

Characterization of trace spaces on regular trees via dyadic norms

Zhuang Wang

Abstract

In this paper, we study the traces of Orlicz-Sobolev spaces on a regular rooted tree. After giving a dyadic decomposition of the boundary of the regular tree, we present a characterization on the trace spaces of those first order Orlicz-Sobolev spaces whose Young function is of the form $t^p \log^\lambda(e+t)$, based on integral averages on dyadic elements of the dyadic decomposition.

1 Introduction

The problem of the characterization of the trace spaces (on the boundary of a domain) of Sobolev spaces has a long history. It was first studied in the Euclidean setting by Gagliardo [12], who proved that the trace operator $T : W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}) \rightarrow B_{p,p}^{1-1/p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $B_{p,p}^{1-1/p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ stands for the classical Besov space, is linear and bounded for every $p > 1$ and that there exists a bounded linear extension operator that acts as a right inverse of T . Moreover, he proved that the trace operator $T : W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}) \rightarrow L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a bounded linear surjective operator with a non-linear right inverse. Peetre [37] showed that one can not find a bounded linear extension operator that acts as a right inverse of $T : W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}) \rightarrow L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. We refer to the seminal monographs by Peetre [38] and Triebel [44, 45] for extensive treatments of the Besov spaces and related smoothness spaces. In potential theory, certain types of Dirichlet problem are guaranteed to have solutions when the boundary data belongs to a trace space corresponding to the Sobolev class on the domain. In the Euclidean setting, we refer to [1, 30, 33, 42, 47, 48] for more information on the traces of (weighted) Sobolev spaces and [8–11, 28, 29, 35, 36] for results on traces of (weighted) Orlicz-Sobolev spaces.

Over the past two decades, analysis in general metric measure spaces has attracted a lot of attention, e.g., [2, 4, 15–19]. The trace theory in the metric setting has been under development. Malý [31] proved that the trace space of the Newtonian space $N^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is the Besov space $B_{p,p}^{1-\theta/p}(\partial\Omega)$ provided that Ω is a John domain for $p > 1$ (uniform domain for $p \geq 1$) that admits a p -Poincaré inequality and whose boundary $\partial\Omega$ is endowed with a codimensional- θ Ahlfors regular measure with $\theta < p$. We also refer to the paper [40] for studies on the traces of Hajlasz-Sobolev functions to porous Ahlfors regular closed subsets via a method based on hyperbolic fillings of a metric space, see [6, 43].

2010 *Mathematics Subject classification*: 46E35, 30L05

Key words and phrases: regular tree, trace space, dyadic norm, Orlicz-Sobolev space

The author has been supported by the Academy of Finland grant 323960.

The recent paper [3] dealt with geometric analysis on Cantor-type sets which are uniformly perfect totally disconnected metric measure spaces, including various types of Cantor sets. Cantor sets embedded in Euclidean spaces support a fractional Sobolev space theory based on Besov spaces. Indeed, suitable Besov functions on such a set are traces of the classical Sobolev functions on the ambient Euclidean spaces, see Jonsson-Wallin [20, 21]. The paper [3, 24] obtained similar trace and extension theorems for Sobolev and Besov spaces on regular trees and their Cantor-type boundaries. Indeed, for a regular K -ary tree X with $K \geq 2$ and its Cantor-type boundary ∂X , if we give the uniformizing metric (see (2.1))

$$d_X(x, y) = \int_{[x, y]} e^{-\epsilon|z|} d|z|$$

and the weighted measure (see (2.2))

$$(1.1) \quad d\mu_\lambda(x) = e^{-\beta|x|}(|x| + C)^\lambda d|x|$$

on X , then the Besov space $\mathcal{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)$ in Definition 2.4 below is exactly the trace of the Newton-Sobolev space $N^{1, p}(X, \mu_\lambda)$ defined in Section 2.3, see [24, Theorem 1.1] and [3, Theorem 6.5]. Here the smoothness exponent of the Besov space is

$$\theta = 1 - \frac{\beta/\epsilon - Q}{p}, \quad 0 < \theta < 1,$$

where $Q = \log K/\epsilon$ is the Hausdorff dimension of the Cantor-type boundary and $\beta/\epsilon - Q$ is a ‘‘codimension’’ determined by the uniformizing metric d_X and the measure μ on the tree.

In Euclidean spaces, the classical Besov norm is equivalent to a dyadic norm, and the trace spaces of the Sobolev spaces can be characterized by the Besov spaces defined via dyadic norms, see e.g. [23, Theorem 1.1]. Inspired by this, we give a dyadic decomposition of the boundary ∂X and define a Besov space $\mathcal{B}_p^\theta(\partial X)$ on the boundary ∂X by using a dyadic norm, see Section 2.4 and Definition 2.5. We show in Proposition 2.7 that the dyadic Besov spaces $\mathcal{B}_p^\theta(\partial X)$ coincide with the Besov space $B_{p, p}^\theta(\partial X)$ and the Hajlasz-Besov space $N_{p, p}^\theta(\partial X)$, see Definition 2.3 and Definition 2.6 for definitions of $B_{p, p}^\theta(\partial X)$ and $N_{p, p}^\theta(\partial X)$. We refer to [3, 13, 14, 22, 25, 26] for more information about Besov spaces $B_{p, p}^\theta(\cdot)$ and Hajlasz-Besov spaces $N_{p, p}^\theta(\cdot)$ on metric measure spaces.

By relying on dyadic norms, we define the Orlicz-Besov space $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)$, $\lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ for the Young function $\Phi(t) = t^p \log^{\lambda_1}(e+t)$ with $p > 1, \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ or $p = 1, \lambda_1 \geq 0$, see Definition 2.8. Our first result shows that the Orlicz-Besov space $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)$ is the trace space of the Orlicz-Sobolev space $N^{1, \Phi}(X, \mu_{\lambda_2})$ defined in Section 2.3.

Theorem 1.1. *Let X be a K -ary tree with $K \geq 2$ and let $\Phi(t) = t^p \log^{\lambda_1}(e+t)$ with $p > 1, \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ or $p = 1, \lambda_1 \geq 0$. Fix $\lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and let μ_{λ_2} be the weighted measure given by (1.1). Assume that $p > (\beta - \log K)/\epsilon > 0$. Then the trace space of $N^{1, \Phi}(X, \mu_{\lambda_2})$ is the space $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)$ where $\theta = 1 - (\beta - \log K)/\epsilon p$.*

Here and throughout this paper, for given Banach spaces $\mathbb{X}(\partial X)$ and $\mathbb{Y}(X)$, we say that the space $\mathbb{X}(\partial X)$ is a trace space of $\mathbb{Y}(X)$ if and only if there is a bounded linear

operator $T : \mathbb{Y}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{X}(\partial X)$ and there exists a bounded linear extension operator $E : \mathbb{X}(\partial X) \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}(X)$ that acts as a right inverse of T , i.e., $T \circ E = \text{Id}$ on the space $\mathbb{X}(\partial X)$.

Our next result identifies the Orlicz-Besov space $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)$ as the Besov space $\mathcal{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)$.

Proposition 1.2. *Let $\lambda, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\Phi(t) = t^p \log^{\lambda_1}(e + t)$ with $p > 1, \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ or $p = 1, \lambda_1 \geq 0$. Assume that $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = \lambda$. Then the Banach spaces $\mathcal{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)$ and $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)$ coincide, i.e., $\mathcal{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X) = \mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)$.*

By combining Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 1.2, we obtain the following result.

Corollary 1.3. *Let X be a K -ary tree with $K \geq 2$. Let $\lambda, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume that $p > (\beta - \log K)/\epsilon > 0$ and let $\theta = 1 - (\beta - \log K)/\epsilon p$. Let $\Phi(t) = t^p \log^{\lambda_1}(e + t)$ with $p > 1, \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ or $p = 1, \lambda_1 \geq 0$. Then the Besov-type space $\mathcal{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)$ is the trace space of $N^{1, \Phi}(X, \mu_{\lambda_2})$ whenever $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = \lambda$.*

When $\lambda_1 = 0$ and $\lambda_2 = \lambda$, the above result coincides with [24, Theorem 1.1], which states that the Besov-type space $\mathcal{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)$ is the trace space of $N^{1, p}(X, \mu_\lambda)$ for a suitable θ . The above result shows that the Besov-type space $\mathcal{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)$ is not only the trace space of $N^{1, p}(X, \mu_\lambda)$ but actually the trace spaces of all these Orlicz-Sobolev spaces $N^{1, \Phi}(X, \mu_{\lambda_2})$ (including $N^{1, p}(X, \mu_\lambda)$) for suitable θ, λ_2 and Φ . It maybe worth to point out here that these Orlicz-Sobolev spaces $N^{1, \Phi}(X, \mu_{\lambda_2})$ are different from each other.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give all the necessary preliminaries. More precisely, we introduce regular trees in Section 2.1 and we consider a doubling property of the measure μ on a regular tree X and the Ahlfors regularity of its boundary ∂X . The definition of Young functions is given in Section 2.2. We introduce the Newtonian and Orlicz-Sobolev spaces on X and the Besov-type spaces on ∂X in Section 2.3 and Section 2.4, respectively. In Section 3, we give the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 1.2.

In what follows, the letter C denotes a constant that may change at different occurrences. The notation $A \approx B$ means that there is a constant C such that $1/C \cdot A \leq B \leq C \cdot A$. The notation $A \lesssim B$ ($A \gtrsim B$) means that there is a constant C such that $A \leq C \cdot B$ ($A \geq C \cdot B$).

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Regular trees and their boundaries

A graph G is a pair (V, E) , where V is a set of vertices and E is a set of edges. We call a pair of vertices $x, y \in V$ neighbors if x is connected to y by an edge. The degree of a vertex is the number of its neighbors. The graph structure gives rise to a natural connectivity structure. A tree G is a connected graph without cycles.

We call a tree G a *rooted tree* if it has a distinguished vertex called the *root*, which we will denote by 0. The neighbors of a vertex $x \in V$ are of two types: the neighbors that are closer to the root are called *parents* of x and all other neighbors are called *children* of x . Each vertex has a unique parent, except for the root itself that has none.

A K -ary tree G is a rooted tree such that each vertex has exactly K children. Then all vertices except the root of G have degree $K + 1$, and the root has degree K . We say that a tree G is K -regular if it is a K -ary tree for some $K \geq 1$.

Let G be a K -regular tree with a set of vertices V and a set of edges E for some $K \geq 1$. For simplicity of notation, we let $X = V \cup E$ and call it a K -regular tree. A K -regular tree X is made into a metric graph by considering each edge as a geodesic of length one. For $x \in X$, let $|x|$ be the distance from the root 0 to x , that is, the length of the geodesic from 0 to x , where the length of every edge is 1 and we consider each edge to be an isometric copy of the unit interval. The geodesic connecting $x, y \in V$ is denoted by $[x, y]$, and its length is denoted $|x - y|$. If $|x| < |y|$ and x lies on the geodesic connecting 0 to y , we write $x < y$ and call the vertex y a descendant of the vertex x . More generally, we write $x \leq y$ if the geodesic from 0 to y passes through x , and in this case $|x - y| = |y| - |x|$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be fixed. We introduce a *uniformizing metric* (in the sense of Bonk-Heinonen-Koskela [5], see also [3]) on X by setting

$$(2.1) \quad d_X(x, y) = \int_{[x, y]} e^{-\epsilon|z|} d|z|.$$

Here $d|z|$ is the measure which gives each edge Lebesgue measure 1, as we consider each edge to be an isometric copy of the unit interval and the vertices are the end points of this interval. In this metric, $\text{diam}X = 2/\epsilon$ if X is a K -ary tree with $K \geq 2$.

Next we construct the boundary of the regular K -ary tree by following the arguments in [3, Section 5]. We define the boundary of a tree X , denoted ∂X , by completing X with respect to the metric d_X . An equivalent construction of ∂X is as follows. An element ξ in ∂X is identified with an infinite geodesic in X starting at the root 0 . Then we may denote $\xi = 0x_1x_2 \cdots$, where x_i is a vertex in X with $|x_i| = i$, and x_{i+1} is a child of x_i . Given two points $\xi, \zeta \in \partial X$, there is an infinite geodesic $[\xi, \zeta]$ connecting ξ and ζ . Then the distance of ξ and ζ is the length (with respect to the metric d_X) of the infinite geodesic $[\xi, \zeta]$. More precisely, if $\xi = 0x_1x_2 \cdots$ and $\zeta = 0y_1y_2 \cdots$, let k be an integer with $x_k = y_k$ and $x_{k+1} \neq y_{k+1}$. Then by (2.1)

$$d_X(\xi, \zeta) = 2 \int_k^{+\infty} e^{-\epsilon t} dt = \frac{2}{\epsilon} e^{-\epsilon k}.$$

The restriction of d_X to ∂X is called the *visual metric* on ∂X in Bridson-Haefliger [7].

The metric d_X is thus defined on \bar{X} . To avoid confusion, points in X are denoted by Latin letters such as x, y and z , while for points in ∂X we use Greek letters such as ξ, ζ and ω . Moreover, balls in X will be denoted $B(x, r)$, while $B(\xi, r)$ stands for a ball in ∂X .

On the regular K -ary tree X , we use the weighted measure μ_λ introduced in [24, Section 2.2], defined by

$$(2.2) \quad d\mu_\lambda(x) = e^{-\beta|x|} (|x| + C)^\lambda d|x|,$$

where $\beta > \log K$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $C \geq \max\{2|\lambda|/(\beta - \log K), 2(\log 4)/\epsilon\}$. If $\lambda = 0$, then

$$d\mu_0(x) = e^{-\beta|x|} d|x| = d\mu(x),$$

which coincides with the measure used in [3].

The following proposition gives the doubling property of the measure μ_λ , see [24, Corollary 2.9].

Proposition 2.1. *For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, the measure μ_λ is doubling, i.e., $\mu_\lambda(B(x, 2r)) \lesssim \mu_\lambda(B(x, r))$.*

The result in [3, Lemma 5.2] shows that the boundary ∂X of the regular K -ary tree X is Ahlfors regular with the regularity exponent depending only on K and on the metric density exponent ϵ of the tree.

Proposition 2.2. *The boundary ∂X is an Ahlfors Q -regular space with Hausdorff dimension*

$$Q = \frac{\log K}{\epsilon}.$$

Hence we have an Ahlfors Q -regular measure ν on ∂X :

$$\nu(B(\xi, r)) \approx r^Q = r^{\log K/\epsilon},$$

for any $\xi \in \partial X$ and $0 < r \leq \text{diam} \partial X$.

Throughout the paper we assume that $1 \leq p < +\infty$ and that X is a K -ary tree with $K \geq 2$.

2.2 Young functions and Orlicz spaces

In the standard definition of an Orlicz space, the function t^p of an L^p -space is replaced with a more general convex function, a Young function. We recall the definition of a Young function. We refer to [46, section 2.2] and [39] for more details about Young functions and we also warn the reader of slight differences between the definitions in various references.

A function $\Phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a *Young function* if it is a continuous, increasing and convex function satisfying $\Phi(0) = 0$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\Phi(t)}{t} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\Phi(t)}{t} = +\infty.$$

A Young function Φ can be expressed as

$$\Phi(t) = \int_0^t \phi(s) ds,$$

where $\phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is an increasing, right-continuous function with $\phi(0) = 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \phi(t) = +\infty$.

A Young function Φ is said to satisfy the Δ_2 -condition if there is a constant $C_\Phi > 0$, called a *doubling constant* of Φ , such that

$$\Phi(2t) \leq C_\Phi \Phi(t), \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

If Young function Φ satisfies the Δ_2 -condition, then for any constant $c > 0$, there exist $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that

$$c_1\Phi(t) \leq \Phi(ct) \leq c_2\Phi(t) \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0,$$

where c_1 and c_2 depend only on c and the doubling constant C_Φ . Therefore, we obtain that if $A \approx B$, then $\Phi(A) \approx \Phi(B)$. This property will be used frequently in the rest of this paper.

Let Φ_1, Φ_2 be two Young functions. If there exist two constants $k > 0$ and $C \geq 0$ such that

$$\Phi_1(t) \leq \Phi_2(kt) \quad \text{for } t \geq C,$$

we write

$$\Phi_1 \prec \Phi_2.$$

The function $\Phi(t) = t^p \log^\lambda(e+t)$ with $p > 1, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ or $p = 1, \lambda \geq 0$ is a Young function and it satisfies the Δ_2 -condition. Moreover, it also satisfies that

$$(2.3) \quad t^{\max\{p-\delta, 1\}} \prec \Phi(t) \prec t^{p+\delta}$$

for any $\delta > 0$.

Let Φ be a Young function. Then the *Orlicz space* $L^\Phi(X)$ is defined by setting

$$L^\Phi(X, \mu_\lambda) = \left\{ u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : u \text{ measurable, } \int_X \Phi(\alpha|u|) d\mu_\lambda < +\infty \text{ for some } \alpha > 0 \right\}.$$

As in the theory of L^p -spaces, the elements in $L^\Phi(X, \mu_\lambda)$ are actually equivalence classes consisting of functions that differ only on a set of measure zero. The Orlicz space $L^\Phi(X, \mu_\lambda)$ is a vector space and, equipped with the *Luxemburg norm*

$$\|u\|_{L^\Phi(X, \mu_\lambda)} = \inf \left\{ k > 0 : \int_X \Phi(|u|/k) d\mu_\lambda \leq 1 \right\},$$

a Banach space, see [39, Theorem 3.3.10]. If $\Phi(t) = t^p$ with $p \geq 1$, then $L^\Phi(X, \mu_\lambda) = L^p(X, \mu_\lambda)$. We refer to [34, 39, 46] for more detailed discussions and properties of Orlicz spaces.

2.3 Newtonian spaces and Orlicz-Sobolev spaces on X

Let $u \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(X, \mu_\lambda)$. We say that a Borel function $g : X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is an *upper gradient* of u if

$$(2.4) \quad |u(z) - u(y)| \leq \int_\gamma g ds_X$$

whenever $z, y \in X$ and γ is the geodesic from z to y , where ds_X denotes the arc length measure with respect to the metric d_X . In the setting of a tree any rectifiable curve with end points z and y contains the geodesic connecting z and y , therefore the upper gradient

defined above is equivalent to the definition which requires that inequality (2.4) holds for all rectifiable curves with end points z and y .

The notion of upper gradients is due to Heinonen and Koskela [18]; we refer interested readers to [2, 15, 19, 41] for a more detailed discussion on upper gradients.

The *Newtonian space* $N^{1,p}(X, \mu_\lambda)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, is defined as the collection of all functions u for which the norm of u defined as

$$\|u\|_{N^{1,p}(X, \mu_\lambda)} := \left(\int_X |u|^p d\mu_\lambda + \inf_g \int_X g^p d\mu_\lambda \right)^{1/p}$$

is finite, where the infimum is taken over all upper gradients of u .

For any Young function Φ , the *Orlicz-Sobolev space* $N^{1,\Phi}(X, \mu_\lambda)$ is defined as the collection of all functions u for which the norm of u defined as

$$\|u\|_{N^{1,\Phi}(X, \mu_\lambda)} = \|u\|_{L^\Phi(X, \mu_\lambda)} + \inf_g \|g\|_{L^\Phi(X, \mu_\lambda)}$$

is finite, where the infimum is taken over all upper gradients of u .

For the Young function $\Phi(t) = t^p$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, the Orlicz-Sobolev space $N^{1,\Phi}(X, \mu_\lambda)$ is exactly the Newtonian space $N^{1,p}(X, \mu_\lambda)$. We refer to [46] for further results on Orlicz-Sobolev spaces on metric measure spaces. If $u \in N^{1,p}(X, \mu_\lambda)$ ($u \in N^{1,\Phi}(X, \mu_\lambda)$ with Φ doubling), then it has a minimal p -weak upper gradient (Φ -weak upper gradient) g_u , which in our case is an upper gradient. The minimal upper gradient is minimal in the sense that if $g \in L^p(X, \mu_\lambda)$ ($g \in L^\Phi(X, \mu_\lambda)$) is any upper gradient of u , then $g_u \leq g$ a.e. We refer the interested reader to [15, Theorem 7.16] ($p \geq 1$) and [46, Corollary 6.9] (Φ doubling) for proofs of the existence of such a minimal upper gradient.

2.4 Besov-type spaces on ∂X

We first recall the Besov space $B_{p,p}^\theta(\partial X)$ defined in [3].

Definition 2.3. For $0 < \theta < 1$ and $p \geq 1$, The Besov space $B_{p,p}^\theta(\partial X)$ consists of all functions $f \in L^p(\partial X)$ for which the seminorm $\|f\|_{\dot{B}_p^\theta(\partial X)}$ defined as

$$\|f\|_{\dot{B}_p^\theta(\partial X)}^p := \int_{\partial X} \int_{\partial X} \frac{|f(\zeta)| - |f(\xi)|^p}{d_X(\zeta, \xi)^{\theta p} \nu(B(\zeta, d_X(\zeta, \xi)))} d\nu(\xi) d\nu(\zeta)$$

is finite. The corresponding norm for $B_{p,p}^\theta(\partial X)$ is

$$\|f\|_{B_{p,p}^\theta(\partial X)} := \|f\|_{L^p(\partial X)} + \|f\|_{\dot{B}_p^\theta(\partial X)}.$$

Next, we give a dyadic decomposition on the boundary ∂X of the K -ary tree X , see also [24, Section 2.4]. Let $V_n = \{x_j^n : j = 1, 2, \dots, K^n\}$ be the set of all n -level vertices of the tree X for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where a vertex x is of n -level if $|x| = n$. Then we have that

$$V = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} V_n$$

is the set containing all the vertices of the tree X . For any vertex $x \in V$, denote by I_x the set

$$\{\xi \in \partial X : \text{the geodesic } [0, \xi] \text{ passes through } x\}.$$

We denote by \mathcal{Q} the set $\{I_x : x \in V\}$ and \mathcal{Q}_n the set $\{I_x : x \in V_n\}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\mathcal{Q}_0 = \{\partial X\}$ and we have

$$\mathcal{Q} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{Q}_n.$$

Then the set \mathcal{Q} is called a dyadic decomposition of ∂X . Moreover, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $I \in \mathcal{Q}_n$, there is a unique element \widehat{I} in \mathcal{Q}_{n-1} such that I is a subset of \widehat{I} . It is easy to see that if $I = I_x$ for some $x \in V_n$, then $\widehat{I} = I_y$ with y the unique parent of x in the tree X . Hence the structure of the dyadic decomposition of ∂X is uniquely determined by the structure of the K -ary tree X .

Definition 2.4. For $0 \leq \theta < 1$ and $p \geq 1$, the Besov-type space $\mathcal{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)$ consists of all functions $f \in L^p(\partial X)$ for which the $\dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta, \lambda}$ -dyadic energy of f defined as

$$\|f\|_{\dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)}^p := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n \theta p} n^\lambda \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) |f_I - f_{\widehat{I}}|^p$$

is finite. The norm on $\mathcal{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)$ is

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)} := \|f\|_{L^p(\partial X)} + \|f\|_{\dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)}.$$

Here and throughout this paper, the measure ν on the boundary ∂X is the Ahlfors regular measure in Proposition 2.2 and $f_I := \int_I f d\nu = \frac{1}{\nu(I)} \int_I f d\nu$ is the usual mean value.

Definition 2.5. For $0 < \theta < 1$ and $p \geq 1$, The Besov space $\mathcal{B}_p^\theta(\partial X)$ consists of all the functions $f \in L^p(\partial X)$ for which the $\dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^\theta$ -dyadic energy of f defined as

$$\|f\|_{\dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^\theta(\partial X)}^p := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n \theta p} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) |f_I - f_{\widehat{I}}|^p$$

is finite. The norm of $\mathcal{B}_p^\theta(\partial X)$ is

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{B}_p^\theta(\partial X)} := \|f\|_{L^p(\partial X)} + \|f\|_{\dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^\theta(\partial X)}.$$

Notice that $\mathcal{B}_p^\theta(\partial X)$ coincides with $\mathcal{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)$ when $\lambda = 0$. Next we introduce the *Hajlasz-Besov spaces* $N_{p,p}^s(\partial X)$ on the boundary ∂X .

Definition 2.6. (i) Let $0 < \theta < \infty$ and let u be a measurable function on ∂X . A sequence of nonnegative measurable functions, $\vec{g} = \{g_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$, is called a *fractional θ -Hajlasz gradient* of u if there exists $Z \subset \partial X$ with $\nu(Z) = 0$ such that for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\zeta, \xi \in \partial X \setminus Z$ satisfying $2^{-k-1} \leq d_X(\zeta, \xi) < 2^{-k}$,

$$|u(\zeta) - u(\xi)| \leq [d_X(\zeta, \xi)]^\theta [g_k(\zeta) + g_k(\xi)].$$

Denote by $\mathbb{D}^\theta(u)$ the collection of all fractional θ -Hajlasz gradients of u .

(ii) Let $0 < \theta < \infty$ and $0 < p < \infty$. The Hajlasz-Besov space $N_{p,p}^\theta(\partial X)$ consists of all functions $u \in L^p(\partial X)$ for which the seminorm $\|u\|_{\dot{N}_{p,p}^\theta(\partial X)}$ defined as

$$\|u\|_{\dot{N}_{p,p}^\theta(\partial X)} := \inf_{\vec{g} \in \mathbb{D}^\theta(u)} \|(\|g_k\|_{L^p(\partial X)})_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}\|_{l^p} = \inf_{\vec{g} \in \mathbb{D}^\theta(u)} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{\partial X} [g_k(\xi)]^p d\nu(\xi) \right)^{1/p}$$

is finite. The norm of $N_{p,p}^\theta(\partial X)$ is

$$\|u\|_{N_{p,p}^\theta(\partial X)} := \|u\|_{L^p(\partial X)} + \|u\|_{\dot{N}_{p,p}^\theta(\partial X)}.$$

The following proposition states that these three Besov-type spaces $\mathcal{B}_p^\theta(\partial X)$, $B_{p,p}^\theta(\partial X)$ and $N_{p,p}^\theta(\partial X)$ coincide with each other.

Proposition 2.7. *Let $0 < \theta < 1$ and $p \geq 1$. For any $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\partial X)$, we have*

$$\|f\|_{\dot{B}_p^\theta(\partial X)} \approx \|f\|_{\dot{B}_p^\theta(\partial X)} \approx \|f\|_{\dot{N}_{p,p}^\theta(\partial X)}.$$

Proof. Notice that $\text{diam}(\partial X) \approx 1$. The first part $\|f\|_{\dot{B}_p^\theta(\partial X)} \approx \|f\|_{\dot{B}_p^\theta(\partial X)}$ follows by using [3, Lemma 5.4] and a modification of the proof of [23, Proposition A.1]. We omit the details.

The second part $\|f\|_{\dot{B}_p^\theta(\partial X)} \approx \|f\|_{\dot{N}_{p,p}^\theta(\partial X)}$ is given by [3, Lemma 5.4] and [14, Theorem 1.2]. \square

The dyadic norms give an easy way to introduce Orlicz-Besov spaces by replacing t^p with some Orlicz function $\Phi(t)$.

Definition 2.8. Let Φ be the Young function $\Phi(t) = t^p \log^{\lambda_1}(e+t)$ with $p > 1, \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ or $p = 1, \lambda_1 \geq 0$. Then the Orlicz-Besov space $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)$ consists of all $f \in L^\Phi(\partial X)$ whose norm generally defined as

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)} := \|f\|_{L^\Phi(\partial X)} + \inf \left\{ k > 0 : |f/k|_{\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)} \leq 1 \right\}$$

is finite, where for any $g \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\partial X)$, the $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}$ -dyadic energy is defined as

$$|g|_{\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)} := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{cn(\theta-1)p} n^{\lambda_2} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) \Phi \left(\frac{|g_I - g_{\hat{I}}|}{e^{-cn}} \right).$$

In this paper, we are only interested in the Young functions in the above definition. Hence in the rest of this paper, we always assume that the Young function is $\Phi(t) = t^p \log^{\lambda_1}(e+t)$ with $p > 1, \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ or $p = 1, \lambda_1 \geq 0$.

3 Proofs

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Proof. Trace Part: Let $f \in N^{1,\Phi}(X)$. We first define the trace operator as

$$(3.1) \quad \text{Tr } f(\xi) := \tilde{f}(\xi) = \lim_{[0,\xi) \ni x \rightarrow \xi} f(x), \quad \xi \in \partial X,$$

where the limit is taken along the geodesic ray $[0, \xi)$. Then our task is to show that the above limit exists for ν -a.e. $\xi \in \partial X$ and that the trace $\text{Tr } f$ satisfies the norm estimates.

Let $\xi \in \partial X$ be arbitrary and let $x_j = x_j(\xi)$ be the ancestor of ξ with $|x_j| = j$. To show that the limit in (3.1) exists for ν -a.e. $\xi \in \partial X$, it suffices to show that the function

$$(3.2) \quad \tilde{f}^*(\xi) = |f(0)| + \int_{[0,\xi)} g_f ds$$

is in $L^p(\partial X)$, where $[0, \xi)$ is the geodesic ray from 0 to ξ and g_f is an upper gradient of f . To be more precise, if $\tilde{f}^* \in L^p(\partial X)$, we have $|\tilde{f}^*| < \infty$ for ν -a.e. $\xi \in \partial X$, and hence the limit in (3.1) exists for ν -a.e. $\xi \in \partial X$.

Set $r_j = 2e^{-j\epsilon}/\epsilon$. Recall that on the edge $[x_j, x_{j+1}]$ we have

$$(3.3) \quad ds \approx e^{(\beta-\epsilon)j} j^{-\lambda_2} d\mu_{\lambda_2} \approx r_j^{1-\beta/\epsilon} j^{-\lambda_2} d\mu \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{\lambda_2}([x_j, x_{j+1}]) \approx r_j^{\beta/\epsilon} j^{\lambda_2}.$$

Then we obtain that

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{f}^*(\xi) &= |f(0)| + \int_{[0,\xi)} g_f ds \leq |f(0)| + \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \int_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]} g_f ds \\ &\approx |f(0)| + \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} r_j^{1-\beta/\epsilon} j^{-\lambda_2} \int_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]} g_f d\mu_{\lambda_2} \approx |f(0)| + \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} r_j \int_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]} g_f d\mu_{\lambda_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\theta = 1 - (\beta - \log K)/(p\epsilon) > 0$, we may choose $1 \leq q < \infty$ such that $\max\{(\beta - \log K)/\epsilon, 1\} < q < p$ if $p > 1$ or $q = 1 = p$. Let $\Psi(t) = t^{p/q} \log^{\lambda/q}(e+t)$. Then $\Psi^q = \Phi$ and Ψ is a doubling Young function. By the Jensen inequality and the doubling property of Ψ , since $\sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} r_j \approx 1$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(\tilde{f}^*(\xi)) &\lesssim \Psi(|f(0)|) + \Psi \left(\sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} r_j \int_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]} g_f d\mu_{\lambda_2} \right) \\ &\lesssim \Psi(|f(0)|) + \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} r_j \int_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]} \Psi(g_f) d\mu_{\lambda_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Choose $0 < \kappa < 1 - (\beta - \log K)/(q\epsilon)$. If $q > 1$, by the Hölder inequality, we obtain the estimate

$$\Phi(\tilde{f}^*(\xi)) = \Psi(\tilde{f}^*(\xi))^q \lesssim \Phi(|f(0)|) + \left(\sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} r_j^\kappa r_j^{(1-\kappa)} \int_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]} \Psi(g_f) d\mu_{\lambda_2} \right)^q$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \Phi(|f(0)|) + \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} r_j^{(1-\kappa)q} \left(\int_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]} \Psi(g_f) d\mu_{\lambda_2} \right)^q \\ &\lesssim \Phi(|f(0)|) + \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} r_j^{q-\kappa q-\beta/\epsilon} j^{-\lambda_2} \int_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]} \Phi(g_f) d\mu_{\lambda_2}, \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} r_j^{kq/(q-1)} \approx 1.$$

If $q = 1$, then $\Psi = \Phi$, and hence the Hölder inequality is not needed in the estimate. It follows that

$$\Phi(\tilde{f}^*(\xi)) \lesssim \Phi(|f(0)|) + \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} r_j^{q-\kappa q-\beta/\epsilon} j^{-\lambda_2} \int_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]} \Phi(g_f) d\mu.$$

Integrating over all $\xi \in \partial X$, since $\nu(\partial X) \approx 1$, we obtain by means of Fubini's theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial X} \Phi(\tilde{f}^*(\xi)) d\nu &\lesssim \Phi(|f(0)|) + \int_{\partial X} \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} r_j^{q-\kappa q-\beta/\epsilon} j^{-\lambda_2} \int_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]} \Phi(g_f) d\mu_{\lambda_2} d\nu(\xi) \\ &= \Phi(|f(0)|) + \int_X \Phi(g_f(x)) \int_{\partial X} \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} r_j^{q-\kappa q-\beta/\epsilon} j^{-\lambda_2} \chi_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]}(x) d\nu(\xi) d\mu_{\lambda_2}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\chi_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]}(x)$ is nonzero only if $j \leq |x| \leq j+1$ and $x < \xi$. Thus the last estimate can be rewritten as

$$\int_{\partial X} \Phi(\tilde{f}^*(\xi)) d\nu \lesssim \Phi(|f(0)|) + \int_X \Phi(g_f(x)) r_{j(x)}^{q-\kappa q-\beta/\epsilon} j(x)^{-\lambda_2} \nu(E(x)) d\mu(x),$$

where $E(x) = \{\xi \in \partial X : x < \xi\}$ and $j(x)$ is the largest integer such that $j(x) \leq |x|$. Since $\nu(E(x)) \lesssim r_{j(x)}^Q$ and $q - \kappa q - \beta/\epsilon + Q > 0$, then for any $j(x) \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that

$$r_{j(x)}^{p(1-\kappa)-\beta/\epsilon+Q} j(x)^{-\lambda_2} \lesssim 1,$$

which induces the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial X} \Phi(\tilde{f}^*(\xi)) d\nu &\lesssim \Phi(|f(0)|) + \int_X \Phi(g_f(x)) r_{j(x)}^{q-\kappa q-\beta/\epsilon+Q} j(x)^{-\lambda_2} d\mu_{\lambda_2}(x) \\ &\lesssim \Phi(|f(0)|) + \int_X \Phi(g_f(x)) d\mu_{\lambda_2}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Actually, the value $|f(0)|$ is not essential. For any $y \in \{x \in X : |x| < 1\}$, a neighborhood of 0, we could modify the definition of $\tilde{f}^*(\xi)$ as

$$\tilde{f}^*(\xi) = |f(y)| + |f(y) - f(0)| + \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} |f(x_{j+1}) - f(x_j)|.$$

Since $\mu_{\lambda_2}(X) \approx 1$, we have that

$$\Phi(|f(y) - f(0)|) \leq \Phi\left(\int_{[0,y]} g_f ds\right) \leq \Phi\left(\int_X g_f ds\right) \lesssim \int_X \Phi(g_f) d\mu_{\lambda_2}.$$

By the same argument as above, we obtain the estimate

$$\int_{\partial X} \Phi(\tilde{f}^*(\xi)) d\nu(\xi) \lesssim \Phi(|f(y)|) + \int_X \Phi(g_f) d\mu_{\lambda_2},$$

for any $y \in \{x \in X : |x| < 1\}$. The fact that $f \in L^\Phi(X, \mu_{\lambda_2})$ gives us that $\Phi(|f(y)|) < \infty$ for μ_{λ_2} -a.e. $y \in X$. This shows that $\tilde{f}^*(\xi)$ is Φ -integrable on ∂X , which finishes the proof of the existence of the limit in (3.1). Moreover, since $|\tilde{f}| \leq \tilde{f}^*$ for any modified \tilde{f}^* , the above arguments also show that for any $y \in \{x \in X : |x| < 1\}$, we have that

$$\int_{\partial X} \Phi(\tilde{f}(\xi)) d\nu(\xi) \lesssim \Phi(|f(y)|) + \int_X \Phi(g_f) d\mu_{\lambda_2}.$$

Integrating over all $y \in \{x \in X : |x| < 1\}$, since $\mu_{\lambda_2}(\{x \in X : |x| < 1\}) \approx 1$, we finally arrive at the estimate

$$(3.5) \quad \int_{\partial X} \Phi(\tilde{f}(\xi)) d\nu(\xi) \lesssim \int_X \Phi(|f|) d\mu_{\lambda_2} + \int_X \Phi(g_f) d\mu_{\lambda_2}.$$

Assume that $\|f\|_{L^\Phi(X, \mu_{\lambda_2})} = t_1$ and $\|g_f\|_{L^\Phi(X, \mu_{\lambda_2})} = t_2$. By the definition of Luxemburg norms, we know that

$$\int_X \Phi(f/t_1) d\mu_{\lambda_2} \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_X \Phi(g_f/t_2) d\mu_{\lambda_2} \leq 1.$$

By estimate (3.5), there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\partial X} \Phi(\tilde{f}(\xi)) d\nu(\xi) \lesssim C \left(\int_X \Phi(|f|) d\mu_{\lambda_2} + \int_X \Phi(g_f) d\mu_{\lambda_2} \right).$$

We may assume $C \geq 1$, since if $C < 1$, we choose $C = 1$. Then we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial X} \Phi\left(\frac{\tilde{f}(\xi)}{2C(t_1 + t_2)}\right) d\nu &\leq C \left(\int_X \Phi\left(\frac{f}{2Ct_1}\right) d\mu_{\lambda_2} + \int_X \Phi\left(\frac{g_f}{2Ct_2}\right) d\mu_{\lambda_2} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_X \Phi(f/t_1) d\mu_{\lambda_2} + \int_X \Phi(g_f/t_2) d\mu_{\lambda_2} \right) \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$(3.6) \quad \|\tilde{f}(\xi)\|_{L^\Phi(\partial X)} \leq 2C(t_1 + t_2) \approx \|f\|_{L^\Phi(X, \mu_{\lambda_2})} + \|g_f\|_{L^\Phi(X, \mu_{\lambda_2})} = \|f\|_{N^{1,\Phi}(X, \mu_{\lambda_2})}.$$

To estimate the dyadic energy $|\tilde{f}|_{B_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)}$, for any $I \in \mathcal{Q}_n$, $\xi \in I$ and $\zeta \in \hat{I}$, we have that

$$|\tilde{f}(\xi) - \tilde{f}(\zeta)| \leq \sum_{j=n-1}^{+\infty} |f(x_j) - f(x_{j+1})| + \sum_{j=n-1}^{+\infty} |f(y_j) - f(y_{j+1})|,$$

where $x_j = x_j(\xi)$ and $y_j = y_j(\zeta)$ are the ancestors of ξ and ζ with $|x_j| = |y_j| = j$, respectively. In the above inequality, we used the fact that $x_{n-1} = y_{n-1}$. By using (3.3) and an argument similar to (3.4), we obtain that

$$|\tilde{f}(\xi) - \tilde{f}(\zeta)| \lesssim \sum_{j=n-1}^{+\infty} r_j \int_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]} g_f d\mu_{\lambda_2} + \sum_{j=n-1}^{+\infty} r_j \int_{[y_j, y_{j+1}]} g_f d\mu_{\lambda_2}.$$

It follows from the Jensen inequality that

$$\Psi \left(\frac{|\tilde{f}(\xi) - \tilde{f}(\zeta)|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right) \lesssim \sum_{j=n-1}^{+\infty} r_{n-1}^{-1} r_j \int_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]} \Psi(g_f) d\mu_{\lambda_2} + \sum_{j=n-1}^{+\infty} r_{n-1}^{-1} r_j \int_{[y_j, y_{j+1}]} \Psi(g_f) d\mu_{\lambda_2},$$

since we have the estimate

$$r_{n-1} \approx e^{-\epsilon n} \approx \sum_{j=n-1}^{+\infty} r_j.$$

By using the fact $\Phi = \Psi^q$ and the Hölder inequality if $q > 1$ (if $q = 1$, the Hölder inequality is not needed), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi \left(\frac{|\tilde{f}(\xi) - \tilde{f}(\zeta)|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right) &= \Psi \left(\frac{|\tilde{f}(\xi) - \tilde{f}(\zeta)|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right)^q \\ &\lesssim r_{n-1}^{-q+\kappa q} \sum_{j=n-1}^{+\infty} r_j^{q-\beta/\epsilon-\kappa q} j^{-\lambda_2} \left(\int_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]} \Phi(g_f) d\mu_{\lambda_2} + \int_{[y_j, y_{j+1}]} \Phi(g_f) d\mu_{\lambda_2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\nu(I) \approx \nu(\hat{I})$ and every \hat{I} is the parent of I , it follows from Fubini's theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) \Phi \left(\frac{|\tilde{f}_I - \tilde{f}_{\hat{I}}|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right) &\leq \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) \int_I \int_{\hat{I}} \Phi \left(\frac{|\tilde{f}(\xi) - \tilde{f}(\zeta)|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right) d\nu(\zeta) d\nu(\xi) \\ &\lesssim \int_{\partial X} r_{n-1}^{-q+\kappa q} \sum_{j=n-1}^{+\infty} r_j^{q-\beta/\epsilon-\kappa q} j^{-\lambda_2} \int_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]} \Phi(g_f) d\mu_{\lambda_2} d\nu(\xi) \\ &= \int_{X \cap \{|x| \geq n-1\}} \Phi(g_f) r_{n-1}^{-q+\kappa q} \int_{\partial X} \sum_{j=n-1}^{+\infty} r_j^{q-\beta/\epsilon-\kappa q} j^{-\lambda_2} \chi_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]}(x) d\nu(\xi) d\mu_{\lambda_2}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\chi_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]}(x)$ is nonzero only if $j \leq |x| \leq j+1$ and $x < \xi$. Thus the last estimate can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) \Phi \left(\frac{|\tilde{f}_I - \tilde{f}_{\hat{I}}|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right) &\lesssim \int_{X \cap \{|x| \geq n-1\}} \Phi(g_f) r_{n-1}^{-q+\kappa q} r_{j(x)}^{q-\beta/\epsilon-\kappa q} j(x)^{-\lambda_2} \nu(E(x)) d\mu_{\lambda_2}(x) \\ &\lesssim \int_{X \cap \{|x| \geq n-1\}} \Phi(g_f) r_{n-1}^{-q+\kappa q} r_{j(x)}^{q-\beta/\epsilon-\kappa q+Q} j(x)^{-\lambda_2} d\mu_{\lambda_2}(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $E(x) = \{\xi \in \partial X : x < \xi\}$ and $j(x)$ is the largest integer such that $j(x) \leq |x|$. Here in the last inequality, we used the fact that $\nu(E(x)) \lesssim r_{j(x)}^Q$. Since $e^{-\epsilon n} \approx r_{n-1}$, we obtain the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{f}|_{\dot{\mathcal{B}}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)} &\lesssim \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} r_{n-1}^{(1-\theta)p-q+\kappa q} n^{\lambda_2} \int_{X \cap \{|x| \geq n-1\}} \Phi(g_f) r_{j(x)}^{q-\beta/\epsilon-\kappa q+Q} j(x)^{-\lambda_2} d\mu_{\lambda_2}(x) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} r_n^{(1-\theta)p-q+\kappa q} (n+1)^{\lambda_2} \sum_{j=n}^{+\infty} \int_{X \cap \{j \leq |x| < j+1\}} \Phi(g_f) r_j^{q-\beta/\epsilon-\kappa q+Q} j^{-\lambda_2} d\mu_{\lambda_2}(x) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \int_{X \cap \{j \leq |x| < j+1\}} \Phi(g_f) r_j^{q-\beta/\epsilon-\kappa q+Q} j^{-\lambda_2} d\mu_{\lambda_2}(x) \left(\sum_{n=0}^j r_n^{(1-\theta)p-q+\kappa q} (n+1)^{\lambda_2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $r_n = 2e^{-n\epsilon}/\epsilon$ and

$$(1-\theta)p-q+\kappa q = \kappa q - (q - (\beta - \log K)/\epsilon) = \kappa q + \beta/\epsilon - q - \log K/\epsilon < 0.$$

Hence we obtain that

$$\sum_{n=0}^j r_n^{(1-\theta)p-q+\kappa q} (n+1)^{\lambda_2} \approx r_j^{\kappa q + \beta/\epsilon - q - \log K/\epsilon} (j+1)^{\lambda_2} = r_j^{\kappa q + \beta/\epsilon - q - Q} j^{\lambda_2}.$$

Therefore, our estimate above for the dyadic energy can be rewritten as

$$|\tilde{f}|_{\dot{\mathcal{B}}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)} \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \int_{X \cap \{j \leq |x| < j+1\}} \Phi(g_f) d\mu_{\lambda_2}(x) = \int_X \Phi(g_f) d\mu_{\lambda_2}(x).$$

By an argument similar to the one that we used to prove (3.6) after getting (3.5), we have that

$$\inf \left\{ k > 0 : |\tilde{f}/k|_{\dot{\mathcal{B}}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)} \leq 1 \right\} \lesssim \|g_f\|_{L^\Phi(X, \mu_{\lambda_2})},$$

which together with (3.6) gives the norm estimate

$$\|\tilde{f}\|_{\dot{\mathcal{B}}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)} \lesssim \|f\|_{N^{1, \Phi}(X, \mu_{\lambda_2})}.$$

Extension Part: Let $u \in \mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)$. For $x \in X$ with $|x| = n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$(3.7) \quad \tilde{u}(x) = \int_{I_x} u d\nu,$$

where $I_x \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ is the set of all the points $\xi \in \partial X$ such that the geodesic $[0, \xi]$ passes through x , that is, I_x consists of all the points in ∂X that have x as an ancestor. Then (3.1) and (3.7) imply that $\text{Tr } \tilde{u}(\xi) = u(\xi)$ whenever $\xi \in \partial X$ is a Lebesgue point of u .

If y is a child of x , then $|y| = n+1$ and I_x is the parent of I_y . Hence we extend \tilde{u} to the edge $[x, y]$ as follows: For each $t \in [x, y]$, set

$$(3.8) \quad g_{\tilde{u}}(t) = \frac{\tilde{u}(y) - \tilde{u}(x)}{d_X(x, y)} = \frac{\epsilon(u_{I_y} - u_{I_x})}{(1 - e^{-\epsilon})e^{-\epsilon n}} = \frac{\epsilon(u_{I_y} - u_{\widehat{I}_y})}{(1 - e^{-\epsilon})e^{-\epsilon n}}$$

and

$$(3.9) \quad \tilde{u}(t) = \tilde{u}(x) + g_{\tilde{u}}(t)d_X(x, t).$$

Then we define the extension of u to be \tilde{u} .

Since $g_{\tilde{u}}$ is a constant and \tilde{u} is linear with respect to the metric d_X on the edge $[x, y]$, it follows that $|g_{\tilde{u}}|$ is a minimal upper gradient of \tilde{u} on the edge $[x, y]$. Then we get the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[x, y]} \Phi(|g_{\tilde{u}}|) d\mu_{\lambda_2} &\approx \int_n^{n+1} \Phi\left(\frac{|u_{I_y} - u_{\hat{I}_y}|}{e^{-\epsilon(n+1)}}\right) e^{-\beta\tau}(\tau + C)^{\lambda_2} d\tau \\ &\approx e^{-\beta(n+1)}(\tau + 1)^{\lambda_2} \Phi\left(\frac{|u_{I_y} - u_{\hat{I}_y}|}{e^{-\epsilon(n+1)}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Now sum up the above integrals for all the edges of X to obtain that

$$(3.10) \quad \int_X \Phi(|g_{\tilde{u}}|) d\mu_{\lambda_2} \approx \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} e^{-\beta n} n^{\lambda_2} \Phi\left(\frac{|u_I - u_{\hat{I}}|}{e^{-\epsilon n}}\right).$$

For any $I \in \mathcal{Q}_n$, we have that

$$\nu(I) \approx e^{-\epsilon n Q},$$

which implies that

$$(3.11) \quad e^{\epsilon n(\theta-1)p} \nu(I) \approx e^{-\epsilon n((\beta - \log K)/\epsilon + Q)} \approx e^{-\beta n}.$$

The above estimates (3.10) and (3.11) give

$$(3.12) \quad \int_X \Phi(|g_{\tilde{u}}|) d\mu_{\lambda_2} \approx \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n(\theta-1)p} n^{\lambda_2} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) \Phi\left(\frac{|u_I - u_{\hat{I}}|}{e^{-\epsilon n}}\right) = |u|_{\dot{B}_{\Phi}^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)}.$$

For the L^{Φ} -estimate of \tilde{u} , we first observe that

$$(3.13) \quad |\tilde{u}(t)| \leq |\tilde{u}(x)| + |g_{\tilde{u}}|d_X(x, y) = |\tilde{u}(x)| + |\tilde{u}(y) - \tilde{u}(x)| \lesssim |u_{I_x}| + |u_{I_y}|$$

for any $t \in [x, y]$. Then we get the estimate

$$\int_{[x, y]} \Phi(|\tilde{u}(t)|) d\mu_{\lambda_2} \lesssim \mu_{\lambda_2}([x, y]) (\Phi(|u_{I_x}|) + \Phi(|u_{I_y}|)) \lesssim e^{-\beta n + \epsilon n Q} n^{\lambda_2} \int_{I_x} \Phi(|u|) d\nu.$$

Here in the last inequality, we used the facts $\mu_{\lambda_2}([x, y]) \approx e^{-\beta n} n^{\lambda_2}$ and $\nu(I_x) \approx \nu(I_y) \approx e^{-\epsilon n Q}$. Now sum up the above integrals for all the edges of X to obtain that

$$\int_X \Phi(|\tilde{u}(t)|) d\mu_{\lambda_2} \lesssim \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} e^{-\beta n + \epsilon n Q} n^{\lambda_2} \int_I \Phi(|u|) d\nu$$

$$= \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} e^{-\beta n + \epsilon n Q} n^{\lambda_2} \int_{\partial X} \Phi(|u|) d\nu.$$

Since $\beta - \epsilon Q = \beta - \log K > 0$, the sum of $e^{-\beta n + \epsilon n Q} n^{-\lambda_2}$ converges. Hence we obtain the estimate

$$(3.14) \quad \int_X \Phi(|\tilde{u}(t)|) d\mu_{\lambda_2} \lesssim \int_{\partial X} \Phi(|u|) d\nu.$$

Applying the very same arguments that we used in proving (3.6) after getting (3.5) to (3.12) and (3.14), we finally arrive at the norm estimate

$$\|\tilde{u}\|_{N^1, \Phi(X, \mu_{\lambda_2})} \lesssim \|u\|_{\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)}.$$

□

3.2 Proof of proposition 1.2

In this section, we always assume that $\Phi(t) = t^p \log^{\lambda_1}(e+t)$ with $p > 1, \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ or $p = 1, \lambda_1 \geq 0$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\lambda, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume that $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = \lambda$. For any $f \in L^1(\partial X)$, we have that $\|f\|_{\mathcal{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)} < \infty$ is equivalent to $|f|_{\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)} < \infty$ whenever $0 < \theta < 1$.*

Proof. When $\lambda_1 = 0$, then the result is obvious since $\|f\|_{\mathcal{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)}^p = |f|_{\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)}$.

When $\lambda_1 > 0$, first we estimate the logarithmic term from above. Since $f \in L^1(\partial X)$, for any $I \in \mathcal{Q}_n$, it follows from $\nu(I) \approx \nu(\hat{I}) \approx e^{-n \log K}$ that

$$\log^{\lambda_1} \left(e + \frac{|f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right) \leq \log^{\lambda_1} \left(e + \frac{|f_I| + |f_{\hat{I}}|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right) \lesssim \log^{\lambda_1} \left(e + \frac{\|f\|_{L^1(\partial X)}}{e^{-(\epsilon + \log K)n}} \right) \leq C n^{\lambda_1},$$

where $C = C(\|f\|_{L^1(\partial X)}, \lambda_1, \epsilon, K)$. Hence we can estimate $|f|_{\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |f|_{\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)} &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n(\theta-1)p n^{\lambda_2}} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) \Phi \left(\frac{|g_I - g_{\hat{I}}|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n \theta p n^{\lambda_2}} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) |f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|^p \log^{\lambda_1} \left(e + \frac{|f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right) \\ &\leq C \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n \theta p n^{\lambda_2 + \lambda_1}} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) |f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|^p = C \|f\|_{\mathcal{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)}^p, \end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(\|f\|_{L^1(\partial X)}, \lambda_1, \epsilon, K)$.

In order to estimate the logarithmic term from below, for any $I \in \mathcal{Q}_n$, we define

$$(3.15) \quad \chi(n, I) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } |f_I - f_{\hat{I}}| > e^{-\epsilon n(\theta+1)/2} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f\|_{\dot{B}_p^{\theta,\lambda}(\partial X)}^p &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n \theta p} n^\lambda \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) |f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|^p \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n \theta p} n^\lambda \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) \chi(n, I) |f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|^p \\
&\quad + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n \theta p} n^\lambda \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) (1 - \chi(n, I)) |f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|^p \\
&=: P_1 + P_2.
\end{aligned}$$

If $|f_I - f_{\hat{I}}| > e^{-\epsilon n(\theta+1)/2}$, since $\theta < 1$ and $\lambda_1 > 0$, we obtain that

$$\log^{\lambda_1} \left(e + \frac{|f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right) > \log^{\lambda_1} \left(e + e^{\epsilon n(1-\theta)/2} \right) \geq C n^{\lambda_1},$$

where $C = C(\epsilon, \theta, \lambda_1)$. Hence we have the estimate

$$P_1 \leq C \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n \theta p} n^{\lambda_2} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} |f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|^p \log^{\lambda_1} \left(e + \frac{|f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right) = C |f|_{\dot{B}_\Phi^{\theta,\lambda_2}(\partial X)}.$$

For P_2 , since $\sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) \approx 1$, we have that

$$P_2 \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n \theta p} n^\lambda \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) e^{-\epsilon n p(\theta+1)/2} \approx \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n p(\theta-1)/2} n^\lambda = C' < +\infty,$$

where $C' = C'(\theta, p, \lambda)$. Therefore, we obtain

$$(3.16) \quad \frac{1}{C} |f|_{\dot{B}_\Phi^{\theta,\lambda_2}(\partial X)} \leq \|f\|_{\dot{B}_p^{\theta,\lambda}(\partial X)}^p = P_1 + P_2 \leq C |f|_{\dot{B}_\Phi^{\theta,\lambda_2}(\partial X)} + C',$$

where C and C' are constants depending only on $\epsilon, \theta, \lambda_1, \lambda, p$ and $\|f\|_{L^1(\partial X)}$.

When $\lambda_1 < 0$, in order to estimate the logarithmic term from above, using definition (3.15), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
|f|_{\dot{B}_\Phi^{\theta,\lambda_2}(\partial X)} &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n \theta p} n^{\lambda_2} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) |f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|^p \log^{\lambda_1} \left(e + \frac{|f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right) \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n \theta p} n^{\lambda_2} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) \chi(n, I) |f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|^p \log^{\lambda_1} \left(e + \frac{|f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n \theta p} n^{\lambda_2} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) (1 - \chi(n, I)) |f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|^p \log^{\lambda_1} \left(e + \frac{|f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right) \\
&=: P'_1 + P'_2.
\end{aligned}$$

If $|f_I - f_{\hat{I}}| > e^{-\epsilon n(\theta+1)/2}$, since $\theta < 1$ and $\lambda_1 < 0$, we have that

$$\log^{\lambda_1} \left(e + \frac{|f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right) < \log^{\lambda_1} \left(e + e^{\epsilon n(1-\theta)/2} \right) \leq Cn^{\lambda_1},$$

where $C = C(\epsilon, \theta, \lambda_1)$. Hence we have the estimate

$$P'_1 \leq C \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n \theta p} n^{\lambda_2 + \lambda_1} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) |f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|^p = C \|f\|_{\dot{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)}^p.$$

For P'_2 , since $\log^{\lambda_1}(e+t) \leq 1$ for any $t \geq 0$ and $\sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) \approx 1$, we obtain that

$$P'_2 \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n \theta p} n^{\lambda_2} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) e^{-\epsilon n(\theta+1)/2} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n p(\theta-1)/2} n^{\lambda_2} = C' < +\infty,$$

where $C' = C(\epsilon, \theta, \lambda_2)$.

Next, we estimate the logarithmic term from below. Since $f \in L^1(\partial X)$ and $\lambda_1 < 0$, for any $I \in \mathcal{Q}_n$, it follows from $\nu(I) \approx \nu(\hat{I}) \approx e^{-n \log K}$ that

$$\log^{\lambda_1} \left(e + \frac{|f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right) \geq \log^{\lambda_1} \left(e + \frac{|f_I| + |f_{\hat{I}}|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right) \gtrsim \log^{\lambda_1} \left(e + \frac{\|f\|_{L^1(\partial X)}}{e^{-(\epsilon + \log K)n}} \right) \geq Cn^{\lambda_1},$$

where $C = C(\|f\|_{L^1(\partial X)}, \lambda_1, \epsilon, K)$. Now we get the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)}^p &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n \theta p} n^{\lambda_2 + \lambda_1} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) |f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|^p \\ &\leq C \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon n \theta p} n^{\lambda_2} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \nu(I) |f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|^p \log^{\lambda_1} \left(e + \frac{|f_I - f_{\hat{I}}|}{e^{-\epsilon n}} \right) \\ &= C |f|_{\dot{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain the estimate

$$(3.17) \quad \frac{1}{C} \|f\|_{\dot{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)}^p \leq |f|_{\dot{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)} = P'_1 + P'_2 \leq C \|f\|_{\dot{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)}^p + C',$$

where C and C' are constants depending only on $\epsilon, \theta, \lambda_1, \lambda_2$ and $\|f\|_{L^1(\partial X)}$.

Combining the inequalities (3.16) and (3.17) which are respect to $\lambda_1 > 0$ and $\lambda_1 < 0$ with the case $\lambda_1 = 0$, we obtain that $\|f\|_{\dot{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)}^p < +\infty$ is equivalent to $|f|_{\dot{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)} < +\infty$. \square

We need a result from functional analysis.

Lemma 3.2 (Closed graph theorem). *Let X, Y be Banach spaces and let $T : X \rightarrow Y$ be a linear operator. Then T is continuous if and only if the graph $\Sigma := \{(x, T(x)) : x \in X\}$ is closed in $X \times Y$ with the product topology.*

Let $L^\Phi(\partial X) \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)$ be the Banach space equipped with the norm

$$\|f\|_{L^\Phi(\partial X) \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)} := \|f\|_{L^\Phi(\partial X)} + \|f\|_{\dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)}.$$

Using the same manner, we could define the space $X \cap Y$ for any two spaces X and Y .

Corollary 3.3. *Let $\lambda, \lambda_1, \lambda_2$ and Φ be as in Lemma 3.1. Then we have*

$$L^\Phi(\partial X) \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X) = \mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)$$

with equivalent norms.

Proof. It directly follows from Lemma 3.1 that $L^\Phi(\partial X) \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)$ and $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)$ are the same vector spaces. Next we use Lemma 3.2 (Closed graph theorem) to show that they are the same Banach spaces with equivalent norms.

Consider the identity map $\text{Id} : L^\Phi(\partial X) \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)$, i.e., $\text{Id}(x) = x$ for any $x \in L^\Phi(\partial X) \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)$. Then the graph of Id is closed. Indeed, if (x_n, x_n) is a sequence in this graph that converges to (x, y) in $(L^\Phi(\partial X) \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)) \times (L^p(\partial X) \cap \mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X))$ with product topology, then x_n converges to x in $\|\cdot\|_{L^\Phi(\partial X) \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)}$ norm and hence in $L^\Phi(\partial X)$. In the same manner, x_n converges to y in $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)}$ and hence in $L^\Phi(\partial X)$.

But the limits are unique in $L^\Phi(\partial X)$, so $x = y$.

Applying Lemma 3.2 (Closed graph theorem), we see that the map Id is continuous from $L^\Phi(\partial X) \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)$ to $\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)$; similarly for the inverse. Thus the norms $\|\cdot\|_{L^\Phi(\partial X) \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta, \lambda_2}(\partial X)}$ are equivalent and the claim follows. \square

There is a slightly difference between the results in Corollary 3.3 and Proposition 1.2, since $\mathcal{B}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X) = L^p(\partial X) \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta, \lambda}(\partial X)$. To get Proposition 1.2 from Corollary 3.3, we need some estimates between the L^p -norm and L^Φ -norm. Since $\nu(\partial X) = 1$, we have the following lemma, see [27, Theorem 3.17.1 and Theorem 3.17.5].

Lemma 3.4. *Let Φ_1, Φ_2 be two Young functions. If $\Phi_2 \prec \Phi_1$, then*

$$\|u\|_{L^{\Phi_2}(\partial X)} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^{\Phi_1}(\partial X)}$$

for all $u \in L^{\Phi_1}(\partial X)$.

By the relation (2.3), for any $\delta > 0$, we have

$$(3.18) \quad \|u\|_{L^{\max\{p-\delta, 1\}}(\partial X)} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^\Phi(\partial X)} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^{p+\delta}(\partial X)}$$

for all $u \in L^{p+\delta}(\partial X)$.

Recall that $\nu(\partial X) = 1$ and $\text{diam}(\partial X) \approx 1$. Since ∂X is Ahlfors Q -regular where $Q = \frac{\log K}{\epsilon}$, we obtain the following lemma immediately from [22, Theorem 4.2]

Lemma 3.5. *Let $0 < s < 1$ and $p \geq 1$. Let $u \in \dot{N}_{p,p}^s(\partial X)$. If $0 < sp < Q = \frac{\log K}{\epsilon}$, then $u \in L^{p^*}(\partial X)$, $p^* = \frac{Qp}{Q-sp}$ and*

$$\inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{\partial X} |u - c|^{p^*} d\nu \right)^{1/p^*} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{N}_{p,p}^s(\partial X)}$$

Proof of Proposition 1.2. Let $s = \min\{\frac{\theta}{2}, \frac{Q}{2p}\}$, where $Q = \frac{\log K}{\epsilon}$. Let $p^* = \frac{Qp}{Q-sp}$ and $\delta = p^* - p$. It follows from the definitions of our Besov-type spaces and Proposition 2.7 that

$$\dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta,\lambda}(\partial X) \subset \dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^s(\partial X) = \dot{N}_{p,p}^s(\partial X).$$

By Lemma 3.5 and triangle inequality, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{\partial X} |u - u_{\partial X}|^{p^*} d\nu \right)^{1/p^*} &\leq 2 \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{\partial X} |u - c|^{p^*} d\nu \right)^{1/p^*} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{N}_{p,p}^s(\partial X)} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta,\lambda}(\partial X)}, \end{aligned}$$

for any $u \in \dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta,\lambda}(\partial X)$, where $u_{\partial X} = \int_{\partial X} u d\nu$. Since $|u| \leq |u - u_{\partial X}| + |u_{\partial X}|$ and $\nu(\partial X) = 1$, it follows from the Minkowski inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L^{p^*}(\partial X)} &\leq \|u - u_{\partial X}\|_{L^{p^*}(\partial X)} + \|u_{\partial X}\|_{L^{p^*}(\partial X)} \\ &= \left(\int_{\partial X} |u - u_{\partial X}|^{p^*} d\nu \right)^{1/p^*} + \left| \int_{\partial X} u d\nu \right| \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{L^1(\partial X)} + \|u\|_{\dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta,\lambda}(\partial X)}, \end{aligned}$$

for any $u \in \dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta,\lambda}(\partial X)$. Since $\|\cdot\|_{L^1(\partial X)} \leq \|\cdot\|_{L^p(\partial X)} \leq \|\cdot\|_{L^{p^*}(\partial X)}$ is trivial, we have that

$$L^1(\partial X) \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta,\lambda}(\partial X) = \mathcal{B}_p^{\theta,\lambda}(\partial X) = L^{p^*}(\partial X) \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta,\lambda}(\partial X).$$

Recall the relation (3.18) and $\delta = p^* - p$. Hence we have that

$$\|\cdot\|_{L^1(\partial X)} \lesssim \|\cdot\|_{L^\Phi(\partial X)} \lesssim \|\cdot\|_{L^{p^*}(\partial X)}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathcal{B}_p^{\theta,\lambda}(\partial X) = L^\Phi(\partial X) \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta,\lambda}(\partial X).$$

Combining with Corollary 3.3, i.e.,

$$L^\Phi(\partial X) \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}_p^{\theta,\lambda}(\partial X) = L^\Phi(\partial X) \cap \dot{\mathcal{B}}_\Phi^{\theta,\lambda_2}(\partial X) = \mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta,\lambda_2}(\partial X),$$

we finally arrive at

$$\mathcal{B}_p^{\theta,\lambda}(\partial X) = \mathcal{B}_\Phi^{\theta,\lambda_2}(\partial X).$$

□

Acknowledgement. The author would like to thank his advisor Professor Pekka Koskela for helpful comments and suggestions.

References

- [1] N. Aronszajn: *Boundary values of functions with finite Dirichlet integral*, Techn. Report 14, University of Kansas, 1955. [1](#)
- [2] A. Björn and J. Björn: *Nonlinear potential theory on metric spaces*, EMS Tracts Math. 17, European Mathematical Society, Zurich 2011. [1](#), [7](#)
- [3] A. Björn, J. Björn, J. T. Gill and N. Shanmugalingam: *Geometric analysis on Cantor sets and trees*. J. Reine Angew. Math. 725 (2017), 63-114. [2](#), [4](#), [5](#), [7](#), [9](#)
- [4] A. Björn, J. Björn and N. Shanmugalingam: *The Dirichlet problem for p -harmonic functions on metric spaces*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 556 (2003), 173-203. [1](#)
- [5] M. Bonk, J. Heinonen and P. Koskela: *Uniformizing Gromov hyperbolic spaces*, Astérisque No. 270 (2001), viii+99 pp. [4](#)
- [6] M. Bonk and E. Saksman: *Sobolev spaces and hyperbolic fillings*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 737 (2018), 161-187. [1](#)
- [7] M. Bridson and A. Haefliger: *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, Grundlehren Math. Wiss. 319, Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1999. [4](#)
- [8] A. Cianchi: *Orlicz-Sobolev boundary trace embeddings*, Math. Z. 266 (2010), no. 2, 431-449. [1](#)
- [9] R. N. Dhara and A. Kałamajska: *On one extension theorem dealing with weighted Orlicz-Slobodetskii space. Analysis on cube*, Math. Inequal. Appl. 18 (2015), no. 1, 61-89. [1](#)
- [10] R. N. Dhara and A. Kałamajska: *On one extension theorem dealing with weighted Orlicz-Slobodetskii space. Analysis on Lipschitz subgraph and Lipschitz domain*, Math. Inequal. Appl. 19 (2016), no. 2, 451-488. [1](#)
- [11] A. Fougères: *Théorèmes de trace et de prolongement dans les espaces de Sobolev et Sobolev-Orlicz*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris SÃr. A-B 274 (1972), A181-A184. [1](#)
- [12] E. Gagliardo: *Caratterizzazioni delle tracce sulla frontiera relative ad alcune classi di funzioni in n variabili*, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova 27 (1957), 284-305. [1](#)
- [13] A. Gogatishvili, P. Koskela and N. Shanmugalingam: *Interpolation properties of Besov spaces defined on metric spaces*, Math. Nachr. 283 (2010), no. 2, 215-231. [2](#)
- [14] A. Gogatishvili, P. Koskela and Y. Zhou: *Characterizations of Besov and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces on metric measure spaces*, Forum Math. 25 (2013), no. 4, 787-819. [2](#), [9](#)
- [15] P. Hajłasz: *Sobolev space on metric-measure spaces, in Heat kernels and analysis on manifolds, graphs and metric spaces (Paris 2002)*, Contemp. Math. 338, American Mathematical Society, Providence (2003), 173-218. [1](#), [7](#)

- [16] P. Hajłasz and P. Koskela: *Sobolev met Poincaré*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. (2000), no. 688, x+101 pp. [1](#)
- [17] J. Heinonen: *Lectures on analysis on metric spaces*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, New York 2001. x+140 pp. [1](#)
- [18] J. Heinonen and P. Koskela: *Quasiconformal mappings in metric spaces with controlled geometry*, Acta Math. 181 (1998), 1-61. [1](#), [7](#)
- [19] J. Heinonen, P. Koskela, N. Shanmugalingam and J. Tyson: *Sobolev Spaces on Metric Measure Spaces: An Approach Based on Upper Gradients*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015. [1](#), [7](#)
- [20] A. Jonsson and H. Wallin: *The trace to subsets of \mathbb{R}^n of Besov spaces in the general case*, Anal. Math. 6 (1980), 223-254. [2](#)
- [21] A. Jonsson and H. Wallin: *Function spaces on subsets of \mathbb{R}^n* , Math. Rep. 2 (1984), no. 1, xiv+221 pp. [2](#)
- [22] N. Karak: *Measure density and embeddings of Hajłasz-Besov and Hajłasz-Triebel-Lizorkin spaces*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 475 (2019), no. 1, 966-984. [2](#), [19](#)
- [23] P. Koskela, T. Soto and Z. Wang: *Traces of weighted function spaces: dyadic norms and Whitney extensions*, Sci. China Math. 60 (2017), no. 11, 1981-2010. [2](#), [9](#)
- [24] P. Koskela and Z. Wang: *Dyadic norm Besov-type spaces as trace spaces on regular trees*, to appear in Potential Anal. arXiv:1908.06937. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- [25] P. Koskela, D. Yang and Y. Zhou: *A characterization of Hajłasz-Sobolev and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces via grand Littlewood-Paley functions*, J. Funct. Anal. 258 (2010), no. 8, 2637-2661. [2](#)
- [26] P. Koskela, D. Yang and Y. Zhou: *Pointwise characterizations of Besov and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces and quasiconformal mappings*, Adv. Math. 226 (2011), no. 4, 3579-3621. [2](#)
- [27] A. Kufner, O. John and S. Fucik: *Function spaces. Monographs and Textbooks on Mechanics of Solids and Fluids; Mechanics: Analysis*, Noordhoff International Publishing, Leyden; Academia, Prague, 1977. xv+454 pp. [19](#)
- [28] M.-Th. Lacroix: *Caractérisation des traces dans les espaces de Sobolev-Orlicz*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B 274 (1972), A1813-A1816. [1](#)
- [29] M.-Th. Lacroix: *Espaces de traces des espaces de Sobolev-Orlicz*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 53 (1974), 439-458. [1](#)
- [30] P. I. Lizorkin: *Boundary properties of functions from "weight" classes* (Russian), Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 132 (1960), 514-517; translated as Soviet Math. Dokl. 1 (1960), 589-593. [1](#)

- [31] L. Malý: *Trace and extension theorems for Sobolev-type functions in metric spaces*, arXiv:1704.06344. [1](#)
- [32] L. Malý, N. Shanmugalingam and M. Snipes: *Trace and extension theorems for functions of bounded variation*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) 18 (2018), no. 1, 313-341.
- [33] P. Mironescu and E. Russ: *Traces of weighted Sobolev spaces. Old and new*, Non-linear Anal. 119 (2015), 354-381. [1](#)
- [34] W. Orlicz: *On certain properties of φ -functions*, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. SÃr. Sci. Math. Astronom. Phys. 8 1960 439-443. [6](#)
- [35] G. Palmieri: *An approach to the theory of some trace spaces related to the Orlicz-Sobolev spaces*, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. B (5) 16 (1979), no. 1, 100-119. [1](#)
- [36] G. Palmieri: *The traces of functions in a class of Sobolev-Orlicz spaces with weight*, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. B (5) 18 (1981), no. 1, 87-117. [1](#)
- [37] J. Peetre: *A counterexample connected with Gagliardo's trace theorem*, Comment. Math. 2 (1979), 277-282. [1](#)
- [38] J. Peetre: *New thoughts on Besov spaces*, Duke University Mathematics Series, No. 1. Mathematics Department, Duke University, Durham, N.C., 1976. [1](#)
- [39] M. M. Rao and Z. D. Ren: *Theory of Orlicz spaces* Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics 146, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1991. [5](#), [6](#)
- [40] E. Saksman and T. Soto: *Traces of Besov, Triebel-Lizorkin and Sobolev spaces on metric spaces*, Anal. Geom. Metr. Spaces 5 (2017), 98-115. [1](#)
- [41] N. Shanmugalingam, *Newtonian spaces: An extension of Sobolev spaces to metric measure spaces*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam., 243-279 ,Vol. 16, 2000. [7](#)
- [42] L. N. Slobodetskii and V. M. Babich: *On boundedness of the Dirichlet integrals* (Russian), Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.) 106 (1956), 604-606. [1](#)
- [43] T. Soto: *Besov spaces on metric spaces via hyperbolic fillings*, arXiv:1606.08082. [1](#)
- [44] H. Triebel: *Theory of function spaces*, Monographs in Mathematics, 78. Birkhuser Verlag, Basel, 1983. [1](#)
- [45] H. Triebel: *The structure of functions*, Monographs in Mathematics, 97. Birkhuser Verlag, Basel, 2001. [1](#)
- [46] H. Tuominen: *Orlicz-Sobolev spaces on metric measure spaces. Dissertation, University of Jyvskyl, Jyvskyl, 2004*. Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. Diss. No. 135 (2004), 86 pp. [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)

- [47] A. I. Tyulenev: *Description of traces of functions in the Sobolev space with a Muckenhoupt weight*, Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. 284 (2014), no. 1, 280-295. [1](#)
- [48] A. I. Tyulenev: *Traces of weighted Sobolev spaces with Muckenhoupt weight. The case $p = 1$* , Nonlinear Anal. 128 (2015), 248-272. [1](#)

Zhuang Wang

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Jyväskylä, PO Box 35, FI-40014
Jyväskylä, Finland

E-mail address: `zhuang.z.wang@jyu.fi`