

# PRODUCTS OF FUNCTIONS IN BMO AND $\mathcal{H}^1$ SPACES ON SPACES OF HOMOGENEOUS TYPE

JUSTIN FEUTO

ABSTRACT. We give an extension to certain *RD-space*  $\mathcal{X}$ , i.e space of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Weiss, which has the reverse doubling property, of the definition and various properties of the product of functions in  $\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{X})$ , and functions in Lipschitz space  $\Lambda_{\frac{1}{p}-1}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X})$  for  $p \in \left(\frac{n}{n+\theta}, 1\right]$ , where  $n$  and  $\theta$  denote respectively the "dimension" and the order of  $\mathcal{X}$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that  $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is the dual space of  $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and that multiplication by  $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is a bounded operator on  $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Those facts allow Bonami, Iwaniec, Jones and Zinsmeister, to define in [2] a product  $\mathfrak{b} \times \mathfrak{h}$  of  $\mathfrak{b} \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $\mathfrak{h} \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$  as a distribution, operating on a test function  $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  by the rule

$$(1) \quad \langle \mathfrak{b} \times \mathfrak{h}, \varphi \rangle := \langle \mathfrak{b}\varphi, \mathfrak{h} \rangle.$$

They proved that such distributions are sums of a function in  $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and a distribution in a Hardy-Orlicz space  $\mathcal{H}^\varrho(\mathbb{R}^n, \nu)$  where

$$(2) \quad \varphi(t) = \frac{t}{\log(e+t)} \text{ and } d\nu(x) = \frac{dx}{\log(e+|x|)}.$$

The idea of defining the above product is motivated among other things by the fact that for  $1 < p < \infty$ , the product  $fg$  of  $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $g$  in the dual space  $L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  of  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is integrable (consequently is a distribution). The Hardy space  $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$  being the right substitute of  $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$  in many problems, it seems natural to look at its product with its dual space  $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Following of the idea in [2], A. Bonami and J. Feuto in [1] extend results, replacing  $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  by  $\mathfrak{bmo}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , defined as the space of locally integrable functions  $\mathfrak{b}$  such that

$$(3) \quad \sup_{|B| \leq 1} \left( \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B |\mathfrak{b}(x) - \mathfrak{b}_B| dx \right) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{|B| \geq 1} \left( \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B |\mathfrak{b}(x)| dx \right) < \infty,$$

---

*Key words and phrases.* space of homogeneous type, Hardy-Orlicz spaces, atomic decomposition, space of test function, distribution space, maximal function.

where  $B$  varies among all balls of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $|B|$  denotes the measure of the ball  $B$  and  $\mathfrak{b}_B$  is the mean of  $\mathfrak{b}$  on  $B$ . They proved that in this case, the weight  $x \mapsto \frac{dx}{\log(e+|x|)}$  is not necessary.

They also proved that for  $\mathfrak{h}$  in the Hardy space  $\mathcal{H}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$  ( $0 < p < 1$ ) the Hardy-Orlicz space is replaced by  $\mathcal{H}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$  provided  $\mathfrak{b}$  belongs to the inhomogeneous Lipschitz space  $\Lambda_{n(\frac{1}{p}-1)}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

The space of homogeneous type introduced by R.R Coifman and G. Weiss in [4] being the right space for generalize results stated in the euclidean spaces, we give here the analogous of those results in this context. For this purpose, we consider a space of homogeneous type  $(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$  (see Section 2 for more explanation about this space) in which all annuli are not empty, i.e.  $B(x, R) \setminus B(x, r) \neq \emptyset$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $0 < r < R < \infty$ , where  $B(x, r) = \{y \in \mathcal{X} : d(x, y) < r\}$  is the ball centered at  $x$  and with radius  $r$ . According to [24], the doubling measure  $\mu$  then satisfies the reverse doubling property: there exist two positive constants  $\kappa$  and a constant  $c_\mu$  depending only on  $\mu$ , such that

$$(4) \quad \frac{\mu(B)}{\mu(\tilde{B})} \geq c_\mu \left( \frac{r(B)}{r(\tilde{B})} \right)^\kappa \quad \text{for all balls } \tilde{B} \subset B,$$

where  $r(B)$  denotes the radius of the ball  $B$ . This reverse doubling condition yields that  $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$ . Using the doubling condition (15) and the reverse condition (4), we have that

$$(5) \quad c_\mu \lambda^\kappa \mu(B(x, r)) \leq \mu(B(x, \lambda r)) \leq C_\mu \lambda^n \mu(B(x, r))$$

for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $r > 0$  and  $\lambda \geq 1$ . We will refer to  $n$  as the dimension of the space. We will also assume that there exists a positive non decreasing function  $\varphi$  defined on  $[0, \infty)$  such that for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $r > 0$ ,

$$(6) \quad \mu(B_{(x,r)}) \sim \varphi(r).^1$$

Notice that (4),(15) and (6) imply that

$$(7) \quad r^n \lesssim {}^2\varphi(r) \lesssim r^\kappa \quad \text{if } 0 < r < 1$$

and

$$(8) \quad r^\kappa \lesssim \varphi(r) \lesssim r^n \quad \text{if } 1 \leq r.$$

These spaces are particular case of the class spaces of homogeneous type named *RD-spaces* in [8]. An example of such space is obtained by considering a Lie group  $X$  with polynomial growth equipped with a left Haar measure  $\mu$  and

---

<sup>1</sup>Hereafter we propose the following abbreviation  $A \sim B$  for the inequalities  $C^{-1}A \leq B \leq CB$ , where  $C$  is a positive constant not depending on not depending on the main parameters.

<sup>2</sup> $A \lesssim B$  mean the ratio  $A/B$  is bounded away from zero by a constant independent of the relevant variables in  $A$  and  $B$

the Carnot-Carathéodory metric  $d$  associated with a Hörmander system of left invariant vector fields (see [10],[17] and [22]).

We use the maximal characterization of Hardy spaces in space of homogeneous type as developed by Grafakos, Lu and Yang in [8]. It is proved that this maximal characterization of  $\mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$  agrees with the atomic characterization of Coifman and Weiss in [5] if  $p \in (\frac{n}{n+\theta}, 1]$ , where  $\theta$  is as in relation (17).

We recall that for  $p \in (0, 1]$  and  $q \in [1, \infty] \cap (p, \infty]$ , a function  $\mathbf{a} \in L^q(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$  is said to be a  $(p, q)$ -atom if the following conditions are fulfilled:

- (a1)  $\mathbf{a}$  is supported in a ball  $B$ ,
- (a2)  $\|\mathbf{a}\|_{L^q(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)} \leq [\mu(B)]^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p}}$  if  $q < \infty$   
and  $\|\mathbf{a}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)} \leq \mu(B)^{-\frac{1}{p}}$  if  $q = \infty$ ,
- (a3)  $\int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{a}(x) d\mu(x) = 0$ .

It is proved in Corollary 4.19 of [8] that for  $p \in (\frac{n}{n+\theta}, 1]$  and  $q \in (p, \infty] \cap [1, \infty]$ ,  $f \in \mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$  if and only if there is a sequence  $(\mathbf{a}_i)_{i \geq 0}$  of  $(p, q)$ -atoms, each  $\mathbf{a}_i$  supported in a ball  $B_i$ , and a sequence  $(\lambda_i)_{i \geq 0}$  of scalars such that

$$(9) \quad \mathfrak{h} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i \mathbf{a}_i \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_i|^p < \infty,$$

where the first series is considered in the sense of distribution as defined in [8], and  $\|\mathfrak{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X})} \sim \inf \left\{ \left( \sum_{i \geq 0} |\lambda_i|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\}$ , the infimum being taken over all the decomposition of  $f$  as above and  $\|\mathfrak{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X})}$  as in (22). For  $\mathfrak{b} \in \text{BMO}(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$  and  $\mathfrak{h} \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$  as in (9), the series  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i (\mathfrak{b} - \mathfrak{b}_{B_i}) \mathbf{a}_i$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i \mathfrak{b}_{B_i} \mathbf{a}_i$  converge in the sense of distribution as we can see in the proof of Theorem 1.1. Thus we define the product of  $\mathfrak{b} \times \mathfrak{h}$  as the sum of both series, i. e. we put

$$(10) \quad \mathfrak{b} \times \mathfrak{h} := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i (\mathfrak{b} - \mathfrak{b}_{B_i}) \mathbf{a}_i + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i \mathfrak{b}_{B_i} \mathbf{a}_i.$$

Our main result can be stated as follows.

**Theorem 1.1.** *For  $\mathfrak{h} \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$  and  $\mathfrak{b} \in \text{BMO}(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$ , the product  $\mathfrak{b} \times \mathfrak{h}$  can be given a meaning in the sense of distributions. Moreover, if  $x_0$  is a fixed element of  $\mathcal{X}$  then we have the inclusion*

$$(11) \quad \mathfrak{b} \times \mathfrak{h} \in L^1(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu) + \mathcal{H}^\varphi(\mathcal{X}, d, \nu),$$

where

$$(12) \quad d\nu(x) = \frac{d\mu(x)}{\log(e + d(x_0, x))}.$$

This result is a generalization of Theorem A of [2]. In Proposition 4.1, we prove that the estimate is valid without weight for  $\mathfrak{b}$  in  $\mathfrak{bmo}(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$ , while in Theorem 4.2 we obtain that Hardy-Orlicz class is replaced by the classical

weight Hardy space  $\mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X}, d, \tau)$  ( $d\tau(x) = w(x)d\mu(x)$  for some appropriate weight) when  $\mathfrak{h} \in \mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$  and  $\mathfrak{b} \in \Lambda_{\frac{1}{p}-1}(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$ . This result is new even in the Euclidean case, since in [1] there was only a remark on the possibility of such estimate.

Section 2 is devoted to notations and definitions. We recall in this paragraph the definition of spaces of homogeneous type and the grand maximal characterization of Hardy space as introduced in [8]. In section 3, we give a prerequisite on Hardy-Orlicz space and prove some lemmas we need for our main result. We prove our main result in the last section, as well as its extensions.

Throughout the paper,  $C$  will denote constants that are independent of the main parameters involved, with values which may differ from line to line.

## 2. NOTATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

A quasimetric  $d$  on a set  $\mathcal{X}$ , is a function  $d : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  which satisfies

- (i)  $d(x, y) = 0$  if and only if  $x = y$  ;
- (ii)  $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$  for all  $x, y$  in  $\mathcal{X}$ ;
- (iii) there exists a finite constant  $K_0 \geq 1$  such that

$$(13) \quad d(x, y) \leq K_0 (d(x, z) + d(z, y))$$

for all  $x, y, z$  in  $\mathcal{X}$ .

The set  $\mathcal{X}$  equipped with a quasimetric  $d$  is called quasimetric space.

Let  $\mu$  be a positive Borel measure on  $(\mathcal{X}, d)$  such that all balls defined by  $d$  have finite and positive measure. We say that the triple  $(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$  is a space of homogeneous type if there exists a constant  $C \geq 1$  such that for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $r > 0$ , we have

$$(14) \quad \mu(B(x, 2r)) \leq C\mu(B(x, r)).$$

This property is known as the doubling property. If  $C_0$  is the smallest constant for which (14) holds, then by iterating (14), we have

$$(15) \quad \frac{\mu(B)}{\mu(\tilde{B})} \leq C_\mu \left( \frac{r(B)}{r(\tilde{B})} \right)^{\mathfrak{n}} \text{ for all balls } \tilde{B} \subset B$$

where  $\mathfrak{n} = \log_2(C_0)$  and  $C_\mu = C_0(2K_0)^{\mathfrak{n}}$ .

Notice that from the reverse doubling property,  $\mu(\{x\}) = 0$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . We also have that

$$(16) \quad \mu(B(x, r + d(x, y))) \sim \mu(B(y, r)) + \mu(B(y, d(y, x)))$$

for  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $r > 0$ .

In this paper,  $\mathcal{X} = (\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$  is a space of homogeneous type in which relations (4) and (6) are satisfied. We also assume (see [15]) that there exist two constants  $A'_0 > 0$  and  $0 < \theta \leq 1$  such that

$$(17) \quad |d(x, z) - d(y, z)| \leq A'_0 d(x, y)^\theta [d(x, z) + d(y, z)]^{1-\theta}.$$

The space is saying to be of order  $\theta$ . We will refer to the constants  $K_0, C_0, \mathfrak{n}, \kappa, C_\mu, c_\mu, A'_0$  and  $\theta$  mentioned above, as the constants of the space. We will not mention the measure and the quasimetric when talking about the space  $(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$ . But if we use another measure than  $\mu$ , this will be mentioned explicitly. The following abbreviation for the measure of balls will be also used

$$(18) \quad V_r(x) = \mu(B(x, r)) \text{ and } V(x, y) = \mu(B(x, d(x, y))),$$

for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $r > 0$ .

**Definition 2.1.** [8] *Let  $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $r > 0$ ,  $0 < \beta \leq 1$  and  $\gamma > 0$ . A complex values function  $\varphi$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  is called a test function of type  $(x_0, r, \beta, \gamma)$  if the following hold:*

$$(i) \quad |\varphi(x)| \leq C \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, r+d(x, x_0)))} \left( \frac{r}{r+d(x_0, x)} \right)^\gamma \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{X},$$

$$(ii) \quad |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| \leq C \left( \frac{d(x, y)}{r+d(x_0, x)} \right)^\beta \frac{1}{\mu(B(x, r+d(x, x_0)))} \left( \frac{r}{r+d(x_0, x)} \right)^\gamma \text{ for all } x, y \text{ in } \mathcal{X} \text{ satisfying } d(x, y) \leq \frac{r+d(x_0, x)}{2K_0}.$$

We denote by  $\mathcal{G}(x_0, r, \beta, \gamma)$  the set of all test functions of type  $(x_0, r, \beta, \gamma)$ , equipped with the norm

$$(19) \quad \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{G}(x_0, r, \beta, \gamma)} = \inf \{C : (i) \text{ and } (ii) \text{ hold}\}.$$

In the sequel, we will fix an element  $x_0$  in  $\mathcal{X}$  and put  $\mathcal{G}(\beta, \gamma) = \mathcal{G}(x_0, 1, \beta, \gamma)$ . It is easy to prove that

$$(20) \quad \mathcal{G}(x_1, r, \beta, \gamma) = \mathcal{G}(\beta, \gamma),$$

with equivalent norms for all  $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $r > 0$ . Furthermore, it is easy to check that  $\mathcal{G}(\beta, \gamma)$  is a Banach space.

For a given  $\epsilon \in (0, \theta]$  and  $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \epsilon]$ ,  $\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma)$  denotes the completion of  $\mathcal{G}(\epsilon, \epsilon)$  in  $\mathcal{G}(\beta, \gamma)$ . Equip  $\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma)$  with the norm  $\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma)} = \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{G}(\beta, \gamma)}$ , and denote  $(\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma))'$  its dual space; that is the set of linear functionals  $f$  from  $\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma)$  to  $\mathbb{C}$  with the property that there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that for all  $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma)$ ,  $|\langle f, \varphi \rangle| \leq C \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{G}(\beta, \gamma)}$ . This dual space will be refer to as a distribution space.

For  $f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma))'$ , the grand maximal function  $f^*$  of  $f$  in the sense of Grafakos, Liu and Yang [8] is defined for  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  by

$$(21) \quad f^*(x) = \sup \left\{ |\langle f, \varphi \rangle| : \varphi \in \mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma), \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{G}(x, r, \beta, \gamma)} \leq 1 \text{ for some } r > 0 \right\}.$$

The corresponding Hardy space  $\mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X})$  is defined for  $p \in (0, \infty]$  to be the set of  $\mathfrak{h} \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma))'$  for which

$$(22) \quad \|\mathfrak{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X})} := \|\mathfrak{h}^*\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} < \infty.$$

It is proved in Proposition 3.15 and Theorem 4.17 of [8] that for  $\epsilon \in (0, \theta]$  and  $p \in (\frac{n}{n+\epsilon}, 1]$ , the definition of  $\mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X})$  as stated above is independent of the choice of the underlying space of distribution, i. e. if  $f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta_1, \gamma_1))'$  with

$$(23) \quad \mathfrak{n}(1/p - 1) < \beta_1, \gamma_1 < \epsilon$$

and  $\|\mathfrak{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X})} < \infty$  then  $f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta_2, \gamma_2))'$  for every  $\beta_2$  and  $\gamma_2$  satisfying (23).

In the rest of the paper  $0 < \epsilon \leq \theta$  is fixed and  $p \in (\frac{n}{n+\epsilon}, 1]$ . We also fix the underline space of distribution  $\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta, \gamma)'$  with  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  as in (23).

As mentioned in the introduction, the dual space of  $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{X})$  is  $\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})$  (space of bounded mean oscillation function), defined as the set of locally integrable functions  $\mathfrak{b}$  satisfying

$$(24) \quad \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B |\mathfrak{b}(x) - \mathfrak{b}_B| d\mu(x) \leq A, \text{ for all ball } B,$$

where  $\mathfrak{b}_B = \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B \mathfrak{b}(x) d\mu(x)$ , and  $A$  a constant depending only on  $\mathfrak{b}$  and the space constant. We put

$$(25) \quad \|\mathfrak{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})} = \sup_{B:\text{ball}} \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B |\mathfrak{b}(x) - \mathfrak{b}_B| d\mu(x)$$

and

$$(26) \quad \|\mathfrak{b}\|_{\text{BMO}^+} = \|\mathfrak{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})} + |f_{\mathbb{B}}|,$$

where  $\mathbb{B}$  is the ball center at  $x_0$  and with radius 1. When the measure of  $\mathcal{X}$  is finite,  $(\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X}), \|\cdot\|_{\text{BMO}})$  is a Banach space. The set of equivalence classes of functions under the relation "  $\mathfrak{b}_1$  and  $\mathfrak{b}_2$  in  $\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})$  are equivalent if and only if  $\mathfrak{b}_1 - \mathfrak{b}_2$  is constant" which we still denote by  $\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})$  equipped with  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})}$  is a Banach space .

As proved in [5], we have that for every  $1 \leq q < \infty$

$$(27) \quad \|\mathfrak{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \sup_{B:\text{ball}} \left( \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B |\mathfrak{b} - \mathfrak{b}_B|^q d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim \|\mathfrak{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})},$$

for all  $\mathfrak{b}$  in  $\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})$ , where the supremum is taken over all balls of  $\mathcal{X}$ .

We also have by the doubling condition of the measure  $\mu$ , that for  $\mathfrak{b} \in \text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})$ , and  $B$  a ball in  $(\mathcal{X}, d)$ ,

$$(28) \quad |\mathfrak{b}_B - \mathfrak{b}_{2^k B}| \leq C(1+k) \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})} \text{ for all non negative integer } k,$$

Theorem B of [5] (see also Theorem 5.3 of [11]) stated that for  $\frac{n}{n+\epsilon} < p < 1$ , the dual space of Hardy space  $\mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X})$  is the Lipschitz space  $\Lambda_{\frac{1}{p}-1}(\mathcal{X})$ . We

recall that for  $0 < \gamma$ , the Lipschitz space  $\Lambda_\gamma(\mathcal{X})$  is the set of those functions  $f$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  for which

$$(29) \quad |f(x) - f(y)| \leq A\mu(B)^\gamma,$$

where  $B$  is any ball containing both  $x$  and  $y$  and  $A$  is a constant depending only on  $f$ .

We can see that this definition of Lipschitz recovers the Euclidean case only when  $0 < \gamma < \frac{1}{n}$ . In fact, unless  $\gamma$  is sufficiently small, it can happen that the only functions satisfying (29) are the constants. But, as shown in [4] there are situations where these spaces are not trivial. However, we are going to consider only  $0 < \gamma < \frac{\varepsilon}{n}$ , since it is the range in which the atomic definition of Hardy coincides with the maximal function characterization. Let put

$$(30) \quad \|f\|_{\Lambda_\gamma(\mathcal{X})} = \inf \{A : (29) \text{ holds}\}$$

then  $\|\cdot\|_{\Lambda_\gamma(\mathcal{X})}$  is a norm on the set of equivalence classes of functions under the relation " $b_1$  and  $b_2$  in  $\Lambda_\gamma(\mathcal{X})$  are equivalent if and only if  $b_1 - b_2$  is constant", which we still denote  $\Lambda_\gamma(\mathcal{X})$ .

### 3. A PREREQUISITE ABOUT ORLICZ SPACES

Let

$$(31) \quad \wp(t) = \frac{t}{\log(e+t)} \text{ for all } t > 0.$$

A  $\mu$ -measurable function  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is said to belong to the Orlicz space  $L^\wp(\mathcal{X})$  if

$$(32) \quad \|f\|_{L^\wp} := \inf \left\{ k > 0 : \int_{\mathcal{X}} \wp(k^{-1}|f(x)|) d\mu(x) \leq 1 \right\} < \infty.$$

It is easy to see that  $L^1(\mathcal{X}) \subset L^\wp(\mathcal{X})$ . More precisely, we have

$$(33) \quad \|f\|_{L^\wp(\mathcal{X})} \leq \|f\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})}.$$

We are going to recall some results involved Orlicz spaces mention in [2], which are also valid in the context of space of homogeneous type.

- (i) If  $\text{Exp L}(\mathcal{X})$  is the Orlicz space associated to the Orlicz function  $t \mapsto e^t - 1$  and  $\text{L kg L}(\mathcal{X})$  the one associated to  $t \mapsto t \log(e+t)$  then we have the following Hölder type inequality

$$(34) \quad \|fg\|_{L^\wp(\mathcal{X})} \leq 4 \|f\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})} \|g\|_{\text{Exp L}(\mathcal{X})}$$

for all  $f \in L^\wp(\mathcal{X})$  and  $g \in \text{Exp L}(\mathcal{X})$  using the elementary inequality

$$(35) \quad \frac{ab}{\log(e+ab)} \leq a + e^b - 1 \text{ for all } a, b \geq 0.$$

We also have the duality between  $\text{Exp } L(\mathcal{X})$  and  $L \log L(\mathcal{X})$ , that is

$$(36) \quad \|fg\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})} \leq 2 \|f\|_{L \log L(\mathcal{X})} \|g\|_{\text{Exp } L(\mathcal{X})},$$

using the following inequalities

$$(37) \quad ab \leq a \log(1+a) + e^b - 1 \text{ for all } a, b \geq 0.$$

- (ii) Since the Orlicz function  $\wp$  we consider is not convex, the triangular inequality does not hold for  $\|\cdot\|_{L^\wp(\mathcal{X})}$ . But we have the following substitute

$$(38) \quad \|f+g\|_{L^\wp(\mathcal{X})} \leq 4\|f\|_{L^\wp(\mathcal{X})} + 4\|g\|_{L^\wp(\mathcal{X})},$$

for  $f, g \in L^\wp(\mathcal{X})$ . This relation remain valid if we replace the measure  $\mu$  by any one absolutely continuous compared to  $\mu$ .

- (iii)  $L^\wp(\mathcal{X})$  equipped with the metric

$$(39) \quad \mathfrak{d}(f, g) := \inf \left\{ \delta > 0 : \int_{\mathcal{X}} \wp(\delta^{-1} |f(x) - g(x)|) d\mu(x) \leq \delta \right\}$$

is a complete linear metric space.

- (iv) If  $\mathfrak{d}(f, g) \leq 1$ , then

$$(40) \quad \|f - g\|_{L^\wp} \leq \mathfrak{d}(f, g) \leq 1.$$

- (v) A sequence  $(f_n)_{n>0}$  converge in  $L^\wp(\mathcal{X})$  to  $f$  if and only if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n - f\|_{L^\wp} = 0$ .

We define the Hardy-Orlicz space  $\mathcal{H}^\wp(\mathcal{X})$ , to be the subset of  $\mathcal{G}_0^\xi(\beta, \gamma)'$  consists of distributions  $f$  such that  $f^* \in L^\wp(\mathcal{X})$ , and we put

$$(41) \quad \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^\wp(\mathcal{X})} := \|f^*\|_{L^\wp(\mathcal{X})}.$$

In [21], it is proved that this characterization of Hardy-Orlicz spaces coincide with some atomic characterization.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $\mathfrak{b}$  be in  $\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})$ . There exists a constant  $C$  such that for every  $(1, q)$ -atom  $\mathfrak{a}$  supported in a ball  $B$ ,*

$$(42) \quad \|(\mathfrak{b} - \mathfrak{b}_B)\mathfrak{a}^*\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})} \leq C \|\mathfrak{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathfrak{b} \in \text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\mathfrak{a}$  a  $(1, q)$ -atom supported in  $B = B(x_0, R)$ . We have

$$(43) \quad \|(\mathfrak{b} - \mathfrak{b}_B)\mathfrak{a}^*\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})} = \int_{B(x_0, 2K_0R)} |\mathfrak{b}(z) - \mathfrak{b}_B| \mathfrak{a}^*(z) d\mu(z) + \int_{B^c(x_0, 2K_0R)} |\mathfrak{b}(z) - \mathfrak{b}_B| \mathfrak{a}^*(z) d\mu(z),$$

where  $B^c(x_0, 2K_0R) = \mathcal{X} \setminus B(x_0, 2K_0R)$ . Furthermore we have

$$(44) \quad \mathfrak{a}^*(z) \leq C\mathcal{M}\mathfrak{a}(z) \text{ for all } z \in \mathcal{X},$$



where  $\mathcal{M}\mathbf{a}(z) = \sup_{B: B \ni z} \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B |\mathbf{a}(x)| d\mu(x)$  denote the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function of  $\mathbf{a}$ , according to Proposition 3.10 of [8]. We also have

$$(45) \quad \mathbf{a}^*(z) \leq C \left( \frac{R}{d(z, x_0)} \right)^\beta \frac{1}{\mu(B(z, d(z, x_0)))}, \text{ for all } z \notin B(x_0, 2K_0R),$$

as it is shown in the proof of Lemma 4.4 of [8]. If we take (44) into first term of the sums (43) and use Hölder inequality with  $1 < q < \infty$ , then we have

$$(46) \quad \int_{B(x_0, 2K_0R)} |\mathbf{b}(z) - \mathbf{b}_B| \mathbf{a}^*(z) d\mu(z) \leq \left( \int_{B(x_0, 2K_0R)} |\mathbf{b}(z) - \mathbf{b}_B|^{q'} d\mu(z) \right)^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{M}\mathbf{a}(z)^q d\mu(z) \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

Since the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator  $\mathcal{M}$  is bounded in  $L^q(\mathcal{X})$ , there exists a constant  $C$  such that

$$(47) \quad \int_{B(x_0, 2K_0R)} |\mathbf{b}(z) - \mathbf{b}_B| \mathbf{a}^*(z) d\mu(z) \leq C \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})}$$

according to relation (27).

On the other hand if we take (54) in the second term of (43) we have

$$(48) \quad \int_{B^c(x_0, 2K_0R)} |\mathbf{b}(z) - \mathbf{b}_B| \mathbf{a}^*(z) d\mu(z) \leq C \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{(2K_0)^{k+1}B \setminus (2K_0)^k B} \left( \frac{R}{d(z, x_0)} \right)^\beta \frac{|\mathbf{b}(z) - \mathbf{b}_B|}{\mu(B(z, d(z, x_0)))} d\mu(z) \leq C \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (2K_0)^{-k\beta} \left[ \frac{1}{\mu((2K_0)^{k+1}B)} \int_{(2K_0)^{k+1}B} |\mathbf{b}(z) - \mathbf{b}_{(2K_0)^{k+1}B}| d\mu(z) + |\mathbf{b}_{(2K_0)^{k+1}B} - \mathbf{b}_B| \right],$$

where the second inequality comes from the fact that  $\mu(B(z, d(z, x_0))) \sim \mu(B(x_0, d(z, x_0)))$ . Since the series  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (2K_0)^{-k\beta}$  converges, we also have that there exists a constant  $C$  not depending on  $\mathbf{b}$  and  $\mathbf{a}$ , such that

$$(49) \quad \int_{B^c(x_0, 2K_0R)} |\mathbf{b}(z) - \mathbf{b}_B| \mathbf{a}^*(z) d\mu(z) \leq C \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})},$$

which end the proof.  $\square$

It is well known that the John-Nirenberg inequality is valid in the context of space of homogeneous type (see [14]). This inequality states that there exist

constants  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  such that for any  $\mathbf{b} \in \text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})$  with  $\|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})} \neq 0$  and any ball  $B \subset \mathcal{X}$ , we have

$$(50) \quad \mu(\{x \in B : |\mathbf{b}(x) - \mathbf{b}_B| > \lambda\}) \leq K_1 \exp\left(-\frac{K_2 \lambda}{\|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})}}\right) \mu(B) \text{ for all } \lambda > 0.$$

An immediate consequence of this inequality is that there is a constant  $K_3$  depending only on the space constants, such that

$$(51) \quad \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B \exp\left(\frac{|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_B|}{K_3 \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})}}\right) \leq 2.$$

for all balls  $B$  in  $\mathcal{X}$ .

Notice that we can choose  $K_3$  as big as we like.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\mathbb{B}$  be the ball centered at  $x_0$  with radius 1. There exists a positive constant  $K_4$  such that for any  $\mathbf{b} \in \text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})$  with  $\|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})} \neq 0$  we have*

$$(52) \quad \int_X \frac{e^{\frac{|\mathbf{b}(x) - \mathbf{b}_{\mathbb{B}}|}{K_4 \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})}} - 1}}{(1 + d(x_0, x))^{2n}} d\mu(x) \leq 1.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{b} \in \text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})$  with  $\|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})} \neq 0$ . We have

$$(53) \quad \int_X \frac{e^{\frac{|\mathbf{b}(x) - \mathbf{b}_{\mathbb{B}}|}{K_3 \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})}} - 1}}{(1 + d(x_0, x))^{2n}} d\mu(x) = \int_{\mathbb{B}} \frac{e^{\frac{|\mathbf{b}(x) - \mathbf{b}_{\mathbb{B}}|}{K_3 \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})}} - 1}}{(1 + d(x_0, x))^{2n}} d\mu(x) + \int_{\mathbb{B}^c} \frac{e^{\frac{|\mathbf{b}(x) - \mathbf{b}_{\mathbb{B}}|}{K_3 \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})}} - 1}}{(1 + d(x_0, x))^{2n}} d\mu(x),$$

where  $\mathbb{B}^c = \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathbb{B}$ . The first term in the right hand side is less than  $\mu(\mathbb{B})$ . for the second term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{B}^c} \frac{e^{\frac{|\mathbf{b}(x) - \mathbf{b}_{\mathbb{B}}|}{K_3 \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})}} - 1}}{(1 + d(x_0, x))^{2n}} d\mu(x) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{2^k \leq d(x_0, x) < 2^{k+1}} \frac{e^{\frac{|\mathbf{b}(x) - \mathbf{b}_{\mathbb{B}}|}{K_3 \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})}} - 1}}{(1 + d(x_0, x))^{2n}} d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-2nk} \int_{B(x_0, 2^{k+1})} \left( e^{\frac{|\mathbf{b}(x) - \mathbf{b}_{\mathbb{B}}|}{K_3 \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})}} - 1} \right) d\mu(x). \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that  $|\mathbf{b}_{\mathbb{B}} - \mathbf{b}_{B(x_0, 2^{k+1})}| \leq \log(2^{\frac{C_0(k+1)}{\log 2}}) \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})}$  and  $\mu(B(x_0, 2^{k+1})) \leq 2^{(k+1)\log_2 C_0} \mu(\mathbb{B})$ , we have the term we are estimated less than

$$(54) \quad C \mu(\mathbb{B}) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{(-n + \frac{C_0}{K_3 \log 2})k}.$$

Take  $K_3 > \frac{C_0}{\mathbf{n} \log 2}$ . Then the series (54) converges. Therefore,

$$(55) \quad \int_X \frac{e^{\frac{|\mathbf{b}(x) - \mathbf{b}_{\mathbb{B}}|}{K_3 \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})}} - 1}}{(1 + d(x_0, x))^{2\mathbf{n}}} d\mu(x) \leq C\mu(\mathbb{B}).$$

The result follows.  $\square$

Let us introduce the following measures

$$(56) \quad d\nu := \frac{d\mu(x)}{\log(e + d(x_0, x))} \text{ and } d\sigma(x) := \frac{d\mu(x)}{(1 + d(x_0, x))^{2\mathbf{n}}},$$

where  $\mathbf{n}$  is the dimension of  $\mathcal{X}$ . It follows from the above lemma that for  $\mathbf{b} \in \text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})$  we have

$$(57) \quad \|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_{\mathbb{B}}\|_{\text{Exp L}(\mathcal{X}, \sigma)} \leq C \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})}.$$

We can also see that for a  $\nu$ -measurable function  $f$ , we have

$$(58) \quad \|f\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X}, \nu)} \leq \|f\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})}.$$

The next result is the analogous of Lemma 3.2 of [2] in the context of spaces of homogeneous type, and its proof is just an adaptation of the one give in that paper.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $f \in \text{Exp L}(\mathcal{X}, \sigma)$ . Then for  $g \in L^1(\mathcal{X})$  we have  $g \cdot f \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{X}, \nu)$  and*

$$(59) \quad \|g \cdot f\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X}, \nu)} \leq C \|g\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})} \|f\|_{\text{Exp L}(\mathcal{X}, \sigma)}.$$

If moreover  $f \in \text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})$  then

$$(60) \quad \|g \cdot f\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X}, \nu)} \leq C \|g\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}^+(\mathcal{X})}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $f \in \text{Exp L}(\mathcal{X}, \sigma)$  and  $g \in L^1(\mathcal{X})$ . If  $\|g\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})} = 0$  or  $\|f\|_{\text{Exp L}(\mathcal{X}, \sigma)} = 0$  then there is nothing to prove. Thus we assume that  $\|g\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})} \|f\|_{\text{Exp L}(\mathcal{X}, \sigma)} \neq 0$ . Let us put  $A = 8\mathbf{n} \|g\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})}$  and  $B = 8\mathbf{n} \|f\|_{\text{Exp L}(\mathcal{X}, \sigma)}$ . We are going to prove that the constant  $C$  is  $64\mathbf{n}^2$ . For this it is sufficient to prove that

$$(61) \quad \int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{\frac{1}{AB} |fg| d\mu(x)}{\log(e + \frac{1}{AB} |fg|) \log(e + d(x_0, x))} \leq 1.$$

For this purpose, we will use the following elementary inequality :

$$(62) \quad 2\mathbf{n} \log(e + d(x_0, x)) > \log(e + (1 + d(x_0, x))^{2\mathbf{n}}) \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{X},$$

and for all  $a, b > 0$ ,

$$(63) \quad \log(e + a) \log(e + b) > \frac{1}{2} \log(e + ab).$$

It comes from the relation (62) that

$$(64) \quad \frac{\frac{1}{AB} |fg|}{\log\left(e + \frac{1}{AB} |fg|\right) \log(e + d(x_0, x))} \leq \frac{\frac{2n}{AB} |fg|}{\log\left(e + \frac{1}{AB} |fg|\right) \log(e + (1 + d(x_0, x))^{2n})}$$

so that applying relation (63) to the left hand side of the inequality, yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\frac{1}{AB} |fg|}{\log\left(e + \frac{1}{AB} |fg|\right) \log(e + d(x_0, x))} &\leq \frac{\frac{4n}{AB} |fg|}{\log\left(e + \frac{1}{AB} |fg|\right) (1 + d(x_0, x))^{2n}} \\ &\leq 4n \frac{|g|}{B} + \frac{4n \left(e^{\frac{|f|}{A}} - 1\right)}{(1 + d(x_0, x))^{2n}}, \end{aligned}$$

according to relation (35). Taking the integral of both sides we obtain inequality (59), since

$$\frac{4n \left(e^{\frac{|f|}{A}} - 1\right)}{(1 + d(x_0, x))^{2n}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\left(e^{8n \frac{|f|}{A}} - 1\right)}{(1 + d(x_0, x))^{2n}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\left(e^{\frac{|f|}{\|f\|_{\text{Exp } L(\mathcal{X}, \sigma)}}} - 1\right)}{(1 + d(x_0, x))^{2n}},$$

and

$$4n \frac{|g|}{B} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{|g|}{\|g\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})}}.$$

The inequality (60) is also trivial if  $\|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})} = 0$ . Thus we assume that  $f$  is not constant almost everywhere and we put  $f \cdot g = (f - f_{\mathbb{B}}) \cdot g + f_{\mathbb{B}} \cdot g$ , so that using relation (38), relation (59) and (57), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f \cdot g\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X}, \nu)} &\leq C \left( \|(f - f_{\mathbb{B}}) \cdot g\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X}, \nu)} + \|f_{\mathbb{B}} \cdot g\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X}, \nu)} \right) \\ &\leq C \left( \|f - f_{\mathbb{B}}\|_{\text{Exp } L(\mathcal{X}, \sigma)} \|g\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})} + |f_{\mathbb{B}}| \|g\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})} \right) \\ &\leq C \|g\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X}, \nu)} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}^+(\mathcal{X})}, \end{aligned}$$

which complete our proof.  $\square$

#### 4. PROOF OF OUR MAIN RESULT

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Let  $\mathbf{b} \in \text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\mathbf{h} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i \mathbf{a}_i \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{X})$ , where  $(\mathbf{a}_i)_{i \geq 1}$  is a sequence of  $(p, \infty)$ -atoms, with  $\mathbf{a}_i$  supported in the ball  $B_i$ , and  $(\lambda_i)_{i \geq 1}$  a sequence of scalars such that  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_i| < \infty$ . To prove our theorem, it is enough to show that the series

$$(65) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i (\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_{B_i}) \mathbf{a}_i \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \mathbf{b}_{B_i} \mathbf{a}_i$$

are convergent in  $L^1(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\mathcal{H}^\varphi(\mathcal{X}, \nu)$  respectively, since the product  $\mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{h}$  by definition is the sum of both series.

The convergence of the first series in  $L^1(\mathcal{X})$  is immediate, since for all index  $i$  we have

$$(66) \quad \|\lambda_i (\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_{B_i}) \mathbf{a}_i\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})} \leq |\lambda_i| \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\mathbf{BMO}(\mathcal{X})} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_i| < \infty,$$

according to Lemma 3.1. For the second series, we consider the partial sum

$$(67) \quad S_k^\ell := \sum_{i=k}^{\ell} \lambda_i \mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{b}_{B_i} \quad \text{for } k < \ell.$$

Our series converges in  $\mathcal{H}^\varphi(\mathcal{X}, \nu)$  if and only if  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|(S_k^\ell)^*\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X}, \nu)} = 0$ . But we have

$$(S_k^\ell)^* \leq \sum_{i=k}^{\ell} |\lambda_i| (\mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{b}_{B_i})^* \leq \sum_{i=k}^{\ell} |\lambda_i| |\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_{B_i}| (\mathbf{a}_i)^* + \left( \sum_{i=k}^{\ell} |\lambda_i| (\mathbf{a}_i)^* \right) |\mathbf{b}|,$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(S_k^\ell)^*\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X}, \nu)} &\leq C \left[ \left\| \sum_{j=k}^{\ell} |\lambda_j| |\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_{B_j}| (\mathbf{a}_j)^* \right\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X}, \nu)} + \left\| \left( \sum_{i=k}^{\ell} |\lambda_i| (\mathbf{a}_i)^* \right) |\mathbf{b}| \right\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X}, \nu)} \right] \\ &\leq C \left[ \left\| \sum_{i=k}^{\ell} |\lambda_i| |\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_{B_i}| (\mathbf{a}_i)^* \right\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})} + \left\| \left( \sum_{i=k}^{\ell} |\lambda_i| (\mathbf{a}_i)^* \right) |\mathbf{b}| \right\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X}, \nu)} \right] \\ &\leq C \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\mathbf{BMO}^+(\mathcal{X})} \sum_{i=k}^{\ell} |\lambda_i|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality come from Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.3. It comes out that,

$$(68) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|(S_k^\ell)^*\|_{L^\varphi} \leq C \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\mathbf{BMO}^+(\mathcal{X})} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=k}^{\ell} |\lambda_i| = 0,$$

since  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_i| < \infty$ . □

If we replace  $\mathbf{BMO}(\mathcal{X})$  by  $\mathbf{bmo}(\mathcal{X})$ , then we obtain that the Hardy-Orlicz space does not depend on a weight. More precisely, we obtain the following result

**Proposition 4.1.** *For  $\mathbf{b}$  in  $\mathbf{bmo}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\mathbf{h}$  in  $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{X})$ , we can give a meaning to the product  $\mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{h}$  in the sense of distribution. Furthermore,*

$$(69) \quad \mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{h} \in L^1(\mathcal{X}) + \mathcal{H}^\varphi(\mathcal{X}).$$

*Proof.* The proof is almost similar to the one of Theorem 1.1. Let  $\mathfrak{h} \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{X})$  be as in the previous theorem. We have for all  $i$

$$(70) \quad \|(\mathfrak{b} - \mathfrak{b}_{B_i})\mathfrak{a}_i\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})} \leq 2 \|\mathfrak{b}\|_{\mathfrak{bmo}(\mathcal{X})},$$

so that  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\mathfrak{b} - \mathfrak{b}_{B_i})\mathfrak{a}_i$  converge normally in  $L^1(\mathcal{X})$ .

Since for all  $i$  we have

$$(71) \quad (\mathfrak{b}_{B_i}\mathfrak{a}_i)^* \leq |\mathfrak{b} - \mathfrak{b}_{B_i}| \mathfrak{a}_i^* + |\mathfrak{b}| \mathfrak{a}_i^*,$$

it follows that if

$$(72) \quad |\mathfrak{b}| \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i \mathfrak{a}_i^* \right)$$

belongs to  $L^\varphi(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$ , then

$$(73) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i \mathfrak{b}_{B_i} \mathfrak{a}_i$$

converge in  $\mathcal{H}^\varphi(\mathcal{X})$ , since according to Lemma 3.1,  $\sum \lambda_i |\mathfrak{b} - \mathfrak{b}_{B_i}| \mathfrak{a}_i^*$  converge normally in  $L^1(\mathcal{X})$  and therefore in  $L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})$ . Let us put  $\psi = |\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i \mathfrak{a}_i^*| \in L^1(\mathcal{X})$ , and consider a ball  $B$  such that  $\mu(B) = 1$ . We have, as proved in [1] that

$$(74) \quad \int_B \varphi(|\mathfrak{b}| \psi) d\mu = \int_B \frac{|\mathfrak{b}| \psi}{\log(e + |\mathfrak{b}| \psi)} d\mu \leq C \|\mathfrak{b}\|_{\mathfrak{bmo}(\mathcal{X})} \int_B \psi d\mu.$$

In fact, we have

$$(75) \quad \int_B \frac{|\mathfrak{b}| \psi}{\log(e + |\mathfrak{b}| \psi)} d\mu \leq \int_{B \cap \{|\mathfrak{b}| \leq 1\}} \psi d\mu + \int_{B \cap \{|\mathfrak{b}| > 1\}} |\mathfrak{b}| \frac{\psi}{\log(e + \psi)} d\mu.$$

Since  $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathfrak{bmo}(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$  implies by the John-Nirenberg inequality (51) that there is a constant  $C$  depending only on the space constant, such that  $\|\mathfrak{b}\|_{\text{Exp } L(B)} \leq C \|\mathfrak{b}\|_{\mathfrak{bmo}(\mathcal{X})}$  and  $\left\| \frac{\psi}{\log(e + \psi)} \right\|_{L \log L(B)} \leq \|\psi\|_{L^1(B)}$ , the result follow from the duality between  $\text{Exp } L(B)$  and  $L \log L(B)$ . This being true for all ball  $B$  of measure 1, we take the sum over all such ball which are almost disjoint.  $\square$

Let us consider now the Hardy space  $\mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X})$ , with  $p < 1$ . We have the following result

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $\frac{n}{n+1} < p < 1$ . For  $f \in \Lambda_{\frac{1}{p}-1}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $g \in \mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X})$  we can give a meaning to the product  $f \times g$  as a distribution. Moreover, we have the inclusion*

$$(76) \quad f \times g \in L^1(\mathcal{X}) + \mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X}, d, \tau), \quad \text{where } d\tau(x) = \frac{d\mu(x)}{(2K_0^2 + K_0 d(x_0, x))^{(1-p)n}}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $f \in \Lambda_{\frac{1}{p}-1}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $g \in \mathcal{H}^p$ . We assume that  $g$  has the following atomic decomposition

$$(77) \quad g = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i \mathbf{a}_i,$$

where  $\mathbf{a}'_i$ 's are atoms supported respectively in the balls  $B_i$ . All we have to prove is that the series

$$(78) \quad \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \lambda_i (f - f_{B_i}) \mathbf{a}_i$$

and

$$(79) \quad \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \lambda_i f_{B_i} \mathbf{a}_i$$

converge respectively in  $L^1(\mathcal{X})$  and in  $\mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X}, d, \tau)$ . Arguing as in the previous theorem, we have that series (78) converges normally in  $L^1(\mathcal{X})$ . It remain to prove that (79) converge in  $\mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X}, d, \tau)$ . As in Theorem 1.1, we have

$$(80) \quad (S_k^\ell)^* \leq \sum_{i=k}^{\ell} |\lambda_i| (\mathbf{a}_i f_{B_i})^* \leq \sum_{i=k}^{\ell} |\lambda_i| |f - f_{B_i}| (\mathbf{a}_i)^* + \left( \sum_{i=k}^{\ell} |\lambda_i| (\mathbf{a}_i)^* \right) |f|,$$

where  $S_k^\ell = \sum_{i=k}^{\ell} \lambda_i \mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{b}_{B_i}$  for  $k < \ell$ . We claim that Lemma 3.1 remain true if we replace the space  $\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})$  by  $\Lambda_{\frac{1}{p}-1}(\mathcal{X})$  and the  $(1, q)$ -atoms by  $(p, q)$ -atoms  $q \geq 1$ , i.e. for  $f \in \Lambda_{\frac{1}{p}-1}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\mathbf{a}$  a  $(p, q)$ -atom supported in the ball  $B$ ,

$$(81) \quad \|(f - f_B) \mathbf{a}^*\|_{L^1} \leq C \|f\|_{\Lambda_{\frac{1}{p}-1}}.$$

In fact, by the definition of Lipschitz space  $\Lambda_{\frac{1}{p}-1}(\mathcal{X})$ , we have

$$(82) \quad \int_{B(x_0, 2K_0 R)} |f(z) - f_B| \mathbf{a}^*(z) d\mu(z) \leq C \|f\|_{\Lambda_{\frac{1}{p}-1}(\mathcal{X})}.$$

In other respect

$$(83) \quad \mathbf{a}^*(z) \leq C \mu(B(x_0, R))^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \left( \frac{R}{d(z, x_0)} \right)^\beta \frac{1}{\mu(B(z, d(z, x_0)))},$$

for all  $z \notin B(x_0, 2K_0 R)$  according to Lemma 4.4 of [8].

Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 3.1, we have that  $\sum |\lambda_i| |f - f_{B_i}| (\mathbf{a}_i)^*$  converges in  $L^1(\mathcal{X})$ . The proof of the Theorem will be complete if we establish that for any ball  $B$  of radius 1, we have for  $f \in \Lambda_{\frac{1}{p}-1}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\psi \in L^p(B)$

$$(84) \quad \int_B (|f(x)\psi(x)|)^p d\tau(x) \leq C \|f\|_{\Lambda_{\frac{1}{p}-1}^+(\mathcal{X})}^p \int_B |\psi(x)|^p d\mu(x),$$

where  $\|f\|_{\Lambda_{\frac{1}{p}-1}^+(\mathcal{X})}^p = \|f\|_{\Lambda_{\frac{1}{p}-1}(\mathcal{X})}^p + \max(|f(x_0)|, 1)^p$ . Following the method in [1], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B \frac{|f(x)\psi(x)|^p}{(2K_0^2 + K_0d(x_0, x))^{\mathfrak{n}(1-p)}} d\mu(x) &\leq \int_{B \cap \{|f| \leq 1\}} |\psi(x)|^p d\mu(x) \\ &+ \int_{B \cap \{|f| > 1\}} |f(x)|^p \frac{|\psi(x)|^p}{(2K_0^2 + K_0d(x_0, x))^{\mathfrak{n}(1-p)}} d\mu(x). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

(85)

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B \cap \{|f| > 1\}} |f(x)|^p \frac{|\psi(x)|^p}{(2K_0^2 + K_0d(x_0, x))^{\mathfrak{n}(1-p)}} d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \int_{B \cap \{|f| > 1\}} |f(x) - f(x_0)|^p \frac{|\psi(x)|^p}{(2K_0^2 + K_0d(x_0, x))^{\mathfrak{n}(1-p)}} d\mu(x) \\ &+ |f(x_0)|^p \int_{B \cap \{|f| > 1\}} \frac{|\psi(x)|^p}{(2K_0^2 + K_0d(x_0, x))^{\mathfrak{n}(1-p)}} d\mu(x). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $B \subset B(x_0, 2K_0^2 + K_0d(x_0, x))$  for all  $x$  in the ball  $B$  of radius 1, it comes from the definition of Lipschitz space  $\Lambda_{\frac{1}{p}-1}(\mathcal{X})$  that the first term in the right hand side of the above inequality is less or equal to

$$\|f\|_{\Lambda_{\frac{1}{p}-1}(\mathcal{X})}^p \int_B \frac{\mu(B(x_0, 2K_0^2 + K_0d(x_0, x)))^{1-p}}{(2K_0^2 + K_0d(x_0, x))^{\mathfrak{n}(1-p)}} |\psi(x)|^p d\mu(x).$$

But, from (6) and (8) we have that  $\mu(B(x_0, 2K_0^2 + K_0d(x_0, x))) \lesssim (2K_0^2 + K_0d(x_0, x))^{\mathfrak{n}}$ .

Thus

(86)

$$\int_{B \cap \{|f| > 1\}} |f(x)|^p \frac{|\psi(x)|^p}{(2K_0^2 + K_0d(x_0, x))^{\mathfrak{n}(1-p)}} d\mu \lesssim \left( \|f\|_{\Lambda_{\frac{1}{p}-1}(\mathcal{X})}^p + |f(x_0)|^p \right) \int_B |\psi(x)|^p d\mu(x).$$

The result follows by covering the hold space by almost disjoint balls of radius 1.  $\square$

**Remark 4.3.** Let  $\frac{\mathfrak{n}}{\mathfrak{n}+\epsilon} < p < 1$  and  $\gamma := \frac{1}{p} - 1$ . Then, for  $h \in \mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X})$  and  $f \in \Lambda_\gamma(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^\infty(\mathcal{X})$ , the product  $h \times f$  can be given a meaning in the sense of distributions. Moreover, we have the inclusion

$$(87) \quad h \times f \in L^1(\mathcal{X}) + \mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X}).$$



*Proof.* Let  $\mathfrak{h} \in \mathcal{H}^p(\mathcal{X})$  be as in (9), where the atoms involved are  $(p, \infty)$ -atoms, and  $f \in \Lambda_\gamma(\mathcal{X})$ . From Theorem 4.2, we have that

$$(88) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i (f - f_{B_i}) \mathfrak{a}_i$$

converge in  $L^1(\mathcal{X})$ . For the series  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i f_{B_i} \mathfrak{a}_i$ , we just have to remark that the functions  $\frac{1}{\|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X})}} f_{B_j} \mathfrak{a}_i$  are  $(p, \infty)$ -atoms. In fact,

- (i)  $\text{supp} f_B \mathfrak{a}_i \subset B_i$ , since  $\text{supp} \mathfrak{a}_i \subset B_i$
- (ii)  $\int_{\mathcal{X}} f_{B_i} \mathfrak{a}_i(x) dx = 0$
- (iii)  $|f_{B_i} \mathfrak{a}_i(x)| \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X})} \mu(B_i)^{-\frac{1}{p}}$

and this end the proof, since  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_i|^p < \infty$  □

**Remark 4.4.** *In the case  $\mu(X) < \infty$ , all our results remain valid, provided we consider the constant function  $\mu(\mathcal{X})^{-\frac{1}{p}}$  as an atom, and put*

$$(89) \quad \|\mathfrak{b}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathcal{X})} = \sup_{B:\text{ball}} \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B |\mathfrak{b}(x) - \mathfrak{b}_B| d\mu(x) + \|\mathfrak{b}\|_{L^1(\mathcal{X})}$$

and

$$(90) \quad \|f\|_{\Lambda_\gamma(\mathcal{X})} = \sup \left\{ \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{\mu(B)}, \text{ for all ball } B \ni x, y \right\} + \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x) d\mu(x) \right|.$$

*In this case the reverse doubling condition (4), need to be satisfied just for small balls.*

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. BONAMI and J. FEUTO, *Products of functions in Hardy and Lipschitz or BMO spaces*, Preprint.
- [2] A. BONAMI, T. IWANIEC, P. JONES, M. ZINSMEISTER, *On the product of Functions in BMO and  $\mathcal{H}^1$* , Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble **57**, no. 5 (2007) 1405-1439.
- [3] D. C. CHANG and S. Y. LI, *On the boundedness of multipliers, commutators and the second derivatives of Green's operators on  $H^1$  and BMO*, Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di Scienze 4<sup>e</sup> série, **28** no. 2 (1999), 341-356.
- [4] R. COIFMAN, G. WEISS, *Analyse Harmonique non-commutative sur certains espaces homogènes*, Lecture Notes in Math. 242, Springer, Berlin, 1971.
- [5] R. COIFMAN, G. WEISS, *Extensions of Hardy spaces and their use in analysis*, Bull. Amer. J. Math. **83** (1977), 569-645.
- [6] X.T. DDUONG and L.X. YAN, *New function spaces of BMO type, the John-Nirenberg inequality, interpolation and applications*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **58** (2005) 1375-1420.
- [7] Y. GUIVARC'H, *Croissance polynpmiale et période des fonctions harmoniques*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **101** (1973), 333-379.

- [8] L. GRAFAKOS, L. LIU and D. YANG, *Maximal function characterizations of Hardy spaces on RD-spaces and their application*, Science in China Series A: Mathematics, **51**, No. 12. (2008), 2253-2284.
- [9] L. GRAFAKOS, *Classical and Modern Fourier Analysis*, Pearson Education, Inc. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey 07458.
- [10] Y. HAN, D. MÜLER and D. YANG, *Littlewood-Paley characterizations for hardy spaces on spaces of homogeneous type*, Math. Nachr. **279** (2006), 1505-1537.
- [11] Y. HAN, D. MÜLER and D. YANG, *A Theory of Besov and Triebel-Lizorkin Spaces on Metric Measure Spaces Modeled on Carnot-Carathodory Spaces*, Abstr. Appl. Anal. 2008, Art. ID 893409, 252 pp.
- [12] Y.S. HAN and E.T. SAWYER, *Littlewood-Paley theory on spaces of homogeneous type and classical function spaces*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **110** (1994), 1-136.
- [13] J. W. JENKINS, *Growth of connected locally compact groups*, J. Funct. Anal. **12** (1973), 113-127.
- [14] J. MATTEU, P. MATTILA, A. NICOLAU and J. OROBITG, *BMO for nondoubling measures*, Duke Math. **102** no. 3 (2000), 533-565.
- [15] R. A. MACÍA and C. SEGOVIA *Lipschitz function on Spaces of Homogeneous type*, Advances in Math. **33** (1979), 257-270.
- [16] R.A. MACÍA and C. SEGOVIA *A decomposition into Atoms of Distributions on Spaces of Homogeneous type*, Advances in Math. **33** (1979), 271-309.
- [17] D. MASCRÉ, *Inégalités à poids pour l'opérateur de hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev dans les espaces métriques mesurés à deux demi-dimensions*, Coll. Math. **105** 1 (2006), 77-104.
- [18] A. NAGEL, E. M. STEIN and S. WAINGER, *Balls and metrics defined by vector fields I. Basic Properties*, Acta Math. **155** (1985), 103-147.
- [19] E. M. STEIN, *Harmonic analysis, real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, Princeton Math. Series 43, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1993.
- [20] M.M. RAO and Z.D. REN, *Theory of Orlicz Spaces*, Pure and Applied Mathematics 146, New York 1991.
- [21] B. E. VIVIANI, *An Atomic Decomposition of the Predual of  $BMO(\rho)$* , Revista Matemática Iberoamericana **3**, N.<sup>os</sup> 3 y 4, (1987) 401-425.
- [22] N. Th. VAROPOULOS, *Analysis on Lie groups*, J. Funct. Anal. **76** (1988), 346-410.
- [23] L. WENMING, *A maximal function characterization of Hardy spaces on spaces of homogeneous type*, Analysis in Theory and Application **14** 2 (1998), 12-27.
- [24] R.L. WHEEDEN, *A characterization of some weighted norm inequalities for the fractional maximal function*, Studia Math. **107** (1993), 251-272.

LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES FONDAMENTALES, UFR MATHÉMATIQUES ET INFORMATIQUE, UNIVERSITÉ DE COCODY, 22 B.P 1194 ABIDJAN 22. CTE D'IVOIRE  
*E-mail address:* justfeuto@yahoo.fr