Abstract. We prove boundedness of Calderón–Zygmund operators acting in Banach functions spaces on domains, defined by the $L_1$ Carleson functional and $L_q$ ($1 < q < \infty$) Whitney averages. For such bounds to hold, we assume that the operator maps towards the boundary of the domain. We obtain the Carleson estimates by proving a pointwise domination of the operator, by sparse operators with a causal structure. The work is motivated by maximal regularity estimates for elliptic PDEs and is related to one-sided weighted estimates for singular integrals.

1. Introduction

We prove estimates of Calderón–Zygmund operators (CZO) acting on functions $f(t, x)$ defined on a half space $\mathbb{R}_{1+n}^+$, in function spaces defined by $L_p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ norms of the classical Carleson and non-tangential maximal functionals $(Cf)(x)$ and $(Nf)(x)$ respectively. For CZOs to be even locally bounded inside $\mathbb{R}_{1+n}^+$, it is necessary to modify $C$ and $N$ since these build on $L_1(\mathbb{R}_{1+n}^+)$ and $L_\infty(\mathbb{R}_{1+n}^+)$ norms respectively. Following Kenig and Pipher [17], Auscher and Axelsson [3], Hytönen and Rosén [15] and Huang [14], we use Whitney $L_q$ averaging $W_qf(t, x)$ with $1 < q < \infty$, as defined in (4) below, and consider function spaces defined by norms $\|C(W_qf)\|_p$ and $\|N(W_qf)\|_p$, which encode interior local $L_q$ regularity, transversal $L_1$ or $L_\infty$ regularity, and $L_p$ regularity along the boundary $\mathbb{R}^n$. It was shown in [15] that the norms $\|N(W_qf)\|_p$ and $\|C(W_{q'}f)\|_{p'}$ are dual, $1/p + 1/p' = 1$, $1/q + 1/q' = 1$. In applications to elliptic partial differential equations (PDEs) as in [17, 3], the case $q = 2$ is particularly important, since for gradients $f$ of weak solutions to elliptic equations, in general we do not have pointwise interior bounds but only local $L_2$ estimates on Whitney regions.

A general $\mathbb{R}_{1+n}^+$ CZO

$$Sf(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_{1+n}^+} k(x, y)f(y)dy,$$

$x = (t, x), y = (s, y)$, fails to be bounded in any of the norms above, even with Whitney averaging. A key observation that we make is that for causal CZOs, bounds in some of the norms hold. By causal we mean that we consider either an upward
mapping CZO, denoted $S^+$, where $k = 0$ for $t < s$, or a downward mapping CZO, denoted $S^-$, where $k = 0$ for $t > s$. In our main Theorem 5.1 we prove that downward mapping CZOs $S^-$ are bounded in Whitney modified Carleson norms $\|C(W_qf)\|_p$ and that, dually, upward mapping CZOs $S^+$ are bounded in Whitney modified non-tangential maximal norms $\|N(W_qf)\|_p$.

In Section 6 we discuss motivating examples: maximal regularity operators arising from integration of elliptic PDEs in the variable transversal to the boundary as in [3]. At the end of the present paper, we explain how our Theorem 5.1 in the presence of pointwise kernel bounds, sharpens the estimate of half of the maximal regularity operators in [3]. In the case of the Laplace equation in $\mathbb{R}^2_+$, the maximal regularity operators $S^\pm$ appearing are the two causal parts of the Beurling transform, in which case one of the key estimates from [3] independently have appeared in Astala–González [2]. We recall that the kernel $k(x; y) = (x - y)^{-2}$ of this Beurling transform is symmetric and as a consequence its causal parts $S^\pm$ are $L_2$ bounded. Hence they are examples of rough CZOs: their kernels are discontinuous across the hypersurface $t = s$. With a slight abuse of notation we refer to such rough CZOs simply as CZOs below.

Our Carleson estimate for $S^-$ uses the method of sparse domination of CZO by A. Lerner. In Section 4 we adapt the proof for general CZO from Lerner [20] and prove a domination of causal CZOs by certain causal sparse operators. Here we take a direction somewhat against the mainstream of recent activity, where the trend has been to establish sparse domination for ever more general classes of operators; in contrasts, we deal with operators having additional structure (the causality), and the point is to preserve at least part of this structure in the dominating sparse operators as well. The one-dimensional special case, $n = 0$, of our Theorem 4.1 reads

\begin{equation}
|S^- f(t)| \lesssim \sum_{t \in (a, a+\ell)} \ell^{-1} \int_{a+\ell/2}^{a+2\ell} |f(s)| ds,
\end{equation}

where the sum is over a sparse collection $D_f$ of dyadic intervals $(a, a+\ell)$, but the average is over the right half and a right neighbourhood of this interval.

There are a number of previous results dealing with causal (also known as one-sided) operators and related weight classes. Due to the intimate connections of sparse domination and weighted norm inequalities, which have been explored in the recent literature, we briefly comment on these works. Sawyer [26] found that the one-sided maximal operator on the line satisfies weighted estimates if and only if the weight satisfies a one-sided $A_p$ condition. Later, Aimar et al. [1] showed that the one-sided $A_p$ condition is also the right condition for the boundedness of one-sided singular integrals on the line. Versions of these results for operators on a half-line (case $n = 0$ of our setting in $\mathbb{R}^{1+n}_+$), including extensions to operator-valued kernels and applications to maximal regularity of Cauchy problems, are recently due to Chill and Krol [11]. We refer to this paper for an extensive bibliography of other related works.

A sharp form of the one-sided maximal function estimates was found by Martín-Reyes and de la Torre [23]. The corresponding problem (a “one-sided $A_2$ conjecture”) for one-sided singular integrals remains open, but the analogous result for one-sided martingale transforms has been achieved in Chen and Lacey [10]. At the time of writing, the established methods of reducing continuous singular integrals to their
dyadic models (including [18, 19, 20, 21, 22] in the case of regular CZOs and [9, 13] for some rough extensions, to name but a selection of the extensive literature) are not available in a form that would respect the one-sided structure. In the present work we obtain a result that may be seen as a version of sparse domination for one-sided operators. While this version serves our present purposes, it is not strong enough to make progress on the mentioned weighted questions. The problem is that our dominating sparse operators are not strictly one-sided (for that, the integral in (1) should be over \((a + \ell, a + 2\ell)\) only) and cannot possibly be estimated in terms of one-sided \(A_p\) weights.

As mentioned above, one-sided weighted estimates for vector-valued singular integrals have been applied to maximal regularity operators for Cauchy problems in [11]. However, our Carleson estimates cannot be viewed as such weighted estimates, but rather correspond to the end-point norms \(r = 1\) and \(r = \infty\) in the scale of \(L_r\) tent spaces from Coifman, Meyer and Stein [12]. Estimates for maximal regularity operators in tent spaces based on the \(L_2\) area functional is in Auscher, Kriegler, Monniaux and Portal [5]. Tent space estimates of the horizontally mapping CZOs are in Auscher and Prisuelos-Arribas [6]. In Section 2, we include counterexamples that show that for non-causal \(R_1^{1+n}\) CZOs, as well as horizontally mapping \(R^n\) CZOs, the Carleson estimates considered in this paper fail in general.

2. CZOs on NT and Carleson spaces

We denote cubes on the boundary \(R^n\) by \(Q, R, \ldots\), and cubes in the half-space \(R_1^{1+n}\) by boldface \(Q, R, \ldots\). We denote \(n\) or \(n + 1\) dimensional measure by \(|\cdot|\) depending on the dimension of the cube, and we denote by \(cQ, c > 0\), the cube with same center as \(Q\) and sidelength \(c\ell(Q)\). For \(Q \subset R_1^{1+n}\) we form \(cQ\) in \(R_1^{1+n}\) as above, and define \(cQ \subset R_1^{1+n}\) as the intersection with \(R_1^{1+n}\), which may not be a cube if \(Q\) is near \(R^n\). A Carleson cube in \(R_1^{1+n}\) is a cube of the form

\[ Q = Q^{ca} = (0, \ell(Q)) \times Q, \]

where \(Q\) is a cube in \(R^n\) with sidelength \(\ell(Q)\). The corresponding Whitney region is the top half

\[ Q^w = (\ell(Q)/2, \ell(Q)) \times Q \]

of \(Q^{ca}\), and is the union of \(2^n\) cubes in \(R_1^{1+n}\) of sidelength \(\ell(Q)/2\). We denote points in \(R^n\) by \(x, y, \ldots\), and points in \(R_1^{1+n}\) by boldface \(x = (t, x), y = (s, t), \ldots\). Indicator functions of cubes and more general sets \(E\) are denoted by \(1_E\).

In particular we use dyadic cubes, and let \(\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{D}_j\) denote a system of dyadic cubes in \(R^n\), with \(\mathcal{D}_j\) being the cubes of sidelength \(\ell(Q) = 2^{-j}\), such that the dyadic cubes in \(\mathcal{D}\) form a connected tree under inclusion. Let \(\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{D}_j\) denote the associated dyadic system for \(R_1^{1+n}\), where \(\mathcal{D}_j\) consists of dyadic cubes of the form \(Q = (k2^{-j}, (k + 1)2^{-j}) \times Q, Q \in \mathcal{D}_j, k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots\). We note that also \(\mathcal{D}\) form a connected tree under inclusion where the dyadic Carleson cubes, the cubes touching \(R^n\), will play the special role.

We consider CZOs acting on functions defined on the half space \(R_1^{1+n}\), \(n \geq 1\), and belonging to endpoint spaces in the scale of tent spaces from [12], whose definitions
use the non-tangential maximal and Carleson functionals

\[ Nf(x) = \text{ess sup}_{|y-x|<\alpha t} |f(t, y)|, \]

\[ Cf(x) = \sup_{Q \ni x} |Q|^{-1} \int_Q |f(t, x)| dt dx, \]

where the second supremum is over all cubes \( Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) containing \( x \), and the Whitney averaging operator

\[ W_{d}f(t, x) = |Q^{w}|^{-1/q} \|f\|_{L_q(Q^{w})}, \]

where \( Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is the cube with center \( x \) and sidelength \( t \). More precisely, we consider the norms \( \|N(W_{q}f)\|_{L_p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \), introduced in [17], and dual norms \( \|C(W_{q}f)\|_{L'_p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \) considered in [15]. We recall from [15] that up to constants these two scales of norms are independent of the choice of aperture \( \alpha > 0 \) and the precise scale of the Whitney regions and Carleson cubes. Moreover, for the dyadic functionals

\[ N_{D}f(x) = \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, Q \ni x} f_Q, \]

\[ C_{D}f(x) = \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, Q \ni x} |Q|^{-1} \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}, R \subset Q} |R^{w}|f_R, \]

acting on sequences \( (f_Q)_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \), and dyadic Whitney \( L_q \) averages

\[ (W_{D, q}f)_Q = \|Q^{w}\|^{-1/q} \|f\|_{L_q(Q^{w})}, \quad Q \in \mathcal{D}, \]

we have \( \|N_{D}W_{D, q}f\|_p \approx \|N(W_{q}f)\|_p \) and \( \|C_{D}W_{D, q}f\|_{p'} \approx \|C(W_{q}f)\|_{p'} \) for \( 1 \leq p < \infty \) and \( 1 \leq q \leq \infty \). (The degenerate case is of no interest here.) Finally, we recall that if \( 1 < p < \infty \), then \( \|C_f\|_p \approx \|Af\|_p \), where

\[ Af(x) = \int_{|y-x|<\alpha t} |f(t, y)|^{-\alpha} dt dx, \]

but the estimate \( \gtrsim \) breaks down as \( p \to \infty \), and \( \lesssim \) breaks down as \( p \to 1 \).

We are interested in boundedness of CZOs in the norms \( \|N(W_{q}f)\|_p \) or equivalently, by duality, in the norms \( \|C(W_{q}f)\|_{p'} \). As discussed in the Introduction, it is necessary to require \( 1 < q < \infty \), and main applications concern \( q = 2 \). For the Carleson functional, which builds on \( L_1 \) integrals, it is natural to make use of the recently technology of sparse domination of CZOs. We recall the following estimate of A. Lerner [20]. Assume given a standard CZO \( S \) on \( \mathbb{R}^{1+n}_+ \) and a function \( f \in L_1(\mathbb{R}^{1+n}_+) \) with bounded support. Then there exists a collection \( \mathcal{D}_f \subset \mathcal{D} \) of cubes, which is \( \eta \)-sparse, for some \( 0 < \eta < 1 \) independent of \( f \), such that

\[ |Sf(x)| \lesssim \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_f, Q \ni x} \int_{3Q} |f(y)| dy \]

holds pointwise almost everywere. Here \( \eta \)-sparse means that there exists subsets \( E_Q \subset Q, Q \in \mathcal{D}_f \), such that \( |E_Q| \geq \eta |Q| \) for all \( Q \in \mathcal{D}_f \), and \( E_Q \cap E_R = \emptyset \) if \( Q \neq R \).

The method of sparse domination has proven very successful in proving optimal bounds for CZOs on weighted \( L_q \) spaces. We apply in this paper the technique to the scales of Banach function spaces described above. Since \( N \) and \( C \) involve an \( L_\infty \) and \( L_1 \) norm respectively however, it is not surprising that in general we have the following counterexamples.
Example 2.1. A sparse operator, that is a sublinear operator of the form

\[ \hat{S}f(x) = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, Q \ni x} \int_{3Q} |f(y)| dy, \]

with a fixed \( \eta \)-sparse collection \( \mathcal{D} \) independent of \( f \), is not in general bounded on \( \|C(W_q f)\|_p \) for any \( p, q \). An example is as follows. Let \( n = 1 \) and fix a Carleson cube \( Q_0 = Q_0^a \) with \( \ell(Q_0) = 1 \). Consider

\[ f_N = 2^{N1(0, 2^{-N}) \times Q_0} \]

and let \( \mathcal{D} \) be the collection of all dyadic Carleson cubes contained in \( Q_0 \). Then \( W_{D,q} f_N = f_N, C_D f_N = 1 \) on \( Q_0 \) and \( \|C_D f_N\|_p \lesssim 1 \) for any fixed \( p > 1 \). However, for \( x = (t, x) \in Q^w \) with \( Q \subset Q_0, \ell(Q) = 2^{-k}, 0 \leq k \leq N \), we have

\[ \hat{S}f_N(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{k} \frac{(2^{N2^{-N}2^{-j}} - 2^{-j})^2}{2^{k+1} - 1} \approx 1/t. \]

Hence \( C_D(\hat{S}f_N) \gtrsim \int_{1}^{2^{-N} t} \frac{df}{t} \approx N \) at each point in \( Q_0 \), so \( \|C_D W_{D,q}(\hat{S}f_N)\|_p \gtrsim N \) for any \( 1 \leq p, q \leq \infty \). However, although domination of CZOs by sparse operators is considered to be quite sharp, the above example does not disprove that CZOs are bounded in these Carleson norms. And indeed, by direct calculations one can show that the Beurling transform on the upper half plane

\[ Sf(z) = \text{p.v.} \left( -\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\text{Im} w > 0} \frac{f(w)}{(w - z)^2} dw \right) \]

maps \( f_N \) boundedly in the Carleson norms. To find a counterexample for the Beurling transform, it is convenient to consider a weak limit

(5) \[ f(t, x) = g(x) \delta_0(t), \]

of functions like \( f_N \), to be modulated by a function \( g(x) \) supported on \( Q_0 = (0, 1) \) that remains to be chosen. In this limit we have

\[ Sf(z) = \text{p.v.} \left( -\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{0}^{1} \frac{g(x)}{(x - z)^2} dx \right), \]

and for real-valued \( g \) we note from Cauchy–Riemann’s equations that \( |Sf(z)| = |\nabla u(z)| \), where \( u \) is the Poisson extension of \( g \). As discussed in the Introduction of [16], by constructing \( g \) via a lacunary Fourier series, it is known that the bound

\[ \|C(\nabla u)\|_p \lesssim \|g\|_p \]

cannot hold uniformly for \( g \), for any fixed \( 1 < p < \infty \). Replacing \( \delta_0 \) in (5) by \( 2^{N1(0, 2^{-N})} \), it is clear that the Carleson bounds for \( S \) cannot hold uniformly in \( N \).

Example 2.2. We next demonstrate that \( \mathbb{R}^n \) CZOs acting horizontally, that is pointwise in \( t \), in general are not bounded either in the norms \( \|N(W_q f)\|_{p'} \) or \( \|C(W_q f)\|_p \). A concrete counterexample is the following. Let

\[ Hf(t, x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \text{p.v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{f(s, y)}{x - y} dy \]
be the Hilbert transform acting horizontally in $\mathbb{R}^2_+$, and consider the function
\[
 f_N(t, x) = \sum_{j=0}^{N} \sum_{k=2^j} 2^k 1_{(2^{-k}, 2^{1-k})}(t) 1_{(k2^{-j-1}, (k+1)2^{-j-1})}(x)
\]
with support in $[0, 1]^2$. The integral of each term in this double sum, supported on a thin rectangle, is seen to be $2^{-j}$, and it is straightforward to verify that $\|C(W_\infty f_N)\|_p \lesssim N$ for each $p > 1$. However, an explicit computation reveals that
\[
 \int_0^1 |Hf_N(t, x)|dx \approx 2^{k-j}(j+1)
\]
for $t \in (2^{-k}, 2^{1-k})$, $2^j \leq k < 2^{j+1}$, $0 \leq j \leq N$, and therefore $C(Hf_N) \gtrsim N^2$ on $(0, 1)$. It follows that $H$ fails to be bounded on the Carleson and non-tangential maximal spaces.

3. Causal Calderón–Zygmund operators

We consider CZOs
\[
 S f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{1+n}_+} k(x, y)f(y)dy
\]
on $\mathbb{R}^{1+n}_+$. More precisely, we assume kernel bounds
\[
 (6) \quad |k(x, y)| \lesssim |x - y|^{-(n+1)}
\]
and regularity
\[
 (7) \quad \max(|k(x, y + t)| - k(x, y), |k(x + t, y) - k(x, y)|) \lesssim |t|^\gamma/|x - y|^{n+1+\gamma},
\]
for all $|t| \leq |x - y|/2$ and a fixed $0 < \gamma \leq 1$.

We assume not only that $S : L_2(\mathbb{R}^{1+n}_+) \rightarrow L_2(\mathbb{R}^{1+n}_+)$ is bounded, but that
\[
 S = S^+ + S^-
\]
where $S^\pm : L_2(\mathbb{R}^{1+n}_+) \rightarrow L_2(\mathbb{R}^{1+n}_+)$ are bounded, where the kernel $k^\pm((t, x), (s, y))$ for $S^\pm$ vanishes when $\pm(t-s) < 0$. Thus $S^\pm$ are Calderón–Zygmund operators, where $S^+$ is upward mapping away from $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $S^-$ is downward mapping towards $\mathbb{R}^n$. We refer to $S^\pm$ as causal operators. They are simple examples of singular integral with rough kernels, in that $k^\pm((t, x), (s, y))$ may be discontinuous on the hyperplane $t = s$ in $\mathbb{R}^{2(n+1)}$, with a simple jump discontinuity when $x \neq y$ and $t = s$.

**Lemma 3.1.** The operators $S^\pm$ satisfy the Hörmander regularity condition
\[
 \int_{(3Q)^c} (|k^\pm(x, y_1)| - k^\pm(x, y_2)| + |k^\pm(y_1, x) - k^\pm(y_2, x)|)dx \lesssim 1,
\]
uniformly for all cubes $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{1+n}_+$ and $y_1, y_2 \in Q$.

**Proof.** For $Q = (a, b) \times Q$, this follows from using (7) for $t < a$ and $t > b$, and using (6) for $a < t < b$. $\square$

Denote by $Mf$ the standard Hardy–Littlewood maximal function of $f$. As in [20], we also require a weak $L_1$ estimate of Lerner’s maximal singular integral
\[
 M_{S^\pm}f(x) = \sup_{Q \ni x} \|S^\pm(1_{(3Q)^c}f)\|_{L_\infty(Q)}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^{1+n}_+,
\]
with supremum over dyadic cubes $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{1+n}_+$, into which $S^\pm$ maps from the complement of the enlarged (non-dyadic) cube $3Q$.

**Proposition 3.2.** The causal CZOs $S^\pm$ and the maximal singular integrals $M_{S^\pm}$ are all bounded from $L_1(\mathbb{R}^{1+n}_+)$ to $L_{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{1+n}_+)$.

**Proof.** (1) The weak $L_1$ estimate for $S^\pm$ itself follows from the standard proof employing the Calderón–Zygmund decomposition, since this only requires the Hörmander regularity estimate from Lemma 3.1.

(2) Following the standard proof of Cotlar’s lemma, see for example [24, Sec. 7.7], we write

$$f_1 = 1_{3Q} f \quad \text{and} \quad f_2 = 1_{(3Q)^c} f,$$

for a cube $Q$ with center $x_0$. We estimate $S^\pm(1_{(3Q)^c} f) = S^\pm f_2$ at each fixed $x_1 \in Q$, by comparing it to the value at a variable point $x \in Q$, writing

$$S^\pm f_2(x_1) = (S^\pm f_2(x_1) - S^\pm f_2(x)) + S^\pm f(x) - S^\pm f_1(x) =: I + II + III.$$

Raising the terms to power $1/p$, $p > 1$, and taking the average over $Q$, terms $II$ and $III$ are estimated in the usual way: $\mathcal{F}_Q |S^\pm f|^{1/p} dy \lesssim M(|S^\pm f|^{1/p})(x_0)$, and $f_Q |S^\pm f_1|^{1/p} dy \lesssim |Q|^{-1/p} \|S^{+1/p} f_1\|_{L_{1,\infty}} \lesssim |Q|^{-1/p} \|f_1\|_{L_1} \lesssim (Mf(x_0))^{1/p}$ by Kolmogorov’s inequality and weak $L_1$ estimate (1) above.

For $I$, we define

$$\Phi(z) = \Phi(u, z) = \begin{cases} (1 + |z|)^{-(1+n+\gamma)}, & u \in (-\infty, -1) \cup (1, \infty), \\ (1 + |z|)^{-(1+n)}, & u \in (-1, 1). \end{cases}$$

Using (7) and (10)

$$|(S^\pm f_2(x_1) - S^\pm f_2(x))| \lesssim M_\Phi f(x_0),$$

where $M_\Phi$ is the maximal operator

$$M_\Phi f(z) = \sup_{t > 0} |f(z)| * t^{-(n+1)} \Phi(z/t).$$

By [27, Sec. II.4, Prop. 2], $M_\Phi$ is weak-type $(1,1)$. This completes the proof, since we have

$$|M_{S^\pm f}(x_0)| \lesssim M_\Phi f(x_0) + M(|S^{+1/p} f_1(x_0)|^{1/p} + f(x_0))$$

and $M$ is bounded on $L_{p,\infty}$ and weak-type $(1,1)$. \hfill \Box

4. **Causal sparse domination of $S^-$**

To state our causal sparse domination, we need the following subsets of the neighbourhood $3Q$. For $Q = (a, a + \ell) \times Q \in \mathcal{D}$, $Q \in \mathcal{D}$, we define the upper and lower halves of $Q$

$$Q^a = (a + \ell/2, a + \ell) \times Q,$$

$$Q^l = (a, a + \ell/2) \times Q,$$

the top and lower parts of $(a, a + 2\ell) \times Q$

$$Q^T = (a + \ell/2, a + 2\ell) \times 3Q,$$

$$Q^L = (a, a + \ell/2) \times 3Q,$$

and the upper part of an annulus around $Q^l$

$$Q^T = ((a, a + 2\ell) \times 3Q) \setminus \overline{Q^L}.$$
For \( x = (t, x) \in Q \) we let
\[
Q_x^\cap = Q^\cap \cap \{(s, y) : s > \min(a + \ell/2, t)\},
\]
so that \( Q^T \subset Q_x^\cap \subset Q^\cap \). The following sparse estimate is a causal adaptation of the estimate in [20]. We specifically note that the very argument of [20] seemed more amenable to this adaptation than either its predecessors or successors in the sparse domination literature.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let \( S^- \) be a downward mapping causal Calderón–Zygmund operator as in Section 3. Let \( f \in L_1(\mathbb{R}^{1+n}) \) have bounded support. Then there exists a \( 1/4 \)-sparse family of cubes \( D_f \subset D \) such that
\[
|S^- f(x)| \lesssim \sum_{Q \in D_f} \frac{1}{Q^\cap} \int_{Q^\cap} |f(y)| dy, \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^{1+n}.
\]

We remark that an essential point in Theorem 4.1 is that the sum uses the same dyadic system as we start out with. If we allow us to replace \( D \) by a finite number of other dyadic systems, then the result is immediate from [20], but cannot be used to prove our Carleson bounds.

We also remark that the one-dimensional result, \( n = 0 \), is somewhat cleaner. In this case \( D \) is the standard dyadic intervals and for \( Q = (a, a + \ell) \), the average in the sparse sum is over \((a + \ell/2, a + 2\ell)\), independent of \( x \in Q \), as in (1).

**Proof.** (1) Fix \( Q \in D \) and assume that the closure of \( 3Q \) contains the support of \( f \). Write \( f^T := 1_{Q^T} f \) and \( f^L := 1_{Q^L} f \). By the downward causal mapping property of \( S^- \), we have
\[
1_Q S^- f = 1_Q S^- f^L + 1_Q S^- f^T.
\]
Define the set
\[
E := \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^{1+n} : |S^- f^T(x)| > c \int_{Q^T} |f| dy\}
\]
\[
\cup \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^{1+n} : |M S^- f^T(x)| > c \int_{Q^T} |f| dy\}.
\]
Let \( R_1, \ldots, R_{2^n} \) denote the children of \( Q \) contained in \( Q^\cap \), and let \( Q_1, Q_2, \ldots \) be an enumeration of all the maximal subcubes of \( Q^\cap \) such that
\[
|Q_j \cap E| > \alpha |Q_j|.
\]
Here \( c > 0 \) and \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \) are parameters to be fixed below. We obtain a family \( \{R_i, Q_j\} \) of disjoint subcubes of \( Q \). By causality
\[
1_Q S^- f^L = \sum_i 1_{R_i} S^- f^L
\]
and by splitting functions we have
\[
1_Q S^- f^T = \sum_i 1_{R_i} S^- f^T + 1_{Q^\cap \cup Q_j} S^- f^T + \sum_j 1_{Q_j} S^- (1_{3Q_j} f^T + 1_{(3Q_j \setminus 3R_i)} f^T).
\]
By causality
\[
\sum_i 1_{R_i} S^- (f^L + f^T) = \sum_i 1_{R_i} S^- (1_{3R_i} f + 1_{(3Q \setminus 3R_i)} f).
\]
and
\[ \sum_j 1_{Q_j} S^-(1_{3Q} f^T) = \sum_j 1_{Q_j} S^-(1_{3Q} f). \]

In total, we obtain
\[ \quad 1_{Q} S^- f = \sum_i 1_{R_i} S^- (1_{3R_i} f) + \sum_j 1_{Q_j} S^- (1_{3Q_j} f) \]
\[ + \sum_i 1_{R_i} S^- (1_{3Q_i \setminus (3R_i)} f) + 1_{Q^* \setminus Q^*} S^- f^T + \sum_j 1_{Q_j} S^- (1_{3Q_j \setminus (3Q)} f^T) \]
\[ =: I_1 + I_2 + II_1 + II_2 + II_3. \]

(2) We next show that terms \( II \) are pointwise bounded by \( \int_{Q^*} |f| dy \), at \( x \in Q \).

For \( II_1 \), this is immediate from (6) and the downward mapping property of \( S^- \). For \( II_2 \), it follows from Lebesgue’s differentiation theorem that
\[ E \cap Q^* \subset \bigcup_j Q_j \]
modulo a set of measure zero. The estimate is then immediate from the definition of \( E \).

For \( II_3 \), consider one of the stopping cubes \( Q_j \). By definition, we have \( |Q_j \cap E| > \alpha |Q_j| \). We require an upper estimate of the measure of \( E \). It follows from Proposition 3.2 that
\[ |E| \lesssim \left( c \int_{Q^*} |f| dy \right)^{-1} \int_{R^+_{1+n}} |f^T| dy \approx |Q|/c. \]

Moreover, if \( Q_j^p \) denotes the dyadic parent of \( Q_j \), then by maximality of \( Q_j \) we have
\[ |Q_j \cap E| \leq |Q_j^p \cap E| \leq \alpha |Q_j^p| = \alpha 2^{1+n} |Q_j|. \]

Let \( \alpha = 2^{-2-n} \). Then in particular there exists \( x \in Q_j \setminus E \). From the definition of \( E \) it now follows that
\[ |S^- (1_{3Q_j \setminus (3Q)} f^T)| \leq M_{S^-} f^T(x) \lesssim \int_{Q^*} |f| dy \]
on almost all of \( Q_j \).

(3) We have shown that for \( f \) supported on \( 3Q \), we have
\[ |1_Q S^- f - \sum_i 1_{R_i} S^- (1_{3R_i} f) - \sum_j 1_{Q_j} S^- (1_{3Q_j} f)| \lesssim \int_{Q^*} |f| dy \]
at almost all \( x \in Q \). To conclude the proof, we iterate this estimate recursively for all the subcubes \( R_i \) and \( Q_j \). To this end, we note that
\[ \sum_i |R_i| = |Q|/2 \]
and, since \( \bigcup Q_j \subset \{ M(1_E) > \alpha \} \), that
\[ \sum_j |Q_j| \lesssim \alpha^{-1} \int_{E} dy = |E|/\alpha \lesssim |Q|/(c \alpha). \]
Fix $c$ large enough so that $\sum_i |R_i| + \sum_j |Q_j| \leq 3|Q|/4$. Define
\[ E_Q := Q \setminus \left( \bigcup_i R_i \cup \bigcup_j Q_j \right), \]
so that $|E_Q| \geq |Q|/4$.

Finally, consider the disjoint union
\[ R_{1+}^{1+n} = \bigcup_k Q^k, \]
modulo zero sets, where the closure of $Q^1$ contains the support of $f$, $Q^2, \ldots, Q^{2^{1+n}}$ are the siblings of $Q$, and $Q^{2^{1+n+1}}, \ldots, Q^{2^{2+n}}$ are the siblings of the parent of $Q$, and so on. Then $Q^1 \subset 3Q^k$ for all $k$, so that
\[ S^- f = \sum_k 1_{Q^k} S^- f = \sum_k 1_{Q^k} S^- (1_{3Q^k} f). \]

We define the family of dyadic cubes $D_f$ to be $Q^1, Q^2, \ldots$ along with, for each of $Q^k$, all generations of stopping cubes starting from $Q = Q^k$, constructed as above. It follows that $D_f$ is $1/4$ sparse and that we have the stated sparse bound of $S^- f$. □

5. Bounds for causal CZOs

The Carleson bounds established in this section apply to slightly larger causal sparse operators
\[ |\hat{S} f(x)| \lesssim \sum_{Q \in D, Q \ni x} \int_{Q^x} |f(y)| dy, \quad x \in R_{1+}^{1+n}, \]
where we have replaced the region $Q^x$ appearing in the sparse operator in Theorem 4.1 by the slightly larger region
\[ Q^x = (a + \min(a + \ell/2, t), a + 2\ell) \times 3Q, \]
for $x = (t, x) \in Q = (a, a + \ell) \times Q$. We also write
\[ Q^x = (a, a + 2\ell) \times 3Q. \]

The following is the main result of this paper.

**Theorem 5.1.** Let $S^+$ and $S^-$ be causal Calderón–Zygmund operators as in Section 3. Let $1 < q < \infty$ and $1 < p \leq \infty$. Then we have the estimates
\[ \|CW_q(S^- f)\|_p \lesssim \|CW_q(f)\|_p, \]
\[ \|NW_{q'}(S^+ f)\|_{q'} \lesssim \|NW_{q'}(f)\|_{q'}. \]

More precisely, the estimate
\[ C_D W_{D,q}(\hat{S} f) \lesssim C_{\hat{D}} W_q(f) + C(f) \]
holds pointwise on $R^n$ for the causal sparse operator $\hat{S}$ from (3), for any $\eta$-sparse collection $\hat{D} \subset D$ with $0 < \eta < 1$. Here $\hat{W}_q(f)$ denotes the Whitney $L_q$ average over $\hat{Q}^w = (\ell(Q)/2, 3\ell(Q)/2) \times (2Q)$, on a dyadic Whitney region $Q^w$. 
Proof. It suffices to prove the estimate of \( \hat{S} \). Indeed, combining this and Theorem \([15, \text{Thm 3.1}]\) yields the bounds for \( S^- \), by using equivalences of norms between the different versions of Carleson functionals and Whitney averages from \([15, \text{Sec. 3}]\). Furthermore, the Carleson duality from \([15, \text{Thm 3.1}]\) proves the bound for \( S^+ \).

Fix \( Q_0 \in \mathcal{D} \) and consider \( \int_{Q_0^w} |W_{D,p}(\hat{S}f)| \, dx \). Consider a Whitney region \( Q^w \subset Q_0^a \), where \( Q \subset Q_0, \, Q \in \mathcal{D} \). We write

\[
\hat{S}f(x) = \sum_{R \in \mathcal{D}, R \ni x} \int_{R_x^a} |f| \, dy = I + II + III,
\]

for a.e. \( x \in Q^w \), where we split the sum according to the cases \( R \subsetneq Q^a \), \( R \supseteq Q^a \) and \( R \cap Q^a = \emptyset \), noting that \( R, Q^a \in \mathcal{D} \). Clearly \( III = 0 \), for \( I \) we can restrict to \( R \subset Q^w \), and for \( II \) we have that \( R = R^a \) are Carleson boxes.

The local terms \( I \) do not require causality and we may replace \( R_x^a \) by the larger set \( R_x^\square \). Standard sparse estimates via duality apply as follows. Let \( g \geq 0 \) be supported on \( Q^w \) with \( \int g^q \, dx = 1, \, 1/q + 1/q' = 1 \). Then

\[
\left( \int_{Q^w} |I|^q \, dx \right)^{1/q} = |Q^w|^{-1/q} \int_{Q^w} g \left( \sum_{R \in \mathcal{D}, R \subset Q^w} 1_R \right) \int_{R_x^\square} |f| \, dy \, dx = |Q^w|^{-1/q} \sum_{R \in \mathcal{D}, R \subset Q^w} \left( \int_R g \, dx \right) \left( \int_{R_x^\square} |f| \, dy \right) |R| \lesssim |Q^w|^{-1/q} \int_{Q^w} M(g) M(1_{Q^w} f) \, dz \lesssim \left( \int_{Q^w} |f|^q \, dz \right)^{1/q},
\]

where \( \tilde{Q}^w = (\ell(Q)/2, 3\ell(Q)/2) \times (2Q) \). We have used that \( |R| \lesssim |E_R| \), that \( M(g) \geq \int_R g \, dx \) and \( M(1_{Q^w} f) \geq \int_{R_x^\square} |f| \, dy \) on all \( E_R \), Hölder’s inequality, and \( L_q' \) and \( L_q \) boundedness of the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \( M \). Integration over \( Q_0^a \) now yields the desired estimate of \( I \) by \( C_D W_q(f) \).

The non-local terms \( II \) do not require sparseness, and we may increase the sum over \( R^a \in \mathcal{D} \) to a sum over \( R \in \mathcal{D} \). Note that the term \( II \) is essentially constant on \( Q^w \), and we replace the Whitney \( L_q \) average by the supremum norm on \( Q^w \), and increase \( (R^a)^\square \) to

\[
(R^a)^\square_Q := (R^a)^\square \cap \{(s, y) : s > \ell(Q)/2\}.
\]

We have

\[
\int_{Q_0^a} |II| \, dx \lesssim \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, Q \subset Q_0} |Q^w| \sum_{R \in \mathcal{D}, R \subset Q} |R^a|^{-1} \int_{(R^a)^\square_Q} |f| \, dy = II_1 + II_2,
\]

where we split the outer sum according to \( R \subset Q_0 \) and \( R \supsetneq Q_0 \). For the tail terms \( II_2 \) we increase \( (R^a)^\square_Q \subset (R^a)^\square = 3R^a \) and get

\[
II_2 \leq |Q_0^a| \sum_{R \in \mathcal{D}, R \supsetneq Q_0} |R^a|^{-1} \int_{3R^a} |f| \, dy \lesssim |Q_0^a| \left( \sum_{k=1}^\infty 2^{-k} \right) \inf C f.
\]
since \(|3R|/|Rca| \leq 2^{-k}/\ell(Q_0)|\) for the \(k\)’th ancestor of \(Q_0\) (and \(|Q_0^a|/\ell(Q_0) = |Q_0|\)).

For the mid-range terms \(II_1\), we write

\[
II_1 = \sum_{R \in \mathcal{D}, R \subset Q_0} |Rca|^{-1} \int_{3R^a} \left( \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}, Q \subset R} |Q^w|1_{\ell(Q) < 2s} \right) |f(s,y)| ds dy
\]

\[
\lesssim \sum_{R \in \mathcal{D}, R \subset Q_0} |Rca|^{-1} \int_{3R^a} (s|R|)|f(s,y)| ds dy
\]

\[
\lesssim \int_{3Q_0^a} \left( \sum_{R \in \mathcal{D}, R \subset Q_0} s\ell(R)^{-1}1_{3R^a} \right) |f(s,y)| ds dy \lesssim \int_{3Q_0^a} |f| ds dy,
\]

since at a given scale \(\ell(R) = 2^{-k}\) we have \(1_{3R^a} = 0\) if \(2^{-k} < s/3\), and otherwise at most \(3^n\) terms are non-zero. In total we obtain a bound of \(II\) by \(C(f)\), which completes the proof. \(\Box\)

6. Motivations from elliptic PDEs

We end this paper by discussing motivations for the estimates in Theorem 5.1 from maximal regularity for PDEs. A natural point of departure for the discussion is the parabolic problem

\[
\partial_t u_t + Lu_t = g_t,
\]

for \(u_t(x) = u(t,x), t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^n\), with \(u_0 = 0\). Here \(L = -\text{div}_x A(x) \nabla_x\), where \(A \in L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^n))\) is accretive. The maximal regularity problem for a space \(\mathcal{H}\) of functions in \(\mathbb{R}^{1+n}\), is whether a source \(g \in \mathcal{H}\) yields a solution \(u\) with \(Lu\) (and hence \(\partial_t u\)) in \(\mathcal{H}\). The maximal regularity operator here is

\[
Lu_t = \int_0^t L e^{-(t-s)L} g_s ds,
\]

which is upward mapping like the operators \(S^+\) considered in this paper. However, this \(S^+\) does not have the CZO kernel bounds (6), even for \(L = -\Delta_x\). Indeed, non-tangential estimates are not natural for this problem due to parabolic scaling.

Instead our motivation comes from the analogous considerations for elliptic divergence form equations

\[
\text{div}_t A(t,x) \nabla_{t,x} u(t,x) = 0, \quad t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^n,
\]

where \(A = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^{1+n}))\) is accretive. Following [3], we consider the associated first order generalized Cauchy–Riemann system

\[
\partial_t f_t + DB_t f_t = 0
\]

for the conormal gradient \(f_t = [([A \nabla_{t,x} u])_1, -\nabla_x u]^T\) of \(u\). This uses the associated Dirac operator \(D = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \text{div}_x \\ -\nabla_x & 0 \end{bmatrix}\) and transformed accretive matrix \(B = \begin{bmatrix} a^{-1} & -a^{-1}b \\ ca^{-1} & d - ca^{-1}b \end{bmatrix}\). For each \(t > 0\), the conormal gradient belongs to the closure of the range of \(D\) since \(\text{curl}_x(\nabla_x u) = 0\), and it was demonstrated in [3] Sec. 3) that (9) is equivalent to (10), under this tangential curl free constraint on the tangential part of \(f_t\).
Now fix bounded and accretive coefficients $B = B(x)$, which are independent of $t$, and consider the equation

\begin{equation}
\partial_t f_t + DB f_t = g_t,
\end{equation}

where $f$ and $g$ are functions of $t > 0$ and take values in $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}(D)$. The $t$-independent case when $B_t = B$ and $g = 0$ was studied in \cite{4}, whereas perturbation results for $t$-dependent coefficients $B_t$ were obtained in \cite{3} via Duhamel’s principle with $g_t = D(B - B_t) f_t$. Following \cite{3}, we integrate (11) with boundary and decay conditions $\lim_{t \to 0} E^+ f_t = 0 = \lim_{t \to \infty} E^- f_t$ and a general source term $g_t$, and obtain

\begin{equation}
- \partial_t f_t = DB f_t = \Lambda f_t^+ - \Lambda f_t^- = \int_0^t \Lambda e^{-(t-s)\Lambda} E^+ g_s ds + \int_t^\infty \Lambda e^{-(s-t)\Lambda} E^- g_s ds = S^+ g_t + S^- g_t,
\end{equation}

where the integrals define the maximal regularity operators $S^+$ and $S^-$. The kernels $\Lambda e^{-(t-s)\Lambda} E^\pm$ of $S^\pm$ are defined through holomorphic functional calculus from the bisectorial operator $DB$ in $\mathcal{H}$, using the symbol $|z| e^{-(t-s)|z|} \chi^\pm(z)$, where $\chi^\pm(z) = \begin{cases} 1, & \pm \text{Re } z > 0, \\ 0, & \pm \text{Re } z < 0, \end{cases}$ and $|z| = z(\chi^+(z) - \chi^-(z))$.

We saw above that the parabolic maximal regularity problem concerned an upward mapping operator $S^+$, using the heat semigroup $\exp(-tL)$, which is not of the form considered in this paper. The elliptic maximal regularity problem involves also a downward mapping operator $S^-$. Both $S^\pm$ from (12) use the Poisson semigroup $\exp(-t\Lambda)$, and $S := S^+ + S^-$ generalizes the Beurling singular integral as the following example from \cite{25} shows.

**Example 6.1.** Consider the Cauchy–Riemann equations for a holomorphic function $f(z)$ in the region above the graph $\gamma$ of a Lipschitz function $y = \phi(x)$. Parametrizing $z = x + i(\phi(x) + t)$, these equations read

\[ \partial_z f + B D f = 0, \]

when written in the real basis $\{1 + i\phi'(x), i\}$. Here $B = (1 + i\phi'(x))^{-1}$ is an accretive, $t$-independent complex multiplier, and $D = -i\partial_x$ is the first order self-adjoint derivative.

Consider now the associated Poisson semigroups and maximal regularity operators, and replace $DB$ by the similar operator $BD = B(DB)B^{-1}$. By computing the kernels of resolvents and operators in the functional calculus of $BD$, it follows as in \cite{25} Lem. 3.1] that

\begin{equation}
S^+ g_t(z) + S^- g_t(z) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty \int_{\gamma} \frac{g_s(w) dw}{(w + is - (z + it))^2} ds,
\end{equation}

which essentially is the classical Beurling transform, compressed to functions supported above $\gamma$. Moreover, the maximal regularity operator $S^+$ is the upward mapping part of the Beurling transform, where integration is over $0 < s < t$ only, and $S^-$ is the downward mapping part of the Beurling transform, where integration is over $t < s < \infty$ only. Except for the non-smooth multiplicative factor implicit in the $dw$ in (13), it is readily checked that (6) and (7) hold in this example. Since $L^2$ boundedness is well known, these operators $S^\pm$ are causal CZOs.
For general elliptic equations (14), the pointwise estimates (5) and (7) of the distribution kernels of the associated operators $S^\pm$ hold only in an average $L^2$ sense. Global $L^2$ bounds

$$ \| \Lambda e^{-|t-s|A} E^\pm \|_{H \to H} \lesssim 1/|t-s| $$

follow from the Kato quadratic estimates, more precisely [8, Thm. 3.1]. Also $L^2$ off-diagonal estimates for $\Lambda e^{-|t-s|A} E^\pm$ can be derived from such estimates for the resolvents of $DB$ (see [8, Prop. 5.2]). As for pointwise kernel estimates, we saw in Example 6.1 that for general non-smooth coefficients $B$, only the first estimate in (7) can hold for $DB$, and only the second estimate can hold for $BD$. More importantly, even (5) may fail for $n \geq 2$. For $n = 1$, at least for real coefficients, the pointwise kernel bound (1) follows from the interior regularity estimates for solutions to (11) of De Giorgi, Nash and Moser (which hold for real coefficients in any dimension). Indeed, $f_t = e^{-t|BD|} f_0$ solves the first order equation $\partial_t f_t + BD f_t = 0$, where the first component of $f$ satisfies a second order equation (14) and hence have pointwise bounds. See [3, Sec. 3.2]. In general this is not true for the remaining components (conjugate functions) in $f$, except when $n = 1$, in which case also the second component/conjugate function does satisfy an equation (14), which some conjugate coefficients. See [7, Lem. 5.3]. To summarize, the operators $S^\pm$ appearing in (12) from [3, Prop. 7.1], are natural for boundary value problems with boundary topology $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for $\lim_{t \to 0} f_t$. On the other hand, the function space

$$ \mathcal{V} = L_2(\mathbb{R}^n_+; tdtdx), $$

along with the subspace $\mathcal{Z}$ with norm $\| f \|_{\mathcal{Z}} = \| C(W_{2,t}) \|_2$, are natural for boundary value problems with boundary topology $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for $\lim_{t \to 0} f_t$. (Corresponding to boundary function space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for the potential $u$.) It was shown in [15] Thm. 3.1] that $\mathcal{Z}^* = \mathcal{X}$, but that $\mathcal{Z}$ is not reflexive.

Previously known bounds for the causal operators $S^\pm$ in (12) from [3 Prop. 7.1], for general accretive coefficients $B$ and not assuming pointwise kernel bounds, can be summarized in the following diagrams.
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The estimate

$$ \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2_+} |f(t,y)|^2 t dtdx \right)^{1/2} \approx \| (A(|f|^2 t))^{1/2} \|_2 \lesssim \| A(W_{2,t}) \|_2 \approx \| C(W_{2,t}) \|_2 $$

(14)
shows that $Z \subset Y$, and hence $Y^* \subset X$. It was shown in [3, Lem. 5.5] that a multiplication operator $E$ maps $X \to Y^*$ if it satisfies the Carleson condition
\begin{equation}
\|C(W_\infty E^2/t)\|_\infty < \infty.
\end{equation}
Moreover, it follows from [15] that $E$ maps as in the diagrams if and only if \(15\) holds.

Writing $DB_t = DB - DBE_t$, the relevant multiplier $E$ in studying $t$-dependent PDEs $\partial_t f_t + DB_t f_t = 0$ through Duhamel integration, is
\[E_t = B^{-1}(B - B_t),\]
where $B = \lim_{t \to 0} B_t$. To prove the existence of boundary values of solutions $f_t$ and representation formulas as in [3, Sec. 8-9], it is needed that
\begin{equation}
(S^+ + S^-)E
\end{equation}
is a bounded operator (with small norm to obtain a Cauchy type representation formula). This will yield equivalences of norms $\|f_0\|_{L^2_2(R^n)} \approx \|f\|_X$ for solutions $f \in X$ to (10), and $\|f_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^{-1} (R^n)} \approx \|f\|_Y$ for solutions $f \in Y$ to (10).

6.1. $L^2_2(R^n)$ boundary traces of solutions $f$. Sufficient for the boundedness of $E$ on $X$ is that $S^\pm E : X \to X$ are bounded. Assuming that pointwise kernel bounds hold as discussed above, so that $S^+$ is a CZO, it follows from Theorem 5.1 that already $S^+ : X \to X$ is bounded. We obtain the new result that only $E \in L^\infty_\Lambda (R^{1+n}_+)$, which is weaker than (15), is needed for boundedness of $S^+ E : X \to X$. However, this does not yield any new estimate for $S^+ + S^-$, needed for the PDE application. Indeed, for the downward mapping maximal regularity operator, the best known bound is that $S^+ : Y^* \to X$. Similar to Section 6.2, we conjecture that the Carleson condition (15) is in general necessary for the boundedness of $S^+ E : X \to X$.

6.2. $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(R^n)$ boundary traces of solutions $f$. Sufficient for the boundedness of $E$ on $Y$ is that $S^\pm E : Y \to Y$ are bounded. It is known from [3, 15] that already $S^- : Y \to Y$ is bounded, so only $E \in L^\infty_\Lambda (R^{1+n}_+)$ is needed for $S^- E : Y \to Y$. The new result from Theorem 5.1 that $S^- : Z \to Z$ is bounded, is not relevant for the boundedness of $S^- E : Y \to Y$.

For the upward mapping maximal regularity operator, the best known bound is that $S^+ : Z \to Y$. This follows by duality from [3, Thm. 6.8]. Furthermore, the Carleson condition (15) on multipliers $E$ is in general necessary for the boundedness of $S^+ E : Y \to Y$. To see this, by duality and the above estimate $S^- : Y \to Y$, we equivalently consider the boundedness of $E S^+ Y^* : Y^* \to Y^*$. In the case of the Beurling transform it was proved in Astala-Gonzalez [2, Thm. 1] that this latter boundedness holds if and only if $E$ satisfies (15), but without the Whitney factor $W_\infty$ (due to the pointwise kernel bounds present for the Beurling transform).

We conclude with a remark concerning the estimate $S : Z \to Y$ and sparse domination. Note from (13) that the $L^2_2$ based tent space norm for $Y$ is smaller than the $L^1$ based tent space norm $\|C(W_2h)\|_2$ for $Z$. The estimate $E : Z \to Y$ was proved in [3, Prop. 7.1], for general accretive coefficients $B$ and not assuming pointwise kernel bounds, by a reduction to the Poisson semigroup $\exp(-t\Lambda)$ and quadratic estimates. A natural question is whether the estimate can be proved more directly through sparse domination, at least for operators with pointwise kernel.
bounds. However, Example 2.1 shows that in general a sparse operator \( \hat{S} \) does not map \( \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y} \). Indeed, \( \int_{\mathcal{Q}_0} (t^{-1})^2 t dt dx \) is not convergent.
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