

A CHARACTERIZATION OF COMPACTNESS VIA BILINEAR $T1$ THEOREM

MINGMING CAO, HONGHAI LIU, ZENGYAN SI, AND KÔZÔ YABUTA

ABSTRACT. We establish a bilinear $T1$ theorem to characterize the weighted compactness of bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operators. Let T be a bilinear operator associated with a standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel. We demonstrate that T can be extended to a compact bilinear operator from $L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2})$ to $L^p(w^p)$ for all exponents $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $1 < p_1, p_2 < \infty$ and for all weights $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$ if and only if the following conditions hold: (i) T is associated with a compact bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel, (ii) T satisfies the weak compactness property, and (iii) $T(1, 1), T^{*1}(1, 1), T^{*2}(1, 1) \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Definition 1.1. Let \mathcal{F} consist of all triples (F_1, F_2, F_3) of bounded functions $F_1, F_2, F_3 : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfying

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} F_1(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_2(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_3(t) = 0.$$

Let \mathcal{F}_0 be the collection of all bounded functions $F : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfying

$$\lim_{\ell(Q) \rightarrow 0} F(Q) = \lim_{\ell(Q) \rightarrow \infty} F(Q) = \lim_{|c_Q| \rightarrow \infty} F(Q) = 0,$$

where \mathcal{Q} is the family of all cubes in \mathbb{R}^n .

Definition 1.2. Let Δ be the diagonal of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. A function $K : (\mathbb{R}^{3n} \setminus \Delta) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is called a *compact bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel* if there exists $\delta \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$(1.3) \quad |K(x, y, z)| \leq \frac{F(x, y, z)}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n}},$$

$$(1.4) \quad |K(x, y, z) - K(x', y, z)| \leq F(x, y, z) \frac{|x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}$$

whenever $|x - x'| \leq \max\{|x - y|, |x - z|\}/2$,

$$(1.5) \quad |K(x, y, z) - K(x, y', z)| \leq F(x, y, z) \frac{|y - y'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}$$

whenever $|y - y'| \leq \max\{|x - y|, |x - z|\}/2$,

$$(1.6) \quad |K(x, y, z) - K(x, y, z')| \leq F(x, y, z) \frac{|y - y'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}$$

Date: April 22, 2024.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 42B20, 42B35.

Key words and phrases. Bilinear $T1$ theorem, Compactness, Extrapolation, Interpolation, Dyadic analysis, Bilinear Calderón–Zygmund operators.

whenever $|z - z'| \leq \max\{|x - y|, |x - z|\}/2$, where

$$F(x, y, z) := F_1(|x - y| + |x - z|)F_2(|x - y| + |x - z|)F_3(|x + y| + |x + z|)$$

with the triple $(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{F}$.

We say that K is a *standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel* if the function F above is replaced by a uniform constant $C \geq 1$. The smallest constant C is denoted by $\|K\|_{\text{CZ}(\delta)}$.

Definition 1.7. We say that a bilinear operator $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is *associated with a compact (or standard) bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel* if there exists a compact (or standard) bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel K such that

$$\langle T(f_1, f_2), g \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3n}} K(x, y, z) f_1(y) f_2(z) g(x) dx dy dz,$$

for any $f_1, f_2, g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\text{supp}(f_1) \cap \text{supp}(f_2) \cap \text{supp}(g) = \emptyset$,

A measurable function w on \mathbb{R}^n is called a *weight* if $0 < w(x) < \infty$ for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Definition 1.8. Given $\vec{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$ with $1 \leq p_1, \dots, p_m \leq \infty$ and $\vec{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_m)$ with $0 < w_1, \dots, w_m < \infty$ a.e. on \mathbb{R}^n , we say that $\vec{w} \in A_{\vec{p}}$ if

$$[\vec{w}]_{A_{\vec{p}}} := \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \left(\int_Q w^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \prod_{i=1}^m \left(\int_Q w_i^{-p'_i} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p'_i}} < \infty,$$

where $\frac{1}{p} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{p_i}$ and $w = \prod_{i=1}^m w_i$. If $p_i = 1$, $(\int_Q w_i^{-p'_i} dx)^{1/p'_i}$ is understood as $(\text{ess inf}_Q w_i)^{-1}$; and if $p = \infty$, $(\int_Q w^p dx)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ is understood as $\text{ess sup}_Q w$.

Given a bilinear operator T , we define its adjoints via

$$\langle T(f_1, f_2), g \rangle = \langle T^{*1}(g, f_2), f_1 \rangle = \langle T^{*2}(f_1, g), f_2 \rangle.$$

Given normed spaces \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , and a quasi-normed space \mathcal{Z} , a bilinear operator $T : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ is called *compact* if for all bounded sets $A \times B \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, the set $T(A, B)$ is relatively compact in \mathcal{Z} . Equivalently, T is compact if for all bounded sequences $\{(x_k, y_k)\} \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, the sequence $\{T(x_k, y_k)\}$ has a convergent subsequence in \mathcal{Z} .

To state our main results conveniently, we make the following hypotheses, for which the precise definition will be given in Section 2.

- (H1) T is associated with a compact bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel,
- (H2) T satisfies the weak compactness property,
- (H3) $T(1, 1), T^{*1}(1, 1), T^{*2}(1, 1) \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Our main result is a compact bilinear $T1$ theorem as follows.

Theorem 1.9. *Let $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a bilinear operator associated with a standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) T satisfies (H1), (H2), and (H3).
- (b) T can be extended to a compact operator from $L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2})$ to $L^p(w^p)$ for all $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $1 < p_1, p_2 < \infty$ and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$, where $w = w_1 w_2$.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains some preliminaries, definitions, and known results to justify our main theorem. Section 3 presents some technical lemmas. The necessity of the hypotheses (H1), (H2), and (H3) is shown in Section 4. Then in Section 5, we prove our hypotheses implies the weighted compactness of bilinear singular integrals, by means of compact extrapolation, weighted compactness of bilinear dyadic shifts and paraproducts, and compact bilinear representation, while the later is established in Section 6.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation and conventions.

- Write $\mathbb{I} = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})^n$ and $\lambda\mathbb{I} := [-\frac{\lambda}{2}, \frac{\lambda}{2})^n$ for any $\lambda > 0$.
- Let \mathcal{Q} denote the family of all cubes $I := \prod_{i=1}^n [a_i, a_i + h) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $h > 0$.
- Let \mathcal{D} denote the family of all dyadic cubes in \mathbb{R}^n .
- For every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $\mathcal{Q}_N := \{I \in \mathcal{Q} : 2^{-N} \leq \ell(I) \leq 2^N, \text{rd}(I, 2^N\mathbb{I}) \leq N\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_N := \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{Q}_N$.
- For any cube $I \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote its center by c_I and its sidelength by $\ell(I)$. For any $\lambda > 0$, we denote by λI the cube with the center $c(I)$ and sidelength $\lambda\ell(I)$.
- Given $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ we write $\text{diam}(E) = \sup_{x,y \in E} |x - y|$ to denote its diameter.
- Given two cubes $I, J \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote by $I \vee J$ the cube with minimal sidelength containing $I \cup J$. If there is more than one cube satisfying this condition, we will simply select one.
- We define the relative distance between cubes I and J by $\text{rd}(I, J) := \frac{d(I, J)}{\max\{\ell(I), \ell(J)\}}$.
- For a Borel set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $0 < |A| < \infty$, we write $f_A f dx := \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A f dx$.
- Given a function φ on \mathbb{R}^n , $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\lambda > 0$, we define $\tau_x \varphi(y) := \varphi(y - x)$ and $\varphi_\lambda(y) := \lambda^{-n} \varphi(y/\lambda)$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
- Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denote the class of Schwarz functions on \mathbb{R}^n , and let $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denote the space of tempered distributions.
- Let $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be the collection of continuous functions vanishing at infinity.
- Let $\mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be the collection of continuous functions with compact supports.
- Let $\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be the collection of smooth functions with compact supports.
- We use the letters c, C to denote harmless positive constants, not necessarily the same at each occurrence, which depend only on dimension and the constants appearing in the hypotheses of the theorems (which we refer to as the “allowable parameters”). We shall also sometimes write $A \lesssim B$ and $A \simeq B$ to mean, respectively, that $A \leq CB$ and $0 < c \leq A/B \leq C$, where the constants c and C are as above, unless explicitly noted to the contrary. Moreover, if c and C depend on some given parameter η , which is somehow relevant, we write $A \lesssim_\eta B$ and $A \simeq_\eta B$.

2.2. Multilinear Muckenhoupt weights. The multilinear maximal operator is defined by

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{M}(\vec{f})(x) := \sup_{Q \ni x} \prod_{i=1}^m \int_Q |f_i(y_i)| dy_i,$$

where the supremum is taken over all cubes Q containing x .

The following characterization of the class $A_{\vec{p}}$ was given in [8, Theorem 3.6].

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\vec{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$ with $1 \leq p_1, \dots, p_m \leq \infty$ and let $\vec{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_m)$ be a vector of weights. Then*

$$\vec{w} \in A_{\vec{p}} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad w^p \in A_{mp} \text{ and } w_i^{-p'_i} \in A_{mp'_i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m,$$

where $\frac{1}{p} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{p_i}$ and $w = \prod_{i=1}^m w_i$. If $p_i = 1$, $w_i^{-p'_i} \in A_{mp'_i}$ is understood as $w_i^{1/m} \in A_1$; and if $p = \infty$, $w^p \in A_{mp}$ is understood as $w^{-1/m} \in A_1$.

Theorem 2.3 ([8]). *Let T be a bilinear operator associated with a standard Calderón–Zygmund kernel. Assume that T is bounded from $L^{q_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{q_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$ with $1 \leq q_1, q_2 < \infty$. Then the following hold:*

- (i) *T is bounded from $L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2})$ to $L^p(w^p)$ for all $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ and $w = w_1 w_2$.*
- (ii) *T is bounded from $L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2})$ to $L^{p, \infty}(w^p)$ for all $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ and at least one of the $p_i = 1$, and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ and $w = w_1 w_2$.*

2.3. Dyadic grids. Let \mathcal{D}_0 be the standard dyadic grid on \mathbb{R}^n :

$$\mathcal{D}_0 := \{2^{-k}([0, 1]^n + m) : k \in \mathbb{Z}, m \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}.$$

Let $\Omega := (\{0, 1\}^n)^\mathbb{Z}$ and let \mathbb{P}_ω be the natural probability measure on Ω : each component ω_j has an equal probability 2^{-n} of taking any of the 2^n values in $\{0, 1\}^n$, and all components are independent of each other. Given $\omega = (\omega_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \Omega$, the *random dyadic grid* \mathcal{D}_ω on \mathbb{R}^n is defined by

$$\mathcal{D}_\omega := \left\{ Q + \omega := Q + \sum_{j: 2^{-j} < \ell(Q)} 2^{-j} \omega_j : Q \in \mathcal{D}_0 \right\}.$$

By a *dyadic grid* \mathcal{D} we mean that $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_\omega$ for some $\omega \in \Omega$.

A cube $Q \in \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_\omega$ is called *bad* if there exists a cube $Q' \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$\ell(Q') \geq 2^r \ell(Q) \quad \text{and} \quad d(Q, \partial Q') \leq \ell(Q)^\gamma \ell(Q')^{1-\gamma}.$$

Here $\gamma = \frac{\delta}{2(2n+\delta)}$, where $\delta > 0$ appears in the kernel estimates. Otherwise a cube is called *good*. Note that $\pi_{\text{good}} := \mathbb{P}_\omega(Q + \omega \text{ is good})$ is independent of the choice of $Q \in \mathcal{D}_0$. The appearing parameter r is a large enough fixed constant so that $\pi_{\text{good}} > 0$.

2.4. Haar system. Let h_I be an L^2 normalized Haar function related to $I \in \mathcal{D}$, where \mathcal{D} is a dyadic grid on \mathbb{R}^n . With this we mean that h_I , $I = I_1 \times \dots \times I_n$, is one of the 2^n functions h_I^η , $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n$, defined by

$$h_I^\eta := h_{I_1}^{\eta_1} \otimes \dots \otimes h_{I_n}^{\eta_n},$$

where $h_{I_i}^0 = |I_i|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{1}_{I_i}$ and $h_{I_i}^1 = |I_i|^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbf{1}_{I_i^-} - \mathbf{1}_{I_i^+})$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. Here I_i^- and I_i^+ are the left and right halves of the interval I_i respectively. If $\eta \neq 0$, the Haar function is cancellative : $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} h_I dx = 0$. All the cancellative Haar functions form an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. If $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we may thus write

$$f = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\eta \in \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{0\}} \langle f, h_I^\eta \rangle h_I^\eta.$$

However, we suppress the finite η summation and just write $f = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \langle f, h_I \rangle h_I$.

Given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the projection operators by

$$P_N f := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_N} \langle f, h_Q \rangle h_Q \quad \text{and} \quad P_N^\perp f := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_N^c} \langle f, h_Q \rangle h_Q,$$

with convergence interpreted pointwise almost everywhere.

Given $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $Q \in \mathcal{D}$, let $\mathcal{D}_i(Q) := \{I \in \mathcal{D} : I \subset Q, \ell(I) = 2^{-i} \ell(Q)\}$. Define

$$\Delta_Q f := \sum_{Q' \in \text{ch}(Q)} (\langle f \rangle_{Q'} - \langle f \rangle_Q) \mathbf{1}_{Q'} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_Q^i f := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_i(Q)} \Delta_I f.$$

Then for every $s \in (1, \infty)$ and $f \in L^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, there holds

$$(2.4) \quad f = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \Delta_Q f,$$

where the convergence takes place unconditionally (that is, independently of the order) in $L^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover,

$$(2.5) \quad \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |\Delta_Q f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^s} \simeq \|f\|_{L^s}, \quad 1 < s < \infty.$$

Given $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define the operators

$$(2.6) \quad E_{2^k} f := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(Q)=2^k} \langle f \rangle_Q \mathbf{1}_Q \quad \text{and} \quad D_{2^k} f := E_{2^{k-1}} f - E_{2^k} f.$$

Then we see that

$$(2.7) \quad E_{2^k} f = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(Q) > 2^k} \Delta_Q f, \quad D_{2^k} f = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(Q)=2^k} \Delta_Q f,$$

and

$$(2.8) \quad \left\| \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |D_{2^k} f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^s} \simeq \|f\|_{L^s}, \quad 1 < s < \infty.$$

Given $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and a dyadic grid \mathcal{D} , define the dyadic square function as

$$S_{\mathcal{D}}^k f := \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |\Delta_Q^k f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For $k = 0$, denote $S_{\mathcal{D}} := S_{\mathcal{D}}^0$. Recall that for any $r \in (0, \infty)$ and $v \in A_\infty$,

$$(2.9) \quad \|f\|_{L^r(v)} \lesssim \|S_{\mathcal{D}}^k f\|_{L^r(v)}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N},$$

which was shown in [11].

2.5. Hardy, BMO, and CMO spaces.

Definition 2.10. Given $q \in (1, \infty]$, a function a is called a q -atom if there exists a cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that the following localization, normalization, and cancellation properties hold:

$$\text{supp}(a) \subset Q, \quad \|a\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq |Q|^{\frac{1}{q}-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} a(x) dx = 0.$$

Notice that any r -atom is also a q -atom whenever $1 < q < r \leq \infty$. It is also simple to verify that every q -atom belongs to $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Definition 2.11. The Hardy space $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is defined as the collection of all Lebesgue measurable functions f defined on \mathbb{R}^n such that

$$(2.12) \quad f = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j a_j \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n,$$

with the a_j 's being ∞ -atoms, and where the sequence $\{\lambda_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{C}$ satisfies $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j < \infty$. The norm in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is defined as

$$(2.13) \quad \|f\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} := \inf \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_j|,$$

where the infimum runs over all the atomic decompositions of f as in (2.12). In particular, the series in (2.12) converges in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Definition 2.14. A locally integrable function f on \mathbb{R}^n is said to be in $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if

$$\|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)} := \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \int_Q |f(x) - f_Q| dx < \infty,$$

where $f_Q := \int_Q f dy$. Let $\text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denote the closure of $\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Additionally, the space $\text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is endowed with the norm of $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

The duality between $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ was given by Fefferman and Stein [3]. Precisely, they showed that

$$(2.15) \quad \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ is the dual space of } H^1(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

2.6. Weak compactness property.

Definition 2.16. Let $T : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a bilinear operator. We say that T satisfies the *weak compactness property* if there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}_0$ such that

$$|\langle T(\mathbf{1}_Q, \mathbf{1}_Q), \mathbf{1}_Q \rangle| \leq F(Q)|Q|.$$

for all cubes $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. We say that T satisfies the *weak boundedness property* if the function F above is replaced by a uniform constant $C \geq 1$.

Lemma 2.17. Let T be a bilinear operator associated with a compact bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel K with parameter $\delta > 0$. Let $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a cut-off function such that $\mathbf{1}_{B(0,1)} \leq \Phi \leq \mathbf{1}_{B(0,2)}$. Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a cube and let $f \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ have compact support in I and mean zero. Then the following hold:

(1) For any $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the limit

$$(2.18) \quad \mathcal{L}(f) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle T\left(\Phi\left(\frac{\cdot - a}{2^k \ell(I)}\right), \Phi\left(\frac{\cdot - a}{2^k \ell(I)}\right)\right), f \right\rangle \quad \text{exists.}$$

(2) For all $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^k \geq \sqrt{n} + |a - x_I|/\ell(I)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathcal{L}(f) - \left\langle T\left(\Phi\left(\frac{\cdot - a}{2^k \ell(I)}\right), \Phi\left(\frac{\cdot - a}{2^k \ell(I)}\right)\right), f \right\rangle \right| \\ & \lesssim 2^{-k\delta} (1 + |a - x_I|/\ell(I))^\delta \sum_{k'=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k'\delta} F(2^{k'+k}|I|) \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $F(t) := F_1(t)F_2(t)F_3(1 + \frac{a}{1+t})$.

- (3) The limit above is independent of the parameter $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and the function Φ .
- (4) If T is bounded from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} < 1$ with $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$, then \mathcal{L} is a bounded linear functional on $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. In particular, by the duality between $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $BMO(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we define $T(1, 1)$ as

$$(2.19) \quad \mathcal{L}(f) = \langle T(1, 1), f \rangle.$$

Proof. Fix $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $2^k \geq \sqrt{n} + 2|a - x_I|/\ell(I)$, and write $\Psi_k := \Phi\left(\frac{\cdot - a}{2^k \ell(I)}\right)$. It is easy to see that $\text{supp}(\Psi_k) \subset \{x : |x - a| \leq 2^{k+1}\ell(I)\}$ and $\text{supp}(\Psi_{k+1} - \Psi_k) \subset \{x : 2^k \ell(I) < |x - a| \leq 2^{k+2}\ell(I)\}$. Let $x \in \text{supp}(f) \subset I$ and $y \in \text{supp}(\Psi_{k+1} - \Psi_k)$. Then we have

$$|x - a| \leq |x - x_I| + |a - x_I| \leq \ell(I)(\sqrt{n}/2 + |a - x_I|/\ell(I)) \leq 2^{k-1}\ell(I) < |y - a|/2,$$

and hence, $|x - y| \geq |y - a| - |x - a| > |x - a| \geq 0$. This means $\text{supp}(f) \cap \text{supp}(\Psi_{k+1} - \Psi_k) = \emptyset$. Moreover, if we denote

$$F_a(x, y, z) := L(|y - a| + |z - a|)S(|x - a|)D\left(1 + \frac{a}{1 + |y - a| + |z - a|}\right),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} F_a(x, y, z) &\leq L(2^{k+1}|I|)S(2^k|I|)D\left(1 + \frac{a}{1 + 2^{k+3}|I|}\right) \\ &\lesssim L(2^k|I|)S(2^k|I|)D\left(1 + \frac{a}{1 + 2^k|I|}\right) = F(2^k|I|), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the monotonicity properties of L , S and D .

We are going to show that $\{\langle T(\Psi_k, \Psi_k), f \rangle\}_{k \geq 1}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Note that

$$(2.20) \quad \begin{aligned} &|\langle T(\Psi_{k+1}, \Psi_{k+1}), f \rangle - \langle T(\Psi_k, \Psi_k), f \rangle| \\ &\leq |\langle T(\Psi_{k+1} - \Psi_k, \Psi_k), f \rangle| + |\langle T(\Psi_{k+1}, \Psi_{k+1} - \Psi_k), f \rangle|. \end{aligned}$$

By the disjoint support, the mean zero of f , and $|x - a| \leq \max\{|y - a|, |z - a|\}/2$, we obtain

$$(2.21) \quad \begin{aligned} &|\langle T(\Psi_{k+1} - \Psi_k, \Psi_k), f \rangle| \\ &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3n}} (K(x, y, z) - K(a, y, z))(\Psi_{k+1} - \Psi_k)(y)\Psi_k(z)f(x) dx dy dz \right| \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3n}} \frac{|x - a|^\delta F_a(x, y, z)}{(|y - a| + |z - a|)^{2n+\delta}} \mathbf{1}_{\text{supp}(\Psi_{k+1} - \Psi_k)}(y)\Psi_k(z)|f(x)| dx dy dz \\ &\lesssim (2^k \ell(I))^n |I| F(2^k|I|) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{(\ell(I) + |a - x_I|)^\delta}{(2^k \ell(I))^{2n+\delta}} \Phi\left(\frac{z - a}{2^k \ell(I)}\right) |f(x)| dx dz \\ &\lesssim 2^{-k\delta} (1 + |a - x_I|/\ell(I))^\delta F(2^k|I|) \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one has

$$|\langle T(\Psi_k, \Psi_{k+1} - \Psi_k), f \rangle| \lesssim 2^{-k\delta} (1 + |a - x_I|/\ell(I))^\delta F(2^k|I|) \|f\|_{L^1},$$

which together (2.20) and (2.21) implies

$$(2.22) \quad |\langle T(\Psi_{k+1}, \Psi_{k+1}), f \rangle - \langle T(\Psi_k, \Psi_k), f \rangle| \lesssim 2^{-k\delta} (1 + |a - x_I|/\ell(I))^\delta F(2^k|I|) \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

By the boundedness of $\vec{F} := (F_1, F_2, F_3)$, (2.22) gives that $\{\langle T(\Psi_k, \Psi_k), f \rangle\}_{k \geq 1}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Therefore, the limit in (2.18) exists, which we denote by $\mathcal{L}_a(f)$. This shows item (1).

Additionally,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_a(f) - \langle T(\Psi_k, \Psi_k), f \rangle &= \mathcal{L}_a(f) - \langle T(\Psi_{k+j+1}, \Psi_{k+j+1}), f \rangle \\ &\quad + \sum_{k'=k}^{k+j} (\langle T(\Psi_{k'+1}, \Psi_{k'+1}), f \rangle - \langle T(\Psi_{k'}, \Psi_{k'}), f \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $j \rightarrow \infty$ and invoking (2.22), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}_a(f) - \langle T(\Psi_k, \Psi_k), f \rangle| &\leq \sum_{k'=k}^{\infty} (\langle T(\Psi_{k'+1}, \Psi_{k'+1}), f \rangle - \langle T(\Psi_{k'}, \Psi_{k'}), f \rangle) \\ &\lesssim (1 + |a - x_I|/\ell(I))^\delta \sum_{k'=k}^{\infty} 2^{-k'\delta} F(2^{k'}|I|) \|f\|_{L^1} \\ &= 2^{-k\delta} (1 + |a - x_I|/\ell(I))^\delta \sum_{k'=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k'\delta} F(2^{k'+k}|I|) \|f\|_{L^1}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows item (2).

Finally, to show item (4), we modify the definition of Ψ_k above into $\Psi_k := \Phi(\frac{\cdot - x_I}{2^k \ell(I)})$. Then we use item (2), the boundedness of T , and (2.22) to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}(f)| &\leq |\mathcal{L}(f) - \langle T(\Psi_k, \Psi_k), f \rangle| + \langle T(\Psi_0, \Psi_0), f \rangle \\ &\quad + \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} (\langle T(\Psi_{k'+1}, \Psi_{k'+1}), f \rangle - \langle T(\Psi_{k'}, \Psi_{k'}), f \rangle) \\ &\lesssim 2^{-k\delta} \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\Psi_0\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|\Psi_0\|_{L^{p_2}} \|f\|_{L^{p'}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k'=0}^{k-1} 2^{-k'\delta} F(2^{k'}|I|) \|f\|_{L^1} \\ &\lesssim 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we assert that \mathcal{L} is a bounded linear functional on $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The proof is complete. \square

2.7. Characterization of compactness.

Theorem 2.23. *Let T be a bilinear operator, which is bounded from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $1 < p, p_1, p_2 < \infty$. Then T is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if and only if $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|P_N^\perp \circ T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} = 0$.*

Proof. Note that P_N is a finite-dimensional operator for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, $\{P_N \circ T\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a collection of compact operators from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which together with the fact that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|P_N \circ T - T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} = 0$ gives that T is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

To show the converse, let T be compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then

$$\mathcal{K} := \{T(f_1, f_2) : \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \leq 1, i = 1, 2\}$$

is a relatively compact subset in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$. It suffices to show that

$$(2.24) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \leq 1}} \|P_N^\perp(T(f_1, f_2))\|_{L^p} = 0.$$

Assume that (2.24) does not hold. Then there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and a sequence $\{f_i^k\}$ with $\|f_i^k\|_{L^{p_i}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 1$, $i = 1, 2$, so that

$$(2.25) \quad \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1^k, f_2^k))\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \geq \varepsilon_0.$$

By the relative compactness of \mathcal{K} , one can find a subsequence (which we relabel) $\{f_i^k\}$ so that

$$(2.26) \quad f_i^k \rightarrow f_i \text{ in } L^{p_i}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ for some } f_i \in L^{p_i}(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Observe that for all $f_i \in L^{p_i}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $i = 1, 2$,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1, f_2))\|_{L^p} = 0,$$

and hence,

$$\sup_k \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1, f_2))\|_{L^p} < \infty,$$

which along with Banach-Steinhaus theorem gives

$$(2.27) \quad \sup_k \|P_k^\perp \circ T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} < \infty.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1^k, f_2^k))\|_{L^p} \\ & \leq \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1, f_2))\|_{L^p} + \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1, f_2^k - f_2))\|_{L^p} + \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1^k - f_1, f_2^k))\|_{L^p} \\ & \leq \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1, f_2))\|_{L^p} + \|P_k^\perp \circ T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2^k - f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \\ & \quad + \|P_k^\perp \circ T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} \|f_1^k - f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2^k\|_{L^{p_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (2.26) and (2.27), this leads

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|P_k^\perp(T(f_1^k, f_2^k))\|_{L^p} = 0,$$

which contradicts with (2.25). Therefore, (2.24) holds. \square

Theorem 2.28 ([1]). *Let $0 < p < \infty$, and let w be a weight on \mathbb{R}^n such that $w, w^{-\lambda} \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $\lambda > 0$. A subset $\mathcal{K} \subset L^p(w)$ is relatively compact if the following are satisfied:*

- (1) $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f\|_{L^p(w)} < \infty$,
- (2) $\lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f \mathbf{1}_{\{|\cdot| > A\}}\|_{L^p(w)} = 0$,
- (3) $\lim_{|h| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f - \tau_h f\|_{L^p(w)} = 0$.

Moreover, the conditions (1) and (2) are necessary, but (3) is not.

Theorem 2.29 ([1]). *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $w \in A_p$. Then a subset $\mathcal{K} \subseteq L^p(w)$ is relatively compact if and only if the following are satisfied:*

- (1) $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f\|_{L^p(w)} < \infty$,
- (2) $\lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(0, A)}\|_{L^p(w)} = 0$,
- (3) $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f - f_{B(\cdot, r)}\|_{L^p(w)} = 0$.

Theorem 2.30 ([1]). *Let $0 < p < \infty$ and $w \in A_{p_0}$ with $1 < p_0 < \infty$. Then a subset $\mathcal{K} \subseteq L^p(w)$ is relatively compact if and only if the following are satisfied:*

- (1) $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f\|_{L^p(w)} < \infty$,
- (2) $\lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \|f \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(0,A)}\|_{L^p(w)} = 0$,
- (3) $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\int_{B(0,r)} |f(x) - f(x+y)|^{\frac{p}{p_0}} dy \right)^{p_0} w(x) dx = 0$.

The following interpolation theorem for bilinear compact operators is a particular case of [1, Corollary 3.7].

Theorem 2.31. *Let $0 < p_0, q_0 < \infty$ and $1 \leq p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2 < \infty$. Assume that T is a bilinear operator such that*

$$\begin{aligned} T &\text{ is compact from } L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n), \\ T &\text{ is bounded from } L^{q_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{q_2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^{q_0}(\mathbb{R}^n). \end{aligned}$$

Then T is compact from $L^{r_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{r_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^{r_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where

$$0 < \theta < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{r_j} = \frac{1-\theta}{p_j} + \frac{\theta}{q_j}, \quad j = 0, 1, 2.$$

The following result was shown in [4, Lemma 6.1]. It says that the limit of a sequence of compact bilinear operators is also compact.

Lemma 2.32. *Let \mathcal{X}_1 and \mathcal{X}_2 be Banach spaces and \mathcal{Y} be a quasi-Banach space. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let T_j be a compact bilinear operator from $\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$ to \mathcal{Y} . If a bilinear operator $T : \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ satisfies*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|T_j - T\|_{\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}} = 0,$$

then T is compact from $\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$ to \mathcal{Y} .

The following result will provide us great convenience in practice.

Lemma 2.33. *Let $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $1 < p, p_1, p_2 < \infty$. Let $\{\alpha_j\}_{j \geq 0}$ be a sequence of positive numbers satisfying $\sum_{j \geq 0} \alpha_j < \infty$. Assume that a bilinear operator T satisfies the following:*

- (i) $T = \sum_{j \geq 0} \alpha_j T_j$, where each T_j is a bilinear operator.
- (ii) $\sup_{j \geq 0} \|T_j\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_0 < \infty$.
- (iii) For every $j \geq 0$, T_j is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Then, T is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Proof. For each $N \geq 1$, let $T^N := \sum_{j=0}^N \alpha_j T_j$. Then T^N is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Note that

$$\|T - T^N\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} = \left\| \sum_{j > N} \alpha_j T_j \right\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} \leq \sum_{j > N} \alpha_j \|T_j\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} \leq C_0 \sum_{j > N} \alpha_j,$$

which tends to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$. This together with Lemma 2.32 implies the compactness of T . \square

3. TECHNICAL LEMMAS

We next give two useful lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *Given $(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{F}$, let*

$$F(x, y, z) := F_1(|x - y| + |x - z|)F_2(|x - y| + |x - z|)F_3(|x + y| + |x + z|).$$

- (i) *There exists a triple $(F'_1, F'_2, F'_3) \in \mathcal{F}$ such that F'_1 is monotone increasing, F'_2 and F'_3 are monotone decreasing, and*

$$(3.2) \quad F(x, y, z) \leq F'(x, y, z) := F'_1(|x - y| + |x - z|)F'_2(|x - y| + |x - z|) \times F'_3\left(1 + \frac{|x + y| + |x + z|}{1 + |x - y| + |x - z|}\right).$$

- (ii) *Assume that F_1 is monotone increasing. Then there exist $\delta' \in (0, \delta)$ and $(F'_1, F'_2, F'_3) \in \mathcal{F}$ such that F'_1 is monotone increasing, F'_2 and F'_3 are monotone decreasing, and*

$$(3.3) \quad F(x, y, z) \frac{|x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}} \leq F'(x, y, z) \frac{|x - x'|^{\delta'}}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta'}},$$

whenever $|x - x'| \leq \max\{|x - y|, |x - z|\}/2$, where

$$(3.4) \quad F'(x, y, z) := F'_1(|x - x'|)F'_2(|x - y| + |x - z|)F'_3\left(1 + \frac{|x + y| + |x + z|}{1 + |x - y| + |x - z|}\right).$$

Proof. Note that $|x + y| + |x + z| \geq \frac{|x + y| + |x + z|}{1 + |x - y| + |x - z|}$. Then by definition,

$$(3.5) \quad \lim_{|x - y| + |x - z| \rightarrow 0} F(x, y, z) = \lim_{|x - y| + |x - z| \rightarrow \infty} F(x, y, z) = \lim_{1 + \frac{|x + y| + |x + z|}{1 + |x - y| + |x - z|} \rightarrow \infty} F(x, y, z) = 0.$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} F'_1(t) &:= \sup_{|x - y| + |x - z| \leq t} F(x, y, z)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ F'_2(t) &:= \sup_{|x - y| + |x - z| \geq t} F(x, y, z)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ F'_3(t) &:= \sup_{1 + \frac{|x + y| + |x + z|}{1 + |x - y| + |x - z|} \geq t} F(x, y, z)^{\frac{1}{3}}. \end{aligned}$$

It is obvious that F'_1 is bounded and monotone increasing, both F'_2 and F'_3 are bounded and monotone decreasing. Moreover, (3.5) implies that $(F'_1, F'_2, F'_3) \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$(3.6) \quad F(x, y, z)^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq F'_i(|x - y| + |x - z|), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

and

$$(3.7) \quad F(x, y, z)^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq F'_3\left(1 + \frac{|x + y| + |x + z|}{1 + |x - y| + |x - z|}\right).$$

Thus, (3.2) is a consequence of (3.6) and (3.7).

To prove part (ii), pick $\delta' \in (0, \delta)$ and denote

$$(3.8) \quad F(x, y, z; x') := F(x, y, z) \frac{|x - x'|^{\delta - \delta'}}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{\delta - \delta'}}$$

for all $|x - x'| \leq \max\{|x - y|, |x - z|\}/2$. We claim that

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{|x-x'|\rightarrow 0} F(x, y, z; x') &= \lim_{|x-y|+|x-z|\rightarrow \infty} F(x, y, z; x') \\ &= \lim_{1+\frac{|x+y|+|x-z|}{1+|x-y|+|x-z|}\rightarrow \infty} F(x, y, z; x') = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, the last two limits in (3.9) follow from (3.5). To show the first one, assume that there exists a sequence $\{(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $|x_k - x'_k| \leq \max\{|x_k - y_k|, |x_k - z_k|\}/2$ with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |x_k - x'_k| = 0$, but

$$(3.10) \quad \inf_k F(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k) > 0.$$

If $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|x_k - x'_k|}{|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k|} = 0$, then the finiteness of F gives $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k) = 0$, which contradicts (3.10). If $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|x_k - x'_k|}{|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k|} > 0$, then there exist a constant $C_0 > 0$ and a subsequence (which we relabel) $\{(x_k, y_k, z_k, x'_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k| \leq C_0 |x_k - x'_k|$. By the monotonicity of F_1 and that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |x_k - x'_k| = 0$, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq F(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k) \leq F(x_k, y_k, z_k) \\ &\lesssim F_1(|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k|) \leq F_1(C_0 |x_k - x'_k|) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k) = 0$, which contradicts (3.10). Consequently, the first limit in (3.9) holds.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} F'_1(t) &:= \sup_{|x-x'|\leq t} F(x, y, z; x')^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ F'_2(t) &:= \sup_{|x-y|+|x-z|\geq t} F(x, y, z; x')^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ F'_3(t) &:= \sup_{1+\frac{|x+y|+|x+z|}{1+|x-y|+|x-z|}\geq t} F(x, y, z; x')^{\frac{1}{3}}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that F'_1 is bounded and monotone increasing, both F'_2 and F'_3 are bounded and monotone decreasing. Besides, (3.9) gives that $(F'_1, F'_2, F'_3) \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$(3.11) \quad F(x, y, z; x')^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq F'_1(|x - x'|), \quad F(x, y, z; x')^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq F'_2(|x - y| + |x - z|),$$

and

$$(3.12) \quad F(x, y, z; x')^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq F'_3\left(1 + \frac{|x + y| + |x + z|}{1 + |x - y| + |x - z|}\right).$$

Therefore, (3.11) and (3.12) imply

$$\frac{F(x, y, z) |x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}} = \frac{F(x, y, z; x') |x - x'|^{\delta'}}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta'}} \leq \frac{F'(x, y, z) |x - x'|^{\delta'}}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta'}},$$

which coincides with (3.3). The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 3.13. *The following statements hold:*

- (1) *If the estimates in Definition 1.2 are satisfied for different triples $(F_1^1, F_2^1, F_3^1) \in \mathcal{F}$ and $(F_1^2, F_2^2, F_3^2) \in \mathcal{F}$ respectively, then they also hold for a new triple $(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{F}$.*
- (2) *If the weak compactness property in Definition 2.16 is satisfied for different functions $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ and $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ respectively, then it also holds for a new function $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}_0$.*

- (3) For each triple $(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{F}$ in Definitions 1.2, we may assume that F_1 is monotone increasing while F_2 and F_3 are monotone decreasing.
- (4) Since any dilation of functions in \mathcal{F} , \mathcal{F}_1 , and \mathcal{F}_2 still belongs to the original space, we will often omit all universal constants appearing in the argument involving these functions.
- (5) In light of Lemma 3.1, we will mostly use alternative estimates for kernels in Definitions 1.2.

Proof. Let us first show item (1). Given $(F_1^1, F_2^1, F_3^1) \in \mathcal{F}$ and $(F_1^2, F_2^2, F_3^2) \in \mathcal{F}$ in Definition 1.2, if we define

$$F_j := \max\{F_j^1, F_j^2\}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3,$$

then the size and Hölder conditions hold for $(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{F}$. Item (2) can be shown in the same way. To show item (3), it suffices to define

$$F_1^*(t) := \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} F_1(s), \quad F_2^*(t) := \sup_{s \geq t} F_2(s), \quad \text{and} \quad F_3^*(t) := \sup_{s \geq t} F_3(s).$$

Items (4) and (5) are direct. \square

Lemma 3.14 ([2]). *Let $r > 1$ and $1 < s < 1 + \frac{1}{n}$. Assume that a bounded and decreasing function $F_2 : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_2(t) = 0$. Then there exists a bounded and decreasing function $\tilde{F}_2 : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfying $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{F}_2(t) = 0$ such that for all cubes $I, J \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\ell(I) = \ell(J)$, $I \cap J = \emptyset$, and $d(I, J) = 0$,*

$$(3.15) \quad \mathcal{J}_1 := \left(\iint_I \iint_J F_2(|x - y|)^r dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \lesssim \tilde{F}_2(\ell(I)),$$

and

$$(3.16) \quad \mathcal{J}_2 := \left(\iint_I \iint_J \frac{1}{|x - y|^{sn}} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \lesssim |I|^{-1}.$$

Lemma 3.17. *Assume that K satisfies the smoothness conditions (1.4)–(1.6) and that*

$$\lim_{|x-y|+|x-z| \rightarrow \infty} K(x, y, z) = 0.$$

Then K satisfies the size condition (1.3) with another triple $(F'_1, F'_2, F'_3) \in \mathcal{F}$.

Proof. We first claim that

$$(3.18) \quad |K(x, y, z) - K(x', y', z')| \leq F(x, y, z) \frac{(|x - x'| + |y - y'| + |z - z'|)^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}$$

whenever $|x - x'| + |y - y'| + |z - z'| \leq (|x - y| + |x - z|)/8$. Indeed, for such x, y and z , the condition (1.4) and Lemma 3.13 give

$$(3.19) \quad |K(x, y, z) - K(x', y, z)| \leq F_1(x, y, z) \frac{|x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}},$$

where

$$F_1(x, y, z) := F_{1,1}(|x - y| + |x - z|)F_{1,2}(|x - y| + |x - z|)F_{1,3}(|x + y| + |x + z|),$$

and $(F_{1,1}, F_{1,2}, F_{1,3}) \in \mathcal{F}$ with $F_{1,1}$ being monotone increasing, $F_{1,2}$ and $F_{1,3}$ being monotone decreasing. It is easy to verify that

$$(3.20) \quad \frac{3}{4} \leq \frac{|x' - y| + |x' - z|}{|x - y| + |x - z|} \leq \frac{5}{4},$$

and

$$|y - y'| \leq (|x - y| + |x - z|)/8 \leq (|x' - y| + |x' - z|)/6,$$

which together with (1.5) and Lemma 3.13 implies

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{aligned} |K(x', y, z) - K(x', y', z)| &\leq F_1(x', y, z) \frac{|y - y'|^\delta}{(|x' - y| + |x' - z|)^{2n+\delta}} \\ &\leq 2^{2n+\delta} F_1(x', y, z) \frac{|y - y'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} F_{2,1}(t) &:= \sup_{\substack{|x-y|+|x-z|\leq t \\ 8|x-x'|\leq |x-y|+|x-z|}} (2^{2n+\delta} F_1(x', y, z))^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ F_{2,2}(t) &:= \sup_{\substack{|x-y|+|x-z|\geq t \\ 8|x-x'|\leq |x-y|+|x-z|}} (2^{2n+\delta} F_1(x', y, z))^{\frac{1}{3}}, \\ F_{2,3}(t) &:= \sup_{\substack{|x+y|+|x+z|\geq t \\ 8|x-x'|\leq |x-y|+|x-z|}} (2^{2n+\delta} F_1(x', y, z))^{\frac{1}{3}}, \end{aligned}$$

and then set

$$F_2(x, y, z) := F_{2,1}(|x - y| + |x - z|) F_{2,2}(|x - y| + |x - z|) F_{2,3}(|x + y| + |x + z|).$$

Thus, $F_{2,1}$ is bounded and monotone increasing, both $F_{2,2}$ and $F_{2,3}$ are bounded and monotone decreasing, and

$$(3.22) \quad 2^{2n+\delta} F_1(x', y, z) \leq F_2(x, y, z).$$

Together with (3.20), the property $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} F_{1,1}(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_{1,2}(t) = 0$ implies $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} F_{2,1}(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_{2,2}(t) = 0$. Moreover, if $|x + y| + |x + z| \leq |x - y| + |x - z|$, then $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_{1,2}(t) = 0$ gives $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_{2,3}(t) = 0$. If $|x + y| + |x + z| \geq |x - y| + |x - z|$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |x' + y| + |x' + z| &\geq |x - y| + |x - z| - 2|x - x'| \\ &\geq |x - y| + |x - z| - (|x - y| + |x - z|)/4 \geq 3(|x - y| + |x - z|)/4, \end{aligned}$$

which along with $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_{1,3}(t) = 0$ yields $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_{2,3}(t) = 0$. This shows $(F_{2,1}, F_{2,2}, F_{2,3}) \in \mathcal{F}$. Collecting (3.20)–(3.22), we conclude

$$(3.23) \quad |K(x', y, z) - K(x', y', z)| \leq F_2(x, y, z) \frac{|y - y'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}.$$

Much as above, there exists $(F_{3,1}, F_{3,2}, F_{3,3}) \in \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$(3.24) \quad |K(x', y', z) - K(x', y', z')| \leq F_3(x, y, z) \frac{|z - z'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}},$$

where

$$F_3(x, y, z) := F_{3,1}(|x - y| + |x - z|) F_{3,2}(|x - y| + |x - z|) F_{3,3}(|x + y| + |x + z|).$$

Hence, (3.18) is a consequence of (3.19), (3.23), and (3.24).

Let $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $x \neq y$ or $x \neq z$. Let $a = 7/6$. We may assume that $x \geq y$ and $x \geq z$. Let $x_0 = x$, $y_0 = y$, and $z_0 = z$. For each $k \geq 1$, define

$$\begin{aligned} x_k &= x_{k-1} + (|x_{k-1} - y_{k-1}| + |x_{k-1} - z_{k-1}|)/24, \\ y_k &= y_{k-1} - (|x_{k-1} - y_{k-1}| + |x_{k-1} - z_{k-1}|)/24, \\ z_k &= z_{k-1} - (|x_{k-1} - y_{k-1}| + |x_{k-1} - z_{k-1}|)/24. \end{aligned}$$

Then for any $k \geq 0$, $x_k \geq y_k$, $x_k \geq z_k$, and

$$\begin{aligned} |x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k| &= a(|x_{k-1} - y_{k-1}| + |x_{k-1} - z_{k-1}|), \\ |x_k + y_k| + |x_k + z_k| &= |x_{k-1} + y_{k-1}| + |x_{k-1} + z_{k-1}|, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$(3.25) \quad |x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k| = a^k(|x - y| + |x - z|),$$

$$(3.26) \quad |x_k + y_k| + |x_k + z_k| = |x + y| + |x + z|.$$

Moreover,

$$|x_{k-1} - x_k| + |y_{k-1} - y_k| + |z_{k-1} - z_k| \leq (|x_{k-1} - y_{k-1}| + |x_{k-1} - z_{k-1}|)/8,$$

which along with (3.18) implies

$$|K(x_{k-1}, y_{k-1}, z_{k-1})| \leq |K(x_k, y_k, z_k)| + \frac{F(x_{k-1}, y_{k-1}, z_{k-1})}{(|x_{k-1} - y_{k-1}| + |x_{k-1} - z_{k-1}|)^2}.$$

Iterating the inequality above, we have

$$|K(x, y, z)| \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |K(x_k, y_k, z_k)| + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{F(x_k, y_k, z_k)}{(|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k|)^2}.$$

Choosing

$$F'_3(t) := F_3(t) \quad \text{and} \quad F'_i(t) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a^{-k} F_i(a^k t), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

we see that $(F'_1, F'_2, F'_3) \in \mathcal{F}$, and (3.25)–(3.26) imply

$$|K(x, y, z)| \lesssim \frac{F'(x, y, z)}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^2},$$

where

$$F'(x, y, z) := F'_1(|x - y| + |x - z|)F'_2(|x - y| + |x - z|)F'_3(|x + y| + |x + z|).$$

The proof is complete. \square

4. NECESSITY OF THE HYPOTHESES

This section is devoted to showing that (b) \implies (a) in Theorem 1.9, that is, the L^p compactness implies the hypotheses (H1), (H2), and (H3), which will be proved in Theorems 4.1, 4.20, and 4.32, respectively.

4.1. Compact Calderón–Zygmund kernels.

Theorem 4.1. *Let T be a bilinear operator associated with a standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel K . Let $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $1 < p, p_1, p_2 < \infty$. If T is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then K is a compact bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel.*

Proof. By Definition 1.2 and symmetry, it suffices to prove that there exists $\delta' \in (0, \delta)$ such that

$$\sup_{\substack{x' \in \mathbb{R}^n: x' \neq x \\ |x-x'| \leq \max\{|x-y|, |x-z|\}/2}} \mathcal{E}(x, y, z; x') \rightarrow 0,$$

whenever $|x-x'| \rightarrow 0$, or $|x-y|+|x-z| \rightarrow \infty$, or $|x+y|+|x+z| \rightarrow \infty$ and $|x-y|+|x-z| \simeq 1$, where

$$\mathcal{E}(x, y, z; x') := |x-x'|^{-\delta'} \frac{|K(x, y, z) - K(x', y, z)|}{(|x-y|+|x-z|)^{-(2n+\delta')}},$$

since the smoothness condition (1.4) gives

$$\mathcal{E}(x, y, z; x') \lesssim \frac{|x-x'|^{\delta-\delta'}}{(|x-y|+|x-z|)^{\delta-\delta'}} \lesssim 1,$$

whenever $|x-x'| \leq \max\{|x-y|, |x-z|\}/2$. The above immediately implies that

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k) = 0 \text{ for any sequence } \{(x_k, y_k, z_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \\ & \text{with } |x_k - x'_k| \leq \max\{|x_k - y_k|, |x_k - z_k|\}/2 \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$(4.3) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|x_k - x'_k|}{|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k|} = 0.$$

This means that it remains to demonstrate (4.2) when $\{(x_k, y_k, z_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ does not satisfy (4.3) but satisfies one of the following:

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{(i) } |x_k - x'_k| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{(ii) } |x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k| \rightarrow \infty, \\ & \text{(iii) } |x_k + y_k| + |x_k + z_k| \rightarrow \infty \text{ and } |x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k| \simeq 1. \end{aligned}$$

In this scenario, there exists $c_0 \in (0, 1/2)$ and a subsequence (which we relabel) $\{(x_k, y_k, z_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$(4.5) \quad c_0 < \frac{|x_k - x'_k|}{|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k|} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let (x_k, y_k, z_k) and x'_k satisfy (4.5). Let $0 < \varepsilon < 2^{-\delta}C$ be fixed and arbitrarily small. We choose a sequence $\{\lambda_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$(4.6) \quad (C^{-1}\varepsilon)^{1/\delta}|x_k - x'_k|/2 \leq \lambda_k \leq (C^{-1}\varepsilon)^{1/\delta}|x_k - x'_k|.$$

Using (4.5), (4.14) and (4.6), we deduce that

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k) & \leq C_0^{\delta'} (|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k|)^{2n} |K(x_k, y_k, z_k) - K(x'_k, y_k, z_k)| \\ & \leq 2C_0^{\delta'} \varepsilon + C_0^{\delta'} (|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k|)^{2n} \Delta(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k) \\ & \lesssim \varepsilon + |x_k - x'_k|^{2n} \Delta(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k) := |\langle T(\tau_{y_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k}, \tau_{z_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k}), \tau_{x_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k} - \tau_{x'_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k} \rangle|$. If we denote

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} f_k &:= |x_k - x'_k|^{\frac{n}{p_1}} \tau_{y_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k}, \quad g_k := |x_k - x'_k|^{\frac{n}{p_2}} \tau_{z_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k}, \\ \text{and } h_k &:= |x_k - x'_k|^{\frac{n}{p}} (\tau_{x_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k} - \tau_{x'_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k}), \end{aligned}$$

then (4.6) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_k\|_{L^{p_1}} &= (\lambda_k^{-1} |x_k - x'_k|)^{\frac{n}{p_1}} \|\Phi\|_{L^{p_1}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{n}{\delta p_1}}, \\ \|g_k\|_{L^{p_2}} &= (\lambda_k^{-1} |x_k - x'_k|)^{\frac{n}{p_2}} \|\Phi\|_{L^{p_2}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{n}{\delta p_2}}, \\ \|h_k\|_{L^{p'}} &\lesssim (\lambda_k^{-1} |x_k - x'_k|)^{\frac{n}{p}} \|\Phi\|_{L^{p'}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{n}{\delta p}}, \end{aligned}$$

This says that $\{f_k\}$ is a bounded sequence in $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\{g_k\}$ is a bounded sequence in $L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then by the compactness of T , there exists a convergent subsequence (which we relabel) $\{T(f_k, g_k)\}$. This gives that for any $\eta > 0$ chosen later, there is $N_\eta > 0$ such that for all $k, j > N_\eta$,

$$(4.9) \quad \|T(f_k, g_k) - T(f_j, g_j)\|_{L^p} < \eta.$$

Thus, by (4.7)–(4.9), we have for all $k, j > N_\eta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(x_k, y_k, z_k; x'_k) &\lesssim \varepsilon + |\langle T(f_k, g_k), h_k \rangle| \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon + |\langle T(f_k, g_k) - T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle| + |\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle| \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon + \|T(f_k, g_k) - T(f_j, g_j)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|h_k\|_{L^{p'}} + |\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle| \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon + \eta \varepsilon^{-\frac{n}{\delta p}} + |\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle| \lesssim \varepsilon + |\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle|, \end{aligned}$$

provided $\eta < \varepsilon^{1+\frac{n}{\delta p}}$. To complete the proof, it suffices to show that for given $k > N_\eta$, there exists $j = j(k) > N_\eta$ sufficiently large such that

$$(4.10) \quad |\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle| \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

To proceed, we rewrite $\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle$ as

$$\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle = |x_j - x'_j|^{n(2-\frac{1}{p})} |x_k - x'_k|^{\frac{n}{p}} \langle T(\tau_{y_j} \Phi_{\lambda_j}, \tau_{z_j} \Phi_{\lambda_j}), \tau_{x_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k} - \tau_{x'_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k} \rangle.$$

Recall that T is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$. This and Theorem 2.3 give that

$$(4.11) \quad T \text{ is bounded from } L^{q_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{q_2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^q(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

for all $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$ with $q_1, q_2 \in (1, \infty)$. Accordingly, we use (4.11) to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} (4.12) \quad |\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle| &\lesssim |x_j - x'_j|^{n(2-\frac{1}{p})} |x_k - x'_k|^{\frac{n}{p}} \|\tau_{y_j} \Phi_{\lambda_j}\|_{L^{q_1}} \\ &\quad \times \|\tau_{z_j} \Phi_{\lambda_j}\|_{L^{q_2}} \|\tau_{x_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k} - \tau_{x'_k} \Phi_{\lambda_k}\|_{L^{q'}} \\ &\lesssim |x_j - x'_j|^{n(2-\frac{1}{p})} |x_k - x'_k|^{\frac{n}{p}} \lambda_j^{-\frac{n}{q_1}} \lambda_j^{-\frac{n}{q_2}} \lambda_k^{\frac{n}{q}} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{2n}{\delta}} \left(\frac{|x_k - x'_k|}{|x_j - x'_j|} \right)^{n(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})} = \varepsilon^{-\frac{2n}{\delta}} \left(\frac{|x_j - x'_j|}{|x_k - x'_k|} \right)^{n(\frac{1}{p'} - \frac{1}{q'})}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2} < 1$ with $q_1, q_2 \in (1, \infty)$.

If the sequence $\{(x_k, y_k, z_k)\}$ satisfies the case (i) in (4.4) and (4.5), then for fixed $k > N_\eta$, we choose $j > k$ large enough and $q \in (1, p)$ in (4.12) so that

$$|\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{2n}{\delta}} \left(\frac{|x_j - x'_j|}{|x_k - x'_k|} \right)^{n(\frac{1}{p'} - \frac{1}{q})} < \varepsilon.$$

If the sequence $\{(x_k, y_k, z_k)\}$ satisfies the case (ii) in (4.4) and (4.5), then $|x_k - x'_k| \rightarrow \infty$. For fixed $k > N_\eta$, we choose $j > k$ large enough and $q \in (p, \infty)$ in (4.12) so that

$$|\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\frac{2n}{\delta}} \left(\frac{|x_k - x'_k|}{|x_j - x'_j|} \right)^{n(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})} < \varepsilon.$$

If the sequence $\{(x_k, y_k, z_k)\}$ satisfies the case (iii) in (4.4) and (4.5), then

$$2(|y_k| + |z_k|) \geq (|x_k + y_k| + |x_k + z_k|) - (|x_k - y_k| + |x_k - z_k|),$$

which implies $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (|y_k| + |z_k|) = \infty$, and furthermore, $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |x_k - y_j| + |x_k - z_j| = \infty$ for any fixed k . Therefore, fixed $k > N_\eta$, we use (4.15) and (4.5), and choose $j > k$ sufficiently large to conclude that

$$|\langle T(f_j, g_j), h_k \rangle| \lesssim \frac{|x_j - x'_j|^{n(2 - \frac{1}{p})} |x_k - x'_k|^{\frac{n}{p} + \delta}}{(|x_k - y_j| + |x_k - z_j|)^{2n + \delta}} \lesssim \frac{1}{(|x_k - y_j| + |x_k - z_j|)^{2n + \delta}} < \varepsilon.$$

This shows (4.10) and completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.13. *Let T be a bilinear operator associated with a standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel K with the parameter δ . Let $0 < \varepsilon < 2^{-\delta} \|K\|_{CZ_\delta}$, $x' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{3n} \setminus \Delta$ such that $|x - x'| \leq \frac{1}{4} \max\{|x - y|, |x - z|\}$. Then for any $0 < \lambda_i < (\varepsilon \|K\|_{CZ_\delta}^{-1})^{1/\delta} |x - x'|$, $i = 1, 2, 3$,*

$$(4.14) \quad |\langle T(\tau_y \Phi_{\lambda_2}, \tau_z \Phi_{\lambda_3}), \tau_x \Phi_{\lambda_1} \rangle - K(x, y, z)| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon |x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n + \delta}},$$

$$(4.15) \quad |\langle T(\tau_y \Phi_{\lambda_2}, \tau_z \Phi_{\lambda_3}), \tau_x \Phi_{\lambda_1} - \tau_{x'} \Phi_{\lambda_1} \rangle| \lesssim \frac{|x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n + \delta}},$$

where Φ is a positive smooth function such that Φ is supported and L^∞ -adapted to \mathbb{I} and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Phi dx = 1$.

Proof. Fix $0 < \lambda_i < (\varepsilon \|K\|_{CZ_\delta}^{-1})^{1/\delta} |x - x'|$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. For any $v_i \in \text{supp}(\Phi_{\lambda_i})$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, we see that

$$4 \max_i |v_i| \leq 2 \max_i \lambda_i \leq |x - x'| \leq \max\{|x - y|, |x - z|\}/4,$$

which implies

$$(4.16) \quad |x - x'| \leq \max\{|x + v_1 - y - v_2|, |x + v_1 - z - v_3|\}/2,$$

$$(4.17) \quad |v_1| \leq \max\{|x - y - v_2|, |x - z - v_3|\}/2,$$

$$(4.18) \quad |v_2| \leq \max\{|x - y|, |x - z - v_3|\}/2,$$

$$(4.19) \quad |v_3| \leq \max\{|x - y|, |x - z|\}/2.$$

Then by (1.4)–(1.6) and (4.17)–(4.19),

$$\begin{aligned} & |K(x + v_1, y + v_2, z + v_3) - K(x, y, z)| \\ & \leq |K(x + v_1, y + v_2, z + v_3) - K(x, y + v_2, z + v_3)| \\ & \quad + |K(x, y + v_2, z + v_3) - K(x, y, z + v_3)| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + |K(x, y, z + v_3) - K(x, y, z)| \\
& \lesssim \frac{|v_1|^\delta}{(|x - y - v_2| + |x - z - v_3|)^{2n+\delta}} \\
& + \frac{|v_2|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z - v_3|)^{2n+\delta}} + \frac{|v_3|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}} \\
& \lesssim \frac{\max_i \lambda_i^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon |x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{LHS of (4.14)} & = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3n}} [K(x + v_1, y + v_2, z + v_3) - K(x, y, z)] \prod_{i=1}^3 \Phi_{\lambda_i}(v_i) dv_i \right| \\
& \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3n}} \frac{\varepsilon |x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}} \prod_{i=1}^3 \Phi_{\lambda_i}(v_i) dv_i \leq \frac{\varepsilon |x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}.
\end{aligned}$$

To prove (4.15), we use (1.4) and (4.16) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbf{K}(v_1, v_2, v_3)| & := |K(x + v_1, y + v_2, z + v_3) - K(x', y + v_2, z + v_3)| \\
& \lesssim \frac{|x - x'|^\delta}{(|x + v_1 - y - v_2| + |x + v_1 - z - v_3|)^{2n+\delta}} \simeq \frac{|x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}.
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence,

$$\text{LHS of (4.15)} = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3n}} \mathbf{K}(v_1, v_2, v_3) \prod_{i=1}^3 \Phi_{\lambda_i}(v_i) dv_i \right| \lesssim \frac{|x - x'|^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}}.$$

The proof is complete. \square

4.2. Weak compactness property.

Theorem 4.20. *Let T be a bilinear operator associated with a standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel K . Let $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $1 < p, p_1, p_2 < \infty$. If T is bounded from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then*

$$(4.21) \quad |\langle T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle| \lesssim [\|P_N^\perp \circ T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} + \|T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} F(I; N)] |I|,$$

for all $I \in \mathcal{D}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, where

$$F(I; N) := F_1(2^N \ell(I)) F_2(2^{-N} \ell(I)) F_3(N^{-1} \text{rd}(I, 2^N \mathbb{I})),$$

$$F_1(t) := (1 + t^{-1})^{-\frac{n}{p}}, \quad \text{and} \quad F_2(t) = F_3(t) := \mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}(t).$$

In particular, if T is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then it satisfies the weak compactness property.

Proof. Fix $I \in \mathcal{D}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. We split

$$(4.22) \quad \langle T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle = \langle P_N(T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle + \langle P_N^\perp(T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle.$$

By Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.23) \quad |\langle P_N^\perp(T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle| & \leq \|P_N^\perp \circ T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} \|\mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^{p_1}} \|\mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^{p_2}} \|\mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^{p'}} \\
& = \|P_N^\perp \circ T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} |I|,
\end{aligned}$$

and by the boundedness of T ,

$$(4.24) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle P_N(T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle| &\leq \|P_N\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \|T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} |I| \\ &\lesssim \|T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} F(I; N) |I| \end{aligned}$$

for any $I \in \mathcal{D}_N$.

To proceed, fix $I \notin \mathcal{D}_N$. It suffices to consider the following three cases:

$$(i) \quad \ell(I) < 2^{-N}, \quad (ii) \quad \ell(I) > 2^N, \quad (iii) \quad 2^{-N} \leq \ell(I) \leq 2^N \text{ and } \text{rd}(I, 2^N \mathbb{I}) > N.$$

Since $P_N \circ P_N = P_N = P_N^*$, we have

$$(4.25) \quad \langle P_N(T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle = \langle P_N^2(T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle = \langle P_N(T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)), P_N \mathbf{1}_I \rangle.$$

By the cancellation of Haar functions, there holds

$$(4.26) \quad P_N \mathbf{1}_I = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_N: I \subsetneq J} \langle \mathbf{1}_I, h_J \rangle h_J.$$

Observe that the condition $I \subsetneq J$ implies that $\ell(J) > 2^N$ in case (ii), and that

$$N < \text{rd}(I, 2^N \mathbb{I}) = 2^{-N} \text{diam}(I \cup 2^N \mathbb{I}) \leq 2^{-N} \text{diam}(J \cup 2^N \mathbb{I}) = \text{rd}(J, 2^N \mathbb{I}).$$

in case (iii). This means that there does not exist $J \in \mathcal{D}_N$ such that $I \subsetneq J$ in cases (ii) and (iii), which along with (4.25) and (4.26) implies

$$(4.27) \quad \langle P_N(T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle = 0, \quad \text{for any } I \text{ in cases (ii) and (iii).}$$

Let us next treat the case (i). Given $I \in \mathcal{D}$ with $\ell(I) < 2^{-N}$, we see that

$$(4.28) \quad P_N \mathbf{1}_I = \sum_{-N < k \leq N} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(Q) = 2^{-k}} \Delta_Q \mathbf{1}_I = \sum_{-N < k \leq N} \Delta_k \mathbf{1}_I = E_N \mathbf{1}_I - E_{-N} \mathbf{1}_I.$$

Note that there exists a unique $I^* \in \mathcal{D}$ with $\ell(I^*) = 2^N$ so that $I \subsetneq I^*$. Thus,

$$E_N \mathbf{1}_I = \sum_{I' \in \mathcal{D}: \ell(I') = 2^{-N}} \langle \mathbf{1}_I \rangle_{I'} \mathbf{1}_{I'} = \langle \mathbf{1}_I \rangle_{I^*} \mathbf{1}_{I^*},$$

which gives

$$(4.29) \quad \|E_N \mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \langle \mathbf{1}_I \rangle_{I^*} \|\mathbf{1}_{I^*}\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} = |I| |I^*|^{-\frac{1}{p}} = 2^{\frac{N}{p}} |I|.$$

In the same way, we obtain

$$(4.30) \quad \|E_{-N} \mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 2^{-\frac{N}{p}} |I|.$$

Now collecting (4.25) and (4.28)–(4.30), we conclude

$$(4.31) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle P_N(T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)), \mathbf{1}_I \rangle| &\leq \|P_N\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \|T(\mathbf{1}_I, \mathbf{1}_I)\|_{L^p} \|P_N \mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^{p'}} \\ &\leq \|P_N\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \|T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} |I|^{\frac{1}{p_1}} |I|^{\frac{1}{p_2}} 2^{\frac{N}{p}} |I| \\ &\leq \|P_N\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \|T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} (2^N \ell(I))^{\frac{n}{p}} |I| \\ &\simeq \|P_N\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \|T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} F(I; N) |I|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the desired estimate (4.21) follows from (4.22)–(4.24), (4.27), and (4.31).

Furthermore, if T is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then Theorem 2.23 gives that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|P_N^\perp \circ T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} = 0,$$

which together with (4.21) and $\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \|P_N\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \lesssim 1$ yields the weak compactness property. \square

4.3. CMO conditions.

Theorem 4.32. *Let T be a bilinear operator associated with a standard bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel K . Let $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $1 < p, p_1, p_2 < \infty$. If T is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then $T(1, 1), T^{*1}(1, 1), T^{*2}(1, 1) \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Proof. By symmetry, it suffices to show $T(1, 1) \in \text{CMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which follows from

$$(4.33) \quad T(1, 1) \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle P_N^\perp(T(1, 1)), f \rangle = 0,$$

uniformly for all $f \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in the unit ball of $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with mean zero and support in a dyadic cube $I \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. By Theorem 4.1, we see that K is a compact bilinear Calderón–Zygmund kernel. This together with Lemma 2.17 item (4) implies that $T(1, 1) \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Note that

$$P_N f = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_N} (|J|^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle f, h_J \rangle) (|J|^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_J)$$

is a finite linear combination of 1-atoms $|J|^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_J$. Then, $P_N f \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, hence

$$P_N^\perp f = f - P_N f \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Since P_N^\perp is self-adjoint, we invoke $T(1, 1) \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $P_N^\perp f \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to get

$$(4.34) \quad \langle P_N^\perp(T(1, 1)), f \rangle = \langle T(1, 1), P_N^\perp f \rangle = \mathcal{L}(P_N^\perp f),$$

where the functional \mathcal{L} is defined in Lemma 2.17.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be an arbitrary number. Choose $k \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $2^{-k\delta} < \varepsilon$. Since T is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, by Theorem 2.23, there exists $N_0 > 0$ such that for all $N > N_0$,

$$(4.35) \quad \|P_N^\perp \circ T\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} < 2^{-\frac{kn}{p}} \varepsilon.$$

Considering that $\text{supp}(f) \subset I$ and $\text{supp}(h_J) \subset J$, we rewrite

$$(4.36) \quad \mathcal{L}(P_N^\perp f) = \mathcal{L}(h) + \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_N^c: I \subsetneq J} \langle f, h_J \rangle \mathcal{L}(h_J),$$

where $\varphi := \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_N^c: I \subsetneq J} \langle f, h_J \rangle h_J$ with

$$\|\varphi\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \|f\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim |I|^{-\frac{1}{p}}.$$

To proceed, we choose a cut-off function $\Phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying $\mathbf{1}_{B(0,1)} \leq \Phi \leq \mathbf{1}_{B(0,2)}$, and set $\Phi_I(x) := \Phi\left(\frac{x-x_I}{2^k \ell(I)}\right)$. By Hölder's inequality and (4.35),

$$(4.37) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_1 &:= |\langle P_N^\perp(T(\Phi_I, \Phi_I)), \varphi \rangle| \\ &\lesssim \|P_N^\perp \circ T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} \|\Phi_I\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|\Phi_I\|_{L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|\varphi\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\lesssim 2^{-\frac{kn}{p}} \varepsilon (2^k \ell(I))^{\frac{n}{p_1}} (2^k \ell(I))^{\frac{n}{p_2}} |I|^{-\frac{1}{p}} = \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and Lemma 2.17 applied to $f = \varphi$ and $a = x_I$ gives

$$(4.38) \quad \mathcal{J}_2 := |\mathcal{L}(\varphi) - \langle P_N^\perp(T(\Phi_I, \Phi_I), \varphi) \rangle|$$

$$\lesssim 2^{-k\delta} \sum_{k'=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k'\delta} F(2^{k'+k}|I|) \|\varphi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \varepsilon,$$

since $\text{supp}(\varphi) \subset I$ and F is bounded. Analogously, writing $\Psi_J(x) := \Phi\left(\frac{x-x_I}{2^k \ell(J)}\right)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{1,J} &:= |\langle P_N^\perp(T(\Psi_J, \Psi_J)), h_J \rangle| \\ &\lesssim \|P_N^\perp \circ T\|_{L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p} \|\Psi_J\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|\Psi_J\|_{L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|h_J\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\lesssim 2^{-\frac{kn}{p}} \varepsilon (2^k \ell(J))^{\frac{n}{p_1}} (2^k \ell(J))^{\frac{n}{p_2}} |J|^{-\frac{1}{p}} = \varepsilon |J|^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

and for any $J \supsetneq I$,

$$\mathcal{J}_{2,J} := |\mathcal{L}(h_J) - \langle P_N^\perp(T(\Psi_J, \Psi_J)), h_J \rangle| \lesssim (2^k \ell(J)/\ell(I))^{-\delta} \|h_J\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

which respectively yields

$$(4.39) \quad \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_N^c: I \subsetneq J} |\langle f, h_J \rangle| \mathcal{J}_{1,J} \lesssim \varepsilon \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_N^c: I \subsetneq J} |I| |J|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \varepsilon \sum_{j \geq 1} 2^{-j} \lesssim \varepsilon,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_N^c: I \subsetneq J} |\langle f, h_J \rangle| \mathcal{J}_{2,J} &\lesssim 2^{-k\delta} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_N^c: I \subsetneq J} \left(\frac{\ell(I)}{\ell(J)} \right)^\delta \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|h_J\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|h_J\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ (4.40) \quad &\lesssim 2^{-k\delta} \sum_{j \geq 1} 2^{-j\delta} \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Now collecting the estimates (4.36)–(4.40), we conclude

$$\mathcal{L}(P_N^\perp f) \leq \mathcal{J}_1 + \mathcal{J}_2 + \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_N^c: I \subsetneq J} |\langle f, h_J \rangle| (\mathcal{J}_{1,J} + \mathcal{J}_{2,J}) \lesssim \varepsilon,$$

which together with (4.34) implies (4.33) as desired. \square

5. $L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2} \rightarrow L^p$ COMPACTNESS

In this section we will prove (a) \implies (b), that is, the hypotheses (H1), (H2), and (H3) imply the compactness of T from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $1 < p_1, p_2 < \infty$.

Given $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ and a dyadic grid \mathcal{D} , we define the *compact bilinear dyadic shift* as

$$\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2) := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} A_Q^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2)$$

with

$$A_Q^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2) := \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{D}_i(Q) \\ J \in \mathcal{D}_j(Q) \\ K \in \mathcal{D}_k(Q)}} \alpha_{I,J,K,Q} \langle f_1, \tilde{h}_I \rangle \langle f_2, \tilde{h}_J \rangle h_K,$$

where

$$(5.1) \quad (\tilde{h}_I, \tilde{h}_J) \in \{(h_I, h_J), (h_I, h_J^0), (h_I^0, h_J)\},$$

and the coefficients $\alpha_{I,J,K,Q}$ satisfy

$$(5.2) \quad |\alpha_{I,J,K,Q}| \leq F(I, J, K, Q) \frac{|I|^{\frac{1}{2}} |J|^{\frac{1}{2}} |K|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^2}$$

with

$$(5.3) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_N := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{D}} \sup_{\substack{Q \notin \mathcal{D}(N) \\ I \in \mathcal{D}_i(Q) \\ J \in \mathcal{D}_j(Q) \\ K \in \mathcal{D}_k(Q)}} F(I, J, K, Q) = 0.$$

Given a sequence of complex numbers $\alpha := \{\alpha_I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$ such that

$$(5.4) \quad \|\alpha\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}}} := \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{|Q|} \sum_{I \subset Q} |\alpha_I|^2 \leq 1,$$

we define the bilinear dyadic paraproduct as

$$\Pi_{\alpha}(f_1, f_2) := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_I \langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I h_I.$$

We will see that to guarantee the compactness of Π_{α} , it requires the following condition

$$(5.5) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{D}} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{|Q|} \sum_{\substack{I \notin \mathcal{D}(N) \\ I \subset Q}} |\alpha_I|^2 = 0.$$

Definition 5.6. Given a bilinear singular integral operator T , we say that T admits a *compact bilinear representation* if there exists a constant $C_0 \in (0, \infty)$ so that for all compactly supported and bounded functions f_1, f_2 , and f_3 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T(f_1, f_2), f_3 \rangle &= C_0 \mathbb{E}_{\omega} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^k 2^{-k\delta/2} \langle \mathbb{S}_{\mathcal{D}_{\omega}}^{i,k}(f_1, f_2), f_3 \rangle + C_0 \mathbb{E}_{\omega} \langle \Pi_{\alpha_0(\omega)}(f_1, f_2), f_3 \rangle \\ &\quad + C_0 \mathbb{E}_{\omega} \langle \Pi_{\alpha_1(\omega)}^*(f_1, f_2), f_3 \rangle + C_0 \mathbb{E}_{\omega} \langle \Pi_{\alpha_2(\omega)}^*(f_1, f_2), f_3 \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{S}_{\mathcal{D}_{\omega}}^{i,k}$ is a finite sum of cancellative shifts $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_{\omega}}^{i,i,k}$, $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_{\omega}}^{i,i+1,k}$, and adjoints of such operators. In addition, Π_{α} is the bilinear paraproduct with $\alpha := \{\alpha_I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$ satisfying both (5.4) and (5.5).

Theorem 5.7. *Let T be a bilinear singular integral operator. Then the hypotheses (H1), (H2), and (H3) imply that T admits a compact bilinear representation.*

Now let us conclude (a) \implies (b) from Theorem 5.7, which will be shown in Section 6. By duality, Theorem 2.28, Lemma 2.33, and Theorems 5.10 and 5.32, we deduce that

$$(5.8) \quad T \text{ is compact from } L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ to } L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

for all $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $1 < p, p_1, p_2 < \infty$. On the other hand, (H2) and (H3) respectively imply the weak boundedness property and $T(1, 1), T^{*1}(1, 1), T^{*2}(1, 1) \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which yields [10, Theorem 1.1]. The later along with Lemmas 5.25 and 5.42 gives

$$(5.9) \quad T \text{ is blunded from } L^{q_1}(v_1^{q_1}) \times L^{q_2}(v_2^{q_2}) \text{ to } L^p(v^q)$$

for all $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$ with $1 < q, q_1, q_2 < \infty$ and for all $(v_1, v_2) \in A_{(q_1, q_2)}$, where $v = v_1 v_2$. Thus, the conclusion (b) follows from (5.8), (5.9), and [1, Theorem 1.1].

5.1. Weighted compactness of dyadic shifts.

Theorem 5.10. *For all $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{E}_\omega \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}^{i,j,k}$ is compact from $L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2})$ to $L^p(w^p)$ for all $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ and $w = w_1 w_2$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\tilde{h}_I = h_I$. Denote $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}} := \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i,j,k}$. Fix $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ with $1 < p, p_1, p_2 < \infty$. By [1, Theorem 1.1], it suffices to prove that $\mathbb{E}_\omega \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}$ is compact from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$. In light of Theorem 2.28, we are deduced to showing the following estimates

$$(5.11) \quad \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \leq 1}} \|\mathbb{E}_\omega \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p} \lesssim 1,$$

$$(5.12) \quad \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \leq 1}} \|\mathbb{E}_\omega \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{|\cdot| > A\}}\|_{L^p} = 0,$$

$$(5.13) \quad \lim_{|v| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \leq 1}} \|\tau_v \mathbb{E}_\omega \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) - \mathbb{E}_\omega \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p} = 0.$$

Note that (5.11) immediately follows from Lemma 5.25.

To justify (5.12), given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^N f := \sum_{Q \notin \mathcal{D}(N)} A_Q^{i,j,k} f.$$

Observe that

$$(5.14) \quad \Delta_{Q'}^k(A_Q^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2)) = A_Q^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{Q'=Q\}} = A_Q^{i,j,k}(\Delta_{Q'}^i f_1, f_2),$$

$$(5.15) \quad \Delta_Q^k(\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^N(f_1, f_2)) = A_Q^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{Q \notin \mathcal{D}(N)\}},$$

$$(5.16) \quad |A_Q^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2)| \leq F_N \langle |f_1| \rangle_Q \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \mathbf{1}_Q, \quad \text{for all } Q \notin \mathcal{D}(N).$$

Then it follows from (5.14)–(5.16) that

$$(5.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^N f\|_{L^p} &\simeq \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |\Delta_Q^k(\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^N(f_1, f_2))|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^p} \\ &= \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \notin \mathcal{D}(N)} |A_Q^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^p} \\ &= \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \notin \mathcal{D}(N)} |A_Q^{i,j,k}(\Delta_Q^i f_1, f_2)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^p} \\ &\leq F_N \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \langle |\Delta_Q^i f_1| \rangle_Q^2 \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q^2 \mathbf{1}_Q \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^p} \\ &\leq F_N \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |\Delta_Q^i f_1|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} M_{\mathcal{D}} f_2 \right\|_{L^p} \\ &\leq F_N \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |\Delta_Q^i f_1|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{p_1}} \|M_{\mathcal{D}} f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim F_N \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}},$$

where the implicit constants are independent of \mathcal{D} , N , f_1 , and f_2 .

Let $A \geq 2^{10}$ and $N := [\frac{1}{2} \log_2 A] > 2$. Note that for any $\omega \in \Omega$ and $K \in \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)$,

$$(5.18) \quad K \subset \{|x| \leq (N+2)2^N\} \subset \{|x| \leq 2^{2N}\} \subset \{|x| \leq A\}.$$

Thus, by Minkowski's inequality, (5.17), and (5.18),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}_\omega \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{|\cdot| > A\}}\|_{L^p} &\leq \mathbb{E}_\omega \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{|\cdot| > A\}}\|_{L^p} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\omega \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}^N(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{|\cdot| > A\}}\|_{L^p} \lesssim F_N \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant is independent of A , ω , f_1 , and f_2 . This gives (5.12).

In order to demonstrate (5.13), observe that

$$(5.19) \quad \|\tau_v \mathbb{E}_\omega \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) - \mathbb{E}_\omega \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p} \leq \mathbb{E}_\omega \|\tau_v \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) - \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p}.$$

Let $0 < |v| < 2^{-j-10}$ and $a \geq 2$ be an integer chosen later. Then there exists an integer $N = N(v) \geq 5$ such that $2^{-a(N+1)} \leq 2^{j+1}|v| < 2^{-aN}$. We split

$$(5.20) \quad \|\tau_v \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2) - \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p} \leq \Xi_1(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) + \Xi_2(v; \omega, f_1, f_2),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_1(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) &:= \left\| \sum_{Q \notin \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{D}_i(Q) \\ J \in \mathcal{D}_j(Q) \\ K \in \mathcal{D}_k(Q)}} \alpha_{I,J,K,Q} \langle f_1, h_I \rangle \langle f_2, \tilde{h}_J \rangle (\tau_v h_K - h_K) \right\|_{L^p}, \\ \Xi_2(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) &:= \left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{D}_i(Q) \\ J \in \mathcal{D}_j(Q) \\ K \in \mathcal{D}_k(Q)}} \alpha_{I,J,K,Q} \langle f_1, h_I \rangle \langle f_2, \tilde{h}_J \rangle (\tau_v h_K - h_K) \right\|_{L^p}. \end{aligned}$$

By changing variables and (5.17), we obtain

$$(5.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \Xi_1(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) &\leq \|\tau_v \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}^N(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p} + \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}^N(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p} \\ &= 2 \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}^N(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p} \lesssim F_N \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant is independent of v , ω , f_1 , and f_2 . Since $|v| \rightarrow 0$ implies $N \rightarrow \infty$, (5.3) and (5.21) imply

$$(5.22) \quad \lim_{|v| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \leq 1}} \Xi_1(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) = 0.$$

Observe that for any $N \geq 2$,

$$(5.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \#\mathcal{D}_\omega(N) &\leq \#\{K \in \mathcal{D}_\omega : 2^{-N} \leq \ell(K) \leq 2^N, K \subset 2^{2N+1}\mathbb{I}\} \\ &\leq \sum_{-N \leq k \leq N} 2^{(2N+1)n} 2^{-kn} \leq 2^{(2N+1)n} 2^{nN+1} = 2^{3nN+n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_2(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) &\leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} \langle |f_1| \rangle_Q \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \sum_{K \in \mathcal{D}_k(Q)} |K|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\tau_v h_K - h_K\|_{L^p} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} |Q|^{-\frac{1}{p}} \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{D}_k(Q)} |v|^{\frac{1}{p}} \ell(K)^{\frac{1}{p}(n-1)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} 2^{kn} 2^{-k \frac{n}{p}} (2^{-k} \ell(Q))^{-\frac{1}{p}} |v|^{\frac{1}{p}} \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \\
&\leq 2^{3nN+n+1} 2^{k(n-\frac{n}{p}+\frac{1}{p})} 2^{\frac{N}{p}} (2^{-j-1} 2^{-aN})^{\frac{1}{p}} \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \\
&\leq 2^{kn+n+1} 2^{\frac{N}{p}(3np+1-a)} \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $a > 3np + 1$, we see that

$$(5.24) \quad \lim_{|v| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \leq 1}} \Xi_2(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) = 0.$$

Therefore, (5.13) is a consequence of (5.19), (5.20), (5.22), and (5.24). \square

Lemma 5.25. *Let $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there holds*

$$\sup_{\mathcal{D}} \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p(w^p)} \lesssim \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1})} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2})},$$

for all $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ and $w = w_1 w_2$.

Proof. By symmetry, it suffices to treat the case $\tilde{h}_I = h_I$. Noting that

$$\langle \Delta_Q^i f, h_I \rangle = \langle f, h_I \rangle \mathbf{1}_{\{I \in \mathcal{D}_i(Q)\}},$$

we have

$$|\langle \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i,j,k}(f_1, f_2), f_3 \rangle| \leq \|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i,k}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^1},$$

where

$$\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i,k}(f_1, f_2, f_3) := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \langle |\Delta_Q^i f_1| \rangle_Q \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \langle |\Delta_Q^k f_3| \rangle_Q \mathbf{1}_Q.$$

By duality and extrapolation [9, Corollary 1.5], we are deduced to showing

$$(5.26) \quad \sup_{\mathcal{D}} \|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i,k}(f_1, f_2, f_3)\|_{L^p(w^p)} \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i\|_{L^{p_i}(w_i^{p_i})},$$

for all $p_1, p_2, p_3 \in (1, \infty)$ and for all $(w_1, w_2, w_3) \in A_{(p_1, p_2, p_3)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{p_3}$ and $w = w_1 w_2 w_3$.

Let $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{p_3}$ with $1 < p, p_1, p_2, p_3 < \infty$, and let $(w_1, w_2, w_3) \in A_{(p_1, p_2, p_3)}$. Write $w = w_1 w_2 w_3$. By extrapolation [9, Corollary 1.5] again, it is enough to prove (5.26) for such exponents (p_1, p_2, p_3) and weights (w_1, w_2, w_3) . Let $p_4 = p'$, $w_4 = w^{-1}$, and $f_4 w_4 \in L^{p_4}$ with $\|f_4 w_4\|_{L^{p_4}} \leq 1$. Observe that

$$(5.27) \quad \langle |\Delta_Q^k f|, \mathbf{1}_Q \rangle = \langle \Delta_Q^k f, \varphi_{Q,f}^k \rangle = \langle f, \Delta_Q^k \varphi_{Q,f}^k \rangle,$$

where $|\varphi_{Q,f}^k| \leq \mathbf{1}_Q$. Setting

$$\Phi_{i,k} := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \langle |\Delta_Q^i f_1| \rangle_Q \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \langle |f_4| \rangle_Q \Delta_Q^k \varphi_{Q,f_3}^k,$$

we use the fact $\Delta_{Q'}^k \Delta_Q^k f = \Delta_Q^k f \mathbf{1}_{\{Q'=Q\}}$ to arrive at

$$S_{\mathcal{D}}^k \Phi_{i,k} \lesssim \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |\langle |\Delta_Q^i f_1| \rangle_Q \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \langle |f_4| \rangle_Q|^2 \mathbf{1}_Q \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which together with (2.9) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i,k}(f_1, f_2, f_3), f_4 \rangle| &\leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \langle |\Delta_Q^i f_1| \rangle_Q \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \langle f_3, \Delta_Q^k \varphi_{Q,f_3}^k \rangle \langle |f_4| \rangle_Q \\
&= \langle f_3 w_3, \Phi_{i,k} w_3^{-1} \rangle \leq \|f_3 w_3\|_{L^{p_3}} \|\Phi_{i,k} w_3^{-1}\|_{L^{p'_3}} \\
&\lesssim \|f_3 w_3\|_{L^{p_3}} \|(S_{\mathcal{D}}^k \Phi_{i,k}) w_3^{-1}\|_{L^{p'_3}} \\
&\lesssim \|f_3 w_3\|_{L^{p_3}} \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |\langle |\Delta_Q^i f_1| \rangle_Q \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \langle |f_4| \rangle_Q|^2 \mathbf{1}_Q \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} w_3^{-1} \right\|_{L^{p'_3}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Fix a sequence of functions $\{f_3^Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ satisfying $\left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |f_3^Q|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{p_3}} \leq 1$. By duality, it suffices to prove

$$(5.28) \quad \mathcal{J} := \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \langle |\Delta_Q^i f_1| \rangle_Q \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \langle |f_4| \rangle_Q \mathbf{1}_Q f_3^Q w_3^{-1} dx \right| \lesssim \prod_{i=1,2,4} \|f_i w_i\|_{L^{p_i}}.$$

By (5.27) and (2.9), there holds

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.29) \quad \mathcal{J} &\leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \langle f_1, \Delta_Q^i \varphi_{Q,f_1}^i \rangle \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \langle |f_4| \rangle_Q \langle |f_3^Q| w_3^{-1} \rangle_Q \\
&=: \langle f_1 w_1, \Phi_i w_1^{-1} \rangle \leq \|f_1 w_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|\Phi_i w_1^{-1}\|_{L^{p'_1}} \\
&\lesssim \|f_1 w_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|(S_{\mathcal{D}}^i \Phi_i) w_1^{-1}\|_{L^{p'_1}},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Phi_i := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \langle |f_3^Q| w_3^{-1} \rangle_Q \langle |f_4| \rangle_Q \Delta_Q^i \varphi_{Q,f_1}^i,$$

and

$$S_{\mathcal{D}}^i \Phi_i \lesssim \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |\langle |f_2| \rangle_Q \langle |f_3^Q| w_3^{-1} \rangle_Q \langle |f_4| \rangle_Q|^2 \mathbf{1}_Q \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{M}(f_2, f_3^Q w_3^{-1}, f_4)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Note that

$$\frac{1}{p'_1} = \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{p_3} + \frac{1}{p_4}, \quad w_1^{-1} = w_2 w_3 w_4, \quad \text{and} \quad (w_2, w_3, w_4) \in A_{(p_2, p_3, p_4)}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.30) \quad \|(S_{\mathcal{D}}^i \Phi_i) w_1^{-1}\|_{L^{p'_1}} &\leq \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{M}(f_2, f_3^Q w_3^{-1}, f_4)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} w_1^{-1} \right\|_{L^{p'_1}} \\
&\lesssim \prod_{i=2,4} \|f_i w_i\|_{L^{p_i}} \times \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} |f_3^Q w_3^{-1}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} w_3 \right\|_{L^{p_3}} \leq \prod_{i=2,4} \|f_i w_i\|_{L^{p_i}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the vector-valued inequality

$$(5.31) \quad \left\| \left(\sum_{k_1, \dots, k_m} |\mathcal{M}(f_1^{k_1}, \dots, f_m^{k_m})|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^r(v^r)} \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^m \left\| \left(\sum_{k_i} |f_i^{k_i}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{r_i}(v_i^{r_i})},$$

for all $\vec{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_m) \in (1, \infty)^m$ and for all $\vec{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_m) \in A_{\vec{r}}$, which follows from [5, Theorem 7.3.1] and [8, Theorem 3.7]. Therefore, (5.28) is a consequence of (5.29) and (5.30). \square

5.2. Weighted compactness of paraproducts.

Theorem 5.32. *For any $\alpha(\omega) := \{\alpha_I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}_\omega}$ satisfying (5.5), bilinear paraproducts $\mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\alpha(\omega)}$, $\mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\alpha(\omega)}^*$, and $\mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\alpha(\omega)}^{*2}$ are compact from $L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2})$ to $L^p(w^p)$ for all $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ and $w = w_1 w_2$.*

Proof. Let $\alpha(\omega) := \{\alpha_I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}_\omega}$ satisfying (5.5). We only present the proof for $\mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\alpha(\omega)}$ because other cases can shown by the same scheme and duality. In view of Lemma 5.42 and [1, Theorem 1.1], it is enough to show that $\mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\alpha(\omega)}$ is compact from $L^4(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^4(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. With Theorem 2.28 in hand, this is reduced to proving that

$$(5.33) \quad \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^4} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^4} \leq 1}} \|\mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\alpha(\omega)}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} \lesssim 1,$$

$$(5.34) \quad \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^4} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^4} \leq 1}} \|\mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\alpha(\omega)}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{|\cdot| > A\}}\|_{L^2} = 0,$$

$$(5.35) \quad \lim_{|v| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^4} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^4} \leq 1}} \|\tau_v \mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\alpha(\omega)}(f_1, f_2) - \mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\alpha(\omega)}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} = 0.$$

Lemma 5.42 gives (5.33) at once.

Denote $\alpha_N := \{\alpha_I \mathbf{1}_{\{I \notin \mathcal{D}(N)\}}\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$. Then

$$(5.36) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\mathcal{D}} \|\alpha_N\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}}} = 0.$$

As did in (5.18), Minkowski's inequality and Lemma 5.42 yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\alpha(\omega)}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{|\cdot| > A\}}\|_{L^2} \leq \mathbb{E}_\omega \|\Pi_{\alpha(\omega)}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{|\cdot| > A\}}\|_{L^2} \\ & = \mathbb{E}_\omega \|\Pi_{\alpha_N(\omega)}(f_1, f_2) \mathbf{1}_{\{|\cdot| > A\}}\|_{L^2} \leq \mathbb{E}_\omega \|\Pi_{\alpha_N(\omega)}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} \\ & \lesssim \mathbb{E}_\omega \|\alpha_N(\omega)\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}}} \|f_1\|_{L^4} \|f_2\|_{L^4} \leq \sup_{\mathcal{D}} \|\alpha_N\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}}} \|f_1\|_{L^4} \|f_2\|_{L^4}, \end{aligned}$$

which together with (5.36) implies (5.34).

To proceed, note that

$$(5.37) \quad \|\tau_v \mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\alpha(\omega)}(f_1, f_2) - \mathbb{E}_\omega \Pi_{\alpha(\omega)}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} \leq \mathbb{E}_\omega \|\tau_v \Pi_{\alpha(\omega)}(f_1, f_2) - \Pi_{\alpha(\omega)}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2}$$

Let $0 < |v| \leq \frac{1}{16}$ and $a \geq 2$ be an integer chosen later. Then there exists an integer $N = N(v) \geq 2$ so that $2^{-a(N+1)} < |v| \leq 2^{-aN}$. We split

$$(5.38) \quad \|\tau_v \Pi_{\alpha(\omega)}(f_1, f_2) - \Pi_{\alpha(\omega)}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} \leq \Upsilon_1(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) + \Upsilon_2(v; \omega, f_1, f_2),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_1(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) &:= \left\| \sum_{I \notin \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} \alpha_I \langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I (\tau_v h_I - h_I) \right\|_{L^2}, \\ \Upsilon_2(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) &:= \left\| \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} \alpha_I \langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I (\tau_v h_I - h_I) \right\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

For the first term, we use Lemma 5.42 to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_1(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) &\leq 2 \left\| \sum_{I \notin \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} \alpha_I \langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I h_I \right\|_{L^2} \\ &= 2 \|\Pi_{\alpha N(\omega)}(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \sup_{\mathcal{D}} \|\alpha_N\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}}} \|f_1\|_{L^4} \|f_2\|_{L^4}, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant is independent of ω . This along with (5.36) gives

$$(5.39) \quad \lim_{|v| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^4} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^4} \leq 1}} \Upsilon_1(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) = 0.$$

To estimate Υ_2 , observe that

$$(5.40) \quad \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_\omega: I \subset Q} |\alpha_I|^2 \leq \|\alpha\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}_\omega}}^2 |Q| \leq \sup_{\mathcal{D}} \|\alpha\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}}}^2 |Q|, \quad \forall Q \in \mathcal{D}_\omega.$$

Then, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (5.23), (5.40), and Lemma 5.48,

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_2(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) &\leq \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} |\alpha_I| |\langle f_1 \rangle_I| |\langle f_2 \rangle_I| \|\tau_v h_I - h_I\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_\omega(N)} |\alpha_I| |\langle f_1 \rangle_I| |\langle f_2 \rangle_I| |v|^{\frac{1}{2}} \ell(I)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq |v|^{\frac{1}{2}} \ell(I)^{-\frac{1}{2}} [\#\mathcal{D}_\omega(N)]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_\omega} |\alpha_I|^2 |\langle f_1 \rangle_I|^2 |\langle f_2 \rangle_I|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq 2^{-a \frac{N}{2}} 2^{\frac{N}{2}} 2^{\frac{1}{2}(3nN+n+1)} \prod_{i=1}^2 \left[\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_\omega} |\alpha_I|^2 |\langle f_i \rangle_I|^4 \right]^{\frac{1}{4}} \\ &\lesssim 2^{\frac{N}{2}(3n+1-a)} \|\alpha\|_{\text{BMO}} \|f_1\|_{L^4} \|f_2\|_{L^4}, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant are independent of v , ω , f_1 , and f_2 . Choosing $a > 3n + 1$, this immediately implies

$$(5.41) \quad \lim_{|v| \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \sup_{\substack{\|f_1\|_{L^4} \leq 1 \\ \|f_2\|_{L^4} \leq 1}} \Upsilon_2(v; \omega, f_1, f_2) = 0.$$

Consequently, (5.35) follows from (5.37)–(5.41). The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 5.42. *For any $\alpha := \{\alpha_I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \in \text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $T_\alpha \in \{\Pi_\alpha, \Pi_\alpha^{*1}, \Pi_\alpha^{*2}\}$, there holds*

$$\|T_\alpha\|_{L^{p_1}(w_1^{p_1}) \times L^{p_2}(w_2^{p_2}) \rightarrow L^p(w^p)} \lesssim \|\alpha\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}}},$$

for all $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ and for all $(w_1, w_2) \in A_{(p_1, p_2)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$, $w = w_1 w_2$, and the implicit constant is independent of b and \mathcal{D} .

Proof. By duality, it suffices to consider Π_α . It follows from [6, Lemma 2.6] that

$$(5.43) \quad |\langle \Pi_\alpha(f_1, f_2), f_3 \rangle| \lesssim \|\alpha\|_{\text{BMO}_{\mathcal{D}}} \|S_{\mathcal{D}} \Phi\|_{L^1},$$

where

$$\Phi := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I \langle f_3, h_I \rangle h_I.$$

Observe that

$$(5.44) \quad S_{\mathcal{D}}\Phi = \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} |\langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I \langle f_3, h_I \rangle|^2 \frac{\mathbf{1}_I}{|I|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} =: \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D}}(f_1, f_2, f_3).$$

By duality, (5.43)–(5.44), and extrapolation theorem [9, Corollary 1.5], we are reduced to proving

$$(5.45) \quad \|\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{D}}(f_1, f_2, f_3) w\|_{L^p} \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i w_i\|_{L^{p_i}}$$

for all $p_1, p_2, p_3 \in (1, \infty)$ and for all $(w_1, w_2, w_3) \in A_{(p_1, p_2, p_3)}$, where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{p_3}$ and $w = w_1 w_2 w_3$.

In view of the multivariable extrapolation theorem in [9, Corollary 1.5], it is enough to show (5.45) in the case $p > 1$. Note that given a sequence of functions $\{a_I(x)\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$, we have

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} |a_I|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} w \right\|_{L^p} = \sup \left\{ \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} a_I b_I w \, dx \right| : \left\| \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} |b_I|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{p'}} \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Fix a sequence of functions $\{f_3^I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$ satisfying $\left\| \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} |f_3^I|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^{p'}} \leq 1$. It suffices to demonstrate

$$\mathcal{J} := \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I \langle f_3, h_I \rangle \mathbf{1}_I |I|^{-\frac{1}{2}} f_3^I w \, dx \right| \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i w_i\|_{L^{p_i}}.$$

By Hölder's inequality,

$$(5.46) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} &= \left| \left\langle f_3 w_3, \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I \langle f_3^I w \rangle_I |I|^{\frac{1}{2}} h_I w_3^{-1} \right\rangle \right| \\ &=: |\langle f_3 w_3, \Psi w_3^{-1} \rangle| \leq \|f_3 w_3\|_{L^{p_3}} \|\Psi w_3^{-1}\|_{L^{p'_3}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$S_{\mathcal{D}}\Psi = \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} |\langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I \langle f_3^I w \rangle_I|^2 \mathbf{1}_I \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2, f_3^I w)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Observe that

$$\frac{1}{p'_3} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{p'}, \quad w_3^{-1} = w_1 w_2 w^{-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad (w_1, w_2, w^{-1}) \in A_{(p_1, p_2, p')}.$$

Then (5.31) implies

$$(5.47) \quad \begin{aligned} \|(S_{\mathcal{D}}\Phi) w_3^{-1}\|_{L^{p'_3}} &\leq \left\| \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{M}(f_1, f_2, f_3^I w)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} w_3^{-1} \right\|_{L^{p'_3}} \\ &\lesssim \|f_1 w_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2 w_2\|_{L^{p_2}} \left\| \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} |f_3^I w|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} w^{-1} \right\|_{L^{p'}} \\ &\leq \|f_1 w_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2 w_2\|_{L^{p_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it follows from (5.46)–(5.47) and (2.9) that

$$\mathcal{J} \leq \|f_3 w_3\|_{L^{p_3}} \|\Phi w_3^{-1}\|_{L^{p'_3}} \lesssim \|f_3 w_3\|_{L^{p_3}} \|(S_{\mathcal{D}}\Phi) w_3^{-1}\|_{L^{p'_3}} \lesssim \prod_{i=1}^3 \|f_i w_i\|_{L^{p_i}}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Let us recall the dyadic Carleson embedding theorem from [7, Theorem 4.5].

Lemma 5.48. *let \mathcal{D} be a dyadic grid. Assume that the nonnegative numbers $\{\alpha_Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}}$ satisfy*

$$\sum_{Q' \in \mathcal{D}: Q' \subset Q} \alpha_{Q'} \leq A |Q|, \quad \forall Q \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Then for all $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha_Q |\langle f \rangle_Q|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq A^{\frac{1}{p}} p' \|f\|_{L^p}.$$

6. A COMPACT BILINEAR REPRESENTATION THEOREM

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 5.7. We will combine the ideas from [2] and [10].

6.1. Initial reductions. By definition and (2.4), we rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T(f_1, f_2), f_3 \rangle &= \mathbb{E}_\omega \sum_{I_1, I_2, I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega} \langle T(\Delta_{I_1} f_1, \Delta_{I_2} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\omega \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega} \sum_{\substack{I_1 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_1)}} \sum_{\substack{I_2 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_2)}} \langle T(\Delta_{I_1} f_1, \Delta_{I_2} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_\omega \sum_{I_2 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega} \sum_{\substack{I_1 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega \\ \ell(I_2) \leq \ell(I_1)}} \sum_{\substack{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega \\ \ell(I_2) < \ell(I_3)}} \langle T(\Delta_{I_1} f_1, \Delta_{I_2} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_\omega \sum_{I_1 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega} \sum_{\substack{I_2 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega \\ \ell(I_1) < \ell(I_2)}} \sum_{\substack{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega \\ \ell(I_1) < \ell(I_3)}} \langle T(\Delta_{I_1} f_1, \Delta_{I_2} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\ &=: \mathcal{S}_1 + \mathcal{S}_2 + \mathcal{S}_3. \end{aligned}$$

Throughout this paper, we only focus on \mathcal{S}_1 since other two terms can be shown with minor modifications. It follows from (2.7) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_1 &= \mathbb{E}_\omega \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_\omega} \langle T(E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_1, E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\omega \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_0} \langle T(E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_1, E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_2), \Delta_{I_3 + \omega} f_3 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathbf{1}_{\text{good}}(I_3 + \omega)$ depends on ω_j for $2^{-j} \geq \ell(I_3)$, while both $E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_1$ and $E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_2$ depend on ω_j for $2^{-j} < \ell(I_3)/2 < \ell(I_3)$, and $\Delta_{I_3 + \omega} f_3$ depends on ω_j for $2^{-j} < \ell(I_3)$. Then using independence, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_1 &= \frac{1}{\pi_{\text{good}}} \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_0} \mathbb{E}_\omega [\mathbf{1}_{\text{good}}(I_3 + \omega)] \mathbb{E}_\omega [\langle T(E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_1, E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_2), \Delta_{I_3 + \omega} f_3 \rangle] \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi_{\text{good}}} \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_0} \mathbb{E}_\omega [\mathbf{1}_{\text{good}}(I_3 + \omega) \langle T(E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_1, E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^\omega f_2), \Delta_{I_3 + \omega} f_3 \rangle] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{\pi_{\text{good}}} \mathbb{E}_{\omega} \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\omega, \text{good}}} \langle T(E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^{\omega} f_1, E_{\ell(I_3)/2}^{\omega} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{\pi_{\text{good}}} \mathbb{E}_{\omega} \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\omega, \text{good}}} \sum_{\substack{I_1 \in \mathcal{D}_{\omega} \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_1)}} \sum_{\substack{I_2 \in \mathcal{D}_{\omega} \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_2)}} \langle T(\Delta_{I_1} f_1, \Delta_{I_2} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\
&=: \frac{1}{\pi_{\text{good}}} \mathbb{E}_{\omega} \mathcal{S}_1(\omega).
\end{aligned}$$

In what follows, fix ω , and let $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_{\omega}$ and $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{S}_1(\omega)$. By (2.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}_1 &= \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{\substack{I_1 \in \mathcal{D} \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_1)}} \sum_{\substack{I_2 \in \mathcal{D} \\ \ell(I_1) \leq \ell(I_2)}} \langle T(\Delta_{I_1} f_1, \Delta_{I_2} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\
&\quad + \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{\substack{I_2 \in \mathcal{D} \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_2)}} \sum_{\substack{I_1 \in \mathcal{D} \\ \ell(I_2) < \ell(I_1)}} \langle T(\Delta_{I_1} f_1, \Delta_{I_2} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\
&= \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{\substack{I_1 \in \mathcal{D} \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_1)}} \langle T(\Delta_{I_1} f_1, E_{\ell(I_1)/2} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\
&\quad + \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{\substack{I_2 \in \mathcal{D} \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_2)}} \langle T(E_{\ell(I_2)} f_1, \Delta_{I_2} f_2), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle \\
&=: \mathcal{S}_{1,1} + \mathcal{S}_{1,2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By symmetry, we will be mainly concerned with the first term $\mathcal{S}_{1,1}$:

$$\mathcal{S}_{1,1} = \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{\substack{I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{D} \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_2) = 2\ell(I_1)}} \langle T(\Delta_{I_1} f_1, \langle f_2 \rangle_{I_2} \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), \Delta_{I_3} f_3 \rangle.$$

Furthermore, we split

$$(6.1) \quad \mathcal{S}_{1,1} = \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^1 + \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^2 + \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}_{1,1}^1 &:= \sum_{\substack{I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{D}, I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}} \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_1) = 2\ell(I_2) \\ \max\{d(I_3, I_1), d(I_3, I_2)\} > 2\ell(I_3)^{\gamma} \ell(I_2)^{1-\gamma}}} \langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1, h_{I_1} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_2}^0 \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle, \\
\mathcal{S}_{1,1}^2 &:= \sum_{\substack{I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{D}, I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}} \\ \ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_1) = 2\ell(I_2) \\ \max\{d(I_3, I_1), d(I_3, I_2)\} \leq 2\ell(I_3)^{\gamma} \ell(I_2)^{1-\gamma} \\ I_3 \cap I_1 = \emptyset \text{ or } I_2 \cap I_1 = \emptyset \text{ or } I_3 = I_1}} \langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1, h_{I_1} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_2}^0 \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle, \\
\mathcal{S}_{1,1}^3 &:= \sum_{\substack{I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{D}, I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}} \\ \ell(I_1) = 2\ell(I_2), I_3 \subset I_2 \subset I_1}} \langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1, h_{I_1} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_2}^0 \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

These three parts are called separated, adjacent, and nested respectively. Recall that we use the ℓ^{∞} metric.

6.2. Separated part. We begin with the term $\mathcal{S}_{1,1}^1$. In the current scenario, by [10, Lemma 4.1], there exists a minimal cube $Q := I_1 \vee I_2 \vee I_3 \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$(6.2) \quad I_1 \cup I_2 \cup I_3 \subset Q \quad \text{and} \quad \max\{d(I_3, I_1), d(I_3, I_2)\} \gtrsim \ell(I_3)^\gamma \ell(Q)^{1-\gamma}.$$

Observe that for all $x \in I_3$, $y \in I_1$, and $z \in I_2$,

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \max\{|x-y|, |x-z|\} &\geq \max\{d(I_3, I_1), d(I_3, I_2)\} \\ &> 2\ell(I_3)^\gamma \ell(I_2)^{1-\gamma} \geq 2^\gamma \ell(I_3) \geq 2^{1+\gamma} |x - c_{I_3}| \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(6.4) \quad \begin{aligned} 1 + \frac{|x+y| + |x+z|}{1 + |x-y| + |x-z|} &\geq \frac{2(|y| + |z|)}{1 + |x-y| + |x-z|} \\ &\geq \frac{4d(Q, \mathbb{I})}{1 + 2\ell(Q)} \geq \frac{d(Q, \mathbb{I})}{\max\{\ell(Q), 1\}} = \text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the monotonicity of F_1 , F_2 , and F_3 , (6.3) and (6.4) yield

$$(6.5) \quad \begin{aligned} F(x, y, z) &:= F_1(|x - c_{I_3}|) F_2(|x - y| + |x - z|) F_3\left(1 + \frac{|x+y| + |x+z|}{1 + |x-y| + |x-z|}\right) \\ &\leq F_1(\ell(I_3)) F_2(\ell(I_3)) F_3(\text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I})) =: F(I_1, I_2, I_3, Q). \end{aligned}$$

In light of (6.2), (6.3), and (6.5), we use the cancellation of h_{I_3} and the Hölder condition of K to deduce

$$(6.6) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle| &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3n}} \frac{F(x, y, z) \ell(I_3)^\delta}{(|x-y| + |x-z|)^{2n+\delta}} |h_{I_1}(y)| |h_{I_2}^0(z)| |h_{I_3}(x)| dx dy dz \\ &\leq \frac{F(I_1, I_2, I_3, Q) \ell(I_3)^\delta}{\max\{d(I_3, I_1), d(I_3, I_2)\}^{2n+\delta}} |I_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C_1 \frac{F(I_1, I_2, I_3, Q) \ell(I_3)^\delta}{[\ell(I_3)^\gamma \ell(Q)^{1-\gamma}]^{2n+\delta}} |I_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= C_1 \left[\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(Q)} \right]^{\frac{\delta}{2}} F(I_1, I_2, I_3, Q) \frac{|I_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $C_0 \in (0, \infty)$ be a universal constant chosen later. Set

$$\alpha_{I_1, I_2, I_3, Q} := \frac{\langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle}{C_0 [\ell(I_3)/\ell(Q)]^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}$$

if $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}$ satisfy $\ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_1) = 2\ell(I_2)$, $\max\{d(I_3, I_1), d(I_3, I_2)\} > 2\ell(I_3)^\gamma \ell(I_2)^{1-\gamma}$, and $I_1 \vee I_2 \vee I_3 = Q$, and otherwise set $\alpha_{I_1, I_2, I_3, Q} = 0$. Note that (6.6) and the condition $(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{F}$ imply (5.2) and (5.3) hold whenever $C_0 \geq C_1$. This enables us to rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^1 &= \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{D}, I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}} \\ \max\{d(I_3, I_1), d(I_3, I_2)\} > 2\ell(I_3)^\gamma \ell(I_2)^{1-\gamma} \\ 2\ell(I_2) = \ell(I_1) = 2^{-i} \ell(Q) \\ \ell(I_3) = 2^{-k} \ell(Q), I_1 \vee I_2 \vee I_3 = Q}} \langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1, h_{I_1} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_2}^0 \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle \\ &= C_0 \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k} 2^{-k\delta/2} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{I_1 \in \mathcal{D}_i(Q) \\ I_2 \in \mathcal{D}_{i+1}(Q) \\ I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_k(Q)}} \alpha_{I_1, I_2, I_3, Q} \langle f_1, h_{I_1} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_2}^0 \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$= C_0 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^k 2^{-k\delta/2} \langle \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{D}}^{i,i+1,k}, f_3 \rangle.$$

6.3. Adjacent part. In this case, by [10, Lemma 4.3], there exists a minimal cube $Q := I_1 \vee I_2 \vee I_3 \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$(6.7) \quad I_1 \cup I_2 \cup I_3 \subset Q \quad \text{and} \quad \ell(Q) \leq 2^r \ell(I_3).$$

We would like to prove

$$(6.8) \quad |\langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle| \leq C_2 \left[\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(Q)} \right]^{\frac{\delta}{2}} F(I_1, I_2, I_3, Q) \frac{|I_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^2},$$

where $F(I_1, I_2, I_3, Q) := F(I_2)$ if $I_3 = I_1$ and $I_2 \in \text{ch}(I_3)$, otherwise

$$F(I_1, I_2, I_3, Q) := F_1(\ell(I_3)) \tilde{F}_2(\ell(I_3)) F_3(\text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I})).$$

Henceforth, denote

$$\tilde{F}_2(t) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k\theta_2} F_2(2^{-k}t),$$

where the parameter $\theta_2 \in (0, 1)$ is harmless and small enough.

First, consider the case $I_3 \cap I_1 = \emptyset$. In this case, $d(I_3, I_1) \leq 2\ell(I_3)^\gamma \ell(I_2)^{1-\gamma} \leq 2\ell(I_1)$, and hence, $I_3 \subset 7I_1 \setminus I_1$. Then the size condition gives

$$(6.9) \quad |\langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle| \leq |I_1|^{-\frac{1}{2}} |I_2|^{-\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{I_2} \int_{I_1} \int_{I_3} \frac{F(x, y, z) dx dy dz}{(|x-y| + |x-z|)^{2n}},$$

where

$$F(x, y, z) := F_1(|x-y| + |x-z|) F_2(|x-y| + |x-z|) F_3 \left(1 + \frac{|x+y| + |x+z|}{1 + |x-y| + |x-z|} \right).$$

Let $\beta \in (0, 1)$ be an auxiliary parameter. Note that for any $x \in I_3$, we have $I_2 - x \subset \{|z| \leq \ell(Q)\}$ and

$$(6.10) \quad \int_{I_2} \frac{dz}{|x-z|^{n-\beta}} = \int_{I_2-x} \frac{dz}{|z|^{n-\beta}} \lesssim \int_0^{\ell(Q)} t^{\beta-1} dt \lesssim \ell(Q)^\beta.$$

Additionally, given $q \in (1, \frac{n+1}{n+\beta})$, Lemma 3.14 yields

$$(6.11) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{I_1} \int_{7I_1 \setminus I_1} \frac{F_2(|x-y|)}{|x-y|^{n+\beta}} dx dy \\ & \leq \left[\int_{I_1} \int_{7I_1 \setminus I_1} \frac{dx dy}{|x-y|^{q(n+\beta)}} \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \left[\int_{I_1} \int_{7I_1 \setminus I_1} F_2(|x-y|)^{q'} dx dy \right]^{\frac{1}{q'}} \\ & \lesssim |I_1|^{\frac{2}{q}-1-\frac{\beta}{n}} \tilde{F}_2(\ell(I_1)) |I_1|^{\frac{2}{q}} \leq \tilde{F}_2(\ell(I_3)) |I_1| \ell(I_1)^{-\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

and for all $(x, y, z) \in I_3 \times I_1 \times I_2$, $|x-y| + |x-z| \leq 2\ell(Q) \leq 2^{r+1}\ell(I_3)$ and

$$(6.12) \quad \begin{aligned} 1 + \frac{|x+y| + |x+z|}{1 + |x-y| + |x-z|} & \geq \frac{2(|y| + |z|)}{1 + |x-y| + |x-z|} \\ & \geq \frac{4d(Q, \mathbb{I})}{1 + 2\ell(Q)} \geq \frac{d(Q, \mathbb{I})}{\max\{\ell(Q), 1\}} = \text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, invoking (6.7)–(6.12), we arrive at

$$(6.13) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle| &\lesssim |I_1|^{-\frac{1}{2}} |I_2|^{-\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{-\frac{1}{2}} F_1(\ell(I_3)) F_3(\text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I})) \\ &\quad \times \int_{I_1} \int_{7I_1 \setminus I_1} \frac{F_2(|x-y|)}{|x-y|^{n+\beta}} \left(\int_{I_2} \frac{dz}{|x-z|^{n-\beta}} \right) dx dy \\ &\lesssim F_1(\ell(I_3)) \tilde{F}_2(\ell(I_3)) F_3(\text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I})) \frac{|I_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|Q|^2} \left(\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

In the same way, we have the same bound in the case $I_3 \cap I_2 = \emptyset$.

Next, we treat the case $I_3 \cap I_2 \neq \emptyset$ and $I_3 = I_1$. Obviously, $I_2 \in \text{ch}(I_3)$. Then we rewrite

$$(6.14) \quad \langle T(h_{I_3}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle = \sum_{I'_3, I''_3 \in \text{ch}(I_3)} \langle h_{I_3} \rangle_{I'_3} \langle h_{I_3} \rangle_{I''_3} |I_2|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle T(\mathbf{1}_{I'_3}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), \mathbf{1}_{I''_3} \rangle.$$

If $I'_3 = I_2 = I''_3$, the weak compactness property implies

$$(6.15) \quad |\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{I_2}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), \mathbf{1}_{I_2} \rangle| \leq F(I_2) |I_2|.$$

If $I'_3 \neq I_2$, then $I'_3 \subset 3I_2 \setminus I_2$, which is similar to the case $I_3 \cap I_1 = \emptyset$. As in (6.13), there holds

$$(6.16) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{I'_3}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), \mathbf{1}_{I''_3} \rangle| &\lesssim F_1(\ell(I''_3)) \tilde{F}_2(\ell(I'_3)) F_3(\text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I})) \frac{|I'_3| |I_2| |I''_3|}{|Q|^2} \left(\frac{\ell(I''_3)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{\frac{\delta}{2}} \\ &\lesssim F_1(\ell(I_3)) \tilde{F}_2(\ell(I_3)) F_3(\text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I})) \frac{|I_1| |I_2| |I_3|}{|Q|^2} \left(\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, in the case $I'_3 \neq I_2$, one has

$$(6.17) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{I'_3}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), \mathbf{1}_{I''_3} \rangle| &= |\langle T^{*1}(\mathbf{1}_{I''_3}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), \mathbf{1}_{I'_3} \rangle| \\ &\lesssim F_1(\ell(I_3)) \tilde{F}_2(\ell(I_3)) F_3(\text{rd}(Q, \mathbb{I})) \frac{|I_1| |I_2| |I_3|}{|Q|^2} \left(\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Gathering (6.14)–(6.17), we obtain (6.8).

Set

$$\alpha_{I_1, I_2, I_3, Q} := \frac{\langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle}{C_0 [\ell(I_3)/\ell(Q)]^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}$$

if $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}$ satisfy $\ell(I_3) \leq \ell(I_1) = 2\ell(I_2)$, $\max\{\text{d}(I_3, I_1) \text{d}(I_3, I_2)\} \leq 2\ell(I_3)^\gamma \ell(I_2)^{1-\gamma}$, and $I_3 \cap I_1 = \emptyset$ or $I_2 \cap I_1 = \emptyset$ or $I_3 = I_1$, and otherwise set $\alpha_{I_1, I_2, I_3, Q} = 0$. By (6.8) and that $(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{F}$, we see that (5.2) and (5.3) hold whenever $C_0 \geq \max\{C_1, C_2\}$. Thus, in light of (6.7) and (6.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^2 &= \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k \leq r} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{D}, I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}} \\ \max\{\text{d}(I_3, I_1), \text{d}(I_3, I_2)\} \leq 2\ell(I_3)^\gamma \ell(I_2)^{1-\gamma} \\ I_3 \cap I_1 = \emptyset \text{ or } I_2 \cap I_1 = \emptyset \text{ or } I_3 = I_1 \\ 2\ell(I_2) = \ell(I_1) = 2^{-i} \ell(Q) \\ \ell(I_3) = 2^{-k} \ell(Q), I_1 \vee I_2 \vee I_3 = Q}} \langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1, h_{I_1} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_2}^0 \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle \\ &= C_0 \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k \leq r} 2^{-k\delta/2} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{I_1 \in \mathcal{D}_i(Q) \\ I_2 \in \mathcal{D}_{i+1}(Q) \\ I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_k(Q)}} \alpha_{I_1, I_2, I_3, Q} \langle f_1, h_{I_1} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_2}^0 \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$= C_0 \sum_{k=0}^r \sum_{i=0}^k 2^{-k\delta/2} \langle \mathbf{S}_D^{i,i+1,k}, f_3 \rangle.$$

6.4. Nested part. By definition, there holds

$$\mathcal{S}_{1,1}^3 = \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{I_2 \supset I_3} \langle T(h_{I_2^{(1)}}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1, h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_2}^0 \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle.$$

We begin with the decomposition

$$\langle T(h_{I_2^{(1)}}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle = \langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2} \langle T(1, 1), h_{I_3} \rangle - \langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2} \langle T(1, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle + \langle T(\phi_{I_2}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle,$$

where $\phi_{I_2} := \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}(h_{I_2^{(1)}} - \langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2})$. This allows us to write

$$(6.18) \quad \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^3 = \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,1} - \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,2} + \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,3},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,1} &:= \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{I_2 \supset I_3} \langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2} \langle T(1, 1), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1, h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle \langle f_2 \rangle_{I_2} \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle, \\ \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,2} &:= \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{I_2 \supset I_3} \langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2} \langle T(1, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1, h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle \langle f_2 \rangle_{I_2} \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle, \\ \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,3} &:= \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{I_2 \supset I_3} \langle T(\phi_{I_2}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1, h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle \langle f_2 \rangle_{I_2} \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, considering $\mathcal{S}_{1,2}$, we obtain the corresponding paraproduct term

$$\mathcal{S}_{1,2}^{3,1} := \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \sum_{I_2 \supset I_3} \langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2} \langle T(1, 1), h_{I_3} \rangle \langle f_1 \rangle_{I_2^{(1)}} \langle f_2, h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle.$$

Note that

$$\langle f, h_{I^{(1)}} \rangle \langle h_{I^{(1)}} \rangle_I = \langle f \rangle_I - \langle f \rangle_{I^{(1)}},$$

which gives

$$\langle f_1, h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle \langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2} \langle f_2 \rangle_{I_2} + \langle f_1 \rangle_{I_2^{(1)}} \langle f_2, h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle \langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2} = \langle f_1 \rangle_{I_2} \langle f_2 \rangle_{I_2} - \langle f_1 \rangle_{I_2^{(1)}} \langle f_2 \rangle_{I_2^{(1)}}.$$

Hence, this leads to

$$(6.19) \quad \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,1} + \mathcal{S}_{1,2}^{3,1} = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}} \langle T(1, 1), h_I \rangle \langle f_1 \rangle_I \langle f_2 \rangle_I \langle f_3, h_I \rangle = \langle \Pi_\alpha(f_1, f_2), f_3 \rangle,$$

where we set

$$\alpha_I = \frac{\langle T(1, 1), h_I \rangle}{\|T(1, 1)\|_{\text{BMO}}}, \quad \text{if } I \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}},$$

otherwise set $\alpha_I = 0$. Then the fact $T(1, 1) \in \text{CMO}$ implies $\alpha := \{\alpha_I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$ satisfies both (5.4) and (5.5).

To analyze $\mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,2}$, we claim that

$$(6.20) \quad |\langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2} \langle T(1, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle| \leq C_3 \left[\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(I_2)} \right]^{\frac{\delta}{2}} F(I_2, I_3) |I_2|^{-\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where

$$(6.21) \quad F(I_2, I_3) := F_1(\ell(I_3)) \tilde{F}_2(\ell(I_3)) \tilde{F}_3(I_2).$$

Here and elsewhere, define

$$\tilde{F}_3(I) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k\theta_3} F_3(\text{rd}(2^k I, \mathbb{I})),$$

where the parameter $\theta_3 \in (0, 1)$ is harmless and small enough. Indeed, if $\ell(I_2) > 2^r \ell(I_3)$, then for all $x \in I_3$ and $z \in I_2^c$, the goodness of I_3 yields

$$(6.22) \quad |x - z| \geq d(I_3, I_2^c) > 2\ell(I_3)^\gamma \ell(I_2)^{1-\gamma} \geq \ell(I_3)^{\frac{1}{2}} \ell(I_2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq \ell(I_3) \geq 2|x - c_{I_3}|,$$

which together with the Hölder condition of K implies

$$(6.23) \quad |\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{3I_3}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle| \leq |I_3|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{I_2^c} \int_{3I_3} \int_{I_3} \frac{F(x, y, z) \ell(I_3)^\delta}{(|x - y| + |x - z|)^{2n+\delta}} dx dy dz,$$

where

$$F(x, y, z) := F_1(|x - c_{I_3}|) F_2(|x - y| + |x - z|) F_3 \left(1 + \frac{|x + y| + |x + z|}{1 + |x - y| + |x - z|} \right).$$

The inequality (6.10) gives

$$(6.24) \quad \int_{3I_3} \frac{dy}{|x - y|^{n-\beta}} \lesssim \ell(I_3)^\beta, \quad x \in I_3,$$

and for any $\alpha > 0$ and $\ell := \ell(I_3)^{\frac{1}{2}} \ell(I_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$,

$$(6.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi(\alpha) &:= \int_{I_3} \int_{|x-z| \geq \ell} F_3 \left(\frac{4|x|}{1 + |x - z|} \right) \frac{dz dx}{|x - z|^{n+\alpha}} \\ &\leq \sum_{k \geq 0} \int_{I_3} \int_{2^k \ell \leq |x-z| < 2^{k+1} \ell} (2^k \ell)^{-n-\alpha} F_3(\text{rd}(2^k I_2, \mathbb{I})) dz dx \\ &\lesssim |I_3| [\ell(I_3)^{\frac{1}{2}} \ell(I_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}]^{-\alpha} \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{-k\alpha} F_3(\text{rd}(2^k I_2, \mathbb{I})) \end{aligned}$$

provided that for all $x \in I_3$ and $2^k \ell \leq |x - z| < 2^{k+1} \ell$,

$$\frac{4|x|}{1 + |x - z|} \geq \frac{4d(2^k I_2, 0)}{1 + 2^{k+1} \ell(I_2)} \geq \frac{d(2^k I_2, 0)}{\max\{2^k \ell(I_2), 1\}} = \text{rd}(2^k I_2, \mathbb{I}).$$

Then it follows from (6.22)–(6.25) that

$$(6.26) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{3I_3}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle| &\lesssim F_1(\ell(I_3)) F_2(\ell(I_3)) |I_3|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \ell(I_3)^{\delta+\beta} \psi(\delta + \beta) \\ &\lesssim F_1(\ell(I_3)) F_2(\ell(I_3)) \tilde{F}_3(I_2) |I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(I_2)} \right)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Much as above, using the estimate

$$\int_{I_2^c} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{n+\frac{\delta}{2}}} \leq \int_{|x-z| \geq \ell} \frac{dz}{|x - z|^{n+\frac{\delta}{2}}} \lesssim \ell^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}, \quad x \in I_3,$$

we obtain

$$(6.27) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{(3I_3)^c}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle| &\lesssim F_1(\ell(I_3)) F_2(\ell(I_3)) |I_3|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \ell(I_3)^\delta \ell^{-\frac{\delta}{2}} \psi(\delta/2) \\ &\lesssim F_1(\ell(I_3)) F_2(\ell(I_3)) \tilde{F}_3(I_2) |I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(I_2)} \right)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (6.26) and (6.27) give (6.20) in the case $\ell(I_2) > 2^r \ell(I_3)$.

To treat the case $\ell(I_2) \leq 2^r \ell(I_3)$, we split

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T(1, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle &= \langle T(\mathbf{1}_{3I_3}, \mathbf{1}_{3I_2 \setminus I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle + \langle T(\mathbf{1}_{3I_3}, \mathbf{1}_{(3I_2)^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle T(\mathbf{1}_{(3I_3)^c}, \mathbf{1}_{3I_2 \setminus I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle + \langle T(\mathbf{1}_{(3I_3)^c}, \mathbf{1}_{(3I_2)^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The first term is similar to $\langle T(h_{I_1}, h_{I_2}^0), h_{I_3} \rangle$ in the case $I_3 \cap I_2 = \emptyset$ in Section 6.3, which along with (6.8) yields the desired bound. The second and third terms are symmetric, while the estimates for the second and last terms are analogous to (6.26) and (6.27) respectively, but now ℓ is replaced by $\ell(I_3)$. Eventually, both are dominated by $F_1(\ell(I_3))F_2(\ell(I_3))\tilde{F}_3(I_2)|I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}}$, which together with $\ell(I_2) \simeq \ell(I_3)$ gives the estimate as desired. This shows (6.20) in the case $\ell(I_2) \leq 2^r \ell(I_3)$.

For $\mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,3}$, we have

$$(6.28) \quad |\langle T(\phi_{I_2}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle| \leq C_4 \left[\frac{\ell(I_3)}{\ell(I_2)} \right]^{\frac{\delta}{2}} F(I_2, I_3) |I_2|^{-\frac{1}{2}} |I_3|^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $F(I_2, I_3)$ is defined in (6.21). Indeed, in the case $\ell(I_2) > 2^r \ell(I_3)$, it is similar to $\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{3I_3}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle$. If $\ell(I_2) \leq 2^r \ell(I_3)$, we split

$$\langle T(\phi_{I_2}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle = \langle T(\phi_{I_2} \mathbf{1}_{3I_2 \setminus I_2}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle + \langle T(\phi_{I_2} \mathbf{1}_{(3I_2)^c}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle,$$

where the last two terms are similar to $\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{3I_3}, \mathbf{1}_{3I_2 \setminus I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle$ and $\langle T(\mathbf{1}_{3I_3}, \mathbf{1}_{(3I_2)^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle$ respectively.

Now set

$$\alpha_{I_2, I_3} := \frac{\langle h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle_{I_2} \langle T(1, \mathbf{1}_{I_2^c}), h_{I_3} \rangle + \langle T(\phi_{I_2}, \mathbf{1}_{I_2}), h_{I_3} \rangle}{C_0 [\ell(I_3)/\ell(I_2)]^{\frac{\delta}{2}}}$$

if $I_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{good}}$ satisfy $I_3 \subset I_2$, and otherwise set $\alpha_{I_2, I_3} = 0$. The estimates (6.20) and (6.28) and that $(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathcal{F}$ imply both (5.2) and (5.3) hold whenever $C_0 \geq \max\{C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4\}$. Consequently, by (6.20) and (6.28), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,2} + \mathcal{S}_{1,1}^{3,3} &= C_0 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k\delta/2} \sum_{I_2 \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{I_3 \in \mathcal{D}_k(I_2)} \alpha_{I_2, I_3} \langle f_1, h_{I_2^{(1)}} \rangle \langle f_2, h_{I_2}^0 \rangle \langle f_3, h_{I_3} \rangle \\ &= C_0 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-k\delta/2} \langle \mathbf{S}_D^{0,1,k}, f_3 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

For the remaining terms, one can obtain the corresponding dyadic shifts symmetrically and similarly. To guarantee (5.2) holds, choose C_0 to be the largest one of finite bounds C_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots$. Collecting all parts together, we conclude the proof of the compact dyadic representation theorem.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Cao, A. Olivo, and K. Yabuta, *Extrapolation for multilinear compact operators and applications*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **375** (2022), 5011–5070.
- [2] M. Cao, K. Yabuta, and D. Yang, *A compact extension of Journé’s T1 theorem on product spaces*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.10965>.
- [3] C. Fefferman and E.M. Stein, *H^p spaces of several variables*, Acta Math. **129** (1972), 137–193.
- [4] H. Gu, Q. Xue, and K. Yabuta, *On some properties of dyadic operators*, Taiwanese J. Math. **26** (2022), 521–544.
- [5] L. Grafakos, *Modern Fourier Analysis*, Third edition. GTM, 250. Springer, New York, 2014.

- [6] I. Holmes, M.T. Lacey, and B.D. Wick, *Commutators in the two-weight setting*, Math. Ann. **367** (2017), 51–80.
- [7] T.P. Hytönen and C. Pérez, *Sharp weighted bounds involving A_∞* , Anal. PDE **6** (2013), 777–818.
- [8] A.K. Lerner, S. Ombrosi, C. Pérez, R.H. Torres, and R. Trujillo-González, *New maximal functions and multiple weights for the multilinear Calderón–Zygmund theory*, Adv. Math. **220** (2009), 1222–1264.
- [9] K. Li, J.M. Martell, and S. Ombrosi, *Extrapolation for multilinear Muckenhoupt classes and applications*, Adv. Math. **373** (2020), 107286.
- [10] K. Li, H. Martikainen, Y. Ou, and E. Vuorinen, *Bilinear representation theorem*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **371** (2019), 4193–4214.
- [11] M. Wilson, *Weighted Littlewood–Paley Theory and Exponential-Square Integrability*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1924, Springer, Berlin, 2008.

MINGMING CAO, INSTITUTO DE CIENCIAS MATEMÁTICAS CSIC-UAM-UC3M-UCM, CONSEJO SUPERIOR DE INVESTIGACIONES CIENTÍFICAS, C/ NICOLÁS CABRERA, 13-15, E-28049 MADRID, SPAIN

Email address: mingming.cao@icmat.es

HONGHAI LIU, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATION SCIENCE, HENAN POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, JIAOZUO 454000, PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Email address: hhliu@hpu.edu.cn

ZENGYAN SI, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATION SCIENCE, HENAN POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, JIAOZUO 454000, PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Email address: zengyan@hpu.edu.cn

KÔZÔ YABUTA, RESEARCH CENTER FOR MATHEMATICS AND DATA SCIENCE, KWANSEI GAKUIN UNIVERSITY, GAKUEN 2-1, SANDA 669-1337, JAPAN

Email address: kyabuta3@kwansei.ac.jp