UNBOUNDEDNESS OF THE BALL BILINEAR MULTIPLIER OPERATOR

GEOFF DIESTEL AND LOUKAS GRAFAKOS

Abstract. For all $n > 1$, the characteristic function of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ is not the symbol of a bounded bilinear multiplier operator from $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)$ when $1/p + 1/q = 1/r$ and exactly one of p, q, or $r' = r/(r-1)$ is less than 2.

1. Introduction

We denote the Fourier transform of a function f on $\mathbb{R}^n$ by $\widehat{f}(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(t)e^{-2\pi i t\cdot\xi}\,dt$ and its inverse Fourier transform by $f^\vee(\xi) = \widehat{f}(-\xi)$. Let B be the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and χ_A the characteristic function of a set A. The unboundedness of the linear operator

$$T_{\chi_B}(f) = (\widehat{f}\chi_B)^\vee$$

on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ when $p \neq 2$ and $n > 1$ was established by Fefferman [2].

In this article we provide a variant of Fefferman's result in the bilinear setting. Our arguments also work for multilinear operators. Let $1 \le p_1, \cdots, p_k \le \infty$ and $0 < p < \infty$. We recall that a bounded function $m : (\mathbb{R}^n)^k \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ is called a k-linear multiplier if the k-linear operator

$$(f_1, \cdots, f_k) \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} m(\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_k)\widehat{f_1}(\xi_1)\cdots\widehat{f_k}(\xi_k)e^{2\pi i(\xi_1+\cdots+\xi_k)\cdot x}d\xi_1\cdots d\xi_k$$

initially defined for Schwartz functions f_j on $\mathbb{R}^n$ admits a bounded extension

$$T_m : L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \cdots \times L^{p_k}(\mathbb{R}^n) \mapsto L^p(\mathbb{R}^n). \tag{1.1}$$

In this case we call m the symbol of T_m. We will denote by $\mathcal{M}_{p_1,p_2,\ldots,p_k,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the set of all $k-$linear multipliers m such that the corresponding operator T_m satisfies (1.1). The norm of m in $\mathcal{M}_{p_1,p_2,\ldots,p_k,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is defined as the norm of T_m.

Nontrivial examples of functions in $\mathcal{M}_{p_1,p_2,p}(\mathbb{R})$ are characteristic functions of half-planes (see [7],[8]) when $p_1^{-1}+p_2^{-1} = p^{-1} < 3/2$ and characteristic functions of planar ellipses when $p_1^{-1} + p_2^{-1} = p^{-1}$ and $2 \le p_1, p_2, p' < \infty$ (see [4]). Here $p' = p/(p-1)$. It is still an open question whether the results of this paper hold if $n = 1$. In this work we show that this is not the case for the characteristic function of the ball in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ if $1/p+1/q = 1/r$ and exactly one of p, q, or r' is less than 2. We will construct a counterexample when $n = 2$ and $r > 2$. The general result will follow from duality and a multilinear version of de Leeuw's theorem [1].

Date: February 15, 2007.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 42B20, 42B25. Secondary 46B70, 47B38.

Key words and phrases. multilinear operators, bilinear Hilbert transform.

Work of both authors is supported by the NSF.

2. Bilinearization of Fefferman's Counterexample for $\mathcal{M}_{p,q,r}(\mathbb{R}^2)$

For a rectangle R in $\mathbb{R}^2$, let R' be the union of the two copies of R adjacent to R in the direction of its longest side. Hence, $R \cup R'$ is a rectangle three times as long as R with the same center. Key to this argument is the following geometric lemma whose proof can be found in [9], page 435 or [3], page 738.

Lemma 1. *Let $\delta > 0$ be given. Then there exists a measurable subset E of $\mathbb{R}^2$ and a finite collection of rectangles R_j in $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that*

(1) *The R_j are pairwise disjoint.*
(2) *We have $1/2 \le |E| \le 3/2$.*
(3) *We have $|E| \le \delta \sum_j |R_j|$.*
(4) *For all j we have $|R_j' \cap E| \ge \frac{1}{12}|R_j|$.*

Let $\delta > 0$ and let E and R_j be as in Lemma 1. The proof of Lemma 1 implies that there are 2^k rectangles R_j of dimenstion $2^{-k} \times 3\log(k+2)$. Here, k is chosen so that $k+2 \ge e^{1/\delta}$. Let v_j be the unit vector in $\mathbb{R}^2$ parallel to the longest side of R_j and in the direction of the set E relative to R_j.

Proposition 1. *Let R be a rectangle in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and let v be a unit vector in $\mathbb{R}^2$ parallel to the longest side of R. Let R' be as above. Consider the half space $\mathcal{H}_v$ of $\mathbb{R}^4$ defined by*

$$\mathcal{H}_v = \{(\xi,\eta) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 : \ (\xi+\eta)\cdot v \ge 0\}$$

Then the following estimate is valid for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$:

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \chi_{\mathcal{H}_v}(\xi,\eta) \widehat{\chi_R}(\xi) \widehat{\chi_R}(\eta) e^{2\pi i x\cdot(\xi+\eta)} d\xi d\eta \right| \ge \frac{1}{10} \chi_{R'}(x)\,. \tag{2.2}$$

Proof. We introduce a rotation (i.e. orthogonal matrix) $\mathcal{O}$ of $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\mathcal{O}(v) = (1,0)$. Setting $\xi = (\xi_1,\xi_2)$, $\eta = (\eta_1,\eta_2)$ we can write the expression on the left in (2.2) as

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \iint\limits_{\mathcal{O}^{-1}(\xi+\eta)\cdot v \ge 0} \widehat{\chi_R}(\mathcal{O}^{-1}\xi) \widehat{\chi_R}(\mathcal{O}^{-1}\eta) e^{2\pi i x\cdot \mathcal{O}^{-1}(\xi+\eta)} d\xi d\eta \right| \\ = &\left| \iint\limits_{\xi_1+\eta_1 \ge 0} \widehat{\chi_{\mathcal{O}[R]}}(\xi) \widehat{\chi_{\mathcal{O}[R]}}(\eta) e^{2\pi i \mathcal{O}x\cdot(\xi+\eta)} d\xi d\eta \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Now the rectangle $\mathcal{O}[R]$ has sides parallel to the axes, say $\mathcal{O}[R] = I_1 \times I_2$. Assume that $|I_1| > |I_2|$, i.e. its longest side is horizontal. Let H be the classical Hilbert transform on the line. Setting $\mathcal{O}x = (y_1,y_2)$ we can write the last displayed expression as

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \chi_{I_2}(y_2)^2 \int_{\xi_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \widehat{\chi_{I_1}}(\xi_1) e^{2\pi i y_1 \xi_1} \int_{\eta_1 \ge -\xi_1} \widehat{\chi_{I_1}}(\eta_1) e^{2\pi i y_1 \eta_1} d\eta_1 \, d\xi_1 \right| \\ = \ & \chi_{I_2}(y_2) \left| \int_{\xi_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \widehat{\chi_{I_1}}(\xi_1) \frac{1}{2}(I + iH)\big[\chi_{I_1}(\cdot) e^{2\pi i \xi_1 (\cdot)}\big](y_1) d\xi_1 \right| \\ = \ & \chi_{I_2}(y_2) \left| \frac{1}{2}(I+iH)(\chi_{I_1})(y_1) \right| = \left| \big[\chi_{\xi_1 \ge 0} \, \widehat{\chi_{I_1 \times I_2}}(\xi_1,\xi_2)\big]^{\vee}(y_1,y_2) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Using the result from [3] (Proposition 10.1.2) or [9] (estimate (33), page 453) we deduce that the previous expression is at least

$$\frac{1}{10}\chi_{(I_1\times I_2)'}(y_1,y_2)=\frac{1}{10}\chi_{(\mathcal{O}[R])'}(\mathcal{O}x)=\frac{1}{10}\chi_{R'}(x)\,.$$

This proves the required conclusion. □

Next we have the following result concerning bilinear operators on $\mathbb{R}^2$ of the form

$$T_m(f,g)(x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} m(\xi_1,\xi_2,\eta_1,\eta_2)\widehat{f}(\xi_1,\xi_2)\widehat{g}(\eta_1,\eta_2)e^{2\pi i x\cdot(\xi_1+\eta_1,\xi_2+\eta_2)}d\xi_1 d\xi_2 d\eta_1 d\eta_2\,.$$

Lemma 2. *Let $v_1, v_2, ..., v_j, ...$ be a sequence of unit vectors in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Define a sequence of half-spaces $\mathcal{H}_{v_j}$ in $\mathbb{R}^4$ as in Proposition 1. Let B, B^{*1}, B^{*2} be the following sets in $\mathbb{R}^4$*

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \{(\xi,\eta)\in\mathbb{R}^2\times\mathbb{R}^2:\ |\xi|^2+|\eta|^2\le 1\}\\ B^{*1} &= \{(\xi,\eta)\in\mathbb{R}^2\times\mathbb{R}^2:\ |\xi+\eta|^2+|\eta|^2\le 1\}\\ B^{*2} &= \{(\xi,\eta)\in\mathbb{R}^2\times\mathbb{R}^2:\ |\xi|^2+|\xi+\eta|^2\le 1\}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that one of T_{χ_B}, $T_{\chi_{B^{*1}}}$, $T_{\chi_{B^{*2}}}$ lies in $\mathcal{M}_{p,q,r}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and has norm $C=C(p,q,r)$. Then we have the following vector-valued inequality

$$\Big\|\Big(\sum_j \big|T_{\chi_{\mathcal{H}_{v_j}}}(f_j,g_j)\big|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big\|_r \le C\Big\|\Big(\sum_j |f_j|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big\|_p\Big\|\Big(\sum_j |g_j|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big\|_q .$$

for all functions f_j and g_j.

Proof. We begin with the assumption that T_{χ_B} lies in $\mathcal{M}_{p,q,r}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for some $p,q,r>0$. Set $\xi=(\xi_1,\xi_2)$ and $\eta=(\eta_1,\eta_2)\in\mathbb{R}^2$. For $\rho>0$ we define sets

$$\begin{aligned} B_\rho &= \{(\xi,\eta)\in\mathbb{R}^2\times\mathbb{R}^2:\ |\xi|^2+|\eta|^2\le 2\rho^2\}\\ B_{j,\rho} &= \{(\xi,\eta)\in\mathbb{R}^2\times\mathbb{R}^2:\ |\xi-\rho v_j|^2+|\eta-\rho v_j|^2\le 2\rho^2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that bilinear multiplier norms are translation and dilation invariant. Easy computations give that

$$\|\chi_{B_{j,\rho}}\|_{\mathcal{M}_{p,q,r}(\mathbb{R}^2)}\le\|\chi_{B_\rho}\|_{\mathcal{M}_{p,q,r}(\mathbb{R}^2)}=C.$$

The important observation is that $\chi_{B_{j,\rho}}\to\chi_{\mathcal{H}_{v_j}}$ pointwise as $\rho\to\infty$ and that the multiplier norms of the functions $\chi_{B_{j,\rho}}$ are bounded above by C.

Moreover, by the bilinear version of a theorem of Marcinkiewicz and Zygmund ([5], section 9), we have the following inequality for all $\rho>0$.

$$\Big\|\Big(\sum_j \big|T_{\chi_{B_\rho}}(f_j,g_j)\big|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big\|_r \le C\Big\|\Big(\sum_j |f_j|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big\|_p\Big\|\Big(\sum_j |g_j|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big\|_q .$$

Since $\chi_{B_{j,\rho}}\to\chi_{\mathcal{H}_{v_j}}$ pointwise as $\rho\to\infty$, we can deduce that

$$\lim_{\rho\to\infty}T_{\chi_{B_{j,\rho}}}(f,g)(x)=T_{\chi_{\mathcal{H}_{v_j}}}(f,g)(x)$$

for all $x\in\mathbb{R}^2$ and suitable functions f and g. We note that the curvature of the ball B is used here. By Fatou's lemma we conclude

$$\Big\|\Big(\sum_j \big|T_{\chi_{\mathcal{H}_{v_j}}}(f_j,g_j)\big|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big\|_r \le \liminf_{\rho\to\infty}\Big\|\Big(\sum_j \big|T_{\chi_{B_{j,\rho}}}(f_j,g_j)\big|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big\|_r . \tag{2.3}$$

Now, observe the following identity:

$$T_{\chi_{B_{j,\rho}}}(f,g)(x) = e^{4\pi i\rho v_j\cdot x}T_{\chi_{B_\rho}}(e^{-2\pi i\rho v_j\cdot(\cdot)}f, e^{-2\pi i\rho v_j\cdot(\cdot)}g)(x).$$

Using (2.3) and the previous identity gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big\|\Big(\sum_j |T_{\chi_{\mathcal{H}_j}}(f_j,g_j)|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big\|_r \\
\leq\ & \liminf_{\rho\to\infty}\Big\|\Big(\sum_j \big|e^{4\pi i\rho v_j\cdot(\cdot)}T_{\chi_{B_\rho}}(e^{-2\pi i\rho v_j\cdot(\cdot)}f_j, e^{-2\pi i\rho v_j\cdot(\cdot)}g_j)\big|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big\|_r \\
\leq\ & \liminf_{\rho\to\infty}\big\|\chi_{B_\rho}\big\|_{\mathcal{M}_{p,q,r}}\Big\|\Big(\sum_j \big|e^{-2\pi i\rho v_j\cdot(\cdot)}f_j\big|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big\|_p\Big\|\Big(\sum_j \big|e^{-2\pi i\rho v_j\cdot(\cdot)}g_j\big|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big\|_q \\
=\ & C\Big\|\Big(\sum_j |f_j|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big\|_p\Big\|\Big(\sum_j |g_j|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big\|_q,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the dilation invariance of bilinear multiplier norms.

The proof of the analogous statements for $T_{B^{*1}}$ and $T_{B^{*2}}$ is as follows. We introduce sets

$$\begin{aligned}
B_\rho^{*1} &= \{(\xi,\eta)\in\mathbb{R}^2\times\mathbb{R}^2:\ |\xi+\eta|^2+|\eta|^2\leq\rho^2\}\\
B_{j,\rho}^{*1} &= \{(\xi,\eta)\in\mathbb{R}^2\times\mathbb{R}^2:\ |\xi-\rho v_j+\eta|^2+|\eta|^2\leq\rho^2\}\\
B_\rho^{*2} &= \{(\xi,\eta)\in\mathbb{R}^2\times\mathbb{R}^2:\ |\xi|^2+|\xi+\eta|^2\leq\rho^2\}\\
B_{j,\rho}^{*2} &= \{(\xi,\eta)\in\mathbb{R}^2\times\mathbb{R}^2:\ |\xi|^2+|\xi+\eta-\rho v_j|^2\leq\rho^2\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that both $B_{j,\rho}^{*1}$ and $B_{j,\rho}^{*2}$ converge to $\mathcal{H}_{v_j}$ as $\rho\to\infty$. Using the identities

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{\chi_{B_{j,\rho}^{*1}}}(f,g)(x) &= e^{2\pi i\rho v_j\cdot x}T_{\chi_{B_\rho^{*1}}}(e^{-2\pi i\rho v_j\cdot(\cdot)}f,g)(x)\\
T_{\chi_{B_{j,\rho}^{*2}}}(f,g)(x) &= e^{2\pi i\rho v_j\cdot x}T_{\chi_{B_\rho^{*2}}}(f,e^{-2\pi i\rho v_j\cdot(\cdot)}g)(x),
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain a similar conclusion for the bilinear operators $T_{\chi_{B^{*1}}}$ and $T_{\chi_{B^{*2}}}$. □

The next ingredient that we will need is a multilinear version of de Leeuw's theorem. For $1\leq j\leq k$ we will consider $\xi_j\in\mathbb{R}^n$, $\eta_j\in\mathbb{R}^m$. Then the pairs $(\xi_j,\eta_j)\in\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$. Also for a function f on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and g on $\mathbb{R}^m$ we introduce another function $f\otimes g$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ by setting $(f\otimes g)(\xi,\eta)=f(\xi)g(\eta)$.

Proposition 2. *Suppose that $m(\xi_1,\eta_1,\xi_2,\eta_2,...,\xi_k,\eta_k)\in\mathcal{M}_{p_1,p_2,...,p_k,p}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ for some $1<p<\infty$. Then for almost every $(\xi_1,...,\xi_k)\in(\mathbb{R}^n)^k$ the function $m(\xi_1,\cdot,\xi_2,\cdot,...,\xi_k,\cdot)$ lies in $\mathcal{M}_{p_1,p_2,...,p_k,p}(\mathbb{R}^m)$, with norm*

$$\|m(\xi_1,\cdot,\xi_2,\cdot,...,\xi_k,\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{M}_{p_1,p_2,...,p_k,p}(\mathbb{R}^m)}\leq\|m\|_{\mathcal{M}_{p_1,p_2,...,p_k,p}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})}.$$

Proof. In the proof that follows for simplicity we take $k=2$. The case of a general k does not present any complications, only notational changes. We also assume that m is continuous. This assumption may be easily removed by considering convolutions of m in each variable with smooth approximate identities.

Fix $f_1,g_1,h_1\in\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $f_2,g_2,h_2\in\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ with $\|f_2\|_{p_1}=\|g_2\|_{p_2}=\|h_2\|_{p'}=1$. Let

$$M(\xi_1,\xi_2)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} m(\xi_1,\eta_1,\xi_2,\eta_2)\widehat{f_2}(\eta_1)\widehat{g_2}(\eta_2)e^{2\pi i(\eta_1+\eta_2)\cdot x_2}d\eta_1 d\eta_2 h_2(x_2)dx_2$$

If we can show that $M \in \mathcal{M}_{p_1,p_2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then by Proposition 4 (vi) in [6], we can deduce that $\|M\|_\infty \le \|M\|_{\mathcal{M}_{p_1,p_2,p}}$. Then, by duality, it will follow that $\|T_m(f_2,g_2)\|_p \le \|M\|_\infty \le \|M\|_{\mathcal{M}_{p_1,p_2,p}}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\left\langle T_M(f_1,g_1),h_1\right\rangle\right| \\
=\ & \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} M(\xi_1,\xi_2)\widehat{f_1}(\xi_1)\widehat{g_1}(\xi_2)e^{2\pi i(\xi_1+\xi_2)\cdot x_1}d\xi_1 d\xi_2 h_1(x_1)dx_1 \\
=\ & \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} m(\xi_1,\eta_1,\xi_2,\eta_2)\widehat{f_2}(\eta_1)\widehat{g_2}(\eta_2)e^{2\pi i(\eta_1+\eta_2)\cdot x_2}d\eta_1 d\eta_2 h_2(x_2)dx_2 \\
& \qquad \widehat{f_1}(\xi_1)\widehat{g_1}(\xi_2)e^{2\pi i(\xi_1+\xi_2)\cdot x_1}d\xi_1 d\xi_2 h_1(x_1)dx_1 \\
=\ & \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+m}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+m}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+m}} m(\xi_1,\eta_1,\xi_2,\eta_2)\widehat{f_1}(\xi_1)\widehat{f_2}(\eta_1)\widehat{g_1}(\xi_2)\widehat{g_2}(\eta_2)e^{2\pi i((\xi_1,\eta_1)+(\xi_2,\eta_2))\cdot(x_1,x_2)} \\
& \qquad d(\xi_1,\eta_1)d(\xi_2,\eta_2)h_1(x_1)h_2(x_2)d(x_1,x_2) \\
=\ & \left|\left\langle T_m(f_1\otimes f_2, g_1\otimes g_2), h_1\otimes h_2\right\rangle\right| \\
\le\ & \|m\|_{\mathcal{M}_{p_1,p_2,p}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})}\|f_1\otimes f_2\|_{p_1}\|g_1\otimes g_2\|_{p_2}\|h_1\otimes h_2\|_{p'} \\
=\ & \|m\|_{\mathcal{M}_{p_1,p_2,p}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})}\|f_1\|_{p_1}\|f_2\|_{p_1}\|g_1\|_{p_2}\|g_2\|_{p_2}\|h_1\|_{p}\|h_2\|_{p'} \\
=\ & \|m\|_{\mathcal{M}_{p_1,p_2,p}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})}\|f_1\|_{p_1}\|g_1\|_{p_2}\|h_1\|_{p'},
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from the boundedness of T_m. □

The following is the main result of this article.

Theorem 1. *Let $n > 1$ and $1/p + 1/q = 1/r$ with exactly one of $p, q,$ or r' less than 2. Let B be the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$. Then $\chi_B \notin \mathcal{M}_{p,q,r}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Proof. Using Proposition 2 and considering the two dual operators $T_{\chi_{B^{*1}}}$ and $T_{\chi_{B^{*2}}}$ of T_{χ_B}, it suffices to show that all of these operators are not in $\mathcal{M}_{p,q,r}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for $p, q, r > 2$. Therefore, we fix $n = 2$ and p, q, r satisfying $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = r^{-1} < 1/2$. We suppose that χ_B is in $\mathcal{M}_{p,q,r}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with norm C.

Suppose that $\delta > 0$ is given. Let E and R_j be as in Lemma 1. Let v_j be the the unit vector parallel to the longest side of R_j and pointing in the direction of the set E relative to R_j. In the spirit of Fefferman's argument, we estimate $\sum_j \int_E \left|T_j(\chi_{R_j},\chi_{R_j})(x)\right|^2 dx$ from above and below and arrive to a contradiction. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_j \int_E \left|T_{\mathcal{H}_{v_j}}(\chi_{R_j},\chi_{R_j})(x)\right|^2 dx \\
\le\ & |E|^{\frac{r-2}{r}} \left\| \Big(\sum_j \left|T_{\mathcal{H}_{v_j}}(\chi_{R_j},\chi_{R_j})\right|^2\Big)^{1/2} \right\|_r^2 \qquad \text{(Hölder's inequality with } r > 2) \\
\le\ & C\,|E|^{\frac{r-2}{r}} \left\| \Big(\sum_j \left|\chi_{R_j}\right|^2\Big)^{1/2} \right\|_p^2 \left\| \Big(\sum_j \left|\chi_{R_j}\right|^2\Big)^{1/2} \right\|_q^2 \qquad \text{(by Lemma 2)} \\
=\ & C\,|E|^{\frac{r-2}{r}} \Big(\sum_j |R_j|\Big)^{2/r} \qquad \text{(by the disjointness of the } R_j\text{s)} \\
\le\ & C\,\delta^{\frac{r-2}{r}} \sum_j |R_j| \qquad \text{(Lemma 1).}
\end{aligned}$$

For the reverse inequality we argue as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_j \int_E \left|T_{\mathcal{H}_{v_j}}(\chi_{R_j},\chi_{R_j})(x)\right|^2 dx &\geq \sum_j \int_E \left(\tfrac{1}{10}\chi_{R'_j}(x)\right)^2 dx && \text{(Proposition 1)}\\
&= \tfrac{1}{100}\sum_j \left|E\cap R'_j\right| \\
&\geq \tfrac{1}{1200}\sum_j \left|R_j\right|. && \text{(Lemma 1)}
\end{aligned}$$

Putting these two estimates together, we obtain that

$$\tfrac{1}{1200}\sum_j |R_j| \leq C\,\delta^{\frac{r-2}{r}} \sum_j |R_j|$$

and therefore

$$\tfrac{1}{1200} \leq C\,\delta^{\frac{r-2}{r}}$$

for any $\delta > 0$. This is a contradiction since $r > 2$.

□

The authors would like to thank Maria Carmen Reguera-Rodríguez for pointing out an oversight in an earlier version of this manuscript.

References

[1] K. de Leeuw, *On L_p multipliers,* Ann. of Math. **81** (1965), 364–379.

[2] C. Fefferman, *The multiplier problem for the ball,* Ann. of Math. **94** (1971), 330–336.

[3] L. Grafakos, *Classical and Modern Fourier Analysis,* Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle RIver, NJ 2003.

[4] L. Grafakos and X. Li, *The disc as a bilinear multiplier,* Amer. J. Math., **128** (2006), 91–119.

[5] L. Grafakos and J. M. Martell, *Extrapolation of weighted norm inequalities for multivariable operators*, J. of Geom. Anal. **14** (2004), 19–46.

[6] L. Grafakos and R. Torres, *Multilinear Calderoón-Zygmund theory,* Adv. in Math. J. **165** (2002), 124–164.

[7] M. T. Lacey and C. M. Thiele, *L^p bounds for the bilinear Hilbert transform, $p > 2$*, Ann. of Math. **146** (1997), 693–724.

[8] M. Lacey and C. Thiele, *On Calderón's conjecture*, Ann. of Math. **149** (1999), 475–496.

[9] E. M. Stein, *Harmonic Analysis, Real Variable Methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory Integrals*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993.

Department of Mathematics, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211, USA
E-mail address: loukas@math.missouri.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208, USA
E-mail address: diestelg@math.sc.edu