

CHARACTERIZATIONS OF H^1 AND FEFFERMAN-STEIN DECOMPOSITIONS OF BMO FUNCTIONS BY SYSTEMS OF SINGULAR INTEGRALS IN THE DUNKL SETTING

JACEK DZIUBAŃSKI AND AGNIESZKA HEJNA

ABSTRACT. We extend the classical theorem of Uchiyama about constructive Fefferman-Stein decompositions of BMO functions by systems of singular integrals to the rational Dunkl setting. On \mathbb{R}^N equipped with a root system R and a multiplicity function $k \geq 0$, let $dw(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{\alpha \in R} |\langle \alpha, \mathbf{x} \rangle|^{k(\alpha)} d\mathbf{x}$ denote the associated measure and let \mathcal{F} stand for the Dunkl (Fourier-Dunkl) transform. Consider a system $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_d)$ of smooth away from the origin and homogeneous of degree zero functions on \mathbb{R}^N . We prove that if

$$\text{rank} \begin{pmatrix} \theta_1(\xi) & \theta_2(\xi) & \dots & \theta_d(\xi) \\ \theta_1(-\xi) & \theta_2(-\xi) & \dots & \theta_d(-\xi) \end{pmatrix} = 2 \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^N, \|\xi\| = 1,$$

then any compactly supported $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^N, \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|, dw)$ function f can be written as

$$f = g_0 + \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{S}^{\{j\}} g_j, \quad \left\| \sum_{j=0}^d g_j \right\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \|f\|_{\text{BMO}},$$

where $\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}} g = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\theta_j \mathcal{F} g)$. As a corollary we obtain characterization of the Hardy space H_{Dunkl}^1 by the system of the singular integral operators $(\mathbf{S}^{\{1\}}, \mathbf{S}^{\{2\}}, \dots, \mathbf{S}^{\{d\}})$.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Preliminaries	4
3. Homogeneous kernels and Dunkl multiplier operators	7
3.1. Regular kernels	7
3.2. Condition (Δ)	10
3.3. Estimates for translations of kernels	10
4. Hardy and BMO spaces - basic properties	12
4.1. Characterizations of H_{Dunkl}^1	12
4.2. $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ and $\text{VMO}(\mathbf{X})$ spaces - duality	13
4.3. Properties of $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$	13
4.4. $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ and Carleson measure	15
5. Chang–Fefferman decomposition	18
5.1. Calderón reproducing formula	18
5.2. Chang–Fefferman decomposition	19
5.3. Support properties	20
5.4. Size and regularity properties	20
5.5. Actions of singular integrals on a_Q	22
5.6. Main lemma	24

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. primary: 44A20, 42B20, 42B25, 47B38, 35K08, 33C52, 39A70.

Key words and phrases. rational Dunkl theory, root systems, singular integrals, Hardy spaces, bounded mean oscillation spaces .

5.7. Auxiliary functions	25
6. Constructive Fefferman-Stein decomposition of BMO(\mathbf{X}) functions	28
6.1. Proof of Theorem 6.1	29
6.2. Proof of Theorem 1.3	39
7. Proof of characterization of H_{Dunkl}^1 by systems of singular integrals	40
Appendix A. Proof of Theorem 3.8	41
Notation	42
Appendix B. Summary of key mathematical constants, their first appearance, and relationships	43
References	44

1. INTRODUCTION

The classical result of Uchiyama [22] asserts that if a system $(\theta_1(\xi), \theta_2(\xi), \dots, \theta_d(\xi))$ of complex valued functions on \mathbb{R}^N , which are C^∞ away from the origin and homogeneous of degree zero, satisfies the condition

$$(\Delta) \quad \text{rank} \begin{pmatrix} \theta_1(\xi) & \theta_2(\xi) & \dots & \theta_d(\xi) \\ \theta_1(-\xi) & \theta_2(-\xi) & \dots & \theta_d(-\xi) \end{pmatrix} = 2 \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^N, \|\xi\| = 1,$$

then the system of the Fourier multiplier operators (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_d) , where

$$\widehat{S_j f}(\xi) = \theta_j(\xi) \widehat{f}(\xi),$$

characterizes the classical real Hardy space $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, that is, an $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ -function f belongs to $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ if and only if $S_j f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq d$. Here the actions of S_j on $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ -functions are understood in the sense of distribution.

The aim of this work is to extend the result of Uchiyama to the rational Dunkl setting. To be more precise, on \mathbb{R}^N equipped with a root system R and a multiplicity function $k \geq 0$, let

$$(1.1) \quad dw(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{\alpha \in R} |\langle \alpha, \mathbf{x} \rangle|^{k(\alpha)} d\mathbf{x}$$

denote the associated measure, where here and subsequently $d\mathbf{x}$ means the Lebesgue measure. Let $\mathcal{F}f$ and $\mathcal{F}^{-1}f$ stand the Dunkl transform and the inversion of the Dunkl transform of f respectively (see (2.5)). Following the classical theory (see Fefferman-Stein [14]), we say that an $L^1(dw)$ -function f belongs to the Hardy space H_{Dunkl}^1 if the maximal function (built up from the Dunkl-heat semigroup)

$$\mathcal{M}f(\mathbf{x}) = \sup_{\|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \leq t} |e^{t\Delta_k} f(\mathbf{x}')|$$

belongs to $L^1(dw)$, where Δ_k is the Dunkl Laplace operator. Then we set

$$\|f\|_{H_{\text{Dunkl}}^1} = \|\mathcal{M}f\|_{L^1(dw)}.$$

It was proved in [10] that if $\theta(\xi)$ is a homogeneous of degree zero and C^∞ away from the origin function on \mathbb{R}^N , then the Dunkl-Fourier multiplier operator

$$f \mapsto \mathbf{S}f = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\theta(\cdot)\mathcal{F}(\cdot)),$$

initially defined on $L^2(dw)$, has a unique extensions to a bounded operator on $L^p(dw)$ for $1 < p < \infty$ and H_{Dunkl}^1 . Moreover, it is well defined in the sense of distributions on

$L^1(dw)$ by the relation

$$\langle \mathbf{S}f, \varphi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \theta(\xi) \mathcal{F}f(\xi) (\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi)(\xi) dw(\xi), \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

We are now in a position to state our main result.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume that a system of $(\theta_1(\xi), \theta_2(\xi), \dots, \theta_d(\xi))$ of complex valued functions on \mathbb{R}^N , which are C^∞ away from the origin and homogeneous of degree zero satisfies the condition (Δ) . Let $\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}}$ denote the multiplier operators $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}}f)(\xi) = \theta_j(\xi)\mathcal{F}f(\xi)$. Then an $L^1(dw)$ -function f belongs to the Hardy space H_{Dunkl}^1 if and only if $\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}}f$ belong to $L^1(dw)$, $1 \leq j \leq d$. Moreover, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$C^{-1}\|f\|_{H_{\text{Dunkl}}^1} \leq \|f\|_{L^1(dw)} + \sum_{j=1}^d \|\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}}f\|_{L^1(dw)} \leq C\|f\|_{H_{\text{Dunkl}}^1}.$$

The characterization of H_{Dunkl}^1 by a special system of multiplier operators, namely by $(\text{Id}, R_1, \dots, R_N)$, where R_j , $j = 1, \dots, N$, are the Dunkl-Riesz transforms (which correspond to the Dunkl multipliers $-i\xi_j/\|\xi\|$) was proved in [2] by the use of some estimates for Δ_k -subharmonic functions. Since the space H_{Dunkl}^1 admits decomposition into Coifman-Weiss type atoms [11], its dual can be identified with the space of $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ functions on the space of homogeneous type $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbb{R}^N, \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|, dw)$ (see Section 4.2). Consequently, as a corollary of the characterization of the Hardy space H_{Dunkl}^1 by the Riesz transforms, one obtains an analogue of the Fefferman–Stein decomposition (see [14]), namely, every $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ -function f can be written as

$$f = g_0 + \sum_{j=1}^N R_j^* g_j, \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_{j=0}^N \|g_j\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}.$$

In order to prove Theorem 1.2 we apply ideas of Uchiyama [22] which in some sense inverse the order. First we prove a counterpart of the Fefferman-Stein decomposition of compactly supported $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ functions which is stated below as our second main result.

Theorem 1.3. *Assume that a system $(\theta_1(\xi), \theta_2(\xi), \dots, \theta_d(\xi))$ of homogeneous of degree zero and smooth away from the origin multipliers satisfies (Δ) . Let $\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}}$ denote the Dunkl-Fourier multiplier operators $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}}f)(\xi) = \theta_j(\xi)\mathcal{F}f(\xi)$. Then there is a constant $C > 0$ such that any compactly supported $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ -function f can be written as*

$$f = \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{S}^{\{j\}*} g_j \right) + g_0,$$

with

$$\sum_{j=0}^d \|g_j\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})},$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^d \|g_j\|_{L^2(dw)} < \infty.$$

Then Theorem 1.2 follows from Theorem 1.3 by a duality argument.

It is worth to emphasize that the ideas of Uchiyama were adapted in Christ-Geller [4] to characterize Hardy spaces on homogeneous nilpotent Lie groups by relevant Riesz

transforms and then extended, by transference methods, to Hardy spaces associated with some Grushin operators [13]. The present paper owes a lot to [4].

For relations concerning the dual spaces to the Hardy spaces H_{Dunkl}^1 with the Dunkl-Riesz transforms, Dunkl-Poisson integrals, and Carleson measures we refer the reader to [15].

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we present basic facts concerning the theory of the Dunkl operators. For more details we refer the reader to [7], [16], [18], and [19].

We consider the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^N with the scalar product $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^N x_j y_j$, where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$, $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_N)$, and the norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 = \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle$. For a nonzero vector $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^N$, the reflection σ_α with respect to the hyperplane α^\perp orthogonal to α is given by

$$\sigma_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x} - 2 \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}, \alpha \rangle}{\|\alpha\|^2} \alpha.$$

In this paper we fix a normalized root system in \mathbb{R}^N , that is, a finite set $R \subset \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\sigma_\alpha(R) = R$ and $\|\alpha\| = \sqrt{2}$ for all $\alpha \in R$. The finite group G generated by the reflections $\sigma_\alpha \in R$ is called the *Weyl group (reflection group)* of the root system. A *multiplicity function* is a G -invariant function $k : R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which will be fixed and ≥ 0 throughout this paper. We denote by $\mathbf{N} = N + \sum_{\alpha \in R} k(\alpha)$ the homogeneous dimension of the system. Clearly,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} t^{-\mathbf{N}} f(\mathbf{x}/t) dw(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for all } f \in L^1(dw) \text{ and } t > 0,$$

$$(2.1) \quad w(B(t\mathbf{x}, tr)) = t^{\mathbf{N}} w(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N, t, r > 0,$$

where the measure w is defined in (1.1) and $B(\mathbf{x}, r) = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N : \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\| < r\}$. Further, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$C^{-1} w(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \leq r^{\mathbf{N}} \prod_{\alpha \in R} (|\langle \mathbf{x}, \alpha \rangle| + r)^{k(\alpha)} \leq C w(B(\mathbf{x}, r)).$$

Consequently, there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that, for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and for all $r_2 \geq r_1 > 0$,

$$(2.2) \quad C^{-1} \left(\frac{r_2}{r_1}\right)^{\mathbf{N}} \leq \frac{w(B(\mathbf{x}, r_2))}{w(B(\mathbf{x}, r_1))} \leq C \left(\frac{r_2}{r_1}\right)^{\mathbf{N}},$$

so $dw(\mathbf{x})$ is doubling, that is, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$(2.3) \quad w(B(\mathbf{x}, 2r)) \leq C w(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N, r > 0.$$

Thus $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbb{R}^N, \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|, dw)$ is a space of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman-Weiss [5].

For $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$, the *Dunkl operators* T_ξ are the following k -deformations of the directional derivatives ∂_ξ by a difference operator:

$$T_\xi f(\mathbf{x}) = \partial_\xi f(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{\alpha \in R} \frac{k(\alpha)}{2} \langle \alpha, \xi \rangle \frac{f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\sigma_\alpha \mathbf{x})}{\langle \alpha, \mathbf{x} \rangle}.$$

The Dunkl operators T_ξ , which were introduced in [7], commute and are skew-symmetric with respect to the G -invariant measure dw . Suppose that $\xi \neq 0$, $f, g \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and g is G -invariant. Then the following Leibniz rule can be confirmed by a direct calculation:

$$T_\xi(fg) = f(T_\xi g) + g(T_\xi f).$$

For fixed $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ the *Dunkl kernel* $E(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is a unique analytic solution to the system

$$T_\xi f = \langle \xi, \mathbf{y} \rangle f, \quad f(0) = 1.$$

The function $E(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, which generalizes the exponential function $e^{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle}$, has a unique extension to a holomorphic function on $\mathbb{C}^N \times \mathbb{C}^N$. Moreover,

$$(2.4) \quad E(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = E(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \text{ and } \overline{E(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} = E(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \text{ for all } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{C}^N.$$

Let $\{e_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq N}$ denote the canonical orthonormal basis in \mathbb{R}^N and let $T_j = T_{e_j}$. For multi-index $I = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_N) \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} |I| &= \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \dots + \beta_N, \\ \partial^I &= \partial_1^{\beta_1} \circ \partial_2^{\beta_2} \circ \dots \circ \partial_N^{\beta_N}, \\ T^I &= T_1^{\beta_1} \circ T_2^{\beta_2} \circ \dots \circ T_N^{\beta_N}. \end{aligned}$$

The *Dunkl (Fourier-Dunkl) transform*

$$(2.5) \quad \mathcal{F}f(\xi) = c_k^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} E(-i\xi, \mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}),$$

where

$$c_k = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} e^{-\frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|^2}{2}} dw(\mathbf{x}) > 0,$$

originally defined for $f \in L^1(dw)$, is an isometry on $L^2(dw)$, i.e.,

$$(2.6) \quad \|f\|_{L^2(dw)} = \|\mathcal{F}f\|_{L^2(dw)} \text{ for all } f \in L^2(dw),$$

and preserves the Schwartz class of functions $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ ([8], see also [6]). It generalizes the Fourier transform. Its inverse \mathcal{F}^{-1} has the form

$$(2.7) \quad \mathcal{F}^{-1}g(\mathbf{x}) = c_k^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} E(i\xi, \mathbf{x}) g(\xi) dw(\xi).$$

The inversion formula

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = c_k^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mathcal{F}f(\xi) E(i\xi, \mathbf{x}) dw(\xi)$$

remains valid if $f, \mathcal{F}f \in L^1(dw)$ (see [6, Theorem 4.2]).

The *Dunkl translation* $\tau_{\mathbf{x}}f$ of a function $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is defined by

$$(2.8) \quad \tau_{\mathbf{x}}f(\mathbf{y}) = c_k^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} E(i\xi, \mathbf{x}) E(i\xi, \mathbf{y}) \mathcal{F}f(\xi) dw(\xi).$$

It is a contraction on $L^2(dw)$, however it is an open problem if the Dunkl translations are bounded operators on $L^p(dw)$ for $p \neq 2$.

The following specific formula for the Dunkl translations of (reasonable) radial functions $f(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{f}(\|\mathbf{x}\|)$ was obtained by Rösler [17]:

$$(2.9) \quad \tau_{\mathbf{x}}f(-\mathbf{y}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\tilde{f} \circ A)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \eta) d\mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\eta) \text{ for } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Here

$$A(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \eta) = \sqrt{\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{y}\|^2 - 2\langle \mathbf{y}, \eta \rangle} = \sqrt{\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 - \|\eta\|^2 + \|\mathbf{y} - \eta\|^2}$$

and $\mu_{\mathbf{x}}$ is a probability measure, which is supported in the set $\text{conv } \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{x})$, where $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{x}) = \{\sigma(\mathbf{x}) : \sigma \in G\}$ is the orbit of \mathbf{x} .

Formula (2.9) implies that for all radial $f \in L^1(dw)$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ we have

$$\|\tau_{\mathbf{x}}f\|_{L^1(dw)} \leq \|f\|_{L^1(dw)}.$$

Let

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

be the distance of the orbit of \mathbf{x} to the orbit of \mathbf{y} . It was proved in [10, Theorem 1.7] that if $f \in L^2(dw)$ and $\text{supp } f \subseteq B(0, r)$, then

$$(2.10) \quad \tau_{\mathbf{x}}f(-\mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \text{for } d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) > r.$$

The *Dunkl convolution* $f * g$ of two reasonable functions f and g (for instance Schwartz functions) is defined by

$$(f * g)(\mathbf{x}) = c_k \mathcal{F}^{-1}[(\mathcal{F}f)(\mathcal{F}g)](\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\mathcal{F}f)(\xi) (\mathcal{F}g)(\xi) E(\mathbf{x}, i\xi) dw(\xi) \text{ for } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

or, equivalently, by

$$(f * g)(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(\mathbf{y}) \tau_{\mathbf{x}}g(-\mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(\mathbf{y})g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}) \text{ for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

where, here and subsequently, $g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \tau_{\mathbf{x}}g(-\mathbf{y})$.

We shall use the notation $f^{*2} = f * f$ and, inductively, $f^{*(n+1)} = f^{*n} * f$.

The *Dunkl Laplacian* associated with R and k is the differential-difference operator $\Delta_k = \sum_{j=1}^N T_j^2$, which acts on $C^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ -functions by

$$\Delta_k f(\mathbf{x}) = \Delta_{\text{eucl}} f(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{\alpha \in R} k(\alpha) \delta_{\alpha} f(\mathbf{x}),$$

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

Obviously, $\mathcal{F}(\Delta_k f)(\xi) = -\|\xi\|^2 \mathcal{F}f(\xi)$. The operator Δ_k is essentially self-adjoint on $L^2(dw)$ (see for instance [1, Theorem 3.1]) and generates the semigroup $e^{t\Delta_k}$ of linear self-adjoint contractions on $L^2(dw)$. The semigroup has the form

$$e^{t\Delta_k} f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(e^{-t\|\xi\|^2} \mathcal{F}f(\xi))(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} h_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) f(\mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}),$$

where the heat kernel

$$h_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \tau_{\mathbf{x}} h_t(-\mathbf{y}), \quad h_t(\mathbf{x}) = c_k^{-1} \mathcal{F}^{-1}(e^{-t\|\xi\|^2})(\mathbf{x}) = c_k^{-1} (2t)^{-N/2} e^{-\|\mathbf{x}\|^2/(4t)}$$

is a C^{∞} -function of all variables $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $t > 0$, and satisfies

$$0 < h_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = h_t(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}),$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} h_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}) = 1.$$

Let us note that for $f \in L^1(dw)$ such that $\mathcal{F}f \in L^1(dw)$, the translation $\tau_{\mathbf{x}}f : \mathbb{R}^N \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ is a bounded function and

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \tau_{\mathbf{x}}f(\mathbf{y}) e^{-t\|\mathbf{y}\|^2} dw(\mathbf{y}) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} c_k^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} E(i\xi, \mathbf{x}) E(i\xi, \mathbf{y}) \mathcal{F}f(\xi) e^{-t\|\mathbf{y}\|^2} dw(\xi) dw(\mathbf{y}) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} c_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} E(i\xi, \mathbf{x}) \mathcal{F}f(\xi) h_t(\xi) dw(\xi) = c_k E(0, \mathbf{x}) \mathcal{F}f(0) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(\mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if $f, \mathcal{F}f, \tau_{\mathbf{x}}f \in L^1(dw)$, then the integral of $\tau_{\mathbf{x}}f$ is preserved, that is,

$$(2.11) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \tau_{\mathbf{x}}f(\mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(\mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}).$$

Set

$$V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, t) := \max(w(B(\mathbf{x}, t)), w(B(\mathbf{y}, t))).$$

Observe that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for any cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^N$

$$(2.12) \quad \frac{1}{w(Q)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-N-\varepsilon} dw(\mathbf{x}) \leq C,$$

where \mathbf{z}_Q denotes the center of Q and $\ell(Q)$ is its side-length.

In Theorem 2.13 we state estimates for $h_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$. The estimate (2.14) was announced by W. Hebisch (with an outline of a proof which used a Poincaré inequality). An elementary and complete two-step proof of (2.14) and (2.15), which is based on (2.9), can be found in [2, Theorem 4.1] and [11, Theorem 3.1]. For more precise upper and lower bounds for $h_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ we refer to [12].

Theorem 2.13. *There are constants $C, c > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $t > 0$ we have*

$$(2.14) \quad h_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq C \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^{-2} V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \sqrt{t})^{-1} e^{-cd(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})^2/t}.$$

Moreover, if $\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}'\| \leq \sqrt{t}$, then

$$(2.15) \quad |h_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - h_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}')| \leq C \frac{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}'\|}{\sqrt{t}} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^{-2} V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \sqrt{t})^{-1} e^{-cd(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})^2/t}.$$

3. HOMOGENEOUS KERNELS AND DUNKL MULTIPLIER OPERATORS

3.1. Regular kernels. We say that a tempered distribution \mathbf{S} on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is a regular kernel of order zero if \mathbf{S} coincides away from the origin with a function of the form $S(\mathbf{x})w(\mathbf{x})$, where $S \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\})$ and satisfies

$$\langle \mathbf{S}, f^s \rangle = \langle \mathbf{S}, f \rangle, \quad s > 0, \quad f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^N),$$

where $f^s(\mathbf{x}) = f(s\mathbf{x})$. Clearly,

$$S(r\mathbf{x}) = r^{-N}S(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \neq 0, r > 0.$$

Any tempered distribution \mathbf{S} , which is a regular kernel of order zero is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{S}, f \rangle &= \mathbf{c}_1 f(0) + \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} \int_{\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|=1} S(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) f(r\bar{\mathbf{x}}) w(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) d\bar{\mathbf{x}} \frac{dr}{r} \\ (3.1) \quad &= \mathbf{c}_1 f(0) + \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\|\mathbf{x}\| > \varepsilon} S(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\int_{\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|=1} S(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) w(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) d\bar{\mathbf{x}} = 0$ and $d\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ is the Lebesgue measure on the unit sphere. The proof of this fact is identical to that of Christ [3, Lemma 2.4] and it is omitted here.

Set

$$\langle \check{\mathbf{S}}, f \rangle = \langle \mathbf{S}, \check{f} \rangle, \quad \check{f}(\mathbf{x}) = f(-\mathbf{x}).$$

Let φ be a C^∞ non-negative radial function supported in the set $\{\mathbf{x} : 1/4 < \|\mathbf{x}\| < 1\}$ such that $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi(2^j \mathbf{x}) = 1$ for $\mathbf{x} \neq 0$. Set

$$S_j(\mathbf{x}) = \varphi(2^{-j} \mathbf{x}) S(\mathbf{x}).$$

Then $S_j(\mathbf{x}) = 2^{-j\mathbf{N}} S_0(2^{-j} \mathbf{x})$ and

$$(3.2) \quad \langle \mathbf{S}, f \rangle = \mathbf{c}_1 f(0) + \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} S_j(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}).$$

The density with respect to the measure dw of the Dunkl transform $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{S}$ of \mathbf{S} coincides with a homogeneous of degree zero, C^∞ away from the origin function θ . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{F}\mathbf{S}, f \rangle &= \langle \mathbf{S}, \mathcal{F}f \rangle = \mathbf{c}_1 \mathcal{F}f(0) + \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} S_j(\mathbf{x}) \mathcal{F}f(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \mathbf{c}_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(\xi) dw(\xi) + \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\mathcal{F}S_0)(2^j \xi) f(\xi) dw(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\mathcal{F}S_0$ is a Schwartz class function such that $\mathcal{F}S_0(0) = 0$. Hence $|\mathcal{F}S_0(\xi)| \leq C\|\xi\|$ for $\|\xi\| \leq 1$. Consequently, it is not difficult to see that $\mathbf{c}_1 + \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}S_0(2^j \xi)$ converges absolutely to a C^∞ function $\theta(\xi)$ for $\xi \neq 0$. Moreover, $|\partial^J \theta(\xi)| \leq C_J \|S_0\|_{C^{1+J+\mathbf{N}}}$ for all $J \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\|\xi\| = 1$. Further, to see that $\theta(\xi)$ is homogeneous of degree zero, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \theta(t\xi) f(\xi) dw(\xi) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \theta(\xi) f_t(\xi) dw(\xi) = \langle \mathbf{S}, \mathcal{F}f_t \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbf{S}, (\mathcal{F}f)^t \rangle = \langle \mathbf{S}, \mathcal{F}f \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \theta(\xi) f(\xi) dw(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, every C^∞ away from the origin homogeneous of degree zero function $\theta(\xi)$ is the Dunkl transform of the distribution

$$\langle \mathbf{S}, f \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \theta(\xi) \mathcal{F}^{-1} f(\xi) dw(\xi)$$

which is a regular kernel of order 0, which means that \mathbf{S} is of the form (3.1). The corresponding homogeneous of degree $-\mathbf{N}$ function $S(\mathbf{x})$ is defined by

$$S(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{j\mathbf{N}} \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\theta \cdot \varphi)(2^j \mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \neq 0.$$

Moreover, for every $s \geq 0$,

$$|\mathbf{c}_1| + \sup_{|I| \leq s, \|\mathbf{x}\|=1} |\partial^I S(\mathbf{x})| \leq C_s \sup_{|J| \leq s + \mathbf{N}, \|\xi\|=1} |\partial^J \theta(\xi)|.$$

With a regular kernel \mathbf{S} of order 0, we associate the convolution operator (initially defined for $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^N)$)

$$\mathbf{S}f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{S} * f(\mathbf{x}) = \langle \check{\mathbf{S}}, \tau_{\mathbf{x}} f \rangle = \langle \mathbf{S}, \widetilde{\tau_{\mathbf{x}} f} \rangle.$$

Clearly,

$$\mathbf{S}f(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \theta(\xi) \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\widetilde{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}f})(\xi) dw(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \theta(\xi) \mathcal{F}f(\xi) E(i\xi, \mathbf{x}) dw(\xi) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\theta(\cdot) \mathcal{F}f(\cdot))(\mathbf{x}),$$

thus \mathbf{S} is a Dunkl multiplier operator, which by the Plancherel's equality (2.6) is bounded on $L^2(dw)$. Theorem 1 of [10] asserts that it is bounded on $L^p(dw)$, weak-type (1.1), and bounded on the Hardy space H_{Dunkl}^1 . Further,

$$\mathbf{S}f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{c}_1 f(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \tau_{\mathbf{x}} S_j f(\mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{c}_1 f(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} S_j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) f(\mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}),$$

where $S_j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \tau_{\mathbf{x}} S_j(-\mathbf{y})$.

For a regular kernel \mathbf{S} of order zero, we define the action of the convolution operator \mathbf{S} on $L^1(dw)$ -functions in the distributional sense, that is,

$$\langle \mathbf{S}f, \varphi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(\mathbf{x}) (\check{\mathbf{S}} * \varphi)(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

This is well defined, since

$$\check{\mathbf{S}} * \varphi(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \theta(\xi) \mathcal{F}^{-1} \varphi(\xi) E(-i\mathbf{x}, \xi) dw(\xi)$$

is a bounded function of \mathbf{x} which belongs to $L^2(dw)$ as well. Further, for a function $f \in L^1(dw)$, the distribution $\mathbf{S}f$ belongs to $L^1(dw)$ if there is $g \in L^1(dw)$ such that

$$\langle \mathbf{S}f, \varphi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g(\mathbf{x}) \varphi(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Then we simply write $\mathbf{S}f = g$. It is not difficult to prove that in this case

$$\mathbf{S}(f * h_t) = (\mathbf{S}f) * h_t,$$

where the action on the right-hand side can be understood in both: the $L^2(dw)$ and distributional sense. It turns out that the kernels $S_j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ satisfy the following estimates (see Theorem 3.7 below) which are crucial in our investigations: for all multi-indexes I and J and any even integer $\kappa > |I| + |J| + \mathbf{N}$ there is a constant $C_{I,J} > 0$ such that

$$|T_{\mathbf{x}}^I T_{\mathbf{y}}^J S_j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| \leq C_{I,J} \|S_0\|_{C^\kappa} 2^{j(|I|+|J|)} w(B(\mathbf{x}, 2^j))^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^j}\right)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 2^j]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})).$$

Consequently, summing up the estimates above, we obtain the following bounds for the associated kernel $S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_j S_j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$:

$$(3.3) \quad |T_{\mathbf{x}}^I T_{\mathbf{y}}^J S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| \leq C_{I,J} \|S_0\|_{C^\kappa} \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|} d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})^{-|I|-|J|} w(B(\mathbf{x}, d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})))^{-1}.$$

Let us also note that for regular kernels \mathbf{S} and \mathbf{Z} of order zero, the corresponding operators \mathbf{S} and \mathbf{Z} commute and its composition is represented as a convolution with a regular kernel of order zero. Moreover, the adjoint operator \mathbf{S}^* to \mathbf{S} corresponds to the Dunkl multiplier $\overline{\theta(\xi)}$.

3.2. Condition (Δ) . Let $\vec{S} = (\mathbf{S}^{\{1\}}, \mathbf{S}^{\{2\}}, \dots, \mathbf{S}^{\{d\}})$ be a system of regular kernels of order 0 on \mathbb{R}^N . We denote:

$$\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}} f = \mathbf{S}^{\{j\}} * f, \quad \mathcal{F}\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}}(\xi) = \theta_j(\xi).$$

Then $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}} * f)(\xi) = \overline{\theta(\xi)} \mathcal{F}f(\xi)$.

We abuse a little our terminology and say that $\vec{S} = (\mathbf{S}^{\{1\}}, \mathbf{S}^{\{2\}}, \dots, \mathbf{S}^{\{d\}})$ satisfies (Δ) if for the system of their Dunkl transforms $(\theta_1(\xi), \theta_2(\xi), \dots, \theta_d(\xi))$ the Uchiyama condition (Δ) holds.

Let us note that if a system \vec{S} of regular kernels of order zero fulfills the Uchiyama condition (Δ) then so \vec{S}^* does, that is,

$$(\bar{\Delta}) \quad \text{rank} \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\theta_1(\xi)} & \overline{\theta_2(\xi)} & \dots & \overline{\theta_d(\xi)} \\ \theta_1(-\xi) & \theta_2(-\xi) & \dots & \theta_d(-\xi) \end{pmatrix} = 2.$$

We say that a regular kernel \mathbf{S} is real if and only if $\mathbf{c}_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $S(\mathbf{x})$ is real valued (see (3.1)), or, equivalently, thanks to (2.4), $\theta(\xi) = \overline{\theta(-\xi)}$, where $\theta(\xi) = \mathcal{F}\mathbf{S}(\xi)$. Similarly, \mathbf{S} is purely imaginary if and only if $\theta(\xi) = -\overline{\theta(-\xi)}$, where $\theta(\xi) = \mathcal{F}\mathbf{S}(\xi)$.

The following proposition proved in Uchiyama [22] is crucial for the proofs of our results.

Proposition 3.4 ([22, Lemma 2.2]). *Suppose that a system of $(\theta_1(\xi), \theta_2(\xi), \dots, \theta_d(\xi))$ of complex valued functions on \mathbb{R}^N , which are C^∞ away from the origin and homogeneous of degree zero, satisfies (Δ) . Then for any $\vec{\nu} \in \mathbb{C}^d$, $\|\vec{\nu}\| = 1$, there is a system of homogeneous of degree zero and smooth away from the origin functions*

$$\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\} \ni \xi \mapsto \Theta_j(\xi, \vec{\nu}) \in \mathbb{C}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, d,$$

such that for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$ we have

$$(3.5) \quad \sum_{j=1}^d \overline{\theta_j(\xi)} \Theta_j(\xi, \vec{\nu}) = 1,$$

$$(3.6) \quad \text{Re} \sum_{j=1}^d \overline{\nu_j} \{\Theta_j(\xi, \vec{\nu}) + \Theta_j(-\xi, \vec{\nu})\} = \text{Im} \sum_{j=1}^d \overline{\nu_j} \{\Theta_j(\xi, \vec{\nu}) - \Theta_j(-\xi, \vec{\nu})\} = 0,$$

$$\left| \partial_\xi^I \Theta_j(\xi, \vec{\nu}) \right| \leq C_I \quad \text{for all } \|\xi\| = 1 \text{ with } C_I > 0 \text{ independent of } \vec{\nu}.$$

3.3. Estimates for translations of kernels. We finish the section by stating estimates for the Dunkl translations of functions associated with regular kernels. We want to emphasize the presence of the Euclidean distance in the estimates. It is crucial in proving the Fefferman-Stein decomposition of compactly supported $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ -functions (see Theorem 1.3).

Unless otherwise defined, for a function f , we denote:

$$f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \tau_{\mathbf{x}} f(-\mathbf{y}), \quad f_t(\mathbf{x}) = t^{-\mathbf{N}} f(\mathbf{x}/t), \quad f_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \tau_{\mathbf{x}}(f_t)(-\mathbf{y}).$$

Theorem 3.7. (cf. [9, Theorem 3.6]). *Let κ and m be non-negative even integers.*

(a) *If $\kappa > \mathbf{N} + m$, then there is a constant $C_\kappa > 0$ such that for all $\varphi \in C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $\text{supp } \varphi \subseteq B(0, 1)$ and all multi-indices I and J such that $|I| + |J| \leq m$ one has*

$$|T_{\mathbf{x}}^I T_{\mathbf{y}}^J \varphi_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| \leq C_\kappa t^{-|I|-|J|} \|\varphi\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{t}\right)^{-1} w(B(\mathbf{x}, t))^{-1} \chi_{[0,t]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$$

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

(b) If $\kappa > \mathbf{N} + 1$, then there is a constant $C'_\kappa > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\varphi_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \varphi_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}')| \\ & \leq C'_\kappa \|\varphi\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} \frac{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}'\|}{t + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|} w(B(\mathbf{x}, t))^{-1/2} (w(B(\mathbf{y}, t))^{-1/2} + w(B(\mathbf{y}', t))^{-1/2}) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}' \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and all $\varphi \in C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\text{supp } \varphi \subseteq B(0, 1)$.

(c) If $\kappa > \mathbf{N} + m + 1$, then there is a constant $C''_\kappa > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & |T_{\mathbf{y}}^I \varphi_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - T_{\mathbf{y}'}^I \varphi_t(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y})| \\ & \leq C''_\kappa t^{-|I|} \|\varphi\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|}{t + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|} w(B(\mathbf{y}, t))^{-1/2} (w(B(\mathbf{x}, t))^{-1/2} + w(B(\mathbf{x}', t))^{-1/2}) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, all multi-indices I , $|I| \leq m$, and all $\varphi \in C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\text{supp } \varphi \subseteq B(0, 1)$.

Proof. For $t = 1$ this is [9, Theorem 3.6]. In order to obtain the estimates for φ_t we apply (2.1) and the relations

$$T_{\mathbf{x}}^I T_{\mathbf{y}}^J \varphi_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (-1)^{|J|} t^{-|I| - |J| - \mathbf{N}} (T^{I+J} \varphi) \left(\frac{\mathbf{x}}{t}, \frac{\mathbf{y}}{t} \right).$$

□

Theorem 3.8. Let κ and m be non-negative even integers.

(a) If $\kappa > \mathbf{N} + 1$, then there is a constant $C_\kappa > 0$ such that for all functions $\psi, \phi \in C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)$ supported in the unit ball $B(0, 1)$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \phi(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ and all $0 < s \leq t$ one has

$$|(\psi_t * \phi_s)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| \leq C_\kappa \|\phi\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} \|\psi\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} \frac{s}{t} w(B(\mathbf{x}, t))^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{t}\right)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 2t]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})).$$

(b) If $\kappa > \mathbf{N} + m + 1$, then there is a constant $C_\kappa > 0$ such that for all functions $\psi, \eta, \phi \in C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)$ supported in the unit ball $B(0, 1)$ such that $\phi = \Delta_k^{m/2} \eta$ and all $0 < s \leq t$ one has

$$|(\psi_t * \phi_s)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| \leq C_\kappa \|\eta\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} \|\psi\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} \left(\frac{s}{t}\right)^m w(B(\mathbf{x}, t))^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{t}\right)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 2t]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})).$$

(c) If $\kappa > \mathbf{N} + 1$, then there is a constant $C_\kappa > 0$ such that for all functions $\psi, \phi \in C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)$ supported in the unit ball $B(0, 1)$ such that ϕ is radial and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \psi(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ and all $0 < s \leq t$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} & |(\psi_s * \phi_t * \phi_t)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - (\psi_s * \phi_t * \phi_t)(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y})| \\ & \leq C_\kappa \|\phi\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)}^2 \|\psi\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} \frac{s}{t} \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|}{t} w(B(\mathbf{y}, t))^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{t}\right)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 4t]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| \leq t$.

(d) If $\kappa > \mathbf{N} + m + 1$, then there is a constant $C_\kappa > 0$ such that for all functions $\psi, \eta, \phi \in C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)$ supported in the unit ball $B(0, 1)$ such that $\phi = \Delta_k^{m/2} \eta$ and all $0 < s \leq t$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} & |(\psi_t * \phi_s)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - (\psi_t * \phi_s)(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y})| \\ & \leq C_\kappa \|\eta\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} \|\psi\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} \left(\frac{s}{t}\right)^m \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|}{t} w(B(\mathbf{x}, t))^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{t}\right)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 4t]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| \leq t$.

The proof of Theorem 3.8 is provided in the appendix.

4. HARDY AND BMO SPACES - BASIC PROPERTIES

The Hardy space H_{Dunkl}^1 is

$$H_{\text{Dunkl}}^1 := \left\{ f \in L^1(dw) : \|f\|_{H_{\text{Dunkl}}^1} := \|\mathcal{M}f\|_{L^1(dw)} < \infty \right\},$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}f(\mathbf{x}) = \sup_{\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}'\|^2 < t} |e^{t\Delta_k} f(\mathbf{x}')|.$$

As in the classical theory of Hardy spaces [14], the space H_{Dunkl}^1 admits other characterizations (see in [2] and [11]). In the present section we state characterizations of the space H_{Dunkl}^1 by relevant Riesz transforms and atomic decompositions proved there. Then we present basic properties of its dual, namely the BMO(\mathbf{X})-space.

4.1. Characterizations of H_{Dunkl}^1 .

4.1.1. *Characterization by Riesz transforms.* The Riesz transform are defined in the Dunkl setting as convolution operators associated with regular kernels of order zero $\mathbf{R}_j(\mathbf{x}) = c'_k x_j \|\mathbf{x}\|^{-N-1}$, hence they are Dunkl multiplier operators:

$$\mathbf{R}_j f = -T_j(-\Delta_k)^{-1/2} f = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(-i \frac{\xi_j}{\|\xi\|} \mathcal{F}f(\xi) \right).$$

Since the action of \mathbf{R}_j on $L^1(dw)$ -functions is well defined in the sense of distribution, we set

$$H_{\text{Riesz}}^1 = \{f \in L^1(dw) : \|\mathbf{R}_j f\|_{L^1(dw)} < \infty \text{ for all } j = 1, 2, \dots, N\}.$$

It was proved in [2, Theorem 2.5] that the spaces H_{Dunkl}^1 and H_{Riesz}^1 coincide and the corresponding norms $\|f\|_{H_{\text{Dunkl}}^1}$ and

$$\|f\|_{\text{Riesz}} := \|f\|_{L^1(dw)} + \sum_{j=1}^N \|\mathbf{R}_j f\|_{L^1(dw)}$$

are equivalent.

4.1.2. *Characterization by atoms of Coifman–Weiss type.* Fix $1 < q \leq \infty$. We say that a measurable function $a : \mathbb{R}^N \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ is a $(1, q)$ -atom if there is a ball B such that $\text{supp } a \subseteq B$, $\|a\|_{L^\infty} \leq w(B)^{\frac{1}{q}-1}$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} a(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) = 0$. A function f belongs to $H_{(1,q)}^1$ if there are sequences $\{\lambda_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of complex numbers and $(1, q)$ -atoms $\{a_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $f = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda_j a_j$ and $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |\lambda_j| < \infty$. Then

$$\|f\|_{H_{(1,q)}^1} := \inf \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |\lambda_j| \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all representation of f as above. Now [11, Theorem 1.5] asserts that for all $1 < q \leq \infty$ the spaces H_{Dunkl}^1 and $H_{(1,q)}^1$ coincide and the norms $\|f\|_{H_{\text{Dunkl}}^1}$ and $\|f\|_{H_{(1,q)}^1}$ are equivalent.

4.2. **BMO(\mathbf{X}) and VMO(\mathbf{X}) spaces - duality.** For a locally measurable function f and a Euclidean ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, let us denote

$$f_B := \frac{1}{w(B)} \int_B f(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}).$$

We set

$$\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X}) = \{b \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(dw) : \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} < \infty\}, \quad \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} := \sup_B \frac{1}{w(B)} \int_B |b(\mathbf{x}) - b_B| dw(\mathbf{x}).$$

Since the Hardy space H^1_{Dunkl} admits decomposition into Coifman-Weiss atoms described in Section 4.1.2, Theorem B in [5] states that its dual can be identified with $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ (cf. [20, pages 142-144]). To be more precise, if $b \in \text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$, then the mapping

$$H^1_{\text{Dunkl}} \ni f \longmapsto \langle b, f \rangle = \sum_j \lambda_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} b(\mathbf{x}) a_j(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x})$$

does not depend on decompositions of $f = \sum_j \lambda_j a_j$ into $(1, q)$ -atoms and defines a bounded linear functional, that is,

$$|\langle b, f \rangle| \leq C_q \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} \|f\|_{H^1_{(1,q)}}.$$

Conversely, every bounded linear functional on H^1_{Dunkl} is of this type and its norm is comparable to $\|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}$.

Further, keeping the terminology of [5, page 638], the $\text{VMO}(\mathbf{X})$ space is defined as the closure of the space $C_c(\mathbb{R}^N)$ of compactly supported continuous functions in the $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ -norm. Theorem 4.1 of [5] asserts that the Hardy space H^1_{Dunkl} is dual to $\text{VMO}(\mathbf{X})$, which means that each continuous linear functional on $\text{VMO}(\mathbf{X})$ has the form

$$\langle f, b \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(\mathbf{x}) b(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for all } b \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^N),$$

where $f \in H^1_{\text{Dunkl}}$ and $\|f\|_{H^1_{\text{Dunkl}}}$ is equivalent to the norm of the functional.

4.3. **Properties of $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$.** In this subsection we collect elementary properties of $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ we shall need later on. We start by the following well-known inequalities stated in the lemma below.

Lemma 4.1. *There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $b \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(dw)$, $r_1 > r > 0$, $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and $\sigma \in G$, we have:*

$$|b_{B(\mathbf{x}, r)} - b_{B(\mathbf{x}, r_1)}| \leq C \log \left(\frac{r_1}{r} + 4 \right) \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})},$$

$$(4.2) \quad |b_{B(\mathbf{x}, r)} - b_{B(\mathbf{y}, r)}| \leq C \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} \quad \text{provided } \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \leq 2r,$$

$$(4.3) \quad |b_{B(\mathbf{x}, r)} - b_{B(\sigma(\mathbf{x}), r)}| \leq C \log \left(\frac{\|\sigma(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}\|}{r} + 4 \right) \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})},$$

(John-Nirenberg inequality) for any $1 \leq s < \infty$ there is $C_s > 0$ such that for all positive integers j we have

$$(4.4) \quad \left(\frac{1}{w(B(\mathbf{x}, 2^j r))} \int_{B(\mathbf{x}, 2^j r)} |b(\mathbf{y}) - b_{B(\mathbf{x}, r)}|^s dw(\mathbf{y}) \right)^{1/s} \leq C_s j \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}.$$

Proposition 4.5. *Let $\delta_1 > 0$. There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $r > t > 0$, $\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)$, and any locally integrable functions f we have*

$$(4.6) \quad \int_{\mathcal{O}(B(\mathbf{x}_0, 2r))^c} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{t}\right)^{-\delta_1} \frac{1}{w(B(\mathbf{x}, d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + t))} |f(\mathbf{y}) - f_{B(\mathbf{x}_0, 2r)}| dw(\mathbf{y}) \\ \leq C \left(\frac{t}{r}\right)^{\delta_1/4} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}.$$

Proof. We split the integral in (4.6) as follows

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}(B(\mathbf{x}_0, 2r))^c} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{t}\right)^{-\delta_1} \frac{1}{w(B(\mathbf{x}, d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + t))} |f(\mathbf{y}) - f_{B(\mathbf{x}_0, 2r)}| dw(\mathbf{y}) \\ \leq \sum_{n=\lfloor \log_2(r/t) \rfloor}^{\infty} \int_{V_n} \dots,$$

where

$$V_n := (\mathcal{O}(B(\mathbf{x}_0, 2r))^c) \cap \mathcal{O}(B(\mathbf{x}_0, 2^{n+1}t)) \cap (\mathcal{O}(B(\mathbf{x}_0, 2^n t)))^c \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}_0, n \geq \lfloor \log_2(r/t) \rfloor.$$

If $\sigma \in G$, $\mathbf{y} \in B(\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0), 2^{n+1}t) \setminus B(\mathbf{x}_0, 2r)$ and $\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)$, then

$$2^{n+1}t + 2\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \geq 2^{n+1}t + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| + r \geq \|\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) - \mathbf{y}\| + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0\| \geq \|\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) - \mathbf{x}_0\|$$

and, consequently,

$$(4.7) \quad \left(4 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{t}\right)^{-\delta_1/4} \leq C 2^{n\delta_1/4} \left(4 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \sigma(\mathbf{x}_0)\|}{t}\right)^{-\delta_1/4}.$$

Moreover, since $n \geq \lfloor \log_2(r/t) \rfloor$, for $\mathbf{y} \in V_n$ and $\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)$, we have

$$w(B(\mathbf{x}, d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + t)) \sim w(B(\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0), 2^n t)) \text{ for all } \sigma \in G.$$

Therefore, applying (4.7) Lemma 4.1, we obtain

$$\int_{V_n} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{t}\right)^{-\delta_1} \frac{1}{w(B(\mathbf{x}, d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + t))} |f(\mathbf{y}) - f_{B(\mathbf{x}_0, 2r)}| dw(\mathbf{y}) \\ \leq C 2^{-3n\delta_1/4} \sum_{\sigma \in G} \int_{B(\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0), 2^{n+1}t) \setminus B(\mathbf{x}_0, 2r)} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{t}\right)^{-\delta_1/4} \frac{1}{w(B(\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0), 2^n t))} |f(\mathbf{y}) - f_{B(\mathbf{x}_0, 2r)}| dw(\mathbf{y}) \\ \leq C 2^{-3n\delta_1/4} \sum_{\sigma \in G} \int_{B(\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0), 2^{n+1}t)} \frac{1}{w(B(\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0), 2^n t))} |f(\mathbf{y}) - f_{B(\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0), 2^{n+1}t)}| dw(\mathbf{y}) \\ + C 2^{-3n\delta_1/4} 2^{n\delta_1/4} \sum_{\sigma \in G} \int_{B(\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0), 2^{n+1}t)} \left(\frac{\|\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0) - \mathbf{x}_0\|}{t} + 4\right)^{-\delta_1/4} \\ \times \frac{1}{w(B(\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0), 2^n t))} |f_{B(\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0), 2^{n+1}t)} - f_{B(\mathbf{x}_0, 2^{n+1}t)}| dw(\mathbf{y}) \\ + C 2^{-3n\delta_1/4} \sum_{\sigma \in G} \int_{B(\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0), 2^{n+1}t)} \frac{1}{w(B(\sigma(\mathbf{x}_0), 2^n t))} |f_{B(\mathbf{x}_0, 2^{n+1}t)} - f_{B(\mathbf{x}_0, 2r)}| dw(\mathbf{y}) \\ \leq C 2^{-n\delta_1/2} (n+1) \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} \leq C 2^{-n\delta_1/4} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}.$$

Finally,

$$\sum_{n=\lfloor \log_2(r/t) \rfloor}^{\infty} 2^{-n\delta_1/4} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} \leq C'' \left(\frac{t}{r}\right)^{\delta_1/4} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})},$$

so (4.6) is proved. \square

The following simple lemma will be used in our further considerations. For the convenience of the reader, we present the proof.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. There is a constant $C_{J-N,p} > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $r > 0$, and $f \in L^p(dw)$ such that $\text{supp } f \subseteq B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)$ we have*

$$\|f\|_{L^p(dw)} \leq C_{J-N,p} w(B(\mathbf{x}_0, r))^{1/p} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}.$$

Proof. The fact that $\text{supp } f \subseteq B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)$ and (4.2) give $|f_{B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)}| \leq C \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}$. Hence, for $1 \leq p < \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L^p(dw)} &\leq \left(\int_{B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)} (|f(\mathbf{x}) - f_{B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)}| + |f_{B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)}|)^p dw(\mathbf{x}) \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \left(\int_{B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)} |f(\mathbf{x}) - f_{B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)}|^p dw(\mathbf{x}) \right)^{1/p} + C \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} w(B(\mathbf{x}_0, r))^{1/p} \\ &\leq C_{J-N,p} w(B(\mathbf{x}_0, r))^{1/p} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used the John-Nirenberg inequality (4.4). \square

4.4. BMO(\mathbf{X}) and Carleson measure.

Theorem 4.9. *Assume that $\varphi \in L^1(dw)$ is such that $\mathcal{F}\varphi \in L^1(dw)$ and the functions satisfy the following properties:*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) = 0,$$

$$(4.10) \quad \sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N, \xi \neq 0} \int_0^\infty |\mathcal{F}\varphi(t\xi)|^2 \frac{dt}{t} < \infty,$$

there are constants $C > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $t > 0$ we have

$$(4.11) \quad |\varphi_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| \leq C \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{t}\right)^{-\delta} \frac{1}{w(B(\mathbf{x}, d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + t))}.$$

Then there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $b \in \text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ and all balls $B \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ we have

$$\int_0^r \int_B |b * \varphi_t(\mathbf{x})|^2 \frac{dw(\mathbf{x}) dt}{t} \leq C^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2 w(B).$$

Remark 4.12. The inequality (4.16) means that the measure

$$d\mu(\mathbf{x}, t) := |b * \varphi_t(\mathbf{x})|^2 \frac{dw(\mathbf{x}) dt}{t}$$

is a Carleson measure (related to dw) with its Carleson norm bounded by $C^2 \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2$.

Proof of Theorem 4.9. Fix a ball $B = B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)$. Set $B^* = B(\mathbf{x}_0, 6r)$. We write all the elements of the group G in a sequence $\sigma_0 = \text{Id}, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{|G|-1}$. We inductively define a partition of $\mathcal{O}(B^*)$ by the sets $U_j \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$, $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, |G| - 1$:

$$U_0 := B(\mathbf{x}_0, 6r) = B^*,$$

$$U_1 := \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^N : \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}_0\| > 6r, \|\mathbf{z} - \sigma_1(\mathbf{x}_0)\| \leq 6r\},$$

$$U_{j+1} := \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^N : \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}_0\| > 6r, \|\mathbf{z} - \sigma_{j+1}(\mathbf{x}_0)\| \leq 6r\} \setminus \left(\bigcup_{j_1=1}^j U_{j_1} \right) \text{ for } j \geq 1.$$

We write

$$\begin{aligned} b(\mathbf{y}) &= b_{B^*} + (b(\mathbf{y}) - b_{B^*}) = b_{B^*} + (b(\mathbf{y}) - b_{B^*})\chi_{(\mathcal{O}(B^*))^c}(\mathbf{y}) + \sum_{j=0}^{|G|-1} (b(\mathbf{y}) - b_{B^*})\chi_{U_j}(\mathbf{y}) \\ &=: f_1(\mathbf{y}) + f_2(\mathbf{y}) + \sum_{j=0}^{|G|-1} f_{\sigma_j}(\mathbf{y}). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (2.11) and our assumptions on φ that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Since f_1 is a constant function, $f_1 * \varphi_t(\mathbf{x}) = 0$.

Further, from property (4.11) and Proposition 4.5, we conclude that for $\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)$ and $0 < t \leq r$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi_t * f_2(\mathbf{x})| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) f_2(\mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}) \right| \\ &\leq C \int_{\mathcal{O}(B(\mathbf{x}_0, 2r))^c} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{t}\right)^{-\delta} \frac{1}{w(B(\mathbf{x}, d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + t))} |f(\mathbf{y}) - f_{B(\mathbf{x}_0, 2r)}| dw(\mathbf{y}) \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{t}{r}\right)^{\delta/4} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{x})}. \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\int_0^r \int_B |\varphi_t * f_2(\mathbf{x})|^2 \frac{dw(\mathbf{x})dt}{t} \leq C^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{x})}^2 \int_0^r \int_B \left(\frac{t}{r}\right)^{\delta/4} \frac{dw(\mathbf{x})dt}{t} \leq C^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{x})}^2 w(B).$$

To deal with f_{σ_j} , we assume that $U_j \neq \emptyset$. We write

$$f_{\sigma_0} * \varphi_t(\mathbf{x}) = ((b - b_{B^*})\chi_{B^*}) * \varphi_t(\mathbf{x}),$$

$$f_{\sigma_j} * \varphi_t(\mathbf{x}) = ((b - b_{\sigma_j(B^*)})\chi_{U_j}) * \varphi_t(\mathbf{x}) + ((b_{\sigma_j(B^*)} - b_{B^*})\chi_{U_j}) * \varphi_t(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, |G| - 1.$$

By Plancherel's equality (2.6), the John-Nirenberg inequality (4.4), and property (4.10)

,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=0}^{|G|-1} \int_0^r \int_B |((b - b_{\sigma_j(B^*)})\chi_{U_j}) * \varphi_t(\mathbf{x})|^2 \frac{dw(\mathbf{x})dt}{t} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{|G|-1} \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\mathcal{F}((b - b_{\sigma_j(B^*)})\chi_{U_j})(\xi) \mathcal{F}\varphi(t\xi)|^2 \frac{d\xi dt}{t} \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=0}^{|G|-1} \|((b - b_{\sigma_j(B^*)})\chi_{U_j})\|_{L^2(dw)}^2 \leq C' |G| \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{x})}^2 w(B). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to consider $(b_{\sigma_j(B^*)} - b_{B^*})\chi_{U_j} * \varphi_t$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, |G| - 1$. To this end we note that by the definition of U_j for $\mathbf{y} \in U_j$ and $\mathbf{x} \in B$, we have

$$(4.13) \quad \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_0\| > 6r, \quad \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \sim (\|\sigma_j(\mathbf{x}_0) - \mathbf{x}_0\| + r).$$

So we conclude

$$(4.14) \quad |\chi_{U_j} * \varphi_t(\mathbf{x})| \leq C \int_{U_j} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{t}\right)^{-\delta} \frac{1}{w(B(\mathbf{x}, d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + t))} dw(\mathbf{y}) \leq C \left(\frac{t}{\|\sigma_j(\mathbf{x}_0) - \mathbf{x}_0\| + r}\right)^{\delta/2}.$$

Finally, using (4.13) and (4.14) together with and (4.3) of Lemma 4.1, we arrive at

$$\int_0^r \int_B |(b_{\sigma_j(B^*)} - b_{B^*})\chi_{U_j} * \varphi_t(\mathbf{x})|^2 \frac{dw(\mathbf{x})dt}{t} \leq C^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2 w(B),$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 4.9. \square

Corollary 4.15. *Assume that $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(B(0, 1))$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) = 0$. Then there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $b \in \text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ and all balls $B \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ we have*

$$(4.16) \quad \int_0^r \int_B |b * \varphi_t(\mathbf{x})|^2 \frac{dw(\mathbf{x})dt}{t} \leq C^2 \|b\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2 w(B).$$

Proof. The corollary follows from Theorem 4.9 and part (a) of Theorem 3.7. \square

Let

$$\mathcal{P}_t f(\mathbf{x}) = e^{-t\sqrt{-\Delta_k}} f(\mathbf{x}) = f * p_t(\mathbf{x}),$$

be the Dunkl-Poisson semigroup, where

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = c_{N,k}(1 + \|\mathbf{x}\|^2)^{-(N+1)/2}$$

is the k -Cauchy kernel (see [21, Section 5], [19]). Set

$$\tilde{\nabla}_k \mathcal{P}_t f(\mathbf{x}) = (\partial_t \mathcal{P}_t f(\mathbf{x}), T_1 \mathcal{P}_t f(\mathbf{x}), \dots, T_N \mathcal{P}_t f(\mathbf{x})).$$

Corollary 4.17. *There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all balls $B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)$ one has*

$$\int_0^r \int_{B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)} \|t \tilde{\nabla}_k \mathcal{P}_t f(\mathbf{x})\|^2 dw(\mathbf{x}) \frac{dt}{t} \leq C w(B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)) \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2.$$

Proof. Set $q(\mathbf{x}) = \partial_t p_t(\mathbf{x})|_{t=1} = c_{N,k}(1 + \|\mathbf{x}\|^2)^{-(N+3)/2}(\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 - N)$.

It is obvious that

$$0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} q(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} T_j p(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}).$$

Since $\mathcal{F}p(\xi) = c_k^{-1} \exp(-\|\xi\|)$, we have $\mathcal{F}q(\xi) = -c_k^{-1} \|\xi\| \exp(-\|\xi\|)$, $\mathcal{F}(T_j p)(\xi) = i c_k^{-1} \xi_j \exp(-\|\xi\|)$. So (4.10) is satisfied for $q(\mathbf{x})$ and $T_j p(\mathbf{x})$. For estimate (4.11) for $q(\mathbf{x})$, see [11, (3.12), Proposition 3.6]. To see (4.11) for $t\tau_{\mathbf{x}}(T_j p_t)(-\mathbf{y}) = tT_{j,\mathbf{x}} p_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, we set $g(\mathbf{x}) = T_j p(\mathbf{x}) = \partial_j p(\mathbf{x})$ (because $p(\mathbf{x})$ is a radial function) and note that

$$|\partial^I g(\mathbf{x})| \leq C_I (1 + \|\mathbf{x}\|)^{-N-2-|I|} \quad \text{for all } I \in \mathbb{N}_0^N.$$

Now Theorem 4.1 of [9] asserts that

$$|tT_{j,\mathbf{x}} p_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| = |g_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| \leq C_I \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{t}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{t}\right)^{-1} \frac{1}{w(B(\mathbf{x}, d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + t))}.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Remark 4.18. It was proved in [15, Proposition 7.4] that if $b \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(dw)$ is such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |b(\mathbf{x})|(1 + \|\mathbf{x}\|)^{-N-1} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \|t\tilde{\nabla}_k \mathcal{P}_t b(\mathbf{x})\|^2 dw(\mathbf{x}) \frac{dt}{t} \text{ is a Carleson measure,}$$

then b belongs to $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$. Corollary 4.17 asserts that the inverse inclusion holds.

5. CHANG–FEFFERMAN DECOMPOSITION

5.1. **Calderón reproducing formula.** For $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, let

$$\mathcal{Q}_{2^j} = \left\{ \prod_{\ell=1}^N [2^j n_\ell, 2^j(n_\ell + 1)) : (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_N) \in \mathbb{Z}^N \right\}$$

denote the decomposition of \mathbb{R}^N into the dyadic cubes of side-length $\ell(Q) = 2^j$. We shall denote by \mathbf{z}_Q the center of the cube Q . Then $\mathcal{Q} = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{Q}_{2^j}$ forms the set of all dyadic cubes.

Assume that $\psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \psi(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) = 0$. It follows from the Plancherel's equality (2.6) that if $f \in L^2(dw)$, then the function $F(\mathbf{x}, t) = \psi_t * f(\mathbf{x})$ belongs to the tent space $T_2^2(\mathbf{X}) = L^2(\mathbb{R}^N \times (0, \infty), \frac{dw(\mathbf{x}) dt}{t})$ and

$$(5.1) \quad \|F\|_{T_2^2(\mathbf{X})} \leq C_\psi \|f\|_{L^2(dw)}.$$

Conversely, the mapping

$$(5.2) \quad T_2^2 \ni F \mapsto \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon^{-1}} \psi_t * F(\cdot, t)(\mathbf{x}) \frac{dt}{t} =: \mathbf{P}_\psi(F)(\mathbf{x})$$

is a bounded operator from $T_2^2(\mathbf{X})$ into $L^2(dw)$. The convergence is in $L^2(dw)$.

Set

$$(5.3) \quad M_1 = 8\lceil N + 1 \rceil.$$

For further purposes, we fix $N_0, N_1 > 0$ satisfying

$$(5.4) \quad 2N < N_0, \quad N_0 + 1 < N_1 \leq (4M_1 + N - 1)/2.$$

From now on, we fix real-valued radial functions $\phi, \eta \in C_c^\infty(B(0, 1/4))$ such that

$$\phi = \Delta_k^{M_1} \eta, \quad |\mathcal{F}\eta(\xi)| \leq C\|\xi\|^2 \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

and

$$\int_0^\infty (\mathcal{F}\phi)(t\xi)^4 \frac{dt}{t} = 1, \quad \text{for all } \xi \neq 0.$$

Then $L^2(dw) \ni f \mapsto \phi_t * \phi_t * f \in T_2^2(\mathbf{X})$ is an isometric injection and the following Calderón reproducing formula holds:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{2^{-n}}^{2^n} (\phi_t * \phi_t) * (\phi_t * \phi_t * f)(\mathbf{x}) \frac{dt}{t},$$

where the convergence is in $L^2(dw)$. Furthermore, for $f \in L^2(dw)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.5) \quad f(\mathbf{x}) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{2^{-n}}^{2^n} \phi_t^{*4} * f(\mathbf{x}) \frac{dt}{t} \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{2^{-n}}^{2^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\phi_t * \phi_t)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) (\phi_t * \phi_t * f)(\mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}) \frac{dt}{t} \\
&= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q^j \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}}} \int_{2^{-j}}^{2^{-j+1}} \int_{Q^j} (\phi_t * \phi_t)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) (\phi_t * \phi_t * f)(\mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}) \frac{dt}{t} \\
&=: \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q^j \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}}} f_{\{Q^j\}}(\mathbf{x}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the convergence is unconditional in $L^2(dw)$.

5.2. Chang–Fefferman decomposition. For $Q^j \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}}$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, we set

$$(5.6) \quad \lambda_{Q^j} := \left(w(Q^j)^{-1} \int_{2^{-j}}^{2^{-j+1}} \int_{Q^j} |\phi_t^{*2} * f(\mathbf{y})|^2 dw(\mathbf{y}) \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{1/2},$$

$$(5.7) \quad a_{Q^j}(\mathbf{x}) := \lambda_{Q^j}^{-1} f_{\{Q^j\}}(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{Q^j}^{-1} \int_{2^{-j}}^{2^{-j+1}} \int_{Q^j} \phi_t^{*2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) (\phi_t^{*2} * f)(\mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}) \frac{dt}{t}$$

provided $\lambda_{Q^j} \neq 0$, otherwise we put $a_{Q^j} \equiv 0$.

Combining (5.5)–(5.7), we obtain the generalization to the Dunkl setting of the Chang–Fefferman decomposition:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{Q^j \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}}} \lambda_{Q^j} a_{Q^j}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where the convergence is unconditional in $L^2(dw)$. Moreover, it follows from (5.1) and the boundedness of $\mathbf{P}_{\phi^{*2}}$ from $T_2^2(\mathbf{X})$ to $L^2(dw)$ (see (5.2)) that there is a constant $C_\phi > 0$ such that for any sub-collection $\mathcal{Q}' \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$ and any $f \in L^2(dw)$, we have

$$(5.8) \quad \left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}'} \lambda_Q a_Q \right\|_{L^2(dw)} \leq C_\phi \|f\|_{L^2(dw)}.$$

Observe that

$$a_{Q^j} = \Delta_k^{2M_1} \tilde{a}_{Q^j},$$

where

$$(5.9) \quad \tilde{a}_{Q^j}(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{Q^j}^{-1} \int_{2^{-j}}^{2^{-j+1}} \int_{Q^j} t^{4M_1} (\eta_t * \eta_t)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) (\phi_t^{*2} * f)(\mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}) \frac{dt}{t}.$$

The remaining part of the section is devoted for studying properties of the Chang–Fefferman decomposition in the case where f is a compactly supported $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ -function. Clearly, by the John–Nirenberg inequality (4.4), such a function belongs to $L^2(dw)$.

5.3. Support properties. For a cube Q (not necessarily dyadic) and $s > 0$, let sQ denote the cube with the same center \mathbf{z}_Q as Q and sides parallel to the axes of the length $s\ell(Q)$. We set

$$(5.10) \quad Q^\circ := \mathcal{O}(B(\mathbf{z}_Q, 2\sqrt{N}\ell(Q))).$$

Proposition 5.11. *Consider the Chang–Fefferman decomposition of a compactly supported $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ -function f (see Subsection 5.2). Then for all $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, a_Q , and \tilde{a}_Q , we have*

$$\text{supp } a_Q \subseteq Q^\circ, \quad \text{supp } \tilde{a}_Q \subseteq Q^\circ.$$

Moreover, there is a constant $C_{10} \geq 1$ such that for all compactly supported $f \in \text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ and $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, we have

$$(5.12) \quad \sum_{\substack{P^\circ \cap Q^\circ \neq \emptyset, \\ \ell(P) \leq \ell(Q)}} \lambda_P^2 w(P) \leq C_{10} w(Q) \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2.$$

In particular,

$$(5.13) \quad 0 \leq \lambda_Q \leq C_{10} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}.$$

Proof. The first assertion follows from (5.7) and the fact that $\phi_t^{*2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0$ for $\mathbf{x} \notin Q^\circ$, $\mathbf{y} \in Q$ and $t \leq 2\ell(Q)$ (see (2.10)).

In order to prove (5.12), we fix $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and consider all the cubes $P \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $\ell(P) \leq \ell(Q)$, $P^\circ \cap Q^\circ \neq \emptyset$. Then, using (5.6), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{P^\circ \cap Q^\circ \neq \emptyset, \\ \ell(P) \leq \ell(Q)}} \lambda_P^2 w(P) &\leq \sum_{2^{-j} \leq \ell(Q)} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}}, \\ P^\circ \cap Q^\circ \neq \emptyset}} \int_{2^{-j}}^{2^{-j+1}} \int_P |\phi_t^{*2} * f(\mathbf{y})|^2 dw(\mathbf{y}) \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\leq C' \int_0^{2\ell(Q)} \int_{(6Q)^\circ} |\phi_t^{*2} * f(\mathbf{y})|^2 dw(\mathbf{y}) \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\leq C'' |G| w(Q) \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used Corollary 4.15 and the doubling property (2.3). \square

5.4. Size and regularity properties. In this section we derive estimates for the Dunkl derivatives of the functions a_Q and \tilde{a}_Q from the Chang–Fefferman decomposition of any L^2 functions f (see Subsection 5.2). We also prove Lipschitz estimates and the cancellation property. We want to emphasize that the constants C, C_I, C'_I in Propositions 5.14 and 5.17 do not depend on f .

Proposition 5.14. *Let $I \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$. There are constants $C_I, C'_I > 0$ such that for all a_Q and \tilde{a}_Q - functions from the Chang–Fefferman decomposition of an $L^2(dw)$ -function f (see Subsection 5.2), and for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ we have*

$$(5.15) \quad |T^I \tilde{a}_Q(\mathbf{x})| \leq C_I \ell(Q)^{4M_1 - |I|} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 2\sqrt{N}\ell(Q)]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)),$$

$$(5.16) \quad |T^I a_Q(\mathbf{x})| \leq C'_I \ell(Q)^{-|I|} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 2\sqrt{N}\ell(Q)]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)).$$

Proof. Using (5.9) and part (a) of Theorem 3.7 and (5.6), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|T^I \tilde{a}_Q(\mathbf{x})| &\leq C_I \lambda_Q^{-1} \int_{\ell(Q)}^{2\ell(Q)} \int_Q t^{4M_1-|I|} w(B(\mathbf{y}, t))^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{t}\right)^{-1} |\phi_t^{*2} * f(\mathbf{y})| dw(\mathbf{y}) \frac{dt}{t} \\
&\quad \times \chi_{[0, 2\sqrt{N}\ell(Q)]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)) \\
&\leq C_I \lambda_Q^{-1} \ell(Q)^{4M_1-|I|} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 2\sqrt{N}\ell(Q)]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)) \\
&\quad \times \left(w(B(Q))^{-1} \int_{\ell(Q)}^{2\ell(Q)} \int_Q |\phi_t^{*2} * f(\mathbf{y})|^2 dw(\mathbf{y}) \frac{dt}{t}\right)^{1/2} \\
&= C_I \ell(Q)^{4M_1-|I|} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 2\sqrt{N}\ell(Q)]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality. This proves (5.15). The proof of (5.16) follows the same pattern. \square

Proposition 5.17. *There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all a_Q -functions from the Chang–Fefferman decomposition of an $L^2(dw)$ -function f (see Subsection 5.2) and for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^N$ are such that $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \leq 2\sqrt{N}\ell(Q)$ we have*

$$(5.18) \quad |a_Q(\mathbf{x}) - a_Q(\mathbf{x}')| \leq C \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|}{\ell(Q)} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 8\sqrt{N}\ell(Q)]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)).$$

Proof. Let us note that if $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \leq 2\sqrt{N}\ell(Q)$, $\mathbf{y} \in Q$, $\ell(Q) \leq t \leq 2\ell(Q)$, then $\phi_t^{*2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0 = \phi_t^{*2}(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y})$ for $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q) > 8\sqrt{N}\ell(Q)$ (see (2.10)). Hence, applying part (c) of Theorem 3.7, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
|a_Q(\mathbf{x}) - a_Q(\mathbf{x}')| &\leq \lambda_Q^{-1} \int_{\ell(Q)}^{2\ell(Q)} \int_Q |\phi_t^{*2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \phi_t^{*2}(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y})| |\phi_t^{*2} * f(\mathbf{y})| dw(\mathbf{y}) \frac{dt}{t} \\
&\leq C \frac{\lambda_Q^{-1}}{w(Q)} \int_{\ell(Q)}^{2\ell(Q)} \int_Q \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|}{\ell(Q)} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-1} |\phi_t^{*2} * f(\mathbf{y})| dw(\mathbf{y}) \frac{dt}{t}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|/\ell(Q) \sim 1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|/\ell(Q)$ for $\mathbf{y} \in Q$, we obtain (5.18) by applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and (5.6). \square

Proposition 5.19. *Let a_Q and \tilde{a}_Q be the functions from the Chang–Fefferman decomposition of an $L^2(dw)$ -function f . Then for all $I \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$, we have*

$$(5.20) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} T^I \tilde{a}_Q(\mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} T^I a_Q(\mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}) = 0.$$

Proof. We note that for each multi-index $I \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lambda_Q^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\ell(Q)}^{2\ell(Q)} \int_Q t^{4M_1} \left| T_{\mathbf{x}}^I(\eta_t * \eta_t)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})(\phi_t^{*2} * f)(\mathbf{y}) \right| dw(\mathbf{y}) \frac{dt}{t} dw(\mathbf{x}) \\
&\leq C_I \frac{\ell(Q)^{4M_1-|I|}}{\lambda_Q} \int_{\ell(Q)}^{2\ell(Q)} \int_Q \left| (\phi_t^{*2} * f)(\mathbf{y}) \right| dw(\mathbf{y}) \frac{dt}{t} \leq C'_I w(Q) \ell(Q)^{4M_1-|I|} < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence from the Fubini theorem and the fact that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} T_{\mathbf{x}}^I \eta_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ for all $I \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we conclude

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} T^I \tilde{a}_Q(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) = 0.$$

The proof of the second equality in (5.20) can be handled in much the same way. \square

5.5. Actions of singular integrals on a_Q .

Proposition 5.21. *Let κ be an even positive integer, $\kappa > \mathbf{N} + 4M_1 + 1$. There exists $C > 0$ such that for all $0 < M \leq 4M_1 + N - 1$, all the functions a_Q from the Chang-Fefferman decomposition of any $L^2(dw)$ function (see Subsection 5.2), and all regular kernels \mathbf{S} of order zero, we have*

$$(5.22) \quad |\mathbf{S}a_Q(\mathbf{x})| \leq C(\mathbf{c}_1 + \|S_0\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)}) \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-M},$$

(5.23)

$$|\mathbf{S}a_Q(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{S}a_Q(\mathbf{x}')| \leq C(\mathbf{c}_1 + \|S_0\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)}) \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|}{\ell(Q)} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')}{\ell(Q)}\right)^M \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-M}.$$

Moreover,

$$(5.24) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mathbf{S}a_Q(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) = 0.$$

Proof. By scaling we may assume that $\ell(Q) = 1$. Further, thanks to Proposition 5.14 and (3.2), it suffices to consider

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} S_j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) a_Q(\mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{S}_j a_Q(\mathbf{x}).$$

From the definition of a_Q (see (5.7)), we get

$$(5.25) \quad \mathbf{S}_j a_Q(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_Q^{-1} \int_1^2 \int_Q (S_j * \phi_t^{*2})(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) (\phi_t^{*2} * f)(\mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{y}) \frac{dt}{t}.$$

In order to prove (5.22), we split the summation into two parts.

Part 1: $j \leq 0$. Then, by part (a) of Theorem 3.8, we conclude that for $1 \leq t \leq 2$ and $\mathbf{y} \in Q$, one has

$$|(S_j * \phi_t^{*2})(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| \leq C \|S_0\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} w(B(\mathbf{x}, 1))^{-1} 2^j \left(1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|\right)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 4\sqrt{N}]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)).$$

Recall that $w(B(\mathbf{x}, 1)) \sim w(B(\mathbf{z}_Q, 1))$ for $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q) \leq 4\sqrt{N}$ (see (1.1) and (2.2)). Hence, using (5.25), the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and (5.6), we obtain

$$(5.26) \quad |\mathbf{S}_j a_Q(\mathbf{x})| \leq C \|S_0\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} 2^j \left(1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|\right)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 4\sqrt{N}]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)).$$

Part 2: $j > 0$. We remark that $w(B(\mathbf{x}, 2^j)) \sim w(B(\mathbf{z}_Q, 2^j))$ if $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q) \leq 4\sqrt{N}2^j$ (see (1.1) and (2.2)). So, from the part (b) of Theorem 3.8 and (2.2), we deduce that for $1 \leq t \leq 2$ and $\mathbf{y} \in Q$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} |(S_j * \phi_t^{*2})(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| &\leq C \|S_0\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} w(B(\mathbf{z}_Q, 2^j))^{-1} 2^{-4M_1 j} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{2^j}\right)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 4\sqrt{N}2^j]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)) \\ &\leq C \|S_0\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} w(B(\mathbf{z}_Q, 1))^{-1} 2^{-(4M_1 + N)j} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{2^j}\right)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 4\sqrt{N}2^j]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, by (5.25), (5.6), and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$(5.27) \quad \begin{aligned} |\mathbf{S}_j a_Q(\mathbf{x})| &\leq C \|S_0\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} 2^{-(4M_1 + N)j} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{2^j}\right)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 4\sqrt{N}2^j]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)) \\ &\leq C \|S_0\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} 2^{-(4M_1 + N - 1)j} \left(1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|\right)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 4\sqrt{N}2^j]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)). \end{aligned}$$

Summing up (5.26) and (5.27), we get the desired estimate (5.22).

We now turn for proving (5.23). We may assume that $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| \leq 2$, otherwise (5.23) follows from (5.22). Thanks to Proposition 5.17, it suffices to deal with the sum

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} (\mathbf{S}_j a_Q(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{S}_j a_Q(\mathbf{x}')) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (S_j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) a_Q(\mathbf{y}) - S_j(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}) a_Q(\mathbf{y})) dw(\mathbf{y}).$$

Part 1: $j \leq 0$. Recall that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} S_0(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) = 0$. Using part (c) of Theorem 3.8, for $1 \leq t \leq 2$ and $\mathbf{y} \in Q$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |S_j * \phi_t^{*2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - S_j * \phi_t^{*2}(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y})| \\ & \leq C \|S_0\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} w(B(\mathbf{x}, 1))^{-1} 2^j \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| \left(1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|\right)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 8\sqrt{N}]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)). \end{aligned}$$

Utilizing (5.25) together with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$(5.28) \quad |\mathbf{S}_j a_Q(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{S}_j a_Q(\mathbf{x}')| \leq C \|S_0\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} 2^j \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| (1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 8\sqrt{N}]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)).$$

Part 2: $j > 0$. Recall that $\phi * \phi = \Delta_k^{2M_1}(\eta * \eta)$ and $\text{supp}(\eta * \eta) \subseteq B(0, 1/2)$. Applying the part (d) of Theorem 3.8, we conclude that for $1 \leq t \leq 2$ and $\mathbf{y} \in Q$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & |S_j * \phi_t^{*2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - S_j * \phi_t^{*2}(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y})| \\ & \leq C \|S_0\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} 2^{-4M_1 j} \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|}{2^j} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{2^j}\right)^{-1} w(B(\mathbf{x}, 2^j))^{-1} \chi_{[0, 2^{j+3}\sqrt{N}]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)) \\ & \leq C \|S_0\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} 2^{-(4M_1 + N)j} \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|}{2^j} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{2^j}\right)^{-1} w(B(\mathbf{x}, 1))^{-1} \chi_{[0, 2^{j+3}\sqrt{N}]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (2.2). Hence, for any $0 < M \leq 4M_1 + N$, we have

$$(5.29) \quad |\mathbf{S}_j a_Q(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{S}_j a_Q(\mathbf{x}')| \leq C \|S_0\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} 2^{-Mj} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| (1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 2^{j+4}\sqrt{N}]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)).$$

Now using (5.18) and summing the inequalities (5.28) and (5.29), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{S} a_Q(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{S} a_Q(\mathbf{x}')| & \leq C \mathbf{c}_1 \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| (1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 8\sqrt{N}]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)) \\ & \quad + C \|S_0\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} \sum_{j \leq 0} 2^j \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| (1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 8\sqrt{N}]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)) \\ & \quad + C \|S_0\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)} \sum_{2^j > d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)/128\sqrt{N}} 2^{-jM} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| (1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|)^{-1} \\ & \leq C (\mathbf{c}_1 + \|S_0\|_{C^\kappa(\mathbb{R}^N)}) \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| (1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|)^{-1} (1 + d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q))^{-M}, \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof of (5.23).

To get (5.24), we note that by Propositions 5.14 and 5.19 the functions a_Q belong to the Hardy space H_{Dunkl}^1 . Hence [10, Theorem 1.2] asserts that $\mathbf{S} a_Q \in H_{\text{Dunkl}}^1$. So (5.24) follows, since all the functions from H_{Dunkl}^1 have integral zero (see Section 4.1.2). \square

Corollary 5.30. *Let $a'_Q(\mathbf{x}) = \text{Re } a_Q(\mathbf{x})$, $a''_Q(\mathbf{x}) = \text{Im } a_Q(\mathbf{x})$. Then Proposition 5.21 holds if we replace a_Q either by a'_Q or by a''_Q .*

5.6. Main lemma. Following Uchiyama [22] we treat \mathbb{C}^d as a $2d$ -dimensional vector space over \mathbb{R} with the identification

$$\mathbb{C}^d \ni \vec{v} \mapsto V(\vec{v}) = (\operatorname{Re} v_1, \operatorname{Im} v_1, \operatorname{Re} v_2, \operatorname{Im} v_2, \dots, \operatorname{Re} v_d, \operatorname{Im} v_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d},$$

$$\vec{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_d).$$

Then $\|\vec{v}\| = \|V(\vec{v})\|$ and $\langle V(\vec{v}), V(\vec{w}) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} = \operatorname{Re} \langle \vec{v}, \vec{w} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} = \operatorname{Re} \langle \vec{w}, \vec{v} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}$. Here $\langle \vec{v}, \vec{w} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} = \sum_{j=1}^d v_j \bar{w}_j$ denotes the inner product in the unitary space \mathbb{C}^d .

Lemma 5.31. (cf. [22, Lemma 2.3]) *Assume that a system $\vec{S} = (\mathbf{S}^{\{1\}}, \mathbf{S}^{\{2\}}, \dots, \mathbf{S}^{\{d\}})$ of regular kernels of order zero satisfies the condition (Δ) . Then there is a constant $C_{11} \geq 1$ such that for any a_Q from the Chang–Fefferman decomposition (see Subsection 5.2) and for any unit vector $\vec{v} \in \mathbb{C}^d$ there is a function $\vec{b}_Q = (b_Q^{\{1\}}, b_Q^{\{2\}}, \dots, b_Q^{\{d\}})$ (which takes values in \mathbb{C}^d) such that for all $0 < M \leq (4M_1 + N - 1)/2$ and $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we have*

$$(5.32) \quad \|\vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x})\| \leq C_{11} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-2M};$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x}')\| \\ & \leq C_{11} \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|}{\ell(Q)} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{2M} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-2M}; \end{aligned}$$

$$(5.33) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{y}) \, dw(\mathbf{y}) = 0;$$

$$(5.34) \quad \vec{S}^* \circ \vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{S}^{\{j\}*} b_Q^{\{j\}} = a_Q(\mathbf{x}), \quad \langle V(\vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x})), V(\vec{v}) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} = 0.$$

Proof of Lemma 5.31. The proof follows [22, proof of Lemma 2.3]. For any unit vector $\vec{v} \in \mathbb{C}^d$, let $\Theta_j(\xi, \vec{v})$ be as in Proposition 3.4. Each $\Theta_j(\xi, \vec{v})$ uniquely corresponds to a regular kernel $\mathbf{Z}_{\vec{v}}^{\{j\}}$ of order zero. For a_Q from the Chang–Fefferman decomposition, set $a'_Q(\mathbf{x}) = \operatorname{Re} a_Q(\mathbf{x})$, $a''_Q(\mathbf{x}) = \operatorname{Im} a_Q(\mathbf{x})$. Put

$$(5.35) \quad b_Q^{\{j\}} = \mathbf{Z}_{\vec{v}}^{\{j\}} a'_Q + i \mathbf{Z}_{i\vec{v}}^{\{j\}} a''_Q = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\Theta_j(\xi, \vec{v}) \mathcal{F} a'_Q(\xi) + i \Theta_j(\xi, i\vec{v}) \mathcal{F} a''_Q(\xi) \right).$$

It follows from Corollary 5.30 and Proposition 5.21 that (5.32) – (5.33) are satisfied. We turn to verify the first equality in (5.34). To this end, using (5.35), we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{S}^{\{j\}*} b_Q^{\{j\}} \right) (\xi) &= \sum_{j=1}^d \overline{\theta_j(\xi)} \Theta_j(\xi, \vec{v}) \mathcal{F} a'_Q(\xi) + i \sum_{j=1}^d \overline{\theta_j(\xi)} \Theta_j(\xi, i\vec{v}) \mathcal{F} a''_Q(\xi) \\ &= \mathcal{F} a'_Q(\xi) + i \mathcal{F} a''_Q(\xi) = \mathcal{F} a_Q(\xi), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we have used (3.5) for \vec{v} and $i\vec{v}$.

In order to verify the second equality in (5.34) we note that $2\operatorname{Re}(\mathcal{F}^{-1}g) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(g + \bar{g})$ for any reasonable function/kernel g , where, according to our notation, $\bar{g}(\mathbf{x}) = g(-\mathbf{x})$.

We also recall that g is real-valued if and only if $\overline{\mathcal{F}a} = \widetilde{\mathcal{F}a}$. Hence, by (5.35),

$$\begin{aligned}
2\langle V(\vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x})), V(\vec{\nu}) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} &= 2\operatorname{Re} \langle \vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x}), \vec{\nu} \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} = 2\operatorname{Re} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \overline{\nu_j} b_Q^{\{j\}}(\mathbf{x}) \right) \\
&= 2\operatorname{Re} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \overline{\nu_j} \Theta_j(\xi, \vec{\nu}) \mathcal{F}a'_Q(\xi) + i\overline{\nu_j} \Theta_j(\xi, i\vec{\nu}) \mathcal{F}a''_Q(\xi) \right) (\mathbf{x}) \\
&= \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \overline{\nu_j} \Theta_j(\xi, \vec{\nu}) \mathcal{F}a'_Q(\xi) + \nu_j \overline{\Theta_j(-\xi, \vec{\nu}) \mathcal{F}a'_Q(-\xi)} \right) (\mathbf{x}) \\
&\quad + \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d i\overline{\nu_j} \Theta_j(\xi, i\vec{\nu}) \mathcal{F}a''_Q(\xi) - i\nu_j \overline{\Theta_j(-\xi, i\vec{\nu}) \mathcal{F}a''_Q(-\xi)} \right) (\mathbf{x}) \\
&= \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \left(\overline{\nu_j} \Theta_j(\xi, \vec{\nu}) + \nu_j \overline{\Theta_j(-\xi, \vec{\nu})} \right) \mathcal{F}a'_Q(\xi) \right) (\mathbf{x}) \\
&\quad + \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \left(i\overline{\nu_j} \Theta_j(\xi, i\vec{\nu}) - i\nu_j \overline{\Theta_j(-\xi, i\vec{\nu})} \right) \mathcal{F}a''_Q(\xi) \right) (\mathbf{x}).
\end{aligned}$$

It easily follows from (3.6) that

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \left(\overline{\nu_j} \Theta_j(\xi, \vec{\nu}) + \nu_j \overline{\Theta_j(-\xi, \vec{\nu})} \right) = 0 = \sum_{j=1}^d \left(i\overline{\nu_j} \Theta_j(\xi, i\vec{\nu}) - i\nu_j \overline{\Theta_j(-\xi, i\vec{\nu})} \right).$$

Thus the second inequality in (5.34) is established. \square

5.7. Auxiliary functions. Recall that $N_0 > 2N$ (see (5.4)). For a compactly supported BMO(\mathbf{X})-function f and for $j, m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define

$$(5.36) \quad \tau_j(\mathbf{x}) = \tau_j(f)(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}}} \lambda_Q \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{x})}{2^{-j}} \right)^{-N_0},$$

$$(5.37) \quad \sigma_m(\mathbf{x}) = \sigma_m(f)(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j \leq m} \left(\frac{9}{10} \right)^{m-j} \tau_j(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{9}{10} \right)^j \tau_{m-j}(\mathbf{x}).$$

where λ_Q are the coefficients from the Chang–Fefferman decomposition of f (see (5.6)). Then

$$(5.38) \quad \sigma_m(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{9}{10} \sigma_{m-1}(\mathbf{x}) + \tau_m(\mathbf{x}).$$

It can be easily proved using (2.12) and (2.3) that for $K > N$ there is a constant $C_K > 0$ such that for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, one has

$$(5.39) \quad \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}}} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{x})}{2^{-j}} \right)^{-K} \leq C_K.$$

Lemma 5.40. *There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for any compactly supported $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ -function f and all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we have*

$$\tau_j(\mathbf{x})^2 \leq C \sum_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}}} \lambda_P^2 \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_P)}{2^{-j}}\right)^{-N_0},$$

where λ_P are the coefficients from the Chang-Fefferman decomposition of f .

Proof. Because $ab \leq (a^2 + b^2)/2$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_j(\mathbf{x})^2 &= \sum_{(P,Q) \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}} \times \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}}} \lambda_P \lambda_Q \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_P, \mathbf{x})}{2^{-j}}\right)^{-N_0} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{x})}{2^{-j}}\right)^{-N_0} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(P,Q) \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}} \times \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}}} \lambda_P^2 \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_P, \mathbf{x})}{2^{-j}}\right)^{-N_0} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{x})}{2^{-j}}\right)^{-N_0} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(P,Q) \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}} \times \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}}} \lambda_Q^2 \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_P, \mathbf{x})}{2^{-j}}\right)^{-N_0} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{x})}{2^{-j}}\right)^{-N_0} \\ &= \sum_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}}} \lambda_P^2 \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_P, \mathbf{x})}{2^{-j}}\right)^{-N_0} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}}} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{x})}{2^{-j}}\right)^{-N_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, thanks to (5.39), the proof is finished. \square

Lemma 5.41 (Christ-Geller [4]). *There is a constant $C_{12} \geq 1$ such that for all compactly supported $f \in \text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ and for all $j, m \in \mathbb{Z}$, one has*

$$(5.42) \quad \|\tau_j\|_\infty \leq C_{12} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})},$$

$$(5.43) \quad \|\sigma_m\|_\infty \leq C_{12} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})},$$

$$(5.44) \quad \int_{Q^\circ} \sum_{2^j \geq \ell(Q)^{-1}} \sigma_j(\mathbf{x}) \tau_j(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) \leq C_{12} w(Q) \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2 \quad \text{for all } Q \in \mathcal{Q}.$$

Proof. The inequality (5.13) combined with (5.39) and the definition of τ_j imply (5.42). Further, to prove (5.43) we use (5.37) and (5.42) and we get

$$\sigma_m(\mathbf{x}) \lesssim \sum_{j \leq m} \left(\frac{9}{10}\right)^{m-j} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}.$$

We now turn to prove (5.44). We adapt the proof of Christ-Geller [4] p. 558. Fix $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Let $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $\ell(Q) = 2^{-\ell}$. For $P \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $\ell(P) \leq \ell(Q)$, let $\tilde{Q}(P) \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}}$ be a unique cube which contains P , that is, $P \subset \tilde{Q}(P)$. If $\mathbf{x} \in Q^\circ$, then by the triangle inequality for the distance $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, we have

$$\left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_P, \mathbf{x})}{\ell(P)}\right)^{-1} \leq C \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{z}_{\tilde{Q}(P)})}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-1}.$$

Hence, applying Lemma 5.40 and using the inequality

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_P, \mathbf{x})}{\ell(P)}\right)^{-N_0/2} dw(\mathbf{x}) \leq Cw(P),$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{Q^\circ} \sum_{j=\ell}^{\infty} \tau_j(\mathbf{x})^2 dw(\mathbf{x}) \\
& \lesssim \int_{Q^\circ} \sum_{j=\ell}^{\infty} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}}} \lambda_P^2 \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{z}_{\tilde{Q}(P)})}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-N_0/2} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_P, \mathbf{x})}{\ell(P)}\right)^{-N_0/2} dw(\mathbf{x}) \\
& \lesssim \sum_{j=\ell}^{\infty} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}}} \lambda_P^2 w(P) \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{z}_{\tilde{Q}(P)})}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-N_0/2} \\
& = \sum_{Q' \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}}} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{Q}, P \subseteq Q'} \lambda_P^2 w(P) \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{z}_{Q'})}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-N_0/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we utilize (5.12) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.45) \quad \int_{Q^\circ} \sum_{j=\ell}^{\infty} \tau_j(\mathbf{x})^2 dw(\mathbf{x}) & \lesssim \sum_{Q' \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}}} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{z}_{Q'})}{\ell(Q')}\right)^{-N_0/2} w(Q') \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2 \\
& \lesssim \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{x})}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-N_0/2} dw(\mathbf{x}) \\
& \lesssim w(Q) \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

If $n \geq 0$, then by (5.45) and (5.42), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.46) \quad \int_{Q^\circ} \sum_{j=\ell-n}^{\infty} \tau_j^2(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) & \leq \int_{Q^\circ} \sum_{j=\ell}^{\infty} \tau_j^2(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) + \int_{Q^\circ} \sum_{j=\ell-n}^{\ell-1} \tau_j^2(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) \\
& \leq Cw(Q)(1+n) \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and then (5.45) and (5.46), we obtain

$$\int_{Q^\circ} \sum_{j=\ell}^{\infty} \tau_j(\mathbf{x}) \tau_{j-n}(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) \leq Cw(Q)(1+n)^{1/2} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2.$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{Q^\circ} \sum_{j=\ell}^{\infty} \tau_j(\mathbf{x}) \sigma_j(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) & = \int_{Q^\circ} \sum_{j=\ell}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tau_j(\mathbf{x}) \left(\frac{9}{10}\right)^n \tau_{j-n}(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) \\
& \leq C \sum_{m \geq 0} \left(\frac{9}{10}\right)^m w(Q)(1+n)^{1/2} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2 \\
& \leq C'w(Q) \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of Lemma 5.41 is complete by taking as C_{12} the largest constant in the proved inequalities. \square

Lemma 5.47 (cf. [4], Lemma 3.4). *There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for any function $f \in \text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ which is supported in a ball $B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)$, $r < 2^{-j}$, one has*

$$\left| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}}} \lambda_Q a_Q(\mathbf{x}) \right| \leq C \frac{r^N}{2^{-jN}} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.8, we have

$$(5.48) \quad \|f\|_{L^1(dw)} \leq Cw(B(\mathbf{x}_0, r))\|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}.$$

Recall that $\text{supp } \phi_t^{*2}(\mathbf{y}, \cdot) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(B(\mathbf{y}, t/2))$ (see (2.10)). Thus for $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}}$,

$$(5.49) \quad \lambda_Q = \left(w(Q)^{-1} \int_{2^{-j}}^{2^{-j+1}} \int_Q \left| \int_{\mathcal{O}(B(\mathbf{y}, t/2)) \cap B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)} \phi_t^{*2}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) \right|^2 dw(\mathbf{y}) \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{1/2}$$

(see (5.6) for the definition of λ_Q). Note also that $\lambda_Q = 0$ if $Q^\circ \cap B(\mathbf{x}_0, r) = \emptyset$, so we can assume that $Q^\circ \cap B(\mathbf{x}_0, r) \neq \emptyset$. Thus, in this case, thanks to (2.2) and the assumption $r \leq \ell(Q)$, for all $\ell(Q) \leq t \leq 2\ell(Q)$, and $\mathbf{y} \in Q$, we have

$$w(B(\mathbf{y}, t/2)) \sim w(B(\mathbf{x}_0, \ell(Q))) \sim w(Q).$$

Consequently, by part (a) of Theorem 3.7, for $\mathbf{y} \in Q$, $\mathbf{x} \in Q^\circ \cap B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)$, we get

$$|\phi_t^{*2}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})| \leq \frac{C}{w(B(\mathbf{y}, 4t))} \leq \frac{C}{w(B(\mathbf{x}_0, \ell(Q)))}.$$

Therefore, from (5.49), (5.48), and (2.2), we conclude that

$$\lambda_Q \leq Cw(B(\mathbf{x}_0, 2^{-j}))^{-1} \|f\|_{L^1(dw)} \leq C \frac{w(B(\mathbf{x}_0, r))}{w(B(\mathbf{x}_0, \ell(Q)))} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} \leq C \frac{r^N}{2^{-jN}} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}.$$

Recall that $|a_Q(\mathbf{x})| \leq C$ (see (5.16)). Since $\text{supp } a_Q \subseteq Q^\circ$ and the sets Q° , where Q runs over $\mathcal{Q}_{2^{-j}}$, have bounded overlapping property with an overlapping constant independent of j , we obtain the lemma. \square

6. CONSTRUCTIVE FEFFERMAN-STEIN DECOMPOSITION OF $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ FUNCTIONS

This section is devoted for proving Theorem 1.3. The main step of the proof is the following theorem.

Theorem 6.1. *Assume that $\vec{S} = (\mathbf{S}^{\{1\}}, \mathbf{S}^{\{2\}}, \dots, \mathbf{S}^{\{d\}})$ is a system of regular kernels of order 0 satisfying (Δ) . Then there are constants $A_0, A \geq 1$ and $0 < \varepsilon_0 < 1$ such that for all $r > 0$, any $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ -function f supported in the ball $B(0, r)$ with $\|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} = \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, can be written as*

$$(6.2) \quad f = \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{S}^{\{j\}*} \tilde{g}_j + \tilde{g}_0 + f_1,$$

$$(6.3) \quad \sum_{j=1}^d \|\tilde{g}_j\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2\sqrt{d} + A\|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}, \quad \|\tilde{g}_0\|_{L^\infty} \leq A\|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})},$$

$$(6.4) \quad \|f_1\|_{\text{BMO}} \leq A\varepsilon^2, \quad \text{supp } f_1 \subseteq B(0, A_0r),$$

Moreover,

$$(6.5) \quad \sum_{j=0}^d \|\tilde{g}_j\|_{L^2(dw)} \leq Aw(B(0, r))^{1/2} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}.$$

6.1. Proof of Theorem 6.1.

Proof. The proof follows the ideas of Uchiyama [13] and Christ and Geller [4].

For \vec{S} , let C_{11} be the constant from Lemma 5.31. We shall prove Theorem 6.1 with

$$A_0 = 32\sqrt{N} \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_0 = (100C_{11}C_{12})^{-1},$$

where C_{12} is the constant from Lemma 5.41. Recall that we fixed constants $N_0 > 2N$ and $N_0 + 1 < N_1 \leq (4M_1 + N - 1)/2$ (see (5.3), (5.4), and Section 5.7).

We may assume without loss of generality that f is supported in $B(0, 1)$, because the dilations $f^{[r]}(\mathbf{x}) = f(r\mathbf{x})$ are isometries on $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ and $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$,

$$\|f\|_{L^2(dw)}^2 = r^N \|f^{[r]}\|_{L^2(dw)}^2 = \frac{w(B(0, r))}{w(B(0, 1))} \|f^{[r]}\|_{L^2(dw)}^2,$$

(see (1.1)), and $\mathbf{S}(f^{[r]}) = (\mathbf{S}f)^{[r]}$ for any regular kernel \mathbf{S} of order zero.

By the Chang–Fefferman decomposition given in Section 5.2, we have

$$(6.6) \quad f = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \lambda_Q a_Q = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}, \ell(Q) \leq 1} \lambda_Q a_Q + \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}, \ell(Q) > 1} \lambda_Q a_Q =: f_0 + g_0.$$

For $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $\tau_\ell(\mathbf{x}) = \tau_\ell(f)(\mathbf{x})$ and $\sigma_\ell(\mathbf{x}) = \sigma_\ell(f)(\mathbf{x})$ be the auxiliary functions associated with the decomposition (see (5.36) and (5.37)).

It follows from Lemma 5.47, Lemma 4.8, and (5.8) that

$$(6.7) \quad \|g_0\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_{13} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}, \quad \|g_0\|_{L^2(dw)} \leq C_{13} w(B(0, 1))^{1/2} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}.$$

Thus, in farther consideration we shall deal with the function $f_0 = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}, \ell(Q) \leq 1} \lambda_Q a_Q$.

For $\ell = -1$ we define $\vec{g}_{-1}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv (1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{C}^d$, $\vec{E}_{-1}(\mathbf{x}) = \vec{h}_{-1}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv (0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Following [4], our task is to construct, by induction, for each integer $\ell \geq 0$ functions \vec{h}_ℓ , \vec{g}_ℓ , and \vec{E}_ℓ on \mathbb{R}^N , taking values in \mathbb{C}^d , such that

$$(6.8) \quad \vec{S}^* \circ \vec{h}_\ell = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}}} \lambda_Q a_Q,$$

$$(6.9) \quad \vec{h}_\ell = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}}} \lambda_Q \vec{b}_Q,$$

with some functions \vec{b}_Q which take values in \mathbb{C}^d and satisfy

$$(6.10) \quad \|\vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x})\| \leq C_{11} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{x})}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-2N_1} \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

$$(6.11) \quad \|\vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{y})\| \leq C_{11} \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{\ell(Q)} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{N_1-1} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{x})}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-N_1+1} \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

$$(6.12) \quad \|\vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{y})\| \leq C_{11} \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{\ell(Q)} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{x})}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-2N_1+1} \quad \text{for } \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \leq A_0 \ell(Q),$$

$$(6.13) \quad \langle V(\vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x})), V(\vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{z}_Q)) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \equiv 0 \quad \text{for all } Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}},$$

$$(6.14) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) = \vec{0},$$

$$(6.15) \quad \|\vec{g}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\| = 1 \text{ for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

$$(6.16) \quad \vec{g}_\ell = \vec{g}_{\ell-1} + \vec{h}_\ell + \vec{E}_\ell \text{ for all } \ell \geq 0,$$

$$(6.17) \quad \|\vec{g}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{g}_\ell(\mathbf{y})\| \leq A_1 \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{2^{-\ell}}\right)^{N_1-1} \sigma_\ell(\mathbf{x}) \text{ for all } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

$$(6.18) \quad \|\vec{E}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\| \leq A_2 \tau_\ell(\mathbf{x}) \sigma_\ell(\mathbf{x}),$$

$$(6.19) \quad \|\vec{E}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{E}_\ell(\mathbf{y})\| \leq A_3 \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2 \text{ for } \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \leq A_0 2^{-\ell},$$

$$(6.20) \quad \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \vec{E}_\ell \text{ converges in } L_{\text{loc}}^1(dw) \text{ to } \vec{E}^0 \in \text{BMO}(\mathbf{X}),$$

$$(6.21) \quad \|\vec{E}^0\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} \leq A_4 \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2,$$

$$(6.22) \quad \{\vec{g}_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ converges in } L_{\text{loc}}^1(dw) \text{ to } \vec{g} \in L^\infty,$$

where the constants A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4 are indicated in the Table B at the end of the article.

In the proofs of (6.8)–(6.22) several inequalities with constants will occur. The constants will not depend on f , provided $\|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} = \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, $\text{supp } f \subset B(0, 1)$. For this purpose we will control their dependencies. We shall provide the inductive step. The proof for $\ell = 0$ is essentially the same as the inductive step.

Assume that (6.8)–(6.19) hold for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $0 \leq j < \ell$.

Step 1: constructions of \vec{h}_ℓ and \vec{b}_Q , proofs of (6.8)–(6.14). For $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}}$, we apply Lemma 5.31 with $\vec{\nu} = \vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{z}_Q)$ and obtain a vector-valued function $\vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x})$ satisfying (6.10)–(6.14) such that $a_Q(\mathbf{x}) = \vec{S}^* \circ \vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x})$ (see (5.34)). Observe that

$$\#\{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}} : b_Q \neq 0\} \text{ is finite,}$$

since $\text{supp } f \subset B(0, 1)$ (see (6.41)). Let $\vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{x})$ be given by (6.9). Then $\vec{h}_\ell \in L^1(dw) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and (6.8) follows from (5.34). In Step 5 of the proof we provide estimates for the $L^2(dw)$ -norm of sums of \vec{h}_ℓ 's,

Step 2: constructions of \vec{g}_ℓ and \vec{E}_ℓ , proofs of (6.15) and (6.16). Thanks to (6.10) and (5.42), we have

$$(6.23) \quad \|\vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\| \leq C_{11} \tau_\ell(\mathbf{x}) \leq C_{11} C_{12} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} = C_{11} C_{12} \varepsilon.$$

Define

$$(6.24) \quad \vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) := \vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}) + \vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{x}).$$

Set $C_{14} = C_{11} C_{12}$. Since $\|\vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x})\| = 1$ (see (6.15)), from (6.23) we conclude that

$$(6.25) \quad 1 - C_{14} \varepsilon \leq \|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\| \leq 1 + C_{14} \varepsilon.$$

In other words, $\|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\|$ is close to 1. Thanks to the orthogonality (6.13) the following better estimates are true:

$$(6.26) \quad |1 - \|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\|| \leq A_2 \tau_\ell(\mathbf{x}) \sigma_\ell(\mathbf{x}) \leq A_2 C_{12}^2 \varepsilon^2 \text{ with } A_2 = \frac{20}{9} C_{11}^2 A_1.$$

The second inequality in (6.26) follows from Lemma 5.41. To see the first one, having the induction hypotheses (6.13) and (6.17) in mind, and using (6.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \langle V(\vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{x})), V(\vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x})) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \right| = \left| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}}} \lambda_Q \langle V(\vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x})), V(\vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x})) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \right| \\
& = \left| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}}} \lambda_Q \langle V(\vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x})), V(\vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{z}_Q)) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \right| \\
& \leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}}} \lambda_Q C_{11} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{x})}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-2N_1} A_1 \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{2^{-\ell+1}} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)}{2^{-\ell+1}}\right)^{N_1-1} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}) \\
& \leq C_{11} A_1 \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}}} \lambda_Q \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)}{2^{-\ell}}\right)^{-N_1-1} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}) \\
& \leq C_{11} A_1 \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}).
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\|\vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x})\| = 1$. If $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0 < (100C_{14})^{-1}$, then (6.23) asserts that $\|\vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\| < 10^{-2}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
|1 - \|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\|| & \leq |1 - \|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\|| \cdot |1 + \|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\|| \\
& \leq 2 |\langle V(\vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{x})), V(\vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x})) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}| + \|\vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \\
& \leq 2C_{11} A_1 \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}) + C_{11}^2 \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\mathbf{x})^2 \\
& \leq 2C_{11}^2 A_1 \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}) + \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\mathbf{x})) \\
& \leq \frac{20}{9} C_{11}^2 A_1 \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\ell(\mathbf{x}),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (5.38). Thus (6.26) is established.

Put

$$\begin{aligned}
\vec{g}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) & := \frac{\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})}{\|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\|}, \\
\vec{E}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) & := \vec{g}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) - (\vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}) + \vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{x})) = \frac{\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})}{\|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\|} - \vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x}).
\end{aligned}$$

Then (6.15) and (6.16) hold for \vec{g}_ℓ and \vec{E}_ℓ .

Step 3: proof of (6.17). Since

$$\left\| \frac{\vec{u}}{\|\vec{u}\|} - \frac{\vec{v}}{\|\vec{v}\|} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{\|\vec{u}\|} \|\vec{u} - \vec{v}\| \quad \text{for all } 0 < \|\vec{u}\| \leq \|\vec{v}\|,$$

using (6.25), we have

$$(6.27) \quad \|\vec{g}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{g}_\ell(\mathbf{y})\| \leq (1 - C_{14}\varepsilon)^{-1} \|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{y})\|.$$

Further, by the definition of $\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})$ (see (6.24)), we get

$$\|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{y})\| \leq \|\vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{y})\| + \|\vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{y})\| =: I_1 + I_2.$$

By the induction hypothesis (6.17),

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.28) \quad I_1 &\leq A_1 \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell+1}} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{2^{-\ell+1}}\right)^{N_1-1} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{A_1}{2} \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{2^{-\ell}}\right)^{N_1-1} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}) \\
&= \frac{2^{-1}}{\frac{9}{10}} A_1 \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{2^{-\ell}}\right)^{N_1-1} \left(\frac{9}{10}\right) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying (6.9) and (6.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.29) \quad I_2 &\leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}}} \lambda_Q \|\vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{y})\| \\
&\leq C_{11} \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{2^{-\ell}}\right)^{N_1-1} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}}} \lambda_Q \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{2^{-\ell}}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{x})}{2^{-\ell}}\right)^{-N_1+1} \\
&\leq C_{11} \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{2^{-\ell}}\right)^{N_1-1} \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\mathbf{x}).
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\frac{2^{-1}}{\frac{9}{10}(1 - C_{14}\varepsilon)} < 1 \quad \text{for all } 0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0.$$

Recall also that $A_1 = C_{11}(1 - C_{14}\varepsilon_0)^{-1} = \frac{100}{99}C_{11}$, see Table B. Hence, from (6.28), (6.29), and (5.38), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.30) \quad &(1 - C_{14}\varepsilon)^{-1} \|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{y})\| \\
&\leq \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{2^{-\ell}}\right)^{N_1-1} \left(\frac{2^{-1}}{\frac{9}{10}(1 - C_{14}\varepsilon)} \frac{9}{10} A_1 \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{C_{11}}{1 - C_{14}\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) \right) \\
&\leq A_1 \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{2^{-\ell}}\right)^{N_1-1} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\ell(\mathbf{x}),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (5.38). Thus (6.17) follows from (6.27) and (6.30).

Step 4: proofs of (6.18) and (6.19). Observe (6.18) is easily obtained from (6.26) and (6.15). Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.31) \quad \|\vec{E}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\| &= \|\vec{g}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\| = \|\vec{g}_\ell(\mathbf{x})(1 - \|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\|)\| \\
&= |1 - \|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\|| \leq A_2 \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\ell(\mathbf{x}).
\end{aligned}$$

We now turn to prove (6.19). Set $C_{15} = 4C_{11}^2 C_{12}^2 A_1 (1 + A_0)^{N_1-1}$. We start by showing that

$$(6.32) \quad \left| \|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\| - \|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{y})\| \right| \leq C_{15} \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}} \varepsilon^2 \quad \text{for } \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \leq A_0 2^{-\ell}.$$

Recall that $\|g_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x})\| = 1$ (by the induction hypothesis (6.15)). So, from (6.25), (6.24), and (6.23), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\| - \|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{y})\| \right| \leq \left| \|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\|^2 - \|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \right| \\
& \leq \left| \|\vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\|^2 - \|\vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{y})\|^2 \right| \\
& \quad + 2 \left| \langle V(\vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{x})), V(\vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x})) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} - \langle V(\vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{y})), V(\vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{y})) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \right| \\
& \leq 2\varepsilon C_{11} C_{12} \|\vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{y})\| \\
& \quad + 2 \left| \langle V(\vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{x})), V(\vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{y})) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \right| \\
& \quad + 2 \left| \langle V(\vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{h}_\ell(\mathbf{y})), V(\vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{y})) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \right| \\
& =: J_1 + J_2 + J_3.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying (6.9), (6.11), and (5.42), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 & \leq 2\varepsilon C_{11} C_{12} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}}} \lambda_Q \|\vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{y})\| \\
& \leq 2\varepsilon C_{11}^2 C_{12} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}}} \lambda_Q \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{2^{-\ell}}\right)^{N_1-1} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{z}_Q - \mathbf{x}\|}{2^{-\ell}}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{x})}{2^{-\ell}}\right)^{-N_1+1} \\
& \leq 2\varepsilon C_{11}^2 C_{12} (1 + A_0)^{N_1-1} \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}} \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) \leq 2C_{11}^2 C_{12}^2 (1 + A_0)^{N_1-1} \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}} \varepsilon^2,
\end{aligned}$$

since $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \leq A_0 2^{-\ell}$.

To estimate J_2 , we use (6.23), the induction hypothesis (6.17), and (5.42) to obtain

$$J_2 \leq 2\varepsilon C_{11} C_{12} A_1 \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell+1}} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{2^{-\ell+1}}\right)^{N_1-1} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{x}) \leq C_{11} C_{12}^2 (1 + A_0)^{N_1-1} A_1 \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}} \varepsilon^2.$$

In order to estimate J_3 , we apply (6.9), together with (6.13) and get

$$J_3 = 2 \left| \left\langle \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}}} \lambda_Q V(\vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{y})), V(\vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{y}) - \vec{g}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{z}_Q)) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \right|.$$

Then utilizing (6.12), the induction hypothesis (6.17), and the definition of $\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_3 & \leq 2 \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}}} \lambda_Q C_{11} \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{z}_Q - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{y})}{2^{-\ell}}\right)^{-2N_1+1} \\
& \quad \times A_1 \frac{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{2^{-\ell+1}} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_Q)}{2^{-\ell}}\right)^{N_1-1} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{y}) \\
& \leq C_{11} A_1 \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}} \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\mathbf{y}) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\ell-1}(\mathbf{y}) \\
& \leq C_{11} C_{12}^2 A_1 \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}} \varepsilon^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used Lemma 5.41. So the proof of (6.32) is complete.

We are now in a position to finish the proof of (6.19). By the definition of \vec{E}_ℓ and (6.25),

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\vec{E}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{E}_\ell(\mathbf{y})\| &= \left\| \left(\frac{\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})}{\|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\|} - \vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) \right) - \left(\frac{\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{y})}{\|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{y})\|} - \vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{y}) \right) \right\| \\
&= \left\| \left(\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{y}) - \vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{\|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\|} \right) + \vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{y}) \left(\frac{1}{\|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\|} - \frac{1}{\|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{y})\|} \right) \right\| \\
&\leq (1 - C_{14}\varepsilon)^{-1} \left\| \vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{y}) \right\| \cdot \left| 1 - \|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\| \right| \\
&\quad + (1 - C_{14}\varepsilon)^{-1} \left| \|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\| - \|\vec{G}_\ell(\mathbf{y})\| \right| \\
&\leq A_1(1 + A_0)^{N_1-1} \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\ell(\mathbf{x}) C_{14}\varepsilon + C_{15}(1 - C_{14}\varepsilon)^{-1} \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}{2^{-\ell}} \varepsilon^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality for the first summand we have used (6.30), while for the second one we have applied (6.32). Now from Lemma 5.41 we obtain (6.19) with

$$A_3 = A_1(1 + A_0)^{N_1-1} C_{12} C_{14} + \frac{100}{99} C_{15}.$$

Thus the construction of the functions \vec{h}_ℓ , \vec{g}_ℓ and \vec{E}_ℓ satisfying (6.8)–(6.19) conducted in Steps 1–4 is complete.

Step 5: proofs of (6.20)–(6.22). Set $N_2 := N_1 - \mathbf{N}$. Then $\mathbf{N} + 1 < N_2 < N_1$ (see (5.4)). First, we check that there is $C_{16} > 0$ such that for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, $\ell(P) \leq \ell(Q)$, one has

$$(6.33) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle \vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x}), \vec{b}_P(\mathbf{x}) \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} dw(\mathbf{x}) \right| \leq C_{16} \frac{\ell(P)}{\ell(Q)} w(P) \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{z}_P)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{-N_2}.$$

Indeed, using (6.14) and then (6.11) together with (6.10) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle \vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x}), \vec{b}_P(\mathbf{x}) \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} dw(\mathbf{x}) \right| = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle \vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{z}_P), \vec{b}_P(\mathbf{x}) \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} dw(\mathbf{x}) \right| \\
&\leq C_{11}^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_P\|}{\ell(Q)} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_Q\|}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_P)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{N_1-1} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{-N_1+1} \\
&\quad \times \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_P\|}{\ell(P)} \right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_P)}{\ell(P)} \right)^{-2N_1} dw(\mathbf{x}) \\
&\leq C_{11}^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{\ell(P)}{\ell(Q)} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{-N_1} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_P)}{\ell(P)} \right)^{-N_1-1} dw(\mathbf{x}) \\
&\leq C_{11}^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{\ell(P)}{\ell(Q)} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{-N_2} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_P)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{-N_2} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_P)}{\ell(P)} \right)^{-\mathbf{N}-1} dw(\mathbf{x}) \\
&\leq C_{11}^2 \frac{\ell(P)}{\ell(Q)} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_P, \mathbf{z}_Q)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{-N_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_P)}{\ell(P)} \right)^{-\mathbf{N}-1} dw(\mathbf{x}) \\
&\leq CC_{11}^2 \frac{\ell(P)}{\ell(Q)} w(P) \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{z}_P)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{-N_2},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the fourth inequality we have used the relation

$$\left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{-N_2} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_P)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{-N_2} \leq \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_P, \mathbf{z}_Q)}{\ell(Q)} \right)^{-N_2},$$

while in the last inequality we have applied (2.12) with $\varepsilon = 1$. Thus (6.33) is verified.

Now for non-negative integers $s_1 \leq s_2$, let $\mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2} = \bigcup_{\ell=s_1}^{s_2} \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}}$. Set $D_0 = [0, 1)$, $D_j = [2^{j-1}, 2^j)$, $j \geq 1$. In virtue of (6.33),

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sum_{\ell=s_1}^{s_2} \vec{h}_\ell \right\|_{L^2(dw)}^2 &= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2}} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2}} \lambda_Q \lambda_P \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle \vec{b}_Q(\mathbf{x}), \vec{b}_P(\mathbf{x}) \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} dw(\mathbf{x}) \\
&\leq 2C_{16} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2}} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2} \\ \ell(P) \leq \ell(Q)}} \lambda_Q \lambda_P \frac{\ell(P)}{\ell(Q)} w(P) \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{z}_P)}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-N_2} \\
&\leq 2C_{16} \sum_{n=0}^{s_2-s_1} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2}} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2} \\ \ell(P)=2^{-n}\ell(Q)}} \lambda_Q \lambda_P \frac{\ell(P)}{\ell(Q)} w(P) \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{z}_P)}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-N_2} \\
&\leq 2C_{16} \sum_{n=0}^{s_2-s_1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2}} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2} \\ \ell(P)=2^{-n}\ell(Q) \\ \ell(Q)^{-1}d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{z}_P) \in D_j}} \lambda_Q \lambda_P w(P) 2^{-n} 2^{-jN_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality two times, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \sum_{\ell=s_1}^{s_2} \vec{h}_\ell \right\|_{L^2(dw)}^2 \\
&\leq 2C_{16} \sum_{n=0}^{s_2-s_1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{-n} 2^{-jN_2} \left\{ \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2}} \lambda_Q^2 w(Q) \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2}} \left(\sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2} \\ \ell(P)=2^{-n}\ell(Q) \\ \ell(Q)^{-1}d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{z}_P) \in D_j}} \lambda_P w(P) \right)^2 \frac{1}{w(Q)} \right\}^{1/2} \\
&\leq 2C_{16} \sum_{\substack{n \geq 0 \\ j \geq 0}} 2^{-n} 2^{-jN_2} \left\{ \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2}} \lambda_Q^2 w(Q) \right\}^{1/2} \\
&\quad \times \left\{ \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2}} \left(\sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2} \\ \ell(P)=2^{-n}\ell(Q) \\ \ell(Q)^{-1}d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{z}_P) \in D_j}} \lambda_P^2 w(P) \right) \left(\sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2} \\ \ell(P)=2^{-n}\ell(Q) \\ \ell(Q)^{-1}d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{z}_P) \in D_j}} w(P) \right) \frac{1}{w(Q)} \right\}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that there is a constant $C_{17} \geq 1$, which depends on N, R, k such that for any integer $n \geq 0$ and any cube $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, one has

$$(6.34) \quad \sum_{\substack{P \in Q \\ \ell(P)=2^{-n}\ell(Q) \\ d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{z}_P) \leq 2^j \ell(Q)}} w(P) \leq C_{17} 2^{jN} w(Q),$$

so, with $C_{18} = 2C_{16}\sqrt{C_{17}}$, we have

$$(6.35) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{\ell=s_1}^{s_2} \vec{h}_\ell \right\|_{L^2(dw)}^2 \\ & \leq C_{18} \sum_{\substack{n \geq 0 \\ j \geq 0}} 2^{-n} 2^{-j(N_2 - N/2)} \left\{ \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2}} \lambda_Q^2 w(Q) \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2}} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2} \\ \ell(P) = 2^{-n} \ell(Q) \\ \ell(Q)^{-1} d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{z}_P) \in D_j}} \lambda_P^2 w(P) \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that there is $C_{19} \geq 1$, which depends on N, R, k , such that for all $j, n \geq 0$ and every $P \in \mathcal{Q}$ the number of cubes $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $\ell(P) = 2^{-n} \ell(Q)$, $d(\mathbf{z}_Q, \mathbf{z}_P) \leq 2^j \ell(Q)$ is bounded by $C_{19} 2^{jN} \leq C_{19} 2^{jN}$. Therefore, with $C_{20} = C_{18} \sqrt{C_{19}}$

$$(6.36) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{\ell=s_1}^{s_2} \vec{h}_\ell \right\|_{L^2(dw)}^2 \\ & \leq C_{20} \sum_{\substack{n \geq 0 \\ j \geq 0}} 2^{-n} 2^{-j(N_2 - N)} \left\{ \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2}} \lambda_Q^2 w(Q) \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2}} \lambda_P^2 w(P) \right\}^{1/2} \\ & \leq 4C_{20} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{s_1, s_2}} \lambda_Q^2 w(Q) \leq 4C_{20} \int_{2^{-s_2}}^{2^{-s_1+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\phi_t * \phi_t * f(\mathbf{y})|^2 dw(\mathbf{y}) \frac{dt}{t}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (5.6). From the Plancherel's equality (2.6) for the Dunkl transform we easily conclude that $\left\| \sum_{\ell=s_1}^{s_2} \vec{h}_\ell \right\|_{L^2(dw)}^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $s_1, s_2 \rightarrow \infty$, since $f \in L^2(dw)$. Thus (6.36) implies that $\sum_{l \geq 0} \vec{h}_l(\mathbf{x})$ converges in $L^2(dw)$ and by Lemma 4.8,

$$(6.37) \quad \begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{l \geq 0} \vec{h}_l \right\|_{L^2(dw)} &= \left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}, \ell(Q) \leq 1} \lambda_Q \vec{b}_Q \right\|_{L^2(dw)} \leq 2\sqrt{C_{20}} \|f\|_{L^2(dw)} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{C_{20}} C_{J-N, 2} \cdot \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{x})} w(B(0, 1))^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Fix $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $2^{-m} = \ell(Q)$. From (6.18) and Lemma 5.41, we obtain

$$(6.38) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{2Q} \sum_{j \geq \max(m, 0)} \|\vec{E}_j(\mathbf{x})\| dw(\mathbf{x}) &\leq A_2 \int_{2Q} \sum_{j \geq \max(m, 0)} \sigma_j(\mathbf{x}) \tau_j(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) \\ &\leq A_2 C_{12} w(Q) \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{x})}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Applying (6.38) to $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $\ell(Q) = 2^0 = 1$, we conclude that the series $\sum_{j \geq 0} \vec{E}_j(\mathbf{x})$ converges locally in $L^1(dw)$ to a function $\vec{E}^0(\mathbf{x})$.

On the other hand, we deduce from (6.19) that for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in 2Q$, $\ell(Q) = 2^{-m}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have the following estimate on the finite sum:

$$(6.39) \quad \sum_{\min(m, 0) \leq j < m} \|\vec{E}_j(\mathbf{x}) - \vec{E}_j(\mathbf{y})\| \leq A_3 \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{x})}^2 \sum_{\min(m, 0) \leq j < m} 2^j \leq A_3 \sqrt{N} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{x})}^2,$$

where the left side of (6.39) is understood to be zero if $m \leq 0$. The estimates (6.38) together with (6.39) imply that

$$\frac{1}{w(2Q)} \int_{2Q} \left\| \vec{E}^0(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{\min(m,0) \leq j < m} \vec{E}_j(\mathbf{z}_Q) \right\| dw(\mathbf{x}) \leq (A_3\sqrt{N} + C_{12}A_2) \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{x})}^2,$$

which together with the doubling property give (6.20) and (6.21) with

$$A_4 = A_3\sqrt{N} + C_{12}A_2.$$

Since $\sum_{j=0}^{\ell} (\vec{h}_j + \vec{E}_j) = \vec{g}_\ell - \vec{g}_{-1}$, we conclude (6.22) from (6.20), (6.37), and (6.15).

Step 6: completion of the proof of Theorem 6.1. Having (6.8)–(6.22) already proved, we are in a position to finish the proof of Theorem 6.1.

It follows from (6.31), (5.43), and the definition of $\tau_\ell(\mathbf{x})$ (see Section 5.7) that

$$(6.40) \quad \|\vec{E}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\| \leq C_{12}A_2 \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}}} \lambda_Q \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q)}{\ell(Q)}\right)^{-N_0}.$$

Recall that $\text{supp } f \subseteq B(0, 1)$. Hence $\lambda_Q = 0$, if $d(\mathbf{z}_Q, 0) > 4\sqrt{N} = A_0/8$ and $\ell(Q) \leq 1$. Moreover, there is a constant $C_{21} \geq 1$, which depends only on N, R , such that

$$(6.41) \quad \#\{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{2^{-\ell}} : \lambda_Q \neq 0\} \leq C_{21}2^{\ell N}, \quad \text{for } \ell \geq 0.$$

Hence, if $\|\mathbf{x}\| = d(\mathbf{x}, 0) > A_0/2$ and $\lambda_Q \neq 0$, then $2^{-1}d(\mathbf{x}, 0) \leq d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_Q) \leq 2d(\mathbf{x}, 0)$ and from (6.40), (5.13), and (5.4), we conclude that

$$(6.42) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\vec{E}^0(\mathbf{x})\| &\leq \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \|\vec{E}_\ell(\mathbf{x})\| \leq C_{12}A_2 C_{10} C_{21} 2^{N_0} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{x})}^2 \sum_{\ell \geq 0} 2^{\ell N} \left(1 + \frac{d(\mathbf{x}, 0)}{2^{-\ell}}\right)^{-N_0} \\ &\leq 2C_{12}A_2 C_{10} C_{21} 2^{N_0} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{x})}^2 d(\mathbf{x}, 0)^{-N_0} = C_{22} \|\mathbf{x}\|^{-N_0} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{x})}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using (6.16), (6.22), and (6.20), we write

$$(6.43) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \vec{h}_\ell &= \sum_{\ell \geq 0} (\vec{g}_\ell - \vec{g}_{\ell-1}) - \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \vec{E}_\ell = \vec{g} - \vec{g}_{-1} - \vec{E}^0 \\ &= \vec{g} - \vec{g}_{-1} - \vec{E}^0 \chi_{B(0, A_0/2)^c} - \vec{E}^0 \chi_{B(0, A_0/2)}. \end{aligned}$$

From (6.15) and (6.42) we have

$$(6.44) \quad \|\vec{g} - \vec{g}_{-1} - \vec{E}^0 \chi_{B(0, A_0/2)^c}\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2 + C_{22} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{x})}^2.$$

Now using (6.42) combined with (6.21), we get

$$(6.45) \quad \left\| \vec{E}^0 \chi_{B(0, A_0/2)} \right\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{x})} \leq \|\vec{E}^0\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{x})} + \|\vec{E}^0 \chi_{B(0, A_0/2)^c}\|_{L^\infty} \leq (A_4 + C_{22}) \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{x})}^2$$

and, consequently, by Lemma 4.8,

$$(6.46) \quad \left\| \vec{E}^0 \chi_{B(0, A_0/2)} \right\|_{L^2(dw)} \leq C_{23} w(B(0, 1))^{1/2} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{x})}^2,$$

with $C_{23} = C_{J-N,2}(A_0/2)^{N/2}(A_4 + C_{22})$. Finally, from (6.43), (6.37), and (6.46), we obtain

$$(6.47) \quad \begin{aligned} \left\| \vec{g} - \vec{g}_{-1} - \vec{E}^0 \chi_{B(0,A_0/2)^c} \right\|_{L^2(dw)} &= \left\| \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \vec{h}_\ell + \vec{E}^0 \chi_{B(0,A_0/2)} \right\|_{L^2(dw)} \\ &\leq (2\sqrt{C_{20}}C_{J-N,2} + C_{23})w(B(0,1))^{1/2} \left(\|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} + \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that for $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_d)$, we denote $\vec{S}^* \circ \vec{f} = \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{S}^{\{j\}*} f_j$. Let

$$(6.48) \quad F = \vec{S}^* \circ \left\{ \vec{E}^0 \chi_{B(0,A_0/2)} \right\}.$$

The Hörmander multiplier theorem [10, Theorem 1.2] asserts that the operators $\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}}$ are bounded on H_{Dunkl}^1 . Hence, by (6.45) and duality arguments, there is a constant $C_{24} \geq 1$ which depends on the system \vec{S} such that for all f satisfying $\|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} = \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, $\text{supp } f \subset B(0,1)$, we have

$$(6.49) \quad \|F\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} \leq C_{24} \|\vec{E}^0 \chi_{B(0,A_0/2)}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} \leq C_{24}(A_4 + C_{22})w(B(0,1))^{1/2} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2.$$

Moreover, using (3.3), (2.3), (6.46), and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get the following bound on $|F(\mathbf{x})|$ for $\|\mathbf{x}\| = d(\mathbf{x}, 0) > A_0$:

$$(6.50) \quad |F(\mathbf{x})| \leq C_{0,0} \sup_{\|\mathbf{y}\| \leq A_0/2} w(B(\mathbf{x}, d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})))^{-1} \|\vec{E}^0 \chi_{B(0,A_0/2)}\|_{L^1(dw)} \leq C_{25} w(B(0,1)) \|\mathbf{x}\|^{-N} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2.$$

with $C_{25} \geq 1$ depending on N, R, k, \vec{S} but independent of f , provided $\|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} = \varepsilon$, $\text{supp } f \subset B(0,1)$. Thus from (6.50) and (6.49), we conclude that there is a constant $C_{26} \geq 1$ independent of $f \in \text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ satisfying $\text{supp } f \subset B(0,1)$, $\|f\|_{\text{BMO}} = \varepsilon$, such that

$$(6.51) \quad \|F \chi_{B(0,A_0)^c}\|_{L^2(dw)} \leq C_{26} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2 = C_{26} \varepsilon^2,$$

$$(6.52) \quad \|F \chi_{B(0,A_0)^c}\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_{26} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2 = C_{26} \varepsilon^2.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|F \chi_{B(0,A_0)}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} &\leq \|F\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} + \|F \chi_{B(0,A_0)^c}\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq (C_{26} + C_{24}(A_4 + C_{22})w(B(0,1))^{1/2}) \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2 = (C_{26} + C_{24}(A_4 + C_{22})w(B(0,1))^{1/2}) \varepsilon^2, \end{aligned}$$

Put

$$(6.53) \quad \begin{cases} \vec{g} = \vec{g} - \vec{g}_{-1} - \vec{E}^0 \chi_{B(0,A_0/2)^c} = \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \vec{h}_\ell + \vec{E}^0 \chi_{B(0,A_0/2)}, \\ \tilde{g}_0 = g_0 - F \chi_{B(0,A_0)^c}, \\ f_1 = -F \chi_{B(0,A_0)}. \end{cases}$$

Then, by (6.44),

$$(6.54) \quad \sum_{j=1}^d \|\tilde{g}_j\|_{L^\infty} \leq \sqrt{d} \|\vec{g}\|_{L^\infty} \leq \sqrt{d}(2 + C_{22} \|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2) \leq \sqrt{d}(2 + C_{22} \varepsilon).$$

Further, from (6.7) and (6.52) we get

$$\|\tilde{g}_0\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|g_0\|_{L^\infty} + \|F\chi_{B(0,A_0)^c}\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_{13}\|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} + C_{26}\|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}^2 \leq (C_{13} + C_{26})\varepsilon,$$

which together with (6.54) give (6.3). For relations (6.4), see (??). Now (6.5) is exactly (6.47) combined with (6.51) and (6.7). Finally, for the decomposition (6.2), we use (6.53) and write

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{S}^* \circ \vec{g} + \tilde{g}_0 + f_1 &= \vec{S}^* \circ \left(\sum_{\ell \geq 0} \vec{h}_\ell \right) + \vec{S}^* \circ \left(\vec{E}^0 \chi_{B(0,A_0/2)} \right) + \tilde{g}_0 + f_1 \\ &= f_0 + F + (g_0 - F\chi_{B(0,A_0)^c}) - F\chi_{B(0,A_0)} \\ &= f_0 + g_0 = f, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we have applied (6.8), (6.6), and (6.48). \square

6.2. Proof of Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let $A, A_0 \geq 1$ and $0 < \varepsilon_0 < 1$ be as in Theorem 6.1. Fix $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ such that $A\varepsilon < 1$ and $AA_0^{N/2}\varepsilon < 1$. Let $0 \not\equiv f$ be a compactly supported $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ -function. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\|f\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} = \varepsilon$. Let $r > 0$ be such that $\text{supp } f \subseteq B(0, r)$. Decompose f according to Theorem 6.1, i.e.,

$$f = \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{S}^{\{j\}*} \tilde{g}_j + \tilde{g}_0 + f_1.$$

Set $\tilde{g}_j^{\{0\}} := \tilde{g}_j$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, d$. If $f_1 \equiv 0$, we are done. Otherwise we apply Theorem 6.1 to the function $\varepsilon f_1 / \|f_1\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}$ and obtain functions $f_2, \tilde{g}_j^{\{1\}}$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, d$, such that

$$f_1 = \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{S}^{\{j\}*} \tilde{g}_j^{\{1\}} + \tilde{g}_0^{\{1\}} + f_2,$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \|\tilde{g}_j^{\{1\}}\|_{L^\infty} \leq (2\sqrt{d} + A\varepsilon) \frac{\|f_1\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}}{\varepsilon} \leq (2\sqrt{d} + A\varepsilon) A\varepsilon, \quad \|\tilde{g}_0^{\{1\}}\|_{L^\infty} \leq A\|f_1\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} \leq A^2\varepsilon^2,$$

$$\|f_2\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} \leq \frac{\|f_1\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}}{\varepsilon} A\varepsilon^2 \leq A^2\varepsilon^3, \quad \text{supp } f_2 \subseteq B(0, A_0^2 r),$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^d \|\tilde{g}_j^{\{1\}}\|_{L^2(dw)} \leq \frac{\|f_1\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}}{\varepsilon} A w(B(0, A_0 r))^{1/2} \varepsilon \leq A^2 w(B(0, A_0 r))^{1/2} \varepsilon^2.$$

Continuing this procedure we obtain sequences of functions $\{\tilde{g}_j^{\{n\}}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}}$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, d$, and $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$f = \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{S}^{\{j\}*} \tilde{g}_j^{\{0\}} + \tilde{g}_0^{\{0\}} + f_1;$$

$$f_n = \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{S}^{\{j\}*} \tilde{g}_j^{\{n\}} + \tilde{g}_0^{\{n\}} + f_{n+1}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots;$$

$$(6.55) \quad \sum_{j=1}^d \|\tilde{g}_j^{\{n\}}\|_{L^\infty} \leq (2\sqrt{d} + A\varepsilon)A^n\varepsilon^n, \quad \|\tilde{g}_0^{\{n\}}\|_{L^\infty} \leq A^{n+1}\varepsilon^{n+1} \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots;$$

$$(6.56) \quad \sum_{j=0}^d \|\tilde{g}_j^{\{n\}}\|_{L^2(dw)} \leq A^{n+1}w(B(0, A_0^n r))^{1/2}\varepsilon^{n+1}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots;$$

$$(6.57) \quad \|f_{n+1}\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} \leq A^{n+1}\varepsilon^{n+2}, \quad \text{supp } f_{n+1} \subseteq B(0, A_0^{n+1}r), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Using Lemma 4.8 together with (1.1), (6.56), and (6.57) we get

$$\|f_n\|_{L^2(dw)} \leq C'w(B(0, A_0^n r))^{1/2}\|f_n\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} \leq C''A_0^{Nn/2}w(B(0, r))^{1/2}A^n\varepsilon^{n+1} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^d \|\tilde{g}_j^{\{n\}}\|_{L^2(dw)} \leq C \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A^{n+1}A_0^{Nn/2}w(B(0, r))^{1/2}\varepsilon^{n+1} < \infty.$$

Putting $\mathbf{g}_j = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{g}_j^{\{n\}}$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, d$ and using (6.55), we complete the proof of Theorem 1.3. \square

7. PROOF OF CHARACTERIZATION OF H_{Dunkl}^1 BY SYSTEMS OF SINGULAR INTEGRALS

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Having Theorem 1.3 about the decompositions of compactly supported $\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})$ -functions, the proof of Theorem 1.2 goes by standard arguments. For the sake of completeness we provide the details. Assume that f is a complex valued $L^1(dw)$ -function such that $\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}}f \in L^1(dw)$ for all $j = 1, \dots, d$. Set $\mathbf{S}^{\{0\}} = \text{Id}$. Consider the functional

$$(7.1) \quad C_c(\mathbf{X}) \ni \varphi \mapsto \Phi(\varphi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi(\mathbf{x})f(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi(\mathbf{x})(f * h_t)(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}).$$

Applying Theorem 1.3, there are $\mathbf{g}_j \in L^2(dw) \cap L^\infty$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, d$, such that

$$\varphi = \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{S}^{\{j\}*} \mathbf{g}_j + \mathbf{g}_0 = \sum_{j=0}^d \mathbf{S}^{\{j\}*} \mathbf{g}_j,$$

$$(7.2) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|\mathbf{g}_j\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|\varphi\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})}.$$

Note that $f * h_t \in L^2(dw)$ for all $t > 0$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\varphi) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \sum_{j=0}^d \mathbf{S}^{\{j\}*} \mathbf{g}_j(\mathbf{x})(f * h_t)(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{j=0}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mathbf{g}_j(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}}(f * h_t)(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{j=0}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mathbf{g}_j(\mathbf{x})((\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}}f) * h_t)(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=0}^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mathbf{g}_j(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}}f(\mathbf{x}) dw(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (7.2),

$$|\Phi(\varphi)| \leq C\|\varphi\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbf{X})} \sum_{j=0}^d \|\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}}f\|_{L^1(dw)}.$$

So, Φ can be extended to a bounded functional on $\text{VMO}(\mathbf{X})$ (see Section 4.2) and its norm is controlled from above by $C \sum_{j=0}^d \|\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}}f\|_{L^1(dw)}$. By Coifman-Weiss [5] (see also

Section 4.2), the functional Φ is represented by integration with a unique H_{Dunkl}^1 -function (see (7.1)). Hence $f \in H_{\text{Dunkl}}^1$ and

$$\|f\|_{H_{\text{Dunkl}}^1} \sim \|\Phi\| \leq C \sum_{j=0}^d \|\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}} f\|_{L^1(dw)}.$$

The inverse estimate $\|\mathbf{S}^{\{j\}} f\|_{L^1(dw)} \leq C \|f\|_{H_{\text{Dunkl}}^1}$ is Theorem 1.2 of [10]. \square

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.8

Proof of Theorem 3.8. Thanks to the scaling, in the proof of the theorem we may assume that $0 < s \leq t = 1$.

Proof of (a). Recall that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \phi_s(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{z}) = 0$ for all $s > 0$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Applying (a) and (b) of Theorem 3.7 and (2.10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_1 * \phi_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\psi_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) - \psi_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) \phi_s(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{z}) \right| \\ &\leq C \|\psi\|_{C^\kappa} \|\phi\|_{C^\kappa} \int_{d(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) \leq s} \frac{\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}\|}{1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|} w((B(\mathbf{x}, 1))^{-1/2} (w(B(\mathbf{z}, 1))^{-1/2} + w(B(\mathbf{y}, 1))^{-1/2}) \\ &\quad \times w(B(\mathbf{z}, s))^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}\|}{s}\right)^{-1} dw(\mathbf{z}) \\ &\leq C \|\psi\|_{C^\kappa} \|\phi\|_{C^\kappa} (1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|)^{-1} s w(B(\mathbf{x}, 1))^{-1/2} \\ &\quad \times \int_{d(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) \leq s} (w(B(\mathbf{z}, 1))^{-1/2} + w(B(\mathbf{y}, 1))^{-1/2}) w(B(\mathbf{z}, s))^{-1} dw(\mathbf{z}). \end{aligned}$$

Let us note that, by (1.1), $w(B(\mathbf{z}, 1)) \sim w(B(\mathbf{y}, 1))$ if $d(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) \leq s \leq 1$. Therefore,

$$|\psi_1 * \phi_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| \leq C \|\psi\|_{C^\kappa} \|\phi\|_{C^\kappa} (1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|)^{-1} s w(B(\mathbf{x}, 1))^{-1/2} w(B(\mathbf{y}, 1))^{-1/2}.$$

Now (a) of the theorem follows from the facts that $w(B(\mathbf{x}, 1)) \sim w(B(\mathbf{y}, 1))$, if $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq 2$. Moreover, $\psi * \phi_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0$ if $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) > 2$ and $0 < s \leq 1$ (see (2.10)).

Proof of (b). Note that $\psi * \phi_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0$ if $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq 2$ and $0 < s \leq t = 1$ (see (2.10)).

Further, since $s^m \Delta_k^{m/2}(\eta_s)(\mathbf{x}) = \phi_s(\mathbf{x})$,

$$(A.1) \quad \psi_1 * \phi_s(\mathbf{x}) = s^m \psi_1 * (\Delta_k^{m/2}(\eta_s))(\mathbf{x}) = s^m (\Delta_k^{m/2} \psi_1) * \eta_s(\mathbf{x}).$$

Consequently, applying part (a) of Theorem 3.7, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_1 * \phi_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| &= s^m \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\Delta_k^{m/2} \psi_1)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \eta_s(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{z}) \right| \\ &\leq C \|\psi\|_{C^\kappa} \|\eta\|_{C^\kappa} s^m \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} w(B(\mathbf{x}, 1))^{-1} (1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}\|)^{-1} \\ &\quad \times w(B(\mathbf{y}, s))^{-1} (1 + \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}\|/s)^{-1} \chi_{[0, s]}(d(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})) dw(\mathbf{z}) \\ &\leq C \|\psi\|_{C^\kappa} \|\eta\|_{C^\kappa} s^m w(B(\mathbf{x}, 1))^{-1} (1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of (c). Applying part (a) of Theorem 3.8, we have

$$|\psi_s * \phi_1(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})| \leq C \|\psi\|_{C^\kappa} \|\phi\|_{C^\kappa} s w(B(\mathbf{y}, 1))^{-1} (1 + \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}\|)^{-1} \chi_{[0, 2]}(d(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})).$$

Recall that $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| \leq 1$ and $0 < s \leq 1$. Now, using part (b) of Theorem 3.7, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\phi_1 * (\psi_s * \phi_1)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \phi_1 * (\psi_s * \phi_1)(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y})| \\
&= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\phi_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) - \phi_1(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{z})) (\psi_s * \phi_1)(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{z}) \right| \\
&\leq C \|\psi\|_{C^\kappa} \|\phi\|_{C^\kappa}^2 s \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|}{(1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}\|)} w(B(\mathbf{z}, 1))^{-1/2} (w(B(\mathbf{x}, 1))^{-1/2} + w(B(\mathbf{x}', 1))^{-1/2}) \\
&\quad \times w(B(\mathbf{y}, 1))^{-1} (1 + \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}\|)^{-1} \chi_{[0,2]}(d(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})) dw(\mathbf{z}) \\
&\leq C \|\psi\|_{C^\kappa} \|\phi\|_{C^\kappa}^2 s w(B(\mathbf{x}, 1))^{-1} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| (1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|)^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is finished, because

$$|\phi_1 * (\psi_s * \phi_1)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \phi_1 * (\psi_s * \phi_1)(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y})| = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq 4 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| \leq 1.$$

Proof of (d). We repeat arguments of the proof of part (b). Using (A.1), we get

$$\psi_1 * \phi_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \psi_1 * \phi_s(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}) = s^m \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\Delta_k^{m/2} \psi_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) - \Delta_k^{m/2} \psi_1(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{z})) \eta_s(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) dw(\mathbf{z}).$$

Applying part (c) of Theorem 3.7 to the function ψ , part (a) to the function ϕ , and having in mind that $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| \leq 1$ and $0 < s \leq 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\psi_1 * \phi_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \psi_1 * \phi_s(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y})| \\
&\leq C \|\psi\|_{C^\kappa} \|\phi\|_{C^\kappa} s^m \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| w(B(\mathbf{x}, 1))^{-1} (1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}\|)^{-1} \chi_{[0,2]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})) \\
&\quad \times w(B(\mathbf{y}, s))^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}\|}{s}\right)^{-1} \chi_{[0,s]}(d(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})) dw(\mathbf{z}) \\
&\leq C \|\psi\|_{C^\kappa} \|\phi\|_{C^\kappa} s^m \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| (1 + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|)^{-1} w(B(\mathbf{x}, 1))^{-1} \chi_{[0,4]}(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of Theorem 3.8 is complete. \square

NOTATION

Q° , 20	$\check{f}(\mathbf{x}) = f(-\mathbf{x})$, 8
λ_{Q^j} , 19	a_{Q^j} , 19
Q , 18	sQ , 20
Q_{2^j} , 18	

APPENDIX B. SUMMARY OF KEY MATHEMATICAL CONSTANTS, THEIR FIRST
APPEARANCE, AND RELATIONSHIPS

Constant	First Appearance	Relations/Comments
ε_0	Theorem 6.1	$\varepsilon_0 = (100C_{11}C_{12})^{-1}$
A	Theorem 6.1	Fixed at the end of the proof
A_0	Theorem 6.1	$A_0 = 32\sqrt{N}$
A_1	Equation (6.17)	$A_1 = C_{11} \cdot \frac{100}{99}$
A_2	Equation (6.18)	$A_2 = \frac{20}{9}C_{11}^2A_1$
A_3	Equation (6.19)	$A_3 = A_1(1+A_0)^{N_1-1}C_{11}C_{12}^2 + \frac{100}{99}4C_{11}^2C_{12}^2(1+A_0)^{N_1-1}A_1$
A_4	Equation (6.21)	$A_4 = A_3\sqrt{N} + C_{12}A_2$
C_{10}	Proposition 5.11	
C_{11}	Lemma 5.31	
C_{12}	Lemma 5.41	
C_{13}	Equation (6.7)	Does not depend on $f \in \text{BMO}$ of compact support
C_{14}	Equation (6.25)	$C_{14} = C_{11}C_{12}$
C_{15}	Equation (6.32)	$C_{15} = 4C_{11}^2C_{12}^2(1+A_0)^{N_1-1}A_1$
C_{16}	Equation (6.33)	$C_{16} = C_{11}^2C'$, where $C' > 0$ satisfies $\frac{1}{w(P)} \int (1 + d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_P)/\ell(P))^{-\mathbf{N}-1} dw(\mathbf{x}) \leq C'.$
C_{17}	Equation (6.34)	Depends only on (N, R, k)
C_{18}	Equation (6.35)	$C_{18} = 2C_{16}\sqrt{C_{17}}$
C_{19}	Below (6.35)	Depends only on (N, R, k)
C_{20}	Below (6.35)	$C_{20} = C_{18}\sqrt{C_{19}}$
C_{21}	Below (6.40)	Depends only on (N, R, k)
C_{22}	Equation (6.42)	$C_{22} = C_{12}A_2C_{10}C_{21}2^{N_0}$
C_{23}	Equation (6.46)	$C_{23} = C_{J-N,2}(A_0/2)^{\mathbf{N}/2}(A_4 + C_{22})$
C_{24}	Equation (6.49)	Depends on (N, R, k) and \vec{S}
C_{25}	Equation (6.50)	Depends on (N, R, k) and \vec{S}
C_{26}	Equation (6.51)	Depends on (N, R, k) and \vec{S}
$C_{J-N,p}$	Lemma 4.8	Constant in John-Nirenberg inequality
M_1	Equation (5.3)	$M_1 = 8[\mathbf{N} + 1]$
N_0	Equation (5.4)	$N_0 > 2\mathbf{N}$
N_1	Equation (5.4)	$N_0 + 1 < N_1 \leq (4M_1 + N - 1)/2$
N_2	Above (6.33)	$N_2 = N_1 - \mathbf{N}$

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Amri, A. Hammi, *Dunkl-Schrödinger operators*, Complex Anal. Oper. Theory 113, (2019), 1033-1058.
- [2] J.-Ph. Anker, J. Dziubański, A. Hejna, *Harmonic functions, conjugate harmonic functions and the Hardy space H^1 in the rational Dunkl setting*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl. 25 (2019), 2356–2418.
- [3] M. Christ, *On the regularity of inverses of singular integral operators*, Duke Math. J. 57 (1988), 459–484.
- [4] M. Christ, D. Geller, *Singular integral characterizations of Hardy spaces on homogeneous groups*, Duke Math. J. 51 (1984), 547–598.
- [5] R. Coifman and G. Weiss, *Extensions of Hardy spaces and their use in analysis*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 83, 4 (1977), 569–645.
- [6] M.F.E. de Jeu, *The Dunkl transform*, Invent. Math. 113 (1993), 147–162.
- [7] C.F. Dunkl, *Differential-difference operators associated to reflection groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. 311 (1989), no. 1, 167–183.
- [8] C.F. Dunkl, *Hankel transforms associated to finite reflection groups*, in: *Proc. of the special session on hypergeometric functions on domains of positivity, Jack polynomials and applications*, Proceedings, Tampa 1991, Contemp. Math. 138 (1989), 123–138.
- [9] J. Dziubański, A. Hejna, *Remarks on Dunkl translations of non-radial kernels*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl. 29:52 (2023), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00041-023-10034-2>.
- [10] J. Dziubański and A. Hejna, *Hörmander’s multiplier theorem for the Dunkl transform*, Journal of Functional Analysis 277 (2019), 2133-2159.
- [11] J. Dziubański, A. Hejna, *Remark on atomic decompositions for the Hardy space H^1 in the rational Dunkl setting*, Studia Math. 251 (2020), no. 1, 89–110.
- [12] J. Dziubański, A. Hejna, *Upper and lower bounds for the Dunkl heat kernel*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 62 (2023), no.1, Paper No. 25, 18 pp.
- [13] J. Dziubański and K. Jotsarop, *On Hardy and BMO Spaces for Grushin Operator*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl. 22 (2016), 954-995.
- [14] C. Fefferman, E.M. Stein, *H^p spaces of several variables*, Acta Math. 129, 137–195 (1972).
- [15] J. Jiu and Z. Li, *The dual of the Hardy space associated with the Dunkl operators*, Advances in Mathematics, Volume 412, (2023).
- [16] M. Rösler, *Positivity of Dunkl’s intertwining operator*, Duke Math. J. 98 (1999), no. 3, 445–463.
- [17] M. Rösler, *A positive radial product formula for the Dunkl kernel*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 355 (2003), no. 6, 2413–2438.
- [18] M. Rösler: *Dunkl operators (theory and applications)*. In: *Koelink, E., Van Assche, W. (eds.) Orthogonal polynomials and special functions* (Leuven, 2002), 93–135. Lect. Notes Math. 1817, Springer-Verlag (2003).
- [19] M. Rösler, M. Voit, *Dunkl theory, convolution algebras, and related Markov processes*, in *Harmonic and stochastic analysis of Dunkl processes*, P. Graczyk, M. Rösler, M. Yor (eds.), 1–112, Travaux en cours 71, Hermann, Paris, 2008.
- [20] E.M. Stein, *Harmonic Analysis (Real Variable Methods, Orthogonality and Oscillatory Integrals)*, Princeton Math. Ser. 43, Princeton Univ. Press, 1993.
- [21] S. Thangavelu, Y. Xu, *Convolution operator and maximal function for the Dunkl transform*, J. Anal. Math. 97 (2005), 25–55.
- [22] A. Uchiyama, *A constructive proof of the Fefferman-Stein decomposition of $BMO(\mathbf{R}^n)$* , Acta Math. 148(1982), 215–241

JACEK DZIUBAŃSKI, UNIwersytet Wrocławski, Instytut Matematyczny, PL. GRUNWALDZKI 2, 50-384 WROCLAW, POLAND
Email address: `jdziuban@math.uni.wroc.pl`

AGNIESZKA HEJNA, UNIwersytet Wrocławski, Instytut Matematyczny, PL. GRUNWALDZKI 2, 50-384 WROCLAW, POLAND & DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, PISCATAWAY, NJ 08854-8019, USA
Email address: `hejna@math.uni.wroc.pl`