

EFFECTIVE INTERVALS AND REGULAR DIRICHLET SUBSPACES

LIPING LI, WENJIE SUN, AND JIANGANG YING

ABSTRACT. It is shown in [10] that a regular and local Dirichlet form on an interval can be represented by so-called effective intervals with scale functions. This paper focuses on how to operate on effective intervals to obtain regular Dirichlet subspaces. The first result is a complete characterization for a Dirichlet form to be a regular subspace of such a Dirichlet form in terms of effective intervals. Then we give an explicit road map how to obtain all regular Dirichlet subspaces from a local and regular Dirichlet form on an interval, by a series of intuitive operations on the effective intervals in the representation above. Finally applying previous results, we shall prove that every regular and local Dirichlet form has a special standard core generated by a continuous and strictly increasing function.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
Notations	4
2. A review of 1-dim symmetric diffusions	5
3. Characterization of D-subspaces	7
4. Road map to attain D-subspaces	9
4.1. Scale-shrink operation	10
4.2. Optional interval-merge operation	14
4.3. Road map to D-subspaces	17
5. D-subspaces generated by a class of functions	18
5.1. Basic assumption	19
5.2. Scale measure and optional interval-merge	19
5.3. D-subspace generated by \mathcal{C}_f	21
5.4. Existence of special standard core	24
6. Further remarks	26
6.1. Diffusions on an interval	26
6.2. Killing inside	27
References	28

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 31C25; Secondary 60J60.

Key words and phrases. Dirichlet forms, regular Dirichlet subspaces, one-dimensional symmetric diffusions, scale functions.

The first named author is partially supported by a joint grant (No. 2015LH0043) of China Postdoctoral Science Foundation and Chinese Academy of Science, China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (No. 2016M590145), NSFC (No. 11688101) and Key Laboratory of Random Complex Structures and Data Science, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences (No. 2008DP173182). The third named author is partially supported by NSFC No. 11271240.

1. INTRODUCTION

A Dirichlet form is a closed and symmetric bilinear form with Markovian property on $L^2(E, m)$ space, where E is a nice topological space and m is a fully supported Radon measure on E . Due to a series of important works by M. Fukushima, M. L. Silverstein in 1970's, a regular Dirichlet form is always associated with a symmetric Markov process uniquely by the transition semigroup, so we do not distinguish them for convenience. For example, when we say a subspace of a symmetric diffusion, it means a subspace of its associated Dirichlet form. We refer the notions and terminologies in the theory of Dirichlet forms to [1, 4].

The notion of regular Dirichlet subspace of a Dirichlet form was first raised by the third named author and his co-authors in [2]. The dual notion, regular Dirichlet extension, was raised in [9] by the first and third named authors together. These two notions are about the inclusion relation between two Dirichlet spaces. Namely, let E be a locally compact separable metric space and m a fully supported Radon measure on E . Given two regular Dirichlet forms $(\mathcal{E}^1, \mathcal{F}^1)$ and $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$ on the same Hilbert space $L^2(E, m)$, if

$$\mathcal{F}^1 \subset \mathcal{F}^2, \quad \mathcal{E}^2(u, v) = \mathcal{E}^1(u, v), \quad \forall u, v \in \mathcal{F}^1,$$

we say $(\mathcal{E}^1, \mathcal{F}^1)$ is a *regular Dirichlet subspace* or simply a *D-subspace* of $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$, and conversely, $(\mathcal{E}^2, \mathcal{F}^2)$ is a *regular Dirichlet extension* or simply *D-extension* of $(\mathcal{E}^1, \mathcal{F}^1)$.

The Brownian motion is a classical and fundamental model in the theory of stochastic processes. It is well known that the Dirichlet form associated with 1-dim (an abbreviation for one-dimensional) Brownian motion is $(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}, H^1(\mathbb{R}))$, where $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ is the 1-Sobolev space and \mathbf{D} is the Dirichlet integral, i.e., for any $u, v \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\mathbf{D}(u, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u'(x)v'(x)dx.$$

The D-subspaces and D-extensions of 1-dim Brownian motion have been studied in [2] and [9] respectively. It is shown that any D-subspace of $(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}, H^1(\mathbb{R}))$ corresponds to an irreducible (or 'regular') symmetric diffusion process on \mathbb{R} in the sense that $\mathbf{P}_x(\sigma_y < \infty) > 0$ for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, where σ_y is the hitting time of $\{y\}$ relative to this diffusion. Moreover, such a subspace may be characterized uniquely by a so-called scale function \mathfrak{s} (Cf. [11, V.46]) satisfying that \mathfrak{s} is absolutely continuous and

$$(1.1) \quad \mathfrak{s}' = 0 \text{ or } 1 \text{ a.e.}$$

However, the D-extension of $(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}, H^1(\mathbb{R}))$ is not necessarily irreducible. In other words, it admits non-trivial invariant components. It is shown as the main result of [9] that the state space \mathbb{R} of each D-extension of $(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}, H^1(\mathbb{R}))$ may be essentially decomposed into at most countable invariant intervals and an exceptional set, and on each interval, it behaves as an irreducible diffusion characterized by some appropriate scale function. We refer further explorations about D-subspaces of some other Dirichlet forms to [3, 5–7] and [8].

In this paper, we shall essentially focus on regular and strongly local Dirichlet forms. The state space is the real line \mathbb{R} if not otherwise stated. The results may be generalized to regular and local Dirichlet forms on an interval without real difficulty as indicated in the last section. Since the unique probabilistic counterpart of such a form is a 1-dim symmetric diffusion or a symmetric diffusion on \mathbb{R} , we often abuse these two notions for simplicity and intuition, if no confusion will be caused.

Inspired by the work on regular Dirichlet extensions of 1-dim Brownian motion, the representation of Dirichlet forms associated with 1-dim symmetric diffusions,

including non-irreducible ones, was studied in [10]. The main result in [10] will be reviewed in §2. Roughly speaking, in spite of the possible killing insides, such 1-dim symmetric diffusion lives on at most countable disjoint intervals, called effective intervals there, and every point outside these intervals (probably non-trivial) is a ‘trap’ of the diffusion in the sense that all the trajectories starting from this point will never leave. On each effective interval, it is an irreducible diffusion characterized by an ‘adapted’ scale function. Thus the associated Dirichlet form is described in unique way by a class of at most countable pairs $\{(I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$, where I_n is the effective interval and \mathfrak{s}_n is an ‘adapted’ scale function on it.

The set of effective intervals with adapted scale functions is a probabilistic point of view to look at a Dirichlet form, which is purely an analytic object. It should be true that any property of such a Dirichlet form may be characterized intuitively by its effective intervals. The main purpose of this paper is to characterize the relation of regular Dirichlet subspace/extension through effective intervals and make this analytic notion more intuitive.

Three main results will be presented in this paper. The first result, stated as Theorem 3.1, is a necessary and sufficient condition for one 1-dim symmetric diffusion to be a D-subspace of another in terms of their effective intervals. Inspired by the result for 1-dim Brownian motion where the scale function with (1.1) plays an essential role, we introduce a new conception, named the scale measure, which is the sum of all measures induced by scale functions on effective intervals. The condition (3.1) in Theorem 3.1 is similar to (1.1). Particularly, (3.1) coincides with (1.1) when returning to 1-dim Brownian motion. Nevertheless, Theorem 3.1 gives only a criterion that a Dirichlet form is a D-subspace of the other, and it is more interesting to know whether it is possible to obtain a D-subspace through some operation on the effective intervals. The second result is to answer this question positively and draw a concrete road map to illustrate how to do this. Roughly speaking, the condition (3.1) may be viewed as an operation which multiplies a factor to its scale measure and gives a new scale measure. However different D-subspaces may share the same scale measure. Therefore once identifying the scale measure, we need ‘interval-merge’ operations to obtain all D-subspaces taking this scale measure, which means that the original effective intervals are firstly grouped and then merged according to some rule into new ones. Several examples are also raised to illustrate these operations. The idea of ‘interval-merge’ was originated in [10, §3.5], where it was used to identify the closure of $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ in a 1-dim symmetric diffusion. In some sense, the discussion in [10, §3] could be treated as a special case of what we shall consider here. Intuitively speaking, 1-dim diffusion may be viewed as an electron wandering on an electric network. The operation of scale-shrink is to reduce the resistance of network by placing super-conductance and the operation of interval-merge is to connect some broken networks, which can be merged, together. The third result, as an application of the second one, is to study a special class of D-subspaces generated by

$$\mathcal{C}_f := C_c^\infty \circ f = \{\varphi \circ f : \varphi \in C_c^\infty(f(\mathbb{R}))\},$$

where f is a continuous and tightly increasing function on \mathbb{R} . We find that the scale measure of this D-subspace is the absolutely continuous part of original scale measure with respect to df , and the optional interval-merge to attain this D-subspace is performed on equivalence classes obtained by the so-called f -scale-connection in Definition 5.3. This can be used to prove an interesting and useful fact that every regular and strongly local Dirichlet form on $L^2(\mathbb{R}, m)$ has a special standard core generated this way, just as Brownian motion has a special standard core consisting of smooth functions.

As a dual conception, D-extensions enjoy the same characterization result as D-subspaces. Particularly, Theorem 3.1 also characterizes D-extensions of a 1-dim diffusion completely. We left further discussions about D-extensions in a future study.

This paper is organized as follows. In §2, we shall briefly review the representation theorem (Cf. [10]) for regular and strongly local Dirichlet forms. In §3, a complete characterization of a D-subspace (or D-extension) for a 1-dim symmetric diffusion is given in terms of effective intervals and scale measures. It turns out that if one regular and strongly local Dirichlet form is a D-subspace of another, then the effective intervals have to be ‘coarser’, and the scale measure has to be reduced in the way presented by (3.1). The section §4 is devoted to draw a road map from the original Dirichlet form to its D-subspaces. We shall introduce two kinds of operations. One is called the ‘scale-shrink’ operation, which essentially identifies the scale measure of a D-subspace. The other is called ‘optional interval-merge’ operation, which groups and merges the effective intervals into new ones. Then in Theorem 4.17, we shall illustrate that every D-subspace is obtained by firstly a scale-shrink operation and then an optional interval-merge operation. The section §5 is an application of this road map. It concerns the D-subspaces generated by a special class of functions. The principal theorem, i.e. Theorem 5.6, presents the scale measures and optional interval-merge to attain these D-subspaces. Particularly, a corollary of this result also provides an effective method to find a ‘nice’ special standard core of the Dirichlet form represented in Theorem 2.1. Some interesting examples are raised to realize this method. We then prove in Theorem 5.11 that any regular and local Dirichlet form has a special standard core of this form. Finally, several further remarks are given in §6. The first one deals with the case that the state space is just an interval. It makes no big difference, but special attentions are needed when we come to the boundaries of the interval. The second remark concerns the killing insides. By using the resurrected transform and killing transform, we can easily deduce that the only additional condition is that the two Dirichlet forms share the same killing measure.

Notations. Let us put some often used notations here for handy reference, though we may restate their definitions when they appear.

For $a < b$, $\langle a, b \rangle$ is an interval where a or b may or may not be contained in $\langle a, b \rangle$. The restrictions of a measure μ and a function f to an interval J are denoted by $\mu|_J$ and $f|_J$ respectively. The notation ‘:=’ is read as ‘to be defined as’. For a scale function \mathfrak{s} (i.e. a continuous and tightly increasing function) on some interval J , $d\mathfrak{s}$ represents its associated measure on J . Set $\mathfrak{s}(J) := \{\mathfrak{s}(x) : x \in J\}$. For two measures μ and ν , $\mu \ll \nu$ means μ is absolutely continuous with respect to ν , and $\mu \simeq \nu$ means that they are mutually absolutely continuous (or simply equivalent). Given a scale function \mathfrak{s} on J and another function f on J , $f \ll \mathfrak{s}$ means $f = g \circ \mathfrak{s}$ for an absolutely continuous function g and

$$\frac{df}{d\mathfrak{s}} := g' \circ \mathfrak{s}.$$

The classes $C_c(J)$, $C_c^1(J)$ and $C_c^\infty(J)$ denote the spaces of all continuous functions on J with compact support, all continuously differentiable functions with compact support and all infinitely differentiable functions with compact support, respectively.

Fix a Markov process $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ associated with a Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ on $L^2(E, m)$. If U is an open subset of E , then the part Dirichlet form of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ on U is denoted by $(\mathcal{E}_U, \mathcal{F}_U)$ and the part process of X on U is denoted by X_U . All the terminologies about Dirichlet forms are standard and we refer them to [1, 4].

2. A REVIEW OF 1-DIM SYMMETRIC DIFFUSIONS

This section is devoted to a brief review of the representation of regular Dirichlet forms associated with 1-dim symmetric diffusions. Intuitively speaking, a 1-dim symmetric diffusion lives on at most countable disjoint intervals, on each interval it is a ‘regular’ diffusion (for regularity of a 1-dim diffusion, see [11, §45]) and outside these intervals the diffusion will never move. These are presented in [10] and for readers’ convenience, we summarize the main results as follows.

Let \mathbb{R} be the real line, and m a fully supported Radon measure on \mathbb{R} . Further let $J := \langle a, b \rangle$ be an interval, where a or b may or may not be contained in J . Note that a ‘regular’ 1-dim diffusion on J is characterized completely by a scale function (uniquely up to a constant), a speed measure and a killing measure. Take a fixed point in the interior of J as follows

$$(2.1) \quad e := \begin{cases} \frac{a+b}{2}, & |a| + |b| < \infty, \\ a+1, & a > -\infty, b = \infty, \\ b-1, & a = -\infty, b < \infty, \\ 0, & a = -\infty, b = \infty. \end{cases}$$

Then the family of scale functions on J is given by

$$\mathbf{S}(J) := \{\mathbf{s} : J \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \mathbf{s} \text{ is strictly increasing and continuous, } \mathbf{s}(e) = 0\},$$

where we impose $\mathbf{s}(e) = 0$ to guarantee the uniqueness of scale function for regular 1-dim diffusion. Since $\mathbf{s}(x)$ is monotone, we set

$$\mathbf{s}(a) := \lim_{x \downarrow a} \mathbf{s}(x), \quad \mathbf{s}(b) := \lim_{x \uparrow b} \mathbf{s}(x).$$

In [10], a scale function \mathbf{s} is required to be adapted to the interval J in the sense that

- (\mathbf{A}_R) $a + \mathbf{s}(a) > -\infty$ if and only if $a \in J$;
- (\mathbf{B}_R) $b + \mathbf{s}(b) < \infty$ if and only if $b \in J$.

Thus we define a sub-family of scale functions as

$$\mathbf{S}_\infty(J) := \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{S}(J) : \mathbf{s} \text{ satisfies } (\mathbf{A}_R) \text{ and } (\mathbf{B}_R)\}.$$

In other words, an open endpoint is unapproachable and a closed endpoint is reflecting for the diffusion on J with a scale function in $\mathbf{S}_\infty(J)$. On the other hand, the possible absorbing property at two infinities is also needed to be considered:

- (\mathbf{L}_R) $a = -\infty$, $\mathbf{s}(-\infty) > -\infty$ and $m((-\infty, 0]) < \infty$;
- (\mathbf{R}_R) $b = \infty$, $\mathbf{s}(\infty) < \infty$ and $m([0, \infty)) < \infty$.

For a function $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{S}_\infty(J)$, the Dirichlet form on $L^2(J, m|_J)$ defined by

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{F}^{(\mathbf{s})} := \left\{ u \in L^2(J, m|_J) : u \ll \mathbf{s}, \frac{du}{d\mathbf{s}} \in L^2(J, d\mathbf{s}); \right. \\ \left. u(a) = 0 \text{ (resp. } u(b) = 0) \text{ whenever } (\mathbf{L}_R) \text{ (resp. } (\mathbf{R}_R)) \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{E}^{(\mathbf{s})}(u, v) := \frac{1}{2} \int_J \frac{du}{d\mathbf{s}} \frac{dv}{d\mathbf{s}} d\mathbf{s}, \quad u, v \in \mathcal{F}^{(\mathbf{s})}$$

is regular and associated with $m|_J$ -symmetric ‘regular’ diffusion on J with scale function \mathbf{s} (see [3]).

The following theorem is taken from [10, Corollary 2.13 and Theorem 4.1], which presents a complete representation of regular and strongly local Dirichlet forms on $L^2(\mathbb{R}, m)$. Note that the strong local property of Dirichlet form implies that the associated Markov process is continuous, and has no killing inside.

Theorem 2.1. *Let m be a fully supported Radon measure on \mathbb{R} . Then $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a regular and strongly local Dirichlet form on $L^2(\mathbb{R}, m)$ if and only if there exist a set of at most countable disjoint intervals $\{I_n = \langle a_n, b_n \rangle : I_n \subset \mathbb{R}, n \geq 1\}$ with a scale function $\mathfrak{s}_n \in \mathbf{S}_\infty(I_n)$ for each $n \geq 1$ such that*

$$(2.3) \quad \mathcal{F} = \left\{ u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, m) : u|_{I_n} \in \mathcal{F}^{(\mathfrak{s}_n)}, \sum_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{E}^{(\mathfrak{s}_n)}(u|_{I_n}, u|_{I_n}) < \infty \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{E}(u, v) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{E}^{(\mathfrak{s}_n)}(u|_{I_n}, v|_{I_n}), \quad u, v \in \mathcal{F},$$

where for each $n \geq 1$, $(\mathcal{E}^{(\mathfrak{s}_n)}, \mathcal{F}^{(\mathfrak{s}_n)})$ is given by (2.2) with the scale function \mathfrak{s}_n on I_n . Moreover, the intervals $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ and scale functions $\{\mathfrak{s}_n : n \geq 1\}$ are uniquely determined, if the difference of order is ignored.

Remark 2.2. This representation theorem is valid a bit more generally. We refer the general version of Theorem 2.1 to [10, Theorem 4.1]. Note that the consideration on \mathbb{R} do not lose generality and the reason is presented in [10, §2.4]. Our results in general case will be briefly stated in §6.

Let us give more explanations for the theorem above. We denote the associated diffusion process of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ by (X_t, \mathbf{P}_x) . The interval I_n is an invariant set of $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ in the sense that

$$\mathbf{P}_x(X_t \in I_n, \forall t \geq 0) = 1, \quad x \in I_n.$$

The restriction X^{I_n} of X to I_n is an $m|_{I_n}$ -symmetric diffusion enjoying irreducibility:

$$\mathbf{P}_x(\sigma_y < \infty) > 0, \quad x, y \in I_n,$$

where σ_y is the first hitting time of $\{y\}$ relative to $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$. The scale function of X^{I_n} is actually \mathfrak{s}_n . Note that the scale function \mathfrak{s}_n is adapted to I_n in the sense of (\mathbf{A}_R) and (\mathbf{B}_R) , and this adapted condition is necessary for the regularity of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. Intuitively, this condition indicates that any finite endpoint of I_n cannot be absorbing. Particularly, when I_n is finite, X^{I_n} must be recurrent, i.e.

$$\mathbf{P}_x(\sigma_y < \infty) = 1$$

for any $x, y \in I_n$. Furthermore, every point outside these intervals is a trap of $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$, that is

$$\mathbf{P}_x(X_t = x, \forall t \geq 0) = 1, \quad x \in \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n \right)^c.$$

Therefore, the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ in Theorem 2.1 is characterized by a set $\{(I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ enjoying the following properties:

- (E1) $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ are mutually disjoint.
- (E2) For each n , \mathfrak{s}_n is adapted to I_n , i.e. $\mathfrak{s}_n \in \mathbf{S}_\infty(I_n)$.

Let us now give a definition.

Definition 2.3. A sequence of intervals $\{(I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$, with a scale function \mathfrak{s}_n on I_n for each n , is called *(a class of) pre-effective intervals* if (E1) is satisfied, and *(a class of) effective intervals*, if both (E1) and (E2) are satisfied.

Therefore we could say that a regular and strongly local Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is represented by a class of effective intervals. We also call the interval I_n with an (adapted) scale function \mathfrak{s}_n on I_n or the pair (I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) a *(pre-)effective interval* of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, if no confusions caused.

3. CHARACTERIZATION OF D-SUBSPACES

Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ be regular and strongly local Dirichlet forms on $L^2(\mathbb{R}, m)$ with effective intervals $\{(I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ and $\{(\mathfrak{I}_k, \mathfrak{s}_k) : k \geq 1\}$, respectively. The main purpose of this section is to present a necessary and sufficient condition on effective intervals for $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ to be a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ (in other words, $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is a D-extension of $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$).

Referring to [2] and [3], when $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ have only one effective interval \mathbb{R} , i.e. $I_1 = \mathfrak{I}_1 = \mathbb{R}$, $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ is a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ if and only if \mathfrak{s}_1 is absolutely continuous with respect to \mathfrak{s}_1 and

$$\frac{d\mathfrak{s}_1}{d\mathfrak{s}_1} = 0 \text{ or } 1, \quad d\mathfrak{s}_1\text{-a.e.}$$

Clearly, when $\{x : d\mathfrak{s}_1/d\mathfrak{s}_1 = 0\}$ is of positive $d\mathfrak{s}_1$ -measure, this D-subspace is proper. On the other hand, when $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is a special standard core of $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$, this issue was explored in [10, §3], in which the idea of ‘interval-merge’ operation was introduced.

In general, define

$$\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} := \sum_{n \geq 1} d\mathfrak{s}_n,$$

which is called the *scale measure* associated to effective intervals $\{(I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$. We shall write

$$\mathcal{E}(f, g) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{df}{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}} \frac{dg}{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}} d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$$

for any $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$, if no confusion caused. Note that each $d\mathfrak{s}_n$ is a Radon measure on I_n and thus $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is a σ -finite measure on \mathbb{R} supported on the closure of $\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n$. Similarly, the scale measure associated to $\{(\mathfrak{I}_k, \mathfrak{s}_k) : k \geq 1\}$ is denoted by $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$. The following theorem could be treated as an extension of all results mentioned above. Note that any D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is also strongly local and characterized by another class of effective intervals. Thus this theorem is also a complete characterization of D-subspaces or D-extensions for a 1-dim symmetric diffusion.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ be two regular and strongly local Dirichlet forms on $L^2(\mathbb{R}; m)$, with effective intervals $\{(I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ and $\{(\mathfrak{I}_k, \mathfrak{s}_k) : k \geq 1\}$ respectively. Further let $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ be the scale measures associated to $\{(I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ and $\{(\mathfrak{I}_k, \mathfrak{s}_k) : k \geq 1\}$ respectively. Then $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ is a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}, m)$ if and only if the following conditions hold:*

- (1) $\{\mathfrak{I}_k : k \geq 1\}$ is coarser than $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ in the sense that for any n , $I_n \subset \mathfrak{I}_k$ for some k .
- (2) $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} \ll \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}}{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}} = 0 \text{ or } 1, \quad \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}\text{-a.e.}$$

Proof. For the sufficiency, we need only to prove

$$\mathfrak{F} \subset \mathcal{F}, \quad \mathcal{E}(u, u) = \mathfrak{E}(u, u), \quad u \in \mathfrak{F}.$$

Take a function $u \in \mathfrak{F}$. For any n , consider the restriction of u to I_n , and denote it also by u if no confusion caused. Let \mathfrak{I}_k be the interval in the first condition with $I_n \subset \mathfrak{I}_k$. The second condition implies that $d\mathfrak{s}_k \ll d\mathfrak{s}_n$ and $d\mathfrak{s}_k/d\mathfrak{s}_n = 0$ or 1 , $d\mathfrak{s}_n$ -a.e. on I_n . Since $u \ll \mathfrak{s}_k$ on \mathfrak{I}_k , it follows that $u \ll \mathfrak{s}_n$ on I_n and

$$(3.2) \quad \int_{I_n} \left(\frac{du}{d\mathfrak{s}_n} \right)^2 d\mathfrak{s}_n = \int_{I_n} \left(\frac{du}{d\mathfrak{s}_k} \right)^2 \left(\frac{d\mathfrak{s}_k}{d\mathfrak{s}_n} \right)^2 d\mathfrak{s}_n = \int_{I_n} \left(\frac{du}{d\mathfrak{s}_k} \right)^2 d\mathfrak{s}_k.$$

Note that $d\mathfrak{s}_k(\mathbb{I}_k \setminus \bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n) = 0$ since $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} \ll \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$. Then we have

$$\sum_{I_n \subset \mathbb{I}_k} \int_{I_n} \left(\frac{du}{d\mathfrak{s}_n} \right)^2 d\mathfrak{s}_n = \int_{\mathbb{I}_k} \left(\frac{du|_{\mathbb{I}_k}}{d\mathfrak{s}_k} \right)^2 d\mathfrak{s}_k.$$

Hence

$$\sum_{n \geq 1} \int_{I_n} \left(\frac{du|_{I_n}}{d\mathfrak{s}_n} \right)^2 d\mathfrak{s}_n = \sum_{k \geq 1} \int_{\mathbb{I}_k} \left(\frac{du|_{\mathbb{I}_k}}{d\mathfrak{s}_k} \right)^2 d\mathfrak{s}_k.$$

Therefore, we conclude $u \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{E}(u, u) = \mathfrak{E}(u, u)$.

Next, we prove the necessity. We first assert that any endpoint of each interval \mathbb{I}_k cannot lie in the interior of any I_n . Indeed, let $\mathbb{I}_k = \langle \mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_k \rangle$ and suppose $\mathbf{a}_k \in (a_n, b_n)$, where $I_n = \langle a_n, b_n \rangle$. Consider the part Dirichlet forms $(\mathcal{E}_{\dot{I}_n}, \mathcal{F}_{\dot{I}_n})$ and $(\mathfrak{E}_{\dot{I}_n}, \mathfrak{F}_{\dot{I}_n})$ of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ on $\dot{I}_n = (a_n, b_n)$. Clearly, $(\mathfrak{E}_{\dot{I}_n}, \mathfrak{F}_{\dot{I}_n})$ is a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}_{\dot{I}_n}, \mathcal{F}_{\dot{I}_n})$. However, $(\mathcal{E}_{\dot{I}_n}, \mathcal{F}_{\dot{I}_n})$ is irreducible while $(\mathfrak{E}_{\dot{I}_n}, \mathfrak{F}_{\dot{I}_n})$ is not irreducible. This contradicts [9, Proposition 2.3 (3)]. This assertion leads to $\dot{I}_n \subset \mathbb{I}_k$ or $\dot{I}_n \cap \mathbb{I}_k = \emptyset$ for any $k \geq 1$. Moreover, $\dot{I}_n \cap \left(\bigcup_{k \geq 1} \mathbb{I}_k \right) = \emptyset$ also contradicts the fact that $(\mathfrak{E}_{\dot{I}_n}, \mathfrak{F}_{\dot{I}_n})$ is a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}_{\dot{I}_n}, \mathcal{F}_{\dot{I}_n})$. Therefore, we conclude that $\dot{I}_n \subset \mathbb{I}_k$ for some k . Note that $(\mathcal{E}_{\dot{I}_n}, \mathcal{F}_{\dot{I}_n})$ and $(\mathfrak{E}_{\dot{I}_n}, \mathfrak{F}_{\dot{I}_n})$ are both irreducible on $L^2(\dot{I}_n, m|_{\dot{I}_n})$ and their scale functions are \mathfrak{s}_n and \mathfrak{s}_k (restricted to \dot{I}_n) respectively. Thus it follows from [2] (or [10, Lemma 3.1]) that

$$(3.3) \quad d\mathfrak{s}_k \ll d\mathfrak{s}_n, \quad \frac{d\mathfrak{s}_k}{d\mathfrak{s}_n} = 0 \text{ or } 1, \quad d\mathfrak{s}_n\text{-a.e. on } \dot{I}_n.$$

For the first condition, it suffices to prove $I_n \subset \mathbb{I}_k$. Suppose that $I_n \not\subset \mathbb{I}_k$, which implies that $a_n = \mathbf{a}_k, a_n \in I_n \setminus \mathbb{I}_k$ or $b_n = \mathbf{b}_k, b_n \in I_n \setminus \mathbb{I}_k$. It follows that either $\mathfrak{s}_n(a_n) > -\infty, \mathfrak{s}_k(\mathbf{a}_k) = -\infty$ or $\mathfrak{s}_n(b_n) < \infty, \mathfrak{s}_k(\mathbf{b}_k) = \infty$. Either of them contradicts (3.3).

Finally, for the second condition, we need only to show that

$$(3.4) \quad d\mathfrak{s}_k \left(\mathbb{I}_k \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n \right) \right) = 0, \quad k \geq 1.$$

In fact, for any $u \in \mathfrak{F}$ with $u|_{\mathbb{I}_k^c} = 0$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}(u, u) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{I_n \subset \mathbb{I}_k} \int_{I_n} \left(\frac{du}{d\mathfrak{s}_n} \right)^2 d\mathfrak{s}_n, \quad \mathfrak{E}(u, u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{I}_k} \left(\frac{du}{d\mathfrak{s}_k} \right)^2 d\mathfrak{s}_k.$$

Similar to (3.2), we can deduce from $\mathcal{E}(u, u) = \mathfrak{E}(u, u)$ that

$$\int_{\mathbb{I}_k \setminus (\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n)} \left(\frac{du}{d\mathfrak{s}_k} \right)^2 d\mathfrak{s}_k = 0.$$

Therefore, we conclude that (3.4) holds. That completes the proof. \square

Remark 3.2. We shall present several remarks which contain some interesting facts, regarding two conditions in the theorem above. Suppose that the conclusion of Theorem 3.1 holds.

- (1) The first condition is equivalent to say that $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ is finer than $\{\mathbb{I}_k : k \geq 1\}$. Since both $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ and $\{\mathbb{I}_k : k \geq 1\}$ satisfy (E1), the finer set $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ could be divided into

$$\mathcal{J}_k := \{I_n : I_n \subset \mathbb{I}_k, n \geq 1\}, \quad k \geq 1.$$

Clearly, $\{\mathcal{J}_k : k \geq 1\}$ are mutually disjoint. Furthermore, we claim that for each k , the intervals in \mathcal{J}_k are topologically dense in I_k in the sense that

$$(3.5) \quad I_k \setminus \left(\bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}_k} J \right)$$

is nowhere dense. In fact, suppose that the open set (a, b) is contained in the closure of (3.5). Then

$$(a, b) \subset \bar{I}_k \setminus \left(\bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}_k} \overset{\circ}{J} \right),$$

where \bar{I}_k is the closure of I_k and $\overset{\circ}{J}$ is the interior of J . It follows that $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}((a, b)) > 0$ but $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}((a, b)) = 0$, which contradicts the absolute continuity $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} \ll \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

- (2) The second condition is equivalent to the statement that the $d\mathfrak{s}_k$ -measure of (3.5) is equal to 0 for any k and whenever $I_n \in \mathcal{J}_k$, it holds that $\mathfrak{s}_k \ll \mathfrak{s}_n$ on I_n and

$$\frac{d\mathfrak{s}_k}{d\mathfrak{s}_n} = 0 \text{ or } 1, \quad d\mathfrak{s}_n\text{-a.e. on } I_n.$$

- (3) $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) = (\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ if and only if $\{I_n : n \geq 1\} = \{I_k : k \geq 1\}$ and $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} = \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$. The condition they share the same scale measure alone, $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} = \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$, can not ensure $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F}) = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. An example is given in the end of this section.
- (4) When $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ has only one effective interval \mathbb{R} , $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ also has only one effective interval \mathbb{R} and the first condition naturally holds. Then the scale measures reduce to the scale functions on \mathbb{R} and the second condition is nothing but the one introduced in [2].

We end this section with two examples. The first example is given in [10, Example 3.12 and Remark 3.15], in which $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ both have only one effective interval, and $I_1 = (0, 1]$ and $I_1 = [0, 1]$. Clearly, $I_1 \subset I_1$. Note that \mathfrak{s}_1 is adapted to I_1 and \mathfrak{s}_1 is adapted to I_1 , which implies $\mathfrak{s}_1(0) = -\infty$ and $\mathfrak{s}_1(0) > -\infty$. Due to (3.1), such \mathfrak{s}_1 and \mathfrak{s}_1 are constructed in [10, Example 3.12]. Another example below is given in [9, Example 3.20] and [10, Example 3.8].

Example 3.3. Let m be the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} and $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ be the Dirichlet form of 1-dim Brownian motion. The effective intervals of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ are given as follows. Let K be the standard Cantor set in $[0, 1]$. Set $U := K^c$ and write U as a union of disjoint open intervals:

$$U = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} (a_n, b_n)$$

where $(a_1, b_1) = (-\infty, 0)$, $(a_2, b_2) = (1, \infty)$. Let $I_1 := (-\infty, 0]$, $I_2 := [1, \infty)$ and $I_n := [a_n, b_n]$ for any $n \geq 3$. For each n , define the scale function $\mathfrak{s}_n(x) = x - e_n$ on I_n ($e_n \in I_n$ as in (2.1)). Since $I_1 = \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathfrak{s}_1(x) = x$, it follows that $I_n \subset I_1$, and $d\mathfrak{s}_n$ and $d\mathfrak{s}_1$ coincide on I_n . Therefore, $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} = \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$, which is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} , as an example promised in Remark 3.2(3).

4. ROAD MAP TO ATTAIN D-SUBSPACES

Fix a regular and strongly local Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}, m)$ with effective intervals $\{(I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ throughout this section. Though Theorem 3.1 in §3 completely characterizes the D-subspaces of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, it does not tell how to construct a D-subspace from $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. In this section, we shall draw an intuitive road map to attain all possible D-subspaces of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. Note that a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is also expressed by another class of effective intervals. Thus essentially, it suffices to

construct a new class of effective intervals. In the following, we shall introduce two kinds of operations on effective intervals. Keep in mind that after each operation, the obtained effective intervals would always enjoy the properties (E1) and (E2) in §2. Finally, the principal theorem shows that every D-subspace can be attained by these two operations.

4.1. Scale-shrink operation. The first kind of operation is called *scale-shrink*. It is composed of a key step and an additional step.

4.1.1. *Key step.* The key step based on (3.1) is to construct a new scale measure. Define a scale function $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n \in \mathbf{S}(I_n)$ such that $d\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n \ll d\mathfrak{s}_n$ and

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{d\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n}{d\mathfrak{s}_n} = 0 \text{ or } 1, \quad d\mathfrak{s}_n\text{-a.e. on } I_n$$

for each n and set

$$\lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}} := \sum_{n \geq 1} d\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n,$$

which is the scale measure associated to $\{(I_n, \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n) : n \geq 1\}$. The measure $\lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}$ is called a shrinking of $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

This step produces a valid scale function on each I_n , but the sequence of pairs $\{(I_n, \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ might break (E2), adaptedness, so that it is possibly only a class of pre-effective intervals. In practice, when I_n is closed, (4.1) implies that $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n$ is still adapted to I_n . However, when I_n is not closed (semi-closed or open), Lemma 4.1 below tells us one can always find scale function $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n$ on I_n , which satisfies (4.1) and is not adapted to I_n . A concrete example is given in [10, Example 3.12] and also mentioned in §3.

Lemma 4.1. *Let J be an interval. Take $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathbf{S}(J)$ and fix a constant $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists a scale function \mathfrak{s} on J such that $d\mathfrak{s}(J) < \varepsilon$, $d\mathfrak{s} \ll d\mathfrak{s}$ and*

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{d\mathfrak{s}}{d\mathfrak{s}} = 0 \text{ or } 1, \quad d\mathfrak{s}\text{-a.e.}$$

Proof. Set

$$G := \left\{ \bigcup_{k \geq 1} (q_k - r_k, q_k + r_k) \right\} \cap J,$$

where $\{q_k : k \geq 1\}$ is the set of rational numbers in J , and $\{r_k : k \geq 1\}$ is a sequence of real number such that for each k , $\mathfrak{s}(q_k + r_k) - \mathfrak{s}(q_k - r_k) < \varepsilon 2^{-k}$. Take a fixed point $e \in J$ as in (2.1) and define

$$\mathfrak{s}(x) = \int_e^x 1_G(y) d\mathfrak{s}(y), \quad x \in J.$$

We assert that \mathfrak{s} satisfies all conditions. Clearly, \mathfrak{s} is absolutely continuous with respect to \mathfrak{s} and (4.2) holds. Since G is a dense open subset of J and \mathfrak{s} is strictly increasing, it follows that \mathfrak{s} is strictly increasing and thus $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathbf{S}(J)$. Finally,

$$d\mathfrak{s}(J) = \int_J 1_G(y) d\mathfrak{s}(y) \leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \int_{(q_k - r_k, q_k + r_k)} d\mathfrak{s} < \varepsilon.$$

That completes the proof. \square

Before proceeding, we should make pre-effective intervals $\{(I_n, \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ be effective. A naive way to restore (E2) after the key step is as follows. Whenever $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n$ is not adapted to I_n , the endpoints, in trouble, of I_n are added to I_n and a new

interval $I_n^{\bar{s}}$ obtained so that \bar{s}_n is adapted to $I_n^{\bar{s}}$. Precisely speaking, for any $n \geq 1$, set

$$(4.3) \quad I_n^{\bar{s}} := \langle a_n, b_n \rangle,$$

where $a_n \in I_n^{\bar{s}}$ (resp. $b_n \in I_n^{\bar{s}}$) if and only if $a_n + \bar{s}_n(a_n) > -\infty$ (resp. $b_n + \bar{s}_n(b_n) < \infty$). Note that $I_n \subset I_n^{\bar{s}}$. However doing so might break (E1). In other words, some intervals could intersect with each other. Surely, we could merge the intersected intervals into a new one and maintain the scale measure. But this ‘interval-merge’ seems not so clear and new (and endless) troubles might appear. The following examples show us a rough observation about this dilemma.

Example 4.2. In the example below, the scale function $\mathfrak{s}(x) = x - e$ on an arbitrary interval (e is a fixed point given by (2.1)) is called the natural scale function.

- (1) Consider a simple example with only two effective intervals: $I_1 = [-1, 0)$ and $I_2 = (0, 1]$. Without loss of generality, assume that the scale functions \bar{s}_1, \bar{s}_2 in the key step are both the natural scale functions. Clearly, (E2) does not hold for the new scales. As in (4.3), set $I_1^{\bar{s}} := [-1, 0]$ and $I_2^{\bar{s}} := [0, 1]$. Then \bar{s}_1, \bar{s}_2 are adapted to $I_1^{\bar{s}}$ and $I_2^{\bar{s}}$ respectively but $I_1^{\bar{s}} \cap I_2^{\bar{s}} \neq \emptyset$. In this case, the merging step is easy and clear. Merge $I_1^{\bar{s}}$ and $I_2^{\bar{s}}$ into a new interval $[-1, 1]$ and the induced scale function on $[-1, 1]$ remains to be the natural scale function.
- (2) Consider the following intervals: $I_1 = (0, 1)$, $I_2 = (-1, -1/2)$, and $I_n = (-1/(n-1), -1/n)$ for any $n \geq 3$. Let \bar{s}_n be the natural scale function on I_n . As in (4.3), we have

$$I_2^{\bar{s}} = [-1, -1/2], \quad I_n^{\bar{s}} = [-1/(n-1), -1/n], \quad n \geq 3.$$

These intervals constitute a chain one by one. Note that $I_1^{\bar{s}} = [0, 1]$ and $I_1^{\bar{s}} \cap I_n^{\bar{s}} = \emptyset$ for any $n \geq 2$. Thus it seems reasonable to divide them into two classes:

$$\mathfrak{J}_1 = \{I_1^{\bar{s}}\}, \quad \mathfrak{J}_2 = \{I_n^{\bar{s}} : n \geq 2\},$$

and then merge \mathfrak{J}_2 into a new interval

$$(4.4) \quad I_2 := \bigcup_{n \geq 2} I_n^{\bar{s}} = [-1, 0).$$

However, the natural scale function is not adapted to I_2 . Thus we need to mimic (4.3) again and set $I_2^{\bar{s}} := [-1, 0]$. Then the new trouble appears: $I_1^{\bar{s}}$ intersects with $I_2^{\bar{s}}$. Finally, we could merge $I_1^{\bar{s}}$ and $I_2^{\bar{s}}$ into $[-1, 1]$ and the natural scale function is eventually adapted to $[-1, 1]$.

- (3) The repair procedures in the second example might be infinite. Mimicking the second example, we can always find a sequence of open intervals one by one, which converge in both directions. For example, let

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= (-1/2, 0), \quad I_2 = (0, 1/2), \\ I_{2n+1} &= \left(\frac{1}{n+2} - 1, \frac{1}{n+1} - 1 \right), \\ I_{2n+2} &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{n+1}, 1 - \frac{1}{n+2} \right), \quad n \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Then $I_{2n+1} \downarrow -1$ and $I_{2n+2} \uparrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We call them a sequence of intervals in the first type. Now take a decreasing sequence of points $a_n \downarrow a$ and an increasing sequence of points $b_n \uparrow b$ with $a_1 = b_1$. For each n , take a sequence of open intervals in the first type between (b_n, b_{n+1}) (resp. (a_{n+1}, a_n)), and b_n, b_{n+1} (resp. a_{n+1}, a_n) are two convergent points. All the intervals between a and b are called a sequence of intervals in the second

type. Similarly, we can build sequences in the m -th type for any integer m . When dealing with these intervals by mimicking the procedures of the second example, we need to repeat the extension (as (4.3)) and merging (as (4.4)) of intervals infinite many times.

4.1.2. Minimal interval-merge. To overcome this problem, we need to design an additional step to complete scale-shrink operation. Heuristically speaking, these ‘virtually connected’ intervals (in Example 4.2) should be glued together to make the scale function be adapted. This step is called ‘minimal interval-merge’, because it is a minimal operation to get the job done.

To show the details, let us introduce a new conception. Recall that e_n is a fixed point in (a_n, b_n) for $n \geq 1$ and $[e_i, e_j]$ denotes the interval ended by e_j and e_i no matter which is bigger. The following definition is stated for $\{(I_n, \bar{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$, but may actually be applied to any class of pre-effective intervals. This means that the minimal interval-merge may be applied to any class of pre-effective intervals.

Definition 4.3. We say that two intervals I_i and I_j are *tightly scale-connected*, or I_i is *tightly scale-connected* to I_j , with respect to the scale measure $\lambda_{\bar{s}}$, if

- (1) $[e_i, e_j] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n\right)$ is at most countable;
- (2) $\lambda_{\bar{s}}([e_i, e_j]) < \infty$.

Remark 4.4. Clearly, all the intervals in each example of Example 4.2 are tightly scale-connected. Let us give two further remarks for this definition.

- (1) Condition (1) in Definition 4.3 implies that $[e_i, e_j] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n\right)$ is nowhere dense. In fact, it is evident that

$$\overline{[e_i, e_j] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n\right)} \subset [e_i, e_j] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} \overset{\circ}{I}_n\right).$$

Condition (1) above implies that $[e_i, e_j] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} \overset{\circ}{I}_n\right)$ has at most countable points, so that it contain no open non-empty intervals. Thus $[e_i, e_j] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n\right)$ is nowhere dense.

- (2) The phenomena of tight scale-connection can only exist in the case of pre-effective intervals. For effective intervals $\{(I_n, \mathbf{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$, we claim that any two different intervals I_i and I_j are not tightly scale-connected with respect to its scale measure $\lambda_{\mathbf{s}}$. In fact, suppose two different intervals I_i and I_j are tightly scale-connected. Then $\lambda_{\mathbf{s}}([e_i, e_j]) < \infty$ implies that the endpoints of $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ between e_i and e_j must be closed. Particularly, the intervals between I_i and I_j are closed. Since $I_i \cap I_j = \emptyset$, it follows that the intervals between e_i and e_j have a Cantor-type structure. This indicates $[e_i, e_j] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n\right)$ has uncountable points, which contradicts condition (1) in Definition 4.3.

The tight scale-connection is an equivalence relation for intervals $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$. Denote all the equivalence classes induced by tight scale-connection by

$$\{\mathfrak{J}_k : k \geq 1\},$$

where \mathfrak{J}_k is a subset of $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ for each k , in which any two intervals are tightly scale-connected. Note that if I_i is tightly scale-connected to I_j , then any interval located between I_i and I_j must be tightly scale-connected to them. Thus each equivalence class looks like a ‘connected’ cluster of intervals and there are at most countable points between these intervals.

The additional step, called *minimal interval-merge*, is defined as follows. For each $k \geq 1$, set

$$(4.5) \quad \mathbf{a}_k := \inf\{x \in J : J \in \mathfrak{J}_k\}, \quad \mathbf{b}_k := \sup\{x \in J : J \in \mathfrak{J}_k\}.$$

Let \mathfrak{s}_k be the increasing function induced by the measure $\lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}|_{(\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_k)}$ and such that $\mathfrak{s}_k(\mathbf{c}_k) = 0$, where \mathbf{c}_k is a fixed point in $(\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_k)$ (Cf. (2.1)). More precisely,

$$\mathfrak{s}_k(x) := \int_{\mathbf{c}_k}^x d\lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}|_{(\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_k)}, \quad x \in (\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_k).$$

Clearly, $\mathfrak{s}_k \in \mathbf{S}((\mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_k))$ by Definition 4.3 and Remark 4.4. Define now

$$(4.6) \quad \mathbf{I}_k := \langle \mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_k \rangle,$$

where $\mathbf{a}_k \in \mathbf{I}_k$ (resp. $\mathbf{b}_k \in \mathbf{I}_k$) if and only if $\mathbf{a}_k + \mathfrak{s}_k(\mathbf{a}_k) > -\infty$ (resp. $\mathbf{b}_k + \mathfrak{s}_k(\mathbf{b}_k) < \infty$). For each k , the pair $(\mathbf{I}_k, \mathfrak{s}_k)$ is called *merging of equivalence class \mathfrak{J}_k relative to $\lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}$* .

Remark 4.5. When $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n = \mathfrak{s}_n$ for any $n \geq 1$, two scale measures are the same. It is said in Remark 4.4 (2) that any two intervals I_i and I_j are not tightly scale-connected with respect to the original scale measure $\lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}$. Hence the minimal interval-merge takes no action, i.e. $\{(\mathbf{I}_k, \mathfrak{s}_k) : k \geq 1\} = \{(I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$.

The following lemma asserts that $\{(\mathbf{I}_k, \mathfrak{s}_k) : k \geq 1\}$, obtained by scale-shrink operation, is also a class of effective intervals, whose associated scale measure is $\lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}$ defined in the key step.

Lemma 4.6. *The sequence $\{(\mathbf{I}_k, \mathfrak{s}_k) : k \geq 1\}$ is a class of effective intervals. In addition, the scale measure associated to $\{(\mathbf{I}_k, \mathfrak{s}_k) : k \geq 1\}$ is exactly $\lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}$, i.e. $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} = \lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that $\{\mathbf{I}_k : k \geq 1\}$ are mutually disjoint. Suppose that $\mathbf{I}_1 \cap \mathbf{I}_2 \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{b}_1 = \mathbf{a}_2$. Take an interval $I_i \in \mathfrak{J}_1$ and another interval $I_j \in \mathfrak{J}_2$. We assert that I_i is tightly scale-connected to I_j , which contradicts the definition of equivalence classes. In fact, since $\mathbf{b}_1 \in \mathbf{I}_1$ and $\mathbf{a}_2 \in \mathbf{I}_2$, it follows that $\lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}([e_i, e_j]) < \infty$. On the other hand, we can take a sequence of increasing intervals $\{I_{p_m} : m \geq 1\} \subset \mathfrak{J}_1$ with $I_{p_1} = I_i$ such that $a_{p_m}, b_{p_m} \uparrow \mathbf{b}_1$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ and another sequence of decreasing intervals $\{I_{q_m} : m \geq 1\} \subset \mathfrak{J}_2$ with $I_{q_1} = I_j$ such that $a_{q_m}, b_{q_m} \downarrow \mathbf{a}_2$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Since both

$$(b_{p_m}, a_{p_{m+1}}) \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n \right) \quad \text{and} \quad (b_{q_{m+1}}, a_{q_m}) \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n \right)$$

contain at most countable points, we then conclude that $[e_i, e_j] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n \right)$ contains at most countable points. That completes the proof. \square

4.1.3. Scale-shrink operation. We may summarize scale-shrink operation in the following definition.

Definition 4.7. A scale-shrink operation on $\{(I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ proceeds as follows:

- (1) Key step. Identify a new scale measure $\lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}$ by defining a new scale function $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n$ satisfying (4.1) on each interval I_n .
- (2) Minimal interval-merge. Divide $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ into several equivalence classes $\{\mathfrak{J}_k : k \geq 1\}$ according to tight scale-connection with respect to $\lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}$, and for each $k \geq 1$, merge \mathfrak{J}_k with scale functions into a new pair $(\mathbf{I}_k, \mathfrak{s}_k)$.

This operation gives a new class of effective intervals $\{(\mathbf{I}_k, \mathfrak{s}_k) : k \geq 1\}$.

Let us give two remarks for this operation. We first present a proposition, which ensure that it is a right approach to attain D-subspaces. Let $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ be the Dirichlet form given by (2.3) with effective intervals $\{\mathbb{I}_k, \mathfrak{s}_k\} : k \geq 1\}$ in Definition 4.7.

Proposition 4.8. $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ is a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$.

Proof. It suffices to verify two conditions in Theorem 3.1. For any $n \geq 1$, I_n belongs to an equivalence class, say \mathfrak{J}_k . We assert $I_n \subset \mathbb{I}_k$. In fact, it follows from (4.5) and (4.6) that $\dot{I}_n \subset \mathbb{I}_k$. Suppose $a_n \in I_n$ but $a_n \notin \mathbb{I}_k$. This implies that $\mathbf{a}_k = a_n$ and $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n(a_n) > -\infty, \mathfrak{s}_k(\mathbf{a}_k) = -\infty$, which contradicts the definition of \mathfrak{s}_k . Thus $\{\mathbb{I}_k : k \geq 1\}$ is coarser than $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$. On the other hand, from the first term of Definition 4.3, we can deduce that $\mathbb{I}_k \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n\right)$ is at most countable. Since $\lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}$ charges no singleton, we have

$$d\mathfrak{s}_k \left(\mathbb{I}_k \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n \right) \right) = \lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}} \left(\mathbb{I}_k \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n \right) \right) = 0.$$

Then it follows from Remark 3.2 (2) and (4.1) that (3.1) holds. That completes the proof. \square

Next, we note that the minimal interval-merge overcomes the dilemma illustrated in Example 4.2. Roughly speaking, it takes essentially the fewest actions (such as (4.3) and (4.4)) to attain a new class of effective intervals under the given scale measure $\lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}$. The following proposition makes the rough idea above rigorous. Note that under the fixed scale measure, a D-subspace is always characterized by a coarser class of intervals, and thus a smaller D-subspace requests more merging.

Proposition 4.9. Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ be in Proposition 4.8. If $(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{F}')$ is another D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ with the same scale measure as $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$, then $(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{F}')$ is a D-subspace of $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}, m)$.

Proof. Let $\{I'_m : m \geq 1\}$ be the effective intervals of $(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{F}')$. By Theorem 3.1, it suffices to prove that $\{I'_m : m \geq 1\}$ is coarser than $\{\mathbb{I}_k : k \geq 1\}$. Since $(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{F}')$ is a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, it follows from Remark 3.2 (1) that we can divide $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ into classes:

$$\mathcal{I}_m := \{I_n : I_n \subset I'_m, n \geq 1\}, \quad m \geq 1.$$

We assert that for any k , $\mathfrak{J}_k \subset \mathcal{I}_m$ for some m , which implies that $\mathbb{I}_k \subset I'_m$. In fact, suppose that $I_1, I_2 \in \mathfrak{J}_k$ but $I_1 \in \mathcal{I}_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{I}_2$. Since $\lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}([e_1, e_2]) < \infty$, it follows that the endpoints of $\{I'_m : m \geq 1\}$ between e_1 and e_2 must be closed. Mimicking Remark 4.4 (2), we obtain that $[e_1, e_2] \setminus \bigcup_{m \geq 1} I'_m$ has uncountable points. Since $\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n \subset \bigcup_{m \geq 1} I'_m$, we know that $[e_1, e_2] \setminus \bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n$ also has uncountable points, which contradicts the tight scale-connection of I_1 and I_2 . That completes the proof. \square

4.2. Optional interval-merge operation. The scale-shrink operation discussed above produces the largest D-subspace with the given scale measure, as indicated in Proposition 4.9. In order to attain all D-subspaces with the given scale measure, we need more merging. We call this operation the *optional interval-merge*.

4.2.1. Maximal interval-merge. Let us start with a special case of optional interval-merge, the so-called maximal interval-merge. Since the scale measure is fixed, there is no loss of generality to start from effective intervals $\{(I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ and scale measure $\lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}$. The following notion is the basis of maximal interval-merge.

Definition 4.10. We call two intervals I_i and I_j are *loosely scale-connected*, or I_i is *loosely scale-connected* to I_j , with respect to the scale measure $\lambda_{\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}$, if

- (1) $[e_i, e_j] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n\right)$ is nowhere dense;
- (2) $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}([e_i, e_j]) < \infty$.

Remark 4.11. Tight scale-connection implies loose scale-connection by Remark 4.4, but not vice versa. For example, the effective intervals in Example 3.3 are loosely scale-connected with each other. However, Remark 4.4 (2) tells us any interval I_n is tightly scale-connected to itself only.

Like tight scale-connection, loose scale-connection is also an equivalence relation on intervals $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$. Analogously, denote all the equivalence classes of $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ induced by loose scale-connection by

$$(4.7) \quad \{\mathfrak{J}_k : k \geq 1\}.$$

The *maximal interval-merge* proceeds as follows: Merge each \mathfrak{J}_k into a new interval

$$(4.8) \quad \mathfrak{I}_k^{\mathfrak{m}} := \langle \mathfrak{a}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}, \mathfrak{b}_k^{\mathfrak{m}} \rangle$$

and induce a new scale function $\mathfrak{s}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}$ on it by means of $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ as the procedures above Remark 4.5. Eventually, the merging of equivalent class \mathfrak{J}_k relative to $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is $(\mathfrak{I}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}, \mathfrak{s}_k^{\mathfrak{m}})$.

We shall now prove that under the given scale measure, the Dirichlet space obtained by this operation is the smallest D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. This is also why we call it the ‘maximal’ interval-merge.

Proposition 4.12. *The set $\{(\mathfrak{I}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}, \mathfrak{s}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}) : k \geq 1\}$ is a class of effective intervals, whose scale measure equals $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$. Let $(\mathfrak{E}^{\mathfrak{m}}, \mathfrak{F}^{\mathfrak{m}})$ be the Dirichlet form given by effective intervals $\{(\mathfrak{I}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}, \mathfrak{s}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}) : k \geq 1\}$. Then $(\mathfrak{E}^{\mathfrak{m}}, \mathfrak{F}^{\mathfrak{m}})$ is a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}, m)$. Furthermore, if $(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{F}')$ is a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ with the scale measure $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$, then $(\mathfrak{E}^{\mathfrak{m}}, \mathfrak{F}^{\mathfrak{m}})$ is also a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{F}')$.*

Proof. Similar to Lemma 4.6, we can deduce that $\{\mathfrak{I}_k^{\mathfrak{m}} : k \geq 1\}$ are mutually disjoint. Thus $\{(\mathfrak{I}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}, \mathfrak{s}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}) : k \geq 1\}$ are effective intervals and clearly, its scale measure equals $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

For the rest of assertion, it is enough to verify that $(\mathfrak{E}^{\mathfrak{m}}, \mathfrak{F}^{\mathfrak{m}})$ is a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{F}')$. Let $\{I'_m : m \geq 1\}$ be the effective intervals of $(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{F}')$. It suffices to prove that $\{\mathfrak{I}_k^{\mathfrak{m}} : k \geq 1\}$ is coarser than $\{I'_m : m \geq 1\}$ by Theorem 3.1. Mimicking Remark 3.2 (1), set

$$\mathcal{I}_m := \{I_n : I_n \subset I'_m\}.$$

Since the scale measure of $(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{F}')$ equals $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$, it follows from Remark 3.2 (1) that the intervals in \mathcal{I}_m are loosely scale-connected with each other. Thus $\mathcal{I}_m \subset \mathfrak{J}_k$ for some k , which leads to the conclusion $I'_m \subset \mathfrak{I}_k$. That completes the proof. \square

4.2.2. Optional interval-merge. The maximal interval-merge, merging each equivalence class of loose scale-connection, \mathfrak{J}_k , into one interval, gives the minimal D-subspace. However the set of intervals in \mathfrak{J}_k may be merged more optionally, so that it produces all possible D-subspaces under the same scale measure.

Let us prepare some ingredients to do other interval-merge operation on (4.7). Fix $k \geq 1$. A point $x \in [\mathfrak{a}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}, \mathfrak{b}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}]$ is called a *left* (resp. *right*) *pre-merging point* if either $x = a_n$ (resp. $x = b_n$) for some $I_n = \langle a_n, b_n \rangle \in \mathfrak{J}_k$ or $x \notin \bigcup_{J \in \mathfrak{J}_k} J$. A pair of points x and y , denoted by $[x, y]$, is called a *pre-merging pair* of \mathfrak{J}_k if x is a left pre-merging point, y is a right pre-merging point and $x < y$. We say that two pre-merging pairs $[x_1, y_1]$ and $[x_2, y_2]$ are disjoint if

$$[x_1, y_1] \cap [x_2, y_2] = \emptyset.$$

Given a pre-merging pair $[x, y]$, $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ induces a scale function \mathfrak{s} on (x, y) and set

$$(4.9) \quad \mathfrak{I} := \langle x, y \rangle,$$

where $x \in \mathbf{I}$ if and only if $x + \mathfrak{s}(x) > -\infty$, $y \in \mathbf{I}$ if and only if $y + \mathfrak{s}(y) < \infty$. In abuse of terminology, we also call $(\mathbf{I}, \mathfrak{s})$ the merging of $[x, y]$ relative to $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

Remark 4.13. The points in $(\mathfrak{a}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}, \mathfrak{b}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}) \setminus (\bigcup_{J \in \mathfrak{J}_k} J)$ are both left and right pre-merging points. The left endpoint $\mathfrak{a}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}$ of $\mathbf{I}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}$, possibly being $-\infty$, is a left pre-merging point, and the right endpoint $\mathfrak{b}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}$, possibly being ∞ , is a right pre-merging point. Notice that the endpoints of intervals in \mathfrak{J}_k , except for $\mathfrak{a}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}$ and $\mathfrak{b}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}$, are all closed. Similarly, (4.9) must be closed when $x, y \in (\mathfrak{a}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}, \mathfrak{b}_k^{\mathfrak{m}})$.

We are now well prepared to present the *optional interval-merge* on \mathfrak{J}_k as follows. Take at most countable disjoint pre-merging pairs $\{[\mathfrak{a}_p^k, \mathfrak{b}_p^k] : 1 \leq p \leq N_k\}$ ($N_k \leq \infty$) and denote their merging relative to $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ by $\{(\mathbf{I}_p^k, \mathfrak{s}_p^k) : 1 \leq p \leq N_k\}$. Let \mathfrak{J}_k^p be the class of all the intervals $J \in \mathfrak{J}_k$ such that $J \subset \mathbf{I}_p^k$. Then the set

$$(4.10) \quad \left\{ (I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : I_n \in \mathfrak{J}_k \setminus \bigcup_{1 \leq p \leq N_k} \mathfrak{J}_p^k \right\} \cup \{(\mathbf{I}_p^k, \mathfrak{s}_p^k) : 1 \leq p \leq N_k\}$$

is what we obtain by an interval-merge operation on \mathfrak{J}_k , which is called an *optional interval-merge*.

Intuitively speaking, to do an optional interval-merge, we choose pre-merging pairs, then merge the intervals lying inside each pair into a new effective interval, and leave the intervals outside unchanged. In that way, we make effective intervals coarser. Particularly, the maximal interval-merge takes only one pre-merging pair $[\mathfrak{a}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}, \mathfrak{b}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}]$ and merges all the intervals in \mathfrak{J}_k into $(\mathbf{I}_k^{\mathfrak{m}}, \mathfrak{s}_k^{\mathfrak{m}})$.

Definition 4.14. Let $\{\mathfrak{J}_k : k \geq 1\}$ be the set of equivalence classes of $\{(I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ induced by the loose scale-connection with respect to $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$. An optional interval-merge operation on $\{(I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ is to execute an optional interval-merge on each \mathfrak{J}_k for any $k \geq 1$.

The following proposition indicates that an optional interval-merge operation leads to a D-subspace.

Proposition 4.15. *The set obtained by an optional interval-merge operation,*

$$(4.11) \quad \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \left(\left\{ (I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : I_n \in \mathfrak{J}_k \setminus \bigcup_{1 \leq p \leq N_k} \mathfrak{J}_p^k \right\} \cup \{(\mathbf{I}_p^k, \mathfrak{s}_p^k) : 1 \leq p \leq N_k\} \right)$$

is a class of effective intervals, with scale measure $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$. Furthermore, its associated Dirichlet form $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ is a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}, m)$.

Proof. For the first assertion, we only need to show the intervals in (4.11) are mutually disjoint. Denote all the intervals in (4.10) by \mathcal{A}_k . Clearly, from the second condition in Definition 4.10, we conclude that $J_1 \in \mathcal{A}_k$ and $J_2 \in \mathcal{A}_{k'}$ with $k \neq k'$ are disjoint. Now fix an integer k , and take $I_n, \mathbf{I}_p^k \in \mathcal{A}_k$. Suppose $a_n < \mathfrak{a}_p^k$ and $I_n \cap \mathbf{I}_p^k \neq \emptyset$. This implies that $b_n = \mathfrak{a}_p^k \in I_n \cap \mathbf{I}_p^k$. Since $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ are mutually disjoint, it follows from the definition of left pre-merging point that $\mathfrak{a}_p^k \notin \bigcup_{J \in \mathfrak{J}_k} J$, which contradicts $\mathfrak{a}_p^k \in I_n$. For the second assertion, since the scale measure associated to (4.11) is equal to $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$, it suffices to prove that (4.11) is coarser than $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$. This fact is clear from the definition of (4.11). That completes the proof. \square

An example below is to explain the optional interval-merge operations on the Dirichlet form in Example 3.3. Recall the $\mathfrak{s}(x) = x - e$ on any interval J is the natural scale function on J .

Example 4.16. Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ be the Dirichlet form in Example 3.3 with effective intervals $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ and natural scale function on each interval. Note that its scale measure is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} . Since the Cantor set K is nowhere dense, $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ are loosely scale-connected to each other and thus there is only one equivalence class \mathfrak{J}_1 induced by the loose scale-connection.

In the following, we shall present several examples of pre-merging pairs. The maximal interval-merge corresponds to the pre-merging pair $[-\infty, \infty]$ ($N_1 = 1$). It merges all the intervals into the new one associated with the 1-dim Brownian motion. A trivial optional interval-merge operation is as follows: Let $N_1 = \infty$ and set

$$[\mathbf{a}_p^1, \mathbf{b}_p^1] := [a_p, b_p], \quad p \geq 1.$$

By this operation, effective intervals remain the same.

The pre-merging pair $[-\infty, b_n]$ for some $n \geq 1$ corresponds to operation, which merges all the intervals between $-\infty$ and b_n into the new interval $(-\infty, b_n]$ with the natural scale function on it. Note that b_n is not a left pre-merging point by the definition. In fact, once we take a pre-merging pair $[b_n, y]$, its merging must be $[b_n, y]$ with natural scale function on it. Then $[b_n, y] \cap I_n \neq \emptyset$ and thus breaks (E1).

Finally, if we take a point $y \in K \setminus \{0, 1, a_n, b_n : n \geq 3\}$, $[-\infty, y]$ is also a pre-merging pair. Clearly, there exists a subsequence $\{I_{n_m} : m \geq 1\}$ such that both the endpoints $a_{n_m} \uparrow y$ and $b_{n_m} \uparrow y$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Thus the merging of $[-\infty, y]$ is $(-\infty, y]$ with the natural scale function on it. Furthermore, since the pre-merging pairs in an optional interval-merge are required to be disjoint, we know that y cannot be either left or right pre-merging point in another pre-merging pair of the same optional interval-merge.

4.3. Road map to D-subspaces. We have already introduced two kinds of operations on effective intervals to obtain D-subspaces. Keep in mind that the scale-shrink operation essentially identifies a new scale measure, and the optional interval-merge operation does not change the scale measure. The main result of this section is the following theorem, which states that every D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ can be obtained by firstly a scale-shrink operation to fix a scale measure and then an optional interval-merge operation to acquire wanted effective intervals.

Theorem 4.17. *Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ be two regular and strongly local Dirichlet forms on $L^2(\mathbb{R}, m)$ having effective intervals $\{(I_n, \mathbf{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ and $\{(\mathbf{I}_k, \mathbf{s}_k) : k \geq 1\}$ respectively. Then $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ is a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}, m)$ if and only if $\{(\mathbf{I}_k, \mathbf{s}_k) : k \geq 1\}$ is attained from $\{(I_n, \mathbf{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ by firstly a scale-shrink operation and then an optional interval-merge operation.*

Proof. The sufficiency follows from Propositions 4.8 and 4.15. It suffices to prove the necessity. Recall that $I_n = \langle a_n, b_n \rangle$ and $\mathbf{I}_k = \langle \mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_k \rangle$. Denote the scale measure associated to $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ by $\lambda_{\mathfrak{S}}$. Since $\{\mathbf{I}_k : k \geq 1\}$ is coarser than $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ by Theorem 3.1, $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ may be divided into classes:

$$\mathfrak{J}_k := \{I_n : I_n \subset \mathbf{I}_k, n \geq 1\}, \quad k \geq 1.$$

We then proceed scale-shrink operation to make the scale measure be $\lambda_{\mathfrak{S}}$. To execute the key step and minimal interval-merge of scale-shrink operation as stated in Definition 4.7, we will obtain a class of effective intervals. More precisely, set $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_n$ to be the scale function on I_n induced by $\lambda_{\mathfrak{S}}$. Divide $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ into several equivalence classes induced by the tight scale-connection

$$\{\mathfrak{J}_p^1 : p \geq 1\},$$

and then merge each \mathcal{I}_p^1 into a new interval \mathbb{I}_p^1 with the scale function \mathfrak{s}_p^1 induced by $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ on \mathbb{I}_p^1 . Thus we attain a new class of effective intervals $\{(\mathbb{I}_p^1, \mathfrak{s}_p^1) : p \geq 1\}$ with scale measure $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

We now prepare to do an optional interval-merge on $\{(\mathbb{I}_p^1, \mathfrak{s}_p^1) : p \geq 1\}$, which amounts to picking a class of pre-merging pairs. At first $\{\mathbb{I}_p^1 : p \geq 1\}$ can be divided into equivalence classes induced by the loose scale-connection with respect to $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$

$$\{\mathcal{I}_q : q \geq 1\},$$

and define for each $q \geq 1$,

$$\mathcal{J}_q^2 := \bigcup_{\mathbb{I}_p^1 \in \mathcal{I}_q} \mathcal{I}_p^1,$$

which is a subset of $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$. It follows from Propositions 4.9 and 4.12 that $\{\mathcal{I}_p^1 : p \geq 1\}$ is finer than $\{\mathcal{J}_k : k \geq 1\}$ and $\{\mathcal{J}_k : k \geq 1\}$ is finer than $\{\mathcal{J}_q^2 : q \geq 1\}$, in other words, for any $p \geq 1$, $\mathcal{I}_p^1 \subset \mathcal{J}_k$ for some k , and for any $k \geq 1$, $\mathcal{J}_k \subset \mathcal{J}_q^2$ for some q . We assert now that

$$\{[\mathfrak{a}_k, \mathfrak{b}_k] : \mathcal{J}_k \subset \mathcal{J}_q^2\}$$

is a class of disjoint pre-merging pairs of \mathcal{I}_q , which implies that $\{(I_k, \mathfrak{s}_k) : k \geq 1\}$ is attained from $\{(\mathbb{I}_p^1, \mathfrak{s}_p^1) : p \geq 1\}$ by an optional interval-merge operation. In fact, we only need to show \mathfrak{a}_k (resp. \mathfrak{b}_k) with $\mathcal{J}_k \subset \mathcal{J}_q^2$ is a left (resp. right) pre-merging point of \mathcal{I}_q . Note that

$$\mathfrak{a}_k = \inf\{x \in J : J \in \mathcal{J}_k\} \geq \inf\{x \in J : J \in \mathcal{J}_q^2\} = \inf\{x \in J : J \in \mathcal{I}_q\}$$

and similarly, $\mathfrak{b}_k \leq \sup\{x \in J : J \in \mathcal{I}_q\}$. When $\mathfrak{a}_k = \inf\{x \in J : J \in \mathcal{I}_q\}$, clearly \mathfrak{a}_k is a left pre-merging point of \mathcal{I}_q . Now assume $\mathfrak{a}_k > \inf\{x \in J : J \in \mathcal{I}_q\}$, which implies that $\mathfrak{a}_k \in I_k$. Suppose $\mathfrak{a}_k \in \mathbb{I}_p^1 := \langle \mathfrak{a}_p^1, \mathfrak{b}_p^1 \rangle$ but $\mathfrak{a}_k \neq \mathfrak{a}_p^1$. This indicates that $\mathfrak{a}_k > \mathfrak{a}_p^1$. Since $\mathbb{I}_p^1 \subset I_k$ or $\mathbb{I}_p^1 \cap I_k = \emptyset$ by Theorem 3.1, it follows from $\mathfrak{a}_k \in I_k \cap \mathbb{I}_p^1$ that $\mathbb{I}_p^1 \subset I_k$, which contradicts the fact $\mathfrak{a}_k > \mathfrak{a}_p^1$. Thus we conclude that \mathfrak{a}_k is a left pre-merging point of \mathcal{I}_q . Similarly, we can deduce that \mathfrak{b}_k is a right pre-merging point of \mathcal{I}_q . That completes the proof. \square

We shall end this section by an interesting observation. All the D-subspaces of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ can be classified by possible scale measures, which are identified in the key step of scale-shrink operation. Let $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ be a scale measure satisfying (3.1) and $\mathcal{S}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}})$ the class of all the D-subspaces with the scale measure $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$. Then the minimal interval-merge in Proposition 4.9 corresponds to the largest D-subspace in $\mathcal{S}(\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}})$ and the maximal interval-merge in Proposition 4.12 gives the smallest one. Optional interval-merge operations produce all other D-subspaces between them.

5. D-SUBSPACES GENERATED BY A CLASS OF FUNCTIONS

In previous sections, we describe how we can obtain all possible D-subspaces from two operations on effective intervals. In this section, we shall come back to analyze how to construct a D-subspace from a particular function and how it relates to the operations in the previous sections.

Fix a Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ with the effective intervals $\{(I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ and scale measure $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$. Recall that $\mathbf{S}(\mathbb{R})$ is the family of all scale functions on \mathbb{R} , i.e.

$$\mathbf{S}(\mathbb{R}) = \{f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid f \text{ is strictly increasing and continuous, } f(0) = 0\}.$$

Let $f \in \mathbf{S}(\mathbb{R})$ and denote its induced Radon measure by λ_f . Write

$$(5.1) \quad \lambda_f^e := \lambda_f|_{\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n}, \quad \lambda_f^t := \lambda_f|_{\left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n\right)^c}.$$

(The superscript ‘e’ stands for ‘effective part’ and ‘t’ stands for ‘trivial part’.) Set $\mathfrak{f}(\mathbb{R}) := \{\mathfrak{f}(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{f}} := C_c^\infty \circ \mathfrak{f} = \{\varphi \circ \mathfrak{f} : \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathfrak{f}(\mathbb{R}))\}.$$

We shall impose the assumption $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{f}} \subset \mathcal{F}$ henceforth. Denote the \mathcal{E}_1 -closure of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{f}}$ by \mathfrak{F} and define

$$\mathfrak{E}(u, v) := \mathcal{E}(u, v), \quad u, v \in \mathfrak{F}.$$

Then it is easy to check that $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ is a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. This section is devoted to study this D-subspace. Note that the special case with $\mathfrak{f}(x) = x$, the natural scale function, has been studied in [10, §3].

5.1. Basic assumption. The following lemma brings into play (5.1) and characterizes the basic assumption $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{f}} \subset \mathcal{F}$.

Lemma 5.1. *The condition $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{f}} \subset \mathcal{F}$ is satisfied if and only if*

$$(5.2) \quad \lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e \ll \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}, \quad \frac{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e}{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}} \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}, \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}).$$

Proof. For the sufficiency, on account of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{f}} \subset L^2(\mathbb{R})$ it suffices to show $\varphi \circ \mathfrak{f} \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{E}(\varphi \circ \mathfrak{f}, \varphi \circ \mathfrak{f}) < \infty$ for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathfrak{f}(\mathbb{R}))$. Indeed, $\varphi \circ \mathfrak{f}|_{I_n} \ll \mathfrak{s}_n$ by $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e \ll \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathcal{E}(\varphi \circ \mathfrak{f}, \varphi \circ \mathfrak{f}) &= \sum_{n \geq 1} \int_{I_n} (\varphi' \circ \mathfrak{f})^2 \left(\frac{d\mathfrak{f}}{d\mathfrak{s}_n} \right)^2 d\mathfrak{s}_n \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\varphi' \circ \mathfrak{f})^2 \left(\frac{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e}{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}} \right)^2 d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then (5.2) implies $\mathcal{E}(\varphi \circ \mathfrak{f}, \varphi \circ \mathfrak{f}) < \infty$.

To the contrary, we need only to note $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{f}} \subset \mathcal{F}$ implies that $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$ and then (5.2) follows from the expression of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. That completes the proof. \square

5.2. Scale measure and optional interval-merge. Clearly, $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ is a regular and strongly local Dirichlet form on $L^2(\mathbb{R}, m)$. Thus it can be represented by another class of effective intervals

$$\{(\mathfrak{I}_k, \mathfrak{s}_k) : k \geq 1\}.$$

Its scale measure is denoted by $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ as before. It is said in Theorem 4.17 that $\{(\mathfrak{I}_k, \mathfrak{s}_k) : k \geq 1\}$ is derived from $\{(I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ by firstly a scale-shrink operation and then an optional interval-merge. In this subsection, we shall identify the expected scale measure $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and describe briefly the optional interval-merge to attain $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$. The proof is postponed to Theorem 5.6 in next subsection.

We shall first formulate the scale measure $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$. Since $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e$ are σ -finite on \mathbb{R} , we have the following Lebesgue-Radon-Nikodym decomposition:

$$(5.3) \quad \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} = \bar{\lambda} + \kappa = g \cdot \lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e + \kappa,$$

where κ is singular with respect to $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e$. The crucial fact we will prove later is that $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ coincides with the absolute part, i.e.

$$(5.4) \quad \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} = \bar{\lambda} \quad (= g \cdot \lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e).$$

Before moving on to optional interval-merge, let us explain the easy part, why $\bar{\lambda}$ is a shrinking of $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$, or it actually induces a proper scale function on each I_n .

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\bar{\lambda}$ be in (5.3). Then for each $n \geq 1$, $\bar{\lambda}|_{I_n}$ induces a scale function $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_n \in \mathbf{S}(I_n)$ satisfying (4.1).*

Proof. Clearly, $\bar{\lambda} \ll \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$,

$$\frac{d\bar{\lambda}}{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}} = 0 \text{ or } 1,$$

$\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ -a.e. and $\bar{\lambda}(\{x\}) = 0$ for any $x \in \bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n$. It suffices to show that $\bar{\lambda}$ is fully supported on I_n . Since $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e$ is fully supported on I_n , this amounts to $g > 0$, $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e$ -a.e. Let H be a measurable subset of \mathbb{R} such that $\kappa(H) = \lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e(H^c) = 0$. Write

$$Z_g := \{x \in H : g(x) = 0\}.$$

Then $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}(Z_g) = \bar{\lambda}(Z_g) = 0$, and it follows from (5.2) that $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e(Z_g) = 0$. That completes the proof. \square

We now move to optional interval-merge, which depends on the equivalence classes induced by \mathfrak{f} .

Definition 5.3. We say that I_i and I_j are \mathfrak{f} -scale-connected, or I_i is \mathfrak{f} -scale-connected to I_j , with respect to the scale measure $\bar{\lambda}$, if

- (1) $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^t([e_i, e_j]) = 0$, where $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^t$ is given by (5.1);
- (2) $\bar{\lambda}([e_i, e_j]) < \infty$.

Remark 5.4. In the case of \mathfrak{f} being the natural scale function, the simpler terminology ‘scale-connection’ was used in [10, Definition 3.5] instead. It is seen that the second condition in Definition 5.3 is related to the scale measure, just as in the definition of tight scale-connection and loose scale-connection. Needless to say, under the same scale measure, tight scale-connection implies \mathfrak{f} -scale-connection, and \mathfrak{f} -scale-connection implies loose scale-connection.

Clearly, \mathfrak{f} -scale-connection is also an equivalence relation on $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$. Thus these intervals may be divided into equivalence classes as usual:

$$\{\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_k : k \geq 1\},$$

where $\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_k \subset \{I_n : n \geq 1\}$, in which the intervals are mutually \mathfrak{f} -scale-connected. Then we merge each group $\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_k$ under the scale measure $\bar{\lambda}$ just as the procedures above Remark 4.5 into an interval $\bar{\mathfrak{I}}_k$ and obtain the merging $(\bar{\mathfrak{I}}_k, \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_k)$ of $\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_k$. We call this operation the \mathfrak{f} -interval-merge.

Mimicking Lemma 4.6, we have the following lemma. The proof is analogical and omitted.

Lemma 5.5. *The sequence $\{(\bar{\mathfrak{I}}_k, \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_k) : k \geq 1\}$ is a class of effective intervals with the scale measure $\bar{\lambda}$.*

Not surprisingly, we shall conclude

$$(5.5) \quad \{(\mathfrak{I}_k, \mathfrak{s}_k) : k \geq 1\} = \{(\bar{\mathfrak{I}}_k, \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_k) : k \geq 1\}.$$

That is to say, \mathfrak{f} -interval-merge gives the D-subspace $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ directly, without seeking the minimal interval-merge. This means that \mathfrak{f} -interval-merge combines the minimal interval-merge and an optional interval-merge together. It is worth noting and not hard to see that \mathfrak{f} -interval-merge is

- (a) identified with the minimal interval-merge, if and only if once $\bar{\lambda}([e_i, e_j]) < \infty$ for $i \neq j$,

$$(5.6) \quad \lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^t([e_i, e_j]) = 0 \Rightarrow [e_i, e_j] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n \right) \text{ is of at most countable points;}$$

- (b) identified with the maximal interval-merge, if and only if once $\bar{\lambda}([e_i, e_j]) < \infty$ for $i \neq j$,

$$(5.7) \quad [e_i, e_j] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n \right) \text{ is nowhere dense} \Rightarrow \lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^{\dagger}([e_i, e_j]) = 0.$$

5.3. D-subspace generated by $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{f}}$. We are now in a position to phrase and prove the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 5.6. *Assume that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{f}} \subset \mathcal{F}$, equivalently (5.2) holds. Let $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ be the D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ generated by $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{f}}$, and $(\bar{\mathfrak{E}}, \bar{\mathfrak{F}})$ the Dirichlet form represented by effective intervals $\{(\bar{I}_k, \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_k) : k \geq 1\}$ in Lemma 5.5. Then*

$$(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F}) = (\bar{\mathfrak{E}}, \bar{\mathfrak{F}}).$$

Proof. We first prove $\mathcal{C} \subset \bar{\mathfrak{F}}$ by applying Lemma 5.1. Indeed, note that the scale measure associated to $(\bar{\mathfrak{E}}, \bar{\mathfrak{F}})$ is $\bar{\lambda} = g \cdot \lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e$, and $g > 0$, $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e$ -a.e. by Lemma 5.2. Recall that H is the measurable subset of \mathbb{R} in the proof of Lemma 5.2. Then $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e \ll \bar{\lambda}$ and

$$\left(\frac{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e}{d\bar{\lambda}} \right)^2 d\bar{\lambda} = \frac{1}{g^2} \cdot 1_H d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} = \left(\frac{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e}{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}} \Big|_H \right)^2 \cdot 1_H d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} = \left(\frac{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e}{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}} \right)^2 d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} \Big|_H,$$

on account of

$$\bar{\lambda} = 1_H \cdot \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} \text{ and } g = \frac{d\bar{\lambda}}{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e} = 1_H \cdot \frac{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}}{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e}.$$

It follows from (5.2) that $d\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e/d\bar{\lambda} \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}, \bar{\lambda})$. Hence by Lemma 5.1, it follows that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{f}} \subset \bar{\mathfrak{F}}$. In addition, for any $u \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{f}} \subset \mathcal{F} \cap \bar{\mathfrak{F}}$, we have $u \ll \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$, $u \ll \bar{\lambda}$ and

$$\mathcal{E}(u, u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{du}{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}} \right)^2 d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{du}{d\bar{\lambda}} \cdot \frac{d\bar{\lambda}}{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}} \right)^2 d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}.$$

Since

$$\left(\frac{d\bar{\lambda}}{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}} \right)^2 d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} = (1_H)^2 d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} = d\bar{\lambda},$$

it hold that

$$(5.8) \quad \mathcal{E}(u, u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{du}{d\bar{\lambda}} \right)^2 d\bar{\lambda} = \bar{\mathfrak{E}}(u, u).$$

Therefore, we conclude that $\mathfrak{F} \subset \bar{\mathfrak{F}}$ and $\bar{\mathfrak{E}}|_{\bar{\mathfrak{F}} \times \bar{\mathfrak{F}}} = \mathfrak{E}$.

Next, we prove (5.4). Since $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ is a D-subspace of $(\bar{\mathfrak{E}}, \bar{\mathfrak{F}})$, Theorem 3.1 tells that $\{(\mathfrak{I}_k, \mathfrak{s}_k)\}$ is coarser than $\{(\bar{\mathfrak{I}}_k, \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_k)\}$. Consider the part Dirichlet forms $(\mathfrak{E}_J, \mathfrak{F}_J)$ and $(\bar{\mathfrak{E}}_J, \bar{\mathfrak{F}}_J)$ of $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ and $(\bar{\mathfrak{E}}, \bar{\mathfrak{F}})$ respectively on $J := \overset{\circ}{\bar{\mathfrak{I}}}_k$, i.e. the interior of $\bar{\mathfrak{I}}_k$. They are two irreducible Dirichlet forms and $(\mathfrak{E}_J, \mathfrak{F}_J)$ is a D-subspace of $(\bar{\mathfrak{E}}_J, \bar{\mathfrak{F}}_J)$. Write $\mathfrak{f}_J := \mathfrak{f}|_J$. Clearly, $C_c^\infty \circ \mathfrak{f}_J$ is a special standard core of $(\mathfrak{E}_J, \mathfrak{F}_J)$. Since

$$d\bar{\mathfrak{s}}_k = g \cdot \lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e|_J = g \cdot d\mathfrak{f}_J \ll d\mathfrak{f}_J,$$

it follows from [10, Theorem 3.2] that $C_c^\infty \circ \mathfrak{f}_J$ is also dense in $\bar{\mathfrak{F}}_J$. Consequently, $(\mathfrak{E}_J, \mathfrak{F}_J)$ and $(\bar{\mathfrak{E}}_J, \bar{\mathfrak{F}}_J)$ are identical and particularly, $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}|_J = \bar{\lambda}|_J$. Note that

$$\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} \left(\bigcup_{k \geq 1} \mathfrak{I}_k \setminus \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \bar{\mathfrak{I}}_k \right) = 0$$

by Remark 3.2. Consequently, $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} = \bar{\lambda}$.

Finally, we derive (5.5). By the fact that $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ is a D-subspace of $(\bar{\mathfrak{E}}, \bar{\mathfrak{F}})$ with the same scale measure, it suffices to verify that any \mathfrak{I}_m contains only one $\bar{\mathfrak{I}}_k$. We shall prove it by contradiction. Suppose that another $\bar{\mathfrak{I}}_j \subset \mathfrak{I}_m$. We assert that $I_p \in \bar{\mathfrak{I}}_k$ is

\mathfrak{f} -scale-connected to $I_q \in \bar{\mathcal{J}}_j$, which contradicts the definition of equivalence classes. In fact, $\bar{\lambda} = \lambda_s$ is a Radon measure on I_m , and hence $\bar{\lambda}([e_p, e_q]) < \infty$. On the other hand, $C_c^\infty \circ \mathfrak{f}|_J$ is a core of part Dirichlet form $(\mathfrak{E}_J, \mathfrak{F}_J)$ of $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ on $J := \dot{I}_m$, and $(\mathfrak{E}_J, \mathfrak{F}_J)$ is an irreducible Dirichlet form with the scale function induced by $\bar{\lambda}|_J$. This implies that

$$\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}|_J \ll \bar{\lambda}|_J.$$

Combining $\bar{\lambda}|_J \ll \lambda_s|_J$, we have $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}|_J \ll \lambda_s|_J$. In particular, $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^t|_J = 0$ and then $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^t([e_p, e_q]) = 0$. As a consequence, I_p is \mathfrak{f} -scale-connected to I_q .

We have reached eventually the conclusion

$$\{(I_k, \mathfrak{s}_k) : k \geq 1\} = \{(\bar{I}_k, \bar{\mathfrak{s}}_k) : k \geq 1\}.$$

That completes the proof. \square

A useful corollary of this theorem is as follows.

Corollary 5.7. $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ (or $(\bar{\mathfrak{E}}, \bar{\mathfrak{F}})$) has the same scale measure as $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, if and only if

$$(5.9) \quad \lambda_s \ll \lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e.$$

Furthermore, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{f}}$ is a special standard core of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ if and only if (5.9) and any one of the following assertions hold:

- (1) Each I_i is \mathfrak{f} -scale-isolated, in other words, it is not \mathfrak{f} -scale-connected to any other interval.
- (2) (5.6) holds, i.e. if $\lambda_s([e_i, e_j]) < \infty$ for some $i \neq j$, then $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^t([e_i, e_j]) = 0$ implies $[e_i, e_j] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} I_n\right)$ is of at most countable points.

Proof. Clearly, (5.9) amounts to $\bar{\lambda} = \lambda_s$ by (5.3). The first assertion implies the equivalence relation induced by \mathfrak{f} -scale-connection is trivial and no interval-merge needs to do. The second assertion means \mathfrak{f} -interval-merge actually coincides with the minimal interval-merge. Then the conclusion follows from Remark 4.5. \square

This corollary provides a simple way to find a ‘nice’ special standard core like $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{f}}$ of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. In practice, we only need to find $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathbf{S}(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying (5.2), (5.6) and (5.9), and then $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{f}} = C_c^\infty \circ \mathfrak{f}$ is an expected special standard core. Many examples where \mathfrak{f} is the natural scale function can be found in [10]. We give more examples below, which tell us that $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^t$ is very flexible to obtain these cores. This is the reason we use the superscript ‘t’ in $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^t$ to stand for ‘trivial part’. We also highlight that \mathfrak{f} is only a medium to induce this core (or produce a D-subspace), and the measure $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e$ is not necessarily equal to the scale measure of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ (or $(\bar{\mathfrak{E}}, \bar{\mathfrak{F}})$).

Example 5.8. Let us consider the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ in Example 3.3. Further we impose (5.2) and (5.9), for instance, $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e$ is taken to be the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} . As a consequence, $\bar{\lambda} = \lambda_s$, and

$$\bar{\lambda}([e_i, e_j]) < \infty, \quad \forall i \neq j.$$

This indicates $C_c^\infty \circ \mathfrak{f}$ is a core of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, if and only if

$$(5.10) \quad \lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^t([e_i, e_j]) > 0, \quad \forall i \neq j.$$

In [10], the authors have shown $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is not \mathcal{E}_1 -dense in \mathcal{F} . In fact, in this case $\mathfrak{f}(x) = x$. Then $\bar{\lambda} = \lambda_s$ is the Lebesgue measure and all the intervals are mutually \mathfrak{f} -scale-connected. Accordingly, the closure of $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is the Dirichlet form of 1-dim Brownian motion.

Let \mathfrak{c} be the standard Cantor function with $\mathfrak{c}(x) = 0$ for any $x \leq 0$, $\mathfrak{c}(x) = 1$ for any $x \geq 1$. Set

$$(5.11) \quad \mathfrak{f}(x) = x + \mathfrak{c}(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Clearly, $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathbf{S}(\mathbb{R})$. We assert (5.2), (5.9) and (5.10) hold, and hence $C_c^\infty \circ \mathfrak{f}$ is a core of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ (Note incidentally $\mathfrak{f}_l(x) := x + l \cdot \mathfrak{c}(x)$ for any $l > 0$ also satisfies these conditions). Indeed, $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e = dx$ and $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^t = d\mathfrak{c}$. For any $i \neq j$, clearly $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^t([e_i, e_j]) = d\mathfrak{c}([e_i, e_j]) > 0$. This is nothing but (5.10).

Example 5.9. We still consider the intervals in Example 3.3, but replace the scale function on I_n for $n \geq 3$ by

$$\mathfrak{s}_n(x) := \frac{x - e_n}{|a_n - b_n|}.$$

If \mathfrak{f} is taken to satisfy (5.2) and (5.9) (such as $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e := dx|_{\cup_{n \geq 1} I_n}$), then $\bar{\lambda} = \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and

$$(5.12) \quad \bar{\lambda}([e_i, e_j]) = \infty, \quad \forall i \neq j.$$

This implies the minimal interval-merge, \mathfrak{f} -interval-merge and maximal interval-merge are identified under the scale measure $\bar{\lambda}$. Particularly, $C_c^\infty \circ \mathfrak{f}$ is a special standard core of the Dirichlet form produced by them.

In practice, it has been shown in [10, Example 3.8 (3)] that $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is a core of this Dirichlet form, in which \mathfrak{f} is the natural scale function. Certainly, any $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathbf{S}(\mathbb{R})$ with $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e = c \cdot dx$ for some constant $c > 0$ (such as (5.11), as well as \mathfrak{f}_l) also induces a special standard core.

Example 5.10. Another similar example of Dirichlet form is presented in [10, Example 3.8 (4)], in which the standard Cantor set K is replaced by a generalized Cantor set, and \mathfrak{s}_n is still taken to be the natural scale function on each interval. If (5.2) and (5.9) hold (such as $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^e := dx|_{\cup_{n \geq 1} I_n}$), then $\bar{\lambda} = \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is the Lebesgue measure on $\cup_{n \geq 1} I_n$. Thus

$$\bar{\lambda}([e_i, e_j]) < \infty, \quad \forall i \neq j.$$

In this case, $C_c^\infty \circ \mathfrak{f}$ is a core of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, if and only if (5.10) holds.

For example, $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^t = dx|_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \cup_{n \geq 1} I_n}$ satisfies (5.10), and particularly, $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is a core of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. Another example of $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^t$ to satisfy (5.10) is the measure induced by the generalized Cantor function related to K . Furthermore, we can also conclude that (5.11) with this generalized Cantor function in place of \mathfrak{c} produces another special standard core.

We give a remark about the maximal interval-merge under the scale measure $\bar{\lambda}$. Apparently, this maximal interval-merge produces a Dirichlet form with a special standard core $C_c^\infty \circ \mathfrak{f}$, if and only if it has no difference with the optional interval-merge stated in §5.2. By the remark after Lemma 5.5, this amounts to (5.7). In Example 5.9, (5.7) is always valid since (5.12) holds. However in Example 5.8 and 5.10,

$$\bar{\lambda}([e_i, e_j]) < \infty, \quad \forall i \neq j,$$

and the intervals have a Cantor-type structure. Then (5.7) means $\lambda_{\mathfrak{f}}^t \equiv 0$. For example, set

$$\mathfrak{f}(x) := \int_0^x 1_{K^c}(y) dy, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

where K is the standard Cantor set or a generalized Cantor set. Clearly, (5.7) holds for this \mathfrak{f} . As a result, $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ coincides with the Dirichlet form produced by the maximal interval-merge. In the case of standard Cantor set, $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ is nothing but 1-dim Brownian motion. Nevertheless, in the case of generalized Cantor set, $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$, associated with an irreducible diffusion on \mathbb{R} which is deeply described in [8], is a proper D-subspace of 1-dim Brownian motion.

5.4. Existence of special standard core. We have seen that the closure of \mathcal{C}_f with $f \in \mathbf{S}(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying (5.2) is a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and how to reach it through a scale-shrink operation and an optional interval-merge operation. We have also seen that a special standard core of the form \mathcal{C}_f with $f \in \mathbf{S}(\mathbb{R})$ exists for the Dirichlet forms in Examples 5.8, 5.9 and 5.10. It is then natural to ask if any D-subspace is generated by such an f . We shall answer this question by a slightly more general result.

Theorem 5.11. *Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ be the Dirichlet form on $L^2(\mathbb{R}, m)$ with the effective intervals $\{(I_n, \mathbf{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ as before. Then there exists a function $f \in \mathbf{S}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\mathcal{C}_f = C_c^\infty \circ f$ is a special standard core of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$.*

Proof. Briefly, by Corollary 5.7, we need to construct $f \in \mathbf{S}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\lambda_f^e \simeq \lambda_s$ (mutually absolutely continuous or equivalent), and for $i \neq j$, I_i and I_j are not f -scale-connected. For obtaining such an f , it suffices to construct a fully supported Radon measure λ on \mathbb{R} , which charges no set of single point and satisfies (5.2), (5.6) and (5.9), so that $d\mathbf{f} = \lambda$.

Write $G := \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \overset{\circ}{I}_n$, where $\overset{\circ}{I}_n$ is the interior of I_n , and $F := G^c$. We shall construct $\lambda_1 = \lambda|_G$ and $\lambda_2 = \lambda|_F$ respectively.

The construction of λ_1 amounts to finding a Radon measure which is equivalent to λ_s . Actually we may find a finite measure λ_1 fully supported on G such that

$$(5.13) \quad \lambda_1 \simeq \lambda_s, \quad \frac{d\lambda_1}{d\lambda_s} \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}, \lambda_s),$$

where \simeq means that two measures are mutually absolutely continuous. In fact, for each $n \geq 1$, write $J_n := \mathbf{s}_n(\overset{\circ}{I}_n)$ and take a strictly positive and continuous function h_n on J_n such that $\int_{J_n} h_n(x) dx \leq 1/n^2$ and $\int_{J_n} h_n(x)^2 dx \leq 1/n^2$. Let $\mathbf{t}_n := \mathbf{s}_n^{-1}$ be the inverse function of \mathbf{s}_n and set $g_n := h_n \circ \mathbf{t}_n$ and

$$(5.14) \quad \lambda_1 := \sum_{n \geq 1} g_n \cdot d\mathbf{s}_n.$$

We verify that λ_1 is such a measure. It is finite since

$$\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \int_{J_n} h_n(x) dx \leq \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n^2} < \infty.$$

It is clear that $\lambda_1 \simeq \lambda_s$ by the definition and the fact that g_n is strictly positive. Since

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{d\lambda_1}{d\lambda_s} \right)^2 d\lambda_s = \sum_{n \geq 1} \int_{\overset{\circ}{I}_n} g_n^2 d\mathbf{s}_n = \sum_{n \geq 1} \int_{J_n} h_n^2(x) dx \leq \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n^2} < \infty,$$

we have $d\lambda_1/d\lambda_s \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, \lambda_s)$.

The role of λ_2 is to separate I_i and I_j when $\lambda_s([e_i, e_j]) < \infty$, i.e., $\lambda_2([e_i, e_j]) = 0$ if and only if $[e_i, e_j] \setminus (\bigcup_n I_n)$ is countable. We construct the measure λ_2 supported on F in the following manner. Write $F = \overset{\circ}{F} \cup \partial F$, where $\overset{\circ}{F}$ is the interior of F and $\partial F = F \setminus \overset{\circ}{F}$, which is a nowhere dense closed set.

Since $\overset{\circ}{F}$ is open, it consists of at most countable disjoint open intervals. Denote these intervals by $\{I_k^{\overset{\circ}{F}} : k \geq 1\}$ and set

$$\mathcal{I} := \{\overset{\circ}{I}_n : n \geq 1\} \cup \{I_k^{\overset{\circ}{F}} : k \geq 1\}.$$

A relation ' \sim ' on the intervals in \mathcal{I} is defined as follows: for $J_1, J_2 \in \mathcal{I}$, $J_1 \sim J_2$ if and only if $[e^1, e^2] \cap \partial F$ is of at most countable points, where e^1, e^2 are two

(arbitrary) points in J_1 and J_2 respectively. Clearly, ' \sim ' is an equivalence relation on \mathcal{I} , and we denote all the equivalence classes by

$$\bigcup_{m \geq 1} \mathcal{I}_m,$$

where $\{\mathcal{I}_m : m \geq 1\}$ are disjoint subsets of \mathcal{I} . For each $m \geq 1$, we merge the intervals in \mathcal{I}_m into a new open interval. More precisely, set $\alpha_m := \inf\{x \in J : J \in \mathcal{I}_m\}$ and $\beta_m := \sup\{x \in J : J \in \mathcal{I}_m\}$. Then (α_m, β_m) is the interval we obtained. By this operation, we attain a family of at most countable intervals

$$\mathcal{I}^\sim = \{(\alpha_m, \beta_m) : m \geq 1\}.$$

Let

$$K := \left(\bigcup_{m \geq 1} (\alpha_m, \beta_m) \right)^c.$$

Then K is a closed subset of ∂F and $\partial F \setminus K$ is at most countable. Furthermore K has no isolated points because the number of isolated points is at most countable. Hence if K is non-empty, it is a set of Cantor-type, i.e., a nowhere dense perfect set. It is well-known that there exists a Cantor function c_K on \mathbb{R} , continuous and increasing, so that the induced measure dc_K is fully supported on K , i.e.,

$$\text{supp}(dc_K) = K.$$

Now $F = \overset{\circ}{F} \cup K \cup (\partial F \setminus K)$, and we define

$$(5.15) \quad \lambda_2 := 1_{\overset{\circ}{F}} \cdot dx + dc_K,$$

which assigns the Lebesgue measure on $\overset{\circ}{F}$, the measure induced by Cantor function c_K on K and zero on $\partial F \setminus K$, an at most countable set.

Finally, we check the measure

$$\lambda := \lambda_1 + \lambda_2,$$

satisfies (5.2), (5.6) and (5.9). Clearly, λ charges no singleton, is fully supported and Radon on \mathbb{R} . Let

$$f(x) := \int_0^x \lambda(dy), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then $f \in \mathbf{S}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\lambda_f = \lambda$. Note that $\lambda_f^e = \lambda_1$ and $\lambda_f^t = \lambda_2$. Then (5.2) and (5.9) follow from (5.13). To show (5.6), we take $i \neq j$ with $\lambda_2([e_i, e_j]) = 0$ where $e_i \in I_i, e_j \in I_j$. Then

$$[e_i, e_j] \cap (\overset{\circ}{F} \cup K) = \emptyset$$

because of (5.15). Hence $[e_i, e_j] \setminus (\bigcup_n I_n) \subset [e_i, e_j] \cap F$ is at most countable and this proves (5.6). That completes the proof. \square

Write $\mathbf{S}^e(\mathbb{R}) := \{f \in \mathbf{S}(\mathbb{R}) : f \text{ satisfies (5.2)}\}$. By Lemma 5.1 and the above theorem, we can conclude the following corollary.

Corollary 5.12. *($\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{F}'$) is a D-subspace of (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) if and only if there exists a function $f \in \mathbf{S}^e(\mathbb{R})$ such that \mathcal{C}_f is a special standard core of ($\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{F}'$). Furthermore, for $f_1, f_2 \in \mathbf{S}^e(\mathbb{R})$, if $df_1 \simeq df_2$, then \mathcal{C}_{f_1} and \mathcal{C}_{f_2} generate the same D-subspace.*

The last assertion follows from Corollary 5.7.

6. FURTHER REMARKS

In this section, we shall give several remarks for all the results above. The first remark concerns the state space of 1-dim symmetric diffusions. As mentioned in Remark 2.2, all the results can be extended to the 1-dim symmetric diffusions on an interval (not only on \mathbb{R}). Furthermore, we shall explain that the presence of killing inside could not affect the discussions about D-subspaces or D-extensions.

6.1. Diffusions on an interval. When the state space \mathbb{R} is replaced by an interval $I = \langle l, r \rangle$, the characterization of Dirichlet form associated with an m -symmetric diffusion on I is presented in [10, Theorem 2.1], where m is a fully supported Radon measure on I . It is also composed of at most countable disjoint effective intervals $\{I_n \subset I : n \geq 1\}$ and an adapted scale function \mathfrak{s}_n on I_n , but now the adapted condition between I_n and \mathfrak{s}_n is a little different. The changes focus on the boundary of $I_n := \langle a_n, b_n \rangle$, and we say \mathfrak{s}_n is adapted to I_n if

- (A) When $a_n > l$ or $a_n = l \in I$, $a_n \in I_n$ if and only if $\mathfrak{s}_n(a_n) > -\infty$;
- (B) When $b_n < r$ or $b_n = r \in I$, $b_n \in I_n$ if and only if $\mathfrak{s}_n(b_n) < \infty$.

Moreover, the Dirichlet form of a diffusion on I_n with the scale function \mathfrak{s}_n is given by (2.2) with replacing (L_R) and (R_R) by

- (L) $a_n = l \notin I$, $\mathfrak{s}_n(a_n) > -\infty$ and $m(a_n+) < \infty$;
- (R) $b_n = r \notin I$, $\mathfrak{s}_n(b_n) < \infty$ and $m(b_n-) < \infty$.

Note that $m(a_n+) < \infty$ (resp. $m(b_n-) < \infty$) means for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$m((a_n, a_n + \epsilon)) < \infty, \quad (\text{resp. } m((b_n - \epsilon, b_n)) < \infty).$$

Loosely speaking, the closed endpoint of I_n must be a reflecting boundary, and the open endpoint of I_n , except for $a_n = l \notin I$ or $b_n = r \notin I$, is an unapproachable boundary. Only when $a_n = l \notin I$ or $b_n = r \notin I$, i.e. a_n or b_n shares the same open endpoint of the state space I , the boundary a_n or b_n is possibly absorbing. Notice that this is essentially the same as the case $I = \mathbb{R}$, since $a_n = l \notin I$ or $b_n = r \notin I$ corresponds to $a_n = -\infty$ or $b_n = \infty$ when $I = \mathbb{R}$.

All the results in the previous sections can be extended to the cases on the state space I . Nothing else need to be changed except for the adapted condition. This conclusion may be easily deduced by mimicking the previous discussions. For example, the extended result of Theorem 3.1 is given as follows. Note that the effective interval (I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) enjoys the new adapted condition (A) and (B), and now the scale measure is a σ -finite measure on I .

Theorem 6.1. *Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ be two regular and strongly local Dirichlet forms on $L^2(I, m)$, whose effective intervals are $\{(I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ and $\{(I_k, \mathfrak{s}_k) : k \geq 1\}$ respectively. Further let $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ be their scale measures respectively. Then $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ is a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ on $L^2(I, m)$ if and only if the following conditions hold:*

- (1) $\{I_k : k \geq 1\}$ is coarser than $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ in the sense that for any n , $I_n \subset I_k$ for some k .
- (2) $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} \ll \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and

$$\frac{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}}{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}} = 0 \text{ or } 1, \quad \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}\text{-a.e. on } I.$$

Next, we highlight that the state space plays an essential role in the definition of D-subspaces or D-extensions. Recall that in this definition, two Dirichlet forms are imposed to be on the same state space with the same symmetric measure. The following example based on Bessel processes shows us an intuitive illustration.

Example 6.2. Roughly speaking, the d -Bessel process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with an integer $d \geq 2$ is an equivalent version of $(|B_t|)_{t \geq 0}$, where $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a d -dimensional Brownian

motion. It is usually treated as a diffusion on $[0, \infty)$, but 0 is a special boundary: Once leaving 0, $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ will never come back. As stated in [10, Example 2.12], $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is symmetric with respect to $m(dx) := x^{d-1}dx$ and its associated Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ on $L^2([0, \infty), m)$ is regular. Moreover, $\{0\}$ is an \mathcal{E} -exceptional set, and $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ has only one effective interval $I_1 := (0, \infty)$ with the scale function \mathfrak{s}_1 on I_1 :

$$\mathfrak{s}_1(x) := \begin{cases} \log x, & d = 2; \\ \frac{x^{2-d} - 1}{2-d}, & d \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

Note that $\mathfrak{s}_1(0) = -\infty$. On the other hand, $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ can be also treated as a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2((0, \infty), m)$, and any set of singleton is of positive \mathcal{E} -capacity.

Let us consider the D-subspaces of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ on $L^2((0, \infty), m)$ and $L^2([0, \infty), m)$ respectively. For the case on $L^2((0, \infty), m)$, it follows from Theorem 6.1 that every D-subspace $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ has only one effective interval $(0, \infty)$. Moreover, all the D-subspaces are characterized by the following class of scale functions

$$\mathfrak{S} := \left\{ \mathfrak{s}_1 \in \mathbf{S}((0, \infty)) : d\mathfrak{s}_1 \ll ds_1, \frac{d\mathfrak{s}_1}{ds_1} = 0 \text{ or } 1, ds_1\text{-a.e.} \right\}.$$

By Lemma 4.1, \mathfrak{S} admits an element \mathfrak{s}_1 such that $\mathfrak{s}_1(0) > -\infty$, whose associated diffusion is absorbing at 0.

For the case on $L^2([0, \infty), m)$, a D-subspace also has only one effective interval I_1 but admits two possibilities: $I_1 = (0, \infty)$ or $[0, \infty)$. If $I_1 = (0, \infty)$, $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ is characterized by a scale function in the subclass of \mathfrak{S} :

$$\mathfrak{S}_\infty := \{ \mathfrak{s}_1 \in \mathfrak{S} : \mathfrak{s}_1(0) = -\infty \}.$$

Clearly, $\{0\}$ is always an \mathfrak{E} -exceptional set in this case. If $I_1 = [0, \infty)$, $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ is characterized by a scale function in another class:

$$\mathfrak{S}_{\text{finite}} := \{ \mathfrak{s}_1 \in \mathfrak{S} : \mathfrak{s}_1(0) > -\infty \}.$$

Notice that $\mathfrak{S} = \mathfrak{S}_\infty \cup \mathfrak{S}_{\text{finite}}$. It is worth noting that in this case, $\mathfrak{s}_1 \in \mathfrak{S}_{\text{finite}}$ corresponds to a D-subspace, whose associated diffusion is reflecting at 0.

6.2. Killing inside. We always impose the Dirichlet forms to have no killing inside in previous sections, since killing insides are not essential for the discussions of D-subspaces or D-extensions. Now we shall briefly explain this imposition and present the results with killing insides.

By [10, Theorem 4.1], a regular and local Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ on $L^2(I, m)$ is characterized by a class of effective intervals $\{(I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ and a killing measure k , which is Radon on I and such that $k \ll m$ on $I \setminus \cup_{n \geq 1} I_n$. Let $(\mathcal{E}^0, \mathcal{F}^0)$ be given by the same effective intervals but with no killing inside. Due to [10, Theorem 4.1], we know that $(\mathcal{E}^0, \mathcal{F}^0)$ is the resurrected Dirichlet form of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, and $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is the perturbed Dirichlet form of $(\mathcal{E}^0, \mathcal{F}^0)$ induced by k . On the other hand, it follows from [5, Theorem 2.1] that any D-subspace or D-extension of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ has the same killing measure as $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. Therefore, we can obtain the extended result of Theorem 6.1 as follows.

Theorem 6.3. *Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ be a regular and local Dirichlet form on $L^2(I, m)$ with effective intervals $\{(I_n, \mathfrak{s}_n) : n \geq 1\}$ and killing measure k . Further let $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ be another regular and local Dirichlet form on $L^2(I, m)$ with effective intervals $\{(I_k, \mathfrak{s}_k) : k \geq 1\}$ and killing measure \mathfrak{k} . Then $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ is a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ on $L^2(I, m)$ if and only if the following conditions hold:*

- (1) $\{I_k : k \geq 1\}$ is coarser than $\{I_n : n \geq 1\}$ in the sense that for any n , $I_n \subset I_k$ for some k .

(2) $\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}} \ll \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and

$$\frac{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}}{d\lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}} = 0 \text{ or } 1, \quad \lambda_{\mathfrak{s}}\text{-a.e. on } I.$$

(3) $\mathfrak{k} = k$.

Proof. Let $(\mathfrak{E}^0, \mathfrak{F}^0)$ be the resurrected Dirichlet form of $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$. In other words, $(\mathfrak{E}^0, \mathfrak{F}^0)$ is a Dirichlet form with the effective intervals $\{(I_k, \mathfrak{s}_k) : k \geq 1\}$. Then we only need to point out that $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ is a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ if and only if $(\mathfrak{E}^0, \mathfrak{F}^0)$ is a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}^0, \mathcal{F}^0)$ and $k = \mathfrak{k}$. That completes the proof. \square

Remark 6.4. That \mathfrak{k} is the killing measure of $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ amounts to $\mathfrak{k} \ll m$ on $I \setminus \cup_{k \geq 1} I_k$. The third condition in Theorem 6.3 indicates that when $(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F})$ is a D-subspace of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, it has more imposition: $\mathfrak{k} \ll m$ on $I \setminus \cup_{n \geq 1} I_n$ (Note that $\cup_{n \geq 1} I_n \subset \cup_{k \geq 1} I_k$).

Roughly speaking, to study a problem about D-subspaces (or D-extensions) of a Dirichlet form with killing insides, we could first consider the analogical problem of the resurrected Dirichlet form and then come back to it by killing transform. Particularly, nothing else need to be changed to derive the analogical results of previous sections for Dirichlet forms with killing insides, except for an additional condition: $\mathfrak{k} = k$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Chen, Z.-Q., Fukushima, M.: Symmetric Markov processes, time change, and boundary theory. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ (2012).
- [2] Fang, X., Fukushima, M., Ying, J.: On regular Dirichlet subspaces of $H^1(I)$ and associated linear diffusions. Osaka J. Math. 42, 27–41 (2005).
- [3] Fang, X., He, P., Ying, J.: Dirichlet forms associated with linear diffusions. Chin. Ann. Math. Ser. B. 31, 507–518 (2010).
- [4] Fukushima, M., Oshima, Y., Takeda, M.: Dirichlet forms and symmetric Markov processes. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin (2011).
- [5] Li, L., Ying, J.: Regular subspaces of Dirichlet forms. In: Festschrift Masatoshi Fukushima. pp. 397–420. World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ (2015).
- [6] Li, L., Ying, J.: Regular subspaces of skew product diffusions. Forum Math. 28, 857–872 (2016).
- [7] Li, L., Ying, J.: Killing transform on regular Dirichlet subspaces. Potential Anal. 46, 105–118 (2017).
- [8] Li, L., Ying, J.: On structure of regular Dirichlet subspaces for one-dimensional Brownian motion, Ann. Probab. 45, 2631–2654 (2017).
- [9] Li, L., Ying, J.: Regular Dirichlet extensions of one-dimensional Brownian motion, arXiv: 1606.00630.
- [10] Li, L., Ying, J.: On symmetric one-dimensional diffusions, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. to appear.
- [11] Rogers, L.C.G., Williams, D.: Diffusions, Markov processes, and martingales. Vol. 2. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York (1987).

RCSDS, HCMS, ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING 100190, CHINA.

E-mail address: liliping@amss.ac.cn

SHANGHAI CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, FUDAN UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI 200433, CHINA.

E-mail address: wjsun14@fudan.edu.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, FUDAN UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI 200433, CHINA.

E-mail address: jgying@fudan.edu.cn