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#### Abstract

In this paper we shall give an elementary proof of a norm estimate given by Igari for the Kakeya maximal operator restricted to functions of product type. Our proof also gives an improvement of the result.


Introduction. For an integer $N>1$ let $\mathscr{B}_{N}$ be the class of all rectangles in $\boldsymbol{R}^{d}, d \geq 2$, of eccentricity $N$, that is, congruent to any dilate of the rectangle $(0,1)^{d-1} \times(0, N)$ and let $B_{N}$ be the sub-class of $\mathscr{B}_{N}$ consisting of all rectangles which are congruent to the rectangle $(0,1)^{d-1} \times(0, N)$.

The Kakeya maximal operator $M_{N}$ is defined on locally integrable functions $f$ of $\boldsymbol{R}^{d}$ by

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

where $|A|$ represents the Lebesgue measure of a set $A$. The smaller Kakeya maximal operator $K_{N}$ is defined by

$$
K_{N} f(x)=\sup _{x \in R \in B_{N}} \frac{1}{|R|} \int_{R}|f(y)| d y .
$$

It is conjectured that $M_{N}$ is bounded on $L^{d}\left(\boldsymbol{R}^{d}\right)$ with the norm which grows no faster than $O\left((\log N)^{\alpha_{d}}\right)$ for some $\alpha_{d}>0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. This conjecture was solved in the affirmative in the case $d=2$ by Córdoba [2], with the exponent $\alpha_{2}=2$ but seems to remain unsolved for $d \geq 3$. For $K_{N}$ Córdoba [2] proved the above estimate with the exponent $\alpha_{2}=1 / 2$ and used that estimate in the proof of the estimate for $M_{N}$.

In the higher dimensional case these estimates were proved so far only for some restricted class of functions. Restricting to functions of product type, Igari [3] proved the estimate for $K_{N}$ with the exponent $\alpha_{d}=3 / 2(d \geq 3)$. Restricting to the functions of radial type, Carbery, Hernández, and Soria [1] proved the estimate for $M_{N}$ with the exponent $\alpha_{d}=1$.

Igari based his proof on an interpolation theorem given in [4]. The purpose of this note is to present an elementary proof of Igari's result with a better value of $\alpha_{d}$.

Theorem 1. Let $d \geq 2$. There exists a constant $C$, independent of $N$, such that

$$
\left\|K_{N} f\right\|_{d} \leq C(\log N)^{1-1 / d}\|f\|_{d}
$$

holds for all $f$ in $L^{d}\left(\boldsymbol{R}^{d}\right)$ of the form

$$
f\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{d}\right)=\prod_{l=1}^{d} f_{l}\left(x_{l}\right) .
$$

Here $\|f\|_{d}$ denotes the $L^{d}$-norm of $f$.
I would like to express my gratitude to my teacher Professor S. T. Kuroda, who introduced me to this problem and helped me in this work.

1. Proof of the theorem. We may assume that $f_{l} \geq 0$. We divide $\boldsymbol{R}^{d}$ into open unit cubes $Q_{i}$ (and their boundaries) which have center at lattice points $i \in \boldsymbol{Z}^{d}$ and whose sides are parallel to the axes. By the local integrability of $f$ we can find for every cube $Q_{i}$ a rectangle $R_{i} \in B_{N}$ such that
(i) $Q_{i} \cap R_{i} \neq \varnothing$,
(ii) $\quad K_{N} f(x) \leq \frac{2}{\left|R_{i}\right|} \int_{R_{i}} f(y) d y, \quad \forall x \in Q_{i}$
(see [2]). From (ii) we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{N} f(x) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathbf{Z}^{d}} \frac{2}{\left|R_{i}\right|} \int_{R_{i}} f(y) d y \chi_{Q_{i}}(x)=\frac{2}{N} \sum_{i \in \mathbf{Z}^{d}} \int_{R_{i}} f(y) d y \chi_{Q_{i}}(x) . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

So, it suffices for the proof of the theorem to estimate the right hand side of (1). To this end we define $\gamma_{i}$ as

$$
\gamma_{i}=\left\{j \in \boldsymbol{Z}^{d} \mid Q_{j} \cap R_{i} \neq \varnothing\right\}
$$

and denote the projection of $Q_{j}$ onto the $l$-th axis by $J_{l}$, that is

$$
J_{l}=\left(j_{l}-1 / 2, j_{l}+1 / 2\right) \quad \text { for } \quad j=\left(j_{1}, j_{2}, \ldots, j_{d}\right) \in \boldsymbol{Z}^{d}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\boldsymbol{R}^{d}}\left(K_{N} f\right)(x)^{d} d x & \leq \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^{d}}\left(\frac{2}{N} \sum_{i \in \mathbf{Z}^{d}} \int_{R_{i}} f(y) d y \chi_{Q_{i}}(x)\right)^{d} d x=\left(\frac{2}{N}\right)^{d} \sum_{i}\left(\int_{R_{i}} f(y) d y\right)^{d} \\
& \leq\left(\frac{2}{N}\right)^{d} \sum_{i}\left(\sum_{j \in \gamma_{i}} \int_{Q_{j}} f(y) d y\right)^{d}=\left(\frac{2}{N}\right)^{d} \sum_{i}\left(\sum_{j \in \gamma_{i}} \prod_{l=1}^{d} \int_{J_{l}} f_{l}\left(y_{l}\right) d y_{l}\right)^{d} .
\end{aligned}
$$

By multiple Hölder's and ordinary Hölder's inequalities we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbf{R}^{d}}\left(K_{N} f\right)(x)^{d} d x \leq\left(\frac{2}{N}\right)^{d} \sum_{i \in \mathbf{Z}^{d}} \prod_{l=1}^{d} \sum_{j \in \gamma_{i}}\left(\int_{J_{l}} f_{l}\left(y_{l}\right) d y_{l}\right)^{d} \\
& \quad \leq\left(\frac{2}{N}\right)^{d} \sum_{i} \prod_{l=1}^{d} \sum_{j \in \gamma_{i}} \int_{J_{l}} f_{l}\left(y_{l}\right)^{d} d y_{l}=\left(\frac{2}{N}\right)^{d} \sum_{i} \prod_{l=1}^{d} \int_{\boldsymbol{R}}\left(\sum_{j \in \gamma_{i}} \chi_{J_{l}}\left(y_{l}\right)\right) f_{l}\left(y_{l}\right)^{d} d y_{l} \\
& \quad=\left(\frac{2}{N}\right)^{d} \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^{d}}\left(\sum_{i} \prod_{l=1}^{d} \sum_{j \in \gamma_{i}} \chi_{J_{l}}\left(y_{l}\right)\right) f(y)^{d} d y .
\end{aligned}
$$

It is now clear that the theorem follows from the following lemma.
Lemma 2. Let $g(y)$ be defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(y)=\sum_{i \in \mathbf{Z}^{d}} \prod_{l=1}^{d} \sum_{j \in \gamma_{i}} \chi_{J_{l}}\left(y_{l}\right) . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then

$$
\|g\|_{\infty} \leq C N^{d}(\log N)^{d-1}
$$

where $C$ does not depend on $N$ and the choice of $R_{i}$.
By the definition of $g$ we have $g(y)=0$ if $y \in \boldsymbol{R}^{d} \backslash \bigcup_{i \in \mathbf{Z}^{d}} Q_{i}$ and $g(y)=g(i)$ if $y \in Q_{i}$. Therefore, it suffices for the proof of the lemma to show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(0) \leq C N^{d}(\log N)^{d-1} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for sufficiently large $N$, where $C$ is a constant independent of the choice of $R_{i}$. More precisely we assume that $N>\sqrt{d-1}$.

Let $\Omega_{l}, 1 \leq l \leq d$, be the band-like domain defined by

$$
\Omega_{l}=\boldsymbol{R}^{l-1} \times(-1 / 2,1 / 2) \times \boldsymbol{R}^{d-l} .
$$

Then, the second sum in (2) with $y=0$ is equal to $\operatorname{card}\left(\left\{j \in \boldsymbol{Z}^{d} \mid Q_{j} \cap\left(\Omega_{l} \cap R_{i}\right) \neq \varnothing\right\}\right)$. Next, we define $A$ as

$$
A=\left\{\left(j_{1}, j_{2}, \ldots, j_{d}\right) \in \boldsymbol{Z}^{d} \cap[0,2 N]^{d} \mid j_{k} \leq j_{d}, 1 \leq k \leq d-1\right\} .
$$

Then by symmetry and the definition of $g$

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(0) \leq C \sum_{i \in A} \prod_{l=1}^{d} \operatorname{card}\left(\left\{j \in \boldsymbol{Z}^{d} \mid Q_{j} \cap\left(\Omega_{l} \cap R_{i}\right) \neq \varnothing\right\}\right) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proposition 3. Let $N>\sqrt{d-1}$. For any $i \in A$ and $R_{i} \in B_{N}$ such that $Q_{i} \cap R_{i} \neq \varnothing$ the estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
\prod_{l=1}^{d} \operatorname{card}\left(\left\{j \in \boldsymbol{Z}^{d} \mid Q_{j} \cap\left(\Omega_{l} \cap R_{i}\right) \neq \varnothing\right\}\right) \leq C N^{d-1} \prod_{l=1}^{d-1}\left(i_{l}+1\right)^{-1} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds. Here, $C$ depends only on $d$.

Inserting (5) into the right hand side of (4) and estimating the sum, we obtain (3) and complete the proof of the lemma.
2. Proof of Proposition 3. We shall first prove some simple geometric propositions. Hereafter, we denote by $[a]$ the largest integer not greater than $a$, use $C$ to denote various constants depending only on $d$, and write for simplicity

$$
D=d^{1 / 2}, \quad D^{\prime}=(d-1)^{1 / 2}
$$

Proposition 4. For any unit cube $Q \subset \boldsymbol{R}^{d}$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{card}\left(\left\{j \in \boldsymbol{Z}^{d} \mid Q_{j} \cap\left(Q \cap \Omega_{l}\right) \neq \varnothing\right\}\right) \leq([D]+2)^{d-1} . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. The proof is clear from the estimate

$$
\operatorname{card}\left(\left\{j \in \boldsymbol{Z} \mid Q \cap\left\{x \in \boldsymbol{R}^{d} \mid x_{k}=j+1 / 2\right\} \neq \varnothing\right\}\right) \leq[D]+1 .
$$

Proposition 5. Let $i \in \boldsymbol{Z}^{d}$. Let $R \in B_{N}$ be such that $R \cap Q_{i} \neq \varnothing$. Let e be a unit vector parallel to longer sides of $R$. Assume that $R \cap \Omega_{l} \neq \varnothing$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\left|i_{l}\right|-\left(D^{\prime}+1\right)\right) / N \leq\left|e_{l}\right| . \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $i_{l} \geq 0$. It follows from $R \cap Q_{i} \neq \varnothing$ and $R \cap \Omega_{l} \neq \varnothing$ that the length of the projection of $R$ on the $x_{l}$-axis is greater than $i_{l}-1$. On the other hand that length is less than $N\left|e_{l}\right|+D^{\prime}$.

Proposition 6. Let e be a unit vector in $\boldsymbol{R}^{d}$ with $e_{l} \neq 0$. Let $L$ be a line parallel to $e$. Then

$$
\operatorname{card}\left(\left\{j \in Z^{d} \mid Q_{j} \cap\left(\Omega_{l} \cap L\right) \neq \varnothing\right\}\right) \leq([D]+2)^{d-1}\left(\left[\left|e_{l}\right|^{-1}\right]+1\right) .
$$

Proof. The length of $\Omega_{l} \cap L$ is $\left|e_{l}\right|^{-1}$. Therefore, $\Omega_{l} \cap L$ is covered by $\left[\left|e_{l}\right|^{-1}\right]+1$ segments of length 1 . To each segment we attach a unit cube containing it and apply Proposition 4.

Proposition 7. Let e be a unit vector in $\boldsymbol{R}^{d}$ with $e_{l} \neq 0$. Let $R$ be a column congruent to $(0,1)^{d-1} \times \boldsymbol{R}$ and parallel to $e$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{card}\left(\left\{j \in Z^{d} \mid Q_{j} \cap\left(\Omega_{l} \cap R\right) \neq \varnothing\right\}\right) & \leq([D]+2)^{d-1}\left(\left[\left(D^{\prime}+1\right)\left|e_{l}\right|^{-1}\right]+1\right) \\
& \leq C\left|e_{l}\right|^{-1} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. When an $\boldsymbol{R}^{\boldsymbol{d}-1}$-dimensional unit cube intersects $\Omega_{l}$, its point farthest from $\Omega_{l}$ has the distance at most $D^{\prime}$ from $\Omega_{l}$. Considering this fact, we proceed as in the proof of Proposition 6.

Using these propositions we shall now prove Proposition 3. If the left hand side of (5) is not equal to 0 , then $R_{i} \cap \Omega_{l} \neq \varnothing$ for all $l, 1 \leq l \leq d$. We define $A_{1}$ and $A_{2}$ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.A_{1}=\left\{j \in \boldsymbol{Z}^{d} \cap\left(\left[D^{\prime}\right]+2,2 N\right]^{d}\right) \mid j_{k} \leq j_{d}, 1 \leq k \leq d-1\right\} \\
& A_{2}=A-A_{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

Case 1. $i \in A_{1}$. From Proposition 5 with $R_{i}$ in place of $R$ we obtain $0<$ $\left(i_{l}-\left(\left[D^{\prime}\right]+2\right)\right) / N \leq\left|e_{l}\right|$ for all $1 \leq l \leq d$. This implies that Proposition 7 is applicable so that it suffices to compute the maximum of $\prod_{l=1}^{d}\left(1 / x_{l}\right)$ in the region

$$
\sum_{l=1}^{d} x_{l}^{2}=1, \quad\left(i_{l}-\left(\left[D^{\prime}\right]+2\right)\right) / N \leq x_{l}
$$

Noting [ $\left.D^{\prime}\right]+3 \leq i_{l}$ in $A_{1}$, we see that the above domain is contained in the region $F \subset \boldsymbol{R}^{d}$ given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{l=1}^{d} x_{l}^{2}=1, \quad\left(i_{l}+1\right)\left\{\left(\left[D^{\prime}\right]+4\right) 3 N\right\}^{-1} \leq x_{l} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

For later convenience we compute the maximum in this extended region. The proof of (5) for the case 1 now follows from the following:

Proposition 8. Let $i \in A$ and let $F$ be the region given by (8). Then,

$$
\max _{x \in F} \prod_{l=1}^{d} x_{l}^{-1} \leq C N^{d-1} \prod_{l=1}^{d-1}\left(i_{l}+1\right)^{-1}
$$

The proof of the proposition will be given later.
Case 2. $i \in A_{2}$. We may assume that $i_{l} \leq\left[D^{\prime}\right]+2$ for $1 \leq l \leq p$ and $i_{l}>\left[D^{\prime}\right]+2$ for $p<l \leq d$, where $p$ is an integer such that $1 \leq p \leq d$. For $l>p$ we use the estimate of Proposition 7. For dealing with the case $1 \leq l \leq p$ we use the following relation (use Proposition 4).

$$
\begin{align*}
\operatorname{card}\left(\left\{j \in Z^{d} \mid Q_{j} \cap\left(\Omega_{l} \cap R_{i}\right) \neq \varnothing\right\}\right) & \leq([D]+2)^{d-1}\left(\left[\left(N^{2}+d-1\right)^{1 / 2}\right]+1\right)  \tag{9}\\
& \leq([D]+2)^{d-1} 3 N .
\end{align*}
$$

Therefore we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{card}\left(\left\{j \in \boldsymbol{Z}^{d} \mid Q_{j} \cap\left(\Omega_{l} \cap R_{i}\right) \neq \varnothing\right\}\right) \leq C \min \left(3 N,\left|e_{l}\right|^{-1}\right) \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

We may assume that $\left|e_{l}\right|<1 /(3 N)$ for $1 \leq l<q$ and $\left|e_{l}\right| \geq 1 /(3 N)$ for $q \leq l \leq p$, where $1 \leq q \leq p+1$. Then by (10)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \prod_{l=1}^{d} \operatorname{card}\left(\left\{j \in Z^{d} \mid Q_{j} \cap\left(\Omega_{l} \cap R_{i}\right) \neq \varnothing\right\}\right) \\
& \quad \leq C(3 N)^{q-1} \prod_{l=q}^{d}\left|e_{l}\right|^{-1} \leq C N^{q-1} \prod_{l=1}^{q-1}\left(i_{l}+1\right)^{-1} \prod_{l=q}^{d}\left|e_{l}\right|^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

When $1 \leq q \leq d$ we want to apply Proposition 8 adapted to the $(d-q+1)$-dimensional
case to $\prod_{l=q}^{d}\left|e_{l}\right|^{-1}$. (This use of inductive argument is due to Professor S. T. Kuroda.) To this end we must check the assumption (8). For $l$ with $q \leq l \leq d$ we see by the above discussion and $\left(i_{l}+1\right)\left\{\left(\left[D^{\prime}\right]+4\right) 3 N\right\}^{-1} \leq 1 /(3 N) \leq\left|e_{l}\right|, q \leq l \leq p$, that

$$
\left(i_{l}+1\right)\left\{\left(\left[D^{\prime}\right]+4\right) 3 N\right\}^{-1} \leq\left|e_{l}\right|
$$

Furthermore, $\sqrt{8} / 3 \leq \sum_{l=q}^{d}\left|e_{l}\right|^{2} \leq 1$. Therefore we can apply Proposition 8 and obtain (5).

When $q=d$ we only need to note $\left|e_{d}\right|^{-1} \leq 3 / \sqrt{8}$.
Finally, we shall prove Proposition 8. Putting $y_{l}=x_{l}^{2}$, the assertion is converted to computing the minimum value of

$$
\psi(y)=\prod_{l=1}^{d} y_{l}
$$

in the region

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{l=1}^{d} y_{l}=1, \quad a_{l} \leq y_{l}, \quad 1 \leq l \leq d \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

We have

$$
\psi(y)=\prod_{1}^{d} y_{l}=\prod_{1}^{d-1} y_{l}\left(1-\sum_{1}^{d-1} y_{l}\right)=\left(\prod_{2}^{d-1} y_{l}\right) y_{1}\left(\left(1-\sum_{2}^{d-1} y_{l}\right)-y_{1}\right)
$$

We shall fix all $y_{l}$ other than $y_{1}$. Then, $\psi(y)$ is a quadratic polynomial of $y_{1}$. From (11) it follows that $y_{1}$ is restricted to

$$
a_{1} \leq y_{1} \leq 1-a_{d}-\sum_{2}^{d-1} y_{l}
$$

By a simple consideration using $a_{1} \leq a_{d}$ we see that $\psi(y)$ attains the minimum value at $y_{1}=a_{1}$.

Next we put $\tilde{\psi}\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{d}\right)=\psi\left(a_{1}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{d}\right)$ and repeat a similar process with $\tilde{\psi}$ instead of $\psi$. In this way we conclude that $\psi(y)$ attains the minimum value

$$
\prod_{1}^{d-1} a_{l}\left(1-\sum_{1}^{d-1} a_{l}\right)
$$

at $y=\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots, a_{d-1}, 1-\sum_{1}^{d-1} a_{l}\right)$.
Therefore, the maximum value in Proposition 8 is

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(\prod_{1}^{d-1} a_{l}\left(1-\sum_{1}^{d-1} a_{l}\right)\right)^{-1 / 2}  \tag{12}\\
& =\left\{\left(\left[D^{\prime}\right]+4\right) 3 N\right\}^{d} \prod_{1}^{d-1}\left(i_{l}+1\right)^{-1}\left(\left(3\left(\left[D^{\prime}\right]+4\right)\right)^{2} N^{2}-\sum_{1}^{d-1}\left(i_{l}+1\right)^{2}\right)^{-1 / 2} .
\end{align*}
$$

From $i \in A$ the quantity inside the square root on the right side of (12) is estimated as

$$
\left(3\left(\left[D^{\prime}\right]+4\right)\right)^{2} N^{2}-\sum_{1}^{d-1}\left(i_{l}+1\right)^{2} \geq\left(3\left(\left[D^{\prime}\right]+4\right)\right)^{2} N^{2}-2(d-1)-8(d-1) N^{2} \geq C N^{2}
$$

Hence, the right hand side of (12) is not greater than $C N^{d-1} \prod_{1}^{d-1}\left(i_{l}+1\right)^{-1}$. This completes the proof of Proposition 8.
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