

Atomic Characterizations of Weak Martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy Spaces and Their Applications

Guangheng Xie and Dachun Yang*

Abstract Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space and $\varphi : \Omega \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a Musielak–Orlicz function. In this article, the authors establish the atomic characterizations of weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces $WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$, $WP_\varphi(\Omega)$ and $WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$. Using these atomic characterizations, the authors then obtain the boundedness of sublinear operators from weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces to weak Musielak–Orlicz spaces, and some martingale inequalities which further clarify the relationships among $WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$, $WP_\varphi(\Omega)$ and $WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$. All these results improve and generalize the corresponding results on weak martingale Orlicz–Hardy spaces. Moreover, the authors also improve all the known results on weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces. In particular, both the boundedness of sublinear operators and the martingale inequalities, for the weak weighted martingale Hardy spaces as well as for the weak weighted martingale Orlicz–Hardy spaces, are new.

1 Introduction

As is well known, the classical weak Hardy spaces naturally appear when studying the boundedness of operators in critical cases. Indeed, Fefferman and Soria [6] originally introduced the weak Hardy space $WH^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and proved in [6, Theorem 5] that some Calderón–Zygmund operators are bounded from $WH^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to weak Lebesgue spaces $WL^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. It should also point out that Fefferman et al. [5] proved that the weak Hardy spaces are the intermediate spaces of Hardy spaces in the real interpolation method.

Recently, various martingale Hardy spaces were investigated; see, for example, Weisz [26, 24, 23], Ho [7, 8], Nakai et al. [19, 20, 21], Sadasue [22] and Jiao et al. [11, 27] for various different martingale Hardy spaces and their applications. Moreover, the theory of weak martingale Hardy spaces has also been developed rapidly. The weak Hardy spaces consisting of Vilenkin martingales were originally studied by Weisz [25] and then fully generalized by Hou and Ren [9]. Inspired by these, Jiao et al. [13, 12] and Liu et al. [17, 16] investigated the weak martingale Orlicz–Hardy spaces associated with concave functions. Zhou et al. [31] introduced the weak martingale

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 60G42; Secondary 60G46, 42B25, 42B35.

Key words and phrases. probability space, atomic characterization, weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy space, sublinear operator.

This project is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 11571039, 11726621, 11671185 and 11761131002).

*Corresponding author/October 22, 2018/Final version.

Orlicz–Karamata–Hardy spaces associated with concave functions and established their atomic characterizations.

On another hand, as a generalization of the Orlicz space and the weighted Lebesgue space, the Musielak–Orlicz spaces prove very useful in dealing with some problems of analysis, probability and partial differential equations (see, for example, [2, 30], [27, 28], [1] and their references). Very recently, Yang [29] introduced the weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces which are a generalization of weak martingale Orlicz–Hardy spaces (see, for example, [12]). Moreover, Yang [29] also established the atomic characterizations of weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces and the boundedness of sublinear operators from weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces to weak Musielak–Orlicz spaces.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. A function $\varphi : \Omega \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is called a *Musielak–Orlicz function* if the function $\varphi(\cdot, t)$ is a measurable function for any given $t \in [0, \infty)$, and the function $\varphi(x, \cdot) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is an Orlicz function for any given $x \in \Omega$, namely, $\varphi(x, \cdot)$ is non-decreasing, $\varphi(x, 0) = 0$, $\varphi(x, t) > 0$ for any $t \in (0, \infty)$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x, t) = \infty$. For any $p \in (0, \infty)$, a Musielak–Orlicz function φ is said to be of *uniformly lower* (resp., *upper*) *type p* if there exists a positive constant $C_{(p)}$, depending on p , such that

$$(1.1) \quad \varphi(x, st) \leq C_{(p)} s^p \varphi(x, t)$$

for any $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in [0, \infty)$, $s \in (0, 1)$ (resp., $s \in [1, \infty)$); see [30] for more details.

Recall that the following assumption is needed through [29].

Assumption 1.A. Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function and let φ be of uniformly lower type $p \in (0, 1]$ and of uniformly upper type 1.

Observe that Assumption 1.A is quite restrictive. Indeed, for any given $p \in (1, \infty)$, if $\varphi(x, t) := t^p$ for any $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$, then φ is of uniformly lower type p and also of uniformly upper type p . However, in this case, φ is not of uniformly upper type 1. Thus, under Assumption 1.A, all the results in [29] can not cover the corresponding results on weak Lebesgue spaces $WL_p(\Omega)$ with any given $p \in (1, \infty)$ in [25, 9].

On another hand, Jiao et al. [12] studied weak martingale Orlicz–Hardy spaces under the following assumption. For any $\ell \in (0, \infty)$, let \mathcal{G}_ℓ be the set of all Orlicz functions Φ satisfying that Φ is of lower type ℓ and of upper type 1 (see, for example, [12, 19]). Let Φ be a concave function and Φ' its derivative function. Its lower index and its upper index of Φ are defined, respectively, by setting

$$(1.2) \quad p_\Phi := \inf_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{t\Phi'(t)}{\Phi(t)} \quad \text{and} \quad q_\Phi := \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \frac{t\Phi'(t)}{\Phi(t)}.$$

All the results in [12] need the assumptions that $\Phi \in \mathcal{G}_\ell$ for some $\ell \in (0, 1]$ and $q_{\Phi^{-1}} \in (0, \infty)$, here Φ^{-1} denotes the inverse function of Φ . Observe that, when $\varphi(x, t) := \Phi(t)$ for any $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$, φ satisfies Assumption 1.A if and only if $\Phi \in \mathcal{G}_\ell$ for some $\ell \in (0, 1]$.

The first motivation of this article is to weaken Assumption 1.A of [29] and to remove the unnecessary assumption $q_{\Phi^{-1}} \in (0, \infty)$ of [12]. Indeed, instead of Assumption 1.A, in this article, we always make the following assumption.

Assumption 1.1. Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function, and let φ be of uniformly lower type p_φ^- for some $p_\varphi^- \in (0, \infty)$ and of uniformly upper type p_φ^+ for some $p_\varphi^+ \in (0, \infty)$.

In this article, under Assumption 1.1, we first establish the atomic characterizations of weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces $WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$, $WP_\varphi(\Omega)$ and $WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$. Using these atomic characterizations, we then obtain the boundedness of sublinear operators from weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces to weak Musielak–Orlicz spaces, and some martingale inequalities which further clarify the relationships among $WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$, $WP_\varphi(\Omega)$ and $WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$. All these results improve and generalize the corresponding results on weak martingale Orlicz–Hardy spaces (see [12]). Moreover, we also improve all the results on weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces in [29]. In particular, both the boundedness of sublinear operators and the martingale inequalities, for the weak weighted martingale Hardy spaces as well as for the weak weighted martingale Orlicz–Hardy spaces, are new.

To be precise, this article is organized as follows.

In Section 2, we first recall some notation and notions on Musielak–Orlicz functions, weak Musielak–Orlicz spaces and weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces. Then we introduce various weak atomic martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces.

Section 3 is devoted to establishing the atomic characterizations of spaces $WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$, $WP_\varphi(\Omega)$ and $WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$ (see Theorems 3.1, 3.2 and 3.5 below). The above five weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces contain weak weighted martingale Hardy spaces, weak martingale Orlicz–Hardy spaces in [12] and weak variable martingale Hardy spaces as special cases (see Remark 2.8 below for more details). Recall that, even for weak martingale Hardy spaces in [25, 9], only the ∞ -atomic characterization is known. However, we establish the q -atomic characterizations for any $q \in (\max\{p_\varphi^+, 1\}, \infty]$ in this article, where p_φ^+ is the uniformly upper type index of φ . Moreover, in [12] for weak martingale Orlicz–Hardy spaces and [29] for weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces, the results of atomic characterizations need the index $p_\varphi^+ = 1$. Differently from [12, 29], we allow $p_\varphi^+ \in (0, \infty)$ in Theorems 3.1, 3.2 and 3.5 below. So, the classical argument used in the proof of [9, Theorem 1] and [12, Theorem 2.1] does not work here anymore. Via using some ideas from the proofs of [14, Theorem 3.5] and constructing some appropriate atoms, we overcome this difficulty; see the proof of Theorems 3.1 and 3.5. Moreover, our atomic characterizations of weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces cover weak variable martingale Hardy spaces, weak weighted martingale Hardy spaces and weak weighted martingale Orlicz–Hardy spaces, which are also new (see Remarks 3.3 and 3.6 below).

In Section 4, we study the boundedness of sublinear operators on weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces. Recall that, for a martingale space X and a measurable function space Y , an operator $T : X \rightarrow Y$ is called a *sublinear operator* if, for any $f, g \in X$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$|T(f + g)| \leq |T(f)| + |T(g)| \quad \text{and} \quad |T(cf)| \leq |c||T(f)|.$$

The boundedness of sublinear operators from the weak martingale Hardy spaces to weak Lebesgue spaces was studied in [9, 25], and then from the weak martingale Orlicz–Hardy spaces to weak Orlicz spaces in [12]. All these results need the assumption that sublinear operators T are bounded on $L^q(\Omega)$ for some $q \in [1, 2]$ or some $q \in [1, \infty)$. Particularly, in [29, Theorem 4.2], Yang also gave some sufficient conditions for a sublinear operator T to be bounded from the weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces to weak Musielak–Orlicz spaces. In what follows, for any measurable set $E \subseteq \Omega$ and $t \in [0, \infty)$, let $\varphi(E, t) := \int_E \varphi(x, t) d\mathbb{P}$. The following assumption on φ is needed in Yang [29, Theorems 4.2 through 4.5].

Assumption 1.B. (i) Let T be a sublinear operator bounded on $L^2(\Omega)$.

(ii) Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function satisfying Assumption 1.A and there exist two positive constants B and D such that, for any measurable subset $E \subseteq \Omega$, $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$,

$$(1.3) \quad B\varphi(x, t)\mathbb{P}(E) \leq \varphi(E, t) \leq D\varphi(x, t)\mathbb{P}(E).$$

Observe that (1.3) is also quite restrictive. Indeed, using (1.3) with $E = \Omega$, we find that, for any $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\frac{1}{D}\varphi(\Omega, t) \leq \varphi(x, t) \leq \frac{1}{B}\varphi(\Omega, t).$$

Thus, Assumption 1.B requires φ to be essentially an Orlicz function. Moreover, [29, Theorems 4.2 through 4.5] do not cover the very important case, namely, the weighted case.

Observe that all these assumptions for the boundedness of sublinear operators used in [9, 25, 12, 29] ensure that T is bounded from some martingale Hardy spaces to some Lebesgue spaces, which, together with the fact that Musielak–Orlicz functions unify Orlicz functions and weights, motivates us to introduce the following assumption.

Assumption 1.2. Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function satisfying Assumption 1.1. Let T be a sublinear operator and satisfy one of the following:

- (i) for some given $q \in (p_\varphi^+, \infty)$, T is bounded from the weighted Hardy space $H_q^s(\Omega, \varphi(\cdot, t) d\mathbb{P})$ to the weighted Lebesgue space $L^q(\Omega, \varphi(\cdot, t) d\mathbb{P})$;
- (ii) for some given $q \in (p_\varphi^+, \infty)$, T is bounded from the weighted Hardy space $H_q^S(\Omega, \varphi(\cdot, t) d\mathbb{P})$ to the weighted Lebesgue space $L^q(\Omega, \varphi(\cdot, t) d\mathbb{P})$;
- (iii) for some given $q \in (p_\varphi^+, \infty)$, T is bounded from the weighted Hardy space $H_q^M(\Omega, \varphi(\cdot, t) d\mathbb{P})$ to the weighted Lebesgue space $L^q(\Omega, \varphi(\cdot, t) d\mathbb{P})$.

(See Section 2 for the definitions of these spaces.)

In Section 4 of this article, under Assumption 1.2, we obtain the boundedness of sublinear operators from $WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$ (resp., $WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$, $WP_\varphi(\Omega)$ or $WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$) to $WL_\varphi(\Omega)$; see Theorems 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 below. Particularly, we obtain the same results as in [29] via replacing Assumption 1.B by Assumption 1.2.

Observe that Assumption 1.2 is much weaker than Assumption 1.B. Indeed, Assumption 1.1 is weaker than Assumption 1.A and the assumption (1.3) in Assumption 1.B does not needed in Assumption 1.2. Moreover, under Assumption 1.B, we find that $p_\varphi^+ = 1$ and the weighted Hardy space $H_2^s(\Omega, \varphi(\cdot, t) d\mathbb{P})$ [resp., $H_q^S(\Omega, \varphi(\cdot, t) d\mathbb{P})$ or $H_q^M(\Omega, \varphi(\cdot, t) d\mathbb{P})$] becomes the martingale Hardy space $H_2^s(\Omega)$ [resp., $H_2^S(\Omega)$ or $H_2^M(\Omega)$], which, together with the boundedness of T on $L^2(\Omega)$ and the boundedness of the operator s (resp., S or M) on $L^2(\Omega)$ (see, for example, [24, Proposition 2.6 and Theorems 2.11 and 2.12]), further implies that Assumption 1.2 holds true. Thus, compared with Assumption 1.B, Assumption 1.2 is much weaker. In particular, Theorems 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 of this article indeed improve [9, Theorems 4, 5 and 6], [12, Theorem 3.1 and Remark 3.2] and [29, Theorems 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4], respectively (see Remark 4.4 below for more details).

Also, in this section, using Theorems 4.1 and 4.2, we obtain some martingale inequalities among the spaces $WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$, $WP_\varphi(\Omega)$ and $WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$, which further clarify

the relations among these spaces, in Theorem 4.6 below. Moreover, Theorem 4.6 generalizes and improves the corresponding results on weak martingale Orlicz–Hardy spaces in [12, Theorem 3.3] (see Remark 4.7 below for the details).

In Section 5, the last section of this article, we obtain some bounded convergence theorems and dominated convergence theorems on weak Musielak–Orlicz spaces $WL_\varphi(\Omega)$ (see Theorems 5.8 and 5.9 below), which are of independent interest.

Finally, we make some conventions on notation used in this article. Throughout the article, we always let $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$, $\mathbb{Z}_+ := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and C denote a positive constant, which may vary from line to line. We use the symbol $f \lesssim g$ to denote that there exists a positive constant C such that $f \leq Cg$. The symbol $f \sim g$ is used as an abbreviation of $f \lesssim g \lesssim f$. We also use the following convention: If $f \leq Cg$ and $g = h$ or $g \leq h$, we then write $f \lesssim g \sim h$ or $f \lesssim g \lesssim h$, rather than $f \lesssim g = h$ or $f \lesssim g \leq h$. For any subset E of Ω , denote $\mathbf{1}_E$ by its *characteristic function*. For any $p \in [1, \infty]$, let p' denote the conjugate number of p , namely, $1/p + 1/p' = 1$.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we first recall some notation and notions on Musielak–Orlicz functions, weak Musielak–Orlicz spaces and weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces and then we introduce various weak atomic martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces.

Definition 2.1. Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function. The *weak Musielak–Orlicz space* $WL_\varphi(\Omega)$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions f such that

$$\|f\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} := \inf \left\{ \lambda \in (0, \infty) : \sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \varphi \left(\{x \in \Omega : |f(x)| > \alpha\}, \frac{\alpha}{\lambda} \right) \leq 1 \right\} < \infty.$$

Let $p \in (0, \infty)$ and Φ be an Orlicz function. If $\varphi(x, t) := t^p$ or $\Phi(t)$ for any $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$, then $WL_\varphi(\Omega)$ becomes weak Lebesgue spaces $WL_p(\Omega)$ (see, for example, [25]) or weak Orlicz space $WL_\Phi(\Omega)$ (see, for example, [12]), here and hereafter, $WL_p(\Omega)$ (resp., $WL_\Phi(\Omega)$) denotes the set of all measurable functions f on Ω such that

$$\|f\|_{WL_p(\Omega)} := \sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \alpha [\mathbb{P}(\{x \in \Omega : |f(x)| > \alpha\})]^{1/p} < \infty$$

$$\left[\text{resp., } \|f\|_{WL_\Phi(\Omega)} := \inf \left\{ \lambda \in (0, \infty) : \sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \Phi \left(\frac{\alpha}{\lambda} \right) \mathbb{P}(\{x \in \Omega : |f(x)| > \alpha\}) \leq 1 \right\} < \infty \right].$$

Remark 2.2. If a Musielak–Orlicz function φ is of uniformly upper type p_φ^+ for some $p_\varphi^+ \in (0, \infty)$, then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any measurable functions f and g ,

$$\|f + g\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \leq C \left[\|f\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \right].$$

Indeed, by the uniformly upper type p_φ^+ property of φ , we find that, for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \varphi \left(\{x \in \Omega : |f(x) + g(x)| > \alpha\}, \frac{\alpha}{\lambda} \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \varphi\left(\left\{x \in \Omega : |f(x)| > \frac{\alpha}{2}\right\}, \frac{\alpha}{2\lambda}\right) + \sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \varphi\left(\left\{x \in \Omega : |g(x)| > \frac{\alpha}{2}\right\}, \frac{\alpha}{2\lambda}\right) \\ &\sim \sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \varphi\left(\{x \in \Omega : |f(x)| > \alpha\}, \frac{\alpha}{\lambda}\right) + \sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \varphi\left(\{x \in \Omega : |g(x)| > \alpha\}, \frac{\alpha}{\lambda}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then the above claim follows immediately.

Remark 2.3. Obviously, if φ is both of uniformly lower type p_1 and of uniformly upper type p_2 , then $p_1 \leq p_2$. Moreover, if φ is of uniformly lower (resp., upper) type p , then, it is also of uniformly lower (resp., upper) type \tilde{p} for any $\tilde{p} \in (0, p)$ [resp., $\tilde{p} \in (p, \infty)$].

Remark 2.4. Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function satisfying Assumption 1.1. If there exist an Orlicz function Φ and two positive constants B and D such that, for any $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$,

$$B\Phi(t) \leq \varphi(x, t) \leq D\Phi(t),$$

then, for any $f \in WL_\varphi(\Omega)$, $\|f\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \sim \|f\|_{WL_\Phi(\Omega)}$ with the positive equivalence constants independent of f .

Let $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ be an increasing sequence of sub- σ -algebras of \mathcal{F} and let $\{\mathbb{E}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ be the associated conditional expectations. The weight we consider in this article are *special weights* with respect to $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+})$, that is, the martingale generated by φ , where φ is a Musielak–Orlicz function, which is strictly positive, and $\sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \int_\Omega \varphi(x, t) d\mathbb{P} < \infty$. More precisely, let $\varphi(\cdot, t) := \{\varphi_n(\cdot, t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ be the martingale generated by $\varphi(\cdot, t)$ for any $t \in (0, \infty)$. For simplicity, we still use $\varphi(\cdot, t)$ to denote the martingale $\varphi(\cdot, t) := \{\varphi_n(\cdot, t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$.

The following weighted condition is due to Izumisawa and Kazamaki [10].

Definition 2.5. Let $q \in [1, \infty)$. A positive Musielak–Orlicz function $\varphi : \Omega \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is said to satisfy the *uniformly $A_q(\Omega)$ condition*, denoted by $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_q(\Omega)$, if there exists a positive constant K such that, when $q \in (1, \infty)$,

$$\sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \mathbb{E}_n(\varphi)(\cdot, t) \left[\mathbb{E}_n\left(\varphi^{-\frac{1}{q-1}}\right)(\cdot, t) \right]^{q-1} \leq K \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-almost everywhere,} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$$

and, when $q = 1$,

$$\sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \mathbb{E}_n(\varphi)(\cdot, t) \frac{1}{\varphi(\cdot, t)} \leq K \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-almost everywhere,} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

A positive Musielak–Orlicz function φ is said to belong to $\mathbb{A}_\infty(\Omega)$ if $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_q(\Omega)$ for some $q \in [1, \infty)$.

The following \mathbb{S} condition arises naturally when dealing with the weighted martingale inequalities. We refer to Doléans-Dade and Meyer [4] and Bonami and Lépingle [3] for more details.

Definition 2.6. Let $t \in [0, \infty)$. The martingale $\varphi(\cdot, t) := \{\varphi_n(\cdot, t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is said to satisfy the *uniformly \mathbb{S} condition*, denoted by $\varphi \in \mathbb{S}$, if there exists a positive constant K such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in (0, \infty)$ and almost every $x \in \Omega$,

$$(2.1) \quad \frac{1}{K} \varphi_{n-1}(x, t) \leq \varphi_n(x, t) \leq K \varphi_{n-1}(x, t).$$

The conditions \mathbb{S}^- and \mathbb{S}^+ denote two parts of \mathbb{S} satisfying only the left or the right hand sides of the preceding inequalities, respectively.

Let w be a special weight on Ω and $\varphi(x, t) := w(x)$ for any $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$. Then Definitions 2.5 and 2.6 go back to the original weighted definition [4, 10].

Denote by \mathcal{M} the set of all martingales $f := (f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ related to $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ such that $f_0 = 0$. For any $f \in \mathcal{M}$, denote its *martingale difference sequence* by $\{d_n f\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, where $d_n f := f_n - f_{n-1}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the *maximal functions* $M_n(f)$ and $M(f)$, the *quadratic variations* $S_n(f)$ and $S(f)$, and the *conditional quadratic variations* $s_n(f)$ and $s(f)$ of the martingale f are defined, respectively, by setting

$$\begin{aligned} M_n(f) &:= \sup_{0 \leq i \leq n} |f_i|, & M(f) &:= \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |f_n|, \\ S_n(f) &:= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |d_i f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, & S(f) &:= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |d_i f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ s_n(f) &:= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{i-1} |d_i f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{and} & \quad s(f) := \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{i-1} |d_i f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Let Λ be the collection of all sequences $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ of nondecreasing, nonnegative and *adapted functions* [namely, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, λ_n is \mathcal{F}_n measurable]. Let $\lambda_\infty := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n$. For any $f \in \mathcal{M}$, let

$$\Lambda[WP_\varphi](f) := \left\{ (\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \in \Lambda : |f_n| \leq \lambda_{n-1} \ (n \in \mathbb{N}), \ \lambda_\infty \in WL_\varphi(\Omega) \right\}$$

and

$$\Lambda[WQ_\varphi](f) := \left\{ (\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \in \Lambda : S_n(f) \leq \lambda_{n-1} \ (n \in \mathbb{N}), \ \lambda_\infty \in WL_\varphi(\Omega) \right\}.$$

Definition 2.7. Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function. The *weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces* $WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$, $WP_\varphi(\Omega)$ and $WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$ are, respectively, defined as follows:

$$WH_\varphi^M(\Omega) := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{M} : \|f\|_{WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)} := \|M(f)\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} < \infty \right\},$$

$$WH_\varphi^S(\Omega) := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{M} : \|f\|_{H_\varphi^S} := \|S(f)\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} < \infty \right\},$$

$$WH_\varphi^s(\Omega) := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{M} : \|f\|_{H_\varphi^s} := \|s(f)\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} < \infty \right\},$$

$$WP_\varphi(\Omega) := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{M} : \|f\|_{WP_\varphi(\Omega)} := \inf_{(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \in \Lambda[WP_\varphi(\Omega)]} \|\lambda_\infty\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} < \infty \right\}$$

and

$$WQ_\varphi(\Omega) := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{M} : \|f\|_{WQ_\varphi(\Omega)} := \inf_{(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \in \Lambda[WQ_\varphi(\Omega)]} \|\lambda_\infty\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} < \infty \right\}.$$

Remark 2.8. Several known weak martingale Hardy spaces can be regarded as special cases of the above five weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces. For example, let $p \in (0, \infty)$, Φ be an Orlicz function on $(0, \infty)$, w a weight and $p(\cdot) : \Omega \rightarrow [1, \infty]$ a measurable function. If $\varphi(x, t) := t^p$, $\Phi(t)$, $t^{p(x)}$ or $w(x)\Phi(t)$ for any $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$, then the corresponding weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy space becomes, respectively, the weak martingale Hardy space (see [9, 25]), the weak martingale Orlicz–Hardy space (see [12]), the weak variable martingale Hardy space or the weak weighted martingale Orlicz–Hardy space.

In what follows, for any $q \in [1, \infty]$, any measurable set $B \subseteq \Omega$ and any measurable function f on Ω , let

$$\|f\|_{L_\varphi^q(B)} := \begin{cases} \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \left[\frac{1}{\varphi(B, t)} \int_\Omega |f(x)|^q \varphi(x, t) d\mathbb{P}(x) \right]^{1/q} & \text{when } q \in [1, \infty), \\ \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} & \text{when } q = \infty. \end{cases}$$

Let \mathcal{T} be the set of all stopping times related to $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$. For any $\nu \in \mathcal{T}$, let $B_\nu := \{x \in \Omega : \nu(x) < \infty\}$. Now we introduce the notion of atoms associated with Musielak–Orlicz function.

Definition 2.9. Let $q \in (1, \infty]$ and φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function. A measurable function a is called a $(\varphi, q)_s$ -atom if there exists a stopping time ν relative to $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ (ν is called the *stopping time associated with a*) such that

- (i) $a_n := \mathbb{E}_n a = 0$ if $\nu \geq n$,
- (ii) $\|s(a)\|_{L_\varphi^q(B_\nu)} \leq \|\mathbf{1}_{B_\nu}\|_{L^\varphi(\Omega)}^{-1}$.

Similarly, $(\varphi, q)_S$ -atom and $(\varphi, q)_M$ -atom are defined via replacing (ii) in the above definition by

$$\|S(a)\|_{L_\varphi^q(B_\nu)} \leq \|\mathbf{1}_{B_\nu}\|_{L^\varphi(\Omega)}^{-1},$$

respectively, by

$$\|M(a)\|_{L_\varphi^q(B_\nu)} \leq \|\mathbf{1}_{B_\nu}\|_{L^\varphi(\Omega)}^{-1}.$$

Via $(\varphi, q)_s$ -atoms, $(\varphi, q)_S$ -atoms and $(\varphi, q)_M$ -atoms, we now introduce three weak atomic martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces $WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, S}(\Omega)$, $WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, S}(\Omega)$ and $WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, M}(\Omega)$, respectively, as follows.

Definition 2.10. Let $q \in (1, \infty]$ and φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function. The *weak atomic martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy space* $WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, S}(\Omega)$ [resp., $WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, S}(\Omega)$ or $WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, M}(\Omega)$] is defined to be the space of all $f \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfying that there exist a sequence of $(\varphi, q)_s$ -atoms [resp., $(\varphi, q)_S$ -atoms or $(\varphi, q)_M$ -atoms] $\{a^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$, related to stopping times $\{\nu^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$, and a positive constant \tilde{C} , independent of f , such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu^k a_n^k = f_n \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{almost everywhere,}$$

where $\mu^k := \tilde{C}^k \|\mathbf{1}_{B_{\nu^k}}\|_{L^\varphi(\Omega)}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and

$$\|f\|_{WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, S}(\Omega)} \quad \left[\text{resp., } \|f\|_{WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, S}(\Omega)} \text{ or } \|f\|_{WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, M}(\Omega)} \right]$$

$$:= \inf \left\{ \inf \left[\lambda \in (0, \infty) : \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi \left(B_{\nu^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda} \right) \leq 1 \right] \right\} < \infty,$$

where the first infimum is taken over all decompositions of f as above.

Let $p \in (0, \infty)$ and w be a special weight. The *weighted Lebesgue space* $L^p(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions f on Ω such that

$$\|f\|_{L^p(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})} := \left[\int_{\Omega} |f(x)|^p w(x) d\mathbb{P}(x) \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty.$$

The *weighted martingale Hardy spaces* $H_p^s(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})$, $H_p^S(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})$ and $H_p^M(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})$ are, respectively, defined as follows:

$$H_p^s(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P}) := \{f \in \mathcal{M} : \|s(f)\|_{L^p(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})} < \infty\},$$

$$H_p^S(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P}) := \{f \in \mathcal{M} : \|S(f)\|_{L^p(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})} < \infty\}$$

and

$$H_p^M(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P}) := \{f \in \mathcal{M} : \|M(f)\|_{L^p(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})} < \infty\}.$$

If $w \equiv 1$, then the weighted Hardy space $H_p^s(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})$ [resp., $H_p^S(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})$ or $H_p^M(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})$] becomes the classical martingale Hardy space $H_p^s(\Omega)$ [resp., $H_p^S(\Omega)$ or $H_p^M(\Omega)$] (see, for example, [24, p. 6]).

3 Atomic characterizations

In this section, we establish atomic characterizations of weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces $WH_{\varphi}^s(\Omega)$, $WH_{\varphi}^M(\Omega)$, $WH_{\varphi}^S(\Omega)$, $WP_{\varphi}(\Omega)$ and $WQ_{\varphi}(\Omega)$. We begin with the atomic characterization of $WH_{\varphi}^s(\Omega)$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $q \in (0, \infty)$ and φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function satisfying Assumption 1.1. If $q \in (\max\{p_{\varphi}^+, 1\}, \infty]$, then $WH_{\varphi}^s(\Omega) = WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, s}(\Omega)$ with equivalent quasi-norms.*

Proof. We prove this theorem by two steps.

Step 1) Prove $WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, s}(\Omega) \subseteq WH_{\varphi}^s(\Omega)$. To prove this, let $f \in WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, s}(\Omega)$. Then, by Definition 2.10, we know that there exists a sequence of $(\varphi, q)_s$ -atoms, $\{a^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$, related to stopping times $\{\nu^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$, such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$f_n = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu^k a_n^k \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{almost everywhere,}$$

where $\mu^k := \widetilde{C}2^k \|\mathbf{1}_{B_{\nu^k}}\|_{L^{\varphi}(\Omega)}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and \widetilde{C} is a positive constant independent of f . By the definitions of $WH_{\varphi}^s(\Omega)$ and $WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, s}(\Omega)$, it suffices to prove that, for any $\alpha, \lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$(3.1) \quad \varphi \left(\{x \in \Omega : s(f)(x) > \alpha\}, \frac{\alpha}{\lambda} \right) \lesssim \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi \left(B_{\nu^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda} \right).$$

To this end, for any fixed $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$, let $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $2^{k_0} \leq \alpha < 2^{k_0+1}$. Combining this and the subadditivity of operator s , we conclude that, for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi\left(\left\{x \in \Omega : s(f)(x) > \alpha\right\}, \frac{\alpha}{\lambda}\right) &\leq \varphi\left(\left\{x \in \Omega : \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu^k s(a^k)(x) > \alpha\right\}, \frac{\alpha}{\lambda}\right) \\ &\leq \varphi\left(\left\{x \in \Omega : \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} \mu^k s(a^k)(x) > 2^{k_0-1}\right\}, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda}\right) \\ &\quad + \varphi\left(\left\{x \in \Omega : \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \mu^k s(a^k)(x) > 2^{k_0-1}\right\}, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda}\right) =: \mathbf{I}_{\alpha,1} + \mathbf{I}_{\alpha,2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in order to show (3.1), we only need to estimate $\mathbf{I}_{\alpha,1}$ and $\mathbf{I}_{\alpha,2}$.

We first estimate $\mathbf{I}_{\alpha,1}$. For any $r \in (\max\{p_\varphi^+, 1\}, \infty)$ and $\ell \in (0, 1 - \frac{\max\{p_\varphi^+, 1\}}{r})$, by the Hölder inequality, the monotone convergence theorem and the definition of $L_\varphi^r(\Omega)$, we know that, for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned} (3.2) \quad \mathbf{I}_{\alpha,1} &\leq \frac{1}{2^{(k_0-1)r}} \int_{\Omega} \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} \mu^k s(a^k)(x) \right]^r \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda}\right) d\mathbb{P} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2^{(k_0-1)r}} \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} 2^{k\ell r} \right)^{\frac{r}{r'}} \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} 2^{-k\ell r} [\mu^k s(a^k)(x)]^r \right\} \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda}\right) d\mathbb{P} \\ &\leq 2^{-r(k_0-1)(1-\ell)} (1 - 2^{-\ell r'})^{-r/r'} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} 2^{-k\ell r} (\mu^k)^r \|s(a^k)\|_{L_\varphi^r(\Omega)}^r \int_{B_{y^k}} \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda}\right) d\mathbb{P}. \end{aligned}$$

For the case $q \in (\max\{p_\varphi^+, 1\}, \infty)$, let $r := q$. From (3.2), the uniformly upper type p_φ^+ property of φ and the fact that a^k is a $(\varphi, q)_s$ -atom for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we deduce that, for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{I}_{\alpha,1} &\leq 2^{-q(k_0-1)(1-\ell)} (1 - 2^{-\ell q'})^{-q/q'} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} 2^{-k\ell q} (\mu^k)^q \|s(a^k)\|_{L_\varphi^q(\Omega)}^q \int_{B_{y^k}} \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda}\right) d\mathbb{P} \\ &\leq 2^{-q(k_0-1)(1-\ell)} (1 - 2^{-\ell q'})^{-q/q'} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} 2^{-k\ell q} (\widetilde{C}2^k)^q 2^{(k_0+1-k)p_\varphi^+} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi\left(B_{y^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which, together with $(1 - \ell)q > p_\varphi^+$, implies that, for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned} (3.3) \quad \mathbf{I}_{\alpha,1} &\leq (\widetilde{C})^q 2^{-q(k_0-1)(1-\ell)} (1 - 2^{-\ell q'})^{-q/q'} 2^{(k_0+1)p_\varphi^+} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} 2^{k[(1-\ell)q - p_\varphi^+]} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi\left(B_{y^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right) \\ &\leq (\widetilde{C})^q (1 - 2^{-\ell q'})^{-q/q'} [1 - 2^{p_\varphi^+ - (1-\ell)q}] \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi\left(B_{y^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\ell \rightarrow 0^+$ in (3.3), we conclude that, for any given $q \in (\max\{p_\varphi^+, 1\}, \infty)$ and any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$(3.4) \quad \mathbf{I}_{\alpha,1} \lesssim (1 - 2^{p_\varphi^+ - q}) \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi\left(B_{y^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right) \lesssim \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi\left(B_{y^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right).$$

For the case $q = \infty$, notice that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\|s(a^k)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|s(a^k)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$. Combining this and (3.2), similarly to the estimation of (3.3), we know that, for any $r \in (\max\{p_\varphi^+, 1\}, \infty)$, $\ell \in (0, 1 - \frac{\max\{p_\varphi^+, 1\}}{r})$ and $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$I_{\alpha,1} \lesssim \left(1 - 2^{-\ell r'}\right)^{-r/r'} \left[1 - 2^{p_\varphi^+ - (1-\ell)r}\right] \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi\left(B_{\nu^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right).$$

Letting $r := p_\varphi^+ + 1$ and $\ell \rightarrow 0^+$ in the above inequality, we finally find that, for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$(3.5) \quad I_{\alpha,1} \lesssim \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi\left(B_{\nu^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right).$$

Now we estimate $I_{\alpha,2}$. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, by the definition of a^k , we have

$$\{x \in \Omega : s(a^k)(x) \neq 0\} \subseteq B_{\nu^k}.$$

From this, it follows that

$$0 \leq s(f_{\alpha,2}) \leq \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \mu^k s(a^k) = \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \mu^k s(a^k) \mathbf{1}_{B_{\nu^k}},$$

which implies that

$$\{x \in \Omega : s(f_{\alpha,2})(x) \neq 0\} \subseteq \bigcup_{k=k_0}^{\infty} B_{\nu^k}.$$

Combining this, the fact that φ is of uniformly lower type p_φ^- and of uniformly upper type p_φ^+ , we obtain, for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} I_{\alpha,2} &\leq \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \varphi\left(B_{\nu^k}, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda}\right) \lesssim \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} 2^{p_\varphi^+} \varphi\left(B_{\nu^k}, \frac{2^{k_0}}{\lambda}\right) \\ &\lesssim 2^{p_\varphi^+} \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} 2^{(k_0-k)p_\varphi^-} \varphi\left(B_{\nu^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right) \lesssim \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi\left(B_{\nu^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right). \end{aligned}$$

From (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6), it follows that, for any $\alpha, \lambda \in (0, \infty)$, (3.1) holds true, which further implies that $\|f\|_{WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi,q,s}(\Omega)}$. Thus, we have $WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi,q,s}(\Omega) \subseteq WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$. This finishes the proof of Step 1).

Step 2) Prove $WH_\varphi^s(\Omega) \subseteq WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi,q,s}(\Omega)$. To this end, let $f \in WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \Omega$, let

$$\nu^k(x) := \inf\{n \in \mathbb{N} : s_{n+1}(f)(x) > 2^k\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu^k := 2^{k+1} \|\mathbf{1}_{B_{\nu^k}}\|_{L^\varphi(\Omega)}.$$

Then $(\nu^k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a sequence of non-decreasing stopping times. Moreover, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, if $\mu^k \neq 0$, let

$$a_n^k := \frac{f_n^{\nu^{k+1}} - f_n^{\nu^k}}{\mu^k};$$

otherwise, let $a_n^k := 0$. Then we have

$$f_n = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu^k a_n^k \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-almost everywhere.}$$

Now we claim that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a^k := (a_n^k)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is a $(\varphi, q)_s$ -atom. Indeed, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, it is clear that a^k is a martingale. When $v^k \geq n$, we easily know $a_n^k = 0$. Thus, a^k satisfies Definition 2.9(i). Similarly to the proof of [27, Theorem 1.4], we know that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\|s(a^k)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|\mathbf{1}_{B_{v^k}}\|_{L^\varphi(\Omega)}^{-1}.$$

This implies that a^k is an $L^2(\Omega)$ -bounded martingale and hence $(a_n^k)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ converges in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Denoting this limit still by a^k , then $\mathbb{E}_n(a^k) = a_n^k$ for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Moreover, for any given $q \in (0, \infty]$ and any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\|s(a^k)\|_{L^q_\varphi(B_{v^k})} \leq \|s(a^k)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|\mathbf{1}_{B_{v^k}}\|_{L^\varphi(\Omega)}^{-1}.$$

Thus, a^k satisfies Definition 2.9(ii) and hence a^k is a $(\varphi, q)_s$ -atom. This proves the above claim. On another hand, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $\{x \in \Omega : s(f)(x) > 2^k\} = B_{v^k}$. From this, it follows that, for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi\left(B_{v^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right) = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi\left(\{x \in \Omega : s(f)(x) > 2^k\}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right) \leq \sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \varphi\left(\{x \in \Omega : s(f)(x) > \alpha\}, \frac{\alpha}{\lambda}\right),$$

which implies that $f \in WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, s}(\Omega)$ and $\|f\|_{WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, s}(\Omega)} \leq \|f\|_{WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)}$. This finishes the proof of Step 2) and hence of Theorem 3.1. \square

Theorem 3.2. *Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function satisfying Assumption 1.1. Then*

$$WP_\varphi(\Omega) = WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, \infty, M}(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad WQ_\varphi(\Omega) = WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, \infty, S}(\Omega) \quad \text{with equivalent quasi-norms.}$$

Proof. The proof of this theorem is just a slight modification on that of Theorem 3.1. For the convenience of the reader, we present some details. We only give the proof for $WP_\varphi(\Omega)$ because the proof for $WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$ is similar.

We first prove $WP_\varphi(\Omega) \subseteq WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, \infty, M}(\Omega)$. To this end, let $f \in WP_\varphi(\Omega)$. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \Omega$, let

$$v^k(x) := \{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+ : \lambda_n(x) > 2^k\}, \quad \mu^k := 3 \cdot 2^k \|\mathbf{1}_{B_{v^k}}\|_{L^\varphi(\Omega)}, \quad \text{and} \quad a_n^k := \frac{f_n^{v^k(x)} - f_n}{\mu^k}$$

if $\mu^k \neq 0$, otherwise, let $a_n^k := 0$, where $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \in \Lambda[WP_\varphi](f)$. Then, using the same method as that used in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we can prove that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\|M(a^k)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|\mathbf{1}_{B_{v^k}}\|_{L^\varphi(\Omega)}^{-1}$, a^k is a $(\varphi, \infty)_M$ -atom and $\|f\|_{WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, \infty, M}(\Omega)} \leq \|f\|_{WP_\varphi(\Omega)}$.

Conversely, let $f \in WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, \infty, M}(\Omega)$. Then there exist a sequence of $(\varphi, \infty)_M$ -atoms, $\{a^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$, related to stopping times $\{v^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and a positive constant \tilde{C} , independent of f , such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$f_n = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{C} 2^k \|\mathbf{1}_{B_{v^k}}\|_{L^\varphi(\Omega)} a_n^k \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-almost everywhere.}$$

For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, let $\lambda_n := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \widetilde{C}2^k \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: \nu^k(x) \leq n\}}$. Then, by the definition of a^k , we know that $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is a nonnegative adapted sequence and, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|f_n| \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \widetilde{C}2^k \|\mathbf{1}_{B_{\nu^k}}\|_{L^\varphi(\Omega)} \|a_n^k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: \nu^k(x) \leq n-1\}} \leq \lambda_{n-1} \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{almost everywhere.}$$

Now we show $\|\lambda_\infty\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, \infty, M}(\Omega)}$. For any fixed $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$, let $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $2^{k_0} \leq \alpha < 2^{k_0+1}$. Similarly to the estimations of (3.5) and (3.6) via replacing $\mu^k s(a^k)$ by $\widetilde{C}2^k \mathbf{1}_{B_{\nu^k}}$, we conclude that, for any $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi\left(\left\{x \in \Omega : \lambda_\infty(x) > \alpha\right\}, \frac{\alpha}{\gamma}\right) &\leq \varphi\left(\left\{x \in \Omega : \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} \widetilde{C}2^k \mathbf{1}_{B_{\nu^k}} > 2^{k_0-1}\right\}, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\gamma}\right) \\ &\quad + \varphi\left(\left\{x \in \Omega : \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \widetilde{C}2^k \mathbf{1}_{B_{\nu^k}} > 2^{k_0-1}\right\}, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\gamma}\right) \lesssim \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi\left(B_{\nu^k}, \frac{2^k}{\gamma}\right). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $f \in WP_\varphi(\Omega)$ and $\|f\|_{WP_\varphi(\Omega)} \leq \|\lambda_\infty\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, \infty, M}(\Omega)}$, which completes the proof of Step 2) and hence of Theorem 3.2. \square

Remark 3.3. (i) For any given $p \in (0, \infty)$, when $\varphi(x, t) := t^p$ for any $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$, in this case, Theorem 3.1 with $q = \infty$ for Vilenkin martingales was investigated by Weisz [25, Theorem 1], and then Theorem 3.1 with $q = \infty$ and Theorem 3.2 were obtained by Hou and Ren [9, Theorems 1, 2 and 3]. Observing that Theorem 3.1 includes the q -atomic characterization of $WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$ for any $q \in (\max\{p, 1\}, \infty)$, Theorem 3.1 generalizes and improves [25, Theorem 1] and [9, Theorem 1]. Moreover, since φ is of wide generality, we know that Theorem 3.2 generalizes [9, Theorems 2 and 3].

(ii) Let Φ be an Orlicz function. Theorem 3.1 with $q = \infty$ and Theorem 3.2 when $\varphi(x, t) := \Phi(t)$ for any $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$ were obtained by Jiao et al. [12, Theorems 2.1 and 2.4] under some slightly stronger assumptions. Indeed, [12, Theorems 2.1 and 2.4] require that $\Phi \in \mathcal{G}_\ell$ for some $\ell \in (0, 1]$ and the upper index $q_{\Phi^{-1}} \in (0, \infty)$ [see (1.2) for its definition], however, Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 in this case only need $\Phi \in \mathcal{G}_\ell$ for some $\ell \in (0, \infty)$. Moreover, in Theorem 3.1, $q \in (\max\{p_\Phi^+, 1\}, \infty]$ is much more than the endpoint case $q = \infty$. Therefore, Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 generalize and improve [12, Theorems 2.1 and 2.4].

(iii) Theorem 3.1 with $q = \infty$ and Theorem 3.2 were first proved by Yang [29, Theorems 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3] under Assumption 1.A. However, Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 only need Assumption 1.1 which is much weaker than Assumption 1.A. Thus, Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 indeed improve [29, Theorems 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3].

(iv) Let $p(\cdot)$ be a measurable function on Ω satisfying

$$0 < p^- := \inf_{x \in \Omega} p(x) \leq p^+ := \sup_{x \in \Omega} p(x) < \infty.$$

Let $\varphi(x, t) := t^{p(x)}$ for any $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$. Observe that, in this case, φ is of uniformly lower type p^- and of uniformly upper type p^+ . From this and Remark 2.8, it follows that Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 give the atomic characterizations of weak variable martingale Hardy spaces, which are also new.

Now we establish the atomic characterizations of $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$ and $WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)$. To this end, we need an additional notion. The stochastic basis $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is said to be *regular* if there exists a positive constant R such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(3.7) \quad f_n \leq Rf_{n-1}$$

holds true for any nonnegative martingale $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$.

The following technical lemma was proved in [28, Lemma 4.7].

Lemma 3.4. *Let $w := (w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \in \mathbb{S}^-$ be a special weight. If the stochastic basis $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is regular, then, for any nonnegative adapted process $\gamma = (\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ and any $\lambda \in (\|\gamma_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \infty)$, there exists a stopping time τ_λ such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,*

$$\sup_{n \leq \tau_\lambda(x)} \gamma_n(x) =: M_{\tau_\lambda} \gamma(x) \leq \lambda, \quad \forall x \in \Omega,$$

$$\{x \in \Omega : M\gamma(x) > \lambda\} \subseteq \{x \in \Omega : \tau_\lambda(x) < \infty\}$$

and

$$w(\{x \in \Omega : \tau_\lambda(x) < \infty\}) \leq KRw(\{x \in \Omega : M\gamma(x) > \lambda\}),$$

where K and R are the same as in (2.1) and (3.7), respectively. Moreover, for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in (0, \infty)$ with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$, $\tau_{\lambda_1} \leq \tau_{\lambda_2}$.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $q \in (0, \infty)$ and $\varphi \in \mathbb{S}^-$ be a Musielak–Orlicz function satisfying Assumption 1.1. If $q \in (\max\{p_\varphi^+, 1\}, \infty]$ and the stochastic basis $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is regular, then*

$$WH_\varphi^S(\Omega) = WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, S}(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad WH_\varphi^M(\Omega) = WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, M}(\Omega) \quad \text{with equivalent quasi-norms.}$$

Proof. We only prove this theorem for $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$, because the proof for $WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)$ only needs a slight modification. We do this by two steps.

Step 1) Prove $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega) \subseteq WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, S}(\Omega)$. To this end, let $f \in WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and for the nonnegative adapted sequence $\{S_n(f)\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$, by Lemma 3.4, we know that there exists a stopping time $\nu^k \in \mathcal{T}$ such that

$$\{x \in \Omega : S(f)(x) > 2^k\} \subseteq \{x \in \Omega : \nu^k(x) < \infty\},$$

$$(3.8) \quad S_{\nu^k}(f)(x) \leq 2^k, \quad \forall x \in \Omega$$

and

$$(3.9) \quad \varphi(\{x \in \Omega : \nu^k(x) < \infty\}, t) \leq KR\varphi(\{x \in \Omega : S(f)(x) > 2^k\}, t), \quad \forall t \in (0, \infty),$$

where K and R are the same as in (2.1) and (3.7), respectively. Moreover, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\nu^k \leq \nu^{k+1}$ and $\nu^k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, let

$$\mu^k := 2^{k+1} \|\mathbf{1}_{B_{\nu^k}}\|_{L^\varphi(\Omega)}, \quad \text{and} \quad a_n^k := \frac{f_n^{\nu^{k+1}} - f_n^{\nu^k}}{\mu^k}$$

if $\mu^k \neq 0$, otherwise, let $a_n^k := 0$. Then, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $f_n(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu^k a_n^k(x)$ for almost every $x \in \Omega$. Now, we claim that, for any fixed $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a^k := (a_n^k)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is a $(\varphi, q)_S$ -atom. Indeed, it is clear that $(a_n^k)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is a martingale. Moreover, by (3.8), we know that

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} [S(a^k)]^2 &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |d_n a^k|^2 = \frac{1}{(\mu^k)^2} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |d_n f^{\nu^{k+1}} - d_n f^{\nu^k}|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{(\mu^k)^2} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |d_n f \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega : \nu^k(x) < n \leq \nu^{k+1}(x)\}}|^2 \leq \frac{1}{(\mu^k)^2} [S_{\nu^{k+1}}(f)]^2 \leq \left(\frac{2^{k+1}}{\mu^k}\right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

From this, it follows that a^k is an $L^2(\Omega)$ -bounded martingale and hence $(a_n^k)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ converges in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Denoting its limit still by a^k , then $\mathbb{E}_n(a^k) = a_n^k$. For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $x \in \{x \in \Omega : \nu^k(x) \geq n\}$, by the definition of $f_n^{\nu^k}$, we know that $a_n^k(x) = 0$. Thus, a^k satisfies Definition (2.9)(i). From (3.10), it follows that

$$\|S(a^k)\|_{L_\varphi^q(B_{\nu^k})} \leq \|S(a^k)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \|\mathbf{1}_{B_{\nu^k}}\|_{L^\varphi(\Omega)}^{-1},$$

which implies that a^k satisfies Definition (2.9)(ii) and hence a^k is a $(\varphi, q)_S$ -atom. This proves the above claim.

Now, we show $f \in WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, S}(\Omega)$. From (3.9), we deduce that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\varphi\left(B_{\nu^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right) \leq RK\varphi\left(\{x \in \Omega : S(f)(x) > 2^k\}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right) \leq RK \sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \varphi\left(\{x \in \Omega : S(f)(x) > \alpha\}, \frac{\alpha}{\lambda}\right).$$

This implies that $\|f\|_{WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, S}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)}$, which completes the proof of Step 1).

Step 2) Prove $WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, S}(\Omega) \subseteq WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$. To prove this, let $f \in WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, S}(\Omega)$. Then there exists a sequence of triples, $\{\mu^k, a^k, \nu^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$, such that $f = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu^k a^k$ pointwise, where $\{a^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are $(\varphi, q)_S$ -atoms, $\{\nu^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are the stopping times associated with $\{a^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$, $\mu^k := \widetilde{C}2^k \|\mathbf{1}_{B_{\nu^k}}\|_{L^\varphi(\Omega)}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and \widetilde{C} is a positive constant independent of f .

Now, we prove that $f \in WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$. For any fixed $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$, let $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $2^{k_0} \leq \alpha < 2^{k_0+1}$. Then, by the arguments same as in the estimations of (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6), we find that, for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi\left(\{x \in \Omega : S(f)(x) > \alpha\}, \frac{\alpha}{\lambda}\right) &\leq \varphi\left(\left\{x \in \Omega : \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} \mu^k S(a^k)(x) > 2^{k_0-1}\right\}, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda}\right) \\ &\quad + \varphi\left(\left\{x \in \Omega : \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \mu^k S(a^k)(x) > 2^{k_0-1}\right\}, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda}\right) \\ &\lesssim \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi\left(B_{\nu^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\|f\|_{WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, S}(\Omega)}$ and hence $f \in WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 3.5. \square

Remark 3.6. (i) Let Φ be an Orlicz function. Theorem 3.5 with $q = \infty$, when $\varphi(x, t) := \Phi(t)$ for any $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$, was proved by Jiao et al. [12, Theorem 2.3] under the regularity assumption and the assumptions that $\Phi \in \mathcal{G}_\ell$ for some $\ell \in (0, 1]$ and the upper index $q_{\Phi^{-1}} \in (0, \infty)$. However, Theorem 3.5, in this case, only needs $\Phi \in \mathcal{G}_\ell$ for some $\ell \in (0, \infty)$ and the regularity condition. Moreover, Theorem 3.5 includes the q -atomic characterizations for any $q \in (\max\{p_\varphi^+, 1\}, \infty)$. Thus, Theorem 3.5 generalize and improve [12, Theorem 2.3].

(ii) Let $p \in (0, \infty)$ and w be a special weight. If $\varphi(x, t) := w(x)t^p$ for any $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$, then Theorems 3.1, 3.2 and 3.5 give the atomic characterizations of weak weighted martingale Hardy spaces, which are also new.

4 Boundedness of sublinear operators

In this section, we first obtain the boundedness of sublinear operators from $WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$ [resp., $WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$, $WP_\varphi(\Omega)$ or $WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$] to $WL_\varphi(\Omega)$, and then clarify relations among these weak martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces.

Theorem 4.1. *Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function satisfying Assumption 1.1 and T a sublinear operator satisfying Assumption 1.2(i). If there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $(\varphi, \infty)_s$ -atom a and any $t \in (0, \infty)$,*

$$(4.1) \quad \varphi(\{x \in \Omega : |T(a)(x)| > 0\}, t) \leq C\varphi(B_\nu, t),$$

where ν is the stopping time associated with a , then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$,

$$(4.2) \quad \|Tf\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. Let $f \in WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$. By Step 2) of the proof of Theorem 3.1, we know that there exists a sequence of $(\varphi, \infty)_s$ -atoms $\{a^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$, related to stopping times $\{\nu^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$, such that, for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$f = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu^k a^k \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi\left(B_{\nu^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right) \leq \sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \varphi\left(\{x \in \Omega : s(f)(x) > \alpha\}, \frac{\alpha}{\lambda}\right)$$

where $\mu^k := \widetilde{C}2^k \|\mathbf{1}_{B_{\nu^k}}\|_{L^\varphi(\Omega)}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and \widetilde{C} is a positive constant independent of f . Thus, in order to prove (4.2), we only need to prove that, for any $\alpha, \lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$(4.3) \quad \varphi\left(\{x \in \Omega : |T(f)(x)| > \alpha\}, \frac{\alpha}{\lambda}\right) \lesssim \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi\left(B_{\nu^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right).$$

For any fixed $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$, let $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $2^{k_0} \leq \alpha < 2^{k_0+1}$. Then, from the definition of T , it follows that, for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\varphi\left(\{x \in \Omega : |T(f)(x)| > \alpha\}, \frac{\alpha}{\lambda}\right) \lesssim \varphi\left(\left\{x \in \Omega : \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} \mu^k |T(a^k)(x)| > \frac{\alpha}{2}\right\}, \frac{\alpha}{\lambda}\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \varphi \left(\left\{ x \in \Omega : \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \mu^k |T(a^k)(x)| > \frac{\alpha}{2} \right\}, \frac{\alpha}{\lambda} \right) \\
& \lesssim \varphi \left(\left\{ x \in \Omega : \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} \mu^k |T(a^k)(x)| > 2^{k_0-1} \right\}, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda} \right) \\
& + \varphi \left(\left\{ x \in \Omega : \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \mu^k |T(a^k)(x)| > 2^{k_0-1} \right\}, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda} \right) =: I_1 + I_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, to show (4.3), we only need to estimate I_1 and I_2 , respectively.

To estimate I_1 , we consider two cases.

Case 1) $q \in (1, \infty) \cap (p_\varphi^+, \infty)$. In this case, for any $\ell \in (0, 1 - \frac{p_\varphi^+}{q})$, by the Hölder inequality and the boundedness of T , we know that, for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 & \lesssim \frac{1}{2^{(k_0-1)q}} \int_{\Omega} \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} \mu^k |T(a^k)(x)| \right]^q \varphi \left(x, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda} \right) d\mathbb{P} \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{2^{(k_0-1)q}} \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} 2^{k\ell q'} \right)^{\frac{q}{q'}} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} 2^{-k\ell q} (\mu^k)^q |T(a^k)(x)|^q \varphi \left(x, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda} \right) d\mathbb{P} \\
& \lesssim 2^{-q(k_0-1)(1-\ell)} (1 - 2^{-\ell q'})^{-q/q'} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} 2^{-k\ell q} (\mu^k)^q \int_{\Omega} |s(a^k)(x)|^q \varphi \left(x, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda} \right) d\mathbb{P}.
\end{aligned}$$

From this, $q(1-\ell) > p_\varphi^+$ and the fact that a^k is a $(\varphi, \infty)_s$ -atom for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we deduce that, for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 & \lesssim 2^{-q(k_0-1)(1-\ell)} (1 - 2^{-\ell q'})^{-q/q'} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} 2^{-k\ell q} (\mu^k)^q \|s(a^k)\|_{L^\infty(B_{y^k})}^q \varphi \left(B_{y^k}, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda} \right) \\
& \lesssim 2^{-q(k_0-1)(1-\ell)} (1 - 2^{-\ell q'})^{-q/q'} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} 2^{-k\ell q} 2^{kq} 2^{(k_0+1-k)p_\varphi^+} \varphi \left(B_{y^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda} \right) \\
& \lesssim (1 - 2^{-\ell q'})^{-q/q'} [1 - 2^{p_\varphi^+ - (1-\ell)q}] \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi \left(B_{y^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $\ell \rightarrow 0$ in above inequality, we conclude that, for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$(4.4) \quad I_1 \lesssim \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi \left(B_{y^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda} \right).$$

Case 2) $q \in (0, 1] \cap (p_\varphi^+, \infty)$. From the boundedness of T and the uniformly upper type p_φ^+ property of φ , it follows that, for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$(4.5) \quad I_1 \lesssim \frac{1}{2^{(k_0-1)q}} \int_{\Omega} \left[\sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} \mu^k |T(a^k)(x)| \right]^q \varphi \left(x, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda} \right) d\mathbb{P}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim \frac{1}{2^{(k_0-1)q}} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} (\mu^k)^q \int_{\Omega} |T(a^k)(x)|^q \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda}\right) d\mathbb{P} \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{2^{(k_0-1)q}} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} (\mu^k)^q \|s(a^k)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^q \varphi\left(B_{v^k}, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda}\right) \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{2^{(k_0-1)q}} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k_0-1} 2^{kq} 2^{(k_0+1-k)p_\varphi^+} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi\left(B_{v^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right) \sim \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi\left(B_{v^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we estimate I_2 . Clearly,

$$\left\{x \in \Omega : \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \mu^k |T(a^k)(x)| > 2^{k_0-1}\right\} \subseteq \bigcup_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \left\{x \in \Omega : |T(a^k)(x)| > 0\right\}.$$

Combining this, (4.1) and the fact that φ is of uniformly lower type p_φ^- and of uniformly upper type p_φ^+ , we find that, for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &\lesssim \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \varphi\left(\left\{x \in \Omega : |T(a^k)(x)| > 0\right\}, \frac{2^{k_0+1}}{\lambda}\right) \\
&\lesssim 2^{p_\varphi^+} \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \varphi\left(B_{v^k}, \frac{2^{k_0}}{\lambda}\right) \lesssim \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} 2^{(k_0-k)p_\varphi^-} \varphi\left(B_{v^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right) \lesssim \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi\left(B_{v^k}, \frac{2^k}{\lambda}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (4.4) and (4.5), further implies that (4.3) holds true. This finishes the proof of Theorem 4.1. \square

Using Theorems 3.2 and 3.5, we can also show that the sublinear operator T is bounded from $WP_\varphi(\Omega)$ [resp., $WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$ or $WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)$] to $WL_\varphi(\Omega)$, whose proofs are similar to that of Theorem 4.1, the details being omitted.

Theorem 4.2. *Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function satisfying Assumption 1.1 and T a sublinear operator satisfying Assumption 1.2(ii) (resp., Assumption 1.2(iii)). If there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $(\varphi, \infty)_S$ -atom (resp., $(\varphi, \infty)_M$ -atom) a and any $t \in (0, \infty)$,*

$$(4.6) \quad \varphi(\{x \in \Omega : |T(a)(x)| > 0\}, t) \leq C\varphi(B_v, t),$$

where v is the stopping time associated with a , then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$ [resp., $f \in WP_\varphi(\Omega)$],

$$\|Tf\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{WQ_\varphi(\Omega)} \quad \left[\text{resp., } \|Tf\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{WP_\varphi(\Omega)}\right].$$

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\varphi \in \mathbb{S}^-$ be a Musielak–Orlicz function satisfying Assumption 1.1 and T a sublinear operator satisfying Assumption 1.2(ii) (resp., Assumption 1.2(iii)). If the stochastic basis $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is regular and there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $(\varphi, \infty)_S$ -atom [resp., $(\varphi, \infty)_M$ -atom] a and any $t \in (0, \infty)$,*

$$\varphi(\{x \in \Omega : |T(a)(x)| > 0\}, t) \leq C\varphi(B_v, t),$$

where ν is the stopping time associated with a , then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)$ [resp., $f \in WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$],

$$\|Tf\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)} \quad \left[\text{resp., } \|Tf\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)} \right].$$

Remark 4.4. (i) For any given $p \in (0, \infty)$, when $\varphi(x, t) := t^p$ for any $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$, Theorem 4.1 for Vilenkin martingales was originally obtained by Weisz [25, Theorem 2]. Then Theorems 4.1 and 4.2, in this case, were proved by Hou and Ren [9, Theorems 4, 5 and 6]. Observe that the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 in this case are weaker than that of [9, Theorem 4]. Indeed, the assumptions of [9, Theorem 4] require that T is bounded on $L^q(\Omega)$ for some $q \in [1, 2] \cap (p, \infty)$ and that (4.1) holds true in this case. Therefore, to prove our claim, we only need to show that the boundedness of T on $L^q(\Omega)$ for some $q \in [1, 2] \cap (p, \infty)$ implies the boundedness of T from $H_q^s(\Omega)$ to $L^q(\Omega)$. This follows immediately from the well-known fact that the operator s is bounded on $L^q(\Omega)$ for any $q \in (0, 2]$ (see [24, Theorem 2.11(i)]). Similarly, we can also deduce that the assumptions of Theorem 4.2 in this case are weaker than that of [9, Theorems 5 and 6]. Thus, Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 generalize and improve [9, Theorems 4, 5 and 6], respectively.

- (ii) Let Φ be an Orlicz function. Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 when $\varphi(x, t) := \Phi(t)$ for any $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$ were proved by Jiao et al. [12, Theorem 3.1 and Remark 3.2] under the assumptions that $\Phi \in \mathcal{G}_\ell$ for some $\ell \in (0, 1]$, $p_{\Phi^{-1}} \in (1, \infty)$ and $q_{\Phi^{-1}} \in (0, \infty)$ [see (1.2) for the definitions of $p_{\Phi^{-1}}$ and $q_{\Phi^{-1}}$]. However, on the assumption on Φ , Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 in this case only need that $\Phi \in \mathcal{G}_\ell$ for some $\ell \in (0, \infty)$. Thus, in this sense, Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 totally improve and generalize [12, Theorem 3.1 and Remark 3.2], respectively.
- (iii) Replacing Assumption 1.2 by Assumption 1.B, Yang [29, Theorems 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4] also proved Theorems 4.1 and 4.2. Clearly, Assumption 1.2 is quite weaker than Assumption 1.B. Thus, Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 improve [29, Theorems 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4], respectively. In particular, Theorem 4.3 is new.
- (iv) Let $p \in (0, \infty)$ and w be a special weight. If, for any $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$, $\varphi(x, t) := w(x)t^p$, then Theorems 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 give the boundedness of sublinear operators from weak weighted martingale Hardy spaces to weak weighted Lebesgue spaces, which are also new.

The following weighted martingale inequalities come from Bonami and Lépingle [3, Theorem 1] and Long [18, Remark 6.6.12, Theorems 6.6.11 and 6.6.12].

Theorem 4.5. *Let w be a special weight.*

- (i) *If $w \in \mathbb{A}_\infty(\Omega) \cap \mathbb{S}(\Omega)$ and $p \in [1, \infty)$, then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in H_p^M(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})$,*

$$(4.7) \quad \frac{1}{C}\|f\|_{H_p^M(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})} \leq \|f\|_{H_p^S(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})} \leq C\|f\|_{H_p^M(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})}.$$

- (ii) *If $w \in \mathbb{S}^-(\Omega)$ and $p \in [2, \infty)$, then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in H_p^S(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})$,*

$$(4.8) \quad \|f\|_{H_p^S(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})} \leq C\|f\|_{H_p^M(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})}.$$

(iii) If $w \in \mathbb{S}^+(\Omega)$ and $p \in (0, 2]$, then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in H_p^s(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})$,

$$(4.9) \quad \|f\|_{H_p^s(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})} \leq C \|f\|_{H_p^s(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})}.$$

(iv) If $w \in \mathbb{A}_\infty(\Omega) \cap \mathbb{S}(\Omega)$ and $p \in (0, 2]$, then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in H_p^s(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})$,

$$(4.10) \quad \|f\|_{H_p^M(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})} \leq C \|f\|_{H_p^s(\Omega, w d\mathbb{P})}.$$

Theorem 4.6. *Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function satisfying Assumption 1.1.*

(i) If $\varphi \in \mathbb{S}^+(\Omega)$ and $p_\varphi^+ \in (0, 2)$, then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$,

$$(4.11) \quad \|f\|_{WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)}.$$

(ii) If $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_\infty(\Omega) \cap \mathbb{S}(\Omega)$ and $p_\varphi^+ \in (0, 2)$, then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$,

$$(4.12) \quad \|f\|_{WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)}.$$

(iii) There exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in WP_\varphi(\Omega)$ [resp., $f \in WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$],

$$(4.13) \quad \|f\|_{WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{WP_\varphi(\Omega)} \quad \left[\text{resp., } \|f\|_{WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{WQ_\varphi(\Omega)} \right].$$

(iv) If $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_\infty(\Omega) \cap \mathbb{S}(\Omega)$, then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in WP_\varphi(\Omega)$ [resp., $f \in WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$],

$$(4.14) \quad \|f\|_{WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{WP_\varphi(\Omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|f\|_{WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{WP_\varphi(\Omega)} \\ \left[\text{resp., } \|f\|_{WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{WQ_\varphi(\Omega)} \right].$$

(v) If $\varphi \in \mathbb{S}^-(\Omega)$, then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$,

$$(4.15) \quad \|f\|_{WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{WQ_\varphi(\Omega)}.$$

(vi) If $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_\infty(\Omega) \cap \mathbb{S}(\Omega)$ and $p_\varphi^+ \in (0, 2)$, then there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$,

$$(4.16) \quad \frac{1}{C} \|f\|_{WQ_\varphi(\Omega)} \leq \|f\|_{WP_\varphi(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{WQ_\varphi(\Omega)}.$$

Moreover, if $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is regular and $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_\infty(\Omega)$, then

$$WH_\varphi^s(\Omega) = WH_\varphi^M(\Omega) = WH_\varphi^s(\Omega) = WP_\varphi(\Omega) = WQ_\varphi(\Omega).$$

Proof. In order to prove (4.11) and (4.12), we use Theorem 4.1 with the operator $T := S$ or M . From Definition 2.9(i), it follows that, for any $(\varphi, q)_s$ -atom a ,

$$0 \leq \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: \nu(x)=\infty\}} [S(a)]^2 = \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: \nu(x)=\infty\}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |d_n a|^2 \leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: \nu(x) \geq n\}} |d_n a|^2 = 0,$$

which implies that $\{x \in \Omega : S(f)(x) > 0\} \subseteq B_\nu$ and hence the operator S satisfies (4.1). Clearly, the Doob maximal operator M also satisfies (4.1). By this, (4.9), (4.10) and Theorem 4.1, we obtain (4.11) and (4.12).

Inequalities (4.13) follow immediately from the definitions of $WP_\varphi(\Omega)$ and $WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$.

To prove inequalities (4.14) and (4.15), we apply Theorem 4.2, respectively, to the operator $T = S, M$ or s . Observe that operators M, S and s all satisfy the condition (4.6). From (4.7) and (4.8), it follows that, for any $q \in [2, \infty)$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$,

$$s : H_q^M(\Omega, \varphi(\cdot, t) d\mathbb{P}) \rightarrow L^q(\Omega, \varphi(\cdot, t))$$

is bounded. Combining this, (4.7), (4.8) and Theorem 4.2, we obtain (4.14) and (4.15).

To show inequalities (4.16), let $f \in WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$. For any $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, there exists an adapted process $\{\lambda_n^{(1)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \in \Lambda[WQ_\varphi](f)$ such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$S_n(f) \leq \lambda_{n-1}^{(1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \lambda_\infty^{(1)} \right\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \leq \|f\|_{WQ_\varphi(\Omega)} + \varepsilon.$$

By this, we find that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|f_n| \leq M_{n-1}(f) + |d_n f| \leq M_{n-1}(f) + S_n(f) \leq M_{n-1}(f) + \lambda_{n-1}^{(1)}.$$

Combining this and (4.14), we know that

$$\|f\|_{WP_\varphi(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)} + \left\| \lambda_\infty^{(1)} \right\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{WQ_\varphi(\Omega)} + \varepsilon,$$

which, together with letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, implies that $\|f\|_{WP_\varphi(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{WQ_\varphi(\Omega)}$ and $f \in WP_\varphi(\Omega)$. Moreover, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, there exists an adapted process $\{\lambda_n^{(2)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \in \Lambda[WP_\varphi](f)$ such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|f_n| \leq \lambda_{n-1}^{(2)} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \lambda_\infty^{(2)} \right\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{WP_\varphi(\Omega)} + \varepsilon,$$

which implies that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$S_n(f) \leq S_{n-1}(f) + |d_n f| \leq S_{n-1}(f) + 2\lambda_{n-1}^{(2)}.$$

From this and (4.14), it follows that

$$\|f\|_{WQ_\varphi(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)} + \left\| \lambda_\infty^{(2)} \right\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{WP_\varphi(\Omega)} + \varepsilon$$

and hence, by letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $\|f\|_{WQ_\varphi(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{WP_\varphi(\Omega)}$. Thus, we conclude that inequalities (4.16) hold true.

Finally, assume that $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is regular. From this and $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_\infty(\Omega)$, it follows that $\varphi \in \mathbb{S}$ (see [18, Proposition 6.3.7]). Then, by Theorems 3.2 and 3.5, we have

$$WQ_\varphi(\Omega) = WH_\varphi^S(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad WP_\varphi(\Omega) = WH_\varphi^M(\Omega).$$

Combining this and (4.14), we know that

$$WQ_\varphi(\Omega) = WH_\varphi^S(\Omega) = WH_\varphi^M(\Omega) = WP_\varphi(\Omega) \subseteq WH_\varphi^S(\Omega).$$

Thus, to complete the proof of this theorem, we only need to show that $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega) \subseteq WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$. By the regularity and [24, Lemma 2.18], we have $|d_n f|^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{n-1}(|d_n f|^2)$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. From this, it follows that $S(f) \lesssim s(f)$ and hence $\|f\|_{WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)}$. Thus, $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega) \subseteq WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$, which completes the proof of Theorem 4.6. \square

Remark 4.7. (i) For any given $p \in (0, \infty)$, if $\varphi(x, t) := t^p$ for any $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$, then Theorem 4.6 in this case coincides with [9, Theorem 7].

(ii) Let Φ be an Orlicz function. Theorem 4.6 when $\varphi(x, t) := \Phi(t)$ for any $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$ was proved by Jiao et al. [12, Theorem 3.3] under some slightly stronger assumptions. Indeed, [12, Theorem 3.3] needs the condition that Φ is of lower type p_Φ^- for some $p_\Phi^- \in (0, 1]$ and of upper type $p_\Phi^+ := 1$ and $q_{\Phi^{-1}} \in (0, \infty)$. However, the conclusions (4.11), (4.12) and (4.16) of Theorem 4.6 only need $p_\Phi^+ \in (0, 2)$. Thus, Theorem 4.6 generalizes and improves [12, Theorem 3.3].

(iii) Under Assumption 1.B, Yang [29, Theorem 4.5] also proved the martingale inequalities among spaces $WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$, $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$, $WP_\varphi(\Omega)$ and $WQ_\varphi(\Omega)$. By Assumption 1.B and Remark 2.4, we know that Theorem 4.6 improves [29, Theorem 4.5].

(iv) Similarly to the discussion of Remark 4.4(iv), Theorem 4.6 is also new on weak weighted martingale (Orlicz) Hardy spaces.

5 Convergence theorems

In this section, we obtain bounded convergence theorems and dominated convergence theorems on weak Musielak–Orlicz spaces $WL_\varphi(\Omega)$. We begin with the following notion.

Definition 5.1. Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function. The space $WL_\varphi(\Omega)$ is said to have *absolutely continuous quasi-norm* if, for any measurable function $f \in WL_\varphi(\Omega)$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: |f(x)| > n\}}\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} = 0.$$

But, not every weak Musielak–Orlicz spaces $WL_\varphi(\Omega)$ has absolutely continuous quasi-norm even when φ satisfies Assumption 1.1. For example, let $\Omega := (0, 1]$ and \mathbb{P} be the Lebesgue measure. For any $x \in (0, 1]$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$, let $\varphi(x, t) := t^p$ with $p \in (0, \infty)$ and $f(x) := x^{-\frac{1}{p}}$ (see, for example, [15, Example 2.5]). Via a simple calculation, we know that $\|f\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} = 1$ and φ is of uniformly lower type p and of uniformly upper type p . However, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\|f \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: |f(x)| > n\}}\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} = 1$. Thus, $WL_\varphi(\Omega)$ for this φ has no absolutely continuous quasi-norm.

Definition 5.2. Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function. The *new Musielak–Orlicz space* $W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)$ is defined as follows:

$$W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega) := \left\{ f \in WL_\varphi(\Omega) : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: |f(x)| > n\}}\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} = 0 \right\}.$$

Lemma 5.3. *Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function with uniformly upper type p_φ^+ for some $p_\varphi^+ \in (0, \infty)$.*

- (i) *For any measurable functions $g \in WL_\varphi(\Omega)$ and $h \in W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)$, if $|g|$ is pointwise \mathbb{P} -almost everywhere bounded by $|h|$, then $g \in W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)$.*
- (ii) *If $g, h \in W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)$, then, for any $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{C}$, $c_1g + c_2h \in W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)$.*
- (iii) *If $\{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)$ and there exists a measurable function g such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|g_n - g\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} = 0$, then $g \in W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)$.*

Proof. It is clear that (i) and (ii) hold true. Now we prove (iii). For any fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, by the condition that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|g_n - g\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} = 0$, we know that there exists a positive integer N_0 such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap (N_0, \infty)$,

$$(5.1) \quad \|g_n - g\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} < \varepsilon.$$

Moreover, for any fixed $n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \cap (N_0, \infty)$, since $g_{n_0} \in W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)$, we find that there exists a positive integer k_0 such that

$$(5.2) \quad \left\| g_{n_0} \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: |g_{n_0}(x)| > k_0\}} \right\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} < \varepsilon.$$

Combining this and the definition of $WL_\varphi(\Omega)$, we conclude that

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \int_{\{x \in \Omega: |g_{n_0}(x)| > \alpha\} \cap \{x \in \Omega: |g_{n_0}(x)| > k_0\}} \varphi\left(x, \frac{\alpha}{\varepsilon}\right) d\mathbb{P} \leq 1.$$

From this, it follows that

$$(5.3) \quad \sup_{\alpha \in (k_0, \infty)} \int_{\{x \in \Omega: |g_{n_0}(x)| > \alpha\}} \varphi\left(x, \frac{\alpha}{\varepsilon}\right) d\mathbb{P} \leq 1.$$

On another hand, since $n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \cap (N_0, \infty)$, from (5.1), it follows that

$$\int_{\{x \in \Omega: |g_{n_0}(x) - g(x)| > k_0\}} \varphi\left(x, \frac{k_0}{\varepsilon}\right) d\mathbb{P} \leq \sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \int_{\{x \in \Omega: |g_{n_0}(x) - g(x)| > \alpha\}} \varphi\left(x, \frac{\alpha}{\varepsilon}\right) d\mathbb{P} \leq 1,$$

which, together with (5.3), implies that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N} \cap (2k_0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \int_{\{x \in \Omega: |g_{n_0}(x)| > \alpha\} \cap \{x \in \Omega: |g_{n_0}(x) - g(x)| > k/2\}} \varphi\left(x, \frac{\alpha}{\varepsilon}\right) d\mathbb{P} \\ & \leq \max \left\{ \sup_{\alpha \in (0, k_0]} \int_{\{x \in \Omega: |g_{n_0}(x) - g(x)| > k/2\}} \varphi\left(x, \frac{\alpha}{\varepsilon}\right) d\mathbb{P}, \sup_{\alpha \in (k_0, \infty)} \int_{\{x \in \Omega: |g_{n_0}(x)| > \alpha\}} \varphi\left(x, \frac{\alpha}{\varepsilon}\right) d\mathbb{P} \right\} \\ & \leq \max \left\{ \int_{\{x \in \Omega: |g_{n_0}(x) - g(x)| > k_0\}} \varphi\left(x, \frac{k_0}{\varepsilon}\right) d\mathbb{P}, 1 \right\} \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

By this and the definition of $WL_\varphi(\Omega)$, we find that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N} \cap (2k_0, \infty)$,

$$\left\| g_{n_0} \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: |g_{n_0}(x) - g(x)| > k/2\}} \right\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} < \varepsilon.$$

Combining this, Remark 2.2, (5.1) and (5.2), we conclude that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N} \cap (2k_0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| g \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega : |g(x)| > k\}} \right\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} &\lesssim \left\| g_{n_0} - g \right\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} + \left\| g_{n_0} \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega : |g_{n_0}(x)| > k/2\}} \right\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \\ &\quad + \left\| g_{n_0} \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega : |g_{n_0}(x) - g(x)| > k/2\}} \right\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \lesssim \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\| g \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega : |g(x)| > k\}} \right\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} = 0$, which completes the proof of (iii) and hence of Lemma 5.3. \square

Remark 5.4. Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function with uniformly upper type p_φ^+ for some $p_\varphi^+ \in (0, \infty)$. From Lemma 5.3, we deduce that $WL_\varphi(\Omega)$ is a closed subspace of $WL_\varphi(\Omega)$.

The following lemma is just [14, Lemma 3.3(ii)].

Lemma 5.5. *Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function satisfying Assumption 1.1. Then, for any $f \in WL_\varphi(\Omega)$ satisfying $\|f\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \neq 0$,*

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \varphi \left(\{x \in \Omega : |f(x)| > \alpha\}, \frac{\alpha}{\|f\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)}} \right) = 1.$$

For any measurable function f , let $\rho_\varphi(f) := \sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \varphi(\{x \in \Omega : |f(x)| > \alpha\}, \alpha)$.

Lemma 5.6. *Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function satisfying Assumption 1.1. Then, for any measurable functions $\{h_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|h_n\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} = 0$ if and only if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_\varphi(h_n) = 0$.*

Proof. If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|h_n\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} = 0$, then, for any fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists a positive integer $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap (N_0, \infty)$, $\|h_n\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} < \varepsilon$. From this, Lemma 5.5 and the fact that φ is of uniformly lower type p_φ^- , we deduce that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap (N_0, \infty)$,

$$\rho_\varphi(h_n) \lesssim \left[\|h_n\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \right]^{p_\varphi^-} \sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \int_{\{x \in \Omega : |h_n(x)| > \alpha\}} \varphi \left(x, \frac{\alpha}{\|h_n\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)}} \right) d\mathbb{P} \lesssim \varepsilon^{p_\varphi^-}.$$

This implies that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_\varphi(h_n) = 0$.

Conversely, if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|h_n\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} = 0$ is not true, then there exist a constant $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ and a sequence $\{h_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of measurable functions such that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|h_{n_k}\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} \geq \varepsilon_0$. Combining this, Lemma 5.5 and the uniformly upper type p_φ^+ property of φ , we find that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$1 \leq \sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \varphi \left(\{x \in \Omega : |h_{n_k}(x)| > \alpha\}, \frac{\alpha}{\varepsilon_0} \right) \lesssim \varepsilon_0^{-p_\varphi^+} \sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \varphi(\{x \in \Omega : |h_{n_k}(x)| > \alpha\}, \alpha),$$

which implies that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\rho_\varphi(h_{n_k}) \gtrsim \varepsilon_0^{p_\varphi^+}$. This contradicts $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_\varphi(h_n) = 0$. Thus, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|h_n\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} = 0$, which completes the proof of Lemma 5.6. \square

Remark 5.7. Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function. Since $\sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \int_\Omega \varphi(x, t) d\mathbb{P} < \infty$, it follows that, for any $t \in (0, \infty)$, $d\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_t := \varphi(\cdot, t) d\mathbb{P}$ is finite measure on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Now we claim that, for any $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_t(F) = 0 \iff \mathbb{P}(F) = 0.$$

To show this, it suffices to prove that, for any $t \in (0, \infty)$, $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_t(F) = 0$ for some $F \in \mathcal{F}$ implies that $\mathbb{P}(F) = 0$. Indeed, for any $t \in (0, \infty)$, $0 = \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_t(F) = \int_F \varphi(\cdot, t) d\mathbb{P}$. From this and the fact that $\varphi(\cdot, t)$ is strictly positive, we deduce that $\mathbb{P}(F) = 0$. This proves the above claim.

We now state the following bounded convergence theorem.

Theorem 5.8. *Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function satisfying Assumption 1.1. Let h be a measurable function on Ω and $\{h_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset WL_\varphi(\Omega)$ a sequence of measurable functions such that $h_n(x)$ converges to $h(x)$ for almost every $x \in \Omega$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. If there exists a positive constant M such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $|h_n(x)| \leq M$ for almost every $x \in \Omega$, then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|h_n - h\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} = 0.$$

Proof. For any fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, let

$$\delta := \min \left\{ \left[\frac{\varepsilon}{2C_{(p_\varphi^-)} \|\varphi(\cdot, 1)\|_{L^1(\Omega)}} \right]^{1/p_\varphi^-}, \frac{1}{2} \right\},$$

here and hereafter, $C_{(p_\varphi^-)}$ is the positive constant same as in (1.1). For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\varphi(h_n - h) &= \sup_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \int_{\{x \in \Omega : |h_n(x) - h(x)| > \alpha\}} \varphi(x, \alpha) d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \max \left\{ \sup_{\alpha \in (0, \delta]} \int_{\{x \in \Omega : |h_n(x) - h(x)| > \alpha\}} \varphi(x, \alpha) d\mathbb{P}, \sup_{\alpha \in (\delta, \infty)} \int_{\{x \in \Omega : |h_n(x) - h(x)| > \alpha\}} \varphi(x, \alpha) d\mathbb{P} \right\} \\ &=: \max\{J_{n,1}, J_{n,2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

We first estimate $J_{n,1}$. By the uniformly lower type p_φ^- property of φ , we know that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(5.4) \quad J_{n,1} \leq \int_{\Omega} \varphi(x, \delta) d\mathbb{P} \leq C_{(p_\varphi^-)} \delta^{p_\varphi^-} \int_{\Omega} \varphi(x, 1) d\mathbb{P} < \varepsilon.$$

Now we estimate $J_{n,2}$. Since, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $|h_n|$ is pointwise \mathbb{P} -almost everywhere bounded by M and h_n converges \mathbb{P} -almost everywhere to h as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we know that $|h|$ is pointwise \mathbb{P} -almost everywhere bounded by M . From this, we deduce that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{aligned} J_{n,2} &\leq \sup_{\alpha \in (\delta, \infty)} \int_{\{x \in \Omega : |h_n(x) - h(x)| > \alpha\}} \varphi(x, |h_n(x) - h(x)|) d\mathbb{P} \\ &\leq \varphi(\{x \in \Omega : |h_n(x) - h(x)| > \delta\}, 2M). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, there exists a measurable set $E \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(E) = 0$ and $h_n \rightarrow h$ on E as $n \rightarrow \infty$. From this and Remark 5.7, it follows that $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{2M}(E) = 0$ and $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{2M}(\Omega) < \infty$. Then we have h_n converges to h in measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{2M}$, that is, for every $\sigma \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(\{x \in \Omega : |h_n(x) - h(x)| > \sigma\}, 2M) = 0.$$

Combining this and (5.5), we find that there exists a positive integer N_0 such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap (N_0, \infty)$, $J_{n,2} < \varepsilon$, which, together with (5.4), implies that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap (N_0, \infty)$, $\rho_\varphi(h_n - h) < \varepsilon$. By this and the arbitrariness of ε , we find that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_\varphi(h_n - h) = 0.$$

From this and Lemma 5.6, it follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|h_n - h\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} = 0$, which completes the proof of Theorem 5.8. \square

Finally, we establish the following dominated convergence theorem.

Theorem 5.9. *Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function satisfying Assumption 1.1. Let $\{h_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of measurable functions that converges \mathbb{P} -almost everywhere to a measurable function h . Suppose that there exists a measurable function $g \in W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)$ such that $|h_n|$ is pointwise \mathbb{P} -almost everywhere bounded by g for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|h_n - h\|_{W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)} = 0.$$

Proof. For any $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, since $g \in W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)$, we deduce that there exists a positive integer N_0 such that

$$\|g \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: |g(x)| > N_0\}}\|_{W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)} < \varepsilon.$$

Combining this, Remark 2.2 and the fact that $\{h_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges \mathbb{P} -almost everywhere to h as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$(5.6) \quad \|(h_n - h) \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: |g(x)| > N_0\}}\|_{W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)} \leq \|2g \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: |g(x)| > N_0\}}\|_{W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)} \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

On another hand, notice that $|h_n(x)| \leq N_0$ for \mathbb{P} -almost every $x \in \{x \in \Omega : |g(x)| \leq N_0\}$. Then, by Remark 2.2 and Theorem 5.8, we know that there exists a positive integer N such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap (N, \infty)$, $\|(h_n - h) \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: |g(x)| \leq N_0\}}\|_{W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)} < \varepsilon$. From this, (5.6) and Remark 2.2, it follows that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap (N, \infty)$,

$$\|h_n - h\|_{W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)} \lesssim \|(h_n - h) \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: |g(x)| > N_0\}}\|_{W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)} + \|(h_n - h) \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: |g(x)| \leq N_0\}}\|_{W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)} \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

By this and the arbitrariness of ε , we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|h_n - h\|_{W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega)} = 0$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 5.9. \square

Remark 5.10. Let φ be a Musielak–Orlicz function satisfying Assumption 1.1. We then let

$$W\mathcal{H}_\varphi^s(\Omega) := \left\{ f = (f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \in \mathcal{M} : s(f) \in W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega) \right\},$$

$$W\mathcal{H}_\varphi^S(\Omega) := \left\{ f = (f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \in \mathcal{M} : S(f) \in W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega) \right\}$$

and

$$W\mathcal{H}_\varphi^M(\Omega) := \left\{ f = (f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \in \mathcal{M} : M(f) \in W\mathcal{L}_\varphi(\Omega) \right\}.$$

From Remark 5.4 and the sublinearity of the operator s , we deduce that $W\mathcal{H}_\varphi^s(\Omega)$ is a closed subspace of $WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$. Similarly, $W\mathcal{H}_\varphi^S(\Omega)$ and $W\mathcal{H}_\varphi^M(\Omega)$ are the closed subspaces of $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$ and $WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)$, respectively.

If $f \in W\mathcal{H}_\varphi^s(\Omega) \subset WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$, by Theorem 3.1, we have $f \in WH_{\text{at}}^{\varphi, q, s}(\Omega)$. Thus, there exists a sequence of triples, $\{\mu^k, a^k, \nu^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$, such that $f = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu^k a^k$ \mathbb{P} -almost everywhere. Now we claim that the sum $\sum_{k=m}^\ell \mu^k a^k$ converges to f in $WH_\varphi^s(\Omega)$ as $m \rightarrow -\infty$ and $\ell \rightarrow \infty$. Indeed, for any $m, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $m < \ell$, we have

$$(5.7) \quad f - \sum_{k=m}^\ell \mu^k a^k = (f - f^{\nu^{\ell+1}}) + f^{\nu^m} \quad \text{and} \quad [s(f - f^{\nu^{\ell+1}})]^2 = [s(f)]^2 - [s(f^{\nu^{\ell+1}})]^2.$$

Thus, we obtain $s(f - f^{v^{\ell+1}}) \leq s(f)$ and $s(f^{v^m}) \leq s(f)$. From this, (5.7), the fact that, for \mathbb{P} -almost every $x \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} s(f - f^{v^{\ell+1}})(x) = 0, \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow -\infty} s(f^{v^m})(x) = 0$$

and Theorem 5.9, we deduce that

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \left\| s(f - f^{v^{\ell+1}}) \right\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow -\infty} \left\| s(f^{v^m}) \right\|_{WL_\varphi(\Omega)} = 0.$$

Combining this, Remark 2.2 and the sublinearity of the operator s , we complete the proof of the claim.

Remark 5.11. Let φ be as in Theorem 3.5 and $f \in WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$ [resp., $WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)$]. Analogously to Remark 5.10, from Theorem 5.9, we deduce that the sum $\sum_{k=m}^\ell \mu^k a^k$ in Step 1) of the proof of Theorem 3.5 converges to f in $WH_\varphi^M(\Omega)$ [resp., $WH_\varphi^S(\Omega)$] as $m \rightarrow -\infty$ and $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, which may be have independent interest.

References

- [1] Y. Ahmida, I. Chlebicka, P. Gwiazda and A. Youssfi, Gossez’s approximation theorems in Musielak–Orlicz–Sobolev spaces, *J. Funct. Anal.* 275 (2018), 2538-2571.
- [2] A. Bonami, S. Grellier and L. D. Ky, Paraproducts and products of functions in $BMO(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ through wavelets, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9) 97 (2012), 230-241.
- [3] A. Bonami and D. Lépingle, Fonction maximale et variation quadratique des martingales en présence d’un poids, in: (French) Séminaire de Probabilités, XIII (Univ. Strasbourg, Strasbourg, 1977/78), pp. 294-306, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* 721, Springer, Berlin, 1979.
- [4] C. Doléans-Dade and P.-A. Meyer, Inégalités de normes avec poids, in: (French) Séminaire de Probabilités, XIII, (Univ. Strasbourg, Strasbourg, 1977/78), pp. 313-331, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* 721, Springer, Berlin, 1979.
- [5] C. Fefferman, N. M. Rivière and Y. Sagher, Interpolation between H^p spaces: the real method, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 191 (1974), 75-81.
- [6] R. Fefferman and F. Soria, The space weak H^1 , *Studia Math.* 85 (1987), 1-16.
- [7] K.-P. Ho, Doob’s inequality, Burkholder–Gundy inequality and martingale transforms on martingale Morrey spaces, *Acta Math. Sci. Ser. B (Engl. Ed.)* 38 (2018), 93-109.
- [8] K.-P. Ho, Atomic decompositions of martingale Hardy–Morrey spaces, *Acta Math. Hungar.* 149 (2016), 177-189.
- [9] Y. Hou and Y. Ren, Weak martingale Hardy spaces and weak atomic decompositions, *Sci. China Ser. A* 49 (2006), 912-921.
- [10] M. Izumisawa and N. Kazamaki, Weighted norm inequalities for martingales, *Tôhoku Math. J.* (2) 29 (1977), 115-124.
- [11] Y. Jiao, D. Zhou, F. Weisz and L. Wu, Variable martingale Hardy spaces and their applications in Fourier analysis, arXiv: 1809.07520.
- [12] Y. Jiao, L. Wu and L. Peng, Weak Orlicz–Hardy martingale spaces, *Internat. J. Math.* 26 (2015), no. 8, 1550062, 26 pp.
- [13] Y. Jiao, Embeddings between weak Orlicz martingale spaces, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 378 (2011), 220-229.

- [14] Y. Liang, D. Yang and R. Jiang, Weak Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces and applications, *Math. Nachr.* 289 (2016), 634-677.
- [15] N. Liu and Y. Ye, Weak Orlicz space and its convergence theorems, (English summary) *Acta Math. Sci. Ser. B (Engl. Ed.)* 30 (2010), 1492-1500.
- [16] K. Liu and D. Zhou, Dual spaces of weak martingale Hardy–Lorentz–Karamata spaces, *Acta Math. Hungar.* 151 (2017), 50-68.
- [17] K. Liu, D. Zhou and L. Peng, A weak type John-Nirenberg theorem for martingales, *Statist. Probab. Lett.* 122 (2017), 190-197.
- [18] R. Long, *Martingale Spaces and Inequalities*, Peking University Press, Beijing, Braunschweig, 1993.
- [19] T. Miyamoto, E. Nakai and G. Sadasue, Martingale Orlicz–Hardy spaces, *Math. Nachr.* 285 (2012), 670-686.
- [20] E. Nakai and G. Sadasue, Some new properties concerning BLO martingales, *Tohoku Math. J. (2)* 69 (2017), 183-194.
- [21] E. Nakai, G. Sadasue and Y. Sawano, Martingale Morrey–Hardy and Campanato–Hardy spaces, *J. Funct. Spaces Appl.* 2013, Art. ID 690258, 14 pp.
- [22] G. Sadasue, Martingale Besov spaces and martingale Triebel–Lizorkin spaces, *Sci. Math. Jpn.* 2018 (to appear).
- [23] F. Weisz, Dual spaces of multi-parameter martingale Hardy spaces, *Q. J. Math.* 67 (2016), 137-145.
- [24] F. Weisz, *Martingale Hardy Spaces and Their Applications in Fourier Analysis*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1568, Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1994.
- [25] F. Weisz, Bounded operators on weak Hardy spaces and applications, *Acta Math. Hungar.* 80 (1998), 249-264.
- [26] F. Weisz, Martingale Hardy spaces for $0 < p \leq 1$, *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 84 (1990), 361-376.
- [27] G. Xie, Y. Jiao and D. Yang, Martingale Musielak–Orlicz Hardy spaces, *Sci. China Math.* (2018), DOI: 10.1007/s11425-000-0000-0.
- [28] G. Xie, F. Weisz, D. Yang and Y. Jiao, New martingale inequalities and applications to Fourier analysis, arXiv: 1810.05007.
- [29] A. Yang, New weak martingale Hardy spaces of Musielak–Orlicz type, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* 42 (2017), 847-857.
- [30] D. Yang, Y. Liang and L. D. Ky, *Real-variable Theory of Musielak–Orlicz Hardy Spaces*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 2182, Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [31] D. Zhou, L. Wu and Y. Jiao, Martingale weak Orlicz–Karamata–Hardy spaces associated with concave functions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 456 (2017), 543-562.

Guangheng Xie and Dachun Yang (Corresponding author)

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

E-mails: guanghengxie@mail.bnu.edu.cn (G. Xie)

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