

1-1-2005

## Maximal Oscillatory Singular Integrals with Kernels in $L \log L(S^{n-1})$

AHMAD AL-SALMAN

Follow this and additional works at: <https://journals.tubitak.gov.tr/math>



Part of the [Mathematics Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

AL-SALMAN, AHMAD (2005) "Maximal Oscillatory Singular Integrals with Kernels in  $L \log L(S^{n-1})$ ," *Turkish Journal of Mathematics*: Vol. 29: No. 3, Article 5. Available at: <https://journals.tubitak.gov.tr/math/vol29/iss3/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by TÜBİTAK Academic Journals. It has been accepted for inclusion in Turkish Journal of Mathematics by an authorized editor of TÜBİTAK Academic Journals. For more information, please contact [academic.publications@tubitak.gov.tr](mailto:academic.publications@tubitak.gov.tr).

## Maximal Oscillatory Singular Integrals with Kernels in $L \log L(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$

*Ahmad Al-Salman*

### Abstract

In this paper, we study the  $L^p$  mapping properties of a certain class of maximal oscillatory singular integral operators. We establish the  $L^p$  boundedness of our operators provided that their kernels belong to the natural space  $L \log^+ L(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$ . Our result substantially improves a previously known result. Moreover, the approach developed in this paper can be applied to handle more general maximal oscillatory singular integral operators.

**Key Words:** Oscillatory singular integrals, Rough kernels, Maximal functions.

### 1. Introduction and statement of Results

Let  $\mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $n \geq 2$  be the  $n$ -dimensional Euclidean space and  $\mathbf{S}^{n-1}$  be the unit sphere in  $\mathbf{R}^n$  equipped with the normalized Lebesgue measure  $d\sigma$ . For nonzero  $y \in \mathbf{R}^n$ , we shall let  $y' = |y|^{-1}y$ . Let  $\Omega \in L^1(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$  be a homogeneous function of degree zero on  $\mathbf{R}^n$  which satisfies the cancellation property

$$\int_{\mathbf{S}^{n-1}} \Omega(y') d\sigma(y') = 0. \quad (1.1)$$

For suitable mappings  $\mathcal{P}(y) : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^d$  and  $\Phi : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ , define the oscillatory singular integral operator  $T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}$  and the maximal oscillatory singular integral operator  $T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^*$

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification:* Primary 42B20; Secondary 42B15, 42B25

(initially for  $C_0^\infty$  functions on  $\mathbf{R}^d$ ) by

$$T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}(f)(x) = \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} e^{i\Phi(y)} f(x - \mathcal{P}(y)) \Omega(y') |y|^{-n} dy \tag{1.2}$$

$$T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^*(f)(x) = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \left| T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^\varepsilon(f)(x) \right|, \tag{1.3}$$

where

$$T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^\varepsilon(f)(x) = \int_{|y| > \varepsilon} e^{i\Phi(y)} f(x - \mathcal{P}(y)) \Omega(y') |y|^{-n} dy.$$

It is clear that if  $\Phi(y) = 0$  and  $\mathcal{P}(y) = y$ , then the operators  $T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}$  and  $T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^*$  are the classical Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator and the maximal singular integral operator respectively. When  $\Phi(y) = 0$  and  $\mathcal{P}(y) = y$ , we shall simply let  $T_\Omega = T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}$  and  $T_\Omega^* = T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^*$ . In their fundamental work on singular integrals, Calderón and Zygmund established the  $L^p$  boundedness of the operators  $\mathbf{T}_\Omega$  and  $T_\Omega^*$  for  $1 < p < \infty$  under the condition that  $\Omega \in L \log^+ L(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$ , i.e.

$$\int_{\mathbf{S}^{n-1}} \left| \Omega(y') \right| \log^+ \left| \Omega(y') \right| d\sigma(y') < \infty. \tag{1.4}$$

The condition in the form that  $\Omega \in L \log^+ L(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$  turns out to be the most desirable size condition for the  $L^p$  boundedness of  $\mathbf{T}_\Omega$  to hold. In fact, Calderón and Zygmund ([4], [5]) showed that  $\mathbf{T}_\Omega$  may fail to be bounded on  $L^p$  for any  $p$  if the condition  $\Omega \in L \log^+ L(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$  is replaced by any condition  $\Omega \in L(\log^+ L)^{1-\varepsilon}(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ . It is worth pointing out that the space  $L \log L(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$  contains the space  $L^q(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$  (for any  $q > 1$ ) properly.

When  $\Phi(y) = 0$ , the  $L^p$  boundedness properties of the operators (1.2)-(1.3) are well understood ([16], [18]; see also [2], [8], among others). However, for general mappings  $\Phi$  and  $\mathcal{P}$ , the problem regarding the  $L^p$  boundedness of the corresponding operators  $T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}$  and  $T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^*$  is still under investigation ([1], [3], [12], [13], [14], [15]).

It should be pointed out that the boundedness of the operators  $T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^*$  imply the boundedness of the corresponding operators  $T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}$ . In fact, establishing the a-priori bound  $\|T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^* f\|_p \leq C \|f\|_p$  with constant  $C$  independent of  $f \in L^p$ , implies that for any  $f \in L^p$ ,  $T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^\varepsilon(f)$  converges (to  $T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}(f)$ ) almost everywhere as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ . Hence, the boundedness of  $T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}$  follows by an application of Fatou's lemma. For the significance

of studying maximal operators of the form (1.3), we advice the reader to consult ([16], [17], [18], [19], among others).

In this paper, we focus our attention on studying the  $L^p$  mapping properties of a class of the maximal operators  $T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^*$ . More specifically, in [10], Fan and Yang studied the operators  $T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^*$  under the conditions that  $\mathcal{P}(y) = (P_1, \dots, P_d)$  where each  $P_j$  is a real valued polynomial and  $\Phi$  is a homogeneous function that satisfies

$$\Phi(ty') = t^\beta \Phi(y') \text{ for } t > 0, \tag{1.5}$$

$$\Phi(y') \in L^\infty(\mathbf{S}^{n-1}), \text{ and } \int_{\mathbf{S}^{n-1}} |\Phi(y')|^{-\delta} d\sigma(y') < \infty, \tag{1.6}$$

for some  $\delta > 0$  and for some  $\beta \neq 0$ . Fan and Yang proved the following theorem.

**Theorem A** ([10]). *Suppose that  $\Omega$  is a homogeneous function of degree zero on  $\mathbf{R}^n$  that satisfies (1.1) and that  $\Omega \in L^q(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$  for some  $q > 1$ . Suppose also that  $\mathcal{P}(y) = (P_1, \dots, P_d)$  is a polynomial mapping. If  $\Phi$  is a homogeneous function that satisfies (1.5)-(1.6) with either the index  $\beta \neq 0$  is not a positive integer or  $\beta$  is a positive integer larger than  $\max\{\deg(P_j) : 1 \leq j \leq d\}$ , then the operator  $T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^*$  is bounded on  $L^p$  for all  $1 < p < \infty$ . Moreover, the operator norm is independent of the coefficients of the polynomial mappings  $\{P_j : 1 \leq j \leq d\}$ .*

Since, by Calderón-Zygmund’s result discussed above, the natural condition to impose on the function  $\Omega$  is that  $\Omega \in L \log^+ L(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$ , the following question naturally arises.

**Question.** *Suppose that  $\Omega$  is a homogeneous function of degree zero on  $\mathbf{R}^n$  that satisfies (1.1). Suppose also that  $\mathcal{P}$ ,  $\Phi$ , and  $T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^*$  are as in Theorem A. Does the result of Theorem A still hold if the condition  $\Omega \in L^q(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$  for some  $q > 1$  is replaced by the weakest and more natural condition  $\Omega \in L \log^+ L(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$ ?*

In this paper, we shall answer this question in the affirmative. In fact, we have the following theorem.

**Theorem B** *Suppose that  $\Omega$  is a homogeneous function of degree zero on  $\mathbf{R}^n$  that satisfies (1.1) and that  $\Omega \in L \log^+ L(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$ . Suppose also that  $\mathcal{P}(y) = (P_1, \dots, P_d)$  is a polynomial mapping. If  $\Phi$  is a homogeneous function that satisfies (1.5)–(1.6) with either the index  $\beta \neq 0$  is not a positive integer or  $\beta$  is a positive integer larger than  $\max\{\deg(P_j) : 1 \leq j \leq d\}$ , then the operator  $T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^*$  is bounded on  $L^p$  for all  $1 < p < \infty$ .*

Moreover, the operator norm is independent of the coefficients of the polynomial mappings  $\{P_j : 1 \leq j \leq d\}$ .

Throughout this paper the letter  $C$  will denote a constant that may vary at each occurrence, but it is independent of the essential variables. For a set  $A$ , we let  $\chi_A$  denote the characteristic function of  $A$ .

Finally, the author would like to thank the referee for his/her valuable remarks.

## 2. Some Lemmas

We shall begin by recalling the following result in [9]:

**Lemma 2.1** ([9]). *Let  $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_d)$  be a polynomial mapping from  $\mathbf{R}^n$  into  $\mathbf{R}^d$ . Suppose  $\Omega \in L^1(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$  and*

$$\mu_{\Omega, \mathcal{P}} f(x) = \sup_{j \in \mathbf{Z}} \int_{2^j \leq |y| < 2^{(j+1)}} |f(x - \mathcal{P}(y))| |y|^{-n} |\Omega(y')| dy.$$

Then for  $1 < p \leq \infty$  there exists a constant  $C_p > 0$  independent of  $\Omega$ , and the coefficients of  $P_1, \dots, P_d$  such that

$$\|\mu_{\Omega, \mathcal{P}} f\|_p \leq C_p \|\Omega\|_{L^1(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})} \|f\|_p$$

for every  $f \in L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ .

The following lemma will be useful in handling the needed oscillatory integrals:

**Lemma 2.2** (van der Corput [18]). *Suppose  $\phi$  is real-valued and smooth in  $(a, b)$ , and that  $|\phi^{(k)}(t)| \geq 1$  for all  $t \in (a, b)$ . Then the inequality*

$$\left| \int_a^b e^{-i\lambda\phi(t)} \psi(t) dt \right| \leq C_k |\lambda|^{-\frac{1}{k}}$$

holds when:

- (i)  $k \geq 2$ , or
- (ii)  $k = 1$  and  $\phi'$  is monotonic.

The bound  $C_k$  is independent of  $a, b, \phi$ , and  $\lambda$ .

We now prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.3** *Let  $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_d)$  be a polynomial mapping from  $\mathbf{R}^n$  into  $\mathbf{R}^d$ . Suppose  $m \in \mathbf{N}$ ,  $\Omega \in L^1(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$ , and  $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$  is a homogeneous function of degree  $\beta \neq 0$ . Let*

$$\begin{aligned} D^{(1,m)} &= \{y \in \mathbf{R}^n : |y| > 2^{2m}\}, \\ D^{(2,m)} &= \{y \in \mathbf{R}^n : |y| < 2^{2m}\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$D^{(0,m)} = \{y \in \mathbf{R}^n : 1 \leq |y| < 2^{2m}\}.$$

Let  $M_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^{(0)}$ ,  $M_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^{(1)}$ , and  $M_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^{(2)}$  be the operators given by

$$M_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^{(0)}(f)(x) = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \left| \int_{|y| > \varepsilon} e^{i\Phi(y)} f(x - \mathcal{P}(y)) |y|^{-n} \Omega(y') \chi_{D^{(0,m)}} \right| dy$$

and

$$M_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^{(i)}(f)(x) = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \left| \int_{|y| > \varepsilon} (e^{i\Phi(y)} - 1) f(x - \mathcal{P}(y)) |y|^{-n} \Omega(y') \chi_{D^{(i,m)}} \right| dy,$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . Then for all  $1 < p < \infty$  there exists a constant  $C_p > 0$  independent of  $\Omega$  and  $m$  such that

$$\left\| M_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^{(i)}(f) \right\|_p \leq m \|\Omega\|_{L^1(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})} C_p \|f\|_p \tag{2.1}$$

for  $i = 0, 1, 2$  with  $\beta < 0$  for  $i = 1$  and  $\beta > 0$  for  $i = 2$ .

**Proof.** We start by proving (2.1) for  $i = 0$ . Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^{(0)}(f)(x) &\leq \int_{1 \leq |y| < 2^{2m}} \left| \Omega(y') \right| |y|^{-n} |f(x - \mathcal{P}(y))| dy \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{2m-1} \left\{ \int_{2^l \leq |y| < 2^{l+1}} \left| \Omega(y') \right| |y|^{-n} |f(x - \mathcal{P}(y))| dy \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{l=0}^{2m-1} \mu_{\Omega, \mathcal{P}} f(x) = 2m \mu_{\Omega, \mathcal{P}} f(x), \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where  $\mu_{\Omega, \mathcal{P}} f$  is the operator given in Lemma 2.1. Hence (2.1) for  $i = 0$  follows by (2.2) and Lemma 2.1.

Now, we prove (2.1) for  $i = 1$ . First, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi, \Omega}^{(1)}(f)(x) &\leq \int_{|y| > 2^{2m}} |\Phi(y)| \left| \Omega(y') \right| |y|^{-n} |f(x - \mathcal{P}(y))| dy \\ &\leq \int_{|y| > 2^{2m}} |\Phi(y')| \left| \Omega(y') \right| |y|^{-n+\beta} |f(x - \mathcal{P}(y))| dy. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

Thus, by (2.3) and the assumption that  $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi, \Omega}^{(1)}(f)(x) &\leq \|\Phi\|_\infty \int_{|y| > 2^{2m}} \left| \Omega(y') \right| |y|^{-n+\beta} |f(x - \mathcal{P}(y))| dy \\ &= \|\Phi\|_\infty \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \int_{2^{mj} < |y| < 2^{m(j+1)}} \left| \Omega(y') \right| |y|^{-n+\beta} |f(x - \mathcal{P}(y))| dy \\ &\leq \|\Phi\|_\infty \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \{2^{m\beta j} \int_{2^{mj} < |y| < 2^{m(j+1)}} \left| \Omega(y') \right| |y|^{-n} |f(x - \mathcal{P}(y))| dy\} \\ &\leq \|\Phi\|_\infty m \left\{ \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} 2^{m\beta j} \right\} \mu_{\Omega, \mathcal{P}} f(x). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Since  $\beta < 0$ , we immediately obtain

$$M_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi, \Omega}^{(1)}(f)(x) \leq \|\Phi\|_\infty \frac{2^\beta m}{1 - 2^\beta} \mu_{\Omega, \mathcal{P}} f(x). \quad (2.4)$$

Hence, (2.1) for  $i = 1$  follows from (2.4) and Lemma 2.1. Similarly, one can obtain (2.1) for  $i = 2$ . We omit the details. This ends the proof.  $\square$

The following lemma will play an important role in the proof of our result.

**Lemma 2.4** *Suppose that  $\Omega \in L^\infty(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$  is a homogeneous function of degree zero on  $\mathbf{R}^n$  that satisfies  $\|\Omega\|_{L^1} \leq 1$  and  $\|\Omega\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2^m$  for some  $m \geq 1$ . Suppose also that  $\mathcal{P}(y) = (P_1, \dots, P_d)$  is a polynomial mapping and  $\Phi$  is a homogeneous function that satisfies (1.5)-(1.6) with either the index  $\beta \neq 0$  is not a positive integer or  $\beta$  is a positive integer larger than  $\max\{\deg(P_j) : 1 \leq j \leq d\}$ . Let  $\psi_{k,m}$  be a smooth function on  $\mathbf{R}$  that*

satisfies  $0 \leq \psi_{k,m} \leq 1$ ,  $\text{supp}(\psi_{k,m}) \subseteq [2^{-m(k+1)}, 2^{-m(k-1)}]$ , and  $\left| \frac{d\psi_{k,m}}{du}(u) \right| \leq Cu^{-1}$  with constant  $C$  independent of  $m$  and  $k$ . Then

$$J_k(\Phi, \xi, \Omega) = \left| \int_{\mathbf{S}^{n-1}} \Omega(y') \int_0^\infty e^{i\{t^\beta \Phi(y') - \mathcal{P}(ty') \cdot \xi\}} \frac{\psi_{k,m}(t) dt d\sigma}{t} \right| \leq mC2^{\beta\alpha(k+1)}$$

for some constants  $0 < \alpha < 1$  and  $C > 0$  which are independent of  $m, k$ , and the coefficients of  $P_1, \dots, P_d$ .

**Proof.** By the properties of  $\psi_{k,m}$ , and the fact that  $\|\Omega\|_{L^1} \leq 1$ , we have

$$J_k(\Phi, \xi, \Omega) \leq 2m \ln 2. \tag{2.5}$$

On the other hand, since  $\|\Omega\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2^m$ , we have

$$J_k(\Phi, \xi, \Omega) \leq 2^m \int_{\mathbf{S}^{n-1}} \left| \int_0^\infty e^{i\{t^\beta \Phi(y') - \mathcal{P}(ty') \cdot \xi\}} \frac{\psi_{k,m}(t)}{t} dt \right| d\sigma(y'). \tag{2.6}$$

Next, let

$$I_k(\Phi, \xi) = \left| \int_0^\infty e^{i\{t^\beta \Phi(y') - \mathcal{P}(ty') \cdot \xi\}} \frac{\psi_{k,m}(t)}{t} dt \right|. \tag{2.7}$$

Then by the support property of  $\psi_{k,m}$ , (2.7) reduces to

$$I_k(\Phi, \xi) = \left| \int_1^{2^{2m}} e^{i\{(a_{k,m}t)^\beta \Phi(y') - \mathcal{P}(a_{k,m}ty') \cdot \xi\}} \frac{\psi_{k,m}(a_{k,m}t)}{t} dt \right|, \tag{2.8}$$

where we set  $a_{k,m} = 2^{-m(k+1)}$ .

Now, notice that

$$\frac{\left| \frac{d^{l+1}}{dt^{l+1}} ((a_{k,m}t)^\beta \Phi(y') - \mathcal{P}(a_{k,m}ty') \cdot \xi) \right|}{-\beta(1-\beta)\dots(l-\beta)(a_{k,m})^\beta |2^{2m(\beta-l-1)}\Phi(y')|} \geq 1$$

for all  $1 \leq t \leq 2^{2m}$ , where  $l$  is the degree of  $\mathcal{P}$ . Thus by Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\left| \int_1^u e^{i\{t^\beta a_{k,m} \Phi(y') - \mathcal{P}(a_{k,m}ty') \cdot \xi\}} dt \right| \leq 2^{2m \frac{l+1-\beta}{l+1}} C \left| (a_{k,m})^\beta \Phi(y') \right|^{-\frac{1}{l+1}}, \tag{2.9}$$



for all  $1 < u \leq 2^{2m}$  where  $C$  is a constant independent of  $m$ . Therefore, by (2.8), (2.9), and integration by parts, we obtain

$$I_k(\Phi, \xi) \leq 2^{2m \frac{(l+1-\beta)}{l+1}} C \left| (a_{k,m})^\beta \Phi(y') \right|^{-\frac{1}{l+1}} C(k, m), \tag{2.10}$$

where

$$C(k, m) = \frac{\psi_{k,m}(a_{k,m}2^{2m})}{2^{2m}} + \int_1^{2^{2m}} \left| \frac{(a_{k,m}t\psi'_{k,m}(a_{k,m}t) - \psi_{k,m}(a_{k,m}t))}{t^2} \right|. \tag{2.11}$$

By the properties of  $\psi_{k,m}$ , we immediately obtain

$$C(k, m) \leq \frac{1}{2^{2m}} - \frac{2}{2^{2m}} + 2 = 1 - \frac{1}{2^{2m}} \leq 1. \tag{2.12}$$

Thus, by (2.10) and (2.12), we get

$$I_k(\Phi, \xi) \leq 2^{2m \frac{(l+1-\beta)}{l+1}} C \left| (a_{k,m})^\beta \Phi(y') \right|^{-\frac{1}{l+1}}; \tag{2.13}$$

which when interpolated with the trivial estimate  $I_k(\Phi, \xi) \leq 2m \ln 2$ , imply that

$$I_k(\Phi, \xi) \leq mC \left| (a_{k,m})^\beta \Phi(y') \right|^{-\frac{\delta}{l+1}}. \tag{2.14}$$

By (2.14), (2.6), and (1.6), we obtain

$$J_k(\Phi, \xi, \Omega) \leq mC2^m \left| (a_{k,m})^\beta \right|^{-\frac{\delta}{l+1}}. \tag{2.15}$$

Now, by an interpolation between (2.5) and (2.15), we get the desired result. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.5** *Let  $k \geq 0, m \geq 1$ , and  $\delta < 0$ . Suppose that  $\{\sigma_{m,k-j} : j \leq 1\}$  is a sequence of Borel measures on  $\mathbf{R}^n$  such that*

(i)  $\sup_{\xi \in \mathbf{R}^n} |\hat{\sigma}_{m,k-j}(\xi)| \leq mC2^{\delta(k-j)};$

(ii) *The corresponding maximal function*

$$M_{m,k}(f)(x) = \sup_{j < 1} |\sigma_{m,k-j} * f(x)|$$

satisfies

$$\|M_{m,k}(f)(x)\|_p \leq mC \|f\|_p \tag{2.16}$$

for all  $1 < p < \infty$ .

Then, for  $1 < p < \infty$  there exist positive constants  $\alpha_p$  and  $C$  which are independent of  $k$  and  $m$  such that

$$\|M_{m,k}(f)(x)\|_p \leq mC2^{\delta\alpha_p k} \|f\|_p.$$

**Proof.** We start by observing that

$$M_{m,k}(f)(x) \leq \sum_{j=-\infty}^1 |\sigma_{m,k-j} * f(x)|.$$

Therefore, by (i) and Plancherel's theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|M_{m,k}(f)\|_2 &\leq \sum_{j=-\infty}^1 \|\sigma_{m,k-j} * f\|_2 \leq \|f\|_2 \sum_{j=-\infty}^1 \|\sigma_{m,k-j}\|_\infty \\ &\leq mC2^{\delta k} \left( \sum_{j=-\infty}^1 2^{-\delta j} \right) \|f\|_2 \leq mC2^{\delta k} \|f\|_2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

Hence, by interpolation between (2.15) and (2.17), we get the desired result. This completes the proof.

We end this section with the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.6** *Suppose that  $h \in L^\infty(\mathbf{R}^+)$  and  $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_d)$  is a polynomial mapping from  $\mathbf{R}^n$  into  $\mathbf{R}^d$ . Suppose also that  $\Omega \in L^\infty(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$  is a homogeneous function of degree zero on  $\mathbf{R}^n$  that satisfies (1.1) with  $\|\Omega\|_{L^1} \leq 1$  and  $\|\Omega\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2^m$  for some  $m \geq 1$ . Then the operator*

$$S_{\mathcal{P},\Omega,h}^*(f)(x) = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \left| \int_{|y| > \varepsilon} f(x - \mathcal{P}(y)) \Omega(y') h(|y|) |y|^{-n} dy \right|$$

satisfies

$$\|S_{\mathcal{P},\Omega,h}^*(f)\|_p \leq m \|h\|_\infty C_p \|f\|_p$$

for all  $1 < p < \infty$  with constant  $C_p$  independent of  $m, h, \Omega$ , and the coefficients of  $P_1, \dots, P_d$ .

It should be pointed out that Lemma 2.6 was proved in (see [8], Theorem 1.2 therein) under the assumption that  $\Omega$  is in the Hardy space  $H^1(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$ . But, in our case, it is essential to determine the dependence of the  $L^p$  bounds on the parameter  $m$ . However, the latter can be obtained by following similar argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [2]. We omit the details.

### 3. Proof of Main Result

**Proof of Theorem B.** Assume that  $\Omega \in L \log L(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$  and satisfies (1.1). Let  $\Phi, \beta$ , and  $\mathcal{P}(y) = (P_1, \dots, P_d)$  be as in the statement of Theorem B. We start by decomposing the function  $\Omega$  as follows.

For  $m \in \mathbf{N}$ , let  $\mathbf{E}_m$  be the set of points  $y' \in \mathbf{S}^{n-1}$  which satisfy  $2^m \leq |\Omega(y')| < 2^{m+1}$ . Also, we let  $\mathbf{E}_0$  be the set of all those points  $y' \in \mathbf{S}^{n-1}$  which satisfy  $|\Omega(y')| < 2$ . For  $m \in \mathbf{N} \cup \{0\}$ , set  $b_m = \Omega \chi_{\mathbf{E}_m}$  and  $\theta_m = \|b_m\|_1$ . Set

$$\mathbf{D} = \{m \in \mathbf{N} : \theta_m \geq 2^{-3m}\}.$$

For  $m \in \mathbf{D}$ , define the function  $A_m$  on  $\mathbf{S}^{n-1}$  by

$$A_m(y') = (\theta_m)^{-1} \{b_m(y') - \int_{\mathbf{S}^{n-1}} b_m(y') d\sigma(y')\}.$$

We also define  $G$  on  $\mathbf{S}^{n-1}$  by

$$G(y') = b_0(y') + \sum_{m \notin \mathbf{D}} b_m(y') - \int_{\mathbf{S}^{n-1}} b_0(y') d\sigma(y') - \sum_{m \notin \mathbf{D}} \int_{\mathbf{S}^{n-1}} b_m(y') d\sigma(y').$$

Then, it is straightforward to show that the following hold:

$$\int_{\mathbf{S}^{n-1}} A_m(y') d\sigma(y') = 0, \text{ and } \int_{\mathbf{S}^{n-1}} G(y') d\sigma(y') = 0; \tag{3.1}$$

$$\|A_m\|_1 \leq C, \|A_m\|_\infty \leq C2^{4(m+1)}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\Omega(y') = G(y') + \sum_{m \in \mathbf{D}} \theta_m A_m(y'); \tag{3.3}$$

$$G \in L^2(\mathbf{S}^{n-1}); \tag{3.4}$$

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbf{D}} m\theta_m \leq C \|\Omega\|_{L(\log L)(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})}. \tag{3.5}$$

Thus by (3.3), we have

$$T_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi, \Omega}^* f(x) \leq T_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi, G}^* f(x) + \sum_{m \in \mathbf{D}} \theta_m T_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi, A_m}^* f(x). \tag{3.6}$$

Since  $G \in L^2(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$ , it follows from Theorem A that

$$\|T_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi, G}^* f\|_p \leq C \|f\|_p \tag{3.7}$$

for all  $1 < p < \infty$ . Therefore by (3.6), (3.7), and (3.5), it suffices to show that

$$\|T_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi, A_m}^* f\|_p \leq mC \|f\|_p \tag{3.8}$$

for all  $1 < p < \infty$  and  $m \in \mathbf{D}$  with constant  $C$  independent of  $m$ .

First, let us show that (3.8) and (3.7) will imply the theorem. Given  $1 < p < \infty$ . Then by (3.6), (3.7), and (3.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi, \Omega}^* f\|_p &\leq \|T_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi, G}^* f\|_p + \sum_{m \in \mathbf{D}} \theta_m \|T_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi, A_m}^* f\|_p \\ &\leq C \{1 + \sum_{m \in \mathbf{D}} m\theta_m\} \|f\|_p \leq C \|f\|_p, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by (3.5).

Now, we turn to the proof of (3.8). By an elementary procedure, choose a collection of  $C^\infty$  functions  $\{\psi_{k,m}\}_{k \in \mathbf{Z}}$  on  $(0, \infty)$  with the properties:

$$\text{supp}(\psi_{k,m}) \subseteq [2^{-m(k+1)}, 2^{-m(k-1)}], 0 \leq \psi_{k,m} \leq 1, \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} \psi_{k,m}(u) = 1,$$

$$\left| \frac{d^s \psi_{k,m}}{du^s}(u) \right| \leq C_s u^{-s}$$

with constants  $C_s$  independent of  $m$  (see [2] for more details).

Now, as in [10], we have two cases. The first case is when  $\beta < 0$  and the second case is when  $\beta$  is a positive integer larger than  $\max\{\deg(P_j) : 1 \leq j \leq d\}$ . We shall only prove the case for  $\beta < 0$ . The proof for the other case follows by minor modifications.

Assume that  $\beta < 0$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(y) &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{-1} \psi_{k,m}(|y|); \\ K_{m,\infty}(y) &= A_m(y')\eta(y); \\ K_{m,0}(y) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} A_m(y')\psi_{k,m}(|y|). \end{aligned}$$

Then, it is clear that

$$\text{supp}(K_{m,\infty}) \subset \{y \in \mathbf{R}^n : |y| \geq 1\}; \tag{3.9}$$

$$K_{m,\infty}(y) = A_m(y') \text{ for all } |y| > 2^{2m}; \tag{3.10}$$

$$\text{supp}(K_{m,0}) \subset \{y \in \mathbf{R}^n : |y| \leq 2^m\}. \tag{3.11}$$

Therefore, we have

$$T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,A_m}^* f(x) \leq T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,K_{m,\infty}}^*(f)(x) + T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,K_{m,0}}^*(f)(x). \tag{3.12}$$

Now, by (3.9) and (3.10), we can decompose the factor  $e^{i\Phi(y)} |y|^{-n} K_{m,\infty}(y)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{i\Phi(y)} |y|^{-n} K_{m,\infty}(y) &= |y|^{-n} A_m(y') \chi_{\{|y|>2^{2m}\}} + \\ &\quad (e^{i\Phi(y)} - 1) |y|^{-n} A_m(y') \chi_{\{|y|>2^{2m}\}} + \\ &\quad e^{i\Phi(y)} |y|^{-n} K_{m,\infty}(y) \chi_{\{1 \leq |y| < 2^{2m}\}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

This immediately implies that

$$T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,K_{m,\infty}}^*(f)(x) \leq S_{\mathcal{P},A_m,h_m}^*(f)(x) + M_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,A_m}^{(1)}(f)(x) + M_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^{(0)}(f)(x),$$

where  $h_m = \chi_{\{|y|>2^{2m}\}}$ ,  $M_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,\Omega}^{(0)}$ ,  $M_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,A_m}^{(1)}$ , and  $S_{\mathcal{P},A_m,h_m}^*$  are the operators given in Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.6. Thus, by Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.6, we obtain

$$\left\| T_{\mathcal{P},\Phi,K_{m,\infty}}^*(f) \right\|_p \leq mC \|f\|_p \tag{3.14}$$

for all  $1 < p < \infty$ .

Next, by (3.11), we have

$$T_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi, K_{m,0}}^*(f)(x) = \sup_{0 < \varepsilon < 2^m} \left| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{|y| > \varepsilon} e^{i\Phi(y)} |y|^{-n} A_m(y') \psi_{k,m}(|y|) f(x - \mathcal{P}(y)) dy \right|. \quad (3.15)$$

Now,  $0 < \varepsilon < 2^m$ , choose  $j \leq 1$  such that  $2^{m(j-1)} \leq \varepsilon < 2^{mj}$ . Therefore,

$$\left| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{|y| > \varepsilon} e^{i\Phi(y)} |y|^{-n} A_m(y') \psi_{k,m}(|y|) f(x - \mathcal{P}(y)) dy \right| \leq I_1(f)(x) + I_2(f)(x), \quad (3.16)$$

where

$$I_1(f)(x) = \left| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{2^{mj} \leq |y| < 2^m} e^{i\Phi(y)} |y|^{-n} A_m(y') \psi_{k,m}(|y|) f(x - \mathcal{P}(y)) dy \right|;$$

$$I_2(f)(x) = \left| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{\varepsilon < |y| < 2^{mj}} e^{i\Phi(y)} |y|^{-n} A_m(y') \psi_{k,m}(|y|) f(x - \mathcal{P}(y)) dy \right|.$$

It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} I_2(f)(x) &\leq \sum_{k=\max\{0, -1-j\}}^{k=2-j} \int_{2^{m(j-1)} \leq |y| < 2^{mj}} |y|^{-n} |A_m(y')| |f(x - \mathcal{P}(y))| dy \\ &\leq 3m \mu_{A_m, \mathcal{P}} f(x), \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

where  $\mu_{A_m, \mathcal{P}} f(x)$  is the operator given in Lemma 2.1 with  $\Omega$  is replaced by  $A_m$

On the other hand, by the support property of  $\psi_{k,m}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 I_1(f)(x) &= \left| \sum_{k=0}^{1-j} \int_{2^{mj} \leq |y| < 2^m} e^{i\Phi(y)} \frac{A_m(y')}{|y|^n} \psi_{k,m}(|y|) f(x - \mathcal{P}(y)) dy \right| \\
 &\leq \left| \sum_{k=0}^{1-j} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} e^{i\Phi(y)} \frac{A_m(y')}{|y|^n} \psi_{k,m}(|y|) f(x - \mathcal{P}(y)) dy \right| + \\
 &\quad \left| \sum_{k=-j}^{1-j} \int_{|y| < 2^{mj}} e^{i\Phi(y)} \frac{A_m(y')}{|y|^n} \psi_{k,m}(|y|) f(x - \mathcal{P}(y)) dy \right| \\
 &\leq \left| \sum_{k=0}^{1-j} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} e^{i\Phi(y)} \frac{A_m(y')}{|y|^n} \psi_{k,m}(|y|) f(x - \mathcal{P}(y)) dy \right| + 2m\mu_{A_m, \mathcal{P}} f(x).
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Therefore by (3.15)–(3.18), we

$$T_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi, K_{m,0}}^*(f)(x) \leq G(f)(x) + 5m\mu_{A_m, \mathcal{P}} f(x), \tag{3.19}$$

where

$$G(f)(x) = \sup_{j < 1} \left| \sum_{k=0}^{1-j} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} e^{i\Phi(y)} |y|^{-n} A_m(y') \psi_{k,m}(|y|) f(x - \mathcal{P}(y)) dy \right|.$$

Let  $\sigma_{m,k}$  be the measure defined by

$$\int f d\sigma_{m,k} = \int e^{i\Phi(y)} |y|^{-n} A_m(y') \psi_{k,m}(|y|) f(\mathcal{P}(y)) dy. \tag{3.20}$$

Then

$$G(f)(x) = \sup_{j < 1} \left| \sum_{k=0}^{1-j} \sigma_{m,k} * f(x) \right| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} M_{m,k}(f)(x), \tag{3.21}$$

where  $M_{m,k}$  is the operator given in Lemma 2.5.

Thus, by (3.21), Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.4, and Lemma 2.5, we have

$$\|G(f)\|_p \leq mC \|f\|_p \tag{3.22}$$

for all  $1 < p < \infty$ ; which when combined with (3.19) and Lemma 2.1, we obtain

$$\left\| T_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi, K_{m,0}}^*(f) \right\|_p \leq mC \|f\|_p \quad (3.23)$$

for all  $1 < p < \infty$ . Hence, (3.8) follows by (3.12), (3.13), and (3.23). This completes the proof.  $\square$

### References

- [1] Al-Salman, A.: Rough oscillatory singular integral operators of non-convolution type, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 299 (2004) 72-88.
- [2] Al-Salman, A., Pan, Y.: Singular integrals with rough kernels in  $L \log^+ L(\mathbf{S}^{n-1})$ , J. London. Math. Soc. (2) 66 (2002) 153-174.
- [3] Al-Salman, A., Al-Jarrah, A.: Rough Oscillatory Singular Integral Operators-II, Turkish. J. Math. 27 (4) (2003), 565-579.
- [4] Calderón, A. P., Zygmund, A.: On the existence of certain singular integrals, Acta Math. 88 (1952), 85-139.
- [5] Calderón, A. P., Zygmund, A.: On singular integrals, Amer. J. Math. 78 (1956), 289-309.
- [6] Chen, L.: On a singular integral, Studia Math. 85 (1987), 61-72.
- [7] Duoandikoetxea, J., Rubio de Francia, J. L.: Maximal and singular integral operators via Fourier transform estimates, Invent. Math. 84 (1986), 541-561.
- [8] Fan, D., Pan, Y.: Singular integral operators with rough kernels supported by subvarieties, Amer. J. Math., 119 (1997), 799-839.
- [9] Fan, D., Guo, K., and Pan, Y.: Singular integrals along submanifolds of finite type, Mich. Math. J. 45 (1998), 135-142.
- [10] Fan, D., Yang, D.: Certain maximal oscillatory singular integrals, Hiroshima Math. J., 28 (1998), 169-182.
- [11] Fefferman, R.: A note on singular integrals, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc 74 (1979), 266-270.
- [12] Jiang, Y. and Lu, S. Z.: Oscillatory singular integrals with rough kernels, in "Harmonic Analysis in China, Mathematics and Its Applications", Vol. 327, 135-145, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1995.



- [13] Lu, S. Z. and Zhang, Y.: Criterion on  $L^p$  -boundedness for a class of oscillatory singular integrals with rough kernels, Rev. Math. Iberoamericana 8 (1992), 201-219.
- [14] Ricci, F. and Stein, E. M.: Harmonic analysis on nilpotent groups and singular integrals I: Oscillatory integrals, Jour. Func. Anal. 73 (1987), 179-194.
- [15] Ricci, F. and Stein, E. M.: Harmonic analysis on nilpotent groups and singular integrals II: Singular kernels supported on submanifolds, Jour. Func. Anal. 78 (1988), 56-84.
- [16] Stein, E. M.: Problems in harmonic analysis related to curvature and oscillatory Integrals, Proc. Inter. Cong. Math., Berkeley (1986), 196-221.
- [17] Stein, E. M.: Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions, Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ, 1970.
- [18] Stein, E. M.: Harmonic Analysis: Real-Variable Methods, Orthogonality and Oscillatory integrals, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993.
- [19] Stein, E. M. and Wainger, S.: Problems in harmonic analysis related to curvature, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 26 (1978),1239-1295.

Ahmad AL-SALMAN  
Department of Mathematics  
Yarmouk University  
Irbid-JORDAN  
e-mail: alsalman@yu.edu.jo

Received 19.01.2004