



Corrigendum

Corrigendum to “Singular integral operators along surfaces of revolution” [J. Math. Anal. Appl. 274 (2) (2002) 608–625]



Hung Viet Le

APU International School, 286 Lanh Binh Thang, Ward 11, District 11, Ho Chi Minh City, Viet Nam

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 12 March 2016
Available online 11 May 2016
Submitted by R.H. Torres

Keywords:

Singular integrals
Maximal functions
Hardy spaces
Fourier transform

ABSTRACT

One of the key estimates in the original paper [3] does not seem to hold true, which may invalidate some results of that paper. However, there is a couple of ways to fix this mistake by adding additional hypotheses in Theorem 1 [3].

© 2016 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

In the proof of Theorem 1 [3], both inequalities

$$|\widehat{\sigma}_k(\zeta, \zeta_{n+1})| \leq C |2^{dk} A_\rho \zeta| \tag{0.1}$$

and

$$|\widehat{\mu}_k(\zeta, \zeta_{n+1}) - \widehat{\mu}_k(0, \zeta_{n+1})| \leq C |2^{kd} A_\rho \zeta| \tag{0.2}$$

rely on the estimate

$$\int_{\zeta'_1 - 3r}^{\zeta'_1 + 3r} |s| ds \leq C r^2, \text{ where } r \equiv r(\zeta') = \rho \sqrt{(\rho \zeta'_1)^2 + (\zeta'_2)^2 + \dots + (\zeta'_n)^2}; (\zeta'_1, \dots, \zeta'_n) \in S^{n-1}. \tag{0.3}$$

Unfortunately, inequality (0.3) may not hold true unless $|\zeta'_1| \leq C r(\zeta')$.

DOI of original article: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-247X\(02\)00316-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-247X(02)00316-5).

E-mail address: hvle2008@yahoo.com.

Inequality (0.1) still holds true by properly using the cancellation property of $F_a(s, \zeta')$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{\sigma}_k(\zeta, \zeta_{n+1})| &= \left| \int_{2^k}^{2^{k+1}} \frac{h(t)}{t} e^{i\zeta_{n+1}\gamma(t)} \int (e^{i|\zeta|\phi(t)s} - e^{i|\zeta|\phi(t)\zeta'_1}) F_a(s, \zeta') ds dt \right| \\ &\leq \left\{ \int_{2^k}^{2^{k+1}} |\zeta| |h(t)\phi(t)| \frac{dt}{t} \right\} \left\{ \int |(s - \zeta'_1) F_a(s, \zeta')| ds \right\} \\ &\leq C |2^{dk}\zeta| r^{-1} \int_{\zeta'_1-3r}^{\zeta'_1+3r} |s - \zeta'_1| ds \\ &\leq C |2^{dk}r\zeta| = C |2^{dk}A_\rho\zeta|. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, it seems to be impossible to obtain inequality (0.2) due to the presence of ζ'_1 . Note that inequality (0.2) was needed in [3] to obtain the L^p -boundedness ($1 < p < \infty$) of $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\mu_k * f|$ via Theorem C* in [3]. We can still obtain the L^p -boundedness of $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\mu_k * f|$ by a different technique and by requiring additional hypotheses on γ . We now proceed its proof below.

Recall from [3] that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu_k * f)(x, x_{n+1}) &= \int_{|y| \cong 2^k} \frac{|h(|y|) a(y')|}{|y|^n} f(x - \phi(|y|)y', x_{n+1} - \gamma(|y|)) dy \\ &\leq C \int_{|y| \cong 2^k} \frac{|a(y')|}{|y|^n} f(x - \phi(|y|)y', x_{n+1} - \gamma(|y|)) dy \\ &\equiv C (\nu_k * f)(x, x_{n+1}), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from the assumption that the function h is bounded almost everywhere. Thus, it suffices to prove that $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\nu_k * f|$ is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ for $1 < p < \infty$. By the method of rotation, it is enough to prove the L^p -boundedness ($1 < p < \infty$) of the following two-dimensional maximal function

$$Mg(x_1, x_2) = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2^k} \int_{2^k}^{2^{k+1}} |g(x_1 - \phi(t), x_2 - \gamma(t))| dt \right\}.$$

We will apply Theorem C [1] to prove. We may assume that $g \geq 0$. Define the positive, finite Borel measures $\{\lambda_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ as

$$(\lambda_k * g)(x_1, x_2) = \frac{1}{2^k} \int_{2^k}^{2^{k+1}} g(x_1 - \phi(t), x_2 - \gamma(t)) dt.$$

In terms of Fourier transform,

$$\widehat{\lambda}_k(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) = \frac{1}{2^k} \int_{2^k}^{2^{k+1}} e^{i\zeta_1\phi(t)} e^{i\zeta_2\gamma(t)} dt.$$

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/4614034>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/4614034>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)