

OPTIMAL FUNCTION SPACES AND SOBOLEV EMBEDDINGS

DAVID KUBÍČEK

ABSTRACT. We establish equivalence between the boundedness of specific supremum operators and the optimality of function spaces in Sobolev embeddings acting on domains in ambient Euclidean space with a prescribed isoperimetric behavior. Our approach is based on exploiting known relations between higher-order Sobolev embeddings and isoperimetric inequalities. We provide an explicit way to compute both the optimal domain norm and the optimal target norm in a Sobolev embedding. Finally, we apply our results to higher-order Sobolev embeddings on John domains and on domains from the Maz'ya classes. Furthermore, our results are partially applicable to embeddings involving product probability spaces.

1. INTRODUCTION

Sobolev embeddings have been closely studied for several decades, ever since the period in which they were pioneered in the works of Sobolev [29], Gagliardo [11], and Nirenberg [24]. Parallel to this research, isoperimetric inequalities were explored by De Giorgi [9] and Federer and Fleming [10]. Some time later, Sobolev embeddings have been connected with isoperimetric inequalities in the works of Maz'ya [17, 18]. The study of the mentioned connection has been rapidly developing ever since, and in 2015 a comprehensive paper [7] presented a unified approach to the topic, and, moreover, a technique suitable for finding optimal target spaces in the Sobolev embeddings on fairly general underlying measure spaces.

Optimality of function spaces with respect to various classes of function spaces has been under scrutiny for a long time, and a wide variety of various points of view has been taken. This research is clearly motivated by the pure fact that one wants to have the results as sharp as possible in order to get strongest possible outcome in applications. On the other hand, the approach necessarily leads to interesting technical obstacles. For one thing, an optimal space does not have to exist. It has been noticed that when optimality is restricted to classes of spaces such as Lebesgue spaces, Lorentz spaces, Orlicz spaces, etc., then there is no guarantee that the optimal object will be found. On the other hand, the research in the last 25 years shows that when one settles for working in the (wider) environment of the so-called rearrangement-invariant spaces (called also symmetric spaces in some older literature), then it is almost certain that an optimal space (on either domain or target position) exists. This approach however brings new difficulties, the pivotal one being the fact that the optimal spaces are often described in a very implicit way, as they involve operations such as taking the associate space, or taking suprema over all equidistributed functions etc.

Consequently, a lot of effort has been spent on making the description of optimal function spaces as 'explicit' as possible. These activities paved way to discoveries of certain interesting phenomena such as, for instance, a surprising connection between optimality of function spaces, their interpolation properties, and boundedness of certain nonlinear operators. Applications of these advances to sharp Sobolev embeddings exist, but exclusively restricted to domains with a Lipschitz boundary. However, as is widely known, it is desirable to have Sobolev-type embeddings for domains with much 'worse' isoperimetric behavior such as domains with cusps, and also domains endowed with product probability measures whose typical example is the Gauss measure. These domains are typically characterized by their isoperimetric profile, or isoperimetric function, denoted I . Let us recall, for instance, that the best possible isoperimetric behavior occurs for John domains (whose subclass is that of Lipschitz domains) when $I(t) = t^{\frac{1}{n'}}$, where n is the dimension and n' is the conjugate index, while the domains with power cusps have $I(t) = t^\alpha$ with $\alpha < \frac{1}{n'}$, and the Gauss measure leads to $I(t) \approx t\sqrt{\log \frac{1}{t}}$ near zero.

The aim of this paper is to obtain explicit description of optimal rearrangement-invariant partner spaces in Sobolev embeddings acting on domains with a general isoperimetric profile. We will achieve this by combining the ideas concerning optimality of spaces for integral operators with the approach to Sobolev embeddings via the isoperimetric profile of an underlying domain. We begin by carefully constructing relevant nonlinear operators and prove their connection to the question of optimality of function spaces. More precisely, we shall exploit the equivalence of Sobolev embeddings and isoperimetric inequalities in order to connect Sobolev embeddings on a domain having the isoperimetric profile I with boundedness of two supremum operators, S_I and T_I , defined as

$$S_I f(t) = \frac{1}{I(t)} \sup_{0 < s \leq t} I(s) f^*(s) \quad \text{and} \quad T_I f(t) = \frac{I(t)}{t} \sup_{t \leq s < 1} \frac{s}{I(s)} f^*(s)$$

for $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ and $t \in (0, 1)$, in a manner similar to that in [14] and [15]. We will prove in particular that the boundedness of S_I is related to the optimality of domain spaces, and T_I corresponds to that of target spaces. Boundedness of operators similar to T_I and S_I was previously studied for example in [13], but only for the case when I is a power. There, the operators were considered in the context of Orlicz L_A and Gamma $\Gamma_{p,\phi}$. Hence, once the equivalence between the optimality of spaces and boundedness of T_I and S_I is established, it will enable us to recover and considerably extend these results.

The fair isoperimetric generality will bring some unavoidable restrictions on the function I . The main setting in the paper will be that I is a quasiconcave function as this allows us to work with both operators S_I and T_I the way we need. There are two main conditions concerning I appearing throughout the paper. The first one reads as

$$(1.1) \quad \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} ds \lesssim I(t), \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

We will see that, for example, the isoperimetric functions of product probability spaces do have this property. This condition allows us to state our first principal result. Given a rearrangement-invariant domain space X , we denote by Y_X the smallest rearrangement-invariant target space in the relevant Sobolev embedding. We similarly denote by X_Y the largest rearrangement-invariant domain space when the target space Y is fixed. Detailed definitions are given below.

Theorem 1.1. *Let I be a quasiconcave function satisfying (1.1) and let X be an r.i. space. Then*

$$\|f\|_{Y_X} \approx \sup_{\|S_I g\|_{X'} \leq 1} \int_0^1 -I(t) g^*(t) df^*(t) + \|f\|_1, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Furthermore, using this condition we show the boundedness of the operator T_I on the associate spaces of the optimal target spaces. However, in order to prove an analogous result for the operator S_I , we further require a condition similar to (1.1),

$$(1.2) \quad \int_0^t \frac{ds}{I(s)} \lesssim \frac{t}{I(t)}, \quad t \in (0, 1),$$

which we will refer to as the *average property* of I . It is easy to see that this condition enforces integrability of $\frac{1}{I}$ and is thus more restraining than (1.1) in this way.

The main theorem of the paper connects the boundedness of supremum operators and optimality of spaces with respect to the operator H_I , which is defined as

$$H_I f(t) = \int_t^1 \frac{f(s)}{I(s)} ds$$

for $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ and $t \in (0, 1)$. In this theorem, however, we will need a few more technical assumptions. In particular, we will require I belong to a certain class, denoted \mathcal{Q} , which will be defined below. Then, the second main result reads as

Theorem 1.2. *Let $I \in \mathcal{Q}$. Then an r.i. space X is the optimal domain space under the map H_I for some r.i. space Y if and only if S_I is bounded on X' . In that case,*

$$(1.3) \quad \|f\|_{Y_X} \approx \left\| \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) \right\|_X + \|f\|_1, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Vice versa, an r.i. space Y is the optimal target space under the map H_I for some r.i. space X if and only if T_I is bounded on Y' . In that case,

$$(1.4) \quad \|f\|_{X_Y} \approx \left\| \int_t^1 \frac{f^*(s)}{I(s)} ds \right\|_Y, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

The principal achievement of Theorem 1.2 is the explicitness of formulae for norms governing the optimal spaces. This fact becomes particularly useful in applications when particular function spaces are in question and their optimal partner spaces are to be nailed down.

Let us recall that the quantity $f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)$, which appears in (1.3), is known to measure, in a certain sense, the symmetrized oscillation of a function. It has been regularly surfacing in various parts of analysis since early 1980's when it was first used in order to introduce the weak version of L^∞ and some other related function classes in [2]. The importance of this quantity partly follows from the classical inequality

$$f^{**}(t) - f^*(t) \lesssim (\nabla f)^{**}(t) t^{\frac{1}{n}},$$

which holds, with a dimensional constant, for every smooth function f with compact support on \mathbb{R}^n and every positive t . The same quantity was utilized several times in various contexts, for example in order to obtain a sharper form of a Sobolev embedding in [1], see also [22, 26, 16], and it is of importance in the theory of classical Lorentz spaces and their applications, see [6, 4]. Its indispensability was beautifully explained by Sinnamon in [28, Section 3.5]. On the other hand, one has to be careful when working with it since it does not possess any reasonable general monotonicity property, and structures built upon it are notoriously known to lack linearity and normability.

Utilizing Theorem 1.2, we prove the intimate relation between Sobolev embeddings and the action of supremum operators for Maz'ya class of domains \mathcal{J}_α for $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{n'}, 1)$. This will be done in the last section of the paper. However, if one can prove the equivalence of the Sobolev embeddings and isoperimetric inequalities for a function I of one's choice satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1.2, one then gets the mentioned equivalence even on domains with isoperimetric profile of I . In our case, we use the equivalence of Sobolev embeddings and the isoperimetric inequalities for the domains from the Maz'ya class \mathcal{J}_α , $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{n'}, 1)$. In particular, we recover the result for Lipschitz or, more generally, John domains from [15].

As the results rely on the boundedness of the Hardy-type operator $f \mapsto \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f(s) ds$, they are not generally applicable to \mathcal{J}_1 , as the function $\frac{1}{t}$ is not integrable near zero. We will see that the norm of the optimal target space cannot be expressed as in (1.3) for certain functions $I \in \mathcal{J}_1$.

The paper is organised as follows. The second and preliminary section covers background results and is divided into four subsections. First we recall the notion of the nonincreasing rearrangement and so-called rearrangement-invariant Banach function spaces, which will form our main framework. It will, however, be necessary to delve a bit deeper and work with quasi-Banach function spaces, such as the weak Lebesgue space $L^{1,\infty}$. In the second subsection we introduce a few properties of functions and name typical examples of functions possessing them. The third subsection covers Sobolev spaces built upon rearrangement-invariant spaces and their connection to isoperimetric inequalities. The fourth subsection is devoted to the interpolation theory and, in particular, to the theory of the K -functional.

In the third section we study the basic properties of the supremum operators S_I and T_I and. Here, we will start with a very general function I , requiring it only to be nondecreasing, and we will demand certain other properties as we work through the section. It is mainly due to the operator S_I , and the relevant Marcinkiewicz type space m_I , that we are forced to work with quasi-Banach function spaces. However, the condition (1.2) characterizes when the m_I is in fact a Banach space, and implies subadditivity of S_I . The end of the section

then calls into play the condition (1.1) and we show its equivalence to two other statements which will play a crucial role in the main, fourth section.

The fourth section finally connects optimal spaces with the boundedness of supremum operators. In its first subsection we present an alternative description of the associate optimal norm via a functional which admits boundedness of the operator S_I . This is in turn used to describe the optimal target norm. Starting with the second subsection, we find an alternative description of the optimal target norm under the assumption of boundedness $f \mapsto \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f(s) ds$. The culmination of the section is then the third subsection which establishes equivalence between optimal spaces and boundedness of T_I or S_I on their associate spaces.

The fifth section connects the results we obtained in the previous sections with Sobolev embeddings. We show that the product probability spaces satisfy the main condition (1.1). We then use Theorem 1.2 to demonstrate a few examples both on the domain part and the space part.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout the paper, we write $A \lesssim B$ if A is dominated by a constant multiple of B , independent of all quantities involved; these quantities will usually be evident from the context. By $A \approx B$ we mean that both $A \lesssim B$ and $A \gtrsim B$.

2.1. Rearrangement invariant spaces. In this section we recall some basics from the theory of rearrangement invariant spaces. Proofs and more details can be found in first two chapters of [3].

Let (Ω, μ) be a nonatomic σ -finite measure space. We set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(\Omega, \mu) &= \{f: \Omega \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]: f \text{ is } \mu\text{-measurable in } \Omega\}, \\ \mathcal{M}_+(\Omega, \mu) &= \{f \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega, \mu): f \geq 0\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{M}_0(\Omega, \mu) = \{f \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega, \mu): f \text{ is finite } \mu\text{-a.e. in } \Omega\}.$$

We will often, for brevity, write only $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ if there is no risk of confusion, and similarly for the other two sets. When $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}$ is measurable, unless stated otherwise, we will consider the Lebesgue measure which we will be denoted by λ . When considering a unit interval $(0, 1)$, which will be of particular interest to us, we will simply write $\mathcal{M}(0, 1)$.

Given $f \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$, we define its *nonincreasing rearrangement*, denoted f^* , by

$$f^*(t) = \inf\{\lambda \geq 0: \mu(\{|f| > \lambda\}) \leq t\}, \quad t \in [0, \infty).$$

The nonincreasing rearrangement is monotone i.e.

$$|f| \leq |g| \quad \mu\text{-a.e. implies } f^* \leq g^*.$$

The nonincreasing rearrangement satisfies *Hardy-Littlewood inequality*

$$(2.1) \quad \int_{\Omega} |f(x)g(x)| d\mu(x) \leq \int_0^{\infty} f^*(t)g^*(t) dt, \quad f, g \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega).$$

The operation $f \mapsto f^*$ is not subadditive and only satisfies the weaker condition

$$(2.2) \quad (f + g)^*(t_1 + t_2) \leq f^*(t_1) + g^*(t_2), \quad t_1, t_2 > 0.$$

It turns out that passing to the so called *maximal nonincreasing rearrangement*, defined by

$$f^{**}(t) = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f^*(s) ds, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega), t \in (0, \infty),$$

we gain subadditivity. To be precise, it holds that $(f + g)^{**} \leq f^{**} + g^{**}$ for $f, g \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$. The maximal nonincreasing rearrangement is also nonincreasing and we have $f^* \leq f^{**}$.

Having defined the nonincreasing rearrangement, we are ready to define the notion of a rearrangement-invariant (r.i.) Banach function norm.

Definition 2.1. A mapping $\rho: \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is called *rearrangement invariant Banach function norm*, or r.i. norm for short, if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (P1) $\rho(f) = 0 \iff f = 0$ a.e.,
 $\rho(af) = a\rho(f)$, $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1), a \geq 0$,
 $\rho(f + g) \leq \rho(f) + \rho(g)$, $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$,
- (P2) $f \leq g$ a.e. $\implies \rho(f) \leq \rho(g)$, $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$,
- (P3) $f_n \nearrow f$ a.e. $\implies \rho(f_n) \nearrow \rho(f)$, $f, f_n \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1), n \in \mathbb{N}$,
- (P4) $\rho(\chi_{(0,1)}) < \infty$,
- (P5) $\int_0^1 f(t) dt \lesssim \rho(f)$, $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$,
- (P6) $\rho(f) = \rho(f^*)$, $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$.

Sometimes we will work with a functional which is not a norm, but still satisfies rearrangement invariance – so-called r.i. quasinorm.

Definition 2.2. A mapping $\rho: \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is called *rearrangement-invariant quasi-Banach function norm*, or r.i.q. norm for short, if it satisfies conditions (P2), (P3), (P4), (P6) and

- (Q1) $\rho(f) = 0 \iff f = 0$ a.e.,
 $\rho(af) = a\rho(f)$, $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1), a \geq 0$,
 $\exists C \geq 1 \rho(f + g) \leq C\rho(f) + \rho(g)$, $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$.

When ρ is an r.i.q. norm, we define its *associate functional*, ρ' , by

$$\rho'(f) = \sup_{\rho(g) \leq 1} \int_0^1 f(t)g(t) dt, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

An immediate consequence of the definition of the associate functional is *Hölder's inequality*

$$\int_0^1 f(t)g(t) dt \leq \rho(f)\rho'(g), \quad f, g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1),$$

under the convention $0 \cdot \infty = 0$ on the right-hand side.

When ρ is an r.i. norm, its associate norm ρ' is an r.i. norm as well and obeys the *principle of duality*, that is,

$$\rho'' := (\rho')' = \rho.$$

Given $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$, *Hardy's lemma* asserts that

$$(2.3) \quad f^{**}(t) \leq g^{**}(t), \quad t \in (0, 1) \implies \int_0^1 f^*(t)h(t) dt \leq \int_0^1 g^*(t)h(t) dt$$

for every $h \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ nonincreasing. An important consequence of Hardy's lemma and the principle of duality is the *Hardy-Littlewood-Pólya (HLP) principle*, which reads as follows:

$$(2.4) \quad f^{**}(t) \leq g^{**}(t), \quad t \in (0, 1) \implies \rho(f) \leq \rho(g)$$

whenever ρ is an r.i. norm.

For an r.i.q. norm ρ we further define $X = X(\rho)$ as a collection of all $f \in \mathcal{M}(0, 1)$ such that $\rho(|f|) < \infty$. Equipping X with a quasinorm defined by $\|f\|_X := \rho(|f|)$ for $f \in X$, we immediately see that $X = (X, \|\cdot\|_X)$ is a quasinormed linear space. By [23, Corollary 3.8], $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$ is a complete metric space, and spaces defined in this manner are called *rearrangement-invariant quasi-Banach function spaces* or, as we will often say for brevity, *r.i.q. spaces*. If ρ is in fact an r.i. norm, the space $X = X(\rho)$ is called *rearrangement-invariant Banach function space* or briefly r.i. space. By X' we denote the space corresponding to ρ' and call it the *associate space* of X .

By X_b we denote the closure of simple functions in the space X .

The *fundamental function* corresponding to an r.i.q. space X , φ_X , is defined by

$$\varphi_X(t) = \|\chi_{(0,t)}\|_X, \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

The fundamental function of r.i. space X satisfies

$$\varphi_X(t) \cdot \varphi_{X'}(t) = t, \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

A consequence to this is that if X is an r.i. space, then φ_X is a *quasiconcave* function, that is

$$t \mapsto \varphi_X(t) \text{ is nondecreasing,} \quad t \mapsto \frac{\varphi_X(t)}{t} \text{ is nonincreasing}$$

and $\varphi_X(t) = 0 \iff t = 0$.

Whenever φ is a quasiconcave function, there exists its *least concave majorant*, say $\tilde{\varphi}$, which satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2}\tilde{\varphi}(t) \leq \varphi(t) \leq \tilde{\varphi}(t), \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

Furthermore, every r.i. space X can be equivalently renormed so that φ_X is a concave function – we will from now on assume that every r.i. space has been renormed in this fashion.

Let now X and Y be two r.i.q. spaces. We write $X \subset Y$ if $f \in X \Rightarrow f \in Y$. When T is an operator on $\mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$, we say that T is *bounded* from X to Y if

$$\|Tf\|_Y \lesssim \|f\|_X, \quad f \in X,$$

and denote this fact by $T: X \rightarrow Y$. If $X = Y$, we say that T is bounded on X . In the particular case when $T = Id$, an inclusion operator, we have [23, Corollary 3.10]

$$X \subset Y \iff Id: X \rightarrow Y.$$

In other words, inclusions between r.i.q. spaces are always continuous. The fact that $Id: X \rightarrow Y$ will be denoted as $X \hookrightarrow Y$.

We say that an operator T' on $\mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ is an *associate operator* of T if

$$\int_0^1 (Tf)(t)g(t) dt = \int_0^1 f(t)(T'g)(t) dt, \quad f, g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

For two r.i. spaces X and Y one sees that

$$(2.5) \quad T: X \rightarrow Y \iff T': Y' \rightarrow X'$$

and $\|T\| = \|T'\|$.

For $s > 0$ the dilation operator E_s defined for $f \in \mathcal{M}(0, 1)$ by

$$(E_s f)(t) = f\left(\frac{t}{s}\right) \chi_{(0, \min\{s, 1\})}(t) \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

It is proved in [3, Chapter 3, Proposition 5.11] for r.i. spaces and, more generally, in [23, Theorem 3.23] for r.i.q. spaces, that E_s is bounded on every r.i.q. space.

Definition 2.3. Let T be an operator on $\mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ and X and Y be r.i. spaces. We say that Y is an *optimal target space* for X under the mapping T , if $T: X \rightarrow Y$ and for every r.i. space Z the following implication holds:

$$T: X \rightarrow Z \implies Y \hookrightarrow Z.$$

Vice versa, we say that X is an *optimal domain space* for Y under the mapping T , if $T: X \rightarrow Y$ and for every r.i. space Z the following implication holds:

$$T: Z \rightarrow Y \implies Z \hookrightarrow X.$$

In the main section we will use the *level function* which is closely related to the nonincreasing rearrangement.

Definition 2.4. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$. Then the level function of f , denoted f° , is the derivative of the least concave majorant of $t \mapsto \int_0^t f(s) ds, t \in (0, 1)$.

Take note that, as f^* is nonincreasing, $t \mapsto \int_0^t f^*(s) ds$ is a concave function, and so

$$(2.6) \quad \int_0^t f^\circ(s) ds \leq \int_0^t f^*(s) ds, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1), t \in (0, 1).$$

G. Sinnamon proved in [27, Corollary 2.4] that

$$(2.7) \quad \|f^\circ\|_{X'} = \|f\|_{X'_d}, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Here, $\|\cdot\|_{X'_d}$ refers to the *down dual associate norm* of an r.i. space X , which is defined by

$$\|f\|_{X'_d} = \sup_{\|g\|_X \leq 1} \int_0^1 f(t)g^*(t) dt, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Evidently $\|f\|_{X'_d} \leq \|f\|_{X'}$ for every $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$. Observe, however, that $\|f\|_{X'_d} = \|f\|_{X'}$ whenever f is nonincreasing.

Classical examples of r.i. spaces would be *Lebesgue* $L^p(0, 1)$ spaces, where $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, whose norm is defined by

$$(2.8) \quad \|f\|_p = \left(\int_0^1 |f(t)|^p dt \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

if $1 \leq p < \infty$ and

$$\|f\|_\infty = \text{ess sup } |f|.$$

We use the convention that $\frac{1}{\infty} = 0 \cdot \infty = 0$. Defining $p' = \frac{p}{p-1}$ for $p \in [1, \infty]$, one has $(L^p)' = L^{p'}$.

Classical examples of r.i.q. spaces, which are not normed nor embedded in L^1 , are Lebesgue's L^p spaces with $p \in (0, 1)$, whose quasinorm is defined as in (2.8), or the weak Lebesgue space $L^{1,\infty}$ with a quasinorm defined as

$$\|f\|_{1,\infty} = \sup_{0 < t < 1} t f^*(t).$$

There is the largest and the smallest r.i. space. To be precise, it holds true that

$$L^\infty \hookrightarrow X \hookrightarrow L^1$$

for every r.i. space X .

One possible generalization of Lebesgue spaces, which we will be particularly interested in, are *Lorentz-Zygmund spaces*. Let $p, q \in [1, \infty]$ and $\beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. The Lorentz-Zygmund spaces $L^{p,q,\beta,\gamma}$ are defined by the functional

$$\|f\|_{p,q,\beta,\gamma} = \left\| t^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}} \ell_1^\beta(t) \ell_2^\gamma(t) f^*(t) \right\|_q, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Here, $\ell_1(t) = 1 + |\log(t)|$ and $\ell_2(t) = 1 + \log \ell_1(t)$. When $\gamma = 0$, we write $L^{p,q,\beta}$ and if $\beta = \gamma = 0$, we simply write $L^{p,q}$. It is known the functional $\|\cdot\|_{p,q,\beta}$ is equivalent to an r.i. norm if and only if $p = q = 1, \beta \geq 0$, or if $p \in (1, \infty), q \in [1, \infty], \beta + \frac{1}{q} < 0$, or if $p = q = \infty, \beta \leq 0$. We will, when working with these spaces, assume that the parameters satisfy one of the mentioned conditions.

Let us finally define the function spaces which will be used abundantly throughout the paper.

Definition 2.5. Let $I: (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, 1)$ be a nondecreasing function. We introduce two functionals defined on $\mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ with values in $[0, \infty]$ by

$$\|f\|_{m_I} := \sup_{0 < t < 1} I(s) f^*(s),$$

$$\|f\|_{\Lambda_I} := \int_0^1 \frac{I(s)}{s} f^*(s) ds.$$

We further denote $m_I := \{f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1): \|f\|_{m_I} < \infty\}$. Analogously we define the space Λ_I .

To simplify notation, by the symbol \tilde{I} we mean a function $\tilde{I}(t) = \frac{t}{I(t)}, t \in (0, 1)$.

2.2. Properties of isoperimetric functions. In this subsection we list some properties of functions, which we will use throughout the paper. For the remainder of the subsection fix $I: (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, 1)$ nondecreasing.

Definition 2.6. We say that I satisfies Δ_2 condition if

$$I(2t) \approx I(t), \quad t \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right),$$

and denote this fact as $I \in \Delta_2$.

Let us now discuss the average property (1.2). First observe that, as I is nondecreasing, the average property implies that the function I is equivalent to a quasiconcave function. Classical examples of functions satisfying the average property are the polynomials $t \mapsto t^\alpha$, $t \in (0, 1)$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Functions which do not possess this property include for example $t \mapsto t$ or $t \mapsto t\sqrt{\log \frac{2}{t}}$ for $t \in (0, 1)$ or any function I such that $\frac{1}{I}$ is not integrable near zero for that matter.

We leave the discussion concerning (1.1) to the fifth section where we present examples of functions satisfying this property.

In the fourth section we will use the following condition

$$(2.9) \quad \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^2} ds \lesssim \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} ds, \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

Note that if I is additionally quasiconcave and satisfies (1.1), condition (2.9) is equivalent to

$$\int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^2} ds \lesssim \frac{I(t)}{t}, \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

The classical examples of a function satisfying (2.9) are $I(t) = t^\alpha$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Functions which do not satisfy this condition include $I(t) = t \log^\alpha \frac{2}{t}$, $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. The condition (2.9) will become particularly handy in connection with boundedness of the maximal nonincreasing rearrangement on suitable function spaces.

The next definition specifies a certain class of quasiconcave functions that will be of use to us in the second part of the fourth section.

Definition 2.7 (Class \mathcal{Q}). Let $I: (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, 1)$ be a quasiconcave bijection. Let

$$(2.10) \quad c = \sup \left\{ \lambda \geq 0 : \lambda \left(\frac{I(t)}{t^2} - 1 \right) \leq \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^3} ds \quad \text{for every } t \in (0, 1) \right\}.$$

We say that $I \in \mathcal{Q}$ if I satisfies (1.1), (1.2), (2.9) and $(1 - c)d \leq c$, where d denotes the smallest positive number such that

$$\int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^2} ds \leq d \frac{I(t)}{t} \quad \text{for every } t \in (0, 1).$$

Remark 2.8. It can be shown that for the constant c from (2.10) we have $c \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. This can be seen by showing that the function

$$F(t) = \frac{I(t)}{t^2} - 1 - \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^3} ds, \quad t \in (0, 1],$$

is nonincreasing and using the fact that if a quasiconcave function is continuous at zero, then it is absolutely continuous and $I'(t) \leq \frac{I(t)}{t}$ at points at which the derivative exists.

The examples of a functions which belong to class \mathcal{Q} are $I(t) = t^\alpha$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

2.3. Sobolev spaces over r.i. spaces and isoperimetric function. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain, that is, a connected open set. We equip Ω with a finite measure μ which is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure with density ω . More precisely,

$$d\mu(x) = \omega(x)dx,$$

where ω is a Borel measurable function satisfying $\omega(x) > 0$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$. Thus, the measure of an arbitrary measurable set $E \subset \Omega$ is given by

$$\mu(E) = \int_E \omega(x)dx.$$

Throughout the paper we will assume, for simplicity, that μ is normalized in such a way that $\mu(\Omega) = 1$. We now recall the definition of the perimeter of a set with respect to our space (Ω, μ) and the isoperimetric function.

Definition 2.9. Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be measurable. We define the *perimeter* of E in (Ω, μ) by

$$P_\mu(E, \Omega) = \int_{\Omega \cap \partial^M E} \omega(x) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x).$$

Here, \mathcal{H}^{n-1} stands for the $n - 1$ dimensional Hausdorff measure on \mathbb{R}^n and $\partial^M E$ denotes the essential boundary of E in the sense of the geometric measure theory [19, 31].

Definition 2.10. The *isoperimetric function* of (Ω, μ) is a mapping $I_{\Omega, \mu}: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ defined by

$$I_{\Omega, \mu}(t) = \inf \left\{ P_\mu(E, \Omega) : E \subset \Omega, t \leq \mu(E) \leq \frac{1}{2} \right\} \quad \text{for } t \in \left[0, \frac{1}{2} \right]$$

and $I_{\Omega, \mu}(t) = I_{\Omega, \mu}(1 - t)$ for $t \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$.

An easy consequence of this definition is the *isoperimetric inequality*

$$I_{\Omega, \mu}(\mu(E)) \leq P_\mu(E, \Omega), \quad E \subset \Omega \text{ is measurable.}$$

It is evident from the definition that $I_{\Omega, \mu}$ is a nondecreasing function on $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Further, by [7, Proposition 4.1], we know that $I_{\Omega, \mu}(t) \lesssim t^{\frac{1}{n}}$ for t sufficiently small.

Given an r.i. space X , we define $X(\Omega) = X(\Omega, \mu)$ as the collection of all $u \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ such that

$$\|u\|_{X(\Omega)} := \|u^*\|_X$$

is finite. The functional $\|\cdot\|_{X(\Omega)}$ defines a norm on $X(\Omega)$. The space $X(\Omega)$ endowed with this norm is also called rearrangement-invariant space, and the space X is called its *representation space*.

The space $X'(\Omega)$ is then defined analogously via $\|\cdot\|_{X'}$.

Throughout the paper we will, for the most part, not distinguish between $X(\Omega)$ and its representation space, as it will be evident whether we work in $X(\Omega)$ or in X .

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $X(\Omega, \mu)$ be an r.i. space. We define the *m-th order Sobolev space* $V^m X(\Omega, \mu)$ as

$$V^m X(\Omega, \mu) = \{u : u \text{ is } m\text{-times weakly differentiable in } \Omega \\ \text{and } |\nabla^m u| \in X(\Omega, \mu)\}.$$

The results of [7] do not require one to work exactly with $I_{\Omega, \mu}$. It suffices to have a lower bound in terms of a nondecreasing function. To be precise, we work with a nondecreasing function $I: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfying $I_{\Omega, \mu}(t) \geq cI(ct)$, $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ for some $c > 0$. In view of [7, Proposition 4.2], it is natural to assume that $I(t) \gtrsim t$, $t \in (0, 1)$, as this guarantees that $V^1 L^1(\Omega) \subset L^1(\Omega)$ and, consequently, that $V^1 X(\Omega) \subset L^1(\Omega)$ for every r.i. space X .

We continue by introducing a pair of integral operators, R_I and H_I , on $\mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ which are defined by

$$R_I f(t) = \frac{1}{I(t)} \int_0^t f(s) ds, \quad t \in (0, 1),$$

and

$$H_I f(t) = \int_t^1 \frac{f(s)}{I(s)} ds, \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

Further, for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we set

$$R_I^m = \underbrace{R_I \circ \dots \circ R_I}_{m\text{-times}} \quad \text{and} \quad H_I^m = \underbrace{H_I \circ \dots \circ H_I}_{m\text{-times}}.$$

Using Fubini's theorem we see that R_I and H_I are mutually associate. Hence, R_I^m and H_I^m are also mutually associate for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

The operator G_I is then defined by

$$G_I f(t) = \sup_{t \leq s < 1} R_I f^*(s), \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1), t \in (0, 1).$$

Therefore, for every $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$, $G_I f$ is a nonincreasing function and $R_I f \leq R_I f^* \leq G_I f$ and so $(R_I f)^* \leq G_I f$.

It holds true that

$$(2.11) \quad \|G_I f\|_X \approx \|R_I f^*\|_X, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1),$$

whenever X is an r.i. space [7, Theorem 9.5].

Unless stated otherwise, by Y_X we will mean the optimal target space of X under the mapping H_I , and by X_Y we mean the optimal domain space of Y under the mapping H_I (if it exists). By the symbol Y'_X we understand $(Y_X)'$ and the symbol Y_{X_Z} stands for $Y_{(X_Z)}$.

The existence of the optimal target space Y_X is justified in [7, Proposition 8.3]. We will leave the question of the optimal domains to the beginning of the Section 4.

2.4. Interpolation theory.

Definition 2.11. Let X_0 and X_1 be quasi-Banach spaces. We say that (X_0, X_1) is a *compatible couple* of quasi-Banach spaces if there exists a Hausdorff topological vector space H such that $X_0 \hookrightarrow H$ and $X_1 \hookrightarrow H$.

We now recall few results from the interpolation theory that we will need at some proofs. Let us note that these theorems are stated in [3, Chapter 5] in the context of Banach spaces. However, it is not hard to see that extending the results together with relevant definitions over quasi-Banach spaces does not create any problems and their proofs would only need minor, if any, modifications. Let us also note that by [23, Theorem 3.4] for every r.i.q. space X we have $X \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_0$, where \mathcal{M}_0 is equipped with the (metrizable) topology of convergence in measure on the sets of finite measure. Consequently, any two r.i.q. spaces form a compatible couple.

Definition 2.12. Let (X_0, X_1) be a compatible couple of quasi-Banach spaces. We define the K -functional on $X_0 + X_1$ by

$$K(f, t, X_0, X_1) = \inf\{\|g\|_{X_0} + t\|h\|_{X_1} : f = g + h, g \in X_0, h \in X_1\}, \quad t \in (0, \infty).$$

The next theorem will be of use to us, especially when combined with Theorem 2.14.

Theorem 2.13. Let (X_0, X_1) be a compatible couple of quasi-Banach spaces. Then for every $f \in X_0 + X_1$ the map $t \mapsto K(f, t, X_0, X_1)$ is nonnegative, nondecreasing and concave on $(0, \infty)$. Consequently,

$$(2.12) \quad K(f, t, X_0, X_1) = K(f, 0+, X_0, X_1) + \int_0^t k(f, s, X_0, X_1) ds,$$

where $t \mapsto k(f, t, X_0, X_1)$ is the uniquely determined nonincreasing and right-continuous function.

Following characterization states when the first term of the righthand side of (2.12) can be omitted. Note that since the spaces involved need not be normed, one should be familiar with a *generalised Riesz–Fischer theorem* [23, Theorem 3.3].

Theorem 2.14. *Let (X_0, X_1) be a compatible couple of quasi-Banach spaces. Then*

$$K(f, 0+, X_0, X_1) = 0, \quad f \in X_0 + X_1$$

if and only if $X_0 \cap X_1$ is dense in X_0 .

Theorem 2.15. *Let (X_0, X_1) and (Y_0, Y_1) be two compatible couples of quasi-Banach spaces. Let T be a sublinear operator such that*

$$T: X_0 \rightarrow Y_0 \quad \text{and} \quad T: X_1 \rightarrow Y_1.$$

Then there is $c > 0$ such that

$$K(Tf, t, Y_0, Y_1) \lesssim K(f, ct, X_0, X_1), \quad f \in X_0 + X_1, t > 0.$$

In many theorems, we will use a certain elementary decomposition of f , to which we will refer as the *optimal decomposition*.

Definition 2.16 (optimal decomposition). Let $f \in \mathcal{M}(0, 1)$ and $t \in (0, 1)$ be given. We define the optimal decomposition of f at point t by

$$f_0(s) = \min\{|f(s)|, f^*(t)\} \operatorname{sgn} f(s),$$

and

$$f_1(s) = \max\{|f(s)| - f^*(t), 0\} \operatorname{sgn} f(s).$$

Then $f = f_0 + f_1$ and it further satisfies

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} f_0^*(s) &= \min\{f^*(s), f^*(t)\}, \\ f_1^*(s) &= (f^*(s) - f^*(t))\chi_{(0,t)}(s), \end{aligned}$$

and $f^* = f_0^* + f_1^*$.

Definition 2.17. Let X_0, X_1 and X be quasi-Banach spaces which all embed to a Hausdorff topological vector space \mathcal{H} and satisfy $X_0 \subset X \subset X_1$. We say that X is an *interpolation space* between X_0 and X_1 , the fact being denoted $X \in \operatorname{Int}(X_0, X_1)$, if for any linear operator T the following holds:

$$T: X_0 \rightarrow X_0 \quad \text{and} \quad T: X_1 \rightarrow X_1 \quad \implies \quad T: X \rightarrow X.$$

The next theorem appears to be indispensable in the proof of Theorem 4.5 and follows from [3, Chapter 5, Theorem 1.19].

Theorem 2.18. *Let (X_0, X_1) and (Y_0, Y_1) be two compatible couples of quasi-Banach spaces and λ be an r.i. norm. Suppose $X_0 \cap X_1$ is dense in X_0 and that $Y_0 \cap Y_1$ is dense in Y_0 . Set $\alpha(f) = \lambda(k(f, t, X_0, X_1))$ and $\beta(f) = \lambda(k(f, t, Y_0, Y_1))$ for $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$. Then for any linear operator T satisfying*

$$T: X_0 \rightarrow Y_0 \quad \text{and} \quad T: X_1 \rightarrow Y_1,$$

we have

$$\beta(Tf) \lesssim \alpha(f), \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Remark 2.19. It is important that the functional λ in the theorem above is an r.i. norm, so that we have the HLP principle at our disposal.

3. OPERATORS INVOLVING SUPREMA

In this section we introduce two operators involving suprema, S_I and T_I , and explore their boundedness and interpolation properties. These operators will be defined in terms of a nondecreasing function $I: (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, 1)$. Most theorems concerning operator S_I in this section will work in a very general setting, essentially requiring only Δ_2 condition. This condition guarantees us that the spaces we will work with are at least quasinormed, as the following proposition suggests.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $I: (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, 1)$ be a nondecreasing function. Then m_I is an r.i.q. space if and only if $I \in \Delta_2$.*

Proof. “ \Rightarrow ” Let $t < \frac{1}{2}$ and put $f = \chi_{(0,t)}$ and $g = \chi_{(t,2t)}$. Then $g^* = f^* = f$ and $(f+g)^* = \chi_{(0,2t)}$. As $\|\cdot\|_{m_I}$ is a quasinorm, we have

$$I(2t) = \|f+g\|_{m_I} \lesssim \|f\|_{m_I} + \|g\|_{m_I} \approx I(t).$$

\Leftarrow We check axioms of r.i.q. norms. From axiom (Q1), only the triangle inequality requires some comment. To this end, let $f, g \in M_+(0,1)$ be given. Then

$$\|f+g\|_{m_I} \leq \sup_{t \in (0,1)} I(t) \left(f^* \left(\frac{t}{2} \right) + g^* \left(\frac{t}{2} \right) \right) \lesssim \sup_{t \in (0,1)} I \left(\frac{t}{2} \right) f^* \left(\frac{t}{2} \right) + \sup_{t \in (0,1)} I \left(\frac{t}{2} \right) g^* \left(\frac{t}{2} \right) \leq \|f\|_{m_I} + \|g\|_{m_I}.$$

If $0 \leq f \leq g$, then $f^* \leq g^*$ and so $\|f\|_{m_I} \leq \|g\|_{m_I}$. The fact that I is bounded implies $\chi_{(0,1)} \in m_I$. Finally, if $0 \leq f_n \nearrow f$, then $f_n^* \nearrow f^*$ and so $\|f_n\|_{m_I} \nearrow \|f\|_{m_I}$. \square

Regarding the operator T_I , we will consider an average-type condition (1.1), which, combined with quasiconcavity of I , in fact implies boundedness of said operator on L^1 . Moreover, the assumption of quasiconcavity allows us to work around the supremum appearing in its definition.

For the remainder of the paper, whenever we mention a quasiconcave function I , we implicitly assume that $I: (0,1) \rightarrow (0,1)$ is a bijection with $I(0+) = 0$ and $I(1-) = 1$. Note that this implies that $I(t) \geq t, t \in (0,1)$.

We proceed by defining two supremum operators.

Definition 3.2. Let I be a nondecreasing function. We define supremum operators S_I and T_I on $\mathcal{M}_+(0,1)$ by

$$(S_I f)(t) := \frac{1}{I(t)} \sup_{0 < s \leq t} I(s) f^*(s), \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1), t \in (0,1),$$

and

$$(T_I f)(t) := \frac{I(t)}{t} \sup_{t \leq s < 1} \frac{s}{I(s)} f^*(s), \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1), t \in (0,1).$$

Observe that $f^* \leq T_I f$ and $f^* \leq S_I f$ for every $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1)$. We also see that both of these operators are monotone – if $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1)$ are such that $f \leq g$, then $S_I f \leq S_I g$ and $T_I f \leq T_I g$.

If we assume that a function I is quasiconcave, $t \mapsto T_I f(t)$ is a nonincreasing function for every $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1)$.

Using (2.2) and assuming I to satisfy Δ_2 condition, we see that

$$(3.1) \quad (S_I(f+g))(t) \lesssim (S_I f) \left(\frac{t}{2} \right) + (S_I g) \left(\frac{t}{2} \right), \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1), t \in (0,1),$$

and

$$(T_I(f+g))(t) \lesssim (T_I f) \left(\frac{t}{2} \right) + (T_I g) \left(\frac{t}{2} \right), \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1), t \in (0,1).$$

Before we begin exploring the mapping properties of the operator S_I , let us observe that $t \mapsto S_I f(t)$ is a nonincreasing function for every $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1)$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let I be a nondecreasing function and $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1)$. Then $S_I f$ is a nonincreasing function on $(0,1)$.*

Proof. Put $Rf(t) = \sup_{0 < s \leq t} I(s) f^*(s)$ for $t \in (0,1)$. Let $0 < t_1 < t_2 < 1$ be given. We consider two cases: If $Rf(t_1) = Rf(t_2)$, then $(S_I f)(t_2) \leq (S_I f)(t_1)$ because $t \mapsto \frac{1}{I(t)}$ is nonincreasing. If $Rf(t_1) < Rf(t_2)$, we consider a function

$$f_1(s) := \begin{cases} f^*(s), & s \leq t_1, \\ f^*(t_1), & t_1 < s < 1. \end{cases}$$

Then $f_1^* = f_1$ and $f^* \leq f_1^*$. Hence, as $Rf(t_1) < Rf(t_2)$, we have

$$Rf(t_2) = \sup_{t_1 < s \leq t_2} I(s) f^*(s)$$

and, consequently,

$$Rf_1(t_2) = \sup_{t_1 < s \leq t_2} I(s) f_1^*(s).$$

We estimate

$$\begin{aligned} (S_I f)(t_2) &\leq (S_I f_1)(t_2) = \frac{1}{I(t_2)} \sup_{t_1 < s \leq t_2} I(s) f_1^*(s) \\ &= \frac{1}{I(t_2)} \cdot I(t_2) f_1^*(t_2) = f_1^*(t_1) = f^*(t_1) \leq (S_I f)(t_1). \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 3.4. *Let I be a nondecreasing function. Then the operator S_I has the following endpoint mapping properties:*

- (i) $S_I: L^\infty \rightarrow L^\infty$,
- (ii) $S_I: m_I \rightarrow m_I$.

Proof. (i) Given $f \in L^\infty$ we estimate

$$\|S_I f\|_\infty = \sup_{0 < t < 1} \frac{1}{I(t)} \sup_{0 < s \leq t} I(s) f^*(s) \leq \|f\|_\infty \sup_{0 < t < 1} \frac{1}{I(t)} \sup_{0 < s \leq t} I(s) = \|f\|_\infty \sup_{0 < t < 1} \frac{1}{I(t)} \cdot I(t) = \|f\|_\infty.$$

(ii) Let $f \in m_I$ be given. By Lemma 3.3 we have

$$\|S_I f\|_{m_I} = \sup_{0 < t < 1} I(t) \left(\tau \mapsto \frac{1}{I(\tau)} \sup_{0 < s \leq \tau} I(s) f^*(s) \right)^* (t) = \sup_{0 < t < 1} I(t) \cdot \frac{1}{I(t)} \sup_{0 < s \leq t} I(s) f^*(s) = \|f\|_{m_I}.$$

□

Theorem 3.5. *Let I be a quasiconcave function. Then the following holds:*

- (i) $T_I: m_{\tilde{I}} \rightarrow m_{\tilde{I}}$,
- (ii) $T_I: L^1 \rightarrow L^1$ if and only if $\int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} ds \lesssim I(t)$ for $t \in (0, 1)$.

Proof. (i) The proof is similar to the proof of (ii) of the previous theorem.

(ii) Follows from [12, Theorem 3.2] with weights $u(t) = \frac{t}{I(t)}$, $w = \frac{1}{u}$ and $v = 1$ in their notation. □

Proposition 3.6. *Let I be a nondecreasing function. Then I satisfies the average property if and only if*

$$(3.2) \quad \sup_{0 < s \leq t} I(s) f^{**}(s) \approx \sup_{0 < s \leq t} I(s) f^*(s), \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1), \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

In this case, we have $m_I = M_I$ with equivalent norms, where M_I is the Marcinkiewicz space with norm given by

$$\|f\|_{M_I} = \sup_{0 < t < 1} I(t) f^{**}(t).$$

Proof. “ \Rightarrow ” Fix $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ and $t \in (0, 1)$. Denoting

$$M = \sup_{0 < s \leq t} I(s) f^*(s),$$

which we can without loss of generality assume to be finite, we have for every $s \in (0, t)$ that

$$f^*(s) \leq M \frac{1}{I(s)}.$$

Thus

$$\sup_{0 < s \leq t} I(s) f^{**}(s) \leq M \sup_{0 < s \leq t} \frac{I(s)}{s} \int_0^s \frac{dr}{I(r)} \lesssim M,$$

where the second inequality is exactly the average property. The converse inequality holds trivially, as $f^* \leq f^{**}$. □

“ \Leftarrow ” Follows from (3.2) by choosing $f = \frac{1}{I}$. □

Remark 3.7. One might ask whether it is truly necessary to work with the space m_I , whether the classical M_I space would do the job. It can be shown that the boundedness of S_I on M_I enforces the average property of I ; it suffices to test the inequality by $f = \chi_{(0,r)}$, $r \in (0,1)$. Consequently, if one wants to work with more general functions in the fashion we do, the quasi-Banach spaces cannot be avoided.

It is evident that the operator S_I and the space m_I are intertwined in a sense that $S_I f$ is finite if and only if $f \in m_I$. Next theorem provides us with a result which essentially says that S_I is the greatest operator which is bounded simultaneously on L^∞ and m_I . To prove this, we require a K -functional related lemma first. The proof is carried out in the spirit of [21], but we need a slightly stronger result, and, moreover, we work on a space of finite measure. We note that a result in a similar manner appeared recently in [30, Proposition 2.3]

Lemma 3.8. *Let $I \in \Delta_2$ be an increasing bijection on $(0,1)$. Then*

$$K(f, t, m_I, L^\infty) \approx \sup_{0 < s \leq I^{-1}(t)} I(s) f^*(s), \quad f \in m_I, t \in (0,1).$$

Proof. Let $f \in m_I$ and $t \in (0,1)$ be given. Write $f = f_0 + f_1$, where $f_0 \in m_I$ and $f_1 \in L^\infty$. By Proposition 3.1 m_I is an r.i.q. space and so, using the boundedness of the dilation operator, the monotonicity of $\|\cdot\|_{m_I}$ and (2.2), we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 < s \leq I^{-1}(t)} I(s) f^*(s) &= \|f^* \chi_{(0, I^{-1}(t))}\|_{m_I} \lesssim \|f^*(2s) \chi_{(0, I^{-1}(t))}(2s)\|_{m_I} \\ &\leq \|f^*(2s) \chi_{(0, I^{-1}(t))}(s)\|_{m_I} \lesssim \left\| f_0^* \chi_{(0, \varphi_X^{-1}(t))} \right\|_{m_I} + \left\| f_1^* \chi_{(0, \varphi_X^{-1}(t))} \right\|_{m_I} \\ &\leq \|f_0\|_{m_I} + \|f_1\|_\infty \cdot \|\chi_{(0, I^{-1}(t))}\|_{m_I} = \|f_0\|_{m_I} + t \|f_1\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

On taking infimum over all such decompositions we obtain

$$\sup_{0 < s \leq I^{-1}(t)} I(s) f^*(s) \lesssim K(f, t, m_I, L^\infty).$$

To prove the converse inequality, let f_0 and f_1 be the optimal decomposition of f at point $I^{-1}(t)$ from (2.13). Then

$$\begin{aligned} K(f, t, m_I, L^\infty) &\leq \|f_1\|_{m_I} + t \|f_0\|_\infty = \sup_{0 < s \leq I^{-1}(t)} I(s) f_1^*(s) + t f^*(I^{-1}(t)) \\ &\leq \sup_{0 < s \leq I^{-1}(t)} I(s) f^*(s) + t f^*(I^{-1}(t)) \leq 2 \sup_{0 < s \leq I^{-1}(t)} I(s) f^*(s). \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 3.9. *Let $I \in \Delta_2$ be an increasing bijection on $(0,1)$ and let S be a sublinear operator defined on m_I . If S is bounded on L^∞ and on m_I , then*

$$(Sf)^*(t) \lesssim (S_I f)(t), \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1), t \in (0,1).$$

If, in addition, I has the average property, then

$$(3.3) \quad (Sf)^{**}(t) \lesssim (S_I f)(t), \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1), t \in (0,1),$$

and so

$$(3.4) \quad (S_I f)^{**}(t) \lesssim (S_I f)(t), \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1), t \in (0,1).$$

In particular, for an r.i. space $X \subset m_I$ we have $X \in \text{Int}(L^\infty, m_I)$ whenever S_I is bounded on X .

Proof. By Lemma 3.8, we have

$$K(f, t, m_I, L^\infty) \approx \sup_{0 < s \leq I^{-1}(t)} I(s) f^*(s).$$

Fix $f \in m_I$ and $t \in (0, d)$, where $d = \min\{\frac{1}{c}, cI(\frac{1}{c})\}$ and $c \geq 1$ is a constant from Theorem 2.15. We estimate

$$(3.5) \quad \sup_{0 < s \leq I^{-1}(t)} I(s) (Sf)^*(s) \lesssim \sup_{0 < s \leq I^{-1}(ct)} I(s) f^*(s).$$

Passing from t to $I(t)$ we arrive at

$$\sup_{0 < s \leq t} I(s)(Sf)^*(s) \lesssim \sup_{0 < s \leq I^{-1}(cI(t))} I(s)f^*(s).$$

Thus, choosing $s = t$ on the left-hand side and dividing by $I(t)$ gives us

$$(Sf)^*(t) \lesssim \frac{1}{I(t)} \sup_{0 < s \leq I^{-1}(cI(t))} I(s)f^*(s) \approx (S_I f)(I^{-1}(cI(t))) \leq (S_I f)(t),$$

where the last inequality stems from Lemma 3.3 and c being no less than one.

Next, assuming S_I is bounded on X we estimate using the boundedness of the dilation operator:

$$\|(Sf)^*\|_X \approx \|(Sf)^*\chi_{(0,d)}\|_X \lesssim \|S_I f \chi_{(0,d)}\|_X \approx \|S_I f\|_X \lesssim \|f\|_X.$$

Now, regarding the ‘‘in addition’’ part of the theorem, we only need to show (3.3) and (3.4), as the rest follows from the previous part. First, (3.3) is a direct application of Proposition 3.6 on the left-hand side of (3.5). Second, (3.4) holds true, because of (3.1) and the boundedness of the dilation operator on r.i.q. spaces. \square

Remark 3.10. Should we assume that I satisfies the average property, then $X \in \text{Int}(L^\infty, M_I)$ if and only if $S_I: X \rightarrow X$. The ‘‘if’’ part is exactly Theorem 3.9. The ‘‘only if’’ part is proved in [8, Theorem 1].

Theorem 3.11. *Let $I \in \Delta_2$ be an increasing bijection on $(0, 1)$ and let X be an r.i. space. Define $\|f\|_Z := \|S_I f\|_X$ for $f \in \mathcal{M}(0, 1)$. Then $\|\cdot\|_Z$ is an r.i.q. norm and, denoting by Z the r.i.q. space corresponding to $\|\cdot\|_Z$, we have that*

$$S_I: Z \rightarrow Z.$$

If I satisfies the average property, then $\|\cdot\|_Z$ is equivalent to an r.i. norm, and so Z is an r.i. space.

Proof. The only property of (Q1) that requires some comment is the quasi-triangle inequality. To this end, let $f, g \in \mathcal{M}(0, 1)$ be given. Using (3.1) and the boundedness of the dilation operator on r.i. spaces we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \|f + g\|_Z &= \|S_I(f + g)\|_X \lesssim \left\| S_I f \left(\frac{t}{2} \right) + S_I g \left(\frac{t}{2} \right) \right\|_X \\ &\leq \left\| S_I f \left(\frac{t}{2} \right) \right\|_X + \left\| S_I g \left(\frac{t}{2} \right) \right\|_X \approx \|S_I f\|_X + \|S_I g\|_X = \|f\|_Z + \|g\|_Z. \end{aligned}$$

Property (P2) obviously holds.

Let $f_n, f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ be such that $f_n \nearrow f$ a.e. Then $f_n^* \nearrow f^*$. Fix $t \in (0, 1)$ and let $K < \sup_{0 < s \leq t} I(s)f^*(s)$. We find $t_0 \in (0, t]$ such that $I(t_0)f^*(t_0) > K$. Then

$$I(t_0)f_n^*(t_0) \nearrow I(t_0)f^*(t_0)$$

and so $(S_I f_n^*)(t) \nearrow (S_I f^*)(t)$. As X is an r.i. norm, we get that $\|f_n\|_Z \nearrow \|f\|_Z$ and (P3) holds.

Regarding (P4), we have $\|\chi_{(0,1)}\|_Z = \|S_I \chi_{(0,1)}\|_X = \|\chi_{(0,1)}\|_X < \infty$.

Thus, functional $\|\cdot\|_Z$ is an r.i.q. norm.

Since $\|\cdot\|_X$ possesses property (P5), we can say the same about $\|\cdot\|_Z$, because $\|\cdot\|_X \leq \|\cdot\|_Z$.

Next, for every $f \in \mathcal{M}(0, 1)$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_I f\|_Z &= \|S_I(S_I f)\|_X = \left\| \frac{1}{I(t)} \sup_{0 < s \leq t} I(s) \left(\tau \mapsto \frac{1}{I(\tau)} \sup_{0 < r \leq \tau} I(r)f^*(r) \right) (s) \right\|_X \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{I(t)} \sup_{0 < s \leq t} I(s) \cdot \frac{1}{I(s)} \sup_{0 < r \leq s} I(r)f^*(r) \right\|_X = \|S_I f\|_X = \|f\|_Z, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality comes from Lemma 3.3.

If I satisfies the average property, Proposition 3.6 tells us that

$$\|f\|_Z = \|S_I f\|_X \approx \|S_I f^{**}\|_X =: \|f\|, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

It follows from the previous and subadditivity of both $f \mapsto f^{**}$ and supremum, that $\|\cdot\|$ is an r.i. norm and $\|\cdot\|_Z \approx \|\cdot\|$. \square

Let us point out that the space Z defined in such a manner is the largest r.i.q. space contained in the space X which admits boundedness of S_I .

Theorem 3.12. *Let I be a quasiconcave function satisfying (1.1). Then*

$$(3.6) \quad (T_I f)^{**}(t) \lesssim (T_I f^{**})(t), \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1), t \in (0, 1).$$

Proof. Fix $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ and $t \in (0, 1)$. Let f_0 and f_1 be the optimal decomposition (2.13) of f at point t .

Then, as $T_I f$ is nonincreasing and supremum is subadditive, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (T_I f)^{**}(t) &= \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} \sup_{s \leq r < 1} \frac{r}{I(r)} f^*(r) \, ds \\ &\leq \underbrace{\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} \sup_{s \leq r < 1} \frac{r}{I(r)} f_0^*(r) \, ds}_I + \underbrace{\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} \sup_{s \leq r < 1} \frac{r}{I(r)} f_1^*(r) \, ds}_{II}. \end{aligned}$$

As for I , we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} \sup_{s \leq r < 1} \frac{r}{I(r)} \min\{f^*(r), f^*(t)\} \, ds \\ &= \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} \max \left\{ \sup_{s \leq r < t} \frac{r}{I(r)} f^*(t), \sup_{t \leq r < 1} \frac{r}{I(r)} f^*(r) \right\} \, ds \\ &= \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} \sup_{t \leq r < 1} \frac{r}{I(r)} f^*(r) \, ds = \frac{I(t)}{t} \cdot \frac{1}{I(t)} \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} \sup_{t \leq r < 1} \frac{r}{I(r)} f^*(r) \, ds \\ &\lesssim \frac{I(t)}{t} \sup_{t \leq r < 1} \frac{r}{I(r)} f^*(r) = (T_I f)(t). \end{aligned}$$

Next, using Theorem 3.5, (ii), we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} II &= \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} \sup_{s \leq r < 1} \frac{r}{I(r)} f_1^*(r) \, ds \leq \frac{1}{t} \int_0^1 \frac{I(s)}{s} \sup_{s \leq r < 1} \frac{r}{I(r)} f_1^*(r) \, ds \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{t} \int_0^1 f_1^*(s) \, ds = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t (f^*(s) - f^*(t)) \, ds \leq f^{**}(t). \end{aligned}$$

Putting everything together, we arrive at what we wanted:

$$(T_I f)^{**}(t) \lesssim (T_I f(t) + f^{**}(t)) \lesssim (T_I f^{**})(t).$$

□

Remark 3.13. Notice that in the proof we used both (1.1) and the boundedness of T_I on L^1 , which we know are equivalent. Now, taking the limit $t \rightarrow 1^-$ in (3.6), we get

$$\int_0^1 (T_I f)(t) \, dt \lesssim \lim_{t \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{I(t)}{t} \sup_{t \leq s < 1} (R_I f^*)(s) = \int_0^1 f^*(t) \, dt.$$

In other words, (3.6) is equivalent to the boundedness of T_I on L^1 .

We shall finish this section with an important consequence of the previous theorem.

Theorem 3.14. *Let X be an r.i. space and let I be a quasiconcave function satisfying (1.1). Then*

$$\left\| \frac{t}{I(t)} (T_I f)^{**}(t) \right\|_X \lesssim \left\| \frac{t}{I(t)} f^{**}(t) \right\|_X, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

In other words, operator T_I is bounded on Y'_X whenever X is an r.i. space.

Proof. For $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ we estimate, owing to Theorem 3.12,

$$\left\| \frac{t}{I(t)} (T_I f)^{**}(t) \right\|_X \lesssim \left\| \frac{t}{I(t)} (T_I f^{**})(t) \right\|_X = \left\| \sup_{t \leq s < 1} \frac{s}{I(s)} f^{**}(s) \right\|_X \approx \left\| \frac{t}{I(t)} f^{**}(t) \right\|_X,$$

where the “ \approx ” is (2.11). \square

4. OPTIMALITY OF FUNCTION SPACES

What follows is the main section of the paper. First two subsections are devoted to expressing the norm of the optimal target space in a more explicit manner. At the end of Subsection 4.1 we present the proof of Theorem 1.1. Finally, the third subsection deals with a simplification of the optimal domain norm and contains the proof of Theorem 1.2.

4.1. Optimal target space. We now explore the norm of the optimal target space in a general setting, requiring only the condition (1.1).

As we said in the preliminary section of the paper, given an r.i. space X , its optimal target space Y_X under the map H_I (in our setting) always exists. Moreover, the following inclusions hold:

$$(4.1) \quad Y_{L^\infty} \subset Y_X \subset Y_{L^1}.$$

The situation with optimal domain spaces is a bit different. The following statement is a specification of a result in [20, Proposition 3.3] to the situation suitable for our purposes.

Proposition 4.1. *Let I be a quasiconcave function and let Y be an r.i. space. Then the functional*

$$\|f\| := \sup_{h \sim f} \|H_I h\|_Y, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1),$$

is an r.i. norm if and only if $H_I 1 \in Y$. In that case $\|\cdot\|_{X_Y} := \|\cdot\|$ is the optimal domain norm for Y under the mapping H_I .

From this proposition it follows that if $\frac{1}{I}$ is integrable, then X_Y exists for every r.i. space Y and, moreover, we have the inclusions

$$X_{L^\infty} \subset X_Y \subset X_{L^1}.$$

We shall now reveal the important relation between boundedness of T_I and interpolation property of a function space.

Proposition 4.2. *Let I be a quasiconcave function, $X \subset \Lambda_I$ be an r.i. space and assume that $T_I: X' \rightarrow X'$. Then $X \in \text{Int}(L^\infty, \Lambda_I)$. If I in addition satisfies (1.1), then $Y_{X'} \in \text{Int}(L^\infty, \Lambda_I)$.*

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ and $t \in (0, 1)$ be given. Let f_0 and f_1 be the optimal decomposition (2.13) of f at point t . Let T be a linear operator bounded on both L^∞ and Λ_I . Using the subadditivity of $f \mapsto f^{**}$ and Hardy’s lemma (2.3), we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} (Tf)^*(s) \, ds &= \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} (T(f_0 + f_1))^*(s) \, ds \leq \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} ((Tf_0)^*(s) + (Tf_1)^*(s)) \, ds \\ &= \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} (Tf_0)^*(s) \, ds + \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} (Tf_1)^*(s) \, ds =: I + II. \end{aligned}$$

Now, for I , we estimate

$$\int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} (Tf_0)^*(s) \, ds \leq \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} \|Tf_0\|_\infty \, ds \lesssim \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} \|f_0\|_\infty \, ds = \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} f_0^*(s) \, ds.$$

As for the II , we compute

$$\int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} (Tf_1)^*(s) \, ds \leq \int_0^1 \frac{I(s)}{s} (Tf_1)^*(s) \, ds \lesssim \int_0^1 \frac{I(s)}{s} f_1^*(s) \, ds = \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} f_1^*(s) \, ds.$$

Combining the last two estimates yields

$$\int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} (Tf)^*(s) \, ds \lesssim \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} f^*(s) \, ds.$$

Applying Hardy's lemma (2.3) to $h(s) = \sup_{s \leq t < 1} \frac{t}{I(t)} g^*(t)$, $g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$, $s \in (0, 1)$, we obtain

$$\int_0^1 \frac{I(s)}{s} \sup_{s \leq t < 1} \frac{t}{I(t)} g^*(t) (Tf)^*(s) \, ds \lesssim \int_0^1 \frac{I(s)}{s} \sup_{s \leq t < 1} \frac{t}{I(t)} g^*(t) f^*(s) \, ds,$$

which is nothing else than

$$\int_0^1 (T_I g)(s) (Tf)^*(s) \, ds \lesssim \int_0^1 (T_I g)(s) f^*(s) \, ds.$$

Finally,

$$\int_0^1 (Tf)^*(t) g^*(t) \, dt \leq \int_0^1 (Tf)^*(t) (T_I g)(t) \, dt \lesssim \int_0^1 f^*(t) (T_I g)(t) \, dt \leq \|f\|_X \|T_I g\|_{X'} \lesssim \|f\|_X \|g\|_{X'}.$$

Division by $\|g\|_{X'}$, $g \neq 0$, followed by taking supremum over $\|g\|_{X'} \leq 1$ provides us with $\|Tf\|_X \lesssim \|f\|_X$, $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$.

Assume now that I satisfies (1.1). Theorem 3.14 guarantees that

$$\|T_I f\|_{Y'_{X'}} \lesssim \|f\|_{Y'_{X'}}, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

It therefore remains to show that $Y_{X'} \subset \Lambda_I$ holds for every r.i. space X . This is by (4.1) equivalent to showing that $Y_{L^1} \subset \Lambda_I$. We show that, in fact, $Y_{L^1} = \Lambda_I$. We know

$$\|f\|_{Y'_{L^1}} = \|R_I f^*\|_\infty = \sup_{0 < t < 1} \frac{t}{I(t)} f^{**}(t) = \|f\|_{M_{\tilde{I}}}, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Observe that the condition (1.1) simply states that \tilde{I} satisfies the average property. Consequently, Proposition 3.6 asserts that $M_{\tilde{I}} = m_{\tilde{I}}$, from whence it follows that $Y_{L^1} = \Lambda_I$. \square

Our next objective is to describe the norm of the optimal target space Y_X . The first step in this direction is to describe the norm of Y'_X via a functional, $\|\cdot\|_Z$, such that S_I is bounded thereon. We begin by exploring the mapping properties of the operator R_I .

Lemma 4.3. *Let I be a quasiconcave function satisfying (1.1). Then the operator R_I has the following mapping properties:*

- (i) $R_I: m_{\tilde{I}} \rightarrow L^\infty$,
- (ii) $R_I: L^1 \rightarrow m_I$,
- (iii) $R_I: L^1 \rightarrow (m_I)_b$.

Proof. Let $f \in m_{\tilde{I}}$ and estimate

$$\|R_I f\|_\infty = \sup_{0 < t < 1} \frac{t}{I(t)} f^{**}(t) \approx \sup_{0 < t < 1} \frac{t}{I(t)} f^*(t) = \|f\|_{m_{\tilde{I}}},$$

where the approximation follows from the assumption that \tilde{I} satisfies the average property.

We take care of (ii) and (iii) in one fell swoop. Let $f_n \rightarrow f$ in L^1 . Then, for every $t \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$|(R_I f)(t)| \leq \|f\|_\infty \frac{1}{I(t)} \int_0^t \, ds = \|f\|_\infty \frac{t}{I(t)} \lesssim \|f\|_\infty,$$

from whence it follows that if f_n is a sequence of bounded functions, then $R_I f_n$ is a sequence of bounded functions. Now,

$$|(R_I f_n)(t) - (R_I f)(t)| = \left| \frac{1}{I(t)} \int_0^t (f_n(s) - f(s)) \, ds \right| \leq \frac{1}{I(t)} \|f - f_n\|_1$$

and so,

$$(s \mapsto |(R_I f_n)(s) - (R_I f)(s)|)^*(t) \leq \frac{1}{I(t)} \|f - f_n\|_1.$$

Multiplying through by $I(t)$ and taking supremum over $t \in (0, 1)$ finish the proof. \square

Proposition 4.4. *Let I be a quasiconcave function. Then*

$$K(f, t, L^1, m_{\bar{I}}) \lesssim \int_0^{I^{-1}(t)} f^*(s) ds + t \sup_{I^{-1}(t) \leq s < 1} \frac{s}{I(s)} f^*(s), \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1), t \in (0, 1).$$

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ and $t \in (0, 1)$ be given. Let f_0 and f_1 be the optimal decomposition (2.13) of f at point $I^{-1}(t)$ in place of t . Using the rearrangement invariance of both L^1 and $m_{\bar{I}}$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} K(f, t, L^1, X) &\leq \|f_1\|_1 + t \|f_0\|_{m_{\bar{I}}} = \|f_1^* \chi_{(0, I^{-1}(t))}\|_1 + t \|f_0^*\|_{m_{\bar{I}}} \\ &= \|f^* \chi_{(0, I^{-1}(t))}\|_1 - I^{-1}(t) f^*(I^{-1}(t)) + t \|f^*(I^{-1}(t)) \chi_{(0, I^{-1}(t))} + f^* \chi_{(I^{-1}(t), 1)}\|_{m_{\bar{I}}} \\ &\lesssim \|f^* \chi_{(0, I^{-1}(t))}\|_1 - I^{-1}(t) f^*(I^{-1}(t)) + t \varphi_{m_{\bar{I}}}(I^{-1}(t)) f^*(I^{-1}(t)) + t \|f^* \chi_{(I^{-1}(t), 1)}\|_{m_{\bar{I}}} \\ &= \|f^* \chi_{(0, I^{-1}(t))}\|_1 + t \|f^* \chi_{(I^{-1}(t), 1)}\|_{m_{\bar{I}}} \leq \int_0^{I^{-1}(t)} f^*(s) ds + t \sup_{I^{-1}(t) \leq s < 1} \frac{s}{I(s)} f^*(s). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Theorem 4.5. *Let I be a quasiconcave function satisfying (1.1) and let X be an r.i. space. Define $\|f\|_Z = \|S_I f\|_{X'}$ for $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$. Then*

$$\|f\|_{Y'_X} = \left\| \frac{1}{I(t)} \int_0^t f^*(s) ds \right\|_{X'} \approx \left\| \frac{1}{I(t)} \int_0^t f^*(s) ds \right\|_Z, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$$

and S_I is bounded on Z .

Proof. We define three functionals

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(f) &:= \|f^{**}(I(t))\|_{X'}, \\ \alpha(f) &:= \lambda(k(f, t, L^1, m_{\bar{I}})) \\ \text{and} \\ \beta(f) &:= \lambda(k(f, t, (m_I)_b, L^\infty)) \end{aligned}$$

for $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$. We check that λ is an r.i. norm. The triangle inequality follows from the subadditivity of $f \mapsto f^{**}$ and the triangle inequality of $\|\cdot\|_{X'}$. The rest of (P1) obviously holds. The same goes for (P2). When $0 \leq f_n \nearrow f$, then $f_n^{**} \nearrow f^{**}$ and so $f_n^{**}(I(t)) \nearrow f^{**}(I(t))$ for every $t \in (0, 1)$. Hence (P3) for λ follows from (P3) of X' . Regarding (P4), we note that the maximal nonincreasing rearrangement of a constant function is the function itself, and so the required property follows from its counterpart in X' . As for (P5), we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(f) &= \|f^{**}(I(t))\|_{X'} \geq \|f^{**}(I(t)) \chi_{(0, \frac{1}{2})}(t)\|_{X'} \geq \left\| f^{**} \left(I \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \right) \chi_{(0, \frac{1}{2})} \right\|_{X'} \\ &\approx f^{**} \left(I \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \right) \approx f^{**} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \approx \|f\|_1, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

As λ is obviously rearrangement invariant, depending only on the nonincreasing rearrangement of f , we conclude that λ is an r.i. norm.

In general, if we have a compatible couple of quasi-Banach spaces (X_0, X_1) such that $X_0 \cap X_1$ is dense in X_0 , Theorem 2.14 combined with the definition of λ give us

$$(4.2) \quad \lambda(k(f, t, X_0, X_1)) = \left\| \frac{1}{I(t)} \int_0^{I(t)} k(f, t, X_0, X_1) \right\|_{X'} = \left\| \frac{1}{I(t)} K(f, I(t), X_0, X_1) \right\|_{X'}.$$

Since $L^1 \cap m_{\bar{I}}$ is dense in L^1 , by Proposition 4.4 we have

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \alpha(f) &= \left\| \frac{1}{I(t)} K(f, I(t), L^1, m_{\bar{I}}) \right\|_{X'} \leq \left\| \frac{1}{I(t)} \left(\int_0^t f^*(s) ds + I(t) \sup_{t \leq s < 1} \frac{s}{I(s)} f^*(s) \right) \right\|_{X'} \\ &\leq \|f\|_{Y'_X} + \left\| \frac{t}{I(t)} (T_I f) \right\|_{X'} \lesssim \|f\|_{Y'_X}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last estimate comes from Theorem 3.14.

Next, $(m_I)_b \cap L^\infty$ is dense in $(m_I)_b$. Using (4.2) once more we have

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta(f) &= \left\| \frac{1}{I(t)} K(f, I(t), (m_I)_b, L^\infty) \right\|_{X'} \\ &\geq \left\| \frac{1}{I(t)} K(f, I(t), m_I, L^\infty) \right\|_{X'} \approx \left\| \frac{1}{I(t)} \sup_{0 < s \leq t} I(s) f^*(s) \right\|_{X'} = \|f\|_Z, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from enlarging the space $(m_I)_b$ to m_I and hence allowing more decompositions. The approximation is an application of Lemma 3.8.

Adding Lemma 4.3 to the kettle we see that all the assumptions of Theorem 2.18 are satisfied. Therefore

$$(4.5) \quad \beta(R_I f^*) \lesssim \alpha(f^*).$$

Finally, chaining (4.4), (4.5) and (4.3) together, we arrive at

$$(4.6) \quad \|R_I f^*\|_Z \lesssim \beta(R_I f^*) \lesssim \alpha(f^*) \lesssim \|f\|_{Y'_X}.$$

This finishes the proof, as the reverse inequality holds trivially. \square

We now introduce two functionals and exhibit their equivalence.

Lemma 4.6. *Let I be a quasiconcave function and let X be an r.i. space. Define a functional $\|f\|_Z = \|S_I f\|_X, f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$. Then*

$$(4.7) \quad \mu(f) := \sup_{\substack{\|g\|_Z \leq 1 \\ \|g\|_\infty < \infty}} \int_0^1 f^*(t) d \operatorname{csup}_{0 < s \leq t} I(s) g^*(s) + \|f\|_1, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1),$$

is an r.i. norm. Here, $\operatorname{csup}_{0 < s \leq t} \varphi(s)$ stands for the least concave majorant of $t \mapsto \sup_{0 < s \leq t} \varphi(s)$.

Proof. Denote $h_g(t) = \operatorname{csup}_{0 < s \leq t} I(s) g^*(s)$ for $g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$. Let us observe that $t \mapsto \sup_{0 < s \leq t} I(s) g^*(s)$ is a quasiconcave map for every $g \in Z$ and so h_g is a finite concave function. Indeed, for such functions g the supremum is finite, as $Z \subset m_I$, and with increasing t the supremum is nondecreasing. It thus remains to check that for $0 < t_1 < t_2 < 1$ the inequality

$$\frac{\sup_{0 < s \leq t_2} I(s) g^*(s)}{t_2} \leq \frac{\sup_{0 < s \leq t_1} I(s) g^*(s)}{t_1}$$

holds. We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sup_{t_1 < s \leq t_2} I(s) g^*(s)}{t_2} &\leq g^*(t_1) \frac{\sup_{0 < s \leq t_1} I\left(\frac{t_2}{t_1} \cdot s\right)}{\frac{t_2}{t_1} \cdot t_1} \\ &\leq \frac{\sup_{0 < s \leq t_1} I(s) g^*(t_1)}{t_1} \leq \frac{\sup_{0 < s \leq t_1} I(s) g^*(s)}{t_1}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we used the quasiconcavity of I . For $\|g\|_Z \leq 1$ we therefore have

$$\int_0^1 f^*(t) dh_g(t) = \int_0^1 f^*(t) \frac{dh_g(t)}{dt} dt.$$

As $t \mapsto \frac{dh_g(t)}{dt}$ is nonincreasing, Hardy's lemma (2.3) gives us a triangle inequality of the functional μ . Property (P2) is obvious. (P3) follows from the monotone convergence theorem. To check (P4), let $\|g\|_Z \leq 1$ be given. Using the fact that $Z \hookrightarrow m_I$, we estimate

$$\int_0^1 d \operatorname{csup}_{0 < s \leq t} I(s)g^*(s) \leq \operatorname{csup}_{0 < s < 1} I(s)g^*(s) \approx \sup_{0 < s < 1} I(s)g^*(s) = \|g\|_{m_I} \lesssim \|g\|_Z \leq 1.$$

Thus $\mu(\chi_{(0,1)}) < \infty$. Regarding (P5), $\|f\|_1 \leq \mu(f)$, $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1)$, follows from the definition of μ . Finally, μ is rearrangement invariant, as the first expression in its definition (4.7) depends only on the nonincreasing rearrangement of a function and the second term, $\|\cdot\|_1$, is rearrangement invariant. \square

Proposition 4.7. *Let I be a quasiconcave function and let X be an r.i. space. Put $\|f\|_Z := \|S_I f\|_X$ for $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1)$. Then the functional λ on $\mathcal{M}_+(0,1)$ defined by*

$$\lambda(f) = \sup_{\|g\|_Z \leq 1} \int_0^1 -I(t)g^*(t) df^*(t) + \|f\|_1, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1),$$

is equivalent to an r.i. norm.

Proof. We show that $\lambda \approx \mu$, where μ is the functional from Lemma 4.6. First observe that, by the monotone convergence theorem, it suffices to consider only bounded functions over which we take the supremum in the definition of the functional λ . Also, without loss of generality, it suffices to consider only the functions which are finite a.e.

We show their equivalence in three steps. Let first $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1)$ be such that $f^*(0+) < \infty$ and $f^*(1-) = 0$ and pick $g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1)$ bounded such that $\|g\|_Z \leq 1$. Then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} f^*(t) \operatorname{csup}_{0 < s \leq t} I(s)g^*(s) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 1^-} f^*(t) \operatorname{csup}_{0 < s \leq t} I(s)g^*(s) = 0.$$

Consequently, integration by parts yields

$$\int_0^1 f^*(t) d \operatorname{csup}_{0 < s \leq t} I(s)g^*(s) = \int_0^1 - \operatorname{csup}_{0 < s \leq t} I(s)g^*(s) df^*(t).$$

We therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\substack{\|g\|_Z \leq 1 \\ \|g\|_\infty < \infty}} \int_0^1 f^*(t) d \operatorname{csup}_{0 < s \leq t} I(s)g^*(s) = \sup_{\substack{\|g\|_Z \leq 1 \\ \|g\|_\infty < \infty}} \int_0^1 - \operatorname{csup}_{0 < s \leq t} I(s)g^*(s) df^*(t) \\ & \approx \sup_{\substack{\|g\|_Z \leq 1 \\ \|g\|_\infty < \infty}} \int_0^1 - \sup_{0 < s \leq t} I(s)g^*(s) df^*(t) = \sup_{\substack{\|g\|_Z \leq 1 \\ \|g\|_\infty < \infty}} \int_0^1 -I(t)(S_I g)(t) df^*(t) \\ & = \sup_{\substack{\|S_I g\|_Z \leq 1 \\ \|g\|_\infty < \infty}} \int_0^1 -I(t)(S_I g)(t) df^*(t) = \sup_{\substack{\|g\|_Z \leq 1 \\ \|g\|_\infty < \infty}} \int_0^1 -I(t)g^*(t) df^*(t), \end{aligned}$$

and so $\mu(f) \approx \lambda(f)$. Here we used the fact that $\|g\|_Z = \|S_I g\|_Z$ for every $g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1)$ and Theorem 3.4, (i), which says that if g is bounded, so is $S_I g$.

Second, let $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0,1)$ satisfy $f^*(1-) = 0$. Let $\{t_n\} \in (0,1)^\mathbb{N}$ be a sequence of points of continuity of f^* such that $t_n \searrow 0$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we set $f_n = f_n^* = \min\{f^*, f^*(t_n)\}$. We now infer that $\lambda(f_n) \nearrow \lambda(f)$. Indeed, by the monotone convergence theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(f_n) &= \sup_{\|g\|_Z \leq 1} \int_0^1 -I(t)g^*(t) df_n^*(t) + \|f_n\|_1 \\ &= \sup_{\|g\|_Z \leq 1} \int_{t_n}^1 -I(t)g^*(t) df^*(t) + \|f_n\|_1 \nearrow \lambda(f). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, let $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ be such that $f^*(1-) < \infty$. Then, using the previous step, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(f) &= \sup_{\|g\|_Z \leq 1} \int_0^1 -I(t)g^*(t) \, df^*(t) + \|f\|_1 \\ &= \sup_{\|g\|_Z \leq 1} \int_0^1 -I(t)g^*(t) \, d(f^* - f^*(1-))(t) + \|f^* - f^*(1-)\|_1 + f^*(1-) \\ &\approx \mu(f^* - f^*(1-)) + f^*(1-) \approx \mu(f), \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(f^* - f^*(1-)) + f^*(1-) &\leq \mu(f) + \mu(f^*(1-)) + f^*(1-) \\ &\approx \mu(f) + \|f^*(1-)\|_1 \leq \mu(f) + \|f\|_1 \approx \mu(f) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mu(f) \leq \mu(f^* - f^*(1-)) + \mu(f^*(1-)) \approx \mu(f - f^*(1-)) + f^*(1-).$$

□

Remark 4.8. Both functionals μ and λ contain $\|\cdot\|_1$ in their definitions. For the functional μ it guarantees that $X(\mu) \hookrightarrow L^1$, while for λ it guarantees that $\lambda(f) = 0 \iff f = 0$ a.e.

Before we establish an alternative description of the optimal target space norm, we require a technical lemma which extends (2.11) to our setting.

Lemma 4.9. *Let I be a quasiconcave function and X be an r.i. space. Put $\|f\|_Z = \|S_I f\|_X$, $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$. Then*

$$\|R_I f^*\|_Z \approx \|G_I f\|_Z, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Proof. We show that $S_I G_I f = G_I f$ for every $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$. To this end, fix $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ and $t \in (0, 1)$. We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} (S_I G_I f)(t) &= \frac{1}{I(t)} \sup_{0 < s \leq t} I(s) \sup_{s \leq r < 1} \frac{1}{I(r)} \int_0^r f^*(z) \, dz \\ &= \frac{1}{I(t)} \sup_{0 < s \leq t} \sup_{s \leq r < 1} I(s) \frac{1}{I(r)} \int_0^r f^*(z) \, dz \\ &= \frac{1}{I(t)} \max \left\{ \sup_{0 < s \leq t} \sup_{s \leq r \leq t} \frac{I(s)}{I(r)} \int_0^r f^*(z) \, dz, \sup_{0 < s \leq t} \sup_{t \leq r < 1} \frac{I(s)}{I(r)} \int_0^r f^*(z) \, dz \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{I(t)} \max \left\{ \sup_{0 < r \leq t} \sup_{0 < s \leq r} \frac{I(s)}{I(r)} \int_0^r f^*(z) \, dz, \sup_{t \leq r < 1} \frac{I(t)}{I(r)} \int_0^r f^*(z) \, dz \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{I(t)} \max \left\{ \sup_{0 < r \leq t} \int_0^r f^*(z) \, dz, \sup_{t \leq r < 1} \frac{I(t)}{I(r)} \int_0^r f^*(z) \, dz \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{I(t)} \max \left\{ \frac{I(t)}{I(t)} \int_0^t f^*(z) \, dz, \sup_{t \leq r < 1} \frac{I(t)}{I(r)} \int_0^r f^*(z) \, dz \right\} \\ &= \max \left\{ \frac{1}{I(t)} \int_0^t f^*(z) \, dz, \sup_{t \leq r < 1} \frac{1}{I(r)} \int_0^r f^*(z) \, dz \right\} \\ &= \sup_{t \leq r < 1} \frac{1}{I(r)} \int_0^r f^*(z) \, dz = G_I f(t). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (2.11),

$$\|G_I f\|_Z = \|S_I G_I f\|_X = \|G_I f\|_X \approx \|R_I f^*\|_X \leq \|S_I R_I f^*\|_X = \|R_I f^*\|_Z.$$

We know $R_I f^* \leq G_I f$ and so $S_I R_I f^* \leq S_I G_I f$. Furnishing this last inequality with $\|\cdot\|_X$ finishes the proof. □

We will now use results of the last two sections to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Put $\|f\|_Z = \|S_I f\|_{X'}$ for $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$. We need to show that $\|f\|_{Y_X} \approx \lambda(f)$ for $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$, where λ is the functional from Proposition 4.7. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ be given and assume $f^*(0+) < \infty$ and $f^*(1-) = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 f^*(s)g^*(s) ds &= \int_0^1 -g^*(s) \int_s^1 df^*(t) ds = \int_0^1 -\int_0^t g^*(s) ds df^*(t) \\ &= \int_0^1 -\frac{I(t)}{I(t)} \int_0^t g^*(s) ds df^*(t) \leq \int_0^1 -I(t)(G_I g)(t) df^*(t) \\ &\approx \frac{\|g\|_{Y'_X}}{\left\| \frac{1}{I(t)} \int_0^t g^*(s) ds \right\|_Z} \int_0^1 -I(t)(G_I g)(t) df^*(t) \\ &\approx \frac{\|g\|_{Y'_X}}{\|G_I g\|_Z} \int_0^1 -I(t)(G_I g)(t) df^*(t) \\ &\leq \|g\|_{Y'_X} \cdot \sup_{\|g\|_Z \leq 1} \int_0^1 -I(t)g^*(t) df^*(t) \leq \|g\|_{Y'_X} \cdot \lambda(f), \end{aligned}$$

where the first approximation is Theorem 4.5 and in the second approximation we used Lemma 4.9. Dividing by $\|g\|_{Y'_X}$ and taking supremum over $g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ with $\|g\|_{Y'_X} \leq 1$ gives us $\|f\|_{Y_X} \lesssim \lambda(f)$.

In the other direction, let $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ be arbitrary. As

$$\|f\|_{Y'_X} = \left\| \frac{1}{I(t)} \int_0^t f^*(s) ds \right\|_{X'},$$

there exists $h \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ with $\|h\|_X \leq 1$ and

$$\frac{1}{2}\|f\|_{Y'_X} \leq \int_0^1 \frac{h(t)}{I(t)} \int_0^t f^*(s) ds dt.$$

Put $g(t) = g^*(t) = \int_t^1 \frac{h(s)}{I(s)} ds$. For $k \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ satisfying $\|k\|_Z \leq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 -I(t)k^*(t) dg^*(t) &= \int_0^1 I(t)k^*(t) \frac{h(t)}{I(t)} dt \\ &= \int_0^1 k^*(t)h(t) dt \leq \|k\|_{X'} \|h\|_X \leq \|k\|_Z \|h\|_X \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

By Fubini's theorem we estimate

$$\int_0^1 g^*(t) dt = \int_0^1 \int_t^1 \frac{h(s)}{I(s)} ds dt = \int_0^1 h(s) \frac{s}{I(s)} ds \leq \int_0^1 h(s) ds \lesssim \|h\|_X \leq 1.$$

The last two estimates tell us that $\lambda(g) \lesssim 1$.

We further have

$$\int_0^1 f^*(t)g^*(t) dt = \int_0^1 f^*(t) \int_t^1 \frac{h(s)}{I(s)} ds dt = \int_0^1 \frac{h(s)}{I(s)} \int_0^s f^*(t) dt ds \geq \frac{1}{2}\|f\|_{Y'_X}.$$

Finally, putting everything together yields

$$\frac{1}{2}\|f\|_{Y'_X} \leq \int_0^1 f^*(t)g^*(t) dt \leq \lambda'(f)\lambda(g) \lesssim \lambda'(f)$$

or, equivalently, $\lambda(f) \lesssim \|f\|_{Y_X}$. □

4.2. Alternative norm in the optimal target space. The goal of this section is to express the optimal target norm using the maximal nonincreasing rearrangement. We will need to strengthen the assumptions we impose on the function I and in turn obtain a helpful tool in the proof of the main theorem and a new way to describe the norm of functions. In view of Proposition 4.2 we will need boundedness of $f \mapsto f^{**}$ on Λ_I .

Proposition 4.10. *Let I be a quasiconcave function satisfying (1.1) and (2.9). Let X be an r.i. space. Put $\|f\|_Z = \|S_I f\|_{X'}$, $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$. Then*

$$\|f\|_{Y_X} \approx \sup_{\|g\|_Z \leq 1} \int_0^1 \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) g^*(t) dt + \|f\|_1, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Proof. Thanks to the fact that I satisfies (2.9), we can use [25, Theorem 10.3.12] to establish that the mapping $f \mapsto f^{**}$ is bounded on Λ_I . This implies that the map $f \mapsto \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f(s) ds$ is, too, bounded on Λ_I . Proposition 4.2 tells us that $Y_X \in \text{Int}(L^\infty, \Lambda_I)$. Therefore $f \mapsto \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f(s) ds$ and, consequently, $f \mapsto f^{**}$ are bounded on Y_X .

Now, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} -I(t) g^*(t) d \left[\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f^{**}(s) ds \right] \\ &= \int_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} -I(t) g^*(t) \left[-\frac{1}{t^2} \int_0^t f^{**}(s) ds + \frac{1}{t} f^{**}(t) \right] dt \\ &= \int_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} I(t) \left[\frac{1}{t^2} \int_0^t (f^{**}(s) - f^*(s)) ds \right] g^*(t) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, passing to the limit and using Fubini's Theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_0^1 I(t) g^*(t) d \left[\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f^{**}(s) ds \right] &= \int_0^1 \frac{I(t)}{t^2} \int_0^t (f^{**}(s) - f^*(s)) ds g^*(t) dt \\ &= \int_0^1 \frac{I(s)}{s} (f^{**}(s) - f^*(s)) \frac{s}{I(s)} \int_s^1 \frac{I(t)}{t^2} g^*(t) dt ds \\ &= \int_0^1 \frac{I(s)}{s} (f^{**}(s) - f^*(s)) (H g^*)(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the operator H is defined as

$$(4.8) \quad H g(s) = \frac{s}{I(s)} \int_s^1 \frac{I(t)}{t^2} g(t) dt, \quad g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1), s \in (0, 1).$$

Observe that, on one hand, we have

$$(4.9) \quad (H g^*)(s) = \frac{s}{I(s)} \int_s^1 \frac{I(t)}{t^2} g^*(t) dt \leq g^*(s) \frac{s}{I(s)} \int_s^1 \frac{I(t)}{t^2} dt \lesssim g^*(s),$$

and, on the other hand,

$$(4.10) \quad (H g^*) \left(\frac{s}{2} \right) \gtrsim \frac{s}{I(s)} \int_{\frac{s}{2}}^s g^*(t) \frac{I(t)}{t^2} dt \gtrsim \frac{s}{I(s)} g^*(s) \frac{I(s)}{s^2} \cdot s = g^*(s).$$

Finally, using Theorem 1.1, we get

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f\|_{Y_X} &\approx \left\| \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f^{**}(s) ds \right\|_{Y_X} \\ &\approx \sup_{\|g\|_Z \leq 1} \int_0^1 \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) (H g^*)(t) dt + \|f\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

To finish the proof we need to show that

$$\sup_{\|g\|_Z \leq 1} \int_0^1 \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t))(Hg^*)(t) dt \approx \sup_{\|g\|_Z \leq 1} \int_0^1 \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t))g^*(t) dt.$$

The inequality “ \lesssim ” immediately follows from (4.9).

The boundedness of the dilation operator followed by (4.11) and the fact that $(f^*(2\cdot))^{**}(t) = f^{**}(2t)$, substitution and (4.10) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{Y_X} &\approx \|f^*(2t)\|_{Y_X} \approx \sup_{\|g\|_Z \leq 1} \int_0^1 \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(2t) - f^*(2t))(Hg^*)(t) dt + \|f\|_1 \\ &\gtrsim \sup_{\|g\|_Z \leq 1} \int_0^1 \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t))(Hg^*)\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) dt + \|f\|_1 \\ &\gtrsim \sup_{\|g\|_Z \leq 1} \int_0^1 \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t))g^*(t) dt + \|f\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 4.11. *Let $I \in \mathcal{Q}$. Let X be an r.i. space such that S_I is bounded on X' . Then*

$$(4.12) \quad \|f\|_{Y_X} \approx \left\| \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) \right\|_X + \|f\|_1, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Proof. Since S_I is bounded on X' , we have $\|S_I g\|_{X'} \approx \|g\|_{X'}$, $g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$. Therefore, by Proposition 4.10, (2.7) and the fact that $\|\cdot\|_X = \|\cdot\|_{X''}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (4.13) \quad \|f\|_{Y_X} &\approx \sup_{\|S_I g\|_{X'} \leq 1} \int_0^1 \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t))g^*(t) dt + \|f\|_1 \\ &\approx \sup_{\|g\|_{X'} \leq 1} \int_0^1 \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t))g^*(t) dt + \|f\|_1 \\ &= \left\| \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) \right\|_{(X')'_d} + \|f\|_1 \\ &= \left\| \left(\frac{I(s)}{s} (f^{**}(s) - f^*(s)) \right)^\circ \right\|_X + \|f\|_1, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (2.6) and the HLP principle (2.4) that $\|f^\circ\| \leq \|f\|$ for every $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ and every r.i. norm $\|\cdot\|$. We have therefore obtained “ \lesssim ” in (4.12).

From the definition of the level function, for every $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$, we have

$$\int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} (f^{**}(s) - f^*(s)) ds \leq \int_0^t \left(\frac{I(y)}{y} (f^{**}(y) - f^*(y)) \right)^\circ(s) ds, \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

Using Hardy’s lemma we get to

$$\int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} (f^{**}(s) - f^*(s))g^{**}(s) ds \leq \int_0^t \left(\frac{I(y)}{y} (f^{**}(y) - f^*(y)) \right)^\circ(s) g^{**}(s) ds$$

for every $t \in (0, 1)$, $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$. Using Fubini’s theorem, we rewrite the last inequality as

$$(4.14) \quad \int_0^t g^*(s) \int_s^t \frac{I(y)}{y} (f^{**}(y) - f^*(y)) \frac{dy}{y} ds \leq \int_0^t g^*(s) \int_s^t \left(\frac{I(z)}{z} (f^{**}(z) - f^*(z)) \right)^\circ(y) \frac{dy}{y} ds.$$

For $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s} (f^{**}(s) - f^*(s)) \frac{ds}{s} \\
&= \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^3} \int_0^1 \chi_{(0,s)}(y) f^*(y) dy ds - \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^2} f^*(s) ds \\
(4.15) \quad &= \int_0^1 f^*(y) \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^3} \chi_{(y,1)}(s) ds dy - \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^2} f^*(s) ds \\
&= \underbrace{\int_0^t f^*(y) dy \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^3} ds}_I + \underbrace{\int_t^1 f^*(y) \int_y^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^3} ds dy - \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^2} f^*(s) ds}_{II}.
\end{aligned}$$

In what follows, let c and d be the constants from Definition 2.7. For I we estimate

$$(4.16) \quad I = t f^{**}(t) \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^3} ds \geq c t f^{**}(t) \left(\frac{I(t)}{t^2} - 1 \right) = c \frac{I(t)}{t} f^{**}(t) - c t f^{**}(t).$$

As for II , using that $c < 1$ (Remark 2.8), we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.17) \quad II &\geq \int_t^1 f^*(y) c \left(\frac{I(y)}{y^2} - 1 \right) dy - \int_t^1 \frac{I(y)}{y^2} f^*(y) dy \\
&= \int_t^1 (c-1) f^*(y) \frac{I(y)}{y^2} dy - c \int_t^1 f^*(y) dy \\
&\geq (c-1) f^*(t) \int_t^1 \frac{I(y)}{y^2} dy - c \int_t^1 f^*(y) dy \\
&\geq (c-1) d \frac{I(t)}{t} f^*(t) - c \int_t^1 f^*(y) dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Deploying the assumption $(1-c)d \leq c$, estimates (4.16), (4.17) and (4.15), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1-c) d \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) - c \|f\|_1 \\
&\leq c \frac{I(t)}{t} f^{**}(t) + (c-1) d \frac{I(t)}{t} f^*(t) - c \|f\|_1 \\
&= c \frac{I(t)}{t} f^{**}(t) - c t f^{**}(t) + (c-1) d \frac{I(t)}{t} f^*(t) - c \int_t^1 f^*(y) dy \\
&\leq I + II = \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s} (f^{**}(s) - f^*(s)) \frac{ds}{s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain

$$\frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) \lesssim \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s} (f^{**}(s) - f^*(s)) \frac{ds}{s} + \|f\|_1, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1), t \in (0, 1).$$

Hence, for every $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.18) \quad \left\| \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) \right\|_X &\lesssim \left\| \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s} (f^{**}(s) - f^*(s)) \frac{ds}{s} \right\|_X + \|f\|_1 \\
&\lesssim \left\| \int_t^1 \left(\frac{I(y)}{y} (f^{**}(y) - f^*(y)) \right)^\circ(s) \frac{ds}{s} \right\|_X + \|f\|_1,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality comes from (4.14) by taking $t = 1$ and supremum over all $g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ with $\|g\|_{X'} \leq 1$.

As I has the average property, by Proposition 3.6 $f \mapsto \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f(s) ds$ is bounded simultaneously on L^∞ and m_I . Since the operator S_I is bounded on X' , Theorem 3.9 asserts that $X' \in \text{Int}(L^\infty, m_I)$. Therefore $f \mapsto \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f(s) ds$ is bounded on X' and so, by duality (2.5), its associate operator, $f \mapsto \int_t^1 \frac{f(s)}{s} ds$, is bounded on X . We therefore have

$$\left\| \int_t^1 \left(\frac{I(y)}{y} (f^{**}(y) - f^*(y)) \right)^\circ(s) \frac{ds}{s} \right\|_X \lesssim \left\| \left(\frac{I(y)}{y} (f^{**}(y) - f^*(y)) \right)^\circ \right\|_X.$$

Adding this estimate to (4.18) and using (4.13) we have

$$\left\| \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) \right\|_X \lesssim \left\| \left(\frac{I(y)}{y} (f^{**}(y) - f^*(y)) \right)^\circ \right\|_X + \|f\|_1 \approx \|f\|_{Y_X},$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Remark 4.12. Observe that the average property was only used in Theorem 3.9 to guarantee us the validity of the theorem for an arbitrary r.i. space. Therefore, if the map $f \mapsto \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f(s) ds$ is bounded on the associate space of a certain r.i. space X , we may drop this assumption and still obtain validity of (4.12).

Also, we can view the condition about I having the average property as the property of the operator H_I to push the optimal target space Y_{L^1} far enough from L^1 , so that $f \mapsto f^{**}$ is bounded on Y_{L^1} .

Since we assume condition (1.1), estimate (4.12) reads as

$$\|f\|_{\Lambda_I} \approx \left\| \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) \right\|_1 + \|f\|_1.$$

From here it is evident, that in order to have the right-hand side majorized by the left-hand side, the boundedness of $f \mapsto f^{**}$ on Λ_I is necessary. This, as we remarked, is not satisfied for example by $I(t) = t \log^\alpha \frac{2}{t}$, $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$.

Corollary 4.13. *Let $I \in \mathcal{Q}$ and let X be an r.i. space. Put $\|f\|_Z = \|S_I f^{**}\|_{X'}$. Then*

$$\|f\|_{Y_X} \approx \left\| \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) \right\|_{Z'} + \|f\|_1.$$

Proof. By virtue of Theorem 3.11, Z is an r.i. space which admits boundedness of the operator S_I . Thus, by Theorem 4.11, we have

$$\|f\|_{Y_{Z'}} \approx \left\| \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) \right\|_{Z'} + \|f\|_1.$$

However, by Proposition 4.10,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{Y_{Z'}} &\approx \sup_{\|S_I g\|_Z \leq 1} \int_0^1 \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) g^*(t) dt + \|f\|_1 \\ &\approx \sup_{\|g\|_Z \leq 1} \int_0^1 \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) g^*(t) dt + \|f\|_1 \approx \|f\|_{Y_X}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

4.3. Optimality and supremum operators. This section presents characterization of optimal spaces by the boundedness properties of supremum operators S_I and T_I . We require two preliminary results regarding the optimal domain norm.

Next proposition is an analogue of Theorem 3.14 for the operator S_I .

Proposition 4.14. *Let Y be an r.i. space and assume that a quasiconcave function I satisfies (1.1) and the average property. Then the operator S_I is bounded on X'_Y .*

Proof. By virtue of Proposition 4.1, the optimal domain space under the map H_I , X_Y , exists for every r.i. space Y and is optimal in

$$\|H_I f\|_Y \lesssim \|f\|_{X_Y}, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

This means, by duality, that X'_Y is optimal in

$$(4.19) \quad \|R_I f^*\|_{X'_Y} \lesssim \|f\|_{Y'}, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

From the definition of the norm of the space Y'_{X_Y} , it easily follows that Y'_{X_Y} is optimal in

$$(4.20) \quad \|R_I f^*\|_{X'_Y} \lesssim \|f\|_{Y'_{X_Y}}, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Let us check that X'_Y , too, is optimal therein. Assume that

$$\|R_I f^*\|_Z \lesssim \|f\|_{Y'_{X_Y}}, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1),$$

for some r.i. space Z . We need to show that $X'_Y \hookrightarrow Z$. Optimality of Y'_{X_Y} in (4.20) and inequality (4.19) tell us that $Y' \hookrightarrow Y'_{X_Y}$, which in turn implies that

$$\|R_I f^*\|_Z \lesssim \|f\|_{Y'}.$$

Finally, optimality of space X'_Y in (4.19) yields $X'_Y \hookrightarrow Z$ as we wanted.

Now, let us set $\|f\|_Z = \|S_I f\|_{X'_Y}$ for $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$. By virtue of Theorem 3.11, Z is an r.i. space. Then, by (4.6), for the space X_Y instead of X , we obtain

$$\|R_I f^*\|_Z \lesssim \|f\|_{Y'_{X_Y}}.$$

Optimality of X'_Y in (4.20) therefore tells us that $\|f\|_Z \lesssim \|f\|_{X'_Y}$. In other words, S_I is bounded on X'_Y . \square

In the final theorem of the section, we will need an alternative description of the optimal domain norm. Boundedness of the operator T_I plays essential role in there.

Theorem 4.15. *Let I be a quasiconcave function satisfying (1.1). Let Y be an r.i. space such that $H_I 1 \in Y$. If T_I is bounded on Y' , then*

$$\sup_{h \sim f} \|H_I h\|_Y \approx \|H_I f^*\|_Y, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

In other words, for the optimal domain space we have

$$\|f\|_{X_Y} \approx \|H_I f^*\|_Y, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Proof. First, as $H_I 1 \in Y$, $\|\cdot\|_{X_Y}$ is an r.i. norm by Proposition 4.1. Next, as T_I is bounded on Y' , we have

$$\|g\|_{Y'} \approx \|T_I g\|_{Y'}, \quad g \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

We need to check that

$$\sup_{h \sim f} \|H_I h\|_Y \lesssim \|H_I f^*\|_Y, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

To this end, fix $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$. We estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_t^1 \frac{f(s)}{I(s)} ds \right\|_Y &= \sup_{\|g\|_{Y'} \leq 1} \int_0^1 g^*(t) \int_t^1 \frac{f(s)}{I(s)} ds dt \\ &= \sup_{\|g\|_{Y'} \leq 1} \int_0^1 \frac{f(s)}{I(s)} \int_0^s g^*(t) dt ds \\ &\leq \sup_{\|g\|_{Y'} \leq 1} \int_0^1 \frac{f(s)}{I(s)} \int_0^s (T_I g)(t) dt ds \\ &\approx \sup_{\|g\|_{Y'} \leq 1} \int_0^1 \frac{f(s)}{\int_0^s \frac{I(r)}{r} dr} \int_0^s (T_I g)(t) dt ds \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sup_{\|g\|_{Y'} \leq 1} \int_0^1 \frac{f^*(s)}{\int_0^s \frac{I(r)}{r} dr} \int_0^s (T_I g)(t) dt ds \\
&\approx \sup_{\|T_I g\|_{Y'} \leq 1} \int_0^1 (T_I g)(t) \int_t^1 \frac{f^*(s)}{I(s)} ds dt \\
&\approx \sup_{\|g\|_{Y'} \leq 1} \int_0^1 g^*(t) \int_t^1 \frac{f^*(s)}{I(s)} ds dt = \left\| \int_t^1 \frac{f^*(s)}{I(s)} ds \right\|_Y.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the first and second “ \approx ” is the assumption that $I(t) \approx \int_0^t \frac{I(s)}{s} ds$. In the second inequality we used the Hardy-Littlewood inequality (2.1), and the fact that

$$s \mapsto \frac{1}{\int_0^s \frac{I(t)}{t} dt} \int_0^s (T_I g)(t) dt = \frac{1}{\int_0^s \frac{I(t)}{t} dt} \int_0^s \sup_{t \leq r < 1} \frac{r}{I(r)} g^*(r) \frac{I(t)}{t} dt$$

is nonincreasing, being the integral mean of a nonincreasing function with respect to the measure $\frac{I(t)}{t} dt$. \square

We are finally prepared to prove the main theorem of the paper.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Since $\frac{1}{t}$ is integrable, the optimal domain space X_Z exists for every r.i. space Z by Proposition 4.1. By Proposition 4.14, S_I is bounded on X'_Y . This, by Theorem 4.11, means that

$$(4.21) \quad \|f\|_{X_{X_Y}} \approx \left\| \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) \right\|_{X_Y} + \|f\|_1, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Now, given an r.i. space Z , operator T_I is bounded on Y'_Z by virtue of Theorem 3.14. Hence, by Theorem 4.15, we have

$$(4.22) \quad \|f\|_{X_{Y_Z}} \approx \left\| \int_t^1 \frac{f^*(s)}{I(s)} ds \right\|_{Y_Z}, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Assuming now that X is optimal for some Y , we have that $X = X_Y$. Consequently (4.21) turns into (1.3) and S_I is bounded X' .

On the contrary, assuming S_I is bounded on X' , we obtain validity of (1.3) by Theorem 4.11. We show that $X_{Y_X} = X$. To this end, let $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$ be given. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.23) \quad \|f\|_{X_{Y_X}} &\approx \left\| \int_t^1 \frac{f^*(s)}{I(s)} ds \right\|_{Y_X} \\
&\approx \left\| \frac{I(t)}{t} \left(\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \int_s^1 \frac{f^*(r)}{I(r)} dr ds - \int_t^1 \frac{f^*(s)}{I(s)} ds \right) \right\|_X + \int_0^1 \int_t^1 \frac{f^*(s)}{I(s)} ds dt \\
&= \left\| \frac{I(t)}{t^2} \int_0^t \frac{r}{I(r)} f^*(r) dr \right\|_X + \int_0^1 \int_t^1 \frac{f^*(s)}{I(s)} ds dt,
\end{aligned}$$

because, by Fubini's theorem,

$$\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \int_s^1 \frac{f^*(r)}{I(r)} dr ds - \int_t^1 \frac{f^*(s)}{I(s)} ds = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \frac{s}{I(s)} f^*(s) ds.$$

Further,

$$(4.24) \quad \int_0^1 \int_t^1 \frac{f^*(s)}{I(s)} ds dt \leq \int_0^1 f^*(t) \int_t^1 \frac{ds}{I(s)} dt \leq \int_0^1 f^*(t) dt \int_0^1 \frac{ds}{I(s)} \lesssim \|f\|_1 \lesssim \|f\|_X.$$

Observe that the operator R defined by

$$Rf(t) = \frac{I(t)}{t^2} \int_0^t \frac{s}{I(s)} f(s) ds, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1), t \in (0, 1),$$

is associate to the operator H defined in (4.8). Now, quasiconcavity of I implies that

$$\int_0^t \frac{s}{I(s)} ds \approx \frac{t^2}{I(t)}, \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

Therefore, for the operator R' defined by

$$R'f(t) = \frac{1}{\int_0^t \frac{s}{I(s)} ds} \int_0^t \frac{s}{I(s)} f(s) ds, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1), t \in (0, 1),$$

we have

$$Rf(t) \approx R'f(t), \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1), t \in (0, 1).$$

The advantage of the operator R' is that $R'f^*$ is nonincreasing for every $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$, being the integral mean of f^* with respect to the measure $\frac{t}{I(t)} dt$. Hence, using (4.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Rf^*\|_X &\approx \|R'f^*\|_X = \sup_{\|g\|_{X'} \leq 1} \int_0^1 R'f^*(t)g^*(t) dt \approx \sup_{\|g\|_{X'} \leq 1} \int_0^1 Rf^*(t)g^*(t) dt \\ &= \sup_{\|g\|_{X'} \leq 1} \int_0^1 f^*(t)Hg^*(t) dt \lesssim \sup_{\|g\|_{X'} \leq 1} \int_0^1 f^*(t)g^*(t) dt = \|f^*\|_X, \end{aligned}$$

for every $f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$.

We also see that

$$\frac{I(t)}{t^2} \int_0^t \frac{r}{I(r)} f^*(r) dr \geq f^*(t) \cdot \frac{I(t)}{t^2} \int_0^t \frac{r}{I(r)} dr \geq f^*(t) \cdot \frac{I(t)}{t^2} \int_{\frac{t}{2}}^t \frac{r}{I(r)} dr \approx f^*(t),$$

as $I \in \Delta_2$. Thus

$$\left\| \frac{I(t)}{t^2} \int_0^t \frac{r}{I(r)} f^*(r) dr \right\|_X \approx \|f\|_X, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Combining this with (4.23) and (4.24) yields

$$\|f\|_{X_{Y_X}} \approx \|f\|_X.$$

Turning our attention to the second part, the assumption on optimality of Y for some space X implies $Y = Y_X$. Hence T_I is bounded on Y' and (4.22) turns into (1.4).

In the other direction, let us assume that T_I is bounded on Y' . We show that $Y = Y_{X_Y}$, which shows optimality of Y for some space – X_Y in fact.

For $t \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^2} (f^{**}(s) - f^*(s)) ds &= \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^3} \int_0^s f^*(r) dr ds - \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^2} f^*(s) ds \\ &= \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^3} \int_0^t f^*(r) dr ds + \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^3} \int_t^s f^*(r) dr ds - \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^2} f^*(s) ds \\ &\geq \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^3} \int_0^t f^*(r) dr ds + \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^3} (s-t) f^*(s) ds - \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^2} f^*(s) ds \\ &= \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^3} \int_0^t f^*(r) dr ds - t \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^3} f^*(s) ds \\ &\geq t \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^3} f^{**}(t) ds - t f^*(t) \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^3} ds \\ &\geq t \int_t^{2t} \frac{I(s)}{s^3} ds (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) \approx \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Using this, (4.21) and Theorem 4.15, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.25) \quad \|f\|_{Y_{X_Y}} &\approx \left\| \frac{I(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) \right\|_{X_Y} + \|f\|_1 \\
&\lesssim \left\| \int_t^1 \frac{I(s)}{s^2} (f^{**}(s) - f^*(s)) \, ds \right\|_{X_Y} + \|f\|_1 \\
&\approx \left\| \int_t^1 \frac{1}{I(s)} \int_s^1 \frac{I(r)}{r^2} (f^{**}(r) - f^*(r)) \, dr \, ds \right\|_Y + \|f\|_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, for every $h \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.26) \quad \int_t^1 \frac{1}{I(s)} \int_s^1 h(r) \frac{dr}{r} \, ds &= \int_t^1 \frac{h(r)}{r} \int_t^r \frac{ds}{I(s)} \, dr \leq \int_t^1 \frac{h(r)}{r} \int_0^r \frac{ds}{I(s)} \, dr \\
&\lesssim \int_t^1 \frac{h(r)}{r} \cdot \frac{r}{I(r)} \, dr = \int_t^1 \frac{h(r)}{I(r)} \, dr,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is the average property of I . Further,

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.27) \quad \int_t^1 \frac{1}{s^2} \int_0^s h(r) \, dr \, ds &= \int_t^1 \frac{1}{s^2} \int_0^t h(y) \, dy \, ds + \int_t^1 \frac{1}{s^2} \int_t^s h(r) \, dr \, ds \\
&\leq \int_0^t h(y) \, dy \int_t^1 \frac{ds}{s^2} + \int_t^1 h(r) \int_r^1 \frac{ds}{s^2} \, dr \\
&\leq \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t h(r) \, dr + \int_t^1 \frac{h(r)}{r} \, dr.
\end{aligned}$$

Deploying (4.26) for $h(r) = \frac{I(r)}{r} (f^{**}(r) - f^*(r))$ and (4.27) for $h(r) = f^*(r)$ in this order in (4.25) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.28) \quad \|f\|_{Y_{X_Y}} &\lesssim \left\| \int_t^1 \frac{1}{s} (f^{**}(s) - f^*(s)) \, ds \right\|_Y + \|f\|_1 \\
&= \left\| \int_t^1 \frac{1}{s^2} \int_0^s f^*(r) \, dr \, ds - \int_t^1 f^*(s) \frac{ds}{s} \right\|_Y + \|f\|_1 \\
&\leq \|f^{**}\|_Y + \|f\|_1.
\end{aligned}$$

We now claim that $T_I: Y' \rightarrow Y'$ implies $Y \subset \Lambda_I$. In the proof of Proposition 4.2 we showed that $\Lambda_I' = m_{\bar{\gamma}}$ whenever I satisfies (1.1). Therefore, we can equivalently show that $Y' \supset m_{\bar{\gamma}}$. Now, for every $f \in m_{\bar{\gamma}}$ there exists $c \geq 0$ such that $f^*(t) \leq c \frac{I(t)}{t}$, $t \in (0, 1)$. Thus, from the lattice property of the space Y' , it suffices to show that $t \mapsto \frac{I(t)}{t} \in Y'$. We observe that $(T_I 1)(t) = \frac{I(t)}{t}$, $t \in (0, 1)$, and so, using the boundedness of the operator T_I on Y' , we have

$$\left\| \frac{I(t)}{t} \right\|_{Y'} = \|T_I 1\|_{Y'} \lesssim \|1\|_{Y'} < \infty.$$

Hence, combining Proposition 4.2 with [25, Theorem 10.3.12] (note that (2.9) is satisfied), we conclude that $f \mapsto f^{**}$ is bounded on Y . Adding this piece of information to (4.28), we obtain

$$\|f\|_{Y_{X_Y}} \lesssim \|f\|_Y.$$

As $Y_{X_Y} \subset Y$ holds trivially, the proof is complete. \square

5. APPLICATIONS TO SOBOLEV EMBEDDINGS

In this section we come back to conditions which we used throughout the paper and see which functions satisfy them. As the function I plays the role of the isoperimetric profile of a domain, we will be mainly interested in two types of domains. Firstly, those whose isoperimetric profile is related to polynomials $I(t) = t^\alpha$, $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{n'}, 1)$

and, secondly, product probability spaces. To this end, we check which conditions are satisfied. We have already stated in the preliminary section that polynomials belong to class \mathcal{Q} .

We shall first summarize relevant observations concerning polynomials.

Proposition 5.1 (Polynomials t^α for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$). *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ be given. Then $I(t) = t^\alpha$ belongs to class \mathcal{Q} . To be precise, for the constants c and d from the Definition 2.7 we have $c = \frac{1}{2-\alpha}$ and $d = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}$. Consequently, the conclusion of Theorem 1.2 is valid for such a choice of function I .*

We now show that the isoperimetric function of product probability spaces satisfy the condition (1.1). Let us consider $\Phi: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. Assume Φ is twice differentiable, strictly increasing and convex in $(0, \infty)$, $\sqrt{\Phi}$ is concave and $\Phi(0) = 0$. Define further a measure on \mathbb{R} by

$$d\mu_\Phi(x) = c_\Phi e^{-\Phi(|x|)} dx,$$

where c_Φ is such that $\mu_\Phi(\mathbb{R}) = 1$.

We then define its *product measure* $\mu_{\Phi, n}$ on \mathbb{R}^n as

$$\mu_{\Phi, n} = \underbrace{\mu_\Phi \times \cdots \times \mu_\Phi}_{n\text{-times}}.$$

Then $(\mathbb{R}^n, \mu_{\Phi, n})$ is a probability space.

It is further known by [7, Chapter 7] that

$$(5.1) \quad I(t) = I_{\mathbb{R}^n, \mu_{\Phi, n}}(t) \approx t\Phi' \left(\Phi^{-1} \left(\log \frac{2}{t} \right) \right), \quad t \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2} \right).$$

Note that I is quasiconcave function – I being nondecreasing is proved in [7, Lemma 11.1], while $t \mapsto \frac{I(t)}{t}$ being nonincreasing follows from the fact that Φ is increasing and convex. We now check that $I'(t) \approx \frac{I(t)}{t}$ on some right neighbourhood of 0. This implies that I satisfies condition (1.1).

First, we observe that $\Phi \in \Delta_2$. Indeed, to see this, recall that $\sqrt{\Phi}$ is concave and so $\sqrt{\Phi} \in \Delta_2$. We estimate

$$\Phi(2t) = \left(\sqrt{\Phi(2t)} \right)^2 \leq \left(c\sqrt{\Phi(t)} \right)^2 = c^2\Phi(t), \quad t \in (0, \infty).$$

As Φ is an increasing convex function with $\Phi(0) = 0$, we write

$$\Phi(t) = \int_0^t \Phi'(s) ds, \quad t \in (0, \infty).$$

Convexity tells us that Φ' is nondecreasing and so, for every $t \in (0, \infty)$, we have

$$\Phi(t) = \int_0^t \Phi'(s) ds \leq t\Phi'(t) \leq \int_t^{2t} \Phi'(s) ds \leq \Phi(2t).$$

Combining with the knowledge that $\Phi \in \Delta_2$, we obtain

$$\Phi'(t) \approx \frac{\Phi(t)}{t}, \quad t \in (0, \infty).$$

Plugging this new information into (5.1), we have

$$(5.2) \quad I(t) \approx \frac{t \log \frac{2}{t}}{\Phi^{-1} \left(\log \frac{2}{t} \right)}, \quad t \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2} \right),$$

and so we may as well consider the very last expression to be the representative of I . Differentiating, we get

$$I'(t) = \frac{\left(\log \frac{2}{t} - 1 \right) \Phi^{-1} \left(\log \frac{2}{t} \right) - \frac{1}{\Phi' \left(\Phi^{-1} \left(\log \frac{2}{t} \right) \right)} \cdot \frac{-1}{t} \cdot t \log \frac{2}{t}}{\left(\Phi^{-1} \left(\log \frac{2}{t} \right) \right)^2}$$

$$= \underbrace{\frac{(\log \frac{2}{t} - 1)}{\Phi^{-1}(\log \frac{2}{t})}}_{A(t)} + \underbrace{\frac{\log \frac{2}{t}}{\Phi'(\Phi^{-1}(\log \frac{2}{t})) \cdot (\Phi^{-1}(\log \frac{2}{t}))^2}}_{B(t)}, \quad t \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right).$$

As for A , we simply note that $\log \frac{2}{t} - 1 \approx \log \frac{2}{t}$ on some right neighbourhood of 0, because $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \log \frac{2}{t} = \infty$. Therefore, it follows that $A(t) \approx \frac{I(t)}{t}$. Using both (5.1) and (5.2), we obtain

$$B(t) \approx \frac{\log \frac{2}{t}}{\frac{I(t)}{t}} \cdot \left(\frac{I(t)}{t \log \frac{2}{t}}\right)^2 = \frac{I(t)}{t \log \frac{2}{t}}.$$

Finally, observing that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{B(t)}{A(t)} = 0$, we conclude that B is negligible.

We have therefore proved the following proposition.

Proposition 5.2. *Let I be as in (5.1). Then I satisfies condition (1.1).*

Recall that Maz'ya classes of domains \mathcal{J}_α for $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{n'}, 1)$ are defined as

$$\mathcal{J}_\alpha = \left\{ \Omega : I_\Omega(t) \gtrsim t^\alpha, t \in \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right] \right\}.$$

Since $I(t) = t^\alpha$ enjoys the average property, we have, by virtue of [7, Proposition 8.6],

$$\|R_I^m f\|_X \approx \left\| \frac{t^{m-1}}{I(t)^m} \int_0^t f(s) \, ds \right\|_X, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1),$$

and

$$\|H_I^m f\|_X \approx \left\| \int_t^1 \frac{s^{m-1}}{I(s)^m} f(s) \, ds \right\|_X, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1),$$

for every r.i. space X . Define a function $J: (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ by

$$J(t) = \frac{I(t)^m}{t^{m-1}} = t^{1-m(1-\alpha)}, \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

From here, we see that whenever $1 - m(1 - \alpha) > 0$, then $J(t)$ is an increasing, strictly concave bijection of $(0, 1)$ onto itself. Proposition 5.1 therefore asserts that the function $J \in \mathcal{Q}$. Therefore, for this particular choice of I , Theorem 1.2 reads as follows:

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{n'}, 1)$ be given and let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $1 - m(1 - \alpha) > 0$. Put $J(t) = t^{1-m(1-\alpha)}$ for $t \in (0, 1)$. Then an r.i. space X is the optimal domain space under the map H_I^m for some r.i. space Y if and only if S_J is bounded on X' . In that case,*

$$\|f\|_{Y_X} \approx \left\| \frac{J(t)}{t} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) \right\|_X + \|f\|_1, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Vice versa, an r.i. space Y is the optimal target space under the map H_I^m for some r.i. space X if and only if T_J is bounded on Y' . In that case,

$$\|f\|_{X_Y} \approx \left\| \int_t^1 \frac{f^*(s)}{J(s)} \, ds \right\|_Y, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Recall that a bounded open $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be a *John domain*, if there exists $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $c > 0$ such that for every $x \in \Omega$ there exists a rectifiable curve $\gamma_x: [0, l] \rightarrow \Omega$, parametrized by its arclength, such that

$$\text{dist}(\gamma_x(t), \partial\Omega) \geq ct, \quad t \in [0, l].$$

It is known that for every John domain Ω we have $I_\Omega(t) \approx t^{\frac{1}{n'}}$. Note that every Lipschitz domain is also a John domain.

Now, given $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ a John domain, [7, Theorem 6.1] asserts that

$$H_{I_\Omega}^m : X \rightarrow Y \iff V^m X \rightarrow Y$$

whenever X and Y are r.i. spaces. Combining this with Theorem 5.3, we obtain the following.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a John domain. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m < n$ be given and put $J(t) = t^{1-\frac{m}{n}}$ for $t \in (0, 1)$. Then an r.i. space $X(\Omega)$ is the optimal domain space in the m -th order Sobolev embedding for some r.i. space $Y(\Omega)$ if and only if S_J is bounded on X' . In that case,*

$$\|f\|_{Y_X} \approx \left\| t^{-\frac{m}{n}} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) \right\|_X + \|f\|_1, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Vice versa, an r.i. space $Y(\Omega)$ is the optimal target space in the m -th order Sobolev embedding for some r.i. space $X(\Omega)$, if and only if T_J is bounded on Y' , in which case

$$\|f\|_{X_Y} \approx \left\| \int_t^1 s^{\frac{m}{n}-1} f^*(s) ds \right\|_Y, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Theorem 5.4 recovers [15, Theorem A] for Lipschitz domains and extends the result to John domains.

Now, the special case of [19, Section 5.3.3] exhibits existence of a particular domain Ω_α whose isoperimetric profile satisfies $I_{\Omega_\alpha}(t) \approx t^\alpha$. Let $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{n}, 1)$ and define $\eta_\alpha: [0, \frac{1}{1-\alpha}] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ by

$$\eta_\alpha(r) = \omega_{n-1}^{-\frac{1}{n-1}} (1 - (1-\alpha)r)^{\frac{\alpha}{(1-\alpha)(n-1)}}, \quad r \in \left[0, \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\right],$$

where ω_{n-1} denotes the Lebesgue measure of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} .

Define $\Omega_\alpha \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ as

$$(5.3) \quad \Omega_\alpha = \left\{ (x', x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, 0 < x_n < \frac{1}{1-\alpha}, |x'| < \eta_\alpha(x_n) \right\}.$$

Then $|\Omega_\alpha| = 1$ and $I_{\Omega_\alpha}(t) \approx t^\alpha$, $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. In particular, $\Omega_\alpha \in \mathcal{J}_\alpha$.

Theorem 5.5. *Let $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{n}, 1)$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $1 - m(1-\alpha) > 0$. Put $J(t) = t^{1-m(1-\alpha)}$ and let Ω_α be as in (5.3). Then an r.i. space $X(\Omega_\alpha)$ is the optimal domain space in the m -th order Sobolev embedding for some r.i. space $Y(\Omega_\alpha)$ if and only if S_J is bounded on X' . In this case, $V^m X(\Omega) \rightarrow Y(\Omega)$ for every $\Omega \in \mathcal{J}_\alpha$ and*

$$\|f\|_{Y_X} \approx \left\| t^{-m(1-\alpha)} (f^{**}(t) - f^*(t)) \right\|_X + \|f\|_1, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Vice versa, an r.i. space $Y(\Omega_\alpha)$ is the optimal target space in the m -th order Sobolev embedding for some r.i. space $X(\Omega_\alpha)$ if and only if T_J is bounded on Y' . In this case, $V^m X(\Omega) \rightarrow Y(\Omega)$ for every $\Omega \in \mathcal{J}_\alpha$ and

$$\|f\|_{X_Y} \approx \left\| \int_t^1 s^{m(1-\alpha)-1} f^*(s) ds \right\|_X, \quad f \in \mathcal{M}_+(0, 1).$$

Proof. By [7, Theorem 6.4] $H_J: X \rightarrow Y$ if and only if $\forall \Omega \in \mathcal{J}_\alpha: V^m X(\Omega) \rightarrow Y(\Omega)$. Hence the result follows from Theorem 1.2. \square

We will now present a specification of our main results to Sobolev embeddings involving Lorentz–Zygmund spaces to obtain a new way to compute the norm and compare it to the known results.

Theorem 5.6. *Let $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{n}, 1)$ be given and let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $1 - m(1-\alpha) > 0$. Set $X = L^{p,q,\beta}$. Then for the optimal target space of X in the Sobolev embedding we have*

$$(5.4) \quad \|f\|_{Y_X} \approx \left(\int_0^1 t^{\frac{q}{p}-1} \ell_1^{\beta q}(t) \left[\left(s \mapsto s^{-m(1-\alpha)} (f^{**}(s) - f^*(s)) \right)^*(t) \right]^q dt \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} + \|f\|_1.$$

Furthermore, the norm in (5.4) is equivalent to

$$\left(\int_0^1 t^{\frac{q-qp m(1-\alpha)-p}{p}} \ell_1^{\beta q}(t) (f^*)^q(t) dt \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \quad \text{if } p = q = 1, \beta \geq 0 \text{ or } p \in \left(1, \frac{1}{m(1-\alpha)} \right),$$

$$\left(\int_0^1 t^{-1} \ell_1^{q(\beta-1)}(t) (f^*)^q(t) dt \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \quad \text{if } p = \frac{1}{m(1-\alpha)}, \beta < 1 - \frac{1}{q},$$

$$\left(\int_0^1 t^{-1} \ell_1^{-1}(t) \ell_2^{-q}(t) (f^*)^q(t) dt \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \quad \text{if } p = \frac{1}{m(1-\alpha)}, q \in (1, \infty], \beta = 1 - \frac{1}{q},$$

$$f^*(0+) \quad \text{if } p = \frac{1}{m(1-\alpha)}, \beta > 1 - \frac{1}{q} \text{ or } p = \frac{1}{m(1-\alpha)}, q = 1, \beta \geq 0 \text{ or } p > \frac{1}{m(1-\alpha)}.$$

Proof. The relation (5.4) is an immediate application of Theorem 5.5. The equivalence can be derived from [20, Proposition 6.4]. \square

Remark 5.7. We would like to point out that, although the equivalence does not seem surprising, relations between spaces involving the quantity $f^{**} - f^*$ to those involving just f^* are quite difficult, and even the question whether such spaces are linear is highly nontrivial, for details see, for example, [5].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

This research was supported by grant no. 23-04720S of the Czech Science Foundation.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bastero, M. Milman, and F. J. Ruiz Blasco. A note on $L(\infty, q)$ spaces and Sobolev embeddings. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 52(5):1215–1230, 2003.
- [2] C. Bennett, R. A. DeVore, and R. Sharpley. Weak- L^∞ and BMO. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 113(3):601–611, 1981.
- [3] C. Bennett and R. Sharpley. *Interpolation of operators*, volume 129 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Academic Press, Inc., Boston, MA, 1988.
- [4] M. Carro, A. Gogatishvili, J. Martín, and L. s. Pick. Weighted inequalities involving two Hardy operators with applications to embeddings of function spaces. *J. Operator Theory*, 59(2):309–332, 2008.
- [5] M. J. Carro, A. Gogatishvili, J. Martín, and L. Pick. Functional properties of rearrangement invariant spaces defined in terms of oscillations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 229(2):375–404, 2005.
- [6] M. J. Carro, A. Gogatishvili, J. Martín, and L. s. Pick. Functional properties of rearrangement invariant spaces defined in terms of oscillations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 229(2):375–404, 2005.
- [7] A. Cianchi, L. Pick, and L. Slavíková. Higher-order Sobolev embeddings and isoperimetric inequalities. *Adv. Math.*, 273:568–650, 2015.
- [8] M. Cwikel and P. Nilsson. Interpolation of Marcinkiewicz spaces. *Math. Scand.*, 56(1):29–42, 1985.
- [9] E. De Giorgi. Sulla proprietà isoperimetrica dell’ipersfera, nella classe degli insiemi aventi frontiera orientata di misura finita. *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Mem. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur. Sez. Ia (8)*, 5:33–44, 1958.
- [10] H. Federer and W. H. Fleming. Normal and integral currents. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 72:458–520, 1960.
- [11] E. Gagliardo. Proprietà di alcune classi di funzioni in più variabili. *Ricerche Mat.*, 7:102–137, 1958.
- [12] A. Gogatishvili, B. Opic, and L. Pick. Weighted inequalities for Hardy-type operators involving suprema. *Collect. Math.*, 57(3):227–255, 2006.
- [13] R. Kerman, C. Phipps, and L. Pick. Marcinkiewicz interpolation theorems for Orlicz and Lorentz gamma spaces. *Publ. Mat.*, 58(1):3–30, 2014.
- [14] R. Kerman and L. Pick. Optimal Sobolev imbeddings. *Forum Math.*, 18(4):535–570, 2006.
- [15] R. Kerman and L. Pick. Optimal Sobolev imbedding spaces. *Studia Math.*, 192(3):195–217, 2009.
- [16] J. Martín and M. Milman. Symmetrization inequalities and Sobolev embeddings. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 134(8):2335–2347, 2006.
- [17] V. G. Maz’ya. Classes of domains and imbedding theorems for function spaces. *Soviet Math. Dokl.*, 1:882–885, 1960.
- [18] V. G. Maz’ya. p -conductivity and theorems on imbedding certain functional spaces into a C -space. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 140:299–302, 1961.
- [19] V. G. Maz’ya. *Sobolev spaces with applications to elliptic partial differential equations*, volume 342 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, Heidelberg, augmented edition, 2011.
- [20] Z. Mihula. Optimal behavior of weighted Hardy operators on rearrangement-invariant spaces. *Math. Nachr.*, 296(8):3492–3538, 2023.
- [21] M. Milman. Interpolation of operators of mixed weak-strong type between rearrangement invariant spaces. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 28(6):985–992, 1979.
- [22] M. Milman and E. Pustylnik. On sharp higher order Sobolev embeddings. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 6(3):495–511, 2004.
- [23] A. Nekvinda and D. Peša. On the properties of quasi-Banach function spaces. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 34(8):Paper No. 231, 2024.

- [24] L. Nirenberg. On elliptic partial differential equations. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3)*, 13:115–162, 1959.
- [25] L. Pick, A. Kufner, O. John, and S. Fučík. *Function spaces. Vol. 1*, volume 14 of *De Gruyter Series in Nonlinear Analysis and Applications*. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, extended edition, 2013.
- [26] E. Pustylnik. Sobolev type inequalities in ultrasymmetric spaces with applications to Orlicz-Sobolev embeddings. *J. Funct. Spaces Appl.*, 3(2):183–208, 2005.
- [27] G. Sinnamon. The level function in rearrangement invariant spaces. *Publ. Mat.*, 45(1):175–198, 2001.
- [28] G. Sinnamon. Monotonicity in Banach function spaces. In *NAFSA 8—Nonlinear analysis, function spaces and applications. Vol. 8*, pages 204–240. Czech. Acad. Sci., Prague, 2007.
- [29] S. Sobolev. On some estimates relating to families of functions having derivatives that are square integrable. In *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, volume 1, pages 267–270, 1936.
- [30] J. Takáč. Optimality of function spaces for kernel integral operators. *Math. Nachr.*, 296(9):4429–4453, 2023.
- [31] W. P. Ziemer. *Weakly differentiable functions*, volume 120 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989. Sobolev spaces and functions of bounded variation.

DAVID KUBÍČEK, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, CHARLES UNIVERSITY, SOKOLOVSKÁ 83, 186 75 PRAHA 8, CZECH REPUBLIC
Email address: kubicek@karlin.mff.cuni.cz