

Sharp Poincaré–Sobolev Inequalities of Choquet–Lorentz Integrals with Respect to Hausdorff Contents on Bounded John Domains

Long Huang, Yuanshou Cao, Dachun Yang and Ciqiang Zhuo*

Abstract Let Ω be a bounded John domain in \mathbb{R}^n with $n \geq 2$, and let $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta$ denote the Hausdorff content of dimension $\delta \in (0, n]$. In this article, the authors prove the Poincaré and the Poincaré–Sobolev inequalities, with sharp ranges of indices, on Choquet–Lorentz integrals with respect to $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta$ for all continuously differentiable functions on Ω . These results not only extend the recent Poincaré and Poincaré–Sobolev inequalities to the Choquet–Lorentz integrals, but also provide some endpoint estimates (weak type) in the critical case. One of the main novelties exists in that, to achieve the goals, the authors develop some new tools associated with Choquet–Lorentz integrals on $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta$, such as the fractional Hardy–Littlewood maximal inequality and the Hedberg-type pointwise estimate on the Riesz potential. As an application, the authors obtain the sharp boundedness of the Riesz potential on Choquet–Lorentz integrals. Moreover, even for classical Lorentz integrals, these Poincaré and Poincaré–Sobolev inequalities are also new.

1 Introduction

On the n -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n with $n \geq 2$, if $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded Lipschitz domain or even a John domain, then the (p, p) -Poincaré inequality

$$(1.1) \quad \inf_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \left[\int_{\Omega} |u(x) - b|^p dx \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C \left[\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u(x)|^p dx \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

for any $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ with $p \in [1, \infty)$ and the $(\frac{np}{n-p}, p)$ -Poincaré–Sobolev inequality

$$(1.2) \quad \inf_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \left[\int_{\Omega} |u(x) - b|^{\frac{np}{n-p}} dx \right]^{\frac{n-p}{np}} \leq C \left[\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u(x)|^p dx \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

for any $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ with $p \in [1, n)$ hold; see, for instance, [30]. Here and thereafter, $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ denotes the classical Sobolev space defined on Ω and, for any differentiable function u on \mathbb{R}^n , ∇u denotes the gradient of u , that is, $\nabla u := (\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_n})$. These Poincaré type inequalities are of great importance in potential theory, harmonic analysis, and partial differential equations; see, for instance, the book [49] and the article [13]. Recently, the counterparts of them in the setting of Choquet integrals with respect to the Hausdorff content $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta$ of dimension $\delta \in (0, n]$ were

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

Key words and phrases. bounded John domain, Hausdorff content, Choquet–Lorentz integral, Poincaré(–Sobolev) inequality.

This project is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 12201139, 12431006, 12371093, and 12371127), the National Key Research and Development Program of China (Grant No. 2020YFA0712900), and the Natural Science Foundation of Hunan province (2024JJ3023).

*Corresponding author, E-mail: cqzhuo87@hunnu.edu.cn/November 22, 2024/Final version.

obtained. To be precise, let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with $n \geq 2$, be a bounded (α, β) -John domain and $\delta \in (0, n]$. The corresponding (p, p) -Poincaré inequality

$$\inf_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{\Omega} |u(x) - b|^p d\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta} \leq C\beta^p \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{2np} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u(x)|^p d\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta}$$

for any $u \in C^1(\Omega)$ (the set of all continuously differentiable functions on Ω) and $p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \infty)$ and the $(\frac{\delta p}{\delta - p}, p)$ -Poincaré–Sobolev inequality

$$(1.3) \quad \inf_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |u(x) - b|^{\frac{\delta p}{\delta - p}} d\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta} \right\}^{\frac{\delta - p}{\delta p}} \leq C \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u(x)|^p d\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta} \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

for any $u \in C^1(\Omega)$ and $p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \delta)$ hold; see [18]. These recover the aforementioned two classical inequalities by taking $\delta = n$.

Notice that, compared (1.3) with the classical Poincaré–Sobolev inequality (1.2), the endpoint estimate for $p = \frac{\delta}{n}$ in the setting of Choquet integrals is missing. Inspired by this problem, we are interested in the Poincaré–Sobolev inequalities based on Choquet integrals in the endpoint case $p = \frac{\delta}{n}$. In this article, we first establish some weak type estimates in this case. Furthermore, we also study the Poincaré–Sobolev inequalities in the context of Choquet–Lorentz integrals with respect to the Hausdorff content $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta}$. Recall that the Lorentz space, as an intermediate space of Lebesgue spaces under real interpolation, traces back to Lorentz [27, 28]. In view of their finer structures, Lorentz spaces appear frequently in the study on various critical or endpoint analysis problems from many different research fields. For instance, Spector [43] gave an optimal Lorentz space estimate for the Riesz potential acting on curl-free vectors and Spector and Van Schaftingen [44] established some optimal embeddings on the Lebesgue space L^1 into Lorentz spaces for some vector differential operators via Gagliardo’s lemma. Indeed, there exist enormous literatures on this subject, here we only mention several recent articles from harmonic analysis (see, for instance, [10, 24, 26]) and partial differential equations (see, for instance, [37, 48]).

In order to state our main theorems, we begin with recalling some notation on Hausdorff contents and the associated Choquet–Lorentz integral. Let $B(x, r) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : |y - x| < r\}$ denote the open ball centered at $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with the radius $r \in (0, \infty)$. For the following definition of the Hausdorff content of a set K in \mathbb{R}^n , we refer to the survey [3] and also the book on the geometric measure theory of Federer [15, p. 169]. For more progress on functional inequalities about Hausdorff contents, we refer to Saito et al. [39, 40, 41, 42] and also to [5, 23, 46].

Definition 1.1. Let K be a set in \mathbb{R}^n with $n \geq 2$ and let $\delta \in (0, n]$. The *Hausdorff content* $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta}(K)$ of K is defined by setting

$$(1.4) \quad \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta}(K) := \inf \left\{ \sum_i r_i^{\delta} : K \subset \bigcup_i B(x_i, r_i) \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all finite or countable ball coverings $\{B(x_i, r_i)\}_i$ of K . The quantity $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta}(K)$ in (1.4) is also referred to as the δ -Hausdorff content or the δ -Hausdorff capacity or the Hausdorff content of K of dimension δ .

Let us now recall the definition of the Choquet integral with respect to the Hausdorff content. In this article, Ω is always assumed to be a *domain* in \mathbb{R}^n with $n \geq 2$, that is, Ω is an open and connected set of \mathbb{R}^n . Let $\delta \in (0, n]$. Then the *Choquet integral with respect to the Hausdorff content* $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta}$, for short, the *Choquet integral* $\int_{\Omega} f(x) d\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta}$ of a non-negative function f on Ω is defined by setting

$$\int_{\Omega} f(x) d\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta} := \int_0^{\infty} \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta}(\{x \in \Omega : f(x) > \lambda\}) d\lambda.$$

Since \mathcal{H}_∞^n is monotone, then, for any function g defined on Ω , its distribution function in the sense of the Hausdorff content $\lambda \mapsto \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(\{x \in \Omega : |g(x)| > \lambda\})$ is decreasing on $\lambda \in [0, \infty)$. Thus, we easily find that the above distribution function is measurable with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Therefore, $\int_0^\infty \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(\{x \in \Omega : |g(x)| > \lambda\}) d\lambda$ is a well-defined Lebesgue integral and hence the Choquet integral is also well defined. Based on this, for any $p \in (0, \infty)$, the p -Choquet integral with respect to the Hausdorff content, $\|f\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}$, of a function f on Ω is defined by setting

$$\|f\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)} := \left[\int_\Omega |f(x)|^p d\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} := \left[p \int_0^\infty \lambda^{p-1} \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(\{x \in \Omega : |f(x)| > \lambda\}) d\lambda \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

In what follows, for any $p \in (0, \infty)$, we always denote by $L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$ the space of all functions f on Ω such that their quasi-norms $\|f\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}$ are finite.

We point out that, compared with Riemann or Lebesgue integrals, the Choquet integral with respect to the Hausdorff content has the following significant differences:

- (i) The Choquet integral is a nonlinear integral, that is, for any non-negative functions f and g on Ω ,

$$\int_\Omega f(x) d\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta + \int_\Omega g(x) d\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta \neq \int_\Omega [f(x) + g(x)] d\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta \leq 2 \left[\int_\Omega f(x) d\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta + \int_\Omega g(x) d\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta \right].$$

- (ii) Choquet integrals are well defined for all non-measurable functions with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

For more details on Choquet integrals, we refer to [3]. The Choquet–Lorentz integral with respect to the Hausdorff content is defined as follows.

Definition 1.2. Let $\delta \in (0, n]$, $p \in (0, \infty)$, and $q \in (0, \infty]$. The *Choquet–Lorentz integral with respect to the Hausdorff content* $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta$, for short, the *Choquet–Lorentz integral* $\|f\|_{L^{p,q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}$ of a Lebesgue measurable function f on Ω is defined by setting

$$\|f\|_{L^{p,q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)} := \begin{cases} \left[p \int_0^\infty \lambda^q \left\{ \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(\{x \in \Omega : |f(x)| > \lambda\}) \right\}^{\frac{q}{p}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} & \text{if } q \in (0, \infty), \\ \left[\sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda \left[\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(\{x \in \Omega : |f(x)| > \lambda\}) \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \right] & \text{if } q = \infty. \end{cases}$$

For convenience, we use $L^{p,q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$ to denote the *Choquet–Lorentz space* of all functions f on Ω having finite quasi-norms $\|f\|_{L^{p,q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}$. Indeed, the Choquet–Lorentz space has appeared in the survey [3, Theorem 7]. Moreover, from the definition, we infer that, when $p = q \in (0, \infty)$, $\|\cdot\|_{L^{p,p}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)} = \|\cdot\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}$ and hence, in this case, $L^{p,p}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta) = L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$; when $p \in (0, \infty)$ and $q = \infty$, the Choquet–Lorentz space $L^{p,\infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$ is the “weak” version of $L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$.

We still need the definition of the (α, β) -John domain, which was originally introduced by John in [25].

Definition 1.3. Assume that Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n with $n \geq 2$. Then Ω is called an (α, β) -*John domain* if there exist constants $0 < \alpha \leq \beta < \infty$ and a point $x_0 \in \Omega$ such that each point $x \in \Omega$ can be joined to x_0 by a rectifiable curve $\gamma_x : [0, \ell(\gamma_x)] \rightarrow \Omega$, parameterized by its arc length, satisfying

$$\gamma_x(0) = x, \quad \gamma_x(\ell(\gamma_x)) = x_0, \quad \ell(\gamma_x) \leq \beta,$$

and

$$\text{dist}(\gamma_x(t), \partial\Omega) \geq \frac{\alpha}{\beta} t \quad \forall t \in [0, \ell(\gamma_x)].$$

Here the point x_0 is called the *John center* of Ω .

Remark 1.4. It is not difficult to show that convex domains and domains with Lipschitz boundary are John domains. The domains with fractal boundaries such as the von Koch snow flake are also John domains, but domains with outward spires are not allowed; see [18]. Moreover, let $\Omega := B(\mathbf{0}, k) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with some positive integer k . Here and thereafter, $\mathbf{0}$ denotes the *origin* of \mathbb{R}^n . Taking $\alpha = \beta = k$ and x_0 being the center of Ω , then Ω is a (k, k) -John domain.

With these preparations, the first main theorem of this article is the following Poincaré inequality and endpoint weak type estimate in terms of Choquet–Lorentz integrals with respect to the Hausdorff content.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $n \geq 2$ be a bounded (α, β) -John domain with $0 < \alpha \leq \beta < \infty$ and let $\delta \in (0, n]$.*

- (i) *If $p, q \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \infty)$, then there exists a positive constant C , depending only on n, δ, p , and q , such that, for any $u \in C^1(\Omega)$,*

$$(1.5) \quad \inf_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \|u - b\|_{L^{p,q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})} \leq C\beta \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{2n} \|\nabla u\|_{L^{p,q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})}.$$

- (ii) *If $p = \frac{\delta}{n}$, then there exists a positive constant C , depending only on n and δ , such that, for any $u \in C^1(\Omega)$,*

$$(1.6) \quad \inf_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \|u - b\|_{L^{p,\infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})} \leq C\beta \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{2n} \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})}.$$

Remark 1.6. (i) We point out that we indeed prove two stronger inequalities than those stated in Theorem 1.5, that is, we show that the left-hand sides of (1.5) and (1.6) can be enhanced, respectively, into $\|u - u_B\|_{L^{p,q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})}$ and $\|u - u_B\|_{L^{p,\infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})}$, where

$$(1.7) \quad u_B := \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B u(x) dx \quad \text{with } B := B\left(x_0, C_{(n)} \frac{\alpha^2}{\beta}\right).$$

Here x_0 is the John center of the bounded (α, β) -John domain Ω and $C_{(n)}$ is a positive constant that depends only on n . In addition, if $q = p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \infty)$, then the Choquet–Lorentz space $L^{p,q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta}) = L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})$. Thus, as a special case, Theorem 1.5(i) with $q = p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \infty)$ reduces back to [18, Theorem 3.2]. Particularly, when $\delta = n$, we then obtain the classical (p, p) -Poincaré inequality (1.1).

- (ii) Notice that $\delta \leq n$ and $p \in [\frac{\delta}{n}, \infty)$. Thus, the integrable exponent p in Theorem 1.5 may less than 1. We point out that, when $p = \frac{\delta}{n}$, the endpoint weak type estimate proved in Theorem 1.5(ii) completes [18, Theorem 3.2] because the endpoint case $p = \frac{\delta}{n}$ in [18, Theorem 3.2] is excluded. Moreover, the estimate (1.6) indeed holds for all $p \in [\frac{\delta}{n}, \infty)$ by Theorem 1.5(i) (or [18, Theorem 3.2]).
- (iii) When $\delta = n$, we know that the Hausdorff content $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta}$ coincides with the Lebesgue measure by (4.2). Then the Poincaré inequalities in Theorem 1.5 with $q \neq p$ also give the Poincaré inequalities on Lorentz spaces with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Even in this special case, Theorem 1.5 seems also new to the best of our knowledge.

As the second main theorem of this article, we establish the Poincaré–Sobolev inequality and also the endpoint weak type estimate in terms of Choquet–Lorentz integrals as follows, in which the dimension $\delta - \mu p$ of the Hausdorff content on the left-hand side is less than or equal to the dimension δ on the right-hand side.

Theorem 1.7. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $n \geq 2$ be a bounded (α, β) -John domain with $0 < \alpha \leq \beta < \infty$. Suppose that $\mu \in [0, 1)$ and $\delta \in (0, n]$.*

- (i) *If $p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \delta)$ and $q \in (\frac{\delta(\delta-\mu p)}{n(\delta-p)}, \infty)$, then there exists a positive constant C , depending only on n, μ, δ, p, q , and the John constants α, β , such that, for any $u \in C^1(\Omega)$,*

$$(1.8) \quad \inf_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \|u - b\|_{L^{\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}, q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta-\mu p})} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta-p)}{\delta-\mu p}}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})}.$$

- (ii) *If $p = \frac{\delta}{n}$, then there exists a positive constant C , depending only on n, μ, δ , and the John constants α, β , such that, for any $u \in C^1(\Omega)$,*

$$(1.9) \quad \inf_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \|u - b\|_{L^{\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}, \infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta-\mu p})} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})}.$$

Remark 1.8. (i) We show that the exponent $\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}$ in Theorem 1.7 is sharp by a counterexample (see Remark 4.3 below). Moreover, similarly to Remark 1.6(i), we indeed prove two stronger inequalities than those stated in Theorem 1.7, that is, the left-hand sides of (1.8) and (1.9) can be enhanced, respectively, into $\|u - u_B\|_{L^{\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}, q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta-\mu p})}$ and $\|u - u_B\|_{L^{\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}, \infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta-\mu p})}$ with the same u_B as in (1.7).

- (ii) Theorem 1.7 covers [18, Theorem 3.7] and extends the range of exponents to the endpoint case $p = \frac{\delta}{n}$. Indeed, by taking $q = \frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}$ in Theorem 1.7(i), we conclude that, for any $p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \delta)$,

$$(1.10) \quad \inf_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \|u - b\|_{L^{\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta-\mu p})} \lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})}.$$

This inequality reduces back to [18, Theorem 3.7]. Choosing $\mu = \frac{1}{p}$ and $\delta = n$ in the last inequality, we obtain

$$\inf_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \|u - b\|_{L^{\frac{p(n-1)}{n-p}}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{n-1})} \lesssim \left[\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u(x)|^p dx \right]^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

which reduces back to [18, Corollary 3.9]. In addition, when $\mu = 0$, the estimate (1.9) is a strengthening version of (1.6) because $\frac{p\delta}{\delta-p} > p$ and Ω is a bounded domain.

- (iii) The interesting special case of Theorem 1.7(i) with $q = \frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}$ and $\mu = 0$ reduces back to [18, Corollary 3.7] [see also (1.3)]. Furthermore, when the dimension $\delta = n$, we recover the classical $(\frac{np}{n-p}, p)$ -Poincaré–Sobolev inequality (1.2). In addition, the estimate (1.9) indeed holds for all $p \in [\frac{\delta}{n}, \delta)$ by (1.10).
- (iv) Similarly to Remark 1.6(iii), if $\delta = n$ and $\mu = 0$, the Poincaré–Sobolev inequality on Choquet–Lorentz integrals in Theorem 1.7 with $q \neq \frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}$ also gives the Poincaré–Sobolev inequality on Lorentz spaces with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Even in this special case, Theorem 1.7 seems also new to the best of our knowledge.

Recall that the mapping properties of Riesz potentials are always important in harmonic analysis and potential theory. For instance, Hatano et al. [21] obtained the boundedness of Riesz potentials on Bourgain–Morrey spaces; Nakai [31, 32, 33, 34] considered the mapping properties of Riesz potentials on Campanato spaces and Morrey spaces. Very recently, Alves et al. [4] discovered a new bilinear Riesz potential for Euler–Riesz systems and established a uniform estimate.

As an application, we obtain the following boundedness of Riesz potentials on Choquet–Lorentz integrals, which is an analogue of the Hardy–Littlewood–Sobolev theorem on the fractional integral in the setting of Choquet–Lorentz integrals with respect to the Hausdorff content. Let $\alpha \in (0, n)$. Recall that the *Riesz potential* I_α is defined by setting, for any $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (the set of all locally integrable functions on \mathbb{R}^n) and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$I_\alpha f(x) := \frac{1}{c_\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{f(y)}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy,$$

where $c_\alpha := \pi^{n/2} 2^\alpha \frac{\Gamma(\alpha/2)}{\Gamma((n-\alpha)/2)}$ and Γ denotes the *Gamma function*.

Theorem 1.9. *Let $\alpha \in (0, n)$, $\delta \in (0, n]$, and $\mu \in [0, \alpha)$.*

- (i) *If $p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \frac{\delta}{\alpha})$ and $q \in (\frac{\delta(\delta-\mu p)}{n(\delta-p\alpha)}, \infty)$, then there exists a positive constant C , depending only on n, α, μ , and δ , such that, for any $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$,*

$$\|I_\alpha f\|_{L^{\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p\alpha}, q}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})} \leq C \|f\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta-p\alpha)}{\delta-\mu p}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}.$$

- (ii) *If $p = \frac{\delta}{n}$, then there exists a positive constant C , depending only on n, α, μ , and δ , such that, for any $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$,*

$$(1.11) \quad \|I_\alpha f\|_{L^{\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p\alpha}, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})} \leq C \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}.$$

Remark 1.10. (i) The exponent $\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p\alpha}$ in Theorem 1.9 is sharp. Indeed, by constructing a counterexample in Example 4.4 below, we show that the exponent is the best possible.

- (ii) The estimate (1.11) is actually true for any $p \in [\frac{\delta}{n}, \frac{\delta}{\alpha})$. Indeed, by taking $q = \frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p\alpha}$ in Theorem 1.9(i), we conclude that, for any $p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \frac{\delta}{\alpha})$,

$$\|I_\alpha f\|_{L^{\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p\alpha}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}$$

with the implicit positive constant independent of f . This obviously implies (1.11) for any $p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \frac{\delta}{\alpha})$.

- (iii) When $\delta = n$ and $\mu = 0$, Theorem 1.9 gives the boundedness of the Riesz potential on Lorentz spaces with respect to the Lebesgue measure and, furthermore, taking $q = \frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p\alpha}$ then Theorem 1.9 reduces back to the Hardy–Littlewood–Sobolev theorem on the fractional integral; see, for instance, Grafakos [17, Theorem 1.2.3].

We establish our main results by borrowing some ideas from the well-known method (see [8, 29]). Indeed, we prove the desired Poincaré–Sobolev inequality with the help of the boundedness of fractional Hardy–Littlewood maximal operators and also the Hedberg-type pointwise estimate on the Riesz potential related to Choquet integrals under consideration. Recall that the classical Hedberg-type pointwise estimate on the Riesz potential goes back to Hedberg [22] and the one related to Choquet integrals with respect to the Hausdorff content was given in [18, Lemma 3.6]. The boundedness of the fractional Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator on Choquet integrals with respect to the Hausdorff content was proved by Adams [3] and simplified by Orobitg and Verdera [36], both heavily rely on the covering lemma. Later on, Tang [45] extended these boundedness to the weighted Choquet space and the Choquet–Morrey space by a similar method and then studied the Carleson embeddings for weighted Sobolev spaces. However, these two pivotal ingredients in

the Choquet–Lorentz integral setting were missing. Thus, to obtain the above main theorems, we need to overcome these two essential difficulties.

To tackle these hurdles, we first notice that classical Lorentz spaces are interpolation spaces of Lebesgue spaces, that is, the real interpolation between Lebesgue spaces L^1 and L^∞ gives the family of classical Lorentz spaces $L^{p,q}$ for any $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $q \in [1, \infty]$; see [6, p. 300, Theorem 1.9]. Based on this perspective, in Theorem 2.1 we establish the boundedness of the fractional Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator from $L^{p,s}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$ to $L^{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})$ via employing the equivalence of $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta$ and the dyadic Hausdorff content $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta$ introduced by Yang and Yuan [47] and the real interpolation theorem

$$\left(L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta), L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta) \right)_{\eta, q} = L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta)$$

from Cerdà et al. [11] (see Lemma 2.9 for the details) rather than beginning with the covering lemma as Adams [3], Oróbitg and Verdera [36], and Tang [45] did. This fortunately works for the present case of Choquet–Lorentz integrals. Indeed, this interpolation theorem combining with the boundedness of fractional Hardy–Littlewood maximal operators on Choquet integrals then immediately implies the boundedness of fractional Hardy–Littlewood maximal operators on Choquet–Lorentz spaces associate with Fatou capacity. However, the Hausdorff content $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta$ is not a Fatou capacity. To overcome the deficiency of the Fatou property, we use the dyadic Hausdorff content $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta$ from [47] as a key bridge and finally establish Theorem 2.1. This hence overcomes the first difficulty.

On the other hand, applying the fractional Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator, we obtain the Hedberg-type pointwise estimates on the Riesz potential in terms of Choquet–Lorentz integrals under consideration; see Proposition 3.1. The pivotal points of Proposition 3.1 are to estimate the Hausdorff context of the superlevel set $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(\{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : |f(y)| > \lambda\})$ for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ and then to convert classical Lorentz integrals to Choquet–Lorentz integrals. From the two crucial tools and also the properties of (α, β) -John domains, we finally derive Theorems 1.5, 1.7, and 1.9. Indeed, our proofs strongly depend on the structure of Choquet–Lorentz integrals and the obtained fractional Hardy–Littlewood maximal inequality as well as the new Hedberg-type pointwise estimates.

The organization of the remainder of this article is as follows.

In Section 2, the fractional Hardy–Littlewood maximal inequality on Choquet–Lorentz integrals with respect to the Hausdorff content is established. Section 3 contains the Hedberg-type pointwise estimates on the Riesz potential in terms of Choquet–Lorentz integrals. The proofs of the main theorems and the corresponding Poincaré or Poincaré–Sobolev inequalities for compactly supported continuously differentiable functions defined on open connected sets are given in Section 4.

Finally, we make some convention on the notation. Let $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$. We denote by C a positive constant which is independent of the main parameters involved, but it may vary from line to line. Besides, we denote $f \leq Cg$ (resp. $f \geq Cg$) for a positive constant C by $f \lesssim g$ (resp. $f \gtrsim g$). We write $f \sim g$ if $f \lesssim g \lesssim f$. Also, we denote by $\mathbf{1}_E$ the characteristic function of set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

2 The Fractional Hardy–Littlewood Maximal Inequality

Let $\mu \in [0, n)$. Recall that $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denotes the set of all locally integrable functions on \mathbb{R}^n and the *fractional Hardy–Littlewood maximal function* $\mathcal{M}_\mu(f)$ of $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with order μ is defined by setting, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\mathcal{M}_\mu(f)(x) := \sup_{r \in (0, \infty)} r^\mu \int_{B(x, r)} |f(y)| dy,$$

where the barred integral denotes the integral average over the ball $B(x, r)$. Notice that, when $\mu = 0$, we denote $\mathcal{M}_0(f)$ by $\mathcal{M}(f)$, which is the classical *Hardy–Littlewood maximal function* of f .

The main result of this section is the following fractional Hardy–Littlewood maximal inequality on the Choquet–Lorentz integral.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\delta \in (0, n]$, $\mu \in [0, n)$, $p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \frac{\delta}{\mu})$, $r \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \infty)$, and $s \in (0, r]$. Then the fractional Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \mathcal{M}_μ is bounded from $L^{p,s}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$ to $L^{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})$, that is, there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in L^{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})$,*

$$\|\mathcal{M}_\mu(f)\|_{L^{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})} \leq C \|f\|_{L^{p,s}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}.$$

Remark 2.2. (i) It is interesting that the above inequality allows the dimension of the Hausdorff content on the left-hand side is less than that on the right-hand side, which leads the fractional Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \mathcal{M}_μ being of (p, p) type. This differs from the classical (p, q) -type of \mathcal{M}_μ on classical Lebesgue spaces with $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{\mu}{n}$.

(ii) The conclusion of Theorem 2.1 is new even in the case $\mu = 0$ and $r = s$. That is, the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator \mathcal{M} is bounded on $L^{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$ for any $p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \infty)$ and $r \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \infty)$, which means that there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $f \in L^{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$,

$$\|\mathcal{M}(f)\|_{L^{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}.$$

(iii) When $\delta = n$, $\mu = 0$, and $r = s = p$, Theorem 2.1 in this case reduces back to the classical Hardy–Littlewood maximal inequality.

We next show Theorem 2.1 by combining a real interpolation result of Choquet-integral spaces due to Cerdà et al. [11, Corollary 1] (see also Lemma 2.9), the boundedness of \mathcal{M}_μ from $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})$ (see Lemma 2.6), and also the dyadic Hausdorff content $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta$ introduced by Yang and Yuan in [47]. For this purpose, we first collect some known properties on the Choquet–Lorentz integral. It is not difficult to obtain the following equivalent quasi-norms of $\|\cdot\|_{L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}$; we omit the details.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\delta \in (0, n]$, $p \in (0, \infty)$, and $q \in (0, \infty]$. If $f \in L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$, then*

$$\|f\|_{L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)} \sim \begin{cases} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^{iq} \left\{ \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta \left(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |f(x)| > 2^i\} \right) \right\}^{\frac{q}{p}} \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} & \text{if } q \in (0, \infty), \\ \sup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} 2^i \left[\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta \left(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |f(x)| > 2^i\} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} & \text{if } q = \infty, \end{cases}$$

where the positive equivalence constants are independent of f .

Remark 2.4. Let $\delta \in (0, n]$ and $p \in (0, \infty)$. By Lemma 2.3 and the well-known inequality that, for any $\theta \in (0, 1]$ and $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{C}$,

$$(2.1) \quad \left(\sum_{i=1}^\infty |a_i| \right)^\theta \leq \sum_{i=1}^\infty |a_i|^\theta,$$

we conclude that, if $0 < s \leq r < \infty$, then $L^{p,s}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta) \subset L^{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$ and, for any $f \in L^{p,s}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$, $\|f\|_{L^{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{p,s}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}$ with the implicit positive constant independent of f .

From the definition of Choquet–Lorentz integrals, we easily infer the following conclusion; we omit the details.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\delta \in (0, n]$, $p \in (0, \infty)$, and $q \in (0, \infty]$. Then, for any $f \in L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$ and $\nu \in (0, \infty)$, it holds that*

$$\| |f|^\nu \|_{L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)} = \| f \|_{L^{\nu p, \nu q}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^\nu.$$

The following conclusion is a special case of [3, Theorem 7(a)].

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\delta \in (0, n]$ and $\mu \in [0, n)$. If $p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \frac{\delta}{\mu})$, then, for any $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$,*

$$\| \mathcal{M}_\mu(f) \|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})} \lesssim \| f \|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}$$

and, if $p = \frac{\delta}{n}$, then

$$\sup_{\lambda \in (0, \infty)} \lambda \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p} \left(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathcal{M}_\mu(f) > \lambda\} \right)^{1/p} \lesssim \| f \|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)},$$

where the implicit positive constants are independent of f .

To apply the real interpolation theorem, we need to recall more properties on the Hausdorff content. It is known that $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta$ is an outer capacity in the sense of Meyers [35, p. 257] and an outer measure. Precisely, the Hausdorff content has the following properties (see, for example, [2]).

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\delta \in (0, n]$. Then the following statements hold.*

(i) $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(\emptyset) = 0$;

(ii) If $A \subset B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, then $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(A) \leq \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(B)$;

(iii) If $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, then

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(K) = \inf \{ \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(U) : U \supset K \text{ and } U \text{ is open} \};$$

(iv) If $\{K_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is a decreasing sequence of compact sets in \mathbb{R}^n , then

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^\infty K_i \right) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(K_i);$$

(v) If $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is any sequence of sets in \mathbb{R}^n , then

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^\infty E_i \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(E_i).$$

However, the Hausdorff content $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta$ is not a capacity in the sense of Choquet [12] because the deficiency of the following property: for any increasing sequence $\{K_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of sets,

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^\infty K_i \right) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(K_i).$$

To overcome this obstacle, the *dyadic Hausdorff content* $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_\infty^\delta$ was introduced (see, for instance, [2]), that is,

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_\infty^\delta(K) := \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^\infty [l(Q_i)]^\delta : K \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty Q_i \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all dyadic cube coverings of K and where $l(Q)$ denotes the edge length of the cube Q . This equivalent Hausdorff content was claimed to be a capacity in the sense of Choquet in [2], but it is true only when $\delta \in (n-1, n]$ (see [47, Propositions 2.1 and 2.2]). Indeed, Yang and Yuan in [47, Proposition 2.2] proved that when $\delta \in (0, n-1]$ there exist compact sets $\{K_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ which is decreasing but

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_\infty^\delta \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} K_j \right) \neq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_\infty^\delta(K_j).$$

To overcome this shortage, a *new dyadic Hausdorff content* $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta$ was introduced in [47, Definition 2.1], that is, for any subset K of \mathbb{R}^n ,

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta(K) := \inf \left\{ \sum_i [l(Q_i)]^\delta : K \subset \left(\bigcup_i Q_i \right)^\circ \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all dyadic cubes $\{Q_i\}_i$ and, for any $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, E° denote the *interior* of the set E . This dyadic Hausdorff content $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta$ has the following good properties.

Remark 2.8. Let $\delta \in (0, n]$ with $n \geq 2$.

- (i) By [47, Proposition 2.3], $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta$ with the positive equivalence constants depending only on n .
- (ii) It follows from [47, Proposition 2.4 and Theorem 2.1] that $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta$ is strongly subadditive, that is, for any sets $K_1, K_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta(K_1 \cup K_2) + \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta(K_1 \cap K_2) \leq \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta(K_1) + \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta(K_2)$$

and, for any $\delta \in (0, n]$, it holds that

- (a) if $\{K_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ are compact and decrease to K , then $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta(K_j) = \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta(K)$;
- (b) if $\{E_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ increase to E , then $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta(E_j) = \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta(E)$.

Therefore, $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta$ is a capacity in the sense of Choquet [12] for all $\delta \in (0, n]$.

We next recall the concept of the real interpolation and, for general facts concerning the interpolation theory, we refer to books [7] and [9]. In [11, Corollary 1], Cerdà et al. established a real interpolation result of Choquet integrals corresponding to a capacity C , which satisfies:

- (i) *Quasi-subadditivity*: there exists $L \in [1, \infty)$ such that, for any subsets A and B of \mathbb{R}^n ,

$$C(A \cup B) \leq L[C(A) + C(B)];$$

- (ii) *Fatou property*: for a sequence $\{E_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ of subsets in \mathbb{R}^n , if $\{E_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ increase to E , then

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} C(E_j) = C(E).$$

We point out that the dyadic Hausdorff content $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta$ satisfies the quasi-subadditivity and the Fatou property for any $\delta \in (0, n]$ by Remark 2.8(ii). But, the Hausdorff content $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta$ does not have the Fatou property. Therefore, we can only apply [11, Corollary 1] to the Choquet integral

with respect to the dyadic Hausdorff content $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta$. Fortunately, $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta$ due to [47, Proposition 2.3].

Let $p_0, p_1 \in (0, \infty)$. Then the space $L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta) + L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta)$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions f on \mathbb{R}^n such that $f = f_0 + f_1$, where $f_0 \in L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta)$ and $f_1 \in L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta)$. For simplicity of presentation, let $A_0 := L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta)$ and $A_1 := L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta)$. Then the *real interpolation space* $(A_0, A_1)_{\theta, q}$, with $\theta \in (0, 1)$ and $q \in (0, \infty]$, is defined to be the set of all functions $f \in A_0 + A_1$ satisfying

$$\|f\|_{\theta, q} := \left\{ \int_0^\infty \left[t^{-\theta} K(t, f; A_0, A_1) \right]^q \frac{dt}{t} \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} < \infty,$$

where $K(t, f; A_0, A_1)$ is called the *K-functional*, defined by setting

$$K(t, f; A_0, A_1) := \inf \{ \|f_0\|_{A_0} + t\|f_1\|_{A_1} : f = f_0 + f_1, f_0 \in A_0, f_1 \in A_1 \}.$$

Now, we state the real interpolation result of the Choquet integral corresponding to the dyadic Hausdorff content $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta$ as follows, which is a special case of [11, Corollary 1].

Lemma 2.9. *Let $\delta \in (0, n]$ and $p \in (0, \infty)$. Then, for any $0 < p_0 < p_1 < \infty$, $q \in (p_0, \infty)$, and $\eta \in (0, 1)$ with $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1-\eta}{p_0} + \frac{\eta}{p_1}$, $(L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta), L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta))_{\eta, q} = L^{p, q}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta)$.*

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $\delta \in (0, n]$, $p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \frac{\delta}{\mu})$, $r \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \infty)$, and $s \in (0, 1]$. We choose $\eta \in (0, 1)$, $p_0, p_1 \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \frac{\delta}{\mu})$ such that $p_0 < r$, $p_0 < p_1$, and $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{\eta}{p_0} + \frac{1-\eta}{p_1}$. Then, by Lemma 2.9, we conclude that, for any $\delta \in (0, n]$,

$$(2.2) \quad L^{p, r}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta) = \left(L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta), L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta) \right)_{\eta, r}$$

and, moreover, for any $\mu \in [0, n)$,

$$(2.3) \quad L^{p, r}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^{\delta-\mu p}) = \left(L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^{\delta-\mu p}), L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^{\delta-\mu p}) \right)_{\eta, r}.$$

Let $f \in L^{p, s}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$. Then $f \in L^{p, r}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta)$ due to Remarks 2.8(i) and 2.4. Thus, by (2.2), we find that there exist two functions $f_0 \in L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta)$ and $f_1 \in L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta)$ such that $f = f_0 + f_1$ and

$$(2.4) \quad \left(\int_0^\infty \left\{ t^{-\eta} \left[\|f_0\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta)} + t\|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta)} \right] \right\}^r \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{p, r}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta)}.$$

Next, we let $E_0 := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{M}_\mu(f)(x) \leq \mathcal{M}_\mu(f_0)(x)\}$ and

$$E_1 := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{M}_\mu(f)(x) \leq \mathcal{M}_\mu(f_1)(x) \right\}.$$

Then, by an obvious inequality that $\mathcal{M}_\mu(f)(x) \leq \mathcal{M}_\mu(f_0)(x) + \mathcal{M}_\mu(f_1)(x)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\mathbb{R}^n = E_0 \cup E_1 = E_0 \cup (E_1 \setminus E_0).$$

Then, using $p_0, p_1 \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \frac{\delta}{\mu})$, Lemma 2.6, and definitions of E_0 and E_1 , we conclude that

$$\mathcal{M}_\mu(f) = \mathcal{M}_\mu(f)\mathbf{1}_{E_0} + \mathcal{M}_\mu(f)\mathbf{1}_{E_1 \setminus E_0} \in L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^{\delta-\mu p}) + L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^{\delta-\mu p}).$$

From this, Remark 2.8(i), (2.3), Lemma 2.6 again, (2.4), and Remark 2.4, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathcal{M}_\mu(f)\|_{L^{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})} \\
& \sim \|\mathcal{M}_\mu(f)\|_{L^{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^{\delta-\mu p})} \sim \|\mathcal{M}_\mu(f)\|_{(L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^{\delta-\mu p}), L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^{\delta-\mu p}))_{\eta,r}} \\
& \lesssim \left\{ \int_0^\infty \left(t^{-\eta} \left[\|\mathcal{M}_\mu(f)\mathbf{1}_{E_0}\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})} + t \|\mathcal{M}_\mu(f)\mathbf{1}_{E_1 \setminus E_0}\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})} \right] \right)^r \frac{dt}{t} \right\}^{\frac{1}{r}} \\
& \lesssim \left\{ \int_0^\infty \left(t^{-\eta} \left[\|f_0\|_{L^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta)} + t \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta)} \right] \right)^r \frac{dt}{t} \right\}^{\frac{1}{r}} \\
& \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^n, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^\delta)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{p,s}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}.
\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of Theorem 2.1. \square

3 Hedberg-Type Pointwise Estimates on Riesz Potentials

In this section, we establish some Hedberg-type pointwise estimates on Riesz potentials in terms of Choquet–Lorentz integrals by borrowing some ideas from [1, 18]. These estimates play an important role in the proofs of Theorems 1.7 and 1.9.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\alpha \in (0, n)$, $\mu \in [0, \alpha)$, and $\delta \in (0, n]$.*

- (i) *If $p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \frac{\delta}{\alpha})$ and $q \in (0, \infty]$, then there exists a positive constant C_1 such that, for any $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \leq C_1 \left[\mathcal{M}_\mu f(x) \right]^{\frac{\delta-p\alpha}{\delta-\mu p}} \|f\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta-p\alpha)}{\delta-\mu p}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\frac{p(\alpha-\mu)}{\delta-\mu p}}.$$

- (ii) *If $p = \frac{\delta}{n}$, then there exists a positive constant C_2 such that, for any $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \leq C_2 \left[\mathcal{M}_\mu f(x) \right]^{\frac{\delta-p\alpha}{\delta-\mu p}} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\frac{p(\alpha-\mu)}{\delta-\mu p}}.$$

To prove Proposition 3.1, notice that, for any Lebesgue measurable function f on Ω , it holds

$$(3.1) \quad \int_{\Omega} |f(x)| dx \lesssim \left[\int_{\Omega} |f(x)|^{\frac{\delta}{n}} d\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta \right]^{\frac{n}{\delta}},$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a domain, $n \geq 2$, and $\delta \in (0, n]$ (see [36, Lemma 3]). Recall that the classical Lorentz space $L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is originally defined via the decreasing rearrangement and further characterized by distribution functions (see, for instance, [16, Proposition 1.4.9]). Let $p \in (0, \infty)$ and $q \in (0, \infty]$. Then $f \in L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if and only if

$$(3.2) \quad \|f\|_{L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)} := \begin{cases} p^{\frac{1}{q}} \left[\int_0^\infty \left\{ \lambda |\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |f(x)| > \lambda\}|^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\}^q \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} & \text{if } q \in (0, \infty), \\ \sup_{\lambda \in (0, \infty)} \lambda |\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |f(x)| > \lambda\}|^{\frac{1}{p}} & \text{if } q = \infty \end{cases}$$

is finite.

We now show Proposition 3.1.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Let $p \in [\frac{\delta}{n}, \frac{\delta}{\alpha}]$, $q \in (0, \infty]$, $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For any $r \in (0, \infty)$, we write

$$(3.3) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy = \left\{ \int_{B(x,r)} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r)} \right\} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy.$$

For the first term of the right-hand side of (3.3), by the assumption that $\mu < \alpha$, we find that

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{B(x,r)} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2^{-k}r \leq |x-y| < 2^{-k+1}r\}} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2^k}{r}\right)^{n-\alpha} \int_{B(x, 2^{-k+1}r)} |f(y)| dy \lesssim r^{\alpha-\mu} \mathcal{M}_{\mu} f(x). \end{aligned}$$

We first prove (i) in the following two steps.

Step 1. We show (i) for any $q \in (0, \infty)$. To achieve this, let $\tilde{p} := \frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p\alpha}$. Next, we estimate the second term of the right-hand side of (3.3) by considering the following two cases on q .

Case 1. $q \in (\frac{\tilde{p}}{2p}, \infty)$. In this case, $\frac{2pq}{p} \in (1, \infty)$. Then, by the fact $p > \frac{\delta}{n}$ and the Hölder inequality of Lorentz spaces (see [16, Theorem 1.4.17(vi)]), we conclude that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r)} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \leq \|f\|_{L^{\frac{pn}{\delta}, \frac{2pq}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r))} \left\| |x-\cdot|^{-n+\alpha} \right\|_{L^{p'_1, q'_1}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r))},$$

where p'_1 and q'_1 denote the conjugate indices of $\frac{pn}{\delta}$ and $\frac{2pq}{p}$, respectively. Since $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^n(K) \leq (\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta}(K))^{\frac{n}{\delta}}$ for any set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ by both (2.1) and $\delta \in (0, n]$, it follows from (4.2) that

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L^{\frac{pn}{\delta}, \frac{2pq}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r))} &\sim \left[\int_0^{\infty} \lambda^{\frac{2pq}{p}} |\{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r) : |f(y)| > \lambda\}|^{\frac{2q\delta}{pn}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \right]^{\frac{\tilde{p}}{2pq}} \\ &\lesssim \left\{ \int_0^{\infty} \lambda^{\frac{2pq}{p}} [\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^n(\{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : |f(y)| > \lambda\})]^{\frac{2q\delta}{pn}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \right\}^{\frac{\tilde{p}}{2pq}} \\ &\lesssim \left\{ \int_0^{\infty} \lambda^{\frac{2pq}{p}} [\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta}(\{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : |f(y)| > \lambda\})]^{\frac{2q}{p}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \right\}^{\frac{\tilde{p}}{2pq}}. \end{aligned}$$

For any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$, let $h(\lambda) := \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta}(\{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : |f(y)| > \lambda\})$. Then the function h is decreasing. Notice that $\frac{pq}{p} = \frac{q(\delta-p\alpha)}{\delta-\mu p} > 0$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{\frac{pq}{p}} h(\lambda)^{\frac{q}{p}} &\sim \int_0^{\lambda} t^{\frac{pq}{p}} h(t)^{\frac{q}{p}} \frac{dt}{t} \lesssim \int_0^{\lambda} t^{\frac{pq}{p}} h(t)^{\frac{q}{p}} \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\lesssim \int_0^{\infty} t^{\frac{pq}{p}} h(t)^{\frac{q}{p}} \frac{dt}{t} \sim \|f\|_{L^{p, \frac{pq}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})}^{\frac{pq}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

From this and (3.5), we infer that

$$(3.6) \quad \|f\|_{L^{\frac{pn}{\delta}, \frac{2pq}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r))} \lesssim \left[\|f\|_{L^{p, \frac{pq}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})}^{\frac{pq}{p}} \int_0^{\infty} \lambda^{\frac{pq}{p}} h(\lambda)^{\frac{q}{p}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \right]^{\frac{\tilde{p}}{2pq}} \sim \|f\|_{L^{p, \frac{pq}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})}.$$

Now, we turn to estimate $\left\| |x-\cdot|^{-n+\alpha} \right\|_{L^{p'_1, q'_1}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r))}$ for any given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. By (3.2), we obtain

$$\left\| |x-\cdot|^{-n+\alpha} \right\|_{L^{p'_1, q'_1}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r))} \sim \left(\int_0^{\frac{1}{r^{n-\alpha}}} \lambda^{q'_1} \left| \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n : r \leq |x-y| < \left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{n-\alpha}} \right\} \right|^{\frac{q'_1}{p'_1}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \right)^{\frac{1}{q'_1}}$$

$$\lesssim \left[\int_0^{\frac{1}{r^{n-\alpha}}} \lambda^{q'_1 - \frac{nq'_1}{(n-\alpha)p'_1}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \right]^{\frac{1}{q'_1}} \sim r^{-(n-\alpha)[1 - \frac{n}{(n-\alpha)p'_1}]} \sim r^{\alpha - \frac{\delta}{p}},$$

where we used the fact that $p < \frac{\delta}{\alpha}$ and hence $1 - \frac{n}{(n-\alpha)p'_1} > 0$. Therefore, in the case where $q > \frac{\bar{p}}{2p}$, it holds

$$(3.7) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r)} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \lesssim r^{\alpha - \frac{\delta}{p}} \|f\|_{L^{p, \frac{pq}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}.$$

Case 2. $q \in (0, \frac{\bar{p}}{2p}]$. In this case, $\frac{2pq}{p} \in (0, 1]$. From the Hölder inequality of Lorentz spaces in [16, Theorem 1.4.17(v)], we deduce that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r)} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{\frac{pn}{\delta}, \frac{2pq}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r))} \| |x - \cdot|^{-n+\alpha} \|_{L^{p'_1, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r))},$$

where p'_1 still denotes the conjugate index of $\frac{pn}{\delta}$. Applying an argument similar to that used in (3.6), we find that

$$\|f\|_{L^{\frac{pn}{\delta}, \frac{2pq}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r))} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{p, \frac{pq}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}.$$

Moreover, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \| |x - \cdot|^{-n+\alpha} \|_{L^{p'_1, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r))} &= \sup_{\lambda \in (0, \infty)} \lambda \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r) : |y-x| < \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right)^{\frac{1}{n-\alpha}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{p'_1}} \\ &\leq \sup_{\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{r^{n-\alpha}})} \lambda \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n : |y-x| < \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right)^{\frac{1}{n-\alpha}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{p'_1}} \lesssim r^{\alpha - \frac{\delta}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in this case, we also obtain the estimate (3.7). Altogether, we conclude that, for any $q \in (0, \infty)$,

$$(3.8) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r)} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \lesssim r^{\alpha - \frac{\delta}{p}} \|f\|_{L^{p, \frac{pq}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}.$$

Combining (3.3), (3.4), and (3.8), we find that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \lesssim r^{\alpha - \mu} \mathcal{M}_\mu f(x) + r^{\alpha - \frac{\delta}{p}} \|f\|_{L^{p, \frac{pq}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}.$$

By taking $r := \left[\frac{\mathcal{M}_\mu f(x)}{\|f\|_{L^{p, \frac{pq}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}} \right]^{-\frac{p}{\delta - \mu p}}$, we further obtain, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \lesssim \left[\mathcal{M}_\mu f(x) \right]^{\frac{\delta - p\alpha}{\delta - \mu p}} \|f\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta - p\alpha)}{\delta - \mu p}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}.$$

This finishes the proof of (i) for any $q \in (0, \infty)$.

Step 2. We show (i) for $q = \infty$. Applying the Hölder inequality of Lorentz spaces (see [16, p.73]), we find that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r)} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{\frac{pn}{\delta}, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r))} \| |x - \cdot|^{-n+\alpha} \|_{L^{\frac{pn}{pn-\delta}, 1}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r))}.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\|f\|_{L^{\frac{pn}{\delta}, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r))} = \sup_{\lambda \in (0, \infty)} \lambda \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x,r) : |f(x)| > \lambda \}^{\frac{\delta}{pn}}$$

$$\lesssim \sup_{\lambda \in (0, \infty)} \lambda [\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |f(x)| > \lambda\})]^\frac{1}{p} \sim \|f\|_{L^{p, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}$$

and

$$\| |x - \cdot|^{-n+\alpha} \|_{L^{\frac{pn}{pn-\delta}, 1}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x, r))} \lesssim r^{\alpha - \frac{\delta}{p}},$$

which, together with (3.3) and (3.4), further imply that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \lesssim r^{\alpha-\mu} \mathcal{M}_\mu f(x) + r^{\alpha-\frac{\delta}{p}} \|f\|_{L^{p, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}.$$

Letting $r := [\frac{\mathcal{M}_\mu f(x)}{\|f\|_{L^{p, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}}]^{-\frac{p}{\delta-\mu p}}$, we further obtain, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \lesssim [\mathcal{M}_\mu f(x)]^{\frac{\delta-p\alpha}{\delta-\mu p}} \|f\|_{L^{p, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\frac{p(\alpha-\mu)}{\delta-\mu p}}.$$

This finishes the proof of (i) for $q = \infty$ and hence (i).

Next, we prove (ii). Let $p = \frac{\delta}{n}$. In this case, we first have

$$(3.9) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x, r)} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \leq r^{\alpha-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x, r)} |f(y)| dy.$$

By (3.1), we obtain

$$(3.10) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(x, r)} |f(y)| dy \lesssim \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f(y)|^{\frac{\delta}{n}} d\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta \right]^{\frac{n}{\delta}} \sim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}.$$

Combining (3.3), (3.4), (3.9), and (3.10), we conclude that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \lesssim r^{\alpha-\mu} \mathcal{M}_\mu f(x) + r^{\alpha-\frac{\delta}{p}} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}.$$

By taking $r := [\frac{\mathcal{M}_\mu f(x)}{\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}}]^{-\frac{p}{\delta-\mu p}}$, we find that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \lesssim [\mathcal{M}_\mu f(x)]^{\frac{\delta-p\alpha}{\delta-\mu p}} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\frac{p(\alpha-\mu)}{\delta-\mu p}}.$$

This finishes the proof of (ii) and hence Proposition 3.1. \square

Remark 3.2. We point out that Proposition 3.1(i) with $q = \frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p\alpha}$ and $\alpha = 1$ reduces back to [18, Lemma 3.6]. In this sense, Proposition 3.1 extends [18, Lemma 3.6] to Choquet–Lorentz integrals and to all $\alpha \in (0, n)$. Moreover, the estimate in Proposition 3.1(ii) is actually true for any $p \in [\frac{\delta}{n}, \frac{\delta}{\alpha})$ by combining Proposition 3.1(i).

4 Proofs of Theorems 1.5, 1.7, and 1.9

In this section, we prove Theorems 1.5, 1.7, and 1.9. For this purpose, let $\delta \in (0, n]$. Recall that the δ -dimensional Hausdorff measure of $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined by setting

$$\mathcal{H}^\delta(K) := \liminf_{\varrho \rightarrow 0^+} \left\{ \sum_i r_i^\delta : K \subset \bigcup_i B(x_i, r_i), r_i \leq \varrho \text{ for any } i \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all such finite or countable ball covers $\{B(x_i, r_i)\}_i$ of K that $r_i \leq \varrho$ for any i . When $\delta = n$, there exists a positive constant C , depending only on n , such that, for any Lebesgue measurable set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$(4.1) \quad C^{-1}\mathcal{H}^n(K) \leq |K| \leq C\mathcal{H}^n(K).$$

Here $|K|$ denotes the *Lebesgue measure* of K . For more properties of the Hausdorff measure we refer to [14, Chapter 2]. In particular, we have the following relation between the Hausdorff content and the Hausdorff measure when $\delta = n$ (see [18, Proposition 2.5]): There exists a positive constant C , depending only on n , such that, for any $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathcal{H}_\infty^n(K) \leq \mathcal{H}^n(K) \leq C\mathcal{H}_\infty^n(K)$. Combining this and (4.1), we easily conclude that there exists a positive constant C , depending only on n , such that, for any Lebesgue measurable set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$(4.2) \quad C^{-1}\mathcal{H}_\infty^n(K) \leq |K| \leq C\mathcal{H}_\infty^n(K).$$

Thus, when $\delta = n$, the Hausdorff content $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta$ is equivalent to the Lebesgue measure. In this case, the space $L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$ coincides with the classical Lorentz space $L^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

The boundedness of \mathcal{M} on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$ is presented below, which is exactly [36, Theorem].

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\delta \in (0, n]$. If $p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \infty)$, then, for any $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)$, it holds*

$$\|\mathcal{M}(f)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}$$

and, if $p = \frac{\delta}{n}$, then

$$\sup_{\lambda \in (0, \infty)} \lambda \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathcal{M}(f)(x) > \lambda\})^{1/p} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)},$$

where the implicit positive constants are independent of f .

As an analogue of (3.1) for Lorentz spaces, we have the following conclusion.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $n \geq 2$ be a domain, $\delta \in (0, n]$, $p \in (0, \infty)$, and $q \in (0, \infty]$. Then, for any Lebesgue measurable function f ,*

$$(4.3) \quad \|f\|_{L^{p,q}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{\frac{p\delta}{n}, q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}$$

with the implicit positive constant independent of f and Ω .

Proof. By (2.1), we find that, for any Lebesgue measurable set E of \mathbb{R}^n , $\mathcal{H}_\infty^n(E) \leq [\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(E)]^{\frac{n}{\delta}}$, which, together with (4.2), further implies that $|E| \sim \mathcal{H}_\infty^n(E) \lesssim [\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(E)]^{\frac{n}{\delta}}$. From this, together with the definitions of $\|f\|_{L^{p,q}(\Omega)}$ and $\|f\|_{L^{\frac{p\delta}{n}, q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}$, we further infer that (4.3) holds. This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.2. \square

We now prove Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. To show (i), let $p, q \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \infty)$. We may assume $\|\nabla u\|_{L^{p,q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}$ is finite. Since $\frac{pn}{\delta} > 1$, it follows from the Hölder inequality of Lorentz spaces (see [16, (v) and (vi) of Theorem 1.4.17 and p. 73]) and Lemma 4.2 that

$$(4.4) \quad \int_\Omega |\nabla u| dx \lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{L^{\frac{pn}{\delta}, q}(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{1}_\Omega\|_{L^{(\frac{pn}{\delta})', q'}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{L^{p,q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)},$$

where we used the assumption that the domain Ω is bounded in the last inequality. This further implies $|\nabla u| \in L^1(\Omega)$ and hence both the Riesz potential and the maximal function of $|\nabla u|$ are well defined.

By [38, Theorem] (see also [8, 29]), we find that, for any given (α, β) -John domain Ω with the John center $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and for any $u \in C^1(\Omega)$,

$$(4.5) \quad |u(x) - u_B| \leq C_{(n)} \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{2n} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla u(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-1}} dy, \quad \forall x \in \Omega,$$

where $C_{(n)}$ is a positive constant depending only on n ,

$$B := B\left(x_0, C_{(n)} \frac{\alpha^2}{\beta}\right), \quad \text{and} \quad u_B := \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B u(x) dx.$$

Moreover, by [49, Lemma 2.8.3] (see also [22, Lemma]), we conclude that the Riesz potential on the bounded domain Ω can be estimated by the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator, which further implies that, for any $u \in C^1(\Omega)$ and $x \in \Omega$,

$$(4.6) \quad |u(x) - u_B| \lesssim \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{2n} \text{diam}(\Omega) \mathcal{M}|\nabla u|(x).$$

With the understanding that $|\nabla u|$ is zero outside Ω , combining (4.6) and Theorem 2.1 with $\mu = 0$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_B\|_{L^{p,q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})} &\lesssim \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{2n} \text{diam}(\Omega) \left\{ \int_0^{\infty} \lambda^q \left[\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta}(\{x \in \Omega : \mathcal{M}|\nabla u|(x) > \lambda\}) \right]^{\frac{q}{p}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &\sim \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{2n} \text{diam}(\Omega) \|\mathcal{M}|\nabla u|\|_{L^{p,q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})} \lesssim \beta \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{2n} \|\nabla u\|_{L^{p,q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\text{diam}(\Omega) \leq 2\beta$ in the last inequality. This finishes the proof of (i).

For (ii), similarly to the proof of (i), we also find that $|\nabla u|$ is well defined. If $p = \frac{\delta}{n}$, by (4.6) and the weak boundedness of \mathcal{M} in Lemma 4.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_B\|_{L^{p,\infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})} &\lesssim \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{2n} \text{diam}(\Omega) \sup_{\lambda \in (0, \infty)} \lambda \left[\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta}(\{x \in \Omega : \mathcal{M}|\nabla u|(x) > \lambda\}) \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{2n} \text{diam}(\Omega) \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})} \lesssim \beta \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{2n} \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (ii) is true, which completes the proof of Theorem 1.5. \square

We next show Theorem 1.7.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Let $\mu \in [0, 1)$ and $\delta \in (0, n]$. We first prove (i). To achieve this, suppose $p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \delta)$ and $q \in (\frac{\delta(\delta-\mu p)}{n(\delta-p)}, \infty)$. Then, applying (4.4), we also obtain $|\nabla u| \in L^1(\Omega)$. From (4.5) and Proposition 3.1(i) with the understanding that $|\nabla u|$ is zero outside Ω and $\alpha = 1$, we infer that, for any $x \in \Omega$,

$$|u(x) - u_B| \leq C_{(n)} \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{2n} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla u(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-1}} dy \lesssim \left[\mathcal{M}_{\mu} |\nabla u|(x) \right]^{\frac{\delta-p}{\delta-\mu p}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta-p)}{\delta-\mu p}}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})},$$

where B is the same as in (4.5). Thus, by Lemma 2.5 and Theorem 2.1 with the fact that $\frac{q(\delta-p)}{\delta-\mu p} > \frac{\delta}{n}$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_B\|_{L^{\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}, q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta-\mu p})} &\lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta-p)}{\delta-\mu p}}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta})} \left\| \left[\mathcal{M}_{\mu} |\nabla u| \right]^{\frac{\delta-p}{\delta-\mu p}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}, q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{\delta-\mu p})} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sim \|\nabla u\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta-p)}{\delta-\mu p}}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\frac{p(1-\mu)}{\delta-\mu p}} \|\mathcal{M}_\mu |\nabla u|\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta-p)}{\delta-\mu p}}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})}^{\frac{\delta-p}{\delta-\mu p}} \\
& \lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta-p)}{\delta-\mu p}}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\frac{p(1-\mu)}{\delta-\mu p}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta-p)}{\delta-\mu p}}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\frac{\delta-p}{\delta-\mu p}} \sim \|\nabla u\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta-p)}{\delta-\mu p}}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)},
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of (i).

For (ii), let $p = \frac{\delta}{n}$. By (4.5) and Proposition 3.1(ii) with the understanding that $|\nabla u|$ is zero outside Ω and $\alpha = 1$, we conclude that, for any $x \in \Omega$,

$$|u(x) - u_B| \leq C_{(n)} \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^{2n} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla u(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-1}} dy \lesssim [\mathcal{M}_\mu(|\nabla u|)(x)]^{\frac{\delta-p}{\delta-\mu p}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\frac{p(1-\mu)}{\delta-\mu p}},$$

which, combined with Lemma 2.5 and the weak boundedness of \mathcal{M}_μ in Lemma 2.6, further implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u - u_B\|_{L^{\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}, \infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})} & \lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\frac{p(1-\mu)}{\delta-\mu p}} \|\mathcal{M}_\mu(|\nabla u|)\|_{L^{p, \infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})}^{\frac{\delta-p}{\delta-\mu p}} \\
& \lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\frac{p(1-\mu)}{\delta-\mu p}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\frac{\delta-p}{\delta-\mu p}} \sim \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, conclusion (ii) is proved. This then finishes the proof of Theorem 1.7. \square

We would like to mention that, after this article is near finishing, we find that Harjulehto and Hurri-Syrjänen [19, Theorem 3.6] and [20, Theorem 4.11] have also obtained an analog of Theorem 1.7(ii), while our article concerns quite different topics from [19, 20]; hence, these articles cannot cover each other and are of independent interest.

We now prove that the exponent $\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}$ in Theorem 1.7 is the best possible. To show this, we give the following example.

Example 4.3. Let $\Omega := B(\mathbf{0}, 1) \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $u_0(x) := |x|^\eta \mathbf{1}_\Omega(x)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\eta \in (-\infty, 0)$ is chosen later. Then $u_0 \in C^1(\Omega)$. Let $\delta \in (0, n]$, $\mu \in [0, 1)$, and $p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \delta)$. We claim that, if $s \in (\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}, \infty)$, then there exists η such that $\|u_0 - b\|_{L^{s, q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})} = \infty$ for any $b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $q \in (0, \infty)$, but

$$(4.7) \quad \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^{p, \tilde{q}}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)} < \infty \quad \text{for any } \tilde{q} \in (0, \infty).$$

Given any $b \in \mathbb{R}$, since $\eta < 0$, it follows that there exists $r \in (0, 1)$ such that $\frac{1}{2}u_0(x) > b$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying $|x| \in (0, r)$. Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u_0 - b\|_{L^{s, q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})}^q & \gtrsim \int_0^\infty \lambda^q \left[\mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p}(\{x \in B(\mathbf{0}, r) : u_0(x) > 2\lambda\}) \right]^{\frac{q}{s}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \\
& \sim \int_0^\infty \lambda^q \left[\mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p}(\{x \in B(\mathbf{0}, r) : |x| < (2\lambda)^{\frac{1}{\eta}}\}) \right]^{\frac{q}{s}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \\
& \gtrsim \int_{\frac{r}{2}}^\infty \lambda^q \left[\mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p}(B(\mathbf{0}, (2\lambda)^{\frac{1}{\eta}})) \right]^{\frac{q}{s}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \sim \int_{\frac{r}{2}}^\infty \lambda^{q + \frac{(\delta-\mu p)q}{\eta s}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last integral is infinite when $q + \frac{(\delta-\mu p)q}{\eta s} \geq 0$, that is, $\eta \leq -\frac{\delta-\mu p}{s}$.

On the other hand, observing that $|\nabla u_0(x)| = |\eta||x|^{\eta-1}$ for any $x \in \Omega$, we find that

$$(4.8) \quad \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^{p, \tilde{q}}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\tilde{q}} \sim \int_0^\infty \lambda^{\tilde{q}} \left[\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(\{x \in \Omega : |\eta||x|^{\eta-1} > \lambda\}) \right]^{\frac{\tilde{q}}{p}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}$$

$$\lesssim \int_0^1 \lambda^{\tilde{q}} \left[\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(B(\mathbf{0}, 1)) \right]^{\frac{\tilde{q}}{p}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} + \int_1^\infty \lambda^{\tilde{q}} \left[\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta \left(B \left(\mathbf{0}, c\lambda^{\frac{1}{\eta-1}} \right) \right) \right]^{\frac{\tilde{q}}{p}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda},$$

where $c := \frac{1}{|\eta|^{1/(\eta-1)}}$. By the fact that $\tilde{q} > 0$ and $\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta(B(\mathbf{0}, r)) \leq r^\delta$, we conclude that the first term of the right-hand side of (4.8) is finite. For the second term of the right-hand side of (4.8), we have

$$\int_1^\infty \lambda^{\tilde{q}} \left[\mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta \left(B \left(\mathbf{0}, c\lambda^{\frac{1}{\eta-1}} \right) \right) \right]^{\frac{\tilde{q}}{p}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \sim \int_1^\infty \lambda^{\tilde{q} + \frac{\delta}{\eta-1} \frac{\tilde{q}}{p}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}$$

is also finite if $\tilde{q} + \frac{\delta}{\eta-1} \frac{\tilde{q}}{p} < 0$, that is, $\eta > 1 - \frac{\delta}{p}$. By $s > \frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}$, we find that $1 - \frac{\delta}{p} < -\frac{\delta-\mu p}{s}$ is reasonable. Thus, we could take the parameter η such that $1 - \frac{\delta}{p} < \eta \leq -\frac{\delta-\mu p}{s}$. Therefore, in this case, $\|u_0 - b\|_{L^{s,q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})} = \infty$ for any $b \in \mathbb{R}$, but $\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^{p,\tilde{q}}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)} < \infty$ for any $\tilde{q} \in (0, \infty)$, and hence the exponent $\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}$ in Theorem 1.7(i) is the best possible. Similarly, one can show that the exponent $\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}$ in Theorem 1.7(ii) is also the best possible.

As a by-product of the proof of Poincaré–Sobolev inequalities, we give the proof of the boundedness of the Riesz potential on Choquet–Lorentz integrals as follows.

Proof of Theorem 1.9. Let $\alpha \in (0, n)$, $\delta \in (0, n]$, and $\mu \in [0, \alpha)$. To prove (i), suppose $p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \frac{\delta}{\alpha})$ and $q \in (\frac{\delta(\delta-p\alpha)}{n(\delta-\alpha p)}, \infty)$. From Proposition 3.1(i), Lemma 2.5, and Theorem 2.1, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|I_\alpha f\|_{L^{\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p\alpha}, q}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})} \\ & \lesssim \left\{ \int_0^\infty \lambda^q \left[\mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p} \left(\left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \left[\mathcal{M}_\mu(f)(x) \right]^{\frac{\delta-p\alpha}{\delta-\mu p}} \|f\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta-p\alpha)}{\delta-\mu p}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)} > \lambda \right\} \right) \right]^{\frac{q(\delta-p\alpha)}{p(\delta-\mu p)}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ & \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta-p\alpha)}{\delta-\mu p}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\frac{p(\alpha-\mu)}{\delta-\mu p}} \left\| \left[\mathcal{M}_\mu(f) \right]^{\frac{\delta-p\alpha}{\delta-\mu p}} \right\|_{L^{\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p\alpha}, q}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})} \\ & \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta-p\alpha)}{\delta-\mu p}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\frac{p(\alpha-\mu)}{\delta-\mu p}} \left\| \mathcal{M}_\mu(f) \right\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta-p\alpha)}{\delta-\mu p}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})}^{\frac{\delta-p\alpha}{\delta-\mu p}} \\ & \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta-p\alpha)}{\delta-\mu p}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\frac{p(\alpha-\mu)}{\delta-\mu p}} \|f\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta-p\alpha)}{\delta-\mu p}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\frac{\delta-p\alpha}{\delta-\mu p}} \sim \|f\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta-p\alpha)}{\delta-\mu p}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of (i).

For (ii), by Lemmas 3.1(ii) and 2.5 and the weak boundedness of \mathcal{M}_μ in Lemma 2.6 for $p = \frac{\delta}{n}$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|I_\alpha f\|_{L^{\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p\alpha}, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})} \\ & \lesssim \sup_{\lambda \in (0, \infty)} \lambda \left[\mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p} \left(\left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \left[\mathcal{M}_\mu(f)(x) \right]^{\frac{\delta-p\alpha}{\delta-\mu p}} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)} > \lambda \right\} \right) \right]^{\frac{\delta-p\alpha}{p(\delta-\mu p)}} \\ & \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\frac{p(\alpha-\mu)}{\delta-\mu p}} \left\| \mathcal{M}_\mu(f) \right\|_{L^{p, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})}^{\frac{\delta-p\alpha}{\delta-\mu p}} \\ & \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\frac{p(\alpha-\mu)}{\delta-\mu p}} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}^{\frac{\delta-p\alpha}{\delta-\mu p}} \sim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, conclusion (ii) is also true. This then finishes the proof of Theorem 1.9. \square

We next show that the exponent $\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p\alpha}$ in Theorem 1.9 is sharp, that is, replacing this exponent by any $s > \frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p\alpha}$, then Theorem 1.9 must be false. To construct a counterexample for this, the basic idea comes from Example 4.3, in which the crucial point of that example working is the singularity of u_0 near the origin. However, Theorem 1.9 requires the function to be locally integrable. Thus, the function u_0 with singularity near the origin is not permitted. To overcome this difficulty, we construct a sequence of locally integrable functions $\{f_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$, whose limit function as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ has singularity near the origin.

Example 4.4. For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, let $f_\varepsilon(x) := |x|^\eta \mathbf{1}_{B(\mathbf{0},10) \setminus B(\mathbf{0},\varepsilon)}(x)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\eta \in (-\infty, 0)$ is chosen later. Then $f_\varepsilon \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$. Let $\alpha \in (0, n)$, $\delta \in (0, n]$, $\mu \in [0, \alpha)$, and $p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \frac{\delta}{\alpha})$. We claim that, if $s \in (\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p\alpha}, \infty)$, then there exists $\eta \in (-\infty, 0)$ such that, for any $q \in (0, \infty)$, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|I_\alpha(f_\varepsilon)\|_{L^{s,q}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})} = \infty$, but, for any $\tilde{q} \in (0, \infty)$, $\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)} \|f_\varepsilon\|_{L^{p,\tilde{q}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)} < \infty$.

Indeed, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $2\varepsilon \leq |x| < 10\varepsilon$, we have

$$I_\alpha(f_\varepsilon)(x) \geq \int_{B(0,|x|) \setminus B(0,\frac{|x|}{2})} \frac{|y|^\eta}{|x-y|^{n-\alpha}} dy \gtrsim |x|^{\eta+\alpha}.$$

Then, with the assumption $\eta + \alpha < 0$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_\alpha(f_\varepsilon)\|_{L^{s,q}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})}^q &\geq \int_0^\infty \lambda^q \left[\mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p}(\{x \in B(\mathbf{0}, 10\varepsilon) \setminus B(\mathbf{0}, 2\varepsilon) : |x|^{\eta+\alpha} > \lambda\}) \right]^{\frac{q}{s}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \\ &\geq \int_{(10\varepsilon)^{\eta+\alpha}}^{(2\varepsilon)^{\eta+\alpha}} \lambda^q \left[\mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p}(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : 2\varepsilon \leq |x| \leq \lambda^{1/(\eta+\alpha)}\}) \right]^{\frac{q}{s}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \\ &\geq \int_{(10\varepsilon)^{\eta+\alpha}}^{(2\varepsilon)^{\eta+\alpha}} \lambda^q \left[\lambda^{\frac{\delta-\mu p}{\eta+\alpha}} - (2\varepsilon)^{\delta-\mu p} \right]^{\frac{q}{s}} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \gtrsim \varepsilon^{[\eta+\alpha+(\delta-\mu p)/s]q} \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ if $\eta < -\frac{\delta-\mu p}{s} - \alpha$. On the other hand, for any \tilde{q} , by an argument similar to that used in the proof of (4.7), we conclude that, with $\eta > -\frac{\delta}{p}$, $\|f_\varepsilon\|_{L^{p,\tilde{q}}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)} \leq C$ for some positive constant C independent of ε . By the assumption that $s > \frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p\alpha}$, we find that $-\frac{\delta}{p} < -\frac{\delta-\mu p}{s} - \alpha$. Therefore, it is possible to choose the parameter η satisfies $-\frac{\delta}{p} < \eta < -\frac{\delta-\mu p}{s} - \alpha$ and, for any such η , the above claim holds. This proves that the exponent $\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p\alpha}$ in Theorem 1.9(i) is the best possible. Similarly, one can show that the exponent $\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p\alpha}$ in Theorem 1.9(ii) is also the best possible.

We end this section by giving a Poincaré–Sobolev inequality for $C^1(\Omega)$ -functions with compact support. First, by [30, p. 22, Theorem 2], we find that there exists a positive constant C such that, for any $u \in C_c^1(\Omega)$ (the set of all continuously differentiable functions on Ω with compact support in Ω) and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$|u(x)| \leq C \int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla u(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-1}} dy,$$

which further implies the following conclusion; we omit the details.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $\delta \in (0, n]$.*

- (i) *If $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded domain and $p, q \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \infty)$, then there exists a positive constant C , depending only on n, δ, p , and q , such that, for any $u \in C_c^1(\Omega)$,*

$$\|u\|_{L^{p,q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)} \leq C \text{diam}(\Omega) \|\nabla u\|_{L^{p,q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}$$

and, if $p = \frac{\delta}{n}$, then there exists a positive constant C , depending only on n, δ , and p , such that, for any $u \in C_c^1(\Omega)$,

$$\|u\|_{L^{p,\infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)} \leq C \text{diam}(\Omega) \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}.$$

- (ii) If $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a domain, $\mu \in [0, 1)$, $p \in (\frac{\delta}{n}, \delta)$, and $q \in (\frac{\delta(\delta-\mu p)}{n(\delta-p)}, \infty)$, then there exists a positive constant C , depending only on n, μ, δ, p , and q , such that, for any $u \in C_c^1(\Omega)$,

$$\|u\|_{L^{\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}, q}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^{p, \frac{q(\delta-p)}{\delta-\mu p}}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}$$

and, if $p = \frac{\delta}{n}$, then there exists a positive constant C , depending only on n, μ, δ , and p , such that, for any $u \in C_c^1(\Omega)$,

$$\|u\|_{L^{\frac{p(\delta-\mu p)}{\delta-p}, \infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^{\delta-\mu p})} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{H}_\infty^\delta)}.$$

References

- [1] D. R. Adams, A note on Riesz potentials, *Duke Math. J.* 42 (1975), 765–778.
- [2] D. R. Adams, A Note on Choquet Integrals with respect to Hausdorff Capacity, in: *Function Spaces and Applications* (1986), pp. 115–124, *Lecture Notes in Math.* 1302, Springer, Berlin, 1988.
- [3] D. R. Adams, Choquet integrals in potential theory, *Publ. Mat.* 42 (1998), 3–66.
- [4] N. J. Alves, L. Grafakos and A. E. Tzavaras, A bilinear fractional integral operator for Euler–Riesz systems, arXiv: 2409.18309.
- [5] K. Astala, A. Clop, X. Tolsa, I. Uriarte-Tuero and J. Verdera, Quasiconformal distortion of Riesz capacities and Hausdorff measures in the plane, *Amer. J. Math.* 135 (2013), 17–52.
- [6] C. Bennett and R. Sharpley, *Interpolation of Operators*, Pure and Applied Mathematics 129, Academic Press, Inc., Boston, MA, 1988.
- [7] J. Bergh and J. Löfström, *Interpolation Spaces. An introduction*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin–New York, 1976.
- [8] B. Bojarski, Remarks on Sobolev imbedding inequalities, in: *Complex Analysis* (1987), pp. 52–68, *Lecture Notes in Math.* 1351, Springer, Berlin, 1988.
- [9] Y. Brudnyi and N. Krugljak, *Interpolation Functors and Interpolation Spaces*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1991.
- [10] M. Carro, J. Raposo and J. Soria, Recent Developments in the Theory of Lorentz Spaces and Weighted Inequalities, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 187 (2007), no. 877, xii+128pp.
- [11] J. Cerdà, J. Martín and P. Silvestre, Capacitary function spaces, *Collect. Math.* 62 (2011), 95–118.
- [12] G. Choquet, Theory of capacities, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* 5 (1953/1954), 13–295.
- [13] F. Dai, X. Lin, D. Yang, W. Yuan and Y. Zhang, Poincaré inequality meets Brezis–Van Schaftingen–Yung formula on metric measure spaces, *J. Funct. Anal.* 283 (2022), Paper No. 109645, 52 pp.
- [14] L. C. Evans and R. F. Gariepy, *Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 1992.
- [15] H. Federer, *Geometric Measure Theory*, Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, 1969, xiv+676 pp.
- [16] L. Grafakos, *Classical Fourier Analysis*, Second edition, *Graduate Texts in Mathematics* 249, Springer, New York, 2014.
- [17] L. Grafakos, *Modern Fourier Analysis*, Third edition, *Graduate Texts in Mathematics* 250, Springer, New York, 2014.
- [18] P. Harjulehto and R. Hurri-Syrjänen, On Choquet integrals and Poincaré–Sobolev inequalities, *J. Funct. Anal.* 284 (2023), Paper No. 109862, 18 pp.
- [19] P. Harjulehto and R. Hurri-Syrjänen, On Sobolev inequalities with Choquet integrals, arXiv: 2311.09964.

- [20] P. Harjulehto and R. Hurri-Syrjänen, On Choquet integrals and pointwise estimates, arXiv: 2311.04626.
- [21] N. Hatano, T. Nogayama, Y. Sawano and D. I. Hakim, Bourgain–Morrey spaces and their applications to boundedness of operators, *J. Funct. Anal.* 284 (2023), Paper No. 109720, 52 pp.
- [22] L. I. Hedberg, On certain convolution inequalities, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 36 (1972), 505–510.
- [23] L. Liu, Hausdorff content and the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator on metric measure spaces, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 443 (2016), 732–751.
- [24] Y. Jiao, Y. Zuo, D. Zhou and L. Wu, Variable Hardy–Lorentz spaces $H^{p(\cdot),q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, *Math. Nachr.* 292 (2019), 309–349.
- [25] F. John, Rotation and strain, *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* 14 (1961), 391–413.
- [26] J. Liu, D. Yang and W. Yuan, Anisotropic Hardy–Lorentz spaces and their applications, *Sci. China Math.* 59 (2016), 1669–1720.
- [27] G. G. Lorentz, Some new functional spaces, *Ann. of Math. (2)* 51 (1950), 37–55.
- [28] G. G. Lorentz, On the theory of spaces Λ , *Pacific J. Math.* 1 (1951), 411–429.
- [29] O. Martio, John domains, bilipschitz balls and Poincaré inequality, *Rev. Roum. Math. Pures Appl.* 33 (1988), 107–112.
- [30] V. G. Maz’ja, *Sobolev Spaces*, Springer Series in Soviet Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985.
- [31] E. Nakai, On generalized fractional integrals, *Taiwanese J. Math.* 5 (2001), 587–602.
- [32] E. Nakai, Singular and fractional integral operators on Campanato spaces with variable growth conditions, *Rev. Mat. Complut.* 23 (2010), 355–381.
- [33] E. Nakai, Generalized fractional integrals on generalized Morrey spaces, *Math. Nachr.* 287 (2014), 339–351.
- [34] E. Nakai, Singular and fractional integral operators on preduals of Campanato spaces with variable growth condition, *Sci. China Math.* 60 (2017), 2219–2240.
- [35] N. G. Meyers, A theory of capacities for potentials of functions in Lebesgue classes, *Math. Scand.* 26 (1970), 255–292.
- [36] J. Oröbitg and J. Verdera, Choquet integrals, Hausdorff content and the Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* 30 (1998), 145–150.
- [37] A. C. Ponce and D. Spector, A boxing inequality for the fractional perimeter, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)* 20 (2020), 107–141.
- [38] Yu. G. Reshetnyak, Integral representations of differentiable functions in domains with non-smooth boundary, *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.* 21 (1980), 108–116, 221.
- [39] H. Saito and H. Tanaka, Dual of the Choquet spaces with general Hausdorff content, *Studia Math.* 266 (2022), 323–335.
- [40] H. Saito, H. Tanaka and T. Watanabe, Block decomposition and weighted Hausdorff content, *Canad. Math. Bull.* 63 (2020), 141–156.
- [41] H. Saito, H. Tanaka and T. Watanabe, Fractional maximal operators with weighted Hausdorff content, *Positivity* 23 (2019), 125–138.
- [42] H. Saito, H. Tanaka and T. Watanabe, Dyadic cubes, maximal operators and Hausdorff content, *Bull. Sci. Math.* 140 (2016), 757–773.
- [43] D. Spector, A noninequality for the fractional gradient, *Port. Math.* 76 (2019), 153–168.
- [44] D. Spector and J. Van Schaftingen, Optimal embeddings into Lorentz spaces for some vector differential operators via Gagliardo’s lemma, *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl.* 30 (2019), 413–436.
- [45] L. Tang, Choquet integrals, weighted Hausdorff content and maximal operators, *Georgian Math. J.* 18 (2011), 587–596.

- [46] J. Verdera, BMO rational approximation and one-dimensional Hausdorff content, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 297 (1986), 283–304.
- [47] D. Yang and W. Yuan, A note on dyadic Hausdorff capacities, *Bull. Sci. Math.* 132 (2008), 500–509.
- [48] J. Zhang, D. Yang and S. Yang, Weighted variable Lorentz regularity for degenerate elliptic equations in Reifenberg domains, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* 45 (2022), 8487–8502.
- [49] W. P. Ziemer, *Weakly Differentiable Functions*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 120, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989.

Long Huang

School of Mathematics and Information Science, Guangzhou University, Guangzhou, 510006,
The People’s Republic of China

E-mail: longhuang@gzhu.edu.cn

Yuanshou Cao and Ciqiang Zhuo (Corresponding author)

Key Laboratory of Computing and Stochastic Mathematics (Ministry of Education), School of
Mathematics and Statistics, Hunan Normal University, Changsha, Hunan 410081, The People’s
Republic of China

E-mails: yscao@hunnu.edu.cn (Y. Cao)

cqzhuo87@hunnu.edu.cn (C. Zhuo)

Dachun Yang

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

E-mail: dcyang@bnu.edu.cn