

# ENDPOINT MIXED WEAK TYPE EXTRAPOLATION

SHELDY OMBROSI AND ISRAEL P. RIVERA-RÍOS

ABSTRACT. The purpose of this note is to extend the extrapolation result in [8] as follows. Given a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of pairs of functions suppose that for some  $0 < p < \infty$  and for every  $w \in A_\infty$

$$(0.1) \quad \int f^p w \leq c_w \int g^p w \quad (f, g) \in \mathcal{F}$$

provided the left-hand side of the estimate is finite. If we have that  $B(t) = \frac{t}{\log(e+1/t)^\rho}$  for some  $\rho > 0$ , then, for every  $u \in A_1$  and every  $v \in A_\infty$  we have that

$$\left\| \frac{f}{v} \right\|_{L^{B, \infty}(uv)} \lesssim \left\| \frac{g}{v} \right\|_{L^{B, \infty}(uv)},$$

where

$$L^{A, \infty}(uv) = \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \sup_{t > 0} A(t)uv(\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |f(x)| > \lambda t\}) \leq 1 \right\}$$

is the weak Orlicz type introduced in [9]. As a corollary of this extrapolation result we derive a mixed weak type inequality for Coifman-Rochberg-Weiss commutators.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

We recall that  $w \in A_1$  if

$$[w]_{A_1} = \left\| \frac{Mw}{w} \right\|_{L^\infty} < \infty.$$

In the late seventies, Muckenhoupt and Wheeden [12] showed that given a weight  $w \in A_1$  for

$$|\{x \in \mathbb{R} : w(x)|Gf(x)| > t\}| \lesssim \frac{1}{t} \int |f(x)|w(x)dx$$

where  $G$  is either the Hilbert transform or the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function. Almost a decade later, Sawyer [15] generalized that result in the following way. Given  $u, v \in A_1$

$$(1.1) \quad uv \left( \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \frac{M(fv)(x)}{v(x)} > t \right\} \right) \lesssim \frac{1}{t} \int |f(x)|u(x)v(x)dx.$$

---

Both authors were partially supported by FONCyT PICT 2018-02501. The first author was partially supported by Spanish Government Ministry of Science and Innovation through grant PID2020-113048GB-I00. The second author was partially supported as well by FONCyT PICT 2019-00018 and by Junta de Andalucía UMA18FEDERJA002 and FQM-354.

Note that even though  $u, v \in A_1$ ,  $uv$  could not have good regularity properties. Also the perturbation induced by having the weight  $v$  dividing the maximal function in the level set makes this inequality way harder to settle than the in the case  $v = 1$ . In [15] it was conjectured as well whether (1.1) holds with  $M$  replaced by the Hilbert transform. This conjecture was solved in the positive by Cruz-Uribe, Martell and Pérez [8]. In that paper generalized (1.1) to the case  $n \geq 1$  and showed that (1.1) actually holds for general Calderón-Zygmund operators. They settled the latter estimate via an extrapolation type result. The precise statement of their result is the following.

**Theorem 1.** *Given a family  $\mathcal{F}$  suppose that for some  $0 < p < \infty$  and for every  $w \in A_\infty$*

$$(1.2) \quad \int f^p w \leq c_w \int g^p w \quad (f, g) \in \mathcal{F}$$

*provided the left-hand side of the estimate is finite. Then, if  $u \in A_1$  and  $v \in A_\infty$ ,*

$$(1.3) \quad \left\| \frac{f}{v} \right\|_{L^{1,\infty}(uv)} \lesssim \left\| \frac{g}{v} \right\|_{L^{1,\infty}(uv)}.$$

We remit the reader to Subsection 2.1 for the precise definition of  $A_\infty$ . Note that the classical Coifman-Fefferman inequality says that (1.2) holds for any  $0 < p < \infty$  with  $(f, g) = (Tf, Mf)$  where  $T$  is any Calderón-Zygmund operator and  $M$  is the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator. Hence the result above yields

$$\left\| \frac{Tf}{v} \right\|_{L^{1,\infty}(uv)} \lesssim \left\| \frac{Mf}{v} \right\|_{L^{1,\infty}(uv)}$$

which combined with (1.1), leads to the corresponding result for  $T$ . At this point it is worth noting that nowadays there is no known proof that avoids the use of extrapolation in the case of Calderón-Zygmund operators for  $u \in A_1$  and  $v \in A_1$ , however a direct proof is feasible in the case  $u \in A_1$  and  $v \in A_\infty(u)$  (see Subsection 2.1 for the precise definition of  $A_\infty(u)$ ). Also the statement of the result above led the authors to raise the so called Sawyer's conjecture, namely whether (1.1) could hold assuming that  $u \in A_1$  and  $v \in A_\infty$ . That conjecture was positively solved recently by Li, the second author and Pérez [10].

Now we turn our attention to our contribution. Note that a few years ago, the study of mixed weak type inequalities for commutators was begun by Berra, Carena and Pradolini [3] (see as well [4]). There the following result was settled.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $u \in A_1$  and  $v \in A_\infty(u)$ . If  $T$  is a Calderón-Zygmund operator and  $b \in BMO$ , then*

$$(1.4) \quad uv \left( \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \frac{|[b, T](fv)(x)|}{v(x)} > t \right\} \right) \lesssim \int \Phi_1 \left( \frac{\|b\|_{BMO}|f(x)|}{t} \right) u(x)v(x)dx$$

where  $\Phi_\rho(t) = t \log^\rho(e+t)$ .

No positive results are known for “unrelated” weights, namely assuming just that  $u \in A_1$  and  $v \in A_1$ . A reasonable approach to this question may consist in establishing the corresponding estimate for  $M_{L \log L}$  (see Subsection 2.1 for the precise definition), namely

$$uv \left( \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \frac{|M_{L \log L}(fv)(x)|}{v(x)} > t \right\} \right) \lesssim \int \Phi \left( \frac{\|b\|_{BMO}|f(x)|}{t} \right) u(x)v(x)dx$$

and then reducing the problem for commutators to the estimate for  $M_{L \log L}$  via some counterpart of 1. In fact, we are going to provide such a counterpart. In order to provide our statement we need following definition that we borrow from [9].

Given an strictly increasing function  $A : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  and a weight  $w$  we define,

$$\|f\|_{L^{A, \infty}(w)} = \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \sup_{t>0} A(t)w(\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |f(x)| > \lambda t\}) \leq 1 \right\}.$$

As we will see in full detail in 2.2, for suitable  $A$ ,

$$(1.5) \quad \mu(\{|G(x)| > t\}) \leq c_G \int A\left(\frac{|f|}{t}\right) d\mu \iff \|Gf\|_{L^{B, \infty}(d\mu)} \leq \tilde{c}_G \|f\|_{A(d\mu)}$$

where  $B(t) = \frac{1}{A(\frac{1}{t})}$  and

$$\|f\|_{A(d\mu)} = \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \int_X A\left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Armed with this notation we are in the position to state our main result.

**Theorem 3.** *Given a family  $\mathcal{F}$  suppose that for some  $0 < p < \infty$  and for every  $w \in A_\infty$*

$$(1.6) \quad \int f^p w \leq c_w \int g^p w \quad (f, g) \in \mathcal{F}$$

*provided the left-hand side of the estimate is finite. Let  $\Phi_\rho(t) = t \log(e+t)^\rho$  for some  $\rho > 0$ . Then, for every  $u \in A_1$  and every  $v \in A_\infty$  we have that*

$$\left\| \frac{f}{v} \right\|_{L^{B_\rho, \infty}(uv)} \lesssim \left\| \frac{g}{v} \right\|_{L^{B_\rho, \infty}(uv)}$$

where  $B_\rho(t) = \frac{1}{\Phi_\rho(\frac{1}{t})} = \frac{t}{\log(e+\frac{1}{t})^\rho}$ .

The fact that we can rewrite the inequalities in terms of weak Orlicz norms and results generalizing associated spaces and interpolation to that scale, relying upon some ideas [9] and [1], will be fundamental for our purposes. This change of view and its corresponding “toolbox” is the crux of the paper. Having all the aforementioned elements at our disposal will enable us to follow the strategy in [8] to finally settle Theorem 3. Before continuing our discussion, we would like to note that, actually, a similar argument to the one that will provide in the proof of Theorem 3 allows as well to obtain a more general version of the theorem above with the hypothesis  $v \in A_\infty$  replaced by  $v^\theta \in A_\infty$  for some  $\theta > 0$  hence extending results in [13]. Note that the flexibility provided by that generalized hypothesis, is useful, for instance, in the multilinear setting. We remit the reader to [11] for further details.

We devote the following lines to provide an example of application of our main result. Note that if  $b \in BMO$  and  $T$  is a Calderón-Zygmund operator, it is well known (see for instance [14]) that, if  $\|b\|_{BMO} = 1$ ,

$$\int |[b, T]f(x)|^p w(x) dx \leq c_w \int M_{L \log L} f(x)^p w(x) dx \quad p \in (0, \infty), w \in A_\infty.$$

Then Theorem 1 above yields that if  $\Phi(t) = t \log(e + t)^\rho$  then,

$$\left\| \frac{[b, T](fv)}{v} \right\|_{L^{B\rho, \infty}(uv)} \lesssim \left\| \frac{M_{L \log L}(fv)}{v} \right\|_{L^{B\rho, \infty}(uv)}.$$

Bearing that estimate in mind, note that if we had that

$$(1.7) \quad uv \left( \left\{ \frac{M_{L \log L}(fv)}{v} > t \right\} \right) \lesssim \int \Phi_\rho \left( \frac{|f|}{t} \right) uv$$

then we that would imply, via (1.5), that,

$$\left\| \frac{M_{L \log L}(fv)}{v} \right\|_{L^{B\rho, \infty}(uv)} \lesssim \|f\|_{\Phi_\rho(uv)}$$

and consequently

$$\left\| \frac{[b, T](fv)}{v} \right\|_{L^{B\rho, \infty}(uv)} \lesssim \left\| \frac{M_{L \log L}(fv)}{v} \right\|_{L^{B\rho, \infty}(uv)} \lesssim \|f\|_{\Phi_\rho(uv)}$$

which in turn, applying the equivalence in (1.5) again, would allow us to conclude that

$$uv \left( \left\{ \frac{|[b, T](fv)|}{v} > t \right\} \right) \lesssim \int \Phi_\rho \left( \frac{|f|}{t} \right) uv.$$

Up until now the best known counterpart of (1.7) is contained in [2] and it says that (1.5) holds for  $\Phi_{1+\frac{1}{\varepsilon}}(t)$  with  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$  for some  $\varepsilon_0$  depending on the weights involved. Hence the best possible available result for commutators up until now is the following.

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $T$  be a Calderón-Zygmund operator and  $b \in BMO$ . If  $u \in A_1$  and  $v \in A_\infty$  we have that*

$$uv \left( \left\{ \frac{|[b, T](fv)|}{v} > t \right\} \right) \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Phi_{1+\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \left( \frac{\|f\| \|b\|_{BMO}}{t} \right) uv$$

for some  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$  depending on the weights.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we gather all the Lemmata required to settle the main result, which proof is presented in Section 3.

## 2. LEMMATA

**2.1.  $A_p$  weights and Orlicz averages.** We recall that if  $p > 1$ , we have that  $w \in A_p$  if and only if

$$[w]_{A_p} = \sup_Q \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q w \left( \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q w^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \right)^{p-1} < \infty.$$

Since the  $A_p$  classes are increasing with  $p$  it is natural to define  $A_\infty = \bigcup_{p \geq 1} A_p$ .

We recall that  $w \in A_p(u)$  if

$$[w]_{A_p(u)} = \sup_Q \frac{1}{u(Q)} \int_Q wu \left( \frac{1}{u(Q)} \int_Q w^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} u \right)^{p-1} < \infty. \quad \text{if } 1 < p < \infty.$$

$$[w]_{A_1(u)} = \left\| \frac{\sup_Q \frac{1}{u(Q)} \int_Q wu}{w} \right\|_{L^\infty} < \infty. \quad \text{if } p = 1.$$

Analogously,  $A_\infty(u) = \bigcup_{p \geq 1} A_p(u)$ .

We borrow the following Lemma from [8, Lemma 2.3] since it will be useful for our interests.

**Lemma 1.** *If  $u \in A_1$ ,  $v \in A_p$ ,  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , then there exists  $0 < \varepsilon_0 < 1$  depending only on  $[u]_{A_1}$  such that  $uv^\varepsilon \in A_p$  for all  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ .*

We end this subsection recalling that given a Young function  $A$  we can define the average of  $f$  associated to  $A$  by

$$\|f\|_{A(L), Q} = \|f\|_{A, Q} = \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q A \left( \frac{x}{\lambda} \right) dx \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Given a Young function  $A$ , it is natural to define the maximal operator associated to  $A$  by

$$M_{A(L)}f(x) = M_Af(x) = \sup_{x \in Q} \|f\|_{A, Q}.$$

A particular case of interest for us will be the case  $M_{L \log L}$  which is given by  $A(t) = t \log(e + t)$ .

**2.2. Results on weak Orlicz spaces.** Our first result contains the precise statement of 1.5.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $A : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be an strictly increasing submultiplicative function. Then given a linear or a sublinear operator  $G$ , the following statements are equivalent*

(1) *There exists  $c_G > 0$  such that for every  $t > 0$*

$$\mu(\{|G(x)| > t\}) \leq c_G \int A\left(\frac{|f|}{t}\right) d\mu.$$

(2) *There exists  $\tilde{c}_G > 0$  such that*

$$\|Gf\|_{L^{B,\infty}(d\mu)} \leq \tilde{c}_G \|f\|_{A(d\mu)}$$

$$\text{where } B(t) = \frac{1}{A\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)}.$$

*Proof.* Assume that (1) holds. Since  $A$  is submultiplicative we have that

$$\mu(\{|G(x)| > t\lambda\}) \leq c_G \int A\left(\frac{|f|}{t\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq c_G c_A A\left(\frac{1}{t}\right) \int A\left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda}\right) d\mu.$$

Hence,

$$\frac{1}{A\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)} \mu(\{|G(x)| > t\lambda\}) \leq c_G c_A \int A\left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda}\right) d\mu.$$

Now choosing  $\lambda = \lambda_0 \|f\|_{A(d\mu)}$  for some  $\lambda_0 > 0$  to be chosen we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{A\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)} \mu(\{|G(x)| > t\lambda_0 \|f\|_{A(d\mu)}\}) &\leq c_G c_A \int A\left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda_0 \|f\|_{A(d\mu)}}\right) d\mu \\ &\leq c_G c_A^2 A\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_0}\right) \int A\left(\frac{|f|}{\|f\|_{A(d\mu)}}\right) d\mu \\ &\leq c_G c_A^2 A\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_0}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $\lambda_0 = \frac{1}{A^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{c_G c_A^2}\right)}$  we have that

$$\frac{1}{A\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)} \mu(\{|G(x)| > t\lambda_0 \|f\|_{A(d\mu)}\}) \leq 1$$

And this yields that

$$\|Gf\|_{L^{B,\infty}(d\mu)} \leq \lambda_0 \|f\|_{A(d\mu)}.$$

Now we assume that

$$\|Gf\|_{L^{B,\infty}(d\mu)} \leq \tilde{c}_G \|f\|_{A(d\mu)}.$$

Note that the estimate above in particular implies that

$$\sup_{t>0} \frac{1}{A\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)} \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |Gf(x)| > \tilde{c}_G \|f\|_{A(d\mu)} t\}) \leq 1$$

and hence

$$\frac{1}{A(1)}\mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |Gf(x)| > \tilde{c}_G \|f\|_{A(d\mu)}\}) \leq 1.$$

Now we observe that by definition

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \int A\left(\frac{2|f|}{\|f\|_{A(d\mu)}}\right) d\mu = \int A\left(\frac{\tilde{c}_G|f|}{\tilde{c}_G\|f\|_{A(d\mu)}}\right) d\mu \\ &\leq c_A A(\tilde{c}_G) \int A\left(\frac{|f|}{\tilde{c}_G\|f\|_{A(d\mu)}}\right) d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$w(\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |Gf(x)| > \tilde{c}_G \|f\|_{A(d\mu)}\}) \leq c_A A(\tilde{c}_G) A(1) \int A\left(\frac{|f|}{\tilde{c}_G\|f\|_{A(d\mu)}}\right) d\mu.$$

and by homogeneity we are done.  $\square$

A fundamental fact for our purposes is that we can rescale weak Orlicz seminorms.

**Lemma 3.** *If  $r > 1$  then*

$$\|f\|_{L^{A,\infty}} = \left\| |f|^{\frac{1}{r}} \right\|_{L^{A_r,\infty}}^r$$

where  $A_r(t) = A(t^r)$ .

*Proof.* We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L^{A,\infty}(w)} &= \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \sup_{t>0} A(t)w(\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |f(x)| > \lambda t\}) \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \sup_{t>0} A(t)w\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |f(x)|^{\frac{1}{r}} > \lambda^{\frac{1}{r}} t^{\frac{1}{r}}\right\}\right) \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \lambda^{\frac{1}{r}} > 0 : \sup_{t>0} A(s^r)w\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |f(x)|^{\frac{1}{r}} > \lambda^{\frac{1}{r}} s\right\}\right) \leq 1 \right\}^r \\ &= \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \sup_{t>0} A(s^r)w\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |f(x)|^{\frac{1}{r}} > \lambda s\right\}\right) \leq 1 \right\}^r \\ &= \left\| |f|^{\frac{1}{r}} \right\|_{L^{A_r,\infty}}^r \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

2.2.1. *Associated weak Orlicz spaces.* We recall that a Young function  $A$  is of lower type  $p > 0$  if for every  $0 \leq s \leq 1$  we have that

$$A(st) \leq C s^p A(t).$$

Note that in [9, (4.8) Theorem] it was shown that if  $A$  is of lower type greater than 1 then

$$\|g\|_{L^{A,\infty}(\mu)} \simeq \sup_{s>0} \frac{g_\mu^*(s)}{A^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{s}\right)}$$

which is a norm. Following as well [9] we define

$$\|g\|_{L^{B,1}(\mu)} = \int_0^\infty \frac{g_\mu^*(s)}{B^{-1}(\frac{1}{s})} \frac{ds}{s}.$$

Our next result provides conditions relating an Orlicz weak space to its associated space.

**Lemma 4.** *Assume that  $A$  is of lower type greater than 1 and that for a certain Young function  $B$   $A^{-1}(t)B^{-1}(t) \simeq t$ . Then*

$$\|g\|_{L^{(A,\infty)'(\mu)}} \simeq \|g\|_{L^{B,1}(\mu)}.$$

*Proof.* Note that since  $A^{-1}(t)B^{-1}(t) \simeq t$  then  $A^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})B^{-1}(\frac{1}{t}) \simeq \frac{1}{t}$ . We define

$$\|g\|_{L^{(A,\infty)'(uv)}} = \sup_{\|f\|_{L^{A,\infty}(uv)}=1} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x)g(x)u(x)v(x)dx \right|$$

Let

$$\|g\|_{L^{B,1}(uv)} = \int_0^\infty \frac{g_{uv}^*(s)}{B^{-1}(\frac{1}{s})} \frac{ds}{s}$$

First we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int fguvdx \right| &\leq \int_0^\infty f_{uv}^*(s)g_{uv}^*(s)ds = \int_0^\infty \frac{f_{uv}^*(s)g_{uv}^*(s)}{\frac{1}{s}} \frac{ds}{s} \\ &\simeq \int_0^\infty \frac{f_{uv}^*(s)g_{uv}^*(s)}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{s})B^{-1}(\frac{1}{s})} \frac{ds}{s} \\ &\leq \left( \sup_{s>0} \frac{f_{uv}^*(s)}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{s})} \right) \int_0^\infty \frac{g_{uv}^*(s)}{B^{-1}(\frac{1}{s})} \frac{ds}{s} \\ &= \|f\|_{L^{A,\infty}(uv)} \|g\|_{L^{B,1}(uv)} \end{aligned}$$

And taking norm over  $\|f\|_{L^{A,\infty}(uv)} = 1$

$$\|g\|_{L^{(A,\infty)'(uv)}} \leq \|g\|_{L^{B,1}(uv)}$$

Now we have to show that

$$\|g\|_{L^{B,1}(uv)} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^{(A,\infty)'(uv)}}$$

By the Luxemburg representation theorem [1, Theorem II.4.10] it suffices to deal with the measure space  $(\mathbb{R}^+, m)$  and functions  $g$  on  $\mathbb{R}^+$  such that  $g = g^*$ . Let

$$f(s) = A^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{s}\right).$$

Note that since  $f$  is decreasing, then  $f = f^*$ . Now we observe that since

$$A^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right) \simeq \frac{1}{tB^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)}$$



we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|g\|_{L^{B,1}(uv)} &= \int_0^\infty \frac{g^*(s)}{B^{-1}(\frac{1}{s})} \frac{ds}{s} \simeq \int_0^\infty A^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{s}\right) g^*(s) ds \\ &= \int_0^\infty f(s)g^*(s) ds = \int_0^\infty f^*(s)g^*(s) ds \\ &\leq \|f\|_{L^{A,\infty}} \|g\|_{L^{(A,\infty)'}}. \end{aligned}$$

But since

$$\|f\|_{L^{A,\infty}(uv)} = \sup_{s>0} \frac{f^*(s)}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{s})} = \sup_{s>0} \frac{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{s})}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{s})} = 1$$

we are done.  $\square$

**2.2.2. An interpolation result in Orlicz scale.** In our next Theorem we show that it is possible to obtain results via interpolation in the weak Orlicz scale having Lorentz spaces and the  $L^\infty \rightarrow L^\infty$  bound as departing points. Since we are not aware this result is already available in the literature, we provide a full proof. For related results we remit the interested reader to [5, 6].

**Theorem 4.** *Assume that*

$$\|Tf\|_{L^{p_0,\infty}} \leq C_0 \|f\|_{L^{p_0,1}}$$

and

$$\|Tf\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_1 \|f\|_{L^\infty}$$

and that  $A$  is a Young function such that

$$(2.1) \quad \int_s^\infty \frac{1}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} t^{-\frac{1}{p_0}} \frac{dt}{t} \leq \kappa \frac{s^{-\frac{1}{p_0}}}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{s})} \quad s > 0$$

for some  $\kappa > 1$ . Then if we call  $c_{A,p_0}$  the smallest of such  $\kappa$ ,

$$\|Tf\|_{L^{A,1}} \leq 2(C_1 + C_0 c_{A,p_0}) \|f\|_{L^{A,1}}.$$

*Proof.* Let

$$f = f_t + f^t = f \chi_{\{x: |f(x)| \leq f^*(t)\}} + f \chi_{\{x: |f(x)| > f^*(t)\}}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|Tf\|_{L^{p,1}} &= \int_0^\infty \frac{(Tf)^*(t)}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} \frac{dt}{t} \leq 2 \int_0^\infty \frac{(Tf_t)^*(t)}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} \frac{dt}{t} + 2 \int_0^\infty \frac{(Tf^t)^*(t)}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} \frac{dt}{t} \\ &= 2(I + II) \end{aligned}$$

For  $I$  note that

$$(Tf_t)^*(t) \leq (Tf_t)^*(0) = \|Tf_t\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_1 \|f_t\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_1 f^*(t).$$

Then

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{(Tf_t)^*(t)}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} \frac{dt}{t} \leq C_1 \int_0^\infty \frac{f^*(t)}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} \frac{dt}{t} = C_1 \|f\|_{L^{A,1}}$$

For  $II$  note that since

$$|f^t(x)| \leq |f(x)|$$

then  $(f^t)^*(s) \leq f^*(s)$ . Furthermore  $\mu_{f^t}(0) = \mu_f(f^*(t)) \leq t$  which implies that  $(f^t)^*(t) = 0$ , and since  $(f^t)^*$  is decreasing and non-negative this yields that  $f^*(s) = 0$  for  $s \geq t$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_0^\infty \frac{(Tf^t)^*(t)}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} \frac{dt}{t} &= \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} t^{-\frac{1}{p_0}} t^{\frac{1}{p_0}} (Tf^t)^*(t) \frac{dt}{t} \\
 &\leq \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} t^{-\frac{1}{p_0}} \left( \sup_s s^{\frac{1}{p_0}} (Tf^t)^*(s) \right) \frac{dt}{t} \\
 &\leq C_0 \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} t^{-\frac{1}{p_0}} \|f^t\|_{L^{p_0,1}} \frac{dt}{t} \\
 &\leq C_0 \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} t^{-\frac{1}{p_0}} \int_0^\infty s^{\frac{1}{p_0}} (f^t)^*(s) \frac{ds}{s} \frac{dt}{t} \\
 &= C_0 \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} t^{-\frac{1}{p_0}} \int_0^t s^{\frac{1}{p_0}} (f)^*(s) \frac{ds}{s} \frac{dt}{t} \\
 &= C_0 \int_0^\infty s^{\frac{1}{p_0}} (f)^*(s) \left( \int_s^\infty \frac{1}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} t^{-\frac{1}{p_0}} \frac{dt}{t} \right) \frac{ds}{s} \\
 &\leq C_0 c \int_0^\infty s^{\frac{1}{p_0}} \frac{s^{-\frac{1}{p_0}}}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{s})} (f)^*(s) \frac{ds}{s} \\
 &= C_0 c \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{A^{-1}(\frac{1}{s})} (f)^*(s) \frac{ds}{s} = \|f\|_{L^{A,1}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

where we used (2.1). □

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 3

Throughout this proof, since  $\rho$  is fixed, we shall drop it when denoting  $B_\rho$  for the sake of clarity.

Given  $u \in A_1$  and  $v \in A_\infty$  we consider the operator

$$Sf(x) = \frac{M(fu)(x)}{u(x)} \chi_{\{u \neq 0\}}(x)$$

Actually, we note that since  $u \in A_1$  then  $u > 0$  a.e. and hence the definition of  $Sf$  makes sense a.e.

Observe that due to the fact that  $u \in A_1$  then,  $S$  is bounded on  $L^\infty(uv)$  with constant  $C_1 = [u]_{A_1}$ . Now we show that  $S$  is bounded on  $L^{p_0}(uv)$  for some  $1 < p_0 < \infty$ . Note that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} Sf(x)^{p_0} u(x)v(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} M(fu)(x)^{p_0} u(x)^{1-p_0} v(x) dx.$$

Since  $v \in A_\infty$  then we have that  $v \in A_t$  for some  $t > 1$ . Then by the factorization theorem, there exist  $v_1, v_2 \in A_1$  such that

$$v = v_1 v_2^{1-t}.$$

Hence

$$u^{1-p_0}v = v_1(uv_2^{\frac{t-1}{p_0-1}})^{1-p_0}.$$

Now we observe that by Lemma there exists  $0 < \varepsilon_0 < 1$  depending just on  $[u]_{A_1}$  such that  $uv_2^\varepsilon \in A_1$  for every  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$  and every  $v_2 \in A_1$ . Hence if we let

$$p_0 = \frac{2(t-1)}{\varepsilon_0} + 1$$

we have that  $u^{1-p_0}v \in A_{p_0}$  and  $M$  is bounded on  $L^{p_0}(u^{1-p_0}v)$  by Muckenhoupt theorem. Therefore,  $S$  is bounded on  $L^{p_0}$  with some constant  $C_0$  that depends just on the  $A_1$  constant of  $u$  and the  $A_t$  constant of  $v$ .

Now we observe that for

$$B_r(t) = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{t^r} \log(e + \frac{1}{t^r})^\rho},$$

then

$$B_r^{-1}(t) = \frac{1}{\Phi_\rho^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}}$$

and we have that

$$B_r^{-1}(t) \simeq t^{\frac{1}{r}} \log\left(e + \frac{1}{t}\right)^{\frac{\rho}{r}}$$

with constant independent of  $r$ . Let us take  $\Psi_{r'}$  such that

$$t = B_r^{-1}(t)\Psi_{r'}^{-1}(t).$$

Namely let  $\Psi_{r'}^{-1}(t) = c_\rho \frac{t^{\frac{1}{r'}}}{\log(e + \frac{1}{t})^{\frac{\rho}{r'}}$ . Note that for  $r' > p_0$ , if we can show that

$$(3.1) \quad \int_s^\infty t^{\frac{1}{r'} - \frac{1}{p_0}} \log(e + t)^{\frac{\rho}{r'}} \frac{dt}{t} \leq c_\rho \frac{1}{\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{r'}} \frac{\log(e + s)^\rho}{\varepsilon s^\varepsilon}$$

namely that, following notation in Theorem 4,

$$C_{\Psi_{r'}, p_0} \leq \frac{c_\rho}{\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{r'}},$$

then, by Theorem 4 itself, we will have that

$$(3.2) \quad \|Sf\|_{L^{\Psi_{r'}, 1}} \leq 4 \left( C_1 + C_0 \frac{c_\rho}{\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{r'}} \right) \|f\|_{L^{\Psi_{r'}, 1}}.$$

Let us show then that  $c_{\Psi_{r'}, p_0} \leq \frac{c_\rho}{\frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{r'}}$ . Let us call  $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{r'} - \frac{1}{p_0}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_s^\infty t^{\frac{1}{r'} - \frac{1}{p_0}} \log(e+t) \frac{t^\rho}{t} dt &= \int_s^\infty \log(e+t) \frac{1}{t^{1+\varepsilon}} dt = \int_s^\infty \frac{\log(e+t)^{\frac{1}{r} \rho}}{t^{\frac{1}{r} + \frac{\varepsilon}{r}}} \frac{dt}{t^{\frac{1}{r} + \frac{\varepsilon}{r}}} \\
 &= \int_s^\infty \left( \frac{\log(e+t)^\rho}{t^{\varepsilon+1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \frac{dt}{t^{\frac{1}{r'} + \frac{\varepsilon}{r}}} \\
 &\leq \left( \int_s^\infty \frac{\log(e+t)^\rho}{t^\varepsilon} \frac{1}{t} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \left( \int_s^\infty \frac{dt}{t^{1+\varepsilon}} \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that for the second integral

$$\int_s^\infty \frac{dt}{t^{1+\varepsilon}} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon s^\varepsilon}$$

and for the first,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_s^\infty \frac{\log(e+t)^\rho}{t^\varepsilon} \frac{1}{t} dt &= \left[ \frac{t^{-\varepsilon}}{-\varepsilon} \log(e+t)^\rho \right]_{t=s}^\infty + \int_s^\infty \rho \frac{\log(e+t)^{\rho-1}}{(e+t)t^\varepsilon} dt \\
 &\leq \frac{\log(e+s)^\rho}{\varepsilon s^\varepsilon} + \rho \int_s^\infty \frac{\log(e+t)^{\rho-1}}{t^{1+\varepsilon}} dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

If  $\rho - 1 \leq 0$  then

$$\int_s^\infty \rho \frac{\log(e+t)^{\rho-1}}{t^{1+\varepsilon}} dt \leq \rho \int_s^\infty \frac{1}{(e+t)t^\varepsilon} dt \leq \rho \int_s^\infty \frac{1}{t^{1+\varepsilon}} dt = \frac{\rho}{\varepsilon s}$$

and we are done. Otherwise arguing again in the same way for the second term until  $\rho - k \leq 0$  we have that

$$\int_s^\infty t^{\frac{1}{r'} - \frac{1}{p_0}} \log(e+t) \frac{t^\rho}{t} dt \leq c_\rho \frac{\log(e+s)^\rho}{\varepsilon s^\varepsilon}.$$

Combining the estimates above yields 3.1 as we wanted to show. Having (3.2) at our disposal we continue our argument noting that

$$\|Sf\|_{L^{\Psi_{r',1}}(uv)} \leq K_0 \|f\|_{L^{\Psi_{r',1}}(uv)}$$

for every  $r' \geq 2p_0$  with  $K_0 = 8p_0(C_0 + C_1)$ .

Observe that for every  $W_1 \in A_1$  with  $[W_1]_{A_1} \leq 2K_0$  there exists  $0 < \tilde{\varepsilon}_0 < 1$  depending just on  $K_0$  such that  $W_1 W_2^\varepsilon \in A_1$  for every  $0 < \varepsilon < \tilde{\varepsilon}_0$ . Let us fix  $0 < \varepsilon < \min\left\{\tilde{\varepsilon}_0, \frac{1}{2p_0}\right\}$  and let  $r = \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)'$ . Then  $r' > 2p_0$  and hence  $S$  is bounded on  $L^{\Psi_{r',1}}(uv)$ . Now we use the Rubio de Francia algorithm to define the operator

$$Rf(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{S^k h(x)}{2^k K_0^k}.$$

It follows from this definition that

- (1)  $h(x) \leq Rh(x)$
- (2)  $\|Rh\|_{L^{\Psi_{r',1}}(uv)} \leq 2\|h\|_{L^{\Psi_{r',1}}(uv)}$
- (3)  $S(Rh)(x) \leq 2K_0 Rh(x)$

In particular it follows from the definition of  $S$  that

$$Rhu \in A_1$$

with  $[Rhu]_{A_1} \leq 2K_0$ . Now let  $W_1 = Rhu$  and  $W_2 = v_1 \in A_1$  (bear in mind that  $v = v_1 v_2^{1-t}$ ). Then  $W_1 W_2^\varepsilon \in A_1$  and we have that

$$Rhu v^{1/r'} = W_1 W_2^\varepsilon v_2^{(1-t)/r'} \in A_\infty.$$

Let  $(f, g) \in \mathcal{F}$  such that the left hand side of (1.6) is finite. Then taking into account Lemmas 3 and 4 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{f}{v} \right\|_{L^{B, \infty}(uv)}^{\frac{1}{r}} &= \left\| \left( \frac{|f|}{v} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \right\|_{L^{B_r, \infty}(uv)} \\ &\simeq \sup_{\|h\|_{L^{\Psi_{r', 1}}(uv)} = 1} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( \frac{|f|}{v} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} h(x) u(x) v(x) dx \right| \end{aligned}$$

We fix  $h$  with  $\|h\|_{L^{\Psi_{r', 1}}(uv)} = 1$  and we shall assume that it is non negative.

We are going to use (1.6) with the weight  $Rhu v^{\frac{1}{r'}} \in A_\infty$  and  $p = \frac{1}{r}$ . Note that we may choose  $p$  arbitrarily since by extrapolation results contained in [7], if (1.6), then it holds as well for every  $0 < p < \infty$ . To use (1.6) we also need to have that the left hand side is finite. Now we show that it is actually the case.

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( \frac{|f|}{v} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} h(x) u(x) v(x) dx \right| &\lesssim \left\| \left( \frac{|f|}{v} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \right\|_{L^{B_r, \infty}(uv)} \|Rh\|_{L^{\Psi_{r', 1}}(uv)} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \left( \frac{|f|}{v} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \right\|_{L^{B_r, \infty}(uv)} \|h\|_{L^{\Psi_{r', 1}}(uv)} < \infty \end{aligned}$$

Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( \frac{|f|}{v} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} h(x) u(x) v(x) dx \right| &\leq \int |f(x)|^{\frac{1}{r}} Rh(x) u(x) v(x)^{\frac{1}{r'}} dx \\ &\lesssim \int |g(x)|^{\frac{1}{r}} Rh(x) u(x) v(x)^{\frac{1}{r'}} dx \\ &\lesssim \left\| \left( \frac{|g|}{v} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \right\|_{L^{B_r, \infty}(uv)} \|Rh\|_{L^{\Psi_{r', 1}}(uv)} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \frac{g}{v} \right\|_{L^{B, \infty}(uv)}^{\frac{1}{r}} \|h\|_{L^{\Psi_{r', 1}}(uv)} \end{aligned}$$

and hence we are done.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bennett, C.; Sharpley, R. Interpolation of operators. Pure and Applied Mathematics, 129. Academic Press, Inc., Boston, MA, 1988. xiv+469 pp.
- [2] Berra, F. Corrigendum to "From  $A_1$  to  $A_\infty$ : new mixed inequalities for certain maximal operators" arXiv math.CA 2211.15329
- [3] Berra, F.; Carena, M.; Pradolini, G. Mixed weak estimates of Sawyer type for commutators of generalized singular integrals and related operators. Michigan Math. J. 68 (2019), no. 3, 527–564.
- [4] Caldarelli, M.; Rivera-Ríos, I. P. A sparse approach to mixed weak type inequalities. Math. Z. 296 (2020), no. 1-2, 787–812.
- [5] Cianchi, Andrea An optimal interpolation theorem of Marcinkiewicz type in Orlicz spaces. J. Funct. Anal. 153 (1998), no. 2, 357–381.
- [6] Cruz-Uribe, David; Hästö, Peter Extrapolation and interpolation in generalized Orlicz spaces. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 370 (2018), no. 6, 4323–4349.
- [7] Cruz-Uribe, D.; Martell, J. M.; Pérez, C. Extrapolation from  $A_\infty$  weights and applications. J. Funct. Anal. 213 (2004), no. 2, 412–439.
- [8] Cruz-Uribe, D.; Martell, J. M.; Pérez, C. Weighted weak-type inequalities and a conjecture of Sawyer. Int. Math. Res. Not. 2005, no. 30, 1849–1871.
- [9] Iaffei, B. Comparison of two weak versions of the Orlicz spaces. Rev. Un. Mat. Argentina 40 (1996), no. 1-2, 191–202.
- [10] Li, K.; Ombrosi, S.; Pérez, C. Proof of an extension of E. Sawyer’s conjecture about weighted mixed weak-type estimates. Math. Ann. 374 (2019), no. 1-2, 907–929.
- [11] Li, Kangwei; Ombrosi, Sheldy J.; Belén Picardi, M. Weighted mixed weak-type inequalities for multilinear operators. Studia Math. 244 (2019), no. 2, 203–215.
- [12] Muckenhoupt, B.; Wheeden, R. L. Some weighted weak-type inequalities for the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function and the Hilbert transform. Indiana Univ. Math. J. 26 (1977), no. 5, 801–816.
- [13] Ombrosi, Sheldy; Pérez, Carlos Mixed weak type estimates: examples and counterexamples related to a problem of E. Sawyer. Colloq. Math. 145 (2016), no. 2, 259–272.
- [14] Pérez, Carlos Sharp estimates for commutators of singular integrals via iterations of the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function. J. Fourier Anal. Appl. 3 (1997), no. 6, 743–756.
- [15] Sawyer, E. A weighted weak type inequality for the maximal function. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 93 (1985), no. 4, 610–614.

(SHELDY OMBROSI) DEPARTAMENTO DE ANÁLISIS MATEMÁTICO Y MATEMÁTICA APLICADA. FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS MATEMÁTICAS. UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE (MADRID, SPAIN). DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA E INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA DE BAHÍA BLANCA. UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DEL SUR - CONICET BAHÍA BLANCA, ARGENTINA.

*Email address:* `sombrosi@ucm.es`

(ISRAEL P. RIVERA RÍOS) DEPARTAMENTO DE ANÁLISIS MATEMÁTICO, ESTADÍSTICA E INVESTIGACIÓN OPERATIVA Y MATEMÁTICA APLICADA. FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS. UNIVERSIDAD DE MÁLAGA (MÁLAGA, SPAIN). DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA. UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DEL SUR (BAHÍA BLANCA, ARGENTINA).

*Email address:* `israelpriverarios@uma.es`