

Optimality of function spaces for kernel integral operators

Jakub Takáč

October 2020

Introduction

The *Laplace transform* is defined by

$$\mathcal{L}f(t) = \int_0^\infty f(s)e^{-ts} ds$$

for every real-valued function f on $(0, \infty)$ for which the integral makes sense, and for every $t \in (0, \infty)$. It is well known that \mathcal{L} is an important integral operator with plenty of applications for example in the theory of differential equations, probability theory, investigation of spectral properties of pseudo-differential operators or the study of Fredholm integral equations (see for instance [1, 5, 22, 26, 29]). The Laplace transform can be viewed as a particular instance of a fairly more general class of *kernel* integral operators

$$Kf(t) = \int_0^\infty f(s)k(s, t) ds,$$

where k is an appropriate measurable function of two variables (to obtain the Laplace transform we set $k(s, t) = e^{st}$ for $s, t \in (0, \infty)$).

In this text we focus on problems concerning sharp action of kernel operators of a particular type, namely operators defined by

$$S_a f(t) = \int_0^\infty f(s)a(st) ds,$$

for all real-valued functions f on $(0, \infty)$ for which the integral makes sense, where $a: (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is an appropriate function of one variable. Various particular types of such operators and their numerous modifications have been studied by many authors. To name just a few classical ones, see [2, 8, 21] and the references therein.

Our goal here is to investigate fine properties of operators of type S_a acting on the so-called rearrangement-invariant (r.i. for short) spaces. In these spaces, sometimes in literature called also symmetric spaces, or Köthe spaces, the decisive parameter is always the *size* of a function (rather than other properties such as continuity, smoothness or oscillation). They are built upon an idea of axiomatization of good properties enjoyed by Lebesgue spaces, which constitute a central subclass of r.i. spaces, but in themselves are not rich enough in order to satisfactorily describe action of important operators and embeddings, especially in their various critical or limiting states. With a certain licence it can be said that the norms in r.i. spaces take into account only the measure of level sets of a given function.

To be more precise, we will concentrate on the questions of existence and eventual characterization of the optimal partner space for an operator of type S_a . By the optimal range partner space, supposing a domain space X is given, we mean a space Y such that S_a takes boundedly X to Y , and Y is the smallest possible such space. Analogously we define the optimal domain partner when the range space is fixed. To make such questions sensible one has to, of course, state the pool of competing spaces - here this will always be that of r.i. spaces.

Let us note that while action of kernel operators on function spaces has been studied, little attention has been so far paid to optimality of such results. On the other hand an extensive research of optimality of function spaces in different situations (e.g. in Sobolev embeddings, trace embeddings, Gaussian measure space, probability spaces etc., see for example [6, 9–12, 14–16, 19, 24, 25, 27]) could be seen mainly during last two decades. There are few exceptions, namely papers in which optimality of spaces for integral operators is studied, for example [7], [17] or [30], [27].

To fulfil our goal, we will combine known techniques with certain new ones which we have to develop. In particular, we will calculate the Peetre K functional for certain specific pairs of spaces (this has been known only partially) and we will, in an efficient way, combine the notion of the Marcinkiewicz-type endpoint space with the norm of the dilation operator. Such methods have not been known before and we shall show that they lead to quite a fruitful theory.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 1 we fix notation and collect all the preliminary stuff including all the definitions and basic knowledge about the function spaces, operators and related topics. We give a detailed definition of r.i. spaces and recall everything we shall need to know about them. We also define particular function spaces which will be used in examples to illustrate the abstract results. In Section 2 we present several background results that will be needed in the proofs of the main results. In particular, we introduce here two types of Marcinkiewicz endpoint spaces and study their elementary but useful properties. We also establish certain important relations concerning the Peetre K -functional in the spirit of [23].

Main results are stated and proved in Section 3. We tackle the problem of the very existence of the partner space, and in the affirmative cases we characterize or construct the optimal one. Furthermore we present a series of results based on spaces given in terms of the norm of the dilation operator on the domain space. To this end we establish several results of independent interest, providing a Calderón-type estimates for the operators in question. The final section contains a thorough and comprehensive analysis of the action of operators S_a on Lorentz spaces.

1 Preliminaries

In this section we recall some definitions and basic properties of rearrangement-invariant spaces. The standard reference is [4].

We denote by m the Lebesgue measure on $(0, \infty)$ and define

$$\mathcal{M} = \{f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty] : f \text{ is Lebesgue-measurable in } (0, \infty)\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{M}_+ = \{f \in \mathcal{M} : f \geq 0\}.$$

The *distribution function* $f_* : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ of a function $f \in \mathcal{M}$ is defined as

$$f_*(\lambda) = |\{x \in (0, \infty) : |f(x)| > \lambda\}|, \lambda \in (0, \infty),$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure, and the *non-increasing rearrangement* $f^* : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ of a function $f \in \mathcal{M}$ is defined as

$$f^*(t) = \inf\{\lambda \in (0, \infty) : f_*(\lambda) \leq t\}, t \in (0, \infty).$$

The operation $f \mapsto f^*$ is monotone in the sense that $|f| \leq |g|$ a.e. in $(0, \infty)$ implies $f^* \leq g^*$. We define the *elementary maximal function* $f^{**} : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ of a function $f \in \mathcal{M}$ as

$$f^{**}(t) = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f^*(s) ds.$$

While the operation $f \mapsto f^{**}$ is subadditive, that is, for any $f, g \in \mathcal{M}$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$ one has

$$(f + g)^{**}(t) \leq f^{**}(t) + g^{**}(t), \tag{1}$$

for $f \mapsto f^*$ one only has the following property. Let $s, t \in (0, \infty)$ and $f, g \in \mathcal{M}$, then

$$(f + g)^*(s + t) \leq f^*(t) + g^*(s). \quad (2)$$

We recall that for every $f \in \mathcal{M}_+$ and every $t \in (0, \infty)$, one has

$$|\{s \in (0, \infty) : f(s) > f^*(t)\}| \leq t. \quad (3)$$

The *Hardy-Littlewood inequality* asserts that if $f, g \in \mathcal{M}$, then

$$\int_0^\infty |f(t)g(t)| dt \leq \int_0^\infty f^*(t)g^*(t)dt. \quad (4)$$

Let us fix $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{M}_+$. If for any $t \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$\int_0^t f_1(s)ds \leq \int_0^t f_2(s)ds,$$

then Hardy's Lemma asserts that for any $g \in \mathcal{M}_+$ non-increasing, the following inequality holds,

$$\int_0^\infty f_1(s)g(s)ds \leq \int_0^\infty f_2(s)g(s)ds. \quad (5)$$

Hardy's inequality asserts that if $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $\alpha > -(1 - \frac{1}{p})$, then

$$\int_0^\infty \left(t^{-\alpha-1} \int_0^t f(s)ds \right)^p dt \leq \left(\frac{1}{1 + \alpha - \frac{1}{p}} \right)^p \int_0^\infty (f(t)t^{-\alpha})^p dt \quad \text{for } f \in \mathcal{M}_+,$$

and if $\alpha > 1 - \frac{1}{p}$, then

$$\int_0^\infty \left(t^{-\alpha+1} \int_t^\infty f(s)ds \right)^p dt \leq \left(\frac{1}{-1 + \alpha + \frac{1}{p}} \right)^p \int_0^\infty (f(t)t^\alpha)^p dt \quad \text{for } f \in \mathcal{M}_+.$$

This Hardy inequality can be found for example in [4, Chapter 3, Lemma 3.9], where a slightly different, but equivalent, formulation is used.

Following [4] we say that a functional $\rho : \mathcal{M}_+ \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a *Banach function norm*, if for all f, g and $\{f_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathcal{M}_+ , and every $\lambda \geq 0$, the following properties hold:

(P1) $\rho(f) = 0$ if and only if $f = 0$; $\rho(\lambda f) = \lambda \rho(f)$;

$$\rho(f + g) \leq \rho(f) + \rho(g);$$

(P2) $f \leq g$ a.e. implies $\rho(f) \leq \rho(g)$;

(P3) $f_j \nearrow f$ a.e. implies $\rho(f_j) \nearrow \rho(f)$;

(P4) $\rho(\chi_G) < \infty$ for every $G \subset (0, \infty)$ of finite measure;

(P5) for every $G \subset (0, \infty)$ of finite measure there is a constant C_G such that $\int_G f(t)dt \leq C_G \rho(f)$.

If also the property

(P6) $\rho(f) = \rho(g)$ whenever $f^* = g^*$,

holds, we say that ρ is a *rearrangement-invariant Banach function norm*, or just a *rearrangement-invariant norm*. If ρ is a rearrangement-invariant norm, then the collection

$$X = X(\rho) = \{f \in \mathcal{M} : \rho(|f|) < \infty\}$$

is called a *rearrangement-invariant Banach function space*, or just a *rearrangement-invariant space*. The norm on the space X is given by $\|f\|_X = \rho(|f|)$. Note that $\rho(|f|)$ is defined for every $f \in \mathcal{M}$, and

$$f \in X \iff \rho(|f|) < \infty.$$

We recall that it follows from the axioms that such X is always complete (even if (P6) does not hold), hence the name Banach function space. For a rearrangement-invariant norm ρ we define its *associate norm* by

$$\rho'(g) = \sup \left\{ \int_0^\infty f(t)g(t)dt : f \in \mathcal{M}_+, \rho(f) \leq 1 \right\} \quad \text{for } g \in \mathcal{M}_+$$

This ρ' is also a rearrangement-invariant norm. Furthermore, it also holds that $\rho'' = \rho$. If $X = X(\rho)$ is a rearrangement-invariant space and ρ' is the norm associate to ρ , then $X(\rho')$ is the *associate space* of X and is denoted by X' .

If X, Y are rearrangement-invariant spaces, we denote by $X \hookrightarrow Y$ the continuous embedding of X into Y and by $T: X \rightarrow Y$ the boundedness of an operator T from X to Y . We have

$$X \hookrightarrow Y \iff Y' \hookrightarrow X'. \quad (6)$$

We say that the rearrangement-invariant space Y is *the optimal range partner* for the linear operator T and a given domain rearrangement-invariant space X if $T: X \rightarrow Y$ and for every rearrangement-invariant space Z such that $T: X \rightarrow Z$ it holds that $Y \hookrightarrow Z$. An operator which will be used extensively throughout this work is the dilation operator E_t defined for any $t \in (0, \infty)$ by the formula

$$E_t f(s) = f\left(\frac{s}{t}\right).$$

We recall that E_t is bounded on every rearrangement-invariant space for any $t \in (0, \infty)$.

We define the *fundamental function*, φ_X , of a given rearrangement-invariant space X by $\varphi_X(t) = \|\chi_{(0,t)}\|_X$, $t \in (0, \infty)$. We say that a function $\varphi: (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is *quasiconcave* if it is non-decreasing and $\frac{t}{\varphi(t)}$ is non-decreasing. We say that the function $\varphi: (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ satisfies the Δ_2 condition, if it is non-decreasing and there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\varphi(2t) \leq C\varphi(t)$ for all $t > 0$. The fundamental function of any rearrangement-invariant space is quasiconcave. Given a quasiconcave function φ , we define the rearrangement-invariant spaces $M_\varphi, \Lambda_\varphi$ with the rearrangement-invariant norms given by

$$\|f\|_{M_\varphi} = \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \varphi(t) f^{**}(t), \quad f \in \mathcal{M}, \quad (7)$$

and

$$\|f\|_{\Lambda_\varphi} = \int_0^\infty f^*(t) d\varphi(t), \quad f \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (8)$$

These are indeed rearrangement-invariant norms and the spaces are called the *Lorentz endpoint space* and the *Marcinkiewicz endpoint space* respectively. It is also known that both M_φ and Λ_φ have a common fundamental function which is equal to φ . For a rearrangement-invariant space X we denote

$$M(X) = M_{\varphi_X}, \quad \Lambda(X) = \Lambda_{\varphi_X},$$

where φ_X is the fundamental function of X . We recall that for a rearrangement-invariant space X we have

$$\Lambda(X) \hookrightarrow X \hookrightarrow M(X),$$

with norms of both embeddings equal to 1. In other words, the spaces $M_\varphi, \Lambda_\varphi$ are respectively the largest and the smallest rearrangement-invariant space with the fixed fundamental function equal to φ .

One of the basic examples of an important class of rearrangement-invariant spaces can be obtained by considering general Lorentz $L^{p,q}$ spaces with $p, q \in (0, \infty]$, governed for $f \in \mathcal{M}$ by the functional

$$\rho_{p,q}(f) = \begin{cases} \left(\int_0^\infty t^{\frac{1}{p}} f^*(t)^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} & \text{if } 0 < q < \infty, \\ \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} t^{\frac{1}{p}} f^*(t) & \text{if } q = \infty. \end{cases}$$

We recall that these are equivalent to rearrangement-invariant norms in cases when either $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $q \in [1, \infty]$ or $p = q = 1$ or $p = q = \infty$. In case $p = \infty$ and $q < \infty$ the resulting space is a trivial set containing only the zero function. Furthermore, note that $L^{p,p} = L^p$, where L^p is the classical Lebesgue space. For $p \in [1, \infty]$ we define the associated exponent p' by $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$. The following equalities hold up to an equivalence of norms and further in this paper will be treated as equalities, disregarding the equivalence constants.

$$\begin{aligned} L^{p,1} &= \Lambda(L^p) & \text{for } p \in [1, \infty), \\ L^{p,\infty} &= M(L^p) & \text{for } p \in (1, \infty], \\ (L^{p,q})' &= L^{p',q'} & \text{for } p \in (1, \infty), q \in [1, \infty] \text{ or } p = q = \infty \text{ or } p = q = 1. \end{aligned}$$

We will also be using the following embeddings:

(a) if $q_1, q_2 \in [1, \infty]$ and $q_1 \leq q_2$, then

$$L^{p,q_1} \hookrightarrow L^{p,q_2} \quad \text{for all } p \in (1, \infty),$$

(b) if $q_1, q_2 \in [1, \infty]$, $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ and $p_1 < p_2$, then

$$L^1 \cap L^{p_1,q_1} \hookrightarrow L^1 \cap L^{p_2,q_2} \quad \text{and} \quad L^\infty \cap L^{p_1,q_1} \hookrightarrow L^\infty \cap L^{p_2,q_2},$$

(c) if $q_1, q_2 \in [1, \infty]$, $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ and $p_1 < p_2$, then

$$L^1 + L^{p_1,q_1} \hookrightarrow L^1 + L^{p_2,q_2} \quad \text{and} \quad L^\infty + L^{p_1,q_1} \hookrightarrow L^\infty + L^{p_2,q_2},$$

where, as per usual, for X_0 and X_1 rearrangement-invariant spaces, the norm in $X_0 \cap X_1$ is given by $\max\{\|\cdot\|_{X_0}, \|\cdot\|_{X_1}\}$. For $X_0 + X_1$ see below.

Let X_0 and X_1 be quasi-normed spaces, which are *compatible* in the sense that they are embedded in some common Hausdorff topological vector space (in our case we are working with the space \mathcal{M}). By $X_0 + X_1$ we denote the set of all functions $f \in \mathcal{M}$ for which there exists a decomposition $f = g + h$ such that $g \in X_0$ and $h \in X_1$. We equip the space $X_0 + X_1$ with the quasinorm

$$\|f\|_{X_0+X_1} = \inf_{f=g+h} (\|g\|_{X_0} + \|h\|_{X_1}),$$

where the infimum is taken over all such decompositions. Recall that if X_0 and X_1 are normed, then $X_0 + X_1$ is also normed. For $f \in X_0 + X_1$ the *Peetre K -functional* is defined by

$$K(t, f; X_0, X_1) := \inf_{f=g+h} (\|g\|_{X_0} + t\|h\|_{X_1}) \quad \text{for } t > 0.$$

The function K as a function of variable t is increasing and concave on $(0, \infty)$. Furthermore, the function $t^{-1}K(t, f; X_0, X_1)$ is non-increasing on $(0, \infty)$. Observe that

$$\frac{1}{t}K(f, t; X_0, X_1) = K(f, \frac{1}{t}, X_1, X_0). \quad (9)$$

Recall that in the case when $X_0 = L^1$ and $X_1 = L^\infty$, an exact formula for the K functional is known (see e.g. [4, Chapter 5, Theorem 1.6]), namely,

$$K(f, t; L^1, L^\infty) = \int_0^t f^*(s) ds \quad \text{for } t \in (0, \infty) \text{ and } f \in (L^1 + L^\infty). \quad (10)$$

2 Background results

In this section, we shall establish some results on rearrangement-invariant spaces and K functionals which will be useful later.

Definition 2.1. Let $\varphi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be a function satisfying the Δ_2 condition. We define the functional $\|\cdot\|_{m_\varphi}$ for $f \in \mathcal{M}$ by the formula

$$\|f\|_{m_\varphi} = \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \varphi(t) f^*(t).$$

We define the space m_φ as the set of all functions f for which the functional $\|f\|_{m_\varphi}$ is finite.

The Δ_2 condition imposed on the function ϕ guarantees that $\|\cdot\|_{m_\varphi}$ is a quasinorm (see also [13]), therefore we will consider m_φ to be a quasinormed space. We say that a linear set $M \subset \mathcal{M}$ together with a functional $F: M \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ can be equivalently renormed with a rearrangement-invariant norm, if there exists a rearrangement-invariant space X and constants C_1 and C_2 such that $X = M$ and

$$C_1 \|f\|_X \leq F(f) \leq C_2 \|f\|_X \quad \text{for } f \in X.$$

If that is the case, we will identify $M = X$ not only set-wise but also as spaces, in other words, we consider M to be a rearrangement-invariant space. Let φ be a quasi-concave function. Then m_φ can be equivalently renormed with a rearrangement-invariant norm $\|\cdot\|_{M_\varphi}$ if and only if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^t \frac{1}{\varphi(s)} ds \leq C \frac{t}{\varphi(t)} \quad \text{for every } t \in (0, \infty). \quad (11)$$

One of the implications can be found for example in [28, Proposition 7.10.5] and the other is an easy exercise. A more general result can be found in [10].

Our next aim is to characterize the K -functional for a pair of Marcinkiewicz spaces. Results in this direction can be found in literature (see e.g. [3, 18, 23, 31]). Here we need to obtain $K(m_\varphi, m_\psi)$ with rather mild conditions on the functions φ, ψ . In particular, we require little more than that they satisfy the Δ_2 condition. Our proof of the Proposition 2.2 is in the spirit of that of [23, Theorem 4.1].

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{M}_+$ satisfy the Δ_2 condition. Denote by s the function $s(t) = \frac{\varphi(t)}{\psi(t)}$ for $t \in (0, \infty)$. If s is monotone, then there exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for every $t > 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{M}$*

$$C_1 (\|(E_{\frac{1}{2}} f)^* \chi_A\|_{m_\varphi} + t \|(E_{\frac{1}{2}} f)^* \chi_B\|_{m_\psi}) \leq K(f, t, m_\varphi, m_\psi) \leq C_2 (\|f^* \chi_A\|_{m_\varphi} + t \|f^* \chi_B\|_{m_\psi}), \quad (12)$$

where $A = \{u: s(u) < t\}$ and $B = (0, \infty) \setminus A$.

Proof. First, let $f = f_0 + f_1$, $f_0 \in m_\varphi$, $f_1 \in m_\psi$ and $t > 0$. Then we have

$$\|f_1\|_{m_\varphi} + t \|f_1\|_{m_\psi} \geq \frac{1}{2} (I_1 + I_2), \quad (13)$$

where

$$I_1 = \sup_{u>0} f_0^*(u) \chi_A(u) \varphi(u) + t \sup_{u>0} f_1^*(u) \chi_A(u) \psi(u) \quad (14)$$

and

$$I_2 = \sup_{u>0} f_0^*(u) \chi_B(u) \varphi(u) + t \sup_{u>0} f_1^*(u) \chi_B(u) \psi(u). \quad (15)$$

From the definition of the set A , we have

$$t \sup_{u>0} f_1^*(u) \chi_A(u) \psi(u) \geq \sup_{u>0} f_1^*(u) \chi_A(u) \varphi(u), \quad (16)$$

therefore, combining (14) with (16), we obtain

$$I_1 \geq \sup_{u>0} (f_0^* + f_1^*)(u) \chi_A(u) \varphi(u) \geq \sup_{u>0} (f_0 + f_1)^*(2u) \chi_A(u) \varphi(u) = \|(E_{\frac{1}{2}} f^*) \chi_A\|_{m_\varphi}, \quad (17)$$

for some positive constant C .

Now from the definition of the set B , it is easy to see that

$$\sup_{u>0} f_0^*(u) \chi_B(u) \varphi(u) \geq t \sup_{u>0} f_0^*(u) \chi_B(u) \psi(u),$$

which in combination with (15) immediately gives

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\geq t \sup_{u>0} f_0^*(u) \chi_B(u) \psi(u) + t \sup_{u>0} f_1^*(u) \chi_B(u) \psi(u) \\ &\geq t \sup_{u>0} (f_0^* + f_1^*)(u) \chi_B(u) \psi(u) \\ &\geq t \sup_{u>0} (f_0^* + f_1^*)(2u) \chi_B(u) \psi(u) \\ &= t \|(E_{\frac{1}{2}} f^*) \chi_B\|_{m_\psi}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

for some positive constant C . Since the decomposition $f = f_0 + f_1$ was arbitrary, combining (17) and (18) together with (13) gives the first inequality.

For the second inequality we will assume s to be non-decreasing and define $s^\dagger(t) = \inf s^{-1}(t)$. If s is non-increasing the proof is analogous with s^\dagger defined using supremum. Decompose $f = f_0 + f_1$, where

$$f_0 = \begin{cases} f - f^*(s^\dagger(t)) & \text{if } f > f^*(s^\dagger(t)) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} t \|f_1^*\|_{m_\psi} &\leq t f^*(s^\dagger(t)) \psi(s^\dagger(t)) + t \|f^* \chi_B\|_{m_\psi} \\ &\leq \sup_{u>0} f^*(u) \chi_A(u) \varphi(u) + t \|f^* \chi_B\|_{m_\psi}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where the last inequality is a consequence of continuity of ψ . We also have

$$\|f_0^*\|_{m_\varphi} \leq \sup_{u>0} f^*(u) \chi_A(u) \varphi(u) \quad (20)$$

Combining (19) and (20) gives the second inequality. \square

Let us point out that for the first inequality in (12) the assumption of monotonicity of s is not needed.

In the proofs of the main results we will also require a characterization of the K -functional for a Marcinkiewicz space and L^∞ . Again, various versions of this result are known and scattered in literature but not in the precise form which we need. Therefore, for a reader's convenience we insert the proof.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $\varphi: (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be a strictly increasing, left continuous function satisfying the Δ_2 condition. Then*

$$\|\chi_{(0, \varphi^{-1}(t))} f^*\|_{m_\varphi} \leq K(f, t; m_\varphi, L^\infty) \leq 2 \|\chi_{(0, \varphi^{-1}(t))} f^*\|_{m_\varphi} \quad (21)$$

for every $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and every $t \in (0, \infty)$.

Proof. Let $f \in (m_\varphi + L^\infty)$ and $t > 0$. Both L^∞ and m_φ norms are defined in terms of f^* so it will suffice to prove the assertion assuming that $f \geq 0$. First, decompose $f = f_0 + f_1$, where

$$f_0 = \begin{cases} f - f^*(\varphi^{-1}(t)) & \text{if } f > f^*(\varphi^{-1}(t)) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then since φ is left continuous, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 < s < \varphi^{-1}(t)} f^*(s)\varphi(s) &\geq \lim_{s \rightarrow \varphi^{-1}(t)_-} f^*(s)\varphi(s) \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow \varphi^{-1}(t)_-} f^*(s) \lim_{s \rightarrow \varphi^{-1}(t)_-} \varphi(s) \\ &\geq f^*(\varphi^{-1}(t))\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(t)) = f^*(\varphi^{-1}(t))t. \end{aligned}$$

And so from the definition of f_0 and the above calculation

$$t\|f_1\|_\infty \leq f^*(\varphi^{-1}(t))t \leq \sup_{0 < s < \varphi^{-1}(t)} f^*(s)\varphi(s) = \|\chi_{(0, \varphi^{-1}(t))} f^*\|_{m_\varphi}. \quad (22)$$

We continue by estimating $\|f_0\|_{m_\varphi}$. By definition of f_0 ,

$$\|f_0\|_{m_\varphi} = \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \varphi(t)f_0^*(t) \leq \sup_{0 < s < \varphi^{-1}(t)} f^*(s)\varphi(s) = \|\chi_{(0, \varphi^{-1}(t))} f^*\|_{m_\varphi}. \quad (23)$$

Combining (22) and (23) we obtain

$$K(f, t; m_\varphi, L^\infty) \leq 2\|\chi_{(0, \varphi^{-1}(t))} f^*\|_{m_\varphi}, \quad (24)$$

establishing the second inequality in (21). For the first one, once again, fix $f \in (m_\varphi + L^\infty)$ non-negative and let $f = g + h$, where $g \in m_\varphi$ and $h \in L^\infty$. Firstly, we shall assert that

$$f^*(t) \leq g^*(t) + \|h\|_\infty \quad \text{for every } t \in (0, \infty). \quad (25)$$

For $t \in (0, \infty)$, set $\lambda = g^*(t) + \|h\|_\infty$ and $y = |\{s \in (0, \infty), f(s) > \lambda\}|$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} y &= |\{s \in (0, \infty), g(s) + h(s) > \lambda\}| \\ &= |\{s \in (0, \infty), g(s) + h(s) > g^*(t) + \|h\|_\infty\}| \\ &\leq |\{s \in (0, \infty), g(s) > g^*(t)\}| + |\{s \in (0, \infty), h(s) > \|h\|_\infty\}| \\ &= |\{s \in (0, \infty), g(s) > g^*(t)\}|, \end{aligned}$$

since the set $\{s \in (0, \infty), h(s) > \|h\|_\infty\}$ obviously has zero measure. By (3) we obtain $y \leq t$. By definition of the decreasing rearrangement we get (25). Consequently, from subadditivity of supremum and because φ is increasing, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 < s < \varphi^{-1}(t)} f^*(s)\varphi(s) &\leq \sup_{0 < s < \varphi^{-1}(t)} g^*(s)\varphi(s) + \sup_{0 < s < \varphi^{-1}(t)} \|h\|_\infty\varphi(s) \\ &\leq \sup_{0 < s < \infty} g^*(s)\varphi(s) + \|h\|_\infty\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(t)) = \|g\|_{m_\varphi} + t\|h\|_\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Taking infimum over all such representations $f = g + h$, we arrive at

$$\|\chi_{(0, \varphi^{-1}(t))} f^*\|_{m_\varphi} \leq K(f, t; m_\varphi, L^\infty),$$

as desired. The assertion now follows from the combination of (24) and (26). \square

3 Operator S_a on rearrangement-invariant spaces

Definition 3.1. For $a \in \mathcal{M}_+$ we define the operator S_a by the formula

$$S_a f(t) = \int_0^\infty a(st)f(s)ds$$

for those $f \in \mathcal{M}$ for which the integral on the right is defined.

Notice that S_a is a generalization of the Laplace transform, the Laplace transform is S_a for $a(t) = e^{-t}$. In this section we will formulate a characterisation of whether a target space for the operator S_a exists with a domain space fixed. We will also show that whenever a target space exists, optimal space also exists and we can find an implicit definition of said space using the kernel a . We will then attempt to find equivalent definitions of target and optimal spaces using Calderón type operators rather than the function a . We shall need some preliminary work. First, note that if X and Y are rearrangement-invariant spaces and $a \in \mathcal{M}$, then

$$S_a: X \rightarrow Y \iff S_a: Y' \rightarrow X'. \quad (27)$$

This follows from the fact that S_a is a self-adjoint operator, that is

$$\int_0^\infty S_a f g = \int_0^\infty f S_a g \quad \text{for all } f, g \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (28)$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let a be a non-increasing, non-negative function on $(0, \infty)$. Then*

$$(S_a f)^* \leq S_a(f^*) \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Proof. Taking $t > 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{M}$, we obtain, by the Hardy–Littlewood inequality (recall that a is non-increasing), that

$$\begin{aligned} (S_a f)^*(t) &= (|S_a f|)^*(t) \leq (S_a |f|)^*(t) = \int_0^\infty |f(s)| a(st) ds \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty f^*(s) a(st) ds = S_a(f^*)(t). \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 3.3. *Let X be a rearrangement-invariant space and let $a \in \mathcal{M}$ be non-increasing. Then there exists a rearrangement-invariant space Y such that $S_a: X \rightarrow Y$ if and only if $a^{**} \in X'$. If that is the case, then the expression ρ , defined by*

$$\rho(f) = \|S_a f^*\|_{X'} \quad \text{for } f \in \mathcal{M}_+,$$

is a rearrangement invariant norm and $S_a: X \rightarrow Z$, where Z is the rearrangement-invariant space determined by ρ' .

Proof. Assume that $S_a: X \rightarrow Y$ and $f \in X$ with $\|f\|_X \leq 1$. Then we have

$$\int_0^\infty S_a f^* \chi_{(0,1)} \leq \|S_a f^*\|_Y \|\chi_{(0,1)}\|_{Y'} \leq \|S_a\|_{X \rightarrow Y} \|\chi_{(0,1)}\|_{Y'} < \infty.$$

Now if we set $C = \|S_a\|_{X \rightarrow Y} \|\chi_{(0,1)}\|_{Y'}$ and recall that S_a is self-adjoint, hence obtaining

$$\sup_{\|f\|_X \leq 1} \int_0^\infty f^* a^{**} = \sup_{\|f\|_X \leq 1} \int_0^\infty f^* S_a \chi_{(0,1)} = \sup_{\|f\|_X \leq 1} \int_0^\infty S_a f^* \chi_{(0,1)} \leq C.$$

The left-most term is by the definition of the associate norm equal to $\|a^{**}\|_{X'}$, which establishes the first implication. To obtain the second one, we show that ρ is a rearrangement-invariant norm. Let us assume for now that ρ indeed is a rearrangement-invariant norm. Then we define the space Z as the rearrangement-invariant space determined by ρ' . Since $S_a f^*$ is a non-increasing function we have by Lemma 3.2, the Hardy–Littlewood inequality, and the Hölder inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_a f\|_Z &= \|(S_a f)^*\|_Z \leq \|S_a f^*\|_Z = \sup_{\rho(g) \leq 1} \int_0^\infty S_a f^* g^* \\ &= \sup_{\rho(g) \leq 1} \int_0^\infty f^* S_a g^* \leq \sup_{\rho(g) \leq 1} \|f\|_X \|S_a g^*\|_{X'} = \|f\|_X, \end{aligned}$$

where we also used (28) in the fourth step. In other words, $S_a : X \rightarrow Z$.

To show that ρ is a rearrangement-invariant norm we show that properties (P1) - (P6) hold. Out of these, (P6) is trivial and (P2) is an easy exercise. To show that (P3) holds, assume $f_n, f \in \mathcal{M}_+$, $f_n \nearrow f$ a.e. It follows that also $f_n^* \nearrow f^*$ (see [4, Proposition 1.1.7]), therefore by the monotone convergence theorem also $S_a f_n^* \nearrow S_a f^*$. Now (P3) holds for ρ , since it holds for $\|\cdot\|_{X'}$. The only non-trivial assertion in (P1) is the triangle inequality. To show that, fix $t \in (0, \infty)$ and recall that by (1) we have for any two measurable functions f_1, f_2

$$\int_0^u (f_1 + f_2)^* \leq \int_0^u f_1^* + \int_0^u f_2^* \quad \text{for all } u \in (0, \infty). \quad (29)$$

Since $a(t \cdot)$ is decreasing, Hardy's Lemma (5) in conjunction with (29) gives

$$\int_0^\infty a(st)(f_1 + f_2)^*(s)ds \leq \int_0^\infty a(st)f_1^*(s)ds + \int_0^\infty a(st)f_2^*(s)ds.$$

The triangle inequality of the norm in X' now gives the triangle inequality of ρ . The property (P4) is an easy consequence of the fact that $a^{**} \in X'$. Indeed, take $u \in (0, \infty)$, then we have

$$S_a \chi_{(0,u)}(t) = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^{ut} a(s)ds \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, \infty). \quad (30)$$

If $u \leq t$, then we have by (30)

$$\rho(\chi_{(0,u)}) \leq \rho(\chi_{(0,1)}) = \|a^{**}\|_{X'}.$$

In case that $u \geq t$ we recall that a is non-increasing and therefore

$$S_a \chi_{(0,u)}(t) \leq u \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t a(s)ds \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, \infty),$$

which in turn gives

$$\rho(\chi_{(0,u)}) \leq u \rho(\chi_{(0,1)}) = u \|a^{**}\|_{X'}.$$

Either way $\rho(\chi_{(0,u)}) < \infty$. It remains to show (P5). To that end, take $G \subset (0, \infty)$ with finite positive measure and $f \in \mathcal{M}_+$. Since a is non-increasing and non-trivial, there exists $u > 0$ and $A > 0$ such that $\sup_{(0,u)} a \geq A$ and so we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(f) &= \|S_a f^*\|_X \geq \left\| \int_0^{\frac{u}{t}} A f^*(s) ds \right\|_{X'} \geq \|\chi_{(0, \frac{u}{|G|})} \int_0^{\frac{u}{t}} A f^*(s) ds\|_{X'} \\ &\geq \|\chi_{(0, \frac{u}{|G|})}\|_{X'} \int_0^{|G|} A f^*(s) ds \geq \|\chi_{(0, \frac{u}{|G|})}\|_{X'} A \int_G f. \end{aligned}$$

□

Norms defined using the kernel of some integral operator, similarly as in our case of ρ from the preceding theorem, were studied before. For a differently defined operator of a type similar to S_a this approach was used for example in [20, Theorem 2.2] (only in the proof), but optimality of the resulting space (see Corollary 3.5) is not shown.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $a \in \mathcal{M}_+$ be non-increasing and non-trivial. Let X be a rearrangement-invariant space with $a^{**} \in X'$ and R be an operator defined at least on \mathcal{M}_+ . Define*

$$\rho(f) = \|Rf^*\|_{X'},$$

and assume that this ρ is a rearrangement-invariant norm. Define Z as the rearrangement-invariant space determined by ρ' . Consider the following two properties of R .

(i) There exists $C > 0$ such that for all $f \in \mathcal{M}$ it holds that

$$S_a f^*(t)C \leq Rf^*(t) \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (0, \infty)$$

(ii) There exists $C > 0$ such that for all $f \in \mathcal{M}$ it holds that

$$S_a f^*(t)C \geq Rf^*(t) \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (0, \infty)$$

If (i) holds, then $S_a: X \rightarrow Z$. If (ii) holds and Y is a rearrangement-invariant space such that $S_a: X \rightarrow Y$, then $Z \hookrightarrow Y$.

Proof. Assume (i) holds. If we set W to be the rearrangement-invariant space determined by the norm associate to $\|S_a f^*\|_{X'}$, then by (i) we have $Z' \hookrightarrow W'$, or equivalently $W \hookrightarrow Z$ and by Theorem 3.3 we have $S_a: X \rightarrow W$, therefore $S_a: X \rightarrow Z$. Now assume (ii) holds and let Y be a rearrangement-invariant space such that $S_a: X \rightarrow Y$. Then we have for any $g \in \mathcal{M}$

$$\|g\|_{Z'} = \|Rg^*\|_{X'} \leq C\|S_a g^*\|_{X'}.$$

Combining this with (27) yields

$$\|g\|_{Z'} \leq C\|S_a\|_{Y' \rightarrow X'}\|g\|_{Y'}.$$

In other words, $Y' \hookrightarrow Z'$, which is equivalent to $Z \hookrightarrow Y$. \square

Setting $R = S_a$ and using Theorems 3.3 and 3.4, we arrive at the following corollary.

Corollary 3.5. *Let $a \in \mathcal{M}_+$ be non-increasing and let X be a rearrangement-invariant space such that $a^{**} \in X'$. The space Z determined by the norm associate to $\rho(f) = \|S_a f^*\|$, $f \in \mathcal{M}_+$, is the smallest rearrangement-invariant space for which $S_a: X \rightarrow Z$.*

Definition 3.6. Assume that X is a rearrangement-invariant space. We denote by $E(X)$ the function given by

$$E(X)(t) = \frac{t}{\|E_t\|_X} \quad \text{for } t \in (0, \infty).$$

Theorem 3.7. *If X is a rearrangement-invariant space, then $m_{E(X)}$ is well defined. Let $a \in \mathcal{M}_+$ be non-increasing. If $a \in X'$ then*

$$S_a: X \rightarrow m_{E(X)}.$$

Proof. Since $E(X)$ is clearly a positive function, to show that $m_{E(X)}$ is well defined, we only need to show that it is non-decreasing and that it satisfies the Δ_2 condition. Fix $t \in (0, \infty)$ and notice that $E_t(f^*) = (E_t f)^*$. Now by definition of norm and from the rearrangement invariance of X we have

$$\|E_t\|_X = \sup_{\|f\|_X \leq 1} \|(E_t f)^*\|_X = \sup_{\|f\|_X \leq 1} \|E_t(f^*)\|_X. \quad (31)$$

Since $X = X''$, the Hardy-Littlewood inequality (4) gives

$$\|E_t(f^*)\|_X = \sup_{\|g\|_{X'} \leq 1} \int_0^\infty f^*\left(\frac{s}{t}\right)g^*(s)ds, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (32)$$

Combining (31) with (32) and using the change of variables $y = \frac{s}{t}$ we obtain

$$\|E_t\|_X = \sup_{\|f\|_X \leq 1} \sup_{\|g\|_{X'} \leq 1} t \int_0^\infty f^*(y)g^*(ty)dy,$$

from which it is easy to see that $E(X)$ is non-decreasing. Since $E_t(f^*) = (E_t f)^*$, it is also clear that $\|E_t\|_X$ itself is non-decreasing, which immediately gives

$$\|E_t\|_X \leq \|E_{2t}\|_X,$$

therefore

$$E(X)(2t) \leq 2E(X)(t),$$

which is the Δ_2 condition. We have shown that $m_{E(X)}$ is well defined. Now assume that $a \in X'$ is non-increasing. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_+$. We first note that since a is non-increasing, so is $S_a f$. Thus, using the change of variables $st = u$ and the Hölder inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_a f\|_{m_{E(X)}} &= \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{t}{\|E_t\|_X} S_a f(t) = \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{t}{\|E_t\|_X} \int_0^\infty a(st) f(s) ds \\ &= \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{t}{\|E_t\|_X} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^\infty a(u) E_t f(u) du \\ &\leq \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{1}{\|E_t\|_X} \|E_t f\|_X \|a\|_{X'} \leq \|a\|_{X'} \|f\|_X. \end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 3.8. Let X be a rearrangement-invariant space such that $\varphi_{X'}$, the fundamental function of X' , is strictly increasing and unbounded. Let $\varphi: (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be quasi-concave, unbounded function with $\varphi(0_+) = 0$. Then we define the function ψ with the formula

$$\psi(t) = \varphi_{X'}^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \right) \quad \text{for } t \in (0, \infty). \quad (33)$$

For $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$ we define the functions $\alpha(f)$, $\beta(f)$ with the formulas

$$\alpha(f)(t) = \int_0^{\psi(t)} f^*(s) ds, \quad (34)$$

$$\beta(f)(t) = \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \|f^* \chi_{(\psi(t), \infty)}\|_X, \quad (35)$$

and we set $R_\infty(f) = \alpha(f) + \beta(f)$.

Definition 3.9. Let X be a rearrangement-invariant space such that φ_X is strictly increasing and unbounded. Let φ be a function such that if we define the function $\tilde{\varphi}$ with the formula $\tilde{\varphi}(u) = \frac{u}{\varphi(u)}$, then the function $\tilde{\varphi}$ is quasi-concave and unbounded with $\tilde{\varphi}(0_+) = 0$. Then we define the function $\tilde{\psi}$ with the formula

$$\tilde{\psi}(t) = \varphi_X^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\varphi}(t)} \right).$$

For $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$ we define the function $R_1 f(t)$ with the formula

$$R_1(f)(t) = \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \|f^* \chi_{(0, \tilde{\psi}(t))}\|_X.$$

In the following theorems we will show that, under some conditions, both of the operators R_1 , R_∞ define rearrangement-invariant spaces in a way we would expect from Theorem 3.4. Note that both R_1 and R_∞ are defined only by means of the space X and the function φ . If we define $\varphi = E(X)$ then R_1 and R_∞ are defined only through X . This means that the obtained range partners depend only on X and the fixed domain space, but not directly on the kernel a . These spaces, of course, are candidates for the optimal range partner, but in the general setting of rearrangement-invariant spaces, it seems very difficult to prove that they, under reasonable conditions, indeed are optimal. We can, however, obtain optimality of said spaces in the special case of $a \in L^\infty \cap L^1$, see Theorem 3.18, or when the domain space is a Lorentz space, with its exponents lying within some boundaries. This is further explored in Section 4.

Theorem 3.10. Assume that X and φ are as in Definition 3.8. Let W be a rearrangement-invariant space and set

$$\rho(f) = \|R_\infty f\|_W, f \in \mathcal{M}_+.$$

If the condition

$$\min \left\{ \frac{1}{\varphi}, 1 \right\} \in W \quad (36)$$

holds, then ρ is a rearrangement-invariant Banach function norm.

Proof. To prove the triangle inequality, fix $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{M}_+$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$. From the definition of the associate norm we have

$$R_\infty(f_1 + f_2)(t) = \int_0^{\psi(t)} (f_1 + f_2)^* + \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \sup \left\{ \int_{\psi(t)}^\infty (f_1 + f_2)^* g^*, \|g\|_{X'} \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Take arbitrary $g \in X'$ with $\|g\|_{X'} \leq 1$ and set

$$h(s) = \begin{cases} 1, & s \in (0, \psi(t)) \\ \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} g^*(s) & s \in [\psi(t), \infty) \end{cases}.$$

We know that $X' \hookrightarrow M(X')$ with the norm of the embedding equal to 1. Therefore we have

$$\sup_{s \in (0, \infty)} g^*(s) \varphi_{X'}(s) \leq \sup_{s \in (0, \infty)} g^{**}(s) \varphi_{X'}(s) \leq \|g\|_{X'} \leq 1.$$

In particular for $s = \psi(t)$ we have

$$g^*(\psi(t)) \leq \frac{1}{\varphi_{X'}(\psi(t))} = \frac{1}{\varphi_{X'} \varphi_{X'}^{-1}(\frac{1}{\varphi(t)})} = \varphi(t),$$

thus h is non-increasing. Now thanks to the subadditivity of $f \mapsto f^{**}$ we have

$$\int_0^u (f_1 + f_2)^* \leq \int_0^u f_1^* + f_2^*, \quad u \in (0, \infty).$$

Using Hardy's Lemma (5) we obtain

$$\int_0^\infty (f_1 + f_2)^* h \leq \int_0^\infty f_1^* h + f_2^* h. \quad (37)$$

From the definition of h it is clear that

$$\int_0^{\psi(t)} (f_1 + f_2)^* + \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \int_{\psi(t)}^\infty (f_1 + f_2)^* g^* = \int_0^\infty (f_1 + f_2)^* h,$$

which, in combination with (37), gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{\psi(t)} (f_1 + f_2)^* + \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \int_{\psi(t)}^\infty (f_1 + f_2)^* g^* \leq \\ & \int_0^{\psi(t)} f_1^* + \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \int_{\psi(t)}^\infty f_1^* g^* + \int_0^{\psi(t)} f_2^* + \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \int_{\psi(t)}^\infty f_2^* g^*. \end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for all $g \in X'$ with $\|g\|_{X'} \leq 1$, we have

$$R_\infty(f_1 + f_2)(t) \leq R_\infty(f_1)(t) + R_\infty(f_2)(t) \quad \text{for } t \in (0, \infty),$$

which, using the (P2) property of the norm in W , gives the triangle inequality.

The fact that $\rho(f) = 0 \iff f = 0$ holds trivially. Positive homogeneity is trivial. We've shown that (P1) holds. Next, (P6) holds obviously and (P2) and (P3) are direct consequences of the corresponding properties of $f \mapsto f^*$ and of $\|\cdot\|_X$ and $\|\cdot\|_W$.

To show (P4) we only need to show that $\rho(\chi_{(0,u)}) < \infty$ for any $u \in (0, \infty)$, because ρ is defined in terms of the non-increasing rearrangement and we know, that for a measurable set $E \subset (0, \infty)$ it holds that $(\chi_E)^* = \chi_{(0,|E|)}$. Fix $u \in (0, \infty)$, by the definition of α and β we have for $t \in (0, \infty)$

$$\alpha(\chi_{(0,u)})(t) = \min\{\psi(t), u\} \leq u \min\{\psi(t), 1\}$$

and

$$\beta(\chi_{(0,u)})(t) = \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \|\chi_{(0,u) \cap (\psi(t), \infty)}\|_X = \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \varphi_X(\max\{u - \psi(t), 0\}) \leq \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \varphi_X(u),$$

where φ_X denotes the fundamental function of X . Furthermore, since $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \psi(t) = \infty$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\beta(\chi_{(0,u)})(t) = 0$, for $t < \epsilon$, and $\frac{1}{\varphi(\epsilon)} \geq 1$. Since $\frac{1}{\varphi} \leq \frac{1}{\varphi(\epsilon)}$ on (ϵ, ∞) we have

$$\beta(\chi_{(0,u)}) \leq \varphi_X(u) \min\left\{\frac{1}{\varphi}, \frac{1}{\varphi(\epsilon)}\right\} \leq \varphi_X(u) \frac{1}{\varphi(\epsilon)} \min\left\{\frac{1}{\varphi}, 1\right\}.$$

Thus, according to (36), $\beta(\chi_{(0,u)}) \in W$. To show that $\alpha(\chi_{(0,u)}) \in W$ we need to only show that there exists a constant C such that $\min\{\psi, 1\} \leq C \min\{\frac{1}{\varphi}, 1\}$, for which it is sufficient to show that there exists $t > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for all $s > t$

$$\frac{1}{\varphi(s)} C \geq \psi(s) = \varphi_{X'}^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\varphi(s)}\right),$$

which is equivalent to $\varphi_{X'}(C\tau) \geq \tau$, for $\tau \leq \frac{1}{\varphi(t)}$, which follows from quasi-concavity of $\varphi_{X'}$. Indeed, each quasi-concave function dominates the function $\min\{1, \tau\}$, $\tau \in (0, \infty)$, up to a multiplicative constant, and so we have

$$\varphi_{X'}(C\tau) \geq C_1 C\tau,$$

for all C and τ such that $C\tau \leq 1$ and for some C_1 . If we set $C = \frac{1}{C_1}$, then we have

$$\varphi_{X'}(C\tau) \geq \tau \quad \text{for } \tau \leq \frac{1}{C}.$$

We only need to find t such that $\frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \leq \frac{1}{C}$, which we can do since φ is unbounded. Now we have t and C as we wanted, therefore we have just proven that $\min\{1, \psi\}$ is dominated by $\min\{1, \frac{1}{\varphi}\}$ up to a constant. Now since both $\beta(\chi_{(0,u)}) \in W$ and $\alpha(\chi_{(0,u)}) \in W$, it obviously holds that $\rho(\chi_{(0,u)}) < \infty$ and thus (P4) holds.

It remains to show (P5). Let $E \subset (0, \infty)$ be of finite measure, let $f \in \mathcal{M}_+$ and choose $u \in \psi^{-1}(|E|)$. Then, since ψ is non-increasing, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(f) &\geq \|\alpha(f)\|_W \\ &\geq \|\chi_{(0,u)}(t) \int_0^{\psi(t)} f^*(s) ds\|_W \\ &\geq \|\chi_{(0,u)}\|_W \int_0^{|E|} f^*(s) ds \\ &\geq \|\chi_{(0,u)}\|_W \int_E f(s) ds, \end{aligned}$$

which establishes (P5). □

Theorem 3.11. *Assume that X and φ are as in Definition 3.8. Let $Y \subset X + L^1$ be a rearrangement-invariant space, assume that φ is strictly increasing and set*

$$\rho(f) = \|R_\infty f\|_{Y'}, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+.$$

Let a be a non-increasing non-negative function on $(0, \infty)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} S_a: X &\rightarrow m_\varphi, \\ S_a: L^1 &\rightarrow L^\infty. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

If the condition (36) holds for $W = Y'$, then ρ is a rearrangement-invariant Banach function norm. Furthermore, if we set Z to be the rearrangement-invariant space given by ρ' , the norm associate to ρ , then

$$S_a: Y \rightarrow Z.$$

Proof. The fact that ρ is a rearrangement-invariant norm was proved in the preceding theorem, so we only need to show $S_a: Y \rightarrow Z$. To this end, we will need to calculate the K -functionals of spaces (X, L^1) and spaces (m_φ, L^∞) . By Theorem 2.3 we have

$$K(f, t; m_\varphi, L^\infty) \approx \|\chi_{(0, \varphi^{-1}(t))} f^*\|_{m_\varphi},$$

and, by [23, Theorem 5.1], we have

$$K(f, t, L^1, X) \leq C \int_0^{\varphi_{X'}^{-1}(t)} f^*(s) ds + t \|f^* \chi_{(\varphi_{X'}^{-1}(t), \infty)}\|_X,$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Fix arbitrary $f \in L^1 + L^\infty$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$. By (38) and the definition of the K -functional, we have

$$K(S_a f, t, L^\infty, m_\varphi) \leq C K(f, t, L^1, X)$$

for some constant C . Combining that with the well known equality

$$\frac{1}{t} K(f, t, L^\infty, m_\varphi) = K(f, \frac{1}{t}, m_\varphi, L^\infty),$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{0 < u < \varphi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})} (Tf)^*(u) \varphi(u) \leq \\ &\leq \frac{C}{t} \left(\int_0^{\varphi_{X'}^{-1}(t)} f^*(s) ds + t \|f^* \chi_{(\varphi_{X'}^{-1}(t), \infty)}\|_X \right). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, since φ is quasiconcave and therefore continuous and $(S_a f)^*$ is non-increasing, we can take $u = \varphi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{t} (S_a f)^*(\varphi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})) \leq \\ &\leq \frac{C}{t} \left(\int_0^{\varphi_{X'}^{-1}(t)} f^*(s) ds + t \|f^* \chi_{(\varphi_{X'}^{-1}(t), \infty)}\|_X \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now since φ is a one-to-one mapping on $(0, \infty)$ and the above holds for every $t \in (0, \infty)$, substituting $\varphi^{-1}(\frac{1}{t}) = u$ we obtain, for all $u \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\varphi(u) (S_a f)^*(u) \leq C \varphi(u) \int_0^{\psi(u)} f^*(s) ds + C \|f^* \chi_{(\psi(u), \infty)}\|_X.$$

Dividing by $\varphi(u)$ and changing the variable u to t yields the following result. There exists $C > 0$ such that for all $f \in X + L^1$ and $t > 0$

$$(S_a f)^*(t) \leq C R_\infty f(t),$$

which is the property (i) in Theorem 3.4, therefore $S_a: Y \rightarrow Z$. \square

In conjunction with Theorem 3.7 we can now formulate a corollary of the preceding theorem, which makes the result more manageable.

Corollary 3.12. *Let X be such that $\varphi = E(X)$ is a quasi-concave unbounded strictly increasing function with $\varphi(0_+) = 0$. Let $Y \subset X + L^1$ be a rearrangement-invariant space and let $a \in X' \cap L^\infty$ be non-increasing. Set*

$$\rho(f) = \|R_\infty f\|_{Y'}, f \in \mathcal{M}_+$$

and assume that (36) holds for $W = Y'$. Then ρ is a rearrangement-invariant norm. Moreover, if we set Z to be the rearrangement-invariant space determined by ρ' , then $S_a: Y \rightarrow Z$.

Proof. Since $a \in L^\infty = (L^1)'$, $E(L^1) \equiv 1$ and $m_1 = L^\infty$, we have $S_a: L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty$, and since $a \in X'$ and $E(X) = \varphi$, we have $S_a: X \rightarrow m_\varphi$ thanks to Theorem 3.7. Now we can apply Theorem 3.11. \square

Theorem 3.13. *Assume that X and φ are as in Definition 3.9. Let W be a rearrangement-invariant space and set*

$$\rho(f) = \|R_1(f)\|_W, f \in \mathcal{M}.$$

If the condition

$$\min \left\{ \frac{1}{\varphi(t)}, \frac{1}{t} \right\} \in W \tag{39}$$

holds, then ρ is a rearrangement invariant Banach function norm.

Proof. To show that (P1) holds, we need only to show the triangle inequality, since the other two assertions clearly hold. To that end take $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(f_1 + f_2)(t) &= \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \|(f_1 + f_2)^* \chi_{(0, \tilde{\psi}(t))}\|_X \\ &= \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \sup_{\|g\|_{X'} \leq 1} \int_0^{\tilde{\psi}(t)} (f_1 + f_2)^* g^* \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \sup_{\|g\|_{X'} \leq 1} \int_0^{\tilde{\psi}(t)} f_1^* g^* + \int_0^{\tilde{\psi}(t)} f_2^* g^* \\ &= R_1(f_1)(t) + R_1(f_2)(t), \end{aligned}$$

where the only inequality is a consequence of the Hardy Lemma (5). Now the (P2) property of the norm in W gives the triangle inequality. Properties (P2) and (P3) obviously hold for ρ . To show (P4) take $u \in (0, \infty)$. We have for all $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \|\chi_{(0, u)} \chi_{(0, \tilde{\psi}(t))}\|_X &= \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \varphi_X(\min\{u, \tilde{\psi}(t)\}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \min\{\varphi_X(u), \varphi_X(\tilde{\psi}(t))\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \min\{\varphi_X(u), \frac{1}{\varphi(t)}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that φ_X is non-decreasing and the definition of $\tilde{\psi}$. If we move $\frac{1}{\varphi(t)}$ inside the argument of the minimum, we get from the definition of $\tilde{\varphi}$ that

$$\frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \min\{\varphi_X(u), \frac{1}{\varphi(t)}\} = \min\left\{\frac{\varphi_X(u)}{\varphi(t)}, \frac{1}{t}\right\} \leq C \min\left\{\frac{1}{\varphi(t)}, \frac{1}{t}\right\}$$

for some $C > 0$ depending on u but not on t . Now (39) gives (P4) property of ρ . It remains to show (P5). To that end take $E \subset (0, \infty)$ with positive measure, $f \in \mathcal{M}_+$ and choose $u \in \tilde{\psi}^{-1}(|E|)$.

Since $\tilde{\psi}$ is non-increasing, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho(f) &= \left\| \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \|f^* \chi_{(0, \tilde{\psi}(t))}\|_X \right\|_W \\
&\geq \|\chi_{(0, u)}(t) \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \|f^* \chi_{(0, \tilde{\psi}(t))}\|_X\|_W \\
&\geq \|\chi_{(0, u)}\|_W \frac{1}{\varphi(u)} \|f^* \chi_{(0, |E|)}\|_X \\
&\geq C \|\chi_{(0, u)}\|_W \frac{1}{\varphi(u)} \int_0^{|E|} f^* \chi_{(0, |E|)} \\
&\geq C \|\chi_{(0, u)}\|_W \frac{1}{\varphi(u)} \int_E f
\end{aligned}$$

for some C only depending on E and the space X , where the second to last inequality is the (P5) property of the norm in X . Since u does not depend on f , we have obtained the (P5) property of ρ . \square

Theorem 3.14. *Assume that X and φ are as in Definition 3.9. Let $Y \subset X + L^\infty$ be a rearrangement-invariant space, assume that $\overline{\varphi}$ is strictly increasing and set*

$$\rho(f) = \|R_1 f\|_{Y'}, f \in \mathcal{M}_+.$$

Let a be a non-increasing non-negative function on $(0, \infty)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
S_a: X &\rightarrow m_\varphi, \\
S_a: L^\infty &\rightarrow L^{1, \infty}.
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

If the condition (39) holds for $W = Y'$, then ρ is a rearrangement-invariant Banach function norm. Furthermore, if we set Z to be the rearrangement-invariant space given by ρ' , the norm associate to ρ , then

$$S_a: Y \rightarrow Z.$$

Proof. Easy modifications of Theorem 2.2 and [23, Theorem 4.1] give respectively

$$\sup_{u < (\overline{\varphi})^{-1}(t)} (S_a f)^*(2u)u + t \sup_{u \geq (\overline{\varphi})^{-1}(t)} (S_a f)^*(2u)\varphi(u) \leq C_1 K(S_a f, t, L^{1, \infty}, m_\varphi) \tag{41}$$

and

$$K(f, t, L^\infty, X) \leq C_2 (f^*(\varphi_X^{-1}(\frac{1}{t}))) + t \|f^* \chi_{(0, \varphi_X^{-1}(\frac{1}{t}))}\|_X, \tag{42}$$

for all $t \in (0, \infty)$, $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$. Positive homogeneity and the definition of the fundamental function immediately gives

$$\|f^* \chi_{(0, \varphi_X^{-1}(\frac{1}{t}))}\|_X \geq f^*(\varphi_X^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})) \varphi_X(\varphi_X^{-1}(\frac{1}{t})),$$

therefore we obtain

$$K(f, t, L^\infty, X) \leq (C_2 + 1)(t \|f^* \chi_{(0, \varphi_X^{-1}(\frac{1}{t}))}\|_X).$$

From the definition of the K -functional and (40), we obtain

$$K(S_a f, t, L^{1, \infty}, m_\varphi) \leq C K(f, t, L^\infty, X),$$

for some constant $C > 0$ and all $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$. Using (41) and (42) we have a possibly different constant $C > 0$ such that, for all $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\sup_{u < (\overline{\varphi})^{-1}(t)} (S_a f)^*(2u)u + t \sup_{u \geq (\overline{\varphi})^{-1}(t)} (S_a f)^*(2u)\varphi(u) \leq C t \|f^* \chi_{(0, \varphi_X^{-1}(\frac{1}{t}))}\|_X.$$

In particular, we can clearly replace the second supremum with the value of its argument in $(\bar{\varphi})^{-1}(t)$. Furthermore, we can do the same in the first supremum since f^* is non-increasing and u is continuous. This results in the following inequality

$$(S_a f)^*(2(\bar{\varphi})^{-1}(t))(\bar{\varphi})^{-1}(t) + t(S_a f)^*(2(\bar{\varphi})^{-1}(t))\varphi((\bar{\varphi})^{-1}(t)) \leq Ct \|f^* \chi_{(0, \varphi_X^{-1}(\frac{1}{t}))}\|_X$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$. Now we can substitute $t = \bar{\varphi}(s)$, since $\bar{\varphi}$ is a one to one mapping of $(0, \infty)$, which results in

$$(S_a f)^*(2s)s + \bar{\varphi}(s)(S_a f)^*(2s)\varphi(s) \leq C\bar{\varphi}(s) \|f^* \chi_{(0, \bar{\psi}(s))}\|_X$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and $s \in (0, \infty)$. A simple calculation now gives

$$(S_a f)^*(2s) \leq C \frac{1}{\varphi(s)} \|f^* \chi_{(0, \bar{\psi}(s))}\|_X$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and $s \in (0, \infty)$, which implies the following statement. There exists $C > 0$ such that for all $f \in X + L^\infty$ and $t > 0$

$$(S_a f)^*(t) \leq CR_1 f(\frac{1}{2}t).$$

Now we need only to use Theorem 3.4 the fact that the dilation operator is bounded on every rearrangement-invariant space. □

The following Corollary is analogous to Corollary 3.12.

Corollary 3.15. *Let X be such that if $\varphi = E(X)$, then $\bar{\varphi}$ is a quasi-concave unbounded strictly increasing function with $\bar{\varphi}(0_+) = 0$. Let $Y \subset X + L^\infty$ be a rearrangement-invariant space and let $a \in X' \cap L^1$ be non-increasing and non-negative. Set*

$$\rho(f) = \|R_1 f\|_{Y'}, f \in \mathcal{M}_+,$$

and assume that (39) holds for $W = Y'$. Then ρ is a rearrangement-invariant norm. Moreover, if we set Z to be the rearrangement-invariant space determined by ρ' , then $S_a: Y \rightarrow Z$.

Now we explore the properties of S_a when the kernel a is both integrable and bounded. This is indeed the strongest possible condition, at least in the context of rearrangement-invariant spaces, as $L^1 \cap L^\infty$ is the smallest rearrangement-invariant space. The chosen approach uses the operator R_∞ and the space $X = L^\infty$. Working with R_1 and setting $X = L^1$, unincidentally, yields the same result.

Lemma 3.16. *Let $a: (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be non-increasing and non-zero on at least some set of non-zero measure. Then there is a constant C such that, for all $f \in \mathcal{M}$,*

$$S_a(f^*)(t) \geq C \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) ds \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, \infty).$$

Proof. Since a is non-increasing and not zero on at least some set of non-zero measure, there exists $u \in (0, 1)$ such that $\inf_{s < u} a(s) = C_1 > 0$. Now if $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} S_a(f^*)(t) &= \int_0^\infty a(st) f^*(s) ds \geq \int_0^{\frac{u}{t}} a(st) f^*(s) ds \\ &\geq C_1 \int_0^{\frac{u}{t}} f^*(s) ds \geq C_1 u \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that f^{**} is non-increasing. □

Lemma 3.17. *Let $X = L^\infty$ and $\varphi = E(L^\infty)$, that is $\varphi(t) = t$, $t \in (0, \infty)$. Then we have, for all $f \in L^1 + L^\infty$ and $t > 0$,*

$$\int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^* \leq R_\infty f(t) \leq 2 \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*.$$

Proof. Take $f \in L^1 + L^\infty$ and $t > 0$. First, we shall observe that $\varphi_{X'}(t) = t$, since $X' = L^1$, therefore $\psi(t) = \frac{1}{t}$. This means that

$$\alpha(f)(t) = \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*$$

and, since $\beta(f) \geq 0$, we can easily obtain the first inequality from the definition of R . Now, a simple calculation shows that

$$\beta(f)(t) = \frac{1}{t} \|f^* \chi_{(\frac{1}{t}, \infty)}\|_\infty = \frac{1}{t} f^* \left(\frac{1}{t} \right) \leq \frac{1}{t} f^{**} \left(\frac{1}{t} \right) = \alpha(f)(t).$$

Therefore

$$R_\infty(t) = \alpha(f)(t) + \beta(f)(t) \leq \alpha(f)(t) + \alpha(f)(t) = 2 \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*,$$

which establishes the second inequality. \square

What follows is a result of independent interest in the spirit of [7, Theorem 3.4].

Theorem 3.18. *Let $a \in L^\infty \cap L^1$ be non-trivial, non-negative and non-increasing. Let Y be a rearrangement-invariant space such that*

$$\min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{t} \right\} \in Y'. \quad (43)$$

For $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and $t > 0$, set

$$\alpha(f)(t) = \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*$$

and

$$\rho(f) = \|\alpha(f)\|_{Y'}.$$

Then ρ is a rearrangement-invariant norm such that if we set Z to be the rearrangement-invariant space given by ρ' , then

$$S_a: Y \rightarrow Z,$$

and Y is optimal for S_a and Y . Furthermore, if the condition (43) does not hold, then there is no rearrangement-invariant space Z such that $S_a: Y \rightarrow Z$.

Proof. The proof of the fact that ρ is a rearrangement-invariant norm is almost identical to that of Theorem 3.11, see also [7, Proposition 3.3], and therefore omitted. We thus know from Corollary 3.12 and Lemma 3.17 that $S_a: Y \rightarrow Z$.

The optimality of Z is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.16 and Theorem 3.4. Indeed, from Lemma 3.16 we have a constant $C > 0$ such that, for all $f \in \mathcal{M}$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$,

$$S_a(f^*)(t) \geq C \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) ds,$$

whence Theorem 3.4 gives the optimality of Z .

It remains to show that if (43) does not hold, then there is no rearrangement-invariant space Z such that $S_a : Y \rightarrow Z$. Since a is integrable, bounded, non-zero on some set of non-zero measure and non-increasing, we can find a constant $C' > 0$ such that

$$a^{**}(t) \geq C' \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{t} \right\} \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

Indeed, suppose first that $t \leq 1$. Then we find $u > 0$ such that $\inf_{s \in (0, u)} a(s) = C_1 > 0$. If $u \geq 1$, then simply

$$\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t a(s) ds \geq \frac{1}{t} t C_1 = C_1.$$

If $u < 1$, then we have

$$\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t a(s) ds \geq \frac{1}{t} \int_0^{\min\{t, u\}} a(s) ds \geq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{t} t C_1, \frac{1}{t} u C_1 \right\} = u C_1.$$

Now, let $t > 1$. Then we set $C_2 = \int_0^1 a(s) ds$ and observe that

$$\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t a(s) ds \geq \frac{1}{t} C_2.$$

Combining these estimates, we arrive at

$$a^{**}(t) \geq C' \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{t} \right\} \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

where $C' = \min\{C_1, uC_1, C_2\}$. Therefore $a^{**} \notin Y'$, whence Theorem 3.3 implies that there is no rearrangement-invariant space Z such that $S_a : Y \rightarrow Z$. \square

4 Operator S_a on the scale of Lorentz spaces

In this section we shall formulate some sufficient conditions involving the kernel function a under which we can obtain the optimal range partner Z for S_a and a fixed domain Lorentz space Y . It turns out that the space Z is also a Lorentz space and, perhaps aside from extremal cases, its exponents only depend on the exponents of the space Y and not on the kernel a . Let us begin with a rather technical lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $p \in [1, \infty]$, $\xi \in (1, \infty)$.*

(i) *If $\xi < p$ and $\eta \in [1, \infty]$. Then there is a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\left\| t^{-\frac{1}{p}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \right\|_{\xi, \eta} \leq C \|f\|_{\xi', \eta} \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (44)$$

(ii) *If $p > 1$ then*

$$\left\| t^{-\frac{1}{p}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \right\|_{p, \infty} = \|f\|_{p', 1} \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (45)$$

(iii) *If $p < \xi$ and $\eta \in [1, \infty]$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\left\| \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) ds + t^{-\frac{1}{p}} \int_{\frac{1}{t}}^{\infty} f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \right\|_{\xi, \eta} \leq C \|f\|_{\xi', \eta} \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{M} \quad (46)$$

(iv) If $p > 1$ then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\left\| \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) ds + t^{-\frac{1}{p}} \int_{\frac{1}{t}}^{\infty} f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \right\|_{p, \infty} \leq C \|f\|_{p', 1} \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (47)$$

(v) The following inequality holds for all $f \in \mathcal{M}$, $t > 0$, $\xi \in (1, \infty)$ and $\eta \in [1, \infty]$

$$\|f\|_{\xi', \eta} \leq \left\| \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^* \right\|_{\xi, \eta}. \quad (48)$$

Proof. We shall prove assertions (i) - (iv) as (v) is very simple and can be found in a more complete form in [7, Proposition 3.7]. For the entirety of the proof assume f to be an arbitrary measurable function. To prove (i), we first assume $\eta \in [1, \infty)$. Then we have

$$\left\| t^{-\frac{1}{p}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \right\|_{\xi, \eta} = \left\| t^{\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{1}{\eta} - \frac{1}{p}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \right\|_{\eta},$$

since the expression inside the norm on the left side is clearly non-increasing. Using a change of variables and Hardy's inequality yields a constant C , such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| t^{\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{1}{\eta} - \frac{1}{p}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \right\|_{\eta} &= \left\| t^{-\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{1}{\eta} + \frac{1}{p}} \int_0^t f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \right\|_{\eta} \\ &\leq C \left\| t^{-\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{1}{\eta} + \frac{1}{p} + 1} f^*(t) t^{-\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{\eta} \\ &= C \left\| t^{\frac{1}{\xi'} - \frac{1}{\eta}} f^*(t) \right\|_{\eta} \\ &= C \|f\|_{\xi', \eta}, \end{aligned}$$

which is (44) in case $\eta \in [1, \infty)$. Now let $\eta = \infty$, then we have

$$\left\| t^{-\frac{1}{p}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \right\|_{\xi, \infty} = \sup_{t > 0} t^{\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{1}{p}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds. \quad (49)$$

We can assume that $f \in L^{\xi', \infty}$ since otherwise there is nothing to prove. If we denote $M = \|f\|_{\xi', \infty}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t > 0} t^{\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{1}{p}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds &\leq M \sup_{t > 0} t^{\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{1}{p}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} s^{-\frac{1}{\xi'}} s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \\ &= M \sup_{t > 0} t^{\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{1}{p}} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{1}{p}} t^{\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{1}{p}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{1}{p}} \|f\|_{\xi', \infty}, \end{aligned}$$

whence (49) gives (44) in case $\eta = \infty$. We also have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| t^{-\frac{1}{p}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \right\|_{p, \infty} &= \sup_{t > 0} t^{\frac{1}{p}} t^{-\frac{1}{p}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \\ &= \|f\|_{p', 1}, \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly (45). Now assume $\eta \in [1, \infty)$ and recall that for any $r, s > 0$ we have the inequality

$$(a + b)^\eta \leq 2^{\eta-1}(a^\eta + b^\eta).$$

Further, note that the expression

$$\int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) ds + t^{-\frac{1}{p}} \int_{\frac{1}{t}}^\infty f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds = \int_0^\infty \min \left\{ 1, (ts)^{-\frac{1}{p}} \right\} f^*(s) ds$$

is non-increasing and so we can obtain

$$\left\| \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) ds + t^{-\frac{1}{p}} \int_{\frac{1}{t}}^\infty f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \right\|_{\xi, \eta}^\eta \leq 2^{\eta-1}(I + II), \quad (50)$$

where

$$I = \int_0^\infty \left(t^{\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{1}{\eta}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) ds \right)^\eta dt$$

and

$$II = \int_0^\infty \left(t^{\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{1}{\eta} - \frac{1}{p}} \int_{\frac{1}{t}}^\infty f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \right)^\eta dt.$$

Using a change of variables gives

$$I = \int_0^\infty \left(t^{-\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{1}{\eta}} \int_0^t f^*(s) ds \right)^\eta dt$$

and

$$II = \int_0^\infty \left(t^{-\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{1}{\eta} + \frac{1}{p}} \int_t^\infty f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \right)^\eta dt.$$

Now, since $\xi \in (1, \infty)$ and $p < \xi$, we can use Hardy inequality which yields constants C_1 and C_2 such that

$$I \leq C_1 \int_0^\infty \left(t^{\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{1}{\eta} + 1} f^*(t) \right)^\eta dt = C_1 \|f\|_{\xi', \eta}^\eta$$

and

$$II \leq C_2 \int_0^\infty \left(t^{\frac{1}{p} + 1 - \frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{1}{\eta}} f^*(t) t^{-\frac{1}{p}} \right)^\eta dt = C_2 \|f\|_{\xi, \eta}^\eta.$$

Recalling (50) and denoting $C = 2^{\eta-1}(C_1 + C_2)$ we arrive at

$$\left\| \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) ds + t^{-\frac{1}{p}} \int_{\frac{1}{t}}^\infty f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \right\|_{\xi, \eta}^\eta \leq C \|f\|_{\xi, \eta}^\eta,$$

which immediately implies (46) in case $\eta \in [1, \infty)$. Now assume $\eta = \infty$. Similarly as before we obtain

$$\left\| \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) ds + t^{-\frac{1}{p}} \int_{\frac{1}{t}}^\infty f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \right\|_{\xi, \eta} \leq I + II,$$

where

$$I = \sup_{t>0} t^{\frac{1}{\xi}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) ds$$

and

$$II = \sup_{t>0} t^{\frac{1}{\xi} - \frac{1}{p}} \int_{\frac{1}{t}}^{\infty} f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds.$$

We can assume that $f \in L^{\xi', \infty}$, since otherwise, there is nothing to prove. If we denote $M = \|f\|_{\xi', \infty}$ then we have for all $t > 0$ that $f^*(t) \leq Mt^{-\frac{1}{\xi'}}$. Replacing $f^*(s)$ with $Ms^{-\frac{1}{\xi'}}$ inside the integrals in I and II and then integrating yields

$$I \leq \xi M$$

and

$$II \leq \frac{1}{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{\xi}} M,$$

which immediately implies (46) in case $\eta = \infty$. Similarly as before we have for $p > 1$

$$\left\| \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) ds + t^{-\frac{1}{p}} \int_{\frac{1}{t}}^{\infty} f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \right\|_{p, \infty} \leq I + II,$$

where

$$I = \sup_{t>0} t^{\frac{1}{p}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) ds$$

and

$$II = \sup_{t>0} t^{\frac{1}{p}} t^{-\frac{1}{p}} \int_{\frac{1}{t}}^{\infty} f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds.$$

We can immediately see that $II = \|f\|_{p', 1}$. Furthermore we have

$$\begin{aligned} I' &= \sup_{t>0} t^{-\frac{1}{p}} \int_0^t f^*(s) ds \\ &= \sup_{t>0} t^{\frac{1}{p'} - 1} \int_0^t f^*(s) ds \\ &= \sup_{t>0} t^{\frac{1}{p'}} f^{**}(t) \\ &= \|f\|_{M(L^{p'})}, \end{aligned}$$

Now the fact that

$$\int_0^t s^{-\frac{1}{p'}} ds = p \frac{t}{t^{\frac{1}{p'}}$$

gives $\|f\|_{M(L^{p'})} \approx \|f\|_{m(L^{p'})} = \|f\|_{p', \infty}$. Additionally, we know that $L^{p', 1} \hookrightarrow L^{p', \infty}$, therefore we obtain some $C_1 > 0$ such that $I \leq C_1 \|f\|_{p', 1}$. We have shown that (47) holds with $C = C_1 + 1$. \square

Now that we have established some necessary inequalities, it is time to use them to calculate the optimal range partners for S_a , in case when the domain space is a Lorentz space. Let us first fix some notation. If it is stated what space X is, we automatically assume that $\varphi = E(X)$ and that the operators R_∞ and R_1 are defined as in Definitions 3.8 and 3.9. Furthermore by Z_∞ and Z_1 we shall denote the spaces given by norms associated to $\|R_\infty f\|_{Y'}$ and $\|R_1 f\|_{Y'}$ respectively, where Y is the fixed domain space.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\xi \in (1, \infty)$, $\eta \in [1, \infty]$ and $a \in \mathcal{M}_+$ a non-increasing function. If W is a rearrangement-invariant space such that $S_a: L^{\xi, \eta} \rightarrow W$, then $L^{\xi', \eta} \hookrightarrow W$.*

Proof. Let

$$Tf(t) = \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) ds \quad \text{for } f \in \mathcal{M}_+, t > 0,$$

then by Theorem 3.18 we know that the expression $\|Tf\|_{\xi', \eta'}$ defines a rearrangement-invariant norm since $\min\{1, \frac{1}{t}\} \in L^{\xi', \eta'}$. Furthermore from Lemma 3.16 we have a constant $C > 0$ such that $S_a f^* \geq CTf$ for all $f \in \mathcal{M}$. If we now set Z to be the rearrangement-invariant space determined by the norm associate to $\|Tf\|_{\xi', \eta'}$, then Theorem 3.4 gives $Z \hookrightarrow W$. Furthermore (48) gives $Z' \hookrightarrow L^{\xi, \eta'}$ or equivalently $L^{\xi', \eta} \hookrightarrow Z$, whence $L^{\xi', \eta} \hookrightarrow W$. \square

Theorem 4.3. *Let $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $a \in \mathcal{M}_+$ a non-increasing function such that $a \in L^1 \cap L^{p', \infty}$. If $\xi \in (1, \infty)$, $p < \xi$, $\eta \in [1, \infty]$, then $S_a: L^{\xi, \eta} \rightarrow L^{\xi', \eta}$ and furthermore, $L^{\xi', \eta}$ is the optimal range partner for S_a and $L^{\xi, \eta}$.*

Proof. First set $X = L^{p, 1}$ and $Y = L^{\xi, \eta}$. Then since $p < \infty$ we have up to a constant that $\varphi(t) = t^{1/p}$, $t > 0$ which is a quasi-concave, unbounded, strictly increasing function with $\varphi(0_+) = 0$. Furthermore $Y = L^{\xi, \eta} \subset X + L^\infty$ since $p < \xi$, also $a \in X' \cap L^1$ and the condition (39) holds for $W = L^{\xi', \eta'}$. Therefore Corollary 3.15 gives $T: L^{\xi, \eta} \rightarrow Z_1$. It is easy to calculate that $\tilde{\psi}(t) = \frac{1}{t}$ and so by (44) we have a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $f \in \mathcal{M}$

$$\|f\|_{Z'_1} = \left\| t^{-\frac{1}{p}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{p}} ds \right\|_{\xi', \eta'} \leq C \|f\|_{\xi, \eta'}.$$

In other words $L^{\xi, \eta'} \hookrightarrow Z'_1$ or equivalently $Z_1 \hookrightarrow L^{\xi', \eta}$, therefore $S_a: L^{\xi, \eta} \rightarrow L^{\xi', \eta}$. The optimality of $L^{\xi', \eta}$ is now an immediate consequence of Lemma 4.2. \square

Theorem 4.4. *Let $q \in (1, \infty]$ and $a \in \mathcal{M}_+$ a non-increasing function such that $a \in L^1 \cap L^{q', \infty}$. If $\xi \in (1, \infty)$, $\xi < q$, $\eta \in [1, \infty]$ then $S_a: L^{\xi, \eta} \rightarrow L^{\xi', \eta}$ and furthermore, $L^{\xi', \eta}$ is the optimal range partner for S_a and $L^{\xi, \eta}$.*

Proof. First set $X = L^{q, 1}$ and $Y = L^{\xi, \eta}$. Then since $q > 1$ we have up to a constant that $\varphi(t) = t^{\frac{1}{q}}$, $t > 0$, which is a quasi-concave, unbounded, strictly increasing function. Furthermore $Y = L^{\xi, \eta} \subset X + L^1$ since $\xi < q$, also $a \in L^\infty \cap X'$ and the condition (11) holds for $W = Y' = L^{\xi', \eta'}$. Therefore Corollary 3.15 gives $S_a: L^{\xi, \eta'} \rightarrow Z_\infty$. It is easy to calculate that $\psi(t) = \frac{1}{t}$, $t > 0$, and by (46) we have a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $f \in \mathcal{M}$

$$\|f\|_{Z'_\infty} = \left\| f^*(s) ds + t^{-\frac{1}{q}} \int_{\frac{1}{t}}^\infty f^*(s) s^{-\frac{1}{q}} ds \right\|_{\xi', \eta'} \leq C \|f\|_{\xi, \eta'}.$$

In other words $L^{\xi, \eta'} \hookrightarrow Z'_\infty$ or equivalently $Z_\infty \hookrightarrow L^{\xi', \eta}$, therefore $S_a: L^{\xi, \eta} \rightarrow L^{\xi', \eta}$. The optimality of $L^{\xi', \eta}$ is now an immediate consequence of Lemma 4.2. \square

Now that we have these optimal results for $a \in L^\infty$ and $a \in L^1$ it is time to apply them to general $a \in \mathcal{M}_+$. We recall that by Theorem 3.4 we require a to be in at least some rearrangement-invariant space, otherwise there is no hope of finding a range partner for S_a and any fixed rearrangement-invariant domain space. Since $L^1 + L^\infty$ is the largest rearrangement-invariant space we can assume $a \in L^1 + L^\infty$, which allows us to divide a into its integrable and bounded parts and then use the previous theorems and the fact, that S_a is linear in a .

Definition 4.5. Given $a \in L^1 + L^\infty$ we define the functions a_1, a_∞ with following formulas

$$\begin{aligned} a_1(t) &= (a(t) - a(1))\chi_{(0,1)} \quad \text{for } t > 0 \\ a_\infty(t) &= \min\{a(1), a(t)\} \quad \text{for } t > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $a = a_1 + a_\infty$ and that by (10) we have $a_1 \in L^1$ and $a_\infty \in L^\infty$.

Theorem 4.6. *Let $a \in L^1 + L^\infty$ be non-increasing. Let $p \in [1, \infty)$, $q \in (1, \infty]$ be such that $a_1 \in L^{p', \infty}$, $a_\infty \in L^{q', \infty}$. If $\xi \in (p, q)$, $\eta \in [1, \infty]$, then $S_a: L^{\xi, \eta} \rightarrow L^{\xi', \eta}$ and furthermore, $L^{\xi', \eta}$ is the optimal range partner for S_a and $L^{\xi, \eta}$.*

Proof. From Theorems 4.3 and 4.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_{a_1}: L^{\xi, \eta} &\rightarrow L^{\xi', \eta} \\ S_{a_\infty}: L^{\xi, \eta} &\rightarrow L^{\xi', \eta}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively, with both of these range spaces being optimal. Now since $a_1 + a_\infty = a$, we also have $S_{a_1} + S_{a_\infty} = S_a$, which implies $S_a: L^{\xi, \eta} \rightarrow L^{\xi', \eta}$ with $L^{\xi', \eta}$ being the optimal range partner for S_a and $L^{\xi, \eta}$. \square

If we set $A = \{r \in [1, \infty), a_1 \in L^{r', \infty}\}$, $B = \{r \in (1, \infty], a_\infty \in L^{r', \infty}\}$, then it is easy to see that A, B are some intervals. Theorem 4.6 gives the optimality of $S_a: L^{\xi, \eta} \rightarrow L^{\xi', \eta}$ for all $\xi \in (A \cap B)^o$. It is also easy to see that if $\xi \notin A \cap B$, then there is no range partner for S_a and $L^{\xi, \eta}$ simply because there is no hope of $a^{**} \in L^{\xi, \eta}$. The problematic case is when $A \cap B = [p, q]$ for some $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ and $\xi = p$ or $\xi = q$. It is not hard, however, to find an example that shows that a similar result in this case does not hold. If one considers $a(t) = t^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \chi_{(0,1)}$, $t > 0$, then we have $A = [p, \infty)$, $B = (1, \infty]$, thus $A \cap B = [p, \infty)$. Setting $\xi = p$, $\eta = 1$ we have $a^{**} \in L^{\xi', \eta'} = L^{p', \infty}$ and so by Corollary 3.5 we know that the optimal space is given by norm associate to

$$\|S_a f^*\|_{p', \infty} = \sup_{t > 0} t^{\frac{1}{p'}} t^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^*(s) s^{\frac{1}{p'}} = \|f\|_{p, 1}.$$

This means that for this specific a we have the optimal result $S_a: L^{\xi, \eta} \rightarrow L^{\xi', \eta'}$. All we can say, using (45), (47) and (48) and the same approach as in the preceding theorems, is the following. If $A \cap B = [p, q]$, then the optimal range partner X_{opt}^p for S_a and $L^{p, 1}$ satisfies $L^{p', 1} \hookrightarrow X_{\text{opt}}^p \hookrightarrow L^{p', \infty}$. In that case, the optimal range partner X_{opt}^q for S_a and $L^{q, 1}$ satisfies $L^{q', 1} \hookrightarrow X_{\text{opt}}^q \hookrightarrow L^{q', \infty}$.

The preceding assertions sum up the boundedness and optimality properties of S_a on the scale of Lorentz spaces $L^{\xi, \eta}$. It is a simple observation that as long as a is non-trivial, $a^{**} \notin L^1$ and therefore, by Theorem 3.3, there is no range partner for S_a and L^∞ . Combined with the preceding results and denoting by $p = \inf A$, $q = \sup B$, we know the following.

- (i) If $\xi \in (p, q)$, $\eta \in [1, \infty]$, then a range partner for S_a and the domain space $L^{\xi, \eta}$ exists. If that is the case, then the optimal range partner is the space $L^{\xi', \eta}$.
- (ii) If $\xi \in (1, \infty)$, $\xi \notin [p, q]$, $\eta \in [1, \infty]$, then no range partner for S_a and the domain space $L^{\xi, \eta}$ exists.
- (iii) If $p \notin A$ or $q \notin B$ and $\xi = p$ or $\xi = q$ respectively, then no range partner for S_a and the domain space $L^{\xi, \eta}$ exists.
- (iv) If $p = \infty$ (or equivalently $A = \emptyset$), then no range partner for S_a and the domain space $L^{\xi, \eta}$ exists.
- (v) $S_a: L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty$ if and only if $a \in L^\infty$ (or equivalently $a_1 \in L^\infty$ or equivalently $p = 1$), if that is the case, then L^∞ is the optimal range partner for S_a and L^1 .
- (vi) If $q = -\infty$ (or equivalently $B = \emptyset$), then there is no rearrangement-invariant domain Lorentz space $Y \neq L^\infty$, for which a range partner exists.
- (vii) If $\xi = \eta = \infty$ then no range partner for S_a and the domain space $L^{\xi, \eta} = L^\infty$ exists.

The only points perhaps not explained above are (v) and (vi). Theorem 3.7 gives $S_a: L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty$ if $a \in L^\infty$, whereas the optimality of this result is a consequence of Lemma 4.2 and the fact that

$$\left\| \int_0^{\frac{1}{t}} f^* \right\|_\infty = \|f\|_1.$$

If $a \notin L^\infty$ then also $a^{**} \notin L^\infty$, thus by Theorem 3.5 there is no range partner for S_a and L^1 . We have shown that (v) holds. To show (vi) it suffices to show that $a^{**} \notin Y$, this is, however, a direct consequence of $q = -\infty$.

Bibliography

- [1] K. F. Andersen. On Hardy's inequality and Laplace transforms in weighted rearrangement invariant spaces. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 39(2):295–299, 1973.
- [2] K. F. Andersen. Weighted generalized Hardy inequalities for nonincreasing functions. *Canad. J. Math.*, 43(6):1121–1135, 1991.
- [3] C. Bennett. Estimates for weak-type operators. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 79:933–935, 1973.
- [4] C. Bennett and R. Sharpley. *Interpolation of operators*, volume 129 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Academic Press, Inc., Boston, MA, 1988.
- [5] A. Boumenir and A. Al-Shuaibi. The inverse Laplace transform and analytic pseudo-differential operators. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 228:16–36, 1998.
- [6] O. G. Bravo. On the optimal domain of the Laplace transform. *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.*, 40(1):389–408, 2017.
- [7] E. Buriánková, D. E. Edmunds, and L. Pick. Optimal function spaces for the Laplace transform. *Rev. Mat. Complut.*, 30(3):451–465, 2017.
- [8] M. J. Carro and C. Ortiz-Caraballo. Boundedness of integral operators on decreasing functions. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 145(4):725–744, 2015.
- [9] A. Cianchi and V. Musil. Optimal domain spaces in Orlicz-Sobolev embeddings. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 68(3):925–966, 2019.
- [10] A. Cianchi and L. Pick. Optimal Sobolev trace embeddings. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 368(12):8349–8382, 2016.
- [11] A. Cianchi, L. Pick, and L. Slavíková. Higher-order Sobolev embeddings and isoperimetric inequalities. *Adv. Math.*, 273:568–650, 2015.
- [12] G. P. Curbera and W. J. Ricker. Optimal domains for kernel operators via interpolation. *Math. Nachr.*, 244:47–63, 2002.
- [13] M. Ówikel, A. Kamińska, L. Maligranda, and L. Pick. Are generalized Lorentz “spaces” really spaces? *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 132(12):3615–3625, 2004.
- [14] M. Cwikel and E. Pustylnik. Sobolev type embeddings in the limiting case. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 4(4-5):433–446, 1998.
- [15] O. Delgado and J. Soria. Optimal domain for the Hardy operator. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 244(1):119–133, 2007.
- [16] D. E. Edmunds, R. Kerman, and L. Pick. Optimal Sobolev imbeddings involving rearrangement-invariant quasinorms. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 170(2):307–355, 2000.

- [17] D. E. Edmunds, Z. Mihula, V. Musil, and L. Pick. Boundedness of classical operators on rearrangement-invariant spaces. *J. Funct. Anal.*, available online, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2019.108341>.
- [18] S. Ericsson. Exact descriptions of some K and E functionals. *J. Approx. Theory*, 90(1):75–87, 1997.
- [19] R. Kerman and L. Pick. Optimal Sobolev imbedding spaces. *Studia Math.*, 192(3):195–217, 2009.
- [20] R. A. Kerman. Function spaces continuously paired by operators of convolution type. *Canad. Math. Bull.*, 22(4):499–507, 1979.
- [21] S. Lai. Weighted norm inequalities for general operators on monotone functions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 340(2):811–836, 1993.
- [22] J. G. McWhirter and E. R. Pike. On the numerical inversion of the Laplace transform and similar fredholm integral equations of the first kind. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, 11(9):1792–1745, 1978.
- [23] M. Milman. Interpolation of operators of mixed weak-strong type between rearrangement invariant spaces. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 28(6):985–992, 1979.
- [24] V. Musil. Fractional maximal operator in Orlicz spaces. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 474(1):94–115, 2019.
- [25] V. Musil and R. Olhava. Interpolation theorem for Marcinkiewicz spaces with applications to Lorentz gamma spaces. *Math. Nachr.*, 292(5):1106–1121, 2019.
- [26] R. O’Neil. Integral transforms and tensor products on Orlicz spaces and $L(p, q)$ spaces. *J. Analyse Math.*, 21:1–276, 1968.
- [27] D. Peša. Reduction principle for a certain class of kernel-type operators. *arXiv:1908.06313*, to appear in *Math. Nachr.*
- [28] L. Pick, A. Kufner, O. John, and S. Fučík. *Function spaces. Vol. 1*, volume 14 of *De Gruyter Series in Nonlinear Analysis and Applications*. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, extended edition, 2013.
- [29] R. Sharpley. Counterexamples for classical operators on Lorentz–Zygmund spaces. *Studia Math.*, 68:141–158, 1986.
- [30] F. Sukochev, K. Tulenov, and D. Zanin. The optimal range of the Calderón operator and its applications. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 277(10):3513–3559, 2019.
- [31] A. Torchinsky. The K -functional for rearrangement invariant spaces. *Studia Math.*, 64(2):175–190, 1979.