langle g T^1 I^\alpha \rangle_I \}_{\alpha \in A}.
\]
We introduce the Bellman function
\[
B(x) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sup \left\{ \langle g T[f - \langle f \rangle_I] \rangle_I \right\} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\langle f \rangle_I = x_1, & \langle g T^1 \rangle_I = x_2, \\
\langle |f|^p \rangle_I = x_3, & \langle g^p \rangle_I = x_4
\end{array} \right\},
\]
where \( x \in l^2_{A} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \), and the supremum is taken over \( f \in L^2(I, l^2_{A}), g \in L^2(I), \) and \( T \in \mathcal{G}(I, l^2_{A}) \) satisfying the identities after the vertical bar. We note that \( B \) does not depend on the choice of \( I \).

**Fact 2.** Let \( \Omega_B \) consist of all the points \( x \) for which the supremum in (5) is taken over a non-empty set. Then we have
\[
\Omega_B \subseteq \Omega_p \overset{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ x \in l^2_{A} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \mid |x_1|^p \leq x_3, x_2 \leq x_4^{2/q} \right\}.
\]

**Proof.** In order to prove that \( \langle |f|^p \rangle_I \leq \langle |f|^p \rangle_I \), we only need to swap the integral and the \( l^2_{A}\)-norm and to employ the Hölder’s inequality. Next, relying on property (1) from Definition 4 and on Hölder’s inequality, we obtain
\[
\langle g T^1 \rangle_I = \frac{1}{|I|} \sum_{\alpha \in A} \langle g, T h_0^{\alpha} \rangle^n \leq \langle |g|^q \rangle_I^{2/q}.
\]
Now we introduce the class of Bellman-type functions.

**Definition 2.** We say that a function \( B \in C(\Omega_p) \) belongs to the class \( \mathcal{K}^p(\ell^2_p) \) if it satisfies the following boundary condition and geometric concave-type condition.

(B1) If \( |x|^p = x_3 \) then \( B(x) \geq 0 \).

(B2) If for \( x, x^+ \in \Omega_p \) and \( \Delta \in \mathbb{R} \) we have

\[
\frac{x^+ + x^-}{2} - x = (0, \Delta^2, 0, 0),
\]

then

\[
B(x) \geq \frac{|x^+ - x^-|}{2} |\Delta| + \frac{B(x^+) + B(x^-)}{2}.
\]

**Theorem 1.** If \( B \in \mathcal{K}^p(\ell^2_p) \), then \( B(x) \leq B(x) \) for all \( x \in \Omega_B \).

We provide a specific representative of the class \( \mathcal{K}^p(\ell^2_p) \). For \( y \in \mathbb{R}^{4,p} \), we define the function

\[
B_0(y) \triangleq 2(y_3 + y_4) - y_p^p - y_2^{q/2} - \delta_p \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
y_1^{2-p} y_2 + y_1^{2-p-2p(p-1)} y_2, & y_1^p \geq y_2^{q/2}; \\
\frac{1}{4}(2 + t_p) y_1^{q/2} + \frac{1}{2}(2 - t_p(p-1)) y_1^p, & y_1^p \leq y_2^{q/2}.
\end{array} \right.
\]

**Theorem 2.** There exist parameters \( t_p \geq 0, \delta_p > 0 \), and a constant \( C_p > 0 \) such that the restriction of the function

\[
B(x) \triangleq C_p B_0(|x_1|, x_2, x_3, x_4)
\]

to \( \Omega_p \) belongs to \( \mathcal{K}^p(\ell^2_p) \).

Theorems 1 and 2 have the following consequence.

**Corollary 1.** If \( T \in \mathcal{G}([0, 1], \ell^2_p) \), then for \( f \in L^2(\ell^2_p) \), we have

\[
\|Tf\|_{L^p} \leq (2p^{1/p} q^{1/q} C_p + 1) \|f\|_{L^p}.
\]

5. **Guessing the candidate.**

In this section, we briefly describe how we guess \( B \). Throughout this heuristic discussion, we restrict ourselves to considering functions \( B(y) \) for \( y \in \mathbb{R}^{4,p} \). First, applying Taylor decomposition to (\ref{Taylor}) and differentiating with respect to \( \Delta \), we come to the assumption that property (B2) is associated with the differential inequalities

\[
d^2 B[y](dy) \leq \frac{(dy_1)^2}{2 \partial_{y_2} B(y)} \leq 0.
\]

On the left, we calculate the Hessian at a point \( y \in \mathbb{R}^{4,p} \) and apply it to an arbitrary vector \( dy \in \mathbb{R}^4 \) as a quadratic form. Using arguments which are essentially the same as in \( \mathbb{R}^4 \), we come to our first guess:

\[
B(y) = 2y_3 + y_4 - y_p^p - y_2^{q/2}.
\]

For this function, condition (\ref{Taylor}) takes the form

\[
-p(p-1)y_1^{q/2 - 2}(dy_1)^2 - \frac{q}{2} (y_1^{q/2} - 1) y_2^{q/2 - 2}(dy_2)^2 \leq -\frac{(dy_1)^2}{qy_2^{q/2 - 1}}.
\]
Therefore, we see that $B$ satisfies (9) where $y_1^{p/2} y_2^{(2-1)/2} \geq 1$ or, what is the same, where $y_2^{2/2} \geq y_1^p$. This situation is similar to the one in (2) (once we do the substitution $y_2 = x_2^p$). Thus, it is tempting to try to add a term to our function (as it is done in (2)) in order to make it “more concave”. We try to add $-\delta_p y_1^{2-p} y_2$ below the critical curve (i.e., in the area $\{y_1^p \geq y_2^{2/2}\}$) and to add

$$-\delta_p \left( \frac{2}{q} y_2^{2/2} + \frac{2-p}{p} y_1^p \right)$$

above the critical curve (the latter expression comes from Young’s inequality). However, a direct computation (which is quite long) shows that the resulting function satisfies (9) only for $q \leq 4 \iff p \geq 4/3$! After that, we try to add the term $-\delta_p y_1^{2-p-2(p-1)/p} y_2^{p+1}$ below the critical curve (and the corresponding term above the critical curve). And this is how we come up with the Bellman candidate.

6. Proofs

6.1. Proof of Theorem 1 Fix $x \in \Omega_B$ and consider $f \in L^2(I, l^2_A)$, $g \in L^2(I)$, and $T \in \mathcal{G}(I, l^2_A)$ such that

$$x = (\langle f, I \rangle, \langle g T f, I \rangle, \langle f f', I \rangle, \langle g g', I \rangle).$$

For $J \subseteq I$, we set $x_1^J \overset{\text{def}}{=} \langle f, J \rangle$, $x_3^J \overset{\text{def}}{=} \langle f f', J \rangle$, and $x_4^J \overset{\text{def}}{=} \langle g g', J \rangle$. We also introduce

$$\delta_J \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{ \langle g T \zeta_J^q \rangle \}_{\alpha \in A} \in l^2_A,$$

where

$$\zeta_J^q \overset{\text{def}}{=} |J|^{1/2} h_J^q = 1_{J^+} - 1_{J^-}.$$

Finally, we set

$$\Delta_J \overset{\text{def}}{=} |\delta_J| \quad \text{and} \quad x_2^J \overset{\text{def}}{=} \langle g^2, J \rangle - \sum_{Q \subseteq J} \Delta_Q^2 |Q| |J|^{-1}.$$

Definition (1) implies that $x_2 = x_2^J$ and $x_2^J \geq 0$, $J \subseteq I$. Next, we have

$$x^J = (x_1^J, x_2^J, x_3^J, x_4^J) \in \Omega_p \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_J^2 = \frac{x_2^J + x_2^J - x_2^J}{2}.$$

We also have

$$\frac{|x_1^J - x_1^J|}{2} \Delta_J \geq \frac{x_1^J - x_1^J}{2} \cdot \delta_J = \frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{\alpha \in A} (f, h_J^q)(g, Th_J^q).$$

Applying inequality (6) $k$ times, we obtain

$$B(x) \geq \frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{J \subseteq I, \alpha \in A} (f, h_J^q)(g, Th_J^q) + \sum_{J \subseteq I} \frac{B(x^J)}{2^k}.$$

We denote the first and second terms in (10) by $U_k$ and $V_k$, respectively. Since the operator $T$ and the inner product are continuous in $L^2$, we have

$$U_k \to \langle g T P f, I \rangle,$$

where $P$ is the orthogonal projection onto $\text{Span} \{ \{ h_J^q \}_{\alpha \in A, J \subseteq I} \}$.

Assume for a while that $g \in L^{\infty}(I)$ and $f \in L^{\infty}_{00}(I, l^2_A)$ (namely, $f$ has a finite number of non-zero components and $|f| \in L^{\infty}(I)$). We introduce the step function
Fact 3. Suppose $y_1, y_2 > 0$ and $y_1^p \geq y_2^{q/2}$. For any $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$q(a_2 - a_1) = 2p(b_1 - b_2) \quad \text{and} \quad a_2 - a_1 \geq 0,$$

we have $y_1^{a_1} y_2^{b_1} \leq y_1^{a_2} y_2^{b_2}$. 

Proof. Raising both parts of $y_1^p \geq y_2^{q/2}$ to the power $\frac{a_2 - a_1}{p}$, we obtain the desired inequality. 

Lemma 1. There exist parameters $t_p \geq 0, \delta_p > 0$, and a constant $c_p > 0$ such that the function $B_0$, defined by (7), belongs to $C^1(\mathbb{R}^4_{\geq 0})$ and we have

$$d^2 B_0[y] (dy) \leq c_p \left( \frac{(dy_1)^2}{2 \partial y_1 \partial y_0(y)} \right) \leq 0$$

for any vector $dy \in \mathbb{R}^4$ and any point $y \in \mathbb{R}^4_{\geq 0}$ where $y_1, y_2 \neq 0$ and $y_1^p \neq y_2^{q/2}$. 

Proof. The direct calculation of $\partial y_1 B_0$ and $\partial y_2 B_0$ implies that $B_0 \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^4_{\geq 0})$ and that $\partial y_2 B_0 \leq 0$ for any $t_p, \delta_p \geq 0$. It remains to prove that

$$\left( \begin{array}{cc} \partial^2_{y_1} B_0 - \frac{c_p}{2 \partial y_1 \partial y_0} & \partial y_1 \partial y_2 B_0 \\ \partial y_1 \partial y_2 B_0 & \partial^2_{y_2} B_0 \end{array} \right) \leq 0,$$
provided $y_1, y_2 \neq 0$ and $y_2^p \neq y_2^{q/2}$. By direct calculations, we have $\partial^2_{y_2} B_0 \leq 0$ for any $t_p, \delta_p \geq 0$. Thus, it suffice to choose $t_p$, $\delta_p$, and $c_p$ such that

$$2 \partial_{y_2} B_0 \frac{\partial^2_{y_1} B_0}{\partial y_1^2} - c_p \geq c_p,$$

and then to prove that

$$2 \partial_{y_2} B_0 (\partial_{y_1} \partial_{y_2} B_0)^2 - c_p \partial^2_{y_2} B_0 \geq 0. \quad (13)$$

First, suppose $y_2^p \leq y_2^{q/2}$. Then inequality (12) takes the form

$$y_1^{p-2} y_2^{q/2-1} (p(p - 1) + 2\delta_p (2 - p - t_p(p - 1))(p - 1)) [q/2 + \delta_p (2 + t_p)] \geq c_p.$$

In the case being considered, we have $y_1^{p-2} y_2^{q/2-1} = (y_1^{1 - p} y_2^{q/2})^{1-2/q} \geq 1$ and $\partial_{y_1} \partial_{y_2} B_0 = 0$. Therefore, inequalities (12) and (13) hold, for example, when $t_p \leq 2 - p$, $\delta_p \geq 0$, and $c_p \leq 1/2$.

Next, suppose $y_2^p \geq y_2^{q/2}$. Fact 3 implies that

$$\max\left(y_1^{p-2} y_2^{q/2}, y_1^{s_p - 2} y_2^{1 + t_p}\right) \leq y_1^{p-2} y_2^{q/2-1},$$

$$\max\left(y_1^{s_p - p}, y_2^{1 - t_p}, y_1^{2 - 2t_p}, y_2^{1 - 2t_p}\right) \leq y_1^{s_p + p + 2} y_2^{t_p},$$

where $s_p \equiv 2 - p - 2p(p - 1)$, $t_p \leq \frac{2 - p}{2(p - 1)} = \frac{q}{p} - 1$, and $0 \leq t_p \leq 1$. Direct calculations give

$$\partial_{y_2} B_0(y) = -\left(\frac{q}{p} y_2^{q/2 - 1} + \delta_p y_1^{2 - p} + (1 + t_p) \delta_p y_1^{s_p} y_2^{t_p}\right),$$

$$\partial^2_{y_2} B_0(y) = -\left(p(p - 1) y_1^{p - 2} + (2 - p)(1 - p) \delta_p y_1^{p - 2} y_2 + s_p(s_p - 1) \delta_p y_1^{p - 2} y_2^{1 + t_p}\right).$$

Using direct calculations and estimates (12), we obtain

$$\partial_{y_2} B_0(y) \partial^2_{y_2} B_0(y) \geq \delta_p p(p - 1) + \frac{q}{p} \beta_1 y_1^{p - 2} y_2^{q/2 - 1} + \delta_p \beta_2 y_1^{s_p + p + 2} y_2^{t_p},$$

where

$$\beta_1 = p(p - 1) - \delta_p (2 - p)(p - 1) - \delta_p s_p (1 - s_p),$$

$$\beta_2 = p(p - 1)(1 + t_p) - \delta_p s_p (2 - p)(1 + t_p) - \delta_p s_p (1 - s_p)(2 + t_p).$$

By putting $c_p = \delta_p p(p - 1)$ and by taking a sufficiently small $\delta_p$, we come to (12).

It remains to prove (13). Fact 3 implies $y_1^{s_p} y_2^{t_p} \leq y_1^{1 - p}$ and $y_1^{s_p - 1} y_2^{t_p} \leq y_1^{1 - p}$.

Relying on these inequalities, we obtain

$$\partial_{y_2} B_0(y) \geq -\left(\frac{q}{p} y_2^{q/2 - 1} + \delta_p (2 + t_p) y_1^{2 - p}\right),$$

$$\partial_{y_2} B_0(y) \geq -\delta_p \left(2 - p + s_p(1 + t_p) y_1^{1 - p} y_2^{1 - t_p}\right) \geq -\delta_p (2 - p + s_p(1 + t_p)) y_1^{1 - p}.$$
Again, Fact 3 implies $y_1^{2-2p} y_2^{q/2-1} \leq y_1^{q/2-2}$ and $y_1^{q-3p} \leq y_1^{p} y_2^{t-1}$. Therefore, expression (15) is greater than
\[
\left(c_p \left(\frac{3}{2} - 1\right) - \delta p \beta_3 \right) y_2^{q/2-2} + \left(c_p \delta p (1 + t_p) t_p - \delta p \beta_4 \right) y_1^{p} y_2^{t-1}.
\]

Taking $c_p = \delta p (p - 1)$, $t_p = \min \left(1, \frac{q}{2} - 1\right)$, and a sufficiently small $\delta p > 0$, we finish the proof.

**Lemma 2.** Suppose $A$ is finite. There exist parameters $t_p \geq 0$, $\delta p > 0$, and a constant $C_p > 0$ such that the function $B$, defined by (8), belongs to $C^{1}(l_2^4 \times \mathbb{R}_0^3)$ and we have
\[
\text{d}^2B[x](dx) \leq \frac{|dx_1|^2}{2 \partial_{x_2} B(x)} \leq 0
\]
for any vector $dx \in l_2^4 \times \mathbb{R}_0^3$ and any point $x \in l_2^4 \times \mathbb{R}_0^3$ where $|x_1|, x_2 \neq 0$ and $|x_1|^2 \neq x_2^{q/2}$.

**Proof.** Let $x_1 = \{x_1^\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ and $r \defas (|x_1|, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in \mathbb{R}_0^4$. First, we note that for any $\alpha \in A$, the function
\[
\partial_{x_1^\alpha} B(x) = C_p \partial_{\alpha} B_0(r) \frac{x_1^\alpha}{|x_1|}
\]
is continuous where $x_1 \neq 0$. We also have
\[
|\partial_{x_1^\alpha} B(x)| \leq C_p |\partial_{\alpha} B_0(r)| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad x_1 \to 0.
\]
Thus, $B \in C^{1}(l_2^4 \times \mathbb{R}_0^3)$. Next, we immediately obtain
\[
\partial_{x_2} B(x) = C_p \partial_{y_2} B_0(r) \leq 0.
\]

It remains to prove the first inequality in (16). As in [7], we obtain
\[
\text{d}^2B[x](dx) = C_p \text{d}^2B_0[r](|dx_1|, dx_2, dx_3, dx_4) + C_p \partial_{y_2} B_0(r) \text{d}^2|x_1|.
\]
Here we mean that the differentials $d|x_1|$ and $d^2|x_1|$ are calculated at $x_1$ and are applied to $dx_1$:
\[
d|x_1| = dx_1 \cdot e \quad \text{and} \quad d^2|x_1| = \frac{|Qdx_1|^2}{|x_1|},
\]
where $e \defas \frac{x_1}{|x_1|}$ and $Qz \defas z - (z \cdot e) e$. Applying Lemma 1 and putting $C_p = \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_p}}$, we get
\[
\text{d}^2B[x](dx) \leq \frac{(d|x_1|)^2}{2 \partial_{x_2} B(x)} + \frac{2 \partial_{y_2} B_0(r) \partial_{y_2} B_0(r)}{c_p |x_1|} \frac{|Qdx_1|^2}{2 \partial_{x_2} B(x)}.
\]
We have $(dx_1 \cdot e)^2 + |Qdx_1|^2 = |dx_1|^2$. By direct calculations, we get
\[
\partial_{y_2} B_0(r) \partial_{y_2} B_0(r) \geq \delta p |x_1|.
\]
Thus, any $\delta p > 0$ and $c_p \leq 2\delta p$ give the desired result.

Now we are ready to prove that $B|_{\Omega_p} \in K^p(l_2^4)$ (see Definition 2). In order to obtain the boundary condition (B1) for $B$ on $\Omega_p$, we only need to take a sufficiently small $\delta p$ and to apply Young’s inequality.
Next, we prove that $\mathcal{B}$ satisfies the concave-type condition (B2) for any $x$ and $x^\pm$ in $\ell^2_A \times \mathbb{R}^3$. We have

$$\partial x \mathcal{B}(x_1, x_2) \equiv \partial x_2 \mathcal{B}(x) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\gamma_1 x_2^{q/2-1} + \gamma_2 |x_1|^{2-p} + \gamma_3 |x_1|^{2-p-2\ell(p-1)} x_2^2, |x_1|^p \geq x_2^{q/2}; \\
\gamma_4 x_2^{q/2-1}, |x_1|^p \leq x_2^{q/2},
\end{array} \right.$$  

where the constants $\gamma_i > 0$ depend only on $p$. We denote

$$x^\tau = (x_1^\tau, x_2^\tau, x_3^\tau, x_4^\tau) \equiv \frac{1+\tau}{2} x^+ + \frac{1-\tau}{2} x^-,$$

$$\phi(\rho) \equiv \mathcal{B}(x^0 - (0, \rho \Delta^2, 0, 0)), \quad \Phi(\tau) \equiv \mathcal{B}(x^\tau),$$

where $\tau \in [-1, 1]$ and $\rho \in [0, 1]$. We have

$$\mathcal{B}(x) - \frac{\mathcal{B}(x^+) + \mathcal{B}(x^-)}{2} = Q + R,$$

where

$$Q \equiv \phi(1) - \phi(0) \quad \text{and} \quad R \equiv \Phi(-1) + \Phi(1).$$

Calculating and reducing the interval of integration, we obtain

$$Q = \int_0^1 \phi'(\rho) \, d\rho \geq -\Delta^2 \int_0^{1/2} \partial x_2 \mathcal{B}(x_1^0, x_2^0 - \rho \Delta^2) \, d\rho.$$

Since $x_2^0 \geq \Delta^2$, we have $x_2^0 - \rho \Delta^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} x_2^0$ for $\rho \leq \frac{1}{2}$. On the other hand, if there exists $\rho' \leq \frac{1}{2}$ such that $|x_1|^p = (x_2^0 - \rho' \Delta^2)^{q/2}$, then $|x_1|^p \asymp (x_2^0 - \rho \Delta^2)^{q/2}$ for all $\rho \leq \frac{1}{2}$. In any case, we obtain $-\partial x_2 \mathcal{B}(x_1^0, x_2^0 - \rho \Delta^2) \asymp -\partial x_2 \mathcal{B}(x_1^0)$ for $\rho \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Thus, we have

$$Q \geq -c_p' \Delta^2 \partial x_2 \mathcal{B}(x_1^0). \tag{17}$$

Now we consider the term $R$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that, first, $A$ is finite and, second, the relations $x_1^+ = x_1^- = 0$ and $x_2^+ = x_2^- = 0$ do not hold. Indeed, we can approximate $x_1$ and $x_1^\pm$ by eventually zero sequences as well as separate $x_i^+$ or $x_i^-$ ($i = 1, 2$) from zero. After that we can, due to the continuity of $\mathcal{B}$, pass to the limit in (13). In particular, this remark allows us to regard the function $\Phi'$ as absolutely continuous. Indeed, the continuous function $\Phi'$ is differentiable on a cofinite set, and, as it can be seen below, $\Phi''(\tau) \leq 0$ on this set. The former implies the Luzin N property for $\Phi'$, and the latter implies that $\Phi'$ is decreasing and, therefore, is of bounded variation. All this suffices for the absolute continuity of $\Phi'$.

Next, we note that for any vectors $h$ and $b$ in $\ell^2_A \times \mathbb{R}^3$, we have the following general relation. If we define, where possible, the function $\Psi(\tau) \equiv \mathcal{B}(\tau h + b)$, then we have

$$\Psi''(\tau) = d^2 \mathcal{B}|\tau h + b|(h), \tag{18}$$
where the right-hand side exists. Further, we set \( h \equiv \frac{x_2 - x_1}{2} \). Employing Taylor’s formula in the integral form, relation (18), and Lemma 2, we obtain

\[
R = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{1} \Phi''(\tau) (1 - |\tau|) \, d\tau = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{1} d^2B[x'](h) (1 - |\tau|) \, d\tau
\]

\[
\geq -\frac{|h_1|^2}{4} \int_{-1}^{1} \frac{1 - |\tau|}{\partial_x^2 B(x')} \, d\tau.
\]

We have \(|h_2| \leq |h_1|^2|\). First, we consider the case \(|h_1| \leq |x_1^0|\). For \( \tau \in [-1/2, 1/2] \), we have \( x_2^2 \geq x_2^0 \) and \( |x_1^\tau| \leq |x_1^0| \). If there exists \( \tau' \in [-1/2, 1/2] \) such that \( |x_1^\tau| = (x_2^\tau)^{q/2} \), then \( |x_1^\tau| \geq (x_2^\tau)^{q/2} \) for all \( \tau \in [-1/2, 1/2] \). All this implies

\[
R \geq -c_p''\frac{|h_1|^2}{4 \partial_x^2 B(x')},
\]

Combining this inequality with (17), we obtain the estimate

\[
Q + R \geq \sqrt{c_p' c_p'' |h_1| |\Delta|}.
\]

Next, suppose \(|h_1| \geq |x_1^0|\). We have

\[
|h_1| \leq 2|\tau| \quad \text{for} \quad \tau \in [-1, 1].
\]

Let \( S \subset [-1, 1] \) be the set of all \( \tau \) such that \( x_2^\tau \geq x_2^0 \geq \Delta^2 \). We have \(|S| = 1 \) and \( x_2^\tau \leq 2x_2^0 \) for \( \tau \in S \). If for all \( \tau \in S \) we have \(|x_1^\tau| \leq (x_2^\tau)^{q/2} \), then we can estimate the integral over \( S \) in the same way as for the case \(|h_1| \leq |x_1^0|\). Suppose there exists \( \tau' \in S \) such that \( |x_1^\tau| > (x_2^\tau)^{q/2} \). Then we have \(|x_1^\tau| > (x_2^\tau)^{q/2} \) for all \( \tau \in S \). This implies

\[
(2|h_1|)^p \geq 2^{-q/2} (x_2^\tau)^{q/2} \geq 2^{-q/2} \Delta^q \quad \text{for} \quad \tau \in S.
\]

Estimates (20) and (21) implies

\[
R \geq c_p''' |h_1| |h_1|^{p-1} \geq c_p'' |h_1| |\Delta|.
\]

Since it is always true that (19) or (22) holds, we can adjust the constant \( C_p \) and obtain inequality (16) for \( B \).

6.3. Proof of Corollary 1. Suppose \( g \in L^2 \) and

\[
x \equiv \left( \langle f \rangle_{[0,1]}, \|gT1\|_{[0,1]}^2, \|f\|_{L^p}^p, \|g\|_{L^q}^q \right).
\]

Let \( \lambda > 0 \). By the homogeneity of \( B \) and by Theorems 1 and 2 we obtain

\[
\left( gT\frac{f}{[0,1]} - \langle f \rangle_{[0,1]} \langle gT1 \rangle_{[0,1]} \right) \leq B(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)
\]

\[
= B(\lambda x_1, \lambda^{-2} x_2, \lambda^p x_3, \lambda^{-q} x_4)
\]

\[
\leq B(\lambda x_1, \lambda^{-2} x_2, \lambda^p x_3, \lambda^{-q} x_4)
\]

\[
\leq 2C_p(\lambda^p x_3 + \lambda^{-q} x_4).
\]
In order to guess optimal $\lambda$, we need to solve the equation $\partial \lambda \left[ \lambda^p x_3 + \lambda^{-q} x_4 \right] = 0$.
We obtain

$$\lambda = \left( \frac{q x_4}{p x_3} \right)^{\frac{1}{p+q}}. \quad (24)$$

By Hölder’s inequality, we have

$$\left| \langle f \rangle_{[0,1]} \langle g, T f \rangle_{[0,1]} \right| \leq \| f \|_{L^p} \| g \|_{L^q}. \quad (25)$$

Combining (23), (24), and (25) for $g$ and $-g$, we obtain

$$\left| \langle g, T f \rangle \right| \leq (2^{1/p} q^{1/q} C_p + 1) \| f \|_{L^p} \| g \|_{L^q}.$$ 

This finishes the proof. \hfill $\Box$
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