

A BOURGAIN-BREZIS-MIRONESCU -TYPE CHARACTERIZATION FOR SOBOLEV DIFFERENTIAL FORMS

ILMARI KANGASNIEMI

ABSTRACT. Given a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, a result by Bourgain, Brezis, and Mironescu characterizes when a function $f \in L^p(\Omega)$ is in the Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ based on the limiting behavior of its Besov seminorms. We prove a direct analogue of this result which characterizes when a differential k -form $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ has a weak exterior derivative $d\omega \in L^p(\wedge^{k+1} T^* \Omega)$, where the analogue of the Besov seminorm that our result uses is based on integration over simplices.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n , let $p \in (1, \infty)$, and let $\theta \in (0, 1)$. The *Besov seminorm* $\|f\|_{B_{p,p}^\theta(\Omega)}$, also known as the *Slobodeckij seminorm*, is defined for measurable functions $f: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(1.1) \quad \|f\|_{B_{p,p}^\theta(\Omega)}^p = \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|f(y) - f(x)|^p}{|x - y|^{n+\theta p}} dx dy.$$

This seminorm leads to the definition of fractional Sobolev spaces $W^{\theta,p}(\Omega)$, also called *Sobolev-Slobodeckij spaces*, which are equipped with the norm $\|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{B_{p,p}^\theta(\Omega)}$.

If one sets $\theta = 1$ in (1.1), the resulting seminorm does not match the Sobolev seminorm $\|\nabla f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$ for weakly differentiable functions f . However, this issue can be rectified with a suitable extra coefficient. Indeed, in [4, Corollary 2], Bourgain, Brezis, and Mironescu gave the following characterization of Sobolev functions using the Besov seminorm.

Theorem 1.1 (Bourgain–Brezis–Mironescu). *Let Ω be a bounded smooth domain in \mathbb{R}^n , let $p \in (1, \infty)$, and let $f \in L^p(\Omega)$. Then $f \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ if and only if $\limsup_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} (1 - \theta) \|f\|_{B_{p,p}^\theta(\Omega)}^p$ is finite. Moreover, if this is the case, then we have*

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} (1 - \theta) \|f\|_{B_{p,p}^\theta(\Omega)}^p = C(n, p) \|\nabla f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p.$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 46E35, Secondary 53C65.

Key words and phrases. Sobolev spaces, Sobolev differential forms, weak exterior derivative, fractional Sobolev spaces, Besov spaces, Sobolev–Slobodeckij, Bourgain–Brezis–Mironescu, Alexander–Spanier.

This work was partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-2247469.

Note that in the above form, the characterization is not true without any regularity assumptions on the domain; see [6, Remark 5], where a counterexample is provided in a slit disk. However, with suitable adjustments to the Besov seminorm, it is possible to eliminate this need for regularity assumptions; see the recent works by Drelichman and Durán [12] and Mohanta [28]. The characterization has spurred a significant amount of follow-up research, especially in the recent few years; see e.g. [32, 30, 25, 26, 7, 31, 9, 8, 14]. Moreover, the characterization has also provided one of the multiple available approaches to studying first order Sobolev theory on metric measure spaces; see e.g. [29, 10, 17, 24].

In this paper, we prove an analogue of Theorem 1.1 for Sobolev differential forms in \mathbb{R}^n . To this end, recall that if $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is open and $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$, a locally integrable measurable differential k -form $\omega \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ has a *weak exterior derivative* $d\omega \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\wedge^{k+1} T^* \Omega)$ if

$$\int_{\Omega} \omega \wedge d\eta = (-1)^{k+1} \int_{\Omega} d\omega \wedge \eta$$

for every compactly supported smooth test form $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\wedge^{n-k-1} T^* \Omega)$. Forms $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ with an L^p -integrable weak exterior derivative $d\omega \in L^p(\wedge^{k+1} T^* \Omega)$ then form a Sobolev space, denoted $W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$.

In many applications of Sobolev differential forms, the spaces $W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ are more useful than the spaces $W^{1,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ of k -forms with coefficients in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. This is for instance since if $\omega \in C_0^\infty(\wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^m)$ is a smooth compactly supported k -form, $f \in W^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ is Sobolev map with $p \geq k+1$, and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded domain, then the pull-back $f^* \omega$ is in $W^{d,p/(k+1)}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, but is not necessarily in any space $W^{1,q}_{\text{loc}}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$. For further exposition on the spaces $W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, we refer readers to e.g. [19, 20]

1.1. Analogue of L^p -norms. If Ω is convex and $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, then we can redefine ω in a null-set to ensure that it is Borel measurable, and afterwards define an integration function

$$I_\omega: \Omega^{k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad I_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \int_{\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_k)} \omega,$$

where $\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_k)$ is the oriented k -simplex with corners at x_i . As we verify in Section 3, I_ω is well defined and finite-valued outside a null-set of Ω^{k+1} , I_ω is Borel measurable, and changing ω in a null-set only changes I_ω in a null-set. The definition of I_ω can then be extended to non-convex domains Ω by zero extending ω outside Ω .

We then let $M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ denote the space of measurable real-valued k -multifunctions on Ω ; that is, an element $F \in M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ is a measurable function $F: \Omega^{k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We note that for $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, the function I_ω is a k -multifunction. We then proceed to define a L^p -seminorm on $M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ using the same philosophy as in Theorem 1.1. Namely, if $F \in M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ and

if $E \subset \Omega$ is measurable, we define

$$(1.2) \quad \|F\|_{L^p M^k(E)}^p = \limsup_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{E^{k+1}} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |F(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p dx_0 \dots dx_k}{(|x_1 - x_0| |x_2 - x_0| \dots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}}.$$

It follows that $\|\cdot\|_{L^p M^k(E)}$ defines a $[0, \infty]$ -valued seminorm on $M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$. We remark that the approach to using products of the standard Bourgain-Brezis-Mironescu -kernel for higher order multifunctions is reminiscent of the ideas employed in [18, (29)], though with an extra limiting process.

We also define three other variants of this seminorm. The first variant imposes a bound on the maximum allowed length of $|x_i - x_0|$. For this, if $E \subset \Omega$ is measurable, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and $R > 0$, we denote

$$\mathbb{B}(E, k, R) = \{(x_0, \dots, x_k) \in E^{k+1} : \max_{i=1, \dots, k} |x_0 - x_k| < R\}.$$

Then, for $F \in M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$, we define that

$$(1.3) \quad \|F\|_{L^p M^k(E|R)}^p = \limsup_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{\mathbb{B}(E, k, R)} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |F(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p dx_0 \dots dx_k}{(|x_1 - x_0| |x_2 - x_0| \dots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}}.$$

The second variant is based on the approach to the characterization proposed in [12], where the set of integration in (1.1) is restricted to points $(x, y) \in \Omega^2$ with $|x - y| < c \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$, where $c \in (0, 1)$ is a fixed constant. In our case, for every $c > 0$ and every measurable $E \subset \Omega$, we define a set

$$E(k, c) := \{(x_0, \dots, x_k) \in E^{k+1} : \max_{i=1, \dots, k} |x_0 - x_k| < c \operatorname{dist}(x_0, \partial E)\}.$$

We then obtain an alternate localized seminorm by

$$(1.4) \quad \|F\|_{L^p M^{k,c}(E)}^p = \limsup_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{E(k,c)} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |F(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p dx_0 \dots dx_k}{(|x_1 - x_0| |x_2 - x_0| \dots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}}.$$

The final variant performs both localizations at the same time: if $R > 0$ and $c > 0$, then we denote

$$(1.5) \quad \|F\|_{L^p M^{k,c}(E|R)}^p = \limsup_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{\mathbb{B}(E, k, R) \cap E(k, c)} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |F(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p dx_0 \dots dx_k}{(|x_1 - x_0| |x_2 - x_0| \dots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}}.$$

For all of the seminorms defined above in (1.2)-(1.5), we define counterparts $[\cdot]_{L^p M^k(E)}$, $[\cdot]_{L^p M^k(E|R)}$, $[\cdot]_{L^p M^{k,c}(E)}$, and $[\cdot]_{L^p M^{k,c}(E|R)}$, where the \limsup in the definition is replaced with a \liminf . For instance,

$$(1.6) \quad [F]_{L^p M^k(E)}^p = \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{E^{k+1}} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |F(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p dx_0 \dots dx_k}{(|x_1 - x_0| |x_2 - x_0| \dots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}}.$$

Moreover, if $F \in M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$, we say that $\|F\|_{L^p M^k(E)}$ is *obtained as a limit* if $[F]_{L^p M^k(E)} = \|F\|_{L^p M^k(E)}$, and similarly for the other seminorms (1.3)-(1.5).

We are now ready to state our first notable result, which relates the above seminorms to the usual L^p -norm of a differential form $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, let $R > 0$, $c > 0$, $p \in [1, \infty)$, $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, and let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, where we extend ω to $L^p(\wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n)$ by setting $\omega = 0$ outside Ω . Let $\|\cdot\|_{p,k}$ be one of the seminorms (1.2)-(1.5) over Ω , and let $[\cdot]_{p,k}$ be the corresponding \liminf -version. Moreover, if $\|\cdot\|_{p,k} = \|\cdot\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega)}$ or $\|\cdot\|_{p,k} = \|\cdot\|_{L^p M^{k,c}(\Omega)}$, we additionally assume that Ω is bounded.*

Then, there exists a constant $K = K(p, k)$, independent of which one of the seminorms (1.2)-(1.5) $\|\cdot\|_{p,k}$ is, such that

$$[I_\omega]_{p,k} = \|I_\omega\|_{p,k} = K \|\omega|_{\mathbb{S},p}\|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

where the norm $|\alpha|_{\mathbb{S},p}$ for k -covectors $\alpha \in \text{Alt}_k(V)$ on an n -dimensional normed space V is defined by

$$|\alpha|_{\mathbb{S},p} = \left(\int_{\{|v_1|=\dots=|v_k|=1\}} |\alpha(v_1, \dots, v_k)|^p d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(v_1) \dots d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(v_k) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

In particular, $\|I_\omega\|_{p,k}$ is obtained as a limit, and there exists a constant $C = C(p, n, k)$ such that

$$C^{-1} \|\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \|I_\omega\|_{p,k} \leq C \|\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$

We note that for 1-covectors α on \mathbb{R}^n , the norm $|\alpha|_{\mathbb{S},p}$ given in Theorem 1.2 is a constant multiple of the usual Euclidean norm $|\alpha|$. Indeed, if α is nonzero, then one can write $|\alpha|_{\mathbb{S},p} = |\alpha| \cdot \|\alpha\|^{-1} |\alpha|_{\mathbb{S},p}$, where the quantity $\|\alpha\|^{-1} |\alpha|_{\mathbb{S},p}$ is independent of α by the rotational symmetry of \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . For $k > 1$, this argument is no longer available due to the existence of non-simple k -covectors $\alpha \in \text{Alt}_k(V)$ which cannot be written in the form $\alpha = \alpha_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_k$ with $\alpha_i \in V^*$.

1.2. The main result. We then recall the *Alexander-Spanier differential* $d: M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow M^{k+1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ on multifunctions, which is defined for $F \in M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ by

$$(1.7) \quad (dF)(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k+1}) = \sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i F(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{k+1})$$

It is useful to note that if $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, then for almost all $(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) \in \Omega^{k+2}$, we have that $dI_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1})$ equals the integral of ω over the boundary $\partial\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1})$.

With this notation, we are ready to state our generalization of the Bourgain-Brezis-Mironescu -theorem to differential forms.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $R > 0$, $c \in (0, 1]$, $p \in (1, \infty)$, $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, and let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, where we extend ω to $L^p(\wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n)$ by setting $\omega = 0$*

outside Ω . Let $\|\cdot\|_{p,k+1}$ be one of the seminorms (1.2)-(1.5) over Ω , and let $[\cdot]_{p,k+1}$ be the corresponding \liminf -version. Moreover, we assume that

- (1) if $\|\cdot\|_{p,k+1} = \|\cdot\|_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega)}$, then Ω is open, bounded, and convex;
- (2) if $\|\cdot\|_{p,k+1} = \|\cdot\|_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega|_R)}$, then Ω is open and convex;
- (3) if $\|\cdot\|_{p,k+1} = \|\cdot\|_{L^p M^{k+1,c}(\Omega)}$, then Ω is open and bounded.
- (4) if $\|\cdot\|_{p,k+1} = \|\cdot\|_{L^p M^{k+1,c}(\Omega|_R)}$, then Ω is open.

Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$;
- (ii) $\|dI_\omega\|_{p,k+1} < \infty$;
- (iii) $[dI_\omega]_{p,k+1} < \infty$.

Moreover, if $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, then

$$[dI_\omega]_{p,k+1} = \|dI_\omega\|_{p,k+1} = K \|\omega|_{\mathbb{S},p}\|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

where $K = K(p, n, k)$ and $|\cdot|_{\mathbb{S},p}$ are as in Theorem 1.2.

Note that the case $k = 0$ of this result matches the original characterization of Bourgain, Brezis, and Mironescu that was stated in Theorem 1.1. Indeed, a 0-form is a function $f: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For such a function f , we have $I_f(x) = f(x)$, and thus $dI_f(x, y) = f(y) - f(x)$. Hence, $\|dI_f\|_{L^p M^1(\Omega)}^p = \limsup_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} (1 - \theta) \|f\|_{B_{p,p}^\theta(\Omega)}^p$.

We then comment on the discrepancies between the assumptions in Theorem 1.3 and the assumptions in usual Bourgain-Brezis-Mironescu -theorems. We first note that for the case (1), our proof requires convexity of Ω , while Theorem 1.1 is shown for non-convex domains. A typical level of generality for more recent formulations of Theorem 1.1 is in domains allowing for extension of Sobolev maps. In our case, we are still able to give a result based on the $\|\cdot\|_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega)}$ -seminorm in such a setting, but this result is less direct than the ones given in Theorem 1.3.

For the statement, we say that a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a (weak) $W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ -extension domain if for every $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, there exists a $\omega_{\text{ext}} \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that the restriction $\omega_{\text{ext}}|_\Omega$ of ω_{ext} to Ω is ω . By an argument based on reflection across the boundary, it follows that bounded Lipschitz domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ are $W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ -extension domains; see e.g. the discussion in [20, p. 48].

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain contained in an open ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, let $p \in (1, \infty)$, and let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ be a Borel measurable differential k -form. Then the following results hold.*

- (i) *If $[dI_\omega]_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega)} < \infty$, then we have $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$.*
- (ii) *If Ω is a weak $W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ -extension domain and $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, then we have $\|dI_{\omega_{\text{ext}}}\|_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega)} < \infty$, where $\omega_{\text{ext}} \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* B)$ is a $W^{d,p}$ -extension of ω to B .*

The statement of Theorem 1.4 matches the characterization given in Theorem 1.3 (i)-(iii) if the seminorm $\|dI_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega)}$ defined using the zero extension of ω agrees with the seminorm $\|dI_{\omega_{\text{ext}}}\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega)}$ defined using a $W^{d,p}$ -extension of ω . This is true for functions $f \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, since if $(x, y) \in \Omega^2$, then $dI_f(x, y) = f(y) - f(x)$ depends only on the values of f on Ω . However, for higher order forms, a simplex with corners in Ω can have its boundary exit Ω , and the question thus becomes more delicate.

Next, we note that when $k = 0$, the case (3) matches the result shown by Drelichman and Durán in [12], with a miniscule improvement of also allowing for $c \in (0, 1]$ instead of $c \in (0, 1)$. However, for the unbounded version of this result shown in case 4, there is a discrepancy between the version for general k that we show and the version for $k = 0$ which follows from the work of Mohanta [28]. This is because if $k = 0$ and $f \in L^p(\Omega)$, then by the argument given in [28, Proposition 17], one always has $\|dI_f\|_{L^p M^{1,c}(\Omega)} = \|dI_f\|_{L^p M^{1,c}(\Omega|_R)}$. However, for $k > 0$, this argument runs into issues, and it is not clear whether one has $\|dI_\omega\|_{L^p M^{k+1,c}(\Omega)} = \|dI_\omega\|_{L^p M^{k+1,c}(\Omega|_R)}$ for $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$.

1.3. Connections to Alexander-Spanier cohomology. While our main objectives in this paper are limited to proving Theorems 1.2 and 1.3, we end the introduction with several more speculative comments and observations that are not relevant to the proofs of these results, but serve to provide context and further motivation for this direction of study.

Given a topological space X , a ring of coefficients \mathbb{K} , and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the space $C_{\text{AS}}^k(X; \mathbb{K})$ of \mathbb{K} -valued *Alexander-Spanier k -cochains* is the quotient of the space of all k -multifunctions $F: X^{k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ with an equivalence relation \sim , where $F \sim G$ if $F|_U = G|_U$ for some neighborhood $U \subset X^{k+1}$ of the diagonal $\Delta_k(X) = \{(x, \dots, x) : x \in X\} \subset X^{k+1}$. The differential d from (1.7) then descends to the quotient space, yielding the Alexander-Spanier complex

$$\dots \xrightarrow{d} C_{\text{AS}}^{k-1}(X; \mathbb{K}) \xrightarrow{d} C_{\text{AS}}^k(X; \mathbb{K}) \xrightarrow{d} C_{\text{AS}}^{k+1}(X; \mathbb{K}) \xrightarrow{d} \dots$$

The cohomology spaces $\ker d / \text{im } d$ of this complex form the *Alexander-Spanier cohomology* of the space X ; see e.g. [33] or [27] for details. Through use of sheaf theory, it can be shown that Alexander-Spanier cohomology often coincides with other cohomology theories, such as the commonly used singular cohomology, or in the case $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$, the de Rham cohomology of differential forms; for details, see e.g. [5, Sections I.7, III.2].

Notably, there is a sense of similarity between the equivalence relation \sim used in the definition of Alexander-Spanier cohomology, and the equivalence relation used to construct the associated normed space of one of the seminorms (1.2)-(1.5). This similarity is most clear in the case $k = 1$; for instance, by Remark 4.1, if Ω is a bounded domain, $F, G \in M^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ with $\|F\|_{L^p M^1(\Omega)} < \infty$ and $\|G\|_{L^p M^1(\Omega)} < \infty$, and $F|_U = G|_U$ for some uniform neighborhood U of the diagonal $\Delta_1(\Omega) \subset \Omega^2$, then $\|F - G\|_{L^p M^1(\Omega)} = 0$.

For $k > 1$, a simple rigorous observation like this becomes more elusive, but since our results indicate that this does hold for k -multifunctions of the form I_ω with $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^*\Omega)$, there could potentially be a larger natural class of measurable k -multifunctions where behavior of this type holds.

Based on this, we suspect that the study of seminorms similar to (1.2)-(1.5) could lead to an L^p -version of Alexander-Spanier cohomology that largely parallels the L^p -version of de Rham cohomology defined using $W_{\text{loc}}^{d,p}$ -spaces. In particular, our results already show that such a theory is possible in Euclidean domains by limiting oneself to k -multifunctions of the form I_ω , where ω is a differential form. If the same can be achieved with a more abstractly defined subclass that does not require an explicit reference to differential forms, then there is potential to extend this theory to a wider class of spaces than just Riemannian manifolds, such as metric measure spaces.

Various L^p -regular de Rham theories have seen several applications in geometric analysis on Riemannian manifolds; see for instance [11, 16, 21, 22]. Existing work on L^p -regular Alexander-Spanier cohomology, such as [2] and [18], appears to be mainly focused on non-local theory at a fixed scale, instead of the infinitesimal information carried by the seminorms (1.2)-(1.5). For context, currently known constructions in the metric setting with connections to differential forms include e.g. the theory of non-smooth differential analysis on RCD-spaces [15] and the theory of metric currents [1].

Acknowledgments. The author thanks Josh Kline, Panu Lahti, Pekka Pankka, and Nageswari Shanmugalingam for several useful discussions on the topic.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We use $C(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ to denote a positive constant that depends on the parameters a_i ; the value of C can change in each estimate even if the parameters remain the same. We also use the shorthand $A_1 \lesssim_{a_1, \dots, a_k} A_2$ for $A_1 \leq C(a_1, \dots, a_k)A_2$. For functions with multiple variables, we use \hat{x}_i to denote an omitted variable: for example $F(x_1, \dots, \hat{x}_3, \dots, x_5) = F(x_1, x_2, x_4, x_5)$.

We use $\mathbb{B}^n(x, r)$ to denote an open ball in \mathbb{R}^n centered at $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with radius r . The unit ball has the abbreviation $\mathbb{B}^n := \mathbb{B}^n(0, 1)$. Moreover, if $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a set, we use $\mathbb{B}^n(E, r)$ to denote the set of points $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\text{dist}(x, E) < r$. We let m_n and \mathcal{H}^n denote the n -dimensional Lebesgue and Hausdorff measure, respectively. We use vol_n to denote the volume form in \mathbb{R}^n . At times, we write dx instead of $dm_n(x)$ for brevity, where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a variable of integration; this notation is not to be confused with the exterior derivative of a differential form, as here x cannot be interpreted as a 0-form when $n > 1$.

2.1. L^p and Sobolev differential forms. We begin by recalling the basics of Sobolev differential forms, restricting ourselves to the Euclidean setting.

As stated in the introduction, for further information on the topic, we refer the reader to e.g. [19, 20].

Given an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, a differential k -form on Ω is a section $\omega \mapsto \wedge^k T^* \Omega$ of the k :th exterior bundle of Ω . Since we are in the Euclidean setting, any differential form ω on Ω can be uniquely written as

$$\omega = \sum_I \omega_I dx_{I_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_{I_k},$$

where $I = (I_1, \dots, I_k)$ range over k -tuples of elements in $\{1, \dots, n\}$ with $I_1 < I_2 < \cdots < I_k$, and $\omega_I: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are real-valued functions. Recall that differential k -forms have a point-wise norm, which in the Euclidean setting can be stated as just

$$|\omega_x| = \sqrt{\sum_I |\omega_I(x)|^2}$$

for all $x \in \Omega$.

We say that a differential form ω is (*Lebesgue*) *measurable* if all the coefficient functions ω_I are (Lebesgue) measurable functions. Similarly we define Borel, continuous, and C^l -smooth differential forms ω by requiring that all ω_I are Borel, continuous, or C^l -smooth, respectively. We denote the spaces of continuous, and C^l -smooth differential k -forms on Ω by $C(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ and $C^l(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, respectively. We also define compactly supported counterparts, which we denote by $C_0(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ and $C_0^l(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, respectively.

Given $p \in [1, \infty]$, we let $L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ denote the space of equivalence classes of measurable differential forms ω such that $|\omega| \in L^p(\Omega)$. As usual, we consider two k -forms in $L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ equal if they agree outside a null-set of Ω , and equip the space $L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ with the norm $\|\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)} = \| |\omega| \|_{L^p(\Omega)}$. We also use $L_{\text{loc}}^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ to denote the space of measurable k -forms ω with $|\omega| \in L_{\text{loc}}^p(\Omega)$.

Moreover, as stated in the introduction, we use $W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ to denote the space of $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ which have a weak exterior derivative $d\omega \in L^p(\wedge^{k+1} T^* \Omega)$. Here, the *weak exterior derivative* of a k -form $\omega \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ is a $(k+1)$ -form $d\omega \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\wedge^{k+1} T^* \Omega)$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} d\omega \wedge \eta = (-1)^{k+1} \int_{\Omega} \omega \wedge d\eta$$

for all test forms $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\wedge^{n-k-1} T^* \Omega)$. Note that a weak exterior derivative $d\omega$ is unique up to a null-set of Ω . The spaces $W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ are equipped with the norm $\|\omega\|_{W^{d,p}(\Omega)} = \|\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|d\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$. We also let $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ be the space of all $\omega \in L_{\text{loc}}^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ with a weak exterior derivative $d\omega \in L_{\text{loc}}^p(\wedge^{k+1} T^* \Omega)$.

Similarly to the usual Sobolev spaces of functions, the spaces $W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ are Banach spaces for $p \in [1, \infty]$. Moreover, by a standard convolution approximation argument, $C^\infty(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ is dense in $W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ for $p \in [1, \infty)$. Note that 0-forms are real-valued functions, and the space $W^{d,p}(\wedge^0 T^* \Omega)$ is

in fact precisely the usual Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. However, for $k > 1$, the coefficients ω_I of a form $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ need not be $W^{1,p}$ -functions; a standard example of this is that if $f, g \in L^p(I)$ where $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded open interval, then the 1-form $\omega = f(x)dx + g(y)dy$ is in $W^{d,p}(\wedge^1 T^* I^2)$ with $d\omega = 0$, even though the functions $(x, y) \mapsto f(x)$ and $(x, y) \mapsto g(y)$ are not necessarily Sobolev-regular.

2.2. Integration of L^p -forms. Suppose that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a convex domain. Then every $(k+1)$ -tuple of points (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k) , $x_i \in \Omega$, defines a unique oriented k -simplex in Ω with corners at x_i . We denote this simplex by $\Delta(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k)$. We also denote the family of all k -simplices in Ω by $S^k(\Omega)$.

Given $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \Omega^{k+1}$, we have a standard affine map $\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}$ from Δ_k to $\Delta(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k)$, where Δ_k is the reference k -simplex

$$\Delta_k = \{(s_1, \dots, s_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k : s_i \geq 0, s_1 + \dots + s_k \leq 1\}.$$

The map $\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}$ is given by

$$\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}(s_1, \dots, s_k) = x_0 + s_1(x_1 - x_0) + s_2(x_2 - x_0) + \dots + s_k(x_k - x_0).$$

We note that for any non-negative Borel function ρ on $\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_k)$, we have

$$(2.1) \quad \int_{\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_k)} \rho d\mathcal{H}^k = \int_{\Delta_k} (\rho \circ \varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}) |J_{\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}}| dm_k,$$

where the co-dimensional Jacobian $|J_{\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}}|$ for a given $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \Omega^{k+1}$ is the constant function

$$(2.2) \quad |J_{\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}}| = \sqrt{\det \begin{bmatrix} \langle x_1 - x_0, x_1 - x_0 \rangle & \dots & \langle x_1 - x_0, x_k - x_0 \rangle \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \langle x_k - x_0, x_1 - x_0 \rangle & \dots & \langle x_k - x_0, x_k - x_0 \rangle \end{bmatrix}}.$$

We then recall the p -modulus of subfamilies of $S^k(\Omega)$; for a more detailed exposition on the p -modulus of surface families, we refer the reader to e.g. the work of Fuglede [13]. If $\mathcal{S} \subset S^k(\Omega)$ is a family of k -simplices, we say that a non-negative Borel function $\rho : \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is *admissible for \mathcal{S}* if

$$\int_{\Delta} \rho d\mathcal{H}^k \geq 1 \text{ for every } \Delta \in \mathcal{S}.$$

We denote the set of admissible functions for \mathcal{S} by $\text{adm}(\mathcal{S})$. Then, given $p \in [1, \infty)$, the p -modulus of \mathcal{S} is defined by

$$\text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{S}) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \rho^p \text{vol}_n : \rho \in \text{adm}(\mathcal{S}) \right\}.$$

The p -modulus Mod_p defines an outer measure on $S^k(\Omega)$. We say that $\mathcal{S} \subset S^k(\Omega)$ is *p -exceptional* if $\text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{S}) = 0$.

Now, suppose that $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ is Borel, with $p \in [1, \infty)$. We define the integral of ω over a simplex $\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_k) \in S^k(\Omega)$ by

$$(2.3) \quad \int_{\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_k)} \omega = \int_{\Delta_k} \varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}^* \omega,$$

where $\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}^* \omega$ is the usual pull-back of the form ω given by

$$\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}^* \omega = \sum_I (\omega_I \circ \varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}) d\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}^{I_1} \wedge \dots \wedge d\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}^{I_k}.$$

Then the integral in (2.3) is well-defined and finite outside a p -exceptional family of k -simplices in Ω . Moreover, changing ω in a null-set only changes the value of the integral on a p -exceptional family of k -simplices. For details, we refer e.g. to [23, Section 4.1], or the corresponding results for functions instead of k -forms given in [13, Theorem 3]. Because every $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ has a Borel representative, we may use this method to define integrals over simplices for L^p -forms.

2.3. Other results. We also record the following simple fact about convex domains that we use later in the article.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded, convex domain. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, the domain $\Omega_\varepsilon = \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > \varepsilon\}$ is a convex domain that is compactly contained in Ω .*

Proof. The parts that Ω_ε is open and compactly contained in Ω are clear. Hence, the main property to verify is that Ω_ε is convex, which will also automatically show that Ω_ε is connected. Thus, suppose that $x, y \in \Omega_\varepsilon$, and suppose towards contradiction that there exists $z \in [x, y]$ such that $z \notin \Omega_\varepsilon$. Then, since $d(x, \partial\Omega) > \varepsilon$, $d(y, \partial\Omega) > \varepsilon$, and $d(z, \partial\Omega) \leq \varepsilon$ there exists a $w \in \partial\Omega$ such that $d(z, w) < \min(d(x, \partial\Omega), d(y, \partial\Omega))$. By the selection criterion of w , we have $x + w - z \in \Omega$ and $y + w - z \in \Omega$. But now $w \notin \Omega$ is on the line segment $[x + w - z, y + w - z] \subset \Omega$, which is a contradiction. \square

3. SIMPLICIAL INTEGRATION FUNCTION

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, and let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ for $p \in [1, \infty)$. By changing ω in a set of measure zero, we may assume that ω is Borel. We extend ω to an element $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n)$ by setting $\omega = 0$ outside Ω . As stated in the introduction, we then define a map $I_\omega : \Omega^{k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(3.1) \quad I_\omega(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k) = \int_{\Delta(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k)} \omega.$$

Note that for 0-forms, i.e. functions $f \in L^p(\Omega)$, the map I_f is just the evaluation map $I_f(x_0) = f(x_0)$.

By the discussion in Section 2.2, we have that the integral on the right hand side of (3.1) is finite outside a p -exceptional family of simplices, and that changing ω in a set of measure zero only changes the integral on a p -exceptional family of simplices. Thus, in order for I_ω to be well-defined,

we show that for every p -exceptional family of simplices, the corresponding family of corners is a Lebesgue null-set of Ω^{k+1} . This fact is somewhat unsurprising, but nonetheless irritating to prove.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a convex domain, let $P \subset \Omega^{k+1}$, and let $\mathcal{S} = \{\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_k) : (x_0, \dots, x_k) \in P\}$. If \mathcal{S} is p -exceptional for some $p \in [1, \infty)$, then P is a Lebesgue null-set.*

Proof. By Fuglede's characterization of p -exceptional families of measures, see [13, Theorem 2], there exists a Borel function $\rho: \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that $\|\rho\|_{L^p(\Omega)} < \infty$, but

$$\int_{\Delta} \rho d\mathcal{H}^k = \infty$$

for every $\Delta \in \mathcal{S}$. By (2.1), this implies that

$$(3.2) \quad \int_{\Delta_k} (\rho \circ \varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}) |J_{\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}}| dm_k = \infty$$

for every $(x_0, \dots, x_k) \in P$.

Consider the function

$$\Phi_{\omega}: \Omega^{k+1} \times \Delta_k \rightarrow [0, \infty], \quad \Phi_{\omega}((x_0, \dots, x_k), x) = |J_{\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}}| \rho(\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}(x)).$$

Since ρ is Borel, the map $((x_0, \dots, x_k), x) \mapsto \varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}(x)$ is continuous, and the map $(x_0, \dots, x_k) \mapsto |J_{\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}}|$ is continuous, we obtain that Φ_{ω} is Borel. Thus, by Fubini's theorem, the function

$$(3.3) \quad (x_0, \dots, x_k) \mapsto \int_{\Delta_k} \Phi_{\omega}((x_0, \dots, x_k), x) dm_k$$

is Borel. Now, we let \tilde{P} be the set of all $(x_0, \dots, x_k) \in \Omega^{k+1}$ such that (3.2) applies, and note that \tilde{P} is Borel, since it is the pre-image of $\{\infty\}$ under the Borel map given in (3.3).

We then prove that \tilde{P} is a null-set, as since $P \subset \tilde{P}$, the claim then follows. Suppose towards contradiction that $m_{(k+1)n}(\tilde{P}) > 0$. Let

$$T: \Omega \times (\mathbb{R}^n)^k \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^n)^{k+1}, \quad F(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k) = (x_0, x_0 + x_1, \dots, x_0 + x_k),$$

and note that T is continuous, T is measure-preserving, and Ω^{k+1} is contained in the image of T . Thus, $T^{-1}\tilde{P}$ is a Borel set with positive measure. For $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^k$, we let

$$E_{x_1, \dots, x_k} = (T^{-1}\tilde{P}) \cap (\Omega \times \{(x_1, \dots, x_k)\}).$$

Then by Fubini's theorem, E_{x_1, \dots, x_k} is Borel for m_{kn} -a.e. $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^k$, and there exists a Borel set $F \subset (\mathbb{R}^n)^k$ with $m_{kn}(F) > 0$ such that E_{x_1, \dots, x_k} is Borel and $m_n(E_{x_1, \dots, x_k}) > 0$ for every $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in F$.

We fix an element $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in F$. Since \tilde{P} contains a simplex of the form $\Delta(x_0, x_0 + x_1, \dots, x_0 + x_k)$, we must have that $\Delta(0, x_1, \dots, x_k)$ has positive k -dimensional measure. Thus, there exists a unique $(n - k)$ -dimensional vector space perpendicular to $\Delta(0, x_1, \dots, x_k)$, which we denote V . Since

$m_n(E_{x_1, \dots, x_k}) > 0$, our third use of Fubini's theorem so far yields a Borel set $W \subset V^\perp$ with $\mathcal{H}^k(W) > 0$ such that $(x + V) \cap E_{x_1, \dots, x_k}$ is Borel and $\mathcal{H}^{n-k}((x + V) \cap E_{x_1, \dots, x_k}) > 0$ for every $x \in W$.

Now, we fix any $x_0 \in W$, and let

$$C = \Delta(0, x_1, \dots, x_k) + ((x_0 + V) \cap E_{x_1, \dots, x_k}),$$

noting that C is a measurable set. By definition of E_{x_1, \dots, x_k} , we observe that $(x, x + x_1, \dots, x + x_k) \in \tilde{P}$ for every $x \in E_{x_1, \dots, x_k}$. Thus, since $\tilde{P} \subset \Omega^{k+1}$ and Ω is convex, we have $C \subset \Omega$. Moreover, for \mathcal{H}^{n-k} -a.e. $x \in (x_0 + V) \cap E_{x_1, \dots, x_k}$, we have by Hölder's inequality that

$$\int_{x + \Delta(0, x_1, \dots, x_k)} \rho^p d\mathcal{H}^k \geq \frac{1}{[\mathcal{H}^k(\Delta)]^{p-1}} \left(\int_{\Delta} \rho d\mathcal{H}^k \right)^p = \infty.$$

Now, since $(x_0 + V) \cap E_{x_1, \dots, x_k}$ is perpendicular to $\Delta(0, x_1, \dots, x_k)$, and since $\mathcal{H}^{n-k}((x_0 + V) \cap E_{x_1, \dots, x_k}) > 0$, the fourth and final use of Fubini's theorem in this proof yields

$$\int_C \rho^p dm_n = \int_{(x_0 + V) \cap E_{x_1, \dots, x_k}} \infty d\mathcal{H}^{n-k} = \infty.$$

This is a contradiction with $\|\rho\|_{L^p(\Omega)} < \infty$. Hence, $m_{(k+1)n}(\tilde{P}) > 0$ is false, and the proof is thus complete. \square

Thus, together with the discussion of Section 2.2, Lemma 3.1 with $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$ immediately yields the following corollary.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set, let $p \in [1, \infty)$, and let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ be Borel, where we extend ω to all of \mathbb{R}^n by zero extension. Then I_ω is well-defined and finite for a.e. $(x_0, \dots, x_k) \in \Omega^{k+1}$. Moreover, changing ω in a set of measure zero only changes I_ω in a set of measure zero.*

We also show that I_ω is measurable.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set, let $p \in [1, \infty)$, and let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ be Borel, where we extend ω to all of \mathbb{R}^n by zero extension. Then $I_\omega: \Omega^{k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Borel.*

Proof. Consider the function $\rho: (\mathbb{R}^n)^{k+1} \times \Delta_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\rho(x_0, \dots, x_k, y) \text{ vol}_k = (\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}^* \omega)_y,$$

where $\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}: \Delta_k \rightarrow \Delta(x_0, \dots, x_k)$ is as in Section 2.2. Then ρ is Borel since ω is Borel and $(x_0, \dots, x_k, y) \mapsto \varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}(y)$ is smooth. Moreover,

$$I_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_k) = \int_{\Delta_k} \varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}^* \omega = \int_{\Delta_k} \rho(x_0, \dots, x_k, y) dm_k(y).$$

By Corollary 3.2, $y \mapsto \rho(x_0, \dots, x_k, y)$ is integrable for a.e. $(x_0, \dots, x_k) \in \Omega^{k+1}$, where we may assume that the exceptional set is Borel by enlarging it. Thus, the fact that I_ω is Borel measurable follows from a technical fact

that is typically wrapped into the statement of Fubini's theorem; for a precise statement of the result we use, see e.g. [3, Corollary 3.4.6]. \square

In conclusion, by Corollary 3.2 and Lemma 3.3, we now have for every open $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ a linear map $L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega) \rightarrow M^k(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ defined by $\omega \mapsto I_\omega$, where ω is a chosen Borel representative of its L^p -class that has been extended outside Ω as zero. Moreover, the choice of Borel representative ω only affects the values of I_ω in a null-set of Ω^{k+1} .

4. L^p -NORMS OF INTEGRATION FUNCTIONS

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open. As stated in the introduction, we let $M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ denote the vector space of measurable functions $F: \Omega^{k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The elements of $M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ are called *measurable (real-valued) k -multifunctions* on Ω . In particular, a measurable function $f: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable 0-multifunction on Ω .

We then fix additional notation related to related to the four seminorms on $M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ that were defined in (1.2)-(1.5). As stated in the introduction, given $E \subset \Omega$, $R > 0$, and $c > 0$, we denote

$$\mathbb{B}(E, k, R) = \{(x_0, \dots, x_k) \in E^{k+1} : \forall i \in \{1, \dots, k\}, x_i \in \mathbb{B}^n(x_0, R)\}.$$

and

$$E(k, c) := \left\{ (x_0, \dots, x_k) \in E^{k+1} : \max_{i=1, \dots, k} |x_0 - x_k| < c \operatorname{dist}(x_0, \partial E) \right\}.$$

Then, for every one of the seminorms (1.2)-(1.5), we define a version for fixed $\theta \in (0, 1)$. In particular, if $F \in M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$, we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\|_{L^p M^k(E, \theta)}^p &= \int_{E^{k+1}} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |F(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p dx_0 \dots dx_k}{(|x_1 - x_0| |x_2 - x_0| \dots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}}, \\ \|F\|_{L^p M^k(E|R, \theta)}^p &= \int_{\mathbb{B}(E, k, R)} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |F(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p dx_0 \dots dx_k}{(|x_1 - x_0| |x_2 - x_0| \dots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}}, \\ \|F\|_{L^p M^k, c(E, \theta)}^p &= \int_{E(k, c)} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |F(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p dx_0 \dots dx_k}{(|x_1 - x_0| |x_2 - x_0| \dots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}}, \\ \|F\|_{L^p M^k, c(E|R, \theta)}^p &= \int_{\mathbb{B}(E, k, R) \cap E(k, c)} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |F(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p dx_0 \dots dx_k}{(|x_1 - x_0| |x_2 - x_0| \dots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $t \mapsto t^p$ is continuous in $[0, \infty]$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\|_{L^p M^k(E)} &= \limsup_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \|F\|_{L^p M^k(E, \theta)}, \text{ and} \\ [F]_{L^p M^k(E)} &= \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \|F\|_{L^p M^k(E, \theta)}. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that every $\|\cdot\|_{L^p M^k(E, \theta)}^p$ is a $[0, \infty]$ -valued seminorm on $M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$, as they are just weighted L^p -seminorms. Thus, since \limsup is subadditive and commutes with multiplication by non-negative constants, $\|\cdot\|_{L^p M^k(E)}$ is

also a $[0, \infty]$ -valued seminorm on $M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$. We also recall that we say that $\|F\|_{L^p M^k(E)}$ is obtained as a limit if

$$[F]_{L^p M^k(E)} = \|F\|_{L^p M^k(E)} = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \|F\|_{L^p M^k(E, \theta)}.$$

Moreover, mutatis mutandis, the aforementioned facts for $\|F\|_{L^p M^k(E)}$ also apply to all of the other seminorms defined in (1.2)-(1.5), as well as their respective lim inf-counterparts.

Clearly, we have for all $\theta \in (0, 1)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\cdot\|_{L^p M^{k,c}(E|R, \theta)} &\leq \|\cdot\|_{L^p M^k(E|R, \theta)} \leq \|\cdot\|_{L^p M^k(E, \theta)}, \quad \text{and} \\ \|\cdot\|_{L^p M^{k,c}(E|R, \theta)} &\leq \|\cdot\|_{L^p M^{k,c}(E, \theta)} \leq \|\cdot\|_{L^p M^k(E, \theta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the above inequalities also pass to the respective lim sup and lim inf-versions. We also point out that if E is bounded, then for all $\theta \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$(4.1) \quad \|F\|_{L^p M^k(E, \theta)} = \|F\|_{L^p M^k(E|(\text{diam } E), \theta)}, \quad \text{and}$$

$$(4.2) \quad \|F\|_{L^p M^{k,c}(E, \theta)} = \|F\|_{L^p M^{k,c}(E|(\text{diam } E), \theta)}.$$

Remark 4.1. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, let $R > 0$, and let $F \in M^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ with $\|F\|_{L^p M^1(\Omega|R)} < \infty$. We claim that if F vanishes in a uniform neighborhood $\mathbb{B}(\Omega, 1, r)$ of the diagonal $\Delta_1(\Omega) \subset \Omega^2$, where $r > 0$, then $\|F\|_{L^p M^1(\Omega|R)} = 0$. Note that if Ω is bounded, this implies a similar result for $\|F\|_{L^p M^1(\Omega)}$ by setting $R = \text{diam } \Omega$.

Indeed, since $\|F\|_{L^p M^1(\Omega|R)} < \infty$, there exists a $\theta_0 \in (0, 1)$ for which $\|F\|_{L^p M^1(\Omega|R, \theta_0)} < \infty$. It follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}(\Omega, 1, R)} |F(x, y)|^p dx dy \leq \frac{R^{n+p\theta_0}}{1-\theta_0} \|F\|_{L^p M^1(\Omega|R, \theta_0)}^p < \infty.$$

Now, if $(x, y) \notin \mathbb{B}(\omega, 1, r)$, then $|x - y| \geq r$. Thus, using the fact that F vanishes in $\mathbb{B}(\omega, 1, r)$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\|_{L^p M^1(\Omega|R)}^p &\leq \limsup_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1-\theta}{r^{np+\theta}} \int_{\mathbb{B}(\Omega, 1, R)} |F(x, y)|^p dx dy \\ &\leq \limsup_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1-\theta}{\min(1, r^{np+1})} \frac{R^{n+p\theta_0}}{1-\theta_0} \|F\|_{L^p M^1(\Omega|R, \theta_0)}^p = 0, \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof of our claim.

As stated in the introduction, a similar argument for $F \in M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ with $k > 1$ becomes more complicated. The reason is that in the complement of $\mathbb{B}(\Omega, k, r)$, one only has an estimate of the form $|x_0 - x_i| \geq r$ for one coordinate i at a time. After such an estimate, one does have an extra $(1-\theta)$ -term compared to the amount of $|x_0 - x_i|$ -terms, but one would have to rule out an unexpectedly fast-growing singularity caused by the other $|x_0 - x_i|$ -terms, possibly using an extra assumption on F . For integration

functions I_ω of L^p -integrable k -forms, such an argument is possible; this is shown in Lemma 4.4.

4.1. The first two cases of Theorem 1.2. Our main objective in this section is to prove Theorem 1.2. We begin by proving the part of the result for $\|\cdot\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)}$. By (4.1), the part of the result for $\|\cdot\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega)}$ will follow suit.

We start with the following version of the upper bound, which will be used in the main proof to enable approximation arguments and dominated convergence use.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set, let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, and let $R > 0$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(n, p, k)$ such that for every $\theta \in (0, 1)$,*

$$(4.3) \quad \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R, \theta)} \leq CR^{k(1-\theta)} \|\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$

In particular,

$$\|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)} \leq C \|\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. Recall that I_ω is defined by extending ω to all of \mathbb{R}^n by setting $\omega = 0$ outside Ω . With Hölder's inequality and the definition of I_ω , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R, \theta)}^p \\ & \lesssim_{p,k} \int_{\Delta_k \times \mathbb{B}(\Omega, k, R)} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |\omega_{\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}(s)}(x_1 - x_0, \dots, x_k - x_0)|^p}{(|x_1 - x_0| \cdots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+p\theta}} ds dx_0 \dots dx_k. \end{aligned}$$

We then note that $|\omega_x(v_1, \dots, v_k)| \leq |\omega_x| |v_1| \cdots |v_k|$. Applying this, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Delta_k \times \mathbb{B}(\Omega, k, R)} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |\omega_{\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}(s)}(x_1 - x_0, \dots, x_k - x_0)|^p}{(|x_1 - x_0| \cdots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+p\theta}} ds dx_0 \dots dx_k \\ & \leq \int_{\Delta_k \times \mathbb{B}(\Omega, k, R)} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |\omega_{\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}(s)}|^p}{(|x_1 - x_0| \cdots |x_k - x_0|)^{n-p(1-\theta)}} ds dx_0 \dots dx_k. \end{aligned}$$

We then denote $y_i = x_i - x_0$, $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Note that in our domain of integration, we have $y_i \in \mathbb{B}^n(0, R)$ for all i . Thus, by a change of variables, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Delta_k \times \mathbb{B}(\Omega, k, R)} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |\omega_{\varphi_{x_0, \dots, x_k}(s)}|^p}{(|x_1 - x_0| \cdots |x_k - x_0|)^{n-p(1-\theta)}} ds dx_0 \dots dx_k \\ & \leq \int_{\Delta_k \times \Omega \times [\mathbb{B}^n(0, R)]^k} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |\omega_{x_0 + s_1 y_1 + \dots + s_k y_k}|^p}{(|y_1| \cdots |y_k|)^{n-p(1-\theta)}} ds dx_0 dy_1 \dots dy_k. \end{aligned}$$

We then use the Fubini-Tonelli theorem to compute the dx_0 -integral first. Due to the fact that ω has been zero extended outside Ω , we obtain the

estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Delta_k \times \Omega \times [\mathbb{B}^n(0,R)]^k} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |\omega_{x_0+s_1y_1+\dots+s_ky_k}|^p}{(|y_1| \cdots |y_k|)^{n-p(1-\theta)}} ds dx_0 dy_1 \dots dy_k \\ \leq \int_{\Delta_k \times [\mathbb{B}^n(0,R)]^k} \frac{(1-\theta)^k \|\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p}{(|y_1| \cdots |y_k|)^{n-p(1-\theta)}} ds dy_1 \dots dy_k \end{aligned}$$

Then, by using polar coordinates on the variables y_i , we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Delta_k \times [\mathbb{B}^n(0,R)]^k} \frac{(1-\theta)^k \|\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p}{(|y_1| \cdots |y_k|)^{n-p(1-\theta)}} ds dy_1 \dots dy_k \\ = m_k(\Delta_k) \left(\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \int_0^R (1-\theta)r^{p(1-\theta)-1} dr \right)^k \|\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p \\ = \frac{m_k(\Delta_k) (\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}))^k}{p^k} R^{kp(1-\theta)} \|\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p, \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof of (4.3). The claimed bound on $\|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)}$ then follows by letting $\theta \rightarrow 1^-$ in the right hand side of (4.3). \square

Next, we record a simple technical lemma about limits that nevertheless is used sufficiently many times to warrant a standalone statement.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain, let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, and let $R > 0$. Suppose that a sequence of k -forms ω_j converges to ω in $L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$. Moreover, suppose that for every $\theta \in (0, 1)$, $\|\cdot\|_\theta$ is a seminorm on $M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ with $\|\cdot\|_\theta \leq \|\cdot\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R,\theta)}$. If $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \|I_{\omega_j}\|_\theta$ exists for every $\theta \in (0, 1)$, then $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \|I_\omega\|_\theta$ exists, and moreover*

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \|I_\omega\|_\theta = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \|I_{\omega_j}\|_\theta.$$

Proof. We compute using Lemma 4.2 and our assumptions on $\|\cdot\|_\theta$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|I_\omega\|_\theta - \|I_{\omega_j}\|_\theta \right| &\leq \|I_\omega - I_{\omega_j}\|_\theta = \|I_{\omega - \omega_j}\|_\theta \\ &\leq \|I_{\omega - \omega_j}\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R,\theta)} \leq C(p, n, k) \max(R^k, 1) \|\omega - \omega_j\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|I_{\omega_j}\|_\theta = \|I_\omega\|_\theta$ uniformly in θ . Thus, the claim follows by using the Moore-Osgood theorem of interchanging limits. \square

Following this, we show that for $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, the definition of the seminorm $\|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega)}$ only depends on tuples (x_0, \dots, x_k) where the points are sufficiently close to each other.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain, let $R > 0$, and let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, where we extend ω to $L^p(\wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n)$ by setting $\omega = 0$ outside Ω . Then, for*

$$(4.4) \quad \varepsilon_\theta = e^{-1/\sqrt{1-\theta}},$$

we have

$$(4.5) \quad \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \left(\|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R, \theta)}^p - \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R\varepsilon_\theta, \theta)}^p \right) = 0.$$

Proof. We first show that we may assume that $\omega \in C_0(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$. Indeed, since $C_0(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ is dense in $L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, we can take an approximating sequence $\omega_j \in C_0(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ of ω . For $F \in M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$, we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\|_\theta^p &:= \|F\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R, \theta)}^p - \|F\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R\varepsilon_\theta, \theta)}^p \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{B}(\Omega, k, R) \setminus \mathbb{B}(\Omega, k, R\varepsilon_\theta)} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |F(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p}{(|x_1 - x_0| \cdots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}} dx_0 \dots dx_k. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\|\cdot\|_\theta$ is a seminorm on $M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ with $\|\cdot\|_\theta \leq \|\cdot\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R, \theta)}$. Thus, by Lemma 4.3 and the assumption that (4.5) holds for ω_j , we have

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \|\omega\|_\theta = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} 0 = 0,$$

implying that (4.5) holds for ω .

Thus, we assume $\omega \in C_0(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$. We note that by the Fubini-Tonelli theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{B}(\Omega, k, R) \setminus \mathbb{B}(\Omega, k, R\varepsilon_\theta)} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |I_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p}{(|x_1 - x_0| |x_2 - x_0| \cdots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}} dx_0 \dots dx_k \\ & \leq \int_\Omega \int_{(\mathbb{B}^n(x_0, R))^k \setminus (\mathbb{B}^n(x_0, R\varepsilon_\theta))^k} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |I_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p}{(|x_0 - x_1| \cdots |x_0 - x_k|)^{n+p\theta}} dx_1 \dots dx_k dx_0. \end{aligned}$$

We fix $x_0 \in \Omega$, and similarly as in the proof of Lemma 4.2, we make changes of variables $y_i = x_i - x_0$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ to obtain

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{(\mathbb{B}^n(x_0, R))^k \setminus (\mathbb{B}^n(x_0, R\varepsilon_\theta))^k} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |I_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p}{(|x_0 - x_1| \cdots |x_0 - x_k|)^{n+p\theta}} dx_1 \dots dx_k \\ & = \int_{(\mathbb{B}^n(0, R))^k \setminus (\mathbb{B}^n(0, D\varepsilon_\theta))^k} \frac{(1-\theta)^k}{(|y_1| \cdots |y_k|)^{n+p\theta}} \left| \int_{\Delta_k} \omega_{x_0 + s_1 y_1 + \cdots + s_k y_k}(y_1, \dots, y_k) ds \right|^p dy_1 \dots dy_k \\ & = \int_{(\mathbb{B}^n(0, R))^k \setminus (\mathbb{B}^n(0, D\varepsilon_\theta))^k} \frac{(1-\theta)^k}{(|y_1| \cdots |y_k|)^{n-p(1-\theta)}} \left| \int_{\Delta_k} \omega_{x_0 + s_1 y_1 + \cdots + s_k y_k} \left(\frac{y_1}{|y_1|}, \dots, \frac{y_k}{|y_k|} \right) ds \right|^p dy_1 \dots dy_k. \end{aligned}$$

We then observe that $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \varepsilon_\theta^{p(1-\theta)} = 1$. Thus, using the fact that $\omega \in C_0(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ implies $\|\omega\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} < \infty$, we obtain for every $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $i \in$

$\{1, \dots, k\}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{(\mathbb{B}^n(x_0, R))^{k-1}} \int_{(\mathbb{B}^n(x_0, R)) \setminus \mathbb{B}^n(0, D\varepsilon_\theta)} \frac{(1-\theta)^k}{(|y_1| \cdots |y_k|)^{n-p(1-\theta)}} \\
& \quad \left| \int_{\Delta_k} \omega_{x_0 + s_1 y_1 + \cdots + s_k y_k} \left(\frac{y_1}{|y_1|}, \dots, \frac{y_k}{|y_k|} \right) ds \right|^p dy_i dy_1 \dots \hat{d}y_i \dots dy_k \\
& \leq C(n, k, p) \|\omega\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}^p R^{(k-1)p(1-\theta)} \left(\int_{R\varepsilon_\theta}^R (1-\theta) r^{p(1-\theta)-1} dr \right) \\
& = C(n, k, p) \|\omega\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}^p R^{kp(1-\theta)} \left(1 - \varepsilon_\theta^{p(1-\theta)} \right) \xrightarrow{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$(4.7) \quad \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{(\mathbb{B}^n(x_0, R))^k \setminus (\mathbb{B}^n(x_0, R\varepsilon_\theta))^k} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |I_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p dx_1 \dots dx_k}{(|x_1 - x_0| \cdots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}} = 0$$

for all $x_0 \in \Omega$, and the convergence is uniform with respect to x_0 . In addition to this, we note that since $\omega \in C_0(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, the integral in (4.7) vanishes when x_0 is outside the compact set $\mathbb{B}^n(\text{spt } \omega, R)$. Thus, the claimed (4.5) follows. \square

We are ready to prove the first part of Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, let $R > 0$, and let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, where we extend ω to $L^p(\wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n)$ by setting $\omega = 0$ outside Ω . Then there exists a constant $K = K(p, k)$ such that*

$$\|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)} = \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)} = K \|\omega\|_{\mathbb{S}, p} \|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

where the norm $\|\alpha\|_{\mathbb{S}, p}$ for k -covectors $\alpha \in \text{Alt}_k(V)$ on an n -dimensional normed space V is defined by

$$\|\alpha\|_{\mathbb{S}, p} = \left(\int_{\{|v_1| = \dots = |v_k| = 1\}} |\alpha(v_1, \dots, v_k)|^p d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(v_1) \dots d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(v_k) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

In particular, $\|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)}$ is obtained as a limit, and there exists a constant $C = C(p, n, k)$ such that

$$C^{-1} \|\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)} \leq C \|\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. We start as in Lemma 4.4, by showing that we may assume that $\omega \in C_0(\wedge^k)$. Indeed, suppose the result has been shown for such ω . Since $C_0(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ is dense in $L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, we can take an approximating sequence $\omega_j \in C_0(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ of ω . By our assumption that the theorem statement holds for ω_j , we have that $\|I_{\omega_j}\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)}$ is obtained as a limit for every j . Thus, we can use Lemma 4.3 with $\|\cdot\|_\theta = \|\cdot\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R, \theta)}$ to obtain that

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R, \theta)} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|I_{\omega_j}\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} K \|\omega_j\|_{\mathbb{S}, p} \|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$

On the other hand, since $|\cdot|_{\mathbb{S},p}$ is comparable with the Grassmann norm $|\cdot|$ due to both being norms on a finite-dimensional vector space, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|\omega|_{\mathbb{S},p}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} - \|\omega_n|_{\mathbb{S},p}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right| &\leq \|\omega|_{\mathbb{S},p} - \omega_n|_{\mathbb{S},p}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \|\omega - \omega_n|_{\mathbb{S},p}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C(p, n, k) \|\omega - \omega_n\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we also have $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|\omega_j|_{\mathbb{S},p}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} = \|\omega|_{\mathbb{S},p}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$, completing the reduction to the continuous compactly supported case.

Thus, we may assume $\omega \in C_0(\wedge^k T^* \Omega) \cap L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$. By Lemma 4.4 and the Fubini-Tonelli theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (4.8) \quad \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R, \theta)}^p &= \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R\varepsilon_\theta, \theta)}^p \\ &= \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega^k \cap (\mathbb{B}^n(x_0, R\varepsilon_\theta))^k} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |I_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p}{(|x_1 - x_0| \cdots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}} dx_1 \dots dx_k dx_0 \end{aligned}$$

if the latter limit exists. We then fix $x_0 \in \Omega$. Noting that $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \varepsilon_\theta = 0$, we suppose that θ is close enough to one that $\mathbb{B}^n(0, R\varepsilon_\theta) \subset \Omega$. Similarly as in (4.6), we get via a change of variables $y_i = x_i - x_0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega^k \cap (\mathbb{B}^n(x_0, R\varepsilon_\theta))^k} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |I_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p}{(|x_1 - x_0| \cdots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}} dx_1 \dots dx_k \\ &= \int_{(\mathbb{B}^n(0, R\varepsilon_\theta))^k} \frac{(1-\theta)^k}{(|y_1| \cdots |y_k|)^{n+\theta p}} \left| \int_{\Delta_k} \omega_{x_0+s_1 y_1+\dots+s_k y_k} \left(\frac{y_1}{|y_1|}, \dots, \frac{y_k}{|y_k|} \right) ds \right|^p dy_1 \dots dy_k. \end{aligned}$$

We can then again apply polar coordinates to y_i to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{[\mathbb{B}^n(0, R\varepsilon_\theta)]^k} \frac{(1-\theta)^k}{(|y_1| \cdots |y_k|)^{n-p(1-\theta)}} \left| \int_{\Delta_k} \omega_{x_0+s_1 y_1+\dots+s_k y_k} \left(\frac{y_1}{|y_1|}, \dots, \frac{y_k}{|y_k|} \right) ds \right|^p dy_1 \dots dy_k \\ &= \int_{(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})^k} \int_{[0, R\varepsilon_\theta]^k} (1-\theta)^k (r_1 \cdots r_k)^{p(1-\theta)-1} \left| \int_{\Delta_k} \omega_{x_0+s_1 r_1 v_1+\dots+s_k r_k v_k} (v_1, \dots, v_k) ds \right|^p dr_1 \dots dr_k dv_1 \dots dv_k, \end{aligned}$$

where the v_i -integrals are respect to spherical volume. Now, since $\omega \in C_0(\wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n)$, its coefficients are uniformly continuous, and thus

$$\lim_{\max(|r_i|) \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Delta_k} \omega_{x_0+s_1 r_1 v_1+\dots+s_k r_k v_k} (v_1, \dots, v_k) ds = m_k(\Delta_k) \omega_{x_0}(v_1, \dots, v_k)$$

uniformly with respect to x_0 and (v_1, \dots, v_k) . Because of this and the previously used fact that

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_0^{R\varepsilon_\theta} (1-\theta)r^{p(1-\theta)-1} dr = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{p} (R\varepsilon_\theta)^{p(1-\theta)} = \frac{1}{p},$$

we obtain

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{[\mathbb{B}^n(0, R\varepsilon_\theta)]^k} \frac{(1-\theta)^k}{(|y_1| \cdots |y_k|)^{n-p(1-\theta)}} \\ & \left| \int_{\Delta_k} \omega_{x_0+s_1y_1+\dots+s_k} \left(\frac{y_1}{|y_1|}, \dots, \frac{y_k}{|y_k|} \right) ds \right|^p dy_1 \dots dy_k \\ &= \int_{(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})^k} p^{-k} m_k^p(\Delta_k) |\omega_{x_0}(v_1, \dots, v_k)|^p dv_1 \dots dv_k \\ &= p^{-k} m_k^p(\Delta_k) |\omega_{x_0}|_{\mathbb{S}, p}^p, \end{aligned}$$

where the convergence is uniform with respect to x_0 .

In conclusion, we have

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{\Omega^k \cap (\mathbb{B}^n(x_0, R\varepsilon_\theta))^k} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |I_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p}{(|x_1 - x_0| \cdots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}} dx_1 \dots dx_k \\ = p^{-k} m_k^p(\Delta_k) |\omega_{x_0}|_{\mathbb{S}, p}^p \end{aligned}$$

for all $x_0 \in \Omega$, and this convergence is uniform in x_0 . Moreover, similarly to the end of the proof of Lemma 4.4, both ω_{x_0} and the integrals on the left hand side of (4.10) vanish when x_0 is outside the compact set $\mathbb{B}^n(\text{spt } \omega, R)$. Thus, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega^k \cap (\mathbb{B}^n(x_0, R\varepsilon_\theta))^k} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |I_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p}{(|x_1 - x_0| \cdots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}} dx_1 \dots dx_k dx_0 \\ = p^{-k} m_k^p(\Delta_k) \int_{\Omega} |\omega|_{\mathbb{S}, p}^p \text{vol}_n. \end{aligned}$$

By combining this with (4.8), we conclude that

$$\|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega)} = p^{-\frac{k}{p}} m_k(\Delta_k) \|\omega\|_{\mathbb{S}, p} \| \omega \|_{L^p(\Omega)}$$

and that $\|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega)}$ is obtained as a limit. Since $|\omega|_{\mathbb{S}, p}$ and $|\omega|$ are uniformly comparable, the claimed two-sided estimate also follows immediately. \square

We immediately obtain the following case of Theorem 1.2 as a corollary.

Corollary 4.6. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and bounded, and let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, where we extend ω to $L^p(\wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n)$ by setting $\omega = 0$ outside Ω . Then*

$$[I_\omega]_{L^p M^k(\Omega)} = \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega)} = K \|\omega\|_{\mathbb{S}, p} \| \omega \|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

where $K = K(p, k)$ and $|\cdot|_{\mathbb{S}, p}$ are as in Proposition 4.5.

Proof. Due to (4.1), the claim follows from Proposition 4.5 with $R = \text{diam } \Omega$. \square

4.2. The last two cases of Theorem 1.2. Two cases of Theorem 1.2 remain. Our strategy is again to resolve the case $\|\cdot\|_{L^p M^{k,c}(\Omega|R)}$, and then apply (4.2) to obtain the result for $\|\cdot\|_{L^p M^{k,c}(\Omega)}$. Before we start proving the cases, we require the following lemma.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, let $R > 0$, and let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, where we extend ω to $L^p(\wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n)$ by setting $\omega = 0$ outside Ω . Suppose that $\text{spt } \omega$ is a compact subset of Ω . Then for every open $V \subset \Omega$ with $\text{spt } \omega \subset V$, we have*

$$[I_\omega]_{L^p M^k(V|R)} = \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(V|R)} = \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)}.$$

Proof. Note that the claim is trivial if $V = \mathbb{R}^n$, since then also $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $r = \text{dist}(\text{spt } \omega, \mathbb{R}^n \setminus V)$. Since V is open, we have $r > 0$. It is clear that

$$\|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(V|R)} \leq \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)},$$

so in order to prove the claim, we need to show that

$$[I_\omega]_{L^p M^k(V|R)} \geq \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)}.$$

Since $\|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)}$ is obtained as a limit due to Proposition 4.5, we obtain the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)}^p - [I_\omega]_{L^p M^k(V|R)}^p \\ &= \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R,\theta)}^p - \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(V|R,\theta)}^p \\ &\leq \limsup_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{\mathbb{B}(\Omega,k,R) \setminus \mathbb{B}(V,k,R)} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |I_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p}{(|x_1 - x_0| \cdots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}} dx_0 \dots dx_k. \end{aligned}$$

We then apply Lemma 4.4 to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} (4.11) \quad & \limsup_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{\mathbb{B}(\Omega,k,R) \setminus \mathbb{B}(V,k,R)} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |I_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p}{(|x_1 - x_0| \cdots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}} dx_0 \dots dx_k \\ &= \limsup_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{\mathbb{B}(\Omega,k,R\varepsilon_\theta) \setminus \mathbb{B}(V,k,R)} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |I_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p}{(|x_1 - x_0| \cdots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}} dx_0 \dots dx_k. \end{aligned}$$

Now, noting that $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \varepsilon_\theta = 0$, suppose that θ is close enough to 1 that $R\varepsilon_\theta < r/2$, and let $(x_0, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{B}(\Omega, k, R\varepsilon_\theta) \setminus \mathbb{B}(V, k, R)$. Since $\mathbb{B}(\Omega, k, R\varepsilon_\theta) \cap V^{k+1} = \mathbb{B}(V, k, R\varepsilon_\theta) \subset \mathbb{B}(V, k, R)$, we must have $(x_0, \dots, x_k) \notin V^{k+1}$. Hence, there exists an index i such that $\text{dist}(x_i, \text{spt } \omega) \geq r$. Moreover, since $(x_0, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{B}(\Omega, k, R\varepsilon_\theta)$, we have $|x_i - x_0| < R\varepsilon_\theta < r/2$, from which it follows that $\text{dist}(x_0, \text{spt } \omega) > r/2 > R\varepsilon_\theta$.

Thus, ω is identically zero in the ball $\mathbb{B}^n(x_0, R\varepsilon_\theta)$ which contains all of the points $x_j, j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. This in turn implies that $I_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_k) = 0$. Thus, the integrands on the right hand side of (4.11) are identically zero for θ close enough to 1, which completes the proof of the claimed $\|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega)}^p - [I_\omega]_{L^p M^k(V)}^p \leq 0$. \square

We then prove the next case of Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 4.8. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, let $R > 0$, let $c > 0$, and let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, where we extend ω to $L^p(\wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n)$ by setting $\omega = 0$ outside Ω . Then*

$$[I_\omega]_{L^p M^{k,c}(\Omega|R)} = \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^{k,c}(\Omega|R)} = K \|\omega\|_{\mathbb{S},p} \| \cdot \|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

where $K = K(p, k)$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{S},p}$ are as in Proposition 4.5.

Proof. By Proposition 4.5, it suffices to show that

$$[I_\omega]_{L^p M^{k,c}(\Omega|R)} = \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^{k,c}(\Omega|R)} = \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)}.$$

We first show that we may yet again assume that $\omega \in C_0(\wedge^k T^* \omega)$. Indeed, given a sequence of $\omega_j \in C_0(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ that converges to ω in $L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, if the statement of the theorem applies to ω_j , then we can apply Lemma 4.3 twice, once with $\|\cdot\|_{L^p M^{k,c}(\Omega|R)}$ and once with $\|\cdot\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)}$, to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^{k,c}(\Omega|R,\theta)} &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \|I_{\omega_j}\|_{L^p M^{k,c}(\Omega|R,\theta)} \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \|I_{\omega_j}\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R,\theta)} = \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we proceed to assume that $\omega \in C_0(\wedge^k T^* \omega)$. Since we trivially have $\|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^{k,c}(\Omega|R)} \leq \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)}$, it suffices to show that $[I_\omega]_{L^p M^{k,c}(\Omega|R)} \geq \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)}$.

For every $\delta > 0$, we define

$$\Omega_\delta = \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > \delta\},$$

where we interpret $\Omega_\delta = \Omega$ if $\partial\Omega = \emptyset$ (i.e. if $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$). Then, since $\omega \in C_0(\wedge^k T^* \omega)$, we may fix $\delta > 0$ to be such that $\text{spt} \omega \subset \Omega_\delta$. By Lemma 4.7, we thus have

$$\|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)} = [I_\omega]_{L^p M^k(\Omega_\delta|R)}.$$

In particular, the claim follows if $[I_\omega]_{L^p M^{k,c}(\Omega|R)} \geq [I_\omega]_{L^p M^k(\Omega_\delta|R)}$.

For this, note that if $(x_0, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{B}(\Omega_\delta, k, R) \setminus (\mathbb{B}(\Omega, k, R) \cap \Omega(k, c)) = \mathbb{B}(\Omega_\delta, k, R) \setminus \Omega(k, c)$, then there exists an index $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $|x_i - x_0| \geq c \text{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega) > c\delta$. Hence, we conclude that if θ is close enough to 1 that $R\varepsilon_\theta < c\delta$, then $\mathbb{B}(\Omega_\delta, k, R) \setminus \Omega(k, c) \subset \mathbb{B}(\Omega, k, R) \setminus B(\Omega, k, R\varepsilon_\theta)$. Thus, by Lemma 4.4, we have

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{\mathbb{B}(\Omega_\delta, k, R) \setminus \Omega(k, c)} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |I_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p}{(|x_1 - x_0| \cdots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}} dx_0 \dots dx_k = 0.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &[I_\omega]_{L^p M^k(\Omega_\delta|R)}^p \\ &= \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{\mathbb{B}(\Omega_\delta, k, R) \cap \Omega(k, c)} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |I_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_k)|^p}{(|x_1 - x_0| \cdots |x_k - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}} dx_0 \dots dx_k \\ &\leq [I_\omega]_{L^p M^{k,c}(\Omega|R)}^p, \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. \square

The last case of Theorem 1.2 is then an immediate corollary.

Corollary 4.9. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and bounded, let $c > 0$, and let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, where we extend ω to $L^p(\wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n)$ by setting $\omega = 0$ outside Ω . Then*

$$[I_\omega]_{L^p M^{k,c}(\Omega)} = \|I_\omega\|_{L^p M^{k,c}(\Omega)} = K \|\omega\|_{\mathbb{S},p},$$

where $K = K(p, k)$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{S},p}$ are as in Proposition 4.5.

Proof. The claim is equivalent to Proposition 4.8 with $R = \text{diam } \Omega$, due to (4.2). \square

By combining Propositions 4.5 and 4.8 with Corollaries 4.6 and 4.9, the proof of Theorem 1.2 is hence complete.

5. WEAK DERIVATIVES

Let Ω be an open set in \mathbb{R}^n . As stated in the introduction, the *Alexander-Spanier differential* $d: M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow M^{k+1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ on measurable k -multi-functions is defined by

$$(dF)(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k+1}) = \sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i F(x_0, x_1, \dots, \hat{x}_i, \dots, x_{k+1})$$

for $F \in M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$. It is clear from the definition that $dF: \Omega^{k+2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is measurable if $F: \Omega^{k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is measurable, and that the map d is linear. It is also well known that this map satisfies

$$(5.1) \quad d(dF) = 0 \quad \text{for all } F \in M^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R}), k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}.$$

We begin our work towards Theorem 1.3 by noting the following fact for smooth differential forms.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, and let $\omega \in C^\infty(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$. Then for all $(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) \in \Omega^{k+2}$ such that $\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) \subset \Omega$, the Alexander-Spanier differential of I_ω satisfies*

$$dI_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) = I_{d\omega}(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}).$$

In particular, if Ω is convex, then this holds for all $(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) \in \Omega^{k+2}$.

Proof. The boundary of a simplex $\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1})$ is given by the simplicial k -chain $\sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i \Delta(x_0, \dots, \hat{x}_i, \dots, x_{k+1})$. Thus, we have by Stokes' theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{d\omega}(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) &= \int_{\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1})} d\omega = \int_{\partial \Delta(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1})} \omega \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i \int_{\Delta(x_0, \dots, \hat{x}_i, \dots, x_{k+1})} \omega = dI_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

\square

A smooth approximation argument then yields the following corollary; see also e.g. [23, Corollary 7.1].

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, and let $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$. Then for a.e. $(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) \in \Omega^{k+2}$ such that $\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) \subset \Omega$, the Alexander-Spanier differential of I_ω satisfies*

$$dI_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) = I_{d\omega}(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}).$$

In particular, if Ω is convex, then this holds for a.e. $(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) \in \Omega^{k+2}$.

Proof. The set $C^\infty(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ is dense in $W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$. Thus, we may select a sequence of smooth forms $\omega_j \in C^\infty(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ such that $\|\omega - \omega_j\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$ and $\|d\omega - d\omega_j\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. It follows from the so-called Fuglede lemma, see [13, Theorem 3 (f)] and also e.g. [23, Lemma 4.1], that by replacing ω_j with a subsequence, we may assume that

$$\int_{\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_k)} \omega_j \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_k)} \omega$$

outside a p -exceptional family of simplices $\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_k)$. The corresponding family $P \subset \Omega^{k+1}$ of exceptional $(k+1)$ -tuples of points is thus a Lebesgue null-set by Lemma 3.1.

We then observe that the family $P' \subset \Omega^{k+2}$ corresponding to simplices with a face in P is also a Lebesgue null-set: indeed, this follows since P' is a finite union of coordinate-permuted versions of $\Omega \times P$. We conclude that

$$dI_{\omega_j}(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} dI_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1})$$

for all (x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) outside P' .

Finally, a second use of the Fuglede lemma for $d\omega_j$ along with another use of Lemma 3.1 shows that, after replacing ω_j with a further subsequence, we have

$$I_{d\omega_j}(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} I_{d\omega}(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1})$$

outside a Lebesgue null-set $Q \subset \Omega^{k+2}$. The claim follows since for all $(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) \in \Omega^{k+2}$ such that $\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) \subset \Omega$, we have $I_{d\omega_j} = dI_{\omega_n}$ for all j by Lemma 5.1. \square

We also need the following L^p -estimate for dI_ω when ω is a convolution. The proof is along the same lines as most standard convolution estimates for L^p -norms.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n)$, let $R > 0$, and let $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, [0, \infty))$ be a mollifying kernel, where $\|\eta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 1$ and $\text{spt } \eta \subset \mathbb{B}^n(0, \varepsilon)$ for a given $\varepsilon > 0$. Consider the convolved differential form $\eta * \omega \in C^\infty(\wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n)$ defined by*

$$(\eta * \omega)_x = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \eta(y) \omega_{x-y} dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \eta(x-y) \omega_y dy.$$

Then for all measurable sets $E_1, E_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathbb{B}^n(E_1, \varepsilon) \subset E_2$, and for every $\theta \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\|dI_{\eta^*\omega}\|_{L^p M^{k+1}(E_1|R, \theta)} \leq \|dI_\omega\|_{L^p M^{k+1}(E_2|R, \theta)}.$$

Proof. We may assume that ω is Borel, as changing ω in a null-set does not effect the convolution. Observe that for all $(x_0, \dots, x_k) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^{k+1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Delta_k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\eta(y)\omega_{x_0+s_1(x_1-x_0)+\dots+s_k(x_k-x_0)-y}(x_1-x_0, \dots, x_k-x_0)| dy ds \\ & \leq m_k(\Delta_k) |x_1-x_0| \cdots |x_k-x_0| \|\eta\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|\omega\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}^p < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This allows us to use Fubini's theorem, which yields for a.e. $(x_0, \dots, x_k) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^{k+1}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\eta^*\omega}(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) &= \int_{\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1})} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \eta(y)\omega_{-y} dy \right) \\ &= \int_{\Delta_k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \eta(y)\omega_{x_0+s_1(x_1-x_0)+\dots+s_k(x_k-x_0)-y}(x_1-x_0, \dots, x_k-x_0) dy ds \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \eta(y)I_\omega(x_0-y, \dots, x_k-y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the definition of the Alexander-Spanier differential, we have for a.e. $(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^{k+2}$ that

$$dI_{\eta^*\omega}(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \eta(y)dI_\omega(x_0-y, \dots, x_{k+1}-y) dy.$$

Now, by using Hölder's inequality, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & |dI_{\eta^*\omega}(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1})|^p \\ &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \eta^{\frac{p-1}{p}}(y) \cdot \eta^{\frac{1}{p}}(y) dI_\omega(x_0-y, \dots, x_{k+1}-y) dy \right|^p \\ &\leq \|\eta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{p-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \eta(y) |dI_\omega(x_0-y, \dots, x_{k+1}-y)|^p dy \end{aligned}$$

for a.e. $(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^{k+2}$. Since $\|\eta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 1$, we can thus use Fubini-Tonelli to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|dI_{\eta^*\omega}\|_{L^p M^{k+1}(E_1|R, \theta)}^p \\ & \leq \int_{\mathbb{B}(E, k+1, R)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \eta(y)(1-\theta)^{k+1} \\ & \quad \frac{|dI_\omega(x_0-y, \dots, x_{k+1}-y)|^p}{(|x_1-x_0| \cdots |x_{k+1}-x_0|)^{n+\theta p}} dy dx_0 \dots dx_{k+1} \\ & = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \eta(y) \|dI_\omega\|_{L^p M^{k+1}((E_1-y)|R, \theta)}^p dy \\ & \leq \|\eta\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|dI_\omega\|_{L^p M^{k+1}(E_2|R, \theta)}^p, \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. \square

We are then ready to prove the first case of Theorem 1.3, namely case (2).

Proposition 5.4. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and convex, $R > 0$, $p, \in (1, \infty)$, $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, and let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, where we extend ω to $L^p(\wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n)$ by setting $\omega = 0$ outside Ω . Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$;
- (ii) $\|dI_\omega\|_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega|R)} < \infty$;
- (iii) $[dI_\omega]_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega|R)} < \infty$.

Moreover, if $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, then

$$[dI_\omega]_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega|R)} = \|dI_\omega\|_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega|R)} = K \| |d\omega|_{\mathbb{S},p} \|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

where $K = K(p, n, k)$ and $|\cdot|_{\mathbb{S},p}$ are as in Theorem 1.2.

Proof. It is clear that (ii) implies (iii). We then prove that (i) implies (ii), along with the additional claims at the end of the theorem. For this, suppose that $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$. Then by Lemma 5.2, we have $dI_\omega = I_{d\omega}$ a.e. on Ω^{k+2} , and by Proposition 4.5, we have

$$[I_{d\omega}]_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)} = \|I_{d\omega}\|_{L^p M^k(\Omega|R)} = K(n, p, k) \| |d\omega|_{\mathbb{S},p} \|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

thus proving the claim in this case.

It remains to prove that (iii) implies (i). Thus, let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ with $[dI_\omega]_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega)} < \infty$, with the objective to show that $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$. For this, let $\varepsilon > 0$, and let $\Omega_\varepsilon = \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > \varepsilon\}$. By Lemma 2.1, Ω_ε is a convex subdomain of Ω with $\mathbb{B}^n(\Omega_\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \subset \Omega$.

We zero extend ω outside Ω so that $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n)$, and select smooth approximations $\omega_j = \eta_j * \omega$ of ω , where the sequence of mollifying kernels $\eta_j \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, [0, \infty])$ is chosen so that $\text{spt } \eta_j \subset \mathbb{B}^n(0, \varepsilon)$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. In particular, by component-wise application of standard properties of convolution approximations, ω_j are smooth k -forms with $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|\omega_j - \omega\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 0$.

We fix an index j . By Proposition 4.5, we have that $\|d\omega_j\|_{L^p(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \lesssim_{n,p,k} [I_{d\omega_j|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}}]_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega_\varepsilon|R)}$. However, since Ω_ε is convex, the values of $I_{d\omega_j}$ in Ω_ε do not depend on how $d\omega_j$ is defined outside Ω_ε , and thus we in fact have $[I_{d\omega_j|_{\Omega_\varepsilon}}]_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega_\varepsilon|R)} = [I_{d\omega_j}]_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega_\varepsilon|R)}$. Moreover, since ω_j are smooth, we have by Lemma 5.1 that $dI_{\omega_j} = I_{d\omega_j}$ in all of \mathbb{R}^n . Lastly, by Lemma 5.3 and the condition $\text{spt } \eta_j \subset \mathbb{B}^n(0, \varepsilon)$, we know that $[dI_{\omega_j}]_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega_\varepsilon|R)} \leq [dI_\omega]_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega|R)}$. By chaining all of the above deductions together, we hence have the uniform upper bound

$$\|d\omega_j\|_{L^p(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \leq [dI_\omega]_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega|R)} < \infty$$

for all indices j .

Since $p > 1$, $L^p(\wedge^{k+1} T^* \Omega_\varepsilon)$ is reflexive, and thus balls in it are weakly compact by the Banach-Alaoglu theorem. Thus, by passing to a subsequence of ω_j , we may assume that there exists a $\tau \in L^p(\wedge^{k+1} T^* \Omega_\varepsilon)$ such that

$d\omega_j \rightharpoonup \tau$ weakly in $L^p(\wedge^{k+1}T^*\Omega_\varepsilon)$. However, now if $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\wedge^{n-k-1}T^*\Omega_\varepsilon)$ is a smooth test form, we can use the smoothness of ω_j to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \left(\tau \wedge \eta - (-1)^{k+1} \omega \wedge d\eta \right) \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \left((\tau - d\omega_j) \wedge \eta - (-1)^{k+1} (\omega - \omega_j) \wedge d\eta \right) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} d\omega_j \wedge \eta - \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \tau \wedge \eta \right| + \|d\eta\|_{L^{p/(p-1)}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|\omega - \omega_j\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $d\omega_j \rightharpoonup \tau$ weakly in $L^p(\wedge^{k+1}T^*\Omega_\varepsilon)$ and $\omega_j \rightarrow \omega$ strongly in $L^p(\wedge^kT^*\mathbb{R}^n)$, the right hand side of the above estimate tends to zero as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, τ is a weak exterior derivative of ω in Ω_ε , and hence $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^kT^*\Omega_\varepsilon)$.

We then apply the case that was proven at the beginning of the proof to obtain

$$(5.2) \quad \|d\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \lesssim_{n,k,p} [dI_\omega]_{L^pM^k(\Omega_\varepsilon|R)} \leq [dI_\omega]_{L^pM^k(\Omega|R)} < \infty,$$

where we again leverage the convexity of Ω_ε to avoid having to switch to a zero extension of ω in the first estimate. Finally we note that $\Omega = \bigcup_{\varepsilon>0} \Omega_\varepsilon$ by openness of Ω . Thus, $\omega \in W_{\text{loc}}^{d,p}(\wedge^kT^*\Omega)$, and by applying monotone convergence on (5.2), we conclude that $\|d\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim_{n,k,p} [dI_\omega]_{L^pM^k(\Omega|R)} < \infty$, completing the proof. \square

As before, due to (4.1), case 1 is an immediate corollary of Proposition 5.4 with $R = \text{diam } \Omega$.

Corollary 5.5. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded, convex domain, $p, \in (1, \infty)$, $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, and let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^kT^*\Omega)$, where we extend ω to $L^p(\wedge^kT^*\mathbb{R}^n)$ by setting $\omega = 0$ outside Ω . Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^kT^*\Omega)$;
- (ii) $\|dI_\omega\|_{L^pM^{k+1}(\Omega)} < \infty$;
- (iii) $[dI_\omega]_{L^pM^{k+1}(\Omega)} < \infty$.

Moreover, if $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^kT^*\Omega)$, then

$$[dI_\omega]_{L^pM^{k+1}(\Omega)} = \|dI_\omega\|_{L^pM^{k+1}(\Omega)} = K \| |\cdot|_{\mathbb{S},p} d\omega \|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

where $K = K(p, n, k)$ and $|\cdot|_{\mathbb{S},p}$ are as in Theorem 1.2.

We then prove the parts of Theorem 1.3 with non-convex Ω . We again start with the unbounded version.

Proposition 5.6. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, $R > 0$, $c \in (0, 1]$, $p, \in (1, \infty)$, $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, and let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^kT^*\Omega)$, where we extend ω to $L^p(\wedge^kT^*\mathbb{R}^n)$ by setting $\omega = 0$ outside Ω . Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^kT^*\Omega)$;
- (ii) $\|dI_\omega\|_{L^pM^{k+1,c}(\Omega|R)} < \infty$;
- (iii) $[dI_\omega]_{L^pM^{k+1,c}(\Omega|R)} < \infty$.

Moreover, if $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, then

$$[dI\omega]_{L^p M^{k+1,c}(\Omega|R)} = \|dI\omega\|_{L^p M^{k+1,c}(\Omega|R)} = K \| |d\omega|_{\mathbb{S},p} \|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

where $K = K(p, n, k)$ and $|\cdot|_{\mathbb{S},p}$ are as in Theorem 1.2.

Proof. We again trivially have that (ii) implies (iii). We start by showing that (iii) implies (i). Thus, suppose that $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ with $[dI\omega]_{L^p M^{k+1,c}(\Omega|R)} < \infty$. Let $x \in \Omega$, and let B be a ball of the form

$$B = \mathbb{B}^n(x, r), \quad \text{where } 0 < r < \min\left(\frac{c}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{R}{2}\right) \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega).$$

Note that since $c > 0$, we have $r \in (0, 1]$. Thus, B is a neighborhood of x , and $B \subset \Omega$.

We first claim that $B^{k+2} \subset \mathbb{B}(\Omega, k+1, R) \cap \Omega(k+1, c)$. For this, let $(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) \in B^{k+2}$. For every $i \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}$, we have

$$|x_0 - x_i| \leq |x_0 - x| + |x - x_i| < \min\left(R, \frac{c}{2} \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)\right).$$

In particular, $B^{k+2} \subset \mathbb{B}(\Omega, k+1, R)$. In addition to this, we have

$$\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega) \geq \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) - |x - x_0| > \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega).$$

Thus, $|x_0 - x_i| < c \text{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega)$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, completing the proof that $B^{k+2} \subset \mathbb{B}(\Omega, k+1, R) \cap \Omega(k+1, c)$.

Now, we have

$$\|dI\omega\|_{L^p M^{k+1}(B)} \leq \|dI\omega\|_{L^p M^{k+1,c}(\Omega|R)} < \infty.$$

Thus, by Corollary 5.5 and the convexity of B , we have $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* B_x)$. Since the sets B as above form an open cover of Ω , it follows that $\omega \in W_{\text{loc}}^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$.

Moreover, the sets B form a Vitali covering of Ω , and we may thus use the Vitali covering theorem to select a countable pairwise disjoint subcollection B_i that covers Ω up to a nullset. By Proposition 5.4, we conclude that

$$\|d\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p = \sum_i \|d\omega\|_{L^p(B_i)}^p \lesssim_{p,n,k} \sum_i [I_{d\omega}]_{L^p M^{k+1}(B_i)}^p$$

Now, since \liminf is superadditive, and since the balls B_i are disjoint, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i [I_{d\omega}]_{L^p M^{k+1}(B_i)}^p &\leq \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \sum_i \|I_{d\omega}\|_{L^p M^{k+1}(B_i, \theta)}^p \\ &= \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{\bigcup_i B_i^{k+2}} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |I_{d\omega}(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1})|^p}{(|x_1 - x_0| \cdots |x_{k+1} - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}} dx_0 \cdots dx_{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, since all B_i are convex subsets of Ω , Lemma 5.2 applies on $\bigcup_i B_i^{k+2}$. By combining this with the fact that $B_i^{k+2} \subset \mathbb{B}(\Omega, k+1, R) \cap \Omega(k+1, c)$ for

all i , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{\bigcup_i B_i^{k+2}} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |I_{d\omega}(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1})|^p}{(|x_1 - x_0| \cdots |x_{k+1} - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}} dx_0 \dots dx_{k+1} \\ &= \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{\bigcup_i B_i^{k+2}} \frac{(1-\theta)^k |dI_\omega(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1})|^p}{(|x_1 - x_0| \cdots |x_{k+1} - x_0|)^{n+\theta p}} dx_0 \dots dx_{k+1} \\ &\leq [dI_\omega]_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega|R)}^p < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $\|d\omega\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p < \infty$, completing the proof that (iii) implies (i).

It remains to prove that (i) implies (ii), along with the other claims at the end of the statement. Thus, suppose that $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$. Let $(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) \in \Omega(c, k)$. By the definition of $\Omega(c, k)$, all the coordinates x_i are contained in $\mathbb{B}^n(x_0, c \operatorname{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega))$. Since $\mathbb{B}^n(x_0, c \operatorname{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega))$ is convex, it follows that $\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) \subset \mathbb{B}^n(x_0, c \operatorname{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega))$. Moreover, since $c \leq 1$, we have $\mathbb{B}^n(x_0, c \operatorname{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega)) \subset \Omega$, and therefore $\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_{k+1}) \subset \Omega$.

Thus, Lemma 5.2 applies in all of $\Omega(c, k)$. We hence have $dI_\omega = I_{d\omega}$ a.e. in $\Omega(c, k)$, and thus also a.e. in $\mathbb{B}(\Omega, k+1, R) \cap \Omega(c, k)$. Now, it remains to apply Proposition 4.8, with which we obtain

$$\|dI_\omega\|_{L^p M^{k+1,c}(\Omega|R)} = \|I_{d\omega}\|_{L^p M^{k+1,c}(\Omega|R)} = K \| |d\omega|_{\mathbb{S},p} \|_{L^p(\Omega)} < \infty.$$

The same application of Lemma 5.2 and Proposition 4.8 also yields

$$[dI_\omega]_{L^p M^{k+1,c}(\Omega|R)} = [I_{d\omega}]_{L^p M^{k+1,c}(\Omega|R)} = K \| |d\omega|_{\mathbb{S},p} \|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

completing the proof. \square

We again get the last case of Theorem 1.3 as a trivial consequence of the previous proposition with $R = \operatorname{diam} \Omega$ and (4.2).

Proposition 5.7. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and bounded, $c \in (0, 1]$, $p \in (1, \infty)$, $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, and let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, where we extend ω to $L^p(\wedge^k T^* \mathbb{R}^n)$ by setting $\omega = 0$ outside Ω . Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$;
- (ii) $\|dI_\omega\|_{L^p M^{k+1,c}(\Omega)} < \infty$;
- (iii) $[dI_\omega]_{L^p M^{k+1,c}(\Omega)} < \infty$.

Moreover, if $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, then

$$[dI_\omega]_{L^p M^{k+1,c}(\Omega)} = \|dI_\omega\|_{L^p M^{k+1,c}(\Omega)} = K \| |d\omega|_{\mathbb{S},p} \|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

where $K = K(p, n, k)$ and $|\cdot|_{\mathbb{S},p}$ are as in Theorem 1.2.

Thus, by combining Propositions 5.4 and 5.6 with Corollaries 5.5 and 5.7, the proof of Theorem 1.3 is complete.

It remains to prove Theorem 1.4, which is a relatively straightforward corollary of the results shown so far. We first recall the statement for convenience of the reader.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain contained in an open ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, let $p \in (1, \infty)$, and let $\omega \in L^p(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ be a Borel measurable differential k -form. Then the following results hold.*

- (i) *If $[dI_\omega]_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega)} < \infty$, then we have $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$.*
- (ii) *If Ω is a weak $W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$ -extension domain and $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, then we have $\|dI_{\omega_{\text{ext}}}\|_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega)} < \infty$, where $\omega_{\text{ext}} \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* B)$ is a $W^{d,p}$ -extension of ω to B .*

Proof. For (i), if $[dI_\omega]_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega)}$ is finite, then we have

$$[dI_\omega]_{L^p M^{k+1,c}(\Omega)} \leq [dI_\omega]_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega)} < \infty.$$

Thus, the claim follows immediately from Theorem 1.3. For (ii), let $\omega \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* \Omega)$, and let $\omega_{\text{ext}} \in W^{d,p}(\wedge^k T^* B)$ be a $W^{d,p}$ -extension of ω . Since B is convex, we may thus use Theorem 1.2 and 1.3 to obtain that

$$\|dI_{\omega_{\text{ext}}}\|_{L^p M^{k+1}(\Omega)} \leq \|dI_{\omega_{\text{ext}}}\|_{L^p M^{k+1}(B)} \lesssim_{p,n,k} \|d\omega_{\text{ext}}\|_{L^p(B)} < \infty,$$

completing the proof of (ii). \square

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Ambrosio and B. Kirchheim. Currents in metric spaces. *Acta Math.*, 185:1–80, 2000.
- [2] L. Bartholdi, T. Schick, N. Smale, and S. Smale. Hodge theory on metric spaces. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 12:1–48, 2012.
- [3] V. Bogachev. *Measure theory*. Springer, 2007.
- [4] J. Bourgain, H. Brezis, and P. Mironescu. Another look at Sobolev spaces. In *Optimal control and partial differential equations*, pages 439–455. IOS, Amsterdam, 2001.
- [5] G. E. Bredon. *Sheaf theory*, volume 170. Springer Science & Business Media, 1997.
- [6] H. Brezis. How to recognize constant functions. A connection with Sobolev spaces. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 57(4):59–74, 2002. Translated in Russian Math. Surveys, 57(4) p. 693–708, 2002.
- [7] H. Brezis and H.-M. Nguyen. The BBM formula revisited. *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl.*, 27(4):515–533, 2016.
- [8] H. Brezis, A. Seeger, J. Van Schaftingen, and P.-L. Yung. Sobolev spaces revisited. *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl.*, 33(2):413–437, 2022.
- [9] H. Brezis, J. Van Schaftingen, and P.-L. Yung. A surprising formula for Sobolev norms. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 118(8), 2021.
- [10] S. Di Marino and M. Squassina. New characterizations of Sobolev metric spaces. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 276(6):1853–1874, 2019.
- [11] S. Donaldson and D. Sullivan. Quasiconformal 4-manifolds. *Acta Math.*, 163(1):181–252, 1989.
- [12] I. Drelichman and R. G. Durán. The Bourgain–Brezis–Mironescu formula in arbitrary bounded domains. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 150(2):701–708, 2022.
- [13] B. Fuglede. Extremal length and functional completion. *Acta math.*, 98:171–219, 1957.
- [14] N. Garofalo and G. Tralli. A Bourgain–Brezis–Mironescu–Dávila theorem in Carnot groups of step two. *Comm. Anal. Geom.*, 31(2):321–341, 2023.
- [15] N. Gigli and E. Pasqualetto. *Lectures on nonsmooth differential geometry*. Springer, 2020.
- [16] V. Gol’dshstein and M. Troyanov. Sobolev inequalities for differential forms and $l^{q,p}$ -cohomology. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 16(4):597–631, 2006.

- [17] W. Górny. Bourgain-Brezis-Mironescu approach in metric spaces with Euclidean tangents. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 32(4):Paper No. 128, 22, 2022.
- [18] M. Hinz and J. Kommer. A tensor product approach to non-local differential complexes. *Math. Ann.*, 389:2357–2409, 2023.
- [19] T. Iwaniec and A. Lutoborski. Integral estimates for null Lagrangians. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 125(1):25–79, 1993.
- [20] T. Iwaniec, C. Scott, and B. Stroffolini. Nonlinear Hodge theory on manifolds with boundary. *Ann. Mat. Pura. Appl. (4)*, 177(1):37–115, 1999.
- [21] I. Kangasniemi. Conformally formal manifolds and the uniformly quasiregular non-ellipticity of $(\mathbb{S}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^2) \# (\mathbb{S}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^2)$. *Adv. Math.*, 393, 2021.
- [22] I. Kangasniemi and J. Onninen. Fibers of monotone maps of finite distortion. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 32(12), 2022.
- [23] I. Kangasniemi and E. Prywes. On the moduli of Lipschitz homology classes. 2022. Pre-print, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.14517>.
- [24] P. Lahti, A. Pinamonti, and X. Zhou. A characterization of BV and Sobolev functions via nonlocal functionals in metric spaces. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 241:Paper No. 113467, 14, 2024.
- [25] G. Leoni and D. Spector. Characterization of Sobolev and *BV* spaces. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 261(10):2926–2958, 2011.
- [26] G. Leoni and D. Spector. Corrigendum to “Characterization of Sobolev and *BV* spaces”. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 266(2):1106–1114, 2014.
- [27] W. Massey. *Homology and cohomology theory: an approach based on Alexander-Spanier cochains*. M. Dekker, 1978.
- [28] K. Mohanta. Bourgain-Brezis-Mironescu formula for $W_q^{s,p}$ -spaces in arbitrary domains. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 63(2):Paper No. 31, 17, 2024.
- [29] V. Munier. Integral energy characterization of Hajlasz-Sobolev spaces. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 425(1):381–406, 2015.
- [30] H.-M. Nguyen. Γ -convergence, Sobolev norms, and BV functions. *Duke Math. J.*, 157(3):495–533, 2011.
- [31] A. Pinamonti, M. Squassina, and E. Vecchi. Magnetic BV-functions and the Bourgain-Brezis-Mironescu formula. *Adv. Calc. Var.*, 12(3):225–252, 2019.
- [32] A. C. Ponce. A new approach to Sobolev spaces and connections to Γ -convergence. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 19(3):229–255, 2004.
- [33] E. Spanier. *Algebraic topology*. Springer, 2012.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI, P.O. BOX 210025, CINCINNATI, OH 45221, USA

Email address: kangaski@ucmail.uc.edu