RIESZ TRANSFORM FOR A FLOW LAPLACIAN ON HOMOGENEOUS TREES
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Abstract. We obtain weak type $(1,1)$ and $L^p$ boundedness, for $p \in (1, \infty)$, of the first order Riesz transform and its adjoint operator on a homogeneous tree endowed with the canonical flow measure. This is a model case of measure metric space which is nondoubling, of exponential growth, does not satisfy the Cheeger isoperimetric inequality, and where the Laplacian does not have spectral gap. This complements a previous work by W. Hebisch and T. Steger.

1. Introduction

Let $T$ be a locally finite tree, which is a connected graph with no cycles where each vertex $x$ has a finite number $q(x) + 1$ of neighbors. We identify $T$ with its set of vertices and endow it with the standard graph distance $d$, counting the number of edges along the shortest path connecting two vertices. We fix a reference point $o \in T$ and set $|x| := d(x,o)$. A ray is a half infinite geodesic, with respect to the distance $d$, emanating from $o$, and the natural boundary $\Omega$ of $T$ is identified with the family of rays. We choose a mythical ancestor $\omega_0 \in \Omega$ and consider the horocyclic foliation it induces on the tree: for each vertex $x$ there exists a unique integer index $\ell(x)$, which we call the level of $x$, indicating to which horocycle the vertex belongs. The level function is given by $\ell(x) = d(o, x \wedge \omega_0) - d(x, x \wedge \omega_0)$, where $x \wedge \omega_0$ denotes the closest point to $x$ on the ray $\omega_0$. For each vertex $x$ we define its predecessor $p(x)$ as the only neighbor vertex such that $\ell(p(x)) = \ell(x) + 1$, while $s(x)$ will denote the set of the remaining neighbors, the sons of $x$, whose level is $\ell(x) - 1$. We introduce a partial order relation on $T$ by writing $x \geq y$ if $d(x,y) = \ell(x) - \ell(y)$.

A flow on $T$ is a function $\nu$ satisfying the flow condition

\[ \nu(x) = \sum_{y \in s(x)} \nu(y), \quad x \in T. \]

Flows, which are common objects in Operation Research and Computer Science, turn out to have interesting properties also from a Harmonic Analysis point of view. Indeed, $\nu$-harmonic functions on trees can be characterized as appropriate nonlinear potentials of flows, see \cite{5}. For a more wide-ranging account on the importance of flows in Probability and Analysis on trees, we refer the reader to \cite{13}.
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In this note we are interested in flow measures, which are positive flows; from now on flows will always be intended to be flow measures. A flow $\nu$ is said to be canonical if it distributes mass uniformly among the sons of each point, i.e., if $\nu(x) = q(x)\nu(y)$, for every $x \in T$, $y \in s(x)$. Up to normalization, the canonical flow is unique: we will refer to the one satisfying $\nu(o) = 1$ as the canonical flow, and denote it with the letter $\mu$. In the sequel we will mainly deal with the homogeneous tree $T_q$, on which $q(x) = q$ for some integer $q$ and every $x \in T_q$, endowed with the canonical flow measure $\mu(x) = q^\ell(x)$, $(T_q, \mu)$ for short.

A systematic analysis on $(T_q, \mu)$ was initiated in a remarkable paper by W. Hebisch and T. Steger [11], where they developed an ad hoc Calderón–Zygmund theory and studied the boundedness properties of spectral multipliers and the Riesz transform $R$ associated with a suitable Laplacian $L$, which we shall call the flow Laplacian. In Section 2 a rigorous definition of flow Laplacian is given, it is put into context in the more general setting of weighted graphs, and the arising notion of Riesz transform is compared with the others appearing in the literature. In [1, 2] an atomic Hardy space $H^1(\mu)$ and a space $BMO(\mu)$ adapted to $(T_q, \mu)$ were introduced and studied, and in [12] the Calderón–Zygmund theory of [11], as well as the Hardy and BMO spaces of [12], were generalized to trees of bounded degree endowed with arbitrary flows.

In this note we aim at completing the study of the boundedness properties of $R$ on $(T_q, \mu)$. By [11, Theorem 2.3] and [2], $R$ is of weak type $(1, 1)$, bounded on $L^p(\mu)$ for $p \in (1, 2]$, and bounded from $H^1(\mu)$ to $L^1(\mu)$. The problem of the $L^p$ boundedness for $p \in (2, \infty)$ was left open in [11]. We define the operator $S$ as the adjoint of $R$, and prove the following result.

**Theorem 1.1.** The operators $R$ and $S$ are of weak type $(1, 1)$ and bounded on $L^p(\mu)$ for $p \in (1, \infty)$.

We also consider some endpoint estimates and show that $R$ does not map $L^\infty$ to $BMO(\mu)$ and $S$ does not map $H^1(\mu)$ to $L^1(\mu)$, see Proposition 4.4.

It is important to point out that the metric space $(T_q, \mu)$ is an adverse setting to study the problem. Indeed, in our recent paper [12] we prove that flow measures do not satisfy the doubling condition, they have exponential growth, and they fail to satisfy the Cheeger isoperimetric property.

The boundedness of the Riesz transform on graphs has been the object of many investigations in recent years. In [16, 15, 3, 9], the authors obtained various boundedness results for Riesz transforms on graphs satisfying the doubling condition and some additional conditions, expressed either in terms of properties of the measure or estimates for the heat kernel. In [4], Celotto and Meda showed that the Riesz transform associated with the combinatorial Laplacian is bounded from a suitable Hardy type space to $L^1$ on graphs with the Cheeger isoperimetric property. In the recent paper [6], the authors obtained the $L^p$ boundedness of Riesz transform for the so-called bounded Laplacians on any weighted graph and any $p \in (1, \infty)$. However, mimicking similar results on manifolds, the authors prove their results only under the assumption of positive spectral gap. We remark again that $(T_q, \mu)$ is nondoubling and does not satisfy the Cheeger isoperimetric property. Moreover, the flow Laplacian $L$, which is a bounded Laplacian in the sense of [6], does not have spectral gap (see Section 2). Hence, none of the above-mentioned results may be applied in our case.
The proof of Theorem 1.1 hinges on explicit formulas for the integral kernel of $R$, obtained by subordination to the heat kernel of $L$. In Section 3, precise estimates of such heat kernel and its gradient are obtained using a relationship between $L$ and $\Delta$, the standard combinatorial Laplacian, and applying the estimates on the heat kernel of $\Delta$ provided in [7]. It is worth mentioning that $S$ is not bounded from the atomic Hardy space $H^1(\mu)$ to $L^1(\mu)$, see Proposition 4.4. As a consequence, the integral kernel of $S$ does not satisfy the Hörmander’s condition in [11, Remark 1.4], so that we cannot apply the Calderón–Zygmund theory developed in [11] to prove the weak type $(1,1)$ boundedness of $S$. We prove the latter by showing that the “local” part of its kernel gives rise to an operator bounded on $L^1(\mu)$ and by making a delicate study of the “global” part of the kernel, which we split into three components in the spatial coordinates which are separately proved to be of weak type $(1,1)$ by different and independent arguments.

We remark that Theorem 1.1 can be thought of as the discrete counterpart of the results obtained in [10, 18, 19] for the Riesz transforms of the first order associated with a distinguished Laplacian on the so-called $ax + b$ groups and their adjoint operators. Another interesting result related to the one presented here is contained in [17]: the characterization of the Hardy space in terms of the Riesz transform $R$ fails, i.e., the atomic Hardy space $H^1(\mu)$ is strictly contained in the space of integrable functions whose Riesz transform is integrable.

While the formulation of the problem on more general trees endowed with more general flows does not require any additional effort, extending the results presented here to these more general situations seems far from being trivial, mainly because of the lack of explicit formulas for the heat kernel. A different approach is probably needed. We will possibly tackle this problem in future work, leaving it open here.

Along the paper, $C$ denotes a positive constant which may vary from line to line. However, when the exact values are unimportant for us, we use the standard notation $f_1(x) \lesssim f_2(x)$ to indicate that there exists a positive constant $C$, independent from the variable $x$ but possibly depending on some involved parameters, such that $f_1(x) \leq Cf_2(x)$ for every $x$. When both $f_1(x) \lesssim f_2(x)$ and $f_2(x) \lesssim f_1(x)$ are valid, we will write $f_1(x) \approx f_2(x)$.

## 2. Laplacian and Riesz Transform

### 2.1. Weighted Laplacians on graphs.

Let $G$ be an infinite, connected, simple, and locally finite graph, where $q(x) + 1$ is the number of neighbors of a vertex $x$. We identify $G$ with its vertex set and denote by $E$ its edge set. For $x, y \in G$ we write $x \sim y$ if there is an edge connecting them. Suppose that $G$ is equipped with a vertex measure $m : G \to \mathbb{R}^+$ and with a positive symmetric kernel function $w : G \times G \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $w(x, y) \neq 0$ if and only if $x \sim y$, playing the role of edge weight. In this generality, the weighted Laplacian is commonly defined as the operator acting on a function $f : G \to \mathbb{R}$, as

$$\Delta_{w,m} f(x) = \frac{1}{m(x)} \sum_{y \in G} w(x, y) (f(x) - f(y)).$$

As an immediate consequence of the symmetry of the edge weight, $\Delta_{w,m}$ is self-adjoint on $L^2(G, m)$. The boundedness of the weighted Laplacian on $L^2(G, m)$ depends on the inter-relationship between the edge weight $w$ and the vertex measure $m$. More precisely, let $m_w$ be the volume measure on the weighted graph $G,
\( m_w(x) = \sum_y w(x, y) \). Then, the following estimate holds, see \([8]\) Lemma 1,

\[
\|m_w/m\|_{L^\infty(G)} \leq \|\Delta_{w,m}\|_{L^2(G,m)\rightarrow L^2(G,m)} \leq 2 \|m_w/m\|_{L^\infty(G)}.
\]

It easily follows that if \( \Delta_{w,m} \) is bounded on \( L^2(G,m) \), then it is bounded on \( L^p(G,m) \) for every \( p \in [1, \infty] \) (see \([8]\) Lemma 2.1 for the details). For short, we will say that \( \Delta_{w,m} \) is a bounded Laplacian if the function \( m_w/m \) is bounded on \( G \).

It is worth noticing that if \( m = m_w \), then the weighted Laplacian \( \Delta_{w,m} \) reduces to the operator \( I - P \), where \( P f(x) = \sum_y p(x, y) f(y) \) is the stochastic operator with Markov kernel \( p(x, y) = w(x, y)/m_w(x) \), satisfying \( \sum_y p(x, y) = 1 \) for every \( x \in T \). Accordingly, we say that \( I - P \) is a probabilistic Laplacian. Observe that probabilistic Laplacians are always bounded.

The simplest Laplacian one may think of is that obtained by choosing the adjacency kernel, \( a(x, y) = 1 \) if \( x \sim y \), \( a(x, y) = 0 \) otherwise, and the associated volume measure \( m_a(x) = q(x) + 1 \). This is known as the combinatorial Laplacian of \( G \) and we will simply denote it by \( \Delta \). Observe that \( \Delta \) is the probabilistic Laplacian associated to the simple nearest neighborhood random walk on \( G \). On \( q \)-regular graphs, and in particular on the homogeneous tree \( T_q \),

\[
\Delta f(x) = \frac{1}{q+1} \sum_{y \sim x} (f(x) - f(y)).
\]

Clearly on regular graphs \( \Delta \) is bounded with respect to the counting measure \( \# \), since it is bounded with respect to \( m_a \), which is a uniform measure.

2.2. The flow Laplacian. Flow measures, i.e., positive functions satisfying \([11]\), are never constant, unless \( T = \mathbb{Z} \). This makes any meaningful Laplacian on trees endowed with flow measures intimately different from the combinatorial Laplacian. We argue here that for any locally finite tree \( T \) and for any flow measure \( \nu \) there exists a natural Laplacian to be considered on \((T, \nu)\), which is the weighted Laplacian associated to the kernel

\[
w(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} \min\{\nu(x), \nu(y)\}.
\]

This kernel is natural in the setting, because it satisfies the volume condition \( \nu(x) = \sum_{y \sim x} w(x, y) \), then assuring that \( \Delta_{w,\nu} \) is a probabilistic Laplacian. Moreover, among the possibly many kernels satisfying the volume condition for the flow measure \( \nu \), \( w \) is the “canonical one”, in that it satisfies \( w(p(x, x)) = \sum_{y \in s(x)} w(x, y) \).

The Markov kernel generating this Laplacian is of nearest neighborhood type and is given by: \( p(x, p(x)) = 1/2 \), \( p(x, y) = \nu(y)/(2\nu(x)) \), for any \( x \in T, y \in s(x) \). Observe that \( \nu(x)p(x, y) = \nu(y)p(y, x) \) for all \( x, y \in T \), i.e., the transition probability is reversible.

In particular, we denote by \( \mathcal{L} \) the natural Laplacian on \((T_q, \mu)\), which we call the flow Laplacian, which is easily seen to be given by

\[
\mathcal{L} f(x) = f(x) - \frac{1}{2q} \sum_{y \sim x} \frac{\mu(y)}{\mu(x)} f(y), \quad x \in T_q.
\]
This is precisely the Laplacian studied in [11]. It is easily seen that the flow Laplacian can be expressed in terms of the combinatorial Laplacian as follows

\[(2.3) \quad L = \frac{1}{1 - b} \mu^{-1/2} (\Delta - bI) \mu^{1/2},\]

where \(b = (\sqrt{q} - 1)^2/(q + 1)\). It is well known (see for instance [1]) that \(b\) is the bottom of the spectrum of \(\Delta\) on \(L^2(T_q, \#)\), from which it immediately follows that \(L\) has no spectral gap on \(L^2(T_q, \mu)\). Indeed, the spectrum of \(L\) is precisely \([0, 2]\), see [11] Remark 2.1. Equation (2.3) plays a fundamental role in proving our results, because it allows us to exploit some known estimates for heat kernel of the combinatorial Laplacian.

2.3. The Riesz transform. The definition of Riesz transform depends on a notion of gradient on graphs, which is not unambiguous in the literature. On any weighted graph \((G, w, m)\), with edge set \(E\), one can assign an (arbitrary) orientation to the edges, denote by \([x, y]\) the edge with starting point \(x\) and ending point \(y\), and define the first order (edge) difference operator of \(f : G \to \mathbb{R}\) as the function \(\delta f : E \to \mathbb{R}\) given by

\[\delta f[x, y] = f(y) - f(x)\]

It is easy to see that

\[\|\delta f\|^p_{L^p(E, w)} \leq 2C_p \sum_{x \in G} f(x)^p \mu(x),\]

so that, if \(\Delta_{w,m}\) is bounded, then \(\delta\) is bounded from \(L^p(G, m)\) to \(L^p(E, w)\). One can easily compute the (weighted) divergence operator on \(G\), defined as the adjoint \(\delta^*\) of \(\delta\) on \(L^2(\mu)\), and check that \(\Delta_{w,m} = \delta^* \delta\). A natural choice would then be to define the Riesz transform on \(G\) as \(\delta \Delta_{w,m}^{-1/2}\). This is the operator whose boundedness is studied in [6]. On the other hand, many authors, including Hebisch and Steger in [11], prefer to regard at the quantity \(f(y) - f(x)\) as a directional derivative at \(x\) in the direction \(y\) and to define the modulus of the gradient of a function \(f\), accordingly, as the vertex function

\[|\nabla f(x)| = \sum_{y \sim x} |f(x) - f(y)|, \quad \text{or} \quad |\nabla f(x)| = \left(\frac{1}{2m(x)} \sum_{y \sim x} |f(x) - f(y)|^2 w(x, y)\right)^{1/2},\]

and consequently the Riesz transform as the operator \(\nabla \Delta_{w,m}^{-1/2}\) or \(\overline{\nabla} \Delta_{w,m}^{-1/2}\).

We argue here that when it comes to boundedness results on \((T_q, \mu)\) all these choices are essentially equivalent. In particular, Theorem [1.1] holds when \(R\) is any of the above operators. From now on, let us just write \(T\) for \(T_q\). The edges of \(T\) get a natural orientation induced by the level structure. More precisely, if \(x \sim y\), the oriented edge connecting them is \([x, y]\) if \(x = p(y)\), \([y, x]\) otherwise. We find this convention natural and convenient but we remark that the choice of orientation plays no role here. To the edge difference operator \(\delta\) we associate the vertex difference operator

\[\partial f(x) = \delta f[p(x), x] = f(x) - f(p(x)), \quad x \in T,\]

and we define the Riesz transform on \((T, \mu)\) as the operator

\[Rf(x) = \partial L^{-1/2} f(x) = L^{-1/2} f(x) - L^{-1/2} f(p(x)), \quad x \in T,\]
where the fractional power of the Laplacian is defined by means of the Spectral Theorem as usual. More explicitly, denoting by $H_t(x,y)$ the heat kernel generated by the flow Laplacian, the Riesz transform is the operator

$$Rf(x) = \sum_{y \in T} R(x,y)f(y)\mu(y),$$

where the kernel $R(x,y)$ is given by

$$R(x,y) = \int_0^\infty t^{-1/2} \partial H_t(x,y)(x)\,dt = \int_0^\infty t^{-1/2}(H_t(x,y) - H_t(p(x),y))\,dt.$$  

It is easily seen that $S$, the adjoint operator of $R$, is the operator with kernel

$$S(x,y) = \int_0^\infty t^{-1/2} \partial H_t(x,\cdot)(y)\,dt = \int_0^\infty t^{-1/2}(H_t(x,y) - H_t(x,p(y)))\,dt.$$  

We claim that, for every $p \geq 1$,

$$\|\delta f\|_{L^p(E,w)} \approx \|\partial f\|_{L^p(T,\mu)} \approx \|\nabla f\|_{L^p(T,\mu)} \approx \|\bar{\nabla} f\|_{L^p(T,\mu)},$$

and

$$\|\delta f\|_{L^{1,\infty}(E,w)} \approx \|\partial f\|_{L^{1,\infty}(T,\mu)} \approx \|\nabla f\|_{L^{1,\infty}(T,\mu)} \approx \|\bar{\nabla} f\|_{L^{1,\infty}(T,\mu)}.$$  

It follows from the claim that the boundedness properties of $R$ are equivalent to those of the operator $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ studied in [11], as well as those of the operators $\delta L^{-1/2}$ and $\bar{\nabla} L^{-1/2}$.

The leftmost and rightmost approximate equalities, in both the equations of the claim, are easy consequences of (2.1). To prove the middle approximate identity, just keep in mind that $\mu(y) = q\mu(x)$ if $y \in s(x)$, so that

$$\|\partial f\|_{L^p(T,\mu)} \lesssim \|\nabla f\|_{L^p(T,\mu)} \lesssim \sum_{x \in T} \sum_{y : y \sim x} |f(x) - f(y)|^p \mu(x)$$

$$= \sum_{x \in T} \left( |f(x) - f(p(x))|^p \mu(x) + q \sum_{y \in s(x)} |f(x) - f(y)|^p \mu(y) \right)$$

$$= (q + 1)\|\partial f\|_{L^p(T,\mu)}.$$  

Finally, on one hand it is clear that $\|\partial f\|_{L^{1,\infty}(T,\mu)} \lesssim \|\nabla f\|_{L^{1,\infty}(T,\mu)}$. On the other, for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\{x : |\nabla f(x)| > \lambda\} \subseteq \left\{ x : |\partial f(x)| > \frac{\lambda}{q + 1} \right\} \cup \left\{ x : \exists y \in s(x), |f(x) - f(y)| > \frac{\lambda}{q + 1} \right\},$$

from which follows

$$\lambda \mu(\{ x : |\nabla f(x)| > \lambda \}) \leq (q + 1)^2\|\partial f\|_{L^{1,\infty}(T,\mu)},$$

which proves the claim.

3. Heat Kernel Estimates

Let $h_t = e^{-t\Delta}$ and $H_t = e^{-t\mathcal{L}}$ be the heat semigroup of the combinatorial Laplacian $\Delta$ and of the flow Laplacian $\mathcal{L}$ on $T$, respectively. We shall use the same symbols to denote the associated heat kernels on the respective measure spaces on which the generators are self-adjoint and bounded, i.e.,

$$h_t f(x) = \sum_{y \in T} h_t(x,y)f(y), \quad H_t f(x) = \sum_{y \in T} H_t(x,y)f(y)\mu(y).$$
By the Spectral Theorem and (2.3), we obtain the following relation between the combinatorial and the flow semigroups,

\( H_t = \mu^{-1/2} e^{bt/(1-b)} h(t/(1-b))^{1/2}. \)

Observe that, when \( q = 1, \) \( H_t = h_t = h_T. \) We shall always assume \( q \geq 2, \) but we will make an extensive instrumental use of the heat kernel on \( H. \) It is well known that \( h_T \) is radial and that the function \( h_T(j) := h_T(j, 0) \) is decreasing in \( j \in \mathbb{N}. \) In the next proposition we collect some fundamental results of M. Cowling, S. Meda and A.G. Setti [11, Theorem 2.3, Lemma 2.4, Proposition 2.5] providing exact and approximated expressions for \( h_t \) and \( h^z_t. \)

**Proposition 3.1** ([11]). The following hold for all \( t > 0, x, y \in T, j \in \mathbb{N}: \)

\( \text{i) } h_t(x, y) = \frac{2e^{-bt}}{(1-b)t} q^{-d(x,y)/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q^{-k} (d(x,y) + 2k + 1) h(t/(1-b))(d(x,y) + 2k + 1), \)

\( \text{ii) } h^z_t(j) - h^z_t(j + 2) = \frac{2(j + 1)}{t} h^z_t(j + 1), \)

\( \text{iii) } h^z_t(j) \approx \frac{e^{-t + \sqrt{j^2 + 1}}}{(1 + j^2 + t^2)^{1/4}} \left( \frac{t}{j + \sqrt{j^2 + t^2}} \right)^j. \)

By means of identity i) and (3.1), we can express the flow heat kernel as

\( H_t(x, y) = q^{-t(x)/2} e^{bt/(1-b)} h(t/(1-b))(x, y) q^{-t(y)/2} = Q(x, y) J_t(x, y), \)

where

\( Q(x, y) = q^{-t(y) - t(x) - d(x,y)/2}, \)

and

\( J_t(x, y) = J_t(d(x,y)) \approx \frac{2}{t} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q^{-k} (d(x,y) + 2k + 1) h^z_t(d(x,y) + 2k + 1). \)

It is useful to observe that

\( H_t(x, y) \approx Q(x, y) \frac{2}{t} (d(x, y) + 1) h^z_t(d(x, y) + 1). \)

**Lemma 3.2.** Assume \( y \not\leq x \) where \( x, y \in T. \) Then, for every \( t > 0, \)

\( |H_t(x, y) - H_t(p, x)| \lesssim \max \left\{ \frac{d(x,y)}{t} H_t(p(x), y), \frac{H_t(x,y)}{d(x,y) + 1} \right\}. \)

**Proof.** Fix \( t > 0 \) and \( x, y \in T \) such that \( y \not\leq x \) and set \( j = d(x, y), \) so that \( d(p(x), y) = j - 1. \) Observe that \( Q(x, y) = Q(p(x), y), \) and

\( J_t(x, y) - J_t(p(x), y) = \frac{2}{t} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q^{-k} \left( (j + 2k + 1) h^z_t(j + 2k + 1) - (j + 2k) h^z_t(j + 2k) \right). \)

Exploiting the fact that \( h^z_t(\cdot) \) is decreasing in \( \mathbb{N} \) and using ii) in Proposition 3.1 for each integer \( j \) we have

\( h^z_t(j + 2k + 1) \geq (j + 2k + 1) h^z_t(j + 2k + 1) - (j + 2k) h^z_t(j + 2k) \)

\( \geq (j + 2k) \left( h^z_t(j + 2k + 1) - h^z_t(j + 2k - 1) \right) = -\frac{2(j + 2k)^2}{t} h^z_t(j + 2k). \)
Hence, by the the above calculation and \((3.5)\), on the one hand we get

\[
H_t(x, y) - H_t(p(x), y) \gtrsim -Q(x, y) \frac{j^2}{t^2} h_t^\varphi(j) \approx -\frac{j}{t} H_t(p(x), y),
\]

and on the other

\[
H_t(x, y) - H_t(p(x), y) \lesssim \frac{2}{t} Q(x, y) h_t^\varphi(j + 1) \approx \frac{H_t(x, y)}{j + 1}.
\]

This completes the proof. 

While to obtain the above result it was sufficient to work on the kernel \(h_t^\varphi\) at a symbolic level, its monotonicity being the only information needed, for what follows we will need to deepen the analysis and exploit the approximate identity \(iii\) in Proposition 3.1. In the following, we will repeatedly encounter the function \(\varphi : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}\) defined by

\[(3.6) \quad \varphi(s) = -s + \sqrt{1 + s^2} + \log s - \log(1 + \sqrt{1 + s^2}).\]

**Lemma 3.3.** The function \(\varphi\) is negative, increasing, and it satisfies the bounds

\[
-\frac{1}{2s} - \frac{1}{2s^2} - \frac{1}{8s^3} \leq \varphi(s) \leq -\frac{1}{2s} + \frac{1}{2s^2}, \quad s > 0.
\]

**Lemma 3.4.** The following holds for all \(x, y \in T\)

\[(3.7) \quad \int_1^\infty t^{-1/2} H_t(x, y) \, dt \lesssim \frac{Q(x, y)}{d(x, y) + 1}.
\]

**Proof.** Fix \(x, y \in T\) and let \(j = d(x, y)\). By the approximate identity \((3.5)\), Proposition 3.1 \(iii\) and the change of variable \(t = (j + 1)s\), we get

\[
\int_1^{(j + 1)^2} t^{-1/2} J_t(x, y) \, dt \lesssim \int_1^{\infty} \frac{1}{s^2} e^{(j + 1)\varphi(s)} \, ds \leq \int_1^{\infty} \frac{1}{s^2} \, ds = \frac{1}{j + 1},
\]

where we have used that \(\varphi \leq 0\). For the remaining part of the integral, we have

\[
\int_1^{(j + 1)^2} t^{-1/2} J_t(x, y) \, dt \leq \int_1^{(j + 1)^2} \frac{e^{(j + 1)\varphi(s)}}{s^2} \, ds = \int_1^{\sqrt{j + 1}} \frac{e^{(j + 1)\varphi(s)}}{s^2} \, ds + \int_{\sqrt{j + 1}}^{j + 1} \frac{e^{(j + 1)\varphi(s)}}{s^2} \, ds \leq e^{(j + 1)\varphi(\sqrt{j + 1})} \int_1^{\sqrt{j + 1}} \frac{1}{s^2} \, ds + \int_{\sqrt{j + 1}}^{j + 1} \frac{e^{-\frac{j + 1}{s^2}}}{s^2} \, ds,
\]

where in the last line we have used Lemma 3.3. Another application of Lemma 3.3 and a direct computation show

\[
e^{(j + 1)\varphi(\sqrt{j + 1})} \int_1^{\sqrt{j + 1}} \frac{1}{s^2} \, ds + \int_{\sqrt{j + 1}}^{j + 1} \frac{e^{-\frac{j + 1}{s^2}}}{s^2} \, ds \leq e^{-\sqrt{j + 1}/2} (j + 1) + 2 e^{-1/2} - e^{-\sqrt{j + 1}/2} \lesssim \frac{1}{j + 1}.
\]

Gluing all together we have

\[
\int_1^\infty t^{-1/2} J_t(x, y) \, dt \lesssim \frac{1}{d(x, y) + 1},
\]

and multiplying both members by \(Q(x, y)\) we obtain the desired result. \qed
Lemma 3.5. Let $x, y \in T$ be vertices such that $y \leq x$. Then,
\[
\int_1^\infty t^{-1/2} |H_t(x, y) - H_t(p(x), y)| \, dt \lesssim \frac{Q(x, y)}{(d(x, y) + 1)^2}.
\]

Proof. Fix $x, y \in T$ such that $y \leq x$ and set $j = d(x, y)$, so that $d(p(x), y) = j - 1$. By Lemma 3.2, it suffices to show that the desired bound holds for both the integrals
\[
\int_1^\infty \frac{1}{j+1} t^{-1/2} H_t(x, y) dt, \quad \int_1^\infty \frac{j}{t} t^{-1/2} H_t(p(x), y) dt.
\]
The estimate concerning the first integral follows by Lemma 3.3. Since $j/t \leq 1/j$ exactly when $t \geq j^2$, it is then enough to prove the bound for the integral
\[
I = \int_1^{j^2} \frac{j}{t} t^{-1/2} H_t(p(x), y) dt + \int_{j^2}^\infty \frac{1}{j} t^{-1/2} H_t(p(x), y) dt := I_1 + I_2.
\]
Again by Lemma 3.4 we conclude that
\[
I_2 \lesssim \frac{Q(x, y)}{(d(x, y) + 1)^2}.
\]
Now, if $y = p(x)$, then $j = 1$ and $I_1 = 0$, and we are done. Suppose hereinafter that $j \geq 2$. By (3.3) and (iii) in Proposition 3.1, we have
\[
J_t(p(x), y) \approx \frac{je^{-t+\sqrt{j^2+t^2}}}{t^{3/2}(1+j^2+t^2)^{1/4}} \left( \frac{t}{j + \sqrt{j^2+t^2}} \right)^j
\]
\[
\leq \frac{j}{t^2} \exp \left( -t + \sqrt{j^2+t^2} + j \log t - j \log(j + \sqrt{j^2+t^2}) \right)
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{j^2} e^{j\varphi(s)},
\]
where $s = t/j$ and $\varphi$ is the function defined in Lemma 3.3. By the above calculation and the change of variables $t = js$, we get
\[
I_1 \lesssim Q(x, y) \int_1^{j^2} \frac{1}{ts^2} e^{j\varphi(s)} ds = Q(x, y) \int_{1/j}^{1} \frac{1}{s^3} e^{j\varphi(s)} ds.
\]
By the monotonicity of $\varphi$, Lemma 3.3, and the fact that $\lim_{j \to \infty} e^{-\sqrt{j}/j^4} = 0$, we obtain
\[
\int_{1/j}^{\sqrt{j}} \frac{1}{s^3} e^{j\varphi(s)} ds \leq e^{j\varphi(\sqrt{j})} \int_{1/j}^{\sqrt{j}} \frac{1}{s^3} ds = e^{j\varphi(\sqrt{j})} \frac{1}{2j} \lesssim e^{-\sqrt{j}/j^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{j^2}.
\]
To complete the proof we observe that for $s \geq \sqrt{j}$, we have $\varphi(s) \leq -1/(2s) + 1/(2s\sqrt{j}) \leq -1/2s + 1/j$, from which follows
\[
\int_{\sqrt{j}}^{j} \frac{1}{s^3} e^{j\varphi(s)} ds \lesssim \int_{\sqrt{j}}^{j} \frac{1}{s^3} e^{-1/2s} ds = \frac{6e^{-1/2} - 2e^{-\sqrt{j}(\sqrt{j}+2)}}{j^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{j^2}.
\]

4. Boundedness properties of $R$ and $S$

As a first step to prove Theorem 1.1, we introduce an auxiliary couple of operators and we study their boundedness properties. We define
\[
Kf(x) = \sum_{y \in T} K(x, y)f(y)\mu(y), \quad K(x, y) = \frac{Q(x, y)}{d(x, y) + 1}\chi_{\{y < x\}}(x, y).
\]
It is easy to see that the adjoint of $K$ on $L^2(\mu)$ is $Tf(x) = \sum_{y \in T} K(y, x) f(y) \mu(y)$. Since for $y > x$ it holds $Q(x, y) \mu(y) = 1$, it follows that

$$Tf(x) = \sum_{y \in T} T(x, y) f(y), \quad T(x, y) = \frac{\chi_{(y, \infty)}(x, y)}{d(x, y) + 1}.$$ 

**Theorem 4.1.** The operator $T$ is bounded on $L^p(\mu)$ for every $p \in (1, \infty)$ and is of weak type $(1, 1)$.

**Proof.** Denote by $\gamma_\omega$ the doubly infinite geodesic $(\omega_0, \omega)$ connecting a boundary point $\omega \in \Omega$ to the mythical ancestor $\omega_0$. Define $\Omega_\nu = \{ \omega \in \Omega : x \in \gamma_\omega \}$, and denote by $\rho$ the measure on $\Omega$ such that $\rho(\Omega_\nu) = \mu(x)$, for any $x \in T$. Then, for any function $\varphi$ on $T$, we obtain the useful identity

$$\sum_{x \in T} \varphi(x) \mu(x) = \sum_{x \in T} \varphi(x) \int_{\Omega_\nu} d\rho(\omega) = \int_{\Omega} \sum_{x \in \gamma_\omega} \varphi(x) d\rho(\omega).$$

Observe that this implies that if $\varphi \in L^1(\mu)$ then $\varphi_\omega \in L^1(\#)$ for $\rho$–a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$. Now, let $x \in T$ with $\ell(x) = n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $\omega$ any point in the boundary such that $x \in \gamma_\omega$. Then, we have the pointwise bound

$$|Tf(x)| \leq \sum_{y \in \gamma_\omega} \frac{|f(y)|}{d(x, y) + 1} = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{|f_\omega(m)|}{n - m + 1} =: h_\omega f_\omega(n),$$

where $f_\omega(m) = f(x_\omega, m)$, and $x_\omega, m$ is the unique point of $\gamma_\omega$ with $\ell(x_\omega, m) = m$. It is classical \cite{14} that the discrete Hilbert transform $h_\omega$ is bounded on $l^p = L^p(\mathbb{Z}, \#)$ for $p \in (1, \infty)$ and of weak type $(1, 1)$. We shall exploit this to deduce the corresponding boundedness properties of $T$ as follows. For any $\lambda > 0$, let $E_\lambda = \{ x \in T : |Tf(x)| > \lambda \}$, and $F_{\lambda, \omega} = \{ n \in \mathbb{Z} : h_\omega f_\omega(n) > \lambda \}$. For $f \in L^1(\mu)$, applying (4.1) to $\varphi = \chi_{E_\lambda}$, exploiting the the weak $(1, 1)$ boundedness of $h_\omega$ with respect to $\#$ and applying (4.1) again to $\varphi = f$, we get

$$\mu(E_\lambda) = \int_{\Omega} \sum_{x \in \gamma_\omega} \chi_{E_\lambda}(x) d\rho(\omega) \leq \int_{\Omega} \#(F_{\lambda, \omega}) d\rho(\omega) \leq \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\lambda} \| f \|_{L^1(\#)} d\rho(\omega) = \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\lambda} \| f \|_{L^1(\mu)} d\rho(\omega),$$

which proves the weak $(1, 1)$ boundedness of $T$ with respect to $\mu$.

Finally, for any $p \in (1, \infty)$, writing $L^p$ norms in terms of distribution functions and exploiting the $L^p(\mathbb{Z}, \#)$ boundedness of $h_\omega$, we obtain

$$\| Tf \|_{L^p(\mu)} = \int_0^\infty \lambda^{p-1} \mu(E_\lambda) d\lambda = \int_0^\infty \lambda^{p-1} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{x \in \gamma_\omega} \chi_{E_\lambda}(x) d\rho(\omega) d\lambda$$

$$\leq \int \| h_\omega f_\omega \|_{L^p(\mathbb{Z}, \#)}^p d\rho(\omega) \leq \int \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |f_\omega(n)|^p d\rho(\omega) = \int \| f \|_{L^p(\mu)}^p d\rho(\omega),$$

which concludes the proof. \qed
To prove that the adjoint operator of $T$ is of weak type $(1,1)$ we need to follow a different strategy. Indeed, we show that its kernel satisfies a suitable integral Hörmander’s condition, which we recently proved to be sufficient for the scope. We recall from [12] that any set $F$ of vertices is called an admissible trapezoid if it is either a singleton or can be written as

$$F = F^{h''}_{h'}(x_0) := \{ x \in T : x \leq x_0, \ell(x_0) - h'' < \ell(x) \leq \ell(x_0) - h' \},$$

where $x_0$ is some vertex and $h', h''$ are two positive integers such that $2 \leq h''/h' \leq 12$. We denote by $\mathcal{F}$ the family of admissible trapezoids. Admissible trapezoids are used as base sets for extending the Calderón–Zygmund theory developed in [11] to trees with locally doubling flow measures, playing the role balls play in the classical theory. In particular, the following lemma holds.

**Lemma 4.2 ([12] Theorem 5.8).** Let $K$ be a linear operator which is bounded on $L^2(\mu)$ and admits a kernel $K$ satisfying the condition

$$\sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{x \in F} \sum_{x \in F} |K(x, y) - K(x, z)|\mu(x) < +\infty,$$

where, for any $F = F^{h''}_{h'}(x_0) \in \mathcal{F}$, we define $F^* = \{ x \in T : d(x, F) < h' \}$. Then $T$ extends to an operator which is of weak type $(1,1)$, bounded from $H^1(\mu)$ to $L^1(\mu)$ and on $L^p(\mu)$, for $1 < p < 2$.

**Theorem 4.3.** The operator $K$ is bounded on $L^p(\mu)$ for every $p \in (1, \infty)$ and is of weak type $(1, 1)$.

**Proof.** Since $T$ is bounded on $L^p(\mu)$ for every $p \in (1, \infty)$, the same holds for its adjoint operator $K$. In order to prove that $K$ is of weak type $(1,1)$, by Lemma 4.2 it suffices to verify that the kernel $K$ satisfies 4.2. Observe that for any $F = F^{h''}_{h'}(x_0) \in \mathcal{F}$, and any $y, z \in F, x \not\in F^*$, the three conditions $x \gg y$, $x \gg z$, $x \geq x_0$ are equivalent, and $Q(x, y)\mu(x) = Q(x, z)\mu(x)$. Then,

$$|K(x, y) - K(x, z)|\mu(x) = \chi_{\{x \geq x_0\}}(x)\left| \frac{1}{d(x, y) + 1} - \frac{1}{d(x, z) + 1} \right|.$$ 

Now, if $\ell(y) = \ell(z)$, the above expression vanishes. Otherwise, by the Mean Value Theorem there exists $\xi \in (\min\{d(x, y), d(x, z)\}, \max\{d(x, y), d(x, z)\})$, such that

$$|K(x, y) - K(x, z)|\mu(x) \leq \chi_{\{x \geq x_0\}}(x)\frac{|d(x, y) - d(x, z)|}{(\xi + 1)^2} \lesssim \frac{h'}{(d(x, x_0) + h' + 1)^2}.$$ 

It follows that, for every $y, z \in F, x \not\in F^*$,

$$\sum_{x \not\in F^*} |K(x, y) - K(x, z)|\mu(x) \lesssim \sum_{x \geq x_0} \frac{h'}{(d(x, x_0) + h' + 1)^2} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{h'}{(n + h' + 1)^2} \lesssim 1,$$

which is the desired result.

We are now ready to prove our main result. Out of convenience, we write $\mathcal{R}$ as the sum of a “local” and a “global” Riesz transform, $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_0 + \mathcal{R}_1$, where $\mathcal{R}_0$ and
\( R_1 \) are the operators with kernels
\[
R_0(x, y) = \int_0^1 t^{-1/2} (H_t(x, y) - H_t(p(x), y)) \, dt,
\]
\[
R_1(x, y) = \int_1^\infty t^{-1/2} (H_t(x, y) - H_t(p(x), y)) \, dt.
\]
The global transform, in turn, can be split in the space domain and written as the sum of three operators, \( \mathcal{R}_1 = \mathcal{R}_\geq + \mathcal{R}_\leq + \mathcal{R}_{\neq, \neq} \), which are, in the order, the operators with kernel
\[
R_1(x, y)\chi_{\{y > x\}}(y), \quad R_1(x, y)\chi_{\{y < x\}}(y), \quad R_1(x, y)\chi_{\{y \neq x, y \neq x\}}(y).
\]
In the very same fashion one can write the adjoint transform as \( \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_0 + \mathcal{S}_\geq + \mathcal{S}_\leq + \mathcal{S}_{\neq, \neq} \).

**4.1. Proof of Theorem** By Theorem 2.3, \( \mathcal{R} \) is of weak type \((1,1)\) and bounded on \( L^p(\mu) \), for \( p \in (1,2] \). Hence, by duality, \( \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}^* \) is bounded on \( L^p(\mu) \), \( p \in [2, \infty) \). The real issue is to establish the weak type \((1,1)\) boundedness of \( \mathcal{S} \). Once this is determined, by interpolation we deduce that \( \mathcal{S} \) is also bounded on \( L^p(\mu) \) for \( p \in [1,2] \) and, by duality, \( \mathcal{R} \) is bounded on \( L^p(\mu) \) for any \( p \in (1, \infty) \).

We claim that (i) \( \mathcal{R}_0, \mathcal{S}_0 \) are bounded on \( L^1(\mu) \), (ii) \( \mathcal{R}_\geq, \mathcal{S}_\leq \) are bounded on \( L^1(\mu) \), (iii) \( \mathcal{R}_\leq \) is of weak type \((1,1)\) and (iv) \( \mathcal{S}_\geq \) is of weak type \((1,1)\).

By (i), (ii), (iii) and the fact that \( \mathcal{R} \) is of weak type \((1,1)\), it follows that \( \mathcal{R}_{\neq, \neq} \) is also of weak type \((1,1)\). But it is easily seen that if \( y \neq x, y \neq x \), then \( \mathcal{d}(y, p(x)) = \mathcal{d}(x, p(y)) \) and \( \ell(y) + \ell(p(x)) = \ell(x) + \ell(p(y)) \), from which follows that the integral kernel of \( \mathcal{R}_{\neq, \neq} \) is symmetric and \( \mathcal{R}_{\neq, \neq} \) is self-adjoint on \( L^2(\mu) \). Therefore, \( \mathcal{S}_{\neq, \neq} = \mathcal{R}_{\neq, \neq} \) is also of weak type \((1,1)\). Then, it follows by (i), (ii), (iv) that \( \mathcal{S} \) is of weak type \((1,1)\).

Let us prove the four claims. First of all observe that
\[
\sum_{x \in T} |R_0(x, y)|\mu(x) \leq \sum_{x \in T} \int_0^1 t^{-1/2} (H_t(x, y) + H_t(p(x), y)) \, dt \, \mu(x)
\]
\[
= \sum_{x \in T} \int_0^1 t^{-1/2} (H_t(x, y)\mu(x) + \frac{1}{q}H_t(p(x), y)\mu(p(x))) \, dt
\]
\[
= 2 \sum_{x \in T} \int_0^1 t^{-1/2} H_t(x, y)\mu(x) \, dt \lesssim \sup_{x \in T} \sup_{0 < t < 1} H_t(x, y)\mu(x).
\]

Now, \( Q(x, y)\mu(x) \leq 1 \) for every \( x, y \in T \), since \( \ell(x) - \ell(y) \leq \mathcal{d}(x, y) \), and \( h_t^j(j) \lesssim t^j(e/j)^j \) for every \( 0 < t < 1 \) and \( j \in \mathbb{N} \), because the exponential appearing in the approximate identity in Proposition 3.1 (iii) is a decreasing function of \( t \). Then, by (3.8), we have
\[
H_t(x, y)\mu(x) \lesssim \left( \frac{e}{\mathcal{d}(x, y) + 1} \right)^{d(x, y)}, \quad 0 < t < 1.
\]
It follows that \( \sum_{x \in T} |R_0(x, y)|\mu(x) \lesssim \sum_{n=0}^\infty (n + 1)^{-n} \lesssim 1 \) and
\[
\|\mathcal{R}_0 f\|_{L^1(\mu)} \leq \sum_{x, y \in T} |R_0(x, y)||f(y)|\mu(y)\mu(x) \lesssim \|f\|_{L^1(\mu)}.
\]
By the very same reasoning, \( \sum_{y \in T} |S_0(x, y)| \mu(y) \leq 2 \sum_{y \in T} \int_0^1 t^{-1/2} H_t(x, y) \mu(y) \, dt \), and by Fubini’s theorem

\[
\|S_0 f\|_{L^1(\mu)} \lesssim \sum_{y \in T} \sum_{x \in T} \int_0^1 t^{-1/2} H_t(x, y) \mu(x) |f(y)| \mu(y) \, dt \lesssim \|f\|_{L^1(\mu)},
\]

which proves claim (i).

To prove claim (ii), we first apply Lemma 3.5 and then use the fact that for \( y > x \) it holds \( Q(x, y) \mu(x) = q^{-d(x, y)} \) to obtain

\[
\|\mathcal{R}_> f\|_{L^1(\mu)} \lesssim \sum_{x, y \in T} \frac{Q(x, y)}{(d(x, y) + 1)^2} \chi_{\{y > x\}}(x, y) |f(y)| \mu(y) \mu(x)
\]

\[
= \sum_{y \in T} \left( \sum_{x \in T} \frac{q^{-d(x, y)}}{(d(x, y) + 1)^2} \chi_{\{x < y\}}(x, y) \right) |f(y)| \mu(y)
\]

\[
= \sum_{y \in T} \left( \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{q^{-n}}{(n + 1)^2} q^n \right) |f(y)| \mu(y) \lesssim \|f\|_{L^1(\mu)}.
\]

Observe that Lemma 3.3 can be rephrased by saying that \( S_1(x, y) \lesssim Q(x, y)/(d(x, y) + 1)^2 \) whenever \( y \geq x \). This, together with the fact that \( Q(x, y) \mu(x) = 1 \) for \( y < x \), allows to get

\[
\|S_< f\|_{L^1(\mu)} \lesssim \sum_{x, y \in T} \frac{Q(x, y)}{(d(x, y) + 1)^2} \chi_{\{x < y\}}(x, y) |f(y)| \mu(y) \mu(x)
\]

\[
= \sum_{y \in T} \left( \sum_{x \in T} \frac{\chi_{\{x < y\}}(x, y)}{(d(x, y) + 1)^2} \right) |f(y)| \mu(y)
\]

\[
= \sum_{y \in T} \left( \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n + 1)^2} \right) |f(y)| \mu(y) \lesssim \|f\|_{L^1(\mu)},
\]

and claim (ii) is proved.

Claim (iii) is obtained by subordinating \( \mathcal{R}_< \) to \( \mathcal{K} \). Indeed, it is not difficult to see that, for \( y < x \), \( H_t(p(x), y) \leq H_t(x, y) \). By this observation and Lemma 3.4

\[
|\mathcal{R}_< f(x)| \leq 2 \sum_{y \in T} \int_1^\infty t^{-1/2} H_t(x, y) \, dt \chi_{\{y < x\}}(x, y) |f(y)| \mu(y)
\]

\[
\lesssim \sum_{y \in T} \frac{Q(x, y)}{(d(x, y) + 1)} \chi_{\{y < x\}}(x, y) |f(y)| \mu(y) = \mathcal{K}|f|(x).
\]

It follows by Theorem 4.3 that \( \mathcal{R}_< \) is of weak type (1,1).

Finally, claim (iv) is obtained by subordinating \( \mathcal{R}_< \) to \( \mathcal{T} \). As before, for \( y > x \), \( H_t(x, p(y)) \leq H_t(x, y) \), and by Lemma 3.4 and the fact that \( Q(x, y) \mu(y) = 1 \) when \( y > x \), one gets

\[
|\mathcal{S}_> f(x)| \lesssim \sum_{y \in T} \frac{Q(x, y)}{(d(x, y) + 1)} \chi_{\{y > x\}}(x, y) |f(y)| \mu(y) = \mathcal{T}|f|(x).
\]

It follows by Theorem 4.1 that \( \mathcal{S}_> \) is of weak type (1,1). \( \square \)
4.2. **Endpoints negative results.** We recall from [12] that a $(1, \infty)$-atom on $(T, \mu)$ is a mean zero function supported on an admissible trapezoid $F$ and bounded by $\mu(F)^{-1}$. The atomic Hardy space $H^1(\mu)$ is the space of functions $g \in L^1(\mu)$ such that $g = \sum \lambda_j \delta_j$, where $a_j$ are $(1, \infty)$-atoms and $\{\lambda_j\}$ an $\ell^1$ sequence of complex numbers. The dual space of $H^1(\mu)$ can be identified with the space $BMO(\mu)$ [12, Theorem 4.10], which is defined as the space of functions $f$ on $T$ for which $\sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} |f - f_F|_F < \infty$, where $f_F$ denotes the integral mean of a function $f$ on the set $F$ with respect to the measure $\mu$. In particular, for any $(1, \infty)$-atom $a$,

$$\langle f, a \rangle = \sum_{x \in T} f(x)a(x)\mu(x) \leq \|f\|_{BMO(\mu)}, \quad f \in BMO(\mu).$$

(4.3)

We end our note by showing that $\mathcal{R}$ does not map $L^\infty$ in $BMO(\mu)$ and, by duality, $\mathcal{S}$ fails to map $H^1(\mu)$ in $L^2(\mu)$.

**Proposition 4.4.** The Riesz transform $\mathcal{R}$ does not map $L^\infty$ to $BMO(\mu)$. As a consequence, $\mathcal{S}$ does not map $H^1(\mu)$ to $L^1(\mu)$.

**Proof.** By [13], it is enough to exhibit a function $f \in L^\infty(\mu)$ and a $(1, \infty)$-atom $a$ such that the dual pairing $\langle \mathcal{R}f, a \rangle$ is not bounded. Consider the admissible trapezoid $F = F^2_1(a) = s(a)$, with $\mu(F) = 1$. Pick $x_1, x_2 \in R$ such that $x_1 \neq x_2$ and define the $(1, \infty)$-atom $a = \delta_{x_1} - \delta_{x_2}$. Let $f = \chi_{x \leq x_1}$. Then,

$$\langle \mathcal{R}f, a \rangle = \mathcal{R}f(x_1)\mu(x_1) - \mathcal{R}f(x_2)\mu(x_2) = \sum_{y \leq x_1} \frac{\mu(y)}{q} \int_0^\infty t^{-1/2}(H_t(x_1, y) - H_t(x_2, y))dt,$$

where we used that $\mu(x_1) = \mu(x_2) = 1/q$ and the cancellation induced from the fact that $p(x_1) = p(x_2)$. Next, observe that whenever $y \leq x_1$, $d(y, x_1) = |y| - 1$, $d(y, x_2) = |y| + 1$, and consequently $Q(x_1, y) = q$ and $Q(x_2, y) = 1$. Then, for any $x \leq y_1$,

$$H_t(x_1, y) - H_t(x_2, y) = Q(x_1, y)\left(J_t(x_1, y) - \frac{1}{q}J_t(x_2, y)\right)$$

$$= q^2 e^{t/2} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q^{-k}(|y| + 2k)h^2_k(|y| + 2k) - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} q^{-k}(|y| + 2k)h^2_k(|y| + 2k)\right)$$

$$= q^2 e^{t/2} |y| |h^2|(|y)| \approx H_t(x_1, y)$$

By (3.5) in Proposition 3.1,

$$t^{-1/2}H_t(x_1, y) \approx Q(x_1, y)\frac{|y|}{t^{3/2}(1 + |y|^2 + t^2)^{1/4}} e^{s|y|\varphi(s)},$$

where $s = t/|y|$ and $\varphi(s)$ is the function defined in Lemma 3.3. Hence, by the monotonicity of $\varphi$, and the fact that for $|y| \geq 1$, $|y|\varphi(|y|) \geq -1/2 - 1/2|y| - 1/8|y|^2 \geq -9/8$, we get

$$\int_0^\infty t^{-1/2}(H_t(x_1, y) - H_t(x_2, y))dt \approx \int_0^\infty \frac{|y|}{t^{3/2}(1 + |y|^2 + t^2)^{1/4}} e^{s|y|\varphi(s)} dt$$

$$\geq \int_{|y|^2}^\infty \frac{|y|}{t^{3/2}(1 + |y|^2 + t^2)^{1/4}} e^{s|y|\varphi(s)} dt \geq \int_{|y|^2}^\infty \frac{1}{s^2} e^{s|y|\varphi(s)} ds \geq \frac{1}{|y|}.$$
It follows that
\[ \langle Rf, a \rangle \gtrsim \sum_{y \leq x_1} \frac{\mu(y)}{|y|} = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k + 1} = +\infty. \qed \]

**Remark 4.5.** By Proposition 4.4, we deduce that the kernel \( S(x, y) \) does not satisfy the Hörmander’s condition. Indeed, otherwise, since \( S \) is bounded on \( L^2(\mu) \), Lemma 4.2 would imply the \( H^1(\mu) - L^1(\mu) \) boundedness of \( S \).
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