

Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova Representation of Quasi-Norms of Ball Quasi-Banach Function Spaces on Spaces of Homogeneous Type with Weak Reverse Doubling Property

Eiichi Nakai, Menghao Tang, Dachun Yang*, Wen Yuan and Chenfeng Zhu

Abstract Let $Y(\mathcal{X})$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space on the space of homogeneous type (\mathcal{X}, ρ, μ) satisfying some mild additional assumptions, $q \in (0, \infty)$, and $\dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(\mathcal{X})$ with $s \in (0, 1)$ be the homogeneous fractional Sobolev space associated with $Y(\mathcal{X})$. In this article, we show that, for any $f \in Y(\mathcal{X}) \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(\mathcal{X})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} &\lesssim \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})}, \end{aligned}$$

where $U(x, y) := \min\{\mu(B(x, \rho(x, y))), \mu(B(y, \rho(x, y)))\}$ for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ and the implicit positive constants are independent of f , which is applied to ten specific ball quasi-Banach function spaces and hence is of wide generality. In particular, when $Y(\mathcal{X}) = L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $q \in [1, \infty)$, the above formula is closely related to the celebrated result of Maz'ya and Shaposhnikova in 2002. We also establish the above representation formula on domains of \mathcal{X} . The main novelty lies in proposing two new concepts, namely the weak reverse doubling condition (for \mathcal{X}) and the weak measure density condition (for domains of \mathcal{X}), which are proved to be necessary in some sense. In addition, we find an interesting fact that, when the underlying space under consideration is bounded, the above Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova-type limit always tends to zero.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova Representation on Spaces of Homogeneous Type Satisfying the WRD Condition	9
2.1	Proof of Theorem 1.5: Upper Estimate	12
2.2	Proof of Theorem 1.5: Lower Estimate	18
2.3	Proof of Theorem 1.7	22
2.4	Failure of Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova Representation on Some Spaces of Homogeneous Type	25

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 46E36; Secondary 42B35, 42B25, 26D10, 30L99.

Key words and phrases. space of homogeneous type, ball quasi-Banach function space, Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova representation, weak reverse doubling condition, weak measure density condition.

This project is partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 12371093, 12431006, and 12501129), and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Grant No. 2253200028).

*Corresponding author, E-mail: dcyang@bnu.edu.cn/December 1, 2025/Final version.

3	Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova Representation on Domains Satisfying the WMD Condition	27
3.1	Proof of Theorem 1.11	28
3.2	Proof of Theorem 1.13	30
3.3	Failure of Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova Representation on Some Domains $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. .	31
4	Applications to Specific Ball Quasi-Banach Function Spaces	32
4.1	Weighted Lebesgue Spaces	32
4.2	Variable Lebesgue Spaces	33
4.3	Weighted Lorentz Spaces	33
4.4	Weighted Orlicz Spaces	34
4.5	Generalized Morrey and Generalized Block Spaces	35
4.6	Generalized Lorentz–Morrey and Generalized Lorentz-Block Spaces	40
4.7	Generalized Orlicz–Morrey and Generalized Orlicz-Block Spaces	42

1 Introduction

The study of the *homogeneous fractional Sobolev spaces* $\dot{W}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $s \in (0, 1)$ and $p \in [1, \infty)$, which is defined to be the set of all measurable functions f on \mathbb{R}^n such that

$$\|f\|_{\dot{W}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} := \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^p}{|x - y|^{n+sp}} dx dy \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} =: \left\| \frac{f(x) - f(y)}{|x - y|^{\frac{n}{p} + s}} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)} \quad (1.1)$$

is finite, has garnered significant attention and there has been a growing interests on this topic over the past few decades. Indeed, these spaces become an indispensable tool and plays a pivotal role in both pure mathematical analysis and applied mathematics; in particular, they have important applications to many problems related to harmonic analysis, variational calculus, and partial differential equations; see [8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 41, 46, 69].

A well-known *defect* of the family of fractional semi-norms $\{\|\cdot\|_{\dot{W}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\}_{s \in (0,1)}$ is the deficiency of the continuity at the endpoint $s = 0$ [corresponding to $\|\cdot\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}$]; see, for example, [15, 52]. In 2002, Maz'ya and Shaposhnikova [80] gave a clever way to repair the above defect by proving that, for any $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{p}} \|f\|_{\dot{W}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} = C_{(p,n)} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $C_{(p,n)}$ is a positive constant depending only on both p and n . Here, and thereafter, $s \rightarrow 0^+$ means $s \in (0, 1)$ and $s \rightarrow 0$. The identity (1.2) is nowadays referred to as the celebrated Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova formula. We refer to [4, 32, 44, 55, 63, 79, 99] for more studies of the Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova formula (1.2) as well as its various variations and to [10, 16, 17, 38, 40, 45, 47, 48, 64, 100] for more related studies of (fractional) Sobolev spaces.

Since its inception, the Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova formula (1.2) has undergone continuous development and has been generalized to many different non-Euclidean settings; see, for instance, Carnot groups [26], anisotropic spaces [51], non-collapsed RCD metric measure spaces [55], and metric measure spaces with N -dimensional Hausdorff measure [57]. It is quite natural to consider the Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova formula (1.2) on more general settings, for example, spaces of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Weiss [30, 31], namely quasi-metric spaces equipped with a doubling measure; see Definition 2.2 for the precise definition of spaces of homogeneous type. These spaces serve as a natural framework for the studies of the boundedness of operators and the real-variable theory of function spaces in harmonic analysis. In particular, the study of Sobolev spaces on spaces of homogeneous type has attracted considerable attention and led to significant progress; see, for example, [50, 54, 58, 65].

On the other hand, there have been systematic development and extensive applications of various (fractional) Sobolev-type spaces in the study of partial differential equations and harmonic analysis over the past few decades, such as weighted (or variable exponent) Sobolev spaces, Orlicz–Sobolev spaces, and Morrey–Sobolev spaces. Significantly, these fundamental function spaces (weighted Lebesgue spaces, variable exponent Lebesgue spaces, Orlicz spaces, and Morrey spaces), on which the aforementioned Sobolev spaces were built, have been comprehensively incorporated into the unifying framework of ball quasi-Banach function spaces introduced by Sawano et al. [106]; see Definition 2.5 for the precise definition of ball quasi-Banach function spaces. It turns out that this inclusive framework systematizes the investigations of many important function spaces in both harmonic analysis and partial differential equations. For more studies related to ball quasi-Banach function spaces, we refer to [27, 71, 103, 106, 125] for Hardy spaces associated with them, to [37, 39, 72, 98, 124, 127, 128, 129, 130] for Sobolev spaces associated with them, and to [59, 60, 115, 116, 126] for the boundedness of operators on them.

Motivated by the aforementioned works, in this article we devote to generalizing the Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova formula (1.2) to the setting of ball quasi-Banach function spaces in the sense of [106], respectively, on the space of homogeneous type (X, ρ, μ) and on the domain $\Omega \subseteq X$, where (X, ρ, μ) satisfies the additional weak reverse doubling condition and Ω is assumed to satisfy a weak version of the measure density condition. It is worth mentioning that an analogous Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova formula on ball quasi-Banach function spaces on \mathbb{R}^n has been established in [98].

The Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova formula yields strikingly different results depending on whether the underlying space or the domain under consideration is bounded or unbounded. We will first present an unexpected result for the bounded case; see Definitions 3.1 and 3.3 for the precise definitions of $Y(\Omega)$ and $\dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(\Omega)$, respectively. Recall that $\Omega \subseteq X$ is said to be *bounded* with respect to the quasi-metric ρ if $\text{diam}(\Omega) := \sup_{x,y \in \Omega} \rho(x, y) < \infty$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $q \in (0, \infty)$, (X, ρ, μ) be a quasi-metric measure space, $\Omega \subseteq X$ a bounded measure set, $Y(X)$ a ball quasi-Banach function space, and $Y(\Omega)$ the restriction of $Y(X)$ to Ω . Then, for any $f \in \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(\Omega)$,*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} = 0,$$

where, for any $x, y \in X$, $U(x, y) := \min\{\mu(B(x, \rho(x, y))), \mu(B(y, \rho(x, y)))\}$.

Remark 1.2. (i) When $\text{diam}(X) < \infty$, Theorem 1.1 holds for any measurable set $\Omega \subseteq X$, in particular, for the case $\Omega = X$.

(ii) For the case where the underlying space or the domain is unbounded, see Theorems 1.5, 1.7, 1.11, and 1.13 below, where we assume that the underlying space (X, ρ, μ) is a space of homogeneous type. However, when the underlying space is unbounded but is not a space of homogeneous type (for example, non-doubling metric spaces), it is still unknown whether the Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova representation as in Theorem 1.5 holds.

Apart from Theorem 1.1, in the remainder of this section, we always assume that the underlying space (X, ρ, μ) is a space of homogeneous type with $\text{diam}(X) = \infty$ which is equivalent to $\mu(X) = \infty$ (see [92, Lemma 5.1]). To establish the Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova representation in this case, we begin with introducing the following weak reverse doubling condition for measures on quasi-metric measure spaces.

Definition 1.3. A quasi-metric measure space (X, ρ, μ) is said to satisfy the *weak reverse doubling* (for short, WRD) *condition* if there exist $x_0 \in X$ and $\lambda, C_{(\mu)} \in (1, \infty)$ such that

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu(B(x_0, \lambda r))}{\mu(B(x_0, r))} \geq C_{(\mu)}. \quad (1.3)$$

Here, and thereafter, we denote by $\underline{\lim}$ and $\overline{\lim}$ respectively the *limit inferior* and the *limit superior*.

Remark 1.4. (i) By (1.3) and $C_{(\mu)} > 1$, we are easy to prove that, if the quasi-metric measure space (X, ρ, μ) satisfies the WRD condition, then $\text{diam}(X) = \infty$. Moreover, if a space of homogeneous type (X, ρ, μ) satisfies the WRD condition, then $\mu(X) = \infty$ because, in this case, $\text{diam}(X) = \infty$ if and only if $\mu(X) = \infty$ (see [92, Lemma 5.1]).

(ii) Assume that (X, ρ, μ) is a quasi-metric measure space satisfying the WRD condition. That is, (1.3) holds for some $x_0 \in X$ and $\lambda \in (1, \infty)$. Then, from the quasi-triangle inequality of ρ [see Definition 2.1(iii)], we are easy to show that there exists $\tilde{\lambda} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $x \in X$, (1.3) also holds with x_0 and λ replaced, respectively, by x and $\tilde{\lambda}$; see Proposition 2.28.

(iii) Assume that $\text{diam}(X) = \infty$. Recall that (X, ρ, μ) is called an RD-space, introduced by Han et al. [56], if (X, ρ, μ) is a space of homogeneous type and satisfies the following *reverse-doubling condition*: there exists $C \in (1, \infty)$ such that, for any $x \in X$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$,

$$C\mu(B(x, r)) \leq \mu(B(x, 2r)). \quad (1.4)$$

If the measure μ satisfies (1.4), then μ always satisfies the WRD condition, which can be deduced from Proposition 2.27. But the converse is not necessary to be true; see the example in [118, Proposition 2.3] which satisfies the WRD condition but does not satisfy (1.4).

We also need the following basic and mild assumption on ball Banach function spaces, which is the first one of two key assumptions of the whole article; see Definition 2.9 for the precise definition of $[Y(X)]'$.

Assumption I. $Y(X)$ is a ball Banach function space and the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator M is bounded on $[Y(X)]'$.

We next present the second main result of this article as follows; see Definitions 2.7, 2.4, and 2.10 for the precise definitions of $Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)$, $C_b^\beta(X)$, and $Y(X)/\mathbb{R}$, respectively.

Theorem 1.5. *Let (X, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type satisfying the WRD condition. Let $0 < q \leq p < \infty$ and $Y(X)$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space such that $Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)$ satisfies Assumption I. Then there exist two positive constants C and \tilde{C} such that the following assertions hold.*

(i) Let $\beta \in (0, \infty)$. For any $f \in C_b^\beta(X) \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(X)$,

$$\begin{aligned} C\|f\|_{Y(X)} &\leq \underline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_X \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_X \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \leq \tilde{C}\|f\|_{Y(X)}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.5)$$

(ii) If $Y(X)$ is further assumed to have an absolutely continuous quasi-norm, then, for any $f \in [Y(X)/\mathbb{R}] \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(X)$,

$$\begin{aligned} C\|f\|_{Y(X)/\mathbb{R}} &\leq \underline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_X \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_X \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \leq \tilde{C}\|f\|_{Y(X)/\mathbb{R}}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

- Remark 1.6.** (i) There are many examples of (X, ρ, μ) such that Theorem 1.5 holds, namely spaces of homogeneous type satisfying the WRD condition, such as Euclidean spaces with A_∞ -weights (in particular, the standard Euclidean space equipped with the Lebesgue measure), Ahlfors-regular spaces, Lie groups of polynomial growth, and Carnot–Carathéodory spaces with doubling measure, finite dimensional Banach spaces, and MCP spaces (see [54, Example 4.8] for the definition of MCP spaces).
- (ii) We point out that the WRD condition in Theorem 1.5 is only used to obtain the lower estimate, namely the first inequality in both (1.5) and (1.6).
- (iii) If $X = \mathbb{R}^n$, ρ is the standard Euclidean distance, and μ is the n -dimensional Lebesgue measure, then Theorem 1.5 reduces to [98, Theorem 2.12]. Moreover, we point out that, even in this special case, the two constants C and \tilde{C} in (1.5) [or in (1.6)] are not equal; see [98, Example 2.20] for the case where $Y(X)$ is the weighted Lebesgue space.
- (iv) By [98, Remark 2.13(iii)], we find that the requirement $q \leq p$ in [98, Theorem 2.12] is sharp, which, combined with (i) of the present remark, further implies that the requirement $0 < q \leq p < \infty$ in Theorem 1.5 is also *sharp* in some sense.
- (v) The WRD condition in Theorem 1.5 is *sharp* in the following sense: There exists an example of spaces of homogeneous type which does not satisfy the WRD condition, and the conclusion of Theorem 1.5 in this case fails; see Remark 2.35.
- (vi) Han [54, Theorem 3.11] proved a generalized Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova formula associated with general mollifiers on non-compact metric measure spaces. We point out that [54, Theorem 3.11] and Theorem 1.5 cannot completely cover each other. Indeed, the volume growth condition on the measure in [54, Assumption 3.4] is stronger than the assumptions on μ in Theorem 1.5. Moreover, the mollifiers $\{\rho_n(x, y)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in [54, Theorem 3.11] are assumed to be radial, that is, for any $x, y \in X$, $\rho_n(x, y)$ depends only on the distance between x and y . In Theorem 1.5, we use the mollifier $U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}$ which might not be radial with respect to $\rho(x, y)$. Thus, Theorem 1.5 even in the special case $Y(X) := L^p(X)$ cannot be covered by [54, Theorem 3.11]. On the other hand, it turns out that, with some assumptions on the measure and the mollifiers, Han [54, Theorem 3.11] obtained an equality with the exact constant 2 in [54, (3.20)]. But, Theorem 1.5 cannot give an equality with an exact constant and hence Theorem 1.5 in the special case $Y(X) := L^p(X)$ cannot cover [54, Theorem 3.11].

When $p \in (0, \infty)$ and the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \mathcal{M} is not known to be bounded on the associate space of $Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)$, Theorem 1.5 seems to be inapplicable to this case; for example, Morrey spaces. To establish the corresponding conclusion of Theorem 1.5 in the setting of the ball quasi-Banach function space $Y(X)$ on which \mathcal{M} may not be bounded on $[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'$, we need the following assumption, which is the second (last) one of two key assumptions of the whole article.

Assumption II. *$Y(X)$ is a ball Banach function space and the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \mathcal{M} is endpoint bounded on $[Y(X)]'$, that is, there exists a sequence $\{\theta_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $(0, 1)$ such that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \theta_m = 1$, $Y^{\frac{1}{\theta_m}}(X)$ is a ball Banach function space and the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \mathcal{M} is bounded on its associate space $[Y^{\frac{1}{\theta_m}}(X)]'$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathcal{M}\|_{[Y^{\frac{1}{\theta_m}}(X)]' \rightarrow [Y^{\frac{1}{\theta_m}}(X)]'} < \infty.$$

Based on Assumption II instead of Assumption I, we present the third main result of this article. Recall that a measure μ is said to be *Borel-semiregular* if μ is a Borel measure on X and, for any measurable set $E \subseteq X$, there exists a Borel set $F \subseteq X$ such that $\mu(E \Delta F) := \mu(E \setminus F) + \mu(F \setminus E) = 0$; see, for instance, [5, Definition 3.9].

Theorem 1.7. *Let (X, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type satisfying the WRD condition. Let $0 < q \leq p < \infty$ and $Y(X)$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space such that $Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)$ satisfies Assumption II.*

- (i) *Let $\beta \in (0, \infty)$. Then, for any $f \in C_b^\beta(X) \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(X)$, (1.5) holds.*
- (ii) *If $Y(X)$ has an absolutely continuous quasi-norm and μ is Borel-semiregular, then, for any $f \in [Y(X)/\mathbb{R}] \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(X)$, (1.6) holds.*

Remark 1.8. If $X = \mathbb{R}^n$, ρ is the standard Euclidean distance, and μ is the n -dimensional Lebesgue measure, then Theorem 1.7 reduces to [98, Theorem 2.16].

Now, we consider the case where X in (1.5) and (1.6) is replaced by an unbounded measurable set $\Omega \subseteq X$. We will also assume that the underlying space under consideration (X, ρ, μ) is a space of homogeneous type satisfying the WRD condition. To state the main results in this case, we first introduce the concept of the weak measure density condition. Although motivated by the measure density condition in [53, (1)], our definition differs slightly from its formulation.

Definition 1.9. Let (X, ρ, μ) be an unbounded space of homogeneous type. A measurable set $\Omega \subseteq X$ is said to satisfy the *weak measure density* (for short, WMD) *condition* if there exist $x_0 \in X$ and $C_0 \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu(B(x_0, r) \cap \Omega)}{\mu(B(x_0, r))} \geq C_0. \quad (1.7)$$

Remark 1.10. (i) If $\Omega \subseteq X$ satisfies the WMD condition, then we are easy to show that $\text{diam}(\Omega) = \infty$ and hence Ω is unbounded. In this case, we also find $\mu(\Omega) = \infty$. Indeed, notice that $\mu(X) = \infty$ if and only if $\text{diam}(X) = \infty$ (see [92, Lemma 5.1]). If $\mu(\Omega) < \infty$, then

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu(B(x_0, r) \cap \Omega)}{\mu(B(x_0, r))} \leq \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu(\Omega)}{\mu(B(x_0, r))} = 0,$$

which contradicts (1.7).

- (ii) If (X, ρ, μ) is bounded, then $\Omega \subseteq X$ satisfies (1.7) if and only if there exists a positive constant C such that

$$\frac{\mu(\Omega)}{\mu(X)} \geq C,$$

which is equivalent to $\mu(\Omega) \in (0, \infty)$ and hence the WMD condition in this case becomes a trivial condition.

- (iii) It is easy to see that X itself satisfies the WMD condition automatically.
- (iv) In Definition 1.9, if we replace x_0 by any fixed point in X , we then obtain an equivalent formulation of the WMD condition; see (3.3).

Next, via assuming that the domain under consideration satisfies the above WMD condition, we give the last two main results of this article as follows. For any $\beta \in (0, \infty)$, denote by $C_b^\beta(\Omega)$ the set of all functions on Ω satisfying that there exists a function $g \in C_b^\beta(X)$ such that $g = f$ on Ω and $g \equiv 0$ on $X \setminus \Omega$.

Theorem 1.11. *Let $0 < q \leq p < \infty$, (X, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type satisfying the WRD condition, $Y(X)$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space, and $Y(\Omega)$ the restriction of $Y(X)$ to Ω , where $\Omega \subseteq X$ satisfies the WMD condition. Assume that $Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)$ satisfies Assumption I. Then there exist two positive constants C and \tilde{C} such that the following statements hold.*

(i) Let $\beta \in (0, \infty)$. For any $f \in C_b^\beta(\Omega) \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} C\|f\|_{Y(\Omega)} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{C}\|f\|_{Y(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.8)$$

(ii) If $Y(X)$ is further assumed to have an absolutely continuous quasi-norm, then, for any $f \in [Y(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}] \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} C\|f\|_{Y(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{C}\|f\|_{Y(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.9)$$

Remark 1.12. (i) Similar to Remark 1.6(iv), the assumption $0 < q \leq p < \infty$ in Theorem 1.11 is also *sharp* in some sense.

(ii) The WMD condition in Theorem 1.11 is *sharp* in the following sense: There exists an example of open sets which does not satisfy the WMD condition, and the conclusion of Theorem 1.11 in this case fails; see Remark 3.9.

(iii) From Remark 1.10(iii), we infer that Theorem 1.11 with $\Omega = X$ holds, which in this case reduces to Theorem 1.5.

Theorem 1.13. Let $0 < q \leq p < \infty$, (X, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type satisfying the WRD condition, $Y(X)$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space, and $Y(\Omega)$ the restriction of $Y(X)$ to Ω , where $\Omega \subseteq X$ satisfies the WMD condition. Assume that $Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)$ satisfies Assumption II.

(i) Let $\beta \in (0, \infty)$. Then, for any $f \in C_b^\beta(X) \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(X)$, (1.8) holds.

(ii) If $Y(X)$ has an absolutely continuous quasi-norm and μ is Borel-semiregular, then, for any $f \in [Y(X)/\mathbb{R}] \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(X)$, (1.9) holds.

As a direct corollary of Theorems 1.11 and 1.13 on the standard Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n , we have the following result. Notice that, in this case, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\rho(x, y) = |x - y| \quad \text{and} \quad U(x, y) = |B(\mathbf{0}, 1)| |x - y|^n,$$

where $|B(\mathbf{0}, 1)|$ is the Lebesgue measure of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^n . Denote by $C_c(\Omega)$ the set of all continuous functions on Ω with compact support in Ω .

Corollary 1.14. Let $0 < q \leq p < \infty$, $Y(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space, and $Y(\Omega)$ the restriction of $Y(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to Ω , where $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies the WMD condition. Assume that $Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies Assumption I or Assumption II. Then there exist two positive constants C and \tilde{C} such that the following assertions hold.

(i) For any $f \in C_c(\Omega) \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} C\|f\|_{Y(\Omega)} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{|\cdot - y|^{n+sq}} dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{|\cdot - y|^{n+sq}} dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{C}\|f\|_{Y(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

- (ii) If $Y(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is further assumed to have an absolutely continuous quasi-norm, then, for any $f \in [Y(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}] \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} C\|f\|_{Y(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{|\cdot - y|^{n+sq}} dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{|\cdot - y|^{n+sq}} dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{C}\|f\|_{Y(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}. \end{aligned}$$

We prove Theorem 1.1 in Section 2, Theorem 1.5 in Subsections 2.1 and 2.2, Theorem 1.7 in Subsection 2.3, Theorem 1.11 in Subsection 3.1, and Theorem 1.13 in Subsection 3.2. We show these by using the method of extrapolation to overcome the difficulties caused by that the quasi-norm of $Y(X)$ has no explicit expression. The primary novelty of this article lies in that, to obtain these results, we propose two new concepts, namely the weak reverse doubling condition (see Definition 1.3) and the weak measure density condition (see Definition 1.9), which are proved to be necessary in some sense. These results are of wide generality and are applied to ten specific ball quasi-Banach function spaces, most of which are new.

It is also worth mentioning that there exists another way to remedy the aforementioned defect of the family $\{\|\cdot\|_{\dot{W}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\}_{s \in (0,1)}$ at the endpoint $s = 0$, that is, to let $s = 0$ in (1.1) and replace the product L^p -norm in (1.1) by the product weak L^p -norm simultaneously; see [15, 52, 98] for the Euclidean space case and [19, 51, 68, 82, 114] for the metric measure space case. We will not pursue more about this issue here.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows.

Section 2 is devoting to showing Theorems 1.1, 1.5, and 1.7. We first recall some preliminary concepts on spaces of homogeneous type and ball quasi-Banach function spaces. We then prove Theorem 1.1 directly. In Subsection 2.1, we first recall some preliminaries on Muckenhoupt weights and then give the proof of Theorem 1.5. To this end, we first use some essential properties of Muckenhoupt weights to show a similar upper estimate of (1.5) in weighted Lebesgue spaces; see Lemma 2.20. Combining this and a key extrapolation lemma (see Lemma 2.23), the latter of which is a bridge connecting ball quasi-Banach function spaces and weighted Lebesgue spaces, we obtain the upper estimate of (1.5); see Theorem 2.17. In Subsection 2.2, applying the WRD condition of μ , we first establish a key lower estimate on spaces of homogeneous type; see Lemma 2.26. Using this, the Fatou property of $Y(X)$, the corresponding estimates on weighted Lebesgue spaces, and a method of extrapolation, we establish the lower estimate of (1.5); see Theorem 2.24. In Subsection 2.3, we use the endpoint bounded assumption on the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator and a density argument to prove Theorem 1.7. In Subsection 2.4, we provide an example to show that the Maz’ya–Shaposhnikova representation of quasi-norms of ball quasi-Banach function spaces fails on certain spaces of homogeneous type, which indicates the weak reverse doubling assumption on μ is necessary in some sense (see Proposition 2.34).

In Section 3, we first give some preliminaries on the restriction of ball quasi-Banach function spaces. In Subsection 3.1, we establish an exquisite lower estimate on domains to prove Theorem 1.11. In Subsection 3.2, we also consider the corresponding result under the endpoint bounded assumption on the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator. That is, we give the proof of Theorem 1.13. In Subsection 3.3, we construct an example to show that the Maz’ya–Shaposhnikova representation of quasi-norms of ball quasi-Banach function spaces fails on certain domains $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, which indicates the weak measure density assumption on Ω is necessary in some sense (see Proposition 3.8).

In Section 4, we apply the main results of this article, namely Theorems 1.5, 1.7, 1.11, and 1.13, to ten specific ball quasi-Banach function spaces, namely weighted Lebesgue spaces, variable Lebesgue spaces, weighted Lorentz spaces, Orlicz spaces, generalized Morrey spaces, generalized block spaces, generalized Lorentz–Morrey spaces, generalized Lorentz-block spaces, generalized

Orlicz–Morrey spaces, and generalized Orlicz-block spaces, most of which are new. To obtain the last two applications, we first prove that the generalized Orlicz–Morrey space and the generalized Orlicz-block space are mutually the associate space (see Theorem 4.40). Moreover, we also establish the boundedness of the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator on generalized Orlicz–Morrey spaces (see Theorem 4.41) and generalized Orlicz-block spaces (see Theorem 4.43). Duo to the generality and the flexibility of the main results of this article, more applications (for example, to some newfound ball quasi-Banach function spaces) are predictable.

At the end of this section, we make some conventions on symbols. Let $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_+ := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Let (X, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type. For any $E \subseteq X$, we denote by E^C the set $X \setminus E$ and by $\mathbf{1}_E$ its *characteristic function*. The ball $B(x, r)$ of X , with center $x \in X$ and radius $r \in (0, \infty)$, is defined by setting $B(x, r) := \{y \in X : \rho(x, y) < r\}$. For any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ and any ball $B := B(x_B, r_B)$ with $x_B \in X$ and $r_B \in (0, \infty)$, let $\lambda B := B(x_B, \lambda r_B)$. For any $x, y \in X$, let

$$U(x, y) := \min \{\mu(B(x, \rho(x, y))), \mu(B(y, \rho(x, y)))\}.$$

The diameter $\text{diam}(X)$ of (X, ρ) is defined by setting $\text{diam}(X) := \sup_{x, y \in X} \rho(x, y)$. Denote by $\mathcal{M}(X)$ the set of all μ -measurable functions on X . For any $f \in \mathcal{M}(X)$, the support $\text{supp } f$ of f is defined by setting $\text{supp } f := \{x \in X : f(x) \neq 0\}$. For any $p \in (0, \infty]$, we denote by the symbol $L_{\text{loc}}^p(X)$ the set of all locally p -integrable functions on X . The *Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator* \mathcal{M} is defined by setting, for any $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(X)$ and $x \in X$,

$$\mathcal{M}(f)(x) := \sup_{B \ni x} \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B |f(y)| d\mu(y),$$

where the supremum is taken over all balls $B \subset X$ containing x . We always use C to denote a *positive constant*, independent of the main parameters involved, but perhaps varying from line to line. We also use $C_{(\alpha, \beta, \dots)}$ to denote a positive constant depending on the indicated parameters α, β, \dots . The symbol $f \lesssim g$ means that $f \leq Cg$. If $f \lesssim g$ and $g \lesssim f$, we then write $f \sim g$. If $f \leq Cg$ and $g = h$ or $g \leq h$, we then write $f \lesssim g = h$ or $f \lesssim g \leq h$. For any $q \in [1, \infty]$, we denote by q' its *conjugate exponent*, that is, $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q'} = 1$. We also use $\underline{\lim}$ and $\overline{\lim}$ to denote the *limit inferior* and the *limit superior*, respectively. Finally, in all proofs we consistently retain the symbols introduced in the original theorem (or related statement).

2 Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova Representation on Spaces of Homogeneous Type Satisfying the WRD Condition

In this section, we aim to establish the Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova representation of quasi-norms of ball quasi-Banach function spaces on spaces of homogeneous type satisfying the WRD condition. In Subsection 2.1, we show the upper estimate of Theorem 1.5. In Subsection 2.2, we prove the lower estimate of Theorem 1.5. In Subsection 2.3, we show Theorem 1.7. In Subsection 2.4, we prove that the weak reverse doubling assumption on μ is necessary in some sense.

We begin with recalling the following definition of quasi-metric spaces.

Definition 2.1. A *quasi-metric space* (X, ρ) is a non-empty set X equipped with a *quasi-metric* ρ , that is, a nonnegative function defined on $X \times X$ satisfies that, for any $x, y, z \in X$,

- (i) $\rho(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$,
- (ii) $\rho(x, y) = \rho(y, x)$,
- (iii) there exists a constant $K_0 \in [1, \infty)$, independent of x, y , and z , such that

$$\rho(x, z) \leq K_0 [\rho(x, y) + \rho(y, z)].$$

Now, we recall the concept of spaces of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Weiss [30, 31].

Definition 2.2. A triplet (X, ρ, μ) is called a *space of homogeneous type* if (X, ρ) is a quasi-metric space and μ is a nonnegative measure, defined on a σ -algebra of subsets of X which contains all ρ -balls, such that the following *doubling condition* holds, that is, there exists a constant $L_{(\mu)} \in [1, \infty)$ such that, for any $x \in X$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$,

$$0 < \mu(B(x, 2r)) \leq L_{(\mu)} \mu(B(x, r)) < \infty. \quad (2.1)$$

Remark 2.3. By (2.1), we conclude that, for any $\lambda \in [1, \infty)$, $x \in X$, and $r \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\mu(B(x, \lambda r)) \leq L_{(\mu)} \lambda^d \mu(B(x, r)), \quad (2.2)$$

where $d := \log_2 L_{(\mu)}$ is called the *upper dimension* of X . Moreover, if the cardinality of the set X is at least 2, then, from (2.1), we deduce that $L_{(\mu)} \in (1, \infty)$ and hence $d \in (0, \infty)$; see [5, p. 72].

Next, we recall the definition of Hölder spaces with bounded support.

Definition 2.4. Let $\beta \in (0, \infty)$. The *Hölder space* $C_b^\beta(X)$ with bounded support is defined to be the set of all complex-valued functions f on X with bounded support such that

$$\|f\|_{C_b^\beta(X)} := \sup_{\substack{x, y \in X \\ x \neq y}} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{[\rho(x, y)]^\beta} < \infty.$$

The following definition can be found in [120, Definition 2.4], which with $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ was introduced by Sawano et al. [106]. Let $\mathcal{M}(X)$ be the set of all measurable functions on X .

Definition 2.5. A quasi-Banach space $Y(X)$, equipped with a quasi-norm $\|\cdot\|_{Y(X)}$ which makes sense for all $f \in \mathcal{M}(X)$, is called a *ball quasi-Banach function space* if

- (i) $f \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ and $\|f\|_{Y(X)} = 0$ imply that $f = 0$ μ -almost everywhere on X ;
- (ii) $f, g \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ and $|g| \leq |f|$ μ -almost everywhere on X imply $\|g\|_{Y(X)} \leq \|f\|_{Y(X)}$;
- (iii) for any sequence $\{f_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{M}(X)$ and any function $f \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ satisfying that $0 \leq f_m \uparrow f$ μ -almost everywhere on X , one has $\|f_m\|_{Y(X)} \uparrow \|f\|_{Y(X)}$;
- (iv) $\mathbf{1}_B \in Y(X)$ for any ball $B \subset X$.

Moreover, a ball quasi-Banach function space $Y(X)$ is called a *ball Banach function space* if

- (v) for any $f, g \in Y(X)$, $\|f + g\|_{Y(X)} \leq \|f\|_{Y(X)} + \|g\|_{Y(X)}$;
- (vi) for any ball $B \subset X$, there exists $C_{(B)} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $f \in Y(X)$,

$$\int_B |f(x)| d\mu(x) \leq C_{(B)} \|f\|_{Y(X)}.$$

Remark 2.6. (i) By (i) and (ii) of Definition 2.5, we find that, if $f \in \mathcal{M}(X)$, then $\|f\|_{Y(X)} = 0$ if and only if $f = 0$ μ -almost everywhere on X .

- (ii) In Definition 2.5, if we replace any ball B by any bounded measurable set E , we then obtain its another equivalent formulation.
- (iii) As pointed in [25, Theorem 2], both (ii) and (iii) of Definition 2.5 imply that any ball quasi-Banach function space is complete; see also [77].

- (iv) From (ii) and (iv) of Definition 2.5, we infer that, for any $\beta \in (0, \infty)$, $C_b^\beta(\mathcal{X}) \subset Y(\mathcal{X})$.
- (v) In Definition 2.5, if we replace (iv) by the *saturation property* that, for any measurable set $E \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ with $\mu(E) \in (0, \infty)$, there exists a measurable set $F \subseteq E$ with $\mu(F) \in (0, \infty)$ satisfying that $\mathbf{1}_F \in Y(\mathcal{X})$, we then obtain the definition of quasi-Banach function spaces in [77]. Moreover, by [129, Proposition 2.5 and Remark 2.6] (see also [95, Proposition 4.21] and [77, Remark 2.8]), we conclude that, if $Y(\mathcal{X})$ satisfies the additional assumption that the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \mathcal{M} is weakly bounded on one of its convexification, then the definition of quasi-Banach function spaces in [77] coincides with the definition of ball quasi-Banach function spaces. Thus, under this additional assumption, working with quasi-Banach function spaces in [77] or ball quasi-Banach function spaces would yield exactly the same results.

Now, we recall the definition of the p -convexification of ball quasi-Banach function spaces; see [121, Definition 2.10].

Definition 2.7. Let $Y(\mathcal{X})$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space. For any given $p \in (0, \infty)$, the p -convexification $Y^p(\mathcal{X})$ of $Y(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by setting $Y^p(\mathcal{X}) := \{f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}) : |f|^p \in Y(\mathcal{X})\}$ equipped with the quasi-norm $\|f\|_{Y^p(\mathcal{X})} := \| |f|^p \|_{Y(\mathcal{X})}^{1/p}$.

The following concept of the absolutely continuous quasi-norm of ball quasi-Banach function spaces with $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$ is precisely [116, Definition 3.2].

Definition 2.8. A ball quasi-Banach function space $Y(\mathcal{X})$ is said to have an *absolutely continuous quasi-norm* on \mathcal{X} if, for any $f \in Y(\mathcal{X})$ and any sequence $\{E_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of measurable sets in \mathcal{X} satisfying that $\mathbf{1}_{E_j} \rightarrow 0$ μ -almost everywhere as $j \rightarrow \infty$, one has $\|f \mathbf{1}_{E_j}\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

The following definition can be found in [121, (2.9)].

Definition 2.9. Let $Y(\mathcal{X})$ be a ball Banach function space. The *associate space* (also called the *Köthe dual*) $[Y(\mathcal{X})]'$ of $Y(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by setting

$$[Y(\mathcal{X})]' := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}) : \|f\|_{[Y(\mathcal{X})]'} := \sup_{\substack{g \in Y(\mathcal{X}) \\ \|g\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} \leq 1}} \|fg\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})} < \infty \right\},$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{[Y(\mathcal{X})]'}$ is called the *associate norm* of $\|\cdot\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})}$.

The following concept of quotient spaces in the case where \mathcal{X} is a space of homogeneous type can be found in [114, Definition 2.10] and where $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$ can be found in [98, Definition 2.9].

Definition 2.10. Let $Y(\mathcal{X})$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space. The *quotient space* $Y(\mathcal{X})/\mathbb{R}$ is defined to be the set of all equivalent classes $[f]$ of measurable functions on \mathcal{X} such that

$$\|[f]\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})/\mathbb{R}} := \inf_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \|f + a\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} < \infty.$$

Throughout this article, we simply use the symbols $f \in Y(\mathcal{X})/\mathbb{R}$ and $\|f\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})/\mathbb{R}}$, respectively, to replace $[f] \in Y(\mathcal{X})/\mathbb{R}$ and $\|[f]\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})/\mathbb{R}}$. In addition, it is worth noticing that $f \in Y(\mathcal{X})/\mathbb{R}$ if and only if there exists $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f + a \in Y(\mathcal{X})$. Moreover, we point out that, under some assumptions on $Y(\mathcal{X})$, if $f \in Y(\mathcal{X})/\mathbb{R}$, then there exists exactly one constant a such that $\|f + a\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} < \infty$. To formalize this, we state the following proposition.

Proposition 2.11. Let (\mathcal{X}, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type with $\text{diam}(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$ and let $Y(\mathcal{X})$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space. Assume that there exists $p \in (0, \infty)$ such that $Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(\mathcal{X})$ satisfies Assumption I. Then $f \in Y(\mathcal{X})$ implies that, for any $a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $f + a \notin Y(\mathcal{X})$.

Proof. We first claim that, for any $a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $a \notin Y(X)$. We show this claim by contradiction. Assume that there exists $a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $a \in Y(X)$. Then we have $1 \in Y(X)$ and hence $1 \in Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)$. From this and Definition 2.9, we deduce that, for any $f \in [Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'$,

$$\|f\|_{L^1(X)} \leq \|1\|_{Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)} \|f\|_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'} < \infty$$

and hence $f \in L^1(X)$. Thus, $[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]' \subset L^1(X)$. On the other hand, by the assumption that $Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)$ is a ball Banach function space and [106, Proposition 2.3] (whose proof remains true on spaces of homogeneous type), we find that $[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'$ is also a ball Banach function space and hence, for any ball $B \subset X$, $\mathbf{1}_B \in [Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'$. From [114, Lemma 3.32], we infer that, for any ball $B \subset X$, $M\mathbf{1}_B \notin L^1(X)$. This, together with the proven conclusion that $[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]' \subset L^1(X)$, implies that $M\mathbf{1}_B \notin [Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'$, which contradicts the assumption that M is bounded on $[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'$. Thus, for any $a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $a \notin Y(X)$. This finishes the proof of the above claim.

Let $f \in Y(X)$. We prove the present proposition by contradiction. Assume that there exists $a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $f + a \in Y(X)$. Then, by the quasi-triangle inequality of $\|\cdot\|_{Y(X)}$, we conclude that $\|a\|_{Y(X)} \lesssim \|f\|_{Y(X)} + \|f + a\|_{Y(X)} < \infty$ and hence $a \in Y(X)$, which contradicts the above claim. Thus, $f + a \notin Y(X)$ for any $a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. This finishes the proof of Proposition 2.11. \square

Next, we introduce the concept of homogeneous fractional ball quasi-Banach Sobolev spaces.

Definition 2.12. Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $q \in (0, \infty)$, and $Y(X)$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space. The *homogeneous fractional ball quasi-Banach Sobolev space* $\dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(X)$ is defined to be the set of all $f \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ such that

$$\|f\|_{\dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(X)} := \left\| \left\{ \int_X \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} < \infty.$$

Remark 2.13. If $Y(X) := L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $q \in [1, \infty)$, then $\dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(X)$ is precisely $\dot{W}^{s,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Now, we show Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $f \in \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(\Omega)$. Then there exists $s_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that $f \in \dot{W}_Y^{s_0,q}(\Omega)$. Since that Ω is bounded, it follows that, for any $x, y \in \Omega$, $\rho(x, y) \leq \text{diam}(\Omega) < \infty$. By this and $f \in \dot{W}_Y^{s_0,q}(\Omega)$, we find that, for any $s \in (0, s_0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} &= s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{s_0q}} [\rho(\cdot, y)]^{(s_0-s)q} dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} \\ &\leq s^{\frac{1}{q}} [\text{diam}(\Omega)]^{s_0-s} \|f\|_{\dot{W}_Y^{s_0,q}(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $s \rightarrow 0^+$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.1. \square

2.1 Proof of Theorem 1.5: Upper Estimate

This subsection is devoted to establishing the upper bound estimate of Theorem 1.5. We first recall the concepts of both Muckenhoupt weights and weighted Lebesgue spaces.

Definition 2.14. (i) A nonnegative locally integral function ω is called an $A_1(X)$ -weight, denoted by $\omega \in A_1(X)$, if

$$[\omega]_{A_1(X)} := \sup_{B \subset X} \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B \omega(x) d\mu(x) \left[\text{ess inf}_{y \in B} \omega(y) \right]^{-1} < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all balls $B \subset X$.

- (ii) Let $p \in (1, \infty)$. A nonnegative locally integral function ω is called an $A_p(X)$ -weight, denoted by $\omega \in A_p(X)$, if

$$[\omega]_{A_p(X)} := \sup_{B \subset X} \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B \omega(x) d\mu(x) \left\{ \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B [\omega(x)]^{\frac{1}{1-p}} d\mu(x) \right\}^{p-1} < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all balls $B \subset X$.

Definition 2.15. Let $p \in (0, \infty)$ and ω be a weight. The *weighted Lebesgue space* $L_\omega^p(X)$ is defined to be the set of all $f \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ such that

$$\|f\|_{L_\omega^p(X)} := \left[\int_X |f(x)|^p \omega(x) d\mu(x) \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty.$$

Next, we recall some basic properties and related conclusions of Muckenhoupt weights; see, for instance, [20, Lemma 2.1], [112, Chapter 1], and [62, Subsection 3.4].

Lemma 2.16. Let $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $\omega \in A_p(X)$.

- (i) If $p = 1$, then $[\omega]_{A_1(X)} \in [1, \infty)$ and, for μ -almost every $x \in X$, $\mathcal{M}\omega(x) \leq [\omega]_{A_1(X)}\omega(x)$.
- (ii)

$$[\omega]_{A_p(X)} = \sup_{B \subset X, \|f\mathbf{1}_B\|_{L_\omega^p(X)} \in (0, \infty)} \frac{[\frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B |f(t)| d\mu(t)]^p}{\frac{1}{\omega(B)} \int_B |f(t)|^p \omega(t) d\mu(t)},$$

where the supremum is taken over all balls $B \subset X$ and all μ -measurable functions f such that $\|f\mathbf{1}_B\|_{L_\omega^p(X)} \in (0, \infty)$.

- (iii) For any $\lambda \in (1, \infty)$ and any ball $B \subset X$, one has

$$\frac{\omega(\lambda B)}{\omega(B)} \leq [\omega]_{A_p(X)} \left[\frac{\mu(\lambda B)}{\mu(B)} \right]^p.$$

- (iv) For any $q \in [p, \infty)$, one has $\omega \in A_q(X)$ and $[\omega]_{A_q(X)} \leq [\omega]_{A_p(X)}$.

The following is the main theorem of this subsection.

Theorem 2.17. Let (X, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type. Let $0 < q \leq p < \infty$ and $Y(X)$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space such that $Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)$ satisfies Assumption I. Then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in [Y(X)/\mathbb{R}] \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(X)$,

$$\overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_X \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \leq C \|\mathcal{M}\|_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]' \rightarrow [Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'}^{\frac{2}{p}} \|f\|_{Y(X)/\mathbb{R}}.$$

To show Theorem 2.17, we need the following two technical lemmas.

Lemma 2.18. Let (X, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type. Let $q \in (0, \infty)$ and $Y(X)$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space. Then, for any $R \in (0, \infty)$ and $f \in \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(X)$,

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{B(\cdot, R)} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} = 0.$$

Proof. From $f \in \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(\mathcal{X})$, we deduce that there exists $s_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that $f \in \dot{W}_Y^{s_0,q}(\mathcal{X})$, which further implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{B(\cdot, R)} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} \\ &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{B(\cdot, R)} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{s_0 q}} [\rho(\cdot, y)]^{(s_0 - s)q} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} \\ &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} R^{(s_0 - s)} \|f\|_{\dot{W}_Y^{s_0,q}(\mathcal{X})} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 2.18. \square

Lemma 2.19. *Let (\mathcal{X}, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type. Let $0 < q \leq p < \infty$ and $Y(\mathcal{X})$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space such that $Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(\mathcal{X})$ satisfies Assumption I. Then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $R \in (1, \infty)$ and $f \in Y(\mathcal{X})/\mathbb{R}$,*

$$\sup_{s \in (0,1)} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{[B(\cdot, R)]^c} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} \leq C \|\mathcal{M}\|_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(\mathcal{X})]^\rightarrow [Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(\mathcal{X})]^\rightarrow}^{\frac{2}{p}} \|f\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})/\mathbb{R}}. \quad (2.3)$$

To prove Lemma 2.19, we need the following lemma, which is a special case of Lemma 2.19 with $Y(\mathcal{X}) = L_\omega^p(\mathcal{X})$.

Lemma 2.20. *Let (\mathcal{X}, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type. Let $0 < q \leq p < \infty$ and $\omega \in A_1(\mathcal{X})$. Then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $R \in (1, \infty)$ and $f \in L_\omega^p(\mathcal{X})$,*

$$\sup_{s \in (0,1)} s^{\frac{p}{q}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ \int_{[B(x, R)]^c} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^q}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{p}{q}} \omega(x) d\mu(x) \leq C [\omega]_{A_1(\mathcal{X})}^2 \|f\|_{L_\omega^p(\mathcal{X})}^p. \quad (2.4)$$

To show Lemma 2.20, we need the following useful lemma, which also plays an important role in the proof of the lower estimate in Theorem 1.5.

Lemma 2.21. *Let (\mathcal{X}, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type, $0 < q \leq p < \infty$, and $\omega \in A_1(\mathcal{X})$. Then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $s \in (0, 1)$, $R \in (0, \infty)$, and $f \in L_\omega^p(\mathcal{X})$,*

$$s^{\frac{p}{q}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ \int_{[B(x, R)]^c} \frac{|f(y)|^q}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{p}{q}} \omega(x) d\mu(x) \leq C \left[\frac{s 2^{sq}}{R^{sq}(2^{sq} - 1)} \right]^{\frac{p}{q}} [\omega]_{A_1(\mathcal{X})}^2 \|f\|_{L_\omega^p(\mathcal{X})}^p.$$

Proof. Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $R \in (0, \infty)$, and $f \in L_\omega^p(\mathcal{X})$. By (2.1), both (ii) and (iv) of Lemma 2.16, Hölder's inequality, and Fubini's theorem, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ \int_{[B(x, R)]^c} \frac{|f(y)|^q}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{p}{q}} \omega(x) d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{B(x, 2^{j+1}R) \setminus B(x, 2^j R)} \frac{|f(y)|^q}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{p}{q}} \omega(x) d\mu(x) \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(2^j R)^{-sq}}{\mu(B(x, 2^{j+1}R))} \int_{B(x, 2^{j+1}R)} |f(y)|^q d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{p}{q}} \omega(x) d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (2^j R)^{-sq} \left[\frac{[\omega]_{A_{p/q}(\mathcal{X})}}{\omega(B(x, 2^{j+1}R))} \int_{B(x, 2^{j+1}R)} |f(y)|^p \omega(y) d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{q}{p}} \right\}^{\frac{p}{q}} \omega(x) d\mu(x) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq [\omega]_{A_1(X)} \int_X \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (2^j R)^{-sq} \right. \\
&\quad \times \left. \left[\frac{1}{\omega(B(x, 2^{j+1}R))} \int_{B(x, 2^{j+1}R)} |f(y)|^p \omega(y) d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{q}{p}} \right\}^{\frac{p}{q}} \omega(x) d\mu(x) \\
&\leq [\omega]_{A_1(X)} \int_X \left\{ \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (2^j R)^{-sq} \right]^{\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)'} \right. \\
&\quad \times \left. \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(2^j R)^{-sq}}{\omega(B(x, 2^{j+1}R))} \int_{B(x, 2^{j+1}R)} |f(y)|^p \omega(y) d\mu(y) \right]^{\frac{q}{p}} \right\}^{\frac{p}{q}} \omega(x) d\mu(x) \\
&= [\omega]_{A_1(X)} \left[\frac{2^{sq}}{R^{sq}(2^{sq} - 1)} \right]^{\frac{p}{q}-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (2^j R)^{-sq} \\
&\quad \times \int_X \left[\frac{1}{\omega(B(x, 2^{j+1}R))} \int_{B(x, 2^{j+1}R)} |f(y)|^p \omega(y) d\mu(y) \right] \omega(x) d\mu(x) \\
&= [\omega]_{A_1(X)} \left[\frac{2^{sq}}{R^{sq}(2^{sq} - 1)} \right]^{\frac{p}{q}-1} \\
&\quad \times \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (2^j R)^{-sq} \int_X \left[\int_{B(y, 2^{j+1}R)} \frac{\omega(x)}{\omega(B(x, 2^{j+1}R))} d\mu(x) \right] |f(y)|^p \omega(y) d\mu(y). \tag{2.5}
\end{aligned}$$

From Definition 2.1(iii), we infer that, for any $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $y \in X$, and $x \in B(y, 2^{j+1}R)$,

$$B(y, 2^{j+1}R) \subset B(x, K_0 2^{j+2}R),$$

which, combined with Lemma 2.16(iii) and (2.2), further implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega(B(y, 2^{j+1}R)) &\leq \omega(B(x, K_0 2^{j+2}R)) \leq [\omega]_{A_1(X)} \frac{\mu(B(x, K_0 2^{j+2}R))}{\mu(B(x, 2^{j+1}R))} \omega(B(x, 2^{j+1}R)) \\
&\lesssim [\omega]_{A_1(X)} \omega(B(x, 2^{j+1}R)).
\end{aligned}$$

By this and (2.5), we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
&s^{\frac{p}{q}} \int_X \left\{ \int_{[B(x, R)]^c} \frac{|f(y)|^q}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{p}{q}} \omega(x) d\mu(x) \\
&\lesssim [\omega]_{A_1(X)}^2 \left[\frac{s 2^{sq}}{R^{sq}(2^{sq} - 1)} \right]^{\frac{p}{q}-1} \\
&\quad \times s \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (2^j R)^{-sq} \int_X \left[\int_{B(y, 2^{j+1}R)} \frac{\omega(x)}{\omega(B(y, 2^{j+1}R))} d\mu(x) \right] |f(y)|^p \omega(y) d\mu(y) \\
&= [\omega]_{A_1(X)}^2 \left[\frac{s 2^{sq}}{R^{sq}(2^{sq} - 1)} \right]^{\frac{p}{q}} \|f\|_{L_\omega^p(X)}^p,
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 2.21. □

Now, we use Lemma 2.21 to prove Lemma 2.20.

Proof of Lemma 2.20. Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $R \in (1, \infty)$, and $f \in L_\omega^p(X)$. Then we have

$$s^{\frac{p}{q}} \int_X \left\{ \int_{[B(x, R)]^c} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^q}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{p}{q}} \omega(x) d\mu(x)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim s^{\frac{p}{q}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ \int_{[B(x,R)]^c} \frac{1}{U(x,y)[\rho(x,y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{p}{q}} |f(x)|^p \omega(x) d\mu(x) \\
&\quad + s^{\frac{p}{q}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ \int_{[B(x,R)]^c} \frac{|f(y)|^q}{U(x,y)[\rho(x,y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{p}{q}} \omega(x) d\mu(x) \\
&=: I_1(s) + I_2(s).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

To estimate $I_1(s)$, from (2.1), we deduce that, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{[B(x,R)]^c} \frac{1}{U(x,y)[\rho(x,y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{B(x,2^{j+1}R) \setminus B(x,2^jR)} \frac{1}{U(x,y)[\rho(x,y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \\
&\lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (2^jR)^{-sq} \int_{B(x,2^{j+1}R) \setminus B(x,2^jR)} \frac{1}{\mu(B(x,2^jR))} d\mu(y) \lesssim \frac{2^{sq}}{R^{sq}(2^{sq}-1)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

By this and Lemma 2.16(i), we conclude that, for any $s \in (0, 1)$,

$$I_1(s) \lesssim \left[\frac{s2^{sq}}{R^{sq}(2^{sq}-1)} \right]^{\frac{p}{q}} [\omega]_{A_1(\mathcal{X})}^2 \|f\|_{L_{\omega}^p(\mathcal{X})}^p. \tag{2.8}$$

Observe that

$$\sup_{s \in (0,1)} \frac{s2^{sq}}{R^{sq}(2^{sq}-1)} < \infty. \tag{2.9}$$

From this, (2.6), (2.8), Lemma 2.21, and $R \in (1, \infty)$, we infer that (2.4) holds, which then completes the proof of Lemma 2.20. \square

To show Lemma 2.19, we also need two technical lemmas. By a slight modification of the proof of [39, Lemmas 4.6 and 4.7] with \mathbb{R}^n therein replaced by \mathcal{X} , we obtain the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.22. *Let (\mathcal{X}, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type. Let $Y(\mathcal{X}) \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})$ be a linear normed space, equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})}$ which makes sense for all functions in $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})$. Assume that the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \mathcal{M} is bounded on $Y(\mathcal{X})$ with its operator norm denoted by $\|\mathcal{M}\|_{Y(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow Y(\mathcal{X})}$. For any $g \in Y(\mathcal{X})$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, let*

$$R_{Y(\mathcal{X})}g(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathcal{M}^k g(x)}{2^k \|\mathcal{M}\|_{Y(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow Y(\mathcal{X})}^k},$$

where, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{M}^k is the k -fold iteration of \mathcal{M} and $\mathcal{M}^0 g := |g|$. Then, for any $g \in Y(\mathcal{X})$, the following assertions hold:

- (i) for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $|g(x)| \leq R_{Y(\mathcal{X})}g(x)$,
- (ii) $R_{Y(\mathcal{X})}g \in A_1(\mathcal{X})$ and $[R_{Y(\mathcal{X})}g]_{A_1(\mathcal{X})} \leq 2\|\mathcal{M}\|_{Y(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow Y(\mathcal{X})}$,
- (iii) $\|R_{Y(\mathcal{X})}g\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} \leq 2\|g\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})}$.

Lemma 2.23. *Let (\mathcal{X}, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type. Let $p \in (0, \infty)$ and $Y(\mathcal{X})$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space such that $Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(\mathcal{X})$ satisfies Assumption I. Then, for any $f \in Y(\mathcal{X})$,*

$$\|f\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} \leq \sup_{\|g\|_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(\mathcal{X})]'} \leq 1} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} |f(x)|^p R_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(\mathcal{X})]'} g(x) d\mu(x) \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq 2^{\frac{1}{p}} \|f\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})}.$$

Next, we are ready to prove Lemma 2.19.

Proof of Lemma 2.19. Let $f \in Y(X)/\mathbb{R}$. Then, from Proposition 2.11, we deduce that there exists a constant $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f + a \in Y(X)$ and $\|f + a\|_{Y(X)} = \|f\|_{Y(X)/\mathbb{R}}$. Notice that (2.3) still holds if we replace f by $f + C$ for any $C \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, without loss of generality, we may assume that $a = 0$. In this case, we have $f \in Y(X)$ and

$$\|f\|_{Y(X)} = \|f\|_{Y(X)/\mathbb{R}}. \quad (2.10)$$

By this and Lemma 2.23, we find that, for any $s \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left\{ \int_{B(\cdot, R)\mathbb{C}} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)}^p \\ & \leq \sup_{\|g\|_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'} \leq 1} \int_X \left\{ \int_{[B(x, R)]\mathbb{C}} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^q}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{p}{q}} R_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'} g(x) d\mu(x). \end{aligned}$$

From this, Lemma 2.20 with ω therein replaced by $R_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'} g$, Lemmas 2.22(ii) and 2.23, and (2.10), we infer that, for any $s \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & s^{\frac{p}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{B(\cdot, R)\mathbb{C}} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)}^p \\ & \lesssim \sup_{\|g\|_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'} \leq 1} [R_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'} g]_{A_1(X)}^2 \int_X |f(x)|^p R_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'} g(x) d\mu(x) \\ & \lesssim \|\mathcal{M}\|_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]' \rightarrow [Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'}^2 \|f\|_{Y(X)}^p = \|\mathcal{M}\|_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]' \rightarrow [Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'}^2 \|f\|_{Y(X)/\mathbb{R}}^p. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 2.19. \square

Now, we use Lemma 2.19 to show Theorem 2.17.

Proof of Theorem 2.17. By the quasi-triangle inequality of $\|\cdot\|_{Y(X)}$ and Lemmas 2.18 and 2.19, we conclude that, for any $R \in (1, \infty)$ and $f \in [Y(X)/\mathbb{R}] \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0, 1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s, q}(X)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_X \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\ & \lesssim \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{B(\cdot, R)} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\ & \quad + \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{[B(\cdot, R)]\mathbb{C}} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\ & \leq \sup_{s \in (0, 1)} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{[B(\cdot, R)]\mathbb{C}} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\ & \lesssim \|\mathcal{M}\|_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]' \rightarrow [Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'}^{\frac{2}{p}} \|f\|_{Y(X)/\mathbb{R}}. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of Theorem 2.17. \square

2.2 Proof of Theorem 1.5: Lower Estimate

The target of this subsection is to establish the lower estimate in (1.5). The main result of this subsection reads as follows.

Theorem 2.24. *Let (X, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type satisfying the WRD condition. Let $0 < q \leq p < \infty$ and $Y(X)$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space such that $Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)$ satisfies Assumption I. Then there exists a positive constant C such that the following statements hold.*

(i) *Let $\beta \in (0, \infty)$. Then, for any $f \in C_b^\beta(X)$,*

$$C\|f\|_{Y(X)} \leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_X \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)}.$$

(ii) *If $Y(X)$ has an absolutely continuous quasi-norm and μ is Borel-semiregular, then, for any $f \in Y(X)/\mathbb{R}$,*

$$C\|f\|_{Y(X)/\mathbb{R}} \leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_X \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)}. \quad (2.11)$$

To prove Theorem 2.24, we need the following three technical lemmas.

Lemma 2.25. *Let (X, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type. Let $0 < q \leq p < \infty$ and $Y(X)$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space such that $Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)$ satisfies Assumption I. Fix $x_0 \in X$. Then the following assertions hold.*

(i) *Let $\beta \in (0, \infty)$. Then, for any $f \in C_b^\beta(X)$,*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} = 0. \quad (2.12)$$

(ii) *If $Y(X)$ has an absolutely continuous quasi-norm, then, for any $f \in Y(X)/\mathbb{R}$, there exists a constant $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(y) + a|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} = 0. \quad (2.13)$$

Proof. We first show (i). Since $f \in C_b^\beta(X)$, it follows that there exists $M \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\text{supp } f \subset B(x_0, M)$, which further implies that, for any given $s \in (0, M^{-q})$ and for any $x \in X$,

$$\int_{[B(x, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(y)|^q}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) = 0$$

and hence

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} = 0,$$

which completes the proof of (2.12) and hence (i).

Next, we prove (ii). Let $s \in (0, 1)$ and $f \in Y(X)/\mathbb{R}$. Then there exists a constant $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f + a \in Y(X)$. By Lemma 2.23, we find that

$$\left\| \left\{ \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(y) + a|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)}^p$$

$$\leq \sup_{\|g\|_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'} \leq 1} \int_X \left\{ \int_{[B(x, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(y) + a|^q \mathbf{1}_{[B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c}(y)}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{p}{q}} R_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'} g(x) d\mu(x),$$

which, combined with Lemma 2.21, the fact that $\sup_{s \in (0,1)} \frac{s^{1+s} 2^{sq}}{K_0^{sq}(2^{sq}-1)} < \infty$, and Lemmas 2.22(ii) and 2.23, further yields

$$\begin{aligned} & s^{\frac{p}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(y) + a|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)}^p \\ & \lesssim \left[\frac{s^{1+s} 2^{sq}}{K_0^{sq}(2^{sq}-1)} \right]^{\frac{p}{q}} \sup_{\|g\|_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'} \leq 1} [R_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'} g]_{A_1(X)}^2 \\ & \quad \times \int_X |f(x) + a|^p \mathbf{1}_{[B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c}(x) R_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'} g(x) d\mu(x) \\ & \lesssim \|\mathcal{M}\|_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]' \rightarrow [Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)]'}^2 \left\| (f+a) \mathbf{1}_{[B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \right\|_{Y(X)}^p. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

This, together with $f+a \in Y(X)$, the fact that $\mathbf{1}_{[B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \rightarrow 0$ as $s \rightarrow 0^+$, and the assumption that $Y(X)$ has an absolutely continuous quasi-norm, further implies that (2.13) holds, which completes the proof of (ii) and hence Lemma 2.25. \square

We also need the following key lower estimate on spaces of homogeneous type by taking advantage of the WRD condition satisfied by the measure.

Lemma 2.26. *Let $q \in (0, \infty)$ and (X, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type satisfying the WRD condition. Then there exists $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $x \in X$,*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s \int_{[B(x, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{1}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \geq C.$$

To show Lemma 2.26, we need the following equivalent characterization of the WRD condition.

Proposition 2.27. *Let (X, ρ, μ) be a quasi-metric measure space. Then (X, ρ, μ) satisfies the WRD condition if and only if there exist $x_0 \in X$, $\lambda, \widetilde{C}_{(\mu)} \in (1, \infty)$, and $r_{x_0} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $r \in (r_{x_0}, \infty)$, $\mu(B(x_0, \lambda r)) \geq \widetilde{C}_{(\mu)} \mu(B(x_0, r))$.*

Proof. We first prove the sufficiency. Assume that there exist $x_0 \in X$, $\lambda, \widetilde{C}_{(\mu)} \in (1, \infty)$, and $r_{x_0} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $\widetilde{r} \in (r_{x_0}, \infty)$, $\mu(B(x_0, \lambda \widetilde{r})) \geq \widetilde{C}_{(\mu)} \mu(B(x_0, \widetilde{r}))$. From this, we deduce that, for any $\widetilde{r} \in (r_{x_0}, \infty)$,

$$\inf_{r > \widetilde{r}} \frac{\mu(B(x_0, \lambda r))}{\mu(B(x_0, r))} \geq \widetilde{C}_{(\mu)}.$$

Letting $\widetilde{r} \rightarrow \infty$, we then conclude that (X, ρ, μ) satisfies the WRD condition. This finishes the proof of the sufficiency.

Now, we show the necessity. Assume that (X, ρ, μ) satisfies the WRD condition. Then there exist $x_0 \in X$ and $\lambda, C_{(\mu)} \in (1, \infty)$ such that (1.3) holds. Let $\epsilon_0 \in (0, C_{(\mu)} - 1)$. Then (1.3) implies that

$$\sup_{r_0 \in (0, \infty)} \inf_{r > r_0} \frac{\mu(B(x_0, \lambda r))}{\mu(B(x_0, r))} > C_{(\mu)} - \epsilon_0.$$

By this, we conclude that exists $r_{x_0} \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\inf_{r > r_{x_0}} \frac{\mu(B(x_0, \lambda r))}{\mu(B(x_0, r))} > C_{(\mu)} - \epsilon_0.$$

Using this and letting $\widetilde{C}_{(\mu)} := C_{(\mu)} - \epsilon_0$ then complete the proof of the necessity and hence Proposition 2.27. \square

Using Proposition 2.27, we obtain the following equivalent formulation of the WRD condition.

Proposition 2.28. *Let (X, ρ, μ) be a quasi-metric measure space. Then (X, ρ, μ) satisfies the WRD condition if and only if there exist $\lambda, C_{(\mu)} \in (1, \infty)$ such that, for any $x \in X$,*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu(B(x, \lambda r))}{\mu(B(x, r))} \geq C_{(\mu)}.$$

Proof. We only prove the necessity because the sufficiency is obvious. Assume that (X, ρ, μ) satisfies the WRD condition. Then, from Proposition 2.27, we infer that there exist $x_0 \in X$, $\lambda, C_{(\mu)} \in (1, \infty)$, and $r_{x_0} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $r \in (r_{x_0}, \infty)$,

$$\mu(B(x_0, \lambda r)) \geq C_{(\mu)} \mu(B(x_0, r)). \quad (2.15)$$

Let $x \in X$ and $r_x := 2K_0 \max\{r_{x_0}, \rho(x, x_0)\}$. Then, by Definition 2.1(iii), we are easy to show that, for any $r \in (r_x, \infty)$,

$$B(x_0, \lambda r) \subset B(x, K_0[\lambda r + \rho(x, x_0)]) \subset B(x, 2K_0 \lambda r)$$

and

$$B(x_0, r) \supset B\left(x, \frac{r}{K_0} - \rho(x, x_0)\right) \supset B\left(x, \frac{r}{2K_0}\right),$$

which, combined with (2.15), further implies that

$$\frac{\mu(B(x, 2K_0 \lambda r))}{\mu(B(x, \frac{r}{2K_0}))} \geq \frac{\mu(B(x_0, \lambda r))}{\mu(B(x_0, r))} \geq C_{(\mu)}.$$

This, together with Proposition 2.27, then finishes the proof of Proposition 2.28. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.26. From Proposition 2.27 and the assumption that (X, ρ, μ) satisfies the WRD condition, we deduce that there exist $x_0 \in X$, $\lambda, \tilde{C}_{(\mu)} \in (1, \infty)$, and $r_{x_0} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $r \in (r_{x_0}, \infty)$,

$$\mu(B(x_0, \lambda r)) \geq \tilde{C}_{(\mu)} \mu(B(x_0, r)). \quad (2.16)$$

Let $x \in X$. By Definition 2.1(iii), we find that, for any given $s \in (0, \infty)$ and for any $y \in B(x, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})$,

$$\rho(x_0, y) \leq K_0 [\rho(x_0, x) + \rho(x, y)] \leq K_0 \left[\rho(x_0, x) + s^{-\frac{1}{q}} \right]$$

and hence

$$B\left(x, s^{-\frac{1}{q}}\right) \subset B\left(x_0, K_0 \left[\rho(x_0, x) + s^{-\frac{1}{q}} \right]\right). \quad (2.17)$$

Let $s_0 \in (0, \infty)$ be such that

$$2K_0 s_0^{-\frac{1}{q}} \geq K_0 \left[\rho(x_0, x) + s_0^{-\frac{1}{q}} \right] > r_{x_0}.$$

From this, (2.17), and (2.16), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s \int_{[B(x, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{1}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \\ & \geq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s \int_{[B(x_0, K_0[\rho(x_0, x) + s^{-\frac{1}{q}}])]^c} \frac{1}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \lim_{\substack{s \in (0, s_0) \\ s \rightarrow 0}} s \int_{[B(x_0, 2K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{1}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \\
&= \lim_{\substack{s \in (0, s_0) \\ s \rightarrow 0}} s \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{B(x_0, \lambda^{j+1} 2K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}}) \setminus B(x_0, \lambda^j 2K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})} \frac{1}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \\
&\gtrsim \lim_{\substack{s \in (0, s_0) \\ s \rightarrow 0}} s \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\lambda^{j+1} 2K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}} \right)^{-sq} \frac{\mu(B(x_0, \lambda^{j+1} 2K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})) - \mu(B(x_0, \lambda^j 2K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}}))}{\mu(B(x_0, \lambda^{j+1} 2K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}}))} \\
&\geq \frac{\widetilde{C}(\mu) - 1}{\widetilde{C}(\mu)} \lim_{\substack{s \in (0, s_0) \\ s \rightarrow 0}} (2K_0 \lambda)^{-sq} \frac{s^{s+1}}{1 - \lambda^{-sq}} = \frac{\widetilde{C}(\mu) - 1}{\widetilde{C}(\mu)} \frac{1}{q \ln \lambda}.
\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 2.26. \square

The following Fatou's lemma on ball quasi-Banach function spaces is exactly [121, Lemma 2.9]; see also [117, Lemma 2.4] for the case $X = \mathbb{R}^n$.

Lemma 2.29. *Let (X, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type and $Y(X)$ a ball quasi-Banach function space. Then, for any sequences $\{f_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $Y(X)$,*

$$\left\| \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} |f_m| \right\|_{Y(X)} \leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|f_m\|_{Y(X)}.$$

Next, we are ready to prove Theorem 2.24.

Proof of Theorem 2.24. We first show (i). Fix $x_0 \in X$ and let $s \in (0, 1)$ and $x \in X$. By Definition 2.1(iii), we easily find that

$$B\left(x, K_0 \rho(x, x_0) + K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}}\right) \supset \left[B\left(x, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}}\right) \cup B\left(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}}\right) \right].$$

From this, Definition 2.5(ii), and the quasi-triangle inequality of $\|\cdot\|_{Y(X)}$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \left\{ s \int_{B(\cdot, K_0 \rho(\cdot, x_0) + K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(\cdot)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\
&\leq \left\| \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(\cdot)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\
&\lesssim \left\| \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\
&\quad + \left\| \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\
&\leq \left\| \left\{ s \int_X \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\
&\quad + \left\| \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using this, Lemma 2.26, Definition 2.5(ii), Lemma 2.29, and Lemma 2.25(i), we conclude that

$$\|f\|_{Y(X)} \lesssim \left\| \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, 2K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(\cdot)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left\| \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 \rho(\cdot, x_0) + K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(\cdot)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\
&\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \left\| \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 \rho(\cdot, x_0) + K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(\cdot)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\
&\lesssim \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \left\| \left\{ s \int_X \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\
&\quad + \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \left\| \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\
&= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \left\| \left\{ s \int_X \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)},
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of (i).

Now, we prove (ii). Let $f \in Y(X)/\mathbb{R}$. Then there exists a constant $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f + a \in Y(X)$. From this and an argument similar to that used in the proof of (i), we infer that, to show (2.11), it is sufficient to prove

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \left\| \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(y) + a|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} = 0. \quad (2.18)$$

By the assumption that $Y(X)$ has an absolutely continuous quasi-norm and Lemma 2.25(ii), we find that (2.18) holds and hence complete the proof of (ii). This finishes the proof of Theorem 2.24. \square

Next, we use Theorems 2.17 and 2.24 to show Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. On the one hand, from Theorems 2.17 and 2.24(i), it follows that Theorem 1.5(i) holds. On the other hand, assume that $Y(X)$ has an absolutely continuous quasi-norm. Then, using Theorems 2.17 and 2.24(ii), we obtain Theorem 1.5(ii) holds, which completes the proof of Theorem 1.5. \square

2.3 Proof of Theorem 1.7

The aim of this subsection is to prove Theorem 1.7. We need two technical lemmas. The following lemma is precisely [114, Lemma 2.29].

Lemma 2.30. *Let (X, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type. Let $p \in (0, \infty)$, $\beta \in (0, \infty)$, and $Y(X)$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space such that $Y^{\frac{1}{p}}(X)$ satisfies Assumption II. Assume that g is a non-negative operator on $\mathcal{M}(X)$ and there exist positive constants C and r such that, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in C_b^\beta(X)$,*

$$\left\| [g(f)]^{\frac{1}{\theta_m}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \leq C \|\mathcal{M}\|_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p\theta_m}}(X)]' \rightarrow [Y^{\frac{1}{p\theta_m}}(X)]'}^{\frac{r}{\theta_m}} \left\| |f|^{\frac{1}{\theta_m}} \right\|_{Y(X)},$$

where $\{\theta_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the same as in Assumption II. Then there exists a positive constant \tilde{C} such that, for any $f \in C_b^\beta(X)$, $\|g(f)\|_{Y(X)} \leq \tilde{C} \|f\|_{Y(X)}$.

Recall that the lower smoothness index $\text{ind}(X, \rho)$, introduced by Mitrea et al. [81, Definition 4.26], of a quasi-metric space (X, ρ) is defined by setting

$$\text{ind}(X, \rho) := \sup_{\varrho \sim \rho} (\log_2 C_\varrho)^{-1}, \quad (2.19)$$

where the supremum is taken over all quasi-metrics ϱ on $X \times X$ which are equivalent to ρ and, for any given quasi-metric ϱ defined on $X \times X$,

$$C_\varrho := \sup_{\substack{x,y,z \in X \\ \text{not all equal}}} \frac{\varrho(x,y)}{\max\{\varrho(x,z), \varrho(z,y)\}}.$$

Throughout this article, $0 < \beta \leq \text{ind}(X, \rho)$ means that $\beta \in (0, \infty)$ and $\beta \leq \text{ind}(X, \rho)$, where the equality $\beta = \text{ind}(X, \rho)$ is only permissible when the supremum in (2.19) is attained.

The following lemma is exactly [114, Lemma 2.27].

Lemma 2.31. *Let (X, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type with μ being a Borel-semiregular measure. Assume that $Y(X)$ is a ball quasi-Banach function space having an absolutely continuous quasi-norm. Then, for any $0 < \beta \leq \text{ind}(X, \rho)$, $C_b^\beta(X)$ is dense in $Y(X)$.*

Now, we are ready to show Theorem 1.7.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. We first prove (i). Fix $R \in (1, \infty)$. From the proof of Theorem 1.5, we deduce that, to show (1.5), it suffices to prove that, for any $f \in C_b^\beta(X)$,

$$\sup_{s \in (0,1)} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{[B(\cdot, R)]^c} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \lesssim \|f\|_{Y(X)} \quad (2.20)$$

and

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})^c \cap B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})^c} \frac{|f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} = 0. \quad (2.21)$$

Let sequence $\{\theta_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $(0, 1)$ be such that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \theta_m = 1$. By Lemma 2.19 and Assumption II, we conclude that, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sup_{s \in (0,1)} \left\| \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, R)]^c} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y^{\frac{1}{\theta_m}}(X)} \lesssim \|\mathcal{M}\|_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p\theta_m}}(X)]' \rightarrow [Y^{\frac{1}{p\theta_m}}(X)]'}^2 \|f\|_{Y^{\frac{1}{\theta_m}}(X)},$$

which further implies that, for any $s \in (0, 1)$,

$$\left\| \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, R)]^c} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q\theta_m}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \lesssim \|\mathcal{M}\|_{[Y^{\frac{1}{p\theta_m}}(X)]' \rightarrow [Y^{\frac{1}{p\theta_m}}(X)]'}^{\frac{2}{\theta_m}} \|f^{\frac{1}{\theta_m}}\|_{Y(X)}.$$

From this and Lemma 2.30 with $g(f)(\cdot)$ replaced by

$$\left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, R)]^c} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}},$$

we infer that, for any $s \in (0, 1)$,

$$s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{[B(\cdot, R)]^c} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \lesssim \|f\|_{Y(X)},$$

where the implicit positive constant is independent of s . Taking the supremum over all $s \in (0, 1)$, we then obtain (2.20).

Next, we show (2.21). By (2.14) and an argument similar to that used in the proof of (2.20), we find that, for any $s \in (0, 1)$,

$$s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \lesssim \|f \mathbf{1}_{[B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c}\|_{Y(X)}, \quad (2.22)$$

which, combined with $f \in C_b^\beta(\mathcal{X})$ and via letting $s \rightarrow 0^+$, further implies that (2.21) holds and hence completes the proof of (i).

Now, we prove (ii). Let $f \in Y(\mathcal{X})/\mathbb{R}$. From Proposition 2.11, we deduce that there exists a constant $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f + a \in Y(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|f + a\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} = \|f\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})/\mathbb{R}}$. By the proof of Theorem 1.5, we conclude that, to show (1.6), it suffices to prove that

$$\sup_{s \in (0,1)} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{[B(\cdot, R)]^c} \frac{|[f(\cdot) + a] - [f(y) + a]|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f + a\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} \quad (2.23)$$

and

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(y) + a|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} = 0. \quad (2.24)$$

Next, we show (2.23). Let $R \in (1, \infty)$. Fix $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$E_N := B(x_0, N) \times B(x_0, N).$$

From the assumption that $Y(\mathcal{X})$ has an absolutely continuous quasi-norm and Lemma 2.31, it follows that $C_b^\beta(\mathcal{X})$ is dense in $Y(\mathcal{X})$, where the positive constant β is the same as in Lemma 2.31. Thus, there exists a sequence $\{f_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $C_b^\beta(\mathcal{X})$ such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|f - f_k\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} = 0. \quad (2.25)$$

Using the quasi-triangle inequality of $\|\cdot\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})}$, we find that, for any $s \in (0, 1)$ and $N, k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{[B(\cdot, R)]^c} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} \mathbf{1}_{E_N}(\cdot, y) d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} \\ & \lesssim \left\| \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, R)]^c} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f_k(\cdot)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} \mathbf{1}_{E_N}(\cdot, y) d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} \\ & \quad + \left\| \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, R)]^c} \frac{|f_k(\cdot) - f_k(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} \mathbf{1}_{E_N}(\cdot, y) d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} \\ & \quad + \left\| \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, R)]^c} \frac{|f_k(y) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} \mathbf{1}_{E_N}(\cdot, y) d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} \\ & =: I_1(s, N, k) + I_2(s, N, k) + I_3(s, N, k). \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

To estimate $I_1(s, N, k)$, from (2.7) and (2.9), we infer that, for any $s \in (0, 1)$ and $N, k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$I_1(s, N, k) \lesssim \|(f - f_k) \mathbf{1}_{B(x_0, N)}\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})}. \quad (2.27)$$

To estimate $I_2(s, N, k)$, applying (2.20) with f therein replaced by f_k and the quasi-triangle inequality of $\|\cdot\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})}$, we obtain, for any $s \in (0, 1)$ and $N, k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$I_2(s, N, k) \lesssim \|f_k\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} + \|f - f_k\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})}. \quad (2.28)$$

To estimate $I_3(s, N, k)$, from an argument similar to that used in the estimation of (2.14), we deduce that, for any $s \in (0, 1)$ and $N, k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$I_3(s, N, k) \lesssim \|(f - f_k) \mathbf{1}_{B(x_0, N)}\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})}.$$

Applying this, (2.25), (2.26), (2.27), and (2.28) and first letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ and then letting $N \rightarrow \infty$, we find that (2.23) holds for any $f \in Y(\mathcal{X})/\mathbb{R}$.

Now, we prove (2.24). By the quasi-triangle inequality of $\|\cdot\|_{Y(X)}$, we conclude that, for any $s \in (0, 1)$ and $N, k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(y) + a|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} \mathbf{1}_{E_N}(\cdot, y) d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\
& \lesssim \left\| \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f_k(y) + a|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} \mathbf{1}_{E_N}(\cdot, y) d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\
& \quad + \left\| \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(y) - f_k(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} \mathbf{1}_{E_N}(\cdot, y) d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\
& =: J_1(s, N, k) + J_2(s, N, k).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

To deal with $J_1(s, N, K)$, from (2.22) and the quasi-triangle inequality of $\|\cdot\|_{Y(X)}$, it follows that, for any $s \in (0, 1)$ and $N, k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1(s, N, k) & \lesssim \left\| (f_k + a) \mathbf{1}_{[B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{p}})]^c} \right\|_{Y(X)} \\
& \lesssim \left\| (f + a) \mathbf{1}_{[B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{p}})]^c} \right\|_{Y(X)} + \left\| (f - f_k) \mathbf{1}_{[B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{p}})]^c} \right\|_{Y(X)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

To deal with $J_2(s, N, k)$, by an argument similar to that used in the estimation of (2.14), we obtain, for any $s \in (0, 1)$ and $N, k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$J_2(s, N, k) \lesssim \|(f - f_k) \mathbf{1}_{B(x_0, N)}\|_{Y(X)}.$$

From this, (2.25), (2.29), (2.30), and the assumption that $Y(X)$ has an absolutely continuous quasi-norm and first letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ and then letting $N \rightarrow \infty$, we infer that (2.24) holds for any $f \in Y(X)/\mathbb{R}$. This, together with (2.23), finishes the proof of Theorem 1.7. \square

2.4 Failure of Maz'ya-Shaposhnikova Representation on Some Spaces of Homogeneous Type

In this section, we give an example which shows that the conclusion of Theorem 1.5 fails on some special spaces of homogeneous type. This indicates that the weak reverse doubling assumption on the measure under consideration in Theorem 1.5 is necessary in some sense. To this end, we first give such an example of underlying spaces under consideration.

Proposition 2.32. *Let $X := \{2^{2^k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\rho(x, y) := |x - y|$ for any $x, y \in X$, and $\mu(\{2^{2^k}\}) = 2^k$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then (X, ρ, μ) is a space of homogeneous type.*

Proof. Let $x \in X$ be an arbitrary point and $r \in (0, \infty)$. Then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x = 2^{2^k}$. Next, we consider the following two cases for r .

Case (1) $r \in (0, 2^{2^{k+1}} - 2^{2^k}]$. In this case,

$$\frac{\mu(B(2^{2^k}, 2r))}{\mu(B(2^{2^k}, r))} \leq \frac{1}{\mu(\{2^{2^k}\})} \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \mu(\{2^{2^j}\}) = \frac{2^{k+2} - 2}{2^k} \leq 4.$$

Case (2) $r \in (2^{2^{i+1}} - 2^{2^k}, 2^{2^{i+2}} - 2^{2^k}]$ with $i \in \mathbb{N} \cap [k, \infty)$. In this case,

$$\frac{\mu(B(2^{2^k}, 2r))}{\mu(B(2^{2^k}, r))} \leq \frac{1}{\mu(\{2^{2^{i+1}}\})} \sum_{j=1}^{i+2} \mu(\{2^{2^j}\}) = \frac{2^{i+3} - 2}{2^{i+1}} \leq 4.$$

Combining the above two cases, we conclude that, for any $r \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\frac{\mu(B(x, 2r))}{\mu(B(x, r))} \leq 4,$$

which, together with the arbitrariness of $x \in X$, further implies that (X, ρ, μ) is a space of homogeneous type. This finishes the proof of Proposition 2.32. \square

The following proposition indicates that (X, ρ, μ) in Proposition 2.32 does not satisfy the WRD condition.

Proposition 2.33. *Let (X, ρ, μ) be the same as in Proposition 2.32. Then (X, ρ, μ) does not satisfy the WRD condition.*

Proof. To prove that (X, ρ, μ) does not satisfy the WRD condition, it suffices to show that, for any given $x \in X$ and $\lambda \in (1, \infty)$, there exists a sequence $\{r_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $(0, \infty)$ satisfying that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} r_j = \infty$ such that, for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mu(B(x, \lambda r_j)) = \mu(B(x, r_j))$, by observing that this implies

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu(B(x, \lambda r))}{\mu(B(x, r))} = 1.$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $x = 2^{2^k}$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Choose $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^{2^{k+j_0}} > 2\lambda$. For any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let $r_j := 2^{2^{k+j_0+j}} - 2^{2^k}$. Then, for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $2^{2^{k+j_0+j}} < x + r_j < x + \lambda r_j < 2^{2^{k+j_0+j+1}}$ and hence

$$\mu(B(x, r_j)) \geq \mu\left(\left\{2^{2^i}\right\}_{i=1}^{k+j_0+j}\right) \geq \mu(B(x, \lambda r_j)) \geq \mu(B(x, r_j)).$$

Thus, the desired conclusion holds and therefore (X, ρ, μ) does not satisfy the WRD condition. This finishes the proof of Proposition 2.33. \square

The following proposition proves that the Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova representation (1.5) fails on (X, ρ, μ) as in Proposition 2.32.

Proposition 2.34. *Let (X, ρ, μ) be the same as in Proposition 2.32. Then there exists a function $f \in L^2(X) \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_{L^2}^{s,1}(X)$ such that $\|f\|_{L^2(X)} \in (0, \infty)$ and*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^2 \int_X \left\{ \int_X \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^s} d\mu(y) \right\}^2 d\mu(x) = 0. \quad (2.31)$$

Consequently, Theorem 1.5(ii) with both $q = 1$ and $Y = L^2$ fails in this setting.

Proof. Let

$$f(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = 4, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in X \setminus \{4\}. \end{cases}$$

Then $\|f\|_{L^2(X)} = 2^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and, for any given $s \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{\dot{W}_{L^2}^{s,1}(X)}^2 &= \int_X \left\{ \int_X \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^s} d\mu(y) \right\}^2 d\mu(x) \\ &= 2 \left[\sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \frac{2^j}{(2^j - 2)(2^{2^j} - 4)^s} \right]^2 + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} 2^j \left[\frac{2}{(2^j - 2)(2^{2^j} - 4)^s} \right]^2 \\ &\sim \left(\sum_{j=2}^{\infty} 2^{-s2^j} \right)^2 + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} 2^{-j-s2^{(j+1)}} < \infty \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

and hence $f \in \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_{L^2}^{s,1}(\mathcal{X})$.

We turn to show (2.31). By the estimation of (2.32), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^2 \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^s} d\mu(y) \right\}^2 d\mu(x) \\ & \sim \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^2 \left[\left(\sum_{j=2}^{\infty} 2^{-s2^j} \right)^2 + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} 2^{-j-s2^{(j+1)}} \right] \\ & \leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \left[\left(s \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} 2^{-s2^j} \right)^2 + 2^{-1}s^2 \right] = \left(\overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} 2^{-s2^j} \right)^2 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and hence (2.31) holds. This finishes the proof of Proposition 2.34. \square

Remark 2.35. From Propositions 2.32, 2.33, and 2.34, we deduce that the space of homogeneous type (\mathcal{X}, ρ, μ) in Propositions 2.32 does not satisfy the WRD condition, on which the Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova representation (1.5) fails. In this sense, the WRD condition in Theorems 1.5 and 1.7 is necessary.

3 Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova Representation on Domains Satisfying the WMD Condition

In this section, we establish the Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova representation of quasi-norms of ball quasi-Banach function spaces on the open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. In Subsection 3.1, we prove Theorem 1.11. In Subsection 3.2, we show Theorem 1.13. In Subsection 3.3, we prove that the weak measure density assumption on the domain under consideration is necessary in some sense.

Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be an open set and $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ denote the set of all μ -measurable functions on Ω . For any function g defined on \mathcal{X} , denote by $g|_{\Omega}$ the *restriction* of g to Ω . The following concept of the space $Y(\Omega)$ of a ball quasi-Banach function space can be found in [130, Definition 2.6].

Definition 3.1. Let $Y(\mathcal{X})$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space. The space $Y(\Omega)$ is defined to be the restriction of $Y(\mathcal{X})$ to Ω , that is,

$$Y(\Omega) := \{f \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) : f = g|_{\Omega} \text{ for some } g \in Y(\mathcal{X})\};$$

moreover, for any $f \in Y(\Omega)$, let $\|f\|_{Y(\Omega)} := \inf\{\|g\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} : f = g|_{\Omega}, g \in Y(\mathcal{X})\}$.

Remark 3.2. Let $Y(\mathcal{X})$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space and $Y(\Omega)$ its restriction to Ω .

(i) By [130, Proposition 2.7], we conclude that, for any $f \in Y(\Omega)$, $\|f\|_{Y(\Omega)} = \|\widetilde{f}\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})}$, where

$$\widetilde{f}(x) := \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in \Omega, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \Omega^c. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

Then, for any $f \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$, we have $f \in Y(\Omega)$ if and only if $\widetilde{f} \in Y(\mathcal{X})$.

(ii) From [130, Proposition 2.8], we infer that $Y(\Omega)$ satisfies all the conditions of Definition 2.5 with \mathcal{X} therein replaced by Ω .

(iii) By (ii) and (iv) of [130, Proposition 2.8], we find that $C_b^{\beta}(\Omega) \subset Y(\Omega)$ for any $\beta \in (0, \infty)$.

For any given open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, we introduce the concept of homogeneous fractional ball quasi-Banach Sobolev spaces on Ω as follows.

Definition 3.3. Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $q \in (0, \infty)$, $Y(\mathcal{X})$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space, and $Y(\Omega)$ the restriction of $Y(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. The *homogeneous fractional ball quasi-Banach Sobolev space* $\dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(\Omega)$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions f on Ω such that

$$\|f\|_{\dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(\Omega)} := \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} dy \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} < \infty.$$

Remark 3.4. If $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is equipped with the standard Euclidean distance and the Lebesgue measure and $Y = L^q$ with $q \in [1, \infty)$, then $\dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(\Omega)$ is precisely $\dot{W}^{s,q}(\Omega)$ with equivalent quasi-norms, the classical homogeneous fractional Sobolev space on Ω .

We now introduce the quotient space of ball quasi-Banach function spaces on Ω .

Definition 3.5. Let $Y(\mathcal{X})$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space and $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. The *quotient space* $Y(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}$ is defined to be the set of all equivalent classes $[f]$ of measurable functions on Ω such that

$$\|[f]\|_{Y(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} := \inf_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \|f + a\|_{Y(\Omega)} < \infty.$$

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1.11

To show Theorem 1.11, we need two lemmas. The first technical lemma gives a lower estimate related to the domain Ω of the space of homogeneous type \mathcal{X} , with the WMD condition on Ω and the WRD condition on \mathcal{X} being required.

Lemma 3.6. Let $q \in (0, \infty)$, (\mathcal{X}, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type satisfying the WRD condition, and $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ satisfy the WMD condition. Then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $x \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s \int_{\Omega \cap [B(x, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{1}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \geq C.$$

Proof. From the assumption that Ω satisfies the WMD condition, we deduce that there exist $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and two constants $r_{x_0}, C \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $r \in (r_{x_0}, \infty)$,

$$\frac{\mu(B(x_0, r) \cap \Omega)}{\mu(B(x_0, r))} \geq C. \quad (3.2)$$

Let $x \in \Omega$ and $r_x := (2K_0)^2[\rho(x_0, x) + r_{x_0}]$. Then Definition 2.1(iii) implies that, for any $r \in (r_x, \infty)$,

$$B\left(x, \frac{r}{(2K_0)^2}\right) \subset B\left(x_0, \frac{r}{2K_0}\right) \subset B(x, r),$$

which, together with (3.2) and (2.2), implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(B(x, r) \cap \Omega) &\geq \mu\left(B\left(x_0, \frac{r}{2K_0}\right) \cap \Omega\right) \geq C\mu\left(B\left(x_0, \frac{r}{2K_0}\right)\right) \\ &\geq C\mu\left(B\left(x, \frac{r}{(2K_0)^2}\right)\right) \geq \tilde{C}\mu(B(x, r)), \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where $\tilde{C} := \frac{C}{L(\mu)(2K_0)^{2d}}$.

On the other hand, by the assumption that (\mathcal{X}, ρ, μ) satisfies the WRD condition and Propositions 2.27 and 2.28, we conclude that there exist constants $\tilde{r}_x \in (0, \infty)$ and $\lambda, C_{(\mu)} \in (1, \infty)$ such that, for any $r \in (\tilde{r}_x, \infty)$,

$$\mu(B(x, \lambda r)) \geq C_{(\mu)}\mu(B(x, r)),$$

which, further implies that there exist $\Lambda \in (1, \infty)$ and $\widetilde{C}_{(\mu)} \in (\frac{1}{C}, \infty)$ such that

$$\mu(B(x, \Lambda r)) \geq \widetilde{C}_{(\mu)} \mu(B(x, r)), \quad (3.4)$$

Let $R_x := \max\{r_x, \widetilde{r}_x\}$. From this, (3.3), (3.4), and (2.2), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s \int_{\Omega \cap [B(x, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{1}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \\ &= \lim_{\substack{s \in (0, (R_x)^{-q}) \\ s \rightarrow 0}} s \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{\Omega \cap B(x, \Lambda^j s^{-\frac{1}{q}}) \setminus B(x, \Lambda^{j-1} s^{-\frac{1}{q}})} \frac{1}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \\ &\geq \lim_{\substack{s \in (0, (R_x)^{-q}) \\ s \rightarrow 0}} s \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\Lambda^j s^{-\frac{1}{q}})^{-sq} \frac{\mu(\Omega \cap B(x, \Lambda^j s^{-\frac{1}{q}})) - \mu(\Omega \cap B(x, \Lambda^{j-1} s^{-\frac{1}{q}}))}{\mu(B(x, \Lambda^j s^{-\frac{1}{q}}))} \\ &\geq \lim_{\substack{s \in (0, (R_x)^{-q}) \\ s \rightarrow 0}} s^{1+s} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \Lambda^{-sqj} \frac{\widetilde{C} \widetilde{C}_{(\mu)} \mu(B(x, \Lambda^{j-1} s^{-\frac{1}{q}})) - \mu(B(x, \Lambda^{j-1} s^{-\frac{1}{q}}))}{\mu(B(x, \Lambda^j s^{-\frac{1}{q}}))} \\ &\sim \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{s+1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \Lambda^{-sqj} \sim 1. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 3.6. \square

The following Fatou's lemma on $Y(\Omega)$ can be easily deduced from [121, Lemma 2.9] and Remark 3.2(i).

Lemma 3.7. *Let (X, ρ, μ) be a space of homogeneous type, $\Omega \subseteq X$, $Y(X)$ be a ball quasi-Banach function space, and $Y(\Omega)$ the restriction of $Y(X)$ to Ω . Then, for any sequences $\{f_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $Y(\Omega)$,*

$$\left\| \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |f_k| \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|f_k\|_{Y(\Omega)}.$$

Next, we are ready to prove Theorem 1.11.

Proof of Theorem 1.11. To show (i), let $f \in C_b^\beta(\Omega) \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(\Omega)$ and \widetilde{f} be as in (3.1). Then $\widetilde{f} \in C_b^\beta(X)$ and $\|\widetilde{f}\|_{Y(X)} = \|f\|_{Y(\Omega)}$.

We first prove the upper estimate in (i). By the assumption that $f \in \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(\Omega)$ and Definition 3.3 and following the proof of Lemma 2.18, we find that, for any $R \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega \cap B(\cdot, R)} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} = 0. \quad (3.5)$$

On the other hand, from Lemma 2.19 with f therein replaced by \widetilde{f} , we deduce that, for any $R \in (1, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega \setminus B(\cdot, R)} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \sup_{s \in (0,1)} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{X \setminus B(\cdot, R)} \frac{|\widetilde{f}(\cdot) - \widetilde{f}(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \lesssim \|\widetilde{f}\|_{Y(X)} = \|f\|_{Y(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

This, together with (3.5), implies that

$$\overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{Y(\Omega)},$$

which completes the proof of the upper estimate in (i).

Now, we prove the lower estimate in (i). Notice that, for any given $x_0 \in \Omega$ and for any $x \in \Omega$ and $s \in (0, 1)$,

$$B\left(x, K_0\rho(x, x_0) + K_0s^{-\frac{1}{q}}\right) \supset \left[B\left(x, K_0s^{-\frac{1}{q}}\right) \cup B\left(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}}\right)\right],$$

which further implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left\{ s \int_{\Omega \cap [B(\cdot, K_0\rho(\cdot, x_0) + K_0s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(\cdot)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} \\ & \lesssim \left\| \left\{ s \int_{\Omega \cap [B(\cdot, K_0\rho(\cdot, x_0) + K_0s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} \\ & \quad + \left\| \left\{ s \int_{\Omega \cap [B(\cdot, K_0s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} \\ & \leq \left\| \left\{ s \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} \\ & \quad + \left\| \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|\widetilde{f}(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

On the one hand, by Lemmas 3.7 and 3.6, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \left\| \left\{ s \int_{\Omega \cap [B(\cdot, K_0\rho(\cdot, x_0) + K_0s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|f(\cdot)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} \\ & \geq \left\| \left\{ \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s \int_{\Omega \cap [B(\cdot, K_0\rho(\cdot, x_0) + K_0s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{1}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} |f(\cdot)| \right\|_{Y(\Omega)} \gtrsim \|f\|_{Y(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

On the other hand, from Lemma 2.25(i), we infer that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \left\| \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|\widetilde{f}(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} = 0,$$

which, combined with both (3.6) and (3.7), completes the proof of the lower estimate in (i). This finishes the proof of (i).

Next, we show (ii). The proof of the upper estimate in (ii) is actually the same as that in (i). The proof of the lower estimate in (ii) is quite similar to that of (i) with Lemma 2.25(i) replaced by Lemma 2.25(ii) and hence we omit the details, which completes the proof of Theorem 1.11. \square

3.2 Proof of Theorem 1.13

In this subsection, we turn to prove Theorem 1.13.

Proof of Theorem 1.13. We first show (i). Let $f \in C_b^\beta(\Omega) \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(\Omega)$ and \widetilde{f} be as in (3.1). Fix $x_0 \in \Omega$. By the proof of Theorem 1.11(i), we find that it suffices to prove that, for some $R \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\sup_{s \in (0,1)} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{[B(\cdot, R)]^c} \frac{|\widetilde{f}(\cdot) - \widetilde{f}(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(X)} \lesssim \|\widetilde{f}\|_{Y(X)} \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \left\| \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|\widetilde{f}(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} = 0. \quad (3.9)$$

Notice that $\widetilde{f} \in C_b^\beta(\mathcal{X})$. From this, (2.20), and (2.21), it follows that both (3.8) and (3.9) hold. This finishes the proof of (i).

Now, we show (ii). Let $f \in [Y(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}] \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_Y^{s,q}(\Omega)$. Then, by Proposition 2.11, we conclude that there exists $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f + a \in Y(\Omega)$ and $\|f + a\|_{Y(\Omega)} = \|f\|_{Y(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}$. Let $g := \widetilde{f + a}$ be defined as in (3.1) with f therein replaced by $f + a$. Then we are easy to prove that $g \in Y(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|g\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} = \|f + a\|_{Y(\Omega)}$. From the proof of Theorem 1.11(ii), we deduce that it suffices to show that, for some $R \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\sup_{s \in (0,1)} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{[B(\cdot, R)]^c} \frac{|g(\cdot) - g(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|g\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} \quad (3.10)$$

and

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \left\| \left\{ s \int_{[B(\cdot, K_0 s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c \cap [B(x_0, s^{-\frac{1}{q}})]^c} \frac{|g(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{Y(\mathcal{X})} = 0. \quad (3.11)$$

Indeed, by (2.23) and (2.24), we find that both (3.10) and (3.11) hold. This finishes the proof of (ii) and hence Theorem 1.13. \square

3.3 Failure of Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova Representation on Some Domains $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$

In this section, we give an example of a domain that does not satisfy the WMD condition and prove that the conclusion of Theorem 1.11 fails in this setting. This indicates that the assumption that Ω satisfies the WMD condition in Theorem 1.11 is necessary in some sense. We consider the case where the underlying space (\mathcal{X}, ρ, μ) is the Euclidean space \mathbb{R} equipped with the standard Euclidean distance and the Lebesgue measure.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $\Omega := \bigcup_{j=1}^\infty (4^j, 4^j + 2^j)$. Then Ω does not satisfy the WMD condition and there exists $f \in L^1(\Omega) \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}^{s,1}(\Omega)$ such that $\|f\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \in (0, \infty)$ and*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s \int_\Omega \int_\Omega \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{|x - y|^{n+s}} dy dx = 0. \quad (3.12)$$

Consequently, Theorem 1.11 with both $q = 1$ and $Y = L^1$ fails in this setting.

Proof. We first show that Ω does not satisfy the WMD condition. Notice that

$$\frac{|B(0, 4^j + 2^j) \cap \Omega|}{4^j + 2^j} \leq 2^{1-j} \rightarrow 0$$

as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, Ω does not satisfy the WMD condition.

Next, we prove that there exists $f \in L^1(\Omega) \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}^{s,1}(\Omega)$ such that $\|f\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \in (0, \infty)$. Let

$$f(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in (4, 6), \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \Omega \setminus (4, 6). \end{cases}$$

Then $\|f\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = 2$. For any $s \in (0, 1)$,

$$\|f\|_{\dot{W}^{s,1}(\Omega)} = 2 \int_4^6 \sum_{j=2}^\infty \int_{4^j}^{4^j+2^j} (y-x)^{-1-s} dy dx$$

$$\sim \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \int_{4^j}^{4^{j+2^j}} y^{-1-s} dy \sim \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} 2^{-j} 4^{-js} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (3.13)$$

where the positive equivalence constants are independent of s , and hence $f \in \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}^{s,1}(\Omega)$. Moreover, (3.13) further implies that (3.12) holds. This finishes the proof of Proposition 3.8. \square

Remark 3.9. From Proposition 3.8 and Theorem 1.11, we infer that Ω in Proposition 3.8 does not satisfy the WMD condition, on which the Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova representation, namely the conclusion of Theorems 1.11 and 1.13, fails. In this sense, the WMD condition in Theorems 1.11 and 1.13 is necessary.

4 Applications to Specific Ball Quasi-Banach Function Spaces

In this section, we apply the main theorems of this article, namely Theorems 1.5, 1.7, 1.11, and 1.13, to weighted (or variable) Lebesgue spaces, weighted Lorentz spaces, weighted Orlicz spaces, generalized Morrey (or Lorenz–Morrey, Orlicz–Morrey) spaces, and generalized block (or Lorentz-block, Orlicz-block) spaces. Throughout this section, we *always assume* that (X, ρ, μ) is a space of homogeneous type satisfying the WRD condition and $\Omega \subseteq X$ is an open set satisfying the WMD condition.

4.1 Weighted Lebesgue Spaces

Recall that weighted Lebesgue spaces (see Definition 2.15) are quasi-Banach function spaces (see [106, p. 86]), but it may not satisfy the conditions of a Banach function space in [6]. By a slight modification of the proof of [98, Theorem 4.1] with [98, Theorem 2.12] replaced by Theorem 1.11, we obtain the following conclusion and omit the details.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $0 < q \leq p \leq r < \infty$ and $\omega \in A_{\frac{r}{p}}(X)$. Then there exist $C, \tilde{C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $f \in [L_{\omega}^r(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}] \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_{L_{\omega}^r}^{s,q}(\Omega)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} C \|f\|_{L_{\omega}^r(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L_{\omega}^r(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L_{\omega}^r(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{C} \|f\|_{L_{\omega}^r(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.2. When $X = \mathbb{R}^n = \Omega$, ρ is the standard Euclidean distance, and μ is the n -dimensional Lebesgue measure, Theorem 4.1 in this case reduces to [98, Theorem 4.1]. The other cases of Theorem 4.1 are new.

The following is a corollary of Theorem 4.1 with $\omega \equiv 1$.

Corollary 4.3. *Let $0 < q \leq r < \infty$. Then there exist $C, \tilde{C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $f \in [L^r(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}] \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_{L^r}^{s,q}(\Omega)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} C \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left[\int_{\Omega} \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^q}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{r}{q}} d\mu(x) \right]^{\frac{1}{r}} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left[\int_{\Omega} \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^q}{U(x, y)[\rho(x, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{r}{q}} d\mu(x) \right]^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq \tilde{C} \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}. \end{aligned}$$

4.2 Variable Lebesgue Spaces

Let r be a positive measurable function on X . Let

$$\tilde{r}_- := \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{x \in X} r(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{r}_+ := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in X} r(x).$$

Fix $x_0 \in X$. The function r is said to be *globally log-Hölder continuous on X* if there exist $r_\infty \in \mathbb{R}$ and a positive constant C such that, for any $x, y \in X$,

$$|r(x) - r(y)| \leq \frac{C}{\log[e + \frac{1}{\rho(x,y)}]} \quad \text{and} \quad |r(x) - r_\infty| \leq \frac{C}{\log[e + \rho(x_0, x)]}.$$

The *variable Lebesgue space* $L^{r(\cdot)}(X)$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions f on X such that

$$\|f\|_{L^{r(\cdot)}(X)} := \inf \left\{ \lambda \in (0, \infty) : \int_X \left[\frac{|f(x)|}{\lambda} \right]^{r(x)} d\mu(x) \leq 1 \right\} < \infty.$$

The study of the variable Lebesgue space can be traced back to [67]. These spaces were employed to investigate both the related nonlinear elliptic boundary value problems and the mapping properties of Nemytskii operators. For more studies on variable Lebesgue spaces, we refer to [21, 23, 33, 34, 42, 43, 90, 93, 94].

Applying a slight modification of the proof of [98, Theorem 4.20] with [98, Theorem 2.12] replaced by Theorem 1.11, we obtain the following conclusion and omit the details.

Theorem 4.4. *Let r be a positive globally log-Hölder continuous function. Assume that $0 < q < \tilde{r}_- \leq \tilde{r}_+ < \infty$. Then there exist $C, \tilde{C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $f \in [L^{r(\cdot)}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}] \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_{L^{r(\cdot)}}^{s,q}(\Omega)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} C\|f\|_{L^{r(\cdot)}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_\Omega \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^{r(\cdot)}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_\Omega \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^{r(\cdot)}(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{C}\|f\|_{L^{r(\cdot)}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.5. When $X = \mathbb{R}^n = \Omega$, ρ is the standard Euclidean distance, and μ is the n -dimensional Lebesgue measure, Theorem 4.4 in this case reduces to [98, Theorem 4.20]. The other cases of Theorem 4.4 are new.

4.3 Weighted Lorentz Spaces

Let ω be a weight on X . For any $r, \tau \in (0, \infty)$, the *weighted Lorentz space* $L_\omega^{r,\tau}(X)$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions f on X such that

$$\|f\|_{L_\omega^{r,\tau}(X)} := \left\{ \int_0^\infty \left[t^{\frac{1}{r}} f^*(t) \right]^\tau \frac{dt}{t} \right\}^{\frac{1}{\tau}} < \infty,$$

where, for any $t \in [0, \infty)$, $f^*(t) := \inf \{s \in (0, \infty) : \omega(\{x \in X : |f(x)| > s\}) \leq t\}$. If $\omega \equiv 1$, then $L_\omega^{r,\tau}(X)$ is the usual Lorentz space introduced by Lorentz [75, 76], which is denoted simply by $L^{r,\tau}(X)$. Lorentz [24] established the intermediate spaces of Lebesgue spaces via the real interpolation method. We refer to [1, 29, 35, 36, 49, 61, 66, 96, 110] for more studies on weighted Lorentz spaces.

By a slight modification of the proof of [98, Theorem 4.22] with [98, Theorem 2.12] replaced by Theorem 1.11, we obtain the following conclusion and omit the details.

Theorem 4.6. Let $r, \tau \in (0, \infty)$, $0 < q \leq p < \min\{r, \tau\}$, and $\omega \in A_{\frac{r}{p}}(\mathcal{X})$. Then there exist $C, \widetilde{C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $f \in [L_{\omega}^{r, \tau}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}] \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0, 1)} \dot{W}_{L_{\omega}^{r, \tau}}^{s, q}(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} C\|f\|_{L_{\omega}^{r, \tau}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L_{\omega}^{r, \tau}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L_{\omega}^{r, \tau}(\Omega)} \leq \widetilde{C}\|f\|_{L_{\omega}^{r, \tau}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.7. When $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n = \Omega$, ρ is the standard Euclidean distance, μ is the n -dimensional Lebesgue measure, and $\omega \equiv 1$, Theorem 4.6 in this case reduces to [98, Theorem 4.22]. The other cases of Theorem 4.6 are new.

4.4 Weighted Orlicz Spaces

A non-decreasing function $\Phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is called an *Orlicz function* if $\Phi(0) = 0$, $\Phi(t) > 0$ for any $t \in (0, \infty)$, and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(t) = \infty$. The function Φ is said to be of *lower* (resp. *upper*) type $r \in \mathbb{R}$ if there exists $C_{(r)} \in [1, \infty)$ such that, for any $t \in (0, \infty)$ and $s \in (0, 1)$ [resp. $s \in (1, \infty)$], $\Phi(st) \leq C_{(r)}s^r\Phi(t)$. Assume that Φ is an Orlicz function with positive lower type r_{Φ}^- and positive upper type r_{Φ}^+ . Let ω be a weight on \mathcal{X} . The *weighted Orlicz space* $L_{\omega}^{\Phi}(\mathcal{X})$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions f on \mathcal{X} such that

$$\|f\|_{L_{\omega}^{\Phi}(\mathcal{X})} := \inf \left\{ \lambda \in (0, \infty) : \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi \left(\frac{|f(x)|}{\lambda} \right) \omega(x) d\mu(x) \leq 1 \right\} < \infty.$$

Then $\|\cdot\|_{L_{\omega}^{\Phi}(\mathcal{X})}$ is a quasi-norm and thereby $L_{\omega}^{\Phi}(\mathcal{X})$ is a ball quasi-Banach function space. If Φ is convex, then $\|\cdot\|_{L_{\omega}^{\Phi}(\mathcal{X})}$ is a norm and thereby $L_{\omega}^{\Phi}(\mathcal{X})$ is a ball Banach function space. The unweighted Orlicz space $L_1^{\Phi}(\mathcal{X})$ was originally introduced in [7, 97], which is widely applied to various branches of analysis. We refer to [22, 25, 66, 73, 91, 101, 102, 122] for more studies on Orlicz spaces.

Let Φ and Ψ be two Orlicz functions. Write $\Phi \approx \Psi$ if there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $t \in (0, \infty)$, $\Phi(C^{-1}t) \leq \Psi(t) \leq \Phi(Ct)$. In this case, $L_{\omega}^{\Phi}(\mathcal{X}) = L_{\omega}^{\Psi}(\mathcal{X})$ with equivalent quasi-norms. For any given Orlicz function Φ , if $1 \leq r_{\Phi}^- \leq r_{\Phi}^+ < \infty$, then there exists a convex Orlicz function Ψ such that $\Phi \approx \Psi$. In this case, $L_{\omega}^{\Phi}(\mathcal{X})$ is a Banach space with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L_{\omega}^{\Psi}(\mathcal{X})}$. In the remainder of this subsection, we always assume that Φ is convex if $1 \leq r_{\Phi}^- \leq r_{\Phi}^+ < \infty$. Let $\Phi^{(\frac{1}{p})}(t) := \Phi(t^{\frac{1}{p}})$ for any $t \in [0, \infty)$. Then $r_{\Phi^{(\frac{1}{p})}}^{\pm} = \frac{r_{\Phi}^{\pm}}{p}$. From this and the obvious fact that any convex Orlicz function is strictly increasing, we may assume that any Orlicz function is strictly increasing.

For any given Orlicz function Φ with $1 < r_{\Phi}^- \leq r_{\Phi}^+ < \infty$, let $\widetilde{\Phi}$ be its *complementary function*, that is, for any $t \in [0, \infty)$,

$$\widetilde{\Phi}(t) := \sup \{tu - \Phi(u) : u \in [0, \infty)\}. \quad (4.1)$$

Then $\widetilde{\Phi}$ is also an Orlicz function with $1 < r_{\widetilde{\Phi}}^- \leq r_{\widetilde{\Phi}}^+ < \infty$ and $\widetilde{\widetilde{\Phi}} = \Phi$. The complementary pair $(\Phi, \widetilde{\Phi})$ of Orlicz functions satisfies $\frac{1}{r_{\Phi}^+} + \frac{1}{r_{\widetilde{\Phi}}^+} = 1$ and $t \leq \Phi^{-1}(t)\widetilde{\Phi}^{-1}(t) \leq 2t$ for any $t \in [0, \infty)$.

Moreover, $L_{\omega}^{\Phi}(\mathcal{X})$ and $L_{\omega}^{\widetilde{\Phi}}(\mathcal{X})$ are the dual and the associate spaces of each other. If $1 < r_{\Phi}^- \leq r_{\Phi}^+ < \infty$ and $\omega \in A_{r_{\Phi}^-}$, then the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \mathcal{M} is bounded on $L_{\omega}^{\Phi}(\mathcal{X})$.

Let Φ be an Orlicz function with lower type r_{Φ}^- and upper type r_{Φ}^+ . Then, by the above fact and $(\frac{r_{\Phi}^+}{p})' = r_{\Phi^{(\frac{1}{p})}}^-$, we conclude that, if $p \in (0, r_{\Phi}^-)$ and $\omega \in A_{(\frac{r_{\Phi}^+}{p})'}(\mathcal{X})$, then $[L_{\omega}^{\Phi}(\mathcal{X})]^{\frac{1}{p}} = L_{\omega}^{\Phi^{(\frac{1}{p})}}(\mathcal{X})$

is a ball Banach function space and the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \mathcal{M} is bounded on $[L_\omega^{\Phi(\frac{1}{p})}(\mathcal{X})]' = L_\omega^{\Phi(\frac{1}{p})}(\mathcal{X})$.

By a slight modification of the proof of [98, Theorem 4.25] with [98, Theorem 2.12] replaced by Theorem 1.11, we obtain the following conclusion and omit the details.

Theorem 4.8. *Let Φ be an Orlicz function with lower type r_Φ^- and upper type r_Φ^+ . Assume that $0 < q \leq p < r_\Phi^- \leq r_\Phi^+ < \infty$ and $\omega \in A_{(\frac{\Phi}{p})^+}(\mathcal{X})$. Then there exist $C, \tilde{C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $f \in [L_\omega^\Phi(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}] \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_{L_\omega^\Phi}^{s,q}(\Omega)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} C\|f\|_{L_\omega^\Phi(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_\Omega \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L_\omega^\Phi(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_\Omega \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L_\omega^\Phi(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{C}\|f\|_{L_\omega^\Phi(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.9. When $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n = \Omega$, ρ is the standard Euclidean distance, $\omega \equiv 1$, and μ is the n -dimensional Lebesgue measure, Theorem 4.8 in this case coincides with [98, Theorem 4.25]. The other cases of Theorem 4.8 are new.

4.5 Generalized Morrey and Generalized Block Spaces

The Morrey spaces were introduced by Morrey [83] in connection with PDEs. For any function $\phi : \mathcal{X} \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and any ball $B = B(x, r)$ with $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$, we shall write $\phi(B)$ in place of $\phi(x, r)$. The *local Lebesgue space* $L_{\text{loc}}^p(\mathcal{X})$ with $p \in (0, \infty)$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions f on \mathcal{X} satisfying that, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists a positive constant r_x such that $\|f\mathbf{1}_{B(x, r_x)}\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} < \infty$. Now, we recall the definition of generalized Morrey spaces.

Definition 4.10. Let $\phi : \mathcal{X} \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and $p \in (0, \infty)$. The *generalized Morrey space* $L_{p,\phi}(\mathcal{X})$ is defined to be the set of all $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^p(\mathcal{X})$ such that

$$\|f\|_{L_{p,\phi}(\mathcal{X})} := \sup_B \frac{1}{\phi(B)} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B |f(x)|^p d\mu(x) \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all balls $B \subset \mathcal{X}$.

The generalized Morrey space $L_{p,\phi}(\mathcal{X})$ is a quasi-Banach space equipped with the quasi-norm $\|\cdot\|_{L_{p,\phi}(\mathcal{X})}$. If $p \in [1, \infty)$, then $L_{p,\phi}(\mathcal{X})$ is a Banach space. If $p \in (0, \infty)$ and there exists a positive constant C such that, for any ball $B \subset \mathcal{X}$, $C^{-1} \leq \phi(B)[\mu(B)]^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C$, then $L_{p,\phi}(\mathcal{X}) = L^p(\mathcal{X})$. In the case $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$, the generalized Morrey space $L_{p,\phi}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ was introduced by Nakai [84] with $\phi(x, r) := [B(x, r)]^{-1} w(x, r)^{\frac{1}{p}}$, where $w : \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$. We refer to [2, 3, 28, 104, 105, 107, 114, 119, 123] for more studies on generalized Morrey spaces.

Next, we recall the concept of blocks.

Definition 4.11. Let $\phi : \mathcal{X} \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and $q \in (1, \infty]$. A function b is called a $[\phi, q]$ -block if there exists a ball B , which is called the *supporting ball* of b , such that

- (i) $\text{supp } b \subset B$;
- (ii) $\|b\|_{L^q(\mathcal{X})} \leq \frac{1}{[\mu(B)]^{\frac{1}{q'}} \phi(B)}$, where $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q'} = 1$.

Denote by $B[\phi, q]$ the set of all $[\phi, q]$ -blocks. Now, we recall the concept of generalized block spaces. In what follows, for any given quasi-normed vector space Y , let Y^* be the dual space of Y .

Definition 4.12. Let $\phi : \mathcal{X} \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and $q \in (1, \infty]$. Assume that $L_{q', \phi}(\mathcal{X}) \neq \{0\}$. The *generalized block space* $B^{[\phi, q]}(\mathcal{X})$ is defined to be the set of all $f \in [L_{q', \phi}(\mathcal{X})]^*$ such that there exist a sequence $\{b_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $B[\phi, q]$ and a sequence $\{\lambda_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $[0, \infty)$ satisfying $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j < \infty$ such that

$$f = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j b_j \text{ in } [L_{q', \phi}(\mathcal{X})]^*. \quad (4.2)$$

For any $f \in B^{[\phi, q]}(\mathcal{X})$, define

$$\|f\|_{B^{[\phi, q]}(\mathcal{X})} := \inf \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j : f = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j b_j \text{ in } [L_{q', \phi}(\mathcal{X})]^* \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all decompositions of f as in (4.2).

The block space (the space generated by blocks) was introduced by Lu et al. [78] and Taibleson and Weiss [113] in connection with the convergence of Fourier series. The generalized block space $B^{[\phi, q]}(\mathcal{X})$ is a Banach space equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{B^{[\phi, q]}(\mathcal{X})}$, which was introduced in [86]. As was shown in [114, Theorem 3.28] that, under some additional assumptions on ϕ , the generalized Morrey space $L_{q, \phi}(\mathcal{X})$ with $q \in (1, \infty)$ and the generalized block space $B^{[\phi, q']}(\mathcal{X})$ are mutually the associate space. We refer to [74, 108, 109] for more studies on generalized block spaces.

We consider the following conditions on ϕ .

Definition 4.13. Let $\phi : \mathcal{X} \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and $p \in (0, \infty)$.

- (i) ϕ is said to satisfy the *doubling condition* if there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r, s \in (0, \infty)$ with $\frac{r}{s} \in [2^{-1}, 2]$,

$$\frac{1}{C} \leq \frac{\phi(x, r)}{\phi(x, s)} \leq C. \quad (4.3)$$

- (ii) ϕ is said to satisfy the *nearness condition* if there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$ satisfying $\rho(x, y) \leq r$,

$$\frac{1}{C} \leq \frac{\phi(x, r)}{\phi(y, r)} \leq C. \quad (4.4)$$

- (iii) ϕ is said to be *almost increasing* (resp. *almost decreasing*) if there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $0 < r < s < \infty$, $\phi(x, r) \leq C\phi(x, s)$ [resp. $C\phi(x, r) \geq \phi(x, s)$].

- (iv) $\mathcal{G}_p^{\text{dec}}$ is defined to be the set of all functions $\phi : \mathcal{X} \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that $r \mapsto [\mu(B(x, r))]^{\frac{1}{p}} \phi(x, r)$ is almost increasing and that $r \mapsto \phi(x, r)$ is almost decreasing.

For a function $\alpha(\cdot) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let $\alpha_- := \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \alpha(x)$ and $\alpha_+ := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \alpha(x)$. Recall that $\alpha(\cdot) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *log-Hölder continuous* if there exists a positive constant $C_{\alpha(\cdot)}$ such that, for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ with $\rho(x, y) \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$,

$$|\alpha(x) - \alpha(y)| \leq -\frac{C_{\alpha(\cdot)}}{\log \rho(x, y)}.$$

Let $\alpha_* \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha(\cdot) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be log-Hölder continuous with $-\infty < \alpha_- \leq \alpha_+ < \infty$, and, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\phi(x, r) := \begin{cases} r^{\alpha(x)} & \text{if } r \in (0, \frac{1}{2}), \\ r^{\alpha_*} & \text{if } r \in [\frac{1}{2}, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Then ϕ satisfies both (4.3) and (4.4); see [88, Proposition 3.3]. Moreover, if $\alpha_+, \alpha_* \in (-\infty, 0]$ and $[\mu(B(x, r))]^{\frac{1}{p}} \phi(x, r)$ is almost increasing, then $\phi \in \mathcal{G}_p^{\text{dec}}$.

Next, applying Theorems 1.11 and 4.1, we obtain the following conclusion.

Theorem 4.14. *Let $0 < q < p < \infty$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{G}_p^{\text{dec}}$ satisfy both (4.4) and that there exists $C_{(\phi)} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $x \in X$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$,*

$$\int_r^\infty \frac{\phi(x, t)}{t} dt \leq C_{(\phi)} \phi(x, r). \quad (4.5)$$

Assume that ϕ satisfies that there exists $\widetilde{C}_{(\phi)} \in [1, \infty)$ such that, for any ball $B \subset X$,

$$\frac{1}{\widetilde{C}_{(\phi)}} \leq \phi(B) [\mu(B)]^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \widetilde{C}_{(\phi)} \quad (4.6)$$

or assume that ϕ satisfies both

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \inf_{x \in B} \phi(x, r) = \infty \quad (4.7)$$

for any ball $B \subset X$ and

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \phi(x, r) [\mu(B(x, r))]^{\frac{1}{p}} = \infty \quad (4.8)$$

for any $x \in X$. Then there exist $C, \widetilde{C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $f \in [L_{p,\phi}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}] \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_{L_{p,\phi}}^{s,q}(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} C \|f\|_{L_{p,\phi}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y) [\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L_{p,\phi}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y) [\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L_{p,\phi}(\Omega)} \leq \widetilde{C} \|f\|_{L_{p,\phi}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Proof. First, we prove the lower estimate in (4.9). From Remark 3.2(i), [114, Proposition 3.31], and the assumption that ϕ satisfies both (4.3) and (4.5), we deduce that there exists $\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that, for any $f \in L_{p,\phi}(\Omega)$,

$$\|f\|_{L_{p,\phi}(\Omega)} \leq \sup_B \frac{\|f\|_{L_{(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}}^p(\Omega)}}{\phi(B) [\mu(B)]^{\frac{1}{p}}} \leq C \|f\|_{L_{p,\phi}(\Omega)},$$

where $C \in (0, \infty)$ is independent of f , which, together with Proposition 2.11, further implies that, for any $f \in L_{p,\phi}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}$,

$$\|f\|_{L_{p,\phi}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} \leq \sup_B \frac{\|f\|_{L_{(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}}^p(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}}{\phi(B) [\mu(B)]^{\frac{1}{p}}} \leq C \|f\|_{L_{p,\phi}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}.$$

By this, the fact that $\sup_B [(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}]_{A_1} < \infty$ (see, for example, [104, Theorem 281]), and Theorem 4.1, we find that, for any $f \in L_{p,\phi}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L_{p,\phi}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} &\leq \sup_B \frac{\|f\|_{L_{(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}}^p(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}}{\phi(B) [\mu(B)]^{\frac{1}{p}}} \\ &\leq \sup_B \frac{1}{\phi(B) [\mu(B)]^{\frac{1}{p}}} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y) [\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L_{(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}}^p(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \sup_B \frac{1}{\phi(B) [\mu(B)]^{\frac{1}{p}}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y) [\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L_{(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}}^p(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L_{p,\phi}(\Omega)}.$$

Now, we show the upper estimate in (4.9). Let $p_1 \in (q, p)$. Then $\phi^{p_1} \in \mathcal{G}_{\frac{p}{p_1}}^{\text{dec}}$ satisfies (4.4). Moreover, from [86, Lemma 7.1], we infer that ϕ^{p_1} satisfies (4.5). By $\frac{p}{p_1} > 1$ and [114, Theorem 3.20], we conclude that $[L_{p,\phi}(\mathcal{X})]^{\frac{1}{p_1}} = L_{\frac{p}{p_1}, \phi^{p_1}}(\mathcal{X})$ is a ball Banach function space. From [114, Theorems 3.28 and 3.30], we deduce that the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator is bounded on

$$B^{[\phi^{p_1}, (\frac{p}{p_1})']}(X) = \left[L_{\frac{p}{p_1}, \phi^{p_1}}(X) \right]' = \left([L_{p,\phi}(\mathcal{X})]^{\frac{1}{p_1}} \right)'.$$

By these and the proof of Theorem 1.11, we find that the last inequality in (4.9) holds. This finishes the proof of Theorem 4.14. \square

Remark 4.15. To the best of our knowledge, Theorem 4.14 is completely new.

The following theorem is an application of Theorem 1.13.

Theorem 4.16. Let $p \in (0, \infty)$, $\beta \in (0, \infty)$, and $\phi \in \mathcal{G}_p^{\text{dec}}$ satisfy both (4.4) and (4.5). Assume that ϕ satisfies (4.6) or assume that ϕ satisfies both (4.7) and (4.8). Then there exist $C, \tilde{C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $f \in C_b^\beta(\Omega) \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_{L_{p,\phi}}^{s,p}(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} C \|f\|_{L_{p,\phi}(\Omega)} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{p}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^p}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sp}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L_{p,\phi}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{p}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^p}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sp}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L_{p,\phi}(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{C} \|f\|_{L_{p,\phi}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

Proof. Let $\theta \in (0, 1]$. Then $\phi^{p\theta} \in \mathcal{G}_{\frac{1}{\theta}}^{\text{dec}}$ satisfies (4.4), which, combined with [114, Theorem 3.20], implies that $L_{\frac{1}{\theta}, \phi^{p\theta}}(X)$ is a ball Banach function space. Moreover, from the proof of [86, Lemma 7.1], we infer that, for any $x \in X$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\int_r^\infty \frac{[\phi(x, t)]^{p\theta}}{t} dt \leq C_{(\phi^{p\theta})} [\phi(x, r)]^{p\theta}$$

with

$$C_{(\phi^{p\theta})} = \begin{cases} 2C_{(\phi)} \left(\frac{1-p\theta}{p\theta} \right)^{1-p\theta} & \text{if } p\theta \in (0, 1), \\ C_{(\phi)} \left(\frac{C^2}{\log 2} \right)^{p\theta-1} & \text{if } p\theta \in [1, \infty), \end{cases}$$

where C and $C_{(\phi)}$ are, respectively, the constants in (4.3) and (4.5). Thus, $\phi^{p\theta}$ satisfies (4.5). By [114, Theorems 3.28 and 3.30], we conclude that, if $\theta \in (0, 1)$, then the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \mathcal{M} is bounded on

$$B^{[\phi^{p\theta}, (\frac{1}{\theta})']}(X) = \left[L_{\frac{1}{\theta}, \phi^{p\theta}}(X) \right]' = \left([L_{p,\phi}(\mathcal{X})]^{\frac{1}{p\theta}} \right)'.$$

If $\theta \rightarrow 1^-$, then $(\frac{1}{\theta})' \rightarrow \infty$ and hence

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \|\mathcal{M}\|_{L^{(\frac{1}{\theta})'}(X) \rightarrow L^{(\frac{1}{\theta})'}(X)} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} C_{(\phi^{p\theta})} < \infty.$$

From the proof of [114, Theorem 3.30], we deduce that

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \|\mathcal{M}\|_{B^{[\phi^{p\theta}, (\frac{1}{\theta})']}(X) \rightarrow B^{[\phi^{p\theta}, (\frac{1}{\theta})']}(X)} < \infty.$$

Therefore, the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \mathcal{M} is endpoint bounded on

$$\left([L_{p,\phi}(\mathcal{X})]^\frac{1}{p}\right)' = [L_{1,\phi^p}(\mathcal{X})]'.$$

By this and Theorem 1.13(i), we find that (4.10) holds, which completes the proof of Theorem 4.16. \square

Remark 4.17. To the best of our knowledge, Theorem 4.16 is completely new.

Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$, $p \in (0, \infty)$, $\lambda_* \in (0, n]$, and $\lambda(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (0, n]$. Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy the WMD condition. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let

$$\phi(x, r) = \begin{cases} r^{-\frac{\lambda(x)}{p}} & \text{if } r \in (0, \frac{1}{2}), \\ r^{-\frac{\lambda_*}{p}} & \text{if } r \in [\frac{1}{2}, \infty). \end{cases} \quad (4.11)$$

Denote $L_{p,\phi}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by $L^{p,\lambda(\cdot);\lambda_*}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then we have the following corollary.

Corollary 4.18. *Let $p \in (0, \infty)$. Assume that $\lambda(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (0, n]$ is log-Hölder continuous, $0 < \lambda_- \leq \lambda_+ \leq n$, and $0 < \lambda_* < n$.*

- (i) *If $q \in (0, p)$, then there exist $c, \tilde{c} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $f \in [L^{p,\lambda(\cdot);\lambda_*}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}] \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_{L^{p,\lambda(\cdot);\lambda_*}}^{s,q}(\Omega)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} c\|f\|_{L^{p,\lambda(\cdot);\lambda_*}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left[\int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{|\cdot - y|^{n+sq}} dy \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^{p,\lambda(\cdot);\lambda_*}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left[\int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{|\cdot - y|^{n+sq}} dy \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^{p,\lambda(\cdot);\lambda_*}(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{c}\|f\|_{L^{p,\lambda(\cdot);\lambda_*}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}. \end{aligned}$$

- (ii) *If $q = p$ and $\beta \in (0, 1]$, then there exist $C, \tilde{C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $f \in C_b^\beta(\Omega) \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_{L^{p,\lambda(\cdot);\lambda_*}}^{s,p}(\Omega)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} C\|f\|_{L^{p,\lambda(\cdot);\lambda_*}(\Omega)} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{p}} \left\| \left[\int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^p}{|\cdot - y|^{n+sp}} dy \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L^{p,\lambda(\cdot);\lambda_*}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{p}} \left\| \left[\int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^p}{|\cdot - y|^{n+sp}} dy \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_{L^{p,\lambda(\cdot);\lambda_*}(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{C}\|f\|_{L^{p,\lambda(\cdot);\lambda_*}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

By a slight modification of the proof of [114, Theorem 3.37] with [114, Theorem 2.11(i)] replaced by Theorem 1.11, we obtain the following conclusion and omit the details.

Theorem 4.19. *Let $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ satisfy $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{G}_p^{\text{dec}}$ satisfy (4.4). Assume that ϕ satisfies (4.6) or assume that ϕ satisfies both (4.7) and (4.8). If $q_1 \in (0, 1]$ and $\beta \in (0, \infty)$, then there exist $C, \tilde{C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $f \in C_b^\beta(\Omega) \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_{B^{[\phi,q]}}^{s,q_1}(\Omega)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} C\|f\|_{B^{[\phi,q]}(\Omega)} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^{q_1}}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq_1}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \right\|_{B^{[\phi,q]}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^{q_1}}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq_1}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \right\|_{B^{[\phi,q]}(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{C}\|f\|_{B^{[\phi,q]}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.20. To the best of our knowledge, Theorem 4.19 is completely new.

Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$, $p \in (0, \infty)$, $\lambda_* \in (0, n]$, and $\lambda(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (0, n]$. For ϕ defined in (4.11), denote $B^{[\phi, q]}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by $B^{\lambda(\cdot); \lambda_*, q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The following corollary is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.19.

Corollary 4.21. *Let $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ satisfy $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. Assume that $\lambda(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (0, n]$ is log-Hölder continuous, $0 < \lambda_- \leq \lambda_+ \leq n$, and $0 < \lambda_* < n$. If $q_1 \in (0, 1]$ and $\beta \in (0, 1]$, then there exist $C, \tilde{C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $f \in C_b^\beta(\Omega) \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0, 1)} \dot{W}_{B^{\lambda(\cdot); \lambda_*, q}}^{s, q}(\Omega)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} C \|f\|_{B^{\lambda(\cdot); \lambda_*, q}(\Omega)} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \left\| \left[\int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^{q_1}}{|\cdot - y|^{n + s q_1}} dy \right]^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \right\|_{B^{\lambda(\cdot); \lambda_*, q}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \left\| \left[\int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^{q_1}}{|\cdot - y|^{n + s q_1}} dy \right]^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \right\|_{B^{\lambda(\cdot); \lambda_*, q}(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{C} \|f\|_{B^{\lambda(\cdot); \lambda_*, q}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

4.6 Generalized Lorentz–Morrey and Generalized Lorentz-Block Spaces

In this subsection, we aim to establish the Maz’ya–Shaposhnikova representation on generalized Lorentz–Morrey spaces and generalized Lorentz-block spaces. To this end, we begin with recalling the concept of generalized Lorentz–Morrey spaces. For a function $\phi : \mathcal{X} \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and a ball $B := B(x, r)$ with $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$, we shall write $\phi(B)$ in place of $\phi(x, r)$. The *locally Lorentz space* $L_{\text{loc}}^{p, p_1}(\mathcal{X})$ with $p, p_1 \in (0, \infty)$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions f on \mathcal{X} such that, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists a positive constant r_x satisfying $\|f \mathbf{1}_{B(x, r_x)}\|_{L^{p, p_1}(\mathcal{X})} < \infty$.

Definition 4.22. Let $\phi : \mathcal{X} \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and $p, p_1 \in (0, \infty)$. The *generalized Lorentz–Morrey space* $L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\mathcal{X})$ is defined to be the set of all $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^{p, p_1}(\mathcal{X})$ such that

$$\|f\|_{L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\mathcal{X})} := \sup_B \frac{\|f \mathbf{1}_B\|_{L^{p, p_1}(\mathcal{X})}}{\phi(B)[\mu(B)]^{\frac{1}{p}}} < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all balls $B \subset \mathcal{X}$.

It is easy to prove that the Lorentz–Morrey space $L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\mathcal{X})$ is a quasi-Banach space equipped with the quasi-norm $\|\cdot\|_{L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\mathcal{X})}$. If $p, p_1 \in (1, \infty)$, then there exists a norm $|||\cdot|||_{L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\mathcal{X})}$ such that, for any $f \in L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\mathcal{X})$,

$$\|f\|_{L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\mathcal{X})} \leq |||f|||_{L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\mathcal{X})} \leq \frac{p}{p-1} \|f\|_{L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\mathcal{X})}.$$

That is, $L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\mathcal{X})$ is a Banach space equipped with the norm $|||\cdot|||_{L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\mathcal{X})}$. If $p, p_1 \in (0, \infty)$ and there exists a positive constant C such that, for any ball $B \subset \mathcal{X}$, $C^{-1} \leq \phi(B)[\mu(B)]^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C$, then $L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\mathcal{X}) = L^{p, p_1}(\mathcal{X})$. For more studies of Lorentz–Morrey spaces, we refer to [57, 70].

We recall the concept of generalized Lorentz-block spaces. We begin with the following definition of $[\phi, q, q_1]$ -blocks.

Definition 4.23. Let $\phi : \mathcal{X} \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and $q, q_1 \in (1, \infty)$. A function b is called a $[\phi, q, q_1]$ -block if there exists a ball B , called the *supporting ball* of b , such that

(i) $\text{supp } b \subset B$;

(ii) $\|b\|_{L^{q, q_1}(\mathcal{X})} \leq \frac{1}{[\mu(B)]^{\frac{1}{q'}} \phi(B)}$, where $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q'} = 1$.

Denote by $B[\phi, q, q_1]$ the set of all $[\phi, q, q_1]$ -blocks.

Definition 4.24. Let $\phi : X \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and $q, q_1 \in (1, \infty)$. Assume that $L_{q', q_1, \phi}(X) \neq \{0\}$. The *generalized Lorentz-block space* $B^{[\phi, q, q_1]}(X)$ is defined to be the set of all $f \in [L_{q', q_1, \phi}(X)]^*$ such that there exist a sequence $\{b_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $B[\phi, q, q_1]$ and a sequence $\{\lambda_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $[0, \infty)$ satisfying $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j < \infty$ such that

$$f = \sum_j \lambda_j b_j \text{ in } [L_{q', q_1, \phi}(X)]^*. \quad (4.12)$$

For any $f \in B^{[\phi, q, q_1]}(X)$, define

$$\|f\|_{B^{[\phi, q, q_1]}(X)} := \inf \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j : f = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j b_j \text{ in } [L_{q', q_1, \phi}(X)]^* \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all decompositions of f as in (4.12).

Remark 4.25. Let $\phi : X \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and $q, q_1 \in (1, \infty)$. As was shown in [114, Theorem 3.51] that, under some additional assumptions on ϕ , the generalized Lorentz–Morrey space $L_{q, q_1, \phi}(X)$ and the generalized Lorentz-block space $B^{[\phi, q', q_1]}(X)$ are mutually the associate space.

Applying Theorems 1.11 and 4.6, we obtain the following Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova formula on generalized Lorentz–Morrey spaces.

Theorem 4.26. Let $p, p_1, q \in (0, \infty)$ satisfy $q < \min\{p, p_1\}$ and let $\phi \in \mathcal{G}_p^{\text{dec}}$ satisfy both (4.4) and (4.5). Assume that ϕ satisfies (4.6) or assume that ϕ satisfies both (4.7) and (4.8). Then there exist $C, \tilde{C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $f \in [L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}] \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0, 1)} \dot{W}_{L_{p, p_1, \phi}}^{s, q}(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} C\|f\|_{L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{C}\|f\|_{L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Proof. We first prove the lower estimate in (4.13). From Remark 3.2(i), [114, Proposition 3.54], and the assumption that ϕ satisfies both (4.3) and (4.5), we infer that there exists $\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that, for any $f \in L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\Omega)$,

$$\|f\|_{L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\Omega)} \leq \sup_B \frac{\|f\|_{L_{p, p_1}^{p_1}(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}(\Omega)}}{\phi(B)[\mu(B)]^{\frac{1}{p}}} \leq C\|f\|_{L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\Omega)},$$

where $C \in (0, \infty)$ is independent of f , which further implies that, for any $f \in L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}$,

$$\|f\|_{L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} \leq \sup_B \frac{\|f\|_{L_{p, p_1}^{p_1}(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}}{\phi(B)[\mu(B)]^{\frac{1}{p}}} \leq C\|f\|_{L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}.$$

By this, the fact that $\sup_B [(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}]_{A_1} < \infty$ (see, for example, [104, Theorem 281]), and Theorem 4.6, we conclude that, for any $f \in L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L_{p, p_1, \phi}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} &\leq \sup_B \frac{\|f\|_{L_{p, p_1}^{p_1}(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}}{\phi(B)[\mu(B)]^{\frac{1}{p}}} \\ &\lesssim \sup_B \frac{1}{\phi(B)[\mu(B)]^{\frac{1}{p}}} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L_{p, p_1}^{p_1}(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \sup_B \frac{1}{\phi(B)[\mu(B)]^{\frac{1}{p}}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{p}{p_1}}_{(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}}(\Omega)} \\
&\lesssim \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L_{p,p_1,\phi}(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the lower estimate in (4.13).

Next, we show the upper estimate in (4.13). Let $p_2 \in (q, \min\{p, p_1\})$. Then $\phi^{p_2} \in \mathcal{G}_{\frac{p}{p_2}}^{\text{dec}}$ satisfies (4.4). Moreover, from [86, Lemma 7.1], we deduce that ϕ^{p_2} satisfies (4.5). By $\frac{p}{p_2} > 1$, $\frac{p_1}{p_2} > 1$, and [114, Theorem 3.45], we find that $[L_{p,p_1,\phi}(\mathcal{X})]^{\frac{1}{p_2}} = L_{\frac{p}{p_2}, \frac{p_1}{p_2}, \phi^{p_2}}(\mathcal{X})$ is a ball Banach function space. From [114, Theorems 3.51 and 3.53], we infer that the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \mathcal{M} is bounded on

$$B^{[\phi^{p_2}, (\frac{p}{p_2})', (\frac{p_1}{p_2})']}(\mathcal{X}) = \left[L_{\frac{p}{p_2}, \frac{p_1}{p_2}, \phi^{p_2}}(\mathcal{X}) \right]' = \left([L_{p,p_1,\phi}(\mathcal{X})]^{\frac{1}{p_2}} \right)'.$$

By these and the proof of Theorem 1.11, we conclude that the last inequality in (4.13) holds. This finishes the proof of Theorem 4.26. \square

Remark 4.27. To the best of our knowledge, Theorem 4.26 is completely new.

Applying a slight modification of the proof of [114, Theorem 3.57] with [114, Theorem 2.11(i)] replaced by Theorem 1.11, we find that the following conclusion and omit the details.

Theorem 4.28. Let $p, p_1, q, q_1 \in (1, \infty)$ satisfy both $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ and $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{q_1} = 1$ and let $\phi \in \mathcal{G}_p^{\text{dec}}$ satisfy (4.4). Assume that ϕ satisfies (4.6) or assume that ϕ satisfies both (4.7) and (4.8). If $q_2 \in (0, 1]$ and $\beta \in (0, \infty)$, then there exist $C, \tilde{C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $f \in C_b^\beta(\Omega) \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_{B^{[\phi,q,q_1]}(\Omega)}^{s,q_2}(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
C \|f\|_{B^{[\phi,q,q_1]}(\Omega)} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q_2}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^{q_2}}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq_2}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q_2}} \right\|_{B^{[\phi,q,q_1]}(\Omega)} \\
&\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q_2}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^{q_2}}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq_2}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q_2}} \right\|_{B^{[\phi,q,q_1]}(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{C} \|f\|_{B^{[\phi,q,q_1]}(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.29. To the best of our knowledge, Theorem 4.28 is completely new.

4.7 Generalized Orlicz–Morrey and Generalized Orlicz–Block Spaces

The Orlicz–Morrey spaces were introduced by [85] to unify Orlicz and Morrey spaces and were studied in [87]. For the definitions of the Orlicz function Φ and its positive lower type r_Φ^- and its positive upper type r_Φ^+ , see Section 4.4. In this section, we always assume that Φ is strictly increasing. If $1 \leq r_\Phi^- \leq r_\Phi^+ < \infty$, we always assume that Φ is convex. The *locally Orlicz space* $L_{\text{loc}}^\Phi(\mathcal{X})$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions f on \mathcal{X} such that, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists a positive constant r_x satisfying $\|f \mathbf{1}_{B(x,r_x)}\|_{L^\Phi(\mathcal{X})} < \infty$. We now introduce the generalized Orlicz–Morrey space as follows.

Definition 4.30. Let $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and Φ be an Orlicz function with positive lower type r_Φ^- and positive upper type r_Φ^+ . The *generalized Orlicz–Morrey space* $L^{(\Phi,\varphi)}(\mathcal{X})$ is defined to be the set of all $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^\Phi(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\|f\|_{L^{(\Phi,\varphi)}(\mathcal{X})} := \sup_B \|f\|_{\Phi,\varphi,B} < \infty$, where the supremum is taken over all balls $B \subset \mathcal{X}$ and

$$\|f\|_{\Phi,\varphi,B} := \inf \left\{ \lambda \in (0, \infty) : \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B \Phi \left(\frac{|f(x)|}{\lambda} \right) d\mu(x) \leq \varphi(B) \right\}.$$

It is easy to prove that $L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})$ is a quasi-Banach space because $\|\cdot\|_{\Phi, \varphi, B} = \|\cdot\|_{L^\Phi(B, \mu_B)}$, where $\mu_B := \frac{\mu}{\mu(B)\varphi(B)}$, which is a quasi-norm on the Orlicz space $L^\Phi(B, \mu_B)$. If $1 \leq r_\Phi^- \leq r_\Phi^+ < \infty$, then $L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})$ is a Banach space equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})}$. If $\varphi(B) = [\mu(B)]^{-1}$, then $L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X}) = L^\Phi(\mathcal{X})$ which is an Orlicz space. If $\Phi(t) = t^p$ with $p \in (0, \infty)$ and $\varphi = \phi^p$, then $L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X}) = L_{p, \phi}(\mathcal{X})$ which is a generalized Morrey space.

In what follows, if there is no confusion, we always omit the variable in integrals. For any given ball B , from Hölder's inequality for Orlicz spaces, we deduce that, for any $f \in L^\Phi(B, d\mu_B)$ and $g \in L^{\bar{\Phi}}(B, d\mu_B)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B |fg| d\mu &= \mu(B)\varphi(B) \int_B |fg| d\mu_B \\ &\leq 2\mu(B)\varphi(B)\|f\|_{L^\Phi(B, d\mu_B)}\|g\|_{L^{\bar{\Phi}}(B, d\mu_B)} \\ &= 2\mu(B)\varphi(B)\|f\|_{\Phi, \varphi, B}\|g\|_{\bar{\Phi}, \varphi, B}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Next, we define the generalized Orlicz-block space.

Definition 4.31. Let $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and Ψ be an Orlicz function with $1 < r_\Psi^- \leq r_\Psi^+ < \infty$. A function b on \mathcal{X} is called a (φ, Ψ) -block if there exists a ball B , called the *supporting ball* of b , such that

- (i) $\text{supp } b \subset B$;
- (ii) $b \in L^\Psi(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|b\|_{\Psi, \varphi, B} \leq \frac{1}{\mu(B)\varphi(B)}$.

Denote by $B(\varphi, \Psi)$ the set of all (φ, Ψ) -blocks.

By (4.14) and Definitions 4.30 and 4.31, we find that, for any $b \in B(\varphi, \Psi)$ with its supporting ball B ,

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} bg d\mu \right| \leq \int_B |bg| d\mu \leq 2\mu(B)\varphi(B)\|b\|_{\Psi, \varphi, B}\|g\|_{\bar{\Psi}, \varphi, B} \leq 2\|g\|_{L^{(\bar{\Psi}, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})}, \quad (4.15)$$

where $\bar{\Psi}$ is the complementary Orlicz function of Ψ . That is, the mapping $g \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{X}} bg d\mu$ is a bounded linear functional on $L^{(\bar{\Psi}, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})$ with norm not exceeding 2.

Definition 4.32. Let $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and Ψ be an Orlicz function with $1 < r_\Psi^- \leq r_\Psi^+ < \infty$. Assume that $L^{(\bar{\Psi}, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X}) \neq \{0\}$. The *Orlicz-block space* $B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})$ is defined to be the set of all $f \in [L^{(\bar{\Psi}, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})]^*$ such that there exist a sequence $\{b_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $B(\varphi, \Psi)$ and a sequence $\{\lambda_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $[0, \infty)$ satisfying $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j < \infty$ such that

$$f = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j b_j \text{ in } [L^{(\bar{\Psi}, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})]^*. \quad (4.16)$$

For any $f \in B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})$, define

$$\|f\|_{B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})} := \inf \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j : f = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j b_j \text{ in } [L^{(\bar{\Psi}, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})]^* \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all decompositions of f as in (4.16).

It is easy to show that $B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})$ is a Banach space equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})}$. The Orlicz-block space $B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})$ was introduced in [89], where it was proved to be the predual space of $L^{(\bar{\Psi}, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})$ in the case where both $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$ and φ is a function from $(0, \infty)$ to $(0, \infty)$. If $\Psi(t) = t^q$, $q \in (1, \infty)$, and $\varphi = \phi^{q'}$, then $B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X}) = B^{[\phi, q]}(\mathcal{X})$ which is a generalized block space.

Now, we first show that $L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})$ is a ball quasi-Banach space. The following lemma was proven by [111, Lemma 4.1] in the case where $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$, $r_\Phi^- \geq 1$, and $\varphi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$.

Lemma 4.33. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_1^{\text{dec}}$ satisfy (4.4) and Φ be an Orlicz function with positive lower type r_Φ^- and positive upper type r_Φ^+ . Then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any ball B , $\mathbf{1}_B \in L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(X)$ and*

$$\frac{1}{\Phi^{-1}(\varphi(B))} \leq \|\mathbf{1}_B\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(X)} \leq \frac{C}{\Phi^{-1}(\varphi(B))}. \quad (4.17)$$

Proof. Let B be a ball. An elementary calculation shows that

$$\|\mathbf{1}_B\|_{\Phi, \varphi, B} = \frac{1}{\Phi^{-1}(\varphi(B))}. \quad (4.18)$$

From this and Definition 4.30, we infer that the first inequality in (4.17) holds. Next, we prove the second inequality in (4.17). Let $\lambda := \frac{1}{\Phi^{-1}(\varphi(B))}$. Then it is enough to show that there exists a constant $C \in [1, \infty)$ such that, for any ball B' with $B \cap B' \neq \emptyset$,

$$\frac{1}{\mu(B')\varphi(B')} \int_{B'} \Phi\left(\frac{\mathbf{1}_B}{C\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq 1. \quad (4.19)$$

Since $B \cap B' \neq \emptyset$, we can take a positive constant $k \in [1, \infty)$, independent of B and B' , such that $B' \subset kB$ or $B \subset kB'$ holds. We consider the following two cases.

Case (1) $B' \subset kB$. In this case, by the fact that $\Phi(t) \geq \Phi(0)$ for any $t \in [0, \infty)$, the definition of λ , and the properties of φ , we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{\mu(B')\varphi(B')} \int_{B'} \Phi\left(\frac{\mathbf{1}_B}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq \frac{1}{\varphi(B')} \Phi\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) = \frac{\varphi(B)}{\varphi(B')} \lesssim 1.$$

Case (2) $B \subset kB'$. In this case, from the fact that $\Phi(t) \geq \Phi(0)$ for any $t \in [0, \infty)$, the definition of λ , and the properties of φ , it follows that

$$\frac{1}{\mu(B')\varphi(B')} \int_{B'} \Phi\left(\frac{\mathbf{1}_B}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq \frac{1}{\mu(B')\varphi(B')} \int_B \Phi\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) d\mu = \frac{\mu(B)\varphi(B)}{\mu(B')\varphi(B')} \lesssim 1.$$

By the both cases, we find that (4.19) and hence (4.17) holds, which then completes the proof of Lemma 4.33. \square

Using Definition 4.30 and Lemma 4.33, we immediately obtain the following conclusion.

Theorem 4.34. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_1^{\text{dec}}$ satisfy (4.4) and Φ be an Orlicz function with positive lower type r_Φ^- and positive upper type r_Φ^+ . Then $L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(X)$ is a ball quasi-Banach function space. Moreover, if $1 \leq r_\Phi^- \leq r_\Phi^+ < \infty$, then $L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(X)$ is a ball Banach function space.*

Now, we prove that $B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(X)$ is a ball quasi-Banach function space. We show that, in some special cases, the generalized Orlicz-block space reduces to the Orlicz space.

Lemma 4.35. *Let $\varphi : X \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and Ψ be an Orlicz function with $1 < r_\Psi^- \leq r_\Psi^+ < \infty$. If there exists a positive constant C_* such that, for any ball B ,*

$$\frac{1}{C_*} \leq \varphi(B)\mu(B) \leq C_*, \quad (4.20)$$

Then $B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(X) = L^\Psi(X)$ and there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(X)$,

$$C^{-1}\|f\|_{L^\Psi(X)} \leq \|f\|_{B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(X)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^\Psi(X)}.$$

Proof. From the assumption that φ satisfies (4.20), we deduce that $L^{(\tilde{\Psi}, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X}) = L^{\tilde{\Psi}}(\mathcal{X})$ with equivalent norms. Let $f \in B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})$. Then there exist a sequence $\{b_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $B(\varphi, \Psi)$ and a sequence $\{\lambda_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $[0, \infty)$ satisfying $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j < \infty$ such that $f = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j b_j$ in $[L^{(\tilde{\Psi}, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})]^* = [L^{\tilde{\Psi}}(\mathcal{X})]^* = L^{\Psi}(\mathcal{X})$ and $2\|f\|_{B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})} \geq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j$. By this and (4.15), we conclude that, for any $g \in L^{\tilde{\Psi}}(\mathcal{X})$,

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} g f d\mu \right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \int_{B_j} |b_j g| d\mu \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \|g\|_{L^{(\tilde{\Psi}, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})} \sim \|f\|_{B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})} \|g\|_{L^{\tilde{\Psi}}(\mathcal{X})},$$

which proves $f \in L^{\Psi}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|f\|_{L^{\Psi}} \lesssim \|f\|_{B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})}$.

Conversely, let $f \in L^{\Psi}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\lambda \in (\|f\|_{L^{\Psi}(\mathcal{X})}, \infty)$. Then

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \Psi\left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq 1. \quad (4.21)$$

Choose a sequence of balls $\{B_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $B_j \subset B_{j+1}$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} B_j = \mathcal{X}$, and

$$\int_{B_j^c} \Psi\left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq (2^{-j})^{r_{\Psi}^+}$$

for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, which, together with (4.21) and (4.20), further implies that

$$\int_{B_1} \Psi\left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq 1 \leq C_* \mu(B_1) \varphi(B_1)$$

and, for any $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap [2, \infty)$,

$$\int_{B_{j-1}^c} \Psi\left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq (2^{-j+1})^{r_{\Psi}^+} C_* \mu(B_j) \varphi(B_j).$$

From this, we infer that there exists $C \in (0, \infty)$, depending only on Ψ and C_* , such that

$$\|f \mathbf{1}_{B_1}\|_{\Psi, \varphi, B_1} \leq C \|f\|_{L^{\Psi}(\mathcal{X})} \quad (4.22)$$

and, for any $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap [2, \infty)$,

$$\|f \mathbf{1}_{B_j \setminus B_{j-1}}\|_{\Psi, \varphi, B_j} \leq 2^{-j+1} C \|f\|_{L^{\Psi}(\mathcal{X})}. \quad (4.23)$$

Let $\lambda_1 := \varphi(B_1) \mu(B_1) \|f \mathbf{1}_{B_1}\|_{\Psi, \varphi, B_1}$ and $b_1 := \lambda_1^{-1} f \mathbf{1}_{B_1}$ and, for any $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap [2, \infty)$, let

$$\lambda_j := \varphi(B_j) \mu(B_j) \|f \mathbf{1}_{B_j \setminus B_{j-1}}\|_{\Psi, \varphi, B_j}$$

and $b_j := \lambda_j^{-1} f \mathbf{1}_{B_j \setminus B_{j-1}}$. Then, by (4.22), (4.23), (4.20), and Definition 4.31, we find that, for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda_j \leq 2^{-j+1} C C_* \|f\|_{L^{\Psi}(\mathcal{X})}$ and $b_j \in B(\varphi, \Psi)$, which implies that

$$f = f \mathbf{1}_{B_1} + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} f \mathbf{1}_{B_j \setminus B_{j-1}} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j b_j$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \leq C C_* \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{-j+1} \|f\|_{L^{\Psi}(\mathcal{X})} \leq 2 C C_* \|f\|_{L^{\Psi}(\mathcal{X})}.$$

That is, $f \in B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|f\|_{B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})} \leq 2 C C_* \|f\|_{L^{\Psi}(\mathcal{X})}$. This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.35. \square

In the proof of the next lemma, we need the following inequality: Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_1^{\text{dec}}$ satisfy (4.4). Then there exists $C \in [1, \infty)$ such that, for any balls B_1 and B_2 ,

$$\frac{\mu(B_1 \cap B_2)}{\mu(B_2)\varphi(B_2)} \leq \frac{C}{\varphi(B_1)}; \quad (4.24)$$

see [114, Lemma 3.18].

Lemma 4.36. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_1^{\text{dec}}$ satisfy (4.4) and Ψ be an Orlicz function with $1 < r_\Psi^- \leq r_\Psi^+ < \infty$. Then $B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X}) \subset L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathcal{X})$ and the expression (4.16) converges μ -a.e. on \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. Let $f \in B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}$. Then there exist a sequence $\{b_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}$ and a sequence $\{\lambda_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $[0, \infty)$ satisfying $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j < \infty$ such that $f = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j b_j$ in $[L^{(\tilde{\Psi}, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})]^*$. For any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let B_j be the supporting ball of b_j . An elementary calculation shows that, for any ball B ,

$$\|\mathbf{1}_{B \cap B_j}\|_{\tilde{\Psi}, \varphi, B_j} = \frac{1}{\tilde{\Psi}^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(B_j)\varphi(B_j)}{\mu(B \cap B_j)}\right)}.$$

From this, (4.14), and (4.24), we deduce that, for any ball B ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j |b_j| d\mu &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \int_{B_j} |b_j| \mathbf{1}_{B \cap B_j} d\mu \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \mu(B_j) \varphi(B_j) \|b_j\|_{\Psi, \varphi, B_j} \|\mathbf{1}_{B \cap B_j}\|_{\tilde{\Psi}, \varphi, B_j} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \frac{1}{\tilde{\Psi}^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu(B_j)\varphi(B_j)}{\mu(B \cap B_j)}\right)} \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \frac{1}{\tilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\varphi(B))} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j b_j$ converges μ -a.e. to some function in $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathcal{X})$ and hence $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathcal{X})$. This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.36. \square

By an argument similar to that used in the proof of [114, Lemmas 3.22 and 3.25], we can prove the following two lemmas; we omit the details.

Lemma 4.37. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_1^{\text{dec}}$ satisfy (4.4) and Ψ be an Orlicz function with $1 < r_\Psi^- \leq r_\Psi^+ < \infty$. If $g, f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})$ are such that $|g| \leq |f|$ μ -a.e. on \mathcal{X} , then $\|g\|_{B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})} \leq \|f\|_{B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})}$.*

Lemma 4.38. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_1^{\text{dec}}$ satisfy (4.4) and Ψ be an Orlicz function with $1 < r_\Psi^- \leq r_\Psi^+ < \infty$. Assume that φ satisfies (4.20) or both*

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \varphi(x, r) = \infty \quad (4.25)$$

for any ball $B \subset \mathcal{X}$ and

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x, r) \mu(B(x, r)) = \infty \quad (4.26)$$

for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Let $\{f_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})$ and $f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})$. If $0 \leq f_m \uparrow f$ μ -almost everywhere on \mathcal{X} as $m \rightarrow \infty$, then $\|f_m\|_{B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})} \uparrow \|f\|_{B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})}$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Using Definition 4.32, Lemmas 4.37 and 4.38, and the properties of the Lebesgue integral, we immediately obtain the following conclusion; we omit the details.

Theorem 4.39. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_1^{\text{dec}}$ satisfy (4.4) and Ψ be an Orlicz function with $1 < r_\Psi^- \leq r_\Psi^+ < \infty$. Assume that φ satisfies (4.20) or both (4.25) and (4.26). Then $B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})$ is a ball Banach function space.*

By an argument similar to that used in the proof of [114, Theorem 3.28], we can also show that the generalized Orlicz–Morrey space and the generalized Orlicz–block space are associate spaces of each other; we omit the details.

Theorem 4.40. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_1^{\text{dec}}$ satisfy (4.4) and (Φ, Ψ) be a complementary pair of Orlicz functions with $1 < r_\Phi^- \leq r_\Phi^+ < \infty$. Then $[B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})]' = L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})$ and, for any $g \in [B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})]'$, it holds $\|g\|_{[B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})]'} \sim \|g\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})}$ with the positive equivalence constants independent of g . In addition, assume that (4.20) holds or assume that both (4.25) and (4.26) hold. Then $[L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})]' = B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})$ and, for any $f \in [L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})]'$, $\|f\|_{[L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})]'} \sim \|f\|_{B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(\mathcal{X})}$ with the positive equivalence constants independent of f .*

Next, we prove the boundedness of the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \mathcal{M} on generalized Orlicz–Morrey spaces and generalized Orlicz-block spaces. It is known that, if $1 < r_\Phi^- \leq r_\Phi^+ < \infty$, then there exists a positive constant c such that, for any $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathcal{X})$, the modular inequality

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(\mathcal{M}f) d\mu \leq c \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(c|f|) d\mu \quad (4.27)$$

holds, where the positive constant c is independent of f ; see Kokilashvili and Krbeć [66, Theorem 1.2.1] whose proof is available to spaces of homogeneous type.

Theorem 4.41. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_1^{\text{dec}}$ satisfy (4.4) and Φ be an Orlicz function with $1 < r_\Phi^- \leq r_\Phi^+ < \infty$. Then the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \mathcal{M} is bounded on $L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})$.*

Theorem 4.41 with $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\varphi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ was shown in [85, 87]. To prove Theorem 4.41, we need the following lemma, which is exactly [111, Lemma 4.3].

Lemma 4.42. *Let $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and Φ be an Orlicz function with $1 < r_\Phi^- \leq r_\Phi^+ < \infty$. Then, for any $f \in L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})$ and any ball B ,*

$$\frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B |f| d\mu \leq 2\Phi^{-1}(\varphi(B)) \|f\|_{\Phi, \varphi, B}.$$

Proof of Theorem 4.41. Let $f \in L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\|f\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})} = 1$. It suffices to prove that, for any ball $B(x, r)$ with $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\frac{1}{\mu(B(x, r))} \int_{B(x, r)} \Phi(\mathcal{M}f) d\mu \lesssim \varphi(x, r). \quad (4.28)$$

Let $k := K_0(1 + 2K_0)$ and write $f = f_1 + f_2$ with $f_1 := f\mathbf{1}_{B(x, kr)}$ and $f_2 := f\mathbf{1}_{[B(x, kr)]^c}$. By (4.27), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(x, r)} \Phi(\mathcal{M}f_1) d\mu &\leq c \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(c|f_1|) d\mu = c \int_{B(x, kr)} \Phi(c|f|) d\mu \\ &\leq c^2 \mu(B(x, kr)) \varphi(x, kr) \sim \mu(B(x, r)) \varphi(x, r). \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

Now, notice that, for any given $z \in B(x, r)$,

$$\mathcal{M}f_2(z) = \sup_{B(y, s) \ni z} \int_{B(y, s)} |f_2| d\mu = \sup_{\substack{B(y, s) \ni z \\ B(y, s) \cap [B(x, kr)]^c \neq \emptyset}} \int_{B(y, s)} |f| d\mu. \quad (4.30)$$

If the ball $B(y, s)$ with $y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $s \in (0, \infty)$ satisfies both $B(y, s) \ni z$ and $B(y, s) \cap [B(x, kr)]^c \neq \emptyset$, then $r \leq s$. Actually, if $r > s$, then, by Definition 2.1(iii), we conclude that, for any $w \in B(y, s)$,

$$\rho(x, w) \leq K_0[\rho(x, z) + \rho(z, w)] \leq K_0\rho(x, z) + K_0^2[\rho(z, y) + \rho(y, w)] \leq K_0(r + 2K_0s) < kr,$$

that is, $w \in B(x, kr)$ and hence $B(y, s) \subset B(x, kr)$, which contradicts $B(y, s) \cap [B(x, kr)]^c \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, from (4.30) and Lemma 4.42, it follows that, for any $z \in B(x, r)$,

$$\mathcal{M}f_2(z) \leq \sup_{\substack{B(y, s) \ni z \\ r \leq s}} \int_{B(y, s)} |f| d\mu \lesssim \sup_{\substack{B(y, s) \ni z \\ r \leq s}} \Phi^{-1}(\varphi(y, s)).$$

Notice that, if $B(x, r) \cap B(y, s) \neq \emptyset$ and $r \leq s$, then $\varphi(y, s) \sim \varphi(x, s) \lesssim \varphi(x, r)$, which further implies that $\Phi(\mathcal{M}f_2(z)) \lesssim \varphi(x, r)$. By this and (4.29), we find that (4.28) holds. This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.42. \square

We turn to consider the generalized Orlicz-block space.

Theorem 4.43. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_1^{\text{dec}}$ satisfy (4.4) and Ψ be an Orlicz function with $1 < r_{\Psi}^- \leq r_{\Psi}^+ < \infty$. Assume that there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$\int_r^\infty \frac{\varphi(x, t)}{t} dt \leq C\varphi(x, r). \quad (4.31)$$

Then the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \mathcal{M} is bounded on $B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(X)$.

Proof. We first claim that there exists a positive constant C_0 such that, for any $b \in B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}$,

$$\|\mathcal{M}b\|_{B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}(X)} \leq C_0. \quad (4.32)$$

Indeed, let $b \in B_{(\varphi, \Psi)}$ and $B(x, r)$ be its supporting ball, where $x \in X$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$. Let c be the same positive constant as in (4.27) and let $k := K_0(1 + 2K_0)$. From (4.27), we infer that, for any $\lambda \in (c\|b\|_{\Psi, \varphi, B(x, r)}, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, kr))\varphi(x, kr)} \int_{B(x, kr)} \Psi\left(\frac{(\mathcal{M}b)\mathbf{1}_{B(x, kr)}}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, kr))\varphi(x, kr)} \int_X \Psi\left(\frac{\mathcal{M}b}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \\ & \leq \frac{c}{\mu(B(x, kr))\varphi(x, kr)} \int_X \Psi\left(\frac{c|b|}{\lambda}\right) d\mu \leq \frac{c\mu(B(x, r))\varphi(x, r)}{\mu(B(x, kr))\varphi(x, kr)} \leq C_1, \end{aligned}$$

which, combined with Definition 4.31(ii) and the assumption on φ , further implies that

$$\|\mathcal{M}b\|_{\Psi, \varphi, B(x, kr)} \leq C_2\|b\|_{\Psi, \varphi, B(x, r)} \leq \frac{C_2}{\mu(B(x, r))\varphi(x, r)} \leq \frac{C_3}{\mu(B(x, kr))\varphi(x, kr)}, \quad (4.33)$$

where the positive constants C_1 , C_2 , and C_3 depend only on c , K_0 , $L_{(\mu)}$, Ψ , and φ .

Next, let $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. For any given $z \notin B(x, 2^jkr)$, we have

$$\mathcal{M}b(z) = \sup_{B(y, s) \ni z} \int_{B(y, s)} |b| d\mu = \sup_{B(y, s) \ni z, B(x, r) \cap B(y, s) \neq \emptyset} \int_{B(y, s)} |b| d\mu.$$

If $z \notin B(x, 2^jkr)$, $z \in B(y, s)$, and $B(x, r) \cap B(y, s) \neq \emptyset$, then $2^jr < s$. Indeed, if $s \leq 2^jr$, then Definition 2.1(iii) implies that, for any $w \in B(x, r) \cap B(y, s)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(x, z) & \leq K_0[\rho(x, y) + \rho(y, z)] \\ & \leq K_0\{K_0[\rho(x, w) + \rho(w, y)] + \rho(y, z)\} \\ & < K_0[K_0(r + s) + s] \leq K_0(2K_0 + 1)2^jr = 2^jkr, \end{aligned} \quad (4.34)$$

which contradicts $z \notin B(x, 2^jkr)$. Thus, $2^jr < s$. By this, $\text{supp } b \subset B(x, r)$, (2.1), and (4.14), we conclude that, for any $z \notin B(x, 2^jkr)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}b(z) & = \sup_{\substack{B(y, s) \ni z \\ s > 2^jr}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(y, s))} \int_{B(y, s)} |b| d\mu \\ & \leq \sup_{\substack{B(y, s) \ni z \\ s > 2^jr}} \frac{1}{\mu(B(y, s))} \int_{B(x, r)} |b| d\mu \leq \frac{C_4}{\mu(B(x, 2^jr))} \int_{B(x, r)} |b| d\mu \\ & \leq \frac{2C_4\mu(B(x, r))\varphi(x, r)\|b\|_{\Psi, \varphi, B(x, r)}\|1\|_{\tilde{\Psi}, \varphi, B(x, r)}}{\mu(B(x, 2^jr))} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{2C_4 \|1\|_{\widetilde{\Psi}, \varphi, B(x, r)}}{\mu(B(x, 2^j r))} = \frac{2C_4}{\mu(B(x, 2^j r)) \widetilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\varphi(x, r))},$$

where C_4 is a positive constant depending only on K_0 and $L(\mu)$, which, together with (4.18) and the relations $\Psi^{-1}(t) \widetilde{\Psi}^{-1}(t) \sim t$ and $\mu(B(x, 2^{j-1} r)) \sim \mu(B(x, 2^j r))$, further implies that, for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\mathcal{M}b) \mathbf{1}_{B(x, 2^j r) \setminus B(x, 2^{j-1} r)}\|_{\Psi, \varphi, B(x, 2^j r)} \\ & \leq \frac{2C_4}{\mu(B(x, 2^{j-1} r)) \widetilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\varphi(x, r))} \|1\|_{\Psi, \varphi, B(x, 2^j r)} \\ & = \frac{2C_4}{\mu(B(x, 2^{j-1} r)) \widetilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\varphi(x, r)) \Psi^{-1}(\varphi(x, 2^j r))} \\ & \leq \frac{C_5 \widetilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\varphi(x, 2^j r))}{\mu(B(x, 2^j r)) \varphi(x, 2^j r) \widetilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\varphi(x, r))}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.35)$$

where the positive constant C_5 depends only on K_0 , $L(\mu)$, and Ψ .

Now, let $\widetilde{\lambda}_0 := C_3$ and, for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\widetilde{\lambda}_j := \frac{C_5 \widetilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\varphi(x, 2^j r))}{\widetilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\varphi(x, r))}$. Let $\widetilde{b}_0 := \frac{(\mathcal{M}b) \mathbf{1}_{B(x, r)}}{\widetilde{\lambda}_0}$ and, for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\widetilde{b}_j := \frac{(\mathcal{M}b) \mathbf{1}_{B(x, 2^j r) \setminus B(x, 2^{j-1} r)}}{\widetilde{\lambda}_j}$. Then, from (4.33) and (4.35), we deduce that $\widetilde{b}_j \in B(\varphi, \Psi)$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $\mathcal{M}b = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \widetilde{\lambda}_j \widetilde{b}_j$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{M}b\|_{B(\varphi, \Psi)} & \leq \widetilde{\lambda}_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \widetilde{\lambda}_j \lesssim 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\widetilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\varphi(x, 2^j r))}{\widetilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\varphi(x, r))} \\ & \sim 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\widetilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\varphi(x, r))} \int_{2^{j-1} r}^{2^j r} \frac{\widetilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\varphi(x, t))}{t} dt \\ & \leq 1 + \frac{1}{\widetilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\varphi(x, r))} \int_r^{\infty} \frac{\widetilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\varphi(x, t))}{t} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (4.36)$$

By [111, Lemma 4.4] and (4.31), we find that, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\int_r^{\infty} \frac{\widetilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\varphi(x, t))}{t} dt \lesssim \widetilde{\Psi}^{-1}(\varphi(x, r)),$$

which, together with (4.36), completes the proof of (4.32) and hence the aforementioned claim.

Let $f \in B(\varphi, \Psi)(\mathcal{X})$. Then there exist a sequence $\{b_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $B(\varphi, \Psi)$ and a sequence $\{\lambda_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $[0, \infty)$ satisfying $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j \leq 2\|f\|_{B(\varphi, \Psi)(\mathcal{X})}$ such that $f = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j b_j$ μ -almost everywhere on \mathcal{X} , which, combined with (4.32), further implies that

$$\|\mathcal{M}f\|_{B(\varphi, \Psi)(\mathcal{X})} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \|\mathcal{M}b_j\|_{B(\varphi, \Psi)(\mathcal{X})} \leq C_0 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \leq 2C_0 \|f\|_{B(\varphi, \Psi)(\mathcal{X})}.$$

This finishes the proof of Theorem 4.43. \square

The following is a characterization of Orlicz–Morrey spaces in terms of A_1 -weights, which is a generalization of [104, Proposition 285] from Morrey spaces on \mathbb{R}^n to Orlicz–Morrey spaces on spaces of homogeneous type.

Proposition 4.44. *Let φ satisfy both (4.3) and (4.31), and let Φ be an Orlicz function with positive lower type r_{Φ}^- and positive upper type r_{Φ}^+ . Then there exist constants $\theta \in (0, 1)$ and $C \in [1, \infty)$, depending only on K_0 , L_{μ} , Φ , and φ , such that, for any $f \in L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X}, \mu)$,*

$$\|f\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X}, \mu)} \leq \sup_B \|f\|_{L_{(\mathcal{M}1_B)^{1-\theta}}^{\Phi}(\mathcal{X}, \mu_B)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X}, \mu)}, \quad (4.37)$$

where the supremum is taken over all balls $B \subset \mathcal{X}$ and $\mu_B := \frac{\mu}{\varphi(B)\mu(B)}$.

Proof. Since $\mathbf{1}_B \leq (\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}$ for any $\theta \in (0, 1)$, it follows that the first inequality in (4.37) holds. Next, we prove the second inequality in (4.37). Let $f \in L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(X, \mu)$. Using (4.31) and [86, Lemma 7.1], we conclude that there exists a positive constant ϵ such that, for any $x \in X$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\int_r^\infty \frac{\varphi(x, t)t^\epsilon}{t} dt \leq C_\epsilon \varphi(x, r)r^\epsilon. \quad (4.38)$$

Take $\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that $\theta \log_2 L_{(\mu)} \leq \epsilon$. Let $B := B(x, r)$, $k := K_0(1 + 2K_0)$, and $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Notice that, if $z \notin 2^j k B$, $z \in B(y, s)$, and $B(x, r) \cap B(y, s) \neq \emptyset$, then $2^j r < s$; see (4.34). In this case, $\mu(B(y, s)) \sim \mu(B(x, s)) \geq \mu(B(x, 2^j r)) = \mu(2^j B)$. Then, for any given $z \notin 2^j k B$,

$$\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B(z) = \sup_{B(y, s) \ni z} \int_{B(y, s)} \mathbf{1}_{B(x, r)} \leq \sup_{\substack{B(y, s) \ni z \\ B(x, r) \cap B(y, s) \neq \emptyset}} \frac{\mu(B(x, r))}{\mu(B(y, s))} \lesssim \frac{\mu(B)}{\mu(2^j B)},$$

which further implies that

$$(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta} = (\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta} \left(\mathbf{1}_{2kB} + \sum_{j=1}^\infty \mathbf{1}_{2^{j+1}kB \setminus 2^j k B} \right) \lesssim \mathbf{1}_{2kB} + \sum_{j=1}^\infty \left[\frac{\mu(B)}{\mu(2^j B)} \right]^{1-\theta} \mathbf{1}_{2^{j+1}kB \setminus 2^j k B}$$

and, for any $\lambda \in (\|f\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(X)}, \infty)$,

$$\Phi\left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda}\right) (\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta} \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^\infty \left[\frac{\mu(B)}{\mu(2^j B)} \right]^{1-\theta} \Phi\left(\frac{|f| \mathbf{1}_{2^{j+1}kB}}{\lambda}\right).$$

From this, (2.1), $\theta \log_2 L_{(\mu)} \leq \epsilon$, and (4.38), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_X \Phi\left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda}\right) (\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta} d\mu_B \\ & \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^\infty \left[\frac{\mu(B)}{\mu(2^j B)} \right]^{1-\theta} \int_X \Phi\left(\frac{|f| \mathbf{1}_{2^{j+1}kB}}{\lambda}\right) \frac{d\mu}{\mu(B)\varphi(B)} \\ & = \frac{1}{\varphi(B)} \sum_{j=0}^\infty \varphi(2^j B) \left[\frac{\mu(2^j B)}{\mu(B)} \right]^\theta \int_X \Phi\left(\frac{|f| \mathbf{1}_{2^{j+1}kB}}{\lambda}\right) \frac{d\mu}{\mu(2^j B)\varphi(2^j B)} \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{\varphi(B)} \sum_{j=0}^\infty \varphi(2^j B) \left[\frac{\mu(2^j B)}{\mu(B)} \right]^\theta \int_{2^{j+1}kB} \Phi\left(\frac{|f|}{\lambda}\right) \frac{d\mu}{\mu(2^{j+1}kB)\varphi(2^{j+1}kB)} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\varphi(B)} \sum_{j=0}^\infty \varphi(2^j B) \left[\frac{\mu(2^j B)}{\mu(B)} \right]^\theta \lesssim \frac{1}{\varphi(x, r)} \sum_{j=0}^\infty \varphi(x, 2^j r) \frac{(2^j r)^\epsilon}{r^\epsilon} \\ & \sim \frac{1}{\varphi(x, r)r^\epsilon} \sum_{j=0}^\infty \int_{2^j r}^{2^{j+1}r} \frac{\varphi(x, t)t^\epsilon}{t} dt = \frac{1}{\varphi(x, r)r^\epsilon} \int_r^\infty \frac{\varphi(x, t)t^\epsilon}{t} dt \leq C_\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This shows

$$\|f\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}_{(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}}(X, \mu_B)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(X)},$$

where the implicit positive constant is independent of both B and f . This finishes the proof of the second inequality in (4.37) and hence Proposition 4.44. \square

Applying Theorems 1.11 and 4.8 and Proposition 4.44, we obtain the following conclusion.

Theorem 4.45. *Let Φ be an Orlicz function with positive lower type r_Φ^- and positive upper type r_Φ^+ , and let $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_1^{\text{dec}}$ satisfy both (4.4) and (4.31). Assume that φ satisfies (4.20) or both (4.25)*

and (4.26). Let $0 < q < r_\Phi^-$. Then there exist $C, \tilde{C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $f \in [L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}] \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0, 1)} \dot{W}_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\Omega)}^{s, q}$,

$$\begin{aligned} C\|f\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{C}\|f\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We first prove the lower estimate. By Remark 3.2(i) and Proposition 4.44, we find that there exists $\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that, for any $f \in L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\Omega)$,

$$\|f\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\Omega)} \leq \sup_B \|f\|_{L_{(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}}^{\Phi}(\Omega, \mu_B)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\Omega)}$$

with $\mu_B := \frac{\mu}{\mu(B)\varphi(B)}$, where $C \in (0, \infty)$ is independent of f , which, together with Proposition 2.11, further implies that, for any $f \in L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}$,

$$\|f\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} \leq \sup_B \|f\|_{L_{(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}}^{\Phi}(\Omega, \mu_B)/\mathbb{R}} \leq C\|f\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}.$$

From this, the fact that, for any ball $B \subset \mathcal{X}$, $[(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}]_{A_1(\mu_B)} \lesssim 1$ with the implicit positive constant independent of B , and Theorem 4.8, we deduce that, for any $f \in [L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}] \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0, 1)} \dot{W}_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\Omega)}^{s, q}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} &\leq \sup_B \|f\|_{L_{(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}}^{\Phi}(\Omega, \mu_B)/\mathbb{R}} \\ &\lesssim \sup_B \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L_{(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}}^{\Phi}(\Omega, \mu_B)} \\ &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \sup_B s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L_{(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{1}_B)^{1-\theta}}^{\Phi}(\Omega, \mu_B)} \\ &\lesssim \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of the lower estimate.

Then we show the upper estimate. By Theorem 4.34, we conclude that the Orlicz–Morrey space $L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})$ is a ball quasi-Banach function space. Take $p \in [q, r_\Phi^-]$ and let $\Phi^{(\frac{1}{p})}(t) = \Phi(t^{\frac{1}{p}})$. Then $[L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})]^{\frac{1}{p}} = L^{(\Phi^{(\frac{1}{p})}, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})$ is a ball Banach function space. From Theorems 4.40 and 4.43 and $1 < r_{\Phi^{(\frac{1}{p})}}^- \leq r_{\Phi^{(\frac{1}{p})}}^+ < \infty$, it follows that the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \mathcal{M} is bounded on $[L^{(\Phi^{(\frac{1}{p})}, \varphi)}(\mathcal{X})]' = B_{(\varphi, \Phi^{(\frac{1}{p})})}(\mathcal{X})$. Then we find that Assumption I is satisfied for $Y = L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}$. By this and the proof of Theorem 1.11, we obtain

$$\overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{(\Phi, \varphi)}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}}.$$

This finishes the proof of Theorem 4.45. □

Remark 4.46. To the best of our knowledge, Theorem 4.45 is completely new.

The following theorem is an application of Theorem 1.11.

Theorem 4.47. *Let Ψ be an Orlicz function with $1 < r_{\Psi}^{-} \leq r_{\Psi}^{+} < \infty$ and let $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_1^{\text{dec}}$ satisfy both (4.4) and (4.31). Assume that ϕ satisfies (4.20) or both (4.25) and (4.26). If $\beta \in (0, \infty)$, then there exist $C, \tilde{C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that, for any $f \in C_b^{\beta}(\Omega) \cap \bigcup_{s \in (0,1)} \dot{W}_{B(\varphi,\Psi)}^{s,q}(\Omega)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} C\|f\|_{B(\varphi,\Psi)(\Omega)} &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{B(\varphi,\Psi)(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{s \rightarrow 0^+} s^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\| \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(\cdot) - f(y)|^q}{U(\cdot, y)[\rho(\cdot, y)]^{sq}} d\mu(y) \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{B(\varphi,\Psi)(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{C}\|f\|_{B(\varphi,\Psi)(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From Theorem 4.39, we infer that $B_{(\varphi,\Psi)}(X)$ is a ball Banach function space. By Theorems 4.40 and 4.41, we conclude that the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \mathcal{M} is bounded on $[B_{(\varphi,\Psi)}(X)]' = L^{(\Phi,\varphi)}(X)$, where Φ is the complementary Orlicz function of Ψ [see (4.1)]. Using these and applying Theorem 1.11(i), we then obtain the desired estimates, which completes the proof of Theorem 4.47. \square

Remark 4.48. To the best of our knowledge, Theorem 4.47 is completely new.

Declaration of competing interest

The author declares that there is no competing interests.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Professor Durvudkhan Suragan for his insightful suggestion to consider the original results of this article in the setting of domains, which led to Theorems 1.11 and 1.13.

Data availability

No data was used for the research described in the article.

References

- [1] N. Accomazzo, J. Duoandikoetxea, Z. Nieraeth, S. Ombrosi and C. Pérez, Weighted Lorentz spaces: Sharp mixed A_p - A_{∞} estimate for maximal functions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 519 (2023), Paper No. 126844, 15 pp.
- [2] D. R. Adams, A note on Riesz potentials, *Duke Math. J.* 42 (1975), 765–778.
- [3] D. R. Adams, Morrey Spaces, *Lecture Notes in Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis*, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2015.
- [4] A. Alberico, A. Cianchi, L. Pick and L. Slavíková, On the limit as $s \rightarrow 0^+$ of fractional Orlicz–Sobolev spaces, *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.* 26 (2020), Paper No. 80, 19 pp.
- [5] R. Alvarado and M. Mitrea, Hardy Spaces on Ahlfors-Regular Quasi Metric Spaces. A Sharp Theory, *Lecture Notes in Math.* 2142, Springer, Cham, 2015.
- [6] C. Bennett and R. Sharpley, *Interpolation of Operators*, Pure and Applied Mathematics 129, Academic Press, Inc., Boston, MA, 1988.
- [7] Z. Birnbaum and W. Orlicz, Über die verallgemeinerung des begriff and only ifes der zueinander konjugierten potenzen, *Studia Math.* 3 (1931), 1–67.
- [8] J. Bourgain, H. Brezis and P. Mironescu, Another look at Sobolev spaces, in: *Optimal Control and Partial Differential Equations*, pp. 439–455, IOS, Amsterdam, 2001.

- [9] J. Bourgain, H. Brezis and P. Mironescu, Limiting embedding theorems for $W^{s,p}$ when $s \uparrow 1$ and applications, *J. Anal. Math.* 87 (2002), 77–101.
- [10] D. Brazke, A. Schikorra and P.-L. Yung, Bourgain–Brezis–Mironescu convergence via Triebel–Lizorkin spaces, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 62 (2023), Paper No. 41, 33 pp.
- [11] H. Brezis, How to recognize constant functions. A connection with Sobolev spaces, *Russian Math. Surveys* 57 (2002), 693–708.
- [12] H. Brezis and P. Mironescu, Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequalities and non-inequalities: The full story, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* 35 (2018), 1355–1376.
- [13] H. Brezis and P. Mironescu, Where Sobolev interacts with Gagliardo–Nirenberg, *J. Funct. Anal.* 277 (2019), 2839–2864.
- [14] H. Brezis and H. M. Nguyen, The BBM formula revisited, *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl.* 27 (2016), 515–533.
- [15] H. Brezis, A. Seeger, J. Van Schaftingen and P.-L. Yung, Sobolev spaces revisited, *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl.* 33 (2022), 413–437.
- [16] H. Brezis, A. Seeger, J. Van Schaftingen and P.-L. Yung, Families of functionals representing Sobolev norms, *Anal. PDE* 17 (2024), 943–979.
- [17] H. Brezis, J. Van Schaftingen and P.-L. Yung, A surprising formula for Sobolev norms, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 118 (2021), Paper No. e2025254118, 6 pp.
- [18] H. Brezis, J. Van Schaftingen and P.-L. Yung, Going to Lorentz when fractional Sobolev, Gagliardo and Nirenberg estimates fail, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 60 (2021), Paper No. 129, 12 pp.
- [19] S. Buccheri and W. Górny, A metric counterpart of the Gu–Yung formula, *arXiv*: 2403.13475.
- [20] H.-Q. Bui, T. A. Bui and X. T. Duong, Weighted Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces associated with operators and applications, *Forum Math. Sigma* 8 (2020), Paper No. e11, 95 pp.
- [21] T. A. Bui, Global $W^{1,p(\cdot)}$ estimate for renormalized solutions of quasilinear equations with measure data on Reifenberg domains, *Adv. Nonlinear Anal.* 7 (2018), 517–533.
- [22] T. A. Bui, Regularity estimates for nondivergence parabolic equations on generalized Orlicz spaces, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 2021 (2021), 11103–11139.
- [23] T. Q. Bui, T. A. Bui and X. T. Duong, Global regularity estimates for non-divergence elliptic equations on weighted variable Lebesgue spaces, *Commun. Contemp. Math.* 23 (2021), Paper No. 2050014, 26 pp.
- [24] A.-P. Calderón, Intermediate spaces and interpolation, the complex method, *Studia Math.* 24 (1964), 113–190.
- [25] R. del Campo, A. Fernández, F. Mayoral and F. Naranjo, Orlicz spaces associated to a quasi-Banach function space: Applications to vector measures and interpolation, *Collect. Math.* 72 (2021), 481–499.
- [26] M. Capolli, A. Maione, A. M. Salort and E. Vecchi, Asymptotic behaviours in fractional Orlicz–Sobolev spaces on Carnot groups, *J. Geom. Anal.* 31 (2021), 3196–3229.
- [27] D.-C. Chang, S. Wang, D. Yang and Y. Zhang, Littlewood–Paley characterizations of Hardy-type spaces associated with ball quasi-Banach function spaces, *Complex Anal. Oper. Theory* 14 (2020), Paper No. 40, 33 pp.
- [28] F. Chiarenza and M. Frasca, Morrey spaces and Hardy–Littlewood maximal function, *Rend. Mat. Appl.* (7) 7 (1987), 273–279.
- [29] H.-M. Chung, R. A. Hunt and D. S. Kurtz, The Hardy–Littlewood maximal function on $L(p, q)$ spaces with weights, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 31 (1982), 109–120.
- [30] R. R. Coifman and G. Weiss, *Analyse Harmonique Non-commutative sur Certains Espaces Homogènes. Étude de Certaines Intégrales Singulières* (French), *Lecture Notes in Math.* 242, Springer-Verlag, Berlin–New York, 1971.

- [31] R. R. Coifman and G. Weiss, Extensions of Hardy spaces and their use in analysis, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 83 (1977), 569–645.
- [32] V. Crismale, L. De Luca, A. Kubin, A. Ninno and M. Pinsiglione, The variational approach to s -fractional heat flows and the limit cases $s \rightarrow 0^+$ and $s \rightarrow 1^-$, *J. Funct. Anal.* 284 (2023), Paper No. 109851, 38 pp.
- [33] D. V. Cruz-Uribe and A. Fiorenza, *Variable Lebesgue Spaces. Foundations and Harmonic Analysis, Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis*, Birkhäuser/Springer, Heidelberg, 2013.
- [34] D. V. Cruz-Uribe and L. A. D. Wang, Variable Hardy spaces, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 63 (2014), 447–493.
- [35] M. Cwikel and C. Fefferman, Maximal seminorms on weak L^1 , *Studia Math.* 69 (1980/81), 149–154.
- [36] M. Cwikel and C. Fefferman, The canonical seminorm on weak L^1 , *Studia Math.* 78 (1984), 275–278.
- [37] F. Dai, L. Grafakos, Z. Pan, D. Yang, W. Yuan and Y. Zhang, The Bourgain–Brezis–Mironescu formula on ball Banach function spaces, *Math. Ann.* 388 (2024), 1691–1768.
- [38] F. Dai, X. Lin, D. Yang, W. Yuan and Y. Zhang, Poincaré inequality meets Brezis–Van Schaftingen–Yung formula on metric measure spaces, *J. Funct. Anal.* 283 (2022), Paper No. 109645, 52 pp.
- [39] F. Dai, X. Lin, D. Yang, W. Yuan and Y. Zhang, Brezis–Van Schaftingen–Yung formulae in ball Banach function spaces with applications to fractional Sobolev and Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequalities, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 62 (2023), Paper No. 56, 73 pp.
- [40] E. Davoli, G. Di Fratta and V. Pagliari, Sharp conditions for the validity of the Bourgain–Brezis–Mironescu formula, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* (2024), <https://doi.org/10.1017/prm.2024.47>.
- [41] E. Di Nezza, G. Palatucci and E. Valdinoci, Hitchhiker’s guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces, *Bull. Sci. Math.* 136 (2012), 521–573.
- [42] L. Diening, P. Harjulehto, P. Hästö and M. Růžička, *Lebesgue and Sobolev Spaces with Variable Exponents*, Lecture Notes in Math. 2017, Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
- [43] L. Diening, P. Hästö and S. Roudenko, Function spaces of variable smoothness and integrability, *J. Funct. Anal.* 256 (2009), 1731–1768.
- [44] Ó. Domínguez, Y. Li, S. Tikhonov, D. Yang and W. Yuan, A unified approach to self-improving property via K -functionals, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 63 (2024), Paper No. 231, 50 pp.
- [45] Ó. Domínguez and M. Milman, New Brezis–Van Schaftingen–Yung–Sobolev type inequalities connected with maximal inequalities and one parameter families of operators, *Adv. Math.* 411 (2022), Paper No. 108774, 76 pp.
- [46] Ó. Domínguez and M. Milman, Bourgain–Brezis–Mironescu–Maz’ya–Shaposhnikova limit formulae for fractional Sobolev spaces via interpolation and extrapolation, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 62 (2023), Paper No. 43, 37 pp.
- [47] Ó. Domínguez, A. Seeger, B. Street, J. Van Schaftingen and P.-L. Yung, Spaces of Besov–Sobolev type and a problem on nonlinear approximation, *J. Funct. Anal.* 284 (2023), Paper No. 109775, 50 pp.
- [48] R. L. Frank, A characterization of $\dot{W}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, *Pure Appl. Funct. Anal.* 9 (2024), 53–68.
- [49] I. Genebashvili, Weighted estimates in Lorentz spaces for a maximal function given on spaces of homogeneous type, *Proc. A. Razmadze Math. Inst.* 106 (1993), 49–61.
- [50] A. Gogatishvili, P. Koskela and Y. Zhou, Characterizations of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on metric measure spaces, *Forum Math.* 25 (2013), 787–819.
- [51] Q. Gu and Q. Huang, Anisotropic versions of the Brezis–Van Schaftingen–Yung approach at $s = 1$ and $s = 0$, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 525 (2023), 127–156.

- [52] Q. Gu and P.-L. Yung, A new formula for the L^p norm, *J. Funct. Anal.* 281 (2021), Paper No. 109075, 19 pp.
- [53] P. Hajlasz, P. Koskela and H. Tuominen, Sobolev embeddings, extensions and measure density condition, *J. Funct. Anal.* 254 (2008), 1217–1234.
- [54] B.-X. Han, On the asymptotic behaviour of the fractional Sobolev seminorms: A geometric approach, *J. Funct. Anal.* 287 (2024), Paper No. 110608, 25 pp.
- [55] B.-X. Han, A. Pinamonti, Z. Xu and K. Zambanini, Maz'ya–Shaposhnikova meet Bishop–Gromov, *Potential Anal.* 63 (2025), 513–529.
- [56] Y. Han, D. Müller and D. Yang, A theory of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on metric measure spaces modeled on Carnot–Carathéodory spaces, *Abstr. Appl. Anal.* 2008 (2008), Art. ID 893409, 1–250.
- [57] N. Hatano, Atomic decomposition for Morrey–Lorentz spaces, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 541 (2025), Paper No. 128735, 28 pp.
- [58] J. Heinonen, P. Koskela, N. Shanmugalingam and J. T. Tyson, *Sobolev Spaces on Metric Measure Spaces. An Approach Based on Upper Gradients*, New Mathematical Monographs 27, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015.
- [59] K.-P. Ho, Erdélyi–Kober fractional integral operators on ball Banach function spaces, *Rend. Semin. Mat. Univ. Padova* 145 (2021), 93–106.
- [60] L. Huang, D.-C. Chang and D. Yang, Fourier transform of Hardy spaces associated with ball quasi-Banach function spaces, *Appl. Anal.* 101 (2022), 3825–3840.
- [61] R. Hunt, On $L(p, q)$ spaces, *Enseign. Math.* (2) 12 (1966), 249–276.
- [62] M. Izuki, T. Noi and Y. Sawano, The John–Nirenberg inequality in ball Banach function spaces and application to characterization of BMO, *J. Inequal. Appl.* 2019 (2019), Paper No. 268, 11 pp.
- [63] M. Kijaczko, Asymptotics of weighted Gagliardo seminorms, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* (4) 204 (2025), 1715–1728.
- [64] M. Kim, Bourgain, Brezis and Mironescu theorem for fractional Sobolev spaces with variable exponents, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* (4) 202 (2023), 2653–2644.
- [65] J. Kline, P. Koskela and K. Nguyen, Large-scale behaviour of Sobolev functions in Ahlfors regular metric measure spaces, *J. Geom. Anal.* 35 (2025), Paper No. 214, 49 pp.
- [66] V. Kokilashvili and M. Krbeć, *Weighted Inequalities in Lorentz and Orlicz Spaces*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Inc, River Edge, NJ, 1991.
- [67] O. Kováčik and J. Rákosník, On spaces $L^{p(x)}$ and $W^{k,p(x)}$, *Czechoslovak Math. J.* 41 (116) (1991), 592–618.
- [68] M. Křepela, Z. Mihula and J. Soria, A weak-type expression of the Orlicz modular, *Mediterr. J. Math.* 20 (2023), Paper No. 113, 8 pp.
- [69] G. Leoni and D. Spector, Characterization of Sobolev and BV spaces, *J. Funct. Anal.* 261 (2011), 2926–2958.
- [70] B. Li, J. Liu, T. Shen and X. Yan, On the Dirichlet problem for the elliptic equations with boundary values in variable Morrey–Lorentz spaces, *J. Differential Equations* 407 (2024), 311–344.
- [71] Y. Li, D. Yang and L. Huang, *Real-Variable Theory of Hardy Spaces Associated with Generalized Herz Spaces of Rafeiro and Samko*, Lecture Notes in Math. 2320, Springer, Singapore, 2022.
- [72] Y. Li, D. Yang, W. Yuan, Y. Zhang and Y. Zhao, Sharp weighted Cohen–Dahmen–Daubechies–Devore inequality with applications to (weighted) critical Sobolev spaces, Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequalities, and Muckenhoupt weights, arXiv: 2405.19790.
- [73] J. Liu, D. Yang and M. Zhang, Sharp bilinear decomposition for products of both anisotropic Hardy spaces and their dual spaces with its applications to endpoint boundedness of commutators, *Sci. China Math.* 67 (2024), 2091–2152.
- [74] R. Long, The spaces generated by blocks, *Sci. Sinica Ser. A* 27 (1984), 16–26.

- [75] G. G. Lorentz, Some new functional spaces, *Ann. of Math. (2)* 51 (1950), 37–55.
- [76] G. G. Lorentz, On the theory of spaces Λ , *Pacific J. Math.* 1 (1951), 411–429.
- [77] E. Lorist and Z. Nieraeth, Banach function spaces done right, *Indag. Math. (N.S.)* 35 (2024), 247–268.
- [78] S. Lu, M. H. Taibleson and G. Weiss, On the almost everywhere convergence of Bochner–Riesz means of multiple Fourier series, in: *Harmonic Analysis (Minneapolis, Minn., 1981)*, pp. 311–318, *Lecture Notes in Math.* 908, Springer, Berlin–New York, 1982.
- [79] A. Maione, A. Salort and E. Vecchi, Maz’ya–Shaposhnikova formula in magnetic fractional Orlicz–Sobolev spaces, *Asymptot. Anal.* 126 (2022), 201–214.
- [80] V. Maz’ya and T. Shaposhnikova, On the Bourgain, Brezis, and Mironescu theorem concerning limiting embeddings of fractional Sobolev spaces, *J. Funct. Anal.* 195 (2002), 230–238.
- [81] D. Mitrea, I. Mitrea, M. Mitrea and S. Monniaux, *Groupoid Metrization Theory. With Applications to Analysis on Quasi-Metric Spaces and Functional Analysis, Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis*, Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2013.
- [82] Y. Miyadera, Remark on the formula for L^p norm characterized by weak L^p norm, *arXiv*: 2306.01434.
- [83] C. B. Morrey, On the solutions of quasi-linear elliptic partial differential equations, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 43 (1938), 126–166.
- [84] E. Nakai, Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator, singular integral operators and the Riesz potentials on generalized Morrey spaces, *Math. Nachr.* 166 (1994), 95–103.
- [85] E. Nakai, Generalized fractional integrals on Orlicz–Morrey spaces, in: *Banach and Function Spaces*, pp. 323–333, Yokohama Publ., Yokohama, 2004.
- [86] E. Nakai, A generalization of Hardy spaces H^p by using atoms, *Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.)* 24 (2008), 1243–1268.
- [87] E. Nakai, Orlicz–Morrey spaces and the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function, *Studia Math.* 188 (2008), 193–221.
- [88] E. Nakai, Singular and fractional integral operators on Campanato spaces with variable growth conditions, *Rev. Mat. Complut.* 23 (2010), 355–381.
- [89] E. Nakai, Orlicz–Morrey spaces and their preduals, in: *Banach and Function Spaces III (ISBFS 2009)*, pp. 187–205, Yokohama Publ., Yokohama, 2011.
- [90] E. Nakai and Y. Sawano, Hardy spaces with variable exponents and generalized Campanato spaces, *J. Funct. Anal.* 262 (2012), 3665–3748.
- [91] E. Nakai and Y. Sawano, Orlicz–Hardy spaces and their duals, *Sci. China Math.* 57 (2014), 903–962.
- [92] E. Nakai and K. Yabuta, Pointwise multipliers for functions of weighted bounded mean oscillation on spaces of homogeneous type, *Math. Japon.* 46 (1997), 15–28.
- [93] H. Nakano, *Modulated Semi-Ordered Linear Spaces*, Maruzen Co., Ltd., Tokyo, 1950.
- [94] H. Nakano, *Topology of Linear Topological Spaces*, Maruzen Co., Ltd., Tokyo, 1951.
- [95] Z. Nieraeth, Extrapolation in general quasi-Banach function spaces, *J. Funct. Anal.* 285 (2023), Paper No. 110130, 109 pp.
- [96] R. Oberlin, A. Seeger, T. Tao, C. Thiele and J. Wright, A variation norm Carleson theorem, *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* 14 (2012), 421–464.
- [97] W. Orlicz, Über eine gewisse Klasse von Räumen vom Typus B, *Bull. Int. Acad. Pol. Ser. A* 8 (1932), 207–220.
- [98] Z. Pan, D. Yang, W. Yuan and Y. Zhang, Gagliardo representation of norms of ball quasi-Banach function spaces, *J. Funct. Anal.* 286 (2024), Paper No. 110205, 78 pp.
- [99] A. Pinamonti, M. Squassina and E. Vecchi, The Maz’ya–Shaposhnikova limit in the magnetic setting, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 449 (2017), 1152–1159.
- [100] A. C. Ponce, A new approach to Sobolev spaces and connections to α -convergence, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 19 (2004), 229–255.

- [101] M. M. Rao and Z. D. Ren, *Theory of Orlicz Spaces, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics* 146, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1991.
- [102] M. M. Rao and Z. D. Ren, *Applications of Orlicz Spaces, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics* 250, Marcel Dekker, New York, 2002.
- [103] Y. Sawano, *Theory of Besov Spaces, Developments in Mathematics* 56, Springer, Singapore, 2018.
- [104] Y. Sawano, G. Di Fazio and D. Hakim, *Morrey Spaces-Introduction and Applications to Integral Operators and PDE's, Vol. I, Monographs and Research Notes in Mathematics*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2020.
- [105] Y. Sawano, G. Di Fazio and D. Hakim, *Morrey Spaces-Introduction and Applications to Integral Operators and PDE's, Vol. II, Monographs and Research Notes in Mathematics*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2020.
- [106] Y. Sawano, K.-P. Ho, D. Yang and S. Yang, Hardy spaces for ball quasi-Banach function spaces, *Dissertationes Math.* 525 (2017), 1–102.
- [107] Y. Sawano and H. Tanaka, Morrey spaces for non-doubling measures, *Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.)* 21 (2005), 1535–1544.
- [108] Y. Sawano and H. Tanaka, Predual spaces of Morrey spaces with non-doubling measures, *Tokyo J. Math.* 32 (2009), 471–486.
- [109] Y. Sawano and H. Tanaka, The Fatou property of block spaces, *J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo* 22 (2015), 663–683.
- [110] A. Seeger and T. Tao, Sharp Lorentz space estimates for rough operators, *Math. Ann.* 320 (2001), 381–415.
- [111] M. Shi, R. Arai and E. Nakai, Commutators of integral operators with functions in Campanato spaces on Orlicz–Morrey spaces, *Banach J. Math. Anal.* 15 (2021), Paper No. 22, 41 pp.
- [112] J. Strömberg and A. Torchinsky, *Weighted Hardy Spaces, Lecture Notes in Math.* 1381, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [113] M. H. Taibleson and G. Weiss, Certain function spaces connected with almost everywhere convergence of Fourier series, in: *Conference on Harmonic Analysis in Honor of Antoni Zygmund, Vol. I, II* (Chicago, Ill., 1981), pp. 95–113, Wadsworth Math. Ser., Wadsworth, Belmont, CA, 1983.
- [114] M. Tang, E. Nakai, D. Yang, W. Yuan and C. Zhu, Weak-type representation of quasi-norms of ball quasi-Banach function spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, *J. Geom. Anal.* 35 (2025), Paper No. 150, 74 pp.
- [115] J. Tao, D. Yang, W. Yuan and Y. Zhang, Compactness characterizations of commutators on ball Banach function spaces, *Potential Anal.* 58 (2023), 645–679.
- [116] F. Wang, D. Yang and S. Yang, Applications of Hardy spaces associated with ball quasi-Banach function spaces, *Results Math.* 75 (2020), Paper No. 26, 58 pp.
- [117] F. Wang, D. Yang and W. Yuan, Riesz transform characterization of Hardy spaces associated with ball quasi-Banach function spaces, *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.* 29 (2023), Paper No. 56, 49 pp.
- [118] F. Wang, D. Yang and W. Yuan, Wavelet characterization of Triebel–Lizorkin spaces for $p = \infty$ on spaces of homogeneous type and its applications, *J. Approx. Theory* 285 (2023), Paper No. 105838, 50 pp.
- [119] S. Yamaguchi, The distance in Morrey spaces to C_{comp}^∞ , arXiv: 2501.17620.
- [120] X. Yan, Z. He, D. Yang and W. Yuan, Hardy spaces associated with ball quasi-Banach function spaces on spaces of homogeneous type: Littlewood–Paley characterizations with applications to boundedness of Calderón–Zygmund operators, *Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.)* 38 (2022), 1133–1184.
- [121] X. Yan, Z. He, D. Yang and W. Yuan, Hardy spaces associated with ball quasi-Banach function spaces on spaces of homogeneous type: Characterizations of maximal functions, decompositions, and dual spaces, *Math. Nachr.* 296 (2023), 3056–3116.

- [122] D. Yang, Y. Liang and L. D. Ky, Real-Variable Theory of Musielak–Orlicz Hardy Spaces, Lecture Notes in Math. 2182, Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [123] W. Yuan, W. Sickel and D. Yang, Morrey and Campanato Meet Besov, Lizorkin and Triebel, Lecture Notes in Math. 2005, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010.
- [124] Z. Zeng, D. Yang and W. Yuan, Extension and embedding of Triebel–Lizorkin-type spaces built on ball quasi-Banach spaces, J. Geom. Anal. 34 (2024), Paper No. 335, 71 pp.
- [125] Y. Zhang, L. Huang, D. Yang and W. Yuan, New ball Campanato-type function spaces and their applications, J. Geom. Anal. 32 (2022), Paper No. 99, 42 pp.
- [126] Y. Zhang, S. Wang, D. Yang and W. Yuan, Weak Hardy-type spaces associated with ball quasi-Banach function spaces I: Decompositions with applications to boundedness of Calderón–Zygmund operators, Sci. China Math. 64 (2021), 2007–2064.
- [127] Y. Zhao, Y. Li, D. Yang, W. Yuan and Y. Zhang, Generalized Frank characterizations of Muckenhoupt weights and homogeneous ball Banach Sobolev spaces, Adv. Math. 458 (2024), Paper No. 109957, 63 pp.
- [128] C. Zhu, D. Yang and W. Yuan, Generalized Brezis–Seeger–Van Schaftingen–Yung formulae and their applications in ball Banach Sobolev spaces, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 62 (2023), Paper No. 234, 76 pp.
- [129] C. Zhu, D. Yang and W. Yuan, Brezis–Seeger–Van Schaftingen–Yung-type characterization of homogeneous ball Banach Sobolev spaces and its applications, Commun. Contemp. Math. 26 (2024), Paper No. 2350041, 48 pp.
- [130] C. Zhu, D. Yang and W. Yuan, Bourgain–Brezis–Mironescu-type characterization of inhomogeneous ball Banach Sobolev spaces on extension domains, J. Geom. Anal. 34 (2024), Paper No. 295, 70 pp.

Eiichi Nakai

Department of Mathematics, Ibaraki University, Mito, Ibaraki 310-8512, Japan

E-mail: eiichi.nakai.math@vc.ibaraki.ac.jp

Menghao Tang, Dachun Yang (Corresponding author) and Wen Yuan

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

E-mails: mhtang@mail.bnu.edu.cn (M. Tang)

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

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

Chenfeng Zhu

School of Mathematical Sciences, Zhejiang University of Technology, Hangzhou 310023, The People’s Republic of China

E-mail: chenfengzhu@zjut.edu.cn