

CLASSIFYING TRIEBEL–LIZORKIN CAPACITIES IN METRIC SPACES

JUHA LEHRBÄCK, KAUSHIK MOHANTA, AND ANTTI V. VÄHÄKANGAS

ABSTRACT. We study non-local or fractional capacities in metric measure spaces. Our main goal is to clarify the relations between relative Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin capacities, potential Triebel–Lizorkin capacities, and metric space variants of Riesz capacities. As an application of our results, we obtain a characterization of a Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin capacity density condition, which is based on an earlier characterization of a Riesz capacity density condition in terms of Hausdorff contents.

1. INTRODUCTION

In mathematical analysis, there are several possible approaches to the concept of *capacity of a set*, depending, for instance, on the general setting and the intended applications. Nevertheless, it often turns out that seemingly different definitions still lead to comparable or otherwise closely related concepts.

In this work, we examine and compare four different approaches to nonlocal or fractional capacities in a metric space X equipped with a doubling measure μ . More precisely, when $B \subset X$ is an open ball and $E \subset \bar{B}$ is a closed set, we consider the following, for parameters $1 < p < \infty$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, $0 < \beta < 1$, and $\Lambda \geq 2$:

- the relative Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin (β, p, q) -capacity $\text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(E, 2B, \Lambda B)$,
- the potential Triebel–Lizorkin (β, p, q) -capacity $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E)$,
- the dual characterization of $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E)$ in terms of measures supported on E ,
- the Riesz (β, p) -capacity $R_{\beta,p}(E)$.

The main purpose of this paper is to establish and clarify the relations between these concepts. For instance, we examine when these capacities are comparable and show that often the parameter q plays no essential role. The last part of the paper, where we characterize a capacity density condition associated to Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin capacities, can be viewed as a continuation of [6, 7].

The Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin function spaces $\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta$ and the corresponding relative capacities $\text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}$ are defined using fractional Hajłasz gradients. In Section 3 we introduce these gradients, following [24], and recall in Lemma 3.2 a Poincaré type inequality for them. Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin spaces and relative capacities $\text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}$ are defined in Section 4, where we also prove a lower bound estimate for these capacities in terms of suitable Hausdorff contents; see Theorem 4.6.

On the other hand, following [2, 3], the Triebel–Lizorkin potential capacity $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E)$ is defined in Section 6 using the potential operator \mathcal{H}_β ,

$$\mathcal{H}_\beta f(x) = \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \int_X \frac{\mathbf{1}_{B(y, 2^{-n})}(x)}{\mu(B(y, 2^{-n}))} f_n(y) d\mu(y),$$

for a sequence $f = (f_n)_{n \geq n_0}$ of nonnegative Borel functions in X . Here n_0 is the smallest integer such that $2^{-n_0} \leq 2 \text{diam}(X)$, with the interpretation that $n_0 = -\infty$ if X is unbounded.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 31C15 (28A12, 31E05).

Key words and phrases. Comparison of capacities, capacity density condition, Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin space, Riesz capacity, metric measure space.

We show that, under suitable assumptions on the space X and the parameters p, q, β and Λ , the capacities $\text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(E, 2B, \Lambda B)$ and $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E)$ are comparable for all compact sets $E \subset \bar{B}$. In particular, besides the doubling condition (see (3)), we need to assume that the measure μ is also reverse doubling (see (4) and (5)), as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $1 < p < \infty$, $1 < q \leq \infty$, $0 < \beta < 1$ and $\Lambda \geq 41$. Assume that the measure μ is doubling and reverse doubling, and satisfies the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) for some exponent $\sigma > \beta p$. Let $B = B(x, r) \subset X$ be a ball with $x \in X$ and $0 < r < \frac{1}{80} \text{diam}(X)$ and let $E \subset \bar{B}$ be a compact set. Then*

$$C^{-1} \text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E) \leq \text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(E, 2B, \Lambda B) \leq C \text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E), \quad (1)$$

where the constant $C \geq 1$ is independent of B and E .

The two inequalities in (1) hold separately under slightly different assumptions, see Theorems 6.5 and 6.6 for precise formulations. Also recall, as a basic example, that in \mathbb{R}^n (equipped with the Euclidean distance) the Lebesgue measure is both doubling and reverse doubling and satisfies condition (5) with $\sigma = n$.

As a technical tool for the proof of the second inequality in (1), we introduce a new discrete potential operator \mathcal{Q}_β , which majorizes the operator \mathcal{H}_β ; see Lemma 6.3. The definition of \mathcal{Q}_β (Definition 5.1) involves a partition of unity and is inspired by the so-called discrete convolutions, see e.g. [1, 23]. Since the functions in the partition of unity are Lipschitz-continuous, the operator \mathcal{Q}_β can be seen as a smooth version of \mathcal{H}_β , whose definition uses noncontinuous characteristic functions of balls. Boundedness properties of \mathcal{Q}_β are studied in Section 5, and in particular we obtain for \mathcal{Q}_β a mixed norm estimate in Lemma 5.2 and a Sobolev type inequality in Lemma 5.3.

In Section 7, we prove a dual characterization of the Triebel–Lizorkin potential capacity $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E)$ for compact sets $E \subset X$. As in the Euclidean case in [3], this is based on the use of (nonnegative) Radon measures ν supported on E . In our setting, the sequence

$$\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu(x) = \left(2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} \right)_{n=n_0}^\infty, \quad x \in X,$$

plays an important role. The main tool in the proof of the dual characterization (Theorem 7.3) is a Minimax theorem, see Lemma 7.4.

In Section 8 we prove a version of the Muckenhoupt–Wheeden theorem (Theorem 8.3), which gives an estimate for the norm of $\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu$ in terms of the fractional maximal function

$$M_\beta \nu(x) = \sup_{0 < r \leq 2^{-n_0}} r^\beta \frac{\nu(B(x, r))}{\mu(B(x, r))}, \quad x \in X.$$

Such results originate in [31], and a very general metric space variant of the Muckenhoupt–Wheeden theorem can be found in [33]. Nevertheless, instead of relying on the more abstract machinery from [33], we present an alternative self-contained proof that is suited for our purposes.

The dual characterization of $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta$ and the Muckenhoupt–Wheeden theorem are crucial ingredients in the proof of Theorem 9.3, which shows that for compact sets the Triebel–Lizorkin capacities $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta$ are in fact independent of the q -parameter, again under a suitable reverse doubling assumption. Consequently, by Theorem 1.1 the same independence holds for the relative capacity $\text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}$, as well.

Finally, in Sections 10 and 11 we compare the Triebel–Lizorkin capacities and the Riesz capacities $R_{\beta,p}(E)$, which are defined in terms of a metric space variant of the classical Riesz potential,

$$I_\beta f(x) = \int_{X \setminus \{x\}} \frac{d(x, y)^\beta}{\mu(B(x, d(x, y)))} f(y) d\mu(y), \quad (2)$$

for Borel functions $f \geq 0$ in X . See Definitions 10.1 and 10.2 for more details.

In Theorem 10.4 we show that $\text{Cap}_{p,\infty}^\beta$ and $R_{\beta,p}$ are comparable. The proof of this theorem follows by rather straightforward applications of the doubling and quantitative reverse doubling conditions, see Lemma 10.3. The q -independence of the potential Triebel–Lizorkin capacities yields for compact sets the same comparability also for $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta$, for every $1 < q \leq \infty$, and thus for the relative capacity $\text{cap}_{M_{p,q}^\beta}$ as well, by Theorem 1.1. In Theorem 10.5 we present an alternative direct proof, again based on the dual characterization, for the fact that for compact sets $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta$ is bounded from above by $R_{\beta,p}$, for all $1 < q \leq \infty$.

The main application of the above results is given in Section 11, where we characterize, for $0 < \beta < 1$, a Hajlasz–Triebel–Lizorkin capacity density condition in complete geodesic metric spaces. The proof of the characterization is based on the following facts:

- (1) The Riesz capacity $R_{\beta,p}$ dominates the corresponding Hajlasz–Triebel–Lizorkin capacity $\text{cap}_{M_{p,q}^\beta}$, for every $1 < q \leq \infty$; see Corollary 10.6.
- (2) The Riesz capacity density condition is equivalent to a Hausdorff content density condition. This is a deep and highly nontrivial result from [6, Theorem 6.4] and [7, Theorem 9.5], and in particular implies a self-improvement result for the Riesz capacity density condition. Here the additional assumptions that the space X is complete and geodesic are needed.
- (3) The Hajlasz–Triebel–Lizorkin capacity $\text{cap}_{M_{p,q}^\beta}$ can be estimated from below by suitable Hausdorff contents, by Theorem 4.6.

In addition to these main ingredients, we also need estimates for the capacities and contents of balls. For Hajlasz–Triebel–Lizorkin capacities such estimates are obtained in Theorem 4.3.

The above characterization leads to a self-improvement result (Corollary 11.5) for the Hajlasz–Triebel–Lizorkin capacity density condition, which is, to the best of our knowledge, new even in the context of Euclidean spaces. Self-improvement of the capacity density condition for the Riesz capacity in \mathbb{R}^n was originally proven by Lewis [26]. See also [6, 7] for corresponding results for other capacities in metric spaces.

Before going to the main parts of the paper, we begin in Section 2 by introducing notation and recalling some useful concepts that are needed later on.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Lizaveta Ihnatsyeva for interesting discussions on the topics of the paper. The second author was supported by the Academy of Finland (project #323960) and by the Academy of Finland via Centre of Excellence in Analysis and Dynamics Research (project #346310).

2. PRELIMINARIES

We write $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ and $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. We also set $p' = \frac{p}{p-1}$ if $1 < p < \infty$, $p' = 1$ if $p = \infty$, and $p' = \infty$ if $p = 1$.

Throughout the rest of the paper we assume that $X = (X, d, \mu)$ is a metric measure space equipped with a metric d and a nonnegative complete Borel measure μ such that $0 < \mu(B) < \infty$ for all open balls $B \subset X$, each of which is an open set of the form

$$B = B(x, r) = \{y \in X : d(y, x) < r\}$$

with $x \in X$ and $r > 0$. The corresponding closed ball is

$$\bar{B}(x, r) = \{y \in X : d(y, x) \leq r\}.$$

Under these assumptions, the space X is separable, see [4, Proposition 1.6]. We also assume that $\#X \geq 2$.

The diameter of a set $A \subset X$ is denoted by $\text{diam}(A)$. We write $n_0 = -\infty$ if $\text{diam}(X) = \infty$, and otherwise choose n_0 to be the smallest integer such that $2^{-n_0} \leq 2 \text{diam}(X)$. In the latter case, we have $\text{diam}(X) < 2^{-n_0} \leq 2 \text{diam}(X)$.

We also assume throughout the paper that the measure μ is *doubling*, that is, there is a constant $c_\mu > 1$, called the *doubling constant of μ* , such that

$$\mu(2B) \leq c_\mu \mu(B) \quad (3)$$

for all balls $B = B(x, r)$ in X . Here we use for $0 < t < \infty$ the notation $tB = B(x, tr)$.

If X is connected, then the doubling measure μ also satisfies the *reverse doubling condition*, that is, there is a constant $0 < c_R = C(c_\mu) < 1$ such that

$$\mu(B(x, r/2)) \leq c_R \mu(B(x, r)) \quad (4)$$

for all $x \in X$ and all $0 < r < \text{diam}(X)/2$; see for instance [4, Lemma 3.7]. Iteration of (4) shows that if X is connected, then there exist an exponent $\sigma > 0$ and a constant $c_\sigma > 0$, both depending on c_μ only, such that the *quantitative reverse doubling condition*

$$\frac{\mu(B(x, r))}{\mu(B(x, R))} \leq c_\sigma \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^\sigma \quad (5)$$

holds for all $x \in X$ and all $0 < r < R \leq 2 \text{diam}(X)$. However, in most of our results we will not assume X to be connected, but instead we often explicitly assume that (5) holds for some exponent $\sigma > 0$.

We denote the closure of a set $A \subset X$ by \bar{A} . In particular, if $B = B(x, r) \subset X$ is a ball, then the notation $\bar{B} = \overline{B(x, r)}$ refers to the closure of the ball B . The characteristic function of a set $A \subset X$ is denoted by $\mathbf{1}_A$; that is, $\mathbf{1}_A(x) = 1$ if $x \in A$ and $\mathbf{1}_A(x) = 0$ if $x \in X \setminus A$.

When $A \subset X$ is a measurable set with $0 < \mu(A) < \infty$, we write

$$f_A = \fint_A f(y) d\mu(y) = \frac{1}{\mu(A)} \int_A f(y) d\mu(y)$$

for the integral average of $f \in L^1(A)$ over A . If $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function, then the *noncentered Hardy–Littlewood maximal function* M^*f of f is defined by

$$M^*f(x) = \sup_B \fint_B |f(y)| d\mu(y), \quad x \in X, \quad (6)$$

where the supremum is taken over all balls $B \subset X$ such that $x \in B$. The sublinear operator M^* is bounded on $L^p(X)$ with a constant $C(c_\mu, p)$ for every $1 < p \leq \infty$, see [4, Theorem 3.13].

Finally, we say that a function $\eta : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is L -Lipschitz, if $|\eta(x) - \eta(y)| \leq Ld(x, y)$ for every $x, y \in X$.

3. FRACTIONAL HAJŁASZ GRADIENT

We define fractional Hajłasz gradients in open sets as in [13], by adapting [24, Definition 1.1].

Definition 3.1. Let $0 < \beta \leq 1$ and let $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function on an open set $\Omega \subset X$. A sequence $g = (g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of nonnegative measurable functions is called a fractional β -Hajłasz gradient of u , if there exists a set $E \subset \Omega$ such that $\mu(E) = 0$ and for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x, y \in \Omega \setminus E$ satisfying $2^{-k-1} \leq d(x, y) < 2^{-k}$, we have

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq d(x, y)^\beta (g_k(x) + g_k(y)).$$

We denote by $\mathbb{D}_\Omega^\beta(u)$ the collection of all fractional β -Hajłasz gradients of u .

We need the following metric space variant of the Poincaré type inequality [24, Lemma 2.1].

Lemma 3.2. Let $0 < \beta < 1$ and assume that μ satisfies the reverse doubling condition (4) with a constant $0 < c_R < 1$. Let $x_0 \in X$, let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $2^{-n+3} < \text{diam}(X)$, and assume that $u \in L^1(B(x_0, 2^{-n+2}))$ and $(g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}_{B(x_0, 2^{-n+2})}^\beta(u)$. Then

$$\fint_{B(x_0, 2^{-n})} |u(x) - u_{B(x_0, 2^{-n})}| d\mu(x) \leq C(c_\mu, c_R) 2^{-n\beta} \sum_{k=n-3}^n \fint_{B(x_0, 2^{-n+2})} g_k(x) d\mu(x).$$

Proof. We estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(x_0, 2^{-n})} |u(x) - u_{B(x_0, 2^{-n})}| d\mu(x) &\leq 2 \int_{B(x_0, 2^{-n})} |u(x) - u_{B(x_0, 2^{-n+2}) \setminus B(x_0, 2^{-n+1})}| d\mu(x) \\ &\leq 2 \int_{B(x_0, 2^{-n})} \int_{B(x_0, 2^{-n+2}) \setminus B(x_0, 2^{-n+1})} |u(x) - u(y)| d\mu(y) d\mu(x). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

We let $E \subset B(x_0, 2^{-n+2})$ be the exceptional set for $(g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ as in Definition 3.1. Fix points $x \in B(x_0, 2^{-n})$ and $y \in B(x_0, 2^{-n+2}) \setminus B(x_0, 2^{-n+1})$ such that $x, y \notin E$. Then

$$2^{-n} \leq d(x, y) < 2^{-n+3}$$

and therefore

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq d(x, y)^\beta \left(\sum_{k=n-3}^{n-1} g_k(x) + \sum_{k=n-3}^{n-1} g_k(y) \right).$$

Since $\mu(E) = 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(x_0, 2^{-n})} \int_{B(x_0, 2^{-n+2}) \setminus B(x_0, 2^{-n+1})} |u(x) - u(y)| d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \\ \leq 2^{-n\beta+3} \left(\int_{B(x_0, 2^{-n})} \sum_{k=n-3}^{n-1} g_k(x) d\mu(x) + \int_{B(x_0, 2^{-n+2}) \setminus B(x_0, 2^{-n+1})} \sum_{k=n-3}^{n-1} g_k(y) d\mu(y) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

By the doubling condition (3), we get

$$\int_{B(x_0, 2^{-n})} \sum_{k=n-3}^{n-1} g_k(x) d\mu(x) \leq c_\mu^2 \sum_{k=n-3}^{n-1} \int_{B(x_0, 2^{-n+2})} g_k(x) d\mu(x). \quad (9)$$

By the assumed reverse doubling condition (4), we have

$$\mu(B(x_0, 2^{-n+1})) \leq c_R \mu(B(x_0, 2^{-n+2})),$$

and therefore

$$\mu(B(x_0, 2^{-n+2}) \setminus B(x_0, 2^{-n+1})) \geq (1 - c_R) \mu(B(x_0, 2^{-n+2})).$$

Hence,

$$\int_{B(x_0, 2^{-n+2}) \setminus B(x_0, 2^{-n+1})} \sum_{k=n-3}^{n-1} g_k(y) d\mu(y) \leq \frac{1}{1 - c_R} \sum_{k=n-3}^{n-1} \int_{B(x_0, 2^{-n+2})} g_k(x) d\mu(x). \quad (10)$$

The desired Poincaré inequality follows by combining inequalities (7), (8), (9) and (10). \square

The following Leibniz type rule for β -Hajłasz gradients is from [13, Lemma 3.10]. The proof is a case study.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $0 < \beta < 1$ and let $(g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}_X^\beta(u)$ be a fractional β -Hajłasz gradient of a measurable function $u: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Assume that η is a bounded L -Lipschitz function in X and define*

$$\rho_k = (g_k \|\eta\|_\infty + 2^{k(\beta-1)} L |u|) \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in X : \eta(x) \neq 0\}}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Then $(\rho_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}_X^\beta(\eta u)$.

4. TRIEBEL–LIZORKIN SPACES AND RELATIVE CAPACITY

Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin spaces were introduced in [24]. The associated global capacities first appeared in [15] and they have been studied, for instance, in [21], [22] and [27]. See also [3] and the references therein for the theory of Triebel–Lizorkin capacities in the Euclidean case. In this section, we first recall Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin spaces on open sets and then we define the corresponding relative capacities that seem to be novel in this generality.

Fix $1 \leq p < \infty$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, and an open set $\Omega \subset X$. For a sequence $g = (g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of measurable functions in Ω , we define the mixed norm

$$\|g\|_{L^p(\Omega; l^q)} = \left\| \|g\|_{l^q(\mathbb{Z})} \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

where

$$\|g\|_{l^q(\mathbb{Z})} = \begin{cases} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |g_k|^q \right)^{1/q}, & \text{for } 1 \leq q < \infty, \\ \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |g_k|, & \text{for } q = \infty. \end{cases}$$

We use the following Fefferman–Stein vector-valued maximal function inequality; we refer to [11, Theorem 1.2] for a proof. If $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 < q \leq \infty$, then there exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that for all sequences of measurable functions $(g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ in X we have

$$\|(M^* g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}\|_{L^p(X; l^q)} \leq C \|(g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}\|_{L^p(X; l^q)}, \quad (11)$$

where $M^* g_k$ is the noncentered maximal function of g_k for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Definition 4.1. Let $1 < p < \infty$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, and $0 < \beta < 1$, and let $\Omega \subset X$ be an open set. The homogeneous Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin space $\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta(\Omega)$ is the seminormed space of all measurable functions $u: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$|u|_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta(\Omega)} = \inf_{g \in \mathbb{D}_\Omega^\beta(u)} \|g\|_{L^p(\Omega; l^q)} < \infty.$$

Notice that $|u|_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta(\Omega)} \leq |u|_{\dot{M}_{p,\tau}^\beta(\Omega)}$ whenever $1 \leq \tau \leq q \leq \infty$. We remark that $|\cdot|_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta(\Omega)}$ is a seminorm but not a norm since $|u|_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta(\Omega)} = 0$ whenever u is a constant function.

The following definition of a relative Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin (β, p, q) -capacity $\text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}$ is motivated by [9, Definition 4.1]; see also [28, Definition 7.1], [10] and [29, §11].

Definition 4.2. Let $1 < p < \infty$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, $0 < \beta < 1$, and $\Lambda \geq 2$. Let $B \subset X$ be a ball and let $E \subset \bar{B}$ be a closed set. Then we write

$$\text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(E, 2B, \Lambda B) = \inf_{\varphi} |\varphi|_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta(\Lambda B)},$$

where the infimum is taken over all continuous functions $\varphi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\varphi(x) \geq 1$ for every $x \in E$ and $\varphi(x) = 0$ for every $x \in X \setminus 2B$.

Observe that if $F \subset E \subset \bar{B}$ are closed sets and $1 \leq \tau \leq q \leq \infty$, then

$$\text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(F, 2B, \Lambda B) \leq \text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,\tau}^\beta}(E, 2B, \Lambda B) \leq \text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,\tau}^\beta}(E, 2B, \Lambda B). \quad (12)$$

Next we estimate the relative capacities of balls. In part (a) we have $q = 1$ and in part (b) $q = \infty$; compare to (12).

Theorem 4.3. Let $1 < p < \infty$, $0 < \beta < 1$, $x_0 \in X$, and $r > 0$.

(a) If $\Lambda \geq 2$, then

$$\text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,1}^\beta}(\overline{B(x_0, r)}, B(x_0, 2r), B(x_0, \Lambda r)) \leq C(c_\mu, \beta, p, \Lambda) r^{-\beta p} \mu(B(x_0, r)).$$

(b) Assume in addition that X is connected and $r < (1/8) \text{diam}(X)$. If $\Lambda > 2$, then

$$r^{-\beta p} \mu(B(x_0, r)) \leq C(\beta, p, c_\mu, \Lambda) \text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,\infty}^\beta}(\overline{B(x_0, r)}, B(x_0, 2r), B(x_0, \Lambda r)).$$

Proof. (a) Write $B = B(x_0, r)$ and let

$$\varphi(x) = \max\{0, 1 - r^{-1} \operatorname{dist}(x, B)\}$$

for every $x \in X$. Then $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$ in X , $\varphi = 1$ in \bar{B} , $\varphi = 0$ in $X \setminus 2B$, and φ is an r^{-1} -Lipschitz function in X . Since φ is admissible for the relative capacity, we have

$$\operatorname{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,1}^\beta}(\bar{B}, 2B, \Lambda B) \leq |\varphi|_{\dot{M}_{p,1}^\beta(\Lambda B)}^p.$$

Lemma 3.3, with $u = 1$ and $g_k = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, implies that $(\rho_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}_X^\beta(\varphi)$, where

$$\rho_k = 2^{k(\beta-1)} r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in X : \varphi(x) \neq 0\}}, \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Let m be the smallest integer such that $2^{-m-1} \leq 2\Lambda r$. Observe that $(\mathbf{1}_{k \geq m} \rho_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}_{\Lambda B}^\beta(\varphi)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi|_{\dot{M}_{p,1}^\beta(\Lambda B)}^p &\leq \|(\mathbf{1}_{k \geq m} \rho_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}\|_{L^p(\Lambda B; l^1)}^p = \int_{\Lambda B} \left(\sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \rho_k(x) \right)^p d\mu(x) \\ &\leq r^{-p} \int_{2B} \left(\sum_{k=m}^{\infty} 2^{k(\beta-1)} \right)^p d\mu(x) \\ &\leq C(\beta, p) r^{-p} 2^{mp(\beta-1)} \mu(2B) \leq C(c_\mu, \beta, p, \Lambda) r^{-\beta p} \mu(B), \end{aligned}$$

and the claim (a) follows from this.

(b) The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 3.2. Write $B = B(x_0, r)$ and choose $\lambda = \min\{3, \Lambda\} > 2$. Let $\varphi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function such that $\varphi(x) \geq 1$ for every $x \in \bar{B}$ and $\varphi(x) = 0$ for every $x \in X \setminus 2B$, and let $g = (g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}_{\Lambda B}^\beta(\varphi)$.

Fix $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $2^{-m-1} \leq r < 2^{-m}$. Then

$$2^{-m-1} \leq r \leq d(x, y) < (1 + \lambda)r \leq 4r < 2^{-m+2}$$

for all $x \in B$ and $y \in \lambda B \setminus 2B$. Since $\varphi \geq 1$ in B and $\varphi = 0$ in $\lambda B \setminus 2B$, we can proceed as in (7) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \int_B \varphi(x) d\mu(x) = \int_B |\varphi(x) - \varphi_{\lambda B \setminus 2B}| d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \int_B \int_{\lambda B \setminus 2B} |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \\ &\leq 4r^\beta \sum_{k=m-2}^m \int_B g_k(x) d\mu(x) + 4r^\beta \sum_{k=m-2}^m \int_{\lambda B \setminus 2B} g_k(y) d\mu(y). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=m-2}^m \int_B g_k(x) d\mu(x) &\leq \sum_{k=m-2}^m \left(\int_B g_k(x)^p d\mu(x) \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq 3 \left(\int_B \left(\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} g_k(y) \right)^p d\mu(x) \right)^{1/p}. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Since X is connected and $\lambda r < 4r < \operatorname{diam}(X)/2$, by [4, Lemma 3.7] there exists a constant $0 < c_R = C(c_\mu, \Lambda) < 1$ such that

$$\mu(2B) = \mu(B(x_0, 2r)) \leq c_R \mu(B(x_0, \lambda r)) = c_R \mu(\lambda B),$$

and therefore

$$\mu(\lambda B \setminus 2B) \geq (1 - c_R) \mu(\lambda B).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=m-2}^m \int_{\lambda B \setminus 2B} g_k(y) d\mu(y) &\leq \frac{1}{1-c_R} \sum_{k=m-2}^m \int_{\lambda B} g_k(x) d\mu(x) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1-c_R} \sum_{k=m-2}^m \left(\int_{\lambda B} g_k(x)^p d\mu(x) \right)^{1/p} \\
&\leq \frac{3}{1-c_R} \left(\int_{\lambda B} \left(\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} g_k(y) \right)^p d\mu(x) \right)^{1/p}.
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

By combining inequalities (13), (14) and (15), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &\leq \left(\int_B \int_{\lambda B \setminus 2B} |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \right)^p \\
&\leq C(p, c_R) r^{\beta p} \left(\int_B \left(\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} g_k(y) \right)^p d\mu(x) + \int_{\lambda B} \left(\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} g_k(y) \right)^p d\mu(x) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$r^{-\beta p} \mu(B) \leq C(p, c_R, \beta) \int_{\lambda B} \left(\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} g_k(y) \right)^p d\mu(x).$$

Since $c_R = C(c_\mu, \Lambda)$, the desired inequality follows by taking infimum over all functions φ and g as above. \square

Observe the strict lower bound $\Lambda > 2$ in part (b) of Theorem 4.3. The following Example 4.4, together with inequality (12), shows that we cannot relax this lower bound to $\Lambda \geq 2$.

Example 4.4. Let $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ equipped with the Euclidean distance and the Lebesgue measure. Fix $1 < p < \infty$ and $0 < \beta < 1$ such that $\beta p < 1$. We show that

$$\text{cap}_{M_{p,1}^\beta}(\overline{B(0,1)}, B(0,2), B(0,2)) = 0. \tag{16}$$

Fix $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and let

$$\varphi_j(x) = \min\left\{1, 2^j \text{dist}(x, \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(0,2))\right\}$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Observe that $0 \leq \varphi_j \leq 1$ in \mathbb{R}^n , $\varphi_j(x) = 1$ for every $x \in \overline{B(0,1)}$ and $\varphi_j(x) = 0$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(0,2)$. It follows that φ_j is an admissible test function for the capacity on the left-hand side of (16). Write $B_j = B(0, 2 - 2^{-j})$ and $A_j = B(0,2) \setminus B_j$. For every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define

$$g_k(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } k < -2, \\ 2^{j\beta} \mathbf{1}_{A_j}, & \text{if } -2 \leq k < j, \\ 2^{j-k(1-\beta)} \mathbf{1}_{A_j}, & \text{if } j \leq k. \end{cases}$$

Since $\varphi_j = 1$ in B_j , a straightforward case study shows that $(g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}_{B(0,2)}^\beta(\varphi_j)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{cap}_{M_{p,1}^\beta}(\overline{B(0,1)}, B(0,2), B(0,2)) &\leq |\varphi_j|_{M_{p,1}^\beta(B(0,2))}^p \leq \int_{B(0,2)} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} g_k(x) \right)^p d\mu(x) \\
&\leq 2^{p-1} \int_{A_j} \left(\sum_{k=-2}^{j-1} 2^{j\beta} \right)^p d\mu(x) + 2^{p-1} \int_{A_j} \left(\sum_{k=j}^{\infty} 2^{j-k(1-\beta)} \right)^p d\mu(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Here

$$\int_{A_j} \left(\sum_{k=-2}^{j-1} 2^{j\beta} \right)^p d\mu(x) \leq |A_j| (j+2)^p 2^{j\beta p} \leq C(n) 2^{-j(1-\beta p)} (j+2)^p$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A_j} \left(\sum_{k=j}^{\infty} 2^{j-k(1-\beta)} \right)^p d\mu(x) &= |A_j| 2^{j\beta p} \left(\sum_{k=j}^{\infty} 2^{(j-k)(1-\beta)} \right)^p \\ &\leq C(p, n, \beta) 2^{-j(1-\beta p)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\beta p < 1$, by taking $j \rightarrow \infty$ we see that (16) holds.

We need suitable Hausdorff contents to obtain more elaborate lower bounds for relative capacities of general sets, see Theorem 4.6 below.

Definition 4.5. Let $0 < \rho \leq \infty$ and $d \geq 0$. The (ρ -restricted) Hausdorff content of codimension d of a set $F \subset X$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_\rho^{\mu, d}(F) = \inf \left\{ \sum_k \mu(B(x_k, r_k)) r_k^{-d} : F \subset \bigcup_k B(x_k, r_k) \text{ and } 0 < r_k \leq \rho \right\}.$$

For $q = \infty$ we have the following lower bound estimate for relative capacities in terms of Hausdorff contents. Observe that by (12) the corresponding result holds for all $1 \leq q < \infty$ as well. We refer to [22] for recent advances on related lower bound estimates.

Theorem 4.6. Let $1 < p < \infty$, $0 \leq \eta < p$, $0 < \beta < 1$, and $\Lambda \geq 41$, and assume that μ satisfies the reverse doubling condition (4) with a constant $0 < c_R < 1$. Let $B = B(x_0, r)$, where $x_0 \in X$ and $0 < r < (1/80) \text{diam}(X)$, and let $E \subset \bar{B}$ be a closed set. Then there exists a constant $C = C(\beta, p, \eta, c_R, c_\mu, \Lambda) > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}_{5\Lambda r}^{\mu, \beta\eta}(E) \leq C r^{\beta(p-\eta)} \text{cap}_{M_{p, \infty}^\beta}(E, 2B, \Lambda B).$$

Proof. Let $\varphi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function such that $\varphi(x) \geq 1$ for every $x \in E$ and $\varphi(x) = 0$ for every $x \in X \setminus 2B$ and let $g = (g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}_{\Lambda B}^\beta(\varphi)$. By replacing the function φ with $\max\{0, \min\{\varphi, 1\}\}$, if necessary, we may assume that $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$. Thus φ is continuous on X , $\varphi = 1$ on E , and $\varphi = 0$ on $X \setminus 2B$. Fix $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $2^{-m-1} \leq 5r < 2^{-m}$. Let $x \in E$ and write $B_0 = B(x, 2^{-m})$.

Since $8r < 80r < \text{diam}(X)$, by inequality (4) we have

$$0 \leq \varphi_{B_0} = \int_{B_0} \varphi(y) dy \leq \frac{\mu(2B)}{\mu(B_0)} \leq \frac{\mu(B(x_0, 2r))}{\mu(B(x_0, 4r))} \leq c_R < 1.$$

As a consequence, since $x \in E$, we find that

$$|\varphi(x) - \varphi_{B_0}| \geq 1 - c_R > 0.$$

Define $B_n = 2^{-n}B_0 = B(x, 2^{-(m+n)})$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By the doubling property of μ ,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < 1 - c_R \leq |\varphi(x) - \varphi_{B_0}| &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\varphi_{B_k} - \varphi_{B_0}| = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} (\varphi_{B_{n+1}} - \varphi_{B_n}) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{B_{n+1}} |\varphi(y) - \varphi_{B_n}| d\mu(y) \leq c_\mu \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{B_n} |\varphi(y) - \varphi_{B_n}| d\mu(y). \end{aligned}$$

Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Observe that $2^{-(m+n)+3} \leq 80r < \text{diam}(X)$ and that $B(x, 2^{-(m+n)+2}) \subset \Lambda B$. Hence, Lemma 3.2 implies that

$$\int_{B_n} |\varphi(y) - \varphi_{B_n}| d\mu(y) \leq C(c_\mu, c_R) 2^{-(m+n)\beta} \sum_{k=n+m-3}^{n+m} \int_{B(x, 2^{-(m+n)+2})} g_k(y) d\mu(y).$$

By combining the above estimates, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
0 < 1 - c_R &\leq c_\mu \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{B_n} |\varphi(y) - \varphi_{B_n}| d\mu(y) \\
&\leq C(c_\mu, c_R) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-(m+n)\beta} \sum_{k=n+m-3}^{n+m} \int_{B(x, 2^{-(m+n)+2})} g_k(y) d\mu(y) \\
&\leq C(c_\mu, c_R) \sum_{n=m-2}^{\infty} 2^{-n\beta} \sum_{k=n-1}^{n+2} \int_{B(x, 2^{-n})} g_k(y) d\mu(y) \\
&\leq C(c_\mu, c_R) \sum_{n=m-2}^{\infty} 2^{-n\beta} \sum_{k=n-1}^{n+2} \left(\int_{B(x, 2^{-n})} g_k(y)^p d\mu(y) \right)^{1/p} \\
&\leq C(c_\mu, c_R) \sum_{n=m-2}^{\infty} 2^{-n\beta} \left(\int_{B(x, 2^{-n})} \left(\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} g_k(y) \right)^p d\mu(y) \right)^{1/p}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\delta = \beta(p - \eta)/p > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
2^{(m-2)\delta} \sum_{n=m-2}^{\infty} 2^{-n\delta} &= C(\beta, p, \eta, c_R)(1 - c_R) \\
&\leq C(\beta, p, \eta, c_R, c_\mu) \sum_{n=m-2}^{\infty} 2^{-n\beta} \left(\int_{B(x, 2^{-n})} \left(\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} g_k(y) \right)^p d\mu(y) \right)^{1/p}.
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, by comparing the above sums it follows that there exists $n \geq m - 2$, depending on x , such that

$$\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))(2^{-n})^{-\beta\eta} \leq C(\beta, p, \eta, c_R, c_\mu) 2^{-\beta m(p-\eta)} \int_{B(x, 2^{-n})} \left(\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} g_k(y) \right)^p d\mu(y).$$

Write $r_x = 2^{-n}$ and $B_x = B(x, r_x) = B(x, 2^{-n})$. Then the previous estimate gives

$$\mu(B_x)r_x^{-\beta\eta} \leq C(\beta, p, \eta, c_R, c_\mu)r_x^{\beta(p-\eta)} \int_{B_x} \left(\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} g_k(y) \right)^p d\mu(y).$$

By the $5r$ -covering lemma [4, Lemma 1.7], we obtain points $x_\ell \in E$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, such that the balls $B_{x_\ell} \subset \Lambda B$ with radii $r_{x_\ell} \leq \Lambda r$ are pairwise disjoint and $E \subset \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{\infty} 5B_{x_\ell}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}_{5\Lambda r}^{\mu, \beta\eta}(E) &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \mu(5B_{x_\ell})(5r_{x_\ell})^{-\beta\eta} \leq Cr^{\beta(p-\eta)} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \int_{B_{x_\ell}} \left(\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} g_k(y) \right)^p d\mu(y) \\
&\leq Cr^{\beta(p-\eta)} \int_{\Lambda B} \left(\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} g_k(y) \right)^p d\mu(y).
\end{aligned}$$

The desired inequality follows by taking infimum over all functions g and φ as above. \square

5. DISCRETE POTENTIAL OPERATOR

In this section we introduce and study a discrete potential operator \mathcal{Q}_β . The main importance of this operator is that it majorizes the potential \mathcal{H}_β that is used in the next section to define the Triebel–Lizorkin (β, p, q) -capacity $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta$; see Definitions 6.1 and 6.2. Moreover, due to the Lipschitz-continuity of the bump functions $\psi_{n,i}$ that are used in the definition of \mathcal{Q}_β , this operator has better smoothing properties than \mathcal{H}_β whose definition is based on characteristic functions of balls. In particular, Lemma 5.2 seem not to be available for \mathcal{H}_β .

We begin with a construction of a partition of unity, following the ideas from [23] and [1]. Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $n \geq n_0$; recall that 2^{-n_0} is essentially $\text{diam}(X)$. By a maximal packing

argument [16, p. 101] and using the separability of X , we may select a countable number of points $x_{n,i} \in X$, $i \in P_n$, such that the balls $B(x_{n,i}, 2^{-n-1})$, $i \in P_n$, are pairwise disjoint, while

$$X = \bigcup_{i \in P_n} B(x_{n,i}, 2^{-n}). \quad (17)$$

Since X is equipped with a doubling measure μ , the balls $B(x_{n,i}, 6 \cdot 2^{-n})$ have a finite overlapping property, that is, there exists a constant $N = C(c_\mu)$ such that

$$\sum_{i \in P_n} \mathbf{1}_{B(x_{n,i}, 6 \cdot 2^{-n})} \leq N. \quad (18)$$

In addition, there are constants $\kappa = C(c_\mu)$ and $L = C(c_\mu)$ and a family of functions $\psi_{n,i}$, $i \in P_n$, with the following properties: $0 \leq \psi_{n,i} \leq 1$, $\psi_{n,i} = 0$ in $X \setminus B(x_{n,i}, 6 \cdot 2^{-n})$, $\psi_{n,i} \geq \kappa$ in $B(x_{n,i}, 3 \cdot 2^{-n})$, $\psi_{n,i}$ is $2^n L$ -Lipschitz in X , and

$$\sum_{i \in P_n} \psi_{n,i}(x) = 1$$

for every $x \in X$.

The family $\psi_{n,i}$, $i \in P_n$, is called a partition of unity subordinate to the cover $B(x_{n,i}, 2^{-n})$. We keep these families, for $n \geq n_0$, fixed throughout the rest of the paper, starting from the following definition.

Definition 5.1. Let $\beta > 0$ and let $f = (f_n)_{n=n_0}^\infty$ be a sequence of nonnegative Borel functions in X . The discrete potential $\mathcal{Q}_\beta f$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{Q}_\beta f(x) = \sum_{n=n_0}^\infty 2^{-\beta n} \sum_{i \in P_n} \psi_{n,i}(x) \int_{B(x_{n,i}, 3 \cdot 2^{-n})} f_n(y) d\mu(y), \quad x \in X.$$

The closely related discrete maximal operator is studied for instance in [1, 14]. We also mention that a median type approach to discrete potential operators appears in [15], where approximation properties of Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin functions are studied in the full range $0 < p, q < \infty$.

The following lemma allows us to control the Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin seminorm of the discrete potential $\mathcal{Q}_\beta f$ in terms of a mixed norm of f .

Lemma 5.2. Let $1 < p < \infty$, $1 < q \leq \infty$, and $0 < \beta < 1$, and assume that $f = (f_n)_{n=n_0}^\infty$ is a sequence of nonnegative Borel functions in X . Then there exists a constant $C = C(c_\mu, \beta, p, q)$ such that

$$|\mathcal{Q}_\beta f|_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta(X)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^p(X; l^q)}.$$

Proof. We may clearly assume that $\|f\|_{L^p(X; l^q)} < \infty$. If X is bounded, then we extend f as a sequence $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ by setting $f_n = 0$ if $n < n_0$. Define $g = (g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$, where

$$g_k(x) = N c_\mu 2^\beta \sum_{n=k}^\infty 2^{\beta(k-n)} M^* f_n(x) + L N c_\mu \sum_{n=-\infty}^{k-1} 2^{(\beta-1)(k-n)} M^* f_n(x)$$

for every $x \in X$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $N = C(c_\mu)$ and $L = C(c_\mu)$ are the constants from the definition of the partitions of unity $\psi_{n,i}$. We aim to show that $g \in \mathbb{D}_X^\beta(\mathcal{Q}_\beta f)$. For this purpose we fix $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x, y \in X$ such that $2^{-k-1} \leq d(x, y) < 2^{-k}$. Observe that $k \geq n_0$.

Write $B_{n,i} = B(x_{n,i}, 2^{-n})$. From the definition of \mathcal{Q}_β we obtain

$$|\mathcal{Q}_\beta f(x) - \mathcal{Q}_\beta f(y)| \leq \sum_{n=n_0}^\infty 2^{-\beta n} \sum_{i \in P_n} |\psi_{n,i}(x) - \psi_{n,i}(y)| \int_{3B_{n,i}} f_n(z) d\mu(z). \quad (19)$$

We split the outer summation in two parts. First,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \sum_{i \in P_n} |\psi_{n,i}(x) - \psi_{n,i}(y)| \int_{3B_{n,i}} f_n(z) d\mu(z) \\
& \leq 2^{-k\beta} \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} 2^{\beta(k-n)} \sum_{i \in P_n} (\psi_{n,i}(x) + \psi_{n,i}(y)) \int_{3B_{n,i}} f_n(z) d\mu(z) \\
& \leq c_\mu 2^\beta d(x, y)^\beta \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} 2^{\beta(k-n)} \sum_{i \in P_n} (\mathbf{1}_{6B_{n,i}}(x) + \mathbf{1}_{6B_{n,i}}(y)) \int_{6B_{n,i}} f_n(z) d\mu(z) \quad (20) \\
& \leq c_\mu 2^\beta d(x, y)^\beta \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} 2^{\beta(k-n)} \sum_{i \in P_n} (\mathbf{1}_{6B_{n,i}}(x) M^* f_n(x) + \mathbf{1}_{6B_{n,i}}(y) M^* f_n(y)) \\
& \leq N c_\mu 2^\beta d(x, y)^\beta \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} 2^{\beta(k-n)} (M^* f_n(x) + M^* f_n(y)).
\end{aligned}$$

Next we assume that $n_0 \leq n \leq k-1$ and $i \in P_n$. If $\psi_{n,i}(x) \neq 0$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\psi_{n,i}(x) - \psi_{n,i}(y)| \int_{3B_{n,i}} f_n(z) d\mu(z) \\
& \leq 2^n L d(x, y) \mathbf{1}_{6B_{n,i}}(x) c_\mu \int_{6B_{n,i}} f_n(z) d\mu(z) \\
& \leq 2^n L c_\mu d(x, y)^\beta 2^{-k(1-\beta)} \mathbf{1}_{6B_{n,i}}(x) M^* f_n(x).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $\psi_{n,i}(y) \neq 0$, then a similar computation shows that

$$|\psi_{n,i}(x) - \psi_{n,i}(y)| \int_{3B_{n,i}} f_n(z) d\mu(z) \leq 2^n L c_\mu d(x, y)^\beta 2^{-k(1-\beta)} \mathbf{1}_{6B_{n,i}}(y) M^* f_n(y).$$

Thus in any case we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{n=n_0}^{k-1} 2^{-\beta n} \sum_{i \in P_n} |\psi_{n,i}(x) - \psi_{n,i}(y)| \int_{3B_{n,i}} f_n(z) d\mu(z) \\
& \leq L c_\mu d(x, y)^\beta \sum_{n=n_0}^{k-1} 2^{-\beta n + n - k(1-\beta)} \sum_{i \in P_n} (\mathbf{1}_{6B_{n,i}}(x) M^* f_n(x) + \mathbf{1}_{6B_{n,i}}(y) M^* f_n(y)) \quad (21) \\
& \leq L N c_\mu d(x, y)^\beta \sum_{n=-\infty}^{k-1} 2^{(\beta-1)(k-n)} (M^* f_n(x) + M^* f_n(y)).
\end{aligned}$$

By combining inequalities (19), (20) and (21), it follows that

$$|\mathcal{Q}_\beta f(x) - \mathcal{Q}_\beta f(y)| \leq d(x, y)^\beta (g_k(x) + g_k(y)),$$

and therefore $g \in \mathbb{D}_X^\beta(\mathcal{Q}_\beta f)$.

Next, define $a = (a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$, where $a_k = N c_\mu 2^\beta \cdot 2^{\beta k}$ if $k \leq 0$ and $a_k = L N c_\mu 2^{(\beta-1)k}$ if $k > 0$. Observe that $(g_k(x))_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} = a \star (M^* f_n(x))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$, where \star designates the discrete convolution

$$(a \star (M^* f_n(x))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}})_k = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{k-n} M^* f_n(x), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Young’s convolution inequality [18, Corollary 20.14] implies for every $x \in X$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(g_k(x))_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}\|_{l^q(\mathbb{Z})} &= \|a \star (M^* f_n(x))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}\|_{l^q(\mathbb{Z})} \\ &\leq \|a\|_{l^1(\mathbb{Z})} \|(M^* f_n(x))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}\|_{l^q(\mathbb{Z})} \\ &\leq C(L, N, c_\mu, \beta) \|(M^* f_n(x))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}\|_{l^q(\mathbb{Z})}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we see that

$$|\mathcal{Q}_\beta f|_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta(X)} \leq \|(g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}\|_{L^p(X; l^q(\mathbb{Z}))} \leq C(L, N, c_\mu, \beta) \|(M^* f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}\|_{L^p(X; l^q(\mathbb{Z}))}.$$

By the Fefferman–Stein vector-valued maximal function inequality (11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|(M^* f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}\|_{L^p(X; l^q(\mathbb{Z}))} &= \left(\int_X \left(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (M^* f_n(x))^q \right)^{p/q} d\mu(x) \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq C(c_\mu, p, q) \left(\int_X \left(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f_n(x)^q \right)^{p/q} d\mu(x) \right)^{1/p} \\ &= C(c_\mu, p, q) \|(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}\|_{L^p(X; l^q(\mathbb{Z}))} \end{aligned}$$

(with the usual modification if $q = \infty$). This concludes the proof, since the constants L and N only depend on c_μ . \square

The following lemma gives for the discrete potential operator \mathcal{Q}_β a local embedding, which can be viewed as a Sobolev type inequality.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $1 < p < \infty$, $1 < q \leq \infty$, and $\beta > 0$. Assume that μ satisfies the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) for some exponent $\sigma > \beta p$, and let $f = (f_n)_{n=n_0}^\infty$ be a sequence of nonnegative Borel functions in X . Then there exists a constant $C = C(c_\sigma, p, q, \sigma, \beta, c_\mu)$ such that*

$$\left(\int_{B(x_0, r)} (\mathcal{Q}_\beta f(x))^p d\mu(x) \right)^{1/p} \leq Cr^\beta \|f\|_{L^p(X; l^q)}$$

for every $x_0 \in X$ and $r > 0$.

Proof. Fix $x_0 \in X$ and $r > 0$. If X is bounded, then we may clearly assume that $0 < r \leq 2^{-n_0}$. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $2^{-k-1} < r \leq 2^{-k}$ and let $\psi_{n,i}$ be as in the definition of \mathcal{Q}_β . We write $B_{n,i} = B(x_{n,i}, 2^{-n})$ and $\mathcal{Q}_\beta f = F + G$, where

$$F(x) = \sum_{n=k}^\infty 2^{-\beta n} \sum_{i \in P_n} \psi_{n,i}(x) \int_{3B_{n,i}} f_n(y) d\mu(y)$$

and

$$G(x) = \sum_{n=n_0}^{k-1} 2^{-\beta n} \sum_{i \in P_n} \psi_{n,i}(x) \int_{3B_{n,i}} f_n(y) d\mu(y)$$

for every $x \in X$.

Fix a point $x \in B(x_0, r)$. We estimate $F(x)$ by using Hölder's inequality, with exponents q and $q' = \frac{q}{q-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
F(x) &= 2^{-\beta k} \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta(n-k)} \sum_{i \in P_n} \psi_{n,i}(x) \int_{3B_{n,i}} f_n(y) d\mu(y) \\
&\leq 2^{-\beta k} \left(\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta(n-k)q'} \right)^{1/q'} \left(\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i \in P_n} \psi_{n,i}(x) \int_{3B_{n,i}} f_n(y) d\mu(y) \right)^q \right)^{1/q} \\
&\leq C(q, \beta, c_\mu) 2^{-\beta k} \left(\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i \in P_n} \mathbf{1}_{6B_{n,i}}(x) \int_{6B_{n,i}} f_n(y) d\mu(y) \right)^q \right)^{1/q} \\
&\leq C(q, \beta, c_\mu, N) 2^{-\beta k} \left(\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} (M^* f_n(x))^q \right)^{1/q},
\end{aligned}$$

where $N = C(c_\mu)$ is the constant from (18). By the Fefferman–Stein vector-valued maximal function inequality (11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B(x_0, r)} (F(x))^p d\mu(x) &\leq C(p, q, \beta, c_\mu, N) 2^{-\beta p k} \int_X \left(\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} (M^* f_n(x))^q \right)^{p/q} d\mu(x) \\
&\leq C(p, q, \beta, c_\mu, N) 2^{-\beta p k} \int_X \left(\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} f_n(x)^q \right)^{p/q} d\mu(x)
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

(with an obvious modification if $q = \infty$).

On the other hand, from the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) with exponent $\sigma > \beta p$, it follows that

$$1 \leq c_\sigma \frac{\mu(B(x_0, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(B(x_0, 2^{-k}))} \left(\frac{2^{-k}}{2^{-n}} \right)^\sigma = c_\sigma 2^{\sigma(n-k)} \frac{\mu(B(x_0, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(B(x_0, 2^{-k}))}$$

whenever $n_0 \leq n \leq k-1$. Fix $x \in B(x_0, r)$. We estimate $G(x)$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
G(x) &= 2^{-k\beta} \sum_{n=n_0}^{k-1} 2^{-\beta(n-k)} \sum_{i \in P_n} \psi_{n,i}(x) \int_{B(x_{n,i}, 3 \cdot 2^{-n})} f_n(y) d\mu(y) \\
&\leq c_\sigma^{1/p} 2^{-k\beta} \sum_{n=n_0}^{k-1} 2^{(\sigma/p-\beta)(n-k)} \left(\frac{\mu(B(x_0, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(B(x_0, 2^{-k}))} \right)^{1/p} \sum_{i \in P_n} \psi_{n,i}(x) \int_{3B_{n,i}} f_n(y) d\mu(y).
\end{aligned}$$

Writing $2^{(\sigma/p-\beta)(n-k)} = 2^{(\sigma/p-\beta)(n-k)/p'} 2^{(\sigma/p-\beta)(n-k)/p}$ and using Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
G(x) &\leq C(c_\sigma, p) 2^{-k\beta} \left(\sum_{n=n_0}^{k-1} 2^{(\sigma/p-\beta)(n-k)} \right)^{1/p'} \\
&\quad \times \left(\sum_{n=n_0}^{k-1} 2^{(\sigma/p-\beta)(n-k)} \frac{\mu(B(x_0, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(B(x_0, 2^{-k}))} \left(\sum_{i \in P_n} \psi_{n,i}(x) \int_{3B_{n,i}} f_n(y) d\mu(y) \right)^p \right)^{1/p}.
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Since $n_0 \leq n \leq k-1$ and $x \in B(x_0, r)$ with $r \leq 2^{-k}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(\sum_{i \in P_n} \psi_{n,i}(x) \int_{3B_{n,i}} f_n(y) d\mu(y) \right)^p \\
 & \leq \left(\sum_{i \in P_n} \mathbf{1}_{6B_{n,i}}(x) \int_{3B_{n,i}} f_n(y) d\mu(y) \right)^p \\
 & \leq C(c_\mu, p) \left(\sum_{i \in P_n} \mathbf{1}_{6B_{n,i}}(x) \int_{B(x_0, 10 \cdot 2^{-n})} f_n(y) d\mu(y) \right)^p \\
 & \leq C(c_\mu, p, N) \left(\int_{B(x_0, 10 \cdot 2^{-n})} f_n(y) d\mu(y) \right)^p \\
 & \leq C(c_\mu, p, N) \int_{B(x_0, 10 \cdot 2^{-n})} f_n(y)^p d\mu(y).
 \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

By combining the estimates (23) and (24), we see that

$$G(x) \leq C(c_\sigma, p, \sigma, \beta, c_\mu, N) 2^{-k\beta} \left(\sum_{n=n_0}^{k-1} \frac{2^{(\sigma/p-\beta)(n-k)}}{\mu(B(x_0, 2^{-k}))} \int_{B(x_0, 10 \cdot 2^{-n})} f_n(y)^p d\mu(y) \right)^{1/p}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{B(x_0, r)} G(x)^p d\mu(x) \\
 & \leq C(c_\sigma, p, \sigma, \beta, c_\mu, N) 2^{-kp\beta} \sum_{n=n_0}^{k-1} 2^{(\sigma/p-\beta)(n-k)} \int_{B(x_0, 10 \cdot 2^{-n})} f_n(y)^p d\mu(y) \\
 & \leq C(c_\sigma, p, \sigma, \beta, c_\mu, N) 2^{-kp\beta} \sum_{n=n_0}^{k-1} 2^{(\sigma/p-\beta)(n-k)} \int_X \left(\sum_{m=n_0}^{k-1} f_m(y)^q \right)^{p/q} d\mu(y) \\
 & \leq C(c_\sigma, p, \sigma, \beta, c_\mu, N) 2^{-kp\beta} \int_X \left(\sum_{n=n_0}^{k-1} f_n(y)^q \right)^{p/q} d\mu(y)
 \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

(with an obvious modification if $q = \infty$).

By combining the estimates (22) and (25), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{B(x_0, r)} (\mathcal{Q}_\beta f(x))^p d\mu(x) & \leq 2^{p-1} \int_{B(x_0, r)} (F(x))^p d\mu(x) + 2^{p-1} \int_{B(x_0, r)} (G(x))^p d\mu(x) \\
 & \leq C(c_\sigma, p, q, \sigma, \beta, c_\mu, N) 2^{-kp\beta} \int_X \left(\sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} f_n(y)^q \right)^{p/q} d\mu(y) \\
 & \leq C(c_\sigma, p, q, \sigma, \beta, c_\mu, N) r^{\beta p} \|f\|_{L^p(X; l^q)}^p.
 \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof since $N = C(c_\mu)$. \square

6. CAPACITY WITH RESPECT TO A POTENTIAL

Next we define the potential \mathcal{H}_β and the associated Triebel–Lizorkin capacity $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta$. The main goal in this section is to show that the capacities $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta$ and $\text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}$ are equivalent, as was stated in Theorem 1.1 in the introduction. The proof of Theorem 1.1 follows by combining Theorems 6.5 and 6.6 that are presented at the end of this section.

The discrete potential operator \mathcal{Q}_β serves as an important technical tool in the proof of Theorem 6.5. More precisely, in Lemmas 6.3 and 6.4 we connect \mathcal{Q}_β with the potential \mathcal{H}_β and the capacity $\text{cap}_{M_{p,q}^\beta}$, respectively, and these two elements are then brought together in the proof of Theorem 6.5. On the other hand, Theorem 6.6 follows by a much more direct argument.

Definition 6.1. Let $\beta > 0$ and let $f = (f_n)_{n=n_0}^\infty$ be a sequence of nonnegative Borel functions in X . The potential $\mathcal{H}_\beta f$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_\beta f(x) = \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \int_X \frac{\mathbf{1}_{B(y, 2^{-n})}(x)}{\mu(B(y, 2^{-n}))} f_n(y) d\mu(y), \quad x \in X.$$

We use potentials \mathcal{H}_β to define the capacity $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta$, by adapting the treatment in [3, Section 4.4] to the metric space setting. This approach is a Triebel–Lizorkin variant of the so-called Meyer’s theory of L^p -capacities, that was initially developed in [30]. See also [35, Section 3.2] for a clear presentation of the L^p -theory in (weighted) Euclidean spaces.

Definition 6.2. Let $1 < p < \infty$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, and $\beta > 0$. The (β, p, q) -capacity of a set $E \subset X$ is defined by

$$\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E) = \inf \left\{ \|f\|_{L^p(X; l^q)}^p : f = (f_n)_{n=n_0}^\infty \geq 0 \text{ and } \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x) \geq 1 \text{ for all } x \in E \right\},$$

where $(f_n)_{n=n_0}^\infty \geq 0$ in the infimum means that $(f_n)_{n=n_0}^\infty$ is a sequence of nonnegative Borel functions in X .

Observe that if $F \subset E \subset X$ and $1 \leq \tau \leq q \leq \infty$, then

$$\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(F) \leq \text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E) \leq \text{Cap}_{p,\tau}^\beta(E). \quad (26)$$

We have the following pointwise comparison between the potentials $\mathcal{H}_\beta f$ and $\mathcal{Q}_\beta f$.

Lemma 6.3. Let $\beta > 0$ and let $f = (f_n)_{n=n_0}^\infty$ be a sequence of nonnegative Borel functions in X . Then there exists a constant $C = C(c_\mu) > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}_\beta f(x) \leq C \mathcal{Q}_\beta f(x)$$

for every $x \in X$.

Proof. Let $x \in X$, let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $n \geq n_0$, and let functions $\psi_{n,i}$, $i \in P_n$, be as in the definition of $\mathcal{Q}_\beta f$, see Definition 5.1. By the covering property (17), there exists $j \in P_n$ such that $x \in B(x_{n,j}, 2^{-n})$. Then $B(x, 2^{-n}) \subset B(x_{n,j}, 3 \cdot 2^{-n}) \subset B(y, 5 \cdot 2^{-n})$ for every $y \in B(x, 2^{-n})$. Observe also that $\mathbf{1}_{B(y, 2^{-n})}(x) = \mathbf{1}_{B(x, 2^{-n})}(y)$ for every $y \in X$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{-\beta n} \int_X \frac{\mathbf{1}_{B(y, 2^{-n})}(x)}{\mu(B(y, 2^{-n}))} f_n(y) d\mu(y) &\leq c_\mu^3 2^{-\beta n} \int_{B(x_{n,j}, 3 \cdot 2^{-n})} f_n(y) d\mu(y) \\ &\leq \kappa^{-1} c_\mu^3 2^{-\beta n} \psi_{n,j}(x) \int_{B(x_{n,j}, 3 \cdot 2^{-n})} f_n(y) d\mu(y) \\ &\leq \kappa^{-1} c_\mu^3 2^{-\beta n} \sum_{i \in P_n} \psi_{n,i}(x) \int_{B(x_{n,i}, 3 \cdot 2^{-n})} f_n(y) d\mu(y), \end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa = C(c_\mu)$ is as in the definition of the functions $\psi_{n,i}$. By summing over all $n \geq n_0$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x) &= \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \int_X \frac{\mathbf{1}_{B(y, 2^{-n})}(x)}{\mu(B(y, 2^{-n}))} f_n(y) d\mu(y) \\ &\leq \kappa^{-1} c_\mu^3 \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \sum_{i \in P_n} \psi_{n,i}(x) \int_{B(x_{n,i}, 3 \cdot 2^{-n})} f_n(y) d\mu(y) = \kappa^{-1} c_\mu^3 \mathcal{Q}_\beta f(x), \end{aligned}$$

and this concludes the proof. \square

Next we connect the relative Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin capacity to the \mathcal{Q}_β potentials.

Lemma 6.4. *Let $1 < p < \infty$, $1 < q \leq \infty$, $0 < \beta < 1$, and $\Lambda \geq 2$. Assume that μ satisfies the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) for some exponent $\sigma > \beta p$. Let $B \subset X$ be a ball, let $E \subset \overline{B}$ be a compact set, and let $f = (f_n)_{n=n_0}^\infty$ is sequence of nonnegative Borel functions in X such that $\mathcal{Q}_\beta f(x) \geq 1$ for every $x \in E$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(c_\sigma, p, q, \sigma, \beta, c_\mu, \Lambda) > 0$ such that*

$$\text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(E, 2B, \Lambda B) \leq C \|f\|_{L^p(X; l^q)}^p. \quad (27)$$

Proof. Clearly, we may assume that the right-hand side of (27) is finite. First we consider the case where $\mathcal{Q}_\beta f$ is continuous. We truncate $\mathcal{Q}_\beta f$ and then use the fractional type Leibniz rule, as follows. Write $B = B(x_0, r) \subset X$, with $x_0 \in X$ and $r > 0$, and let

$$\eta(x) = \max\left\{0, 1 - \frac{\text{dist}(x, B)}{r}\right\}$$

for every $x \in X$. Then

$$|\eta(x) - \eta(y)| \leq \frac{d(x, y)}{r}, \quad \text{for every } x, y \in X,$$

$0 \leq \eta \leq 1$ in X , $\eta = 1$ in the closure \overline{B} , and $\eta = 0$ in $X \setminus 2B$. The function $\varphi = \eta \mathcal{Q}_\beta f$ is continuous in X . Since $E \subset \overline{B}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_\beta f \geq 1$ in E , we have $\varphi \geq 1$ in E , and clearly $\varphi = 0$ in $X \setminus 2B$. Let $g = (g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{D}_X^\beta(\mathcal{Q}_\beta f)$. Lemma 3.3 implies that $(\rho_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}_X^\beta(\varphi)$, where

$$\rho_k = (g_k \|\eta\|_\infty + 2^{k(\beta-1)} r^{-1} \mathcal{Q}_\beta f) \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in X : \eta(x) \neq 0\}}, \quad \text{for every } k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Let m be the smallest integer such that $2^{-m-1} \leq 2\Lambda r$. Observe that $(\mathbf{1}_{k \geq m} \rho_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}_{\Lambda B}^\beta(\varphi)$.

By Definition 4.2 of the capacity $\text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(E, 2B, \Lambda B) &\leq |\varphi|_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta(\Lambda B)}^p \leq \int_{\Lambda B} \left(\sum_{k \geq m} \rho_k(x) \right)^{p/q} d\mu(x) \\ &\leq C(p) \int_{2B} \left(\sum_{k \geq m} g_k(x) \right)^{p/q} d\mu(x) + C(p) \int_{2B} \left(\sum_{k \geq m} (2^{k(\beta-1)} r^{-1} \mathcal{Q}_\beta f(x))^q \right)^{p/q} d\mu(x) \\ &\leq C(p) \int_X \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} g_k(x) \right)^{p/q} d\mu(x) + C(p) r^{-p} \left(\sum_{k \geq m} 2^{kq(\beta-1)} \right)^{p/q} \int_{2B} (\mathcal{Q}_\beta f(x))^p d\mu(x) \\ &\leq C(p) \int_X \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} g_k(x) \right)^{p/q} d\mu(x) + C(p, q, \beta) r^{-p} 2^{mp(\beta-1)} \int_{2B} (\mathcal{Q}_\beta f(x))^p d\mu(x) \\ &\leq C(p) \int_X \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} g_k(x) \right)^{p/q} d\mu(x) + C(p, q, \beta, \Lambda) r^{-\beta p} \int_{2B} (\mathcal{Q}_\beta f(x))^p d\mu(x). \end{aligned}$$

By taking infimum over all g as above, we obtain

$$\text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(E, 2B, \Lambda B) \leq C(p) |\mathcal{Q}_\beta f|_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta(X)}^p + C(p, q, \beta, \Lambda) r^{-\beta p} \int_{2B} (\mathcal{Q}_\beta f(x))^p d\mu(x),$$

and the claim in the present case follows from Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3.

Next we consider the case where the function $\mathcal{Q}_\beta f$ is not continuous. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $h_k = (h_{k,n})_{n=n_0}^\infty$, where $h_{k,n} = \mathbf{1}_{|n| \leq k} f_n$ for every $n \geq n_0$. Then $(\mathcal{Q}_\beta h_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an increasing

sequence of continuous real-valued functions in X that converges to $\mathcal{Q}_\beta f$ pointwise in X . We consider the open sets

$$E_k = \left\{ x \in X : \mathcal{Q}_\beta h_k(x) > \frac{1}{2} \right\}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since $\mathcal{Q}_\beta f(x) \geq 1$ for every $x \in E$, we see that $E \subset \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} E_k$. By the compactness of E , there exists a finite subcover, and since $E_n \subset E_{n+1}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $E \subset E_k$. Thus we have $\mathcal{Q}_\beta(2h_k) > 1$ in E , and by the first part of the proof

$$\text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(E, 2B, \Lambda B) \leq C \|2h_k\|_{L^p(X;l^q)}^p \leq 2^p C \|f\|_{L^p(X;l^q)}^p.$$

This shows that inequality (27) holds also in the non-continuous case, and the proof is complete. \square

We now have all the tools needed for the comparison of the two capacities. We begin with the second inequality in (1).

Theorem 6.5. *Let $1 < p < \infty$, $1 < q \leq \infty$, $0 < \beta < 1$, and $\Lambda \geq 2$, and assume that μ satisfies the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) for some exponent $\sigma > \beta p$. Let $B \subset X$ be a ball and $E \subset \bar{B}$ be a compact set. Then there exists a constant $C = C(c_\sigma, p, q, \sigma, \beta, c_\mu, \Lambda) > 0$ such that*

$$\text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(E, 2B, \Lambda B) \leq C \text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E). \quad (28)$$

Proof. We may assume that $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E) < \infty$. Let $f = (f_n)_{n=n_0}^\infty$ be a sequence of nonnegative Borel functions in X such that $\mathcal{H}_\beta f \geq 1$ in E . By Lemma 6.3, there is a constant $C = C(c_\mu) > 0$ such that $C \mathcal{Q}_\beta f(x) \geq 1$ for every $x \in E$. Hence $\mathcal{Q}_\beta(Cf)(x) \geq 1$ for every $x \in E$ and therefore Lemma 6.4 implies that

$$\text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(E, 2B, \Lambda B) \leq C(c_\sigma, p, q, \sigma, \beta, c_\mu, \Lambda) \|Cf\|_{L^p(X;l^q)}^p \leq C(c_\sigma, p, q, \sigma, \beta, c_\mu, \Lambda) \|f\|_{L^p(X;l^q)}^p.$$

Inequality (28) follows by taking infimum over all sequences f as above. \square

The converse inequality, that is, the first inequality in (1), requires further restrictions on Λ and r , but otherwise the assumptions are less restrictive than in Theorem 6.5.

Theorem 6.6. *Let $1 < p < \infty$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, $0 < \beta < 1$, and $\Lambda \geq 41$, and assume that μ satisfies the reverse doubling condition (4), with a constant $0 < c_R < 1$. Assume that $B = B(x_0, r)$, with $x_0 \in X$ and $0 < r < (1/80) \text{diam}(X)$, and let $E \subset \bar{B}$ be a closed set. Then there exists a constant $C = C(p, c_\mu, c_R) > 0$ such that*

$$\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E) \leq C \text{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(E, 2B, \Lambda B).$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 4.6. Let $\varphi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function such that $\varphi(x) \geq 1$ for every $x \in E$ and $\varphi(x) = 0$ for every $x \in X \setminus 2B$, and let $g = (g_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{D}_{\Lambda B}^\beta(\varphi)$. By replacing φ with $\max\{0, \min\{\varphi, 1\}\}$, if necessary, we may assume that $0 \leq \varphi \leq 1$.

Let $x \in E$ and let $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $2^{-m-1} \leq 5r < 2^{-m}$. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 4.6 and using the inclusion $B(x, 2^{-n}) \subset B(x_0, \Lambda r)$ if $n \geq m - 2$, we obtain

$$0 < 1 - c_R \leq C(c_\mu, c_R) \sum_{n=m-2}^{\infty} 2^{-n\beta} \sum_{k=n-1}^{n+2} \int_{B(x, 2^{-n})} \mathbf{1}_{\Lambda B}(y) g_k(y) d\mu(y).$$

Define $f = (f_n)_{n \geq n_0}$, where $f_n = \mathbf{1}_{\Delta B} \sum_{k=n-1}^{n+2} g_k$ for each $n \geq n_0$. Since $m - 2 > n_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < 1 - c_R &\leq C(c_\mu, c_R) \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-n\beta} \int_{B(x, 2^{-n})} f_n(y) d\mu(y) \\ &\leq C(c_\mu, c_R) \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-n\beta} \int_X \frac{\mathbf{1}_{B(y, 2^{-n})}(x)}{\mu(B(y, 2^{-n}))} f_n(y) d\mu(y) \\ &= C(c_\mu, c_R) \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, there exists a constant $C = C(c_\mu, c_R) > 0$ such that $\mathcal{H}_\beta(Cf)(x) \geq 1$ for every $x \in E$. Thus

$$\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E) \leq \|Cf\|_{L^p(X;l^q)}^p = C^p \|f\|_{L^p(X;l^q)}^p \leq (4C)^p \|g\|_{L^p(\Delta B;l^q)}^p,$$

and the claim follows by taking infimum first over all g and then over all φ as above. \square

7. DUAL CHARACTERIZATION OF CAPACITY

We now turn to the dual characterization of the capacity $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta$ given in terms of measures, see Theorem 7.3 below. In Euclidean spaces, this type of results have a long history, see for instance [2, 3, 30] and the references therein. We prove the dual characterization by adapting the proof of equality (4.4.7) in [3] to the setting of metric measure spaces. A fundamental tool in the proof is the Minimax theorem [3, Theorem 2.4.1]. The somewhat technical task of verifying the assumptions of the Minimax theorem in our setting is carried out separately in Lemma 7.4.

Definition 7.1. Let $\beta > 0$ and let ν be a nonnegative Borel measure in X . We define

$$\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu(x) = \left(2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} \right)_{n=n_0}^{\infty}, \quad x \in X. \quad (29)$$

Of particular interest to us are the nonnegative Radon measures on a compact set $E \subset X$.

Definition 7.2. Let $E \subset X$ be a compact set. We say that ν is a nonnegative Radon measure on E , if ν is a nonnegative Borel measure on E that satisfies the following properties:

- $\nu(E) < \infty$.
- For every Borel set F in E , we have

$$\nu(F) = \inf\{\nu(U) : F \subset U \text{ and } U \text{ is open in } E\}.$$

- For every Borel set F in E , we have

$$\nu(F) = \sup\{\nu(K) : K \subset F \text{ and } K \text{ is compact in } E\}.$$

We denote by $\mathcal{M}^+(E)$ the set of all nonnegative Radon measures on E . If f is a Borel function on X and $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(E)$, we define

$$\int_X f d\nu = \int_E f|_E d\nu.$$

We also define $\nu(A) = \nu(A \cap E)$ if $A \subset X$ is a Borel set, and this extends ν as a nonnegative Borel measure in X .

We are ready to state and prove the dual characterization of the capacity.

Theorem 7.3. Let $1 < p < \infty$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, and $\beta > 0$, and let $E \subset X$ be a compact set. Then

$$\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E)^{1/p} = \sup \left\{ \frac{\nu(E)}{\|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X;l^{q'})}} : \nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(E) \right\}.$$

Proof. Let $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(E)$, let $f = (f_n)_{n=n_0}^\infty$ be a sequence of nonnegative Borel functions, and write

$$\mathcal{E}_\beta(\nu, f) = \int_X \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x) d\nu(x).$$

Using Definition 6.1 and Fubini's theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\beta(\nu, f) &= \sum_{n=n_0}^\infty 2^{-\beta n} \int_X \int_X \frac{\mathbf{1}_{B(y, 2^{-n})}(x)}{\mu(B(y, 2^{-n}))} f_n(y) d\mu(y) d\nu(x) \\ &= \sum_{n=n_0}^\infty 2^{-\beta n} \int_X \frac{f_n(y)}{\mu(B(y, 2^{-n}))} \int_X \mathbf{1}_{B(y, 2^{-n})}(x) d\nu(x) d\mu(y) \\ &= \int_X \sum_{n=n_0}^\infty 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu(B(y, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(B(y, 2^{-n}))} f_n(y) d\mu(y) \\ &= \int_X \langle \check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu(y), f(y) \rangle d\mu(y). \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Now, assume that $\mathcal{H}_\beta f(x) \geq 1$ for all $x \in E$. Then, by using also Hölder's inequality twice, we get

$$\nu(E) \leq \mathcal{E}_\beta(\nu, f) \leq \|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^{q'})} \|f\|_{L^p(X; l^q)}.$$

By taking infimum over all sequences f with $\mathcal{H}_\beta f \geq 1$ in E , we thus obtain

$$\frac{\nu(E)}{\|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^{q'})}} \leq \text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E)^{1/p}.$$

Taking supremum over all $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(E)$ gives

$$\sup \left\{ \frac{\nu(E)}{\|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^{q'})}} : \nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(E) \right\} \leq \text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E)^{1/p}.$$

For the converse inequality, we will use the Minimax theorem [3, Theorem 2.4.1]; we refer to Lemma 7.4 for further details. Define

$$Z = \{\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(E) : \nu(E) = 1\}$$

and

$$W = \{f \in L^p(X; l^q) : f = (f_n)_{n=n_0}^\infty \geq 0 \text{ and } \|f\|_{L^p(X; l^q)} \leq 1\}.$$

Observe from [11, Lemma 2.3] and (30) that for $\nu \in Z$ we have

$$\frac{\|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^{q'})}}{\nu(E)} = \sup_{f \in W} \int_X \langle \check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu(y), f(y) \rangle d\mu(y) = \sup_{f \in W} \mathcal{E}_\beta(\nu, f).$$

By taking infimum over all $\nu \in Z$, we get

$$\inf_{\nu \in Z} \frac{\|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^{q'})}}{\nu(E)} = \inf_{\nu \in Z} \sup_{f \in W} \mathcal{E}_\beta(\nu, f). \tag{31}$$

On the other hand, since the Dirac delta measure δ_x belongs to Z for any $x \in E$, we have

$$\inf_{\nu \in Z} \mathcal{E}_\beta(\nu, f) = \inf_{\nu \in Z} \int_X \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x) d\nu(x) \leq \inf_{x \in E} \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x) \leq \frac{\inf_{x \in E} \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x)}{\|f\|_{L^p(X; l^q)}}$$

for every $f \in W$. By scaling and Definition 6.2, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sup_{f \in W} \inf_{\nu \in Z} \mathcal{E}_\beta(\nu, f) &\leq \sup_{f \in W} \frac{\inf_{x \in E} \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x)}{\|f\|_{L^p(X; l^q)}} = \sup_{0 \leq f \in L^p(X; l^q)} \frac{\inf_{x \in E} \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x)}{\|f\|_{L^p(X; l^q)}} \\
 &= \sup_{0 \leq f \in L^p(X; l^q)} \left(\left\| \frac{f}{\inf_{x \in E} \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x)} \right\|_{L^p(X; l^q)}^p \right)^{-1/p} \\
 &= \left(\inf_{0 \leq f \in L^p(X; l^q)} \left\| \frac{f}{\inf_{x \in E} \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x)} \right\|_{L^p(X; l^q)}^p \right)^{-1/p} \leq \text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E)^{-1/p}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

By (31), the Minimax theorem in the following Lemma 7.4, and (32) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \inf_{\nu \in Z} \frac{\|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^{q'})}}{\nu(E)} &= \inf_{\nu \in Z} \sup_{f \in W} \mathcal{E}_\beta(\nu, f) = \sup_{f \in W} \inf_{\nu \in Z} \mathcal{E}_\beta(\nu, f) \\
 &\leq \sup_{f \in W} \inf_{\nu \in Z} \mathcal{E}_\beta(\nu, f) \leq \text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E)^{-1/p}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E)^{1/p} \leq \sup_{\nu \in Z} \frac{\nu(E)}{\|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^{q'})}} \leq \sup \left\{ \frac{\nu(E)}{\|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^{q'})}} : \nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(E) \right\},$$

as claimed. \square

To complete the proof of Theorem 7.3, we still need to verify that the Minimax theorem is valid in our setting. The underlying ideas are well known, but we present the details for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 7.4. *Under the notation of the proof of Theorem 7.3, we have*

$$\inf_{\nu \in Z} \sup_{f \in W} \mathcal{E}_\beta(\nu, f) = \sup_{f \in W} \inf_{\nu \in Z} \mathcal{E}_\beta(\nu, f).$$

Proof. Since E is compact, the Riesz representation theorem [34, Theorem 6.19] implies that every $T \in (C(E), \|\cdot\|_\infty)^*$ is represented by a unique regular Borel measure ν , in the sense that $T(g) = \int_E g d\nu$ for every $f \in C(E)$. The operator norm $\|\nu\|$ of ν is the total variation of ν . Hence, we can regard Z as a subset of the dual $(C(E), \|\cdot\|_\infty)^*$, and endow Z with the relative weak* topology.

We will apply the Minimax theorem [3, Theorem 2.4.1] to the functional \mathcal{E}_β defined in $Z \times W$. The sets Z and W are convex and \mathcal{E}_β is convex in Z and concave in W , see [3, p. 30]. Hence, we need to show that

- (a) Z is a Hausdorff space,
- (b) Z is compact, and
- (c) for any $f \in W$, the functional $\mathcal{E}_\beta(\cdot, f)$ is lower semicontinuous in Z .

We first prove (a). Let $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in Z = \{\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(E) : \nu(E) = 1\}$ be two distinct measures. By the uniqueness part of the Riesz representation theorem, there exist a real-valued $g \in C(E)$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\int_E g d\nu_1 < \alpha < \int_E g d\nu_2$. Then

$$U = \left\{ \nu \in Z : \int_E g d\nu < \alpha \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad V = \left\{ \nu \in Z : \int_E g d\nu > \alpha \right\}$$

are open and disjoint subsets of Z , and $\nu_1 \in U$ and $\nu_2 \in V$. Thus Z is a Hausdorff space.

Next we prove (b). Given $\nu \in Z$, the operator norm of ν on $(C(E), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$ is $\|\nu\| = \nu(E) = 1$, and therefore

$$Z \subset \overline{B}(0, 1) = \{\nu \in (C(E), \|\cdot\|_\infty)^* : \|\nu\| \leq 1\}.$$

Recall that Z is equipped with the relative weak* topology. By the Banach–Alaoglu theorem, the closed unit ball $\overline{B}(0, 1)$ is compact in the weak* topology. Hence, in order to show that Z is compact, it suffices to verify that Z is closed in the weak* topology of $(C(E), \|\cdot\|_\infty)^*$. Write

$$G = \{g \in C(E) : g(E) \subset [0, \infty)\}.$$

For every $g \in G$ we define $\Lambda_g : (C(E), \|\cdot\|_\infty)^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\Lambda_g(\nu) = \int_E g \, d\nu$. Then the functionals Λ_g are continuous for every $g \in G$ and

$$Z = \Lambda_1^{-1}(\{1\}) \cap \bigcap_{g \in G} \Lambda_g^{-1}([0, \infty)).$$

Indeed, above the inclusion from left to right is immediate. Conversely, if $\nu \in (C(E), \|\cdot\|_\infty)^*$ belongs to the set on the right-hand side, then $\nu(E) = 1$ and $0 \leq \int_E g \, d\nu < \infty$ for all $g \in C(E)$ satisfying $0 \leq g < \infty$ in E . Hence ν is a nonnegative linear functional on $C(E)$, and [34, Theorem 2.14] implies that $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(E)$. Thus $\nu \in Z$, and it follows that Z is closed in $(C(E), \|\cdot\|_\infty)^*$ since it is an intersection of closed sets.

It remains to prove condition (c). Since $E \subset X$ is compact, by Stone–Weierstrass theorem and Urysohn’s lemma, the Banach space $(C(E), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$ is separable. Since $Z \subset (C(E), \|\cdot\|_\infty)^*$ is weak* compact, the weak* topology relative to Z is metrizable. Hence, it suffices to show sequential lower semicontinuity. To this end, we fix $f \in W$. Recall that

$$\mathcal{H}_\beta f(x) = \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \int_X \frac{\mathbf{1}_{B(y, 2^{-n})}(x)}{\mu(B(y, 2^{-n}))} f_n(y) \, d\mu(y), \quad x \in X.$$

For each fixed $n \geq n_0$, we define a function $g_n : E \rightarrow [0, \infty]$,

$$g_n(x) = 2^{-\beta n} \int_X \frac{\mathbf{1}_{B(y, 2^{-n})}(x)}{\mu(B(y, 2^{-n}))} f_n(y) \, d\mu(y), \quad x \in E.$$

Let $x \in E$ and let $(x_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in E such that $x_j \rightarrow x$ in E . Then

$$\mathbf{1}_{B(y, 2^{-n})}(x) \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{1}_{B(y, 2^{-n})}(x_j)$$

for all $y \in X$. Thus, by Fatou’s lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} g_n(x) &\leq 2^{-\beta n} \int_X \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\mathbf{1}_{B(y, 2^{-n})}(x_j)}{\mu(B(y, 2^{-n}))} f_n(y) \right) \, d\mu(y) \\ &\leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} 2^{-\beta n} \int_X \frac{\mathbf{1}_{B(y, 2^{-n})}(x_j)}{\mu(B(y, 2^{-n}))} f_n(y) \, d\mu(y) = \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} g_n(x_j). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the function g_n is lower semicontinuous in E , and therefore also $\mathcal{H}_\beta f = \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} g_n$ is lower semicontinuous in E . By [17, Proposition 4.2.2], there exists a sequence $(h_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of continuous functions in E such that $0 \leq h_1(x) \leq h_2(x) \leq \dots \leq \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x)$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_k(x) = \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x)$ for every $x \in E$. Now, let $\nu \in Z$ and let $(\nu_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in Z such that $\nu_i \rightarrow \nu$ in Z . Then, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E h_k(x) \, d\nu(x) &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_E h_k(x) \, d\nu_i(x) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_E \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x) \, d\nu_i(x) \\ &= \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_X \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x) \, d\nu_i(x). \end{aligned}$$

By using also the monotone convergence theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\beta(\nu, f) &= \int_X \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x) \, d\nu(x) = \int_E \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x) \, d\nu(x) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_E h_k(x) \, d\nu(x) \\ &\leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_X \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x) \, d\nu_i(x) = \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_\beta(\nu_i, f). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\mathcal{E}_\beta(\cdot, f)$ is sequentially lower semicontinuous, and the proof is complete. \square

8. MUCKENHOUP–WHEEDEN THEOREM

The original formulation of the celebrated Muckenhoupt–Wheeden Theorem in [31] bounds the L^p -norm of the Riesz potential by the L^p -norm of a fractional maximal function in the (suitably weighted) Euclidean space. In Theorem 8.3 we present a variant of this result for the mixed $L^p(X, l^1)$ -norm of the operator $\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta$. Theorem 8.3 could actually be obtained as a consequence of a very general metric space formulation of the Muckenhoupt–Wheeden Theorem in [33], but for the sake of completeness and transparency we give below a more organic and self-contained proof. In fact, the application of the general result from [33] would still require rather tedious verification of the various assumptions; compare for instance to [8, Theorem 4.2]. Our proof of Theorem 8.3 follows the general approach in [3, Theorem 3.6.1], based on a good λ -inequality, but the present setting requires several modifications.

For the formulation of Theorem 8.3, we need fractional maximal functions.

Definition 8.1. Let $\beta \geq 0$ and let ν be a nonnegative Borel measure in X . The fractional maximal function $M_\beta \nu$ is defined by

$$M_\beta \nu(x) = \sup_{0 < r \leq 2^{-n_0}} r^\beta \frac{\nu(B(x, r))}{\mu(B(x, r))}, \quad x \in X. \quad (33)$$

When X is unbounded, the supremum is taken over all radii $0 < r < \infty$. When $\beta = 0$ we get the centered maximal function which is denoted by $M\nu = M_0\nu$.

We need the following technical lemma concerning lower semicontinuity. Recall that here $\bar{B}(x, 2^{-n})$ is the closed ball centered at x .

Lemma 8.2. Let $\beta > 0$ and let ν be a nonnegative Borel measure in X . Then the function

$$\sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(\bar{B}(x, 2^{-n}))}, \quad x \in X,$$

is lower semicontinuous in X .

Proof. Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $n \geq n_0$. By the properties of semicontinuous functions, see [5, p. 362], it suffices to show that the nonnegative functions $f(x) = \nu(B(x, 2^{-n}))$ and $g(x) = \mu(\bar{B}(x, 2^{-n}))^{-1}$ are lower semicontinuous in X . Let $x \in X$ and let $(x_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in X such that $x_j \rightarrow x$ in X . By Fatou's lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= \int_X \mathbf{1}_{B(x, 2^{-n})}(y) d\nu(y) \leq \int_X \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{1}_{B(x_j, 2^{-n})}(y) d\nu(y) \\ &\leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_X \mathbf{1}_{B(x_j, 2^{-n})}(y) d\nu(y) = \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} f(x_j), \end{aligned}$$

showing that f is lower semicontinuous in X .

Define $h(x) = \mu(\bar{B}(x, 2^{-n}))$, $x \in X$. Then, if $(x_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence converging to $x \in X$ as above, we have

$$h(x) = \int_X \mathbf{1}_{\bar{B}(x, 2^{-n})}(y) d\mu(y) \geq \int_X \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{1}_{\bar{B}(x_j, 2^{-n})}(y) d\mu(y).$$

Write $\bar{B}_j = \bar{B}(x_j, 2^{-n})$ and $B = B(x, M)$, where $M > 0$ is chosen so that $\bar{B}_j \subset B$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\mathbf{1}_{\bar{B}_j} \leq \mathbf{1}_B \in L^1(d\mu)$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. By applying Fatou's lemma to the nonnegative

functions $\mathbf{1}_B - \mathbf{1}_{\overline{B}_j}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(B) - \int_X \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{1}_{\overline{B}_j}(y) d\mu(y) &= \int_X \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{1}_B - \mathbf{1}_{\overline{B}_j})(y) d\mu(y) \\ &\leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_X (\mathbf{1}_B - \mathbf{1}_{\overline{B}_j})(y) d\mu(y) \\ &= \mu(B) - \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_X \mathbf{1}_{\overline{B}_j}(y) d\mu(y). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we see that

$$h(x) \geq \int_X \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{1}_{\overline{B}_j}(y) d\mu(y) \geq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_X \mathbf{1}_{\overline{B}_j}(y) d\mu(y) = \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} h(x_j).$$

Therefore

$$g(x) = \frac{1}{h(x)} \leq \frac{1}{\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} h(x_j)} = \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h(x_j)} = \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} g(x_j),$$

and thus also g is lower semicontinuous in X . \square

The following proof is an adaptation of the proof of [3, Theorem 3.6.1]. As usual, it is possible to generalize Theorem 8.3 to Muckenhoupt A_∞ weighted setting.

Theorem 8.3. *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $\beta > 0$. Assume that μ satisfies the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) for some exponent $\sigma > \beta$, and let ν be a nonnegative Borel measure in X . Then there exists a constant $C = C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma, p)$ such that*

$$\|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^p(X; l^1)} \leq C \|M_\beta \nu\|_{L^p(X)}. \quad (34)$$

Proof. Observe that we have, for every $x \in X$,

$$\|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu(x)\|_{l^1} = \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} \leq c_\mu \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(\overline{B}(x, 2^{-n}))}.$$

Throughout the proof, we use the function

$$h(x) = \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(\overline{B}(x, 2^{-n}))}, \quad x \in X.$$

The advantage of h compared to $\|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu(x)\|_{l^1}$ is the lower semicontinuity in X , given by Lemma 8.2.

If X is bounded, we can make a further reduction concerning the measure ν by assuming that there exists $z \in X$ such that

$$\nu(B(z, \frac{1}{3} \text{diam}(X))) = 0. \quad (35)$$

Indeed, if X is bounded, we fix points $x, y \in X$ such that $d(x, y) \geq (2/3) \text{diam}(X)$. Let $B_x = B(x, (1/3) \text{diam}(X))$ and $B_y = B(y, (1/3) \text{diam}(X))$, whence $B_x \cap B_y = \emptyset$. Define Borel measures ν_x and ν_y in X by setting $\nu_x(A) = \nu(A \setminus B_x)$ and $\nu_y(A) = \nu(A \setminus B_y)$ for all Borel sets $A \subset X$. Then

$$\nu(A) = \nu((A \setminus B_x) \cup (A \setminus B_y)) \leq \nu_x(A) + \nu_y(A),$$

for all Borel sets $A \subset X$, and it follows that

$$\|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^p(X; l^1)} \leq \|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu_x\|_{L^p(X; l^1)} + \|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu_y\|_{L^p(X; l^1)}.$$

Observe also that $M_\beta \nu_x \leq M_\beta \nu$ and $M_\beta \nu_y \leq M_\beta \nu$. Hence, if X is bounded, then by considering the measures ν_x and ν_y instead of ν we may assume that (35) holds for some $z \in X$.

By arguing as in [3, p. 73], for the claim (34) it is sufficient to establish the following good λ -inequality: There exists constants $a = 2 \cdot c_\mu^5(1 + 4 \cdot 2^{4\beta}) > 1$, $C_1 = C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma) > 0$ and $C_2 = C(c_\mu) \geq 1$ such that for all $\lambda > 0$ and all $0 < \varepsilon \leq (3c_\mu^2)^{-1}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu(\{x \in X : h(x) > a\lambda\}) \\ & \leq C_1 \varepsilon \mu(\{x \in X : h(x) > \lambda\}) + C_2 \mu(\{x \in X : M_\beta \nu(x) > \varepsilon \lambda\}). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

To this end, fix $\lambda > 0$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq (3c_\mu^2)^{-1}$. Since the function h is lower semicontinuous in X , the level set $\Omega = \{x \in X : h(x) > \lambda\}$ is open in X . Since $a > 1$, we may assume that $\Omega \neq \emptyset$.

We first consider the case $\Omega = X$. If X is unbounded, then (36) holds whenever $C_1 > 0$ since $\mu(X) = \infty$ by the assumed reverse doubling condition and the assumption $\text{diam}(X) = \infty$. If X is bounded, there exists $z \in X$ such that (35) holds. Since $z \in X = \Omega$, we see that $h(z) > \lambda$. Recall that by the definition of n_0 we have $X = B(x, 2^{-n_0})$ for every $x \in X$. If $x \in X$, we obtain from (35) that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda < h(z) &= \sum_{n=n_0}^{n_0+2} 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu(B(z, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(\overline{B}(z, 2^{-n}))} \leq 3c_\mu^2 \cdot 2^{-\beta n_0} \frac{\nu(X)}{\mu(X)} \\ &= 3c_\mu^2 \cdot 2^{-\beta n_0} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-n_0}))}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n_0}))} \leq 3c_\mu^2 M_\beta \nu(x). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $M_\beta \nu(x) > (3c_\mu^2)^{-1} \lambda$ for every $x \in X$, and consequently (36) holds whenever $C_2 \geq 1$ since $\varepsilon \leq (3c_\mu^2)^{-1}$. This concludes the proof in the case $\Omega = X$.

In the sequel, we assume that $\Omega \neq \emptyset$ and $X \setminus \Omega \neq \emptyset$. By [17, Proposition 4.1.15], there exists a countable collection $\mathcal{W} = \{B(x_i, r_i)\}$ of the so-called Whitney balls in Ω such that $\Omega = \bigcup_i B(x_i, r_i)$ and $\sum_i \mathbf{1}_{B(x_i, r_i)} \leq N = C(c_\mu)$, where

$$r_i = \frac{1}{8} \text{dist}(x_i, X \setminus \Omega).$$

We write $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}_1 \cup \mathcal{W}_2$, where the collection \mathcal{W}_1 consists of all Whitney balls B_i such that $M_\beta \nu(x) > \varepsilon \lambda$ for all $x \in B_i$, and $\mathcal{W}_2 = \mathcal{W} \setminus \mathcal{W}_1$. Thus

$$\{x \in B_i : M_\beta \nu(x) \leq \varepsilon \lambda\} \neq \emptyset \quad (37)$$

for all $B_i \in \mathcal{W}_2$. Since $a > 1$ and $\mathbf{1}_\Omega \leq \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{B_i}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\{x \in X : h(x) > a\lambda\}) &= \int_{\{x \in X : h(x) > a\lambda\}} \mathbf{1}_\Omega(y) d\mu(y) \\ &\leq \sum_{B_i \in \mathcal{W}_1} \int_{\{x \in X : h(x) > a\lambda\}} \mathbf{1}_{B_i}(y) d\mu(y) + \sum_{B_i \in \mathcal{W}_2} \int_{\{x \in X : h(x) > a\lambda\}} \mathbf{1}_{B_i}(y) d\mu(y). \end{aligned}$$

For the first sum above we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{B_i \in \mathcal{W}_1} \int_{\{x \in X : h(x) > a\lambda\}} \mathbf{1}_{B_i}(y) d\mu(y) \leq \sum_{B_i \in \mathcal{W}_1} \mu(B_i) \\ & \leq \sum_{B_i \in \mathcal{W}_1} \mu(\{x \in B_i : M_\beta \nu(x) > \varepsilon \lambda\}) \leq \int_{\{x \in X : M_\beta \nu(x) > \varepsilon \lambda\}} \sum_{B_i \in \mathcal{W}_1} \mathbf{1}_{B_i}(y) d\mu(y) \\ & \leq N \mu(\{x \in X : M_\beta \nu(x) > \varepsilon \lambda\}). \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the second sum, we claim that

$$\mu(\{x \in B_i : h(x) > a\lambda\}) \leq C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma) \varepsilon \mu(B_i) \quad (38)$$

holds for all $B_i \in \mathcal{W}_2$. Using (38), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{B_i \in \mathcal{W}_2} \int_{\{x \in X : h(x) > a\lambda\}} \mathbf{1}_{B_i}(y) d\mu(y) &\leq C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma)\varepsilon \sum_{B_i \in \mathcal{W}_2} \mu(B_i) \\ &= C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma)\varepsilon \int_{\{x \in X : h(x) > \lambda\}} \sum_{B_i \in \mathcal{W}_2} \mathbf{1}_{B_i}(y) d\mu(y) \\ &\leq C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma)N\varepsilon\mu(\{x \in X : h(x) > \lambda\}). \end{aligned}$$

By combining the estimates above, we conclude that the good λ -inequality (36) holds with $C_1 = C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma)N$ and $C_2 = N$, where $N = C(c_\mu)$.

Thus, to complete the proof, we need to show that (38) holds for all $B_i \in \mathcal{W}_2$. We fix $B_i \in \mathcal{W}_2$ and define Borel measures ν_1 and ν_2 by setting $\nu_1(A) = \nu(A \cap 10B_i)$ and $\nu_2(A) = \nu(A \setminus 10B_i)$ for all Borel sets $A \subset X$. We also write, for all $x \in X$, that

$$h_1(x) = \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu_1(B(x, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(\overline{B}(x, 2^{-n}))} \quad \text{and} \quad h_2(x) = \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu_2(B(x, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(\overline{B}(x, 2^{-n}))}.$$

Then $\nu = \nu_1 + \nu_2$ and $h = h_1 + h_2$. We prove inequality (38) by showing that

$$\{x \in B_i : h(x) > a\lambda\} \subset \{x \in B_i : h_1(x) > a\lambda/2\} \quad (39)$$

and

$$\mu(\{x \in B_i : h_1(x) > a\lambda/2\}) \leq C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma)\varepsilon\mu(B_i). \quad (40)$$

For the inclusion in (39), we assume that $x \in B_i$ is such that $h(x) > a\lambda$, and we first aim to show that $h_2(x) \leq \frac{a}{2}\lambda$. If $10B_i = X$, then $h_2(x) = 0$. Hence, in the sequel we may assume that $X \setminus 10B_i \neq \emptyset$. Let $k \geq n_0$ be the largest integer such that $B(x, 2^{-k}) \setminus 10B_i \neq \emptyset$. Then $2^{-k} \geq 9r_i > r_i$, and by the definition of ν_2 ,

$$h_2(x) = \sum_{n=n_0}^k 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu_2(B(x, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(\overline{B}(x, 2^{-n}))}.$$

Since $9r_i = \frac{9}{8} \text{dist}(x_i, X \setminus \Omega)$, there exists $w \in 9B_i \setminus \Omega$. Then $h(w) \leq \lambda$ by the definition of the set Ω .

Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $n_0 \leq n \leq k$. Then

$$\nu_2(B(x, 2^{-n})) \leq \nu_2(B(w, 2^{-n+4})) \leq \nu(B(w, 2^{-n+4}))$$

and

$$\mu(\overline{B}(w, 2^{-n+4})) \leq \mu(B(x, 2^{-n+5})) \leq c_\mu^5 \mu(\overline{B}(x, 2^{-n})).$$

From these estimates we obtain

$$2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu_2(B(x, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(\overline{B}(x, 2^{-n}))} \leq c_\mu^5 2^{-\beta(n-4)} \frac{\nu(B(w, 2^{-(n-4)}))}{\mu(\overline{B}(w, 2^{-(n-4)}))},$$

and so

$$h_2(x) \leq c_\mu^5 \sum_{n=n_0}^k 2^{-\beta(n-4)} \frac{\nu(B(w, 2^{-(n-4)}))}{\mu(\overline{B}(w, 2^{-(n-4)}))} \leq c_\mu^5 (1 + 4 \cdot 2^{4\beta}) h(w) \leq \frac{a}{2}\lambda.$$

It follows that

$$a\lambda < h(x) = h_1(x) + h_2(x) \leq h_1(x) + \frac{a}{2}\lambda,$$

and thus $h_1(x) > a\lambda/2$, proving the inclusion in (39).

Next we show that (40) holds. Let $x \in B_i$ be such that $h_1(x) > a\lambda/2$ and choose $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $2^{-k-1} < r_i \leq 2^{-k}$. Then

$$\sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu_1(B(x, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(\overline{B}(x, 2^{-n}))} \leq M\nu_1(x) \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \leq C(\beta)2^{-\beta k} M\nu_1(x) \leq C(\beta)r_i^\beta M\nu_1(x),$$

where M is the centered maximal operator. On the other hand, the assumed quantitative reverse doubling condition (5), with $\sigma > \beta$, gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{n=n_0}^k 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu_1(B(x, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(\overline{B}(x, 2^{-n}))} &\leq \nu_1(X) \sum_{n=n_0}^k \frac{2^{-\beta n}}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} \\
 &= \nu_1(X) \frac{2^{-\sigma k}}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-k}))} \sum_{n=n_0}^k 2^{-n(\beta-\sigma)} \left(\frac{2^{-n}}{2^{-k}}\right)^\sigma \frac{\mu(B(x, 2^{-k}))}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} \\
 &\leq c_\sigma \nu_1(X) \frac{2^{-\sigma k}}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-k}))} \sum_{n=-\infty}^k 2^{n(\sigma-\beta)} \\
 &= C(c_\sigma, \beta, \sigma) \nu_1(X) \frac{2^{-\beta k}}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-k}))} \\
 &\leq C(c_\sigma, \beta, \sigma) \nu_1(X) \frac{r_i^\beta}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-k}))}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $\nu_1(X) = \nu(10B_i)$, we obtain

$$\nu_1(X) \frac{r_i^\beta}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-k}))} = r_i^\beta \frac{\nu_1(B(x_i, 10r_i))}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-k}))} \leq c_\mu^4 r_i^\beta \frac{\nu_1(B(x, 11r_i))}{\mu(B(x, 11r_i))} \leq c_\mu^4 r_i^\beta M\nu_1(x).$$

By combining the above estimates, we get

$$a\lambda/2 < h_1(x) \leq C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma) r_i^\beta M\nu_1(x) = \kappa M\nu_1(x),$$

where we have written $\kappa = C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma) r_i^\beta$. We conclude that

$$\mu(\{x \in B_i : h_1(x) > a\lambda/2\}) \leq \mu(\{x \in X : M\nu_1(x) > a\lambda/(2\kappa)\}). \quad (41)$$

The proof of [4, Lemma 3.12] shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu(\{x \in X : M\nu_1(x) > a\lambda/(2\kappa)\}) &\leq C(c_\mu) \frac{2\kappa}{a\lambda} \nu_1(X) \\
 &\leq \frac{C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma)}{a\lambda} r_i^\beta \frac{\nu_1(X)}{\mu(B_i)} \mu(B_i).
 \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Since $B_i \in \mathcal{W}_2$, by (37) there exists $z \in B_i$ such that $M_\beta \nu(z) \leq \varepsilon\lambda$. Taking also into account that $r_i \leq (1/8) \text{diam}(X)$ in the bounded case, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 r_i^\beta \frac{\nu_1(X)}{\mu(B_i)} &= r_i^\beta \frac{\nu(B(x_i, 10r_i))}{\mu(B(x_i, r_i))} \leq c_\mu^4 (11r_i)^\beta \frac{\nu(B(z, 11r_i))}{\mu(B(z, 11r_i))} \\
 &\leq \left(\frac{11}{8}\right)^\beta c_\mu^4 M_\beta \nu(z) \leq \left(\frac{11}{8}\right)^\beta c_\mu^4 \varepsilon\lambda.
 \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

By combining the above estimates (41), (42) and (43), we conclude that

$$\mu(\{x \in B_i : h_1(x) > a\lambda/2\}) \leq \frac{C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma)}{a} \varepsilon \mu(B_i).$$

Since $a = 2 \cdot c_\mu^5 (1 + 4 \cdot 2^{4\beta})$, this shows that (40) holds, and the proof is complete. \square

9. q -INDEPENDENCE OF CAPACITIES

In the previous section, we obtained an upper bound for the $L^p(X, l^1)$ -norm of $\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu$ in terms of the L^p -norm of $M_\beta \nu$. On the other hand, due to the doubling property of μ , the $L^p(X, l^\infty)$ -norm of $\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu$ gives an easy upper bound for the L^p -norm of $M_\beta \nu$; cf. Lemma 9.1 and the proof of Lemma 9.2. Together, these estimates yield the main result of this section, Theorem 9.3, which gives the comparability of the (β, p, q) -capacities $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E)$ for all values

of the parameter $1 \leq q \leq \infty$. Observe that the Muckenhoupt–Wheeden Theorem 8.3 and the dual characterization of $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E)$ in terms of $\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu$ are both crucial for this approach, which in Euclidean spaces originally appeared in [2]; see also [3, Sections 3.6 and 4.4] and [20].

We begin with a simple two-sided estimate for the fractional maximal function.

Lemma 9.1. *Let $\beta > 0$ and let ν be a nonnegative Borel measure in X . Then*

$$\sup_{n \geq n_0} 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} \leq M_\beta \nu(x) \leq c_\mu \sup_{n \geq n_0} 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))}$$

for every $x \in X$, where the supremums are taken over all integers n such that $n \geq n_0$.

Proof. The first inequality follows from definition (33). For the converse inequality, we let $x \in X$ and $0 < r \leq 2^{-n_0}$, and let $k \geq n_0$ be an integer such that $2^{-k-1} < r \leq 2^{-k}$. Then the doubling property (3) of μ implies that

$$r^\beta \frac{\nu(B(x, r))}{\mu(B(x, r))} \leq 2^{-\beta k} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-k}))}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-k-1}))} \leq c_\mu 2^{-\beta k} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-k}))}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-k}))} \leq c_\mu \sup_{n \geq n_0} 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-n}))}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))}.$$

The claim follows by taking supremum over all $0 < r \leq 2^{-n_0}$. \square

From Lemma 9.1 and the Muckenhoupt–Wheeden Theorem 8.3, we obtain a q -independence result for the operator $\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta$.

Lemma 9.2. *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $\beta > 0$. Assume that μ satisfies the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) for some exponent $\sigma > \beta$, and let ν be a nonnegative Borel measure in X . Then there exists a constant $C = C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma, p) > 0$ such that*

$$\|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^p(X; l^1)} \leq C \|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^p(X; l^\infty)}.$$

Proof. The Muckenhoupt–Wheeden Theorem 8.3 gives

$$\|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^p(X; l^1)} \leq C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma, p) \|M_\beta \nu\|_{L^p(X)}.$$

On the other hand, Lemma 9.1 implies

$$\|M_\beta \nu\|_{L^p(X)} \leq c_\mu \|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^p(X; l^\infty)},$$

and the claim follows by combining these two estimates. \square

Under the assumptions of the following theorem, the capacities $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E)$ and $\text{Cap}_{p,\tau}^\beta(E)$ are comparable for all $1 \leq q, \tau \leq \infty$; cf. [3, p. 107]. We emphasize that the constant of comparison is independent of q and τ .

Theorem 9.3. *Let $\beta > 0$, $1 < p < \infty$, and $1 \leq q, \tau \leq \infty$, and assume that μ satisfies the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) for some exponent $\sigma > \beta$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma, p) > 0$ such that $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E) \leq C \text{Cap}_{p,\tau}^\beta(E)$ for all compact sets $E \subset X$.*

Proof. The dual characterization of the capacity in Theorem 7.3 implies that

$$\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E)^{1/p} = \sup \left\{ \frac{\nu(E)}{\|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^{q'})}} : \nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(E) \right\}$$

and

$$\text{Cap}_{p,\tau}^\beta(E)^{1/p} = \sup \left\{ \frac{\nu(E)}{\|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^{\tau'})}} : \nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(E) \right\}.$$

By Lemma 9.2, we have

$$\|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^{\tau'})} \leq \|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^1)} \leq C \|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^\infty)} \leq C \|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^{q'})}$$

for every $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(E)$, where $C = C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma, p)$. The desired conclusion follows. \square

10. COMPARISON TO RIESZ CAPACITY

In this section we clarify the relations between Riesz capacities and Triebel–Lizorkin capacities. Riesz capacities are defined in terms of Riesz potentials, which appear frequently in potential analysis, see for instance [3, 25]. In metric spaces there are several slightly different ways to define Riesz potentials. The most natural for our purposes is the following variant, which appears for instance in [12, 16, 19].

Definition 10.1. Let $\beta > 0$ and let ν be a nonnegative Borel measure in X . The Riesz potential $I_\beta \nu$ is defined by

$$I_\beta \nu(x) = \int_{X \setminus \{x\}} \frac{d(x, y)^\beta}{\mu(B(x, d(x, y)))} d\nu(y), \quad x \in X.$$

If $f \geq 0$ is a Borel function in X , we write $I_\beta f = I_\beta \nu$, where $d\nu = f d\mu$.

Assuming that $f \geq 0$ is a Borel function in X and μ satisfies the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) for some $\sigma > 0$, we have

$$I_\beta f(x) = \int_{X \setminus \{x\}} \frac{d(x, y)^\beta}{\mu(B(x, d(x, y)))} f(y) d\mu(y) = \int_X \frac{d(x, y)^\beta}{\mu(B(x, d(x, y)))} f(y) d\mu(y) \quad (44)$$

for all $x \in X$ since $\mu(\{x\}) = 0$ for every $x \in X$.

Riesz capacities are well known in Euclidean spaces; we refer to [3, 26] and the references therein. In metric spaces, variants of Riesz capacities have been studied for instance in [6, 32]. If μ satisfies the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) for some $\sigma > 0$, then the following definition coincides with that of [6, Section 2.3], by (44).

Definition 10.2. Let $\beta > 0$ and $1 < p < \infty$. The Riesz (β, p) -capacity of a subset $E \subset X$ is

$$R_{\beta, p}(E) = \inf \{ \|f\|_{L^p(X)}^p : f \geq 0 \text{ and } I_\beta f \geq 1 \text{ on } E \},$$

where $f \geq 0$ in the infimum means that f is a nonnegative Borel function in X .

The pointwise inequalities for Riesz potentials in Lemma 10.3 will be useful when comparing Riesz capacities and Triebel–Lizorkin capacities. The proofs of these estimates are rather straightforward computations based on the doubling and reverse doubling conditions.

Lemma 10.3. Let $\beta > 0$ and let ν be a nonnegative Borel measure in X . Then

$$I_\beta \nu(x) \leq c_\mu \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-n}) \setminus \{x\})}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} \quad (45)$$

for every $x \in X$.

Conversely, if μ satisfies the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) for some exponent $\sigma > \beta$, then there exists a constant $C = C(c_\sigma, \sigma, \beta) > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-n}) \setminus \{x\})}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} \leq C I_\beta \nu(x) \quad (46)$$

for every $x \in X$.

Proof. Fix $x \in X$ and write $A_n = B(x, 2^{-n}) \setminus B(x, 2^{-n-1})$ for every $n \geq n_0$. We have

$$I_\beta \nu(x) = \int_{X \setminus \{x\}} \frac{d(x, y)^\beta}{\mu(B(x, d(x, y)))} d\nu(y) = \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \int_{A_n} \frac{d(x, y)^\beta}{\mu(B(x, d(x, y)))} d\nu(y). \quad (47)$$

The doubling property (3) of μ implies that

$$\frac{d(x, y)^\beta}{\mu(B(x, d(x, y)))} \leq \frac{2^{-\beta n}}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n-1}))} \leq c_\mu \frac{2^{-\beta n}}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))}$$

for every $y \in A_n$ and $n \geq n_0$, and thus

$$I_\beta \nu(x) \leq c_\mu \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \frac{2^{-\beta n} \nu(A_n)}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} \leq c_\mu \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-n}) \setminus \{x\})}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))}.$$

This proves inequality (45).

For the proof of (46), we assume that μ satisfies the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) for some exponent $\sigma > \beta$. We estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-n}) \setminus \{x\})}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} &= \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \int_{B(x, 2^{-n}) \setminus \{x\}} \frac{2^{-\beta n}}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} d\nu(y) \\ &= \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} \int_{A_m} \frac{2^{-\beta n}}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} d\nu(y) = \sum_{m=n_0}^{\infty} \int_{A_m} \sum_{n=n_0}^m \frac{2^{-\beta n}}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} d\nu(y). \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $n_0 \leq n \leq m$ and let $y \in A_m$. Then the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) implies that

$$\frac{\mu(B(x, d(x, y)))}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} \leq c_\sigma \left(\frac{d(x, y)}{2^{-n}} \right)^\sigma.$$

Hence,

$$\frac{2^{-\beta n}}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} = 2^{n(\sigma-\beta)} \frac{2^{-\sigma n}}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} \leq c_\sigma 2^{n(\sigma-\beta)} \frac{d(x, y)^\sigma}{\mu(B(x, d(x, y)))},$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=n_0}^m \frac{2^{-\beta n}}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} &\leq c_\sigma \frac{d(x, y)^\sigma}{\mu(B(x, d(x, y)))} \sum_{n=-\infty}^m 2^{n(\sigma-\beta)} \\ &\leq C(c_\sigma, \sigma, \beta) \frac{d(x, y)^\sigma}{\mu(B(x, d(x, y)))} 2^{m(\sigma-\beta)} \\ &\leq C(c_\sigma, \sigma, \beta) \frac{d(x, y)^\beta}{\mu(B(x, d(x, y)))} \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

for every $m \geq n_0$ and $y \in A_m$. Combining the estimates (48) and (49) and the identity in (47), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-n}) \setminus \{x\})}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} &\leq C(c_\sigma, \sigma, \beta) \sum_{m=n_0}^{\infty} \int_{A_m} \frac{d(x, y)^\beta}{\mu(B(x, d(x, y)))} d\nu(y) \\ &= C(c_\sigma, \sigma, \beta) I_\beta \nu(x), \end{aligned}$$

as was claimed. \square

The following theorem explains the relation between the Riesz (β, p) -capacities and the Triebel–Lizorkin (β, p, q) -capacities. Namely, in the case $q = \infty$ these capacities are comparable for all sets $E \subset X$, under our standard assumptions. The proof is quite simple, relying on the pointwise estimates given by Lemma 10.3.

Theorem 10.4. *Let $\beta > 0$ and $1 < p < \infty$, and assume that μ satisfies the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) for some exponent $\sigma > \beta$. Then*

$$c_\mu^{-2p} \text{Cap}_{p, \infty}^\beta(E) \leq R_{\beta, p}(E) \leq C(c_\mu, c_\sigma, \sigma, \beta, p) \text{Cap}_{p, \infty}^\beta(E),$$

for all sets $E \subset X$.

Proof. To show the first inequality, we fix a nonnegative Borel function f such that $I_\beta f(x) \geq 1$ for every $x \in E$. We set $h_n = f$ for every $n \geq n_0$ and define $h = (h_n)_{n=n_0}^\infty \geq 0$. Assuming that $x \in E$, Lemma 10.3 with the measure $d\nu = f d\mu$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq I_\beta f(x) = I_\beta \nu(x) \leq c_\mu \sum_{n=n_0}^\infty 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-n}) \setminus \{x\})}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} \\ &\leq c_\mu \sum_{n=n_0}^\infty 2^{-\beta n} \int_X \frac{\mathbf{1}_{B(x, 2^{-n})}(y)}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} f(y) d\mu(y) \\ &\leq c_\mu^2 \sum_{n=n_0}^\infty 2^{-\beta n} \int_X \frac{\mathbf{1}_{B(y, 2^{-n})}(x)}{\mu(B(y, 2^{-n}))} h_n(y) d\mu(y) = \mathcal{H}_\beta(c_\mu^2 h)(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\text{Cap}_{p,\infty}^\beta(E) \leq \|c_\mu^2 h\|_{L^p(X; l^\infty)}^p = c_\mu^{2p} \|h\|_{L^p(X; l^\infty)}^p = c_\mu^{2p} \|f\|_{L^p(X)}^p,$$

and the first inequality of the claim follows by taking infimum over all f as above.

Let then $f = (f_n)_{n=n_0}^\infty$ be a sequence of nonnegative Borel functions in X such that $\mathcal{H}_\beta f(x) \geq 1$ for all $x \in E$. We define $h = \sup_{n \geq n_0} f_n \geq 0$ and fix $x \in E$. Using Lemma 10.3, with the measure $d\nu = h d\mu$, and the fact that $\mu(\{x\}) = 0$ for every $x \in X$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \mathcal{H}_\beta f(x) = \sum_{n=n_0}^\infty 2^{-\beta n} \int_X \frac{\mathbf{1}_{B(y, 2^{-n})}(x)}{\mu(B(y, 2^{-n}))} f_n(y) d\mu(y) \\ &\leq c_\mu \sum_{n=n_0}^\infty 2^{-\beta n} \int_{X \setminus \{x\}} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{B(x, 2^{-n})}(y)}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} h(y) d\mu(y) \\ &= c_\mu \sum_{n=n_0}^\infty 2^{-\beta n} \frac{\nu(B(x, 2^{-n}) \setminus \{x\})}{\mu(B(x, 2^{-n}))} \leq C I_\beta \nu(x) = I_\beta(C h)(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(c_\mu, c_\sigma, \sigma, \beta)$. This implies that

$$R_{\beta,p}(E) \leq \|C h\|_{L^p(X)}^p = C^p \|h\|_{L^p(X)}^p = C^p \|f\|_{L^p(X; l^\infty)}^p,$$

and the second inequality of the claim follows by taking infimum over all f as above. \square

By the q -independence of the (β, p, q) -capacities for compact sets, given by Theorem 9.3, we obtain from Theorem 10.4 the comparability of $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta$ and $R_{\beta,p}$ for all $1 \leq q \leq \infty$. Thus the following result is an immediate consequence of those two theorems. Nevertheless, we give below also an alternative direct proof, which is based on the dual characterization of $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta$ and uses some arguments from [32].

Theorem 10.5. *Let $\beta > 0$, $1 < p < \infty$, and $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, and assume that μ satisfies the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) for some exponent $\sigma > \beta$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma, p) > 0$ such that $\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E) \leq C R_{\beta,p}(E)$ for all compact sets $E \subset X$.*

Proof. Theorem 7.3 implies that

$$\text{Cap}_{p,q}^\beta(E)^{1/p} = \sup \left\{ \frac{\nu(E)}{\|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\beta,p} \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^{q'})}} : \nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(E) \right\}. \quad (50)$$

Let $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(E)$ and let $f \geq 0$ be such that $I_\beta f \geq 1$ on E . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(E) &\leq \int_X I_\beta f(x) d\nu(x) = \int_X \int_X \mathbf{1}_{X \setminus \{x\}}(y) \frac{d(x, y)^\beta}{\mu(B(x, d(x, y)))} f(y) d\mu(y) d\nu(x) \\ &\leq c_\mu \int_X \int_X \mathbf{1}_{X \setminus \{y\}}(x) \frac{d(y, x)^\beta}{\mu(B(y, d(y, x)))} d\nu(x) f(y) d\mu(y) \\ &= c_\mu \int_X I_\beta \nu(y) f(y) d\mu(y) \leq c_\mu \|I_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X)} \|f\|_{L^p(X)}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 10.3 and Lemma 9.2 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X)} &\leq c_\mu \|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^1)} \leq C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma, p) \|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^\infty)} \\ &\leq C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma, p) \|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^{q'})}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\frac{\nu(E)}{\|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^{q'})}} \leq C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma, p) \|f\|_{L^p(X)},$$

and by taking infimum over all f as above, we get

$$\frac{\nu(E)}{\|\check{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \nu\|_{L^{p'}(X; l^{q'})}} \leq C(c_\sigma, c_\mu, \beta, \sigma, p) R_{\beta, p}(E)^{1/p}.$$

The claim follows by taking supremum over all $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(E)$ and using (50). \square

We also record explicitly the following corollary concerning the comparability of the Riesz capacity and the relative Hajlasz–Triebel–Lizorkin (β, p, q) -capacity. This result is needed below in our applications concerning capacity density conditions.

Corollary 10.6. *Let $1 < p < \infty$, $1 < q \leq \infty$, $0 < \beta < 1$, and $\Lambda \geq 2$, and assume that μ satisfies the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) for some exponent $\sigma > \beta p$. Let $B \subset X$ be a ball and let $E \subset \bar{B}$ be a compact set. Then there exists a constant $C = C(c_\sigma, p, q, \sigma, \beta, c_\mu, \Lambda) > 0$ such that*

$$\text{cap}_{M_{p, q}^\beta}(E, 2B, \Lambda B) \leq C R_{\beta, p}(E).$$

Proof. This follows by combining Theorems 6.5 and 10.5. \square

11. CAPACITY DENSITY

We conclude the paper by applying the results from the previous sections to obtain a characterization of the capacity density condition for the relative Hajlasz–Triebel–Lizorkin capacity. This extends the results in [26], [6] and [7] to our present setting and in particular implies that also this density condition is open-ended (self-improving) in complete geodesic metric spaces; see Corollary 11.5.

In the proof of the characterization in Theorem 11.4 we will need most of the theory that has been established in the paper. In particular, we use Corollary 10.6, which follows from the comparability results between the relative Hajlasz–Triebel–Lizorkin (β, p, q) -capacity, the Triebel–Lizorkin (β, p, q) -capacity, and the Riesz (β, p) -capacity. In the proofs of the comparability results we applied the discrete \mathcal{Q}_β -potentials and the q -independence of the Triebel–Lizorkin (β, p, q) -capacities. The proof of the latter was, in turn, based on the dual characterization of the Triebel–Lizorkin capacities and the Muckenhoupt–Wheeden Theorem. Finally, we utilize also the estimates for the relative (β, p, q) -capacities from Section 4.

Besides these results from the present work, one essential ingredient in the proof of Theorem 11.4 is [6, Theorem 6.4], which however requires some additional assumptions on the space X . The proof of [6, Theorem 6.4] utilizes a non-trivial characterization of a Hajlasz

capacity density condition in terms of Hausdorff content density conditions from [7, Theorem 9.5].

Before the statement of Theorem 11.4, we introduce the relevant density conditions.

Definition 11.1. Let $1 < p < \infty$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, and $0 < \beta < 1$. A closed set $E \subset X$ satisfies the Hajlasz–Triebel–Lizorkin (β, p, q) -capacity density condition, if there are constants $c_0, c_1 > 0$ and $\Lambda > 2$ such that

$$\text{cap}_{M_{p,q}^\beta}(E \cap \overline{B(x,r)}, B(x, 2r), B(x, \Lambda r)) \geq c_0 \text{cap}_{M_{p,q}^\beta}(\overline{B(x,r)}, B(x, 2r), B(x, \Lambda r)) \quad (51)$$

for all $x \in E$ and all $0 < r < c_1 \text{diam}(E)$.

By inequality (44), the following Riesz capacity density condition coincides with the one in [6, Definition 6.3] if μ satisfies the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) for some $\sigma > 0$.

Definition 11.2. Let $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $\beta > 0$. A closed set $E \subset X$ satisfies the Riesz (β, p) -capacity density condition, if there is a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$R_{\beta,p}(E \cap \overline{B(x,r)}) \geq c_0 R_{\beta,p}(\overline{B(x,r)}) \quad (52)$$

for all $x \in E$ and all $0 < r < (1/8) \text{diam}(E)$.

We also need a suitable version of the Hausdorff content density condition; recall Definition 4.5. The following definition coincides with [6, Definition 5.1].

Definition 11.3. A closed set $E \subset X$ satisfies the Hausdorff content density condition of codimension $d \geq 0$, if there is a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}_r^{\mu,d}(E \cap \overline{B(x,r)}) \geq c_0 \mathcal{H}_r^{\mu,d}(\overline{B(x,r)}) \quad (53)$$

for all $x \in E$ and all $0 < r < \text{diam}(E)$.

We are now ready to characterize the Hajlasz–Triebel–Lizorkin capacity density condition. The implication from (ii) to (iii) in the following theorem relies (via [6, Theorem 6.4]) on [7, Theorem 9.5]. This is the most difficult of the implications in the proof. The bounds $\Lambda \geq 41$ and $c_1 \leq 1/80$ in (i) and (iv) are convenient due to the use of Theorem 4.6, but they have not been optimized. Nevertheless, part (iv) shows that the actual value of these constants is not essential. Moreover, a straightforward modification of Example 4.4 shows that all closed sets $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy condition (i) of Theorem 11.4 with $\Lambda = 2$ when $1 < p < \infty$ and $0 < \beta < 1$ are such that $\beta p < 1$. Not all closed sets satisfy, say, condition (iii) and therefore the requirement $\Lambda \geq 41$ cannot be replaced with $\Lambda \geq 2$ in part (i) of Theorem 11.4.

Theorem 11.4. Let $1 < p < \infty$, $1 < q \leq \infty$, and $0 < \beta < 1$. Assume that X is a complete geodesic metric space and that μ satisfies the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) for some exponent $\sigma > \beta p$. Then the following conditions are equivalent for all closed sets $E \subset X$:

- (i) E satisfies the Hajlasz–Triebel–Lizorkin (β, p, q) -capacity density condition (51), with some constants $\Lambda \geq 41$ and $c_1 \leq 1/80$.
- (ii) E satisfies the Riesz (β, p) -capacity density condition (52).
- (iii) E satisfies the Hausdorff content density condition (53) for some $0 < d < \beta p$.
- (iv) E satisfies the Hajlasz–Triebel–Lizorkin (β, p, q) -capacity density condition (51), for all constants $\Lambda \geq 41$ and $c_1 \leq 1/80$.

Proof. Assume first that condition (i) holds, with constants $c_0 > 0$, $\Lambda \geq 41$, and $c_1 \leq 1/80$ in (51). Fix $x \in E$ and $0 < R < (1/8) \text{diam}(E)$, and write $r = 8c_1 R < c_1 \text{diam}(E)$. The geodesic space X is in particular connected, and therefore, by [6, Lemma 5.5], there is a constant $C_1 = C(c_\mu, c_\sigma, \sigma, \beta, p) > 0$ such that

$$R_{\beta,p}(\overline{B(x,R)}) \leq C_1 R^{-\beta p} \mu(B(x,R)) \leq C(C_1, c_1, c_\mu) r^{-\beta p} \mu(B(x,r)). \quad (54)$$

We use Theorem 4.3 (b) and inequality (12) to get

$$r^{-\beta p} \mu(B(x, r)) \leq C(\beta, p, c_\mu, \Lambda) \operatorname{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(\overline{B(x, r)}, B(x, 2r), B(x, \Lambda r)). \quad (55)$$

By combining (54) and (55), we obtain

$$R_{\beta,p}(\overline{B(x, R)}) \leq C(\beta, p, \sigma, c_\sigma, c_\mu, c_1, \Lambda) \operatorname{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(\overline{B(x, r)}, B(x, 2r), B(x, \Lambda r)).$$

Since E satisfies the Hajlasz–Triebel–Lizorkin (β, p, q) -capacity density condition (51), with the constant $c_0 > 0$, we see that

$$R_{\beta,p}(\overline{B(x, R)}) \leq C(\beta, p, \sigma, c_\sigma, c_\mu, c_0, c_1, \Lambda) \operatorname{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(E \cap \overline{B(x, r)}, B(x, 2r), B(x, \Lambda r)).$$

The closed and bounded set $E \cap \overline{B(x, r)}$ is compact by [4, Proposition 3.1], and so Corollary 10.6 implies that

$$R_{\beta,p}(\overline{B(x, R)}) \leq C(\beta, p, q, \sigma, c_\sigma, c_\mu, c_0, c_1, \Lambda) R_{\beta,p}(E \cap \overline{B(x, r)}).$$

Clearly $R_{\beta,p}(E \cap \overline{B(x, r)}) \leq R_{\beta,p}(E \cap \overline{B(x, R)})$, and therefore (ii) holds.

The implication from (ii) to (iii) follows from [6, Theorem 6.4] and the implication from (iv) to (i) is a triviality. Hence, it suffices to show that (iii) implies (iv). To this end, assume that (iii) holds, with a constant $c_0 > 0$ in (53). Let $\Lambda \geq 41$ and $c_1 \leq 1/80$, and fix $x \in E$ and $0 < r < c_1 \operatorname{diam}(E)$. Theorem 4.3 (a) and inequality (12) imply that

$$\operatorname{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(\overline{B(x, r)}, B(x, 2r), B(x, \Lambda r)) \leq C(c_\mu, \beta, p, \Lambda) r^{-\beta p} \mu(B(x, r)). \quad (56)$$

On the other hand, by the simple estimate in [6, Remark 5.2] and the assumed condition (iii), we obtain

$$r^{-d} \mu(B(x, r)) \leq \mathcal{H}_r^{\mu,d}(\overline{B(x, r)}) \leq C(c_0) \mathcal{H}_r^{\mu,d}(E \cap \overline{B(x, r)}). \quad (57)$$

Let $\{B(x_k, r_k)\}_k$ be a countable cover of $E \cap \overline{B(x, r)}$, with $0 < r_k \leq 5\Lambda r$ for all k . If $0 < r_k \leq r$ for all k , then by Definition 4.5 of the Hausdorff content we have

$$\mathcal{H}_r^{\mu,d}(E \cap \overline{B(x, r)}) \leq \sum_k \mu(B(x_k, r_k)) r_k^{-d},$$

and thus, by (57),

$$r^{-d} \mu(B(x, r)) \leq C(c_0) \sum_k \mu(B(x_k, r_k)) r_k^{-d}. \quad (58)$$

On the other hand, if $r < r_k$ for some k , then we may assume that $r < r_1 \leq 5\Lambda r$ and that $B(x_1, r_1) \cap \overline{B(x, r)} \neq \emptyset$. In this case we obtain, using also the doubling condition (3), that

$$\begin{aligned} r^{-d} \mu(B(x, r)) &\leq C(d, \Lambda) r_1^{-d} \mu(B(x_1, 3r_1)) \\ &\leq C(d, c_\mu, \Lambda) \mu(B(x_1, r_1)) r_1^{-d} \leq C(d, c_\mu, \Lambda) \sum_k \mu(B(x_k, r_k)) r_k^{-d}. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

By taking infimum over all such covers of $E \cap \overline{B(x, r)}$, we conclude from (58) and (59) that

$$r^{-d} \mu(B(x, r)) \leq C(c_0, d, c_\mu, \Lambda) \mathcal{H}_{5\Lambda r}^{\mu,d}(E \cap \overline{B(x, r)}). \quad (60)$$

Since X is connected, the measure μ satisfies the reverse doubling condition (4) for a constant $0 < c_R = C(c_\mu) < 1$. By using (60), Theorem 4.6 with $\eta = d/\beta$, and inequality (12), we get

$$r^{-d} \mu(B(x, r)) \leq C(\beta, p, d, c_\mu, c_0, \Lambda) r^{\beta p - d} \operatorname{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(E \cap \overline{B(x, r)}, B(x, 2r), B(x, \Lambda r)). \quad (61)$$

Combining (56) and (61) gives

$$\operatorname{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(\overline{B(x, r)}, B(x, 2r), B(x, \Lambda r)) \leq C \operatorname{cap}_{\dot{M}_{p,q}^\beta}(E \cap \overline{B(x, r)}, B(x, 2r), B(x, \Lambda r)),$$

where $C = C(\beta, p, d, c_\mu, c_0, \Lambda)$. This proves condition (iv), and the proof of the theorem is complete. \square

As a corollary of Theorem 11.4, we obtain for the Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin capacity density condition the following self-improvement property, which is new even in the Euclidean spaces. Similar self-improvement results for other fractional capacities have been obtained in [26, 6, 7].

Corollary 11.5. *Let $1 < p < \infty$, $1 < q, \tau \leq \infty$, and $0 < \beta < 1$. Assume that X is a complete geodesic metric space and that μ satisfies the quantitative reverse doubling condition (5) for some exponent $\sigma > \beta p$. Assume that a closed set $E \subset X$ satisfies the Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin (β, p, q) -capacity density condition (51), with some constants $\Lambda \geq 41$ and $c_1 \leq 1/80$. Then there exists $0 < \delta < \min\{\beta, p - 1\}$ such that E satisfies the Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin (γ, s, τ) -capacity density condition (51), for any $\Lambda \geq 41$ and $c_1 \leq 1/80$, whenever*

$$\beta - \delta < \gamma < 1, \quad p - \delta < s < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma > \gamma s.$$

Proof. Theorem 11.4 implies that E satisfies the Hausdorff content density condition (53) for some $0 < d < \beta p$. Notice that this condition is open-ended, so it allows us to choose $0 < \delta < \min\{\beta, p - 1\}$ such that $d < (\beta - \delta)(p - \delta)$. Let γ and s be such that

$$0 < \beta - \delta < \gamma < 1, \quad 1 < p - \delta < s < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma > \gamma s.$$

Then $0 < d < \gamma s$, and since E satisfies the Hausdorff content density condition (53) of codimension d , Theorem 11.4 implies that E satisfies the Hajłasz–Triebel–Lizorkin (γ, s, τ) -capacity density condition (51), for all constants $\Lambda \geq 41$ and $c_1 \leq 1/80$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Aalto and J. Kinnunen. The discrete maximal operator in metric spaces. *J. Anal. Math.*, 111:369–390, 2010.
- [2] D. R. Adams. The classification problem for the capacities associated with the Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces. In *Approximation and function spaces (Warsaw, 1986)*, volume 22 of *Banach Center Publ.*, pages 9–24. PWN, Warsaw, 1989.
- [3] D. R. Adams and L. I. Hedberg. *Function spaces and potential theory*, volume 314 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.
- [4] A. Björn and J. Björn. *Nonlinear potential theory on metric spaces*, volume 17 of *EMS Tracts in Mathematics*. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2011.
- [5] N. Bourbaki. *General topology. Chapters 1–4*. Elements of Mathematics (Berlin). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998. Translated from the French, Reprint of the 1989 English translation.
- [6] J. Canto, L. Ihnatsyeva, J. Lehrbäck, and A. V. Vähäkangas. Capacities and density conditions in metric spaces. *arXiv:2208.14732*, 2022.
- [7] J. Canto and A. V. Vähäkangas. The Hajłasz capacity density condition is self-improving. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 32(11):Paper No. 276, 42, 2022.
- [8] B. Dyda, L. Ihnatsyeva, J. Lehrbäck, H. Tuominen, and A. V. Vähäkangas. Muckenhoupt A_p -properties of distance functions and applications to Hardy–Sobolev–type inequalities. *Potential Anal.*, 50(1):83–105, 2019.
- [9] B. Dyda, J. Lehrbäck, and A. V. Vähäkangas. Fractional Poincaré and localized Hardy inequalities on metric spaces. *Adv. Calc. Var.*, 16(4):867–884, 2023.
- [10] B. Dyda and A. V. Vähäkangas. Characterizations for fractional Hardy inequality. *Adv. Calc. Var.*, 8(2):173–182, 2015.
- [11] L. Grafakos, L. Liu, and D. Yang. Vector-valued singular integrals and maximal functions on spaces of homogeneous type. *Math. Scand.*, 104(2):296–310, 2009.
- [12] P. Hajłasz and P. Koskela. Sobolev met Poincaré. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 145(688):x+101, 2000.
- [13] T. Heikkinen, L. Ihnatsyeva, and H. Tuominen. Measure density and extension of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin functions. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 22(2):334–382, 2016.
- [14] T. Heikkinen, J. Kinnunen, J. Nuutinen, and H. Tuominen. Mapping properties of the discrete fractional maximal operator in metric measure spaces. *Kyoto J. Math.*, 53(3):693–712, 2013.
- [15] T. Heikkinen, P. Koskela, and H. Tuominen. Approximation and quasicontinuity of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin functions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 369(5):3547–3573, 2017.
- [16] J. Heinonen. *Lectures on analysis on metric spaces*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.

- [17] J. Heinonen, P. Koskela, N. Shanmugalingam, and J. T. Tyson. *Sobolev spaces on metric measure spaces, An approach based on upper gradients*, volume 27 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015.
- [18] E. Hewitt and K. A. Ross. *Abstract harmonic analysis. Vol. I*, volume 115 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, second edition, 1979. Structure of topological groups, integration theory, group representations.
- [19] B. Iaffei and L. Nitti. A unified point of view on boundedness of Riesz type potentials. *Rev. Un. Mat. Argentina*, 59(1):99–121, 2018.
- [20] B. Jawerth, C. Perez, and G. Welland. The positive cone in Triebel-Lizorkin spaces and the relation among potential and maximal operators. In *Harmonic analysis and partial differential equations (Boca Raton, FL, 1988)*, volume 107 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 71–91. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1990.
- [21] N. Karak. Triebel-Lizorkin capacity and Hausdorff measure in metric spaces. *Math. Slovaca*, 70(3):617–624, 2020.
- [22] N. Karak and D. Mondal. Capacity in Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin spaces with generalized smoothness. *Georgian Mathematical Journal (to appear)*, 2024.
- [23] J. Kinnunen and V. Latvala. Lebesgue points for Sobolev functions on metric spaces. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, 18(3):685–700, 2002.
- [24] P. Koskela, D. Yang, and Y. Zhou. Pointwise characterizations of Besov and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces and quasiconformal mappings. *Adv. Math.*, 226(4):3579–3621, 2011.
- [25] N. S. Landkof. *Foundations of modern potential theory*. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 180. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1972. Translated from the Russian by A. P. Doohovskoy.
- [26] J. L. Lewis. Uniformly fat sets. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 308(1):177–196, 1988.
- [27] Z. Li, D. Yang, and W. Yuan. Lebesgue Points of Besov and Triebel–Lizorkin Spaces with Generalized Smoothness. *Mathematics*, 9(21), 2021.
- [28] H. Luiro and A. V. Vähäkangas. Beyond local maximal operators. *Potential Anal.*, 46(2):201–226, 2017.
- [29] V. G. Maz'ya. *Sobolev spaces with applications to elliptic partial differential equations*, volume 342 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, Heidelberg, augmented edition, 2011.
- [30] N. G. Meyers. A theory of capacities for potentials of functions in Lebesgue classes. *Math. Scand.*, 26:255–292 (1971), 1970.
- [31] B. Muckenhoupt and R. Wheeden. Weighted norm inequalities for fractional integrals. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 192:261–274, 1974.
- [32] J. Nuutinen and P. Silvestre. The Riesz Capacity in Metric Spaces. arXiv:1501.05746v2, 2015.
- [33] C. Pérez and R. L. Wheeden. Potential operators, maximal functions, and generalizations of A_∞ . *Potential Anal.*, 19(1):1–33, 2003.
- [34] W. Rudin. *Real and complex analysis*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, third edition, 1987.
- [35] B. O. Turesson. *Nonlinear potential theory and weighted Sobolev spaces*, volume 1736 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000.

(J.L.) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, P.O. BOX 35, FI-40014 UNIVERSITY OF JYVASKYLA, FINLAND

Email address: juha.lehrback@jyu.fi

(K.M.) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, P.O. BOX 35, FI-40014 UNIVERSITY OF JYVASKYLA, FINLAND

Email address: kaushik.k.mohanta@jyu.fi

(A.V.V.) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, P.O. BOX 35, FI-40014 UNIVERSITY OF JYVASKYLA, FINLAND

Email address: antti.vahakangas@iki.fi