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## 1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to extend known results on the relationship between Hardy-Littlewood type maximal functions and certain multi-directional generalizations of the Hilbert transform to the case of weighted Lebesgue spaces. It is well known that the boundedness of the HardyLittlewood maximal function on the spaces $L^{p}(\mathbf{R}), 1<p<\infty$, is closely related to the boundedness of the Hilbert transform on these same spaces. In their paper, On the equivalence between the boundedness of certain classes of maximal and multiplier operators in Fourier Analysis [3], A. Cordoba and R. Fefferman study the relationship between two operators, one related to the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function and one to the Hilbert transform, whose boundedness properties are not so well known.

Specifically, let $\theta_{1}>\theta_{2}>\theta_{3}>\ldots$ be a decreasing sequence of angles, $0<\theta_{i}<\pi / 2$. Define the maximal function $M_{\theta}$ on $L^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ by

$$
M_{\theta}(f)(x)=\sup _{x \in R} \frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R}|f(y)| d y
$$

where each rectangle $R \subset \mathbf{R}^{2}$ is oriented in one of the directions $\theta_{i}$. Let $P_{\theta}$ be the subset of the plane shown in Fig. 1. Consider the multiplier $T_{\theta}$ (defined initially on $L^{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ ) given by $\hat{T_{\theta}} \hat{(f)}(t)=X_{p_{\theta}}(t) \hat{f}(t)$, where $X_{p_{\theta}}$ is the characteristic function of $P_{\theta}$, and $\hat{g}$ denotes the Fourier transform of $g$.

Cordoba and Fefferman have proven the following two results giving the relationship between the boundedness of $M_{\theta}$ and $T_{\theta}$ :

Theorem A. If for some $p>2, M_{\theta}$ is a bounded operator on $L^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$, then $T_{\theta}$ is also bounded, but on the space $L^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$.
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ThEOREM B. If for some $p>2, T_{\theta}$ is bounded on $L^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$, then under the additional assumption that $\left|\left\{M_{\theta}\left(X_{E}\right)>1 / 2\right\}\right| \leq C|E|$ for all measurable $E \subset$ $\mathbf{R}^{2}$, it follows that $M_{\theta}$ is of weak type $\left[(p / 2)^{\prime},(p / 2)^{\prime}\right]$.

In this paper we extend Theorem A to the case of weighted spaces. Let $w(x, y)$ be a locally integrable nonnegative function of two variables. Let $d \mu=\omega d \lambda$, where $d \lambda$ denotes Lebesgue measure on $\mathbf{R}^{2}$. (In this paper $d \mu$ always denotes $w d \lambda$, for other weights we will use $d \nu$ or $d \sigma$.) We obtain two versions of Theorem $A$; for the precise definitions see the material that follows.

Theorem 4B. If $p>2, w \in A_{2}(\theta)$ and $w \in A_{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$, and if $M_{\theta}$ is bounded on $L_{\nu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ where $\nu=w^{1-(p / 2)^{2}}$, then $T_{\theta}$ is bounded on $L_{\mu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$, with norm depending only on the $A_{2}(\theta)$ and $A_{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ constants of $w$ and the norm of $M_{\theta}$.

Theorem 6. If $p_{0}>2$ and $M_{\theta}$ is bounded on $L_{\nu}^{p^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$, where $\nu=w^{1-p^{\prime}}$, and $p \in\left[p_{0}, p_{0}-\varepsilon\right)$ for some $\varepsilon>0$, then the multiplier operator $T_{\theta}$ is bounded on $L_{\mu}^{p_{0}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$, with norm depending only on the norm of $M_{\theta}$ and the $A_{p}(\theta)$ constant of $w$.

Theorem 4B gives, in particular, the result of Cordoba and Fefferman in the case $w \equiv 1$. However, Theorem 6 implies that $w \in A_{p_{0}}(\theta)$ (rather than $A_{2}$ ) which is what one would hope for.

In proving Theorem 4B we obtain a result relating a weighted integral inequality to vector-valued inequalities, and in proving Theorem 6 we use results related to extrapolation. In Section 6 we consider a result on extrapolation in the directions $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i}$. We finish the paper with several applications of the results mentioned above, including a weighted version of the angular Littlewood-Paley inequality.
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## 2. A condition which implies boundedness

In this section we use a condition, shown by J.L. Rubio de Francia [14], [15] to be related to vector-valued inequalities and interpolation, which will imply the boundedness of the operator $T_{\theta}$ on $L_{\mu}^{p}$. In later sections we will relate this condition to the boundedness of $M_{\theta}$. The boundedness condition is:
$B C(\mu, p)$. Let $p>2$ be given. For each $g$ in $L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right), g \geq 0$, there is a $G \geq g, G$ in $L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ such that

$$
\|G\|_{L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}} \leq C_{p}\|g\|_{L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}}
$$

and $G \cdot w \in A_{2}(\theta)$. Here $c$ depends only on $p$ and $\mu$, and is independent of $g$.
$A_{p}(\theta)$ denotes the class of all those functions $w$ such that

$$
\sup _{R}\left(\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R} w(x, y) d x d y\right)\left(\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R} w(x, y)^{-1 / p-1} d x d y\right)^{p-1}=C<\infty
$$

where the supremum is taken over all rectangles in one of the directions $\theta_{i}$, $i=1,2,3, \ldots$. The number $C$ is called the $A_{p}(\theta)$-constant for $w$. We also let $A_{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ be the $A_{p}$ condition with the supremum taken over rectangles oriented in the direction of the coordinate axes.

Theorem 1. Given $p>2$ and $w \in A_{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$, assume that the boundedness condition $B C(\mu, p)$ is true. Then $T_{\theta}$ is bounded on $L_{\mu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ with norm depending only on the $A_{p}(\theta)$ and $A_{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$-constants of $w$, and the $A_{2}$-constant of $G \cdot w$.

Proof. Consider the infinite strip

$$
E_{k}=\left\{(x, y) \in \mathbf{R}^{2}: 2^{k} \leq x<2^{k+1}\right\}
$$

Define the multiplier operator $S_{k}$ by $\widehat{S_{k}}(f)(x)=X_{E_{k}}(x) \cdot \hat{f}(x)$. Kurtz [10] shows that

$$
\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \approx\left\|\left(\sum\left|S_{k} f\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \text { for } \quad w \in A_{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)
$$

( $A \approx B$ means there are constants $c$ and $c^{\prime}$ such that $c A \leq B \leq c^{\prime} A$.) Let $F_{k}$ be the half-plane shown in Fig. 2. Define $H_{k}$, initially on $L^{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$, by


Fig. 2
$\left(H_{k} f\right)^{\wedge}(x)=X_{F_{k}}(x) \cdot \hat{f}(x)$. Then $H_{k}$ is essentially the Hilbert transform oriented in the direction $\theta_{k}$ and consequently is bounded on $L_{\mu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ for $\mu \in A_{p}\left(\theta_{k}\right)$ (i.e., $A_{p}$ where the supremum is taken over all rectangles oriented in the direction $\theta_{k}$ ). Note, also, that $S_{k} T_{\theta}(f)=H_{k} S_{k}(f)$ : Indeed,

$$
\left(S_{k} T_{\theta}\right)^{\wedge}(f)=X_{E_{k}} \cdot X_{P_{0}} \cdot \hat{f}=X_{F_{k}} \cdot X_{E_{k}} \cdot \hat{f}=\left(H_{k} S_{k}\right)^{\wedge}(f)
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|T_{\theta}(f)\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}^{p} & \leq C\left\|\left(\sum_{k}\left|S_{k} T_{\theta}(f)\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}^{p} \\
& =C\left\|\left(\sum_{k}\left|H_{k} S_{k}(f)\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}^{p} \\
& =C\left\|\sum_{k}\left|H_{k} S_{k}(f)\right|^{2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p / 2}}^{p / 2}
\end{aligned}
$$

We estimate this last norm using duality. Choose $g \geq 0, g \in L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ with $\|g\|_{L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}} \leq 1$, and note that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}} \sum_{k}\left|H_{k} S_{k}(f)(x)\right|^{2} g(x) w(x) d x \\
& \quad=\sum_{k} \int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}}\left|H_{k} S_{k}(f)(x)\right|^{2} g(x) w(x) d x \\
& \quad \leq \sum_{k} \int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}}\left|H_{k} S_{k}(f)(x)\right|^{2} G(x) w(x) d x \\
& \quad \leq C \sum_{k} \int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}}\left|S_{k}(f)(x)\right|^{2} G(x) w(x) d x
\end{aligned}
$$

where $G$ is the function from the boundedness condition, and the last inequality follows since $H_{k}$ is bounded for $G \cdot w \in A_{2}\left(\theta_{k}\right)$. Hence,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}} \sum_{k}\left|H_{k} S_{k}(f)(x)\right|^{2} g(x) w(x) d x \\
& \leq c \int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}} \sum_{k}\left|S_{k}(f)(x)\right|^{2} G(x) w(x) d x \\
& \leq c\left[\int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}}\left(\sum_{k}\left|S_{k}(f)(x)\right|^{2}\right)^{p / 2} w(x) d x\right]^{2 / p} \\
& \quad \times\left[\int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}}(G(x))^{(p / 2)^{\prime}} w(x) d x\right]^{1-2 / p} \\
& \leq c\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}^{2} \cdot\|g\|_{L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}} \leq c\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

If we take the supremum of all such functions $g$ it follows that

$$
\left\|T_{\theta}(f)\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \leq c\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}
$$

where $c$ depends only on the $A_{2}(\theta)$-constant of $G \cdot w$ and the $A_{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$-constant of $w$.

In the next three sections we discuss conditions on $M_{\theta}$ that imply the boundedness condition, and hence boundedness of $T_{\theta}$.

## 3. Weighted vector-valued inequalities

Rubio de Francia [14] has shown that the boundedness condition $B C(\mu, p)$, is equivalent to certain weighted vector-valued inequalities. We will show that the same type of result is true for the weights in $A p(\theta)$.

Theorem 2. Given a weight $w$ and $p>2$, the following conditions are equivalent:
(a)

$$
\left\|\left(\sum_{j}\left|M_{j} f_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \leq C_{p}\left\|\left(\sum_{j}\left|f_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}
$$

where $M_{j}$ is the maximal function with supremum taken over all rectangles oriented in the direction $\theta_{j}, f_{j} \in L_{\mu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right), j=1,2, \ldots$.
(b)

$$
\left\|\left(\sum_{j}\left|H_{j} f_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \leq C_{p}^{\prime}\left\|\left(\sum_{j}\left|f_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}
$$

and

$$
\left\|\left(\sum_{j}\left|H_{j}^{\perp} f_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \leq C_{p}^{\prime \prime}\left\|\left(\sum_{j}\left|f_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}
$$

where $H_{j}$ is the Hilbert transform in the direction $\theta_{j}$ and $H_{j}{ }^{\perp}$ the Hilbert transform in the direction $\theta_{j}+\pi / 2$, and $f_{j} \in L_{\mu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right), j=1,2, \ldots$.
(c) The boundedness condition $B C(\mu, p)$ : For each $g \geq 0, g \in L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}$, there is $a G \geq g$ with

$$
\|G\|_{L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}} \leq K\|g\|_{L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}}
$$

and $G \cdot w \in A_{2}(\theta)$.
Here $c_{p}, c_{p}^{\prime}$, and $c_{p}^{\prime \prime}$ depend only on $K$ and $p$ and the $A_{2}(\theta)$-constant of $G \cdot w$.
To prove this we will need to assume the following result of Rubio de Francia [15]:

Theorem. Let $F=\left\{T_{j}\right\}$ be a family of sublinear operators $T_{j}, T_{j}: L_{\mu}^{q} \rightarrow L_{\mu}^{q}$, then

$$
\left\|\left(\sum_{j}\left|T_{j} f_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{q}} \leq c_{q}\left\|\left(\sum_{j}\left|f_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{q}}
$$

if and only if for $r=(q / 2)^{\prime}$ and $g \geq 0, g \in L_{\mu}^{r}$, there is a $G \in L_{\mu}^{r}$ such that $\|G\|_{L_{\mu}^{r}} \leq c\|g\|_{L_{\mu}^{r}}$ with $G \geq g$ and

$$
\int\left|T_{j} f\right|^{2} G(x) d \mu \leq c_{p} \int|f|^{2} G(x) d \mu
$$

for $j=1,2, \ldots$, with $c_{p}$ independent of $j$.

We will assume this result and move on to the proof of Theorem 2.
(c) implies (a).

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\left[\sum_{j}\left|M_{j} f_{j}\right|^{2}\right]^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}^{2} & =\sup _{j} \sum_{j}\left|M_{j} f_{j}(x)\right|^{2} g(x) w(x) d x \\
& \text { where the sup is taken over } g \geq 0,\|g\|_{L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)}} \leq 1 \\
& \leq \sup _{g} \sum_{j} \int\left|M_{j} f_{j}(x)\right|^{2} G(x) w(x) d x \\
& \leq c_{p}\left(\sup _{g} \sum_{j} f\left|f_{j}(x)\right|^{2} G(x) w(x) d x\right) \\
& \leq c_{p}\left(\sup _{g}\left\|\left(\sum_{j}\left|f_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}^{2}\|G\|_{L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}}\right) \\
& \leq c_{p}\left\|\left[\sum_{j}\left|f_{j}\right|^{2}\right]^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

The second inequality follows since $M_{j}$ is bounded on $L_{\mu}^{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ for $\mu=w(x) d x$ in $A_{2}\left(\theta_{j}\right)$.
(c) implies (b). Since both $H_{j}$ and $H_{j}^{\perp}$ are bounded on $L_{\mu}^{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ for $w$ in $A_{2}\left(\theta_{j}\right)$, for $j=1,2, \ldots$, the proof is exactly as (c) implies (a) above, with $M_{j}$ replaced by $H_{j}$ (or $H_{j}{ }^{\perp}$ ).
(a) implies (c). Since the vector valued inequality holds then, by the theorem of Rubio de Francia stated above, for any nonnegative $g$ in $L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}$, there is a $G$ with $g \leq G$,

$$
\|G\|_{L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)}} \leq c^{\prime}\|g\|_{L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)}}
$$

and

$$
\int\left|M_{j} f\right|^{2} G(x) w(x) d x \leq c \int|f|^{2} G(x) w(x) d x
$$

for $c$ independent of $f \in L_{\mu}^{p}$ and $j=1,2,3, \ldots$ This implies that $G \cdot w \in$
$A_{2}\left(\theta_{j}\right)$ with $A_{2}\left(\theta_{j}\right)$ constant independent of $j$. Hence $G \cdot w \in A_{2}(\theta)$ and thus $G$ satisfies the condition for boundedness $B C(\mu, p)$.
(b) implies (c). This follows as above, since we get both

$$
\int\left|H_{j} f(x)\right|^{2} G(x) w(x) d x \leq c_{1} \int|f(x)|^{2} G(x) w(x) d x
$$

and

$$
\int\left|H_{j}^{\perp} f(x)\right|^{2} G(x) w(x) d x \leq c_{2} \int|f(x)|^{2} G(x) w(x) d x
$$

for all $j$, which implies that $G \cdot w \in A_{2}\left(\theta_{j}\right)$ with $A_{2}\left(\theta_{j}\right)$-constant independent of $j$. Hence $G \cdot w \in A_{p}(\theta)$. Note: In the above proof we used the fact that if $H_{j}$ and $H_{j}^{\perp}$ are bounded on $L_{\mu}^{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$, then $w \in A_{2}\left(\theta_{j}\right)$. The idea behind this is as follows. For convenience of notation let's suppose the Hilbert transforms $H_{x}$ and $H_{y}$ are bounded on $L_{\mu}^{2}$; here $H_{x}$ is the Hilbert transform in the direction of the $x$-axis and similarly for $H_{y}$. We will also let $M_{x}$ and $M_{y}$ be the one-dimensional Hardy-Littlewood maximal functions in the direction of the $x$ and $y$ axes respectively. Then $w(\cdot, y) \in A_{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{1}\right)$ with constant independent of $y$ and $w(x, \cdot) \in A_{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{1}\right)$ with constant independent of $x$.

Hence

$$
\|M(f)\|_{L_{\mu}^{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)} \leq\left\|M_{x}\left(M_{y} f\right)\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{2}} \leq c\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{2}}
$$

and this implies $w \in A_{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$.

## 4. A weighted integral inequality

The main result of this section is a weighted integral inequality for the strong maximal function. From this the first of the theorems in which boundedness of $M_{\theta}$ implies that of $T_{\theta}$ follows.

Lemma 1. If $w \in A_{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right), 1<p<\infty$, then for some $\varepsilon>0, w \in A_{p-\varepsilon}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ with $A_{p-\varepsilon}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$-constant and $\varepsilon$ depending only on $p$ and the $A_{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$-constant of $w$.

Proof. A.P. Calderon has proven that if $w \in A_{p}(\mathbf{R})$ then $w \in A_{p-\varepsilon}(\mathbf{R})$ where $\varepsilon$ and the $A_{p-\varepsilon}(\mathbf{R})$-constant of $w$ depend only on $p$ and the $A_{p}(\mathbf{R})$ constant of $w$. (See [1], Theorems 1 and 2 as well as the proof of Theorem 2.)

In this case, for each $x, w(x,-) \in A_{p}(\mathbf{R})$ with constant independent of $x$. Hence $w(x,-) \in A_{p-\varepsilon}(\mathbf{R})$ with $\varepsilon$ and the $A_{p-\varepsilon}(\mathbf{R})$-constant of $w(x,-)$
independent of $x$. Similarly $w(-, y) \in A_{p-\varepsilon}(\mathbf{R})$ with $\varepsilon$ and constant independent of $y$. So $w \in A_{p-\varepsilon}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ with $\varepsilon$ and $A_{p-\varepsilon}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$-constant depending only on $p$ and the $A_{p-\varepsilon}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$-constant of $w$.

More notation will be needed before we state Lemma 2. For $f$ in $L^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ let $M_{x}(f)$ be the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function of $f$ in the $x$-variable only (similarly for $M_{y}(f)$ ). For a weight $w$ define

$$
M_{\mu}(f)(x)=\sup _{R} \frac{1}{\mu(R)} \int_{R} f(x) d \mu(x)
$$

where the supremum is taken over all rectangles $R$ containing $x$ with sides parallel to the axes and $d \mu(x)=w(x) d x$.

Lemma 2. If $w \in A_{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right), 1<p<\infty$, then

$$
\int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}}\left|M_{x}\left(M_{y}(f)\right)(x)\right|^{p} g(x) d \mu(x) \leq c_{p} \int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}}|f(x)|^{p} M_{\mu}\left(M_{\mu}(g)\right)(x) d \mu(x)
$$

with $c_{p}$ independent of $f$ and $g$ and depending only on $p$ and the $A_{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$-constant of $w$.

Proof. Let $q=p-\varepsilon$. Then for any rectangle $R$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R} g(w) w(x) d x\right)\left(\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R}\left(M_{w}(g)(x) w(x)\right)^{-1 / q-1} d x\right)^{q-1} \\
& \quad \leq\left(\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R} g(x) w(x) d x\right) \\
& \quad \times\left(\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R}\left(\frac{w(R)}{\int_{R} g(y)(w(y) d y}\right)^{1 / q-1} w(x)^{-1 / q-1} d x\right)^{q-1} \\
& \quad \leq \frac{1}{|R|} w(R)\left(\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R} w(x)^{-1 / q-1} d x\right)^{q-1} \\
& \quad \leq A_{q}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right) \text {-constant of } w .
\end{aligned}
$$

So $\left(g w,\left(M_{w} g\right) w\right) \in A_{p-\varepsilon}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ with constant no more than the $A_{p-\varepsilon}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ constant of $w$.

As in Lemma 1, this implies that $\left(g w,\left(M_{w}(g)\right) w\right) \in A_{p-\varepsilon}\left(\mathbf{R}^{1}\right)$ uniformly in each variable. Hence,

$$
\int_{\left\{M_{x}\left(M_{y}(f)\right)>x\right\}} g(x, y) w(x, y) d x \leq \frac{c}{\alpha^{p-\varepsilon}} \int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}} M_{y}(f)^{p-\varepsilon} M_{w}(g) w(x) d x
$$

By interpolating with the trivial $L_{\mu}^{\infty}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ result, the corresponding strongtype inequality holds for $p$. Hence, integrating in the $x_{1}$-variable alone,

$$
\left.\int_{\mathbf{R}} M_{x}\left(M_{y}(f)\right)^{p}(x) g(x) w(x) d x_{1} \leq \int_{\mathbf{R}} M_{y}(f)(x)\right)^{p} M_{\mu}(g)(x) w(x) d x_{1}
$$

Likewise, $\left(M_{\mu}(g) w, M_{\mu}\left(M_{\mu}(g)\right) w\right) \in A_{p-\varepsilon}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ and so proceeding as above and integrating in the $x_{2}$-variable we now have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{\mathbf{R}^{2}} M_{x}\left(M_{y}(f)\right)^{p}(x) g(x) w(x) d x_{1} d x_{2} \\
& \quad \leq c \iint_{\mathbf{R}^{2}}|f(x)|^{p} M_{\mu}\left(M_{\mu}(g)\right)(x) w(x) d x_{1} d x_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

This lemma will enable us to prove two theorems which show that the boundedness of $M_{\theta}$ implies that of $T_{\theta}$. Define

$$
M_{\mu, i}(f)(x)=\sup _{R \ni x} \frac{1}{\mu(R)} \int_{R} f(x) d \mu(x)
$$

where the supremum is taken over all rectangles oriented in the direction $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i}$. Let

$$
M_{\mu, \theta}(f)(x)=\sup _{i} M_{\mu, i}(f)(x)
$$

Theorem 3. If $p>2, w \in A_{2}(\theta)$ and $w \in A_{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ and if

$$
\left\|M_{\mu, \theta}(f)\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}} \leq c\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}} \quad \text { for all } f \in L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)
$$

then
(A)

$$
\left\|\left(\sum_{j}\left|M_{j} f_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \leq c_{p}^{\prime}\left\|\left(\sum_{j}\left|f_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \quad \text { for all } f_{j} \in L_{\mu}^{p}
$$

and
(B) $T_{\theta}$ is bounded on $L_{\mu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ with norm depending only on the constant $c$ above, and on the $A_{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ and $A_{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ constants of $w$.

Proof. By duality. Let

$$
g \in L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right),\|g\|_{L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}} \leq 1
$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}} \sum_{j}\left|M_{j} f_{j}\right|^{2} g(x) d \mu(x) \\
& \quad \leq c \sum_{j} \int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}}\left|f_{j}\right|^{2} M_{\mu, j}\left(M_{\mu, j}(g)\right)(x) d \mu(x) \\
& \quad \leq c \int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}}\left(\sum_{j}\left|f_{j}\right|^{2}\right) M_{\mu, \theta}\left(M_{\mu, \theta}(g)\right)(x) d \mu(x) \\
& \quad \leq c\left\|\left(\sum_{j}\left|f_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}^{2}\left\|M_{\mu, \theta}\left(M_{\mu, \theta}(g)\right)\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}} \\
& \quad \leq c\left\|\left(\sum_{j}\left|f_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Part (B) follows immediately from part (A), Theorem 1 and Theorem 2.
Theorem 4. If $p>2, w \in A_{2}(\theta)$ and $w \in A_{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$, and if $M_{\theta}$ is bounded on $L_{\nu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right), \nu=w^{1-(p / 2)^{\prime}}$, then
(A)

$$
\left\|\left(\sum_{j}\left|M_{j} f_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \leq c\left\|\left(\sum_{j}\left|f_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}, \quad d \mu(x)=w(x) d \lambda
$$

and
(B) $T_{\theta}$ is bounded on $L_{\mu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ with norm depending only on the norm of $M_{\theta}$ and on the $A_{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ and $A_{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$-constants of $w$.

Proof. We use another version of duality. The dual of $L_{\mu}^{p / 2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ is $L_{\nu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$, where $\langle f, g\rangle=\int f g d x$. Let $g \in L_{\nu}^{(p / 2)^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ with norm less than
or equal to 1 , then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}}\left(\sum_{j}\left|M_{j} f_{j}\right|^{2}\right) g(x) d x & \leq c \sum_{j} \int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}}\left|f_{j}\right|^{2} M_{j}\left(M_{j}(g)\right)(x) d x \\
& \leq c \int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}} \sum_{j}\left|f_{j}\right|^{2} M_{\theta}\left(M_{\theta}(g)\right)\left(\frac{w^{2 / p}}{w^{2 / p}}\right) d x \\
& \leq c\left\|\left(\sum_{j}\left|f_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}^{2}\left\|M_{\theta}\left(M_{\theta}(g)\right)\right\|_{L_{\nu}^{(p / 2)}} \\
& \leq c\left\|\left(\sum_{j}\left|f_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking the supremum over all such functions $g$ gives us part (A).
Part (B) follows from Theorems 1, 2 and part A.
In the case of Lebesgue measure both theorems 3B and 4B give the result of Cordoba and Fefferman. However, both demand a stronger condition than $w \in A p(\theta)$. In the next section we will prove a result which will only require $w \in A p(\theta)$, but we will also assume $M_{\theta}$ to be bounded on $L_{\nu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right), \nu=$ $w^{1-p^{\prime}} d \lambda$, a stronger condition than the above.

## 5. The main result

The results in this and the following section are related to an extrapolation theorem of Garcia-Cuerva. Before we proceed we will need some notation.

We say that a pair ( $w, v$ ) of nonnegative locally integrable functions satisfies the $A p(F)$-condition, $1<p<\infty$, and write $(w, v) \in A p(F)$ if for all rectangles $R$ in the family $F$,

$$
\left(\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R} w(y) d y\right)\left(\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R} v(y)^{-1 /(p-1)} d y\right)^{p-1} \leq c
$$

with $c$ independent of $R$. The smallest such $c$ is called the $A p(F)$-constant of ( $w, v$ ).

A well known result is that the weak-type inequality for the HardyLittlewood maximal function,

$$
\int_{\{M f>\lambda\}} w(y) d y \leq \frac{c_{p}}{\lambda^{p}} \int_{\mathbf{R}}|f|^{p} v(y) d y
$$

is true if and only if $(w, v) \in A p(\mathbf{R})$. Here $c_{p}$ depends only on the $A p$ constant of $(w, v)$.

We are now ready to prove the following.
TheOrem 5. If $p_{0}>2$ and $M_{\theta}$ is bounded on $L_{\nu}^{p^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right), \nu=w^{1-p^{\prime}}$, for $p \in\left(p_{0}-\varepsilon, p_{0}\right), \varepsilon>0$, then the boundedness condition $B C\left(\mu, p_{0}\right)$ is true: For each $g \geq 0, g \in L_{\mu}^{\left(p_{0} / 2\right)^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$, there is $a G \geq g, G \in L_{\mu}^{\left(p_{0} / 2\right)^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ with

$$
\|G\|_{L_{\mu}^{\left(p_{0} / 2\right)^{\prime}}} \leq c\|g\|_{L_{\mu}^{\left(p_{0} / 2\right)^{\prime}}}
$$

and $G \cdot w \in A_{2}(\theta)$, and the $A_{2}(\theta)$-constant of $G \cdot w$ depends only on the $A p_{0}(\theta)$-constant of $w$.

To prove this theorem we need the following lemma:
Lemma 4. Assume that $p>2$ and $M_{\theta}$ is bounded on $L_{\nu}^{p^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right), \nu=w^{1-p^{\prime}}$. For $0<\eta<1$ and $g \in L^{p^{\prime} / \eta}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ let

$$
G(y)=\left[M_{\theta}\left(g^{1 / \eta} \cdot w\right)(y) / w(y)\right]^{\eta}
$$

Then
(i) $G \geq g$,
(ii) $(g w, G w) \in A_{\eta+p(1-\eta)}(\theta)$,
(iii) $\|G\|_{L_{\mu}}^{p^{\prime} / \eta} \leq c\|g\|_{L_{\mu}}^{p^{\prime} / \eta}$,
where both $c$ and the $A_{\eta+p(1-\eta)}(\theta)$-constant of $(g w, G w)$ depend only on the $A p(\theta)$ constant of $w$.

We will postpone the proof of the lemma until after that of the theorem.
Proof (of Theorem 5). Choose $\eta=\left(p_{0}+\varepsilon^{\prime}-2\right) /\left(p_{0}-1\right)$ for some $\varepsilon^{\prime}, \varepsilon>\varepsilon^{\prime}>0$. Then from Lemma 4 we obtain a $G$ such that
(i) $g \leq G$,
(ii) $(g w, G w) \in A_{2-\varepsilon^{\prime}}(\theta)$,
(iii) $\|G\|_{L_{\mu}^{\left(p_{0} / 2\right)^{\prime}}} \leq c\|g\|_{L_{\mu}^{\left(p_{0} / 2\right)^{\prime}}}$
where $c$ and the $A_{2-\varepsilon^{\prime}}(\theta)$ constant depend only on the norm of $M_{\theta}$.
Part (i) is obvious from the definition of $G$.
Part (ii) is true since for $p=p_{0}-\varepsilon$,

$$
\eta+p(1-\eta)=1+\frac{p-1}{p_{0}-1}(1-\varepsilon)<2-\varepsilon
$$

and so

$$
A_{\eta+p(1-\eta)}(\theta) \subseteq A_{2-\varepsilon}(\theta)
$$

Part (iii) follows from the lemma by interpolating part (iii) of the lemma with

$$
\|G\|_{L_{\mu}^{\infty}} \leq C\|g\|_{L_{\mu}^{\infty}} ;
$$

since

$$
\left(p_{0} / 2\right)^{\prime}=p_{0}^{\prime} / \eta^{\prime} \quad \text { where } \quad \eta^{\prime}=\frac{p_{0}-2}{p_{0}-1}<\eta
$$

so

$$
\left(p_{0} / 2\right)^{\prime}=p_{0}^{\prime} / \eta^{\prime}>p_{0}^{\prime} / \eta
$$

The next step is to replace $G$ by a function $H$ such that $H \cdot w \in A_{2}\left(\theta_{i}\right)$, independent of $i$. We will show this in the case $\theta_{i}=0$, that is, $H \cdot w \in A_{2}$ in the $x_{1}$ and $x_{2}$ directions. One rotates to obtain the result in each direction $\theta_{i}$, but the notation gets out of hand.

By the Lebesgue differentiation theorem, $(g w, G \cdot w) \in A_{2-\varepsilon^{\prime}}(\theta)$ implies that $(g w, G w) \in A_{2-\varepsilon^{\prime}}$ in each direction $\cdot \theta_{i}$ independently. Thus (assuming for the moment that $\theta_{i}=0$ )

$$
\begin{aligned}
& M_{1}: L_{\nu}^{2-\varepsilon^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{1}\right) \rightarrow L_{\sigma}^{2-\varepsilon^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{1}\right) \quad \text { and } \\
& M_{2}: L_{\nu}^{2-\varepsilon^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{1}\right) \rightarrow L_{\sigma}^{2-\varepsilon^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{1}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

are of weak type ( $\nu=g w$ and $\sigma=G w$ ). So by interpolation with the trivial $L^{\infty}$ result,

$$
M_{1}: L_{\nu}^{2}\left(x_{1}\right) \rightarrow L_{\sigma}^{2}\left(x_{1}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad M_{2}: L_{\nu}^{2}\left(x_{2}\right) \rightarrow L_{\sigma}^{2}\left(x_{2}\right)
$$

are (strong-type) bounded. Since $M(f) \leq M_{1}\left(M_{2}(f)\right)$ it follows that

$$
M: L_{\nu}^{2}\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right) \rightarrow L_{\sigma}^{2}\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right)
$$

is (strong-type) bounded, with norm depending only on the norm of $M_{\theta}$.
Now let $g_{0}=g, g_{1}=G$ and $\nu_{i}=g_{i} \cdot w$. Then

$$
\left\|g_{1}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{\left(p_{0} / 2\right)^{\prime}} \leq c}\left\|g_{0}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{\left(p_{0} / 2\right)^{\prime}}}
$$

and

$$
\|M(f)\|_{L_{\nu_{1}}^{2}} \leq K\|f\|_{L_{\nu_{0}}^{2}} \quad \text { for } \quad f \in L_{\mu}^{\left(p_{0} / 2\right)}
$$

with $c$ and $K$ depending only on the norm of $M_{\theta}$.
Proceeding inductively, given $g_{j}$ we can obtain $g_{j+1} \geq g_{j}$ and $\nu_{j+1}=$ $g_{j+1} \cdot w$ so that

$$
\left\|g_{j+1}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p_{0} / 2 y}} \leq c\left\|g_{j}\right\|_{L_{w_{0}}^{\left(p_{0} / 2\right)}} \leq c^{j+1}\left\|g_{0}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{\left(p_{0} / 2\right)}}
$$

and

$$
\|M(f)\|_{L_{\nu_{j}+1}^{2}} \leq K\|f\|_{L_{\nu_{j}}^{2}}^{2}
$$

Now let

$$
H(g)=\sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \frac{g_{j}(y)}{(c+1)^{j}}
$$

Since

$$
\frac{\left\|g_{j}(y)\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{\left(p_{0} / 2\right)}}}{(c+1)^{j}} \leq\left[\frac{c}{c+1}\right]^{j}\|g\|_{L_{\mu}^{\left(p_{0} / 2 y\right.}}
$$

the series converges, and also $H \geq g$ and

$$
\|H\|_{L_{\mu}^{\left(p_{0} / 2\right)}} \leq(c+1)\|g\|_{L_{\mu}^{\left(p_{0} / 2\right)}}
$$

Now if we let $\nu=H \cdot w$, since

$$
\|M(f)\|_{L_{\nu_{j}+1}^{2}} \leq K\|f\|_{L_{r_{j}}^{2}}^{2}
$$

we have

$$
\|M(f)\|_{L_{\nu}^{2}} \leq \sum_{K=0}^{\infty} \frac{K}{(c+1)^{j}}\|f\|_{L_{\nu}^{2}}=c\|f\|_{L_{\nu}^{2}}
$$

This last inequality implies $H \cdot w \in A_{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ with $A_{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ norm depending only on the norm of $M_{\theta}$. By replacing the strong maximal function $M$ by the maximal function with rectangles oriented in the direction $\theta_{i}$, one obtains similarly $H \cdot w \in A_{2}\left(\theta_{i}\right)$ with the $A_{2}\left(\theta_{i}\right)$ constant depending only on the norm of $M_{\theta}$. Since this is independent of $i$, it follows that $H \cdot w \in A_{2}(\theta)$.

Proof of Lemma 4. Note that $M_{\theta}$ is bounded on $L_{\nu}^{p^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right), \nu=w^{1-p^{\prime}}$, $w \in A p(\theta)$.
(i) It is obvious that $G \geq g$.
(ii) We must show that $(g w, G w) \in A_{\eta+p(1-\eta)}(\theta)$, i.e.,

$$
\left(\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R} g(y) w(y) d y\right)\left(\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R}\left(\frac{M_{\theta}\left(g^{1 / \eta} w\right)(y)}{w(y)}\right)^{-\eta /(q-1)} d y\right)^{q-1} \leq c
$$

for any rectangle $R$ oriented in any of the directions $\theta_{i}$. Here $q=\eta+$ $p(1-\eta)$ so $q-1=(p-1)(1-\eta)>0$. Hence $q>1$.

By Holder's inequality with indices $1 / \eta, 1 / 1-\eta$,

$$
\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R} g(y) w(y) d y \leq\left(\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R} g(y)^{1 / \eta} w(y) d y\right)^{\eta}\left(\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R} w(y) d y\right)^{1-\eta}
$$

Also for $y \in R$,

$$
M_{\theta}\left(g^{1 / \eta} w\right)(y) \geq \frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R} g(x)^{1 / \eta} w(x) d x
$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {\left[\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R}\left(\frac{M_{\theta}\left(g^{1 / \eta} w\right)(y)}{w(y)}\right)^{-\eta /(q-1)} w(y)^{-1 /(\eta-1)}\right]^{q-1}} \\
& \quad \leq\left(\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R} g(x)^{1 / \eta} w(x)\right)^{-\eta} \cdot\left[\frac{1}{R} \int_{R} w(y)^{(\eta-1) /(q-1)} d y\right]^{q-1} \\
& \quad=\left(\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R} g(x)^{1 / \eta} w(x) d y\right)^{-\eta}\left(\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R} w(y)^{-1 /(p-1)} d y\right)^{(p-1)(1-\eta)}
\end{aligned}
$$

So, the $A p(\theta)$ condition is bounded by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {\left[\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R} w(y) d y\right]^{1-\eta}\left[\frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R} w(y)^{-1 /(p-1)} d y\right]^{(p-1)(1-\eta)}} \\
& \quad \leq[A p(\theta) \text { constant of } w]^{1-\eta}
\end{aligned}
$$

(iii)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int\left[\frac{M_{\theta}\left(g^{1 / \eta} w\right)(y)}{w(y)}\right]^{\eta \cdot p^{\prime} / \eta} w(y) d y \\
& \quad=\int M_{\theta}\left(g^{1 / \eta} w\right)^{p^{\prime}} w(y)^{1-p^{\prime}} d y \leq c \int g^{p^{\prime} / \eta} w(y) d y
\end{aligned}
$$

Finally we have the main result of this section:
ThEOREM 6. If $p_{0}>2$ and $M_{\theta}$ is bounded on $L_{\nu}^{p^{\prime}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right) \text {, for } p \in, ~}$ ( $p_{0}-\varepsilon, p_{0}$ ), some $\varepsilon>0$, then the multiplier operator $T_{\theta}$ is bounded on $L_{\mu}^{p_{0}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ with norm depending only on the norm of $M_{\theta}$ and the $A p(\theta)$-constant of $w$.

Proof. This follows directly from Theorems 1 and 5.

## 6. An extrapolation result

In this section we generalize an extrapolation theorem of Garcia-Cuerva to weights in $A p(\theta)$. The theorem of Garcia-Cuerva states that for any sublinear operator $T$, if $T$ is bounded on $L_{\mu}^{p_{0}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ where $d \mu(x)=w(x) d x$, for some $p_{0}, 1<p_{0}<\infty$, and all $w \in A p_{0}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$, then $T$ is bounded on $L_{\mu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ for all $p$, $1<p<\infty$, and all $w \in A p\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$. For more on extrapolation see [7], [15], or [17].

Theorem 7. Assume that $T$ is a sublinear operator satisfying the following conditions:

There is a $p_{0}, 1<p_{0}<\infty$, such that for every $w \in A p_{0}(\theta)$,

$$
\|T f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p_{0}}} \leq c\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p_{0}}}
$$

$d \mu(x)=w(x) d x$, where $c$ is independent of $f$ and depends only on the $A p_{0}(\theta)$ constant of $w$.
(i) For $p_{0}<p<+\infty$ assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|M_{\theta} f\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{r}} \leq c^{\prime}\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{r}} \text { for all } w \in A p_{0}(\theta), c^{\prime} \tag{a}
\end{equation*}
$$

independent in $A p_{0}(\theta)$ and $r \in\left(p_{0}-\varepsilon, p_{0}\right]$ for some $\varepsilon>0$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|M_{\theta} f\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{q}} \leq K\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{q}} \text { if and only if }\left\|M_{\theta} f\right\|_{L_{\nu}^{q^{\prime}}} \leq K^{\prime}\|f\|_{L_{v}^{q^{\prime}}} \tag{b}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $1<q<+\infty, 1 / q^{\prime}+1 / q=1$ and $d \nu(x)=w(x)^{1-q^{\prime}} d x$.
(ii) For $1<p<p_{0}$ assume that $\left\|M_{\theta} f\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \leq c\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}$ for $c$ independent in $A p(\theta)$.

Then $\|T f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \leq K(p)\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}$ for all $p, 1<p<\infty$, and for all $w \in A p(\theta)$ where $K(p)$ is independent in $A p(\theta)$.

Proof. Case (i). For $p_{0}<p<+\infty$, let $w \in A p(\theta)$ and $f \in L_{\mu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$. To begin we need the following lemma.

Lemma 5. If $\left\|M_{\theta} f\right\|_{L_{\beta}^{\prime}} \leq c\|f\|_{L_{\beta}^{r}}, d \beta(x)=w(x)^{1-r} d x, r \in\left(p^{\prime}-\varepsilon, p^{\prime}\right]$ for some $\varepsilon>0$, and $f \in L_{\sigma}^{r}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$, then for each non-negative $g \in L_{\mu}^{\left(p / p_{0}\right)}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ there is $a G \geq g$ such that
$\|G\|_{L_{\mu}^{\left(p / p_{0}\right)^{\prime}}} \leq c\|g\|_{L_{\mu}^{\left(p / 0_{0}\right)}}$ and $G \cdot w \in A p_{0}(\theta)$. Here $c$ is independent of $g$.

The proof of Lemma 5 is the same as the proof of Theorem 5, with 2 replaced by $p_{0}$.
To complete the proof of Case (i), note that $M_{\theta}$ bounded on $L_{\mu}^{p_{0}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ implies, by interpolation with the trivial $L^{\infty}$ result, that $M_{\theta}$ is bounded on $L_{\mu}^{p_{0}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right), p_{0} \leq p \leq+\infty$. So by hypothesis $M_{\theta}$ is bounded on $L_{v}^{p^{\prime}}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right), d \nu(x)$ $=w^{1-p^{\prime}}(x) d \lambda$ for $p_{0} \leq p \leq+\infty$. We may apply Lemma 5 in this range and get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|T f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}^{p_{p}^{p}}=\left\||T f|^{p_{0}}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p_{\mu}} p_{0}}^{p_{0}} \\
&= \sup \int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}}|T f(y)|^{p_{0}} g(y) w(y) d y, \\
& \quad(\text { where the sup is taker } \\
& \leq \sup \int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}}|T f(y)|^{p_{0}} G(y) w(y) d y \\
& \leq \sup c \int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}}|f(y)|^{p_{0}} G(y) w(y) d y \\
& \leq \sup c\left\|f| |^{p_{0}}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p / p_{0}} \|}\| \|_{L_{\mu}^{\left(p / p_{0}\right)}} \\
& \leq c\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}^{p_{0}},
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\text { (where the sup is taken over }\|g\|_{L_{\mu}^{\left(p / p_{0}\right)^{\prime}}} \leq 1, g \geq 0 \text { ) }
$$

with $c$ independent of $f$ and $\mu$.
Case (ii). For $1<p<p_{0}$, let $w \in A p(\theta)$ and $f \in L_{\mu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$. We also need a lemma here.

Lemma 6. Assume that $1<p<p_{0}, w \in A p(\theta)$ and that

$$
\left\|M_{\theta} f\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \leq c\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}
$$

$c$ independent of $f$. Then for each non-negative $g \in L_{\mu}^{p /\left(p-p_{0}\right)}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$, we can find $G \geq g$ such that

$$
\|G\|_{L_{\mu}^{p /\left(p-p_{0}\right)}} \leq c^{\prime}\|g\|_{L_{\mu}^{p} /\left(p-p_{0}\right)}
$$

and $G^{-1} w \in A p_{0}(\theta)$, with both $c^{\prime}$ and the $A p_{0}(\theta)$-constant of $G^{-1} w$ dependent only on the $A p(\theta)$-constant of $w$.

Proof. This is the dual to Lemma 5 and is proved exactly as in [17], Chapter 9, Proposition 7.5.

To complete the proof of the theorem let

$$
g(x)=\left(|f(x)| /\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}\right)^{p_{0}-p}
$$

where $f(x) \neq 0, g(x)=0$ elsewhere. Note that

$$
\int_{\{f \neq 0)}|f(x)|^{p_{0}} g(x)^{-1} w(x) d x=\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}^{p_{0}}
$$

and

$$
\|g\|_{L_{\mu}^{p / p_{0}-p}}=1
$$

Apply Lemma 6 to obtain $G \geq g$ with the given properties. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|T f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}^{p_{0}} & =\left[\int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}}\left[\frac{|T(f)(x)|^{p_{0}}}{G(x)}\right]^{p / p_{0}} G(x)^{p / p_{0}} w(x) d x\right]^{p_{0}} \\
& \leq\|G\|_{L_{\mu}^{p / p_{0}-p}} \int_{\mathbf{R}^{2}}|T(f)(x)|^{p_{0}} G(x)^{-1} w(x) d x \\
& \leq c \int_{(f \neq 0)}|f(x)|^{p_{0}} G^{-1}(x) w(x) d x \\
& \leq c \int_{(f \neq 0)}|f(x)|^{p_{0}} g^{-1}(x) w(x) d x=\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}^{p_{0}}
\end{aligned}
$$

## 7. Applications

In this section we use the results proven above to obtain two applications. The first concerns an infinite class $\theta$ where $M_{\theta}$ is known to be bounded. The
second application is a weighted version of the angular Littlewood-Paley operator.

Definition. A sequence $\left\{\theta_{K}\right\}$ is called lacunary provided there is a constant $r<1$ such that $0<\theta_{K+1}<r \theta_{K}, K=1,2, \ldots$.

Theorem. If $\theta=\left\{\theta_{K}\right\}$ is lacunary then $\left\|M_{\theta}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \leq c\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}, d \mu(x)=$ $w(x) d x$, if and only if $w \in A p(\theta)$, where $c$ depends only on the $A p(\theta)$-constant of $w$.

For a proof of this result see reference [8].

Theorem 8. If $w \in A p(\theta)$ and $A p\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$, and if $\theta=\left\{\theta_{K}\right\}$ is lacunary, then $T_{\theta}$ is bounded on $L_{\mu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right) 1<p<+\infty, d \mu(x)=w(x) d \lambda$.

Proof. For $p>2$ the theorem immediately above, combined with Theorem 6, gives the result. For $1<p \leq 2$ we apply Theorem 7, the result on extrapolation.

Theorem 9. Let $\theta=\left\{\theta_{K}\right\}$ be lacunary and let $H_{K}$ be the Hilbert transform in the direction $\theta_{K}$. If $1<p<\infty, w \in A p(\theta)$ and $A p\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ and if $f \in L_{\mu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ then

$$
\left\|\left(\sum_{k}\left|H_{k}(f)\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \leq c\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}
$$

Here $c$ depends on $w$ and $p$ and is independent of $f$.

Proof. We may assume $p>2$ and apply Theorem 7 to finish the proof.
Since $M_{\theta}$ is bounded on $L_{\mu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right), 1<p<\infty$, by Theorem 5 , the condition $B C(\mu, p)$ is true for $p>2$. Then by theorem 2 ,

$$
\left\|\left(\sum_{k}\left|H_{k} f_{k}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \leq c\left\|\left(\sum_{k}\left|f_{k}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}
$$

If $S_{k}$ is the dyadic Littlewood-Paley operator defined on $L^{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ by

$$
\widehat{S_{k}}(f)(x)=X_{R_{k}}(x) \hat{f}(x)
$$

where each $R_{k}$ is a dyadic rectangle, then Kurtz [9] has shown:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\left(\sum_{k}\left|S_{k} f\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)} \leq c\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\left(\sum_{k}\left|f_{k}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)} \approx\left\|\left(\sum_{k}\left|S_{k} f_{k}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $c$ is independent of $f$.
Using this result, it then follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\left(\sum_{k}\left|H_{k} f\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} & \leq c\left\|\left(\sum_{k}\left|S_{k} H_{k} f\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \\
& =c\left\|\left(\sum_{k}\left|H_{k} S_{k} f\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \\
& \leq c\left\|\left(\sum_{k}\left|S_{k} f\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \\
& \leq c\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $c$ is independent of $f$, and depends on $w$ and $p$.
As an immediate corollary we have the following version of the Angular Littlewood-Paley inequality.

Theorem 10. Let $\theta=\left\{\theta_{k}\right\}$ be lacunary, $0<\theta_{k}<\pi / 2$, and define the sector $\sigma_{k}$ by

$$
\sigma_{k}=\left\{x \in \mathbf{R}^{2}: \theta_{k}<\operatorname{argument}(x) \leq \theta_{k+1}\right\}
$$

for $k=0,1,2, \ldots$ Set $\hat{T}_{k}(f)(x)=X_{\sigma_{k}}(x) \hat{f}(x)$. Then if $f$ is supported in $\cup_{k} \sigma_{k}, f \in L_{\mu}^{p}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ and $f \in L_{\mu}^{2}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right), d \mu=w(x) d \lambda(x)$, and if $w \in A p(\theta)$ and $A p\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}\right)$ then

$$
\left\|\left(\sum_{k}\left|T_{k} f\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}} \leq c\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^{p}}
$$

where $c=c(\mu, p)$ is independent of $f$.
Proof. Since $T_{k}=H_{k+1}-H_{k}$ this follows immediately from Theorem 9.
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