

A THEOREM OF FEFFERMAN, KENIG AND PIPHER RE-REVISITED

SIMON BORTZ, MORITZ EGERT, AND OLLI SAARI

ABSTRACT. We investigate the small constant case of a characterization of A_∞ weights due to Fefferman, Kenig and Pipher. We also give an application of our result to the study of elliptic measures associated to elliptic operators with coefficients satisfying the Dahlberg-Kenig-Pipher condition.

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this work is to study the small constant version of a characterization of A_∞ weights due to Fefferman, Kenig and Pipher [FKP91]. The theory of (Muckenhoupt) A_∞ weights, initially introduced in the study of maximal functions and singular integral operators, has played a fundamental role in the L^p solvability of elliptic equations. In the paper [FKP91], the authors were investigating the stability of the A_∞ property of elliptic measure under certain perturbations quantified by a Carleson condition. In order to produce a counterexample (to show their main theorem was sharp) they introduced the Carleson characterization of A_∞ weights investigated here.

Some time later, Korey [Kor98a] studied an *asymptotic* version of this A_∞ characterization. Small constant weight conditions and related topics have been studied for a variety of conditions equivalent or similar to A_∞ (e.g. [Kor98b, PV12, Sar75]). It was not clear from the arguments neither in [FKP91] nor in [Kor98a] whether there was a *quantitative small constant* version of the characterization in [FKP91]. The following theorem shows this is the case. The Carleson norm $\|\mu_w\|_C$ is defined in Definition 2.5 and the A_∞ characteristic $[w]_{A_\infty}$ is defined in Definition 2.3.

Theorem 1.1. *Let w be a doubling weight on \mathbb{R}^n . Set $\phi(x) := \pi^{-n/2} e^{-|x|^2}$ and define the measure μ_w on $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$ by*

$$d\mu_w(x, r) := |\nabla_x \log(\phi_r * w)(x)|^2 r \, dx \, dr,$$

where $\phi_r(x) := r^{-n} \phi(x/r)$. For every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists δ depending on ϵ , n and the doubling constant of w such that if the Carleson norm of μ_w satisfies $\|\mu_w\|_C \leq \delta$, then the A_∞ characteristic of w satisfies $[w]_{A_\infty} \leq 1 + \epsilon$.

Remark 1.2. Theorem 1.1 also holds for doubling measures. If ν is a doubling measure, then one can define $d\mu_\nu(x, r)$ in the same manner and if $\|\mu_\nu\|_C < \infty$, then ν is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure and $d\mu_\nu = d\mu_w$ for $w := \frac{d\nu}{dx}$. See [BTZ21].

Theorem 1.1 has a converse and we sketch the proof, see Theorem 8.1. The idea behind proving Theorem 1.1 is to first show that

$$(1.3) \quad \log[w]_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mu\|_C + \mathcal{E},$$

where \mathcal{E} is a quantity that can be made very small if w has a strong doubling property. This reduces the proof of Theorem 1.1 to showing if $\|\mu\|_C$ is small enough, then w has the required doubling property. Identifying a strong doubling property that suits our purpose in this argument (henceforth called M -good doubling) is one of the new contributions in this work and does not follow by simply tracking constants in [FKP91, Kor98a]. We then prove M -good doubling by using the (Charles) Fefferman-Stein [FS72] change of kernel argument in the form found in [FKP91, Kor98a] and an appropriate family of kernels that test M -good doubling.

Our interest in reinvestigating the work of Fefferman, Kenig and Pipher comes from some recent developments in the study of elliptic equations with variable coefficients which satisfy an oscillation condition sometimes known as the Dahlberg-Kenig-Pipher (DKP) condition. This condition was first introduced by Dahlberg and then studied by Kenig and Pipher [KP01] (see also [DPP07, HL01]). It was shown very recently by David, Li and Mayboroda [DLM21a] that the Green functions for such operators in the upper half-space have gradients that are quantitatively small in tangential directions. The first author, Toro and Zhao [BTZ21] showed that these estimates can be used to control the Carleson norm of μ_w in Theorem 1.1, when w is the elliptic measure. Combining Theorem 1.1 and the results in [BTZ21], we prove Theorem 7.10, which shows that if the constant in the (weak) DKP condition is small, then the elliptic measure has close to optimal A_∞ constant. This quantitative control is what seems to be needed in order to push the small/vanishing constant theory to rougher settings (Lipschitz graphs and chord arc domains). Further details are provided at the end of Section 7.

We should point out that the *dyadic* version of Theorem 1.1 can be deduced from the work of Fefferman, Kenig and Pipher [FKP91, Theorem 3.22] (see also¹ [Buc93, Theorem 2.2 (iii)]). While the dyadic arguments include the (implicit or explicit) use of martingales, a special role in the *computations* that yield (1.3) is played by the heat kernel (see Section 6). Interestingly, the Fefferman-Stein change of kernel argument shows that the Gaussian kernel is *not* important in the Carleson condition, see [Kor98a, Corollary 12]. Moreover, while the present work gives very concrete and quantitative approach to controlling the ‘error terms’ (the term we called \mathcal{E} above) we still need the use of this change of kernel argument as a ‘black box’. It is unclear to us if there is a way to treat the setting with dyadic martingales and the continuous setting in a unified way.

Acknowledgment. This work was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany’s Excellence Strategy

¹There are differences in the proofs in [Buc93] and [FKP91], and [Buc93] gives a comprehensive study of dyadic A_∞ and summation conditions similar to those in [FKP91].

– EXC-2047/1 – 390685813 and CRC 1060 and by the ANR project RAGE ANR-18-CE40-0012. The first author would like to thank Tatiana Toro and Zihui Zhao for some helpful comments about the paper.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We fix a dimension $n \in \mathbb{N}$ throughout. In what follows w will always denote a weight, that is, a non-negative locally integrable function. As is customary in the study of weights, we will abuse notation and write w also for the measure $w dx$ so that for a Borel set E we have $w(E) = \int_E w(x) dx$. Throughout, we set $\Delta(x, r)$ to be the open Euclidean ball in \mathbb{R}^n with center $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and radius $r > 0$. We occasionally write $r(\Delta)$ for the radius of Δ .

We will use the following special functions.

- The heat kernel

$$\phi(x) := \pi^{-n/2} e^{-|x|^2},$$

which is an L^1 normalized non-negative function.

- The derivative of the heat kernel

$$\psi := \nabla \phi,$$

which is an odd function with mean value zero.

- The characteristic function of the unit ball χ .
- The normalized characteristic function of the unit ball $\tilde{\chi} := |\Delta(0, 1)|^{-1} \chi$.
- A reference bump function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Delta(0, 2))$, which is a fixed non-negative and radially decreasing function with $\nabla \varphi = 0$ on $\Delta(0, 1)$ and $\|\varphi\|_1 = 1$.

For any function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and any number $r > 0$, we denote

$$f_r(x) := r^{-n} f(x/r).$$

A central notion in the present work is that of doubling. We will always work with weights w that satisfy a doubling property.

Definition 2.1 (Doubling). Given a Borel measure ν on \mathbb{R}^n , we say ν is doubling if ν is non-trivial and there exists a constant C_{doub} such that

$$\nu(\Delta(x, 2r)) \leq C_{doub} \nu(\Delta(x, r)), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, r > 0.$$

We call the least C_{doub} the doubling constant for ν . We say a weight is doubling if $w dx$ is doubling.

We will also work with a much stronger notion of doubling.

Definition 2.2 (M -good doubling). Let $M > 1$. We say that a Borel measure ν on \mathbb{R}^n has the M -good doubling property if for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $R > 0$ it holds

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{M}\right)^{-1} \leq \frac{\nu(\Delta(x, r)) s^n}{\nu(\Delta(y, s)) r^n} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{M}, \quad \forall y \in \Delta(x, R), r, s \in [R/M, MR].$$

We say a weight w has the M -good doubling property if $w dx$ has the M -good doubling property.

Notice in the definition above $1/M^2 \leq s/r \leq M^2$, so that s and r are comparable, but that the condition does *not* guarantee any comparability of the density of ν at two nearby points since $|x - y| < M \min\{r, s\}$.

We define the related notion of A_∞ weights.

Definition 2.3 (A_∞ weights). A weight w is said to be in A_∞ if there exists a constant C such that

$$(2.4) \quad \int_{\Delta(x,r)} w(z) dz \leq C \exp \left(\int_{\Delta(x,r)} \log w(z) dz \right), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, r > 0.$$

The infimum over constants C such that the inequality (2.4) holds is called the A_∞ constant, written $[w]_{A_\infty}$.

Notice that by Jensen's inequality we always have $[w]_{A_\infty} \geq 1$, so when $[w]_{A_\infty}$ is close to 1 the weight is 'better'. There are several equivalent definitions of the A_∞ class [DMRO16] and correspondingly several alternative but not equivalent definitions of the A_∞ constant [HP13]. The original constant as in [Hru84] is however the correct one for our application. In particular, it connects to the Carleson measure condition in [FKP91]. Recall that, roughly speaking, a measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$ is Carleson if it acts like an n -dimensional measure at the boundary.

Definition 2.5 (Carleson measures). For any n -dimensional ball $\Delta(x, r)$ we define

$$T_\Delta := \Delta(x, r) \times (0, r).$$

Let μ be a Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$. We call μ a Carleson measure if

$$\|\mu\|_C := \sup_{\Delta} |\Delta|^{-1} \mu(T_\Delta) < \infty,$$

where the supremum is over all n -dimensional balls Δ in \mathbb{R}^n . We call $\|\mu\|_C$ the Carleson norm of μ .

Next we state two special properties of doubling measures. Doubling weights have the property that they assign zero measure to the boundary of balls. This can be deduced from the following lemma, which roughly says thin annuli have small measure. The statement is 'almost standard', but the usual textbook references do not formulate the right-hand side in the form that we need.

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose that ν is a doubling measure on \mathbb{R}^n with doubling constant (less than) C_{doub} . There exists a non-decreasing function $F : (1, 2] \rightarrow (1, C_{doub}]$ depending only on C_{doub} such that $\lim_{a \rightarrow 1^+} F(a) = 1$ and*

$$\frac{\nu(\Delta(x, r))}{\nu(\Delta(x, s))} \leq F \left(\frac{r}{s} \right), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, r \in (s, 2s].$$

Proof. Without loss of generality assume that $r = 1$ and $x = 0$ so that $s \in [1/2, 1)$. To reduce to this case we can replace ν by

$$\tilde{\nu}(E) := \nu(x + rE),$$

which will have the same doubling constant as ν .

Assume first $s = 1 - 2^{-k_0}$ for $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. Set $\Delta := \Delta(0, 1)$ and for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ set $s_k := 1 - 2^{-k}$ and $\Delta_k := \Delta(0, s_k)$. Define the annuli

$$A_k := \Delta \setminus \Delta_k, \quad A'_k := \Delta_{k+1} \setminus \Delta_k.$$

Notice that $A'_k = A_k \setminus A_{k+1}$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, form a maximal family of pairwise disjoint balls

$$\Delta_{k,j} := \Delta(y_j, 2^{-k-2}), \quad |y_j| = \frac{s_{k+1} + s_k}{2},$$

and let \mathcal{B}_k be the family of the indices j . Then

$$\bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{B}_k} \Delta_{k,j} \subset A'_k, \quad A_{k+1} \subset \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{B}_k} 5\Delta_{k,j},$$

where the first inclusion follows by the definition and the second one by triangle inequality and the maximality of \mathcal{B}_k . Indeed, if $z \in A_{k+1}$, then for $z' := \frac{(s_{k+1} + s_k)}{2|z|}z$ we have $|z - z'| \leq 3 \cdot 2^{-k-2}$ and, by maximality, there exists y_j such that $|z' - y_j| < 2 \cdot 2^{-k-2}$.

Now

$$\nu(A_{k+1}) \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}_k} \nu(5\Delta_{k,j}) \leq C_{doub}^3 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}_k} \nu(\Delta_{k,j}) \leq C_{doub}^3 \nu(A'_k) = C_{doub}^3 (\nu(A_k) - \nu(A_{k+1})),$$

so that

$$\nu(A_{k+1}) \leq \frac{C_{doub}^3}{1 + C_{doub}^3} \nu(A_k) =: \beta \nu(A_k)$$

and $\beta \in (0, 1)$ is fixed and depends only on doubling. Iterating this inequality, we have

$$\nu(A_{k+1}) \leq \beta^k \nu(A_1) \leq \beta^k \nu(\Delta)$$

and using that $A_{k+1} = \Delta \setminus \Delta_{k+1}$ we obtain

$$\frac{\nu(\Delta)}{\nu(\Delta_{k+1})} \leq (1 - \beta^k)^{-1},$$

which proves the claim when $s = s_{k+1}$.

Now we deal with general s . If $s \in (s_k, s_{k+1}]$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$, then we have $\nu(\Delta(0, s)) \geq \nu(\Delta(0, s_k))$ and hence the above analysis gives

$$\frac{\nu(\Delta)}{\nu(\Delta(0, s))} \leq \frac{\nu(\Delta)}{\nu(\Delta_k)} \leq (1 - \beta^{k-1})^{-1}.$$

It is always the case that for $s \in [1/2, 1]$ we have

$$\frac{\nu(\Delta)}{\nu(\Delta(0, s))} \leq C_{doub} \leq 1 + C_{doub}^3.$$

Therefore a suitable F is the piecewise defined function

$$F(a) := \begin{cases} 1 + C_{doub}^3 & \text{if } a \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}], \\ (1 - \beta^{k-1})^{-1} & \text{if } a \in [\frac{1}{s_{k+1}}, \frac{1}{s_k}) \text{ for some } k \geq 2. \end{cases} \quad \square$$

We use the property to relate rough and smooth averages of doubling weights.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ and w be a doubling weight. Then there exists $\eta > 0$ depending on C_{doub} and ϵ such that if $f \in C_c(\Delta(0, 1 + \eta))$ is radially decreasing with $f \geq 0$ and $f \equiv 1$ on $\Delta(0, 1)$, then*

$$1 \leq \frac{(f_r * w)(x)}{(\chi_r * w)(x)} \leq 1 + \epsilon, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, r > 0.$$

In particular, for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r, s > 0$ it holds

$$(1 + \epsilon)^{-1} \frac{(f_r * w)(x)}{(f_s * w)(y)} \leq \frac{w(\Delta(x, r)) s^n}{w(\Delta(y, s)) r^n} \leq (1 + \epsilon) \frac{(f_r * w)(x)}{(f_s * w)(y)}.$$

Proof. The second statement in the lemma follows from the first. To prove the first statement, we observe that

$$\chi_r \leq f_r \leq (1 + \eta)^n \chi_{(1+\eta)r}.$$

The lower bound follows immediately. Moreover, by Lemma 2.6 we have

$$r^n (f_r * w)(x) \leq w(\Delta(x, (1 + \eta)r)) \leq F(1 + \eta) w(\Delta(x, r)),$$

where we can choose $\eta > 0$ depending on doubling so that $F(1 + \eta) < 1 + \epsilon$. Here F is the function in Lemma 2.6. The claim follows by dividing both sides by $w(\Delta(x, r))$. \square

3. JUST ESTIMATES

Here, we derive estimates for the heat extension $(x, s) \mapsto (\phi_s * w)(x)$ of w , using exponential decay, positivity and symmetry of the heat kernel ϕ . The differential equation satisfied by the extension will only play a role in Section 6.

Heat averages of a doubling weight are comparable to usual averages, that is,

$$(3.1) \quad (\phi_s * w)(x) \approx s^{-n} w(\Delta(x, s)), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, s > 0,$$

with the comparability constants only depending on dimension and doubling. Indeed, it suffices to split \mathbb{R}^n into the sets $\Delta(x, s)$ and $\Delta(x, 2^k s) \setminus \Delta(x, 2^{k-1} s)$, $k \geq 1$, estimate the size of ϕ_s from above and below and use the doubling property. (See also the proof of Lemma 3.2 below where this argument will be re-used.) If the weight is M -good doubling, the constants of comparability can be quantified accordingly. Recall that we write $\tilde{\chi}$ for the normalized characteristic function of the unit ball.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and let w be a doubling weight on \mathbb{R}^n . Then there exists M only depending on dimension and ϵ so that if w has the M -good doubling property, then*

$$(3.3) \quad (1 + \epsilon)^{-1} \leq \frac{(\phi_s * w)(y)}{(\tilde{\chi}_s * w)(x)} \leq 1 + \epsilon, \quad \forall s > 0, |x - y| < s.$$

Proof. Because w and $w(y + s \cdot)$ are M -good doubling with the same M , we see by a change of variable that it suffices to show the claim for $s = 1$ and $y = 0$. We first treat the case $x = y = 0$.

Let $\theta \in (0, 1)$ to be chosen later. We let $\kappa > \pi^{n/2}$ be a very large number that is allowed to depend on θ , M and the doubling constant. Define the horizontally and vertically truncated heat kernel as

$$\phi^{(\kappa)}(z) := \mathbb{1}_{\Delta(0, \kappa)}(z) \min\{\phi(z), \pi^{-n/2} - 1/\kappa\}.$$

Clearly $\phi^{(\kappa)} \rightarrow \phi$ uniformly as $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$, and we argue by approximation.

We first claim

$$(3.4) \quad 0 \leq \frac{((\phi - \phi^{(\kappa)}) * w)(0)}{(\tilde{\chi} * w)(0)} \leq \theta$$

provided κ is sufficiently large. To this end, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi * w)(0) - (\phi^{(\kappa)} * w)(0) &= \int_{\{\phi > \pi^{-n/2} - 1/\kappa\}} (\phi - \phi^{(\kappa)})(z)w(z) dz + \int_{|y| \geq \kappa} \phi(z)w(z) dz \\ &=: \text{I} + \text{II}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking κ sufficiently large, depending on dimension, it follows from the uniform convergence

$$(3.5) \quad \{\phi > \pi^{-n/2} - 1/\kappa\} \subset \Delta(0, 1), \quad \|\phi - \phi^{(\kappa)}\|_\infty < \frac{\theta}{2|\Delta(0, 1)|}$$

so that

$$\text{I} \leq \frac{\theta w(\Delta(0, 1))}{2|\Delta(0, 1)|}.$$

To bound II, we assume that $\kappa = 2^{k_0}$ for some k_0 large and hence by estimating the size of ϕ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{II} &\leq \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-2^{2k}\kappa^2}}{\pi^{n/2}} \int_{\{2^k \leq |y| < 2^{k+1}\}} w(z) dz \leq \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-2^{2k}\kappa^2} C^{k+1}}{\pi^{n/2}} w(\Delta(0, 1)) \\ &\leq \frac{\theta w(\Delta(0, 1))}{2|\Delta(0, 1)|}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining our estimates for I and II, we have shown that (3.4) holds. Now we fix a $\kappa = 2^{k_0}$ such that the estimates above hold and, in addition,

$$(3.6) \quad (1 + \theta)^{-1/2} \leq \|\phi^{(\kappa)}\|_1 \leq 1,$$

which can be done by the monotone convergence theorem.

As the approximation error is small according to (3.4), it remains to show the claimed inequality for the approximant $\phi^{(\kappa)}$ in place of ϕ . To this end, we show

$$(3.7) \quad (1 + \theta)^{-1} \leq \frac{(\phi^{(\kappa)} * w)(0)}{(\tilde{\chi} * w)(0)} \leq 1 + \theta.$$

We denote

$$\Delta_\lambda = \{z : \phi^{(\kappa)}(z) > \lambda\}.$$

The set Δ_λ is a ball centered at the origin if $\lambda < \pi^{-n/2} - 1/\kappa$ and a set of measure zero otherwise. Moreover, for κ large enough and $r_0 := (-\log(1 - \pi^{n/2}/\kappa))^{1/2}$ we have

$$(3.8) \quad r_0 \leq r(\Delta_\lambda) \leq \kappa, \quad \forall \lambda \in (0, \pi^{-n/2} - 1/\kappa).$$

By definition of Δ_λ , we can write

$$\phi^{(\kappa)}(z) = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}_{\Delta_\lambda}(z) d\lambda$$

and it follows

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} (\phi^{(\kappa)} * w)(0) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \phi^{(\kappa)}(z)w(z) dz = \int_0^{\pi^{-n/2-1/\kappa}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} w(z)\mathbb{1}_{\Delta_\lambda}(z) dz d\lambda \\ &= \int_0^{\pi^{-n/2-1/\kappa}} w(\Delta_\lambda) d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (3.8), provided M is sufficiently large, the M -good doubling gives the estimate

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{M}\right)^{-1} w(\Delta(0, 1))r(\Delta_\lambda)^n \leq w(\Delta_\lambda) \leq w(\Delta(0, 1))r(\Delta_\lambda)^n \left(1 + \frac{1}{M}\right)$$

where M is allowed to depend on θ . It follows from the Cavalieri principle and (3.9) that if M is sufficiently large ($(1 + 1/M) \leq (1 + \theta)^{1/2}$ to be precise), then

$$\frac{w(\Delta(0, 1))}{|\Delta(0, 1)|(1 + \theta)^{1/2}} \|\phi^{(\kappa)}\|_1 \leq (\phi^{(\kappa)} * w)(0) \leq \frac{w(\Delta(0, 1))(1 + \theta)^{1/2}}{|\Delta(0, 1)|} \|\phi^{(\kappa)}\|_1.$$

Thus using (3.6), the proof of (3.7) is complete.

Combining the estimates (3.7) and (3.4), we have

$$(3.10) \quad (1 + \theta)^{-1} \leq \frac{(\phi * w)(0)}{(\tilde{\chi} * w)(0)} \leq 1 + 2\theta.$$

Picking first θ small and then κ and M large, this yields the claim when $x = y = 0$ and $s = 1$ with the prescribed ϵ . Finally, if $|x| < 1$, the M -good doubling property yields

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{M}\right)^{-1} \frac{(\phi * w)(0)}{(\tilde{\chi} * w)(0)} \leq \frac{(\phi * w)(0)}{(\tilde{\chi} * w)(x)} \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{M}\right) \frac{(\phi * w)(0)}{(\tilde{\chi} * w)(0)}.$$

Picking M even larger yields the claim in the case $y = 0$ and $s = 1$ and the proof is complete. \square

Next we prove a lemma which allows us to compare nearby values of $w * \psi_s$ for any doubling weight. Recall that $\psi = \nabla\phi$.

Lemma 3.11. *Let w be a doubling weight. For every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ there exists $\beta \in (0, 1/2)$ depending on α , dimension and the doubling constant of w such that if $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $r > 0$, $y \in \Delta(x, \beta r)$ and $s \in ((1 - \beta)r, r]$, then*

$$\frac{|(\psi_r * w)(x) - (\psi_s * w)(y)|}{w(\Delta(x, r))} \leq \alpha.$$

Proof. As usual we may assume $x = 0$ and $r = 1$. Without any restrictions on β , aside from being in $(0, 1/2)$, we may find $R^* > 10$ depending on α , n and doubling such that

$$\int_{|z| \geq R^*} |\psi(-z)|w(z) dz, \int_{|z| \geq R^*} |\psi_s(y - z)|w(z) dz \leq \frac{\alpha}{3} w(\Delta(0, 1))$$

The first bound follows immediately by estimating the size of ψ on annuli as in the estimate of Π in the proof of Lemma 3.2. To obtain the second bound one uses in addition that $|z|/2 \leq |y - z| \leq 2|z|$.

To complete the proof of the lemma it suffices to show, with R^* now fixed, that

$$\int_{\Delta(0, R^*)} |\psi(-z) - \psi_s(y-z)| w(z) dz \leq \frac{\alpha}{3} w(\Delta(0, 1)).$$

Using the doubling property of w , we bound the left-hand side above by

$$(C_{doub})^{\lceil \log_2 R^* \rceil} E(R^*, y, s) w(\Delta(0, 1)),$$

where

$$E(R^*, y, s) := \sup_{|z| \leq R^*} |\psi(-z) - \psi_s(y-z)|.$$

Since R^* is fixed and ψ is uniformly continuous, it holds for s sufficiently close to 1 and $|y|$ sufficiently small that

$$E(R^*, y, s) \leq \frac{(C_{doub})^{-\lceil \log_2 R^* \rceil} \alpha}{3}.$$

Therefore by choosing β sufficiently small the lemma holds. \square

The next lemma says that the gradient of the heat extension is small relative to the extension itself, provided w has very good doubling properties.

Lemma 3.12. *Let w be a doubling weight and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. There exists a constant M depending on dimension and ϵ such that if w is M -good doubling, then*

$$(3.13) \quad \frac{|(\psi_s * w)(x)|}{(\phi_s * w)(x)} \leq \epsilon, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, r > 0.$$

Proof. We work with $M \geq 2$ so that the doubling constant for w is uniformly bounded. By translation and dilation, we assume as usual that $x = 0$ and $r = 1$. Taking (3.1) into account, it is then enough to obtain the bound

$$(3.14) \quad |(\psi * w)(0)| \leq 3\epsilon w(\Delta(0, 1))$$

for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$ provided M is large enough depending on dimension and ϵ .

Using Lemma 3.11, there exists $\eta \in (0, 1)$ depending on dimension and ϵ such that

$$(3.15) \quad |(\psi * w)(0) - (\psi * w)(y)| \leq \epsilon w(\Delta(0, 1)), \quad \forall |y| < \eta.$$

We fix this η and recall

$$\tilde{\chi} = |\Delta(0, 1)|^{-1} \chi_{\Delta(0, 1)}.$$

Then by (3.15),

$$(3.16) \quad |(\psi * w)(0) - (\tilde{\chi}_\eta * \psi * w)(0)| \leq \epsilon w(\Delta(0, 1))$$

and hence it suffices to bound the magnitude of $(\tilde{\chi}_\eta * \psi * w)(0)$ by $2\epsilon w(\Delta(0, 1))$.

Recall that ϕ is radially symmetric, and hence $\psi = \nabla \phi$ is odd. Set $A_k := \Delta(0, 2^k) \setminus \Delta(0, 2^{k-1})$ for $k \geq 1$ and $A_0 := \Delta(0, 1)$. Consider a large integer k_0 to be chosen

later. Using that ψ is odd, we observe

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tilde{\chi}_\eta * \psi * w)(0) &= \int \psi(-y) (\tilde{\chi}_\eta * w)(y) dy \\
(3.17) \quad &= \int \psi(-y) \frac{w(\Delta(y, \eta)) - w(\Delta(-y, \eta))}{2|\Delta(0, \eta)|} dy \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{A_k} \psi(-y) \frac{w(\Delta(y, \eta)) - w(\Delta(-y, \eta))}{2|\Delta(0, \eta)|} dy.
\end{aligned}$$

By doubling and kernel decay we may choose k_0 large enough (depending on dimension) so that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.18) \quad \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \int_{A_k} |\psi(-y) w(\Delta(\pm y, \eta))| dy &\leq \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} C_{doub}^{k+1} 2^{k+1} \pi^{-n/2} e^{-2^{2(k-1)}} w(\Delta(0, 1)) \\
&\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} w(\Delta(0, 1)).
\end{aligned}$$

We fix such a k_0 now. If w has M -good doubling with $M \geq \eta^{-1} 2^{k_0-1}$, we have for $k \leq k_0 - 1$ and $y \in A_k$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{|w(\Delta(y, \eta)) - w(\Delta(-y, \eta))|}{2|\Delta(0, \eta)|} &\leq \frac{w(\Delta(0, 2^k + \eta))}{2|\Delta(0, 2^k + \eta)|} \left(1 + \frac{1}{M} - \left(1 + \frac{1}{M} \right)^{-1} \right) \\
&= \frac{w(\Delta(0, 2^k + \eta))}{|\Delta(0, 2^k + \eta)|} \frac{2M + 1}{2M(M + 1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, crudely controlling the size of ψ , we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.19) \quad &\left| \sum_{k=0}^{k_0-1} \int_{A_k} \psi(-y) \cdot \frac{w(\Delta(y, \eta)) - w(\Delta(-y, \eta))}{2|\Delta(0, \eta)|} dy \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{k_0-1} 2^{k+1} \pi^{-n/2} e^{-2^{2(k-1)}} |A_k| \frac{w(\Delta(0, 2^k + \eta))}{|\Delta(0, 2^k + \eta)|} \frac{2M + 1}{2M(M + 1)} \\
&\leq w(\Delta(0, 1)) \frac{2M + 1}{M(M + 1)} \pi^{-n/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C_{doub}^{k+1} 2^k e^{-2^{2(k-1)}} \\
&\leq \epsilon w(\Delta(0, 1)),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds provided M is large enough. Combining (3.16) with (3.17), (3.18) and (3.19), the proof of (3.14) is complete. \square

4. A SMOOTH TESTING CONDITION FOR M -GOOD DOUBLING

Here, we discuss a sufficient smooth testing condition for M -good doubling. Recall we have fixed the non-negative and radially decreasing function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Delta(0, 2))$ with $\nabla \varphi = 0$ on $\Delta(0, 1)$ and $\|\varphi\|_1 = 1$. Given $\eta > 0$, we define

$$\tilde{\varphi}^\eta(x) := (\mathbb{1}_{\Delta(0, 1+\eta/2)} * \varphi_{\eta/4})(x).$$

Note that $\tilde{\varphi}^\eta$ is suitable for use in Lemma 2.7. In particular, $\tilde{\varphi}^\eta \equiv 1$ on $\Delta(0, 1)$ and $\tilde{\varphi}^\eta \in C_c^\infty(\Delta(0, 1 + \eta))$. Furthermore, we denote

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{y,r}^\eta(x) := \frac{1}{r^n} \tilde{\varphi}^\eta\left(\frac{x-y}{r}\right).$$

The following lemma is our sufficient condition for M -good doubling in terms of smooth averages instead of measures of balls.

Lemma 4.1. *Let w be a doubling weight. For every $M > 1$ there exist $\eta \in (0, 1)$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ both depending on M , the dimension and the doubling constant, such that if*

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{|((\tilde{\varphi}_{y_1, r_1}^\eta - \tilde{\varphi}_{y_2, r_2}^\eta)_R * w)(x)|}{(\phi_R * w)(x)} \leq \epsilon$$

holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $R > 0$, $y_1, y_2 \in \Delta(0, M)$, $r_1, r_2 \in [1/M, M]$, then w has the M -good doubling property.

Proof. We choose η so that Lemma 2.7 holds with $1/(2M)$ in place of ϵ therein. By (3.1) and doubling there exists C_0 only depending on M, n, C_{doub} , such that

$$(4.3) \quad (\phi_R * w)(0) \leq (C_0)^{-1} r^{-n} w(\Delta(0, r)), \quad \forall r \in [R/M, MR].$$

We set $\epsilon := C_0/(2M + 1)$. With these choices of η and ϵ we are going to prove the contrapositive of the claimed implication.

If w fails to have the M -good doubling property, there exist $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $R > 0$, $y \in \Delta(x, R)$ and $r, s \in [R/M, MR]$ such that

$$(4.4) \quad \frac{s^n w(\Delta(x, r))}{r^n w(\Delta(y, s))} \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{M}\right)^{-1}.$$

By translation we may assume as usual that $x = 0$. By Lemma 2.7 applied with the weight $w_{0,1/r}$, which has the same doubling properties as w , we get

$$(4.5) \quad 1 \leq \frac{((\tilde{\varphi}_{0,r/R}^\eta)_R * w)(0)}{r^{-n} w(\Delta(0, r))} = \frac{(\tilde{\varphi}_{0,r}^\eta * w)(0)}{r^{-n} w(\Delta(0, r))} = \frac{(\tilde{\varphi}^\eta * w_{0,1/r})(0)}{w_{0,1/r}(\Delta(0, 1))} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2M}$$

and likewise

$$(4.6) \quad 1 \leq \frac{((\tilde{\varphi}_{y/R, s/R}^\eta)_R * w)(0)}{s^{-n} w(\Delta(y, s))} = \frac{(\tilde{\varphi}_{y,s}^\eta * w)(0)}{s^{-n} w(\Delta(y, s))} = \frac{(\tilde{\varphi}^\eta * w_{y/s, 1/s})(0)}{w_{y/s, 1/s}(\Delta(0, 1))} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2M}.$$

By (4.3),

$$\frac{|((\tilde{\varphi}_{0,r}^\eta - \tilde{\varphi}_{y,s}^\eta) * w)(0)|}{(\phi_R * w)(0)} \geq C_0 \frac{|((\tilde{\varphi}_{0,r}^\eta - \tilde{\varphi}_{y,s}^\eta) * w)(0)|}{r^{-n} w(\Delta(0, r))} \geq C_0 \frac{|((\tilde{\varphi}_{0,r}^\eta - \tilde{\varphi}_{y,s}^\eta) * w)(0)|}{\tilde{\varphi}_{0,r}^\eta * w(0)},$$

where we used (4.5) in the last inequality. Then using (4.5), (4.6) and (4.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|((\tilde{\varphi}_{0,r/R}^\eta - \tilde{\varphi}_{y/R, s/R}^\eta)_R * w)(0)|}{(\phi_R * w)(0)} &\geq C_0 \left(\frac{(\tilde{\varphi}_{y,s}^\eta * w)(0)}{(\tilde{\varphi}_{0,r}^\eta * w)(0)} - 1 \right) \\ &\geq C_0 \left(\frac{s^{-n} w(\Delta(y, s))}{(1 + \frac{1}{2M}) r^{-n} w(\Delta(0, r))} - 1 \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\geq C_0 \left(\frac{1 + \frac{1}{M}}{1 + \frac{1}{2M}} - 1 \right) = \epsilon.$$

This means that (4.2) fails for some choice of admissible parameters. Therefore the proof is complete. \square

We can connect the test functions appearing on the left hand side of (4.2) to the gradient of the heat kernel. This is the content of Lemma 4.7 below. It is a direct application of [Kor98a, Lemma 11] once we notice, given any finite family of Schwartz seminorms, the family of test functions with mean zero

$$\{\tilde{\varphi}_{y_1, r_1}^\eta - \tilde{\varphi}_{y_2, r_2}^\eta : x \in \mathbb{R}^n, y_1, y_2 \in \Delta(0, M), r_1, r_2 \in [1/M, M]\}$$

is uniformly bounded with upper bound depending on η , M , the dimension and the finite family of seminorms that was chosen.

Lemma 4.7. *Let w be a doubling weight. For every fixed M and η there exists a constant $C_1 \geq 1$ depending on M , η , dimension and the doubling constant of w such that*

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \\ R > 0}} \frac{|((\tilde{\varphi}_{y_1, r_1}^\eta - \tilde{\varphi}_{y_2, r_2}^\eta)_R * w)(x)|}{(\phi_R * w)(x)} \leq C_1 \sup_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \\ R > 0}} \frac{|(\psi_R * w)(x)|}{(\phi_R * w)(x)},$$

for all $y_1, y_2 \in \Delta(0, M)$, $r_1, r_2 \in [1/M, M]$.

5. CONTROL ON THE CARLESON NORM GIVES BETTER DOUBLING

We continue to assume w is doubling. We associate to w a measure μ_w on $\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} := \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$ defined by

$$d\mu_w(x, r) := |\nabla_x \log(\phi_r * w)(x)|^2 r \, dx \, dr.$$

A computation shows that

$$(5.1) \quad d\mu_w(x, r) = \frac{|(\psi_r * w)(x)|^2 \, dx \, dr}{((\phi_r * w)(x))^2 \, r}.$$

Recall our main theorem, Theorem 1.1, says that when $d\mu_w$ has small Carleson norm, then the A_∞ constant of w is close to 1. An important step is to show that if the Carleson norm is sufficiently small, then w is M -good doubling.

Proposition 5.2. *Let w be a doubling weight define the measure μ_w as above. For every $M > 1$ there exists $\delta_M > 0$ depending on M , n and the doubling constant for w such that if*

$$\|\mu_w\|_C \leq \delta_M,$$

then w is M -good doubling.

Proof. By Lemma 4.1, to show M -good doubling it is enough to show

$$(5.3) \quad \frac{|(H_R * w)(x)|}{(\phi_R * w)(x)} \leq \epsilon, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, R > 0$$

for all H as on the left hand-side of (4.2) with ϵ as specified in Lemma 4.1. By Lemma 4.7, to prove the proposition it suffices to show that there exists δ_M depending on ϵ , n and the doubling constant for w such that if

$$\|\mu_w\|_C \leq \delta_M,$$

then

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \\ R > 0}} \frac{|(\psi_R * w)(x)|}{(\phi_R * w)(x)} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{C_1}.$$

Here, C_1 is the constant in Lemma 4.7 when applied with the parameter η specifying the class of test functions H . We will choose δ_M later.

Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $R > 0$ such that

$$(5.4) \quad \frac{|(\psi_R * w)(x)|}{(\phi_R * w)(x)} > \frac{\epsilon}{C_1} =: \theta.$$

By Lemma 3.11, doubling and (3.1) there exists $\beta \in (0, 1)$ depending on n , θ , R and the doubling constant of w such that

$$\frac{|(\psi_r * w)(y)|}{(\phi_r * w)(y)} \geq \beta\theta$$

for all $y \in \Delta(x, \beta R)$ and $r \in ((1 - \beta)R, R)$. Then, using (5.1), we have for $T_{\Delta(x, R)} := \Delta(x, R) \times (0, R)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_w(T_{\Delta(x, R)}) &= \int_0^R \int_{\Delta(x, R)} \frac{|(\psi_r * w)(y)|^2}{((\phi_r * w)(y))^2} \frac{dy dr}{r} \\ &\geq \int_{(1-\beta)R}^R \int_{\Delta(x, \beta R)} \beta^2 \theta^2 \frac{dy dr}{r} \\ &= \left(\log \frac{1}{1-\beta} \right) \beta^2 \theta^2 |\Delta(x, \beta R)| \\ &\geq c\theta^2 |\Delta(x, R)|, \end{aligned}$$

where c depends on β and doubling. Thus, setting $\delta_M := c\theta^2/2$, it can never be that (5.4) is true if $\|\mu_w\|_C \leq \delta_M$. This yields the desired contradiction and the proof is complete. \square

6. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

Throughout this section we let u be the heat extension of w with the proper parabolic scaling

$$u(x, s) := (\phi_{\sqrt{s}} * w)(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, s > 0.$$

We have all the estimates of the previous section at our disposal but here we are going to use in addition that u is a solution to the heat(-like) equation $\partial_t u - \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{div}_x(\nabla_x u) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$ with $u(x, s) \rightarrow w(x)$ as $s \rightarrow 0$ for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. A convenient way to see the convergence at the boundary is to consider separately local and global parts of w in and outside of some fixed ball Δ . For the local part the result is classical [Ste93, Section I.6.1] and for $x \in \frac{1}{2}\Delta$ the global part

vanishes in the limit as $s \rightarrow 0$ using doubling of w and the decay of ϕ as in the proof of Lemma 3.3.

By means of u , the measure μ_w under consideration can be written as

$$d\mu_w(y, s) = \frac{|\nabla_x u(y, s^2)|^2}{u(y, s^2)^2} s \, dy \, ds,$$

so that by a change of variables,

$$(6.1) \quad \mu_w(T_{\Delta(x,r)}) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{r^2} \int_{\Delta(x,r)} \frac{|\nabla_x u(y, s)|^2}{u(y, s)^2} \, dy \, ds, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, r > 0.$$

The fundamental observation that goes back to the proof of [FKP91, Theorem 3.4] is that via the heat equation the quadratic quantity on the right can be recovered as

$$\partial_t \log u - \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{div}_x (\nabla_x \log u) = \frac{1}{4} \frac{|\nabla_x u|^2}{u^2}.$$

Thus, integration by parts in (6.1) immediately yields the following lemma. We write $\gamma_n := |\Delta(0, 1)|$ and H^{n-1} for the $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure in \mathbb{R}^n .

Lemma 6.2. *Let w be a doubling weight, u be the heat extension of w and μ_w the measure defined above. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$,*

$$\frac{1}{2} |\Delta(x, r)|^{-1} \mu(T_{\Delta(x,r)}) = h_1(x, r) + h_2(x, r),$$

where

$$h_1(x, r) = \frac{1}{\gamma_n r^n} \int_{|x-y| < r} \log \left(\frac{u(y, r^2)}{w(y)} \right) \, dy$$

and

$$h_2(x, r) = -\frac{1}{4\gamma_n r^n} \int_0^{r^2} \int_{|x-y|=r} \frac{\nabla_x u(y, s)}{u(y, s)} \cdot \frac{y-x}{|y-x|} \, dH^{n-1}(y) \, ds.$$

Using this computation and the work we have done, we may prove the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By Proposition 5.2, M -good doubling follows from our assumption, and making δ smaller, we may assume M to be as large as we wish. Fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$. By assumption

$$0 \leq h_1(x, r) + h_2(x, r) \leq \frac{\delta}{2},$$

where δ is to be fixed later and the functions h_1 and h_2 are defined in Lemma 6.2. We write

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(x, r) &= \frac{1}{\gamma_n r^n} \int_{|x-y| < r} \log \left(\frac{\gamma_n^{-1} r^{-n} w(\Delta(x, r))}{w(y)} \right) \, dy \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\gamma_n r^n} \int_{|x-y| < r} \log \left(\frac{u(y, r^2)}{\gamma_n^{-1} r^{-n} w(\Delta(x, r))} \right) \, dy \\ &=: \frac{1}{\gamma_n r^n} \int_{|x-y| < r} \log \left(\frac{\gamma_n^{-1} r^{-n} w(\Delta(x, r))}{w(y)} \right) \, dy \\ &\quad + \tilde{h}_1(x, r). \end{aligned}$$

We are going to show

$$(6.3) \quad |\tilde{h}_1(x, r)| \leq \delta$$

and

$$(6.4) \quad |h_2(x, r)| \leq \delta.$$

Let us take the claim for granted momentarily and conclude the theorem. The computations above along with the claim give

$$\left| \frac{1}{\gamma_n r^n} \int_{|x-y|<r} \log \left(\frac{\gamma_n^{-1} r^{-n} w(\Delta(x, r))}{w(y)} \right) dy \right| \leq \frac{5\delta}{2}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \log \int_{\Delta(x, r)} w(y) dy - \int_{\Delta(x, r)} \log w(y) dy \right| \\ &= \left| \log(\gamma_n^{-1} r^{-n} w(\Delta(x, r))) - \int_{\Delta(x, r)} \log w(y) dy \right| \leq \frac{5\delta}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by making δ small enough to ensure $e^{5\delta/2} < 1 + \epsilon$, we have that $[w]_{A_\infty} \leq 1 + \epsilon$ (see Definition 2.3). It thus remains to prove (6.3) and (6.4).

Let $\epsilon' \in (0, 1)$ be fixed later and let M be large enough so that (3.3) and Lemma 3.12 hold with ϵ' in place of ϵ . From (3.3) we have

$$\left| \log \left(\frac{u(y, r^2)}{\gamma_n^{-1} r^{-n} w(\Delta(x, r))} \right) \right| \leq \log(1 + \epsilon'), \quad \forall y \in \Delta(x, r).$$

Then using the definition of $\tilde{h}_1(x, r)$,

$$|\tilde{h}_1(x, r)| \leq \log(1 + \epsilon')$$

and hence (6.3) holds if ϵ' is sufficiently small. Using Lemma 3.12, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |h_2(x, r)| &\leq \frac{1}{4\gamma_n r^n} \int_0^{r^2} \int_{|x-y|=r} \frac{|\nabla_x u(y, s)|}{u(y, s)} dH^{n-1}(y) ds \\ &= \frac{n}{r} \int_0^{r^2} \int_{|x-y|=r} \frac{|\nabla_x u(y, s)|}{u(y, s)} dH^{n-1}(y) ds \\ &= \frac{n}{r} \int_0^{r^2} \int_{|x-y|=r} \frac{|s^{-1/2}(\psi_{\sqrt{s}} * w)(y)|}{(\phi_{\sqrt{s}} * w)(y)} dH^{n-1}(y) ds \\ &\leq \frac{n}{r} \int_0^{r^2} \epsilon' s^{-1/2} ds = 2n\epsilon'. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (6.4) holds if ϵ' is sufficiently small. As we have shown (6.3) and (6.4), the proof of the theorem is complete. \square

To conclude this section, we note that the role of the heat kernel is important in the ‘Fefferman-Kenig-Pipher computation’, but by a change of kernel argument, it is not (as) important in the Carleson condition. In fact, we may replace the Gaussian with a general non-negative (non-zero) Schwartz function at the cost of a constant depending on the Schwartz function and the doubling constant. This is the

content of [Kor98a, Corollary 12]. For the purposes of the next section, we present the following theorem based on this fact.

Theorem 6.5. *Let w be a doubling weight on \mathbb{R}^n . Define the measures μ_w and $\tilde{\mu}_w$ by*

$$d\mu_w(x, r) := |\nabla_x \log(\phi_r * w)(x)|^2 r \, dx \, dr$$

and

$$(6.6) \quad d\tilde{\mu}_w(x, r) := |\nabla_x \log(\varphi_r * w)(x)|^2 r \, dx \, dr.$$

Then $\|\mu_w\|_C < \infty$ if and only if $\|\tilde{\mu}_w\|_C < \infty$. Moreover, there exists a constant $C_2 > 1$ depending on n and the doubling constant of w such that

$$(6.7) \quad \frac{1}{C_2} \|\mu_w\|_C \leq \|\tilde{\mu}_w\|_C \leq C_2 \|\mu_w\|_C.$$

In particular, for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ depending on ϵ , dimension and the doubling constant such that

$$\|\tilde{\mu}_w\|_C \leq \delta$$

implies $[w]_{A_\infty} \leq 1 + \epsilon$.

All of the statements in Theorem 6.5 can be deduced from [Kor98a, Corollary 12] except for the existence of δ . The existence of δ follows from (6.7) and Theorem 1.1.

7. AN APPLICATION TO ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS SATISFYING THE DAHLBERG-KENIG-PIPHER CONDITION.

Here, we apply our quantitative estimates to the study of elliptic measures for elliptic operators satisfying the Dahlberg-Kenig-Pipher (DKP) condition. We use the notation $\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} := \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$ below. We need to give several definitions before stating our application.

Definition 7.1 (Elliptic Matrices and Operators). Fix $\Lambda \geq 1$. We say a matrix-valued function $A : \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} \rightarrow M_{n+1}(\mathbb{R})$ is Λ -elliptic if $\|A\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1})} \leq \Lambda$ and

$$\langle A(X)\xi, \xi \rangle \geq \Lambda^{-1} |\xi|^2, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, X \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}.$$

We say A is elliptic if it is Λ -elliptic for some $\Lambda \geq 1$. The smallest constant $\Lambda \geq 1$ such that A is Λ -elliptic is called the ellipticity constant of A . We say L is a divergence form elliptic operator (on \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}) if $L = -\operatorname{div} A \nabla$ (viewed in the weak sense) for an elliptic matrix A . We denote by A^T the transpose of A and by L^T the transpose of the associated operator, which is again a divergence form elliptic operator. Given $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ open we say $u \in W_{loc}^{1,2}(\Omega)$ is a weak solution to $Lu = 0$ in Ω if

$$\iint A \nabla u \cdot \nabla F \, dX = 0, \quad \forall F \in C_c^\infty(\Omega).$$

For every elliptic operator there is an associated family of elliptic measures.

Definition 7.2 (Elliptic measure and the Green function). Let $L = -\operatorname{div} A \nabla$ be a divergence form elliptic operator on \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} . There exists a family of Borel probability measures on \mathbb{R}^n , $\{\omega_L^X\}_{X \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$, such that for $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the function

$$u(X) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(y) d\omega_L^X(y)$$

is the unique weak solution to the Dirichlet problem

$$(D)_L \begin{cases} Lu = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}, \\ u|_{\mathbb{R}^n} = f, \end{cases}$$

satisfying $u \in C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} \cup \{\infty\})$, that is, $u(X) \rightarrow 0$ as $|X| \rightarrow \infty$ in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} . We call the measure ω_L^X the elliptic measure with pole at X .

By [HMT17, Lemma 2.25], there is a Green function associated to L in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} ,

$$G_L(X, Y) : \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} \setminus \{(x, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

which satisfies the following. For fixed $X \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ the Green function can be extended, as a function in Y , to a function that vanishes continuously on the boundary \mathbb{R}^n . The following ‘Riesz formula’ holds and connects the elliptic measure and the Green function: If $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $F \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ are such that $F|_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}} = f$, then

$$(7.3) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(y) d\omega_L^X(y) - F(X) = - \iint A^T(Y) \nabla_Y G_L(X, Y) \cdot \nabla_Y F(Y) dY.$$

There is also a notion of Green function and elliptic measure with pole at infinity.

Lemma 7.4 (Green function and elliptic measure at infinity [BTZ21, Lemma 3.5]). *Let L be a divergence form elliptic operator (on \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}) with Green function $G_L(X, Y)$. Define the sequence of functions $u_k : \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by*

$$u_k(Y) := \frac{G_L((0, 2^k), Y)}{G_L((0, 2^k), (0, 1))},$$

where we have extended u_k to the boundary by zero ($u_k(y, 0) = 0$, $\forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n$). There exists a subsequence u_{k_j} such that u_{k_j} converges uniformly on compact subsets of $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$ to a function U with the following properties.

- $U(y, 0) = 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
- $U(0, 1) = 1$.
- $U(Y) > 0$ for all $Y \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$.
- $U \in C(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}})$.
- U solves $L^T U = 0$ in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} .

Moreover, there exists a locally finite doubling measure ω_L^∞ on \mathbb{R}^n with

$$\frac{1}{G((0, 2^{k_j}), (0, 1))} \omega_L^{(0, 2^{k_j})} \rightarrow \omega_L^\infty$$

such that the following Riesz formula holds

$$(7.5) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(y) d\omega_L^\infty(y) = - \iint_{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} A^T(Y) \nabla_Y U(Y) \cdot \nabla_Y F(Y) dY,$$

whenever $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $F \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ are such that $F|_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}} = f$.

We call ω_L^∞ the elliptic measure with pole at infinity and U the Green function with pole at infinity.

We define the following coefficients which measure the oscillation of an elliptic matrix on various regions.

Definition 7.6 (Oscillation Coefficients). Let A be a Λ -elliptic matrix-value function on \mathbb{R}^{n+1} . For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$ we define

$$\alpha_2(x, r) := \inf_{A_0 \in \mathfrak{A}(\Lambda)} \left(\iint_{(y,s) \in W(x,r)} |A(y, s) - A_0|^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

where $\mathfrak{A}(\Lambda)$ denotes the collection of all *constant* Λ -elliptic matrices.

Now we recall the weak DKP condition and the associated norm.

Definition 7.7 (weak DKP condition). We say a Λ -elliptic matrix A satisfies the weak DKP condition if ν defined by

$$d\nu(x, r) := \alpha_2(x, r)^2 \frac{dx dr}{r}$$

is a Carleson measure. If A satisfies the weak DKP condition, we call $\|\nu\|_C$ the weak DKP norm of A .

Remark 7.8. There are other similar oscillation coefficients that are either controlled by, or comparable to, $\alpha_2(x, r)$. For instance, the weak DKP condition here is implied by the original DKP condition. Since this is not the focus of the present work, we do not go into the details. See [DPP07, DLM21a, BTZ21].

The following was proved in [BTZ21], by using estimates produced in [DLM21a].

Theorem 7.9 ([BTZ21, Theorem 4.1]). *Let A be a Λ -elliptic matrix-valued function on \mathbb{R}^{n+1} and let ω be the elliptic measure for $L = -\operatorname{div} A \nabla$ with pole at infinity. Define the measure*

$$d\mu(x, r) := |\nabla_x \log(\varphi_r * \omega)(x)|^2 r dx dr = \frac{|((\nabla \varphi)_r * \omega)(x)|^2 dx dr}{|(\varphi_r * \omega)(x)|^2 r}.$$

Suppose that A satisfies the weak DKP condition, that $\alpha_2(x, r)$ are the oscillation coefficients of A and define

$$d\nu(x, r) := \alpha_2(x, r)^2 \frac{dx dr}{r}.$$

Then $\omega \ll \mathcal{L}^n$ and there exists a constant C_3 depending on n and Λ such that

$$\|\mu\|_C \leq C_3 \|\nu\|_C.$$

In the theorem \mathcal{L}^n is n -dimensional Lebesgue measure and the statement $\omega \ll \mathcal{L}^n$ follows from the fact that $\|\mu\|_C < \infty$, see Remark 1.2. From Theorems 6.5 and 7.9 we may immediately deduce the following, which is our main application of the present work.

Theorem 7.10. *Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and $\Lambda > 1$. There exists $\delta > 0$ depending only on n , Λ and ϵ such that the following holds. If A is a Λ -elliptic matrix-value function on*

\mathbb{R}^{n+1} , ω is the elliptic measure for $L = -\operatorname{div} A \nabla$ with pole at infinity and A satisfies the weak DKP condition with

$$\|v\|_C \leq \delta,$$

then $\omega \in A_\infty$ with $[\omega]_{A_\infty} \leq 1 + \epsilon$. Here, v is defined by

$$dv(x, r) := \alpha_2(x, r)^2 \frac{dx dr}{r},$$

where $\alpha_2(x, r)$ are the oscillation coefficients of A .

Let us offer a little more motivation for Theorem 7.10. The study of operators with coefficients with *small* DKP norm was initiated by Dindos, Petermichl and Pipher [DPP07], where they show that the L^p -Dirichlet problem is solvable for small $p > 1$ provided that the (original) DKP norm is sufficiently small. Theorem 7.10 and pole change argument should allow one to recover this result in the upper half space even under the weak DKP condition. Additionally, it would allow one to control the BMO norm of the logarithm of the elliptic kernel at small scales. It also seems that one could push these results to the context of Lipschitz domains with small constant (as in [DPP07]) by using the ‘Dahlberg-Kenig-Stein pullback’ [Dah86] and carefully tracking the constants, see [DPP07, KP01]. If one is able to work in Lipschitz domains with small constant, then one could attempt to work in even more exotic geometric settings as was done in the pioneering work of [KT97] (for constant coefficient operators). Some variable coefficient adaptations of the tools in [KT97] can be found in [BTZ20]. Finally, we remark that David, Li and Mayboroda have provided higher co-dimensional analogues of [DLM21a] in [DLM21b]. It may be that the tools in the present work and [BTZ21] could be useful in this higher co-dimensional setting, but we have not investigated this nor have we investigated the methods in [BTZ20] in higher co-dimension setting.

8. THE CONVERSE OF THEOREM 1.1

We briefly sketch the ideas to the converse of Theorem 1.1. In particular, we sketch the proof of the following theorem.

Theorem 8.1. *Let w be a doubling weight on \mathbb{R}^n . Set $\phi(x) := \pi^{-n/2} e^{-|x|^2}$ and define the measure μ_w on $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$ by*

$$d\mu_w(x, r) := |\nabla_x \log(\phi_r * w)(x)|^2 r dx dr,$$

where $\phi_r(x) = r^{-n} \phi(x/r)$. For every $\delta > 0$ there exists ϵ depending on δ and n such that if the A_∞ characteristic of w satisfies $[w]_{A_\infty} \leq 1 + \epsilon$, then the Carleson norm of μ_w satisfies $\|\mu_w\|_C \leq \delta$.

Here we note that the $[w]_{A_\infty} \leq 2$ will imply the doubling constant is bounded, so that the δ' in the theorem need not depend on the doubling of w . Upon inspection of the proof of Theorem 1.1 we see that in fact we have shown

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\mu_w\|_C \leq \log [w]_{A_\infty} + \mathcal{E},$$

where \mathcal{E} (stands for ‘error’) is the quantity

$$\mathcal{E} := \sup_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \\ r > 0}} |\tilde{h}_1(x, r)| + |h_2(x, r)|.$$

(The quantities $\tilde{h}_1(x, r)$ and $h_2(x, r)$ are defined above in Lemma 6.2 and in the proof of Theorem 1.1.) Moreover, the proof of Theorem 1.1 shows that \mathcal{E} is small provided that w has the M -good doubling property for some sufficiently large M . Therefore to show Theorem 8.1 it suffices to show the following lemma.

Lemma 8.2. *For every $M > 1$ there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $[w]_{A_\infty} \leq 1 + \epsilon$ implies w has the M -good doubling property.*

Proof. The important ingredient is the following. By [Kor98b]² for every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that if $[w]_{A_\infty} \leq 1 + \epsilon$, then for all balls Δ and $E \subseteq \Delta$,

$$(8.3) \quad \frac{w(E)}{w(\Delta)} \leq (1 + \alpha) \left(\frac{|E|}{|\Delta|} \right)^{1-\alpha}.$$

By applying this inequality to $\Delta \setminus F$, we have for $F \subseteq \Delta$,

$$(8.4) \quad \frac{w(F)}{w(\Delta)} \geq 1 - (1 + \alpha) \left(1 - \frac{|F|}{|\Delta|} \right)^{1-\alpha}.$$

To prove the M -good doubling property we want to take Δ to be a very large ball, and F and E to be smaller balls contained in Δ and then take α to be small.

More specifically, fix M and suppose that $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $R > 0$, $y \in \Delta(x, R)$ and $s, r \in [R/M, MR]$. Take $\Delta = \Delta(x, 10MR)$, $E = \Delta(x, r)$, $F = \Delta(y, s)$. By the conditions on s and r , we have

$$\frac{|F|}{|\Delta|} \leq \frac{1}{10^n}, \quad \frac{|E|}{|\Delta|} \geq \frac{1}{(10M^2)^n}.$$

Then choosing α (extremely) small depending on M and using (8.3) and (8.4), we obtain

$$\frac{w(\Delta(x, r))}{w(\Delta)} \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{M} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{r}{10MR} \right)^n$$

and

$$\frac{w(\Delta(y, s))}{w(\Delta)} \geq \left(1 + \frac{1}{M} \right)^{-1/2} \left(\frac{s}{10MR} \right)^n.$$

Therefore

$$\frac{w(\Delta(x, r))}{w(\Delta(y, s))} \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{M} \right) \left(\frac{r}{s} \right)^n,$$

which gives the upper bound in the M -good doubling property. The lower bound is proved by interchanging the roles of E and F . \square

²See [Kor98b, Theorem 10]. This theorem can be made quantitative. In fact, [Kor98b, Theorem 10] is deduced by the localizing the quantitative version of the theorem.

REFERENCES

- [BTZ20] Simon Bortz, Tatiana Toro, and Zihui Zhao. Optimal Poisson kernel regularity for elliptic operators with Hölder-continuous coefficients in vanishing chord-arc domains. Preprint. arXiv:2010.03056, 2020.
- [BTZ21] Simon Bortz, Tatiana Toro, and Zihui Zhao. Elliptic measures for Dahlberg-Kenig-Pipher operators: Asymptotically optimal estimates. Preprint. arXiv:2105.12200, 2021.
- [Buc93] Stephen M. Buckley. Summation conditions on weights. *Michigan Math. J.*, 40(1):153–170, 1993.
- [Dah86] Björn E. J. Dahlberg. Poisson semigroups and singular integrals. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 97(1):41–48, 1986.
- [DLM21a] Guy David, Linhan Li, and Svitlana Mayboroda. Carleson measure estimates for the Green function. Preprint. arXiv:2102.09592, 2021.
- [DLM21b] Guy David, Linhan Li, and Svitlana Mayboroda. Carleson estimates for the green function on domains with lower dimensional boundaries. Preprint. arXiv: 2107:08101, 2021.
- [DMRO16] Javier Duoandikoetxea, Francisco J. Martín-Reyes, and Sheldy Ombrosi. On the A_∞ conditions for general bases. *Math. Z.*, 282(3-4):955–972, 2016.
- [DPP07] Martin Dindos, Stefanie Petermichl, and Jill Pipher. The L^p Dirichlet problem for second order elliptic operators and a p -adapted square function. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 249(2):372–392, 2007.
- [FKP91] Robert A. Fefferman, Carlos E. Kenig, and Jill Pipher. The theory of weights and the Dirichlet problem for elliptic equations. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 134(1):65–124, 1991.
- [FS72] Charles Fefferman and Elias M. Stein. H^p spaces of several variables. *Acta Math.*, 129(3-4):137–193, 1972.
- [HL01] Steve Hofmann and John L. Lewis. The Dirichlet problem for parabolic operators with singular drift terms. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 151(719):viii+113, 2001.
- [HMT17] Steve Hofmann, José María Martell, and Tatiana Toro. A_∞ implies NTA for a class of variable coefficient elliptic operators. *J. Differ. Equations*, 263(10):6147–6188, 2017.
- [HP13] Tuomas Hytönen and Carlos Pérez. Sharp weighted bounds involving A_∞ . *Anal. PDE*, 6(4):777–818, 2013.
- [Hru84] Sergei V. Hruščev. A description of weights satisfying the A_∞ condition of Muckenhoupt. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 90(2):253–257, 1984.
- [Kor98a] Michael Brian Korey. Carleson conditions for asymptotic weights. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 350(5):2049–2069, 1998.
- [Kor98b] Michael Brian Korey. Ideal weights: asymptotically optimal versions of doubling, absolute continuity, and bounded mean oscillation. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 4(4-5):491–519, 1998.
- [KP01] Carlos E. Kenig and Jill Pipher. The Dirichlet problem for elliptic equations with drift terms. *Publ. Mat.*, 45(1):199–217, 2001.
- [KT97] Carlos E. Kenig and Tatiana Toro. Harmonic measure on locally flat domains. *Duke Math. J.*, 87(3):509–551, 1997.
- [PV12] Nikolaos Pattakos and Alexander Volberg. The Muckenhoupt A_∞ class as a metric space and continuity of weighted estimates. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 19(2):499–510, 2012.
- [Sar75] Donald Sarason. Functions of vanishing mean oscillation. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 207:391–405, 1975.
- [Ste93] Elias M. Stein. *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, volume 43 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993. With the assistance of Timothy S. Murphy, Monographs in Harmonic Analysis, III.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA, TUSCALOOSA, AL, 35487, USA

Email address: sbortz@ua.edu

MORITZ EGERT, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TU DARMSTADT, SCHLOSSGARTENSTRASSE 7, 64289 DARMSTADT, GERMANY

Email address: egert@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de

OLLI SAARI, MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF BONN, ENDENICHER ALLEE 60, 53115 BONN, GERMANY

Email address: saari@math.uni-bonn.de