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Abstract. We establish continuity mapping properties of the non-centered fractional maximal operator $M_\beta$ in the endpoint input space $W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $d \geq 2$ in the cases for which its boundedness is known. More precisely, we prove that for $q = d/(d - \beta)$ the map $f \mapsto |\nabla M_\beta f|$ is continuous from $W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $0 < \beta < 1$ if $f$ is radial and for $1 \leq \beta < d$ for general $f$. The results for $1 \leq \beta < d$ extend to the centered counterpart $M^c_\beta$. Moreover, if $d = 1$, we show that the conjectured boundedness of that map for $M^c_\beta$ implies its continuity.

1. Introduction

Given $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $0 \leq \beta < d$, the non-centered fractional Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator $M_\beta$ is defined by

$$M_\beta f(x) := \sup_{B(z,r) \ni x} \frac{r^\beta}{|B(z,r)|} \int_{B(z,r)} |f(y)| \, dy$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The centered version of $M_\beta$, denoted by $M^c_\beta$, is defined by taking the supremum over all balls centered at $x$. The non-fractional case $\beta = 0$ corresponds to the classical maximal function, which we denote by $M = M_0$.

In recent years, there has been considerable interest in understanding the regularity properties of $M$ and $M_\beta$. This study was initiated by Kinnunen [13], who showed that if $f \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $1 < p < \infty$, then $Mf \in W^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and

$$|\nabla Mf(x)| \leq M(|\nabla f|)(x)$$

almost everywhere in $\mathbb{R}^d$. His result extends in a straightforward way to the fractional case in the scaling line $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{q} - \frac{\beta}{d}$; more generally, any $L^p - L^q$ bounded sublinear operator $A$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ that commutes with translations preserves the boundedness at the derivative level if $1 < p, q < \infty$, that is

$$\|Af\|_{1,q} \leq C\|f\|_{1,p}.$$  

At the endpoint $p = 1$, one cannot expect boundedness of $M_\beta$ from $W^{1,1}$ to $W^{1,\frac{d}{d-\beta}}$ to hold, as $M_\beta$ fails to be bounded at the level of Lebesgue spaces. However, one
may still ask the question of whether the map \( f \mapsto |\nabla M_\beta f| \) is bounded from \( W^{1,1} \) to \( L^{\frac{d}{1-\beta}} \). This problem has received a lot of attention in recent years and in the case \( \beta = 0 \) is commonly referred to as the \( W^{1,1} \)-problem. In this case, despite the question is still open, there are positive results for \( d = 1 \) \([27, 1, 16]\) and for \( d > 1 \) if the function \( f \) is radial \([19]\); see also \([11, 9, 20, 24, 15]\) for related results and \([4, 6, 22]\) for similar results in the discrete setting. In the fractional case \( 0 < \beta < d \), it was observed by Carneiro and the second author \([7]\) that the case \( \beta \geq 1 \) follows from combining Sobolev embeddings with the following smoothing property of fractional maximal functions due to Kinnunen and Saksman \([14]\): if \( f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d) \) with \( 1 < p < d \) and \( 1 \leq \beta < d/p \), then

\[
|\nabla M_\beta f(x)| \leq C M_{\beta-1} f(x)
\]  

(1.2)

almost everywhere in \( \mathbb{R}^d \). Together with the boundedness of \( M_{\beta-1} \) and the Gagliardo–Nirenberg–Sobolev inequality,

\[
\| \nabla M_\beta f \|_q \leq C \| M_{\beta-1} f \|_q \leq C \| f \|_{1,1} \leq C \| \nabla f \|_{1,1}
\]

for \( q = \frac{d}{\beta - 1} \), establishing the endpoint Sobolev bound for \( \beta \geq 1 \). Here and in (1.2) the results continue to hold for \( M_\beta^p \).

The case \( 0 < \beta < 1 \) is considerably more difficult. The one dimensional case was established by Carneiro and the second author \([7]\), whilst in higher dimensions Luiro and the second author \([20]\) proved its validity for radial functions. More recently, the first author, Ramos and Saari \([2]\) obtained the boundedness result for \( d \geq 2 \) without the radial hypothesis but for certain variants of \( M_\beta \). Such variants correspond to a lacunary version of the maximal function \( M_\beta \) and to maximal functions of convolution type with smoother kernels than \( \chi_{B(0,1)} \).

The maximal functions \( M_\beta \) are sublinear operators, and therefore their boundedness on Lebesgue spaces implies its continuity. However, this property is not preserved at the derivative level: the map \( f \mapsto |\nabla M_\beta f| \) is no longer sublinear. Therefore, it is a non-trivial question to determine the continuity of \( f \mapsto |\nabla M_\beta f| \) as a map from \( W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) to \( L^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \). This question was first posed by Hajłasz and Onninen \([12]\), where it was attributed to Iwaniec. The first affirmative results in this direction were obtained by Luiro and the second author \([17]\) for \( \beta = 0 \) in the non-endpoint cases \( p > 1 \), although his analysis extends to the fractional setting; see also his work \([15]\) for more general maximal operators in non-endpoint cases, which includes an interesting result for \( M_\beta \) in the case \( 1 \leq \beta < d \).

In analogy to the boundedness problem, the continuity at the endpoint \( p = 1 \) is a much subtler question. In recent years, there has been progress in this direction for \( d = 1 \): Carneiro, the second author and Pierce \([5]\) established the continuity for \( d = 1 \) and \( \beta = 0 \), and the second author \([21]\) showed the analogous result for \( d = 1 \) and \( 0 < \beta < 1 \). The main goal of this paper is to explore the analogous questions in higher dimensions for the cases in which the boundedness of the map \( f \mapsto |\nabla M_\beta f| \) from \( W^{1,1} \) to \( L^q \) is known. In particular, we obtain positive results for the fractional case. Similarly to the boundedness, our analysis naturally splits in two cases depending on whether \( 0 < \beta < 1 \) or \( 1 \leq \beta < d \); this is dictated by the availability of \([1, 2]\) in the latter case.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let \( M_\beta \in \{M_\beta, M_\beta^p\} \). If \( 1 \leq \beta < d \), the operator \( f \mapsto |\nabla M_\beta f| \) maps continuously \( W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) into \( L^{d/(d-\beta)}(\mathbb{R}^d) \).
The range $0 < \beta < 1$ is more interesting as the inequality (1.2) is no longer at our disposal. However, we are able to give positive results for radial functions; note that boundedness of $M_\beta$ at its derivative level is currently only known under this assumption. This constitutes the main result of this paper\footnote{The space $W^{1,1}_{\text{rad}}$ in Theorem 1.2 denotes the subspace of $W^{1,1}$ consisting of radial functions.}.

**Theorem 1.2.** If $0 < \beta < 1$, the operator $f \mapsto |\nabla M_\beta f|$ maps continuously $W^{1,1}_{\text{rad}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ into $L^{d/(d-\beta)}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

The proof of this theorem differs significantly from its one dimensional counterpart, which strongly uses that $Mf$ and $M_\beta f$ are in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ if $f \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$. In fact, the one-dimensional arguments only continue to work in higher dimensions in the restricted range $d - 1 < \beta < d$ which is, in particular, covered by Theorem 1.1. Instead, our approach is based on refining the techniques used in \cite{20} to show the bound $\|\nabla M_\beta f\|_{d/(d-\beta)} \leq C\|f\|_1$ for radial functions.

Moreover, our arguments can be combined with those in \cite{21} to yield a conjectural result in one dimension regarding the continuity of the map $f \mapsto |(M_\beta f)'|$ from $W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$ to $L^{(1-\beta)/1}(\mathbb{R})$. Our result depends upon the boundedness of that map between such function spaces, which is currently an open question.

**Theorem 1.3.** Let $0 < \beta < 1$. Assume that $\|(M_\beta f)'\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$ holds for $q = 1/(1-\beta)$. Then the operator $f \mapsto |(M_\beta f)'|$ maps continuously $W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$ into $L^q(\mathbb{R})$.

Finally, it is noted that some of our arguments also continue to work without the radial assumption, for $\beta = 0$ and for the centered maximal function. In particular, the analysis can always be reduced to showing the continuity inside a compact set $K$; this will be discussed in Section 4.3.

**Structure of the paper.** Section 2 contains many auxiliary results that will be used in the proofs of the main theorems. The proofs of Theorems 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 are provided in Sections 3, 4, and 5 respectively. Finally, an alternative proof for the range $\beta \in (d - 1, d)$ based on a one dimensional analysis will be provided in an Appendix.

**Acknowledgements.** The authors are indebted to Hannes Luiro for a clarification regarding his previous work \cite{17} and to Juha Kinnunen for valuable comments. They also would like to thank Carlos P´erez for his hospitality during his visit to BCAM.

2. Preliminaries

**Notation.** Throughout this paper, the value of the Lebesgue exponent $q$ will always be $q = d/(d-\beta)$. Given a measurable set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $\chi_E$ denotes the characteristic function of $E$ and $E^c := \mathbb{R}^d \setminus E$ its complementary set in $\mathbb{R}^d$. For $c \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $cE$ the concentric set to $E$ dilated by $c$. The integral average of $f \in L^{1}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ over $E$ is denoted by $f_E = \frac{1}{|E|} \int_E f$. The notation $A \lesssim B$ is used if there exists $C > 0$ such that $A \leq CB$, and similarly $A \gtrsim B$ and $A \sim B$. The implicit constant may change from line to line but will be always independent of the relevant parameters.
(such as the index $j$), and depend only on the dimension $d$ and the fractional order $\beta$. The volume of the $d$-dimensional unit ball is denoted by $\omega_d$.

2.1. The families of good balls and good radii. Fix $0 \leq \beta < d$. Given a function $f \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, define the family of good balls for $f$ at $x$ as

$$\mathcal{B}_x^\beta(f) := \left\{ B(z,r) : x \in \overline{B(z,r)}, M_{\beta}f(x) = r^\beta \int_{B(z,r)} |f(y)| \, dy \right\}.$$  

Note that $\mathcal{B}_x^\beta(f) \neq \emptyset$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ if $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover, $\mathcal{B}_x^\beta(f)$ is a compact set in the sense that if $B(z_k, r_k) \in \mathcal{B}_x^\beta(f)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z_k \to z$ and $r_k \to r$ as $k \to \infty$, then $B(z,r) \in \mathcal{B}_x^\beta(f)$.

For ease of notation, $\mathcal{B}_x^\beta(f)$ will be simply denoted by $\mathcal{B}_x^\beta$, and given a sequence of functions $\{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ the associated families of good balls are denoted by $\mathcal{B}_{x,j}^\beta$. The families of good radii $\mathcal{R}_x^\beta$ and $\mathcal{R}_{x,j}^\beta$ are defined as the subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ consisting of the radii associated to good balls in $\mathcal{B}_x^\beta$ and $\mathcal{B}_{x,j}^\beta$, respectively.

If $0 < \beta < d$, the value $r = 0 \not\in \mathcal{R}_x^\beta$ for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. This is indeed a simple consequence of the Lebesgue differentiation theorem. Assume that $\{B(z_k, r_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a family of balls containing $x$ such that $r_k \to 0$; then $\{x\} = B(x,0) \in \mathcal{B}_x^\beta$ by compactness. By Lebesgue differentiation theorem

$$\frac{1}{r_k} \int_{B(z_k,r_k)} |f| \to 0 \times f(x) = 0 \quad \text{a.e. as } k \to \infty,$$

but $M_{\beta}f(x) > 0$ for any $f$ not identically zero.

If $\beta = 0$, a similar argument yields that $0 \not\in \mathcal{R}_x^0$ on the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : Mf(x) > f(x)\}$.

An important observation is the following relation between the sets $\mathcal{B}_{x,j}^\beta$ and $\mathcal{B}_x^\beta$, which constitutes the fractional higher dimensional analogue of Lemma 12 in [1].

**Lemma 2.1.** Let $f \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that $\|f_j - f\|_{W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$. For a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $\{(z_j, r_j)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,\infty)$ be a sequence of centers and radii such that $B_{x,j} = B(z_j, r_j) \in \mathcal{B}_{x,j}^\beta$. If $(z,r)$ is an accumulation point of $\{(z_j, r_j)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$, then $B(z,r) \in \mathcal{B}_x^\beta$.

**Proof.** Set $f_0 = f$, and for every $j \geq 0$ let $E_j$ be the set of the Lebesgue points of $f_j$. Define $E = \cap_{j \geq 0} E_j$; note $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus E$ is a set of measure zero. Consider a point $x \in E$ and assume, without loss of generality, that $(z_j, r_j) \to (z, r)$ as $j \to \infty$ (going through a subsequence, if necessary) and that $r \neq 0$. Note the convergence

$$\left| M_{\beta}f_j(x) - r_{\beta} \int_{B(z,r)} |f(y)| \, dy \right| \leq \frac{r_{\beta}}{r_j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f_j - f| + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f(y)| \left( \frac{r_{\beta}}{r_j} \chi_{B(z_j, r_j)}(y) - \frac{r_{\beta}}{r_{\beta}} \chi_{B(z, r)}(y) \right) \, dy \to 0$$

as $j \to \infty$. The first term goes to 0 as $r_j \to r > 0$ and $\|f_j - f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$. The convergence of the second term may be seen by the dominated convergence theorem, as $f \in L^1((z_j, r_j) \to (z, r)$ as $j \to \infty$ and $r_j, r > C$ for some constant $C$ and $j$ large enough. As $\|f_j - f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0$ for $1 \leq p \leq \frac{d}{\beta - d}$, then $\|M_{\beta}f_j - M_{\beta}f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$ for some $r > \frac{d}{\beta - d}$ and therefore there
is a subsequence \( \{M_{\beta}f_{j_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) converging to \( M_{\beta}f \) almost everywhere as \( k \to \infty \), so \( B(z, r) \in \mathcal{B}_{\beta}^2(f) \).

We conclude the proof observing that, by contradiction, the case \( r = 0 \) does not happen for \( x \in E \). To see this, define the set \( A_j = \{ y \in E : M(f_j - f)(y) > 1 \} \). If \( |\{ j \in \mathbb{N} : x \notin A_j \}| = \infty \) then going through a subsequence, if necessary,

\[
M_{\beta}f_{j_k}(x) \leq r_{j_k}^\beta M(f_{j_k} - f) + \frac{r_{j_k}^\beta}{\rho_{j_k}^d} \int_{B_{r_{j_k}}(x)} |f| \to 0 + 0 \times |f(x)| = 0
\]

by the Lebesgue differentiation theorem, which is a contradiction. Otherwise, if \( |\{ j \in \mathbb{N} : x \notin A_j \}| < \infty \) then

\[
x \in A := \bigcup_{j_0 \geq 1} \bigcap_{j \geq j_0} A_j,
\]

which is a measure zero set as a consequence of the weak \((1, 1)\) inequality for the maximal operator \( M \) and the hypothesis \( \|f_j - f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0 \).

In the case of \( M_{\beta}^c \), the family of good balls \( \mathcal{B}_{\beta}^2 \) is just determined by the family of good radii \( R_{\beta, z}^j \). Of course, Lemma 2.1 continues to hold in this case, where \( z = x \) and \( z_j = x \) for all \( j \in \mathbb{N} \).

2.2. The derivative of \( M_{\beta} \). In order to understand the weak derivative \( \nabla M_{\beta}f \), it is useful to recall the concept of approximate derivative. A function \( f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) is said to be \textit{approximately differentiable} at a point \( x_0 \in \mathbb{R} \) if there exists a real number \( \alpha \) such that, for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \), the set

\[
A_{\varepsilon} = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \left| \frac{|f(x) - f(x_0) - \alpha(x - x_0)|}{|x - x_0|} \right| < \varepsilon \right\}
\]

has \( x_0 \) as a density point. In this case, the number \( \alpha \) is called the \textit{approximate derivative} of \( f \) at \( x_0 \) and it is uniquely determined. It follows directly from the definition that if \( f \) is differentiable at \( x_0 \) then it is approximately differentiable at \( x_0 \), and the classical and approximate derivatives coincide. In the absence of differentiability, if the weak derivative of \( f \) exists it also coincides with the approximate derivative [10] Theorem 6.4.

Hajlasz and Maly [11] showed that \( M_{\beta}^c f \) is approximate differentiable, and their arguments easily adapt to the non-centered maximal operator and to the fractional setting. Moreover, the boundedness

\[
\|\nabla M_{\beta}f\|_q \leq C\|f\|_1
\]

for \( 1 \leq \beta < d \) [13] and \( \beta \in (0, 1) \) if \( f \) is radial [20] implies that \( M_{\beta}f \) is weakly differentiable in those cases and therefore its weak derivative equals to its approximate derivative, leading to the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2 (Derivative of the maximal function [20]). Let \( f \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) and \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \). Then, for all \( B = B(z, r) \in \mathcal{B}^2_{\beta} \), we have that

(i) If \( 1 \leq \beta < d \), then \( M_{\beta}f \) is weakly differentiable and for almost every \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) its weak derivative \( \nabla M_{\beta}f \) satisfies

\[
\nabla M_{\beta}f(x) = r^\beta \int_B \nabla f(y) \, dy
\]

and the same holds for \( M_{\beta}^c f \).
(ii) If $\beta \in (0,1)$ and $f$ is a radial function, then $M_\beta f$ is differentiable a.e., and for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ its derivative $\nabla M_\beta f$ satisfies
\[
\nabla M_\beta f(x) = r^\beta \int_{B(x)} \nabla |f|(y) \, dy.
\]
We call this identity Luiro’s formula.

The value of the approximate derivative of $M_\beta f$ is a simple computation which can be obtained arguing as in [11] or [20], and has its roots in the work of Luiro [17]. The stronger statement in (ii) regarding the a.e. differentiability of $M_\beta f$ in the radial case is a consequence of the one-dimensional result of Carneiro and the second author [7], who showed that for $d = 1$, the maximal function $M_\beta f$ is absolutely continuous and therefore differentiable almost everywhere in the classical sense; this extends to higher dimensions when acting on radial functions.

The following observation will also be useful in the proof of Theorem 1.2.

**Remark 2.3.** Given a function $g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the fractional maximal function $M_\beta g$ is locally Lipschitz a.e. and, in particular, is locally bounded a.e. This fact will feature in an application of the dominated convergence theorem on compact sets in the forthcoming proof of Theorem 1.2. This follows, via a contradiction argument, from the fact that the truncated fractional maximal function is Lipschitz. More precisely, Haj’lasz and Malý [11] showed that if $g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ the truncated classical maximal function
\[
M_\varepsilon^\beta g(x) := \sup_{B(z,r) \ni x} \frac{1}{r^\beta} \int_{B(z,r)} |g|
\]
is Lipschitz continuous, with Lipschitz constant depending on $\varepsilon$, and this can be adapted to the truncated fractional maximal function $M_\varepsilon^\beta g$ in a straightforward way.

Remove the measure zero set for which Lemma 2.1 fails, and let $r_x := \inf\{r > 0 : r \in \mathcal{R}_\beta^\varepsilon(g)\}$; note that $r_x > 0$. It is claimed that there exists an open neighbourhood $U_x$ of $x$ such that for all $y \in U_x$ there exists $r_y \in \mathcal{R}_\beta^\varepsilon(g)$ with $r_y \geq r_x/2$. Assume, for a contradiction, that there exists $x_i \rightarrow x$ with $r_{x_i} < r_x/2$. By the observation in Luiro [17], the limit $r := \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} r_{x_i}$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}_\beta^\varepsilon(g)$, but this is a contradiction as $r \leq r_x/2 < r_x$ and $r_x$ was assumed to be the infimum of all radii in $\mathcal{R}_\beta^\varepsilon(g)$.

Thus, a given compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ may be covered by the union of such $U_x$ for all $x \in K$, and therefore there exist $x_1, \ldots, x_N$ such that
\[
K \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^N U_{x_i}.
\]

On each $U_{x_i}$, the maximal function $M_\beta$ may be replaced by $M_{\beta_i}^{r_{x_i}/2}$, which is Lipschitz continuous. Taking the maximum over all Lipschitz constants for $M_{\beta_i}^{r_{x_i}/2}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$, one has that $M_\beta$ is Lipschitz continuous on $K$ a.e.

### 2.3. A Brézis–Lieb type reduction

In order to prove both Theorem 1.1 and 1.2 we will show that for any $f \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ sequence of functions in $W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\|f_j - f\|_{W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, then
\[
\|\nabla M_\beta f_j - \nabla M_\beta f\|_{L^{d/(d-\beta)}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad j \rightarrow \infty.
\] (2.1)
The classical Brézis–Lieb lemma \[3\] reduces the proof of (2.1) to showing that
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla M_\beta f_j|^{\frac{d}{d-\beta}} \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla M_\beta f|^{\frac{d}{d-\beta}} \quad \text{as } j \to \infty
\]
provided the almost everywhere convergence
\[
\nabla M_\beta f_j(x) \to \nabla M_\beta f(x) \quad \text{a.e. as } j \to \infty
\]
holds.

The rest of this section is devoted to show (2.2), which is the content of the forthcoming Lemma 2.5.

2.4. Almost everywhere convergence of the derivatives. In order to show (2.2) we extend to higher dimensions and to the fractional case the strategy of Carneiro, Pierce and the second author \[8\]. Their arguments do not straightforward generalise to higher dimensions due to the lack of uniform convergence of $M_\beta f_j$ to $M_\beta f$ (which holds for $d = 1$ and $W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$-functions).

In view of the representation of the derivative of $M_\beta$ in Lemma 2.2, it is useful to note that convergence of $f_j$ to $f$ in $W^{1,1}$ implies convergence of their modulus. A proof of this functional analytic result is provided below for completeness as we could not find it in the literature. This fact was implicitly used in the work of Luiro \[17\], to whom we are grateful for a helpful conversation regarding a step in the proof. It is noted that the one-dimensional version of this result has a slightly simpler proof based on the fundamental theorem of calculus; see \[8\] Lemma 14.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let $f \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that $\|f_j - f\|_{W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$. Then $\|f_j - f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$.

**Proof.** Of course $\|f_j - f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \|f_j - f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0$ follows from the triangle inequality. To see that $\|\nabla f_j - \nabla f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0$, define the sets $X_j := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : f_j(x) > 0\}$, $Y_j := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : f_j(x) < 0\}$ and $Z_j := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : f_j(x) = 0\}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $X, Y$ and $Z$ be defined similarly with respect to $f$. It then suffices to show the convergence on each of the nine subsets obtained by intersecting $X_j, Y_j, Z_j$ with $X, Y, Z$. Note that on $X_j \cap X$, $Y_j \cap Y$ and $Z_j \cap Z$, one has $|\nabla f_j| - |\nabla f| = |\nabla f_j - \nabla f|$ and therefore the convergence on those sets follows from the hypothesis $\|\nabla f_j - \nabla f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0$.

On $X_j \cap Z$ and $Y_j \cap Z$, one should note that $\nabla f = |\nabla f| = 0$ except for a set of measure zero. Indeed, if $I \subset Z$ has positive measure, one has $f(x) = |f(x)| = 0$ on $I$ and therefore $\nabla f = |\nabla f| = 0$. Then $|\nabla f_j| - |\nabla f| = |\nabla f_j - \nabla f| \quad \text{a.e. on } X_j \cap Z$ and $Y_j \cap Z$ and the convergence on such sets follows again simply by the hypothesis $\|\nabla f_j - \nabla f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0$. The terms corresponding to $Z_j \cap X$ and $Z_j \cap Y$ follow in a similar manner.

On $X_j \cap Y$,
\[
\int_{X_j \cap Y} |\nabla f_j| - |\nabla f| = \int_{X_j \cap Y} |\nabla f_j - \nabla f| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla f_j - \nabla f| + \int_{X_j \cap Y} 2|\nabla f|.
\]
The first term goes to 0 as $j \to \infty$, as by hypothesis $\|\nabla f_j - \nabla f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0$.

To show that second term goes to 0, it suffices to see that $\int_{X_j \cap Y} |\nabla f| \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$. Indeed, assume that this assumption holds and, for a contradiction, that there exists a subsequence $j_k$ and $c > 0$ such that
\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{X_{j_k} \cap Y} 2|\nabla f| \geq c.
\]
As it is assumed that $|X_j \cap Y| \to 0$, there exists a further subsequence $j_{k\ell}$ for which $\chi_{X_{j_{k\ell}}} \cap Y \to 0$ a.e., and thus the dominated convergence theorem yields
\[ \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \int_{X_{j_{k\ell}}} 2|\nabla f| = 0, \]
a contradiction. Finally, to show that $|X_f \cap Y| \to 0$, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\delta > 0$ be such that
\[ |A_\delta| := |\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : 0 < f(x) \leq \delta\}| \leq \varepsilon/2. \]
The set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : f_j(x) < 0$ and $f(x) < \delta\}$ is contained in $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |f(x) - f_j(x)| > \delta\}$, and the measure of the latter converges to 0 as $j \to \infty$ by hypothesis (convergence in $L^1$ implies convergence in measure). Thus, there exists $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that
\[ |B_{j_0}| := |\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : f_j(x) < 0$ and $f(x) < \delta\}| \leq \varepsilon/2 \]
for all $j \geq j_0$. As $X_f \cap Y := A_\delta \cup B_{j_0}$, the result follows from combining the two previous displays. The term corresponding to $Y_j \cap X$ follows analogously, and the proof is then concluded.

We now have all the necessary ingredients to prove (2.2). The proof is a minor variant of its one-dimensional counterpart in [8, Lemma 15]; full details are given below for completeness.

**Lemma 2.5.** Let $f \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that $\|f_j - f\|_{W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$. Then
\[ \nabla M_\beta f_j(x) \to \nabla M_\beta f(x) \text{ a.e. as } j \to \infty \quad (2.3) \]
if Luiro’s formula holds for $M_\beta$, and the same holds for $M_\beta^c$.

**Proof.** Set $f_0 = f$, and for every $j \geq 0$ let $E_j$ be the set of measure zero for which Lemma 2.4 fails for $f_j$. The set $E := \bigcup_{j \geq 0} E_j$ continues to have measure zero. Let $F$ be the sets of measure zero for which Lemma 2.1 fails. It then suffices to prove the desired result for $x \in D := \mathbb{R}^d \setminus (E \cup F)$.

Given $x \in D$, there exist $\delta = \delta(x) > 0$ and $N = N(x) < \infty$ such that $\mathcal{R}_x^{\beta} \subset [\delta, N]$. We claim that there exists $j_0 = j_0(x)$ such that $\mathcal{R}_x^{\beta} \subset (\delta/2, 2N)$ for $j \geq j_0$. Otherwise, we may find a sequence $\{r_{j_k}\}_{k \geq 1} \subset [0, \delta/2] \cup [2N, \infty)$. If there exists a constant $C < \infty$ such that $\{r_{j_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [0, \delta/2] \cup [2N, C]$, the sequence $\{r_{j_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ admits a convergent subsequence $\{r_{j_{k\ell}}\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$. By Lemma 2.1, $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} r_{j_{k\ell}} = \infty$, which is a contradiction. If one cannot find such a $C < \infty$, there exists a subsequence $\{r_{j_{k\ell}}\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} r_{j_{k\ell}} = \infty$, which is again a contradiction by Lemma 2.1.

Let $r_j \in \mathcal{R}_x^{\beta}$ for $j \geq j_0$ and $z_j$ such that $B_j = B(z_j, r_j) \in B_{x,j}^{\beta}$. Using the above lower bound on $r_j$ and Lemma 2.2, one has
\[ |\nabla M_\beta f_j(x)| \leq r_j^{\beta-d} \int_{B_j} |\nabla f_j| \leq r_j^{\beta-d} (||\nabla f_j||_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} + ||\nabla f||_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}) \leq C \]
for $j \geq \max\{j_0, j_1\}$, where $j_1$ is such that $||\nabla f_j - \nabla f||_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon$. Then $\{\nabla M_\beta f_j(x)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a bounded sequence. Consider any convergent subsequence $\{\nabla M_\beta f_j(x)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$. As the sequence $\{r_{j_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, passing to a
further subsequence one may assume that \((z_{j_{k}}, r_{j_{k}}) \to (z, r)\) as \(\ell \to \infty\), where \(B(z, r) \in B_{x}^{\beta}\) by Lemma 2.4. By Lemma 2.2,

\[
\nabla M_{\beta} f_{j_{k}}(x) = r_{j_{k}}^{-\beta} \int_{B_{j_{k}}} \nabla |f_{j_{k}}| \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla M_{\beta} f(x) = r^{-\beta} \int_{B(z, r)} \nabla |f|.
\]

Then \(\nabla M_{\beta} f_{j_{k}}(x) \to \nabla M_{\beta} f(x)\) as \(\ell \to \infty\), as

\[
|\nabla_{j_{k}}^{\beta} f_{j_{k}}(x) - r_{j_{k}}^{-\beta} \int_{B_{j_{k}}} \nabla |f_{j_{k}}| - \nabla M_{\beta} f(x)| \leq r_{j_{k}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \nabla |f_{j_{k}}| + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} |\nabla f||\left(\frac{r_{j_{k}}^{\beta}}{r_{j_{k}}} \chi_{B_{j_{k}}}(y) - \frac{r_{j}^{\beta}}{r_{j}} \chi_{B(z, r)}(y)\right) dy \to 0
\]
as \(\ell \to \infty\); the first term goes to 0 by Lemma 2.4 whilst the second term can be seen to go to 0 by the dominated convergence theorem, as \(f \in W^{1,1}\) and the radii \(r_{j_{k}}\) are bounded below. Then, the original convergent subsequence \(\{\nabla M_{\beta} f_{j_{k}}(x)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) converges to \(\nabla M_{\beta} f(x)\) as \(k \to \infty\). As this holds for any convergent subsequence \(\{\nabla M_{\beta} f_{j}(x)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) of \(\{\nabla M_{\beta} f_{j_{k}}(x)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}\), one has that \(\nabla M_{\beta} f(x)\) is the unique accumulation point of \(\{\nabla M_{\beta} f_{j}(x)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}\), and thus the result follows because such a sequence is bounded. \(\square\)

**Remark 2.6.** Note that the above proof also shows that, in particular, for any \(0 < \beta < d\),

\[
M_{\beta} f_{j}(x) \to M_{\beta} f(x)
\]
a.e. on \(\mathbb{R}^{d}\) as \(j \to \infty\), provided \(\|f_{j} - f\|_{W^{1,1}} \to 0\). Note that for \(d = 1\), or \(d > 1\) and \(\beta \in (d - 1, d)\) this is slightly easier due to the \(L^{\infty}\) boundedness of \(M_{\beta}\) for \(f \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^{d})\). The same holds for \(M_{\beta}^{\beta}\).

### 2.5. A classical convergence result

Finally, the following classical variant of the dominated convergence theorem will be used several times throughout the paper.

**Theorem 2.7** (Generalised Dominated Convergence Theorem). Let \(1 \leq p < \infty\) \(f, g \in L^{p}(\mathbb{R}^{d})\) and \(\{f_{j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}\) and \(\{g_{j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}\) be sequences of functions on \(L^{p}(\mathbb{R}^{d})\) such that

\[
(i) |f_{j}(x)| \leq |g_{j}(x)| \quad \text{a.e.,}
(ii) f_{j}(x) \to f(x) \quad \text{and} \quad g_{j}(x) \to g(x) \quad \text{a.e. as} \quad j \to \infty,
(iii) \|g_{j} - g\|_{L^{p}(\mathbb{R}^{d})} \to 0.
\]

Then \(\|f_{j} - f\|_{L^{p}(\mathbb{R}^{d})} \to 0\).

The proof of this theorem is standard and consists in two applications of Fatou’s lemma; see for instance [25, Chapter 4, Theorem 19].

### 3. The case \(1 \leq \beta < d\): Proof of Theorem 1.1

This follows from a simple application of the Generalised Dominated Convergence Theorem together with the inequality (1.2) and the a.e. convergences (2.3) and (2.4).

Indeed, let \(f \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^{d})\) and \(\{f_{j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^{d})\) such that \(\|f_{j} - f\|_{W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^{d})} \to 0\) as \(j \to \infty\). Recall the inequality (1.2) of Kinnunen and Saksman [13],

\[
|\nabla M_{\beta} f_{j}(x)| \leq M_{\beta-1} f_{j}(x)
\]
for all \(j > 0\),
which holds for all $1 \leq \beta < d$ as $f_j \in L^r$ for $1 \leq r \leq \frac{d}{d-1}$. By Lemma 2.5 one has
\[ \nabla M_\beta f_j \to \nabla M_\beta f \quad \text{a.e. as } j \to \infty. \]

By Remark 2.6
\[ M_{\beta-1} f_j \to M_{\beta-1} f \quad \text{a.e. as } j \to \infty \]
and, moreover, the sublinearity and boundedness of $M_{\beta-1}$ implies
\[ \| M_{\beta-1} f_j - M_{\beta-1} f \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \| f_j - f \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \| \nabla f_j - \nabla f \|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0 \]
as $j \to \infty$.

The hypothesis of Theorem 2.7 are then satisfied, yielding
\[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla M_\beta f_j| \frac{dx}{|x|^d} \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla M_\beta f| \frac{dx}{|x|^d} \quad \text{as } j \to \infty, \]
as desired.

4. The case $0 < \beta < 1$ for radial functions: Proof of Theorem 1.2

The proof strategy for Theorem 1.2 consists in studying separately what happens inside and outside a large compact set $K$. The main difficulty relies in establishing convergence in $K$; the term corresponding to $K^c$ may be seen as an error term. This strategy was already used by the second author in the one dimensional case [21]. However, none of the techniques used therein to analyse $K$ and $K^c$ continue to hold in higher dimensions.

In order to overcome the higher dimensional obstacles, we make use of some fundamental observations that proved to be useful in establishing the bound
\[ \| \nabla M_\beta f \|_q \leq C(d, \beta)\| \nabla f \|_1 \]
(4.1)
for radial $f$ in [20]. We remark that in contrast to [21], our analysis outside the compact set is rather general and continues to hold for general function, any dimension, the centered case and any $0 \leq \beta < d$ (including the classical Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator) provided the bound (4.1) holds in each corresponding case. This will be appropriately discussed in Section 4.3.

4.1. Preliminaries. A trivial but important observation for the non-centered maximal function is that if $|\nabla M_\beta f(x)| \neq 0$ and $B \in B^d_\beta$, then $x \in \partial B$: as $B$ is an admissible ball for all $y \in B$, one would have $M_\beta f(x) \leq M_\beta f(y)$ for all $y \in B$, so if $x$ lied in the interior of the ball, it would be a local minimum for $M_\beta f$ and therefore $\nabla M_\beta f(x) = 0$.

Arguing in a similar manner, if $f$ is a radial function, $|\nabla M_\beta f(x)| \neq 0$ and $B \in B^d_\beta$, the center of the ball $B$ must lie in the direction joining $x$ and the origin: otherwise, there is a point $y$ lying in the interior of $B$ with $|y| = |x|$ which by radiality satisfies $|\nabla M_\beta f(x)| = |\nabla M_\beta f(y)|$, and the previous argument would imply $|\nabla M_\beta f(y)| = 0$.

Next we shall recall some preliminary lemmas observed in [20] which will be useful to the proof of Theorem 1.2. The first one corresponds to a refinement of Kinnunen’s pointwise estimate (1.1).

---

2As mentioned in the Introduction, the analysis on $K$ for $d = 1$ in [21] only extends in a natural way to higher dimensions if $d - 1 < \beta < d$; further details of this will be provided in the Appendix.
Lemma 4.1 (Lemma 2.9 [20]). Suppose that $f \in W^{1,1}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $0 < \beta < d$ and $B_x \in \mathcal{B}_x^\beta$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ such that $B_x \subset B(0,|x|)$. Then

\[
\left\| \int_{B_x} \nabla f(y) \, dy \right\| \leq \int_{B_x} |\nabla f(y)| \, |y| \, dy.
\]

Another useful auxiliary result is a refinement of the Kinnunen–Saksman inequality [122], which in fact is an implicit consequence of their proof. It is noted that this refinement also works for the centered maximal function - this will be used in Section 4.3.

Lemma 4.2 ([114]). Suppose that $f \in W^{1,1}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $0 < \beta < d$ and $B_x \in \mathcal{B}_x^\beta$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and let $r_x$ denote the radius of $B_x$. Then

\[
\left\| r_x^\beta \int_{B_x} \nabla f(y) \, dy \right\| \leq C(d, \beta) r_x^{\beta-1} \int_{B_x} |f(y)| \, dy.
\]

In fact, Luiro and Madrid [20, Lemma 2.7] obtained a further refinement in the case of $M_f$. This corresponds to an equality involving a boundary term arising from integration-by-parts, although such a stronger statement will not be needed for the purposes of this paper.

Finally, the next auxiliary lemma provides a gain over Minkowski’s inequality.

Lemma 4.3 (Lemma 2.10 [20]). Suppose that $f \in W^{1,1}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is radial, $0 < \beta < d$, $B_x \in \mathcal{B}_x^\beta$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and let $r_x$ denote the radius of $B_x$. If $r_x \leq |x|/4$ and

\[
A_x := \{ y \in 2B_x : \frac{1}{2} |f|_{B_x} \leq f(y) \leq 2|f|_{B_x} \},
\]

then

\[
\left\| r_x^\beta \int_{B_x} \nabla f(y) \, dy \right\| \leq C(d, \beta) r_x^{\beta-1} \int_{2B_x} |\nabla f(y)| \chi_{A_x}(y) \, dy.
\]

Remark 4.4. The above lemmas continue to hold for $\beta = 0$ if $x$ is such that $M_f(x) > f(x)$, which ensures $0 \notin \mathcal{R}_x^0$.

4.2. Inside a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d, d > 1$. We first prove convergence inside a compact set $K$.

Proposition 4.5. Let $0 < \beta < 1$, $f \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ radial functions such that $\|f_j - f\|_{W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0$. Then, for any compact set $K$,

\[
\| \nabla M_{\beta} f_j - \nabla M_{\beta} f \|_{L^q(K)} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad j \to \infty,
\]

where $q = d/(d - \beta)$.

Proof. Set $f_0 = f$, and let $E_j$ be the set of measure zero for which Lemma 2.2 fails for $f_j$. The set $E := \cup_{j \geq 0} E_j$ continues to have measure zero. Let $F, G$ and $H$ be the set of measure zero for which Lemmas 2.1, 2.3 and Remark 2.6 fail respectively. It then suffices to show (1.2) for $K$ replaced by $\tilde{K} := K \setminus (E \cup F \cup G \cup H)$, which for ease of notation is relabelled as $K$.

For all $j \geq 0$ we have $K = K_j^0 \cup U_j \cup V_j \cup W_j$, where $K_j^0 = \{ x \in K : \nabla M_{\beta} f_j(x) = 0 \}$ and

\[
U_j = \{ x \in K \setminus K_j^0 : \exists B_{x,j} \in \mathcal{B}_{x,j}^\beta \text{ with } r_{x,j} > |x|/4 \text{ and } B_{x,j} \subset B(0,|x|)\},
\]

\[
V_j = \{ x \in K \setminus K_j^0 : \exists B_{x,j} \in \mathcal{B}_{x,j}^\beta \text{ with } r_{x,j} > |x|/4 \text{ and } B_{x,j} \subset B(0,|x|)\}
\]
and \( W_j = \{ x \in K \setminus K^0_j : \exists B_{x,j} \in \mathbb{B}^2_{x,j} \text{ with } r_{x,j} \leq |x|/4 \}. \)

Define the functions
\[
\begin{align*}
u_j(x) &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla f_j(y)| \frac{\chi_{B(0,|y|)}(x)}{|y|^d} \, dy, \\
v_j(x) &:= \frac{1}{|x|^d} \int_{B(0,|x|)} |\nabla f_j(y)| \frac{|y|}{|x|} \, dy
\end{align*}
\]
and
\[w_j(x) := |\nabla M_\beta f_j(x)| \chi_{W_j}(x).\]

By Lemma 2.2,
\[|\nabla M_\beta f_j(x)|^q \leq \|\nabla f_j\|_{L^q}^{q-1} \int_{B_{x,j}} |\nabla f_j(y)| \, dy \text{ for all } x \in K. \tag{4.3}\]

Note that if \( |\nabla M_\beta f_j(x)| \neq 0 \) on \( U_j \cup V_j \cup W_j \), the good balls \( B_{x,j} \in \mathbb{B}^2_{x,j} \) are of the type described in the previous subsection: \( x \in \partial B_{x,j} \) and the center of \( B_{x,j} \) belongs to the line joining \( x \) and the origin; this features in the following bounds on \( U_j, V_j \) and \( W_j \).

For every \( x \in U_j \), if \( y \in B_{x,j} \) one has \( r_{x,j} \geq |y| - |x| \geq |y| - 4r_{x,j} \) and \( |x| \leq |y| \). Then
\[
\left| \int_{B_{x,j}} |\nabla f_j(y)| \, dy \right| \leq \frac{5^d}{\omega_d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla f_j(y)| \frac{\chi_{B(0,|y|)}(x)}{|y|^d} \, dy = \frac{5^d}{\omega_d} u_j(x) \text{ on } U_j.
\]

For every \( x \in V_j \), one has \( |x|/4 < r_{x,j} \leq 2|x| \) and Lemma 4.1 then yields
\[
\left| \int_{B_{x,j}} |\nabla f_j(y)| \, dy \right| \leq \frac{4^d}{\omega_d|x|^d} \int_{B(0,|x|)} |\nabla f_j(y)| \frac{|y|}{|x|} \, dy = \frac{4^d}{\omega_d} v_j(x) \text{ on } V_j.
\]

Using (4.3) in \( U_j \cup V_j \) and the previous estimates, for all \( j > 0 \),
\[|\nabla M_\beta f_j(x)|^q \lesssim \|\nabla f_j\|_{L^q}^{q-1} \left( u_j(x) + v_j(x) \right) + |w_j(x)|^q \text{ on } K. \tag{4.4}\]

The desired result will follow from an application of the generalised dominated convergence theorem (Theorem 2.4) for functions on \( L^1 \). Indeed, a successful application of that theorem would yield
\[
\|\nabla M_\beta f_j|^q - |\nabla M_\beta f|^q \|_{L^1(K)} \to 0 \text{ as } j \to \infty,
\]
and consequently
\[
\int_K |\nabla M_\beta f_j|^q \to \int_K |\nabla M_\beta f|^q \text{ as } j \to \infty.
\]

Convergence on \( L^q(K) \) would now follow from the Brézis–Lieb lemma (see Remark 2.3). Therefore, it suffices to verify the hypothesis of Theorem 2.4 with the sequences involved in (4.1).

Concerning the left-hand-side, the estimate \( \|\nabla M_\beta f\|_q \lesssim \|\nabla f\|_1 \) in [20] implies that the sequence \( \{\|\nabla M_\beta f_j(x)\|^q\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) is on \( L^1(K) \). Moreover, Lemma 2.8 ensures that \( |\nabla M_\beta f_j|^q \to |\nabla M_\beta f|^q \text{ a.e. as } j \to \infty \), satisfying the desired hypothesis.

Concerning the right-hand-side, we will show that
\[
u_j(x) \to u(x) \text{ and } \|u_j - u\|_1 \to 0 \text{ as } j \to \infty, \tag{4.5}\]
\[v_j(x) \to v(x) \text{ and } \|v_j - v\|_1 \to 0 \text{ as } j \to \infty \tag{4.6}\]
and
\[ w_j(x) \to w(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \|w_j - w\|_q \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad j \to \infty, \quad (4.7) \]
where \( u, v \) and \( w \) are defined analogously to \( u_j, v_j \) and \( w_j \) respectively but with \( f_j \) replaced by \( f \) and the slight modification that \( \chi_W \) is replaced by \( \chi_{\bar{W}} \), where \( \bar{W} := W \cup \{ x \in K : |\nabla M_{\beta} f(x)| = 0 \} \). This technicality arises to ensure the a.e. convergence of the sequences \( w_j \) to \( w \) as \( j \to \infty \), and by ease of notation \( \bar{W} \) is relabelled as \( W \).

As Lemma 2.3 ensures that \( \|\nabla |f_j| - \nabla |f||_1 \to 0 \) as \( j \to \infty \), this implies together with (4.5), (4.6) and (4.7) that the right-hand-side on (4.4) converges a.e. and on \( L^1 \), as desired for the application of Theorem 2.7.

The rest of the proof is devoted to verifying (4.5), (4.6) and (4.7).

4.2.1. The case of \( u_j \). For any \( x \neq 0 \), one trivially has
\[
|u_j(x) - u(x)| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla |f_j||y| - \nabla |f||y|\chi_{B(0,|y|)}(x) \frac{x}{|y|^d} \, dy
\leq \frac{1}{|x|^d} \|\nabla |f_j| - \nabla |f||_1 \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad j \to \infty
\]
as \( |y| \geq |x| \), so \( u_j \to u \) a.e. as \( j \to \infty \). Moreover, by Fubini’s theorem
\[
\|u_j - u\|_1 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla f_j(y) - \nabla f(y)| \frac{x}{|y|^d} \, dx \, dy
\lesssim \|\nabla |f_j| - \nabla |f||_1 \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad j \to \infty.
\]

4.2.2. The case of \( v_j \). Similarly, for any \( x \neq 0 \),
\[
|v_j(x) - v(x)| \leq \frac{1}{|x|^d} \int_{B(0,|x|)} |\nabla f_j(y) - \nabla f(y)| \frac{|y|}{|x|} \, dy
\leq \frac{1}{|x|^d} \|\nabla f_j - \nabla f||_1 \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad j \to \infty.
\]
Moreover, by Fubini’s theorem and a change to polar coordinates one has
\[
\|v_j - v\|_1 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla f_j(y) - \nabla f(y)||y| \, dx \, dy
\lesssim \|\nabla f_j - \nabla f||_1 \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad j \to \infty.
\]

4.2.3. The case of \( w_j \). We will first show that
\[ w_j(x) \to w(x) \quad \text{a.e. as} \quad j \to \infty. \]
By Lemma 2.3 it suffices to show that \( \chi_{W_j} \to \chi_W \) a.e. as \( j \to \infty \). As \( \{\chi_{W_j}(x)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) is a bounded sequence, it is enough to see that \( \chi_{W_j}(x) \) is the unique accumulation point. Let \( \{\chi_{W_{j_k}}(x)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) be any convergent subsequence and consider the associated sequence of radii \( \{r_{x,j_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \). As \( x \in W_{j_k} \), the radii satisfy \( r_{x,j_k} \leq |x|/4 < C_K \), so there exists a further convergent subsequence \( \{r_{x,j_{k_\ell}}\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \) whose limit, denoted by \( r_x \), belongs to \( \mathcal{R}_\beta^2 \) by Lemma 2.1. Moreover, \( r_x \leq |x|/4 \) and \( x \in W \), so \( \chi_{W_{j_{k_\ell}}}(x) \to \chi_W(x) \) as \( \ell \to \infty \) and therefore \( \chi_{W_{j_{k_\ell}}}(x) \to \chi_W(x) \) as \( k \to \infty \); thus \( \chi_W(x) \) is the unique accumulation point of \( \{\chi_{W_j}(x)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \).
Next we show that \( \|w_j - w\|_{L^q(K)} \to 0 \) as \( j \to \infty \). By the a.e. convergence and the Brézis–Lieb lemma, it suffices to show \( \|w_j\|_{L^q(K)} \to \|w\|_{L^q(K)} \). Moreover, by Fatou’s lemma, \( \|w\|_{L^q(K)} \leq \liminf_{j \to \infty} \|w_j\|_{L^q(K)} \), so it suffices to show that

\[
\limsup_{j \to \infty} \|w_j\|_{L^q(K)} \leq \|w\|_{L^q(K)}.
\]

By the triangle inequality, \( w_j(x) \leq w_j^1(x) + w_j^2(x) + w(x) \), where

\[
w_j^1(x) := \int_{B_{x,j}} (\nabla |f_j|(y) - \nabla |f|(y)) \, dy \chi_{W_j}(x)
\]

and

\[
w_j^2(x) := \int_{B_{x,j}} (\nabla |f_j|(y) \chi_{W_j}(x) - |\nabla M \beta f(x)| \chi_{W}(x);
\]

it thus suffices to show that \( \|w_j^1\|_{L^q(K)} \to 0 \) and \( \|w_j^2\|_{L^q(K)} \to 0 \) as \( j \to \infty \). We first focus on \( w_j^1 \). For any \( 0 < \gamma < \beta \), one has the bound

\[
\|w_j^1\|_{L^q(K)} \leq \|\nabla |f_j| - \nabla |f|\|_{L^q(K)} \gamma \int_K \int_{B_{x,j}} (\nabla |f_j|(y) - \nabla |f|(y)) \, dy \chi_{W_j}(x) dx.
\]

By Lemma 2.4, \( \|\nabla |f_j| - \nabla |f|\|_{L^q(K)} \to 0 \) as \( j \to \infty \), so it suffices to show that the other factor is uniformly bounded in \( j \) for large \( j \). Note that it may be further bounded by a constant times

\[
\int_K \int_{B_{x,j}} (\nabla |f_j|(y) \chi_{W_j}(x) - |\nabla M \beta f(x)| \chi_{W}(x)) \, dy \chi_{W_j}(x) dx + \int_K |M_\gamma(|\nabla |f||)(x)|^{\frac{d-\gamma}{d}} dx.
\]

Since \( M_\gamma \) is locally Lipschitz a.e. (see Remark 2.3), the second term is bounded. To see uniform boundedness of the first term, we argue as in the proof of the boundedness of the map \( f \to |\nabla M \beta f| \) from \( W^{1,1} \) to \( L^\gamma \) of Liu and the second author [20], which is recalled presently. First,

\[
\int_K \int_{B_{x,j}} (\nabla |f_j|(y) \chi_{W_j}(x) - |\nabla M \beta f(x)| \chi_{W}(x)) \, dy \chi_{W_j}(x) dx
\]

\[
\leq \|\nabla |f_j|\|_{L^q(K)}^{\frac{d-\gamma}{d}} \int_K \int_{B_{x,j}} \nabla |f_j|(y) \, dy \chi_{W_j}(x) dx.
\]

Using Lemma 4.3 and Fubini’s theorem

\[
\int_K \int_{B_{x,j}} \nabla |f_j|(y) \, dy \chi_{W}(x) dx
\]

\[
\leq C(d, \beta) \int_K \int_{2B_{x,j}} |\nabla f(y)| \chi_{A_{x,j}}(y) \, dy \chi_{W_j}(x) dx
\]

\[
= C(d, \beta) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla f(y)| \int_K \int_{B_{x,j}} \frac{1}{r_{x,j}^d} \chi_{A_{x,j}}(y) \chi_{2B_{x,j}}(y) \chi_{W_j}(x) dx dy.
\]

Observe that the set

\[
\{(y, x) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d : \chi_{A_{x,j}}(y) \chi_{2B_{x,j}}(y) \neq 0 \text{ and } \chi_{A_{x,j}}(y) \chi_{2B_{x,j}}(y) = 0 \text{ for all } z \neq x\}
\]

has measure zero. Thus, one may assume that for fixed \( y \in \mathbb{R}^d \), there are at least two points \( x_0, x_1 \in K \) such that

\[
\chi_{A_{x_0,j}}(y) \chi_{2B_{x_0,j}}(y) \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_{A_{x_1,j}}(y) \chi_{2B_{x_1,j}}(y) \neq 0.
\]
In particular, by definition of $A_{x,j}$, this implies that $|f_j|_{B_{x_0,j}} \sim |f_j|_{B_{x_1,j}}$. Assume, without loss of generality, that $r_{x_0,j} \leq r_{x_1,j}$. Then, $y \in 2B_{x_0,j} \cap 2B_{x_1,j}$ and one has $B_{x_0,j} \subseteq 8B_{x_1,j}$ so that $8B_{x_1,j}$ is an admissible ball for $x_0$ and

$$M_{\beta} f_j(x_0) = r_{x_0,j}^\beta \int_{B_{x_0,j}} |f_j| \geq (8r_{x_1,j})^\beta \int_{8B_{x_1,j}} |f_j| \geq \frac{(8r_{x_1,j})^\beta}{8d} \int_{B_{x_1,j}} |f_j|.$$  

As $|f_j|_{B_{x_0,j}} \sim |f_j|_{B_{x_1,j}}$ one can deduce from the above that $r_{x_0,j} \gtrsim r_{x_1,j}$ and therefore $r_{x_0,j} \sim r_{x_1,j}$. Thus, for a fixed $y$, if $x \in \{x \in K : \chi_{A_{x,j}}(y)\chi_{2B_{x,j}}(y) \neq 0\}$ then $r_{x,j} \sim R_j^\beta$ for some $R_j^\beta > 0$. In particular, the above set is contained in a ball $B(y, cR_j^\beta)$ for some dimensional constant $c$ and this shows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{r_{x,j}^d} \chi_{A_{x,j}}(y)\chi_{2B_{x,j}}(y)\chi_{W_j}(x) \, dx \lesssim \int_{B(y, cR_j^\beta)} \frac{dx}{(R_j^\beta)^d} \lesssim 1$$

uniformly in $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $j$. Altogether

$$\int_K \frac{r_{x,j}^\beta}{r_{x,j}^\beta} \int_{B_{x,j}} \nabla |f_j|(y) \, dy \chi_{W_j}(x) \, dx \lesssim \|\nabla |f_j| - \nabla |f|\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|\nabla |f|\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}$$

with implicit constant independent of $j$. The right-hand-side is then bounded uniformly in $j$ for $j$ large enough by Lemma 2.2. Combining the previous observations one has $\|w_j^2\|_{L^q(K)} \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$, as desired.

Regarding $w_j^2(x)$, note that by Lemma 2.2 or simply 1.1,

$$|w_j^2(x)| \leq 2M_{\beta}(\|\nabla |f|\|)\chi_K(x),$$

which is bounded a.e. on $K$ by Remark 2.3. As constants are $q$-integrable in a compact set $K$, by the dominated convergence theorem, it suffices to show that $w_j^2 \to 0$ a.e. on $K$ as $j \to \infty$, or equivalently

$$w_j^2(x) := \left| r_{x,j,k}^\beta \int_{B_{x,j,k}} \nabla |f|(y) \chi_{W_j}(x) \to |\nabla M_{\beta} f(x)|\chi_{W}(x).$$

To this end, let $x \in K \setminus L_0$, where $L_0$ is the set of measure zero where Remark 2.3 fails, that is where $M_{\beta}(\|\nabla |f|\|)$ fails to be Lipschitz continuous. As $\{w_j^2(x)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a bounded sequence, it suffices to show that $|\nabla M_{\beta} f(x)|\chi_{W}(x)$ is the unique accumulation point. Consider a convergent subsequence $\{w_j^2(x)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ and the associated sequence of radii $\{r_{x,j,k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, which satisfies $r_{x,j,k} \leq \|x\|/4 < C_K$. This admits a further convergent subsequence, denoted by $r_{x,j,k_\ell}$, whose limit as $\ell \to \infty$, denoted by $r_x$, belongs to $R_x^2$ by Lemma 2.1 and moreover $r_x \leq \|x\|/4$. Then

$$\left| r_{x,j,k_\ell}^\beta \int_{B_{x,j,k_\ell}} \nabla |f|(y) \chi_{W_{j,k_\ell}}(x) \to \left| r_x^\beta \int_{B_x} \nabla |f|(y) \chi_{W}(x) = |\nabla M_{\beta} f(x)|\chi_{W}(x) as \ell \to \infty, and the sequence $\{w_j^2\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges then to the same limit as $k \to \infty$, leading to the fact that $\nabla M_{\beta} f(x)|\chi_{W}(x)$ is the only accumulation point of the sequence $\{w_j^2(x)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$, as desired.

Altogether, the previous arguments lead to the conclusion $\|w_j - w\|_{L^q(K)} \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$, concluding the proof of Proposition 4.5.
4.3. Smallness outside a compact set $3K$. In order to conclude the proof, it suffices to show smallness outside a compact set. Our argument relies on Lemma 4.2 and therefore continues to work for the case $\beta = 0$, the centered maximal function $M_0^c$ and does not require any radial hypothesis on the functions.

**Proposition 4.6.** Let $0 \leq \beta < d$, $f \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\{f_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \subset W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\|f_j - f\|_{W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0$. Assume that $\mathcal{M}_\beta \in \{M_0, M_0^c\}$ satisfies

$$\|\nabla \mathcal{M}_\beta f\|_q \leq \|f\|_1,$$

where $q = d/(d - \beta)$. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a compact set $K$ and $j_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\|\nabla \mathcal{M}_\beta f_j - \nabla \mathcal{M}_\beta f\|_{L^q((3K)^c)} < \varepsilon$$

for all $j \geq j_\varepsilon$.

The above lemma may be applied in our case as the bound (4.8) is satisfied for the non-centered fractional maximal function $M_j$ acting on radial functions. As is mentioned above, it is remarked that it would also apply to the centered case, to general functions and to $\beta = 0$ provided the hypothetical endpoint Sobolev bound (4.8) holds in such cases.

**Proof.** Let $1 < p < d/r$ and $r$ be such that $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{r} - \frac{\beta}{q}$. As $f_j, f \in W^{1,1}$, one has $f_j, f \in L^p$, and by the boundedness of $\mathcal{M}_\beta$ one has

$$\|\mathcal{M}_\beta f\|_r \lesssim \|f\|_p.$$  

(4.9)

Given $\varepsilon > 0$, let $K$ be a compact set satisfying

$$\int_{K^c} |f| < \varepsilon, \quad \int_{K^c} |\nabla f| < \varepsilon, \quad \int_{K^c} |\mathcal{M}_\beta f|^r < \varepsilon^r \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{K^c} |\nabla \mathcal{M}_\beta f|^q < (\varepsilon/2)^q \quad (4.10)$$

for some $r > q$; note that the two last conditions follow from (4.9) and the hypothesis (4.8). Moreover, let $j_\varepsilon > 0$ be such that

$$\|f_j - f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla f_j - \nabla f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \varepsilon \quad (4.11)$$

for all $j \geq j_\varepsilon$.

For every $j \geq j_\varepsilon$ write $(3K)^c = Y_1^j \cup Y_2^j$, where $Y_1^j := \{x \in (3K)^c : K \cap B_{x,j} = \emptyset\}$ and $Y_2^j = (3K)^c \setminus Y_1^j$. By the triangle inequality and the last condition in (4.10) it suffices to show

$$\int_{Y_2^j} |\nabla \mathcal{M}_\beta f_j|^q < (\varepsilon/2)^q \quad \text{for all } j \geq j_\varepsilon.$$

On $Y_1^j$ one may replace $f_j$ by $f_j \chi_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus K}$. Using (4.8), (4.10) and (4.11),

$$\int_{Y_1^j} |\nabla \mathcal{M}_\beta f_j(y)|^q \, dy \leq \int_{Y_1^j} |\nabla \mathcal{M}_\beta (f_j \chi_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus K}(y))|^q \, dy \leq \|\nabla (f_j \chi_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus K})\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}^q \lesssim \|\nabla f_j\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}^q \leq \|\nabla f_j - \nabla f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}^q + \|\nabla f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}^q \lesssim 2\varepsilon^q$$

for all $j \geq j_\varepsilon$. 

If \( x \in Y_2^j \) one has \( r_{x,j} > |x|/3 \). This and Lemma 1.2 imply
\[
|\nabla M_{\beta} f_j(x)| \leq \frac{C(d, \beta)}{r_{x,j}} M_{\beta} f_j(x) \leq \frac{3C(d, \beta)}{|x|} M_{\beta} f_j(x).
\]
For \( p \) and \( r \) as above, note that \( r > q \) and \( \frac{q}{r-q} > d \). Then, by Hölder’s inequality, (4.9), (4.10) and (4.11),
\[
\int_{Y_2^j} |\nabla M_{\beta} f_j|^{q} \, dx \lesssim \left( \int_{Y_2^j} (M_{\beta} f_j)^r \right)^\frac{q}{r} \left( \int_{Y_2^j} |x|^{-q} \, dx \right) \left( \int_{Y_2^j} |x|^{-q} \, dx \right)^\frac{r}{q},
\]
\[
\lesssim \left( \int_{Y_2^j} (M_{\beta} f_j)^r \right)^\frac{q}{r} + \left( \int_{Y_2^j} (M_{\beta} f_j)^r \right)^\frac{q}{r}
\]
\[
\lesssim (\|f_j - f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \varepsilon)^q
\]
\[
\leq (2\varepsilon)^q
\]
for all \( j \geq j_{\varepsilon,1} \), as the values of \( q \) and \( r \) ensure that the second integral in (4.12) is uniformly finite provided \( K \) contains the unit ball. Reverse engineering the choice of \( \varepsilon \) in (4.10) and (4.11) concludes the proof.

4.4. Concluding the argument: Proof of Theorem 1.2

This is now a simple consequence of Propositions 4.5 and 4.6. Given \( \varepsilon > 0 \), by Proposition 4.6 there exist a compact set \( K \) and \( j_{\varepsilon,1} > 0 \) such that
\[
\|\nabla M_{\beta} f_j - \nabla M_{\beta} f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus K)} < \varepsilon/2
\]
for all \( j \geq j_{\varepsilon,1} \). As \( 3K \) is itself a compact set, Proposition 4.5 shows that there exists \( j_{\varepsilon,2} > 0 \) such that
\[
\|\nabla M_{\beta} f_j - \nabla M_{\beta} f\|_{L^q(3K)} < \varepsilon/2
\]
for all \( j \geq j_{\varepsilon,2} \). Therefore
\[
\|\nabla M_{\beta} f_j - \nabla M_{\beta} f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \varepsilon
\]
for all \( j \geq \max\{j_{\varepsilon,1}, j_{\varepsilon,2}\} \), as desired.

5. The case \( M_{\beta}^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha}} \) if \( d = 1 \): Proof of Theorem 1.3

As in the previous section, we first use Proposition 4.6 to show that it suffices to see the convergence inside any compact set \( K \). That convergence follows from adapting the ideas from the second author in [21, Theorem 1]. More precisely, we use the locally absolute continuity of the centered maximal operators \( M^c f \) (see [16, Corollary 1.3]) and the locally Lipschitz property of \( M_j f \) (see Remark 2.3) for \( f \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}) \) in order to obtain a positive lower bound for the set of good radii \( \{r > 0 : r \in R_{x,j}^d \text{ for some } j \geq j_{\varepsilon} \text{ and } x \in K \} \). This allows us to obtain an upper bound for \( |(M_j f_j)'| \) uniformly in \( j \) (see (A.1)) on \( K \). The convergence inside the compact set \( K \) then follows from an application of the dominated convergence theorem and Lemma 2.3. A detailed exposition of this argument is included in the Appendix A. It is important to note that the monotonicity arguments used in [21] to show smallness of \( (M_{\beta} f_j)' \) outside a compact set do not adapt to the centered maximal operator \( M_{\beta} \) and therefore Proposition 4.6 plays a crucial role here.

\(^3\)Note that for \( \beta = 0 \), if \( x \in Y_2^j \) then \( 0 \not\in R^d_{x,j} \), and Lemma 4.2 can safely be applied in this case.
APPENDIX A. THE CASE $\beta \in (d - 1, d)$

The goal of this appendix is to show the limitations of the one dimensional techniques in [21], which only extend to higher dimensions in the limited range $\beta \in (d - 1, d)$; note that this range is already subsumed by Theorem 1.1.

Let $f \in W^{1,1}$ and $\{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset W^{1,1}$ such that $\|f_j - f\|_{W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$. By Sobolev embedding and interpolation with $L^1$, one has $\|f_j - f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0$ for all $1 \leq p \leq \frac{d}{d-1}$ as $j \to \infty$. Note that for $p = d/\beta$ and any $B_r$ of radius $r$,

$$\int_{B_r} |f(y)| \, dy \leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f(y)|^p \, dy \right)^{1/p},$$

so

$$|M_\beta f_j(x) - M_\beta f(x)| \leq |M_\beta(f_j - f)(x)| \leq \|f_j - f\|_{d/\beta} \to 0 \quad \text{as } j \to \infty$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ provided $1 \leq d/\beta \leq \frac{d}{d-1}$, which requires $d - 1 \leq \beta < d$. Thus, in this regime of $\beta$, there is uniform convergence of $M_\beta f_j$ to $M_\beta f$. Interpolation with the convergence of $M_\beta f_j$ to $M_\beta f$ in $L^{\frac{d}{d-\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which holds by assumption, yields the convergence on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\frac{d}{d-\alpha} < r \leq \infty$.

The convergence inside any compact set $K$ of $\nabla M_\beta f_j$ to $\nabla M_\beta f$ on $L^4(d - \beta)$ can then be deduced as follows. First, let $C_{K, j} > 0$ be such that

$$\inf_{x \in K} M_\beta f(x) = C_K \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{x \in K} M_\beta f_j(x) = C_{K, j};$$

note that these constants always exist provided $f$ is not identically 0. As $\|M_\beta f_j - M_\beta f\|_{\infty} \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$, there exists $j_1(1)$ such that $C_{K, j} > C_K/2$ for all $j > j_1(1)$. For each $x \in K$, let $B_{x, j} := B(z_{x, j}, r_{x, j}) \in B^\beta_{x, j}$. Then

$$C_K/2 \leq r_{x, j}^\beta \int_{B_{x, j}} \|f_j\| \leq r_{x, j}^\alpha \|f_j\|_{s'} \lesssim r_{x, j}^\alpha \|f\|_{s'}$$

for $j > \max\{j_1(1), j_2(1)\}$ where $j_2(1)$ is large enough so that $\|f_j - f\|_{s'} \leq \|f\|_{s'}$ for $1 \leq s' \leq \frac{d}{d-1}$, where $\alpha := \beta - d/s'$. Note that if $\alpha = \beta - d/s' > 0$, one has the uniform lower bound $C_{x, j} \gtrsim (C_K)^{1/\alpha} : = \bar{C}_K > 0$. Thus, it is required that $s' > d/\beta$ and $s' < \frac{d}{d-1}$, which holds if $d - 1 < \beta < d/\alpha$.

This uniform lower bound on the radius together with Lemmas 2.2 and 2.4 yield the bound

$$|
\nabla M_\beta f_j(x)
| \leq \frac{1}{(C_K)^{d-\beta}} (||\nabla f_j||_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} + ||\nabla f||_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)})$$

$$\lesssim 1 \quad (A.1)$$

for $j > \max\{j_1(1), j_2(1)\}$. As constants have finite integral in a compact set and Lemma 2.6 ensures $\nabla M_\beta f_j \to \nabla M_\beta f$ a.e. as $j \to \infty$, the dominated convergence

$\footnote{Note that a crucial point in this argument is the uniform convergence of $M_\beta f_j$ to $M_\beta$, which allows one relate $C_{K, j}$ and $C_K$. This is no longer available for $0 < \beta < d - 1$.}$

$\footnote{The required conditions on $s$ do not allow to obtain the case $\beta = d - 1$; in particular, this method does not yield results for the classical case $\beta = 0$ if $d = 1$.}$
theorem allows one to conclude that
\[ \int_K |\nabla M_\beta f_j|^{q/d} \to \int_K |\nabla M_\beta f|^{q/d}, \]
which suffices in view of the Brézis–Lieb reduction discussed in Section 2.3. It is noted that the arguments currently presented continue to work for the centered case.

In order to show smallness outside a compact set \( K \), one can argue as in Proposition 1.3 or, more directly, appeal to the Kinnunen–Saksman inequality (1.2) instead of its refined version in Lemma 4.2 which is at our disposal in the range \( \beta \in (d-1, d) \) for \( d > 1 \), yielding
\[ \int_{K^c} |\nabla M_\beta f_j|^q \lesssim \int_{K^c} |M_{\beta-1} f|^q + \int_{K^c} |M_{\beta-1} (f - f_j)|^q. \]
As \( f \in L^{q/d}(\mathbb{R}^d) \), one has \( M_{\beta-1} f \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d) \) and one can then choose \( K \) so that \( \int_{K^c} |M_{\beta-1} f|^q < \varepsilon^q \). For the second term, one can use the boundedness of \( M_{\beta-1} \) and the convergence of \( f_j \) to \( f \) in \( L^{q/d} \) as \( j \to \infty \) to conclude
\[ \int_{K^c} |M_{\beta-1} (f - f_j)|^q \lesssim \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f - f_j|^{q/(q-1)} \right)^{q(d-1)/d} \lesssim \varepsilon^q \]
provided \( j \) is large enough.

Finally, it is remarked that the inequality (1.2) does not yield a favourable estimate in one dimension to show smallness outside a compact set. Instead, given a fixed compact set \( K = [-R, R] \), the argument in [21] for \( d = 1 \) splits \( \mathbb{R}^d \setminus 3K = Y_1 \cup Y_2 \), where \( Y_1 \) is the complementary set in \( \mathbb{R}^d \setminus 3K \). The smallness in \( Y_1 \) is obtained as in Proposition 4.6. However, to show smallness on \( Y_2 \), the author makes use of the fundamental theorem of calculus after observing some monotonicity properties satisfied \( M_{\beta} f \); this is very attached to the case \( d = 1 \) and does not extend to higher dimensions or the centered case \( M_\beta f \). The more general Proposition 4.6 now subsumes the one dimensional case in [21].
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