

Preserving Besov (fractional Sobolev) energies under sphericalization and flattening

Anders Björn

Department of Mathematics, Linköping University, SE-581 83 Linköping, Sweden
anders.bjorn@liu.se, ORCID: 0000-0002-9677-8321

Jana Björn

Department of Mathematics, Linköping University, SE-581 83 Linköping, Sweden
jana.bjorn@liu.se, ORCID: 0000-0002-1238-6751

Riikka Korte

Department of Mathematics and Systems Analysis, Aalto University,
PL 11100, FI-00076 Aalto, Finland
riikka.korte@aalto.fi, ORCID: 0000-0002-6313-2233

Sari Rogovin

Department of Mathematics and Systems Analysis, Aalto University,
PL 11100, FI-00076 Aalto, Finland
sari.rogovin@aalto.fi, ORCID: 0009-0001-3713-637X

Timo Takala

Department of Mathematics and Systems Analysis, Aalto University,
PL 11100, FI-00076 Aalto, Finland
timo.i.takala@aalto.fi, ORCID: 0009-0006-3376-9635

To appear in *J. Reine Angew. Math.*

Abstract. We introduce a new sphericalization mapping for metric spaces that is applicable in very general situations, including totally disconnected fractal type sets. For an unbounded complete metric space which is uniformly perfect at a base point for large radii and equipped with a doubling measure, we make a more specific construction based on the measure and equip it with a weighted measure. This mapping is then shown to preserve the doubling property of the measure and the Besov (fractional Sobolev) energy. The corresponding results for flattening of bounded complete metric spaces are also obtained. Finally, it is shown that for the composition of a sphericalization with a flattening, or vice versa, the obtained space is biLipschitz equivalent with the original space and the resulting measure is comparable to the original measure.

Key words and phrases: Besov energy, doubling measure, flattening, fractional Sobolev energy, metric space, sphericalization.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020): Primary: 30L10 Secondary: 31E05 46E36.

1. Introduction

The stereographic projection and its inverse between the Riemann sphere and the complex plane are very useful mappings in many situations. Similar mappings on metric spaces have been studied and used during the last 25 years. Since the inverse of the stereographic projection “sphericalizes” the complex plane, such mappings from an unbounded to a bounded metric space are called *sphericalizations*. In the other direction, from a bounded to an unbounded space, they are called *flattenings*.

These mappings (with suitably chosen parameters) can preserve the Dirichlet energy and the notion of p -harmonic functions, and thus make it possible to transform boundary value problems in unbounded domains to problems in bounded domains, see e.g. Björn–Björn–Li [5] and Gibara–Korte–Shanmugalingam [12]. Natural spaces for p -harmonic functions are the Sobolev spaces, whose traces on the boundary of sufficiently nice domains Ω are the Besov (fractional Sobolev) spaces $B_p^\theta(\partial\Omega)$, see e.g. [6], [17] and [22]. Besov spaces are also important for nonlocal (fractional) partial differential equations and in other situations.

In this paper we therefore study preservation of the Besov (fractional Sobolev) energy

$$[u]_{\theta,p}^p = [u]_{\theta,p,Z,d,\nu}^p := \int_Z \int_Z \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{d(x,y)^{\theta p}} \frac{d\nu(y) d\nu(x)}{\nu(B(x,d(x,y)))} \quad (1.1)$$

under suitably defined sphericalizations and flattenings in rather general complete metric measure spaces (Z, d, ν) . In particular, our general results apply to closed uniformly perfect subsets of \mathbf{R}^n , including many fractals.

Roughly speaking, by a *sphericalization* we mean a topology-preserving change of metric which makes a complete unbounded metric space into a bounded space whose completion adds exactly one point (denoted by ∞) which is the accumulation point of every unbounded set in the original space. Similarly, a *flattening* is a topology-preserving change of metric which makes a punctured complete bounded metric space into an unbounded complete metric space such that the puncture at the base point is sent to infinity. See Section 2.1 for precise definitions.

The following are some of our main results. In order to treat sphericalization and flattening simultaneously we introduce the parameter $m_0 = 0$ for flattening and $m_0 = 1$ for sphericalizing. The resulting space is denoted (\hat{Z}, \hat{d}) . To be precise, a point ∞ is added to the sphericalized space to make it complete, while a base point b is removed from the original space during flattening.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that (Z, d) is a complete metric space that is uniformly perfect at a base point $b \in Z$ for radii $r \geq m_0$ and that the measure ν is doubling. Let the deformed space $(\hat{Z}, \hat{d}, \hat{\nu})$ be defined using (1.3)–(1.5) below.*

- (a) *In both cases, sphericalization and flattening, the transformed measure $\hat{\nu}$ is doubling.*
- (b) *Let $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $\theta > 0$. If the parameter σ in (1.4)–(1.5) satisfies $\sigma = p\theta$, then for every measurable function u on Z , the Besov (fractional Sobolev) energies (1.1) with respect to (Z, d, ν) and $(\hat{Z}, \hat{d}, \hat{\nu})$ are comparable, i.e.*

$$C_1 [u]_{\theta,p,Z,d,\nu}^p \leq [u]_{\theta,p,\hat{Z},\hat{d},\hat{\nu}}^p \leq C_2 [u]_{\theta,p,Z,d,\nu}^p$$

where the comparison constants $0 < C_1 \leq C_2$ depend only on $\sigma = p\theta$, the doubling constant C_ν and the uniform perfectness constant κ .

Also inversions are covered by our results, see Remark 4.1. Roughly speaking, an inversion is a topology-preserving change of metric between two punctured complete unbounded metric spaces such that the puncture at the base point is sent to infinity while infinity is sent to a new puncture (denoted by ∞). See Section 2.1 for the precise definition.

In Section 7 we end the paper by showing that sphericalization and flattening are each other's inverses, up to a biLipschitz equivalence of the metric and the measure.

As far as we know, Bonk–Kleiner [7] were the first to study sphericalization of general metric spaces. They used the sphericalized distance

$$\hat{d}(x, y) := \inf \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \rho(x_j) \rho(x_{j-1}) d(x_j, x_{j-1}) \right\}, \quad (1.2)$$

where the infimum is taken over all chains $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n = y$, and with the specific choice

$$\rho(x) = \frac{1}{1 + d(x, b)},$$

where b is a fixed base point.

Some years later, Buckley–Herron–Xie [8] used (1.2) with $\rho(x) = 1/d(x, b)$, which led them to inversions and flattenings (both of which were called inversions in [8]). Balogh–Buckley [1] used general sphericalizing/flattening functions and defined the new metric by integrating and taking the infimum over rectifiable paths between two points. This way they showed that the quasihyperbolic metrics corresponding to the spherical and the flat metrics are biLipschitz equivalent. Such an approach requires pathconnected spaces.

We have taken a different route, using the sum $\rho(x_j) + \rho(x_{j-1})$ in (1.3) below rather than the product $\rho(x_j)\rho(x_{j-1})$ in (1.2), since the product definition does not work with all the parameters we need, see Remark 3.10. Starting with a general nonincreasing *metric density* function $\rho : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty]$ and a complete metric space $Z = (Z, d)$ we define a deformed metric \hat{d} , by letting

$$\hat{d}(x, y) := \inf \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n (\rho(x_j) + \rho(x_{j-1})) d(x_j, x_{j-1}) \right\}, \quad (1.3)$$

where the infimum is taken over all chains $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n = y$. Unlike [1], which also considers general sphericalizing functions, we do not use any curves and therefore allow disconnected spaces. Even in connected spaces, our transformations differ from [1]. For example, the completion of the sphericalized \mathbf{R} in [1] adds two points (corresponding to $\pm\infty$) and is therefore not a sphericalization in our sense, while in our construction it only adds one point ∞ , by the following result for general metric density functions ρ .

Proposition 1.2.

- (a) (Sphericalization) *Let (Z, d) be complete, unbounded and uniformly perfect at large scales at b and $\rho(0) < \infty$. Then (Z, \hat{d}) is bounded and its completion adds exactly one point, called ∞ , if and only if*

$$\int_1^\infty \rho \, dt < \infty.$$

- (b) (Flattening) *Let (Z, d) be complete, bounded and uniformly perfect at b . Then $(Z \setminus \{b\}, \hat{d})$ is unbounded and complete if and only if*

$$\int_0^1 \rho \, dt = \infty.$$

For most of our results, we assume that Z is uniformly perfect at the base point $b \in Z$. This assumption is needed to guarantee that the distances in the deformed space are not larger than expected. Propositions 3.8 and 3.9 show that uniform perfectness is also essentially preserved by our general transformations.

In order to show the preservation of measure-theoretic properties, as in Theorem 1.1, we consider particular choices of the metric density function ρ in (1.3), namely

$$\rho(t) = \frac{1}{(t + m_0)\nu(B(b, t + m_0))^{1/\sigma}}, \quad (1.4)$$

with $m_0 = 0$ for flattening and $m_0 = 1$ for sphericalizing. In both cases, $\sigma > 0$ is a fixed but arbitrary parameter and the deformed space $(\widehat{Z}, \widehat{d})$ is equipped with the measure $\widehat{\nu}$ defined by

$$d\widehat{\nu} = \rho^\sigma d\nu. \quad (1.5)$$

The papers [1], [7] and [8] studied purely metric notions, and did not consider any measure. For the metric transformation (1.2) considered in [7], Wildrick [27, Proposition 6.13] showed that if (Z, d) is connected and Ahlfors Q -regular (with respect to the Q -dimensional Hausdorff measure), then its sphericalization $(\widehat{Z}, \widehat{d})$ is also Ahlfors Q -regular. Li–Shanmugalingam [21] considered more general measures in connection with sphericalization and flattening of metric spaces and showed that (under suitable conditions) these transformations preserve the doubling property, Ahlfors regularity and Poincaré inequalities. Further results in this direction were obtained by Durand-Cartagena–Li [10] and [11].

Using a weighted version of the measure from [21], Björn–Björn–Li [5] showed that (again under suitable assumptions) sphericalization preserves p -harmonic functions. This was then applied to study the Dirichlet problem and boundary regularity for such functions on unbounded open sets. All the above papers ([5], [10], [11], [21] and [27]) used the sphericalization and flattening functions from [7] and [8].

Gibara–Shanmugalingam [13] considered a sphericalization similar to the one in [1], but with the sphericalizing function depending on the distance to the boundary of a uniform domain, instead of a single base point. They showed that uniformity is preserved in this type of sphericalization. This same idea was further developed by Gibara–Korte–Shanmugalingam [12], where they also defined a new measure on the deformed space. They showed that the transformed measure is doubling and the transformed domain supports a Poincaré inequality, and used this to solve the p -Dirichlet problem for Besov boundary data.

Most of these papers rely on pathconnectedness of the original space (or even stronger assumptions such as Poincaré inequalities). Due to the nonlocal nature of the Besov space this is not required here. We instead assume the much weaker assumption of uniform perfectness at b (for radii $r \geq m_0$). In fact, many fractal type sets are natural objects for our study. The smoothness exponent θ in the Besov energy (1.1) on such sets can even be greater than 1. In doubling metric measure spaces supporting a certain Sobolev–Poincaré inequality, such as \mathbf{R}^n , this would force functions in B_p^θ (defined by (2.7)) to be constant (see Theorem 1.6 and Corollary 1.8 in Kumagai–Shanmugalingam–Shimizu [20]).

At the same time, there are plenty of spaces (even rectifiably connected ones) for which the Besov spaces B_p^θ are nontrivial for some $\theta > 1$. More precisely, letting

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_p &= \sup\{\theta : B_p^\theta \text{ contains nonconstant functions}\} \quad \text{and} \\ s_p &= \sup\{\theta : B_{p,\infty}^\theta \text{ contains nonconstant functions}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $B_{p,\infty}^\theta$ is the Besov–Lipschitz (Korevaar–Schoen) space, it follows from (2.8) below that $\theta_p = s_p$. For the Sierpiński carpet, Theorem 1.4 in Murugan–Shimizu [23] shows that

$$s_p = \frac{d_{w,p}}{p}, \quad \text{where } d_{w,p} \text{ is the } p\text{-walk dimension.}$$

At the same time, $d_{w,p} > p$ by Theorem 2.27 in Shimizu [26] (or the more general Theorem 9.8 in Kajino–Shimizu [18]), and hence $\theta_p > 1$ for the Sierpiński car-

pet. Similar observations for the Sierpiński gasket follow from Kajino–Shimizu [19, Theorem 5.26] and [18, Theorem 9.13].

Other examples of spaces carrying nontrivial Besov spaces with $\theta > 1$ can be obtained by a general snowflaking process, such as the von Koch snowflake. (Note that on e.g. \mathbf{R}^n , Besov spaces with $\theta > 1$ are usually defined in a different way. Here we ignore such Besov spaces, and only consider Besov spaces defined as in (2.7).) See Kumagai–Shanmugalingam–Shimizu [20] for recent results about potential theoretic implications of finite dimensionality of Besov spaces when $\theta > 1$.

The walk dimension mentioned above is an important concept in the differential calculus on fractal sets. For $p = 2$, it describes the scaling time $\simeq \text{space}^\beta$ for random walks or diffusion processes, based on Dirichlet forms. In \mathbf{R}^n the walk dimension $\beta = 2$, but on fractal sets typically $\beta > 2$.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we introduce some basic notions essential in this paper. In particular uniform perfectness, doubling measures and the Besov (semi)norm are defined here. In Section 3 we prove results about the metric \hat{d} defined with a general metric density function ρ in (1.3). In particular we prove Proposition 1.2. Here the measure does not play any role.

In Section 4 we turn to the more specific choices of the metric density function ρ given by (1.4) for the sphericalization and flattening. Using some additional notation, we are able to treat both cases simultaneously in most of our estimates. These are mainly carried out in Sections 4 (where uniform perfectness is not assumed) and 5 (where uniform perfectness is made a standing assumption) leading to the proof of Theorem 1.1(a) (= Theorem 5.9). In Section 6 we deduce Theorem 1.1(b) (= Theorem 6.1). We end the paper, in Section 7, by showing that if we flatten the sphericalized space, or sphericalize the flattened space, then the resulting space is biLipschitz equivalent to the original space and the resulting measure is comparable to the original measure.

Acknowledgement. AB and JB were supported by the Swedish Research Council, grants 2018-04106, 2020-04011 and 2022-04048, and also by SVEFUM. RK was supported by the Research Council of Finland grant 360184. TT was supported by The Magnus Ehrnrooth foundation. Part of the research was done while RK, SR and TT visited the Department of Mathematics at Linköping University. They wish to thank the university for kind hospitality. We also thank the anonymous referee for a careful reading and useful suggestions.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout the paper we let $Z = (Z, d)$ be a complete metric space with $\text{diam } Z > 0$. We also fix a base point $b \in Z$. Further standing assumptions are added at the beginning of various sections.

We will use the following notation:

$$|x| = d(x, b) \quad \text{and} \quad R_\infty = \sup_{x \in Z} |x|, \quad (2.1)$$

and for balls,

$$B(x, r) = \{y \in Z : d(x, y) < r\} \quad \text{and} \quad B_r = B(b, r).$$

All balls considered in this paper are open. It will be convenient to use this notation also with $r = 0$, i.e. $B_0 = B(b, 0) = \emptyset$.

Throughout the paper, we write $a \lesssim b$ and $b \gtrsim a$ if there is an implicit comparison constant $C > 0$ such that $a \leq Cb$, and $a \simeq b$ if $a \lesssim b \lesssim a$. The implicit comparison constants are allowed to depend on the fixed data. We will carefully explain the dependence in each case.

2.1. Sphericalizations, flattenings and inversions

Our main aim in this paper is to study certain sphericalizations and flattenings given by a gauge function as in (3.1), but we start by defining what we mean by sphericalizations and flattenings in general.

By a *sphericalization* we mean a topology-preserving change of metric from an unbounded complete space (Z, d) to a bounded space (Z, d') whose completion adds exactly one point ∞ , so that for any sequence $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ in Z ,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} d'(x_j, \infty) = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} d(x_j, b) = \infty. \quad (2.2)$$

The metric d' extends directly to $Z \cup \{\infty\}$. With a slight abuse of terminology, we call also the completion $(Z \cup \{\infty\}, d')$ a *sphericalization* of (Z, d) .

Next, let us continue to assume that (Z, d) is a complete metric space and let $Z_0 = Z \setminus \{b\}$. A *flattening* is a topology-preserving change of metric from a bounded punctured space (Z_0, d) to an unbounded complete space (Z_0, d') (called a *flattening* of (Z, d)) such that for any $b_0 \in Z_0$ and any sequence $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ in Z_0 ,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} d'(x_j, b_0) = \infty \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} d(x_j, b) = 0. \quad (2.3)$$

Similarly, an *inversion* is a topology-preserving change of metric from an unbounded punctured space (Z_0, d) to an unbounded space (Z_0, d') whose completion adds exactly one point ∞ such that (2.2) and (2.3) hold for all sequences in Z_0 .

Note that (Z, d) is assumed to be complete but not necessarily proper (i.e. its closed bounded subsets need not be compact), in which case $(Z \cup \{\infty\}, d')$ will not be compact. However, from Section 4 onwards we assume that (Z, d) is equipped with a doubling measure ν , which together with the completeness implies that (Z, d) is proper, by e.g. Proposition 3.1 in Björn–Björn [2]. For the results in Section 3 it is not even required that (Z, d) is separable.

2.2. Uniform perfectness at a point

The space Z is *uniformly perfect at x* if there is a constant $\kappa > 1$ such that

$$B(x, \kappa r) \setminus B(x, r) \neq \emptyset \quad \text{whenever } B(x, r) \neq Z \text{ and } r > 0. \quad (2.4)$$

Note that the condition $B(x, r) \neq Z$ in (2.4) can equivalently be replaced by $B(x, \kappa r) \neq Z$. The space Z is *uniformly perfect* if it is uniformly perfect at every x with the same constant κ . See Heinonen [16, Chapter 11] and Björn–Björn [4, Section 2] for further discussion and history. Note that Z is uniformly perfect with any $\kappa > 1$ if it is connected. We will also need the following notions, which may not have been considered before.

Let $m_0 \geq 0$. Then Z is *uniformly perfect at x for radii $r \geq m_0$* if there is a constant $\kappa > 1$ such that

$$B(x, \kappa r) \setminus B(x, r) \neq \emptyset \quad \text{whenever } B(x, r) \neq Z \text{ and } 0 \neq r \geq m_0.$$

Note that Z is uniformly perfect at x if and only if it is uniformly perfect at x for radii $r \geq 0$.

We also say that Z is *uniformly perfect at large scales at x* , if it is unbounded and uniformly perfect at x for radii $r \geq 1$. It is easy to see that the constant 1 in $r \geq 1$ can equivalently be replaced by any other positive number, provided that κ is allowed to change.

2.3. Doubling measures

In this section, we will provide some preliminary estimates for a doubling measure under the assumption that the space is uniformly perfect at a fixed base point $b \in Z$.

A complete Borel regular measure ν is *doubling* if there is a *doubling constant* $C_\nu > 1$ such that

$$0 < \nu(B(x, 2r)) \leq C_\nu \nu(B(x, r)) < \infty \quad \text{for all } x \in Z \text{ and } r > 0.$$

The following simple lemma from Björn–Björn [2, Lemma 3.6] will be used several times.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that ν is a doubling measure on Z . Let $B = B(x, r)$ and $B' = B(x', r')$ be two balls such that*

$$d(x, x') \leq ar \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{r}{a} \leq r' \leq ar.$$

Then $\nu(B) \simeq \nu(B')$ with comparison constants depending only on $a \geq 1$ and C_ν .

The following consequence of the doubling property and uniform perfectness is a (strong) type of reverse-doubling. Recall from (2.1) that $R_\infty = \sup_{x \in Z} |x|$.

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that ν is a doubling measure on Z and that Z is uniformly perfect at b for radii $r \geq m_0$ with constant κ . Then there are constants $\alpha > 0$ and $\Lambda \geq 1$, only depending on C_ν and κ , such that*

$$\frac{\nu(B_r)}{\nu(B_R)} \leq \Lambda \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^\alpha \quad \text{when } m_0 \leq r < R < 2R_\infty.$$

In particular $\nu(\{b\}) = 0$ if $m_0 = 0$.

Proof. If $R_\infty \leq 2m_0$, then

$$\frac{\nu(B_r)}{\nu(B_R)} \leq 1 \leq \frac{4r}{R},$$

so the claim holds with $\alpha = 1$ and $\Lambda = 4$.

Now assume that $R_\infty > 2m_0$. The claim is trivial if $r = 0$ since $B_0 = \emptyset$, so we may assume that $r > 0$. Let $t > 0$ be such that $m_0 < t < \frac{1}{2}R_\infty$. By the uniform perfectness, there is $x \in B_{2\kappa t} \setminus B_{2t}$. Then

$$\nu(B_t) \leq \nu(B(x, 3\kappa t)) \lesssim \nu(B(x, t)).$$

Thus

$$\nu(B_{4\kappa t}) \geq \nu(B_t) + \nu(B(x, t)) \geq \Lambda \nu(B_t), \quad (2.5)$$

where $\Lambda > 1$.

For $j = 0, 1, \dots$, let $r_j = (4\kappa)^{-j}R$ and find n such that $r_{n+1} \leq r < r_n$. Note that $r_n > m_0$ and $r_1 < \frac{1}{2}R_\infty$. Then, by (2.5),

$$\frac{\nu(B_r)}{\nu(B_R)} \leq \frac{\nu(B_{r_n})}{\nu(B_R)} = \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{\nu(B_{r_j})}{\nu(B_{r_{j-1}})} \leq \Lambda^{-n} = \Lambda \left(\frac{r_{n+1}}{R} \right)^\alpha \leq \Lambda \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^\alpha,$$

where

$$\alpha = \frac{\log \Lambda}{\log 4\kappa}.$$

□

2.4. The Besov (fractional Sobolev) energy

Let $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $\theta > 0$. For a measurable function $u : Z \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ (which is finite ν -a.e.) we define the *Besov (fractional Sobolev) energy (seminorm)* by

$$[u]_{\theta,p}^p = [u]_{\theta,p,Z}^p = \int_Z \int_Z \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{d(x,y)^{\theta p}} \frac{d\nu(y) d\nu(x)}{\nu(B(x, d(x,y)))}. \quad (2.6)$$

Here and elsewhere, the integrand should be interpreted as zero when $y = x$.

The *Besov (fractional Sobolev) space* $B_p^\theta(Z)$ consists of functions u for which the norm

$$\|u\|_{B_p^\theta(Z)} := [u]_{\theta,p} + \|u\|_{L^p(Z)} \quad (2.7)$$

is finite. This is a Banach space (after taking ν -a.e.-equivalence classes), see Remark 9.8 in Björn–Björn–Shanmugalingam [6]. We restrict our attention to Besov spaces with two indices (i.e. “ $q = p$ ”).

The above spaces and (semi)norms go under various names, such as fractional Sobolev, Gagliardo–Nirenberg, Sobolev–Slobodetskiĭ and Besov. Besov spaces is the usual name in the metric space literature, while fractional Sobolev spaces is more common in e.g. the community working with nonlinear nonlocal operators on \mathbf{R}^n such as the fractional p -Laplacian $(-\Delta_p)^s$.

Equivalent definitions, using equivalent seminorms, can be found in Gogatishvili–Koskela–Shanmugalingam [14, Theorem 5.2 and (5.1)] for the case when ν is doubling. When ν is also reverse-doubling (or equivalently Z is uniformly perfect), further equivalent definitions can be found in Gogatishvili–Koskela–Zhou [15, Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 4.1], for example that the Besov space $B_p^\theta(Z)$ considered here coincides with the corresponding Hajlasz–Besov space. By [14, Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2], it is related to fractional Hajlasz spaces, considered already in Yang [28].

The spaces $B_p^\theta(Z)$ are closely related to the so-called Korevaar–Schoen (or Besov–Lipschitz) spaces $B_{p,\infty}^\theta(Z)$ considered in the literature on fractals, see e.g. [19], [20] and [23]. More precisely, if ν is doubling, then for every $0 < \delta < \theta$,

$$B_p^\theta(Z) \subset B_{p,\infty}^\theta(Z) \subset B_p^{\theta-\delta}(Z), \quad (2.8)$$

see Kumagai–Shanmugalingam–Shimizu [20, Lemma 2.6] (where it also shown that $B_{p,\infty}^\theta(Z) = KS_p^\theta(Z)$ when ν is doubling).

Our definition (2.7) is also equivalent to certain norms based on heat kernels (with “ $q = p$ ”), under suitable a priori estimates for the kernel, see Saloff-Coste [25, Théorème 2] (on Lie groups) and Pietruska-Paľuba [24, Theorem 3.1] (on metric spaces). For $p = 2$, our definition of $[u]_{\theta,2}^2$ coincides with the energy used in connection with heat kernel estimates in Chen–Kumagai [9] when

$$J(x, y) = \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, d(x, y)))\rho(x, y)^{2\theta}}$$

therein. See the above papers for the precise definitions and earlier references to the theory on \mathbf{R}^n , fractals and Ahlfors regular metric spaces.

3. Deformation of the metric

Recall the standing assumptions from the beginning of Section 2. In particular, $Z = (Z, d)$ is a complete metric space throughout the paper.

In this section we deal with purely metric notions, and do not need any measure.

Let $\rho : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be a nonincreasing function and let $\rho(0) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \rho(t)$. Also let $\rho(x) = \rho(|x|)$ for $x \in Z$. We define

$$\hat{d}(x, y) := \inf \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n (\rho(x_j) + \rho(x_{j-1})) d(x_j, x_{j-1}) \right\}, \quad (3.1)$$

where the infimum is taken over all chains $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n = y$. We call ρ a *metric density* function.

If $\rho(0) = \infty$, then $\hat{d}(x, b) = \infty$ for every $x \neq b$, and therefore \hat{d} is not a metric on Z . We therefore introduce

$$Z' = \{x \in Z : \rho(x) < \infty\} = \begin{cases} Z, & \text{if } \rho(0) < \infty, \\ Z \setminus \{b\}, & \text{if } \rho(0) = \infty. \end{cases}$$

We will show in Proposition 3.1 that \hat{d} is a metric on Z' . The completion of (Z', \hat{d}) will be denoted by \widehat{Z} . The metric \hat{d} extends directly to \widehat{Z} . Lemma 3.5 below implies that if Z is uniformly perfect at b , $\rho(0) = \infty$ and $\rho \in L^1(0, 1)$, then \widehat{Z} adds back b to Z' with

$$\hat{d}(b, x) := \hat{d}(x, b) := \lim_{y \rightarrow b} \hat{d}(x, y).$$

Balls with respect to the metric \hat{d} are denoted by

$$\widehat{B}(x, r) := \{y \in \widehat{Z} : \hat{d}(x, y) < r\}.$$

Proposition 3.1. *\hat{d} is a metric on Z' .*

For proving this proposition, we will need the following lemma, which will be useful also later.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $x, y \in Z'$ be such that $x \neq y$. Then*

$$0 < d(x, y) \inf_{B(x, d(x, y))} \rho \leq \hat{d}(x, y) \leq (\rho(x) + \rho(y))d(x, y). \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. Let $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n = y$ be any chain from x to y and let j_0 be the smallest index such that $x_{j_0} \notin B(x, d(x, y))$. (Such a j_0 always exists as $x_n = y \notin B(x, d(x, y))$.) Let $m = \inf_{B(x, d(x, y))} \rho > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n (\rho(x_j) + \rho(x_{j-1})) d(x_j, x_{j-1}) &\geq \sum_{j=1}^{j_0} \rho(x_{j-1}) d(x_j, x_{j-1}) \\ &\geq m \sum_{j=1}^{j_0} d(x_j, x_{j-1}) \geq m d(x, x_{j_0}) \geq m d(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the infimum over all chains from x to y shows the first inequality in (3.2).

For the second inequality, we instead use the trivial chain $x = x_0, x_1 = y$ to obtain that

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \leq (\rho(x) + \rho(y))d(x, y). \quad \square$$

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Clearly $\hat{d}(x, x) = 0$ for each $x \in Z'$, and \hat{d} is symmetric and satisfies the triangle inequality. Finally, $0 < \hat{d}(x, y) < \infty$ for all $x, y \in Z'$ with $x \neq y$, by Lemma 3.2. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Assume that $x, y \in Z$ and that $|x| \leq |y|$. Then*

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \geq \int_{|x|}^{|y|} \rho dt.$$

Proof. Let $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n = y$ be a chain. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n (\rho(x_j) + \rho(x_{j-1}))d(x_j, x_{j-1}) &\geq \sum_{|x_j| \geq |x_{j-1}|} \rho(x_{j-1})d(x_j, x_{j-1}) \\ &\geq \sum_{|x_j| \geq |x_{j-1}|} \int_{|x_{j-1}|}^{|x_j|} \rho dt \geq \int_{|x|}^{|y|} \rho dt. \end{aligned}$$

The claim then follows by taking the infimum over all chains from x to y . \square

Proposition 3.4. *The deformation $(Z', d) \mapsto (Z', \hat{d})$ is topology-preserving, i.e. for any sequence $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ in Z' and $x \in Z'$,*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} d(x_j, x) = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \hat{d}(x_j, x) = 0. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. If $d(x_j, x) \rightarrow 0$, then clearly $|x_j| \rightarrow |x|$ and so for big enough j we have $|x_j| \geq |x|/2$ and $\rho(x_j) \leq \rho(|x|/2)$. It thus follows from Lemma 3.2 that $\hat{d}(x_j, x) \rightarrow 0$.

Conversely, if $\hat{d}(x_j, x) \rightarrow 0$, then $|x_j| \rightarrow |x|$ by Lemma 3.3. So for large enough j we have $|x_j| \leq |x| + 1$ and hence $B(x, d(x_j, x)) \subset B(b, 3|x| + 1)$. Thus, Lemma 3.2 implies that for these large enough j ,

$$d(x_j, x) \leq \frac{\hat{d}(x_j, x)}{\rho(3|x| + 1)},$$

yielding $d(x_j, x) \rightarrow 0$. \square

Using uniform perfectness we can obtain the following converse of Lemma 3.3.

Lemma 3.5. *Assume that Z is uniformly perfect at b for radii $r \geq m_0$ with constant $\kappa > 1$. Let $x, y \in Z'$ with $m_0 \leq |x| \leq |y|$. Then*

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \lesssim \int_{|x|/\kappa}^{|y|} \rho dt,$$

where the comparison constant only depends on κ .

Proof. Assume first that $|x| > 0$. By the uniform perfectness we can find a finite sequence of points $x = x_0, \dots, x_n = y$ such that

$$\kappa^{j-1}|x| \leq |x_j| \leq \kappa^j|x|, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{d}(x, y) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n (\rho(x_j) + \rho(x_{j-1}))d(x_j, x_{j-1}) \leq 4 \sum_{j=1}^n |x_j| \rho(x_{j-1}) \\ &\leq 4\kappa^2 \left(|x| \rho(x) + \sum_{j=2}^n \rho(\kappa^{j-2}|x|) \kappa^{j-2}|x| \right) \leq \frac{8\kappa^3}{\kappa - 1} \int_{|x|/\kappa}^{|y|} \rho dt. \end{aligned}$$

If $|x| = 0$, then $\rho(0) < \infty$ and $m_0 = 0$. If $|y| = 0$, the claim is trivial, so assume that $|y| > 0$. By the uniform perfectness there exists a sequence $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ such that $0 < |x_i| \leq |y|$ for every i and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |x_i| = 0$. Therefore, by the above estimate for $\hat{d}(x_i, y)$,

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \leq \hat{d}(x, x_i) + \hat{d}(x_i, y) \lesssim \rho(0)d(x, x_i) + \int_{|x_i|/\kappa}^{|y|} \rho dt \rightarrow \int_0^{|y|} \rho dt, \quad \text{as } i \rightarrow \infty. \quad \square$$

As a consequence of Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5 we obtain the following characterizations.

Proposition 3.6. *Assume that $\rho(0) < \infty$ and that (Z, d) is unbounded and uniformly perfect at large scales at b . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) (Z, \hat{d}) is bounded,
- (b)

$$\int_1^\infty \rho dt < \infty,$$

- (c) (Z, \hat{d}) is not complete,
- (d) the completion \widehat{Z} of (Z, \hat{d}) adds exactly one point, denoted ∞ ,
- (e) (\widehat{Z}, \hat{d}) is a sphericalization of (Z, d) , i.e. it adds exactly one point ∞ to Z and (2.2) (with d' replaced by \hat{d}) and (3.3) hold.

Note that $Z' = Z$, because $\rho(0) < \infty$, and thus (Z, \hat{d}) is a metric space. Note also that $\int_0^1 \rho dt \leq \rho(0) < \infty$.

Proof. (a) \Leftrightarrow (b) This follows directly from Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5, as Z is unbounded and so $\sup_{y \in Z} |y| = \infty$.

Next, consider an arbitrary d -bounded sequence $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ in Z . Then $d(x_j, x_k) \leq |x_j| + |x_k|$ and thus, $B(x_j, d(x_j, x_k)) \subset B(b, 3 \sup_i |x_i|)$. Hence, by Lemma 3.2,

$$\rho\left(3 \sup_i |x_i|\right) d(x_j, x_k) \leq \hat{d}(x_j, x_k) \leq 2\rho(0)d(x_j, x_k). \quad (3.4)$$

It follows that $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is a \hat{d} -Cauchy sequence if and only if it is a d -Cauchy sequence, in which case it also converges with respect to both metrics, since (Z, d) is complete.

(b) \Rightarrow (e) Let $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be a \hat{d} -Cauchy sequence. If it is d -bounded, then we have already seen by (3.4) that it converges within Z . On the other hand, if $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is d -unbounded, then it does not \hat{d} -converge to any $z \in Z$. Indeed, if $\hat{d}(x_j, z) \rightarrow 0$ for some $z \in Z$, then by Lemma 3.3,

$$0 < \int_{|z|}^\infty \rho dt = \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{|z|}^{|x_j|} \rho dt \leq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \hat{d}(z, x_j) = 0,$$

which is a contradiction. We therefore denote the \hat{d} -limit of $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ by ∞ . This also shows that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |x_j| = \infty$, since any d -bounded subsequence of $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ would \hat{d} -converge within Z because of (3.4), which is impossible. Similarly, if $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is another d -unbounded \hat{d} -Cauchy sequence, then also $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |y_j| = \infty$. By mixing x_j and y_j , we obtain a new unbounded sequence, which must be a \hat{d} -Cauchy sequence, because of Lemma 3.5 and (b). Hence every d -unbounded \hat{d} -Cauchy sequence converges to ∞ , and $\widehat{Z} = Z \cup \{\infty\}$. Moreover, if $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is any sequence with $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |z_j| = \infty$ then it is also \hat{d} -Cauchy by Lemma 3.5 and (b). In particular, (2.2) holds (with d' replaced by \hat{d}). Finally, the deformation is topology-preserving on $Z' = Z$ by Proposition 3.4 i.e. (3.3) holds.

(e) \Rightarrow (d) \Rightarrow (c) These implications are trivial.

\neg (b) \Rightarrow \neg (c) Let $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be a \hat{d} -Cauchy sequence. Then it follows from Lemma 3.3 and \neg (b) that $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is d -bounded, and hence by the above it is \hat{d} -convergent within Z . So (Z, \hat{d}) is complete. \square

Proposition 3.7. *Assume that (Z, d) is bounded and uniformly perfect at b . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) $(Z \setminus \{b\}, \hat{d})$ is unbounded,
 (b)

$$\int_0^1 \rho \, dt = \infty,$$

- (c) $(Z \setminus \{b\}, \hat{d})$ is complete,
 (d) $(Z \setminus \{b\}, \hat{d})$ is a flattening of $(Z \setminus \{b\}, d)$, i.e. it is complete and (2.3) (with d' replaced by \hat{d}) and (3.3) hold.

Note that (b) implies that $\rho(0) = \infty$ and hence that $Z' = Z \setminus \{b\}$.

Proof. (a) \Leftrightarrow (b) This follows directly from Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5, since Z is uniformly perfect at b and hence $\inf_{x \in Z \setminus \{b\}} |x| = 0$.

(b) \Rightarrow (d) Let $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be a \hat{d} -Cauchy sequence in $Z \setminus \{b\}$. Then it follows from (b) and Lemma 3.3 that $\inf_i |x_i| > 0$. Since (Z, d) is bounded, Lemma 3.2 implies that

$$\rho\left(\sup_{x \in Z} |x|\right) d(x_j, x_k) \leq \hat{d}(x_j, x_k) \leq 2\rho\left(\inf_i |x_i|\right) d(x_j, x_k).$$

Thus $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is a d -Cauchy sequence, and moreover has the same \hat{d} -limit as the d -limit provided by the completeness of Z . That the deformation is topology-preserving on $Z \setminus \{b\}$ follows from Proposition 3.4.

It remains to show (2.3). To this end, let $b_0 \in Z \setminus \{b\}$ and let $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be an arbitrary sequence in $Z \setminus \{b\}$. If $|x_j| \rightarrow 0$, then it follows from (b) and Lemma 3.3 that $\hat{d}(x_j, b_0) \rightarrow \infty$. Conversely, if $\hat{d}(x_j, b_0) \rightarrow \infty$ then it follows from (b), Lemma 3.5 and the boundedness of (Z, d) that $|x_j| \rightarrow 0$.

(d) \Rightarrow (c) This is trivial.

\neg (b) \Rightarrow \neg (c) By the uniform perfectness, there is a sequence $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ in $Z \setminus \{b\}$ such that $|x_j| \rightarrow 0$, as $j \rightarrow \infty$. By Lemma 3.5 and \neg (b), $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is a \hat{d} -Cauchy sequence. On the other hand, it follows from Proposition 3.4 that $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ cannot \hat{d} -converge to any $z \neq b$. \square

Proof of Proposition 1.2. Part (a) follows directly from Proposition 3.6, while (b) follows directly from Proposition 3.7. \square

Next we will show that uniform perfectness is in a certain sense preserved by metric transformations.

Proposition 3.8. *Assume that $\rho(0) < \infty$, that (Z, d) is unbounded and uniformly perfect at large scales at b , and that (Z, \hat{d}) is bounded. Also assume that there is $A \geq 1$ such that*

$$\rho(t) \leq A\rho(2t) \quad \text{for every } t > 0. \quad (3.5)$$

Then (\hat{Z}, \hat{d}) is uniformly perfect at ∞ with a constant $\hat{\kappa} > 1$ that depends only on A, κ and $\rho(0)/\rho(1)$.

Condition (3.5) can be seen as a *doubling condition* for the nondecreasing function $t \mapsto 1/\rho(t)$.

Proof. By the uniform perfectness at large scales, there are $x_j \in Z$ such that

$$\kappa^{j-1} \leq |x_j| \leq \kappa^j, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots$$

In particular, $\hat{d}(x_j, \infty) \rightarrow 0$ by (2.2) (from Proposition 3.6(e)). By Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5, and the doubling property (3.5) of ρ we then see that

$$\int_{|x|}^\infty \rho \, dt \leq \hat{d}(x, \infty) \lesssim \int_{|x|/\kappa}^\infty \rho \, dt \simeq \int_{|x|}^\infty \rho \, dt \quad \text{if } |x| \geq 1. \quad (3.6)$$

Since $1 \leq |x_1| \leq \kappa$, the monotonicity of ρ and another use of (3.5) give us that

$$\hat{d}(x_1, \infty) \simeq \int_1^\infty \rho \, dt \geq \rho(2) \simeq \rho(1) \quad (3.7)$$

and that there exists a constant $\kappa' > 1$ (only depending on A and κ) such that

$$\frac{1}{\kappa'} \hat{d}(x_j, \infty) \leq \hat{d}(x_{j-1}, \infty) \leq \kappa' \hat{d}(x_j, \infty), \quad j = 2, 3, \dots$$

Let $0 < r \leq \hat{d}(x_1, \infty)$. Since $\hat{d}(x_j, \infty) \rightarrow 0$, as $j \rightarrow \infty$, there is a smallest integer j_r such that $\hat{d}(x_{j_r+1}, \infty) < r$. Then $j_r \geq 1$ and

$$r \leq \hat{d}(x_{j_r}, \infty) \leq \kappa' \hat{d}(x_{j_r+1}, \infty) < \kappa' r.$$

Next, (3.6) and (3.7) show that

$$\hat{d}(x, \infty) \lesssim \hat{d}(x_1, \infty) \quad \text{if } |x| \geq 1.$$

On the other hand, if $|x| < 1$ then $d(x, x_1) \leq 1 + \kappa$ and estimating $\hat{d}(x, x_1)$ with the trivial chain $x = x_0, x_1$, together with the monotonicity of ρ and (3.7), shows that

$$\frac{\hat{d}(x, \infty)}{\hat{d}(x_1, \infty)} \leq \frac{\hat{d}(x, x_1) + \hat{d}(x_1, \infty)}{\hat{d}(x_1, \infty)} \lesssim \frac{2(1 + \kappa)\rho(0)}{\rho(1)} + 1 \lesssim \frac{\rho(0)}{\rho(1)}.$$

We can therefore find $\hat{\kappa} \geq \kappa'$, depending only on A , κ and $\rho(0)/\rho(1)$, such that

$$\hat{\kappa} \geq \frac{\sup_{x \in Z} \hat{d}(x, \infty)}{\hat{d}(x_1, \infty)},$$

and thus $\widehat{B}(\infty, \hat{\kappa}r) = \widehat{Z}$ when $r > \hat{d}(x_1, \infty)$. Hence, (\widehat{Z}, \hat{d}) is uniformly perfect at ∞ with constant $\hat{\kappa}$. \square

Proposition 3.9. *Assume that Z is uniformly perfect at b and that*

$$\int_0^1 \rho \, dt = \infty. \quad (3.8)$$

Also assume that the doubling condition (3.5) for ρ holds. Then for every $b' \in Z'$, the space (Z', \hat{d}) is uniformly perfect at large scales at b' with a constant $\hat{\kappa} > 1$ that depends only on A , κ and $|b'|\rho(b')$.

Proof. Note that by (3.8) and the monotonicity of ρ , we have $\rho(0) = \infty$ and therefore $Z' = Z \setminus \{b\}$. By the uniform perfectness at b , there are $x_j \in Z'$ such that

$$\kappa^{-j-1}|b'| \leq |x_j| \leq \kappa^{-j}|b'|, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots$$

By Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5, we see that

$$\int_{|x_j|}^{|b'|} \rho \, dt \leq \hat{d}(x_j, b') \lesssim \int_{|x_j|/\kappa}^{|b'|} \rho \, dt = \int_{|x_j|/\kappa}^{|x_j|} \rho \, dt + \int_{|x_j|}^{|b'|} \rho \, dt.$$

The doubling condition (3.5) of ρ gives that

$$\int_{|x_j|/\kappa}^{|x_j|} \rho \, dt \simeq \rho(x_j)|x_j| \lesssim \int_{|x_j|}^{|b'|} \rho \, dt$$

and then similarly,

$$\hat{d}(x_j, b') \simeq \int_{|x_j|}^{|b'|} \rho \, dt \simeq \int_{|x_{j+1}|}^{|b'|} \rho \, dt \simeq \hat{d}(x_{j+1}, b').$$

In particular, $\hat{d}(x_1, b') \simeq |b'| \rho(b')$. Here the comparison constants depend only on A and κ . From (3.8) we get that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \hat{d}(x_j, b') = \infty$. Then for some $\hat{\kappa} > 1$ and each $r \geq \hat{d}(x_1, b')$ there is j_r such that

$$x_{j_r} \in \widehat{B}(b', \hat{\kappa}r) \setminus \widehat{B}(b', r).$$

After replacing $\hat{\kappa}$ by $\hat{\kappa} \max\{1, \hat{d}(x_1, b')\}$, the same statement holds for all $r \geq 1$. \square

Remark 3.10. We will now explain why it is important in this paper to define sphericalization and flattening using a sum as in (3.1) rather than a product. Suppose that one would like to sphericalize an unbounded metric space (Z, d) using the formula

$$\tilde{d}(x, y) := \inf \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{\rho}(x_j) \tilde{\rho}(x_{j-1}) d(x_j, x_{j-1}) \right\}, \quad (3.9)$$

where the infimum is taken over all chains $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n = y$, and with a general positive nonincreasing function $\tilde{\rho}(x) = \tilde{\rho}(|x|)$ such that $\tilde{\rho}(0) < \infty$. Note that a transformation using products as in (3.9) that is equivalent to a transformation using sums as in (3.1), or path integrals, would typically have $\tilde{\rho} \simeq \sqrt{\rho}$.

The main problem with the product definition is that $\tilde{\rho}(x_j) \tilde{\rho}(x_{j-1})$ can be small even when $\tilde{\rho}(x_j)$ is large, provided that x_{j-1} is very far away and $\tilde{\rho}$ is fast decreasing. We can see this by considering a transformation with $\tilde{\rho}$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t \tilde{\rho}(t) = 0$. Let $z_1, z_2 \in Z$. Since (Z, d) is unbounded, there is a sequence $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ such that $|y_j| \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. We then get (using the chain $x_0 = z_1, x_1 = y_j, x_2 = z_2$) that for sufficiently large j ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{d}(z_1, z_2) &\leq \tilde{\rho}(z_1) \tilde{\rho}(y_j) d(y_j, z_1) + \tilde{\rho}(z_2) \tilde{\rho}(y_j) d(y_j, z_2) \\ &\leq 2(\tilde{\rho}(z_1) + \tilde{\rho}(z_2)) \tilde{\rho}(y_j) |y_j| \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned} \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

So in order for \tilde{d} to be a metric, we need $\liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |x| \tilde{\rho}(|x|) > 0$. If this type of sphericalization of e.g. $Z = \mathbf{R}^n$ is equipped with the measure $d\tilde{\nu} = \tilde{\rho}^\sigma dx$, then $\tilde{\nu}(\mathbf{R}^n) = \infty$ whenever $\sigma \leq n$, and thus $\tilde{\nu}$ is not a doubling measure (since the sphericalized space is required to be bounded). In conclusion, using sums as in (3.1), rather than products as in (3.9), gives much more flexibility.

If one instead uses the approach by Balogh–Buckley [1] then one is limited to pathconnected spaces with additional connectivity at ∞ . In this case Lemma 3.3 holds. However, with such an approach, the completion of (\mathbf{R}, \tilde{d}) will add two points, corresponding to $\pm\infty$, and is thus *not* a sphericalization in our sense. Hence additional connectivity at ∞ is required, which would severely restrict the spaces under consideration.

4. Sphericalization and flattening

In the rest of the paper, we assume that the complete metric space (Z, d) is equipped with a doubling measure ν .

In order to treat sphericalization and flattening simultaneously it will be convenient to introduce the function

$$m(t) = t + m_0, \quad (4.1)$$

where $m_0 \in \{0, 1\}$ is the same constant that appears in the uniform perfectness condition. For $x \in Z$, we let $m(x) = m(|x|)$. We will use $m_0 = 0$ for flattening and $m_0 = 1$ for sphericalization.

We will use the metric density function

$$\rho(x) = \rho(|x|) = \frac{1}{m(x)\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}}, \quad \text{where } \sigma > 0 \text{ is fixed,} \quad (4.2)$$

with the interpretation that $\rho(0) = \infty$ if $m_0 = 0$. For $m_0 = 1$, we have $\rho(0) = 1/\nu(B_1)^{1/\sigma} < \infty$. Note that ρ is decreasing and that by the doubling property of ν ,

$$\rho(x) \simeq \rho(y) \quad \text{whenever } \frac{1}{M}m(x) \leq m(y) \leq Mm(x) \text{ for some } M > 1, \quad (4.3)$$

where the comparison constants depend only on C_ν , M and σ . In particular, ρ satisfies condition (3.5).

Equip Z with the metric \hat{d} defined as in (3.1) with the above ρ . Recall that

$$R_\infty = \sup_{x \in Z} |x| \quad \text{and} \quad Z' = \begin{cases} Z, & \text{if } m_0 = 1, \\ Z \setminus \{b\}, & \text{if } m_0 = 0. \end{cases}$$

Note that $m(x) > 0$ for every $x \in Z'$. Recall also that \hat{Z} is the metric completion of (Z', \hat{d}) and that we denote balls with respect to (\hat{Z}, \hat{d}) by \hat{B} . We equip (\hat{Z}, \hat{d}) with the measure

$$d\hat{\nu} = \rho^\sigma d\nu,$$

with the interpretation that $\hat{\nu}(\{\infty\}) = 0$ if $\infty \in \hat{Z}$.

Remark 4.1. Inversions are also covered by our results: When Z is unbounded and we let $m_0 = 0$, we obtain an *inversion* which maps b to infinity, while ∞ becomes a finite point in \hat{Z} . The results in Sections 4–6, including Theorems 5.9 and 6.1, are formulated so that they cover sphericalizations and flattenings, as well as inversions.

We leave it to the interested reader, to investigate what happens when one composes an inversion with an inversion, à la our results in Section 7.

In this section we deduce lemmas not needing uniform perfectness, while in the next section we make uniform perfectness a standing assumption.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $x, y \in Z'$ and $M > 1$.*

(a) *If $m(y) \geq Mm(x)$, then*

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \gtrsim \rho(x)m(x) = \frac{1}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}} \geq \frac{1}{\nu(B_{m(y)})^{1/\sigma}}. \quad (4.4)$$

(b) *If $M^{-1}m(x) \leq m(y) \leq Mm(x)$, then*

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \simeq \rho(x)d(x, y).$$

In both cases, the comparison constants depend only on C_ν , M and σ .

Proof. (a) Lemma 3.3 and the doubling property of ν yield

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{d}(x, y) &\geq \int_{|x|}^{|y|} \rho dt = \int_{|x|}^{|y|} \frac{1}{m(t)\nu(B_{m(t)})^{1/\sigma}} dt = \int_{m(x)}^{m(y)} \frac{1}{s\nu(B_s)^{1/\sigma}} ds \\ &\geq \int_{m(x)}^{Mm(x)} \frac{1}{s\nu(B_s)^{1/\sigma}} ds \simeq \frac{1}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (4.4).

(b) The \lesssim inequality follows directly from (4.3) by choosing the trivial chain $x = x_0, x_1 = y$.

For the \gtrsim inequality, let $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n = y$ be a chain. If $m(x_j) \leq Mm(x)$ for all j , then $\rho(x_j) \gtrsim \rho(x)$ by (4.3), and hence

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (\rho(x_j) + \rho(x_{j-1})) d(x_j, x_{j-1}) \gtrsim \rho(x) \sum_{j=1}^n d(x_j, x_{j-1}) \geq \rho(x) d(x, y).$$

On the other hand, if $m(x_k) \geq Mm(x)$ for some k , then (4.4) with $y = x_k$ implies that

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (\rho(x_j) + \rho(x_{j-1})) d(x_j, x_{j-1}) \geq \hat{d}(x, x_k) \gtrsim \rho(x) m(x).$$

Since also

$$d(x, y) \leq |x| + |y| \leq (M+1)m(x),$$

the claim follows after taking the infimum over all chains from x to y . \square

Lemma 4.3. *There are constants $c_0 > 0$ and $a_2 \geq a_1 > 0$, depending only on C_ν and σ , such that if $x \in Z'$ and $0 < r \leq c_0 \nu(B_{m(x)})^{-1/\sigma}$, then*

$$B\left(x, \frac{a_1 r}{\rho(x)}\right) \subset \hat{B}(x, r) \subset B\left(x, \frac{a_2 r}{\rho(x)}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(y) \simeq \rho(x) \quad \text{for all } y \in \hat{B}(x, r).$$

Moreover,

$$\hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(x, r)) \simeq \rho(x)^\sigma \nu\left(B\left(x, \frac{r}{\rho(x)}\right)\right).$$

In this lemma the comparison constants depend only on C_ν and σ .

Proof. First note that it follows from Lemma 4.2(b) with $M = 2$ that there are $C_1 \geq c_1 > 0$ such that

$$c_1 \rho(x) d(x, y) \leq \hat{d}(x, y) \leq C_1 \rho(x) d(x, y) \quad \text{when } \frac{1}{2}m(x) \leq m(y) \leq 2m(x). \quad (4.5)$$

Assume next that $y \in \hat{B}(x, r)$. If $m(y) \geq 2m(x)$ or $m(x) \geq 2m(y)$, then Lemma 4.2(a) with $M = 2$ implies that

$$\frac{1}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}} \lesssim \hat{d}(x, y) < r \leq \frac{c_0}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}}.$$

This leads to a contradiction if c_0 is sufficiently small. Fix such a small constant $c_0 > 0$. Then $\frac{1}{2}m(x) \leq m(y) \leq 2m(x)$ and thus, by (4.3),

$$\rho(y) \simeq \rho(x). \quad (4.6)$$

It then follows from (4.5) that

$$d(x, y) \leq \frac{\hat{d}(x, y)}{c_1 \rho(x)} < \frac{r}{c_1 \rho(x)},$$

showing that the second inclusion in the lemma holds when $a_2 = 1/c_1$.

On the other hand, if $d(x, y) < r/2c_0\rho(x)$, then

$$d(x, y) < \frac{r}{2c_0\rho(x)} \leq \frac{c_0\nu(B_{m(x)})^{-1/\sigma}}{2c_0\rho(x)} = \frac{1}{2}m(x).$$

It thus follows that

$$m(y) \leq m(x) + d(x, y) < \frac{3}{2}m(x) \quad \text{and} \quad m(y) \geq m(x) - d(x, y) > \frac{1}{2}m(x). \quad (4.7)$$

Letting $a_1 = 1/\max\{2c_0, C_1\}$ and using (4.5) we see that

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \leq C_1 \rho(x) d(x, y) < r \quad \text{for } y \in B\left(x, \frac{a_1 r}{\rho(x)}\right),$$

which proves the first part of the lemma. The estimate for $\hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(x, r))$ then follows from (4.6) together with the doubling property of ν . \square

5. The doubling property of the deformed measure

Recall the standing assumptions from the beginning of Sections 2 and 4. In this section we also assume that ρ is given by (4.2) and that the complete metric space Z is uniformly perfect at b with constant $\kappa > 1$ for radii $r \geq m_0$. If $m_0 = 1$, we also assume that Z is unbounded.

Lemma 5.1. (a) If $m_0 = 1$, then (Z, \hat{d}) is bounded.
 (b) If $m_0 = 0$, then $(Z', \hat{d}) = (Z \setminus \{b\}, \hat{d})$ is unbounded.

Proof. (a) In this case, Z is assumed to be unbounded. Since Lemma 2.2 implies that $\nu(B_t) \gtrsim t^\alpha \nu(B_1)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ and all $t \geq 1$, we have

$$\int_1^\infty \rho dt \lesssim \int_1^\infty \frac{dt}{m(t)^{1+\alpha/\sigma} \nu(B_1)^{1/\sigma}} \leq \frac{1}{\nu(B_1)^{1/\sigma}} \int_1^\infty \frac{dt}{t^{1+\alpha/\sigma}} < \infty,$$

and thus (Z, \hat{d}) is bounded by Proposition 3.6.

(b) In this case, for any $0 < \delta < \text{diam } Z$,

$$\int_0^\delta \rho dt \geq \frac{1}{\nu(B_\delta)^{1/\sigma}} \int_0^\delta \frac{dt}{t} = \infty,$$

and thus (Z', \hat{d}) is unbounded by Lemma 3.3 since Z is uniformly perfect at b . \square

Lemma 5.2. For all $0 < r < \frac{1}{2}R_\infty$,

$$\hat{\nu}(\hat{Z} \setminus B_r) \simeq \hat{\nu}(\{y \in Z : |y| > r\}) \simeq m(r)^{-\sigma},$$

where the comparison constants depend only on C_ν , κ and σ . In particular,

$$\hat{\nu}(\hat{Z}) \simeq \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } m_0 = 1, \\ \infty, & \text{if } m_0 = 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. To start with, assume that $r > m_0$ and let $r_j = (4\kappa)^j r$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots$. From (4.3), (2.5) and the doubling property of ν we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\nu}(\hat{Z} \setminus B_r) &\simeq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho(r_j)^\sigma \nu(B_{4\kappa r_j} \setminus B_{r_j}) \simeq \sum_{r_j < \frac{1}{2}R_\infty} \rho(r_j)^\sigma \nu(B_{4\kappa r_j} \setminus B_{r_j}) \\ &\simeq \sum_{r_j < \frac{1}{2}R_\infty} \frac{\nu(B_{r_j})}{m(r_j)^\sigma \nu(B_{m(r_j)})} \simeq \sum_{r_j < \frac{1}{2}R_\infty} m(r_j)^{-\sigma} \simeq m(r)^{-\sigma}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have also used that

$$r_j \leq m(r_j) = r_j + m_0 < 2r_j \quad \text{and hence} \quad \nu(B_{r_j}) \simeq \nu(B_{m(r_j)}).$$

For $m_0 = 1 \geq r > 0$, we then get from the above (because $\rho(0) = \nu(B_1)^{-1/\sigma}$ and $R_\infty = \infty$ in this case) and from the doubling property of ν that

$$\begin{aligned} m(2)^{-\sigma} &\simeq \hat{\nu}(\widehat{Z} \setminus B_2) \leq \hat{\nu}(\widehat{Z} \setminus B_r) \\ &\leq \hat{\nu}(\widehat{Z}) = \hat{\nu}(B_2) + \hat{\nu}(\widehat{Z} \setminus B_2) \lesssim 1 + m(2)^{-\sigma} \simeq 1, \end{aligned}$$

and thus $\hat{\nu}(\widehat{Z} \setminus B_r) \simeq \hat{\nu}(\widehat{Z}) \simeq 1 \simeq m(r)^{-\sigma}$.

Finally, if $m_0 = 0$, then

$$\hat{\nu}(\widehat{Z}) \geq \lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} \hat{\nu}(\widehat{Z} \setminus B_r) \simeq \lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} m(r)^{-\sigma} = \infty. \quad \square$$

Lemma 5.3. *Let $x, y \in Z'$ with $|x| \leq |y|$. Then*

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}},$$

where the comparison constant depends only on C_ν , κ and σ .

Proof. Assume first that $|x| \geq m_0$. Note that $m(x) \simeq m(|x|/\kappa)$ and so $\nu(B_{m(x)}) \simeq \nu(B_{m(|x|/\kappa)})$ by the doubling property of ν . We then have by Lemmas 3.5 and 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{d}(x, y) &\lesssim \int_{|x|/\kappa}^{|y|} \rho(t) dt \\ &\leq \int_{|x|/\kappa}^{R_\infty} \frac{dt}{m(t)\nu(B_{m(t)})^{1/\sigma}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\nu(B_{m(|x|/\kappa)})^{1/\sigma}} \int_{|x|/\kappa}^{R_\infty} \left(\frac{m(|x|/\kappa)}{m(t)} \right)^{\alpha/\sigma} \frac{dt}{m(t)} \\ &\simeq \frac{m(|x|/\kappa)^{\alpha/\sigma}}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}} \int_{|x|/\kappa}^{R_\infty} \frac{dt}{(m_0 + t)^{1+\alpha/\sigma}} \\ &\leq \frac{\sigma}{\alpha \nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

Now let $|x| < m_0 = 1$. If $|y| \leq \kappa$, then

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \leq 2\rho(0)d(x, y) < \frac{2(\kappa + 1)}{\nu(B_1)^{1/\sigma}} \leq \frac{2(\kappa + 1)C_\nu^{1/\sigma}}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}}.$$

On the other hand if $|y| > \kappa$, then by the uniform perfectness there exists $z \in Z$ such that $1 \leq |z| \leq \kappa$ and therefore using (5.1) with x replaced by z ,

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \leq \hat{d}(x, z) + \hat{d}(z, y) \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}} + \frac{1}{\nu(B_{m(z)})^{1/\sigma}} \leq \frac{2}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}}. \quad \square$$

Corollary 5.4. *Let $M > 1$. Then there are constants $C_2 \geq c_2 > 0$ (depending only on C_ν , κ , M and σ) such that for all $x, y \in Z'$ with $m(y) \geq Mm(x)$,*

$$\frac{c_2}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}} \leq \hat{d}(x, y) \leq \frac{C_2}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}}. \quad (5.2)$$

In particular, if $m_0 = 1$, then

$$\frac{c_2}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}} \leq \hat{d}(x, \infty) \leq \frac{C_2}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}} \quad \text{for all } x \in Z'. \quad (5.3)$$

Proof. The first part follows directly from Lemmas 4.2(a) and 5.3. The last part then follows by letting $y \rightarrow \infty$, which is possible since (\widehat{Z}, \hat{d}) is uniformly perfect at ∞ when $m_0 = 1$, by Proposition 3.8. \square

Lemma 5.5. *Let $x, y \in Z'$, $M > 0$ and $C_0 > 0$. If $m(x) \leq Mm(y)$, then*

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}}, \quad (5.4)$$

with the comparison constant depending only on C_ν , κ , M and σ .

Conversely, if $\hat{d}(x, y) \leq C_0 \nu(B_{m(x)})^{-1/\sigma}$, then $m(x) \lesssim m(y)$, where the comparison constant depends only on C_0 , C_ν , κ and σ .

Proof. If $m(x) \leq m(y)$ then (5.4) follows directly from Lemma 5.3. If instead $m(y) \leq m(x) \leq Mm(y)$, then $\nu(B_{m(y)}) \simeq \nu(B_{m(x)})$ by the doubling property of ν and so Lemma 5.3 with x and y interchanged gives

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu(B_{m(y)})^{1/\sigma}} \simeq \frac{1}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}}.$$

Conversely, assume that $\hat{d}(x, y) \leq C_0 \nu(B_{m(x)})^{-1/\sigma}$. If $m(x) \leq 2m(y)$, then there is nothing to show. On the other hand, if $m(x) \geq 2m(y)$, then Lemma 4.2(a), with $M = 2$ and the roles of x and y interchanged, implies that

$$\frac{1}{\nu(B_{m(y)})^{1/\sigma}} \lesssim \hat{d}(x, y) \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}},$$

which together with Lemma 2.2 gives that $m(x) \lesssim m(y)$. \square

Proposition 5.6. *Let $0 < c_0 \leq C_0$. Assume that $x \in Z'$ and*

$$\frac{c_0}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}} \leq r \leq \frac{C_0}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}}.$$

Then

$$\hat{\nu}(\widehat{B}(x, r)) \simeq m(x)^{-\sigma}, \quad (5.5)$$

with comparison constants depending only on c_0 , C_0 , C_ν , κ and σ .

Proposition 5.6 holds for any $c_0 > 0$, but will sometimes be used with the constant c_0 given by Lemma 4.3.

Proof. Let $y \in \widehat{B}(x, r)$. Then

$$\hat{d}(x, y) < r \leq \frac{C_0}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}}$$

and Lemma 5.5 implies that there is $M > 2$ such that $m(x) \leq Mm(y)$.

Let us first consider the case $m(x) > Mm_0$. Then $|y| \geq m(x)/M - m_0 =: r_0 > 0$ and therefore $\widehat{B}(x, r) \subset \widehat{Z} \setminus B_{r_0}$. As $M > 2$ and $m(x) \leq R_\infty + m_0$, we see that now $0 < r_0 < \frac{1}{2}R_\infty$. Lemma 5.2 gives that

$$\hat{\nu}(\widehat{B}(x, r)) \leq \hat{\nu}(\widehat{Z} \setminus B_{r_0}) \simeq m(r_0)^{-\sigma} = \left(\frac{m(x)}{M} \right)^{-\sigma}.$$

On the other hand, if $m(x) \leq Mm_0$, then $m_0 = 1$, because $m(x) > 0$ for every $x \in Z'$. Therefore, by Lemma 5.2,

$$\hat{\nu}(\widehat{B}(x, r)) \leq \hat{\nu}(\widehat{Z}) \simeq 1 \simeq m(x)^{-\sigma},$$

which completes the proof of the \lesssim inequality in (5.5).

For the \gtrsim inequality, Lemma 4.2(b) with $M = 2$ implies that there is C_1 such that

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \leq C_1 \rho(x) d(x, y) \quad \text{whenever} \quad \frac{1}{2}m(x) \leq m(y) \leq 2m(x). \quad (5.6)$$

Let $a_0 := \min\{c_0/C_1, \frac{1}{2}\}$ and consider points y with $d(x, y) < a_0 m(x)$. Then as in (4.7) we have

$$\frac{1}{2}m(x) \leq m(y) \leq \frac{3}{2}m(x)$$

and therefore (5.6), the definition of ρ and the assumption of this proposition imply that

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \leq C_1 \rho(x) d(x, y) < C_1 \rho(x) a_0 m(x) \leq \frac{c_0}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}} \leq r.$$

Thus $B(x, a_0 m(x)) \subset \hat{B}(x, r)$. Since also $\rho(y) \simeq \rho(x)$ by (4.3), we get from Lemma 2.1 and the doubling property of ν that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(x, r)) &\geq \hat{\nu}(B(x, a_0 m(x))) \\ &\simeq \rho(x)^\sigma \nu(B(x, a_0 m(x))) \simeq \rho(x)^\sigma \nu(B_{m(x)}) = m(x)^{-\sigma}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

To prove that the doubling property of the measure is preserved under our transformations, it is convenient to introduce the following “inverse” of ν ,

$$\nu^{-1}(t) = \sup\{r \geq 0 : \nu(B_r) \leq t\} = \inf\{r > 0 : \nu(B_r) > t\} \quad (5.7)$$

for $0 \leq t < \nu(Z)$. It follows immediately from the regularity of ν that

$$\nu(B_{\nu^{-1}(t)}) = \sup_{0 \leq r < \nu^{-1}(t)} \nu(B_r) \leq t \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq t < \nu(Z), \quad (5.8)$$

and consequently,

$$r > \nu^{-1}(t) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \nu(B_r) > t. \quad (5.9)$$

In particular, the supremum in (5.7) is always attained.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $M \geq 1$. Then for all $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq Mt_1$, such that $\nu(B_{m_0}) \leq t_1 \leq t_2 < \nu(Z)$,*

$$\nu^{-1}(t_2) \lesssim \nu^{-1}(t_1) \leq \nu^{-1}(t_2), \quad (5.10)$$

with the comparison constant depending only on C_ν , κ and M . In particular if $\nu(B_{m_0}) \leq t < \frac{1}{2}\nu(Z)$, then $\nu^{-1}(2t) \simeq \nu^{-1}(t)$.

Proof. The second inequality in (5.10) is immediate, because ν^{-1} is nondecreasing. For the first inequality, let $r_1 = \nu^{-1}(t_1)$ and $r_2 = \nu^{-1}(t_2)$. If $r_1 = r_2$, there is nothing to prove, so assume that $r_1 < r_2$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that $r_1 + \varepsilon < r_2$. By (5.8) we have $\nu(B_{r_2}) \leq t_2 < \nu(Z)$ and thus $r_2 \leq R_\infty$. Moreover by the definition of $\nu^{-1}(t_1)$ we have $r_1 \geq m_0$ and by (5.9) we get $\nu(B_{r_1+\varepsilon}) > t_1$. It thus follows from Lemma 2.2 (with Λ and α as therein) that

$$\frac{1}{M} \leq \frac{t_1}{t_2} < \frac{\nu(B_{r_1+\varepsilon})}{\nu(B_{r_2})} \leq \Lambda \left(\frac{r_1 + \varepsilon}{r_2} \right)^\alpha.$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ shows that

$$\nu^{-1}(t_2) = r_2 \leq (\Lambda M)^{1/\alpha} r_1 = (\Lambda M)^{1/\alpha} \nu^{-1}(t_1). \quad \square$$

Proposition 5.8. *There is a constant $C' > 1$ depending only on C_ν , κ and σ such that for all $x \in Z'$ and $r > C'\nu(B_{m(x)})^{-1/\sigma}$,*

$$\hat{\nu}(\widehat{B}(x, r)) \simeq \begin{cases} \nu^{-1}(r^{-\sigma})^{-\sigma}, & \text{if } r \leq c_2\nu(B_{m_0})^{-1/\sigma}, \\ \hat{\nu}(Z), & \text{if } r \geq \frac{1}{2}c_2\nu(B_{m_0})^{-1/\sigma}. \end{cases} \quad (5.11)$$

with comparison constants depending only on C_ν , κ and σ . Here $c_2 \leq 1$ is a constant from Corollary 5.4 with $M = 2$.

Note that $\nu(B_{m_0}) = \nu(\emptyset) = 0$ if $m_0 = 0$, in which case we use the interpretation $\nu(B_{m_0})^{-1/\sigma} = \infty$. Thus the second case in (5.11) is possible only if $m_0 = 1$.

Proof. Let $C_2 \geq c_2 > 0$ be the constants from Corollary 5.4 with $M = 2$. We can assume that $c_2 \leq 1 \leq C_2$. Define $C' = \max\{C_2C_\nu^{1/\sigma}, 3C_1\} > 1$, where C_1 is as in (5.6). We shall show that

$$\{y \in Z : \nu(B_{m(y)}) > t_2\} \subset \widehat{B}(x, r) \cap Z \subset \{y \in Z : \nu(B_{m(y)}) > t_1\}, \quad (5.12)$$

where

$$t_1 := \left(\frac{c_2}{r}\right)^\sigma \leq t_2 := \left(\frac{C_2}{r}\right)^\sigma.$$

To this end, let $y \in Z'$. If $m(y) \geq 2m(x)$, then by Corollary 5.4 and the assumption $r > C'\nu(B_{m(x)})^{-1/\sigma}$, we get that

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \leq \frac{C_2}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}} < r$$

and so $y \in \widehat{B}(x, r)$. Similarly, if $\frac{1}{2}m(x) \leq m(y) \leq 2m(x)$, then by (5.6),

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \leq C_1\rho(x)d(x, y) \leq \frac{C_1(m(x) + m(y))}{m(x)\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}} \leq \frac{3C_1}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}} < r$$

and so $y \in \widehat{B}(x, r)$ also in this case. Finally, if $2m(y) \leq m(x)$ and $\nu(B_{m(y)}) > t_2 = (C_2/r)^\sigma$, then Corollary 5.4 with x and y interchanged gives

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \leq \frac{C_2}{\nu(B_{m(y)})^{1/\sigma}} < r, \quad \text{i.e. } y \in \widehat{B}(x, r).$$

This proves the first inclusion in (5.12).

In order to prove the second inclusion in (5.12), let $y \in \widehat{B}(x, r) \cap Z$. If $2m(y) \leq m(x)$, then Corollary 5.4 with $M = 2$ and the roles of x and y interchanged shows that

$$r > \hat{d}(x, y) \geq \frac{c_2}{\nu(B_{m(y)})^{1/\sigma}} \quad \text{and so} \quad \nu(B_{m(y)}) > \left(\frac{c_2}{r}\right)^\sigma = t_1.$$

On the other hand, if $2m(y) \geq m(x)$, then the doubling property of ν and the assumption $r > C'\nu(B_{m(x)})^{-1/\sigma}$ yield

$$C_\nu\nu(B_{m(y)}) \geq \nu(B_{m(x)}) > \left(\frac{C'}{r}\right)^\sigma \geq C_\nu\left(\frac{C_2}{r}\right)^\sigma \geq C_\nu\left(\frac{c_2}{r}\right)^\sigma,$$

proving the second inclusion in (5.12).

Next we use Lemma 5.2 to estimate the $\hat{\nu}$ -measure of the sets in (5.12). For this we note that when $R_\infty < \infty$ (and thus $m_0 = 0$), we have by the doubling property of ν that

$$t_1 \leq t_2 < \left(\frac{C_2}{C'}\right)^\sigma \nu(B_{m(x)}) \leq \frac{\nu(B_{R_\infty})}{C_\nu} \leq \nu(B_{R_\infty/2}) < \nu(Z).$$

It then follows from (5.9) that

$$r_j := \nu^{-1}(t_j) < \frac{1}{2}R_\infty, \quad j = 1, 2,$$

while this is trivial when $R_\infty = \infty$.

We now distinguish two cases. If $r \leq c_2\nu(B_{m_0})^{-1/\sigma}$, then $t_1 \geq \nu(B_{m_0})$ and thus $r_1 \geq m_0$, by (5.9). The inclusions (5.12), together with (5.9) and Lemma 5.2, then imply that

$$\hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(x, r)) \leq \hat{\nu}(\{y \in Z : m(y) > r_1\}) \leq \hat{\nu}(Z \setminus B_{r_1-m_0}) \simeq m(r_1 - m_0)^{-\sigma} = r_1^{-\sigma},$$

and similarly

$$\hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(x, r)) \geq \hat{\nu}(\{y \in Z : m(y) > r_2\}) \simeq m(r_2 - m_0)^{-\sigma} = r_2^{-\sigma}.$$

Since $t_1 \leq r^{-\sigma} \leq t_2$, Lemma 5.7 shows that $r_1 \simeq r_2 \simeq \nu^{-1}(r^{-\sigma})$, which proves the first estimate in (5.11) for such r .

Next, if $r \geq \frac{1}{2}c_2\nu(B_{m_0})^{-1/\sigma}$, then $m_0 = 1$ (and thus (Z, d) is unbounded by assumption) and $t_2 \leq (2C_2/c_2)^\sigma \nu(B_{m_0}) =: t_0$. Hence $\nu^{-1}(t_0) \geq m_0$ and by (5.12), (5.9) and Lemma 5.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\nu}(Z) &\geq \hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(x, r)) \geq \hat{\nu}(\{y \in Z : \nu(B_{m(y)}) > t_0\}) \\ &= \hat{\nu}(\{y \in Z : m(y) > \nu^{-1}(t_0)\}) \simeq m(\nu^{-1}(t_0) - m_0)^{-\sigma} = \nu^{-1}(t_0)^{-\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Since also $t_0 \lesssim \nu(B_{m_0})$, we conclude using (5.9) and Lemma 2.2 that $\nu^{-1}(t_0) \lesssim m_0 = 1$, which together with $\hat{\nu}(Z) \simeq 1$ from Lemma 5.2 implies the second estimate in (5.11). \square

Theorem 5.9. *The measure $\hat{\nu}$ is doubling on (Z', \hat{d}) and on its completion (\hat{Z}, \hat{d}) . The doubling constant $C_{\hat{\nu}}$ depends only on C_ν , κ and σ .*

Proof. Let $x \in Z'$. If $0 < r \leq \frac{1}{2}c_0\nu(B_{m(x)})^{-1/\sigma}$, where c_0 is the constant in Lemma 4.3, then we get using Lemma 4.3 and the doubling property of ν that

$$\hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(x, 2r)) \simeq \rho(x)^\sigma \nu\left(B\left(x, \frac{r}{\rho(x)}\right)\right) \simeq \hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(x, r)).$$

If $r > C'\nu(B_{m(x)})^{-1/\sigma}$, where $C' > 1$ is as in Proposition 5.8, then

$$r^{-\sigma} < (C')^{-\sigma} \nu(B_{m(x)}) < \nu(Z).$$

Hence, by Proposition 5.8 and Lemma 5.7, either

$$\hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(x, 2r)) \simeq \nu^{-1}((2r)^{-\sigma})^{-\sigma} \simeq \nu^{-1}(r^{-\sigma})^{-\sigma} \simeq \hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(x, r))$$

(when $2r \leq c_2\nu(B_{m_0})^{-1/\sigma}$) or $\hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(x, 2r)) \simeq \hat{\nu}(Z) \simeq \hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(x, r))$.

Finally if $\frac{1}{2}c_0\nu(B_{m(x)})^{-1/\sigma} \leq r \leq C'\nu(B_{m(x)})^{-1/\sigma}$, then Proposition 5.6 yields that

$$\hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(x, 2r)) \simeq m(x)^{-\sigma} \simeq \hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(x, r)).$$

Thus $\hat{\nu}$ is doubling on (Z', \hat{d}) . The same doubling constant can be used also on (\hat{Z}, \hat{d}) , by Proposition 3.3 in Björn–Björn [3]. \square

6. Preservation of the Besov energy

Recall the standing assumptions from the beginning of Sections 2 and 4.

The aim of this section is to show that the transformation of the metric and the measure introduced in Section 4 preserves the Besov (fractional Sobolev) energy (2.6) if we choose $\sigma = p\theta$. Recall that the metric \hat{d} was defined in (3.1) and (4.1)–(4.2) with

$$\rho(x) = \frac{1}{m(x)\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}} \quad \text{and} \quad m(x) = |x| + m_0, \quad (6.1)$$

and that

$$d\hat{\nu} = \rho^\sigma d\nu$$

with $\hat{\nu}(\{\infty\}) = 0$ if $\infty \in \widehat{Z}$.

Theorem 6.1. *Assume that Z is uniformly perfect at b for radii $r \geq m_0$, with constant $\kappa > 1$, and equipped with a doubling measure ν . Let $1 \leq p < \infty$, $\theta > 0$ and $\sigma = p\theta$.*

Then for every measurable function u on Z , the Besov energies (2.6) with respect to (Z, d, ν) and $(\widehat{Z}, \hat{d}, \hat{\nu})$ are comparable, with comparison constants depending only on C_ν , κ and σ .

Proof. It suffices to consider what happens to the part of the integrand in the Besov energy (2.6) that depends on the metric or on the measure when we transform them. More precisely, the comparability of the Besov energy after the transformation will follow if we can show that for every $x, y \in Z'$ with $x \neq y$,

$$\frac{\rho(x)^\sigma \rho(y)^\sigma}{\hat{d}(x, y)^\sigma \hat{\nu}(\widehat{B}_{xy})} \simeq \frac{1}{d(x, y)^\sigma \nu(B_{xy})}, \quad (6.2)$$

where

$$B_{xy} := B(x, d(x, y)) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{B}_{xy} := \widehat{B}(x, \hat{d}(x, y)).$$

(It suffices to consider $x, y \in Z'$, because $\hat{\nu}(\{\infty\}) = 0$ (if $\infty \in \widehat{Z}$), and if $Z' \neq Z$ then $m_0 = 0$ and therefore $\nu(\{b\}) = 0$.) By the doubling properties of ν and $\hat{\nu}$, see Theorem 5.9, together with Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\nu(B_{xy}) \simeq \nu(B_{yx}) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\nu}(\widehat{B}_{xy}) \simeq \hat{\nu}(\widehat{B}_{yx}).$$

Therefore by symmetry, it is enough to consider points with $|x| \leq |y|$. We now consider several cases.

Case 1: $m(x) \leq m(y) \leq 2m(x)$. Then by (4.3) and Lemma 4.2(b) with $M = 2$,

$$\rho(y) \simeq \rho(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{d}(x, y) \simeq \rho(x)d(x, y). \quad (6.3)$$

Hence, in order to show (6.2), it is enough to show that

$$\frac{\rho(x)^\sigma}{\hat{\nu}(\widehat{B}_{xy})} \simeq \frac{1}{\nu(B_{xy})}. \quad (6.4)$$

Case 1a: $\hat{d}(x, y) \leq c_0 \nu(B_{m(x)})^{-1/\sigma}$, where $c_0 > 0$ is as in Lemma 4.3. Then Lemma 4.3, the doubling property of ν and (6.3) imply that

$$\hat{\nu}(\widehat{B}_{xy}) \simeq \rho(x)^\sigma \nu\left(B\left(x, \frac{\hat{d}(x, y)}{\rho(x)}\right)\right) \simeq \rho(x)^\sigma \nu(B_{xy}),$$

i.e. (6.4) holds.

Case 1b: $\hat{d}(x, y) \geq c_0 \nu(B_{m(x)})^{-1/\sigma}$. In this case, we have by (6.1) and (6.3) that

$$d(x, y) \simeq \frac{\hat{d}(x, y)}{\rho(x)} = m(x) \nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma} \hat{d}(x, y) \geq c_0 m(x).$$

Hence also

$$m(x) \lesssim d(x, y) \leq m(x) + m(y) \leq 3m(x)$$

and consequently,

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \simeq \rho(x) d(x, y) \simeq \rho(x) m(x) = \frac{1}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}}.$$

Proposition 5.6 then shows that

$$\hat{\nu}(\hat{B}_{xy}) \simeq m(x)^{-\sigma},$$

while Lemma 2.1 and (6.1) imply that

$$\nu(B_{xy}) \simeq \nu(B_{m(x)}) = (\rho(x) m(x))^{-\sigma} \simeq \frac{\hat{\nu}(\hat{B}_{xy})}{\rho(x)^\sigma},$$

i.e. (6.4) holds.

Case 2: $m(y) \geq 2m(x)$. In this case we have by Corollary 5.4 that

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \simeq \frac{1}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}} = \rho(x) m(x)$$

and hence by Proposition 5.6,

$$\hat{\nu}(\hat{B}_{xy}) \simeq m(x)^{-\sigma}.$$

Since also

$$d(x, y) \geq m(y) - m(x) \geq \frac{1}{2}m(y) \quad \text{and} \quad d(x, y) \leq m(y) + m(x) \leq \frac{3}{2}m(y), \quad (6.5)$$

the doubling property of ν and Lemma 2.1 imply that

$$\nu(B_{xy}) \simeq \nu(B_{yx}) \simeq \nu(B_{m(y)}).$$

It therefore follows that

$$\frac{\rho(x)^\sigma \rho(y)^\sigma}{\hat{d}(x, y)^\sigma \hat{\nu}(\hat{B}_{xy})} \simeq \frac{\rho(x)^\sigma \rho(y)^\sigma}{(\rho(x) m(x))^\sigma m(x)^{-\sigma}} = \frac{1}{m(y)^\sigma \nu(B_{m(y)})} \simeq \frac{1}{d(x, y)^\sigma \nu(B_{xy})}. \quad \square$$

7. Duality of sphericalization and flattening

In this section, we show that flattening and sphericalization are inverse processes. In Section 7.1 we consider the flattening of a sphericalized space, while in Section 7.2 we consider the reverse order.

Note that in this section we do *not* require $\sigma = p\theta$ (as we did in Section 6).

7.1. The flattening of a sphericalized space

In this section we assume that (Z, d, ν) is an unbounded complete metric space equipped with a doubling measure ν with a doubling constant C_ν . We also assume that Z is uniformly perfect at large scales at a base point b with constant $\kappa > 1$.

We denote the sphericalization of the space (Z, d, ν) by $(\widehat{Z}, \widehat{d}, \widehat{\nu})$ as defined in Section 4 with the function $m(x) = |x| + 1$ and $\widehat{Z} = Z \cup \{\infty\}$. By Proposition 3.8 and Lemma 5.1, $(\widehat{Z}, \widehat{d})$ is bounded and uniformly perfect at the point ∞ . Note that the doubling constant in (3.5) can be chosen so that $A \leq 2C_\nu^{1/\sigma}$. Moreover, $\rho(0)/\rho(1) \leq 2C_\nu^{1/\sigma}$ and thus the uniform perfectness constant $\widehat{\kappa}$ of $(\widehat{Z}, \widehat{d})$ (from Proposition 3.8) only depends on C_ν , κ and σ . By Theorem 5.9 the measure $\widehat{\nu}$ is doubling in $(\widehat{Z}, \widehat{d})$ with a doubling constant depending only on C_ν , κ and σ .

Now let $(Z, \tilde{d}, \tilde{\nu})$ be the flattening of the sphericalization $(\widehat{Z}, \widehat{d}, \widehat{\nu})$ of (Z, d, ν) . The flattening is done at the base point ∞ as in Section 4 by using the gauge function $\widehat{m}(x) = \widehat{d}(x, \infty)$. Observe that the flattening removes ∞ and thus gives the space Z back. Let us denote by ρ the metric density function used in the sphericalization and by $\hat{\rho}$ the metric density function used in the flattening, i.e.

$$\rho(x) = \frac{1}{m(x)\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\rho}(x) = \frac{1}{\widehat{d}(x, \infty)\widehat{\nu}(\widehat{B}(\infty, \widehat{d}(x, \infty)))^{1/\sigma}}. \quad (7.1)$$

Lemma 7.1. *Let $x \in Z$. Then $\rho(x)\hat{\rho}(x) \simeq 1$. In particular, $d\tilde{\nu}(x) \simeq d\nu(x)$. Here, the comparison constants depend only on C_ν , κ and σ .*

Proof. We have by (7.1), together with Corollary 5.4, the doubling property of $\widehat{\nu}$ and Lemma 2.1 (for $\widehat{\nu}$), that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\rho(x)\hat{\rho}(x)} &= m(x)\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}\widehat{d}(x, \infty)\widehat{\nu}(\widehat{B}(\infty, \widehat{d}(x, \infty)))^{1/\sigma} \\ &\simeq m(x)\widehat{\nu}\left(\widehat{B}\left(x, \frac{c_0}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}}\right)\right)^{1/\sigma}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.2)$$

where c_0 is as in Lemma 4.3. Since

$$\frac{c_0}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}} = c_0 m(x) \rho(x),$$

Lemmas 4.3 and 2.1 yield

$$\widehat{\nu}\left(\widehat{B}\left(x, \frac{c_0}{\nu(B_{m(x)})^{1/\sigma}}\right)\right) \simeq \rho(x)^\sigma \nu(B(x, c_0 m(x))) \simeq \rho(x)^\sigma \nu(B_{m(x)}) = m(x)^{-\sigma}.$$

Inserting this into (7.2) concludes the proof. \square

Theorem 7.2. *The flattening of the sphericalized space is equivalent to the original space in the following sense: The metrics \tilde{d} and d are equivalent and the measures $\tilde{\nu}$ and ν are comparable, that is, for all $x, y \in Z$,*

$$\tilde{d}(x, y) \simeq d(x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad d\tilde{\nu}(x) \simeq d\nu(x),$$

where the comparison constants depend only on C_ν , κ and σ .

Proof. The comparability of the measures was already proved in Lemma 7.1. For the metrics we may assume by symmetry that $\widehat{d}(y, \infty) \leq \widehat{d}(x, \infty)$.

Case 1: $\hat{d}(x, \infty) \geq 2\hat{d}(y, \infty)$. In this case, Corollary 5.4 (first (5.2) applied to \hat{d} and then (5.3) applied to d), together with Lemma 2.1, yields

$$\tilde{d}(x, y) \simeq \hat{\nu}(\widehat{B}(\infty, \hat{d}(y, \infty)))^{-1/\sigma} \simeq \hat{\nu}\left(\widehat{B}\left(y, \frac{1}{\nu(B_{m(y)})^{1/\sigma}}\right)\right)^{-1/\sigma} \simeq m(y),$$

where the last comparison follows from Proposition 5.6 with $r = \nu(B_{m(y)})^{-1/\sigma}$.

If $m(y) \geq 2m(x)$ then as in (6.5), also $\frac{1}{2}m(y) \leq d(x, y) \leq \frac{3}{2}m(y)$ and the result follows. On the other hand, if $m(y) \leq 2m(x)$ then $\nu(B_{m(y)}) \lesssim \nu(B_{m(x)})$ by the doubling property of ν , and thus Corollary 5.4 implies that we are in the following case:

Case 2: $\hat{d}(x, \infty) \lesssim \hat{d}(y, \infty) \leq \hat{d}(x, \infty)$. In particular, $\hat{m}(x) \simeq \hat{m}(y)$. It also follows from Corollary 5.4 that $\nu(B_{m(x)}) \simeq \nu(B_{m(y)})$, and thus $m(x) \simeq m(y)$ by Lemma 2.2. Using also Lemma 4.2(b) (applied first to \tilde{d} and then to \hat{d}) and Lemma 7.1 we get that

$$\tilde{d}(x, y) \simeq \hat{\rho}(x)\hat{d}(x, y) \simeq \hat{\rho}(x)\rho(x)d(x, y) \simeq d(x, y). \quad \square$$

7.2. The sphericalization of a flattened space

In this section we assume that (Z, d) is a bounded complete metric space equipped with a doubling measure ν with a doubling constant C_ν . We also assume that Z is uniformly perfect at a base point b with constant $\kappa > 1$.

We denote the flattening of this space by $(Z', \hat{d}, \hat{\nu})$ as defined in Section 4 with the gauge function $m(x) = |x|$ and $Z' = Z \setminus \{b\}$. By Lemma 5.1(b) the space (Z', \hat{d}) is unbounded, and by Proposition 3.7 it is complete, so $\widehat{Z} = Z'$. Theorem 5.9 shows that the measure $\hat{\nu}$ is doubling on (\widehat{Z}, \hat{d}) with a doubling constant depending only on C_ν , κ and σ .

Note that ρ is doubling and the doubling constant A for ρ in (3.5) can be chosen so that $A \leq 2C_\nu^{1/\sigma}$. Therefore by Proposition 3.9, the space (\widehat{Z}, \hat{d}) is uniformly perfect at large scales at a base point $\hat{b} \in \widehat{Z}$ with a constant $\hat{\kappa} > 1$ that depends only on C_ν , κ , σ and $|\hat{b}|\rho(\hat{b}) = \nu(B_{\hat{b}})^{-1/\sigma}$, where we let

$$B_z = B(b, |z|) \quad \text{for } z \in Z$$

in this section.

Then we sphericalize the space $(\widehat{Z}, \hat{d}, \hat{\nu})$ at the base point \hat{b} , as defined in Section 4 with the function $\hat{m}(x) = \hat{d}(x, \hat{b}) + 1$. After sphericalization, we get a new space, which we denote by $(\tilde{Z}, \tilde{d}, \tilde{\nu})$. The act of sphericalization adds one point to \widehat{Z} , which is denoted ∞ . It follows from Case 3 in the proof of Theorem 7.4 below that we can identify ∞ with the point b that was removed in the flattening. Thus $\tilde{Z} = (Z \setminus \{b\}) \cup \{\infty\} = Z$.

Denote by ρ the metric density function used in the flattening and by $\hat{\rho}$ the metric density function used in the sphericalization, i.e.

$$\rho(x) = \frac{1}{|x|\nu(B_x)^{1/\sigma}} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\rho}(x) = \frac{1}{\hat{m}(x)\hat{\nu}(\widehat{B}(\hat{b}, \hat{m}(x)))^{1/\sigma}}.$$

Recall that

$$R_\infty := \sup_{x \in Z} |x| < \infty.$$

Lemma 7.3. *Let $x \in Z \setminus \{b\}$. Then $\rho(x)\hat{\rho}(x) \simeq 1$. In particular, we have $d\tilde{\nu}(x) \simeq d\nu(x)$ for every $x \in Z \setminus \{b\}$. The comparison constants depend only on C_ν , κ , σ , R_∞ , $\nu(Z)$ and $|\hat{b}|$.*

Proof. In this case we have

$$\frac{1}{\rho(x)\hat{\rho}(x)} = |x|\nu(B_x)^{1/\sigma}\hat{m}(x)\hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(\hat{b}, \hat{m}(x)))^{1/\sigma}, \quad (7.3)$$

where $\hat{m}(x) = \hat{d}(x, \hat{b}) + 1$. Note that $|\hat{b}| \simeq 1$ and $\nu(B_{\hat{b}}) \simeq 1$ (since the comparison constants are allowed to depend on C_ν , R_∞ , $\nu(Z)$ and $|\hat{b}|$).

If $|x| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\hat{b}|$ then also $|x| \simeq 1$. Moreover, Lemma 4.2(b) implies that

$$\hat{d}(x, \hat{b}) \simeq \rho(\hat{b})d(x, \hat{b}) \simeq d(x, \hat{b}) \leq d(x, b) + d(b, \hat{b}) \leq 2R_\infty.$$

Hence

$$\hat{m}(x) = \hat{d}(x, \hat{b}) + 1 \simeq 1 \quad \text{and consequently} \quad \hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(\hat{b}, \hat{m}(x))) \simeq 1,$$

where we also used Lemma 4.3. Thus all the four factors in (7.3) are $\simeq 1$, which gives the desired estimate.

On the other hand, if $|x| \leq \frac{1}{2}|\hat{b}|$ then Corollary 5.4 with $y = \hat{b}$ gives that

$$\hat{d}(x, \hat{b}) \simeq \frac{1}{\nu(B_x)^{1/\sigma}} \geq \frac{1}{\nu(B_{\hat{b}})^{1/\sigma}} \simeq 1$$

and hence

$$\hat{m}(x) = \hat{d}(x, \hat{b}) + 1 \simeq \hat{d}(x, \hat{b}) \simeq \frac{1}{\nu(B_x)^{1/\sigma}}.$$

Thus, the two middle factors in (7.3) cancel. Then Lemma 2.1 and Proposition 5.6 with $r = \hat{m}(x)$ and $m(x) = |x|$ yield that

$$\hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(\hat{b}, \hat{m}(x)))^{1/\sigma} \simeq \hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(x, \hat{m}(x)))^{1/\sigma} \simeq (|x|^{-\sigma})^{1/\sigma} = |x|^{-1}.$$

Inserting this into (7.3) concludes the proof. \square

Theorem 7.4. *The sphericalization of the flattened space is equivalent to the original space in the following sense: The metrics \tilde{d} and d are equivalent and the measures $\tilde{\nu}$ and ν are comparable, that is, for all $x, y \in Z$,*

$$\tilde{d}(x, y) \simeq d(x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad d\tilde{\nu}(x) \simeq d\nu(x),$$

where the comparison constants depend only on C_ν , κ , σ , R_∞ , $\nu(Z)$ and $|\hat{b}|$.

Proof. Since $\tilde{\nu}(\{\infty\}) = \nu(\{b\}) = 0$ by Lemma 2.2, the comparability of the measures follows from Lemma 7.3. For the metrics we may assume by symmetry that $|x| \leq |y|$ and $y \neq b$. Let $a > 0$ be a constant, to be chosen later, such that $a \leq \frac{1}{2}|\hat{b}|/R_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

Case 1: $0 < |x| \leq a|y|$. By Lemma 2.2,

$$\nu(B_x) \leq \Lambda a^\alpha \nu(B_y) \leq \Lambda a^\alpha \nu(Z). \quad (7.4)$$

Moreover, $|x| \leq a|y| \leq aR_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2}|\hat{b}|$ and hence by Corollary 5.4 with $M = 2$,

$$\hat{d}(x, \hat{b}) \simeq \frac{1}{\nu(B_x)^{1/\sigma}} \gtrsim a^{-\alpha/\sigma}, \quad (7.5)$$

where by (7.4) the comparison constants do not depend on a . Since $|y| \leq R_\infty \lesssim |\hat{b}|$, Lemma 5.5, (7.4) and (7.5) yield that

$$\hat{d}(y, \hat{b}) \lesssim \frac{1}{\nu(B_y)^{1/\sigma}} \lesssim \frac{a^{\alpha/\sigma}}{\nu(B_x)^{1/\sigma}} \simeq a^{\alpha/\sigma} \hat{d}(x, \hat{b}), \quad (7.6)$$

where the comparison constants do not depend on a . Thus by choosing $a \leq \frac{1}{2}|\hat{b}|/R_\infty$ small enough, we see that it follows from (7.5) and (7.6) that $|x| \leq a|y|$ implies that

$$\hat{m}(x) = \hat{d}(x, \hat{b}) + 1 \geq 2(\hat{d}(y, \hat{b}) + 1) = 2\hat{m}(y) \quad \text{and} \quad d(x, y) \simeq |y|. \quad (7.7)$$

For such x and y , we then get from Corollary 5.4 and Lemma 2.1 that

$$\tilde{d}(x, y) \simeq \frac{1}{\hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(\hat{b}, \hat{m}(y)))^{1/\sigma}} \simeq \frac{1}{\hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(y, \hat{m}(y)))^{1/\sigma}}. \quad (7.8)$$

If $|y| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\hat{b}|$, then $\nu(B_y) \simeq 1$ and therefore by (7.6),

$$1 \leq \hat{m}(y) = 1 + \hat{d}(y, \hat{b}) \lesssim 1 + \frac{1}{\nu(B_y)^{1/\sigma}} \simeq 1,$$

and hence by the first comparison in (7.8) and Lemma 4.3,

$$\tilde{d}(x, y) \simeq \frac{1}{\hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(\hat{b}, 1))^{1/\sigma}} \simeq 1 \simeq |y| \simeq d(x, y).$$

On the other hand, if $|y| \leq \frac{1}{2}|\hat{b}|$ then by Corollary 5.4,

$$\hat{m}(y) = 1 + \hat{d}(y, \hat{b}) \simeq 1 + \frac{1}{\nu(B_y)^{1/\sigma}} \simeq \frac{1}{\nu(B_y)^{1/\sigma}}$$

and therefore by (7.8), Proposition 5.6 with $r = \hat{m}(y)$ and (7.7),

$$\tilde{d}(x, y) \simeq \frac{1}{\hat{\nu}(\hat{B}(y, \hat{m}(y)))^{1/\sigma}} \simeq |y| \simeq d(x, y).$$

Case 2: $a|y| \leq |x| \leq |y|$. If $|x| \leq |y| \leq \frac{1}{2}|\hat{b}|$, then by Corollary 5.4,

$$\hat{d}(x, \hat{b}) \simeq \frac{1}{\nu(B_x)^{1/\sigma}} \simeq \frac{1}{\nu(B_y)^{1/\sigma}} \simeq \hat{d}(y, \hat{b}).$$

On the other hand if $\frac{1}{2}|\hat{b}| \leq |y| \leq |x|/a$, then we get from Lemma 5.5 that

$$1 \leq \hat{m}(y) = 1 + \hat{d}(y, \hat{b}) \lesssim 1 + \frac{1}{\nu(B_{\hat{b}})^{1/\sigma}} \lesssim 1$$

and similarly, $\hat{m}(x) \simeq 1$. In both cases, we have $\hat{m}(x) \simeq \hat{m}(y)$ and hence by Lemma 4.2(b), applied to both \hat{d} and d , together with Lemma 7.3,

$$\tilde{d}(x, y) \simeq \hat{\rho}(x)\hat{d}(x, y) \simeq \hat{\rho}(x)\rho(x)d(x, y) \simeq d(x, y).$$

Case 3: $x = b$. Let $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be a sequence in $Z \setminus \{b\}$ such that $d(x_j, b) \rightarrow 0$ (it exists because Z is uniformly perfect at b). Then $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is a d -Cauchy sequence, and hence by the above Cases 1 and 2 also a \tilde{d} -Cauchy sequence. Since it cannot \tilde{d} -converge to any $z \in \widehat{Z} = Z \setminus \{b\}$, it must \tilde{d} -converge to ∞ . Thus we can identify ∞ with b . The comparison $\tilde{d}(x, y) \simeq d(x, y)$ is then extended to $x = b = \infty$ by continuity. \square

References

1. BALOGH, Z. and BUCKLEY, S., Sphericalization and flattening, *Conform. Geom. Dyn.* **9** (2005), 76–101. [3](#), [4](#), [14](#)

2. BJÖRN, A. and BJÖRN, J., *Nonlinear Potential Theory on Metric Spaces*, EMS Tracts in Mathematics **17**, European Math. Soc., Zürich, 2011. [6](#), [7](#)
3. BJÖRN, A. and BJÖRN, J., Poincaré inequalities and Newtonian Sobolev functions on noncomplete metric spaces, *J. Differential Equations* **266** (2019), 44–69. Corrigendum: *ibid.* **285** (2021), 493–495. [22](#)
4. BJÖRN, A. and BJÖRN, J., Sharp Besov capacity estimates for annuli in metric spaces with doubling measures, *Math. Z.* **305** (2023), Paper No. 41, 26 pp. [6](#)
5. BJÖRN, A., BJÖRN, J. and LI, X., Sphericalization and p -harmonic functions on unbounded domains in Ahlfors regular spaces, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **474** (2019), 852–875. [2](#), [4](#)
6. BJÖRN, A., BJÖRN, J. and SHANMUGALINGAM, N., Extension and trace results for doubling metric measure spaces and their hyperbolic fillings, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **159** (2022), 196–249. [2](#), [8](#)
7. BONK, M. and KLEINER, B., Rigidity for quasi-Möbius group actions, *J. Differential Geom.* **61** (2002), 81–106. [3](#), [4](#)
8. BUCKLEY, S. M., HERRON, D. and XIE, X., Metric space inversions, quasi-hyperbolic distance, and uniform spaces, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **57** (2008), 837–890. [3](#), [4](#)
9. CHEN, Z.-Q. and KUMAGAI, T., Heat kernel estimates for jump processes of mixed types on metric measure spaces, *Probability Theory Related Fields* **140** (2008), 277–317. [8](#)
10. DURAND-CARTAGENA, E. and LI, X., Preservation of p -Poincaré inequality for large p under sphericalization and flattening, *Illinois J. Math.* **59** (2015), 1043–1069. [4](#)
11. DURAND-CARTAGENA, E. and LI, X., Preservation of bounded geometry under sphericalization and flattening: quasiconvexity and ∞ -Poincaré inequality, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* **42** (2017), 303–324. [4](#)
12. GIBARA, R., KORTE, R. and SHANMUGALINGAM, N., Solving a Dirichlet problem on unbounded domains via a conformal transformation, *Math. Ann.* **389** (2024), 2857–2901. [2](#), [4](#)
13. GIBARA, R. and SHANMUGALINGAM, N., Conformal transformation of uniform domains under weights that depend on distance to the boundary, *Anal. Geom. Metr. Spaces.* **10** (2022), 297–312. [4](#)
14. GOGATISHVILI, A., KOSKELA, P. and SHANMUGALINGAM, N., Interpolation properties of Besov spaces defined on metric spaces, *Math. Nachr.* **283** (2010), 215–231. [8](#)
15. GOGATISHVILI, A., KOSKELA, P. and ZHOU, Y., Characterizations of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on metric measure spaces, *Forum Math.* **25** (2013), 787–819. [8](#)
16. HEINONEN, J., *Lectures on Analysis on Metric Spaces*, Springer, New York, 2001. [6](#)
17. JONSSON, A. and WALLIN, H., *Function Spaces on Subsets of \mathbf{R}^n* , Math. Rep. **2:1**, Harwood, London, 1984. [2](#)
18. KAJINO, N. and SHIMIZU, R., Contraction properties and differentiability of p -energy forms with applications to nonlinear potential theory on self-similar sets, *Preprint*, 2024. [arXiv:2404.13668v2](#) [4](#), [5](#)
19. KAJINO, N. and SHIMIZU, R., Korevaar–Schoen p -energy forms and associated energy measures on fractals, to appear in *Facets of Contemporary Analysis, Geometry and Non-Euclidean Statistics*, Tohoku Series in Mathematical Sciences **1**, Springer, Singapore, 2026. [5](#), [8](#)
20. KUMAGAI, T., SHANMUGALINGAM, N. and SHIMIZU, R., Finite dimensionality of Besov spaces and potential-theoretic decomposition of metric spaces, *Ann. Fenn. Math.* **50** (2025), 347–369. [4](#), [5](#), [8](#)

21. LI, X. and SHANMUGALINGAM, N., Preservation of bounded geometry under sphericalization and flattening, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **64** (2015), 1303–1341. [4](#)
22. MALÝ, L., Trace and extension theorems for Sobolev-type functions in metric spaces, *Preprint*, 2017. [arXiv:1704.06344](#) [2](#)
23. MURUGAN, M. and SHIMIZU, R., First-order Sobolev spaces, self-similar energies and energy measures on the Sierpiński carpet, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **78** (2025), 1523–1608. [4](#), [8](#)
24. PIETRUSKA-PALUBA, K., Heat kernel characterisation of Besov–Lipschitz spaces on metric measure spaces, *Manuscripta Math.* **131** (2010), 199–214. [8](#)
25. SALOFF-COSTE, L., Analyse sur les groupes de Lie à croissance polynômiale, *Ark. Mat.* **28** (1990), 315–331. [8](#)
26. SHIMIZU, R., Construction of p -energy and associated energy measures on Sierpiński carpets, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **377** (2024), 951–1032. [4](#)
27. WILDRICK, K., Quasisymmetric parametrizations of two-dimensional metric planes, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* **97** (2008), 783–812. [4](#)
28. YANG, D., New characterizations of Hajłasz–Sobolev spaces on metric spaces, *Sci. China Ser. A* **46** (2003), 675–689. [8](#)