

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

Ryan Alvarado, Fan Wang, Dachun Yang* and Wen Yuan

Abstract In this article, the authors establish the pointwise characterization of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type via clarifying the relationship among Hajłasz–Sobolev spaces, Hajłasz–Besov and Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin spaces, grand Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces, and Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces. A major novelty of this article is that all results presented in this article get rid of both the dependence on the reverse doubling condition of the measure and the metric condition of the quasi-metric under consideration. Moreover, the pointwise characterization of the inhomogeneous version is new even when the underlying space is an RD-space.

1 Introduction

It is well known that Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces provide a unified frame for the study of many function spaces and indeed cover many well-known classical concrete function spaces such as Lebesgue spaces, Sobolev spaces, potential spaces, (local) Hardy spaces, and the space of functions with bounded mean oscillation. We refer the reader to monographs [5, 42, 43, 44, 45] for a comprehensive treatment of these function spaces and their history. We also refer the reader to [57] for relationships among Morrey spaces, Campanato spaces, and Besov–Triebel–Lizorkin spaces, to [3, 40] for some new progress of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces, and to [6, 7, 8, 9] for various characterizations and applications of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces associated with operators.

Particularly, fractional Sobolev spaces play an important major role in many questions involving partial differential equations on \mathbb{R}^n . It is known that a theory of first order Sobolev spaces on doubling metric spaces has been established based on both upper gradients [41, 31] and pointwise inequalities [14]; see [15, 16] for a survey on this. These different approaches result in the same function class if the underlying space supports a suitable Poincaré inequality [37]. In this article, we further investigate the spaces introduced by Hajłasz [14] (see also [51] and Definition 2.10 below) which are defined via pointwise inequalities.

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

Key words and phrases. space of homogeneous type, Besov space, Triebel–Lizorkin space, Hajłasz–Sobolev space, Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin space, grand Triebel–Lizorkin space, pointwise characterization.

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

*Corresponding author, E-mail: dcyang@bnu.edu.cn/June 21, 2021/Final version.

On another hand, as a generalization of \mathbb{R}^n , the space of homogeneous type was introduced by Coifman and Weiss [10, 11] (see Definition 2.2 below), which provides a natural setting for the study of function spaces and the boundedness of Calderón–Zygmund operators. Spaces of homogeneous type, with some additional assumptions, have been extensively investigated in many articles. For instance, the *Ahlfors d -regular space* is a special space of homogeneous type satisfying the following condition: there exists a positive constant C such that, for any ball $B(x, r) \subset \mathcal{X}$ with center x and radius $r \in (0, \text{diam } \mathcal{X})$,

$$C^{-1}r^d \leq \mu(B(x, r)) \leq Cr^d,$$

where here, and thereafter, $\text{diam } \mathcal{X} := \sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{X}} d(x, y)$. Another case is the RD-space (see [34, 19, 20] for instance), which is a doubling metric measure space satisfying the following additional *reverse doubling condition*: there exist positive constants $\tilde{C}_{(\mu)} \in (0, 1]$ and $\kappa \in (0, \omega]$ such that, for any ball $B(x, r)$ with $r \in (0, \text{diam } \mathcal{X}/2)$ and $\lambda \in [1, \text{diam } \mathcal{X}/(2r))$,

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

Obviously, an RD-space is a generalization of an Ahlfors d -regular space. We refer the reader to [56] for more equivalent characterizations of RD-spaces.

Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type satisfying some additional assumptions were also studied. We refer the reader to [21, 22, 52, 54, 55] for various characterizations of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on Ahlfors d -regular spaces, and to [48, 49, 50, 53] for some applications. We also refer the reader to [20, 38, 56] for various characterizations of these Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on RD-spaces. Besides, Koskela et al. [35, 36] introduced the Hajłasz–Besov and Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on RD-spaces. We refer the reader to [12, 27, 28, 29, 30] for various characterizations and applications of Hajłasz–Besov and Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin on a metric measure space satisfying the doubling property.

Recently, using the wavelet reproducing formulae in [18], Han et al. [17] introduced Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type and established several embedding theorems. On the other hand, Wang et al. [46] also introduced Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, based on the Calderón reproducing formulae established in [24], and established the boundedness of Calderón–Zygmund operators on these spaces as an application. Later, He et al. [25] obtained characterizations of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces via wavelets, molecules, Lusin area functions, and Littlewood–Paley g_λ^* -functions. Besides, He et al. [25] also showed that those two kinds of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces studied, respectively, in [17] and [46] coincide. Then Wang et al. [47] established the difference characterization of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type.

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

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

In Section 2, we first recall the notions of homogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type introduced in [46], and then introduce Hajłasz–Sobolev spaces and Hajłasz–Besov–Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type. Then we state the main result of this article; see Theorem 2.16 below.

In Section 3, we first introduce the homogenous grand Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type. Then we investigate the relation among homogeneous grand Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces and homogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces; see Theorem 3.3 below. Later, we establish the equivalence between homogenous Hajłasz–Besov–Triebel–Lizorkin spaces and homogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces; see Theorem 3.10 below. To this end, we first establish a Poincaré type inequality (see Lemma 3.11 below). It should be mentioned that, in the proof of Lemma 3.11, the constant A_0 appearing in the quasi-triangle inequality (see Definition 2.1 below) also brings some difficulty. That is why we need additional restrictions on parameters involved therein. Besides, all the proofs in Section 3 get rid of the dependence on the reverse doubling assumption.

In Section 4, we establish the equivalence between inhomogeneous Hajłasz–Besov–Triebel–Lizorkin spaces and inhomogeneous Besov–Triebel–Lizorkin spaces (see Theorem 4.10 below). To this end, we first establish a new characterization of inhomogeneous Besov–Triebel–Lizorkin spaces (see Theorem 4.11 below).

Finally, let us make some conventions on notation. For any given $p \in (0, \infty]$, the *Lebesgue space* $L^p(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by setting, when $p \in (0, \infty)$,

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

and

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

Throughout this article, we use A_0 to denote the positive constant appearing in the *quasi-triangle inequality* of d (see Definition 2.1 below), the parameter ω to denote the *upper dimension* in Definition 2.2 [see (2.2) below], and η to denote the smoothness index of the exp-ATI in Definition 2.5 below. Moreover, δ is a small positive number, for instance, $\delta \leq (2A_0)^{-10}$, coming from the construction of the dyadic cubes on \mathcal{X} (see Theorem 2.5). For any given $p \in [1, \infty]$, we use p' to denote its conjugate index, that is, $1/p + 1/p' = 1$. For any $r \in \mathbb{R}$, r_+ is defined by setting $r_+ := \max\{0, r\}$. For any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, let $a \wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$ and $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$. The symbol C denotes a positive constant which is independent of the main parameters involved, but may vary from line to line. We use $C_{(\alpha, \beta, \dots)}$ to denote a positive constant depending on the indicated parameters α, β, \dots . The symbol $A \lesssim B$ means that $A \leq CB$ for some positive constant C , while $A \sim B$ means $A \lesssim B \lesssim A$. If $f \leq Cg$ and $g = h$ or $g \leq h$, we then write $f \lesssim g \sim h$ or $f \lesssim g \lesssim h$, rather than $f \lesssim g = h$ or $f \lesssim g \leq h$. The set of positive integers is denoted by \mathbb{N} , namely, $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$, and the set $\mathbb{Z}_+ := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. For any $r \in (0, \infty)$ and $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ with $x \neq y$, define $V(x, y) := \mu(B(x, d(x, y)))$ and $V_r(x) := \mu(B(x, r))$. For any $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ and $s \in (-\beta \wedge \gamma, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, we always let

$$p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma) := \max \left\{ \frac{\omega}{\omega + (\beta \wedge \gamma)}, \frac{\omega}{\omega + (\beta \wedge \gamma) + s} \right\}, \quad (1.1)$$

where ω and η are, respectively, as in (2.2) and Definition 2.5. The operator M always denotes the *central Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator* which is defined by setting, for any locally integrable

function f on \mathcal{X} and any $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$M(f)(x) := \sup_{r \in (0, \infty)} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, r))} \int_{B(x, r)} |f(y)| d\mu(y). \quad (1.2)$$

For any set $E \subset \mathcal{X}$, we use $\mathbf{1}_E$ to denote its characteristic function and, for any set J , we use $\#J$ to denote its *cardinality*.

2 Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces and Hajłasz–Sobolev spaces on spaces of homogeneous type

In this section, we recall the notions of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type and introduce Hajłasz–Sobolev spaces on spaces of homogeneous type. Let us begin with the notion of quasi-metric spaces.

Definition 2.1. A *quasi-metric space* (\mathcal{X}, d) is a non-empty set \mathcal{X} equipped with a *quasi-metric* d , namely, a non-negative function defined on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ satisfying that, for any $x, y, z \in \mathcal{X}$,

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

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

The *ball* B of \mathcal{X} , centered at $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ with radius $r \in (0, \infty)$, is defined by setting

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

For any ball B and $\tau \in (0, \infty)$, we denote by τB the ball with the same center as that of B but of radius τ times that of B .

Definition 2.2. Let (\mathcal{X}, d) be a quasi-metric space and μ a non-negative measure on \mathcal{X} . The triple (\mathcal{X}, d, μ) is called a *space of homogeneous type* if μ satisfies the following doubling condition: there exists a positive constant $C \in [1, \infty)$ such that, for any ball $B \subset \mathcal{X}$,

$$0 < \mu(2B) \leq C\mu(B) < \infty. \quad (2.1)$$

Let $C_{(\mu)} := \sup_{B \subset \mathcal{X}} \mu(2B)/\mu(B)$. Then it is easy to show that $C_{(\mu)}$ is the smallest positive constant such that (2.1) holds true. The above doubling condition implies that, for any ball B and any $\lambda \in [1, \infty)$,

$$\mu(\lambda B) \leq C_{(\mu)} \lambda^\omega \mu(B), \quad (2.2)$$

where $\omega := \log_2 C_{(\mu)}$ is called the *upper dimension* of \mathcal{X} . Note that $\omega \in (0, \infty)$ (see, for instance, [2, p. 72]). If $A_0 = 1$, then (\mathcal{X}, d, μ) is called a *metric measure space of homogeneous type* or, simply, a *doubling metric measure space*.

Without loss of generality, we may make the following assumptions on (X, d, μ) . For any point $x \in X$, we assume that the balls $\{B(x, r)\}_{r \in (0, \infty)}$ form a basis of open neighborhoods of x . Moreover, we suppose that μ is *Borel regular* which means that open sets are measurable and every set $A \subset X$ is contained in a Borel set E satisfying that $\mu(A) = \mu(E)$. We also assume that $\mu(B(x, r)) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\mu(\{x\}) = 0$ for any given $x \in X$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$.

Now, we recall the notion of test functions and distributions on X , whose following versions were originally introduced in [20] (see also [19]).

Definition 2.3 (test functions). Let $x_1 \in X$, $r \in (0, \infty)$, $\beta \in (0, 1]$, and $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$. For any $x \in X$, define

$$D_\gamma(x_1, x; r) := \frac{1}{V_r(x_1) + V(x_1, x)} \left[\frac{r}{r + d(x_1, x)} \right]^\gamma. \quad (2.3)$$

A measurable function f on X is called a *test function of type* (x_1, r, β, γ) if there exists a positive constant C such that

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

$$|f(x)| \leq CD_\gamma(x_1, x; r); \quad (2.4)$$

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

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq C \left[\frac{d(x, y)}{r + d(x_1, x)} \right]^\beta D_\gamma(x_1, x; r). \quad (2.5)$$

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

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{G}(x_1, r, \beta, \gamma)} := \inf\{C \in (0, \infty) : (2.4) \text{ and } (2.5) \text{ hold true}\}.$$

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

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

and is equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathring{\mathcal{G}}(x_1, r, \beta, \gamma)} := \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{G}(x_1, r, \beta, \gamma)}$.

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

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

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

Lemma 2.4. *Let constants $0 < c_0 \leq C_0 < \infty$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be such that $12A_0^3 C_0 \delta \leq c_0$. Assume that a set of points, $\{z_\alpha^k : k \in \mathbb{Z}, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ with \mathcal{A}_k for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ being a set of indices, has the following properties: for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, we recall the notion of approximations of the identity with exponential decay from [24].

Definition 2.5. A sequence $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of bounded linear integral operators on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ is called an *approximation of the identity with exponential decay* (for short, exp-ATI) if there exist constants $C, \nu \in (0, \infty)$, $a \in (0, 1]$, and $\eta \in (0, 1)$ such that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the kernel of the operator Q_k , a function on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$, which is still denoted by Q_k , satisfies the following conditions:

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

$$|Q_k(x, y)| \leq C \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_{\delta^k}(x) V_{\delta^k}(y)}} H_k(x, y),$$

where here, and thereafter,

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

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

$$|Q_k(x, y) - Q_k(x', y)| + |Q_k(y, x) - Q_k(y, x')| \leq C \left[\frac{d(x, x')}{\delta^k} \right]^\eta \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_{\delta^k}(x) V_{\delta^k}(y)}} H_k(x, y);$$

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

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

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

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

The existence of such an exp-ATI on spaces of homogeneous type is guaranteed by [4, Theorem 7.1] with η same as in [4, Theorem 3.1] which might be very small (see also [24, Remark 2.8(i)]). However, if d is a metric, then η can be taken arbitrarily close to 1 (see [33, Corollary 6.13]).

The following lemma states some basic properties of exp-ATIs. One can find more details in [24, Remarks 2.8 and 2.9, and Proposition 2.10].

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be an exp-ATI and $\eta \in (0, 1)$ as in Definition 2.5. Then, for any given $\Gamma \in (0, \infty)$, there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the kernel Q_k has the following properties:*

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

$$|Q_k(x, y)| \leq CD_\Gamma(x, y; \delta^k), \quad (2.6)$$

where $D_\Gamma(x, y; \delta^k)$ is as in (2.3);

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

$$|Q_k(x, y) - Q_k(x', y)| + |Q_k(y, x) - Q_k(y, x')| \leq C \left[\frac{d(x, x')}{\delta^k + d(x, y)} \right]^\eta D_\Gamma(x, y; \delta^k); \quad (2.7)$$

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

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

Based on exp-ATIs, we now recall the notions of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type; see [46, Definitions 3.1 and 5.1].

Definition 2.7. Let $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ with η as in Definition 2.5, and $s \in (-\beta \wedge \gamma, \beta \wedge \gamma)$. Let $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be an exp-ATI.

- (i) Let $p \in (p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma), \infty]$, with $p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma)$ as in (1.1), and $q \in (0, \infty]$. The *homogenous Besov space* $\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by setting

$$\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) := \left\{ f \in \left(\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma) \right)' : \|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} < \infty \right\},$$

where, for any $f \in \left(\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma) \right)'$,

$$\|f\|_{\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} := \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \|Q_k(f)\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}^q \right]^{1/q}$$

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

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

$$\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) := \left\{ f \in \left(\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma) \right)' : \|f\|_{\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} < \infty \right\},$$

where, for any $f \in \left(\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma) \right)'$,

$$\|f\|_{\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} := \left\| \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} |Q_k(f)|^q \right]^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}$$

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

The following definition introduces the notion of Triebel–Lizorkin spaces with $p = \infty$; see [46, Definition 5.1].

Definition 2.8. Let $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$, $s \in (-\beta \wedge \gamma, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, and $q \in (p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma), \infty]$ with η as in Definition 2.5 and $p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma)$ as in (1.1). Let $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be an exp-ATI. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$, let Q_α^k be as in Lemma 2.4. Then the *homogeneous Triebel–Lizorkin space* $\dot{F}_{\infty,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by setting

$$\dot{F}_{\infty,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) := \left\{ f \in \left(\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma) \right)' : \|f\|_{\dot{F}_{\infty,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} < \infty \right\},$$

where, for any $f \in \left(\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma) \right)'$,

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

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

Remark 2.9. (i) In Definition 2.5, we need $\text{diam } \mathcal{X} = \infty$ to guarantee (v). Observe that it was shown in [39, Lemma 5.1] (see also [4, Lemma 8.1]) that $\text{diam } \mathcal{X} = \infty$ implies $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$. Therefore, $\text{diam } \mathcal{X} = \infty$ if and only if $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$ under the assumptions of this article. Due to this, we always assume that $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$ in Sections 2 and 3.

- (ii) In [46], Wang et al. proved that $\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ and $\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ in Definition 2.7 are independent of the choices of β and γ as in in Definition 2.7, and exp-ATIs (see [46, Propositions 3.13 and 3.16] for more details). Besides, it was also shown that $\dot{F}_{\infty,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ in Definition 2.8 is independent of the choices of β and γ , and exp-ATIs (see [46, Propositions 5.4 and 5.5] for more details).

Now, we introduce the notions of s -gradients and s -Hajłasz gradients on spaces of homogenous type (see, for instance, [36, Definition 1.1 and (2.1)]).

Definition 2.10. Let $s \in (0, \infty)$ and u be a measurable function on \mathcal{X} .

- (i) A nonnegative function g is called an s -gradient of u if there exists a set $E \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $\mu(E) = 0$ such that, for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X} \setminus E$,

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq [d(x, y)]^s [g(x) + g(y)].$$

Denote by $\mathcal{D}^s(u)$ the collection of all s -gradients of u .

- (ii) A sequence of nonnegative functions, $\{g_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$, is called an s -Hajłasz gradient of u if there exists a set $E \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $\mu(E) = 0$ such that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x, y \in \mathcal{X} \setminus E$ with $\delta^{k+1} \leq d(x, y) < \delta^k$,

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq [d(x, y)]^s [g_k(x) + g_k(y)].$$

Denote by $\mathbb{D}^s(u)$ the collection of all s -Hajłasz gradients of u .

Next, we introduce the notions of homogeneous Hajłasz–Sobolev spaces, Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin spaces, and Hajłasz–Besov spaces (see, for instance, [36, Definitions 1.2 and 2.1]).

Definition 2.11. Let $s \in (0, \infty)$.

- (i) Let $p \in (0, \infty)$. The *homogeneous Hajłasz–Sobolev space* $\dot{M}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions u on \mathcal{X} such that

$$\|u\|_{\dot{M}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})} := \inf_{g \in \mathcal{D}^s(u)} \|g\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} < \infty.$$

- (ii) Let $p \in (0, \infty)$ and $q \in (0, \infty]$. The *homogeneous Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin space* $\dot{M}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions u on \mathcal{X} such that

$$\|u\|_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} := \inf_{\{g_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)} \left\| \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} g_k^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} < \infty$$

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

- (iii) Let $q \in (0, \infty)$. The *homogeneous Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin space* $\dot{M}_{\infty,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions u on \mathcal{X} such that

$$\|u\|_{\dot{M}_{\infty,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} := \inf_{\{g_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left\{ \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, \delta^k))} \int_{B(x, \delta^k)} [g_j(y)]^q d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} < \infty.$$

- (iv) The *homogeneous Hajlasz–Triebel–Lizorkin space* $\dot{M}_{\infty,\infty}^s(\mathcal{X})$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions u on \mathcal{X} such that

$$\|u\|_{\dot{M}_{\infty,\infty}^s(\mathcal{X})} := \inf_{\{g_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)} \left\| \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} g_k \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X})} < \infty.$$

- (v) Let $p, q \in (0, \infty]$. The *homogeneous Hajlasz–Besov space* $\dot{N}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions u on \mathcal{X} such that

$$\|u\|_{\dot{N}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} := \inf_{\{g_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)} \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \|g_k\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}^q \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} < \infty$$

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

By Definition 2.11, it is easy to see the following conclusion. We omit the details.

Proposition 2.12. *Let $s \in (0, \infty)$ and $p \in (0, \infty]$. Then $\dot{M}_{p,\infty}^s(\mathcal{X}) = \dot{M}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})$.*

Next, we recall the notion of weak lower bounds (see, for instance, [17, Definition 1.1], [47, Definition 4.4], and [1, (2) or (3)]).

Definition 2.13. Let (\mathcal{X}, d, μ) be a space of homogeneous type with upper dimension ω as in (2.2). The measure μ is said to have a *weak lower bound* Q with $Q \in (0, \omega]$ if there exists a positive constant C and a point $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ such that, for any $r \in [1, \infty)$,

$$\mu(B(x_0, r)) \geq Cr^Q.$$

Remark 2.14. We point out that, in [47, Definition 4.4], μ is said to have a lower bound Q with $Q \in (0, \omega]$ if there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$, $\mu(B(x, r)) \geq Cr^Q$. That is why we call it the weak lower bound in Definition 2.13.

As the next result illustrates, it follows from the doubling property of the measure that the weak lower bound and lower bound conditions are equivalent when $Q = \omega$, where ω is as in (2.2).

Proposition 2.15. *With ω as in (2.2), the measure μ has a weak lower bound $Q = \omega$ if and only if it has a lower bound $Q = \omega$.*

Proof. Clearly, the lower bound condition implies the weak lower bound condition. Now, we show the converse. To this end, suppose that the measure μ has a weak lower bound $Q = \omega$ for some fixed $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$. Fix $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$. Next, choose $R \in [1, \infty)$ large enough so that $R > r$ and $B(x, r) \subset B(x_0, R)$. Consider the smallest $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2A_0R \leq (2A_0)^k r$, where $A_0 \in [1, \infty)$ is the constant in the quasi-triangle inequality. Note that $k \geq 1$ because $r < R$, and hence $(2A_0)^k > 1$. Also, this choice of k ensures that $(2A_0)^k r \leq (2A_0)^2 R$ which further implies that $B(x_0, R) \subset B(x, (2A_0)^k r)$. Using this, the weak lower bound $Q = \omega$ for the ball $B(x_0, R)$, the doubling condition in (2.1), and $(2A_0)^k r \leq (2A_0)^2 R$, we further conclude that

$$R^\omega \lesssim \mu(B(x_0, R)) \lesssim \mu(B(x, (2A_0)^k r)) \lesssim (2A_0)^{k\omega} \mu(B(x, r)) \lesssim (2A_0)^{2\omega} \left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^\omega \mu(B(x, r)),$$

from which it follows that $\mu(B(x, r)) \gtrsim r^\omega$. Thus, μ has a lower bound $Q = \omega$, as wanted. This finishes the proof of Proposition 2.15. \square

Now, we can state our main results of this article.

Theorem 2.16. *Let $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ with η as in Definition 2.5, $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, p, q be as in Definition 2.7, and ω as in (2.2). Assume that the measure μ of X has a weak lower bound $Q = \omega$.*

- (i) *If $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), \infty)$ and $q \in (\omega/(\omega + s), \infty]$, then $\dot{M}_{p,q}^s(X) = \dot{F}_{p,q}^s(X)$.*
- (ii) *If $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), \infty]$ and $q \in (0, \infty]$, then $\dot{N}_{p,q}^s(X) = \dot{B}_{p,q}^s(X)$.*

3 Relations with homogeneous grand Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces

Before we prove Theorem 2.16, we need to introduce the notions of another important spaces, namely, the homogeneous grand Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogenous type.

Definition 3.1. Let η be as in Definition 2.5, $s \in (-\eta, \eta)$, $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$, and $q \in (0, \infty]$. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in X$, define

$$\mathcal{F}_k(x) := \left\{ \phi \in \dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma) : \|\phi\|_{\dot{\mathcal{G}}(x, \delta^k, \beta, \gamma)} \leq 1 \right\}.$$

- (i) For any given $p \in (0, \infty]$, the *homogenous grand Besov space* $\mathcal{A}\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(X)$ is defined by setting

$$\mathcal{A}\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(X) := \left\{ f \in \left(\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma) \right)' : \|f\|_{\mathcal{A}\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(X)} < \infty \right\},$$

where, for any $f \in \left(\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma) \right)'$,

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{A}\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(X)} := \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left\| \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}_k(\cdot)} |\langle f, \phi \rangle| \right\|_{L^p(X)}^q \right]^{1/q}$$

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

- (ii) For any given $p \in (0, \infty)$, the *homogenous grand Triebel–Lizorkin space* $\mathcal{A}\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(X)$ is defined by setting

$$\mathcal{A}\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(X) := \left\{ f \in \left(\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma) \right)' : \|f\|_{\mathcal{A}\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(X)} < \infty \right\}$$

where, for any $f \in \left(\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma) \right)'$,

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{A}\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(X)} := \left\| \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}_k(\cdot)} |\langle f, \phi \rangle|^q \right]^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(X)}$$

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

(iii) The *homogenous grand Triebel–Lizorkin space* $\mathcal{A}\dot{F}_{\infty,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by setting

$$\mathcal{A}\dot{F}_{\infty,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) := \left\{ f \in (\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))' : \|f\|_{\mathcal{A}\dot{F}_{\infty,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} < \infty \right\},$$

where, for any $f \in (\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$,

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{A}\dot{F}_{\infty,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} := \sup_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_l} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(Q_\alpha^l)} \int_{Q_\alpha^l} \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}_k(x)} |\langle f, \phi \rangle|^q d\mu(x) \right]^{1/q}$$

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

Remark 3.2. Let $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be an exp-ATI. By (2.6) and (2.7), it is easy to see that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $Q_k(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{F}_k(x)$.

Now, we establish the relationship between homogeneous grand Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces and homogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ with η as in Definition 2.5, and $s \in (-\beta \wedge \gamma, \beta \wedge \gamma)$.*

- (i) *If p and q are as in Definition 2.7(ii), then $\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{A}\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$.*
- (ii) *If p and q are as in Definition 2.7(i), then $\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{A}\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$.*

To prove Theorem 3.3, we need several lemmas. Let us begin with recalling the following very basic inequality.

Lemma 3.4. *For any $\theta \in (0, 1]$ and $\{a_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{C}$, it holds true that*

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |a_j| \right)^\theta \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |a_j|^\theta. \quad (3.1)$$

The following lemma contains several basic and very useful estimates related to d and μ on \mathcal{X} . One can find the details in [20, Lemma 2.1] or [24, Lemma 2.4].

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \infty)$.*

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

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

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

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

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} D_\gamma(x_1, y; r) d\mu(y) \leq C;$$

where, $D_\gamma(x, y; r)$ is as in (2.3).

The following homogeneous discrete Calderón reproducing formula was obtained in [24, Theorem 5.11]. Let $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be sufficiently large such that $\delta^{j_0} \leq (2A_0)^{-3}C_0$. Based on Lemma 2.4, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$, let

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

and $N(k, \alpha) := \#\mathfrak{N}(k, \alpha)$. From Lemma 2.4, it follows that $N(k, \alpha) \lesssim \delta^{-j_0\omega}$ and $\bigcup_{\tau \in \mathfrak{N}(k, \alpha)} Q_\tau^{k+j_0} = Q_\alpha^k$. We rearrange the set $\{Q_\tau^{k+j_0} : \tau \in \mathfrak{N}(k, \alpha)\}$ as $\{Q_\alpha^{k,m}\}_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)}$. Also, denote by $y_\alpha^{k,m}$ an arbitrary point in $Q_\alpha^{k,m}$ and $z_\alpha^{k,m}$ the “center” of $Q_\alpha^{k,m}$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\{Q_k\}_{k=-\infty}^\infty$ be an exp-ATI and $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ with η as in Definition 2.5. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$, and $m \in \{1, \dots, N(k, \alpha)\}$, suppose that $y_\alpha^{k,m}$ is an arbitrary point in $Q_\alpha^{k,m}$. Then there exists a sequence $\{\tilde{Q}_k\}_{k=-\infty}^\infty$ of bounded linear integral operators on $L^2(X)$ such that, for any $f \in (\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$,*

$$f(\cdot) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^\infty \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) \tilde{Q}_k(\cdot, y_\alpha^{k,m}) Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}).$$

in $(\dot{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$. Moreover, there exists a positive constant C , independent of the choices of both $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$, and $m \in \{1, \dots, N(k, \alpha)\}$, and f , such that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the kernel of \tilde{Q}_k satisfies

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

$$|\tilde{Q}_k(x, y)| \leq CD_\gamma(x, y; \delta^k), \quad (3.2)$$

where $D_\gamma(x, y; \delta^k)$ is as in (2.3);

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

$$|\tilde{Q}_k(x, y) - \tilde{Q}_k(x', y)| \leq C \left[\frac{d(x, x')}{\delta^k + d(x, y)} \right]^\beta D_\gamma(x, y; \delta^k); \quad (3.3)$$

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

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

We also need the following three lemmas (see, for instance, [46, Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6]).

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$ and $p \in (\omega/(\omega + \gamma), 1]$ with ω as in (2.2). Then there exists a constant $C \in [1, \infty)$ such that, for any $k, k' \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x \in X$, and $y_\alpha^{k,m} \in Q_\alpha^{k,m}$ with $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$ and $m \in \{1, \dots, N(k, \alpha)\}$,*

$$C^{-1} [V_{\delta^{k \wedge k'}}(x)]^{1-p} \leq \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) [D_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; \delta^{k \wedge k'})]^p \leq C [V_{\delta^{k \wedge k'}}(x)]^{1-p},$$

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

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$ and $r \in (\omega/(\omega + \gamma), 1]$ with ω as in (2.2). Then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $k, k' \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and $a_\alpha^{k,m} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $y_\alpha^{k,m} \in Q_\alpha^{k,m}$ with $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$ and $m \in \{1, \dots, N(k, \alpha)\}$,*

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

where $D_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; \delta^{k \wedge k'})$ is as in (2.3) and M as in (1.2).

The following lemma is the Fefferman–Stein vector-valued maximal inequality which was established in [13, Theorem 1.2].

Lemma 3.9. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$, $q \in (1, \infty]$, and M be the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator on \mathcal{X} as in (1.2). Then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any sequence $\{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of measurable functions on \mathcal{X} ,*

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

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

Now, we prove Theorem 3.3.

Proof of Theorem 3.3. We first show (i). Assume that $f \in \mathcal{AF}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ and that $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is an exp-ATI. From Remark 3.2, we deduce that $|Q_k(f)| \leq \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}_k(\cdot)} |\langle f, \phi \rangle|$ and hence $\|f\|_{\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} \leq \|f\|_{\mathcal{AF}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}$.

Conversely, assume that $f \in \dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$. By Lemma 3.6, we know that, for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and $\phi \in \mathcal{F}_l(x)$,

$$\langle f, \phi \rangle = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m}) \int_{\mathcal{X}} \bar{Q}_k(z, y_\alpha^{k,m}) \phi(z) d\mu(z).$$

Notice that, by an argument similar to that used in the proof of [46, Lemma 3.9], we have, for any fixed $\eta' \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$,

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} \bar{Q}_k(z, y_\alpha^{k,m}) \phi(z) d\mu(z) \right| \lesssim \delta^{[k-l]\eta'} D_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; \delta^{k \wedge l}),$$

where $D_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; \delta^{k \wedge l})$ is as in (2.3). Using this, Lemma 3.8, the arbitrariness of $y_\alpha^{k,m}$, and choosing $r \in (\omega/(\omega + \gamma), \min\{p, q, 1\})$, we obtain

$$|\langle f, \phi \rangle| \lesssim \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{[k-l]\eta'} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k, \alpha)} \mu(Q_\alpha^{k,m}) |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})| D_\gamma(x, y_\alpha^{k,m}; \delta^{k \wedge l})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{|k-l|\eta'} \delta^{|k-(k\wedge l)|\omega(1-1/r)} \left[M \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} |Q_k f(y_\alpha^{k,m})|^r \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(x) \right)^{1/r} \right] \\
&\lesssim \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{|k-l|\eta'} \delta^{|k-(k\wedge l)|\omega(1-1/r)} [M(|Q_k f|^r)(x)]^{1/r}.
\end{aligned}$$

By this, we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f\|_{\mathcal{A}\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} &\lesssim \left\| \left\| \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{(l-k)sq} \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{|k-l|\eta'} \delta^{|k-(k\wedge l)|\omega(1-1/r)} \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \left. \times [M(\delta^{-ksr} |Q_k f|^r)]^{1/r} \right\}^{q-1/q} \right\| \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})},
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with the Hölder inequality when $q \in (1, \infty]$, or (3.1) when $q \in (\omega/[\omega + (\beta \wedge \gamma)], 1]$, implies that

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{A}\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} [M(\delta^{-ksr} |Q_k f|^r)]^{q/r} \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}.$$

From this and Lemma 3.9, we deduce that

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

This finishes the proof of (i).

The proof of (ii) is similar to that of (i) and we omit the details. \square

Next, we establish the equivalence between homogenous Hajłasz–Besov spaces and Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin spaces, and homogeneous grand Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces.

Theorem 3.10. *Let $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ with η as in Definition 2.5, and $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$. Assume that the measure μ of \mathcal{X} has a weak lower bound $Q = \omega$.*

(i) *If $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), \infty]$ and $q \in (\omega/(\omega + s), \infty]$, then $\mathcal{A}\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) = \dot{M}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$.*

(ii) *If $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), \infty]$ and $q \in (0, \infty]$, then $\mathcal{A}\dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) = \dot{N}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$.*

To prove Theorem 3.10, we need several lemmas. The following lemma was originally shown in [15, Theorem 8.7] when $s = 1$ and $A_0 = 1$. When $s \in (0, 1)$ and $A_0 \in (1, \infty)$, we need more restrictions on A_0 and δ . We borrow some ideas from the proof of [15, Theorem 8.7]. In what follows, for any measurable set $E \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $\mu(E) > 0$, let

$$\mathcal{f}_E := \frac{1}{\mu(E)} \int_E.$$

Lemma 3.11. *Let $s \in (0, \infty)$, $p \in (0, \omega/s)$, and $p^* := \frac{\omega p}{\omega - sp}$ with ω as in (2.2). If $A_0 \delta^{p/\omega} < 1$, then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $B_0 := B(x_0, r_0) \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r_0 \in (0, \infty)$, $u \in \dot{M}^{s,p}(B(x_0, \delta^{-1}r_0))$, and $g \in \mathcal{D}^s(u)$, one has $u \in L^{p^*}(B_0)$ and*

$$\inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left[\int_{B_0} |u(y) - c|^{p^*} d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{1}{p^*}} \leq Cr_0^s \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{1/p}. \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. If $\int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y) = \infty$, then (3.4) holds true. If

$$\int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y) = 0,$$

then we know that $g(x) = 0$ for almost every $x \in \delta^{-1}B_0$ and hence there exists a $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $u(x) = c$ for almost every $x \in \delta^{-1}B_0$. Thus, in this case, (3.4) holds true.

In what follows, we assume that

$$0 < \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y) < \infty.$$

Note that this implies $g > 0$ almost everywhere in \mathcal{X} . Moreover, we may also assume that, for every $x \in \delta^{-1}B_0$,

$$g(x) \geq \delta^{1+1/p} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{1/p}, \quad (3.5)$$

as otherwise we may replace g by $\tilde{g}(x) := g(x) + \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{1/p}$ for any $x \in \delta^{-1}B_0$, because

$$\left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [\tilde{g}(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{1/p} \lesssim \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{1/p}.$$

For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, define

$$E_k := \left\{ x \in \delta^{-1}B_0 : g(x) \leq \delta^{-k} \right\}.$$

It is easy to see that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $E_{k-1} \subset E_k$ and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu(E_k) = \mu(\delta^{-1}B_0). \quad (3.6)$$

Since $g > 0$ almost everywhere in \mathcal{X} , we also have

$$\mu \left(\delta^{-1}B_0 \setminus \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (E_k \setminus E_{k-1}) \right) = 0,$$

which allows us to write

$$\int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y) \sim \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-kp} \mu(E_k \setminus E_{k-1}). \quad (3.7)$$

For any $c \in \mathbb{R}$, if we let $a_k := \sup_{y \in B_0 \cap E_k} |u(y) - c|$, then a_k is nondecreasing and

$$\int_{B_0} |u(y) - c|^{p^*} d\mu(y) \leq \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} a_k^{p^*} \mu(B_0 \cap [E_k \setminus E_{k-1}]). \quad (3.8)$$

Note that, if $\mu(\delta^{-1}B_0 \setminus E_{k-1}) = 0$, then $\mu(E_k \setminus E_{k-1}) = 0$. Thus, to estimate (3.7) and (3.8), we only need to consider $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\mu(\delta^{-1}B_0 \setminus E_{k-1}) > 0$, which is always assumed in what follows.

Let

$$b := (4A_0)^{-\omega} \delta^\omega r_0^{-\omega} \mu(\delta^{-1}B_0) \quad (3.9)$$

and

$$r_k := 2b^{-\frac{1}{\omega}}[\mu(\delta^{-1}B_0 \setminus E_{k-1})]^{\frac{1}{\omega}}.$$

Then we know that $r_k \in (0, \infty)$. Moreover, by the Chebyshev inequality, we know that

$$\mu(\delta^{-1}B_0 \setminus E_k) = \mu(\{x \in \delta^{-1}B_0 : g(x) > \delta^{-k}\}) \leq \delta^{kp} \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y), \quad (3.10)$$

which implies that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} r_k = 0$. Thus, there exists a $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, which will be determined later, such that, for any $k > k_0$, we can find an $x_k \in B_0$ satisfying $B(x_k, r_k) \subset \delta^{-1}B_0$, where $r_k \leq \delta^{-1}r_0$. Observe that, by the doubling condition of \mathcal{X} , we can conclude that, for any $k > k_0$, $\mu(B(x_k, r_k)) \geq br_k^\omega$. Combining this and the definition of r_k , we find that

$$\mu(B(x_k, r_k)) \geq br_k^\omega > \mu(\delta^{-1}B_0 \setminus E_{k-1}) = \mu(\delta^{-1}B_0) - \mu(E_{k-1}).$$

From this, we deduce that $B(x_k, r_k) \cap E_{k-1} \neq \emptyset$, that is, there exists an $x_{k-1} \in B(x_k, r_k) \cap E_{k-1}$. Now, if $B(x_{k-1}, r_{k-1}) \subset \delta^{-1}B_0$, then we can repeat the above procedure to find an x_{k-2} such that $x_{k-2} \in B(x_{k-1}, r_{k-1}) \cap E_{k-2}$. As a summary, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, k - k_0 + 1\}$, if $B(x_{k-i}, r_{k-i}) \subset \delta^{-1}B_0$, then we can find an x_{k-i-1} such that $x_{k-i-1} \in B(x_{k-i}, r_{k-i}) \cap E_{k-i-1}$. We now want to determine k_0 . Note that, by (3.10), $x_k \in B_0$, and the assumption that $A_0\delta^{p/\omega} < 1$, we know that, for any $y \in B(x_{k_0}, r_{k_0})$,

$$\begin{aligned} d(y, x_0) &\leq A_0[d(y, x_k) + d(x_k, x_0)] < A_0d(y, x_k) + A_0r_0 \\ &\leq A_0^2[d(y, x_{k_0}) + d(x_{k_0}, x_k)] + A_0r_0 \\ &\leq A_0^2r_{k_0} + A_0^3[d(x_{k_0}, x_{k_0+1}) + d(x_{k_0+1}, x_k)] + A_0r_0 \\ &\leq A_0^2r_{k_0} + A_0^3r_{k_0+1} + \dots + A_0^{k-k_0+1}r_{k-1} + A_0^{k-k_0+1}r_k + A_0r_0 \\ &\leq 2A_0^{-k_0+3}b^{-1/\omega} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(z)]^p d\mu(z) \right\}^{1/\omega} \sum_{i=k_0-1}^{k-1} (A_0\delta^{p/\omega})^i + A_0r_0 \\ &\leq A_0^2\delta^{(k_0-1)p/\omega} \frac{2b^{-1/\omega}}{1 - A_0\delta^{p/\omega}} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(z)]^p d\mu(z) \right\}^{1/\omega} + A_0r_0. \end{aligned}$$

If

$$A_0^2\delta^{(k_0-1)p/\omega} \frac{2b^{-1/\omega}}{1 - A_0\delta^{p/\omega}} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(z)]^p d\mu(z) \right\}^{1/\omega} + A_0r_0 \leq \delta^{-1}r_0, \quad (3.11)$$

then we know that, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, k - k_0\}$, $B(x_{k-i}, r_{k-i}) \subset \delta^{-1}B_0$. Observe that (3.11) is equivalent to

$$\delta^{1-k_0} \geq \left[\frac{2A_0^2}{(1 - A_0\delta^{p/\omega})(\delta^{-1} - A_0)} \right]^{\omega/p} (br_0^\omega)^{-1/p} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(z)]^p d\mu(z) \right\}^{1/p}. \quad (3.12)$$

We claim that, if (3.12) holds true, then, for any $k \geq k_0$, $r_k \leq \delta^{-1}r_0$. Indeed, by the definition of r_k , (3.10), (3.12), and the fact that δ is very small, we conclude that

$$r_k \leq 2b^{-\frac{1}{\omega}} \left\{ \delta^{(k-1)p} \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{\omega}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 2b^{-\frac{1}{\omega}} \delta^{\frac{(k_0-1)p}{\omega}} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{\omega}} \\
&\leq 2b^{-\frac{1}{\omega}} \left[\frac{2A_0^2}{(1-A_0\delta^{p/\omega})(\delta^{-1}-A_0)} \right]^{-1} b^{\frac{1}{\omega}} r_0 \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{-\frac{1}{\omega}} \\
&\leq \frac{(1-A_0\delta^{p/\omega})(\delta^{-1}-A_0)}{A_0^2} r_0 \\
&\leq \delta^{-1} r_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the above claim holds true. Observe that (3.5) implies $E_k = \emptyset$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ small enough. By this and (3.6), we conclude that there exists a $\tilde{k}_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\mu(E_{\tilde{k}_0-1}^-) < \delta\mu(\delta^{-1}B_0) \leq \mu(E_{\tilde{k}_0}^-). \quad (3.13)$$

From this, we deduce that $E_{\tilde{k}_0}^- \neq \emptyset$ and, by (3.5), we have, for any $x \in E_{\tilde{k}_0}^-$,

$$\delta^{1+1/p} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{1/p} \leq g(x) \leq \delta^{-\tilde{k}_0}.$$

On the other hand, since δ is very small, we may assume that $\delta < 1/2$. Then, by (3.13) and (3.10), we know that

$$\delta\mu(\delta^{-1}B_0) < (1-\delta)\mu(\delta^{-1}B_0) < \mu(\delta^{-1}B_0 \setminus E_{\tilde{k}_0-1}^-) \leq \delta^{(\tilde{k}_0-1)p} \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y).$$

Combining the above two estimates, we find that

$$\delta^{1+1/p} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{1/p} \leq \delta^{-\tilde{k}_0} \leq \delta^{-1-1/p} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{1/p}.$$

Let l_0 be the smallest integer such that

$$\delta^{-l_0} > \max \left\{ \delta^{-2-1/p} \left[\frac{2A_0^2}{(1-A_0\delta^{p/\omega})(\delta^{-1}-A_0)} \right]^{\omega/p}, 1 \right\} \left[\frac{\mu(\delta^{-1}B_0)}{br_0^\omega} \right]^{1/p}$$

and let $k_0 := \tilde{k}_0 + l_0$. Then we conclude that (3.12) holds true and

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^{-k_0} &= \delta^{-1} \delta^{-\tilde{k}_0} \delta^{-(l_0-1)} \\
&\leq \delta^{-1} \delta^{-1-1/p} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{1/p} \\
&\quad \times \max \left\{ \delta^{-2-1/p} \left[\frac{2A_0^2}{(1-A_0\delta^{p/\omega})(\delta^{-1}-A_0)} \right]^{\omega/p}, 1 \right\} \left[\frac{\mu(\delta^{-1}B_0)}{br_0^\omega} \right]^{1/p} \\
&\lesssim (br_0^\omega)^{-1/p} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(z)]^p d\mu(z) \right\}^{1/p},
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (3.12), implies that

$$\delta^{-k_0} \sim (br_0^\omega)^{-1/p} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(z)]^p d\mu(z) \right\}^{1/p}. \quad (3.14)$$

Now, we estimate a_k . We consider two cases on k .

Case 1) $k > k_0$. In this case, it suffices to consider $k > k_0$ such that $E_k \cap B_0 \neq \emptyset$. For any $x_k \in E_k \cap B_0$, choose $\{x_{k-1}, \dots, x_{k_0}\}$ as above. Then, by $g \in \mathcal{D}^s(u)$, the definition of r_k , (3.10), and $p \in (0, \omega/s)$, we find that, for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x_k) - c| &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{k-k_0-1} |u(x_{k-i}) - u(x_{k-i-1})| + |u(x_{k_0}) - c| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{k-k_0-1} [d(x_{k-i}, x_{k-i-1})]^s [g(x_{k-i}) + g(x_{k-i-1})] + |u(x_{k_0}) - c| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{i=0}^{k-k_0-1} \delta^{-k+i} r_{k-i}^s + |u(x_{k_0}) - c| \\ &\lesssim b^{-s/\omega} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(z)]^p d\mu(z) \right\}^{s/\omega} \sum_{i=0}^{k-k_0-1} \delta^{-k+i} \delta^{(k-i-1)ps/\omega} + |u(x_{k_0}) - c| \\ &\lesssim b^{-s/\omega} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(z)]^p d\mu(z) \right\}^{s/\omega} \delta^{-(k-1)(1-ps/\omega)} + |u(x_{k_0}) - c|, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$a_k \lesssim b^{-s/\omega} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(z)]^p d\mu(z) \right\}^{s/\omega} \delta^{-k(1-ps/\omega)} + \sup_{x \in E_{k_0}} |u(x) - c|.$$

Choose $\tilde{c} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\text{ess inf}_{x \in E_{k_0}} |u(x) - \tilde{c}| = 0$. Then we can find $\{y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset E_{k_0}$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |u(y_j) - \tilde{c}| = 0$. By $g \in \mathcal{D}^s(u)$ and the definition of E_{k_0} , we have, for any $x \in E_{k_0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x) - \tilde{c}| &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |[u(x) - \tilde{c}] - [u(y_j) - \tilde{c}]| = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |u(x) - u(y_j)| \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{j \rightarrow \infty} [d(x, y_j)]^s [g(x) + g(y_j)] \leq 2^{s+1} A_0^s r_0^s \delta^{-k_0-s}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

which further implies that, for any $k > k_0$,

$$a_k \lesssim b^{-s/\omega} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(z)]^p d\mu(z) \right\}^{s/\omega} \delta^{-k(1-ps/\omega)} + r_0^s \delta^{-k_0}. \quad (3.16)$$

Case 2) $k \leq k_0$. In this case, by (3.15) and the fact that E_k is increasing, we know that

$$a_k = \sup_{y \in B_0 \cap E_k} |u(y) - \tilde{c}| \leq \sup_{y \in B_0 \cap E_{k_0}} |u(y) - \tilde{c}| \leq \sup_{y \in E_{k_0}} |u(y) - \tilde{c}| \lesssim r_0^s \delta^{-k_0}, \quad (3.17)$$

where we let $a_k := 0$ if $B_0 \cap E_k = \emptyset$.

From (3.16), (3.17), (3.8), (3.7), (3.14), and (3.9), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_0} |u(y) - \bar{c}|^{p^*} d\mu(y) &\leq \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} a_k^{p^*} \mu(B_0 \cap [E_k \setminus E_{k-1}]) \\
&\lesssim b^{-sp^*/\omega} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(z)]^p d\mu(z) \right\}^{sp^*/\omega} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-k(1-ps/\omega)p^*} \mu(E_k \setminus E_{k-1}) \\
&\quad + r_0^{sp^*} \delta^{-k_0 p^*} \mu(B_0) \\
&\lesssim b^{-sp^*/\omega} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(z)]^p d\mu(z) \right\}^{sp^*/\omega} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(z)]^p d\mu(z) \right\} \\
&\quad + \mu(B_0) r_0^{sp^*} (br_0^\omega)^{-p^*/p} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(z)]^p d\mu(z) \right\}^{p^*/p} \\
&\lesssim \left[1 + \frac{\mu(B_0)}{br_0^\omega} \right] b^{-sp^*/\omega} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(z)]^p d\mu(z) \right\}^{p^*/p} \\
&\lesssim \frac{\mu(B_0)}{br_0^\omega} b^{-sp^*/\omega} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(z)]^p d\mu(z) \right\}^{p^*/p},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\left[\int_{B_0} |u(y) - \bar{c}|^{p^*} d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{1}{p^*}} \lesssim (br_0^\omega)^{-1/p^*} b^{-s/\omega} \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_0} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{1/p}.$$

Recalling that $b = (4A_0)^{-\omega} \delta^\omega r_0^{-\omega} \mu(\delta^{-1}B_0)$, then we conclude that

$$(br_0^\omega)^{-1/p^*} b^{-s/\omega} \lesssim r_0^s [\mu(\delta^{-1}B_0)]^{-1/p}.$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 3.11. \square

Remark 3.12. Let p^* , u , and B_0 be as in Lemma 3.11. If $p^* \in [1, \infty)$, then $u \in L^1(B_0)$ and, moreover, the left hand side of (3.4) can be replaced by

$$\left[\int_{B_0} |u(y) - u_{B_0}|^{p^*} d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{1}{p^*}},$$

where

$$u_{B_0} := \int_{B_0} u(y) d\mu(y).$$

Indeed, we can find a $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\left[\int_{B_0} |u(y) - c_0|^{p^*} d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{1}{p^*}} \leq 2 \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left[\int_{B_0} |u(y) - c|^{p^*} d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{1}{p^*}}.$$

By the Hölder inequality, we have

$$\left[\int_{B_0} |u(y) - u_{B_0}|^{p^*} d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{1}{p^*}} = \left[\int_{B_0} \left| u(y) - \int_{B_0} u(z) d\mu(z) \right|^{p^*} d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{1}{p^*}}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \left[\int_{B_0} \int_{B_0} |u(y) - u(z)|^{p^*} d\mu(z) d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{1}{p^*}} \\ &\lesssim \left[\int_{B_0} |u(y) - c_0|^{p^*} d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{1}{p^*}}. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of the above claim.

The next result is a consequence of Lemma 3.11 and highlights the fact that functions in $\dot{M}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ are actually locally integrable whenever $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), \infty)$.

Corollary 3.13. *Let $s \in (0, \infty)$, $q \in (0, \infty]$, and $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), \infty)$, where ω as in (2.2). Then every function in $\dot{M}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ is locally integrable on \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. Fix $u \in \dot{M}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ and observe that, if $\{g_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)$, then $g \in \mathcal{D}^s(u)$, where

$$g := \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} g_k^q \right)^{1/q}$$

with the usual modification when $q = \infty$. Thus, $u \in \dot{M}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})$. Consider any ball $B_0 \subset \mathcal{X}$ and suppose that $A_0 \delta^{p/\omega} < 1$. If we choose $t \in (\omega/(\omega + s), p \wedge (\omega/s))$, then $u \in \dot{M}^{s,t}(\delta^{-1}B_0)$ and Lemma 3.11 implies $u \in L^{t^*}(B_0)$, where $t^* = \frac{\omega t}{\omega - st} > 1$. Thus, $u \in L^1(B_0)$, which completes the proof of Corollary 3.13. \square

The following result also follows from Lemma 3.11.

Corollary 3.14. *Let $s \in (0, \infty)$, $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), \omega/s)$, and $p^* := \frac{\omega p}{\omega - sp}$ with ω as in (2.2). Assume that \mathcal{X} has a weak lower bound $Q = \omega$. Then there exists a constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for any $u \in \dot{M}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})$, $u - C \in L^{p^*}(\mathcal{X})$ and*

$$\|u - C\|_{L^{p^*}(\mathcal{X})} \leq \tilde{C} \|u\|_{\dot{M}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})}, \quad (3.18)$$

where \tilde{C} is a positive constant independent of u .

Proof. Let s and p be as in this corollary. Let $u \in \dot{M}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})$ and fix a point $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $B_k := B(x_0, k)$. Choose a $g \in \mathcal{D}^s(u)$ such that $\|g\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \leq 2\|u\|_{\dot{M}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})}$. By Lemma 3.11, we find that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left[\int_{B_k} |u(y) - u_{B_k}|^{p^*} d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{1}{p^*}} \lesssim k^s \left\{ \int_{\delta^{-1}B_k} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{1/p} \lesssim k^s [\mu(B_k)]^{-1/p} \|u\|_{\dot{M}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})}.$$

This, together with the assumption that \mathcal{X} has a weak lower bound $Q = \omega$, and Proposition 2.15, implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\int_{B_k} |u(y) - u_{B_k}|^{p^*} d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{1}{p^*}} &\lesssim k^s [\mu(B_k)]^{1/p^* - 1/p} \|u\|_{\dot{M}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})} \\ &\lesssim k^{s(1-Q/\omega)} \|u\|_{\dot{M}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{M}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

By this, we find that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |u_{B_k} - u_{B_1}| &\leq \frac{1}{\mu(B_1)} \int_{B_1} |u(y) - u_{B_k}| d\mu(y) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{[\mu(B_1)]^{1/p^*}} \left[\int_{B_1} |u(y) - u_{B_k}|^{p^*} d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{1}{p^*}} \leq \frac{1}{[\mu(B_1)]^{1/p^*}} \|u\|_{M^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\{u_{B_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded sequence. From this, we deduce that there exist a subsequence $\{u_{B_{k_j}}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $C = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} u_{B_{k_j}}$. Moreover, by (3.19) and the Fatou lemma, we further conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} |u(x) - C|^{p^*} d\mu(x) \right]^{\frac{1}{p^*}} &= \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |u(x) - u_{B_{k_j}} \mathbf{1}_{B_{k_j}}(x)|^{p^*} d\mu(x) \right]^{\frac{1}{p^*}} \\ &\leq \underline{\lim}_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left[\int_{B_{k_j}} |u(x) - u_{B_{k_j}}|^{p^*} d\mu(x) \right]^{\frac{1}{p^*}} \lesssim \|u\|_{M^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})}. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of Corollary 3.14. \square

Remark 3.15. Let ω be as in (2.2) and $p \in (0, \omega)$. In [1, Theorem 22], Alvarado et al. proved that, if \mathcal{X} is uniformly perfect (see [1, (39)]), then that (3.18) holds true with $s = 1$ is equivalent to that \mathcal{X} has a lower bound.

The following lemma is a Poincaré type inequality for $\mathbb{D}^s(u)$ (see also [36, Lemma 2.1]).

Lemma 3.16. *Let $s \in (0, \infty)$. Then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, any measurable function u on \mathcal{X} , $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and $\{g_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)$,*

$$\inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{B(x, \delta^k)} |u(y) - c| d\mu(y) \leq C \delta^{ks} \sum_{j=k-3}^{k-1} \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-2})} g_j(y) d\mu(y). \quad (3.20)$$

Proof. Let s, u , and $\{g_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be as in this lemma. Observe that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{B(x, \delta^k)} |u(y) - c| d\mu(y) &\leq \int_{B(x, \delta^k)} |u(y) - u_{B(x, \delta^{k-2}) \setminus B(x, A_0 \delta^{k-1})}| d\mu(y) \\ &\leq \int_{B(x, \delta^k)} \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-2}) \setminus B(x, A_0 \delta^{k-1})} |u(y) - u(z)| d\mu(y) \mu(z). \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

Note that, due to the fact that δ is very small, we have, for any $y \in B(x, \delta^k)$ and $z \in B(x, \delta^{k-2}) \setminus B(x, A_0 \delta^{k-1})$,

$$d(y, z) \leq A_0[d(y, x) + d(x, z)] < 2A_0\delta^{k-2} \leq \delta^{k-3}$$

and

$$d(x, z) \leq A_0[d(x, y) + d(y, z)] < A_0\delta^k + A_0d(y, z),$$

which implies that

$$\delta^k \leq d(y, z) < \delta^{k-3}.$$

From this, we deduce that there exists a unique $j_0 \in \{k-1, k-2, k-3\}$ such that

$$\delta^{j_0+1} \leq d(y, z) < \delta^{j_0}$$

and hence

$$|u(y) - u(z)| \leq [d(y, z)]^s [g_{j_0}(y) + g_{j_0}(z)] \leq \delta^{(k-3)s} \sum_{j=k-3}^{k-1} [g_j(y) + g_j(z)].$$

Therefore, by this and (3.21), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{B(x, \delta^k)} |u(y) - c| d\mu(y) \\ & \lesssim \delta^{ks} \sum_{j=k-3}^{k-1} \int_{B(x, \delta^k)} \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-2}) \setminus B(x, A_0 \delta^{k-1})} [g_j(y) + g_j(z)] d\mu(y) \mu(z) \\ & \lesssim \delta^{ks} \sum_{j=k-3}^{k-1} \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-2})} g_j(y) d\mu(y), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 3.16. \square

Remark 3.17. Similarly to Remark 3.12, under the assumptions same as in Lemma 3.16, the left hand side of (3.20) can be replaced by

$$\int_{B(x, \delta^k)} |u(y) - u_{B(x, \delta^k)}| d\mu(y).$$

Using Lemma 3.11, we can show the following Poincaré type inequality, which is very useful in the case when $p \in (0, 1]$.

Lemma 3.18. *Let $s \in (0, \infty)$, $p \in (0, 1]$, and $\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in (0, s)$ with $\varepsilon < \varepsilon'$. If $A_0 \delta^{p/\omega} < 1$, then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x \in X$, any measurable function u , and $\{g_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left[\int_{B(x, \delta^k)} |u(y) - c|^{\frac{\omega p}{\omega - \varepsilon p}} d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{\omega - \varepsilon p}{\omega p}} \\ & \leq C \delta^{k\varepsilon'} \sum_{j=k-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')} \left\{ \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-1})} [g_j(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Proof. Let all the notation be the same as in this lemma. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the right hand side of (3.22) is less than infinity. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in X$, let

$$g(x) := \left\{ \sum_{j=k-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon)p} [g_j(x)]^p \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

We claim that $g \in \mathcal{D}^s(u)$ and $u \in \dot{M}^{\varepsilon,p}(B(x, \delta^{k-1}))$. Indeed, for any $y, z \in B(x, \delta^{k-1})$, we have

$$d(y, z) \leq A_0[d(y, x) + d(x, z)] < 2A_0\delta^{k-1} < \delta^{k-2}.$$

Therefore, there exists a unique integer $j_0 \geq k-2$ such that

$$\delta^{j_0+1} \leq d(y, z) < \delta^{j_0}.$$

Then, since $\{g_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)$, it follows that there exists an $E \subset X$ with $\mu(E) = 0$ such that, for any $y, z \in B(x, \delta^{k-1}) \setminus E$,

$$\begin{aligned} |u(y) - u(z)| &\leq [d(y, z)]^s [g_{j_0}(y) + g_{j_0}(z)] \leq [d(y, z)]^\varepsilon \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon)} [g_{j_0}(y) + g_{j_0}(z)] \\ &\leq [d(y, z)]^\varepsilon [g(y) + g(z)], \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $g \in \mathcal{D}^\varepsilon(u)$. On the other hand, by $p \in (0, 1]$, the Hölder inequality with exponent $1/p \geq 1$, and $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon' < s$, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \|g\|_{L^p(B(x, \delta^{k-1}))} &= \left\{ \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-1})} \sum_{j=k-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon)p} [g_j(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= \left\{ \sum_{j=k-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(\varepsilon'-\varepsilon)p} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')p} \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-1})} [g_j(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \left[\sum_{j=k-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(\varepsilon'-\varepsilon)p(1/p)'} \right]^{\frac{1}{(1/p)'/p}} \sum_{j=k-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')} \left\{ \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-1})} [g_j(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\lesssim \delta^{k(\varepsilon'-\varepsilon)} [V_{\delta^{k-1}}(x)]^{1/p} \sum_{j=k-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')} \left\{ \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-1})} [g_j(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

From this, we deduce that $u \in \dot{M}^{\varepsilon,p}(B(x, \delta^{k-1}))$. Combining the above claim and Lemma 3.11, and using the Hölder inequality with exponent $1/p \geq 1$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left[\int_{B(x, \delta^k)} |u(y) - c|^{\frac{\omega p}{\omega - \varepsilon p}} d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{\omega - \varepsilon p}{\omega p}} \\ &\lesssim \delta^{k\varepsilon} \left\{ \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-1})} [g(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{1/p} \\ &\sim \delta^{k\varepsilon} \left\{ \sum_{j=k-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon)p} \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-1})} [g_j(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \delta^{k\varepsilon} \left\{ \sum_{j=k-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(\varepsilon'-\varepsilon)p(1/p)'} \right\}^{\frac{1}{(1/p)'/p}} \sum_{j=k-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')} \left\{ \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-1})} [g_j(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\lesssim \delta^{k\varepsilon'} \sum_{j=k-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')} \left\{ \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-1})} [g_j(y)]^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 3.18. \square

The following lemma illustrates that any element of $\mathcal{AF}_{p,\infty}^s(\mathcal{X})$ is a locally integrable function.

Lemma 3.19. *Let $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ with η as in Definition 2.5, $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, and $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), \infty)$ with ω as in (2.2). Assume that the measure μ of \mathcal{X} has a weak lower bound $Q = \omega$. Then, for any $f \in \mathcal{AF}_{p,\infty}^s(\mathcal{X})$, there exists an $\tilde{f} \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathcal{X})$ such that $f = \tilde{f}$ in $(\mathring{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$.*

To prove Lemma 3.19, we need the notion of approximations of the identity with exponential decay and integration 1; see [23, Definition 2.8] for more details.

Definition 3.20. Let $\eta \in (0, 1)$ be as in Definition 2.5. A sequence $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of bounded linear integral operators on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ is called an *approximation of the identity with exponential decay and integration 1* (for short, 1-exp-ATI) if $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ has the following properties:

- (i) for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, Q_k satisfies (ii), (iii), and (iv) of Definition 2.5 but without the decay factor

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

- (ii) for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

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

- (iii) letting, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $P_k := Q_k - Q_{k-1}$, then $\{P_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is an exp-ATI.

Remark 3.21. As was pointed out in [23, Remark 2.9], the existence of the 1-exp-ATI is guaranteed by [4, Lemma 10.1]. Moreover, by the proofs of [24, Proposition 2.9] and [20, Proposition 2.7(iv)], we know that, if $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a 1-exp-ATI, then, for any $f \in L^2(\mathcal{X})$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Q_k f = f$ in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$.

By an argument similar to that used in the proof of [24, Proposition 2.10], we have the following conclusion; we omit the details.

Lemma 3.22. *Let $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ with η as in Definition 2.5, $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, and $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a 1-exp-ATI. For any $z \in \mathcal{X}$, let*

$$\phi(z) := \delta^{ks} [d(x, y)]^{-s} [Q_k(x, z) - Q_k(y, z)].$$

If $d(x, y) \in (0, \delta^k]$, then $\phi \in \mathcal{F}_k(x)$, where $\mathcal{F}_k(x)$ is as in Definition 3.1.

Next, we prove Lemma 3.19.

Proof of Lemma 3.19. Assume that $f \in \mathcal{AF}_{p,\infty}^s(\mathcal{X})$ and $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is an 1-exp-ATI. For any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, let

$$g(x) := \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \delta^{-ks} \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}_k(x)} |\langle f, \phi \rangle|.$$

First, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we have

$$|Q_k f(x) - Q_{k+i} f(x)| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} |Q_{k+j} f(x) - Q_{k+j+1} f(x)| = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} |\langle f, Q_{k+j}(x, \cdot) - Q_{k+j+1}(x, \cdot) \rangle|.$$

Note that, by (2.6) and (2.7), we obtain, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$Q_{k+j}(x, \cdot) - Q_{k+j+1}(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{F}_{k+j+1}(x).$$

From this, we deduce that

$$|Q_k f(x) - Q_{k+i} f(x)| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \delta^{(k+j+1)s} g(x) \lesssim \delta^{ks} g(x). \quad (3.23)$$

We now consider the case $p \in (1, \infty)$ first. To this end, note that (3.23) implies that $\{Q_k f - Q_{k+i} f\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^p(\mathcal{X})$. By the completeness of $L^p(\mathcal{X})$, we find that there exists an $f_k \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$ such that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} (Q_k f - Q_{k+i} f) = f_k$$

both in $L^p(\mathcal{X})$ and pointwise. Observe that, for any $k, k' \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_k &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} (Q_k f - Q_{k+i} f) = Q_k f - Q_{k'} f + \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} (Q_{k'} f - Q_{k+i} f) \\ &= Q_k f - Q_{k'} f + f_{k'} \end{aligned}$$

both in $L^p(\mathcal{X})$ and pointwise. Let $\tilde{f} := Q_0 f - f_0$. Then, by this, we conclude that $\tilde{f} \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{X})$ and, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\tilde{f} = Q_k f - f_k$. On the other hand, since $Q_k f \rightarrow f$ in $(\mathring{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that, for any $\psi \in \mathring{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{f}, \psi \rangle &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \tilde{f}(x) \psi(x) d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ Q_0 f(x) - \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} [Q_0 f(x) - Q_i f(x)] \right\} \psi(x) d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} Q_0 f(x) \psi(x) d\mu(x) - \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{X}} [Q_0 f(x) - Q_i f(x)] \psi(x) d\mu(x) \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{X}} Q_i f(x) \psi(x) d\mu(x) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \langle Q_i f, \psi \rangle = \langle f, \psi \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of this lemma in the case when $p \in (1, \infty)$.

Next, we consider the case $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), 1]$. For any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, let $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $\delta^{k_0+1} < d(x, y) \leq \delta^{k_0}$. Then, by Lemma 3.22 and (3.23), we know that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $k > k_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_k f(x) - Q_k f(y)| &\leq |Q_k f(x) - Q_{k_0} f(x)| + |Q_{k_0} f(x) - Q_{k_0} f(y)| \\ &\quad + |Q_{k_0} f(y) - Q_k f(y)| \\ &\lesssim \delta^{k_0 s} [g(x) + g(y)] \lesssim [d(x, y)]^s [g(x) + g(y)]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

On the other hand, we find that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $k \leq k_0$,

$$|Q_k f(x) - Q_k f(y)| = [d(x, y)]^s \delta^{-ks} \left\langle f, \delta^{ks} [d(x, y)]^{-s} [Q_k(x, \cdot) - Q_k(y, \cdot)] \right\rangle.$$

Note that, due to $k \leq k_0$, then $d(x, y) \leq \delta^k$. From this and Lemma 3.22, we deduce that

$$\delta^{ks} [d(x, y)]^{-s} [Q_k(x, \cdot) - Q_k(y, \cdot)] \in \mathcal{F}_k(x),$$

which implies that

$$|Q_k f(x) - Q_k f(y)| \lesssim [d(x, y)]^s [g(x) + g(y)]. \quad (3.25)$$

Combining (3.24) and (3.25), we know that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$|Q_k f(x) - Q_k f(y)| \lesssim [d(x, y)]^s [g(x) + g(y)]. \quad (3.26)$$

Moreover, by $f \in \mathcal{AF}_{p, \infty}^s(\mathcal{X})$, we know that $g \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$. From this and (3.26), we further deduce that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$Q_k f \in \dot{M}^{s, p}(\mathcal{X}) \quad \text{and} \quad \|Q_k f\|_{\dot{M}^{s, p}(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \sim \|f\|_{\mathcal{AF}_{p, \infty}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

By this and Corollary 3.14, we find that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists a constant C_k such that

$$Q_k f - C_k \in L^{p^*}(\mathcal{X}) \quad \text{and} \quad \|Q_k f - C_k\|_{L^{p^*}(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|Q_k f\|_{\dot{M}^{s, p}(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{AF}_{p, \infty}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

From this and the weak compactness property of $L^{p^*}(\mathcal{X})$ (recall that $p^* > 1$ in this case), we deduce that there exist a subsequence $\{Q_{k_j} f - C_{k_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a function $\tilde{f} \in L^{p^*}(\mathcal{X})$ such that

$$\tilde{f} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} [Q_{k_j} f - C_{k_j}]$$

both weakly in $L^{p^*}(\mathcal{X})$ and also in $(\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$. Besides, by (3.23), we find that, for any $j, j' \in \mathbb{N}$, $Q_{k_j} f - Q_{k_{j'}} f \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$ and $[Q_{k_j} f - C_{k_j}] - [Q_{k_{j'}} f - C_{k_{j'}}] \in L^{p^*}(\mathcal{X})$, which further implies that $C_{k_j} = C_{k_{j'}}$. By the fact that $Q_{k_j} f \rightarrow f$ in $(\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that

$$f = f - C_{k_0} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} [Q_{k_j} f - C_{k_j}] = \tilde{f}$$

in $(\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$. This finishes the proof of Lemma 3.19. \square

We now present the proof of Theorem 3.10.

Proof of Theorem 3.10. By similarity, we only prove (i). We first show $\dot{M}_{p, q}^s(\mathcal{X}) \subset \mathcal{AF}_{p, q}^s(\mathcal{X})$. To this end, fix $u \in \dot{M}_{p, q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ and recall that u is locally integrable on \mathcal{X} by Corollary 3.13. With this in mind, we consider five cases on p and q .

Case 1) $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $q \in (1, \infty]$. In this case, we only consider the case $q \in (1, \infty)$, because the proof of the case $q = \infty$ is similar to that of $q \in (1, \infty)$. Choose $\{g_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)$ such that

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} g_k^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{M}_{p, q}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

Then we have, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and $\phi \in \mathcal{F}_k(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle u, \phi \rangle| &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} \phi(y) u(y) d\mu(y) \right| = \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} \phi(y) [u(y) - u_{B(x, \delta^k)}] d\mu(y) \right| \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} D_\gamma(x, y; \delta^k) |u(y) - u_{B(x, \delta^k)}| d\mu(y) \end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma} \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-j})} |u(y) - u_{B(x, \delta^k)}| d\mu(y),$$

where $D_\gamma(x, y; \delta^k)$ is as in (2.3). Notice that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-j})} |u(y) - u_{B(x, \delta^k)}| d\mu(y) \\ &= \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-j})} |u(y) - u_{B(x, \delta^{k-1})} + u_{B(x, \delta^{k-1})} - u_{B(x, \delta^k)}| d\mu(y) \\ &\leq \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-j})} |u(y) - u_{B(x, \delta^{k-1})}| d\mu(y) + \frac{1}{V_{\delta^k}(x)} \int_{B(x, \delta^k)} |u(y) - u_{B(x, \delta^{k-1})}| d\mu(y) \\ &\lesssim \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-j})} |u(y) - u_{B(x, \delta^{k-1})}| d\mu(y) + \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-1})} |u(y) - u_{B(x, \delta^{k-1})}| d\mu(y) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{i=0}^j \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-i})} |u(y) - u_{B(x, \delta^{k-i})}| d\mu(y). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two inequalities, we obtain, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle u, \phi \rangle| &\lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma} \sum_{i=0}^j \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-i})} |u(y) - u_{B(x, \delta^{k-i})}| d\mu(y) \\ &\sim \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \delta^{j\gamma} \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-i})} |u(y) - u_{B(x, \delta^{k-i})}| d\mu(y) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \delta^{i\gamma} \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-i})} |u(y) - u_{B(x, \delta^{k-i})}| d\mu(y). \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

From this and Lemma 3.16 (see also Remark 3.17), we deduce that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle u, \phi \rangle| &\lesssim \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \delta^{i\gamma} \delta^{(k-i)s} \sum_{j=k-i-3}^{k-i-1} \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-i-2})} g_j(y) d\mu(y) \\ &\lesssim \delta^{ks} \sum_{j=-\infty}^k \sum_{i=k-j-3}^{k-j-1} \delta^{i(\gamma-s)} \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-i-2})} g_j(y) d\mu(y) \\ &\lesssim \delta^{k\gamma} \sum_{j=-\infty}^k \delta^{-j(\gamma-s)} \int_{B(x, \delta^{j-2})} g_j(y) d\mu(y) \lesssim \delta^{k\gamma} \sum_{j=-\infty}^k \delta^{-j(\gamma-s)} M(g_j)(x). \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

By this, the Hölder inequality, and Lemma 3.9, we conclude that

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{AF}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left[\delta^{k\gamma} \sum_{j=-\infty}^k \delta^{-j(\gamma-s)} M(g_j) \right]^q \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{k(\gamma-s)} \sum_{j=-\infty}^k \delta^{-j(\gamma-s)} [M(g_j)]^q \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(X)} \\
&\lesssim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} [M(g_j)]^q \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(X)} \lesssim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} g_j^q \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(X)} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^s(X)},
\end{aligned}$$

which is the desired estimate in this case.

Case 2) $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $q \in (\omega/(\omega + s), 1]$. In this case, choose $\{g_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)$ as in Case 1). Recall that we may assume $A_0 \delta^{p/\omega} < 1$. As such, combining (3.27) and Lemma 3.18 [with $p = \omega/(\omega + \varepsilon) < 1$], we find that for any fixed $\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in (0, s)$ with $\varepsilon < \varepsilon'$, there holds true

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle u, \phi \rangle| &\lesssim \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \delta^{i\gamma} \delta^{(k-i)\varepsilon'} \sum_{j=k-i-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')} \left\{ \int_{B(x, \delta^{k-i-1})} [g_j(y)]^{\frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{\omega+\varepsilon}{\omega}} \\
&\lesssim \delta^{k\varepsilon'} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{k-2} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')} \left[M \left([g_j(x)]^{\frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon}} \right) \right]^{\frac{\omega+\varepsilon}{\omega}} \sum_{i=k-j-2}^{\infty} \delta^{i(\gamma-\varepsilon')} \\
&\quad + \delta^{k\varepsilon'} \sum_{j=k-1}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')} \left[M \left([g_j(x)]^{\frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon}} \right) \right]^{\frac{\omega+\varepsilon}{\omega}} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \delta^{i(\gamma-\varepsilon')} \\
&\lesssim \delta^{k\gamma} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{k-2} \delta^{j(s-\gamma)} \left[M \left([g_j(x)]^{\frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon}} \right) \right]^{\frac{\omega+\varepsilon}{\omega}} + \delta^{k\varepsilon'} \sum_{j=k-1}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')} \left[M \left([g_j(x)]^{\frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon}} \right) \right]^{\frac{\omega+\varepsilon}{\omega}}. \quad (3.29)
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\varepsilon \in (0, s)$ such that $\frac{\omega}{\omega+s} < \frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon} < q$, and using (3.29), (3.1) (with $\theta = q$), and Lemma 3.9, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(X)} &\lesssim \left\| \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left\{ \delta^{k\gamma} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{k-2} \delta^{j(s-\gamma)} \left[M \left([g_j]^{\frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon}} \right) \right]^{\frac{\omega+\varepsilon}{\omega}} \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \left. + \delta^{k\varepsilon'} \sum_{j=k-1}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')} \left[M \left([g_j]^{\frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon}} \right) \right]^{\frac{\omega+\varepsilon}{\omega}} \right\}^q \right)^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(X)} \\
&\lesssim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \delta^{k\gamma q} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{k-2} \delta^{j(s-\gamma)q} \left[M \left([g_j]^{\frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon}} \right) \right]^{\frac{(\omega+\varepsilon)q}{\omega}} \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(X)} \\
&\quad + \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \delta^{k\varepsilon' q} \sum_{j=k-1}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')q} \left[M \left([g_j]^{\frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon}} \right) \right]^{\frac{(\omega+\varepsilon)q}{\omega}} \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(X)} \\
&\lesssim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \left[M \left([g_j]^{\frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon}} \right) \right]^{\frac{(\omega+\varepsilon)q}{\omega}} \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(X)} \lesssim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} g_j^q \right\}^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(X)} \\
&\lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^s(X)}.
\end{aligned}$$

This is the desired estimate in this case.

Case 3) $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), 1]$ and $q \in (\omega/(\omega + s), \infty]$. In this case, the proof of Theorem 3.10 is similar to that of Case 2); the details are omitted.

Case 4) $p = \infty$ and $q \in (1, \infty]$. In this case, we only consider the case $q \in (1, \infty)$ because the proof of the case $q = \infty$ is similar to that of $q \in (1, \infty)$. Choose $\{g_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)$ such that

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left\{ \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \int_{B(x, \delta^k)} [g_j(y)]^q d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{M}_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X})}. \quad (3.30)$$

By (3.28) and the Hölder inequality, we know that, for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(x, 2A_0C_0\delta^l)} \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}_k(z)} |\langle u, \phi \rangle|^q d\mu(z) \\ & \lesssim \int_{B(x, 2A_0C_0\delta^l)} \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \left[\delta^{k\gamma} \sum_{j=-\infty}^k \delta^{-j(\gamma-s)} \int_{B(z, \delta^{j-2})} g_j(y) d\mu(y) \right]^q d\mu(z) \\ & \lesssim \int_{B(x, 2A_0C_0\delta^l)} \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \delta^{k(\gamma-s)} \sum_{j=-\infty}^k \delta^{-j(\gamma-s)} \left[\int_{B(z, \delta^{j-2})} g_j(y) d\mu(y) \right]^q d\mu(z) \\ & \lesssim \int_{B(x, 2A_0C_0\delta^l)} \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \delta^{k(\gamma-s)} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{l-1} \delta^{-j(\gamma-s)} \left[\int_{B(z, \delta^{j-2})} g_j(y) d\mu(y) \right]^q d\mu(z) \\ & \quad + \int_{B(x, 2A_0C_0\delta^l)} \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \delta^{k(\gamma-s)} \sum_{j=l}^k \delta^{-j(\gamma-s)} \left[\int_{B(z, \delta^{j-2})} g_j(y) d\mu(y) \right]^q d\mu(z) \\ & =: Y_1 + Y_2. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate Y_1 , by the Hölder inequality with exponent $q > 1$, and (3.30), we find that, for any $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $z \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\left[\int_{B(z, \delta^{j-2})} g_j(y) d\mu(y) \right]^q \leq \int_{B(z, \delta^{j-2})} [g_j(y)]^q d\mu(y) \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{M}_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X})}^q.$$

From this, we further deduce that

$$Y_1 \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{M}_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X})}^q \int_{B(x, 2A_0C_0\delta^l)} \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \delta^{k(\gamma-s)} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{l-1} \delta^{-j(\gamma-s)} d\mu(z) \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{M}_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X})}^q.$$

To estimate Y_2 , note that, for any $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $j \geq l$, $z \in B(x, 2A_0C_0\delta^l)$, and $y \in B(z, \delta^{j-2})$, we have

$$d(y, x) \leq A_0[d(y, z) + d(z, x)] < A_0\delta^{j-2} + 2A_0^2C_0\delta^l \leq (A_0\delta + 2A_0^2C_0\delta^3)\delta^{l-3} \leq \delta^{l-3},$$

which further implies that

$$Y_2 \lesssim \int_{B(x, 2A_0C_0\delta^l)} \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \delta^{k(\gamma-s)} \sum_{j=l}^k \delta^{-j(\gamma-s)} \left[\int_{B(z, \delta^{j-2})} g_j(y) \mathbf{1}_{B(x, \delta^{l-3})}(y) d\mu(y) \right]^q d\mu(z)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim \int_{B(x, 2A_0 C_0 \delta^l)} \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \delta^{k(\gamma-s)} \sum_{j=l}^k \delta^{-j(\gamma-s)} \left[M(g_j \mathbf{1}_{B(x, \delta^{l-3})})(z) \right]^q d\mu(z) \\
&\lesssim \sum_{j=l}^{\infty} \int_{B(x, 2A_0 C_0 \delta^l)} \left[M(g_j \mathbf{1}_{B(x, \delta^{l-3})})(z) \right]^q d\mu(z) \\
&\lesssim \sum_{j=l}^{\infty} \int_{B(x, 2A_0 C_0 \delta^l)} \left[g_j(z) \mathbf{1}_{B(x, \delta^{l-3})}(z) \right]^q d\mu(z) \\
&\lesssim \sum_{j=l-3}^{\infty} \int_{B(x, \delta^{l-3})} \left[g_j(z) \right]^q d\mu(z) \lesssim \|u\|_{M_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X})}^q.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the estimates of Y_1 and Y_2 , we conclude that, for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\int_{B(x, 2A_0 C_0 \delta^l)} \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}_k(z)} |\langle u, \phi \rangle|^q d\mu(z) \lesssim \|u\|_{M_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X})}^q,$$

which, together with Lemma 2.4(iii), implies the desired estimate in this case.

Case 5) $p = \infty$ and $q \in (\omega/(\omega + s), 1]$. In this case, choose $\{g_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}^s(u)$ as in Case 4). Arguing as in (3.29), we have, for any fixed $\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in (0, s)$ with $\varepsilon < \varepsilon'$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B(x, 2A_0 C_0 \delta^l)} \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}_k(z)} |\langle u, \phi \rangle|^q d\mu(z) \\
&\lesssim \int_{B(x, 2A_0 C_0 \delta^l)} \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \delta^{i\gamma q} \delta^{(k-i)\varepsilon' q} \\
&\quad \times \sum_{j=k-i-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')q} \left\{ \int_{B(z, \delta^{k-i-1})} [g_j(y)]^{\frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{(\omega+\varepsilon)q}{\omega}} d\mu(z) \\
&\sim \int_{B(x, 2A_0 C_0 \delta^l)} \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \sum_{m=-\infty}^k \delta^{(k-m)\gamma q} \delta^{m\varepsilon' q} \\
&\quad \times \sum_{j=m-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')q} \left\{ \int_{B(z, \delta^{m-1})} [g_j(y)]^{\frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{(\omega+\varepsilon)q}{\omega}} d\mu(z) \\
&\lesssim \int_{B(x, 2A_0 C_0 \delta^l)} \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{(Nm)(\gamma-s)q} \delta^{m(\varepsilon'-\gamma)q} \\
&\quad \times \sum_{j=m-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')q} \left\{ \int_{B(z, \delta^{m-1})} [g_j(y)]^{\frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{(\omega+\varepsilon)q}{\omega}} d\mu(z) \\
&\lesssim \int_{B(x, 2A_0 C_0 \delta^l)} \sum_{m=-\infty}^l \delta^{l(\gamma-s)q} \delta^{m(\varepsilon'-\gamma)q} \\
&\quad \times \sum_{j=m-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')q} \left\{ \int_{B(z, \delta^{m-1})} [g_j(y)]^{\frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{(\omega+\varepsilon)q}{\omega}} d\mu(z)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_{B(x, 2A_0C_0\delta^l)} \sum_{m=l+1}^{\infty} \delta^{m(\varepsilon'-s)q} \dots \\
& =: Y_3 + Y_4.
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate Y_3 , choosing $\varepsilon \in (0, s)$ such that $\omega/(\omega + s) < \omega/(\omega + \varepsilon) < q$, and using the Hölder inequality and (3.30), we find that, for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $z \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\left\{ \int_{B(z, \delta^{m-1})} [g_j(y)]^{\frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{(\omega+\varepsilon)q}{\omega}} \leq \int_{B(z, \delta^{m-1})} [g_j(y)]^q d\mu(y) \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{M}_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X})}^q,$$

which implies that

$$Y_3 \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{M}_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X})}^q \sum_{m=-\infty}^l \delta^{l(\gamma-s)q} \delta^{m(\varepsilon'-\gamma)q} \sum_{j=m-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')q} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{M}_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X})}^q.$$

To estimate Y_4 , observe that, for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $m \geq l+1$, $z \in B(x, 2A_0C_0\delta^l)$, and $y \in B(z, \delta^{m-1})$, we have

$$d(y, x) \leq A_0[d(y, z) + d(z, x)] < A_0\delta^{m-2} + 2A_0^2C_0\delta^l \leq (A_0\delta + 2A_0^2C_0\delta^2)\delta^{l-2} \leq \delta^{l-2},$$

which further implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_4 & \lesssim \int_{B(x, 2A_0C_0\delta^l)} \sum_{m=l+1}^{\infty} \delta^{m(\varepsilon'-s)q} \sum_{j=m-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')q} \\
& \quad \times \left\{ \int_{B(z, \delta^{m-1})} [g_j(y) \mathbf{1}_{B(x, \delta^{l-2})}(y)]^{\frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{(\omega+\varepsilon)q}{\omega}} d\mu(z) \\
& \lesssim \int_{B(x, 2A_0C_0\delta^l)} \sum_{m=l+1}^{\infty} \delta^{m(\varepsilon'-s)q} \sum_{j=m-2}^{\infty} \delta^{j(s-\varepsilon')q} \left\{ M\left([g_j \mathbf{1}_{B(x, \delta^{l-2})}]^{\frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon}}\right)(z) \right\}^{\frac{(\omega+\varepsilon)q}{\omega}} d\mu(z) \\
& \lesssim \int_{B(x, 2A_0C_0\delta^l)} \sum_{j=l-1}^{\infty} \left\{ M\left([g_j \mathbf{1}_{B(x, \delta^{l-2})}]^{\frac{\omega}{\omega+\varepsilon}}\right)(z) \right\}^{\frac{(\omega+\varepsilon)q}{\omega}} d\mu(z) \\
& \lesssim \sum_{j=l-2}^{\infty} \int_{B(x, \delta^{l-2})} [g_j(z)]^q d\mu(z) \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{M}_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X})}^q.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the estimates of Y_3 and Y_4 , we conclude that, for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\int_{B(x, 2A_0C_0\delta^l)} \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}_k(z)} |\langle u, \phi \rangle|^q d\mu(z) \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{M}_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X})}^q,$$

which, together with Lemma 2.4(iii), implies the desired estimate in this case.

Thus, we have $\dot{M}_{p, q}^s(\mathcal{X}) \subset \mathcal{AF}_{p, q}^s(\mathcal{X})$.

We finally show $\mathcal{AF}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) \subset \dot{M}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$. Assume that $f \in \mathcal{AF}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$. By Lemma 3.19 and its proof, we know that there exist a subsequence $\{Q_{k_j}f\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} Q_{k_j}f(x) = f(x) - C$. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, let

$$g_k(x) := \delta^{-ks} \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}_k(x)} |\langle f, \phi \rangle|.$$

For almost every $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $\delta^{k_0+1} \leq d(x, y) < \delta^{k_0}$, we can find a $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $k_0 \leq k_{j_0}$ and we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x) - f(y)| &= \left| f(x) - Q_{k_{j_0}}f(x) + Q_{k_{j_0}}f(x) - Q_{k_{j_0}}f(y) + Q_{k_{j_0}}f(y) - f(y) \right| \\ &\leq \left| Q_{k_{j_0}}f(x) - Q_{k_{j_0}}f(y) \right| + \sum_{j=j_0}^{\infty} \left[\left| Q_{k_{j+1}}f(x) - Q_{k_j}f(x) \right| + \left| Q_{k_{j+1}}f(y) - Q_{k_j}f(y) \right| \right] \\ &\leq \delta^{k_{j_0}s} [g_{k_{j_0}}(x) + g_{k_{j_0}}(y)] + \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \left[\left| Q_{k+1}f(x) - Q_kf(x) \right| + \left| Q_{k+1}f(y) - Q_kf(y) \right| \right] \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \delta^{ks} [g_k(x) + g_k(y)]. \end{aligned}$$

For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, define

$$h_k := 2 \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \delta^{(-k+j-1)s} g_j.$$

We then have, for almost every $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ with $\delta^{k+1} \leq d(x, y) < \delta^k$,

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x) - f(y)| &\leq 2 \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \delta^{js} [g_j(x) + g_j(y)] \leq \delta^{(k+1)s} [h_k(x) + h_k(y)] \\ &\leq [d(x, y)]^s [h_k(x) + h_k(y)], \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\{h_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}^s(f)$. Note that, by the Hölder inequality when $q \in (1, \infty]$, or (3.1) when $q \in (\omega/(\omega + s), 1]$, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} h_k^q \lesssim \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \delta^{(-k+j-1)s} g_j \right]^q \lesssim \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \delta^{(-k+j-1)sq/2} g_j^q \lesssim \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} g_j^q,$$

which implies that, for any given $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), \infty)$ and $q \in (\omega/(\omega + s), \infty]$,

$$\|f\|_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} \leq \left\| \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} h_k^q \right)^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \left\| \left(\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} g_j^q \right)^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \sim \|f\|_{\mathcal{AF}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

When $p = \infty$, then, by the Hölder inequality when $q \in (1, \infty]$, or (3.1) when $q \in (\omega/(\omega + s), 1)$, we have, for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\sum_{k=l}^{\infty} h_k^q \lesssim \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \left[\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \delta^{(-k+j-1)s} g_j \right]^q \lesssim \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \delta^{(-k+j-1)sq/2} g_j^q \lesssim \sum_{j=l}^{\infty} g_j^q,$$

which implies that, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\sum_{k=l}^{\infty} \int_{B(x, \delta^l)} [h_k(y)]^q d\mu(y) \lesssim \sum_{j=l}^{\infty} \int_{B(x, \delta^l)} [g_j(y)]^q d\mu(y).$$

From this, we deduce that $\|f\|_{\dot{M}_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{AF}_{\infty, q}^s(\mathcal{X})}$, which completes the proof of (i) and hence of Theorem 3.10. \square

Now, we can show Theorem 2.16.

Proof of Theorem 2.16. The Theorem 2.16 is a direct corollary of Theorems 3.3 and 3.10; we omit the details. \square

4 Pointwise characterization of inhomogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces

In this section, we establish the inhomogeneous version of Theorem 2.16. Let us begin with the notion of inhomogeneous approximations of the identity with exponential decay (see [24, Definition 6.1]).

Definition 4.1. Let $\eta \in (0, 1)$ be as in Definition 2.5. A sequence $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ of bounded linear integral operators on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ is called an *inhomogeneous approximation of the identity with exponential decay* (for short, exp-IATI) if $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ has the following properties:

- (i) $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} Q_k = I$ in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$;
- (ii) for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, Q_k satisfies (ii) through (v) of Definition 2.5;
- (iii) Q_0 satisfies (ii), (iii), and (iv) of Definition 2.5 with $k = 0$ but without the decay factor

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

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

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} Q_0(x, y) d\mu(y) = 1 = \int_{\mathcal{X}} Q_0(y, x) d\mu(y). \quad (4.1)$$

Remark 4.2. As was pointed out in [24, Remark 6.2], the existence of an exp-IATI on \mathcal{X} is guaranteed by the main results from [4]. In Definition 4.1, due to (4.1), we do not need $\text{diam } \mathcal{X} = \infty$ to guarantee the existence of an exp-IATI on \mathcal{X} . In other words, $\text{diam } \mathcal{X}$ can be finite or infinite.

Based on the notion of exp-IATIs, He et al. established the following inhomogeneous discrete Calderón reproducing formulae in [24, Theorems 6.10 and 6.13].

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ be an exp-IATI and $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ with η as in Definition 2.5. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$, and $m \in \{1, \dots, N(k, \alpha)\}$, suppose that $y_\alpha^{k,m}$ is an arbitrary point in $Q_\alpha^{k,m}$. Then there exist an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sequence $\{\tilde{Q}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ of bounded linear integral operators on $L^2(X)$ such that, for any $f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$,*

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

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

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

and $Q_{\alpha,1}^{k,m}(f) := \langle f, Q_{\alpha,1}^{k,m} \rangle$. Moreover, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the kernel of \tilde{Q}_k , still denoted by \tilde{Q}_k , satisfies (3.2), (3.3), and the following integral condition: for any $x \in X$,

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

Now, we recall the notions of inhomogeneous spaces $B_{p,q}^s(X)$ and $F_{p,q}^s(X)$ introduced in [46]. To this end, for any dyadic cube Q and any non-negative measurable function f on X , let

$$m_Q(f) := \frac{1}{\mu(Q)} \int_Q f(y) d\mu(y).$$

Definition 4.4. Let $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ with η as in Definition 2.5, and $s \in (-(\beta \wedge \gamma), \beta \wedge \gamma)$. Let $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ be an exp-IATI and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ as in Lemma 4.3.

- (i) If $p \in (p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma), \infty]$ with $p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma)$ as in (1.1), and $q \in (0, \infty]$, then the *inhomogeneous Besov space* $B_{p,q}^s(X)$ is defined to be the set of all $f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$ such that

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

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

- (ii) If $p \in (p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma), \infty)$ and $q \in (p(s, \beta \wedge \gamma), \infty]$, then the *inhomogeneous Triebel–Lizorkin space* $F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ is defined to be the set of all $f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$ such that

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

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

Remark 4.5. (i) We point out that we *do not* need the assumption $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$ in Definitions 4.1 and 4.4.

- (ii) It was proved in [46, Propositions 4.3 and 4.4] that, when β , γ , s , p , and q are as in Definition 4.4, the inhomogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces are independent of the choices of both exp-IATIs and the spaces of distributions.

We next recall the notions of 1-exp-IATIs (see, for instance, [26, Definition 3.1]) and the local Hardy space $h^p(\mathcal{X})$ (see, for instance, [26, Section 3]).

Definition 4.6. Let $\eta \in (0, 1)$ be as in Definition 2.5. A sequence $\{P_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ of bounded linear integral operators on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ is called an *inhomogeneous approximation of the identity with exponential decay and integration 1* (for short, 1-exp-IATI) if $\{P_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ has the following properties:

- (i) for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, P_k satisfies (ii) and (iii) of Definition 2.5 but without the term

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

- (ii) for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

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

- (iii) letting $Q_0 := P_0$ and, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $Q_k := P_k - P_{k-1}$, then $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is an exp-IATI.

Definition 4.7. Let \mathcal{X} be a space of homogeneous type. Let $\{P_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a 1-exp-IATI. The *local radial maximal function* $\mathcal{M}_0^+(f)$ of f is defined by setting, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\mathcal{M}_0^+(f)(x) := \max \left\{ \max_{k \in \{0, \dots, N\}} \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{m=1}^{N(k,\alpha)} \sup_{z \in Q_\alpha^{k,m}} |P_k f(z)| \mathbf{1}_{Q_\alpha^{k,m}}(x) \right\}, \sup_{k \in \{N+1, N+2, \dots\}} |P_k f(x)| \right\},$$

where $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is as in Lemma 4.3. For any $p \in (0, \infty)$, the *local Hardy space* $h^p(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by setting

$$h^p(\mathcal{X}) := \left\{ f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))' : \|f\|_{h^p(\mathcal{X})} := \|\mathcal{M}_0^+(f)\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} < \infty \right\}.$$

Remark 4.8. In [26, Theorem 3.3], it was shown that, when $p \in (1, \infty]$, then $h^p(\mathcal{X}) = L^p(\mathcal{X})$. Besides, in [46, Theorem 6.13], it was proved that, when $p \in (1, \infty)$, $F_{p,2}^0 = L^p(\mathcal{X})$. Moreover, the Littlewood–Paley g -function characterization of $h^p(\mathcal{X})$ in [26, Theorem 5.7] implies that, for any given $p \in (\omega/(\omega + \eta), 1]$, $F_{p,2}^0(\mathcal{X}) = h^p(\mathcal{X})$.

Now, we introduce the notions of inhomogeneous Hajłasz–Sobolev spaces, Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin spaces, and Hajłasz–Besov spaces.

Definition 4.9. Let $s \in (0, \infty)$.

- (i) Let $p \in (0, \infty)$. The *inhomogeneous Hajłasz–Sobolev space* $M^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions u on \mathcal{X} such that

$$\|u\|_{M^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})} := \|u\|_{h^p(\mathcal{X})} + \|u\|_{\dot{M}^{s,p}(\mathcal{X})} < \infty.$$

- (ii) Let $p, q \in (0, \infty]$. The *inhomogeneous Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin space* $M_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions u on \mathcal{X} such that

$$\|u\|_{M_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} := \|u\|_{h^p(\mathcal{X})} + \|u\|_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} < \infty.$$

- (iii) Let $p, q \in (0, \infty]$. The *inhomogeneous Hajłasz–Besov space* $N_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions u on \mathcal{X} such that

$$\|u\|_{N_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} := \|u\|_{h^p(\mathcal{X})} + \|u\|_{\dot{N}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

The following theorem states the inhomogeneous version of Theorem 2.16.

Theorem 4.10. Let ω and η be, respectively, as in (2.2) and Definition 2.5, $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$, $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, and p, q be as in Definition 4.4. Assume that $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$ and the measure μ of \mathcal{X} has a weak lower bound $Q = \omega$.

- (i) If $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), \infty)$ and $q \in (\omega/(\omega + s), \infty]$, then $M_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) = F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$.
- (ii) If $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), \infty]$ and $q \in (0, \infty]$, then $N_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) = B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$.

To prove Theorem 4.10, we first establish a relationship between local Hardy spaces and inhomogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces, whose RD-space version was obtained in [56, Theorem 1.2]. We point out that the proof of [56, Theorem 1.2] just depends on the size, the regularity, and the cancellation conditions of the approximation of the identity (for short, ATI), but *does not* involve the reverse doubling condition of the underlying space and the bounded support of ATI. This results in that the proof of [56, Theorem 1.2] is still valid in any space of homogeneous type due to Definition 2.5(v) and Lemma 2.6; we omit the details.

Theorem 4.11. Let $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \eta)$ with η as in Definition 2.5, $s \in (0, \beta \wedge \gamma)$, and $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), \infty)$ with ω as in (2.2). Assume $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$. Let $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be an exp-ATI.

(i) If $q \in (0, \infty]$, then $f \in B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if $f \in h^p(\mathcal{X})$ and

$$J_1 := \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} \|Q_k f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}^q \right]^{1/q} < \infty.$$

Moreover, $\|f\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}$ is equivalent to $\|f\|_{h^p(\mathcal{X})} + J_1$ with positive equivalence constants independent of f .

(ii) If $q \in (\omega/(\omega + s), \infty]$, then $f \in F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if $f \in h^p(\mathcal{X})$ and

$$J_2 := \left\| \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{-ksq} |Q_k f|^q \right)^{1/q} \right\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} < \infty.$$

Moreover, $\|f\|_{F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}$ is equivalent to $\|f\|_{h^p(\mathcal{X})} + J_2$ with positive equivalence constants independent of f .

Remark 4.12. Usually, it makes no sense to write the conclusions of Theorem 4.11 as $B_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) = h^p(\mathcal{X}) \cap \dot{B}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ and $F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) = h^p(\mathcal{X}) \cap \dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ because homogeneous and inhomogeneous spaces are defined via different kinds of spaces of distributions (see [56, Remark 1.1(iv)]).

Now, we show Theorem 4.10.

Proof of Theorem 4.10. We only prove (i) because the proof of (ii) is similar to that of (i). We first show $M_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) \subset F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$. To this end, assume that $u \in M_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$. By Definition 4.9, we know that $u \in h^p(\mathcal{X})$ and $u \in \dot{M}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$. We consider two cases on p .

Case 1) $p \in (1, \infty)$. In this case, since $p \in (1, \infty)$, from [26, Theorem 3.3], it follows that $u \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$. Moreover, by Theorem 2.16, we know that $u \in \dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$. These, together with [46, Theorem 6.12], imply that $u \in F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|u\|_{F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|u\|_{M_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}$.

Case 2) $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), 1]$. In this case, by Theorem 2.16, we know that $u \in \dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|u\|_{\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}$. Then, using Theorem 4.11(ii), we conclude that $u \in F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|u\|_{F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|u\|_{M_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}$.

Next, we show $F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X}) \subset M_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$. To this end, assume that $u \in F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$. We also consider two cases on p .

Case 1) $p \in (1, \infty)$. In this case, since $p \in (1, \infty)$, from [46, Theorem 6.12], it follows that $u \in L^p(\mathcal{X}) \cap \dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ and

$$\|u\|_{F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} \sim \|u\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} + \|u\|_{\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}.$$

By [26, Theorem 3.3] again, we know that $u \in h^p(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|u\|_{h^p(\mathcal{X})} \sim \|u\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}$. Besides, from Theorem 2.16, we deduce that $u \in \dot{M}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|u\|_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} \sim \|u\|_{\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}$, which further implies that $u \in M_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|u\|_{M_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|u\|_{F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}$.

Case 2) $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), 1]$. In this case, since $u \in F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$, from [46, Proposition 4.4], it follows that $u \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta, \gamma))'$ with β and γ as in Definition 4.4. By $p \in (\omega/(\omega + s), 1]$, we know that $s > \omega(1/p - 1)$. Choosing $\beta_0 \in (0, \eta)$ and $\gamma_0 \in (s, \eta) \subset (\omega[1/p - 1], \eta)$, then we find that $u \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\eta(\beta_0, \gamma_0))' \subset (\mathring{\mathcal{G}}_0^\eta(\beta_0, \gamma_0))'$. From this, Theorem 4.11(ii), and [46, Proposition 3.15], we deduce that $u \in \dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ and

$$\|u\|_{F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} \sim \|u\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} + \|u\|_{\dot{F}_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})},$$

which implies that $u \in M_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|u\|_{M_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|u\|_{F_{p,q}^s(\mathcal{X})}$. This finishes the proof of (i) and hence of Theorem 4.10. \square

Remark 4.13. We point out that it is not clear whether or not Theorem 4.10 still holds true when $\mu(\mathcal{X}) \neq \infty$, due to that the existence of exp-ATIs in Theorem 4.11 needs $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$ [see Remark 2.9(i)].

Acknowledgments. The second author would like to thank Ziyi He for his valuable discussions and suggestions for this article.

References

- [1] R. Alvarado, H. Górká and P. Hajłasz, Sobolev embedding for $M^{1,p}$ spaces is equivalent to a lower bound of the measure, *J. Funct. Anal.* 279 (2020), 108628, 39 pp.
- [2] R. Alvarado and M. Mitrea, *Hardy Spaces on Ahlfors-Regular Quasi Metric Spaces*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 2142, Springer, New York, 2015.
- [3] K. Asami and Y. Sawano, Non-smooth decomposition of homogeneous Triebel–Lizorkin–Morrey spaces, *Comment. Math.* 58 (2018), 37–56.
- [4] P. Auscher and T. Hytönen, Orthonormal bases of regular wavelets in spaces of homogeneous type, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* 34 (2013), 266–296.
- [5] O. V. Besov, V. P. Il’in and S. M. Nikol’skiĭ, *Integralnye Predstavleniya Funktsii i Teoremy Vlozheniya*, Second edition, Fizmatlit “Nauka”, Moscow, 1996.
- [6] T. A. Bui, Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces for Schrödinger operators with inverse-square potentials and applications, *J. Differential Equations* 269 (2020), 641–688.
- [7] T. A. Bui, Hermite pseudo-multipliers on new Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces, *J. Approx. Theory* 252 (2020), 105348, 16 pp.
- [8] T. A. Bui and X. T. Duong, Inhomogeneous Besov spaces associated to operators with off-diagonal semigroup estimates, *Adv. Differential Equations* 22 (2017), 191–234.
- [9] H.-Q. Bui, T. A. Bui and X. T. Duong, Weighted Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces associated to operators and applications, *Forum Math. Sigma* 8 (2020), e11, 95 pp.
- [10] R. R. Coifman and G. Weiss, *Analyse Harmonique Non-Commutative sur Certains Espaces Homogènes*, (French) Étude de Certaines Intégrales Singulières, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 242, Springer-Verlag, Berlin–New York, 1971.
- [11] R. R. Coifman and G. Weiss, Extensions of Hardy spaces and their use in analysis, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 83 (1977), 569–645.
- [12] A. Gogatishvili, P. Koskela and Y. Zhou, Characterizations of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on metric measure spaces. *Forum Math.* 25 (2013), 787–819.
- [13] L. Grafakos, L. Liu and D. Yang, Vector-valued singular integrals and maximal functions on spaces of homogeneous type, *Math. Scand.* 104 (2009), 296–310.
- [14] P. Hajłasz, Sobolev spaces on an arbitrary metric spaces, *Potential Anal.* 5 (1996), 403–415.
- [15] P. Hajłasz, Sobolev spaces on metric-measure spaces, in: *Heat Kernels and Analysis on Manifolds, Graphs, and Metric Spaces*, Paris, 2002, in: *Contemp. Math.*, vol. 338, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003, pp. 173–218.

- [16] P. Hajłasz and P. Koskela, Sobolev met Poincaré, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 145 (688) (2000), 1–101.
- [17] Ya. Han, Yo. Han, Z. He, J. Li and C. Pereyra, Geometric characterizations of embedding theorems: For Sobolev, Besov, and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type — via orthonormal wavelets, *J. Geom. Anal.* 31 (2021), 8947–8978.
- [18] Y. Han, J. Li and L. A. Ward, Hardy space theory on spaces of homogeneous type via orthonormal wavelet bases, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* 45 (2018), 120–169.
- [19] Y. Han, D. Müller and D. Yang, Littlewood–Paley characterizations for Hardy spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, *Math. Nachr.* 279 (2006), 1505–1537.
- [20] Y. Han, D. Müller and D. Yang, A theory of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on metric measure spaces modeled on Carnot–Carathéodory spaces, *Abstr. Appl. Anal.* 2008, Art. ID 893409, 1–250.
- [21] Y. Han and D. Yang, New characterizations and applications of inhomogeneous Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on homogeneous type spaces and fractals, *Dissertationes Math. (Rozprawy Mat.)* 403 (2002), 1–102.
- [22] Y. Han and D. Yang, Some new spaces of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin type on homogeneous spaces, *Studia Math.* 156 (2003), 67–97.
- [23] Z. He, Y. Han, J. Li, L. Liu, D. Yang and W. Yuan, A complete real-variable theory of Hardy spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.* 25 (2019), 2197–2267.
- [24] Z. He, L. Liu, D. Yang and W. Yuan, New Calderón reproducing formulae with exponential decay on spaces of homogeneous type, *Sci. China Math.* 62 (2019), 283–350.
- [25] Z. He, F. Wang, D. Yang and W. Yuan, Wavelet characterizations of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type and its applications, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* 54 (2021), 176–226.
- [26] Z. He, D. Yang and W. Yuan, Real-variable characterizations of local Hardy spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, *Math. Nachr.* 294 (2021), 900–955.
- [27] T. Heikkinen, L. Ihnatsyeva and H. Tuominen, Measure density and extension of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin functions, *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.* 22 (2016), 334–382.
- [28] T. Heikkinen, P. Koskela and H. Tuominen, Approximation and quasicontinuity of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin functions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 369 (2017), 3547–3573.
- [29] T. Heikkinen and H. Tuominen, Approximation by Hölder functions in Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces, *Constr. Approx.* 44 (2016), 455–482.
- [30] T. Heikkinen and H. Tuominen, Smoothing properties of the discrete fractional maximal operator on Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces, *Publ. Mat.* 58 (2014), 379–399.
- [31] J. Heinonen and P. Koskela, Quasiconformal maps in metric spaces with controlled geometry, *Acta Math.* 181 (1998), 1–61.
- [32] T. Hytönen and A. Kairema, Systems of dyadic cubes in a doubling metric space, *Colloq. Math.* 126 (2012), 1–33.
- [33] T. Hytönen and O. Tapiola, Almost Lipschitz-continuous wavelets in metric spaces via a new randomization of dyadic cubes, *J. Approx. Theory* 185 (2014), 12–30.
- [34] A. Jonsson, Besov spaces on closed subsets of \mathbb{R}^n , *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 341 (1994), 355–370.
- [35] P. Koskela, D. Yang and Y. Zhou, A characterization of Hajłasz–Sobolev and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces via grand Littlewood–Paley functions, *J. Funct. Anal.* 258 (2010), 2637–2661.

- [36] P. Koskela, D. Yang and Y. Zhou, Pointwise characterizations of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces and quasiconformal mappings, *Adv. Math.* 226 (2011), 3579–3621.
- [37] S. Keith and X. Zhong, The Poincaré inequality is an open ended condition, *Ann. of Math.* (2) 167 (2008), 575–599.
- [38] D. Müller and D. Yang, A difference characterization of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on RD-spaces, *Forum Math.* 21 (2009), 259–298.
- [39] E. Nakai and K. Yabuta, Pointwise multipliers for functions of weighted bounded mean oscillation on spaces of homogeneous type, *Math. Japon.* 46 (1997), 15–28.
- [40] Y. Sawano, *Theory of Besov Spaces*, *Developments in Mathematics* 56, Springer, Singapore, 2018.
- [41] N. Shanmugalingam, Newtonian spaces: An extension of Sobolev spaces to metric measure spaces, *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* 16 (2000), 243–279.
- [42] H. Triebel, *Theory of Function Spaces. I*, *Monographs in Mathematics* 78, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1983.
- [43] H. Triebel, *Theory of Function Spaces. II*, *Monographs in Mathematics* 84, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1992.
- [44] H. Triebel, *Theory of Function Spaces. III*, *Monographs in Mathematics* 100, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2006.
- [45] H. Wallin, New and old function spaces, in: *Function Spaces and Applications* (Lund, 1986), 99–114, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* 1302, Springer, Berlin, 1988.
- [46] F. Wang, Y. Han, Z. He and D. Yang, Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type with applications to boundedness of Calderón–Zygmund operators, *Dissertationes Math.* 565 (2021), 1–113.
- [47] F. Wang, Z. He, D. Yang and W. Yuan, Difference characterization of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, *Commun. Math. Stat.* (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40304-021-00243-w>.
- [48] D. Yang, T_1 theorems on Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type and their applications, *Z. Anal. Anwendungen* 22 (2003), 53–72.
- [49] D. Yang, Riesz potentials in Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces over spaces of homogeneous type, *Potential Anal.* 19 (2003), 193–210.
- [50] D. Yang, Embedding theorems of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, *Sci. China Ser. A* 46 (2003), 187–199.
- [51] D. Yang, New characterizations of Hajlasz–Sobolev spaces on metric spaces, *Sci. China Ser. A* 46 (2003), 675–689.
- [52] D. Yang, Localization principle of Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, *Rev. Mat. Complut.* 17 (2004), 229–249.
- [53] D. Yang, Real interpolations for Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, *Math. Nachr.* 273 (2004), 96–113.
- [54] D. Yang, Some new inhomogeneous Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on metric measure spaces and their various characterizations, *Studia Math.* 167 (2005), 63–98.
- [55] D. Yang, Some new Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on spaces of homogeneous type and their frame characterizations, *Sci. China Ser. A* 48 (2005), 12–39.
- [56] D. Yang and Y. Zhou, New properties of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on RD-spaces, *Manuscripta Math* 134 (2011), 59–90.

- [57] W. Yuan, W. Sickel and D. Yang, Morrey and Campanato Meet Besov, Lizorkin and Triebel, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 2005, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010.

Ryan Alvarado

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Amherst College, 303 Seeley Mudd, Amherst, MA 01002, United States of America

E-mail: rjalvarado@amherst.edu

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

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

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

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

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