

# HARDY SPACES MEET HARMONIC WEIGHTS REVISITED

MARCIN PREISNER AND ADAM SIKORA

ABSTRACT. We investigate the Hardy spaces  $H_L^1(X)$  corresponding to self-adjoint operators  $L$ . Our main aim is to obtain a description of  $H_L^1(X)$  in terms of atomic decompositions similar to such characterisation of the classical Hardy spaces  $H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Under suitable assumptions, such a description was obtained by Yan and the authors in [Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 375 (2022), no. 9, 6417–6451], where the atoms with respect to an  $L$ -harmonic function are considered. Here we continue this study and modify the previous definition of atoms. It leads to a more natural and flexible description of Hardy and BMO spaces. We expect that the new definition variant opens the possibility of extending the atomic decomposition of the Hardy spaces  $H_L^1(X)$  under less restrictive assumptions.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Hardy and BMO spaces theory is a significant mainstream area of harmonic analysis. Its origin can be traced back to a notion from complex analysis initiated by Hardy. For an elegant and comprehensive description of the classical theory of real Hardy and BMO spaces, we refer readers to [12]. A recent new direction in this area is to extend the investigation to Hardy and BMO spaces corresponding to semigroups generated by some differential operators. It is a natural idea. After all, one of the equivalent forms of classical definition can be stated in terms of the maximal function corresponding to the heat semigroup. That is, we define the maximal function  $M$  by the formula

$$Mf(x) = \sup_{t>0} |\exp(t\Delta)f(x)|,$$

where  $\Delta$  is the standard Laplace operator and  $\exp(t\Delta)$  is the corresponding heat semigroup. Then we define the  $H^1$  norm by setting

$$\|f\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \|Mf(x)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

This definition can be easily generalised for any semigroup generated by a non-negative self-adjoint operator  $L$ , defined on  $L^2(X)$ , where  $X$  is a metric measure space. There are several papers devoted to the study of Hardy and BMO spaces corresponding to the semigroup of operators, see for example [1–3, 5, 6, 9, 11] and references therein. A general approach in this direction is discussed in seminal paper [8].

Here we continue to explore the investigation initiated in [10]. Our goal is to describe the Hardy spaces  $H_L^1(X)$  in terms of atomic decompositions. Our atoms are related to harmonic functions associated with  $L$ . Our main assumption is that there exists a non-negative  $L$ -harmonic function  $h$  such that the semigroup  $\exp(-tL)$ , after applying the Doob transform corresponding to  $h$ , satisfies the upper and lower Gaussian estimates. In this note, we modify the notion of atoms from [10]. The new definition is more natural, and its geometrical aspects are more evident. The new approach is less technical. It should enable us to expand our approach to more general settings, which we intend to study elsewhere.

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 42B30, 42B35, 47B38.

*Key words and phrases.* Hardy space, harmonic weight, atomic decomposition, maximal function, non-negative self-adjoint operator, Gaussian bounds, Doob transform.

We shall work under the following assumptions, c.f. [10]. Consider a space of homogeneous type  $(X, d, \mu)$  and a non-negative self-adjoint operator  $L$  on  $L^2(\mu)$ . In particular,  $\mu$  satisfies the doubling condition and there exists  $C, D > 0$  such that

$$(1.1) \quad \mu(B(x, R)) \leq C \left( \frac{R}{r} \right)^D \mu(B(x, r)), \quad x \in X, \quad 0 < r \leq R,$$

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

Consider a positive self-adjoint operator  $L$  acting on  $L^2(\mu)$  and the semigroup  $T_t = \exp(-tL)$  generated by  $L$ . We assume that the corresponding kernel  $T_t(x, y)$  satisfies the following Gaussian upper bounds. There exist  $C, c > 0$  such that:

$$(UG) \quad 0 \leq T_t(x, y) \leq C \mu(B(x, \sqrt{t}))^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{d(x, y)^2}{ct}\right), \quad t > 0, \quad x, y \in X.$$

The maximal function corresponding to the semigroup  $T_t = \exp(-tL)$  is given by the formula

$$M_L f(x) = \sup_{t>0} |\exp(-tL)f(x)|.$$

Then we set the  $H_L^1(X)$  norm by

$$\|f\|_{H_L^1(X)} = \|M_L f(x)\|_{L^1(\mu)}.$$

We assume that there exists a positive function  $h \in L_{loc}^\infty(X)$  that is  $L$ -harmonic in the sense that for all  $t > 0$

$$(1.2) \quad T_t h(x) = h(x), \quad \text{a.e. } x \in X.$$

Moreover, we also assume that there exist  $c_1, c_2, C > 0$  such that for  $x, y \in X$  and  $t > 0$  we have

$$(ULG_h) \quad \frac{C^{-1}}{\mu_{h^2}(B(x, \sqrt{t}))} \exp\left(-\frac{d(x, y)^2}{c_1 t}\right) \leq \frac{T_t(x, y)}{h(x)h(y)} \leq \frac{C}{\mu_{h^2}(B(x, \sqrt{t}))} \exp\left(-\frac{d(x, y)^2}{c_2 t}\right),$$

where  $\mu_{h^2}$  is the measure on  $X$  with the density  $h^2(x)d\mu(x)$ .

In this note we shall prove that  $H_L^1(X)$  is equivalent with the following atomic Hardy space.

**Definition 1.3.** For  $r > 1$  we say that a function  $a : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is a  $(\mu, h, r)$ -atom if there exists a ball  $B$  in  $X$  such that:

$$(1.4) \quad \text{supp } a \subseteq B, \quad \|a\|_{L^r(\mu)} \leq \mu(B)^{-1+1/r}, \quad \int a(x)h(x) d\mu(x) = 0.$$

Then, the space  $H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r)$  is defined as follows: we say that  $f \in H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r)$  if  $f(x) = \sum_k \lambda_k a_k(x)$ , where  $\sum_k |\lambda_k| < \infty$  and  $a_k(x)$  are  $(\mu, h, r)$ -atoms. We set

$$\|f\|_{H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r)} = \inf \sum_k |\lambda_k|,$$

where the infimum is taken over all representations as above.

The atoms from the definition above are a new variant of the atoms that appeared in [10], where the atoms satisfied the conditions:

$$(1.5) \quad \text{supp } a \subseteq B, \quad \|a\|_{L^2(h^{-1}\mu)} \leq \mu_h(B)^{-1/2}, \quad \int a(x)h(x) d\mu(x) = 0,$$

where  $\mu_h$  is the measure on  $X$  with the density  $h(x)d\mu(x)$ . The functions satisfying (1.5) are denoted by  $[\mu, h]$ -atoms. Then, the space  $H_{at}^1[\mu, h]$  is defined analogously as in Definition 1.3. It will appear that, under suitable assumptions, the spaces  $H_L^1(X)$ ,  $H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r)$ , and  $H_{at}^1[\mu, h]$  are equivalent.

One of the main results of [10] describes  $H_L^1(X)$  by atomic decompositions with atoms as in (1.5). For the precise statement of this result see Theorem 2.1 below. Here we characterize the space  $H_L^1(X)$  in terms of  $(\mu, h, r)$ -atoms.

In order to state our results, recall that a non-negative function  $w \in L_{loc}^1(\mu)$  on  $X$  is in the Reverse Hölder class  $RH_q(\mu)$  for  $1 < q < \infty$  if there is a constant  $C$  such that

$$\left( \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B w(x)^q d\mu(x) \right)^{1/q} \leq \frac{C}{\mu(B)} \int_B w(x) d\mu(x)$$

for every ball  $B$  in  $X$ . Moreover,  $RH_\infty(\mu)$  is defined by

$$\sup_{x \in B} w(x) \leq \frac{C}{\mu(B)} \int_B w(x) d\mu(x).$$

Recall that  $RH_{q_2}(\mu) \subseteq RH_{q_1}(\mu)$  for  $1 < q_1 \leq q_2 \leq \infty$ .

We shall prove two similar results that establish the equality  $H_L^1(X) = H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r)$ . The first one has stronger assumption  $h \in RH_\infty(\mu)$  and provides  $(\mu, h, 2)$ -atoms.

**Theorem A.** *Let  $(X, d, \mu)$  satisfies (1.1), and  $L, h$  are such that (UG), (1.2), and (ULG<sub>h</sub>) are satisfied. Assume moreover that  $h \in RH_\infty(\mu)$ . Then the spaces  $H_L^1(X)$  and  $H_{at}^1(\mu, h, 2)$  coincide and have comparable norms.*

The second statement has slightly weaker assumption, but it results in obtaining  $(\mu, h, r)$ -atoms with  $r < 2$ .

**Theorem B.** *Let  $(X, d, \mu)$  satisfies (1.1), and  $L, h$  are such that (UG), (1.2), and (ULG<sub>h</sub>) are satisfied. There exists  $q_0 \geq 3$  such that if  $h \in RH_q(\mu)$  for some  $q > q_0$ , then for  $r = 2q/(q+1)$  we have that  $H_L^1(X)$  and  $H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r)$  coincide and have comparable norms.*

In this note the parameters:  $q \in (1, \infty]$  from  $RH_q(\mu)$  and  $r \leq 2$  from  $(\mu, h, r)$ -atoms are always related by the equation:

$$(1.6) \quad r = \frac{2q}{q+1}.$$

In Theorem A we deal with  $q = \infty$  and  $r = 2$ , whereas in Theorem B we have  $q \in (3, \infty)$  and  $r \in (3/2, 2)$ . At this point let us also mention that the assumption (1.2) is superfluous. If a function  $h$  satisfies (ULG<sub>h</sub>) then one can find  $\tilde{h}$  that is comparable to  $h$  and satisfy (1.2), see [10, Proposition 2.3].

Let us point out the differences between Theorems A and B and the results from [10], see Theorem 2.1 below. Firstly and most significantly, the atoms in Theorems A and B satisfy  $\|a\|_{L^r(\mu)} \leq \mu(B)^{-1+1/r}$ , whereas previously one had a more complicated size condition  $\|a\|_{L^2(h^{-1}\mu)} \leq \mu_h(B)^{-1/2}$ . The later involves the function  $h$  and we believe that this is a significant drawback. For example the new size condition opens possibility of studying manifolds in the case when there exist two or more bounded harmonic functions. It also has clearer geometrical meaning when  $h$  is used only in cancellation condition. Secondly, the assumption  $h^{-1} \in A_p(\mu_{h^2})$  from Theorem 2.1 is replaced by  $h \in RH_q(\mu)$  with either  $q = \infty$  or  $q$  sufficiently large. Thirdly, a simple observation stated in Lemma 2.5 allows us to get rid of the assumption that  $\mu_{h^2}$  is doubling. Let us mention that for all the applications that are familiar to us the condition  $h \in RH_\infty(\mu)$  holds. This will be briefly discussed at the end of this note. There is a natural question whether the spaces  $H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r)$  are equivalent for a full range of  $r \in (1, \infty]$ , but we do not investigate this issue here.

As a consequence of our new atomic description of  $H_L^1(X)$  we also obtain a more natural description of the dual space of  $H_L^1(X)$ . Let  $r' \in (1, \infty)$  and  $h \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mu)$ . For  $g \in L_{loc}^{r'}(\mu)$

define

$$\|g\|_{\text{BMO}(\mu, h, r')} = \sup_B \left( \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left( \mu(B)^{-1} \int_B (|g(x) - ch(x)|^{r'} d\mu(x))^{1/r'} \right) \right),$$

where supremum is taken over all balls in  $X$ . By definition, the elements of  $\text{BMO}(\mu, h, r')$  are classes  $\{g + ch\}$  such that  $\|g\|_{\text{BMO}(\mu, h, r')} < \infty$ . We have the following duality result, see Section 3.

**Theorem C.** *Assume that  $h \in L_{loc}^\infty(\mu)$  and let  $r, r' > 1$  be such that  $1/r + 1/r' = 1$ . Then the space  $\text{BMO}(\mu, h, r')$  is dual to  $H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r)$ .*

**Remark 1.7.** *The above statement does not refer to the operator  $L$  and the corresponding semigroup. However, its main motivation comes from Theorems A and B.*

## 2. PROOFS OF THEOREMS A AND B.

Recall that a locally integrable nonnegative function  $w$  is in the Muckenhoupt class  $A_p(\nu)$  if

$$\left( \frac{1}{\nu(B)} \int_B w(x) d\nu(x) \right) \left( \frac{1}{\nu(B)} \int_B w(x)^{-1/(p-1)}(x) d\nu(x) \right)^{p-1} \leq C$$

for all balls  $B$ .

The atomic Hardy space  $H_{at}^1[\mu, h]$  with  $[\mu, h]$ -atoms (see (1.5)) was considered in [10]. Similarly as in Definition 1.3, a function  $f$  is in  $H_{at}^1[\mu, h]$  if  $f = \sum_k \lambda_k a_k(x)$ , where  $\sum_k |\lambda_k| < \infty$  and  $a_k$  are  $[\mu, h]$ -atoms.

**Theorem 2.1.** *[10, Theorem A] Let  $(X, \mu, d)$  be a doubling space,  $L$  be a non-negative self-adjoint operator related to the semigroup  $T_t$  with the kernel  $T_t(x, y)$  satisfying (UG). We assume that there exists a function  $h : X \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  such that:  $h$  is  $L$ -harmonic in the sense of (1.2), the measure  $\mu_{h^2}$  is doubling, and (ULG<sub>h</sub>) is satisfied. Then there exists  $p_0 \in (1, 2]$  such that if  $h^{-1} \in A_{p_0}(\mu_{h^2})$ , then  $H_L^1(X)$  and  $H_{at}^1[\mu, h]$  coincide with*

$$\|f\|_{H_L^1(X)} \simeq \|f\|_{H_{at}^1[\mu, h]}.$$

Recall that the notion of so-called Doob transform (or  $h$ -transform) technique, see e.g. [7, Sec. 5.1.2]. This was one of the main tools in the proof of Theorem 2.1. For the semigroup  $T_t$  on  $L^2(\mu)$  one can define a kernel

$$\tilde{T}_t(x, y) = \frac{T_t(x, y)}{h(x)h(y)},$$

which defines a semigroup on the space  $L^2(\mu_{h^2})$ . The semigroup  $\tilde{T}_t$  is conservative (i.e.  $\int_X \tilde{T}_t(x, y) d\mu_{h^2}(x) = 1$  for a.e.  $y \in X$ ). Notice that the assumption (ULG<sub>h</sub>) translates into upper and lower Gaussian bounds for  $\tilde{T}_t(x, y)$ , i.e.

(2.2)

$$C^{-1} \mu_{h^2}(B(x, \sqrt{t}))^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{d(x, y)^2}{c_1 t}\right) \leq \tilde{T}_t(x, y) \leq C \mu_{h^2}(B(x, \sqrt{t}))^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{d(x, y)^2}{c_2 t}\right).$$

It is known that the estimates (ULG<sub>h</sub>) automatically give the following Hölder-type estimates, for a short proof see e.g. [4, Section 4]. See also [7, Theorem 5.11].

**Lemma 2.3.** *Assume that  $T_t$  and  $h$  satisfy (ULG<sub>h</sub>). Then there exist  $C, \delta > 0$  such that for  $t > 0$  and  $x, y, y_0 \in X$  satisfying  $d(y, y_0) \leq \sqrt{t}$  we have*

$$(2.4) \quad \left| \frac{T_t(x, y)}{h(x)h(y)} - \frac{T_t(x, y_0)}{h(x)h(y_0)} \right| \leq C \left( \frac{d(y, y_0)}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^\delta \mu_{h^2}(B(x, \sqrt{t}))^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{d(x, y)^2}{c_3 t}\right).$$

*Proof.* Note that  $\int_X \tilde{T}_t(x, y) d\mu_{h^2}(x) = 1$  a.e. and the semigroup  $\tilde{T}_t$  satisfies (2.2). Therefore (2.4) follows from [4, Theorem 5].  $\square$

Another consequence of (ULG<sub>h</sub>) is the following lemma that was mentioned in the previous section.

**Lemma 2.5.** *If  $T_t(x, y)$  and  $h$  satisfy (ULG<sub>h</sub>), then the measure  $\mu_{h^2}$  is doubling on  $X$ .*

*Proof.* The lemma is standard and follows from (2.2). We shall provide a short proof for the sake of completeness. Let  $x \in X$ ,  $r > 0$ . Using (2.2) for  $y \in B(x, r)$  we have that  $\mu_{h^2}(B(x, \sqrt{2}r))^{-1} \gtrsim \tilde{T}_{2r^2}(x, y)$ . By averaging this inequality over  $B(x, r)$  and using the semigroup property we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{h^2}(B(x, \sqrt{2}r))^{-1} &\gtrsim \mu_{h^2}(B(x, r))^{-1} \int_{B(x, r)} \tilde{T}_{2r^2}(x, y) d\mu_{h^2}(y) \\ &\gtrsim \mu_{h^2}(B(x, r))^{-1} \int_{B(x, r)} \int_{B(y, r)} \tilde{T}_{r^2}(x, z) \tilde{T}_{r^2}(z, y) d\mu_{h^2}(z) d\mu_{h^2}(y) \\ &\gtrsim \mu_{h^2}(B(x, r))^{-2} \int_{B(x, r)} \int_{B(y, r)} \mu_{h^2}(B(y, r))^{-1} d\mu_{h^2}(z) d\mu_{h^2}(y) \\ &\simeq \mu_{h^2}(B(x, r))^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

The next lemma describes relation between  $[\mu, h]$ -atoms and  $(\mu, h, r)$ -atoms. This will be needed in the first part of the proof of Theorems A and B.

**Lemma 2.6.** (a) *Assume that  $h \in RH_\infty(\mu)$ . Then there exists  $C$  such that for any ball  $B$  and any function  $a$  supported in  $B$  we have*

$$\|a\|_{L^2(h^{-1}\mu)} \leq \mu_h(B)^{-1/2} \implies \|a\|_{L^2(\mu)} \leq C\mu(B)^{-1/2}.$$

(b) *Assume that  $h \in RH_q(\mu)$  for  $q > 1$  and  $r$  is as in (1.6). Then there exists  $C$  such that for any ball  $B$  and any function  $a$  supported in  $B$  we have*

$$\|a\|_{L^2(h^{-1}\mu)} \leq \mu_h(B)^{-1/2} \implies \|a\|_{L^r(\mu)} \leq C\mu(B)^{-1+1/r}.$$

*Proof.* The part (a) follows from the definition of  $RH_\infty(\mu)$ . Indeed

$$\|a\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \leq \sup_{x \in B} h(x) \cdot \|a\|_{L^2(h^{-1}\mu)}^2 \leq \sup_{x \in B} h(x) \cdot \mu_h(B)^{-1} \lesssim \mu(B)^{-1}.$$

To prove (b) we use Hölder's inequality with the exponents  $2/r$  and  $2/(2-r)$  and the definition of  $RH_q(\mu)$  with  $q = r/(2-r) > 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|a\|_{L^r(\mu)}^r &= \int_B |a(x)|^r h^{-r/2} h^{r/2} d\mu(x) \leq \left( \int_B |a(x)|^2 h^{-1}(x) d\mu(x) \right)^{r/2} \cdot \left( \int_B h^{r/(2-r)} \right)^{(2-r)/2} \\ &\lesssim \mu_h(B)^{-r/2} \cdot \mu(B)^{1-r} \cdot \mu_h(B)^{r/2} = \mu(B)^{1-r}. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

In what follows  $p$  and  $q$  will always be related by the equation

$$(2.7) \quad p = \frac{q-1}{q-2}.$$

The same relation holds between  $p_0$  from Theorem 2.1 and  $q_0$  from Theorem B.

**Lemma 2.8.** *Assume that  $h \in RH_q(\mu)$  for  $q > 2$ . Then we have  $h^{-1} \in A_p(\mu_{h^2})$  for  $p$  as in (2.7). In particular, if  $h \in RH_\infty(\mu)$ , then  $h^{-1} \in A_p(\mu_{h^2})$  for all  $p > 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $p > 1$  and  $q > 2$  satisfy (2.7), i.e.  $q = 2 + (p - 1)^{-1}$ . Then the condition  $h^{-1} \in A_p(\mu_{h^2})$  is equivalent to

$$(2.9) \quad \mu(B)^{-1} \int_B h d\mu \cdot \left( \mu(B)^{-1} \int_B h^q d\mu \right)^{p-1} \leq C \left( \mu(B)^{-1} \int_B h^2 d\mu \right)^p.$$

By the Reverse Hölder inequality the LHS of (2.9) can be estimated by  $(\mu(B)^{-1} \int_B h d\mu)^{2p}$ . Then, (2.9) follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. The second statement follows immediately, since if  $q \rightarrow \infty$  then  $p = 1 + 1/(q - 2)$  tends to 1.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem B.* Let  $q_0 = \max(D/\delta, 2 + (p_0 - 1)^{-1})$ , where  $D$  is as in (1.1),  $\delta$  is as in (2.4), and  $p_0$  is from Theorem 2.1. Notice that since  $p_0 \leq 2$  then  $q_0 \geq 3$ . Assume that  $h \in RH_q(\mu)$  with  $q > q_0$  and, as always,  $r = 2 - 2/(q + 1)$ .

Notice that  $h \in RH_{q_0}(\mu)$  and using Lemma 2.8 we obtain that  $h^{-1} \in A_{p_0}(\mu_{h^2})$ . Recall that by Lemma 2.5 the measure  $\mu_{h^2}$  is doubling. By Theorem 2.1 we have that  $H_L^1(X) = H_{at}^1[\mu, h]$ . Moreover, Lemma 2.6 (b) states that every  $[\mu, h]$ -atom is also an  $(\mu, h, r)$ -atom, so  $H_L^1(X) \subseteq H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r)$ .

Now we prove that  $H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r) \subseteq H_L^1(X)$ . Since the maximal operator  $M_L$  is of weak-type  $(1, 1)$ , a standard argument shows that it is enough to verify that

$$\left\| \sup_{t>0} |T_t a(\cdot)| \right\|_{L^1(\mu)} \leq C$$

for every  $(\mu, h, r)$ -atom  $a$  with  $C$  independent of  $a$ . Assume that  $a$  is related to a ball  $B = B(y_0, R)$  and satisfies (1.4). Denote  $\lambda B = B(y_0, \lambda R)$ ,  $\lambda > 0$ . By (1.1) and the boundedness of  $M_L$  on  $L^r(\mu)$  we have

$$\|M_L a\|_{L^1(2B, \mu)} \leq \mu(2B)^{1-\frac{1}{r}} \|M_L a\|_{L^r(\mu)} \leq C \mu(B)^{1-\frac{1}{r}} \|a\|_{L^r(\mu)} \leq C.$$

Now our goal is to estimate  $M_L a(x)$  for  $x \notin 2B$ . Notice that if  $y \in B$ , then  $d(x, y) \simeq d(x, y_0)$ . Consider first  $t$  such that  $\sqrt{t} > d(y, y_0)$ . In this case, the cancellation  $\int a h d\mu = 0$  and (2.4) yields

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} |T_t a(x)| &\leq h(x) \int_B \left| \frac{T_t(x, y)}{h(x)h(y)} - \frac{T_t(x, y_0)}{h(x)h(y_0)} \right| |a(y)| h(y) d\mu(y) \\ &\leq Ch(x) \int_B \left( \frac{d(y, y_0)}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^\delta \mu_{h^2}(B(x, \sqrt{t}))^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{d(x, y)^2}{ct}\right) |a(y)| h(y) d\mu(y) \\ &\leq h(x) \left( \frac{R}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^\delta \mu_{h^2}(B(x, \sqrt{t}))^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{d(x, y_0)^2}{ct}\right) \int_B |a| h d\mu \\ &\leq h(x) \left( \frac{R}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^\delta \mu_{h^2}(B(x, d(x, y_0)))^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{d(x, y_0)^2}{ct}\right) \int_B |a| h d\mu, \end{aligned}$$

In the second case,  $\sqrt{t} \leq d(y, y_0)$ , we have that  $R > \sqrt{t}$  and using (ULG<sub>h</sub>) we get

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} |T_t a(x)| &\leq h(x) \int_B \frac{T_t(x, y)}{h(x)h(y)} |a(y)| h(y) d\mu(y) \\ &\leq Ch(x) \left( \frac{R}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^\delta \mu_{h^2}(B(x, \sqrt{t}))^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{d(x, y_0)^2}{ct}\right) \int_B |a| h d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that Lemma 2.5 implies

$$(2.12) \quad \frac{\mu_{h^2}(B(x, d(x, y_0)))}{\mu_{h^2}(B(x, \sqrt{t}))} \lesssim \left( 1 + \frac{d(x, y_0)}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^D.$$

By combining (2.10), (2.11), (2.12), and using Hölder's inequality we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.13) \quad M_L a(x) &\lesssim h(x) \sup_{t>0} \left( \left( \frac{R}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^\delta \mu_{h^2}(B(x, \sqrt{t}))^{-1} \exp \left( -\frac{d(x, y_0)^2}{ct} \right) \right) \int_B |a| h \, d\mu \\
 &\lesssim h(x) \mu_{h^2}(B(x, d(x, y_0)))^{-1} \sup_{t>0} \left( \left( \frac{R}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^\delta \exp \left( -\frac{d(x, y_0)^2}{c't} \right) \right) \int_B |a| h \, d\mu, \\
 &\lesssim \left( \frac{R}{d(x, y_0)} \right)^\delta \frac{h(x)}{\mu_{h^2}(B(x, d(x, y_0)))} \|a\|_{L^r(B, \mu)} \|h\|_{L^{r'}(B, \mu)},
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $1/r + 1/r' = 1$ .

For  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  denote  $S_n = 2^{n+1}B \setminus 2^n B$ . Then

$$\|M_L a\|_{L^1((2B)^c, \mu)} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \underbrace{\|M_L a\|_{L^1(S_n, \mu)}}_{P_n}$$

We claim that  $\sum_{n \geq 1} P_n \leq C$ . Notice that  $\mu_{h^2}(B(x, d(x, y_0))) \simeq \mu_{h^2}(B(y_0, d(x, y_0)))$ , see Lemma 2.5. For  $x \in S_n$  we have that  $2^n R \leq d(x, y_0) \leq 2^{n+1}R$ , so using (2.13) and (1.4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_n &\lesssim 2^{-n\delta} \frac{\mu_h(2^{n+1}B)}{\mu_{h^2}(2^n B)} \mu(B)^{-1+1/r} \|h\|_{L^{r'}(B, \mu)} \\
 &\simeq 2^{-n\delta} \frac{(\mu(2^{n+1}B))^{-1} \int_{2^{n+1}B} h \, d\mu \cdot \left( \mu(B)^{-1} \int_B h^{r'} \, d\mu \right)^{1/r'}}{\mu(2^{n+1}B)^{-1} \int_{2^{n+1}B} h^2 \, d\mu} \\
 &\simeq 2^{-n\delta} \frac{\left( \mu(B)^{-1} \int_B h^{r'} \, d\mu \right)^{1/r'}}{\left( \mu(2^{n+1}B)^{-1} \int_{2^{n+1}B} h^2 \, d\mu \right)^{1/2}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

In the estimate above we used Lemma 2.5 and Hölder's inequality. Recall that  $q > q_0 \geq 3$ ,  $r' = 2q/(q-1) \leq q$ , and  $h \in RH_q(\mu)$ . Using Hölder's and Reverse Hölder's inequalities we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_n &\lesssim 2^{-n\delta} \frac{(\mu(B)^{-1} \int_B h^q \, d\mu)^{1/q}}{\mu(2^{n+1}B)^{-1} \int_{2^{n+1}B} h \, d\mu} \\
 &\lesssim 2^{-n\delta} \left( \frac{\mu(2^{n+1}B)}{\mu(B)} \cdot \frac{\int_B h^q \, d\mu}{\int_{2^{n+1}B} h^q \, d\mu} \right)^{1/q} \\
 &\lesssim 2^{-n\delta} 2^{nD/q},
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $D$  is from (1.1). The claim  $\sum_{n \geq 1} P_n \leq C$  is proved, since  $\delta - D/q > 0$ . The proof of Theorem B is finished.  $\square$

The proof of Theorem A goes by the same argument with appropriate modifications. The assumption  $h \in RH_\infty(\mu)$  implies  $h \in RH_q(\mu)$  for all  $q > 1$ . Then  $h^{-1} \in A_p(\mu_{h^2})$  for all  $p > 1$ , see Lemma 2.8. The main difference in the proof is that we use Lemma 2.6 (a) (instead of (b)), and, therefore, we may keep  $r = 2$ . We leave the details to the reader.

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM C.

Theorem C follows by standard arguments and we shall only briefly discuss a sketch of the proof. In this section we assume that  $r, r' > 1$  are such that  $1/r + 1/r' = 1$ . Let us recall the precise meaning of Theorem C. It consists of two facts:

- 1) For each  $g \in \text{BMO}(\mu, h, r')$  there exists an unique bounded linear functional that we shall denote  $\langle f, g \rangle$ ,  $f \in H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r)$ , such that

$$|\langle f, g \rangle| \leq \|f\|_{H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r)} \|g\|_{\text{BMO}(\mu, h, r')}.$$

- 2) Conversely, for every  $l \in (H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r))^*$  there exists  $g \in \text{BMO}(\mu, h, r')$  such that  $l$  is defined as above, i.e.  $l(f) = \langle f, g \rangle$ .

To prove **1)** take a  $(\mu, h, r)$ -atom  $a$  and  $g \in \text{BMO}(\mu, h, r')$ . Since  $a \in L^r(\mu)$  and  $g \in L_{loc}^{r'}(\mu)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_X a(x)g(x)d\mu(x) \right| &\leq \int_X |a(x)| |g(x) - ch(x)| d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_X |a(x)| |g(x) - ch(x)| d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \|a\|_{L^r(\mu)} \left( \int_B |g(x) - ch(x)|^{r'} d\mu(x) \right)^{1/r'} \\ &\leq \|g\|_{\text{BMO}(\mu, h, r')}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\int_X \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j a_j(x)g(x)d\mu(x)$  is a Cauchy sequence as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and we define the pairing  $\langle f, g \rangle$  as its limit for an arbitrary  $f \in H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r)$ . We have

$$|\langle f, g \rangle| \leq \|f\|_{H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r)} \|g\|_{\text{BMO}(\mu, h, r')}.$$

Notice that  $\langle f, g \rangle = \int f(x)g(x) d\mu(x)$  when  $f$  is a finite linear combination of  $(\mu, h, r)$ -atoms (this subspace is dense in  $H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r)$ )

Now we turn to prove **2)**. This follows from standard arguments, see e.g. [12, p. 145] or [10, Sec. 5]. For the convenience of the reader we present a sketch of the proof. Let  $l$  be a linear functional on  $H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r)$ . We may assume that  $\|l\|_{H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}} \leq 1$ . Let  $B$  be a ball and consider the space

$$\mathcal{H}_B = \left\{ f \in L^r(\mu|_B) : \int_B f(x)h(x)d\mu(x) = 0 \right\}.$$

Obviously, if  $f \in \mathcal{H}_B$ , then  $f \in H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r)$  with

$$\|f\|_{H_{at}^1(\mu, h, r)} \leq \mu(B)^{1-1/r} \|f\|_{L^r(\mu)}.$$

Therefore, by the Riesz characterization theorem there is  $\tilde{g}_B$  (defined up to  $ch(x)\chi_B(x)$ ) such that

$$\begin{aligned} l(f) &= \int_B f(x)\tilde{g}_B(x) d\mu(x), \quad f \in \mathcal{H}_B, \\ \|\tilde{g}_B\|_{L^{r'}(\mu)} &= \|l\|_{\mathcal{H}_B \rightarrow \mathbb{C}} \leq \mu(B)^{1-1/r}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $c_B$  be a constant chosen so that for the function  $g_B = \tilde{g}_B + c_B h$  we have  $\int_{B_0} g_B d\mu = 0$  on some fixed ball  $B_0$ . Take an increasing family of balls  $B_0 \subseteq B_1 \subseteq \dots$  such that  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n = X$ . We have that  $g_{B_n} - g_{B_{n+1}} = c_n h$  on  $B_n \supseteq B_0$ . However, the left hand side has zero integral on  $B_0$ , so  $c_n = 0$ . Then

$$g(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_{B_n}(x).$$

Notice that the limit exists, and  $g$  coincides with  $g_B$  on a ball  $B$ . Finally,

$$(3.1) \quad \left( \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B |g(x) - c_B h(x)|^{r'} d\mu(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}} = \left( \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \|\tilde{g}_B\|_{L^{r'}(\mu)}^{r'} \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}} \leq C.$$

This proves that  $g \in \text{BMO}(\mu, h, r')$  and  $\|g\|_{\text{BMO}} \leq C$ . Also,  $l(f) = \int_X f(x)g(x)d\mu(x)$  whenever  $f$  is a finite combination of atoms. This ends the proof of **2)**.



## 4. APPLICATIONS

It is easy to check that all of the several examples discussed in [10, Sec. 6] satisfy the assumptions of Theorems A and C, including the condition  $h \in RH_\infty(\mu)$ . We do not list all examples here and, instead, we just quote one application.

*Exterior domain outside a bounded convex  $C^{1,1}$  set.* Assume that  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is such that  $\Omega^c$  is convex, compact, and its boundary is locally a  $C^{1,1}$  function. We consider the Laplace operator  $\Delta_\Omega$  on  $\Omega$  with the Dirichlet boundary condition and the corresponding Hardy space  $H_{\Delta_\Omega}^1(\Omega)$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** *Assume that for  $n \geq 3$ ,  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is the exterior of a  $C^{1,1}$  compact convex domain. Then there exists a function  $h : \Omega \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ , such that*

$$h(x) \simeq \min(1, \text{dist}(x, \Omega^c))$$

*and the Hardy space  $H_{\Delta_\Omega}^1(\Omega)$  coincides with  $H_{at}^1(\mu, h, 2)$ , where  $\mu$  is the Lebesgue measure on  $\Omega$ .*

It is not difficult to check that if  $\Omega$  is convex  $C^{1,1}$  set then  $h \in RH_\infty(\mu)$ . Hence Theorem 4.1 is a direct consequence of Theorem A. Assumptions of Theorem C are also satisfied. For other results concerning Hardy spaces on domains on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  we refer the reader to [1, 2] and references therein.

## REFERENCES

- [1] P. Auscher and E. Russ, *Hardy spaces and divergence operators on strongly Lipschitz domains of  $\mathbb{R}^n$* , J. Funct. Anal. **201** (2003), no. 1, 148–184.
- [2] D.-C. Chang, S.G. Krantz, and E. M. Stein,  *$H^p$  theory on a smooth domain in  $\mathbf{R}^N$  and elliptic boundary value problems*, J. Funct. Anal. **114** (1993), no. 2, 286–347.
- [3] X. T. Duong and L. Yan, *Duality of Hardy and BMO spaces associated with operators with heat kernel bounds*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **18** (2005), no. 4, 943–973.
- [4] J. Dziubański and M. Preisner, *Hardy spaces for semigroups with Gaussian bounds*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **197** (2018), no. 3, 965–987.
- [5] J. Dziubański and J. Zienkiewicz, *On Hardy spaces associated with certain Schrödinger operators in dimension 2*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **28** (2012), no. 4, 1035–1060.
- [6] ———, *On isomorphisms of Hardy spaces associated with Schrödinger operators*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl. **19** (2013), no. 3, 447–456.
- [7] P. Gyrya and L. Saloff-Coste, *Neumann and Dirichlet heat kernels in inner uniform domains*, Astérisque (2011), no. 336, viii+144.
- [8] S. Hofmann, G. Lu, D. Mitrea, M. Mitrea, and L. Yan, *Hardy spaces associated to non-negative self-adjoint operators satisfying Davies-Gaffney estimates*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **214** (2011), no. 1007, vi+78.
- [9] S. Hofmann, S. Mayboroda, and A. McIntosh, *Second order elliptic operators with complex bounded measurable coefficients in  $L^p$ , Sobolev and Hardy spaces*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) **44** (2011), no. 5, 723–800.
- [10] M. Preisner, A. Sikora, and L. Yan, *Hardy spaces meet harmonic weights*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **375** (2022), no. 9, 6417–6451.
- [11] L. Song and L. Yan, *Maximal function characterizations for Hardy spaces associated with nonnegative self-adjoint operators on spaces of homogeneous type*, J. Evol. Equ. **18** (2018), no. 1, 221–243.
- [12] E. M. Stein, *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, Princeton Mathematical Series, vol. 43, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993, With the assistance of Timothy S. Murphy, Monographs in Harmonic Analysis, III.

MARCIN PREISNER, INSTYTUT MATEMATYCZNY, UNIWERSYTET WROCŁAWSKI, PL. GRUNWALDZKI 2, 50-384 WROCŁAW, POLAND

*Email address:* marcin.preisner@uwr.edu.pl

ADAM SIKORA, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY, NSW 2109, AUSTRALIA

*Email address:* adam.sikora@mq.edu.au