

Products and Commutators of Martingales in H_1 and BMO

Aline Bonami*, Yong Jiao, Guangheng Xie, Dachun Yang and Dejian Zhou

Abstract Let $f := (f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ and $g := (g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ be two martingales related to the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ equipped with the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$. Assume that f is in the martingale Hardy space H_1 and g is in its dual space, namely the martingale BMO. Then the semi-martingale $f \cdot g := (f_n g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ may be written as the sum

$$f \cdot g = G(f, g) + L(f, g).$$

Here $L(f, g) := (L(f, g)_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ with $L(f, g)_n := \sum_{k=0}^n (f_k - f_{k-1})(g_k - g_{k-1})$ for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, where $f_{-1} := 0 =: g_{-1}$. The authors prove that $L(f, g)$ is a process with bounded variation and limit in L^1 , while $G(f, g)$ belongs to the martingale Hardy-Orlicz space H_{\log} associated with the Orlicz function

$$\Phi(t) := \frac{t}{\log(e+t)}, \quad \forall t \in [0, \infty).$$

The above bilinear decomposition $L^1 + H_{\log}$ is sharp in the sense that, for particular martingales, the space $L^1 + H_{\log}$ cannot be replaced by a smaller space having a larger dual. As an application, the authors characterize the largest subspace of H_1 , denoted by H_1^b with $b \in \text{BMO}$, such that the commutators $[T, b]$ with classical sublinear operators T are bounded from H_1^b to L^1 . This endpoint boundedness of commutators allow the authors to give more applications. On the one hand, in the martingale setting, the authors obtain the endpoint estimates of commutators for both martingale transforms and martingale fractional integrals. On the other hand, in harmonic analysis, the authors establish the endpoint estimates of commutators both for the dyadic Hilbert transform beyond doubling measures and for the maximal operator of Cesàro means of Walsh–Fourier series.

1 Introduction

Motivated by developments in geometric function theory and nonlinear elasticity, Bonami et al. in their pioneer work [9] investigated the linear decomposition of products of two functions respectively in the Hardy space $H_1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and the space $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ of functions of bounded mean oscillation and conjectured in [9, Conjecture 1.7] that this linear decomposition should be bilinear.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 60G42; Secondary 60G46, 47B47, 42B25, 42B30.

Key words and phrases. martingale Hardy space, martingale BMO, bilinear decomposition, commutator, dyadic Hilbert transform.

This project is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 12001541, 12125109, 12201647, 11971058 and 12071197), the National Key Research and Development Program of China (Grant No. 2020YFA0712900), and the Natural Science Foundation of Hunan Province (Grant Nos. 2021JJ40711 and 2021JJ40714).

*Corresponding author, E-mail: aline.bonami@univ-orleans.fr/February 06, 2023 /Final version.

Via the wavelet multiresolution analysis, Bonami et al. [8] completely solved this conjecture by proving that there exist two bounded bilinear operators

$$L : H_1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

and

$$G : H_1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

such that the product fg of any $f \in H_1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $g \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ can be represented as

$$fg = L(f, g) + G(f, g).$$

Here the product is taken in the sense of Schwartz distributions and $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a Musielak–Orlicz Hardy space related to the Musielak–Orlicz function

$$(1.1) \quad \varphi(x, t) := \frac{t}{\log(e + |x|) + \log(e + t)}$$

for any $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, \infty)$. The question of the optimality of the result was raised in this article, to know whether $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ can be replaced by a smaller vector space. The pointwise multiplier theorem of Nakai and Yabuta [31] allowed the authors in [7] to answer that the smallest Banach space containing $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is in some sense the smallest Banach space containing these products. Optimality was deduced in one dimension in [10] from an exact factorization and in [7] for $n \geq 2$ from a weak factorization. More related progress on this subject over \mathbb{R}^n can be found in [12, 6, 45, 46]. Other contexts than \mathbb{R}^n have also been studied recently. In particular, Fu et al. [17] and Liu et al. [23] established bilinear decomposition on metric measure spaces of homogeneous type.

It is natural to consider the product of general martingales. It turns out that the bilinear decomposition appears particularly intuitive in the context of martingales, even if new difficulties appear. Let us first fix some symbols before describing this new situation.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space and $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ an increasing sequence of sub- σ -algebras of \mathcal{F} satisfying $\mathcal{F} = \sigma(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathcal{F}_n)$. We assume for simplicity that $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$. The martingale Hardy space and the martingale BMO are denoted, respectively, by H_1 and BMO . Martingales $f = (f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ that belong to H_1 or BMO can be identified with their limits f_∞ , so that these martingale spaces may be seen as spaces of functions (or random variables) on Ω , but it is no more the case for the products we are interested in: if $f = (f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ belongs to H_1 and $g = (g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ belongs to BMO , the product $f_\infty g_\infty$ is not integrable in general, so that such an identification is not possible. Recall that it is possible in the sense of distributions in the case of \mathbb{R}^n . Here it is natural to define $f \cdot g$ as the discrete process $(f_n g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$. But it is not a martingale. Fortunately it is a semi-martingale, which is the sum of a martingale and a process with bounded variation. Our main result gives the decomposition of the semi-martingale $f \cdot g$ into two parts, one a martingale in H_{\log} and one a bounded variation process. We call \mathcal{BV} the space of such processes, that is, the space of adapted sequences of random variables, $h = (h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$, such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |h_n - h_{n-1}| \right) < \infty,$$

where \mathbb{E} denotes the expectation. On the other hand, H_{\log} is the martingale Orlicz Hardy space associated with the Orlicz function

$$(1.2) \quad \Phi(t) := \frac{t}{\log(e+t)}, \quad \forall t \in [0, \infty).$$

For an adapted process $h = (h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$, we let $d_0(h) := h_0$ and $d_n(h) = d_n h := h_n - h_{n-1}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The main result of our first part is the following one.

Theorem 1.1. *For any $(f, g) \in H_1 \times \text{BMO}$, one can write*

$$f \cdot g = L(f, g) + G(f, g),$$

where L and G are two bounded bilinear operators with

$$L : H_1 \times \text{BMO} \rightarrow \mathcal{BV}$$

and

$$G : H_1 \times \text{BMO} \rightarrow H_{\log}.$$

Moreover, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$L(f, g)_n := \sum_{k=0}^n d_k(f) d_k(g).$$

The bilinearity of L is clear by its definition and follows immediately for G . The martingale $G(f, g)$ is the sum of two paraproducts, $\Pi_1(f, g)$ and $\Pi_2(f, g)$, which are respectively such that $d_n(\Pi_1(f, g)) = f_{n-1} d_n(g)$ and $d_n(\Pi_2(f, g)) = g_{n-1} d_n(f)$ for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.

Remark 1.2. (i) We will show that Theorem 1.1 is somewhat sharp in the sense of duality. For this, we will rely this theorem to its dual and use the characterization of pointwise multipliers of BMO given in [28]. Precisely, if Theorem 1.1 holds true for \mathcal{Y} with $\mathcal{Y} \subset H_{\log}$, then

$$(L^1 + \mathcal{Y})^* = (L^1 + H_{\log})^*.$$

(ii) As quoted above, in the same problem on \mathbb{R}^n , the Orlicz function Φ in (1.2) that appears in the definition of H_{\log} is replaced by the Musielak–Orlicz function φ in (1.1); see [8]. The dependence in x is there for the behavior at ∞ in \mathbb{R}^n and does not appear in local results or periodic ones; see, for instance, [9, 12, 45, 46] in the Euclidean space. It is natural to find the same Orlicz function here as that for periodic functions on \mathbb{R} or for the dyadic situation which was studied by Bakas et al. [2].

(iii) We would like to mention that Odysseas Bakas, Zhendong Xu, Yujia Zhai, and Hao Zhang [3] have independently obtained the analog of Theorem 1.1. They then developed very interesting generalizations to H^p for any $p \in (0, 1)$ and to martingales related to non probability measures, while our article takes another direction. It is worth mentioning that in Theorem 1.1 we insist on the meaning of the product. An analog of the definition of the product as a distribution as in the classical case does not seem available in general. This is why we define the product as a semi-martingale, namely a sum of a martingale and a process with bounded variation.

The next observation will be central in our further developments and gives another way to see the products involved in the theorem. Observe that $L(f, g)$ converges in L^1 and almost surely (for short a.s.). When $n \rightarrow \infty$, since $f_n g_n$ converges also a.s., the same is valid for $G(f, g)_n$ but the fact that we only know that it is in H_{\log} does not allow us to recover the martingale from its a.s. limit. Nevertheless it is the case when f is an L^2 -martingale and, in this case, the decomposition can also be written in terms of limit values at ∞ . In general, the H_{\log} part of the product can be recovered as a limit, using the density of L^2 -martingales in H_1 .

One remarkable application of the aforementioned bilinear decomposition in harmonic analysis is due to Ky [21, 22]. It is well known that commutators generated by both Calderón–Zygmund operators and $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ functions may not map $H_1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ continuously into $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Using the bilinear decomposition, Ky [21] characterized the largest subspace \mathcal{Z} of $H_1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that most classical commutators are bounded from this subspace \mathcal{Z} to $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The second goal of this article is to adapt this characterization in the martingale setting and establish endpoint estimates of commutators generated by both martingale operators and multiplications by BMO functions.

Commutators of martingale transforms were first investigated by Janson [20] and then studied by Chao and Peng [15] for regular martingales. Commutators of martingale transforms for non-regular martingales were recently investigated by Treil [39]. In addition, the boundedness of commutators of martingale fractional integrals were developed by Chao and Ombe [14] and very recently by Nakai et al. [30, 1]. However, up to now, there does not exist any endpoint estimate of martingale commutators.

More precisely, let $b \in \text{BMO}$, $q \in [1, \infty)$, and T be in a class \mathcal{K}_q of sublinear operators containing almost all important operators in the martingale setting (see Definition 4.1 for its definition). The commutator $[T, b]$ of the sublinear operator T is defined by setting (when it makes sense), for any $f \in H_1$ and $x \in \Omega$,

$$[T, b](f)(x) := T(bf - b(x)f)(x).$$

Moreover, if T is linear, then $[T, b](f) = T(bf) - bT(f)$. Now, we establish the (sub)bilinear decomposition for the commutator $[T, b]$ as follows.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $q \in [1, \infty)$ and $T \in \mathcal{K}_q$. Then there exists a bounded subbilinear operator*

$$R : H_1 \times \text{BMO} \rightarrow L^q$$

such that, for any $(f, b) \in H_1 \times \text{BMO}$,

$$|T(L(f, b))| - R(f, b) \leq |[T, b](f)| \leq R(f, b) + |T(L(f, b))|,$$

In particular, if T is linear, then, for any $(f, b) \in H_1 \times \text{BMO}$, the bilinear operator $R(f, b)$ defined by setting

$$R(f, b) := [T, b](f) - T(L(f, b))$$

is bounded from $H_1 \times \text{BMO}$ into L^q .

This means that continuity properties for the commutator may be deduced from continuity properties for $T(L(f, b))$. For any $b \in \text{BMO}$, we introduce a new martingale Hardy space H_1^b (see Definition 4.11 below) which is related to endpoint estimates of commutators $[T, b]$ for any $T \in \mathcal{K}_q$.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $q \in [1, \infty)$, $T \in \mathcal{K}_q$, and $b \in \text{BMO}$. Then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in H_1^b$,*

$$\|[T, b](f)\|_{L^q} \leq C\|f\|_{H_1^b}.$$

Remark 1.5. Let $b \in \text{BMO}$. It is worth mentioning that the space H_1^b in Theorem 1.4 is sharp in the sense that $\mathcal{Y} := H_1^b$ is the largest subspace of H_1 such that, for any $T \in \mathcal{K}_1$, the commutator $[T, b]$ is bounded from \mathcal{Y} to L^1 ; see Remark 4.13 below.

Remark 1.6. By analogy with the classical case on \mathbb{R}^n (see [32, 21]), examples of functions in H_1^b are given by atoms a related to the integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\mathbb{E}_n(ab) = 0$ as well as sums of such atoms.

We point out that our results have wide applications in martingale theory and harmonic analysis. On the one hand, we obtain the endpoint boundedness of the commutators of both martingale transforms and martingale fractional integrals (see Section 4.4 below). Note that these endpoint estimates were not considered before. So, these estimates complete the story of martingale commutators investigated by Janson [20], Chao et al. [14, 15], Nakai et al. [30, 1], and Treil [39].

On the other hand, we provide some applications in harmonic analysis. In recent years, dyadic operators have attracted a lot of attention related to the so-called A_2 -conjecture in harmonic analysis. Especially, the boundedness of the dyadic Hilbert transform beyond doubling measures (also known as the dyadic shift; see, for instance, [35]) was first characterized by López-Sánchez et al. [25]. Motivated by this, we establish the endpoint estimate of the commutator for the dyadic Hilbert transform beyond doubling measures. Additionally, we establish the endpoint estimate of the commutator for the maximal operator of Cesàro means of Walsh–Fourier series. To the best of our knowledge, the commutator for the maximal operator of Cesàro means of Walsh–Fourier series had not been investigated before.

Observe that the Vilenkin system is a natural generalization of the Walsh system (see, for instance, [33, 34]). It is interesting to see whether or not our methods still work for the Vilenkin system.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows.

In Section 2, we present some notation and preliminaries about the martingale Hardy space, the martingale BMO space, and the atomic decomposition that we use to prove our main results.

Section 3 is devoted to proving Theorem 1.1. Once written the product of martingales via martingale paraproducts, write

$$f \cdot g = \Pi_1(f, g) + \Pi_2(f, g) + L(f, g), \quad \forall (f, g) \in H_1 \times \text{BMO},$$

the problem is reduced to the study of these three bilinear operators. The main difficulty is to find a suitable decomposition of martingales from the martingale Hardy space H_1 . Recall that wavelets or atomic decompositions are used in \mathbb{R}^n (see [5, 8]). However, the martingale Hardy space H_1 associated with the martingale square function does not admit a classical atomic decomposition when the underlying filtration is not regular. To overcome this difficulty, we use the Davis decomposition (see Lemma 2.4 below) and decompose the martingale $f \in H_1$ into two parts. The first one is in the martingale Hardy space h_1 defined by the martingale conditional square operator and has an atomic decomposition. The second one is in the h_1^d , so that it is an ℓ^1 sum of integrable

jumps. So it is sufficient to estimate $\{\Pi_i(a, g)\}_{i=1}^2$, where a is an atom (or a jump martingale, that is, a martingale h such that $d_k h$ is 0 except for one value of k).

In Section 4, we establish the (sub)bilinear decomposition of commutators and the endpoint estimate of commutators. We first introduce a class \mathcal{K}_q , with $q \in [1, \infty)$, of sublinear operators. Comparing with [21], we do not limit ourselves only to the case $q = 1$ and benefit from this is to treat martingale fractional integral operators. Applying Theorem 1.1, we first establish a subbilinear decomposition of the sublinear commutator $[T, b]$ (see Theorem 1.3 below), and then establish an equivalent characterization of the martingale Hardy-type space H_1^b via the bilinear operator L (see Theorem 4.12 below). All these would suffice for us to show Theorem 1.4. In Section 4.4, we provide examples of operators in the class \mathcal{K}_q , such as martingale transforms and martingale fractional integral operators.

Finally, Section 5 focuses on applications of our results in harmonic analysis. In Section 5.1, we obtain the endpoint estimate of the commutator for the dyadic Hilbert transform beyond doubling measures. Section 5.2 contains the endpoint estimate of commutators of the maximal operator of Cesàro means of Walsh–Fourier series.

Throughout this article, we always let $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$, $\mathbb{Z}_+ := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, and $\mathbb{Z} := \{0, \pm 1, \dots\}$, respectively. We use C to denote a positive constant, which may differ from line to line. The symbol $f \lesssim Cg$ means that there exists a positive constant C such that $f \leq Cg$. If we write $f \approx g$, then it stands for $f \lesssim g$ and $g \lesssim f$. If $f \leq Cg$ and $g = h$ or $g \leq h$, we then write $f \lesssim g \approx h$ or $f \lesssim g \lesssim h$, rather than $f \lesssim g = h$ or $f \lesssim g \leq h$. For any subset E of Ω , we use $\mathbf{1}_E$ to denote its *characteristic function*. For any measurable function f , define $\text{supp}(f) := \{x \in \Omega : f(x) \neq 0\}$.

2 Preliminaries

This section includes some basic preliminary background concerning martingale Hardy spaces and BMO spaces that are needed throughout this article. Our notation and terminology are standard as may be found in monographs [18, 24, 42].

2.1 Martingale Hardy spaces

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space and $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ an increasing sequence of sub- σ -algebras of \mathcal{F} satisfying $\mathcal{F} = \sigma(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathcal{F}_n)$. The expectation operator with respect to \mathcal{F} is denoted by \mathbb{E} . The conditional expectation operators with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ are denoted, respectively, by $(\mathbb{E}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$. The sequence $f := (f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \subset L^1$ is called a *martingale* if, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$\mathbb{E}_n(f_{n+1}) = f_n.$$

Denote by \mathcal{M} the set of all the martingales $f := (f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ related to $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$. For any $f \in \mathcal{M}$, define its *martingale difference* by setting (with convenience, $f_{-1} := 0$ and $\mathbb{E}_{-1} := 0$)

$$d_n(f) = d_n f := f_n - f_{n-1}, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

As usual, for any martingale $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and any $p \in [1, \infty]$, let

$$\|f\|_{L^p} := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \|f_n\|_{L^p} := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \left(\int_{\Omega} |f_n|^p d\mathbb{P} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

If $\|f\|_{L^p} < \infty$, then f is called an L^p -bounded martingale.

Remark 2.1. If $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $f \in \mathcal{M}$ is an L^p -bounded martingale, then there exists an $f_\infty \in L^p$ such that $f_n = \mathbb{E}_n(f_\infty)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\|f_n - f_\infty\|_{L^p} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$; see, for instance, [24, p. 28]. In this case, we will also speak of the L^p -martingale. Recall that this is no more true for an L^1 -bounded martingale $f := (f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$. If a martingale $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is generated by a measurable function $f_\infty \in L^1$, that is, $f_n = \mathbb{E}_n(f_\infty)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, then, in this case, one also has $\|f_n - f_\infty\|_{L^1} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and we will also speak of the L^1 -martingale.

When a martingale $f := (f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is generated by a function f_∞ , that is, when f is an L^1 -martingale, we will not distinguish at times the martingale and f_∞ .

For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the Doob maximal operators $M(f)$, the square function $S(f)$, and the conditional square functions $s(f)$ of a martingale f are defined, respectively, by setting

$$M(f) := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |\mathbb{E}_n(f)|, \quad S(f) := \left(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |d_n f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and

$$s(f) := \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{n-1} |d_n f|^2 + |d_0 f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Definition 2.2. The martingale Hardy spaces H_1 , h_1 , and h_1^d are defined, respectively, by setting

$$H_1 := \{f \in \mathcal{M} : \|f\|_{H_1} := \|S(f)\|_{L^1} < \infty\},$$

$$h_1 := \{f \in \mathcal{M} : f_0 = 0, \|f\|_{h_1} := \|s(f)\|_{L^1} < \infty\},$$

and

$$h_1^d := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{M} : \|f\|_{h_1^d} := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \|d_k f\|_{L^1} < \infty \right\}.$$

Clearly, martingales in H_1 are L^1 -martingales.

The following is the famous Davis inequality; see [16] or [24, Theorem 2.1.9].

Lemma 2.3. *There exists a constant $C \in [1, \infty)$ such that, for any $f \in H_1$,*

$$C^{-1} \|f\|_{H_1} \leq \|M(f)\|_{L^1} \leq C \|f\|_{H_1}.$$

The following result is a part of [42, Lemma 2.15].

Lemma 2.4. *For any $f \in H_1$, there exist a positive constant C and two martingales $f^1 \in h_1$ and $f^d \in h_1^d$ such that $f = f^1 + f^d$ with*

$$(2.1) \quad \|f^1\|_{h_1} \leq C \|f\|_{H_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \|f^d\|_{h_1^d} \leq C \|f\|_{H_1}.$$

We will need to use at the same time the fact that $f \in H_1$ and f belongs to L^2 . Going back to the proof, one has the following property.

Remark 2.5. In Lemma 2.4, if, moreover, f is an L^2 -martingale, then both f^1 and f^d may be chosen so that they are also L^2 -martingales.

The Orlicz space L^{\log} is defined to be the set of all the measurable functions f such that

$$\|f\|_{L^{\log}} := \inf \left\{ \lambda \in (0, \infty) : \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f|/\lambda}{\log(e + |f|/\lambda)} d\mathbb{P} \leq 1 \right\} < \infty.$$

Clearly, $\|\cdot\|_{L^{\log}}$ is a quasi-norm and $L^1 \subset L^{\log}$ with continuous embedding. If we replace $\|\cdot\|_{L^1}$ in Definition 2.2 therein by $\|\cdot\|_{L^{\log}}$, then we obtain the definition of the *martingale Hardy spaces* H_{\log} and h_{\log} .

The following result is a part of both [42, Theorem 2.11] and [27, Theorem 2.5].

Lemma 2.6. (i) *There exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in h_1$,*

$$\|f\|_{H_1} \leq C\|f\|_{h_1}.$$

(ii) *There exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in h_{\log}$,*

$$\|f\|_{H_{\log}} \leq C\|f\|_{h_{\log}}.$$

2.2 Martingale BMO spaces and John–Nirenberg inequality

This section is devoted to definitions and basic results concerning martingale BMO spaces. Let X_1 and X_2 be two quasi-normed spaces both of which are subspaces of some Hausdorff topological vector space. The space $X_1 + X_2$ is defined to be the set of all the elements x of the form $x = x_1 + x_2$, where $x_1 \in X_1$ and $x_2 \in X_2$, and is equipped with the quasi-norm

$$\|x\|_{X_1 + X_2} := \inf \left\{ \|x_1\|_{X_1} + \|x_2\|_{X_2} \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all the elements $x_1 \in X_1$ and $x_2 \in X_2$ whose sum is equal to x . The space $X_1 \cap X_2$ is defined to be the set of all the elements $x \in X_1 \cap X_2$ and is equipped with the quasi-norm

$$\|x\|_{X_1 \cap X_2} := \max \left\{ \|x\|_{X_1}, \|x\|_{X_2} \right\}.$$

Definition 2.7. For any $p \in [1, \infty)$, the *martingale space* BMO_p is defined to be the set of all the martingales $f \in L^p$ with the norm

$$\|f\|_{\text{BMO}_p} := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \left\| \mathbb{E}_n (|f - f_{n-1}|^p) \right\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty.$$

The *martingale space* bmo_p is defined to be the set of all the martingales $f \in L^p$ with the norm

$$\|f\|_{\text{bmo}_p} := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \left\| \mathbb{E}_n (|f - f_n|^p) \right\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty.$$

The *martingale space* bmo^d is defined to be the set of all the martingales $f \in L^\infty$ with the norm

$$\|f\|_{\text{bmo}^d} := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \|d_n f\|_{L^\infty} < \infty.$$

It is well known that, for any $p \in [1, \infty)$,

$$L^\infty \subset BMO_p \subset bmo_p \subset L^p;$$

see Weisz [42, p. 51] for more details. In the case $p = 2$, it is obvious that

$$BMO_2 = bmo_2 \cap bmo^d$$

with equal norms. The John–Nirenberg inequality states that, for any given $p \in [1, \infty)$, $BMO_p = BMO_1$ with equivalent norms. We refer the reader to [18] or [24, Chapter 4] for more details and also Nakai and Sadasue [29] for more related studies. Henceforth, in the sequel, we simply write BMO instead of BMO_p for any given $p \in [1, \infty)$.

Now, we recall the dual theorem on martingale Hardy spaces. For any (quasi) Banach space X , we denote by X^* the *dual space* of X , namely, the space of all continuous linear functional on X .

Lemma 2.8. *The following duality results hold true:*

- (i) $(H_1)^* = BMO$ with equivalent norms;
- (ii) $(h_1)^* = bmo_2$ and $(h_1^d)^* = bmo^d$ with equivalent norms.

We refer the reader to [24, Theorem 2.2.2] for the proof of item (i) and to both [42, Theorem 2.23] and [42, Theorem 2.32] for the proof of item (ii).

2.3 Atomic decompositions of martingale Hardy spaces

In this subsection, we introduce atomic decompositions of Hardy spaces defined in Section 2.1. We first recall the definition of atoms; see the monograph [42, Chapter 2] of Weisz for more details.

Definition 2.9. A measurable function a is called a *simple (s, ∞) -atom* if there exist an integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and a set $A \in \mathcal{F}_n$ such that

- (i) $a_n := \mathbb{E}_n(a) = 0$;
- (ii) $\text{supp}(a) \subset A$;
- (iii) $\|s(a)\|_{L^\infty} \leq [\mathbb{P}(A)]^{-1}$.

If the above (iii) is replaced by $\|a\|_{L^\infty} \leq [\mathbb{P}(A)]^{-1}$, then one obtains the definition of a *simple ∞ -atom*.

In the following lemma, we collect several useful properties related to simple (s, ∞) -atoms.

Lemma 2.10. *Let a be a simple (s, ∞) -atom with respect to some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_n$. Then the following hold true:*

- (i) for any $T \in \{M, S, s\}$, the support of $T(a)$ is contained in the set A ;
- (ii) for any $p \in [1, 2]$, one has $\|M(a)\|_{L^p} \leq 2[\mathbb{P}(A)]^{1/p-1}$;

(iii) for any $p \in [1, 2]$ and $T \in \{S, s\}$, one has $\|T(a)\|_{L^p} \leq [\mathbb{P}(A)]^{1/p-1}$;

(iv) for any $p \in [1, 2]$, one has $\|a\|_{L^p} \leq [\mathbb{P}(A)]^{1/p-1}$.

In particular, a is in h_1 .

Proof. We give the proof for completeness. Note that $A \in \mathcal{F}_n$ and, for any $m \leq n$, $\mathbb{E}_m(a) = 0$. Thus, for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $\mathbb{E}_m(a)\mathbf{1}_A = \mathbb{E}_m(a)$ and $d_m(a)\mathbf{1}_A = d_m(a)$, which yield item (i). By item (i), for each $p \in [1, 2]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|M(a)\|_{L^p} &= \|M(a)\mathbf{1}_A\|_{L^p} \leq \|M(a)\|_{L^2} [\mathbb{P}(A)]^{1/p-1/2} \\ &\leq 2\|a\|_{L^2} [\mathbb{P}(A)]^{1/p-1/2} = 2\|s(a)\|_{L^2} [\mathbb{P}(A)]^{1/p-1/2} \\ &\leq 2\|s(a)\|_{L^\infty} [\mathbb{P}(A)]^{1/2} [\mathbb{P}(A)]^{1/p-1/2} \leq 2[\mathbb{P}(A)]^{1/p-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we used the Doob maximal inequality (see e.g. [24, Theorem 2.1.3]). Item (iii) and item (iv) can be proved by the same argument as that used in the proof of item (ii). Instead of the Doob maximal inequality, we use the following basic facts

$$\|a\|_{L^2} = \|S(a)\|_{L^2} = \|s(a)\|_{L^2}.$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 2.10. \square

Let us now turn to the atomic decomposition, which is attributed to Herz and found in [19]. In this article, we use the following simple atomic decomposition of h_1 , which can be found in [42, Theorem 2.5] (see also [41] and [33, Chapter 5.3]).

Lemma 2.11. *Let $f \in h_1$. Then there exist a sequence $(a^k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of simple (s, ∞) -atoms, a sequence $(\mu_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of real numbers, and a positive constant C such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,*

$$f_n = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_k \mathbb{E}_n(a^k) \quad a.s.$$

and

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\mu_k| \leq C\|f\|_{h_1}.$$

We will need to use at the same time the fact that $f \in h_1$ and f is an L^2 -martingale. Going back to the proof, one has the following property.

Remark 2.12. In Lemma 2.11, if, moreover, f is an L^2 -martingale, then the series $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_k \mathbb{E}_n(a^k)$ converges also in L^2 .

3 Products and Paraproducts

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1. Take $(f, g) \in H_1 \times \text{BMO}$. We may assume without loss of generality that $g_0 = 0$ (if not, there is a supplementary term in H_1 , which is contained in H_{\log}). We start from the identity: for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(3.1) \quad f_n g_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n (d_j f)(d_k g)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \sum_{k=1}^n f_{k-1}(d_k g) + \sum_{k=1}^n (d_k f)g_{k-1} + \sum_{k=1}^n (d_k f)(d_k g) \\
 &=: \Pi_1(f, g)_n + \Pi_2(f, g)_n + L(f, g)_n.
 \end{aligned}$$

Note first that, since $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \|d_n g\|_{L^\infty} < \infty$, it follows that each g_n for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ is bounded. So each term of these above expressions is integrable. We recognize in the last term the process of bounded variation (we will prove this). Note that Π_1 and Π_2 are paraproducts. They are martingales because, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{k-1}(f_{k-1} d_k g) = 0 \text{ and } \mathbb{E}_{k-1}(d_k f g_{k-1}) = 0.$$

This induces that $(f_n g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is a semi-martingale. We first prove that $L(f, g)$ has bounded variation, then that the martingale $\Pi_1(f, g)$ belongs to H_1 , with the continuity of the mapping $(f, g) \mapsto \Pi_1(f, g)$, and the same for Π_2 , with H_{\log} in place of H_1 . Since H_1 is contained in H_{\log} , this will allow us to conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1.

3.1 The process of bounded variation

This is given by the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $f := (f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \in H_1$ and $g := (g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \in \text{BMO}$. Then*

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |d_k f| |d_k g| \in L^1.$$

In particular the process $L(f, g)$ converges to a function in L^1 .

Proof. From the proof of the duality $(H_1)^* = \text{BMO}$ (see, for instance, [24, p. 43]), one can deduce that

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbb{E}(|d_k f d_k g|) \leq \sqrt{2} \|f\|_{H_1} \|g\|_{\text{BMO}} < \infty.$$

The desired result follows from the fact that L^1 is a complete space. This finishes the proof of Proposition 3.1. \square

3.2 The paraproduct Π_1

This subsection aims to show the boundedness of the bilinear operator Π_1 defined in (3.1). In fact we prove more. That is, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 3.2. *The bilinear operator Π_1 is bounded from the product space $H_1 \times \text{bmo}_2$ into the space h_1 .*

To show Proposition 3.2, by the Davis decomposition in Lemma 2.4, we can write f as a sum of two martingales, one in h_1 and the other one in h_1^d . This leads us to consider separately the cases of martingales in h_1 and h_1^d .

Lemma 3.3. *Let $f \in h_1^d$ and $g \in \text{bmo}_2$. Then the paraproduct $\Pi_1(f, g)$ is in h_1 , with*

$$\|\Pi_1(f, g)\|_{h_1} \leq \|g\|_{\text{bmo}_2} \|f\|_{h_1^d}.$$

Proof. Since h_1 is a Banach space, it is sufficient to consider separately each term of the product, that is, each $\Pi_1(d_n(f), g) = d_n(f) \sum_{k \geq n+1} d_k(g)$. But, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$s(\Pi_1(d_n(f), g)) = |d_n(f)| \left[\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} E_{k-1}([d_k(g)]^2) \right]^{1/2}.$$

We use the Schwarz inequality for the conditional expectation related to \mathcal{F}_n and write that, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_n(s(\Pi_1(d_n(f), g))) &\leq |d_n(f)| \left[\mathbb{E}_n \left(\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{k-1}([d_k(g)]^2) \right) \right]^{1/2} \\ &= |d_n(f)| \left[\mathbb{E}_n \left(\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} [d_k(g)]^2 \right) \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The second factor is bounded by the bmo_2 norm of g , so that, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$\mathbb{E}_n(s(\Pi_1(d_n(f), g))) \leq |d_n(f)| \|g\|_{\text{bmo}_2}.$$

We conclude by taking the expectation of both sides, then the sum in $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. This finishes the proof of Lemma 3.3. \square

In order to prove the proposition for martingales in h_1 , we prove the following lemma which also gives an explicit constant, but for atoms.

Lemma 3.4. *For any simple (s, ∞) -atom a and any $g \in \text{bmo}_2$,*

$$\|\Pi_1(a, g)\|_{h_1} \leq 2\|g\|_{\text{bmo}_2}.$$

Proof. Let $g \in \text{bmo}_2$. Since a is a simple (s, ∞) -atom, it follows that there exist an $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and an $A \in \mathcal{F}_n$ such that $\mathbb{E}_n(a) = 0$ and $\text{supp}(a) \subset A$. So $a_k = \mathbb{E}_k(a) = 0$ for any $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$. Then

$$\Pi_1(a, g) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} a_{k-1} d_k g = \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} a_{k-1} d_k g,$$

which, combined with the definitions of both s and bmo_2 , further implies that

$$\begin{aligned} s(\Pi_1(a, g)) &= \left[\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{k-1}(|a_{k-1}|^2 |d_k g|^2) \right]^{1/2} \\ &= \left[\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} |a_{k-1}|^2 \mathbb{E}_{k-1}(|d_k g|^2) \right]^{1/2} \leq M(a) \|g\|_{\text{bmo}_2}. \end{aligned}$$

From the above argument and both (i) and (ii) of Lemma 2.10, we infer that

$$\|\Pi_1(a, g)\|_{h_1} \leq \|M(a)\|_{L^1} \|g\|_{\text{bmo}_2} \leq \|M(a)\|_{L^2} \mathbb{P}(A)^{1/2} \|g\|_{\text{bmo}_2} \leq 2\|g\|_{\text{bmo}_2},$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 3.4. \square

We are now ready to prove Proposition 3.2.

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Take $(f, g) \in H_1 \times \text{BMO}$. According to Lemma 2.4, there exists a decomposition $f = f^1 + f^d$ such that $f^1 \in h_1$ and $f^d \in h_1^d$ with

$$\|f^1\|_{h_1} \lesssim \|f\|_{H_1} \text{ and } \|f^d\|_{h_1^d} \lesssim \|f\|_{H_1}.$$

By the atomic decomposition of h_1 (Lemma 2.11), we have

$$f^1 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_k a^k \text{ a.s. and } \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\mu_k| \lesssim \|f^1\|_{h_1},$$

where $(a^k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a sequence of simple (s, ∞) -atoms. Combining this and Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi_1(f, g)\|_{h_1} &\leq \|\Pi_1(f^1, g)\|_{h_1} + \|\Pi_1(f^d, g)\|_{h_1} \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\mu_k| \cdot \|\Pi_1(a^k, g)\|_{h_1} + \|\Pi_1(f^d, g)\|_{h_1} \\ &\lesssim \|f^1\|_{h_1} \|g\|_{\text{bmo}_2} + \|f^d\|_{h_1^d} \|g\|_{\text{bmo}_2} \lesssim \|f\|_{H_1} \|g\|_{\text{bmo}_2}. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of Proposition 3.2. \square

Remark 3.5. We point out here that Proposition 3.2 can be deduced from [13, Corollary 6] which was proved via stopping time argument. Here, we provide a different proof of Proposition 3.2 by using the atomic decomposition of martingale Hardy spaces. Moreover, our argument here leads us to establish the endpoint estimate of commutators (see Section 4 below) via using the atomic decomposition.

3.3 Boundedness of the operator Π_2

The goal of this subsection is to show that the bilinear operator Π_2 defined in (3.1) is bounded from $H_1 \times \text{BMO}$ into H_{\log} , namely the following result.

Proposition 3.6. *The bilinear operator Π_2 is a bounded operator from the product space $H_1 \times \text{BMO}$ into the space H_{\log} .*

Proof. The proof is straightforward. We can assume as before that $g_0 = 0$. We do not need to consider separately h_1 and h^d here. We write that

$$(3.2) \quad S(\Pi_2(f, g)) = \left[\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |g_{n-1}|^2 d_n(f)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq M(g)S(f).$$

The present proposition follows then from the next two lemmas which are well known. The first one, which is an adaptation of John–Nirenberg’s inequality and may be found in [24, p. 131], says that $M(g)$ belongs to the exponential class. Let us recall that a function ψ belongs to the *exponential class* $\exp L$ if there exists a positive constant α such that $\exp(\alpha\psi)$ is integrable. The exponential class $\exp L$ is a Banach space and we can take as the *Luxemburg norm* the quantity

$$\|\psi\|_{\exp L} := \inf \{ \lambda \in (0, \infty) : \mathbb{E}(\exp(\psi/\lambda)) \leq 2 \}.$$

Lemma 3.7. *Let g be a martingale in BMO, with $g_0 = 0$. Then Mg is in the exponential class and there exists a positive constant C , independent of g , such that*

$$\|Mg\|_{\exp L} \leq C\|g\|_{\text{BMO}}.$$

We then conclude the proof of Proposition 3.6 by using the following generalized Hölder inequality which may be found for instance in [40, Lemma 3.2] (see also [2]). We give a short proof for completeness. We only write this lemma for both functions on Ω and the Orlicz functions that we have in mind, but it is valid in a general context.

Lemma 3.8. *Let ϕ be a function in L^1 , and ψ a function in the exponential class. Then the product $\phi\psi$ belongs to L^{\log} . Moreover, there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$\|\phi\psi\|_{L^{\log}} \leq C\|\phi\|_{L^1}\|\psi\|_{\exp L}.$$

The positive constant C does not depend on ϕ, ψ .

Proof. By homogeneity in the two factors of the product, we can assume that both norms are 1. Moreover, as in the proof of Hölder's inequality, this inequality is obtained from an elementary inequality. Here, we claim that, for any $s, t \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\frac{st}{\log(e + st)} \leq t + e^s.$$

Indeed, this is certainly true for s or t less than 1. Assume that $1 < s < \log(e + t)$. Then the left hand side is bounded by t . Finally, if $e^s > t + e$, the left hand side is bounded by e^s . To conclude the proof of the present lemma, we replace s and t , respectively, by $\phi(x)$ and $\psi(x)$, and then integrate in x . This finishes the proof of Lemma 3.8. \square

Now the conclusion of Proposition 3.6 is direct: just replace ψ by $M(g)$, which is in the exponential class by Lemma 3.7, and ϕ by $S(f)$. This then finishes the proof of Proposition 3.6. \square

Remark 3.9. We realize that the proof of Proposition 3.6 is identical to [3, Section 3.4] even if the bibliography to which we refer is different. In fact both rely on a strong property of BMO functions. The authors of [3] cited Garcia's book [18] for the fact that $M(g)$ for any $g \in \text{BMO}$ is still in BMO, while we use directly Long's book [24], in which John–Nirenberg's inequality was directly given for $M(g)$ with $g \in \text{BMO}$.

3.4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

We can now prove Theorem 1.1 with the help of Propositions 3.1, 3.2, and 3.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $(f, g) \in H_1 \times \text{BMO}$. Clearly, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$f_n g_n = \Pi_1(f, g)_n + \Pi_2(f, g)_n + L(f, g)_n.$$

Then, according to Proposition 3.1, L is bounded from the product space $H_1 \times \text{BMO}$ into the space L^1 . Let $G := \Pi_1 + \Pi_2$. Observe that $H_1 \subset H_{\log}$ and $h_1 \subset H_1$. A combination of this observation with Propositions 3.2 and 3.6 yields that G is bounded from $H_1 \times \text{BMO}$ into H_{\log} . This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.1. \square

Recall that the space H_1 can be as well defined as the space of martingales f such that Mf belongs to L^1 , that is, we can replace the martingale square operator S by the Doob maximal operator M . This is no more the case for the space H_{\log} and we define H_{\log}^M as the space of martingales f for which Mf is in L^{\log} . We have nevertheless the following statement.

Theorem 3.10. *Theorem 1.1 holds true when the space H_{\log} is replaced by the space H_{\log}^M .*

Proof. Only Proposition 3.6 deserves to be modified. We observe that the previous proof extends directly to $f \in h_1^d$ because

$$M(\Pi_2(f, g)) \leq M(g) \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |d_n(f)|.$$

As for $f \in h_1$, we notice that

$$s(\Pi_2(f, g)) \leq M(g) s(f),$$

so that $\Pi_2(f, g)$ is in h_{\log} . But this last space is a subspace of H_{\log}^M (see, for instance, [27, (2.5)]). This allows us to conclude also for any $f \in h_1$. To finish the proof of the present theorem, we use the Davis decomposition in Lemma 2.4 for $f \in H_1$, write $f = f^1 + f^d$ and use the fact that H_{\log}^M is a quasi-Banach space, so that

$$\|\Pi_2(f, g)\|_{H_{\log}^M} \lesssim \|\Pi_2(f^1, g)\|_{H_{\log}^M} + \|\Pi_2(f^d, g)\|_{H_{\log}^M}.$$

The remainder of the proof is straightforward. This finishes the proof of Theorem 3.10. \square

Remark 3.11. To show that the two Hardy spaces H_{\log}^M and H_{\log} do not coincide in general, one can apply a similar argument to the one used in the proof of [42, Proposition 2.16].

Simplifications occur under assumptions on the filtration. Recall that a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is said to be *regular* if there exists a positive constant C_{reg} such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_n$, there exists a set $B \in \mathcal{F}_{n-1}$ such that $A \subset B$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(B) \leq C_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{P}(A).$$

Equivalently (see, for instance, [24, p. 265]), for any \mathcal{F}_n measurable non-negative function f ,

$$f \leq C_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{E}_{n-1}(f).$$

We will provide concrete examples of martingales in Examples 4.19 and 5.2 below, which include both regular and non-regular martingales.

If the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is regular, we have $s(f) \lesssim S(f)$, so that there exists a constant $C \in [1, \infty)$ such that, for any $f \in h_1$,

$$(3.3) \quad C^{-1} \|f\|_{h_1} \leq \|f\|_{H_1} \leq C \|f\|_{h_1}$$

and, for any $f \in h_{\log}$,

$$(3.4) \quad C^{-1} \|f\|_{h_{\log}} \leq \|f\|_{H_{\log}} \leq C \|f\|_{h_{\log}}.$$

See, for instance, [42, Corollary 2.23] and [27, Theorem 2.5].

Remark 3.12. Let $p, q \in [1, \infty)$. If the relevant $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is regular, then all spaces BMO_p and bmo_q are equivalent; see [42, Corollary 2.51] for more details.

Using Theorem 1.1, (3.3), (3.4), and Remark 3.12, we obtain the following bilinear decomposition.

Corollary 3.13. *If the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is regular, then Theorem 1.1 holds true when the spaces H_1 , BMO , and H_{\log} therein are replaced, respectively, by the spaces h_1 , bmo , and h_{\log} .*

As we can see, in the proof of Theorem 1.1, Lemma 3.8 plays an important role in the estimation of the operator Π_2 . It is well known that John–Nirenberg inequality is not valid in general for bmo_p in place of BMO . A counter-example is given in [42, Example 2.17]. This is why we could not replace in general the space BMO by bmo_2 in Theorem 1.1.

3.5 Density and terminal values

In defining the product of martingales, one was tempted to define it as the product of terminal values. But, as we have seen in the introduction, the product $f_\infty g_\infty$, which is well defined a.s., is not integrable in general. Martingales in H_{\log} have no terminal value, either. But one can use the density to give a sense at formulas, using the following well-known lemma (see, for instance, [24, p. 42]).

Lemma 3.14. *The space of L^2 -martingales is dense in H_1 .*

Now, assuming that f is an L^2 -martingale and g is a BMO martingale, the function $f_\infty g_\infty$ is in L^p for any $p \in (0, 2)$ and $(\mathbb{E}_n(f_\infty g_\infty))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is an L^1 -martingale. We can, as before, write

$$f \cdot g = L(f, g) + G(f, g).$$

Since $L(f, g)$ and $\Pi_1(f, g)$ have a terminal value in L^1 , it follows that the same is valid for $\Pi_2(f, g)$. We deduce immediately from (3.2) that $\Pi_2(f, g)$ is an L^p -martingale for any $p \in (0, 2)$ and, in particular, an L^1 -martingale. The previous equality can as well be written

$$(3.5) \quad f_\infty g_\infty = (f \cdot g)_\infty = \Pi_1(f, g)_\infty + \Pi_2(f, g)_\infty + L(f, g)_\infty.$$

We write as well $\Pi_j(f, g)$ for any $j \in \{1, 2\}$ in place of their terminal value when it makes sense. Theorem 1.1 leads then to the following one which deals with functions instead of martingales. Here, as was proposed in Remark 2.1, we identify an L^1 function f with the martingale $(\mathbb{E}_n(f))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ and say that it is in BMO (resp. H_1 or H_{\log}) if this martingale is in BMO (resp. H_1 or H_{\log}). With these symbols, we deduce from Theorem 1.1 the following statement.

Corollary 3.15. *There exist two bilinear operators and a positive constant C such that $\mathbf{L} : L^2 \times \text{BMO} \rightarrow L^1$ and $\mathbf{G} : L^2 \times \text{BMO} \rightarrow L^{3/2}$ such that, for any $\varphi \in L^2$ and $\psi \in \text{BMO}$,*

$$\varphi\psi = \mathbf{L}(\varphi, \psi) + \mathbf{G}(\varphi, \psi)$$

with

$$\|\mathbf{L}(\varphi, \psi)\|_{L^1} \leq C\|\varphi\|_{H_1}\|\psi\|_{\text{BMO}} \text{ and } \|\mathbf{G}(\varphi, \psi)\|_{H_{\log}} \leq C\|\varphi\|_{H_1}\|\psi\|_{\text{BMO}}.$$

3.6 Multipliers

By duality, Theorem 1.1 leads to a theorem on pointwise multipliers of BMO, which we define now.

Definition 3.16. For X being a normed space of \mathcal{F} -measurable functions, an \mathcal{F} -measurable function g is called a *pointwise multiplier on X* if the pointwise product fg belongs to X for any $f \in X$ and if there exists some positive constant C , independent of f , such that

$$\|fg\|_X \leq C\|f\|_X.$$

We denote by $\text{PWM}(X)$ the set of all pointwise multipliers on X . For any $g \in \text{PWM}(X)$, its norm is defined by setting

$$\|g\|_{\text{PWM}(X)} := \sup_{f \in X, \|f\|_X \neq 0} \frac{\|fg\|_X}{\|f\|_X}.$$

Applying Theorem 1.1, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 3.17. *Bounded functions in $(H_{\log})^*$ are pointwise multipliers of BMO. In particular, for regular filtrations, bounded functions in $(h_{\log})^*$ are pointwise multipliers of BMO.*

Proof. Let us first notice that, since H_1 is contained in H_{\log} , its dual space identifies with a subspace of BMO, and the dual of $L^1 + H_{\log}$ identifies with $L^\infty \cap (H_{\log})^*$. Moreover, if $b \in L^\infty \cap (H_{\log})^*$ and $f \in L^2$, the duality is given by the scalar product in L^2 , and

$$|\mathbb{E}(bf)| \leq \|b\| \|f\|_{L^1 + H_{\log}}.$$

Let $g \in \text{BMO}$. For any $f \in L^2$, the product bfg is in L^p for any $p \in (0, 2)$, and using Theorem 1.1, we have

$$|\mathbb{E}(bfg)| \lesssim \|f\|_{H_1} \|g\|_{\text{BMO}}.$$

Since L^2 is dense in H_1 , this means that bg identifies with a BMO function, that is, b is a pointwise multiplier of BMO. The last statement on regular filtrations is a consequence of Lemma 2.8 and (3.4). This finishes the proof of Corollary 3.17. \square

For the case of regular martingales a direct proof can be deduced from the work [28] of Nakai and Sadasue. They also give a converse in the particular case when all σ -algebras \mathcal{F}_n are generated by atoms. Recall that, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, a set $B \in \mathcal{F}_n$ is called an *atom* of \mathcal{F}_n if there exists no subset $A \subset B$ with $A \in \mathcal{F}_n$ satisfying $\mathbb{P}(A) < \mathbb{P}(B)$. The *martingale Campanato space* bmo_{\log} is defined to be the set of all the martingales $f \in L^2$ such that

$$\|f\|_{\text{bmo}_{\log}} := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \sup_{A \in \mathcal{F}_n} \frac{1}{\phi(\mathbb{P}(A))} \left[\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(A)} \int_A |f - \mathbb{E}_n(f)|^2 d\mathbb{P} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty,$$

where $\phi(r) := \frac{1}{r\Phi^{-1}(1/r)}$ for any $r \in (0, \infty)$ and Φ is a concave function which is equivalent to the function $r \mapsto \frac{r}{\log(e+r)}$ for any $r \in (0, \infty)$. It was proved in [27, Theorem 2.10] that $(h_{\log})^* = \text{bmo}_{\log}$ with equivalent norms.

In [28, Corollary 1.5], Nakai and Sadasue identified the pointwise multipliers of martingale Campanato spaces, which, in our case, gives the following statement.

Lemma 3.18. *Assume that the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is regular and, moreover, every σ -algebra \mathcal{F}_n for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is generated by a countable collection of atoms and $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{\Omega, \emptyset\}$. Then*

$$\text{PWM}(\text{bmo}_1) = \text{bmo}_{\log} \cap L^\infty$$

with equivalent norms.

This means that, in some sense and in this particular case, Theorem 1.1 is the best possible: the dual statement is the best possible.

4 Endpoint estimates of commutators in the martingale setting

In this section, we apply the bilinear decomposition established in the previous section to investigate the endpoint estimate of commutators in the martingale setting. We also provide the proofs of both Theorems 1.3 and 1.4. We first define the class of operators for which we will study commutators.

4.1 A class of operators

This subsection is devoted to proving Theorem 1.3. We first introduce the class \mathcal{K}_q of sublinear operators. Recall that we call the *martingale jump* a function $g \in L^1$ for which there exists an $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that g is \mathcal{F}_n measurable and $\mathbb{E}_{n-1}(g) = 0$. For any $q \in [1, \infty)$, the space $L^{q,\infty}$ is defined to be the set of all the measurable functions f on Ω such that

$$\|f\|_{L^{q,\infty}} := \sup_{t>0} t [\mathbb{P}(\{x \in \Omega : |f(x)| > t\})]^{1/q} < \infty.$$

Definition 4.1. Let $q \in [1, \infty)$. Denote by \mathcal{K}_q the set of all the continuous sublinear operators T on L^2 satisfying

(i) T is bounded from H_1 to L^q ;

(ii) T is bounded from L^1 to $L^{q,\infty}$;

(iii) if a is a simple (s, ∞) -atom with respect to some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, then, for any $b \in \text{BMO}$,

$$(4.1) \quad \|(b - b_{n-1})T(a)\|_{L^q} \leq C\|b\|_{\text{BMO}}$$

and

$$(4.2) \quad \|[T, b_{n-1}](a)\|_{L^q} \leq C\|b\|_{\text{BMO}};$$

(iv) if g is a martingale jump with respect to some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, then, for any $b \in \text{BMO}$,

$$(4.3) \quad \|(b - b_{n-1})T(g)\|_{L^q} \leq C\|g\|_{L^1}\|b\|_{\text{BMO}}$$

and

$$(4.4) \quad \|[T, b_{n-1}](g)\|_{L^q} \leq C\|g\|_{L^1}\|b\|_{\text{BMO}},$$

where C is a positive constant independent of a , g , and b .

Denote by \mathcal{K}_H the set of all the $T \in \mathcal{K}_1$ such that $T(f) \in L^1$ if and only if $f \in H_1$.

Recall that an operator T is said to be *sublinear* if, for any functions f, g and any scalars α, β , one has

$$|T(\alpha f + \beta g)| \leq |\alpha| |Tf| + |\beta| |Tg|.$$

It follows in particular that, for any functions f, g ,

$$||Tf| - |Tg|| \leq |T(f - g)|.$$

Remark 4.2. According to (3.3), if the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is regular, then the martingale space H_1 also has the atomic decomposition. Thus, in regular case, we do not need (4.3) and (4.4) in Definition 4.1. Moreover, in this case, we can use simple ∞ -atoms instead of simple (s, ∞) -atoms; see [42, Corollary 2.23] and [42, Theorem 2.5]. Thus, in regular case, to show (4.1) and (4.2), it suffices to prove that (4.1) and (4.2) hold true for any simple ∞ -atom a with respect to some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.

If moreover σ -algebras \mathcal{F}_n are atomic, we do not need the assumptions (4.2) and (4.4) because, in this case, b_{n-1} is a constant on the support of an atom. This explains why Ky does not need these assumptions in the classical case [21].

Remark 4.3. Comparing with the definition of Ky in [21], we assume that T is an already bounded operator on L^2 . It is not a problem for applications, for which it is always satisfied. This assumption has been added to be able to give a meaning to commutators on a dense subset. Ky [21] uses finite atomic decompositions, which have not been developed in the context of martingales. In the opposite direction, we allow q to give other values, not just $q = 1$ as in [21], and hence we can also treat of fractional integral operators.

Next, we show that both the Doob maximal operator M and the square function S are in \mathcal{K}_1 . In Section 4.4, we provide more examples of sublinear operators that are in \mathcal{K}_q .

Example 4.4. Let T be the Doob maximal operator M or the square function S . Then $T \in \mathcal{K}_1$.

Proof. Definition 4.1(i) with $q = 1$ is a consequence of the definition of H_1 for S and of Lemma 2.4 for M . Both M and S are of weak type $(1, 1)$ and hence satisfy Definition 4.1(ii) with $q = 1$; see [24, Theorems 2.1.1 and 2.1.2]. To prove that they satisfy both (iii) and (iv) of Definition 4.1, we first show that (4.1) and (4.3) hold true for $T = M$. The other case can be proved by a similar argument. Let a be a simple (s, ∞) -atom with respect to some $A \in \mathcal{F}_n$ with $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. By Lemma 2.10(i), we find that $\text{supp}(M(a)) \subset A$. From both the Jensen inequality for conditional expectations and the Hölder inequality, we deduce that, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ ($b_{-1} := 0$ for convenience),

$$\begin{aligned} \|(b - b_{n-1}) M(a)\|_{L^1} &= \int_A |b - b_{n-1}| \cdot M(a) d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_A \mathbb{E}_n(|b - b_{n-1}| \cdot M(a)) d\mathbb{P} \\ &\leq \int_A \left[\mathbb{E}_n(|b - b_{n-1}|^2) \right]^{1/2} \cdot \left[\mathbb{E}_n(M(a)^2) \right]^{1/2} d\mathbb{P} \\ &\leq \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} \left\| \left[\mathbb{E}_n(M(a)^2) \right]^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2} \|1_A\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2.10(ii), we obtain, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$\left\| \left[\mathbb{E}_n \left(M(a)^2 \right) \right]^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2} = \|M(a)\|_{L^2} \leq 2 [\mathbb{P}(A)]^{-1/2}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\|(b - b_{n-1})M(a)\|_{L^1} \leq 2\|b\|_{\text{BMO}}.$$

This shows (4.1) holds true for M .

Now, we assume that g is a martingale jump with respect to some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then g is \mathcal{F}_n -measurable and $\mathbb{E}_{n-1}(g) = 0$ ($\mathbb{E}_{-1}(g) := 0$ for convenience), so, $M(g) = |g|$. Thus, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(b - b_{n-1})M(g)\|_{L^1} &= \int_{\Omega} |b - b_{n-1}| \cdot |g| d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_{\Omega} |g| \cdot \mathbb{E}_n(|b - b_{n-1}|) d\mathbb{P} \\ &\leq \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} \int_{\Omega} |g| d\mathbb{P} \leq \|g\|_{L^1} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (4.3) holds true for M .

Finally, let us prove that (4.2) and (4.4) also hold true for M . It is easily seen that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $M(b_{n-1}f) = b_{n-1}M(f)$, when the function f is such that $d_k(f) = 0$ for any $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. The two operators, M and multiplication by b_{n-1} , commute for those functions, which allows to conclude for these two properties. We then conclude from the above argument that Definition 4.1 with $q = 1$ holds true for the Doob maximal operator M . The proof for S is similar. This finishes the proof of Examples 4.4. \square

4.2 Proof of Theorem 1.3 and Operator U

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let us now define the commutator $[T, b]$ of both the sublinear operator $T \in \mathcal{K}_q$ and $b \in \text{BMO}$. It is well defined on L^2 by setting, for any $f \in L^2$ and $x \in \Omega$,

$$[T, b](f)(x) := T(bf - b(x)f)(x).$$

Each separated term (in the linear case) does not make sense for a function in H_1 . But the function $[T, b](f)$ is well defined for L^2 as a function in L^p for any $p \in [1, 2)$. It will be defined on H_1 by continuity from the dense space L^2 . We first need to find a priori estimates.

So we first prove the present theorem for any $f \in L^2$. Once we have proved the adequate a priori estimate, it extends automatically to H_1 .

We first consider the linear case and use the paraproduct decomposition (3.5), so that

$$[T, b](f) = T(\Pi_1(f, b)) + T(\Pi_2(f, b)) + T(L(f, b)) - bT(f).$$

Using Proposition 3.2 and Definition 4.1(ii), we already know that $f \mapsto T(\Pi_1(f, b))$ extends into a bounded operator from H_1 to L^q with $q \in [1, \infty)$. It remains to consider the other term, which may be written, for a general sublinear operator $T \in \mathcal{K}_q$ with $q \in [1, \infty)$, as

$$(4.5) \quad U(f, b)(x) = T(\Pi_2(f, b) - b(x)f)(x).$$

In fact, as before, this quantity is not well defined at this moment in all generality, but makes sense when f is in L^2 . We will develop a priori estimates on the dense subset of L^2 functions, so that U is defined by continuity. The main result for U is the following.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $q \in [1, \infty)$ and U be the same as in (4.5) with $T \in \mathcal{K}_q$. Then U extends into a bounded operator from $H_1 \times \text{BMO}$ into L^q .*

If we take this lemma for granted, the proof of Theorem 1.3 follows at once for T linear. Whenever T is only sublinear, we let

$$R(f, b) := |U(f, b)| + |T(\Pi_1(f, b))|.$$

Then it is easy to show that

$$|T(\Pi_3(f, b))| - R(f, b) \leq |[T, b](f)| \leq R(f, b) + |T(\Pi_3(f, b))|$$

and then conclude the desired conclusion in the same way as the linear case. This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.3. \square

We now show Lemma 4.5 whose proof needs a series of lemmas. We begin with the following result.

Lemma 4.6. *Assume that a is a simple (s, ∞) -atom with respect to some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and assume $A \in \mathcal{F}_n$. If $b \in \text{BMO}$, then*

$$\|\Pi_2(a, b - b_{n-1})\|_{H_1} \leq 2\|b\|_{\text{BMO}}.$$

Proof. By the assumption on a , we find that $d_k a = 0$ for any $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\Pi_2(a, b - b_{n-1})\|_{H_1} \\ &= \left\| \sum_{k \geq n+1} (b_{k-1} - b_{n-1}) d_k a \right\|_{H_1} = \left\| \left(\sum_{k \geq n+1} |b_{k-1} - b_{n-1}|^2 |d_k a|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq \left\| \left(\sum_{k \geq n+1} |b_{k-1} - b|^2 |d_k a|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^1} + \left\| \left(\sum_{k \geq n+1} |b - b_{n-1}|^2 |d_k a|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^1} \\ &=: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

We first estimate I_1 . Note that $\text{supp}(d_k a) \subset A$ for each $k \geq n+1$. Thus, by the Hölder inequality, we obtain

$$I_1 \leq \left\| \left(\sum_{k \geq n+1} |b_{k-1} - b|^2 |d_k a|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2} \|\mathbf{1}_A\|_{L^2}.$$

On the other hand, by both the definition of BMO and Lemma 2.10(iv), we have

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{k \geq n+1} |b_{k-1} - b|^2 |d_k a|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2}^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k \geq n+1} \int_{\Omega} |b - b_{k-1}|^2 |d_k a|^2 d\mathbb{P} \\
&= \sum_{k \geq n+1} \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{E}_k(|b - b_{k-1}|^2) |d_k a|^2 d\mathbb{P} \\
&\leq \|b\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 \|S(a)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|b\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 [\mathbb{P}(A)]^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $I_1 \leq \|b\|_{\text{BMO}}$.

Next, we estimate I_2 . Since $\text{supp}(S(a)) \subset A$ (see Lemma 2.10) and $A \in \mathcal{F}_n$, it follows from both the Hölder inequality and Lemma 2.10(iii) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \left(\sum_{k \geq n+1} |b - b_{k-1}|^2 |d_k a|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^1} \\
&\leq \| |b - b_{n-1}| S(a) \mathbf{1}_A \|_{L^1} \leq \| |b - b_{n-1}| \mathbf{1}_A \|_{L^2} \|S(a)\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \left[\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{E}_n(|b - b_{n-1}|^2) \mathbf{1}_A d\mathbb{P} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \|S(a)\|_{L^2} \leq \|b\|_{\text{BMO}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This establishes the desired inequality and hence finishes the proof of Lemma 4.6. \square

We come back to the operator U .

Lemma 4.7. *Let $q \in [1, \infty)$ and $T \in \mathcal{K}_q$. Then there exists a positive constant C such that*

(i) *for any simple (s, ∞) -atom and any $b \in \text{BMO}$,*

$$\|U(a, b)\|_{L^q} \leq C \|b\|_{\text{BMO}};$$

(ii) *for any martingale jump g and any $b \in \text{BMO}$,*

$$\|U(g, b)\|_{L^q} \leq C \|g\|_{L^1} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}}.$$

Proof. We first show (i). Without loss of generality, we may assume that a is a simple (s, ∞) -atom with respect to some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_n$. Observe that $\Pi_2(a, b_{n-1}) = ab_{n-1}$. By this observation, we rewrite $U(a, b)$ as that, for any $x \in \Omega$,

$$(4.6) \quad U(a, b)(x) = T(\Pi_2(a, b - b_{n-1}) + [b_{n-1} - b_{n-1}(x)]a + [b_{n-1}(x) - b(x)]a)$$

Since $T \in \mathcal{K}_q$, it follows from Definition 4.1 that T is bounded from H_1 to L^q . Using this, (4.1), (4.2), and Lemma 4.6, we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|U(a, b)\|_{L^q} &\leq \|T(\Pi_2(a, b - b_{n-1}))\|_{L^q} + \|[T, b_{n-1}](a)\|_{L^q} \\
&\quad + \|(b - b_{n-1})T(a)\|_{L^q} \\
&\lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} + \|\Pi_2(a, b - b_{n-1})\|_{H_1} \lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (i).

For any martingale jump g with respect to some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we have

$$\Pi_2(g, b - b_{n-1}) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} d_k g \mathbb{E}_{k-1}(b - b_{n-1}) = g \mathbb{E}_{n-1}(b - b_{n-1}) = 0$$

and $\Pi_2(g, b_{n-1}) = g b_{n-1}$. Using (4.6), (4.4), and (4.3), we then obtain (ii). This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.7. \square

We finally prove Lemma 4.5.

Proof of Lemma 4.5. Take $(f, b) \in H_1 \times \text{BMO}$. By Lemma 2.4, we find that there exists a decomposition $f = f^1 + f^d$ such that (2.1) holds true. Moreover, by Remark 2.5, we can assume that both f^1 and f^d are L^2 -martingales. From Lemma 2.11, we infer that there exist a sequence $(a^k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of simple (s, ∞) -atoms and a sequence $(\mu_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of real numbers such that

$$f^1 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_k a^k \text{ a.s.}$$

Moreover, using Remark 2.12, we can assume that the sum is convergent in L^2 and

$$U(f^1, b) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U\left(\sum_{k=-n}^n \mu_k a^k, b\right).$$

Similarly, we also have

$$U(f^d, b) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U\left(\sum_{k=-n}^n d_k(f^d), b\right).$$

To prove that the limit defines a bounded sublinear operator on H_1 , it is sufficient to show its uniform boundedness when both f^1 and f^d are replaced by finite sums. In this case, combining the previous equalities, Lemma 4.7, and (2.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|U(f, b)\|_{L^q} &\leq \|U(f^1, b)\|_{L^q} + \|U(f^d, b)\|_{L^q} \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\mu_k| \|U(a^k, b)\|_{L^q} + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \|U(d_n(f^d), b)\|_{L^q} \\ &\lesssim \|f^1\|_{H_1} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \|d_n(f^d)\|_{L^1} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} \\ &\approx \left(\|f^1\|_{H_1} + \|f^d\|_{H_1^d}\right) \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} \lesssim \|f\|_{H_1} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}}. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.5. \square

We now give two corollaries. The first one is another way to write Theorem 1.3. The other is a direct consequence.

Corollary 4.8. *Let $q \in [1, \infty)$, $T \in \mathcal{K}_q$, and $b \in \text{BMO}$. Then $[T, b](f)$ is in L^1 if and only if $T(L(b, f))$ is in L^1 .*

Corollary 4.9. *Let $q \in [1, \infty)$, $T \in \mathcal{K}_q$, and $b \in \text{BMO}$. Then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in H_1$,*

$$\| [T, b](f) \|_{L^{q, \infty}} \leq C \|f\|_{H_1}.$$

Proof. Just use Theorem 1.3, the fact that $L(f, b)$ is in L^1 , and the weak L^q estimate for T . This finishes the proof of Corollary 4.9. \square

Let us write the effect of Theorem 1.3 on the maximal operator. Recall that \mathcal{K}_H is the set of all the $T \in \mathcal{K}_1$ such that $T(f) \in L^1$ if and only if $f \in H_1$. According to Example 4.4, we find that the Doob maximal function $M \in \mathcal{K}_H$. One can check that

$$[M, b](f) = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |[\mathbb{E}_n, b](f)|.$$

By Theorem 1.3, we immediately obtain the following result.

Corollary 4.10. *For any $(f, b) \in H_1 \times \text{BMO}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |\mathbb{E}_n(L(f, b))| - R(f, b) &\leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |[\mathbb{E}_n, b](f)| \\ &\leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |\mathbb{E}_n(L(f, b))| + R(f, b), \end{aligned}$$

where L is the same as in (3.1) and $R : H_1 \times \text{BMO} \rightarrow L^1$ is a bounded bilinear operator.

4.3 Martingale Hardy space H_1^b and the proof of Theorem 1.4

In this subsection, we introduce the martingale Hardy space H_1^b by borrowing some ideas from Ky [21] in harmonic analysis. We also prove Theorem 1.4 in this subsection.

Definition 4.11. Let $b \in \text{BMO}$. The *martingale Hardy space* H_1^b is defined to be the set of all the martingales f such that

$$\|f\|_{H_1^b} := \|f\|_{H_1} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} + \left\| \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |[\mathbb{E}_n, b](f)| \right\|_{L^1} < \infty.$$

We establish the following characterizations of the space H_1^b .

Theorem 4.12. *Let $b \in \text{BMO}$ be non-constant. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (i) $f \in H_1^b$;
- (ii) $L(f, b) \in H_1$;
- (iii) $[T, b](f) \in L^1$ with $T \in \mathcal{K}_H$.

Furthermore, if one of the above conclusions holds true, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{H_1^b} &= \|f\|_{H_1} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} + \left\| \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |[\mathbb{E}_n, b](f)| \right\|_{L^1} \\ &\approx \|f\|_{H_1} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} + \|L(f, b)\|_{H_1} \\ &\approx \|f\|_{H_1} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} + \|[T, b](f)\|_{L^1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the positive equivalence constants are independent of both f and b .

Proof. (i) \iff (ii). By Corollary 4.10, we find that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |[\mathbb{E}_n, b](f)| \in L^1$ if and only if

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |\mathbb{E}_n(L(f, b))| \in L^1,$$

which, combined with Lemma 2.3, further implies that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |[\mathbb{E}_n, b](f)| \in L^1$ if and only if $L(f, b) \in H_1$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{H_1^b} &= \|f\|_{H_1} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} + \left\| \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |[\mathbb{E}_n, b](f)| \right\|_{L^1} \\ &\approx \|f\|_{H_1} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} + \|L(f, b)\|_{H_1}, \end{aligned}$$

which further implies the equivalence between items (i) and (ii).

(ii) \iff (iii). From Theorem 1.3, we deduce that $[T, b](f) \in L^1$ if and only if $T(L(f, b)) \in L^1$. Since $T \in \mathcal{K}_H$, it follows that $T(f) \in L^1$ if and only if $f \in H_1$; see Definition 4.1. Thus, $[T, b](f) \in L^1$ if and only if $L(f, b) \in H_1$. Moreover,

$$\|f\|_{H_1} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} + \|L(f, b)\|_{H_1} \approx \|f\|_{H_1} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} + \|[T, b](f)\|_{L^1},$$

which further implies the equivalence between items (ii) and (iii), and hence completes the proof of Theorem 4.12. \square

Now, we show Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let $f \in H_1^b$. Then, by Theorem 4.12, we find that $L(f, b) \in H_1$. Since $T \in \mathcal{K}_q$, from Definition 4.1, we infer that T is bounded from H_1 to L^q . Now, using Theorem 1.3, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \|[T, b](f)\|_{L^q} &\leq \|T(L(f, b))\|_{L^q} + \|R(f, b)\|_{L^q} \\ &\lesssim \|L(f, b)\|_{H_1} + \|f\|_{H_1} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}} \lesssim \|f\|_{H_1^b}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 1.4. \square

Remark 4.13. Let $b \in \text{BMO}$. We point out that $\mathcal{Y} := H_1^b$ is the largest subspace of H_1 such that, for any $T \in \mathcal{K}_H$, the commutator $[T, b]$ is bounded from \mathcal{Y} to L^1 . Indeed, if \mathcal{Y} is a subspace of H_1 such that $[T, b]$ is bounded from \mathcal{Y} to L^1 , then any element $f \in \mathcal{Y}$ justifies that $[T, b](f) \in L^1$. Hence, Theorem 4.12 implies $f \in H_1^b$, which means $\mathcal{Y} \subset H_1^b$.

4.4 Examples of class \mathcal{K}_q

As we already stated in Example 4.4, both the Doob maximal function and the square function belong to $\mathcal{K}_H \subset \mathcal{K}_1$ defined in Definition 4.1. In this subsection, we give typical operators that are in \mathcal{K}_q .

4.4.1 Martingale transforms

Martingale transforms were first introduced by Burkholder [11]. Nowadays, martingale transforms have proven a very powerful tool not only in probabilistic situation but also in harmonic analysis; see, for instance, [4] and its references. Recently, commutators of martingale transforms for non-regular martingales were studied in [39]. In this subsection, we show that every martingale transform belongs to \mathcal{K}_1 . Consequently, we can apply both Corollary 4.9 and Theorem 1.4 to study the endpoint estimate of commutators of martingale transforms.

Let $\varepsilon := (\varepsilon_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ be an adapted measurable process (that is, ε_k is \mathcal{F}_k -measurable for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$) with

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \|\varepsilon_k\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1.$$

We let $\varepsilon_{-1} = 0$ for convenience. The *martingale transform* of the martingale f related to ε is the martingale $T_\varepsilon(f)$ defined by $d_k(T_\varepsilon f) := \varepsilon_{k-1} d_k f$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Since $S(T_\varepsilon f) \leq S(f)$, it follows immediately that T_ε is bounded on L^p for any $p \in (1, \infty)$ and also bounded on H_1 . In all these cases it can be identified with the mapping that is induced on terminal values: with now f a function in L^p with $p \in (1, \infty)$ or in H_1 , the function $T_\varepsilon f$ is defined by setting

$$T_\varepsilon(f) := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \varepsilon_{k-1} d_k f.$$

We still speak of the martingale transform.

We also define the *maximal martingale transform* $M \circ T_\varepsilon$ by

$$M \circ T_\varepsilon f := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \left| \sum_{k=0}^n \varepsilon_{k-1} d_k f \right|.$$

Recall that the martingale transform shares the following properties (see [11, 24]):

- (i) for any $f \in L^2$, $\|T_\varepsilon(f)\|_{L^2} \leq \|M \circ T_\varepsilon(f)\|_{L^2} \leq C\|f\|_{L^2}$;
- (ii) for any $f \in H_1$, $\|T_\varepsilon(f)\|_{L^1} \leq \|M \circ T_\varepsilon(f)\|_{L^1} \leq C\|f\|_{H_1}$;
- (iii) for any $f \in L^1$, $\|T_\varepsilon(f)\|_{L^{1,\infty}} \leq \|M \circ T_\varepsilon(f)\|_{L^{1,\infty}} \leq C\|f\|_{L^1}$,

here C is a positive constant independent of f .

Proposition 4.14. *Let T_ε be the martingale transform and $M \circ T_\varepsilon$ be the maximal martingale transform as above. Then both T_ε and $M \circ T_\varepsilon$ are all in \mathcal{K}_1 .*

Proof. Let us show that (4.1) and (4.3) hold true for both T_ε and $M \circ T_\varepsilon$. It is not hard to check that the supports of both $T_\varepsilon(a)$ and $M \circ T_\varepsilon(a)$ are contained in A whenever a is a simple (s, ∞) -atom with respect to some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_n$. Besides, if g is a martingale jump with respect to some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, then we have

$$|T_\varepsilon(g)| \leq |g| \text{ and } |M \circ T_\varepsilon(g)| \leq |g|.$$

Note that both T_ε and $M \circ T_\varepsilon$ are bounded on L^2 . Applying the same argument as that used in the proof of Example 4.4, we obtain both (4.1) and (4.3) hold true for both T_ε and $M \circ T_\varepsilon$. Finally, the two last properties (4.2) and (4.4) for both T_ε and $M \circ T_\varepsilon$ are consequences of commutation properties: with the previous symbols, $T_\varepsilon(b_{n-1}a) = b_{n-1}T_\varepsilon(a)$ and $T_\varepsilon(b_{n-1}g) = b_{n-1}T_\varepsilon(g)$; the same holds true for $M \circ T_\varepsilon$. This finishes the proof of Proposition 4.14. \square

The following result is a direct consequence of both Corollary 4.9 and Theorem 1.4.

Corollary 4.15. *Let T_ε be the martingale transform as above. Let $b \in \text{BMO}$ be a non-constant function. Then*

- (i) *the commutator $[T_\varepsilon, b]$ is bounded from H_1 to $L^{1,\infty}$;*
- (ii) *the commutator $[T_\varepsilon, b]$ is bounded from H_1^b to L^1 .*

Before leaving this subsection, we will prove an analogue of the examples of functions in H_1^b given in the classical case. We need a supplementary definition.

Definition 4.16. Let $b \in \text{BMO}$ be a non-constant function. The atom a with respect to $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ is called a (b, ∞) -atom if it satisfies the additional property

$$\mathbb{E}_n(ba) = 0.$$

Moreover, we denote \mathcal{H}_1^b the space of all the functions f in H_1 such that

$$f = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_j a^j \text{ a.s. and } \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |\mu_j| < \infty,$$

where $(a^j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are (b, ∞) -atoms.

Proposition 4.17. *For $b \in \text{BMO}$ a non-constant function, the space \mathcal{H}_1^b is contained in H_1^b .*

Proof. We will only sketch the proof because it asks for variants of the previous ones. The first ingredient is the fact that we can as well consider martingale transforms with values in a Hilbert space (see, for instance, [19]). Consider in particular the martingale transform Γ , with values in ℓ^2 , given by $\Gamma f = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (d_n f) e_n$, where e_n is the canonical basis of ℓ^2 . Since $\|\Gamma f\|_{\ell^2} = S(f)$, it follows that H_1 -martingales are characterized among L^1 -martingales by the fact that Γf is in $L^1(\Omega, \ell^2)$. We will take for granted that the previous theorems are valid for vector valued theorems, so that it is sufficient to prove that $\Gamma(L(f, b))$ belongs to $L^1(\Omega, \ell^2)$ whenever f belongs to \mathcal{H}_1^b . We start by proving it for a (b, ∞) -atom.

Lemma 4.18. *Let $b \in \text{BMO}$ be a non-constant function and a be a (b, ∞) -atom. Then $\Gamma(L(a, b))$ is in $L^1(\Omega, \ell^2)$. Moreover, its $L^1(\Omega, \ell^2)$ norm is bounded by a uniform constant.*

Proof. Assume that the (b, ∞) -atom a is related to some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. We deduce from Corollary 4.8 that it is sufficient to show that $[\Gamma, b](a)$ is in $L^1(\Omega, \ell^2)$ with uniform norm. It is even sufficient to show the same for $[\Gamma, b - b_{n-1}](a)$ because of Property (4.2), or for $\Gamma((b - b_{n-1})a)$ because of Property (4.1). But this is a consequence of the fact that $(b - b_{n-1})a$ is in H_1 with a uniformly bounded norm. Indeed, since it is a (b, ∞) -atom,

$$\mathbb{E}_n((b - b_{n-1})a) = \mathbb{E}_n(ba) - b_{n-1}\mathbb{E}_n(a) = 0.$$

Moreover, by the Hölder inequality, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(|(b - b_{n-1})a|^p) \leq \left[\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_A |b - b_{n-1}|^{2p}) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\mathbb{E}(|a|^{2p}) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim [P(A)]^{1-p},$$

where we used the fact that

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_A |b - b_{n-1}|^{2p}) \leq \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_A) \left[\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_n(|b - b_{n-1}|) \right]^{2p}.$$

So $M((b - b_{n-1})a)$ is supported in A and hence is in L^1 with uniformly bounded norm. This implies that $(b - b_{n-1})a$ is in H_1 with uniformly bounded norm, which is what we wanted to prove. This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.18. \square

Let us come back to the proof of Proposition 4.17. Let $f = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_j a^j$ a.s. with $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |\mu_j| < \infty$, where $(a^j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are (b, ∞) -atoms. The sequence $(\sum_{j=1}^N \mu_j \Gamma(L(a^j, b)))_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in H_1 , which converges to its limit in $L^{1,\infty}(\Omega, \ell^2)$, that is, $\Gamma(L(f, b))$. So $L(f, b)$ is in H_1 and hence f is in H_1^b . This finishes the proof of Proposition 4.17. \square

4.4.2 Fractional integrals in the martingale setting

In the martingale setting, both the fractional integral operator and its commutator were first investigated in [14]. We also refer the reader to Nakai et al. [1] for some recent developments on this topic. Nowadays, it is well known that the martingale fractional integral operator can be viewed as a discrete model of the Riesz potential in harmonic analysis. In this subsection, we show that the fractional integral operator I_α belongs to $\mathcal{K}_{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}$ provided $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Based on this, we can investigate the endpoint estimate of commutators of the fractional integral operator I_α . Here, for convenience, we only consider $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}; (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+})$ given as below.

Example 4.19. Let the number sequence $(p_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \subset \mathbb{N}$ be such that $p_k \geq 2$ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, let $P_n := \prod_{k=0}^n p_k$,

$$(4.7) \quad \mathcal{F}_n := \sigma\{[kP_n^{-1}, (k+1)P_n^{-1}) : k \in \{0, \dots, P_n - 1\}\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{F} := \sigma\left(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathcal{F}_n\right).$$

Let us equip the measurable space $([0, 1), \mathcal{F})$ with the Lebesgue measure v . Then it is not hard to show that the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is not regular whenever $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} p_k = \infty$.

For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, denote by $A(\mathcal{F}_n)$ the set of all atoms in \mathcal{F}_n . For any $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$, any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and any martingale $f \in L^1$, the fractional integrals, $I_{\alpha,n}$ and I_α , of f are defined, respectively, by setting

$$(4.8) \quad I_{\alpha,n}(f) := \sum_{k=0}^n \beta_k^\alpha d_k f \quad \text{and} \quad I_\alpha(f) := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \beta_k^\alpha d_k f,$$

where, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$\beta_k := \sum_{B \in A(\mathcal{F}_k)} \mathbb{P}(B) \mathbf{1}_B$$

and $\beta_{-1} := \beta_0$. We refer to [36, 38] for more details on the fractional integral I_α . It is clear that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $\beta_k = \frac{1}{P_k}$. Hence, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$I_{\alpha,n}(f) := \sum_{k=0}^n P_k^{-\alpha} d_k f \quad \text{and} \quad I_\alpha(f) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} P_k^{-\alpha} d_k f.$$

Note that Example 4.19 is a special case of the filtration studied in [36, 38]. Thus, from [36, Theorem 2.11] and [38, Lemma 1.2 and Theorem 0.1], we infer that, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, there exists a positive constant $C_{(\alpha)}$, depending only on α , such that

- (i) for any $f \in H_1(0, 1)$, $\|I_\alpha(f)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}(0,1)} \leq C_{(\alpha)} \|f\|_{H_1(0,1)}$;
- (ii) for any $f \in L^1(0, 1)$, $\|I_\alpha(f)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}, \infty}(0,1)} \leq C_{(\alpha)} \|f\|_{L^1(0,1)}$;
- (iii) for any $f \in L^p(0, 1)$, $\|I_\alpha(f)\|_{L^q(0,1)} \leq C_{(\alpha)} \|f\|_{L^p(0,1)}$, where $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $1/p - 1/q = \alpha$.

Proposition 4.20. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then the fractional integral operator I_α belongs to $\mathcal{K}_{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}$.*

Proof. According to the above argument, it remains to show that (4.1)-(4.4) hold true for I_α with $q := \frac{1}{1-\alpha}$. We first assume that a is a simple (s, ∞) -atom with respect to some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_n$. Take $r \in (\alpha, 1)$ such that $r - \alpha \in (0, 1/2)$. Note that $\text{supp}(I_\alpha(a)) \subset A$ because I_α is still a martingale transform. Then the Hölder inequality gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \|(b - b_{n-1})I_\alpha(a)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}(0,1)} &\leq \|(b - b_{n-1})\mathbf{1}_A\|_{L^{\frac{1}{r-\alpha}}(0,1)} \|I_\alpha(a)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{1-r}}(0,1)} \\ &=: I_1 \times I_2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $A \in \mathcal{F}_n$, it follows that

$$I_1^{\frac{1}{r-\alpha}} = \int_A \mathbb{E}_n \left(|b - b_{n-1}|^{\frac{1}{r-\alpha}} \right) d\nu \lesssim \|g\|_{\text{BMO}(0,1)}^{\frac{1}{r-\alpha}} \nu(A).$$

On the other hand, for I_2 , by the boundedness of I_α from $L^{\frac{1}{1-(r-\alpha)}}(0, 1)$ to $L^{\frac{1}{1-r}}(0, 1)$, we obtain

$$I_2 \lesssim \|a\|_{L^{\frac{1}{1-(r-\alpha)}}(0,1)} \lesssim [\nu(A)]^{-(r-\alpha)},$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma 2.10(iv) because $1 < \frac{1}{1-(r-\alpha)} < 2$. Combining the estimates of both I_1 and I_2 , we then conclude that

$$\|(b - b_{n-1})I_\alpha(a)\|_{L^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}(0,1)} \lesssim \|g\|_{\text{BMO}(0,1)}.$$

This shows (4.1).

In the remainder of the present proof, assume that a is a martingale jump with respect to some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then

$$|I_\alpha(a)| \leq P_n^{-\alpha} |a|.$$

Since a is measurable with respect to \mathcal{F}_n , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \| (b - b_{n-1}) I_\alpha(a) \|_{L^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}(0,1)}^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \\
& \leq \int_0^1 (|b - b_{n-1}| \cdot P_n^{-\alpha} |a|)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} d\nu \\
& = \int_\Omega (P_n^{-\alpha} |a|)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_n \left(|b - b_{n-1}|^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \right) d\nu \\
& \leq \|g\|_{\text{BMO}(0,1)}^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \|P_n^{-\alpha} a\|_{L^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}(0,1)}^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \stackrel{(R)}{\lesssim} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(0,1)}^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \|a\|_{L^1(0,1)}^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality (R) is due to [36, Lemma 2.3(i)]. Thus, (4.3) holds true. Finally, I_α is a martingale transform and satisfies the same commutation properties which lead to (4.2) and (4.4). Thus, $I_\alpha \in \mathcal{K}_{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}$. This finishes the proof of Proposition 4.20. \square

Remark 4.21. The authors would like to thank Dmitriy Stolyarov who indicated to us that the estimates (i)–(iii) ahead of Proposition 4.20 are not valid when β_k is replaced by β_{k-1} in the definition of the fractional integral (4.8) and who attracted our attention to his joint article [38].

Since $I_\alpha \in \mathcal{K}_{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}$, the following conclusion directly follows from both Corollary 4.9 and Theorem 1.4.

Corollary 4.22. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and I_α be the fractional integral operator as above. Let $b \in \text{BMO}(0, 1)$ be non-constant. Then*

- (i) *the commutator $[I_\alpha, b]$ is bounded from $H_1(0, 1)$ to $L^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}, \infty}(0, 1)$;*
- (ii) *the commutator $[I_\alpha, b]$ is bounded from $H_1^b(0, 1)$ to $L^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}(0, 1)$.*

5 Applications to harmonic analysis

In this section, we aim to apply the bilinear decomposition of commutators established in previous sections to some problems of harmonic analysis.

5.1 Dyadic Hilbert transform beyond doubling measures

Recall that the boundedness of both the dyadic Hilbert transform and its adjoint associated with Borel measures were first characterized by López-Sánchez et al. [25]. Motivated by this, we devote this subsection to studying the commutator of the dyadic Hilbert transform and its adjoint beyond doubling measures.

Here, we work with $([0, 1), \mathcal{F}; (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+})$, which corresponds to Example 4.19 with $p_k = 2$ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ therein. However, we equip the measurable space $([0, 1), \mathcal{F})$ with a probability measure μ which is not necessarily the Lebesgue measure. In this subsection, the related Lebesgue space, martingale Hardy space, and BMO space are denoted, respectively, by $L^p(\mu)$, $H_1(\mu)$, and $\text{BMO}(\mu)$.

In what follows, for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, denote by $A(\mathcal{F}_n)$ the set of all the dyadic intervals in \mathcal{F}_n . Let $A(\mathcal{F}) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} A(\mathcal{F}_n)$. Given $I \in A(\mathcal{F})$, we write I_- and I_+ , respectively, for the left and the right dyadic children of I . For any $I \in A(\mathcal{F})$, let

$$m(I) := \frac{\mu(I_-)\mu(I_+)}{\mu(I)} \quad \text{and} \quad h_I := \sqrt{m(I)} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}_{I_-}}{\mu(I_-)} - \frac{\mathbf{1}_{I_+}}{\mu(I_+)} \right].$$

The following lemma is straightforward; see [25, (2.3)].

Lemma 5.1. *For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and any dyadic interval $I \in \mathcal{F}_n$, the function h_I is \mathcal{F}_{n+1} -measurable and $\mathbb{E}_n(h_I) = 0$. Moreover*

$$(5.1) \quad \|h_I\|_{L^1(\mu)} = 2\sqrt{m(I)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|h_I\|_{L^\infty(\mu)} \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{m(I)}}$$

with the positive equivalence constants independent of I .

The probability measure μ is said to be m -increasing (resp. m -decreasing) if there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $I \in A(\mathcal{F})$,

$$(5.2) \quad m(I) \leq Cm(\widehat{I}) \quad [\text{resp. } Cm(I) \geq m(\widehat{I})].$$

Here and thereafter, the symbol \widehat{I} stands for the dyadic parent of I .

The next example is taken from [25, Section 4.1] and proves that the dyadic filtration may be non-regular with respect to μ .

Example 5.2 (Non-regular dyadic filtration). *Let $(I_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ be a decreasing sequence of dyadic intervals, for instance, $I_k = [0, 2^{-k})$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Let $(I_k^b)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be its dyadic brother. Let $(\alpha_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\beta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be such that $\alpha_1 := 1/2$, $\alpha_k := 1 - 2^{-k^2}$ for any $k \geq 2$, and $\beta_k := 1 - \alpha_k$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Define μ recursively by setting $\mu(I_0) := 1$ and, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mu(I_k) := \alpha_k \mu(I_{k-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(I_k^b) := \beta_k \mu(I_{k-1}).$$

For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and any dyadic interval $J \subset I_k^b$, define

$$\mu(J) := \frac{\nu(J)}{\nu(I_k^b)} \mu(I_k^b),$$

where ν denotes the usual Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1)$. It was shown in [25, p. 72] that μ is m -increasing. However, μ is non-dyadically doubling. Hence, the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ equipped with the measure μ is not regular.

Following [25, p. 50], the dyadic Hilbert transform is defined by setting, for any measurable function f on $[0, 1)$ and any $x \in [0, 1)$,

$$(5.3) \quad H_{\mathcal{D}}(f)(x) := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{I \in A(\mathcal{F}_k)} \delta(I) \langle f, h_I \rangle h_I(x),$$

where $\delta(I) := 1$ if $I := (\widehat{I})_-$, $\delta(I) := -1$ if $I := (\widehat{I})_+$, and $\langle f, h_I \rangle := \mathbb{E}(fh_I)$. The main result of this subsection is as follows.

Proposition 5.3. *Let μ be an m -increasing probability measure on $[0, 1)$. Then the dyadic Hilbert transform $H_{\mathcal{D}}$ belongs to \mathcal{K}_1 .*

To show Proposition 5.3, we need several lemmas. The following result is due to [25, (3.4)] and [25, Theorem 2.5].

Lemma 5.4. *Let μ be an m -increasing probability measure on $[0, 1)$. Then*

- (i) $H_{\mathcal{D}}$ is bounded on $L^2(\mu)$ and, moreover, for any $f \in L^2(\mu)$, $\|H_{\mathcal{D}}(f)\|_{L^2(\mu)} \leq 2\|f\|_{L^2(\mu)}$;
- (ii) $H_{\mathcal{D}}$ is bounded from $L^1(\mu)$ to $L^{1,\infty}(\mu)$.

Similarly to the proofs of both (i) and (ii) of Lemma 2.10, using Lemma 5.4(i), we can show the following conclusions; we omit the details.

Lemma 5.5. *Let μ be an m -increasing Borel measure on $[0, 1)$. Assume that a is a simple (s, ∞) -atom with respect to some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and some dyadic interval $Q \in A(\mathcal{F}_n)$. Then*

- (i) $\text{supp}(H_{\mathcal{D}}(a)) \subset Q$;
- (ii) $\|H_{\mathcal{D}}(a)\|_{L^p(\mu)} \leq 2[\mu(Q)]^{1/p-1}$ for any $p \in [1, 2]$.

Lemma 5.6. *Let μ be an m -increasing Borel measure on $[0, 1)$. Then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $w \in L_d^1(\mu)$,*

$$\|H_{\mathcal{D}}(w)\|_{L^1(\mu)} \leq C\|w\|_{L_d^1(\mu)}.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that w is a martingale jump with respect to some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Let us prove that $\langle w, h_{\tilde{I}} \rangle := \mathbb{E}(wh_{\tilde{I}})$ is 0 except when I belongs to $A(\mathcal{F}_n)$. Indeed, if $I \in A(\mathcal{F}_k)$ with some $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, since $h_{\tilde{I}}$ is \mathcal{F}_k -measurable, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_n(wh_{\tilde{I}}) = h_{\tilde{I}}\mathbb{E}_n w = 0.$$

Next, if $I \in A(\mathcal{F}_k)$ with $k \in \{n+1, n+2, \dots\}$, then

$$\mathbb{E}_{k-1}(wh_{\tilde{I}}) = w\mathbb{E}_{k-1}(h_{\tilde{I}}) = 0,$$

where we used Lemma 5.1 for the last inequality. Thus, $\mathbb{E}(wh_{\tilde{I}}) = 0$ when I does not belong to $A(\mathcal{F}_n)$.

Form (5.3), it follows that

$$(5.4) \quad H_{\mathcal{D}}(w) = \sum_{I \in A(\mathcal{F}_n)} \delta(I) \langle w, h_{\tilde{I}} \rangle h_I.$$

By the above equality, (5.1) and (5.2), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \|H_{\mathcal{D}}(w)\|_{L^1(\mu)} &\leq \sum_{I \in A(\mathcal{F}_n)} |\langle w, h_{\tilde{I}} \rangle| \|h_I\|_{L^1(\mu)} \\ &\leq \sum_{I \in A(\mathcal{F}_n)} \|h_{\tilde{I}}\|_{L^\infty(\mu)} \|h_I\|_{L^1(\mu)} \int_I |w| d\mu \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\lesssim \sum_{I \in A(\mathcal{F}_n)} \frac{\sqrt{m(I)}}{\sqrt{m(\widehat{I})}} \int_{\widehat{I}} |w| d\mu \\
 &\lesssim \sum_{I \in A(\mathcal{F}_n)} \int_{\widehat{I}} |w| d\mu \lesssim \|w\|_{L^1},
 \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 5.6. \square

Remark 5.7. It follows from (5.4) that, for a general martingale f ,

$$H_{\mathcal{D}}(f) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \sum_{I \in A(\mathcal{F}_n)} \delta(I) \langle d_n(f), h_I \rangle h_I.$$

Moreover, if a is an atom or a jump with respect to n and if g is $A(\mathcal{F}_{n-1})$ -measurable, then $H_{\mathcal{D}}(ga) = gH_{\mathcal{D}}(a)$.

Proposition 5.8. *Let μ be an m -increasing Borel measure on $[0, 1)$. Then the dyadic Hilbert transform $H_{\mathcal{D}}$ is bounded from $H_1(\mu)$ to $L^1(\mu)$.*

Proof. Let $f \in H_1(\mu)$. Then the desired assertion follows from a combination of Lemmas 2.1, 2.11, 5.5, and 5.6. Indeed, by these lemmas, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|H_{\mathcal{D}}(f)\|_{L^1(\mu)} &\leq \|H_{\mathcal{D}}(f^1)\|_{L^1(\mu)} + \|H_{\mathcal{D}}(f^d)\|_{L^1(\mu)} \\
 &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\mu_k| \|H_{\mathcal{D}}(a^k)\|_{L^1(\mu)} + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \|H_{\mathcal{D}}(d_n(f^d))\|_{L^1(\mu)} \\
 &\lesssim \|f^1\|_{h_1(\mu)} + \|f^d\|_{h_1^d(\mu)} \lesssim \|f\|_{H_1(\mu)},
 \end{aligned}$$

where $(a^k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a sequence of simple (s, ∞) -atoms. This finishes the proof of Proposition 5.8. \square

Now, we are ready to show Proposition 5.3.

Proof of Proposition 5.3. The second assertion of Remark 5.7 implies (4.2) and (4.4). So, with the help of both Lemma 5.4 and Proposition 5.8, by Definition 4.1 with $q = 1$, to complete the proof of present proposition, it suffices to show that both (4.1) with $q = 1$ and (4.3) with $q = 1$ hold true for $H_{\mathcal{D}}$. Using Lemma 5.5 and repeating the argument used in the proof of Example 4.4, we find that (4.1) with $q = 1$ holds true for $H_{\mathcal{D}}$. Now, assume that $b \in \text{BMO}(\mu)$ and $w \in L_d^1(\mu)$ is a martingale jump with respect to some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\|(b - b_{n-1})H_{\mathcal{D}}(w)\|_{L^1(\mu)} \\
 &\leq \|(b - b_n)H_{\mathcal{D}}(w)\|_{L^1(\mu)} + \|(b_n - b_{n-1})H_{\mathcal{D}}(w)\|_{L^1(\mu)} \\
 &=: I_1 + I_2.
 \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.6, we have

$$I_2 \leq \|b_n - b_{n-1}\|_{L^\infty(\mu)} \|H_{\mathcal{D}}(w)\|_{L^1(\mu)} \lesssim \|w\|_{L^1} \|b\|_{\text{bmo}^d(\mu)} \lesssim \|w\|_{L^1} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mu)}.$$

Note that $H_{\mathcal{D}}(w)$, which is given by (5.4), is \mathcal{F}_{n+1} -measurable. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_0^1 [\mathbb{E}_{n+1}(|b - b_n|)] \times |H_{\mathcal{D}}(w)| \, d\mu \\ &\leq \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mu)} \|H_{\mathcal{D}}(w)\|_{L^1(\mu)} \lesssim \|w\|_{L^1} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we conclude from the estimates of both I_1 and I_2 that

$$\|(b - b_{n-1})H_{\mathcal{D}}(w)\|_{L^1(\mu)} \lesssim \|w\|_{L^1} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mu)}.$$

Therefore, (4.3) with $q = 1$ also holds true for $H_{\mathcal{D}}$. This finishes the proof of Proposition 5.3. \square

Applying Proposition 5.3, the following corollary can be deduced directly from both Corollary 4.9 and Theorem 1.4.

Corollary 5.9. *Let μ be an m -increasing Borel measure on $[0, 1)$ and let $b \in \text{BMO}(\mu)$ be non-constant. Then*

- (i) *the commutator $[H_{\mathcal{D}}, b]$ is bounded from $H_1(\mu)$ to $L^{1,\infty}(\mu)$;*
- (ii) *the commutator $[H_{\mathcal{D}}, b]$ is bounded from $H_1^b(\mu)$ to $L^1(\mu)$.*

Remark 5.10. Denote by $H_{\mathcal{D}}^*$ the adjoint operator of the dyadic Hilbert transform $H_{\mathcal{D}}$. Let μ be an m -decreasing Borel measure on $[0, 1)$ and let $b \in \text{BMO}(\mu)$ be non-constant. Similarly to the above corollary, we can show that the commutator $[H_{\mathcal{D}}^*, b]$ is bounded from $H_1(\mu)$ to $L^{1,\infty}(\mu)$ and also from $H_1^b(\mu)$ to $L^1(\mu)$; we omit the details. Besides, one may also concern the L^p -boundedness, with $p \in (1, \infty)$, of both the commutators $[H_{\mathcal{D}}, b]$ and $[H_{\mathcal{D}}^*, b]$. To limit the length of this article, we will not push this question here.

5.2 Cesàro means of Walsh–Fourier series

In this subsection, we apply both Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 to study the commutator of the maximal operator of Cesàro means of Walsh–Fourier series of functions in $L^1[0, 1)$. Throughout this subsection, we work with $([0, 1), \mathcal{F}, \nu; (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+})$, where ν is the Lebesgue measure and each \mathcal{F}_n with $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ is the same as in (4.7) with $p_k = 2$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is regular.

The following basic symbols in the Walsh–Fourier analysis are taken from [37, 44]. Every point $t \in [0, 1)$ can be written as follows:

$$t = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} t_k 2^{-k-1} \text{ with } t_k \in \{0, 1\} \text{ for any } k \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

If there are two different forms for the same t , we choose the one for which $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_k = 0$. The Rademacher functions $(r_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ on $[0, 1)$ are defined by setting, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$r_n(t) := \exp(\pi i t_k), \quad \forall t \in [0, 1).$$

The product system generated by the Rademacher functions is the Walsh system $(w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$: for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ with $n = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} n_k 2^k$ ($n_k \in \{0, 1\}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$),

$$w_n := \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} r_k^{n_k}.$$

The *dyadic addition* \oplus on $[0, 1)$ is defined in the following way: for any $t, s \in [0, 1)$ with

$$t = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} t_k 2^{-k-1} \text{ and } s = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} s_k 2^{-k-1},$$

where $t_k, s_k \in \{0, 1\}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, let

$$t \oplus s := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |t_k - s_k| 2^{-k-1}.$$

For any $t \in [0, 1)$ and $I \in \mathcal{F}$, let

$$I \oplus t := \{x \oplus t : x \in I\}.$$

By Theorem 4 in [37, p. 13], we find that

$$(5.5) \quad \nu(I \oplus t) = \nu(I), \quad \forall t \in [0, 1),$$

and, moreover, if $I = [0, 2^{-n})$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} t_k 2^{-k-1} \in [\ell 2^{-n}, (\ell + 1) 2^{-n})$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, then

$$(5.6) \quad I \oplus t = \begin{cases} [\ell 2^{-n}, (\ell + 1) 2^{-n}), & \bar{t} \notin I, \\ [\ell 2^{-n}, (\ell + 1) 2^{-n}], & \bar{t} \in I, \end{cases}$$

where $\bar{t} := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \bar{t}_k 2^{-k-1}$ with

$$\bar{t}_k = \begin{cases} 0, & k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}, \\ |1 - t_k|, & k \in \{n, n+1, \dots\}. \end{cases}$$

Remark 5.11. Denote by \mathbf{Z}_2 the discrete cyclic group of order 2, namely the set $\{0, 1\}$ with the discrete topology and modulo 2 addition. The *dyadic group* G is then defined as the product

$$G := \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{Z}_2,$$

equipped with the product topology. We refer the reader to [37, Chapter 1.3] for the details that the dyadic group G can be identified with the interval $[0, 1)$. Particularly, the Walsh functions on $[0, 1)$ can be viewed as the characters of the dyadic group G .

For any $f \in L^1[0, 1)$, the n -th *Walsh–Fourier coefficient* of f is defined by setting, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$\widehat{f}(n) := \int_0^1 f(t) w_n(t) d\nu(t).$$

The *Walsh–Dirichlet kernels* $(D_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are defined by setting, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $D_n := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} w_k$ which satisfies

$$(5.7) \quad D_{2^n}(x) = \begin{cases} 2^n & \text{if } x \in [0, 2^{-n}), \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in [2^{-n}, 1). \end{cases}$$

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, denote by $S_n(f)$ the n -th partial sum of the Walsh–Fourier series of $f \in L^1[0, 1)$, that is, for any $x \in [0, 1)$,

$$S_n(f)(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \widehat{f}(k) w_k(x) = f * D_n(x) = \int_0^1 f(t) D_n(x \oplus t) d\nu(t).$$

For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $f \in L^1[0, 1)$, and $Q \in \mathcal{F}_n$, let

$$f_Q := \frac{1}{\nu(Q)} \int_Q f d\nu.$$

Then, by the definition of the condition expectation, we obtain, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$\mathbb{E}_n(f) = \sum_{Q \in A(\mathcal{F}_n)} f_Q \mathbf{1}_Q.$$

From (5.7), it is easy to deduce that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in [0, 1)$,

$$S_{2^n}(f)(x) = \int_0^1 f(t) D_{2^n}(x \oplus t) d\nu(t) = \mathbb{E}_n(f)(x).$$

The *Cesàro means* $(\sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $f \in L^1[0, 1)$ are defined by setting, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in [0, 1)$,

$$\sigma_n(f)(x) := f * K_n(x) = \int_0^1 f(t) K_n(x \oplus t) d\nu(t),$$

where K_n denotes the *Walsh–Fejér kernel* defined by setting

$$K_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n D_k.$$

Since the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is regular, it follows from [29, p. 189] that there exists a positive constant C satisfying, for any $b \in \text{BMO}[0, 1)$,

$$\frac{1}{C} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}[0, 1)} \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \sup_{Q \in A(\mathcal{F}_n)} \frac{1}{\nu(Q)} \int_Q |b - b_Q| d\nu \leq C \|b\|_{\text{BMO}[0, 1)}.$$

We first prove the following technical lemma.

Lemma 5.12. *Let the maximal operator $\sigma := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_n$. Then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $b \in \text{BMO}[0, 1)$ and any simple ∞ -atom a with respect to some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and some $Q \in A(\mathcal{F}_n)$,*

$$\left\| (b - b_{\widehat{Q}}) \sigma(a) \right\|_{L^1[0, 1)} \leq C \|b\|_{\text{BMO}[0, 1)},$$

where \widehat{Q} denotes the dyadic parent of Q .

Proof. Noting that the Lebesgue measure ν is translation invariant with respect to the dyadic addition (see (5.5) and also [43, p. 238]). According to (5.6), we find that, for any $Q \in A(\mathcal{F}_n)$ with $Q = [\ell 2^{-n}, (\ell + 1)2^{-n})$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $Q = [0, 2^{-n}) \oplus t$ for some fixed $t \in Q$. So, without loss of generality, we may assume that $Q = [0, 2^{-n})$. We first write

$$\begin{aligned} \|(b - b_{\widehat{Q}})\sigma(a)\|_{L^1[0,1]} &= \int_Q |b - b_{\widehat{Q}}| \sigma(a) d\nu + \int_{[0,1] \setminus Q} \dots \\ &=: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

Since σ is bounded on $L^\infty[0, 1]$ (this can be easily deduced from Theorem 3.4 in [44]) and a is a simple ∞ -atom, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (5.8) \quad I_1 &\leq \|\sigma(a)\|_{L^\infty[0,1]} \int_Q |b - b_{\widehat{Q}}| d\nu \\ &\lesssim \|a\|_{L^\infty[0,1]} 2^{-n+1} \|b\|_{\text{BMO}[0,1]} \lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}[0,1]}. \end{aligned}$$

For the term I_2 , it was proved in [43, p. 238] that, for any $x \in [0, 1) \setminus Q$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(a)(x) &\lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \sum_{i=j}^{n-1} \{2^{i-n} \mathbf{1}_{[2^{-n}, 2^{-i})}(x) + 2^{i-n} \mathbf{1}_{[2^{-j-1}, 2^{-j-1} \oplus 2^{-i})}(x)\} \\ &\quad + 2^n \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} 2^j \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} 2^{-i} \mathbf{1}_{[2^{-j-1}, 2^{-j-1} \oplus 2^{-n})}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{2^{-k}}^{2^{-k+1}} |b - b_{\widehat{Q}}| \sigma(a) d\nu \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} 2^{i-n} \int_{2^{-k}}^{2^{-k+1}} |b - b_{\widehat{Q}}| d\nu \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \sum_{i=j}^{n-1} 2^{i-n} \int_{2^{-k}}^{2^{-k+1}} |b - b_{\widehat{Q}}| \mathbf{1}_{[2^{-j-1}, 2^{-j-1} \oplus 2^{-i})} d\nu \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^n 2^n 2^{k-1} \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} 2^{-i} \int_{2^{-k}}^{2^{-k+1}} |b - b_{\widehat{Q}}| \mathbf{1}_{[2^{-k}, 2^{-k} \oplus 2^{-n})} d\nu \\ &=: B_1 + B_2 + B_3. \end{aligned}$$

We recall that, if $Q \in A(\mathcal{F}_n)$ and $Q' \in A(\mathcal{F}_k)$ with $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ such that $Q \subset Q'$, then

$$(5.9) \quad |f_{Q'} - f_Q| \lesssim (n - k) \|f\|_{\text{BMO}[0,1]}.$$

This elementary inequality will be frequently used in the sequel.

To estimate B_1 , let $Q_k := [0, 2^{-k})$ for every $1 \leq k \leq n$. Using (5.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &\leq 2^{-n} \sum_{k=1}^n k 2^k \int_{2^{-k}}^{2^{-k+1}} |b - b_{Q_{k-1}} + b_{Q_{k-1}} - b_{\widehat{Q}}| dv \\ &\lesssim 2^{-n} \sum_{k=1}^n k 2^k \int_{2^{-k}}^{2^{-k+1}} |b - b_{Q_{k-1}}| dv + 2^{-n} \sum_{k=1}^n k 2^k 2^{-k} |b_{Q_{k-1}} - b_{\widehat{Q}}| \\ &\lesssim 2^{-n} \left[\sum_{k=1}^n k + \sum_{k=1}^n k(n-k) \right] \|b\|_{\text{BMO}[0,1)} \lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}[0,1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we estimate B_2 . For any $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let $I_{i,j} := [2^{-j}, 2^{-j} \oplus 2^{-i}) = [0, 2^{-i}) \oplus 2^{-j}$. It is clear that $\nu(I_{i,j}) = 2^{-i}$ and $I_{i,j} \in A(\mathcal{F}_i)$ for each choice of i, j ; see (5.5). According to (5.6), we have

$$I_{i,j+1} = \begin{cases} [0, 2^{-i}), & i = j, \\ [2^{-j-1}, 2^{-i} + 2^{-j-1}), & i \geq j+1. \end{cases}$$

Hence, by this, we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_2 &= \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \sum_{i=j+1}^{n-1} 2^{i-n} \int_{2^{-k}}^{2^{-k+1}} |b - b_{\widehat{Q}}| \mathbf{1}_{[2^{-j-1}, 2^{-j-1} + 2^{-i})} dv \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} 2^{j-n} \int_{2^{-k}}^{2^{-k+1}} |b - b_{\widehat{Q}}| \mathbf{1}_{[0, 2^{-j})} dv \\ &=: B_{2,1} + B_{2,2}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that, for any $i \geq j+1$, $I_{i,k} \subset [2^{-k}, 2^{-k+1})$ and $I_{i,j} \cap [2^{-k}, 2^{-k+1}) = \emptyset$ whenever $j \neq k$. Using this and (5.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} B_{2,1} &= \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=k}^{n-1} 2^{i-n} \int_{I_{i,k}} |b - b_{I_{i,k}} + b_{I_{i,k}} - b_{Q_{k-1}} + b_{Q_{k-1}} - b_{\widehat{Q}}| dv \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=k}^{n-1} 2^{i-n} \int_{I_{i,k}} |b - b_{I_{i,k}}| dv + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=k}^{n-1} 2^{i-n} 2^{-i} |b_{I_{i,k}} - b_{Q_{k-1}}| \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=k}^{n-1} 2^{i-n} 2^{-i} |b_{Q_{k-1}} - b_{\widehat{Q}}| \\ &\lesssim 2^{-n} \left[\sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=k}^{n-1} + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=k}^{n-1} (i-k) + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=k}^{n-1} (n-k) \right] \|b\|_{\text{BMO}[0,1)} \\ &\lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}[0,1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, by (5.9), we find that

$$B_{2,2} \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} 2^{j+1-n} \int_{2^{-k}}^{2^{-k+1}} |b - b_{Q_{k-1}} + b_{Q_{k-1}} - b_{\widehat{Q}}| dv$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\lesssim \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} 2^{j+1-n} \left[2^{-k+1} + 2^{-k}(n-k) \right] \|b\|_{\text{BMO}[0,1)} \\
 &\lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}[0,1)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for B_3 , it follows from both the fact $I_{n,k} \subset Q_{k-1}$ and (5.9) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 B_3 &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n 2^k \int_{I_{n,k}} \left| b - b_{I_{n,k}} + b_{I_{n,k}} - b_{Q_{k-1}} + b_{Q_{k-1}} - b_{\widehat{Q}} \right| d\nu \\
 &\lesssim \sum_{k=1}^n 2^k \int_{I_{n,k}} |b - b_{I_{n,k}}| d\nu + \sum_{k=1}^n 2^k 2^{-n} |b_{I_{n,k}} - b_{Q_{k-1}}| \\
 &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^n 2^k 2^{-n} |b_{Q_{k-1}} - b_{\widehat{Q}}| \\
 &\lesssim \left[\sum_{k=1}^n 2^k 2^{-n} + \sum_{k=1}^n 2^k 2^{-n}(n-k) \right] \|b\|_{\text{BMO}[0,1)} \\
 &\lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}[0,1)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude that $I_2 \lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}[0,1)}$, which, together with (5.8), further implies the desired assertion. This finishes the proof of Lemma 5.12. \square

Applying the above lemma, we obtain the endpoint estimate of the commutator $[\sigma, b]$ with $b \in \text{BMO}[0, 1)$.

Proposition 5.13. *Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 when $T = \sigma$ and $q = 1$ hold true.*

Proof. The following two inequalities can be found in Corollary 2 of [37, p. 265] and [26, Corollary 2.3] (see also [43]):

- (i) for any $f \in L^1[0, 1)$, $\|\sigma(f)\|_{L^{1,\infty}[0,1)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^1[0,1)}$, where C is a positive constant independent of f ;
- (ii) for any $f \in H_1[0, 1)$, $\frac{1}{C}\|f\|_{H_1[0,1)} \leq \|\sigma(f)\|_{L^1[0,1)} \leq C\|f\|_{H_1[0,1)}$, where C is a positive constant independent of f .

Observe that, in the proofs of both Theorems 1.3 and 1.4, (4.1) and (4.2) are only used to show the following inequality: for any simple ∞ -atom a and for any $b \in \text{BMO}[0, 1)$,

$$(5.10) \quad \|U(a, b)\|_{L^1[0,1)} \lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}[0,1)},$$

where, for any $x \in [0, 1)$,

$$U(a, b)(x) := \sigma(\Pi_2(a, b) - b(x)a)(x).$$

Note that the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ in this section is regular. Thus, to prove the present proposition, it is sufficient to show (5.10).

For any $b \in \text{BMO}[0, 1]$ and any simple ∞ -atom a respect to some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and some $Q \in A(\mathcal{F}_n)$, we obtain, for any $x \in [0, 1]$,

$$(5.11) \quad \begin{aligned} |U(a, b)(x)| &= \left| U(a, b - b_{\widehat{Q}})(x) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sigma \left(\Pi_2(a, b - b_{\widehat{Q}}) \right)(x) \right| + \left| b(x) - b_{\widehat{Q}} \right| \sigma(a)(x). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{supp}(a) \subset Q$, it follows that

$$\Pi_2(a, b - b_{\widehat{Q}}) = \Pi_2(a, b - b_{n-1}),$$

which, together with both the boundedness of σ from $H_1[0, 1]$ to $L^1[0, 1]$ and Lemma 4.6, further implies that

$$\left\| \sigma \left(\Pi_2(a, b - b_{\widehat{Q}}) \right) \right\|_{L^1[0, 1]} \lesssim \left\| \Pi_2(a, b - b_{\widehat{Q}}) \right\|_{L^1[0, 1]} \lesssim \|b\|_{\text{BMO}[0, 1]}.$$

Combining this, (5.11), and Lemma 5.12, we conclude that (5.10) holds true. This finishes the proof of Proposition 5.13. \square

The following conclusions follow directly from both Proposition 5.13 and Remark 4.13; we omit the details.

Corollary 5.14. *Let $b \in \text{BMO}[0, 1]$ be non-constant. Then*

- (i) *the commutator $[\sigma, b]$ is bounded from $H_1[0, 1]$ to $L^{1, \infty}[0, 1]$;*
- (ii) *$\mathcal{Y} := H_1^b[0, 1]$ is the largest subspace of $H_1[0, 1]$ such that the commutator $[\sigma, b]$ is bounded from \mathcal{Y} to $L^1[0, 1]$.*

Acknowledgement. We thank Odysseas Bakas, Zhendong Xu, Yujia Zhai, and Hao Zhang for personal communication on this subject and for sending to us a preliminary version of [3]. We also thank Quanhua Xu for his interest in the subject and for having indicated to us that Odysseas Bakas, Zhendong Xu, Yujia Zhai, and Hao Zhang worked on related problems, which led us to send them a first draft of the content of this article.

Thanks go also to Dmitriy Stolyarov who indicated to us that we cited wrongly some results on the fractional integral (see Remark 4.21).

References

- [1] R. Arai, E. Nakai and G. Sadasue, *Fractional integrals and their commutators on martingale Orlicz spaces*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **487** (2020), Paper No. 123991, 35 pp.
- [2] O. Bakas, S. Pott, S. Rodríguez-López and A. Sola, *Notes on H^{\log} : structural properties, dyadic variants, and bilinear H^1 -BMO mappings*, Ark. Mat. **60** (2022), 231–175.
- [3] O. Bakas, Z. Xu, Y. Zhai and H. Zhang, *Multiplication between elements in martingale Hardy spaces and their duals*, arXiv: 2301.08723.
- [4] R. Bañuelos, *The foundational inequalities of D. L. Burkholder and some of their ramifications*, Illinois J. Math. **54** (2010), 789–868 (2012).

- [5] A. Bonami, J. Cao, L. D. Ky, L. Liu, D. Yang and W. Yuan, *Multiplication between Hardy spaces and their dual spaces*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **131** (2019), 130–170.
- [6] A. Bonami, L. Liu, D. Yang and W. Yuan, *Pointwise multipliers of Zygmund classes on \mathbb{R}^n* , J. Geom. Anal. **31** (2021), 8879–8902.
- [7] A. Bonami, J. Feuto, S. Grellier and L. D. Ky, *Atomic decomposition and weak factorization in generalized Hardy spaces of closed forms*, Bull. Sci. Math. **141** (2017), 676–702.
- [8] A. Bonami, S. Grellier and L. D. Ky, *Paraproducts and products of functions in $BMO(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\mathcal{H}_1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ through wavelets*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **97** (2012), 230–241.
- [9] A. Bonami, T. Iwaniec, P. Jones and M. Zinsmeister, *On the product of functions in BMO and H_1* , Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **57** (2007), 1405–1439.
- [10] A. Bonami and L. D. Ky, *Factorization of some Hardy-type spaces of holomorphic functions*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **352** (2014), 817–821.
- [11] D. L. Burkholder, *Martingale transforms*, Ann. Math. Statist. **37** (1966), 1494–1504.
- [12] J. Cao, L. D. Ky and D. Yang, *Bilinear decompositions of products of local Hardy and Lipschitz or BMO spaces through wavelets*, Commun. Contemp. Math. **20** (2018), 1750025, 30 pp.
- [13] J.-A. Chao and R. Long, *Martingale transforms with unbounded multipliers*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **114** (1992), 831–838.
- [14] J.-A. Chao and H. Ombe, *Commutators on dyadic martingales*, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci. **61** (1985), 35–38.
- [15] J.-A. Chao and L. Peng, *Schatten classes and commutators on simple martingales*, Colloq. Math. **71** (1996), 7–21.
- [16] B. Davis, *On the integrability of the martingale square function*, Israel J. Math. **8** (1970), 187–190.
- [17] X. Fu, D. Yang and L. Liang, *Products of functions in $BMO(X)$ and $H_{at}^1(X)$ via wavelets over spaces of homogeneous type*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl. **23** (2017), 919–990.
- [18] A. M. Garsia, *Martingale Inequalities: Seminar Notes on Recent Progress*, Mathematics Lecture Note Series, W. A. Benjamin, Inc., Reading, Mass.-London-Amsterdam, 1973.
- [19] C. Herz, *Bounded mean oscillation and regulated martingales*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **193** (1974), 199–215.
- [20] S. Janson, *BMO and commutators of martingale transforms*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **31** (1981), 265–270.
- [21] L. D. Ky, *Bilinear decompositions and commutators of singular integral operators*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **365** (2013), 2931–2958.
- [22] L. D. Ky, *Endpoint estimates for commutators of singular integrals related to Schrödinger operators*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **31** (2015), 1333–1373.
- [23] L. Liu, D. Yang and W. Yuan, *Bilinear decompositions for products of Hardy and Lipschitz spaces on spaces of homogeneous type*, Dissertationes Math. **533** (2018), 1–93.
- [24] R. Long, *Martingale Spaces and Inequalities*, Peking University Press, Beijing; Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, 1993.
- [25] L. D. López-Sánchez, J. M. Martell and J. Parcet, *Dyadic harmonic analysis beyond doubling measures*, Adv. Math. **267** (2014), 44–93.
- [26] N. Memić and S. Sadiković, *Maximal operators and characterization of Hardy spaces*, Anal. Math. **46** (2020), 119–131.

- [27] T. Miyamoto, E. Nakai and G. Sadasue, *Martingale Orlicz-Hardy spaces*, Math. Nachr. **285** (2012), 670–686.
- [28] E. Nakai and G. Sadasue, *Pointwise multipliers on martingale Campanato spaces*, Studia Math. **220** (2014), 87–100.
- [29] E. Nakai and G. Sadasue, *Some new properties concerning BLO martingales*, Tohoku Math. J. (2) **69** (2017), 183–194.
- [30] E. Nakai and G. Sadasue, *Commutators of fractional integrals on martingale Morrey spaces*, Math. Inequal. Appl. **22** (2019), 631–655.
- [31] E. Nakai and K. Yabuta, *Pointwise multipliers for functions of bounded mean oscillation*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **37** (1985), 207–218.
- [32] C. Pérez, *Endpoint estimates for commutators of singular integral operators*, J. Func. Anal. **128** (1995), 163–185.
- [33] L.-E. Persson, F. Schipp, G. Tepnadze and F. Weisz, *An analogy of the Carleson–Hunt theorem with respect to Vilenkin systems*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl. **28** (2022), Paper No. 48, 29 pp.
- [34] L.-E. Persson, G. Tepnadze and F. Weisz, *Martingale Hardy Spaces and Summability of One-Dimensional Vilenkin–Fourier Series*, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2022.
- [35] M. C. Pereyra, *Dyadic harmonic analysis and weighted inequalities: the sparse revolution*, in: New Trends in Applied Harmonic Analysis, Vol. 2, Harmonic Analysis, Geometric Measure Theory, and Applications, pp. 159–239, Appl. Numer. Harmon. Anal., Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2019.
- [36] N. Randrianantoanina and L. Wu, *Noncommutative fractional integrals*, Studia Math. **229** (2015), 113–139.
- [37] F. Schipp, W. R. Wade and P. Simon, *Walsh Series*, Adam Hilger, Ltd., Bristol, 1990, An Introduction to Dyadic Harmonic Analysis, With the collaboration of J. Pál.
- [38] D. Stolyarov and D. Yarcev, *Fractional integration for irregular martingales*, Tohoku Math. J. (2) **74** (2022), 253–261.
- [39] S. Treil, *Commutators, paraproducts and BMO in non-homogeneous martingale settings*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **29** (2013), 1325–1372.
- [40] A. L. Volberg and V. A. Tolokonnikov, *Hankel operators and problems of best approximation of unbounded functions*, Translated from Zapiski Nauchnykh Seminarov Leningradskogo Matematicheskogo Instituta im. V.A. Steklova AN SSSR, 141 (1985), 5–17.
- [41] F. Weisz, *Martingale Hardy spaces for $0 < p \leq 1$* , Probab. Theory Related Fields **84** (1990), 361–376.
- [42] F. Weisz, *Martingale Hardy Spaces and Their Applications in Fourier Analysis*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 1568, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994.
- [43] F. Weisz, *Cesàro summability of one- and two-dimensional Walsh-Fourier series*, Anal. Math. **22** (1996), 229–242.
- [44] F. Weisz, *Summability of Multi-dimensional Fourier Series and Hardy Spaces*, Mathematics and its Applications, Vol. 541, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2002.
- [45] D. Yang, W. Yuan and Y. Zhang, *Bilinear decomposition and divergence-curl estimates on products related to local Hardy spaces and their dual spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. **280** (2021), Paper No. 108796, 74 pp.

- [46] Y. Zhang, D. Yang and W. Yuan, *Real-variable characterizations of local Orlicz-slice Hardy spaces with application to bilinear decompositions*, Commun. Contemp. Math. **24** (2022), Paper No. 2150004, 35 pp.

Aline Bonami

Institut Denis Poisson, UMR CNRS 7013, University of Orléans, 45067 Orléans cedex 2, France

E-mail: aline.bonami@univ-orleans.fr (A. Bonami)

Yong Jiao, Guangheng Xie and Dejian Zhou

School of Mathematics and Statistics, HNP-LAMA, Central South University, Changsha 410083, The People's Republic of China

E-mails: jiaoyong@csu.edu.cn (Y. Jiao)

xianguangheng@csu.edu.cn (G. Xie)

zhoudejian@csu.edu.cn (D. Zhou)

Dachun Yang

Laboratory of Mathematics and Complex Systems (Ministry of Education of China), School of Mathematical Sciences, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, The People's Republic of China

E-mail: dciyang@bnu.edu.cn (D. Yang)