

SINGULAR INTEGRAL OPERATORS, T_1 THEOREM, LITTLEWOOD-PALEY THEORY AND HARDY SPACES IN DUNKL SETTING

CHAOQIAN TAN, YANCHANG HAN, YONGSHENG HAN, MING-YI LEE AND JI LI

ABSTRACT. The purpose of this paper is to introduce a new class of singular integral operators in the Dunkl setting involving both the Euclidean metric and the Dunkl metric. Then we provide the T_1 theorem, the criterion for the boundedness on L^2 for these operators. Applying this singular integral operator theory, we establish the Littlewood-Paley theory and the Dunkl-Hardy spaces. As applications, the boundedness of singular integral operators, particularly, the Dunkl-Riesz transforms, on the Dunkl-Hardy spaces is given. The L^2 theory and the singular integral operator theory play crucial roles. New tools developed in this paper include the weak-type discrete Calderón reproducing formulae, new test functions and distributions, the Littlewood-Paley, the wavelet-type decomposition, and molecule characterizations of the Dunkl-Hardy space, Coifman's approximation to the identity and the decomposition of the identity operator on L^2 , Meyer's commutation Lemma, and new almost orthogonal estimates in the Dunkl setting.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction and statement of main results	2
1.1. Preliminaries and questions in the Dunkl setting	3
1.2. Statement of main results	8
1.2.1. Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator and T_1 theorem	8
1.2.2. Calderón reproducing formula and Littlewood-Paley theory on $L^p, 1 < p < \infty$	13
1.2.3. Littlewood-Paley theory and Hardy space	15
1.2.4. Boundedness of Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator on Dunkl-Hardy space	17
2. Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund Singular Integral Operators and T_1 Theorem	19
2.1. Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund Singular Integral Operators	19
2.2. Meyer's commutation Lemma	26
2.3. Boundedness of Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operators on smooth molecule functions	32

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 42B35; Secondary 43A85, 42B25, 42B30.

Key words and phrases. Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral, T_1 theorem, Littlewood-Paley theory, Hardy space.

2.4. Proof of $T1$ Theorem	38
3. Weak-Type Discrete Calderón Reproducing Formula and Littlewood-Paley Theory on $L^p, 1 < p < \infty$	52
3.1. Weak-Type Discrete Calderón Reproducing Formula	52
3.2. Littlewood-Paley Theory on $L^p, 1 < p < \infty$	62
4. Littlewood-Paley Theory and Dunkl-Hardy Space	67
4.1. Littlewood-Paley square function $S(f)$ in $L^p, p \leq 1$	67
4.2. Dunkl-Hardy space $H_d^p, \frac{N}{N+1} < p \leq 1$	74
5. Boundedness of Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund Operators on H_d^p	82
5.1. Boundedness of Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund Operator from H_d^p to L^p	82
5.2. $T1$ Theorem on Dunkl-Hardy space H_d^p	91
References	94

1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF MAIN RESULTS

It is well known that group structures enter in a decisive way in harmonic analysis. In this paper, we develop harmonic analysis in the Dunkl setting which is associated with finite reflection groups on the Euclidean space. This particular group structure is conducting the analysis. Indeed, in the Dunkl setting, there are corresponding Dunkl transform, the Dunkl translation and convolution operators. Therefore, the Dunkl setting does not fall in the scope of spaces of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Weiss. More precisely, in the Dunkl setting, we introduce the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operators with operator kernels involving both the Euclidean metric and the so called Dunkl "metric" deduced by the finite reflection groups. This new class of singular integrals covers the well-known Dunkl Riesz transforms and generalizes the classical Calderón-Zygmund singular integrals on space of homogeneous type. Moreover, we establish the $T1$ theorem to provide the criterion for the boundedness on L^2 for the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operators. Further, we also establish the Littlewood-Paley theory and the Dunkl-Hardy spaces H_d^p for $p \leq 1$ and close to 1, in which H_d^p when $p < 1$ was missing in the Dunkl literature. We characterize H_d^p via Littlewood-Paley theory, the wavelet-type and atomic decomposition, and molecule theory in the Dunkl setting. As applications, we obtain the boundedness of this new singular integrals on the Dunkl-Hardy spaces. The crucial ideas used in this paper are the L^2 theory and the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator theory. New tools developed in this paper are new test functions and distributions, the weak-type discrete Calderón reproducing formula, and several almost orthogonal estimates in the Dunkl setting.

We now state the background and main results in more details.

1.1. Preliminaries and questions in the Dunkl setting.

The classical Fourier transform, initially defined on $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, extends to an isometry of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and satisfies certain properties with translation, dilation and rotation groups. Dunkl introduced a similar transform, the Dunkl transform, which enjoys properties similar to the classical Fourier transform. This transform is defined by

$$\hat{f}(x) = c_h \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} E(x, -iy) f(y) h_\kappa^2(y) dy,$$

where the usual character $e^{-i\langle x, y \rangle}$ is replaced by $E(x, -iy) = V_\kappa(e^{-i\langle \cdot, y \rangle})(x)$ for some positive linear operator V_κ and the weight functions h_κ are invariant under a finite reflection group G on \mathbb{R}^N , see [19]. Particularly, the Dunkl transform satisfies the Plancherel identity, namely, $\|\hat{f}\|_2 = \|f\|_2$ and if the parameter $\kappa = 0$, then $h_\kappa(x) = 1$ and $V_\kappa = id$, thus the Dunkl transform becomes the classical Fourier transform.

The classical Fourier transform behaves well with the translation operator. However, the measure $h_\kappa^2(x)dx$ is no longer invariant under the usual translation. In [44] the translation operator related to Dunkl transform then is defined on the Dunkl transform side by

$$\widehat{\tau_y f}(x) = E(y, -ix) \hat{f}(x)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

When the function f is in the Schwartz class, the above equality holds pointwise. As an operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, h_\kappa^2)$, τ_y is bounded. However, it is not at all clear whether the translation operator can be defined for L^p functions with $p \neq 2$. Even the L^p boundedness of τ_y on the dense subspace of Schwartz class for $p \neq 2$ is still open. So far, an explicit formula for τ_y is known only in the cases: when f is a radial function or when $G = \mathbb{Z}_2^N$. To be precise, in [40] it was proved that if f is a radial Schwartz function and $f(x) = f_0(\|x\|)$, then

$$\tau_y f(x) = V_\kappa[f_0((\|x\|^2 + \|y\|^2 - 2\|x\|\|y\|\langle x', \cdot \rangle)^{\frac{1}{2}})](y'),$$

where $x' = \frac{x}{\|x\|}$ for non-zero $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

For $f, g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, h_\kappa^2)$, their convolution can be defined in terms of the translation operator by

$$f *_\kappa g(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(y) \tau_x g^\vee(y) h_\kappa^2(y) dy,$$

where $g^\vee(y) = g(-y)$.

In [19], Dunkl also introduced so-called Dunkl operators, that is a family of first order differential-difference operators which play the role similar to the usual partial differentiation for the reflection group. To be precise, denote the standard inner product in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^N by $\langle x, y \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^N x_j y_j$ and the corresponding norm by $\|x\| = \{\sum_{j=1}^N |x_j|^2\}^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Let $B(x, r) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^N : \|x - y\| < r\}$ stand for the ball with center $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and radius $r > 0$. Let R be a root system in \mathbb{R}^N normalized so that $\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle = 2$ for $\alpha \in R$ with R_+ a fixed positive subsystem, and G be the finite reflection group generated by the reflections σ_α ($\alpha \in R$), where $\sigma_\alpha x = x - \langle \alpha, x \rangle \alpha$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. We set

$$V(x, y, r) := \max\{\omega(B(x, r)), \omega(B(y, r))\}$$

and denote $d(x, y) = \min_{\sigma \in G} \|x - \sigma(y)\|$ by the distance (the so-called Dunkl "metric") between two G -orbits $\mathcal{O}(x)$ and $\mathcal{O}(y)$. Obviously, $d(x, y) \leq \|x - y\|$, $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ and $d(x, y) \leq d(x, z) + d(z, y)$ for all $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Moreover, $\omega(B(x, r)) \sim \omega(B(y, r))$ when $d(x, y) \sim r$, and $\omega(B(x, r)) \leq \omega(B_d(x, r)) \leq |G|\omega(B(x, r))$, where $B_d(x, r) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^N : d(x, y) < r\}$.

A *multiplicity function* κ defined on R (invariant under G) is fixed ≥ 0 throughout this paper. Let

$$d\omega(x) = \prod_{\alpha \in R} |\langle \alpha, x \rangle|^{\kappa(\alpha)} dx$$

be the associated measure in \mathbb{R}^N , (see [8]), where, here and subsequently, dx stands for the Lebesgue measure in \mathbb{R}^N . We denote by $\mathbf{N} = N + \sum_{\alpha \in R} \kappa(\alpha)$ the homogeneous dimension of the system. Clearly,

$$\omega(B(tx, tr)) = t^{\mathbf{N}} \omega(B(x, r))$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(x) d\omega(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{t^{\mathbf{N}}} f\left(\frac{x}{t}\right) d\omega(x)$$

for $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $t > 0$.

Observe that for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $r > 0$,

$$\omega(B(x, r)) \sim r^{\mathbf{N}} \prod_{\alpha \in R} (|\langle \alpha, x \rangle| + r)^{\kappa(\alpha)}$$

and hence, $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} \omega(B(x, 1)) \geq c > 0$.

Moreover,

$$(1.1) \quad C^{-1} \left(\frac{r_2}{r_1}\right)^{\mathbf{N}} \leq \frac{\omega(B(x, r_2))}{\omega(B(x, r_1))} \leq C \left(\frac{r_2}{r_1}\right)^{\mathbf{N}} \quad \text{for } 0 < r_1 < r_2.$$

This implies that $d\omega(x)$ satisfies the doubling and reverse doubling properties, that is, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $r > 0$ and $\lambda \geq 1$,

$$(1.2) \quad C^{-1} \lambda^{\mathbf{N}} \omega(B(x, r)) \leq \omega(B(x, \lambda r)) \leq C \lambda^{\mathbf{N}} \omega(B(x, r)).$$

The Dunkl operators T_j are defined by

$$T_j f(x) = \partial_j f(x) + \sum_{\alpha \in R^+} \frac{\kappa(\alpha)}{2} \langle \alpha, e_j \rangle \frac{f(x) - f(\sigma_\alpha(x))}{\langle \alpha, x \rangle},$$

where e_1, \dots, e_N are the standard unit vectors of \mathbb{R}^N .

The Dunkl Laplacian related to R and κ is the operator $\Delta = \sum_{j=1}^N T_j^2$, which is equivalent to

$$\Delta f(x) = \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(x) + \sum_{\alpha \in R} \kappa(\alpha) \delta_\alpha f(x),$$

where $\delta_\alpha f(x) = \frac{\partial_\alpha f(x)}{\langle \alpha, x \rangle} - \frac{f(x) - f(\sigma_\alpha(x))}{\langle \alpha, x \rangle^2}$.

The operator Δ is essentially self-adjoint on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ ([8]) and generates the heat semi-group

$$H_t f(x) = e^{t\Delta} f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} h_t(x, y) f(y) d\omega(y),$$

where the heat kernel $h_t(x, y)$ is a C^∞ function for all $t > 0, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and satisfies $h_t(x, y) = h_t(y, x) > 0$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} h_t(x, y) d\omega(y) = 1$.

The Poisson semigroup is given by

$$P_t f(x) = \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^\infty e^{-u} \exp\left(\frac{t^2}{4u} \Delta\right) f(x) \frac{du}{u^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

and $u(x, t) = P_t f(x)$, so-called the Dunkl Poisson integral, solves the boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t^2 + \Delta_x)u(x, t) = 0, \\ u(x, 0) = f(x) \end{cases}$$

in the half-space \mathbb{R}_+^N , see [8].

All these tools, the Dunkl transform, Laplacian and Poisson integral together with the Dunkl translation and convolution operators, opened the door for developing the harmonic analysis related to the Dunkl setting, which includes the Littlewood-Paley theory, Hardy spaces and singular integral operators. To be more precise, in [8], the Littlewood-Paley theory was established and the Hardy space $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ was characterized by the area integrals, maximal function and the Riesz transforms, see also [7]. The atomic decomposition of $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ was provided in [21]. The boundedness of singular integral convolution operators and the Hörmander multipliers was given by [22] and [23], respectively. See [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 15, 14, 16, 18, 20, 32, 33, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45] for other topics related to the Dunkl setting.

Some natural questions arise: Are there the Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator theory, particularly, the $T1$ theorem, the Littlewood-Paley theory and Hardy spaces $H^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $p \leq 1$ in the Dunkl setting?

In this paper, we answer these questions. To reach our goal, it is well known that in the \mathbb{R}^N and, even more general setting, spaces of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Weiss, the Littlewood-Paley theory gives a uniform treatment of function spaces and provides a powerful tool for providing the boundedness for Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operators on these function spaces. The key point is that before developing the classical Littlewood-Paley theory, one should establish the Calderón reproducing formula. To see this, let ψ be a Schwartz function satisfying the following conditions:

- (i) $\text{supp } \widehat{\psi} \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N : 1/2 \leq |\xi| \leq 2\}$;
- (ii) $|\widehat{\psi}(\xi)| \geq C > 0$ for all $3/5 \leq |\xi| \leq 5/3$.

Calderón in [10] provided the following formula:

$$(1.3) \quad f = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \phi_k * \psi_k * f,$$

where ϕ satisfies the properties similar to $\psi, \psi_k(x) = 2^{kN} \psi(2^k x)$, the series converges in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$. We point out that the Fourier transform is the main tool to show the above formula.

This formula is called to be the Calderón reproducing formula. Based on this formula, one can define the following square function

$$S(f)(x) = \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} |\psi_k * f(x)|^2 \right\}^{1/2}.$$

The Littlewood-Paley L^p , $1 < p < \infty$, theory is given by the following estimates:

$$\|S(f)\|_p \sim \|f\|_p.$$

It is well known that the classical Hardy space H^p can be characterized by such a square function. However, in applications, for example, to get the atomic decomposition and the dual space of H^p , the discrete square function is a powerful version. To this end, one needs the following discrete Calderón reproducing formula:

$$(1.4) \quad f(x) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_Q |Q| \phi_Q(x - x_Q) \psi_Q * f(x_Q),$$

where ϕ and ψ are same as in the formula (1.3), Q are all dyadic cubes with the side length 2^{-k} , $\phi_Q = \phi_k, \psi_Q = \psi_k, x_Q$ are all dyadic points at the left lower corner of Q and the series converges in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $1 < p < \infty$, $S_\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, Schwartz functions with all moment cancellation conditions, and $S'(\mathbb{R}^N)/\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, the space of Schwartz distributions modulo the space of all polynomials. Again, the proof of this discrete Calderón reproducing formula depends on the compact support of the Fourier transform.

This discrete Calderón reproducing formula leads the following discrete Littlewood-Paley square function

$$(1.5) \quad S_d(f)(x) = \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_Q |\psi_Q * f(x_Q)|^2 \chi_Q(x) \right\}^{1/2}.$$

See [25] for more details.

To generalize the classical Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator theory to more general setting, Coifman and Weiss introduced spaces of homogeneous type, see [11]. As we point out that the classical harmonic analysis rely on the Fourier transform. Needless to say, the Fourier transform does not exist on spaces of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Weiss. However, David, Journé and Semmes in [13] developed the Littlewood-Paley theory for spaces of homogeneous type. The key tools they used are Coifman's approximation to the identity and Coifman's decomposition of the identity on L^2 . To be precise, spaces they considered are (X, ρ, μ) with quasi-metric ρ satisfying some regularity properties and measure μ satisfying the condition $\mu(B(x, r)) \sim r^n, n > 0$, which is much stronger than the doubling condition. Applying Coifman's approximation to the identity, that is, $\{S_k\}_{k=-\infty}^{\infty}$ is an approximation to the identity on $L^2(X, \mu)$ where $\{S_k(x, y)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, the kernels of $\{S_k\}_{k=-\infty}^{\infty}$, satisfy certain size and regularity conditions, and together using Coifman's decomposition of the identity on L^2 , namely

$$(1.6) \quad \begin{aligned} I &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} D_k = \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} D_k \right) \left(\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} D_j \right) \\ &= \sum_{|k-j| \leq N} D_k D_j + \sum_{|k-j| > N} D_k D_j = T_N + R_N, \end{aligned}$$

where $D_k = S_{k+1} - S_k$, David, Journé and Semmes proved that R_N is bounded on $L^p(X)$, $1 < p < \infty$, with the operator norm less than 1 if N is large enough and thus, T_N^{-1} , the inverse of T_N , is bounded on $L^p(X)$, $1 < p < \infty$. Denote $D_k^N = \sum_{|j| \leq N} D_{k+j}$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, they

obtained the following Calderón-type reproducing formulae:

$$(1.7) \quad f = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} T_N^{-1} D_k^N D_k(f) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} D_k D_k^N T_N^{-1}(f)$$

where the series converge in $L^p(X)$, $1 < p < \infty$. Using this formula, they were able to obtain the Littlewood-Paley theory for the space $L^p(X)$: There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $f \in L^p(X)$, $1 < p < \infty$,

$$C^{-1} \|f\|_{L^p(X)} \leq \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} |D_k(f)|^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^p(X)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^p(X)}.$$

Applying the above Littlewood-Paley estimates, they showed the remarkable $T1$ theorem on such spaces of homogeneous type.

However, the presence of the operator T_N^{-1} prevents one from developing Littlewood-Paley characterizations for other spaces, such as the Hardy spaces, by simply applying the Calderón-type formula in (1.3). To obtain the Calderón reproducing formula similar to one given in (1.3), in [31], the space of test functions, $\mathcal{M}(X)$, a suitable analogue of $S_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ was introduced. The key idea is to show that T_N^{-1} is a Calderón-Zygmund operator whose kernel has some additional second order smoothness and is bounded on $\mathcal{M}(X)$. Since then $T_N^{-1} D_k^N$ satisfy nice estimates sufficiently similar to those satisfied by D_k itself. Precisely, the Calderón reproducing formula provided in [31] is given by the following: There exist families of operators $\{\tilde{D}_k\}_{k=-\infty}^{\infty}$ and $\{\bar{D}_k\}_{k=-\infty}^{\infty}$ such that

$$(1.8) \quad f = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{D}_k D_k(f) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} D_k \bar{D}_k(f),$$

where the series converge in the norms of the space $L^p(X)$, $1 < p < \infty$, the space $\mathcal{M}(X)$ and the dual space $(\mathcal{M}(X))'$, respectively.

Note that the formula in (1.8) is similar to that in (1.3). In [28], applying Coifman's decomposition of the identity together with the boundedness of Calderón-Zygmund operators satisfying the second order smoothness on the test function space, the following discrete Calderón reproducing formula was established:

$$(1.9) \quad f = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_Q \mu(Q) \tilde{D}_k(x, x_Q) D_k(f)(x_Q) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_Q \mu(Q) D_k(x, x_Q) \bar{D}_k(f)(x_Q),$$

where Q are dyadic cubes in the sense of Christ, x_Q are any fixed point in Q , and the series converge in the norms of the space $L^p(X)$, $1 < p < \infty$, the space $\mathcal{M}(X)$ and the dual space $(\mathcal{M}(X))'$, respectively.

We remark that the Calderón-Zygmund operator theory plays a crucial role for the proofs of the Calderón reproducing formulae in (1.8) and (1.9). Using formulae (1.9), the Hardy space H^p theory was established, which includes the Littlewood-Paley characterization of H^p , atomic decomposition and dual space of H^p , and the $T1$ theorem of the boundedness of singular integrals on these spaces. See [27, 28, 31].

In [30], motivated by the work of Nagel and Stein on the several complex variables in [36], they considered spaces of homogeneous type (X, ρ, μ) , where the quasi-metric ρ satisfies

some regularity properties and the measure μ satisfies the doubling condition and the reverse doubling condition, that is, there are constants $\kappa > 0$ and $c \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$(1.10) \quad c\lambda^\kappa \mu(B(x, r)) \leq \mu(B(x, \lambda r))$$

for all $x \in X$, $0 < r < \sup_{x, y \in X} \rho(x, y)/2$ and $1 \leq \lambda < \sup_{x, y \in X} \rho(x, y)/2r$.

Applying Coifman's approximation to the identity and Coifman's decomposition of the identity together with some modified test functions, they provided the discrete Calderón reproducing formulae as in (1.9) and established the Hardy space theory in this setting. We would like to point out that the reverse doubling condition of μ and the Calderón-Zygmund operator theory play a crucial role for the boundedness of T_N^{-1} on the space of test functions. See [30] for the Littlewood-Paley characterization of the Hardy space and its applications in this setting.

Notice that the regularity of the quasi-metric ρ is key fact for constructing Coifman's approximation to the identity and the reverse doubling condition is crucial to get the boundedness of T_N^{-1} on the space of test functions. To develop the Littlewood-Paley theory on space of homogeneous (X, ρ, μ) , where the quasi-metric ρ has no any regularity and the measure μ satisfies the doubling condition only, a new approach is required.

Adapting the developed randomized dyadic structure on space of homogeneous type (X, ρ, μ) where ρ is the quasi-metric without any regularity and the measure μ satisfies the doubling condition only, in [9], Auscher and Hytönen build a remarkable orthonormal basis of Hölder-continuous wavelet with exponential decay. Using this wavelet basis they provided a universal Calderón reproducing formula to study and develop function spaces theory and singular integrals. More precisely, they discussed L^p , $1 < p < \infty$ spaces, BMO and gave a proof of the $T1$ theorem in this general setting. See more details in [9]. Applying Auscher-Hytönen's orthonormal basis, the Hardy space and the product Hardy space were developed in [26, 29].

1.2. Statement of main results.

The main results of this paper are (i) the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operators and the $T1$ theorem; (ii) the Littlewood-Paley theory and the Hardy spaces; (iii) the boundedness for the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operators, particularly, the Dunkl-Riesz transforms, on the Dunkl-Hardy space.

1.2.1. Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator and $T1$ theorem.

As mentioned above, we can consider the Dunkl setting, $(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$, as a space of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Weiss. Note that the measure ω satisfies the doubling and the reverse doubling properties. Let $C_0^\eta(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\eta > 0$, denote the space of continuous functions f with compact support and

$$\|f\|_\eta := \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{\|x - y\|^\eta} < \infty.$$

The classical Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator in $(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$ is defined by the following

Definition 1.1. An operator $T : C_0^\eta(\mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow (C_0^\eta(\mathbb{R}^N))'$ with $\eta > 0$, is said to be a Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator if $K(x, y)$, the kernel of T , satisfies the following estimates: for some $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$,

$$(1.11) \quad |K(x, y)| \leq \frac{C}{\omega(B(x, \|x - y\|))}$$

for all $x \neq y$;

$$(1.12) \quad |K(x, y) - K(x', y)| \leq \left(\frac{\|x - x'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{C}{\omega(B(x, \|x - y\|))}$$

for $\|x - x'\| \leq \frac{1}{2}\|x - y\|$;

$$(1.13) \quad |K(x, y) - K(x, y')| \leq \left(\frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{C}{\omega(B(x, \|x - y\|))}$$

for $\|y - y'\| \leq \frac{1}{2}\|x - y\|$. Moreover,

$$\langle T(f), g \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y) f(x) g(y) d\omega(x) d\omega(y)$$

for $\text{supp } f \cap \text{supp } g = \emptyset$.

See [30] for more details.

However, the following motivation leads to consider a new class of the Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operators in the Dunkl setting. Recall that $p_t(x, y)$ is the Dunkl-Poisson kernel. Applying the size and smoothness conditions of $p_t(x, y)$ (see [21]) implies that $K(x, y) = \int_0^\infty p_t(x, y) \frac{dt}{t}$ satisfies the following estimates (see the Proposition 2.1 in **Section 2**): for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$,

$$|K(x, y)| \lesssim \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon$$

for all $x \neq y$;

$$|K(x, y) - K(x, y')| \lesssim \left(\frac{\|y - y'\|}{d(x, y)} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon$$

for $\|y - y'\| \leq d(x, y)/2$;

$$|K(x', y) - K(x, y)| \lesssim \left(\frac{\|x - x'\|}{d(x, y)} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon$$

for $\|x - x'\| \leq d(x, y)/2$.

This motivation leads to introduce the following Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operators.

Definition 1.2. An operator $T : C_0^\eta(\mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow (C_0^\eta(\mathbb{R}^N))'$ with $\eta > 0$, is said to be a Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator if $K(x, y)$, the kernel of T , satisfies the following estimates: for some $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$,

$$(1.14) \quad |K(x, y)| \lesssim \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon$$

for all $x \neq y$;

$$(1.15) \quad |K(x, y) - K(x, y')| \lesssim \left(\frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}$$

for $\|y - y'\| \leq d(x, y)/2$;

$$(1.16) \quad |K(x', y) - K(x, y)| \lesssim \left(\frac{\|x - x'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}$$

for $\|x - x'\| \leq d(x, y)/2$.

Moreover,

$$\langle T(f), g \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y) f(x) g(y) d\omega(x) d\omega(y)$$

for $\text{supp} f \cap \text{supp} g = \emptyset$.

A Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator is said to be the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operator if it extends a bounded operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

We remark that the size and regularity conditions of the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator are much weaker than the classical Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operators given in space of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Weiss. Indeed, by the reverse doubling condition on the measure ω in (1.2), $\omega(B(x, \|x - y\|)) = \omega(B(x, \frac{\|x - y\|}{d(x, y)} \cdot d(x, y)) \geq C \left(\frac{\|x - y\|}{d(x, y)} \right)^N \omega(B(x, d(x, y)))$. Thus,

$$(1.17) \quad \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, \|x - y\|))} \lesssim \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|} \right)^N \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}$$

$$(1.18) \quad \lesssim \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}$$

and if $\|x - x'\| \leq \frac{1}{2}d(x, y) \leq \frac{1}{2}\|x - y\|$, then,

$$(1.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\|x - x'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, \|x - y\|))} &\leq C \left(\frac{\|x - x'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|} \right)^N \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{\|x - x'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}. \end{aligned}$$

Further, if $K(x, y)$ satisfies the above size condition (1.14), then $K(x, y)$ is locally integrable in $\{\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N : x \neq y\}$. Indeed, for any fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $0 < \delta < R < \infty$, by the doubling properties of the measure ω , (see the details in **Section 2**)

$$\int_{\delta < \|x - y\| < R} |K(x, y)| d\omega(y) \leq C \frac{1}{\delta} \int_{d(x, y) < R} \frac{d(x, y)}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} d\omega(y) \leq C \frac{R}{\delta} < \infty.$$

It is well known that if T is the classical Calderón-Zygmund operator on \mathbb{R}^N , then T is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $1 < p < \infty$, from $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ to $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and from $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ to $BMO(\mathbb{R}^N)$. These results still hold for the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operators.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose that T is a Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operator. Then T is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $1 < p < \infty$, from $H_d^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ to $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and from $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ to $BMO_d(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$.*

Here $H_d^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ is the Dunkl-Hardy space introduced in [8] and $BMO_d(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ is the classical BMO function defined in $(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$, as a space of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Wiess.

If T is a Dunkl-convolution operator, the Dunkl transform is the main tool for providing the $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ boundedness of T . However, beyond the convolution operators, it becomes indispensable to obtain a criterion for $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ continuity. As Meyer pointed out that without such a criterion of the $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, the theory of the Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operators collapses like a house of cards. In the classical case, one such criterion is the remarkable $T1$ theorem of David and Journé. In Dunkl setting, we have a similar $T1$ theorem.

Before describing the $T1$ theorem, we need to extend the definition of the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operators to bounded functions in $C^\eta(\mathbb{R}^N)$. The idea for doing this is to define $T(b)$ for $b \in C^\eta(\mathbb{R}^N)$, as a distribution on $C_{0,0}^\eta(\mathbb{R}^N) = \{f : f \in C_0^\eta, \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(x)d\omega(x) = 0\}$. To this end, given $f \in C_{0,0}^\eta(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with the support contained in the ball $B(x_0, R)$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $R > 0$. Let $\eta(x) = 1$ for $x \in B_d(x_0, 2R)$ and $\eta(x) = 0$ for $x \in (B_d(x_0, 4R))^c$. Write $b = \eta b + (1 - \eta)b$ and formlly, $\langle Tb, f \rangle = \langle T(b\eta), f \rangle + \langle T(1 - \eta)b, f \rangle$. The first term $\langle T(b\eta), f \rangle$ is well defined. By the cancellation condition of f and the fact that if $x \in \text{supp } f$ and $y \in \text{supp } \eta$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T(1 - \eta)b, f \rangle &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y)(1 - \eta(y))b(y)f(x)d\omega(y)d\omega(x) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [K(x, y) - K(x_0, y)](1 - \eta(y))b(y)f(x)d\omega(y)d\omega(x). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that when $x \in B(x_0, R)$ and $y \notin B_d(x_0, 2R)$, $\|x - x_0\| \leq R \leq \frac{1}{2}d(x_0, y)$. Applying the smoothness condition of $K(x, y)$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |K(x, y) - K(x_0, y)||f(x)|d\omega(y)d\omega(x) \\ &\leq C \int_{\|x-x_0\| \leq R} \int_{d(x_0, y) \geq 2R} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x_0, y))} \left(\frac{\|x - x_0\|}{\|x_0 - y\|}\right)^\varepsilon |f(x)|d\omega(y)d\omega(x) \\ &\leq C \int_{\|x-x_0\| \leq R} \int_{d(x_0, y) \geq 2R} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x_0, y))} \left(\frac{\|x - x_0\|}{d(x_0, y)}\right)^\varepsilon |f(x)|d\omega(y)d\omega(x) \\ &\leq C\|f\|_1 \end{aligned}$$

and thus, $\langle Tb, f \rangle$ is well defined. It is easy to see that this definition is independent of the choice of the function η . Therefore, $T(b)$ is a distribution in $(C_{0,0}^\eta)'$. Now $T(1) = 0$ means that for any $f \in C_{0,0}^\eta$, $\langle T1, f \rangle = 0$. This is equivalent to $T^*(f) = 0$ for any $f \in C_{0,0}^\eta$. The definition of $T^*(1) = 0$ is defined similarly.

If considering $(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$ as a space of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Wiess, the classical weak boundedness property of T says that for $f, g \in C_0^\eta(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\text{supp } f, g \subseteq B(x_0, t)$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n, t > 0$, then there exists a constant C such that

$$|\langle Tf, g \rangle| \leq C\omega(B(x_0, t))t^{2\eta}\|f\|_\eta\|g\|_\eta.$$

Indeed, if $f \in C_0^\eta(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\text{supp } f \subseteq B(x_0, t)$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n, t > 0$, then

$$\|f\|_2^2 = \int_{B(x_0, t)} |f(x)|^2 d\omega(x) = \int_{B(x_0, t)} |f(x) - f(x_1)|^2 d\omega,$$

where $t < \|x_1 - x_0\| \leq 2t$ and thus, $f(x_1) = 0$. This implies that $\int_{B(x_0, t)} |f(x) - f(x_1)|^2 d\omega(x) \leq Ct^{2\eta} \|f\|_\eta^2 \omega(B(x_0, t))$ and we get

$$\|f\|_2 \leq C(\omega(B(x_0, t)))^{1/2} t^\eta \|f\|_\eta.$$

Suppose that T is bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and $f, g \in C_0^\eta(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\text{supp} f, g \subseteq B(x_0, t)$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n, t > 0$, then

$$|\langle Tf, g \rangle| \leq \|T\| \|f\|_2 \|g\|_2 \leq C\omega(B(x_0, t)) t^{2\eta} \|f\|_\eta \|g\|_\eta.$$

In our situation, the *weak boundedness property* (WBP) in the Dunkl setting is defined by following

Definition 1.4. The Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator T with the distribution kernel $K(x, y)$ is said to have the weak boundedness property if there exist $\eta > 0$ and $C < \infty$ such that

$$|\langle K, f \rangle| \leq C \max\{\omega(B(x_0, r)), \omega(B(y_0, r))\}$$

for all $f \in C_0^\eta(\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq B(x_0, r) \times B(y_0, r), x_0, y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N, \|f\|_\infty \leq 1, \|f(\cdot, y)\|_\eta \leq r^{-\eta}$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\|f(x, \cdot)\|_\eta \leq r^{-\eta}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

If the operator T has the weak boundedness property, we denote by $T \in WBP$. It is easy to see that if the operator T is bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$, then T satisfies the weak boundedness property defined by the Definition 1.4.

It is well known that in the classical case, the almost orthogonal estimates are fundamental tools for the proof of the $T1$ theorem. The following result provides such a tool in the Dunkl setting.

Theorem 1.5. *Suppose that T is the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator with $T(1) = T^*(1) = 0$ and $T \in WBP$. Then T maps $\mathbb{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0)$ to $\tilde{\mathbb{M}}(\beta, \gamma', r, x_0)$ with $0 < \beta < \varepsilon, 0 < \gamma' < \gamma < \varepsilon$, where ε is the exponent of the regularity of the kernel of T . Moreover, there exists a constant C such that*

$$\|T(f)\|_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}(\beta, \gamma', r, x_0)} \leq C \|f\|_{\mathbb{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0)}.$$

Here $\mathbb{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0)$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{M}}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0)$ are defined by following

Definition 1.6. A function $f(x)$ is said to be a smooth molecule for $0 < \beta \leq 1, \gamma > 0, r > 0$ and some fixed $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, if $f(x)$ satisfies the following conditions:

$$(1.20) \quad |f(x)| \leq C \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0\|} \right)^\gamma;$$

$$(1.21) \quad |f(x) - f(x')| \leq C \left(\frac{\|x - x'\|}{r} \right)^\beta \left\{ \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0\|} \right)^\gamma + \frac{1}{V(x', x_0, r + d(x', x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}_0\|} \right)^\gamma \right\};$$

$$(1.22) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(x) d\omega(x) = 0.$$

If $f(x)$ is a smooth molecule, we denote $f(x)$ by $f \in \mathbb{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0)$ and define the norm of f by

$$\|f\|_{\mathbb{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0)} := \inf\{C : (1.20) - (1.21) \text{ hold}\}.$$

Observe that $t\partial_t p_t(x, y)$ with p_t , the Poisson kernel, is the smooth molecule with $\beta, \gamma < 1, r = t, x_0 = y$ for fixed y , and it is also the smooth molecule for $x_0 = x$ for x is fixed.

Definition 1.7. A function $f(x)$ is said to be a weak smooth molecule for $0 < \beta \leq 1, \gamma > 0, r > 0$ and some fixed $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, if $f(x)$ satisfies the following conditions:

$$(1.23) \quad |f(x)| \leq C \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_0)} \right)^\gamma;$$

$$(1.24) \quad |f(x) - f(x')| \leq C \left(\frac{\|x - x'\|}{r} \right)^\beta \left\{ \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_0)} \right)^\gamma + \frac{1}{V(x', x_0, r + d(x', x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}_0)} \right)^\gamma \right\};$$

$$(1.25) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(x) d\omega(x) = 0.$$

If $f(x)$ is a weak smooth molecule, we denote $f(x)$ by $f \in \widetilde{\mathbb{M}}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0)$ and define the norm of f by

$$\|f\|_{\widetilde{\mathbb{M}}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0)} := \inf\{C : (1.23) - (1.24) \text{ hold}\}.$$

We remark that all $\|x - x_0\|$ and $\|x' - x_0\|$ in the smooth molecule are placed by $d(x, x_0)$ and $d(x', x_0)$ in the weak smooth molecule, respectively.

Now we can state the $T1$ theorem for Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operators by the following

Theorem 1.8. *Suppose that T is a Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator. Then T extends to a bounded operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ if and only if (a) $T(1)(x) \in BMO_d(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$; (b) $T^*(1)(x) \in BMO_d(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$; (c) $T \in WBP$.*

We remark that the theory of Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operators plays a fundamental role for establishing the weak-type discrete Calderón reproducing formulae, the Littlewood-Paley theory and the Hardy spaces in the Dunkl setting.

1.2.2. Calderón reproducing formula and Littlewood-Paley theory on $L^p, 1 < p < \infty$.

We begin with the Calderón reproducing formula. Thanks [8], the authors provided such a formula as follows: for $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$,

$$(1.26) \quad f(x) = \int_0^\infty \psi_t * q_t * f(x) \frac{dt}{t},$$

where $q_t f = t \frac{\partial}{\partial t} p_t f$ with p_t is the Poisson kernel as mentioned above and $\psi \in C_0^\infty(B(0, 1/4))$ is a radial function with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \psi(x) d\omega(x) = 0$.

Write

$$f(x) = \int_0^\infty \psi_t * q_t * f(x) \frac{dt}{t} = T_M(f)(x) + R_1(f)(x) + R_M(f)(x),$$

where

$$T_M(f)(x) = -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_j(x, x_Q) q_j * f(x_Q),$$

$$R_1(f)(x) = - \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{r^{-j}}^{r^{-j+1}} \left[\psi_t * q_t * f(x) - \psi_j * q_j * f(x) \right] \frac{dt}{t}$$

and

$$R_M(f)(x) = -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \int_Q \left[\psi_j(x, y) q_j * f(y) - \psi_j(x, x_Q) q_j * f(x_Q) \right] d\omega(y),$$

where $\psi_j = \psi_{r^j}$, $q_j = q_{r^j}$, with $1 < r \leq r_0$ for some fixed r_0 , Q^j is the collection of all "r-dyadic cubes" Q with the side length r^{-M-j} for M is some fixed large integer, and x_Q is any fixed point in the cube Q .

Applying the Coifman's decomposition of the identity on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ gives

$$I = T_M + R_1 + R_M.$$

We will show that R_1 and R_M are Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operators and the boundedness of R_1 and R_M on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $1 < p < \infty$, follows from the Cotlar-Stein Lemma and Theorem 1.3, respectively. Moreover, $\|R_1 + R_M\|_{p,p} < 1$ which implies that $(T_M)^{-1}$, the inverse of T_M , exists and is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $1 < p < \infty$. This yields the following weak-type discrete Calderón reproducing formula:

Theorem 1.9. *If $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $1 < p < \infty$, then there exists a function $h \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, such that $\|f\|_2 \sim \|h\|_2$ and $\|f\|_p \sim \|h\|_p$,*

$$f(x) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) \psi_j(x, x_Q) q_j h(x_Q),$$

where $q_j h(x) = q_j * h(x)$, the series converges in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ with $\psi_j = \psi_{r^j}$, $q_j = q_{r^j}$, $1 < r \leq r_0$, for some fixed r_0 , Q^j is the collection of all "r-dyadic cubes" Q with the side length r^{-M-j} for M is some fixed large integer, and x_Q is any fixed point in the cube Q .

This weak-type discrete Calderón reproducing formula leads to the following discrete Littlewood-Paley square function.

Definition 1.10. For $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $S(f)$, the discrete Littlewood-Paley square function of f , is defined by

$$(1.27) \quad S(f)(x) := \left\{ \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} |q_Q f(x_Q)|^2 \chi_Q(x) \right\}^{1/2},$$

where $q_Q = q_j$ when $Q \in Q^j$ and $\chi_Q(x)$ is the characteristical function of the cube Q .

Applying the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator theory, the Littlewood-Paley L^p , $1 < p < \infty$, estimates are given by the following

Theorem 1.11. *There exist two constants C and C' such that for $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $1 < p < \infty$,*

$$C' \|f\|_p \leq \|S(f)\|_p \leq C \|f\|_p.$$

1.2.3. *Littlewood-Paley theory and Hardy space.*

The above discrete Littlewood-Paley theory leads to introduce the Dunkl-Hardy space norm for $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ as follows:

Definition 1.12. For $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $\|f\|_{H_d^p}$, the Dunkl-Hardy space norm of f , is defined by $\|f\|_{H_d^p} := \|S(f)\|_p$ for $0 < p \leq 1$.

Using the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator theory, the weak-type discrete Calderón reproducing formula for $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ with respect to the Dunkl-Hardy space norm is given by the following:

Theorem 1.13. *If $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ with $\|f\|_{H_d^p} < \infty$, for $\frac{N}{N+1} < p \leq 1$, then there exists a function $h \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, such that $\|f\|_2 \sim \|h\|_2$, $\|f\|_{H_d^p} \sim \|h\|_{H_d^p}$ and*

$$f(x) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) \psi_Q(x, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q),$$

where $\psi_Q = \psi_j$, $q_Q = q_j$ for $Q \in Q^j$ and the series converges in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ norm and the Dunkl-Hardy space norm.

We remark that the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator theory plays a crucial role to obtain the sharp range $\frac{N}{N+1} < p \leq 1$ which is the same as the classical case.

Applying the above Theorem 1.13 implies the following duality estimate which will be a key idea for developing the Dunkl-Hardy space theory:

Proposition 1.14. For $f, g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and $\frac{N}{N+1} < p \leq 1$, then there exists a constant C such that

$$|\langle f, g \rangle| \leq C \|f\|_{H_d^p} \|g\|_{CMO_d^p}.$$

Here for $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ function, the norm of the Dunkl-Carleson measure space $CMO_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ is defined by

Definition 1.15. Suppose that $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. The norm of $f \in CMO_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ is defined by

$$\|f\|_{CMO_d^p} := \sup_P \left\{ \frac{1}{\omega(P)^{\frac{2}{p}-1}} \sum_{Q \subseteq P} \omega(Q) |\psi_Q f(x_Q)|^2 \right\}^{1/2} < \infty$$

for $0 < p \leq 1$, where P runs over all dyadic cubes and $\psi_Q = \psi_j$ when $Q \in Q^j$.

The above Proposition 1.14 means that each function $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ with $\|f\|_{H_d^p} < \infty$ can be considered as a continuous linear functional on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, the subspace of $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ with the Dunkl-Carleson measure space norm $\|g\|_{CMO_d^p} < \infty$. Therefore, one can consider $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ as a new test function space and define the Dunkl-Hardy space H_d^p as the collection of some distributions on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. More precisely, the Dunkl-Hardy space is defined by the following

Definition 1.16. The Dunkl-Hardy space $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $\frac{N}{N+1} < p \leq 1$, is defined by the collection of all distributions $f \in (L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega))'$ such that

$$f(x) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) \lambda_Q \psi_Q(x, x_Q)$$

with $\left\| \left\{ \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} |\lambda_Q|^2 \chi_Q \right\}^{1/2} \right\|_p < \infty$, where the series converges in the distribution sense and $\psi_Q = \psi_j$ if $Q \in Q^j$.

If $f \in H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, the norm of f is defined by

$$\|f\|_{H_d^p} := \inf \left\{ \left\| \left\{ \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} |\lambda_Q|^2 \chi_Q(x) \right\}^{1/2} \right\|_p \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all $f(x) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) \lambda_Q \psi_Q(x, x_Q)$.

We remark that if $\left\| \left\{ \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} |\lambda_Q|^2 \chi_Q \right\}^{1/2} \right\|_p < \infty$, then the series $\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) \lambda_Q \psi_Q(x, x_Q)$ defines a distribution in $(L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega))'$. See the proof in the **Section 4**.

The following theorem is very useful in the proof of the boundedness for the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operators on the Dunkl-Hardy spaces $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$.

Theorem 1.17.

$$H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) = \overline{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)},$$

where $\overline{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p}$ is the collection of all distributions $f \in (L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega))'$ such that there exists a sequence $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ with $\|f_n - f_m\|_{H_d^p} \rightarrow 0$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, f_n converges to f in $(L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega))'$.

As a direct consequence of Theorem 1.17, we obtain the following

Corollary 1.18. *The subspace $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ is dense in $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ for $\frac{N}{N+1} < p \leq 1$.*

It is well known that the atomic decomposition is a powerful tool for the boundedness of the classical Calderón-Zygmund operator on the classical Hardy space. The following theorem gives such an atomic decomposition for the Dunkl-Hardy space. We recall that a function $a(x)$ is an $(p, 2)$ atom if (i) $\text{supp}(a) \subseteq Q$, where Q is a cube in \mathbb{R}^N ; (ii) $\|a\|_2 \leq \omega(Q)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}}$; (iii) $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} a(x) d\omega(x) = 0$.

Theorem 1.19. *Suppose $\frac{N}{N+1} < p \leq 1$. If $f \in H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ then f has an atomic decomposition. More precisely, $f(x) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda_j a_j(x)$, where all a_j are $(2, p)$ atoms and*

$$\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |\lambda_j|^p \leq C \|f\|_{H_d^p}^p$$

for some constant C .

Conversely, if f has an atomic decomposition $f(x) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda_j a_j(x)$, then $f \in H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and

$$\|f\|_{H_d^p}^p \leq C \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |\lambda_j|^p.$$

1.2.4. *Boundedness of Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator on Dunkl-Hardy space.*

Let's recall the singular integrals convolution operators in the rational Dunkl setting, which was introduced in [23].

Definition 1.20. For a positive integer s , consider a kernel $K \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\})$ such that

- (i)
$$\sup_{0 < a < b < \infty} \left| \int_{a < |x| < b} K(x) d\omega(x) \right| < \infty,$$
- (ii)
$$\left| \frac{\partial^\beta}{\partial x^\beta} K(x) \right| \leq C \|x\|^{-N-|\beta|} \text{ for all } |\beta| \leq s,$$
- (iii)
$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\varepsilon < |x| < 1} K(x) d\omega(x) = L, \text{ where } L \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Set $K^t(x) = K(x)(1 - \phi(\frac{x}{t}))$, where ϕ is a fixed radial C^∞ -function supported by the unit ball $B(0, 1)$ such that $\phi(x) = 1$ for $\|x\| < \frac{1}{2}$. The following result was shown in [23]:

Theorem 1.21. *Suppose that $T^t(f)(x) = f * K^t(x)$ where $K(x)$ satisfies the above conditions. Then the limit $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} f * K^t(x)$ exists. Moreover, $T(f)(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} f * K^t(x)$ is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ for $1 < p < \infty$ and is of weak type $(1, 1)$ as well.*

The boundedness of the Hörmander multiplier was proved in [22] as follows:

Theorem 1.22. *Let $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a non-zero radial function such that $\text{supp } \psi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$. If m is a function on \mathbb{R}^N which satisfies the Hörmander condition*

$$M = \sup_{t > 0} \|\psi(\cdot)m(t\cdot)\|_{W_2^s} < \infty$$

for some $s > N$, then the multiplier operator

$$T_m(f) = (m\hat{f})^\vee,$$

originally defined by the Dunkl transform on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, is

- (A) of weak type $(1, 1)$,
- (B) of strong type (p, p) for $1 < p < \infty$,
- (C) bounded on the Hardy space H_{atom}^1 .

Here the classical Sobolev norm is defined by

$$\|m\|_{W_2^s} = \|\widehat{m}(x)(1 + \|x\|)^s\|_{L^2(dx)}.$$

The boundedness of the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operators on the Dunkl-Hardy space are following:

Theorem 1.23. *Suppose that the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operator with the kernel $K(x, y)$ satisfies the smoothness conditions only: for $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$,*

$$(1.28) \quad |K(x, y) - K(x, y')| \leq C \left(\frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \quad \text{for } \|y - y'\| \leq d(x, y)/2.$$

Then T is bounded from the Dunkl-Hardy space $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ for $\frac{N}{N+\varepsilon} < p \leq 1$.

When $p = 1$, the above smoothness condition can be replaced by the following Hörmander condition:

$$\int_{\|y-y'\| \leq d(x,y)/2} |K(x,y) - K(x,y')| d\omega(x) \leq C$$

and T is also bounded from $H_d^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ to $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$.

It is well known that the molecule theory of the Hardy space is a powerful tool for providing the boundedness of the classical Calderón-Zygmund operators on the classical Hardy space. The molecule theory for the Hardy spaces was developed by Coifman and Weiss for space of homogeneous type (X, ρ, μ) where ρ is the measure distance and the measure μ satisfies the doubling property, see page 594 in [12]. In [26], the molecule theory was established for (X, ρ, μ) , where ρ is the quasi-metric without any regularity and the measure μ satisfies the doubling property only. In this paper, applying the similar idea as in [26], we develop the molecule theory for $(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$ in the Dunkl setting.

Definition 1.24. Suppose $\frac{N}{N+1} < p \leq 1$. A function $m(x) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ is said to be an $(p, 2, \varepsilon, \eta)$ molecule centered at $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ for the Dunkl-Hardy space $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ if $1 \geq \varepsilon > \eta > 0$, $\frac{N}{N+\varepsilon-\eta} < p \leq 1$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} m(x) d\omega(x) = 0$ and

(1.29)

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} m(x)^2 d\omega(x) \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} m(x)^2 \omega(B(x_0, \|x - x_0\|))^{1 + \frac{2\varepsilon - 2\eta}{N}} d\omega(x) \right)^{\left(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N} \frac{p}{2-p} - 1 \right)^{-1}} \leq 1.$$

Note that the fact that $\frac{N}{N+\varepsilon-\eta} < p$ implies $\frac{\varepsilon-\eta}{N} > \frac{1}{p} - 1 = \frac{1-p}{p}$. Thus, $\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N} \frac{p}{2-p} - 1 = \left(1 + \frac{2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\right) \frac{p}{2-p} - 1 > \left(1 + \frac{2-2p}{p}\right) \frac{p}{2-p} - 1 > 0$.

The following result shows that each $(p, 2, \varepsilon, \eta)$ molecule $m(x)$ belongs to $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Theorem 1.25. Suppose that m is an $(p, 2, \varepsilon, \eta)$ molecule. Then $m \in H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and moreover,

$$\|m\|_{H_d^p} \leq C,$$

where the constant C is independent of m .

Applying the above Theorem 1.25, we obtain the $T1$ Theorem for the boundedness of Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operators on the Hardy space $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Theorem 1.26. Suppose that T is a Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operator with the kernel $K(x, y)$ satisfying the following smoothness condition only: when $M > \frac{N}{2}$, $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and $\|y - y'\| \leq \frac{1}{2}d(x, y)$,

$$|K(x, y) - K(x, y')| \leq C \left(\frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|} \right)^M.$$

Then T is bounded on the Dunkl-Hardy space $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $\frac{N}{N+\varepsilon} < p \leq 1$, if and only if $T^*(1) = 0$.

We remark that the size condition on the kernel of T is not required. Moreover, if T is a classical Calderón-Zygmund operator on space of homogeneous type $(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$. Then, by the estimate in (1.19) with $N > \frac{N}{2}$, $K(x, y)$, the kernel of T , satisfies the smoothness condition of the above Theorem 1.26.

The general $T1$ Theorem for the Dunkl-Hardy space $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ is the following

Theorem 1.27. *Suppose that T is a Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operator. Then T is bounded on $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $\frac{N}{N+\varepsilon} < p \leq 1$, where ε is the exponent of the regularity of the kernel of T , if and only if $T^*(1) = 0$.*

As a consequence of Theorems 1.23 and 1.27, we obtain the boundedness of the Dunkl-Riesz transforms in the Dunkl-Hardy space $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$.

Theorem 1.28. *The Dunkl-Riesz transforms R_j , $1 \leq j \leq N$, are bounded on the Hardy space $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and from $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $\frac{N}{N+1} < p \leq 1$.*

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, the almost orthogonal estimates, the main tools in this paper will be provided. The proofs of Theorems 1.3, 1.5 and 1.8 will be given. In section 3, we show Theorem 1.9, the weak-type discrete Calderón reproducing formula Theorem 1.9 and Theorem 1.11, Littlewood-Paley theory on L^p , $1 < p < \infty$. In section 4, we discuss the Dunkl-Hardy theory and demonstrate Theorem 1.13, Proposition 1.14 and Theorems 1.17 and 1.19. The boundedness of operators on the Hardy space, molecule theory, Theorems 1.23, 1.25 and 1.26-1.27 will be included in the last section.

Before ending this section, some remarks must be in order. As mentioned above, one can consider the Dunkl setting $(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$ as a space of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Weiss. As Meyer remarked in his preface to [17], *“One is amazed by the dramatic changes that occurred in analysis during the twentieth century. In the 1930s complex methods and Fourier series played a seminal role. After many improvements, mostly achieved by the Calderón–Zygmund school, the action takes place today on spaces of homogeneous type. No group structure is available, the Fourier transform is missing, but a version of harmonic analysis is still present. Indeed the geometry is conducting the analysis.”* The geometry involved in the Dunkl setting, namely, the finite reflection groups on \mathbb{R}^N , plays a crucial role. More precisely, the geometric consideration is conducting the Dunkl transform, translation and convolution operators. They are not appeared in general spaces of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Weiss. Moreover, they are also conducting the Riesz transforms, the Dunkl-Hölmänder multipliers and the Dunkl-Hardy space in the Dunkl setting. The results of this paper indicate: (1) the operators, namely, the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral theory conducted by the geometry involved in the Dunkl setting are different from those defined on spaces of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Weiss and this theory still plays a fundamental role in the Dunkl setting; (2) the Dunkl-Hardy spaces deduced by this geometry are same as those defined on spaces of homogeneous type; (3) many methods, such as, almost orthogonal estimates, Coifman’s approximation to the identity and the decomposition of the identity operator, Meyer’s commutation Lemma still can be applied to the Dunkl setting.

2. DUNKL-CALDERÓN-ZYGMUND SINGULAR INTEGRAL OPERATORS AND $T1$ THEOREM

2.1. Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund Singular Integral Operators.

We begin with the following proposition which is the motivation for introducing the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operators.

Proposition 2.1. Suppose that $S_t(x, y)$ satisfy the following conditions:

$$(i) \quad |S_t(x, y)| \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \frac{t}{t + \|x - y\|},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(ii)} \quad & |S_t(x, y) - S_t(x', y)| \\
& \lesssim \frac{\|x - x'\|}{t} \left(\frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, y, t + d(\mathbf{x}, y))} \frac{t}{t + \|\mathbf{x} - y\|} + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}', y, t + d(\mathbf{x}', y))} \frac{t}{t + \|\mathbf{x}' - y\|} \right), \\
\text{(iii)} \quad & |S_t(x, y) - S_t(x, y')| \\
& \lesssim \frac{\|y - y'\|}{t} \left(\frac{1}{V(x, \mathbf{y}, t + d(x, \mathbf{y}))} \frac{t}{t + \|x - \mathbf{y}\|} + \frac{1}{V(x, \mathbf{y}', t + d(x, \mathbf{y}'))} \frac{t}{t + \|x - \mathbf{y}'\|} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

then $K(x, y) = \int_0^\infty S_t(x, y) \frac{dt}{t}$ satisfies the following estimates: for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$,

$$(2.1) \quad |K(x, y)| \lesssim \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))};$$

$$(2.2) \quad |K(x, y) - K(x, y')| \lesssim \left(\frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \quad \text{for } \|y - y'\| \leq d(x, y)/2;$$

$$(2.3) \quad |K(x', y) - K(x, y)| \lesssim \left(\frac{\|x - x'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \quad \text{for } \|x - x'\| \leq d(x, y)/2.$$

Proof. We first verify (2.1). By the condition (i),

$$\begin{aligned}
|K(x, y)| & \lesssim \int_0^\infty |S_t(x, y)| \frac{dt}{t} = \int_0^{d(x, y)} \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \frac{t}{t + \|x - y\|} \frac{dt}{t} \\
& \quad + \int_{d(x, y)}^{\|x - y\|} \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \frac{t}{t + \|x - y\|} \frac{dt}{t} \\
& \quad + \int_{\|x - y\|}^\infty \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \frac{t}{t + \|x - y\|} \frac{dt}{t} \\
& =: I_1 + I_2 + I_3.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\omega(B(x, d(x, y))) \sim \omega(B(y, d(x, y))) \sim V(x, y, d(x, y))$, we obtain

$$I_1 \lesssim \frac{1}{\|x - y\|} \int_0^{d(x, y)} \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} dt \lesssim \frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}.$$

If $d(x, y) \leq t \leq \|x - y\|$, by using the reverse doubling condition on the measure ω , we get $V(x, y, t + d(x, y)) \geq \omega(B(x, t)) \geq C \left(\frac{t}{d(x, y)} \right)^N \omega(B(x, d(x, y)))$. Thus, we have

$$I_2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\|x - y\|} \int_{d(x, y)}^{\|x - y\|} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{t} \right)^N \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} dt.$$

Hence, if $N > 1$,

$$I_2 \lesssim \frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}.$$

If $N = 1$, then there exists $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ such that

$$I_2 \lesssim \frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|} \ln \left(\frac{\|x - y\|}{d(x, y)} \right) \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \lesssim \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}.$$

Again, by the reverse doubling property of the measure ω , we see that $V(x, y, d(x, y)) = V(x, y, \frac{d(x, y)}{t}t) \lesssim (\frac{d(x, y)}{t})^N V(x, y, t)$ for $d(x, y) \leq \|x - y\| \leq t < \infty$. Thus, I_3 can be estimated as follows

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &\lesssim \int_{\|x-y\|}^{\infty} \frac{1}{V(x, y, d(x, y))} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{t}\right)^N \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|x-y\|}\right)^N \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \\ &\lesssim \frac{d(x, y)}{\|x-y\|} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain that (2.1) holds.

To verify (2.2), we write

$$\begin{aligned} |K(x, y) - K(x, y')| &\lesssim \int_0^{\infty} |S_t(x, y) - S_t(x, y')| \frac{dt}{t} \\ &= \int_0^{\|y-y'\|} |S_t(x, y) - S_t(x, y')| \frac{dt}{t} + \int_{\|y-y'\|}^{\|x-y\|} |S_t(x, y) - S_t(x, y')| \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\quad + \int_{\|x-y\|}^{\infty} |S_t(x, y) - S_t(x, y')| \frac{dt}{t} \\ &=: II_1 + II_2 + II_3. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that when $d(y, y') \leq \|y - y'\| \leq \frac{1}{2}d(x, y) \leq \frac{1}{2}\|x - y\|$, $d(x, y) \sim d(x, y')$ and $\|x - y\| \sim \|x - y'\|$. Then applying condition (i), we get

$$\begin{aligned} II_1 &\lesssim \int_0^{\|y-y'\|} |S_t(x, y) - S_t(x, y')| \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\lesssim \int_0^{\|y-y'\|} \left\{ \frac{1}{V(x, \mathbf{y}, t + d(x, \mathbf{y}))} \frac{t}{t + \|x - \mathbf{y}\|} + \frac{1}{V(x, \mathbf{y}', t + d(x, \mathbf{y}'))} \frac{t}{t + \|x - \mathbf{y}'\|} \right\} \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying condition (iii) implies that for any fixed $0 < \varepsilon < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} II_2 &\lesssim \int_{\|y-y'\|}^{\|x-y\|} \frac{\|y - y'\|}{t} \left(\frac{1}{V(x, \mathbf{y}, t + d(x, \mathbf{y}))} \frac{t}{t + \|x - \mathbf{y}\|} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{V(x, \mathbf{y}', t + d(x, \mathbf{y}'))} \frac{t}{t + \|x - \mathbf{y}'\|} \right) \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|} \ln \left(\frac{\|x - y\|}{\|y - y'\|} \right) \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^{\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} II_3 &\lesssim \int_{\|x-y\|}^{\infty} \frac{\|y - y'\|}{t} \left(\frac{1}{V(x, \mathbf{y}, t + d(x, \mathbf{y}))} \frac{t}{t + \|x - \mathbf{y}\|} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{V(x, \mathbf{y}', t + d(x, \mathbf{y}'))} \frac{t}{t + \|x - \mathbf{y}'\|} \right) \frac{dt}{t} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \int_{\|x-y\|}^{\infty} \frac{\|y-y'\|}{t} \left(\frac{1}{V(x, \mathbf{y}, t+d(x, \mathbf{y}))} + \frac{1}{V(x, \mathbf{y}', t+d(x, \mathbf{y}'))} \right) \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\|y-y'\|}{\|x-y\|} \cdot \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}. \end{aligned}$$

The verification for (2.3) is similar and we omit the details here.
The proof of Proposition 2.1 is complete. \square

Before proving Theorem 1.3, we first give the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *For any $\varepsilon, t > 0, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, there exists a constant C depending on ε such that,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{\omega(x, t+d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon} d\omega(x) \leq C.$$

Proof. Let $S = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{\omega(x, t+d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon} d\omega(x)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} S &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{t2^{j-1} \leq d(x, y) < t2^j} \frac{1}{\omega(x, t+d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon} d\omega(x) \\ &\quad + \int_{d(x, y) < t} \frac{1}{\omega(x, t+d(x, y))} d\omega(x). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{d(x, y) < t} \frac{1}{\omega(x, t+d(x, y))} d\omega(x) &\lesssim \sum_{\sigma \in G} \int_{\|\sigma(y)-x\| < t} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, t))} d\omega(x) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\sigma \in G} \int_{\|\sigma(y)-x\| < t} \frac{1}{\omega(B(\sigma(y), t))} d\omega(x) \\ &\lesssim 1. \end{aligned}$$

And for $j \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{t2^{j-1} \leq d(x, y) < t2^j} \frac{1}{\omega(x, t+d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon} d\omega(x) \\ &\lesssim 2^{-j\varepsilon} \sum_{\sigma \in G} \int_{\|\sigma(y)-x\| < t2^j} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, t2^j))} d\omega(x) \\ &\lesssim 2^{-j\varepsilon} \sum_{\sigma \in G} \int_{\|\sigma(y)-x\| < t2^j} \frac{1}{\omega(B(\sigma(y), t2^j))} d\omega(x) \\ &\lesssim 2^{-j\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$S \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{-j\varepsilon} + 1 \lesssim 1.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.2. \square

We now show Theorem 1.3.

The proof of Theorem 1.3. To begin with, we first show the weak type (1,1) estimate. The idea is to apply the classical Calderón-Zygmund decomposition. To this end, let $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap L^1$ and let λ be a positive real number. Then there exist disjoint cubes Q_j and f can be written as the sum of a function $g \in L^1 \cap L^2$, and of a series of functions $\{b_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ such that each function b_j is contained in the corresponding cube Q_j . More precisely, $g(x) = f(x)$ if $x \notin \cup Q_j$, whereas $g(x) = |Q_j|^{-1} \int_{Q_j} f(x) d\omega(x)$ for $x \in Q_j$ and $b(x) = f(x) - g(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_j(x)$ where $b_j(x) = f(x) - |Q_j|^{-1} \int_{Q_j} f(x) d\omega(x)$ for $x \in Q_j$. It is easy to see that

$$(i) \quad f(x) = g(x) + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_j(x), x \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

$$(ii) \quad |g(x)| = |f(x)| \leq \lambda, \text{ for almost all } x \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} Q_j,$$

$$(iii) \quad |g(x)| \leq 2^N \lambda, \forall x \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} Q_j,$$

$$(iv) \quad \left| \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} Q_j \right| \leq \lambda^{-1} \|f\|_1,$$

$$(v) \quad \|g\|_2 \leq 2^N \lambda^{1/2} \|f\|_1^{1/2},$$

$$(vi) \quad \int_{Q_j} |b_j(x)| d\omega(x) \leq 2^{N+1} \lambda |Q_j|,$$

$$(vii) \quad \int_{Q_j} b_j(x) d\omega(x) = 0.$$

Let $\mathcal{O}(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} 4\sqrt{N}Q_j) = \{x : d(x, x_{Q_j}) \leq l(4\sqrt{N}Q_j), \text{ for each } j\}$ with x_{Q_j} , the center of Q_j and $l(4\sqrt{N}Q_j)$ the side length of $4\sqrt{N}Q_j$. Then

$$\omega(\mathcal{O}(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} 4\sqrt{N}Q_j)) \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |Q_j| \lesssim \lambda^{-1} \|f\|_1$$

and

$$\lambda |\{x \in \mathcal{O}(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} 4\sqrt{N}Q_j)^c : |Tb(x)| \geq \lambda\}| \leq \int_{\mathcal{O}(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} 4\sqrt{N}Q_j)^c} |Tb(x)| d\omega(x).$$

We estimate the last term above as follows. For $x \in \mathcal{O}(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} 4\sqrt{N}Q_j)^c$,

$$Tb_j(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y) b_j(y) d\omega(y) = \int_{Q_j} [K(x, y) - K(x, x_{Q_j})] b_j(y) d\omega(y),$$

where the cancellation condition of b_j is used.

Observe that if $x \in \mathcal{O}(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} 4\sqrt{N}Q_j)^c$, $y \in Q_j$ and y_j is the center of Q_j , then $d(x, y) \geq 2\|y - x_{Q_j}\|$ and hence, applying the smoothness condition of $K(x, y)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathcal{O}(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} 4\sqrt{N}Q_j)^c} |Tb_j(x)|d\omega(x) \\
& \lesssim \int_{\mathcal{O}(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} 4\sqrt{N}Q_j)^c} \int_{Q_j} \left(\frac{\|y - x_{Q_j}\|}{d(x, y)} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(x, d(x, y))} |b_j(y)|d\omega(y)d\omega(x) \\
& \lesssim \int_{Q_j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(\frac{\|y - x_{Q_j}\|}{\|y - x_{Q_j}\| + d(x, y)} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(x, \|y - x_{Q_j}\| + d(x, y))} d\omega(x) |b_j(y)|d\omega(y) \\
& \lesssim \int_{Q_j} |b_j(y)|d\omega(y) \\
& \lesssim 2^{N+1}\lambda|Q_j|,
\end{aligned}$$

where we applying the Lemma 2.2 in the second inequality and the property(vi) in the last inequality above. And hence, by (iv),

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} 4\sqrt{N}Q_j)^c} |Tb(x)|d\omega(x) \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda|Q_j| \lesssim \|f\|_1.$$

All these estimates together with the L^2 boundedness of T and (v) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega\left(\left\{x : |Tf(x)| \geq \lambda\right\}\right) & \lesssim \omega\left(\left\{x : |Tg(x)| \geq \frac{\lambda}{2}\right\}\right) + \omega\left(\left\{x : |Tb(x)| \geq \frac{\lambda}{2}\right\}\right) \\
& \lesssim \left(\frac{\|g\|_2}{\lambda}\right)^2 + \omega(\mathcal{O}(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} 4\sqrt{N}Q_j)) + \lambda^{-1} \int_{\mathcal{O}(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} 4\sqrt{N}Q_j)^c} |Tb(x)|d\omega(x) \\
& \lesssim \lambda^{-1}\|f\|_1,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that T is of weak type $(1,1)$.

By interpolation, T is bounded on L^p , $1 < p \leq 2$. The same proof applies to T^* gives the L^p , $1 < p \leq 2$ boundedness of T^* and then, by the duality, T is bounded on L^p , $2 \leq p < \infty$.

To show that T is bounded from $H_d^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ (introduced in [8]) to $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, we apply the the atomic decomposition of $H_d^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ provided in [21]. it suffices to show that if $a(x)$ is an atom, that is, a satisfies (i) support of a is contained in a cube Q in \mathbb{R}^N ; (ii) $\|a\|_2 \leq \omega(Q)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$; (iii) $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} a(x)d\omega(x) = 0$; then $\|T(a)\|_1 \leq C$, where the constant C is independent of a . To this end, let $B = \{x : d(x, x_Q) \leq 4\sqrt{N}l(Q)\}$, where x_Q is the center of Q and $l(Q)$ is the side length of Q . Write

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |T(a)(x)|d\omega(x) = \int_B |T(a)(x)|d\omega(x) + \int_{B^c} |T(a)(x)|d\omega(x).$$

The Hölder inequality, the L^2 boundedness of T , and the size condition of a imply that

$$\int_B |T(a)(x)|d\omega(x) \leq C\omega(B)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|a\|_2 \leq C\omega(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|a\|_2 \leq C.$$

If $x \in B^c$ and $y \in Q$, then $\|y - x_Q\| \leq \frac{1}{2}d(x, x_Q)$. By the cancellation condition of a and the smoothness condition of the kernel $K(x, y)$,

$$\begin{aligned} T(a)(x) &= \int_Q K(x, y)a(y)d\omega(y) = \int_Q [K(x, y) - K(x, x_Q)]a(y)d\omega(y) \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{l(Q)}{\|x - x_Q\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(x, d(x, x_Q))} \|a\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B^c} |T(a)(x)|d\omega(x) &\lesssim \int_{B^c} \left(\frac{l(Q)}{\|x - x_Q\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(x, d(x, x_Q))} \|a\|_1 d\omega(x) \\ &\lesssim \int_{d(x, x_Q) \geq l(Q)} \left(\frac{l(Q)}{d(x, x_Q)} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(x, d(x, x_Q))} d\omega(x) \\ &\lesssim 1, \end{aligned}$$

since $\|a\|_1 \leq C$ and hence, T is bounded from $H_d^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ to $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$.

We now prove the $L^\infty - BMO_d(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ boundedness of T . We first provide a strict definition of $Tf(x)$ when $f \in L^\infty$. To this end, we follow the idea given in [35]. If $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, we define the functions $f_j(x)$ by $f_j(x) = f(x)$, when $\|x\| \leq j$, and $f_j(x) = 0$, if $\|x\| > j$. Since $f_j \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $T(f_j)$ is well defined by the action of T on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. We claim that there exists a sequence $\{c_j\}_j$ of constants such that $T(f_j) - c_j$ converges, uniformly on any compact set in \mathbb{R}^N , to a function in $BMO_d(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ which will be defined by $T(f)$ modulo the constant functions. Indeed, set $c_j = \int_{1 \leq d(0, y) \leq j} K(0, y)d\omega(y)$. Observe that, by the size condition on the kernel $K(x, y)$,

$$\begin{aligned} c_j &\leq C \int_{1 \leq d(0, y) \leq j} \frac{1}{\omega(B(0, d(0, y)))} \left(\frac{d(0, y)}{\|y\|} \right)^\varepsilon d\omega(y) \\ &\leq C \frac{\omega(B(0, j))}{\omega(B(0, 1))} j^\varepsilon < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

To show $T(f_j) - c_j$ converges uniformly on the compact ball $B(0, R)$, we split f_j into $g + h_j$, where $g(x) = f(x)$, when $d(0, x) \leq 2R$, and $g(x) = 0$, if $d(0, x) > 2R$. Taking $j > 2R$, we have, for $\|x\| \leq R$,

$$\begin{aligned} T(f_j)(x) &= T(g)(x) + T(h_j)(x) = T(g)(x) + \int_{2R \leq d(0, y) \leq j} K(x, y)f(y)d\omega(y) \\ &= T(g)(x) + \int_{2R \leq d(0, y) \leq j} [K(x, y) - K(0, y)]f(y)d\omega(y) + c_j - C(R), \end{aligned}$$

where $C(R) = \int_{1 \leq d(0, y) \leq 2R} K(0, y)d\omega(y)$. Observe that when $\|x\| \leq R$, by the smoothness condition on the kernel $K(x, y)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{2R \leq d(0, y)} |K(x, y) - K(0, y)| \cdot |f(y)|d\omega(y) \\ &\leq C \int_{2R \leq d(0, y)} \frac{1}{\omega(B(0, d(0, y)))} \left(\frac{\|x\|}{\|y\|} \right)^\varepsilon d\omega(y) \|f\|_\infty \\ &\leq C \int_{2R \leq d(0, y)} \frac{1}{\omega(B(0, d(0, y)))} \left(\frac{R}{d(0, y)} \right)^\varepsilon d\omega(y) \|f\|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C\|f\|_\infty.$$

Thus the integral $\int_{2R \leq d(0,y) \leq j} |K(x,y) - K(0,y)| \cdot |f(y)| d\omega(y)$ converges uniformly on $\|x\| \leq R$ as j tends to ∞ , which implies that $T(f_j) - c_j$ converges uniformly on any compact set in \mathbb{R}^N . We remark that the smoothness condition on the kernel $K(x,y)$ can be replaced by

$$\int_{d(x,y) \geq 2\|x-x'\|} |K(x,y) - K(x',y)| d\omega(y) \leq C.$$

Once the $T(f)$ is defined with $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ by the above claim, we can show that $T(f) \in BMO_d(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and moreover, $\|T(f)\|_{BMO_d} \leq C\|f\|_\infty$. To this end, let B denote an arbitrary ball with center x_0 and radius R , and $\mathcal{O}_B = \{y : d(x_0, y) \leq 2R\}$. Then we write $f = f_1 + f_2$, where f_1 is the multiplication of f with the characteristic function of \mathcal{O}_B . We now define $T(f_2)(x)$ for $x \in B$ by the following absolutely convergent integral

$$T(f_2)(x) = \int_{d(x_0, y) \geq 2R} [K(x, y) - K(x_0, y)] f(y) d\omega(y).$$

Indeed, by the smoothness condition of T ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{d(x_0, y) \geq 2R} |K(x, y) - K(x_0, y)| \cdot |f(y)| d\omega(y) \\ & \leq C\|f\|_\infty \int_{d(x_0, y) \geq 2R} \frac{1}{\omega(x_0, d(y, x_0))} \left(\frac{R}{d(x_0, y)}\right)^\varepsilon d\omega(y) \\ & \leq C\|f\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since $f_1 \in L^\infty$ is supported in a bounded set \mathcal{O}_B , we see that $f_1 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. Hence $T(f_1)(x)$ is well-defined.

We can now give a strict definition of $T(f)(x)$ as follows: $T(f)(x) = T(f_1)(x) + T(f_2)(x)$. Further, this definition of $T(f)(x)$ is only differing by a constant, depending on x_0 and R . To see the proof that $T(f)$ belongs to $BMO_d(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, we have

$$\|T(f_2)\|_\infty \leq C\|f\|_\infty$$

and, further,

$$\|T(f_1)\|_2 \leq \|T\| \|f_1\|_2 \leq C\|f\|_\infty \omega(\mathcal{O}_B)^{1/2} \|T\|.$$

We thus get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_B \left| T(f)(x) - \frac{1}{\omega(B)} \int_B T(f)(y) d\omega(y) \right|^2 d\omega(x) \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq C\|f\|_\infty \omega(B)^{1/2} + C\omega(\mathcal{O}_B)^{1/2} \|f\|_\infty \|T\| \\ & \leq C'(\omega(B))^{1/2} \|f\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $\omega(\mathcal{O}_B) \sim \omega(B)$. The proof of Theorem 1.3 is complete. \square

2.2. Meyer's commutation Lemma.

Now we prove the Theorem 1.5. To this end, we first recall Meyer's commutation Lemma, which plays a fundamental role in the Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator theory. Given $\phi(x) \in C_0^\infty$ with $\text{supp } \phi \subseteq B(x_0, r), r > 0$. Let $\theta(x)$ be a function in $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with

$\theta(x) = 1$ if $|x| \leq 1$ and $\theta(x) = 0$ if $|x| > 2$, and $\eta_0(x) = \theta(\frac{|x-x_0|}{2r})$. Meyer's commutation Lemma is the following

Lemma 2.3. ([34]) *Suppose that T is a classical Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator with the kernel $K(x, y)$ satisfying the size and smoothness conditions. Moreover, T has the weak boundedness property and $T(1) = 0$. Then*

$$T(\phi)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y)[\phi(y) - \phi(x)]\eta_0(y)dy + \phi(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y)\eta_0(y)dy$$

with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y)[\phi(y) - \phi(x)]\eta_0(y)dy = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{|x-y| \geq \delta} K(x, y)[\phi(y) - \phi(x)]\eta_0(y)dy$, where the limit exists.

Applying this lemma, Meyer obtained the boundedness of Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operators on smooth molecule space. As a consequence, Meyer proved that all classical Calderón-Zygmund operators with the conditions $T(1) = T^*(1) = 0$ form an algebra. See [34] for more details.

In [13], David, Journé and Semmes stated Meyer's commutation Lemma as follows.

Lemma 2.4. ([13]) *Suppose that T is a continuous operator from $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ to $(C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N))'$ with the kernel $K(x, y)$ satisfying the size condition and T has the weak boundedness property. Then for all $f, g, h \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$,*

$$\langle f, T(gh) \rangle - \langle fg, T(h) \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(x)K(x, y)[g(y) - g(x)]h(y)dydx,$$

where the integral absolutely converges.

Using this lemma, they showed that if T has the weak boundedness property with $C_0^\eta(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $\eta > 0$, then T has the weak boundedness property with $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$. See [13] for more details.

In [31], Meyer's commutation Lemma was proved for spaces of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Weiss. More precisely, suppose that (X, ρ, μ) is a space of homogeneous type with the measure satisfying $\mu(B(x, r)) \sim r$ with $B(x, r) = \{y \in X : \rho(x, y) < r\}$ and $r > 0$. Let θ be the same as above and $\eta_0(x) = \theta(\frac{\rho(x_0, x)}{2r})$, $\eta_0 + \eta_1 = 1$. Then Meyer's commutation Lemma is given by

Lemma 2.5. ([31]) *Suppose that T is a classical Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator defined on space (X, d, μ) with the kernel $K(x, y)$ satisfying the size and smoothness conditions. Moreover, T has the strong-weak boundedness property and $T(1) = 0$. Then*

$$\langle T\phi, \psi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\{y: y \neq x\}} K(x, y) \left\{ [\phi(y) - \phi(x)]\eta_0(y) - \eta_1(y)\phi(x) \right\} d\mu(y)d\mu(x)$$

and

$$\langle K(x, y), [\phi(y) - \phi(x)]\eta_0(y) \rangle = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\rho(x, y) \geq \delta} K(x, y)[\phi(y) - \phi(x)]\eta_0(y)dy$$

where the limit exists.

Applying this lemma, the boundedness on the test function space for classical Calderón-Zygmund integral operators defined on space (X, ρ, μ) with the kernel $K(x, y)$ satisfying the size and smoothness conditions together with some additional second order smoothness and $T(1) = T^*(1) = 0$. And the Calderón reproducing formulae were established. See [31] for

more details. See also [30] for similar results on spaces of homogeneous type with the measure satisfying doubling and reverse doubling conditions.

To establish the $T1$ theorem for non-doubling measures, Tolsa introduced the following definition.

Definition 2.6. ([46]) Let T be an SCZO with the kernel $K(x, y)$. We say that T satisfies the commutation lemma of Meyer, and we write $T \in CLM$, if for compactly supported functions $\phi, \psi, w \in L^\infty(\mu)$, with ψ Lipschitz, the following identity holds:

$$\langle T\phi, \psi w \rangle - \langle T(\phi\psi), w \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y)(\psi(y) - \psi(x))\phi(x)w(y)d\mu(y)d\mu(x).$$

This definition plays a crucial role in the proof of the $T1$ theorem for non-doubling measures. See [46] for more details.

In this paper, we prove Meyer's commutation Lemma in the Dunkl setting as follows.

Lemma 2.7. (Meyer's commutation Lemma) *Suppose that T is a Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator from C_0^η to $(C_0^\eta)'$ satisfying $T \in WBP$ and $T(1) = 0$. Then for any $M > 1$, there exists a positive constant C_M depending on M such that*

$$\|T\phi\|_{L^\infty(B(0, Mr))} \leq C_M$$

whenever there exist $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $r > 0$ such that $\text{supp}(\phi) \subseteq B(x_0, r)$ with $\|\phi\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $\|\phi\|_\eta \leq r^{-\eta}$.

Proof. Fix a function $\theta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with the following properties: $\theta(x) = 1$ for $|x| \leq 1$ and $\theta(x) = 0$ for $|x| > 2$. Let $\chi_0(x) = \theta(\frac{d(x, x_0)}{2r})$ and $\chi_1 = 1 - \chi_0$. Then $\phi = \phi\chi_0$ and for all $\psi \in C_0^\eta(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\text{supp}\psi \subseteq B(x_0, Mr)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T\phi, \psi \rangle &= \langle K(x, y), \phi(y)\psi(x) \rangle = \langle K(x, y), \chi_0(y)\phi(y)\psi(x) \rangle \\ &= \langle K(x, y), \chi_0(y)[\phi(y) - \phi(x)]\psi(x) \rangle + \langle K(x, y), \chi_0(y)\phi(x)\psi(x) \rangle \\ &=: p + q, \end{aligned}$$

where $K(x, y)$ is the distribution kernel of T .

To estimate p , let $\lambda_\delta(x, y) = \theta(\frac{\|x-y\|}{\delta})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} p &= \langle K(x, y), (1 - \lambda_\delta(x, y))\chi_0(y)[\phi(y) - \phi(x)]\psi(x) \rangle \\ (2.4) \quad &+ \langle K(x, y), \lambda_\delta(x, y)\chi_0(y)[\phi(y) - \phi(x)]\psi(x) \rangle \\ &=: p_{1,\delta} + p_{2,\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Since K is locally integrable on $\Omega = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N : x \neq y\}$. By the size condition on $K(x, y)$ and the smoothness condition on ϕ together with the fact that if $\chi_0(y) \neq 0$, $\psi(x) \neq 0$ and $1 - \lambda_\delta(x, y) \neq 0$, then $\delta \leq \|x - y\|$ and $d(x, y) \leq (M + 4)r$. Thus, the first term on the right side of (2.4) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |p_{1,\delta}| &= \left| \iint_{\Omega} K(x, y)(1 - \lambda_\delta(x, y))\chi_0(y)[\phi(y) - \phi(x)]\psi(x)d\omega(y)d\omega(x) \right| \\ &\lesssim \iint_{d(x,y) \leq (M+4)r} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\eta \left(\frac{\|x - y\|}{r} \right)^\eta |\psi(x)|d\omega(y)d\omega(x) \\ &\lesssim \|\psi\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to show that $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} p_{2,\delta} = 0$, that is,

$$(2.5) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \langle K(x, y), \lambda_\delta(x, y) \chi_0(y) [\phi(y) - \phi(x)] \psi(x) \rangle = 0.$$

To this end, let $\{y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ be the maximal collection of points satisfying

$$(2.6) \quad \frac{1}{2}\delta < \inf_{j \neq k} \|y_j - y_k\| \leq \delta.$$

By observing that $\{y_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a maximal collection, we get that for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ there exists a point y_j such that $\|x - y_j\| \leq \delta$. Let $\eta_j(y) = \theta(\frac{\|y - y_j\|}{\delta})$ and $\bar{\eta}_j(y) = [\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \eta_i(y)]^{-1} \eta_j(y)$. To see that $\bar{\eta}_j$ is well defined, it suffices to show that for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, there are only finitely many η_j with $\eta_j(y) \neq 0$. This follows from the following fact: $\eta_j(y) \neq 0$ if and only if $\|y - y_j\| \leq 2\delta$ and hence this implies that $B(y_j, \delta) \subseteq B(y, 4\delta)$. Inequality (2.6) shows $B(y_j, \frac{\delta}{4}) \cap B(y_k, \frac{\delta}{4}) = \emptyset$ for $j \neq k$ and hence there are at most C_0 points $y_j \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $B(y_j, \frac{\delta}{4}) \subseteq B(y, 4\delta)$. Now let $\Gamma = \{j : \bar{\eta}_j(y) \chi_0(y) \neq 0\}$. Then $\#\Gamma \leq C r^N / \delta^N$ since $\text{supp}(\chi_0) \subseteq \bigcup_{\sigma \in G} B(\sigma(x_0), 2r)$ and $\text{supp}(\bar{\eta}_j) \subseteq B(y_j, 2\delta)$. We write

$$\lambda_\delta(x, y) \chi_0(y) [\phi(y) - \phi(x)] \psi(x) = \sum_{j \in \Gamma} \lambda_\delta(x, y) \bar{\eta}_j(y) \chi_0(y) [\phi(y) - \phi(x)] \psi(x),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle K(x, y), \lambda_\delta(x, y) \chi_0(y) [\phi(y) - \phi(x)] \psi(x) \rangle \\ &= \sum_{j \in \Gamma} \langle K(x, y), \lambda_\delta(x, y) \bar{\eta}_j(y) \chi_0(y) [\phi(y) - \phi(x)] \psi(x) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

It is then easy to check that $\text{supp}(\lambda_\delta(x, y) \bar{\eta}_j(y) \chi_0(y) [\phi(y) - \phi(x)] \psi(x)) \subseteq B(y_j, 4\delta) \times B(y_j, 2\delta)$ and

$$\|\lambda_\delta(x, y) \bar{\eta}_j(y) \chi_0(y) [\phi(y) - \phi(x)] \psi(x)\|_\infty \leq C \delta^\eta,$$

where C is a constant depending only on θ, ϕ, ψ, x_0 , and r but not on δ and j .

We claim that

$$(2.7) \quad \|\lambda_\delta(\cdot, y) \bar{\eta}_j(y) \chi_0(y) [\phi(y) - \phi(\cdot)] \psi(\cdot)\|_\eta \lesssim 1,$$

and

$$(2.8) \quad \|\lambda_\delta(x, \cdot) \bar{\eta}_j(\cdot) \chi_0(\cdot) [\phi(\cdot) - \phi(x)] \psi(x)\|_\eta \lesssim 1.$$

Assuming (2.7) and (2.8) for the moment, since $T \in WBP$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle K(x, y), \lambda_\delta(x, y) \chi_0(y) [\phi(y) - \phi(x)] \psi(x) \rangle| \\ & \leq \sum_{j \in \Gamma} |\langle K(x, y), \lambda_\delta(x, y) \bar{\eta}_j(y) \chi_0(y) [\phi(y) - \phi(x)] \psi(x) \rangle| \\ & \leq \sum_{j \in \Gamma} \omega(B(y_j, 4\delta)) \delta^\eta \lesssim \frac{r^N}{\delta^N} \sup_{j \in \Gamma} \omega(B(y_j, 1)) \delta^N \delta^\eta \lesssim \sup_{j \in \Gamma} \omega(B(y_j, 1)) r^N \delta^\eta. \end{aligned}$$

hence, (2.5) holds.

It remains to show (2.7) and (2.8). To check (2.7), it suffices to show that for given $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $\|x_1 - x_2\| \leq \delta$,

$$|\bar{\eta}_j(y) \chi_0(y) \|\lambda_\delta(\mathbf{x}_1, y) [\phi(y) - \phi(\mathbf{x}_1)] \psi(\mathbf{x}_1) - \lambda_\delta(\mathbf{x}_2, y) [\phi(y) - \phi(\mathbf{x}_2)] \psi(\mathbf{x}_2)\| \lesssim \|x_1 - x_2\|^\eta,$$

since if $\|x_1 - x_2\| \geq \delta$, then the expansion on the left above is clearly bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & |\bar{\eta}_j(y)\chi_0(y)|\{|\lambda_\delta(x_1, y)[\phi(y) - \phi(x_1)]\psi(x_1)| + |\lambda_\delta(x_2, y)[\phi(y) - \phi(x_2)]\psi(x_2)|\} \\ & \lesssim \delta^\eta \leq \|x_1 - x_2\|^\eta. \end{aligned}$$

By the construction of $\bar{\eta}_j$, it follows that

$$|\bar{\eta}_j(y)\chi_0(y)| \lesssim 1$$

for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & |\bar{\eta}_j(y)\chi_0(y)|\lambda_\delta(x_1, y)[\phi(y) - \phi(x_1)]\psi(x_1) - \lambda_\delta(x_2, y)[\phi(y) - \phi(x_2)]\psi(x_2)| \\ & \lesssim |\lambda_\delta(x_1, y)[\phi(y) - \phi(x_1)]\psi(x_1) - \lambda_\delta(x_2, y)[\phi(y) - \phi(x_2)]\psi(x_2)| \\ & \lesssim |\lambda_\delta(x_1, y) - \lambda_\delta(x_2, y)|[\phi(y) - \phi(x_1)]\psi(x_1)| + |\lambda_\delta(x_2, y)[\phi(x_1) - \phi(x_2)]\psi(x_1)| \\ & \quad + |\lambda_\delta(x_2, y)[\phi(y) - \phi(x_2)]\psi(x_1) - \psi(x_2)| \\ & =: I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\|x_1 - x_2\| \leq \delta$. If $\|x_1 - y\| > 4\delta$, then $\lambda_\delta(x_1, y) = \lambda_\delta(x_2, y) = 0$, so $I_1 = 0$. Thus we may assume that $\|x_1 - y\| \leq 4\delta$,

$$I_1 \lesssim \left| \frac{\|x_1 - y\|}{\delta} - \frac{\|x_2 - y\|}{\delta} \right| \|x_1 - y\|^\eta \lesssim \delta^{\eta-1} \|x_1 - x_2\| \lesssim \|x_1 - x_2\|^\eta,$$

since we may assume $\eta \leq 1$. Terms I_2 and I_3 are easy to estimate:

$$I_2 + I_3 \lesssim \|x_1 - x_2\|^\eta,$$

since we may assume that $\delta < 1$.

To check (2.8) it suffices to show that for $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $\|y_1 - y_2\| \leq \delta$,

$$|\lambda_\delta(x, \mathbf{y}_1)\bar{\eta}_j(\mathbf{y}_1)\chi_0(\mathbf{y}_1)[\phi(\mathbf{y}_1) - \phi(x)]\psi(x) - \lambda_\delta(x, \mathbf{y}_2)\bar{\eta}_j(\mathbf{y}_2)\chi_0(\mathbf{y}_2)[\phi(\mathbf{y}_2) - \phi(x)]\psi(x)| \lesssim |y_1 - y_2|^\eta.$$

Similarly, if $\|y_1 - y_2\| \geq \delta$, then the expansion on the left-hand side above is clearly bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & |\lambda_\delta(x, y_1)\bar{\eta}_j(y_1)\chi_0(y_1)[\phi(y_1) - \phi(x)]\psi(x)| + |\lambda_\delta(x, y_2)\bar{\eta}_j(y_2)\chi_0(y_2)[\phi(y_2) - \phi(x)]\psi(x)| \\ & \lesssim \delta^\eta \leq \|y_1 - y_2\|^\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, suppose $\|y_1 - y_2\| \leq \delta$ and write

$$\begin{aligned} & |\lambda_\delta(x, y_1)\bar{\eta}_j(y_1)\chi_0(y_1)[\phi(y_1) - \phi(x)]\psi(x) - \lambda_\delta(x, y_2)\bar{\eta}_j(y_2)\chi_0(y_2)[\phi(y_2) - \phi(x)]\psi(x)| \\ & \leq |\lambda_\delta(x, y_1) - \lambda_\delta(x, y_2)|\bar{\eta}_j(y_1)\chi_0(y_1)[\phi(y_1) - \phi(x)]\psi(x)| \\ & \quad + |\lambda_\delta(x, y_2)[\bar{\eta}_j(y_1) - \bar{\eta}_j(y_2)]\chi_0(y_1)[\phi(y_1) - \phi(x)]\psi(x)| \\ & \quad + |\lambda_\delta(x, y_2)\bar{\eta}_j(y_2)[\chi_0(y_1) - \chi_0(y_2)][\phi(y_1) - \phi(x)]\psi(x)| \\ & \quad + |\lambda_\delta(x, y_2)\bar{\eta}_j(y_2)\chi_0(y_2)[\phi(y_1) - \phi(y_2)]\psi(x)| \\ & =: II_1 + II_2 + II_3 + II_4. \end{aligned}$$

If $\|x - y_1\| > 4\delta$, then $\lambda_\delta(x, y_1) = \lambda_\delta(x, y_2) = 0$, so $II_1 = II_2 = II_3 = II_4 = 0$. Thus we may assume that $\|x - y_1\| \leq 4\delta$,

$$II_1 \lesssim \left| \frac{\|x - y_1\|}{\delta} - \frac{\|x - y_2\|}{\delta} \right| \|x - y_1\|^\eta \lesssim \delta^{\eta-1} \|y_1 - y_2\| \lesssim \|y_1 - y_2\|^\eta.$$

And

$$II_2 \lesssim \left| \frac{\|y_1 - y_j\|}{\delta} - \frac{\|y_2 - y_j\|}{\delta} \right| \|y_1 - x\|^\eta \lesssim \delta^{\eta-1} \|y_1 - y_2\| \lesssim \|y_1 - y_2\|^\eta.$$

Similarly,

$$II_3 \lesssim \left| \frac{d(y_1, x_0)}{\delta} - \frac{d(y_2, x_0)}{\delta} \right| \|y_1 - x\|^\eta \lesssim \delta^{\eta-1} d(y_1, y_2) \lesssim \delta^{\eta-1} \|y_1 - y_2\| \lesssim \|y_1 - y_2\|^\eta.$$

It is clear that

$$II_4 \lesssim \|y_1 - y_2\|^\eta.$$

This completes the proofs of (2.7) and (2.8) and we obtain

$$|p| \lesssim \|\psi\|_1.$$

To finish the proof of Lemma 2.7, we now estimate q . It suffices to show that for $x \in B(x_0, r)$,

$$(2.9) \quad |T\chi_0(x)| \lesssim 1.$$

To see this, it is easy to check that $q = \langle T\chi_0, \phi\psi \rangle$, and hence (2.9) implies

$$|q| \leq \|T\chi_0\|_{L^\infty(B(x_0, r))} \|\phi\psi\|_{L^1(B(x_0, r))} \lesssim \|\psi\|_1.$$

To show (2.9), let $\psi \in C^\eta(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\text{supp}(\psi) \subseteq B(x_0, r)$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \psi(x) d\omega(x) = 0$. By the facts that $T(1) = 0$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \psi(x) d\omega(x) = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle T\chi_0, \psi \rangle| &= |-\langle T\chi_1, \psi \rangle| \\ &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [K(x, y) - K(x_0, y)] \chi_1(y) \psi(x) d\omega(y) d\omega(x) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the supports of $\chi_1(y)$ and $\psi(x)$ imply $d(y, x_0) > 2r$ and $\|x - x_0\| \leq r$, respectively. The smoothness condition of K yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle T\chi_0, \psi \rangle| &\lesssim \iint_{d(y, x_0) > 2r \geq 2\|x - x_0\|} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(y, x_0)))} \left(\frac{\|x - x_0\|}{\|y - x_0\|} \right)^\varepsilon d\omega(y) |\psi(x)| d\omega(x) \\ &\lesssim \iint_{d(y, x_0) > 2r \geq 2\|x - x_0\|} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(y, x_0)))} \left(\frac{r}{d(y, x_0)} \right)^\varepsilon d\omega(y) |\psi(x)| d\omega(x) \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\psi(x)| d\omega(x). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $T\chi_0(x) = \alpha + \gamma(x)$ for $x \in B(x_0, r)$ with α is a constant depending on χ_0 and $\|\gamma(x)\|_\infty \leq C_0$ for some constant C_0 independent of χ_0 . To estimate α , choose $\varphi \in C_0^\eta(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\text{supp } \varphi \subseteq B(x_0, r)$, $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$, $\|\varphi\|_\eta \leq r^{-\eta}$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi(x) d\omega(x) = C_1 \omega(B(x_0, r))$, for some constant C_1 independent of r . We then use $T \in WBP$ to get

$$\left| C_1 \omega(B(x_0, r)) \alpha + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi(x) \gamma(x) d\omega(x) \right| = |\langle T\chi_0, \varphi \rangle| \leq C \omega(B(x_0, r)),$$

which implies $|\alpha| \leq C_0 + \frac{C}{C_1}$ and hence, the proof of Lemma 2.7 is complete. \square

We remark that if the operator T and functions ϕ, χ_0 satisfy the conditions as given in the Lemma 2.7, then $T\phi(x)$ is a locally bounded function rather than a distribution. This fact will play a crucial role in the following proof of Theorem 1.5.

2.3. Boundedness of Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operators on smooth molecule functions.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Suppose that $f(x)$ is a smooth molecule in $\mathbb{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0)$, we will show that $\|T(f)\|_{\tilde{\mathbb{M}}(\beta, \gamma', r, x_0)} \leq C\|f\|_{\mathbb{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0)}$, where $0 < \beta < \varepsilon, 0 < \gamma < \gamma' < \varepsilon$ and ε is the exponent of the regularity of the kernel of T . We first estimate the size condition for $Tf(x)$. To this end, we consider two cases: Case (1): $d(x, x_0) \leq 5r$ and Case (2): $d(x, x_0) = R > 5r$.

For the first case, set $1 = \xi(y) + \eta(y)$, where $\xi(y) = \theta\left(\frac{d(y, x_0)}{10r}\right)$ with $\theta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}), \theta(x) = 1$ for $\|x\| \leq 1$ and $\theta(x) = 0$ for $\|x\| \geq 2$. Applying the Lemma 2.7, we write

$$\begin{aligned} Tf(x) &= \langle K(x, y), (\xi(y) + \eta(y))f(y) \rangle \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y)\xi(y)(f(y) - f(x))d\omega(y) + f(x)\langle K(x, y), \xi(y) \rangle \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y)\eta(y)f(y)d\omega(y) \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the size condition for the kernel $K(x, y)$ in (1.14) and the smoothness condition for f in (1.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1| &\lesssim \int_{d(x, y) \leq 20r} |K(x, y)| \cdot |f(y) - f(x)| d\omega(y) \\ &\lesssim \int_{d(x, y) \leq 20r} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|}\right)^\beta \left(\frac{\|x - y\|}{r}\right)^\beta \left\{ \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{y}, x_0, r + d(\mathbf{y}, x_0))} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \left(\frac{r}{r + \|\mathbf{y} - x_0\|}\right)^\gamma + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, x_0, r + d(\mathbf{x}, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + \|\mathbf{x} - x_0\|}\right)^\gamma \right\} d\omega(y). \end{aligned}$$

Note that if $d(y, x) \leq 20r$ and $d(x, x_0) \leq 5r$, then $\omega(B(y, r + d(x, x_0))) \sim \omega(B(x, r + d(x, x_0)))$. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1| &\lesssim \frac{1}{r^\beta} \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \int_{d(x, y) \leq 20r} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} d(x, y)^\beta d\omega(y) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)}\right)^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of (2.9) in Lemma 2.7, we can get $|T(\xi)(x)| \lesssim 1$ and thus

$$I_2 \lesssim |f(x)| \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)}\right)^\gamma.$$

For the last term I_3 , observing that $d(x, x_0) \leq 5r$ and the support of $\eta(y)$ is contained in $\{y \mid d(y, x_0) \geq 10r\}$, so $d(x, y) \geq 5r$ and $d(x, y) \sim d(y, x_0)$, and thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |I_3| &\lesssim \int_{\substack{d(y, x_0) \geq 10r \\ d(x, y) \geq 5r}} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \frac{1}{V(y, x_0, r + d(y, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + \|y - x_0\|} \right)^\gamma d\omega(y) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, r))} \int_{d(y, x_0) \geq 10r} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x_0, d(y, x_0)))} \left(\frac{r}{d(y, x_0)} \right)^\gamma d\omega(y) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, r))} \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)} \right)^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2. $d(x, x_0) = R > 5r$.

Set $1 = I(y) + J(y) + L(y)$, where $I(y) = \theta\left(\frac{16d(y, x)}{R}\right)$, $J(y) = \theta\left(\frac{16d(y, x_0)}{R}\right)$ and $f_1(y) = I(y)f(y)$, $f_2(y) = J(y)f(y)$ and $f_3(y) = L(y)f(y)$.

Observing that, if y is in the support of $f_1(y)$, then $d(y, x_0) \sim d(x, x_0) = R$, and thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad |f_1(y)| &\lesssim |I(y)| \frac{1}{V(y, x_0, r + d(y, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + \|y - x_0\|} \right)^\gamma \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, R)} \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^\gamma. \\ \text{(ii)} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |f_1(y)| d\omega(y) &\lesssim \int_{d(y, x_0) \geq \frac{7R}{8}} \frac{1}{V(y, x_0, d(y, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{d(y, x_0)} \right)^\gamma d\omega(y) \lesssim \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^\gamma. \\ \text{(iii)} \quad |f_1(y) - f_1(x)| &\lesssim \left(\frac{\|y - x\|}{r} \right)^\beta \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^\gamma. \\ \text{(iv)} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |f_3(y)| \omega(y) dy &\lesssim \int_{d(y, x_0) \geq \frac{R}{16}} \frac{1}{V(y, x_0, r + d(y, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{d(y, x_0)} \right)^\gamma d\omega(y) \lesssim \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

By the fact $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(y) d\omega(y) = 0$, we have

$$\text{(v)} \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f_2(y) d\omega(y) \right| = \left| - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f_1(y) d\omega(y) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f_3(y) d\omega(y) \right| \lesssim \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^\gamma.$$

We first estimate $Tf_1(x)$ as follows.

Set $u(y) = \theta\left(\frac{2d(y, x)}{R}\right)$. Then $f_1(y) = u(y)f_1(y)$. By using Lemma 2.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Tf_1(x) &= \langle K(x, y)u(y)f_1(y) \rangle \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y)u(y)[f_1(y) - f_1(x)] d\omega(y) + f_1(x) \langle K(x, \cdot), u(\cdot) \rangle \\ &=: I + II. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of (2.9) in Lemma 2.7, we can get $|T(u)(x)| \lesssim 1$ and thus

$$|II| \lesssim |f(x)| \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)} \right)^\gamma.$$

For the term I , we write it in two parts.

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \int_{d(x, y) \leq r} K(x, y)u(y)[f_1(y) - f_1(x)] d\omega(y) + \int_{r < d(x, y) \leq R} K(x, y)u(y)[f_1(y) - f_1(x)] d\omega(y) \\ &=: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the size condition on the kernel $K(x, y)$ and the property (iii) above implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1| &\lesssim \int_{d(x,y) \leq r} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\beta \left(\frac{\|x - y\|}{r} \right)^\beta \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^\gamma d\omega(y) \\ &= \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^\gamma \int_{d(x,y) \leq r} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{r} \right)^\beta d\omega(y) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)} \right)^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the size conditions for the kernel $K(x, y)$ and property (i) above, we obtain that for $\delta = \gamma - \gamma'$,

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2| &\lesssim \int_{r < d(x,y) \leq \frac{R}{4}} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|y - x\|} \right)^\delta [|f_1(y)| + |f_1(x)|] d\omega(y) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^\gamma \left(\frac{1}{r} \right)^\delta \int_{d(x,y) \leq \frac{R}{4}} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} d(x, y)^\delta d\omega(y) \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{R}{r} \right)^\delta \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^\gamma \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, d(x, x_0))} \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)} \right)^{\gamma'}. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate $Tf_2(x)$, we decompose it in two parts.

$$Tf_2(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [K(x, y) - K(x, x_0)] f_2(y) d\omega(y) dy + K(x, x_0) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f_2(y) d\omega(y) =: II_1 + II_2.$$

By the estimate in (v) above,

$$|II_2| \lesssim |K(x, x_0)| \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^\gamma \lesssim \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, x_0)))} \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^\gamma \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)} \right)^\gamma.$$

For the term II_1 , we write it by

$$\begin{aligned} II_1 &= \left(\int_{\|y - x_0\| \leq \frac{R}{4}} + \int_{d(y, x_0) \leq \frac{R}{4} \leq \|y - x_0\|} \right) [K(x, y) - K(x, x_0)] f_2(y) d\omega(y) \\ &=: II_{11} + II_{12}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the size condition for f_2 and the smoothness condition on the kernel $K(x, y)$ in (2.2) with $\|y - x_0\| \leq \frac{1}{2}d(x, x_0)$ for term II_{11} implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |II_{11}| &\lesssim \int_{d(y, x_0) \leq \frac{R}{8}} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, x_0)))} \left(\frac{\|y - x_0\|}{\|x - x_0\|} \right)^{\gamma'} \left(\frac{r}{r + \|y - x_0\|} \right)^\gamma \frac{1}{V(y, x_0, r + d(y, x_0))} d\omega(y) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, x_0)))} \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^{\gamma'} \int_{d(y, x_0) \leq \frac{R}{8}} \left(\frac{r}{r + \|y - x_0\|} \right)^{\gamma - \gamma'} \frac{1}{V(y, x_0, r + d(y, x_0))} d\omega(y) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)} \right)^{\gamma'}. \end{aligned}$$

For the term II_{12} , since $d(y, x_0) \leq \frac{R}{4}$ implies $d(x, y) \geq d(x, x_0) - d(y, x_0) \geq \frac{3}{4}d(x, x_0)$. Applying the size conditions for the kernel $K(x, y)$ and $K(x, x_0)$ yields

$$|II_{12}| \lesssim \int_{d(y, x_0) \leq \frac{R}{4} \leq \|y - x_0\|} \left\{ \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} + \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, x_0)))} \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \times \left(\frac{r}{r + \|y - x_0\|} \right)^\gamma \frac{1}{V(y, x_0, r + d(y, x_0))} d\omega(y) \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, x_0)))} \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^{\gamma'} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(y, x_0)} \right)^{\gamma - \gamma'} \frac{1}{V(y, x_0, r + d(y, x_0))} d\omega(y) \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)} \right)^{\gamma'}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
|Tf_3(y)| & \lesssim \int_{\substack{d(y, x) \geq \frac{R}{16}, \\ d(y, x_0) \geq \frac{R}{16}}} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \left(\frac{r}{r + \|y - x_0\|} \right)^\gamma \frac{1}{V(y, x_0, d(y, x_0))} d\omega(y) \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, x_0)))} \int_{d(y, x_0) \geq \frac{R}{16}} \left(\frac{r}{d(y, x_0)} \right)^\gamma \frac{1}{V(y, x_0, d(y, x_0))} d\omega(y) \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, x_0)))} \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^\gamma \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)} \right)^\gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to show the regularity of $T(f)$, that is the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}
|Tf(x) - Tf(x')| & \lesssim \left(\frac{\|x - x'\|}{r} \right)^\beta \left\{ \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, x_0, r + d(\mathbf{x}, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(\mathbf{x}, x_0)} \right)^{\gamma'} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}', x_0, r + d(\mathbf{x}', x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(\mathbf{x}', x_0)} \right)^{\gamma'} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Observing that we only need to consider the case where $\|x - x'\| \leq \frac{1}{20}r$. Indeed, if $\|x - x'\| \geq \frac{1}{20}r$, by the size estimate of $T(f)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|Tf(x) - Tf(x')| & \leq |Tf(x)| + |Tf(x')| \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, x_0, r + d(\mathbf{x}, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(\mathbf{x}, x_0)} \right)^{\gamma'} \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}', x_0, r + d(\mathbf{x}', x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(\mathbf{x}', x_0)} \right)^{\gamma'},
\end{aligned}$$

which gives the desired regularity estimate of $T(f)$.

Set $\|x - x'\| = \delta \leq \frac{1}{20}r$. We will consider it in the following two cases: $d(x, x_0) = R \geq 10r$ and $d(x, x_0) < 10r$.

Case (1): $d(x, x_0) = R \geq 10r$. Let $I(y) = \theta\left(\frac{8d(y, x)}{R}\right)$, $J(y) = 1 - I(y)$. Denote $f_1(y) = I(y)f(y)$, $f_2(y) = J(y)f(y)$. Write

$$\begin{aligned}
Tf_1(x) & = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y)u(y)[f_1(y) - f_1(x)]d\omega(y) \\
& \quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y)v(y)f_1(y)d\omega(y) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y)u(y)f_1(x)d\omega(y),
\end{aligned}$$

where $u(y) = \theta\left(\frac{d(y, x)}{2\delta}\right)$ and $v(y) = 1 - u(y)$.

Let $p(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y)u(y)[f_1(y) - f_1(x)]d\omega(y)$ and $q(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y)v(y)f_1(y)d\omega(y) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y)u(y)f_1(x)d\omega(y)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|p(x)| &\lesssim \int_{d(x, y) \leq 4\delta} |K(x, y)| \cdot |f_1(y) - f_1(x)| d\omega(y) \\
&\lesssim \int_{d(x, y) \leq 4\delta} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(y, x)))} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|}\right)^\beta \left(\frac{\|x - y\|}{r}\right)^\beta \\
&\quad \times \left\{ \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{y}, x_0, r + d(\mathbf{y}, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(\mathbf{y}, x_0)}\right)^\gamma + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, x_0, r + d(\mathbf{x}, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(\mathbf{x}, x_0)}\right)^\gamma \right\} d\omega(y) \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{r^\beta} \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)}\right)^\gamma \int_{d(x, y) \leq 4\delta} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(y, x)))} (d(x, y))^\beta d\omega(y) \\
&\lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{r}\right)^\beta \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)}\right)^\gamma,
\end{aligned}$$

since $d(y, x) \leq \frac{1}{4}R$ and $d(x, x_0) = R$, so $d(y, x_0) \sim d(x, x_0)$.

If replacing x by x' , we still have

$$|p(x')| \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{r}\right)^\beta \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)}\right)^\gamma \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))}.$$

Therefore,

$$|p(x) - p(x')| \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{r}\right)^\beta \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)}\right)^\gamma \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))}.$$

Observing that by $T(1) = 0$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
q(x) - q(x') &= \int_{d(x, y) \geq 2\delta} [K(x, y) - K(x', y)]v(y)[f_1(y) - f_1(x)]d\omega(y) \\
&\quad + [f_1(x) - f_1(x')] \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x', y)u(y)d\omega(y) =: I + II.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of (2.9) in Lemma 2.7, we can get $|T(u)(x')| \lesssim 1$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
II &\lesssim |f_1(x) - f_1(x')| \\
&\lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{r}\right)^\beta \left\{ \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, x_0, r + d(\mathbf{x}, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(\mathbf{x}, x_0)}\right)^\gamma \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}', x_0, r + d(\mathbf{x}', x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(\mathbf{x}', x_0)}\right)^\gamma \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

For term I, applying the smoothness condition of $K(x, y)$ with $\|x - x'\| = \delta \leq \frac{1}{2}d(x, y)$ and the smoothness condition for f_1 implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
|I| &\lesssim \int_{d(x, y) \geq 2\delta} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(y, x)))} \left(\frac{\|x - x'\|}{\|x - y\|}\right)^\varepsilon \left(\frac{\|y - x\|}{r}\right)^\beta \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^\gamma d\omega(y) \\
&\lesssim \frac{\delta^\varepsilon}{r^\beta} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)}\right)^\gamma \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \int_{d(x, y) \geq 2\delta} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(y, x)))} \frac{1}{(d(x, y))^{\varepsilon - \beta}} d\omega(y) \\
&\lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{r}\right)^\beta \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)}\right)^\gamma,
\end{aligned}$$

since $d(y, x_0) \sim d(x, x_0)$. The estimates of I and II gives the desired estimate for $Tf_1(x) - Tf_1(x')$.

To see the estimate for $Tf_2(x) - Tf_2(x')$, note that if $f_2(y) \neq 0$, then $d(x, y) \geq \frac{1}{8}R \geq 2\|x - x'\|$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |Tf_2(x) - Tf_2(x')| \\
& \leq \int_{d(y,x) \geq \frac{3}{4}R \geq 2\delta} |K(x, y) - K(x', y)| \cdot |f_2(y)| d\omega(y) \\
& \lesssim \int_{d(y,x) \geq \frac{3}{4}R} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(y, x)))} \left(\frac{\|x - x'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{V(y, x_0, r + d(y, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(y, x_0)} \right)^\gamma d\omega(y) \\
& \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{R} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, x_0)))} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{V(y, x_0, r + d(y, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(y, x_0)} \right)^\gamma d\omega(y) \\
& \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{r} \right)^\varepsilon \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, x_0)))} \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{r} \right)^\beta \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)} \right)^\gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

Cases 2: $d(x, x_0) < 10r$. The proof of this case is easier. Indeed, set $1 = \xi(y) + \eta(y)$, where $\xi(y) = \theta\left(\frac{d(y, x)}{5\delta}\right)$ and again write $Tf(x) = p(x) + q(x)$, where $p(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y)[f(y) - f(x)]\xi(y)d\omega(y)$ and

$$q(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y)f(y)\eta(y)d\omega(y) + f(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x, y)\xi(y)d\omega(y).$$

Applying the size condition for $K(x, y)$ and the smoothness condition for f implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
|p(x)| & \lesssim \int_{d(x,y) \leq 10\delta} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\beta \left(\frac{\|x - y\|}{r} \right)^\beta \\
& \quad \times \left\{ \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{y}, x_0, r + d(\mathbf{y}, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + \|\mathbf{y} - x_0\|} \right)^\gamma \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, x_0, r + d(\mathbf{x}, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + \|\mathbf{x} - x_0\|} \right)^\gamma \right\} d\omega(y) \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{r^\beta} \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r)} \int_{d(x,y) \leq 10\delta} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} (d(x, y))^\beta d\omega(y) \\
& \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{r} \right)^\beta \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)} \right)^\gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

Repeating the same proof implies that

$$|p(x')| \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{r} \right)^\beta \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)} \right)^\gamma.$$

Similarly, by $T(1) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& q(x) - q(x') \\
& = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [K(x, y) - K(x', y)]\eta(y)[f(y) - f(x)]d\omega(y) + [f(x) - f(x')] \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(x', y)\xi(y)d\omega(y) \\
& := I + II.
\end{aligned}$$

Observing that if $d(y, x) \geq 5\delta$, then $|K(x, y) - K(x', y)| \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{\|x-y\|}\right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(y, x)))}$ and

$$|f(y) - f(x)| \lesssim \left(\frac{\|x-y\|}{r}\right)^\beta \left\{ \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{y}, x_0, r + d(\mathbf{y}, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + \|\mathbf{y} - x_0\|}\right)^\gamma + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, x_0, r + d(\mathbf{x}, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + \|\mathbf{x} - x_0\|}\right)^\gamma \right\}.$$

Note that $r + d(x, x_0) \lesssim r + d(y, x_0)$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} |I| &\lesssim \frac{\delta^\varepsilon}{r^\beta} \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \int_{d(y, x) \geq 5\delta} \frac{1}{d(y, x)^{\varepsilon-\beta}} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(y, x)))} d\omega(y) \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{r}\right)^\beta \frac{1}{V(x, x_0, r + d(x, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(x, x_0)}\right)^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of (2.9) in Lemma 2.7, we can get $|T(\xi)(x')| \lesssim 1$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} |II| &\lesssim |f(x) - f(x')| \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{r}\right)^\beta \left\{ \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, x_0, r + d(\mathbf{x}, x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(\mathbf{x}, x_0)}\right)^\gamma + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}', x_0, r + d(\mathbf{x}', x_0))} \left(\frac{r}{r + d(\mathbf{x}', x_0)}\right)^\gamma \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The fact that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} T(f)(x) d\omega(x) = 0$ follows from $T^*(1) = 0$.

The proof of Theorem 1.5 is complete. \square

2.4. Proof of $T1$ Theorem.

To show Theorem 1.8, the $T1$ theorem, observe that the necessary conditions of the $T1$ theorem follow from Theorem 1.3, namely $T(1), T^*(1) \in BMO_d(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and $T \in WBP$ by the definition of the weak boundedness of property.

To show the sufficient conditions of Theorem 1.8, we need to apply Coifman's approximation to the identity. For this purpose, we first extend T to a continuous linear operator from $\Lambda^s \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ into $(C_0^s)'$ where $\Lambda^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ denotes the closure of $C_0^\eta(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_s, 0 < s < \eta$. To be precise, given $g \in C_0^s, 0 < s < 1$, with the support contained in a ball $B(x_0, r)$, and set $\theta \in C_0^s$ with $\theta(x) = 1$ for $d(x, x_0) \leq 2r$ and $\theta(x) = 0$ for $d(x, x_0) \geq 4r$. Given $f \in \Lambda^s \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, we write

$$\langle Tf, g \rangle = \langle T(\theta f), g \rangle + \langle T((1 - \theta)f), g \rangle.$$

The first term makes sense since $\theta f \in C_0^s$. To see that the second term is also well defined, by the size condition of $K(x, y)$ and the fact $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ together with the doubling and the reverse doubling conditions of the measure ω , we first write

$$\langle T((1 - \theta)f), g \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g(x) \int_{\{y: d(x, y) > r\}} K(x, y)(1 - \theta(y))f(y) d\omega(y) d\omega(x).$$

By Hölder's inequality,

$$\left| \int_{\{y: d(x, y) > r\}} K(x, y)(1 - \theta(y))f(y) d\omega(y) \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim \|f\|_2 \left(\int_{\{y: d(x,y) > r\}} |K(x,y)|^2 d\omega(y) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\lesssim \|f\|_2 \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{\{2^j r \leq d(x,y) \leq 2^{j+1} r\}} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x,y)))^2} d\omega(y) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\lesssim \|f\|_2 \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{\{2^j r \leq d(x,y) \leq 2^{j+1} r\}} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, 2^j r))^2} d\omega(y) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\lesssim \|f\|_2 \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{-jN} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, r))} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&< \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $\inf_x \omega(B(x, r)) > 0$.

This implies that $\langle T((1-\theta)f), g \rangle$ is well defined. Moreover, this extension is independent of the choice of θ .

We now describe the properties of Coifman's approximation to the identity acting on $\Lambda^s \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. Let's begin with considering $(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$ as space of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Weiss. Note that the measure ω satisfies the doubling and the reverse doubling properties. Therefore, in this case, the Littlewood-Paley theory has already established in [30]. We recall main results for $(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$. Here and throughout, $V_k(x)$ always denotes the measure $\omega(B(x, r^{-k}))$ for $r > 1, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. We also denote by $V(x, y) = \omega(B(x, \|x-y\|))$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

Let $\theta : \mathbb{R} \mapsto [0, 1]$ be a smooth function which is 1 for $\|x\| \leq r$ and vanishes for $\|x\| \geq 2r$ with some fixed $r > 1$. Applying the construction of Coifman's approximation to the identity, we define

$$T_k(f)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \theta(r^k \|x-y\|) f(y) d\omega(y), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Then

$$T_k(1)(x) \leq \int_{\|x-y\| \leq 2r^{-k}} d\omega(y) \leq C\omega(B(x, r^{-k})).$$

Conversely,

$$T_k(1)(x) \geq \int_{\|x-y\| < r^{-k}} d\omega(y) = \omega(B(x, r^{-k})).$$

Hence, $T_k(1)(x) \sim \omega(B(x, r^{-k})) = V_k(x)$. It is easy to check $V_k(x) \sim V_k(y)$ whenever $\|x-y\| \leq r^{5-k}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
T_k \left(\frac{1}{T_k(1)} \right) (x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \theta(r^k \|x-y\|) \frac{1}{T_k(1)(y)} d\omega(y) \\
&\sim \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \theta(r^k \|x-y\|) \frac{1}{V_k(y)} d\omega(y) \\
&\sim \frac{1}{V_k(x)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \theta(r^k \|x-y\|) d\omega(y) \\
&= \frac{1}{V_k(x)} T_k(1)(x) \sim 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Let M_k be the operator of multiplication by $M_k(x) := \frac{1}{T_k(1)(x)}$ and let W_k be the operator of multiplication by $W_k(x) := [T_k(\frac{1}{T_k(1)})(x)]^{-1}$. Coifman's approximation to the identity is constructed by $S_k = M_k T_k W_k T_k M_k$, where the kernel of S_k is

$$S_k(x, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} M_k(x) \theta(r^k \|x - z\|) W_k(z) \theta(r^k \|z - y\|) M_k(y) d\omega(z).$$

In [30], it was proved that kernels $S_k(x, y)$ defined on $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$ satisfy the following properties.

- (i) $S_k(x, y) = S_k(y, x)$;
- (ii) $S_k(x, y) = 0$ if $\|x - y\| > r^{4-k}$ and $|S_k(x, y)| \leq \frac{C}{V_k(x) + V_k(y)}$;
- (iii) $|S_k(x, y) - S_k(x', y)| \leq C \frac{r^k \|x - x'\|}{V_k(x) + V_k(y)}$ for $\|x - x'\| \leq r^{8-k}$;
- (iv) $|S_k(x, y) - S_k(x, y')| \leq C \frac{r^k \|y - y'\|}{V_k(x) + V_k(y)}$ for $\|y - y'\| \leq r^{8-k}$;
- (v) $|[S_k(x, y) - S_k(x', y)] - [S_k(x, y') - S_k(x', y')]| \leq C \frac{r^k \|x - x'\| r^k \|y - y'\|}{V_k(x) + V_k(y)}$
for $\|x - x'\| \leq r^{8-k}$ and $\|y - y'\| \leq r^{8-k}$;
- (vi) $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} S_k(x, y) d\omega(x) = 1$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$;
- (vii) $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} S_k(x, y) d\omega(y) = 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

Coifman's decomposition of the identity on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ is given as follows. Let $D_k := S_k - S_{k-1}$. The identity operator I on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ can be written as

$$I = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} D_k = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} D_k D_j = T_M + R_M,$$

where $T_M = \sum_{\{j, k \in \mathbb{Z}: |k-j| \leq M\}} D_k D_j = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} D_k D_k^M$ with $D_k^M = \sum_{\{j \in \mathbb{Z}: |j| \leq M\}} D_{k+j}$ and $R_M = \sum_{\{j, k \in \mathbb{Z}: |k-j| > M\}} D_k D_j$. It is known, see [30], that there exists a constant C such that

$$(2.10) \quad |D_j D_k(x, y)| \leq C r^{-|j-k|} \frac{1}{V_{j \wedge k}(x) + V_{j \wedge k}(y)},$$

where $j \wedge k = \min\{j, k\}$.

This estimate implies

$$\|D_j D_k\|_{L^2(\omega) \rightarrow L^2(\omega)} \lesssim r^{-|j-k|}.$$

By the Cotlar-Stein Lemma we obtain

$$\|R_M(f)\|_{L^2(\omega)} \leq C r^{-M} \|f\|_{L^2(\omega)}$$

and then for a fixed large M , T_M^{-1} , the inverse of T_M , is bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. This yields that T_M converges to the identity in the L^2 norm and moreover,

$$I = T_M^{-1} T_M = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} T_M^{-1} D_k^M D_k = T_M T_M^{-1} = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} D_k^M D_k T_M^{-1} \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega).$$

The following lemma describes the properties of operators T_M acting on Λ^s .

Lemma 2.8. *Suppose $0 < s < \frac{1}{2}$. Then*

- (i) $T_M = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} D_k D_k^M$ converges uniformly and in the norm of Λ^s ,
- (ii) T_M is bounded on Λ^s ,
- (iii) $\|T_M - I\|_s \rightarrow 0$ as $M \rightarrow +\infty$.

To prove Lemma 2.8, we need the following estimates for D_k and D_k^M .

Lemma 2.9. *Let $0 < s < 1$. Then*

- (i) $\|D_k f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim r^{-ks} \|f\|_s$,
- (ii) $\|D_k f\|_s \lesssim r^{ks} \|f\|_{L^\infty}$,
- (iii) $\|D_k f\|_\beta \lesssim r^{k(\beta-s)} \|f\|_s$ if $0 < s \leq \beta < 1$,
- (iv) $\|D_k^M f\|_s \lesssim M \|f\|_s$.

Proof. For (i), the cancellations of D_k gives

$$D_k f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} D_k(x, y) [f(y) - f(x)] d\omega(y).$$

Since $D_k(x, y) = 0$ for $\|x - y\| \geq r^{4-k}$, the size condition of D_k and the smoothness condition of f yield

$$\begin{aligned} |D_k f(x)| &\lesssim \|f\|_s \int_{\|x-y\| \leq r^{4-k}} \frac{1}{V_k(x) + V_k(y)} \|x - y\|^s d\omega(y) \\ &\lesssim r^{-ks} \|f\|_s. \end{aligned}$$

For (ii), the smoothness condition of D_k gives

$$\begin{aligned} |D_k f(x) - D_k f(y)| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (D_k(x, z) - D_k(y, z)) f(z) d\omega(z) \right| \\ &\leq \|f\|_{L^\infty} \left(\int_{\|x-z\| \leq r^{4-k}} + \int_{\|y-z\| \leq r^{4-k}} \right) \frac{(r^k \|x - y\|)^s}{V_k(x) + V_k(z)} d\omega(z), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\|D_k f\|_s \lesssim r^{ks} \|f\|_\infty.$$

To estimate (iii), if $\|x - y\| \leq r^{6-k}$, using the the cancellations of D_k and the smoothness condition of f , we get

$$\begin{aligned} |D_k f(x) - D_k f(y)| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [D_k(x, z) - D_k(y, z)] f(z) d\omega(z) \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [D_k(x, z) - D_k(y, z)] [f(z) - f(x)] d\omega(z) \right| \\ &\lesssim \left(\int_{\|x-z\| \leq r^{4-k}} + \int_{\|y-z\| \leq r^{4-k}} \right) \frac{(r^k \|x - y\|)^\beta}{V_k(x) + V_k(z)} \|x - z\|^s \|f\|_s d\omega(z) \\ &\lesssim \|x - y\|^\beta r^{k(\beta-s)} \|f\|_s. \end{aligned}$$

When $\|x - y\| > r^{6-k}$, (i) gives

$$|D_k f(x) - D_k f(y)| \lesssim r^{-ks} \|f\|_s \lesssim \|x - y\|^\beta r^{k(\beta-s)} \|f\|_s.$$

(iii) follows from these estimates. The estimate of (iv) follows from (iii) with $\beta = s$. \square

We now show Lemma 2.8.

Proof of Lemma 2.8. We first show that $T_M(f)(x) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} D_k D_k^M(f)(x)$ is well defined on $\Lambda_s(\mathbb{R}^N)$. To this end, let $f \in C_0^\eta$ with $\eta > s$ and set $G_k f(x) := D_k D_k^M f(x)$. Observe that if $f \in C_0^\eta$ then $f \in L^\infty$ and hence, $\|D_k^M(f)\|_1 \leq CM\|f\|_\infty$. By (iv), $\|D_k^M(f)\|_\eta \lesssim M\|f\|_\eta$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |G_k(f)(x)| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} D_k(x, y) D_k^M(f)(y) d\omega(y) \right| \leq C \frac{1}{V_k(x)} \|f\|_\infty \\ &\lesssim r^k \frac{1}{V_0(x)} \|f\|_\infty \lesssim r^k \|f\|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

since $\inf_x V_0(x) \geq C > 0$. And

$$\begin{aligned} |G_k(f)(x)| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} D_k(x, y) D_k^M(f)(y) d\omega(y) \right| = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} D_k(x, y) [D_k^M(f)(y) - D_k^M(f)(x)] d\omega(y) \right| \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_\eta \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |D_k(x, y)| \|x - y\|^\eta d\omega(y) \lesssim r^{-k\eta} \|f\|_\eta. \end{aligned}$$

These two estimates imply that if $f \in C_0^\eta$ then the series $\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} D_k D_k^M(f)(x)$ converges uniformly. Moreover, for given $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, choose $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $r^{-k_0} \leq \|x - y\| \leq r^{-k_0+1}$. Then Lemma 2.9 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (2.11) \quad \left| \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} [G_k f(x) - G_k f(y)] \right| &\leq \sum_{k \geq k_0} |G_k f(x) - G_k f(y)| + \sum_{k < k_0} |G_k f(x) - G_k f(y)| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k \geq k_0} 2\|G_k f\|_{L^\infty} + \sum_{k < k_0} \|x - y\|^\beta r^{k(\beta-s)} \|f\|_s \\ &\lesssim r^{-k_0 s} \|f\|_s + r^{k_0(\beta-s)} \|x - y\|^\beta \|f\|_s \\ &\lesssim \|x - y\|^s \|f\|_s. \end{aligned}$$

Hence if $f \in C_0^\eta$ with $\eta > s$, then the series $\sum_k D_k D_k^M f$ converges in Λ^s norm. Observe that C_0^η with $\eta > s$ is dense in Λ^s . This implies that T_M extends to Λ^s . Indeed, if $f \in \Lambda^s$, then there exists a sequence $f_n \in C_0^\eta, \eta > s$, such that $\|f_n - f\|_s$ tends to zero as n tends to ∞ . Let $T_M(f)(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_M(f_n)(x)$. Then T_M is bounded on Λ^s and moreover, $\|T_M(f)\|_s \lesssim \|f\|_s$ for $f \in \Lambda^s$.

To show $\|T_M - I\|_s \rightarrow 0$ as $M \rightarrow +\infty$, it is sufficient to prove $\|R_M\|_{s,s} \rightarrow 0$ as $M \rightarrow +\infty$. To this end, we rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} R_M f &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{\{j \in \mathbb{Z}: |k-j| > M\}} D_k D_j = \sum_{\{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}: |\ell| > M\}} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} D_k D_{k+\ell} f \\ &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} D_k (I - S_{k+M}) f + \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} D_k S_{k-M-1} f. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} S_k(x, y) d\omega(y) = 1$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$|(I - S_{k+M})f(x)| = |f(x) - S_{k+M}f(x)|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} S_{k+M}(x, y)[f(x) - f(y)]d\omega(y) \right| \\
&\leq Cr^{-(M+k)s} \|f\|_s
\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\|(I - S_{k+M})f\|_{L^\infty} \leq Cr^{-(M+k)s} \|f\|_s.$$

The above estimate together with Lemma 2.9 and applying the same proof for (2.11) imply that $\left\| \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} D_k(I - S_{k+M})f \right\|_s \leq r^{-Ms} \|f\|_s$, which gives $\left\| \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} D_k(I - S_{k+M}) \right\|_{s,s} \rightarrow 0$ as $M \rightarrow +\infty$.

To estimate $\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} D_k S_{k-M-1}f$, the second term of $R_M f$, let $H_k f = D_k S_{k-M-1}f$ and denote $H_k(x, y)$ by the kernel of H_k . Then $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} H_k(x, y)d\omega(y) = D_k S_{k-M-1}(1) = D_k(1) = 0$ and $H_k(x, y) = 0$ if $\|x - y\| \geq r^{6-(k-M)}$. By the cancellation of D_k and the smoothness of S_{k-M-1} ,

$$\begin{aligned}
|H_k(x, y)| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} D_k(x, z)[S_{k-M-1}(z, y) - S_{k-M-1}(x, y)]d\omega(z) \right| \\
&\leq C \int_{|x-z| \leq r^{2-k}} (V_k(x))^{-1} \frac{r^{k-M-1}\|x-z\|}{V_{k-M-1}(x)} d\omega(z) \\
&\leq Cr^{-M} (V_{k-M-1}(x))^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for $f \in \Lambda^s$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|H_k f(x)| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} H_k(x, y)[f(y) - f(x)]d\omega(y) \right| \\
&\leq C \int_{|x-y| \leq r^{6-(k-M)}} r^{-M} (V_{k-M-1}(x))^{-1} \|x-y\|^s \|f\|_s d\omega(y) \\
&\leq Cr^{-M} r^{-(k-M)s} \|f\|_s.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$(2.12) \quad \|H_k f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim r^{-M} r^{-(k-M)s} \|f\|_s.$$

If $\|x - x'\| \leq r^{6-(k-M)}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&|H_k(x, y) - H_k(x', y)| \\
&= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [D_k(x, z) - D_k(x', z)] S_{k-M-1}(z, y) d\omega(z) \right| \\
(2.13) \quad &\leq C \int_{\{\|x-z\| \leq r^{2-k} \text{ or } \|x'-z\| \leq r^{2-k}\}} \frac{r^k \|x-x'\|}{V_k(x) + V_k(z)} (V_{k-M-1}(y))^{-1} d\omega(z) \\
&\leq Cr^k \|x-x'\| (V_{k-M-1}(y))^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

For $\|x - y\| \leq r^{6-(k-M)}$, applying (2.13) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&|H_k f(x) - H_k f(y)| \\
&= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [H_k(x, z) - H_k(y, z)] f(z) d\omega(z) \right|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [H_k(x, z) - H_k(y, z)][f(z) - f(x)]d\omega(z) \right| \\
&\lesssim \int_{\{\|x-z\| \leq r^{6-(k-M)} \text{ or } \|y-z\| \leq r^{6-(k-M)}\}} r^k \|x-y\| (V_{k-M-1}(y))^{-1} \|x-z\|^s \|f\|_s d\omega(z) \\
&\lesssim r^k r^{-(k-M)s} \|x-y\| \|f\|_s.
\end{aligned}$$

For $\|x-y\| > r^{6-(k-M)}$, the estimate (2.12) implies

$$|H_k f(x) - H_k f(y)| \lesssim r^{-M} r^{-(k-M)s} \|f\|_s \lesssim r^k r^{-(k-M)s} \|x-y\| \|f\|_s.$$

These estimates imply that $H_k(f)(x)$ is a Lipschitz function with the Lipschitz norm bounded by

$$(2.14) \quad \|H_k f\|_{Lip} \lesssim r^k r^{-(k-M)s} \|f\|_s.$$

Using the fact that $\|f\|_\beta \leq \|f\|_\infty^{1-\beta} \|f\|_{Lip}^\beta$, $0 < \beta < 1$, the estimates (2.12) and (2.14) yield

$$(2.15) \quad \|H_k f\|_\beta \lesssim r^{-M(1-2\beta)} r^{-(k-M)(s-\beta)} \|f\|_s.$$

Given $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, choose $k_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $r^{-k_1} \leq \|x-y\| \leq r^{-k_1+1}$. The estimates in (2.12) and (2.15) imply that for $s < \beta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} [H_k f(x) - H_k f(y)] \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{\{k:k \geq k_1\}} |H_k f(x) - H_k f(y)| + \sum_{\{k:k < k_1\}} |H_k f(x) - H_k f(y)| \\
&\lesssim \sum_{\{k:k \geq k_1\}} 2\|H_k f\|_{L^\infty} + \sum_{\{k:k < k_1\}} \|x-y\|^\beta \|H_k f\|_\beta \\
&\lesssim \sum_{\{k:k \geq k_1\}} r^{-M} r^{-(k-M)s} \|f\|_s + \sum_{\{k:k < k_1\}} \|x-y\|^\beta r^{-M(1-2\beta)} r^{-(k-M)(s-\beta)} \|f\|_s \\
&\lesssim r^{-k_1 s} r^{-M+Ms} \|f\|_s + r^{-M(1-2\beta)} r^{M(s-\beta)} r^{k_1(\beta-s)} \|x-y\|^\beta \|f\|_s \\
&\lesssim r^{-M(1-2\beta)} \left(r^{M(s-2\beta)} + r^{M(s-\beta)} \right) \|x-y\|^s \|f\|_s \\
&\lesssim r^{-M(1-2\beta)} \|x-y\|^s \|f\|_s.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} H_k f \right\|_s \lesssim r^{-M(1-2\beta)} \|f\|_s \quad \text{for } s < \beta < 1.$$

If $s < \frac{1}{2}$, we can choose β so that $r^{-M(1-2\beta)} \rightarrow 0$ as $M \rightarrow +\infty$. The proof of Lemma 2.8 is finished. \square

We are now ready to give the proof of sufficient conditions of the $T1$ theorem under the assumptions that $T(1) = T^*(1) = 0$. Notice that T_M converges strongly on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ since, by the almost orthogonal estimates and the Cotlar-Stein Lemma,

$$\sup_{L_1, L_2} \left\| \sum_{k=L_1}^{L_2} D_k D_k^M \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)} < +\infty.$$

Thus, by Lemma 2.8, T_M converges strongly on $\Lambda^s \cap L^2$.

It is clear that $\Lambda^s \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ is dense in L^2 . To prove the sufficient condition of Theorem 1.8, it suffices to show that

$$|\langle g_0, T f_0 \rangle| \leq C \|g_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)} \|f_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)}$$

for any $g_0, f_0 \in \Lambda^s \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ with compact supports. For given $f_0 \in \Lambda^s \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ with compact support, by Lemma 2.8, set $f_1 = T_M^{-1} f_0 \in \Lambda^s \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and let

$$U_{L_1, L_2} = \sum_{k=L_1}^{L_2} D_k D_k^M.$$

By Lemma 2.8, $\lim_{\substack{L_1 \rightarrow -\infty \\ L_2 \rightarrow +\infty}} U_{L_1, L_2} f_1 = f_0$ in $\Lambda^s \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. Observe that operator T extends to a continuous linear operator from $\Lambda^s \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ into $(C_0^s)'$. Hence, for each $g_0 \in \Lambda^s \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ with compact support,

$$\langle g_0, T f_0 \rangle = \lim_{\substack{L_1 \rightarrow -\infty \\ L_2 \rightarrow +\infty}} \langle g_0, T U_{L_1, L_2} f_1 \rangle.$$

Similarly, let $g_1 = T_M^{-1} g_0$. Then $g_1 \in \Lambda^s \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and $\lim_{\substack{L'_1 \rightarrow -\infty \\ L'_2 \rightarrow +\infty}} U_{L'_1, L'_2} g_1 = g_0$ in $\Lambda^s \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. Thus,

$$\langle g_0, T f_0 \rangle = \lim_{\substack{L_1 \rightarrow -\infty \\ L_2 \rightarrow +\infty}} \lim_{\substack{L'_1 \rightarrow -\infty \\ L'_2 \rightarrow +\infty}} \langle U_{L'_1, L'_2} g_1, T U_{L_1, L_2} f_1 \rangle.$$

Observe that

$$\langle U_{L'_1, L'_2} g_1, T U_{L_1, L_2} f_1 \rangle = \sum_{k=L_1}^{L_2} \sum_{k'=L'_1}^{L'_2} \langle D_{k'}^M g_1, D_k^* T D_k D_k^M f_1 \rangle.$$

The following almost orthogonal estimate is crucial.

Lemma 2.10. *Let T be a Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral satisfying $T(1) = T^*(1) = 0$ and $T \in WBP$. Then*

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} D_k(x, u) K(u, v) D_j(v, y) d\omega(u) d\omega(v) \right| \lesssim r^{-|k-j|\varepsilon'} \frac{1}{V(x, y, r^{(-j) \vee (-k)} + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{r^{(-j) \vee (-k)}}{r^{(-j) \vee (-k)} + d(x, y)} \right)^\gamma$$

where $\gamma, \varepsilon' \in (0, \varepsilon)$ and ε is the regularity exponent of the kernel of T given in (1.12) and (1.13), $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$.

Assuming the Lemma 2.10 for the moment, then

$$\|D_k^* T D_{k'}\|_{L^2(\omega) \rightarrow L^2(\omega)} \lesssim 2^{-|k-k'|}.$$

Applying the Cotlar-Stein lemma yields

$$|\langle U_{L_1, L_2} g_1, T U_{L'_1, L'_2} f_1 \rangle| \lesssim \|f_1\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)} \|g_1\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)} \lesssim \|f_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)} \|g_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)}$$

for all L_1, L_2, L'_1 and L'_2 . Hence,

$$|\langle g_0, T f_0 \rangle| \leq C \|g_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)} \|f_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)}.$$

The proof of Theorem 1.8 with the assumptions $T(1) = T^*(1) = 0$ is complete.

To show the Lemma 2.10, we need the following lemma, which will be used to establish the discrete weak-type Calderón reproducing formula and the boundedness of the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operators on the Dunkl-Hardy spaces.

Lemma 2.11. *Let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\varepsilon_0, t, s > 0$ with $t \geq s$. Suppose that $f_t(x, \cdot)$ is a weak smooth molecule function in $\widetilde{\mathbb{M}}(\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0, t, x)$ and $g_s(\cdot, y)$ is a smooth molecule function in $\mathbb{M}(\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0, s, y)$. Then for any $0 < \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 < \varepsilon_0$, there exists $C > 0$ depending on $\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$, such that for all $t \geq s > 0$,*

$$(2.16) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f_t(x, u) g_s(u, y) d\omega(u) \leq C \left(\frac{s}{t} \right)^{\varepsilon_1} \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon_2}.$$

If $f_t(x, \cdot)$ and $g_s(\cdot, y)$ both are smooth molecule functions in $\mathbb{M}(\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0, t, x)$ and $\mathbb{M}(\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0, s, y)$, respectively, then for any $0 < \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 < \varepsilon_0$, there exists $C > 0$ depending on $\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$, such that for all $t, s > 0$,

$$(2.17) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f_t(x, u) g_s(u, y) d\omega(u) \leq C \left(\frac{s}{t} \wedge \frac{t}{s} \right)^{\varepsilon_1} \frac{1}{V(x, y, (t \vee s) + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t \vee s}{(t \vee s) + \|x - y\|} \right)^{\varepsilon_2},$$

where $a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$ and $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$.

Before proving the above lemma, we first give the following lemma.

Lemma 2.12. *For any $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, t, s > 0$, Let*

$$T = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{V(x, z, t + d(x, z))} \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, z)} \right)^{\varepsilon_1} \frac{1}{V(z, y, s + d(z, y))} \left(\frac{s}{s + d(z, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon_2} d\omega(z),$$

then there exists a constant C depending on $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$ such that,

$$T \leq \frac{C}{V(x, y, (t \vee s) + d(x, y))}.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume $t \geq s$. We just need to show that

$$T \leq \frac{C}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))}.$$

Case 1: $d(x, y) \leq t$,

$$\begin{aligned} T &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{V(x, z, t)} \frac{1}{V(z, y, s + d(z, y))} \left(\frac{s}{s + d(z, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon_2} d\omega(z) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, t))} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{V(z, y, s + d(z, y))} \left(\frac{s}{s + d(z, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon_2} d\omega(z). \end{aligned}$$

By the condition $d(x, y) \leq t$ and Lemma 2.2, we have

$$T \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))}.$$

Case 2: $d(x, y) \geq t$, since $d(x, z) + d(y, z) \geq d(x, y)$, we have

$$T \leq \int_{d(x, z) \geq \frac{1}{2}d(x, y)} \frac{1}{V(x, z, t + d(x, z))} \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, z)} \right)^{\varepsilon_1} \frac{1}{V(z, y, s + d(z, y))} \left(\frac{s}{s + d(z, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon_2} d\omega(z)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_{d(y,z) \geq \frac{1}{2}d(x,y)} \frac{1}{V(x,z,t+d(x,z))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x,z)} \right)^{\varepsilon_1} \frac{1}{V(z,y,s+d(z,y))} \left(\frac{s}{s+d(z,y)} \right)^{\varepsilon_2} d\omega(z) \\
& =: T_1 + T_2.
\end{aligned}$$

For term T_1 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T_1 & \lesssim \int_{d(x,z) \geq \frac{1}{2}d(x,y)} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x,t+d(x,y)))} \frac{1}{V(z,y,s+d(z,y))} \left(\frac{s}{s+d(z,y)} \right)^{\varepsilon_2} d\omega(z) \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x,y,t+d(x,y))} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{V(z,y,s+d(z,y))} \left(\frac{s}{s+d(z,y)} \right)^{\varepsilon_2} d\omega(z).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.2, we have

$$T_1 \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x,y,t+d(x,y))}.$$

For term T_2 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2 & \lesssim \int_{d(y,z) \geq \frac{1}{2}d(x,y)} \frac{1}{V(x,z,t+d(x,z))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x,z)} \right)^{\varepsilon_1} \frac{1}{\omega(B(y,d(x,y)))} d\omega(z) \\
& = \frac{1}{\omega(B(y,d(x,y)))} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{V(x,z,t+d(x,z))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x,z)} \right)^{\varepsilon_1} d\omega(z).
\end{aligned}$$

By the condition $d(x,y) \geq t$ and Lemma 2.2, we have

$$T_2 \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x,y,d(x,y))} \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x,y,t+d(x,y))}.$$

This complete the proof of the Lemma 2.12. \square

Now we prove the Lemma 2.11.

Proof. We begin with the estimate (2.16). Let $\varepsilon = \max\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}$, then we just need to show that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f_t(x,u)g_s(u,y)d\omega(u) \leq C \left(\frac{s}{t} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{V(x,y,t+d(x,y))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x,y)} \right)^\varepsilon, \quad \text{for } t \geq s.$$

we write

$$S = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f_t(x,u)g_s(u,y)d\omega(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(f_t(x,u) - f_t(x,y) \right) g_s(u,y)d\omega(u).$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
|S| & \leq \int_{\|u-y\| \leq t} |f_t(x,u) - f_t(x,y)| \cdot |g_s(u,y)| d\omega(u) \\
& \quad + \int_{\|u-y\| > t} (|f_t(x,u)| + |f_t(x,y)|) \cdot |g_s(u,y)| d\omega(u) \\
& =: I + II,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I & \lesssim \int_{\|u-y\| \leq t} \left(\frac{\|u-y\|}{t} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} \left(\frac{1}{V(x,\mathbf{u},t+d(x,\mathbf{u}))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x,\mathbf{u})} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{1}{V(x,\mathbf{y},t+d(x,\mathbf{y}))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x,\mathbf{y})} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} \right) \times \frac{1}{V(u,y,s+d(u,y))} \left(\frac{s}{s+\|u-y\|} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} d\omega(u)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} II &\lesssim \int_{\|u-y\|>t} \left(\frac{1}{V(x, \mathbf{u}, t+d(x, \mathbf{u}))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x, \mathbf{u})} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} + \frac{1}{V(x, \mathbf{y}, t+d(x, \mathbf{y}))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x, \mathbf{y})} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} \right) \\ &\quad \times \frac{1}{V(u, y, s+d(u, y))} \left(\frac{s}{s+\|u-y\|} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} d\omega(u). \end{aligned}$$

For term I, since $\|u-y\| \leq t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\|u-y\|}{t} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} \left(\frac{s}{s+\|u-y\|} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} &\leq \left(\frac{\|u-y\|}{t} \right)^{\varepsilon} \left(\frac{s}{\|u-y\|} \right)^{\varepsilon} \left(\frac{s}{s+\|u-y\|} \right)^{\varepsilon_0-\varepsilon} \\ &= \left(\frac{s}{t} \right)^{\varepsilon} \left(\frac{s}{s+\|u-y\|} \right)^{\varepsilon_0-\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} I &\lesssim \left(\frac{s}{t} \right)^{\varepsilon} \int_{\|u-y\|\leq t} \left(\frac{1}{V(x, \mathbf{u}, t+d(x, \mathbf{u}))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x, \mathbf{u})} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} + \frac{1}{V(x, \mathbf{y}, t+d(x, \mathbf{y}))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x, \mathbf{y})} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} \right) \\ &\quad \times \frac{1}{V(u, y, s+d(u, y))} \left(\frac{s}{s+\|u-y\|} \right)^{\varepsilon_0-\varepsilon} d\omega(u). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$I_1 = \int_{\|u-y\|\leq t} \frac{1}{V(x, u, t+d(x, u))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x, u)} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} \frac{1}{V(u, y, s+d(u, y))} \left(\frac{s}{s+\|u-y\|} \right)^{\varepsilon_0-\varepsilon} d\omega(u)$$

and

$$I_2 = \int_{\|u-y\|\leq t} \frac{1}{V(x, y, t+d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} \frac{1}{V(u, y, s+d(u, y))} \left(\frac{s}{s+\|u-y\|} \right)^{\varepsilon_0-\varepsilon} d\omega(u),$$

then $I \lesssim \left(\frac{s}{t} \right)^{\varepsilon} \cdot (I_1 + I_2)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq \frac{1}{V(x, y, t+d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{V(u, y, s+d(u, y))} \left(\frac{s}{s+d(u, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon_0-\varepsilon} d\omega(u) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, y, t+d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

where we apply Lemma 2.2 in the last inequality above.

Note that

$$I_1 \leq \int_{d(u, y) \leq t} \frac{1}{V(x, u, t+d(x, u))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x, u)} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} \frac{1}{V(u, y, s+d(u, y))} \left(\frac{s}{s+d(u, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon_0-\varepsilon} d\omega(u).$$

We will discuss it in the following two cases: $d(x, y) \leq 2t$ and $d(x, y) > 2t$.

Case 1: $d(x, y) \leq 2t$, applying the Lemma 2.12, we have

$$I_1 \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, y, t+d(x, y))} \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, y, t+d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon}.$$

Case 2: $d(x, y) > 2t$, by $d(u, y) \leq t < \frac{1}{2}d(x, y)$ and $d(x, u) + d(y, u) \geq d(x, y)$, we obtain $d(x, u) \geq \frac{1}{2}d(x, y)$. And hence,

$$I_1 \leq \int_{d(u, y) \leq t} \frac{1}{V(x, u, t+d(x, u))} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x, u)} \right)^{\varepsilon} \left(\frac{t}{t+d(x, u)} \right)^{\varepsilon_0-\varepsilon}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \times \frac{1}{V(u, y, s + d(u, y))} \left(\frac{s}{s + d(u, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon} d\omega(u) \\
& \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{V(x, u, t + d(x, u))} \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, y)} \right)^\varepsilon \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, u)} \right)^{\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon} \\
& \quad \times \frac{1}{V(u, y, s + d(u, y))} \left(\frac{s}{s + d(u, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon} d\omega(u) \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, y)} \right)^\varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

where we apply the Lemma 2.12 in the last inequality above.

Therefore

$$I \lesssim \left(\frac{s}{t} \right)^\varepsilon \cdot (I_1 + I_2) \lesssim \left(\frac{s}{t} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, y)} \right)^\varepsilon.$$

For term II , Let

$$II_1 = \int_{\|u-y\|>t} \frac{1}{V(x, u, t + d(x, u))} \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, u)} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} \frac{1}{V(u, y, s + d(u, y))} \left(\frac{s}{s + \|u-y\|} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} d\omega(u)$$

and

$$II_2 = \int_{\|u-y\|>t} \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} \frac{1}{V(u, y, s + d(u, y))} \left(\frac{s}{s + \|u-y\|} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} d\omega(u)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
II_2 &= \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} \int_{\|u-y\|>t} \frac{1}{V(u, y, s + d(u, y))} \\
& \quad \times \left(\frac{s}{s + \|u-y\|} \right)^{\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon} \left(\frac{s}{s + \|u-y\|} \right)^\varepsilon d\omega(u) \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, y)} \right)^\varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{V(u, y, s + d(u, y))} \\
& \quad \times \left(\frac{s}{s + d(u, y)} \right)^{\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon} \left(\frac{s}{t} \right)^\varepsilon d\omega(u) \\
& \lesssim \left(\frac{s}{t} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, y)} \right)^\varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

where we apply the Lemma 2.2 in the last inequality above.

For term II_1 , since $d(x, u) + d(y, u) \geq d(x, y)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
II_1 &\leq \int_{\substack{d(x,u) \geq \frac{1}{2}d(x,y) \\ \|u-y\|>t}} \frac{1}{V(x, u, t + d(x, u))} \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, u)} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} \frac{1}{V(u, y, s + d(u, y))} \left(\frac{s}{s + \|u-y\|} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} d\omega(u) \\
& \quad + \int_{\substack{d(y,u) \geq \frac{1}{2}d(x,y) \\ \|u-y\|>t}} \frac{1}{V(x, u, t + d(x, u))} \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, u)} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} \frac{1}{V(u, y, s + d(u, y))} \left(\frac{s}{s + \|u-y\|} \right)^{\varepsilon_0} d\omega(u) \\
& =: II_{11} + II_{12}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$II_{11} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{V(x, u, t + d(x, u))} \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, y)} \right)^\varepsilon \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, u)} \right)^{\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \times \frac{1}{V(u, y, s + d(u, y))} \left(\frac{s}{t}\right)^\varepsilon \left(\frac{s}{s + d(u, y)}\right)^{\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon} d\omega(u) \\ & \lesssim \left(\frac{s}{t}\right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, y)}\right)^\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where we apply Lemma 2.12 in the last inequality above. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} II_{12} &= \int_{\substack{d(y, u) \geq \frac{1}{2}d(x, y) \\ \|u - y\| > t}} \frac{1}{V(x, u, t + d(x, u))} \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, u)}\right)^{\varepsilon_0} \\ & \quad \times \frac{1}{V(u, y, s + d(u, y))} \left(\frac{s}{s + \|u - y\|}\right)^\varepsilon \left(\frac{s}{s + \|u - y\|}\right)^{\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon} d\omega(u). \end{aligned}$$

Since $d(y, u) \geq \frac{1}{2}d(x, y)$ and $\|u - y\| > t$, we have $\|u - y\| \geq \frac{1}{2}(t + \|u - y\|) \geq \frac{1}{2}(t + d(u, y)) \geq \frac{1}{4}(t + d(x, y))$.

Therefore

$$\left(\frac{s}{s + \|u - y\|}\right)^\varepsilon \lesssim \left(\frac{s}{t + d(x, y)}\right)^\varepsilon = \left(\frac{s}{t}\right)^\varepsilon \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, y)}\right)^\varepsilon,$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} II_{12} &\lesssim \left(\frac{s}{t}\right)^\varepsilon \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, y)}\right)^\varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{V(x, u, t + d(x, u))} \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, u)}\right)^{\varepsilon_0} \\ & \quad \times \frac{1}{V(u, y, s + d(u, y))} \left(\frac{s}{s + d(u, y)}\right)^{\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon} d\omega(u) \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{s}{t}\right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t + d(x, y)}\right)^\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where we apply the Lemma 2.12 in the last inequality above. This completes the proof of the estimate (2.16). The proof of the estimate (2.17) is almost the same. To be precise, replacing $d(x, u)$ by $\|x - u\|$ for all fractions $\frac{t}{t + d(x, u)}$ and $d(x, y)$ by $\|x - y\|$ for all fractions $\frac{t}{t + d(x, y)}$, respectively, yields the proof of the estimate (2.17). We leave the details to the reader. \square

We point out that the estimate (2.16) of Lemma 2.11 will be used for the proof of Lemma 2.10 and while the estimate (2.17) will be needed for establishing the weak-type discrete Calderón reproducing formula in next **Section**.

We return to the proof of Lemma 2.10, that is, we show that if T is a Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral satisfying $T(1) = T^*(1) = 0$ and $T \in WBP$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} D_k(x, u) K(u, v) D_j(v, y) d\omega(u) d\omega(v) \right| \\ & \lesssim r^{-|k-j|\varepsilon'} \frac{1}{V(x, y, r^{-j\nu-k} + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{r^{-j\nu-k}}{r^{-j\nu-k} + d(x, y)}\right)^\gamma, \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma, \varepsilon' \in (0, \varepsilon)$ and ε is the regularity exponent of the kernel of T .

To this end, we may assume $k \leq j$. Observe that $D_k(x, \cdot)$ is a smooth molecule in $\mathbb{M}(1, 1, t, x)$ with $t = r^{-k}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $D_j(\cdot, y)$ is a smooth molecule in $\mathbb{M}(1, 1, s, y)$ with $s = r^{-j}$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Set $\tilde{D}_k(x, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} D_k(x, u) K(u, v) d\omega(u)$. By Theorem 1.5, for any $0 <$

$\varepsilon_0 < 1$, $\tilde{D}_k(x, \cdot)$ is a weak smooth molecule in $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0, t, x)$ with $t = r^{-k}$. Note that when $k \leq j$, then $t \geq s$. Applying the estimate (2.16) in the Lemma 2.11 yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} D_k(x, u) K(u, v) D_j(v, y) d\omega(u) d\omega(v) \right| \\ & \lesssim r^{(k-j)\varepsilon'} \frac{1}{V(x, y, r^{-k} + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{r^{-k}}{r^{-k} + d(x, y)} \right)^\gamma, \end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon', \gamma < \varepsilon_0$.

Similarly, if $j \leq k$, then $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K(u, v) D_j(v, y) d\omega(v)$ is a weak smooth molecule and repeating the same proof gives the desired estimate.

Finally, to finish the proof of the Theorem 1.8, it remains to consider the general case: $T(1) \in BMO(\omega)(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and $T^*(1) \in BMO(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. To handle this case, we recall the paraproduct operators on space of homogeneous type. We begin with the following definition of the test functions in space of homogeneous type $(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$:

Definition 2.13. A function $f(x)$ defined on \mathbb{R}^N is said to be a test function if there exists a constant C such that for $0 < \beta \leq 1, \gamma > 0, r > 0$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

- (i) $f(x) \leq \frac{C}{V(x, r + \|x - x_0\|)} \left(\frac{r}{r + \|x - x_0\|} \right)^\gamma$;
- (ii) $|f(x) - f(x')| \leq C \left(\frac{\|x - x'\|}{r + \|x - x_0\|} \right)^\beta \frac{1}{V(x, r + \|x - x_0\|)} \left(\frac{r}{r + \|x - x_0\|} \right)^\gamma$,
for $\|x - x'\| \leq \frac{1}{2}(r + \|x - x_0\|)$;
- (iii) $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(x) d\omega(x) = 0$.

We denote such a test function by $f \in \mathcal{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0)$ and $\|f\|_{\mathcal{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0)}$, the norm in $\mathcal{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0)$, is defined by the smallest C satisfying the above conditions (i) and (ii).

Applying Coifman's decomposition for the identity operator and the Calderón-Zygmund operator theory, the discrete Calderón reproducing formula in space of homogeneous type is given by the following

Theorem 2.14. Let $\{S_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a Coifman's approximations to the identity and set $D_k := S_k - S_{k-1}$. Then there exists a family of operators $\{\tilde{D}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ such that for any fixed $x_Q \in Q$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and Q are "r-dyadic cubes" with the side length r^{-M-k} ,

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} \omega(Q) \tilde{D}_k(x, x_Q) D_k(f)(x_Q),$$

where the series converge in $L^p(\omega)$, $1 < p < \infty$, $\mathcal{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0)$, and in $(\mathcal{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0))'$, the dual of in $\mathcal{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0)$, and moreover, the kernels of the operators \tilde{D}_k satisfy the the following conditions:

- (i) $|\tilde{D}_k(x, y)| \leq C \frac{1}{V_k(x) + V_k(y) + V(x, y)} \frac{r^{-k}}{r^{-k} + \|x - y\|}$;
- (ii) $|\tilde{D}_k(x, y) - \tilde{D}_k(x', y)| \leq C \frac{\|x - x'\|}{r^{-k} + \|x - x'\|} \frac{1}{V_k(x) + V_k(y) + V(x, y)} \frac{r^{-k}}{r^{-k} + \|x - y\|}$,
for $\|x - x'\| \leq (r^{-k} + \|x - y\|)/2$;

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(iii)} \quad & \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \tilde{D}_k(x, y) d\omega(x) = 0 \quad \text{for all } y \in \mathbb{R}^N; \\ \text{(iv)} \quad & \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \tilde{D}_k(x, y) d\omega(y) = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, there exists a family of linear operators $\{\tilde{\tilde{D}}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ such that for any fixed $x_Q \in Q$,

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} \omega(Q) D_k(x, x_Q) \tilde{\tilde{D}}_k(f)(x_Q),$$

where the kernels of the operators $\tilde{\tilde{D}}_k$ satisfy the above conditions (i), (iii), (iv) and (ii) with x and y interchanged,

The paraproduct operator is defined by

Definition 2.15. Suppose that $\{S_k\}, \{D_k\}$ and $\{\tilde{\tilde{D}}_k\}$ are same as defined above. The paraproduct operator of $f \in \mathcal{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0)'$ is defined by

$$\Pi_b(f)(x) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} \omega(Q) D_k(x, x_Q) \tilde{\tilde{D}}_k(b)(x_Q) S_k(f)(x_Q),$$

where $b \in BMO_d(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$.

We need the following result on space of homogeneous type:

Theorem 2.16. *The paraproduct operator is the Calderón-Zygmund operator. Moreover, $\Pi_b(1) = b$ in the topology (H_d^1, BMO_d) , $(\Pi_b)^*(1) = 0$ and there exists a constant C such that for $1 < p < \infty$,*

$$\|\Pi_b(f)\|_p \leq C \|b\|_{BMO_d} \|f\|_p.$$

See [30] for all these results and the details of the proofs.

Observe that the classical Calderón-Zygmund operator on space of homogeneous type is also the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operator. Suppose now that both $T(1)$ and $T^*(1)$ belong to $BMO_d(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. Set $\tilde{T} = T - \Pi_{T(1)} - (\Pi_{T^*(1)})^*$. Then \tilde{T} is a Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator. Moreover, $\tilde{T}(1) = (\tilde{T})^*(1) = 0$ and $\tilde{T} \in WBP$. Therefore, \tilde{T} is bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and hence, T is also bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$.

The proof of Theorem 1.8 is completed.

3. WEAK-TYPE DISCRETE CALDERÓN REPRODUCING FORMULA AND LITTLEWOOD-PALEY THEORY ON $L^p, 1 < p < \infty$

In this section, we will apply the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operator Theory, namely the Cotlar-Stein Lemma and the L^p boundedness of the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operators to establish the weak-type discrete Calderón reproducing formula and Littlewood-Paley theory on $L^p, 1 < p < \infty$.

3.1. Weak-Type Discrete Calderón Reproducing Formula.

We begin with the following Calderón reproducing formula provided in [8].

Theorem 3.1. For $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$,

$$(3.1) \quad f(x) = \int_0^\infty \psi_t * q_t * f(x) \frac{dt}{t}$$

where $q_t = t\partial_t p_t$ with the Poisson kernel p_t , $q_t * f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} q_t(x, y) f(y) d\omega(y)$ and $\psi_t * f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \psi_t(x, y) f(y) d\omega(y)$ with $\psi(x)$ being a radial Schwartz function supported in the unit ball $B(0, 1)$.

We remark that in [8], the authors established the estimates for $p_t(x, y)$, the Poisson kernel, as follows:

$$(3.2) \quad |\partial_t^m \partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta p_t(x, y)| \lesssim t^{-m-|\alpha|-|\beta|} p_t(x, y).$$

In [21], the authors improved the estimates for $p_t(x, y)$ by

$$|p_t(x, y)| \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \frac{t}{t + \|x - y\|}$$

and hence,

$$(3.3) \quad |\partial_t^m \partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta p_t(x, y)| \lesssim t^{-m-|\alpha|-|\beta|} \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \frac{t}{t + \|x - y\|}.$$

These estimates indicate that $q_t(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $t > 0$, satisfy the following conditions:

- (i) $|q_t(x, y)| \leq \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \frac{t}{t + \|x - y\|},$
- (ii) $|q_t(x, y) - q_t(x', y)| \leq \frac{\|x - x'\|}{t} \left(\frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \frac{t}{t + \|x - y\|} + \frac{1}{V(x', y, t + d(x', y))} \frac{t}{t + \|x' - y\|} \right),$
- (iii) $|q_t(x, y) - q_t(x, y')| \leq \frac{\|y - y'\|}{t} \left(\frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \frac{t}{t + \|x - y\|} + \frac{1}{V(x, y', t + d(x, y'))} \frac{t}{t + \|x - y'\|} \right),$
- (vi) $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} q_t(x, y) d\omega(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} q_t(x, y) d\omega(x) = 0.$

And $\psi_t(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $t > 0$ satisfy the similar conditions as $q_t(x, y)$ but $\psi_t(x, y)$ is supported in $\{(x, y) : d(x, y) \leq t\}$.

It is easy to check that $q_t(x, y)$ are smooth molecules. Indeed, $q_t(\cdot, y) \in \mathbb{M}(1, 1, t, y)$ for any fixed y and $q_t(x, \cdot) \in \mathbb{M}(1, 1, t, x)$ for any fixed x , and similarly for $\psi_t(x, y)$.

Now we show Theorem 1.9 with $p = 2$. The main tools are the almost orthogonal estimates and the Cotlar-Stein Lemme.

Proof of Theorem 1.9 with $p = 2$. Let $1 < r \leq r_0$, where r_0 will be chosen later, and $t_j = r^{-j}$ and $\psi_j = \psi_{r^{-j}}$ and $q_j = q_{r^{-j}}$. For given $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, we decompose f as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= \int_0^\infty \psi_t * q_t * f(x) \frac{dt}{t} \\ &= - \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{r^{-j}}^{r^{-j+1}} \psi_j * q_j * f(x) \frac{dt}{t} + \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{r^{-j}}^{r^{-j+1}} \left[\psi_j * q_j * f(x) - \psi_t * q_t * f(x) \right] \frac{dt}{t} \end{aligned}$$

$$= -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_j * q_j * f(x) + R_1(f),$$

where $R_1 f(x) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{r^{-j}}^{r^{-j+1}} \left[\psi_t * q_t * f(x) - \psi_j * q_j * f(x) \right] \frac{dt}{t}$. Further, we decompose

$$\begin{aligned} & -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_j * q_j * f(x) \\ &= -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \int_Q \psi_j(x, y) q_j * f(y) d\omega(y) \\ &= -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_j(x, x_Q) q_j * f(x_Q) \\ &\quad + \ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \int_Q \left[\psi_j(x, x_Q) q_j * f(x_Q) - \psi_t(x, y) q_j * f(y) \right] d\omega(y) \\ &= T_M(f)(x) + R_M f(x), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$T_M(f)(x) = -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_j(x, x_Q) q_j * f(x_Q)$$

and

$$R_M(f)(x) = \ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \int_Q \left[\psi_j(x, x_Q) q_j * f(x_Q) - \psi_t(x, y) q_j * f(y) \right] d\omega(y),$$

M is any fixed integer and Q^j are all “ r -dyadic cubes” with the side length r^{-M-j} , and x_Q is any fixed point in Q .

The identity operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ can be written by the following

$$I = T_M + R_1 + R_M.$$

We claim that there exist r_0 for any $1 < r \leq r_0$ and M such that

$$\|R_1(f)\|_2 \leq C(r-1)\|f\|_2$$

and

$$\|R_M(f)\|_2 \leq r^{-M}\|f\|_2.$$

Assuming the claim for the moment, if we choose r_0 to be close to 1 and M to be sufficiently large, then $\|R_1 + R_M\|_{2,2} < 1$. Observing that $T_M = I - R_1 - R_M$, therefore, T_M is bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and moreover, $(T_M)^{-1}$, the inverse of T_M , is also bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ since $(T_M)^{-1} = (I - R_1 - R_M)^{-1}$. For each $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ setting $h = (T_M)^{-1}f$ then $h \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ with $\|f\|_2 \sim \|h\|_2$. We obtain the weak-type discrete Calderón reproducing formula

$$f(x) = T_M(T_M)^{-1}f(x) = -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_j(x, x_Q) q_j * h(x_Q).$$

To see that the above series converges in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, we need the Littlewood-Paley estimates on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, namely, $\|S(f)\|_2 \leq C\|f\|_2$, where $S(f)$ is the square function of f . See details in next **Subsection**. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{|j| \geq n} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_Q(\cdot, x_Q) q_Q * h(x_Q) \right\|_2^2 \\ & \leq C \left\| \left(\sum_{|j| \geq n} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} |q_Q * h(x_Q)|^2 \chi_Q(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last term tends to zero as n tends to ∞ . See more details in next **Subsection**.

We now return to the proof of the claim. The proof for R_1 follows from the Cotlar-Stein Lemma. To this end, we have

$$R_1 f(x) = - \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{r^{-j}}^{r^{-j+1}} \left[\psi_t * q_t * f(x) - \psi_j * q_j * f(x) \right] \frac{dt}{t} = - \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{r^{-j}}^{r^{-j+1}} S_j(f)(x) \frac{dt}{t},$$

where $S_j f(x) = S_j * f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} S_j(x, y) f(y) d\omega(y)$ with $S_j(x, y) = \psi_t * q_t(x, y) - \psi_j * q_j(x, y)$.

We first show that $S_j(\cdot, y) \in \mathbb{M}(1, 1, r^{-j}, y)$ and the proof for $S_j(x, \cdot) \in \mathbb{M}(1, 1, r^{-j}, x)$ is similar. Note that

$$S_j(x, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left\{ (\psi_t(x, z) - \psi_j(x, z)) q_t(z, y) + \psi_j(x, z) (q_t(z, y) - q_j(z, y)) \right\} d\omega(z).$$

To estimate the size condition of $S_j(x, y)$, applying the estimates in (3.3) with $\partial_t q_t(x, y) = \partial_t p_t(x, y) + t \partial_t^2 p_t(x, y)$ implies that for $r^{-j} \leq t \leq r^{-j+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (3.4) \quad |q_t(z, y) - q_j(z, y)| & \leq C \frac{(r^{-j+1} - r^{-j})}{r^{-j}} \frac{1}{V(z, y, r^{-j} + d(z, y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|z - y\|} \\ & \leq C(r-1) \frac{1}{V(z, y, r^{-j} + d(z, y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|z - y\|}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$(3.5) \quad |\psi_t(x, z) - \psi_j(x, z)| \leq C(r-1) \frac{1}{V(x, z, r^{-j} + d(x, z))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|x - z\|}.$$

Therefore, Lemma (2.12) gives

$$(3.6) \quad |S_j(x, y)| \leq C(r-1) \frac{1}{V(x, y, r^{-j} + d(x, y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|x - y\|}.$$

To see the smooth condition of $S_j(\cdot, y)$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} & S_j(x, y) - S_j(x', y) \\ & = (\psi_t - \psi_j) q_t(x, y) + \psi_j (q_t - q_j)(x, y) - (\psi_t - \psi_j) q_t(x', y) - \psi_j (q_t - q_j)(x', y) \\ & = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[(\psi_t(x, z) - \psi_t(x', z)) - (\psi_j(x, z) - \psi_j(x', z)) \right] q_t(z, y) d\omega(z) \\ & \quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[\psi_j(x, z) - \psi_j(x', z) \right] [q_t(z, y) - q_j(z, y)] d\omega(z) \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the first term for $r^{-j} \leq t \leq r^{-j+1}$, applying Lemma (3.3) with $m = 1, |\alpha| = 1, |\beta| = 0$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} & |(\psi_t(x, z) - \psi_t(x', z)) - (\psi_j(x, z) - \psi_j(x', z))| \\ & \leq C \frac{(r^{-j+1} - r^{-j}) \|x - x'\|}{r^{-j} r^{-j}} \\ & \quad \times \left[\frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, z, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{x}, z))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{x} - z\|} + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}', z, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{x}', z))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{x}' - z\|} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma (2.12), for $r^{-j} \leq t \leq r^{-j+1}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [(\psi_t(x, z) - \psi_t(x', z)) - (\psi_j(x, z) - \psi_j(x', z))] q_t(z, y) d\omega(z) \right| \\ & \leq C \frac{(r^{-j+1} - r^{-j}) \|x - x'\|}{r^{-j} r^{-j}} \left[\frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, y, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{x}, y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{x} - y\|} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}', y, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{x}', y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{x}' - y\|} \right] \\ & \leq C(r-1) \frac{\|x - x'\|}{r^{-j}} \left[\frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, y, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{x}, y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{x} - y\|} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}', y, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{x}', y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{x}' - y\|} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the second term, applying the smoothness condition on ψ_j and the estimate in (3.4) and then apply the Lemma (2.12) yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [\psi_j(x, z) - \psi_j(x', z)] [q_t(z, y) - q_j(z, y)] d\omega(z) \right| \\ & \leq C \frac{(r^{-j+1} - r^{-j}) \|x - x'\|}{r^{-j} r^{-j}} \left[\frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, y, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{x}, y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{x} - y\|} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}', y, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{x}', y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{x}' - y\|} \right] \\ & \leq C(r-1) \frac{\|x - x'\|}{r^{-j}} \left[\frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, y, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{x}, y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{x} - y\|} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}', y, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{x}', y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{x}' - y\|} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain

$$|S_j(x, y)| \leq C(r-1) \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, y, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{x}, y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|x - y\|}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |S_j(x, y) - S_j(x', y)| & \leq C(r-1) \frac{\|x - x'\|}{r^{-j}} \left[\frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, y, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{x}, y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{x} - y\|} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}', y, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{x}', y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{x}' - y\|} \right], \end{aligned}$$

which together with the fact $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} S_j(x, y) d\omega(x) = 0$ implies that for any fixed y , $S_j(x, y)$ is a smooth molecule in $\mathbb{M}(1, 1, r^{-j}, y)$. Moreover,

$$\|S_j(\cdot, y)\|_{\mathbb{M}(1, 1, r^{-j}, y)} \leq C(r-1).$$

Similarly, for any fixed x , $S_j(x, \cdot) \in \mathbb{M}(1, 1, r^{-j}, x)$ and

$$\|S_j(x, \cdot)\|_{\mathbb{M}(1, 1, r^{-j}, x)} \leq C(r-1).$$

Applying the same argument, we also obtain that $S_j^*(\cdot, y) \in \mathbb{M}(1, 1, r^{-j}, y)$ for any fixed y and $S_j^*(x, \cdot) \in \mathbb{M}(1, 1, r^{-j}, x)$ for any fixed x .

By (2.17) in the Lemma (2.11), there exists $\varepsilon < 1$ such that

$$|S_j S_k^*(x, y)| \leq C(r-1)^2 r^{-|j-k|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{V(x, y, r^{-j\nu-k} + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{r^{-j\nu-k}}{r^{-j\nu-k} + d(x, y)} \right)^\varepsilon.$$

Let $T_j(x, y) = \int_{r^{-j}}^{r^{-j+1}} S_j(x, y) \frac{dt}{t}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |T_j T_k^*(x, y)| &\leq \int_{r^{-j}}^{r^{-j+1}} \int_{r^{-k}}^{r^{-k+1}} |S_j S_k^*(x, y)| \frac{dt}{t} \frac{ds}{s} \\ &\leq C(r-1)^2 r^{-|j-k|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{V(x, y, r^{-j\nu-k} + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{r^{-j\nu-k}}{r^{-j\nu-k} + d(x, y)} \right)^\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Let $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. Then

$$\|T_j T_k^* f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} T_j T_k^*(x, y) f(y) d\omega(y) \right|^2 d\omega(x)$$

By the definition, $d(x, y) = \min_{\sigma \in G} \|\sigma(x) - y\|$,

$$\begin{aligned} |T_j T_k^*(x, y)| &\leq \sum_{\sigma \in G} C(r-1)^2 r^{-|j-k|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\omega(B(y, r^{-j\nu-k} + \|\sigma(x) - y\|))} \left(\frac{r^{-j\nu-k}}{r^{-j\nu-k} + \|\sigma(x) - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \\ &\sim \sum_{\sigma \in G} C(r-1)^2 r^{-|j-k|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{(B(\sigma(x), r^{-j\nu-k} + \|\sigma(x) - y\|))} \left(\frac{r^{-j\nu-k}}{r^{-j\nu-k} + \|\sigma(x) - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since G is finite,

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_j T_k^* f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)}^2 &\lesssim \sum_{\sigma \in G} (r-1)^4 r^{-2|j-k|\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (Mf(\sigma(x)))^2 d\omega(x) \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in G} (r-1)^4 r^{-2|j-k|\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (Mf(x))^2 d\omega(x) \\ &\lesssim (r-1)^4 r^{-2|j-k|\varepsilon} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where M denotes the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator on $(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$. Hence

$$\|T_j T_k^*\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)} \leq C(r-1)^2 r^{-|j-k|\varepsilon}.$$

By the Cotlar-Stein's lemma, for $1 < r \leq r_0$,

$$\left\| \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{r^{-j}}^{r^{-j+1}} \left[\psi_t q_t f(x) - \psi_{r^{-j}} q_{t_j} f(x) \right] \frac{dt}{t} \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)} \leq C(r-1)^2.$$

This implies that $\|R_1 f\|_{2,2} \leq C(r-1)$.

It remains to show the claim for R_M . To do this, we write

$$\begin{aligned} R_M f(x) &= -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \int_Q (\psi_Q(x, y) - \psi_Q(x, x_Q)) q_Q f(y) d\omega(y) \\ &\quad + \ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \int_Q \psi_Q(x, x_Q) (q_Q f(x_Q) - q_Q f(y)) d\omega(y) \\ &= R_M^1 f(x) + R_M^2 f(x), \end{aligned}$$

where Q^j are all cubes with the side length r^{-M-j} .

We estimate $\|R_M^2(f)\|_2$ only since the proof for $\|R_M^1(f)\|_2$ is similar.

Denote $R_M^2(f)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} E_j(x, z) f(z) d\omega(z)$, where

$$E_j(x, z) = \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \int_Q \psi_Q(x, x_Q) (q_Q(x_Q, z) - q_Q(y, z)) d\omega(y).$$

We show that $E_j(x, z)$ are smooth molecules. Precisely, $E_j(\cdot, z) \in \mathbb{M}(1, 1, r^{-j}, z)$ and $E_j(x, \cdot) \in \mathbb{M}(1, 1, r^{-j}, x)$. Moreover, $\|E_j(x, \cdot)\|_{\mathbb{M}(1, 1, r^{-j}, x)} \leq Cr^{-M}$ and similarly for $E_j(\cdot, x)$. We show $E_j(x, \cdot) \in \mathbb{M}(1, 1, r^{-j}, x)$ only. It is clear that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} E_j(x, z) d\omega(z) = 0$. Observe that if $y \in Q \in Q^j$,

$$\begin{aligned} &|q_Q(x_Q, z) - q_Q(y, z)| \\ &\leq C \frac{\|y - x_Q\|}{r^{-j}} \left[\frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}_Q, z, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{x}_Q, z))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{x}_Q - z\|} + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{y}, z, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{y}, z))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{y} - z\|} \right] \\ &\leq C \frac{r^{-j-M}}{r^{-j}} \frac{1}{V(y, z, r^{-j} + d(y, z))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|y - z\|}, \end{aligned}$$

since $r^{-j} + d(y, z) \sim r^{-j} + d(x_Q, z)$ and $r^{-j} + \|y - z\| \sim r^{-j} + \|x_Q - z\|$ for $y \in Q \in Q^j$. Note that $\psi_Q(x, x_Q) \sim \psi_Q(x, y)$, thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |E_j(x, z)| &\leq C \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \int_Q |\psi_Q(x, x_Q) (q_Q(x_Q, z) - q_Q(y, z))| d\omega(y) \\ &\leq Cr^{-M} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\psi_{r^{-j}}(x, y)| \frac{1}{V(y, z, r^{-j} + d(y, z))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|y - z\|} d\omega(y) \\ &\leq Cr^{-M} \frac{1}{V(x, z, r^{-j} + d(x, z))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|x - z\|}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we verify the smooth condition of $E_j(x, \cdot)$. To this end, we write

$$\begin{aligned} &E_j(x, z) - E_j(x, z') \\ &= \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \int_Q \psi_Q(x, x_Q) \left[(q_Q(y, z) - q_Q(x_Q, z)) - (q_Q(y, z') - q_Q(x_Q, z')) \right] d\omega(y). \end{aligned}$$

Applying the estimate in (3.3) with $|\alpha| = |\beta| = 1$ yields

$$|[q_Q(y, z) - q_Q(x_Q, z)] - [q_Q(y, z') - q_Q(x_Q, z')]|$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \frac{\|y - x_Q\| \|z - z'\|}{r^{-j} r^{-j}} \left\{ \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{y}, z, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{y}, z))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{y} - z\|} \right. \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}_Q, z, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{x}_Q, z))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{x}_Q - z\|} + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{y}, z', r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{y}, z'))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{y} - z'\|} \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}_Q, z', r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{x}_Q, z'))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{x}_Q - z'\|} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that if $y \in Q \in Q^j$, then $(y, z, r^{-j} + d(y, z)) \sim (x_Q, z, r^{-j} + d(x_Q, z))$ and $(y, z', r^{-j} + d(y, z')) \sim (x_Q, z', r^{-j} + d(x_Q, z'))$, and $\psi_Q(x, x_Q) \sim \psi_Q(x, y)$ thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &|E_j(x, z) - E_j(x, z')| \\ &\leq Cr^{-M} \frac{\|z - z'\|}{r^{-j}} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \int_Q |\psi_Q(x, y)| \left(\frac{1}{V(y, z, r^{-j} + d(y, z))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{y} - z\|} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{V(y, z', r^{-j} + d(y, z'))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{y} - z'\|} \right) d\omega(y) \\ &\leq Cr^{-M} \frac{\|z - z'\|}{r^{-j}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\psi_{r^{-j}}(x, y)| \left(\frac{1}{V(y, z, r^{-j} + d(y, z))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{y} - z\|} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{V(y, z', r^{-j} + d(y, z'))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{y} - z'\|} \right) d\omega(y) \\ &\leq Cr^{-M} \frac{\|z - z'\|}{r^{-j}} \left(\frac{1}{V(x, z, r^{-j} + d(x, z))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|x - z\|} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{V(x, z', r^{-j} + d(x, z'))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|x - z'\|} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $E_j(x, \cdot) \in \mathbb{M}(1, 1, r^{-j}, x)$ with $\|E_j(x, \cdot)\|_{\mathbb{M}(1, 1, r^{-j}, x)} \leq Cr^{-M}$.

The same estimates hold for E_j^* , the adjoint operator of E_j . By (2.17) in the Lemma 2.11,

$$|E_j E_k^*(x, y)| \lesssim r^{-2M} r^{-|j-k|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{V(x, y, r^{-j \vee -k} + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{r^{-j \vee -k}}{r^{-j \vee -k} + \|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon.$$

Similar to the proof for R_1 , applying Cotlar-Stein's Lemma gets $\|R_M^2 f\|_{L^2} \lesssim r^{-2M} \|f\|_{L^2}$. The claim is proved and hence, the proof of Theorem 1.9 with $p = 2$ is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.9 with $1 < p < \infty$. The main toll of the proof of the Theorem 1.9 with $1 < p < \infty$ is the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator theory. Namely, we will show that R_1 and R_M are the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operators. To this end, observe that these two operators have been proved to be bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ with the operator norms less than $C(r-1)$ and Cr^{-M} for $1 < r \leq r_0$, respectively. It suffices to show that the kernels of R_1 and R_M are the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operator kernels.

We first verify the kernel of R_1 . We recall

$$R_1 f(x) = - \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{r^{-j}}^{r^{-j+1}} \left[\psi_t q_t f(x) - \psi_j q_j f(x) \right] \frac{dt}{t} = - \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{r^{-j}}^{r^{-j+1}} S_j(f)(x) \frac{dt}{t},$$

where $S_j(f)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} S_j(x, y)f(y)d\omega(y)$ with $S_j(x, y) = \psi_t q_t(x, y) - \psi_j q_j(x, y)$. $R_1(x, y)$, the kernel of R_1 , can be written as

$$R_1(x, y) = - \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{r^{-j}}^{r^{-j+1}} S_j(x, y) \frac{dt}{t}.$$

Observe that if $r^{-j} \leq t \leq r^{-j+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |S_j(x, y)| &\leq C(r-1) \frac{1}{V(x, y, r^{-j} + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \\ &\leq C(r-1) \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t + \|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |R_1(x, y)| &\lesssim \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{r^{-j}}^{r^{-j+1}} |S_j(x, y)| \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\lesssim (r-1) \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{r^{-j}}^{r^{-j+1}} \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t + \|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\lesssim (r-1) \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{V(x, y, t + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t + \|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{dt}{t}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the same proof as given in the Proposition 2.1, implies that for any fixed $0 < \varepsilon < 1$,

$$|R_1(x, y)| \lesssim (r-1) \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}.$$

To verify the regularity conditions for R_1 , we apply the following estimate for $r^{-j} \leq t \leq r^{-j+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &|S_j(x, y) - S_j(x', y)| \\ &\lesssim (r-1) \frac{\|x - x'\|}{r^{-j}} \\ &\quad \times \left(\frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, y, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{x}, y))} \left(\frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{x} - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}', y, r^{-j} + d(\mathbf{x}', y))} \left(\frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|\mathbf{x}' - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \right) \\ &\lesssim (r-1) \frac{\|x - x'\|}{t} \\ &\quad \times \left(\frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, y, t + d(\mathbf{x}, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t + \|\mathbf{x} - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}', y, t + d(\mathbf{x}', y))} \left(\frac{t}{t + \|\mathbf{x}' - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $\|y - y'\| \leq d(x, y)/2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |R_1(x, y) - R_1(x', y)| &\leq C(r-1) \int_0^\infty \frac{\|x - x'\|}{t} \left(\frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}, y, t + d(\mathbf{x}, y))} \left(\frac{t}{t + \|\mathbf{x} - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{V(\mathbf{x}', y, t + d(\mathbf{x}', y))} \left(\frac{t}{t + \|\mathbf{x}' - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \right) \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\lesssim C(r-1) \left(\frac{\|x - x'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \quad \text{for } \|x - x'\| \leq d(x, y)/2. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $\|y - y'\| \leq d(x, y)/2$,

$$|R_1(x, y) - R_1(x, y')| \lesssim (r - 1) \left(\frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}.$$

Now we verify that R_M is a Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operator. We recall

$$\begin{aligned} R_M f(x) &= -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \int_Q (\psi_Q(x, y) - \psi_Q(x, x_Q)) q_Q f(y) d\omega(y) \\ &\quad - \ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \int_Q \psi_Q(x, x_Q) (q_Q f(x_Q) - q_Q f(y)) d\omega(y) \\ &= R_M^1 f(x) + R_M^2 f(x). \end{aligned}$$

Denote $R_M^1(f)(x) = -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} E_j(x, z) f(z) d\omega(z)$, where

$$E_j(x, z) = \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \int_Q (\psi_Q(x, y) - \psi_Q(x, x_Q)) q_Q(y, z) d\omega(y).$$

Applying the same proof for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$,

$$|E_j(x, z)| \lesssim r^{-M} \frac{1}{V(x, z, r^{-j} + d(x, z))} \left(\frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|x - z\|} \right)^\varepsilon.$$

Note that $R_M^1(x, z) = -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} E_j(x, z)$. Similar to the estimate for R_1 , we obtain that for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$,

$$(3.7) \quad |R_M^1(x, z)| \lesssim r^{-M} \left(\frac{d(x, z)}{\|x - z\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))};$$

$$(3.8) \quad |R_M^1(x, z) - R_M^1(x, z')| \lesssim r^{-M} \left(\frac{\|z - z'\|}{\|x - z\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, z)))}$$

for $\|z - z'\| \leq d(x, z)/2$;

$$(3.9) \quad |R_M^1(x', z) - R_M^1(x, z)| \lesssim r^{-M} \left(\frac{\|x - x'\|}{\|x - z\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, z)))}$$

for $\|x - x'\| \leq d(x, z)/2$.

Observe that

$$R_M^2(x, z) = \ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \int_Q \psi_Q(x, x_Q) (q_Q(y, x_Q) - q_Q(z, y)) d\omega(y).$$

Similarly, the kernel $R_M^2(x, z)$ also satisfies the conditions (3.7)-(3.9).

Suppose that T is the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operator. We denote $\|T\|_{dcz} = \|T\|_{2,2} + \|K\|_{dcz}$ by the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operator norm, where $\|K\|_{dcz}$ the minimum of the constants in (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3). The $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ boundedness and all size and smoothness

conditions for R_1 and R_M obtained above imply that R_1 and R_M are the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operator with the operator norm $\|R_1\|_{dcz} \lesssim (r-1)$ and $\|R_M\|_{dcz} \lesssim r^{-M}$, where $1 < r \leq r_0$.

Applying Theorem 1.3, R_1 and R_M are bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $1 < p < \infty$, with $\|R_1\|_{p,p} \lesssim (r-1)$ and $\|R_M\|_{p,p} \lesssim r^{-M}$. Therefore, if take r_0 to be close to 1 and M is large enough, then $T_M = I - R_1 - R_M$ is invertible and the inverse of T_M is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ for all $1 < p < \infty$. For $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $1 < p < \infty$, set $h = (T_M)^{-1}f$. Then $\|h\|_p \sim \|f\|_p$. Moreover,

$$f(x) = T_M(T_M)^{-1}f(x) = -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_j(x, x_Q) q_j h(x_Q).$$

It remains to show that the above series converges in the $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $1 < p < \infty$, norm. The proof will follow from Theorem 1.11, the Littlewood-Paley estimates on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ for $1 < p < \infty$. See the details in next **Subsection**. \square

3.2. Littlewood-Paley Theory on L^p , $1 < p < \infty$.

We now give the proof of Theorem 1.11.

Proof of Theorem 1.11 with $p = 2$. We first show

$$\|S(f)\|_2^2 = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) |q_Q f(x_Q)|^2 \leq C \|f\|_2^2.$$

The proof follows from a duality argument together with the almost orthogonal estimates. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup \left\{ \left(\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) |q_Q f(x_Q)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} : f \in L^2, \|f\|_2 \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) |q_Q f(x_Q) \cdot g_Q| : f \in L^2, \|f\|_2 \leq 1, \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) |g_Q|^2 \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \left\| \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) g_Q q_Q(x_Q, \cdot) \right\|_2 : \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) |g_Q|^2 \leq 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) g_Q q_Q(x_Q, \cdot) \right\|_2^2 &= \left\langle \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) g_Q q_Q(x_Q, \cdot), \sum_{j'=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q' \in Q^{j'}} \omega(Q') g_{Q'} q_{Q'}(x_{Q'}, \cdot) \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \sum_{j'=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q' \in Q^{j'}} \omega(Q) \omega(Q') \langle q_{Q'}(x_{Q'}, \cdot), q_Q(x_Q, \cdot) \rangle g_Q g_{Q'} \end{aligned}$$

and for $Q \in Q^j$ and $Q' \in Q^{j'}$, applying the almost orthogonal estimates implies

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle q_{Q'}(x_{Q'}, \cdot), q_Q(x_Q, \cdot) \rangle| \\ & \lesssim r^{-|j-j'|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x_Q, r^{-j-M} \vee r^{-j'-M} + d(x_Q, x_{Q'})))} \left(\frac{r^{-j-M} \vee r^{-j'-M}}{r^{-j-M} \vee r^{-j'-M} + \|x_Q - x_{Q'}\|} \right)^\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

The above estimate yields

$$\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) |\langle q_{Q'}(x_{Q'}, \cdot), q_Q(x_Q, \cdot) \rangle| \leq C.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \sum_{j'=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q' \in Q^{j'}} \omega(Q) \omega(Q') \langle q_{Q'}(x_{Q'}, \cdot), q_Q(x_Q, \cdot) \rangle g_Q g_{Q'} \\ & \leq C \left(\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) |g_Q|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{j'=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q' \in Q^{j'}} \omega(Q') |g_{Q'}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

We have proved the estimate $\|S(f)\|_2 \leq C\|f\|_2$, which together with the duality argument implies the estimate $\|f\|_2 \leq C\|S(f)\|_2$. We leave the detail to the reader. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.11 with $1 < p < \infty$. The idea of the proof is to consider $S(f)$ as a vector-valued Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operator. To this end, we recall

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}f(x) &= \left(\sum_Q |q_Q f(x_Q)|^2 \chi_Q(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \left(\sum_Q \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \chi_Q(x) q_Q(x_Q, y) f(y) d\omega(y) \right|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

This leads to introduce the H -valued function $\{f_Q(x)\}$, where Q are all r -dyadic cubes in \mathbb{R}^N and the norm of $\{f_Q(x)\}$ is defined by

$$\|f_Q(x)\|_H := \left(\sum_Q |f_Q(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Suppose that T is an L^2 -bounded H -valued operator defined by

$$T(f)(x) = \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} K_Q(x, y) (f)(y) d\omega(y) \right\},$$

where $K(x, y) = \{K_Q(x, y)\}$ satisfies the following condition: for some $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$,

$$(3.10) \quad \|K(x, y) - K(x, y')\|_H \lesssim \left(\frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \quad \text{for } \|y - y'\| \leq d(x, y)/2;$$

Then T is bounded from $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ to $L^p(H)$, that is, there exists a constant C such that for $1 < p < \infty$,

$$\|Tf\|_{L^p(H)} \leq C\|f\|_p.$$

The proof of this argument is same as in the proof of Theorem 1.3. We leave the details of the proof to the reader.

Now we define the H -valued operator $\mathcal{S}f(x) = \{K_Q(f)(x)\}$, where

$$K_Q(f)(x) = q_Q(f)(x_Q) \chi_Q(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \chi_Q(x) q_Q(x_Q, y) f(y) d\omega(y).$$

Observe that $\|\mathcal{S}(f)\|_{L^2(H)} = \|S(f)\|_2$ and hence

$$\|\mathcal{S}(f)\|_{L^2(H)} = \|S(f)\|_2 \leq C\|f\|_2.$$

To see that $\mathcal{S}(f)$ is bounded from $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ to $L^p(H)$, $1 < p < \infty$, it remains to verify that the kernel of \mathcal{S} satisfies the condition (3.10). To this end, we write $K(x, y)$, the kernel of \mathcal{S} , as $K(x, y) = \{K_Q(x, y)\} = \{\chi_Q(x)q_Q(x_Q, y)\}$. It follows that

$$\|K(x, y) - K(x, y')\|_H = \|\{\chi_Q(x)[q_Q(x_Q, y) - q_Q(x_Q, y')]\}\|_H.$$

Therefore,

$$\|K(x, y) - K(x, y')\|_H = \left(\sum_Q \chi_Q(x) |q_Q(x_Q, y) - q_Q(x_Q, y')|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

By the size condition on q_Q with $x \in Q$ and $Q \in Q^j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |q_Q(x_Q, y) - q_Q(x_Q, y')| &\lesssim \frac{1}{V(x_Q, \mathbf{y}, r^{-j} + d(x_Q, \mathbf{y}))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|x_Q - \mathbf{y}\|} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{V(x_Q, \mathbf{y}', r^{-j} + d(x_Q, \mathbf{y}'))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|x_Q - \mathbf{y}'\|}. \end{aligned}$$

and by the smoothness condition on q_Q ,

$$\begin{aligned} |q_Q(x_Q, y) - q_Q(x_Q, y')| &\lesssim \frac{\|y - y'\|}{r^{-j}} \left(\frac{1}{V(x_Q, \mathbf{y}, r^{-j} + d(x_Q, \mathbf{y}))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|x_Q - \mathbf{y}\|} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{V(x_Q, \mathbf{y}', r^{-j} + d(x_Q, \mathbf{y}'))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|x_Q - \mathbf{y}'\|} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that when $d(y, y') \leq \|y - y'\| \leq \frac{1}{2}d(x, y) \leq \frac{1}{2}\|x - y\|$ then $d(x, y) \sim d(x, y')$ and $\|x - y\| \sim \|x - y'\|$. Moreover, if $x \in Q$ and $Q \in Q^j$ then $V(x_Q, y, r^{-j} + d(x_Q, y)) \sim V(x, y, r^{-j} + d(x, y)) \sim V(x_Q, y', r^{-j} + d(x_Q, y')) \sim V(x, y', r^{-j} + d(x, y'))$ and $\|x_Q - y\| \sim \|x - y\| \sim \|x_Q - y'\| \sim \|x - y'\|$. This yields

$$|q_Q(x_Q, y) - q_Q(x_Q, y')| \lesssim \frac{1}{V(x, y, r^{-j} + d(x, y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|x - y\|}$$

and

$$|q_Q(x_Q, y) - q_Q(x_Q, y')| \lesssim \frac{\|y - y'\|}{r^{-j}} \frac{1}{V(x, y, r^{-j} + d(x, y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|x - y\|}.$$

Thus, if $\|y - y'\| \leq \frac{1}{2}d(x, y)$, we consider three cases: (i) $\|y - y'\| \geq r^{-j}$; (ii) $\|y - y'\| \leq r^{-j} \leq \|x - y\|$; (iii) $r^{-j} \geq \|x - y\|$. For the first case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j:(i)} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \chi_Q(x) |q_Q(x_Q, y) - q_Q(x_Q, y')|^2 \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j:(i)} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \chi_Q(x) \left(\frac{1}{V(x, y, r^{-j} + d(x, y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|x - y\|} \right)^2 \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

For the second case, it follows

$$\sum_{j:(ii)} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \chi_Q(x) |q_Q(x_Q, y) - q_Q(x_Q, y')|^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim \sum_{j:(ii)} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \chi_Q(x) \left(\frac{\|y - y'\|}{r^{-j}} \frac{1}{V(x, y, r^{-j} + d(x, y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|x - y\|} \right)^2 \\
&\lesssim \left(\frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|} \ln \frac{\|x - y\|}{\|y - y'\|} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \right)^2 \\
&\lesssim \left(\left(\frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The last case gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j:(iii)} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \chi_Q(x) |q_Q(x_Q, y) - q_Q(x_Q, y')|^2 \\
&\lesssim \sum_{j:(iii)} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \chi_Q(x) \left(\frac{\|y - y'\|}{r^{-j-M}} \frac{1}{V(x, y, r^{-j} + d(x, y))} \frac{r^{-j}}{r^{-j} + \|x - y\|} \right)^2 \\
&\lesssim \left(\frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

These estimates imply that if $\|y - y'\| \leq \frac{1}{2}d(x, y)$,

$$\|K(x, y) - K(x, y')\|_H \lesssim \left(\frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}.$$

Again, the estimate $\|S(f)\|_p \leq C\|f\|_p$, $1 < p < \infty$, together with the duality argument implies the estimate $\|f\|_p \leq C\|S(f)\|_p$, $1 < p < \infty$.

The proof of Theorem 1.11 is complete. \square

We now return to the proof on the convergence in Theorem 1.9, that is, for $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $1 < p < \infty$, there exists a function h with $\|h\|_p \sim \|f\|_p$ such that

$$f(x) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) \psi_Q(x, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q),$$

where the series converges in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$.

It is sufficient to show that

$$\left\| \sum_{|j|>n} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) \psi_Q(\cdot, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q) \right\|_p \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

By Theorem 1.11, we only need to show

$$\left\| S \left(\sum_{|j|>n} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) \psi_Q(\cdot, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q) \right) \right\|_p \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
&S \left(\sum_{|j|>n} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) \psi_Q(\cdot, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q) \right) (x) \\
&= \left(\sum_{Q'} \left| q_{Q'} \left(\sum_{|j|>n} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) \psi_Q(\cdot, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q) \right) (x_{Q'}) \right|^2 \chi_{Q'}(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$q_{Q'} \left(\sum_{|j|>n} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) \psi_Q(\cdot, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q) \right) (x_{Q'}) = \sum_{|j|>n} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) q_{Q'} \psi_Q(x_{Q'}, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q).$$

Applying the almost orthogonal estimate 2.17 in the Lemma 2.11 on $(q_{Q'} \psi_Q)(x_{Q'}, x_Q)$, we obtain that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|(q_{Q'} \psi_Q)(x_{Q'}, x_Q)| \lesssim r^{-|j-j'|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{V(x_{Q'}, x_Q, r^{-j\vee-j'} + d(x_{Q'}, x_Q))} \left(\frac{r^{-j\vee-j'}}{r^{-j\vee-j'} + d(x_{Q'}, x_Q)} \right)^\varepsilon.$$

By the definition, $d(x, y) = \min_{\sigma \in G} \|\sigma(x) - y\|$, for $x \in Q'$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} & |q_{Q'} \psi_Q(x_{Q'}, x_Q)| \chi_{Q'}(x) \\ & \lesssim r^{-|j-j'|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x_Q, r^{-j\vee-j'} + d(x, x_Q)))} \left(\frac{r^{-j\vee-j'}}{r^{-j\vee-j'} + d(x, x_Q)} \right)^\varepsilon \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\sigma \in G} r^{-|j-j'|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x_Q, r^{-j\vee-j'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|))} \left(\frac{r^{-j\vee-j'}}{r^{-j\vee-j'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|} \right)^\varepsilon \chi_{Q'}(x) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\sigma \in G} r^{-|j-j'|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\omega(B(\sigma(x), r^{-j\vee-j'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|))} \left(\frac{r^{-j\vee-j'}}{r^{-j\vee-j'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|} \right)^\varepsilon \chi_{Q'}(x) \end{aligned}$$

for $x \in Q'$. Let M denote the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator on \mathbb{R}^N . Following a discrete version of the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function estimate, see more detail of the proof of Lemma 4.1 in next **Subsection 4.1**, yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \frac{1}{\omega(B(\sigma(x), r^{-j\vee-j'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|))} \\ (3.11) \quad & \times \left(\frac{r^{-j\vee-j'}}{r^{-j\vee-j'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|} \right)^\varepsilon |q_Q h(x_Q)| \\ & \leq C r^{|-j'| - (-j'\vee-j)|\mathbf{N}(1-\frac{1}{\theta})} \left\{ M \left(\sum_{Q \in Q^j} |q_Q h(x_Q)|^\theta \chi_Q \right) (\sigma(x)) \right\}^{1/\theta}, \end{aligned}$$

where θ satisfies $\frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N}+\varepsilon} < \theta < 1$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) q_{Q'} \psi_Q(x_{Q'}, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q) \chi_{Q'}(x) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\sigma \in G} r^{-|j-j'|\varepsilon} r^{|-j'| - (-j'\vee-j)|\mathbf{N}(1-\frac{1}{\theta})} \left\{ M \left(\sum_{Q \in Q^j} |q_Q h(x_Q)|^\theta \chi_Q \right) (\sigma(x)) \right\}^{1/\theta} \chi_{Q'}(x). \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that for $\frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N}+\varepsilon} < \theta < 1$,

$$\sup_{j'} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} r^{-|j-j'|\varepsilon} r^{|-j'| - (-j'\vee-j)|\mathbf{N}(1-\frac{1}{\theta})} < \infty.$$

By Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\left| \sum_{|j|>n} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) q_{Q'} \psi_Q(x_{Q'}, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q) \right|^2 \chi_{Q'}(x)$$

$$\lesssim \sum_{\sigma \in G} \sum_{|j| > n} r^{-|j-j'|\varepsilon_r - |j' - (-j' \vee -j)|\mathbf{N}(1-\frac{1}{\theta})} \left\{ M \left(\sum_{Q^j} |q_{Q^j} h(x_{Q^j})|^\theta \chi_{Q^j} \right) (\sigma(x)) \right\}^{2/\theta} \chi_{Q'}(x).$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} & S \left(\sum_{|j| > n} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) \psi_Q(x, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q) \right) \\ & \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{\sigma \in G} \sum_{|j| > n} \left\{ M \left(\sum_{Q \in Q^j} |q_Q h(x_Q)|^\theta \chi_Q \right) (\sigma(x)) \right\}^{2/\theta} \right\}^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the estimate is used: for $\frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N}+\varepsilon} < \theta < 1$,

$$\sup_j \sum_{j' \in \mathbb{Z}} r^{-|j-j'|\varepsilon_r - |j' - (-j' \vee -j)|\mathbf{N}(1-\frac{1}{\theta})} < \infty.$$

The Fefferman-Stein vector valued maximal function inequality with $\theta < 1 < p < \infty$ yields

$$\left\| S \left(\sum_{|j| > n} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) \psi_Q(\cdot, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q) \right) \right\|_p \lesssim \sum_{\sigma \in G} \left\| \left(\sum_{|j| > n} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} |q_Q h(x_Q)|^2 \chi_Q(\sigma(x)) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p.$$

Since G is finite group and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(\sigma(x)) d\omega(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(x) d\omega(x),$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| S \left(\sum_{|j| > n} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} \omega(Q) \psi_Q(\cdot, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q) \right) \right\|_p \\ & \lesssim \left\| \left(\sum_{|j| > n} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} |q_Q h(x_Q)|^2 \chi_Q(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p, \end{aligned}$$

where the last term tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ since $h \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $1 < p < \infty$, and hence, $\|S(h)\|_p \leq C$ by Theorem 1.11.

4. LITTLEWOOD-PALEY THEORY AND DUNKL-HARDY SPACE

In this section, we establish the Littlewood-Paley Theory for $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $p \leq 1$ and develop the Dunkl-Hardy Space.

4.1. Littlewood-Paley square function $S(f)$ in L^p , $p \leq 1$.

We begin with the proof of Theorem 1.13.

The proof of Theorem 1.13. As mentioned before, the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operator theory plays a crucial role. Let's recall the proof of Theorem 1.11. First, we decompose the identity operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ by $I = T_M + R_1 + R_M$ and then applying the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operator theory, namely, Theorem 1.3, to estimate R_1 and R_M on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. We obtained that the L^p , $1 < p < \infty$, norm of $R_1 + R_M$ is less than 1. It turns out that T_M is invertible and $(T_M)^{-1}$, the inverse of T_M , is bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. Applying the same strategy, to show Theorem 1.13, we need to estimate R_1 and R_M on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and show that the norms of R_1 and R_M on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$

are less than 1. To this end, we recall the Littlewood-Paley theory and Hardy space on space of homogeneous type $(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$ in the sense of Coifman and Weiss. The discrete Calderón reproducing formula in Theorem 2.14 leads the following discrete square function on space of homogeneous type $(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$:

Definition 4.1. Suppose that $f \in (\mathcal{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0))'$. $S_{cw}(f)$, the Littlewood-Paley square function of f for space of homogeneous type $(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$, is defined by

$$S_{cw}(f)(x) = \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} |D_k f(x_Q)|^2 \chi_Q(x) \right\}^{1/2},$$

where D_k, Q^k are the same as given by Theorem 2.14.

See [30] for more details.

The strategy for estimating R_1 and R_M on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ is to establish the following estimates:

$$\|S(R_1(f))\|_p \leq C \|S_{cw}(R_1(f))\|_p \leq C \|R_1\|_{dcz} \|S_{cw}(f)\|_p \leq C \|R_1\|_{dcz} \|S(f)\|_p$$

and the similar estimates hold for R_M .

In Theorem 1.11, R_1 has been proved to be the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operator with $\|R_1\|_{dcz} \leq C(r-1)$ for some $1 < r \leq r_0$ with r_0 is closed 1. The similar estimates hold for R_M with $\|R_M\|_{dcz} \leq Cr^{-M}$ for $1 < r < r_0$. Now we show the above estimates for R_1 by the following steps.

Step 1 : $\|S(R_1(f))\|_p \leq C \|S_{cw}(R_1(f))\|_p$

Indeed, we only need to show that for each $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$,

$$\|S(f)\|_p \leq C \|S_{cw}(f)\|_p$$

since R_1 is bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$.

To this end, by the discrete Calderón reproducing formula of $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ on space of homogeneous type given in Theorem 2.14, we have

$$f(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} \omega(Q) D_k(x, x_Q) \tilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q)$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} S(f)(x) &= \left(\sum_{k' \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q' \in Q^{k'}} |q_{Q'} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} \omega(Q) D_k(\cdot, x_Q) (x_{Q'}) \tilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q) \right) (x_{Q'})|^2 \chi_{Q'}(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \left(\sum_{k' \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q' \in Q^{k'}} \left| \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} \omega(Q) q_{Q'} D_k(x_{Q'}, x_Q) \tilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q) \right) \right|^2 \chi_{Q'}(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate $q_{Q'} D_k(x_{Q'}, x_Q)$, we need the following

Lemma 4.2. *Let k and k' belong to \mathbb{Z} . Suppose that $S_{k,k'}(x, y)$ satisfies the following condition:*

$$|S_{k,k'}(x, y)| \leq Cr^{-|k-k'|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{V(x, y, r^{-k \vee -k'} + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{r^{-k \vee -k'}}{r^{-k \vee -k'} + d(x, y)} \right)^\varepsilon,$$

for $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$. Then for $\frac{N}{N+\varepsilon} < p \leq 1$,

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{k' \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q' \in Q^{k'}} \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} \omega(Q) S_{k,k'}(x_{Q'}, x_Q) \lambda_Q \right|^2 \chi_{Q'} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p$$

$$\lesssim \left\| \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} |\lambda_Q|^2 \chi_Q \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p.$$

Proof. Observing that $\omega(B(x, r^{-k\nu-k'} + d(x, x_{Q^k}))) \sim \omega(B(y, r^{-k\nu-k'} + d(y, x_{Q^k})))$ for $x, y \in Q^{k'}$, hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & |S_{k,k'}(x_{Q'}, x_Q)| \chi_{Q'}(x) \\ & \lesssim C r^{-|k-k'|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{V(x_Q, x_{Q'}, r^{-k\nu-k'} + d(x_{Q'}, x_Q))} \left(\frac{r^{-k\nu-k'}}{r^{-k\nu-k'} + d(x_{Q'}, x_Q)} \right)^\varepsilon \\ & \lesssim C r^{-|k-k'|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x_Q, r^{-k\nu-k'} + d(x, x_Q)))} \left(\frac{r^{-k\nu-k'}}{r^{-k\nu-k'} + d(x, x_Q)} \right)^\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Applying $d(x, y) = \min_{\sigma \in G} \|\sigma(x) - y\|$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} & |S_{k,k'}(x_{Q'}, x_Q)| \chi_{Q'}(x) \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\sigma \in G} r^{-|k-k'|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x_Q, r^{-k\nu-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|))} \left(\frac{r^{-k\nu-k'}}{r^{-k\nu-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|} \right)^\varepsilon \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\sigma \in G} r^{-|k-k'|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\omega(B(\sigma(x), r^{-k\nu-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|))} \left(\frac{r^{-k\nu-k'}}{r^{-k\nu-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|} \right)^\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Let θ satisfy that $\frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N}+\varepsilon} < \theta < p \leq 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{Q \in Q^k} w(Q) \frac{1}{\omega(B(\sigma(x), r^{-k\nu-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|))} \left(\frac{r^{-k\nu-k'}}{r^{-k\nu-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|} \right)^\varepsilon |a_Q(x_Q)| \\ & \leq \left\{ \sum_{Q \in Q^k} w(Q)^\theta \frac{1}{\omega(B(\sigma(x), r^{-k\nu-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|))^\theta} \left(\frac{r^{-k\nu-k'}}{r^{-k\nu-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|} \right)^{\theta\varepsilon} |\lambda_Q|^\theta \right\}^{\frac{1}{\theta}}. \end{aligned}$$

Denote by c_Q the center point of Q . Let $A_0 = \{Q \in Q^k : \|c_Q - \sigma(x)\| \leq r^{-k\nu-k'}\}$ and $A_\ell = \{Q \in Q^k : r^{\ell-1+(-k\nu-k')} < \|c_Q - \sigma(x)\| \leq r^{\ell+(-k\nu-k')}\}$ for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. We use (1.1) to obtain that for $Q \in Q^k$,

$$\omega(Q) \chi_Q(z) \sim \omega(B(z, r^{-k})) \chi_Q(z) \sim \omega(B(\sigma(z), r^{-k})) \chi_Q(z) \quad \text{for } \sigma \in G$$

and

$$\omega(B(x_Q, r^{-k\nu-k'})) \lesssim r^{[k+(-k\nu-k')]\mathbf{N}} \omega(B(x_Q, r^{-k})).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{Q \in Q^k} w(Q)^\theta \frac{1}{\omega(B(\sigma(x), r^{-k\nu-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|))^\theta} \left(\frac{r^{-k\nu-k'}}{r^{-k\nu-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|} \right)^{\theta\varepsilon} |\lambda_Q|^\theta \\ & = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in A_\ell} w(Q)^\theta \frac{1}{\omega(B(\sigma(x), r^{-k\nu-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|))^\theta} \left(\frac{r^{-k\nu-k'}}{r^{-k\nu-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|} \right)^{\theta\varepsilon} |\lambda_Q|^\theta \\ & \lesssim r^{[-k-(-k\nu-k')]\mathbf{N}(\theta-1)} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\omega(B(\sigma(x), r^{-k\nu-k'}))}{\omega(B(\sigma(x), r^{\ell+(-k\nu-k')}))} \right)^{\theta-1} \frac{1}{r^{\theta\varepsilon\ell}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \times \frac{1}{\omega(B(\sigma(x), r^{\ell+(-k\vee-k')})))} \int_{\|\sigma(x)-z\|\leq 2r^{\ell+(-k\vee-k')}} \sum_{Q \in A_\ell} |\lambda_Q|^\theta \chi_Q(z) d\omega(z) \\
& \lesssim r^{[-k-(-k\vee-k')]\mathbf{N}(\theta-1)} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r^{\ell[\theta\varepsilon+\mathbf{N}(\theta-1)]}} M\left(\sum_{Q \in Q^k} |\lambda_Q|^\theta \chi_Q\right)(\sigma(x)) \\
& \lesssim r^{[-k-(-k\vee-k')]\mathbf{N}(\theta-1)} M\left(\sum_{Q \in Q^k} |\lambda_Q|^\theta \chi_Q\right)(\sigma(x)),
\end{aligned}$$

where M denote the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator on $(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{Q \in Q^k} \omega(Q) \frac{1}{\omega(B(\sigma(x), r^{-k\vee-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|))} \left(\frac{r^{-k\vee-k'}}{r^{-k\vee-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|} \right)^\varepsilon |a_Q(x_Q)| \\
& \lesssim r^{[-k-(-k\vee-k')]\mathbf{N}(1-1/\theta)} \left\{ M\left(\sum_{Q \in Q^k} |\lambda_Q|^\theta \chi_Q\right)(\sigma(x)) \right\}^{1/\theta}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{Q \in Q^k} \omega(Q) S_{k,k'}(x_{Q'}, x_Q) \lambda_Q \chi_{Q'}(x) \\
& \lesssim \sum_{\sigma \in G} r^{[-k-(-k'\vee-k)]\mathbf{N}(1-\frac{1}{\theta})} \left\{ M\left(\sum_{Q \in Q^k} |\lambda_Q|^\theta \chi_Q\right)(\sigma(x)) \right\}^{1/\theta} \chi_{Q'}(x).
\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that for $\frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N}+\varepsilon} < \theta < p \leq 1$,

$$\sup_{k'} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} r^{-|k-k'|\varepsilon} r^{[-k-(-k'\vee-k)]\mathbf{N}(1-\frac{1}{\theta})} < \infty.$$

By Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} \omega(Q) S_{k,k'}(x_{Q'}, x_Q) \lambda_Q \right|^2 \chi_{Q'}(x) \\
& \lesssim \sum_{\sigma \in G} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} r^{-|k-k'|\varepsilon} r^{[-k-(-k'\vee-k)]\mathbf{N}(1-\frac{1}{\theta})} \left\{ M\left(\sum_{Q^k} |\lambda_{Q^k}|^\theta \chi_{Q^k}\right)(\sigma(x)) \right\}^{2/\theta} \chi_{Q'}(x).
\end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k' \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q' \in Q^{k'}} \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} \omega(Q) S_{k,k'}(x_{Q'}, x_Q) \lambda_Q \right|^2 \chi_{Q'} \\
& \lesssim \left\{ \sum_{\sigma \in G} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ M\left(\sum_{Q \in Q^k} |\lambda_Q|^\theta \chi_Q\right)(\sigma(x)) \right\}^{2/\theta} \right\}^{1/2},
\end{aligned}$$

where the estimate is used: for $\frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N}+\varepsilon} < \theta < p \leq 1$,

$$\sup_k \sum_{k' \in \mathbb{Z}} r^{-|k-k'|\varepsilon} r^{[-k-(-k'\vee-k)]\mathbf{N}(1-\frac{1}{\theta})} < \infty.$$

The Fefferman-Stein vector valued maximal function inequality with $\theta < p \leq 1$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{k' \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q' \in Q^{k'}} \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} \omega(Q) S_{k,k'}(x_{Q'}, x_Q) \lambda_Q \right|^2 \chi_{Q'} \right\|_p \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\sigma \in G} \left\| \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} |\lambda_Q|^2 \chi_Q(\sigma(x)) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

Since G is finite group and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(\sigma(x)) d\omega(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(x) d\omega(x),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{k' \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q' \in Q^{k'}} \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} \omega(Q) S_{k,k'}(x_{Q'}, x_Q) \lambda_Q \right|^2 \chi_{Q'} \right\|_p \\ & \lesssim \left\| \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} |\lambda_Q|^2 \chi_Q(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the Lemma 4.2 is completed. \square

Remark 4.1. Using the similar proof of Lemma 4.2, we also obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left(\sum_{k' \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q' \in Q^{k'}} \left| \sum_{|k| > j} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} \omega(Q) S_{k,k'}(x_{Q'}, x_Q) \lambda_Q \right|^2 \chi_{Q'} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p \\ & \lesssim \left\| \left(\sum_{|k| > j} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} |\lambda_Q|^2 \chi_Q \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p \quad \text{for } j \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned}$$

We now return to the proof of **Step 1**. Applying the almost orthogonal estimate given in the Lemma 2.11 for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} & |q_{Q'} D_k(x_{Q'}, x_Q) \chi_{Q'}(x)| \\ & \lesssim r^{-|k-k'|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{V(x_{Q'}, x_Q, r^{-k \vee -k'} + \|x_{Q'} - x_Q\|)} \left(\frac{r^{-k \vee -k'}}{r^{-k \vee -k'} + \|x_{Q'} - x_Q\|} \right)^\varepsilon \chi_{Q'}(x). \end{aligned}$$

The Lemma 4.2 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|S(f)(x)\|_p &= \left\| \left(\sum_{k' \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q' \in Q^{k'}} \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} \omega(Q) q_{Q'} D_k(x_{Q'}, x_Q) \tilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q) \right|^2 \chi_{Q'}(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p \\ &\lesssim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} |\tilde{D}_k f(x_Q)|^2 \chi_Q \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p \\ &\lesssim \|S_{cw}(f)\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

Step 2 : $\|S_{cw}(R_1(f))\|_p \leq C \|R_1\|_{dcz} \|S_{cw}(f)\|_p$

To show the above inequality, we write

$$\|S_{cw}(R_1 f)(x)\|_p = \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} |D_k R_1(f)(x_Q)|^2 \chi_Q(x) \right\}^{1/2} \right\|_p.$$

The L^2 boundedness of R_1 together with the discrete Calderón reproducing formula of $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ on space of homogeneous type given in Theorem 2.14 yields

$$\|S_{cw}(R_1(f))\|_p = \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} \left| \sum_{k' \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q' \in Q^{k'}} \omega(Q') D_k R_1 D_{k'}(x_Q, x_{Q'}) \widetilde{D}_{k'}(f)(x_{Q'}) \right|^2 \chi_{Q'}(x) \right\}^{1/2} \right\|_p.$$

Applying the almost orthogonal estimate given in Lemma 2.10 to $D_k R_1 D_{k'}(x_Q, x_{Q'})$, we obtain that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |D_k R_1 D_{k'}(x_Q, x_{Q'})| \chi_{Q'}(x) \\ & \lesssim \|R_1\|_{dcz} r^{-|k-k'|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{V(x_{Q'}, x_Q, r^{-k\vee-k'} + d(x_{Q'}, x_Q))} \left(\frac{r^{-k\vee-k'}}{r^{-k\vee-k'} + d(x_{Q'}, x_Q)} \right)^\varepsilon \chi_{Q'}(x) \\ & \lesssim \|R_1\|_{dcz} \sum_{\sigma \in G} r^{-|k-k'|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{V(x_{Q'}, x_Q, r^{-k\vee-k'} + \|\sigma(x_{Q'}) - x_Q\|)} \left(\frac{r^{-k\vee-k'}}{r^{-k\vee-k'} + \|\sigma(x_{Q'}) - x_Q\|} \right)^\varepsilon \chi_{Q'}(x) \\ & \lesssim \|R_1\|_{dcz} \sum_{\sigma \in G} r^{-|k-k'|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x_Q, r^{-k\vee-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|))} \left(\frac{r^{-k\vee-k'}}{r^{-k\vee-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|} \right)^\varepsilon \chi_{Q'}(x) \\ & \lesssim \|R_1\|_{dcz} \sum_{\sigma \in G} r^{-|k-k'|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\omega(B(\sigma(x), r^{-k\vee-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|))} \left(\frac{r^{-k\vee-k'}}{r^{-k\vee-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|} \right)^\varepsilon \chi_{Q'}(x), \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that if $x \in Q'$ then $r^{-k\vee-k'} + \|\sigma(x_{Q'}) - x_Q\| \sim r^{-k\vee-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|$.

Applying the Lemma 4.1 implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{Q' \in Q^k} w(Q') \frac{1}{\omega(B(\sigma(x), r^{-k\vee-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|))} \\ & \quad \times \left(\frac{r^{-k\vee-k'}}{r^{-k\vee-k'} + \|\sigma(x) - x_Q\|} \right)^\varepsilon |\widetilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q)| \\ & \leq C r^{[-k' - (-k'\vee-k)]\mathbf{N}(1-\frac{1}{\theta})} \left\{ M \left(\sum_{Q \in Q^k} |\widetilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q)|^\theta \chi_Q \right) (\sigma(x)) \right\}^{1/\theta}, \end{aligned}$$

where θ satisfies $\frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N}+\varepsilon} < \theta < p \leq 1$. By Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} \omega(Q) D_k R_1 D_{k'}(x_Q, x_{Q'}) \widetilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q) \right|^2 \chi_{Q'}(x) \\ & \lesssim \|R_1\|_{dcz} \sum_{\sigma \in G} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} r^{-|k-k'|\varepsilon} r^{[-k' - (-k'\vee-k)]\mathbf{N}(1-\frac{1}{\theta})} \left\{ M \left(\sum_{Q \in Q^k} |\widetilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q)|^\theta \chi_Q \right) (\sigma(x)) \right\}^{2/\theta} \chi_{Q'}(x), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$S_{cw}(R_1(f))(x) \lesssim \|R_1\|_{dcz} \left\{ \sum_{\sigma \in G} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ M \left(\sum_{Q \in Q^k} |\widetilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q)|^\theta \chi_Q \right) (\sigma(x)) \right\}^{2/\theta} \right\}^{1/2}.$$

The Fefferman-Stein vector valued maximal function inequality with $\theta < p \leq 1$ yields

$$\|S_{cw}R_1(f)\|_p \lesssim \|R_1\|_{dcz} \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} |\widetilde{D}_k f(x_Q)|^2 \chi_Q(\sigma(x)) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^p(\omega)}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \|R_1\|_{dcz} \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} |\tilde{D}_k f(x_Q)|^2 \chi_Q(x) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^p(\omega)} \\ &\lesssim \|R_1\|_{dcz} \|S_{cw}(f)\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the similar proof, we still have $\|S_{cw}R_M(f)\|_p \lesssim \|R_M\|_{dcz} \|S_{cw}(f)\|_p$.

We remark that the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operator theory plays a crucial role for the proof of this estimate. More precisely, we obtain the sharp range for $p : \frac{N}{N+\varepsilon} < \theta < p \leq 1$, which is same as in the classical case.

Step 3 : $\|S_{cw}(f)\|_p \leq C\|S(f)\|_p$ To show this estimate, the key point is to write

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_Q w(Q) \psi_j(x, x_Q) q_j f(x_Q) + R_1(f)(x) + R_M(x) \\ &= T_M(f)(x) + R_1(f)(x) + R_M(x). \end{aligned}$$

By the estimates in **Step 2** for $\frac{N}{N+1} < p \leq 1$, we have

$$\|S_{cw}R_1(f)\|_p \leq C\|R_1\|_{dcz} \|S_{cw}(f)\|_p \leq \frac{1}{4} \|S_{cw}(f)\|_p$$

and

$$\|S_{cw}R_M(f)\|_p \leq C\|R_M\|_{dcz} \|S_{cw}(f)\|_p \leq \frac{1}{4} \|S_{cw}(f)\|_p.$$

These estimates imply

$$\|S_{cw}(f)\|_p^p \leq \|S_{cw}(T_M(f)(x) + R_1(f)(x) + R_M(x))\|_p^p \leq \|S_{cw}(T_M f)\|_p^p + \frac{1}{2} \|S_{cw}(f)\|_p^p$$

and, hence,

$$\|S_{cw}(f)\|_p \leq C_p \|S_{cw}(T_M f)\|_p.$$

We claim $\|S_{cw}(T_M f)\|_p \leq C\|S(f)\|_p$. Indeed, observing that

$$T_M(f)(x) = -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_Q(x, x_Q) q_Q f(x_Q),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| D_k T_M(f)(x) \right| &= \left| D_k \left(-\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_Q(\cdot, x_Q) q_Q f(x_Q) \right) (x) \right| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) |D_k \psi_Q(x, x_Q)| |q_Q f(x_Q)|. \end{aligned}$$

Following the same proof as in **Step 1** and applying the estimate (2.17) in the Lemma 2.11, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $x_Q \in Q, Q \in Q^j, Q' \in Q^k$,

$$\begin{aligned} &|D_k \psi_Q(x, x_Q)| \chi_{Q'}(x) \\ &\lesssim r^{-|j-k|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{V(x, x_Q, r^{-j\nu-k} + d(x, x_Q))} \left(\frac{r^{-j\nu-k}}{r^{-j\nu-k} + \|x - x_Q\|} \right)^\varepsilon \chi_{Q'}(x). \end{aligned}$$

We obtain

$$|D_k T_M f(x)|^2 \chi_{Q'}(x)$$

$$\lesssim \sum_{\sigma \in G} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} r^{-|j-k|\varepsilon_r^{[-k-(-k\nu-j)]\mathbf{N}(1-\frac{1}{\theta})}} \left\{ M \left(\sum_{Q_j} |q_j f(x_{Q_j})|^\theta \chi_{Q_j} \right) (x) \right\}^{2/\theta} \chi_{Q'}(x),$$

which the fact that $\frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N}+\varepsilon} < \theta < p \leq 1$ together with the Fefferman-Stein vector-valued maximal inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_{cw}(T_M f)\|_{L^p(\omega)} &= \left\| \left\{ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q' \in Q^k} |D_k T_M f(x_{Q'})|^2 \chi_{Q'}(x) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^p} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} |q_Q f(x_Q)|^2 \chi_Q(x) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^p} \\ &\lesssim \|S(f)\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of **Step 3** is complete.

Observing that $f(x) = T_M(f)(x) + R_1(f)(x) + R_M(f)(x)$ and applying the above estimates, namely, $\|S(R_1 + R_M)(f)\|_p \leq C(\|R_1\|_{dcz} + \|R_M\|_{dcz})\|S(f)\|_p$, imply that

$$\|S(I - T_M)(f)\|_p = \|S(R_1(f)(x) + R_M(f))\|_p \leq \frac{1}{2}\|S(f)\|_p.$$

Therefore, $\|S((T_M)^{-1}f)\|_p \leq C\|Sf\|_p$. Set $h = (T_M)^{-1}f$, we obtain

$$f(x) = T_M h(x) = -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_Q(x, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q),$$

where $\|f\|_2 \sim \|h\|_2$ and $\|f\|_{H_d^p} \sim \|h\|_{H_d^p}$, for $\frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N}+1} < p \leq 1$.

It remains to show that the above series converges in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. To this end, we only need to prove

$$\left\| S \left(\sum_{|j|>n} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_Q(x, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q) \right) \right\|_p \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Indeed, repeating the same proof as **Step 1**,

$$(4.1) \quad \left\| S \left(\sum_{|j|>n} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_Q(x, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q) \right) \right\|_p \lesssim \left\| \left\{ \sum_{|j|>n} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} |q_Q h(x_Q)|^2 \chi_Q(x) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p,$$

where by the fact $\|S(h)\|_p \leq C\|h\|_p$, the last term tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The proof of Theorem 1.13 is complete. \square

4.2. Dunkl-Hardy space $H_d^p, \frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N}+1} < p \leq 1$.

As mentioned, the departure for introducing the Hardy space $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega), \frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N}+1} < p \leq 1$, in the Dunkl setting is the Proposition 1.14.

The proof of Proposition 1.14. Applying the weak-type discrete Calderón-type reproducing formula given in Theorem 1.13 for $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, we write

$$f = -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_Q(x, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q),$$

where $\|h\|_2 \sim \|f\|_2$ and $\|S(h)\|_p \sim \|S(f)\|_p$.

Set $\Omega_\ell = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : S(h)(x) > 2^\ell\}$ and

$$B_\ell = \left\{ Q : Q \text{ are } r\text{-dyadic cubes, } \omega(Q \cap \Omega_\ell) > \frac{1}{2}\omega(Q) \text{ and } \omega(Q \cap \Omega_{\ell+1}) \leq \frac{1}{2}\omega(Q) \right\}.$$

Denote $B_\ell^* := \{Q_\ell^*\}$ by the maximal r -dyadic cubes in B_ℓ for $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$. We claim that

$$f = -\ln r \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{\substack{Q_\ell^* \in B_\ell^* \\ Q \in B_\ell}} \omega(Q) \psi_Q(x, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q).$$

In order to prove the above claim, we only need to show that if the dyadic cube $Q \notin B_\ell$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$, then

$$\omega(Q) \psi_Q(x, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q) = 0.$$

Observe that by the stopping time argument, each dyadic cube Q can be in one and only one in B_ℓ , that is, if Q belongs to both B_ℓ and $B_{\ell'}$, then $\ell = \ell'$. We now can assume that $\omega(Q) \neq 0$. Otherwise, the above equality holds obviously. Note that $\omega(\Omega_\ell) < 2^{-2\ell} \|S_L(f)\|_{L^2(X)}^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $\ell \rightarrow +\infty$. As a consequence, if $Q \notin B_\ell$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $\omega(Q \cap \Omega_\ell) \leq \frac{1}{2}\omega(Q)$, for all $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ since, otherwise, there exists an $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that $\omega(Q \cap \Omega_{\ell_0}) > \frac{1}{2}\omega(Q)$. However $\omega(Q \cap \Omega_\ell) \rightarrow 0$ as $\ell \rightarrow +\infty$ and $\{\omega(Q \cap \Omega_\ell)\}_\ell$ is a decreasing sequence. This implies that there must be one critical index ℓ_1 such that $\omega(Q \cap \Omega_{\ell_1}) > \frac{1}{2}\omega(Q)$ and $\omega(Q \cap \Omega_{\ell_1+1}) \leq \frac{1}{2}\omega(Q)$, that is, $Q \in B_{\ell_1}$. This is contradict to the fact that Q is not in B_ℓ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$.

The fact $\omega(Q \cap \Omega_\ell) \leq \frac{1}{2}\omega(Q)$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ implies that $\mu(Q \cap \Omega_\ell^c) \geq \frac{1}{2}\mu(Q)$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$. Now set $K = \{x \in X : S(h)(x) = 0\}$. Note that $\cap_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \Omega_\ell^c = \cap_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \{x \in X : S(h)(x) \leq 2^\ell\} = K$. As a consequence,

$$\omega(Q \cap K) = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow -\infty} \omega(Q \cap \Omega_\ell^c) \geq \frac{1}{2}\omega(Q) > 0.$$

Since for all $x \in K$, $0 = S(h)(x) = \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} |q_Q h(x_Q)|^2 \chi_Q(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we have $q_Q h(x_Q) = 0$

and hence, the claim follows.

We get

$$\langle f, g \rangle = -\ln r \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{\substack{Q_\ell^* \in B_\ell^* \\ Q \in B_\ell}} w(Q) q_Q h(x_Q) \psi_Q g(x_Q).$$

Applying first the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and then the $p, 0 < p \leq 1$, inequality in the last summation implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle f, g \rangle| &\lesssim \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{\substack{Q_\ell^* \in B_\ell^* \\ Q \in B_\ell}} \left(\sum_{\substack{Q \in B_\ell^* \\ Q \in B_\ell}} w(Q) |q_Q h(x_Q)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{\substack{Q \in B_\ell^* \\ Q \in B_\ell}} w(Q) |\psi_Q g(x_Q)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{\substack{Q_\ell^* \in B_\ell^* \\ Q \in B_\ell}} \left(\sum_{\substack{Q \in B_\ell^* \\ Q \in B_\ell}} w(Q) |q_Q h(x_Q)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left(\sum_{\substack{Q \in B_\ell^* \\ Q \in B_\ell}} w(Q) |\psi_Q g(x_Q)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Observing that the last summation above is dominated by

$$\left(\sum_{\substack{Q \in B_\ell^* \\ Q \in B_\ell}} w(Q) |\psi_Q g(x_Q)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \leq \omega(Q_\ell^*)^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \|g\|_{CMO_d^p}^p,$$

which implies that

$$|\langle f, g \rangle| \lesssim \|g\|_{CMO_d^p} \left\{ \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q_\ell^* \in B_\ell^*} \omega(Q_\ell^*)^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \left(\sum_{\substack{Q \in B_\ell^* \\ Q \in B_\ell}} w(Q) |q_Q h(x_Q)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

By the Hölder inequality, we have

$$|\langle f, g \rangle| \lesssim \|g\|_{CMO_d^p} \left\{ \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left[\sum_{Q_\ell^* \in B_\ell^*} \omega(Q_\ell^*) \right]^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \left(\sum_{Q \in B_\ell} w(Q) |q_Q h(x_Q)|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

To estimate the last term above, let $\tilde{\Omega}_\ell = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : M(\chi_{\Omega_\ell})(x) > \frac{1}{2}\}$, where M is the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function on \mathbb{R}^N with the measure $d\omega$ and $\chi_{\Omega_\ell}(x)$ is the indicate function of Ω_ℓ . It is not difficult to see that if $Q \in B_\ell$ then $Q \subseteq \tilde{\Omega}_\ell$. Since all Q_ℓ^* are disjoint, thus,

$$\left[\sum_{Q_\ell^* \in B_\ell^*} \omega(Q_\ell^*) \right]^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \leq \omega(\tilde{\Omega}_\ell)^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \leq C\omega(\Omega_\ell)^{1-\frac{p}{2}},$$

where the first inequality follows from the facts that $\bigcup_{Q_\ell^* \in B_\ell^*} Q_\ell^* \subseteq \tilde{\Omega}_\ell$ and $\sum_{Q_\ell^* \in B_\ell^*} \omega(Q_\ell^*) \leq \omega(\tilde{\Omega}_\ell)$

and, by the L^2 -boundedness of the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function, the last inequality follows from the estimate $\omega(\tilde{\Omega}_\ell) \leq C\omega(\Omega_\ell)$.

We claim that

$$(4.2) \quad \sum_{Q \in B_\ell} w(Q) |q_Q h(x_Q)|^2 \leq C2^{2\ell} \omega(\Omega_\ell).$$

Assuming this claim (4.2) for the moment, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle f, g \rangle| &\leq C \|g\|_{CMO_d^p} \left(\sum_{\ell=-\infty}^{\infty} \omega(\Omega_\ell)^{1-\frac{p}{2}} 2^{p\ell} \omega(\Omega_\ell)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq C \|g\|_{CMO_d^p} \left(\sum_{\ell=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{p\ell} \omega(\Omega_\ell) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq C \|S(h)\|_p \|g\|_{CMO_d^p} \\ &\leq C \|S(f)\|_p \|g\|_{CMO_d^p}. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to show the claim (4.2). To this end, we begin with the following estimate

$$\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_\ell \setminus \Omega_{\ell+1}} S(h)^2(x) d\omega(x) \leq C2^{2\ell} \omega(\tilde{\Omega}_\ell) \leq C2^{2\ell} \omega(\Omega_\ell).$$

Note that

$$\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_\ell \setminus \Omega_{\ell+1}} S(h)^2(x) d\omega(x) \geq \sum_{Q \in B_\ell} |q_Q h(x_Q)|^2 \omega((\tilde{\Omega}_\ell / \Omega_{\ell+1}) \cap Q).$$

Since for each $Q \in B_\ell$, $Q \subseteq \tilde{\Omega}_\ell$ and $\Omega_{\ell+1} \subset \Omega_\ell$, hence,

$$w((\tilde{\Omega}_\ell/\Omega_{\ell+1}) \cap Q) = w(Q) - w(\Omega_{\ell+1} \cap Q) \geq \frac{1}{2}w(Q).$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_\ell/\Omega_{\ell+1}} |S(h)(x)|^2 d\omega(x) \geq C \sum_{Q \in B_\ell} w(Q) |q_Q h(x_Q)|^2,$$

which implies the claim (4.2). The proof of Proposition 1.14 is concluded. \square

The Proposition 1.14 indicates that if $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a sequence in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ with $\|S(f_n - f_m)\|_p \rightarrow 0$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$, then for each $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ with $\|g\|_{CMO_d^p} < \infty$, $\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \langle f_n - f_m, g \rangle = 0$. Therefore, there exists f , as a distribution on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p$, such that for each $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ with $\|g\|_{CMO_d^p} < \infty$,

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f_n, g \rangle.$$

Before introducing the Dunkl-Hardy space, we need the following

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\frac{N}{N+1} < p \leq 1$. Then $q_j(\cdot, y)$ is in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p$ for any fixed j and $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Moreover,*

$$\sup_P \frac{1}{\omega(P)^{\frac{2}{p}-1}} \sum_{Q \subseteq P} \omega(Q) |\psi_Q(q_j(\cdot, y))(x_Q)|^2 \leq C,$$

where both P and Q are r -dyadic cubes on \mathbb{R}^N and the constant C which depends on j but is independent of y .

Proof. Fix a dyadic cube P with the side length r^{-M-k_0} and the center x_P . For $Q \in Q^k$, the almost orthogonal estimate (2.17) in the Lemma (2.10) implies

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_Q(q_j(\cdot, y))(x)| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \psi_k(x, z) q_j(z, y) d\omega(z) \right| \\ (4.3) \quad &\leq C r^{-|k-j|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{V(x, y, r^{-k \vee -j} + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{r^{-k \vee -j}}{r^{-k \vee -j} + \|x - y\|} \right)^\varepsilon \\ &\leq C r^{-|k-j|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, r^{-k \vee -j}))} \\ &\leq C r^{-|k-j|\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, r^{-j}))}. \end{aligned}$$

For $k_0 \geq j$, we use (4.3) to get

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\omega(P)^{\frac{2}{p}-1}} \sum_{Q \subseteq P} \omega(Q) |\psi_Q(q_j(\cdot, y))(x_Q)|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{\omega(P)^{\frac{2}{p}-1}} \sum_{k=k_0}^\infty \sum_{\{Q \in Q^k: Q \subseteq P\}} \omega(Q) |\psi_Q(q_j(\cdot, y))(x_Q)|^2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\omega(P)^{\frac{2}{p}-1}} \sum_{k=k_0}^\infty \sum_{\{Q \in Q^k: Q \subseteq P\}} \omega(Q) \frac{1}{\omega(B(x_Q, r^{-j}))^2} r^{-2|k-j|\varepsilon} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim \sup_{x \in P} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, r^{-j}))^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\omega(P)^{\frac{2}{p}-1}} \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\{Q \in Q^k: Q \subseteq P\}} \omega(Q) r^{-2|k-j|\varepsilon} \\
&\lesssim \sup_{x \in P} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, r^{-j}))^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\omega(P)^{\frac{2}{p}-2}} \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} r^{-2|k-j|\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $k_0 \geq j$, then doubling property of the measure ω implies,

$$\omega(B(x_P, r^{-j})) \lesssim r^{(-j+k_0)\mathbf{N}} \omega(B(x_P, r^{-k_0})) \lesssim r^{(-j+k_0)\mathbf{N}} \omega(B(x_P, r^{-k_0})) \omega(P).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\omega(P)^{\frac{2}{p}-1}} \sum_{Q \subseteq P} \omega(Q) |\psi_Q(q_j(\cdot, y))(x_Q)|^2 \\
&\lesssim \sup_{x \in P} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, r^{-j}))^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\omega(B(x_P, r^{-j}))^{\frac{2}{p}-2}} \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} r^{-2|k-j|\varepsilon} r^{(-j+k_0)\mathbf{N}(\frac{2}{p}-2)} \\
&\lesssim \sup_{x \in P} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, r^{-j}))^{\frac{2}{p}}} \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} r^{-2|k-j|\varepsilon} r^{(-j+k_0)\mathbf{N}(\frac{2}{p}-2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N}+\varepsilon} < p$, we have $\mathbf{N}(\frac{2}{p}-2) - 2\varepsilon \leq 0$ and then $\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} r^{(-j+k_0)\mathbf{N}(\frac{2}{p}-2)-2(k_0-j)\varepsilon} \lesssim 1$. The above inequality yields

$$\sup_P \frac{1}{\omega(P)^{\frac{2}{p}-1}} \sum_{Q \subseteq P} \omega(Q) |\psi_Q(q_j(\cdot, y))(x_Q)|^2 \leq C_j \sup_{x \in P} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, r^{-j}))^{\frac{2}{p}}}.$$

For $k_0 \leq j$, applying (4.3) gets

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\omega(P)^{\frac{2}{p}-1}} \sum_{Q \subseteq P} \omega(Q) |\psi_Q(q_j(\cdot, y))(x_Q)|^2 \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{\omega(P)^{\frac{2}{p}-1}} \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\{Q \in Q^k: Q \subseteq P\}} \omega(Q) \frac{1}{\omega(B(x_Q, r^{-j}))^2} r^{-2|k-j|\varepsilon} \\
&\lesssim \sup_{x \in P} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, r^{-j}))^2} \frac{1}{\omega(P)^{\frac{2}{p}-1}} \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \sum_{\{Q \in Q^k: Q \subseteq P\}} \omega(Q) r^{-2|k-j|\varepsilon} \\
&\lesssim \sup_{x \in P} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, r^{-j}))^2} \frac{1}{\omega(P)^{\frac{2}{p}-1}} \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \omega(P) r^{-2|k-j|\varepsilon} \\
&\lesssim \sup_{x \in P} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, r^{-j}))^2} \frac{1}{\omega(P)^{\frac{2}{p}-2}} \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} r^{-2|k-j|\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\omega(B(x_Q, r^{-j})) \leq \omega(B(x_Q, r^{-k_0})) \sim \omega(P)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\omega(P)^{\frac{2}{p}-1}} \sum_{Q \subseteq P} \mu(Q) |\psi_Q(q_j(\cdot, y))(x_Q)|^2 &\lesssim \sup_{x \in P} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, r^{-j}))^{\frac{2}{p}}} \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} r^{-2|k-j|\varepsilon} \\
&\leq C_j \sup_{x \in P} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, r^{-j}))^{\frac{2}{p}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over all dyadic cubes P and using

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} \omega(B(x, 1)) \geq C,$$

we obtain

$$\sup_P \frac{1}{\omega(P)^{\frac{2}{p}-1}} \sum_{Q \subseteq P} \omega(Q) |\psi_Q(q_j(\cdot, y))(x_Q)|^2 \leq C_j.$$

and the proof is complete. \square

We denote $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p$ by the subspace of all $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ with the norm $\|f\|_{CMO_d^p} < \infty$. Based on the above Lemma 4.3, if $f \in (L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p)'$, then $q_j(f)(x)$ is well defined since for each fixed $x, q_j(x, y) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p$.

The following result describes an important property for such a distribution f . More precisely, we establish the following weak-type discrete Calderón reproducing formula in the distribution sense:

Proposition 4.4. Suppose that $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a sequence in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ with $\|S(f_n - f_m)\|_p \rightarrow 0$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$. Then there exists f , as a distribution in $(L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p)'$, such that (i) $\|S(f)\|_p = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S(f_n)\|_p < \infty$; (ii) there exists a distribution $h \in (L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p)'$ with $\|f\|_2 \sim \|h\|_2$, $\|S(f)\|_p \sim \|S(h)\|_p$, such that for each $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p$, f has the following weak-type discrete Calderón reproducing formula in the distribution sense:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f, g \rangle &:= \langle -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_Q(\cdot, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q), g \rangle \\ &= -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_Q g(x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q), \end{aligned}$$

where the last series converges absolutely.

Proof. By the Proposition 1.14, there exists $f \in (L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p)'$ such that for each $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p$,

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f_n, g \rangle.$$

Observing that $\|S(f - f_n)\|_p = \|S(\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (f_m - f_n))\|_p \leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|S(f_m - f_n)\|_p$, and hence, $\|S(f - f_n)\|_p \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This implies that $\|S(f)\|_p = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S(f_n)\|_p < \infty$. Applying Theorem 1.13, for each f_n there exists an h_n such that $\|f_n\|_2 \sim \|h_n\|_2$ and $\|f_n\|_{H_d^p} \sim \|h_n\|_{H_d^p}$. Thus, by the Proposition 1.14, there exists $h \in (L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p)'$ such that for each $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p$,

$$\langle h, g \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle h_n, g \rangle.$$

Therefore, $\|S(h_n - h_m)\|_p \rightarrow 0$ and $\|S(h)\|_p = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S(h_n)\|_p \sim \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S(f_n)\|_p \sim \|S(f)\|_p$.

To show that f has a weak-type discrete Calderón reproducing formula in the distribution sense, for each $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p$, applying the proof of the Proposition 1.14,

$$\left| \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_Q g(x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q) \right| \leq C \|f\|_{H_d^p} \|g\|_{CMO_d^p},$$

which implies that the series $\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_Q(x, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q)$ is a distribution in $(L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p)'$. Moreover, by the weak-type discrete Calderón reproducing formula of f_n in Theorem 1.13, for each $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p$,

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f_n, g \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_Q(x, x_Q) q_Q h_n(x_Q), g \right\rangle,$$

where $\|f_n\|_2 \sim \|h_n\|_2$ and $\|S(f_n)\|_p \sim \|S(h_n)\|_p$.

Observe that, by the same proof of Proposition 1.14,

$$\left| \left\langle -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_Q(x, x_Q) q_Q (h - h_n)(x_Q), g \right\rangle \right| \leq C \|S(h_n - h)\|_p \|g\|_{CMO_d^p},$$

where the last term above tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and hence,

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f_n, g \rangle = \left\langle -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_Q(x, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q), g \right\rangle.$$

The proof of Proposition 4.4 is complete. \square

The Proposition 4.4 indicates that one can consider $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p$, the subspace of all $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ with the norm $\|f\|_{CMO_d^p} < \infty$, as the test function space and $(L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p)'$, as the distribution space. The Dunkl-Hardy space is defined by Definition 1.16. We remark that in the Definition 1.16, the series $\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \lambda_Q \psi_Q(x, x_Q)$ with $\|\{\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} |\lambda_Q|^2 \chi_Q\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_p < \infty$ defines a distribution in $(L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p)'$. Indeed, applying the proof of Proposition 1.14, for each $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p$,

$$\left| \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \lambda_Q \psi_Q g(x_Q) \right| \leq C \left\| \left\{ \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} |\lambda_Q|^2 \chi_Q \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p \|g\|_{CMP_d^p}.$$

We now show Theorem 1.17.

The proof of Theorem 1.17. Suppose $f \in H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. Then $f \in (L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p)'$ and f has a wavelet-type decomposition $f(x) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \lambda_Q \psi_Q(x, x_Q)$ in $(L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p)'$ with $\left\| \left\{ \sum_j \sum_{Q \in Q^j} |\lambda_Q|^2 \chi_Q \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p < \infty$. Set

$$f_n(x) = \sum_{|j| \leq n} \sum_{\substack{Q \in Q^j \\ Q \subseteq B(0, n)}} w(Q) \lambda_Q \psi_Q(x, x_Q).$$

Then $f_n \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and f_n converges to f in $(L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p)'$ as n tends to ∞ . To see that $f \in \overline{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)}$, by Proposition 4.4, it suffices to show that $\|f_n - f_m\|_{H_d^p} \rightarrow 0$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$. Indeed, if let $E_n = \{(j, Q) : |j| \leq n, Q \in Q^j \subseteq B(0, n)\}$ and

$E_{n,m}^c = E_n/E_m$ with $n \geq m$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_n - f_m\|_{H_d^p} &= \left\| \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q' \in Q^k} |q_{Q'}(f_n - f_m)(x_{Q'})|^2 \chi_{Q'}(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p \\ &\leq \left\| \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q' \in Q^k} |q_{Q'} \left(\sum_{E_{n,m}^c} w(Q) \lambda_Q \psi_Q(\cdot, x_Q) \right)(x_{Q'})|^2 \chi_{Q'}(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p \\ &\leq C \left\| \left\{ \sum_{E_{n,m}^c} |\lambda_Q|^2 \chi_Q \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as n, m tend to ∞ , where the last inequality follows from the same proof of **Step 1** in the Theorem 1.13 and hence, $f \in \overline{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)}$.

Conversely, if $f \in \overline{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)}$ by Proposition 4.4, then there exists $h \in (L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p)'$ with $\|S(h)\|_p \sim \|S(f)\|_p$ such that for each $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p$,

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \left\langle -\ln r \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \psi_Q(x, x_Q) q_Q h(x_Q), g \right\rangle.$$

Set $\lambda_Q = -\ln r q_Q h(x_Q)$ with $Q \in Q^j$. We obtain a wevelet-type decomposition of f in $(L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p)'$ in the distribution sense:

$$f = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q) \lambda_Q \psi_Q(x, x_Q)$$

and hence, $f \in H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. Moreover

$$\|f\|_{H_d^p} = \inf \left\{ \left\| \left\{ \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} |\lambda_Q|^2 \chi_Q \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p \right\} \leq C \|S(h)\|_p \leq C \|S(f)\|_p.$$

The proof of Theorem 1.17 is complete. \square

To describe the relationship between the Dunkl-Hardy space $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and the Hardy space $H_{cw}^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$ on space of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman and Weiss, we recall H_{cw}^p as follows.

Definition 4.5. $H_{cw}^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$ is the collection of all distributions $f \in (\mathcal{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0))'$ such that $\|f\|_{H_{cw}^p} = \|S_{cw}(f)\|_p < \infty$, where the square function $S_{cw}(f)$ is defined in the Definition 4.1.

The relationship between the Dunkl-Hardy space $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and the Hardy space $H_{cw}^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$ is given by the following

Theorem 4.6. *Suppose $\frac{N}{N+1} < p \leq 1$. The Hardy space $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ is equivalent to the Hardy space $H_{cw}^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$ in the sense that if $f \in H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ then $f \in H_{cw}^p$ and there exists a constant C such that $\|f\|_{H_{cw}^p} \leq C \|f\|_{H_d^p}$. Conversely, if $f \in H_{cw}^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$ then f can extend to a distribution \tilde{f} on $(L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p)'$ such that $\langle \tilde{f}, g \rangle = \langle f, g \rangle$ for all $g \in \mathcal{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0)'$ and $\tilde{f} \in H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, Moreover, $\|\tilde{f}\|_{H_d^p} \leq C \|f\|_{H_{cw}^p}$.*

Proof. The proof of Theorem 4.6 is based on Theorems 1.13 and 1.17. Indeed, for $\frac{N}{N+1} < p \leq 1$ and $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, by Theorem 1.13, $\|S(f)\|_p \sim \|S_{cw}(f)\|_p$. Therefore $\overline{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)} =$

$L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_{cw}^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$ with the equivalent norms. Given $f \in H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, by Theorem 1.17, there exists a sequence $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ such that for each $f_n \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and f_n converges to f in $(L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p)'$. Moreover, $\|S(f)\|_p = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S(f_n)\|_p$. It is well known that by a classical result, $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_{cw}^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$ is dense in $H_{cw}^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$ and by Lemma 4.3, $(L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p)' \subseteq (\mathcal{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0))'$. Hence, f_n is also converges to f in $(\mathcal{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0))'$ and $\|S_{cw}(f)\|_p = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S_{cw}(f_n)\|_p$. This implies that

$$\|f\|_{H_{cw}^p} \leq C \|f\|_{H_d^p}.$$

Suppose $f \in H_{cw}^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$. there exists a sequence $\{f_n\} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ such that f_n converges f in $(\mathcal{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0))'$ and $\|f\|_{H_{cw}^p} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n\|_{H_{cw}^p}$. By the proof of Theorem 1.13, $\|S(f_n - f_m)\|_p \sim \|S_{cw}(f_n - f_m)\|_p$ and hence, $\|f_n - f_m\|_{H_d^p} = \|S(f_n - f_m)\|_p$ tends to zero as n, m tends to ∞ . Therefore, by Proposition 4.4, f_n tends to \tilde{f} in $(L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap CMO_d^p)'$. It is clear that $\tilde{f} = f$ in $(\mathcal{M}(\beta, \gamma, r, x_0))'$. Moreover, by Theorem 1.17,

$$\|\tilde{f}\|_{H_d^p} = \|S(\tilde{f})\|_p = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S(f_n)\|_p \leq C \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n\|_{H_{cw}^p} = C \|f\|_{H_{cw}^p}.$$

The proof of Theorem 4.6 is complete. \square

The proof of the Theorem 1.19 follows from the Theorem 4.6. This atomic decomposition of $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ is crucial for providing the boundedness of the Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operators from $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$.

5. BOUNDEDNESS OF DUNKL-CALDERÓN-ZYGMUND OPERATORS ON H_d^p

5.1. Boundedness of Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund Operator from H_d^p to L^p .

It is well known that the atomic decomposition is the main tool to prove the boundedness of the classical Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operators from $H^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $0 < p \leq 1$. Note that the proof of the theorem 1.23 for $p = 1$ was given in the proof of Theorem 1.3. We prove the Theorem 1.23 for $\frac{N}{N+\varepsilon} < p < 1$ only.

The proof of Theorem 1.23. It is well known that the atomic decomposition of the Hardy spaces is a key method to show the boundedness of operators from $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. Observe that $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ is dense in $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. Moreoevr, if $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, by the Theorem 1.19, then f has an atomic decomposition which converges in both $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, respectively. Therefore, it suffices to show that if $a(x)$ is an $(p, 2)$ atom of $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, then $\|T(a)\|_p \leq C$, where the constant C is independent of a . To this end, let $\text{supp } a(x) \subseteq Q$ and $B = \{x : d(x, x_Q) \leq 4\sqrt{N}l(Q)\}$, where x_Q is the center of Q and $l(Q)$ is the side length of Q . Write

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |T(a)(x)|^p d\omega(x) = \int_B |T(a)(x)|^p d\omega(x) + \int_{B^c} |T(a)(x)|^p d\omega(x).$$

The Hölder inequality, the L^2 boundedness of T , and the size condition of a imply that

$$\int_B |T(a)(x)|^p d\omega(x) \leq C \omega(B)^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \|a\|_2^p \leq C \omega(Q)^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \omega(Q)^{p(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p})} \leq C,$$

where the fact $\omega(B) \sim \omega(Q)$ is used.

If $x \in B^c$ and $y \in Q$, then $\|y - x_Q\| \leq \frac{1}{2}d(x, x_Q)$. By the cancellation condition of a and the smoothness condition of the kernel $K(x, y)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |T(a)(x)| &= \left| \int_Q K(x, y)a(y)d\omega(y) \right| = \left| \int_Q [K(x, y) - k(x, x_Q)]a(y)d\omega(y) \right| \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{l(Q)}{\|x - x_Q\|} \right)^\varepsilon \frac{1}{\omega(x, d(x, x_Q))} \|a\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{B^c} |T(a)(x)|^p d\omega(x) \leq C \int_{B^c} \left(\frac{l(Q)}{\|x - x_Q\|} \right)^{\varepsilon p} \left(\frac{1}{\omega(x, d(x, x_Q))} \right)^p \|a\|_1^p d\omega(x).$$

Applying the doubling on the measure ω and size condition on $a(x)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B^c} \left(\frac{l(Q)}{\|x - x_Q\|} \right)^{\varepsilon p} \left(\frac{1}{\omega(x, d(x, x_Q))} \right)^p \|a\|_1^p d\omega(x) \\ &= \sum_{j \geq 1} \int_{2^j l(Q) \leq d(x, x_Q) < 2^{j+1} l(Q)} \left(\frac{l(Q)}{d(x, x_Q)} \right)^{\varepsilon p} \left(\frac{1}{\omega(x, d(x, x_Q))} \right)^p \|a\|_1^p d\omega(x) \\ &\leq C \sum_{j \geq 1} 2^{-j\varepsilon p} \|a\|_1^p (\omega(x_Q, 2^j l(Q)))^{1-p} \\ &\leq C \sum_{j \geq 1} 2^{-j\varepsilon p} 2^{j\mathbf{N}(1-p)} (\omega(x_Q, l(Q)))^{1-p} (\omega(Q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|a\|_2)^p \\ &\leq C \sum_{j \geq 1} 2^{j(\mathbf{N} - (\varepsilon p + \mathbf{N}p))} \\ &\leq C, \end{aligned}$$

since $\frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N} + \varepsilon} < p$.

This implies $\|T(a)\|_p \leq C$, where the constant C is independent of $a(x)$. \square

We prove Theorem 1.25.

The proof of Theorem 1.25. Set $\sigma = \|m\|_{L^2}^{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha = \frac{2p}{(2-p)\mathbf{N}}$. Observe that $B(x_0, 2^{i+1}\sigma) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{N}}$ as i tends to ∞ . Thus, there exists an integer i_0 such that

$$(5.1) \quad \mu(B(x_0, 2^{i_0+1}\sigma)) > \sigma^{\mathbf{N}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(B(x_0, 2^{i_0}\sigma)) \leq \sigma^{\mathbf{N}}.$$

Set $\chi_0 = B(x_0, 2^{i_0}\sigma)$ and $\chi_i = B(x_0, 2^i 2^{i_0}\sigma) \setminus B(x_0, 2^{i-1} 2^{i_0}\sigma) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{N}} : 2^{i-1} 2^{i_0}\sigma \leq \|x - x_0\| < 2^i 2^{i_0}\sigma\}$ for $i \geq 1$. Let $\chi_i(x)$ be the characteristic function of χ_i for $i \geq 0$. We claim that there exists an integer $j_1 > 1$ such that $\omega\left(\bigcup_{\ell=1}^{j_1} \chi_\ell\right) > \omega(\chi_0)$ and $\omega\left(\bigcup_{\ell=1}^{j_1-1} \chi_\ell\right) \leq \omega(\chi_0)$. Indeed, suppose that such j_1 does not exist. Then for every integer $j > 1$, we would have $\omega\left(\bigcup_{\ell=1}^j \chi_\ell\right) \leq \omega(\chi_0)$. This implies that for any $j > 1$, $\omega(B(x_0, 2^j 2^{i_0}\sigma)) \leq \omega(B(x_0, 2^{i_0}\sigma))$, which is impossible since $\omega\left(B(x_0, 2^j 2^{i_0}\sigma)\right) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $j \rightarrow +\infty$.

Applying the same stopping time argument yields that there exists a sequence $\{j_k\}_k$ such that $j_{k+1} > j_k + 1$,

$$\omega\left(\bigcup_{\ell=j_k+1}^{j_{k+1}} \chi_\ell\right) > \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_k} 2^{i_0} \sigma))$$

and

$$\omega\left(\bigcup_{\ell=j_k+1}^{j_{k+1}-1} \chi_\ell\right) \leq \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_k} 2^{i_0} \sigma)).$$

Observe that

$$(5.2) \quad \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_{k+1}} 2^{i_0} \sigma)) = \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_k+1} 2^{i_0} \sigma)) = \omega\left(\bigcup_{\ell=j_k+1}^{j_{k+1}} \chi_\ell\right) \geq 2\omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_k} 2^{i_0} \sigma))$$

for each integer $k \geq 0$. Here we set $j_0 = 0$.

Applying (5.2) and the induction together with the doubling condition of the measure ω yields

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_k} 2^{i_0} \sigma)) &\geq 2^k \omega(B(x_0, 2^{i_0} \sigma)) \\ &\geq C_\omega^{-1} 2^{-N} 2^k \omega(B(x_0, 2^{i_0+1} \sigma)) \geq C_\omega^{-1} 2^{-N} 2^k \sigma^N. \end{aligned}$$

We point out that for each integer $k \geq 1$, if $j_k = j_{k-1} + 1$, then we directly obtain that $\omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_k} 2^{i_0} \sigma)) \leq C_\omega 2^N \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_{k-1}} 2^{i_0} \sigma))$ from the doubling property of the measure ω . While if $j_k > j_{k-1} + 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_k} 2^{i_0} \sigma)) &\leq C_\omega 2^N \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_{k-1}} 2^{i_0} \sigma)) \\ &= C_\omega 2^N \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_{k-1}} 2^{i_0} \sigma) \setminus B(x_0, 2^{j_{k-1}} 2^{i_0} \sigma)) + C_\omega 2^N \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_{k-1}} 2^{i_0} \sigma)). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_k} 2^{i_0} \sigma) \setminus B(x_0, 2^{j_{k-1}} 2^{i_0} \sigma)) = \omega\left(\bigcup_{\ell=j_{k-1}+1}^{j_k} \chi_\ell\right) \leq \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_{k-1}} 2^{i_0} \sigma)),$$

which, together with the above estimate for the case $j_k = j_{k-1} + 1$, yields

$$(5.4) \quad \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_k} 2^{i_0} \sigma)) \leq C_\omega 2^{N+1} \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_{k-1}} 2^{i_0} \sigma))$$

for each integer $k \geq 1$.

We also point out that, by (5.4), we obtain

$$\omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_{k+1}} 2^{i_0} \sigma)) \leq 2^{N+1} C_\omega \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_k} 2^{i_0} \sigma)),$$

which together with the following estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_k} 2^{i_0} \sigma)) &\leq \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_{k-1}} 2^{i_0} \sigma)) + \omega\left(\bigcup_{\ell=j_{k-1}+1}^{j_k} \chi_\ell\right) \\ &\leq 2\omega\left(\bigcup_{\ell=j_{k-1}+1}^{j_k} \chi_\ell\right), \end{aligned}$$

gives

$$(5.5) \quad \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_k+1} 2^{i_0} \sigma)) \leq 4C_\omega 2^{\mathbf{N}} \omega\left(\bigcup_{\ell=j_{k-1}+1}^{j_k} \chi_\ell\right).$$

We now set

$$\tilde{\chi}_0(x) := \chi_0(x), \quad \tilde{\chi}_{j_k}(x) := \sum_{\ell=j_{k-1}+1}^{j_k} \chi_\ell(x)$$

for integer $k \geq 1$, and

$$(5.6) \quad m_k(x) := m(x) \tilde{\chi}_{j_k}(x) - \frac{1}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{N}}} \tilde{\chi}_{j_k}(z) d\omega(z)} \int_{\tilde{\chi}_{j_k}} m(y) d\omega(y) \tilde{\chi}_{j_k}(x)$$

for each integer $k \geq 0$.

Decompose m by

$$m(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} m_k(x) + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \bar{m}_k \tilde{\chi}_{j_k}(x),$$

where $\bar{m}_k = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{N}}} m(x) \tilde{\chi}_{j_k}(x) d\omega(x)$ and $\tilde{\chi}_{j_k}(x) = \frac{\tilde{\chi}_{j_k}(x)}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{N}}} \tilde{\chi}_{j_k}(y) d\omega(y)}$.

We show that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} m_k(x)$ gives an atomic decomposition with m_k are $(p, 2)$ atoms due to multiplication of certain constant. Observe that m_k is supported in $\tilde{\chi}_{j_k} = \bigcup_{\ell=j_{k-1}+1}^{j_k} \chi_\ell$, and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{N}}} m_k(x) d\omega(x) = 0$. It remains to estimate the L^2 norm of m_k . First, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|m_0\|_{L^2} &\leq \left(\int_{\chi_0} |m(x)|^2 d\omega(x) \right)^{1/2} + \left(\int_{\chi_0} \left| \frac{1}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{N}}} \chi_0(z) d\omega(z)} \int_{\chi_0} m(y) d\omega(y) \tilde{\chi}_0(x) \right|^2 d\omega(x) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq 2 \left(\int_{\chi_0} |m(x)|^2 d\omega(x) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq 2 \|m\|_{L^2} \\ &= 2\sigma^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \\ &\leq 2\omega(B(x_0, 2^{i_0} \sigma))^{-\frac{1}{\alpha \mathbf{N}}} \\ &= 2\omega(\chi_0)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we use the fact in (5.1) with $\alpha = \frac{2p}{(2-p)\mathbf{N}}$.

Thus, $\frac{1}{2}m_0(x)$ is an $(p, 2)$ atom. Similarly, for each $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|m_k\|_{L^2} &\leq 2 \left(\int_{\tilde{\chi}_{j_k}} |m(x)|^2 d\omega(x) \right)^{1/2} \\ &= 2 \left(\int_{\tilde{\chi}_{j_k}} |m(x)|^2 \omega(B(x_0, \|x - x_0\|))^{1 + \frac{2\varepsilon - 2\eta}{\mathbf{N}}} \omega(B(x_0, \|x - x_0\|))^{-(1 + \frac{2\varepsilon - 2\eta}{\mathbf{N}})} d\omega(x) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq 2\omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_{k-1}+1} 2^{i_0} \sigma))^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon - \eta}{\mathbf{N}}} \left(\int_{\tilde{\chi}_{j_k}} |m(x)|^2 \omega(B(x_0, \|x - x_0\|))^{1 + \frac{2\varepsilon - 2\eta}{\mathbf{N}}} d\omega(x) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq 2\omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_{k-1}+1} 2^{i_0} \sigma))^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon - \eta}{\mathbf{N}}} \|m\|_{L^2}^{-\left(\frac{\mathbf{N} + 2\varepsilon - 2\eta}{\mathbf{N}} \frac{p}{2-p} - 1\right)} \end{aligned}$$

$$= 2\omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_{k-1}}2^{i_0}\sigma))^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\varepsilon-\eta}{\mathbf{N}}}\sigma^{\frac{1}{\alpha}(\frac{\mathbf{N}+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{\mathbf{N}}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)}.$$

Applying the estimates given in (5.3) yields

$$\sigma^{\frac{1}{\alpha}(\frac{\mathbf{N}+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{\mathbf{N}}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)} \leq (C_\omega 2^{\mathbf{N}} 2^{-k} \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_k} 2^{i_0} \sigma)))^{\frac{1}{\mathbf{N}\alpha}(\frac{\mathbf{N}+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{\mathbf{N}}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)},$$

which, together with the estimates given in (5.4), namely that

$$\omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_k} 2^{i_0} \sigma))^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\varepsilon-\eta}{\mathbf{N}}} \leq (2^{\mathbf{N}+1})^{(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varepsilon-\eta}{\mathbf{N}})} \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_k} 2^{i_0} \sigma))^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\varepsilon-\eta}{\mathbf{N}}}$$

implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|m_k\|_{L^2} &\leq 2\omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_{k-1}}2^{i_0}\sigma))^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\varepsilon-\eta}{\mathbf{N}}}\sigma^{\frac{1}{\alpha}(\frac{\mathbf{N}+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{\mathbf{N}}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)} \\ (5.7) \quad &\leq 2 \cdot 2^{-\frac{1}{\mathbf{N}\alpha}(\frac{\mathbf{N}+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{\mathbf{N}}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)k} (C_\omega 2^{\mathbf{N}+1})^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varepsilon-\eta}{\mathbf{N}}} (C_\omega 2^{\mathbf{N}})^{\frac{1}{\mathbf{N}\alpha}(\frac{\mathbf{N}+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{\mathbf{N}}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)} \\ &\quad \times \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_k} 2^{i_0} \sigma))^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $2^{-1} \cdot 2^{\frac{1}{\mathbf{N}\alpha}(\frac{\mathbf{N}+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{\mathbf{N}}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)k} (2^{\mathbf{N}+1})^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\varepsilon-\eta}{\mathbf{N}}} (C_\omega 2^{\mathbf{N}})^{-\frac{1}{\mathbf{N}\alpha}(\frac{\mathbf{N}+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{\mathbf{N}}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)} m_k$ are $(p, 2)$ atoms.

Moreover, $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\frac{1}{\mathbf{N}\alpha}(\frac{\mathbf{N}+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{\mathbf{N}}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)kp} < \infty$. As a consequence, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} m_k(x)$ gives the desired atomic decomposition and hence, by the Theorem 1.19, belongs to $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with the norm not larger than the constant C , which depends only on $p, \mathbf{N}, \varepsilon, \eta$ and C_ω .

It remains to show that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \bar{m}_k \tilde{\chi}_{j_k}(x)$ also gives an atomic decomposition. To see this, let $N_{k'} = \sum_{k=k'}^{\infty} \bar{m}_k$. Note that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \bar{m}_k = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} m(x) d\omega(x) = 0$. Summing up by parts implies that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \bar{m}_k \tilde{\chi}_k(x) = \sum_{k'=0}^{\infty} (N_{k'} - N_{k'+1}) \tilde{\chi}_{k'}(x) = \sum_{k'=0}^{\infty} N_{k'+1} (\tilde{\chi}_{k'+1}(x) - \tilde{\chi}_{k'}(x)).$$

Observe that the support of $\tilde{\chi}_{k'+1}(x) - \tilde{\chi}_{k'}(x)$ lies within $B(x_0, 2^{k'+1}\sigma)$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\tilde{\chi}_{k'+1}(x) - \tilde{\chi}_{k'}(x)) d\omega(x) = 0$$

since $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \tilde{\chi}_{k'}(x) d\omega(x) = 1$ for all k' . And we also have

$$|\tilde{\chi}_{k'+1}(x) - \tilde{\chi}_{k'}(x)| \leq \frac{1}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \tilde{\chi}_{k'+1}(y) d\omega(y)} + \frac{1}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \tilde{\chi}_{k'}(y) d\omega(y)} \leq \frac{2}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \tilde{\chi}_{k'}(y) d\omega(y)} = \frac{2}{\omega(\tilde{\chi}_{k'})}.$$

Now applying (5.5), we obtain that

$$(5.8) \quad |\tilde{\chi}_{k'+1}(x) - \tilde{\chi}_{k'}(x)| \leq \frac{8C_\omega}{\omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_{k'+1}} 2^{i_0} \sigma))}.$$

Applying the Hölder inequality and the estimates in (5.7), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} |N_{k'+1}| &\leq \sum_{k=k'+1}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |m(x) \tilde{\chi}_{j_k}(x)| d\omega(x) \\ &\leq C \sum_{k=k'+1}^{\infty} \left(\int_{\tilde{\chi}_{j_k}} |m(x)|^2 d\omega(x) \right)^{1/2} \omega(\tilde{\chi}_{j_k})^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C \sum_{k=k'+1}^{\infty} 2 \cdot 2^{-\frac{1}{N\alpha}(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)k} (2^{\mathbf{N}+1}C_{\omega})^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varepsilon-\eta}{N}} (2^{\mathbf{N}}C_{\omega})^{\frac{1}{N\alpha}(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)} \\
&\quad \times \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_k}2^{i_0}\sigma))^{\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}\right)} \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_k}2^{i_0}\sigma))^{1/2} \\
&\leq C 2 \cdot 2^{-\frac{1}{N\alpha}(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)(k'+1)} (2^{\mathbf{N}+1}C_{\omega})^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varepsilon-\eta}{N}} (2^{\mathbf{N}}C_{\omega})^{\frac{1}{N\alpha}(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)} \\
&\quad \times \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_{k'+1}}2^{i_0}\sigma))^{1-\frac{1}{p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The estimate above and the size estimate of $\tilde{\chi}_{k'+1}(x) - \tilde{\chi}_{k'}(x)$ in (5.8) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
&|N_{k'+1}(\tilde{\chi}_{k'+1}(x) - \tilde{\chi}_{k'}(x))| \\
&\leq C 2 \cdot 2^{-\frac{1}{N\alpha}(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)(k'+1)} (2^{\mathbf{N}+1}C_{\omega})^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\varepsilon-\eta}{N}} (2^{\mathbf{N}}C_{\omega})^{\frac{1}{N\alpha}(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)} \\
&\quad \times \frac{6 \cdot 2^{\mathbf{N}}C_{\omega}}{\omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_{k'+1}}2^{i_0}\sigma))} \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_{k'+1}}2^{i_0}\sigma))^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\leq C 2^{-\frac{1}{N\alpha}(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)(k'+1)} \omega(B(x_0, 2^{j_{k'+1}}2^{i_0}\sigma))^{-\frac{1}{p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can rewrite $N_{k'+1}(\tilde{\chi}_{k'+1}(x) - \tilde{\chi}_{k'}(x))$ as

$$N_{k'+1}(\tilde{\chi}_{k'+1}(x) - \tilde{\chi}_{k'}(x)) = \alpha_{k'}\beta_{k'}(x),$$

where $\alpha_{k'} = C 2^{-\frac{1}{N\alpha}(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)(k'+1)}$ and $\beta_{k'}(x)$ are $(p, 2)$ atoms. Hence, by the Theorem 1.19, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \overline{m}_k \tilde{\chi}_k(x)$ belongs to $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with the norm does not exceed C .

The proof of Theorem 1.25 is concluded. \square

Applying the molecule theory, we show the Theorem 1.26.

The proof of Theorem 1.26. Recall that $K(x, y)$, the kernel of T , satisfies the smoothness condition

$$|K(x, y) - K(x, y')| \leq C \left(\frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|} \right)^{\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\|x - y\|} \right)^M$$

with $M > \mathbf{N}/2$.

We first show the sufficient condition for Theorem 1.26. Note that for $\frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N}+\varepsilon} < p \leq 1$, $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, is dense in $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. As mentioned, if $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ then f has an atomic decomposition $f = \sum_j \lambda_j a_j$ where the series converges in both $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$

and $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. Therefore, to show that T extends to be a bounded operator on $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, by Theorem 1.25, it suffices to prove that for each $(p, 2)$ -atom a , $m = T(a)$ is an $(p, 2, \varepsilon, \eta)$ -molecule with $\frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N}+\varepsilon-\eta} < p \leq 1, 0 < \eta < \varepsilon$, up to a multiplication of a constant C . To this end, suppose that a is an $(p, 2)$ atom with the support $B(x_0, r)$. We write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} m(x)^2 d\omega(x) \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} m(x)^2 \omega(B(x_0, \|x - x_0\|))^{1+\frac{2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}} d\omega(x) \right)^{\left(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1\right)^{-1}} \\
&\leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} m(x)^2 d\omega(x) \right) \left(\int_{d(x_0, x) \leq 2r} m(x)^2 \omega(B(x_0, \|x - x_0\|))^{1+\frac{2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}} d\omega(x) \right)^{\left(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1\right)^{-1}} \\
&\quad + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} m(x)^2 d\omega(x) \right) \left(\int_{d(x_0, x) > 2r} m(x)^2 \omega(B(x_0, \|x - x_0\|))^{1+\frac{2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}} d\omega(x) \right)^{\left(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1\right)^{-1}}
\end{aligned}$$

$=: I + II$.

Observe that, by the L^2 boundedness of T and the size condition on a , we have $\|m\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \omega(B(x_0, r))^{(1-\frac{2}{p})}$. For I , applying the doubling property on ω implies that

$$\begin{aligned} I &\leq C\omega(B(x_0, r))^{(1-\frac{2}{p})}\omega(B(x_0, 2r))^{(1+\frac{2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N})(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)^{-1}}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} m(x)^2 d\omega(x)\right)^{\left(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1\right)^{-1}} \\ &\leq C\omega(B(x_0, r))^{(1-\frac{2}{p})}\omega(B(x_0, r))^{(1+\frac{2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N})(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)^{-1}}\omega(B(x_0, r))^{(1-\frac{2}{p})(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)^{-1}} \\ &\leq C, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $(1+\frac{2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N})+(1-\frac{2}{p})=\frac{2-p}{p}(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)$ and thus, $(1+\frac{2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N})(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)^{-1}+(1-\frac{2}{p})(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1)^{-1}=\frac{2-p}{p}$.

To estimate II , observe that if $d(x_0, x) > 2r$, by the support and the cancellation condition on a and the smoothness condition on the kernel $K(x, y)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |m(x)| &= \int_{\|y-x_0\|\leq r\leq\frac{1}{2}d(x_0, x)} [K(x, y) - K(x, x_0)]a(y)d\omega(y) \\ &\leq C \int_{d(x_0, x) > 2r \geq 2\|y-x_0\|} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x_0, d(x_0, x)))} \left(\frac{\|y-x_0\|}{\|x-x_0\|}\right)^\varepsilon \left(\frac{d(x_0, x)}{\|x-x_0\|}\right)^M |a(y)|d\omega(y) \\ &\leq C \frac{1}{\omega(B(x_0, d(x_0, x)))} \left(\frac{r}{\|x-x_0\|}\right)^\varepsilon \left(\frac{d(x_0, x)}{\|x-x_0\|}\right)^M \omega(B(x_0, r))^{1-\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

The estimate of $m(x)$ for $d(x_0, x) > 2r$ and the doubling property on ω give

$$\begin{aligned} II &\leq C\omega(B(x_0, r))^{(1-\frac{2}{p})}\left(\int_{d(x_0, x) > 2r} m(x)^2 \omega(B(x_0, \|x-x_0\|))^{1+\frac{2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}} d\omega(x)\right)^{\left(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1\right)^{-1}} \\ &\leq C\omega(B(x_0, r))^{(1-\frac{2}{p})}\left(\int_{d(x_0, x) > 2r} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x_0, d(x_0, x)))^2} \left(\frac{r}{\|x-x_0\|}\right)^{2\varepsilon} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \left(\frac{d(x_0, x)}{\|x-x_0\|}\right)^{2M} \omega(B(x_0, \|x-x_0\|))^{1+\frac{2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}} \omega(B(x_0, r))^{2-\frac{2}{p}} d\omega(x)\right)^{\left(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1\right)^{-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

We now split $\{x : d(x_0, x) > 2r\}$ into annuli in terms of the Dunkl and Euclidean metrics as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} II &\leq C\omega(B(x_0, r))^{(1-\frac{2}{p})}\left(\sum_{j,k\geq 1} \int_{\substack{d(x_0, x)\sim 2^j r \\ \|x-x_0\|\sim 2^k d(x_0, x)}} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x_0, 2^j r))^2} \left(\frac{r}{2^k 2^j r}\right)^{2\varepsilon} (2^{-k})^{2M} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \omega(B(x_0, 2^k 2^j r))^{1+\frac{2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}} \omega(B(x_0, r))^{2-\frac{2}{p}} d\omega(x)\right)^{\left(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1\right)^{-1}} \\ &\leq C\omega(B(x_0, r))^{(1-\frac{2}{p})}\left(\sum_{j,k\geq 1} \omega(B(x_0, 2^j r)) \frac{1}{\omega(B(x_0, 2^j r))^2} \left(\frac{r}{2^k 2^j r}\right)^{2\varepsilon} (2^{-k})^{2M} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \omega(B(x_0, 2^k 2^j r))^{1+\frac{2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}} \omega(B(x_0, r))^{2-\frac{2}{p}}\right)^{\left(\frac{N+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{N}\frac{p}{2-p}-1\right)^{-1}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C\omega(B(x_0, r))^{(1-\frac{2}{p})} \\
&\quad \times \left(\sum_{j,k \geq 1} 2^{k \cdot \mathbf{N}} 2^{-2k\varepsilon} 2^{-2j\varepsilon} \left(2^{-k} \right)^{2M} 2^{k(2\varepsilon-2\eta)} 2^{j(2\varepsilon-2\eta)} \omega(B(x_0, r))^{\frac{2\varepsilon-2\eta}{\mathbf{N}}+2-\frac{2}{p}} \right)^{\left(\frac{\mathbf{N}+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{\mathbf{N}} \frac{p}{2-p} - 1 \right)^{-1}} \\
&\leq C\omega(B(x_0, r))^{(1-\frac{2}{p})} \left(\omega(B(x_0, r))^{\frac{2\varepsilon-2\eta}{\mathbf{N}}+2-\frac{2}{p}} \right)^{\left(\frac{\mathbf{N}+2\varepsilon-2\eta}{\mathbf{N}} \frac{p}{2-p} - 1 \right)^{-1}} \\
&\leq C,
\end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality follows from the doubling property of the measure ω , the fourth inequality follows from the fact that $M > \mathbf{N}/2, \eta > \mathbf{0}$, and the last inequality follows from the fact that

$$1 - \frac{2}{p} + \left(\frac{2\varepsilon - 2\eta}{\mathbf{N}} + 2 - \frac{2}{p} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{\mathbf{N} + 2\varepsilon - 2\eta}{\mathbf{N}} \frac{p}{2-p} - 1 \right)^{-1} = 0.$$

Finally, by the fact that $T^*(1) = 0$, we obtain that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} m(x) d\omega(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} T(a)(x) d\omega(x) = 0$ and hence m is the multiple of an $(p, 2, \varepsilon, \eta)$ molecule. The proof of the sufficient implication of Theorem 1.26 then follows from Theorem 1.25.

We now show the necessary condition of the Theorem 1.26 for the boundedness on $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. Indeed, we will prove a general result, that is, if T is bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and on $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ then $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} T(f)(x) d\omega(x) = 0$ for $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. This follows from the following general result.

Proposition 5.1. *If $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $\frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N}+\varepsilon} < p \leq 1$, then there exists a constant C independent of the $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ norm of f such that*

$$(5.9) \quad \|f\|_p \leq C \|f\|_{H_d^p}.$$

Assuming Proposition 5.1 for the moment, if $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, by Proposition 5.1, then $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. Hence, by interpolation, $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. To see the integral of f is zero, we apply the Calderón reproducing formula,

$$f(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q \in Q^k} \omega(Q) D_k(x, x_Q) \tilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q),$$

where the series converges in both $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. Let $E_n(k, Q)$ be a finite set of $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $Q \in Q^k$ and $E_n(k, Q)$ tends to the whole set $\{(k, Q) : k \in \mathbb{Z}, Q \in Q^k\}$. Therefore,

$\sum_{E_n^c(k, Q)} \omega(Q) D_k(x, x_Q) \tilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q)$ converges to zero as n tends to infinity in both $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$

and $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. We obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(x) d\omega(x) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \sum_{E_n(k, Q)} \omega(Q) D_k(x, x_Q) \tilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q) d\omega(x) \right| + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \sum_{E_n^c(k, Q)} \omega(Q) D_k(x, x_Q) \tilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q) d\omega(x) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \sum_{E_n^c(k, Q)} \omega(Q) D_k(x, x_Q) \tilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q) d\omega(x) \right|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C \left\| \sum_{E_n^c(k, Q)} \omega(Q) D_k(x, x_Q) \tilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q) \right\|_{H_d^p} + C \left\| \sum_{E_n^c(k, Q)} \omega(Q) D_k(x, x_Q) \tilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q) \right\|_2,$$

where the second inequality follows from the fact that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \sum_{E_n(k, Q)} \omega(Q) D_k(x, x_Q) \tilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q) d\omega(x) = 0$$

by the cancellation property of $D_k(x, x_Q)$. Letting n tend to infinity gives the desired result since the last two terms tend to zero as n tends to infinity.

Now suppose that T is bounded on both $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, then $Tf \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and hence $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} Tf(x) d\omega(x) = 0$. The necessary implication of Theorem 1.26 is concluded.

It remains to show Proposition 5.1. The key idea of the proof is to apply the method of atomic decomposition for subspace $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_{cw}^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ as in the proof of Proposition 1.14. More precisely, if $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_{cw}^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, we set

$$\Omega_l = \{x \in X : S_{cw}(f)(x) > 2^l\},$$

$$B_l = \left\{ Q : \omega(Q \cap \Omega_l) > \frac{1}{2} \omega(Q) \text{ and } \omega(Q \cap \Omega_{l+1}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \omega(Q) \right\}$$

and

$$\tilde{\Omega}_l = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : M(\chi_{\Omega_l})(x) > 1/2\},$$

where Q are Christ's dyadic cubes in space of homogeneous type $(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\cdot\|, \omega)$ and M is the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function on \mathbb{R}^N with respect to the measure ω and hence, $\omega(\tilde{\Omega}_l) \leq C\omega(\Omega_l)$.

Applying the decomposition of f as in the proof of Proposition 1.14, we write

$$f(x) = \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in B_l} \omega(Q) D_k(x, x_Q) \tilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q),$$

where the series converges in both $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and $H_{cw}^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. Thus, for $\frac{N}{N+\varepsilon} < p \leq 1$,

$$\|f(x)\|_p^p \leq \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{Q \in B_l} \omega(Q) D_k(x, x_Q) \tilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q) \right\|_p^p.$$

Note that if $Q \in B_l$ then $Q \subseteq \tilde{\Omega}_l$. Therefore, $\sum_{Q \in B_l} \omega(Q) D_k(x, x_Q) \tilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q)$ is supported in $\tilde{\Omega}_l$. Applying Hölder inequality implies that

$$\|f(x)\|_p^p \leq \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu(\tilde{\Omega}_l)^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \left\| \sum_{Q \in B_l} \omega(Q) D_k(x, x_Q) \tilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q) \right\|_2^p.$$

As in the proof of Proposition 1.14, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{Q \in B_l} \omega(Q) D_k(x, x_Q) \tilde{D}_k(f)(x_Q) \right\|_2 \leq C 2^l \mu(\tilde{\Omega}_l)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which gives

$$\|f(x)\|_p^p \leq C \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{lp} \mu(\Omega_l)^p \leq C \|S_{cw}(f)\|_p^p \leq C \|f\|_{H_{cw}^p}^p \leq C \|f\|_{H_d^p}^p$$

since $\omega(\tilde{\Omega}_l) \leq C\omega(\Omega_l)$. \square

5.2. **T_1 Theorem on Dunkl-Hardy space H_d^p .** We show the Theorem 1.27.

The proof of Theorem 1.27. By Proposition 5.1, we only need to show that if T is a Dunkl-Calderón-Zygmund operator with $T^*(1) = 0$, then T is bounded on the Dunkl-Hardy space $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, $\frac{N}{N+\varepsilon} < p \leq 1$. Following a similar idea used for the proof of the T_1 Theorem 1.8, we consider first that T also satisfies $T(1) = 0$. Since $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ is dense in $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, it suffices to show $\|T(f)\|_{H_d^p} \leq C\|f\|_{H_d^p}$ for $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. Observe that if $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega) \cap H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, then $f(x) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} w(Q)\lambda_Q\psi_Q(x, x_Q)$ with

$\|\{\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} |\lambda_Q|^2 \chi_Q\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_p \leq C\|f\|_{H_d^p}$, where the series converges in both $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(f)\|_{H_d^p} &= \|S(T(f))\|_p \\ &= \|\{\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} |q_Q \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q' \in Q^k} \omega(Q')\lambda_{Q'}T(\psi_{Q'}(\cdot, x'_Q)) \right)(x_Q)|^2 \chi_Q\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_p \\ &= \|\{\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in Q^j} |\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q' \in Q^k} \omega(Q')\lambda_{Q'}q_Q T\psi_{Q'}(x_Q, x'_Q)|^2 \chi_Q\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

Applying The Lemma 2.10, we get

$$|q_Q T\psi_{Q'}(x_Q, x'_Q)| \leq Cr^{-|k-j|\varepsilon'} \frac{1}{V(x, y, r^{-j\nu-k} + d(x, y))} \left(\frac{r^{-j\nu-k}}{r^{-j\nu-k} + d(x, y)} \right)^\gamma$$

and then applying the Lemma 4.2 implies that

$$\|T(f)\|_{H_d^p} \leq C\|\{\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{Q' \in Q^k} |\lambda_{Q'}|^2 \chi_{Q'}\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_p \leq C\|f\|_{H_d^p}.$$

To remove the condition $T(1) = 0$, set $\tilde{T} = T - \Pi_{T_1}$. Then $\tilde{T}(1) = (\tilde{T})^*(1) = 0$, so \tilde{T} is bounded on $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. By a classical result, Π_{T_1} is bounded on the classical Hardy space H_{cw}^p and thus, T is bounded on $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$. \square

Finally, we show the Theorem 1.28.

The proof of Theorem 1.28. All we need to do is to check that $R_j(x, y)$, the kernel of the Dunkl-Riesz transforms satisfy the conditions in the Theorem 1.27. Indeed, it is known that $R_j, 1 \leq j \leq N$ are bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ and $H_d^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$, see [8]. Then by Proposition 5.1 and then the proof of the necessary condition for Theorem 1.27, $R_j(1) = 0$ and hence, $(R_j)^*(1) = 0$ since the Dunk-Riesz transforms are convolution operators. It remains to see that $R_j(x, y)$ satisfy all kernel conditions. To this end, observe that

$$(\widehat{R_j(f)})(\xi) = -i \frac{\xi_j}{\|\xi\|} \widehat{f}(\xi),$$

for $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$.

Note that

$$R_j(f) = -T_j(\Delta)^{-1/2}f = -c \int_0^\infty T_j e^{t\Delta} f \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

and

$$e^{t\Delta} f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} h_t(x, y) f(y) d\omega(y),$$

where the integral converges in L^2 and $h_t(x, y)$ is the heat kernel. For all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $t > 0$,

$$T_j h_t(x, y) = \frac{y_j - x_j}{2t} h_t(x, y).$$

We write the Riesz transforms as follows:

$$R_j f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} R_j(x, y) f(y) d\omega(y).$$

To estimate the kernel $R_j(x, y)$, we recall the following estimates for the Dunkl-heat kernel given in [22, Theorem 3.1]

(a) There are constants $C, c > 0$ such that

$$|h_t(x, y)| \leq C \frac{1}{V(x, y, \sqrt{t})} \left(1 + \frac{\|x - y\|}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^{-2} e^{-cd(x, y)^2/t},$$

for every $t > 0$ and for every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

(b) There are constants $C, c > 0$ such that

$$|h_t(x, y) - h_t(x, y')| \leq C \left(\frac{\|y - y'\|}{\sqrt{t}}\right) \frac{1}{V(x, y, \sqrt{t})} \left(1 + \frac{\|x - y\|}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^{-2} e^{-cd(x, y)^2/t},$$

for every $t > 0$ and for every $x, y, y' \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $\|y - y'\| < \sqrt{t}$.

We now estimate the kernel $R_j(x, y)$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} |R_j(x, y)| &\lesssim |y_j - x_j| \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{V(x, y, \sqrt{t})} \frac{t}{\|x - y\|^2} e^{-cd(x, y)^2/t} \frac{dt}{t\sqrt{t}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\|x - y\|} \left(\int_0^{d(x, y)^2} + \int_{d(x, y)^2}^\infty \right) \frac{1}{V(x, y, \sqrt{t})} e^{-cd(x, y)^2/t} \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \\ &=: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

For $t \leq d(x, y)^2$, by using the doubling condition we have that

$$\omega(B(x, d(x, y))) \lesssim \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^N \omega(B(x, \sqrt{t}))$$

and hence

$$(5.10) \quad V(x, y, \sqrt{t})^{-1} \lesssim \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, \sqrt{t}))} \lesssim \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^N \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}.$$

We obtain

$$I_1 \lesssim \frac{1}{\|x - y\|} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \int_0^{d(x, y)^2} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^N e^{-cd(x, y)^2/t} \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim \frac{1}{\|x-y\|} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \int_0^{d(x, y)^2} \frac{d(x, y)^N}{t^{\frac{1+N}{2}}} \left(\frac{t}{d(x, y)^2}\right)^{\frac{1+N}{2}} dt \\
&\lesssim \frac{d(x, y)}{\|x-y\|} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}.
\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that for $t \geq d(x, y)^2$, by using the reversed doubling condition,

$$\left(\frac{\sqrt{t}}{d(x, y)}\right)^N \omega(B(x, d(x, y))) \lesssim C\omega(B(x, \sqrt{t})),$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &\lesssim \frac{1}{\|x-y\|} \int_{d(x, y)^2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{V(x, y, d(x, y))} \frac{d(x, y)^N}{t^{\frac{1+N}{2}}} dt \\
&\lesssim \frac{d(x, y)}{\|x-y\|} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}.
\end{aligned}$$

To see the smoothness estimates, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
|R_j(x, y) - R_j(x, y')| &\leq c|y_j - y'_j| \int_0^{\infty} |h_t(x, y) - h_t(x, y')| \frac{dt}{t\sqrt{t}} \\
&\leq c|y_j - y'_j| \left(\int_0^{\|x-y\|^2} + \int_{\|x-y\|^2}^{\infty} \right) |h_t(x, y) - h_t(x, y')| \frac{dt}{t\sqrt{t}} \\
&=: II_1 + II_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|y - y'\| < \frac{1}{2}d(x, y)$, we have $d(x, y') \leq \frac{3}{2}d(x, y)$

$$\begin{aligned}
II_1 &\lesssim \frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|^2} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \int_0^{\|x-y\|^2} \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^N e^{-cd(x, y)^2/t} \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \\
&\lesssim \frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|^2} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \int_0^{\|x-y\|^2} \frac{d(x, y)^N}{t^{\frac{1+N}{2}}} \left(\frac{t}{d(x, y)^2}\right)^{\frac{N}{2}} dt \\
&\lesssim \frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}.
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate II_2 , we have $\|y - y'\| < \frac{1}{2}d(x, y) \leq \frac{1}{2}\|x - y\| < \sqrt{t}$ and the above condition (b) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
II_2 &\lesssim \|y_j - y'_j\| \int_{\|x-y\|^2}^{\infty} \|y - y'\| \frac{1}{V(x, y, \sqrt{t})} e^{-cd(x, y)^2/t} \frac{dt}{t^2} \\
&\lesssim \|y - y'\|^2 \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))} \int_{\|x-y\|^2}^{\infty} t^{-2} dt \\
&\lesssim \frac{\|y - y'\|}{\|x - y\|} \frac{1}{\omega(B(x, d(x, y)))}.
\end{aligned}$$

The estimate of the smoothness for x variable is similar. We conclude that $R_j, 1 \leq j \leq N$, satisfy all conditions in the Theorem 1.27 and hence, the Dunkl-Riesz transforms are bounded on the Dunkl-Hardy space $H_d^p(\mathbb{R}^N, \omega)$ for $\frac{N}{N+1} < p \leq 1$. \square

Acknowledgement: Chaoqiang Tan is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12071272). Yanchang Han is supported NNSF of China (Grant No. 12071490) and Guangdong Province Natural Science Foundation (Grant No. 2021A1515010053). M. Lee is supported by MOST 108-2115-M-008-002-MY2. Ji Li is supported by ARC DP 220100285. Ji Li would like to thank Jorge Betancor for helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Arcozzi, R. Rochberg, E. T. Sawyer and B. D. Wick, Potential Theory on Trees, Graphs and Ahlfors-regular Metric Spaces, *Potential Anal.*, **41** (2014), 317–366.
- [2] B. Amri, J. Ph. Anker and M. Sifi, Three results in Dunkl theory, *Cplloq. Math.*, **118** (2010), 299–312.
- [3] B. Amri, A. Gasmi and M. Sifi, Linear and bilinear multiplier operators for Dunkl transform, *Mediterr. J. Math.*, **7** (2010), 503–521.
- [4] B. Amri and A. Hammi, Dunkl-Schrödinger operators, *Complex Anal. Oper. Theory*, **13** (2019), 1033–1058.
- [5] B. Amri and M. Sifi, Riesz transforms for Dunkl transform, *Ann. Math. Blaise Pascal*, **19** (2012), 247–262.
- [6] J.-Ph. Anker, An introduction to Dunkl theory and its analytic aspects, *Analytic, Algebraic and Geometric Aspects of Differential Equations*, 3-58, Trends Math., Birkhäuser, Chem, 2017.
- [7] J.-Ph. Anker, N. Ben Salem, J. Dziubański and N. Hamda, The Hardy space H^1 in the rational Dunkl setting, *Constr. Approx.*, **42** (2015), 93–128.
- [8] J.-Ph. Anker, J. Dziubański and A. Hejna, Harmonic functions, conjugate harmonic functions and the Hardy H^1 in rational Dunkel setting, *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, **25** (2019), no. 5, 2356–2418.
- [9] P. Auscher and T. Hytönen, Orthonormal bases of regular wavelets in spaces of homogeneous type, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, **34** (2013), 266–296.
- [10] A. P. Calderón, Intermediate spaces and interpolation, the complex method, *Studia Math.*, **24** (1964), 113–190.
- [11] R. R. Coifman, G. Weiss, *Analyse Harmonique Non-commutative sur Certains Espaces Homogènes*, Lecture Notes in Math., **242**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1971).
- [12] R.R. Coifman and G. Weiss, Extensions of Hardy spaces and their use in analysis, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **83** (1977), 569–645.
- [13] G. David, J. L. Journé, S. Semmes, Opérateurs de Calderón-Zygmund, fonctions paraaccrétives et interpolation, *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, **1** (1985), 1–56.
- [14] F. Dai and Y. Xu, *Analysis on h-harmonics and Dunkl transforms*, edited by Sergey Tikhonov, Advanced Courses in Mathematics. CRM Barcelona, Birkhäuser/Springer, Basel, 2015. MR33009987.
- [15] F. Dai and H. Wang, A transference theorem for the Dunkl transform and its applications, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **258** (2010), no. 12, 4052–4074.
- [16] L. Deleaval and C. Kriegler, Dunkl spectral multipliers with values in UMD lattices, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **272** (5) (2017), 4052–4074.
- [17] D. Deng and Y. Han, *Harmonic analysis on spaces of homogeneous type*, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1966, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009, with a preface by Yves Meyer.
- [18] C.F. Dunkl, Reflection groups and orthogonal polynomials on the sphere, *Math. Z.*, **197** (1) (1988), 33–60.
- [19] C.F. Dunkl, Differential-difference operators associated to reflection groups, *Trans. Amer. Math.*, **311** (1989), no. 1, 167–183.
- [20] C.F. Dunkl, Integral kernels with reflection group invariance. *Canad. J. Math.*, **43** (1991) no. 6 1213–1227.
- [21] J. Dziubański and A. Hejna, Remark on atomic decompositions for the Hardy space H^1 in the rational Dunkl setting, *Studia Math.*, **251** (2020), 89–110.

- [22] J. Dziubański and A. Hejna, Hörmander multiplier theorem for the Dunkl transform, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **277** (2019), 2133–2159.
- [23] J. Dziubański and A. Hejna, Singular integrals in the rational Dunkl setting, *Revista Matemática Complutense*, (2021) DOI10.1007/s13163-021-00402-1.
- [24] M. Frazier and B. Jawerth, A discrete transform and decomposition of distribution spaces, *J. Funct. Anal.* **93** (1990), 34–170.
- [25] M. Frazier and B. Jawerth, Decomposition of Besov spaces, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, **34** (1985), no. 4, 777–799.
- [26] Ya. Han, Yo. Han and J. Li, Criterion of the boundedness of singular integrals on spaces of homogeneous type, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **271** (2016), 3423–3464.
- [27] Y. Han, Calderón-type reproducing formula and the Tb theorem, *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, **10** (1994), 51–91.
- [28] Y. Han, Plancherel-Pólya type inequality on spaces of homogeneous type and its applications, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **126** (1998), 3315–3327.
- [29] Y. Han, J. Li and L. Ward, Product H^p , $CMOP$, VMO and duality via orthonormal bases on spaces of homogeneous type, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, **45** (2018), no. 1, 120–169.
- [30] Y. Han, D. Müller and D. Yang, A theory of Besov and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces on metric measure spaces modeled on Carnot–Carathéodory spaces, *Abstr. Appl. Anal.*, Vol. 2008, Article ID 893409. 250 pages.
- [31] Y. Han and E. T. Sawyer, Littlewood-Paley theory on spaces of homogeneous type and classical function spaces, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **110** (1994), no. 530, 1–126.
- [32] M.F.E. de Jeu, The Dunkl transform, *Invent. Math.*, **113** (1993), 147–162.
- [33] Z. Li and J. Liao, Harmonic analysis associated with the one-dimensional Dunkl transform, *Constr. Approx.*, **37** (2) (2013), 233–281.
- [34] Y. Meyer, Les nouveaux opérateurs de Calderón-Zygmund, *Astérisque*, tome **131** (1985), 237–254.
- [35] Y. Meyer and R. Coifman, *Wavelets Calderón-Zygmund and multilinear operators*, Translated by David Salinger, Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [36] A. Nagel and E. M. Stein, *The $\bar{\partial}_b$ -complex on decoupled boundaries in \mathbb{C}^n* , *Ann. Math.*, **164** (2006), 649–713.
- [37] M. Rösler, Asymptotic analysis for the Dunkl transform and its applications, *J. Approx. Theory*, **119** (1) (2002), 110–126.
- [38] M. Rösler, Positivity of Dunkl intertwining operator, *Duke Math. J.*, **98** (1999) 445–463.
- [39] M. Rösler, Dunkl operators: theory and applications, *Orthogonal polynomials and special functions*(Leuven, 2002), *Lecture Notes in Math.* vol. 1817, Springer, Berlin, 2003, pp. 93–135.
- [40] M. Rösler, A positive radial product formula for the Dunkl kernel, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **355** (2003), 2413–2438.
- [41] M. Rösler and M. Voit, Markov processes related with Dunkl operators, *Adv. Appl. Math.*, **21** (1998), 575–643.
- [42] M. Rösler and M. Voit, Dunkl theory, convolution algebras, and related Markov processes, in: P. Graczyk, M. Rösler and M. Yor (Eds.), *Harmonic and Stochastic Analysis of Dunkl Processes*, in: *P. Travaux en Cours*, vol. 71, Hermann, Paris, 2008, pp. 1–112.
- [43] F. Soltani, L^p -Fourier multipliers for the Dunkl operator on the real line, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **209** (2004), 16–35.
- [44] S. Thangvelu and Yuan Xu, Convolution operator and maximal function for the Dunkl transform, *J. Anal. Math.*, **97** (2005), 25–55.
- [45] S. Thangvelu and Yuan Xu, Riesz transform and Riesz potentials for Dunkl transform, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, **199** (2007), 181–195.
- [46] X. Tolsa, Littlewood-Paley Theory and the $T(1)$ Theorem with Non-doubling Measures, *Adv. in Math.*, **164** (2001), 57–116.

E-mail address: cqtan@stu.edu.cn

School of Mathematic Sciences, South China Normal University, Guangzhou, 510631, P.R. China.

E-mail address: 20051017@m.scnu.edu.cn

Department of Mathematics, Auburn University, AL 36849-5310, USA.

E-mail address: hanyong@auburn.edu

Department of Mathematics National Central University Chung-Li 320, Taiwan Republic of China

E-mail address: mylee@math.ncu.edu.tw

Department of Mathematics, Macquarie University, NSW, 2109, Australia.

E-mail address: ji.li@mq.edu.au