

Difference Characterization of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin Spaces on Spaces of Homogeneous Type

Fan Wang, Ziyi He, Dachun Yang* and Wen Yuan

Abstract In this article, the authors introduce the spaces of Lipschitz type on spaces of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Weiss, and discuss their relations with Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces. As an application, the authors establish the difference characterization of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type. A major novelty of this article is that all results presented in this article get rid of the dependence on the reverse doubling assumption of the considered measure of the underlying space \mathcal{X} via using the geometrical property of \mathcal{X} expressed by its dyadic reference points, dyadic cubes, and the (local) lower bound. Moreover, some results when $p \leq 1$ but near to 1 are new even when \mathcal{X} is an RD-space.

1 Introduction

In 1970s, Coifman and Weiss [10, 11] introduced the space of homogeneous type which is a natural generalization of \mathbb{R}^n and has provided a suitable setting for the study of function spaces and the boundedness of Calderón–Zygmund operators. Let us recall the following notion of quasi-metric spaces, which is the basis of the notion of spaces of homogeneous type.

Definition 1.1. Let \mathcal{X} be a non-empty set and d a *quasi-metric* on \mathcal{X} , namely, a non-negative function on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ satisfying that, for any $x, y, z \in \mathcal{X}$,

- (i) $d(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$;
- (ii) $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$;
- (iii) there exists a constant $A_0 \in [1, \infty)$, independent of x, y , and z , such that

$$d(x, z) \leq A_0[d(x, y) + d(y, z)].$$

Then (\mathcal{X}, d) is called a *quasi-metric space*.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 46E36; Secondary 46E35, 42B25, 42B20, 42B35, 30L99.

Key words and phrases. space of homogeneous type, Calderón reproducing formula, Besov space, Triebel–Lizorkin space, Lipschitz-type space, difference.

This project is partially supported by the National Key Research and Development Program of China (Grant No. 2020YFA0712900) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 11971058, 12071197 and 11871100).

*Corresponding author, E-mail: dcyang@bnu.edu.cn/January 9, 2021/Final version.

If $A_0 = 1$, then d becomes a *metric* and (\mathcal{X}, d) is called a *metric space*. The *ball* B of \mathcal{X} , centered at $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ with radius $r \in (0, \infty)$, is defined by setting

$$B := \{x \in \mathcal{X} : d(x, x_0) < r\} =: B(x_0, r).$$

We denote by τB the ball with the same center as that of B but of radius τ times that of B for any ball $B \subset \mathcal{X}$ and $\tau \in (0, \infty)$.

Now, let us recall the notion of spaces of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Weiss ([10, 11]).

Definition 1.2. Let (\mathcal{X}, d) be a quasi-metric space and μ a measure on \mathcal{X} . The triple (\mathcal{X}, d, μ) is called a *space of homogeneous type* if μ has the following doubling property: there exists a positive constant $C_{(\mu)} \in [1, \infty)$ such that, for any ball $B \subset \mathcal{X}$,

$$\mu(2B) \leq C_{(\mu)}\mu(B).$$

Note that the above doubling condition implies that, for any ball B and any $\lambda \in [1, \infty)$,

$$(1.1) \quad \mu(\lambda B) \leq C_{(\mu)}\lambda^\omega \mu(B),$$

where $\omega := \log_2 C_{(\mu)}$ is called the *upper dimension* of \mathcal{X} . If $A_0 = 1$, then (\mathcal{X}, d, μ) is called a *metric measure space of homogeneous type* or, simply, a *doubling metric measure space*.

In recent years, function spaces and their applications on spaces of homogeneous type, with some additional assumptions, have been extensively investigated; see, for instance, [2, 12, 26, 49, 53] for the Ahlfors d -regular space case, and [24, 25, 55, 57, 58] for the RD-space case. Recall that an *RD-space* is a doubling metric measure space satisfying the following *reverse doubling condition*: there exist positive constants $\tilde{C}_{(\mu)} \in (0, 1]$ and $\kappa \in (0, \omega]$ such that, for any ball $B(x, r)$ with $r \in (0, \text{diam } \mathcal{X}/2)$ and $\lambda \in [1, \text{diam } \mathcal{X}/(2r))$,

$$\tilde{C}_{(\mu)}\lambda^\kappa \mu(B(x, r)) \leq \mu(B(x, \lambda r));$$

here and thereafter, $\text{diam } \mathcal{X} := \sup\{d(x, y) : x, y \in \mathcal{X}\}$.

Recently, Auscher and Hytönen established a wavelet system on (\mathcal{X}, d, μ) in [4] based on [32, Theorem 2.2]. Motivated by this, He et al. [29, Definition 2.7] introduced a new kind of approximations of the identity with exponential decay (see also Definitions 2.4 and 2.8 below for details). He et al. [29] also established (in)homogeneous continuous/discrete Calderón reproducing formulae (which are re-stated in Lemmas 2.7 and 2.10 below) on a space of homogeneous type by using these approximations of the identity. Using the wavelet system in [4] and the Calderón reproducing formulae in [29], a real-variable theory of function spaces on a space of homogeneous type has been developed rapidly. For instance, Han et al. [22] established the wavelet reproducing formulae by using the wavelets in [4]. Then Han et al. [20] characterized the atomic Hardy spaces via discrete Littlewood–Paley square functions in [29] by using those formulae. Later, Han et al. [21] introduced a new kind of Hardy spaces by using another kind of distribution spaces. Right after the Calderón reproducing formulae were established in [29], He et al. [28] obtained a complete real-variable theory of atomic Hardy spaces on a space (\mathcal{X}, d, μ) of homogeneous type with $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$ which is equivalent to $\text{diam } \mathcal{X} = \infty$ (see, for instance, Nakai and Yabuta [41, Lemma

5.1] or Auscher and Hytönen [4, Lemma 8.1]). Besides, He et al. [31] established a real-variable theory of local Hardy spaces on (X, d, μ) without the assumption $\mu(X) = \infty$. We point out that, in both [28] and [31], He et al. gave a complete answer to an open question asked by Coifman and Weiss [11, p. 642] on the radial maximal function characterization of Hardy spaces over spaces of homogeneous type (see also [9, p. 5]). Later, Fu et al. [14] obtained a real-variable theory of Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces on X . Besides, Zhou et al. [57] established a real-variable theory of Hardy–Lorentz spaces on spaces of homogeneous type. On another hand, Duong and Yan [13] investigated Hardy spaces defined by means of the area integral function associated with the Poisson semigroup. Later, Song and Yan [42] obtained various maximal function characterizations of Hardy spaces associated with operators. Moreover, Bui et al. [8, 9, 7, 6] obtained various maximal function characterizations of a new local-type Hardy spaces associated with operators. Besides, S. Yang and D. Yang [53] established atomic and maximal function characterizations of Musielak–Orlicz–Hardy spaces associated to non-negative self-adjoint operators on spaces of homogeneous type.

As a unified frame of many well-known classical concrete function spaces, the study on Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces has a long history. We refer the reader to monographs [5, 44, 45, 46, 47] for a comprehensive treatment of these function spaces and their history on \mathbb{R}^n . Also, Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type with some additional assumptions were also studied; see, for instance, [23, 27, 50, 51, 52]. Han et al. [25] and Müller and Yang [40] introduced and studied Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on RD-spaces. Later, in [56], Yang and Zhou established a new characterization of these Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces. Besides, Koskela et al. introduced the Hajlasz–Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on RD-spaces in [38, 39]. Later, Grafakos et al. [17] developed a systematic theory on the multilinear analysis of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on RD-spaces. Besides, in [40], Müller and Yang also introduced the spaces of Lipschitz type on RD-spaces and discussed their relations with Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces in [25]. As an application, a difference characterization of those Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces was obtained. On one hand, using the wavelet reproducing formulae in [22], Han et al. [19] introduced Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type and established embedding theorems. On the other hand, Wang et al. [48] also introduced Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on space of homogeneous type, based on the Calderón reproducing formulae established in [29], and established the boundedness of Calderón–Zygmund operators on these spaces as an application. Later, He et al. [30] obtained characterizations of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces via wavelets, molecules, Lusin area functions, and Littlewood–Paley g_λ^* -functions and, moreover, He et al. also showed that two kinds of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces studied, respectively, in [19] and [48] coincide.

To complete the theory of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, it is natural to ask whether or not we can also establish a difference characterization for Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on space of homogeneous type. The main target of this article is to give an affirmative answer to this question.

Precisely speaking, in this article, we introduce spaces of Lipschitz type on spaces of homogeneous type (see Definitions 3.6 and 3.8 below), and discuss their relations with Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces introduced in [48]. As an application, we obtain a difference characterization of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces (see Theorems 4.13 and 5.8 below).

The organization of the remainder of of this article is as follows.

In Section 2, we make some preliminaries via recalling the Calderón reproducing formulae, the dyadic cube system, and some basic properties of the spaces of homogeneous type.

In Section 3, we recall the notion of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type introduced in [48], and introduce the Lipschitz-type spaces on spaces of homogeneous type.

In Section 4, we discuss the relations between Lipschitz-type spaces and homogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces, while the inhomogeneous counterparts are given in Section 5.

We point out that all the proofs get rid of the dependence on the reverse doubling assumption of the considered underlying space by using the Calderón reproducing formulae (see Lemmas 2.6, 2.7, 2.6, and 2.7 below) in which the related approximation of the identity includes the terms of exponential decay, consisting of the side length of related dyadic cubes and the distance between point and dyadic reference points, so that one can fully use the geometrical properties of \mathcal{X} . To deal with the case $p \leq 1$ but near to 1, we use the (local) lower bound of \mathcal{X} , which also reflects the geometrical properties of \mathcal{X} . Moreover, some results in the case $p \leq 1$ but near to 1 are new even when the underlying space is an RD-space [see Propositions 4.6(iv) and 5.4(iv) below]. To obtain these results, we introduce some new Lipschitz-type spaces $\dot{L}_t(s, p, q, u; \mathcal{X})$ and $L_t(s, p, q, u; \mathcal{X})$ (see Definition 3.8 below), in which we add a parameter u that enables us to use the boundedness of the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator on $L^p(\mathcal{X})$ with $p \in (1, \infty]$.

Finally, let us make some conventions on notation. Throughout this article, A_0 always denotes the positive constant appearing in the *quasi-triangle inequality* of d (see Definition 1.1), the parameter ω means the *upper dimension* in Definition 1.2 [see (1.1)], and η is defined to be the smoothness index of the exp-ATI in Definition 2.4 below. Moreover, δ is a small positive number, for instance, $\delta \leq (2A_0)^{-10}$, coming from the construction of the dyadic cubes on \mathcal{X} (see Lemma 2.3). For any $r, a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, define $r_+ := \max\{0, r\}$, $a \wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$, and $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$. The symbol C denotes a positive constant which is independent of the main parameters involved, but may vary from line to line. We use $C_{(\alpha, \beta, \dots)}$ to denote a positive constant depending on the indicated parameters α, β, \dots . The symbol $A \lesssim B$ means that $A \leq CB$ for some positive constant C , while $A \sim B$ means $A \lesssim B \lesssim A$. If $f \leq Cg$ and $g = h$ or $g \leq h$, we then write $f \lesssim g \sim h$ or $f \lesssim g \lesssim h$, rather than $f \lesssim g = h$ or $f \lesssim g \leq h$. For any $r \in (0, \infty)$ and $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ with $x \neq y$, define $V(x, y) := \mu(B(x, d(x, y)))$ and $V_r(x) := \mu(B(x, r))$. For any $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ and $s \in (-\beta \wedge \gamma, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, we let

$$(1.2) \quad p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma) := \max \left\{ \frac{\omega}{\omega + (\beta \wedge \gamma)}, \frac{\omega}{\omega + (\beta \wedge \gamma) + s} \right\},$$

where ω and η are, respectively, as in (1.1) and Definition 2.4. The operator M always denotes the *central Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator* which is defined by setting, for any locally integral function f on \mathcal{X} and any $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$(1.3) \quad M(f)(x) := \sup_{r \in (0, \infty)} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, r))} \int_{B(x, r)} |f(y)| d\mu(y).$$

Finally, for any set $E \subset \mathcal{X}$, we use $\mathbf{1}_E$ to denote its characteristic function and, for any set J , we use $\#J$ to denote its *cardinality*. For any $p \in [1, \infty]$, we use p' to denote its conjugate index, namely, $1/p + 1/p' = 1$.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we make some preliminaries. Let us begin with the notion of Lebesgue spaces.

Definition 2.1. The *Lebesgue space* $L^p(\mathcal{X})$ for any given $p \in (0, \infty]$ is defined by setting, when $p \in (0, \infty)$,

$$L^p(\mathcal{X}) := \left\{ f \text{ is measurable on } \mathcal{X} : \|f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} := \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} |f(x)|^p d\mu(x) \right]^{1/p} < \infty \right\},$$

and

$$L^\infty(\mathcal{X}) := \left\{ f \text{ is measurable on } \mathcal{X} : \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X})} := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |f(x)| < \infty \right\}.$$

For any given $p \in (0, \infty)$, the *locally p -integrable Lebesgue spaces* $L^p_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by setting

$$L^p_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{X}) := \left\{ f \text{ is measurable on } \mathcal{X} : \text{for any } x \in \mathcal{X}, \text{ there exists an } r \in (0, \infty) \text{ such that } \|f\|_{L^p(B(x,r))} < \infty \right\}.$$

Now, we recall the notions of test functions and distributions, whose following versions were originally given in [25] (see also [24]).

Definition 2.2. Let $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}$, $r \in (0, \infty)$, $\beta \in (0, 1]$, and $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$. A measurable function f on \mathcal{X} is called a *test function of type* (x_1, r, β, γ) , if there exists a positive constant C such that

(i) for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$(2.1) \quad |f(x)| \leq C \frac{1}{V_r(x_1) + V(x_1, x)} \left[\frac{r}{r + d(x_1, x)} \right]^\gamma;$$

(ii) for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ satisfying $d(x, y) \leq (2A_0)^{-1}[r + d(x_1, x)]$,

$$(2.2) \quad |f(x) - f(y)| \leq C \left[\frac{d(x, y)}{r + d(x_1, x)} \right]^\beta \frac{1}{V_r(x_1) + V(x_1, x)} \left[\frac{r}{r + d(x_1, x)} \right]^\gamma.$$

The set of all test functions of type (x_1, r, β, γ) is denoted by $\mathcal{G}(x_1, r, \beta, \gamma)$. For any $f \in \mathcal{G}(x_1, r, \beta, \gamma)$, its norm $\|f\|_{\mathcal{G}(x_1, r, \beta, \gamma)}$ is defined by setting

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{G}(x_1, r, \beta, \gamma)} := \inf\{C \in (0, \infty) : (2.1) \text{ and } (2.2) \text{ hold true}\}.$$

Its subspace $\mathring{\mathcal{G}}(x_1, r, \beta, \gamma)$ is defined by setting

$$\mathring{\mathcal{G}}(x_1, r, \beta, \gamma) := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{G}(x_1, r, \beta, \gamma) : \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x) d\mu(x) = 0 \right\}$$

equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathring{\mathcal{G}}(x_1, r, \beta, \gamma)} := \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{G}(x_1, r, \beta, \gamma)}$. Both $\mathcal{G}(x_1, r, \beta, \gamma)$ and $\mathring{\mathcal{G}}(x_1, r, \beta, \gamma)$ are called the *spaces of test functions* on \mathcal{X} .

Note that, for any fixed $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r_1, r_2 \in (0, \infty)$, $\mathcal{G}(x_1, r_1, \beta, \gamma) = \mathcal{G}(x_2, r_2, \beta, \gamma)$ and $\mathring{\mathcal{G}}(x_1, r_1, \beta, \gamma) = \mathring{\mathcal{G}}(x_2, r_2, \beta, \gamma)$ with equivalent norms, but the positive equivalence constants may depend on x_1, x_2, r_1 , and r_2 . Thus, for fixed $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r_0 \in (0, \infty)$, we may denote $\mathcal{G}(x_0, r_0, \beta, \gamma)$ and $\mathring{\mathcal{G}}(x_0, r_0, \beta, \gamma)$ simply, respectively, by $\mathcal{G}(\beta, \gamma)$ and $\mathring{\mathcal{G}}(\beta, \gamma)$.

Fix $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ and $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \epsilon]$. Let $\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma)$ [resp., $\mathring{\mathcal{G}}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma)$] be the completion of the set $\mathcal{G}(\epsilon, \epsilon)$ [resp., $\mathring{\mathcal{G}}(\epsilon, \epsilon)$] in $\mathcal{G}(\beta, \gamma)$ [resp., $\mathring{\mathcal{G}}(\beta, \gamma)$]. Furthermore, the norm of $\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma)$ [resp., $\mathring{\mathcal{G}}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma)$] is defined by setting $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma)} := \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{G}(\beta, \gamma)}$ [resp., $\|\cdot\|_{\mathring{\mathcal{G}}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma)} := \|\cdot\|_{\mathring{\mathcal{G}}(\beta, \gamma)}$]. The dual space $(\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma))'$ [resp., $(\mathring{\mathcal{G}}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma))'$] is defined to be the set of all continuous linear functionals from $\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma)$ [resp., $\mathring{\mathcal{G}}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma)$] to \mathbb{C} , equipped with the weak-* topology. The spaces $(\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma))'$ and $(\mathring{\mathcal{G}}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma))'$ are called the *spaces of distributions* on \mathcal{X} .

The following lemma, which comes from [32, Theorem 2.2], establishes the dyadic cube system of (\mathcal{X}, d, μ) .

Lemma 2.3. *Let constants $0 < c_0 \leq C_0 < \infty$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be such that $12A_0^3 C_0 \delta \leq c_0$. Assume that a set of points, $\{z_\alpha^k : k \in \mathbb{Z}, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ with \mathcal{A}_k for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ being a set of indices, has the following properties: for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,*

$$d(z_\alpha^k, z_\beta^k) \geq c_0 \delta^k \quad \text{if } \alpha \neq \beta, \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} d(x, z_\alpha^k) < C_0 \delta^k \quad \text{for any } x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Then there exists a family of sets, $\{Q_\alpha^k : k \in \mathbb{Z}, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k\}$, satisfying

- (i) for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} Q_\alpha^k = \mathcal{X}$ and $\{Q_\alpha^k : \alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k\}$ is disjoint;
- (ii) if $l, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $k \leq l$, then, for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{A}_l$, either $Q_\beta^l \subset Q_\alpha^k$ or $Q_\beta^l \cap Q_\alpha^k = \emptyset$;
- (iii) for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$, $B(z_\alpha^k, (3A_0^2)^{-1} c_0 \delta^k) \subset Q_\alpha^k \subset B(z_\alpha^k, 2A_0 C_0 \delta^k)$.

Throughout this article, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, define

$$\mathcal{G}_k := \mathcal{A}_{k+1} \setminus \mathcal{A}_k \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Y}^k := \left\{ z_\alpha^{k+1} \right\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{G}_k} =: \left\{ y_\alpha^k \right\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{G}_k}$$

and, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, define

$$d(x, \mathcal{Y}^k) := \inf_{y \in \mathcal{Y}^k} d(x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad V_{\delta^k}(x) := \mu(B(x, \delta^k)).$$

Now, we recall the notion of approximations of the identity with exponential decay from [29].

Definition 2.4. A sequence $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of bounded linear integral operators on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ is called an *approximation of the identity with exponential decay* (for short, exp-ATI) if there exist constants $C, \nu \in (0, \infty)$, $a \in (0, 1]$, and $\eta \in (0, 1)$ such that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the kernel of the operator Q_k , a function on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$, which is still denoted by Q_k , satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) (the identity condition) $\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} Q_k = I$ in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$, where I denotes the identity operator on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$;

(ii) (the *size condition*) for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$|Q_k(x, y)| \leq C \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_{\delta^k}(x)V_{\delta^k}(y)}} \exp \left\{ -\nu \left[\frac{d(x, y)}{\delta^k} \right]^a \right\} h_k(x, y),$$

here and thereafter,

$$h_k(x, y) := \exp \left\{ -\nu \left[\frac{\max\{d(x, \mathcal{Y}^k), d(y, \mathcal{Y}^k)\}}{\delta^k} \right]^a \right\};$$

(iii) (the *regularity condition*) for any $x, x', y \in \mathcal{X}$ with $d(x, x') \leq \delta^k$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |Q_k(x, y) - Q_k(x', y)| + |Q_k(y, x) - Q_k(y, x')| \\ & \leq C \left[\frac{d(x, x')}{\delta^k} \right]^\eta \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_{\delta^k}(x)V_{\delta^k}(y)}} \exp \left\{ -\nu \left[\frac{d(x, y)}{\delta^k} \right]^a \right\} h_k(x, y); \end{aligned}$$

(iv) (the *second difference regularity condition*) for any $x, x', y, y' \in \mathcal{X}$ with $d(x, x') \leq \delta^k$ and $d(y, y') \leq \delta^k$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |[Q_k(x, y) - Q_k(x', y)] - [Q_k(x, y') - Q_k(x', y')]| \\ & \leq C \left[\frac{d(x, x')}{\delta^k} \right]^\eta \left[\frac{d(y, y')}{\delta^k} \right]^\eta \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_{\delta^k}(x)V_{\delta^k}(y)}} \exp \left\{ -\nu \left[\frac{d(x, y)}{\delta^k} \right]^a \right\} h_k(x, y); \end{aligned}$$

(v) (the *cancellation condition*) for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} Q_k(x, y') d\mu(y') = 0 = \int_{\mathcal{X}} Q_k(x', y) d\mu(x').$$

The existence of such an exp-ATI on spaces of homogeneous type is guaranteed by [4, Theorem 7.1], due to $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$, with η the same as in [4, Theorem 3.1] which might be very small (see also [29, Remark 2.8(i)]). However, if d is a metric, then η can be taken arbitrarily close to 1 (see [33, Corollary 6.13]).

The following lemma states some basic properties of exp-ATIs. One can find more details in [29, Remarks 2.8 and 2.9, and Proposition 2.10]. In what follows, for any $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, let

$$(2.3) \quad R_\gamma(x, y; k) := \frac{1}{V_{\delta^k}(x) + V(x, y)} \left[\frac{\delta^k}{\delta^k + d(x, y)} \right]^\gamma.$$

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be an exp-ATI and $\eta \in (0, 1)$ as in Definition 2.4. Then, for any given $\Gamma \in (0, \infty)$, there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the kernel Q_k has the following properties:*

(i) for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$(2.4) \quad |Q_k(x, y)| \leq CR_\Gamma(x, y; k);$$

(ii) for any $x, x', y \in X$ with $d(x, x') \leq (2A_0)^{-1}[\delta^k + d(x, y)]$,

$$|Q_k(x, y) - Q_k(x', y)| + |Q_k(y, x) - Q_k(y, x')| \leq C \left[\frac{d(x, x')}{\delta^k + d(x, y)} \right]^\eta R_\Gamma(x, y; k);$$

(iii) for any $x, x', y, y' \in X$ with $d(x, x') \leq (2A_0)^{-2}[\delta^k + d(x, y)]$ and $d(y, y') \leq (2A_0)^{-2}[\delta^k + d(x, y)]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |[Q_k(x, y) - Q_k(x', y)] - [Q_k(x, y') - Q_k(x', y')]| \\ & \leq C \left[\frac{d(x, x')}{\delta^k + d(x, y)} \right]^\eta \left[\frac{d(y, y')}{\delta^k + d(x, y)} \right]^\eta R_\Gamma(x, y; k). \end{aligned}$$

Using the above exp-ATI, He et al. [29, Theorem 4.18] established the following homogeneous continuous/ discrete Calderón reproducing formulae. We point out that these homogeneous reproducing formulae need the assumption that $\mu(X) = \infty$.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ with η as in Definition 2.4, and $\{Q_k\}_{k=-\infty}^\infty$ be an exp-ATI. Then there exists a sequence $\{\tilde{Q}_k\}_{k=-\infty}^\infty$ of bounded linear integral operators on $L^2(X)$ such that, for any $f \in (\mathring{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$,*

$$f = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{Q}_k Q_k f \quad \text{in } (\mathring{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))',$$

and, moreover, there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the kernel of \tilde{Q}_k , still denoted by \tilde{Q}_k , satisfies that

(i) for any $x, y \in X$,

$$(2.5) \quad |\tilde{Q}_k(x, y)| \leq CR_\gamma(x, y; k);$$

(ii) for any $x, x', y \in X$ with $d(x, x') \leq (2A_0)^{-1}[\delta^k + d(x, y)]$,

$$(2.6) \quad |\tilde{Q}_k(x, y) - \tilde{Q}_k(x', y)| \leq C \left[\frac{d(x, x')}{\delta^k + d(x, y)} \right]^\beta R_\gamma(x, y; k);$$

(iii) for any $x \in X$,

$$(2.7) \quad \int_X \tilde{Q}_k(x, y) d\mu(y) = 0 = \int_X \tilde{Q}_k(y, x) d\mu(y),$$

where $R_\gamma(x, y; k)$ is as in (2.3).

To recall the homogeneous discrete Calderón reproducing formula obtained in [29, Theorem 5.11], we need more notions. Let $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be sufficiently large such that $\delta^{j_0} \leq (2A_0)^{-3}C_0$. Based on Lemma 2.3, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$, let

$$\mathcal{N}(k, \alpha) := \{\tau \in \mathcal{A}_{k+j_0} : Q_\tau^{k+j_0} \subset Q_\alpha^k\}$$

and $N(k, \alpha) := \#\mathcal{N}(k, \alpha)$. From Lemma 2.3, it follows that there exists a positive constant C , independent of k and α , such that $N(k, \alpha) \leq C\delta^{-j_0\omega}$ and $\bigcup_{\tau \in \mathcal{N}(k, \alpha)} Q_\tau^{k+j_0} = Q_\alpha^k$. We rearrange the set $\{Q_\tau^{k+j_0} : \tau \in \mathcal{N}(k, \alpha)\}$ as $\{Q_\alpha^{k, m}\}_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)}$. Denote by $y_\alpha^{k, m}$ an arbitrary point in $Q_\alpha^{k, m}$, and $z_\alpha^{k, m}$ the ‘‘center’’ of $Q_\alpha^{k, m}$.

Lemma 2.7. Let $\{Q_k\}_{k=-\infty}^{\infty}$ be an exp-ATI and $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ with η as in Definition 2.4. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$, and $m \in \{1, \dots, N(k, \alpha)\}$, suppose that $y_\alpha^{k,m}$ is an arbitrary point in $Q_\alpha^{k,m}$. Then there exists a sequence $\{\tilde{Q}_k\}_{k=-\infty}^{\infty}$ of bounded linear integral operators on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ such that, for any $f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$,

$$f(\cdot) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) \tilde{Q}_k(\cdot, y_\alpha^{k,m}) Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) \quad \text{in } (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'.$$

Moreover, there exists a positive constant C , independent of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$, and $m \in \{1, \dots, N(k, \alpha)\}$, and f , such that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the kernel of \tilde{Q}_k satisfies (2.5), (2.6), and (2.7).

Now, we recall the inhomogeneous approximation of the identity with exponential decay (see [29, Definition 6.1]), which is the basis of inhomogeneous Calderón reproducing formulae.

Definition 2.8. Let $\eta \in (0, 1)$ be as in Definition 2.4. A sequence $\{Q_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ of bounded linear integral operators on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ is called an *inhomogeneous approximation of the identity with exponential decay* (for short, exp-IATI) if $\{Q_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ has the following properties:

- (i) $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} Q_k = I$ in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$;
- (ii) for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, Q_k satisfies (ii) through (v) of Definition 2.4;
- (iii) Q_0 satisfies (ii), (iii), and (iv) of Definition 2.4 with $k = 0$ but without the term

$$\exp\left\{-\nu \left[\max\{d(x, \mathcal{Y}^0), d(y, \mathcal{Y}^0)\}\right]^a\right\};$$

moreover, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} Q_0(x, y) d\mu(y) = 1 = \int_{\mathcal{X}} Q_0(y, x) d\mu(y).$$

Note that the existence of such an exp-IATI does not need the assumption that $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$.

Next, we state the inhomogeneous continuous and discrete Calderón reproducing formulae which were obtained, respectively, in [29, Theorem 6.8] and [29, Theorem 6.13].

Lemma 2.9. Let $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ with η as in Definition 2.4, and $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ an exp-IATI. Then there exist an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sequence $\{\tilde{Q}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ of bounded linear integral operators on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ such that, for any $f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$,

$$f = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \tilde{Q}_k Q_k f \quad \text{in } (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))',$$

where, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the kernel of \tilde{Q}_k , still denoted by \tilde{Q}_k , satisfies (2.5), (2.6), and the following integral condition: for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \tilde{Q}_k(x, y) d\mu(y) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \tilde{Q}_k(y, x) d\mu(y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k \in \{0, \dots, N\}, \\ 0 & \text{if } k \in \{N+1, N+2, \dots\}. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 2.10. *Let $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ with η as in Definition 2.4, and $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ an exp-IATI. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$, and $m \in \{1, \dots, N(k, \alpha)\}$, suppose that $y_\alpha^{k,m}$ is an arbitrary point in $Q_\alpha^{k,m}$. Then there exist an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sequence $\{\tilde{Q}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ of bounded linear integral operators on $L^2(X)$ such that, for any $f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$,*

$$\begin{aligned} f(\cdot) &= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_0} \sum_{m=1}^{N(0, \alpha)} \int_{Q_\alpha^{0,m}} \tilde{Q}_0(\cdot, y) d\mu(y) Q_{\alpha,1}^{0,m}(f) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) \tilde{Q}_k(\cdot, y_\alpha^{k,m}) Q_{\alpha,1}^{k,m}(f) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) \tilde{Q}_k(\cdot, y_\alpha^{k,m}) Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) \end{aligned}$$

in $(\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$, where, for any $k \in \{0, \dots, N\}$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$, and $m \in \{1, \dots, N(k, \alpha)\}$,

$$Q_{\alpha,1}^{k,m}(f) := \frac{1}{\mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m})} \int_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} Q_k f(u) d\mu(u).$$

Moreover, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the kernel of \tilde{Q}_k , still denoted by \tilde{Q}_k , satisfies the same conditions as in Lemma 2.9 with the positive constant C independent of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, where $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$ and $m \in \{1, \dots, N(k, \alpha)\}$.

3 Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces and spaces of Lipschitz-type on spaces of homogeneous type

In this section, we introduce some notions of function spaces on spaces of homogeneous type. Let us begin with the notions of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type; see [48, Definitions 3.1, 4.1, 5.1 and 5.8].

Definition 3.1. Let $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ with η as in Definition 2.4, $s \in (-\beta \wedge \gamma, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, and $p, q \in (0, \infty]$ satisfy

$$\beta \in \left(\max \left\{ 0, -s + \omega \left(\frac{1}{p} - 1 \right) \right\}, \eta \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma \in \left(\max \left\{ s, \omega \left(\frac{1}{p} - 1 \right) \right\}, \eta \right)$$

with ω as in (1.1). Let $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be an exp-ATI.

- (i) Let $p \in (p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma), \infty]$ with $p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma)$ as in (1.2), and $q \in (0, \infty]$. The *homogenous Besov space* $\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(X)$ is defined by setting

$$\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(X) := \left\{ f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))' : \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(X)} := \left[\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \delta^{-ksq} \|Q_k(f)\|_{L^p(X)}^q \right]^{1/q} < \infty \right\}$$

with usual modifications made when $p = \infty$ or $q = \infty$.

- (ii) Let $p \in (p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma), \infty)$ and $q \in (p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma), \infty]$. The *homogenous Triebel–Lizorkin space* $\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by setting

$$\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) := \left\{ f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))' : \|f\|_{\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} := \left\| \left[\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \delta^{-ksq} |Q_k(f)|^q \right]^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} < \infty \right\}$$

with usual modification made when $q = \infty$.

For any measurable set $E \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $\mu(E) \in (0, \infty)$, and for any non-negative measurable function f , let

$$m_E(f) := \frac{1}{\mu(E)} \int_E f(x) d\mu(x).$$

Now, we recall the notion of inhomogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type.

Definition 3.2. Let $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ with η as in Definition 2.4, $s \in (-(\beta \wedge \gamma), \beta \wedge \gamma)$, and $p, q \in (0, \infty]$ satisfy

$$\beta \in \left(\max \left\{ 0, -s + \omega \left(\frac{1}{p} - 1 \right) \right\}, \eta \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma \in \left(\omega \left(\frac{1}{p} - 1 \right), \eta \right)_+$$

with ω as in (1.1). Let $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ be an exp-IATI and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ as in Lemma 2.10.

- (i) Let $p \in (p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma), \infty]$ with $p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma)$ as in (1.2), and $q \in (0, \infty]$. The *inhomogeneous Besov space* $B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by setting

$$B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) := \left\{ f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))' : \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} := \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) [m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k(f)|)]^p \right\}^{1/p} + \left[\sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \|Q_k(f)\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}^q \right]^{1/q} < \infty \right\}$$

with usual modifications made when $p = \infty$ or $q = \infty$.

- (ii) Let $p \in (p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma), \infty)$ and $q \in (p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma), \infty]$. The *inhomogeneous Triebel–Lizorkin space* $F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by setting

$$F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) := \left\{ f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))' : \|f\|_{F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} := \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) [m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k(f)|)]^p \right\}^{1/p} + \left\| \left[\sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} |Q_k(f)|^q \right]^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} < \infty \right\}$$

with usual modification made when $q = \infty$.

Definition 3.3. Let $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$, $s \in (-\beta \wedge \gamma, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, and $q \in (p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma), \infty]$ with η as in Definition 2.4 and $p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma)$ as in (1.2). Let $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be an exp-ATI. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$, let Q_α^k be as in Lemma 2.3. Then the *homogeneous Triebel–Lizorkin space* $\dot{F}_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by setting

$$\dot{F}_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X}) := \left\{ f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))' : \|f\|_{\dot{F}_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X})} := \sup_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_l} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(Q_\alpha^l)} \times \int_{Q_\alpha^l} \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} |Q_k(f)(x)|^q d\mu(x) \right]^{1/q} < \infty \right\}$$

with usual modification made when $q = \infty$.

Definition 3.4. Let $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ with η as in Definition 2.4, and $s \in (-\beta \wedge \gamma, \beta \wedge \gamma)$. Let $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be an exp-IATI and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ as in Lemma 2.10. The *inhomogeneous Triebel–Lizorkin space* $F_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by setting

$$F_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X}) := \left\{ f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))' : \|f\|_{F_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X})} := \max \left[\sup_{k \in \{0, \dots, N\}} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sup_{m \in \{1, \dots, N(k, \alpha)\}} m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k(f)|), \sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}, l > N} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_l} \left\{ \frac{1}{\mu(Q_\alpha^l)} \int_{Q_\alpha^l} \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} |Q_k(f)(x)|^q d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/q} \right] < \infty \right\}$$

with usual modification made when $q = \infty$.

Remark 3.5. (i) Recall that homogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on \mathcal{X} need to require $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$ which is not necessary for inhomogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on \mathcal{X} .

(ii) It was proved in [48] that those spaces defined in Definitions 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 are independent of the choices of β, γ , and exp-(I)ATIs (see [48, Propositions 3.12, 3.15, 4.3, 4.4, 5.4, 5.5, 5.10, and 5.11]), which makes those spaces well defined.

Next, we introduce the notion of Lipschitz-type spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, which originates from [43, 36, 34]; see also [40, Definition 3.1].

Definition 3.6. Let $p, q \in (0, \infty]$, $s \in (0, \infty)$, and $\tilde{C} \in (0, \infty)$ be a constant.

(i) A function $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^p(\mathcal{X})$ is said to belong to the *Lipschitz-type space* $\dot{L}(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$ if

$$\|f\|_{\dot{L}(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})} := \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \tilde{C}\delta^k))} \int_{B(x, \tilde{C}\delta^k)} |f(x) - f(y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q},$$

with usual modifications made when $p = \infty$ or $q = \infty$, is finite.

(ii) A function $f \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$ is said to belong to the *Lipschitz-type space* $L(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$ if

$$\|f\|_{L(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})} < \infty.$$

Moreover, for any $f \in L(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$, let

$$\|f\|_{L(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})} := \|f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} + \|f\|_{\dot{L}(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})}.$$

(iii) A function $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{X})$ is said to belong to the *Lipschitz-type space* $\dot{L}_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$ if

$$\|f\|_{\dot{L}_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})} := \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \tilde{C}\delta^k))} \int_{B(x, \tilde{C}\delta^k)} |f(x) - f(y)| d\mu(y) \right]^p d\mu(x) \right\}^{q/p} \right)^{1/q},$$

with usual modifications made when $p = \infty$ or $q = \infty$, is finite.

(iv) A function $f \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$ is said to belong to the *Lipschitz-type space* $L_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$ if

$$\|f\|_{\dot{L}_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})} < \infty.$$

Moreover, for any $f \in L_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$, let

$$\|f\|_{L_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})} := \|f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} + \|f\|_{\dot{L}_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})}.$$

When \mathcal{X} is a d -set of \mathbb{R}^n , the Lipschitz-type space $\dot{L}(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$, for any given $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p, q \in (0, \infty]$, was introduced in [35, 37]; see also [15, 16]. When \mathcal{X} is an Ahlfors n -regular metric measure space, these spaces were introduced in [54]. We also point out that, when \mathcal{X} is a metric measure space, these spaces may be non-trivial even when $s \in (1, \infty)$ (see, for instance, [54] for more details).

It is easy to show that the spaces $\dot{L}(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$, $L(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$, $\dot{L}_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$, and $L_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$ are independent of the choice of \tilde{C} (see, for instance, [35] and [54]). These spaces have the following basic properties, whose proofs are similar to those presented in [54], and we omit the details here.

Proposition 3.7. *Let $s \in (0, \infty)$.*

(i) *If $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $q \in (0, \infty]$, then*

$$\dot{L}(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{L}_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) \quad \text{and} \quad L(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) \subset L_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}).$$

(ii) *If $p \in (0, \infty]$ and $0 < q_0 \leq q_1 \leq \infty$, then $\dot{L}(s, p, q_0; \mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{L}(s, p, q_1; \mathcal{X})$, $\dot{L}_b(s, p, q_0; \mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{L}_b(s, p, q_1; \mathcal{X})$, $L(s, p, q_0; \mathcal{X}) \subset L(s, p, q_1; \mathcal{X})$, and $L_b(s, p, q_0; \mathcal{X}) \subset L_b(s, p, q_1; \mathcal{X})$.*

(iii) *If $p \in (0, \infty]$, $q_0, q_1 \in (0, \infty]$, and $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, then $L(s + \varepsilon, p, q_0; \mathcal{X}) \subset L(s, p, q_1; \mathcal{X})$ and $L_b(s + \varepsilon, p, q_0; \mathcal{X}) \subset L_b(s, p, q_1; \mathcal{X})$.*

Now, we introduce the following Lipschitz-type spaces $\dot{L}_t(s, p, q, u; \mathcal{X})$ and $L_t(s, p, q, u; \mathcal{X})$.

Definition 3.8. Let $p, q \in (0, \infty]$, $s, u \in (0, \infty)$, and $\tilde{C} \in (0, \infty)$ be a constant..

(i) A function $f \in L^u_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{X})$ is said to belong to the *Lipschitz-type space* $\dot{L}_t(s, p, q, u; \mathcal{X})$ if

$$\|f\|_{\dot{L}_t(s, p, q, u; \mathcal{X})} := \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(\cdot, \tilde{C}\delta^k))} \int_{B(\cdot, \tilde{C}\delta^k)} |f(\cdot) - f(y)|^u d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{q}{u}} \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})},$$

with usual modification made when $q = \infty$, is finite.

(ii) A function $f \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$ is said to belong to the *Lipschitz-type space* $L_t(s, p, q, u; \mathcal{X})$ if

$$\|f\|_{L_t(s,p,q,u;\mathcal{X})} := \|f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} + \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(\cdot, \widetilde{C}\delta^k))} \int_{B(\cdot, \widetilde{C}\delta^k)} |f(\cdot) - f(y)|^u d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{q}{u}} \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})},$$

with usual modification made when $q = \infty$, is finite.

It is easy to see that the spaces $L_t(s, p, q, u; \mathcal{X})$ with $u \in (0, p)$, and $\dot{L}_t(s, p, q, u; \mathcal{X})$ are independent of the choice of \widetilde{C} (see, for instance, [35] and [54]). If $u = 1$, we denote $\dot{L}_t(s, p, q, u; \mathcal{X})$ and $L_t(s, p, q, u; \mathcal{X})$ simply, respectively, by $\dot{L}_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$ and $L_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$ which were also introduced in [54] when \mathcal{X} is an Ahlfors n -regular metric measure space. Now, we give some basic properties of $\dot{L}_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$ and $L_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$, which can be proved in a way similar to that used in the proof of [54, Proposition 3.5]; we omit the details here.

Proposition 3.9. *Let $s \in (0, \infty)$.*

- (i) *If $p \in (0, \infty]$ and $0 < q_0 \leq q_1 \leq \infty$, then $\dot{L}_t(s, p, q_0; \mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{L}_t(s, p, q_1; \mathcal{X})$ and $L_t(s, p, q_0; \mathcal{X}) \subset L_t(s, p, q_1; \mathcal{X})$.*
- (ii) *If $p \in (0, \infty]$, $q_0, q_1 \in (0, \infty]$, and $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, then $L_t(s + \varepsilon, p, q_0; \mathcal{X}) \subset L_t(s, p, q_1; \mathcal{X})$.*
- (iii) *If $p, q \in (0, \infty]$, then*

$$\dot{L}_b(s, p \min(p, q); \mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{L}_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{L}_b(s, p, \max(p, q); \mathcal{X})$$

and

$$L_b(s, p \min(p, q); \mathcal{X}) \subset L_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) \subset L_b(s, p, \max(p, q); \mathcal{X}).$$

- (iv) *If $p \in (0, \infty]$, then $\dot{L}_b(s, p, p; \mathcal{X}) = \dot{L}_t(s, p, p; \mathcal{X})$ and $L_b(s, p, p; \mathcal{X}) = L_t(s, p, p; \mathcal{X})$.*

The following characterizations of $L(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$ and $L_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$ come from [40, Proposition 3.3] which still holds true in the setting of spaces of homogenous type; we omit the details here.

Proposition 3.10. *Let $s \in (0, \infty)$ and $\widetilde{C} \in (0, \infty)$ be a constant.*

- (i) *Let $p, q \in (0, \infty]$. Then $f \in L(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$ if and only if $f \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$ and*

$$\|f\|_{\widetilde{L}(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})} := \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^k))} \int_{B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^k)} |f(x) - f(y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q}$$

is finite. Moreover, in this case,

$$\|f\|_{L(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})} \sim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} + \|f\|_{\widetilde{L}(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})}$$

with the positive equivalence constants independent of f .

(ii) Let $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $q \in (0, \infty]$. Then $f \in L_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$ if and only if $f \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$ and

$$\|f\|_{\tilde{L}_b(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})} := \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \tilde{C}\delta^k))} \int_{B(x, \tilde{C}\delta^k)} |f(x) - f(y)| d\mu(y) \right]^p d\mu(x) \right\}^{q/p} \right)^{1/q}$$

is finite. Moreover, in this case,

$$\|f\|_{L_b(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})} \sim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} + \|f\|_{\tilde{L}_b(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})}$$

with the positive equivalence constants independent of f .

4 Relations with homogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces

In this section, we study the relations between spaces of Lipschitz-type and homogeneous Besov spaces or Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogenous type. In this section, we always assume that $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$. Let us begin with the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. Let η be as in Definition 2.4, $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$, and $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$.

- (i) If $p \in (\omega/[\omega + (\beta \wedge \gamma)], \infty]$ and $q \in (0, \infty]$, then $\dot{L}_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$;
- (ii) If $p, q \in (\omega/[\omega + (\beta \wedge \gamma)], \infty]$, then $\dot{L}_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$.

To prove Proposition 4.1, we need the following basic and useful inequality.

Lemma 4.2. Let $\theta \in (0, 1]$. It then holds true that, for any $\{a_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{C}$,

$$(4.1) \quad \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |a_j| \right)^{\theta} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |a_j|^{\theta}.$$

The following lemma contains some basic and very useful estimates related to d and μ on a space (\mathcal{X}, d, μ) of homogeneous type. One can find the details in [25, Lemma 2.1] or [29, Lemma 2.4].

Lemma 4.3. Let $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \infty)$.

- (i) For any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$, $V(x, y) \sim V(y, x)$ and

$$V_r(x) + V_r(y) + V(x, y) \sim V_r(x) + V(x, y) \sim V_r(y) + V(x, y) \sim \mu(B(x, r + d(x, y)));$$

moreover, if $d(x, y) \leq r$, then $V_r(x) \sim V_r(y)$. Here the positive equivalence constants are independent of x, y , and r .

- (ii) There exists a positive constant C such that, for any $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{V_r(x_1) + V(x_1, y)} \left[\frac{r}{r + d(x_1, y)} \right]^{\gamma} d\mu(y) \leq C.$$

(iii) *There exists a positive constant C such that, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $R \in (0, \infty)$,*

$$\int_{\{z \in \mathcal{X}: d(x,z) \leq R\}} \frac{1}{V(x,y)} \left[\frac{d(x,y)}{R} \right]^\beta d\mu(y) \leq C$$

and

$$\int_{\{z \in \mathcal{X}: d(x,z) \geq R\}} \frac{1}{V(x,y)} \left[\frac{R}{d(x,y)} \right]^\beta d\mu(y) \leq C.$$

(iv) *There exists a positive constant C such that, for any $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r, R \in (0, \infty)$,*

$$\int_{\{x \in \mathcal{X}: d(x_1,x) \geq R\}} \frac{1}{V_r(x_1) + V(x_1,x)} \left[\frac{r}{r + d(x_1,x)} \right]^\gamma d\mu(x) \leq C \left(\frac{r}{r+R} \right)^\gamma.$$

Now, we show Proposition 4.1.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. We first prove (i). We claim that, for any given $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$, $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, $p \in (\omega/[\omega + (\beta \wedge \gamma)], \infty]$, and $q \in (0, \infty]$,

$$(4.2) \quad \dot{L}_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) \subset (\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'.$$

Indeed, assume that $f \in \dot{L}_b(s, p, \infty; \mathcal{X})$ and $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ is a fixed point. Then f is finite for almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $f(x) < \infty$. To simplify the presentation of this proof, here and thereafter, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, let

$$(4.3) \quad J_k(f; x) := \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \tilde{C}\delta^{-k}))} \int_{B(x, \tilde{C}\delta^{-k})} |f(x) - f(y)| d\mu(y).$$

For any $g \in \dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma)$, by Lemma 4.3, we have, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(y)g(y) d\mu(y) \right| &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} [f(x) - f(y)]g(y) d\mu(y) \right| \\ &\lesssim \|g\|_{\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma)} \int_{\mathcal{X}} |f(x) - f(y)| R_\gamma(x_1, y; 0) d\mu(y) \\ &\lesssim \|g\|_{\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma)} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma} J_j(f; x), \end{aligned}$$

where $R_\gamma(x_1, y; 0)$ is as in (2.3). When $p \in (\omega/[\omega + (\beta \wedge \gamma)], 1]$, from (4.4), (4.1), and $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(y)g(y) d\mu(y) \right| &= \left\{ \frac{1}{\mu(B(x_1, 1))} \int_{B(x_1, 1)} \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} [f(x) - f(y)]g(y) d\mu(y) \right|^p d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \|g\|_{\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma)} \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma p} \int_{\mathcal{X}} [J_j(f; x)]^p d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \|g\|_{\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma)} \|f\|_{\dot{L}_b(s, p, \infty; \mathcal{X})}; \end{aligned}$$

while, when $p \in (1, \infty]$, by the Minkowski inequality, (4.4), and $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(y)g(y) d\mu(y) \right| &\lesssim \|g\|_{\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma)} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} [J_j(f; x)]^p d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \|g\|_{\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma)} \|f\|_{\dot{L}_b(s, p, \infty; \mathcal{X})}. \end{aligned}$$

By this and Proposition 3.7(ii), we conclude that (4.2) holds true.

Now, we prove that $\dot{L}_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{B}_{p, q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ for any given $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$, $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, $p \in (\omega/[\omega + (\beta \wedge \gamma)], \infty]$, and $q \in (0, \infty]$. To this end, let $f \in \dot{L}_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$ and $\{Q_k\}_{k=-\infty}^{\infty}$ be an exp-ATI. Then, by the cancellation and the size conditions of Q_k , we have, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} |Q_k f(x)| &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} Q_k(x, y)[f(x) - f(y)] d\mu(y) \right| \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathcal{X}} R_\gamma(x, y; k)|f(x) - f(y)| d\mu(y) \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma} J_{j-k}(f; x), \end{aligned}$$

where $R_\gamma(x, y; k)$ is as in (2.3).

If $p \in (\omega/[\omega + (\beta \wedge \gamma)], 1]$, by (4.1) and (4.5), we find that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$(4.6) \quad \|Q_k f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma p} \int_{\mathcal{X}} [J_{j-k}(f; x)]^p d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/p}.$$

When $q/p \in (0, 1]$, from (4.6), (4.1), and $s \in (0, \gamma)$, we deduce that

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p, q}^s(\mathcal{X})} &= \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \|Q_k f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}^q \right\}^{1/q} \\ &\lesssim \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma p} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} [J_{j-k}(f; x)]^p d\mu(x) \right\}^{q/p} \right]^{1/q} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{L}_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j(\gamma-s)p} \right)^{1/q} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{L}_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})}; \end{aligned}$$

while, when $q/p \in (1, \infty]$, by (4.6) and the Minkowski inequality, we conclude that

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p, q}^s(\mathcal{X})} &= \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \|Q_k f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}^q \right\}^{1/q} \\ &\lesssim \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma p} \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} [J_{j-k}(f; x)]^p d\mu(x) \right\}^{q/p} \right)^{p/q} \right]^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{L}_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})}. \end{aligned}$$

If $p \in (1, \infty]$, then, from (4.5) and the Minkowski inequality, we deduce that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$(4.9) \quad \|Q_k f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} [J_{j-k}(f; x)]^p d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/p}.$$

When $q \in (0, 1]$, by (4.1) and (4.9), we obtain

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} &= \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \|Q_k f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}^q \right\}^{1/q} \\ &\lesssim \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma q} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} [J_{j-k}(f; x)]^p d\mu(x) \right\}^{q/p} \right]^{1/q} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{L}_b(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})}; \end{aligned}$$

while, when $q \in (1, \infty]$, by (4.9) and the Minkowski inequality, we conclude that

$$\|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma} \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} [J_{j-k}(f; x)]^p d\mu(x) \right\}^{q/p} \right]^{1/q} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{L}_b(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})}.$$

This, together with (4.7), (4.8), and (4.10), then finishes the proof of (i).

Next, we prove (ii). By Proposition 3.9(iii), we have, for any given s , p , and q as in Proposition 4.1(ii),

$$\dot{L}_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{L}_b(s, p, \max\{p, q\}; \mathcal{X}).$$

Thus, from (4.2), we deduce that $\dot{L}_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) \subset (\hat{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$ with β , γ , s , p , and q as in (ii).

Let $\{Q_k\}_{k=-\infty}^{\infty}$ be an exp-ATI and $f \in \dot{L}_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$. Then, by the cancellation and the size conditions of Q_k , we find that, for any fixed $\Gamma \in (0, \infty)$ and for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} |Q_k f(x)| &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} [f(x) - f(y)] Q_k(x, y) d\mu(y) \right| \lesssim \int_{\mathcal{X}} R_\Gamma(x, y; k) |f(x) - f(y)| d\mu(y) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\Gamma} J_{j-k}(f; x), \end{aligned}$$

where $R_\Gamma(x, y; k)$ is as in (2.3). If $q \in (\omega/[\omega + (\beta \wedge \gamma)], 1]$, using (4.1) and (4.11), and choosing $\Gamma \in (\gamma, \infty)$, we conclude that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$(4.12) \quad |Q_k f(x)| \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma q} [J_{j-k}(f; x)]^q \right\}^{1/q};$$

while, when $q \in (1, \infty]$, using the Hölder inequality and choosing $\Gamma \in (\gamma, \infty)$ again, we have, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$(4.13) \quad |Q_k f(x)| \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma q} [J_{j-k}(f; x)]^q \right\}^{1/q} \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j(\Gamma-\gamma)q'} \right]^{1/q'} \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma q} [J_{j-k}(f; x)]^q \right\}^{1/q}.$$

Combining the above two estimates, we conclude that, for any given $q \in (\omega/[\omega + (\beta \wedge \gamma)], \infty]$ and for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$|Q_k f(x)| \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma q} [J_{j-k}(f; x)]^q \right\}^{1/q}.$$

Now, we consider the following two cases.

Case 1) $p \in (\omega/[\omega + (\beta \wedge \gamma)], \infty)$. In this case, if $p/q \in (0, 1]$, then, by (4.12), (4.13), (4.1), and $s \in (0, \gamma)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (4.14) \quad \|f\|_{\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} &= \left\| \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} |Q_k f|^q \right]^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \\ &\lesssim \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma q} [J_{j-k}(f; x)]^q \right\}^{p/q} d\mu(x) \right)^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma p} \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} [J_{j-k}(f; x)]^q \right\}^{p/q} d\mu(x) \right)^{1/p} \\ &\sim \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma p} \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} [J_{j-k}(f; \cdot)]^q \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}^p \right)^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{L}_t(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})}; \end{aligned}$$

while, if $p/q \in (1, \infty)$, by (4.12), (4.13), the Minkowski inequality, and an argument similar to that used in the estimation of (4.14), we have

$$(4.15) \quad \|f\|_{\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma q} \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} [J_{j-k}(f; \cdot)]^q \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}^q \right)^{1/q} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{L}_t(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})},$$

which, combined with (4.14), then completes the proof of (ii) in this case.

Case 2) $p = \infty$. In this case, by (4.12) and (4.13), we find that, for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$(4.16) \quad \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} |Q_k f(x)|^q \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma q} \sum_{k=j}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} [J_{j-k}(f; x)]^q \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{L}_t(s,\infty,q;\mathcal{X})}^q,$$

which implies that, for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_l$,

$$\frac{1}{\mu(Q_\alpha^l)} \int_{Q_\alpha^l} \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} |Q_k f(x)|^q d\mu(x) \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{L}_t(s,\infty,q;\mathcal{X})}^q.$$

Thus, $f \in \dot{F}_{\infty,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|f\|_{\dot{F}_{\infty,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{L}_t(s,\infty,q;\mathcal{X})}$, which completes the proof of (ii) in this case.

Combining with the two above cases, we complete the proof of (ii) and hence of Proposition 4.1. \square

To establish the contrary of Proposition 4.1, we need the following notion of lower bounds; see, for instance, [19, Definition 1.1] and [1].

Definition 4.4. Suppose that (X, d, μ) is a space of homogeneous type with upper dimension ω as in (1.1). The measure μ is said to have a *lower bound* Q with $Q \in (0, \omega]$, if there is a positive constant C such that, for any $x \in X$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$,

$$(4.17) \quad \mu(B(x, r)) \geq Cr^Q.$$

Remark 4.5. (i) We point out that, in Definition 4.4, the restriction $Q \in (0, \omega]$ is necessary. Indeed, fix a point $x_0 \in X$. Then, by (1.1) and (4.17), we find that, for any $r \in [1, \infty)$,

$$r^Q \lesssim \mu(B(x_0, r)) \lesssim r^\omega \mu(B(x_0, 1)),$$

which implies that $r^{Q-\omega} \lesssim 1$. Letting $r \rightarrow \infty$, we then obtain $Q \leq \omega$, which explains the reasonability of the above restriction on Q .

(ii) Observe that the lower bound Q of X in [19, Definition 1.1] is directly restricted to the same as the upper dimension ω of X .

Now, we establish the inverse of Proposition 4.1.

Proposition 4.6. Let η be as in Definition 2.4, ω as in (1.1), $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$, and $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$.

- (i) If $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $q \in (0, \infty]$, then $\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(X) \subset \dot{L}(s, p, q; X)$;
- (ii) If $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), 1)$ satisfies $-\eta < s - \omega/p$, $q \in (0, \infty]$, and X has a lower bound ω , then $\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(X) \subset \dot{L}(s, p, q; X)$;
- (iii) If $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $q \in (1, \infty]$, then $\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(X) \subset \dot{L}_t(s, p, q; X)$;
- (iv) If $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), 1]$ satisfies $-\eta < s - \omega/p$, $q \in (\omega/[\omega + (\beta \wedge \gamma)], \infty]$, and X has a lower bound ω , then $\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(X) \subset \dot{L}_t(s, p, q, u; X)$ with $u \in (0, \min\{p, q\})$.

To show Proposition 4.6, we need several technical lemmas. Han et al. [19, Theorem 1.3] obtained a necessary and sufficient condition for the validity of the embedding theorems for Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type. The following lemma comes from the combination of [19, Theorem 1.3] and [30, Theorem 3.2].

Lemma 4.7. Let η be as in Definition 2.4, ω as in (1.1), $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$, $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, and $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), 1]$ satisfy $-\eta < s - \omega/p$. Assume that X has a lower bound ω .

(i) If $q \in (0, \infty]$, then

$$\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(X) \subset \dot{B}_{1,q}^{s-\omega(\frac{1}{p}-1)}(X).$$

(ii) If $q \in (\omega/[\omega + (\beta \wedge \gamma)], \infty]$, then

$$\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(X) \subset \dot{F}_{1,q}^{s-\omega(\frac{1}{p}-1)}(X).$$

Remark 4.8. We point that the lower bound of \mathcal{X} in Proposition 4.6 and Lemma 4.7 is required to be the same as the upper dimension ω . It is still unclear whether or not the conclusions of Proposition 4.6 and Lemma 4.7 still hold true if the lower bound Q of \mathcal{X} belongs to $(0, \omega)$. Indeed, we prove Proposition 4.6 by using Lemma 4.7, while Lemma 4.7 strongly depends on [19, Proposition 3.1] which needs $Q = \omega$. But, it is easy to check that [19, Proposition 3.1] still holds true when $Q \in [\omega, \infty)$, which, together with Remark 4.5(i), results in the restriction of Lemma 4.7 and hence Proposition 4.6 on the lower bound of \mathcal{X} .

The following two technical lemmas play a very important role, respectively, in dealing with Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type. Lemma 4.9 comes from [48, Lemma 3.13].

Lemma 4.9. *Let $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$ and $p \in (\omega/(\omega + \gamma), 1]$ with ω as in (1.1). Then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $k, k' \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and $y_\alpha^{k,m} \in Q_\alpha^{k,m}$ with $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$ and $m \in \{1, \dots, N(k, \alpha)\}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} C^{-1}[V_{\delta^{k \wedge k'}}(x)]^{1-p} &\leq \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) \left[\frac{1}{V_{\delta^{k \wedge k'}}(x) + V(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})} \right]^p \left[\frac{\delta^{k \wedge k'}}{\delta^{k \wedge k'} + d(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})} \right]^{\gamma p} \\ &\leq C[V_{\delta^{k \wedge k'}}(x)]^{1-p}. \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma is just [25, Lemma 5.3] whose proof remains valid for any quasi-metric d and is independent of the reverse doubling property of the considered measure; we omit the details here.

Lemma 4.10. *Let $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$ and $r \in (\omega/(\omega + \gamma), 1]$ with ω as in (1.1). Then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $k, k' \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and $a_\alpha^{k,m} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $y_\alpha^{k,m} \in Q_\alpha^{k,m}$ with $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$ and $m \in \{1, \dots, N(k, \alpha)\}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) \frac{1}{V_{\delta^{k \wedge k'}}(x) + V(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})} \left[\frac{\delta^{k \wedge k'}}{\delta^{k \wedge k'} + d(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})} \right]^\gamma |a_\alpha^{k,m}| \\ &\leq C \delta^{[k - (k \wedge k')] \omega (1-1/r)} \left[M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} |a_\alpha^{k,m}|^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) (x) \right]^{1/r}, \end{aligned}$$

where M is as in (1.3).

The following lemma is the Fefferman–Stein vector-valued maximal inequality established in [18, Theorem 1.2].

Lemma 4.11. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$, $q \in (1, \infty]$, and M be the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator on \mathcal{X} as in (1.3). Then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any sequence $\{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of measurable functions on \mathcal{X} ,*

$$\left\| \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} [M(f_j)]^q \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \leq C \left\| \left(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |f_j|^q \right)^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}$$

with the usual modification made when $q = \infty$.

Now, we prove Proposition 4.6.

Proof of Proposition 4.6. To prove (i), by [3, Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 3.16], we have, for any $f \in \dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ with s, p , and q as in (i), $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^p(\mathcal{X})$. Let $\{Q_k\}_{k=-\infty}^{\infty}$ be an exp-ATI and fix $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $f \in \dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$, from [48, Propositions 3.13(i) and 3.15], it follows that $f \in \dot{B}_{p,\infty}^s(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,\infty}^s(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}$, and, moreover, $f \in (\mathring{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$ with η, β , and γ as in this proposition. Thus, for any $g \in \mathring{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma)$, by $\int_{\mathcal{X}} g(x) d\mu(x) = 0$ and Lemma 2.7, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f, g \rangle &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l_0-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) \langle \tilde{Q}_k(\cdot, y_\alpha^{k,m}) - \tilde{Q}_k(x_1, y_\alpha^{k,m}), g \rangle \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) \langle \tilde{Q}_k(\cdot, y_\alpha^{k,m}), g \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Define, formally, for any $l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in B(x_1, \delta^{l_0})$,

$$\begin{aligned} (4.18) \quad \tilde{f}(x) &:= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l_0-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) [\tilde{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}) - \tilde{Q}_k(x_1, y_\alpha^{k,m})] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) \tilde{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}) \\ &=: J_1(x) + J_2(x). \end{aligned}$$

We next show that \tilde{f} is well defined. We first consider the case $p \in [1, \infty)$. In this case, we show that, for any $l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$(4.19) \quad \left[\int_{B(x_1, \delta^{l_0})} |\tilde{f}(x)|^p d\mu(x) \right]^{1/p} \lesssim \delta^{l_0 s} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,\infty}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

We first estimate J_1 . By (2.6), we have, for any $x \in B(x_1, \delta^{l_0})$,

$$(4.20) \quad |J_1(x)| \lesssim \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l_0-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| \left[\frac{d(x, x_1)}{\delta^k + d(x_1, y_\alpha^{k,m})} \right]^\beta R_\gamma(x_1, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k),$$

where $R_\gamma(x_1, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k)$ is as in (2.3). From this, (4.1), Lemma 4.3(i), the Hölder inequality, Lemma 4.9, $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, and $\mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) \lesssim V_{\delta^k}(y_\alpha^{k,m})$, we deduce that, for any $x \in B(x_1, \delta^{l_0})$,

$$\begin{aligned} |J_1(x)|^p &\lesssim [d(x, x_1)]^{\beta p} \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l_0-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \delta^{-k\beta} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| R_\gamma(x_1, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \right\}^p \\ &\lesssim [d(x, x_1)]^{\beta p} \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l_0-1} \left[\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \delta^{-k\beta p} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p R_\gamma(x_1, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \right] \right\}^{1/p} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \times \left[\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) R_\gamma(x_1, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \right]^{1/p'} \Big\}^P \\
& \lesssim \frac{[d(x, x_1)]^{\beta p}}{V_{\delta^0}(x_1)} \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l_0-1} \delta^{-k\beta} \left[\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right]^{1/p} \right\}^P \\
& \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,\infty}^s(X)}^p \frac{[d(x, x_1)]^{\beta p}}{V_{\delta^0}(x_1)} \delta^{-l_0(\beta-s)p},
\end{aligned}$$

which further implies that, for any $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.21) \quad \int_{B(x_1, \delta^0)} |J_1(x)|^p d\mu(x) & \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,\infty}^s(X)}^p \frac{\delta^{-l_0(\beta-s)p}}{V_{\delta^0}(x_1)} \int_{B(x_1, \delta^0)} [d(x, x_1)]^{\beta p} d\mu(x) \\
& \lesssim \delta^{l_0 s p} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,\infty}^s(X)}^p.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we estimate J_2 . By (2.5), we find that, for any $x \in B(x_1, \delta^0)$,

$$(4.22) \quad |J_2(x)| \lesssim \sum_{k=l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k).$$

Thus, using the Hölder inequality and Lemma 4.9, we conclude that, for any $x \in B(x_1, \delta^0)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_2(x)| & \lesssim \sum_{k=l_0}^{\infty} \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \right\}^{1/p} \\
& \quad \times \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \right\}^{1/p'} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{k=l_0}^{\infty} \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \right\}^{1/p}.
\end{aligned}$$

From this, the Minkowski inequality, and (4.34), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.23) \quad \left[\int_{B(x_1, \delta^0)} |J_2(x)|^p d\mu(x) \right]^{1/p} & \\
& \lesssim \sum_{k=l_0}^{\infty} \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \int_X R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/p} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{k=l_0}^{\infty} \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right\}^{1/p} \lesssim \delta^{l_0 s} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,\infty}^s(X)}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (4.21) and (4.23), we know that (4.19) holds true and the infinite summation in (4.18) converges in $L_{\text{loc}}^p(X)$ when $p \in [1, \infty)$. Moreover, \tilde{f} is well defined when $p \in [1, \infty)$.

Next, we consider the case $p = \infty$. Indeed, in this case, from (4.20), Lemma 4.9, $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, we deduce that, for any $l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in B(x_1, \delta^{l_0})$,

$$(4.24) \quad \begin{aligned} |J_1(x)| &\lesssim \delta^{l_0\beta} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l_0-1} \delta^{-k\beta} \|Q_k f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X})} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) R_\gamma(x_1, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \\ &\lesssim \delta^{l_0\beta} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^s(\mathcal{X})} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l_0-1} \delta^{-k(\beta-s)} \lesssim \delta^{l_0 s} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^s(\mathcal{X})}. \end{aligned}$$

Besides, by (4.22), Lemma 4.9, $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, we conclude that, for any $l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in B(x_1, \delta^{l_0})$,

$$(4.25) \quad |J_2(x)| \lesssim \sum_{k=l_0}^{\infty} \|Q_k\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^s(\mathcal{X})} \sum_{k=l_0}^{\infty} \delta^{k s} \lesssim \delta^{l_0 s} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{\infty,\infty}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

From this and (4.24), we deduce that (4.19) holds true and the infinite summation in (4.18) converges in $L^\infty(B(x_1, \delta^{l_0}))$. Moreover, \tilde{f} is well defined when $p = \infty$.

Now, we show that, for any $l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists a constant $C_{(l_0)}$, depending on l_0 , such that, for almost every $x \in B(x_1, \delta^{l_0})$, $\tilde{f}(x) - C_{(l_0)} = f(x)$. Indeed, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} f_n(\cdot) &:= \sum_{k=l_0-n}^{l_0-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) [\bar{Q}_k(\cdot, y_\alpha^{k,m}) - \bar{Q}_k(x_1, y_\alpha^{k,m})] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=l_0}^{l_0+n-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) \bar{Q}_k(\cdot, y_\alpha^{k,m}). \end{aligned}$$

Then we know that $f_n \rightarrow f$ in $(\mathring{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and, by (4.21), (4.23), (4.24), (4.25), and the dominated convergence theorem, we find that $f_n \rightarrow \tilde{f}$ in $L^p(B(x_1, \delta^{l_0}))$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, for any given $\varphi \in \mathring{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma)$ with $\text{supp } \varphi \subset B(x_1, \delta^{l_0})$ and $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(x_1, \delta^{l_0})} f(x) \varphi(x) d\mu(x) &= \langle f, \varphi \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f_n, \varphi \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B(x_1, \delta^{l_0})} f_n(x) \varphi(x) d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_{B(x_1, \delta^{l_0})} \tilde{f}(x) \varphi(x) d\mu(x), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that there exists a constant $C_{(l_0)}$, depending on l_0 , such that, for almost every $x \in B(x_1, \delta^{l_0})$, $\tilde{f}(x) - C_{(l_0)} = f(x)$. This proves the above claim.

Next, we show that, for any $f \in \dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ with s, p , and q as in (i),

$$(4.26) \quad \|f\|_{L(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

We first consider the case $p \in [1, \infty)$. Indeed, there exists a unique $l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\bar{C} \in (\delta^{l_0+1}, \delta^{l_0})$, where \bar{C} is as in Definition 3.6(i). Then, for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and $y \in B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l)$, we write

$$f(x) - f(y) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l+l_0-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) [\bar{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}) - \bar{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \cdots \\
& =: J_3(x, y) + J_4(x, y).
\end{aligned}$$

We first estimate J_3 . Since $d(x, y) < \widetilde{C}\delta^l \leq \delta^{l+l_0} < (2A_0)^{-1}[\delta^k + d(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})]$ for any $k \in (-\infty, l+l_0-1] \cap \mathbb{Z}$, from the regularity condition of \widetilde{Q}_k , it then follows that

$$(4.27) \quad |J_3(x, y)| \lesssim \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l+l_0-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| \left[\frac{d(x, y)}{\delta^k + d(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})} \right]^\beta R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k),$$

where $R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k)$ is as in (2.3). By this, (2.6), the Hölder inequality, and Lemma 4.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_3(x, y)| & \lesssim \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l+l_0-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| \left[\frac{d(x, y)}{\delta^k + d(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})} \right]^\beta R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \\
& \lesssim \delta^{l\beta} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{-k\beta} \left[\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p R_{\beta+\gamma}(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \right]^{1/p}.
\end{aligned}$$

From this, Lemma 4.3(ii), and the Minkowski inequality, we deduce that, for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.28) \quad & \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)} |J_3(x, y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{1/p} \\
& \lesssim \delta^{l\beta} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{-k\beta} \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \left. \times R_{\beta+\gamma}(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \right\}^{1/p} \right]^p d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/p} \\
& \lesssim \delta^{l\beta} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{-k\beta} \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \int_{\mathcal{X}} R_{\beta+\gamma}(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/p} \\
& \lesssim \delta^{l\beta} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{-k\beta} \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right\}^{1/p} \\
& \lesssim \delta^{l\beta'} \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{-k\beta'q} \left[\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\beta' := \beta$ when $q \in (0, 1]$ by using (4.1), or $\beta' \in (s, \beta)$ when $q \in (1, \infty]$ by using the Hölder inequality. By (4.28), we conclude that, if $p \in [1, \infty)$, then

$$(4.29) \quad \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)} |J_3(x, y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

Next, we estimate J_4 . Note that, by Lemma 4.3(i), we obtain, for any given $p \in (0, \infty)$ and for any $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$, and $x, y \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.30) \quad & \int_X \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l)} |\bar{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \\
&= \int_X \int_X \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l))} |\bar{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{y \in X: d(x,y) < \bar{C}\delta^l\}}(y) d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \\
&= \int_X |\bar{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \left[\int_X \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l))} \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in X: d(x,y) < \bar{C}\delta^l\}}(x) d\mu(x) \right] d\mu(y) \\
&\lesssim \int_X |\bar{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p d\mu(y).
\end{aligned}$$

From (2.5), the Hölder inequality, and Lemma 4.9, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_4(x, y)| &\lesssim \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| \left[|\bar{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})| + |\bar{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})| \right] \\
&\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \delta^{-ksp/2} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \left[|\bar{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})| + |\bar{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})| \right] \right\}^{1/p} \\
&\quad \times \left\{ \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \delta^{ksp'/2} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) \left[|\bar{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})| + |\bar{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})| \right] \right\}^{1/p'} \\
&\lesssim \delta^{ls/2} \left\{ \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \delta^{-ksp/2} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \left[|\bar{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})| + |\bar{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})| \right] \right\}^{1/p},
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (2.5), (4.30), and (4.34), further implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.31) \quad & \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_X \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l)} |J_4(x, y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \\
&\lesssim \delta^{-lsq/2} \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksp/2} \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right\}^{q/p}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $q/p \in (0, 1]$, then, by (4.31), (4.1), and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.32) \quad & \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_X \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l)} |J_4(x, y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \\
&\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \delta^{(k-l)sq/2} \delta^{-ksp} \left[\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \\
&\lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(X)};
\end{aligned}$$

while, if $q/p \in (1, \infty]$, by (4.31), the Hölder inequality, and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l)} |J_4(x, y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \\ & \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq/2} \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq/4} \left[\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right]^{q/p} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \left[\sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksp(q/p)'/4} \right]^{\frac{1}{(q/p)'}} \right\}^{1/q} \\ & \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}, \end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (4.29), (4.32), then completes the proof of (4.26) when $p \in [1, \infty)$. The proof of the case $p = \infty$ is similar to that of the case $p \in [1, \infty)$; we omit the details here. This finishes the proof of (i).

Now, we show (ii). To this end, by [3, Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 3.16], we know that, for any $f \in \dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ with s, p , and q as in (ii), $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathcal{X})$. We claim that (4.19) still holds true for any $l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, and s and p as in (ii). Indeed, if $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), 1]$, from (4.20), (4.1), Lemma 4.3(i), $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, and $\mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) \lesssim V_{\delta^k}(y_\alpha^{k,m})$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} |J_1(x)|^p & \lesssim \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l_0-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \left[\mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| \right]^p \\ & \quad \times \left[\frac{d(x, x_1)}{\delta^k + d(x_1, y_\alpha^{k,m})} \right]^{\beta p} \left[\frac{1}{V_{\delta^k}(x_1) + V_{\delta^k}(y_\alpha^{k,m}) + V(x_1, y_\alpha^{k,m})} \right]^p \\ & \lesssim \frac{[d(x, x_1)]^{\beta p}}{V_{\delta^{l_0}}(x_1)} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l_0-1} \delta^{-k\beta p} \left[\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right] \\ & \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,\infty}^s(\mathcal{X})}^p \frac{[d(x, x_1)]^{\beta p}}{V_{\delta^{l_0}}(x_1)} \delta^{-l_0(\beta-s)p}. \end{aligned}$$

By this, we further conclude that, for any $l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $p \in (\omega/(\omega + 1), 1)$,

$$(4.33) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{B(x_1, \delta^{l_0})} |J_1(x)|^p d\mu(x) & \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,\infty}^s(\mathcal{X})}^p \frac{\delta^{-l_0(\beta-s)p}}{V_{\delta^{l_0}}(x_1)} \int_{B(x_1, \delta^{l_0})} [d(x, x_1)]^{\beta p} d\mu(x) \\ & \lesssim \delta^{l_0 s p} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,\infty}^s(\mathcal{X})}^p. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from Lemmas 4.3(i) and 4.9, we deduce that, for any $k \in \{l_0, l_0 + 1, \dots\}$,

$$(4.34) \quad \int_{\mathcal{X}} [R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k)]^p d\mu(x) \lesssim [\mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m})]^{1-p},$$

which, together with (4.22) and (4.1), implies that, for any $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), 1)$ and $l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$(4.35) \quad \int_{B(x_1, \delta^{l_0})} |J_2(x)|^p d\mu(x)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim \int_X \sum_{k=l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} [\mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m})]^p |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p [R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k)]^p d\mu(x) \\
&\lesssim \sum_{k=l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} [\mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m})]^p |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \int_X [R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k)]^p d\mu(x) \\
&\lesssim \sum_{k=l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \lesssim \delta^{l_0 s p} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,\infty}^s(\mathcal{X})}^p.
\end{aligned}$$

By (4.33) and (4.35), we know that (4.19) still holds true and the infinite summation in (4.18) converges in $L_{\text{loc}}^p(\mathcal{X})$. Moreover, \widetilde{f} is well defined when s and p are as in (ii).

Next, we claim that, for any $l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists a constant $C_{(l_0)}$, depending on l_0 , such that, for almost every $x \in B(x_1, \delta^{l_0})$, $\widetilde{f}(x) - C_{(l_0)} = f(x)$. Indeed, by Lemma 4.7, we know that

$$\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{B}_{1,q}^{s-\omega(\frac{1}{p}-1)}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{B}_{1,\infty}^{s-\omega(\frac{1}{p}-1)}(\mathcal{X}).$$

Since $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), 1)$, it follows that $s - \omega(\frac{1}{p} - 1) > 0$. Using an argument similar to that used in the estimations of (4.21) and (4.23), we also know that $\widetilde{f} \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathcal{X})$. From this and an argument similar to that used in the case $p \in [1, \infty)$, we deduce that, for any $l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists a constant $C_{(l_0)}$, depending on l_0 , such that, for almost every $x \in B(x_1, \delta^{l_0})$, $\widetilde{f}(x) - C_{(l_0)} = f(x)$.

Now, we show that, for any $f \in \dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ with s , p , and q as in (ii), (4.26) still holds true. Indeed, by (4.27), (4.1), and (4.34), we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.36) \quad &\left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_X \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)} |J_3(x, y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \\
&\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{l(\beta-s)q} \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{-k\beta p} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $q/p \in (0, 1]$, by (4.36), (4.1), and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, we have

$$(4.37) \quad \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_X \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)} |J_3(x, y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})};$$

while, if $q/p \in (1, \infty]$, by (4.27), the Hölder inequality, $s \in (0, \beta)$, and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.38) \quad &\left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_X \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)} |J_3(x, y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \\
&\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{l(\beta-s)q} \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{-k\beta p} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lesssim \left(\sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{l(\beta-s)q} \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{-k(\beta+s)q/2} \left[\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right]^{q/p} \right\} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{-k(\beta-s)p(q/p)'/2} \right\}^{\frac{q}{(q/p)'} p} \right)^{1/q} \\
& \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \sum_{l=k-l_0+1}^{\infty} \delta^{(l-k)(\beta-s)q/2} \left[\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \\
& \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by (4.1), (4.30), (2.5), and (4.34), we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.39) \quad & \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)} |J_4(x, y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{1/p} \\
& \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \left[\mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| \right]^p \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)} \left[|\widetilde{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p + |\widetilde{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right] d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/p} \\
& \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \left[\mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| \right]^p \int_{\mathcal{X}} |\widetilde{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/p} \\
& \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right\}^{1/p}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $q/p \in (0, 1]$, by (4.1) and (4.39), we conclude that

$$(4.40) \quad \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)} |J_4(x, y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})};$$

while, if $q/p \in (1, \infty]$, by (4.39) and the Hölder inequality, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)} |J_4(x, y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \\
& \lesssim \delta^{lsq/2} \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq/2} \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right\}^{q/p},
\end{aligned}$$

which further implies that

$$(4.41) \quad \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)} |J_4(x, y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

This, combined with (4.37), (4.38), and (4.40), shows that (4.26) still holds true for any given s , p , and q as in (ii), and hence finishes the proof of (ii).

Next, we show (iii). Let $\{Q_k\}_{k=-\infty}^{\infty}$ be an exp-ATI and $f \in \dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ with $p \in (1, \infty)$. Note that there exists a unique $l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\bar{C} \in (\delta^{l_0+1}, \delta^{l_0}]$, where \bar{C} is as in Definition 3.6(i). Using an argument similar to that used in the estimation of (4.19), we know that, for any s , p , and q as in (ii), $\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) \subset L_{\text{loc}}^p(\mathcal{X})$, and, for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l)$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) - f(y) &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l+l_0-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) [\bar{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}) - \bar{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \cdots \\ &=: J_5(x, y) + J_6(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

We first estimate J_5 . By (2.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |J_5(x, y)| &\lesssim \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l+l_0-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| \left[\frac{d(x, y)}{\delta^k + d(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})} \right]^\beta R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{(l-k)\beta} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k), \end{aligned}$$

where $R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k)$ is as in (2.3). From this, Lemma 4.10, and the Hölder inequality, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l)} |J_5(x, y)| d\mu(y) \right]^q \right\}^{1/q} \\ &\lesssim \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left\{ M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}| \right) (x) \right\}^q \right]^{1/q} \end{aligned}$$

with M as in (1.3), which, together with Lemma 4.11 and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, further implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (4.42) \quad &\left\| \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(\cdot, \bar{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(\cdot, \bar{C}\delta^l)} |J_5(\cdot, y)| d\mu(y) \right]^q \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left\{ M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}| \right) \right\}^q \right]^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we estimate J_6 . By Lemma 4.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |J_6(x, y)| &\lesssim \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k, m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})| \left[|\tilde{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k, m})| + |\tilde{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k, m})| \right] \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \left\{ M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})| \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k, m}} \right) (x) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})| \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k, m}} \right) (y) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

From this, the Hölder inequality, and the Lebesgue differential theorem, we deduce that, for almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \tilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \tilde{C}\delta^l)} |J_6(x, y)| d\mu(y) \right]^q \right\}^{1/q} \\ &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \left\{ M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})| \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k, m}} \right) (x) \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + M \circ M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})| \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k, m}} \right) (x) \right\} \right]^q \right\}^{1/q} \\ &\lesssim \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left\{ M \circ M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})| \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k, m}} \right) (x) \right\} \right]^{q-1/q}, \end{aligned}$$

where, for any $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{X})$, $M \circ M(f) := M(M(f))$. This, combined with Lemma 4.11 and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k, m}$, implies that

$$\left\| \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(\cdot, \tilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(\cdot, \tilde{C}\delta^l)} |J_6(\cdot, y)| d\mu(y) \right]^q \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{F}_{p, q}^s(\mathcal{X})},$$

which, together with (4.42), then completes the proof of (iii).

Finally, we prove (iv). Let $\{Q_k\}_{k=-\infty}^{\infty}$ be an exp-ATI and $f \in \dot{F}_{p, q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ with s , p , and q as in (iii). Note that there exists a unique $l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\tilde{C} \in (\delta^{l_0+1}, \delta^{l_0}]$, where \tilde{C} is as in Definition 3.8(i). Using an argument similar to that used in the estimation of (4.19), we know that $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{X})$ and, for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and $y \in B(x, \tilde{C}\delta^l)$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) - f(y) &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l+l_0-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k, m}) Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m}) [\tilde{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k, m}) - \tilde{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k, m})] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \dots \end{aligned}$$

$$=: J_7(x, y) + J_8(x, y).$$

We first estimate J_7 . By (2.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |J_7(x, y)| &\lesssim \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l+l_0-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k, m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})| \left[\frac{d(x, y)}{\delta^k + d(x, y_\alpha^{k, m})} \right]^\beta R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k, m}; k) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k=-\infty}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{(l-k)\beta} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k, m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})| R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k, m}; k), \end{aligned}$$

where $R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k, m}; k)$ is as in (2.3). From this and Lemma 4.10, we deduce that, for any $r \in (\omega/(\omega + \gamma), 1]$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l)} |J_7(x, y)|^u d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{q}{u}} \right\}^{1/q} \\ &\lesssim \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left\{ M \left[\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})|^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k, m}} \right] (x) \right\}^{\frac{q}{r}} \right]^{1/q}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (4.1) when $q \in (0, 1]$, or the Hölder inequality when $q \in (1, \infty]$. This, combined with Lemma 4.11 and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k, m}$, implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (4.43) \quad &\left\| \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(\cdot, \bar{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(\cdot, \bar{C}\delta^l)} |J_7(\cdot, y)|^u d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{q}{u}} \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left\{ M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})|^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k, m}} \right) \right\}^{\frac{q}{r}} \right]^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left\{ M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})|^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k, m}} \right) \right\}^{\frac{q}{r}} \right]^{\frac{r}{q}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{p}{r}}(\mathcal{X})}^{\frac{1}{r}} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left[\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})|^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k, m}} \right]^{\frac{q}{r}} \right]^{\frac{r}{q}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{p}{r}}(\mathcal{X})}^{\frac{1}{r}} \\ &\sim \left\| \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})|^q \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k, m}} \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{F}_{p, q}^s(\mathcal{X})}, \end{aligned}$$

where we chose $r \in (\omega/(\omega + \gamma), \min\{p, q\})$.

Now, we estimate J_8 . By the size condition of \widetilde{Q}_k and Lemma 4.10, we have, for any $r \in (\omega/(\omega + \gamma), 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} |J_8(x, y)| &\lesssim \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k, m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})| \left[|\widetilde{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k, m})| + |\widetilde{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k, m})| \right] \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \left\{ M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})|^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k, m}} \right) (x) \right\}^{\frac{1}{r}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \left\{ M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})|^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k, m}} \right) (y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{r}} \\ &=: J_{8,1}(x) + J_{8,2}(y). \end{aligned}$$

Using an argument similar to that used in the estimation of (4.43), we conclude that

$$(4.44) \quad \left\| \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(\cdot, \widetilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(\cdot, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)} |J_{8,1}(\cdot)|^u d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{q}{u}} \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(X)} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(X)}.$$

To estimate $J_{8,2}$, since $u \in (0, \min\{p, q\})$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)} |J_{8,2}(y)|^u d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{q}{u}} \right\}^{1/q} \\ &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[M \left(\left\{ \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \left[M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})|^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k, m}} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{r}} \right)^u \right] \right]^{\frac{q}{u}} \right\}^{1/q}, \end{aligned}$$

which, together with Lemma 4.11, implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(\cdot, \widetilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(\cdot, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)} |J_{8,2}(y)| d\mu(y) \right]^q \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(X)} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[M \left(\left\{ \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \left[M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})|^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k, m}} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{r}} \right)^u \right] \right]^{\frac{q}{u}} \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(X)} \\ &\sim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[M \left(\left\{ \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \left[M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})|^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k, m}} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{r}} \right)^u \right] \right]^{\frac{q}{u}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{u}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{p}{u}}(X)} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left\{ \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \left[M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k, m})|^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k, m}} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{r}} \right\}^q \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^p(X)}. \end{aligned}$$

From this and an argument similar to that used in the estimation of J_7 , we deduce that

$$\left\| \left\{ \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(\cdot, \bar{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(\cdot, \bar{C}\delta^l)} |J_{8,2}(y)| d\mu(y) \right]^q \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})},$$

where we chose $r \in (\omega/(\omega + \gamma), \min\{p, q\})$. Combining this, (4.43), and (4.44), we then complete the proof of (iv) and hence of Proposition 4.6. \square

Remark 4.12. We point out that Proposition 4.6(iv) is new even when \mathcal{X} is an RD-spaces.

Using Propositions 3.7(i), 4.1, and 4.6, we obtain the following difference characterization of homogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces, and we omit the details here.

Theorem 4.13. *Let η be as in Definition 2.4, $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$, and $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$.*

- (i) *If $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $q \in (0, \infty]$, then $\dot{L}(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) = \dot{L}_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) = \dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ with equivalent (quasi-)norms.*
- (ii) *If $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $q \in (1, \infty]$, then $\dot{L}_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) = \dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ with equivalent norms.*

5 Relations with inhomogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces

In this section, we consider the relations between spaces of Lipschitz-type and inhomogeneous Besov spaces or Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogenous type. In this section, we do not need to assume that $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$. Let us begin with the following proposition.

Proposition 5.1. *Let η be as in Definition 2.4 and ω as in (1.1), $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$, and $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$.*

- (i) *If $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $q \in (0, \infty]$, then $L_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) \subset B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$;*
- (ii) *If $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $q \in (\omega/[\omega + (\beta \wedge \gamma)], \infty]$, then $L_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) \subset F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. We first prove (i). By the definition of $L_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$ with s, p , and q as in this proposition, we know that $L_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) \subset L^p(\mathcal{X})$. From this and $p \in [1, \infty]$, it follows that $L^p(\mathcal{X}) \subset (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$ and hence $L_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) \subset (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$ for any given $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$.

Let $\{Q_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ be an exp-IATI and $f \in L_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$. Note that, by [29, Proposition 2.2(iii)], we know that, for any $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $k \in \{0, \dots, N\}$,

$$(5.1) \quad \|Q_k f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}.$$

From this, (4.5), and the Minkowski inequality, it follows that

$$(5.2) \quad \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} = \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) \left[m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k(f)|) \right]^p \right\}^{1/p} + \left[\sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \|Q_k(f)\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}^q \right]^{1/q}$$

$$\lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} + \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} [J_{j-k}(f; x)]^p d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/p} \right]^q \right\}^{1/q},$$

where $J_{j-k}(f; x)$ is as in (4.3). If $q \in (0, 1]$, by (5.2) and (4.1), we find that

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} &\lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} + \left[\sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma q} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} [J_{j-k}(f; x)]^p d\mu(x) \right\}^{q/p} \right]^{1/q} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} + \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma q} \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} [J_{j-k}(f; x)]^p d\mu(x) \right\}^{q/p} \right]^{1/q} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} + \|f\|_{\dot{L}_b(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})} \sim \|f\|_{L_b(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})}; \end{aligned}$$

while, if $q \in (1, \infty]$, by (5.2) and the Minkowski inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} &\lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma} \left[\sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} [J_{j-k}(f; x)]^p d\mu(x) \right\}^{q/p} \right]^{1/q} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} + \|f\|_{\dot{L}_b(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})} \sim \|f\|_{L_b(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})}. \end{aligned}$$

This, combined with (5.3), then finishes the proof of (i).

Now, we prove (ii). Assume that $f \in L_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$ with s , p , and q as in this proposition. By the definition of $L_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$, we know that $L_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) \subset L^p(\mathcal{X})$. Since $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $L^p(\mathcal{X}) \subset (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$, it follows that $L_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) \subset (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$ for any given $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$.

Let $\{Q_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ be an exp-IATI. If $p \in [1, \infty)$, using (5.1) and an argument similar to that used in the estimations of (4.14) and (4.15), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) [m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k(f)|)]^p \right\}^{1/p} + \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} |Q_k f|^q \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} + \|f\|_{\dot{L}_t(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})} \sim \|f\|_{L_t(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})}. \end{aligned}$$

If $p = \infty$, then, from (2.4) and (4.34), it follows that, for any $k \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$|Q_k f(x)| = \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} Q_k(x, y) f(y) d\mu(y) \right| \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X})}$$

and hence, for any $k \in \{0, \dots, N\}$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$, and $m \in \{1, \dots, N(k, \alpha)\}$,

$$(5.4) \quad m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k f|) \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X})}.$$

Moreover, by an argument similar to that used in (4.16), we find that, for any $j \in \{N+1, N+2, \dots\}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_j$,

$$\frac{1}{\mu(Q_\alpha^j)} \int_{Q_\alpha^j} \sum_{k=j}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} |Q_k f(x)|^q d\mu(x) \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{L}_t(s,\infty,q;\mathcal{X})}^q.$$

Using this and (5.4), we conclude that $f \in F_{\infty,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ and

$$\|f\|_{F_{\infty,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X})} + \|f\|_{L_t(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})} \sim \|f\|_{L_t(s,p,q;\mathcal{X})},$$

which completes the proof of (ii) and hence of Proposition 5.1. \square

To establish the converse of Proposition 5.1, we need the following notion of local lower bounds; see, for instance, [19, Definition 1.1].

Definition 5.2. Suppose that (\mathcal{X}, d, μ) is a space of homogeneous type with upper dimension ω as in (1.1). The measure μ is said to have a *local lower bound* Q with $Q \in (0, \infty)$, if there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r \in (0, 1]$,

$$\mu(B(x, r)) \geq Cr^Q.$$

Remark 5.3. (i) Differently from the global lower bound Q , which only makes sense for any $Q \in (0, \omega]$, of \mathcal{X} in Definition 4.4, the local lower bound Q of \mathcal{X} indeed makes sense for any $Q \in (0, \infty)$.

(ii) Observe that the local lower bound Q of \mathcal{X} in [19, Definition 1.1] is directly required to be the same as in the upper dimension ω of \mathcal{X} .

Next, we establish the converse of Proposition 5.1.

Proposition 5.4. Let η be as in Definition 2.4, ω as in (1.1), $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$, $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, and $Q \in [\omega, \infty)$.

- (i) If $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $q \in (0, \infty]$, then $B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) \subset L(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$;
- (ii) If \mathcal{X} has a local lower bound Q , $p \in (Q/(Q+s), 1)$ satisfies $-\eta < s - Q/p$, and $q \in (0, \infty]$, then $B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) \subset L(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$;
- (iii) If $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $q \in (1, \infty]$, then $F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) \subset L_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$;
- (iv) If \mathcal{X} has a local lower bound Q , $p \in (Q/(Q+s), 1]$ satisfies $-\eta < s - Q/p$, and $q \in (Q/[Q + (\beta \wedge \gamma)], \infty]$, then $F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) \subset L_t(s, p, q, u; \mathcal{X})$ with $u \in (0, \min\{p, q\})$.

To show Proposition 5.4, we need the following embedding lemma for inhomogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, which comes from the combination of [19, Theorem 1.3] and [30, Theorem 7.4] with some slight modifications based on the observation that it is easy to check that [19, Proposition 3.1] still holds true when $Q \in [\omega, \infty)$. Recall that Lemma 5.5 was proved in [19, Theorem 1.3] only in the case $Q = \omega$.

Lemma 5.5. Let η be as in Definition 2.4, ω as in (1.1), $Q \in [\omega, \infty)$, $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$, $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, and $p \in (Q/(Q+s), 1]$ satisfy $-\eta < s - Q/p$. Assume that \mathcal{X} has a local lower bound Q .

(i) If $q \in (0, \infty]$, then

$$B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) \subset B_{1,q}^{s-Q(\frac{1}{p}-1)}(\mathcal{X}).$$

(ii) If $q \in (Q/[Q + (\beta \wedge \gamma)], \infty]$, then

$$F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) \subset F_{1,q}^{s-Q(\frac{1}{p}-1)}(\mathcal{X}).$$

Remark 5.6. We point that the local lower bound Q of \mathcal{X} in Proposition 5.4 and Lemma 5.5 is required to be in $[\omega, \infty)$. It is still unclear whether or not the conclusions of Proposition 5.4 and Lemma 5.5 still hold true if the local lower bound Q of \mathcal{X} belongs to $(0, \omega)$. Indeed, we prove Proposition 5.4 by using Lemma 5.5, while Lemma 5.5 strongly depends on [19, Proposition 3.1] which needs $Q = \omega$ but it is easy to check that [19, Proposition 3.1] still holds true when $Q \in (\omega, \infty)$. This results in the restriction of Proposition 5.4 on the local lower bound of \mathcal{X} .

Now, we prove Proposition 5.4.

Proof of Proposition 5.4. We first prove (i). By an argument similar to that used in the proof of [48, Theorem 6.12], we know that, for any $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $q \in (0, \infty]$, $B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) \subset L^p(\mathcal{X})$. Using this and Proposition 3.10(ii), to prove (i), it suffices to show that

$$(5.5) \quad \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)} |f(x) - f(y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \lesssim \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

Note that there exists a unique $l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\widetilde{C} \in (\delta^{l_0+1}, \delta^{l_0}]$. Since the space $\dot{L}_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$ is independent of the choice of \widetilde{C} , without loss of generality, we may assume that $l_0 \in (-\infty, 0] \cap \mathbb{Z}$. By Lemma 2.10, we have

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)} |f(x) - f(y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \\ & \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \delta^{l+l_0}))} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \times \int_{B(x, \delta^{l+l_0})} \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_0}^{N(0,\alpha)} \sum_{m=1} \int_{Q_\alpha^{0,m}} |\widetilde{Q}_0(x, z) - \widetilde{Q}_0(x, z)| d\mu(z) Q_{\alpha,1}^{0,m}(f) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \times \left| \widetilde{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}) - \widetilde{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m}) \right| \left| Q_{\alpha,1}^{k,m}(f) \right| \right\}^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \\ & \quad + \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{N+2-l_0} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \delta^{l+l_0}))} \int_{B(x, \delta^{l+l_0})} \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) \right. \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \left. \times \left| \widetilde{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}) - \widetilde{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m}) \right| \left| Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) \right| \right\}^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left\{ \sum_{l=N+3-l_0}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \delta^{l+l_0}))} \int_{B(x, \delta^{l+l_0})} \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{l+l_0-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}) \right. \right. \\
& \times \left. \left. \left| \bar{Q}_k(x, y_{\alpha}^{k, m}) - \bar{Q}_k(y, y_{\alpha}^{k, m}) \right| \left| Q_k f(y_{\alpha}^{k, m}) \right| \right\}^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \\
& + \left\{ \sum_{l=N+3-l_0}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \delta^{l+l_0}))} \int_{B(x, \delta^{l+l_0})} \left\{ \sum_{k=l+l_0-1}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}) \right. \right. \\
& \times \left. \left. \left| \bar{Q}_k(x, y_{\alpha}^{k, m}) - \bar{Q}_k(y, y_{\alpha}^{k, m}) \right| \left| Q_k f(y_{\alpha}^{k, m}) \right| \right\}^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \\
& =: Y_1 + Y_2 + Y_3 + Y_4.
\end{aligned}$$

We first estimate Y_1 . By [48, (4.6)], we further obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.7) \quad Y_1 & \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \delta^{l+l_0}))} \int_{B(x, \delta^{l+l_0})} \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}) m_{Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}}(|Q_k f|) \right. \right. \\
& \times \left. \left. \sup_{z \in Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}} \left| \bar{Q}_k(x, z) - \bar{Q}_k(y, z) \right| \right\}^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \\
& \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{N+1-l_0} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \delta^{l+l_0}))} \int_{B(x, \delta^{l+l_0})} \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}) m_{Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}}(|Q_k f|) \right. \right. \\
& \times \left. \left. \left[\sup_{z \in Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}} \left| \bar{Q}_k(x, z) \right| + \sup_{z \in Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}} \left| \bar{Q}_k(y, z) \right| \right] \right\}^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \\
& + \left\{ \sum_{l=N+2-l_0}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \delta^{l+l_0}))} \int_{B(x, \delta^{l+l_0})} \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}) \right. \right. \\
& \times m_{Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}}(|Q_k f|) \sup_{z \in Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}} \left| \bar{Q}_k(x, z) - \bar{Q}_k(y, z) \right| \right\}^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \\
& =: Y_{1,1} + Y_{1,2}.
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate $Y_{1,1}$, note that, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $z \in Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}$, $\delta^k + d(x, z) \sim \delta^k + d(x, y_{\alpha}^{k, m})$. By this, the Hölder inequality, and Lemmas 4.3(i) and 4.9, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}) m_{Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}}(|Q_k f|) \left[\sup_{z \in Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}} \left| \bar{Q}_k(x, z) \right| + \sup_{z \in Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}} \left| \bar{Q}_k(y, z) \right| \right] \\
& \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}) [m_{Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}}(|Q_k f|)]^p \left[\sup_{z \in Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}} \left| \bar{Q}_k(x, z) \right| + \sup_{z \in Q_{\alpha}^{k, m}} \left| \bar{Q}_k(y, z) \right| \right] \right\}^{1/p},
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with Lemmas 4.3(i) and 4.9, (4.30), (4.34), and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, further implies that

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{1,1} &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{N+1-l_0} \delta^{-lsq} \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) [m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k f|)]^p \int_{\mathcal{X}} R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}, \end{aligned}$$

where $R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k)$ is as in (2.3).

Now, we estimate $Y_{1,2}$. By (2.6), the fact that $\delta^k + d(x, z) \sim \delta^k + d(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})$ for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the regularity of \bar{Q}_k , and $z \in Q_\alpha^{k,m}$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} (5.8) \quad Y_{1,2} &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=N+2-l_0}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \delta^{l+l_0}))} \int_{B(x, \delta^{l+l_0})} \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k f|) \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \times \left[\frac{d(x, y)}{\delta^k + d(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})} \right]^\beta R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \right\}^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \\ &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=N+2-l_0}^{\infty} \delta^{l(\beta-s)q} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \delta^{l+l_0}))} \int_{B(x, \delta^{l+l_0})} \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k f|) \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \times R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \right\}^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q}. \end{aligned}$$

From this, $s \in (0, \beta)$, $p \in [1, \infty]$, and an argument similar to that used in the estimation of $Y_{1,1}$, we deduce that

$$Y_{1,2} \lesssim \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

Next, we estimate Y_2 . We first note that, by the Hölder inequality, (2.5), and Lemma 4.9, for any fixed $\bar{s} \in (0, s)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |\bar{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}) - \bar{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})| |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| \\ &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-k\bar{s}p} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |\bar{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}) - \bar{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})| |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right\}^{1/p} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{k\bar{s}p'} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |\bar{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}) - \bar{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})| \right\}^{1/p'} \\ &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-k\bar{s}p} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |\bar{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}) - \bar{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})| |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right\}^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

From this, (4.30), (4.34), and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} Y_2 &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{N+2-l_0} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left[\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(\mathcal{Q}_\alpha^{k,m}) \left| \mathcal{Q}_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) \right|^p \right]^{q/p} \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \left[\sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{k(s-\bar{s})p(q/p)'} \right]^{1/(q/p)'} \right\}^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (4.1) when $q/p \in (0, 1]$, or the Hölder inequality when $q/p \in (1, \infty]$.

We now estimate Y_3 . By (2.6), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} (5.9) \quad Y_3 &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=N+3-l_0}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \delta^{l+l_0}))} \int_{B(x, \delta^{l+l_0})} \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{l+l_0-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(\mathcal{Q}_\alpha^{k,m}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \times \left| \mathcal{Q}_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) \right| \left[\frac{d(x, y)}{\delta^k + d(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})} \right]^\beta R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \right\}^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q} \\ &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=N+3-l_0}^{\infty} \delta^{l(\beta-s)q} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \delta^{l+l_0}))} \int_{B(x, \delta^{l+l_0})} \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{-k\beta} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(\mathcal{Q}_\alpha^{k,m}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \times \left| \mathcal{Q}_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) \right| R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \right\}^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q}, \end{aligned}$$

where $R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k)$ is as in (2.3). Due to $p \in [1, \infty]$, by (5.9), the Hölder inequality, Lemma 4.9, and (4.34), we have

$$\begin{aligned} Y_3 &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=N+3-l_0}^{\infty} \delta^{l(\bar{\beta}-s)q} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \delta^{l+l_0}))} \int_{B(x, \delta^{l+l_0})} \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{-k\bar{\beta}p} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(\mathcal{Q}_\alpha^{k,m}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \times \left| \mathcal{Q}_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) \right|^p R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \right\}^{q/p} \right]^{1/q} \\ &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=N+3-l_0}^{\infty} \delta^{l(\bar{\beta}-s)q} \left[\sum_{k=N+1}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{-k\bar{\beta}p} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(\mathcal{Q}_\alpha^{k,m}) \left| \mathcal{Q}_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) \right|^p \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\beta} \in (s, \beta)$ is a fixed constant. From this, (4.1) when $q/p \in (0, 1]$, or the Hölder inequality when $q/p \in (1, \infty]$, and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, we deduce that

$$Y_3 \lesssim \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

Finally, using an argument similar to that used in the estimation of Y_2 , we also obtain $Y_4 \lesssim \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}$. This finishes the proof of (5.5) and hence of (i).

Next, we show (ii). Assume that $p \in (Q/(Q+s), 1)$, $q \in (0, \infty]$, $\{Q_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is an exp-IATI, and $f \in B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$. Then, by Lemma 2.10, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}(x) &:= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_0} \sum_{m=1}^{N(0,\alpha)} \int_{Q_\alpha^{0,m}} \tilde{Q}_0(x,y) d\mu(y) Q_{\alpha,1}^{0,m}(f) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) \tilde{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}) Q_{\alpha,1}^{k,m}(f) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=N+1}^\infty \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) \tilde{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}) Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}). \end{aligned}$$

We claim that \tilde{f} is well defined and, moreover, $\tilde{f} \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$. Indeed, from (4.34), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}^p &\lesssim \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} [\mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k f|)]^p \int_{\mathcal{X}} [R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k)]^p d\mu(x) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=N+1}^\infty \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} [\mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|]^p \int_{\mathcal{X}} [R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k)]^p d\mu(x) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) [m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k f|)]^p + \sum_{k=N+1}^\infty \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}^p, \end{aligned}$$

where $R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k)$ is as in (2.3) and we used (4.1) when $q/p \in (0, 1]$, or the Hölder inequality when $q/p \in (1, \infty]$. Using this, we obtain $\tilde{f} \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|\tilde{f}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}$. Moreover, by Lemma 5.5, we conclude that $f \in B_{1,q}^{s-Q(\frac{1}{p}-1)}(\mathcal{X})$. Thus, from an argument similar to that used in the proof of [48, Theorem 6.12], we deduce that $f = \tilde{f}$ in $(\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$. Based on this, in what follows, we do not need to distinguish f or \tilde{f} . Using this and Proposition 3.10(ii), we know that, to prove (i), it suffices to show that (5.5) still holds true for any given s, p , and q as in (ii). Therefore, by (5.6) and (5.7), we need to estimate $Y_{1,1}$, $Y_{1,2}$, Y_2 , Y_3 , and Y_4 , respectively.

To estimate $Y_{1,1}$, by (4.1), (2.5), Lemma 4.3(i), (4.30), (4.34), and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{1,1} &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{N+1-l_0} \delta^{-lsq} \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} [\mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k f|)]^p \int_{\mathcal{X}} [R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k)]^p d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate $Y_{1,2}$, from (5.8) and an argument similar to that used in the estimation of $Y_{1,1}$, we deduce that

$$Y_{1,2} \lesssim \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

Now, we estimate Y_2 . By $p \in (Q/(Q+s), 1]$, (4.1), (4.30), (2.5), and (4.34), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} Y_2 &\lesssim \left[\sum_{l=0}^{N+2-l_0} \delta^{-lsq} \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \left[\mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| \right]^p \right. \right. \\ &\quad \times \left. \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left[\frac{1}{V_{\delta^k}(y_\alpha^{k,m}) + V(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})} \right]^p \left[\frac{\delta^k}{\delta^k + d(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})} \right]^{\gamma p} d\mu(x) \right\}^{q/p} \right]^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \left[\sum_{l=0}^{N+2-l_0} \delta^{-lsq} \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right\}^{q/p} \right]^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

If $q/p \in (0, 1]$, by this, (4.1), $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} Y_2 &\lesssim \left[\sum_{l=0}^{N+2-l_0} \delta^{-lsq} \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right\}^{q/p} \right]^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}; \end{aligned}$$

while, if $q/p \in (0, \infty]$, by this, the Hölder inequality, and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} Y_2 &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{N+2-l_0} \delta^{-lsq} \left(\sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left[\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right]^{q/p} \right) \left[\sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{lsp(q/p)'} \right]^{1/(q/p)'} \right\}^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we estimate Y_3 . Since $p \in (Q/(Q+s), 1]$, from (5.9), (4.1), and (4.34), it follows that

$$Y_3 \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=N+3-l_0}^{\infty} \delta^{l(\beta-s)q} \left[\sum_{k=N+1}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{-k\beta p} \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right\} \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q}.$$

If $q/p \in (0, 1]$, by this, (4.1), and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} Y_3 &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-k\beta p} \left[\sum_{l=k-l_0+1}^{\infty} \delta^{l(\beta-s)q} \left[\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right]^{q/p} \right]^{1/q} \right\} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}; \end{aligned}$$

while, if $p/q \in (1, \infty]$, by this, the Hölder inequality, $s \in (0, \beta)$, and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, we conclude that

$$Y_3 \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=N+3-l_0}^{\infty} \delta^{l(\beta-s)q} \left[\sum_{k=N+1}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{-k(\beta+s)p/2} \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^p \right\} \right]^{q/p} \right\}^{1/q}$$

$$\times \left[\sum_{k=N+1}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{-k(\beta-s)p(q/p)'/2} \right]^{\frac{1}{(q/p)'\frac{q}{p}}}^{1/q}$$

$$\lesssim \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

Finally, using an argument similar to that used in the estimation of Y_2 , we also obtain $Y_4 \lesssim \|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}$. Combining the estimates of $Y_{1,1}$, $Y_{1,2}$, Y_2 , Y_3 , and Y_4 , we show that (5.5) still holds true for any given s , p , and q as in (ii), which completes the proof of (ii).

Now, we show (iii). Using an argument similar to that used in the proof of [48, Theorem 6.12 (II)], we know that, for any given $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, $p \in (1, \infty)$, and $q \in (1, \infty]$,

$$F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) \subset L^p(\mathcal{X}) \quad \text{and, for any } f \in F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}), \quad \|f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

By this and Proposition 3.10(iii), to prove (iii), it suffices to show that, for any $f \in F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ with $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, $p \in (1, \infty)$, and $q \in (1, \infty]$,

$$(5.10) \quad \left\| \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(\cdot, \tilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(\cdot, \tilde{C}\delta^l)} |f(\cdot) - f(y)| d\mu(y) \right]^q \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

Next, we show (5.10). Let $\{Q_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ be an exp-IATI and $f \in F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$. Note that there exists a unique $l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\tilde{C} \in (\delta^{l_0+1}, \delta^{l_0}]$. Since the space $L_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X})$ is independent of \tilde{C} in Definition 3.8(ii), without loss of generality, we may assume $l_0 \in [N+2, \infty) \cap \mathbb{Z}$. By Lemma 2.10, for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and $y \in B(x, \tilde{C}\delta^l)$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) - f(y) &= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_0} \sum_{m=1}^{N(0,\alpha)} \int_{Q_\alpha^{0,m}} [\tilde{Q}_0(x, z) - \tilde{Q}_0(y, z)] d\mu(z) Q_{\alpha,1}^{0,m}(f) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) [\tilde{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}) - \tilde{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})] Q_{\alpha,1}^{k,m}(f) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=N+1}^{l+l_0-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) [\tilde{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}) - \tilde{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})] Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \cdots \\ &=: Z_1(x, y) + Z_2(x, y) + Z_3(x, y) + Z_4(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

We first estimate Z_1 and Z_2 . By [48, (4.6)], (2.6), and Lemmas 4.3(i) and 4.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|Z_1(x, y)| + |Z_2(x, y)| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k f|) \left[\frac{d(x, y)}{\delta^k + d(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})} \right]^\beta R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim \delta^{l\beta} \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k f|) R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \\
&\lesssim \delta^{l\beta} \sum_{k=0}^N M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k f|) \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) (x),
\end{aligned}$$

where $R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k)$ is as in (2.3).

Similarly, we obtain

$$|Z_3(x, y)| \lesssim \sum_{k=N+1}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{(l-k)\beta} M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) (x).$$

From these estimates, the Hölder inequality, Lemma 4.11, and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(\cdot, \bar{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(\cdot, \bar{C}\delta^l)} |Z_1(\cdot, y) + Z_2(\cdot, y) + Z_3(\cdot, y)| d\mu(y) \right]^q \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(X)} \\
&\lesssim \left\| \sum_{k=0}^N M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k f|) \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) \right\|_{L^p(X)} \\
&\quad + \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{-ksq} \left[M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) \right]^q \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(X)} \\
&\lesssim \|f\|_{F_{p,q}^s(X)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we estimate Z_4 . By (2.5) and Lemma 4.10, we have

$$|Z_4(x, y)| \lesssim \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \left[M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) (x) + M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) (y) \right].$$

From this and the Hölder inequality, we further deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l)} |Z_4(x, y)| d\mu(y) \\
&\lesssim \delta^{ls/2} \left\{ \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq/2} \left[M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) (x) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + M \circ M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) (x) \right]^q \right\}^{1/q},
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with Lemma 4.11 and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, implies that

$$\left\| \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(\cdot, \bar{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(\cdot, \bar{C}\delta^l)} |Z_4(\cdot, y)| d\mu(y) \right]^q \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(X)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left[M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + M \circ M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) \right] \right\}^q \right\|_{L^p(X)}^{1/q} \\
&\lesssim \|f\|_{F_{p,q}^s(X)}.
\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of (5.10) and hence of (iii).

Finally, we show (iv). By an argument similar to that used in the proof of (ii), we know that, for any given s , p , and q as in this proposition,

$$F_{p,q}^s(X) \subset L^p(X) \quad \text{and, for any } f \in F_{p,q}^s(X), \quad \|f\|_{L^p(X)} \lesssim \|f\|_{F_{p,q}^s(X)}.$$

Let $\{Q_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ be an exp-IATI and $f \in F_{p,q}^s(X)$. Note that there exists a unique $l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\bar{C} \in (\delta^{l_0+1}, \delta^{l_0}]$. In what follows, we assume $l_0 \in [N+2, \infty) \cap \mathbb{Z}$. By Lemma 2.10, for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $x \in X$, and $y \in B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l)$, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x) - f(y) &= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_0} \sum_{m=1}^{N(0,\alpha)} \int_{Q_\alpha^{0,m}} [\bar{Q}_0(x, z) - \bar{Q}_0(y, z)] d\mu(z) Q_{\alpha,1}^{0,m}(f) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) [\bar{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}) - \bar{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})] Q_{\alpha,1}^{k,m}(f) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=N+1}^{l+l_0-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) [\bar{Q}_k(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}) - \bar{Q}_k(y, y_\alpha^{k,m})] Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=l+l_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \cdots \\
&=: \mathbf{R}_1(x, y) + \mathbf{R}_2(x, y) + \mathbf{R}_3(x, y) + \mathbf{R}_4(x, y).
\end{aligned}$$

We first estimate \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 . By [48, (4.6)], (2.6), and Lemmas 4.3(i) and 4.10, we have, for any fixed $r \in (Q/(Q+\gamma), 1]$ and for any $x \in X$ and $y \in B(x, \bar{C}\delta^l)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbf{R}_1(x, y)| + |\mathbf{R}_2(x, y)| &\lesssim \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k f|) \left[\frac{d(x, y)}{\delta^k + d(x, y_\alpha^{k,m})} \right]^\beta R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \\
&\lesssim \delta^{l\beta} \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k f|) R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k) \\
&\lesssim \delta^{l\beta} \sum_{k=0}^N \left[M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} [m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k f|)]^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) (x) \right]^{\frac{1}{r}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $R_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; k)$ is as in (2.3). Using these estimates and Lemma 4.11, and choosing $r \in (Q/(Q + \gamma), p)$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(\cdot, \widetilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(\cdot, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)} |\mathbf{R}_1(\cdot, y) + \mathbf{R}_2(\cdot, y)|^u d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{q}{u}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^p(X)} \\
& \lesssim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \delta^{l(\beta-s)q} \sum_{k=0}^N \left[M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} [m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k f|)]^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) \right]^{\frac{q}{r}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^p(X)} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^N \left\| \left\{ M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} [m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k f|)]^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) \right\}^{\frac{1}{r}} \right\|_{L^p(X)} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^N \left\| \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} [m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k f|)]^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{r}} \right\|_{L^p(X)} \\
& \sim \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} [m_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(|Q_k f|)]^p \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim \|f\|_{F_{p,q}^s(X)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we estimate \mathbf{R}_3 . Similarly to the estimations of \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 , we have, for any $x \in X$ and $y \in B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)$,

$$|\mathbf{R}_3(x, y)| \lesssim \sum_{k=N+1}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{(l-k)\beta} \left[M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) (x) \right]^{\frac{1}{r}},$$

which further implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(x, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)} |\mathbf{R}_3(x, y)|^u d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{q}{u}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
& \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{l+l_0-1} \delta^{(l-k)\beta} \left[M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) (x) \right]^{\frac{1}{r}} \right\}^q \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
& \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left[M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) (x) \right]^{\frac{q}{r}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}},
\end{aligned}$$

where, in the last inequality, we used (4.1) when $q \in (Q/[Q + (\beta \wedge \gamma), 1]$, or the Hölder inequality when $q \in (1, \infty]$, and $s \in (0, \beta)$. Using this, Lemma 4.11, and the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, and choosing $r \in (Q/(Q + \gamma), \min\{p, q\})$, we find that

$$\left\| \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(\cdot, \widetilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(\cdot, \widetilde{C}\delta^l)} |\mathbf{R}_3(\cdot, y)|^u d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{q}{u}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^p(X)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lesssim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left[M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) \right]^{\frac{q}{r}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \\
& \sim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left[M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right) \right]^{\frac{q}{r}} \right\}^{\frac{r}{q}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{p}{r}}(\mathcal{X})} \\
& \lesssim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^q \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}} \right\}^{\frac{r}{q}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{p}{r}}(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, from an argument similar to that used in the proof of Proposition 4.6(iii), we deduce that

$$\left\| \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \delta^{-lsq} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B(\cdot, \tilde{C}\delta^l))} \int_{B(\cdot, \tilde{C}\delta^l)} |\mathcal{R}_4(\cdot, y)|^u d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{q}{u}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

This finishes the proof of (iii) and hence of Proposition 5.4. \square

Remark 5.7. We point out that Proposition 5.4(iv) is new even when \mathcal{X} is an RD-spaces.

Combining Propositions 3.7(i), 5.1, and 5.4, we obtain the following difference characterization of inhomogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces; we omit the details.

Theorem 5.8. *Let η be as in Definition 2.4, $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$, and $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$.*

- (i) *If $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $q \in (0, \infty]$, then $L(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) = L_b(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) = B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ with equivalent (quasi-)norms.*
- (ii) *If $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $q \in (1, \infty]$, then $L_t(s, p, q; \mathcal{X}) = F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ with equivalent norms.*

References

- [1] R. Alvarado, H. Górká, P. Hajłasz, Sobolev embedding for $M^{1,p}$ spaces is equivalent to a lower bound of the measure, *J. Funct. Anal.* 279 (2020), 108628, 39 pp.
- [2] R. Alvarado and M. Mitrea, *Hardy Spaces on Ahlfors-Regular Quasi Metric Spaces. A Sharp Theory*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 2142, Springer, Cham, 2015.
- [3] R. Alvarado, F. Wang, D. Yang and W. Yuan, A pointwise characterization of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, Submitted.
- [4] P. Auscher and T. Hytönen, Orthonormal bases of regular wavelets in spaces of homogeneous type, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* 34 (2013), 266–296.
- [5] O. V. Besov, V. P. Il’in and S. M. Nikol’skiĭ, *Integralnye Predstavleniya Funktsii i Teoremy Vlozheniya*, Second edition, Fizmatlit “Nauka”, Moscow, 1996.
- [6] T. A. Bui and X. T. Duong, Sharp weighted estimates for square functions associated to operators on spaces of homogeneous type, *J. Geom. Anal.* 30 (2020), 874–900.

- [7] T. A. Bui, X. T. Duong and L. D. Ky, Hardy spaces associated to critical functions and applications to $T1$ theorems, *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.* 26 (2020), Article number 27, 67 pp.
- [8] T. A. Bui, X. T. Duong and F. K. Ly, Maximal function characterizations for new local Hardy type spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 370 (2018), 7229–7292.
- [9] T. A. Bui, X. T. Duong and F. K. Ly, Maximal function characterizations for Hardy spaces on spaces of homogeneous type with finite measure and applications, *J. Funct. Anal.* 278 (2020), 108423. 55 pp.
- [10] R. R. Coifman and G. Weiss, *Analyse Harmonique Non-Commutative sur Certains Espaces Homogènes*, (French) *Étude de Certaines Intégrales Singulières*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 242, Berlin–New York, Springer-Verlag, 1971.
- [11] R. R. Coifman and G. Weiss, Extensions of Hardy spaces and their use in analysis, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 83 (1977), 569–645.
- [12] D. Deng and Y. Han, *Harmonic Analysis on Spaces of Homogeneous Type*. With a Preface by Yves Meyer, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1966, Berlin, Springer-Verlag, 2009.
- [13] X. T. Duong and L. Yan, Hardy spaces of spaces of homogeneous type, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 131 (2003), 3181–3189.
- [14] X. Fu, T. Ma and D. Yang, Real-variable characterizations of Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* 45 (2020), 343–410.
- [15] A. Grigor’yan, Heat kernels and function theory on metric measure spaces, in: *Heat Kernels and Analysis on Manifolds, Graphs, and Metric Spaces* (Paris, 2002), pp. 143–172, *Contemp. Math.* 338. Amer. Math. Soc. Providence, RI 2003.
- [16] A. Grigor’yan, J. Hu and K. Lau, Heat kernels on metric-measure spaces and an application to semi-linear elliptic equations, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 355 (2003), 2065–2095.
- [17] L. Grafakos, L. Liu, D. Maldonado and D. Yang, Multilinear analysis on metric spaces, *Dissertationes Math.* 497 (2014), 1–121.
- [18] L. Grafakos, L. Liu and D. Yang, Vector-valued singular integrals and maximal functions on spaces of homogeneous type, *Math. Scand.* 104 (2009), 296–310.
- [19] Ya. Han, Yo. Han, Z. He, J. Li and C. Pereyra, Geometric characterizations of embedding theorems — for Sobolev, Besov, and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type — via orthonormal wavelets, *J. Geom. Anal.* (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12220-020-00536-6>.
- [20] Ya. Han, Yo. Han and J. Li, Criterion of the boundedness of singular integrals on spaces of homogeneous type, *J. Funct. Anal.* 271 (2016), 3423–3464.
- [21] Ya. Han, Yo. Han and J. Li, Geometry and Hardy spaces on spaces of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Weiss, *Sci. China Math.* 60 (2017), 2199–2218.
- [22] Y. Han, J. Li and L. A. Ward, Hardy space theory on spaces of homogeneous type via orthonormal wavelet bases, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* 45 (2018), 120–169.
- [23] Y. Han, S. Lu and D. Yang, Inhomogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, *Approx. Theory Appl.* (N. S.) 15 (3) (1999), 37–65.
- [24] Y. Han, D. Müller and D. Yang, Littlewood–Paley characterizations for Hardy spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, *Math. Nachr.* 279 (2006), 1505–1537.
- [25] Y. Han, D. Müller and D. Yang, A theory of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on metric measure spaces modeled on Carnot–Carathéodory spaces, *Abstr. Appl. Anal.* 2008, Art. ID 893409, 1–250.

- [26] Y. Han and D. Yang, New characterizations and applications of inhomogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on homogeneous type spaces and fractals, *Dissertationes Math. (Rozprawy Mat.)* 403 (2002), 1–102.
- [27] Y. Han and D. Yang, Some new spaces of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin type on homogeneous spaces, *Studia Math.* 156 (2003), 67–97.
- [28] Z. He, Y. Han, J. Li, L. Liu, D. Yang and W. Yuan, A complete real-variable theory of Hardy spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.* 25 (2019), 2197–2267.
- [29] Z. He, L. Liu, D. Yang and W. Yuan, New Calderón reproducing formulae with exponential decay on spaces of homogeneous type, *Sci. China Math.* 62 (2019), 283–350.
- [30] Z. He, F. Wang, D. Yang and W. Yuan, Wavelet characterizations of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type and their applications, Submitted.
- [31] Z. He, D. Yang and W. Yuan, Real-variable characterizations of local Hardy spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, *Math. Nachr.* (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1002/mana.201900320>.
- [32] T. Hytönen and A. Kairema, Systems of dyadic cubes in a doubling metric space, *Colloq. Math.* 126 (2012), 1–33.
- [33] T. Hytönen and O. Tapiola, Almost Lipschitz-continuous wavelets in metric spaces via a new randomization of dyadic cubes, *J. Approx. Theory* 185 (2014), 12–30.
- [34] A. Jonsson, Besov spaces on closed subsets of \mathbb{R}^n , *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 341 (1994), 355–370.
- [35] A. Jonsson, Brownian motion on fractals and function spaces, *Math. Z.* 222 (1996), 495–504.
- [36] A. Jonsson and H. Wallin, *Function Spaces on Subsets of \mathbb{R}^n* , Math. Reports, Vol. 2, Harwood Academic Publ., London 1984.
- [37] A. Jonsson and H. Wallin, Boundary value problems and Brownian motion on fractals, *Chaos Solitons Fractals* 8 (1997), 191–205.
- [38] P. Koskela, D. Yang and Y. Zhou, A characterization of Hajłasz–Sobolev and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces via grand Littlewood–Paley functions, *J. Funct. Anal.* 258 (2010), 2637–2661.
- [39] P. Koskela, D. Yang and Y. Zhou, Pointwise characterizations of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces and quasiconformal mappings, *Adv. Math.* 226 (2011), 3579–3621.
- [40] D. Müller and D. Yang, A difference characterization of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on RD-spaces, *Forum Math.* 21 (2009), 259–298.
- [41] E. Nakai and K. Yabuta, Pointwise multipliers for functions of weighted bounded mean oscillation on spaces of homogeneous type, *Math. Japon.* 46 (1997), 15–28.
- [42] L. Song and L. Yan, Maximal function characterizations for Hardy spaces associated with nonnegative self-adjoint operators on spaces of homogeneous type, *J. Evol. Equ.* 18 (2018), 221–243.
- [43] E. M. Stein, *Singular Integrals and Differentiability Properties of Functions*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970.
- [44] H. Triebel, *Theory of Function Spaces. I*, Monographs in Mathematics 78, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1983.
- [45] H. Triebel, *Theory of Function Spaces. II*, Monographs in Mathematics 84, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1992.
- [46] H. Triebel, *Theory of Function Spaces. III*, Monographs in Mathematics 100, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2006.

- [47] H. Wallin, New and old function spaces, in: *Function Spaces and Applications* (Lund, 1986), 99–114, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* 1302, Springer, Berlin, 1988.
- [48] F. Wang, Y. Han, Z. He and D. Yang, Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type with applications to boundedness of Calderón–Zygmund operators, Submitted or arXiv: 2012.13035.
- [49] D. Yang, Frame characterizations of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type and their applications, *Georgian Math. J.* 9 (2002), 567–590.
- [50] D. Yang, Localization principle of Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, *Rev. Mat. Complut.* 17 (2004), 229–249.
- [51] D. Yang, Some new inhomogeneous Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on metric measure spaces and their various characterizations, *Studia Math.* 167 (2005), 63–98.
- [52] D. Yang, Some new Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type and their frame characterizations, *Sci. China Ser. A* 48 (2005), 12–39.
- [53] S. Yang and D. Yang, Atomic and maximal function characterizations of Musielak–Orlicz–Hardy spaces associated to non-negative self-adjoint operators on spaces of homogeneous type, *Collect. Math.* 70 (2019), 197–246.
- [54] D. Yang and Y. Lin, Spaces of Lipschitz type on metric spaces and their applications, *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc.* (2) 47 (2004), 709–752.
- [55] D. Yang and Y. Zhou, Radial maximal function characterizations of Hardy spaces on RD-spaces and their applications, *Math. Ann.* 346 (2010), 307–333.
- [56] D. Yang and Y. Zhou, New properties of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on RD-spaces, *Manuscripta Math* 134 (2011), 59–90.
- [57] X. Zhou, D. Yang and Z. He, A real-variable theory of Hardy–Lorentz spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, *Anal. Geom. Metr. Spaces* 8 (2020), 182–260.
- [58] C. Zhuo, Y. Sawano and D. Yang, Hardy spaces with variable exponents on RD-spaces and applications, *Dissertationes Math.* 520 (2016), 1–74.

Fan Wang, Dachun Yang (Corresponding author) and Wen Yuan

Laboratory of Mathematics and Complex Systems (Ministry of Education of China), School of Mathematical Sciences, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, People’s Republic of China

E-mails: fanwang@mail.bnu.edu.cn (F. Wang)

dcyang@bnu.edu.cn (D. Yang)

wenyuan@bnu.edu.cn (W. Yuan)

Ziyi He

School of Science, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Beijing 100876, People’s Republic of China

E-mail: ziyihe@bupt.edu.cn